MAR 18 1957

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 102—PART 5

MARCH 28, 1956, TO APRIL 26, 1956
(PAGES 5707 TO 7176)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1956

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God and Father of us all, amid all the global concerns which drain our strength and devour our hours, somehow, sometime, somewhere, this week of the passion, may we take time for commerce and communion with the unseen and eternal where in an oasis of quietness there may be restored the inner resources of our pressured lives.

Save us from sweeping through the whole year as if there were no shame upon us, nothing to repent of, nothing richer for us to accept and attain. We confess that the symbols of a contrite spirit such as Thou dost not despise may be very inadequate—our sackcloth may be lined with silk, and our ashes scented with the juice of roses, but let us do something in the healing shadow of the cross that shall break the mere monotony of complacent living. And so, this Holy Week, may the obtrusive secularism which blocks the door of our hearts be pushed back and let the way be cleared, that the highest and best may enter and meet no obstacle. Thus, may we celebrate the singing Easter of the soul. In the risen Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 27, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session: A protocol dated at Montreal, June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the Convention on International Civil Aviation; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of T. Keith Glennan, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stephen Sibley Bean, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of R. Lockwood Jones, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be a United States circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be a United States district judge for the northern district of Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the District of Columbia municipal court of appeals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be a judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Public Health Service will be considered en bloc, and without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO LEASEHOLD AND CONSTRUCTION LOANS MADE BY NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to leasehold and construction loans which may be made by national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL 2410, RELATING TO OPERATIONS OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting sundry amendments to the bill (S. 2410) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to withdrawals of public lands in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the year 1955, no reservations were made of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMISSION FOR CELEBRATION OF 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF JOHN MARSHALL

A letter from the Chairman, United States Commission for the Celebration in 1955 of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of that Commission (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the water pollution control act

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill to revise and extend the expiring Water Pollution Control Act; and

"Whereas the continuance of the benefits provided by this act is essential to the welfare of many of the citizens of this commonwealth; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the Water Pollution Control Act, incorporating therein the provisions of H. R. 9540 and providing for grants to cities and towns for the elimination of stream pollution and the construction of sewage treatment plants; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this commonwealth."

Resolutions adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, Los Angeles, Calif.; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memoralizing Congress to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of Government, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same

"Whereas the people and the General Assembly of South Carolina have voted to increase substantially outlays and taxes in South Carolina for our public schools and other needed projects which it is the exclusive responsibility of the State to provide; and

"Whereas greater sums will be necessary to meet pressing needs; and

"Whereas with the increase and extension of the scope and magnitude of Federal taxation there is a resulting diminution of revenue sources available to the State and a consequent diminution of revenue sources remaining to local governments; and

"Whereas it is obvious that the people of the United States are confronted with a financial crisis, unparalleled in history, with our future form of government turning on the decision as to how to finance these vital State and local functions from State and local revenues as they should be under our form of government; and

"Whereas the time has now come for Congress to face this problem realistically and to recognize that an evaluation must be made of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power and the effect thereof upon the three levels of Government; and to this end, Congress should initiate such a study by the creation of a joint and representative body which will be vested with the authority and duty to consider and make such recommendations as may be necessary to preserve State sovereignty in this respect, including the consideration of an appropriate constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power; and

"Whereas Congress should then effectuate said recommendations either by a calling of a constitutional convention to propose such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary or by the proposal of an amendment embodying said recommendations to be submitted to the States for ratification: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned to institute a study of the Federal taxing power and fiscal policy as they affect each level of government, by the creation of a joint and representative body which will include in its consideration the propriety of a constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power in order to preserve State sovereignty.

"2. That the findings and recommendations of such a body be effectuated by calling a constitutional convention to propose such

constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary and appropriate or by the proposing by Congress of an appropriate constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

"3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from this State."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3246. A bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research (Rept. No. 1719); and

S. 3259. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1720).

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 3246), just reported by me, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3076. A bill to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1718).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 2851. A bill to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona (Rept. No. 1717).

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 3214. A bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1721).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3541. A bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 3542. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3543. A bill to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3544. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Sipala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3545. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3546. A bill to exempt motor vehicles sold for the use of religious and nonprofit educational institutions from Federal excise tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3547. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 555), authorizing the sale of certain land by the Pueblos of San Lorenzo and Pojoaque; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 3548. A bill to amend section 9 of the Navaho-Hopi Indian Rehabilitation Act to extend the matching formula provided by such section to State plans under the Social Security Act for the permanently and totally disabled and to administrative expenditures under the public-assistance programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3549. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; and

S. 3550. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. IVES, Mr. LONG, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3551. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 3552. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3553. A bill to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Pubilc Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ELIMINATION OF LIMITATION ON CERTAIN HOLDINGS OF AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association.

The American Historical Association is a nonprofit, learned society for the promotion, in the charter's words, "of historical studies, the collection and preservation of historical manuscripts, and for kindred purposes in the interest of American history, and of history in America." Since its founding in 1884 it has steadfastly pursued these objectives.

Because membership in the association has increased from 287 in 1885 to 6,500 today, its activities as an association and the value of its assets have increased substantially. As a result, it has become necessary to have the original act of incorporation amended in order to meet present circumstances.

The association asks therefore that its charter be changed by elimination of the financial limitation of $500,000 now imposed upon it. This seems to me a valid and proper request. Senator Hoar of Massachusetts filed the original bill authorizing incorporation of this association. It is for this reason as well that I am pleased to introduce this bill at the present time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3541) to eliminate the financial limitation on real and personal estate holdings of the American Historical Association, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPECIAL SERIES OF POSTAGE STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp to celebrate the founding of the city of Pittsburgh.

November 27, 1958, will mark the 200th anniversary of the naming of the city. While this is 2 years ahead of us, a committee of public and private citizens has been organized to work out plans to honor this occasion. It is one hope that the Postmaster General will have sufficient time to schedule and prepare a stamp of suitable design. It will mean a great deal to the people of Pittsburgh.

The history of this great city is closely interwoven with the development of our life as a nation. In fact, it was a young Virginia militia officer named George Washington who first selected the site where the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers meet at Pittsburgh to form the mighty Ohio as the location for a fort.

The French got there first and built Fort Duquesne. It was the British general, John Forbes, who later wrested the area from the French and named his new fortification Fort Pitt. Pittsburgh dates its founding from that day—November 27, 1758—General Forbes addressed a letter to the English Prime Minister Pitt, telling him that the city-to-be was named in his honor—Pittsburgh.

Since that time, the name of Pittsburgh has become a synonym for industry. It became the arsenal of the Union during the Civil War and carried that title to unprecedented heights during subsequent wars. It has been settled by English, Scotch, Irish, and people from practically every country of central and southern Europe. It has given birth to religious and political movements which have swayed the history of the Nation.

The people of Pittsburgh are justly proud of their city, which today has emerged from the smoke of history, and is building to newer and greater accomplishments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3542) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DUFF), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce a bill, send it to the desk, and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3543) to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an explanation of the bill, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to explain the purpose of the bill I have just introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, having been active in the retail automobile business, I have long been searching for a means, within the limits of existing law, of solving the "automobile bootlegging" problem. The bill I have just introduced contains such a solution.

This plan is based on two premises: first, that the interest of the consuming public is much more important than that of the manufacturers and the dealers; second, that in America today we have an essentially new commercial pattern, created because of the many products of a mechanical and electrical nature, which are purchased and operated by relatively unskilled persons, who need the protection of manufacturers' warranties, and also require that service be conveniently available during the entire useful life of the product. The bill recognizes that this responsibility to furnish service is shared by both the manufacturer and the dealer, and that, therefore, they can properly enter into an agreement recognizing this function, for which the manufacturer can properly compensate the franchised dealer who maintains the facilities and supplies the services required. Under this reasoning, it follows that the dealer's compensation can be divided between that for his selling function and that for his service function, thus reducing the potential profit to dealers who provide only the selling function. It is believed that the net effect of this arrangement will be to dry up the bootlegging evil under economic, rather than legal, pressure.

The bill suggests other features which might be introduced into such an agreement, including one under which the manufacturer could accept responsibility for the retail advertising of his product when sold as new. The bill also provides that the terms and conditions of any agreement arrived at pursuant to its provisions must be filed with the Federal Trade Commission, which, in the bill, is given power to modify any agreement if it is found to be contrary to the provisions of the bill.

I have discussed this bill with a number of persons in the industry, both manufacturers and dealers. They have indicated interest, although not complete agreement.

I am sending a copy of the bill and a more complete explanation of its contents to every Member of the Senate. Therefore, I ask that the bill be allowed to lie at the desk for 4 days after the close of the Easter recess, in order that any Senator who is interested may join me in sponsoring the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

Having been active in a retail automobile dealership before I came to the Senate, I have been searching for a proposal which might help to correct the conditions revealed by the current Senate hearings on manufacturer-dealer relationships in the automobile industry. I realize that to be effective, such a program must provide relief without doing violence to our existing law for the protection of free competition and the prevention of restraint of trade. Today I am introducing a bill for myself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], which I hope will help meet this situation. I ask that it be allowed to lie on the table until 4 days after the close of the Easter recess, during which any of my colleagues who may choose to do so may join in sponsoring it, and that thereafter it be appropriately referred.

In seeking a solution for these problems, I have found it helpful to refocus my thinking and approach them from a point of view that I feel is important in two respects:

First, instead of concentrating directly on the manufacturer-dealer relationship itself, I have sought to approach the problems from the point of view of the needs and interests of the consumers. That they have a much greater stake in its solution is indicated by the fact that there are millions of Americans who own and drive more than 60 million cars and trucks. My approach to the problems, then, is to develop a program through which the manufacturers and dealers can develop a pattern of relationships with the consumers' interests as its chief objective, thus substituting an attitude of shared responsibility for a less desirable relationship.

Second, we need to consider the new business pattern that is developing because ours is essentially an electrical age. This new commercial pattern grows out of the fact that there are millions of comparatively new devices which are delicate, sensitive, complicated—yes, and sometimes even inherently dangerous. These products are growing in variety and complexity each year and are bound to continue to increase in number. They are not limited to automobiles and trucks. They also include such things as radios and television sets, ranges and refrigerators, heating and air conditioning equipment with all its automatic controls, computing and recording devices, and agricultural implements and methods. All of these products have two things in common. First, they are purchased and operated by relatively untrained consumers; second, most of them are purchased from independent dealers on whom the purchasers must rely for service as well as sales. In fact, as product complexity increases and the span of its usefulness lengthens, these service functions become infinitely more important and impose a new kind of continuing business responsibility on both the manufacturer and the dealer.

That such service problems exist and that they must be provided for has long been recognized by many industries, including the automotive industry. The manufacturer usually ackoledged his responsibility by providing a limited warranty on his product and by requiring his franchised dealers to set up and maintain extensive service facilities manned by trained men. In the case of the automotive industry, these dealer service facilities carry a double burden. The manufacturer uses them to satisfy customer claims under the warranty, and the customer himself uses them to service the product long after the warranty period has expired—out to the very end of the product's useful life.

My bill, then, is based on the recognition of these two things: (a) the overriding interest of the consumer public and (b) the existence of this comparatively new business pattern involving service after the sale. The chief purpose of my bill, then, is to set up conditions under which the shared responsibilities of manufacturer and dealer can be expressed in a franchise agreement. While it is specifically designed to serve the needs of the automobile industry, I think the bill is broad enough to cover most, if not all, mechanical or electrical products.

The chief purpose of the bill is to set forth the area that may be covered by an agreement whose purpose is to protect the public in the operation of and in performance under warranties on delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machines, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce. Its chief concern is with an agreement to protect the service function. Such an agreement shall set forth the minimum consumer service functions which the dealer shall be required to maintain, both to fulfill the manufacturer's warranty and to provide service for the full useful life of the product; and the agreement shall state the mutual obligations of the parties in carrying out their warranty and service responsibilities. Such a franchised dealer who has provided the required minimum consumer service facilities could also be appointed as an agent of the manufacturer to accept applications for the manufacturer's warranty from the consumer, to issue such warranty, and to perform the work required by any claims under the warranty. If the franchised dealer met these requirements, the manufacturer could include in the agreement a plan by which he could compensate the franchised dealer for his services. This

compensation could be paid in cash or by allowances or could be expressed as a portion of the trade discount or markup. Of course, the conditions for such payment would have to be identical for each francised dealer performing a like service.

The compensation in this case is conceived as functional and the conditions on which the dealer could qualify and the manner of computing the amounts involved would properly be part of the agreement and left to the judgment of the agreeing parties.

Because questions of truth in advertising have been raised, the bill, as an additional precaution, would permit the manufacturer under the agreement to assume control of and responsibility for all advertising of his product when offered for sale by the dealer as a new rather than used or secondhand product.

The chief approach of the bill is permissive, but it does provide that if a manufacturer and dealer enter into such an agreement, the agreement must contain all the terms and conditions of the contract. It also contains a prohibition against including in any agreement anything with respect to resale prices or terms, and it would require that the agreement be filed with the Federal Trade Commission which could, after notice and hearing, suspend, nullify, or modify any provisions thereof.

The effectiveness of the bill in providing the local dealer protection from bootlegging is based on the idea that it would drastically reduce the bootleggers' profit and thus dry up this source of trouble.

After checking the proposed language of the bill with legal counsel well versed in the application of existing antitrust laws, I have been given the opinion that this proposal will not violate any existing laws. Most of the known proposals to give territorial security to dealers have been attacked under the antitrust laws as inconsistent with a merchant's freedom to resell goods to whomever he may choose on his own terms. Section 1 of the Sherman Act prohibits any agreement between a manufacturer and a dealer which limits the dealer in his resales of automobiles to consumers residing or working within a limited geographical area is a restriction on his freedom to engage in commerce. Similarly, an agreement, requiring a dealer to pay a penalty to another dealer for selling an automobile to a consumer residing in the other dealer's geographical territory, is a restraint on the seller's freedom to engage in commerce. An agreement by a dealer not to resell to bootleggers would be a restraint on his freedom to resell to customers of his own choice.

The proposed bill does not run afoul of any of these prohibitions. The manufacturer is unrestricted in the dealers whom it may franchise as its franchised dealers. The bill does not require manufacturers to sell only to franchised dealers, although presumably manufacturers might choose to do so. Existing law gives a manufacturer the right to choose its customers, and currently manufacturers decline to issue franchises to dealers who do not possess minimum sales and service facilities.

The proposed bill does not restrict the dealer in the resale of automobiles. Any dealer may resell any automobile to any person at any price he may choose. Similarly, a consumer is free to purchase an automobile from any dealer in any area he may select.

In many respects, this bill stays clearly within existing law. No law requires a manufacturer to issue an express warranty, and implied warranties apply only to the condition of the goods at the time of sale. For reasons of their own choice, automobile manufacturers elect to give certain warranties to consumers.

The discount that automobile manufacturers grant dealers from list price is a functional discount. It compensates the dealer for several functions which he performs in the distribution of the product, only one of which is making the sale to the consumer. Dealers certainly may also agree to maintain certain service and repair facilities and to perform the warranty obligations of the manufacturer. A dealer for a particular car is generally already expected to perform the warranty obligation of the manufacturer on any automobile of that brand, no matter where it was purchased or where the buyer resides.

No law stipulates the amount of functional discount which the manufacturer must allow the dealer. This is a matter of negotiation between the seller and buyer, subject only to the restrictions of the Robinson-Patman Act against price discrimination.

No existing law prohibits a manufacturer from appointing an agent for the purpose of issuing its warranty to the consumer. Inherently, the manufacturer would want that agent to have knowledge concerning the character and operation of the product in order that he might make certain that the product was in a condition suitable for warranty at the time the warranty was issued. The manufacturer might wish to know that nothing had been done to the product, from the time it left the manufacturer's hands until it was delivered to the consumer, that might affect the liability of the manufacturer under the warranty.

In terms of automobiles, there is no prohibition under existing law to prevent a manufacturer from selecting certain dealers to issue warranties on its behalf, certainly no objection to authorizing all of its franchised dealers to do so. Since this is one of the functions the dealer performs in earning his functional discount, it would be appropriate to separate the compensation to be paid dealers for that purpose, from the functional discount they earn in other respects.

Furthermore, the automobile manufacturer has the right to choose its own customers and cannot be said to discriminate in price unless it charges different prices to competing customers.

The proposed bill contemplates that the automobile manufacturer would charge a nondiscriminatory price to its automobile dealers (presumably uniform to all dealers except for variations in freight charges); that each dealer would be free to resell his automobiles to any person in any area at any price he might choose; and the ultimate purchaser would be free to apply to any authorized dealer of the manufacturer for the manufacturer's warranty. Certainly, it cannot be contended that a manufacturer can be required to permit unauthorized persons to inspect vehicles on its behalf preparatory to issuing warranties, much less than such unauthorized persons could commit the manufacturer by a warranty.

It is, therefore, apparent that the course of conduct contemplated by this bill is permissible under existing antitrust laws and is not contrary to any of their provisions.

The bill further permits manufacturers to supervise and regulate the advertising of their dealers on new automobiles; and it would make the manufacturer liable for any false and misleading advertising of the dealer within its power to prevent. There is no existing prohibition against a contract between a manufacturer and a dealer under which the dealer agrees to use the manufacturer's trade name or trademark only in advertising previously approved by the owner of the trade name or trademark. In fact, the owner of the trade name or trademark may prohibit all advertising using its trade name or trademark. To the extent that the bill may be said to go beyond existing law in this area, it is only that it would make the manufacturer responsible for the advertising of the dealer which it could control, and it is not unlikely that under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act that it is already liable for false and misleading advertising which it has approved expressly or by implication.

The only additional provisions of the bill provide for filing of contracts with the Federal Trade Commission and granting the Commission authority to enforce the purposes of the bill. To the extent that this may be said to go beyond existing statutory authorization, it would do no more than to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to protect the consuming public with respect to matters which the manufacturer and the dealer are already free to agree.

The purpose of the bill, then, is not so much to make new law with respect to the relationship between manufacturers and their service dealers as to focus attention on the existence of a functional service relationship which can be used as the basis for a manufacturer-dealer agreement under existing law, the practical effects of which would be to reduce the potential profit from bootlegging and thus tend to dry up this evil under economic rather than legal pressure. I commend the study of this approach to the committees concerned and to all of my colleagues in the Senate.

S. 3543

A bill to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms or apparatus sold in interstate commerce

Whereas the American public annually purchase, in interstate commerce, many billions of dollars of delicate, complicated, sensitive, and sometimes inherently dangerous machines or mechanisms, such as electronic, refrigeration and heating equipment, computing and recording devices, automobiles, trucks, agricultural implements, and other manufactured products, from independent dealers on whom purchasers rely as the manufacturer's sales and service representatives; and

Whereas dealers in, and manufacturers of, such machines and mechanisms have a joint responsibility to the consumer for performance under the warranty issued in connection with the sale of any such machine, and for maintaining facilities to assure the availability of service throughout the useful life of such machine, which responsibility can neither be separated nor performed adequately by either without the cooperation of the other.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Interstate Machine Sales Act of 1956.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act:

(a) "Commerce" shall have the meaning given the term in the act of September 26, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 45).

(b) "Person" shall mean any individual, partnership, firm, or corporation.

(c) "Commission" shall mean the Federal Trade Commission created by the Act of September 26, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 45).

(d) "Product" shall mean any manufactured, fabricated, or assembled delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machine, mechanism, or apparatus such as, but not limited to, electronic, refrigeration, or heating equipment, computing or recording devices, automobiles, trucks, agricultural implements, and like manufactured goods.

(e) "Franchised dealer" shall mean any distributor of a product manufactured by a "manufacturer," pursuant to a "dealer agreement" filed with the Commission pursuant to this act.

(f) "Manufacturer" shall mean any person engaged in commerce who manufactures or assembles a product sold or distributed to consumers under its own trade name or trade names.

(g) "Dealer agreement" shall mean a written contract or agreement between a manufacturer and a franchised dealer entered into pursuant to the provisions of this act and the form of which is filed with the Commission as herein provided.

(h) "Consumer" shall mean any person purchasing a product for his or its own personal, domestic, or commercial use, and which he or it registers in his or its own name whenever State law requires registration, and not a person purchasing for resale for profit.

(i) "Consumer service facilities" shall mean the physical property, mechanized equipment, trained personnel, and stocks of new and replacement parts and accessories necessary to furnish consumers with an opportunity for demonstration and visual inspection of the product, and to adequately service and repair such product both before and after its delivery to the consumer.

SEC. 3. The purposes of this act are (a) to protect the consuming public in performance under the warranty issued on a purchased product, (b) to insure the continued availability to the public of adequate consumer service facilities, and (c) to preserve the availability of adequate consumer service facilities to consumers, from the thousands of small-business men dealers of such products, both during the period of the warranty and thereafter during the useful life of the product.

SEC. 4. A manufacturer (or his representative) and a franchised dealer may enter into a dealer agreement pursuant to this act, and any such agreement:

(a) Shall provide that it is entered into pursuant to the provisions of this act and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission as provided for in section 7 of this act.

(b) Shall contain all of the terms and conditions of the agreement between the parties, shall state the minimum consumer service facilities required to be maintained by the dealer in order that he can perform the warranty issued to the consumer and achieve the other purposes of this act both during and after the warranty period, shall state the mutual obligations of the parties between themselves in compliance with their joint warranty and service responsibility to the consumer, and may contain such reasonable provisions as are required adequately to protect the manufacturer's good will in the sale, servicing, and advertising of his product by the franchised dealer.

(c) May provide for the appointment of franchised dealers of the manufacturer as its agents to accept from any consumer an application for, and to issue, a warranty on a trade-named product of the manufacturer and may establish or stipulate that portion of the dealer discount or markup (stated either in terms of a sum of money or as a proration of a trade discount or markup) representing the value of the franchised dealer's function in issuing and fulfilling such warranty and in having available appropriate consumer service facilities to service such product thereafter during its useful life, if called upon to do so by the consumer.

(i) The means, times and methods by which the manufacturer may make payments to franchised dealers, of the agreed value of issuing the warranty and maintaining consumer service facilities, may be such as are agreed upon by the manufacturer and the franchised dealers; provided, however, that the terms and conditions of such payments shall be identical for each franchised dealer, of any trade-named product of any manufacturer, performing like services.

(ii) The agreement shall provide the terms and conditions on which the warranty may be issued; provided, however, that nothing herein contained shall permit any restriction on the consumer in his free choice of the vendor from whom he may purchase a product, or to whom he may thereafter take such product for service, or of the franchised dealer he may select to fulfill the obligations of the warranty.

(d) Shall make no provision, express or implied, with respect to resale prices or resale terms or conditions of any product.

SEC. 5. A dealer agreement entered into pursuant to this act may also provide that all advertising by a franchised dealer for products, which use the manufacturer's brand or trade name (except when such products are offered for sale as used or secondhand), shall be (i) copy furnished or approved by the manufacturer, or (ii) copy and layout similar to that previously furnished or approved by the manufacturer (and unlike any copy ever disapproved by the manufacturer), and (iii) copy that is not false, misleading or deceptive.

If a manufacturer elects to enter into an agreement that contains provisions provided for in paragraph 5 above, it shall be legally responsible for advertising of its products (except when such products are offered for sale as used or secondhand) by a franchised dealer which is false, misleading or deceptive and which it could have prevented by reasonable utilization of the contractual commitments permitted by paragraph 5 above.

SEC. 6. Every manufacturer electing to enter into dealer agreements pursuant to this act shall file with the Commission, not later than 10 days after entering into any such agreement, a copy of the form of such agreement. Such form need not contain the name or address of the franchised dealer, the terminal date of the particular agreement, the number of products to be purchased by the particular dealer, or similar information of a numerical nature varying with different dealers and not expressly provided for by this act. When the same form is used by the manufacturer with more than 1 franchised dealer, it may file only 1 such form with the Commission.

(a) The Commission may, after notice and hearing, suspend, nullify, or modify any provision of any such dealer agreement which it finds contrary to the provisions and purposes of this act. Any proceeding hereunder by the Commission shall conform to the procedures and practices described in the Administrative Procedures Act, except that notice of hearing may be given merely by 60 days' advance publication in the Federal Register. Any party adversely affected by any final order or ruling of the Commission made pursuant to this section shall be entitled to a review thereof in the manner provided in section 11 of the act of October 15, 1914 (15 U. S. C. 22). No order of the Commission entered under this section shall have any retroactive effect.

SEC. 7. It shall be an unfair method of competition, in violation of any subject to the proceeding under section 5 of the act of September 26, 1914 (Federal Trade Commission Act; 15 U. S. C. 45), for any person to violate a provision of this act.

FEDERAL PARTICIPATION IN PROTECTION OF SHORES OF PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of 14 other Senators and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the act of 1946 authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting one of the Nation's great natural assets, our shorelines.

I have been joined in this effort to overcome the beach erosion problem by the following colleagues: Senators BENDER, BRICKER, BUSH, EASTLAND, ERVIN, GEORGE, IVES, LONG, PAYNE, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, and KENNEDY.

Under existing law, the Federal Government has limited authority to deal with wave and storm damage to our beaches. The Beach Erosion Board of the Army Corps of Engineers has entered into cooperative study agreements with 22 States. And, with the Federal share at one-third of project cost and with the State and local share at two-thirds, the Army engineers currently are involved in protection projects where publicly owned beach is involved.

Mr. President, we have not yet gained the mastery in the struggle to protect our shoreline from erosion by our lakes and seas. I believe that we cannot solve the problem by building protective works only where the shore is public property and ignoring adjoining areas which are privately owned. The processes of erosion cannot read signs. We cannot be truly effective by building groins, seawalls, and jetties here and there, without a comprehensive plan.

The need for expanding our present authority for dealing with beach erosion at the Federal level has been developed in the House, thanks, in great part, to the legislative efforts of Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey. The work he and several of his colleagues from various sections of the country are doing on new approaches to this problem has sparked the introduction of this bill.

The legislation we are introducing in the Senate today would not change present law affecting use of Federal funds for protection of public property. It would extend existing authority to private shore protection with the same ratio of Federal and State-local contributions embodied in Public Law 727.

In considering the merits of our bill, it should be remembered that in the case of flood-control projects, the Federal Government normally pays all the costs without regard to public or private ownership. The same theory applies to other engineering projects undertaken by the Army engineers. In addition, pending bills establishing hurricane and flood insurance programs make no differentiation between public and private property.

Mr. President, an extensive screening process would be involved, if this legislation is enacted, before individual beach erosion projects would be finally approved.

There are many safeguards against abuse incorporated in our bill. First, the Beach Erosion Board must agree with the State that a project is sound and economically justified. Moreover, the State or political subdivision must agree to keep up the project once completed.

Mr. President, this bill means flexibility in operation and assurance that the job can be adequately done under a cooperative partnership, with the Federal Government joining in dealing effectively with the problem for the first time.

Under a cooperative study agreement with our own State, the Army engineers have been surveying a major portion of the New Jersey coastline. The Engineers' initial recommendations cover an area of approximately 100 miles. The cost of improvement and rehabilitation is estimated at about $24 million.

Under existing law, the Federal share would reach about $3 million. The State or its subdivisions would be responsible for the other $21 million.

Under this bill, the Federal share would become $8 million. Under this bill such work and similar projects in other States could be accomplished. Moreover, there is continuity to the recommendations of the Army engineers. Private and public shores would not be segregated, some areas to be protected and improved while the rest are ignored.

Mr. President, I commend this bill to the Senate as a sensible and logical extension of Federal interest in a natural resource and a source of recreation of incalculable value to the American people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3551) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ERVIN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, some time ago, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia and myself, I submitted an amendment to H. R. 7225, for the purpose of increasing Federal matching funds to State public welfare programs for old-age assistance.

On February 24 I had the privilege of submitting, on behalf of 46 Senators, our amendment to the social security bill. Other Senators were offered the opportunity to join in sponsoring this amendment after it had been modified to include a provision to assure that the increased Federal funds would be passed along to the needy aged. Many of our colleagues responded enthusiastically.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to two of the proposals made on March 6 by the very able senior Senator from Washington. These proposals, submitted as amendments to the amendment I had the honor of sending to the desk February 24, would apply the same matching formula—that is, a Federal payment of five-sixths of the first $30, plus one-half up to $65—to our State programs for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for his prompt action in this matter, and to state my own belief that the more adequate formula should be applied to the needy blind and needy disabled programs as well as to the old-age assistance program. I had originally considered including provisions for these changes in the amendment which I introduced. However, I decided to delay including the blind and disabled programs until figures became available regarding the cost to the Federal Government, and until I could better ascertain the sentiments of other Senators in this regard.

A tabulation showing the effect of changing the formulas for the other two programs for each State is now available. The total cost to the Federal Government would be $23,435,000 annually. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Long amendments to H. R. 7225:[1] Aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled—Estimated annual increase in Federal funds under assumption II,[2] includes vendor payments for medical care

[Based on data for September 1955. Excludes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands]

State	Annual increase in Federal funds under assumption II [2] (in thousands)	
	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled
Total	$6,960	$16,475
Alabama	98	653
Alaska	6	----------
Arizona	65	----------
Arkansas	123	300
California	1,105	----------
Colorado	$27	$411
Connecticut	30	178
Delaware	19	23
District of Columbia	22	189
Florida	169	9
Georgia	204	637
Hawaii	9	109
Idaho	16	71
Illinois	305	544
Indiana	143	----------
Iowa	125	----------
Kansas	52	281
Kentucky	180	----------
Louisiana	160	937
Maine	45	23
Maryland	38	395
Massachusetts	162	901
Michigan	154	206
Minnesota	107	71
Mississippi	222	190
Missouri	329	794
Montana	38	120
Nebraska	67	----------
Nevada	11	----------
New Hampshire	24	22
New Jersey	77	305
New Mexico	26	110
New York	377	3,506
North Carolina	294	703
North Dakota	9	73
Ohio	320	526
Oklahoma	176	483
Oregon	29	277
Pennsylvania	525	1,040
Rhode Island	15	135
South Carolina	106	486
South Dakota	12	42
Tennessee	196	97
Texas	391	----------
Utah	20	151
Vermont	9	29
Virginia	84	311
Washington	68	482
West Virginia	70	517
Wisconsin	95	99
Wyoming	6	39

[1] Federal funds shall equal 5/6 of the first $30 on the average per recipient plus ½ of the balance within a maximum of $65 on the individual payment per recipient.

[2] Assuming the States spend as much per recipient from State and local funds as they spent in September 1955.

Mr. LONG. My view, Mr. President, that the application of these changes to the two additional programs would be highly desirable, is shared by other Senators who joined as cosponsors of the February 24 amendment. In view of this, and in view of the desirability of having a "clean" amendment for consideration by the Finance Committee, I submit a revised amendment containing provisions applying the new formula to aid to the blind and aid to the disabled. It is submitted on behalf of myself, the other Senators who joined in the February 24 amendment, and on behalf of Senators MONRONEY and PURTELL, who also desire to associate with these proposals.

The revised amendment contains an additional change of a technical nature. I have been attempting to perfect a pass-along proviso which would insure that States actually spend the increased funds for payments to recipients. The additional change would make the pass-along provision applicable for only 1 year, in order that the States could make allowance for the increasing number of aged persons who in the future will receive small payments under old-age and survivors insurance. A State could permanently qualify for the more liberal formula by maintaining for 1 year its average payment per recipient from State funds.

It is my earnest hope that the Congress will favorably act on these proposals during this session in order to bring a modest measure of relief to our neediest citizens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator is doing. Now that we have the figures, I think we can all come to an agreement that these two categories of our people should be included.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator and appreciate his realization of the situation and bringing it to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

The amendment, submitted by Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WELKER, and Mr. YOUNG), was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the bill, H. R. 7225, to amend the Social Security Act, which would increase the present unrealistic minimum benefit payment under old-age and survivors insurance from $30 to $55 monthly. Senators may recall that I proposed an amendment to the social-security bill of 1954, requiring the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the problems involved in increasing the minimum payment. Although the Department recommends against my proposal, this study has been made and has been carefully examined in connection with the amendment I am now proposing.

I believe the time has come for the Congress to give serious consideration to the adequacies of minimum benefits under social security. We should give more recognition to the role of the aged in our economic life, and take into account the increased productivity of this Nation insofar as the benefits payable to those who earned social security coverage during the depression years are concerned.

About 40 percent of our 4.5 million retired workers drawing social security receive less than $55 per month; and a much higher percentage of the 2 million secondary beneficiaries receive less than $55.

For many of these individuals, the social-security check is the only source of income. I do not believe that it is reasonable to expect anyone to exist on $30 a month today.

It is estimated that if the $55 minimum were adopted 400,000 cases presently on old-age public assistance could be closed or reduced immediately, and by 1960 over 650,000 could be closed or reduced. For the country as a whole, this would reduce the expenditure for old-age assistance by $73 million immediately and by $116 million in 1960.

Furthermore, the administration's study estimates that of the present full-time male labor force covered by social security, based on 1954 wages, only 1.6 percent would qualify for less than $55 monthly when retirement age is reached. The time is thus approaching when most workers will receive at least $55 upon retirement age without changes in the law. However, it is neither necessary nor desirable to ignore the minimum needs of those already retired, nor to insist, during this interim period that they go on the public welfare rolls.

Without any further increases in payroll tax, a minimum benefit of $55 monthly could be paid, and the trust fund of the old-age and survivors' insurance program would continue to increase at the following rates, according to the administration study:

Trust fund short-range estimates

Year:	*Billions*
1955 (present law)	$21.6
1957 ($55 minimum)	22.4
1958 ($55 minimum)	22.9
1959 ($55 minimum)	23.2
1960 ($55 minimum)	25.2

The administration study was requested on alternative minimum benefits of $55, $60, and $75 per month. The following table indicates the increased benefits which would be payable at each of these levels:

[Millions]

Year	Increased disbursements		
	$55	$60	$75
1956	$591	$800	$651
1957	601	816	1,744
1958	600	814	1,746
1959	590	800	1,727
1960	571	775	1,685

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

REORGANIZATION OF SAFETY FUNCTIONS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 23, 1956,

The name of Mr. SPARKMAN was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3517) to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on March 23, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Easter address by Senator WILEY; and editorial entitled "The Light Shineth in Darkness," published in the Ripon (Wis.) Press of March 23, 1956.

TITLES TO CERTAIN LAND AND REAL PROPERTY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the following bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2581, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim all interest of the United States in certain land located in Forrest County, Miss., in order to clear the title to such land; and

S. 1523, to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.

The request which has been made is agreeable to the sponsors of each of the mentioned bills as well as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Both of these bills are in the same category as other "color of title" claims which are now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMENDATION OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT FOR SEIZURE OF DAILY WORKER AND COMMUNIST PARTY OFFICES; AND RECOMMENDATION OF FURTHER LEGAL ATTACK ON TAX FRONT AGAINST THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Treasury Department for its action yesterday in seizing and padlocking the premises of the Daily Worker, as well as those of the Communist Party in New York and its branches across the country, on the ground of failure to pay back income taxes and penalties for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. In my judgment, such action—strong, but perfectly legal and proper—is long overdue.

I should like to point out that almost a year ago—on April 20, 1955—I pointed out on the Senate floor how, for a period of months preceding that date, I had been urging the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews, to launch a "tax blitz" against the Communist Party and its affiliates. On February 25, 1955, I wrote to Commissioner Andrews, pointing out, for example, that a New York State joint legislative committee had conclusively proven that only three Communist Party front organizations—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the so-called Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—had, among themselves, raised a total of $3½ million. What about all the other millions of dollars raised by the party and its fronts, I asked. What do the tax returns on these millions of dollars show or fail to show, I inquired. I stated that it was essential to place "under the miscroscope" the finances of the entire Communist and satellite system in our country. I urged vigorous analysis of the tax returns of the wealthy Communist-liners who have defrayed party expenses, the "business agents" who have reportedly invested huge Red sums in private enterprises on behalf of the party, and so forth.

This morning, I wrote an open letter to Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, urging further investigative action along this line.

I send to the desk the text of my letter to Secretary Humphrey. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the text of my remarks published in the April 20, 1955, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 4, pages 4783–4785, be reprinted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
United States Department of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am pleased to note the action of the Treasury Department in directing the Internal Revenue agents to seize Communist Party, as well as Daily Worker, offices because of nonpayment of back income taxes and penalties.

We can, of course, anticipate that a counterattack of criticism on the basis of alleged infringement of the press which has already been launched will be intensified on the part of the Communist Party.

We may also expect further criticism on the part of some otherwise well-meaning individuals, of proven loyalty, who may misguidedly assume that the Treasury Department's action may have been a violation of the first amendment.

In my judgment, as a lawyer, and as senior Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, based on facts which have become available thus far, it would appear that the Department was entirely within its legal rights in taking this action on the basis of the levy issued by the district director of internal revenue.

The Daily Worker and the Communist Party will, of course, have their day in court,

as is their right. They will have the fullest opportunity, in accordance with due process of law, to present their case.

As you know so well, however, they are not entitled to anything more than the law allows. And the whole outrageous history of the Communist Party, from its brazen bail-jumping officers to the many other Smith Act convictions against it, confirms the wisdom of the Treasury Department in not treating the present case as if it involves people and organizations of good faith. If it did involve such ordinary citizens, the Department might well have proceeded in a different pace and manner. But, instead, the Department was perfectly sound in acting decisively and speedily in delivering this hard-hitting legal blow.

In my judgment, the action yesterday should, however, be but the first element in an all-out blitz against the party. I believe—as I wrote to you and Commissioner Andrews last year—that a special section might well be set up in the Internal Revenue Service—a section of lawyers, CPA's, and others—specializing in the tax returns of the Communist conspiracy in our midst. Such a nationwide unit should function in collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Investigation in ferreting out every possible lead on Communist and satellite tax returns and in cracking down on every error of omission or commission.

This Nation well remembers that it was conviction for income-tax violations which finally put Al Capone in the penitentiary and which broke the back of other leading criminals in our country.

There is no reason why the same cannot be done against the Communist Party. Its whole financial basis is a vast web of sinister mystery whose exposure could well prove decisive. In my judgment, there is no point in treating Red tax returns in an ordinary or routine way.

I look forward to hearing from you on the effective followup of yesterday's action.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 20, 1955, pp. 4783–4785]

CRACKING DOWN ON COMMUNISTS' TAX RETURNS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been deeply interested for some time in making sure that the fullest investigative scrutiny of the United States Internal Revenue Service is directed at the Communist conspiracy in our Nation.

In my judgment, the tax investigative power offers a vital weapon which should not be ignored or underused in the all-out battle against the law-breaking Communist network in our land.

I send to the desk a statement and attachments on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

" 'Will the United States Government use its fullest powers to investigate tax returns in combating communism in our midst?'

"This is a question which I have raised on several occasions with the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and with various other Federal authorities, in both the legislative and executive branches.

"In my judgment, the answer to that question must be 'Yes.'

"I believe it is absurd not to use this tax probe weapon, on a group which, from all evidence, is violating our tax laws, just as it has been violating so many other laws.

"I believe we could strike the Communist conspiracy where it would hurt the most, namely, in its financial artery, by turning the fullest light of investigation on Red financial trickery. This is more than a matter of definitely denying tax exemption to Red-front groups; it is a matter of an all-out tax investigation blitz on the Red conspiracy.

"Commissioner Andrews in his responses has commented on his organization's prompt followup in denying tax exemption to subversive groups.

"He has, however, raised the overall question as to the extent to which the Internal Revenue Service could depart from its regular tax review purpose for an auxiliary objective of assisting in investigating subversive forces financial operations, as such. The question as to just what should be the policy role of the Tax Bureau is in my judgment a very proper one to raise.

"However, in my view, the Internal Revenue Service can definitely find it administratively and legally feasible to do what I am asking. It can comply with both the letter and spirit of the law in making the type of comprehensive investigation which I am recommending.

"I recognize, of course, that the tax service has a job already on its hands with 50 million law-abiding Americans' tax returns.

"So, I believe, that, if necessary, it should seek additional staff for the purpose which I am recommending today, cracking down on Red lawbreakers. I believe further, that such an investigation could produce very fruitful results, in cooperation with those Federal sources, notably the great Federal Bureau of Investigation, which are necessarily the most expert in meeting the subversive problem, as such.

"In raising and reiterating this overall question, on which the Revenue Service has failed thus far to come to agreement with me, I should like to emphasize that I am not, of course, reflecting in any way on the stalwart anticommunism of Commissioner Andrews. He has been vigorously opposed to communism long before most folks were apparently even aware of this menace in our midst.

"I should like to say, moreover, that Commissioner Andrews has done a tremendous job in reorganizing and strengthening the Internal Revenue Service, and the Nation appreciates his efforts along this line. I understand that further improvements of tax machinery are in the works.

"I believe, however, that the antisubversive recommendation such as I am making today could add further credit both to his service and the Eisenhower administration as a whole.

"There follow excerpts from a few of my messages to him. They are preceded by an International News Service dispatch which apeared in, among many other papers, the April 10 Sunday Mirror of New York City. The dispatch is by Rose McKee, and is based upon my contact with Chairman FRANCIS E. WALTER, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, along this same line.

"As the initial item, I am reprinting important excerpts from the book, Men Without Faces, written by Louis Francis Budenz and published by Harper & Bros. in 1948. These excerpts underline the importance of my efforts in exposing Red finances."

MEN WITHOUT FACES

(By Louis Francis Budenz)

The finances of the party were a complete mystery to most of the national committee members. Reports on finances were sometimes given and sometimes not; but it made little difference. As they were presented, very few people could make them out any way. It was quite clear that a much larger payroll was being met than the party dues and collections could account for. With the complication of district and section financing, for which separate books were kept, the whole thing became completely confounded.

The party always discreetly kept its financial records private until the Hitler-Stalin pact period. Their publication then meant little since they did not include the big secret fund under Robert William Weiner's control. However, that there were huge sums of money in the conspiratorial fund handled by Weiner and the secret committee cooperating with him, I knew to be a fact. At times Weiner had deposits amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in various banks. On occasion, William Browder also deposited amounts up to a million dollars, sometimes in his own name. The source of funds was frequently a mystery, further increased by the practice of conveying thousands of dollars in cash back and forth between Weiner and the various unions and other organizations under Red control. These transactions never appeared on the books of any organization since they were so arranged that the money appeared to be in the cash fund of the union or other body making the loan to Weiner.

A basic source of these mysterious funds is from abroad, flowing into Weiner's hands from Moscow. The late Joseph Brodsky was one of the connecting links in this transmission. But the Red international apparatus insists that every fifth column must stand on its own feet whenever possible. What Soviet financial aid does is to make the Communist group a going concern, always sure of capitalization. Whenever a fifth column in any country is in dire need, it receives the assistance it requires. On that foundation, it is supposed to hustle for itself and, by influence with Hollywood stars of a Red tinge, tired businessmen who want a thrill, and wealthy young people who have inherited huge sums, to raise as much money as it can.

In the big Daily Worker drives for the subsidy of $200,000 needed each year, there were large sums of money given to sections and reported as their donation whose original source was vague. In 1944, business manager William Browder reported to me that we had $50,000 in the Daily Worker drive which we did not know how to handle. Weiner had delayed giving it over to us for fear of possible inquiry, which would be embarrassing. For weeks the money was on hand, but the fund-drive reports could not show it publicly. It finally got on the Daily Worker books by allocating it to various local groups.

Week after week Bill Browder as business manager and I as president of the corporation had to work out various ways of getting money for the paper. It was a trying experience, when we knew that $50,000 which could relieve us of most of our effort and worry was lying in the till.

The secret fund was used for a number of purposes. It financed the beginnings of Communist-created front organizations, setting them on their feet and giving them an initial financial advantage over any genuinely American competitor. It was also used to supplement the regular salaries of leading comrades with cash gifts for personal emergencies. Vacation trips, special visits to health resorts, extraordinary medical care, and similar items were paid for in cash by Weiner from this fund. Some comrades bought houses with this assistance; automobiles were also purchased the same way. But a more important use of this huge cash account was to finance the secret and illegal trips of the leading Reds to other countries. It was with the aid of this fund that Eisler, Browder, Dennis, Stachel, and all the others moved into Asia and Europe and back with forged passports. Since the expenses of these trips were laid out in cash and never accounted for, they did not appear on the books of the party.

In this particular illegal financial work, Weiner often used the name of "Blake."

Active in the administration of the secret fund with the alien Weiner was a native American whose wealthy family was connected with Wall Street brokerage interests. He was Lement U. Harris, who has long lived in an exclusive section of Westchester County near Chappaqua. From him I learned that this fund helped initiate a number of enterprises, including Barney Josephson's Cafe Society Uptown. The purpose was to make that night club a rendezvous for artists and entertainers and people of wealth, with whom Communists could there establish acquaintance.

[From the New York Daily Mirror of April 10, 1955]

WILEY PUSHES DRIVE FOR TAX CRACKDOWN ON REDS

(By Rose McKee)

WASHINGTON, April 9.—Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, invited the House Un-American Activities Committee today to join with him in pressing for a tax crackdown on Reds and Communist-front organizations.

WILEY, in a letter to House Committee Chairman WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, said he believes the Internal Revenue Service has the legal right to make such an investigation.

WILEY told WALTER he has had "considerable correspondence" with Tax Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews on the subject.

He said Andrews "has questioned whether his agency can depart from its traditional effort to secure tax revenue for an auxiliary purpose of helping to crack down on the Communist conspiracy."

TELLS OF METHODS

The Senator said former Communists such as Louis Budenz have said that front organizations have collected millions of dollars for one cause or another, frequently transferring the money from one group to another to escape accountability.

He said he had in mind a "blitz type" of investigation that would "hit the Reds where it hurts—in the purse."

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
December 29, 1954.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you with regard to a very important phase of the anti-Communist effort. I refer to the checking of tax returns of the great number of key individuals, organizations, and businesses within the Communist orbit in the United States.

As you know, the Reds have hatched all sorts of enterprises—companies and fronts have repeatedly transferred funds back and forth between them, and have otherwise juggled their books, according to strong evidence given to the FBI and to congressional investigative groups by ex-Communists.

It seems to me that we could sever the financial arteries of the Communist Party if a special effort were made to investigate the books of at least the major Red groups. In so doing, we could probably interfere with Red espionage in this country, which is dependent on disguised expenditures, of course. While they have probably covered their tracks carefully, an all-out probe would no doubt prove very fruitful.

I realize that this tax probe would be a very considerable undertaking, and that it would require a great deal of personnel. However, it seems to me that for too long, the Communists have been gettting away with financial trickery, and that they should be held to account taxwise, as well as in every other way.

I strongly believe that they have broken tax laws in handling the books of their fronts and of their key functionaries, just as they have broken other types of laws, in all their nefarious activities.

I would very much appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible, as to your reaction to this suggestion for an intensified effort in investigating their tax returns.

With all good wishes, I am.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 25, 1955.

The Honorable T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: * * * Since the Internal Revenue Service is necessarily not the most expert source on antisubversion but must necessarily rely on other Federal agencies, I hope that it will actively seek out what I know will be the ready cooperation of these other agencies rather than to sit back and wait for pertinent information to come to it.

As an example of the pressing need for interagency cooperation, I point out that a New York State Joint Legislative Committee has just indicated that three subversive groups—the Civil Rights Congress, the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee—raised, alone, a total of $3½ million, but spent most of it apparently for subversive purposes. What about the National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, and similar well-financed ventures, I ask?

I am glad that action is being taken to deny tax exempt status to such subversive groups, but my feeling is that there is usually such a considerable time lag before these groups can be so officially designated that a great deal of money in the meanwhile pours into the Communist fronts.

I realize, of course, that there is a strict limitation on your available manpower, but I earnestly feel that if such manpower as might be available could be assigned to this task now, our country would reap significant dividends in terms of its security.

Moreover, if necessary, I believe that a request to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees for additional manpower to handle the task might be well received by the Congress.

I am enclosing herewith some remarks which I am making in my State this coming Sunday night, in which I urge an all-out effort.

In summary, I do think that if an investigative "blitz" could be launched on your own initiative against these Communist fronts, we could set the Communist conspiracy back on its heels for quite some time.

* * * * *

Looking forward to hearing from you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

CONFIRMATION OF RED FINANCIAL MYSTERY FROM LOUIS BUDENZ

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, finances are part of the lifeblood of the Red conspiracy. Slash the financial artery, and the conspiracy—propaganda, espionage, sabotage, and so forth—will be severely restricted. Of course, Red fanaticism will continue, with or without money; but dollars or rubles still play a major part.

DOMESTIC SECURITY COMPATIBLE WITH WORLD SECURITY

What of the foreign policy implication of yesterday's actions?

As senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I assume that it will not be long before Moscow propaganda organs begin to shriek that the Treasury Department's action allegedly runs contrary to the so-called "peaceful co-existence" lullaby of the Kremlin. Our answer is this: The entire underground apparatus of the Communist Party in our own country and throughout the world completely belies the "peaceful coexistence" line of the Kremlin. The Kremlin has not called off a single spy, saboteur, or agitator either in our own country or anywhere else. There is no reason, therefore, why the Untied States should shrink back in the slightest from all-out legal action against the Red conspiracy in our midst. As a matter of fact, in our self-defense, I point out that the whole history of past such so-called peaceful periods between East and West evidences that they have been used by the Kremlin to intensify, rather than diminish, underground activity.

I hope our action on yesterday will serve as a model to other free peoples, a model which says this, in effect: "Smash the Red conspiracy by every legal means available. Meanwhile, hold fast to your basic liberties and continue your quest for world peace. After all, there is complete compatibility between the twin goals of domestic security on the home front and international security on the world front."

The Daily Worker will, no doubt, continue to be published through whatever makeshift arrangements it can devise. After all, the comrades must be informed as to what today's party line is, whether Comrade Stalin was a "bloody murderer," or whether he was really the "infallible genius" that he was pictured for three decades. The comrades must be informed whether Party Chief William Z. Foster must now get the ax because he was an unquestioning supporter of Stalin, or whether he is still the Kremlin's authentic mouthpiece.

Mr. President, let me conclude by stating that I, for one, yield to no man in my devotion to the faithful application of the Constitution or its Bill of Rights, even as regards the words and deeds of those whom we completely oppose and who completely oppose us. As the Supreme Court indicated, however, in its 7-to-2 decision on the witness immunity case just last Monday, there is no real reason why a constitutional guaranty—in that instance against self-incrimination—should serve as an absolute roadblock against the legal efforts of the Government of the United States to protect itself against those who would destroy it. "Freedom of the press" must stand as a great bulwark of our liberties. But the Red conspiracy must be smashed.

THE KANSAS CITY IDEA ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a new idea in foreign relations was recently tried out with great success by 31 civic, business, and professional leaders of Kansas City, Mo. The new approach on foreign relations by these American citizens is worthy of serious consideration.

Acting on the suggestion of Hal Hendrix, Latin America specialist of the Kansas City Star, 31 men made a 3-week good will trip, visiting 8 Latin American countries. On February 24, in an editorial entitled "Kansas City Looks South," the New York Times described this approach as "Something new and pleasant and important in the way of hemispheric relations." On March 7, Daniel James, writing from Kansas City for the New York Herald Tribune, said:

This bustling Midwestern capital may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate.

Even though these men were official ambassadors of good will from the Missouri city known as the Heart of America, each member paid all of his own expenses.

The immediate success of the trip was demonstrated by the warm hospitality and friendly reception accorded them in every area they visited. Veteran observers in South America reported newspaper and picture coverage of the visit of this Kansas City delegation was from 3 to 5 times as large as that received by any other delegation ever to visit in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a New York Times editorial of February 24, incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY LOOKS SOUTH

Something new and pleasant and important in the way of hemispheric relations has just come to a successful conclusion. It was a trip of 30 leading professional and business men from Kansas City, Mo., headed by the city's vigorous mayor, H. Roe Bartle, to 8 of the Latin-American countries. This is surely the first time that a group of leading citizens from a municipality in the very heart of the United States has made such a journey.

The idea and the push came from the Kansas City Star, which in recent years has shown a commendable interest in Latin-American affairs. The group whose trip has just ended was constituted as the "Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade" by a resolution of the city council and it has a 3-year term. Under the resolution it has "the purpose of fostering good will in the Americas and strengthening hemispheric solidarity, particularly between Kansas City, Mo., its metropolitan area and our Latin-American neighbor Republics to the south." The commission started in Venezuela 3 weeks ago and visited Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama and Mexico before returning to Kansas City.

There was nothing eccentric about the idea. Kansas City is a booming and dynamic city which has much to offer to Latin America and it made sense for a group of civic leaders to call the attention of Latin Americans to the trade opportunities of their area. It is, besides, a national service for North Americans of this type to go around Latin America and show their interest in the region. The Middle West, with its historic isolationism, has certainly moved a long way out when Kansas City can send a delegation of this sort on such a trip.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, after getting approval of the State Department, Hal Hendrix presented his idea last fall to Kansas City's able and patriotic mayor, H. Roe Bartle. Mayor Bartle received the suggestion with enthusiasm, discussed it with the city council, and the council immediately authorized the Mayor to appoint a Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade.

So that members of the Senate and others interested in our foreign relations may note the varied fields of endeavor represented on the Kansas City Commission, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the commissioners and their businesses or professions be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS CITY COMMISSION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND TRADE

Hon. H. Roe Bartle, mayor, Kansas City, Mo.

J. E. Dunn, chairman of the commission, president of the J. E. Dunn Construction Co.

C. J. Kaney, vice chairman of the commission, president of the Swift & Henry Livestock Commission Co., and chairman of the metropolitan area planning council.

N. T. Veatch, vice chairman of the commission, Black & Veatch (engineers).

Louis B. McGee, secretary of the commission, and treasurer of the Old American Life Insurance Co.

Dr. Arnold V. Arms, official commission physician.

R. N. Bergendoff, senior partner, Howard, Needles, Tammen, & Bergendoff (bridge engineers).

Dudley C. Brown, partner, Brown & Loe (produce brokers).

Forrest D. Byars, executive secretary, downtown committee, chamber of commerce.

J. Roger DeWitt, president, the DeWitt Co. (real estate and investments).

Harry M. Gambrel, partner, Mann, Kerdolff, Kline & Welsh (insurance).

Kenneth G. Gillespie, vice president and general manager, Jenkins Music Co.

Edward C. Gosnell, president, Inter-Collegiate Press (manufacturers and publishers).

George Fuller Green (real estate and investments), member, Kansas City Board of Park Commissioners.

Hal Hendrix, Latin American specialist, the Kansas City Star.

John D. Hilburn, president, Boese-Hilburn Electric Co., and president, Advertising and Sales Executives Club.

C. Earl Hovey (United States patent attorney).

Lowell R. Johnson, executive vice president, Puritan Compressed Gas Corp.

Ray E. Lawrence, Black & Veatch (project engineering).

Beverly Miller, president, Allied Independent Theatre Owners, Inc.

John O'Keefe, owner, O'Keefe Travel Service, and honorary vice consul of Spain.

Alfred F. Parmelee, president, United States Safety Service Co. (manufacturers and distributors of safety equipment).

Joseph V. Quigley, chairman of the board of Chapman Dairy Co. (Sealtest) and Franklin Ice Cream Co.

Walter A. Reich, president, A. Reich & Sons, Inc. (produce distributors).

Nathan Rieger, president, Mercantile Bank & Trust Co.

Charles C. Shafer, Jr., attorney at law and city councilman.

Frank H. Spink, president, Bunting Hardware Co., and president, board of police commissioners.

Eugene F. Stanton, president, Klughartt Machinery Co. (agricultural equipment).

Fred R. Suddarth, president, Kaw Transport Co., Inc., and president, Blue Valley Manufacturers & Merchants Association.

R. Carter Tucker, director and general counsel, Rudy Patrick Seed Co.

Lancie L. Watts, tax attorney, commission interpreter, and past president, Kansas City Lawyers Association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on February 2 the Commission visited Washington for an official briefing by State Department officials, departing immediately thereafter on this good-will tour, which took them to Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama, and Mexico.

Upon return to Kansas City, February 24, the Commissioners did not halt their efforts for better understanding with our South American neighbors. Instead, they immediately started a heavy schedule of reports to civic, church, and school groups, and also appeared often on radio and television.

Following the trip, the Commission announced a program of scholarships for Latin American students at colleges and universities in the Kansas City area, the sponsoring of an International Trade Fair next spring, and the entertaining of several Latin American officials in Kansas City next fall.

In my opinion, Mr. President, this leadership by Kansas City in the field of inter-American relations deserves the notice and approval of the entire Nation.

The dedicated zeal of this particular group of business and professional men, representing all that is best in the American way of life, may well have set a pattern for future visits by comparable groups, not only to South America but throughout the entire world.

The far-reaching effect this tour could have on foreign policy was reported in the Kansas City Times on March 3. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN TRIP DRAWS PRAISE FROM AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

WASHINGTON, March 2.—Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin America, said today the trip of a group of Kansas City officials and businessmen to Latin America last month contributed to the mutual understanding we are striving for in this hemisphere.

"Reports received by the State Department from our Ambassadors in Latin America," Holland said, "indicate that the trip of the Kansas City commission for international relations and trade was most successful.

"In each of the cities visited by the commission, it made an excellent impression. They had the opportunity to talk with the presidents of a number of countries, as well as with other high officials, business and professional men.

"The friendliness of members of the group and their genuine interest in the countries visited contributed to the success of their mission. It is certainly true that Kansas City is now known and appreciated more in Latin America than at any time in the past.

"The trip of this commission made a worthwhile contribution to the mutual understanding we are striving for in this hemisphere."

The commission, which spent 3 weeks in Latin America, was headed by Mayor A. Roe Bartle and J. E. Dunn, commission chairman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this new idea in foreign relations was further noted in an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on March 7. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which was reprinted in over 137 additional newspapers, be made a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KANSAS CITY IDEA

(By Daniel James)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—This bustling Midwestern capital may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate.

Kansas City's answer is not to wait for Federal action, but to act on your own. As a result, it has jumped with both feet into the tense international arena, and become the first American municipality to send a friendship-and-trade delegation to Latin America.

Just back after 3 weeks in 8 Latin American countries, the delegation, consisting of 30 prominent Kansas Citians headed by dynamic Mayor H. Roe Bartle, has scored some impressive results.

First and foremost, the idea of a group of private United States' citizens paying Latin America a friendly call, without in any way being sopnsored by Washington, has made the Latins happier than anything we've done in recent years.

The peripatetic Kansas Citians, as a matter of fact, got a bigger press in Latin America than any official United States delegation of late.

In the second place, some good commercial contacts were made which promise to profit both Kansas City and Latin America tangibly. The tour, then, was not just a glad-handing affair.

Nor was it a one-shot affair. Kansas City is planning at least 2 similar trips within the next 2 years, besides other related activities in line with a new international program it has initiated.

The idea of promoting trade and friendship between Kansas City and Latin America was originated by Hal Hendrix, Latin American specialist of the Kansas City Star, who promptly sold it to Mayor Bartle.

Hendix' idea took concrete form last November, when the mayor, himself, a longtime exponent of inter-American solidarity, was authorized to appoint an International Relations and Trade Commission.

The commission's major purpose, as laid down in a city ordinance, is to acquaint Latin America with Kansas City's "trade opportunities, economic development, and cultural life, and to develop better understanding among the people of the Greater Kansas City community of the cultural and social life of the countries of Latin America."

To make his commission both representative and potent, Bartle appointed 30 of Kansas City's most promient citizens, ranging from a suave patent attorney to a roughhewn cattleman. The 30 at once decided to look over Latin America for themselves, instead of sending a study group, and each paid his own way to the tune of about $3,000.

The commission's only connection with Washington was to go there for a briefing by various Government agencies, and to promise a report.

I interviewed Mayor Bartle and six of his commission members 2 days after they returned home from Latin America, and can report without exaggeration that I have rarely seen such enthusiastic supporters of Pan Americanism.

"They say we're isolationists here in Kansas City," Mayor Bartle boomed in his infectiously friendly way. "But we aren't. We very much believe in hemispheric solidarity."

Commission Chairman J. E. Dunn, who heads a flourishing construction company, repeated several times:

"We need South America more than it needs us."

All members of the delegation I interviewed were unanimous in asserting that boundless economic opportunities exist south of the border.

Commission Vice Chairman C. J. Kaney, one of America's leading cattlemen, told me:

"Many South American cities are moving ahead faster than ours. Latin America is a giant just about to wake up."

The Kansas Citians stressed that Americans could play a decisive role in Latin America's future, and thus earn its undying friendship, by supplying it with American know-how.

Illustrating the point, Commission member, C. Earl Hovey, a shrewed patent lawyer, told me that a Kansas City vending-machine company helped a Mexican affiliate expand its output 30 percent by lending it the use of United States patents.

At least three of the touring Kansas Citians made direct commercial contacts in as many South American countries. One proposes, for example, to manufacture unbreakable eyeglasses.

The Commission's report to Washington will stress these Latin needs:

1. Loans, especially for transportation.

2. Easier credit. The midwesterners found that the Latins prefer to buy from Europe, even where the goods are inferior to ours, because they get better credit terms.

3. Development of barter. Since some major Latin American exports—wheat and cattle, for example—are not needed by us, we should develop a three-way barter system by which they can be exported elsewhere, but in return enabling Latin America to get manufactured items from us.

4. More United States know-how. Our businessmen and technicians, the Kansas Citians feel, must aid Latin American expansion by lending it their experience, merchandising methods, and technological knowledge.

Emphasizing that Kansas City's interest in Latin America is real and permanent, Dunn pointed out:

"We didn't go down there to plant a seed and let it die. We have just begun. We're going to keep working at this through our city, and Washington as well."

Several Commission members observed that Soviet Premier Bulganin's offer of increased trade with Latin America is being taken seriously there, but such ventures as Kansas City's could more than offset any possible damage the Soviets can do.

Already, the Kansas City idea seems to be catching on elsewhere. St. Louis and Detroit now contemplate sending delegations to Latin America. Kansas City itself will follow up with an international fair in September, which will feature Latin America.

Is it farfetched to hope that the Kansas City idea will also be applied to other parts of the world, notably Asia and Africa? If it can be, it may well be the answer to the new Soviet economic offensive. For if anyone can outsell Moscow's star salesmen, Khrushchev and Bulganin, it is the American businessman once he gets going.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The wide notice given this program was also heralded in a roundup of newspaper comments appearing in the Kansas City Times on March 21. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS OTHERS SEE GOOD-WILL TOUR

Kansas City not only has strengthened its friendship and trade ties with Latin America as a result of the recent good-will tour of the new Commission for International Relations and Trade. By its initiative, it also has awakened the interest of numerous United States cities in better hemispheric understanding.

Newspapers in various parts of the country have commented editorially on what has become known as the Kansas City Idea. Several United States cities are suggesting closer relationships with our community. Some publications even have expressed a note of jealousy.

Several cities have launched plans to send commissions similar to the Kansas City group to Latin America on good will and trade missions. Some have written here to seek the organization formula. New York and Buffalo, N. Y., are in the development stages. The mayor of Miami, Randall N. Christmas, has appointed a 14-member commission. The group plans to depart for Latin America April 15.

"This is a frank bid for Latin American trade," commented the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, "and it could be hugely successful. What irritates us is that the Kansas City group is doing something that St. Louis should have been doing for years. Latin American markets have been open to us and we have done precious little to cultivate them by concentrated promotion. If Kansas City can send a trade delegation to beat the drums for business in Latin America, why can't St. Louis?"

On a different plane, the New York Herald Tribune comments that this "Midwestern capital (Kansas City) may have the answer to the current Soviet offensive to win friends by offering economic aid. It certainly seems to have the answer to Moscow's recently announced economic penetration of Latin America, at any rate."

The Herald Tribune points out that "Kansas City's answer is not to wait for Federal action, but to act on your own. As a result it has jumped with both feet into the tense international arena, and become the first American municipality to send a friendship-and-trade delegation to Latin America.

"Is it farfetched to hope that the Kansas City idea will also be applied to other parts of the world, notably Asia and Africa? If it can be, it may well be the answer to the Soviets. For if anyone can outsell Moscow's star salesmen, Khrushchev and Bulganin, it is the American businessman once he gets going."

The Mobile (Ala.) Press states that "leaders of this Gulf Port city might do well to keep a keen eye on a new movement launched in Kansas City to promote friendship and trade in Latin America. . . . A movement of this kind, although centering in a Midwestern community, is of considerable significance to Mobile. It can be expected that some of the trade that develops therefrom in the future will funnel through Mobile."

"The high-powered mission of Kansas Citians should bring more business through the Port of Houston," the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle notes. "What's good for Kansas City is good for Houston."

The Miami (Fla.) Daily News comments that Kansas City "is approaching this good-neighbor idea with common sense. Kansas City may be tucked away in the heartland of the United States, but there is no reason it cannot become a partner in business with Latin America."

In Latin America itself, the Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, noted that the Venezuelan capital has learned that "Kansas City is a tremendous agricultural and industrial metropolis of the Midwest with a big heart and eyes that see far. The Kansas City delegation proved that the Midwest is no longer an isolationist stronghold; the Midwest wants to be a good neighbor, too."

It was quipped recently that Kansas City is the only municipality in the United States of America with its own built-in State department. Editorial comments seem to bear this out.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I believe Members of the Senate and other students of our foreign relations will find the work of the Kansas City Trade Commission of increasing significance. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the commission's official report, as filed last week with the State Department, the Treasury Department, and the Export-Import Bank, be made a part of the RECORD at this point, and I direct particular attention to the 20 specific recommendations appearing at the end thereof.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE KANSAS CITY COMMISSION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND TRADE—LATIN-AMERICAN FACTFINDING TRIP FEBRUARY 1956

This is a report of impressions, observations, and suggestions of the Kanass City Commission for International Relations and Trade following its first factfinding tour of eight Latin American nations.

The report represents the concensus of the 30 members of the commission, each of whom paid all of his individual expenses for the 24-day trip that covered more than 15,000 miles. Even though the commission now is an authorized unit of the municipal government of the city of Kansas City, Mo., there was no expenditure of taxpayers' funds for any phase of our mission.

For purposes of background, the city council of Kansas City in November 1955, adopted a resolution authorizing the mayor to establish the Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade and to name 30 members to serve 3-year terms.

The resolution stated that "the commission shall be authorized to represent Kansas City and its metropolitan area for the purpose of acquainting the Latin American countries with this area's trade opportunities, economic development, and cultural life, and to develop a better understanding among the people of the Greater Kansas City community of the economic potentialities and the cultural and social life of the countries of Latin America."

Mayor H. Roe Bartle appointed the commission membership and named J. E. Dunn as chairman, Cliff J. Kaney and N. T. Veatch as vice chairmen, and Louis B. McGee as secretary. The membership represents a cross section of Kansas City's business, industrial, agricultural, professional, and cultural leadership.

For the commission's first project, it chose to visit the countries of Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Panama, and Mexico. At the invitation of officials of the State Department, the Commission first visited Washington for briefings on the areas to be visited.

At the outset of this report, we wish to express our gratitude to State, Commerce, and Treasury Departments, the Export-Import Bank, and the Pan-American Union for the excellent briefings given the commission when it visited in Washington February 2 to start the mission. As our trip progressed we found all the information gained in these briefings most helpful in becoming oriented with situations in the various Latin American nations.

We also wish to state that every embassy of the United States in the countries we visited could not possibly have been more cooperative. The caliber of each Ambassador and his staff made each one of us feel very proud of our Government. We know our Government's affairs in Latin America are in most able hands. At every turn we saw the work of these competent Foreign Service officers reflected in a sincere feeling of warmth for the United States of America. We cannot express enough commendation for our capable diplomatic service in Latin America.

In our 24-day factfinding trip we were privileged to meet and enjoy highly informative discussions with presidents, cabinet officials, governors, mayors, city councilmen, and leaders of business, industry, finance, health, professions, and education. We met and talked with literally hundreds of Latin Americans, rich and poor, and United States citizens living in Latin America. We inspected housing projects, schools, trafficways, oilfields, ranches, parks, hospitals, cultural centers, retail establishments, dairies, manufacturing plants, and many other fields of interest.

Bearing in mind that the membership of the commission, with three exceptions, never had seen any of Latin America beyond Mexico, the group returned to Kansas City unanimous in two conclusions: The United States needs Latin America as much or more than Latin American needs the United States of America, and we are more cognizant than ever before of the interdependence of the 20 Latin American republics and the United States of America.

Everywhere the commission traveled it was greeted with friendliness, understanding, and enthusiasm. People in every country were genuinely interested in making certain that we had every opportunity to obtain all the facts we sought. Outstanding courtesy was the rule. No one attempted to apply pressure. Everyone we visited shared our desire to strengthen our social and economic ties and to develop a stronger, healthier, better educated, and more prosperous family of the Americas. The commission is deeply appreciative of the kindness and courtesy extended to us by everyone.

We found a strong similarity between the people of North America and Latin America. We found a desire for a much better way of life. We found them experiencing a social revolution to attain this natural goal. We found them proud, patriotic, and independent people, who, under no circumstances, appeared to be willing to trade freedom for communism in their quest for a better life.

We found that the Latin Americans do not want charity nor handouts in the form of Government grant aids from this country. We learned they need and welcome our assistance in the form of loans for projects that will lead to a better way of living than now exists in some sections of the area. We found some adverse reactions and dissatisfaction over the policies of our Government with respect to billions of dollars given in grant aids to countries of Europe and Asia.

We found discontent over the failure of Secretary of State Dulles to visit Latin American countries. It was pointed out to us repeatedly that he has visited nearly everywhere in Europe and the Far East, but only once to Latin America—and then only to attend the Inter-American conference at Caracas in 1954. Each time the question arose, mainly in press conferences, Mayor Bartle and Chairman Dunn met it by stating that Secretary Dulles' trip abroad has been made to help meet problems that might grow and endanger or engulf the Western Hemisphere and the rest of the free world. It was noted that we have good friends in Latin America and a person or a country doesn't have to worry about good friends.

With the great natural resources that lie untapped in South America, it is our firm belief that in helping the Latin Americans satisfy their demands for a broader development of their economies, we will be helping ourselves. It is not enough just to make loans of dollars. We must give them more of ourselves in sharing our know-how and showing them how to best obtain the things they need most. By being this kind of a friend, we can plant seeds that will bear good fruit and we, as well as Latin America, can share in enjoying the fruits of these efforts in the years ahead.

The commission found the technical assistance program of the United States Government to be a tremendous asset in each of the countries visited. We feel this is one of the best expenditures of United States Government funds that can be made in Latin America.

Private investment, by both Latin American and foreign capital, appears to be one of the best avenues for greater production and consequent higher standards of living in Latin America. Venezuela certainly affords an outstanding example of what foreign private investment, with its technical know-how, can do to better general living conditions. We found, however, in some countries varying degrees of nationalism that constituted a handicap to development through foreign capital. This nationalism has, in some instances, developed very cumbersome restrictions. Such measures could easily discourage a potential investor.

We found United States business firms operating in Latin America making a marked contribution to the development of the countries in which they were established. Some of these investments, such as the Creole Petroleum Co. in Venezuela, provided a model example of cooperation and assistance in the form of better housing, health and working conditions and education for national employees. We found all the United States business officials to be very effective in interpreting to the nationals the policies of our Republic. This appeared with such firms as Pan American World Airways, the W. R. Grace Co., Sears, Roebuck & Co., United States Steel, Standard Oil, General Motors, and others with whom we were associated.

Three Latin American needs stand out as most pressing to the commission. They are needs for additional educational facilities, additional roads and highways, and additional power-producing facilities.

Shortage of school facilities appears to be general. As an example a Chilean educator noted that his school was providing education for about 1,200 boys and girls, but if the school facilities were enlarged and staffed accordingly the same education could be given to 12,000 boys and girls in that community.

Shortages of roads and highways also appear to be general. We learned in Brazil alone that there were only 1,800 miles of paved highways compared to approximately 560,000 miles in this country, and Brazil is much larger in area than the United States. We also learned of many instances in which foodstuffs rotted in the production areas because of inadequate transportation and distribution facilities. A highway network and many farm-to-market roads are absolute necessities if substantial gains are to be made in bettering living conditions.

Power shortages also constitute a serious handicap to the development the Latin Americans are seeking. Nearly all the countries have hydroelectric potentials, but in most cases they are stymied because of dollar shortages. The Export-Import Bank loan for a large Brazilian powerplant will contribute tremendously to Brazil's industrial activities, but one plant isn't going to solve but

a fraction of the demand. It also seems to the commission that development of Brazil's oil industry at a much faster rate is an absolute must if its industrial growth is to continue in the race of demand brought on by the tremendous population increase, which is growing at the estimated rate of 2 million annually.

Inflation in some of the countries the commission visited, particularly Chile and Brazil, is another major point of distress observed. Its negative effects are very obvious, but we heard encouraging reports of programs being undertaken to curb inflation.

In connection with foreign trade, the commission heard many times that European countries and Japan are beginning to make sizable inroads on the Latin American market. The chief reasons appeared to be lower product costs, because of correspondingly lower labor costs in these foreign production centers; more attractive credit terms; more opportunities for barter with other dollar-short countries, and lower shipping costs. The long-term credit feature appeared to be the most dominant. The commission learned that United States products were higher in quality and more desired but that Latin American purchases now have to be tailored to fit the Latin American pocketbooks.

The commission also learned that Latin Americans are far better acquainted with the United States than citizens of this country are with Latin America. The commission is firmly convinced that there is a large area for expansion in this country for a better understanding of Latin America, its peoples, and its countries.

The commission is privileged to have as a member a representative of the medical profession who travelled as official commission physician. He visited and was highly impressed with physicians he met in the hospitals and medical institutions seen. His views and observations are shared by the commission.

We learned that a majority of the medical men we met either had visited or studied in the United States, and several had received scholarships from the Rockefeller or Kellogg Foundations. We learned that a real problem in the medical field is not in finding capable recent graduates who desire to come to the United States on scholarships for further training, but rather that professors and instructors in medical schools feel that much of this expensive training is being wasted since many young physicians are not able to practice their knowledge of new techniques upon returning to their own countries because of a lack of facilities or special equipment. We learned this has created a severe shortage of practicing medical specialists. For example, there is only one internal medical specialist in Caracas, Venezuela, a city of almost 1 million inhabitants.

The commission also learned that instructors and professors in medical centers feel a strong need for refresher courses and opportunity for study and research in their specialty fields, but are not eligible for the aforementioned scholarships unless they take the entire postgraduate course prescribed for them, generally the same courses given young students. We learned that transportation expenses are keeping these instructors at home, where no postgraduate training is available. The commission feels the medical instructors should have better opportunities to study the latest medical advances made in this country.

The Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade would respectfully submit the following recommendations to the United States Government:

1. Intensify its financial assistance in the form of loans for sound development projects, such as road construction and powerplants.

2. Consider extending loans strictly for educational purposes, such as school construction and teacher training.

3. Intensify its technical assistance programs in all Latin American nations, with increased numbers of skilled technicians and specialists.

4. Expand existing programs of education and cultural exchange cooperation, including scholarships for both Latin American and United States students, expansion of binational centers, and refresher training for teachers and professors.

5. Encourage more practicing Latin American doctors to visit the United States for training in the latest specialty medical techniques and skills and hospital operation.

6. Encourage oragnizations sponsoring medical scholarships in this country to amend their programs to add transportation costs to scholarship awards, and include refresher training and research for medical teachers, professors, and instructors; explore the feasibility of establishing a special fund in existing cultural exchange programs of our Government to assist Latin American medical instructors in keeping abreast of advancements made in our institutions.

7. Explore the feasibility of making more loans to speed up the mechanization of agriculture in Latin America.

8. Encourage United States producers and manufacturers to offer more attractive credit terms to Latin American countries and customers.

9. Develop a program to better acquaint manufacturers throughout the United States interested in export with the money exchange and freedom of restriction of exchange in each South American country.

10. Encourage United States manufacturers to prepare their South American correspondence in Spanish or Portuguese, and to print their sales brochures, circulars, etc., in the same manner.

11. Send to South America men trained in installment credit to aid in establishing and training South American merchants in the use of credit interchange bureaus.

12. Encourage all Latin American countries to eradicate any remaining cumbersome and complex business operation restrictions and work toward an areawide equal climate favorable to foreign investment capital.

13. Encourage more United States firms to explore the advantages of establishing productive operations in Latin American nations, including an examination of existing obstacles in this country to private investment abroad.

14. Adhere to bipartisan and stable trade policies with all Latin American nations.

15. Explore the formation of an international board of trade operation, through which a broad based program of barter exchange could be developed to aid countries with low dollar earning power.

16. Explore the possibility of enlisting the services of men of nationally known ability in business and industry in the United States to advise and assist Latin American governments with development problems, in the same manner that our economic leaders have served the United States, if the Latin American nations desire such assistance.

17. Encourage the United States school system to participate in more exchange-of-idea programs and cultural projects with Latin American nations.

18. Encourage more communities of this country to send delegations on fact-finding tours of Latin America, and at the same time lend official encouragement to Latin American cities to send delegations of their leaders to this country for a similar purpose.

19. Encourage the public information media of this country to disseminate more informative and constructive news about Latin America.

20. Encourage more missionary work on the part of all denominations for the purpose of elevating the way of life among the lesser developed areas of these countries.

It has been a most interesting and rewarding experience for this commission to represent Kansas City and the United States on its mission. There is no doubt in the minds of the commission members about the future of Latin America. While it is recognized that conditions in some countries today provide fertile ground for Communist infiltration, the commission is convinced that the Latin American people are devout, freedom-loving individuals who will not become gullible prey of the Communist doctrine. Latin America is on the march to become a powerful economic area of the free world.

This commission believes that our country's future prosperity and freedom are very closely related to that of Latin America. Two devastating world wars have strained this country's strategic resources. In this atomic age in which we are living, the wealth of strategic materials in the soil of Latin America could well be considered the guardian of freedom of the Americas. We have a great and important relationship of interdependence with our Latin American countries in this age. A much closer person-to-person and community-to-community relationship between the nations of the Western Hemisphere is essential if we are to sustain freedom and opportunity for all other liberty-loving people of the world.

The people of Latin America are our friends. It is mutually important that we build stronger and better-understood political, cultural, and economic ties between us. If we are a people of good will and share our many blessings, God's peace will be ours for many years to come.

Respectfully submitted.

The commission: J. E. Dunn,[1] chairman; C. J. Kaney,[1] vice chairman; N. T. Veatch, vice chairman; Louis B. McGee,[1] secretary; Arnold V. Arms, M. D.; R. N. Bergendoff; Dudley C. Brown; Forrest D. Byars; J. Roger DeWitt; Harry M. Gambrel; Kenneth G. Gillespie[1]; Edward C. Gosnell; George Fuller Green; Hal Hendrix[1]; John D. Hilburn; C. Earl Hovey[1]; Lowell R. Johnson; Ray E. Lawrence; Beverly Miller; John O'Keefe; Alfred F. Parmelee; Joseph V. Quigley; Walter A. Reich; Nathan Rieger; Charles C. Shafer, Jr.; Frank H. Spink; Eugene F. Stanton; Fred R. Suddarth; R. Carter Tucker; Lancie L. Watts; Mayor H. Roe Bartle,[1] Ex Officio.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In closing this commendation of a group of patriotic and unselfish men, I am reminded that what we of the free world want more than anything else is permanent world peace.

What better way could there be toward that desirable end than this Kansas City idea for spreading friendliness and good will among our neighbors—an atmosphere sadly lacking in some other parts of the world.

I am sure all America wishes to thank these men of Kansas City for their leadership in the interest of world peace.

THE MODERNIZED PARITY FORMULA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have today sent to Secretary of Agriculture Benson, with reference to the so-called modernized parity formula.

[1] Members of the report committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Your statements to the press yesterday with reference to the dual-parity formula have caused me deep concern. You seem determined to put the so-called modernized parity formula for basic farm commodities into effect at all costs.

The so-called modernized parity formula, as you know, uses as its major provision in determining parity (fair price) the average price received by farmers for the previous 10-year period. Presently the prices received by farmers are averaging about 80 percent of parity. If farm prices continue at this low level for the next 10 years, then this low level of farm prices becomes parity or a fair price 10 years from now. That is wrong in principle. Almost every farm organization recognizes this, as was evidenced nearly everywhere the Senate Agriculture Committee held hearings throughout the United States last fall.

It is inconceivable that either labor or industry would ever sanction the use of any formula which would tie them to the average price received for the previous 10-year period. Both labor and industry, as you know, use as their base in making similar price calculations that favorable period of 1947 to 1949. In view of this, why should agriculture be subjected to this unreasonable principle which provides that the fair price in future years is based on the average price received for the previous 10-year period, no matter how adverse it may be.

It may be wrong, to some extent, to continue the dual-parity formula indefinitely. There is every justification, however, to continue the dual-parity formula until the Department of Agriculture can come forward with a new parity formula which will be more reasonable and fair to the farmers of America. The modernized parity formula is wrong in principle. As a Senator from a farming area, I do not feel it possible for me to compromise on a principle which I think is wrong. If permitted to go into effect, the modernized parity formula would do inestimable damage to the whole cause of agriculture.

The dairy farmers of America, recognizing that the modernized parity formula was doing an injustice to them, were able to have a provision inserted in the Senate agriculture bill which permits them to use the base period from 1946 to 1950. By this action they were able to set aside application of the modernized parity formula so far as the dairy industry is concerned. This action was completely justified and I was happy to support it.

I was pleased to note that no Member of the Senate—Republican or Democrat—moved to strike this provision from the agriculture bill. This in itself indicates the widespread disapproval of the so-called modernized parity formula.

It is my sincere hope that the Department of Agriculture will make an immediate study of parity formulas and that you will have ready for consideration by Congress next January a new parity formula that will be more fair to all segments of agriculture.

Respectfully yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator.

THE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 10 days ago, on March 19, the day the Senate finally passed the Agricultural Act of 1956, I made the following statement as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in concluding my remarks during that long debate:

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope all this is done before the Easter recess is taken. I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I heard the Senator make his statement about how much America needs a farm bill, and I concur wholeheartedly in everything he has said in that connection. However, I would not want the country to think—and I know the Senator would not want it to think—that it is at all possible to get a farm bill out of conference between now and the time the House is scheduled to go on its Easter recess, before Good Friday. As a matter of fact, the leaders on both sides of the aisle in the Senate conferred yesterday at some length, and conferred with the leaders on both sides in the other body. It was the consensus of the members of the conference committee of both parties—and a rather lengthy colloquy took place in the House—that it would be impossible to do a thorough and adequate job of bringing in a conference report before probably the latter part of next week.

I wished to have the Senator know that that sentiment is expressed by both Democrats and Republicans, by the majority leadership as well as the minority leadership.

So far as I know, every single Senator would be willing to remain here on Good Friday, Saturday, Monday, and Tuesday, if there was any hope of getting a bill. However, the fact is that there is no such hope. Representatives ANDRESEN, HOPE, and COOLEY say it is necessary for their subcommittees to study many of the amendments placed in the bill by the Senate, and that in their opinion it would require several days, even after agreement was reached on all the items, to have the conference report written up and printed. The majority leader was informed—and he so informed the minority leader, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and other Senators who are very much interested in the subject—that there was absolutely no hope of having a report and having it printed and available for consideration until after the Easter recess.

Mr. MUNDT. The majority leader was unduly worried if he felt that I was about to try to indict the Democratic leadership.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will yield, the majority leader did not intend to imply that he was worried at all. He was attempting to convey to his beloved friend from South Dakota information which he assumed the Senator from South Dakota did not possess, in the light of the statement he was making.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the information, and I shall comment upon it when I conclude reading what I said 10 days ago, at the time the debate was concluded.

I wish to reiterate what I said 10 days ago in concluding debate on the farm bill. I said at that time:

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that I hope all this is done before the Easter recess is taken. I think Congress needs an Easter recess; but I think America needs a farm bill worse than Congress needs a recess. If there is any tendency in the other body to drag heels or to delay action in conference, I suggest that we abandon the Easter recess rather than abandon the idea of having a new farm bill for the farmers to use in the crop year 1956. Time is running short but there is still time to complete this task by Easter—and we should resolve to stay here in session until conference approval is completed.

That concludes the statement I made 10 days ago, at the time we were debating the farm bill.

I rise today to reiterate every word of what I said 10 days ago. I know that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held our committee in session virtually day and night, in his very constructive and commendable effort to push the farm bill forward for action in time to make it effective this year; but I do not believe the Congress should begin its spring recess until it concludes action upon the conference report on the farm bill.

Much could have been done in conference during the past 10 days, and undoubtedly much has been done. I shall not speculate on that subject.

However, this I know: The spring work season is upon us in the farm belt now. Our farmers have a right to know under what farm program they will be working in 1956. Congress has the duty to give them this information. If necessary, therefore, I say to our leaders, we should postpone our spring recess by a week or two. We cannot turn back the calendar or retard the advance of spring. We can postpone our recess, but we cannot change the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas attempted to make it abundantly clear to the Senator from South Dakota and every other Senator that that was the offer yesterday of the leadership on both sides of the aisle. We offered to postpone the recess if any good could come from it.

However, the conferees are postponing their recess, and they are meeting day and night. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will note that the conferees have said there is no hope of having the conference report ready for consideration before week after next.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, this I know, and the Senator from Texas knows also, that no conferees sitting on a Thursday of one week can set a time schedule and state definitely that they cannot conclude consideration of a matter until a week thereafter. Perhaps they may be able to conclude the matter earlier. That is entirely possible. Therefore, I say we should stay in session and urge them to complete their work earlier.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should think, however, that the conferees from both parties would be better informed as to when they could conclude their business than an individual Senator who

makes a speech and says he is willing to stay here through the Easter holidays.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree that they may have a better educated guess than I, but their guess is nevertheless not to be taken as absolutely accurate. We have a tremendously serious problem on our hands, and it is a problem which must be solved. I believe we should stay in session until that important problem is solved.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to our distinguished chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for the compliments he has paid me. I fully expected to have the conference report ready by tomorrow. As a matter of fact, I discussed the matter with the leadership, with both the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The majority leader even agreed to have the Senate stay in session on Friday and Saturday if we could get the House to act.

However, we cannot control the action of the House. I was terribly disappointed yesterday when it was made known by the House leadership that it would take a few days for the Members of the House to read over the report and that there was no possibility of even considering the report this week.

Therefore, what the conferees have decided to do is to remain in session during the Easter recess until we get through with the job. It is my hope that not later than Saturday of this week we will have the conference report in shape.

Mr. MUNDT. Of this week, did the Senator say?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; Saturday of this week. However, under the rules of the House, as the Senator knows, the report must lie over for a day. We could not reach our goal this week, therefore.

I am very sorry about that, as the Senator knows. Let me go back a little bit in time. The Senator knows that when Congress was in session early in January, I expressed the hope that we could have the farm bill before the Senate on the 15th of February.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator not only expressed that hope, but he did everything a human being could do to make that hope come true.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. In making that prediction I forgot about the usual Lincoln Day holiday which is taken by the Republicans. Because of that there was a delay, as the Senator knows. Let us not try to blame each other for that.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may interrupt the Senator at that point, I should like to have the record made abundantly clear that I have not indicated that there has been any derelection of duty on the part of the Democratic leadership. I have been very careful in that regard. I am sure the majority leader will bear me out. I am pointing out what one Member of the Senate has a right to point out, even though he knows he cannot control the action of the other body, and to express his resentment at the fact that the other body has decided to go home when an important matter like the farm bill is under consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not think it is fair to blame anyone. The leadership on both sides of the aisle were in agreement that we stay here and complete the bill if we thought there was any chance at all of completing it.

However, if the Senator will read the RECORD at page 5686 of yesterday, he will note that there are 38 Senate amendments that must be considered.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is an optimist. The Senator from Louisiana thought we would pass the Senate bill a long time before we actually did pass it. The Senator from Louisiana was willing to sit all during the holiday that we had agreed we would take over Lincoln Day. However, because it has been customary to take that holiday, we carried out our agreement in that respect.

We met with the House leadership. I do not wish to criticize the House by implication or otherwise. Under the rules of the House, the House does not have an opportunity to debate the subject as fully and as thoroughly as the Senate does. In addition, there are 38 amendments to be considered.

We have taken care of only a few of those amendments. The Senator knows that Good Friday is upon us. I do not believe that the Senator from South Dakota or his farmers in South Dakota would advocate that we meet on Good Friday.

Mr. MUNDT. I am willing to take Good Friday off.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The House says it has various subcommittees dealing with individual commodities, like wheat, corn, and cotton, which must consider various amendments that the Senate has added to the bill. They have made it abundantly clear that in their opinion nothing could be gained by the House or the Senate or both staying in session next week.

The conferees have canceled their trip home. They have made a sacrifice. They are going to stay here to try to get it through. Perhaps their guess is bad; but, after all the parties had talked with the leadership on both sides of the aisle—and the Senator will see what was said if he will refer to the RECORD—and it was felt that no conference report would be available before Monday a week.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say to my distinguished friend from Texas in concluding my remarks, that earlier in the colloquy he suggested that I would do well if I took the suggestion of the conferees as to when they could conclude their labors. The chairman of the conference committee within the last 5 minuntes said that the conferees expected to finish the conference report on Saturday of this week.

Therefore, I am not particularly concerned about whom I am criticizing. I am criticizing the fact that because we are going into an Easter recess, it looks as though we will have a week's delay in acting on the conference report, on the basis of the estimate made by the chairman of the conference committee, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], for whom I have such an abundance of respect and in whom I have such great confidence.

Therefore, I merely say that while the farmers of America are compelled to wait and wonder about their future, I do not believe we should be in recess, when we could, perhaps, gain a week's time by staying here and taking our recess at a later date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I believe the RECORD is abundantly clear to the members of the Senator's own party—and I think the Senator from South Dakota was aware of it before he made his statement, and I believe his own leader is aware of the fact—that nothing would be gained by staying here next week. The conference report, when it is filed and is ready for action, will establish the fact that the Senator is aware of it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I do not believe that next week will be wasted. I have conferred with the farmers of my State. I conferred with them when I was home.

The Senate version of the bill is entirely different from what they expected. I know I have already scheduled not 1, but 5 meetings in my State with farmers, and I want to discuss with them the farm situation and then come back with their opinions. Therefore, I do not believe the time next week will be wasted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has been around the Capitol long enough to know that we can always expect at least one speech along the line of the speech made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Therefore, in anticipation of that speech I went to the minority leader and said, "We are likely to be confronted with this kind of situation." After consulting with the minority leader I went to the Speaker of the House and the majority leader of the House, both of whom conferred with the minority leader of the House. Then after that I had numerous conferences with the chairman of the conference committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

I assured him that we would be glad to stay here on Saturday night and on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, or at any time, if we needed to do so in order to get the conference report acted on. However, it must be remembered that the conference report is not just a report to the Senate or just the report of one Senator. It is the report of two groups. What do the conferees say about it? I should like to read what the very able Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN said yesterday:

> Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me.
>
> It is quite obvious that if we are to secure a good farm bill it will take time on the part of the conferees. I am one of the conferees. I can assure the gentleman there are a great many disagreements between the House and the Senate bill which we must discuss. I am foregoing any Easter vacation, like my chairman, so that we can be here to sit down and try to work out a good, sound farm bill that will receive the approval of the Congress. I may not agree to everything that is agreed to in the committee of conference; nevertheless, I feel that we must have a farm bill at the present time. The time is short, so I am going to stay here to work on the committee and get a bill out of the conference,

in the hope that we can vote on it when the recess is over.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to know whether the gentleman agrees with me in the statement I made a minute ago. Although we have worked faithfully and diligently and long hours, does the gentleman think it is even humanly possible for us to reach an agreement, prepare a bill, prepare a conference report, and have it back here before the Easter recess?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am in accord with the chairman, because I do not think that with all the knowledge we have here we could sit down and analyze every Senate amendment and be able to explain it to the House unless we have ample time to do it.

The Speaker of the House subsequently said:

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to propound this inquiry to the gentleman from North Carolina. I realize that the gentleman has a colossal job and I hope you do it thoroughly. I know it cannot be done hurriedly. That is just one thing that is absolutely certain because with 38 amendments and with deep differences between many of the conferees, it would seem to me that it would be a practical impossibility to even come to an agreement this week even if the conferees sat until Saturday. Then, also, with a complicated bill like this, the staff of the committee must go to work and seek to bring in a report explaining the bill so that the House can understand it. Does not the gentleman think that even that would take several days?

The chairman agreed with him.

Mr. President, the conference report has got to be participated in by the House. It has got to be acted on first by the House. The majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate were informed by the leadership of the other body that the conference report could not be available today and that they were asking the members of the conference committee to sit all week to try to make the report available. For that reason we expect to go through with our previous plans. If, by setting those plans aside, we could get a farm bill 1 hour earlier, I am sure I speak for the minority leader in saying that we would be glad to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, when the majority leader inquired of me the other day as to whether I would be prepared to join with him in keeping the Senate in session to a late hour on Thursday, or even extending the period of the recess, if we could complete the farm bill, I told him he would have full cooperation on this side of the asile to complete action on the farm bill if it were at all possible to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I even went so far as to talk to some of the House conferees and ask them if they would not sit late into the evening. They are practical men, Mr. President. The Senate took days and days and weeks and weeks in discussing the farm bill. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and it ill behooves anyone to criticize the fact that there is a brief delay of a few days when it took the Senate weeks to act on the bill. It was not just the fault of the majority side; it was the fault of the minority side, too. I dislike to have the impression go out that we are not concerned with the farmers' interest. I thought the bill would be ready if the conference committee stayed in session, as did the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the House conferees, and everyone except the Senator from Louisiana, who, I think, has grave doubts himself. When he first came to us, he thought the conference report would be ready, but there are still some 38 amendments which have not been touched.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I had complete confidence in the accuracy of the prediction of the chairman of the conference committee [Mr. ELLENDER] that we could complete action by Saturday night. If that had been true, we could have acted upon the report on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is not speaking for the Senator from Louisiana, but if the Senator from South Dakota will read the RECORD, I think he will see that action is not going to be completed by Saturday night. The Senator from Louisiana thought it would be completed by Wednesday night, but he was very optimistic. We cannot expect the House conferees to take 38 amendments and put them all into a suitcase and say they are going to take them all. They want to examine them thoroughly. I think they do themselves credit and do the legislative body of the United States credit when they cancel their own vacation to stay here and work on the conference report.

TRADE WITH LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to take just a moment to congratulate the junior Senator from Missouri and the fine Kansas City group of civic, business and professional leaders on their recent good-will trip to various Latin American countries.

The distinguished Senator has rendered a great service in bringing this new idea of promoting better understanding with our friends and neighbors to the south to the attention of the Senate.

I believe every one of us recognizes that as our trade with European and Asian countries diminishes, the United States of America must look to the countries in Central America and South America for their future economic welfare. The Latin American nations are rapidly growing to the extent that it is estimated they will have 300 million people by 1975. Theirs is an area of the world which is fertile for development of natural resources needed by these United States. They in turn need the things we make and need extended credit with which to purchase them. I think it is an excellent idea which was put forward by the Kansas City group; namely, getting civic, business, and professional leaders together and making a trip to those countries to try to encourage and promote trade with our Latin American neighbors. These ambassadors of good will certainly did an excellent job and should most definitely be encouraged to do it again next year. I trust that their idea will receive the serious attention of other civic, business, and professional leaders throughout this fair land of ours.

INTERFERENCE BY WHITE HOUSE AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE IN PRIMARY ELECTION PROCESS IN OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 8 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there have been few more glaring examples of White House interference in a senatorial contest in an individual State than what recently occurred in my home State of Oregon.

This intrusion by the present White House hierarchy makes pallid and mild by comparison any participation in a State race that took place under the Presidency of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I say this, Mr. President, even though I am aware of the fact that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], was once the object of the intervention in a State campaign by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the Democratic primary in Georgia in 1938.

It does not take a long memory to remember how Mr. Roosevelt was denounced as a dictator and as the author of "purges" because he occasionally indicated a preference for one or another candidate in a Democratic Party primary somewhere in the Nation.

But no intervention which President Roosevelt ever sanctioned could compare even remotely with the ruthless brushing aside of the Republican Party in Oregon by the White House staff and the Republican National Committee when they recently dropped Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay into the Oregon Republican senatorial primary.

Already entered in that primary were four candidates. These men were not even notified that the White House was interjecting McKay into the race. Yet Oregon's leading Republican newspaper is authority for the fact that Mr. McKay expected these other candidates to step aside for him, to withdraw abjectly from the election in his favor. Mr. President, did any intervention in a primary ever occur under Franklin D. Roosevelt which could even get close enough to this ruthless intervention to communicate with it by smoke signals? I doubt it, Mr. President. This intrusion by the White House and by Mr. McKay is in a class by itself.

President Roosevelt was accused of wanting a rubber-stamp Congress because of his several forays into some Democratic Party primaries. What would have been said, Mr. President, had President Roosevelt at the 11th hour dispatched a Cabinet member to a party primary in a sovereign State of

the Union without so much as a moment's notice to the faithful party members already enlisted in that primary and then had expected these men to withdraw cringingly in favor of the White House entry?

Had President Roosevelt done anything like that, Mr. President, he would have been compared with every dictator from Atilla the Hun to Benito Mussolini, and more besides.

Let me read two paragraphs from the March 10, 1956, issue of the Portland Oregonian, a newspaper completely Republican in its editorial allegiance:

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airliner just after midnight that they thought the national committee had paved the way—that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator reading a quotation from the Portland Oregonian?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is an exact quotation from the Portland, Oreg., Oregonian. I continue to read:

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming. Neither did Lamar Tooze nor Phil Hitchcock, 2 of the 4 announced candidates for the nomination.

State Senator Hitchcock added the candid comment, in the columns of the Oregonian, that "Secretary McKay's decision comes a complete surprise to me."

Just imagine what transpired, Mr. President. A little group of men in the White House and the Republican National Committee handpicked a Republican senatorial candidate for the State of Oregon. Then they sent him off to Oregon, without so much as a courtesy notice to the Republicans already filed in that race—all this on the eve of the closing of filings. And, furthermore, this vine-ripened specimen from the hothouses of the GOP National Committee confidently anticipated that the other nominees would back out of the race, merely at the signal that the White House and Leonard Hall had decided whom the Republicans of Oregon should nominate.

Nothing that I can say about this ruthless intervention in the Oregon primary, Mr. President, can be as caustic as the recent statement of State Senator Lowell Steen of Umatilla County, a Republican member of the State legislature. Senator Steen is a regular Republican leader who supported my opponent in the 1954 senatorial election, but listen to his comments concerning the White House-Leonard Hall blitzkrieg on Oregon's primary election processes. This is what Senator Steen declared:

The issue in the May 18 primary election is whether the Republicans will pick their own candidate or let the national Republican Party organization dictate who the candidate will be.

There has also been comment on the manner in which Mr. McKay, at the last moment, was injected into the Oregon senatorial race by the White House and the national leadership of the Republican Party. Let me quote, for example, the editorial reaction from the Oregon Statesman, published in our State capital city by a former Republican governor of my State and a nationally known figure, Mr. Charles A. Sprague:

McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as has been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon. This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Statesman of March 15, 1956]

HITCHCOCK REMAINS A CANDIDATE

Phil Hitchcock has decided not to withdraw as candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator. Pressures were put on him to pull out of the contest after Secretary McKay announced his entry. Hitchcock concluded that having entered the contest in good faith and at the urging of many Republicans he should stay in the race.

The Statesman commends Hitchcock for his decision. He is a man eminently qualified for the office he seeks. He was under no obligation, political or moral, to step aside. On the contrary those who had urged him to enter are the ones who are under obligation to continue their support.

As for McKay, the Oregon primary is open to all who want to run for office in the party to which they adhere. McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as has been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon. This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

The argument offered to support the shift to McKay was that he will be the strongest candidate the party can put up to contest with MORSE. Whether this is correct, of course, only time will tell. If McKay is the nominee then the issue becomes one of vindicating McKay and the McKay policies as Secretary of the Interior. Republicans are thus thrown on the defensive. With another candidate the issues are not so tightly narrowed, and MORSE is the one put on the defensive.

Much is made of support for the Eisenhower policies. Hitchcock has already made it clear that he supports Eisenhower and his program. But the latter is much broader than the policies of the Interior Department. It embraces foreign affairs, maintaining a high level of prosperity without inflation, revision of farm legislation, expansion of Federal aid to highways, Federal aid for school construction, etc. The campaign in Oregon should not be bogged down with justifications for Al Serena mining claims, Hells Canyon, and tidelands grant to States. These appear to be settled issues, and while their wisdom may become part of the political debate, as was the case in 1954, the Republican campaign in Oregon needs to be conducted on a much broader basis. For that reason the Statesman feels that the Republican Party should draw on fresh material, especially where there is available a man of Hitchcock's character and ability.

It will be a mistake for the Republican Party in Oregon to let the effort to defeat MORSE absorb all its energy. There is a whole slate of offices to fill, especially at the State level, and members to be elected to the legislative assembly as well as to the State decision on the presidental ticket. So Republican electors should do some hard thinking before casting their ballots on the senatorial nominees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not former Governor Sprague appointed either as a delegate or alternative delegate to the United Nations?

Mr. NEUBERGER. He was, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is he not one of the most distinguished citizens of Oregon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The name of former Governor Sprague has won more high journalistic honors, if my memory serves me correctly, than has any other journalist in the modern history of Oregon.

This is what ex-Governor Sprague said, in part, about the entry into the Oregon primary race of his fellow townsman of the city of Salem, a fellow Republican, and a fellow former governor of Oregon, Mr. McKay:

McKay was free to become a candidate even though on numerous occasions he had rejected the idea of standing against MORSE. The Statesman, however, objects to the commissioning of a candidate by the Republican national chairman or by the White House as was done with McKay, to the extent of having a special letter of commendation written by the President. It protests also to the way the maneuver was handled with no contact, so far as had been admitted, with party leaders in Oregon.

This worked to McKay's embarrassment when he arrived Friday and certainly was embarrassing to State Chairman Wendell Wyatt. We think Hitchcock should stay in the race both because of his splendid qualifications and to repudiate the notion that Oregon is a province of the GOP GHQ.

Mr. Hitchcock is the man I mentioned earlier.

Mr. President, those are not the words of a Democratic Senator; they are the words of a leading Republican, a former governor of Oregon, the foremost Republican editor in the State, who, I might add parenthetically, opposed the present junior Senator from Oregon editorially when I was a candidate in 1954.

The passage of a couple of weeks since Senator McKay's last-minute announcement of his candidacy for the Republican nomination for Senator from Ore-

gon has afforded an opportunity for other press comments and assessments of the situation created by this sudden step. I believe some of these press comments will be of interest to Senators, and I am making them available by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

For example, the Denver Post, published by Mr. E. P. Hoyt, who used to publish the Portland Oregonian—and both of these newspapers supported the Republican ticket in 1952—commented in an editorial on March 12, 1956:

Secretary of the Interior McKay's departure from the Eisenhower Cabinet to contest the Senate seat held by Oregon's Republican-turned-Democrat WAYNE L. MORSE, will be no loss to the President or to the country. Nor will it, in our opinion, frighten the Democrats of Oregon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MCKAY STEPS DOWN

Secretary of the Interior McKay's departure from the Eisenhower Cabinet to contest the Senate seat held by Oregon's Republican-turned-Democrat, WAYNE L. MORSE, will be no loss to the President or to the country. Nor will it, in our opinion, frighten the Democrats of Oregon, even though the GOP has worked up a real boil on Mr. MORSE who bolted the party which elected him to two terms.

Mr. McKay was a popular legislator and two-term Governor of Oregon. A Salem, Oreg., automobile dealer, member of a pioneer family and a doughty little Scotchman with folksy ways and a good World War I record, Mr. McKay got along fine in the politics of the Beaver State. But when he was pulled into the national spotlight and given command of the explosive and angrily denounced affairs of Interior, Mr. McKay flopped futilely around like a Columbia River Chinook salmon on the cannery floor.

Mr. McKay had worked persistently for flood control on the Willamette River which courses through Salem and occasionally bursts its banks. But he either had insufficient knowledge about the economics of great reclamation and power projects in the West, or he was forced into subscribing to fuzzy and phony compromises in setting policy for future Federal investments in land and water developments. And after 3 years Mr. McKay found himself wholly on the defensive in such matters as the relocation of Indians, the so-called partnership in generating hydroelectric power, the granting of mineral leases in wildlife refuges and the giveaway of public timber by misuse of the mining laws.

Even when the Secretary was not wrong in principle, he was terribly inept in proving that he was right. And during 3 years as Secretary of the Interior he became identified with retrenchment, retreat, and apology in prosecuting the functions of this great western agency, rather than advocacy of legitimate public works which contributed to western prosperity and national security in the 20 years preceding his regime.

We said once before, in suggesting Mr. McKay's retirement, that he was a man of courage, honor, and decent instincts. But he was, to, a small man in a big job—a job demanding vision and imagination as the supplements of courage, and a real deep-down belief in the economic role of the West in the drama of an expanding nation. Perhaps Mr. McKay was restrained by the unsympathetic influences in the administration he served. More likely, he went along without discriminating between what was good for the West and what was good for the Republican Party.

Mr. Eisenhower's firm and successful prosecution of the upper Colorado River storage, reclamation and power project provides him with an opportunity to free Mr. McKay's successor in championing public works without the self-imposed inhibitions and fears about socialism. That makes it rather important that Ike name a Secretary who is not publicly identified with parroting such groundless fears to the expense of public works that cannot and will not be undertaken by misnamed free private enterprise.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon was the first State to adopt a system for the direct election of United States Senators. It was one of the first States to have a direct primary election. If Oregon Republicans permit their primary to be perverted and dominated by absentee dictation from 3,000 miles away, then the primary election system is as dead as the mastodon, so far as Oregon Republicans are concerned.

Already one Republican candidate has withdrawn—General Tooze. This was done because Mr. McKay entered the race. Of course, this is the privilege of the man who withdrew, just as it was his privilege to enter the contest originally. But when, Mr. President, has there been such an example of gross and outright interference in a primary contest by the highest political echelons of a major party, as the Republican Party has done in the Oregon Republican senatorial contest?

Of course, Mr. President, I am not privy to the innermost secrets of the Republican Party. Therefore, I do not know whether the White House superimposed its will on the Oregon primary election because it wanted to eliminate from the Cabinet a man who has become a national symbol of giving away water-power sites, national-forest timber, and wildlife refuges, or whether the White House actually felt that Mr. McKay has any real chance of election against the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The latter supposition is so remote from the truth that perhaps the former assumption is correct. It may have been that this entire invasion of a party primary was merely undertaken in order to rid the President's Cabinet of a man who is now anathema to the millions of Americans who are dedicated to true conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was it not the practice in the former German Empire that if a figure around the court of Kaiser Wilhelm became unpopular he was sent to the most dangerous portion of the western front?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it might be said that Secretary McKay was sent to the front; and when I consider the high esteem in which the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is held by the people of Oregon, it might be said that Mr. McKay has been sent to a dangerous sector of the front, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was interested in what the Senator had to say about the GOP–GHQ.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not say that; a distinguished former Republican governor of Oregon said it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that it was not said by the junior Senator from Oregon, but was said by a man who used to be a Republican governor in what used to be called the Republican State of Oregon.

But I am interested in the power exercised and displayed by the praetorian guard in the White House. They seem to be arrogating unto themselves a great deal of power in more ways than one; not only arrogating to themselves power in legislative matters, but also in the matter of subordinating the legislative branch at the same time.

Mr. McKay has a reputation for giving away the natural resources of the American people. Perhaps what the Republican GHQ had in mind was giving Mr. McKay away. But if that is the way it is going to work it is going to be a good thing for McKay, because he will not win against Senator MORSE. It will be a good thing for the country, because he will be out of his position, which he has used ruthlessly in the last 3 years in giving away the Nation's resources and in retarding the development of the country.

As a matter of fact, it would appear that Mr. McKay has outlived his "uselessness."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that he is certainly right. It is a good thing for America to have Mr. McKay out of the Cabinet, because of his policies of giving away our resources. It is a good thing for the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to have Mr. McKay as an opponent. The only possible circumstance for which it is bad is the freedom of Republican primary elections in the State of Oregon.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The junior Senator from Oregon is a former member of the Oregon State Legislature. I wonder if the Senator knows of any law during his time of service, or of any law that has been passed any time since, which repealed the primary laws of the State of Oregon. They are still on the books, are they not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are still on the books, to my knowledge.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oregonians have a peculiarly historic right to be proud, being members of the first State in the Union which had direct election of Senators, and they have pride in the freedom of being able to go into primaries and pick their own candidates in a given party. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator say some of that spirit which has emanated from Oregon has gone across the Columbia River to the north, too?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The people in the State of Washington, I am sure, will resent just as much as will the people in the State of Oregon, any intrusion by the White House, or by "GHQ of the GOP," into the primary elections in the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator and I think the people of the States of Oregon and Washington still adhere to the position—the Senator has had wide experience in both States—that we have primaries for a reason. The reason is that the people may pick the candidates in the various political parties. Then if the "GHQ" wants to say, "We are for the Republican nominee," the people will say, "That is only politically natural."

Will the Senator agree with me that we have had a lot of talk around the Senate in the last few weeks about campaign moneys and campaign contributions? The Senator knows, having freshly come from a campaign, that it costs considerable money to run a campaign, even in a State like Oregon or Washington, or States similarly populated. Would the Senator think that not only has the "GHQ" suggested, or pretended to suggest, to the people of Oregon that they can anoint a candidate, but it also may suggest that they might finance him after they have anointed him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I take the suggestion of the senior Senator from Washington to be true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And most of the financing will come, not from the people of Oregon, but from people outside the State of Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Undoubtedly, what the senior Senator from Washington says is entirely correct. I should like to emphasize to the senior Senator from Washington, who has raised this point, that the Portland Oregonian, a newspaper with which the senior Senator from Washington is familiar, because it has a large circulation in the western portion of Washington—and it is a Republican newspaper—stated as follows, and again I want to read these two sentences to show how ruthlessly Mr. McKay was superimposed on the Oregon primaries:

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airlines just after midnight—

This was just before the time for filing would close—

that they thought the national committee had paved the way, that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true that several statements had been prepared the day before, and had been given to various persons throughout the Government, including Members of Congress, to be read at noon, announcing what a great man the Secretary of the Interior was, and that they had to withhold those statements because something happened out there? They were already to read them at noon. The statements were prepared before the announcement was made that he was going to file. They had to wait until about 3 or 4 o'clock until they had word from the "western front" what had happened.

Mr. NEUBERGER. All I can say to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington is that evidently the statements were not transmitted to Oregon, because several of the Republican nominees, I might say, quite courageously and impudently, stayed in the race, and they are running against Mr. McKay. They are actually running against him. His resignation has just been submitted as Secretary of the Interior, evidently indicating he feels some sense of emergency has arisen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As long as the Portland Oregonian referred to the GHQ of the GOP——

Mr. NEUBERGER. That was the Oregon Statesman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder if they meant the headquarters of the Republican National Committee, which is listed in the Washington telephone book as 1625 I Street, or whether they meant 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not having access to the innermost thinking processes of our distinguished ex-Republican governor, I would not know, but perhaps he might have referred to both of them, because evidently it was a calculated move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Referring to what the Senator from Illinois has said, did it not come to be quite a common practice during the war to have what was known as a combined GHQ?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not remember it until the distinguished Senator from Montana reminded me of it, but, of course, that is so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think it will take a combined GHQ to put Mr. McKay over. He will have to get a little more in the way of sustenance than he has so far. I am not referring to finances. He will have to have a combined GHQ to fall back on after the election is over.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am sure it will be necessary for him, if he survives the primaries.

Mr. President, it is none of my business who wins the Republican primary in Oregon May 18. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be reelected in November, regardless of the identity of his opponent. But the primary-election system in our State belongs to no party, be it Republican or Democratic. It belongs to the people, the descendants of those long-gone pioneers of political reform in Oregon who resisted fear and caution to give the voters the right to pick their own nominees at the polls.

What happened in our State March 9, when the White House and the Republican National Committee imposed their will on the Oregon primary system, was not democracy and it was not in the interest of good government. As one who heard Franklin D. Roosevelt being roundly criticized for so much milder and less overt intrusion into primary elections, I still am waiting for some words to be said, Mr. President, about purges and dictatorship and interference in State elections on the part of this administration.

Or, Mr. President, have we reached the stage where what is sauce for the goose actually is not sauce for the gander? Can the present administration act to choke off and muffle a primary election, as Secretary McKay evidently hoped would happen in Oregon? Is it permissible for our current national political leaders to subvert a primary, by attempting to secure a clear field for their handpicked nominee, who suddenly is thrust into the State's nominating process from 3,000 miles away?

Mr. President, by way of conclusion, I am extremely happy that many of the distinguished editors of my State and of nearby States, such as Colorado, share the indignation that has been voiced on the floor of the Senate today over the intrusion by GHQ of the GOP into the Oregon Republican primaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks two excellent editorials from the Medford Mail Tribune of March 20, 1956, by a former winner of the Pulitzer prize for journalism, Mr. Robert W. Ruhl; and, also, an article by Mr. A. Robert Smith, which appeared in the Oregon Statesman of March 18, 1956, and an editorial from the Astorian Budget of March 12, 1956, and an article from the Oregonian of March 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Medford Mail Tribune of March 20, 1956]

WHAT PERSUADED MCKAY?

Who or what did persuade Secretary of the Interior McKay to agree to resign his Cabinet job and run against Senator WAYNE MORSE for the Upper House?

The general supposition at first was it must have been the President. But Secretary McKay has publicly denied this. He says in effect, no one persuaded him. He decided to run himself.

Yet as the Mail Tribune correspondent in Washington, A. Robert Smith brought out so clearly in Sunday's paper:

On Monday, March 5, in an hour's interview, Mr. McKay said he hoped to retire to his beloved Oregon, reiterating that he had no intention of running for MORSE's Senate seat, that at 62 he was too old to tackle that sort of a job, that a younger man should take over, etc., etc.

On the next Tuesday, March 6, Secretary McKay told the same story to an Associated Press representative. He said he would not make the Senate race, but unless the President wished him to remain in the Cabinet he would retire.

On the day following (Wednesday, the 7th), Secretary McKay was invited to breakfast by Leonard Hall, the dynamic GOP chairman, and the pressure was put on hard

from the standpoint that the defeat of WAYNE MORSE on the Republican agenda came second only in importance to a victory for Ike and that the Secretary was the one man to do it, Lamar Tooze and Phil Hitchcock, the other contenders being not well enough known in Oregon.

According to Correspondent Smith, although the pressure was considerable Secretary McKay was still unconvinced.

The next day, however, Mr. McKay was called to a conference at the White House. En route (again according to Reporter Smith), he told an AP reporter he was still opposed to making the race against MORSE. But presto, bingo—that afternoon, only a few hours later, Secretary and Mrs. McKay were on a plane en route to Salem, Oreg., and the following day the controversial Secretary of the Interior, did what he had maintained for weeks and only the day before, he would never do—entered the lists to kick his old-time enemy WAYNE MORSE out of the United States Senate and take the seat for the next 6 years himself.

Secretary McKay still stuck to his original story however, that President Eisenhower did not ask him to run, but was immensely pleased when Oregon's former governor told him he had decided to do so.

There is no reason to doubt this.

It comes down then, largely, to a matter of semantics.

No doubt the President did not put his arm around "Dear Doug's" shoulder and plead with him to make the race and thus save the GOP and the Nation. But his "alter ego," Sherman Adams probably did do something of the sort, so it was in reality the realization that his boss and revered leader wanted him to make the race, and would be sorely displeased and disappointed if he didn't, that as Reporter Smith expressed it: "Pushed McKay into a campaign he personally did not wish to enter."

R. W. R.

HE REFUSES TO QUIT

There was a second big surprise in this all-out GOP effort to "get" WAYNE MORSE—or else.

It was assumed in Washington that Messrs. Tooze and Hitchcock would meekly acquiesce and when they got word from "on high" that Secretary McKay had been properly chosen and anointed, they would fold up their tents and quietly sneak away.

Attorney Tooze did so. But former State Senator Hitchcock appeared to be made of sterner stuff.

At any rate, on his visit here Mr. Hitchcock assured his friends and supporters he was in the race to stay. He believed he had a better chance of beating Oregon's senior Senator than the vulnerable and reactionary Secretary of the Interior, and that in justice to those who believed as he did, he would not, regardless of what pressure might be brought, obey the command to quit and retreat, even if it were issued from GHQ or thereabouts.

Win, lose, or draw, Candidate Hitchcock is to be commended for his spirit and independence.

More than that, he will find plenty of support among Republicans for his contention that he would give WAYNE MORSE a harder run for his money than the Secretary of the Interior.

For all the true TR conservationists are not in the Democratic Party by any means. Nor are all the advocates of public power over private power at Hells Canyon or at similar multiple project. Thousands of liberal Republicans particularly here in the Northwest are as critical of the Interior Department's record under McKay as any of the Democrats, and while probably few of them would like to vote for WAYNE MORSE, not many of them would vote for 6 more years of McKay giveaway doctrine in the United States Senate—or anywhere else either.

So while as things now stand it isn't probable, it is possible, that young Hitchcock may pull one of the big upsets of the campaign and thus allow Secretary McKay to do what he really wants to do—retire from public life and hand over the job of carrying the torch for the Grand Old Party to younger and more eager hands.

R. W. R.

[From the Oregon Statesman of March 18, 1956]

RECONSTRUCTED STORY SHOWS VITAL ROLE OF IKE'S ADVISERS IN DECISION BY SECRETARY MCKAY

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The sudden decision of Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay to pull out of the Cabinet and run for the Senate in Oregon was brought about in a matter of hours by President Eisenhower's top political advisers, if not by the President himself.

This is the reconstructed background story, as completely as it could be pieced together, of this major political development.

Monday, March 5, in an hour-long interview with McKay that afternoon in his office, he told me he had no plans for the future except to resign next January 20 and let the President decide whether he wanted to make a Cabinet change. Either way would have been O. K. with McKay, for he said he was looking forward to retiring. In previous interviews, McKay said he had no desire to run for the Senate, explaining that a man younger than his 62 years should be tackling that job.

McKay seemed relaxed, genial as ever, and profiting personally from the philosophy he applies to his controversy-ridden job. No matter how thick the brickbats might fly, "I never go to sleep at night mad at anyone," he said.

In the month since the late Governor Patterson died, he had been urged by many to return to Oregon and take on Senator WAYNE MORSE. He had held out adamantly against this idea. Mrs. McKay was even more stoutly opposed to it. Up to this day, no one had successfully moved either from that position.

Tuesday, March 6: McKay told an inquiring reporter for the Associated Press substantially what he had told me Monday about his future plans.

Wednesday, March 7: McKay had breakfast with Leonard Hall, GOP national chairman. From this point the wheels began grinding furiously. Hall reportedly told McKay that a public opinion firm hired by the Republican National Committee had taken a sampling in Oregon and found McKay much better known by the average citizen than either Phil Hitchcock or Lamar Tooze, the two main Republican contenders for MORSE's seat. The day before, Hall told 1,500 ladies attending the National Republican Women's Conference here that MORSE was a prime GOP target, next in importance to the Presidency in this year's elections. Party leaders didn't want to take a chance on a relatively unknown candidate. McKay was told they thought he was the man to do the job.

McKay left the breakfast table unconvinced. During the day he sounded out close advisers. Some encouraged him to run. He said he would have to talk it over with Mrs. McKay that night. That same evening, Attorney General Herbert Brownell told a prominent Republican that despite the heat on McKay to run, he was still dragging his feet. Brownell said he was confident McKay would change his mind by the following day. He explained that an 11 o'clock appointment set up by the White House for McKay with the President the following morning would cinch the matter if McKay were still holding out when he arrived at the White House.

In this conversation, Brownell, who is one of the administration's top political masterminds, explained that party political leaders here felt that McKay had not made a satisfactory recovery from the political onslaught of the Democrats on the giveaway charge. Other Cabinet members, placed on the hot seat by partisan critics, had recovered much better, Brownell added, mentioning Defense Secretary Wilson.

This was clearly not the attitude of many western Republicans, such as Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, who had come to regard McKay very highly and defended him frequently on the Senate floor. There was no apparent organized effort from the West, where Interior policies are most vital, to replace McKay before the campaign got under way. Indeed, Mountain State Republicans feel they are riding high now, having won congressional approval of the McKay supported upper Colorado project—second highest Federal reclamation project ever proposed by Congress.

Thursday, March 8: McKay went to the White House that morning. A top Republican told the AP that before he arrived he was still determined not to run. In any case, by late afternoon he was aboard a flight bound for Portland with a hastily prepared statement explaining his decision to oppose MORSE. McKay said he was not urged by Eisenhower himself to run, but that Sherman Adams, the President's chief assistant, encouraged him to do so and it pleased the President when he told him of his decision. That day Eisenhower wrote McKay a letter, saying his decision was worthy of the highest commendation.

Friday, March 9: McKay invited Hitchcock and Tooze to a morning confab to discuss his sudden entry into the race. Both, because he had been led to believe by party bigwigs in Washington that Tooze and Hitchcock had agreed to withdraw if he entered the race; Tooze and Hitchcock because no one had even mentioned it to them.

When the news leaked out about what was afoot, McKay told reporters there was some confusion and he didn't know whether he would run or not. This was flashed to Washington, and in turn the White House got on the phone to McKay and Ralph Cake, former GOP national committeeman. Adams and Hall were on the White House end of the line to see about ending the confusion. Shortly thereafter, McKay announced he was in the race, he drove to Salem to file, and the White House formally announced the news here.

Available evidence points to the conclusion that McKay was pushed into a campaign he personally did not wish to enter, by party officials at the Washington level who led him to believe he was the strongest of possible challengers for MORSE, that other Oregon candidates would welcome his candidacy and pull out (although they were not consulted) and that he would be doing what the President and the party most wanted him to do if he knocked off WAYNE MORSE.

Motivating at least some of this pressure on McKay was a feeling held by some of the GOP's top strategists here that McKay had not been able to combat his Democratic critics as effectively as they might have wished and that it would be no less politically valuable to have a new Secretary of the Interior as the 1956 campaign got under way than to have McKay barnstorming up and down his native Oregon after the scalp of his harshest critic.

[From the Evening Astorian-Budget of March 12, 1956]

LIVELY FIGHT AHEAD

There's certainly new life in the political situation this week with Interior Secretary Douglas McKay's dramatic entrance into

the contest for Senator WAYNE MORSE's senatorial seat.

The resignation of a Cabinet member to enter a senatorial contest is highly unusual in United States politics.

When that Cabinet member has been the principal target of criticisms of a major administration policy—the handling of Northwest power development—and when his opponent for the Senate seat is a leading critic of that policy, obviously the issue for the campaign is drawn clearly.

We will have a real rouser of a campaign battle, it seems safe to predict, with full dress debate of the administration's "partnership" power policy versus the policy of full Federal development of power as advocated by Senator MORSE and the Democrats.

The outcome will clearly be of interest to the whole Nation as well as to Oregon and the Northwest, because it is such a showdown test of the administration's standing with the people of the Northwest on the power situation.

Whether one agrees with McKay's opinions or not, one must credit him with political courage in staking his political future and the administration's reputation in a tough political battle of doubtful outcome.

Senator MORSE is a competent campaigner, with few equals in skill at extemporaneous, rough and tumble debating. Any one who takes him on is in for a tough time. He had intimated quite often that there is nothing he would rather do than take on McKay in a campaign.

Well, he has his chance. There's no need to say that it will be an interesting campaign.

[From the Oregonian of March 10, 1956]

IKE'S BLESSING GOES TO DOUG FOR CAMPAIGN—INTERIOR BOSS' LAST-MINUTE FILING SEEN AS GOP MOVE TO BEAT MORSE

Douglas McKay, 62, Secretary of Interior, flew to Oregon Friday to enter the race for United States Senator with the blessing of President Eisenhower.

McKay's last-minute entry was an admitted attempt by the Republican National Committee to beat Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican-turned-Democrat, whose defeat probably is second only to the reelection of President Eisenhower on the party's priority list.

McKay said President Eisenhower had not personally urged him to make the race. But the President specifically gave McKay his personal blessing in a letter dated Wednesday, March 8, and released by Murray Snyder, assistant Presidential secretary at the White House Friday simultaneously with McKay's formal announcement that he would file for the Republican nomination.

In a statement announcing his candidacy, McKay said:

"I am coming back home to bring to a showdown in Oregon the question of whether the President's program is to be jeopardized in the future, as it has been in the past, by those seeking personal gratification and notoriety at the expense of the national welfare. The plain fact is that I believe my native State is not now represented by a Senator whose political integrity can be relied upon."

DECISION HELD WORTHY

President Eisenhower wrote:

"Your decision to campaign for election to the United States Senate from your beloved State of Oregon is worthy of the highest commendation.

"The vast experience you have gained in private life, as a veteran State legislator, governor, and able administrator of the vital affairs of the Department of the Interior, qualifies you for legislative judgments that will be of the utmost importance, not only to the people of Oregon, but to the remainder of the Nation as well.

"As a personal matter, of course, I have mingled emotions. You have been a tremendous asset to us in the Cabinet and you will be missed. At the same time it is easy to understand your desire to be of maximum personal service to your home State," the President added. "As a Member of the United States Senate you will add a great deal to the working strength we need and must have in order to carry out the objectives of the administration."

McKay told the Oregonian Friday morning that up to Monday he had laughed at any suggestion he run for the Senate against MORSE. He said it was the Republican National Committee which importuned him to make the race.

TOOZE TO WITHDRAW

It was obvious when the Secretary and Mrs. McKay slipped in unannounced by United Airliner just after midnight that they thought the national committee had paved the way, that all candidates would withdraw to make way for McKay.

It quickly developed, however, that the way had not been paved. Even top Republican brass in the State did not know he was coming. Neither did Lamar Tooze nor Phil Hitchcock, 2 of the 4 announced candidates for the nomination.

Tooze by noon had indicated he would withdraw as soon as McKay actually filed. Hitchcock, ex-State senator, now public relations representative for Lewis and Clark College, has not indicated he will withdraw.

Friday afternoon he issued a statement declaring:

"Secretary McKay's decision comes as a complete surprise to me. Many people throughout the State have committed themselves to support me and I have committed myself to them to make the race. At this time I do not see how I could withdraw that commitment."

ACTIVE DRIVE PLEDGED

McKay, after conferring with Tooze, Hitchcock, and Republican Party leaders all morning, announced his candidacy at noon.

"I'm in," he told the Oregonian. "I propose to fight it out along the Eisenhower policy line."

In a formal statement issued as he left for Salem at 1:30 p. m. to file for the nomination he said:

"I am looking forward to active participation in the forthcoming battle for the principles and ideals of government that President Eisenhower and the Republican Party stand for."

McKay early indicated he had not expected to make a campaign in the State primary. He later explained that he would be in no position to do so. He has commitments as Secretary of the Interior, which will keep him busy throughout April and into May, he said.

"I will resign as soon as possible in view of my obligations to my Cabinet job, maybe June 1," he said.

IKE SAID "PLEASED"

While McKay emphasized that the President did not urge him to make the race against MORSE, the Secretary said he had reported to the President before leaving Washington, however, and said the President was "pleased."

McKay made it plain he is not fond of Washington, D. C.

"I want nothing better than to get back to Oregon and retire," he said. "I want to die in Oregon," he added with a grin.

He feels a duty to serve the Nation and the party, however, in whatever capacity he is needed, he indicated.

"It was 72 when we left Washington," he said. "But this weather still looks good to me," he added, ducking from a sudden dash of hail mixed with gobs of Oregon dew.

RETURN SET SUNDAY

Despite two sleepless nights of travel, McKay looked relaxed, fit and 45, rather than 62, Mrs. McKay, who travels with him, admitted the prospect of another 6 years in Washington did not fill her with glee.

McKay admitted, however, he would enjoy a good fight with MORSE, with whose philosophies he has frequently clashed. McKay plans to return to Washington Sunday. He leaves next Wednesday for a trip to the Virgin Islands.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following con-

current resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes.";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which were, on page 3, strike out line 3; on page 3, line 16, strike out "Veccirkas" and insert "Vecoirkas", and on page 6, after line 2, insert:

T-303059, Bartolini, Alberto.
8511-A-1274, Caramanlau, Gheorghe.
E-053084, Cepeda-Teran, Aurelio.
A-3042474, Chaykowski, Michael.
A-1427387, Chervinski, Charles.
E-89265, Chillemi, Giovanni.
A-5934786, Cimino, Jean.
0800-106472, Cobos, Tomas.
A-1459543, Cowart, Harry Fuller.
E-069328, Dem, Louise.
A-2888771, Drewnowski, Czeslaw.
A-1847251, Elber, Isadore.
A-5524604, Feldman, Pal.
A-4724104, Ferro, Pete.
A-2174885, Figiolia, Louis Jack.
A-3740609, Grado, Luigi Di.
A-4705290, Gutstein, Albert.
A-5343594, Holody, Martin.
A-2194350, Honkamaa, Charles.
A-3155214, Irla, Anthony Stanley.
A-3237162, Kalinovik, Alexander Paul.
A-1028748, Kaplan, Abraham.
A-2518778, Kashigian, Artin.
A-5918920, Kauth, Kurt Max.
A-3132325, Knowles, Ann Eirwen.
A-7858221, Kryczka, John.
A-5402770, Lamars, Pete.
A-3623367, Latarski, Sigmund.
A-4963675, Lukac, John.
A-2941249, Maneniskis, Joseph.
A-5151675, Matheson, Wilfred Laurier (William Matheson).
A-3017074, Medoway, Sam.
A-5987784, Napolitano, Giovanni Antonio.
E-070997, Novak, Bela.
A-5720885, Nowak, John.
A-3818026, Ostrashelski, Constantine.
E-083290, Pong, Soon.
A-8116357, Reed, John David.
A-4755643, Richter, Walter.
A-5753580, Rocco, Louis.
A-2671145, Rucienski, Aleksander.
2770-P-142631, Sandler, Josel David.
A-1853190, Sandor, Victor.
E-086512, Schwar, Klara.
0800-84629, Simon, Aurif.
A-5862381, Slater, Frank.
E-47365, Sosa-Paz, Luz.
2310-P-15457, Stagliano, Maria Calogera nee La Forte.
A-1840646, Torres, Jose Buenaventura.
A-1815668, Tuchet, Frank.
A-5490012, Veilleux, Joseph Charles.
A-4967148, Walonce, Stanley Francis.
A-2935138, Wilkas, Julius.
A-1704536, Ziegenhirt, Joseph Francisco.
A-3122325, Forsbacka, Johannes Alfred.
A-5967839, Hovanec, John.
A-1985254, Jurlin, Daniel D.
A-7485159, Keefe, Everett Vernon.
E-057815, Moreno-Aguilar, Conrado.
A-4727339, Proch, John Alexander.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, acting on behalf of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who happens to be absent at this time, I wish to state that on February 3 last the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, approving the granting of suspension of deportation of certain deportable aliens. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 68 with amendments, to delete the name of one alien whose case has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, and to correct the spelling of one name. The resolution was further amended to add the names of certain aliens whose cases were previously approved and included in an earlier resolution by the Senate, and whose names were deleted from that resolution by the House of Representatives. Three additional cases which were being held for further study have also been approved and included in the resolution.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 68.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, with the exception of the deletion to which the Senator from South Carolina has referred, the concurrent resolution, as amended by the House, amounts in effect, to a consolidation of certain measures dealing with aliens, which previously had been acted on favorably by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is substantially the case.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to establish whether the Senate had previously acted upon the measures. If that is not the case, I would wish to have a little more time, in order to consult with Members of this side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, Mr. President; the Senate has already acted upon them; and the amendment merely makes the concurrent resolution conform with measures on which the Senate already has acted favorably, and sent to the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

FERNANDA MILANI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the admendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 101) for the relief of Fernanda Milani, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fernanda Milani, Spirodon Karousatos, Romana Michelina Serini, Mojsze Hildeshaim, Ita Hildeshaim, Angel Feratero Madayag, Jirair Mazartzian, Gertrude Mazartzian, Mario Mazartzian, Santiago Landa Arrizabalaga, Pak-Chue Chan, Oi-Jen Tsin Chan (nee Tsin), Chee Tao Chan, and Wai May Chan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of

this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 101, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of seven similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ANA P. COSTES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 117) for the relief of Ana P. Costes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ana P. Costes, Wolodymyr Krysko, Rosa Tomasina Maria Puglisi (Rosa Tomasina Maria Sano), Shima Shinohara, Hsi-Lin Tung, Ruth Min-Kwong Leung Tung, Sumie Legasse, Hava Shpak, A. A. Shpak, Sympcha Shpak, Richard Karl Hoffman, Marcelina Anderson, Gerassimo Troianos, Markos Demetrius Spanos, Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon), Dolores Maria Gandiaga, nee Seijo, Chang Ho Cho, Chia-Yi Jen (also known as Charles Jen), Catherine Samouris, Kerson Huang, Cirilo Jose, Meliton Topacio Tapawan, Alvaro A. Jose, Hedi Gertrude Spiecker, Vaclav Majer, Irma Majer, Vaclav Majer, Jr., and Chocura Yoshida, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 117, to grant the status of permanent resident in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 20 similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

INGEBORG C. KARDE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 213) for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Ingeborg C. Karde, Shigeko Nakamura, and Valdis Mikelsons shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Georges Demetelin, Athena Demetelin, Stanley William Wheatland, Mareanthe Baicou, and Peter Skole. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said persons shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Domenico Bompiani, Beri Denovi, Mervin Walter Ball, Gordon Thompson Brown, Edward White, Lily Elsie White, Doctor Klaus Hergt, and Stephen Fodo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 22, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 213, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On February 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 13 individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to provide for restoration of the beneficiary's United States citizenship, but, as amended, provides for the granting of permanent residence. Two cases which passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence to the beneficiaries, have been included in Senate bill 213, to provide for the cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 213.

The motion was agreed to.

ASHER EZRACHI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Asher Ezrachi which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Asher Ezrachi and Ralph Piccolo (Raffaele Piccolo) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bart Krijger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Jerman Bonito and Esteni Rodriguez Estopinan de Witlicki may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivan Gerasko may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Alvarez, Hildegard Kropfitsch Pelloski, George Roland Lavoie, Katharine Lajimodiere (nee Schneeberger), Luigi Cardone, Ingeburg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki), and Hilde Schiller may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 30, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 315 to waive the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On February 7, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the

bill with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 11 similar individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence, but has been amended to grant a waiver of the excludable grounds.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 315.

The motion was agreed to.

THERESA POK LIM KIM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 396) for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "visitor", insert "and may be admitted to the United States"; on page 2, after line 12, insert:

SEC. 2. In the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Kalwies, the fiance of William H. Crandall, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor and may be admitted to the United States for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Edith Kalwies is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said William H. Crandall and that she is found to be otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of that act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Edith Kalwies, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Edith Kalwies as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Concetta Speranza Tapp, widow of Floyd William Tapp, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosa Roppo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Michael Roppo and Julia Roppo, citizens of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on June 14, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 396, to provide for the admission of the beneficiary to the United States for the purpose of marrying her United States citizen fiance. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the amendments make no substantive changes, but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 396.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM T. COLLINS (VASILIOS T. BUZUNIS)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 663) for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis), which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, William T. Collins, also known as Vasilios Buzunis, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 663, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with an amendment to grant a waiver of the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. By departing from the United States, the beneficiary will be able to qualify for a visa to reenter the United States for permanent residence.

This language is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MR. AND MRS. ANDREJ (AVRAM) GOTTLIEB

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 963) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb, Jenny Gottlieb (nee Binder), Toy Lin Chen, Nouritza Terzian, Maria Ioannou Karvelis, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 22, 1955, the Senate passed S. 963, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiaries. On March 20, 1956, the House of Representatives passed Senate bill 963 with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PURITA RODRIGUEZ ADIARTE AND HER TWO MINOR CHILDREN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1242) for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purita Rodriquez Adiarte, Irene Grace Adiarte, Patrick Robert Adiarte, Katharina Steinbach, Joseph G. Ferrara, Clorinda Perri Sturino, Yee Loy Foo (also known as Loy Foo Yee or Ted Yee), Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis, Rosita A. Jocson, Young Hi Yun, Cheuk Wa Leung, Camilla Ying Ling Leung, Panagiotis Nicolas Lalos, Antyro Panagiotis Lalos, Myra Louise Dew, and George Poulio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haim Cohen (Haim Braun) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 3. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the case of Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Antonio Domenico Narciso Bianchi shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on July 11, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 1242, which would grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of 12 individual Senate bills. One case included in the bill passed the Senate, to grant permanent residence to the beneficiary, but has been amended to provide only for cancellation of outstanding deportation proceedings in behalf of the

beneficiary, and will accomplish the desired effect in providing relief from deportation.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

UNIQUE PLACE OF JAMES F. BYRNES IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for approximately 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas placed in the RECORD the names of 109 persons who have served their States as governor, Member of the United States House of Representatives, and Member of the United States Senate. Since that time I have had the records checked and find that one of the distinguished gentlemen named holds a unique place in history. In addition to having served his State as governor, as United States Representative, and as United States Senator, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, has also served on the United States Supreme Court and as a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

He is the only person in history who has held the three high offices mentioned by the Senator from Kansas and who, in addition, has served on the Court and in the Cabinet.

I would like to take this occasion, as the date of his next birthday approaches, to mention some of the highlights in the career of this son of South Carolina who attained the stature of world statesman.

James Francis Byrnes is of Irish descent, his grandparents having immigrated from the old country. His father, who was a clerk in the city government at Charleston, S. C., died a few months before his son was born on May 2, 1879.

At the age of 14, James F. Byrnes left school to help earn a living for himself and his mother. He worked in a law office in Charleston. He learned shorthand and by the time he was 20, he was making enough money as a stenographer to support his mother.

Young Byrnes entered a competition for the position of court reporter and won the job. He moved to Aiken, S. C., and, while working in the court, he studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1903. For a time, he also owned and edited a weekly newspaper in Aiken.

Mr. Byrnes married Miss Maude Perkins Busch, of Aiken, on May 2, 1906. She is a charming lady who has been a true helpmate to her distinguished husband.

Mr. Byrnes won his first election by 57 votes in 1908 when he was elected solicitor of the second circuit of South Carolina. After 2 years, he was elected to Congress from South Carolina's second district, and served in the House of Representatives for 14 years.

During World War I, he was 1 of 5 members of the House Deficiency Appropriations Committee which was responsible for recommending most of the appropriations made by the Congress for war activities.

One of the first things he did as a Congressman was to bring about the formation of the House Committee on Roads, from which grew the present Federal roads system.

In 1924 Mr. Byrnes lost the only political contest of the many in which he has participated. He ran for the Senate but lost to Cole L. Blease by a narrow margin.

For the next 6 years, Mr. Byrnes practiced law in Spartanburg, S. C., in the firm of Nichols, Wyche and Byrnes. Mr. Nichols had himself served in Congress and Mr. C. C. Wyche, the other member of the firm, has been for many years a distinguished Federal district judge in the western district of South Carolina.

In 1930 Mr. Byrnes ran against Senator Blease and defeated him. Senator Byrnes was a powerful and respected member of this body for the next 11 years. He rarely made a speech on the floor, but he seldom missed a committee meeting. When he did make a speech, his words were carefully weighed in high quarters. His power of persuasion in committees and in the cloakroom was legendary even while he was in the Senate.

At the Democratic Convention in 1932, Senator Byrnes had an important part in the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt as the presidential candidate. In the Senate he was chief lieutenant for the President. When he did not agree with Roosevelt proposals, he did not hesitate to vote against them.

In July 1941, President Roosevelt appointed Senator Byrnes to the Supreme Court, the third person from South Carolina ever to serve on the Court and the first in nearly a century and a half.

At the ceremony when Associate Justice Byrnes took the oath of office, President Roosevelt said he wished he were Solomon so he could divide Byrnes in two, appointing half of him to the Supreme Court and leaving the other half in the Senate.

But America was soon at war and Justice Byrnes offered himself to President Roosevelt for whatever service he could render his country.

In October 1942, the President called him from the Court to head the Office of Economic Stabilization and to coordinate the war effort.

His responsibilities were increased in 1943 when he was made Director of War Mobilization. In November 1944, the additional responsibilities of reconversion were put under his direction and his title became Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Except for the President, no other official in Government held so much power and responsibility. He was known as and in fact was the assistant President.

For his meritorious service in these vital offices during World War II, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that Justice Byrnes be awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. The President made the award on August 4, 1945, and read the following citation:

> Mr. James F. Byrnes, as Director of War Mobilization from October 1942 to March 1945, discharged duties of great responsibility with outstanding success. Faced with the problem of aiding the Chief Executive in girding the Nation for a conflict of unprecedented proportion, he accomplished his task with exceptional skill. * * * He accompanied the Commander in Chief to vital conferences, applying his extensive knowledge of interallied problems to their prompt and effective solution. With vast understanding, exceptional ability as an arbiter, unswerving devotion to the national interests and firm determination, Mr. Byrnes performed difficult service (of high importance), making a major contribution to the war effort.

President Truman called him out of retirement to become Secretary of State. He held the office for 562 days and 350 of those days were spent at international conferences. His journeys abroad carried him to London, Paris, Potsdam, and Moscow. As a diplomat he traveled approximately 77,000 miles. Other important conferences, including the 1946 meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers, were held in this country.

Secretary Byrnes established the United States policy of firmness and patience with Russia in the early postwar period. He gave Germany hope for the future and helped to bind our relations with that country.

The statement of American policy which then helped bind Germany to the West was made by Secretary Byrnes in a speech at Stuttgart on September 6, 1946. He told the German people that the United States would continue her interest in the affairs of Europe and of the world. In words that Russia could not misunderstand, he declared that "peace and well-being cannot be purchased at the price of the peace and well-being of any other country." He assured the Germans that American troops would remain in their land as long as the troops of any other nation remained.

Another principal achievement by Mr. Byrnes as Secretary of State was the negotiation of the Balkan treaties.

Time magazine named Secretary Byrnes "man of the year" for 1946. In its cover article in the issue of January 6, 1947, Time said:

> Had 1946 ended as it began, Molotov would have been the year's man. * * *
>
> Before the year was out, however, the Russian flood was contained. On the dam that held it many men had labored. * * * But the dam's chief builder was James F. Byrnes * * * who became the firm and patient voice of the United States in the councils of the world. * * *
>
> He managed to get over to the Russians, and the world, that the United States had planted the weight of its power in the path of the Russian advance.

Mr. Byrnes' resignation as Secretary of State was effective on January 20, 1947. He again took up active legal practice in the appellate courts, commuting between an office in Washington and one in South Carolina.

Persuaded that he could render vital service to South Carolina as Governor, he entered the Democratic primary in

1950 and won nomination over three opponents.

Governor Byrnes had campaigned on two main planks: That he would do everything in his power to improve the public schools of the State and that he would seek extensive improvements of facilities for mental patients.

He was inaugurated Governor in January 1951, and by the end of the legislative session that spring, Governor Byrnes had succeeded in getting the legislature to enact a broad program of educational improvement. A statewide school construction program resulted in allocation by the State of $125 million for new schools. This program has now reached the $200 million mark.

In his inaugural address, Governor Byrnes called for the unmasking of the Ku Klux Klan. This law was quickly enacted by the general assembly.

Many other progressive programs were started and completed during the Byrnes administration in South Carolina.

In 1952 Governor Byrnes declared his support for General Eisenhower in the presidential race. He stated that he did so because he felt he must place principle above party and that he believed the general the best qualified candidate for the office.

In 1953 Governor Byrnes served as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly.

Several years ago at the unveiling of a portrait of Mr. Byrnes in the South Carolina Senate, his friend Bernard Baruch spoke. He described Mr. Byrnes as "having joined that little band of immortals who make the world a finer and more peaceful place. We, of South Carolina, will always glory in that name."

Since he attained fame, Governor Byrnes has been the recipient of a number of honorary degrees from some of America's great universities. Occasionally, he comments humorously that he has been educated by degrees.

In 1947 he wrote a book, Speaking Frankly, which is an account of his experiences as Secretary of State. He established the James F. Byrnes Foundation to administer the proceeds from the sale of the book, and nearly 150 needy orphan students have received grants to prepare them for their chosen careers. The man who walked with kings did not forget those who needed help when he was able to offer that help.

Upon retirement from public office in 1955, Governor and Mrs. Byrnes built a new home in Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. He no longer practices law, but he goes to his private office almost daily to answer mail which comes from friends and strangers in faraway places.

He has the esteem, the high prestige, and the great respect and affection of millions, not only in South Carolina but throughout the world.

His career has been unique; his position of prominence is equally unique.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to regulate the use of motor vehicles not owned by motor carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Florida be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the trip-leasing issue has been before the Congress for over 3 years and I believe the time is way overdue that it be settled by statute to remove the continuing doubt, uncertainty, and confusion it has brought to those engaged in transporting agricultural commodities by motor vehicle. Likewise, the uncertainty and confusion should be ended in fairness to the farmers of the Nation who produce crops which, in order to be put to beneficial use, must be transported to the persons and places where they are needed.

Let me make perfectly clear at the outset that the bill before the Senate today, S. 898, as reported by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 30, 1955, in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, is a compromise bill. It is far different from the bill overwhelmingly passed by the House in 1953 (H. R. 3203) and as introduced in the Senate during the last session.

In its reported form it has been cut down from completely prohibiting the ICC to regulate length of lease or amount of compensation for a lease to meet the minimum necessary needs of agriculture, and contains far less restriction on the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the leasing of trucks than the earlier regulation.

First, let me give a little history and background to the problem. There are two general types of motor carriers which are fully regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission—common motor carriers which must obtain certificates of convenience and necessity and contract carriers which must obtain permits for operating authority. These two general types of carriers are generally referred to as authorized carriers.

Outside of the regulatory control and authority of the ICC, except as to safety matters, are four main groups of carriers most concerned in this legislation, namely farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, operators who haul agricultural commodities, and private carriers.

Back in May 1951, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued some regulations in a proceeding known as Ex Parte MC–43 to govern the lease and interchange of vehicles by motor carriers—Lease and Interchange of Vehicles by Motor Carriers, 52 MCC 675. One of the rules promulgated by the Commission would have limited the minimum duration of the lease of any truck to an authorized carrier to 30 days. This rule became the subject of court action and finally, on January 12, 1953, the Supreme Court of the United States held, in the case of *American Trucking Associations* v. *U. S.* (344 U. S. 298 (1953)), that although the Interstate Commerce Act contained no specific grant of authority from the Congress to the Commission to put such a restrictive rule into effect; however, under the implications of the general grants of authority in the Interstate Commerce Act, the promulgation of this rule for authorized carriers falls within the Commission's power.

Just where did this decision of the Supreme Court in 1953 leave agriculture as to its ability to meet its practical transportation requirements?

Judging from the outcry and protestations that came from farmers and their representatives from nearly all sections of the country, continuing right down to today, it left the farmers away out on the limb and the limb was about to be cut off.

For many years, even predating the passage of the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, trucks hauling farm products to market have found it necessary to try to obtain from some of the regular carriers a load of general freight to transport back to or in the general direction of the area where the original movement started. This has helped to reduce the cost of transporting the farm products to markets because obviously the rate or cost on the initial movement is decreased if a payload can be obtained for the backhaul.

The imposition of the 30-day minimum limitation proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the lease of trucks with drivers to authorized carriers, by farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, operators hauling agricultural commodities, or private carriers would obviously prohibit trip-leasing, which is usually for only a few days. None of these haulers would or could tie up their trucks to authorized carriers, even if the authorized carriers needed them, for a period of 30 days when their economic need was to return as fast as possible to home base or go to another harvest area to perform legitimate hauling functions.

So the people in agriculture, alert to the serious dislocations and the great blow that would be dealt the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities by the imposition of the 30-day rule of the ICC, asked Congress to establish a fair, clear policy by law which would preserve the economical and efficient practice of leasing trucks, with drivers, to authorized carriers for backhauls.

Bills were simultaneously introduced in the Senate and House in 1953. The House of Representatives moved first to consider the proposed legislation to relieve the plight of the farmer which would result from the prohibition by the ICC against trip-leasing. After extended public hearings before the House

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1953, and lengthy executive sessions, the House Commerce Committee reported favorably and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed H. R. 3203 on a voice vote June 24, 1953.

The bill gave the Interstate Commerce Commission affirmative powers not theretofore written specifically in the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate leasing practices, but denied to the Commission the authority "to regulate the duration of any such lease, contract, or other arrangement for the use of any motor vehicle, or the amount of compensation to be paid for such use." The compensation provision was inserted in order to prevent the Commission through indirect control over the amount of the rental compensation for the lease of trucks to bring about the abolition of trip-leasing.

Let me make it clear here that when an agricultural hauler leases his truck and services to an authorized carrier for a backhaul, the agricultural hauler and authorized carrier may mutually agree upon any rental compensation they care to but the authorized carrier must charge the published tariff rate to the shipper, whose freight is being hauled, just as if he were using an owned, rather than a leased truck.

Although public hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the trip-leasing bill in 1953, no action was taken. Again hearings were held in May and June 1954, before the full Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the trip-leasing bill. In spite of repeated efforts by some members of the committee on both sides of the aisle to bring the bill to a vote in the committee, these efforts were unsuccessful, and the 83d Congress was permitted to adjourn in 1954 without a committee vote being taken.

At the beginning of the 84th Congress, last year, the junior Senator from Oklahome [Mr. MONRONEY] and I cosponsored the trip-leasing bill again and public hearings were held on this legislation before our Subcommittee on Surface Transportation during June 1955.

Finally on July 30, 1955, in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill, with amendments, favorably to the Senate.

The committee report is before the Senate and sets forth a summary analysis of the problem and compelling reasons why the proposed legislation is sound and necessary. It has been clearly demonstrated on the record that if the Commission's original 30-day rule had gone into effect, it would have resulted in substantial increases in transportation charges for moving agricultural products from the farmer to the consumer. In addition, it would have put out of business many of the agricultural haulers upon whom many farmers, particularly the family-type farmers, are dependent for the marketing of their products.

The Commission has evidenced its recognition of this condition by amending its proposed 30-day rule at least 3 times while the proposed legislation was before Congress, and has also during the past 3-year period extended from time to time the effective date of the 30-day rule which is now scheduled for July 1, 1956. Except for the trip-leasing feature with respect to private carriers, the Commission has no objection to the bill.

Simply stating the problem before us, farmers and others have empty trucks which must be moved to points where traffic is available. Rather than incur the loss of moving an empty truck, the truck is leased for use to someone who has traffic to be moved in the direction in which the truck is bound. Usually the lease is for only a few days or for the duration of a trip; hence the term "trip lease." Such leases are often necessary to get the truck into position for profitable use, and are often arranged with common and contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the July 1 order, the ICC would have leases of motor vehicles made for a minimum of 30 days, thus effectively putting an end to trip leasing and the economies accompanying it. S. 898 would establish standards for the ICC to follow in regard to trip leasing, with specific provisions designed to meet the needs of agriculture and private carriers.

I have spent a great deal of time on this matter and have conferred with representatives of farm operators from all sections of the country. I am convinced that the bill has been watered down as much as is possible without permitting serious detriment to the marketing of farm products. We all know there are actually thousands of private canneries, meat-packing houses, citrus plants, and the like, which, because of the continual increase in railroad and regulated motor-carrier rates, have been forced from the standpoint of economy of operations to buy their own trucks and transport their own products to their customers. These trucks are an important part of the transportation pool that serves the farmer's total transportation needs.

It would be uneconomic to permit a farmer or a group of farmers who have trucks in which they haul canned vegetables to their customers to lease the trucks to authorized carriers for a back haul, but to deny the same right to the privately owned cannery across the road from the farmer's plant. Likewise, the transportation costs and the right of the private cannery to trip lease have a direct bearing upon the amount which the private cannery can pay the farmer for his products. The same is true with respect to the thousands of private dairy plants, meat-packing houses, and other private concerns that deliver to their customers in their own trucks the processed food and fiber produced on the Nation's farms.

It is important to note that the private carrier, under the bill, cannot go all around the country, as it has been claimed some have done in the past, but will be definitely restricted in leasing his truck in a single movement or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based.

So much for the bill, what it will do, and why it is necessary. So far as agriculture is concerned, there is a more far-reaching reason why it is necessary for Congress to settle the matter of trip-leasing by statute rather than to leave it for determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Ever since the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, the ICC has demonstrated its attitude toward the exemption from route and rate regulation of trucks hauling agricultural commodities, which Congress wrote into the Motor Carrier Act in 1935. Obviously the advantage to farmers of exemption from rate regulation of trucks hauling farm products to markets is dependent upon those trucks being able to earn some compensation on the return movement which results in lower round-trip operational costs.

Time and time again the ICC since 1935 has recommended legislative action to Congress which would either restrict or completely repeal the agricultural exemption. In the 69th Annual Report of the ICC to Congress, dated November 1, 1955, and submitted just a few weeks ago, the Commission at page 128 recommended "that section 203 (b) be amended so as to limit the exemption of motor vehicles transporting agricultural commodities, fish, and livestock to transportation from point of production to primary market."

In the same report, at page 129, the Commission recommended that agricultural haulers and private carriers, as well as other carriers subject to safety regulations but not subject to economic regulation, be required to register with the Commission. Of course, we all know that registration is a customary first step toward eventual full economic regulation.

Aside from its legislative recommendations, the Commission time and again through strict construction of the scope of the term "agricultural commodities" has clearly demonstrated that it wants to exercise more and more regulatory power over the manner and cost of the movement of agricultural commodities by motor vehicle. Today there is pending before the Supreme Court a case to determine whether dressed poultry is an agricultural commodity. The Commission, although admitting that live poultry is an agricultural commodity and that trucks hauling it are beyond its regulatory jurisdiction, has contended that chickens with their heads and feathers removed have been transformed into a manufactured product and trucks hauling such dressed poultry are subject to the Commission's regulatory powers as to rates and routes. In the eighth Federal circuit, where it was held that dressed poultry is an agricultural product, the ICC follows this ruling. In the remainder of the country, the ICC considers dressed chickens a manufactured product—*Kroblin* v. *U. S.* (348 U. S. 836 (1954)).

Likewise, there is now being litigated in a New Jersey district court the issue of whether shelled nuts are an agricultural commodity. The Commission says no; agriculture thinks that whether shelled or in the shell, nuts are an agricultural commodity.

These are only a few of the many decisions by the Commission reflecting its attitude toward the agricultural commodities exemption, an attitude which has caused farmers to feel extremely insecure about the trip-leasing problem; they will continue to so feel until Congress acts. I must say, in all fairness, that there is much other evidence in the record to support agriculture's concern and feeling of insecurity.

Furthermore, the ICC is an agency of mortal men who may be on the Commission today and gone tomorrow. Any decision by the Commission today on this 30-day leasing rule which will protect the proper interests of agriculture might not be the decision of the Commission tomorrow or at some time in the future when the composition of the Commission has changed. This, of course, does not impute any bad faith at all to either former, present or future members of the Commission. As an example of the changes that occur, since the end of 1955, a little over 2 months, there have developed 4 vacancies on the Commission. Since May 1951, when the original 30-day rule was issued by the Commission, 10 of its 11 members have departed by resignation, retirement, or expiration of their terms.

There are other compelling reasons arising from the manner in which this whole problem has been handled by the Commission that makes, I believe, action by the Congress necessary.

On February 2, 1955, the ICC by official order postponed the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule from March 1, 1955, to March 1, 1956. The deferment was stated as being primarily for the purpose of affording Congress an adequate opportunity to consider and dispose of the pending legislation. On June 22, 1955, when spokesmen for the ICC appeared before our subcommittee at public hearings on this bill, in discussing the effective date of the 30-day rule, the Commission spokesman reiterated that the effective date of the rule had been postponed until March 1, 1956. These assurances were one factor in our willingness for this bill to go over from last year to this second session for action by the Senate. Then out of the clear, after Congress had adjourned last year, on October 17, 1955, the ICC made public an order advancing from March 1, 1956, to December 1, 1955, the effective date of the controversial 30-day rule.

Many Members of the Congress are familiar with this event, and only after many protests from Members of Congress and shippers around the country did the Commission, on November 15, 1955, restore the effective date to March 1, 1956. The Commission subsequently deferred the effective date to July 1, 1956.

I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate, not in any spirit of destructive criticism of the Commission, for whom as individuals and an official body I have the highest respect. I do regard it as essential, however, that the Members of the Senate be acquainted with some of the facts incident to the ICC's handling of this whole matter, which certainly is not conducive to the inspiration of confidence on the part of the agricultural shippers of the Nation that their interests will be reasonably protected in this matter unless a policy is established by statute.

In conclusion, I wish to say a few words on this matter of safety. Some of the opponents of the bill have made the argument that trip-leasing must be prohibited to promote safety on our highways. Of course, safety is a matter that is close to the hearts of every American. It involves the welfare of all our families and every person using our highways. We are in accord with every reasonable move that will promote safety. But the fact is that, in the hundreds of pages of printed testimony before congressional committees on this issue, I cannot find any convincing evidence, if any evidence at all, that the leased trucks on our highways are more dangerous than owned trucks. Realistically, it is reasonable to believe that the man who owns and drives a truck under lease to someone else, in which he has an investment, would be just as careful, if not more so than the man who is an employee driver.

A few dramatic cases have been brought up which show accidents in which leased trucks have been involved. But they do not prove anything. One could as reasonably argue that the several railroad accidents in recent months, in which a considerable number of persons have been killed and many more injured, make rail transportation more hazardous than some other modes of transportation. But such argument would be absurd.

There are two rather convincing points that undermine the weight of the safety argument that has been advanced against this bill.

First, the Supreme Court dispelled this argument in its decision on January 12, 1953, involving this issue. The majority opinion said:

> The conclusion that highway safety may be impaired rests admittedly on informed speculation rather than statistical certainty. A road check examination conducted by the Bureau (Bureau of Motor Carriers, ICC) did not indicate any significant difference in the number of safety violations between leased and owned vehicles (*American Trucking Associations* v. *U. S.* (344 U. S. 298, 305, footnote 7 (1953)).

Second, after the controversy over the 30-day rule developed, the ICC reopened the leasing proceeding to take additional testimony on the issue. Further hearings were held before an ICC examiner in 1954 at which many witnesses appeared. The examiner's proposed report was finally released on January 17, 1955, based upon all the evidence he had received, and in his official report on the matter of safety he gave substantially the same answer regarding safety as was given by the Supreme Court.

Thereupon the examiner recommended to the Commission that the effective date of the 30-day rule be postponed until at least March 1, 1957, and that the Commission enter an order requiring authorized carriers to segregate all reportable accidents reported according to whether the accident involves company-owned, term-leased, or trip-leased equipment. The examiner's recommendation contemplated that in the 2-year period reliable data on a natonwide basis could be compiled and considered at a further hearing as to just what bearing, if any, the trip-leasing of vehicles had on the matter of safety on the highways.

But the Commission did not see fit to follow this recommendation of their examiner, who had heard all the evidence and had an opportunity to weigh it carefully. Instead, the Commission proceeded to order the 30-day rule to go into effect, although it has been subsequently postponed.

So, regardless of the arguments made against this bill in the name of safety, which is of universal concern to us all, it is perfectly clear from the record that such arguments are based on isolated cases and conjecture—not facts that prove anything.

I do not think I need to say more at this time. There was probably never a bill which came before the Senate on which there have been more thorough hearings and screening and on which so much effort has been expended to reconcile the opposing views.

In view of the extended debate recently held on this floor on the farm bill, in an effort to find a constructive way to help the farmer help himself, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress would permit an agency of Government to be free to further extend its regulatory powers, as the ICC has proposed to do and as this bill is intended to prevent, with a certain further increase in transportation costs and a further tightening of the cost-price squeeze on the farmers of our Nation.

This is one of the few issues in my memory on which all of the farm organizations and agriculture generally, from the grassroots to Washington, have been in accord. The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and the National Farmers Union, as well as scores of other national organizations across the country serving farmers in their marketing operations, have publicly and privately, time and again, urged the passage of this legislation.

I highly recommend that the Senate pass S. 898.

I might say at this point that, as the able chairman of the committee knows, and as the former chairman of the committee is aware, we have discussed this particular proposed legislation, not only with the farm groups, but we have talked it over with the railroad associations, with the trucking groups, and with the representatives of the private carriers.

The bill which is now before the Senate represents the very best bill we shall be able to get on this particular problem. It is my hope that we shall be able to pass a bill which will, once and for all, define exactly what we mean when we give an agricultural exemption and at the same time try to recognize, as we do in the bill, that if we are to have any sort of regulated common carriage in this country, we must continue to give to the ICC certain authority whereby it can control certain certificated common carriers.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Florida advise me whether the bill as it has been reported will cover the problem adequately?

Mr. SMATHERS. My answer is "yes." I think the bill will protect the different groups. I am sure it protects the reasonable demands of the agricultural groups.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand an amendment later will be offered. My interest in the bill and the amendment which will be presented results from the fact that in my State of New Jersey there are several large firms which are engaged in the processing of quick-frozen foods, especially the Seabrook Farms—and several firms dealing in canned foods, especially the Campbell soup firm. I understand the bill is to be amended in a way which might affect the activities of the frozen-food industry and the canned-soup industry in my State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I think if the Senator from New Jersey will wait until I offer the amendment, it might be a better time to ask the question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to postpone further questioning of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from New Mexico so that he may submit a conference report, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 27, 1956, pp. 5765–5768, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I wished to present and have printed in the RECORD for the purpose of adding to the legislative history. I do not intend to read the statement at this time. Other members of the committee are present. I am anxious to have them comment on the conference report.

But I ask unanimous consent to have my statement on the conference report printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 500, TO AUTHORIZE THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

In connection with the conference report on S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River Storage Project, a few comments on the consummation of this legislative objective are desirable, not only as a matter of information to the Congress, but to make a matter of record certain points in connection with the legislative history of this measure for the guidance of the executive departments in considering administrative features of the bill. The legislative history will also have an important bearing as a matter of guidance for the Congress in the future in connection with appropriations for the construction of the Colorado River Storage Project.

First, I desire, on behalf of the Senate conferees, to express our appreciation of the cooperative spirit shown by the House conferees in connection with the deliberations of this all-important measure, not only to the development of the upper Colorado River Basin States, but to the arid West and the country as a whole. The adoption of the Conference report will again put the Congress on record in registering unmistakable approval of the reclamation program, initiated under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, through the enactment of the Reclamation Act of 1902. The stamp of approval the Congress registers through adopting the conference report will serve as a rebuke to detractors of the Reclamation program as an instrument for the conservation of the water resources of the West for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, municipal, industrial and domestic water supply. It is the unmistakable answer of the Congress to proposals that the potential water resources of the West—in this case the Colorado River Basin—shall be limited to aid one particular area of the West and that another vital segment of the West shall be condemned to remain undeveloped.

Likewise, its recognition of the fact that again the Reclamation program is recognized by the Congress, the President and the executive departments as deserving and receiving nonpolitical, nonpartisan and nonsectional support.

I refer to the fact that the program for the Colorado River storage project was developed under the democratic administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, and it was endorsed and recommended by a Republican, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

On the passage of the bill in the Senate, by a vote of 58 to 23, more than 2 to 1, the party division was:

For the bill: Democrats, 31; Republicans, 27.

Against the bill: Democrats, 15; Republicans, 8.

Not voting: Democrats, 3; Republicans, 12.

In the House of Representatives the vote was:

For the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 120.

Against the bill: Democrats, 63; Republicans, 73.

Absent or not voting: Democrats, 32; Republicans, 8.

Passed, 1.

Paired for: Democrats, 11; Republicans, 1.

Paired against: Democrats, 9; Republicans, 3.

This party division is cited for the purpose of showing the nonpartisan front that maintains confidence that the Congress, when the chips are down, drops political considerations and votes for developments of natural resources that benefit the entire country.

Now, as to some of the features of the Colorado River storage bill itself, I point out a few essential provisions for the legislative record for administrative guidance in connection with the programing, construction, and operation of the Colorado River project.

I shall not reiterate all of the items commented on by the managers on the part of the House in their report. However, I do desire to point out several features of the bill as presented by the conference report which have significance with respect to the legislative history of the measure.

First, Senate bill 500 reaffirms the law of the river, as applied to the Colorado River system by the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of 1939, and the upper Colorado River compact of 1950. The language with respect to the law of the river is designed to protect the legitimate interest of all States, whether in the lower or the upper basin, in their rights to Colorado River water as laid down in the compacts and in congressional legislation enacted in pursuance thereof.

An objective of the reiteration of the law of the river is also to give maximum protection to lawful contracts made in pursuance of the compacts and the existing legislation. An objective is to minimize the justification for controversy or legal action over contracts or agreements that do not flow directly from congressional authorizations or action.

A second major point that requires elaboration as to the intent of the Congress is with respect to section 12 which reads as follows:

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this act, but not to exceed $760 million."

It should be pointed out that the amount of $760 million written into the bill by the House committee and approved on the floor of that body represents merely a current limitation on appropriations authorized and not a limitation on the estimated cost of the features of the project directly authorized in the bill or conditionally authorized through the requirement of the feasibility report by the Secretary before construction may begin, as in the case of the Curecanti Dam in Colorado or projects which may hereafter be authorized by the Congress.

In this connection, the record is made for the information of the Senate and as a part of the legislative history. The conferees considered precedents which have been established by the executive agencies and the Congress with respect to language and figures similar to those in section 12, to which I have referred. Two outstanding examples of precedents may be cited.

One is in connection with the Boulder Canyon project, Nevada-Arizona, in the lower Colorado River Basin. When this project, of which the present Hoover Dam is the principal unit, was authorized by the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928, an appropriation of $165 million was authorized. Without any change in the language in the original act, the Congress, on presentation of the situation to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, has appropriated a total of $223,064,101. Appropriations for Hoover Dam and powerplant alone have totaled $160 million, or within $5 million of the appropriations authorized in the original act of 1928. The excess over the original authorization has gone into construction of the All-American and Coachella Canals.

A more recent and at least an applicable precedent is cited in the case of appropriations authorized for construction of the Missouri River Basin project. In this case, the Congress has authorized total appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, of $550 million, in amounts of approximately $150 million at a time. Actual appropriations made under these authorizations now total $494 million.

At the same time, construction of units under the Missouri River Basin project, in-

cluding multiple-purpose dams, powerplants, and irrigation works have been completed, or started, that entail an ultimate cost of approximately $845 million. This procedure has been explained to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House by the Bureau of Reclamation with approval of the Department of the Interior. In our opinion, the Missouri Basin project record constitutes an adequate precedent that will insure the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to finance from appropriations to be made by the Congress the initial construction of all of the storage dams and projects authorized or conditionally authorized (such as Curecanti Dam) in S. 500. In simple words, this explanation means that the Secretary of the Interior can and should proceed as rapidly as initial funds are appropriated by the Congress with the construction of the storage dams such as Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge and Navaho, those in the initial phase of the central Utah project and Curecanti Dam, when the Secretary of the Interior reports to the Congress that the benefits anticipated from the Curecanti Dam exceed the estimated cost.

At the same time, the program for and initial construction of the authorized participating irrigation projects should proceed. Of course, water must be available; local interest in repayment manifest; and the limitations with respect to bringing new land into production under the surplus crop limitation amendment met.

The Senate conferees accepted the delineation from the bill by the House of the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument area of western Colorado. The position of the Senate has been that Echo Park Dam would benefit rather than adversely affect the national monument area, and constituted no invasion of the sanctity of national parks. However, out of deference to the sincere views of the great majority of the conservation organizations of the country, and so as to expedite authorization of the upper Colorado River storage project, the Senate conferees yielded on the Echo Park point and made no effort to urge the House conferees to accept the Senate version in this respect. We regard that matter as closed.

Provision is made in the bill for the protection of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument by directing that the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the construction of the Glen Canyon unit, shall take adequate measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge and National Monument.

The conferees, by appropriate language, adhere to the traditional position of the Congress with respect to construction costs of irrigation facilities on Indian lands. Those Indian lands, under participating irrigation projects authorized by the bill, will not be subject to irrigation construction charges as long as they remain in Indian ownership.

With respect to the Navaho participating project in New Mexico the following sentence in section 6 of the bill as submitted by the conferees reads as follows:

"In the event that the Navaho participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navaho Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable."

The Senate conferees insisted, and the House conferees receded from the amendment to extend the repayment period for power and other facilities to 100 years. The language of the bill as shown in the conference report provides for a 50-year basic repayment period. It was our feeling that the 50-year period represents a sounder approach to the maintenance of the principles of the reclamation program.

In conclusion, the conferees express the hope that the construction program for the upper Colorado storage project shall be carried forward expeditiously, efficiently, and economically. Such suggested procedure will require adequate finances first to get planning of major storage units completed so that early contracts may be awarded for actual construction. Construction should be so programed and financed that long-drawn-out periods will be avoided. It is axiomatic that unduly lengthy construction periods result in excessive overhead costs and unexplainable delays in achieving the ultimate objective of the construction of the facilities.

The cooperation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and both Houses of the Congress in appropriating funds must be mobilized to effect the desired result.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise merely to express my deep appreciation of the great ability with which the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled this matter both before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and in the conference between the two Houses. The Senator from New Mexico has won the gratitude of all the upper basin States by the magnificient manner in which he led the fight for the attainment of this great objective, a work which will be of inestimable value to the upper basin States.

I see the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] upon the floor. He, too, like all the other members of the committee, labored unflaggingly to bring this legislation about. It harnesses the waters of the upper Colorado River, and for the first time stops the wastage of this vital force into the sea. Now, for the first time, in the upper basin States it can be put to use.

I know all of us feel most grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for what he has done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I had not anticipated what the Senator from Wyoming would say.

I desire to pay tribute to the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have participated in this rather long and arduous task, and particularly to pay tribute to the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation for their extremely fine work and cooperation. I am looking at the able senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who on behalf of all of us, introduced this bill or a similar bill 2 years ago, and who has steadfastly, consistently, and persistently assisted those of us who wanted to bring about the result to which the Senator from Wyoming has alluded.

I have been cheered by the fine spirit of cooperation which has been evidenced on both sides of the aisle; and in that connection I mention the work the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has done, and I also mention the work done by his senior colleague from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the excellent work done by the able and very conscientious Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. Let me say that I am particularly happy that the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is now on the floor. It would have been his privilege, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to have caused us innumerable delays. But he did not do so. He fought vigorously and valiantly for the rights of his State; sometimes I thought he did so almost a little too vigorously. But he was not obstructive. He was willing to see that the Congress worked its way on this particular measure.

Mr. President, I am very anxious that there appear in the RECORD recognition of the fine work done by the members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and particularly by the members of its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his expression of appreciation of the way the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] handled the bill in committee and on the floor of the Senate, and in conference. His work was really outstanding.

It was very heartening to me to work with the group from both sides of the aisle and also with the House group on such a cooperative enterprise, so as really to bring forth a very fine bill which will accomplish the purposes desired to be accomplished by such very important legislation.

I also express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], to my colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and also to the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—in short, to all the sponsors of Senate bill 500, which finally has reached this stage of parliamentary procedure. The cooperative effort which was made was very fine, indeed.

Naturally, at this time I think of the beginning of this work. It began many years ago, when the great project known as Hoover Dam was initiated. At that time we began an investigation of the upper Colorado resources and the possibilities of storing its water and putting it to beneficial use. That program has gone forward consistently since that time. When I came into the Congress, during the early stages of my service, I introduced at least two bills to authorize the central Utah project, which is part and parcel of this upper Colorado storage project.

Then in 1952, I believe, I introduced a bill to authorize the Colorado River project. I had been working in reclamation matters for many years before I came to the Senate; such matters have long been of special interest to me.

One of the great experiences in my life has been the outstanding cooperation and the fine spirit of nonpartisanship that have been manifested by all Members of both the House and the Senate who come from the upper basin States. I wish to extend my thanks to all Members of the Senate and to all others who have helped with this great piece of legislation.

I join with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in his statement in respect to the junior Senator from

California [Mr. KUCHEL]. The Senator from California fought vigorously and valiantly to protect the rights of his State.

I am happy to say that, so far as I can determine, the bill—which I think I understand—protects the rights of California and of all the other States. The bill was not intended to take from any State anything which rightfully belonged to it, but was intended only to bring about the development of the waters which had been agreed upon by means of the compact, entered into in 1922, dealing with the waters belonging to the upper basin States, and the putting of them to beneficial use.

Mr. President, this measure is another forward step in accomplishing that great purpose. However, there is no use in our deceiving ourselves; we are still a long way from the time when the first dam will be completed and the water will be stored. It will take a long time to develop this project to its ultimate goal, namely, putting to beneficial use all the waters of the upper Colorado River which have been allotted to the four States under the 1922 compact.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this long dispute is about to be concluded. Senate bill 500 is about to receive final congressional approval and be sent to the President who will, I have no doubt, sign it into law.

Ever since I first came to the Senate, 4 years ago, I have fought as earnestly and as vigorously as I could against what I contended was proposed legislation inimical to the interests of the people of California whom I have the honor to represent in part.

I am more grateful than I can say to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for their comment, because in all the zeal which has motivated me in opposing the measure which now is before us. Mr. President, I have endeavored to be free from rancor and bitterness. I shall never seek the role of demagogue. On the other hand one who serves in the Senate of the United States is not worth his salt unless as best he can he seeks to uphold the interests and rights and needs of the people he represents.

Mr. President, there are 1 or 2 questions which I should like to ask; and then I shall make a very brief comment, and shall conclude by congratulating my friends who are now finally victorious in this long controversy.

Referring to the conference report, and particularly to section 14, on page 6, I read:

SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin.

This is the language to which I desire particularly to refer:

In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

I ask my friend from New Mexico what is the intention, in his opinion, of the language permitting a State to file such a suit against the United States?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the statement was repeatedly made that something in this legislation might permit an administration of the river which would do violence to the rights of California, Arizona, Nevada, or some other State. We tried by this language to make it entirely clear that if a State felt itself wronged by anything that was being done in the administration of the act, it could move immediately into the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States would automatically become a party, and it could proceed with the litigation of the existing trouble. We felt that that would permit a State also to represent its subdivisions, if they were in difficulty over the application of the law.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New Mexico. I remember very well the original discussion in the Senate committee with respect to rights to sue under this legislation, were there to arise a contention of grievance or a breach by a party to a contract with the Federal Government respecting water in the Colorado River. It is one of my pleasant memories that the Senate committee approved the amendment which I offered at that time, providing for the right to sue by States against the Federal Government. While the language, as it comes brack from the conference committee, is different from that which was originally approved, I am most happy to see that feature in the bill. I think it is a protection not alone to California, but to the other States of the Union. I am glad to have the views of the Senator from New Mexico, with whom I agree, that a State may, under the conference report, represent its subdivisions, and file a lawsuit if it feels aggrieved.

Mr. President, I would vigorously oppose any legislation which would permit political subdivisions to sue the Government of the United States. In my opinion that would be wrong, and I would oppose it. I am glad that such a provision is not a part of the conference report. But by the same token, I thank my friend from New Mexico and the other members of the conference committee who maintained and wrote into the conference report the right of a State to sue on its own behalf or on behalf of a subdivision, if the State should determine that there was a grievance under any water contract with the United States.

I wish to refer to two sections of the conference report, and to tell the members of the conference committee that I thank them for including them in the bill.

I refer first to certain language at the end of section 4, on page 3 of the conference report, which reads as follows:

All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the upper basin fixed in the Colorado River compact and the upper Colorado River Basin compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (treaty series 994).

I read section 7, on page 5 of the conference report:

SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

I thank the conferees for including that language, as well as for including section 9. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the text of section 9, found on page 6 of the conference report.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Rio Grande compact of 1938, or the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is a reclamation State. The State from which I come now has a popuation in excess of 13 million, and we receive into our State a thousand new permanent residents every day in the year. I am sure that they, and we who endeavor to serve them in the Congress, can look forward in the future to the sympathetic consideration of my fellow Senators with respect to their problems relating to water. Water is the basic problem before the people of California.

As I conclude, I congratulate my brethren from the upper Colorado River Basin States, and wish for them godspeed and success in what I trust may be a project which will be of assistance to them and the people they represent and a detriment to none of the rest of us and the people which we represent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I had the privilege of serving as a conferee in this conference, the report from which has just been presented. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and all other members of the conference committee on the fine work that was done in conducting that

conference. It was a very difficult task. It was undertaken with finesse, skill, great tack, diplomacy, and all the other arts of statesmanship one should bring to a great task like this.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on his feet. I congratulate him. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] was one of the conferees. He did excellent work. Every member of the conference committee is to be congratulated upon doing a statesmanlike, perfect piece of work. This is a great day for the people who live in the Colorado River Basin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ONE-HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1739, Senate bill 3386, and that I may be permitted to yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3386) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is a noncontroversial bill. On the 28th of July, 1955, Congress authorized the establishment of a commission, consisting of 15 persons, to make plans for observing the 100th anniversary of the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt. The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House, and 8 persons appointed by the President at large constituted the Commission.

The members of the Commission were required to file, by the 1st of March 1956, their report on the plans. The report has been filed, and hearings were held. Now it becomes necessary to proceed within about 36 months to carry out the plans.

The pending bill is an authorization bill to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate not to exceed $461,000 to carry out the purposes set forth in the bill. There is no objection to the measure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am in complete support of the measure. I think it very important that we give recognition to Teddy Roosevelt, and that such recognition as is contemplated in the bill be given to him by the Nation. I say most respectfully that I hope the authorities involved will ask themselves the question as to what Theodore Roosevelt, if he were alive, would think about any proposal to prevent a few piers of a bridge across the Potomac to be built on Theodore Roosevelt Island. Knowing his interest in the common people of the country, I cannot bring myself to believe that he would think he was in any way being dishonored if a part of the monument, Theodore Roosevelt Island, served as the foundation piers for a bridge.

On the contrary, I am inclined to believe that he would appreciate the building of such a highway on which human traffic would day by day cross the island dedicated to his memory, with the attention of the people called to the fact that they were crossing Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Speaking as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have never been able to understand the opposition of some of the officials of the Commission to having a bridge touch Theodore Roosevelt Island. We have a very serious situation confronting us. I believe a great memorial bridge could be built to the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, just as the Arlington Memorial Bridge, commonly known as the Lincoln Memorial Bridge, is a great monument to Abraham Lincoln. I hope my remarks today, as I support the Senator's proposal, will at least be noted by the members of the Commission. They are completely wrong in taking the position that a Roosevelt Memorial Bridge would in someway not be a proper part of Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made his contribution to the support of the bill. I noted with pleasure his statement that a bridge across the southern portion of Theodore Roosevelt Island, which would be comparable to the so-called Lincoln Memorial Bridge, would be an honor to the former President. I shall be very happy someday to appear with him before the Committee on the District of Columbia in an effort to make sure that no bridge which is of less grandeur than the one he has described shall be built in that place. I hope the pending measure may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt", approved July 28, 1955, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $461,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as is set forth in the report of the committee:

> The committee believes it is necessary that the Centennial Commission be provided additional and adequate funds in order to accomplish the purposes set forth in the resolution creating the Commission.

With the prophetic words of Theodore Roosevelt: "The fate of the 20th century will in no small degree depend upon the type of citizenship developed on this continent," the committee believes that a proper celebration of the centennial of the death of the 26th President of the United States should make this observance a potent factor in the fight for an awakened, free, and inspired America.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, N. MEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1665, H. R. 6625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6625) to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the pending bill relates to about 1¾ acres of land which the Government acquired from the Pueblo of San Lorenzo for school purposes. For that purpose it paid $600 for that piece of land. Subsequently, the Government decided not to run a day school at that location, and decided to abandon the school. The Government is now willing to surrender to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo the land which it had acquired from the pueblo.

We felt it would be of no value to have the Government in possession of an empty school building, which would be a hazard to the community. We would therefore prefer to have the land transferred back to the pueblo for its administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read a brief statement on the bill.

H. R. 6625 proposes to provide for the transfer of title of certain land and the improvements thereon to the pueblo of San Lorenzo in New Mexico without compensation. The property comprises four parcels of land aggregating 1.77 acres which were acquired by the United States through condemnation proceedings in 1920 and 1930 for $662 for the purpose of establishing a day school for the Indians of the pueblo of San Lorenzo.

According to the committee report, the total estimated value of the improvements on the land involved is $13,752. The improvements on the property consist of a schoolhouse, a teacherage, a clinic, a small building which houses a home-economics room and four small structures.

Arrangements have been made so that the Indian children of the pueblo attend local public schools, therefore there is no longer a necessity for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to conduct a school or for the United States to continue to hold title to the property.

As I understand, those are the bare, cold facts that are involved in this matter. The Senator from New Mexico, of

course, knows the Morse formula problem that disturbs the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. This is a piece of Federal property on which the taxpayers of the country have spent, in round figures, $13,000 by way of improvements. We are confronted by the physical fact of the property being in the middle of an Indian pueblo, which is really an Indian community. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. On an Indian reservation, I understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I understand further that we are also confronted with the proposition that the Indians claim they have no money.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. What confronts the Senator from Oregon, to be very frank with the Senator from New Mexico, is that he is in the position where, under any other state of facts, he would insist on the application of the Morse formula which requires that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the land be paid to the Government, because the property technicaly belongs to all the taxpayers of the country, and not to the Indians.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. However, this exception should be stated. The land was acquired from the Indians for the purposes of establishing a day school. The Indians are very sensitive on the subject of ownership of land within their pueblo. They would never have allowed the condemnation of the land in the first place, except for the fact that the school was to be built on the land. Subsequently it was decided to take the children to school somewhere else. The Indians want this land returned to them.

If the Senator from Oregon were to insist on the 50-percent formula being applied, the Indians would refuse to take the property, and the property would stand as vacant property within the pueblo. I believe such a situation would do violence to the very principle the Senator from Oregon has fought for.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, there would be even some difficulty about salvage operations because the Indians control the pueblo.

Mr. ANDERSON. This is a building that would be worthless as salvage, I may say to the Senator. The Senator knows that I have always helped him in fighting for his principle in the application of what is called the Morse formula. I assure the Senator that, so far as I know, there is no way in which that formula could be applied to this situation. Therefore the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. MORSE. That is the understanding I have as the result of my discussion with staff members of the committee. I am put in the position where there is not much that can be done about the Morse formula with respect to this rather novel and unique and exceptional fact situation.

Let me ask the Senator a question or two along this line.

I am not seeking a rationalization for a waiver of the Morse formula. I may vote against the bill when the vote is called for, but I am seeking to make a record to see if there is a distinguishable line which can be drawn. I have no desire to do an injustice to either the Indians or the taxpayers by insisting upon an application of the Morse formula if in part there is justification for not applying it.

Under the Indian policies of the Federal Government, it is true, is it not, that we have very definite Federal responsibilities and obligations which we owe the Indians in the administration of Indian affairs?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that very frequently the various funds in the Treasury of the United States that can be used for Indian purposes are used to supply an Indian reservation with necessary seed, feed, and so on, to meet various disaster problems or special economic problems which confront the Indians?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. We frequently supply money for the digging of wells, and establishing sanitary systems as well as ordinary water systems. Those things are done for the Indians who are our awards.

Mr. MORSE. It is on the ward feature that I wish to inquire for a moment. Because of the fact that this relationship has existed ever since our treaties with the Indians were signed, whereby the Federal Government exercises what may be called a type of guardianship over the Indians as wards, we do spend a great deal of Federal money for the benefit of the Indians, whether it be the building of a school or supplying them with medical services, or libraries, or recreation facilities, or with feed, seed, and whatnot. The Federal Government frequently makes what amounts to a donation to the Indians from the standpoint of carrying out our guardianship obligations to them as our wards.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MORSE. In this instance, what this bill can be said to be is a donation, really, that we are making to one Indian reservation over which we still have guardanship responsibility, just as we make donations to the Indians for other purposes——

Mr. ANDERSON. With this additional factor, that no other person could have built these facilities in the first place except the guardian who is looking after them. Now that the guardian no longer has use for the facilities, we think they should be surrendered back.

Mr. MORSE. During the time we operated these buildings we operated them somewhat as a tenant by suffrance. Also we operated them as a donated service to the Indians in carrying out our guardianship obligations.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. And I suppose they would have had authority at any time to cease cooperating with the Federal Government in regard to the services which the Federal Government sought to make available to the Indians through the use of these facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that they had to transfer title. They had to do that to get the building built.

Mr. MORSE. And title was transferred in the first instance for the specific purpose of the uses to which the Federal Government put the buildings.

Mr. ANDERSON. And no other.

Mr. MORSE. Now that the use is no longer going to be fulfilled, it is your position that the title should revert to the Indians?

Mr. ANDERSON. When the original bill had been passed it should have carried a provision for the reversion of the title, if the property was no longer used for school purposes. Then we would not need this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Could it not be said with complete accuracy that at the time of the original transfer of title there was the implied understanding on the part of the Indians and the Federal Government that at any time the buildings were not to be used for their original purpose the property would revert to the Indians? In other words is it not true that the Indians transferred title only to meet a technical legal requirement and the parties well understood that if the Federal Government ever abandoned the original purpose for the transfer the Indians would get back the property?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so that no one will say in the future, "Oh, you made an exception to the Morse formula in the New Mexico case," I have raised these questions on the floor of the Senate. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for the answers and information he has given to me. I am satisfied that under the facts and special circumstances of the case the Morse formula does not apply. It is clear to me that the Federal Government under its guardianship responsibilities should provide these facilities for these Indians in any event.

One of the services, I am informed by a staff member of the committee, is to use some of the structures for clinic services and some of the buildings for community-center services. We should be doing that, anyway, in carrying out our guardianship functions and obligations which we owe to these Indians.

I shall vote for the bill. I shall vote for it, because, after I have weighed all the facts in the matter, I think it can be justified on the ground that we are simply making Federal facilities available to the Indians for the carrying out of services which, under our guardianship, we should carry out anyway, and, in all probability, would carry out. Therefore, in my judgment, the bill does not, in fact, violate the spirit, the intent, and the purpose of the Morse formula.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABOLISHMENT OF FOSSIL CYCAD NATIONAL MONUMENT, S. DAK.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1677, Senate bill 1161.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1161) to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, this bill would disestablish a national monument consisting of a 40-acre tract. The National Park Service desires to have it disestablished.

I desire to offer an amendment which would, in effect, postpone the disestablishment until September 1, 1957, so that in the interim scientific or educational institutions may remove the fossils.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert the following:

That, effective September 1, 1957, the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., is hereby abolished, and the lands contained therein shall be administered thereafter by the Secretary of the Interior as public lands in accordance with the public-land laws of the United States: *Provided*, That prior thereto the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he determines to be appropriate, issue permits to scientific and educational institutions for the discovery, excavation, and removal of fossil cycads for scientific and educational purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have not had an opportunity to study this measure, but my understanding of it leads me to the conclusion that it does not involve transferring title to the land. It is simply a transfer of the use of the land from a monument purpose to other purposes, under the control of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. It is only a 40-acre tract, and the Government will still retain control over it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective September 1, 1957, the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., is hereby abolished, and the lands contained therein shall be administered thereafter by the Secretary of the Interior as public lands in accordance with the public-land laws of the United States: *Provided*, That prior thereto the Secretary of the Interior may, under such regulations as he determines to be appropriate, issue permits to scientific and educational institutions for the discovery, excavation, and removal of fossil cycads for scientific and educational purposes; and

That if any excavations on such lands for the recovery of fissionable materials or any other minerals should be undertaken, such fossil remains discovered shall become the property of the Federal Government.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a concurrent resolution relative to the Easter adjournment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 226, which the clerk will state for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate be authorized to submit reports to the Secretary of the Senate during the Easter adjournment from March 29 to April 9, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN TITANIUM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the very fine paper reviewing the history and present status of research and development in titanium given before AIME, on March 6, 1956, by Mr. John H. Garrett, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Research and Development.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TITANIUM SITUATION

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

We sometimes hear the thought expressed that the Government is placing too much research and development emphasis on titanium in relation to other metals. Consideration of the principles which underlie all of our materials research and development effort will show why titanium has, I think properly, received such favored treatment.

One of the most difficult aspects of management of the defense research and development program is determination of the relative emphasis which should be placed on different parts of the program. The objective of research management is to obtain the maximum contribution to the defense effort, in relation to the resources expanded. In applying this principle to the materials research program, a second principle comes to the front. This is, that Government resources will usually be applied only in areas which will not be supported directly by industry. Since the industrial research program on materials is very large in the aggregate, the Government program must be very selective, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of work supported by industry.

Is there any general rule by which we can differentiate between materials research which industry might be expected to accomplish, and materials research which must be supported, if at all, by the Government? There appears to be such a rule, of quite general application. Industry will chiefly support materials development in areas where it is able to assess the size of the market for successfully developed products. This means, of necessity, an industrial or civilian market. Industry does not feel that it can judge the magnitude of the future military market, since it is completely dependent upon the vagaries of national and international politics. It is for this reason that industrial facilities required for military products, such as airplane, guided missile and ammunition plants, are chiefly financed by the Government.

In the field of metals, titanium alone among general purpose structural metals, will be used almost exclusively in military products during the foreseeable future. In the case of steel and aluminum, for example, something like 95 percent of current production is for nonmilitary use. With titanium, on the other hand, less than 5 percent goes into civilian products. Under these circumstances, it is evident that a large government research program on steel or alumium should not be necessary, and conversely, if there is to be a large research effort on titanium, it must be government-supported.

Financing titanium research

With these principles established, it is possible to develop a basis for judging the appropriate level of a government-supported titanium research and development program. In a well established, but progressive, business it is considered appropriate to budget 5 percent of sales for product development. In a business dependent upon new and difficult technology, as is titanium, probably a research and development budget equal to at least 10 percent of gross would be more reasonable.

Let us estimate the gross government investment in titanium during 1956. In round figures, some 5,000 tons of mill product will be produced. The value of this titanium in final fabricated form might be estimated at $20 a pound, of $40,000 a ton. The 5,000 tons would then cost some $200 million. In addition, several thousands tons of sponge will be purchased by the government under existing commitments, at about $7,000 a ton. The total cost of government procurement of titanium will therefore in all probability amount to about $250 million during 1956. If we take 10 percent as a reasonable level of research and development expenditure, we would have $25 million.

The level of identifiable goverment support for fiscal year 1956 is about $16 million, of which some $4 million is for research, $3,500,000 for the sheet rolling program, $7,500,000 for experimental fabrication and $1 million for the Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory. In addition, the aircraft and engine industries will spend some part of their product improvement funds on titanium applications, so that the total government expenditure should be close to the $25 million figure.

Review of Government titanium activities

Before discussing the present status of titanium, it is useful to review the history of the development, in order to understand the

reasons for the various actions that have been taken.

Although titanium is the fourth most common structural metal in the earth's crust, it was strictly a laboratory curiosity until after World War II. The first Defense Department sponsored work on titanium was accomplished by Battelle in 1946 as part of the Air Force Rand project. This was followed by Bureau of Aeronautics efforts starting in 1947 and Army Ordnance work about the same time. All of these early efforts were small, being principally exploratory in nature. During this period the Bureau of Mines carried on a sustained effort laying the groundwork of knowledge of extractive metallurgy on which the present industry is based.

The first big boost to titanium came in 1951 when Army Ordnance allocated over $2 million to the support of titanium research, a considerable part of which was expended for procurement of sponge from the Bureau of Mines and titanium products from the infant titanium industry.

During the 5-year period from inception of interest in titanium as a structural metal in 1947-52, a great deal of fundamental knowledge of the characteristics of titanium was gained, but the industry was not able to turn out a uniform high-quality product which would meet the standards of the aircraft industry. The level of production climbed steadily to about 1,000 tons per year, and then faltered at that point because the aircraft industry was apparently not able to put the metal to use in production quantities. The halt in the growth of sales was then understood to be due to two basic factors. First, the aircraft and engine people were fearful that they would not be able to obtain adequate quantities of the metal if airplanes and engines were committed to its use. Second, the level of production in each producer's plant was too small to permit development of adequate production controls, in order to assure production of mill products of the required quality and uniformity.

At this crucial stage in the growth of the titanium industry, it is fortunate that there were enthusiastic supporters of the importance of titanium in all three services. Among these were Colonel Mesick in Army Ordnance, Mr. Promisel in the Bureau of Aeronautics and General Metzger and Colonel Dick in the Air Force. Had it not been for the faith of these and others in various places in the Defense Department in the ultimate success of the titanium program, the effort might well have been dropped.

It is interesting to note that when decisions were made involving the commitment of millions, and even hundreds of millions, in the titanium program, no one in the Defense Department had any specific knowledge, based on engineering studies, of the advantages to be gained from use of titanium in aircraft structures. Such engineering studies have only recently been made on a broad basis. At that time (around 1952) our chief basis for believing in the ultimate usefulness of titanium was a comparison of its mechanical properties with those of alternative materials. The high-strength, corrosion-resistant steels were not then available and the properties of titanium looked very good. Had the steel industry developed these alloys five years earlier, I doubt if the decision to go ahead with a major titanium effort would have been made.

Sponge production program

Early in 1952 a committee on materials was formed within the Research and Development Board organization. Much of the time of this committee was devoted to the perrenial problem, titanium. In the summer of 1952 it recommended a course of action that was to have far-reaching consequences. It had concluded that the difficulties besetting the industry were primarily due to the inability to process titanium into mill products on a continuous basis, in order to learn how to establish adequate control of product quality. A survey was made of the potential use of titanium over a 3-year period, assuming that all quality problems were overcome. This survey indicated that 35,000 tons per year of sponge might be needed after 3 years. The committee then took the bull by the horns, and recommended that the necessary steps be taken to build up sponge capacity to 35,000 tons by 1955. This was reduced by ODM to an initial goal of 25,000 tons by 1956, and subsequently further downward adjustments have been made.

This was the origin of the Government sponge support program. Certain errors and omissions in connection with this action are the cause of some of the subsequent problems which have been encountered.

In the first place, the difficulties encountered by the producers were not confined to the sponge production stage. While the sponge produced at that time would now be considered to contain an unacceptable level of impurities, the principal difficulties affecting the quality of mill products were in the melting and fabrication stages. Action taken to build up sponge production would not help solve the problems of subsequent stages in the process.

Secondly, no account was taken of the lead time between the time when a material with satisfactory properties becomes available and the time it can be procured in quantities for production use. This lead time is the time required to obtain complete engineering data, fabricate and test experimental components, and design, fabricate and test prototypes. For such complex structures as aircraft, this period can easily cover from 3 to 6 years, or even more where the effort is small.

It was therefore no surprise that use of sponge in mill products failed to reach the level of even the reduced sponge program.

About a year ago, when the gap between the sponge production rate established by the Government, and the rate of use by industry became uncomfortably large, a new plan was adopted. Recognizing that in the early stages of application of titanium, it is difficult to make accurate estimates of consumption more than a year ahead, whereas 2 or more years are required to plan and construct added sponge capacity, it was decided that a factor of safety of 100 percent should be added to forecasts of consumption. Since, even with this factor of safety, use of sponge would be somewhat less than the planned rate of expansion under the old program, certain of the planned increments of production were postponed.

The growth of consumption of titanium is being very closely watched, with new estimates being made every 3 months, so that we will be able to take timely action to raise production goals in ample time to prevent a sponge bottleneck.

Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory

A very significant event in the history of the titanium industry was the establishment, a year ago, of the Titanium Metallurgical Laboratory at Battelle Memorial Institute. During the summer of 1954 the Secretary of Defense became concerned with the magnitude of the problems confronting the titanium and aircraft industries, which were preventing a desirable rate of introduction of titanium into the construction of military aircraft. He requested the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Research and Development) to take appropriate action to correct this situation. After consulting with a number of his senior advisers, Mr. Quarles concluded that two steps should be taken. The first was establishment of a titanium laboratory to undertake research of a short-range nature on urgent problems and to provide technical consulting services to industry and the Department of Defense on titanium metallurgy.

The second step was the organization of a group to exercise greater leadership and coordination in the Department of Defense titanium program. This group is the so-called titanium steering group.

The operation of the laboratory has centered around four phases of activity:

1. Collection and dissemination of technical information on titanium.
2. Advice to the steering group to assist in formulating the D. O. D. titanium program.
3. Special tasks, investigations, and surveys on important problems.
4. Technical consulting services to industry.

Much effort during this first year of operation of the laboratory has gone into the organization of the information center. The laboratory has attempted to obtain copies of all existing reports on Government and Government-sponsored research and development on titanium. There are about 200 such research projects currently in existence, and an additional four-hundred-odd projects have been completed. From these projects, approximately 1,400 reports have been collected. Technical literature for the past 50 years was screened, and abstracts and full texts of important articles have been obtained. Arrangements have been made for the laboratory to secure, as they are issued, copies of all reports on current Government-sponsored research. The laboratory is also monitoring current technical literature throughout the world for information on titanium. Approximately 1,250 journals are being monitored either directly or through various abstracting services. In addition, a systematic effort has been started to collect nonproprietary information from private research and other private sources, as well as the mass of unorganized and unreported data which has been accumulated by industry.

All of this mass of information is organized in such a way that all information pertinent to a particular subject may be found on one place in the files. These files are available to anyone having a legitimate interest in defense applications of titanium. Access to the information may be either by a letter of inquiry or by a personal visit to the Laboratory. In addition, the more significant information is summarized in a series of state-of-the-art reports covering selected aspects of titanium metallurgy. About 15 such reports have been issued and 20 more are under preparation. These reports are distributed to a mailing list containing over 600 names.

In addition to the operation of the Information Center, the Laboratory is engaged in a wide variety of activities serving both industry and the Government. One of the most interesting of these activities involves a study, in cooperation with the Aircraft Structural Materials Subcommittee of NACA and the ANC–5 Committee, of the true nature of design data required by aircraft designers. It would require a prodigious amount of effort to secure mechanical property data covering yield and ultimate strengths in tension and compression, as well as values for ductility, bearing strength and other properties even at room temperature for a wide range of titanium alloys. When you multiply this by the amount of additional data required to cover a broad range of elevated temperatures, as well as short time and transient conditions, you can see what an imposing task faces us in supplying quickly the sort of information designers are accustomed to using for conventional materials.

An analysis of conventional mechanical property data, such as tensile strengths and elongations, revealed that these are imaginary concepts having no fundamental meaning in relation to structural design. An effort is being made to see if there are not more fundamental values which could be established by relatively few tests on each new alloy, and from which conventional properties could be computed. If such a shortcut

can be found, it will save millions of dollars and months, if not years, of time in furnishing essential data.

Titanium technology

So much for an account of how we got where we are. I would like to make a few remarks on the current state of titanium technology.

As far as I know all production applications of titanium (with one minor exception) use the metal in the annealed condition. The alloys commercially available, of which there are 5 in general use, have a minimum guaranteed yield strength ranging from 110,000 to 130,000 pounds per square inch. Four of these alloys are of the alpha-beta type, and therefore capable of strengthening by heat treatment. Typical annealed strenghths are from 5,000 to 30,000 pounds per square inch above the specification value, and one of the problems of titanium producers is to try to narrow this range. This variation in strength is a major cause of difficulty in fabricating titanium. It also penalizes titanium unduly in relation to other materials, because it is necessary to use the low side of the range of typical strengths, for design calculations.

Since practically all titanium is used as annealed, a comparison of the strength of annealed titanium with steel and aluminum of equivalent weight is of interest. While for aircraft design purposes the tensile yield is not very significant, it is convenient to use for purposes of comparison. Titanium at 120,000 pounds per square inch and 0.165 pounds per cubic inch density is approximately equivalent to aluminum at 73,000 pounds per square inch, and steel at 175,000 pounds per square inch. The annealed titanium competes fairly well with high strength heat treated alloys of aluminum or steel.

In order to obtain the full advantage of titanium in aircraft design it is necessary to heat treat the alpha-beta alloys to the strength levels of which they are capable. We do not have enough information to know what strength can be expected on a commercial basis either as typical values or minimum specification values. Laboratory experiments have shown that any of the alloys can be heat treated to yield strengths ranging from 170,000 to 190,000 pounds per square inch or higher, while retaining elongation of around 10 percent. For the sheet rolling program we are sponsoring, the objective is to reach 160,000 pounds per square inch yield as the minimum guaranteed value at room temperature, with uniform elongation of 10 percent and 105,000 pounds per square inch at 800° F. Typical values will probably be 170,000 pounds per square inch at room temperature and 115,000 pounds per square inch at 800° F. Equivalent room temperature values would be 102,000 pounds per square inch for aluminum and 300,000 pounds per square inch for steel. This compares with available typical yield strength of 72,000 pounds per square inch for aluminum alloy and 170,000 for steel (with, however, only 5 percent elongation). It is comparisons such as these that keep our enthusiasm for titanium alive in the face of discouragingly high prices and technical problems.

A great deal of work is being accomplished to develop improved alloys to overcome the shortcomings of the alloys which are commercially available. Some of these difficulties are nonuniformity of distribution of alloying elements in the ingot, poor formability in sheet, susceptibility to hydrogen embrittlement, and instability at elevated temperatures. The popular alloying elements around which many of the newer alloys are developed are aluminum, vanadium, and molybdenum.

Aluminum, which is an alpha-stabilizer, contributes to high-temperature strength. By the same token, alloys containing high percentages of aluminum are difficult to roll into sheet. Molybdenum and vanadium are beta-stabilizers and seem to confer a better combination of strength and ductility than some of the other beta-stabilizers such as iron and chromium. A very important characteristic of these elements is the tolerance to hydrogen which they seem to confer to the alloys.

The first alloy in the new series to reach commercial importance is the 6Al–4V alloy. This was originally developed as a bar and forging alloy. More recently there has been intense interest in its use as a sheet alloy because of the very good properties that can be obtained through heat treatment. The relatively high aluminum content has made this a difficult alloy to roll into sheet, and there are other problems inherent in this alloy in sheet form, such as difficulty in controlling oxygen content.

Some mention should be made of the sheet rolling program being sponsored by the Titanium Steering Group and administered by the Bureau of Aeronautics. This is an effort to accelerate, perhaps by several years, the availability of improved alloys in sheet form to meet the present needs of aircraft designers. A careful selection has been made among candidate alloys for large scale experimentation. For each of the alloys selected, contracts are being negotiated with two producers to produce the alloys in selected gages on a full commercial scale with the objective of meeting the target mechanical properties. These properties represent the highest level which it is believed can be successfully met in the present state of the art. At the same time, they are high enough to meet the essential needs of aircraft designers, and to place them well out in front of competing materials. The alloys which have been tentatively selected are 4Al–2V–1Cr–1Mo, 3Al–6Mo, 4½Al–3Mo–1V. A good look is also being taken at the 6Al–4V, in spite of the known fabricating difficulties, because of its excellent heat-treated strength possibilities and its low density.

It might be of interest to diverge for a moment to discuss the question of density in titanium alloys. At first glance, one would think that the difference between the density of the 6A1 4V alloy (0.162 pounds per cubic inch) and the 4½ A1–3Mo–1V (0.168 pounds per cubic inch) would not be significant. A calculation has been made for a particular airplane now in the design stage, showing that, other things being equal, substitution of the heavier alloy would add 80,000 pounds to the gross weight of the airplane. This heavy penalty is due to the operation of the well-known principle of growth in aircraft design. In this airplane the growth factor was unusually high—15. Because of the great importance of density, there are real advantages in basing alloy development on aluminum and vanadium, rather than iron, chromium, or molybdenum. Another way of saying this is that use of the heavier alloying elements must be accompanied by advantages which will offset their added weight.

Practically all present applications of titanium are in pieces originally designed for steel, where substitution of titanium is deemed worth the cost because of the saving in weight through direct substitution. In this type of application advantage cannot be taken of the growth factor, as when a new design is under consideration, and the cost of the weight saving is likely to be very high in terms of dollars per pound. Because of this high cost per pound of weight saved, titanium is only used in airplanes which are substantially overweight, so that a few pounds saving in weight is worth a great many dollars. As all such applications of titanium confer marginal benefits, and it would be possible to substitute back to steel if necessary, the titanium industry is at present on a hand-to-mouth basis. Not until titanium is incorporated in major elements of a new design—so that the airplane will be fully committed to titanium—will the benefits of large-scale production of titanium be gained.

There is no airplane currently scheduled for production which uses substantial amounts of titanium in its original design. There are several reasons for this, but they all add up to one thing—the industry has not had enough experience with the newer strong titanium alloys to commit themselves beyond the point of no return. What is needed is (1) more design data and (2) more experience with fabrication and test of these alloys in structural elements.

It should be recognized that this inability to use a theoretically more desirable material results in a combination of two undesirable effects on our military equipment—it increases the weight of the equipment, and reduces the performance of which the equipment will be capable. Both of these effects are distinct military handicaps which can be minimized by adequate remedial measures. The specific causes of titanium difficulties are becoming more evident. If these causes could have been identified, and appropriate measures taken 2 or 3 years ago, titanium would today be much nearer to massive use, which would have been greatly to the benefit of our aircraft programs.

Another possible obstacle is the lack of specialized facilities for fabricating titanium mill products. All titanium mill products are now produced on equipment designed for handling another metal—generally steel. The requirements for titanium are not the same as for the other metals. Differences involve rolling temperatures, amount and effect of scaling in heating furnaces, rate of reduction or speed of extrusion, pickling and other descaling procedures, annealing temperatures and furnace atmospheres, and, in fact, practically every detail of mill-product-fabricating procedure. It can, therefore, only be considered a makeshift situation to intersperse orders for titanium and steel (or aluminum or brass), using the same equipment and the same labor force. The early use of higher strength alloys—which will increase the demands on mill equipment—makes this question of facilities particularly urgent.

The structure of the titanium industry is such that it will be a very slow process for the industry to establish, with its own resources alone, the type of integrated specialized titanium facilities which would seem to be desirable. There are four independent organizations offering complete lines of titanium rolled products, and a number of others experimenting with production of extrusions or other special forms. With total business of less than 2,000 tons annually, divided among this number of plants, it has not been feasible for any of the companies to establish separate titanium facilities. If it is the desire of the Government to have titanium available for all useful military applications, it may be necessary to provide a certain amount of direct financial assistance toward procurement of production facilities.

At the present time the Materials Advisory Board is studying the adequacy of existing titanium fabricating facilities. It is hoped that the report, which should be available in about 6 weeks, will clarify the extent to which direct Government assistance in financing capital equipment would assist in meeting Defense Department titanium requirements.

There has been a notable increase in interest in titanium within the aircraft and engine industries during the past year. This appears to have been due to the combined influence of the following factors:

1. Clearing up of certain technical deficiencies in titanium alloys;

2. Completion of further engineering calculations showing the weight advantages to be gained from use of titanium in aircraft;

3. Wide dissemination of technical information through the titanium metallurgical laboratory;

4. Improvement in quality of mill products provided by the titanium industry; and

5. Favorable service experience with titanium.

In spite of the accelerated degree of acceptance of titanium, we are only on the threshold of development and use of this metal. The total research and testing expenditures on titanium from all sources is only a minute fraction of that which has been expended on steel or aluminum. As a consequence, only a bare beginning has been made in obtaining the voluminous data, not to mention service experience, which engineers must have before titanium can take its place as a routine material of construction.

REGULATION OF USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for permitting the Senate to dispose of certain bills while a number of Senators were on the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the letter "(e)", to strike out "The" and insert "Subject to the provisions of subsection (f) hereof, the"; on page 2, line 16, after the word "regulations", to insert "as if they were the owners of such vehicles"; in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "equipment; but nothing" and insert "equipment and inspection thereof, which requirements may include but shall not be limited to promulgation of regulations requiring liability and cargo insurance covering all such equipment"; at the beginning of line 24, to insert "(f) Nothing"; on page 3, line 2, after the word "vehicle", to insert "with driver"; in line 3, after the word "such", to strike out "use." and insert "use—."

The next amendment of the committee was, after line 3, to insert:

"(1) where the motor vehicle so to be used is that of a farmer or of a cooperative association or a federation of cooperative associations, as specified in section 203 (b) (4a) or (5), or is that of a private carrier of property by motor vehicle as defined in section 203 (a) (17), and such motor vehicle is to be used by the motor carrier in a single movement or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based; or

"(2) where the motor vehicle so to be used is one which has completed a movement covered by section 203 (b) (6) and such motor vehicle is next to be used by the motor carrier in a loaded movement in any direction, and/or in one or more of a series of movements, loaded or empty, in the general direction of the general area in which such motor vehicle is based.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, after the numerals "(17)", it is proposed to insert "and is used regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before explaining the purpose of the amendment, I should like to comment briefly on the purpose of the proposed legislation. The subject has been very adequately covered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, but the bill has been a matter of much complexity and controversy since he has been a Member of the Senate, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and I can testify that that was true long before that. The subject has been a problem in our whole transportation system for a long time.

I do not know how many hours have been taken, or the number of conferences which the Members of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have had, not only with farm groups, but also with transportation and trucking groups, railroad organizations, and everyone else involved in the matter.

The junior Senator from Florida has done yeoman work on the bill. He has discussed the many facets of it. I could not help thinking, when consideration of this bill was interrupted in order to discuss the Colorado River bill, that the trip-leasing problem has more facets than the Colorado River has tributaries.

It is very difficult to prepare a bill which will satisfy completely the various segments of the transportation industry which are involved. Although the United States has the finest transportation system in the world, we have a national transportation problem. Without our transportation system, the economy of the country could not exist. Without it, we could not adequately prepare our defenses.

The transportation industry has grown and has become healthy and strong mainly because there has been competent regulation of the transportation system.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is, I believe, the oldest of the regulatory commissions which have been established in the Government. It was created upon the theory that in the whole surface-transportation system, some rules of government would be required.

Our transportation system is in even more need of rules of the game today because it is constantly growing. I do not know how many Senators realize it, but the fact is that 1 out of every 18 persons who are employed in the United States work for some part of the transportation systems of the country.

Of the gross national product of close to $400 billion, the transportation industry contributes more than $70 billion to the national economy; and of the $70 billion, $67 billion is represented by the transportation agencies which are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As the Senator from Florida has pointed out, the Interstate Commerce Commission has made many mistakes, but they have dealt with difficult, complex problems. Some of their rulings have not been consistent. I think the Senator from Florida stated the situation correctly when he said that farm groups have complained because some of the rulings of the Commission with respect to agricultural products have been inconsistent. That has caused much trouble.

In fairness to the Commission, though, and I think the Senator from Ohio will agree with me, much of the delay has been caused by the fact that the entire matter has been in controversy in Congress for a long time. I hope, as the Senator from Florida has said, that the bill will be passed. After many weeks of consultation, conference, and compromise, I think a much better bill has been drafted than was originally proposed. The present bill fits into our national transportation policy better than the original bill. I wish to compliment the Senator from Florida in that regard, because he actually had to umpire a tug of war between the different interests concerned, as did the Senator from Ohio and other members of the committee, including the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who is seated beside me.

Finally, we reached the point where there was only one major controversy. Everyone agreed that the farmer should be exempt, so that he could haul his own products. Everyone agreed that if a private trucker could get agricultural products and haul them to a destination, both he and the farmer should have the right to trip lease their trucks home.

But there was some disagreement as to how the farmer should go home. Finally, the committee came to an agreement that he at least ought to return in the general direction of his home. If he had taken a load of oranges from Florida to New York, he at least should not return to Florida by way of Oklahoma.

Thus the committee came to many agreements, but there was no definition of what a private carrier could do. The two words "private carrier" caused much controversy. I think the Senate ought to know how important this matter is to a regulated transportation system.

The trucking system of the United States now carries close to 62 percent of the gross tonnage of our national economy. This tonnage has grown rapidly and is growing faster. That is why it is necessary to have a national policy or system of regulation of the trucking industry, while still not injuring the farmer. No one wants to do that. The senior Senator from Washington has never, to his knowledge, ever stood on the floor of either the Senate or the House and voted against a bill which he thought was in the interest of the farmer who owned the trucks. Because there has been an exemption for

farmers to haul their products in their own farm trucks, there has been a healthy growth in the production of farm products. Normally, the farm trucks are not for hire.

There has been a healthy growth of the trucking industry. Three million trucks are owned as farm trucks. Sometimes they are for hire. There are trucks used in the U-Drive industry. Normally they are subject only to the regulations and laws of the road.

One million, three hundred thousand trucks comprise the bulk of our common carrier system. Four million trucks comprise the big bulk of private carriers. These are the ones we are talking about.

I think the Senator from Florida made his position clear in the hearings, near the end of June, when he said:

Senator SMATHERS. Of course, that is all we are trying to do, is to make it possible for the genuine agricultural trucker to be able to trip lease coming home. * * *

So that he can get back and haul some more agriculture.

We are not interested in making this so that truckers who are not legitimate agricultural haulers can just take off and go around the country. We are not interested in letting those fellows run without regulation.

We think they should be regulated, and we think they deserve to be regulated; but we do not want to interfere with the movement of fruit and vegetables and things like that, as they are moved into the markets.

That is the problem I see.

I think that is a correct statement. The bill does not define private carriers. As the bill now stands, a private carrier can travel all over the country. One of the trucks can haul shoes from Connecticut to New Jersey, and then take a load of bed springs from New Jersey to Minneapolis, and then go to Dallas, Tex., with some other products, and then move into Los Angeles, and finally get back to Connecticut. I do not think anyone believes that should be allowed to happen.

What we are trying to do is give the farmer the best protection he can have, because his business is seasonal. He needs trip-leasing.

The amendment provides that somewhere along the line that the private carrier moves his trip must have some connection with agricultural products. Such products are not literally defined as the ICC defines them. It was pointed out, as an extraordinary case, that the ICC has said that when a chicken is plucked, it is a chicken no longer, or that when milk is processed into the form of cheese, it is not an agricultural product.

The language of my amendment is:

And is used regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6).

That defines the products we are talking about in connection with private carriers.

I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from Florida and other Senators. While I do not speak for them, I think I can truthfully say that the amendment is necessary, and that the amendment is in line not only with the general philosophy of the bill, but makes maximum transportation facilities available to the farmers of the country at the lowest possible cost, without at the same time seriously injuring the common carriers, which are the backbone of the transportation system.

Most of us on the committee had been concerned with the private-carrier provision of the bill as it now stands. As it stands, it would authorize the private carriers to go around the country without ever having hauled a single agricultural product. The trip-leasing benefits of the bill are extended to these private carriers without their ever having contributed in any way to the objective the bill seeks to attain.

I pointed out previously that there are 4 million private trucks in the country.

The amendment provides that the trip-leasing benefits are available to a private carrier whose truck is used "regularly in the transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities of the character referred to in section 203 (b) (6)." Section 203 (b) (6) is the section that exempts agricultural products, including livestock, poultry, and fish. So the amendment would extend the benefits of trip leasing to private carriers who transport processed or manufactured perishable products from agricultural commodities, livestock, fish—I call this to the attention of the Senator from Maine—or poultry.

In other words, a private carrier who uses his equipment regularly to haul dressed poultry, dressed meat, milk, butter, fish, or similar perishables processed or manufactured from agricultural commodities could trip lease home in accordance with the provisions of the bill. I think that would give the farmer more transportation in the long run.

I believe my amendment to be a fair one. The bill does not resolve all the problems. It will still have to go to the House. The House will hold adequate hearings.

I have discussed the amendment with members of the committee. I am sure the Senate will be doing the fair thing if it sends the bill in its present shape to the House, after all the work has been done on it, containing the proposal I suggest.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask two questions. In my State there are many small farmers who raise their products and send them to processors. We have in my State the Seabrook Farms, an organization which processes frozen and canned goods. The Campbell Soup people are also in my State, and they can vegetables which are obtained from the farmers. They are big processors, who, for the most part, have their own trucks.

It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Washington would mean that private carriers who haul agricultural commodities or manufactured perishable goods made from such exempt agricultural products on the original trip would be allowed to trip-lease home. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I may add, further, that they would be encouraged to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There seems to be some confusion as to carrying of manufactured products, such as canned goods, on the original trip. If the amendment is adopted, will both carriers to whom I have made reference be allowed to trip-lease home if they have carried canned goods, such as canned soups, on their original trip?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned goods would not necessarily be in the nature of perishables. If there is some confusion about that question, let us take the case of the Campbell Soup people in the Senator's own State. Let us assume the firm makes a haul to Chicago. It would have a right, under the general rules of the ICC, to lease its truck for the trip back, in any event. It will still be able to do that.

I assume the interested parties in the Senator's State were interested in whether or not the amendment would in any way limit their right to do that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his explanation and for his reply to my questions.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington indulge me again?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are present two persons on the floor who are interested in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation conference report. They are way ahead of schedule. They have done a wonderful job. If it can be taken up at this time, they can dispose of it very promptly. Since the Senator from Washington has been detained so long that he cannot leave anyway, I wonder if he would indulge me so that the conference report can be considered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have missed my last plane to Seattle for today, so I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of March 27, 1956, p. 5765, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the committee action on the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1957, H. R. 9064

Appropriation title	1956 appropriations	Estimated increased pay costs, H. Docs. 330 and 341	Estimated total, 1956	1957 estimates	House bill	House bill compared with—		Restoration or amendment requested	Senate subcommittee recommendation	Senate full committee recommendation	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
						1956 appropriation	1957 estimate					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Treasury Department:												
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$2,680,000	$170,000	$2,850,000	$2,922,000	$2,900,000	+$220,000	−$22,000		$2,900,000	$2,900,000	$2,900,000	$2,900,000
Bureau of Accounts:												
Salaries and expenses	[1] 2,785,000	126,000	2,911,000	2,950,000	2,925,000	+140,000	−25,000		2,925,000	2,925,000	2,925,000	2,925,000
Division of Disbursement: Salaries and expenses	15,475,000	280,000	15,755,000	16,240,000	16,100,000	+625,000	−140,000		16,100,000	16,100,000	16,100,000	16,100,000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	18,260,000	406,000	18,666,000	19,190,000	19,025,000	+765,000	−165,000		19,025,000	19,025,000	19,025,000	19,025,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	44,500,000	752,000	45,252,000	45,500,000	45,500,000	+1,000,000			45,500,000	45,500,000	45,500,000	45,500,000
Office of the Treasurer, United States: Salaries and expenses	15,000,000	175,000	15,175,000	15,125,000	15,125,000	+125,000			15,125,000	15,125,000	15,125,000	15,125,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	41,200,000	2,855,000	44,055,000	44,500,000	44,250,000	+3,050,000	−250,000		44,250,000	44,250,000	44,250,000	44,250,000
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	282,250,000	17,900,000	300,150,000	307,850,000	305,000,000	+22,750,000	−2,850,000		305,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000	305,000,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	2,990,000	155,000	3,145,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+260,000			3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000
U. S. Secret Service:												
Salaries and expenses	2,960,000	179,000	3,139,000	3,374,000	3,340,000	+380,000	−34,000		3,340,000	3,340,000	3,340,000	3,340,000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	800,000	57,000	857,000	859,000	859,000	+59,000			859,000	859,000	859,000	859,000
Salaries and expenses, guard force	268,000	17,000	285,000	287,000	285,000	+17,000	−2,000		285,000	285,000	285,000	285,000
Total, U. S. Secret Service	4,028,000	253,000	4,281,000	4,520,000	4,484,000	+456,000	−36,000		4,484,000	4,484,000	4,484,000	4,484,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	3,650,000		3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000				3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000
U. S. Coast Guard:												
Operating expenses	[2] 160,750,000		160,750,000	165,350,000	164,850,000	+4,100,000	−500,000		164,850,000	164,850,000	164,850,000	164,850,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvement	7,000,000		7,000,000	7,500,000	7,400,000	+400,000	−100,000		7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Retired pay	[3] 23,900,000		23,900,000	25,400,000	24,500,000	+600,000	−900,000		24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000	24,500,000
Reserve training	[4] 3,403,000		3,403,000	[5] 3,750,000	3,500,000	+97,000	−250,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Total, Coast Guard	195,053,000		195,053,000	202,000,000	200,250,000	+5,197,000	−1,750,000		200,250,000	200,250,000	200,250,000	200,250,000
Total, Treasury Department	609,611,000		609,611,000	648,507,000	643,434,000	+33,823,000	−5,073,000	[6] Language	643,434,000	643,434,000	643,434,000	643,434,000
Post Office Department:												
Administration	15,500,000		15,500,000	20,000,000	19,000,000	+3,500,000	−1,000,000	$1,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Operations	1,870,000,000		1,870,000,000	2,118,880,000	2,108,000,000	+238,000,000	−10,880,000	10,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,118,880,000	2,113,440,000
Transportation	661,620,500		661,620,500	655,000,000	645,000,000	−16,620,500	−10,000,000	10,000,000	655,000,000	655,000,000	655,000,000	650,000,000
Finance	17,200,000		17,200,000	12,945,000	12,900,000	−4,300,000	−45,000		12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000	12,900,000
Facilities	157,400,000		157,400,000	193,175,000	189,000,000	+31,600,000	−4,175,000	4,175,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000
Total, Post Office Department	2,721,720,500		2,721,720,500	3,000,000,000	2,973,900,000	+252,179,500	−26,100,000	26,055,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,984,340,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,170,000	48,000	1,218,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	+195,000			1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
Grand total, Treasury and Post Office Departments and Tax Court	3,332,501,500	22,714,000	3,355,215,500	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	+286,197,500	−31,173,000	26,055,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

[Limitation on amount of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or activity	Authorization, 1956	Estimated increase, 1956	Estimated total, 1956	Estimates, 1957	House allowance	House allowance compared with—		Restoration requested	Recommended by Senate subcommittee	Recommended by Senate full committee	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
						Authorization, 1956	Estimates, 1957					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Federal Facilities Corporation	$975,000		$975,000	$250,000	$250,000	−$725,000			$250,000	$250,000	$250,000	$250,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,400,000	$85,000	1,485,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	−340,000			1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000	1,060,000
Total	2,375,000	85,000	2,460,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	−1,065,000			1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000	1,310,000

[1] Includes $185,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[2] Includes $7,000,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[3] Includes $2,600,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[4] Includes $228,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956.
[5] Excludes $3,500,000 budget amendment in H. Doc. 326.
[6] Two language amendments proposed by Washington Plate Printers Union affecting Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the conferees were unanimously in favor of the report. The report was signed by all the Senate conferees and all but two of the House conferees, those two being out of town. The items in disagreement were with respect to increased funds for operations and transportation.

The members of the Senate committee felt that the testimony presented to us in regard to the estimated volume of mail for the next fiscal year clearly indicated the necessity for the budget estimates; and the bill as passed by the Senate provided for the budget estimates, which were $10,880,000 more than the House had allowed for operations, and $10 million more than the House had allowed for transportation.

In conference, several proposals were made, back and forth. Finally we compromised by splitting the difference—50–50. So the conference report provides for operations $5,440,000 more than was carried in the bill as passed by the House, and an equal amount less than was carried in the bill as passed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 3, for transportation, the conference report provides $5 million more than was included in the bill as passed by the House and $5 million less than was included in the bill as passed by the Senate.

We think the House was a little tight on the Post Office Department. The Department may have to have a supplemental estimate next year, to keep the mails moving. But most legislative matters involve compromise; and in that spirit we have submitted the conference report, and request its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to concur in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said. The conference report represents a meeting of the minds of the conferees, and is a compromise. But it seems to us to be a very thorough one.

I concur in the request of the Senator from Virginia that the conference report be adopted.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations wishes to acknowledge with thanks the fine assistance given him by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], both in the hearings and in marking up the bill and in conference.

We upheld the Senate's position until we decided that it would be better to make a compromise and get a report, and have a bill enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the very able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the very able senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for their promptness in handling this bill. Last year we thought they set a record when they made it possible for us to pass the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill on May 23, and for the President to sign the bill on June 1. But now we find they have moved the schedule up to March. I am not sure that they are entirely responsible for the speed and the thorough action; I rather suspect that the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has been expediting the work of the committee. In any event, regardless of who may be responsible, the leadership on both sides of the aisle are very grateful, I am sure, for the very prompt, very thorough, and very efficient way in which this first appropriation bill has been handled.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I acknowledge with grateful appreciation the nice tribute paid by the majority leader.

Let me say that if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the chairman of the subcommittee could control debate on the floor of the Senate as well as we have been able to do in our committee, the Senate would end its session by the middle of June. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am sure the minority wish to join with the majority leadership in expressing appreciation not only to the distinguished chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], but also to the ranking members on both the minority and majority sides of the committee, and particularly to the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the very able chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, who, I am sure, has had the cooperation of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member, and all other members of the committee in expediting the taking of action on the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, as has already been indicated, we could not have accomplished this without the full cooperation of the minority members of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, sometimes visitors to the Capitol see legislative measures passed by the Senate with a minimum of controversy, and do not understand how a bill can be passed without having a knockdown and dragout fight. Let me say that one of the secrets in that connection was revealed to me only yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I had not been assigned to his committee for more than minutes—literally minutes—under the order of the Senate, entered a few days ago, assigning me to membership on that committee, before the Senator from Arizona came to me and gave me a list of the subcommittees and their membership, and suggested that I take the list home with me and study it, and become acquainted with the organization of the committee. I did so.

Then, on yesterday, I had no more than entered the committee room when the Senator from Arizona came to me, and called a clerk to join us, and said to me, "Here is a list of the schedule of subcommittee meetings, and here is one that I want you to begin hearings with."

I asked, "When?"

He replied, "May 7."

I asked the Senator from Arizona, "Are you not planning a little far ahead? Usually Senator KNOWLAND and I plan the work for the Senate Chamber only 2 or 3 days ahead."

The Senator from Arizona replied, "Well, that is the schedule; and you are to start the hearing on May 7."

So I want to pay a great tribute to this distinguished son of Arizona, who has done so much to contribute to the efficiency of the work of the Senate. I wish to say that I very greatly appreciate all of his extremely fine work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I thank all the Senators—and particularly for not calling me a slave driver. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader did not quite tell the whole story. The hearings may start on May 7; but the rest of the story is that when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee says hearings will begin at 10 o'clock, they begin at 10 o'clock. I think a person could deliver a rather pointed lecture on punctuality to the United States Senate and to a great many members of the committees. Frankly, time after time three-quarters of an hour or half an hour is wasted at the beginning of a committee session. If a committee is to meet at 10 o'clock it often takes until 11 o'clock to obtain a quorum; and, of course, in the meantime the members who are present cannot pursue their usual duties.

I wish to say, to the everlasting credit of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that at 10 o'clock a. m., when the hearings begin, he is there, and the hearings get under way then, regardless of whether any other member is present at that time.

Mr. President, once we hew to that line, we shall accomplish a great deal more in handling the business of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the admonition of the Senator from Illinois; and I am sure that in connection with matters in which the majority leader is interested, he will be present promptly at 10 o'clock.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have been listening most intently, in anticipation that some Senator would move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be made a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

REGULATION OF USE BY MOTOR CARRIERS OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 898) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, Mr. President, I am willing to yield again. Of course, some time ago I had the floor; and since then the Senate has passed approximately six bills or other measures. I am willing to yield, to have the Senate pass six more, if that is desired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Not only has the Senate done what the Senator has mentioned, Mr. President, but the Senate has appropriated almost $100 million, by means of the conference report on the appropriation bill which was acted upon a few minutes ago.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. What is a public carrier?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A public carrier is an authorized carrier, which includes both common and contract carriers operating in interstate commerce.

Mr. FREAR. What is a private carrier?

Mr. MAGNUSON. A private carrier is one carrying its own goods, and is not subject to economic regulation, and need not file rates.

Let me inquire whether we are indulging in quizzes.

Mr. FREAR. I merely wish to ask some questions, and to obtain answers to them.

What is 203 (b) (6) to which the Senator from Washington refers in his amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. 203 (b) (6) is part of the Interstate Commerce Act which interprets the term agricultural commodities; in other words, it states what they are.

Mr. FREAR. Yes. Does a private carrier pay the transportation tax?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; a private carrier would pay the transportation tax in the States in which such carrier operates.

Mr. FREAR. I mean the transportation tax levied by the Government on the transportation of property and the transportation of people. It is not a sales tax; it is a transportation tax.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know the carriers pay the sales tax in the various States. Perhaps the Senator from Florida can enlarge upon that point.

Mr. SMATHERS. Today, a private carrier is, of course, one which carries products or property it owns; and the only tax it is required to pay is the regular State tax, provided for by the State regulatory body.

Mr. FREAR. What is that?

Mr. SMATHERS. It differs from State to State.

Mr. FREAR. That is the license for the vehicle.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all he pays.

Mr. FREAR. What is the rate of transportation tax on a public carrier?

Mr. SMATHERS. I can tell the Senator from Delaware that a certificated carrier must pay 3 percent of the amount paid for transportation.

Mr. FREAR. I think that is entirely correct. The private carrier does not have to pay that 3 percent.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. What would be the volume of tax paid into the Federal Treasury if all private carriers were assessed a 3 percent tax, which public carriers must pay?

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know, but it would be considerably more. There are 4 million private carriers, as the Senator from Washington has just pointed out.

Mr. FREAR. Then by the terms of this bill, and by section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, are we not giving a tax exempt privilege to a private carrier, while we are assessing public carriers?

Mr. SMATHERS. No, we are not. A private carrier is not presumed to be in the business of common carriage. He is supposed to be carrying only his own goods. What the Senator is saying is that if we do not amend the bill as the Senator from Washington has suggested, in many respects we shall be permitting a private carrier, in effect, to operate as a common carrier, and to that extent, probably, avoid paying the 3 percent tax.

Mr. FREAR. Is it not true that many people who have been shipping by public carrier have installed their own systems of transportation, to avoid the 3 percent transportation tax?

Mr. SMATHERS. We are leaving out one very important step. For example, when the private carrier carries his own monkey wrenches from Chicago to Delaware, in order to trip lease his truck back home, he must go to a certificated carrier and enter into a lease with such carrier. The certificated carrier pays all the taxes necessary, in order to bring that truck through.

Mr. FREAR. Is the Senator sure about that?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the law today, and the bill does not change it.

Mr. FREAR. I am sure that both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Washington are familiar with some of the large private carriers of this country. They went into business to haul their own products, and they are hauling their own products; but if they were not in that business, and had to use public transportation, they would be paying a 3 percent tax into the Federal Treasury, would they not?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Then are we not widening the field of exemption by continuing to increase the number of private transporters?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are leaving it as it is.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me put it this way: For example, Sears, Roebuck & Co. is a private carrier, carrying only those things which it manufactures or sells. When it takes its trucks from Washington, D. C., to Chicago and unloads them at its store, if it wishes to bring any truck back loaded, it must either buy something and take title to it, in which event it could bring it back without paying the common carrier tax; or if it wished to bring back something else, it would have to go to a certificated carrier and say, "Here is our truck, and here is our driver. We will lease this truck to you under your certificate." Perhaps, in that case, the truck would bring back monkey wrenches. In such a case the certificated carrier would pay the tax.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then, of course, he would come under the same regulation as a common carrier.

Mr. FREAR. In such a case would he then operate under authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly, because he leases to a common carrier.

Mr. FREAR. Then he would be subject to the rates imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and also subject to the transportation tax.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Let us carry the illustration a little further. Suppose the same truck which the Senator has used in his illustration went to Chicago, and then went outside Chicago 20 miles and picked up a truckload of pumpkins from the farmer or producer, and brought them back to Washington.

Mr. SMATHERS. He can always carry agricultural products without being subject to ICC regulation. Pumpkins in the raw state are obviously agricultural products, so he does not need any certificate from the ICC to carry them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or a pumpkin pie, under my amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Or a pumpkin pie, if it is perishable.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is perishable.

Mr. SMATHERS. I presume a pumpkin pie would be considered perishable.

Mr. FREAR. Anything of a canned nature which is perishable could also be included in that category; could it not?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct under the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. FREAR. The bill as it stands, without the amendment of the Senator from Washington, does not include that feature; does it?

Mr. SMATHERS. The way the bill is now written, before consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Washington, it provides that all private carriers may trip lease by one or a series of leases in the general direction of home base. To do that would, in many respects, as the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Delaware have pointed out, authorize certain private carriers to trip lease who have nothing whatsoever to do with agriculture, and never intend to have anything to do with agriculture; in effect to go into the trucking business, because they could trip lease to whomever they wished, and wherever they wished, as long as the movement is in the general direction of home, without being subject to ICC regulation.

Mr. FREAR. As private carriers?

Mr. SMATHERS. As private carriers.

Mr. FREAR. Without paying the transportation tax?

Mr. SMATHERS. They themselves would not pay the transportation tax, but I will say to the Senator from Delaware that when they trip lease, the man

to whom they lease must pay the transportation tax.

Mr. FREAR. Under all circumstances?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct; under all conditions.

Mr. FREAR. I noticed that the Senator from Washington was very explicit in his enumeration of the products covered by his amendment. He mentioned fish. I should like to inquire if oysters are included in that category.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Canned or fresh?

Mr. MAGNUSON. They would have to be fresh, or perishable.

Mr. FREAR. How about canned oysters?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Canned oysters would not be considered perishable. Canned goods are not touched by this amendment at all. The right to haul canned goods by private carrier or authorized carrier remains as it is. A private carrier may still trip lease, if it is for longer than a 30-day period, after transporting canned goods, in any amount.

Mr. FREAR. What advantage is the Senator's amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The advantage of my amendment is that a private carrier must haul agricultural products or processed agricultural perishable products, in order to trip lease back. My amendment would affect the so-called itinerant truckers who run around the country. If they are to run around the country under an agricultural exemption, I say to them, "Sometime during your trip you had better haul some agricultural products." I think that would help the farmer.

Mr. FREAR. In effect, the Senator's amendment would give greater discretion, or greater control to the Interstate Commerce Commission than would the bill as it stands.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. I think we are not proposing to give the Interstate Commerce Commission more control.

Mr. FREAR. But the Senator is proposing to place more vehicles under its control.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. What we are doing in one respect, definitely, is defining the exemption given to the haulers of agricultural products, which has been a source of confusion in many cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. There has not, in many instances, been a clear-cut definition of the term "agricultural products." We are defining that exemption once and for all. It will include, as far as private carriers are concerned, perishable processed agricultural products.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that there are 4 million private carriers. What the Senator from Washington is saying is, "We will not permit all those 4 million private carriers to trip lease. If they are going to be in that business, they should become common carriers and obtain certificates."

Out in the Midwest, butter and other processed products are no longer considered agricultural products. When meat has been cut up and the skin has been taken off it, and the carcass has been disjointed, the resulting product is no longer considered a straight agricultural product. Milk which has been pasteurized is no longer considered an agricultural product. Under those conditions, wholesalers and those engaged in the business of regularly carrying that type of processed agricultural product to the market in Chicago, Indianapolis, or elsewhere would be able, under the amendment of the Senator from Washington, to trip lease in order to get home, so that the cost of carrying the product to market would not be unduly increased. Unless they are regular carriers of processed or manufactured agricultural commodities, perishable in nature, they will not have the privilege of trip leasing.

Mr. FREAR. Under the present law, as I understand, they do not have the privilege of trip leasing, but must return empty. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The practice of trip leasing has been permitted to everybody on everything. During the war when there was a shortage of trucks, and to meet the transportation problem, the ICC permitted the practice to grow. The war is over. The common carriers come in and say, "We must get a certificate from you in Washington and spend weeks and a great deal of money in order to get it. Then you finally give us a certificate under which we are authorized to carry one product." For example, they could be certificated to carry nothing but monkey wrenches. After they get that certificate they say, "Why do you allow a private carrier, like Sears, Roebuck, to transport the one thing that you let us carry?"

The ICC, under its order, would stop all of it. That order would affect the farmers, as well. The farmers rose up in righteous indignation and said to us that you have to meet that farm problem. We thereupon began to work in trying to solve the whole problem. I might say that the ICC said to us, "If you people want to set a policy, we would like to have you go ahead and do it. Otherwise, we will have to stop all this trip leasing."

That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to keep the ICC from eliminating trip leasing, so far as farmers are concerned, so far as farm cooperatives are concerned, and so far as businesses which regularly carry agricultural commodities are concerned.

Then with the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], we are also going to permit trip leasing by a private carrier when the private carrier is regularly employed in carrying perishable processed or manufactured agricultural commodities. We are therefore setting up specific rules applicable to private carriers with respect to trip leasing.

Mr. FREAR. According to the statement just made by the Senator from Florida, if the bill were not enacted, the ICC would not permit any trip leasing, including the trip leasing of trucks carrying agricultural commodities. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. The ICC issued an order about 5 years ago that would not permit anyone to trip lease because the regulation required that leases of trucks must be for a period of 30 days or longer. That was an effective way of eliminating trip leasing, because no farm group wanted to trip lease its truck for 30 days or longer. They want to have that truck return home immediately.

The Senator from Washington, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and other Senators have been discussing the trip-lease regulations with the ICC. At our request the ICC has held up its order, MC–43, until Congress could set some guideposts and establish a policy on the subject.

Mr. FREAR. Is that the situation at the present time?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FREAR. The bill proposes to give definitions as to what is permissible under the trip-leasing practice. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. We would say who can do it and who cannot do it.

Mr. FREAR. According to the Senator from Washington, he is improvising on the bill by adding an amendment which will permit trip leasing on perishable canned products if it is the regular commodity carried by that truck. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. Under his amendment a truck could trip lease on the return trip. It would be able to carry anything it wants to carry as long as it was leased to an authorized carrier.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And if it goes in the general direction of the home base.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator for giving me a better understanding of the bill. I do wish to say to the Senator from Florida, who is also a member of the Committee on Finance that he is cognizant of the fact, I am sure, that there is a shortage in the till of the Federal Treasury, and that we would not help to reduce that shortage by permitting private carriers to escape the payment of the 3 percent transportation tax.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that the proposal of the Senator from Washington would probably do a great deal to make a private carrier either lease his truck legitimately to a certificated carrier or to move his goods himself. The result would be that there probably would be more tax money coming into the Treasury.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had a considerable amount of correspondence addressed to me by various organizations, individuals, and groups in my State on S. 898. I have also received correspondence from groups outside my State.

I wish to commend the Senator from Florida and the other members of the committee for the very clear record they have made today in support of S. 898. It is very interesting that the only correspondence I have had on the subject is

in favor of the bill, and that no correspondence has come to me in opposition to the bill. I have studied the correspondence and the committee report and the various briefs that have been filed in connection with S. 898, and I have come to the conclusion that it is legislation which is in the public interest. Therefore I shall vote for it this afternoon, including the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the correspondence that I have received on the subject, on the basis of which and the committee report I have formed my final conclusion to support the legislation.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUE LAKE PACKERS, INC.,
Salem, Oreg., March 5, 1956.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is our understanding that the trip-leasing bill S. 898, is scheduled to come before the Senate in the near future for debate and action. We urge your support of this bill in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, without further restrictive amendment, for we sincerely believe that it preserves the economical and efficient practice of long-standing of leasing trucks for return hauls for it further preserves the importance from the standpoint of agriculture for the right of private carriers to trip lease.

In these days of increasingly keen competition and the price squeeze on the products of the farm, the maintenance and utilization of every possible economy is increasingly necessary.

Thanks in advance for your support of this bill which we sincerely feel is necessary to the agricultural economy of the State of Oregon.

Very truly yours,

N. W. MERRILL,
Executive Vice President and General Manager.

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Interstate Commerce Commission has taken action in the past to discontinue the short-term leasing of independently owned trucks. Trip leasing, as you are well aware, is necessary for the agricultural exemption clause of the Interstate Commerce Act to have any meaning.

In the last session of Congress, H. R. 3203 was passed by the House of Representatives to prevent the ICC from nullifying trip leasing. A bill was introduced into the Senate, S. 898, to accomplish the same purpose as the House bill but did not reach the Senate floor prior to adjournment. Unless this bill is passed during the current session, the ICC has ruled that trip leasing of trucks by private carriers must cease on June 1, 1956.

The major purpose of the bill is to terminate the authority of the Commission to prohibit trip leasing or short-term leases of trucks. Trip leasing is the long-established practice whereby a hauler of farm products, having reached market, obtains a return haul by leasing his truck and his services to a common carrier.

Continuation of this practice is essential to efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. Unless trucks hauling farm products are permitted to obtain revenue on the return haul by trip leasing they must either (1) increase transportation rates for hauling farm products, or (2) go out of business because they cannot survive the competition of carriers that are permitted to obtain two-way revenue.

The existence of the independent truck operator, who can move from any farm shipping area to any market without back-hauling and transfer of lading, and who can be mobilized from surrounding areas to move seasonal commodities, is essential if farm products are to be marketed to best advantage.

Unless the right to trip-lease is maintained, the agricultural exemption of the Interstate Commerce Act becomes meaningless.

The enactment of S. 898 is supported by all agricultural interests and organizations.

We request your support for this legislation which is important to all agricultural producers in the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD K. BAUM,
Executive Secretary.

NORTHWEST NUT GROWERS,
Portland, Oreg., March 8, 1956.

Re trip-leasing bill, S. 898
Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: For many months we have been observing the progress and the pro and con arguments which have taken place in the Senate concerning the above-captioned bill. I know you are fully aware of the contents of this legislation, also the reasons for it. So there is no particular use for me to go over those things again.

Basically, of course, this bill is designed to preserve the efficient and economical practice of leasing trucks for return hauls. Since there are great numbers of private carrier trucks which transport agricultural products in processed form, it is most important from the standpoint of agriculture that the right of private carriers to trip-lease shall be preserved.

The form in which this bill has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the form in which we feel it should be passed without further restrictive amendments.

In light of the situation which is presently engulfing the farmers' economy, I feel this is one way in which Congress can help us partially solve our problems. The high cost of freight is ever becoming more serious. High freight cost from the Pacific Northwest to eastern markets is even more of a consideration than it is in some other parts of the country. There is scarcely any need to observe that the recently granted 6-percent increase to railroads by ICC was anything but welcome news to the farmers.

With these increases granted to the railroads, the truck people will be fully justified in asking for a similar adjustment and, of course, they will get it.

Thank you for your good attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. TRUNK,
General Manager.

YAKIMA, WASH., *March 12, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fruit industry urges you vote for S. 898. Continuation of trip-leasing privileges as therein authorized will help provide adequate supply agricultural exempt trucks whose flexibility of route and service enhances distribution our fruits. Without trip leasing we would face serious transportation shortage as outlined in my statement forwarded with my letter of June 13.

ERNEST FALK,
Northwest Horticultural Council.

HOOD RIVER TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
Hood River, Oreg., March 13, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are informed that finally the Senate bill 898 is up for vote before the Senate and we trust that you will vote favorably for the passage of this bill as indicated in our previous correspondence. We have advised you of our interest in this bill from time to time and the reasons why we are in favor of this bill. You also have indicated your intention to support our position if and when the bill did finally come to the Senate for a vote.

It is our understanding that the bill as approved by the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is the one that will come to the Senate for a vote and the bill as recommended by the committee is the one that the agricultural interests are in favor of. If, by chance, amendments are added to the bill that changes the intent and purpose of the bill as recommended by the committee, we would want to be informed of such action without delay.

As you realize, this bill has been before the Congress for 3 years and has had difficulty in being passed although the House did take favorable action on it a year ago, and, due to delaying tactics, it never came before the Senate for vote at the last session. However, it was progressed through committee to the point where it could be considered at this session.

Now that it has reached the Senate, we trust that you will continue to support the bill and there will be sufficient support in the Senate to pass the bill.

Yours very truly,

R. G. SCEARCE,
Secretary-Manager.

PENDLETON GRAIN GROWERS, INC.,
Pendleton, Oreg., March 12, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is our understanding that the so-called trip-leasing bill, Senate bill 898, should come before the Senate in the near future for debate and action.

This is an effective way for the farmers of the Nation to obtain some actual competition in transportation of farm products. We very definitely want to see the trip-leasing provision maintained for all types of carriers, particularly private carriers. Therefore, when this bill comes on the Senate floor, we hope that you will support it in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee without any further restrictive amendments being put onto the bill.

We certainly appreciate your interest in those problems which affect the interests of our farm people. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, JR.,
Manager.

OREGON FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Salem, Oreg., February 29, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, for the past several years, has been particularly interested in the continuation of the practice of trip leasing—or the short-term leases of trucks.

Oregon agriculture is particularly concerned about the problem because of the rapid growth of this practice in the last few years—especially as it relates to haulers taking Oregon farm products into the State of California, and then obtaining a return haul by being able to lease the truck to a common carrier.

The farmers of Oregon are depending upon a continuation of this practice in order that orderly marketing functions may be continued and competition be offered in the transportation field.

The independent operators perform a very valuable service to the farmers of Oregon. Many of them live in farming communities, and are willing to fit their operations to the special needs of the farmer. They are willing to load on farms, help load, and to put up with loading inconveniences. They are willing to move from farm to farm so as to most effectively reach all market outlets to the best advantage of the farmer. They are willing and able to provide an individual service on the farms, on the road, or at the marketplace.

We, therefore, view with concern any regulation which would make it more difficult for independent operators to continue this service to agriculture.

The Senate will undoubtedly consider S. 898 (trip-lease bill) which gives the ICC power to regulate the leasing practices of common and contract carriers. The bill also provides that the ICC shall not have the power to regulate the duration of such short-term lease where the motor vehicle has a previous history of hauling agricultural products.

On behalf of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation we respectfully urge your support of S. 898.

Yours truly,

GEORGE W. DEWEY,
Executive Secretary.

THOMAS C. DYER, INC.,
Spokane, Wash., March 15, 1956.

Re Senate bill 898.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As vice president and manager of Thomas C. Dyer, Inc., I am writing to you asking your support in favor of the pasage of Senate bill 898.

Our only source of revenue is the transportation of farm machinery from the points of manufacture to the farm machinery dealers in Oregon and surrounding States. As you can readily understand, our volume of traffic fluctuates greatly at different times of the year. It is not economical for us, a reasonably small operation, to own equipment to be able to meet these peak demands of the season for the service. It is essential that we lease trucks and trailers from both private individuals and other trucklines. Many times this leased equipment is available and/or needed for only one trip, particularly during emergencies.

The Interstate Commerce Commission proposes two leasing rules which would prevent the lease of equipment for a period of less than 30 days and would also prevent a payment of rental based upon the revenue derived from the use of the equipment. Both of these leasing rules would make it impossible for the haulers of farm machinery to operate on a sound, economic basis. Most of the drivers for Thomas C. Dyer, Inc., own their own equipment. Under present conditions it is possible for them to use their equipment for other purposes when it is not needed by this firm. The extreme peaks and valleys of the volume of traffic make imperative the lease of the equipment for whatever period is necessary and payment of rental based upon the revenue derived from the use of the equipment.

Senate bill 898 would curb the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe the length of the lease period and determine the manner of rental compensation.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has exempted carriers of automobiles from the subject of these rules, but has refused to give the farm machinery haulers the same consideration. There is absolutely no difference in the mode of operation and the need for exemption between the automobile carriers and the farm machinery carriers.

The carriers of farm machinery sincerely feel that they are being discriminated against, and for that reason they urgently desire the passage of Senate bill 898.

Yours very truly,

DAVID C. COOK.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are informed that the trip-leasing bill (S. 898) will be on the Senate floor for vote in the next few days. We urge you to vote for the bill as it was voted out by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We urge you to oppose any amendment to further restrict the practice of trip leasing such as to prohibit private truckers from trip leasing.

Trip leasing promotes efficiency and good service in trucking. This practice, therefore, is of vital concern to farmers. It permits the agricultural truckers and other truckers to get a return load by leasing the equipment and driver to common and contract carriers, instead of returning empty. We do not ask that exempt agricultural truckers and private truckers be allowed to secure a return load on their own account by direct negotiation with shippers, but we do request that they be permitted to continue the time-honored practice of leasing truck and driver to common and contract carriers for a load under the authorized carriers' schedule of rates and safety requirements.

In many cases it is more economical for common and contract carriers to trip lease a truck than to send their own truck. They, themselves, might not have a return load. At times, the common or contract carriers do not have enough equipment of their own, and, therefore, without the privilege of trip leasing they would not be able to meet all the transportation demands, or they would have to maintain an idle reserve of equipment in order to take care of peak periods. The trip-leasing practice, in effect, provides a fluid or mobile reserve of trucks and drivers to meet peak and unusual demands.

Since the day the Interstate Commerce Commission issued the order banning trip leasing the Commission has made many changes or exceptions in it. However, the amended order still prohibits private truckers, such as those firms processing agricultural products and operating their own fleet, from trip leasing their trucks to common and contract carriers to get a return load. For example: a meat packer in Chicago who sends his own meat products to Florida in his own refrigerated truck would, under the pending ICC trip-leasing order, be prohibited from trip leasing it to a common or contract carrier for a return load of frozen citrus concentrates. We in agriculture are concerned with the transportation charges all the way between farmers and consumers and not only between farmers and the nearest rail or truck shipping point. Senate bill 898, if passed, would preserve the time-honored practice of trip leasing.

The safety argument against trip leasing is largely irrelevant. In the first place, a common or contract carrier that leases a truck is as responsible for compliance with safety rules on this truck as he is on his own trucks. Secondly, the States have the primary responsibility for enforcement of safety. In the third place, there is evidence to indicate that trip-leased trucks are as safe as employee-operated, company-owned equipment, or even safer. That is why the examiner in the further hearing on trip leasing concluded that the record afforded no definite answer on the question of safety.

Again, we urge you to vote for Senate bill 898 without crippling amendments.

Respectfully yours,

LLOYD C. HALVORSON,
Economist.

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 22, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We respectfully and earnestly ask that you vote for the trip-leasing bill, Senate bill 898. Your support of the proposed legislation is urgently needed to assure farmers that in the transportation of agricultural commodities to market by truck facilities will be available at all times at reasonable costs. The long-established practice of trip leasing has made possible efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. It must be continued.

This week the Senate passed the farm bill. Honorable and sincere men differ on the benefits to agriculture to be obtained from its various provisions. The farm organizations have opposing positions. However, there is no disagreement whatever among the national agricultural groups regarding the benefits agriculture will derive from the provisions of Senate bill 898.

The National Milk Producers Federation has supported and continues its support of the proposed legislation.

Your favorable vote for Senate bill 898 as reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

E. M. NORTON,
Secretary.

VEGETABLE GROWERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
March 20, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As the representative of the Vegetable Growers Association of America, the only national organization of vegetable growers, who depend heavily upon truck transportation and particularly trip-leased vehicles, I strongly urge your support of Senate bill 898 as favorably reported by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The association adopted the following resolution at its 47th annual convention held here in Washington, December 1955:

"We urge the Congress to clarify its intent to the ICC to maintain previously granted highway exemptions of agricultural commodities."

This association is widely known for its policy of refusing the use of Government subsidies, which are a direct cost to the taxpayer. This policy reflects the traditional American right, the opportunity to produce and market their commodity as the law of supply and demand dictates. Therefore, this association believes it is not unreasonable to request your support of S. 898, which will not handicap their efforts or further reduce their already depressed income.

To deny the long-standing and satisfactory practice of trip leasing will only add to the cost of vegetables to consumers and reduce the return to the vegetable grower. It will

deny the consumer of fresh produce in many instances because of a lack of facilities to handle rapidly perishable vegetables. To firmly establish the practice of trip leasing will be an outstanding and appreciated contribution by the Congress to American agriculture and particularly the Nation's vegetable growers.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. SHELLY,
Secretary.

INTERNATIONAL APPLE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There is at present pending before your honorable body for consideration S. 898 which would, in effect, permit continuation of the long-established practice of trip-leasing trucks by restraining the Interstate Commerce Commission from regulating the duration of such leases.

The members of International Apple Association are vitally concerned in this matter, and urge your favorable consideration of this legislation when it is brought to a vote. This association has actively advocated passage of similar legislation when it was brought up in previous sessions of Congress, and has opposed the Interstate Commerce Commission's endeavors to impose a minimum lease of 30 days by regulations issued under MC–43, lease and interchange of motor vehicles.

While these regulations as presently proposed to be put into effect by Interstate Commerce Commission are purported to take care of trip leasing by exempt agricultural haulers, it is the belief of IAA members that only by legislative action can this be assured since the Commission has issued more than 75 orders in connection with these regulations since they were first issued on May 8, 1951. There is no reason to presume that they will not be further amended, especially if the threat of imminent legislative action is removed.

This is a very real problem in many producing areas, and one not to be shrugged off lightly. I earnestly urge your consideration of this matter and your favorable action on this bill, S. 898.

Sincerely yours,

FRED W. BURROWS,
Executive Vice President.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the next few days the Senate will consider S. 898, the trip-lease bill, by Senators SMATHERS and MONRONEY.

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends your support of this measure in the form reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Its enactment is, in our opinion, essential to continued efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products.

We are enclosing a copy of a statement in which we have endeavored to state concisely the purpose of the bill.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President.

S. 898, THE TRIP-LEASE BILL

This bill would provide specific statutory authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the truck leasing practices of contract and common carriers by motor vehicles; but would provide that the Commission shall not have authority to regulate the duration of any such lease where the motor vehicle leased is one previously used for the hauling of farm products.

The major purpose of the bill is to terminate the authority of the Commission to prohibit trip leasing or short-term leases of trucks. Trip leasing is the long established practice whereby a hauler of farm products, having reached market, obtains a return haul by leasing his truck and his services to a common carrier.

Continuation of this practice is essential to efficient marketing and economical transportation of farm products. Unless trucks hauling farm products are permitted to obtain revenue on the return haul by trip leasing they must either (1) increase transportation rates for hauling farm products, or (2) go out of business because they cannot survive the competition of carriers that are permitted to obtain two-way revenue.

The existence of the independent truck operator, who can move from any farm shipping area to any market without back-hauling and transfer of lading, and who can be mobilized from surrounding areas to move seasonal commodities, is essential if farm products are to be marketed to best advantage.

Unless the right to trip lease is maintained, the agricultural exemption of the Interstate Commerce Act becomes meaningless.

The enactment of S. 898 is supported by all agricultural interests and organizations.

HISTORY OF ISSUE

On May 8, 1951, ICC issued a ruling, MC–43, which provided that all truck leases must be for a period of at least 30 days—thus effectively terminating the practice of trip leasing.

A bill, H. R. 3203, was introduced in the 83d Congress, to prevent the Commission from taking such action. This bill was passed by an overwhelming voice vote in the House, but did not reach the Senate floor prior to adjournment.

During the process of congressional hearings of H. R. 3203 and S. 898, the Interstate Commerce Commission amended MC–43 on numerous occasions and in numerous respects. In its present amended form MC–43 contains much, but by no means all, of the provisions of S. 898. Many of the provisions of the amended MC–43 have been in effect for some time. Certain provisions thereof, including a prohibition against trip leasing of their trucks by private carriers, become effective June 1, 1956.

It is our conviction that the amendments to MC–43 that were made during congressional consideration of the bill, were the result of the legislative situation, were designed to head off legislation, and do not represent any change of viewpoint by the Commission.

Unless S. 898 is approved, the Commission will be free to re-amend its regulations in the future, to prohibit trip leasing. In view of the long history of ICC opposition to the agricultural exemption, and the Commission's expressed views with respect to the practice of trip leasing it is believed this would be the eventual outcome.

Trip leasing is of major significance to the efficient operation of truck common carriers—many of whom have supported the enactment of S. 898. Few companies can afford to own equipment adequate to handle peak loads and seasonal movements. It is uneconomic to maintain idle equipment for such contingencies. Even when a company is well supplied with equipment, it may not have equipment of the right kind, at the right place, at the right time, to meet all its needs. In order to efficiently service all their customers, common carirers must be able to dip into the transportation pool represented by exempt haulers to meet such needs.

From time to time the Congress appropriately concerns itself with the problem of maintaining small business as a healthy and dynamic part of our economy. With the exception of farmers and retail businesses there is no segment of our economy with a larger number of small businesses than the trucking industry. Curtailment of the practice of trip leasing would disastrously affect the welfare, and in many cases the continued existence, of these small businesses.

The enactment of S. 898 does not involve any change in the status of regulation of trucks as such regulations exist at this time. On the contrary, it would insure the maintenance of the status quo.

UNITED FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: S. 898 is an important agricultural bill. We understand it is to be taken up for consideration in the Senate following passage of the farm bill. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported favorably on S. 898.

The Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order, originally effective March 1 but postponed until July 1, which, in effect, would prevent haulers of agricultural products from leasing their trucks for return loads of nonagricultural freight. The order of the Commission, however, would permit such leasing for not less than 30 days, with certain ambiguous and complicated requirements. For all practical purposes, the net effect of the order would prohibit trip leasing, and substantially nullify the agricultural exemption in the Interstate Commerce Act which has been sustained and extended by the Congress on several occasions.

S. 898 would prohibit such regulation by the Commission except as to safety. A similar bill was passed in the House on June 24, 1953, and we have every reason to believe S. 898 would be approved promptly by the House.

S. 898 has been endorsed by the four national farm organizations, and numerous organizations interested in the marketing of agricultural and fishery products. It is very important to the marketing of highly perishable fresh fruits and vegetables.

We respectfully urge your favorable consideration of S. 898.

Sincerely,

C. W. KITCHEN,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1956.

Re S. 898 (trip-leasing bill).

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I respectfully urge your support of S. 898, referred to as the trip-leasing bill, in the form in which it has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The bill has been cleared by the majority policy committee to be taken up in the Senate following consideration of the resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to election of the President and the Vice President.

In the 3 years that this bill and similar legislation have been the subject of hearings and consideration by the Senate at the committee level, many irrelevant questions have been introduced by the opposition to confuse and distract attention from the main issue involved and the real purpose of the legislation.

The heart of the bill is that provision which would preserve the right by statute

of farmers, cooperative associations of farmers, private carriers, and other agricultural haulers to lease their trucks to authorized motor carriers for backhauls and for other short periods of time, rather than having to return empty in the direction of the areas where their trucks are usually based. The legislation was made necessary by the proposed imposition by the Interstate Commerce Commission of a 30-day minimum limitation on the length of time for which a truck might be leased and by the continuing threat that, unless a clear policy is established by statute, the Interstate Commerce Commission might at will reinstate such limitation, or an even more stringent one, as applied to trucks hauling agricultural commodities.

The leasing of trucks for return hauls or for short periods at the peak of harvest seasons not only promotes economy in the transportation charges for the movement of agricultural commodities from the farm to the consumer, but also results in efficient and full utilization of equipment and balanced operations for both the lessor and lessee motor carriers.

At a time when the main groups opposing this legislation are enjoying unprecedented prosperity, it is almost beyond belief that they—the management and some labor groups in the railroad and regulated trucking industry—would seek the elimination or curtailment of the trip-leasing practice that has proved its economic value to both producer and consumer in the more economical, efficient, and timely marketing of food products and other agricultural commodities through the years.

The bill would not effect any changes in present trip-leasing practices. It would only make certain by law that in the future the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not put into effect any regulation such as it has proposed which would further restrict the leasing of trucks than as provided in the bill.

In view of the current efforts of the Congress to help stabilize and improve the alarmingly low net income position of agriculture, we feel it is imperative that this bill be enacted promptly to preserve at least some measure of competitive economy in the transportation of agricultural commodities to offset partially the continuing climb in railroad and other regulated carrier rates.

Powerful forces, including the Interstate Commerce Commission, have been alined against a united agriculture on this issue and have succeeded in delaying final congressional action for 3 years. We earnestly urge you to weigh carefully the facts pertinent to the issue and I am confident that you will conclude that S. 898 is not only necessary from the standpoint of agriculture but is fully justified on the basis of the proper interests of all segments of our economy.

Sincerely yours,

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
Executive Vice President.

P. S.—Because of the paramount interest of our members throughout the country in this matter, as evidenced by several resolutions adopted by our delegate body, I have had our staff prepare a rather complete factual information concerning the issues involved in S. 898, trip-leasing bill. I am enclosing a copy with the thought that this more complete information, fully documented, may be of some value to you and your staff in anticipation of the early consideration of and action on the measure by the Senate.

FACTUAL INFORMATION CONCERNING THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN S. 898, TRIP-LEASING BILL

This bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 30, 1955, vests the Interstate Commerce Commission with specific affirmative authority to regulate the leasing of trucks by common and contract motor carriers, including the requirement that all leases must be in writing, but denies to the Commission authority to limit the length of time for which a truck may be leased from a farmer, a cooperative association, a private carrier, or anyone else following a movement of agricultural commodities in the truck.

The bill has as its primary purpose the preservation of the long-standing economical and efficient practice of trip-leasing whereby farmers, cooperative associations, private carriers, or other owner-operators of for-hire trucks engaged in hauling farm products, after a trip to market have leased their trucks, with drivers, to authorized carriers for a loaded movement back to home base or in the general direction of the area where the truck was based.

BACKGROUND TO THE BILL

The Interstate Commerce Commission on May 8, 1951, issued rules in Ex Parte No. MC–43 to govern the lease and interchange of vehicles by motor carriers. One of these rules prohibited the lease of any truck, with driver, for a period of less than 30 days. Such rule would have had the effect of completely outlawing the trip-leasing of trucks.

The matter was litigated to the Supreme Court of the United States which in a divided opinion on January 12, 1953, held that although there was no specific statutory provision in the Interstate Commerce Act to authorize such restrictive regulation, the Court was of the opinion that under its implied miscellaneous powers the ICC had the authority to issue such rule.

Promptly after the Supreme Court decision there were introduced in both the Senate and the House in the first session of the 83d Congress bills which would establish by statute that although the ICC can regulate leasing practices, it cannot limit the length of time for which a truck might be leased and thus outlaw the leasing of trucks for a single trip.

The House of Representatives overwhelmingly on a voice vote passed such bill on June 24, 1953, after extended public hearings before its Commerce Committee. Hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 (July 8 and 9) and before the full Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1954 (May 10, 11, June 7, 8, and 25) but the bill was not permitted to come to a vote before the Senate Commerce Committee before the adjournment of the 83d Congress.

Bills were again introduced in both the Senate and House at the beginning of the 84th Congress last year to preserve the trip-leasing practice. Further hearings were again held before the Surface Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on June 20, 21, 22, and 23, 1955, and in the closing days of the 1st session of this Congress, the bill was reported in a compromised form to the Senate.

During this long period while the legislation has been under congressional consideration, the ICC has on numerous occasions amended its rules and postponed the effective date of the 30-day rule, as amended. The 30-day rule is now scheduled to go into effect on July 1, 1956.

In view of the fact that the House of Representatives spent considerable time in hearings and approval of the trip-leasing legislation in 1953, only to have the bill die in the Senate Commerce Committee, the House is awaiting action by the Senate at this session before acting on the legislation again. Prompt action by the Senate is important to allow time for hearings and House action before the presently scheduled effective date of the restrictive rule on July 1, 1956.

IMPORTANCE TO AGRICULTURE

Elimination of the leasing of trucks for return hauls would mean that many agricultural haulers would be put out of business, thus denying their services to agriculture, and those that could continue to operate would have to increase their charges on the transportation of agricultural commodities if they had to make the return trips without a pay load.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized the adverse effect that its original 30-day rule would have on agriculture by amending its rule on at least 3 occasions since the legislation has been before Congress to lighten its impact on the marketing of farm products.

The only significant difference between the rule as now proposed by the Commission and the bill before the Senate (S. 898) is that the Commission rule would not permit private carriers to lease their trucks for return hauls to home base. It is tremendously important that this right be preserved so that the trucks of private carriers which transport canned goods, frozen concentrate, meat products, butter and other farm products in a form processed to an extent that the ICC does not regard them as "agricultural commodities," may trip lease their trucks as freely as the operators of trucks which haul the products of agriculture in raw state.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD ACT

Of the 11 members of the ICC today on the retirement of Commissioner J. Monroe Johnson, there is only 1 member who was on the Commission on May 8, 1951, when the 30-day rule was originally issued (Richard F. Mitchell). Since November 30, 1953, when the ICC made a change, which it termed a permanent amendment of the 30-day rule, to alleviate its adverse impact on agricultural hauling there have been 6 members (including Commissioner Johnson's prospective retirement), more than half, of the Commission to leave by retirement, resignation or expiration of their terms. The two members of the Commission, James K. Knudson and Hugh W. Cross, who were the principal spokesmen for the ICC in opposition to the trip-leasing bill in public hearings before congressional committees in 1953–54–55 are no longer members of the ICC.

The above facts definitely evidence the mutable character of the Commission and show how necessary it is for Congress to establish a definite policy on this matter by statute rather than leaving the policy for determination in accordance with the changing views of a Commission whose membership is continually changing.

PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS OF THE LEGISLATION

A partial list of those supporting and opposing S. 898, as reflected by the printed hearings before the Senate Surface Transportation Subcommittee last year is as follows:

For

American Farm Bureau Federation.
National Grange.
National Farmers Union.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Milk Producers Federation.
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.
International Apple Association.
National Fisheries Institute.
Vegetable Growers Association of America.
Growers and Shippers League of Florida.
Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association.
California Grape and Tree Fruit League.
Northwest Horticultural Council.
Dairy Industry Committee.

National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture.
Private Carrier Conference of ATA.
Private Truck Council of America, Inc.
American Association of Nurserymen.
National Live Stock Producers Association.
American National Cattlemen's Association.
National Wool Growers Association.
Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.
Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California.
National Potato Council.
Hood River Traffic Association (Oregon).
Dixie Central Produce Co., Inc. (South Carolina).
Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission.
National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc.
Atlanta Freight Bureau.
Atlanta Paper Co.
United States Department of Agriculture.
General Services Administration.
United States Department of Interior.

Against

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union of America.
Association of American Railroads and American Short Line Railroad Association.
Regular Common Carriers Conference of ATA.
Contract Carrier Conference of ATA.
American Federation of Labor.
Associated Transport, Inc.
Washington Motor Transport Association.
Group of Florida Certificated Motor-Transport Carriers.
Helm's New York-Pittsburgh Motor Express, Inc.
Shirks Motor Express (Pennsylvania).
Western States Meat Packers Association Inc.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
United States Department of Commerce.
Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC CONDITION OF AGRICULTURE AND THE PRINCIPAL GROUPS OPPOSING THIS BILL

Exclusive of the Interstate Commerce Commission, an agency of the Government, the main groups which have sought to eliminate the trip leasing of trucks and which have opposed the trip-leasing bill are the railroads; some, although not all, of the larger common and contract motor carriers; and the teamsters union. The gist of their arguments has been that the leasing of trucks for return hauls or other short periods from agricultural haulers and private carriers has tended to undermine the rate structure and adversely affect the financial health of the regulated transportation industry. Thus, the clear issue presented in this bill is an economic one, an alleged conflict in interest between the above groups on the one hand and the farmer on the other. It should be remembered that through the years since the Motor Carrier Act was passed in 1935 right up to the present time there has not been in effect by statute or regulation any limitation on the length of time for which a truck may be leased or any prohibition against trip leasing.

Let's look at the record of the comparative financial health and progress of these groups opposing the trip-leasing bill compared to agriculture.

CLASS I RAILROADS

The net railway operating income, after Federal income taxes, of the class I railroads of the United States for 1955 was $1,128 million, compared with $874 million for 1954, an increase of 29.1 percent for 1955 over 1954. The net railway operating income for 1955 was the highest for any year in the 11-year period 1945–1955, and represented a 32.4 percent increase over 1945. The net railway operating income, after Federal income taxes, for the past 5 years is as follows:

Year:	*Millions*
1951	$943
1952	1,078
1953	1,109
1954	874
1955	1,128

(Above data from Transport Economics, February 1956, p. 1, monthly publication of the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, ICC.)

The large intercity motor carriers of property for the first 9 months of 1955 had net income after income taxes of $57,678,944, compared with $37,040,734 for the comparable period in 1954, an increase of 55.7 percent. Furthermore, this net income after income taxes for the first 9 minths of 1955 for the large intercity motor carriers of property, amounting to $57,678,944 was substantially in excess of the $51,543,832 of net income after income taxes reported by the class I intercity motor carriers for the whole year of 1954 (foregoing data on motor carrier net income from reports Q-800 and Transport Economics, January 1956, published by Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics, ICC). Even with this bright 1955 picture, some motor carriers have already in 1956 put into effect higher rates with the acquiescence of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TEAMSTERS UNION

The average wage per employee in all trucking and warehousing is believed to be the most accurate available index to how the members of the Teamsters Union are faring in our economy.

The average wage per employee for all trucking and warehousing employees was at the highest figure for the past 11 years in 1954 at $4,884. Although the 1955 figure is not yet available and will not be compiled until later in the year, on the basis of known increases consummated in 1955, it is estimated by those in a position to know, that the average wage for 1955 will probably show as much as a 5 percent increase in 1955 over 1954. The 1954 average wage of $4,884 for trucking and warehousing employees was 30.7 percent higher than the average wage per employee for all private industry in 1954 at $3,734. The uninterrupted climb of wages in the trucking industry, reflecting the financial progress and stability of the regulated trucking industry, is disclosed by the following data on page 17 of American Trucking Trends (1955), an annual publication of the American Trucking Associations, Inc.:

Average wage per employee, all trucking and warehousing 1944–1954

1944	$2,374
1945	2,545
1946	2,752
1947	3,063
1948	3,355
1949	3,545
1950	3,811
1951	4,069
1952	4,377
1953	4,730
1954	4,884

It is also significant to note from American Trucking Trends (1955) at page 16 that in 1953 truck wages were 53 percent of the total truck revenues of the class I intercity common carriers of general freight, the highest percentage in the 10-year period since 1944.

AGRICULTURE

The conditions in agriculture present a striking contrast to the unprecedented prosperity presently enjoyed by the railroad and trucking industries. A few indexes of the contrasting picture will suffice.

The parity ratio which shows the relationship between the index of the prices received by farmers and the prices paid by farmers was in January 1956 at 80, the lowest point for any year since 1939, when it was 77. At 107 in 1951, it has moved downward continuously, as follows:

Parity ratio

1951	107
1952	100
1953	92
1954	89
1955	84
1956 (January)	80

The steady decline in the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar since 1951, reflecting the increase in handling costs of which transportation charges are a major item in excess of 10 percent, is reflected in the following data from the Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture:

Farmer's share (percent)

1951	48
1952	47
1953	45
1954	43
1955 (preliminary estimate)	41

The farmer's share of the consumer's retail food dollar was 53 percent in 1945.

The continued decline in the farmer's economic condition since 1951 is also reflected by the following data on income of farm operators from Economic Indicators by Council of Economic Advisers, January 1956, page 7:

[In billions of dollars]

	Realized gross farm income	Net income
1951	37.1	14.8
1952	36.9	14.1
1953	35.2	13.4
1954	34.0	11.8
1955 (3d quarter annual rate)	32.1	10.0

The Economic Report of the President, January 1956 (table D–16, p. 181) reflects that the per capita income from all sources of the farm population for the same years was as follows:

1951	$977
1952	949
1953	918
1954	913
1955	856

The above report of the President, in table D–24, also reflected some very significant wage data, as follows:

Average gross hourly earnings in selected industries, 1955

Manufacturing	$1.88
Bituminous coal mining	2.55
Building construction	2.66
Class I railroads	1.95
Telephone	1.82
Wholesale trade	1.91
Retail trade	1.50
Laundries	1.01
Agriculture	.675

CONCLUSION

Reasonable conclusions to be drawn from the above documented data are that:

1. The leasing of trucks to authorized carriers for return trips or other short periods of time, less than 30 days, which has been practiced through the years and is being practiced at present, has not undermined the rate levels of the regulated carriers nor brought about financial instability to the transportation industry.

2. Agriculture is the No. 1 economic problem of the Nation today and any undue restrictions on the leasing of trucks engaged wholly or in part in marketing agricultural commodities will add to transportation costs

which must largely be borne by farmers and will be reflected in further decreases in their net income. S. 898 is designed to prevent administrative action by the Interstate Commerce Commission with such results to frustrate and partly nullify the other efforts now being made by Congress to stabilize and improve conditions in agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be complete, I wish to make very brief comment on the pending legislation. Similar legislation, or legislation dealing with the same subject matter, has been before Congress for a number of years.

In the 81st Congress it was my privilege, along with the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] to hold hearings on surface transportation.

The problems of the exemption field and the irregular carrier and the exempt carrier and the private carrier and the so-called gypsy carrier came before us in a rather acute form.

From that time to this we have been dealing in committee with that problem and with the need of getting a satisfactory answer to what would be a very serious problem if it were considered wholly from the standpoint of one transportation system.

In the last 30 or 40 years, we have moved from what was essentially a monopoly system of transportation to a system that is highly competitive at the present time. That highly competitive condition has brought about the problems with which we are dealing today. As the result of those problems and because of the effort of the Interstate Commerce Commission to solve them by the issuance of its order, whose suspension has been brought about from time to time, as the Senator from Florida has stated, we are today faced with the necessity of Congress having to define the various areas of truck transportation in this country.

The committee has done an excellent job, and I wish to commend the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Florida, who is the chairman of the subcommittee.

The pending bill is not satisfactory, of course, to any 1 form of transportation or to any 1 segment of our transportation industry. I do not know that it is entirely satisfactory to the agricultural interests.

However, in my judgment, it is the most satisfactory bill we can work out as among the various competitive factors in our transportation system. I believe its enactment will be in the interest of agriculture and in the interest of the transportation system generally, and tend to the orderly development of our transportation system among common carriers, private carriers, farm carriers, and so-called irregular carriers in many of the States of the Union.

I merely wished to add my word of commendation to those of other members of the committee who worked hard on the bill. I hope we may be able to pass it this afternoon and finally provide a definite congressional solution of what has proved to be such a complex problem to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I, too, as a member of the committee, wish to endorse the outstanding work that has been done by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], in connection with this matter, as well as the very constructive approach that was taken by all of my colleagues on the committee. I wish to join in urging support for and passage of the measure.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the junior Senator from Maine has given thorough study to S. 898, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by the motor carriers. Although I was not a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, I carefully reviewed the testimony given at those hearings, and when the bill was before the full committee I voted to report it to the Senate with the recommendation that it be passed.

Despite the fact that the problem of trip-leasing has been before both the 83d Congress and the 84th Congress, and that during both Congresses extensive hearings were held on the subject, there still seems to be considerable confusion as to just what is the purpose of the bill. As a member of the Senate committee which studied the bill, and a Senator from a State that is much concerned with the problem involved, it is my hope that, without going too much into detail, I can resolve the surrounding cloudiness and clearly present the real question. If this can be done I believe there is very little question as to what action the Senate should take on S. 898.

As my distinguished colleagues all know, the trip-leasing problem is one of long standing. It has been under active consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission for at least 7 years. During this period the Commission has issued regulations covering trip-leasing, established an effective date for the regulation, modified the regulations, and postponed the effective date repeatedly. It is my understanding that the latest Commission action has been to further postpone the effective date until July 1, 1956. The changes and postponements occurred with direct correlation to congressional activity and information developed by Congress on the subject.

At this point it might be well to state in general terms what trip-leasing is. When Congress adopted the Interstate Commerce Act providing for regulation of motor carriers, it partially exempted certain carriers from regulation. Basically these exempt carriers were private carriers and carriers of agricultural commodities, including livestock and fish. These carriers are not exempt from safety requirements regulations. Generally trip-leasing is the practice of the leasing of an exempt carrier by a regulated carrier for a single one-way or round trip. It is obvious that under many different circumstances such an arrangement is desirable to all parties concerned. As a result the practice has been in effect since the enactment of the Interstate Commerce Act. Over the years abuses crept into the system.

It was the abuses that caused the Interstate Commerce Commission to first look into the matter. As a result of its investigation the Commission proposed a regulation which would prohibit trip-leases for less than 30 days duration. The effective result of this regulation would be to abolish trip-leasing altogether. At this point it should be noted that no trip-leasing regulations have ever been put into effect by the Commission.

The heart of the problem as it comes before the Senate today centers on the purpose of Congress in exempting certain motor carriers when it adopted the Interstate Commerce Act. That purpose was to provide a highly flexible system of transportation for agricultural and fishery products to allow rapid and efficient distribution of such products to the markets. The need for having a flexible system of transportation for these products is obvious, and it is equally obvious that that need is as great today as when the act was originally put into effect.

What is the effect of trip-leasing on these exempt carriers and what would be the effect of prohibiting trip-leasing are the real issues at stake. Clearly the transportation of agricultural or fishery products from their point of origin to a market is a one-way operation. By trip-leasing his vehicle to a regulated carrier the operator can haul a payload on his return trip and thus help meet the cost of the trip. Obviously if this arrangement were prohibited so that the carrier had to return home empty it would increase the cost of transportation of agricultural or fishery products and thus would increase the cost to the consumer of such products.

The imposition of a requirement that trip-leases must be for 30 days duration or more would destroy the flexibility of the system that Congress was trying to protect. After this was demonstrated at congressional hearings the Interstate Commerce Commission amended its proposed regulations to exclude agricultural carriers. The proposed regulation would, however, prohibit trip-leasing by private carriers. These private carriers are an essential part of the agricultural transportation system since many producers of such goods do not operate their own vehicles, and the private carriers fill a very definite requirement.

As the trip-leasing legislation was originally proposed in the 83d Congress it would have specifically provided that the Interstate Commerce Commission could not regulate the duration of any trip-lease. At the hearings on S. 898 it became evident that with regard to the nonagricultural aspects of the problem there might be abuses which it would be desirable to control.

S. 898 as reported to the Senate by the committee will clearly establish the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate trip-leasing except with regard to the duration of leases of carriers of agricultural and fishery products. Basically the bill would allow such carriers to trip-lease home after hauling exempt commodities, but would give the Commission authority to restrict general trip-leasing.

As a general proposition the bill would put into law the present provisions of the Commission's proposed regulations. Because of the indefinite history of the proposed regulations it is considered desirable that Congress should clearly establish its policy in this important matter. The principal objection to the bill has come from the railroads and some of the large motor carriers and is to the effect that trip-leasing is detrimental to their operations. The record of the past 10 years clearly shows that the income of these carriers has been steadily rising even though the practice of trip-leasing has been flourishing. The bill as it now stands will protect the legitimate operations

of the exempt carriers, but leave the Interstate Commerce Commission free to otherwise regulate the carriage of goods on the highways.

For these reasons the junior Senator from Maine strongly urges the passage of S. 898.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington one question for the RECORD. The Senator's amendment refers to "transportation of processed or manufactured perishable commodities or products." That means, does it not, that the citrus concentrate pecple of Florida, Texas, and California, as private carriers, would be able to carry their citrus concentrate and single-strength orange juice to the market and then trip-lease in the general direction home?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I was discussing the matter with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We do not want to leave out apples, of course. We have a great deal in common, although we live far apart geographically. It would include apples. That is the intent. I hope the ICC will follow out that congressional intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, essentially, the trip-leasing bill is a farm bill. The whole motive behind it is to try to help the farmer, and I think in many ways that is what has been done.

As has been pointed out in the debate, trip-leasing at present is a practice which is recognized and accepted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A private carrier or a farmer, or anyone else, at this moment can trip-lease his truck. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission indicated about 5 years ago that it would not permit the practice of trip-leasing to continue, and it issued order MC-43, which provided that as of a certain date trip-leasing would not be permitted unless the person who trip-leased his truck to a particular carrier did so for a period of 30 days or more.

It was obvious from the order that it was the intention of the Interstate Commerce Commission to do away with trip-leasing. If it had been done away with, it would have cost the farmer a large sum of money. If a farmer in South Carolina wants to send his peaches to market in Chicago or New York, under the agricultural exemption he can carry the peaches to Chicago or New York in his own truck, and is able to sell his produce at a reasonable price.

Recently, the farmer has been able to trip-lease his truck on the return journey. In other words, he may take his truck to a large trucking concern, which has a certificate to carry certain manufactured goods, and say, "I want to trip-lease my truck to you for one trip to South Carolina." In that way, his truck returns loaded, and he makes a little money on the transaction. This means that the expense of moving his peaches from South Carolina to Chicago or New York is less than what it would have been if the practice of trip-leasing were not permitted.

So when the Interstate Commerce Commission indicated it planned to do away with the old practice of trip-leasing, Congress had to do something in order to establish by law the right of the farmer to trip-lease his vehicles. The committee began to consider over a long space of time the different bills which were presented. As a matter of fact, the committee has been trying to solve this particular problem for 3 years. We realized that it was desirable to let the farmer carry to market whatever he might grow, and to give him the right to trip-lease his truck back. That is a provision which is now written into the bill, and we hope it will now become law. That provision is not in the law at this point.

The bill also permits the farmers' cooperatives, which buy trucks and regularly haul to market the produce from the area in which the cooperatives are located, to trip-lease their trucks so that they may return loaded with manufactured goods to the area from which they started, thereby reducing the cost of shipping the original farm produce to the markets.

The bill also makes it possible for the regular haulers—those who are engaged in the business of hauling agricultural products—not the farmers themselves—to trip-lease their trucks. Not only are they given the right to trip-lease their trucks back home, but also they are given the right to trip-lease them once in any direction before starting home.

The reason for that provision is to enable the regular agricultural haulers to move from one harvest area to another. When the citrus crop in Florida becomes ripe at a certain time of the year, the citrus is hauled away to the markets of the North. About that time, as the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who is at present the Presiding Officer, knows, the peaches in South Carolina begin to ripen, and the agricultural haulers begin to transfer their operations from the Florida area to the areas of Georgia and South Carolina.

After the agricultural commodities of South Carolina and Georgia have been hauled to the markets, the harvesting of crops begins in Texas and California.

So the agricultural haulers have been given the right to trip-lease in any direction. They may go from South Carolina all the way to California while carrying nonagricultural commodities, so that they can get to the new harvest areas and help the farmers in those areas move their produce to the markets. So that provision is now in the bill.

A question on which there was disagreement this afternoon was with respect to the private carrier, who is not in the business of hauling agricultural commodities at all—that is, the big manufacturer, a steel company, let us say, who has a great fleet of trucks and is sending steel to all parts of the country. The farmers originally wanted that kind of private carrier to have the right to trip-lease, even though he had nothing to do with agriculture.

It seemed to us, and it certainly seemed to me, as chairman of the committee, that the fact that the farmer wanted such a provision did not necessarily make it desirable. We felt we had protected the farmer in every way, because what the farmer sought and what the various farm groups wanted with respect to private carriers in many ways had nothing to do with agriculture. If the steel company wanted to ship some steel ties from Pittsburgh to Chicago and thereafter to bring back furniture, that would not be of benefit to the farmers.

So the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington was designed to relate the trip-lease of a private carrier to agricultural products and, therefore, to make it possible for the legitimate agricultural producer to have the benefit of the private carrier. That was the purpose of his amendment.

I said I could not oppose it because it seemed only proper and right to me that farmers should utilize the private carriers, but that only carriers of products processed from the basic agricultural commodities should be permitted to trip-lease.

Farm groups were opposed to that provision in some respects, but I could not go along with them. I believe in the system of regulated transportation.

When Mr. A, who lives in Dallas, Tex., buys a great number of trucks, goes before the ICC, spends money to obtain a certificate which permits him to haul manufactured commodities from Dallas, Tex., to California, submits his rates to the ICC to get approval of them, and pays both a Federal and a State tax on the weight of his truck plus other taxes, I do not believe Congress should destroy his certificate and permit private carriers to go into the same business without any regulation whatsoever.

So it seemed to me the amendment offered by the able Senator from Washington was a fair amendment, and I was happy to vote for it and support it.

As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] stated earlier, I think we now have a bill which, in my judgment, is the best bill we will be able to get. The truckers are not completely satisfied with it. The railroads are not completely satisfied with it. The farm people are not completely satisfied with it. But it is the nearest bill we can arrive at upon which all the interests concerned can give some semblance of agreement. We have obtained the greatest degree of agreement it is possible to reach on a particular bill.

I think the bill will be of great assistance to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know it will be of great benefit to the farmers, because the bill writes into the law for the first time the specific agricultural exemptions which he enjoys.

Trip-leasing will not work unless it has the cooperation of all groups, farmers, private carriers, railroads and common carriers alike. The ICC does not have sufficient manpower to enforce all of the regulations. It is already tremendously understaffed. For these reasons, it is important that we have a bill on which

all interests primarily concerned could agree. To do this we all had to give and take a little. As a result we feel that we worked out a satisfactory compromise. Though it does not satisfy everybody completely, it is a measure under which all can work together. I sincerely hope that the Senate will overwhelmingly adopt S. 898 as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. Is it contemplated that the Senate will now proceed to take up Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Oregon is as much interested in the bill as I am, and it is my understanding that the majority leader, the Senator from Texas, wishes to have it go over until tomorrow. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion a moment?

Mr. SMATHERS. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other day I made a speech on the access roads problem wherein I pointed out that the forward-looking lumber interests of my State and of the country have come to recognize the soundness of an access-road program, both from the standpoint of a conservation program and from the standpoint of a sound lumber management economy.

I know of no better proof and documentation of the position I took the other day than is furnished in a very able article which appears in Crow's Pacific Coast Lumber Digest for March 15, 1956, with which I am very glad to associate myself, and should like to make a part of my speech this afternoon.

The article reads as follows:

LOGGERS CONVENE—RISING ROAD COSTS PROBED

One of the major topics at the Willamette Valley logging conference in Eugene March 1–3 was logging roads. Costs are going up. One reason: lack of experienced logging engineers.

The log comes first, then lumber. But before there can be logs there must be roads to reach the timber. If roads cost more than they should, the added expense is passed all along the line. It's included in the final price paid for lumber by the retail yard. If extra costs aren't passed along, someone loses money or goes out of business.

Naturally, these problems are vitally important to the logger. They're also important to the wholesaler or retailer who wonders why lumber prices keep going up.

Mr. President, when I was discussing the access-road problem the other day and pointing out what the attitude of many lumber companies in my State was, I was presenting accurate information as to the attitude of lumber leaders of my State.

The article goes on to say:

GROWING MORE ACUTE

One of the many reasons was highlighted at the Willamette Valley Logging Conference March 1–3 in Eugene, Oreg. It's the shortage of engineers; logging engineers, road-building engineers, forest engineers. There aren't enough to go around, for industry or for the Forest Service. The situation is growing more acute all the time.

Speakers at the conference showed how this scarcity is contributing to higher road-building and logging costs. The shortage refrain ran all through a panel discussion on logging roads, for which the moderator was Starr Reed of the Albany division of M & M Wood Working Co. Panel members were: Aaron Mercer, logging engineer for the Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Dallas; J. Wesley Webb, Webb Construction Co., Salem; Ralph De Moisy, general manager, Mapleton division, U. S. Plywood Corp.; C. E. Remington, assistant regional engineer, United States Forest Service, Portland.

An important part of the problem of added road-building costs was laid at the door of the Forest Service, but it was a give-and-take affair, and Remington parried most of the criticisms with dexterity.

Loggers frequently contend that Forest Service road-building standards are too high. These basic policies Remington defended, but there were other complaints. For instance, Mercer said figures allowed for rock in Forest Service appraisals are often too low—even below cost. Moderator Reed said that if a rigid time schedule is enforced on road-building, despite bad weather, costs are boosted. He suggested more flexibility in interpreting the rules. A speaker from the floor asserted that inexperienced locators can make poor selections of pit sites and thus create added rock-hauling costs. Sometimes larger rock than necessary has to be used, or a crusher has to be employed when this could be avoided with better planning.

Questions of interpretation arise when part of a Forest Service road has been completed and a logger has to use it before the rest of the road has been finished. There have been cases in which Forest Service representatives have required that more rock be put on this used section of road later, an added expense to the roadbuilder which properly should be charged to maintenance.

Remington answered this one by saying it is the policy of the Forest Service to accept a road by sections and pay the contractor accordingly. Repairs on accepted roads after use by loggers are regarded as maintenance and not as a charge against the contractor, he explained. But other speakers indicated there have been difficulties about drawing the line between construction and maintenance. Interpretations are often made by personnel on the job and loggers or contractors are reluctant to go over their heads.

LOCATORS NEEDED

Not all but much of the trouble can be traced to the lack of experienced engineers or other technical employees. On this point Remington said:

"Fellows who graduate as logging engineers don't often go to work for the Forest Service because of the lower pay scale. We need 75 locators in region 6 and we have only a fraction of that number. We recently trained 29 locators, but because of the pay scale we doubt that we'll be able to keep them all on the job."

One of the points stressed by industry and Government witnesses alike at last fall's congressional timber hearings was the need for larger appropriations for Federal timber-managing agencies in order to do an efficient job.

The Senate will recall that when I made my speech on the access road problem the other day I discussed the timber hearings of last fall, and pointed out that this personnel problem was raised. There was general agreement at those hearings not only on the need for access roads but also on the need for larger appropriations for Federal timber-managing agencies for the hiring of expert help so that they could do a more efficient job. That was particularly pointed out in the hearings when we dealt with the problem of coming nearer to the allowable cut in the Federal forests.

The hearings brought out that some of the Federal forests were falling 50 percent short of the allowable cut because they did not have enough help in the Forest Service to process sales. That is not a sound conservation policy. If we let a large stand of timber overripen, let it become diseased, let it become windblown, and do not go in and get that timber out of the woods quickly, we are bound to waste thousands and thousands of dollars of potential Federal revenue.

As this article points out, there is great need for increased appropriations for forestry personnel, so that an efficient management job can be done in handling the people's forests. This would be sound economy.

It is false economy to fail to appropriate the necessary money for access roads and for the Forest Service personnel which is needed for an efficient management of Federal timber. The article points out:

But even if more money is available, where will the skilled men come from? Every other industry is competing for engineers today, offering attractive salaries and training programs to lure graduates.

L. L. Stewart, president of the Bohemia Lumber Co., touched on this subject in addressing the loggers. Stewart is a logging engineer himself, and a Lane County representative in the Oregon legislature. Speaking of the shortage of trained foresters, he said: "We should aggressively work to induce high school boys to go into forestry. As time goes on, more and more foresters will be needed in management jobs."

The same statement probably could be applied to all types of professionally trained men needed by the logging and lumber industries, and by Government. There appears to be no quick and easy answer, and that means keener and keener competition for the available supply of engineers.

Since making my speech the other day, I have heard from lumber operators in my State who support the position I have taken on the need for additional appropriations for access roads and additional appropriations for personnel in the Forest Service agencies of the Government.

I shall continue throughout this session of Congress to discuss this matter frequently on the floor of the Senate, because I want to point out that the policy which Congress is following, appropriation-wise, in respect to the management of the forests belonging to all the people of the country, is costing the taxpayers of the Nation millions of dollars in waste each year. It is waste that, in my judgment, cannot be justified. It is a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy. I think someone must be willing to stand on the floor of the Senate and, by repetition, drum away on the point, until finally we catch the attention and the consideration of the Senate, because I think the taxpayers of the country are entitled to the savings which I am urging.

Before I close on this subject, I shall have to suggest the absence of a quorum, because the reporters, apparently, have taken from my desk some other material I need to use in my remarks. During the quorum call, I shall try to get the material back from the reporters.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the second part of my speech on this forest problem this afternoon and comment briefly on some of the very important facts set out in the annual report of the Pacific Northwest region of the United States Forest Service. In particular, I should like to call attention to the financial record being made by these 18 national forests in Oregon and Washington.

In fiscal year 1955 their receipts were $39,857,525 and their deposit in the Treasury, before taxes, or gross profit before taxes, was $29,680,135. These forests made "in lieu" payments to counties of approximately $9,682,194, and their net profit to the Treasury was $20,005,941. I do not think that the national forests in any other region can match this record.

On a nationwide basis, the national forests showed a gross profit of $7,692,249 before payments to counties were made, but after paying this amount they had a deficit of $13,210,603.

In the Pacific Northwest our national forests returned to the Treasury two dollars for every dollar spent.

When we come in and request that more access roads be built, that the recreational facilities on the forest be increased, that the inventories be brought up to date so that the full allowable cut can be harvested, we in the Northwest do this with the full understanding that our national forests are capable of producing substantial revenues for the Treasury, do make substantial contributions to local government, and can provide economic and social benefits not only to our region but to the Nation.

I wish to make it very clear to my colleagues in the Senate from other parts of the United States where there are national forests that the return to the Treasury of the United States would be much higher if we had more access roads into those forests. Also the return to the Treasury would be much greater if we appropriated the needed funds for the personnel for a more efficient management of the forests. If, for example, we had adequate personnel it would be possible for the management of Federal forests to cut up to the allowable cut and that would mean profits for the taxpayers of the country.

So, as I said a few moments ago, when I make the fight for more appropriations for access roads and forest personnel, I am making a fight to save the taxpayers of this country a great amount of money, because these forests will more than pay their way. They will pay a large profit to the people of the United States, if we provide the Federal Government forest agencies with appropriations so the forests can be efficiently managed.

I think the annual report of the Pacific Northwest Region of the United States Forest Service amply documents and supports the contentions I have just made. I am offering it for the record this afternoon, and I call attention to the relatively low level of investment in access roads and to the critical shortage of housing for timber sale personnel on the national forests.

I ask unanimous consent that the annual report of the Pacific Northwest Region of the United States Forest Service be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my speech.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL REPORT, FOREST SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION, 1955

INTRODUCTION

The Nation's national forest system is divided into 10 administrative regions. The Pacific Northwest region is composed of 18 national forests in Oregon and Washington. These forests contain a net of 23.5 million acres within their boundaries. They are blessed with rare combinations of scenic beauty; provide important water for power, industrial, and domestic use; provide forage for large numbers of wildlife and domestic livestock; and since about 37 percent of the commercial timberland acreage in Oregon and Washington is within their borders, it is not surprising that this region is the greatest of all national forest regions in the production of timber. Following is a brief summary of major work accomplishments and activities during 1955.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Timber sales

A new record was set in calendar year 1955. Timber sold amounted to 2,860,450 thousand board-feet, compared with 2,404,300 thousand board-feet for 1954. A total of 2,729,885 thousand board-feet was cut for which $44,582,518 was paid, or an average of $16.33 per thousand board-feet. In 1954 the cut amounted to 2,585,792 thousand board-feet with a value of $34,787,611. The 1955 cut was 94.5 percent of the allowable annual cut, according to present timber inventories. About one-quarter billion board-feet consisted of salvage of dead or dying timber.

Planting and stand improvement

A total of 10,276,000 seedlings and transplants were produced in Forest Service nurseries at Wind River, Wash., and Bend, Oreg., for field planting throughout the region.

A total of 18,734 acres were reforested by planting and 2,703 acres by seeding. Of this work, 20,159 acres were financed with cooperative sale-area-betterment funds and the remaining 1,278 acres with regular appropriated funds.

Total area successfully reforested by planting and seeding in the region to date is 175,414 acres.

In addition to thinnings of timber stands through commercial sale procedure on several national forests, improvement work was completed on 39,309 acres of young forests. This consisted of 5,523 acres of stand release and thinning and 33,786 acres of pruning. All of this work was financed with cooperative sale-area-betterment funds.

Spruce budworm project

To protect against Spruce budworm killing, 620,950 acres of Douglas-fir and white fir forests were aerially sprayed in 1955 in cooperation with the State of Oregon and private forest owners. Sprayed areas were mostly on the Ochoco, Malheur, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests. This brings the total treated area for the period of 1949–55 to 3,840,000 acres. Cost of treatment has been about $1 per acre. Results have been excellent. Spruce budworm damage has been reduced to the point where no control activities will be necessary during 1956.

Blister rust control project

We treated 6,162 acres of sugar pine and white pine forests on the Rogue River and Umpqua National Forests to prevent damage from blister rust. In addition, the Forest Service provided technical direction and coordination to blister rust control work done in Oregon and Washington by the Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service. The Bureau of Land Management treated about 26,000 acres, mainly on and adjacent to the Siskiyou National Forest, and the Park Service completed work on 639 acres at Mount Rainier and Crater Lake National Parks.

Road rights-of-way

Considerable progress was made in obtaining road rights-of-way to permit the construction of timber access roads. During the year action was taken on 128 right-of-way cases. Types of cases, and accomplishment, are listed in the following table:

	Number completed	Number pending
Easements across private land	70	20
Easements across mining claims	6	2
Road-use agreements	6	4
Cooperative construction agreements	2	5
Rights-of-way across public domain	7	0
Stipulations across national-forest land	5	0
Condemnation case		1
Total	96	32

Sustained yield units

No formal cooperative or Federal sustained yield unit applications were received during 1955. However, two submitted previously received attention. One of these was for Wind River Federal Unit. After much study, a hearing was denied the proponents because they failed to qualify on the basis of need at this time. Several informal requests for Federal units were received during the year and given consideration.

Management plans and inventories

Seven revised management plans were approved by the chief during the year. An increase of 100 million board feet of allowable annual cut will be possible as a result of these revisions. This increase reflects the results of reinventories on 7 working circles, which aggregate 3.5 million acres. New inventories were started on an additional 1.2 million acres. Goal for completion of the total reinventory job is the year 1960, but will depend upon funds available to do this work.

Reinventories and management plans as revised have shown increases of allowable cut because of added timber areas which are now considered operable by reason of new logging equipment and methods, the utilization of tree species heretofore not harvested, and the use of a greater proportion of individual trees.

RECREATION AND LANDS

Recreation

Recreational use of the national forests has continued its steady increase. Visits, which numbered 3,810,000 in 1952 increased to 5,192,496 in 1955. During recent years winter sports have become more popular. Ski enthusiasts last year totaled 658,600—a 10 percent increase over the previous year.

Some additional money was appropriated by Congress for sanitation and care of public campgrounds. The increase in funds to our region enabled us to maintain about one-third of the campgrounds satisfactorily and to replace or add 195 pit toilet buildings, 743 tables, and 484 fireplaces. In addition, a number of campground water systems were improved. Despite this accomplishment, the protection of resources from the impact of recreational use is far from satisfactory. It is a major national forest management problem locally and nationally.

Oregon's famous Timberline Lodge on Mount Hood is now under the operation of Richard L. Kohnstamm. The lodge was closed a portion of last year through cancellation of the previous operator's permit because of unsatisfactory operation. Mr. Kohnstamm has done an exceptionally fine job of rehabilitating the lodge and in providing services of which the public may be proud. One of these is the construction of a new chair lift, the upper terminal of which is located adjacent to the west wing of the lodge. The new lift enables skiers to use the fine terrain below the lodge which is sheltered by trees. This area is suitable for skiing during stormy periods when the upper chair lift is unable to operate.

Other major developments constructed this past year at winter-sports areas are two new electric tows in the Ski Bowl at Mount Hood, new pomalifts at both Snoqualmie Pass and White Pass, a new jumping hill at Spout Springs, and a new chair lift on the beginners hill at Stevens Pass.

Water

Important new water facilities within the national forests are being constructed. Near Oakridge, Oreg., on the Willamette Forest preliminary survey work, timber cutting, engineering, and recreation plans are in progress for the Hills Creek Dam area. The dam is being constructed by the United States engineers. The Pacific Northwest Power Co. has applied for a license to construct two new dams on the Snake River, below Hells Canyon. These are to be called the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley Dams. Preliminary road, trail, and recreation plans have been started for both of them.

Wilderness and wild areas

A public hearing was held in Eugene, Oreg., February 16 and 17, 1955, on a Forest Service proposal to reclassify the Three Sisters primitive area to a wilderness area and make certain changes in the boundary. The region's recommendation was sent to the Chief June 10. We also recommend to the Chief that the Mount Washington wild area (46,655 acres) and the Diamond Peak wild area (35,440 acres) in the Willamette and Deschutes Forests be established.

Mining claims

A flurry of new mining claims occurred following the discover of uranium in the Fremont Forest. It is estimated that about 1,000 new claims were filed on this forest in July and August. Uranium claims were located on other forests in smaller numbers.

During the year about 150 claims of all types on national forests were protested by the Government and 27 were clear listed. Seventeen decisions were issued by the Bureau of Land Management with the following results: Protest upheld on 69 claims (7 cases); 28 claims (6 cases) were declared null and void; 118 claims (2 cases) defaulted and were declared null and void, and on 2 claims (2 cases) the Government was overruled and the claims vindicated. The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have joint responsibilities in the administration of mining law on Federal lands.

A milestone was reached on July 23, 1955, with the adoption of Public Law 167. This law represents the first major change in the mining laws since 1872. It gives to the Forest Service authority to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources on claims located after enactment of the law, to manage other surface resources (except minerals subject to the mining laws), and to use as much of the surface as necessary for access to adjacent lands. It also establishes a procedure in the nature of a quiet-title action whereby the Government can resolve uncertainties as to surface rights on mining claims located prior to July 23, 1955.

A test area on the Snoqualmie National Forest was selected to determine surface rights under provisions of the law. Preliminary examination was completed to determine who owns the numerous claims within the test area. Affidavits were prepared by those making the examination, setting forth the nature of the examination and the names and addresses of all persons known to have an interest in the claims. Early in 1956 we will notify each claimant that surface rights will be determined on all unpatented mining claims within the test area.

About 125 applications for oil and gas leases on national forest lands were received during the year. Eighty percent of these were on the Siuslaw Forest; about 15 percent on the Ochoco; and the remaining 5 percent on the Fremont and Snoqualmie Forests.

Coffee Pot Flat waterspreading project

The region was allotted $20,000 to invest in waterspreading on Coffee Pot Flat on the Fremont Forest during fiscal year 1956. The money was used to apply early-season runoff, through a series of contour ditches, to more than 300 acres of valley bottom land which had been revegetated. To do this, 25 miles of contour ditches and 1.3 miles of diversion ditch were built. The Coffee Pot area was selected as our highest priority project on the basis of public benefits to be expected from a limited investment. In addition to the tangible benefits of water control and soil stabilization, this project has much value as a demonstration.

Small watershed projects

During 1955, Forest Service participation on small watershed projects (brought about under Public Law 566) increased considerably. This included work on project feasibility surveys, program development, and hydrologic analyses. Preliminary field examinations were made on 9 watersheds in Washington and 7 in Oregon. Feasibility studies were made on 2 watersheds in Oregon and 3 in Washington.

On the Mission Creek watershed protection demonstration project, the Wenatchee National Forest completed 5 miles of fence, 6 miles of new trail, ⅜ mile of channel straightening, and some experimental work in planting and reseeding.

Land exchange

Under Public Law 426, 83d Congress, much progress has been made toward exchanging O. & C. and national forest lands for better administration. The job of appraising the lands has been finished. It is expected that the exchange will be completed and recommendations forwarded to Washington, D. C., well in advance of the date Congress set for its completion.

WILDLIFE AND RANGE MANAGEMENT

Range management

Livestock ranges in the region furnished forage for 89,466 cattle and 164,961 sheep in 1955. These figures represent an increase of 2,232 head of cattle and a decrease of 8,020 head of sheep, compared with 1954.

Grazing receipts were $224,159, about the same as the previous year. Higher market prices to cattle growers in 1954 were reflected by a slight increase in grazing fees for cattle, from 44 cents per cow month in 1954 to 45 cents in 1955. Sheep rates remained the same at 9 cents per sheep month.

Based on preliminary reports, seeding of livestock ranges was as follows: 333 acres of depleted forest ranges; 10,666 acres of logging-disturbed areas, to prevent erosion; and 2,964 acres of accidental burns (project only one-third completed). In addition, 2,200 acres of private land adjacent to the forest will be aerially seeded under cooperative agreement.

Field trials were made using a shortcut method of range inventory. Approximately 100,000 acres were surveyed in that manner.

To put the measurement of range conditions on a scientific basis, the region has started installing lines of permanent study plots, called range transects. Recurrent observations at the same point will give reliable data on the trend of range conditions. Progress in this work has been made, but only about 15 percent of the needed transects have been installed to date.

Wildlife management

Big game numbers continued to increase. The 1955 population estimates, prior to the hunting season, showed 325,000 deer and 53,000 elk on national forest land. The 1955 legal kill is estimated to be a little higher than the 1954 harvest of 68,000 deer and 5,900 elk. Measures were taken to control excess numbers on problem ranges. A number of special early-season and post-season hunts were held and some previously closed areas were opened. Work is progressing on wildlife management plans for the forests. Ten of the 18 forests have submitted their plans; the others are due in 1956.

Above normal snowfall and below normal temperatures over most of the region, exerted pressures on winter game ranges during late 1955. If such conditions prevail winter long, big game losses may run high.

Efforts are being made, in cooperation with State game commissions, to improve depleted ranges and to bring livestock and big game use into proper balance with range conditions.

FIRE CONTROL

The 1955 fire season was average as to number of fires and acreage of burn, but an unusual peak occurred over the Labor Day weekend during the severe fire weather which began August 1 and continued until September 10 to 13. September 4 a series of dry lightning storms began. About one-third of the number of fires for the year and most of the burned acreage came about the ensuing week.

	1955	1954	1950-54 average
Number of fires	[1] 1,013	729	1,040
Acreage burned	16,231	1,692	17,268

[1] The 1,013 fires include 618 from lightning, 140 from careless smokers, and 130 campfires. Man-caused fires numbered 395. Hunter fires were about one-half of the 124 reported in 1954.

Cooperation

Four of our larger fires this year were boundary fires resulting in joint action with the State of Oregon and the Klamath Forest Protective Association. Good cooperative action was taken in extinguishing these blazes. Cooperation of private forest industry was outstanding on many fires, especially during Labor Day weekend. Without this splendid help our losses would have been much greater in view of the critical conditions which prevailed.

Slash burning

Slash burning accomplishment was disappointing on many forests, especially those in western Washington. Fall rains started early and continued without sufficient drying periods to permit effective slash burning in many areas. Disposal of logging slash was only about 50 percent of that planned.

Aerial program

Smokejumpers and aircraft were used extensively during the year. June and September lightning fire concetrations taxed our facilities. Continued modernization of our air fleet took place. We acquired another twin-engined Beechcraft and a Cessna 180, and disposed of a Stinson Voyager. Our regional fleet consists of 6 planes; 3 for transporting smokejumpers and supplies and 3 for passenger travel and reconnaissance.

No fatalities and but few injuries resulted from the smokejumper activity during 1955. Smokejumpers were used interregionally. They played an important role in keeping numerous lightning fires to small size.

New structures and equipment

We purchased 22 additional slip-on tanker units which can be quickly loaded onto a pickup truck or 4-wheel drive vehicle for rapid, economical transportation to fires. A unit consists of a water tank, power-driven pumper, hose reel, hose, nozzles and all accessories needed for pumping water onto a fire. They are used most often near roads but may be hauled into the woods on a tractor-drawn sled.

Four new lookout structures were built and eight others were bettered.

ENGINEERING

Forest highways

Contracts amounting to $2,347,930 were awarded covering 85 miles of forest highway construction in 1955. Forest highways are high class roads on or adjacent to the national forest, used for transportation of forest products or for forest users. Most of this work was reconstruction of obsolete roadways to bring them up to the higher standard needed for modern traffic.

Roads and trails

Most road work in the region continues to be for access to timber areas. Accomplishments were:

Work done with Federal funds

New bridges on timber access roads (11)	$107,000
Bridges replaced with bridges (34)	1,012,076
Bridges replaced with culverts (52)	149,968
Timber access roads, new (25.2 miles)	3,972,921
Timber access roads, reconstructed (37.6 miles)	1,877,081
Other roads reconstructed (20 miles)	75,343

Work done through timber sale contracts (operators)

Bridge construction and replacement (30)	$355,450
Timber access roads, new (549.2 miles)	8,896,769
Timber access roads, reconstruction (205.4 miles)	2,316,994

Other accomplishments

Survey and design (910 miles)	$917,000
Inspection purchaser roads (791.9 miles)	339,117
Trail construction (127.8 miles)	133,709
Roads maintained (11,969 miles)	[1] 861,632
Trails maintained (13,803 miles)	[1] 389,031

[1] Includes regional overhead costs.

Cartography

Accurate, up-to-date maps are basic to the conduct of all multiple-use business on the national forests. For a number of years the region has been modernizing its maps by the use of aerial photographs and photogrammetric methods. This is important to others, also, since Forest Service mapping is made available to other Federal agencies. The States, and forest industries, also benefit. In turn, we obtain aerial photographs and map data from other agencies. Mapping programs are coordinated to avoid unnecessary duplication of work.

Since 1947 planimetric mapping of approximately 44,000 square miles, on a scale of 2 inches to the mile, has been completed. An additional 6,000 square miles is now underway and should be finished by July 1, 1956. Approximately 22,000 square miles are yet to be done. About 75 percent of this mapping is still subject to field editing.

New base maps of each national forest, on a scale of one-half inch to the mile, are being made, based upon planimetric mapping. Three base maps are in progress (about 75-percent completed) leaving 15 to be made.

During the past year aerial photography for mapping purposes, on a scale of 1:20,000 or larger, was accomplished for about 3,000 square miles. Another 1,500 square miles was completed on a scale of 1:40,000. Additional photography is needed. The amount will depend upon the quantity available to the Forest Service from other agencies.

Recreation maps were prepared for the Malheur and Siskiyou National Forest recreation folders, the latter 50-percent completed. Special topographic maps for timber-sale purposes, amounting to 230 square miles, were prepared for 25 separate sales scattered throughout the region.

Communications

We purchased 173 new radios in fiscal year 1955. This expanded the coverage by radio for forest protection. Radio use has also been an aid to better administration of all resource management work. The Forest Service radio laboratory has developed an automatic alarm for lookouts. This automatic alarm, attached to a battery radio, allows a dispatcher to call a lookout during periods when the lookout would normally be off the air. This devise should permit further reduction of telephone lines which are costly to maintain. Radio efficiency has been improved by the installation of remote and relay stations into forest areas not formerly covered. To accomplish this, a low-price remote-control unit for battery radios was developed, which permits operation of a single radio by two or more work stations which may be widely separated.

Automotive equipment

Without increasing the regional vehicle fleet inventory, peak summer needs were met by using some older cars and renting others from Bonneville Power Administration. The regional office and the Snoqualmie National Forest assisted the General Services Administration at Seattle in preparing a motor pool study and report. The auction method of selling old automotive equipment was used for the first time during 1955 with highly satisfactory results.

Building, water and sanitary systems

Architectural plans were prepared for renovation of 7 residences and 6 offices. Plans were prepared for 1 ski-warming hut, a new standard 3-bedroom residence and a 2-bedroom residence. Eight ranger station site plans were made. The Hemlock ranger Station water system on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest is being redesigned and reconstructed for safe domestic use and for adequate supply to the Wind River Tree Nursery. Studies were started for a sanitary system needed to serve this ranger station, the adjacent experiment station headquarters, residences, and the regional training school buildings.

Waterpower projects

Applications for licenses, and preliminary permits for waterpower projects on national forest land, require field examinations as to how these projects affect forest protection, administration, management, and use. Reports must be made to the Federal Power Commission. Eight cases were reported in 1955 and 18 applications are in active status.

In addition, the region has a total of 111 waterpower projects as of January 1, which require regular inspection and reports. Forty-eight of these are major and 52 are minor Federal Power Commission cases. The other 11 cases are projects approved by the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture before the existence of the Federal Power Act.

Soil study program

We have recognized the urgent need for more information about soil—to be used in determining proper road locations, adequate road drainage, soil stabilization and other practices involved in the multiple-use management of the forest resources. Work was begun in 1952 to develop satisfactory methods to be used in producing soils maps for extensive areas. As of January 1, 1956, field work mapping, field checking, and written reports have either been finished, or are in various stages of completion for all of the national forests in Washington.

OPERATION

Inadequate housing has become a major problem regionwide. It is of critical proportions in a considerable number of work areas. During the year an intensive survey of housing needs was made for each ranger district. The survey included the deficiencies in residences, ranger office space, small storage and warehouse buildings and other utilities. This survey was correlated with the anticipated program of national-forest development for the next 5 years. It was found we need at least $7 million for this project. It is particularly important that adequate housing be provided for timber-sale personnel if we are to reach our allowable annual cut in a planwise manner.

This critical situation was alleviated somewhat during the year. Eighty-eight house trailers were purchased from other Government agencies. They are being used by families in rapidly expanding work areas. This provides temporary relief in the most critical places until more suitable, permanent housing can be obtained.

During 1955, improvements were made in the operation of our regional office, by making further space adjustments, obtaining additional space, better lighting and air circulation, and necessary office equipment. To handle increased workloads, some additional personnel were added to the regional staff.

The task of preparing our annual budget of over $15 million, exclusive of cooperative work funds, was greater this year than ever before. This was due to: New legislation, including the Fringe Benefits Act; increased

appropriations to finance increasing workloads; salary increases; and refinements in the budgetary processes.

Plans were worked out with the General Services Administration and the Bonneville Power Administration to consolidate blueprinting, photostating, and other reproduction work. This should result in greater efficiency for this phase of the job.

Three other items are of interest. A total of 134 management improvement suggestions from employees were reviewed and processed. A study has been undertaken to develop a procedure for the use of IBM methods in checking truck log-load receipts. Details were worked out whereby a 2-acre tract of land, not needed at the site of the Mt. Hood supervisor's headquarters, was transferred through General Services Administration to Multnomah County, Oreg.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

Cooperative forest protection

Federal funds allotted to the States under the cooperative Clarke-McNary forest protection program for fiscal year 1956, amounted to $612,679 for Oregon and $560,860 for Washington. This was approximately 25 percent of the amounts spent by the two States for the protection of State and private forest lands. Assistance was given the State forestry departments in developing safety programs and improving fire training and inspection procedures. Special assistance was given to the State Forester of Oregon in the development of job load analysis and standard accounting methods.

A study was begun with State officials to determine the cost of providing a basic level of protection for all State and private forest lands. The report will be completed in 1956 and will be used, in part, for determining distribution of Federal C–M 2 funds to cooperating States.

Cooperative forest management

Beginning with fiscal year 1956, active supervision of the farm forestry program in the State of Washington will be under the State Supervisor of Forestry. This change was initiated by the Extension Service to consolidate and simplify those activities. The Extension Service continues to share the State's portion of the costs. All farm forestry projects in the region are now under the direct supervision of the State Forester.

Federal funds were made available for fiscal year 1956 for the cooperative forest management program in the amounts of $8,162 for Oregon and $11,100 for Washington. Of the total of $47,468 budgeted for the CFM program in Oregon and Washington, $19,252, or 40 percent, was made available through Federal allotment. This helps to provide for 10 farm foresters in the 2 States. One or two more are currently contemplated in the State of Washington.

Information was gathered regarding improved forest survey and inventory techniques through the use of punch cards and electronic calculators. This information was discussed in a conference of public and industrial foresters.

Special analysis of timber resource review data

The region, with the assistance of its many cooperators, obtained additional detailed information on conditions of recently cut timber lands when these were surveyed in the field for the Timber Resource Review. This information appears as a special section for the west coast, in chapter IV–B, Condition of recently cutover lands in the preliminary review draft of the Timber Resource Review. A study is now underway to determine the reasons for unsatisfactory stocking of cutover lands. This condition is prevalent in the smaller woodlands of Oregon and Washington. An effort will be made to determine what might be done to improve stocking of these timberlands.

Cooperative tree planting

Financial and technical assistance was given to State foresters in the production and distribution of 6½ million forest tree seedlings. State nurseries are currently being enlarged to produce more than twice this number of trees.

Agricultural conservation program

Technical forestry information was provided the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Office in the development and execution of the agricultural conservation program. In part, this is a supplement to the farm forestry activities aimed at encouraging improved forest management practices among small woodland owners.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Training

During 1955 approximately 70 young foresters were appointed to Forest Service positions. This brings the total number of technical foresters employed by the Forest Service in Oregon and Washington to approximately 600.

To accomplish the in-service training for these new men, and other personnel, nine training meetings were held. A 4-day orientation meeting in Portland was attended by 73 new foresters. An administrative and resource management training camp was held at the Wind River training station, attended by 39 trainees. Twenty-three fire control staffmen held a conference at Wind River training station, and an administrative assistants' training meeting at Portland, on the subject of internal audits, was attended by 1 representative from each of the 18 forests. Fifteen field men participated in a range management training meeting at Madras, Oreg.

Four engineering training courses were held as follows:

Course	Location	Trainees
Advanced road location, design and construction.	Portland, Oreg.	20
Bridge course	do	26
Road location	Arboretum (in cooperation with OSC).	18
Staff leadership in road location and design.	Portland, Oreg.	11

Safety

Continued emphasis on accident prevention at all levels of administration, and a near normal fire season (despite the critical fire situation in early September), resulted in the region performing 606,633 man-days of work with the low accident frequency rate [1] of 8.03. There were 33 cases of lost time due to personal injuries, and 6 cases due to occupational illness. The accident severity rate [2] was 1,464, the number of man-days lost on account of personal injuries and occupational illness numbered 7,143, and 1 fatality occurred from firefighting.

Pacific Northwest region, Forest Service—Condensed statement of receipts and expenditures national forest programs, fiscal year 1955

	Receipts	Expenditures	
		Operating	Investments
National forest protection and management and land utilization projects		$4,601,718	$304,436
Fighting forest fires		230,151	
Blister rust control		67,491	
Forest pest control		574,864	
Cooperative range improvements		22,071	
Road and trail system, construction and maintenance		1,398,553	2,870,455
Flood prevention and watershed protection		10,404	
Cooperative deposits	$57,395	89,247	
National forest and land utilization area receipts:			
Forest reserve fund	38,179,777		
Oregon and California lands (national forest)	1,271,251		
Land utilization areas (title III, Farm Tenant Act)	5,789		
Other miscellaneous receipts	343,313		
Total	39,857,525	6,994,499	3,174,891
Comparative total, statewide	82,340,150	50,144,523	24,503,380

Additional computation by the office of Senator MORSE:

Pacific Northwest Region

Receipts		$39,857,525
Operating expenses	$6,994,499	
Investment expenses	3,174,891	
		10,169,390
Gross profit before taxes		29,688,135
Payment in lieu of taxes to local government		9,682,194
Net profit to United States		20,005,941

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have just reviewed the calendar with the distinguished minority leader. The Senate has only about 21 bills left on its calendar. Some of the bills have been passed over since January 1955 and should probably be returned to committee.

Calendar No. 1629, House bill 5265, to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons, is the unfinished business. After we convene on tomorrow, we shall proceed with the consideration of that bill.

I should like to have the Senate be on notice that it may be possible at some time in the not-too-distant future—perhaps on tomorrow, in some instances—for us to consider Calendar No. 235, Senate bill 300, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; Calendar No. 832, Senate Resolution 131, relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee; Calendar No. 1193, Senate

[1] Accident frequency rate=number of disabling injuries×1 million divided by number man-hours worked.

[2] Severity rate=number of man-days of lost time×1 million divided by number man-hours worked.

Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House; Calendar No. 1601, Senate bill 2042, to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; Calendar No. 1615, Senate bill 1687, for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson; and Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. I am sure it will not be possible, Mr. President, to arrange to have present on tomorrow all Senators on both sides who are interested in each of those measures; and of course they will not be called up unless the Senators who are interested in them are ready to have them taken up.

I should like to have the RECORD show that although the committees have been very diligent, at this session we have already passed hundreds of bills, and there are less than 21 measures on the calendar. So unless the committees quickly report additional measures, there will not be many important ones for the Senate to consider.

I call the attention of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the possibility that Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, may be considered by the Senate on tomorrow. I rather doubt that the Senate will reach it tomorrow, because several Senators who desire to speak on that measure may not be present at that time. But during the evening I shall try to get in touch with them; and if we find that it is possible to have the Senate act tomorrow on the other measures to which I have referred, we shall try to have the Senate take up the Senator's concurrent resolution. We wish to accommodate him if we possibly can.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader for giving consideration to the possibility of having the Senate consider on tomorrow Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

I realize there is some opposition to that measure, and that it may not be possible to have the Senate consider it on tomorrow. However, I am very appreciative of the fact that the leaders on both sides are agreeable to having the concurrent resolution considered on tomorrow. On the other hand, if anything prevents its consideration on tomorrow, I wonder whether the majority leader and the minority leader are able to give me assurance that the concurrent resolution will be considered as soon as possible following the recess.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am very anxious to accommodate the Senator from Montana. I spoke to him on yesterday, I believe, about the concurrent resolution. I shall do all I can to have it considered by the Senate as soon as possible; and I shall also do anything else the Senator from Montana wants done, insofar as I am able to do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's inquiry, let me say, further, that if it is not possible for the Senate to consider Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 on tomorrow, and still accommodate certain Senators, I shall certainly cooperate with the majority leader in urging that that measure be scheduled for consideration possibly immediately following the action of the Senate on the conference report on the farm bill, which I assume will be ready for our action when we return from the Easter recess.

Although the Senator from Montana knows that I am not supporting his concurrent resolution, nevertheless I believe it should be called up and should be subject to consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished minority leader, who once again is exhibiting his great sense of fairness. I am perfectly satisfied, on the assurance of both the majority leader and the minority leader, that this measure will receive consideration in due time.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF ON-FARM TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

When the GI bill for veterans of the Korean war was passed it included a provision for institutional on-farm training for interested veterans. This program is of particular importance in the State of Montana, where a considerable number of the people rely on farming and ranching.

In some of the more isolated and less populated areas of the State these programs have been delayed because there had been too few qualified veterans to warrant the offering of such training by a school located in the area of their residence. However, the institutional on-farm training class was then started in several Montana cities when interest had increased; but a number of veterans were unable to enroll under Public Law 550 because their 3-year period for the initiation of the program of education or training under the law had expired. I am sure that comparable situations will be found in all the other States.

The bill I am introducing would extend the time when a veteran may start this program. I do not like to see a veteran penalized for not participating in a program which, through no fault of his own, was not made readily available to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3553) to extend the time for initiating and pursuing programs of institutional on-farm training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 212 (a) of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that an eligible veteran may, with the approval of the Administrator, initiate a program of institutional on-farm training at any time within 5 years after his discharge or release from active service."

SEC. 2. Section 213 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"EXPIRATION OF ALL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

"SEC. 213. (a) No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran (other than an eligible veteran to whom subsection (b) applies) under this title beyond 8 years after either his discharge or release from active service or the end of his basic service period, whichever is earlier.

"(b) An eligible veteran who initiates a program of institutional on-farm training under this title more than 3 years after his discharge or release from active service may, with the approval of the Administrator, be afforded institutional on-farm training under this title until the end of the 10th year after his discharge or release from active service.

"(c) In no event shall education or training be afforded under this title after January 31, 1965."

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 28 (legislative day, March 26), 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

Stanley C. Allyn, of Ohio, to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Afghanistan.

Jefferson Patterson, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

T. Keith Glennan, of Ohio, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1958.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Thomas M. Healy, of Georgia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 28, 1958.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Stephen Sibley Bean, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring August 27, 1960.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

R. Lockwood Jones, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1960.

Francis Adams Cherry, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring March 4, 1960.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren E. Burger, of Minnesota, to be United States circuit judge for District of Columbia circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Paul C. Weick, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for northern district of Ohio.

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be chief judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia for term of 10 years.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, for term of 4 years.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Cable A. Wirtz, of Hawaii, to be judge of the second circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William L. Longshore, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Alabama for term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard Andrew Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General for term of 4 years.

The following appointments in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, to be effective date of acceptance:

To be senior surgeon

Anibal R. Valle
Paul Q. Peterson
Trois E. Johnson

To be surgeon

Osamu Hayaishi — Frank W. Mount
Gerald R. Cooper — Jack Orloff
Phyllis Q. Edwards — William L. Bunch, Jr.
Henry K. Beye

To be senior dental surgeon

Clarence A. Eggler

To be dental surgeon

Paul H. Keyes

To be sanitary engineer

Arve H. Dahl
Paul W. Reed

To be senior scientist

Lloyd W. Law — Everette L. May

To be scientist

Melvin H. Goodwin, Jr.

To be veterinarian

Raymond J. Helvig

To be senior nurse officer

Mary O. Jenney

To be nurse officer

Doris E. Roberts

To be dietitian

Dorothy M. Youland

To be senior assistant surgeon

John K. Irion — Lesther Winkler
Harold P. Schedl — Samuel G. Southwick
Allen C. Pirkle — Robert H. Parrott
James L. German — Edward F. Wenzlaff
Patrick J. Hennelly, Jr.

To be assistant surgeon

Duane L. Hanson — Lowell H. Hansen
W. King Engel — Donald A. Neher
Theodore A. Labow — Leon N. Branton
Munsey S. Wheby — Alex Rosen
James C. Wooton — Herman L. Smith
Alvin Singer — Hugh S. Pershing

To be assistant dental surgeon

Dale E. Smith

To be nurse officer

Mildred Struve

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Jean C. Casey

To be senior assistant therapist

Josef Hoog — JaNeva I. Porter
Howard A. Haak — John R. De Simio
John F. Burke — Nellie L. Evans

To be assistant therapist

Royce P. Noland — Dean P. Currier
Michael J. Oliva — Lennes A. Talbot, Jr.

To be junior assistant therapist

Arthur J. Nelson, Jr. — John L. Echternach
Dell C. Nelms — James W. Barbero

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Reginald Wall, of Decatur, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, it is with a deep sense of unworthiness that we approach Thy throne of grace. Especially during this Holy Week which reminds us of the sufferings of our Saviour do we realize what undeserving creatures and unprofitable servants we are. When we think of all the Christian church has done in her earnest desire to evangelize the world and then face the painful fact that in all of these 2,000 years she has been able to win but little more than one-tenth of the world's people to a saving knowledge of our Lord, when we look up and down the columns of our newspapers and see every page crimson with the history of the broken laws of God and man, when we see the nations of the world unable to adjust their differences and increasing their armaments to a point never known before in history, we are compelled to cry from the depths of needy souls, Lord help us and guide us. We would intercede on behalf of these leaders of our own dear land with whom is entrusted so much responsibility. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their faith in Thee. Grant us such true statesmen in Congress, such godly teachers in our schools, such divinely called and courageous men in our pulpits, and such consecrated Christian parents in our homes till true brotherhood must prevail throughout our world and peace cannot perish from the earth. This we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the conference asked by the House on the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and other purposes; and appoints Messrs. BIBLE, FREAR and BEALL, as its managers.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

RELIEF FROM TAXES ON GASOLINE USED ON FARMS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1957)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"'(A) by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of

livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife, on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator; except that if such use is by any person other than the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm, then (i) for purposes of this subparagraph, in applying subsection (a) to this subparagraph, and for purposes of section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii) (but not for purposes of section 4041), the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which gasoline or a liquid taxable under section 4041 is used shall be treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of such gasoline or liquid, and (ii) for purposes of applying section 6416 (b) (2) (C) (ii), any tax paid under section 4041 in respect of a liquid used on a farm for farming purposes (within the meaning of this subparagraph) shall be treated as having been paid by the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which such liquid is used;' " and the Senate agree to the same.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
By HARRY F. BYRD,
ROBT. KERR,
EDWARD MARTIN,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8780) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 6420 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as proposed to be amended by the bill as it passed both the House and Senate, prescribe the uses of gasoline which for purposes of the bill are to be treated as use for farming purposes. Senate amendment No. 1 struck out subparagraph (A) and inserted a substitute. No change was made in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D).

Under subparagraph (A) of the House bill, gasoline was to be treated as used for farming purposes if used by "any person" in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvestng any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

Under Senate amendment No. 1, gasoline used for any of the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph was to be treated as used for farming purposes only if used by the owner, tenant, or operator of a farm (1) on a farm of which he is the owner, tenant, or operator, or (2) on any other farm (but only if the gasoline used by him on other farms is less than one-half of all gasoline used by him, during the period with respect to which claim is filed, on all farms for the purposes set forth in the preceding paragraph). Thus, under the Senate amendment gasoline used by a custom operator or other independent contractor in performing a service for one of the purposes specified in section 6420 (c) (3) (A) was not to be included in any refund claim.

Under the conference agreement, as under the House bill and the Senate amendment, if gasoline is used on a farm by the owner, tenant, or operator thereof for the purposes set forth above, he will be entitled to the payment provided for under the new section 6420 if he is the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline. In addition, under the conference agreement, if gasoline is used on a farm by any other person for these purposes, the owner, tenant, or operator of such farm is treated as the user and ultimate purchaser of the gasoline, and is therefore entitled to the payment. For example, where a custom operator uses the gasoline, the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the gasoline is used will be entitled to the payment. In general, in the case where a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) on a farm, the payment under section 6420 (a) will be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom such services are performed.

Under the conference agreement, comparable rules are provided with respect to diesel fuel and special motor fuels. For example, if a custom operator performs services described in the new section 6420 (c) (3) (A) and uses a special fuel in a motor vehicle, the tax imposed by section 4041 (b) would apply but the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm on which the fuel is used will be entitled to a refund of the tax paid with respect to the fuel used on the farm. As in the case of gasoline, the refund will, in general, be made to the person (the owner, tenant, or operator, as the case may be) for whom the custom operator performed the services.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: These amendments are clerical. The House recedes.

JERE COOPER,
W. D. MILLS,
NOBLE J. GREGORY,
DANIEL A. REED,
By T. A. JENKINS,
THOMAS A. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8780 as it passed the House would have relieved farmers of the burden of the excise taxes on gasoline and special motor fuels used on their farms for farming purposes. Since the cost of these fuels contributes to the expenses of farming, the bill would have removed the taxes on these fuels from the farmers' operating costs, providing them with approximately $60 million a year by way of tax relief.

The Senate basically adopted the House-passed bill. However, it amended the bill to deny tax relief in certain cases where custom operators, that is, independent contractors, perform services on a farm for a farmer in connection with the raising or harvesting of a crop. The House bill would have granted such custom operators relief from the fuel taxes where they did this work for farmers. The Senate amendment would have reduced the tax relief by $1 million, to about $59 million, as compared to the $60 million of relief under the House-passed bill. The Senate felt that custom operators should be excluded from this relief "because there is no assurance that they will pass the benefit of the refunds on to the farmers." The relief would under the Senate bill generally still have been available to farmers who exchange services with each other provided these services constituted less than one-half of the total services of the farmer.

The conference agreement would grant relief in the case of custom operations for the farmer by allowing a refund with respect to gasoline and special fuels used by custom operators, but the refund will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the custom work is performed. The conference agreement assures that the farmer will benefit by the tax relief provided in the case of custom operations on his farm.

There also were two clerical amendments made by the Senate, to which the House conferees agreed.

I urge that the bill as agreed to in conference be adopted by the House.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8780, embodies President Eisenhower's recommendation that the Nation's farmers be relieved of the burden of the Federal excise tax on gasoline used on the farm in the course of farming operations. I introduced a bill to carry out this proposal, as did our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], immediately following receipt of the President's recommendation.

The bill passed the House and the Senate with one major difference. The Senate bill denied the gas-tax relief in the case of so-called custom operations. I believe that the conferees have worked out a provision which resolves this difference very satisfactorily to all concerned. Under the conference agreement, a refund of the gasoline tax is to be available in all cases where gasoline is used for cultivating the soil for raising or harvesting crops, but, under our compromise, the refund will be payable only to the farmer on whose farm the gasoline is used and not to the custom operator. This amendment guarantees that the tax relief will go where we intended it to go, namely, to the farmer himself.

I believe that the Congress is to be commended for acting so promptly upon this recommendation of President Eisenhower.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9064) appropriating funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1956)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,113,440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$650,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, and to the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION FUND

Amendment No. 1: Corrects punctuation as proposed by the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,113,440,000 for "Operations," instead of $2,108,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,118,880,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $650,000,000 for "Transportation," instead of $645,000,000 as proposed by the House and $655,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
GORDON CANFIELD,
BENJ. F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT No. 1958)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$12,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.,
J. GLENN BEALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9770) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

There were two principal differences between the House version and the Senate version of the bill. The House version contained no exemption from the 2-percent sales and use taxes on the gross proceeds from the rental of textiles, the essential part of which includes recurring service of laundering or cleaning thereof (industrial laundry and diaper service companies). The Senate bill contained such an exemption. Under the conference agreement the Senate provision was retained.

The House version of the bill authorized an appropriation for fiscal year 1957, and each fiscal year thereafter, of $11,000,000 toward defraying the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. The Senate version raised this amount to $13,000,000. These amounts are in addition to the $11,000,000 authorized for such purposes by section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947, as amended. Thus, under the House version the total authorized Federal contribution was $22,000,000, and under the Senate version it was $24,000,000. The House version also provided that so much of the aggregate annual payments by the United States to the general fund of the District of Columbia as is in excess of $15,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent fiscal years, would be available for capital outlay only. The Senate bill raised the $15,000,000 figure in the House bill to $17,000,000. Thus under either the House version or the Senate version there would be $7,000,000 available under this authorization for capital outlay. The conference agreement provides for an authorization of $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1957, and subsequent years, or a total of $23,000,000. Of this $23,000,000, $7,000,000 will be available for capital outlays.

HOWARD W. SMITH,
OREN HARRIS,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1950)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, in order to initiate the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin, for the purposes, among others, of regulating the flow of the Colorado River, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the Upper Basin to utilize, consistently with the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the apportionments made to

and among them in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, providing for the reclamation of arid and semiarid land, for the control of floods, and for the generation of hydroelectric power, as an incident of the foregoing purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized (1) to construct, operate, and maintain the following initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works: Curecanti, Flaming Gorge, Navajo (dam and reservoir only), and Glen Canyon: *Provided,* That the Curecanti Dam shall be constructed to a height which will impound not less than nine hundred and forty thousand acre-feet of water or will create a reservoir of such greater capacity as can be obtained by a high waterline located at seven thousand five hundred and twenty feet above mean sea level, and that construction thereof shall not be undertaken until the Secretary has, on the basis of further engineering and economic investigations, reexamined the economic justification of such unit and, accompanied by appropriate documentation in the form of a supplemental report, has certified to the Congress and to the President that, in his judgment, the benefits of such unit will exceed its costs; and (2) to construct, operate, and maintain the following additional reclamation projects (including power-generating and transmission facilities related thereto), hereinafter referred to as participating projects: Central Utah (initial phase); Emery County, Florida, Hammond, La Barge, Lyman, Paonia (including the Minnesota unit, a dam and reservoir on Muddy Creek just above its confluence with the North Fork of the Gunnison River, and other necessary works), Pine River Extension, Seedskadee, Silt and Smith Fork: *Provided further,* That as part of the Glen Canyon Unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument.

"SEC. 2. In carrying out further investigations of projects under the Federal reclamation laws in the Upper Colorado River Basin, the Secretary shall give priority to completion of planning reports on the Gooseberry, San Juan-Chama, Navajo, Parshall, Troublesome, Rabbit Ear, Eagle Divide, San Miguel, West Divide, Bluestone, Battlement Mesa, Tomichi Creek, East River, Ohio Creek, Fruitland Mesa, Bostwick Park, Grand Mesa, Dallas Creek, Savery-Pot Hook, Dolores, Fruit Growers Extension, Animas-La Plata, Yellow Jacket, and Sublette participating projects. Said reports shall be completed as expeditiously as funds are made available therefor and shall be submitted promptly to the affected States, which in the case of the San Juan-Chama project shall include the State of Texas, and thereafter to the President and the Congress: *Provided,* That with reference to the plans and specifications for the San Juan-Chama project, the storage for control and regulation of water imported from the San Juan River shall (1) be limited to a single offstream dam and reservoir on a tributary of the Chama River, (2) be used solely for control and regulation and no power facilities shall be established, installed or operated thereat, and (3) be operated at all times by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior in strict compliance with the Rio Grande Compact as administered by the Rio Grande Compact Commission. The preparation of detailed designs and specifications for the works proposed to be constructed in connection with projects shall be carried as far forward as the investigations thereof indicate is reasonable in the circumstances.

"The Secretary, concurrently with the investigations directed by the preceding paragraph, shall also give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project.

"SEC. 3. It is not the intention of Congress, in authorizing only those projects designated in section 1 of this Act, and in authorizing priority in planning only those additional projects designated in section 2 of this Act, to limit, restrict, or otherwise interfere with such comprehensive development as will provide for the consumptive use by States of the Upper Colorado River Basin of waters, the use of which is apportioned to the Upper Colorado River Basin by the Colorado River Compact and to each State thereof by the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, nor to preclude consideration and authorization by the Congress of additional projects under the allocations in the compacts as additional needs are indicated. It is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument.

"SEC. 4. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, in constructing, operating, and maintaining the units of the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects listed in section 1 of this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided,* That (a) irrigation repayment contracts shall be entered into which, except as otherwise provided for the Paonia and Eden projects, provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any project contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law; (b) prior to construction of irrigation distribution facilities, repayment contracts shall be made with an 'organization' as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which has the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within its boundaries to assist in making repayments, except where a substantial proportion of the lands to be served are owned by the United States; (c) contracts relating to municipal water supply may be made without regard to the limitations of the last sentence of section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and (d), as to Indian lands within, under or served by any participating project, payment of construction costs within the capability of the land to repay shall be subject to the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564): *Provided further,* That for a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from any participating project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security. All units and participating projects shall be subject to the apportionments of the use of water between the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River and among the States of the Upper Basin fixed in the Colorado River Compact and the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, respectively, and to the terms of the treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby authorized a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Basin Fund), which shall remain available until expended, as hereafter provided, for carrying out provisions of this Act other than section 8.

"(b) All appropriations made for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, other than section 8, shall be credited to the Basin Fund as advances from the general fund of the Treasury.

"(c) All revenues collected in connection with the operation of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects shall be credited to the Basin Fund, and shall be available, without further appropriation, for (1) defraying the costs of operation, maintenance, and replacements of, and emergency expenditures for, all facilities of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, within such separate limitations as may be included in annual appropriation acts: *Provided,* That with respect to each participating project, such costs shall be paid from revenues received from each such project; (2) payment as required by subsection (d) of this section; and (3) payment as required by subsection (e) of this section. Revenues credited to the Basin Fund shall not be available for appropriation for construction of the units and participating projects authorized by or pursuant to this Act.

"(d) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of operating needs shall be paid annually to the general fund of the Treasury to return—

"(1) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to power pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(2) the costs of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof which are allocated to municipal water supply pursuant to section 6 of this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years from the date of completion of such unit, participating project, or separable feature thereof;

"(3) interest on the unamortized balance of the investment (including interest during construction) in the power and municipal water supply features of each unit, participating project, or any separable feature thereof, at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided in subsection (f), and interest due shall be a first charge; and

"(4) the costs of each storage unit which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of this Act within a period not exceeding fifty years.

"(e) Revenues in the Basin Fund in excess of the amounts needed to meet the requirements of clause (1) of subsection (c) of this section, and to return to the general fund of the Treasury the costs set out in subsection (d) of this section, shall be apportioned among the States of the Upper Division in the following percentages: Colorado, 46 per centum; Utah, 21.5 per centum; Wyoming, 15.5 per centum; and New Mexico, 17 per centum: *Provided,* That prior to the application of such percentages, all revenues remaining in the Basin Fund from each participating project (or part thereof), herein or hereinafter authorized, after payments, where applicable, with respect to such projects, to the general fund of the Treasury under subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of this section shall be apportioned to the State in which such participating project, or part thereof, is located.

"Revenues so apportioned to each State shall be used only for the repayment of construction costs of participating projects or parts of such projects in the State to which such revenues are apportioned and shall not be used for such purpose in any other State without the consent, as expressed through its legally constituted authority, of the State to which such revenues are apportioned. Subject to such requirement, there shall be paid annually into the general fund of the Treasury from the revenues apportioned to each State (1) the costs of each participating project herein authorized (except Paonia) or any separable feature thereof, which are allocated to irrigation pursuant to section 6 of

this Act, within a period not exceeding fifty years, in addition to any development period authorized by law, from the date of completion of such participating project or separable feature thereof, or, in the case of Indian lands, payment in accordance with section 4 of this Act; (2) costs of the Paonia project, which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay, within a period prescribed in the Act of June 25, 1947 (61 Stat. 181); and (3) costs in connection with the irrigation features of the Eden project as specified in the Act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277).

"(f) The interest rate applicable to each unit of the storage project and each participating project shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the time the first advance is made for initiating construction of said unit or project. Such interest rate shall be determined by calculating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations during the month of June next preceding the fiscal year in which said advance is made, on all interest-bearing marketable public debt obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of said month, and by adjusting such average annual yield to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(g) Business-type budgets shall be submitted to the Congress annually for all operations financed by the Basin Fund.

"SEC. 6. Upon completion of each unit, participating project or separable feature thereof, the Secretary shall allocate the total costs (excluding any expenditures authorized by section 8 of this Act) of constructing said unit, project or feature to power, irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, navigation, or any other purposes authorized under reclamation law. Allocations of construction, operation and maintenance costs to authorized nonreimbursable purposes shall be nonreturnable under the provisions of this Act. In the event that the Navajo participating project is authorized, the costs allocated to irirgation of Indian-owned tribal or restricted lands within, under, or served by such project, and beyond the capability of such lands to repay, shall be determined, and, in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire nation, such costs shall be nonreimbursable. On January 1 of each year the Secretary shall report to the Congress for the previous fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, upon the status of the revenues from, and the cost of, constructing, operating, and maintaining the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects. The Secretary's report shall be prepared to reflect accurately the Federal investment allocated at that time to power, to irrigation, and to other purposes, the progress of return and repayment thereon, and the estimated rate of progress, year by year, in accomplishing full repayment.

"SEC. 7. The hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by this Act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates, but in the exercise of the authority hereby granted he shall not affect or interfere with the operation of the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered unto under said Compacts and Acts. Subject to the provisions of the Colorado River Compact, neither the impounding nor the use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project shall preclude or impair the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes pursuant to applicable State law.

"SEC. 8. In connection with the development of the Colorado River storage project and of the participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects; and (2) facilities to mitigate losses of, and improve conditions for, the propagation of fish and wildlife. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and to withdraw public lands from entry or other disposition under the public land laws necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the facilities herein provided, and to dispose of them to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to alter, amend, repeal, construe, interpret, modify, or be in conflict with the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057), the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774), the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Rio Grande Compact of 1938, or the Treaty with the United Mexican States (Treaty Series 994).

"SEC. 10. Expenditures for the Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Curecanti, and Navajo initial units of the Colorado River storage project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1954.

"SEC. 11. The Final Judgment, Final Decree and stipulations incorporated therein in the consolidated cases of *United States of America* v. *Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, Civil Nos. 2782, 5016 and 5017, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado, are approved, shall become effective immediately, and the proper agencies of the United States shall act in accordance therewith.

"SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed $760,000,000.

"SEC. 13. In planning the use of, and in using credits from, net power revenues available for the purpose of assisting in the payout of costs of participating projects herein and hereafter authorized in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Secretary shall have regard for the achievement within each of said States of the fullest practicable use of the waters of the Upper Colorado River system, consistent with the apportionment thereof among such States.

"SEC. 14. In the operation and maintenance of all facilities, authorized by Federal law and under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, in the basin of the Colorado River, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, and the Treaty with the United Mexican States, in the storage and release of water from reservoirs in the Colorado River Basin. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section, and consent is given to the joinder of the United States as a party in such suit or suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

"SEC. 15. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to continue studies and to make a report to the Congress and to the States of the Colorado River Basin on the quality of water of the Colorado River.

"SEC. 16. As used in this Act—

"The terms 'Colorado River Basin', 'Colorado River Compact', 'Colorado River System', 'Lee Ferry', 'States of the Upper Division', 'Upper Basin', and 'domestic use' shall have the meaning ascribed to them in article II of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact;

"The term 'States of the Upper Colorado River Basin' shall mean the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming;

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin' shall have the same meaning as the term 'Upper Basin';

"The term 'Upper Colorado River Basin Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on October 11, 1948 by commissioners representing the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of April 6, 1949 (63 Stat. 31);

"The term 'Rio Grande Compact' shall mean that certain compact executed on March 18, 1938, by commissioners representing the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas and consented to by the Congress of the United States of America by Act of May 31, 1939 (53 Stat. 785);

"The term 'Treaty with the United Mexican States' shall mean that certain treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers, as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understandings recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof."

And the House agree to the same.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 500, "To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River Storage Project and participating projects, and for other purposes," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the language agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The language incorporates the recommendations of the conference committee with respect to each of the differences between the Senate and House bills.

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

With respect to the scope of the project, the conference committee agreed to retain in the bill for authorization only the four storage units and eleven participating projects in the House-approved bill.

The matter of retaining intact our national park system was an important issue in the consideration by Congress of this legislation. The House-approved bill—

(1) deleting the Echo Park storage unit,

(2) requiring "protective measures to preclude impairment of the Rainbow Bridge National Monument", and

(3) expressing the "intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this Act shall be within any national park or monument",—

makes clear the intention of the House that there be no invasion or impairment of the national park system by the works authorized to be constructed under this legislation. The conference committee upheld the House position and adopted the House-approved language.

The Juniper project would have been authorized as a storage unit by the language in the Senate bill. The House language would have required the Secretary to give priority to completion of a planning report on the Juniper unit in the event he found the Curecanti unit infeasible. The conference committee adopted substitute language which requires that priority be given to completion of a planning report on the Juniper project but removes the contingency in the House language and does not specify whether the Juniper project is to be a storage unit or a participating project.

The conference committee adopted House language requiring the Secretary to give priority to completion of planning reports on certain participating projects including those, except Woody Creek, which would have been conditionally authorized by the language in the Senate bill.

The sum of $760 million remains in the bill as the amount authorized to be appropriated. However, the conference committee, in retaining this amount in the bill, agreed that it should not be earmarked projectwise and that there is no prohibition against the use of such funds for the construction of the Curecanti unit, subject to the certification by the Secretary required in section 1 of the act.

REPAYMENT PLAN AND BASIN FUND

With respect to the repayment plan incorporated in the legislation, the conference committee agreed to and adopted language in the Senate bill, which requires the repayment with interest of costs allocated to power in not to exceed 50 years—a requirement that is in accordance with presently established policy.

The House-approved bill contained language setting out certain accounting and funding requirements to be made applicable to the basin fund. The conference committee adopted the language of the House bill, which provides for the establishment, from surplus power revenues of the storage project, of credits, within the basin fund, to each State of the upper basin for financial assistance to irrigation development in such State. It should be understood that the revenues thus credited to the States are only for use, within the individual States, in assisting the construction of Federal reclamation projects and shall not be used for any other purpose.

INDIAN LANDS

The House-approved bill contained language making nonreimbursable the costs allocated to irrigation of Indian lands which are beyond the capability of such lands to repay. The conference committee agreed to and adopted substitute language limiting this provision to the Navajo participating project. This language was adopted in recognition of the fact that assistance to the Navajo Indians is the responsibility of the entire Nation and not just the upper basin States.

OPERATION OF POWER FACILITIES

Section 7 of the House-approved bill, containing a grant of authority to the Secretary of the Interior relating to operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed by S. 500, has been amended by the conference committee in two respects.

The first sentence of section 7, directing the Secretary to operate such facilities so as to produce the greatest amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm rates, has been amended through adoption of substitute language which relates to the grant of authority to the Secretary, and provides that such operation—

"* * * shall not affect or interfere with the operations of the provisions of the Colorado River compact, the upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act and any contract lawfully entered into under said compacts and acts."

This language has been adopted to make clear the intent that all of the instruments constituting the law of the Colorado River shall be read together by the Secretary of the Interior in the operation of the power facilities authorized to be constructed, operated, and maintained by this legislation.

In a similar vein, the conference committee has adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House-approved language contained in the second sentence in section 7. The language of this sentence, which deals with the impounding and use of water for the generation of power and energy at the plants of the Colorado River storage project, has been rewritten to make clear the intent of Congress that, subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact, such impounding and use shall be subservient to the appropriation of water for domestic or agricultural purposes.

APPROVAL OF FINAL COURT DECREE RELATING TO BLUE RIVER WATER

The Senate bill contained language authorizing conveyance to the city of Denver of certain water rights used for the production of power at Green Mountain Dam on the Blue River in Colorado. The conference committee adopted substitute language. These water rights have been the subject of prolonged litigation between the United States, Denver, and water users on both the eastern and western slopes of Colorado in the consolidated cases of the *United States of America* v. *Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District, et al.*, in the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. Since the Senate action on S. 500, agreement has been reached between representatives of the eastern slope and western slope of Colorado and a final decree has been filed by the United States District Court in this matter. Copies of the final decree and stipulations have been submitted to the Congress. The substitute language adopted by the conference committee gives immediate congressional approval to the final judgment, final decree and stipulations, and instructs the proper agencies of the United States to act in accordance therewith.

PLANNING OF FUTURE PROJECTS

With respect to House language in section 13 of the bill relating to the planning of future projects by the Secretary, the conference committee adopted substitute language which does not change the intended purpose of this section. The intention of the language is to require the Secretary, in planning additional developments in the upper basin, to give consideration to achievement, within each of the States, of the fullest practicable use of the water apportioned to each State. Since, under section 5, revenues to assist irrigation development are apportioned to the States on the basis of the estimated percentages of upper basin water remaining to be developed in each such State, the intention of this section could also be stated as requiring the Secretary, in planning future projects, to give consideration to the revenues which it is anticipated will be available for repayment of such projects.

CONSENT TO SUIT OF UNITED STATES

Section 14 of the bill, which gives consent to joinder of the United States as a party to an action or actions by any State of the Colorado River Basin asserting noncompliance with the provisions of law made applicable by this section, has been amended to make clear the intent of Congress that the United States may be joined as a party thereto as a defendant or otherwise.

QUALITY-OF-WATER STUDIES

The House-approved bill included language in section 15 requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make certain quality-of-water studies. The conference committee adopted substitute language which, although not as specific, accomplishes the same purpose and recognizes that such studies are already required by law and are under way.

OTHER DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HOUSE AND SENATE LANGUAGE

With respect to all other major differences between the House and the Senate bills not discussed hereinbefore, the conference committee concurred in and adopted the House language.

In conclusion, one additional observation appears in order: throughout the hearings and deliberations of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on this legislation, in Floor presentation and debate, and in the several sessions of the conference committee, there has existed unity of understanding and agreement on the purpose of this legislation. That purpose is to authorize the construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and to provide for the operation of the facilities thereof in accordance with the law of the Colorado River.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
LEO W. O'BRIEN,
WILLIAM A. DAWSON,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman with respect to the repayment provisions found in the conference report. As I understand, the provisions of the House bill were taken out and the provisions of the other body agreed to. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct, and that represents the only major change in the bill as passed by the House. The Senate provision called for a repayment of both the irrigation and the power features in 50 years. The bill that passed the House required equal annual installments of 50 years on the irrigation features, thus deferring for a somewhat longer time the repayment of the power features. The Bureau of the Budget

preferred the language of the Senate bill, and as a consequence of that and in order not to encounter any difficulties with the Bureau on that subject, we took what we regarded as the more restrictive language as far as payout time is concerned of the Senate bill.

Mr. HOSMER. That would be restrictive as to the payback period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. In other words, the current policy of the Bureau of the Budget is not to look beyond 50 years, and they did not like the provisions of the House bill which permitted the power features to go beyond 50 years for their final payout. So, we restricted it to 50 years on each of them, which made it necessary for us to take out the provisions of the House bill calling for equal annual installments.

Mr. HOSMER. Do the provisions now require that both the power and the irrigation features be paid back within the 50-year period?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct.

Mr. HOSMER. Is there any priority between them in the event the revenues do not provide sufficient money for the repayment?

Mr. ENGLE. The power features have to pay out in 50 years with interest. In other words, what we actually did in the House was this: We had a priority for the irrigation features with 50-year equal installments. We took that out, and what it boils down to is that the power features have to pay out with interest in 50 years, and if there is not enough money to pay for them both the final payment on the irrigation features has to come in later.

Mr. HOSMER. The irrigation features are nonreimbursable, as far as interest goes, to the United States Treasury, and the longer they remain unpaid, the more interest cost is involved.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true in all reclamation projects. So, the repayment program we have in this bill is exactly the same as other projects. The one we had in the House was really more onerous to the landowners because they had to pay interest longer.

Mr. HOSMER. One other question with respect to the $760 million authorization. I notice that the Curecanti Dam provisions have been somewhat liberalized in that the Secretary can now, if he chooses, build Curecanti or commence to build it, and I am wondering, inasmuch as the cost of Curecanti was not considered in arriving at the authorization figure, if the committee intends that some of the other projects be deleted or that an increase in the authorization will be sought at a later time.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money, they will have to come back to Congress. We left it just exactly as it was in the House bill. The conference report simply points out that we never set up any priority as among projects; in other words, they can start with whatever is best to start out with, and if they do not have enough money, they will have to come back to Congress for additional authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. As the bill now stands, there is not enough money to go around for all the projects authorized.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, we cannot be too sure about what the situation is going to be 25 years hence.

Mr. HOSMER. Even if the cost remained the same, the possibilities now with regard to Curecanti, which were not considered before, do not make the authorization sufficient on the basis of presently estimated cost for the approved projects involved.

Mr. ENGLE. If they run out of money they have to come back for additional money. They cannot start a project for which they do not have sufficient money to complete and, as a consequence, it is, in effect, saying when they run out of money they are going to have to come back for another authorization.

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman means that we have more or less written a blank check?

Mr. ENGLE. No, sir; we have not. They can keep building on what they are authorized to build, and when and if the money runs out a new and further authorization will have to be given by Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, in respect to the conference report on S. 500, now under consideration, I would like to say there were a number of Members of the House who, like myself, supported this measure when it was considered here 3 or 4 weeks ago. I supported the authorization with the understanding from the committee in charge of the bill, as well as the supporters of the measure, that although this is an authorized project, it will, if appropriations are approved, be what may be known as self-liquidating, and that only approximately 1 percent of the cost of the project will really be charged to the Federal Treasury. When this legislation was considered in the House, the chairman stated that 99 percent of the capital investment will be paid from reclamation funds presently on hand amounting now to about $27 million, together with income to be obtained from the use of the project, including income from power and income from reclamation. So because of the small amount of charges against the general taxpayers of the country, I went along with the majority of the House.

The proponents of this bill insisted that major crops grown on the irrigated land will not be the kind that will come in competition with crops grown in other areas, especially those in surplus. As a matter of fact, an amendment was adopted in the House to take care of that situation.

If I thought the authorization of this project would provide for a substantial charge against the taxpayers of this country, I would not support it. We were informed by the proponents of the measure, including the chairman of the committee that approximately 1 percent of the entire cost of the project would finally come out of the Federal Treasury.

I am also advised that the approval of this legislation will to a considerable degree, alleviate a situation in regard to the Navaho Indians who will use a part of the land when irrigated to provide food for themselves so they will not be dependent upon the expenditure of millions of dollars of food costs from the Federal Treasury.

PUT SOME SENSE IN FARM SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the House-Senate conference committee now working on the farm bill could bring some sense and some reason to the surplus food disposal program by adopting, as part of the compromise bill, a food stamp plan such as proposed in my bill, H. R. 5105. This would assure getting some of the surplus to those in our country who are in need—many of them actually hungry. Let us feed our own needy as well as the poor of other nations.

The Senate bill provides for up to $500 million for sending surplus food abroad, including shipping costs. If we can afford that—and I am sure we can—then we can certainly afford the cost of distributing some of this surplus to needy Americans under a food-stamp plan. We have already bought and paid for this food. Let us distribute it.

The differences between the House and Senate farm bills are so great that the conference committee would have adequate authority to adopt a food-stamp amendment as a compromise provision. I urge the House conferees to suggest such an amendment. I urge its adoption by the conference committee.

We have over 5 million Americans on different forms of public welfare assistance. Each one needs—actually needs—some of this surplus food. These are people who do not now get enough to eat. Let us use this blessed surplus—this abundance—to help feed the hungry here at home as well as abroad.

The Sullivan bill for a food-stamp plan, H. R. 5105, is as follows:

H. R. 5105

A bill to provide for the establishment of a food stamp plan for the distribution of $1 billion worth of surplus food commodities a year to needy persons and families in the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the general welfare, raise the levels of

health and of nourishment for needy persons whose incomes prevent them from enjoying adequate diets, and to remove the specter of want, malnutrition, or hunger in the midst of mountains of surplus food now accumulating under Government ownership in warehouses and other storage facilities, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to promulgate and put into operation as quickly as possible, a program to distribute to needy persons in the United States through a food stamp system a portion of the surpluses of food commodities acquired and being stored by the Federal Government by reason of its price-support operations or other purchase programs.

SEC. 2. In carrying out such program the Secretary shall—

(1) distribute surplus food made available by the Secretary for distribution under this program only when requested to do so by a State or political subdivision thereof;

(2) issue, or cause to be issued, pursuant to section 3, food stamps redeemable by eligible needy persons for such types and quantities of surplus food as the Secretary shall determine;

(3) distribute surplus food in packaged or other convenient form on the local level at such places as he may determine;

(4) establish standards under which, pursuant to section 3, the welfare authorities of any State or political subdivision thereof may participate in the food stamp plan for the distribution of surplus foods to the needy;

(5) consult the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor, in establishing standards for eligibility for surplus foods and in the conduct of the program generally to assure achievement of the goals outlined in the first section of this act; and

(6) make such other rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall issue to each welfare department or equivalent agency of a State or political subdivision requesting the distribution of surplus food under section 2 (1) food stamps for each kind of surplus food to be distributed, in amounts based on the total amount of surplus food to be distributed and on the total number of needy persons in the various States and political subdivisions eligible to receive such food. The food stamps shall be issued by each such welfare department or equivalent agency to needy persons receiving welfare assistance, or in need of welfare assistance but ineligible because of State or local law, and shall be redeemable by such needy persons at local distribution points to be determined by the Secretary under section 2 (3).

SEC. 4. Surplus food distributed under this act shall be in addition to, and not in place of, any welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) granted needy persons by a State or any political subdivision thereof.

SEC. 5. In any one calendar year the Secretary is authorized to distribute surplus food under this act of a value of up to $1 billion, based on the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring, storing, and handling such food.

SEC. 6. The distribution of surplus food to needy persons in the United States under this act shall be in place of distribution to such needy persons under section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C., sec. 612c), as amended, and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall affect distribution of surplus food presently provided for in such sections other than to needy persons as defined in section 7 of this act.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act a needy person is anyone receiving welfare assistance (financial or otherwise) from the welfare department or equivalent agency of any State or political subdivision thereof, or who is, in the opinion of such agency or agencies, in need of welfare assistance but is ineligible to receive it because of State or local law.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a study of, and shall report to Congress within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, on the feasibility of, the costs of, and the problems involved in, extending the scope of the food stamp plan established by this act to include persons receiving unemployment compensation, receiving old-age and survivor's insurance (social security) pensions, and other low-income groups not eligible to receive food stamps under this act by reason of section 7 of this act.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until noon on Saturday to file a report from its Subcommittee on International Operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations have until midnight tonight to file a report on certain activities in the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Everette Lee DeGolyer, a citizen of Texas, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Harvey N. Davis, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Crawford Hallock Greenewalt, a citizen of Delaware, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Vannevar Bush, resigned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILLING VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, be filled by the appointment of Caryl Parker Haskins, resident in the city of Washington, for the statutory term of 6 years, to succeed Owen Josephus Roberts, deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other day the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] made a distinguished speech on the floor in which he outlined the means by which the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, had made payments on cheese to restaurants, cheese to dealers, and to distributors that the Comptroller General ruled were unauthorized and improper. In the course of that speech he contrasted the legal action which was instituted by the Department of Agriculture against 281 wheat farmers who had violated their marketing quotas, wheat farmers who only owed the Government less than $500

apiece. And the prompt institution of prosecution and attempt to recover from these wheat farmers against the failure to try to recover for the cheese.

I suggest, however, that Secretary Benson knew that his program for farm people, and for the wheat farmers especially, was such that they were going to be bankrupt, so he proceeded promptly to recover the money for the Government. We should not be too critical of his actions.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS AND OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT AND CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, accompanied by staff members of the House Subcommittee To Investigate Federal Printing and Paperwork, I recently inspected storage rooms containing hundreds of thousands of surplus and obsolete books which were printed for the House and Senate Libraries and the House folding room. This vast quantity of books, for the most part still in their original wrappings and stored in the subbasement of the Library of Congress and elsewhere, represents an accumulation which has developed over a long period of time, extending far back into the last century. Many of these books have only salvalge value, but some undoubtedly have historical value and may be of considerable interest to libraries and educational organizations. It is also likely that historical groups, like the Ford Foundation, in Dearborn, Mich., will avail themselves of any opportunity that may develop, to acquire such publications as will make some valuable contribution to their collections of Americana and history-making memorabilia.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on House Administration has referred the report of this accumulation to the Joint Committee on the Library. It is hoped that the disposal recommendations which it prescribes will take cognizance of the potential historical value of many of the books.

An inventory and proper disposition of this mountainous accumulation will well be recognized as a real progressive step toward giving the true value to the purpose for publishing these books and at the same time releasing thousands of square feet of valuable floor space which is presently used to entomb these books.

SECURITY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I arise on this occasion to comment on one of the most significant decisions of the present administration.

This was the recent decision by the Department of Justice not to appeal to the Supreme Court a lower court's decision condemning the use of secret informers in security proceedings. An answer has been long overdue to the controversial question of whether an accused security risk has a constitutional right to know and face his accusers or whether, as the Government has contended, informants' names must be kept secret in the interest of national security.

Last October, the United States court of appeals in San Francisco held that the Coast Guard's security program for maritime workers was unconstitutional because the seamen were not told of the sources of the charges against them. In its decision, the court denounced what it called a system of secret informers, whispering, and talebearers. Since that time there has been much interest in speculation as to whether the Justice Department would petition the Supreme Court to review the case.

When we consider the strong position which the Justice Department took last year in the case of Dr. John P. Peters against any requirement for confrontation in security cases, it seems strange that this same Department has now affirmatively decided not to appeal this position to the Supreme Court. And I think it is worth pointing out that this decision not to appeal was made by Solicitor General Sobeloff after consultation with and with the concurrence of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.

I do not think I am overstating the case, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this decision signals a significant victory for civil liberties in the United States. But the battle is not yet won. The decision of the court of appeals, which now becomes the law of the land, simply affirms the constitutional rights of a private employee accused of being a security risk to know and face his accusers. It is still possible, for a Federal employee, similarly accused of being a security risk, to lose his job without knowing or having the opportunity to face his or her accusers.

In other words, what constitutes due process of law for a private employee is now very different from that which constitutes due process of law for a Government employee. It is argued that working for the Government is a privilege, not a right, and that a Government worker is therefore not entitled to the constitutional guaranty of due process—including confrontation of his accusers. How much longer, I wonder, are we going to be content to find excuses for a security system lacking both in principle and honesty.

This question has been only partially answered, Mr. Speaker. Not only are Government employees still in doubt, but many thousands of others as well. On two occasions before, I have called attention to the fact that honorably discharged veterans of the Korean conflict are having their prisoner-of-war compensation denied them on the grounds that they collaborated with the Communists. Are these men to examine the evidence against them? No indeed. Are they allowed to face their accusers? No, indeed. Have they the opportunity of cross-examining those who have furnished derogatory information against them? Again, the answer is "No." And have they the right to court review? No, again. The simple fact, Mr. Speaker, is that these American veterans are not accorded even the suggestion of traditional American justice.

Certainly it is true that an efficient, intelligent security system is necessary for the protection of our Nation. But a security system which is unnecessarily destructive of our individual liberties cannot be tolerated. We cannot sit idly by while the freedoms are being flagrantly abused—all in the name of "security."

The decision of the court of appeals on this subject is well worth reading, Mr. Speaker. In part, the court says:

> It is unbelievable that the result (of this decision) will prevent evil officials from procuring proof. * * * But surely it is better that these agencies suffer from handicap than that the citizens of a freedom-loving country shall be denied that which has always been considered their birthright.
>
> Indeed it may well be that in the long run nothing but beneficial results will come from a lessening of such talebearing. It is a matter of public record that the somewhat comparable security risk program directed at Government employees has been used to victimize perfectly innocent men.
>
> The objective of perpetuating a doubtful system of secret informers likely to bear upon the innocent as well as upon the guilty * * * cannot justify an abandonment here of ancient standards of due process.
>
> Furthermore, in considering the public interests in the preservation of system under which unidentified informers are encouraged to make unchallengable statements about their neighbors, it is not amiss to bear in mind whether or not we must look forward to a day when substantially everyone will have to contemplate the possibility that his neighbors are being encouraged to make reports to the FBI about what he says, what he reads and what meetings he attends. * * *
>
> The time has not come when we have to abandon a system of liberty for one modeled on that of the Communists.

INVESTIGATION OF DAILY WORKER

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a paradox developed. The internal-revenue men closed up the Daily Worker offices at the same time we were discovering the Daily Worker enjoys second-class mailing privileges for its mail. Therefore, in effect, the Daily Worker gets a subsidy from our own Government which the Postmaster General is not happy about. The paradox is that apparently here in the United States of America a revolution is all right so long as you pay your taxes—and if you pay taxes the United States will subsidize the revolution. I think the United States is the only country in the world that subsidizes those who try to overthrow it. I

call upon our Committee on the Civil Service and Post Office to look into the matter and bring those who own and manage the Daily Worker before that committee so we may inquire how far our own Government is going in spending its own money to destroy itself—in other words, to commit hara-kiri.

The subsidy enjoyed by the Daily Worker, through cheap second-class mailing privileges, should be ended. The overthrow of our free Government should not be subsidized by the Government itself.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H. R. 7679, H. R. 8123, H. R. 8490, H. R. 8674, H. R. 9260, H. R. 9263, H. R. 9824, H. R. 10046.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORPORATE TAXES AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, I introduced legislation designed to ease one of the most onerous burdens which over the years small business has had to bear.

Most small corporations have been unable to expand and grow in the American tradition because of the heavy imposition of income taxes. In the past, in addition to the normal tax we have had for many years surtaxes which applied to small as well as to large corporations. It was not until recently that an exemption of $25,000 was made available in the surtax bracket. We know also that the normal tax rate of 25 percent of the taxable net income was raised to 30 percent and that increase in the normal tax rate still applies.

The bill which I introduced will not decrease revenue. It will, however, encourage the growth of small corporations. It will encourage thousands of businesses presently operating as individuals or partnerships to take advantage of an opportunity to place their businesses on a sound corporate basis. The corporate tax base would be broadened and within a reasonable period corporate tax revenue would be increased. At the same time, small corporations would be able to keep pace with their larger competitors in plant modernization which is imperative in an era of rapid technological development.

In providing relief for small corporations it is not intended, nor do I propose, to penalize corporations simply because they are large. As a matter of fact, under my bill until earnings exceed $700,000 there is no increase in the corporate tax. The increase above $700,000 amounts to only 2 percent more than the present effective rate of 52 percent or 54 percent. I consider this increase temporary, and it is my expectation that if this bill is enacted into law, a general corporate tax reduction would take place within the foreseeable future. Of course, we must remember that our present high tax rates are the result of wars and the necessity for the maintenance of a strong national defense. Few, if any, of us I believe are not willing to pay our fair share of the national-defense budget. At the same time, in order to keep our economy strong and healthy we must place a great deal of emphasis on the words "fair share."

I do not believe that we can continue to tax corporations without taking into account ability to pay. We apply that principle, after a fashion, to individuals and despite the opinions of some of our theorists and experts, I believe that a truly equitable graduated income tax for corporations is as sound from an economic viewpoint as a graduated tax for individuals. I desire to emphasize also that our corporate tax structure must not be confiscatory to large corporations nor have the effect of stultifying the growth of small corporations. I repeat that I hope my bill will receive serious consideration by the Ways and Means Committee this year. I also hope that the majority will see fit to schedule hearings on this most important and critical problem of small and independent business.

The tax rates which are proposed in H. R. 9851 are as follows:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	10 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $25,000.	$500, plus 20 percent of excess over $5,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 40 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$34,500, plus 54 percent of excess over $100,000.

BAGGAGE ALLOWANCES AND EXCESS BAGGAGE RATES BY AIR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include a joint resolution introduced by me today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. Speaker, when the Douglas DC–3's, Lockheed Lodestars, and Boeing 247–D's were the big all-metal luxury airliners, the infant airlines accepted passenger weight. We used to have to get on scales and be weighed in, personally, with briefcases, overcoats, and baggage.

Those were the days when a full load of passengers sometimes crowded out gasoline in making total gross weight limits. Oh, sometimes the mail bumped a passenger, or even two occasionally. But total gross was a very important figure, with CAA inspectors riding incognito and waiting to check load manifests.

It was in that time that 40 pounds—the minimum packed weight of a small suitcase—was established as the allowable weight without an excess baggage charge being levied on the sometimes unsuspecting passenger. Of course, there were those who filled their topcoat pockets with the heavier toilet articles and there were those who managed to hide briefcases from the eyes of vigilant countermen. It is still that way.

And then I remember when the weighing-in process got to be such a nuisance that test runs were made on weight manifests to find out what the average passenger weighed. I do not remember whether said passenger was weighed during the summer or in winter, but anyhow, the figure 160 pounds came out. A very convenient figure, that. Add it to 40 pounds of baggage and you round out 200 pounds. Very neat.

That evidently accounts for the nice little figures on the inside back cover of the Official Airline Guide. There it declares that excess baggage rates shall be figured at one-half of 1 percent of the applicable one-way adult fare. In other words, the excess baggage rates shall be the same as the passenger rate per pound.

So it is not difficult to figure. If the fare to Duck City is $64, the excess baggage rate per pound is 32 cents. But Duck City is exactly 1,000 miles distant so again it is easy to figure the passenger rate per mile. Divide $64 by 1000 and you have $.064 per mile as the answer.

It is also easy to figure passenger cost per ton-mile if you just figure that 10 passengers equal 1 ton and multiply $0.064 by 10. The answer $0.64. So the passenger pays 64 cents per ton-mile for himself and baggage.

Of course, in this discussion we have not mentioned air mail or air mail rates. And we shall refrain, because comparisons are odious either way you slice them. Neither will we discuss air express.

Suppose we talk about passenger fares in foreign commerce for a while. If a passenger is destined from Copenhagen to Los Angeles—or vice versa—he can carry 66 pounds of baggage all the way on his ticket and pay no excess baggage charge. If he flies SAS direct, there is no problem. And if he flies Pan-Am to New York and any domestic carrier to Los Angeles, there is no problem either, because he is a preferred customer on the domestic carrier. No excess baggage is charged anyone who has a portion of foreign travel on his ticket.

Take for example the Cuban who makes a round trip from Habana to Washington with a stop-over at Miami, and the Washingtonian who intends to spend some time in Miami, including in his plans possibly a trip to Habana. It is the same for both, except in the matter of our Federal transportation tax which the Cuban, of course, escapes. In what follows, the 10 percent Federal tax is not included.

The Washington-Miami round-trip costs our well-dressed passenger with 66 pounds of baggage $63.30 plus $63.30 less 5 percent, or $120.27, plus .005×$63.30 ×26×2 or $16.64 excess baggage round trip. Total: $136.91. Add to that a

round trip to Habana from Miami—on which trip he is entitled to carry 66 pounds of baggage—at a cost of $36 and you have a total trip cost of $172.91.

But if he were to buy a round-trip from Washington to Habana with a stopover in Miami, he would be entitled to carry 66 pounds of baggage all the way and the total cost of the ticket is $155.30, a saving of $17.61. So the smart Washingtonian going to Miami buys a round-trip ticket to Habana whether he carries excess baggage or not, because the Washington-Miami round-trip carrying 40 pounds of baggage—$120.27—plus the Miami-Habana round trip allowing 66 pounds of baggage—$36—about equals the Washington-Habana round trip at $155.30, carrying 66 pounds all the way. So if any excess baggage is to be carried to Miami and a Habana trip is contemplated, it is actually cheaper to buy a through ticket, whether you use all of it or not. You might get a refund on the unused portion.

How silly can we be? A Cuban can travel all over the United States, if he is ticketed for it, carrying 66 pounds and the only difference between him and the American is that he flew over the 90 miles of the gulf. I suppose that entitles him to an advantage.

Now, just for a lark, let us consider a round trip from San Francisco to Habana by way of an interchange. First, the fare to Miami via Los Angeles-Dallas-Atlanta costs $174.40. So the excess baggage charge is 87 cents per pound. The round trip is $331.36 carrying 40 pounds. The round trip Miami-Habana is $36 carrying 66 pounds. So if you buy a ticket to Miami and return and then decide you want to visit Habana—you are that close—it costs $367.36 total. But if you bought a through round trip to Habana with stopover privileges, it only costs $355.51, and 66 pounds can be carried all the way.

But to add insult to injury, you will have to add excess baggage charges in on the San Francisco-Miami traveler, which, at 26 pounds at 87 cents times 2 equals $47.24. So the Miami round trip with 26 pounds excess costs $378.60 as against the Habana round trip with the same baggage costing $355.51, and if the Miami passenger decides to go on to Habana it is $36 more, or $414.60 transportation that he could have purchased for $355.51—a $59.09 saving.

Now, let us take a look at the Washington-Los Angeles round trip. If made entirely in the United States, the one-way fare is $149.35 and the round trip $283.86, and the excess-baggage rate is 75 cents per pound. If 66 pounds is carried, the round trip plus excess baggage at $39 is $322.80.

But if the trip is made via Mexico City you are offered that side trip—and you can make it either or both ways—for $59 additional over the round-trip fare, or a total of $342.80, and carry the 66 pounds without excess charge. So we come up with the fact that the side trip to Mexico City is really a bargain to the 66-pound baggage person—it only costs $20 net extra.

On mileage, it is really a bonanza. Washington-Mexico City is 2,123 miles; Mexico City-Los Angeles 1,640 miles, for a total of 3,763, or 7,526 miles round trip. Washington-Los Angeles round trip is 4,620 miles. So it will cost $20 for 2,906 extra miles of flight, or $.007 per mile if the Mexico City privilege is used both ways. That is the cheapest passenger transportation I know of anywhere.

The United States air carriers certainly discriminate against Americans who travel in the United States and in favor of foreigners and those Americans who travel abroad. You might think that the domestic carriers get something extra out of foreign ticketing, but they do not. They carry the extra baggage without a whimper.

But let someone say that the domestic carriers ought to treat Americans at least as well as they treat foreigners and a cry goes to high heaven that someone is robbing them of revenue.

Now to go from the ridiculous to the sublime, let us consider a trip to Honolulu. You can buy a first-class ticket from the east cost to Hawaii over any airline or combination of airlines that serve both ends of your trip and carry 66 pounds of baggage the whole way without extra charge.

The same thing is true of the first-class passenger who flies to Alaska. He too can carry, en route, 66 pounds all over the United States free of charge.

As a matter of fact the 40-pound limit applies only within the continental United States and Canada.

Abroad they recognize that passengers paying first-class fares should receive first-class treatment as to baggage allowance. Abroad you can carry 66 pounds anywhere on a first-class ticket. A tourist or second-class passenger can carry 44 pounds.

A United States coach-flight passenger to Hawaii or Alaska is entitled to carry 44 pounds just like the European tourist. It is only the continental passenger who is limited to 40 pounds.

But even sadder—the coach passenger in the United States and Canada has to pay the same excess-baggage charge as the first-class passenger, in spite of the fact that his ticket costs two-thirds as much. He must pay premium rates on excess baggage. Even the air mail travels for far less.

This is a situation that in air travel is as antique as the 247–D. It should be brought down to date. The same baggage allowance should persist all over the world for the same class of ticket, and this discrimination against the domestic traveler should be abolished. It should be done voluntarily by the carriers, but I have prepared a bill designed to accomplish it if they do not.

Then we might suggest that additional extra luggage could be carried in the same plane at freight rates. When that happens—the passenger with baggage will feel free to travel anywhere by air.

The joint resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 595

Joint resolution to amend section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to excess baggage charges collected by air carriers

Whereas under the tariffs filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board by air carriers, passengers holding tickets entitling them to transportation only in domestic air transportation must pay an excess baggage charge for baggage weight in excess of 40 pounds; and

Whereas, on the other hand, under the tariffs applicable to overseas and to foreign air transportation and to domestic air transportation when included with either overseas or foreign air transportation, first-class passengers are not required to pay an excess baggage charge except for baggage weight in excess of 66 pounds, and coach or second-class passengers in such transportation are not required to pay an excess baggage charge except for baggage weight in excess of 44 pounds; and

Whereas there are certain situations in which first-class passengers who are actually traveling between points in the United States may be able, at little extra cost because their tickets permit foreign travel, to carry up to 66 pounds of baggage without having to pay an excess baggage charge; and

Whereas coach or second-class excess baggage charges and weight allowances in domestic air transportation are the same as those applicable to first-class passengers, thus providing an even heavier discrimination against coach passengers; and

Whereas the result is severe discrimination against users of both first-class and coach or second-class passenger service in domestic air transportation only which neither the domestic air carriers as a group nor the Civil Aeronautics Board has done anything to correct: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C., sec. 484), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"EXCESS BAGGAGE CHARGES

"(d) The Board shall prescribe just and reasonable excess baggage charges which may be collected by air carriers, and no air carrier may collect any excess baggage charge which is not authorized by the Board. Such charges prescribed for any class of service shall be the same in the case of each type of air transportation. For the purposes of this subsection the types of air transportation shall be held and considered to be interstate air transportation, overseas air transportation, and foreign air transportation."

AGRICULTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] stated that the Secretary of Agriculture left with the Committee on Agriculture a draft of a bill on the 27th day of February, which was printed as a committee print but has not been introduced as yet, and further stated:

The Secretary has not been able to prevail upon any Member of the House, either Republican or Democrat, to introduce the bill which he proposed.

While that particular print was not introduced as a bill, similar legislation was then pending before our committee. The soil-bank legislation proposed in the committee print was introduced by Congressman HOPE as H. R. 8543 and by me as H. R. 8544 on January 17, 1956. These bills contain many of the sections

in the committee print and the titles were such that any recommendation made by the Secretary of Agriculture in the committee print could have been adopted under H. R. 8543 or 8544.

So this legislation was before the Committee on Agriculture. Beginning on page 22 of the committee print, title III, "Agricultural Credit," are provisions amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which were introduced by me as a separate bill on March 8, as H. R. 9843.

A subcommittee has held hearings on bills identical to title III of the committee print, so this legislation has been introduced and is before the Committee on Agriculture.

In fact the titles of these bills are so written that any of the changes suggested by the committee print would be germane to the Hope and Hill bills.

RESEARCH PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPING INCREASED USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1956 I introduced H. R. 10148, a bill to provide for a scientific study and research program for the purpose of developing increased and additional industrial uses of agricultural products so as to reduce surpluses of such products and to increase the income of farmers, and for other purposes.

This bill is identical with the bill introduced by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, and others in the Senate—S. 3503. As a farmer, I can appreciate this forward-looking approach to the solution of the farmers' problems. Unfortunately, too many approaches to the farm problem have been from the viewpoint of securing votes instead of actually helping the farmer. The present plight of the farmer actually is the result of the continuance of such a program and the farmer is entitled to an intelligent and honest approach to the solution of depressed agricultural conditions whenever they may arise.

H. R. 10148 is not a substitute for H. R. 12 which is in conference committee at the present time. It is an approach to the long term study of further uses of agricultural products, marketing research, and other ideas that will be of specific interest and help to the agricultural economy. I hope that the agriculture committee will give early and serious study to this bill and similar bills that have been submitted.

IMPORTS OF CHERRIES IN BRINE FROM ABROAD

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of communications from the cherry growers and processors organizations in the State of Washington which indicate their real concern over the possibility of reductions in tariffs on imports of cherries in brine from abroad. These cherries can be produced in foreign countries much cheaper than they can be produced here because of the cheaper labor and production costs abroad. That being the case, the foreign producer can place his product on the American market at a lower price than can his American counterpart.

Any further reductions in tariffs on this product, coupled with increases in the amount of imports, will drive the domestic producer out of his own market and will put him out of business. There are about 20,000 growers and producers in the Pacific Northwest who are affected by this problem and all of them are sincerely worried about their present and future welfare.

These people, through their organizations, urge that Congress act to protect their industry. They want no further reductions in tariff on imported cherries in brine, and suggest that a quota be placed on the amount of imports. Certainly their requests should be given favorable consideration.

AGRICULTURE BILL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on Monday when the question of the recess was approached by the leadership of the House, I suggested that we ought to have a rollcall, and I said that I would insist on a rollcall unless I could be convinced that there was no possibility at all of bringing in a farm bill between now and the 9th of April. The leadership yesterday convinced me that it would be impossible to get a workable bill here—one that we understood and on which a report could be written that could be understood, and to bring in a bill which would be a good farm bill. So I am not going to ask for a rollcall on the resolution calling for a recess. I do suggest that the leadership in the House and on the Committee of Agriculture that they work hard to bring in a good bill that can be voted upon as soon as the Congress returns on April 9. The report should be clear and spell out all provisions of the bill. Time is of the essence. Agriculture needs a good bill, not one salted and seasoned with political gadgets.

The bill from the Senate with 40 amendments is a political hodge-podge of contradictory provisions. It is not workable or acceptable to the White House. Let the report on the bill be one understood and acceptable to those charged with its administration. I offer the suggestion in the hope that it will not be a political Christmas tree or something that the President will have to veto. The action of the conference committee so far is to the effect that a bill will be presented to this House that will not be acceptable to the other end of the avenue. From the sidelines it appears that there are those who hope the President will have to veto a farm bill. I trust the administration can also give and bend a little in order that a new agriculture bill can be promptly enacted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

RECESS, MARCH 29–APRIL 9, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 226).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the 2 Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until April 9, 1956, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INTERIM APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 9, 1956, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 11, 1956, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR AND PRIVATE CALENDAR TO BE CALLED APRIL 9

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 9, 1956, it shall be in order to consider business under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule, and also that it shall be in order to consider business under clause 6, rule XXIV, the Private Calendar rule.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this so we may learn the rest of the program for the week of April 9, if the gentleman from Oklahoma can inform us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, Monday, April 9 is District day, but there is no business.

As indicated in my request, both the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar will be called.

On Tuesday the bill H. R. 9893, the Military Installations bill, will be called up and Tuesday devoted to general debate.

On Wednesday the bill H. R. 9893 will be read under the 5-minute rule and it will be followed on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday by the following bills:

House Resolution 400, investigations, coal industry.

H. R. 5299, authorize Virgin Islands National Park.

S. 1188, examination of national banks.

S. 1736, qualifications of national bank directors.

H. R. 9285, extend authority, direct purchase bill.

H. R. 8750, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

Conference reports may be called up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there anything scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. There is no business scheduled for the balance of this week.

Mr. MARTIN. I did not note in the gentleman's listing of the program any reference to the farm legislation.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise the distinguished minority leader that I have announced that conference reports may be called up at any time.

It is planned to bring up the conference report on the farm bill as soon as it is ready.

Mr. MARTIN. Could we not get unanimous consent to have that filed during the recess so that it can be brought up on Monday, April 9?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman from North Carolina intends to make that request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if and when the conference report on the bill, H. R. 12, is ready for printing we may have it printed and made available to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to bring that up on Monday the 9th or on Tuesday the 10th for a vote in the House?

Mr. COOLEY. I have no control over the program. I assume it cannot be brought up on Monday the 9th. I am advised that no RECORD will be printed during the recess. The conference report will have to be printed in the RECORD of Monday, the 9th, and will be available on Tuesday, the 10th.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then will a vote come before Wednesday the 11th?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand there is a primary election in Illinois on Tuesday, the 10th, so it appears to me it cannot possibly be called up before Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little disturbed over waiting until Wednesday. The farmers are waiting to get word as to where they stand.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is not half as much disturbed as I am, but that is the situation we are in and we have no control over the matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the acting majority leader say anything about the State Department appropriation bill? I am interested in that bill because it provides for several hundred additional employees in a tremendously increased budget. I am somewhat interested in the Federal Government paying $47 for wastepaper baskets for the State Department. Can the gentleman say whether that bill is coming up immediately after recess? I remember a year ago when we came back from the Easter recess that that State Department appropriation bill was called up immediately.

Mr. ALBERT. I may advise the gentleman it has been the practice to program appropriation bills as soon as they are ready. We have programed a number already.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will not program that bill for action immediately after we return from the Easter recess.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS SAY IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT CONGRESS STRENGTHEN THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, small business is asking for protection against a monopolistic practice which destroys small business. This should not be confused with big businesses' "bad faith." Small business is not asking for protection against bad faith. Protection against bad faith is already provided in the law as a result of a majority opinion of the Supreme Court's Standard Oil Company of Indiana against FTC.

EFFECTIVE ANTITRUST LAWS MUST CURB BIG BUSINESS ABUSE OF POWER

The effect of the Standard Oil opinion was to tell big business that it is perfectly all right to go ahead and discriminate in prices—which is to bring abuse of power into the competitive contest—just so long as big business is discriminating in good faith. In other words, the effect of the Court's interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act is that it is all right to create a monopoly in good faith, and to use in good faith a method which destroys the smaller competitors, which keeps new competitors out of the market and ultimately but surely creates monopoly.

A law against bad faith is inadequate on two counts. First, it is too vague and nebulous to be enforceable, and it amounts to no protection at all. Second, it is irrelevant to the central problem. If we are to preserve even a vestigal state of competition, we must have antitrust laws which protect against monopoly. We must have antitrust laws which keep the door of opportunity open, so that small business, big business, medium size business, and every other business, may take its chances of succeeding on the basis of its efficiency. This means that the antitrust laws must place an effective curb on abuses of power; we cannot allow methods of competition by which the biggest firm will inevitably win and take over the markets, while the smaller firms will inevitably be squeezed out. It matters not whether these methods are employed in good faith or bad faith.

H. R. 11 will correct the misinterpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act which the Supreme Court made in the Standard Oil of Indiana opinion. It will thus restore to small business some equality of opportunity to survive and to succeed. It will help in a significant way to stop the tremendous numbers of small-business bankruptcies and failures which are now taking place in a period of unprecedented big-business profits. The Members know, I think, that there is a petition on the Clerk's desk to call up H. R. 11 for debate and a vote. If there should turn out to be as many as 218 Members of the House—that is a simple majority—who sign the petition, we can make certain of having a chance to vote on, and to pass, H. R. 11 during this Congress.

ALL SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ASKED FOR PASSAGE OF H. R. 11

Last November, when the Small Business Committee was holding hearings on small-business problems, representatives of every small-business organization came before our committee and entered a plea for legislation to correct the Supreme Court's misinterpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act and to return to small business the full protection against price discrimination which that act was intended to provide.

One of these small-business organizations is the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc. This organization has 2,500 members, doing business in all 48 States and the District of Columbia. These members are independent tire dealers—mostly retailers but also some wholesalers—and they are

not tire manufacturers or big chain distributors.

Mr. W. W. Marsh, executive secretary of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., testified before our committee on November 4 and entered on behalf of this association a plea that Congress pass legislation to correct the Standard Oil decision. I know that all Members will be interested in Mr. Marsh's statement, which I am inserting in part, as follows:

REQUEST OF INDEPENDENT TIRE DEALERS

It is essential to the preservation of the purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act that Congress modify the rationale of the Standard Oil decision to provide that good faith shall remain an effective defense except where the discrimination may substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The present status of the good-faith defense permits the same disadvantages and discriminations against the small buyer through the exercise of market control of large distributors in a particular market as pertained prior to the act.

Certainly the fact that a distributor sets a lower price in a market which may be far removed from his establishment that he would from his local market gives rise to necessity for an explanation or justification. Thus, the ability to control the market by meeting a low price of a competitor, which may in itself be the result of an unlawful conspiracy, will result in the same abuses which the Robinson-Patman Act was intended to correct.

This association feels that the theory and spirit of the Robinson-Patman Act is vital to the continuance of small independent businessmen in this country. When it is weakened or when wedges are driven into it to permit circumvention, as the Standard Oil case has done, the small-business man is in a very vulnerable position.

One fallacy of the reasoning of those who support the rationale of the Standard Oil decision is that it emphasizes only the lower price and gives no attention whatsoever to the higher price which must exist if there is to be a price discrimination. The low price, it is said, is a response to competition and that if a company is denied the right to discriminate to meet the lower price, that company may sell only at the higher price, which would reflect a weakening of competition.

But why should not this lowering of price then be available to all of its customers instead of just to some of them? It is certainly reasonable to assume that no businessman gives a price concession unless competition forces him to.

Systematic and continuous discrimination by dominant sellers, though in good faith, may equally discourage the price competition of smaller rivals and result in the very monopoly or market control that the act attempts to discourage.

Therefore, the good-faith defense should not apply to systematic and continuous discrimination practice by dominant sellers.

The only way to accomplish this is by amending the act to provide that the good-faith defense not be an absolute one if the effect of the price discrimination be to lessen competition or encourage monopoly.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear before this committee and to present the views of the independent tire dealer to the Small Business Committee, which has done so much to protect and preserve the competitive status of the independent businessman.

* * * * *

The hope for the future of the independent tire dealer lies in the hands of this committee and its administrative counterpart.

DECISION OF COURT OF CLAIMS WITH REFERENCE TO INDIAN LANDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the other day Mr. Perry Morton, who is one of the Assistant Attorneys General in the Department of Justice, testified before an Appropriations Committee that because of certain recent decisions of the Court of Claims, this country would have to buy its Indian lands all over again, and suggested that additional legislation either in language in a forthcoming appropriation bill or in the legislative committee in charge, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be passed in order to foreclose the recent decision of the Court of Claims.

That decision was the decision of Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians, and it is reported in volume 131, Court of Claims Report, at page 593.

The first question that was to be decided by the Court of Claims was whether the Congress, in creating the Indian Claims Commission did create a new cause of action for the Indians.

This is what the court held:

We think it is quite clear from the face of the Indian Claims Commission Act that in its passage Congress was, to a certain extent, exercising its political function of creating certain new causes of action and recognizing liability in the United States, if the facts warranted, in connection with such causes. In fact, the act clearly creates causes of action and permits suit thereon which would not have been possible, and are not possible, as far as we know, between private individuals.

One of the new causes of action that was created, that the Court of Claims allowed the Indians to bring, was a claim under Indian title. The Court defines Indian title as that of exclusive possession, occupancy and use from time immemorial.

The Government, in the Otoe case took the position that even if the Congress did create new causes of action based on the revision of treaties for unconscionable consideration, or on lack of fair and honorable dealings by the United States, there is nothing in the act which indicates a congressional intent to create a cause of action in the claimant, or to admit the existence of a liability in the Government, where the treaty sought to be revised, or the dealings claimed to be unfair, involve land held by the Indan claimants by aboriginal use and occupancy title, Indian title, rather than reservation or treaty title.

The Otoe case decided that claims brought by the Indians which involve claims based on the payment of an unconscionable consideration under a treaty cession of land were proper claims for Indian title under the Indian Claims Commission Act. Having so decided, that the new cause of action was created, they decided against the Government and gave the Indians a claim.

When the Department of Justice lost the lawsuit in the Court of Claims, and when the Supreme Court of the United States declined to take jurisdiction on a writ of certiorari, they have come back to the Congress and said to us it was not the congressional intent to allow for such claims as were involved in the Otoe case.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear from an examination of the legislative history of the Indian Claims Commission Act, it is clear from an examination of the decisions of the Indian Claims Commission, and the Supreme Court decisions, that there was a legislative intent to create a cause of action in cases of this nature. There was a congressional intent to create a cause of action for aboriginal claims, there was a congressional intent to create a cause of action for claims where the Government's title was based on unfair treatment of the Indians or based on unconscionable and inadequate payments to the Indians.

The attempt on the part of the Department of Justice to have this legislative action repealed and the decision of the Court of Claims reversed—in the testimony that appeared before the Committee on Appropriations—is violative of the basic proposition that legislation, of this sort should be brought before the appropriate committee of the House, in this case, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. And, if we are going to change the rules in the middle of these Indian Claims Commission suits, we should change them only after open and forthright hearings before the appropriate committee, well knowing what the result of such change will be.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has stated that from an examination of the act there is a clear legislative intent following the line of decisions to which he has referred. I am wondering if the gentleman has read the statement by the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], on page 106 of the hearings to which the gentleman has referred, in which Mr. ROONEY said this:

We most certainly should have an interest in it if it involves the figures to which you have referred.

Over the luncheon recess I have had an opportunity to do some checking and I am glad to find that I did not vote for this bill. I discussed it with some of the Members of Congress who were concerned with the bill back at that time, and they seemed to uniformly say that it was never contemplated that anything like this should be developing nor that the Government should buy back the country from the Indians.

It was never intended that the Indian lands would cover, when it comes to compensation, all the places through which they roamed.

Has the gentleman considered that in making his statement?

Mr. METCALF. It was that language in the testimony of Mr. Morton at that point in the record that gave me concern about the future of this Indian claims legislation.

Mr. BOW. Well, can the gentleman tell us the amount that might be recovered under the present legislation and the decision of the court in the Otoe case?

Mr. METCALF. I will yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] to answer that question.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana for this opportunity to participate in the discussion on a matter of vital importance to thousands of Indians across the face of this country. With specific reference to the point raised by my good friend, I would like to say that we have discussed at some length the interchange between Assistant Attorney General Morton and Chairman ROONEY of the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles Justice Department appropriations. I can assure the gentleman, in the first place, that there has never been any decision, to my knowledge, and certainly the Otoe decision does not hold, that Indian people are entitled to be compensated for land over which they roamed at any time. The concept of Indian title does not at all involve the idea of roaming over the lands and thereby acquiring a compensable right with regard to those lands. The idea of Indian title means exclusive occupancy, exclusive possession as against white people and against other Indian tribes, and that is a much smaller portion of the land than would be involved in the remarks which Mr. Morton made to the committee.

Mr. BOW. Has the gentleman estimated the cost, if the Otoe decision stands, to the Federal Government?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If every acre of land claimed in the 852 claims on file before the Indian Claims Commission were compensated for at the same rate that the land in the Otoe decision was compensated for, which is approximately 50 cents an acre, we would have a total figure of approximately $650 million, which is a far cry from the $5 billion figure cited by the Attorney General.

May I say this further? The record indicates very clearly in the cases already handled by the Indian Claims Commission that the percentage of recovery on the claims which have been asserted has been approximately 1.5 percent. If we apply to the estimated total value of claims which have been asserted and take into account all of the duplicating claims on which the same tribes are claiming the same land, which obviously is an impossibility under the concept of Indian title, as I understand it, if we allowed a 1.5 percent recovery on every acre of those lands to every tribe claiming them, it is my personal estimate based upon the recovery figure of the Indian Claims Commission that your total figure would be somewhere between $135 million and $150 million. That is my personal estimate.

I do not know that it has any greater weight than the estimate of the Assistant Attorney General, but it is based upon the experience of the Indian Claims Commission in dealing with these cases. I do not believe that Mr. Morton's estimate is based upon anything other than an ill-founded guess as to the probable outcome, and it is certainly a gross exaggeration when we consider it is more than 30 times as much as the Indian Claims Commission's experience would indicate.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to have the gentleman's explanation, as a member of the subcommittee before whom the Assistant Attorney General Morton appeared. What does the gentleman have to say about the fact that there are now pending claims before the Commission for more than 1,320 million acres of land compared to the total of 1,900 million acres throughout the entire United States? It is apparent from that that there is a claim being made for practically all of the land in the United States. Does the gentleman have some comment to make upon that subject?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would say, in the first place, that I think it represents about 600 million acres less than the total acreage, for one thing, when I personally believe that had the Indians claimed every acre over which they roamed they could have claimed every acre in the United States. But aside from that I ask the gentleman once again to consider the figures on recovery allowed in the Otoe case. The recovery was only 50 cents an acre on claims asserted.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman say that the figure of 1,320 million acres is a correct figure by the assistant attorney general?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think if you allow duplicating claims where the same tribes are claiming the same land it would probably be in that neighborhood. But obviously you cannot have 10 tribes collecting for the same parcel of land when you require the establishment of exclusive occupancy as a basis for Indian title.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I was concerned also about the fact that in my own State of Ohio there are about 38 claims pending aggregating 117 million acres. In the entire area of the State of Ohio there are something in the neighborhood of 26 million acres. We have claims pending against 117 million acres when we have only about 26 million acres in the State. So that this has pyramided to the point where the committee is concerned about the possibility of $5 billion or even more in claims being made under this decision.

I appreciate the gentleman's bringing this to our attention because, as I say, our committee is quite concerned about this problem.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that we are concerned about the problem, too. If the gentleman will carefully examine the decision in the Otoe case he will discover that there are no new rules as to Indian title. There is no change in the basic law. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a brief as to what the Indian title was before the decision in the Otoe case, and the gentleman will see that there have been no new changes.

The provision respecting the elements which must be found to sustain an award based upon unrecognized original Indian title is based upon the standards prescribed by the courts, as recently summarized by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Santa Fe Pacific Railroad* (314 U. S. 339, 345):

> If it were established as a fact that the lands in question were, or were included in, the ancestral home of the Walapais in the sense that they constituted definable territory occupied exclusively by the Walapais (as distinguished from lands wandered over by many tribes), then the Walapais had Indian title—

One of the classic statements of the nature and extent of use or occupancy required to prove original Indian title was given by the Court of Claims in the case of *The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations* v. *United States* (34 C. Cls. 17, 51):

> In all cases there must have been * * * some mastery of the tribe over the soil to the exclusion of others, or the joint possession of two or more tribes such as gave to each something of a fixed habitation or use of the land as hunting ground to establish a title by occupancy.

And in the case of the *Fort Berthold Indians* v. *United States* (71 C. Cls. 308, 334), the Court of Claims further stated:

> The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the Indians' claim of right of occupancy of lands is dependent upon actual and not constructive possession.

But in defining use or occupation or possession, reference has always been to standards of the Indians' own economy and culture, as stated by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Mitchel* v. *United States* (9 Pet. (34 U. S.) 711, 746):

> Indian possession or occupation was considered with reference to their habits and modes of life; their hunting grounds were as much in their actual possession as the cleared fields of the whites; and their rights to its exclusive enjoyment in their own way and for their own purposes were as much respected, until they abandoned them, made a cession to the Government, or an authorized sale to individuals.

In the case of the *Pawnee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma* v. *the United States* (1 Ind. Cls. Comm. 230, 258–262), the Indian Claims Commission adopted the above standards for application under the Indian Claims Commission Act, stating:

> It is well settled that where a claim is based on original Indian title, occupancy of the claimant tribe to the exclusion of other tribes [is] necessary (pp. 258–259).

And the Commission further stated:

> It is true the jurisdictional provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act are broader than those contained in prior acts of Congress authorizing the adjudication of Indian claims, but this does not permit the Commission to deviate from these requirements made by the Supreme Court, as to what is necessary to establish original Indian title in land (id. at p. 262).

The use of the phrase "original Indian title" in the proposed amendment is not intended to suggest any distinction between that phrase and equivalent phrases which have been used by the courts, such as "aboriginal Indian title," "Indian title," "Indian right of occupancy," "aboriginal use and occupancy," "immemorial use and occupancy," and so forth. The qualifying word "unrecognized" has been used, because, as the law now stands, where the Indians' title to

land has been recognized by the Government, factual proof of actual use and occupancy is not required.

The language of the proposed amendment, prescribing the measure of damages, adopts the rule which has been applied by the courts heretofore in unrecognized original Indian title cases. See *Alcea Band of Tillamooks* v. *United States* (115 C. Cls. 463 (reversed as to interest, 341 U. S. 48)), *Rogue River Tribe of Indians et al.* v. *United States* (116 C. Cls. 454, cert. den. 341 U. S. 902), *Otoe and Missouria Tribe of Indians* v. *The United States* (131 C. Cls. 593, cert. den. 350 U. S. 848). It expressly excludes any allowance of interest or any other increment as damages for delay in making payment, such as is normally allowed in computing just compensation. Therefore, as to claims based upon unrecognized original Indian title, there will be no liability upon the part of the Government to pay interest on the value of the land going back many years to the date when the Indians lost their interest in the land. Otherwise, the language of the amendment is intended to adopt the settled rules of valuation applied by the courts in determining just compensation. See *United States* v. *Miller* (317 U. S. 369), *Klamath Indians* v. *United States* (85 C. Cls. 451, affirmed 304 U. S. 119), *Shoshone Tribe of Indians* v. *United States* (85 C. Cls. 331, affirmed 304 U. S. 111).

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield, does this open the door for the filing of additional cases that would not have been filed otherwise?

Mr. METCALF. The passage of the Indian Claims Commission Act did, as was said in the Otoe case, create a new cause of action that opened the door for the filing of additional cases.

But the rules under which Indian title is determined are unchanged. This overlap about which the gentleman is concerned and about which the gentleman from Oklahoma has talked will not be the basis for additional claims because they have to prove their Indian title under the same rules that were in existence before the passage of the act. Merely roaming over the land will not give them title.

Mr. BOW. Does this go back to the aboriginal title?

Mr. METCALF. The decision in the Otoe case demonstrated that Congress intended the Commission to have jurisdiction over claims arising out of original Indian title but such title had to be proved under established and recognized rules; mere roaming over the land did not give them title upon which to base a claim.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. With regard to this matter of the legislative intent, which is the matter Mr. Morton brought up to the Appropriations Committee, was not that particular aspect of the problem fully considered in cases before the United States Court of Claims?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like at this point, if I may, to call to the attention of the House the remarks on the floor at the time this bill was before the House back in 1946 of some of the men who were responsible for the legislation and some of the men who were responsible for the interpretation of the legislation at the time it was under consideration. In the first place, I would like to direct the attention of the gentleman to the remarks made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] at the very outset of the discussion on the Indian Claims Commission bill. He said this:

> I do not propose to go into the merits of the legislation. I will leave that to the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs. However, may I say that this matter of Indian claims, claims of Indian citizens against their Government should be settled once and for all.

Along that line, we had testimony thereafter on the floor of the House by the different people associated with the bill, one after another of them stating that it was intended under this bill to take care of all of the claims of the Indian people. The gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. Robertson, who was a member of the committee at that time, called attention to a finding by the Select Committee on Indian Affairs to investigate Indian affairs under House Resolution 166 in the 78th Congress wherein they pointed out that—

> Indian claims of varying degrees of legality, morality, and merit remain outstanding against the Government in the aggregate sum of many hundreds of millions of dollars. Some of these claims are of unquestioned merit; others are highly questionable.

He goes on to point out that it is imperative that we take them all up in one forum and dispose of them.

Mr. Stigler, from Oklahoma, the late Bill Stigler, who was my distinguished predecessor in the House and one of the authors of this legislation, pointed this out:

> This bill creates a commission of three, appointed by the President subject to confirmation of the Senate, to hear and determine all claims of every nature whatsoever against the United States on behalf of any Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable group of American Indians residing within the territorial limits of the United States or Alaska.

The gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, had a similar statement in the RECORD. He said:

> Until and unless the Congress takes action to dispose of these claims, it simply means that these annual appropriations for the Indian Service and the Indian Bureau and for the bureaucrats who run them are going to have to be made, and the Indians will stay on their reservations, and we will get no place steadily in promoting the real interest and advancement of the Indian.

The Congressman from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, made this statement:

> Since 1928 when at the suggestion, I believe, of President Hoover, a comprehensive study was made by the Brookings Institution of our Indian administration, every group, private or public, that has studied this Indian problem has come to the conclusion that there ought to be a prompt and final settlement of all claims between the Government and its Indian citizens, and that the best way to accomplish this purpose is to set up temporarily an Indian Claims Commission which will sift all these claims, subject to appropriate judicial review, and bring them to a conclusion once and for all. That, in brief, is what H. R. 4497 seeks to accomplish.

Now that was the chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee in the House.

Then we have the Senator from the State of Washington who stated that the purpose of this bill was to consider all of these claims.

What we are objecting to is the action on the part of the Department of Justice through the Assistant Attorney General in coming in the back door and by means of a rider on an appropriation bill substantially reducing the rights of the American Indians without giving them a public hearing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, with respect to this matter of the Indian Claims Commission law, the Department of Justice attorneys have known for more than 10 years now that all the lawyers who were representing the Indians were filing claims all over the country in behalf of the Indians for their aboriginal rights. They knew that the Indians were going to great expense in gathering evidence on their claims. They knew that through all these years. I think it comes with poor grace on the part of the Department of Justice attorneys to wait until they had lost their case and then come in here at this late date trying to get an amendment through the Appropriations Committee. If they thought the law needed clarification, and if they did not agree with the attorneys who were filing these suits that there was a cause of action, they should have come here before the proper committee to try to clarify the matter. I think it is just a case of their asking for more money from the Committee on Appropriations, and, in order to justify it, they brought in this big case and made quite a to do about it. The committee was no doubt surprised at the fantastic figures cited as the probable cost of recovery. When they were asked about it by the committee, they glibly said, "Yes; we can suggest language to take care of the situation." They know, or ought to know, that it is not the province of the Appropriations Committee to amend or repeal substantive law.

Mr. UDALL. I quite agree with my colleague, and I intended to comment on that point.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida who is chairman of the subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALEY. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished gentle-

man from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] who just preceded me. I think that the gentleman from the Justice Department was merely trying to justify additional appropriations. I think he has become alarmed over something here without studying the thing, and even if the figures that he has submitted here—which I think are all out of proportion—even if they were correct and that were true, does not the gentleman believe that all Indians as well as any other Americans have a perfect right to come into a court of competent jurisdiction and have their day in court?

Mr. UDALL. I agree entirely with the chairman of our committee.

I might say that this Indian Claims Commission Act, which was passed 10 years ago, has been called by students of history one of the highest acts of conscience of any civilized country having aboriginal people who once occupied the land and were pushed aside. I would say to my colleagues, the gentlemen from Oklahoma and Montana, and the others from Indian States who have participated in this discussion that the Indian Claims Commission Act has come to be a symbol of the sincerity of our Government in its dealings with our Indian citizens. In fact, I believe those of us from the Indian States feel that until such time as these claims are settled once and for all, our Indian people will tend to look backward at their grievances and we will have a hard time getting them to look on ahead to the future and assume their responsibilities. It is my further belief that the action of the Department of Justice is properly regarded by the Indians as a hostile act by the Eisenhower administration. I know it is so regarded by the Indian tribes in my own State.

Let me give you for a moment the actions of the present Department of Justice in the handling of Indian Claims Commission cases. I have followed their efforts perhaps closer than anyone in the Congress because my State has more Indians under trusteeship than any other in the country—I have 12 tribes comprising approximately 80,000 Indians. Although this act has been in effect for 10 years not a single case by any of the tribes of my State has been adjudicated. Also, largely due to the fault of the Department of Justice, very few cases have been disposed of during the 10-year life of this act. One of the principal reasons for this is the fact that the Department has adopted a policy of refusing to compromise cases out of court. There is a rather curious aspect about this policy.

One division of the Justice Department—the Antitrust Division—has been boasting lately that practically all of its cases are being settled out of court on a consent decree basis. There are no trials, but this division is dealing with litigants who are big-business combines. On the other hand where Indians litigants are concerned this other arm of Justice has adopted a flat policy of no out-of-court compromises or settlements. To me that is a harsh and unrealistic policy, and I do not think it reflects credit on the Government of the United States. In addition, these attorneys have refused in these Indian clams cases to stipulate to facts which might bring the cases to issue in a hurry. It has been obvious all along that Justice has an inadequate staff to handle these cases. Now, finally, after 3 years, they have come in and asked for an additional appropriation of $300,000 to get the staff they need to process these cases.

This Division of the Department of Justice had the unique distinction of being cited by the Hoover Commission on Legal Services and Procedures for its delays and inadequacies in pursuing under proper legal procedures the matters which it is to handle.

So I think the Congress should take note of this particular Division of the Department of Justice. I think it is high time that its activities and failings are called to the attention of the Members of this body.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Does not the gentleman agree with me also that it comes with rather poor grace from the Department which is supposed to be fighting for and contending for the rights of minority groups, as established by the courts, to go in the back door of an Appropriations Committee and seek to reduce and to diminish those rights for a substantial minority in our country by that back door, "no public hearing" approach, when those rights have been established and are substantial, as far as the Indian people are concerned?

Mr. UDALL. I agree with the gentleman. I think the Indians of my State take that view of it also.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Does not the gentleman agree that we are not buying 1 foot of this land over again, when the original consideration for the land was determined by the Court to be so inadequate as to be a violation of the treaty?

Mr. UDALL. I do not think we are. Nor do I think that Congress intended that we should rebuy any Indian lands.

Mr. METCALF. Had they purchased the land for a proper consideration originally there would be no basis for a claim.

Mr. UDALL. That is true.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I congratulate the gentleman upon his very fine statement, and state that in my own State two of the great civilized tribes, the Choctaws and the Chickasaws, won a case in which they won a judgment for several million dollars. The policy that is now being pursued would preclude other Indian tribes from having exactly the same kind of treatment that was given to those tribes through the Indian Claims Act. Is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. That is quite true. It would place that particular tribe of Indians in a preferential category, and deny other Indians the same rights granted to those tribes.

Mr. ALBERT. And in the case of the Choctaws and the Chickasaws, as any other tribe, if they have another claim of equal merit they would be in the position of not being able to get an adjudication of their claims under the same precedent under which they have previously obtained what they considered to be a fair price for land that had been taken from them for inadequate consideration.

Mr. UDALL. That is true also.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to say to the gentleman, in addition to what my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] said about minority races and the interest of the Department of Justice in minority groups, it so happens that the Indians are wards of the Federal Government and here you find the legal arm of the Government taking action against a group of people under its own wardship. Is that not true?

Mr. UDALL. I think the Indians could very properly conclude, as the gentleman has suggested, that the Government has abused its trust duties.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. It worries me a little about the legal implications of what the distinguished gentleman said about the problem of which we are all aware.

I wonder if we start renegotiating the acquisition price of all these lands all over the country just where that will lead if allowed to go to its ultimate extreme. As I remember we paid only $24 for the island of Manhattan. Is it the gentleman's logic that we should renegotiate everything, every land purchase from the Indians?

Mr. UDALL. I think if the gentleman would see this problem in its proper light he would realize there is not any claim pending for the island of Manhattan at the present time. And even if there were such a claim the price would be as of the time of taking and not the present-day price.

But many of these Indians out in the West have never been compensated at all for the lands which were taken from them, or they were compensated at rates which could only be considered as unconscionable.

Mr. BROWNSON. One further observation, if the gentleman will permit: We have had a great many years in which to negotiate these particular problems, at least 22 in which the gentleman's party was in power, and apparently they did not take any interest in it during that period of time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to say with reference to what the gentleman just said that it was under the previous administration that the Indian Claims Commission Act was passed whereby our people achieved some justice in these cases.

The gentleman might also be interested to know that the States which have these claims pending include 28 of the 48 States. Some people would be surprised to know that there are 11 Indian groups in the State of Indiana that have claims filed before the Indian Claims

Commission; 21 in the State of Kansas; 59 in the State of Michigan; 15 in the State of Minnesota; 15 in the State of Nebraska; 33 in the State of New York; and 11 in the State of Wisconsin.

These claims are carried throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks a list of States in which such claims are pending at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. It will take me but a very brief time to complete my statement. I will yield to the gentleman then.

Mr. Speaker, having lost those cases in the Court of Claims—and the Supreme Court having declined to take the cases—what did Mr. Morton, the gentleman in charge of this Division of the Department of Justice, proceed to do? He first threw out these "scare figures" that the Indian Claims Commission Act was going to cost many, many billions of dollars in his annual report last January.

He did not come back to the committee that originally handled this legislation—the committee which was considering, and is now considering, the extension of this act—but approached a committee which has never considered this legislation before and could very readily be misled. He then made to this committee his misleading assertions about the high cost of this legislation. He attempted to get a rider attached to an appropriation bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act.

So there we have the posture of this whole matter at the present time. We find the Eisenhower administration and its Department of Justice attempting, as I say, to cut the very heart out of the Indian Claims Commission Act. As far as the Indian tribes of America are concerned, if the aboriginal title provision of the Indian Claims Act is stricken, the central purpose of the act will be eliminated.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to a number of statements that have been made charging the present administration with not being fair to minority groups. I think the record ought to be straight on this matter. The fact is that at the time of passage of this legislation by the Congress the then Attorney General, who was of the gentleman's party and not an appointee of this administration, opposed the passage of this legislation. The facts about that will be found on page 107 of the hearings of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Then again may I say to the gentleman that the Comptroller General during the previous administration, when this law was enacted, also opposed this legislation.

I should also like to add that at the time this bill passed the Congress, which would have made possible compensation based upon Indian title, President Truman vetoed it. Let us keep the record straight. In the previous administration there were objections filed by the then Attorney General, by the Comptroller General, and President Truman vetoed a bill which would have permitted this.

Mr. UDALL. I am well aware of the facts the gentleman sets forth, and they are facts; but the truth of the matter is that notwithstanding those objections the Congress went ahead and enacted the Indian Claims Commission Act and made it possible for the Indians to present their claims. It is my position that any change in that act now should be accomplished by the Congress through its appropriate committees.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. So that we may have this in the RECORD, I would like to say to the gentlemen from the Justice Department that if they think legislation of this kind is necessary, I hope they will recommend it so that it may go to the appropriate committee of the Congress. If they will request it—I do not say I will support their request—I will be very glad to introduce such legislation so that there may be public hearings and the matter given proper consideration by the proper committee.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is willing to see that full hearings are had, and a full presentation made on this issue by both sides as to whether the Indian Claims Act should be changed?

Mr. HALEY. That is correct.

Mr. UDALL. I think the gentleman should be commended for his generous spirit. In my opinion, the jurisdiction to change this very important piece of legislation rests with his committee and I hope if any action is taken that it will be taken by that committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma delegation in the House and Senate at a meeting held on yesterday, March 27, 1956, on this subject wherein they request that the Attorney General submit any proposal for changes in the Indian Claims Act in the form of proposed legislation on which public hearings can be held in order that the Indian people may have their day in court before these committees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION OF THE OKLAHOMA DELEGATION, MARCH 27, 1956

Whereas information has reached members of the delegation that an Assistant Attorney General has been seeking substantial amendment of the Indian Claims Commission Act by presentations before an appropriations subcommittee of the House, and in executive session before a Senate subcommittee; and

Whereas the Indians of Oklahoma have been seeking justice under the Indian Claims Commission Act since 1946, in accordance with court decisions interpreting that act; and

Whereas the proposed change in the law supported by the Assistant Attorney General would materially and substantially reduce and diminish the rights of many Oklahoma Indians under the Indian Claims Commission Act, without affording them any opportunity to be heard on the proposal in open hearings before congressional committees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oklahoma delegation in the House and the Senate of the United States, That we respectfully request that the Attorney General of the United States submit any proposal for changes in the Indian Claims Commission Act in the form of proposed legislation, on which open public hearings will be held by the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House, in order that the Indian people may have their day in court before these committees, and an opportunity to be heard fully before any change is voted by Congress in the Indian Claims Commission Act, and the chairman of the Oklahoma delegation is hereby instructed to inform the Attorney General of the United States of the contents of this resolution.

Indian Claims Commission: Number of claims filed (852) by States of claimants

Alabama-Florida-Mississippi	3
Alaska	17
Arizona	42
Arizona-California	19
Arizona-Colorado-New Mexico-Utah	17
Arizona-Nevada-Utah	1
Arizona-New Mexico	12
Arizona-New Mexico-Oklahoma	2
California	11
California-Nevada	3
Colorado	1
Colorado-Utah	2
Connecticut	1
Florida	4
Florida-Mississippi	1
Idaho	1
Idaho-Montana	1
Idaho-Nevada-Utah-Wyoming	12
Idaho-Washington	3
Idaho-Washington-Oregon	2
Idaho-Wyoming	5
Indiana	11
Iowa-Kansas-Nebraska-Oklahoma	36
Iowa-Kansas-Oklahoma	6
Iowa-Oklahoma	19
Kansas	21
Kansas-Nebraska	3
Kansas-Nebraska-Oklahoma	1
Kansas-Oklahoma	15
Michigan	59
Minnesota	15
Minnesota-North Dakota	4
Minnesota-Wisconsin	11
Mississippi	2
Montana	23
Montana-Oklahoma	3
Montana-Wyoming	12
Nebraska	13
Nebraska-South Dakota	2
Nevada	2
New Mexico	19
New York	33
New York-Oklahoma	3
New York-Oklahoma-Wisconsin	10
North Carolina	3
North Dakota	10
North Dakota-South Dakota	1
Oklahoma	264
Oklahoma-New York-Wisconsin	3
Oregon	14
South Dakota	9
Utah	2
Washington	49
Wisconsin	11
Wyoming	3

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to call to the attention

of the Members of the House the substantial facts in controversy in the Otoe case which were decided with regard to the land involved in that particular decision.

The third cause of action on which they secured a judgment for $554,000 in the Otoe decision dealt with 792,000 acres which were held under Indian title for which the Indians had been paid by the Government a total of 4.9 cents per acre for land which was found actually to be worth at that time at least 75 cents an acre.

If the position taken by the Attorney General were to be sustained and were to be written into law at this time, we would in effect ratify the purchase by the Government of these 700,000 acres of land for about 5 cents an acre when that land was actually worth 75 cents an acre at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has done a generous and a splendid thing in setting up legislation whereby we can review some of these transactions to see that justice is done where there are tribes to present claims by that kind of action. To undo the good work which we have done in this field would certainly be a step backward insofar as rehabilitation of our Indian people is concerned. One of the major reasons holding together tribes on reservations today is the fact that they think they will have their claims against the Government adjudicated. If we deprive them of their right to have some of those claims adjudicated at this time we are going to slow down and retard the business of getting them off of reservations and into a useful place in society as citizens should be in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will not take this backward step. I hope the gentleman on the left side here will join us in preventing this from coming to pass through a rider on an appropriation bill.

WHAT ARE THE ANSWERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was reported that another explosion of atomic bomb intensity had taken place within Soviet Russia. Further, that it was the first in a possible resumption of nuclear tests series.

Mr. Speaker, this news was preceded by a bigger bomb of world surprise proportions which allegedly exploded at the recent secret party congress held in Moscow; its shattering effects being pieced together in dispatches in the western press and its repercussions and reverberations will be watched very closely.

More specifically, the new look, the attendant circumstances leading up to what appears may be a most momentous decision not only upon the people within the confines of the vast territory terrorized by direct Soviet rule but also the possible resulting effect upon people and governments outside of the Iron Curtain.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, my speech today is directed toward remarks attributed to Nikita Khrushchev, Secretary General of the Communist Party, announcing that Dictator Stalin was a very bad man, that he perpetrated multitudes of crimes and murders, made many blunders, and therefore should be condemned rather than continued on the high pedestal of adoration, albeit he, Khrushchev, and each of his comrades at the secret conclave contributed much and were accessories and accomplices along the bloody road to their sanctified Kremlin.

Watching developments since Stalin's demise and endeavoring to interpret them, it is my conclusion that the announcement by Khrushchev, who deposed Malenkov and saw to it that Beria was liquidated and others purged, was a most bitter pill for him to swallow. Why? Because it revealed the defeat of his own drive and intention to be the single successor to Stalin of Georgia—to step into his high boots of unquestioned authority. Time was not of sufficient length prior to the secret party meeting to remove all of the obstacles and, therefore, with the votes of those who attended with him, which votes or nods were not yet controlled by him, the decision could not be a unanimous one of autocratic authority for the Secretary General but a determination that the others in attendance continue to have a part in the over-all, finalized decrees.

To assure, as much as such was possible, that Khrushchev would not become a second Stalin, the mold had to be destroyed and a collective control confirmed by blasting the sanguine deeds of the heretofore Communist ideal.

Naturally, each of us now speculates as to the possibilities—we took hope from the Geneva Conference—there appeared a new tactic—smiles—friendly overtures—but, Mr. Speaker, the deeds which speak loudest are still forthcoming. How far will this new leadership group go? Will they admit that the survivors of Stalin's rule—they who escaped immediate death—will be freed from slavery, from work camps, from Siberia, if you please, because they wrongly and unjustifiably were placed there by whim, caprice, or order of Stalin.

Will the collective leadership now say that the Katyn massacre of Polish officers and men was Stalin's direct order? Will they now take different views on agriculture which has been a basis for much difficulty since the plots of land reserved for use of those who work the land have been constantly diminished? Will the people in the satellite countries be given an opportunity to vote as to whether they want to remain under the present administrators or whether they now would like to be under the leadership of the new regime?

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is no criterion on which we can make other than hopeful expectations, since the entire Soviet setup is different from other governments outside their aggrandized limits. I mean this, particularly, which has been the basis of some government overthrows in South America; the army would spearhead an uprising or revolution. I do not expect such an event in the U. S. S. R. since the army again through purges has been Sovietized to a very large extent in contrast to the people within the Soviet orbit, be they peasants or other civilians.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions to which we await answers now that allegedly there has been some change.

We must wait and watch. There may even be some more colds among other administrators who will be sent to Moscow for special treatment, such as we had in the case of Mr. Beirut who was the man in charge in Poland, who contracted a cold while he was in Moscow during the congress there, was given some specialized medical treatment and sent back to Poland in a casket.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Easter time. We shall be adjourning tomorrow out of respect for that great holiday, that great observance, the salvation of mankind. We must keep strong in faith and defense and hope, as we wait and watch whether the surprise bomb, as I referred to it at the outset, will mean a lessening of the threat of communism or, forbid, an intensification.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CRETELLA. I would like to commend my colleague from Connecticut on an excellent presentation of a subject in which he has shown deep and enthusiastic interest. I should like to congratulate him on the presentation.

Mr. SADLAK. I am delighted to have that observation from my distinguished colleague from the third district. I know how closely he, too, is watching these newest developments.

A NEW LOBBY TO WEAKEN THE FLAMMABLE FABRICS ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a new lobby has been born. It is part Japanese and it is part American. Its purpose is to weaken the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1954 so as to permit the importation and sale in the United States of certain lightweight silk scarfs manufactured in Japan which now cannot meet the act's safety tests developed after years of study and experimentation.

This new lobby reportedly is determined to work on the executive establishment, Members of Congress, and management and labor organizations, because certain Japanese manufacturers do not wish to treat their products for fire retardance and also because millions of dollars of such dangerous scarfs are now in offsale storage or bonded warehouses, chiefly in the New York area, and such cannot be released for sale to the American public because of the Federal statute and a like New York State statute.

It will be recalled that the House last year rejected by a more than 2-to-1 vote a rule which would bring up for floor debate and action a bill permitting the importation and sale of such scarfs. This fact of life, however, has not deterred those who would destroy the Flammable Fabrics Act and it appears

now that the new lobby is reaching out to cover the waterfront in its program.

It is time that the women of America, through their clubs and organizations, the fire marshals, and fire chiefs of our land, and others who over the years crusaded to have written into the laws of our country a protective statute, should be alerted concerning this new threat.

I have been pleased to learn from a recent letter from the Honorable John W. Gwynne, distinguished Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and a former respected Member of the House, that inspectors of the Commission have been diligently on their toes in enforcing the Flammable Fabrics Act. Chairman Gwynne advises that the Commission has issued formal complaints against a substantial number of New York scarf importers violating the laws and many thousands of such scarfs have been condemned.

Contrary to earlier Japanese statements that they have found no way to make their scarfs meet the flammability test of our law, Chairman Gwynne states that new imports have been shown to pass the test readily because of being properly treated before export. He writes:

As a result of Commission efforts and a growing consciousness on the part of importers, wholesalers, and retailers, of their responsibilities under the Flammable Fabrics Act, very few shipments of scarfs of questionable weight and material are being presented to customs authorities for entry into this country. However—

The Chairman goes on to say—

I am advised that many of our American importers still have sizable inventories of lightweight scarfs either in offsale storage or bonded warehouses. These stocks remain under close scrutiny of representatives of this agency as well as New York State authorities who also are administering a State flammable fabrics act of practically identical provisions as the Federal law. Before being offered for sale, the merchandise must necessarily be treated with a fire retardant process which may be applied either here or in some foreign market.

There is the story and because some importers do not want to meet the flammability tests of Federal and State law, the new lobby is moving in. I cannot believe that this House will retreat 1 inch in its evident determination to maintain and protect a law designed to prevent the killing and maiming of our people, so many of them women and children, as in yesteryear.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks a complete copy of Chairman Gwynne's letter to me, dated March 12, 1956:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Washington, March 12, 1956.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANFIELD: Thank you very much for your letter of March 2, 1956, relating to a bill presently before Congress to exempt from the provisions of the Flammable Fabrics Act scarfs which are made from plain surface materials. Your views in the matter are greatly appreciated.

In response to your request for information relating to the 1955 exports of Japanese silk scarfs to this country, the following is submitted:

During the latter part of 1954 it came to the attention of this agency that certain of the lightweight untreated silk scarfs being imported from Japan were questionable under the prescribed test for flammability set forth in the Flammable Fabrics Act. This information was immediately made known to the American scarf importers and they were generally advised that untreated silk habutae material less than 5 momme weight was questionable under the act and that the marketing of articles of wearing apparel made therefrom was unlawful.

Practically all importations of questionable Japanese silk scarfs entering this country during 1954 and the early part of 1955 involved shipments for which orders, accompanied by irrevocable letters of credit, were placed with Japanese exporters prior to the effective date of the Flammable Fabrics Act or at a time when it was generally thought throughout the trade that 4 momme silk habutae material would pass the prescribed test for flammability. As a result of these importations and the later sale of some of the scarfs contained therein, the Commission has issued formal complaints against a substantial number of New York scarf importers. During the same period libel proceedings were instituted by the Commission in the New York Federal District Court and approximately 88,000 silk scarfs of 3 momme weight were condemned.

Many of the lightweight scarfs imported into this country during 1954 and the early part of 1955 were treated for fire retardance before being marketed. In addition, I am advised that a large number of such scarfs have been returned by the importers to Japan or other foreign markets for further processing before sale.

Upon becoming aware of the questionable nature of untreated silk scarfs weighing less than 5 momme, the importing trade where possible converted orders which had already been placed but not delivered into ones for heavier weight silk or combination silk and rayon materials which safely pass the test for flammability. Likewise, most new orders, a large number of which were delivered during 1955, were for the heavier weight and combination silk and rayon materials. In addition, some of the 1955 entries were treated scarfs which readily passed the test for flammability.

As a result of Commission efforts and a growing consciousness on the part of importers, wholesalers, and retailers of their responsibilities under the Flammable Fabrics Act, very few shipments of scarfs of questionable weight and material are being presented to customs authorities for entry into this country. I am advised, however, that many of our American importers still have sizable inventories of lightweight scarfs either in offsale storage or bonded warehouses. These stocks remain under close scrutiny of representatives of this agency as well as New York State authorities who also are administering a State Flammable Fabrics Act of practically identical provisions as the Federal law. Before being offered for sale the merchandise must necessarily be treated with a fire retardant process which may be applied either here or in some foreign market.

I hope that the above will be helpful to you. However, if you desire more detailed information on the subject matter here involved, please let me know and I will have the chief of our division of wool, fur, and flammable fabrics call on you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from California, my good friend, who was one of the original sponsors of the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making. As he knows, in 1944 I introduced the first bill of this kind that was ever presented to the Congress. It was really a draft of a bill that the fire marshal of California asked me to introduce, because we had a statute in California which effectively barred flammable fabrics manufactured in our State from being sold in California. Mr. Walter Jones, editor of the Sacramento Bee suggested to me that the real solution of the problem would be a national act prohibiting the manufacture of dangerous fabrics which would provide our people with security and safety on a nationwide basis.

In working on that bill the Bureau of Standards helped me. They conducted in my office the first test to determine what was the right type and speed of burning, as far as the time element was concerned, which would make a fabric safe for human use. A member from the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], was also present and viewed the test at the suggestion of Mr. Lea, chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Later I personally investigated and found that a great many people, including children, had been burned by these dangerous fabrics. The gentleman is talking about these flammably dangerous scarves that ladies wear around their necks. I remember distinctly one case of a young lady at Texas University who was a member of a sorority, the same sorority to which my wife belonged in college. This young lady was going out to a party. She lighted a cigarette, and her scarf started to burn so rapidly that the poor girl was burned so badly that she died.

We were unable to accurately determine how many people had been injured by that kind of fabric, and whether they were fatal or not. The reason was that the insurance companies, who cheerfully gave us a great deal of data, did not record exactly how the injury occurred. They did not look into the question of the fabric involved, they merely ascertained that certain persons who were their policyholders had been burned and, therefore, the insurance policies had to be paid. They did not investigate the type of the burns.

I compliment the gentleman for raising this issue here in the House of Representatives today as we do not want the people desiring to change this law to go in the back door now that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has on the books this very effective law that outlaws this type of dangerous fabrics and gives protection to everyone who uses fabrics. I am very much pleased with what the gentleman is saying. I offer him my sincere gratitude for bringing this before the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his testimony. I know that he

is just as determined as I am that this act shall not be weakened or diluted in any way that may impair its effectiveness.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I must refer to one other matter, of which the gentleman who has been so gracious in yielding to me is aware which illustrates that the fabric industry both in the retail field as well as in the manufacturing field are aware of the benefits of a strong fabric law and opposed to it being weakened.

Since I had been interested and appeared before committees on the problem of outlawing dangerous fabrics, I became known to many in the industry who might be affected.

Among others was the president of the Penney Co. He invited me to their New York laboratory and illustrated to me how they were continuously testing fabrics for flammability, to be sure that no fabrics going into their products would be dangerous to persons using these fabrics as wearing apparel. They were anxious to help the enforcement agencies keep the law strong and safe against injury. The company was anxious to have Members of Congress know about their efforts.

Also in the Easter recess in 1945 I visited an office near Charlottesville, the specific name of which I cannot now remember. However, here I talked to a very interesting man who represented the cotton industry. He informed me that his group was doing research designed to learn the flammability of various fabrics, the purpose being to sell only those whose flammability was so low that no possible danger from fire could result from the wearing of these fabrics.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMERICA FACES LOSS OF WORLD LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, as all of us here know, one of the most dangerous attitudes a person can have it overconfidence. I wonder how long it is going to take us to realize that overconfidence is exactly the attitude we have fallen into in the past few years. I wonder how many Americans realize that Russia may well be the world's leader in science and technology a decade from now. In fact, the Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force stated on February 9 that the Russians not only are "making scientific and technological advances at a faster rate than we," but that they are presently "beating us at our own game" of mass production.

This statement is supported by some of their recent advances in scientific development. For example:

First. In June 1954 they completed a 5,000 kilowatt atomic reactor which produces commercial electric power.

Second. Last May the Russian Air Force revealed intercontinental jet bombers which compare favorably with any long-range bomber we have in production.

Third. They recently announced plans to construct an atomic-powered ice breaker and they may well have an atomic-powered surface craft completed before we do.

Fourth. According to some people who should know, the Russians expect to be in production on an intermediate range ballastic missile before the end of the year. And it should be common knowledge that a ballistic missile with a range of 1,500 miles will render our entire air defense system obsolete.

Fifth. The automation experts who visited Russia recently reported that the Soviets have completely automatic production lines which compare with the automated lines we have in this country.

Sixth. They have recently announced in their technical publications great advances in the field of electronic computers.

Seventh. Last summer at the Geneva Conference on Atomic Energy they reported that they are constructing a cyclotron which is bigger than any in the free world. We have no basis in fact to doubt their report.

Eighth. The Soviets have exploded hydrogen bomb devices. Soviet leaders boast that they really get a "bigger bang for a buck" with these bombs. They maintain that they use less of the costly materials involved to get results comparable to ours.

Ninth. The Russians have apparently progressed so far in the realm of nuclear technology that they can afford to share some of their reactors, fissionable material and technicians. They have made deals with both Rumania and Yugoslavia to furnish those countries with atomic reactors, the material to fire them and the technicians required for their installation and maintenance.

The United States has also made progress in these fields, but it has not been fast enough to maintain our position of scientific supremacy. How does it happen that a nation which only a few years ago was considered industrially primative can today challenge the leadership of the United States in atomic research and technology as well as in the sciences generally?

Well, let me recite some facts which may account for this alarming situation. The fault you will see lies in our own shortcomings.

AMERICAN SUPPLY OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS VERSUS DEMAND

Last year the American economy needed 35,000 additional engineers. Yet American colleges graduated only 23,000 engineers. This left a deficit of some 12,000.

This year, not counting the carryover demand from last year, it is estimated we will need 39,000 new engineers. Yet American colleges will produce only about 30,000. Thus, we will have a cumulative shortage during these 2 years of 21,000 engineers.

At the rate our annual technological requirements are increasing the shortage will be staggering by 1964. In that year, it is estimated that Government and industry will need 71,000 new engineers. Yet on the basis of current estimates, we will produce only 43,000 new engineers.

In total by 1964 we can expect the cumulative shortage to be some 166,000 new engineers alone. And that estimate merely assumes a continued industrial level of partial mobilization. What our shortage would be in the event of full mobilization is extremely disquieting to contemplate.

In some specific fields such as nuclear engineering the situation will be even worse than the figures indicate. Much the same picture prevails in the supply and demand of research scientists as well.

AMERICAN VERSUS RUSSIAN GRADUATION OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Mr. Speaker, if we compare Russian graduating classes with our own, we can easily see why they are gaining on us. The result is a colossal danger signal.

Five years ago we graduated nearly twice as many engineers as the Soviet Union. Two years ago the Soviets graduated more than twice as many as we did. And last year they produced nearly three times as many as we did.

At the moment we still have more engineers available to the Nation than the Soviet Union has, but our margin of leadership is getting smaller each year. If the present trend in both nations continues they will soon pass us.

QUALITY IS IMPORTANT TOO

The caliber of our scientists and engineers and the quality of American professional training is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Still we cannot rest our hopes on that fact alone.

The quality of Soviet scientists and Soviet training, from a technical standpoint, is more than adequate for their needs. This fact was made amply apparent during their last May Day celebration and at the First International Conference on the Peacetime Uses of Atomic Energy, which took place at Geneva last year.

I had the opportunity of attending that atomic energy conference in Geneva. While I was there I had the opportunity of seeing some of their impressive progress. I made every effort to talk to as many scientists from the free nations of Europe as I could. Many of them had visited the Soviet Union and saw firsthand the products of Soviet scientists. The technical people I talked with in Geneva told me quite frankly that Soviet scientists, mathematicians, and engineers are as good as will be found anywhere. No one who attended that Conference went away in any mood to disparage the quality of Soviet scientists or their work.

At the Geneva Conference many American scientists were impressed with the high level of basic scientific and atomic

research accomplished by Soviet scientists. This research has no direct military use. It is, however, the key to leadership, first in the sciences and sooner or later in technology. In the past American leadership in this area was unquestioned. Today, however, the Soviets are gaining on us in basic research as well as in technology. This is largely due to the current critical shortage of people with advanced training in the theoretical areas of the sciences.

SOVIET EFFORTS TO DEVELOP TECHNICIANS

Getting to the heart of the matter, the scientists I spoke with at Geneva told me that the efforts of the Communist leaders to develop an elite corps of science and engineering students was amazingly successful. Potential scientists and engineers among Soviet boys and girls are sought out and encouraged from the very earliest grades. If Russian boys and girls decide to enter the sciences, substantial government scholarships and the highest honors of the Soviet society are theirs. The size of the graduating classes in Russia demonstrates how effective this program is.

Neither do the Russian leaders spare any expense in making the very latest and best research tools and laboratories as well as a plentiful supply of qualified science teachers available to Soviet students. Their grade schools and high schools as well as their colleges have a broad and intensive curriculum in mathematics and the sciences. Their young students receive instruction from the best scientists and engineers available. Whatever one may think of Communist instruction in Marxist hogwash, their results in the physical sciences are impressive.

AMERICAN EFFORTS TO DEVELOP TECHNICIANS

The Russian educational system contrasts greatly with ours. We have a long tradition of local financing and control of schools. This means that our students largely have a free choice of studies and of careers. For this we can be grateful. Under no circumstances would we want the Soviet type of regimentation and dictatorship in our schools.

Unfortunately, the contrast does not stop here. In the United States only half of the high-school graduates who are potential science and engineering students enter college. And, to make matters worse, less than half of those who embark on science and engineering studies finish their preparation for a career in science or engineering.

This, in the total picture, means that the United States is receiving the services of, roughly, only 2 out of every 10 boys and girls who are its potential scientific and engineering resources. The rest of that talent, through lack of guidance and encouragement, is being lost. This Nation can ill afford such extravagance.

Time and again history has demonstrated that a nation's most valuable resource is the ability, character, and training of its people. The nation which squanders the potentialities of its young men and women is courting national disaster. And that is exactly what is happening in the United States today.

Let us go back one step further and look at the college preparation of high-school boys and girls in this country today. In 1900 over half of our high-school students enrolled in algebra courses. Today less than a quarter do.

In 1900 a fifth of the students took geometry. Today about a tenth do.

Most startling of all is the decreasing enrollments in physics courses. In 1900 a fourth of all high-school students studied this basic physical science. Today about 4 percent do. Indeed, today less than half of the high schools even include the science of physics in their curriculum.

The problem of high-school curriculum is closely tied up with the availability of teachers. With a shortage of scientists and technicians in high-paying industrial fields, it is only natural that a shortage of high-school science and mathematics teachers should occur. The result is a thin watered-down scientific course in high schools.

It is small wonder, then, that college enrollments in the physical sciences and engineering have fallen off. Unless students become acquainted with mathematics, physics, and chemistry early in their careers, they can hardly be expected to select these fields for their lifework.

This, however, is only part of the reason for a decreasing supply of graduate engineers and scientists. There are some basic economic reasons why many boys and girls do not go to college. A college education is getting more expensive every year. The cost of books, housing, clothing, and food, not to mention tuition, has been going up yearly. The purchasing power of college scholarships is only a fraction of what it was a few years ago. This means that boys and girls without money find it impossible to work their way through and still get a decent education. The Nation, not the student, is the loser in this economic squeeze.

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM

The general pattern of this problem is clear. A shortage of teachers and a decreasing curriculum in the high schools means that fewer students get early training in the sciences and mathematics. The poorer college preparation of our students means that they have less interest or incentive to go on to professional studies in college, especially in light of the high cost of such an education. Thus we have fewer graduates in the face of an increasing demand.

This by no means tells the whole story, but the root causes of the present crisis stand out sharp and clear. I have tried to picture some of them here.

The seriousness of the crisis becomes clear when you consider the dire consequences of this shortage.

DANGER TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

First, let us not forget for a moment that any flaw in the Amercan economic machine weakens our potential for national defense. Our national security rests on our technological superiorities. Man for man, the free world is outnumbered many times over by the teeming population of the Soviet world. We in the free world have been forced to base our defense on the greater fire power, greater mobility, and long-range striking power of our fighting forces.

Until recently our weapons have been so far superior to those of our enemies they have not dared attack us. They have been constrained to weigh heavily the disastrous consequences of war to themselves whether they won or lost. Without a continuing and increasing contribution from our scientists and engineers to the national defense we will be in serious trouble. They must keep us out in front in the race for the ultimate weapon. In spite of this great need we do not have enough scientists and engineers working to keep a safe margin between us and the Soviet Union. It is cause for alarm that the Soviet Union has so greatly surpassed us in turning out scientists and technicians. They are surpassing us in a primary element of military and industrial strength.

It is impossible to separate advance in the field of atomic energy from advance in the other sciences and mathematics. They go hand in glove, for the one relies heavily on the other. A single problem requires coordinated attacks by many different kinds of specialists. This is the reason why we on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have become so concerned with the problem.

DANGER TO OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Secondly, let us recall that one of the greatest factors in the phenomenal growth of the American standard of living in the last century and a half has been our science and technology. The application of technical know-how to our vast physical resources has helped make us the freest, wealthiest, and happiest Nation on earth. It has provided us with a firm base for fulfilling the promise of the American way of life.

If we are to continue the constructive work of our predecessors, we must realize that progress is not an accidental occurrence. It is the result of hard work and careful planning. American industry still has a big job to do. It must continually expand to satisfy the needs of an expanding population. It must tackle more difficult and more complex problems to find new and better ways of fulfilling its mission. All of this means that the normal need for scientific and engineering manpower grows greater each year we progress.

This is illustrated by the fact that in 1900 there was only 1 engineer for approximately every 290 workers in industrial fields. Today there is 1 engineer for every 65 such workers. We may one day progress to the point where there are more scientific and technical workers than there are production workers. A shortage of technologists today is clearly a threat to our industrial strength and standard of living in the years ahead.

ACTION BY CONGRESS IS REQUIRED

This situation is urgent, but little has been done. The National Science Foundation and the AEC as well as industry and professional associations are making attempts to recruit more technological workers, but this only treats a symptom, not the cause. In the face of the gravity of the problem and the apparent

inability of others to tackle it, Congress must assume leadership. This present session of Congress must initiate a crash program to prevent a steady decay in our economy and national defense. Should the present trends continue, we are certain to find ourselves sitting face to face with national tragedy in the near future.

As a first step we need to get more information. And we need to get suggested solutions from those who have already been working with the problem. Needless to say, a problem involving our national education system must be studied thoroughly. We dare not risk a remedy here which is worse than the ailment. However, hundreds of qualified people have been studying the problem for several years now. We want to bring out in the open the results of their research.

In order to lay the groundwork for this process, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared, at my request, an excellent summary of the material already available on the subject. As a result the problem areas which need our attention have been isolated.

As a second step, the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is going to study this problem in open hearings. These hearings will be held as soon as circumstances permit. As chairman of that subcommittee, I invite every interested person who has something to contribute to join us in our study.

We plan to use the document prepared by the Legislative Reference Service as a jumping off point in our hearings. In order that this study may receive as wide a distribution as possible, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has had it printed as a committee document in preparation for the hearings. Copies of this study are being sent to every Member of Congress today. Additional copies may be obtained from the committee or from the Government Printing Office.

I am sure that every Member of Congress regardless of party or committee assignment will wish to participate in this important discussion and help formulate a positive program of Federal action in the coming weeks. It is certain that we cannot continue our present drifting without going on the rocks.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his concern and for his serious study of our national shortcomings in the technological training of our people which are so essential to our national defense as well as for production and for the Government itself. His very carefully prepared report on this subject, which has been printed by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, should be required reading for every Member of Congress.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kind remarks. I hope every Member of Congress will look over this study which will probably be on his desk tomorrow. He will find in it much food for thought. It will be helpful to him in his consideration of the problem. I know there are many Members of the House who are deeply interested.

WHY NO LABOR LEGISLATION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will begin its regular 10-day Easter recess tomorrow.

I suggest to my colleagues that this absence from Washington gives us an excellent opportunity to review this session's legislative progress. It also gives us the opportunity to resolve to increase our rate of progress after our return if we desire to do so.

Certainly that objective is of substantial importance since we will obviously desire to end this session in time for the national political conventions. This will reduce the period of time which might otherwise be available by extending the session for considering and adopting useful legislation.

Each one of us is aware that this is an election year.

But all of us are obliged to recognize that this is a legislative year as well. I am quite sure that our constituents will judge us in November against the standard of whether we discharge our legislative duties in meeting the session's issues and not against the standard of how successfully vital issues have been avoided for reasons of political self-protection.

Each of us in this Chamber shares a measure of responsibility to see to it that needed legislation is promptly enacted.

The major responsibility, in this connection, lies quite obviously with the Democrat Party which, as the majority party, controls the congressional committees and elects the committee chairmen, who in turn determine what legislation, if any, will be considered.

I wonder if the Democrat Party's campaign spokesmen will admit to this responsibility a few short months from now?

I think the answer to this question will be of great interest to substantial groups of our citizens.

I should imagine the answer to this question will be of particular importance to our American working men and women and their unions, since the Democrat Party has consistently advertised itself as being completely devoted to their interest.

The extent of this devotion—if legislative activity in this Congress upon proposals which seem to have some bearing on the American worker's welfare is any measure—would seem to be more a matter of lip-service than of heart-felt regard.

This matter has aroused increased public interest in recent weeks, thanks to the interest of men who really want to get something accomplished for the benefit of American wage earners.

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, who is charged by act of Congress with the duty of fostering the American wage earner's welfare, has publicly expressed his concern that the appropriate congressional committees are disregarding the administration's proposals which are intended to benefit America's working men and women. Secretary Mitchell has expresesd the earnest hope that these proposals will at least receive consideration.

Here, it seemed to me, was an opportunity to compare the amount of interest the Republican Party and the Democrat Party have displayed so far by their support of Federal legislative proposals of benefit to the American workers. I, therefore, made some inquiries.

The results are amazing, when it is considered that 7 of the proposals I will describe to you are estimated to affect approximately 43 million American working men and women. That is a lot of people.

Republican Members of this House introduced nine bills which embodied proposals of interest to the Department of Labor in the first session. President Eisenhower specifically referred to some of these proposals in various of his messages to the Congress, and the Bureau of the Budget cleared each of them prior to its introduction so that they all can be considered in accord with the President's program.

The status of these proposals follows:

I. A BILL TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1163—and in the House—H. R. 4312—on February 23, 1955.

President Eisenhower recommended the adoption of 2 of its 3 proposed amendments in his January 20, 1955, Economic Report. These were that all eligible claimants be entitled to receive unemployment compensation benefits for a maximum period of 26 weeks if they are unemployed that long, and that a uniform period of 6 weeks during which benefits will be postponed on disqualification be established, while providing for only 1 type of disqualification for the same act. The third proposal tightens the wage-qualifying requirements.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 225,000 working men and women.

The House District Committee has taken no action upon this proposal since its introduction 1 year ago.

II. A BILL TO AMEND TITLE IV OF THE VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1418—on March 14, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 4946—on March 15, 1955.

It amends the act to provide that an ex-serviceman shall not be eligible for the special unemployment compensation benefits of the act for more than 3 years after his discharge or the effective date of the amendment, whichever is later, except where he has pursued education and training or vocational rehabilitation programs provided by the act.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee acted most promptly on this proposal, and I am happy to report that it was

enacted into law—Public Law 176—with President Eisenhower's signing of the measure on July 26, 1955.

III. A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO THOSE STATES WHICH ESTABLISH AN APPROVED PLAN FOR A PROGRAM OF INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1091—on February 18, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5740—on April 20, 1955.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage the States to develop industrial safety programs in order that they may adequately combat industrial accidents which result in injury, death, excessive financial loss, and uncomputable misery. Thus, in 1955 alone, industrial accidents caused 15,000 deaths, about 76,800 workers suffered some kind of permanent physical impairment, and more than 1,839,000 received injuries which disabled them for 1 day. The estimated direct and indirect cost of these accidents is almost $3½ billion.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 39 million working men and women.

The Department of Labor voluntarily transmitted its report to the House Education and Labor Committee on May 30, 1955. This committee has taken no action upon the proposal since its introduction 11 months ago.

IV. A BILL TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR HOURS OF WORK AND OVERTIME PAY OF LABORERS AND MECHANICS EMPLOYED ON WORK DONE UNDER CONTRACT FOR, OR WITH THE FINANCIAL AID OF, THE UNITED STATES, FOR ANY TERRITORY, OR FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1204—on February 25, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5758—on April 20, 1955.

It proposes to revise, modify, and codify the vast series of complicated and overlapping statutes, dating back to 1892, which govern the hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on public work by the Federal Government and its contractors and subcontractors. It will, for example, eliminate such ambiguities as whether the law gives an employee who works overtime the right to collect time and one-half compensation if his employer fails to pay it. It also proposes to amend the existing overtime provisions which, as an example, presently permit certain contractors to perform Federal work with laborers and mechanics who work 56 hours a week without receiving overtime compensation even though Congress has established a straight-time workweek of 40 hours for Federal employment, for work connected with interstate commerce under the wage and hour law, and for work on Federal supply contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 1 million working men and women.

The House Education and Labor Committee has taken no action upon this proposal since its introduction 11 months ago.

V. A BILL TO AMEND THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT TO AUTHORIZE MORE EFFECTIVE USE OF THE SPECIAL FUND PROVIDED FOR IN SECTION 44

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1308—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5759—on April 20, 1955.

The existing measure, aside from being the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia and its compensation rate is the measure for compensation paid by the Federal Government under the War Hazards Act. The act's total coverage, as extended, is estimated to total between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

The section 44 special fund, which derives from collected fines and penalties and amounts paid by employers in the stevedoring industry covered by the act has an average annual income of approximately $35,000 and an average annual disbursement of approximately $10,000; the fund presently totals about $734,522. Experience indicates that the fund is capable of supporting certain presently unprovided worthwhile and necessary services for its beneficiaries.

The draft legislation proposes to establish a priority for payments from the entire fund for permanent total disability resulting from the combined effect of two injuries, to increase the amount of the maximum allowance for maintenance of employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation from $10 to $25 per week, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to use the fund for furnishing prosthetic appliances or other apparatus to refit an injured employee for employment, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to procure rehabilitation services in cases where necessary services are not otherwise available through existing facilities, and to authorize the payment of awards to provide relief to employees who are unable to collect compensation awards because of the insolvency of their employers or their deceased employers' estates.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 650,000 working men and women.

I wish to note for the record that the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act began hearings on S. 2280 and pending House bills on March 12, 1956.

VI. A BILL TO AMEND THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' ACT, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE INCREASED BENEFITS IN CASE OF DISABLING INJURIES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1307—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5757—on April 20, 1955.

This act, which I just mentioned as being also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia and whose rate is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the so-called War Hazards Act, specifies that benefits shall be paid at 66⅔ percent of the employee's average weekly wage, with a maximum dollar limit of $35 a week. This weekly sum aggregates only $1,820 when extended on an annual basis; this benefit limit therefore prevents the percentage from operating in the case of wage earners whose wages exceed the dollar maximum. Thus, as the level of wages rises, the compensation which is received sinks far below the two-thirds of the employee's wages intended by the law.

These weekly compensation limits were set in 1948 in relation to the prevailing wage rate in the industry and the then prevailing cost of living, and their continuance under today's economic conditions is obviously unrealistic.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 650,000 working men and women.

I wish to note for the record that the House Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act began hearings on this and allied measures on March 12, 1956.

VII. A BILL TO INCLUDE PERSONS ENGAGED IN CARRYING OUT THE PROVISIONS OF LABOR LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 111 AND 1114 OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1150—on February 21, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 6997—on June 23, 1955.

The bill proposes to provide protection to Department of Labor officers and employees who are engaged in the administration and enforcement of Federal labor laws, as similarly engaged officers in other Federal activities are now protected. The protection results from the deterrent effect of designating these acts as Federal crimes.

The House Judiciary Committee has not considered this bill to date, although the Department of Labor transmitted its report on July 13, 1955.

VIII. A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT BY PROVIDING FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENDITURES FROM THE EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND BY FEDERAL EMPLOYING AGENCIES

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 1309—on March 4, 1955, and in the House—H. R. 5751—on April 20, 1955.

This bill proposes to assist in reducing the personal accident toll in the Federal service by shifting the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. The theory is, of course, that the agencies will develop a greater sense of responsibility in preventing accidents in the course of employment if they are required to discuss their accident rates in justifying appropriations to reimburse for claims of this nature.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 2 million working men and women.

The House Education and Labor Committee has taken no action upon this measure since its introduction 11 months ago.

IX. A BILL TO EXTEND THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM TO PUERTO RICO

This bill was introduced in the Senate—S. 2183—on June 10, 1955 and in the House—H. R. 6577—on May 31 1955.

Its purpose is to round out the effort which this Congress has heretofore made in meeting serious social problems in Puerto Rico: the evidence of this effort is that the fact that the Commonwealth now share in the benefits of the Federal-State unemployment service, the maternal and child-welfare program, the program for old-age assistance, aid to

dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently disabled, and the old-age and survivors' insurance program, and all of the other provisions of the Social Security Act except the unemployment compensation program.

Although the Commonwealth Government is making great strides in attracting new industry to overcome its labor surplus, the extension of the unemployment compensation program will help to maintain purchasing power and assist in stabilizing and bolstering Puerto Rico's economy until the effort to attract industry takes up the slack of unemployment.

It is estimated that this proposal will benefit approximately 185,000 working men and women.

The House Ways and Means Committee has taken no action upon this bill to this date.

The score upon these 9 first session administration proposals in the labor field thus is that 7 of them were introduced into the House almost a year ago.

One of these seven proposals was passed expeditiously into law.

Hearings were finally afforded three of these bills this month.

The appropriate House committees have taken no action on the remaining 3 proposals which were introduced almost a year ago, or on the 2 measures which were introduced in May and June of last year.

The effect of ignoring these first session proposals indicates a distressing lack of interest in the problems of wage earners on the part of the Democratic leadership of this House. Republican Members have added to this total of similar desirable legislation in this session by introducing additional bills which the administration supports; these proposals will also benefit great numbers of working men and women. These measures include providing for a nonoccupational disability insurance program for the District of Columbia—affecting approximately 225,000 workers—the regulation of welfare and pension plans—affecting approximately 12 million workers—an equal pay bill for women—affecting approximately 7 million workers—the transfer of the District of Columbia Unemployment Service to the District Commissioners, the regulation of the interstate transportation of migratory workers—affecting approximately 1 million workers—and the clarifying of the judicial enforcement of reservists' reemployment rights provision of the Universal Military and Training Act—affecting approximately 1½ million workers.

Now, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I do not say to you that these first session and second session proposals, like the philosopher's stone of old, will cure every ill in the areas to which they are directed. Hearings well may reveal that amendments and changes to their ideas will give a more valuable benefit in the particular situation as to which they are intended to correct an existing deficiency or supply an existing need. Adjustments of this nature are all part and parcel of this system of Government of ours.

But I do say to you that neither you nor I will have the privilege of examining these or similar worthy proposals until hearings are held on them or their subject matter. Such needed hearings have not been held.

The Democratic Party holds control of this House and its committees. It is therefore its responsibility either to open hearings or to continue to deny hearings with respect to these and many other equally worthy proposals. This responsibility can neither be dodged nor befogged by last-minute campaign demagogery. Fustian is no substitute for facts.

The Democratic Party must explain to the working men and women of this country in the forthcoming campaign that, through its responsibility, hearings have not been held. After this Congress returns on April 9, Democrat leadership will have one last chance to fish or cut bait.

I hope we will see this reluctant Democrat leadership encourage hearings upon these proposals between April 9 and the session's end.

It is time to substitute performance for promises. American wage earners will judge this Democratic Congress as the foot-dragging, do-nothing Congress unless it mends its ways.

And soon.

THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have already taken a good deal of the time of the House today during the appearances on the floor of my colleagues from Arizona and Montana, therefore I will take only a few additional minutes. There are two points which I would like to nail down and nail down as firmly as possible before we close the discussion for today on the Indian Claims Commission bill and the amendments being suggested to it before the appropriations subcommittee of the House by the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. It is necessary that I leave to attend a committee meeting, but I should like to say to the gentleman that I hope legislation will be presented to the proper legislative committees of the House to review this mater. I quite agree with the gentleman and those who have spoken today that the proper way to legislate is not through appropriation riders. However, I do hope the gentleman will consider and that the Justice Department will send to the Congress for consideration this very important matter which may cost the taxpayers of this country somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 billion unless we have a review of the subject.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman very much for sharing our concern about the attempt to legislate on this through the Appropriations Committee, and I appreciate his point of view on it. I hope that the gentleman will join us who feel so concerned in doing what he can to prevent any action in the Committee on Appropriations on that suggested rider.

Mr. Speaker, there was some discussion a few moments ago as to whether or not the administration, back at the time of the passage of this bill, was in favor of its enactment. In this connection, the gentleman who just left the floor directed attention to the fact that there were opinions supplied by the Comptroller General and also by the Attorney General of the United States in which they recommended against passage of the Indian Claims Commission Act. I have reviewed those opinions supplied by the two officials on the executive side of the Government at that time, and it is true that they did make recommendations against passage of the legislation as it was written. They did propose some substantial changes with regard to the legislation. Some of the things which they proposed actually were incorporated into the bill in later stages of its consideration. The significant thing with regard to the position taken by the parties, however, is this: The bill was proposed by Democratic authors in a Democratic House of Representatives. It was enacted by a Democratic Congress, and it was signed into law by a Democratic President of the United States. If that does not make pretty clear the record of Democratic sponsorship and support for this legislation, I do not know how else you can establish it.

I think also it is rather significant that there was support from the other side of the aisle at that time. It is significant because of the language of the Republican Party platform which was cited with regard to this legislation by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in his remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 4, page 5319. Mr. CASE read this language from the Republican national platform in 1944:

> We pledge an immediate, just, and final settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

Now, the Republican Party platform of 1944 did not say of all claims except those based on Indian title. They did not say of all claims except those based upon original title or aboriginal title or the right of occupancy. They said:

> We pledge an immediate, just, and equitable settlement of all Indian claims between the Government and the Indian citizenship of the Nation.

That was the position they took then. That was the right position. That was the same position as that taken by the Democratic Party at that time, and because that was the party position which both sides shared, there was bipartisan support for this legislation to adjudicate all of these claims.

The question is not so much, however, where the parties stood in 1944 or 1946. The question is this: Where do the parties stand today, in 1956, with regard to these Indian claims? Is the Republican Party of 1956 repudiating the language of its platform back in 1944 when they

come before us and say "You should not have a settlement of claims based upon Indian title or original title under this legislation." When the Assistant Attorney General comes before the House and says "We should change the law because it is going to cost us too much money," is he standing for immediate and final settlement of all claims, or is he qualifying those claims?

Incidentally, I am curious to know why the only reason which he can give against this legislation is it is going to cost too much money. He has not claimed that it is not fair to settle with the Indians. He has not claimed that it is not just to settle with them on these claims. He has not claimed at all that the Otoes should only have received 5 cents an acre for their land instead of the 75 cents an acre which was allowed to them under one portion of the Otoe decision. What he said is this: It is going to cost us too much money, so because it is going to cost us too much money, we have to change the law. That is the question for today. Where does the Republican Party and the Republican administration stand today with regard to the Indian rights of the Nation? Are they going to uphold the minority rights of one segment of our population on the one hand and then turn around and in the next breath, by a back-door entrance to a congressional committee seek to reduce and undermine the established and adjudicated rights of another minority group in our Nation? They are making a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde record on the subject of minority rights in this country if what they are doing with regard to Indian rights under the Indian Claims Commission is any indication of what their overall position is.

Let me nail for once and for all this question of what the intent of Congress was on the subject of Indian title. Here is the exact language presented to the House by the House managers in the conference committee report. I am going to quote it verbatim:

> The bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, enumerated six classes of claims cognizable by the Commission. The Senate, in the interest of simplicity, reduced these to three, being careful to state in its report, that the change was not intended to deprive the claimants of the right to invoke the jurisdiction of the Commission in any case which would have been cognizable under the language of the bill as it passed the House. Out of an abundance of caution the conferees reinserted two of the classifications struck by the Senate because they wanted to make sure that if any tribal claimant could prove facts sufficient to make a case under either of these classifications, the Commission would have authority to make an award to such claimant. * * * The second of these classifications covers claims arising from the taking by the United States of Indian lands, i. e., lands to which tribal claimants had Indian title or the right of occupancy. Sometimes these lands were taken under the guise of unratified treaties, sometimes without any semblance of a treaty. The reinsertion of this classification makes it plain that where claimant can prove sufficient facts within the language of this classification the Commission has full authority to award proper damages therefor.

There is the language of the managers in the conference, as presented on the floor of the House, with respect to Indian title or the right of occupancy. Clearly, the bill was intended to cover claims based on that kind of right.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with a quotation from a message of the President of the United States when he signed this bill into law. At that time, in 1946, he said:

> This bill makes perfectly clear what many men and women, here and abroad, have failed to recognize, that in our transactions with the Indian tribes we have at least since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 set for ourselves the standard of fair and honorable dealings, pledging respect for all Indian property rights.

That was the spirit in which the President signed this bill into law. That is the spirit under which the Indians have prepared their cases over a period of 10 years for adjudication by the Indian Claims Commission. Are we today under the so-called great crusade of this administration to retreat from a standard of fair and honorable dealings with the Indian people of this Nation? That is the question which we believe the Attorney General of the United States should settle and settle conclusively with regard to the position his Department has been taking on the matter of Indian claims.

COMPANY ORGANIZATION

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, whenever I find anything out of the ordinary and especially wonderful I always try to take it down home to our beloved Alabama. I have been talking to Gen. Robert E. Wood for many, many long years and he has been telling me about the great organization that he had helped to perfect down through the years.

Of course, I did not think it was possible to find anybody in this particular kind of business half as wonderful as General Wood, but we had a great meeting down in that southern city of Atlanta, Ga., last week. The industralists from every State in the Union were there to listen to the head of this great corporation—the head of Sears, Roebuck & Co.—they say of Chicago, but I think it is of every State in the Union, and I believe we were told at this meeting that they had different businesses in some 35 countries.

Anyway, the principal speaker at this great meeting held at the Biltmore Hotel in Atlanta, Ga., was Mr. Ted V. Houser, chairman of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co. The speech was truly amazing and fantastic, and it was so good that I wanted the Members of the Congress of the United States to know all about it. We have here in the Congress 435 men, who represent every human being in this great Nation of 165 million people. I want these men who represent this great Nation to read what this great man, T. V. Houser, had to say about the work they had done, are doing, and will continue to do. It is almost unbelievable, and there is no way to tell about it except as Mr. Houser unfolded the story; it was almost like a fairy tale.

It shows you what brains and ability can do; what organization can do; and that is what this great company has done. It developed in the meeting by the man who introduced Mr. Houser that Mr. Houser used to be with Montgomery Ward, and I was just wondering if he—Ted Houser—is not a mixture of two great men, who have led two great businesses to such high places in this Nation. I am speaking of Gen. Robert E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and the great one and only—just like General Wood, only of a different calibre—Sewell Avery. General Wood, with his associates, has led Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Mr. Sewell Avery and his associates have led Montgomery Ward. I do not know but what every man and woman and every boy and girl in this Nation know about these people. I remember when I was a little boy, I used to look at their catalogs with their beautiful things and just wish for them. Then they only had, I guess, 1 or 2 stores, but now they have them everywhere.

I think this great story, as related by my friend, T. V. Houser, will be an inspiration to all men everywhere and will show just what can be done by working, pulling together and praying, as I am sure this great man does.

I spent a long time with Mr. T. V. Houser. I had Gen. Lewis A. Pick, former Chief of the Army Engineers, with me, along with Mr. Pleas Looney, General Pick's assistant, from Alabama. Mr. Houser had with him some wonderful men. I will name a few of them—Frank Parsons of their great Atlanta office; Edward Gudeman, of their Chicago office; John J. Amato, also of Chicago; C. H. Kellstadt, of Atlanta; and many other great men who represent these men and women that own this great plant from all over this Nation, and almost all over the world, and I think they will be all over the world sooner or later, if they keep going.

This man Houser is a very sincere and serious man, and like the man he succeeded, General Wood, he has a brilliant brain, a world of energy and an imagination that is truly wonderful. For instance, General Pick asked him how much money they had out on the installment plan, that they let our people in every State in the Union have, so they could have all of these great necessities of life. I believe he said, Mr. Speaker, $900 million. Think of it—$900 million—just distributed to the men and women and the boys and girls of this Nation. This makes it possible, on the installment plan, to own so many wonderful things—practically everything.

I was amazed to find out the different things they do, and I will not try to tell about it, because I want, at this time, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will go to every library and every beat in this Nation, a speech by Mr. T. V. Houser, so everybody can know about what a group of men are doing—their plans and how they do it. I believe it will help them along with their busi-

ness, or the business they hope to get, because all of the little businesses want to be big businesses, and that is what they are working for.

The only way to properly appreciate what I am telling you is to read this great message that was given to us by a great man in a great city—Atlanta, Ga. I wish we could not only read this message, but could hear the story that was told us after the meeting was over in the rooms of Mr. Houser, where he had this group around, and where he talked to General Pick, Pleas Looney, and me for so long.

They are wonderful people; they are doing great work; they are the most unselfish group I have ever known, and I wanted everybody everywhere to know about it. I believe the speech that I am inserting here will give us the message.

I wish the other men that head the great corporations of this Nation would do the same thing. I believe it would do a lot of good, because while I have been close to them and I have visited with General Wood in Alaska, I have had him to visit me in Mobile—as a matter of fact, he will be coming down to Alabama just this very week—and we have kept in close touch with each other here in Washington, in Chicago and everywhere, I just had no idea of the magnitude of this great business that this speech so well describes.

The address follows:

The agenda for your day's discussions includes the subject of company organization, and I thought a leaf or two from Sears experience might be of interest to you.

Sears has traditionally been a growth company, and its growth is reflected in the evolution of its organizational structure. In tracing the development of organization through almost 70 years, several distinct periods can be seen, each one an era of growth, and each one associated with a modification of the organization to adjust to the problems of growth. As a growing and profitable company in the early days of mail order, Sears, Roebuck & Co. had attracted a group of highly competent aggressive men. It suited the purposes and personal inclinations of both Richard Sears, the founder of the business, and Julius Rosenwald, who succeeded Mr. Sears as the chief officer of the company, to give these men a relatively free rein. Thus from the beginning, Sears organization has never been the result of a master-mind plan, but rather of periodic appraisal of new conditions, with a resulting continuous series of adjustments. The history of Sears, from an organizational point of view, is largely a record of the response of a relatively fluid, loose-structured, highly personal type of organization to changing business conditions and growth, the absorption of new groups of people in various administrative and staff capacities, and the development of interauthorities and responsibilities.

Sears was founded in 1886 as a mail-order merchandising business and continued as such for almost 40 years. During these early years, the business was carried on from a single mail-order plant. Businesses conducted in a single location, as Sears was in those days, usually adopt a functional type of organization built around the three primary functions of any business—sales, procurement, or production, and auditing-finance—with the head of the business appointing individuals in charge of these activities. He looks to them for specialized knowledge and direct responsibility for results in these areas. In such an organization, all threads come together at only one point, namely, the head of the business, and he alone can be responsible for the overall success or failure of the enterprise. He cannot separate off any one part of the business and look to some individual to be responsible for the complete functioning of that part, and therefore responsible for that much of the profit and loss of the whole.

The Sears organization fell into this basic pattern, but with an important variation brought about by the special characteristics of a mail-order business. The function called merchandise embraced both the procurement of goods and sales responsibility as well, inasmuch as it planned and produced the medium of sale—the catalog. Because of its fundamental importance in this dual role, it came to be dominant in the organization. The activity comparable to production functions in other types of businesses was called operating, and was concerned with the physical handling of customer orders, the receipt and shipment of merchandise and the large volume of customer correspondence associated with the mail-order business. The auditing-finance activity was conventional.

Mr. Julius Rosenwald called this organization a federation of merchants, and this in itself is indicative of the importance attached to the merchandise side of the business from the early days of the company. The merchandise function was carried on by a group of department heads, each one in charge of a given line of merchandise. These department heads had almost unquestioned authority within their lines. They established quality standards and selling prices of their merchandise, selected sources of supply and dealth with them, using the two buying advantages Sears possessed in those days—volume purchasing and prompt payment of bills. In some cases, where merchandise procurement problems made it necessary for the company to buy or build factory operations, such factories were under the supervision of the appropriate merchandise department head. Accuracy of copy and illustrations of merchandise offered in the catalog were the responsibility of department heads.

The merchandise department heads reported to the vice president in charge of merchandising in the general merchandise office. As near as I can determine, the merchandising office concerned itself largely with overall inventory control and establishing size and cost limits of the catalog. In keeping with the federation concept, the general merchandise office influenced the merchandise departments only to the extent required to fulfill these two principal responsibilities.

A counterpart of the general merchandise office existed in the operating function in the office of the operating vice president. The operating activity was concerned with the receipt of customer orders, preparation of tickets for each merchandise department, general correspondence, and the receipt of incoming merchandise. To carry out this function, a series of systems were established and precise production routines were developed. Schedules were devised for handling the flow of work, and successful operation of the plant depended on extremely rigid adherence to these schedules and routines.

Here we have a situation which contained some seeds of conflict. The merchandise department heads had extreme latitude and were aggressive enough to claim every function related to their departments, some of which overlapped to a considerable degree those of the operating vice president. On the other hand, the operating people were accountable for the handling of orders and felt that their control of every operating function would insure the smooth and precise performance of the mail order plant. Conflicts did arise, but they were settled on a basis of negotiations between the functions concerned on a day-to-day basis. No decrees were issued outlining the boundaries between jobs. Instead there was a process of adjustment over a period of years, the net result being a clearer definition of jobs, with the merchandise function and its department heads gradually becoming limited to those matters clearly related to merchandising.

Another conflict arose later when a group of men began to question the techniques used to present merchandise in the catalogs. These men were convinced that advertising was becoming a specialized field, requiring specialized techniques. At this time Sears did not have a separate advertising department. The layout, art work, typography, and copy for catalog pages was either prepared by the individual merchandise departments or by the company-owned printing plant under their close supervision. The printing plant merely followed instructions in the physical production of the catalog. The only limitations on the advertising activities of the merchandise departments were those imposed by the general merchandise office as to the size and cost of the catalog.

With the sale of the printing plant and the contracting of catalog production with others, a mail order advertising department gradually developed with highly skilled specialists in the field of layout, art work, copy, and general advertising techniques. In general, the final evolution of this particular activity was to leave authority for selection of goods and allocation of catalog space by items to the merchandise people, with the advertising people pretty largely taking over the rest. There are still some marginal questions such as use of color pages and selections therefore, which are usually resolved by requiring the joint approval of both advertising and merchandise departments.

Basically these two modifications of the merchandise department heads authority can be traced to technical changes. The production line techniques developed by the operating people required a greater degree of integration of the operating functions for efficiency. In a like manner, the specialized techniques that were developing in advertising could be employed more efficiently by the creation of an advertising department staffed with people skilled in the various specialties.

Technical changes, however, were not the sole or the most important influence on the Sears organization. From 1886 until 1907, all of Sears business was carried on from a single mail order plant. In 1907 a branch office was opened in Dallas, Tex., and thus the company assumed territorial dimensions, which, in my opinion bring with them the really major complications in any business organization.

Between 1907 and 1920, Sears opened mail order plants in Dallas, Seattle, and Philadelphia. As Sears operations became dispersed geographically, it was perhaps natural that the people responsible for the various functions in Chicago should try to operate these plants by simply extending their authority to the distant operation. However, by the time the fourth mail-order plant was opened in Philadelphia in 1920, it was plain to see that there was a need for an appraisal of this type of company organization. For one thing, delays in handling problems and the lack of knowledge of local and regional conditions were proving to be real limitations. It also became obvious that the personnel in the outlying mail-order plants could not possibly report in detail on all of their work to Chicago, nor could the people in Chicago make all of the detailed decisions necessary in these remote locations.

Out of this appraisal came the recognition that a delegation of responsibility and a certain measure of authority had to be made to local plant management. Watchfulness, guidance, and an intimate knowledge of the individuals and problems in the field was substituted for direct control by Chicago. In effect, the functional people in Chicago

began to assume a staff relationship to top management and became less and less a part of a line chain of command. Each local plant was responsible for maintenance of inventories and availability of goods for customer orders in such distant plant. It was not responsible for selection of goods in the catalog or the source of supply and buying terms for such merchandise.

Along in the middle twenties, this evolution was recognized to the extent that the merchandising responsibility of the Chicago plant, which had been directed by the merchandise function, was removed from that authority and put on the same basis as the other mail-order plants. Thus the separation of powers between a parent group and local management of a mail order plant was beginning to take shape. The experience gained in this period of mail-order expansion was put to good use when Sears started opening retail stores in 1925. Not only were the retail stores also physically remote from headquarters operation, but they also represented a new type of business to Sears, thus introducing an element of diversification which had not been present before.

The retail stores were fitted into the existing pattern of organization, with the store managers reporting to the mail-order plant managers. This pattern seemed logical for several reasons, but primarily because of the jobbing function performed for retail stores by the mail-order plants. In addition, most of the retail stores initially opened were located in the mail-order plants themselves or in the metropolitan areas of mail-order plant cities, thus making the physical job of supervision by mail-order plant management relatively easy.

The company's expansion in the retail field was carried on at a rapid rate, and at the end of 1929, almost 5 years after the first store was opened, there were 324 retail stores. By this time it had become apparent that the physical scope of retail operations and the variety of local problems—inventory, local competition, community and customer relations—were such that a reappraisal of the organization was necessary.

The field organization which grew out of this reappraisal became the forerunner of our present organization. Regional managers were established on a territorial basis for the supervision of the retail stores, which were then separated from mail-order supervision. Retail stores reported to a district manager in each territory.

This organization was probably rather typical of chain-store operations at that time, but this form of organization lasted only a relatively short time because very fundamental weaknesses became apparent. The center of authority tended toward the district manager, which did not give enough latitude to the local store manager to handle those purely local matters properly—local personnel, sales promotion, inventory control, and so forth. Also the district managers were so removed from Chicago management that they could not properly interpret basic company policies and could not keep up with new developments emanating from the central organization.

The next step was to have all of the larger stores, called "A" stores, either individual or large city groups, report theoretically to the president of the company, and the smaller stores regrouped into fewer and larger group now called zones. The zone manager now had too many stores to attempt close and detailed direction but was in a better position to interpret overall company plans and policies, keep up with new merchandise developments, check personnel selection and training, and in short perform a rather broad administrative supervision. These zone managers theoretically reported also to the president of the company. In practice, a retail administrator, occupying a staff position to the president, reviewed store results and advised the president on many details. A personnel and employee-relations department was beginning to emerge at this time, which was also under the direction of the retail administrator so that there could be coordination between operating results and personnel administration.

The company made great strides during this period of the late thirties and during the war years under this general form of organization. The concept developed that the merchandise and operating functions in Chicago were there to develop plans and procedures covering merchandising selection and availability, sales techniques, store arrangement and operating methods to obtain the most efficient costs. In a general way, stores were expected to accept and put into use such plans and be responsible to the president for specific profit and loss performance. Some of the details covered in this over-all parent activity were mandatory for the stores, but the range of details that were optional was also very broad.

Up to 1941, the complete functions of merchandise, operating, auditing-finance, personnel and public relations were all in Chicago. In theory at least, none of these functions were specifically responsible for the execution of their functional activity in any single store because of the fact that these parent functions were by-passed by the line of authority from president to store group or zone manager. In practice, many store managers were not experienced enough for this long distance Chicago administrative supervision, and the three primary functions of merchandise, operating and auditing performed many rather direct functional jobs of supervision, but largely on a trouble-shooting basis.

In 1941, General Wood recognized that some intermediate position was necessary between the centralizing of all functional activities in Chicago and the extreme decentralization of day-to-day operations to 617 stores over the country. Beginning then and completed after the war, five territories were established, each under an officer of the company. Store, group and zone managers in each territory now were responsible to this territorial officer for operating results. In effect, the president of the company had now moved to five places, insofar as daily operations of the business were concerned. The operating function of Chicago was abolished insofar as any administrative activity was concerned, and thus became part of the territorial officer's responsibility.

Now with this historical background, let us take a good look at the organization we have today, because it is essentially a refinement of this last territorial principle.

The basic elements of the organization structure are first a staff of specialists and technicians which we call the parent, and which is without administrative authority in a coercive sense. Secondly, territorial administrative units to whom store results are accountable, and who in turn bypass the entire parent organization by being responsible direct to the president of the company.

This parent organization consists of 4,681 people. In its relations to the mail order, retail, and factory operating units, it is at one and the same time a banker, the landlord, the supplier of professional and technical skills; and in the president and chairman the final authority of company management. As banker, the parent organization loans working capital at the rate of 4 percent to every operating unit to cover inventories—credit accounts receivable—and necessary cash balances. At peak periods the total sum required for these purposes may exceed $1½ billion. As landlord, it provides store buildings and parking-lot facilities for which a rental charge is made of 4 percent on the undepreciated balance of the cost. For both owned and leased buildings, this landlord function provides investment in store fixtures and equipment, trucks, and all necessary capital goods, for which interest charge is also made on the unamortized balance.

In its capacity of being a professional staff the following functions are represented: Parent operating, which consists of divisions specializing in customer mechanical service, retail procedures, mail-order procedures, the service of supply to both mail-order plants and stores, a general traffic department which includes in its activity the company-owned over-the-road truck lines as well as rail-freight-forwarding operations, a communications department, operating one of the country's largest internal communications systems, and an operations research department, which in addition to its purely research function also supervises the departments which actually operate the computers and various other electronic equipment used in our parent organization.

The auditing, or controller's function, is made up of retail, mail order, parent, foreign, and merchandise accounting divisions, and a general auditing statistics unit, the insurance department and the credit department.

The personnel activity consists of sections responsible for employee relations, employee benefits and personnel policies, compensation, employee training and executive development, which includes a unit preparing and administrating correspondence courses for employee training, psychological testing and employee morale surveys. This latter activity carries on considerable research in this highly specialized field.

The factory management department serves the wholly owned factories and subsidiary factories in the same way in which other parent departments serve the mail-order plants and retail stores. Within the factory organization are units responsible for soft-line factories, hard line, electronic, plastic and paint factories. In addition, there is an industrial engineering unit, a personnel department, and a factory controllers department.

The public relations department is comprised of sections responsible for contributions and memberships, press relations, consumer education, employee publications and research. Located in this department also are the individuals in charge of the major projects of the Sears-Roebuck Foundation—agricultural programs, urban renewal, aid to education, which includes our scholarship program, and medical assistance. In addition, there is a controller for this activity.

The treasurer's office is responsible for the cashiering activity in all company units, the maintenance of banking relations and stockholder records. In addition, the tax department, with sections devoted to Federal taxes, foreign taxes, State taxes, local taxes, licenses, and manufacturers taxes, reports to the treasurer's office. Incidentally, it takes 135 people to handle Sears tax matters in Chicago and in the field.

The legal department is staffed with men specializing in various aspects of our business such as real estate, merchandise, factories, operating, and personnel. In addition it serves the traditional function of maintaining the nonfinancial corporate records.

The property department is made up of units in charge of various phases of construction and maintenance work, including architectural, structural, electrical, mechanical, temperature control and plumbing engineering, estimating, building material purchasing, and field construction supervision. An extensive drafting section supports the work of this department.

Our Latin-American operations are represented in Chicago by a parent function headed up by a vice president who in effect is a sixth territorial officer. On his staff are men who work with 36 stores in Sears 6 Latin-American corporations on personnel,

merchandise, ordering, shipping, construction and real-estate problems.

The parent merchandise function is comprised of 50 buying departments, catalog preparation, production, and distribution departments, a merchandise development and testing laboratory, a store planning and display division, a packaging and a merchandise-control operation, a merchandise comparison unit, a quality-control operation, an economic research department, and a department which purchases the supplies and mechanical equipment employed in the business.

All of these staff departments are maintained by a charge of a certain percent of sales made to every operating unit. This charge is designed to offset the exact cost of maintaining this staff of experts. This leaves the interest and rent received from operating units as income to this parent function, against which must be charged the interest paid banks for loans or costs of installment financing. The parent on the books of the company is the owner of factories and investments in subsidiaries, both manufacturing, foreign and retail companies, and Allstate insurance companies, and dividends from such investments are a part of this parent income account. There is for every operating unit a profit and loss statement monthly as well as a balance sheet, which constitutes the accounting between such operating unit and Chicago parent. Thus for 707 retail stores and 11 mail order houses, there are some 8,616 complete profit and loss and balance sheet statements prepared annually. In addition, there are test or sample statements covering factories, catalog sales offices, telephone sales units, and miscellaneous enterprises such as the diamond shop, the gun repair shop—even our company airplanes. Twice a year profit and loss statements are prepared for each of some 50 merchandise departments of each mail order plant and of 106 retail stores. Thus we have a total of about 20,500 profit and loss statements annually.

Now a word as to the functioning of this parent organization and its relations with operating units. We will use the buyer's job in the merchandise function as an illustration. Each buyer is responsible for the selection, design, or development of his specialized line of merchandise; he is responsible for the determination of the manufacturing source of supply and for the terms and conditions of purchase. He notifies each operating unit where applicable about his merchandise, and while no one else in the company has the authority to purchase or deal with manufacturers for his kind of goods, at the same time he does not have the authority to order any single store to carry his line of goods. Thus we achieve all the advantages of a highly centralized buying authority with the extreme decentralized authority to each store manager to express his own judgment as to the merchandise in his store. The buyer recommends a selling price and calculates the gross profit that should result to a store with a proper balance of sales between various lines and items. The buyer must make his commitments with a manufacturer without knowing to what degree the individual stores will back up his judgment. He may have the hedge of cataloging the item for mail order selling, which is his responsibility. Otherwise, he depends upon previous experience, his judgment as to acceptability of the merchandise in question, and the persuasion of himself and the sales manager of his department.

The buyer may not know just which stores carry certain of his items, but as orders flow to the manufacturer, it is his responsibility to see that sufficient lead time is provided for manufacture so that a supply will be available for ensuing demand. The local operating unit is wholly responsible for keeping goods in stock to serve the demand of its customers and for controlling the overall inventory so as to avoid both financial strain and seasonal carryover. Thus you see again the assumption locally of those operations which can be performed locally without detailed administration from the outside, except the overall territorial administrative office. The merchandise office in the parent is responsible for sales plans of the company as a whole, and this means minute correlatiton of the logistics concerning raw material supply to the factory, manufacturing process, distribution time to stores, advertising mat service, window and interior display information to stores, and enough advance time for employee understanding and instruction.

I will not attempt to describe in detail the many other staff activities of the parent whose wide range of interest was given in the former list, but I want to mention quite briefly the relationship of the controller's office and the personnel department with the territorial and field organization.

Since the controller's office has the responsibility of safeguarding company property, it has a direct line of communication through representatives in the territorial offices and thus direct to the store. This direct line is a necessary safety measure in a company doing business in 2,000 locations with a merchandise inventory of $500 million and installment accounts on the books totaling $900 million where uniform accounting practices are essential.

The personnel department evolves techniques and procedures which must be sold to the field on their merits. From this standpoint the influence of this department depends on the quality of its work. But it has an additional responsibility of developing a list of promotable people or the reserve group as we call it. In the maintenance and development of this reserve group, essential in a company which has a firm policy of promotion from within, the personnel department plays an important part in the development and advancement of individuals. This is especially true of interterritorial promotions, where an overall judgment as well as a point of coordination is necessary.

With the development of these staff functions, the question arises, How can one be sure that the best use is made of the specialized knowledge available in the functional or staff jobs? After all, staff people have no authority to apply their knowledge direct to a line operation or to force line personnel to accept their findings. At Sears we have solved the situation by what I call the right of challenge. Regardless of the results being obtained by the individual management of a distant unit, the function which now has a purely staff character in the overall picture, has the right to challenge the results or the way they were obtained, so far as its specialty is concerned. The fact that acts of local management are subject to challenge by someone who knows far more about a certain subject than anyone in the local organization, is the price local management pays for its latitude in a decentralized operation. In effect, local management must be prepared to show that it is openminded, willing to take advantage of the highly developed skills found in the staff functions, and is applying with good judgment the specialized knowledge available to it in the staff departments.

In conclusion, while I have attempted a chronological history of the development of the present structural form of Sears corporate organization and its functioning in a broad sense, one must recognize that other factors have been envolving concurrently, which have been essential to the successful functioning of this organization. Probably personnel policies have been the most important of these factors. As I see it, sound merchandise policies, or public relations or finance, all of these could be reasonably successful, regardless of the particular structural form of the organization, but since the very essence of organization involves the way people work together, the whole atmosphere of personnel plays an important part. Sears has been fortunate in having a rich heritage from its earliest days of attaching great importance to the individual. Its well known profit-sharing plan started in 1916 was an early and tangible recognition of the responsibility and respect for the individual on the part of the company's management. It has been a magnet through the years of pulling in the one direction of overall company success the individual actions of thousands of people. There may be disputes at times between the individuals or company units as to the best way of performing some operation, but the fact that each party has in mind only the best interests of the company as a whole is taken for granted.

Practically the only place open for newcomers at Sears is at the bottom, if one may include in that phrase the basic-training program which certain selected but thoroughly inexperienced men undertake. I do not have time to cover the many highly organized techniques employed to identify promising talent at various levels of advancement and how we guide and direct their development. Every attempt is made to create an atmosphere wherein character and ability are recognized and a constant flow of talent through all levels is maintained. The new and expanded facilities in just the last 5 years alone created jobs for 24,000 people with all that this implies in the way of supervisory and technical positions.

We subject line executives, as I have indicated, to the discipline of the profit and loss and balance sheet statement. Their earnings are in proportion to results. While we believe in very adequate, competent, and highly specialized staff assistants, we are quite successful in preventing a bureaucratic atmosphere by giving no authority to such specialists so far as the line organization is concerned. They must attain influence through acceptance of sheer merit.

Many students of organization would say that an organization where 65 departments report to a functional officer, or 36 report to a line officer could not work. It does seem to work, however. The intangibles which make it work are far more difficult to recognize, identify, and evalute than mere physical form. I am sure that a business organization can get too large for a rigid, tightly compartmentized, dictatorial kind of organization, and must turn to greater and greater reliance on the initiative and good judgment of the individual, making sure that such individuals are the product of advancement through merit with adequate exeprience and motivated toward a common goal.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the part I have had in enacting legislation to permit State road workers, State employees, municipal workers, and schoolteachers to come under the provisions of the Social Security Act. One of my first acts after coming to Congress was to advocate the embracing of this group of workers under the coverage of this humanitarian act. I feel I have had quite a large part in strengthening and liberalizing this law.

We have done much in the past 20 years since the existence of the social security program to improve its benefits, but there is still room for further improvements. That is why I am shocked

and saddened that we have an administration which opposes the lowering of the age at which women can receive social security benefits.

Where can a woman past 60 obtain employment these days? Who will employ women of this age? There is no place for women past 60 in the commercial job market. As a matter of fact where can men find gainful employment when they are past 60. I am in favor of lowering the age of both men and women with an increase in the provisions.

During the 84th Congress we have amended the social-security law to continue benefits to permanently and totally disabled children after they have reached the age of 18; extended coverage to certain professional groups and others not heretofore covered; lowered the retirement age of women from 65 to 62, bringing immediate benefits to 800,000 additional women; provided disability insurance benefits to some 250,000 permanently and totally disabled workers aged 50 or over.

I am astonished that the administration opposes the House-approved provision which provides for the payment of benefits to the permanently disabled at the age of 50. Certainly the provision paying benefits to a disabled man at age 50 is no more than right. How can a man who is totally and permanently disabled provide a living for his family? Only the most callous could oppose this provision.

Actually, I believe the retirement age should be lowered even below that set in the House-approved bill. I feel that men should be allowed to retire under social security after reaching the age of 60 and that women should be allowed to retire at an even lower age.

It is unfortunate that the present administration refuses to improve the social-security law. If we go ahead and pass this bill, it will be the cornerstone for security and happiness for the disabled and aged in our society.

This is not a giveaway program. This is not charity. Every man and woman who participates pays into this fund and it does not cost the Government 1 cent. I do not see how anyone can conscientiously oppose the program. I hope and pray that the Senate in its wisdom will see fit to improve the House version as passed last year instead of undermining and weakening the bill.

The Social Security Act has closed the poor houses all over the Nation and has made respectable citizens of our aged so they can face their sunset years with faith and confidence. I look at these things in the light of the teachings of the Master of Galilee and try to be helpful to the aged and infirmed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CANFIELD, for 20 minutes, on today.

Mr. PRICE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 15 minutes, on today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANAHAN (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois).

Mr. DIGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL and to include a statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "an act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the County of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 29, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1684. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report stating that no reservations were made during the calendar year 1955, relating to lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, pursuant to section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1685. A letter from the Chairman, United States Commission for the Celebration in 1955 of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, transmitting the final report of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, pursuant to Public Law 581, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint

resolution to establish a national motto of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9952. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7679. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8490. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8674. A bill to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9260. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9263. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain impediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10046. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9824. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Thirteenth Intermediate Report of Certain Activities Regarding Power, Department of the Interior (Changes in power line regulations) (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10249. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 10250. A bill to amend section 2056 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10252. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10253. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 10254. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10255. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10256. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10257. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10258. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10259. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10260. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10261. A bill to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10262. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10263. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, entitled "Copyrights" with respect to certain fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 10264. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to permit the barter or exchange of surplus agricultural commodities with certain foreign countries with which such barter or exchange was formerly prohibited; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase in certain cases the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 10266. A bill designating the first day of May in each year as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10267. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 10268. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvement of domiciliary or hospital buildings of State or Territorial-operated soldiers' homes by a grant to subsidize in part the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10269. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical grade alumina on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 10270. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10271. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers or plaques commemorating certain deceased members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 10272. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an officer or employee of a State or local government to elect social security coverage as a self-employed individual if he is not covered by a retirement system and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system has not been extended to his services by an agreement under section 218 of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10273. A bill to provide for the development by the Secretary of the Interior of Independence National Historical Park,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 10274. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on account of the real property constituting Sunflower Village, Johnson County, Kans.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10275. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of Federal funds payable thereunder to States which have approved plans for old-age assistance and which maintain their expenditures for such assistance at or above the 1955 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 10276. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 10277. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Mohawk River at and in the vicinity of Schoharie and Greene Counties, N. Y., and of the Hudson River in the vicinity of Columbia, Dutchess, Greene, Schoharie, and Ulster Counties, N. Y., in the interests of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 595. Joint resolution to amend section 404 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, with respect to excess baggage charges collected by air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. Res. 452. Resolution to authorize the Select Committee on Small Business to investigate and study the problems of small business with respect to basic and applied scientific research and development work; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 10278. A bill for the relief of Mr. Dusan Lezaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 10279. A bill for the relief of Albert H. Ruppar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10280. A bill for the relief of Fiorindo Francesco Nappo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10281. A bill for the relief of Walter C. Jordan and Elton W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10282. A bill for the relief of Evangelia Harlaos Papamattheakis Lester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. J. Res. 596. Joint resolution waiving certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

785. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Herman E. Seiser and others of Stark County, Ohio, for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

786. Also, petition of W. C. Gonder and others of Stark, Tuscarawas and Wayne Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

787. Also, petition of Byron S. Miller and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

788. Also, petition of Stephen Garfield and others of Stark and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

789. Also, petition of Michael DeGirolamo and others of Alliance, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

790. Also, petition of Josephine E. Carmichael and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

791. Also, petition of E. J. Kuntz and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

792. Also, petition of E. C. Williner and others of Stark and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

793. Also, petition of J. A. Eames and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

794. Also, petition of William Wilson and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

795. Also, petition of Howard G. Thorley and others of Canton, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

796. Also, petition of Hon. R. E. Fair, mayor of Shanesville, Ohio, and others of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

797. Also, petition of E. J. Hunsinger and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

798. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of Jerusha E. Brown and 31 other residents of the cities of Albany and Eugene, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

799. Also, petition of 44 members of post 1775, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Glendale, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

800. Also, petition of Henry La Barge and 44 other citizens of Brookings and Harbor, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

800. Also, petition of Henry La Barge and 45 other residents of the cities of Jacksonville, Central Point, and Medford, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

802. Also, petition of William Kidder and 44 other residents of the cities of Eugene, Fall Creek, Lowell, and Dexter, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

803. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of 22 residents of Glendale, Calif., urging enactment of legislation which prohibits alcoholic-beverage advertising on radio, television, and in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

804. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

805. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 270 members of Post Hocking, No. 6430, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Logan, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

806. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Post, No. 7174, The Plains, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

807. Also, petition of 145 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Nelsonville, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

808. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

809. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension porgram for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

810. Also, petition of 46 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Basil, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

811. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, Ottumwa, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

812. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Earl M. Scringer and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

813. Also, petition of Conrad H. Bannasch and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

814. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), Detroit, Mich., relative to Packard Local Union No. 190, UAW, going on record as endorsing the McNamara bill, S. 1206, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Easter Address by Senator Wiley and Editorial on Empire State Building Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was interested to read in last Friday's—March 23—issue of the Ripon (Wis.) Press, an editorial entitled "The Light Shineth in Darkness." It refers to the revolving beacons which will shine from atop the world's highest building—the Empire State Building—as a symbol of America's faith and freedom, and as a guide to the world.

As was stated by Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., these lights may symbolize "not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

It is most appropriate, as we approach the hallowed Easter observance, that we turn our thoughts to man's greatest goal, his dearest wish—a just and enduring peace.

I sent to the desk the text of the Ripon Press editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be followed by the text of a pertinent radio address which I am delivering over most of the radio stations of my State on the theme of Easter.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ripon (Wis.) Press of March 23, 1956]

THE LIGHT SHINETH IN DARKNESS

Announcement has just been made of the "air age supplement to the American welcome so long extended to shipborne visitors by the Statue of Liberty." This new aerial symbol of welcome and freedom, which it is hoped can be turned on for Easter Sunday, will be visible to overseas visitors for 300 miles out over the Atlantic.

Described as a spectacular electronic tiara, this bright new welcome will be provided by 4 revolving beacons 1,092 feet above the sidewalks of New York atop the world-famous Empire State Building. These 4 Empire State lights, generating a brilliance of nearly 4 billion candlepower will be the brightest continuous source of man-made light in the world. The 4 huge lamps, weighing a ton apiece, are being installed at the base of the mighty television tower that provides the antenna for all 7 of New York City's TV stations. The synchronized beacons will revolve counterclockwise at approximately 1 revolution per minute, and will be in operation from sundown until midnight.

Air travelers in our own country will see the Empire State lights from as far away as Harrisburg, Albany, Boston, Batimore, and Washington. From the ground, they will be visible in Bridgeport, Conn., Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Allentown and Bethlehem in Pennsylvania, and on especially clear nights perhaps in Philadelphia, 85 miles away.

It is the hope of Col. Henry Crown, president of the Empire State Building Corp., that these fabulous shafts of light will "symbolize not only welcome—but the unlimited opportunities of America and our hopes and prayers for peace."

Certainly these lights of liberty will give blazing testimony to the achievements possible with peace and opportunity and should likewise impress the beholder with man's ultimate faith in peace and his determination to pierce the darkness of suspicion and ignorance and oppression.

FULFILLING THE MEANING OF EASTER—1956

(Radio address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations, Easter, 1956)

Eastertime is once more at hand. And with it, the thoughts of mankind return to the triumphant scene in the Holy Land when the Master, the wayshower, proved that there is no death; that life is eternal; that the immortal spirit is triumphant over mortal flesh.

In this beautiful time of year, all of nature tells the story of life returning—in the green earth, in trees, in flowers, in every bud that soon will bloom. Our thoughts naturally turn to this question:

"How may all of us—you and I—truly fulfill the message of Easter? How may we live by the spirit of Easter—of life triumphant?"

And so, during these next few minutes, through the kind courtesy of this station, I would like to share with you some observations on the subject of applying the spirit of Eastertime—applying it in all phases of our lives—in our homes, with our families, our neighbors, our friends, in our business or shop or factory or on our farm.

WORSHIP IN THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS

Question. Senator WILEY, how best can all of us observe this Easter season?

Answer. The answer to that is, of course, by going to the church of our beliefs and worshipping there in "the way, the truth and the life."

The answer, too, is of course, by applying not simply on Sunday, but 7 days a week, the principles of Him who came that "we might have life, and have it more abundantly."

In other words, it is obviously up to each of us really to demonstrate our creed, our faith in the spiritual nature of man—in the brotherhood of man, and the Fatherhood of God.

Question. And what of our attitude toward the problem of death itself?

THERE IS NO DEATH

Answer. Perhaps, the poet gave us the best answer—the best statement that there really is—that there really can be no death of the spirit of man, that life is truly triumphant, and right and truth.

Thus, in the poem, An Easter Carol, Phillips Brooks wrote of death and life:

"Tomb, thou shalt not hold Him longer;
Death is strong, but life is stronger;
Stronger than the dark, the light;
Stronger than the wrong, the right;
Faith and hope triumphant say
Christ will rise on Easter Day."

RISING ATTENDANCE OF CHURCHES

Question. Senator WILEY, you mentioned going to the church of our choice. What do the statistics show as regards American churchgoing?

Answer. The Gallup poll reports the welcome news that last year the American people set an all-time high church-attendance record. During an average week approximately 49½ million adults attended church.

By contrast, back in 1950 12¼ million fewer Americans attended church during the average week. On Easter Sunday last year an estimated 60½ million Americans—nearly 6 out of 10 adults—went to church.

Question. How do you interpret that statistic, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I think that the meaning is very clear. More and more Americans are recognizing that material answers do not provide the solution to our basic problems of living in this complex age—our problems of human relations. Some men's lust for wealth, their lust for power, lust for property—these are not the real keys to happiness or to peace of mind.

So, as more and more people come to understand this fact, as they come to understand the real laws of living and loving, the laws of giving and receiving, the divine law, they give of themselves to God. They turn to prayer.

Question. What else may be said about church attendance figures, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Just this. We are all naturally delighted that more and more Americans are finding inspiration and guidance in houses of worship. But, of course, we can't judge this churchgoing trend simply on the basis of big statistics. We will judge it on the inner quality of church attendance—the quality in your heart and mine, as we truly become filled with the presence of the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-powerful Creator.

As you know, just a little more than 90 million Americans list themselves as belonging to some church. That is the highest such total in our history.

If all of these Americans—if you and I—become true spreaders of the Gospel the good news of happy, fruitful, peaceful, harmonious living, then ours will be a happy country indeed. We will each find fulfillment. We will not be agitated, but will be calm, cool, and collected—the three C's—no matter what crisis may ever come.

HAPPY AMERICA AT EASTERTIME

Question. As you look about America on the Easter scene, Senator, how does the national picture look to you?

Answer. It looks excellent indeed. By almost every standard our country is enjoying more blessings of peace than ever before in our history.

Sixty-five million Americans are employed today, including 1.1 million Wisconsinites, over and above our Badger people employed in farming.

Our total national production of goods and services now approaches $400 billion. Our national income is $320 billion.

Income moreover, is fortunately better distributed among all Americans than ever before in our history. That means a better break for the little fellow in the lower income brackets.

Americans today own 250 million life insurance policies. They have $235 billion in liquid savings. Last year, Americans bought 7 million radios, 7 million television sets, 3½ million washing machines, a million air conditioners.

Today, 25 million of us own our own homes.

And 15 million of us have more than $30 billion invested for our later years in pension and retirement trust funds.

And I could go on and on with other impressive facts and figures that spell good news for the United States of America.

OUR MOST PRECIOUS ASSETS

Question. And you feel, Senator, that even more important than all these material assets is our spiritual wealth.

Answer. Of course. We could have all these possessions, all this wealth, and a lot

more besides, and still possibly not be happy, unless—I emphasize, unless—we had a true respect for the real value of life's greatest blessings—our home, our mate, our family, our fine country, our God.

OUTLOOK FOR PEACE BRIGHTER

Question. And what about the problem of peace, Senator WILEY—peace which is so sacred, especially at Eastertime. What is the outlook for peace?

Answer. I believe that the prospects for peace are getting better all the time. That doesn't mean that world communism is not still on the march. On the contrary, atheistic, aggressive communism still seeks to conquer the world—by subversion, spying, sabotage, revolution.

Question. But you apparently feel that Red Russia itself is subject to stresses and strains from within.

Answer. Absolutely. There is vast ferment inside Russia. The terrible, longstanding lies about Dictator Joseph Stalin have now been completely debunked. He is being shown up for what he was—a ruthless murderer. The iron dictatorship is giving way slowly to some new forms.

Meanwhile, the people of Russia, the enslaved people of East Germany, of Poland, the Baltic States, of the Balkans—hunger for freedom.

But communism remains a deadly menace, and we must be strong, on our guard, and vigilant.

SOME NEGATIVE FACTORS ON UNITED STATES SCENE

Question. Senator WILEY, you've mentioned the positive side, the affirmative side of America's assets and of the outlook for peace. Now, as you look around, on the American scene, itself, what do you find are some of the factors which seem too contrary to the Easter spirit—factors which we should, in the Easter spirit, try to alter?

Answer. I can list several such negative factors which all of us ought to seek to change: First, there is the matter of some disharmony in our land. I refer to occasional prejudice and bigotry, to tension and hatred, between some groups, between regions—North and South—between races and religions. Such harmful conditions are, of course, contrary to the universal teachings of the Master—who taught love and understanding among all men. "Love thy brother as thyself" He taught.

Second, there is the awful matter of crime in our country. Two million crimes are committed every year—crimes against human beings and crimes against property.

Then, there is the matter of juvenile delinquency—a million American youngsters getting into trouble with the law.

Surely, we as a civilized, Christian Nation can achieve a better record than that. Surely, we can each raise our children—through the combined influence of home, church, and school, so that our youngsters abide by the law, and so that they live worthwhile lives.

Question. Any other negative factors?

Answer. Yes, there is the matter of conflict—occasional bitter conflict between labor and management. We see, for example, the recent awful Westinghouse strike in which everybody proved to be the loser. That strike lasted 156 days—the worst in American history. It crippled a great corporation; it cost the union a fortune. It destroyed millions of dollars of workers' pay envelopes. There were irreparable losses in communities. There was unhappiness in innumerable families.

Surely, men of good will, men of reason, in labor and management, could somehow have avoided or minimized such a terrific toll. What I am saying is simply that labor and management have a responsibility to themselves and to the American public, to try to work out things better in a spirit of harmony and brotherhood and good will.

As one man put it, "Let us not try to follow your way, or my way, but God's way."

SUMMARY

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that our listeners have been enjoying your comments on both the practical and spiritual phases of the meaning of Eastertime. Thus far, you have commented upon the great blessings enjoyed by the American people. You have mentioned the bright prospects of preserving the peace, particularly now that the Soviet Union is ridden with strife and stress. You have pointed out the encouraging factors of America's prosperity; prosperity which covers virtually all groups of America, but which, as you have pointed out on many other occasions, does not extend as yet to American farming, as it should and will.

And then you have mentioned some of the continuing problems on the American scene—problems of discord, between some groups, of crime in our midst, and juvenile delinquency. But throughout, you have stressed the spiritual aspect of the American way of life.

LO, I AM WITH YOU ALWAYS

Answer. And I would like to reemphasize the importance of that spiritual aspect. You will remember, Jesus said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

Perhaps some of us do not realize the full significance of these words.

What the Master was saying was this, not the physical Jesus is present, but the spiritual truths He taught are available now and always to the earnest seeker.

He had told us to claim our heritage: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

This, He indicated, is not to be accomplished by blind faith, but by following in His steps—by understanding, by sound works and deeds.

He had told us to reach out and tap the source of all power. "I of mine own self can do nothing. It is the Father who worketh with Me," He had said.

Bear in mind that man, to a lesser extent had reached out and harnessed the mighty power of electricity or of the atom. But there is an infinitely greater power, a healing power, available to us all.

By following in the steps of the Man of Galilee, by fulfilling His teachings, the holy spirit will fill us with the light of inspiration, giving us continued guidance and direction.

Question. And you feel that this is a fact to be grasped throughout one's entire life and every hour of the day?

Answer. Of course. The divine law is not something to be practiced 1 day a week. Rather, it should be fulfilled throughout all our days and lives.

There is absolutely no place where we cannot follow in the Wayshower's steps—in our own home; certainly, of course, in our church; in our schoolroom; as we walk the outdoor paths of nature; in our lodge, our women's clubs, our veterans' post, as we bargain at the labor-management conference table.

Yes, those of us who are privileged to serve you in the halls of the United States Congress likewise have the heavy obligation to follow in His steps.

This, then, is the message of Eastertime. It is a message which will bring peace, which will bring harmony, which will bring fulfillment for all.

Question. I know, Senator WILEY, that your listeners have enjoyed your inspiring message today on the true meaning of Easter.

Answer. I have certainly enjoyed being with you. It would be a pleasure to get the benefit of your reactions to this broadcast.

And now may I wish for you and yours an Eastertime rich with blessings.

This is your senior Senator, ALEC WILEY, signing off from the Nation's Capital.

Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the statement I made this morning in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project, before the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE DANIEL A. REED, OF NEW YORK, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely thank you and the members of your subcommittee for this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the Barcelona Harbor project in my congressional district.

I am here to urge an appropriation for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, Westfield, N. Y.

On February 21, 1956, the President communicated with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 for various projects, one of which is the Barcelona Harbor. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget recommended to the President that the sum of $2,260,000 be used to initiate construction of 4 authorized projects. Of that amount I believe the Army engineers have recommended that $250,000 be allocated for improvement of the Barcelona Harbor for the fiscal year 1957.

The Rivers and Harbors Act, approved March 2, 1945, adopted a project for improvement of Barcelona Harbor, N. Y., in accordance with the report contained in House Document 446, 78th Congress, providing for an entrance channel 10 feet deep with a harbor basin 8 feet deep, with breakwater protection.

The harbor is one of the authorized projects for construction of harbors of refuge on the coast of the Great Lakes for light draft vessels.

In 1945 the estimated cost of the breakwaters and dredging was $303,000, with annual maintenance estimated at $2,000, provided that local interests contribute $7,500 in cash toward the cost of the protective structures and dredging.

The local conditions were met several years ago. In July 1949, a $60,000 bond issue, needed to obtain the then estimated $791,600 in Federal aid for extensive improvements to Barcelona Harbor, was approved by the citizens of Westfield, N. Y., by a vote of 534 to 30. This was the first time in the history of Westfield that the town citizenry had been called upon to participate in a referendum authorizing a bond issue. The $60,000 bond issue was needed to contribute the necessary $7,500 in cash as well as to provide without cost to the United States, all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction of the project, including suitable spoil-disposal areas when and as required.

Assurances of local cooperation as required by law were furnished by the town of Westfield and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Army on December 20, 1949.

In 1950 the estimated cost of the project had risen to $830,600 of which $15,600 had been allocated and expended for advanced planning of the project.

Now the estimate of the cost of construction is closer to a million dollars.

When this work is completed Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge. Completion of this work will also mean the return of the million-dollar fishing industry to Westfield, N. Y.

Most of the fleet of 28 fishing boats formerly anchored at Barcelona Harbor in Westfield, because of the splendid fishing, were forced to move to Erie, Pa., and other places, after Barcelona Harbor became filled with sand.

Let me tell you something about Barcelona Harbor.

Barcelona Harbor was made a port of entry 125 years ago in 1831, when the Barcelona Co. laid out the area as a city on Lake Erie.

The Federal Government needed a lighthouse to protect the lake-borne commerce. Judge Trumbull B. Campbell built a beautiful stone lighthouse without cost to the Federal Government.

Judge Campbell constructed a wooden pipeline more than a mile in length to convey natural gas to furnish light to the lighthouse, at no expense to Federal Government.

A wharf was built by E. T. Foote to take care of the lively traffic by water which developed, and this wharf was built at no cost to the Federal Government.

In 1847, the increase in business was so great a larger wharf was built, costing $20,000, at no cost to the Federal Government.

Other than planning money resulting from authorization of improvement of the harbor in 1945, the United States has failed to appropriate a cent to preserve this harbor since 1838.

The citizens of Westfield have constantly done their part to maintain this harbor. They financed a large warehouse for freight inside the bar suitable for small steamers and sailing vessels, which continued to carry on a thriving waterborne trade, some of it with Canada.

Even as early as 1831 the *Western Peacock* steamboat was built by a company principally of Westfield people, the thriving village which this improvement at Barcelona Harbor will serve. This steamboat transported passengers between Buffalo and Erie.

Notwithstanding the failure of the Government to appropriate money for the harbor, the traffic to and from Barcelona held up for quite a number of years.

I cannot stress too strongly the importance to Westfield, N. Y., and its environs of the fishing industry which has been driven out of the Barcelona Harbor, because of the neglect of the Government in making the necessary improvements in the past, which improvements have now been authorized and for which I am asking you to act favorably upon the recommendations of the President and Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

A large fleet of tugs once operated out of Barcelona Harbor to the fishing grounds which lie between Barcelona and Canada. Now that these tugs cannot enter Barcelona they and their crews have been driven, together with their families, to the city of Erie, Pa., and to Buffalo, N. Y., and some even to Canada.

According to the State of New York Conservation Department, the bulk of the fish produced from New York waters of Lake Erie are taken out of two ports, Dunkirk and Barcelona. Approximately one-half of the total poundage would be taken out of Barcelona.

Barcelona has important advantages as a fishing port because it is closer to the best fishing grounds of certain times of the year, for instance the early spring fishing for whitefish and the late fall fishing for blue pike and ciscoes.

Fish production from the New York State waters of Lake Erie for 1948 was almost a million pounds and in 1946 it was 2¼ million pounds.

This harbor is needed not only to restore the fishing industry, which is a source of food and employment, but it is greatly needed as a harbor of refuge.

The storms that sweep Lake Erie are hard to describe. Spring and fall blizzards sweep through this area and within a few minutes Lake Erie can be transformed from a state of calm into roaring waves of mountainous size, in which only the strongest boats can survive.

Barcelona Harbor greatly needs improvement so that it can be a place of refuge. Moreover, when a fleet of tugs can enter and occupy the harbor they can serve as reserve ships to help save small boats caught in violent storms.

My brother was master of one of the largest ships on Lake Erie, and during his lifetime he commanded a ship 600 feet long. He encountered many of these severe storms and on one occasion on Lake Erie the smoke stack of this great ship almost dipped water, and his huge ship barely escaped capsizing.

You can readily see that the small craft which are increasing by the hundreds each year on Lake Erie need a nearby port to escape the hazards of these sudden and violent storms.

I believe that a community which has for years sought to hold its business of a great fishing industry and provide safety for its sailors through its own efforts and contributions should receive help from the Government.

The last major appropriation for Barcelona Harbor was under the River and Harbor Act of July 7, 1838, 118 years ago, in the amount of $35,466.

Barcelona Harbor is essential as a harbor of refuge. This harbor, once a thriving fishing port, should be restored. Fishing tugs with their nets and cold-storage facilities have been forced, by the filling in of this harbor with sand and silt, to either cease business or to move to other ports.

No more heroic men than those who operate the fishing tugs can be found when ships, either large or small, are in distress. When the work on this harbor is completed and they are once again able to locate there they will again be available to go to the rescue of persons and ships in distress.

I want to restore this harbor of refuge, and have these wonderful fishing tugs operate out of and in this historic port. There are several industries, especially small boatbuilding concerns, anxious to locate adjacent to this harbor when this project shall have been completed.

With completion of the improvements on the harbor, Westfield, N. Y. will again become a thriving commercial, industrial center of activity. Local hotels will find a lucrative business when small ships can use Barcelona Harbor. There will be ingoing and outgoing package freight, and excursion boats will operate from Barcelona to Erie, Cleveland, Dunkirk, Buffalo, and also to Canadian ports.

This improvement of the harbor will make it one of the popular ports for many of the hundreds of thousands of small craft in use on the Great Lakes.

When completed, Barcelona Harbor will again be a harbor of refuge and the million-dollar fishing industry will return and this will mean a rise in employment in the Westfield, N. Y. area.

Because some of the industries in my district have moved to the South, thus causing unemployment in some sections of the 43d district of New York which I represent, I am most anxious that the fishing industry be returned to Westfield.

I have been trying for many years to get an appropriation for this project and I sincerely hope you will act favorably upon the President's proposal and the budget director's recommendation concerning this project.

Discharge Petition on H. R. 11 Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual petition has been filed to discharge the House Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of Mr. PATMAN'S bill, H. R. 11. This petition seeks to force a vote on this bill on the House floor without the benefit of committee hearings.

Members of the House, and particularly those who have signed or indicated an interest in signing this petition, should be apprised of all the facts. They should know that the House Judiciary Committee scheduled hearings on this bill well prior to the filing of the discharge petition. Specifically, on February 24, 1956, I advised Representative PATMAN by letter that the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee would hold hearings on his bill April 18, 19, and 20, and would afford all interested parties an opportunity to testify. Some 2 weeks later, on March 12, the discharge petition was filed.

It is not only unusual, I think it is unprecedented, for a discharge petition to be filed after the chairman of a standing committee of this body announces that he is scheduling hearings on a bill.

Members should also understand the complexity and far-reaching effect of H. R. 11. Without prejudging this bill in any respect, it should be noted that it seeks to overturn a 1951 decision of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case. If ever there has been a bill pending before Congress which requires careful deliberation, this is such a bill. Manifestly, it should not be voted upon by the membership of the House without benefit of committee hearings, including cross examination of witnesses, and committee recommendations.

This bill, H. R. 11, is designed to amend the antitrust laws. I think the record of the House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee shows beyond question extreme vigilance in support of the competitive principles embodied in the antitrust laws. Never before, to my knowledge, has a discharge petition been filed on an antitrust bill.

In light of these considerations, together with the fact that intensive hearings will be held on H. R. 11 starting next week, those who have already signed the discharge petition may well wish to reconsider and withdraw their signatures.

Lines Drawn in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says in an editorial in the March 11 issue, this administration has paid the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] a high compliment in dispatching a Cabinet member to run against him. The editorial follows:

LINES DRAWN IN OREGON

The Eisenhower administration has paid Senator WAYNE MORSE a high compliment in dispatching Secretary of the Interior McKay to run against him in Oregon.

Some who regard Douglas McKay as something less than a gold-plated asset of the administration may suggest that the Oregon Democrat has really been done a favor. But it would be premature to regard Senator MORSE as a shoo-in. Clearly the administration has given the very highest political priority to the task of retiring this former Republican who committed the unforgivable sin of opposing Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952, and then turning Democrat.

Secretary McKay is quite right in saying that the contest will amount to a showdown on the Eisenhower policies—and particularly, the Eisenhower policies on public power, conservation, and resource development which have been Mr. McKay's special province.

The people of Oregon heard those policies devastatingly criticized in 1954, and they sent the critic to the Senate in the person of RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the first Democratic Senator from the State in 40 years. Now they will get a chance to register their sentiments on these issues, as well as many others, again.

The campaign will be watched with interest by the rest of the country because Senator MORSE has distinguished himself as one of those rare Senators who does not conform to a pattern of political orthodoxy. Like the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska, he values his independence more than his party standing, and he therefore performs many a useful service which others neglect.

Mr. Speaker, the voters of Oregon will be called upon to evaluate Mr. McKay's record, including that in the field of conservation.

In this connection, I call your attention to the report on Preservation of National Wildlife Refuges, issued March 22 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. That report, adopted unanimously, was critical of the administration of wildlife refuge lands by Secretary of Interior McKay.

The committee's report said that hearings held early this year revealed "a picture of extreme administrative confusion" in the Department of Interior. It declares that new oil leasing regulations for refuges, issued last December 2 by Secretary McKay, "fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary."

The committee report, referring to oil leases on wildlife refuge lands, declared:

Such increased activity in the issuance of leases by the Secretary of the Interior, or by those under his immediate supervision, can only result in serious damage to the wildlife refuge system in this country.

As the distinguished chairman of that committee told us Monday:

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was most charitable to the Secretary of the Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as to the entire Department of the Interior, because the report will absolutely show that there was chaos existing in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Administrative matters were being passed from the Secretary of the Department out into the field without the Director knowing anything about it.

The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is evident to the point of being self-evident that the greatest single obstruction to rise in farm prices is the surplus that has accumulated in excess of reasonable carryover and that reduction of the surplus to manageable volume is essential to price improvement and cutting the tremendous cost of storage.

We began the major assault on that problem 2 years ago when the bill introduced by Senator SCHOEPPEL in the Senate and by me in the House of Representatives was approved on July 10, 1954, and became the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. This act has been described as the most significant agricultural legislation in the last 25 years.

On March 14, 1956, the Secretary of Agriculture reported that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities under title I of this act. The full text of the Secretary's announcement follows:

WASHINGTON, *March 14, 1956.*

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today announced that agreements totaling $1.2 billion have been signed for export sale of surplus United States agricultural commodities, under title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

This law provides for sale of commodities to friendly foreign countries for their currencies, thereby helping meet convertibility and dollar-shortage problems and facilitate export of farm surpluses.

"This represents excellent progress," Secretary Benson said. "The program was set up by the Congress for 3 years, ending June 30, 1957. The goal of $1.5 billion in export commitments was to be reached as rapidly as possible. We are pleased to be able to report that as of today, not only are actual agreements signed that total $1.2 billion but also negotiations are under way that should lead to commitments for the remainder of the allotted $1.5 billion in the near future.

"The program is having timely and helpful effect. It has given strength to our foreign and domestic markets at a time when such strength has been needed.

"Thanks in big part to the program, our agricultural exports have been able not only to hold their own in the face of increased world competition but, on a volume basis, have increased 16 percent during the past 2 years. And these gains appear to be continuing."

The $1.2 billion of title I commitments since the fall of 1954 is based on Commodity Credit Corporation value of commodities. It represents well over $900 million export value of commodities. The mark was attained this week with the signing of agreements with Chile, Korea, and Turkey.

A total of 50 agreements have been made with the following 25 countries:

Latin America (6): Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru.

Western Europe (10): Austria, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Far East (7): Burma, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Thailand.

Middle East (2): Egypt, Israel.

It is estimated that title I agricultural exports during the current fiscal year will total from $500 million to $550 million. This would represent about one-sixth of expected total farm exports.

During the 6 months, July through December 1955, title I exports totaled about $217 million. Commitments made prior to that time have largely been carried out, except for cotton, and here it is expected that the recently announced export sales program for all upland cotton should substantially increase exports after August 1.

Commodity highlights:

Rice: Export commitments recently made or in process will virtually wipe out Government holdings of surplus milled rice resulting from 1953 and 1954 crops. Programs announced a few days ago will result in the movement of almost as much rice as the total United States rice exports in fiscal year 1955. These programs include 7,800,000 bags of rice for Indonesia and Pakistan under title I, as well as an additional 1,320,000 bags programed for Pakistan under title II of Public Law 480, administered by the International Cooperation Administration.

Wheat: The program has helped maintain United States wheat exports, despite increased foreign competition. An estimated 40 percent of all United States wheat exports are now moving as a result of title I arrangements. To date, more than 120 million bushels of wheat have been programed. Through January, 64 million bushels had been exported.

Livestock products: Yugoslavia has purchased nearly 88 million pounds of lard under the program, which has helped bolster the domestic lard market. Israel is beginning procurement of 40 million pounds of beef, recently arranged for. Programs recently signed with Spain and Korea include 28 million pounds of pork products. An agreement has been made with West Germany that includes 3 million pounds of poultry.

Vegetable oils: Since July 1955, title I agreements have included about 700 million pounds of vegetable oils. This programing has been a major factor in strengthening markets for soybeans and cottonseed.

Tobacco: Largely due to title I sales, exports of United States tobacco in 1955 exceeded the previous year by about 15 percent. Agreements with Korea and Burma represent the opening of new markets for United States tobacco. Under an arrangement with the United Kingdom, it is making an equivalent value of housing available to the United States Air Force in return for $15 million of United States tobacco.

Cotton: From July through December 1955 title I exports of 307,000 bales accounted for 40 percent of total United States cotton exports. A total of 1⅓ million bales has been programed under title I, with nearly half of this due to agreements signed during the past 6 weeks.

Fruits and vegetables: Within the last few weeks 2 program agreements have been signed providing for the sale of fruit and 1 for the sale of potatoes.

Approximate quantities of commodities included in title I agreements, Public Law 480

Commodity	Quantity	Market value	CCC cost
	Thousands	*Millions*	*Millions*
Wheat.....bushels	120,908	$208.0	$406.8
Feed grains.....do	45,418	55.4	86.9
Rice.....hundredweight	9,926	65.2	119.1
Cotton.....bales	1,302.3	238.9	238.9
Cotton linters.....do	16.7	.3	.3
Tobacco.....pounds	96,753	62.6	62.6
Dairy products.....do	89,366	19.4	33.2
Fats and oils.....do	1,022,326	153.4	161.9
Poultry.....do	3,000	1.2	1.2
Dry edible beans hundredweight	37	.3	.3
Fruits.....pounds	4,630	.5	.5
Potatoes.....hundredweight	667	1.4	1.4
Hay and pasture seed.....do	55	2.5	4.0
Meat.....pounds	81,284	25.1	25.1
Total commodities		834.2	1,142.2
Ocean transportation		75.8	75.8
Total agreements		910.0	1,218.0

Exports of Iron and Steel Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned in the past 3 years with the tremendous increase in the exports of iron and steel scrap. I have also found it very difficult to obtain any kind of official and reliable information as to the exports abroad of iron and steel scrap. As everyone knows, this is a very important activity to watch because we all remember that before World War II Japan, in particular, was buying iron and steel scrap in large quantities in the United States.

I have tried to obtain information from the proper departments of Government as to whether or not any of this iron or steel scrap was being resold to the Soviet Union, or anyone in the Communist-controlled countries, and the information I have received is that so far as is known, none has been resold to such countries. However, I have my doubts.

A staff member of mine has made a very careful check of the exports from the United States of iron and steel scrap during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as to the quantity shipped to the different countries abroad. The assimilation of this information required tremendous research work. It is based upon the figures of the releases from time to time by the Department of Commerce.

I enclose in my remarks a table showing the exports during the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, as well as the amounts exported to different countries. The amazing fact is in 1953 there was exported from the United States 307,673 short tons; in 1954, 1,507,310 short tons; and in 1955, 5,047,942 short tons. In other words, in a 2-year period, an increase of about 1,600 percent. I enclose in my extension of remarks the table showing the amounts exported, and to the countries that the iron and steel scrap has been exported during the calendar years 1953, 1954, and 1955, together with a copy of a letter that I have sent to Hon. Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Exports, iron and steel scrap, by countries and classes, calendar years 1953–55

[Short tons]

Country	1953	1954	1955
Samples	3,966	7,360	10,890
Canada	76,559	42,664	413,403
Mexico	156,732	225,763	276,776
United Kingdom	9,055	181,342	1,015,549
Japan	61,006	321,800	715,823
Argentina		75,381	107,876
Sweden		6,434	25,366
Netherlands		20,182	42,233
Belgium-Luxembourg	163	23,268	185,989
France		20,951	246,372
West Germany		254,893	691,891
Austria		32,031	79,521
Spain		54,492	110,600
Italy	56	178,502	1,084,582
Yugoslavia		44,130	17,161
India		4,353	1,163
Taiwan		10,362	7,840
Finland			13,022
Salvador			114
Chile			54
Union of South Africa	91		50
Norway		3,256	
Philippine Republic	36	43	19
Colombia		81	
Brazil			99
Jamaica			24
Israel		22	50
Iran			914
Hong Kong			561
Venezuela	9		
Total	307,673	1,507,310	5,047,942

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1956.

Hon. GORDON GRAY,
Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: During the past 2 years I have been greatly disturbed by the enormous quantities of ferrous scrap that has been exported from the Port of Boston and from other ports in the United States.

Attached is a table showing the tonnages exported as revealed by statistics issued by the Department of Commerce.

You will note that the tonnages for the past 3 calendar years have been as follows:

	Short tons
Calendar year 1953	307,673
Calendar year 1954	1,507,310
Calendar year 1955	5,047,942

It will be seen that the 1954 exports were 5 times those of 1953 and the 1955 shipments were 3 times plus those of 1954 and more than 15 times those of 1953. The 1955 exports make over 50,000 freight car loads of 100 tons each. In analyzing shipments by destinations in 1955, it is found that 25 rate in this order:

Italy	1,084,582
United Kingdom	1,015,549
Japan	715,823
West Germany	691,891
Canada	413,403
Mexico	276,776
France	246,372
Belgium/Luxembourg	185,989
Spain	110,600
Argentina	107,876
Austria	79,521
Netherlands	42,233
Sweden	25,366
Yugoslavia	17,161
Finland	13,022
Taiwan	7,840
India	1,163
Iran	914
Hong Kong	561
Salvador	114
Brazil	99
Chile	54
Union of South Africa	50
Israel	50
Jamaica	24

It seems to me that the shipments to some countries are so large and unprecedented that we should be certain we are not reenacting the mistake made prior to Pearl Harbor.

Since your position is, I assume, to insure security in matters such as this and I find there may be divided responsibility as between the Department of State (including ICA), Commerce, and Defense, I would appreciate a prompt answer from you on these questions:

1. Are you convinced that there is no diversion or transshipment of this material to unfriendly countries?

2. Have you checked to insure that this material is being used for domestic purposes in the country of destination?

3. Do you consider that present export laws and regulations are adequate to protect our vital security interests in this matter?

4. Have you found cases of violations of export laws or regulations as regards these materials?

5. Do you have any recommendations with respect to amending our laws or policies regarding the export of ferrous scrap?

6. Are you convinced that responsibility over the export of scrap is sufficiently fixed as to insure adequate security? If so, where does the primary responsibility lie?

I am sure you agree that shipments of the magnitude involved in 1955 have portents worthy of review.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Air Force Submits to Saudi Arabian Anti-Christian Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches indicate that the United States Air Force has made concessions to Saudi Arabian prejudice against Christianity in addition to tolerating anti-Jewish discrimination by Saudi Arabia.

At the Dharan Base, according to the reports, United States chaplains do not wear the insignia crosses denoting their status as Christian chaplains. This is done to avoid fanatical Moslem wrath. Catholic officials—in the interest of their personal safety—have been obliged to defrock when on a mission to the base.

Further, according to the reports, Chrisian religious services on the base are conducted with a measure of secrecy, with precautions taken to avoid arousing Moslem ire. The base figured in the news recently when Secretary of State Dulles, in response to Senate Foreign Relations Committee questioning, said that Saudi Arabia prohibited United States forces from stationing American servicemen of Jewish faith there.

One report recently heard is that the United States flag is not flown over the

base because the Saudi Arabians look upon it as an infidel symbol. A question has been raised by service personnel as to the extent of control the United States command has over the base because of the numerous reported concessions to Saudi Arabian extremism. Several weeks ago Saudi Arabia threatened to refuse renewal of the agreement under which the base is leased, thus forcing the State Department to release 18 Army tanks held up at the port of shipment because of the tense Arab-Israel situation.

This proves that prejudice cannot be confined. It becomes all pervading. First Saudi Arabia directed its prejudice against Israel merchants by boycotting them, then discrimination was extended to American citizens of Jewish persuasion, and now it embraces members of the Christian faith.

The Easter Season and the Holy Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Easter season turns my thoughts to the Holy Land and to a wonderful old lady I met there last year.

Mrs. Bertha Spafford Vester is the oldest American resident of Jerusalem, having gone there with her parents as a child in 1881.

Mrs. Vester's parents were wealthy Chicagoans who suffered a series of family tragedies and decided to go to Jerusalem to seek peace in service to the local people. With a small group of friends, they began a clinic for the poor. Jerusalem is a holy city to Christian, Jew, and Moslem, and these Americans served all three. Neither religion nor race made any difference when they found people in need.

Gradually the charities expanded until today the American colony, as it is called, operates the most modern children's hospital in the area as well as an infant welfare center and an outpatient clinic. Last year the hospital treated 623 patients; the center was visited by over 22,000 mothers bringing their babies; and the outpatient clinic treated 39,636 patients.

When Mrs. Vester came to Jerusalem as an infant, the city was a part of the old Ottoman Turkish Empire. She had lived there, raising a large family and serving the poor, through all of the troubled times since the surrender of the city to General Allenby in 1917; the stormy period of the British mandate; and the Israeli-Arab conflicts of recent years. Those who know her tell me that she has never flinched at danger nor permitted it to interfere with her impartial treatment of all who needed help.

The friends this fine American woman has made over the years are legion. Mrs. Vester is now ministering to her third generation of the sick and poor. To them she has become a symbol of the United States of America, and her generosity, courage, and enterprise are considered by them to be American characteristics.

As I met and talked with this fine lady last fall, it seemed to me that her lifetime of work as an individual American probably has accomplished more for good feeling between ourselves and the people of that area than all of the dollars and all of the propaganda we have poured into the Middle East.

Santa Fe Railroad: Misleading Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspaper I was impressed by a large advertisement on behalf of the Santa Fe Railroad which advertised the fact that this railroad was spending $102 million for progress in building for the great future growth in America's industry and population. This ad points out that this is the largest sum this railroad has ever budgeted for capital improvements in a single year and that the costs of these improvements were computed to $270,000 per day for 1956.

In the next portion of this ad it is stated that the largest part of this expenditure will be for 5,210 additions to the railroad's fleet of freight cars, including many of new and improved design.

In one of its most emphatic sentences, this advertisement states that all of this progress comes from Santa Fe dollars—earned dollars—not a single penny from taxes paid by taxpayers.

This advertisement is typical of the great quantity of misleading advertisement which is being disseminated to the American public about the public spirit of the corporate spending. Nowhere does this advertising tell the public the truth about the fast tax writeoff certificate which makes it possible for the railroad to pay for the great bulk of this expansion out of current income which would normally flow to the Public Treasury in the form of taxes. Through the use of the rapid amortization device, the railroad will be able to amortize this investment and siphon off its profits to this improvement during the period of the next 5 years. In this way, the railroad cars get constructed but most of the money is money that would otherwise be public tax funds.

When they tell you that this progress comes from Santa Fe's dollars—earned dollars—and not a single penny comes from taxes you pay, they are forgetting to tell you that the dollars they use are dollars short-circuited from the United States Treasury in taxes deferred and perhaps never paid.

So in the end every taxpayer is helping to contribute to the great progress of the Santa Fe this year. Let us give credits where they are due.

The Facilities of the United Nations Should Be Used in Program of Economic Aid for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I wrote to the Secretary of State suggesting that he give earnest consideration to channeling an increased percentage of funds for economic aid to other countries through the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my letter to Mr. Dulles:

FEBRUARY 21, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you today on a matter to which I have given much thought during the past weeks. As a member of the United States delegation to the Tenth General Assembly, concerned particularly with the work of Committee II, I became convinced that the United States must soon find an effective way to help meet the aspirations of the less developed countries with respect to economic development. In meeting after meeting it was impressed upon me, and I am sure, upon the other members of the delegation, that to most of the nations in the United Nations an increase in the standard of living of their people and an improvement in their economic prospects are matters of importance far transcending most of the political issues with which their representatives deal in the United Nations.

I heartily subscribe to the declaration of the United States delegation which was forwarded to you, and I was gratified and proud that you saw fit to bring it to the attention of the President and to read it, with his permission, in a recent press conference. I believe in that declaration. I believe that we are engaged in a profound and far-reaching struggle with the Soviet Union for the loyalty and confidence of the less developed countries of the world, and I am convinced that our response to the appeal of these countries for economic aid will be a paramount factor in determining some vital decisions which they must make.

The Soviet Union, on its side, has put on a smiling mask of assumed generosity. I believe that many of the countries to which the Soviet blandishments are directed are aware of the evil designs back of these actions. But I am afraid that, in the absence of some effective measures on our part to give them the kind of help they desire, some may turn to the Soviets, either in desperation, or because they delude themselves into thinking they can accept Soviet aid while resisting Soviet penetration.

We are all fully aware of the generosity and magnitude of our aid activities in past years. As a Member of Congress, I have par-

ticipated in the framing and passage of many such measures. But in my work in the General Assembly I was struck by the extent to which many of the underdeveloped countries about which we are most concerned would prefer to be helped through the United Nations rather than to receive bilateral assistance which they may view as having "strings attached." This feeling is so strong in many cases as to amount almost to an obsession. Whether we agree with it or not, we must recognize that it exists.

I have no particular brief for the SUNFED proposal as it now exists. I recognize the disadvantages and the dangers of placing substantial sums of our tax money into a fund which might be administered irresponsibly by numerical majorities without due regard to sound economic plans. But, Mr. Secretary, I greatly fear that unless we in the United States can produce a better plan which we are willing to support and which will have enough of a United Nations impress to satisfy the underdeveloped countries, we may find ourselves in the highly uncomfortable position of standing before an accomplished fact and being forced to join an organization which we dislike or else allow it to crash down in failure, shattering with it the hopes of millions of poor people in the world.

The United States now proposes to devote $1.9 billion to economic assistance in the coming fiscal year. Would it not be worth while to consider whether we should seek some means of using a relatively small percentage of that amount through the United Nations? I have no doubt that the financial experts in the Department of State and in the other agencies of the United States Government could, if so directed, draw up a sound and workable plan for an international aid fund to be related to the United Nations and to which the United States could contribute. If this can be done, I am sure that our sponsorship of such an idea in the United Nations would meet an immediately favorable reaction in the United Nations and would win for us a spontaneous expression of appreciation comparable, perhaps, to that which greeted the atoms for peace proposal in 1953. Moreover, I believe that this would bring us far greater returns proportionately in good will and cooperation than the dollars we put into bilateral assistance.

Mr. Secretary, I hope that you will give this matter your urgent consideration. I fear that time may be running short for us in this connection. With high personal regards,

Sincerely,

BROOKS HAYS.

Independence of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 135th anniversary of Greek independence from the Ottoman Empire was observed on Sunday, March 25, 1956, and I am pleased again to pay homage to that land from which much of our own culture sprang. Also to participate in the more recent efforts of Americans of Greek descent to help in effectuating the union of Cyprus with Greece, the motherland.

We, as present-day American citizens, in this land of the free, cannot quite comprehend alien tyranny as being experienced by so many peoples at the present time. Yet, in spite of such tyranny, these groups have remained true to their ancient traditions, cherishing the ideal of national independence.

The world is today looking to England to see what her position will be regarding the early return to Cyprus of their recently exiled Archbishop Makarios, one of the highest church officials of the Orthodox faith on the island of Cyprus.

A famous English writer, H. G. Wells, with whom we are all familiar, said in his Outline of History that "the British acquired the island of Cyprus to which they had no right whatever and which has never been of the slightest use to them." Other English scholars and writers have similar views on enosis, which stands for the Cypriot movement aimed at the union of Cyprus with the Greek motherland. Back in 1880 Prime Minister Gladstone was sympathetic to this cause and so expressed himself, but the then Queen of England would not consent to the cession of Cyprus, and Gladstone announced that although he was very anxious for the happiness of the Cypriots he regretted he was bound by treaties which he could not break. More recently, the British press has made statements favoring the union of Cyprus with Greece and condemned the negative attitude of Prime Minister Eden and his colleagues.

All this has dampened the spirit of elation in Cyprus which is usually felt on Greek Independence Day, but we continue to hope and pray for early action that will result in self-determination for Cyprus, and for lasting peace and freedom for Greece.

An Opportunity Now for the House To Act on Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked frequently why it is that Congress apparently does nothing in meeting and discharging its responsibilities in the field of civil-rights legislation. I assume many of my colleagues have been asked the same question.

It must be admitted that the record of Congress over the years in this field has been anything but a distinguished one.

No one, except an extreme partisan, would question the proven fact that the executive departments have made substantial and significant contributions in implementing an excellent civil rights program.

Few, whose opinions are respected, would challenge the progress made in the judicial department and particularly by the Supreme Court of the United States and of the other Federal courts in defining and upholding the civil rights of American citizens.

But Congress, which has now and has had many vital phases of legislation in this field confronting it, seems to all too many of those to whom it is responsible to have been indifferent, inept, or lacking in courage.

It is of little use to point out that congressional procedures are usually, and in many cases wisely, slow.

It is of as little use to call attention to the number of bills which have been filed in this field over the years by Members of Congress as to the number of hearings and even reports by congressional committees.

It is of no value at all to try to explain why it is that any real results have been delayed, obstructed, and even prevented by a very few having the power to do that or by such parliamentary devices as filibusters.

But now, next month, the House will have the opportunity of direct action in this field if a bare majority of the Members wish to exercise their undoubted right to demand it.

H. Res. 440 and H. Res. 441 were filed respectively by the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] on March 21.

These are identical resolutions providing for the consideration of H. R. 627.

Each provides for recognition for the consideration of H. R. 627, a bill described as follows:

To enact national policy to protect the right of the individual to be free from discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. Establishes a five-man Commission on Civil Rights, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, to gather information and report to the President on what activities affect civil rights. Authorizes a full-time staff director. Creates a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General. Creates a 14-man Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. Amends and supplements existing civil-rights statutes; provides additional criminal penalties and gives the United States district courts concurrent jurisdiction with State courts to enforce civil actions against offenders (amending U. S. C. 18, sec. 13).

These resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee and, of course, can be reported by that committee.

However, if there is no action by that committee by the time this House reconvenes on April 9, it will be in order, under the rules, to file a discharge petition and this will be done. This petition will become effective once it is signed by a majority of the Members of the House. Therefore, whatever actions may be taken by others and irrespective of the reasons assigned for such actions, each individual Member of the House will have his clear opportunity early next month of becoming a part of the majority of the House demanding that it be given an opportunity to express its own judgment and convictions in this field of civil-rights legislation.

It is important to note that 218 signatures are construed to be a majority within the purview of the rule, that additional signatures are not admitted after

the requisite number have been affixed, and that when a majority of the membership has signed the discharge petition, the motion, generally known as the petition, is printed in the RECORD, entered in the Journal and referred to the Calendar of Motions to discharge committees.

It may be suggested that this discharge petition procedure is usually futile. It must be conceded that this is a fact.

But the exceptions are notable.

Many Members feel quite reasonably that the procedure should not be utilized unless there have been full hearings on the proposed legislation and a clear situation exists making it practically certain that this House as a whole will be deprived of its opportunity to pass upon such proposed legislation unless that procedure is invoked. If the Rules Committee decides not to take affirmative action upon either of these discharge rules by the time Congress returns from the recess, both conditions will be satisfied beyond any possibility of question.

It may also be suggested that consideration of H. R. 627 and action by this House on it may be frustrating because no one can guarantee the necessary further action. That, too, may become a fact; but if so, it will be one over which no Member of the House has any control. And the responsibility for it becoming a fact will be understood by everyone concerned as to the imperative need of congressional action at this time in the field of civil rights.

These are the facts which confront this House now.

I want to conclude with a reference to the brief remarks in the RECORD of March 21, at pages 5298 and 5299, which accompanied the introduction of House Resolution 440 and House Resolution 441.

I know that there has been some evidence of an inclination toward partisanship with reference to the consideration of H. R. 627 by this House. Any examination of the remarks in the RECORD which I have cited will contradict any such resort to partisanship and should prevent its recurrence while the matter is before this House.

That any such reference is not only unjustified but also completely inaccurate is proven beyond any possible doubt by the statements that these resolutions were filed, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] said, as "representing a very large group," and, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], said, "in behalf of Members of the House on both sides of the aisle who have been meeting sincerely and earnestly in an attempt to work out with the Attorney General a thoughtful legislative solution to some of the civil-rights problems which face us" and "as a constructive step in the direction of making sure that the membership of this House will have a full opportunity to express themselves in connection with this problem of curtailment of civil rights." The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] stated the undeniable fact when he said that "Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. BROWNSON have by their remarks indicated that this is an issue stripped of partisan politics." The good reputation of this House, in the judgment of an overwhelming majority of the American people, will be enhanced if the issue remains divorced from partisan politics and if a strong majority of the Members insist upon the right of individual Members to express themselves in this field of legislation as to which it has an absolute and unqualified responsibility.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a statement which I recently submitted to the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This statement was in support of H. R. 3087 which is similar to my own bill, H. R. 8828. H. R. 3087, introduced by Congressman CHARLES BENNETT, of Florida, proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. My statement, which follows, explains its provisions:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. BYRD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, SIXTH WEST VIRGINIA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS, HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify here today in favor of H. R. 3087, introduced by Congressman BENNETT of Florida. I have introduced a similar bill, H. R. 8828. This bill proposes three ways of liberalizing railroad retirement benefits. It provides, first, retirement at age 60 with 30 years of service, or with 35 years of service regardless of age. Secondly, it provides for computation of credit for service prior to January 1, 1937, on the basis of the five highest years rather than on the basis of average earnings for the years 1924–1931. Thirdly, it provides a 15 percent increase across the board to pensioners, annuitants, and survivors.

Reducing the retirement age after many years of service is necessary to care for those who lose their railroad positions at advanced ages, but before they have reached 65. Perhaps 65 as a retirement age is not a great hardship on rail employees who can remain in their employment until attaining that age, but it does seem that Congress should attempt to give some relief to employees who, through no fault of their own, lose their position a few years before becoming 65.

The Railroad Retirement Act was established in 1934 to deal with the hazards within the industry, and there is no greater hazard which can confront a worker today than to lose one's job late in life after many years of faithful service to the employer of his choice. This has happened to a large group of shop employees in the past. Those employees were deprived of their living. They have used up their unemployment insurance, sold their savings bonds, depleted their savings, and they are desperate when they must take a reduced pension because they are not 65 years of age. There is another class of employees who are interested in this provision—those who are in poor health and cannot qualify for a disability pension under the present act. This class would gladly retire, and it would be in the interest of all concerned if employees in this condition were availed of the opportunities for earlier retirement.

The elimination of the test period 1924–1931 is another provision of this bill that is very important to all railway employees who had service with the rail lines prior to 1937 when the present act became law. The using of this period to determine annuities brings in the depression years of 1929–1930, when some of the railway employees were only working a few days per month, and using this as a basis is the reason why only a little more than 1 percent today qualify for the maximum annuity or pension of $165.60 per month. A precedent has been established by social security in which the 4 highest years are used. H. R. 3087 would substitute the 5 highest years in lieu of this low earning period which has no relation to our present economy. There are over 60 million workers today in this country, and I say without fear of contradiction that none of them work at the level of earnings they made in the years 1924–1931. Every railway employee who retires before 1967 will have to use prior service credits, and this feature alone accounts for the fact that few retired railway workers have any conception of what their annuities will be until they retire and the sad news is broken to them by the Railroad Retirement Board.

The 15 percent increase would benefit all annuitants and pensioners. This would be of general help in the financial problems faced by all retired rail employees. Most of the retired people who are trying to live on a pegged income of a pension today find it very hard to cope with the high prices, and they learn that their pension dollars buy so little. In 1951 the last increase was made in their rail pensions and annuities. Several increases have been granted members of the various labor crafts during this interim. Retired railroaders feel that they are the forgotten creatures who contributed generously toward the national economy while employed in the heyday of their working career. They look forward, most hopefully, to this Congress for relief from an intolerable situation.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for permitting me to appear here today in behalf of the measure introduced by Congressman BENNETT. In introducing a similar bill, I recognized the need for such legislation, and I sincerely hope that your distinguished committee will be able to act favorably upon H. R. 3087.

President Eisenhower Holds Important Conference With President Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, there is no act of the administration in recent months that can so readily produce good will and beneficial results of a lasting character than the invitation of President Eisenhower to meet with President Adolpho Ruiz Cortines, of Mexico, and Prime Minister St. Laurent, of Canada.

The purpose of this meeting held at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., at the

famous Greenbrier Hotel, was to discuss in a friendly and informal manner problems and conditions that affect the welfare of the three great nations of the North American Continent. This important gathering could mean much to the future security and well-being of not only the three nations involved, but also to the entire Western Hemisphere.

The holding of this important meeting at this little village in the Allegheny Mountains is not the first time that this has been the site for important gatherings. It has entertained 13 Presidents in its time. But, this was the first time that the President of Mexico, the Prime Minister of Canada and our own President have met either there or elsewhere in a joint conference.

Notwithstanding the importance of many other conferences that have been held in this beauty spot of America, never has there been one so full of possibilities as this present one. It is my opinion that it is long overdue. It seems as if we have heretofore looked upon the far-off nations of the world as our chief concern. Our national wealth has been poured out lavishly upon all of them, large and small, in an effort to strengthen them in their economy, as well as militarily. All of this has given the appearance that these distant nations are more important to our welfare and security than the nations of Mexico and Canada, our immediate neighbors to the south and north of us. Furthermore, it has seemed that we were taking the friendship of Canada and Mexico for granted. While there is every reason to consider that these two nations are our friends in the truest sense of the term, and while it is not necessary to buy their friendship, as we seem to be trying to do elsewhere in the world, yet, it is a great mistake to take them for granted, not because they would ever become other than friends, but because they are our friends. These two nations, Mexico and Canada, have been, and will continue to be, our friends. It is because of this unadulterated friendship that we owe them a greater degree of appreciation and acknowledgment than we have shown in the past.

Thus, it comes with a feeling of satisfaction that we have at last recognized the friendship of these two great nations to the north and south of us. And it is particularly gratifying that this recognition comes on our highest level, namely, the President of our Nation. It is fitting that it be so.

We are all much more aware of the economic ties that bind us to Canada than we are to those that bind us to Mexico. This may be the reason that we have not always seemed as anxious to recognize our obligation to create trade conditions between Mexico and ourselves that would be mutually helpful to both.

Without any intention to discount the favorable trade relations that exist between our Nation and that of Canada, which it is a pleasure to recognize, yet, because of a general lack of knowledge of the facts underlying our trade relationships with Mexico, it seems appropriate to make some reference to them as a justification of the reason that has impelled President Eisenhower to include Mexico with Canada in a consideration of affairs that are pertinent to our mutual welfare.

An examination of our trade statistics reveals that Mexico is the fourth largest purchaser of United States products in the entire world, and the first in all of Latin America. It is buying $1.60 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican products bought by the United States from Mexico. As an illustration, it is astounding to realize that Mexico's sugar industry alone is buying more than $7 worth of United States products for each $1 worth of Mexican sugar bought by the United States. Altogether, the purchase of United States products by Mexico is the fourth largest among all the nations of the world. It is exceeded only by Canada, United Kingdom, and Japan. Furthermore, a further examination of United States public records shows that Mexico's purchases enrich the economy of every State in the Union.

It is highly desirable that these little known facts of Mexico's trade relations with the United States be given the fullest consideration as a result of the joint conference recently held. The favorable results that can be obtained as a result of strengthening the ties that bind the United States, Canada, and Mexico together can be of incalculable benefit, not only to each of the participating nations, but also in promoting the economy and security of the whole Western Hemisphere.

The Negro and the Destiny of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, consent is requested to include in the RECORD the following address, which I made over the NBC network on Thursday, March 15, 1956, on the occasion of Newspaper Week, sponsored by the National Newspaper Publishers Association. The address follows:

With each of the participants on this broadcast, I share a deep feeling of responsibility in being invited to express views on a matter crucial to American welfare. The press is the pulse of the life of any democratic nation and its expressions record the beat and ebb of that life.

There is a gripping tie between this matter of freedom of the press and its functions and the destiny of the Negro and democracy. Despite those who would deny it, we need only glance through any American newspaper to become certainly informed that the Negro and democracy's destiny, entwined for some 300 years, has come to the inevitable crisis. Whether or not democracy will arise from its bed of crisis and live to walk among the free people of this earth and strengthen itself by drawing to it the uncommitted peoples who form three-fourths of the world's population, depends upon the choices it makes today and in the months ahead concerning the Negro and the pattern of human relations it adopts with them and, consequently, takes to itself.

From the freeing of the slaves through the executives proclamations and judicial and legislative mandates of our day, Negroes have taken their battle for freedom always to the law of the land embodied in the Constitution. This is why America's pattern of human relations applying to Negro citizens is of such concern to the rest of the world. They know that this pattern is evidence of the legal operation of the laws of democracy.

Negroes ask for such things as the right to vote, protection from mob violence, the opportunity to obtain education, employment, and housing without facing bars based solely upon color of skin. The answer of those who hesitate to make their choice in favor of democracy has been that most of these are guaranties already existing in our Constitution and the case law of the Nation. This may well be true, but many of these guaranties as now spelled out are ambiguous and capable of interpretation which is guided by personal bias and interest.

At this crisis in American human relations, we are in a general election year. Daily events communicate to the world through national and international press that 300 years is too long for a democratic nation to tolerate slavery or subjugation in any degree and now a choice of principles must be made. The representatives and guardians of the American way of life—politicians in their partisan activities in executive chambers and legislative halls—have no alternative but to uphold the democratic form of government or reject it in the face of the world. There is no middle course when one has arrived at the point of fundamentals. They choose a course of no return when, as representatives, they deny the requests for legislation to correct abuse of democratic principles and enforce its concepts. Our newspapers, the white and the Negro press, have made it certain that the vast majority of Americans know these requested mandates are necessary and needed now. The Democratic Party has been the leader of democracy's cause, but it is now subjected to legitimate criticism because of equivocating actions of some of its present leaders. The Republican Party, although pursuing the course of action initiated by its predecessors, is certainly not being creative in the field of civil rights and is not following through vigorously with the kind of leadership that the executive branch can follow; nor have their congressional responsibilities been fulfilled. These responsibilities must be fulfilled as representatives of our form of government chart America's destiny in the next few months as a democratic nation and a leader of men of the world. Those affected and concerned with civil rights should keep this in mind and withhold support from any individual candidate, regardless of his party, who fails to take a positive stand on this vital issue.

Present Administration Policies Swiftly Forcing Ruination of Small Independent Farmers, the Backbone of Our Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statistics which indicate the facts that the

farm population is decreasing and that the size of the farm is greatly increasing in the State of Oklahoma. These authentic statistics which I have secured indicate that not only one county but every county in the State of Oklahoma has suffered.

The present administration or any administration owes it to the present populace of our Nation and to posterity to protect the tiller of the soil, the backbone of our national economic life:

Change in size and number of farms, 1950–54

County	Change in number of farms (percent)	Change in average size (percent)
1. Adair	−17.1	+20.3
2. Alfalfa	−14.6	+13.0
3. Atoke	−20.4	+18.0
4. Beaver	−6.9	+12.4
5. Beckham	−16.5	+11.4
6. Blaine	−12.7	+17.7
7. Bryan	−18.1	+25.0
8. Caddo	−20.4	+27.7
9. Canadian	−11.5	+12.4
10. Carter	−19.5	+22.2
11. Cherokee	−22.6	+3.9
12. Choctaw	−24.2	+37.9
13. Cimarron	−9.3	+9.8
14. Cleveland	−21.9	+13.6
15. Coal	−25.8	+35.4
16. Comanche	−12.9	+5.0
17. Cotton	−11.8	+13.7
18. Craig	−15.2	+14.2
19. Creek	−28.5	+35.3
20. Custer	−13.9	+18.0
21. Delaware	−18.1	+14.8
22. Dewey	−15.3	+15.2
23. Ellis	−13.6	+11.3
24. Garfield	−11.3	+14.6
25. Garvin	−16.7	+8.7
26. Grady	−19.9	+24.9
27. Grant	−6.8	+10.2
28. Greer	−20.8	+18.0
29. Harmon	−15.6	+11.7
30. Harper	−14.7	+18.5
31. Haskell	−25.2	+32.6
32. Hughes	−19.4	+21.6
33. Jackson	−3.6	+14.5
34. Jefferson	−23.3	+28.4
35. Johnston	−23.6	+26.9
36. Kay	−12.8	+12.3
37. Kingfisher	−16.2	+16.9
38. Kiowa	−12.2	+16.3
39. Latimer	−7.7	+19.7
40. LeFlore	−17.6	+23.6
41. Lincoln	−16.2	+15.1
42. Logan	−4.3	+8.4
43. Love	−18.9	+18.5
44. McClain	−11.0	+20.2
45. McCurtain	−22.1	+27.0
46. McIntosh	−26.3	+39.2
47. Major	−4.1	+6.6
48. Marshall	−18.3	0
49. Mayes	−15.1	+10.2
50. Murray	−15.5	+10.9
51. Muskogee	−17.1	+15.9
52. Noble	−8.5	+12.3
53. Nowata	−17.3	+16.2
54. Okfuskee	−22.3	+25.3
55. Oklahoma	−14.2	+14.7
56. Okmulgee	−18.7	+31.8
57. Osage	−11.2	+3.8
58. Ottawa	−22.0	+23.2
59. Pawnee	−9.1	+11.4
60. Payne	−10.3	+12.8
61. Pittsburg	−16.5	+18.0
62. Pontotoc	−13.7	+31.0
63. Pottawatomie	−19.1	+20.3
64. Pushmataha	−21.8	+22.4
65. Roger Mills	−9.2	+4.9
66. Rogers	−4.9	−5.0
67. Seminole	−26.6	+33.7
68. Sequoyah	−15.2	+13.2
69. Stephens	−8.2	+7.2
70. Texas	−8.3	+6.7
71. Tillman	−17.9	+20.9
72. Tulsa	−30.6	+62.1
73. Wagoner	−15.8	+25.9
74. Washington	−27.4	+26.2
75. Washita	−13.4	+14.4
76. Woods	−9.9	+13.8
77. Woodward	−8.8	+17.0
State	−16.4	+20.3

NOTE.—Acres of land in farms in the State decreased 1.05 percent between 1950 and 1954.

Source: 1954 Census of Agriculture, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Appointment of Maj. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson as Superintendent of USMA at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the people of First Congressional District of Kansas have always deemed ourselves most fortunate to have the illustrious Command and General Staff College of the United States Army situated at Leavenworth, Kans. To this famous school of military learning come the keenest minds of our own Army and its sister services and those of other great nations allied with us in the cause of freedom. From the college over the years have graduated the great military leaders of the past century: MacArthur, Eisenhower, Patton, Bradley, and a host of other distinguished field commanders.

It is only fitting that this school be led by men of stature and vision. This requirement has, of course, been seen to in the past by the Army Chief of Staff who has unfailingly sent only the finest men to be commandants of the college. In all fairness to those who have gone before, I submit that the present Commandant, Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, must be counted among the very best. My remarks this morning are taken upon the recent announcement that General Davidson, after excellent service since July 1954, is about to depart from the Command and General Staff College to become Superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point. We are reluctant, indeed, to see this outstanding officer leave our midst in Kansas, but we rejoice in the fact that he has been selected to lead the long gray line in which he himself once stood many years ago as a cadet.

Garrison H. Davidson was born in the Fordham section of New York City on April 24, 1904, and graduated from the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., with a bachelor-of-science degree on June 14, 1927, when he was appointed a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers. His initial assignment was as assistant football coach at the Academy in September 1927. From then until the fall of 1930, he alternated between coaching at the Academy each fall and service as a platoon leader with the 1st Engineers at Fort Du Pont, Del., and Camp Dix, N. J. After the 1930 football season he remained at the Academy as an instructor in the Department of Natural and Experimental Philosophy, doubling as assistant football coach each fall.

In October 1932, when still a second lieutenant, he was chosen as head football coach at the United States Military Academy. He is the youngest to have held that position in which he remained until June 1938.

In July 1938, he was transferred to Hawaii for duty. He commanded a company of the 3rd Engineers, Schofield Barracks, for a year and served as assistant G–4 of the Hawaiian Division his second year there. In July 1940 he was detailed as airbase engineer, Hamilton Field, Calif.

In January 1941 he was detailed to duty in Washington, D. C., with the construction division of the Office of the Chief of Engineers and was assigned staff supervision over the near billion dollar program of construction and expansion of the ports and supply depots throughout the United States in preparation for World War II. He served in this capacity until September 1942 when he was named executive officer to the engineer of the Western Task Force, which invaded North Africa under General Patton 2 months later. In November 1942 he became General Patton's engineer in the First Armored Corps in the North African Theater of Operations and served in that capacity in North Africa and later when the corps became the Seventh Army on D-Day in Sicily.

Commenting on the performance of the engineer troops in Sicily, General Eisenhower stated:

> Only through the engineers has the end of the campaign come so quickly.

At the close of the Sicilian campaign, military insignia not being available locally, General Patton pinned a pair of his own stars on him, when at the age of 39 he became one of the youngest general officers in the ground forces.

During the month following General Patton's departure from the Seventh Army and prior to General Patch's arrival he "commanded" the Seventh Army, then a planning headquarters. In this capacity he was called on during this period to recommend the area of Southern France into which the assault from the south should be launched. He named the area between Cavalaire and Agay on the Cote d'Azur which was not changed during the months of further study and planning that followed and where the assault was made 4 or 5 months later. He continued as army engineer under General Patch throughout the campaign in France and Germany.

Of the performance of the engineer troops in the landing in southern France and the pursuit of the German forces up the Rhone Valley to the Vosges, General Patch commented:

> The engineer support of the operation of the Seventh Army was the highlight performance of the Army.

He pinned the Distinguished Service Medal on him in Saverne, Alsace-Lorraine.

In July 1945, he became president of the first German War Crimes Commission in which capacity he conducted the first mass trial of German war criminals at Darmstadt, Germany, preceding the Nuremberg trials. In August 1945, he was appointed engineer of the ETO force commanded by General Patton.

In March 1946, back in the United States he was assigned to Headquarters, Sixth Army, as engineer. In September

1947 Gen. Mark Clark appointed him as his chief of staff. He continued in that capacity after General Wedemeyer took command.

In August 1950, he was assigned to the Eighth Army in Korea, and appointed Assistant Division Commander of the 24th Division. While serving in this capacity he commanded several task forces notably one which eliminated the last North Korean penetration of the Naktong bridgehead north of Anju on the Chongchon River against which the first Chinese intervention was stopped in the first week of November 1950. In February 1951, he was assigned to Headquarters Eighth Army and designated to supervise the construction of several defense lines, notably the defensive line north of Seoul against which the Chinese operation of April 1951 piled up and was stopped. In May 1951 he was appointed Acting Chief of the Korean Military Advisory Group in which capacity he served until July 10, when he returned to the Zone of the Interior.

Since July 1951, he served the Weapons System Evaluation Group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In July 1954, General Davidson was named Commandant of the Command and General Staff College and has won our unqualified respect and admiration since that time.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Commendation Ribbon with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Presidential Unit Citation, the Legion of Honor—French—Croix de Guerre—French—Commander, Order of the British Empire, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

General Davidson wears 13 battle stars; 7 of World War II and 6 from the Korean campaign. He also wears the Bronze Arrowhead for assault landings at Fedala, French Morocco; Gela in Sicily; and St. Tropes in southern France.

Perhaps it is only indicative of the quality of the man and the high esteem in which General Davidson is held by his superiors to note that at 39 he was the youngest brigadier general in the United States Army.

We, the people of the First Congressional District of Kansas, wish General Davidson every happiness and success in his new assignment and in the fine future that must certainly be in store for him in the Army.

Guaranteeing Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years since I first came to the Congress I have been pleased to see—and to help bring about—a remarkable improvement in the status of civil rights. As we look back on these 10 years we cannot avoid being deeply impressed by how much has happened to remove inequities and inequalities and to bring about a more healthy society in our democracy. During that time we have seen some of our own cities and States do exactly what we have maintained should be done nationally—and that is set up fair-employment practices and antidiscrimination agencies. And, nationally, the courts have been instrumental in bringing about some far-reaching changes in the American scene.

But this progress has not always been steady. There have been ups and downs. There have been periods of retrogression. It is my feeling we are in such a period right now. The tensions which have been building up in some areas, stimulated by those who refuse to conform to the law or who seek to delay the application of the law, have already led to some serious and even tragic consequences.

I am not taking the position here in the House that these issues are easily solved or can be met merely by words. But there is a need for speaking out on this subject, to demonstrate that those who oppose progress in civil rights are not in truth the voice of the American people or of the Congress.

Also, however, there is a need for action. Action has been too long delayed. That is why I have proceeded to introduce bills to assure greater adherence to and protection for the civil rights of the American people of whatever color or creed.

The greatest ally we have in the fight for full civil rights is that great instrument which was drafted in my city of Philadelphia, the Constitution of the United States. As has been said, the Constitution is colorblind. It applies equally to all. It is the rock of our freedom. It cannot be set aside by States acting on their own or by individuals who set up their own views or prejudices to be above the requirements and principles of the Constitution.

In this respect, the courts, as I said, have done a remarkable job in interpreting the Constitution in this field of civil rights. But the courts do not act in a vacuum. Cases must be brought. They must be fought up through the lower courts. They must present clear-cut constitutional issues in order to reach the highest court for final determination.

I am deeply proud that in the years of the Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman administrations the Department of Justice of the United States was always in the forefront in bringing civil-rights cases up through the courts to the Supreme Court.

In the past few years some people seem to have closed their eyes to some of the most glaring incidents of violation of civil rights. The Till case is a good example. There have been others. We read that in some States spiritual successors of the days of the lynch mob and the fiery cross are now busily at work whipping up hatred for the Negro.

Let us not for a moment fool ourselves that achieving integration in the schools can be accomplished if this hatred is allowed to go on unchecked and unchallenged. The excesses of the few must be stopped by law and by order—and by decency.

There is a role here for the churches. There is a role here for local law and order, and for State law, and for national justice. There is much which has to be done. But fundamentally, we must see to it that the rabble rouser or the fanatic or the lawless mobster cannot defy the laws of this country or of God.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while we need tolerance and moderation and understanding and all the other things which go with accomplishing social change smoothly and effectively, we also need the authority of law and the punishment—swift and sure—of those who flagrantly defy the law.

Let us enforce the laws we have to protect the individual. If local appointees and elected officials will not or cannot enforce those laws to protect the individual, then the States must step in; and if they fail, then the Federal Government must exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution to guarantee the rights of the individual.

If more laws are needed, let us pass them. I have introduced the so-called civil-rights package of proposed laws which are intended to nail down and make clear the responsibilities of the Federal Government in this field, but it seems to me that effective and active and vigorous enforcement of laws now on the books would go a long way toward resolving the issue.

How can it be that a boy can be kidnaped and murdered but no one is convicted of a crime, such as happened in the Till case? How does it happen that Negroes can be shot and killed in some areas but the person who wields the gun is found innocent of wrongdoing on the plea of self-defense against, for instance, an unarmed Negro?

Cases of this kind help to bring about a condition in which hate groups can flourish, because the haters develop a defiance of law and feel that they are immune from punishment in their mob activities against Negroes.

As one who has voted for and supported antilynch, anti-poll-tax, and FEPC bills, and who believes in their principles, I call upon this country to act now to end these terrible incidents by prompt and decisive policies to guarantee civil rights for all.

Statement by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson Submitted to the House Committee on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 28, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on H. R. 12 to the House

Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday, March 27, 1956:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in response to your request of March 16 I am glad to review for you the President's recommendations in general and the pending agricultural bill, H. R. 12, as it was passed by the Senate a week ago. It is my earnest hope that when the bill comes before the House and Senate for final action we will have a measure that will truly serve the best interests of American agriculture. This is the hope of the great majority of people who are genuinely concerned with the well-being of those who live on our Nation's farms. But time is running short. Already it is so late that it would be difficult to put the soil bank fully into operation so as to help farmers this year. There remains much to be done to shape the bill into the kind of legislation now required to deal effectively with agriculture's difficult problems. That is the challenge which confronts the House and Senate conferees as they work on the bill, already too long delayed.

We in the Department of Agriculture want to assist Congress in every way possible in speedily developing and implementing legislation which is sorely needed by farmers now. It is getting late. Many 1956 crops have already been planted or soon will be planted. It is imperative that Congress act quickly.

Remedial farm legislation has been placed high on this administration's priority list. You will recall that on January 9 President Eisenhower sent his farm program message to Congress. It made specific recommendations for raising agricultural income and advancing the security of our farm families. Then on January 12, my staff and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to discuss the President's recommendations in detail. In its deliberations the Senate committee freely called upon Department staff members for help, and all of us were glad to provide this assistance. Legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives embodying practically all of the President's recommendations shortly thereafter. Representative HOPE introduced H. R. 8543, and Representative HILL introduced H. R. 8544 on January 17. Then on February 10, nearly a month after the President's message, the Senate committee reported out its bill S. 3183. You will recall that I appeared before your committee on February 21, and members of my staff appeared on February 22 and 23 to discuss with you the farm situation and the need for legislative action. On February 27 in response to your request we submitted the legislative languange that would put the President's recommendations into effect. This later appeared as a committee print. In addition, you are familiar with the general subject from the Senate debate on S. 3183 which is now embodied in H. R. 12.

In making recommendations, we feel that there are certain fundamentals which must be fully recognized if we are to have a sound agricultural program. Among these are:

1. A Government warehouse is not a market.

2. Large stocks of commodities in Government hands depress prices.

3. Emphasis on outlets for the surplus and preventing the buildup of new surpluses must go hand in hand.

4. In the best interests of farmers we must reduce rather than increase Government regulations and controls.

Since the end of the shooting war in Korea we have seen how farm income has been falling off while our agricultural surpluses were piling up. This took place in spite of the very programs that we have had in operation to support farm income. Thus it is now clearly apparent that a sound program for farmers must have in it the means to take off their backs the price depressing surpluses which are dragging down farm income. This drag on farm income is at the rate of $2 billion per year. The program transmitted to Congress by the President is designed to improve farm income and help relieve this surplus situation. It will help primarily through the soil bank—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

The question has been raised as to whether the Department of Agriculture had authority to operate the soil bank program as proposed by the President without any new legislation. This has been carefully reviewed by our legal staff and the answer is that there are definite legal reasons for the necessity of new legislation. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to make clear that if Congress had provided the authority this soil bank program would be in operation right now. This program is of such importance and means so much to the welfare of agriculture that each day's delay in granting the needed legislative authorization is costing our farmers badly needed income.

I should like to review briefly our major recommendations which are covered in the draft of a bill which we submitted a month ago in accordance with your request. These recommendations are:

First is the soil bank which consists of two parts—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve.

Acreage reserve program: This recommended program would authorize the Secretary to compensate producers for reducing their 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton and rice below their respective acreage allotments. It should be noted that there is special legislation with respect to these commodities such as minimum acreage allotments which prevent the adjustment of supply to normal levels. As a result of these minimum provisions in the law the 1956 acreage allotment for wheat is 36 million acres more than needed to adjust supplies to normal; cotton is 11 million acres above, and rice is 700,000 acres in excess. The acreage reserve program will help compensate for this needed adjustment, and assist in getting supplies back to normal levels.

In adjusting to their allotments, producers of these three commodities diverted a substantial part of the acreage taken out of production into feed grains. As a result, the 1954 and 1955 production of oats, barley, and grain sorghums increased about 800 million bushels, corn equivalent by weight. This led to the substitution of other feed grains for corn, a build-up of the corn carryover, and unrealistically low allotments for corn. The law prescribes the manner of establishing corn acreage allotments.

Against this background of minimum allotments for other basics and reduced corn acreage allotments resulting from the diverted acreage problem, it is only fair to provide for corn an acreage reserve program with payment for adjustments from the 1953–55 average acreage. Corn does not have these minimum allotment provisions. Corn producers cannot shift into production of basics covered by marketing quotas. Corn producers have been hurt by the feed grain production on acres diverted from other basics. This recommended program is just simple justice. A realistic corn acreage reserve program as proposed will bolster feed grain and livestock prices. This will be a great step forward. It is basic and constructive for the feed-livestock economy, out of which comes 5 out of every 8 dollars of farm receipts.

This acreage reserve program has been budgeted at $750 million, for the first year.

Conservation reserve program: With this program we hope to shift millions of acres from cropland to forage, trees or water storage. This is a long-range adjustment program designed to eliminate from cropping the less productive lands and some of the diverted acres. Payments would be made for establishment of suitable cover and annual rental payments would be made for a specified number of years. Thus, there would be income from these acres and reduced feed grain supplies would be translated into higher market prices for grains and livestock. This program has been budgeted at $350 million for the first year.

Another factor in a sound agricultural economy is the availability of adequate credit to farmers at all times. The importance of this was emphasized by the President in his farm message and we have made the following recommendations to bring about the desired credit situation for our farmers:

1. Authorize real estate loans to owner-operators of family type farms for refinancing of debts.

2. Authorize real estate and operating loans under titles I and II of the Bankhead Act on less than adequate farms where satisfactory off-farm income is to be available.

3. Increase the aggregate amount of insured loans for a fiscal year from $100 million to $125 million.

4. Eliminate the present limitation on insured loans of not exceeding 90 percent of the fair and reasonable value of the farm, thereby placing the insured loans and direct loans under title I on the same basis.

5. Eliminate the requirement that loans may not be made in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm management units in the county, thereby making it possible to serve any family-type farm operator who is otherwise eligible for credit services under the act.

6. Provide that, not to exceed 10 percent of the annual appropriation for operating loans under title II may be used for loans in excess of $10,000 but in no event in excess of $20,000.

7. Permit in justifiable cases, due to causes beyond the borrower's control, outstanding loans to be renewed or extended for a period not to exceed 10 years and also authorize the agency to make further loans in such case during the 10-year period.

8. Extend and revise the authority under the statute for the compromise, adjustment and reduction of debts for loans being serviced by the agency.

In addition to these recommendations, we made suggestions for further improving our greatly expanded surplus disposal operations, strengthening commodity programs, considering dollar limits on price supports, and carrying out a rural development program.

Now let us turn to the agricultural bill that was passed by the Senate Monday of last week and which you requested me to discuss at this time. It is appropriate that we examine together the various features of the pending legislation (H. R. 12) as it now stands and analyze as best we can its total impact upon American agriculture.

The bill as passed by the Senate has some good features but it also carries a number of provisions which would work to the disadvantage of farmers and tend to defeat the purposes of the soil bank.

The proposed soil bank, with both its acreage reserve and conservation reserve, would move definitely in the direction of reducing agricultural surpluses which are seriously depressing farm income. While some modifications in legislative language may be necessary, this section of the bill is generally good. It will permit a massive assault on the most important factor depressing farm income, the surplus. Together with our stepped up surplus disposal operations farm prices and incomes will be strengthened in the market place.

Some of the other constructive features of the bill as passed by the Senate are:

1. The long needed adjustment in the grade and staple length for parity and supports for upland cotton.

2. Authorization for the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing commodities donated under section 416 into a form suitable for home or institutional use.

3. The provision for a Surplus Disposal Administrator.

4. The exemption from marketing quota penalties of wheat grown and used on the farm where produced.

5. Assistance to the States in tree planting and reforestation.

Now I should like to review some of the provisions of H. R. 12, as it passed the Senate, which we believe are economically unsound and contrary to the best interests of our farmers and our agriculture in general.

I. Increased set-aside: Last minute amendments to the bill which would statistically isolate vast surpluses of corn, cotton and wheat in an effort to boost support price levels would have the effect of aggravating still further the surplus problem.

This device can only move us away from a permanent solution for the farm problem. It merely perpetuates the very system that got us into our present trouble in the first place.

Changing the name or calling a surplus a "set aside" does not wish it out of existence nor does it remove the depressing effect on market prices. Every student of markets recognize and takes into consideration the existence of the burdensome supplies that have resulted from high rigid price supports. For, what one Congress does can be changed by the next. The physical existence remains.

For example, let us take a look at the 1955 corn situation. Market prices have been 40–50 cents under support—$1.58 per bushel (87 percent of parity). Does anyone honestly think that the market price would rise just because the Secretary waved a magic wand and placed a label on 250 million bushels marked "set aside"? Changing the lines on the thermometer does not change the patient's temperature.

Moreover, in the case of cotton, the increase in the set-aside provided for in the bill would curtail CCC's ability to export or otherwise sell any upland cotton. The reason for this is that CCC now owns 6¾ million bales whereas the mandatory minimum set-aside is proposed to be fixed under the bill at 7½ million bales. This would be a serious blow to cotton growers.

You may ask me why I oppose this increase in the set-aside, when the set-aside idea was originally proposed by the administration in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

The differences are these:

We proposed the set-aside as a gradual means of moving to a flexible program; this bill apparently contemplates their use as a means of avoiding such a move.

We proposed to and have in fact been reducing the set-aside; the bill apparently considers them as a more or less permanent way of life.

II. Double standard parity: Prior to the adoption of the new parity definition which became effective in 1950, parity prices were sharply criticized because they retained the same pattern of price relationships that existed in 1910–14. One of the major reasons for adopting the new parity formula was to bring and to keep the pattern of price relationships more nearly up to date.

To avoid sharp adjustments in the parity prices of individual commodities, the law provided that the decline in the parity price of any commodity could not exceed 5 percent of the old parity price. This provision was effective for nonbasic commodities beginning in 1950. The Agricultural Act of 1954 provided for a similar transition provision to become effective on basic commodities in 1956.

The effect of continuing the use of old or new parity, whichever is higher, for basic commodities is acceptance of the new parity formula when it results in a higher parity price and rejection when it results in a lower parity price. This provides more generous treatment for basic commodities than for the nonbasics.

Making the parity price the result of whichever of two alternative calculations gives the higher answer raises serious questions about the whole parity concept. If the new parity formula is an improvement over the old formula, it should be accepted for all commodities. If it is not an improvement, it should be rejected for all commodities.

If modernized parity is right for rice, soybeans, hogs, apples, lemons, potatoes, and 150 other commodities, why isn't it right for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts? If it is right for commodities covering 80 percent of the gross receipts, why is it wrong for the other 20 percent?

The shift proposed in the bill would boost parity prices, mainly for peanuts, wheat, and corn. To the extent that we artifically raise prices we will stimulate over production, reduce consumption, increase stocks, and lower free market prices.

This dual approach destroys the very usefulness of the parity concept itself. It abandons parity as a principle. It places in the hands of enemies of all price support a potent weapon which they would not hesitate to use.

III. Higher dairy price supports: The dairy business in 1955 was much improved over 1954. Not everything is as we would like it, true enough. But real progress is being made, production and consumption are coming into better balance. During the past year:

	Percent
Number of milk cows decreased	1
Consumption of milk increased	5
Per capita consumption of butter increased	2
Milk prices increased	1
Feed prices declined	7
Farm income from the sale of milk increased	2

Stocks of CCC-owned butter, which stood at 466 million pounds in 1954, are now virtually all committed. We are out of butter. I hasten to add that we have substantial stocks of cheese, and that our low inventory of dairy products has been achieved through sales at less than cost and through a sizable donation program. Realized cost of the dairy program in the last year of record was $440 million.

Government purchases have dropped. In the marketing year 1953–54, dairy products in the equivalent of 11 billion pounds of milk were acquired. In 1954–55 the figure was 5.7 billion pounds in 1955–56 purchases of surplus-dairy products will be the equivalent of about 5 billion pounds of milk.

The dairy industry has greatly increased its promotional expenditures designed to increase milk consumption, and there is excellent cooperation all along the line. These efforts are paying off in increased sales of dairy products and expanded consumption.

Now comes this bill with a provision that turns us back toward the dark days of 1953 and 1954.

An arbitrary period of time is taken by selecting a high-base period. It does violence to the parity concept as normally considered. It will freeze forever a parity equivalent relationship which existed for a short time 7 years ago and which is already badly out of date.

It will discourage the dairy industry from its valiant effort to promote consumption of dairy products. Why try to sell milk in the commercial market when Uncle Sam stands ready to pay more than the trade will pay?

The results of enacting this provision might seem advantageous on the surface, but underneath dairymen will recognize the same old siren song that led their ship onto the rocks before.

IV. Domestic parity plan for wheat: We have spent considerable time reviewing the pros and cons of this part of the legislation. As I indicated in a meeting with representatives of wheat producers, I stood ready to reexamine the proposed plan with its new features. Just yesterday, this whole subject was reviewed for the fourth time, by the National Agricultural Advisory Commission. The Commission, which has had a changing composition during the past 3 years, turned down the domestic parity plan decisively in each instance. There is serious question whether this proposal will accomplish the objectives its sponsors seek.

Our analysis indicates that:

1. It will hurt the small wheat grower. Under the present program any farmer can produce up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties. Any farmer may do this even though he exceeds his acreage allotment. Therefore, these small wheat producers are in a position to obtain substantial benefits from the operation of the present price-support program since they can sell all their production in a market protected by the price-support level.

Contrast this with the effects on the producer under the domestic parity plan. If a farmer has no allotment he will be forced to sell all his production at a feed price which will be very substantially less than the current support price.

Let us take the example of a farmer in the commercial wheat area with a 3-acre allotment and a 25-bushel yield. Under the present program he can produce 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This would give him a production of 375 bushels which he can sell at close to the support level, $1.81 per bushel.

This same farmer under the domestic parity scheme would receive the domestic parity level on 37 bushels, and the balance of 338 bushels would have to be sold at a price comparable to feed price, $1.40 per bushel. Thus the small farmer would lose in income about $100 from what he otherwise would receive with the present program in effect.

The proposed certificate plan for wheat would be costly indeed to the small wheat grower. It should be remembered that almost two-thirds of the wheat farms in the United States have allotments of 15 acres or less. In some States this runs above 90 percent. Here are the figures for certain States: Ohio, 82 percent of the wheat growers produce less than 15 acres. In Indiana, it is 80 percent; Michigan, 85 percent; New York, 84 percent; Kansas, 24 percent; North Dakota, 4 percent; Washington, 37 percent; and Oregon, 59 percent.

2. Small farmers will be disenfranchised. Under the present marketing quota program any farmer in the commercial wheat area who intends to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat is eligible to vote. All wheat producers outside the commercial area are not subject to the quotas. They do not vote because they are not subject to quotas.

Under the proposed certificate plan, all wheat producers—large and small, no matter where located—would be directly affected by the plan. And yet, not all these producers—only those in the commercial area who intend to harvest more than 15 acres of wheat—would be eligible to vote. This would be only about 35 percent of all the farmers who grow wheat.

This means that all the small farmers who now have the opportunity to plant up to 15 acres of wheat without marketing quota penalties will not be in a position to vote in the referendum on the certificate plan even though it directly affects every one of them.

Thus, on a plan that so seriously affects the welfare of about two-thirds of the wheat farmers in the United States their voice will not be heard. This legislation definitely disenfranchises the small wheat producer. In this connection it should also be noted that feed-grain producers who will be adversely affected by this legislation would not be eligible to vote unless they had wheat allotments of more than 15 acres.

3. The proposed certificate plan for wheat will result in lower prices for other feed

grains. Feed grain prices would drop by at least 2 percent. CCC would acquire the equivalent in other feed grains of about 50 percent of the additional wheat fed. Thus to the diverted acre problem is added the feed wheat problem for the cash grain producer.

4. Exports would not increase under the certificate proposal. We probably would still have price-support loans at above the world free market level for wheat. Therefore, CCC would still acquire wheat under the support program and we would need all the present Government programs such as Public Law 480, barter, ICA, IWA, and others to maintain the current level of exports. There would be no advantage for us to engage in a price war since importing countries would probably go on a hand-to-mouth basis anyhow.

5. It should be well understood that with a certificate plan there would be need for even more controls. Under the proposal allotments and price-support operations would continue to be authorized. The only additional feature is the domestic market certificate.

6. The cost of present farm programs is borne by taxation, according to income. Under this plan, the cost is borne according to consumption.

7. There would be demands from other commodity groups for price fixing of the domestically consumed portion of their crop.

8. The proposal permits one segment of our population to vote a program on themselves without others, who may be adversely affected, having opportunity to participate in the referendum.

V. Certificate plan for rice: It is generally recognized that our rice industry is now confronted with very serious surplus supply and production problems. The acreage has been reduced from 2.6 million in 1954 to 1.6 million acres in 1956. We in the Department of Agriculture, and I am confident that the Members of the House and Senate, want to see legislation enacted which is best for the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people. The bill as passed by the Senate contains a provision for a certificate plan for rice. I am sure that if this provision did not meet the long-time interest of our rice producers and the American people, its sponsors would not want this legislation in the pending bill.

How would this proposed certificate plan for rice operate?

I. Producers would receive marketing certificates. The total amount of such certificates would equal the estimated consumption of rice in the primary market. Please note that under this proposal the primary market includes the United States possessions and Cuba. By means of these certificates, each producer would be allotted shares of the primary market based on a proportion of his normal production from his allotted acreage. The value of these certificates per hundredweight of rice would equal 35 percent of parity in 1956 and probably 40 percent of parity after 1956.

2. Processors would be required to purchase certificates for all rough rice milled.

3. A support price of 55 percent of parity would be made available for 1956, and probably 50 percent of parity in other years.

The separation of the primary market (which includes exports to Cuba) from the export market, as provided by the bill as passed by the Senate, would have serious economic, administrative, and international impacts. While I am sure that this type of legislation would not be without some advantages, it seems to me that on balance the disadvantages far outweigh the advantages.

Let us examine some of the disadvantages of this type of legislation.

1. Tremendous problems of enforcement would be encountered. One of the serious problems would be to prevent purchases for the secondary export market from finding their way into domestic consumption and exports to Cuba. Certainly this bill does not permit us to control imports into Cuba. If Cuban millers should so desire they could purchase rough rice in the United States at a very low price and mill this rice in Cuba. Thus, what many proponents of this legislation consider as a part of a primary market could be taken from the American producers in the form of sales at secondary market prices. Also, the American mills could lose the business of milling rice.

Let us examine another loophole in this proposal which depends so strongly on including Cuba in the primary market. Let us assume for a minute that a domestic mill has milled rice and has exported it to the Bahamas. The domestic miller would receive a refund for the milled rice exported. The purchaser in the Bahamas could then without even unloading the vessel transship the rice into Cuba. If the Cuban market is maintained at a high level, this United States-produced rice would move into Cuba at a profit to the transshipper, unless Cuban licensing and restrictions could prevent this.

Altogether, it seems to me that there are too many loopholes. Without the unilateral inclusion of Cuba in this program it cannot succeed.

2. Section 380 (c) relating to the establishment of the rice primary market quota requires the Secretary to make this determination at least 7 months prior to the start of the marketing season. While the experts tell me it is not too difficult to estimate the domestic requirements, the estimate of exports to Cuba so far in advance, especially when we are selling to Cuba at much above competitive levels, would be extremely difficult.

This increases the chance for error, a factor which is present even on estimates made just prior to the start of the marketing season. Also, there is no provision for adjusting the primary marketing quota upward once the determination is made.

3. The announcement of such a program could result in a virtual cessation of exports to non-Cuban areas after passage of the bill until August 1, 1956, unless a provision is made for a special subsidy since anyone who could defer purchases would do so in order to obtain rice at a lower market price.

4. The requirement of section 380 (h) that CCC make refund payments to owners of rough rice on July 31, 1956, equal to 35 percent of parity as of August 1, 1956, would result in windfalls to such processors for this reason:

(a) The support price in 1955 averaged only 86 percent of parity and on January 1, 1956, the farm price averaged 82 percent of parity. A refund of 35 percent of parity would result in a net price of 47 percent of parity, as against a new support for 1956 of 55 percent of parity. This procedure could provide an 8-percent windfall.

5. This type of program appears to be in violation of article I of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It violates the principle of the most-favored-nation clause. It is, in effect, a United States tax on Cuban consumers. Certainly Cuba would prefer to collect its own taxes rather than turn them over to the United States rice producer.

6. The higher we force Cuban prices the greater their incentive to increase production. The certificate plan would put United States rice at a disadvantage in the Cuban market, where it now enjoys a preference. We stand to lose the Cuban market.

In summary, I would like to point out that the rice certificate plan in the bill provides for more rather than less Government controls than are provided under the present program. The certificate plan would still retain acreage allotments, loans, and penalize farmers for overplanting. The new complication would be in the form of processing certificates. The impact on international relations should not be overlooked. We would probably be accused of dumping, and countries would retaliate by price competition or discrimination against the imports of American agricultural and manufactured products. For the above reasons it seems to me that the certificate plan for rice included in the pending bill is not in the best interest of rice producers and the American people.

VI. Compulsory price supports on feed grains: This provision will make thousands of farmers ineligible for 1956 price support. In areas such as the heavy grain sorghum area of Texas which expanded markedly in 1954 and 1955, limiting the acreage to the 3-year average may require farmers to cut back sharply if they are to be eligible for price support.

In addition, and most important of all, it sets up a system of price support relationships which defies logic. It goes on the theory that distance from a market has no effect on price. It discards all previous concepts of price relationships for the feed grains.

Adjoining farms would have price supports that differed as much as 25 percent from one another, where previously there had been no differences. Discretionary supports, which have been in effect up to now, have worked well. The provision in the Senate bill would move oats, barley, and sorghum into the group of problem commodities. They would move into Government warehouses and not into consumption. And a Government warehouse is not a market.

Also it would add a whole series of new Government controls on feed grain producers.

VII. Processor's certification on prices paid producer: This provision requires the Secretary, when conducting any support or surplus removal program through purchases, to obtain a certification from the processor that the producer was paid not less than the support price or, in the absence of a support price, a fair price determined and publicly announced by the Secretary.

This provision is impossible of administration. It would be ineffective and tend to defeat its purpose. It would cause widespread dissatisfaction among producers.

Processed products purchased by the Department in many cases are processed from milk, live animals, fruits and vegetables received from many producers. Prices paid to individual producers vary substantially by seasons, location, quality, age, class, or variety, as well as hauling and other services performed. It generally would be impracticable to make equitable adjustments for these factors in support prices or in fair prices required to be named. Also in many cases the commodities sold by farmers move through several hands before they are processed and sold to the Government.

Also, it would deny the direct benefits of support to those farmers whose only outlets are processors who could not or would not certify that they had paid the specified prices and who would sell their processed products in the commercial market instead of to the Government. The provision could result in lower prices to those farmers and cause widespread dissatisfaction among such farmers.

There are other provisions in both the Senate and House versions of H. R. 12 which are subject to question. For example, it will be extremely difficult in view of the requirements for annual appropriations to make long-term contracts under the conservation reserve program.

The Department of Agriculture will be happy to provide additional information if requested by the conferees. We shall be glad to provide an item by item summary of our position and the major reasons therefor. Our interest is that a sound bill be hammered out in conference, that this be done speedily and that the bill be quickly passed by both Houses in such shape that it can be signed by the President.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of life and light, our glad hearts thrill at the risen glory of the awakening earth robed in the blooming garb of spring. As common bushes, lately so bare, are now aflame and the time for the singing of birds has come, may a spiritual springtime make our own hearts even as the garden of the Lord, where barren branches may be clothed upon with the beauty of holiness and the fair flowers of humility and charity lift their fair petals above the fallow ground.

Prepare our hearts this holy day for the solemn glory of a malefactor's cross blazing with the splendor of an empty tomb. As so soon now we come to the place called Calvary, steady our hearts for the good fight we must wage, by the assurance that not a nail touched His truth, not a sword severed the secret of His might, that no cross could impede His conquering way, and the gates of hell cannot prevail over the Conqueror of Good Friday and Easter. So may we fare forth greeting the unseen and the unknown with a cheer, sure that the third day cometh. In His ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes;

H. R. 9064. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADDITION OF BILLS TO CALENDAR AND POSSIBILITY OF THEIR CONSIDERATION TODAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce to the Senate that five new bills have been placed on the calendar since yesterday, Orders Nos. 1740 through 1744, as follows:

S. 2851, a bill to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona.

S. 3076, a bill to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 3246, a bill to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research.

S. 3259, a bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes.

S. 3214, a bill to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir.

The majority leader, and the minority leader and his policy group, have cleared those bills. It may be that we shall proceed to their consideration during the day. All the bills come from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, except one, which comes from the Committee on Public Works. I should like to have the attachés in the Senate inform the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority members of the committee that it is the plan of the leadership to call up the bills, and I should like all Senators on notice.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND FOR PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the Senate until April 9, 1956, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the President of the Senate or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO APPOINT MEMBERS OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES DURING EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate until April 9, 1956, the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint members of commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the Senate.

I cleared this before, but I wanted the minority leader to know about it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with a great feeling of pride and satisfaction that I send to the desk an order, and ask for its immediate consideration.

I should like to observe that the Democratic steering committee, the official committee on committees for the majority party, has unanimously selected the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for membership on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As Members of this body may recall, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri had an outstanding record in the executive departments before he was sent to the Senate by the people of his own State in 1952, by a tremendous majority. He had distinguished service as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, as Secretary of the Air Force, as Administrator of the RFC, and as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. In addition, Mr. President, one of the chief interests of the junior Senator from Missouri has been in the farmers of this country, and in seeing that the farmer got his fair share of the income.

So, Mr. President, after considering all the available men for this assignment, the steering committee, in its wisdom, selected the junior Senator from Missouri. If this order is agreed to, he will be excused by the Senate from further service on the Committee on Public Works, and will be assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

So I send to the desk an order, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the order.

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] be excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Public Works and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements, and I ask Senators to please observe the 2-minute limitation, because there is present on the floor the distinguished chairman of a committee who has four noncontroversial bills which he wants to have passed. After those bills have been acted on, Senators will be recognized and may speak until the evening, if they desire.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FINANCIAL REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential financial report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH BUSINESS FIRMS IN THE UNITED STATES FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, AND RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Loo Wei Yung from a report transmitted to the Senate on June 22, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation designed to insure the construction of a high dam on the lower Cumberland River

"Whereas the region traversed by the Cumberland River has been the scene of numerous floods which have caused great and extensive damage to property and have moreover added to the steady depletion of the natural resources of the Commonwealth and of the Nation; and

"Whereas power production facilities in said area are insufficient to meet the demand with the result that large industries vital to the economic well-being of the citizens of the area are reluctant to establish there; and

"Whereas it appears desirable that Cumberland River be deepened thereby making more of its length navigable and affording industries of the area a more economic means of shipping their products; and

"Whereas it appears desirable that the citizens of the area be provided with a plan of recreation not only for their own enjoyment and welfare but as an inducement to tourist trade with its direct economic benefits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States act, in the exercise of its broad legislative powers, to insure the construction, with all possible haste commensurate with the exercise of sound judgment, of a high dam on the lower Cumberland River.

"SEC. 2. That the clerk of the house cause copies of this resolution to be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Kentucky delegation to the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act

"Whereas there is pending in Congress a bill to revise and extend the expiring Water Pollution Control Act; and

"Whereas the continuance of the benefits provided by this act is essential to the welfare of many of the citizens of this Commonwealth: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the Water Pollution Control Act, incorporating therein the provisions of H. R. 9540 and providing for grants to cities and towns for the elimination of stream pollution and the construction of sewage-treatment plants; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTER AND PETITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am in recepit of a letter signed by Mrs. Thure Johnson, of Butte, Mont., relative to the Siler bill (H. R. 6427) and the Langer bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the petition accompanying the letter, without the signatures attached, be made a part of the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and they will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and petition, without the signatures attached, are as follows:

BUTTE, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am sending you a petition about the Siler and Langer bills. Will you please include the number of signers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Sincerely,

Mrs. THURE JOHNSON.

PETITION REGARDING THE SILER BILL, H. R. 6427, AND THE LANGER BILL, S. 923

To Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the State under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages.

At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic, there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless especially by the audio and visual suggestion of radio and television.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have received a petition signed by 354 citizens of Maine urging the passage of the Langer bill and the Siler bill, which states:

We, the undersigned citizens of Maine, being greatly disturbed by the rapid increase in drinking among young people and being convinced that the attractive advertising of alcoholic beverages contribute much to this problem, do humbly petition the Members of Congress of the United States that they vote in favor of the adoption of the Langer bill, S. 923, and the Siler bill, H. R. 4627 to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce.

I call this expression not only to the attention of the Senate, but also to the attention and consideration of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has primary jurisdiction over this legislation and which holds the control over whether such legislation is reported to the Senate for a vote.

The petition was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 3554. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3555. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3556. A bill to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 3557. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Lecomples; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 3558. A bill to provide a library of captioned films for the deaf and hard-of-hear-

ing; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. PURTELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 3559. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 3560. A bill to amend the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928 so that certain awards of the Mixed Claims Commission having a residual balance of $15,000 or less will be paid in full immediately, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 3561. A bill to incorporate the National Music Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3562. A bill to provide a measure of coordination between the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, subject to employee referendum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 3563. A bill for the relief of Benito Comellas Freixa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3564. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

S. 3565. A bill for the relief of George P. Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3566. A bill to provide for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of certain Government-owned alcohol and rubber plants; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3567. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of stamps to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the arrival in Springfield, Mo., of the first west-bound stage of the Overland Butterfield Stage Co.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3568. A bill to provide for the establishment in western North Dakota of a uraniferous lignite buying station and a mill for processing uranium-bearing lignites; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3569. A bill for the relief of George La Hood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3570. A bill to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued to eligible orphans under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and for other purposes;

S. 3571. A bill to extend the time during which visas may be issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953;

S. 3572. A bill to provide for the issuance of a number of visas to permit the entry into the United States of certain aliens afflicted with tuberculosis;

S. 3573. A bill to permit any voluntary agency recognized by the Department of State to submit assurances in behalf of certain aliens seeking to enter the United States; and

S. 3574. A bill to provide for the allocation of cetrain special nonquota immigrant visas which are authorized to be issued under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create an additional Federal judicial district within the State of Florida, and to provide for the appointment of a district judge for such district.

The State of Florida today has two Federal judicial districts, namely, the northern and southern districts, but by reason of a tremendous growth in population, the present boundaries of the southern district have long since been outgrown. This situation prevents the expeditious and effective handling of the heavy case load causing a litigation log jam which can only be alleviated by a new division of the southern district.

As presently constituted the southern district comprises 45 counties, extending westward from the Atlantic along the boundary of the State of Georgia to and including Madison County, then southward from Levy and Alachua to include the greater part of the peninsula. Located within the boundary are the populous areas of Tampa, St. Petersburg, Palm Beach, and Miami. According to the last official census taken in 1950, this area had a total population of 2,277,535, as compared to that of 493,770 of the northern district. The population of Dade County alone, one of the counties included in the southern district was 495,084, or 1,300 more than the total population of the northern district. Of the State's total population of 2,771,305, which has increased substantially since the last official census, over 80 percent is located within the southern district. The phenomenal growth in population within the southern district has increased the volume of Federal litigation, both civil and criminal, to such an extent that the present composition of the United States attorney's office is inadequate to sufficiently cope with it. Unreasonable delay in the proper administration of justice is the net result.

Statistics taken from the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office, United States Courts, furnish ample proof of the heavy case burden now carried by the southern district. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, there was a total of 1,407 civil cases and 474 criminal cases pending at the beginning of the period; 1,365 civil and 877 criminal cases commenced, 1,352 civil and 1,000 criminal cases terminated, and 1,407 civil and 474 criminal cases pending on June 30, 1955, the end of the fiscal year as compared with the northern district, with a total of 181 civil cases and 49 criminal cases pending at the beginning of the period, 177 civil and 178 criminal cases commenced and 161 civil and 166 criminal cases terminated, and 181 civil cases and 49 criminal cases pending at the end of the fiscal period.

A Federal grand jury inquired into conditions prevalent in the southern district and submitted a report on January 22, 1953, urging that immediate action be taken to create a new judicial district, such being in its opinion the only solution on this vexing problem. At that time, the grand jury found, first, that the creation of new judgeships, though imperative to meet present needs, is not a solution to the problem; second, that the problem is largely an administrative one which can only be solved by action directly affecting the operations office of the United States attorney; third, that the work which evolves upon the Miami office has increased to a point where it encompasses at least 40 percent of the work of the entire district; fourth, that it is three times as great as the work done in the entire northern district; fifth, that the court dockets are clogged with a backlog of both civil and criminal cases for an unreasonable period of time; sixth, that routine work of this office such as the evaluation and disposition of civil and criminal complaints not yet in the litigation phase has lagged even further behind; seventh, that a properly staffed United States attorney's office should certainly be located in Miami, where its operations at all times would be under the direct supervision of a United States attorney; and, eighth, that by taking such action adequate and effective supervision of its operations could be maintained thus assuring that the legal work of the Government is handled with dispatch and efficiency.

I can fully appreciate the findings of the grand jury on the conditions existing in the Southern Federal Judicial District, for just prior to World War II, I had the honor of serving as an assistant United States attorney in charge of the Miami office, at which time, according to statistics, it was the 11th busiest United States attorney's office in the Nation. Since that time, the volume of work in that office has greatly increased to a point where it is a matter of urgent concern to all of us who are familiar with the litigation logjam in the area.

The orderly, speedy, and effective administration of justice is the concrete foundation of our system of government. To democracy it is a pillar of strength which should never be allowed to decay. Not too infrequently have we been warned that justice delayed is tantamount to justice being denied. Nothing could contribute more toward undermining the faith of our people in their institutions of government than to carelessly permit or condone by inaction a situation which prevents litigants from having their cases disposed of promptly and efficiently or which imposes upon litigants seeking such disposition undue hardships. Unreasonable delay in the administration of justice is therefore a situation which warrants prompt and effective corrective action by the Congress.

My bill is designed to correct the intolerable situation which exists in the southern Federal judicial district by giving effect to the recommendations of the Federal grand jury, to the views of the members of the bar, of the press, and of all the citizens of the State of Florida,

who are familiar with the problem. It simply provides that the State of Florida be divided into three Federal judicial districts to be known as the northern, middle, and southern districts. In addition, it contains a provision for the appointment of a district judge for what would be a newly created middle district. This legislation, if enacted into law, will more evenly distribute the workload of Federal litigation and make a substantial contribution to the orderly, speedy, and effective administration of justice. Florida's rapidly expanding population makes its need imperative.

Since the facts justifying the need for this legislation are uncontrovertible, it is my hope that the Judiciary Committee and the Congress will give this proposal immediate and favorable consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3555) to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 551, CHAPTER 616, 83D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who unfortunately is not able to be present today, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which was requested by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3556) to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for Mr. MURRAY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIBRARY OF CAPTIONED FILMS FOR THE DEAF

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Library of Congress to establish a captioned film library for the use of the deaf and hard of hearing.

This program is similar to the Braille book and talking book programs already in operation for the benefit of the blind. These captioned films, much like the old silent motion pictures, will be distributed to public residential schools, day schools, day classes in various schools, denominational schools, and schools for the multiple handicapped. There are more than 300 of these schools in the country and their total enrollment is more than 22,000.

In addition, there are more than 500 organizations of deaf and hard-of-hearing persons or organizations engaged in work in behalf of the deaf and hard-of-hearing. It is estimated that, in addition to the children, there are approximately 200,000 deaf and hard-of-hearing adults throughout the country who will benefit from this program.

The need for this program has been attested to by Captioned Films for the Deaf, Inc., which is sponsored by the Conference of Executives, American Schools for the Deaf; the Convention of Instructors, American Schools for the Deaf; the National Association of the Deaf; the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf and the Junior League of Hartford, Conn.

Dr. Edmund B. Boatner who heads the American School for the Deaf in West Hartford, Conn., is also the President of this organization, and his association has been most generous and cooperative in furnishing information in regard to this program which I think will fill a most important humanitarian and educational need.

In past years films were one of the greatest sources of information and recreation for the deaf. The advent of sound film deprived the deaf of this valuable resource and up until now, they have had nothing satisfactory to take its place. It is also true that the great number of educational films in existence are of little use, particularly to the deaf child, because nearly all of these films are carried by narration.

This program would provide great advantages not only from the educational and informative subject matter of the films themselves, but also in the recreational therapy and in the opportunity for a great increase in general understanding. Our deaf and hard-of-hearing are deprived of the many advantages available to others through radio and television and this program would compensate in a considerable measure for this lack.

A pilot program of this sort has been started by the Captioned Films organization which was able to pioneer in this work as a result of a gift of money from the Junior League of Hartford. There are now 17 films circulating among schools for the deaf and their enthusiastic reception justifies this proposal as a most worthwhile program.

Our research shows that there is need for at least 120 recreational film programs, consisting of a feature length film and a short subject, and a provision for at least 60 replacement films yearly. There is an even greater need for a larger number of educational films which are of paramount importance to schools for the deaf.

My visits to the American School for the Deaf in West Hartford, and my research in this matter, have convinced me of the worthiness of this project in behalf of young and old, who are deaf and hard-of-hearing. I believe this bill for $250,000 to inaugurate this program is reasonable and that the sum is comparatively small when measured against the opportunity for the incalculable benefit which it offers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3558) to provide a library of captioned films for the deaf and hard-of-hearing, introduced by Mr. PURTELL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a national charter for the National Music Council. I believe the bill would be a most helpful contribution to the advancement of music in our country. I have prepared a statement on the background of the legislation, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3561) to incorporate the National Music Council, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement, presented by Mr. WILEY, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Music is the universal language of mankind."

These are the words of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. And they have been quoted time and again in our country and throughout the world.

Down through the ages, countless tributes have been paid to the role of music in expressing man's highest ideals, his search for beauty, for harmony, his desire to pour forth his soul in a lyrical way which would be understood by all men.

Carlyle wrote that "music is well said to be the speech of angels."

And Robert Browning wrote "there is no truer truth obtainable by man than comes of music."

OUR REMEMBRANCE OF MUSIC

There is not one of us who does not recall some music which he or she has heard in bygone years.

We remember perhaps the music of graduation day, the tunes identified with great singers or of unforgettable motion pictures, the music of a Memorial Day prade when we stood with our parents and watched our servicemen march by.

Or we recall the anthems of a Fourth of July band concert or the music of the wedding march or of a child's confirmation. We recall music in our homes, our churches, our public halls, the music of the great composers of mankind, operatic selections, symphonic orchestrations, chamber music, pop music, or music over the radio, over television, or phonographs, tapes, and in countless other spheres and media.

AMERICA'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO MUSIC

We of this country are proud to have made our unique contributions to the music of mankind—serious music and light music, American jazz and American spirituals, the music of Gershwin and of other great composers, of Tin Pan Alley and Basin Street. The world has come to know and appreciate American music.

And here, in our own land, we are ever increasing the acquaintanceship of young and old with the delights of music.

FINE WORK OF NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL

I feel that it is most appropriate, therefore, that Congress consider the granting of a charter to the National Music Council.

It is an organization representing 45 nationally active music associations, with a combined individual membership of over 800,000.

The council has contributed on many occasions in war and peace to the service of

music. All segments of the musical world are represented in it—composers, performers, teachers, music publishers, and others.

LEGISLATION ON BOTH SENATE AND HOUSE SIDES

Already, legislation has been introduced on both the Senate and House sides for such a national charter. On the House side, it is principally, in the form of H. R. 7128, offered by the tireless champion of artistic efforts in our country, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey. In addition, there are other bills, like H. R. 8110 and H. R. 8739. On the Senate side, the counterpart of the Thompson bill is S. 2662. The Wiley bill and the other bills are all identical with the exception that my own bill contains a new preamble of "Findings and Declarations" emphasizing the modern significance.

On January 26, House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4 held hearings on this legislation. A tremendously impressive group of witnesses testified on behalf of the bill. I append to my statement a list of the prominent individuals who presented testimony in person or in written form on behalf of this legislation.

NATIONAL FEDERATION SUPPORTS THIS BILL

Among the witnesses was Mrs. Ronald Arthur Dougan, of Beloit, in my State, president of the National Federation of Music Clubs. This federation, founded in 1898, is a nonprofit organization, the largest single music organization in the world.

It is a charter member of the National Music Council. Its membership representing several hundreds of thousands, is a cross section of musicians in America—concert artists, teachers, composers, students, choral and symphony society members, music clubs, and others.

The national federation has splendidly helped to raise standards in every field of music. It promotes and encourages youngsters with musical talent. It contributes in the dissemination of music among the Armed Forces, and serves other worthy purposes as well.

Among other witnesses at the House of Representatives hearing were: the Honorable Emanuel Celler; Mr. Howard Hanson, president of the National Music Council, Mr. Edwin Hughes, executive secretary of the National Music Council, and Dr. Harold Spivacke, chief of the Library of Congress, Music Division.

HOUSE ADVERSE DECISION SHOULD BE REVERSED

Unfortunately, it was the decision of the House Judiciary Committee not to report this bill favorably.

Its decision was taken, as I understand it, not as a reflection on the bill itself, but rather, merely as part of a congressional committee's reluctance in recent years to grant almost any additional national charter.

I, for one, feel that we should, of course, strictly limit the number of national charters, lest, if the practice be extended too widely, it depreciate the value of the charters already granted, e. g., to great American patriotic and veterans' organizations.

Nevertheless, I think that it would be well to grant such a charter to the National Music Council.

It will involve no cost to the Federal Government, no appropriations. It will, however, confer appropriate recognition to this great fountainhead of culture.

ASCAP ENTHUSIASTICALLY ENDORSES BILL

Although it is only but a few days since I first announced word that I intended to cosponsor this legislation, I am delighted to say that a great many enthusiastic messages in support have already come to my office.

Promptest response has come from the famed American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers. Its distinguished president, Mr. Stanley Adams, wrote me as follows:

MARCH 27, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: ASCAP participates in the public-service activities on the National Music Council, and the undersigned assists in the formation of council policies as one of its vice presidents. Consequently, we are grateful to you for your intention to introduce in the Senate a bill to incorporate the National Music Council, thus according it the national status which it justly deserves. It is especially fitting that this measure should be introduced by you, in view of the cultural achievements of your State of Wisconsin and your own record of friendly support of music and the allied arts. It is also my feelings that your preamble as drafted, with its emphasis on the importance of music both nationally and internationally, should do much to win adherents to this needed legislation.

Mr. Cunningham, I am sure, will be in to see you in the very near future, and he will personally convey our support in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY ADAMS,
President.

TELEGRAM FROM ASCAP'S PAUL CUNNINGHAM

I may say parenthetically by way of background that Mr. Paul Cunningham, ASCAP chairman of public relations, has on many occasions brought to my attention and the attention of many other legislators on the Hill, ASCAP's marvelous service, particularly on behalf of the morale of our fighting men overseas. ASCAP troupe have contributed invaluably in entertaining our boys abroad, not to mention ASCAP's other patriotic and civic services.

Mr. Cunningham himself wired me as follows:

"On behalf of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, I wish to express our hearty endorsement of your bill for the incorporation of the National Music Council. The council has done fine work in the past, and we are confident that its recognition by our Government will advance the cultural interests of the United States, especially in the field of music."

Both Mr. Adams and Mr. Cunningham, I may say, are famous in American music in their own right.

MUSIC-MINDED WISCONSIN

I have also heard from numerous persons in my own State expressing gratification.

I should like to cite now a letter to me from Mr. Le Roy Umbs, of Milwaukee, on behalf of the Wisconsin Teachers' Association.

"As chairman of the Wisconsin Music Teachers Certification Committee and as first vice president of the east central division of the Music Teachers National Association, I wish heartily to endorse the establishment of a national music council and the issuance of a charter by the Federal Government to such a council.

"This country has been peculiarly slow to sponsor and encourage the arts. Other countries of the Western World are far ahead of us in this respect. Great Britain with its National Arts Council; Western Germany, with its municipally and provincially supported opera and drama; France, with its Radio Diffusion Francaise; Switzerland, with its state orchestra and radio; even tiny and impoverished Austria with its magnificent rebuilt opera house, all these countries and others may well serve as models and guides for our own great Nation to follow:

"Speaking for the groups, in which I am a leader, I know that they are solidly behind you in your efforts to charter the proposed National Music Council."

WISCONSIN FEDERATION OF MUSIC CLUBS WRITES

This is what Mrs. W. Paul Benzinger, of Oconomowoc, advisory chairman of the Wisconsin Federation of Music Clubs, wrote:

"I am delighted to learn that you will introduce the bill for a National Charter for the National Music Council.

"I feel along with many people who love and foster the study of music, that as a people increase their culture they also increase their humanities.

"Granted a charter, the National Music Council will have greater potential value to our country's musical development.

"With kindest wishes to you."

In the Wisconsin federation, Mrs. Alvin A. Mellentine of Stevens Point is president, Mr. Roger G. Cunningham of Jamesville is first vice president, Mrs. O. T. Slagsvol of Eau Claire, second vice president, Mrs. Lyle H. Brown of Waupun, third vice president, Mrs. Ragnhild H. Congdon of Kenosha, secretary, and Mrs. A. J. Bowen is treasurer.

BADGER PAPERS REPORT PEOPLE'S INTEREST

Each day in my office, I receive copies of publications issued in my State—newspapers and magazines. There is not a daily newspaper or a weekly newspaper in my State which does not somewhere virtually in every single issue report some musical activity. It may be a symphony or a band concert, a choral group, a piano recital, or any of a broad variety of musical forms.

Of course, Wisconsin has long been deeply interested in music. Wisconsin pioneers who came from the Old World brought a love of music to our shores, and this love has continued down through the years.

I have before me now literally dozens of clippings on music from Wisconsin periodicals.

The Wisconsin State Journal, for example, reports that 103 Madison and surrounding area high school musicians won superior ratings in a district music solo and ensemble festival.

Another issue of the same paper reports that 14 Madison students are members of the University of Wisconsin Concert Band, which will play its annual Palm Sunday Concert in the Wisconsin Union Theater. Still another clipping reports that 6 members of the Madison Civic Chorus appear as soloists when the Madison Civic Symphony Orchestra gives its sixth concert of Madison's 30th season of civic music.

And I could duplicate instances in other Wisconsin newspapers, not only from our famed State capital but from towns as large as Milwaukee and ranging to the smallest Badger communities where music is still richly enjoyed.

Music is the common heritage of us all. The smallest youngster in the tiniest hamlet, practicing his keys on the piano or the most accomplished virtuoso performing in Carnegie Hall in New York, enjoy a common hunger to express their souls, and they draw upon a common musical heritage.

OTHER NATIONS VALUE MUSIC HIGHLY

Earlier, in the letter from Mr. Umbs, there was indicated how foreign countries honor their musical profession.

Virtually all the nations of the Old World recognize in music a priceless national asset. So, too, even the relatively new nations of South Asia are similarly aware of their musical heritage dating back to ancient cultures. They all enjoy contact with American music and American musicians, whether it be Louis Armstrong's jazz or more serious music played by the Symphony of the Air.

Just the other day, I was pleased to note as senior Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee that the Senate wisely approved legislation reported by our committee to make permanent the President's program for United States participation in cultural exchange programs.

I have been pleased to cosponsor legislation for this goal, and I trust that the House of Representatives will soon take prompt, final action.

Let us have more of the finest musical talent from abroad and let the finest of our talent journey overseas. Moreover, let us nurture the roots of American music in our land so that from Madison or Oconomowoc or Superior or La Crosse or Milwaukee or from Chicago or Cheyenne or anywhere else will come fine, new talent in the world of tomorrow.

DIFFICULT ECONOMIC PROBLEM FOR UNITED STATES MUSICIANS

Of late, it is an unfortunate fact that the professional musicians of America, as such, have had a rocky time of it. In this modern, technological age, there are more and more transcriptions of music. (America today has more than a half million jukeboxes alone.)

The tendency is to cut down on live playing of music.

It is an unhappy situation to note the seriously declining number of American musicians and how difficult it is for those who remain full-time in the profession to make a decent living.

Excise taxes on musical entertainment in the Nation's hotels and cabarets have had a severe impact on live music. The American Federation of Musicians and other groups have pointed out this grim fact, and it cannot be repeated too often if we are to take remedial action so as adequately to preserve our great musical heritage.

Here, in our Nation's Capital, we have a particular obligation to help advance American music. Establishment of a National Music and Fine Arts Center would be a great national asset.

CONCLUSION—MAKE 1956 A GREAT MUSIC YEAR

In conclusion, may I say that the granting of a national charter to the National Music Council will constitute only a relatively small contribution in relation to the problems of the musical world, and yet it can prove most helpful.

And for that reason, I trust that there will be favorable action on this subject in the Senate Judiciary Committee and thereafter in the full Senate. I trust, moreover, that my colleagues on the House side in the Judiciary Committee will reconsider their previous adverse position.

I know that I speak for my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in these sentiments, as well as for our able friend from New Jersey, Congressman THOMPSON, and for Senator LEHMAN, sponsor of S. 2662.

I may say, incidentally, that my colleague from Wyoming comes naturally by his interest in music because I understand that his father had a rich tenor voice and his brother also has fine singing talent. When a Democrat like JOE O'MAHONEY and I, as a Republican, can work together as we are happy to, on behalf of a fine cause like this, it is a symbol of bipartisan harmony and agreement which I trust will mark this bill through final passage. Finally, I say this:

All over America we are helping to celebrate the 200th birthday of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart. How appropriate it would be in this year of 1956 for the New World to send a message to the Old World that America rededicates herself to the cause of good music.

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS WHO TESTIFIED ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL BILL BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON, JR., a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.

Mr. Howard Hanson, president, the National Music Council, director, Eastman School of Music.

Mrs. Ronald Arthur Dougan, president, National Federation of Music, Beloit, Wis.

Mr. Harold Spivacke, Chief, Music Division of the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Sidney W. Wattenberg, counsel, National Music Council, New York.

Mr. Herman Finkelstein, general attorney, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Mr. Edwin Hughes, executive secretary, National Music Council.

Mr. George Lockhart, national president, American Society of Piano Technicians.

Mr. Wladimir Lakond, American Performing Rights Society.

Dr. Grace Spofford, vice president, National Guild of Community Music Schools, New York City.

Dr. William Doty, president, National Association of Schools of Music, Austin, Tex.

Mr. Guillermo Espinosa, chief, music section, Pan American Union, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Lenard Quinto, National Association for Music Therapy.

Mr. David S. Cooper, Chief, Music Program, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Patrick Hayes, chairman, cultural development committee, Washington Board of Trade.

Mr. John W. Travis, president, National Association of Piano Tuners.

LIST OF INDIVIDUALS WHO FILED STATEMENTS

Mr. S. Lewis Elmer, national president, American Guild of Organists.

Mr. S. Turner Jones, executive secretary, Music Teachers National Association.

Mr. Stanley Adams, president, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Mr. Thomas H. Belviso, member of executive committee, National Music Council.

Mr. Donald F. Malin, president, Music Publishers' Association.

Mr. E. Clifford Toren, president, National Association of Teachers of Singing, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. Frank W. Hill, president, American String Teachers' Association.

Miss Mary Howe, Washington, D. C.

COORDINATION BETWEEN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACTS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a measure of coordination between the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, subject to employee referendum, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3562) to provide a measure of coordination between the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Social Security Act, subject to employee referendum, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement, presented by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE OF NEW JERSEY

After a thorough study of pending legislative proposals to amend the laws governing retirement of civil-service employees I have reached four basic conclusions:

1. Retirement and survivor benefits for Federal employees, including both short-service and full career employees should be improved.

2. There would be real advantages both to employees and to the Federal service in extending to Federal employees the basic protection the Social Security Act now provides for employees in private industry.

3. Federal employees need both the basic protections of the social-security system and the benefits of a sound and adequate retirement system. Neither should be displaced by or subordinated to the other. For that reason I have joined with the proposal for extension of social-security benefits to Federal employees my proposal for substantial improvement in benefits under the retirement system.

4. An opportunity should be given to all Federal employees to express their views upon their inclusion in the social-security system.

The bill which I have introduced would provide for an increase in the basic formula for computing annuities under the retirement system. It will extend to Federal employees coverage under the social-security system. And it will become effective only if approved by a majority of Federal employees eligible under the retirement system.

Under my bill, the Civil Service Commission would be directed to conduct a referendum, in which each eligible employee would be advised of the proposed substantive changes in the retirement laws. After at least 3 months' notice, each employee would express his wishes by secret written ballot. The substantive changes in the law would become effective only if they are accepted and approved by a majority of affected employees. If a majority do not approve, the bill would not become effective.

Here are the major changes I propose to submit for employee approval or disapproval:

1. The basic formula for computing annuities would be 1¾ percent of average salary times years of service, in lieu of the existing 1½ percent.

2. New appointees would be under social security immediately, and would pay the regular employee tax. The rate is now 2 percent of the first $4,200 of salary. The rate is scheduled to be increased to 2½ percent in 1960; to 3 percent in 1965; to 3½ percent in 1970; and to 4 percent in 1975. The employing agency would pay the employer tax at the same rates.

3. Employees currently subject to civil-service retirement would become also subject to social security. After 3 years of continuous employment new appointees would come under civil-service retirement (as well as social security). Instead of the present salary deduction of 6 percent for civil-service retirement, the deduction rate would be 3½ percent of the first $4,200 of salary and 6 percent on salary over $4,200.

4. Federal employees would receive all social-security benefits for which they qualify under the laws generally applicable to private industry. An employee with 5 years of Federal service would be guaranteed eligibility for social-security survivor benefits in the event of his death. New employees would be eligible for generous survivor benefits after 1½ years of service, and would qualify for old-age benefits after periods ranging from 1½ to 10 years.

5. Present Civil Service Retirement provisions for age and optional retirement eligibility would be retained, as would eligibility for survivor benefits for widows generally. Benefits would be provided for dependent widowers.

6. Annuities payable before age 65 would be computed under the improved formula of 1¾ percent of average salary (or 1 percent of average salary plus $25), multiplied by years

of service. When the retired employee reached age 65, if eligible for a Social Security benefit, his annuity would be reduced by $25 or less for each year of his service. His combined Civil Service Retirement and Social Security benefits would be larger than the annuity he received before age 65.

7. The annuity of an employee retired for disability would be a minimum of 40 percent of average salary, or the annuity he would have earned by age 60 if less.

In summary, my bill would (1) retain and improve the best features of the civil service retirement plan, with its promise of substantial rewards for long service, and (2) by extension of social security coverage to Federal employees, provide greater protection, particularly in the area of survivor benefits.

CARE OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA, AMENDMENTS

Mr. MALONE submitted amendments, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OR SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, together with an explanatory statement of the amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, appropriately referred, and printed; and, without objection, the amendment and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was received, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

On page 78, immediately preceding line 1, insert the following new subsection:

"(u) (1) Section 207 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812, as amended; 5 U. S. C. 191a, 275) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Whenever it is determined that any payment is due and payable under this subsection to any person in consequence of the correction of any military or naval record pursuant to subsection (a), such payment shall be due and payable effective on the date on which application for the making of such correction was filed.'

"(2) Subparagraph I (a) (3) of part I of Veterans' Regulation Numbered 2 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) Where a claim has been finally disallowed, a subsequent claim on the same factual basis, if supported by new and material evidence, shall have the attributes of a new claim, except that whenever any disallowed claim is reopened and thereafter allowed on the basis of new and material evidence resulting from the correction of the military or naval records of the proper Service Department the date of application for the pension so awarded shall be deemed to be the date of receipt of the original application therefor.'

"(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall be effective as of August 2, 1946, except that no payment shall be made for any period before the date of enactment of this subsection unless application therefor is made within 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. LONG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

This amendment is designed to remove an inequity from existing law in connection with those claims for benefits by survivors of military personnel which depend upon obtaining a correction in military records. Under existing law, benefits can be paid only for the period after the change in military records has been accomplished and a new claim filed with the Veterans' Administration.

In my opinion, this is unjust. As anyone knows who has made such an attempt, it is extremely difficult to obtain any correction in military records. Anyone who succeeds in obtaining a formal correction of a record should certainly not be penalized by being denied benefits during the lengthy process which is required.

I should like to emphasize that the scope of this proposed amendment is very narrow. It would apply only to those cases in which a claim for benefits is denied because of entries in official military records. The change in the law would apply only to those cases in which an application to change the military record is subsequently accepted. The only additional benefits which would be paid would be those during the period the application for change in the military record is being processed.

It is my hope that the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration will give their approval to this proposed amendment and that it can be made a part of H. R. 7089, which is scheduled for consideration by the Finance Committee in the near future.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Address delivered by him before the Inland Daily Press Association, Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1956, on the subject of the Communist conspiracy.

By Mr. MORSE:

A statement by him entitled "Enactment of Poultry Inspection Legislation Imperative."

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Letter to Senator NEELY from Senator MCNAMARA, Senator MORSE, and himself relative to mass transportation problems in the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF LOWELL C. PINKERTON TO BE AMBASSADOR TO THE SUDAN

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the Sudan. Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF JAMES W. BARCO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations. Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

CONDITION OF WEST COAST SHIPYARDS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the body of the RECORD a resolution adopted at a recent conference of the International Association of Machinists. This conference, held in Portland, Oreg., my home city, was attended by representatives and delegates of this organization from each port on the Pacific coast.

The general vice president, in a letter to me, points out the very deplorable situation concerning our shipyards in the United States. Mr. President, this letter points out that the United States is now ranked in 10th place, due to the lack of construction and repair of ships.

There are 84 class 1 shipyards on the Pacific coast. Approximately 2,000 machinists are employed, at the last report. This is far from the figure of over 100,000 who worked in these 84 shipyards during the war. Of the thousands no longer employed, undoubtedly a great percentage has been forever lost to the ship-building industry. What, Mr. President, would we do if an emergency arose? Is it possible to recruit quickly and efficiently more than 98,000 machinists? Is it not to prevent such a possible occurrence that the act of May 17, 1938—title 34, United States Code, section 498j—places on the shoulders of the President of the United States the responsibility to see that the shipyards of the west coast are given a sufficient share of the Nation's ship construction and repair to maintain these yards and their manpower in condition for any rapid expansion which an emergency might necessitate? I believe the exact wording of that act reads:

The Navy Department shall construct upon the Pacific coast of the United States such vessels as the President of the United States may determine to be necessary in order to maintain shipyard facilities upon the Pacific coast necessary and adequate to meet the requirements of national defense. (May 17, 1938, ch. 243, sec. 11, 52 Stat. 403.)

Under the conditions described in Mr. McBreen's letter to me, which I have drawn on for information, one may properly ask whether this act is being even loosely adhered to by the present administration.

I know the people in the Northwest will deeply appreciate any action the

White House may take which will implement the statement I have quoted from the act of May 17, 1938.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas since our zone conference of last year, the various agencies of our Government interested in shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities on the Pacific coast, have, along with State agencies, conducted hearings and investigations up and down the Pacific coast checking the facilities of our shipbuilding and ship-repair yards and the availability of skilled manpower; and

Whereas while these hearings and investigations were going on, the American shipbuilding and ship-repair industry has dropped from its 4th place position of 1954, to 10th place in 1955 in the world shipbuilding standings, behind Great Britain, Germany, Japan, Sweden, Holland, France, Italy, Norway, and Denmark; and

Whereas at the present time, according to the latest available statistics, June 1955, there are on order by United States companies and their affiliates, in foreign yards, for foreign registry, over 62 vessels to be built; and

Whereas on the same date United States companies, or their affiliates have on order in United States shipyards only eight vessels: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Pacific Zone Marine Conference of the International Association of Machinists assembled in the city of Portland, Oreg., on this 17th day of January 1956, strongly urges that Congress in session institute a merchant marine and shipbuilding program within the boundaries of the United States to prevent further decay of our shipyard facilities, and the restoration of our merchant fleet, as well as the retention of our skilled craftsmen employed in our private shipyards. That Congress must bring back to the private shipyards in the United States, the shipbuilding and ship-repair work now being done in foreign yards by American companies, and by the Government itself; now, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That if necessary our offshore procurement program be revised to protect our American shipbuilding and ship-repair industry.

S. 3444 WOULD IMPERIL NATIONAL FOREST CONSERVATION POLICIES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement today in opposition to Senate bill 3444, which would most adversely affect my State by leading to elimination of the national forests.

Mr. President, as one of the Senators from a State in which the Federal Government owns 51 percent of all the land, and in which the national forests, owned and managed by the United States Forest Service, are of primary importance to the economy, the water supply, and the recreational opportunities of the people, I am concerned about proposals which look toward dismantling these great national assets under the guise of States rights. Such a proposal is contained in a bill which recently has been introduced in the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]—S. 3444—which would create a series of individual Federal-State land study commissions to develop plans for the disposal of Federal land in the different States. I believe that the objectives of this bill are of such far-reaching importance to States such as Oregon, that it deserves to be brought to the attention of the people of Oregon and other States which are concerned about the protection of the federally held natural resources within their borders.

Senate bill 3444 is based on the views of the present Republican administration regarding the management of the resources which are held by the Federal Government for all the people of this country. According to its sponsor, the bill reflects the ideas of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Real Property Management and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, that Federal lands should be transferred to State or private ownership.

Those study groups recommended a special presidential commission for the purpose of planning and carrying out such transfers on a national basis. But Senate bill 3444 would go beyond that; it proposes an individual commission for each State which requests one, with participation by members nominated by the governor of the State. This would facilitate dismemberment of the public domain, one State at a time. Furthermore, disposal plans prepared by the administration to carry out the recommendations of such a Federal-State land commission would be subject to only a negative veto by Congress—that is, both Houses of Congress would have to adopt a resolution of disapproval within 60 days, in order to block the proposed disposal of Federal land.

Mr. President, among all the lands held by the Federal Government, the 161 million acres of our 150 national forests are the most valuable national asset. Their continued existence and sound management are the keystone to all conservation policy in the United States. Large Western cities, such as Portland, Seattle, and Denver, depend upon national forest watersheds for pure drinking water. The whole pattern of native American wildlife and of outdoor sports such as hiking, camping, hunting, and fishing, depends on these forests. And, as I have said, the timber supply of the Nation and the economy of the States which furnish the supply depend on their maintenance and continued sound management.

Of course, this situation may not be of such great importance in Louisiana; and the junior Senator from Louisiana may not have had the national forests specifically in mind in introducing his bill. But their prominence in value among the Federal public lands is such that we cannot doubt that immense pressures would be brought to bear to have them parceled out to States and private owners, were Senate bill 3444 enacted. The Nation still remembers that only recently we saw an example of these pressures when the Federal offshore oil reserves were turned over to the four States of Texas, California, Louisiana, and Florida. And in the field of timber management we have precedent in regard to what may happen when Federal forest lands are transferred to States. When my own State of Oregon was admitted to the Union, it received 4,203,000 acres of public lands for "school purposes." Of these acres, only 765,000 are still held in trust for schools; yet only $10,771,000 from these lands is held in permanent school-fund accounts. Many valuable stands of Douglas fir were sold by the State legislature for $3.16 an acre, which would be worth $1,000 later on. In view of the history of the management of natural resources in this country, we have little reason to believe that if these lands were to be parceled out among individual State governments, they would be as safe from covetous hands as they have been in the trust of the National Government since the days of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot.

The Federal-State land commissions proposed by Senate bill 3444 would only submit recommendations for land disposal; but there can be no doubt that a policy of widespread disposal would be the whole basis for their existence, and that this administration would carry out their recommendations. Thus it is, in effect, proposed to permit the administration to parcel out the public domain; and Congress would have no further control over this wholesale and retail dismemberment and disposal, except by passing a concurrent resolution in each instance in which it desired to prevent a sale and to retain the property in Federal ownership.

Mr. President, I can see no reason for such an abdication of congressional authority over the Federal lands, and I urge that Senate bill 3444 be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before any action is even begun toward such a radical and far-reaching reversal of our historic conservation policies.

SURVEY AND SPECIAL STUDIES OF SICKNESS AND DISABILITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1741, Senate bill 3076.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3076) to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with an amendment on page 2, in line 11, after the word "secure", to insert "on a noncompulsory basis", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Morbidity Survey Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the latest information on the number and other relevant characteristics of persons in the country suffering from heart disease, cancer, diabetes, arthritis and rheumatism, and other diseases, injuries, and handicapping conditions is now seriously out of date; and

(2) that periodic inventories providing reasonably current information on these matters are urgently needed for purposes such as (A) appraisal of the true state of health of our population (including both

adults and children), (B) adequate planning of any programs to improve their health, (C) research in the field of chronic diseases, and (D) measurement of the numbers of persons in the working ages so disabled as to be unable to perform gainful work.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies to secure on a noncompulsory basis accurate and current statistical information on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States and the services received for or because of such conditions.

SEC. 3. Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. ch. 6A) is amended by adding after section 304 of the following new section:

"NATIONAL MORBIDITY SURVEYS AND STUDIES

"SEC. 305. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to make, by sampling or other appropriate means, surveys and special studies of the population of the United States to determine the extent of illness and disability and related information such as: (1) The number, age, sex, ability to work or engage in other activities, and occupation or activities of persons afflicted with chronic or other disease or injury or handicapping condition; (2) the type of disease or injury or handicapping condition of each person so afflicted; (3) the length of time that each such person has been prevented from carrying on his occupation or activities; (4) the amounts and types of services received for or because of such conditions; and (5) the economic and other impacts of such conditions.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized, at appropriate intervals, to make available, through publications and otherwise, to any interested governmental or other public or private agencies, organizations, or groups, or to the public, the results of surveys or studies made pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) For each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1956, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may determine for carrying out the provisions of this section.

"(d) To assist in carrying out the provisions of this section the Surgeon General is authorized to cooperate and consult with the Departments of Commerce and Labor and any other interested Federal departments or agencies and with State health departments. For such purpose he may also utilize the services or facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, of any appropriate State or other public or private agency, organization, group, or individual, in accordance with agreements between the head of such agency, organization, or group, or such individual, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Payment, if any, for such services or facilities shall be made in such amounts as may be provided in such agreement."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who will make a brief statement in explanation of the bill. I understand that the bill has been reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill has the strong support of the Eisenhower administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Enactment of the bill will meet a very great need—namely, in order that we may have a survey and study of the diseases from which the people of the United States suffer today. Such a study has not been made in the last 20 years. One was made more than 20 years ago by the WPA, but perhaps it was not the most efficient study.

There is a very great need for the making of such a study at this time; and there is an unanimous report on the bill, as I am sure my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], will confirm.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Speaking for the Republican side of the committee, I am happy to join in the statement the Senator from Alabama has made. All of us joined in reporting the bill, which was very carefully studied.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3076) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1742, Senate bill 3246.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3246) to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Alabama, who will make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill would do nothing but increase the authorization for an appropriation for construction of a building to house adequately the National Institute of Dental Research.

I may say that the original bill, as introduced by the late Senator Taft, then chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, carried an authorization of $2 million. Since that time, due to the increase in the cost of many things, we have found that $2 million is not sufficient. This bill will only increase that authorization.

As I have said, the bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will confirm.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, let me say that I am very glad to join him in supporting the bill. Our committee considered it thoroughly, and joined unanimously in reporting it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bil.

The bill (S. 3246) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the National Dental Research Act, approved June 24, 1948 (Public Law 755, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out "$2,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1743, Senate bill 3259.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3259) to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama, who will explain the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say that this bill was also unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill does only one thing, namely, it increases the authorization for an appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind, which, as we know, is in Kentucky. For many years we have made a small appropriation in order that the books published by the American Printing House for the Blind—its books being printed in Braille—may be available to the blind.

Because of the increased cost of so many things today, it is necessary, if we are to meet the need which we have met in the past—namely, the need for education of the blind, that the authorization be increased. I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will confirm what I have said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, let me say I am happy to join him in supporting the bill, which has the support of all members—on both sides of the aisle—of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3259) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph of section 102 of the act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U. S. C. 102), labeled "First" is amended to read as follows:

"First. Such appropriation shall be expended by the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind each year in manufacturing and furnishing books and other materials specially adapted for instruction of the blind; and the total amount of such books and other materials so manufactured and furnished by such appropriation shall each year be distributed among all the public institutions, in the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, in which blind pupils are educated. Each public institution for the education of the blind shall receive, in books and other materials, upon requisition of its superintendent, that portion of the appropriation as is shown by the ratio between the number of blind pupils in that institution and the total number of blind pupils in all of the public institutions in which blind pupils are educated. Each chief State school officer shall receive, in books and other materials, upon requisition, that portion of the appropriation as is shown by the ratio between the number of blind pupils in public institutions (in the State) in which blind pupils are educated, other than institutions to which the preceding sentence is applicable, and the total number of blind pupils in the public institutions in which blind pupils are educated, in all of the States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia. The ratio referred to in each of the two immediately preceding sentences shall be computed upon the first Monday in January of each year; and for purposes of such sentences the number of blind pupils in public institutions in which blind pupils are educated shall be authenticated in such manner and as often as the trustees of the American Printing House for the Blind shall require. For purposes of this act, an institution for the education of the blind is any institution which provides education exclusively for the blind, or exclusively for the blind and other handicapped children (in which case special classes are provided for the blind); the chief State school officer of a State is the superintendent of public elementary and secondary schools in such State or, if there is none, such other official as the governor certifies to have comparable responsibility in the State; and a blind pupil is a blind individual pursuing a course of study in an institution of less than college grade."

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind," approved August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), is further amended by striking out "$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$400,000."

ADJUSTMENT OF RENTALS UNDER LEASES FOR COMMERCIAL RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AT CLARK HILL RESERVOIR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1744, Senate bill 3214.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3214) to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 1, in line 4, before the word "lease", to insert "existing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized to amend any existing lease providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir, entered into prior to the date of the enactment of this act under section 4 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 460d), so as to provide for adjustment, either by increase or decrease, from time to time during the term of such lease of the amount of rental or other consideration payable to the United States under such lease, when and as he determines such adjustment to be necessary or advisable in the public interest. No adjustment shall be made under the authority of this act so as to increase or decrease the amount of rental or other consideration payable under such lease for any period prior to the date of such adjustment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who will explain the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Chief of Engineers, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, to amend any lease for the construction, maintenance, and operation of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir, entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act under section 4 of the act of December 22, 1944, as amended (16 U. S. C. 460d), so as to provide for adjustment of rentals from time to time during the term of such leases when and as he determines such adjustment to be necessary or advisable in the public interest.

The bill was reported favorably by the Department of the Army, and the committee has reported it unanimously.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE YAVAPAI INDIANS OF ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1740, Senate bill 2851. I ask the attention of my distinguished friend from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2851) to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "over", to strike out "approximately"; in line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "eighty-one" and insert "twenty"; in the same line, after the word "land", to insert "more or less"; and on page 2, line 5, after the word "jointly", to insert a comma and "and in the event a survey is required to make such determination, the Department of the Interior shall bear the expense thereof. The transfer shall be subject to such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the Veterans' Administration Center, Whipple, Ariz.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction over 1,320 acres of land, more or less, formerly a part of the Fort Whipple Military Reservation, Ariz., and subsequently transferred to the Veterans' Administration by section 6 of the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1550), is hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and the title to such lands shall be held by the United States in trust for the Yavapai Indians, subject to any valid and existing rights in such lands. The description of the lands hereby transferred shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, jointly, and in the event a survey is required to make such determination, the Department of the Interior shall bear the expense thereof. The transfer shall be subject to such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines to be necessary to protect the interest of the Veterans' Administration Center, Whipple, Ariz.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. It was unanimously reported from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The bill has the support of the Department of the Interior and the Veterans' Administration. All it does is to permit the transfer from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior of certain lands which are not now needed by the veterans, in order that the lands may be used by the Indians in Arizona for grazing purposes.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will confirm what I have said.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was very happy to join with the Senator from Alabama in reporting the bill favorably from our committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTE TO COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation

to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished ranking minority member and former chairman [Mr. SMITH of New Jersey] for their efficient work today. Four bills were unanimously reported from their committee. They were reported only after they had received thorough consideration. I think it is a circumstance we all ought to note. The Senate has sufficient confidence in these men and the thorough work of their committee that four measures of major importance were handled in less than 25 minutes by the Senate.

I am sure I speak for the minority leader when I say that we are grateful for the efficiency and thoroughness which the members of this committee have demonstrated in their committee work.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to express the thanks and appreciation of the committee for the very fine help and cooperation of the distinguished majority leader, and also the very fine cooperation of the minority leader. Both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] have not only been very helpful in expediting the passage of these four bills, but they are always most helpful and cooperative toward the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to add a word to express my appreciation for the cooperation of the majority leader and the minority leader in expediting the passage of these bills. Also I wish to pay special tribute to the chairman of our committee [Mr. HILL] who helped us in expediting the passage of these bills today.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILL. These bills could not have been passed without the very fine help and cooperation, and the enthusiastic support, of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS IN CERTAIN CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1601, Senate bill 2042.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2042) to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to insert a saving clause in section 1346 (d) (2) of the Judicial Code so as to restore to the jurisdiction of the district courts certain wage claims which were pending on October 31, 1951, and which were dismissed solely because the Judicial Code was then amended to take away the jurisdiction of the district courts over claims by employees of the United States for salary or wages.

So far as is known there were only about 100 very small salary claims pending in either the district courts or the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals which were inadvertently prejudiced by the October 31, 1951, amendment.

It should be emphasized that the purpose of this legislation is merely to enable approximately 100 salaried employees of the United States to have a day in court as to whether they are legally entitled to certain salary or overtime payments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., sec. 1346 (d)) is amended as follows:

"(d) The district courts shall not have jurisdiction under this section of—

"(1) any civil action or claims for a pension; and

"(2) any civil action or claim to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of officers or employees of the United States: *Provided*, That the exclusion of claims to recover fees, salary, or compensation from the jurisdiction of the district court as set forth in subsections (d) (1) and (2) of this section shall not affect the jurisdiction of the district courts in cases which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeals on October 31, 1951, and any such pending cases which may have been dismissed by reason of the withdrawal of jurisdiction during their pendency, shall be restored upon petition to the appropriate court."

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it passed S. 2042, to restore jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I did not quite understand the Senator's request.

Mr. STENNIS. I have asked that the Senate reconsider the vote on Calendar No. 1601, S. 2042, which was passed this morning. It has been discovered that there is a companion bill now before the Committee on the Judiciary. It would simplify matters if the Senate would reconsider its vote on the Senate bill, discharge the committee from further consideration of the House bill, and if the Senate were to pass the House bill amended by substituting the text of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 5862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 5862.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The amendment was to strike all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., sec. 1346 (d)) is amended as follows:

"(d) The district courts shall not have jurisdiction under this section of—

"(1) any civil action or claims for a pension; and

"(2) any civil action or claim to recover fees, salary, or compensation for official services of officers or employees of the United States: *Provided*, That the exclusion of claims to recover fees, salary, or compensation from the jurisdiction of the district court as set forth in subsections (d) (1) and (2) of this section shall not affect the jurisdiction of the district courts in cases which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeals on October 31, 1951, and any such pending cases which may have been dismissed by reason of the withdrawal of jurisdiction during their pendency, shall be restored upon petition to the appropriate court."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2042 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LYDIA G. DICKERSON

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is one more bill for which I desire present consideration. The Senate can then return to the morning hour. I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues and their cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calender No. 1615, Senate bill 1687.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1687) for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lydia G. Dickerson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is feebleminded in behalf of the minor child of a United States citizen. The bill has been amended to provide for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of facts contained in the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 6-year-old native and citizen of Germany who presently resides in that country. Her mother was married to Cpl. John Truman Dickerson, a citizen of the United States, on April 13, 1954, in Germany. The beneficiary has been found inadmissible to the United States because she has been certified as being feebleminded. Corporal Dickerson is presently stationed at Fort Riley, Kans., and without the waiver provided for in the bill, the beneficiary will be unable to accompany her mother to the United States for permanent residence.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated July 29, 1955, to the chairman of the Senate Committtee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the case, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 29, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 1687) for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Kansas City, Mo., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would waive the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act which excludes from admission into the United States aliens who are feebleminded and would permit the beneficiary to enter the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible. The bill also provides that this exemption shall apply only to a ground of exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Commissioner.

"MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE LYDIA G. DICKERSON, BENEFICIARY OF S. 1687

"The information concerning the beneficiary was furnished by her natural father, Cpl. John Truman Dickerson, the sponsor of the bill.

"The beneficiary, Lydia G. Dickerson, a native and citizen of Germany, was born on August 9, 1949. She is presently residing at a special speech institute known as Sonnenhaus at Auf Schloss Seckendorff, 13a Unterleinleiter, Germany. Her mother resides in Germany. The beneficiary has never been in the United States and, according to the sponsor, was refused an immigrant visa by the American consul at Munich, Germany, because she was certified by the United States Public Health Service as being feebleminded. The committee may wish to make inquiry of the Visa Office of the Department of State for further information in this connection.

"The sponsor was born on July 9, 1930, at Butler, Mo. He completed 2 years high school. He has served in the United States Army since April 4, 1951, and is presently stationed at Fort Riley, Kans. He has stated that he expects to make the Army his career. Corporal Dickerson was stationed in Germany in 1948 as a civilian at which time he met the beneficiary's mother, whom he married on April 13, 1954. He claims to have adopted the beneficiary in Germany in June 1954. His earnings are about $150 per month and he has cash savings of about $400. He was arrested in 1950 for stealing chickens, which charge was dismissed on October 2, 1951. He has stated that he will take leave and travel to Germany for the beneficiary if she is permitted to enter the United States."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the author of the bill, has submitted the following information in support of the bill:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 18, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Immigration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARLEY: On April 14, 1955, I introduced S. 1687, for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson, copy attached.

This child is the daughter of Cpl. John Dickerson, who is now stationed at Fort Riley, Kans. I have been endeavoring to assist him in bringing his wife and daughter to the States. Mrs. Margarete A. Dickerson was found eligible for a visa in all respects. However, her daughter's case was deferred for 1 year, or until October 14, 1955.

I quote from a letter received from the Visa Office:

"The neuropsychiatric consultant of the United States Public Health Service who examined the 5-year-old child deferred her for 1 year on account of her functioning currently at a retarded intellectual level. The report which the consulate general received from the Public Health Service stated that after the deferral period it will be possible to determine whether schooling will assist in improving her level of functioning."

The reason for the introduction of this bill by me is because I cannot see why a child of that age should not accompany its mother—what should be done? By waiting until the deferral date, next October, and if she were still found not intellectual enough to meet the requirements, then should she be abandoned?

Thanking you for your early and favorable consideration of this legislation, I am,

Sincerely,

STUART SYMINGTON.

On February 3, 1956, the Department of State informed the committee that on the basis of additional tests given the beneficiary following the 1-year deferral period, she is still feebleminded, and, therefore, there is no administrative remedy available.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 1687), as amended, should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SENATE THUS FAR IN THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the Senate for action on the bills which have been disposed of today. I have a brief statement to make for the RECORD, and then I shall yield the floor to my colleagues, who have been so kind and generous in indulging me during the past 25 minutes.

As of March 28, 1956, the Senate has been in session 54 days during 1956. As of March 31, 1955, the Senate had been in session 38 days.

Of the total of 337 Senate and House bills and Senate and House joint resolutions, 117 have been general legislation and 220 private bills. It is estimated that only 40 or 50 of the measures passed by March 1, 1955, were general bills. Fifty of the more important bills passed by the Senate so far this year are listed in a statement which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As of March 28, 1956, the Senate had been in session 54 days. As of March 31, 1955, there had been 38 session days.

Of the total of 337 Senate and House bills and Senate and House joint resolutions, 117 have been general legislation and 220 private bills. It is estimated that only 40 or 50 of the 140 measures passed by March 31, 1955, were general bills. Fifty of the more important bills passed by the Senate so far this year are listed below:

1. H. R. 12, the farm bill: A bill to provide an improved farm program, and including a soil-bank provision.

2. H. R. 8780, the farm gasoline bill: Relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used on the farm, and directs a refund of taxes paid on such gasoline in 1956.

3. House Joint Resolution 471, home disaster relief: Permits the FHA to provide

title I repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

4. H. R. 7871, disaster loans: Increases to $375 million the funds available to the Small Business Administration for disaster loans.

5. S. 2861, emergency highway funds: Authorizes an increase from $10 million to $30 million in emergency relief highway funds for fiscal year 1956, as a result of flood and hurricane damage.

6. H. R. 6645, natural gas bill: Freed independent natural-gas producers from direct Federal (FPC) price control.

7. H. R. 7930, Russian River project: Authorizes completion of the initial stage of development at Russian River Basin, Calif., a flood control and irrigation project.

8. S. 3116, cultural and athletic exchanges: Provides a permanent program for United States participation in international cultural, athletic, and industrial fairs.

9. H. R. 2552, Great Lakes channels: Authorizes the modification of existing connecting channels above Lake Erie, to provide deeper channels on several tributaries.

10. H. R. 6309, Mississippi-gulf outlet: Provides for a new channel between the gulf and the Mississippi waterway system, for deep-draft shipping.

11. H. R. 7036, limitation on retirement income: Increases from $900 to $1,200 the amount a person under 72 can earn before his over 65 retirement credit must be reduced.

12. S. 2990, polio vaccine: Extends to June 30, 1957, authority to make grants to the States, for their provision of Salk vaccine to children and expectant mothers.

13. H. R. 1855, forest research: Authorizes a permanent program of United States contribution to specialized forest, range, and watershed research.

14. H. R. 7236, soil conservation: Authorizes Federal assistance in soil-conservation programs to farmers in all areas, not merely arid sections of the United States.

15. S. 2887, security of juries: Makes a criminal offense the tapping, recording, or unauthorized observance of grand and petit jury deliberations.

16. H. R. 3233, fleeing arson prosecution: Makes it a Federal offense to move across State lines to avoid prosecution or custody for arson.

17. H. R. 7201, life-insurance company tax: Establishes new system of taxing income of life-insurance companies: reforms tax laws on investments by life-insurance companies; and amends the law regarding new insurance companies.

18. H. R. 5614, FCC complaints: Allows the FCC to demur to protests against the authorization of grants, and to dismiss insubstantial protests, after oral argument, without hearings.

19. S. 1456, FCC procedure: Permits the FCC to dispense with certain duplicatory procedures relating to reports and hearings, where communications carriers are jointly owned or where consolidations are desired.

20. S. 1135, Civil Air Patrol: Extends the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to senior CAP members.

21. Executive Q, 83d Congress, 1st session, treaty, commercial samples: Ratified the international convention to facilitate importation of commercial advertising samples.

22. H. R. 8100, submarines to Brazil: Authorizes the loan of 2 reserve submarines to Brazil, for 5 years, and authorizes MDAP payment of outfitting costs.

23. H. R. 6712, tax revision: Amends section 1237 of the code to afford capital gains treatment to corporations or individuals holding foreclosed land for 10 years, subdividing and selling, unless as part of a real estate trading business.

24. H. R. 1726, Federal Seed Act: Provides a civil action for violation of the analysis and labeling provisions of the act.

25. H. R. 8107, Reserve Act amendment: Equalizes, the pay scales of reservists called to 6-month training duty with those of National Guard members, and provides increased medical and disability benefits.

26. H. R. 7030, Sugar Act: Extending to December 31, 1962, the legislation under which domestic and imported sugar is controlled in the United States. Modifies the distribution formula for increased sugar requirements as between domestic and foreign producers and among foreign producers.

27. S. 2884, durum wheat: Extends to the 1956 durum wheat crop the increased acreage allotment provided for 1955.

28. H. R. 8320, school milk-brucellosis programs: Authorizes an additional $10 million for the school-milk program, or from $50 to $60 million; and $2 million for the brucellosis program, or from $15 million to $17 million through June 30, 1956.

29. H. R. 6574, motor-vehicle registration plates: Reestablishes the former fee of $1 for the transfer of motor vehicle registration plates from one vehicle to another during the course of a registration year in the District of Columbia.

30. H. R. 9063, urgent deficiency for 1956 appropriating $64,670,201.

31. H. R. 9064, Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act for 1957, appropriating $3,629,139,000.

32. House Joint Resolution 582, authorizing an additional $13 million for unemployment compensation for Federal employees to be derived from transfer from the appropriation for unemployment compensation for veterans, 1956.

33. H. R. 9770, Federal contribution: Authorizes the annual payment by the Federal Government to be increased $3 million toward the cost of operating the District of Columbia government for fiscal 1957 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

34. S. 1777, disabled—reduced rates: Permits common carriers to transport, for one fare, a disabled person and his attendant, if an attendant is required for such person.

35. S. 2438, Maj. Walter Reed: Amends the act of 1929 which provided a pension of $125 monthly to Major Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever by increasing such pensions to $200 per month.

36. H. R. 2667, Internal Revenue Code: Makes effective December 31, 1947 (now 1950) the estate tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide that there shall not be included in a decedent's estate, property previously transferred in trust as to which the decedent retained certain discretionary powers if for at least 3 months prior to December 31, 1947, and up to his death he was under a mental disability.

37. H. R. 4376, duty free: Adds to the free list of the 1930 Tariff Act, handwoven fabrics imported by religious societies for use in making vestments.

38. H. R. 4582, amends the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, section 381 (c), to permit parent corporations acquiring subsidiary corporations under the 1939 Revenue Code under tax-free liquidations or mergers to deduct from gross income the unused contributions of the subsidiary to pension funds.

39. H. R. 5428, amends the Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that where a transferee or fiduciary by agreement waives the statute of limitations for the assessment of additional income taxes, the statutory period for credits or refunds shall be similarly extended.

40. H. R. 7054, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide an election for executors of a credit against the estate tax for the amount of tax paid on property which passed to the decedent from a spouse who died within 2 years prior to the decedent's death.

41. H. R. 7094, amends the 1939 code to allow for all taxable years governed by that code an unlimited charitable deduction where in 8 out of 10 of the preceding years the individual's contributions to charity and his income-tax payments are equal to 90 percent or more of his taxable income.

42. H. R. 7247, adds to the 1954 Revenue Code a new section which provides for the recognition of no gain in the recapitalization of a railroad corporation under the bankruptcy laws or in receivership proceedings where the property of a transferor corporation is exchanged solely for securities or stock of the transferee.

43. H. R. 7282, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in the computation of credits allowable for the corporate dividends received, dividends paid and Western Hemisphere trade corporations, corporations in determining their adjusted net income shall include their net long-term capital-gain income even though it may have been subject to the alternative 25-percent tax rate.

44. S. 1146, removes requirement that reasonableness of attorney's fees, in regard to claims under Trading With the Enemy Act, be passed on by Alien Property Office.

45. Senate Joint Resolution 95, authorizes the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, and to make its recommendations on the site and design to Congress as early as practicable.

46. H. R. 7634, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the stamp tax the issuance of debt certificates sold under installment arrangements whereby the obligee may not pay more than 20 percent annually of the total maturity value.

47. H. R. 9166, provides a 1-year extension of the present corporate income tax and the existing rates of certain excises, which were scheduled for reduction on April 1, 1956.

48. H. R. 6904, establishes a public national memorial for Booker T. Washington, who, through prodigious efforts and many great contributions to his people and all mankind, was elected to the Hall of Fame.

49. S. 500, Colorado River storage: Authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project.

50. S. 898, trip leasing: Defines the legal standards for truck trip leasing by farmers, farm cooperatives, and private carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Every Member of the Senate, particularly the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], has a right to be proud of the work which has been done by the Senate in less than 90 days since the Congress reconvened in January. The Senator from Maine presided when most of these bills were passed. Efficient committee work, efficient work on the part of presiding officers, and complete understanding between majority and minority leadership, resulted in our passing 412 bills from January 3 to March 28. During the same period last year we had acted upon only 140.

This year we passed 161 House bills. Last year we had passed only 10 at this stage. This year we passed 158 Senate bills. Last year at this time we had passed only 62.

In order that the Senate and the country may realize what we have done during the last 90 days, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement bringing us up to date on the work of the Senate through March 28, and comparing the record this year with the work done during the same period last year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Measures passed by Senate through Mar. 28, 1956

Senate bills	158
House bills	161
Senate joint resolutions	7
House joint resolutions	11
Senate concurrent resolutions	11
House concurrent resolutions	3
Senate resolutions	61
Total	412

Measures passed by Senate through Mar. 31, 1955

Senate bills	62
House bills	10
Senate joint resolutions	3
House resolutions	3
Senate concurrent resolutions	3
House concurrent resolutions	7
Senate resolutions	52
Total	140

At this time we do not have accurate information on how many of the bills passed were general as distinct from private legislation. It would seem a safe guess, however, that at least two-thirds, or 94 of the 140 bills passed were private measures.

As of March 31, 1955, the Senate had been in session 38 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield the floor.

SEIZURE OF PROPERTY OF COMMUNIST PARTY AND COMMUNIST DAILY WORKER

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, very often Federal employees are criticized for their shortcomings and are overlooked when they render an outstanding service.

The bold action of Mr. Donald R. Moysey, new Director of Internal Revenue in the lower Manhattan District in New York, earlier this week when he ordered the seizure of all property, bank accounts, and so forth, owned by the Communist Party and the Communist Daily Worker to secure payment of delinquent Federal income taxes, is action which should be commended.

Several years ago it was discovered that through strict interpretation and drastic enforcement of our Federal income-tax laws we could pick up prominent racketeers in this country. The Communist Party and its membership certainly fall in this category.

Their refusal to disclose their records to the Internal Revenue agents renders them liable for the assessment, and Mr. Moysey is to be commended by every American citizen for calling their bluff. Failure to have collected this tax liability would have meant that every American taxpayer would to that extent be making his contribution to the Communist Party.

Let us hope that the courts will pursue this case to the maximum degree of enforcement.

HARVEY M. MATUSOW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 832, Senate Resolution 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 131) relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is the usual type of resolution which is adopted by the Senate in the case of a person who refuses to testify before a Senate committee. The pending resolution is similar to other resolutions that have been previously adopted by the Senate in such cases.

The RECORD should show that Harvey Matusow was properly served with a subpena to appear before the committee; that he appeared before the committee; that certain questions were asked of him, as set forth in the report; and that he refused to answer the questions after the committee insisted that he answer them.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the committee report (No. 825) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act, and Other Internal Security Laws, of the Committee on the Judiciary, as created and authorized by the United States Senate by Senate Resolution 366, 81st Congress, 2d session, and Senate Resolution 172 agreed to January 27, 1954, and Senate Resolution 49 agreed to February 4, 1955, caused to be issued a subpena ad testificundum to Harvey M. Matusow, of New York, N. Y. The said subpena directed Harvey M. Matusow to be and appear before the said subcommittee on February 21, 1955, at 1 p. m. at their committee room 130B, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify relative to the subject matters under consideration by said subcommittee.

The said subpena was issued February 14, 1955.

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return thereof, by Louis R. Colombo, who was duly authorized to serve such subpena. The return of the service by the said Louis R. Colombo, bearing his endorsement, is set forth as follows:

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

I made service of the within subpena by giving in hand the within-named Mr. Harvey Matusow, at Foley Square, New York City at 4:20 o'clock p. m., on the 14th day of February 1955.

LOUIS R. COLOMBO.

The said Harvey M. Matusow, pursuant to and in compliance with the said subpena, appeared before the said subcommittee as a witness, as required by said Senate Resolution 366, but failed and refused to answer certain questions propounded by the chairman, or by the acting chairman, or by the chief counsel, of the said subcommittee, after being specifically directed to do so by the said chairman and/or acting chairman, which questions were pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry. Excerpts from the records of the hearings, held February 28, March 1, and March 2, respectively, whereat Harvey M. Matusow appeared before the said subcommittee and thereupon refused and failed to answer the said questions as directed, are annexed hereto and made a part hereof and designated "Annex I."

As a result of the refusal of said Harvey M. Matusow to answer the certain questions as aforesaid pursuant to the inquiry of the said subcommittee, as appears in the aforementioned excerpts of the records annexed hereto, the said subcommittee therefore was deprived of evidence pertinent to the subject matter which, under said Senate Resolution 366, the said subcommittee was instructed to investigate and his persistent and illegal refusal to answer questions as ordered, deprived the subcommittee of necessary and pertinent evidence and places the said Harvey M. Matusow in contempt of the United States Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is my understanding that there is no objection to the adoption of the resolution. If there is, I do not know of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.]

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harvey M. Matusow may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

LIESELOTTE BOEHME

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1347, House bill 1667.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Lieselotte Boehme. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee. The bill also provides for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the beneficiary will not become a public charge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of facts appearing in the report of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement of facts was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 32-year-old native and citizen of Germany who last entered the United States on September 15, 1952, as a visitor under bond. The beneficiary resides with her naturalized United

States citizen parents and she also has 1 brother and 2 sisters, who are also citizens of this country. The beneficiary was refused a visa in 1938, when her mother and sister immigrated to the United States because of her mental condition, having been classified as mentally retarded. She resided with an aunt in Germany until 1952, when her aunt died. The beneficiary's parents indicate that they are willing to assume full responsibility for her full support, including a trust fund, and doctors state that her condition is showing improvement.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated April 18, 1955, to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with reference to the case, reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request of the Department of Justice for a report relative to the bill (H. R. 1667) for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the Los Angeles, Calif., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would grant the alien the status of a permanent resident of the United States upon payment of the required visa fee. It also directs that one number be deducted from the appropriate immigration quota. The bill further provides that a suitable bond prescribed in section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act be posed with this Service.

The beneficiary is chargeable to the quota of Germany.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Commissioner.

"MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE LIESELOTTE BOEHME, BENEFICIARY OF H. R. 1667

"The beneficiary, Lieselotte Boehme, a native and citizen of Germany, was born in Mannheim, Baden, Germany, on May 14, 1923. She is single and resides with her naturalized United States citizen parents in Los Angeles, Calif. She is mentally retarded (Mongoloid type) with a mental age of 9 years. The beneficiary is not employed and is completely dependent upon others for care and support, which her parents presently furnish. In addition to her parents, the beneficiary has 1 brother and 2 sisters, all adults, naturalized United States citizens, residing in Los Angeles, Calif. She has no relatives outside of the United States.

"The beneficiary was refused an immigration visa in 1938 when her mother and sister immigrated to the United States, because of her mental condition. She resided in Germany with an aunt until her aunt's death in 1952, at which time she moved to the home of friends in Germany where she remained until arrangements were made for her entry into the United States. She entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on September 15, 1952, being admitted as a temporary visitor until March 14, 1953, under the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, under bond of $1,000. Her temporary stay was subsequently extended to September 14, 1953.

"Application for extension of stay beyond September 14, 1953, was not made due to the fact that private bill H. R. 6634 was introduced in the 83d Congress for the relief of the beneficiary. She was subsequently granted until March 1, 1955, to voluntarily depart from the United States. The beneficiary failed to depart from the United States, consequently deportation proceedings were instituted on March 2, 1955.

"The net worth of beneficiary's father is about $48,000 and that of her brother is about $21,000. She has received regular medical treatment and psychiatric observation since her entry into the United States and doctors have certified that her physical health and mental condition is constantly showing improvement. Members of her family indicate that they are willing to assume full responsibility for her future support, including a trust fund for the beneficiary, in order that she may be permitted to remain in the United States."

Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, the author of the bill, addressed the following letter to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, with reference to the case:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1955.

Re H. R. 1667.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the
Judiciary, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CELLER: On January 6, 1955, I introduced H. R. 1667 which is for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme, a sister-in-law of a constituent, William E. Crane, of Long Beach, Calif.

You may recall that I introduced a similar bill, H. R. 6634, for Miss Boehme's relief in the 1st session of the 83d Congress. Although the appropriate reports were obtained by your committee and the bill was docketed for consideration by Subcommittee No. 1, the legislation was not reached for consideration and action during the second session.

This, in my judgment, is a very worthy case, and I request your assistance in seeing that early consideration is given to the bill which I have reintroduced for the relief of Miss Boehme.

Miss Boehme, who is 29 years of age, is a citizen of Mannheim, Germany, and is here on a temporary visa which expired September 15, 1953. Of course, I have been informed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service that deportation will be stayed until March 1, 1955.

She came to the United States on September 15, 1952, to be reunited with her mother, who is a United States citizen, and to receive medical treatment. She was separated from her mother at the beginning of World War II when she was denied an immigration visa owing to a physical handicap which carried with it sufficient mental aberration to bar her clearance by examining immigration doctors in Stuttgart, Germany.

Miss Boehme's mother left her in the care of an aunt in Germany, who has since died, and came to this country with a younger child believing that within a few months it would be possible for her to bring Lieselotte Boehme to the United States.

Since in this country, Miss Boehme has been under the care of two specialists and her condition has improved remarkably. Although I am told that she is not yet socially competent, she is an excellent domestic worker. Her family in California know that if she is deported, it will be necessary for one of them to return to Germany to care for her.

Although I furnished this same information to the committee when the previous bill was introduced, I believe it will be helpful for you to have it at hand when H. R. 1667 is considered.

Thank you for your courtesy.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, 18th District,
California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA GERSHBEIN RUBINSTEIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1360, Senate bill 1244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "act", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eva Gershbein Rubinstein may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is mentally defective, in behalf of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein, the daughter of a lawful, permanent resident of the United States. The bill also provides for the posting of a bond as a guaranty that the alien will not become a public charge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of facts contained in the report of the committee.

There being no objecion, the statement of facts was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 32-year-old native of Russia, now living in Mexico. Her widowed mother, her 2 brothers, and her 2 sisters are all permanent residents of the United States. One of the sisters is married to a United States citizen, and the other sister has been naturalized. One brother is serving in the United States Armed Forces. The beneficiary was denied a visa to the United States because of feeblemindedness. She supports herself, working as a housemaid and has the equivalent of a fifth-grade education. Her unmarried sister in New York, with whom her mother resides, has agreed to support the beneficiary, if necessary. Without the waiver provided for in

the bill, she will be unable to join her family in the United States.

A letter, with attached memorandum, dated September 1, 1955, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service with reference to the bill, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., September 1, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In response to your request for a report relative to the bill (S. 1244) for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein, there is attached a memorandum of information concerning the beneficiary. This memorandum has been prepared from the Immigration and Naturalization Service files relating to the beneficiary by the New York, N. Y., office of this Service, which has custody of those files.

The bill would waive the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which excludes from admission into the United States aliens who are feebleminded, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

Sincerely,

———,
Commissioner.

"MEMORANDUM OF INFORMATION FROM IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE FILES RE EVA GERSHBEIN RUBINSTEIN, BENEFICIARY OF PRIVATE BILL S. 1244

"Information concerning this case was obtained from Aida Gershbein Rubinstein, who is the mother of the beneficiary.

"Eva Gershbein Rubinstein, born January 10, 1924, is a native of Russia and a citizen of Mexico. She is unmarried and resides as a domestic in the household of Morris Melamed in Mexico City. The beneficiary has the equivalent of a fifth year elementary school education. Her mother, two brothers, and a sister are permanent residents of the United States. Another sister is a United States citizen.

"In 1949, the beneficiary applied at the United States consulate in Mexico City, for a visa to enter the United States. After an examination she was found to be feebleminded and therefore inadmissible into this country.

"Mrs. Aida Gershbein Rubinstein, a 50-year-old widow, was admitted to the United States for permanent residence on February 4, 1949. She resides with her unmarried United States citizen daughter, Rose Gershbein Rubinstein, at 370 Snediker Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., who is employed as a factory worker, and receives a salary of $50 a week. The latter has agreed to provide for the beneficiary, in the event she is admitted to the United States."

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the author of the bill, has submitted a number of letters and documents in connection with the case, among which are the following:

BOSTON, *August 9, 1954.*

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: The following are all the facts which I have at present. Her name is Eva Gershbein Rubinstein; age, 29 years; single. A visa application was filed in November 1946 in her behalf by her mother. At time permission was granted to her by Washington to enter the country. But the health department refused her permission to enter on the grounds that she had a mental age of 7. For the next 7 years, no application for a visa was filed. Her family (mother, 2 brothers, and 3 sisters) were granted their visas and they left her here alone. About 2 months ago, I took an interest in this case but did not file a visa application. The Embassy informed me that it would be useless unless the health department gave her a clean bill of health. I took her to see the health officer who advised me that it would be necessary to give her some mental tests. We did this and the reports favored her but not sufficient to convince the health officer that she was mentally well. He classified her as feebleminded. He was also worried that her condition might be hereditary. There is no insanity or related disease in her family. The Mexican psychiatrists have stated that they do not believe that it is hereditary. The girl has expressed a willingness to undergo an operation so that she will not ever have any children if it is necessary. About a year ago, she underwent an operation to change the contour of her face because people have remarked that she resembles a feebleminded person. She talks coherent with me at all times but when she is in the presence of doctors, she becomes nervous. She is able to talk, read, and write intelligently. At the present time, she is working as a maid. Her work consists of washing clothes, ironing, and cleaning the house in general. She makes the food, does the shopping for the house and answers the telephone. She buys her own clothes and is dependent on no one. She understands directions perfectly and is punctual. She has a very good memory and knows her way around the city better than most of us. She is very friendly and never has moods of sadness, etc. Her entertainment consists of movies and reading. She likes to dress well and uses lipstick and makeup. If you wish to check with the psychiatrists, I will give you their addresses: Dr. Marin Foucher, consultorios medicos, Sinaloa No. 9, Mexico, D. F.; Dra. Lemberger, Estraburger No. 5–C, Mexico, D. F.

Her entire family are now living in the United States. Two of her sisters are married to American citizens. One brother is in the Army. They will be responsible for her financial support. We can also obtain various affidavits of people willing to be responsible for her. If you need them, I shall be very glad to obtain same for you.

I sincerely hope that the above information will be sufficient for you to introduce a private bill in her behalf. If you wish any further information, I shall be very happy to send it to you.

Thank you once again for all your help in this matter. Once again, I would like to say that you would not be making a mistake if you should be able to get her into the United States.

Hoping to hear from you as soon as conveniently possible, I am,

Cordially yours,
MURRAY H. RITTENBERG,
Counselor at Law.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

To Whom It May Concern:

I wish to vouch for Eva Gershbein. I am a citizen of the United States having been born here. I am 40 years of age. I am in business at 4707 Church Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. I have been at this store for 7 years, prior to that I was in business at the King Diamond Market at Ralph Avenue and Avenue A, Brooklyn, N. Y., for 6 years ever since I came out of the United States Army.

I have my account at the Manufacturers Trust Co. at Church Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. I can refer you to the wholesale fruits and vegetable merchants I deal with, if you like. The merchants are as follows: Polen Bros., M. Finer, and C. English, all of Osborne Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
MEYER FRIEDMAN.

P. S.—I am a brother-in-law to Ann Levine, Eva Gershbein's sister.

Sworn to before me this 17th day of December 1954.

[SEAL] SOLOMON I. SHAPIRO,
Notary Public, State of New York.
My commission expires March 30, 1956.

HY KRAUS ORCHESTRA,
Brooklyn, N. Y., January 13, 1955.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Hyman Kraus, I vouch for Eva Gershbein. I am a citizen of the United States for the past 36 years, having been born and resided in the metropolitan area all my life.

I am married, have two adopted children and own my own home.

I am an orchestra leader and have been in business for the past 10 years. I have my account at the Lafayette National Bank on Bay Parkway, Brooklyn.

I have known the Gershbein family for the past 6 years and can also vouch for their honesty, integrity, and good citizenship. If there is any other information you may require, I am at your service.

Yours very truly,
HYMAN KRAUS.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of Kings:

Acknowledged to before me.
NATHAN D. ORUN,
Notary Public, State of New York.
Commission expires March 30, 1955.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (S. 1244), as amended, should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eva Gershbein Rubinstein may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are still in the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, that concludes consideration of all measures with the exception of the unfinished business, and I am prepared to bring it up at this time. If the distinguished Senator from Oregon desires to address the Senate, I shall wait before suggesting the absence of a quorum.

There are only 16 bills remaining on the Senate Calendar, and this would be a good time for the chairmen of committees to get their committees to report those measures, because the Senate is in position to consider them.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] has indulged me, and I now yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT A REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the special committee appointed to investigate the statements made on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] during the natural-gas bill debate be allowed to file its report in vacation during the Easter adjournment. I may state that the committee has finished its work, and the report may be filed even tomorrow, but I ask unanimous consent that we may be permitted to file the report during the Easter vacation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, now pending before the Committee on Finance. I wish to have the amendment printed and sent to that committee. The amendment is a technical amendment and provides that if a child before becoming 18 years of age or at 18 years of age is totally and permanently disabled, his benefits may be continued after the passing of the father or the mother from whom he received some assistance until he became 18 years of age, but whose assistance ceases at age 18. That is a great defect in our present social security law.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. GEORGE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

The amendment I am proposing would remedy a serious defect in the bill as it applies to disabled children over 18.

We are all familiar with the situation faced by people who have the care of a child who never grows up, because of a mental deficiency, or who requires constant care throughout his entire life. Fortunately most of us do not have the care of such a child, but we are all aware of the heartaches the parents of such a child must endure. Their suffering is the more acute because they are constantly concerned about what will happen to the child when they can no longer care for him or when the father's income is cut off by retirement.

The present social-security law ignores the plight of these unfortunate children and their parents. The father will probably qualify for monthly benefits under social security when he retires at age 65 or later, and if he has a child under age 18 at that time the child can get a benefit equal to one-half the father's benefit. The mother also gets a benefit, which makes it easier for her to stay at home and care for the dependent child or children. But benefits for a child stop when he reaches 18, regardless of whether the child is still dependent because of mental or physical incapacity. Thus the problem remains unsolved after the child reaches 18. A child who is over 18 when his father retires cannot get social-security benefits at all, even though he is just as dependent on his father as he was before he reached 18.

H. R. 7225 would meet the problem in the first situation, where the child was under 18 when the father retired or died. In this situation, a child who was disabled before 18 would continue to receive his benefits after reaching 18. The mother caring for him would also receive benefits. It is estimated that about 1,000 children would benefit immediately under this provision. But this provision of the bill does not meet the problem in the second situation, which I am convinced is much the more common, where the child is over 18 when the father retires or dies. Reports of the Social Security Administration show that of the men who first became entitled to old-age insurance benefits in 1954 only 4 percent had children under 18 who were awarded benefits. Thus the chances are that if any of these workers had a disabled child, the child was already over 18 before the father retired. The amendment I am proposing would enable a child totally disabled before 18 who has always been dependent on his parents to draw benefits whenever the parent who has been supporting him retires or dies regardless of how old the child may be at that time.

The cost of paying benefits in these additional cases would be negligible. The cost of the disabled child's benefits provided by the bill has been estimated as under one-hundredth of 1 percent of payroll. Even if my amendment should cost several times as much, the cost would still be negligible.

I realize that there may be some opposition to this proposal on the administrative ground that if a child is, say, 40 years old when he first applies for benefits it may be difficult to prove that he was totally disabled before 18 and has always been dependent on his parents. I believe, though, that most of the cases will be those of children congenitally disabled who have never worked and who obviously could never work. Some few cases might present difficulties, but I do not think they will be too great or that the possibility of running into a few administrative problems is sufficient reason for refusing benefits to this most deserving group. My thought in making benefits available to disabled children regardless of their age would be that it would be the responsibility of the claimant to prove that he met the requirements for benefits. The burden of proving that he had been totally disabled before age 18 and had continued to be dependent on his parents would rest with him. Of course, he would not have to prove that he became disabled on any exact date—only that he was totally disabled before he reached age 18. In the few cases where the claimant could not prove conclusively that he met the requirements, he would not receive benefits.

The fact that a provision of this kind could be administered without undue diffculty is proved by the recent experience of the railroad retirement system. Before 1954, the survivor benefits for children under the railroad retirement system were limited to children under 18, as they are under social security. The Railroad Retirement Act was amended in 1954 to provide that a survivor annuity (as the benefits are called in that program) may be paid to a disabled child aged 18 or over if the child was totally and permanently disabled before age 18, and to the child's widowed mother if the child is in her care. This provision applies not only to children who become disabled before the provision went into effect but also to those who became disabled at any time before enactment of the provision, subject only to the limitation that the disability must have begun before age 18.

The disabled children awarded railroad retirement benefits through June 1955 were on the average 35 years old when their railroad retirement annuity began. Over half of the 922 children awarded benefits during this period had become disabled before 1937, when the railroad retirement system came into existence. It is my understanding that the Railroad Retirement Board has experienced no appreciable difficulties with these cases because most of the applicants were helplessly crippled either mentally or physically, or both, and have never been employed. I can see no reason why such a provision could not be administered with equal success by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I strongly recommend to the Congress this amendment which would bring peace of mind and much-needed financial assistance to the parents who carry the burden of a permanently disabled child. For a very small cost, my amendment will bring a rich return in increased family security.

LIABILITY OF MARITIME ACADEMY GRADUATES FOR ACTIVE NAVAL SERVICE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not in excess of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maine may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on March 15 I called to the Senate's attention the effect that a recent Navy Department announcement that graduates of State maritime academies will serve on active duty for 3 years will have on our American merchant marine. At that time I stated that I had written a letter of protest to the Chief of Naval Personnel. Since Admiral Holloway, Chief of Naval Personnel, has replied to my letter, I wish to briefly review the situation to point up the urgency of this matter, to demonstrate as clearly as I am able, the source of the problem and to indicate the course of action that should be taken.

Up to January 1, 1953, students in both the State and Federal maritime academies were appointed as Reserve midshipmen in the Navy while attending school and were commissioned as ensigns in the Naval Reserve upon graduation. While in school they were exempt from draft registration or service and there was no obligation on the Navy to call such students to active duty. This program was entirely consistent with the Navy's requirements. In his recent letter to me, Admiral Holloway stated in part as follows:

Briefly, the Navy's interest in the maritime academies stems from the national defense

requirement for an adequate merchant marine manned by well-trained officers possessing an understanding of naval procedures and capable of operating with the Navy in time of war. To the extent that bugetary limitations permit, the Navy has participated, and desires to continue to participate, in the training of such officers by teaching naval science courses in the academies.

The Navy does not however, require nor desire the operation of any merchant marine school for the purpose of producing Naval Reserve officers. It conceives of these schools as primarily and essentially required for the manning of our merchant marine.

Unfortunately the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 withdrew statutory recognition of the Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve. At the urgent request of the Maritime Administration the Navy set up a temporary program for appointing maritime academy students as officer candidates, with the understanding that the Department of Commerce would propose legislation to continue the program as conducted before January 1, 1953. Such legislation was introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], as S. 1748 and was passed by the Senate on July 30, 1955. The bill is presently before the House Armed Services Committee where no action has been taken, and none is scheduled, because of objections entered by the Department of Defense subsequent to Senate passage of S. 1748.

As a result students presently in attendance at the maritime academies, who entered after January 1, 1953, are, under an agreement between the Commerce and Navy Departments, officer candidates in the Naval Reserve, and the Navy is required by law to call such federally subsidized officer candidates to active duty. The Navy's recent announcement which prompted my remarks on March 15 was not because of the Navy's need for new officers, but rather because of the situation already indicated. As a matter of fact the Navy is reluctant to have to call all maritime academy graduates since this might require the curtailing of normal naval officer procurement programs. Therefore, the Navy does not wish to continue the officer candidate program for the maritime academies. Unless some action is taken soon, the unfortunate result will be that the Navy will have to withdraw its support of the maritime academies, contrary to its own desires and contrary to the needs of the academies, to say nothing of being contrary to the national interest.

When S. 1748 was under consideration by the Senate last year, it was actively supported by the Navy Department, and Admiral Holloway testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee recommending passage of the bill. Since that time the Navy Department, in order to comply with Department of Defense policy, has been forced to withdraw its support of the measure. The Department of Defense insists that the bill be amended to provide that merchant-marine students be given only a deferred status rather than the exempt status provided in the bill. The effect of this would be to compel the Navy to call such students to active duty upon the conclusion of their education and prior to service in the merchant marine. In other words, if the views of the Department of Defense were followed the situation that now exists would not be changed at all, except that the students would be called midshipmen rather than officer candidates.

The Department of Defense has taken the position that to be consistent with the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 it cannot support an exemption of students that does not lead to active military service. In view of the demonstrated importance of the American merchant marine, which has been repeatedly recognized by President Eisenhower, and in view of the fact that the Senate expressed its belief that the maritime academies meet a special defense need and should be exempt from normal draft and service requirements when it passed S. 1748, it seems to me that the position of the Department of Defense is unreasonable, unrealistic, and untenable. In effect, it refuses to recognize the importance of the merchant service. The result of this refusal has led to one of the worst stalemates I have ever seen.

Because of the fact that unless some action is taken the merchant marine academy graduates of this year will all go into the Navy and thus severely impair the merchant service, I believe the Congress should pass S. 1748 without delay and so clearly express the fact that maritime academy graduates are needed in the merchant service, an important segment of our national defense establishment, and that they should not be subject to active military service to the detriment of the merchant marine. In this connection I strongly recommend that the Department of Defense immediately withdraw its opposition to S. 1748.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Admiral Holloway and a copy of his reply, together with a copy of a letter I have sent today to the Secretary of Defense urging that the Department of Defense withdraw its opposition to S. 1748, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 8, 1956.

Vice Adm. J. L. HOLLOWAY, USN,
Chief of Naval Personnel,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMIRAL HOLLOWAY: It has recently come to my attention that the Navy Department, in a letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel to the heads of the Departments of Naval Science at the four State maritime academies, dated February 27, 1956, serial Pers-B6262-raa, has announced its decision to exercise its legal authority to require all federally subsidized graduates of the State maritime academies to serve 3 years of active duty in the Navy immediately upon graduation.

The action of the Navy Department in this matter is directly contrary to the policy that has been followed in recent years. Until the letter referred to above was issued, State maritime academy graduates were going on active duty on a purely voluntary basis.

As a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over the maritime academies, both State and Federal, I was appointed last year to a special subcommittee to make a thorough study of merchant marine training and education. As acting chairman of the subcommittee, I held extensive hearings at the east coast academies, and in Portland, Boston, and Washington. The subcommittee filed its report in January, which was adopted by the full committee and submitted to the Senate. A copy of this report is attached.

In consequence of the wealth of information gathered by the special subcommittee, I am very well informed as to the need of the American merchant marine for well-trained officers. The study clearly established that the merchant marine requires between 1,000 and 1,600 newly licensed officers each year. On the average, the four State maritime academies and the Federal academy graduate about 450 officers each year. On the basis of a highly optimistic estimate no more than 500 new officers come into the merchant marine each year from nonacademy sources. From this it can readily be seen that the supply of trained officers in the merchant marine is inadequate to meet the demand.

Of the 450 annual graduates of the maritime academies, somewhat over half are federally subsidized students and come under the authority of the Navy to serve on active duty. It would seem to go without saying that if the supply of trained officers is already inadequate to meet the needs of the merchant service a further reduction in excess of 225 annually will have an extremely damaging effect.

I am advised that for fiscal 1955 the Navy required 10,488 new officers, and that requirement was fully met from what might be termed "normal sources," that is principally the Naval Academy, the NROTC, the OCS program, and the ROC program. The maritime academies were not a source of active duty naval officers beyond the voluntary service of individuals. For fiscal 1956, I am informed that the Navy expects to require about 11,668 new officers and that this need will be met from the normal sources exclusive of the maritime academies.

The present decision to call all maritime academy graduates under the Navy's jurisdiction to active duty appears to be based on the very tentative estimates of needs for fiscal 1957. In view of the severe damage that would be done to the merchant marine, it would seem that if the Navy expects to require a significantly greater number of new officers in fiscal year 1957 and after, serious consideration should be given to expanding the existing normal sources of naval officer supply, particularly the OCS program, since it appears to be the most flexible.

The fact that the recent letter did not apply to the Federal Maritime Academy at Kings Point is a cause of some concern to me. If it is necessary for the Navy to call up maritime academy graduates it does not seem fair or appropriate that graduates of Kings Point should be excluded.

In view of the foregoing, I wish to strongly urge that the Bureau of Naval Personnel carefully reconsider its decision to call maritime academy graduates to active duty. The need to maintain a strong, efficient merchant marine goes without saying, and the recent decision of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will do incalculable harm to this vital segment of our National Defense Establishment.

It will be appreciated if the Bureau of Naval Personnel will review this matter at the earliest opportunity and advise me of its views.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1956.

Hon. F. G. PAYNE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: This is in reply to your letter of March 8, 1956, wherein you

strongly urge that I reconsider my decision with respect to calling Merchant Marine Academy graduates to active duty and you stress the importance of these graduates to meet the demand for trained officers for the merchant marine. You indicate that the study made by the special subcommittee under your chairmanship clearly established that the merchant marine requires between 1,000 and 1,600 newly licensed officers each year, but that academy sources can only produce about 450 officers and that nonacademy sources are optimistically estimated not more than 500 each year. Your information is correct that the Navy did meet its officer requirements for fiscal year 1955, and plans to meet the requirements in fiscal year 1956 from normal sources; that is, principally the Naval Academy, the NROTC, the OCS, and ROC programs. Further, the Navy can meet its officer requirements through these normal sources without reliance on the merechant marine academies in the future.

At the very outset, I wish to state that both the Secretary of the Navy and I are in full accord with the philosophy expressed in your letter to the effect that the primary purpose of the merchant marine academies is to supply the need for well-trained officers for the merchant marine in order to support a strong merchant marine, a vital segment of our national defense establishment.

The Navy's interest in the maritime academies has been restated many times to the Congress, to Department of Commerce, to maritime academy officials, and other interested parties. Briefly, the Navy's interest in the maritime academies stems from the national defense requirement for an adequate merchant marine manned by well-trained officers possessing an understanding of naval procedures and capable of operating with the Navy in time of war. To the extent that budgetary limitations permit, the Navy has participated, and desires to continue to participate, in the training of such officers by teaching naval science courses in the academies.

The Navy does not, however, require nor desire the operation of any merchant marine school for the purpose of producing naval Reserve officers. It conceives of these schools as primarily and essentially required for the manning of our merchant marine.

Pursuant to law, all federally subsidized officer candidates (merchant marine) attending either at the United States Merchant Marine Academy or any of the four State academies are obligated to serve 3 years on active duty upon graduation. The action recently taken in my letter of February 27, 1956, was intended to clarify the active duty obligation and not a change in policy to impose an active duty obligation. This move was not made in order to meet the contemplated needs of the service for officers since this need can be met through normal sources of naval officer procurement without reliance upon the merchant marine academies.

In order to properly apprise you of the current situation, it may be well to sketch, in brief, developments leading to the requirement of active duty for officer candidates (merchant marine).

Events leading up to the requirement of active duty are contained in the attached letter of August 12, 1954, to the then Maritime Administrator, Mr. Louis S. Rothschild. I have underlined in red those pertinent thoughts in the letter and made certain footnotes reflecting current information. Substantially, the temporary officer candidate (merchant marine) program was established at the urgent request of the Maritime Administration and officials of the State academies as an interim procedure due to a lack of statutory authority to continue the merchant marine midshipman program which required no active duty. This was done only with the understanding that legislation would be proposed by the Department of Commerce which would continue the program as operated prior to January 1, 1953, the effective date of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, which withdrew recognition of the Merchant Marine Reserve of the Naval Reserve.

Legislation in the form of S. 1748, sponsored by the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce and supported by me at that time, passed the Senate July 30, 1955. It would permit cadets at the Federal and State merchant marine academies to be appointed as Reserve midshipmen in the United States Navy and would provide for their exemption from registration and service while serving as such midshipmen.

The Secretary of Defense has recently indicated that he is opposed to the present wording of pending legislation, S. 1748. Specifically, he has indicated that, consistent with the intent of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, the Department of Defense is opposed to any exemption for students with a military status which does not lead directly to active duty or active duty for training with the Armed Forces upon graduation and commissioning.

The Secretary of Defense further states that S. 1748, before it can be supported by the Department of Defense, must be reworded to provide for merchant marine students to be placed in a deferred status similar to the NROTC student rather than in an exempt status. This would require the Navy to bring all merchant marine graduates to active duty for 2 or 3 years or for 6 months' active duty for training. This, in effect, would continue the temporary officer candidate (merchant marine) program, except that such individuals will be known under another military name. The Chief of Naval Personnel and the Secretary of the Navy have continually maintained the position that a long-term commitment to place all such graduates on active duty is objectionable to the Department of the Navy and that any such procedure would be inconsistent with the Navy's own officer procurement programs. I am taking the liberty of enclosing a letter of March 8, 1956, to Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which further reflects the Department of Defense and Department of Navy's position with respect to subject matter. Accordingly, the Department of the Navy is unable to support S. 1748 under the present circumstances.

In view of the foregoing, it can readily be seen that I am placed in that position of having to take action to bring officer candidates (merchant marine), as distinguished from merchant marine midshipmen, to active duty whether or not they are attending the United States Merchant Marine Academy or any of the four State academies.

In view of your extensive knowledge of merchant marine training and education, I can appreciate your position with respect to this matter, and again, believe me, it is regretted that the Navy cannot relieve officer candidates (merchant marine) who are prospective graduates from immediate active duty. However, realizing that certain of the officer candidates (merchant marine) attending the State academies understood that they would be required to serve only 2 years, I am advising them that they will only be obligated for 2 years, and not 3 years. It should be noted, however, that those who executed contracts for 3 years will be required to serve on active duty for the agreed period.

May I assure you that the entire matter is receiving my personal attention, and that of the Secretary of the Navy under whose policy aegis I execute the statutory duties of my office. If there is any further information that you desire, or any amplification of the points I have discussed, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

With high esteem and kind regards, believe me, my dear Senator, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. L. HOLLOWAY, Jr.,
Vice Admiral, United States Navy,
Chief of Naval Personnel.

MARCH 29, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Prior to January 1, 1953, students at the State and Federal maritime academies were appointed as midshipmen, Merchant Marine Reserve, United States Naval Reserve, by the Secretary of the Navy. Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (title 50, U. S. C., app. sec. 456 (a)), they were relieved of liability for registration and active military service. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, which became effective January 1, 1953, withdrew statutory authority to appoint midshipmen, merchant marine reserve, United States Naval Reserve.

For some time the Navy Department has given support to the maritime academies because of the importance of the merchant marine and the need to have the merchant marine prepared to work closely with the Navy in time of war. To the best of my knowledge the Navy has never considered the maritime academies as a source of naval officers and does not desire to do so today.

The effect of the 1952 legislation was to withdraw the justification on which the Navy contributed to the operation of the maritime academies. At the urgent request of the Maritime Administration, the Navy instituted a temporary program to appoint maritime academy students as officer candidates. This action was taken with the understanding that legislation would be prepared to reinstate the midshipmen program. The Navy Department, at that time, realized that by appointing students as officer candidates they would not be exempt, but only deferred, and that upon commissioning, the Navy would be compelled to call them to active duty. This is undesirable both because of the damage to the merchant marine which needs 1,000 to 1,600 new officers annually and because if the Navy is required to call these graduates to active duty, it may force a curtailment of normal naval officer procurement programs.

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH introduced a bill (S. 1748) on April 20, 1955, which would provide statutory authority to appoint midshipmen, merchant marine reserve, United States Naval Reserve, retroactive to January 1, 1953. When this bill was considered by the Senate Armed Services Committee, it was actively supported by the Navy Department. It was passed by the Senate on July 30, 1955, and is now before the House Armed Services Committee.

During the congressional recess last fall the Department of Defense indicated its opposition to the bill and the Navy Department withdrew its support to conform with Department of Defense policies. This opposition is based on an interpretation of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, under which the Department states it is forced to oppose any exemption during training which does not lead to active military duty. However, if the bill were amended to conform to the position taken by the Department of Defense it would not help the present critical situation.

As the problem now stands, the maritime academies are 1 of the 2 principal sources of merchant-marine officers. The merchant marine annually needs more officers than these sources can supply. Without the adoption of S. 1748, the Navy will be compelled to call graduates to the maritime academies to active duty to the severe detriment of the

merchant marine. The Navy may also be forced to withdraw its support of the academies which would be contrary to the best interests of both the Navy and the merchant marine, to say nothing of being contrary to overall national security interests.

President Eisenhower and the Congress have repeatedly recognized the merchant marine as a vital segment of the National Defense Establishment. In the particular problem at hand, the Senate of the United States has expressed itself as favoring the exemption of maritime academy students because of the particular needs of the merchant service. Therefore, it appears that the position taken by the Department of Defense is unreasonable and untenable as well as contrary to the best interests of the United States as clearly stated by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

For these reasons I strongly urge that the Department of Defense withdraw its opposition to S. 1748 in order that action may be taken expeditiously to prevent possible severe injury to the effectiveness of the American merchant marine. It will be appreciated if you will advise me at the earliest practicable date of the Department's final position in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
United States Senator.

FIVE HEROIC RUMANIAN EXILES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "Are They Heroes or Criminals?" written by Peggy Mann, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1956.

The article describes a splendid broadcast over channel 4 of the National Broadcasting Co., on Tuesday, March 20, 1956, sponsored by the Armstrong Circle Co.

The broadcast, entitled "The Five Who Shook the Mighty," told the story of the 5 heroic Rumanian exiles who in February 1955 seized the Communist Rumanian Embassy in Bern Switzerland, held it for several days, and captured immense amounts of documentary material on the Soviet spy network which operates out of Switzerland in many European countries. The material included the latest Soviet secret directives to the Communist parties of Western Europe. The five young men were arrested by the Swiss Government, which refused to extradite them to Communist Rumania. Their trial will be held shortly in Switzerland. Their legal defense is being conducted by Mr. Mihail Farcasanu, president of the League of Free Rumanians, 47 East 61st Street, New York City.

The broadcast was one of a series of vigorously anti-Communist broadcasts sponsored by the Armstrong Circle Co. and televised by the National Broadcasting Co.

I warmly congratulate these two companies for informing the television audience of climactic chapters in the story of Soviet expansion and anti-Communist resistance. The telling of this story over mass communication media is vital to our national defense and our ability to win ultimate victory over the Communist conspiracy against the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THEY HEROES OR CRIMINALS?

(By Peggy Mann)

BERN, SWITZERLAND.—Four young men will go on trial here next month for a crime which has never before been committed.

The question is, Was it a crime—a mockery of international law—or was it an act of heroism that gave help to the free world and hope to Europe's enslaved?

It began in February 1955, in a small furnished room in the West German town of Konstanz. Five young men and a girl sat intently around a table spread with maps.

The girl must remain nameless. She was young, and to Oliviu Beldeanu, the leader of the group, she was beautiful; they were in love, Beldeanu and this Rumanian refugee girl he had met in Munich.

Beldeanu, too, was Rumanian. He had graduated from the Bucharest School of Fine Arts, a talented sculptor. He had taken to the mountains to fight in the resistance movement. In 1949, when arrest was imminent, he had fled to Yugoslavia. There, in forced labor camps, he had met the four young Rumanians who sat with him now around the table.

There was Ion Chirila, called the Colt. There was Soare Codrescu, an auto mechanic. There was Dumitru Ochiu, shy and mild. And there was Theodore Ciochina, nicknamed Dorel, which means longing.

This was what they had lived for—the hope that some day they would find a way to help their countrymen. Their will to help was typified by Dorel Ciochina when he wrote a letter to the American Army:

"I am a fine driver. I could drive a tank, and in danger I would not run away. This is certain. I could not, for I have no legs."

All were members of the League of Free Rumanians. Through his work in the resistance movement, Beldeanu had learned that on the night of February 14 new directives to Communist parties throughout Western Europe would be issued by Moscow. These directives were to be distributed through the Rumanian Legation in Bern.

At 7 p. m. on the night of February 14 the chauffeur of the Rumanian Legation would drive from Bern to the airport in Zurich. This chauffeur was in fact a top-ranking Communist agent, Arel Setu. At the airport Setu would meet an emissary from Bucharest, who would hand him a briefcase containing the new directives.

If the five young Rumanians were waiting for Setu when he returned to the legation, if the directives were to find their way into western hands—

Dorel Ciochina had a car—part payment for a pair of legs. He had been run over in Munich and granted 30,000 marks (about $7,500) insurance. He had bought a Volkswagen and made his way to Bern. His four friends had crossed Lake Constance by rowboat and met him in the Swiss capital.

The Volkswagen drove slowly down the Schlosslistrasse and drew up before No. 5, a building flying the hammer and sickle of the new Rumanian flag.

Silently, four masked figures climbed out of the car and scaled the 6-foot wall of the legation. Beldeanu knocked at a door of a small chalet to the side of the main building. It was opened by the wife of the chauffeur. He clapped his hands over her mouth. They gagged her and bound her in a chair.

Quickly they pried open desk drawers, filing cabinets; stuffed papers, documents, records into suitcases they had brought with them.

In the cellar, they discovered a virtual arsenal, with ammunition, automatic weapons, time bombs. There was also a short-wave transmitter and a collection of Swiss police and army uniforms.

Twenty-six-year-old Soare Codrescu was alone upstairs when the front door opened and Setu entered. Codrescu, gun in hand, demanded the chauffeur's briefcase.

Setu, a burly man, walked forward, "What are you doing here, boy? Playing games?"

Setu lunged forward, refusing to obey Codrescu's demand to halt. The young Rumanian stepped back and shot the Communist in the leg. Setu turned, staggered out of the door and fell into the snow. Within minutes the chauffeur's briefcase, along with other document-filled suitcases, was hidden in the Volkswagen and Chiochina drove off swiftly toward the West German border.

The other four might easily have left with him. Instead, Ochiu was dispatched on foot as a decoy.

Beldeanu, Chirila, and Codrescu ran into the legation building to fulfill the second portion of their plan. Entering the lobby, they beheld startled staff members in nightclothes peering over the banisters. They had been awakened by the shot.

Under Beldeanu's watchful pistol, staff members were permitted to don garments tossed to them by Beldeanu's companions. They were told to take Setu with them, but they did not stop in their haste to get out of the building.

The following morning the historic Rumanian flag flew above the building. Two hundred Swiss policemen surrounded the grounds and the crowds grew as the day wore on.

The Swiss could do nothing, for the Rumanian chargé d'affaires had not received instructions from Bucharest and he could not allow Swiss police to enter the legation. How, for example, could he account for the munitions, arms and Swiss uniforms?

The Swiss council of ministers hurriedly met. Notes were exchanged between Bern and Bucharest.

Finally Bucharest authorized the Swiss police commission to enter the legation and take the masked men into custody. But the young men would not come forth. They told the commissioner that by taking back this small portion of Rumanian soil, even for a matter of hours, he could dramatize the struggle for the satellite nations.

They had taken a solemn vow not to leave. The young Rumanians were in earnest, the police commissioner reported. They had barricaded themselves inside and had guns, gas masks and ampoules of poison.

The Communist Rumanian Government threatened to break off diplomatic relations with Switzerland for failure to extradite the bandits of Bern.

Later, the Swiss council of ministers came to a firm decision. Despite threats, they would not extradite the men if they asked asylum. When this was communicated to them * * * 43 hours after the siege had begun * * * the three masked men surrendered to the Swiss authorities and were driven off to jail.

One of their companions, Ochiu, already had been arrested. Ciochina later was arrested in West Germany and he, too, will be tried after the Bern trial.

What did the young Rumanians achieve with their unprecedented raid? The concrete results may never become completely known publicly, but here are a few results that were released:

Through two large code books which they found in the chauffeur's safe, western authorities were able to decode messages sent by the Rumanian Government during the previous 6-month period to all western countries.

Lists of British subjects who were selling information to the Rumanian legation were found in its files and were turned over to the British Government.

Through the raid, the Swiss police received a tip on two fat dummy accounts in an obscure farmers' bank in the mountains of Switzerland. The Communists were using the money to run far-reaching spy nets in Western Europe. Other Swiss authorities uncovered a Rumanian organization for buying foreign money in the black market with Swiss francs.

In Copenhagen, Rumanian refugees kidnaped another Rumanian legation chauffeur spy, Ion Cympu. He gave valuable information to Danish authorities.

Authorities in Stockholm, tipped off by the Bern raid, uncovered an important spy ring centering around the Rumanian and Czechoslovakian legations.

THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON THE TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY AS A FACTOR AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, transportation costs absorb a considerable portion of the wholesale prices of many farm commodities that are produced at a distance from the main terminal markets. Prices of the commodities that farmers buy are also affected by transportation costs.

Most of the increase in these costs since the war ended is due to the sharp rise in freight charges. Among other significant factors which have increased marketing costs for the farmer, is the excise tax on the transportation of property.

The tax on the transportation of property increases transportation costs by the full amount of the tax. It also applies to other services furnished by the carrier in connection with shipping a commodity. These additional services, such as refrigeration or heating, loading, unloading, storage, demurrage, transfer in transit, local cartage, and other similar services may add 10–15 percent or more to the basic transportation charges, depending upon the commodity and the distance hauled.

HISTORY OF THE TAX

Transportation taxes were a part of World War I revenue legislation, and were repealed on January 1, 1922. Similarly, the present tax on the transportation of property was enacted during World War II for revenue purposes. But, unlike the earlier legislation, more than 10 years have passed since the end of hostilities, yet the tax has not been repealed.

The tax on the transportation of property became effective on December 1, 1942. It is levied at the rate of 3 percent of the transportation charges made by rail, motor, water, or air carriers, on all commodities except coal, which carries a rate of 4 cents per short ton.

All types of for-hire transportation are subjected to the tax, including common and contract carriers, local moving firms, express companies, freight forwarders, and so forth. Exemptions to the tax that affect agriculture are:

First. Payments for the transportation of property intended for export.

Second. Payments for the transportation of property by a freight forwarder, express company, or other carrier for which a transportation tax has already been paid.

Through June 30, 1955, taxes collected on the transportation of property totaled more than $4 billion. It has been estimated that approximately 22 percent of these tax collections, equal to $784 million, was derived from the movement of agricultural products.

EFFECTS OF THE TAX UPON PRICES

The tax on the transportation of property tends to increase the prices of the commodities which the farmer buys and to reduce the prices that he receives for the commodities which he sells.

Mr. President, this effect of the tax has especially burdensome on the farmer during the past few years because of the ever-widening margin between the prices paid by farmers and the prices received by them.

Prices paid by farmers have been quite stable in recent years at a level only 4 percent below the peak reached in May 1952.

In sharp contrast, prices received by farmers have rapidly declined. For the calendar year 1955 they average 5 percent below the previous year, and 24 percent below the peak established in February 1951. The parity ratio for 1955 was 84 compared with 89 a year earlier and with the post-Korean peak of 113 in February 1951.

The division of the transportation tax among the parties involved may differ in the long run and in the short run. In the short run, market conditions may result in producers or dealers absorbing all or part of the tax. The long-run effects, however, are likely to be quite different.

To the extent that competition exists within markets and complete mobility of factors of production prevails, there is a tendency for consumers eventually to bear a substantial portion of the tax. But because the farmer serves the dual role of producer and consumer he can not escape the burden.

Since the tax is a fixed percentage, any increase in the rate will be accompanied by an increase in the tax. Freight rates have been increased 11 times since the end of the war, and on December 30, 1955, the railroads petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission for an additional increase of approximately 7 percent.

As a result of these increases, the tax in cents per 100 pounds has risen substantially during this period. For example, on the movement of fresh meats from Kansas City, Kans., to New York City, N. Y., the rate increased from $1.21 per 100 pounds in 1946 to $2.35 in 1956—this year. This increased the tax from 3.6 cents to 7.0 cents.

The increase in the prices paid by consumers resulting from the transportation tax is often greater than the tax itself. The increase in price will exceed the amount of the tax to the extent that middlemen price goods at a fixed percentage above the cost.

To illustrate, assume that a retailer purchases goods valued at $5,000, including transportation costs of $800, exclusive of the tax. At a 25 percent markup on cost, the retailer's gross margin would equal $1,250 and the selling price would equal $6,250. However, when the transportation tax of $24—3 percent of $800—is added, total costs now equal $5,024.

Computing the markup on the basis of the larger cost increases the selling price to $6,280. This latter figure exceeds the former selling price plus the transportation tax by $6—an amount which represents a 25 percent markup on the transportation tax.

The oftener this process is repeated, the greater the effect of the tax. In complex trade channels made up of several middlemen, the result may be to increase prices substantially.

Another significant aspect of the effect of the tax results from the fact that changes in transportation charges tend to lag behind price changes. Thus, when the price of a commodity is declining, transportation charges make up an increasing proportion of the retail value. Since the transportation tax is a fixed percentage of the freight charges, it also increases in relation to the retail price.

EFFECTS UPON THE COMPETITIVE POSITIONS OF PRODUCERS AND SHIPPERS

A flat percentage increase in freight rates will affect adversely the competitive position of the long-distance shipper.

This principle has been recognized in many general rate increases through the use of "hold-downs" on a number of agricultural commodities, where maximum rate increases on selected agricultural commodities were limited to a specified amount in cents per 100 pounds. In some cases the effect of the "hold-downs" was to increase the rates from competing areas by the same amount, thus maintaining their relative positions within a given market.

In other cases, where the amount of the increase was less than the hold-down from one or both producing areas, the result was to increase the difference in rates to the disadvantage of the one farthest from the market. For example, the rates on shipments of celery to New York City are $2.38 per 100 pounds from Chula Vista, Calif., and 60 cents from Marion, N. Y., or a difference of $1.78. When the tax is added to the rates, the differential becomes $1.83.

Based upon a minimum carload of 20,000 pounds, the California producer would pay a tax of $14.28 per carload, while the New York producer pays a tax of only $3.60 per carload. Similar results would occur in a comparison of many other commodities. If protective services were included in the previous computations, the increase in the differential due to the tax would be even greater.

This widening differential in the freight rates paid by long-haul versus short-haul producers tends to discourage long-distance hauling, especially of lower-valued commodities, and stimulates production that is close to markets. The utilization of the most fertile lands is likely to be decreased.

The increase in transportation costs caused by the tax thus may reduce the degree of geographical division of labor and the volume of production. These conclusions also apply to articles farmers buy.

EFFECTS UPON CARRIERS

The principal effect of the tax upon carriers by rail, motor, water, and air has been to divert traffic to private transportation. In its 62d annual report, the Interstate Commerce Commission pointed out this problem by declaring:

This method of taxation * * * adds to the difficulties of for-hire carriers in their competition with private transportation since the war, it appears reasonable to question whether continued use of for-hire carriers for tax-collecting purposes is justified.

Furthermore, since the tax tends to reduce long-haul transportation, carriers' revenues are affected adversely.

That is one of the reasons why I offered a bill in an effort to have the Congress do something about this very serious situation, which I think militates against the farmer, and about which I hope something will be done in due time by the Congress of the United States, and especially the Finance Committee.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If there is no further business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsections (a) and (b) of section 4261 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the tax on transportation of persons) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Amounts paid within the United States: There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid within the United States for taxable transportation of persons (as defined in section 4262) by rail, motor vehicle, water, or air a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount so paid.

"(b) Amounts paid outside the United States: There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid without the United States for taxable transportation of persons (as defined in section 4262) by rail, motor vehicle, water, or air, but only if such transportation begins and ends in the United States, a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount so paid."

SEC. 2. Section 4262 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on transportation of persons) is hereby amended by striking out subsection (a) and by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e), respectively. Such action, as so amended, is hereby renumbered as section 4263.

SEC. 3. Part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after section 4261 the following new section:

"SEC. 4262. Definition of taxable transportation of persons.

"For purposes of this part—

"(1) General rule: The term 'taxable transportation of persons' means transportation that begins in the United States or at any point in Canada or Mexico not more than 225 miles from the continental United States and ends in the United States or at any point in Canada or Mexico not more than 225 miles from the continental United States.

"(2) Transportation outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere: The term 'taxable transportation of persons' does not include transportation any part of which is outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere (the area lying west of the 30th meridian west of Greenwich, east of the International Date Line, and north of the equator, not including any country of South America)."

SEC. 4. (a) Part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4264. Special rules.

"(a) Payments made outside the United States for prepaid orders: If the payment upon which tax is imposed by section 4261 (b) is made for a prepaid order, exchange order, or similar order, the person furnishing the initial transportation pursuant to such order shall collect the amount of the tax.

"(b) Tax deducted upon refunds: Every person who refunds any amount with respect to a ticket or order which was purchased without payment of the tax imposed by section 4261, shall deduct from the amount refundable, to the extent available, any tax due under such section as a result of the use of a portion of the transportation purchased in connection with such ticket or order, and shall report to the Secretary or his delegate the amount of any such tax remaining uncollected.

"(c) Payment of tax: Where any tax imposed by section 4261 is not paid at the time payment for transportation is made, then, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate—

"(1) such tax shall be paid by the person paying for the transportation or by the person using the transportation;

"(2) such tax shall be paid within such time as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations after whichever of the following first occurs:

"(A) the rights to the transportation expire; or

"(B) the time when the transportation becomes taxable transportation; and

"(3) payment of such tax shall be made to the person to whom the payment for transportation was made or to the Secretary or his delegate.

This subsection shall not apply in the case of any tax collected in the manner provided in subsection (a) or subsection (b) (to the extent any tax due is collected)."

"(d) Application of tax: The tax imposed by section 4261 (a) shall apply to any amount paid within the United States for transportation of persons unless the taxpayer establishes, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, at the time of payment for the transportation, that the transportation is not taxable transportation of persons (as defined in section 4262).

"(e) Round trips: For purposes of this part, a round trip shall be considered to consist of transportation from the point of departure to the destination and separate transportation from such destination to the point of departure."

(b) Section 4261 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to payment of tax imposed on transportation of persons) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "except as provided in section 4264."

(c) The first sentence of section 4291 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to cases where persons receiving payment must collect tax) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Every person receiving any payment for facilities or services on which a tax is imposed upon the payor thereof under this chapter shall collect the amount of the tax from the person making such payment, except as provided in section 4264 (a)."

SEC. 5. Subchapter B of chapter 68 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to assessable penalties) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6676. Failure to pay tax on transportation of persons.

"In addition to any criminal penalty provided by law, if any person liable for payment of tax imposed by section 4261 (relating to tax on transportation of persons) fails to pay such tax within the period prescribed, unless it is shown that failure to pay is due to reasonable cause, such person shall be liable to a penalty in an amount equal to whichever of the following is greater:

"(1) Two times the amount of tax due; or

"(2) $10."

SEC. 6. (a) The table of sections of part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by striking out

"SEC. 4262. Exemptions."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 4262. Definition of taxable transportation of persons.

"SEC. 4263. Exemptions.

"SEC. 4264. Special rules."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter B of chapter 68 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof

"SEC. 6676. Failure to pay tax on transportation of persons."

SEC. 7. The amendments made by this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation commencing on or after such first day.

Mr. SMATHERS obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill which now is under consideration.

The bill seeks to eliminate a discrimination in our tax laws, which originated when the Congress in 1946 passed a bill removing the 10 percent travel tax from all travel originating in the United States and ending in Europe, Asia, or South America. In other words, it provided that one who travels from New York to

London can travel without paying the 10 percent transportation tax. However, we happened to ignore at that time—probably by oversight, rather than by design—the fact that there still existed a 10 percent transportation tax on travel, for example, from New York to Mexico City, or from New York to Canada, or from New York to Cuba, or from New York to any of the Central American countries.

So, Mr. President, today a rather unusual situation exists, in that the Federal Government does not apply the transportation tax to the travel of one whose trip originates in the United States and takes him to Europe, Asia, or South America—which is considered to include all the countries below the Panama Canal. On the other hand, the 10 percent travel tax on tickets purchased in the United States applies to a trip taken by one whose journey originates in the United States and takes him to Canada, Mexico, any of the Caribbean countries, or to Alaska or Hawaii.

So the purpose of the bill is to eliminate that particular discrimination. It has been estimated that the bill, if enacted, will cost the Treasury approximately $20 million. However, because of the discrimination which exists in the present law, the Treasury Department approved of the elimination of this discrimination. The bill also has the tacit approval of the State Department. It is the belief of those agencies of the Government and others favoring this legislation that the discrimination against our best friends and customers such as Canada, Mexico, Cuba, Dominican Republic should be removed.

The sole purpose of this measure, which has been unanimously reported by the Finance Committee passed some time ago by the House of Representatives, is to eliminate this discrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and my colleague from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] I submit to the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 6, in line 4, it is proposed to redesignate paragraph (2) ("Transportation outside the northern portion of the Western Hemisphere") paragraph (3), and to insert at the end of paragraph (1) on page 6, at line 4, the following:

"(2) Transportation to or from Alaska or Hawaii: The term 'taxable transportation of persons' does not include that portion of transportation to or from the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii which—

"(A) is outside the United States,

"(B) is not transportation between ports or stations within the continental United States or that portion of Canada or Mexico within 225 miles of the continental United States, and

"(C) is not transportation between ports or stations within the Territory of Alaska or the Territory of Hawaii."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in discussing my amendment to the committee amendment. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement on my amendment submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also a memorandum statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY IN SUPPORT OF SENATOR MORSE'S AMENDMENT TO RESTORE ALASKA AND HAWAII TO H. R. 5625

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has general responsibility for legislation affecting the Territories of the United States, I strongly concur in the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE, to restore Alaska and Hawaii to the offshore areas exempted from the Federal transportation tax by H. R. 5265.

I may state that Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which continue to be exempted under the bill as amended by the Senate Finance Committee, are just as much a part of our committee's responsibility as are Alaska and Hawaii. I know I can speak for a majority of the committee when I say that we heartily approve the exemption of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The exemption will serve to further tourist travel and commerce, and thus contribute substantially to the economy of these areas.

But Hawaii and Alaska also merit, and need, the economic benefits that exemption from transportation tax will bring. I personally visited Hawaii during the recess to study at first hand some of the legislative problems before our committee respecting the Territory. Of my own knowledge, I know that the tourist trade is the second largest industry of Hawaii. Only agriculture exceeds it in importance as the foundation of the economy of the approximately half-million American citizens who comprize the population of the Hawaiian Islands. Tourist facilities there are being greatly expanded, both by new capital from the Mainland and by local enterprise, and the tourist business is entering a period of very vigorous competition there.

H. R. 5265 as reported is discriminatory against Hawaii and Alaska. Both are as dependent upon trade and travel with the mainland, at this point in their economic development, as are Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. All four of these offshore Territories of the United States should be treated equally in this respect.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

MEMORANDUM STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

As passed by the House of Representatives on July 30, 1955, H. R. 5265 contained a section providing for a partial exemption from the transportation tax for travel between the mainland of the United States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

The Senate Finance Committee in reporting this bill on February 24, 1956, removed this partial exemption. The attached amendment has only one purpose and that is to restore this partial exemption to the bill. The reasons supporting this amendment can be summarized as follows:

1. The partial exemption for travel to the Territories was added to the original version of the bill by the House Ways and Means Committee, and approved by the House of Representatives, as a means of lessening to some extent the handicap which the Territories suffer because of their distance from the mainland of the United States. Both Territories are completely dependent on commerce with the United States, which requires a substantial volume of business travel between the Territories and the mainland. In addition, the partial exemption provided in the House bill would stimulate tourist travel to the Territories, and revenue from this source is important to both Territories, particularly so in the case of Hawaii.

2. The fact that the Territories may some day become States is no argument against this partial exemption. Their becoming States will not change their geographical location, and the transportation tax handicap resulting therefrom. The effect of the exemption would simply be that, for transportation tax purposes, both Territories would be moved in space so that their boundaries become contiguous with the United States.

3. Both the House and Senate Finance Committee bills remove the tax from travel to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It would be inequitable not to give at least a partial exemption to Alaska and Hawaii.

4. The partial exemption for travel to the Territories is needed to correct a tax evasion practice which the present law encourages. For example, if a passenger travels from Seattle to Honolulu, he must pay tax on the entire trip. If, however, he crosses the border into Canada and buys his ticket in Vancouver for travel from Vancouver to Honolulu, the entire trip is tax free. This evasion practice diverts traffic from American-flag carriers to foreign-flag carriers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, suffice it to say, by way of argument, that my amendment seeks to eliminate the inequity and injustice which would be inflicted upon Alaska and Hawaii if the bill were enacted in its present form.

As passed by the House of Representatives on July 30, 1955, House bill 5265 contained a section providing for a partial exemption from the transportation tax for travel between the mainland of the United States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii. The Senate Finance Committee, in reporting the bill on February 24, 1956, removed this partial exemption. The only purpose of my amendment is to restore to the bill this partial exemption.

If the exemption were not restored, the result would be an unwarranted inequity against Hawaii and Alaska and a discrimination in favor of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I am in favor of the exemption insofar as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are concerned, but I also take the position that it is only fair to provide the same exemption for Alaska and Hawaii. In this connection, I think I need to read only one paragraph from my statement in order to make clear the essence of my argument:

The partial exemption for travel to the Territories is needed to correct a tax-evasion practice which the present law encourages. For example, if a passenger travels from

Seattle to Honolulu, he must pay the tax on the entire trip. If, however, he crosses the border into Canada and buys his ticket in Vancouver, for travel from Vancouver to Honolulu, the entire trip is tax free. This evasion practice diverts traffic from American-flag carriers to foreign-flag carriers.

So, Mr. President, at present we are encouraging such tax evasion.

Mr. President, I wish to make clear that the amendment to the committee amendment covers only the part of the trip from the mainland of the United States to Alaska or to Hawaii; it does not cover, for example, the part of the trip from New York to San Francisco or from New York to Seattle or to Portland. The amendment covers only the travel from the American port where the trip begins—for example, from one of the ports on the West coast—to either the Territory of Alaska or to the Territory of Hawaii.

So I submit the amendment to the committee amendment, with a plea that my friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] extend me the favor of taking the amendment to conference. I know his position on this matter. I also know him to be a very cooperative legislator. I think the merits of my amendment to the committee amendment are so clear that it should be taken to conference.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Oregon will agree that if we had discriminated against Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the same fashion that this bill, without the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, would discriminate against Alaska and Hawaii, it would be absolutely impossible for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to have any tourist traffic.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the bill will do justice to our friends, Canada, Mexico, and the Central American countries, we only seek to have the same treatment accorded to Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the support he has given to this matter in the committee, as well as for the support he is giving it at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL rose.

Mr. MORSE. Let me inquire whether my friend, the Senator from California, desires to interrogate me about this matter.

Mr. KUCHEL. No; I am merely waiting to make a brief statement about it.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. Then let me ask whether the Senator from Florida wishes to ask questions of me at this time, or whether he prefers to wait to hear from the Senator from California.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to be persuaded.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this bill is a worthwhile and desirable measure designed to end unintended discrimination and burdens and to promote the very significant travel business. However, it falls far short of remedying all present injustices imposed in the 10 percent tax on transporttion, and has the extra curse of perpetuating a vicious deterrent to trade and travel between the United States mainland and our Pacific Territories.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, which I am cosponsoring, because it is indefensible to me to treat Hawaii and Alaska under a different formula than the one which applies to American possessions in the Atlantic. Americans in one segment of the hemisphere are entitled to the identical consideration that we give to those in a second segment.

The thought of continuing to collect 10 percent of the cost of tickets for travel to Hawaii and Alaska is exceedingly repugnant, because of the refusal of Congress to extend the thoroughly earned right of statehood to the Territories. By insisting that vacationers and businessmen pay this tax for trips to and from those Territories, we compound the offense of according the people of Hawaii and Alaska only second-class citizenship.

It makes no more sense to say that travelers to and from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are entitled to tax-free transportation, while persons going between the mainland and these Pacific Territories must pay the tax, than it would be to pay an outright subsidy to foreign-flag steamships which serve the routes between west coast ports and Hawaii and Alaska.

In fact, by imposing this tax on Pacific travel, we are encouraging tourist and business trade to use Canadian ports and diverting patronage from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle.

While it is true that these Territories belong to the United States, they still—because we deny them the statehood for which they have demonstrated convincing fitness—are not truly of the United States. At the same time, they are almost entirely dependent upon the United States, and their welfare is inextricably wrapped up in trade with, and travel to and from, the mainland. Their growth and prosperity are vital to the United States, yet this tax puts us in the position of placing obstacles in their way while showing deep concern about trade and travel between the United States and a foreign nation such as Cuba.

If there is need at all for this bill, there is overwhelming reason why it should be passed in the form in which it originated and went through the House of Representatives, extending the same relief to Hawaii and Alaska as it gives to noncontiguous American possession in the eastern half of the hemisphere.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is crystal clear that there is manifest justice in the amendment which is being proposed, and I very much hope the Senate will adopt it, and that it will become a part of the law.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the position of the Finance Committee when this particular subject was discussed was essentially that we would be creating a bad policy by adopting an amendment such as that suggested by the very able Senator from Oregon. His proposal is based on the theory that when one travels over water or over land outside the continental limits of the United States, that portion of the trip should be tax free.

A person may travel in an airplane from New York City to Miami, Fla., by direct flight, three-fourths of which trip would be over the water, and outside the continental limits of the United States. Would not that bring up the question as to whether that particular three-fourths of the trip should be tax free?

When a person travels from Tampa, Fla., to New Orleans, La., a great portion of that trip—in fact, practically all of it—is over international waters and is not travel over the United States.

We believe that while this amendment might be limited so as to apply only with respect to the Territory of Alaska and the Territory of Hawaii, it might contravene the due process and uniformity provisions of the Constitution inasmuch as both the Territories are deemed to be a part of the United States. In effect we would be discriminating against the other 48 States of the Union in any case in which they might be reached by going outside the continental limits of the United States.

For example, a person might get on a boat in Miami and travel through the Panama Canal to the home State of the able minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. All of such travel would be travel outside the continental limits of the United States. Do we propose to establish a precedent in this particular case which will enable steamship companies to say, in a given case, "We think this particular trip should not be taxed," and to cite as their authority the precedent which we established here?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Under the terms of the proposed legislation—and I am in support of the bill, and also of the amendment—it would be possible, if I correctly understand the measure, for a person to buy a ticket in New York City and fly to Mexico City, let us say, without any portion of that trip being taxed. Is that not true?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Under the terms of the amendment we are proposing, Hawaii, being in competition with Acapulco, Mexico, would be affected by the tax covering that part of the United States over which the plane flew. Only about 40 percent of the trip would be exempt. So we are not asking nearly as much for Hawaii and Alaska as is being asked for Mexico, Cuba, and other countries.

Mr. SMATHERS. Economically speaking, the Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct, as is the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from California.

But are we not establishing a principle here? The Senator from Louisiana is a strong advocate of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. One of the arguments he uses is that they are incorporated Territories, and that they are being treated in many respects as States.

What would happen with respect to the Senator's own State of Louisiana if it were desired to create a little more travel between Florida and Louisiana? Most of the trip would be over the waters beyond the continental limits of the

United States. Will it be said that that particular portion of the trip should not be subject to tax because we have eliminated, by this amendment, the tax on travel from San Francisco to Hawaii?

Mr. LONG. So far as I am concerned, I should like to repeal the entire transportation tax. But if we are to tax transportation within the United States, and exclude transportation outside the United States, it seems to me that the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, in seeking American tourist trade, have the same problem as almost any foreign nation in trying to attract the American tourist dollar. Therefore, I feel that they should have the same consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the proposed legislation will be enacted, and that the amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] will be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill and taken to conference. I hope it may be retained in the bill in conference.

This amendment would, in effect, place the proposed legislation in the situation in which it was when it passed the House of Representatives.

The question of establishing a precedent has been raised. I think the legislative history is perfectly clear. This is not a subterfuge whereby someone leaving Florida and flying to New York would be exempted merely because a part of the flight might be over international waters. I think the legislative history is clear, to the effect that such is not the intent; nor would it be countenanced. Nor would a flight from San Francisco to Seattle, if it passed over international waters, be exempted. It is not the legislative intent that that be done.

However, in view of the fact that certain of our good neighbors in the Caribbean area are exempted, it is perfectly logical, in view of the prior exemptions made with respect to travel to Europe, and our action with respect to our possessions of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, that equal consideration be given to Hawaii and Alaska. Otherwise there would be a discrimination against the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska.

I believe that no unusual precedent would be established in this regard. The fact remains that neither Alaska nor Hawaii is a State of the Union today. I wish I could be sure that statehood legislation would be enacted at this session of Congress. I am not that optimistic at the present time. However, I hope consideration may be given to statehood legislation at an early date. But by the time these two great Territories become States—as I think they are destined to become in the not too distant future—I hope we can eliminate the entire transportation tax. Actually, it is an undue penalty imposed particularly upon people in the far reaches of our country. In normal times I believe that it places an unnecessary burden upon them. I hope that by the time Alaska and Hawaii become States in the Union we shall have abolished the transportation tax upon travel between Florida and California or between New York and Seattle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to buttress what the Senator from California has stated, so that we may pin down the legislative history, so that there will be no doubt about the legislative intent. It is certainly not our intention to set up any such precedent as the Senator from Florida has suggested. Rather, it is our intention to provide that the bill shall deal only with trips from the mainland of the United States to Alaska and Hawaii, and from Hawaii and Alaska to the mainland of the United States. That is the purpose and intent, and I believe it is clear in the language. I do not believe there is a necessity for any modifying language. With that statement, I am ready to submit the amendment to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 24, of the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "225" and insert in lieu thereof "100"; and on page 6, line 2, to strike out "225" and insert in lieu thereof "100."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the amendment would merely change the distance provisions in the bill from 225 miles to 100 miles. I am offering the amendment on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. We have heard from constituents along the Mexican border who feel that the bill should be applicable to travel between the border and Monterey, Mex. Several cities along the Mexican border would come within the provisions of the bill if it were amended to change the distance from 225 miles to 100 miles.

Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida will at least agree to take the provision to conference, so that it may be given due consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas that we discussed this point for quite some time in committee. The senior Senator from Texas was interested in it, and the proposal was thoroughly debated before the Committee on Finance. It was determined, after much discussion, that we had to have a 225-mile buffer zone. If we did not have it, we were afraid we would encourage too many people to avoid the payment of the 10 percent transportation tax. For example, if trips to any point in Mexico were tax free, a person going from Washington to Los Angeles could buy a ticket to Tijuana, Mexico. If the entire ticket was tax free, he would have saved money by purchasing the ticket all the way to Tijuana although he never intended to go farther than Los Angeles. The distance of 225 miles, rather than some other distance, was fixed to establish a sufficient distance in Canada or Mexico that it would not commonly be possible for a person to purchase a ticket to a foreign destination at a lower price than he could purchase one to an American city that was his actual destination. We were afraid that we would be opening up a Pandora's box of trouble if we cut down the zone to less than 225 miles. It was the considered judgment of the committee that we could not very well do it without getting into all kinds of difficulty.

Therefore, it is with deep regret that I must say to my very good friend, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas, that on behalf of the Committee on Finance we just cannot take the amendment to conference. I hope the Senate will reject it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAINTENANCE OF A PERMANENT DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of April 21,

1955, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report entitled "A Study on the Feasibility of Maintaining a Permanent Domestic Tin-Smelting Industry in the United States."

The study was made for me by the Office of Defense Mobilization with the assistance of a special interagency group comprised of representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, and Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission.

I concur with the conclusions of the study and I am also in accord with the recommendation contained in the attached memorandum from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 29, 1956.*

THE PORTSMOUTH STORY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, recently in Portsmouth, Ohio, a unique celebration was held by labor, capital, and the community, celebrating an event which has come to be called in Ohio the Portsmouth story.

In Portsmouth great progress has been achieved through the cooperation of management, labor, and the community. As a matter of fact, the celebration is very unique, since the industries concerned and the labor organizations and the community have been operating on a wholesome basis, and the entire citizenry turns out for the celebration. That fine relationship has existed there over a long period of time.

There is one phase of the development, however, which is very unfortunate indeed. Transportation facilities are greatly lacking in the area, particularly air service. Portsmouth is identified with the neighboring atomic-energy plant and with the vast development of the Detroit Steel Co., and many other developments.

I hope the application for air service, principally for the benefit of the atomic-energy installation and the demands of the steel industry, will be considered very seriously, so that the air facilities will be made available.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Looking to the future," published in the Portsmouth Times of February 29, 1956; an article entitled "Detroit Steel To Offer Scholarships in Labor Relations," published in the Portsmouth Times; an editorial entitled "Mutual Understanding," published in the magazine Steel of March 12, 1956; an article entitled "The Portsmouth Story," by James B. Pugh; an address entitled "The Portsmouth Story," delivered by Kenneth A. Dunbar; the text of the address by the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, delivered on February 29, 1956; and an address delivered on the same day by Mr. George Reese, assistant director of organizations, AFL-CIO. The addresses were delivered on the occasion of the community celebration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portsmouth Times of February 29, 1956]

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Tonight's labor-management recognition banquet could go a long way toward establishing Portsmouth in the minds of citizens elsewhere as a 100-percent community.

The Portsmouth area has about every tangible asset needed to attract others to it. It has utilities, transportation, water, good government, good schools, good churches, a good athletic plant, and all the other facilities a community needs. It has friendly people and a cordial welcome for newcomers, as many of them have found out over the years.

Now, tonight, it is making community recognition of another asset which just about fills the kit of things Portsmouth has to offer—fine labor-management relationship.

That asset began to develop some years ago. It got a big boost from the splendid experience of construction workers and contractors who are nearing completion of the mammoth Portsmouth area atomic-energy plant.

At the same time, Detroit Steel Corp. and its employees have developed a fine esprit de corps and achieved a marvelous success in continuing steel production while a major rebuilding and expansion program was in process, without either's interfering with the other. The Selby Shoe Co. is finding harmony under a 5-year contract with its employees. And there are other notable evidences of a spirit of cooperation among labor and management and the community.

Portsmouth is honored signally in having here today and tonight the United States Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, as its main banquet speaker. And there are a host of other notables here from labor and management and government, all at the invitation of the sponsoring Jaycees and chamber of commerce.

The visiting dignitaries will have an opportunity to hear the Portsmouth Story—the story of how a community has achieved community success through the teamwork of its various segments. And Portsmouth people themselves are glad to hear—and to tell—that story.

It is through such a great community effort as this that Portsmouth can continue to progress, and continue to provide the atmosphere for continued growth of its established industry as well as for the new growth everyone feels sure is bound to come.

Labor and management leaders well should be proud of their achievement. Tonight's recognition affair should serve as a challenge for the future and a demonstration of progress that can be made when everyone cooperates toward the common goal of orderly development and growth for Portsmouth.

[From the Portsmouth Times]

THANKS TO COMMUNITY—DETROIT STEEL TO OFFER SCHOLARSHIPS IN LABOR RELATIONS

In appreciation of its acceptance in the community, Detroit Steel Corp., Portsmouth Division, announced Wednesday afternoon a $4,000 scholarship in labor relations.

As far as local officials knew, it was the first scholarship ever offered by an industry in that field.

Besides granting the scholarship winner $1,000 each year for 4 years, the steel company also will grant the chosen college $500 a year for each year the student attends the school.

Max J. Zivian, president of DSC, announced the scholarship as the community honored industry and labor.

The 4-year scholarship, to be made annually "to the boy or girl desirous of pursuing a college course in the field of labor relations, is the company's action in appreciation for the tribute which Portsmouth has paid to both labor and industry in this community," Mr. Zivian said.

Recipients will be entitled to $1,000 each year for the 4 years of his or her college career.

"It is our intent that the scholarship shall be a gift to a well-deserving community," Mr. Zivian said, "We are asking that a group of community leaders, including school officials, determine the recipients of these annual gifts.

"It is our desire to continue the improved relationships which have come to exist here between labor and industry. We believe sincerely that real progress is being made wherein the triumvirate—community, labor, and local industry—is being best served, each with its own responsibilities toward the other two.

"For this reason we also will invite our labor union to be represented on the selection committee."

The boy or girl to receive the scholarship each year is to be chosen on the basis of character, scholarship, interest, and aptitude, Mr. Zivian said. To be eligible, an applicant must be a high school graduate residing in Scioto County, or the son or daughter of a present, retired, or deceased employee of Detroit Steel's Portsmouth Division—in which case the residential requirement does not apply.

Each scholarship recipient will be free to attend any accredited college or university offering a recognized degree in labor relations. One scholarship is to be granted annually, renewable for each year required for a baccalaureate degree.

The recipient must maintain a creditable scholarship record and remain in good standing as judged by his university officials.

The $1,000 scholarship may be used for tuition, books, board, room, or any other legitimate college expense. The accompanying grant of $500 to the college selected by the student is to be paid directly to the college for each year the student attends.

The first scholarship is to become effective in the fall of 1956. As planned, there will be four scholarships in effect, beginning in the fall of 1959 and thereafter, subject to the company's continued approval of the program, Mr. Zivian said.

As an additional aid to scholarship recipients, the company has agreed to provide summer employment for those desiring it.

To insure a well-rounded work experience for the student, Mr. Zivian expressed the hope that the student would elect to alternate his work between the union and the company during summer vacations.

"No recipient, however, will be in any way obligated to become employed by the company during summers or after graduation," he emphasized.

[From magazine Steel of March 12, 1956]

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

One of the most unusual demonstrations of the growing desire on the part of management and labor to understand each other's problems occurred a few days ago in the Ohio River city of Portsmouth, Ohio. The entire community took time out for a recognition day to pay tribute to both sides for their efforts in achieving mutual understanding.

Portsmouth had good reason to celebrate. The city was about to become a ghost city when World War II ended. Except for a shoe factory and a few smaller plants, its people were largely dependent for their livelihood on a steel plant that was about to be abandoned. The city's labor record made it unattractive to new enterprise.

Financier Cyrus Eaton came to the rescue by acquiring the steel plant in June 1946, and initiating a modernization program. In January 1950 Portsmouth Steel was consolidated with Detroit Steel Corp. By the end of 1957, $90 million will have been expended on modernization and expansion. Already, jobs have been made for 4,200 workers.

At the outset, Detroit Steel's management decided on a policy of dealing frankly with its employees and the community. It initiated a program of supervisory training and management development. It encouraged management personnel to participate actively in community affairs (its blast furnace superintendent is Portsmouth's mayor). Speakers were provided for clubs and societies, and plant tours were set up for community groups. Educational material about the company was made available to schools. A 4-year college scholarship in labor relations was set up for Portsmouth high-school graduates.

The program for industrial harmony fostered by industry, labor, and the community has paid off in many ways. For example: The Atomic Energy Commission picked a site near Portsmouth for its gaseous diffusion plant. Labor agreements concluded in advance made it possible to complete this $1 billion plant (it employs 2,700) ahead of time and at savings of millions of dollars.

There is nothing especially unusual about the methods used in Portsmouth. What is unusual is the determined effort to make them work through better mutual understanding.

THE PORTSMOUTH STORY

(By James B. Pugh)

May I speak for the joint committee of the Portsmouth Jaycees and the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce when I express our extreme pleasure in welcoming you all to participate in tonight's meeting so that not only our Portsmouth citizens, but our guests and the Nation can hear the Portsmouth story.

Tonight is the culmination of the dream of every industrial community, namely, that its labor, its management, and its citizens live harmoniously together in mutual understanding and respect, that each facet of our community life recognizes and accepts its responsibility to the whole and becomes thereby committed to continue the same progressive cooperation and peaceful effort which has proved both successful and satisfying.

The first chapters of the Portsmouth story were written several years ago after earlier misunderstandings between labor and management resulted in strife and periodic unemployment.

Over the years the sincere application of faith and commonsense to problems and disparities by both labor and management have resulted in substantially improved relations accounting for the present enviable peace and understanding which now exist. We acclaim and recognize tonight the leaders of both labor and management who have so diligently and ably applied themselves to the task. The production and expansion of our mills and factories reflect the cooperative attitude which has been engendered by high-quality leadership of all parties concerned.

Another chapter of the Portsmouth story was begun in August 1952. In that exciting and important year for us in southern Ohio, the AEC chose the Pike County site on which to build the giant plant we have now come to accept as one of our local industries. Those early uncertain days were filled with speculation, and no little apprehension; first, as to whether the neighboring site would be chosen and then, after the choice was a fact, as to just what to do next.

When the first wild flurry of excitement subsided our dreams for new industry became the reality of thousands of men and machines melting somehow into amazingly efficient forces to accomplish the gigantic construction task which, being now practically completed, we accept, perhaps too casually.

The giant which we call the A-plant, initiated by one of the largest single contracts known to history, now stands as a monument to industry and to labor and to the cooperative effort of both who have performed the Herculean task in record time.

The priority of this atomic energy project, at its inception, demanded a vastly different approach than had any similar project to that time, to the end that both parties to the complex labor-management problem reached a unique, an extraordinary and a fair and sensible agreement and high policy level under which the job was operated. Result—completion ahead of schedule, the saving of millions of man-hours and millions of dollars, the latter of which, in the final analysis, must come from your pocket or mine. And, yes, a most valuable byproduct was revealed in the doing—mutual confidence and pride which grew apace during the progress of the job. To say "Well done" is not sufficiently commendatory. Such cooperative spirit and practical applications, completely aside from the end results, have become a shining example which justifies not only local pride, but national recognition.

I have told you nothing new. Most of you here tonight know the Portsmouth story as well, or perhaps better than I, and it applies not only to the atomic plant but to all our local industries. I am certain most of us also are cognizant of the great strides forward which local labor and management have taken in recent years. We see and feel and are alert to such improvement, but one most important question remains—are prospective businesses and industries aware of improved conditions in this area? All too many times, we must admit, have prospective industries remembered only the old news stories and have quietly turned the page on the Portsmouth area. This fact constitutes another prime reason for this meeting, the unwritten chapter, if you please. We want the Nation to know, not only of the natural resources which lie in the Ohio Valley, but also that our people can supply the know-how, the skills and the leadership to satisfy the most demanding requirement. We can now prove that the entire community is determined to move forward to greater heights.

Our intention in telling the Portsmouth story is to banish once and for all the ghosts of yesterday and to mark a day of dedication by you and me, management and labor, the teacher, the janitor, the banker, the millwright, the stenographer, and the plumber, that by the same and continuing sincere and cooperative effort, we can go forward in the knowledge that each is helping the other and that the mutuality of benefit is recognized by all. We think the Portsmouth story is new and different and unique and that our story, multiplied many times, will prove to be the commonsense American way to build a happy, progressive and prosperous community.

Now, since you have been kind enough to listen so attentively to these brief foregoing remarks, we come to the really important phases of our program. I am sure you will be indulgent in consideration of the problems we have encountered in planning for the many guests and dignitaries who honor us by their presence. We haven't had much opportunity to practice protocol. We are embarrassed that time does not permit us to ask for remarks from all of our guests. It has been necessary, as a matter of fact, to request brevity by reason of our well-filled speaker and guest tables. I use "well filled" figuratively and I hope, literally. To cover with dispatch the Portsmouth story we have planned the next best thing, as you have already noted in your program, namely, to have one representative speak for a particular group; otherwise, it would have been necessary to have the Second Presbyterian women prepare ham and eggs for breakfast in the early morning hours. You are also aware that it is necessary to meet a close time-schedule so that the main address can be carried live by the ABC radio network to some 400 affiliated stations across the Nation. We therefore ask your kind indulgence.

THE PORTSMOUTH STORY

(By Kenneth A. Dunbar)

It is indeed a privilege to take part in the Portsmouth story being sponsored jointly by the junior chamber of commerce and the Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce. To me, the Portsmouth story began to unfold about 4 years ago. It was about that tie that some very serious planning was being done toward a sizeable expansion of production facilities for the separation of the uranium isotope 235 from 238 by the gaseous diffusion method. This program was to include additional facilities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Paducah, Ky., and a new plant, the location of which was yet to be decided. It was estimated at that time that the program would cost roughly $2 billion and that the plant at the new location would represent about half of the total cost. The new location ultimately became the Portsmouth area and it is of this plant which I will now confine my remarks.

As you may well imagine, there were many problems to be solved and much work to be done before product could finally be taken from the plant. For discussion purposes, we can group the problems as follows:

1. Design;
2. Selection of site ;
3. Obtaining of power;
4. Construction; and
5. Operation of the plant.

The design criteria and fundamental scoping was done by the Carbide Nuclear Corp. who were at that time and still are operating the plants at Oak Ridge and Paducah. The detailed engineering was done by eight firms, including Giffels & Vallet, of Detroit; Sargent & Lundy, of Chicago; and A. M. Kinney, of Cincinnati. There were roughly 14,000 drawings made by these eight firms.

The criteria for the site included several very important requirements such as—

1. An area of 6 to 10 square miles not subject to flooding and with suitable soil on which to build.

2. An area in which sufficient crafts and labor could be assembled to meet the needs of construction and operation, and in which reasonable stability could be expected.

3. An abundant water supply (40 million gallons per day).

4. An area in which there existed cities and towns of sufficient size to provide some and absorb reasonably well the remainder of the manpower requirements.

5. An area in which cheap electric power could be produced and, during the time that new generation was being constructed, could provide sufficient power and energy to meet our needs.

6. A location where adequate rail facilities existed and where highways were adequate at least until improvements could be made.

In addition, there is another factor which is very important and that is the support of the community. A successful venture needs community support. Your civic leaders assured this support before the selection was made and it thus became a plus factor in the decision to locate here.

The problem of obtaining power was solved by an agreement with the Ohio Valley Electric Corp. for the supply of both interim and permanent power. This corporation is made up of 15 utility companies located

within this general area. In order to provide our permanent requirements of nearly 2 million kilowatts, OVEC constructed two steam generating plants, one near Gallipolis, Ohio, and the other near Madison, Ind.

In order to get the plant built, we considered all of the construction firms in the United States that we thought were capable of handling the job and finally selected the Peter Kiewit Sons Co., of Omaha, Nebr. An exhaustive search for qualified specialty subcontractors finally culminated in the selection of the Reynolds-Newberry joint venture for the electrical work, Grinnell Corp. for the piping, and George Koch Sons, Inc., for the sheet-metal work.

The fifth of the problems mentioned was the selection of a firm to operate the plant. In order to do this, many firms whose business was such as to qualify them, were contacted and invited to submit proposals. A careful study of these proposals finally led us to the conclusion that the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. offered us the best organization with which to successfully operate the plant. Thus the Goodyear Atomic Corp. was formed by the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. for the purpose of operating the plant for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Due to the strict limitation of time, I have really boiled the problem down. We are, however, far enough along in the Portsmouth story to check some of the theoretical answers with actual ones, and I am happy to report that the calculations were good. Our contractors have lived up to expectation. Our plant construction has progressed through a peak employment of slightly over 20,000 construction workers to a force of about 500. Our original time schedule was met and slightly bettered. Our actual cost is considerably below the original estimate. Interim power has been supplied in needed quantities and the two generating plants are substantially complete. The segments of plant which Goodyear have operated to date have performed as expected. They were able to recruit and train an adequate number of people for the job. Their employment of roughly 2,700 people appears to be sufficient. We have found the State and local communities to have been most cooperative. The impact was taken in an admirable fashion. There was exhibited throughout the job a sincere effort on the part of labor and management to mutually resolve their differences and progress together toward a common goal. This teamwork played an important role in meeting schedules at reasonable costs. Both labor and management have reason to be proud. And certainly your community can be proud, not only of the fine labor-management record which has been established, but also of the fine manner in which you received newcomers and the hospitality shown during their stay. It is sincerely hoped that the plant has filled a need for employment in this area and that more fields have been opened for those young people who are now choosing a profession or are seeking an occupation. It is also hoped that other industry will find an analysis of the Portsmouth area to their liking and you all will be rewarded with their locating here. May the Portsmouth story continue to be good reading.

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE JAMES P. MITCHELL, SECRETARY OF LABOR, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

We are gathered here tonight to tell and to celebrate the Portsmouth story. I think too, tonight, we have another thing to celebrate, at least I have. I can't begin to talk tonight, without sharing with the millions of American citizens and the millions of people throughout the world, the joy and the gratitude we all feel that the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, has decided to continue in office for another 4 years.

The purpose of this meeting is to celebrate and to attest to a stirring story of labor-management cooperation, that I think is one of the signal stories in the country today. I had the opportunity, today, to meet with representatives of labor, with representatives of management, and to visit several of the plants in this area. And I want to tell you, as I talked to labor and talked to management and met with the men and the women who man your offices and your plants and your mills and your factories and your hearths, that you have in this area a labor-management cooperation that should be the envy of most communities of America. And I think that business can well be proud and labor can well be proud of the spirit that was evident to me in all my visits and trampings today through the mills and factories. It seems to me that what I saw represented one of the most precious business assets that any community can have, and that is an asset of people working harmoniously together in a common cause. I think we have come to the stage in this country, when we realize that between labor and management there is a mutuality of interest—that they are both dedicated to the same common cause which is the preservation of the free-enterprise system.

Surely, labor realizes today, as Mr. Reese has so well said, that its members are trade union, it is true, but that its members are also citizens of the community. And management realizes today that it has a responsibility to its employees and a responsibility to the community in which it lives. Labor realizes that there are no jobs unless management exists. And management realizes that it cannot produce a product or make a profit without the workers who work in their plants. Labor realizes that management's position competitively is a vital force which must be recognized by labor. And management realizes that labor is entitled to and must get a fair share of the products of its labor. It seems to me that this concept of mutuality of interest that is so well expressed in this community is something that we in the United States, every community in the United States, can well envy.

When you realize that in Portsmouth, Ohio, and in many other communities throughout the land, the old philosophy of squeeze labor; the old philosophy of hate the boss; has disappeared; we find them both going down the same road toward the preservation and improvement and increase of the products they are both making. When you see this in Portsmouth, Ohio, you wonder why it shouldn't be true in every community throughout the land. It is true in many and it has grown stronger each day.

As I travel about this country, I have seen the mutual respect and regard of management for labor and labor for management grow. There has begun in this country, at the grassroots level, a recognition of one for the other. There has begun in this country, a recognition that the free-enterprise system, which we here in America regard so preciously, is the foundation on which our prosperity is built. In Portsmouth, Ohio, I think we have an evidence, an evidence here tonight, what can be done, when labor and management see alike, in terms of their mutuality of interest. Certainly, this does not mean, and I'm sure labor and management would not want it to mean that these things can be accomplished without difficulties. Certainly, we are going to have disagreements, as between management and labor, as to how each one shares the product they both produce. Certainly, we are going to have in the free-enterprise system, industrial dispute. We are going to have strikes in the free-enterprise system, but I think as this mutual regard and understanding grows, we will have a greater era of industrial peace, fewer strikes than we have had in the past.

In talking to the people today in the shops and in the plants, I could not help but think that here in this area you have a skilled labor force in the building trades, in the plants; a skilled labor force that is devoted to the job at hand. A skilled labor force that in the main, owns their own homes. A skilled labor force that is an integral part of the community in which they live and that asset to business is an invaluable asset, as I'm sure business recognizes. And I hope that communities throughout the country might take a leaf out of the book of Portsmouth, Ohio, and pay homage and recognition to the industrial peace which exists in many communities in this country. In this respect, I think Portsmouth, Ohio, has led the way, and I am sure many other communities, with the assistance of labor and of management may see fit to do as Portsmouth has done and to take recognition of harmonious labor relations which I have called business' most precious asset.

You know, in this free-enterprise system of ours, Government has a very little part to play. The level of prosperity which is being enjoyed today; the low level of unemployment; the high wages; the stability of the cost of living; the high standard of living; is due largely, in my opinion, to the fact that the Government policy has been to unleash the ingenuity and resourcefulness of management and of labor at the local level and permit it to flower, and as a result of that unleashing, you have all over this country, greater investment in plants, greater investment in equipment, all of which provide jobs. You have a greater investment in things that make life better living in terms of automobiles, refrigerators, television sets, and all the things that increase our standards of living.

I am sure that the announcement tonight of an additional $20 million to be invested by the Detroit Steel Corp. in Portsmouth, is evidence enough that given confidence in the future; business, management, using your money and my money will invest to the limit in the future of any community in which it has confidence. And the evidence of the Detroit Steel Corp. today, I think is real evidence of its confidence in the labor of this community, and for that expression of confidence I congratulate both the community and organized labor groups within this community which have made this investment possible.

As I walked through the plants today, several thoughts occurred to me, as to problems of the future. As you know, President Eisenhower, the other day, released over $1 billion of nuclear energy power for civilian use to the world. That means, I believe, that we of the future, in labor and in management, are going to be presented with problems that we have never confronted before. Right now, in the plants that I visited today, there was evidence of those problems arising. One of them is: What do you do about the skills that are going to be required in the future, and that are required, even now, in some occupations. Mr. Reese, representative of the AFL-CIO of Washington, mentioned the basic interest of that great organization in schools and I would like to take a moment to develop what good schools mean in terms of future business, because it seems to me that unless we look ahead to see what skills are required to do the jobs that must be done in the next 10 years, and unless we take a look ahead to see what training is required to develop those skills, we may find ourselves unable to produce the things that our people can use and need. Certainly, as jobs become more complex; as jobs become more mechanized; as jobs are created as a result of improved technological methods; it means in my mind, that the people who are to be trained in those jobs have to have a basic education that many of our children in the past have

not received and that many of our children currently are not receiving. So it seems to me that the community, labor, and management have a very selfish interest, in terms of the future, in the real development of the necessary schooling for all of our children.

As I walked through the plants today, I saw other problems. This problem of skill; the higher the skill, the more difficult it is to get a man to do it, and it seems to me that if we are going to meet the skill requirements of the future, we have got to develop, we have got to develop every single American to the highest potential of which he or she is capable in terms of skill. It seems to me that we cannot any longer tolerate in America the waste of manpower that we have tolerated for so many years. For example, from just good, hard, business commonsense, we can no longer tolerate the waste of the manpower of 6 million Negroes. If we are to meet the Communist threat, we can meet it not in numbers of workers, because we are outnumbered many times. We can only meet it in terms of the skill, the individual skill of every single, last American man and woman. And if we are to develop that skill, or permit that skill to be developed, in terms of skilled mechanics, in terms of technicians, in terms of scientists, in terms of engineers, then we must begin right in the communities to build our schools and make them adequate to do the job, so that industry in turn can build on that basic education in the training of people.

I saw another problem today as I went through the plants. In one plant I was impressed by the fact that I met people with 30 years of service, with 35 years, with 44 years of service. Men doing an actual tough skilled job in the various shops. We have got to learn in this country ways and means of further improving our methods and our techniques in the use and employment of older workers. We have been discriminating as a matter of personnel policy too long against older people in jobs.

These are some of the problems that I saw as I went through the plants, and I would like to leave this thought with you. If we value the society in which we live, if we value the things like homes, work, church, then we must necessarily support with all our hearts this wonderful thing we call, for the want of a better name, the free-enterprise system; because I believe that in so doing, like Lincoln said, "We can nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

Thank you very much.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE REESE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF ORGANIZATIONS, AFL–CIO, AT LABOR-MANAGEMENT RECOGNITION BANQUET, PORTSMOUTH, OHIO, FEBRUARY 29, 1956

The city of Portsmouth and the workers therein are synonymous. The largest group of citizens of this city are the wage earners and the progress of Portsmouth is therefore intimately bound up with the advancement in the welfare of those who depend upon wages for their livelihood. The purpose of the AFL–CIO is to improve the standard of living of all workers and insure freedom and justice for all.

To make the community a better place to live, has been a foremost purpose of the AFL–CIO since its inception. Abraham Lincoln once said: "The strongest bond of human sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting all working people." Our concern as a labor organization has not been confined to the welfare of labor alone. From the outset, we have proposed and supported programs and policies designed to raise the general standard of living, to provide for better community services.

As our President, George Meany, said in 1952: "No officer or member can place the welfare of his union or the welfare of his members ahead of the welfare of the country as a whole." Organized labor is taking its place as a responsible partner in those industries and services which serve the Nation's needs. It is accepted politically and socially as a constructive group in the community. This is the result of organized effort—not chance. It is our obligation to hand equal opportunities on to future generations and such added progress as we are able to achieve.

The major share of responsibility for the development of public schools in this country belongs to organized labor. In the days when schooling was available only to the children of the well-to-do, unions fought for free public schools so that children of wage earners could have equal educational opportunities. It was the trade-union movement also that conducted the successful campaign for free textbooks.

Enactment of child labor laws and of compulsory school attendance laws secured by organized labor took the children of wage earners out of factories and mines and enabled them to get the necessary schooling.

When we fight for better schools for the children of our members, we are helping to provide better schools for every family and a better break for every child. When we seek the elimination of slums and the promotion of better housing, we are not just advancing some special interest of trade-union members—we are helping to make the community at large a better and a more wholesome place in which to live and raise a family. When we undertake to advance the cause of democracy in local, State and National affairs, and to secure a type of representation that will respond to the pressing needs of the many rather than the selfish demands of a few, we are not working for labor government but for good government, in the best American tradition.

For the trade-union movement is native to the soil. It springs from the natural aspirations of the men and women who comprise the solid base of every substantial community. Power, in the AFL–CIO does not flow from the top down, or from some remote centralized authority. It wells from the bottom up, through the efforts, energies, and devotion of millions of individual members, working through their local organizations. Those local organizations, serving workers at firsthand in their shops and hometowns, are the fountain heads from which all of the strength and vigor of organized labor at large are drawn.

The whole can be no greater than its component parts, and the chain no stronger than each of its links. Only to the extent that labor succeeds in fulfilling its proper role in the life of the local community can it hope to grow and endure as a force in the life of the Nation. Thus, the progress of the trade unionists of this area—so well exemplified by this occasion—in source of encouragement and renewed confidence for all of us within the whole family of the AFL-CIO.

Just as the origins of trade unionism stemmed from the efforts of individuals to make a better life for themselves in their own native surroundings, its end results must be measured by the extent of labor's contribution to the improvement of local conditions. Everything that we are able to accomplish through every channel and at every level of activity is ultimately reflected in the status of our members in their own hometowns and neighborhoods. Labor's gains are of value only to the extent that they find their final expression in a better and a more abundant life, a more wholesome environment, and a more fruitful range of opportunities for the working men and women in their own community.

Every element of the community has a stake in those gains, for labor does not, and cannot, serve itself alone, in isolation from the welfare of the rest of society. Our progress is shared by every group within and without the family of labor.

We need apologize to no person or group for the direction of our efforts for the methods we employ, or the results of those efforts. The trade union serves basic human needs, responds to basic human drives and aspirations, and is closely attuned to the practical requirements of the times and conditions in which we live. The trade union is far more than just another pressure group. It is, and will continue to be, an active movement forward, in the vanguard of progress, toward a better life for all.

Labor is a stable, permanent part of the community, casting its lot—for better or for worse—with the future of the community. The object of labor is to place its hands and skills in the services of local improvement, to enlarge the opportunities that exist for all individuals and groups within the home community, so as to make it a better and a richer place in which to work and live.

The AFL–CIO stands today in membership, vigor, and solidarity at the highest point of its development. This progress is reflected in the pay envelopes and in the standards of life, labor, and leisure enjoyed by the millions of trade unionists throughout the length and breadth of this land. Perhaps the greatest testimonial to the AFL–CIO today is that, regardless of the fact that we have many who oppose the trade-union movement in America, our membership each year grows and grows and stands today that no enemies of labor can long retard a movement such as ours, so deeply rooted in basic human needs and aspiration, and so responsive to the practical requirements of the time in which we live.

Our responsibilities and our interests extend around the world and reach into every community. Upon the quality of our performance in meeting those heavy responsibilities may well depend the future of democracy, the ideal of human progress, and the institution of freedom itself. These responsibilities begin in the local communities, the towns and cities of America, where our members must live, find education, housing, and medical care and make a place for themselves in society.

If we in the AFL–CIO neglect our role in the life of the community we can never hope to grow as a force in the life of the Nation or in the affairs of this world. There is no conflict between the trade-union movement and the community at large. Our members, after all, are the people from many different walks of life, and their interests are broadly representative of the basic interests of the people as a whole.

In analyzing our social problems and the responsibilities which we face today I am confident all will agree that in a society such as the one in which we live cooperation between individuals and groups, between labor and management, is absolutely essential. Here we are working together in a knowledge that by contributing to the good of all the individual gains most for himself. It seems that here in America we are blessed with the spirit and ability to work together better than anywhere in the world. Indeed history well demonstrates tragically that freedom and democracy cannot survive unless there is the universal desire to work together voluntarily in a common cause.

In asserting our cherished independence we must always be aware of, and responsive to the duty and responsibility of joining in worthy projects. Which in altogether too many lands are carried on, if at all, under the threat of the gun or the lash. If it be true that voluntary cooperative effort is the means of strengthening our social system

and in finding a solution to our social problems, then indeed it follows that participation by all is imperative. All must share, labor, management, and other segments of our society. If this effort is to spell success, the social problems that we face must be faced with the responsibility to achieving a positive end in correcting them. For social problems are manmade. If social problems are manmade then they can also be unmade by man.

It is time we recognize that the things we call social problems are the makings or unmakings of man. We in the trade-labor movement have a long tradition particularly here in America that the impossible is merely a little more difficult than the rest to achieve.

The problems with which all of us are concerned are all interdependent one with the other. If we are working in the field of health we know that our progress ultimately comes up against the upper limits of education, and of housing and of general well being. If we are working in the field of education we know that we cannot leave untouched, housing and health, community organization, and material welfare. There is nothing separate to any of them and to touch one is to be involved in all.

Social workers today deserve a great deal of credit for their time and effort in trying to solve these problems. It is our duty in the AFL-CIO, and responsibility, to help them solve these problems to the best of our ability. For some unknown reason social workers in seeking help in solving a problem, look upon labor and management as not only too diverse but too perpetually antagonistic groups in the community. This is not so, actually both labor and management could point out many cooperative programs that they are carrying out for the benefit of their workers and also for the benefit of the community.

Enlightened management no longer seeks to carry out these programs alone but now seeks and welcomes the cooperation of their organized employees. As we broaden the base of interest we invite and inspire more good citizens to carry on the united campaign services.

Labor and management are recognizing more and more every day their great responsibilities to their communities. Management today recognizes the right that management has to make progress, but both labor and management have a right to make progress only when their progress is a part of the total progress of the whole community.

To those assembled here today, who are members of the AFL-CIO I would like to leave this message with you.

There are some who would call all of this participation in community welfare, good public relations. I prefer to call it good human relations. The challenge of the day is in building sound, honest, good human relations. It means to maintain and promote the living standards of the well and to raise those of the needy. It means to actively live up to, the second moral and religious commandment, the vital principle behind all voluntary agencies. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH, MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1289) to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

DOMESTIC RELATIONS BRANCH, MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 101. That there is hereby created in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, a domestic relations branch.

SEC. 102. Definitions: As used in this act—

(a) "Branch" and "Domestic Relations Branch" mean the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia created by this act;

(b) "Court" means the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia and the several judges thereof.

SEC. 103.(a) Additional judges: The first section of the act entitled "an act to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and to prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 887), is hereby amended by striking therefrom "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen."

(b) The judges appointed to the additional positions authorized by the amendments set forth in subsection (a) of this section shall during their tenures of office serve as judges of the Domestic Relations Branch, but the chief judge of the court may, if he finds the work in the Domestic Relations Branch will not be adversely affected thereby assign any of said judges of the Domestic Relations Branch to perform the duties of any other judge of the court. The chief judge of the court shall also have the authority to assign any of the other judges of the court to serve temporarily in the Domestic Relations Branch if, in the opinion of the said chief judge, the work of the Domestic Relations Branch requires such assignment.

SEC. 104. The judges of the Domestic Relations Branch, with the approval of the chief judge of the court, shall have authority to appoint and remove a clerk and such other personnel as may be necessary for the operation of the branch.

SEC. 105. Jurisdiction of Domestic Relations Branch: The Domestic Relations Branch and each judge sitting therein shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental to such actions for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children; applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board; civil actions to enforce support of minor children; civil actions to enforce support of wife; actions seeking custody of minor children; actions to declare marriages void; actions to declare marriages valid; actions for annulments of marriage; and proceedings in adoption.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to divest the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction and power to consider, and to enter and enforce judgments, orders, and decrees in any such action, application or proceeding filed in such court prior to the effective date of this section to the same extent as if this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 106. (a) Domestic Relations Branch vested with power to effectuate purposes of act: The Domestic Relations Branch is hereby vested with so much of the power as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, whether in law or in equity, as is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, including but not limited to, the power to issue restraining orders, injunctions, writs of habeas corpus, and ne exeat, and all other writs, orders, and decrees.

(b) The Domestic Relations Branch shall have the same power to enforce and execute judgments, orders, and decrees entered by it as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Judgments of the branch shall have the same legal status as liens upon real estate as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 107. (a) Amendments of statutes: Section 963 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 845), as amended by the act approved June 21, 1949 (63 Stat. 215, ch. 233; sec. 16–416, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3, and section 13 of the act entitled "An act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia", approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 241), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District" and inserting in lieu thereof "Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal."

(c) Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes", approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 194), as amended, is amended by striking "Office of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia" and by striking "Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and by inserting in lieu of each such phrase "Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 108. Docket: A separate docket shall be maintained for the Domestic Relations Branch. There shall be recorded in such docket the actions taken at each stage of each action and proceeding instituted or conducted in the Branch.

SEC. 109. Process: Service of process for the Domestic Relations Branch shall be made by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia or by any of his authorized assistants. Service of process for the Domestic Relations Branch may also be had by publication in the same manner as service of process is had by publication for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 110. Rules: The judges of the Domestic Relations Branch, with the approval of the chief judge of the court, shall by rules prescribe the fees, charges, and costs and the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure in actions and proceedings in the Domestic Relations Branch. Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant. Except as otherwise specifically provided by such rules, the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall govern in the Branch.

SEC. 111. Appeals: Any party aggrieved by any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the Domestic Relations Branch shall have the same right of appeal available in respect to any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the civil branch of the court.

SEC. 112. Sessions: The Domestic Relations Branch, with at least one judge in attendance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays, and, if deemed necessary, may also hold night sessions.

SEC. 113. Jurisdiction of Juvenile Court not affected: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed so as to affect or diminish the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, or any judge presiding therein.

SEC. 114. Appropriations authorized: Appropriations for expenses necessary for the operation of the Domestic Relations Branch, including personal services, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 115. Effective dates: This act, except sections 105, 106, and 107, shall take effect

upon its approval. Sections 105, 106, and 107 shall take effect 30 days after the appointment and qualification of the 3 additional judges authorized by this act to be appointed to the court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that this morning the Committee on the District of Columbia decided by unanimous vote to substitute the House bill for the Senate bill in connection with the so-called family court in the District of Columbia.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. I understand that the senior Senator from Oregon desires to make a speech.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a brief dissertation.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say for the benefit of the Senate that the acting majority leader has been instructed to move that the Senate adjourn at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

RURAL REVOLT—ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting article published in this morning's Wall Street Journal. The Wall Street Journal is not known as an anti-Republican paper. On the contrary, it is frequently referred to as the economic handbook of the Eisenhower administration. The article I have reference to is entitled "Rural Revolt—Liked Ike in 1952, but Plan Switch in 1956, Say Minnesota Farmers—President, not Benson, Gets Most Blame for Sliding Income, Rising Costs—Politics and the 20-cent Hogs."

The article stresses so many of the things which I have been stressing since the inauguration, when I started to place the responsibility exactly where it belonged, on the President of the United States, that I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL REVOLT—LIKED IKE IN 1952 BUT PLAN SWITCH IN 1956, SAY MINNESOTA FARMERS—PRESIDENT, NOT BENSON, GETS MOST BLAME FOR SLIDING INCOME, RISING COSTS—POLITICS AND 20-CENT HOGS

(By Sterling E. Soderlind)

BLUE EARTH, MINN.—"This is a real farmers' rebellion against Ike, his hired man, Benson, and their farm program. You bet I'm voting Democratic this fall. I never knew I would hurt myself so much when I voted Republican in 1952."

Richard Quaday, a hog and corn farmer near this southern Minnesota town, thus explains his defection from Republican ranks. Shocker for the GOP: Interviews with farmers in this State show that 3 of every 5 who voted for Mr. Eisenhower in 1952 now plan to switch to the Democratic candidate in November.

The discontent of Mr. Quaday and other Minnesota farmers, which received its first political expression in the March 20 Minnesota presidential primary election, is of growing importance to both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Serious farm dissatisfaction could cost the GOP congressional seats and electoral votes in key Midwest States in November.

POLITICIAN, PUNDIT VIEWS

Politicians and pundits began arguing the meaning of the Minnesota election results even before the polls closed. Republican leaders generally attributed Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S resounding victory over Adlai Stevenson as a slap at alleged dictation and bossism of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party and its leaders, Gov. Orville Freeman and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Democrats like Senator KEFAUVER and Mr. Stevenson noted that the total Democratic vote was more than double the GOP vote, indicating, they said, an agrarian revolt and a smashing repudiation of the present administration. The Stevenson forces also laid their defeat to thousands of KEFAUVER Republicans, who, according to their theory, invaded the Democratic primary to stop Stevenson and embarrass D. F. L. leaders.

Both parties are now at work checking these theories and what they portend for November. Shortly after President Eisenhower said he thought the Minnesota election should be studied to see what it means, the Republican National Committee assigned three staff members to help the State party organization analyze the vote.

DISSATISFACTION DEEP

Wall Street Journal interviews with Minnesota voters this week indicate that Republican analysts will find little to be happy about in rural Minnesota. The interviews, with nearly four score farmers, show their dissatisfaction is deep, bearing out the Democrat's theory of agrarian revolt.

"I switched over from Ike to the Democrats last October when I got as low as $9.45 a hundred for 250 hogs I marketed," said Francis O'Neil, who farms 240 acres southwest of Blue Earth. "I've taken a personal beating under the Republicans. As far as I'm concerned they have a mighty tough row to hoe from now on."

Farmer Quaday says he waited 3 years "for Ike to make good his farm promises made right here at Kasson, Minn., in 1952. But nothing is getting better and I have eight kids to support. In 1950 I could have sold out, a house in town and be sitting pretty. Now I couldn't even pay my debts if I sold the works."

SQUARELY ON IKE

While Secretary Benson takes much of the criticism for lower farm income, many farmers place the blame for their personal predicament squarely on the President. Says an Ortonville farmer as he unloads his hogs at the South St. Paul stockyards: "I don't know what folks got against Mr. Benson. I wished I had a hired man that good. He does everything the boss tells him to." The farmer, who liked Ike in 1952, crossed over to KEFAUVER in the primary and will vote Democratic this fall.

Wallace Manthei, who helps his mother run a diversified farm in Kittson County in the extreme northwest corner of Minnesota, says he will change his vote in November "because Benson seems to think that those of us who have trouble in farming should seek employment elsewhere." Mr. Manthei says he doesn't expect the Democrats "will have all the answers either, but at least it will be a change."

The seriousness of farm discontent in Minnesota was measured in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll taken in mid-March, but published after the election. In trial heat pairings, Minnesota farmers favored Senator KEFAUVER over President Eisenhower by 52 percent to 45 percent. In cities Ike led, 56 percent to 40 percent. If they were voting today, the poll showed Ike running ahead of Stevenson, 49 percent to 43 percent among farmers, and 56 percent to 40 percent in cities.

FARMERS UNION VIEW

Edwin Christianson, president of left-leaning Minnesota Farmers Union, which has 35,000 members, termed the results a decisive repudiation of sliding scale farm policies. He noted that the combined vote of the 2 candidates favoring firm, adequate farm programs vastly exceeded the combined vote of the 2 sliding-scale candidates. (The Democrats polled 422,000 to the Republicans 195,000 in incomplete returns. Individual tallies were Kefauver, 239,000; Stevenson, 183,000; Eisenhower, 192,000; Knowland, 3,000.)

Many Republicans argue that the lower GOP vote in the Minnesota primary, in comparison with the Democratic total, is easily explained by the fact that, since Senator KNOWLAND pulled out of the race, there was no Republican contest and little incentive for voting. Says Leonard Hall, Republican national chairman: "Republicans weren't in the Minnesota primary; we were on the sidewalk watching."

But talks with farmers over the back fence, in the feedstore, and along the streets of Minnesota's rural communities leave little doubt that, despite such factors, the farm revolt is real.

And another, more surprising fact emerges from these interviews. Until now it was theorized that although some farmers might express discontent by switching their votes from Republican to Democratic Congressmen this fall and by griping about Secretary Benson, their devotion to Ike remained strong. Actually, almost the opposite seems to be the case.

STAND WITH CONGRESSMEN

Minnesota farmers who plan to switch parties this fall in the presidential election show little inclination at this early date to express their dissatisfaction by voting against the three farm area Republican Congressmen. This is explained by the fact that the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the exception of one Minneapolis representative, is nearly as outspoken against the administration's farm program as their Democratic colleagues.

Not all of President Eisenhower's 1952 farm supporters have soured on him, of course. The President enjoys much good will among Minnesota farmers for ending the Korean war and bringing peace to the country.

"I'd rather be getting half prices and peace instead of full prices and war," remarks Ernest Frank, as he hefts a box of groceries into a truck to return to his farm near Madison Lake. "I was for Ike in 1952, and he'll get my vote again in November."

When asked what it would take to keep them in the Republican ranks this fall, most farmers who plan to switch parties come up with variations on this theme: "We have to have higher prices for what we sell and lower prices on what we buy." Alfred Labf, Blue Earth County farmer, says hogs would have to climb from the present 13 or 14 cents a pound to 20 cents before he would go for Ike again. Farmer Quaday says he won't vote Republican again no matter what happens. "It doesn't pay to have a short memory," he adds.

WHY FARMERS PREFER ESTES

Although Stevenson forces believe the Tennessean beat out Adlai on the Minnesota

farm front because he outpromised their candidate, most farmers interviewed gave other reasons as to why they preferred Senator KEFAUVER.

Comments run along these lines: "KEFAUVER is just more of a farmers' man"; "I can't see going for a loser like Stevenson," and "Me and my friends feel KEFAUVER is more sincere on this farm issue."

Few farmers seemed to think that Senator KEFAUVER's advocacy of 100 percent of parity for low-income farmers gave him any special edge over Mr. Stevenson.

A Mankato farm implement dealer said the fine distinction between the two Democrats' farm policies amounted to the feeling they left in their farmer audiences. "To most of our farmers, Stevenson seemed to be rigid on flexibles while KEFAUVER was flexible on flexibles."

Undoubtedly, many Minnesota Republicans didn't vote in the primary. Yet the GOP total of 195,000 compared not too unfavorably with the total of 290,000 in 1952, considering that there was a Republican contest that year between supporters of Mr. Eisenhower and favorite son Harold Stassen. Ike's vote was a writein, but his backers were in a contest with Stassen supporters, especially in the final days before the election.

REPUBLICAN CROSSOVERS

Some Republican city dwellers freely admit that they took advantage of the primary law which allows voters to cross over into the opposition's primary. Since most of these city crossovers may return to their party in the general election, they are not regarded as posing a serious problem for the Republican Party such as that presented by farmers who have changed allegiance because of an issue.

"Sure I switched over," explains Eli Momsen, a salesman for a St. Paul gold refining firm. "I could name 20 others who did, too. No good Republican would pass up a chance to put FREEMAN and HUMPHREY in their place. Of course I'm for Ike."

"I crossed over just for fun," explains Frank W. Wilkens, a Twin Cities insurance agent. "Stevenson was too glib and I welcomed a chance to vote against him. Of course, I'm no KEFAUVER lover, either."

But such harassing-action crossovers by some urban Republicans can in no way hide the fact that a great share of the switching done in Minnesota was done by farmers and stemmed from deep dissatisfaction with the GOP. Not one farmer was found who had switched his vote just for the harassing effect.

One Blue Earth farmer summed up the general feeling: "I think Mr. Eisenhower needs a rest and I believe we folks around here are going to give it to him."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also have in my hand another very interesting political announcement of the day which I think is worthy of a comment or two. It is a news item from Bismarck, N. Dak., which reads as follows:

North Dakota's Nonpartisan League broke a 40-year tradition today by voting to switch from the Republican to the Democratic column in filing its candidates in this year's elections.

The action was taken on the 40th anniversary of the league's organization.

A standing vote at the league's State endorsing convention here was about 150 to 7 in favor of the change.

I think that is a rather substantial majority. The article goes on to say:

Some leaders of the Nonpartisan League have been trying for several years to effect the shift to the Democrats. Political sources here saw their success this year as a protest against the Eisenhower-Benson farm program.

The league, although without legal status in North Dakota as a political party, has been a power in State politics since its inception in 1916. It claims strong backing from the Farmers Union, an organization which claims membership of more than 80 percent of the farm families in North Dakota.

Today's action came as no surprise to State political observers. Nonpartisan League county conventions held recently voted heavily in favor of backing the switch.

Mr. President, I am waiting to find my very dear and close friend from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], because I have always felt that sooner or later he would join with me, and I think that now the possibilities and probabilities are a little greater.

RECURRING BOXCAR SHORTAGES IN THE NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now, in a very serious vein, to a discussion of an economic issue of great concern to the people of my State, to the lumber industry, and to the small businesses of my State. I wish to speak for a few minutes about the boxcar shortage, Oregon's annual headache, and I wish to state for the record where I think the responsibility rests.

I desire to point out, Mr. President, that the No. 1 industry in my State is the lumber industry. It is very frequently said in economic circles, "As lumber goes, so goes employment in Oregon. As lumber goes, so goes the small-business man in Oregon. As lumber goes, so goes the economy of our State."

Mr. President, we have been plagued for many years with a boxcar shortage, and the responsibility for its rests, in my judgment, on two groups—the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads of the country.

A group of lumbermen from Oregon are in Washington today testifying before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, at a hearing which was arranged many weeks ago by the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. They will discuss not only the boxcar shortage, but an order known as ICC Order 910, recently promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, about which I shall have a few things to say, and also discuss the bill which provides for laying a penalty on railroads that do not return cars to the true owners as rapidly as they should be returned, within the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, we just seem to wait each year for this emergency to arise. It usually comes along in July, August, and September, by way of a boxcar shortage, with resulting losses of millions of dollars to the economy of my State. We are being fed up with it, Mr. President. We think that the Congress has a responsibility to take some action in respect to the matter.

I had a few things to say about it before the committee this morning, and I want to make a record in regard to some of the same points in the Senate this afternoon, because I want to serve notice, as I did on the committee this morning, that I do not intend to stop this fight until the people and the shippers of my State get some protection and some help from the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Commission already has adequate authority, within the law as it is presently written, to prevent this fiasco by way of a boxcar shortage occurring every year. The Commission can no longer hide behind the alibi and rationalization that it is a seasonal problem, because it is fast becoming a problem of almost 12 months duration.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that in my opinion, the Interstate Commerce Commission has adequate authority under existing law to do a better job than it has done in connection with alleviating these boxcar shortages each year. The reason why it is not doing so—and I know the seriousness of the statement I make, but I am satisfied that it is true—is that they pay too much attention to the railroads and too little attention to the shipping needs of the people of this country.

I asked this morning for hearings on the part of the Interstate Commerce Committee so that we could bring forth a record and disclose what the Interstate Commerce Commission is up to.

I make the charge that if the Commission paid less attention to the railroads of this country and more attention to the shipping needs of the people, we would not be confronted with the boxcar shortages of such serious proportions that we have suffered for years past. I do not intend to let the Commission off the hook, because I have studied this matter sufficiently to be satisfied that the Commission must share a large proportion of the responsibility for the great losses suffered through the car shortages year after year. I shall bring out in the course of my remarks this afternoon, as I have before the committee this morning, certain aspects of the problem involving the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I serve notice on the Senate that I shall press for hearings on the matter before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, and as chairman of a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business and as a member of the select committee, I intend to press the question, because we are dealing with inefficiency in administration by a Commission which is a child of the Congress, and we, the Congress, have some responsibility in the matter.

As I pointed out this morning, we should bring this child in and not only give it a spanking, but a horsewhipping, because of its inefficiency and maladministration and its failure over the years to do a better job in connection with boxcar shortages.

I am all fed up with the passing of the buck that we get each year from the Interstate Commerce Commission. They say they do not have enough personnel. That is always the excuse of any commission which is not doing a good job. The question is, What kind of a job are you doing with the personnel you have?

I submit, Mr. President, that the Interstate Commerce Commission is rendering very poor service in this matter. They recognize that if we wait long enough, time will ride out the storm each year. So when we are in the eco-

nomic mess that goes along with the situation, the Commission keeps issuing press releases stating that the problem is seasonal, and that it is doing the best it can. They are trying to put Congress before the public as not having given them enough money to enable them to operate satisfactorily. We have to exercise some judgment in the Congress as to how much they should get.

In respect to certain phases of the Interstate Commerce Commission's budget, I think they do need more personnel, such as in the car policing section, about which I shall have something to say in a moment. But, Mr. President, I think we have a duty now to look into this matter, so far as the policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission are concerned, and see how they have been doing. When that shall be done, I am satisfied we will discover that a very poor record has been made.

Last summer, at the height of the boxcar shortage which confronted the Nation, I traveled extensively in my State, visiting lumber operator after lumber operator, and getting the story as to what the problem was. Lumber operator after lumber operator told me, what I have become satisfied is a fact and can be documented, that much of the cause of the boxcar shortage was the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission to do an effective, efficient boxcar service policing job, for reasons which I shall point out shortly.

I am making my speech in the Senate today on the basis of a very careful investigation which my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and I have already made of the problem. I do not intend to wait until July or August to do something about it. I serve notice today that I intend to drum the condition into the ears of my colleagues in the Senate week after week, from now until adjournment, in the hope that there will be no excuse on the part of any Senator that he does not have the facts about the matter.

From the standpoint of the interests of the vast numbers of small-business men, wherever there is a boxcar shortage, this is a problem about which Congress has the duty to do something. Therefore, on behalf of the rail shippers of Oregon, I am making this speech, and I shall present in it the views of some of the lumber operators and shippers in my State who have discussed the problem with me. It is a problem, seemingly, of endless freight-car shortages in our State, but I am satisfied it is subject to solution if Congress has the will and the determination to take the legislative and investigational steps which are necessary to bring about its solution.

The subject is not new to Oregon. Businessmen who are engaged in shipping by rail tell me that the problem of freight-car shortages, particularly in the lumber industry, has reached the half-century mark. This is an interesting milestone, but is one that should be removed promptly. In my opinion the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the able leadership of its chairman, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is performing a fine public service in its efforts to put an end to the nonstop endurance contest of freight-car shortages. I might add that this contest is one in which the railroads do the promoting and collect the gate receipts, the shippers engage in exhausting efforts, and the public, as spectators, finds little amusement.

For many years past I have worked with Government officials and with colleagues in the Senate to bring relief from these periodic shortages. Others have joined in this effort, but the problem has not been solved to a substantial degree. However, some progress has been made in that we have determined the root cause of the problem, namely, the lack of initiative and foresight on the part of American railroads in meeting shippers' needs and a failure on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to carry out its full duties and obligations under the law.

AMERICAN RAILROADS NEED AWAKENING

The sad fact is that the number of freight cars owned by our railroads is steadily decreasing.

This comes as a surprise to most persons, when they are first asked to look into the matter. Most persons who have not studied the facts, if they were asked the question, "Do you think the number of boxcars in the United States is increasing?" would say, "Yes, I think so." Why? Because they read newspaper items from time to time about the production of new boxcars. But the fact is that the number of boxcars in the tracks of America has not been increasing; it has been decreasing. Why? Because of some very selffish motivations within the railroad industry.

From recent figures compiled by the Association of American Railroads, I note that freight car ownership by the class I railroads decreased from 1,729,939 on March 1, 1955, to 1,696,259 on March 1, 1956. This trend has been in effect since the beginning of 1926 when the railroads owned a total of 2,347,275 freight cars. Of course, the freight car of today has greater capacity to move traffic than the car of years ago, but the railroads appear to have made little real effort to meet the expanding needs of the shippers. I have a strong suspicion, Mr. President, that the railroads are concentrating so intensively on the profit dollar that they fail to comprehend fully the car service needs of business and industry. Apparently, general freight rate increases, not more freight cars or better service to shippers, seem to appeal to the railroads as a means of bettering their situation. I doubt that any other form of business takes such an attitude. It is small wonder, therefore, that the railroads' proportion of the total intercity traffic is steadily decreasing. In 1939 the railroads carried 62.34 percent of such traffic—in 1954 only 49.5 percent. We can predict an even smaller proportion of traffic for the railroads in the future unless they change their attitude.

The foregoing facts become most disturbing when we recall that during recent years the class I railroads of this country have not suffered from financial malnutrition. Figures made available to me by the ICC reveal extremely favorable net railway operating income averaging about a billion dollars per year for American class I railways for the years 1950 to 1954, inclusive. This figure increased during 1955, when the class I railways earned $1,128,000,000 in net railway operating income.

Contrast the foregoing profit figures with those relating to capital expenditures for equipment. During the period of 1951 to 1954 inclusive, there was a steady and marked decline in capital expenditures for equipment on class I railroads. In 1951 equipment outlays were slightly over $1 billion. In 1954 they dropped to approximately one-half of that amount—$499 million.

The figures for new freight cars put into operation and freight cars retired on class I railroads between 1951 and 1955 inclusive, are also very revealing. They show a decided adverse trend insofar as interests of shippers are concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table showing the total number of freight cars installed and retired on class I railways, 1951–1955, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total freight cars installed and retired, class I railways, 1951–55, inclusive

	Total freight cars installed	Total freight cars retired
1951	87,727	53,028
1952	67,420	62,240
1953	69,394	50,123
1954	30,562	71,858
1955	37,509	73,491
January-February 1956	9,276	7,362
Total	301,888	318,102

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the figures in this table are sufficiently discouraging in themselves, but they become appalling when we reflect that during the same period of 1951 to 1955, inclusive, the class I railroads had the benefit of rapid tax amortization on their freight-car program.

I digress to point out what the accelerated tax amortization program really is. It is an interest-free loan supplied the beneficiary by the taxpayers of America out of the Treasury of the United States. That is what it amounts to. What the seekers after accelerated tax amortization like to gloss over in their representations about it to the public is the little matter of interest. They simply think the average layman does not pay very much attention to the little item of interest. But we are dealing here with construction projects which involve many millions of dollars. A little difference in interest over the period of amortization amounts to many millions of dollars of savings to the beneficiary of this kind of giveaway.

I do not want to be misunderstood about this matter. I voted for the tax-amortization program for the building of boxcars, because I made a study of the situation at the time. For example, I, myself, went to Altoona, Pa., which is one of the centers of boxcar construction

in the United States. I went there at the invitation of a civic group, which wanted me to see a distressed employment area, an area where thousands of people were out of work. In Altoona, I talked with small-business men, who pointed out that they were carrying on their cuffs, figuratively speaking, credit to the extent of thousands and thousands of dollars to relieve the economic needs of the consumers of Altoona, Pa., hoping that the sunny day would come when men would again pick up their dinner pails in the morning and go to work for a full day's employment.

I came back here to the Senate. I recall distinctly pointing out to the Senate the disastrous situation that existed not only in Altoona, Pa., but in a good many other places where there were pockets of great unemployment. So we voted for an accelerated tax-amortization program for the railroads of the country for the building of new boxcars. We had in mind the purpose not only of helping the unemployment problem at the time, but we also had in mind doing something about the annual boxcar shortage.

What did the railroads do? They built new cars, but they took off the tracks more cars than they built, cars which, I am satisfied the record will show, could be kept on the tracks with a little outlay of money for repair. What they have been doing is using a tax-free loan from the taxpayers of the country to improve their rolling stock, to get new cars at a low cost resulting therefrom, and they are junking some of their older, but still usable, cars. That means, in the long run, more profit dollars for the railroads.

Get it out of your head, Mr. President, if you think a boxcar shortage means economic trouble for the railroads. To use a figure of speech, it creates a "gravy train," and places it into the hands of the railroads, by the law of scarcity.

I said in committee this morning, and I am willing to say it on the floor of the Senate, that not only did I vote for the accelerated tax amortization program for the railroads, but I am willing to vote for another one, because the purpose of an accelerated tax amortization program is to meet an emergency need. Show me the emergency need, show me that in order to meet that need and to serve the public interest there is a need for an accelerated tax-amortization program, and I will vote for it.

My bill of complaint is not that we voted for an accelerated tax-amortization program for the railroads for boxcar construction, but that the Interstate Commerce Commission did not do a better job in carrying out its policing functions to stop the railroads from junking usable cars. Do not think the railroads would not listen to the Commission. The trouble is that the Interstate Commerce Commission is in the habit of listening too much to the railroads, rather than making the railroads listen to the Interstate Commerce Commission. If we could get the Commission to change in its attitude about that, we would have part of the answer to the annual boxcar shortage.

I said in committee this morning that I not only would vote for an accelerated tax-amortization program for the building of boxcars to increase the total number of boxcars on the tracks, but, as I said laughingly there, I would even run the risk of being called a creeping Socialist by saying that my devotion to the American free-enterprise system and my devotion to protecting the competitive free-enterprise system in America is such that I would have the Government come to the assistance of the small-business men and the shippers of the country if the railroads could show on the record—I do not think they could, but if they could—that it would be economically unjust to require them to keep on hand a surplus of boxcars to meet the boxcar shortage part of the year. I would go so far as to say I would have the Government participate in some form of subsidy to build their cars in order to stem them over the period of car shortage and have them available for the free-enterprise system of America, represented by the small-business men and the shippers of America.

In my opinion that is what the Government ought to do for the people, and I do not look upon it as at all socialistic, although I know my detractors will say, "Why MORSE proposes that the Government build boxcars." What I am proposing is that if we are to have the boxcars to meet the needs of the free-enterprise system, and the railroads will not build them, then it becomes the duty of the Government to come to the assistance of small-business men when they cannot get assistance any other way. There is nothing socialistic about that. That is carrying out the spirit of what Lincoln pleaded for, that it is the duty of the Government to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, but what needs to be done for the general welfare of the people.

Mr. President, this situation is serious, not only in my own State, but as one travels in the grain States of the Middle West he is confronted with great losses each year as a result of the boxcar shortage. We have a national problem. The time has come when we ought to do something about the national problem, and this happens to be the national legislative body to do it.

Therefore, I shall continue to urge that we follow a sound policy, so far as our economy is concerned, and stop this penny-wise pound-foolish policy that has characterized our failure up to date to enact legislation which will help meet the boxcar shortage, and to issue instructions and, if necessary, orders to the Interstate Commerce Commission—by legislation if necessary—to require it to do a better job than it has been doing in this matter.

Mr. President, based upon information supplied by the Interstate Commerce Commission, we find that a total valuation of $2,320,908,334 in freight-car construction was under 85-percent accelerated tax amortization between 1951 and 1955, inclusive.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table of figures printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Year:	*Freight car valuation under amortization*
Available from 1950 to be carried forward	$33,862,000
1951	636,520,800
1952	843,320,231
1953	428,428,484
1954	143,098,485
1955	235,678,334
Total	2,320,908,334

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, thus, the amortizable amount was $1,731,600,890, constituting, in effect, a tax-free loan from the Government. There is a serious doubt as to whether this rapid tax writeoff program should apply where it fails to produce an overall increase in the number of boxcars on American railroads.

I wish to stress that point. I am for the tax amortization program. I think the amortizable program is sound to meet an emergency need if—and I underscore the word "if"—by its use the railroads increase the total number of boxcars. That is the test. Now, if they are going to try to continue to play the game they have played up to now, of coming in and testifying about the great need for new boxcars, and then proceeding to take off the tracks usable cars which, with a little repair work could be kept in operation from 2 to 5 years—and that is what some of the experts have told me about this junking game of the railroads—then they ought to pay the full tax, and we ought to seek some other remedy for aiding farmers, shippers, and small-business men who need boxcars.

A mystery that practically defies the imagination is why the railroads, with this enormous rapid tax writeoff bonus, did not initiate a truly forward-looking car construction program. Their record of heel dragging is inexcusable.

The railroads have been described as the lifeline of our economy, particularly in times of emergency. Their importance to our whole economy and to national defense is tremendous. That is why I am deeply concerned over current indications that this vital industry is failing to keep pace with the transportation demands of the Nation.

RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR USE PRACTICES ADD TO THE CAR SHORTAGES IN THE WEST

The economic activities of the West, as compared with those of the heavily industrialized East, set the stage for boxcar shortages in the West.

The principal economic activities in the West, and those in the South, as well, are the production of bulky heavy-loading commodities, such as lumber, minerals, and grain. These by necessity must move in large volume to the areas of greatest consumption in eastern portion of the United States, where the bulk of the population and most of the Nation's industry are located. Obviously, in the West and in the South more carloads of freight are originated than terminated. The opposite is true in the East.

Thus, the preponderance of freight movement is eastbound, requiring movements of empty cars West and South.

Prompt return of these cars is highly important to the economic well-being of these areas. Once these cars are unloaded in the East, it seems that there is a tendency for the eastern railroads to avail themselves of the use of these cars for their own traffic, rather than to load them promptly with freight destined to the South and West, or to return them empty. Expressed in a word that often has been used in another connection, the Interstate Commerce Commission should be given authority to unleash freight cars, when necessary to relieve car shortages.

Failure to return freight cars promptly accentuates the car shortage in Oregon in the period each year when economic activity is at its height. The shortage is aggravated even more in the areas where a single railroad holds a monopoly, and knows that shippers must wait until the carriers choose to furnish boxcars.

The committee bill, S. 2770, is designed to correct this practice of the eastern railroads of delaying the return of freight cars to the West. The bill would grant to the Interstate Commerce Commission increased authority to deal with freight-car shortages. I favor the giving of such authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission; so I favor the passage of this bill, as it is now written, or with reasonable changes calculated to give the Commission authority to establish penalty per diem rates to promote "expeditious movement, distribution, interchange or return of freight cars," the additional charges to be paid to the owners by the carrier using such cars.

"Return of freight cars" is a phrase used in the bill that is of great practical importance to the State of Oregon and the rest of the Pacific Northwest. It is failure to return the cars owned by the railroads in the Northwest that accentuates the shortages of freight cars that occur periodically. The enactment of this proposed legislation is of the greatest importance to the areas where a monopoly of rail service exists. Some of those areas lie in Oregon.

RAILROAD-CAR SERVICE MONOPOLY—A GUARANTY OF FREIGHT-CAR SHORTAGES

During the past summer and fall, as I have said, I traveled extensively in Oregon; and I can assure the committee that the subject of freight-car shortages was raised by scores of Oregon businessmen, especially those engaged in the lumber and plywood industries in the area south of Albany, Oreg., and west to the Pacific Ocean. Again and again these people, who have had firsthand experience, insisted that the Southern Pacific Railroad is discriminating against the State of Oregon in the distribution of freight cars, and that it has been favoring California shippers of lumber, to the disadvantage of Oregon shippers. They further contended that the freight-car shortage is most acute in the areas of the State where the Southern Pacific is the sole source of rail-freight transportation. In other words, they asserted that where competition exists among rail-freight carriers in Oregon, Washington, and California, boxcars are available in ample quantities for the lumber industry. But, where the Southern Pacific Co. enjoys a monopoly—as it does in so many Oregon communities—almost invariably lumber shippers can be sure of one thing: an insufficient quantity of boxcars.

Several months ago I talked to a group of about 15 lumbermen in Grants Pass, Oreg. They stated that the Southern Pacific Railroad apparently regards Grants Pass as a forgotten area. These businessmen said that for weeks they had been getting from 25 to 50 percent of the boxcars actually needed, and that this resulted in mill operations that often totaled less than 50 percent of capacity. They charged that the Interstate Commerce Commission failed to police properly a critical shortage of boxcars where a rail-freight carrier operates as a monopoly.

Mr. President, what does that situation mean? It means unemployment and men laid off from work, and it means that families are losing paychecks. So when we consider the boxcar problem, we are not dealing only with boxcars; we are also dealing with the problems which the shortage of boxcars creates throughout the entire economic life of the area in which that shortage is experienced. In other words, in that case we are dealing with the economic interests of men, women, and children who are dependent for their standard of living upon an ample supply of boxcars.

So I wish to say to the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission that in taking this position in regard to some of their attitudes on the boxcar shortage, I am making a fight for the economic interests of the men, women, and children of my State who have suffered inexcusably and unjustifiably because of the failure of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the past to do a more efficient and more effective job in regard to this problem.

Mr. President, this problem has ceased to be "seasonal in nature." The unfortunate boxcar shortage in western Oregon appears to have become an institution; but it is one that cannot and should not be tolerated longer.

The lumber market is one that is subject to rapid fluctuations. Readily available and adequate rail transportation is absolutely essential to obtaining the benefits of a favorable market. Both large and small producers of lumber and lumber products in Oregon suffer substantial economic losses while they wait for their share of boxcars at the sufferance of the rail carrier. If the Southern Pacific is in fact discriminating against Oregon in the distribution of freight cars, that is a practice that cannot be endured much longer by Oregon lumber producers in the category of small business.

I urge the committee to explore ways and means of getting freight cars for use at the height of the season in this rail-monopoly area of my State. Favorable action on Senate bill 2770 will help, but additional remedies are essential. One of these, I respectfully submit, is the addition of highly essential car service agents to the staff of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee can perform an important public service by making recommendations on this score.

CREEPING PARALYSIS IN THE ICC—THE REDUCTION IN CAR SERVICE PERSONNEL

The Interstate Commerce Act gives the Interstate Commerce Commission powers under which to assure adequate service on the part of our American railroads to the public. For example, we find these provisions:

11. It shall be the duty of every carrier by railroad subject to this part to furnish safe and adequate car service and to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable rules, regulations, and practices with respect to car service. * * *

14. The Commission may, after hearing, on a complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, establish reasonable rules, regulations, and practices with respect to car service by common carriers by railroad subject to this part * * * and the penalties or other sanctions for nonobservance of such rules, regulations, or practices.

15. Whenever the Commission is of opinion that shortage of equipment, congestion of traffic, or other emergency requiring immediate action exists in any section of the country, the Commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint, or upon its own initiative without complaint, at once, if it so orders, without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, and with or without notice, hearing, or the making or filing of a report, according as the Commission may determine: (a) to suspend the operation of any or all rules, regulations, or practices then established with respect to car service for such time as may be determined by the Commission; (b) to make such just and reasonable direction with respect to car service with regard to the ownership as between carriers of locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, during such emergency as in its opinion will best promote the service in the interest of the public and the commerce of the people, upon such terms of compensation as between the carriers as they may agree upon, or, in the event of their disagreement, as the Commission may after subsequent hearing find to be just and reasonable; (c) to require such joint or common use of terminals, including main-line track or tracks for a reasonable distance outside of such terminals, as in its opinion will best meet the emergency and serve the public interest, and upon such terms as between the carriers as they may agree upon, or, in the event of their disagreement, as the Commission may after subsequent hearing find to be just and reasonable. * * *

16. Whenever the Commission is of opinion that any carrier by railroad subject to this part is for any reason unable to transport the traffic offered it so as properly to serve the public, it may, upon the same procedure as provided in paragraph (15), make such just and reasonable directions with respect to the handling, routing, and movement of traffic of such carrier and its distribution over other lines of roads, as in the opinion of the Commission will best promote the service in the interest of the public.

Mr. President, a law which is not efficiently administered and effectively enforced is practically worthless, so far as end results are concerned. The record shows quite clearly that, in recent years, a creeping paralysis has reduced the Interstate Commerce Commission's enforcement staff in the field from over 100 agents to 30, as of now.

Just yesterday I learned the almost unbelievable fact that in the Interstate Commerce Commission Zone No. 25, we now have only three car-service agents—one each in Spokane, Portland, and San

Francisco. Believe it or not, Mr. President, these men have not one secretary to assist them in their clerical duties. It is little wonder that we have an almost insurmountable problem of policing the boxcar situation in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, let us consider this inefficiency on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission and let us see what it means when translated into action or lack of action in regard to the boxcar shortage problem. There sits in Portland, Oreg., the Commission's so-called boxcar policing agent; and he has to finger out on his own typewriter his redtape reports—and they are many—with the result that he has little time to go into the field and do the policing job which should be done. The Interstate Commerce Commission does not even supply that agent with a secretary. I say good naturedly that I could walk down to the Interstate Commerce Commission this afternoon and take out at least a dozen secretaries, and I would not by one iota lessen the efficiency of the Interstate Commerce Commission at the Washington level; and I could transfer them to the field and thus could give these boxcar policing agents the assistants they need in order to do the work and to compile the reports and to take the action required in order to help alleviate the boxcar shortage.

I know something about the oversupply of personnel which develops in Washington departments. I am not moved to tears by the Interstate Commerce Commission, with its personnel argument, until it can first show me that it is doing a more efficient job in using the personnel it has, so far as secretarial help is concerned. What we do need, and what the railroads do not want, are some more boxcar policemen. The Car Service Agency of the Interstate Commerce Commission needs to have its personnel increased. I am about to recommend that it be increased at least to 60 for this year.

If the rules and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission were effectively enforced, I am satisfied that our car-shortage problem would diminish. Such enforcement, of course, is not possible in the absence of a proper enforcement staff in the field and the employment of such a staff is, of course, a Federal budgetary matter.

I believe that, at the earliest possible moment, we should bring the ICC car service agent back to a minimum of 100. I am pleased to note that the House recommended an increase from 30 to 40 a few days ago. I suggest that the number be raised by the Senate to 60 this year, with the ultimate target of 100 to restore efficiency in the field of enforcement.

I have looked into this subject, and I find that that is about the last thing the railroads would like to have us do. The railroads are not eager to have the Car Service Department of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the field enlarged by more personnel, because they know that if there were more personnel in the field, some of the wrongdoing of the railroads would be more easily brought to light. But if we wish to do something constructive in the direction of helping to alleviate the boxcar shortage problem, we must come to grips with the problem of supplying the Interstate Commerce Commission with the field agents it needs to enforce the regulations of the Commission. I sincerely hope that if the members of this committee agree with my conclusions in this respect, they will join me in urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to provide the necessary funds this year. I intend to appear before the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and make my plea for such funds. An increase of car service agents from 40 to 60 would call for an addition of approximately $200,000 for the Interstate Commerce Commission. In my judgment it would save many millions of dollars in the economy which are now lost because of the failure to supply an adequate number of boxcars.

The importance of the public service these men can perform would make this a bargain-rate appropriation.

CAR SERVICE ORDER NO. 910

On March 19, 1956, Division 3 of the Interstate Commerce Commission issued car service order No. 910.

Almost immediateley, my office received comments from Oregon lumber shippers. The great majority of communications I received contend that order 910, if put into effect, will completely disrupt normal marketing procedures to the disadvantage of the small mills in Oregon and will play into the hands of the large operators. Other communications, fewer in number, insist that this order will help resolve the box car shortage. Those who have protested on this order assert that they have not been heard on the subject and they ask that the April 9, 1956 effective date of the service order No. 910 be postponed by the Commission pending a hearing.

This morning, before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I made this plea in behalf of the shippers of my State who desire a postponement of the application of this order. I sincerely hope that the committee and the Interstate Commerce Commission may heed that plea. These businessmen, who are our fellow citizens, are entitled to a hearing on the effects of the order before it is put into effect on April 9. We ought to listen to some of their testimony as to what this order would do to the small mills in my State.

As I pointed out to the committee this morning, it would create, according to their testimony, great economic hardship, and inexcusable injustice. I do not think we should stand idly by and let a child of the Congress, namely, the Interstate Commerce Commission, engage in such delinquent acts.

In the past day or two, I have talked to many Oregon lumbermen and I am satisfied that they make a strong prima facie case for postponement of the effective date of the order in order to afford all interested parties a hearing on the merits.

The problem is so serious and it has been presented to me in such convincing fashion that I feel it would be a mistake for the Commission to proceed with order No. 910 without having received the views of both sides. Therefore, I urge this committee to communicate immediately with the Commission asking for a postponement of the April 9 effective date of the order in question.

Therefore I am urging the Commission and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to provide for a suspension of this order, or a postponement beyond April 9, so that hearings on the order can be held. I would prefer hearings in the field.

A group of small lumber operators in my State traveled to Washington, a distance of more than 3,000 miles, to testify before the committee today. They did not come for nothing. It is an expensive trip. I think the Federal Government owes it to the objectors to order No. 910 to have some early field hearings, out in the parts of the country where the devastating effects alleged by the mill operators would take place.

BOXCARS SHOULD NOT BECOME MOBILE GRAIN ELEVATORS

Many people with whom I have conferred on the car shortage contend that Commodity Credit Corporation shipments of grain during the period of high demand for boxcars intensify the problem. For example, I am told that the inadequacy of permanent storage facilities in the Grain Belt has, in effect, caused large sums of freight cars to become mobile grain elevators. This, in turn, has caused delay in the transfer of such boxcars to other parts of the country, including the Pacific Northwest. The complex problems of the freight-car shortage have been heightened by the fact that the demands for grain and lumber shipping space too often coincide. It is quite likely that the Government can establish periods of grain movement which do not conflict with the periods at which lumber shipments are the heaviest.

As I stated before the committee this morning, I have received information which I think is reliable—but I am having it checked with the Commodity Credit Corporation—to the effect that under the rules and regulations of the Commodity Credit Corporation they prohibit the shipment of grain in trucks in some instances. It has been reported to me that trucks will leave the west coast, for example, loaded with goods for St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, Detroit, or other midwestern or eastern cities, and return, at least part of the way, empty. Frequently they pass Commodity Credit Corporation elevators and storage bins where they could stop and pick up a load of grain and take it to the shipping center by truck. However, the Commodity Credit Corporation allegedly has a rule which prohibits shipment of the grain in trucks, and requires that the grain be shipped in freight cars.

That is unsound economically. It is an injustice to our farmers, and it is an injustice to our shippers, who need the boxcars. Whenever the commodities can be shipped by other conveyances, I do not think we should have any Federal regulation by any agency of the Government which prevents shipment by truck.

Insofar as the demand for grain shipping space amplifies the shortage of rail transportation for lumber, an indirect

solution might be worked out through an accelerated Federal program of increasing grain storage facilities coupled with a more realistic plan for disposal of our surplus grain to hungry people in friendly foreign nations.

It seems to me that the committee could explore to the advantage of the public, shippers, and the railroads themselves, some of the following suggestions relative to car shortages:

First. Increase demurrage charges to discourage delay in car movements.

Second. Reduce to a minimum empty cars held for loading.

Third. Place embargoes against consignees who accumulate cars.

Fourth. Repair defective cars promptly.

Fifth. Load cars promptly and as heavily as possible.

Sixth. Increase the supply of new cars.

Speaking of loading the cars as heavily as possible, the lumbermen with whom I conferred at breakfast this morning tell me that under the so-called transit-sale system they are able to get into the cars about 20 percent more lumber than is loaded in the cars when there is a so-called firm sale in advance of shipment.

They also point out on this subject that it is not true, as the representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission are so prone to say, that the transit-sale program results in undue delays in the delivery of cars. They say that at the height of the boxcar shortage period—and, of course, that is the period that concerns us—the average time for the transportation by way of a so-called transit sale is 3.9 days. However, if we follow order No. 910, what will happen is that the shippers will take the longest route around. In this instance, they say some of our Oregon shippers will use the Southern Pacific and take the lumber down through California and on around to Houston and then up into the Middle West. That plays right into the hands of the Southern Pacific Railroad and gives them an advantage which in my opinion they are not entitled to have.

I pressed that point this morning in committee, and it is a point that I shall continue to investigate and to press forward on in connection with the boxcar shortage program.

In conclusion, I suggest that the Government has perhaps relaxed its vigilance of former years in the field of railroad transportation. The time appears to be opportune for closer analysis of the whole subject of rail transportation. Our economy is becoming too complex to permit extended delay in this respect. There is much to be gained by a determination as to whether existing freight handling practices of the American railroads is efficient, economic, and in the interest of the American public. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can do immeasurable good in calling to the attention of Government agencies and the public, the adverse economic effects of the constantly recurring freight-car shortages and in suggesting affirmative action on the part of the carriers and the Federal Government in correcting this condition.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very interesting document. It is a hard one to get. It is scarcer than hen's teeth. It contains some very interesting information which apparently some people do not want to have subjected to very wide circulation. It will get some very wide circulation now. It is Report No. 30708 of the Interstate Commerce Commission in "Shippers Car Supply Committee against Southern Pacific Co." It is an examiner's report. It is an exceedingly interesting report.

Because I shall refer to it from time to time as we press forward on the boxcar shortage problem in the weeks ahead, I ask unanimous consent to have the examiner's report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, No. 30708, SHIPPERS CAR SUPPLY COMMITTEE[1] VERSUS SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO.

Defendant not shown to have engaged in unreasonable or otherwise unlawful practices that could be remedied by retroactive order, in furnishing or not furnishing cars to complainant and intervener in western Oregon. Complaint and intervening petition dismissed.

William P. Ellis and Dean Ellis for complainant and interveners.

James E. Lyons, Charles W. Burkett, Jr., James C. Dezendorf, and Stanfield B. Johnson for defendant.

Report proposed by O. L. Mohundro, examiner.

By complaint filed November 6, 1950, complainant charges the following specific violations of law:

1. Failure to provide transportation of property upon reasonable request, particularly in failing to provide adequate trackage, motive power, and other facilities and equipment to meet the demands of the shipping public, in violation of section 1 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended.

2. Failure to furnish adequate car service, particularly (a) in failing and neglecting to purchase or construct a supply of cars adequate for the needs of its shippers; (b) failing to effect suitable arrangements with connecting carriers for interchange of empty and loaded cars; and (c) failing to employ an adequate staff of competent employees to promptly, efficiently, and fairly distribute the supply of cars available, in violation of section 1 (11) of the act.

3. Causing undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage to camplainant's members by failure to provide car service to them in the same proportion to actual requirements as were provided to other shippers on its lines in Oregon and elsewhere, contrary to section 3 (1) of the act.

4. Causing undue and unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage to shippers generally on its lines in Oregon and giving undue and unreasonable preference and advantage to other shippers on its lines in other States, in violation of section 3 (1) of the act.

5. Causing substantial increases in transportation and marketing costs, substantial losses in labor, production, and profits of complainant's members and others by curtailing their production by preventing them from making deliveries on contracts and from selling their products in the open market, which has resulted in damage and loss of goodwill for which defendant is liable.

[1] Complainant is a nonprofit corporation of Oregon dedicated to the purpose of improving the freight car supply and the quality of railroad service, especially in western Oregon.

Complainant seeks an order commanding the defendant to cease and desist from the unlawful acts alleged and requiring it to provide complainant's members and other shippers on defendant's lines in western Oregon with adequate and nondiscriminatory service and facilities; also that defendant be required to pay to complainant's members such damages as may be claimed and established by them, with reasonable counsel fees.

The Commissioner of Public Utilities of Oregon, at the time of hearing, Hon. Geo. H. Flagg, later Hon. Chas. H. Heltzel, intervened generally in support of complainant and joined with complainant in the making of the record herein.

A. L. MacInnis and Cosima D. MacInnis, doing business as Wren Planing Mill, members of complainant, Shippers Car Supply Committee, intervened in support of complainant and in addition to the prayer for general relief, seek an award of damages.

Defendant answered, challenging the sufficiency of the complaint and alleging that there is a defect of parties defendant in that connecting lines are necessary parties with respect to the matters alleged, particularly paragraphs IV and V thereof. Defendant denies the alleged violations of the act; and, as an affirmative defense, alleges that during the years 1947 to 1950, inclusive, unavoidable freight car shortages existed on its lines during the peak of the fall shipping seasons; that similar shortages existed contemporaneously on the lines of other railroads throughout the United States, and that such shortages resulted from a number of causes, specifically set forth of record, for none of which defendant can be held accountable.

The answer further alleges that defendant has done, is doing, and in the future will continue to do all practical things within its power, circumscribed only by financial limitations, availability of materials, and production capacity of car and equipment builders throughout the country, to acquire and maintain a reasonably adequate car supply, including locomotives to move them, and to maintain a railroad system reasonably adequate to meet the needs of the public defendant serves.

Concurrently with the filing of its answer defendant made a motion to dismiss the complaint and, alternatively, to make the same more definite and certain. This motion was denied on February 8, 1951, but without prejudice to defendant requesting, at the close of complainant's testimony, a further hearing for introduction of defendant's evidence respecting those allegations of the complaint which defendant claims are indefinite and uncertain. Such further hearing was held, and the record is ably briefed on all major issues.

The chairman of complainant, Shippers Car Supply Committee, has been engaged in the wholesale lumber business as the Trio Lumber Co. at Eugene, Oreg., for more than 25 years. He owns an interest in the Douglas Manufacturing Co., a sawmill and remanufacturing plant near Roseburg, Oreg., with an output of 90,000 feet per day, and Ada Co., out of Ada, Oreg., cutting 25,000 to 30,000 feet per day. The market for his lumber and that of other shippers who testified of record is practically throughout the United States. The practice of billing is not uniform. Sometimes the company is shown as the shipper, sometimes the mill, and in some instances the purchaser of the lumber is named as the shipper. The inability to obtain cars when desired caused the chairman of the complainant committee in 1946 to investigate the causes for lack of cars for Oregon lumber shippers. He contacted the western representative for the AAR in Seattle, Wash.

He described the situation, stressing the local conditions, lack of carrier competition, etc., but without results. Thereafter, following the car shortage of 1947, he and two

other firms, by letters, requested an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the lack of car service to western Oregon lumber shippers, "but he didn't get anywhere with that." In 1948, he was appointed chairman of a traffic committee for the Western Forest Industries Association. The purpose of the association was to make an investigation among shippers with a view to remedying the situation caused by the car shortage. During the investigation, it was determined that an organization devoted solely to investigating the car supply should be formed. The complainant committee, an Oregon corporation, nonprofit in character, controlled by a board of directors elected from the membership was created for the purpose.

In his business the car shortage at Eugene was serious during the summer months of 1946 and for subsequent summer seasons, including 1950 and some of 1951. During the summer, or demand months, he could not tell a customer when a shipment would be made because of the lack of cars. This condition affected western Oregon lumber shippers, particularly those located on the lines of defendant, to such an extent that they lost the so-called premium business—premium price for quick shipments. The inability to get cars when needed caused the mills to take orders for short periods instead of a normal 30-day order supply. The car shortage of 1946 and 1947 caused purchasers to operate somewhat in the same manner. This eventually led to the practice of so-called transit sales. Though not satisfactory either to the producer or the buyer of the lumber, 50 percent or more of the volume shipped from western Oregon was forced into this practice because of inability to arrange for shipment of a car when needed.

In 1950 the chairman of the committee went into Washington to get cars to stop off for complete loading in Oregon. That caused extra expense and delay. Shippers could get cars from railroads in Washington, put a small amount of lumber therein, and route them through Oregon to complete loading. The routing of such cars generally was "UP–SP–UP." For a time no definite amount of lumber had to be loaded to get the car. Later 25 percent of car minimum was required. That requirement was hard to meet because of the difficulty and cost of obtaining the quantity and quality of lumber desired. This caused wasteful use of cars and did not prove a real help. Experience thus gained caused the witness to think that the cars should have been given to defendant at Portland. In some instances lumber was hauled by truck as much as 200 miles from valley points (local to defendant) to Portland for partial loading, and some cars were fully loaded from the trucks in Portland.

The failure to get cars when needed caused many mills to "shut down" during the summer months of 1946–50, inclusive. The situation was particularly bad in 1949 and 1950. When the lumber could not be shipped as produced, storage soon became so expensive that shutdown was made necessary. Shipping members of complainant at Grants Pass, Oreg. (local to defendant), experienced severe car shortage during 1947–50, inclusive, "but not too bad in 1951." Costly shutdowns in 1949 and 1950 were forced by lack of cars. A member of complainant committee operating a custom milling business and manufacturing molding plant at Grants Pass had a capacity of eight cars per day. During the car shortage periods of 1949–50, that member received as low as 1 or 2 cars per day. He had storage for some 5 million feet of lumber, but when that much lumber accrued, the plant had to stop work, thus causing a shutdown of all supplying mills. Handling and storing large quantities of lumber was inconvenient and expensive. The cost of such operations could not be added to the price of the lumber or millwork. Shippers generally, and particularly those at Grants Pass, complained of poor service, such as switching, time changes of switching, and the manner of handling orders for cars.

Some 15 other witnesses representing lumber shippers who operated from 1 to 5 mills and who produced large quantities of lumber for shipment by rail, and most of whom were dependent for cars upon defendant, testified along the same lines and to the same effect.

Witnesses for feed and seed dealers of Oregon located on defendant's lines at Cornelius, Gladstone, North Plains, and Roy described as serious to them the car shortages of 1946 and 1947. Their greatest losses caused by lack of cars were during the summer months of those years. Some of their plants are located also on the "SP&S," and some of the lines of both the defendant and the Oregon Electric. At most times they were able to get cars as needed at the competitive points. For example, in 1947 they shipped 57 cars from North Plains, a competitive point, and only 10 cars from Roy, local to defendant. They reduced the bad effects of the 1950 car shortage by trucking their grain to Portland. The 1951 crop was said to be about 10 percent of usual volume, so there was little for shipment that year.

Witnesses for the lumber interests of Grants Pass were recalled at the adjourned hearing to testify as to conditions existing during the summer months of 1952. Operations of the Engler-Hudson Co., located some four city blocks distant from defendant's station, were described. The company operated two shifts daily and produced some 250,000 feet per day. The capacity of the plant was rated as 8 cars per day. On 6 of the first 10 business days of July, orders were not filled, though presumably there was no car shortage elsewhere on the line at that time. On July 11, six cars were furnished. A shortage of cars was experienced every other working day in July (1952), except two. Record for the month was 113 cars ordered, 82 furnished, a shortage of 31. The situation shown for August was not so good. On seven working days, the company received no cars, but had orders for an average of 8 cars for each day. The record for August was 184 cars ordered, 83 furnished, a shortage of 101. During the period September 1 to 19 (1952), 72 cars were ordered, 56 furnished, shortage 17.

The switching service at Grants Pass continued bad as shown by the following (RECORD, pp. 739–740):

"Question (by Mr. Lyons). Mr. Hedrick, what kind of an engine is it that switches your plant? Is it an assigned switch engine at Grants Pass, or is it a line haul engine that comes down from Medford?

"Answer. It's both. The one that goes to Glendale also. There's three. You never know which one you're going to get for sure. They have a diesel switch engine that apparently stays at Grants Pass most of the time, and that's the one that does the switching usually.

"However, here lately it's been whatever crew they could get to do it.

"Question. Well, have you taken up with the trainmaster or the superintendent the question of having the switches made at a convenient hour to your plant?

"Answer. Yes, we did. They came down—I don't recall who I talked to—one fellow we used to talk to, I believe, was named Barney—Ted Barney. I may be wrong about that, but I think that's his name—from Roseburg, and we got together with him on this night switch, which was very convenient for us if they'd do it. They wanted to switch us about 10:30 at night, but that fell through.

"Question. Well, I understood from your testimony that the switching has not been satisfactory as it might be, but it's only been in the last month or two that it's been particularly bad for your plant because the switching came at irregular hours and sometimes in the morning and sometimes at night; is that right?

"Answer. That's correct.

"Question. But have you in the last 30 days or so taken up with any superior officer of the Southern Pacific the question?

"Answer. Taken it up with our own local agent. I can't find out anymore who you do take it up with. I took it up with Mr. Criswell; I talked to Mr. Criswell just before he went on his vacation which I believe was Friday, and he told me that it really had him beat because he said it got to the point where he had no authority whatsoever.

"I talked to Mr. Nugent, who is taking Mr. Criswell's place; I talked with him Monday, and he says he's fighting a losing battle, too.

"Question. Well, may I suggest that the general manager is in the room, that you contact him, and he'll relay it down to the proper party?

"Answer. I called Mr. Leslie and spent 'oodles' of money on the telephone for the past 2 years, and haven't succeeded. So I quit spending that money."

Complainant employed a special representative with some 30 years' experience in traffic matters in the considered origin territory. His special attention was directed to car supply and transportation service in western Oregon since 1948. He visited practically all communities in that part of the State, attended many meetings looking to the improvement of the car supply. He worked closely with members of complainant committee and lumber shippers in western Oregon during the car shortage of 1950. During the months of car shortage on defendant's lines in 1950, he found no specific shortage of cars at Portland. Accompanied by lumber shippers he personally called on all carrier agents in the Portland switching area. Some of the agents are said to have admitted that at no time during the summer of 1950 had there been a shortage of cars at Portland. The agents at Portland would not furnish cars to lumber shippers on the lines of defendant in western Oregon. He found a large quantity of lumber during that summer being loaded from trucks into cars at Portland, and found that it had been trucked from points local to defendant's lines. Some of it had been trucked as far distant as Coos Bay. The record indicates that the cars were furnished by carriers other than defendant, though some were being loaded on trucks at Park Street and at East Portland on tracks operated by the "UP" and "SP."

To correct the situation, the witness suggested that the Oregon Electric Railway from Eugene to Portland, including branch lines, be used to capacity, or at least more than they had been in the past. Tariffs, according to this witness, should provide that lumber shippers located only on the lines of the defendant could order cars from the nearest agent of the Oregon Electric Railway, the cars to be handled in switching or line haul, but delivered back to the Oregon Electric by defendant. The lines of defendant and the Oregon Electric connect at Eugene, Albany, Lebanon, and Salem. As an example of how shippers would benefit, a shipper at Corvallis (10 or 12 miles from Albany) would order a car from the Oregon Electric agent at Albany. Oregon Electric would furnish the car for defendant to move to Corvallis where it would be loaded. The car would then be forwarded by defendant to the Oregon Electric at Albany for movement to Portland. (Tr. 393.) The witness expressed the belief that this would be better than the present practice because at present shippers on Southern Pacific have trouble over the period of years getting sufficient equipment, whereas the northern lines generally have equipment when sorely needed by shippers local to the lines of defendant. According to this witness there have been

car shortages on the Southern Pacific in western Oregon periodically for 30 years. During those periods if the relief suggested had been afforded by the Oregon Electric, the situation would have been corrected or materially improved.

An agent for the Union Pacific Railroad stated that the current practice of solicitation for freight on the lines of defendant at Oregon is through the Ogden gateway. Obviously, solicitation of defendant is for its long haul, and not for routing of Oregon shipments by way of the Portland gateway (Tr. 492 and 1126).

This proceeding, though a complaint case, was presented much in the nature of a general investigation proceeding. Considerable evidence of record was obtained by employees of the Commissioner of Public Utilities of Oregon. These employee witnesses cooperated with complainant and its counsel in making the record. The proceeding and its purpose is described in complaint's brief as follows:

"The situation is even more acute as concerns the supply of empty cars because, as stated by Mr. Hallawell (General Manager of defendant lines) 'the only available reservoir of empties that the Southern Pacific can get hold of is located in the Southwest,' making it necessary to 'haul empties 1,500 to 2,000 miles to take care of the needs of western Oregon.' (930) The utter dependence of western Oregon shippers upon this circuitous route of supply, as so forcefully demonstrated by the earthquake in Southern California last year, and the helpless, hopeless attitude indicated by Southern Pacific management, manifestly underlines the urgency of some alternative relief measures.

"The necessity of traversing a mountain range via either Southern Pacific route from western Oregon is a second geographical disadvantage, emphasized by the severity of grades and curvature and by the prohibitive cost of double tracking.

"The natural conflict of interest between the defendant and its shippers arises in part from the fact that its traffic, with Oregon excluded, is relatively well balanced. Loadings and unloadings in California are relatively equal, and it is not unnatural that Southern Pacific directors should desire to preserve western Oregon timber traffic for future generations of stockholders. There can be little doubt that this factor has, over a period of years, resulted in more favorable consideration toward improvements on other portions of the system, and neglect in providing for the construction of needed trackage and other facilities for the development of western Oregon tonnage, tonnage which will much better serve defendant's purposes if kept in the western Oregon storehouse for perhaps another hundred years. This is demonstrated by the testimony and exhibits of Mr. Andrus (assistant to president, defendant lines)."

Complainant stresses the fact that the trackage and other facilities of defendant are not adequate to meet the transportation needs of the area in western Oregon served only by its lines. It charges the management of defendant of failure to recognize the transition of the lumber industry as it has taken place. During the past 15 to 20 years, the transition from western Washington to western Oregon has been evident, and the tempo recently has increased. Exhibit 14 of the record shows that lumber shipments from Oregon originating on the lines of defendant have increased some 92,000 cars, 1950 over 1938, an increase of 65.92 percent. In 1925 Washington produced almost twice as much lumber as that produced in Oregon. Now the figures have been reversed. On brief it is stated:

"The growth of the lumber industry in western Oregon during the past 10 years has exceeded that of any previous period. Its growth has substantially exceeded other industrial growth in the Northwest, largely by virtue of the vast stand of mature timber. But in that same 10 years the defendant company has done nothing to assist in that development through improvement or extension of its facilities. At the close of 1951 it was operating 22 miles less trackage in Oregon than in the year 1940 (p. 6, Ex. 20)."

It is the opinion of the witnesses who have been connected with the lumber business in Oregon that production will continue to increase in volume for many more years; that the yard tracks at Eugene are sometimes jammed" (Tr. 60) at Roseburg short of adequate storage (Tr. 222 and 784), and Brooklyn yard facilities at Portland so taxed at times as to cause delays (Tr. 933) is practically conceded.

From this testimony complainant asserts that carrier facilities designed for conditions of 1930 do not meet the needs of the Oregon lumber industry of 1952.

It was not possible for the personnel of intervener, public utilities commissioner of Oregon, to survey traffic conditions on all lines of defendant in Oregon. Effort was concentrated on certain portions which seem to constitute bottlenecks. The Oakridge-Crescent Lake portion was characterized as the cork in the bottle—having in 1950 reached a point "where it saturates; you can't run any more."

Train sheets were checked for record of performance. The Oakridge-Crescent Lake section of defendant's lines in Oregon was regarded as the principal bottleneck. The investigation made by the witness was to ascertain the extent to which car supply was affected by operating conditions. Train sheets were checked at Eugene, Portland, and Albany. The testimony related principally to the operation of trains between Eugene and Crescent Lake and between Ashland, Oreg., and Black Butte, Calif. Operation over the mountains is considered an important factor materially affecting the ability of defendant to get empty cars into the valley and loaded cars out. The following description of this portion of track and somewhat of the conditions encountered is copied from complainant's brief:

"At Oakridge, 45 miles west of Eugene yard, a helper station is operated; helpers are attached to westbound trains at that point. The Springfield subdivision between Eugene yard and Oakridge, extends 45 miles; between Oakridge and Crescent Lake 51.9 miles, consisting of two dispatcher districts. Between Springfield, 6.1 miles west of Eugene yard, and Oakridge, 38.9 miles, there are 2 telegraph offices. Between Oakridge and Cascade Summit, 43.8 miles, there are 4 telegraph offices. At Oakridge, 45 miles west of Eugene yard, the helper station is operated. Helpers are attached to westbound trains at that point and are normally cut out at Cascade Summit, 43.8 miles westward (278).

"The gradient between Oakridge and Cascade Summit is continuous, ascending at the rate of 1.8 percent for the distance shown. Nineteen tunnels are located within this mileage, as well as 8 passing tracks and 4 train-order stations. The distance between sidings averages about 4 miles. The passing tracks are limited from 98 to 115 cars. Train order stations are spaced westward from Oakridge, 11.2 miles, 8.9 miles, 5.6 miles, 8.8 miles, and 9.3 miles, respectively. Carrier records show average tonnage freight trains consist of 85 cars (279).

"Springfield subdivision carries the main passenger and freight business moving from and to Oregon points for California and east. This subdivision connects with the Shasta division at Crescent Lake, through which the principal car supplies move to the loading territory on the Portland division (279). The Black Butte subdivision connects with the Shasta division at Ashland, Oreg. Only one regular passenger train is operated between Springfield Junction and Ashland and one regular passenger train between Ashland and Black Butte, Calif. An operating division point is located at Roseburg, Oreg., 71.7 miles west of Springfield Junction (279). For operating convenience, tonnage originating at Dillard, 10.6 miles west of Roseburg, generally moves eastward to Eugene where it is placed in westbound trains and routed over Springfield subdivision.

"The direction of this line is, from a compass standpoint, north and south, but for train operating purposes it is designated west and east, west being toward San Francisco, and east being away from San Francisco (280).

"Westward from Ashland, trains are operated over what is known as the Siskiyou Mountain. The gradient consists of 16.9 miles of 3.3 ascending grade for westward trains, to the station Siskiyou; then passes through a tunnel about 1 mile in length. The grade is then descending for a distance of 19.1 miles to Hornbrook, Calif. Eastward trains are operated over the mountain grades mentioned. Between Ashland and Hornbrook there are 5 passing tracks with capacity varying from 48 to 73 cars. Only 1 train order station, at Hilt, 27.3 miles west of Ashland, is operated (280).

"Freight train frequency of operation on the two subdivisions mentioned is materially affected by the physical characteristics of the line, especially on the two mountain grades mentioned, of Oakridge and Ashland."

From his studies the witness stated that the total number of trains operated daily on the Oakridge-Crescent Lake tracks was between 32 and 34. It seldom exceeded 16 freight trains per day in each direction. Often no more than 7 or 8 freight trains were operated in either direction. During the week of April 2, 1950, 51 freight trains were operated east and 51 west between Eugene and Crescent Lake. Forty-three passenger trains were operated and 68 helpers and light, making a total of 215 trains. (Tr. 283). The density for the week ending April 9 was 57 freight trains east, 51 west, 53 passenger trains, 68 helpers and light, a total of 219 (Ex. 5). The density for the week April 2, 1950, through the week commencing October 22, the average number of trains operated daily ranged from 32.4 to 34.7. In 1950 the average west cars on hand at the Eugene yards ranged from 400 during the first 2 weeks of April, above 500 for May and the first half of June, reached 861 for the week of June 21 and did not again drop materially below 500 until late in July 1950. During 1951 the total cars handled west from Eugene averages some 17 more per day than in 1950. This is said to be due to an order from "D. T. A." requiring heavier loading. The total cars handled in both directions in 1951 through Eugene yard averaged about 35 more daily than in 1950. From this study the witness for the Commissioner of Oregon concluded that the Oakridge-Crescent portion of defendant's line has reached its maximum capacity under existing conditions and that substantial delays in the movement of both empties and loads have resulted.

A similar study was made of the train density via Ashland. During April 1950 some 10 freight trains were operated daily between Ashland and Black Butte; 2 passenger trains, 3.9 helpers and light, or a total of 15.9 trains per day. The two passenger trains were operated throughout the period studied. The operation was as low as 6.3 freight trains per day in May, 5.9 in June, 6.8 in July, 4.8 in August, and 6.1 in September. For the period April through October, the daily average of freight trains in both directions over the Ashland-Black Butte lines ranged from 6.6 to 9.3.

The main supply of empty cars for loading in the valley comes through the Crescent Lake gateway. The Ashland gateway supplies empty cars for Medford, Phoenix, and Grants Pass, Oreg., and southern portions of

defendant's lines. The study (exhibit 7) reflected a day-by-day analysis for the period April to October 1950 of freight cars loaded and empty, handled east and west by Eugene and Crescent Lake with a comparison showing the number of west cars on hand as of 5 a. m. each day and the locomotives available. Complainant described the study on brief as follows:

"For the weekly period beginning April 3 the daily average of west cars on hand was 356; in the following week, 379; the next week, 485; then 539, 619, 558, 564, 691, 516, 463, 757; a high of 861 for the week of June 21; 784 the following week, 480 the next, 544 the next, 604 the next, then 460, 527, 380, 390, 243, 247, 275, 608, 391, 376, 448, 392, 439 and for the last week shown, the week of October 23, 539.

"On 2 days of the week commencing June 19 the west cars on hand exceeded 1,000, the average being 861. During that same week the average daily cars handled was 1,353. During the following week when the west cars on hand average 784 the average number of cars handled daily was 1,377; the highest daily average, 1,435 cars, was reached during the week of May 15, when the west cars on hand reached a high of 671 and averaged 564.

"The second section (of exhibit 7) covers the period April to October 1951, and likewise shows cars handled east and west and the west cars on hand, as well as additional locomotives available. The week ending April 2, there were 952 cars to be handled west at a daily average, 657 average was handled each day leaving an average of 310 on hand as of 5 a. m. The following week an average of 976 was available for westbound movement and an average of 320 left on hand. For the week of April 16, the daily average to be handled was 1,074 and the daily average on hand was 386; for the following week the daily average westbound cars to be handled was 1,028 and on hand 298; for the week of May 7, the west cars on hand was 378; for the week of May 14 a high of 501 west cars on hand was reached; for the following week 463, then 400, 388, 497, 582 for the week of June 18; 443 for the week of June 25, 276 for the week of July 2, 283 for the week of July 9, 320 for the week of July 16, 434 for the week of July 23, 438 for the week of July 30, 537 for the week of August 6, 426 for the week of August 13, 488 for the week of August 20, 500 for the week of August 27; 292 for the week of September 3, 398 for the week of September 10, 314 for the week of September 17, 378 for the week of September 24, 308 for the week of October 1, 353 for the week of October 8, 453 for the week of October 15, 432 for the week of October 22.

"The highest weekly average for total cars handled was for the week of April 23, with an average of 1,496 cars. The highest daily average for westbound movement of loads and empties was reached during the week of June 18 when an average of 742 cars was handled daily. In that week the eastbound daily average was 609 cars and the total cars handled 1,351."

From the studies the witness concluded that there is more traffic available on the Southern Pacific Western Oregon lines than is practical or feasible to handle in their existing operations. In his opinion relief could come from an order of the Commission requiring the Oregon Electric to furnish cars as far south as Drain and get them back, keeping the cars away from the mountain. Defendant could handle more traffic to Portland. If such were the case, trains could be increased and congestion would be avoided on the Cascade Line. The distance from the Oregon lumber area to the east through Portland is some 175 miles shorter than the distance through Ogden. The witness was strong for using the Portland gateway. He stated that provision should be made for free exchange of equipment at Portland, expecially for traffic as far south as Albany. The witness suggested that lumber shippers would be benefited, and the handling of Oregon lumber traffic could be facilitated if the yards at Eugene were enlarged, by central traffic control on congested portions of the line, and the lengthening of passing tracks on the Eugene-Crescent Lake Line. Some of his reasons for concluding that the portion of line in question was being used substantially to capacity were the fact that during the summer months of 1950, 1951, and 1952 there were very few days when the train density exceeded 35 trains, and seldom was there a density of freight trains exceeding 17.

The total number of cars originated by defendant in 1950 exceeded the number originated in 1940 by 427,000 carloads, an increase of 54 percent. The number of cars owned by defendant increased 15,389. This, however, does not portray adequately the picture so far as availability of cars for loading Oregon lumber is concerned. Defendant is said to have depended for many years for its car supply upon cars furnished by other lines. At numerous times during the last 10 years complainant shows that defendant has had between 180 and 194 percent of its ownership on line, whereas in more recent years, 1949, for example, it had an average of only 128 percent of ownership on line. The general superintendent of transportation of defendant testified (transcript 965) that the general adoption of the 5-day week has decreased the utility of freight cars to such an extent that it has displaced an estimated 5,197 of defendant's car supply. Using that figure, instead of an increase of 41 percent in effective car ownership in the 10-year period, it has shown an increase of only 27 percent in contrast to 54 percent increase in cars originated. The inadequacy of defendant's car supply is further emphasized by defendant's witness, Andrus (83), in his testimony wherein he states that the average length of haul of lumber products originating in Oregon has increased from 1,293 miles in 1940 to 1,598 miles in 1949 and 1,718 miles in 1951.

The record shows that in certain instances cars furnished Oregon shippers were undesirable for intended shipments. Typical of this evidence was by witness Griswold (transcript 75), who was given 44 undesirable cars out of 98 furnished in the month of July 1950. Witness Anderson was compelled to load cattle cars, refrigerators, and gondolas; witnesses Bronson (transcript 261) and Hedrick (transcript 738) were compelled to accept cars littered with debris from previous shipment. Others were furnished automobile cars limited to California destinations where the market was not desirable.

Complainant stresses the inadequate car ownership of defendant as a factor contributing directly to the car shortages that work hardship on Oregon lumber shippers. It considers the lack of a proper number of cars owned by defendant as one of the direct causes of car shortage and alleged poor car service in the origin territory considered. It criticizes the use by defendant of its 1940 ownership as a base of comparison because, as it claims, 1940 is the lowest ebb in car ownership for a long period of years, being only 85 percent of 1937 ownership. Complainant asserts that this is largely the reason for the fact that during the war years 1941–1945, defendant had little more than half enough cars to meet its traffic requirements. Exhibit 14, page 14, shows the average percentage of cars on line to cars owned (1941–1945) range from 151 to 202 percent.

Complainant insists that defendant was short some 19,000 cars in 1940. That comparison of increases in car ownership with growth of traffic is little help to the understanding of the real causes or effects of car shortages to the Oregon lumber shipper, because the development of the lumber business is so much dependent upon an adequate car supply during the times the cars are most needed. Complainant uses exhibits filed by defendant to emphasize this point. For example, defendant shows that the 1951 cars owned or leased was 147.7 percent of those in 1940 (exhibit 51). The improvement made in cars shows that they could transport in 1951, 155.6 percent of the 1940 tonnage. (Exhibit 53.) For the same period carloads of revenue freight originated increased 143 percent and tons increased 158 percent. These average figures have little significance to lumber and grain shippers, complainants herein. The latter are interested principally in boxcars. The increase 1951 over 1940 for that class of car was 145.1 percent in number, and 146.6 percent in carrying capacity. Forest products (excluding logs) originated by defendant in Oregon during that period increased 183 percent in carloads and 209 percent in tons. It is claimed that some 7,700 more boxcars than was acquired by defendant was needed for the increase in traffic. It would have required 12,000 additional boxcars to have kept pact with the 204 percent increase in Douglas fir lumber production in Oregon during the same period. (Exhibit 14.) In 1950 some 82½ percent of defendant's traffic originated in Oregon consisted of forest products. Comparisons were made of revenue-ton miles and traffic originated per mile of road on lines of defendant with national averages. On the revenue ton-mile showing, complainant insists that defendant was short in car ownership by several thousand cars. As to traffic originated per mile of line, the national average in 1950 was 145 cars in contrast with 150 for defendant system lines, and 215 on its Oregon lines. Other comparisons were made in computations from exhibits of record to show that viewed from any standpoint car ownership of defendant is much below its current needs. The following summary from complainant's brief is designed to place side by side the several yardsticks which it has used:

Method of measurement:	*Added cars shown to be required*
Index number increases over 1940 based on increase in lumber production	20,500
Same, with Grant[1] allowance for 5-day week	25,700
Revenue ton-miles, 1950	31,000
Revenue ton-miles, 1951	26,500
Revenue ton-miles, 1951, adjusted to Wascoe,[2] exhibit 56	24,000
Revenue ton-miles, 1951, adjusted to Wascoe exhibit 56, with Grant allowance for 5-day week requirements	29,000
Percentage of ownership on line, 5-year average, 1941–49	33,254
Percentage of ownership on line, 1949 only	25,858
Car orders, exhibit 47	20,836

[1] Witness C. H. Grant, general superintendent of transportation, defendant lines.

[2] Witness Ferdinand Wascoe, assistant engineer, bureau of transportation research, defendant lines.

Shortage of adequate car ownership by defendant would affect its ability to serve shippers over the whole of its system lines. Complainant shows, upon brief, that Oregon lumber shippers are made to bear the brunt of all car shortages and the shortages have been severe during the summer months—the main shipping season for the years 1946 and since.

A witness for the Oregon commissioner (exhibit 11) shows that the car shortage on the Portland division was acute from the week ended May 15 and continued until the second week of November 1950. Weekly shortages after the first week exceeded 1,000 cars, averaging 2,864 cars during July and

showing a high of 5,562 in late August. Defendant does not question seriously the correctness of these figures. Somewhat comparable figures appear in exhibit 30, introduced by the general superintendent of transportation for defendant. It shows that an average shortage of some 1,352 cars existed on the Portland division. The exhibit indicates that a severe shortage of cars was experienced on the Portland division some weeks before any shortage was indicated for the rest of the system. No overall system shortage is shown until the week ended June 17, 1950. The system shortage for that week appeared as 831 cars, whereas the shortage for the Portland division is shown as 1,497 cars. Extensive comparisons are shown in complainant's exhibit 11 and defendant's exhibit 30. According to complainant the weekly average shortage on the Portland division was 2 or 3 times that shown for the system. For example, for the weeks ended July 15, 22, and 29 there was shown a net system surplus of 303,421, and 95 cars (exhibit 30, p. 30), whereas there was a shortage on the Portland division of 2,091, 2,793, and 2,884 cars, respectively (exhibit 11, p. 1).

Complainant claims that during the period of extreme shortage of cars on the Portland division in 1950, there was reported a surplus—sometimes a substantial surplus—on other parts of the system of defendant lines. In support of this, complainant on brief states:

"We have prepared the following table entirely from Southern Pacific data admitted to be—indeed claimed to be—accurate. We are convinced the system data are exaggerated and that Portland division data reported to San Francisco for inclusion therein did not account for the full shortage. The system figures are from * * * exhibit 30, page 30, the Portland division figures are from * * * exhibit 11, pages 1–3, and the final column showing car surpluses on the Pacific system, excluding Portland, are our computations therefrom."

Portland division shortage—System surplus

[Total cars, all types]

Week ending—	Portland division shortage	S. P. Co. Pacific lines surplus or shortage	S. P. Co. Pacific lines (excluding Portland division) surplus
1950			
May 20	451	3,440	3,891
May 27	1,433	4,146	5,579
June 3	1,617	1,701	3,318
June 10	1,910	334	2,244
June 17	1,947	[1] 831	666
June 24	1,113	[1] 893	220
July 1	2,319	[1] 1,108	1,211
July 8	2,282	[1] 487	1,795
July 15	2,091	303	2,394
July 22	2,793	421	3,214
July 29	2,884	95	2,979
Aug. 5	3,686	[1] 1,000	2,686
Aug. 12	4,650	[1] 904	3,746
Aug. 19	4,853	[1] 1,008	3,845
Aug. 26	5,253	[1] 1,382	3,871
Sept. 2	5,562	[1] 1,171	4,391
Sept. 9	3,873	[1] 1,422	2,456
Sept. 16	4,624	[1] 419	4,205
Sept. 23	4,915	[1] 270	4,645
Sept. 30	4,232	[1] 1,117	3,115
Oct. 7	4,454	[1] 1,023	3,431
Oct. 14	3,915	[1] 934	2,981
Oct. 21	2,800	926	1,874
Oct. 28	2,012	[1] 192	1,820
Nov. 4	1,456	1,644	2,100
Nov. 11	453	2,226	2,679

[1] Denotes shortage.

The above figures may not be correct in every detail. However, the record is persuasive that there have been during the summer months 1946–50, inclusive, serious shortages of cars for all the lumber that western Oregon shippers desired to have moved. Complainant asserts that the all too few cars have been so distributed as to unjustly discriminate against and among the lumber shippers of western Oregon. The real basis of discrimination among such shippers is said to have arisen from the manner in which allotment of the cars available was made to the several western Oregon mills. Mills were given ratings by an official of defendant at Portland. The ratings were published early in the car-shortage period of 1950 in what is called Agent's 50 Report. The method employed in determining mill ratings for cars is an issue about which there is much controversy in the record. Typical of these reports are shown in exhibit 82 (in three parts) (Tr. 801). In discussing this issue on brief, defendant states, in part:

"The difficulty of solving the problem of accurate mill ratings was brought out by Mr. George Leslie, assistant superintendent of defendant's Portland division, in charge of car distribution (741). Mr. Leslie said that the question first arose in the early twenties, when a meeting was called by the Oregon Railroad Commission during the time Mr. William P. Ellis was secretary (794). This hearing was attended by representatives of the Oregon Commission, of the ICC, and defendant. As the result of that meeting a group of lumber shippers appointed a committee who gave defendant the ratings of each sawmill on its line at that time for use in distributing cars during the shortage then in progress (1094–1095).

"There being no car shortages on defendant's line from the early twenties to 1946, there was no occasion to maintain any mill ratings during that long period. However, the question again came up in 1948 when a meeting was held at Grants Pass on the invitation of lumbermen at that point. This meeting was presided over by Mr. Carl W. Huson, manager of the Engler-Huson Co., and was attended by a large number of shippers and by Mr. Leslie and other railroad representatives (1095–1096).

"At the meeting, Mr. Leslie suggested that the shippers form a committee and supply defendant with the ratings of each of the mills in the Rogue River Valley. At first, they said they would, but later they reported that they did not want to do so because it would divulge each other's secrets (1096–1097).

"The next time the subject came up, according to Mr. Leslie, was in the spring of 1950, when another meeting was held in Eugene, Oreg. This meeting was attended by between 75 and 100 persons, including Mr. Robert H. Bronson, one of the witnesses for complainant in the instant case, by Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH and a number of others. Mr. Leslie testified concerning this meeting:

" 'Question. [By Mr. Lyons]. And what was the subject of that meeting?

" 'Answer. It was a general discussion of the car situation, sort of a friendly get-together meeting.

" 'Question. Was anything said about the mill ratings?

" 'Answer. Yes. Mr. Hopkins personally addressed the meeting and asked any of the lumbermen if they could help us out in obtaining some substantial data as to the ratings of the mills, and he would (1097) like a committee, if possible, of the lumberman to get together and give us such information.

" 'Question. And did they on their own volition supply you with any information as a result of that meeting?

" 'Answer. No, sir.

" 'Question. Now, your present recollection is that this meeting was called shortly after you had already initiated steps to obtain some form of rating sheet in 1950 in anticipation of a car shortage in the summer that year?

" 'Answer. Yes, sir, because the weather was good and it was a nice noonday at the hotel, as I was facing the windows and it was a nice sunshiny day and it should have been shortly after the early spring.

" 'Question. Well, then, failing to get any assistance as a result of that meeting, what did you try to do?

" 'Answer. I proceeded to do the best I could in the short time I had to take up the information on the ratings and the capacities of the mills with my first rough draft.

" 'Question. Now, do you claim that the first rough agent's 50 report was 100 percent accurate?

" 'Answer. No, sir.

" 'Question. Was it the best that you knew how to get at the time?

" 'Answer. It was, sir.

" 'Question. Now, did you during 1950 make a revision in the agent's 50 rating sheets as information came to you of either errors or (1098) desires on the part of any shipper whose rating was indicated that wanted to have a change made?

" 'Answer. Yes, sir; and that is borne out by the fact that I reissued this R–50 report several times because I found bugs in it.

" 'Question. Now, how long was the first agent's 50 rating sheet in effect?

" 'Answer. I can't say that, but I presume about 6 weeks.

" 'Question. And you did accept revisions as, for example, was brought out in connection with the mill at Stomar Lumber Co.?

" 'Answer. Yes, sir; I did.

" 'Question. Now, there were others; were there not?

" 'Answer. Yes, sir.

" 'Question. How many mills were covered by the first agent's 50 report?

" 'Answer. Four hundred and thirty-six' (1099).

"This testimony stands uncontradicted in the record. Copies of the ratings were supplied by defendant to the Oregon Public Utilities Commissioner, who secured the number of cars furnished each shipper from defendant's records (1099–1100). No objection was made by him, so far as the present record indicates, to any of such matters."

As shown in the testimony, the agent's 50 report was placed in use on the Portland division at the beginning of the car shortage period in 1950. It was compiled from information received from agents on the Portland division (Tr. 802). The witness was subpenaed by complainant, and appeared as an adverse witness. Defendant in 1950 was distributing cars from the Portland office for almost the entire Portland division, and that undertaking was left largely to the official just named.

The testimony of this witness is treated, in part, upon brief of complainant as follows:

"Questioning of Mr. Leslie developed the actual process followed in compiling the mill ratings embraced in the agent's 50 report," which were thereafter made the basis for allotment of quotas of constantly varying percentages. Our questions were directed to specified stations, picked at random, which were believed to represent a cross section of the Portland district. The record, therefore, shows clearly the process followed.

"In compiling the first issue of his allocation list he depended upon reports from local agents of his company responsive to his inquiry as to two principal facts—production capacity and loading capacity. This information was obtained largely from the mill management by the local agents and transmitted to Mr. Leslie, who made his own interpretation of the data submitted and established the rating. In compiling later lists like process was used except that the inquiry was made direct to the mill management by Mr. Leslie, who accepted the replies at face value, without verification, but who apparently wavered between production capacity and loading capacity in establishing his rating figure with most discriminatory results.

"He stated that the inquiry concerning loading capacity, made in his letter to shippers and agent, had no bearing on the rated capacity of the mill, and was intended mainly for information purposes (1052–3). But

a Coos Bay mill producing 4 cars daily was rated at 8 cars, because it could load 8 cars (1059). A Dallas mill producing 20 to 22 cars daily was given a quota of 30 cars daily (1060). A Grants Pass mill that can load 8 cars per shift—of 16 cars per day—is allotted only 5 (1066). A Grants Pass shipper with an 8-car capacity was alloted only 5 (1067). Another Grants Pass mill that can load 14 cars was rated at 4 (1070).

"A tide water mill at Toledo which normally ships no more than 8 cars by rail is given a 20-car rating, ignoring its water shipments (1090), while a 24-car cargo mill at Coos Bay had an allotment of only 6 (1056). A Corvallis mill with a capacity equal to 4 cars daily, without any report on loading capacity, was given a 6-car rating (804). A Wren mill of greater capacity was rated first at 4 cars, then raised to 5 on the protest of its owner (807). A Medford mill with a production capacity of 8 cars has an allocation of 16 (1079).

"The foregoing constitute examples of some of the more glaring inconsistencies in the compiling of data for the Agent's 50 Report. Other shippers, perhaps a large portion of them, were rated on their own claim of actual productive capacity. While the overall productive capacity of all mills combined, as developed by the report, is perhaps reasonably accurate, it is only by reason of the fact that the high ratings offset the low ratings. Between individual shippers, however, the inaccurate ratings produced rank discrimination and injustice. A mill with a rating double its normal production suffered no shortage of cars when the mills of the district were working on a 50 percent quota. Competitors rated fairly dropped from 2 shifts to 1 and tried to stay in business. The underrated mill kept going as long as it could, then shut down its planer, or perhaps shut down entirely and waited for the building season and car shortage to end—to sell its inventory at reduced prices.

"It is difficult to explain, and this record does not explain, why he should have used such unconventional and basically unsound methods in establishing the yardstick upon which all car distribution was to be measured, when he had readily available in his own records, as he well knew and admitted, accurate data of actual shipments, and there were at least three recognized, unbiased directories of lumber mills and their production available for his guidance. Indeed, his own freight traffic manager had published unbiased and current data which he could have safely used with little possibility of challenge. Instead he relied upon biased reports of local agents, selfish claims of individual mill owners and then—to cap the climax—personally established the rating of individual mills without any disclosed reason or justification for his choice of method either upon claimed mill capacity or claimed loading capacity, which might mean length of spur track, capacity of loading dock, or perhaps the number of men in the loading crew then employed, although he professed to believe the capacity of the mill should be the rule."

The complaint herein charges defendant with unlawful acts in connection with car service, or the lack of it, in western Oregon which have caused lumber shippers to bear increases in transportation and marketing costs, loss in labor causing the curtailment of production, preventing deliveries on sale contracts for lumber, from selling in the open market, all resulting in damage and loss of good will, for which complainant alleges the defendant is liable. These allegations were made in the complaint for the benefit of any lumber shipper member of complainant committee who might desire redress through an award of reparation. Only one, A. L. MacInnis and Cosima D. MacInnis, d. b. a. Wren Planing Mill, has asked damages or reparation in this proceeding. Violations of sections 1 (4), 1 (11), and 3 (1) specifically are alleged by this complainant, and damages under sections 8 and 9 of the act are sought for the period June 1 to October 1, 1950. It specifically is charged that during that period defendant failed to furnish this shipper a reasonable car supply, and that it unlawfully discriminated against this shipper in that it failed to make an equitable distribution of the cars it did have on the Portland division. This claim is based principally on the failure of defendant to establish and enforce car quotas equitably to distribute its short supply of cars during the period in question, due largely to inconsistencies and variances in keeping records of cars ordered and supplied to this and other shippers. Most Oregon lumber mills, including Wren, are dependent on adequate car supply to keep their mills in operation. Storage facilities are limited. Without cars the storage space soon is filled and slowdown or shutdown in operation is forced. The claim here is that defendant prevented Wren from producing lumber that it could have produced and sold by failure to supply cars. The shipper testified directly that there was no stoppage of work at his mill during the period June 1 to October 1, 1950, except for that made necessary by lack of cars (Tr. 536, 599). There was no recorded sawmill production for a period of 10 days from August 18 to August 29, 1950 (Tr. 1149). However, exhibit 18 shows that during that time defendant furnished Wren two cars, one on August 23 and one on August 24. On August 14 Wren ordered 6 cars for placement August 18; on August 19, 6 cars were ordered for replacement on August 21; and on August 24, 18 cars were ordered, 6 for each day of August 25, 26, and 28. This total of 30 cars ordered for delivery during the 10-day period, according to complainant, shows that the shutdown was due solely to the lack of cars.

The complaint refers to the reports of the Commission in which it has discussed methods for distribution of cars in periods of car shortages. In *Tanner & Co.* v. *Chicago, B. & Q. R. R. Co.* (53 I. C. C. 401, 406), the report states:

"Thus it is a common practice of carriers in periods of car shortage to distribute coal cars in accordance with mine ratings, determined by the volume of past shipments; but coal is shipped as mined and the amount that may be considered ready for shipment is the amount that can be mined, loaded, and forwarded from day to day. The best evidence of mine capacity is the volume of shipments during normal periods."

Lumber produced at mills in western Oregon must be shipped almost as it is produced. Complainant stresses the fact that rating such a mill for cars based on production, as indicated in the quotation above, is not a proper measure because car shortages in western Oregon during summer months since 1946 has been the rule and not the exception. Ratings based on prior production would necessarily carry into effect the consequences of prior shortages of cars and serve to protect defendant in its alleged failure to furnish cars during the complaint period herein. Because of this, complainant asserts that there has not been a period of normal movement of lumber from the considered origin territory that would show the true capacity of lumber mills or the true market demand. It is argued, therefore, that the rules established in cases determining quotas for movement of wheat and coal would not be equitable if applied strictly to the case of western Oregon lumber. It further is argued that in considering the question of damages suffered by Wren during the summer months of 1950, it should not be limited to lumber on hand, nor to shipments made in prior years as a basis for capacity. Prior operations and prior shipments are only as accurate a measure of Wren's capacity as defendant's furnishing of cars in any period was proper and complete. There being no period of proper or complete car service for Wren, rules for distribution stated in prior Commission reports should not be considered as controlling here.

Rating for mills in the so-called agent 50 reports gave Wren 4 cars on a stated production of 135,000 feet. This production figure was said to have been furnished defendant by 1 of the partners of Wren (Tr. 807). The rating later was raised to 5 cars, but the record is indefinite as to why just such an increase was made. Wren claims that it was at the time producing more lumber; that it was and is shown in reliable publications relating to the Oregon lumber industry as having a capacity of 140,000 feet in its resaw and 200,000 feet for the planing mill. Wren claims that the proper official of defendant was advised of this capacity which would warrant a quote or rating of 7 cars per day, but that the carrier official could not remember having received such advice from Wren (Tr. 808). Notwithstanding the fact that reliable information was published by defendant's freight traffic manager, Crow's Buyers and Sellers Guides, and so forth, such publications were not consulted nor used in making ratings for Wren or other mills on the Toledo division of defendant's lines. At no time during the period covered by the report was Wren given a rating of more than 5 cars (Tr. 797).

Reference is made to *Martin Bros. Box Co.* v. *Southern P. Co.* (280 I. C. C. 395) (now under court review). The Commission, division 3, dismissed the complaint which sought damages in the amount of $737,140.96 from losses of profit and $3,614,747 for loss of good will. It was alleged that defendant failed in its duty to provide and furnish transportation from the plant of complainant at Oakland, Oreg., upon reasonable request therefor, failed in its duty to furnish safe and adequate car service at that plant and subjected the complainant to undue or unreasonable prejudice and disadvantage. On brief, counsel undertakes to distinguish this from the Martin case as follows:

"The method by which proof of damages was made in the Martin case is similar to Wren's evidence herein, to the extent that loss was predicated upon estimated gross sales and a margin of profit computed from other business done by the complainant. (See 280 ICC, p. 403.) This method was not criticized by the Commission. Criticisms were: (1) That there was no evidence in the record by which operations (computed for a full year by complainant) could be broken down to the 9 months period covered by the complaint. (2) Margin of profit was computed on margins realized during a 5-year period, 1943–47, at complainant's plants located in Aurora, Ind., and Toledo, Ohio. The Commission said that conditions in 1943, 1944, and 1945 were not like those in 1947. (The Commission might have added that margins of profit at established plants located in the Midwest could vary considerably from the margins realized in a new mill located in western Oregon.)"

Wren asks an award of damages in the amount of $154,385.86. This total is made up of two items: (1) Loss of profits $144,510.45 (this is said to be what could have been obtained from mill and planer operations if Wren had available cars for capacity operation and shipment); and (2) for loss on sales of cants $9,875.41. The computations on which these losses are based are shown of record in exhibits 16 and 17. The computations appear to be based on a capacity operation—a production of 4 million feet per month, or 16 million feet for the reparation period June to September 1950 (both inclusive). That volume production appears to have been used by the witness based on what he termed "normal production" or that produced by Wren in July and August 1948 (Tr. 555, 585). Exhibits 16 and 17 are

copied in appendix A hereto. In explaining these exhibits, the witness said in part:

"Schedule A, page 1, this schedule is a recapitulation of the information shown on the other four schedules. From schedule D, page 4, we have the shipments under approximate normal production and from that we had deducted the actual shipments had by the company during the period, leaving an estimated shortage applicable to each of the sawmill's production and to the cants and lumber purchased. Such shortage is broken between the sawmill production of approximately 3,073,000 feet and to that applicable to the cants purchased and custom milling, 5,517,000 feet, or a total shortage of approximately 8,590,000 feet.

"The summary in the middle of the page shows the margin of profit—actually the margin of gross profit—computed by including only the direct variable costs, resulting in a margin of profit in their own sawmill production of approximately $32.12 per thousand, and on the cants and lumber purchased of $8.30 a thousand.

"The very last figures on the schedule merely apply the loss or estimated shortage of lumber by the appropriate rates per (Tr. 558) thousand on the estimated margin of profit to arrive at a total loss of profit, estimated approximately at $144,510.45 (Tr. 559). * * *

"On September 30, 1950, the Wren Planing Mill had on hand in cant inventory a footage of 560,784 feet. This footage was shipped in October of 1950 at less than what the actual purchase price of such cants were.

"The actual cost of the cant sales were $65.32, as shown by schedule A of exhibit 16, and the average sales price of the cants in October of 1950 was $47.71 per thousand, or a loss of $17.61 a thousand on the sale of the cant inventory in October of 1950. The total loss amounted to $9,875.41 which again is an approximation of the loss (Tr. 561). * * *

"(Mr. Lyons):

"Question. Now, turning your attention to exhibit No. 17, does that imply that there was a sale of cants, as such, by the Wren Planing Mill?

"Answer. No. They were remanufactured and sold. The company didn't just buy lumber and then act as—buy and sell the same lumber. They remanufactured and sold the lumber they purchased.

"Question. Inasmuch as your exhibit 16 covers the entire operation, I don't get the significance of exhibit 17.

"Answer. Exhibit 17 was for the purpose of showing the loss or the difference between the sales price and the actual cost to the Wren Planing Mill. In other words, they sold that cant inventory for less than what they paid for it (Tr. 595)."

On June 1, 1950, Wren had on hand 285,358 feet of sawmill lumber and 77,919 feet of cants; on July 1, 543,733 feet of lumber and 182,766 feet of cants; on August 1, 685,800 feet of lumber and 145,756 feet of cants; on September 1, 165,768 feet of lumber and 480,798 feet of cants; on September 30, 1,408,033 feet of lumber and 560,784 feet of cants (Tr. 595).

Witness for Wren presented at the hearing copies of a substantial number of car orders bearing dates in June, July, August, and September of 1950. Generally they sought delivery or placement of six cars per day. On some there were notations indicating that 5 cars were furnished on an order for 6; on others there were no notations to indicate whether any cars had been furnished on a particular car order. The record indicates that there may have been other car orders on which Wren received cars during the period, but which the witness had not brought to the hearing. (The copies of car orders mentioned above are exhibit 18 of record Tr. 577.) The witness stated that Wren actually received 173 cars (of which 7 were stopovers) during the period June to September 1950, inclusive. Of the 343 cars ordered during the period (Tr. 580), Wren shipped 47 cars in October and 26 cars in November 1950 (Tr. 582).

Exhibits 16 and 17 (reproduced herein as appendix A) were presented by a certified public accountant employed by Wren. They were reworked by another certified public accountant employed by defendant, whose study was introduced as exhibit 78. Wren made all his records available to the latter. From this examination of Wren's records, the witness stated that of 350 cars ordered for spotting by Wren, June to September 1950, inclusive, 197 were furnished during the period. Orders for 165 cars placed during the period were canceled (Tr. 1139–1140). For the year 1950, schedule B of exhibit 78 shows that Wren ordered 557 cars, canceled orders for 245 cars, and received 394 cars—82 more than asked for on uncanceled orders. No showing is made of cars either ordered or furnished for January and February. By months the record is as follows:

	Cars ordered	Cars received by month of receipt	Cancellations on orders of month
January			
February			
March	31	33	
April	24	47	
May	41	55	
June	93	58	1
July	44	45	1
August	81	31	32
September	132	32	132
October	78	46	78
November	24	26	1
December	9	21	
Total	557	394	245

From this, defendant argues that Wren was given a reasonable flow of empty cars for all the months during which it operated in 1950, actually 82 cars more than its records show from uncanceled orders for the year.

On the issue of discrimination against the Wren mill, on brief, counsel states:

"Distinct from the question of a general failure to provide cars there remains the question of discrimination in allocating the cars which were actually available in western Oregon during the complaint period. If Southern Pacific goes scot free on the more general question of car supply, it must nevertheless respond in damages to Wren for the discrimination which we believe is established by the record.

"On this question we confine ourselves to the period June 12, 1950, to and including September 30, 1950, which was the period used by Dench in exhibit 11 and by Southern Pacific in its related exhibits 79 and 80. The most detailed and complete record of cars ordered and furnished to Wren is contained in defendant's exhibit 66, and to eliminate argument we will adopt that exhibit with respect to cars ordered and furnished. From exhibit 66 we note two corrections which should first be made in defendant's exhibit 80. With respect to total number of cars ordered for the period June 12 to September 30, 1950, an analysis of exhibit 66 reveals that 315 cars were ordered instead of 309 as shown in exhibit 80. Likewise, exhibit 66 shows 156 as total cars furnished during the period instead of 155.

"We believe that during the period June 12 to September 30, 1950, Wren was entitled to receive, as a minimum, the same percentage of cars in relation to its car orders as the other 23 mills on the Toledo branch, listed in defendant's exhibit 80. To arrive at that percentage we have subtracted Wren orders and cars furnished from the total orders and cars furnished as shown by exhibit 80. Excluding Wren, 3,045 cars were ordered and 2,365 cars were supplied on those orders. The percentage of cars furnished to cars ordered is 77.5.

"Taking the 315 cars ordered by Wren for this period, as shown by defendant's exhibit 66, Wren was entitled to receive 77.5 percent or 244 cars. From exhibit 66 we find that Wren received only 156 cars, or a shortage of 88 cars.

"At this point we are compelled to lean over backward in estimating the footage of Wren lumber which would have been shipped in those 38 cars, because of a deficiency in the record. We know that Wren averaged 39,200 feet per car for 36 cars in August of 1950, and that the average was 30,200 feet for March 1950 (Tr. p. 1144). The average for the total complaint period is not in the record. Witness Shinn thought it would exceed 30,000 board-feet per car (Tr. p. 583). In view of the foregoing evidence, we think there can be no objection to our assumption of a figure of 30,000 feet per car, which has been used throughout the record as an industry average. At that figure, Wren could have shipped 2,640,000 feet in the 88 cars.

"Taking the percentages of Wren's own sawmill lumber and cants for the complaint period, as shown by exhibit 16, 47 percent or 1,240,800 board-feet would be attributable to Wren's own sawmill operation, and at the actual realization of $32.12 per thousand on such sawmill lumber, as shown by exhibit 16, the profit would be $39,854.49. On the 53 percent attributable to cants, we would have 1,399,200 board-feet at a profit of $8.30 per thousand or $11,613.36. A total loss of profit of $51,467.85. To this should be added the $9,875.41 loss on cant inventory as shown by exhibit 17, for total damages of $61,343.26.

"If we revise the margin of profit to give effect to Hutchison's testimony, as we have hereinbefore set out, the margin of $25.15 per thousand on sawmill lumber and $9.38 per thousand on cants would give a total loss of profits of $44,330.61, which with the loss on cant inventory added would give total damages of $54,206.02.

"We contemplate that these figures will be objected to by the defendant on the grounds that Wren ordered a greater percent of its rated capacity than the average mill on the Toledo branch. If those rated capacities were accurate there would be merit in such an objection. And if Wren had ordered more than 100 percent of a correct rated capacity we would likewise agree that such excess orders should not be considered; but in view of the testimony of the defendant's superintendent in charge of car supply, Mr. Leslie, showing that each mill's own statement of its capacity was used as a basis for car quotas (Tr. p. 797) and the admission of witness Grant for defendant that under such circumstances the ratings were no more reliable than car orders as a basis for allocating cars (Tr. pp. 1183–1184), we believe that the rule of *Wausau Southern Lumber Co.* v. *G. & S. I. R. R. Co.* (64 I. C. C. 732), is properly invoked. This case involved an alleged discrimination in distribution of cars in favor of competing lumber companies. Distribution was supposedly based on the proportion of cars loaded during normal supply, with adjustments for capacity changes. The complainant contended that distribution should be based upon ability to promptly load as determined by production and accumulated stock on hand. An inspector from the American Association of Railroads made an investigation and established quotas. The Commission said that it was not satisfied that the quota basis was correct, and added:

" 'The best evidence of whether or not complainant was discriminated against in the matter of car supply would be afforded by testimony showing the number of cars ordered by the respective lumber companies * * * during the period in question,

and the number of cars furnished thereon by the carriers.'

"The complainant did not recover because there was no evidence in the record with respect to cars ordered and furnished.

"The Commission went on to say, at page 736, that any rule of car distribution established at one shipping point would of necessity have to be extended to include other lumber shippers located on the carrier's lines in the same general district. And that it was just as important to maintain a proper relationship for car distribution between shipping points, districts, and railroad divisions as between individual shippers.

"Approaching the problem from another standpoint, if Mr. Leslie had in the case of Wren, used Wren's statement of capacity, as he said he did in the case of other mills, he would have rated Wren upon a 6-day week (Tr. p. 536), and upon a capacity in excess of 200,000 feet per day (Tr. pp. 529–530) which would show a rating of 7 cars per day. Taking only the 6 cars which Wren thought it was rated (Tr. p. 535) instead of the 4 or 5 cars of the actual rating (Ex. 80) and using the 6-day week, Wren would have been entitled to 564 cars during the period June 12 to September 30, 1950 (same as shown for Corvallis Lumber Co., Ex. 80). Its orders of 315 cars would then appear as only 56 percent of rated capacity, instead of the 82 percent shown by defendant on exhibit 80; and that 56 percent is not disproportionate to percentages of other mills on the Toledo branch."

Exhibit 11, referred to by counsel, was submitted by Witness Thomas W. Dench, an employee of the public utilities commissioner of Oregon, who had been engaged in checking defendant's records during the period of 2 years prior to the hearing. He testified on cross-examination as follows:

"Question (by Mr. Lyons). Well, as a preliminary question, I like to ask you, Mr. Dench, did the Southern Pacific officers, including superior officers, and the station agents along the line cooperate with the Public Utilities Commissioner?

"Answer. We received 100 percent cooperation from the Southern Pacific; any files that they had available they permitted us to see; any material that we requested to look at—there was no indication that came to my knowledge of any refusal to supply information which we might have requested.

"Question. Now, you realize, Mr. Dench, that the Southern Pacific lines in Oregon are far flung and consist of many branch lines.

"Answer. That is correct.

"Question. And to distribute a large number of cars within that area is a pretty hard job, isn't it?

"Answer. There is no doubt of it, Mr. Lyons.

"Question. And do you think after the 2 years' investigation, the Southern Pacific made a bona fide attempt to distribute its cars equitably and fairly among the shippers?

"Answer. Well, I believe the answer, in my opinion, is that the shippers and the Southern Pacific are both human; human errors will creep up, and certainly I believe that they tried, certainly (432) tried to do the best they could." (433).

One of the partners, a principal witness for Wren was asked: "Now, Mr. MacInnis what was your car supply situation in 1951." Answer, "It was very good." (Tr. 577). In 1951, Wren is shown to have ordered for daily placement from 1 to 4 cars (exhibit 67). During the months of June to September inclusive, 1951, on 5 days only Wren ordered as many as 4 cars. For the rest of the period orders were for 1 to 3 cars. Defendant argues from this that orders of 6 cars per day during the summer period of 1950 by contrast with those ordered in 1951, and further evidenced by the large cancelation of car orders made in September and October 1950, show beyond doubt that the 1950 car orders were inflated and excessive. Schedule D of exhibit 78 shows total footages of lumber shipped by Wren by months for 1950 and 1951 as follows:

Total footages shipped

	1951	1950
January	666,586	0
February	83,119	0
March	110,038	1,001,061
April	60,482	1,207,061
May	490,896	1,429,970
June	1,293,778	2,269,640
July	1,503,143	1,722,566
August	1,448,938	1,573,728
September	1,141,352	1,626,028
October	1,551,318	1,723,706
November	462,685	816,694
December	473,906	608,145
Total	9,286,241	13,978,599

The accountant witness was asked about profits of Wren for operations in 1948, 1949, and 1950. He stated that Wren's profits exceeded $118,500 for 1948, $105,500 for 1949, and approximated $94,500 for 1950 (Tr. 590). The stated production capacity as 16 million feet of lumber and cants used for the basis of reparation sought assumed that Wren would operate almost full time during the 103 working days June through September 1950. Operations, production, etc., are assumed at full capacity with small margin for hazard that might cause stoppage of work, due to loading, shipping, marketing, or other hindrance (Tr. 593). The estimate based on capacity operation and handling of cant purchases also contemplated cars sufficient in number and when needed to keep the total volume of lumber moving as produced (Tr. 587). The estimates for the 4-month period also uses the prevailing prices for lumber at the time. It is assumed that those prices would have remained in effect if Wren and all the other western Oregon mills had 100 percent car supply during the period (Tr. 589). In contrast with the claim of right to cars for full capacity production and for placement when desired during the peak shipping season—or damages for not having received that sort of car service—Wren's counsel states on brief:

"The record in this case is replete with testimony of various mill owners who were required to reduce from a double to a single shift operation, and in some cases completely suspend operation during the period covered by Wren's complaint, until cars could be obtained (Tr. pp. 143, 360, 371, 661). Wren mill was among those so afflicted by the car shortage (Tr. p. 536). The planer was forced to go on a single shift operation and the sawmill was forced to close down completely, once for 10 days, and again for 2 weeks (Tr. p. 1163).

"The factors pointed out in the preceding paragraphs, arising from the car shortage, do not make less certain the fact of damages, but they do make necessary the use of some estimates in arriving at what the actual damages were."

It will be noted from the statement just quoted that other mills like Wren were prevented from operating at capacity during the peak season of 1950 for lack of cars.

Wren was entitled to just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory car service. However, there is no absolute right of cars for any shipper, and the carrier is liable in damages only if it fails to render a reasonable service. In *Midland Valley R.* v. *Barkley* (276 U. S. 482, 484–485) the Supreme Court said:

"The right of a shipper to cars is not an absolute right and the carrier is not liable if its failure to furnish cars was the result of sudden and great demands which it had no reason to apprehend would be made and which it could not reasonably have been expected to meet in full. The law exacts only what is reasonable from such carriers."

There have been car shortages severe in nature on the Portland division of defendant's lines during the summer seasons since 1946. From the showing made of record there is no ground for the assumption that Wren or any other of the 436 mills on the Portland division reasonably might have expected cars for maximum lumber capacity production and in addition thereto, lumber purchases during the summer months of 1950.

On the issue of discrimination, it is clear from the record that Wren did not receive as many cars in the summer of 1950 as he desired; neither did other mills, as a rule, on the Portland division. Wren was diligent in his efforts to obtain cars; so were other shippers in the territory, and some of them are shown to have expended greater effort to obtain cars than did Wren. There is some evidence that Wren did not receive cars in the exact proportion to capacity production as was furnished other mills on the division during the time. This is said to be due to the method used and the manner in which defendant allotted cars to the mills during the period on a quota or rated basis. The main issue here is whether the alleged discrimination was "undue" and "unjust." Without here determining fully the lawfulness of car distribution as made by defendant on the Portland division, as treated in the main case, it properly may be said that the record shows that a rating was assigned Wren based on the information furnished by it. This is the method that was followed in the case of other mills. Ratings were revised as shown by exhibit 82. In such revision the rating for Wren was increased from 4 to 5 cars per day. Wren claims that the rating should have been changed to 7 cars per day. He claims that he furnished the proper official of defendant information sufficient to entitle him to that rating. The official testified that he had no recollection of having received any such advice from Wren. The official is criticized for not having used or consulted information furnished by the traffic manager of defendant and official publications relating to the lumber industry in Oregon for better results in assigning ratings to Wren and other mills on the Portland division. The same method was followed in assigning quotas or ratings for Wren that was followed in the giving of ratings to other and competing mills. The results were not satisfactory to Wren, nor to many other shippers who testified of record. The testimony of the official of defendant whose sole responsibility it was to make the quotas or ratings, viewed in retrospect, causes one to wonder why management of defendant left to one man so great a task with apparently little supervision and inadequate assistance. It is shown that the official was diligent in his undertaking to distribute the all too few cars, and, however unsatisfactory in some parts as to the results, he was not shown intentionally nor negligently to have failed in his undertaking fairly to distribute the cars provided for the Portland division during the period in question.

One of the partners of Wren observed cars that were placed for competing mills in his vicinity as he passed along the highway near the carrier tracks. He did not know the ratings of those mills, nor did he check to ascertain the car numbers for identification nor keep a record of such cars by definite count. From this he assumed that competing mills in the vicinity were getting a better quota of cars than was being furnished him. The annoyance caused by such observation is obvious. However, the evidence is short of proof requisite to establish unjust discrimination.

There is not upon this record proof to sustain an award of damages as sought by Wren. It follows that the claim for reparation should be dismissed.

Defendant called attention to certain tesimony on the issue of alleged inadequate facilities and lack of service to western

Oregon lumber shippers of witnesses for the commissioner of Oregon. On the facilities question, witness Winter conceded that in 1951 defendant "handled a few more cars" (Tr. 616) from western Oregon than in 1950. Page 2 of witness Clark's exhibit 20 shows the number of cars originated and terminated by defendant in Oregon 1940–51, inclusive, as follows:

	Carloads
1940	344,000
1941	409,000
1942	461,000
1943	476,000
1944	466,000
1945	418,000
1946	427,000
1947	479,000
1948	478,000
1949	449,000
1950	460,000
1951	507,000

It will be noted that 47,000 more carloads were originated and terminated in 1951 than in 1950. Of these, 15,635 cars consisted of lumber and forest products. The increase in volume of lumber and forest products carried was 619,400 tons.

As to operation of trains, witness Winter showed an operation of 1,672 westbound freight trains in the period April to October 1950 between Eugene and Crescent Lake, whereas during the like period in 1951, defendant moved a total of 1,747 such trains over the same section of line. Considering the rapidity in which defendant has increased its fleet of powerful diesel locomotives and switchers (exhibits 55 and 64), the completion of new retarder yards at Roseville and Los Angeles, increase in traffic density and freight-train speed (exhibit 29), planned centralized traffic control (hereinafter sometimes referred to as CTC) on the lines between Crescent Lake and Klamath Falls—the saturation point apparently has not been reached as claimed by Witness Winter.

Witness Winter mentioned the desirability of CTC as a means of expediting movement on portions of defendant's lines. At the time of hearing defendant had well underway a study of its several subdivisions of lines in Oregon, including the Portland division, the Springfield subdivision, and the Shasta division. These studies are discussed in brief as follows:

"Redispatching studies were made of train operations on each of those subdivisions as well as on portions of them for the latest 12-month period for which data was available. This study was made for the purpose of determining what effect the installation of CTC would have upon the movement of traffic over each of the subdivisions in their entirety, as well as over selected segments thereof. The segments studied were those between Oakridge and Crescent Lake on the Springfield subdivision, and the Klamath Falls-Chemult segment of the Kirk subdivision. The Kirk subdivision of the Shasta division, which lies south of Crescent Lake, handles all of the traffic that moves over the Springfield subdivision of the Portland division, plus the increment represented by the traffic of the Great Northern Railroad which uses that line between Chemult and Klamath Falls for a total distance of 74 miles, or approximately 75 percent of the total territory of that subdivision (890). In addition, there are many log haulers operated on the Kirk subdivision. The work of dispatching trains by train order system on the Kirk subdivision was found to be approaching a point where it would become a burden upon dispatchers and eventually lead to train delays. The Kirk subdivision is dispatched by one set of dispatchers, that is, 3 men around the clock, each working 8 hours, it being impractical to separate the subdivision into 2 districts for dispatching purposes (890–891). The Springfield subdivision of the Portland division naturally subdivides at Oakridge. One set of dispatchers handles the line between Eugene and Oakridge, a distance of 41 miles, and another set of dispatchers handles the line between Oakridge and Crescent Lake, a distance of 51.9 miles, as contrasted with the 99-mile Kirk subdivision (891).

"The * * * studies * * * mentioned demonstrated that, if there was any portion of the line between Klamath Falls and Eugene which would first become restrictive to the flow of traffic between Eugene and Klamath Falls, it would be that portion of the line extending between Klamath Falls and Chemult, and not the portion of the Springfield subdivision extending between Oakridge and Crescent Lake, as Mr. Winter contends. Because of the impracticability of separating the Kirk subdivision into two dispatching districts, one between Klamath Falls and Chemult, to be operated under CTC, and the other between Chemult and Crescent Lake, to be operated by the conventional train order system, it was concluded to equip the entire Kirk subdivision, Crescent Lake to Klamath Falls, with CTC, and the sum of $2,400,000, heretofore mentioned, was appropriated to accomplish this objective. The work has been started and it is expected the completed installation will be in service sometime before midyear 1953" (891–892).

There are not enough cars made empty in Oregon nor in California north of San Francisco to satisfy demands for empty cars for loading in these areas. It is necessary for defendant to move empty cars from the area around Los Angeles and from as far distant as Texas and Louisiana. A small number of cars are received from the D. & R. G. W. and the U. P. at Ogden. The necessity of bringing empties from such distant areas and over such portions of route as that via Tehachapi increases the chance of events to restrict or stop the flow of cars from those distant areas to the Oregon territory. Events that have hindered or stopped the flow of cars to western Oregon, such as the Tehachapi earthquake in July 1952, the loss of Western Pacific tunnel by fire in the Feather River Canyon, Calif., in August 1952, are said to be typical of events that make it almost impossible at times for defendant to get adequate cars into western Oregon. Obviously, that is true, but it emphasizes the claim of shippers local to defendant in western Oregon that they are made to bear the brunt of all car shortages, and that there are often severe shortages there when none is reported for the other portion of defendant system lines.

Prior to 1949 the supply of cars for western Oregon was hindered by a sort of bottleneck in that portion of line from Indio to Alhambra. Defendant, in undertaking better to serve shippers in western Oregon, the aforesaid bottleneck was relieved by CTC installed in 1949 at a cost of $2,500,000 (Tr. 898). A modern retarder yard was completed at Los Angeles in 1951 at a cost of $2,300,000. Operation on the line between Redding and Black Butte, Calif., has been improved by installation of CTC at a cost of approximately $855,000 (Tr. 899). At the time of hearing there had been completed a modern retarder yard at Roseville, Calif., at a cost of approximately $4,700,000. Roseville is said to be a sort of hub to and from which is dispatched loaded and empty cars. It is expected that the Roseville yard will relieve pressure on its yard at Eugene. The general manager of defendant lines testified somewhat at length in reply to criticisms made by witness Winter, an employee of the Oregon Commissioner. Witness Winter criticized sharply defendant's operations between Eugene and Crescent Lake. The testimony of the general manager is quoted on brief as follows:

"Since September 1, 1926, when the Cascade line was placed in operation, up to the present time, various portions of the railroad and facilities thereon have approached the point of being restrictive in the movement of traffic, including empties into Oregon, and as that potential has developed, these deficiencies have been corrected.

"Never has there been a time within the scope of my experience when the Springfield subdivision between Eugene and Crescent Lake, or that portion of it between Oakridge and Crescent Lake, constituted the governing factor in the movement of traffic, including empties into Oregon or the movement of traffic out of that State, except, of course, during those occasions when the movement of trains on that subdivision was interrupted by reason of snow difficulties, slides, derailments, and so on.

"It is also of interest to note that during the period 1942–1944, when I was serving as General Superintendent of (900) Transportation, and as a member of the Advisory Committee to W. F. Kirk, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, and Agent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it became necessary to divert traffic from various of Southern Pacific routes under authority of Interstate Commerce Commission orders to the end of avoiding or liquidating congestion occasioned by heavy upsurges of military traffic. Such situations were experienced on the El Paso route eastward from Los Angeles, on the Ogden route eastward from Roseville, and on the Valley route extending between Los Angeles and central California via Mojave and Bakersfield, but at no time was it necessary to seek such relief because of restriction imposed upon traffic flow by the Springfield subdivision of the Portland division.

"It must be remembered, and, as will be testified to in detail by a subsequent witness, that except for those spot shortages that may be due to traffic interruption for causes immediateley mentioned above or because of more serious and prolonged interruptions, as exemplified by the earthquake damage on the Tehachapi Mountains, when cars are in short supply in Oregon, they are in short supply elsewhere on the system.

"No reservoir of empty equipment ordinarily exists anywhere on the lines of this company that might be tapped for the benefit of Oregon, and which tapping it is alleged is prevented by restrictions imposed by the physical characteristics of the Springfield subdivision." (901)

Witness Winter also criticized the lack of facilities and the operation on the Siskiyou line between Ashland, Oreg., and Hornbrook, Calif. He described the line as incapable of handling more traffic (Tr. 319). Witness Hallawell stated that prior to 1926 the Siskiyou line was defendant's only entrance into Oregon. In June 1926 that line carried 32½ trains per day. Inauguration of service over the Cascade line through Klamath Falls diverted traffic from the Siskiyou line such that in 1952 the average movement over the latter was 8.2 trains per day. Defendant asserts that except for the removal of a few short sidings the line is the same as in 1926. The Siskiyou line now handles 30 percent or less of the empty cars brought into Oregon. In 1926 locomotives operated over the Siskiyou line into Oregon were of the 2–10–2 type with a rating of 645 tons. The locomotives now used to serve Oregon are for the most part diesels with a rating of 2,450 tons (Tr. 902). With the Cascade line in service western Oregon is now giving train service per day some eleven times that in 1926. Carloads originating on defendant's lines in Oregon have increased 170 percent and tons originated have increased 200 percent 1951 over 1926 (Tr. 903).

Complainant sought to emphasize the fact that defendant's facilities have not kept pace with the rapid development of industry in western Oregon during recent years.

That is a substantial issue in the proceeding. Bearing on that issue, defendant shows that over $630 million has been spent in the last 20 years for additions and betterments to its property and for locomotives and cars. Some $375 million of the investment has been made in the last 6 years. The testimony relating to the expenditure designed for expeditious handling of traffic to and from Oregon (made in the last 30 years) is summarized in brief as follows:

"1. Constructed the Cascade line, otherwise known as the 'Natron Cutoff,' completed in 1926 at a cost of over $33 million. This line, running from Natron, Oreg., to Klamath Falls, was constructed in order to bypass the heavy grades and curvatures encountered in movement over the Siskiyou Mountains. With increased capacity and reduced time en route, the Cascade line now handles all Southern Pacific through traffic to and from points east, in the railroad sense, of Eugene, Oreg.;

"2. Relocated a section of the line between Black Butte and Klamath Falls at a cost of $10,800,000. This line change, when considered along with the Cascade line, resulted in more expeditious handling of California and south line traffic originating in Oregon east and north of Eugene and also from Myrtle Creek, some 100 miles south of Eugene;

"3. Constructed the Alturas line from Klamath Falls, Oreg., to Fernley, Nev., at a cost of around $5 million, and standard-gaged and reconstructed the former Nevada, California & Oregon Railway between Wendel and Alturas, at a cost of more than $2,700,000, all of which combined to reduce time in transit on eastbound carloads originating in Oregon and westbound empties destined to Oregon for loading;

"4. Constructed the Taylor retarder yard in Los Angeles at a cost of nearly $2 million and the Roseville retarder yard at Roseville, Calif., at an additional cost of more than $3.3 million, which yards, though remote from Oregon, have improved the handling of cars destined to and from that area by reducing the switching and blocking of outbound loads and by expediting the movement of empties toward Oregon loading points. (The amounts stated are for investment expenditures only and do not include total costs amounting to from $2.5 to $3 million more than the figures just stated.) (842);

"5. Installed CTC between Black Butte and Dunsmuir, Dunsmuir and Redding, Bena and Tehachapi, Santa Margarita and San Luis Obispo, Alhambra and Colton, Colton and Indio in California between Sparks and Massie in Nevada, and between Lucin and Bridge in Utah, all of which installations contribute to hurrying loads and empties toward Oregon and loads from Oregon to markets in all parts of the country;

"6. Recently defendant's board of directors approved the expenditure of $2.4 million to install CTC on the section of the line from Crescent Lake to Klamath Falls, which will greatly improve the movement of cars to and from Oregon (842);

"7. Installed diesel engine servicing facilities at El Paso, Roseville, and Ogden at a cost of many millions of dollars;

"8. Installed radiotelephones in 44 cabooses operating between Eugene and Dunsmuir via Klamath Falls at a cost of $121,968. From 20 minutes to 5 hours per trip have been saved by such telephones through avoiding delays incident to cutting out helpers, cutting trains at sidings, and entering and leaving sidings, particularly those not equipped with spring switches (843); and

"9. Had on order and undelivered, as of August 31, 1952, 6,718 freight cars and 116 diesel locomotives at a cost of $66 million (845)."

Defendant asserts that the car shortages during the peak shipping season 1947–50, inclusive, are the only severe peacetime shortages on its lines since 1922–23. It refers to the period 1924 to late 1940 as one of large surpluses of empty cars on all class I railroads. This surplus is said to have reached 700,000 cars for the national average. In 1939 defendant had on line a daily surplus of 6,632 serviceable cars, and in 1940 the average of such cars was 5,374. Reference is made to annual reports of this Commission which discuss the matter, and the effect such surpluses had on new car purchases, etc., during that period. That period was followed by an upsurge in volume of traffic as a result of World War II. The latter period 1942–45 caused a real problem for defendant in its effort to dispose of cars made empty on its lines. During that period defendant was required to haul trainloads of empties to its eastern connections. With the end of the war, the situation suddenly reversed. The car supply generally was short until the decline in industrial production—and in railroad traffic—which occurred in 1949. That recession soon was followed by an upsurge in traffic caused by the Korean situation, and so-called scare buying. The national traffic situation changed from a reported car surplus of some 35,000 to one of car shortages that became widespread and severe in many parts of the country—particularly in western Oregon. Much space in the record and in briefs was given the topics just mentioned. Suffice it here to say that exhibits 45 and 46 (Tr. 964–167) show a daily shortage national in scope of several thousand needed cars for immediate movement. The effect of the 5-day week in terms of car shortage, was to reduce the Nation's car supply by about 175,000 cars. That subject was discussed in the 64th and 65th annual reports of this Commission to the Congress. The car shortages, national in scope, were widely publicized during the principal period covered by the complaint and record herein.

Contributing to the difficulty of defendant to furnish cars to its shippers during the period in question, defendant shows by exhibits 34 and 35 that the Association of American Railroads issued several car service orders or directives requiring it to turn over to their connecting lines specified numbers of serviceable cars as described in the orders. The record shows that 7 such orders were issued in 1946, 4 in 1948, 3 in 1949, 10 in 1950, and 7 in 1951. Four of these were still in effect in December 1950. The service orders made effective during 1950 are described on pages 4 and 5 of exhibit 35 as follows:

"Effective May 6, 1950 (still in effect December 1950). Order provided for return empty of all gondolas of Eastern Allegheny ownership with the exception that gondolas covered by this order locating west of the Continental Divide could be loaded to any destination east thereof.

"Effective May 21, 1950 (canceled June 10, 1950). Order requires S. P. Co. to deliver A. T. & S. F. Ry. 500 plain box suitable for merchandise loading or better at rate of 50 cars daily. Order was modified effective June 1 through June 10 to require S. P. Co. to exclude A. T. & S. F. Ry. plain box from all distribution and loading excepting in the State of Oregon and return empty to owners.

"Effective July 5, 1950 (canceled November 15, 1950). This order restricted the loading of Canadian owned boxcars to destinations only north of a line extending from St. Louis through Kansas City to Denver or to destinations to or via Canadian Roads.

"Effective July 7, 1950 (canceled August 3, 1950). Order required S. P. Co. to withdraw from distribution and return to owners W. P. RR. boxcars locating in States of California and Nevada. This order was superseded by another effective July 10 which directed S. P. Co. to deliver 50 empty serviceable plain boxcars to W. P. RR., daily, for a 10-day period. This order took preference over S. P. Co. requirements.

"Effective July 7, 1950 (canceled August 3, 1950), order required that S. P. Co. exempt from distribution D. & R. G. W. Railroad boxcars and expedite return empty to owners; however, order was immediately modified to permit cars to be loaded in accordance with car service rules.

"Effective July 16, 1950 (canceled October 5, 1950), order required S. P. Co. to deliver to U. P. Railroad at southern California junctions 50 serviceable plain boxcars daily, count not to include Canadian boxcars or cars home to owners at junctions where made empty. Order was amended on August 2, increasing requirements to 125 cars daily, and again amended August 17 to increase demands to 200 cars daily, excluding junction rule 2 and Canadian ownership.

"Effective July 17, 1950 (canceled August 30, 1950), order required that all flats and gondola cars other than Pacific coast, Canadian, and D. & R. G. W. ownerships arriving San Francisco-Oakland area under load with Government shipments be returned empty in service route. Order was modified on August 31 through September 30 to permit the loading of flats falling within provisions of this order to destination east of the Continental Divide.

"Effective August 10, 1950 (canceled October 4, 1950), order required S. P. Co. to deliver to W. P. Railroad for movement via W. P. Railroad, and delivery to G. N. at Bieber, Calif., 10 serviceable boxcars daily, preferably of G. N. ownership."

The orders made worse the bad situation for defendant at the very time it could not supply its shipper demand for cars. Defendant calls attention to the fact that during World War II the purchase of cars, locomotives, etc., was restricted by priorities. In the period 1940–51 defendant purchased 48,813 freight cars and 725 locomotives. Some 454 of the latter were diesels. Defendant has purchased 30,680 cars since 1946 at a cost of approximately $380 million. In addition, since 1946 defendant contributed some $79 million for the purchase of refrigerator cars for the Pacific Fruit Express, of which defendant owns one-half. Delays were experienced in delivery of some of the equipment. Bad-order cars have been repaired with diligence (Tr. 838). Defendant asserts its serious consideration of the plight of shippers during the periods of car shortages in recent years. It claims to have done all within its power to serve its shippers, and cites the above purchases and expenditures as indicative of its undertaking to do all within its power to provide service to all its shipper patrons. In addition to the equipment referred to, defendant has spent in recent years some $375 million for construction, additions, and betterments. Reference is made to an agreement reached by the railroads in July 1951 at Chicago to "(a) increase ownership to 1,727,873 cars as of July 1, 1950, or an increase of 122,000 cars; (b) reduce bad-order cars to 5 percent ownership of each class of car on each railroad; (c) speed up car handling so as to attain an average of 50 miles per freight car per day; (d) avoid delays and other insufficiencies in freight-car handling; and (e) solicit shipper-receiver cooperation in freight-car efficiency."

Defendant shows that at all times during recent years it has had on order cars much above the average for class I railroads; that in carrying out the Chicago agreement it has far exceeded the efficiency in operation there contemplated. In 1950 defendant was moving freight cars more than 65 miles per day and for all serviceable cars 68 miles. Unserviceable cars on all class I railroads were shown to be about twice the percentage of that on the system lines of defendant (Tr. 852). The efficiency in operation shown here of record for the period 1946–51 shows that

defendant exceeded the national average in additions to equipment and other improvement. Such a showing is important to the ultimate conclusion in this proceeding, but it affords little comfort to the lumber shippers in western Oregon, who, as claimed, have suffered more shortage in cars desired than is shown for any other area in the territory served by defendant. The supply of cars during favorable weather conditions for producing lumber in western Oregon largely determines the amount that can be produced and determines definitely the volume of business of the industry.

The production of lumber in western Oregon has been increasing steadily for several years. The tempo has accelerated in recent years. Since 1946 defendant has not furnished all the cars desired by Oregon lumber shippers during the peak season of summer months. It appears, however, that on an annual basis cars furnished have approximated, and in some instances exceeded, those ordered (on orders remaining uncanceled).

Shippers in western Oregon local to defendant are dependent for cars drawn, for the most part, from 1,500 to 2,000 miles distant from that area. As empties are pulled up from Texas through California obviously the supply of empties shrink en route. The supply diminishes along the route when shippers there are asking for cars. This has caused the car supply in western Oregon for shippers local to defendant to bear no small part of the grief when shortages occur on the system lines of defendant.

Careful consideration has been given all the findings proposed by counsel on briefs. The situation is aptly stated in brief of complainant (p. 293): "Many conditions shown to prevail perhaps cannot be fully corrected within the limit and scope of this proceeding. Full restitution to damaged shippers can never be made." One cannot consider the record herein without feeling the force of these statements. The records show that in times of car shortage the Portland division generally is reported "short." Seldom, but at times, other divisions are reported "short" by smaller percentage of cars furnished to cars ordered than that of the Portland division. Consideration has been given by the Commission's Bureau of Service to the issuance of a car service order that would require carriers more equitably to distribute cars among its several operating divisions in times of car shortage where surpluses were reported on certain of the divisions. Instances are here shown of record of distribution in which it appears that the Portland division and 1 or 2 other divisions of defendant's lines appeared to have been given less than an equitable share of cars on hand. The Commission's Bureau of Service generally receives daily reports of cars on hand, cars ordered, cars furnished, surpluses or shortages for the several operating divisions of carriers in car shortage areas. Application promptly should be made to the Commission for relief, when and where an equitable distribution is not made among operating divisions, for the issuance of a car service order to effect needed relief. All the findings proposed by complainants properly may not be made on this record. Section 15 (4) of the act protects the carrier originating the traffic in its long haul. Section 15 (8) allows the shipper the right to route his traffic. Both defendant and shippers here are shown to have exercised those statutory rights.

Upon this record the Commission should find:

1. The complainant herein and interveners in its behalf are proper parties complainant.

2. The defendant originates, transports and delivers a very substantial portion of the volume of rail freight moving to or from points in western Oregon and, except in the limited territory served by Oregon Electric Railway Co., enjoys what almost amounts to a monopoly in that portion of western Oregon southerly from Portland.

3. While Portland, Oreg., to some extent, as designated in the tariffs, is an open gateway for the movement of rail shipments originating on lines of defendant in western Oregon, so far as rates and routings are concerned, and competitive rates and practical routings exist via Portland in connection with Union Pacific Railroad Co., and, to a lesser extent with other northern lines, defendant has discouraged the use of such route and has solicited against it; Union Pacific Railroad Co. solicits traffic at points on lines of defendant for routing via Ogden.

4. During the past decade that portion of western Oregon served by defendant has experienced a substantial industrial growth, particularly in the production of lumber and other forest products, which growth and development has substantially increased the rail freight tendered to and transported by defendant, and has likewise greatly increased the potential traffic of the area to a point exceeding that here reflected of record in rail shipments.

5. That defendant, by reason of its near monopoly in rail transport facilities within the described area in western Oregon, owes to the shippers of that area the duty of anticipating any community and industrial growth reasonably to be expected, and of furnishing to shippers and prospective shippers service, equipment and facilities as nearly as reasonably possible, adequate to their needs, and to augment the same from time to time in advance of development to such extent that such development and growth may reasonably be anticipated.

6. That the alleged failure to furnish intervener, Wren Planing Mill, all the cars it desired during the period June 1 to September 30, 1950, is not shown to have constituted a vioaltion of the Interstate Commerce Act as to warrant a finding of damages on the issues raised.

7. That the record does not afford a basis upon which the Commission may make an enforceable order retroactive to the periods covered by the complaint and the evidence adduced of record.

It follows, therefore, that the complaint, including the intervening petition, should be dismissed.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE A. WREN PLANING MILL

Footage and profits comparison to actual results of operations with estimated normal results of operations for the months of June to September 1950, inclusive

	Applicable to sawmill shipments	Applicable to cants purchased and custom milling	Total
Estimated shipments based on approximately normal production as per schedule attached	*Feet* 7,562,466	*Feet* 8,437,534	*Feet* 16,000,000
Actual shipments during the period, per records of the Company	4,489,048	2,920,394	7,409,442
Estimated shortage	3,073,418	5,517,140	8,590,558
Summary of per M feet sales and costs as shown on attached schedules:			
Average sales prices applicable during the 4 months	$68.02	$73.62	
Less—			
Direct variable costs included in lumber from own sawmill	26.86		

	Applicable to sawmill shipments	Applicable to cants purchased and custom milling	Total
Summary, etc.—Continued			
Less—Continued			
Direct variable costs included in resaw, planing mill, and shipping	$9.04	$9.04	
Cost of cants purchased		56.28	
	35.90	65.32	
Margin of profit	32.12	8.30	
Loss of production:			
Sawmill, 3,073,418 feet at $32.12 per thousand or			$98,718.19
Purchased cants and lumber, 5,517,140 feet at $8.30 per thousand or			45,792.26
Loss of profits, partly estimated			144,510.45

SCHEDULE B. WREN PLANING MILL

Sales prices and production costs applicable to year 1950

	Amount	Feet	Per M feet
Actual sawmill sales price in 4 months of June to September 1950	$305,338.34	4,489,048	$68.02
Actual sales price of cants and lumber purchased, remanufactured, and sold during the 4 months of June to September 1950	155,477.55	2,111,845	73.62
Direct variable costs included in lumber from our sawmill exclusive of resaw, planing, and shipping for the year 1950	275,063.47	10,239,630	26.86

	Amount	Feet	Per M feet
Cost of cants and lumber purchased for the year 1950	$184,376.15	$3,275,943	56.28
Direct variable costs applicable to resaw, planing mill, and shipping being on combined footage of sawmill production sold and purchased lumber sold for the year 1950	118,629.45	13,129,477	9.04

SCHEDULE C. WREN PLANING MILL

Data in re costs and expenses for the year 1950

Direct variable costs:			Power, lights, and water		$10,146.38
Gross payroll for the year		$167,564.32	Total direct costs of all operations		629,800.18
Lumber and cants purchased		184,376.15			
Logs purchased	$284,071.99		Less:		
Less:			Supervisory labor and other labor including watchmen (fixed costs)	$49,703.22	
Logs sold	64,085.55		Payroll taxes and payroll insurance thereon	2,027.89	
Increase in inventory during year	9,168.23				51,731.11
		210,818.21			
Stumpage depletion		11,854.60			
Supplies and expenses		38,212.18			
Payroll taxes and payroll insurance (4.08 percent average)		6,828.34	Total direct costs variable applicable to production		578,069.07

Distributed as follows:

	Sawmill production	Cants, resaw and planer	Total		Sawmill production	Cants, resaw and planer	Total
Gross payroll	$66,935.06	$100,629.26	$167,564.32	Less cants and lumber purchased		$184,376.15	
Lumber and cants purchased		184,376.15	184,376.15				
Logs purchased	210,818.21		210,818.21	Total		118,629.45	
Stumpage depletion	11,854.60		11,854.60				
Supplies and expenses	14,397.10	23,815.08	38,212.18	Mill cut feet	10,239,630		
Payroll taxes and payroll insurance	2,730.95	4,097.39	6,828.31	Cants and lumber purchased do		3,275,943	
Power, lights, and water	4,058.55	6,087.83	10,146.38	Cants and lumber purchased and sold do		3,245,236	
Total	310,794.47	319,005.71	629,800.18	Sawmill production sold do		9,884,241	
Less:							
Gross payroll fixed	34,330.32	15,372.90	49,703.22				
Payroll taxes and payroll insurance thereon	1,400.68	627.21	2,027.89				
	35,731.00	16,000.11	51,731.11				
Total direct costs	275,063.47	303,005.60	578,069.07				

SCHEDULE D. WREN PLANING MILL

Data in re footages for the months of June to September 1950, inclusive

Footage shipments had in 1948:

July	3,979,193
August	4,038,730
Total for 2 months	8,017,923
Average	4,008,961
Use	4,000,000

This footage represents essentially the capacity of the entire operation including our sawmill production, lumber purchased and remanufactured in resaw and planer, and custom milling.

Had there been a sufficiency of railroad cars for shipment of the production, at least 4 million feet of lumber would have been shipped in each of the 4 months of June to September 1950, inclusive and the shipments would have been segregated between own lumber produced and cants purchased on essentially the following basis:

Own lumber produced being based on average daily production in June, 1950, prior to curtailment of sawmill operations:

	Feet
See attached schedule	7,562,466
Balance applicable to cants purchased remanufactured, and shipped and to some custom milling	8,437,534
Total estimated normal shipments for the 4 months of June to September, 1950, inclusive	16,000,000

SCHEDULE E. WREN PLANING MILL

Footage of sawmill production for the month of June 1950

Date	Day shift	Night shift	Total
	Feet	Feet	Feet
1	43,472	37,007	80,479
2	37,067	43,145	80,212
3	37,216		37,216
5	51,059	41,598	92,657
6	45,934	36,634	82,568
7	43,754	37,961	81,715
8	38,262	35,476	73,738
9	41,942	39,351	81,293
10	44,533	39,835	84,368
12	44,134	38,134	82,268

Footage of sawmill production for the month of June 1950—Continued

Date	Day shift	Night shift	Total
	Feet	Feet	Feet
13	41,835	37,218	79,053
14	44,224	41,120	85,344
15	43,051	43,029	86,080
16	48,596	42,501	91,097
17	43,377	38,875	82,252
19	44,394	38,876	83,270
20	48,729	45,031	93,760
21	43,158	40,864	84,022
22	44,919	41,310	86,229
23	30,080	38,349	68,429
24	39,526		39,526
26	44,149	39,549	83,698
27	40,032	42,659	82,691
28	42,175	42,827	85,002
29	42,954	44,039	86,993
30	41,035	39,980	81,015
Total	1,109,607	965,368	2,074,975

Total footage	feet	2,074,975
Less average of 8 percent falldown, for trim, resaw, and through planing mill being approximate experience of the company	feet	165,998
Sawmill production	do	1,908,977
Total days operated during June 1950		26
Average cut per day	feet	73,422
Working days in 4 months ended Sept. 30, 1950		103
Estimated production if operated continuously during the said 4 months on basis similar to preceding months	feet	7,562,466

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE SENATE THUS FAR IN THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief comment—and I am doing it as a "Liberal"—on what I consider to be unfair criticism directed to the legislative record which the majority leader of the Senate is making in this session of Congress.

For example, I have before me an analysis of measures passed by the Senate through March 29, 1956. It does not include measures that were passed in the Senate today since the compilation was drafted. The compilation compares the record of the Senate this year with the record of the Senate a year ago. By March 31, 1955, we had passed 140 bills, a large number of which were private bills. This year, by March 28, 1956, we have passed 412 bills.

The compilation shows that as of March 28, 1956, the Senate has been in session 54 days. As of March 31, 1955, the Senate had been in session 38 days.

Of the total of 337 Senate and House bills and Senate and House joint resolutions, 117 have been general legislation and 220 private bills. It is estimated that only 40 or 50 of the 140 measures passed by March 31, 1955, were general bills. Fifty of the more important bills passed by the Senate so far this year are listed in the compilation, which I believe has already been printed in the RECORD.

I wish to say as a "Liberal" that it is very unfair to read in some press stories that this has been a do-nothing Senate thus far in this session. We started in January with bills to vote on. We proceeded immediately with debate and voting. That does not usually happen at the beginning of a session. I also wish to say that I do not share the view of some liberals in the country who have been quoted recently in press stories as castigating the majority leader because of the legislative course of action he has followed in this session of Congress.

Let me cite a major piece of legislation or two. It may be that there are certain types of liberals who feel we should not have followed the course of action we followed in connection with the gas bill. I was a little surprised, at the beginning of the session, when the gas bill was brought up for early debate and vote, that there was a suggestion from some liberal sources in the country that we ought to bottle it up in committee. I do not believe in either steamroller tactics or in bottling-up tactics.

That is why I took the floor to state that as a liberal I would be no party to a proposal to bottle up the gas bill. I thought it was a very bad bill. I disagreed with the majority leader of the

Senate. I believe he was dead wrong on the gas bill.

However, that has nothing to do with the parliamentary procedure in the Senate. That has nothing to do with the rights of our colleagues in the Senate, both on the majority side and on the minority side. When a bill goes through hearings in committee and is reported out by the committee, as was the case with the gas bill, within a reasonable period of time it should be brought to the floor of the Senate and disposed of.

It was suggested that I go into the Democratic policy committee and oppose bringing the bill out of committee. I refused to do that. On the contrary, I took the floor of the Senate and set forth my feeling as to why it ought to be brought up. I said it ought to be brought up because we could not justify, under our legislative process, the adoption of tactics that some liberals thought would be all right to adopt in that case, because they thought it was such a bad piece of legislation.

Mr. President, the soundest way to strengthen a liberal program in this country is always to be willing to take it on, on the merits. It may mean getting ready to be defeated sometimes, but one of the responsibilities of a liberal in the Senate is to make the record so that liberals who will follow will be in a stronger position to serve the public than they would have been if the record had not been written.

I believe the record we made against the gas bill will redound to the benefit and the glory of liberals in the Congress of the United States in connection with future issues, because I can already hear someone say, "Well, you know what happened with the gas bill. You know the position they took, and you had better be ready to meet them on the merits."

In this session of the Congress we have devoted many hours to the farm bill. What would the critics of the majority leader have us do? I happen to think—and the majority leader knows this, and I have criticized him privately about it—that we held too many night sessions. I think we were held in session too many nights, to the disadvantage of the legislative process in the Senate. He does not share my point of view on that matter, but he is not entitled to the criticism that he is a do-nothing majority leader. On the contrary, he has been a very effective majority leader, who has kept the so-called pressure upon the Members of the Senate to get our work done. The figures in the RECORD on that point cannot be denied. I think it is due the majority leader, before we begin our recess period, to make that statement. I think it is unfair to close this part of the session of the Congress with these criticisms of the majority leader going unanswered. I think everyone knows that on substantive legislation I have disagreed with him time and time again, but I have a high regard for his fairness; I have a high regard for his complete impartiality in the handling of his parliamentary duties in the Senate; and I have a high regard for his dedication and devotion to the public service in carrying out his responbilities as majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO APRIL 9, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 226, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday, April 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 226, until Monday, April 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 29 (legislative day, March 26), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sudan.

UNITED NATIONS

James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be a deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United States.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Spire, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years vice Donald R. Ross, resigned.

ASSOCIATE JUDGE

Austin L. Fickling, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia for a term of 10 years vice Armond W. Scott, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, in this moment of prayer, we are coming unto Thee in the spirit of penitence and confession, of praise and adoration, of supplication and intercession.

We beseech Thee to give us a more vivid sense of our filial relationship to Thee and may we seek to be one with Thee in the thoughts of our minds, the desires of our hearts, and the endeavors of our lives.

May we also cultivate a deeper appreciation and understanding of our fraternal relationship to mankind everywhere and may all attitudes of contempt and hatred toward others be supplanted by feelings of considerateness and love.

Grant that this Holy Week, reminding us of the sufferings and death of our blessed Lord, and the Easter season, commemorating His resurrection, may inspire us to rise with Him in newness of life and give ourselves more sacrificially to the glorious task of building a finer and nobler civilization in which men and nations shall live together in peace and good will.

Hear us in the name of our crucified Saviour and risen Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses adjourn Thursday, March 29, 1956, they stand adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1956.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9064) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, and for other purposes; and

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 101. An act for the relief of Fernanda Milani;

S. 117. An act for the relief of Ana P. Costes;

S. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Asher Ezrachi;

S. 396. An act for the relief of Theresa Pok Lim Kim;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of Purita Rodriguez Adiarte and her two minor children, Irene Grace Adiarte and Patrick Robert Adiarte; and

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Ad-

ministration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 453) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings of the Department of Defense Appropriations for 1957 for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations 1,000 copies of the hearings entitled "Department of Defense Appropriations for 1957," held before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

EVOLUTION OF A PARTY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this happy Easter time I feel it appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle an editorial from a Republican newspaper, the Chicago Tribune of March 27, 1956. Commenting on an article in the New York Times this editorial says:

Mr. White, as the representative of an eastern newspaper, is pleased to observe that the center of control over party affairs has shifted to the East. This is not exactly news, and does not signify that the Republican center of gravity has shifted at all from the Middle West. What it does mean is that the successful political wirepullers in the party are mostly easterners.

Further the editorial says:

In other words, the party is in the hands of eastern men who wield financial clout and who control the instruments of propaganda. We believe that to be true.

Then the editorial goes on:

We thought our middle western readers would like to know of this eastern viewpoint on where they fit in the new Republicanism. It seems that they just don't fit.

This from the Republican Chicago Tribune. I do hope that my bringing it to the attention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not mess up with gloom the joyous Easter greetings that with my colleagues on this side of the aisle I extend to them as we recess.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

DUST STORMS

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, high in the sky over America this Easter weekend, will be great eddies of dust that a few days ago were topsoil on the western plains.

The loss of that good earth means the destruction, according to the papers, of three-fourths of the crop of hard winter wheat.

But it means much more than that. These clouds of airborne topsoil can never be returned to that prairie land. Those precious acres are well on the way to becoming stark and arid desert, land which America may never reclaim.

May I remind the leadership of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, that on Tuesday, January 17 of this year, an eminent Member of this body, an authority on agriculture, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], addressed this House and said:

There is no reason in the world why a man should plow up land that will blow away at the first gust of wind.

I am fearful of another cycle of terrific dust storms—

He prophesied.

It is so dry in three counties in my district that they have little water for their livestock. They have had no snow, practically no moisture since last fall. So, a windstorm in that area would bring about a serious situation.

It is true that we were forced by the emergency of war to plow up these sod lands and crop them chiefly for wheat. It is true, likewise, that we had to help these farms by the parity program for several years after the war, but we saw the handwriting on the wall when the wheat crop on these sod land acres dropped from 100 million bushels a year down to 20 million and 40 million bushels for the last 2 years.

And now, as we face God's wrath as expressed by the wind and the dust storms, are we preparing to add another year of high parity to encourage more growing of grain we cannot use, sell, or eat?

Go back and read again that January speech. It tells us what must be done today to save our land.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] called our attention to a number of important bills affecting the wage earners of this country in various ways. Mr. SCOTT pointed out that despite the importance of these bills, and the desirability of enacting suitable legislation in these fields, the Democrat leadership had shown little interest in their enactment. His warning that we should increase our rate of progress is well-timed. We may be in session for only 3 more months, and our legislative schedule is lagging.

I should like to call attention today to H. R. 5740, the so-called industrial safety bill, which I introduced almost 12 months ago, on April 20, 1955. This bill was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee, of which I am a member. The Department of Labor transmitted its report on this bill to that committee on May 30, 1955.

This bill, to promote industrial safety, is important. When 609 Americans died in Christmas holiday accidents last year, we called the weekend Black Christmas and the Nation deplored the useless and tragic loss of life. Yet we seem to ignore the fact that last year almost 15,000 workers died in job accidents while doing the work that is keeping America strong and prosperous. During that same period nearly 2 million workers were injured.

The suffering of the workers injured and killed during 1955 and the sorrow of their families cannot, of course, be calculated. The economic loss to our Nation, however, can be estimated. It has been calculated that the direct and indirect cost of these accidents amounted to $3½ billion in 1955.

In 1955 lost time due to industrial accidents is estimated at 39 million mandays of work. Think of what could be built or produced with 39 million days of work. That is a week's work for almost 7½ million men and women.

This is bad enough, but it is not all.

The accumulative effects of these accidents—the time lost in the future due to the deaths and permanent disabilities suffered last year—will amount to 193 million man-days.

How many good things for us all could be made or built in 193 million days of work? It is staggering. The future time lost because of last year's occupational accidents could build more than 100 million refrigerators or cut and sew 200 million men's suits, or make 1½ billion pairs of men's shoes. It could fabricate more than 26,000 modern jet bombers or construct a million 6-room houses or mine 2 billion tons of coal.

And year after year after year, this tragic loss goes on and on. The most heartbreaking fact is that nearly all these accidents could be prevented.

If H. R. 5740, or something like it, could be enacted, we should have taken a step toward reducing occupational accidents in this country. It would further the cause of industrial safety by providing grants-in-aid to the States so that they can improve their safety programs. President Eisenhower has included in his recent budget message a request for $2 million to finance these grants when the legislation is passed.

Under our Federal-State system, the States have the basic legal responsibility for occupational safety. President Eisenhower believes firmly in the exercise by the States of this initiative.

Few State labor departments today, however, are equipped to carry on a good safety program, to make necessary inspections, and to advise management on ways to prevent accidents. A study made several years ago showed that out of 37 States less than two-thirds spent as much as 10 cents per year per industrial worker on safety.

State labor departments, except for the few which administer employment security programs, are the one main branch of State governments that do not receive

the benefit of Federal financial grants. If such grants were available, the same progress in industrial safety could be expected as has taken place in State public health, vocational rehabilitation, vocational education, and welfare programs. All these programs are partly financed by Federal funds.

Were this proposed law in effect today, an estimated 39 million workers would benefit if every State and Territory accepted its provisions.

This legislation, along with several other bills which would directly benefit many millions of workers, was originally proposed by President Eisenhower in 1955. Since Congress took no action, and our committee held no hearings, President Eisenhower has proposed it again this year.

Inaction with respect to these important pieces of legislation is difficult to explain. These bills would benefit millions of working men and women throughout the country, and they should be acted upon.

This spring perhaps this bill and others may be given a speedy hearing. At this time of year hope springs eternal.

KEEP: RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress a project in Japan, largely the vision of a single American, which is today contributing immeasurably to the well-being of an important ally of the United States and providing an inspiring "pilot plant" for other countries in Asia.

The people of Japan have long been beset with the problem of finding sufficient food to meet the needs of their teeming population. Today, with over 89 million people living on 4 small islands—an area no larger than our own State of Montana—that problem is more acute than ever before. Only 17 percent of Japan can be used for growing the foodstuffs which are traditional in Japan.

Beyond this, the people of Japan face a spiritual problem—one of obtaining a workable faith in God and man which will constitute an adequate underpinning of the democratic form of government they desire to maintain. They recognize their need for this faith, particularly for a demonstration of how democratic ideas can be made to work at the grassroots level.

KEEP, or to give it its full name, the Kiyosato Educational Experiment Project, offers to the Japanese people at least a partial answer to these two pressing problems. This project, located in the mountains of Yamanashi Prefecture at the village of Kiyosato, some 70 miles west of Tokyo, stems from a summer camp founded in 1938 by an American teacher in Japan. Today it is known all over Japan, not only for its camp facilities but for the pioneering it has done in agriculture, medicine, public health, and youth work. It is, in effect, a full-scale demonstration for the betterment of rural life, inspired directly by some of the finest traditions to be found in America—our original New England combination of church and meeting house, our free libraries, our voluntary hospitals, and our colleges of agriculture.

Last year over 20,000 Japanese, young and old alike, came to visit KEEP's experimental farm, library, hospital, conference center, and village church. Several whole schools of 500 students and upward were brought there by their teachers for 1-day inspections. More than 5,000 persons participated in the formal conferences alone, which included such groups as university students, high school boys and girls, 4–H groups, and farm extension agents. A number of American students also came to participate in work camps and to learn more of rural Japan and its problems.

Mr. Speaker, KEEP has proven to the Japanese people that there are yet ways in which their small country can increase its food production. There is little that the world can teach Japan about ordinary paddy field crop raising. Their lowland farmers are as efficient as can be found. In uplands farming, however, KEEP has blazed a new trail. It brought the first Jersey cattle into that part of Japan and proved that they could be pastured in Japan's mountain areas. As a result of this experiment there are today over 5,000 Jersey cattle in Yamanashi Prefecture. KEEP also, in 1952, flew into Japan 200 Hampshire Red chicks from Petaluma, Calif., to begin a poultry industry. Today there are 10,000 Hampshire Red laying hens in the area around Kiyosato. One village has stated that the introduction of this breed increased the economic prospects for their whole population.

KEEP has also proven that 19 kinds of vegetables and 7 cereals and grains can be raised in the unused lands of that part of Japan—all 5,000 feet above sea level. It has now begun to introduce Hereford beef cattle, the first ever to be seen in Japan.

Beyond the immediate problem of food, however, KEEP has brought a new meaning to life for the people of Yamanashi Prefecture. Its free lending library, its pioneer work in rural public health, its outpatient medical service, and its annual county fair—modeled on those great fairs which all of us who grew up in rural America remember so well—have given the impoverished farmers of Yamanashi a broader vision, and feeling of local pride.

KEEP is an ambitious project, but not a luxurious one. Its buildings are of the simplest construction, but they are practical. What is more, they are designed to be within reach of other rural communities of Japan that desire to establish similar projects. KEEP was made possible by a number of small gifts from over 6,000 organizations and individuals here in the United States. Many of these persons served in Japan with our Armed Forces and hence know at firsthand how important KEEP is. Others have never been in Japan, but they have met the dynamic man who established KEEP. It is heartening to know that KEEP's plant is now practically complete and is already nearly self-supporting. There remains to be established only a rural-life training institute, where farm families can learn to develop household industries.

A native of Kentucky, Paul Rusch, the founder of KEEP, first went to Japan in 1925 on a business venture. What started out to be a year in the Far East has turned out to be a lifetime. From 1926 until 1942 he served as a member of the economics faculty of St. Paul's University, an educational institution in Tokyo, founded and supported by the Episcopal Churches of America. He introduced American football to Japan in 1934; but he is most remembered for the Christian work he established among young university men in Japan.

On the day of Pearl Harbor, Paul Rusch was the sole American faculty member remaining at St. Paul's and was arrested and interned by the Japanese secret police. Repatriated in the exchange of 1942, he volunteered for service in the American Army.

From 1942 to 1945 as an intelligence officer he was engaged in the training of some 6,000 officers and men for Japanese language duty in the Far East. Almost all of these were nisei, Americans of Japanese ancestry. The school was just outside my city of Minneapolis and it was here that I came to know and respect Paul Rusch. In mid-1945 he was flown to Manila to enter Japan as a colonel on General MacArthur's staff. From 1945 through 1949 he served in the Civil Intelligence Section of General Headquarters, Tokyo. For his service he was awarded the Army Commendation Ribbon and the Legion of Merit.

Paul Rusch, however, saw a challenge beyond his Army career. In 1949 he left the service and began in earnest to develop the work he had started at KEEP before the war. Since that time he has devoted all his energies to organzing the project and raising the necessary funds in Japan and in the United States to make it possible.

Recognition of this great man's record has come from all quarters. Hobart College has awarded him an honorary degree. The Japanese Governor of Yamanashi Prefecture has said:

> The precious seed of democracy planted and watered by KEEP has grown into a big tree, which is already bearing fruit.

Shigeru Yoshida, former Prime Minister of Japan, describes KEEP as "a wonderful work for the betterment of rural life in this country.

The Dallas Morning News once observed:

> Paul Rusch asks Congress for nothing. He does not demand the enactment of laws by the Japanese Diet. He simply goes to work for his fellow man.

Dr. Paul Rusch is but one of many Americans who over the past hundred years have given themselves to lives of service for the people of Asia. His work is unique, however, in that it demonstrates so dramatically what can be

done, with faith and a shoestring, to help a people to help themselves. That this has been accomplished by private initiative and support is in the best American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, I know few if any places where Americans can invest their dollars with greater long-range benefit to more people.

All America can well be proud of Paul Rusch and the forward-looking men and women who have made and are making KEEP possible.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old principle of engineering against forcing. If technicians in the scientific world have discovered that rule of engineering, some legislators have not or do not apply the principle to the successful enacting of laws in a great body like the Congress of the United States.

As one who consistently supports civil-rights legislation I realize that a Member of Congress can wave his arms and shout and lay the blame for the ills of the Nation on the administration in power, and yet actually such tactics are damaging to the very cause which is being embraced.

On the other hand by quiet persistence, reason, and tact it is possible to make great progress.

The administration has announced a three-point civil-rights program to broaden Federal authority in this controversial field. As I understand it, the executive branch will ask for, first, the creation of a Civil Rights Commission with subpena power to review complaints of violations of Federal law; second, the establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, headed by an Assistant Attorney General; third, enactment of a law to permit civil suits to be filed in Federal courts against persons or organizations that deny or attempt to deny voting rights in any States.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that the long-range remedy for race problems lies in the third proposal because once, for example, the Negro gets and exercises the opportunity to vote, he will bring about through his voting franchise the equality he seeks and is entitled to. However, what I would like to point out is that the Congress, particularly the other body, is constituted in such a way that too much pressure at this time would only result in no remedial legislative action. Like good legislative engineers those of us who favor the civil-rights program should not try to force our colleagues against their wills. We must be reasonable and compromise to the extent that half a loaf is better than no bread at all.

I noticed that one of our distinguished colleagues is instituting a discharge petition to force a certain bill out of committee. In this connection I want to say that I believe all legislation should have a public hearing and committee consideration before a measure comes to the floor of the House. Again, like the engineer, I say do not force. Let us use all the persuasive power at our command to get the Judiciary Committee to report out legislation we favor. Let us be patient and calm. After all, it will do our cause no good even if the House passes the bill if it is pigeonholed in the other body. So again I say it is better not to use force.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me express my pleasure and satisfaction that the administration is sending this three-point civil-rights program to us. I hope it will be speedily considered and acted upon favorably.

EX-CONVICT DISPLACES DISABLED VETERAN

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply hurt this morning when I read in the Washington Post that John Maragon, a former 5-percenter and ex-convict, was an employee in the House folding room. I was hurt because Ralph Scalzo, a friend of mine and a disabled American veteran who served his country for 13 years and is 60 percent disabled, a man who wears 4 battle stars from the Africa-Italy campaign, had been displaced by Mr. Maragon.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that at times politics can be awfully rough, but I think we are carrying it just a little too far when we replace a lad who is a 60 percent disabled veteran and then give that job to an ex-convict.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the fine gentleman in charge of such affairs in the House of Representatives will see that justice prevails and that this disabled veteran is reinstated in his job.

Fortunately, I have a little clerk hire left in my allowance, and I am going to put him on temporarily to assist him in increasing his earning power a little over the disability pension he now receives.

Mr. Speaker, if this is an example of what is going on, I think perhaps it would be advisable to establish a bipartisan committee to screen these employees as they come into the House of Representatives.

THE HONORABLE JAMES MIDDLETON COX

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to express my highest personal regards and all good wishes to a very illustrious and distinguished citizen of our great Miami Valley, who will celebrate the 86th anniversary of his birth this coming Saturday, March 31.

The Honorable James Middleton Cox, a former Representative in Congress from the Third District of Ohio, the same district I now have the high honor and privilege to represent here in the Congress, was born near Jacksonburg, Butler County, Ohio, on March 31, 1870.

After graduating from the high school in Amanda, Ohio, he taught school, worked on the farm, and also worked in the mechanical and editorial departments of a daily newspaper. Showing very early in life all those abilities, drive and interests which have always characterized him, he became the owner and publisher of the Dayton Daily News in 1898. In 1903 he also became the owner and publisher of the Springfield (Ohio) Daily News, the Miami (Fla.) Metropolis in 1923, and the Atlanta Journal in 1939. A few years ago he also became the owner of the Dayton Journal Herald and in addition to all these highly respected newspapers, he also owns and operates a number of radio and television stations. Through all these years he has maintained a very close personal daily contact with each of these very important newspapers, radio stations, and television stations. His son, James M. Cox, Jr., of whom he is understandably proud, has been closely associated with and has ably assisted his father in all these far-flung business interests. James Cox, Jr., has also followed his father's interest in all civic affairs and has just successfully conducted a Red Cross finance campaign in Dayton during which the high quota set was substantially exceeded.

Mr. Cox, in spite of his great personal and financial responsibilities in his many business matters, has always been deeply interested in and devoted to all those matters which are in the best public interest of our great district, State, and Nation.

Mr. Cox was elected as a Democrat to the 61st and 62d Congresses and served with distinction from March 4, 1904, until January 12, 1913, when he resigned to become Governor of Ohio. Governor Cox became the first Governor of Ohio to serve our great State of Ohio for three successive terms. During his three terms as Governor, a great deal of legislation was enacted that has since become models for many other States. Time will not permit a review of all this forward-looking legislation, but I must mention one phase in particular. In March 1913, a devastating flood struck the Miami Valley causing millions of dollars of property loss and taking the lives of hundreds of people. The famous "do-it-yourself" spirit of our area and State soon asserted itself. The people, through voluntary contributions, raised the necessary money to develop a flood-prevention program. The State legislature, under the very capable leadership of Governor Cox, passed the Ohio conservancy law which has since become a model for many other States. The Miami Conservancy District was formed—

dams were built, streams were deepened and straightened, and this entire area protected from future floods—all of it being done at the expense of the area itself with no help either being requested or received from the Federal Government. The Ohio conservancy laws and the Miami Conservancy District are living monuments today of Governor Cox and the many distinguished citizens of our area who are devoted to the principle of local responsibility and self-help.

Governor Cox is noted for many other civic and business contributions and successes. Although he was the unsuccessful candidate for President of the United States in 1920, he did not permit his defeat to embitter him or lessen his interest in public affairs. He has always been willing to assist in any civic or national matter. He served with distinction as vice chairman of the United States delegation to the World Economic Conference in London in 1933 and was president of its Monetary Commission. He has served our community and our Nation in many other ways and many times.

Governor Cox retired from active political life in 1946 but he maintains a very keen and active interest in all of the affairs of Government at all levels. He constantly encourages all of his associates and employees to maintain their interest in all public matters and the columns of his newspapers constantly reflect an alert constructive awareness of all the problems which face our Nation and its communities.

Mr. Speaker, Governor Cox will be 86 years young on March 31. He has a host of friends throughout the length and breadth of this Nation. He is a great American who not only has served our community, State, and Nation with honor and distinction, but he is one who also continues his interest and work in our behalf each day. I heartily congratulate Governor Cox on the 86th anniversary of his birth and express my most sincere hope that he will enjoy many more happy, healthful, and fruitful years of active life.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks on the life and character of ex-Governor Cox at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, again I wish to congratulate my old and dear friend, James M. Cox, on his birthday. Jim Cox's life has been a full and useful one. It may be said of him that he has really and finely served his day and generation. He is and has been a friend to man.

PENSIONS FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I submit a petition which I received from Mr. Lloyd LaPlant and others of Manitowoc and Brown Counties, Wis., relating to pensions for World War I veterans, which I ask be referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the question of United States immigration policy is one which is of great concern to all of us. Ever since the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, proposals have been forwarded by legislators, private citizens, and civic organizations indicating the need to reconsider the principles of this act.

Such reconsideration is justified.

Look at the record. By continuing the unjust precedent of the national origins quota system, it has given credence to racist theories and undemocratic practices. By providing 70 percent of our meager quota to northern and western European nations, the law discriminates against other deserving European immigrants. By making distinctions between naturalized and native-born American citizens, the law debases citizenship itself. By granting sweeping and unreviewable powers to administrative officials, the act has a great potentiality for injustice. On this last point, Adlai Stevenson recently wrote:

> The decision of a customs official with regard to the admission of a sack of beans can be appealed to the highest court of the land. But the decision of a consular official with regard to the admission of an American citizen's mother or wife is final and subject to no appeal whatever.

The bill which I have introduced, H. R. 8392, presents a more equitable and just means of meeting the need for a democratic immigration and naturalization policy. It provides a policy which is responsive to the humanitarian desires of the Nation and yet protective of its security.

The bill bases the annual quota at one-sixth of 1 percent of the United States population according to the latest census. Thus, approximately 250,000 immigrants per year will be admitted when the bill is enacted. Since my bill provides for a percentage based on changing census figures, the number of immigrants admitted will change as our population changes. We now admit approximately 150,000 immigrants a year, just as we did in 1924. Our population has increased by half since then. Our quota has remained exactly the same.

Surely we must liberalize this provision.

H. R. 8392 provides furthermore, that these immigrants be admitted not on the basis of the nation from which they come, but on the basis of our national needs and policies. In addition to allotting a minimum of 20 percent of the quota annually to newcomers, the bill indicates percentages to be distributed in order to bring skilled persons into the United States; to reunite families; to provide a haven for the persecuted victims of tyranny; and to promote the national policies of our country. In this last category, the act will probably be devoted, at the present time, to aiding those nations with population pressures which threaten their stability.

By granting our visas in this manner, we affirm our basic democratic belief that the true worth of a man is not determined by the nation of his birth, but by his individual qualifications.

The national origins quota system is an outmoded product of a bygone era—it has no place in our Nation today.

Another democratizing feature of my bill is that it eliminates those distinctions which make the naturalized American a second-class citizen. For the first time in the history of naturalization legislation, we have had, written into our laws, provisions differentiating between citizens who have been naturalized in good faith and native-born citizens. Before the Immigration and Nationality Act, the grant of citizenship to an alien placed him on an equal level with other citizens. But a change was introduced by the present immigration law—a change which, if unchecked, may start a dangerous trend making the naturalized citizen always suspect, always a little bit less than those who, by an accident of birth, happened to be born here. Under the present law, a naturalized American can be deprived of his citizenship on grounds which are not even considered criminal when the same act is committed by a native-born citizen.

I have eliminated such provisions. Naturalized citizens are given the same rights and duties as native-born citizens. They suffer the same penalties for wrongdoing.

Under the present administrative system of the act, the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department, are the two governmental bodies which oversee our immigration laws. This division of responsibility begets confusion and delay. With no clear line of authority, our immigration policy remains uncoordinated and overcomplicated.

H. R. 8392 provides for the creation of an Immigration and Naturalization Commission, which would be a single, independent authority, responsible solely for this vital function.

In addition, this bill provides a workable set of standards to insure against the entry of genuine subversives and antidemocratic peoples into our Nation. In the current act there are so many contradictory and complicated requirements that we often bar the scientist, the professor, the scholar and others who can make a real contribution to our democracy. This failing represents a loss to our national security and a loss to our international prestige.

There is no reason why our security provisions cannot protect us from evil and still assure us of good. H. R. 8392 provides an orderly and sensible procedure for doing exactly that. It can never be attacked on the grounds of laxity, it can be applauded on the grounds of justice. Thus, when we are offered a means of safeguarding our security, and bolstering our democracy, we must not reject it.

On these grounds, I urge passage of H. R. 8392. This bill represents the comprehensive revision long sought by thinking and responsible citizens. It represents an enlightened and human approach to a vital national function. It represents our Nation at its best.

CONSTRUCTIVE CORPORATE TAX REFORM IN THE INTEREST OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a corporate income tax bill which I believe is a constructive approach to the tax problems of small and intermediate incorporated business concerns. In introducing this bill I am associating myself with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], who introduced an identical bill on March 8, 1956. This step is taken in full recognition of the fact that the present corporate normal and surtax rates have been extended through March 31, 1957.

Frankly, it is not my expectation that additional tax legislation affecting corporate income tax rates will be considered in this, the 84th, Congress. However, a basis for future action should be established, and it will be my purpose to press for such action as soon as is possible. I will say that I hope the Ways and Means Committee will be able to hold hearings this session on the several corporate tax rate schedules which are now, or may be, before the committee. I think that small and independent business has a right to voice its opinions in tax legislation at the earliest possible moment. Small business should not only have the right to express its opinions, but it should have those opinions carefully and earnestly considered by the Ways and Means Committee.

It is becoming more evident, as time goes on, that tax relief to small and intermediate corporations is a prerequisite for our continuously expanding economy. With the growth of our larger business units and a trend toward mergers and consolidation, we should write into our tax laws a formula which will encourage every independent enterprise in this country.

In my years of service on the Small Business Committee I have been interested in what could properly be accomplished by the Federal Government to help small business. We have considered, I believe, every type of problem which has beset small business over the years. May it be said that in the consideration of these problems that the House Small Business Committee in past Congresses has on numerous occasions been able to point out areas for improvement to the executive departments and agencies. Many of our recommendations were adopted.

In our consideration of small-business problems, we have found it necessary on at least two occasions to establish independent agencies for the avowed purpose of aiding and assisting small business in its dealings with the Government. We have provided through these agencies financial assistance, help in securing Government contracts, and aid in production and management problems. May I say parenthetically that the Small Business Administration, the first peacetime agency wholly devoted to the affairs of small business, in my opinion has done an outstanding job. There is no doubt in my mind that this agency should be placed on a permanent basis to work in the fields that Congress has authorized and to even work harder in these fields throughout the years to come. As important and as useful as these various aids by the Federal Government are to small and independent business, they are only a partial solution to the problems of the small-business man. The most formidable barrier to the growth and health of small business is the continuance of an unrealistic corporate income tax levy particularly in the lower tax brackets.

There is one point which many of us sometimes overlook or forget. By far the greatest majority of businessmen in the United States ask only for a free hand in the operation of their businesses. They do not like to be hampered by rules or regulations which serve no other purpose than to restrict or control their efforts to become an integral part of our American free enterprise system. Businessmen are as patriotic as any other group in these United States. They do, however, welcome rules and regulations which guarantee fair play in business and which afford protection to the consumer. They have in fact loyally accepted the most stringent regulations on materials, prices, wages and other economic controls needed to maintain our national defense. There is no question about that in my mind. I do believe, nevertheless, that we have imposed through our taxes a formidable deterrent to the successful operations of small business.

I am a small businessman myself. I feel that I have some personal knowledge of small business problems. As one in the manufacturing field, I know the necessity of streamlined production facilities and the absolute necessity of increasing production because that is the only way you can stay in business. I know the difficulties experienced by small firms which generally lack product diversification and sell in rather narrow markets. Many small firms operate on a narrow margin and lack financial resources with which to meet changes in consumer demand.

It is, however, absolutely essential that in order to remain competitive, a business concern replace wornout or obsolete equipment, develop new products, erect new buildings, or fill many of the other demands necessitated by today's highly competitive markets.

Customarily, a small firm depends upon its earnings to finance expansion. With the tax burden such as it is today, however, they must turn to borrowing, and borrowing is itself difficult.

They are, as we all know, unable to go into the securities market and it is increasingly difficult to attract private investors. High taxes have discouraged what used to be one of the best sources of capital for small firms. In fact, small-business men themselves are discouraged in their efforts to expand or to even maintain their present operations. They feel that with such high tax rates the return does not justify the risk and work entailed.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot help but admire the versatility and tenacity of today's small-business man. But let us give him the relief and strength which is so badly needed. The country as a whole will be the ultimate beneficiary.

Reductions in our corporate tax rates in appropriate earnings brackets seem to me to be a logical and imperative step in the solution of the problems of small and independent business. The rates in the bill which I am introducing are as follows:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $5,000	10 percent of the taxable income.
Over $5,000 but not over $25,000.	$500, plus 20 percent of excess over $5,000.
Over $25,000 but not over $100,000.	$4,500, plus 40 percent of excess over $25,000.
Over $100,000	$34,500, plus 54 percent of excess over $100,000.

May I say in conclusion that these schedules will not reduce revenue. Moreover, they do not penalize the larger corporations. The slight increase to 54 percent is negligible when compared with the benefits derived by small corporations as a whole.

Of course, a continued effort should be made to reduce all taxes and it is my hope this may be done.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for today may be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House the fact that today the Committee on Government Operations of the House approved a report of the Subcommittee on

International Operations on Technical Assistance in Latin America.

That report is founded on a study by the International Operations Subcommittee which has been going on for several months. Included in that study was a trip to the capitals of 11 Latin American countries, made between the 7th of October and the 1st of November last year. That subcommittee is under the chairmanship of the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., of Virginia. The other Members who took the field trip were the Honorable JACK BROOKS, of Texas; the Honorable VICTOR KNOX, of Michigan; and myself.

I want to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], for the statesmanlike, impartial attitude he has taken in all the investigations of our subcommittee and particularly that phase dealing with our expenditures on technical assistance programs in Latin America.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but express appreciation to my distinguished colleague for the kind remarks he has made; and particularly I should like to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KOX], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], who participated with me in the hearings and in the preparation and writing of the report that was approved today. All those gentlemen contributed immeasurably to the work of the committee and gave a tremendous amount of thought and effort to the preparation of the report. I do want the gentleman to know that I appreciate his contribution particularly.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I might say that while the subcommittee's inquiry concerned itself primarily with so-called point 4 expenditures in South America, we did have occasion to go into other overseas activities of the United States; activities of our diplomatic representatives, and activities of the United States Information Agency.

In addition, almost everywhere we went in the capitals of those South American countries we met informally with representatives of American business, members of the American Chambers of Commerce of Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Montevideo, Buenos Aires, Santiago, and Lima. On other occasions we met informally with American business representatives and from them attempted to get their appraisals of the effectiveness and success of our programs in Latin American countries.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on International Operations. I am sorry I was unable to make the study trip this year. I do want to say that having read the report it is my considered opinion that the Members who made the trip did a capable job of investigation and reporting. It is my prediction that the taxpayers of the United States will save a considerable amount of money as a result of this report. For that reason I desire to commend our capable chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], with whom I have traveled previously and whose judgment I respect very highly, and the other Members who participated in this report. I particularly call to the attention of the Members of the House this report which was approved by the House Committee on Government Operations today, and which I believe has a great deal of merit as a basis for study of our continuing South American relationships.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for those remarks.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. May I say that the gentleman from Indiana did read our report and studied it very thoroughly, and made some constructive suggestions to the committee before it was submitted to the full committee for approval. I express my regret that the gentleman was unable to accompany us on our trip to South America, because I know he could have contributed a great deal to our deliberations.

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman from Virginia that I share his sentiments concerning the contribution of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I now include what I regard as an excellent article appearing in the January 1956 Americas, the monthly magazine published by the Organization of American States, in English, Spanish, and Portuguese editions, which gives an account of this subcommittee's activities on this trip to South America:

MY TRIP WAS WORTH IT—A UNITED STATES CONGRESSMAN, JUST BACK FROM LATIN AMERICA, REPORTS ON HIS EXPERIENCES

(By PORTER HARDY, JR.)

In the annual exodus of hundreds of thousands of travelers from the United States to foreign lands, probably no trip attracts more attention than that of a departing or arriving legislator. Congressional travel abroad—which some people like to refer to as junkets—seldom fails to provide a lively topic for discussion in the press and among the people. Just as it seems to be a perennial puzzle to the United States taxpayer, who foots the bill, perhaps it is also a source of wonder to the citizens of the country of destination. Why do Congressmen go abroad? What do they do when they get there? What are the results?

In the light of my own experience, I would like to try to answer these three questions. I have just returned, along with three of my colleagues on the House Government Operations Committee, from a 22-day, 15,000-mile official journey to 11 countries in Latin America. I cannot deny that it was pleasant, although it was not a pleasure trip; it was also colorful, exciting—and arduous. Despite the generous hospitality of our hosts in each country and the wonderful things to be seen everywhere, our job was basically hard work.

One of the functions of Congress is to watch over the expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar to make such that the executive agencies who do the spending use a maximum of economy and a minimum of waste. The way Congress is organized, a major part of this responsibility falls on the Government Operations Committee of the House. The International Operations Subcommittee of which I am chairman, is specifically charged with the duty of examining United States overseas civilian operations, including those of the United States Department of State and allied agencies.

Only if we have good people, good organization, and good managerial control at all levels can we carry out our programs abroad economically and efficiently. Take one of the major United States activities in Latin America, for example, the cooperative technical assistance program through which the United States and the Republics to the south exchange know-how on problems of economic development, better known as point 4. Examination of this program in all its ramifications was the principal task undertaken by the International Operations Subcommittee. For several months we made an intensive inquiry in Washington, collecting and analyzing a wealth of documentary material from the Department of State, from the Foreign Operations Administration, and from the United States Information Agency, with personnel, organization, and managerial control our chief concerns. We held a series of hearings in Washington, with witnesses from the Government and recognized civilian authorities in organization and management. Still, important questions remained unanswered—questions that could be answered only in the field.

For example, there was considerable confusion in Washington about the organizational structure, since the technical assistance program has bounced around from one agency to another. At one time it was handled by the autonomous Institute for Inter-American Affairs; later it became a unit of the Technical Cooperation Administration within the Department of State; in 1953 it was transferred to the newly created Foreign Operations Administration; and now it falls under the International Cooperation Administration, which has itself been moved part way back inside the Department of State. One reason for our journey was to clear up the lines of responsibility. To get the answers to our questions, we had to talk with people in the field who had these tasks in hand.

What does such a journey accomplish? In our swing around the continent we visited Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Colombia, Panama, Guatemala, and Mexico. We took more than 50 hours of recorded testimony on the point 4 program and allied United States activities; we talked with Government officials at all levels—Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, Congressmen—and with local businessmen in the various countries and members of the press. With the accurate, up-to-date, and voluminous information we collected, the result should be a most useful report to the Congress on the status of the technical assistance program in Latin America.

Perhaps the best way to give an idea of what our committee did in Latin America is to describe only one of the countries we visited. We arrived in Bolivia on a Wednesday night, stayed through Thursday, and left shortly after noon on Friday. In that short space of time we spent approximately 14 hours in a round of formal and informal conferences and meetings and brought back a verbatim transcript of the information we gathered from United States officials there. It left us literally breathless at two and a half miles above sea level. For visitors like ourselves, the altitude of La Paz was hard to take. We found we had to move slowly there, since any excessive physical exertion—even walking up a flight of stairs—brought on dizziness.

As picturesque as its landscape are the people of Bolivia, particularly the Indians. The women were dressed in colorful skirts and shawls, and all, without exception, wore brown derby hats. I heard at least two tentative explanations for the origin of these hats. One was that they were the typical headgear worn by the Spanish conquerors hundreds of years earlier; the other suggested that they were the result of an enterprising salesman's visit some years ago. Neither of my informants seemed certain. The derbies may even be left over from a presidential campaign we had in the United States back in 1928.

Fleeting impressions can be very misleading, of course. More than one Bolivian may have wondered why a United States Congressman was armed on the streets of La Paz. Here's how it happened. On our way to visit the President, my colleague, JACK BROOKS, of Texas, who served in the Marines during the war, admired the firearms of the palace guards. He mentioned his interest to President Paz Estenssoro, who promptly presented him with one of his own Mausers as a souvenir, complete with a box of ammunition, so that Jack could go hunting in Texas with a Bolivian rifle.

Bolivia probably best typifies the role played by our technical-assistance program. About one-seventh as large as the United States, the nation has slightly more than 3 million people. The eastern half of the country consists of sparsely populated lowland plains with tremendous but almost unexploited agricultural possibilities. The western half is divided into valleys, where some crops are grown, and a high, barren plateau about 500 miles long and 80 miles wide. Most of Bolivia's people and industries are found here. For years, the nation's economy has depended upon the mineral resources of this area, chiefly tin. Late in 1953, because of falling tin prices, many Bolivians faced starvation. After appeals to the United States, $12,400,000 was authorized for emergency shipments of wheat and flour. For Bolivians must import $20 million worth of foodstuffs annually.

In diversifying the Bolivian economy, in developing the agricultural possibilities of the Bolivian lowlands, in improving health and rural education facilities, and—more recently—in developing a sizable petroleum industry, United States technical assistance plays a significant part. Under this program, improved cultivation methods have been employed, the use of better seeds has been encouraged, fertilizers and insecticides have been introduced. Training centers in health education have been set up, and mobile units have served more than 580,000 people annually in the effort to control such communicable diseases as diphtheria, typhus, and typhoid. Significant progress has been made in the provision of teacher-training for rural elementary schools. Through June of last year the United States had obligated $8 million for this program. Over the next 12 months it will spend about $2½ million more. Bolivia, for her part, has contributed about $9 million, and plans to spend $5 million more next year.

Our trip was worth many times what it cost. Above all, we hope that it will enable us to point out measures of economy and efficiency in the conduct of the technical-assistance program which will result in substantial savings in operating costs. But the journey also produced some intangibles that cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

Each legislator who goes abroad as a member of a committee does so in a dual capacity and with dual responsibilities. As a committee member he has the responsibility for informing himself on the particular matters over which the Congress has given his committee jurisdiction. As a Congressman, however, he is called upon to exercise his independent judgment and to vote upon all matters which come before the Congress as a whole. In his travels abroad, therefore, each legislator has both the opportunity and the duty to enlarge his understanding of the countries he visits, quite apart from his concerns as a committee member. Today's world—and certainly tomorrow's world—depends for its very existence on informed judgment and a thorough appreciation of affairs beyond the confines of a single nation's boundaries.

During the course of our discussions in the many lands we visited we learned a great deal about Latin America. One thing we all discovered—and on this I think I can speak for the other committee members, Congressman BROOKS of Texas, Congressman MEADER, of Michigan, and Congressman KNOX, of Michigan—is that it is difficult, even dangerously misleading, to generalize about Latin America. The differences between the individual countries, their geographies, their histories, their economies, their governments, and the state of their development make it almost impossible to treat them as a group. How, for example, can one talk about the sophisticated seacoast capital of Rio de Janeiro and the busy, booming commercial city of Sao Paulo in terms of the land-locked mountain civilization in the highlands of Bolivia? How compare an Argentina now apparently emerging from years of political dictatorship with its small neighbor, Uruguay, where democratic procedures and freedom of the press have been part of the political landscape for years? I think that if anyone in our group started out on this trip with the idea that Latin America could be lumped together as a single entity, he was thoroughly disabused of that notion by the time he returned.

All of us learn by contrasts and similarities, and I found myself inevitably trying to understand what I saw in terms of what I already knew—the United States. As one Congressman was supposed to have said some years ago, after his first trip abroad: "You know, I've discovered that there's a whale of a difference between Paris and Jersey City, and the funny part of it is, you notice it more in Paris than you do in Jersey City."

Certainly no visitor to the Republics of Latin America can fail to be impressed by the beauty of the land, by the largely untapped economic potential, and by the peoples of Latin America. A flood of memories tumbling one over the other comes to mind. The winding road up Corcovado, with its impressive statue of Christ at the top and the magnificent view of Rio far below, of Sugarloaf and the blue waters of the harbor; the friendly, alert Uruguayans and their pride in their fine country; the lush green fields of Argentina; the incredibly beautiful Andes near Santiago and the naval base at Valparaíso; the utterly unique landscape of Bolivia's altiplano; free enterprise thriving in Peru; the portrait of George Washington alongside that of Bolívar and other Latin American liberators in the Governor's Palace at Guayaquil; the fascinating Colombian music that led me to purchase recordings for my teenage daughter; the thrill of seeing both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans as we came in for a refueling stop at Panama; the vigor of the Guatemalans under their youthful leaders; the bustling, colorful metroplis that is Mexico City—and everywhere, in the people, in the land, almost in the air itself, the sense of growth, of development, of burgeoning progress.

I came back from this journey deeply impressed with the vast potential of Latin American resources. The strides in public health and education have been big and promise to grow bigger. Only then can Latin America take full advantage of her greatest resource; her people. The extent of the second great resource—the natural endowments of the land—in terms of agricultural and industrial possibilities has barely been discovered, let alone developed. On these two counts alone, I am convinced there are few if any areas in the world that can look to the future with more confidence and optimism.

To be sure, the path is not free of obstacles. We have returned aware that pressing and serious problems face many of these countries. Historically, it appears that many suffer from having put their economic eggs in one basket for too long. Dependence on a single export, such as coffee, tin, copper, or nitrates, has brought serious difficulties. With world markets subject to considerable price shifts, such dependence has at times brought disaster. Obviously, diversification of the individual countries' economies is the answer. But this is neither an easy nor a quick solution. In the United States, it took two centuries, and even at that rate there were grave problems. A country today faced with a similar task can shortcut the process by leaning on our experience. The costly trial-and-error method is no longer necessary nor justifiable. Here, I think United States technical assistance can play its greatest role.

In the light of the knowledge we gained about the working of the United States technical assistance program, and in the longer view, considering what we learned about Latin America in general. I can say with conviction, "My trip was worth it."

I might say that this was not a pleasure trip. The gentleman from Virginia, however congenial and statesmanlike he may be, is a hard taskmaster. We found ourselves attempting to keep a very tight schedule of committee hearings, taking testimony from our officials in formal hearings, which always began at 9 o'clock and sometimes lasted late in the afternoon. The days we did not have hearings we were traveling and our chairman would arrange to have our bags picked up at our hotel rooms at 7 o'clock in the morning, and we were aboard the plane at 8.

I believe the Members will find a great deal of interesting information in our hearings. Unfortunately, they are not yet in final printed form but are in galley proof.

I hope the report we filed and the hearings we held will provide a foundation for study of the proposed extension of the mutual security program currently before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

My own reaction to the activities of our representatives in South America was that on the whole they are doing a good job in continuing the good neighbor policy. Frankly, I think there should be in their organizational structure a closer integration of activities. Our programs suffer from the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing.

With respect to the technical assistance expenditures in and of themselves, which account for about $30 million of United States taxpayers' funds annually, I believe there could be a tightening up of the administration of those funds. I feel that the area in which our officials roam is entirely too wide and without adequate limits on individual discretion. Point 4 officials in the field need clearer guidance and instructions and stronger control from Washington.

The point 4 program in Latin America of course is an old one. It commenced during World War II and therefore provides a basis for studying a program which has been in existence longer in

that area than it has in other parts of the world. The program is designed to help Latin American governments build up services of their own in the field of agriculture, public health, sanitation, education, and so on. By and large Latin American countries are pioneering in developing their natural resources, something like our own pioneering several decades ago, but they are making rapid strides in economic progress.

I believe if we should facilitate the investment of American capital in Latin America, we would thereby automatically and without expense to the taxpayers transfer the know-how and the capital to enable them to develop their economies rapidly and efficiently and establish them on a free enterprise basis.

In my opinion the subcommittee should continue to examine expenditures of this kind. I believe its work will be fruitful in achieving better results at a substantial savings of taxpayers' money. In this connection, I was informally advised that, as the result of one of our hearings, two questionable programs which totaled approximately $150,000 a year, were completely eliminated. At least that specific saving can be attributed to the investigation our subcommittee conducted.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I incorporate in my remarks the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report of the Hardy subcommittee which has just been approved by the Government Operations Committee today:

CONCLUSIONS

1. The technical-assistance program in Latin America as a whole lacks clearly defined objectives, although many individual projects have been well conceived and satisfactorily carried out.

2. The technical-assistance program has been hampered by failure on the part of the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration to issue instructions clearly defining areas of responsibility and authority assigned to Embassy and United States Operations Mission officials. In some countries this has been overcome by close liaison and cooperation initiated by field personnel, but in other countries organizational problems and interagency disagreements have resulted both from the absence of specific instructions and the sometimes conflicting instructions issued from Washington.

3. Planning of projects and programs has been deficient in that they have sometimes been started without adequate information concerning the extent of the problem, without determination of the availability of necessary technical personnel, and frequently without reasonable evidence of genuine host-country interest. As a result, desired objectives have not been achieved.

4. In spite of a basic requirement that only projects desired by the host countries are to be undertaken, the subcommittee found projects being implemented where host country approval had been obtained through selling methods rather than as a result of a bona fide interest on the part of the host government. Some of these instances appear to be engendered simply by the availability of technicians. There was also evidence that pressure for certain projects was generated in Washington. Almost invariably such projects were financed with a maximum of United States funds, and little, if any, host country contribution.

5. Although the law intends and International Cooperation Administration instructions require the phasing out of United States financial participation in technical assistance projects, there is no evidence that provision for this is included when the programs are developed and the transfer of projects for continuation by host countries has not been accomplished to the extent desirable.

6. Some projects have continued beyond the point where they can properly be termed technical assistance and have assumed characteristics of economic aid. In a number of these cases technical assistance funds are being used to finance what would normally be routine day-to-day activities of the host governments.

7. The so-called illustrative method of presenting technical assistance budget requests to the Congress is unwise. The need for flexibility to meet unforeseen contingencies is not sufficient to justify the use of this method for technical assistance budgeting. The illustrative program fails to provide adequate information for the exercise of congressional judgment. It circumvents the normal requirement for specific congressional approval in advance of the expenditure of funds. It entails no commitment by the agency to expend any funds for the particular program used as an illustration. It accentuates the tendency toward hasty allocation and ill-considered obligation of funds during the closing months of the fiscal year.

8. Actual host country contributions to technical assistance programs and projects cannot be determined because presentations to Congress on this subject have been unrealistic and misleading. This has resulted from (a) the employment of differing exchange rates in the same compilation which have the effect of maximizing host country contributions and minimizing host country economic capabilities; (b) the inclusion as host country contributions of third-party funds which actually represent payments made by the beneficiaries for goods and services supplied; and (c) the listing of so-called in-kind contributions which are computed, in part, by placing arbitrary values upon intangibles.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee recommends as follows:

1. The Department of State should deal decisively with the organizational problems created by the location of the International Cooperation Administration as a semi-autonomous unit within the Department. Positive and vigorous measures should be taken to define on a current basis both for Washington and the field the policy objectives of the technical assistance program.

2. The Department and the International Cooperation Administration should review all existing and applicable directives and instructions governing the technical assistance program for the purpose of (a) bringing them up to date; (b) eliminating existing conflicts and confusion; and (c) clearly delineating the authority and responsibility of Embassy and United States Operations Mission personnel in overseas posts.

3. Administrative controls should be strengthened at the Washington level and in the field to assure that deficiencies in program planning are eliminated; that programs approved conform to overall policy objectives; that these which do not so conform are discontinued; that the formal host country request for a project or program reflects a bona fide interest and indicates an intent to contribute a fair share of the cost; that in the development of programs provision is made for the phasing out of United States financial participation and the transfer of projects to host country responsibility.

4. The use of the illustrative program method of presenting technical assistance budget requests to the Congress should be discontinued. Requests for appropriations should be accompanied by completed and well-documented plans which should include clear evidence of bona fide host country interest.

5. Statistical compilations on which the International Cooperation Administration bases its statements to the Congress and to the public regarding the amount of host country contributions to technical assistance programs should be entirely recast to reflect a true picture of the relative contributions of the United States and the host countries. Specifically, realistic exchange rates keyed to current values should be uniformly applied; so-called third-party payments should not be included as host country contributions; in kind contributions should either be eliminated entirely or should include only those items tantamount to a contribution in cash, whose value is readily ascertainable.

Mr. Speaker, I also incorporate my additional remarks on technical assistance in Latin America.

I subscribe to the committee's report on technical assistance in Latin America. However, I desire to make certain additional observations which I believe may contribute to more effective execution of our foreign policy.

American foreign policy in Latin America is, of course, to maintain friendly relations—furthering the good neighbor policy—to combat the extension of world communism and to promote healthy and stable free economies, free governments and free institutions. All United States activities—the activities of our diplomatic representatives, our information activities and our aid and technical assistance programs, as well as military assistance—should be aimed at that broad goal of our foreign policy.

We believe that economic and political stability are achieved through a flourishing free-enterprise system depending on private capital rather than socialistic governmental operation and control of economic activities. That has been officially announced as United States Government policy in Latin America by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Henry Holland, in the following words:

One of the fundamental facts of United States-Latin American relations today is the determination of the governments and people of Latin America to make even more rapid economic progress than they are now making and to improve their standard of living. In recognizing this fact it should also be understood that the individual opportunities which our Government has for facilitating the economic development objectives of our sister Republics must be considered within the following context:

LIMITS ON UNITED STATES ACTIVITY

First, the measures which our Government can take will not be the decisive factor in the economic development of Latin America. There is nothing that this Government can do to create a stable economy or raise living standards in another country unless the necessary factors are already there. But if the internal conditions necessary for economic development are there, then our Government can hurry the process somewhat by pursuing constructive policies.

Second, we have neither the right nor the desire to prescribe to any other American Republic the kind of economic system which it should adopt or the programs it should follow to achieve its economic aspirations. That is the exclusive domestic responsibility of every sovereign state. On the other hand, whatever help we give will be, as it should, consistent with our own national philosophy as to the role which a government should

play in the economic field and with the wishes of the majority of our people. Likewise, it will be given in support of those programs and policies which our experience has led us to believe are best designed to achieve real economic progress.

OUR ECONOMIC BELIEFS

These are reasonable views. They do raise questions, of course. What are our convictions as to the role of Government in the economic field? What kinds of programs and policies do we believe will produce strong economies? The answers are probably apparent. The people of the United States believe in the private-enterprise system. We are convinced that we ourselves can do more than any government can to make business enterprises grow, to create new ones, to create more employment at acceptable wages, and to raise the standards of living of our people. We believe that our Government helps the national economy most when it creates those conditions which give us, the working men and women, the farmers, the businessmen of the country, the greatest opportunity to carry on all those processes of private enterprise which have brought us to the point where we now are.

This means that there are certain things that we expect our Government to do and some that we expect it not to do. We rely on our Government leaders to follow sound fiscal and taxing policies, policies that will maintain a stable currency, policies that will combat the evil disease of inflation, policies that will assure to investors a fair chance to make a reasonable profit if they risk their capital in industry or commerce. We expect our Government to supply those public facilities and services which are needed in a free-enterprise system, but which are not in themselves attractive to private investors. These include such things as roads, schools, hospitals for the poor, irrigation systems, port works, and things of that nature.

GOVERNMENT VERSUS BUSINESS

Of equal importance are the things that we expect our Government not to do. We strongly believe that except in special situations our Government should stay out of the field of business. When Government enters a particular industry or commercial activity, private enterprise generally withdraws. This is because onerous regulations are usually imposed on the private enterprise in order to insure the survival of the less well organized and operated Government enterprises which cannot compete without special advantages. Our experience has convinced us that as a rule Government-run enterprises are not as strong and do not make as great a contribution to the national economy as do their counterparts operated by private citizens. Therefore, we feel that Governments should invade the field of industry and commerce only where essential and then, if possible, only on a temporary basis.

Our Government's chief emphasis will be on those kinds of economic cooperation that contribute to the creative efforts of private individuals, particularly nationals of the other countries. We believe they are the greatest hope for progress in the other American Republics. The most effective contribution that our country could make to the economic development of Latin America would be to help private enterprise throughout the hemisphere. It is responsible for our inter-American trade which each year provides our neighbors with about $3½ billion in cash and credits. Our own private investors have supplied some $6½ billion of capital for the economic development of the area. In addition they are also providing technical knowledge, equipment, and marketing opportunities for Latin America's growing industries.

From that general statement of United States policy certain broad principles can be enumerated to serve as guides to all our officers stationed in Latin America.

Any activities and related expenditure of United States tax funds should have clear and specific relationship to the achievement of the goals of foreign policy as above stated. Efforts of our diplomatic representatives, our information people and our technical assistance officials should seek constantly to promote development and investment of private capital in economic undertakings; to eliminate or minimize barriers to investment and trade and to facilitate creation of a climate favorable to the investment of private capital. On the other hand, by all appropriate diplomatic means they should seek to discourage the extension of socialism and nationalized industries and should decline to commit United States funds to the support of Government-owned and Government-operated industrial and commercial facilities. They should likewise avoid expenditure of our funds to support erroneous policies and practices of foreign governments which, without our financial support, would sooner or later have to be corrected or eliminated by the force of circumstances.

The foregoing is not intended to advocate or condone meddling in international affairs of other countries. Obviously all of our activities should be carried out with full regard for the sovereignty of friendly nations and by methods and actions calculated not to offend. Yet there should be no hesitation on the part of our officials from top to bottom under the guidance of the President's representative in each country—the Ambassador—to let it be known that United States funds are trust funds exacted through taxes from the American people; that they must be devoted to ends calculated to promote the common defense and general welfare of the American people; that they were appropriated by the Congress, not for the purpose of pure philanthropy but for the security and interest of the United States, in the belief that the threats of Communist imperialism and subversion can best be met by promoting the stability of free peoples so that they may be able to defend themselves against aggression and subversion.

Aside from our commitment to the philosophy of free economic and political institutions and our economic interest in trade and commerce with free peoples as contrasted to totalitarian controlled economies, we are convinced that economic and political stability are promoted by free-enterprise institutions and are weakened by socialistic institutions.

Many Latin-American governments have flirted with various forms of socialism. Testimony taken by the subcommittee almost universally demonstrated that true economic programs were impeded by those excursions. For example, at Rio de Janeiro, in Brazil, the economic counselor, Mr. Robert P. Terrill, testified before the committee as follows:

Mr. MEADER. Is there any sentiment, getting away from oil for a moment, either in the Congress or general public for getting the Government out of any of these other businesses they are in—transportation, etc.?

Mr. TERRILL. I regret to say there is very little. Some but not much.

Mr. MEADER. You pointed out that the losses of those business-type operations are definite contributing factors to inflation?

Mr. TERRILL. Yes, they are losing 8 billion cruzeiros a year. On the railways, statistics for last year show that they did not earn enough gross revenue to pay their wages bill. They have to keep rates practically constant in order to avoid political complications. Thus with inflation the losses go up and up.

Mr. MEADER. Would you say they are poorly managed?

Mr. TERRILL. Extremely so.

Mr. MEADER. Shipping, railroads, power?

Mr. TERRILL. The majority of existing power facilities are privately owned by Americans and Canadians.

Mr. MEADER. Communications?

Mr. TERRILL. Only one Government company; mostly owned by private companies.

Mr. MEADER. Is there any noticeable trend for any more Government operations of an economic character?

Mr. TERRILL. There is no pronounced trend such as there was in the thirties and immediately after the war. The bloom is off the rose, so to speak. There have been some cases where the Government is going in to support new operations. For example, a new steel mill is projected for São Paulo, which will be privately owned. I might add the Government's steel mill, Volta Redonda, is, by Latin-American standards, an excellent operation and earns its way very nicely, with handsome profits.

Mr. MEADER. Well managed?

Mr. TERRILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEADER. And completely Government owned?

Mr. TERRILL. No, sir, there are many private stockholders; however, the stock of the company is owned in the majority by the Government in accordance with the statutes of the corporation. I was going to add that the new electrical generating capacity is, to an increasing extent, being constructed under the auspices of the Government.

Mr. MEADER. It strikes me that this rapid economic growth you mentioned would tend to build up a sentiment for greater private enterprise activities rather than a trend in the opposite direction, when the record of the Government in business has been so poor here.

Mr. TERRILL. I believe, sir, that experience accounts for the statement I made earlier that the bloom is definitely off socialism in Brazil. A Government officer stated the other day, "The worst enemy of socialism is socialization."

This is the case in Brazil. There is no strong movement for socialism.

It is common knowledge that the Peron experiment into national socialism in Argentina converted, in a 10-year period, a prosperous economy with an extremely favorable foreign exchange position into a condition of economic chaos approaching bankruptcy. The Argentine people face a period of turmoil and privation until they can rebuild their economy and their political institutions on a basis of free representative government and free economic institutions, and establish political and economic stability and prosperity.

In Peru a controlled economy produced such economic chaos that the Peruvian Government employed Klein and Sacks, a firm of economic consultants, to make a study. Their recommendations, which by and large recommended the removal of governmental controls and the establishment of free institutions, have gone

far already to improve the economic health of Peru.

Chile has employed the same firm of consultants to assist in lifting Chile from its economic difficulties.

In Chile the committee was told by Ambassador Beaulac:

Chile's principal problem today is inflation. As an index to what inflation means here, when we came to Chile 2 years ago the dollar was worth less than 200 pesos. Today it is worth 670 in the free market. While that is not an important market, it does reflect the degree of inflation. Our problem down here—our effort—is to help Chile to improve the economic situation, using the devices we have available to us—point 4, the information program, and traditional diplomacy within the free democratic system I have described.

The larger copper-mining companies—the most important element in Chile's economy— furnish most of the foreign exchange, for example, something like half of the foreign exchange that the country earns. The Government has given to the country increasingly generous social-security provisions, retirement provisions, wage guaranties, and so forth, which have required additional funds needed to service these programs from the copper companies, and to a lesser degree, from the nitrate companies.

One result which could be anticipated is that the copper industry in Chile has declined in importance, and Chile, from being the second most important copper-producing country in the world, has now become fourth. In absolute production she has kept her level, but she hasn't increased as she should have in terms of the markets that exist for copper. The result of that has been that the copper industry—and I give you that because it is the important example—ceased for a long time to make important investments; and that tended to prevent Chile's economy from having the dynamic character which it needs in order to progress.

By improving or helping to improve the position of the copper industry, we could help to improve the overall situation in Chile and tend to accomplish both our principal objectives at the same time.

Conversely, by helping to improve the general atmosphere for investments and the general attitude of the Government toward private initiative, we could tend to improve the attitude of the Government toward the copper industry; and our programs here, diplomatic program, point 4, and information program, have been directed squarely at trying to accomplish that double purpose. In order to do that, as a means of doing that, we try to have the coordination which seems possible in the situation. For example, every 2 weeks we have a meeting here of economic people, point 4 people, and our information people.

During these meetings we exchange information—our labor reporting officer is included in those meetings, and I must say that labor forms an important part of this picture.

So our effort is through the coordination we try to have, and we have not only these biweekly meetings but there is a very close coordination between Mr. Patterson, point 4 director, and Mr. Harkness, the information director, and myself; and between those persons and Mr. Rosenson, for example, the head of our economic section. Through all these men we try to cooperate in order to bring about those objectives.

Uruguay, with a long history of political stability and free elections along democratic lines, nevertheless is perhaps the most socialistic of all Latin American governments. The situation in Uruguay is briefly described in the following passage from the committee's record of testimony taken at Montevideo:

Mr. MEADER. Ambassador McIntosh, I was interested in the industrial activities of the Government. Does the Government itself operate all utilities, such as power, communications, railways?

Ambassador MCINTOSH. The Government of Uruguay operates all the utilities except the gas. For some reason they have left the English gas company undisturbed by the Government operations, but the Government operates the electric power, telephones, railways, and all other utilities. In addition, the Government has a monopoly in the oil-refining field. They are building a cement factory. They have an insurance monopoly—no private insurance companies are permitted to operate here.

Mr. MEADER. Banking?

Ambassador MCINTOSH. No; private banks are allowed to operate, but the Government bank competes with them, since it is both a bank of issue and commercial bank. In general, the Government of Uruguay treats foreign investments very fairly, and the foreign companies operating here are treated just the same as Uruguayan companies. There is no discrimination against them.

Mr. MEADER. I understand the Government also has a monopoly on meat for the city of Montevideo. Is that true?

Ambassador MCINTOSH. I omitted to mention that one Government operation, which is one of their biggest. That is called frigerifico nacional. It means "packing-plant national." That Government packing plant has a monopoly to supply meat to the city.

Mr. MEADER. Are these industrial operations successful—the Government's industrial operations—or do they lose money?

Ambassador MCINTOSH. Unfortunately, nearly all the Government operations lose money continuously. The railways are very unprofitable and show heavy, continuous losses, and that is also true of the frigerifico nacional. So Government ownership, in my opinion, is becoming less popular here than it was.

Mr. MEADER. Is there any sentiment for divesting the Government of some of these activities?

Ambassador MCINTOSH. Yes.

We must bear in mind that the stability of the economies and the governments of other countries is primarily the problem of the people who live in them and not ours. Our role must be a very minor one of assisting their efforts to achieve those goals where our assistance is requested.

Efforts on the part of our officials to dictate policies, to persuade officials of other countries to accept our ideas, or to tell them how they should run their business achieve only resentment and hostility.

Very often the basic problems confronting a country are bound up in internal politics. For example, many Latin American countries are attempting to develop an oil industry through government-owned monopolies. Testimony taken by the subcommittee is convincing that this socialistic method of developing oil reserves is unsuccessful. Tremendous amounts of capital for drilling, pipelines, refineries, and so forth are required. They are not available, however, to governments whose fiscal condition is precarious.

But it would be politically unpopular for an elected official of such countries to advocate that privately owned oil companies be invited to engage on a fair basis in the development of oil reserves. "The oil is ours" is the slogan, and anything other than government development of oil reserves is immediately attacked as a sellout. That line, while not originating with Communist and Marxist elements, is effectively exploited by them.

Venezuela, of course, is the outstanding example of a Latin American country which has created a climate favorable to the development of oil reserves through private capital. Its flourishing economy probably has done—and will do—more to induce a different attitude throughout Latin America toward developing their oil businesses with private capital than anything the United States Government might do by way of propaganda or persuasion.

Brazil is throught to have substantial oil reserves which, if proven, will be adequate for its domestic needs for some time to come. Nevertheless, because of the inability of the Brazilian monopoly, Petrobas, to produce the petroleum products Brazil needs, that nation is required to drain off one-quarter billion dollars annually of scarce foreign exchange for the importation of petroleum products. That contributes to inflationary forces which are affecting Brazil's economy. The situation is similar in Argentina.

Bolivia recently passed a law permitting development of Bolivian oil reserves through private capital. That should help relieve the desperate condition of the Bolivian economy as soon as outside capital begins to flow into Bolivia for the development of the petroleum industry.

When all of our representatives abroad have a clear understanding of our foreign policy objectives; when we have established sound organizational structures with clear lines of command; when relationships between agencies have been clarified and their activities coordinated; when procedures have been simplified and streamlined; then all our representatives, under the guidance of the President's representative—the ambassador—will work together as a team in helping friendly free countries to build economic and political stability on a foundation of free individual enterprise, enabling them effectively to resist Communist imperialism and subversion.

ADMINISTRATION OPPOSITION TO SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss with my colleagues in the House an outstanding example of a spokesman of the Republican Party faithfully adhering to those long-enduring tenets of Republican principles; namely, being consistently inconsistent and being indifferent to anything resembling humanitarianism. I would like to speak about the social-security program, specifically on the Republican record on social security, and even more specifically on the strange paradox that is created by the

Honorable Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on social security.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the House of Representatives by a vote of 372 yeas to 31 nays acted favorably on the Social Security Amendments of 1955, H. R. 7225. This legislation is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee and would make modest but important changes in our social-security law by removing certain benefit gaps and extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to certain groups now excluded under the law. Specifically, this legislation would amend the Social Security Act to—

First. Provide for the payment of monthly disability benefits at or after age 50 to eligible workers who are permanently and totally disabled;

Second. Provide for the continuation of child benefits for a child upon attaining age 18 if such child has become totally and permanently disabled before reaching that age;

Third. Provide for a reduction in the age requirement for women so as to make them eligible for monthly benefits at age 62—insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers;

Fourth. Provide for an extension of coverage under the OASI system to include in the program certain groups—primarily professional—who are presently denied the protection afforded by the old-age and survivors insurance system; and

Fifth. Provide for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Social Security Financing to review periodically the status of the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund in relations to the long-term commitments of the program.

Mr. Speaker, from the foregoing recitation of the principal features of H. R. 7225, it is evident that this legislation is designed to make the social-security program more adequately provide protection for a greater number of Americans. On this subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House of a fairly recent statement on the part of the present administration. I quote as follows:

> First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control; second, the welfare of the people demands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services.

That statement, which ably describes the actions of the Democratic Party when our great party is in power, was actually uttered by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message of February 2, 1953. That quote from the President, taken at its face value, could be construed to be a direct endorsement of the Democratic-sponsored Social Security Amendments of 1955.

We should have been able to infer from that expression by the President that representatives of his administration would support legislation that was designed to improve our social-security system so as to make OASI benefits available to disabled persons who have suffered "personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond their control" and that would call for "performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services." We can very properly ask ourselves, Did the administration pattern its actions after its platitudinous words in connection with the consideration of H. R. 7225?

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the present Republican administration departed from the literal meaning of its platitudes and carefully adhered to the traditional Republican policy of being consistently inconsistent and indifferent to basic humanitarianism considerations. Administration spokesmen appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means while H. R. 7225 was being prepared by our committee under the distinguished leadership of our chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, and opposed disability benefits for our disabled workers and opposed making OASI benefits available at an earlier and more realistic age to the women of America.

More recently, than its opposition before the Committee on Ways and Means, the Republican administration has persisted in its obstructionist attitude toward improvements in the Social Security Act by appearing before the Senate Finance Committee and reiterating its opposition to the basic provisions of H. R. 7225. The administration spokesman in this instance was the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, the man who is charged with the administration of the social-security program. In a statement before the Senate Finance Committee on March 22, 1956, Mr. Folsom said:

> It was 21 years ago, in February 1935, when I first appeared before the Committee in behalf of a sound social-security program.

I would suggest that the Secretary's recent appearance before the Senate Finance Committee might be said to be in behalf of a half sound social-security program.

The Secretary in his statement went on to tell the distinguished members of the Senate Finance Committee:

> My interest this morning is the same as it has always been—to support a strong and sound system of economic security for the American people.

I would suggest that the Secretary is limiting his concern for the economic security of the American people to only a segment of our population—the business interests which the present administration continually brags about representing. In opposing H. R. 7225, Secretary Folsom was in effect seeking to deny the increased protection that would go, under the legislation, to the groups of Americans who are most urgently in need of OASI benefits. He would deny the protection of disability insurance benefits that would be afforded under H. R. 7225 to all American citizens. None of us can say that the present disabled are not deserving of OASI benefits. None of us can say that he may not suffer the misfortune of being disabled tomorrow. The workers themselves who are the potential beneficiaries of this protection and about whom Mr. Folsom expresses such pious concern not only fully support disability benefits but also fully endorse an increase in taxes on themselves to pay for them.

The people who would derive immediate and direct benefit from the disability insurance are the individuals who have suffered a crippling disability and who are without resources other than the income they derived from employment prior to their disability. Such people, in the absence of disability insurance benefits, are compelled to seek public assistance despite the fact that they must have, under the House-passed bill, a substantial record of contributing toward OASI benefits. It is my view that disability causing forced retirement is just as logically a test of retirement as is old age. Certainly our workers who have contributed many years to social security deserve the concern of all of us. You would think that they, above all, would rate the concern of the man who administers the social-security program. But no; he wants them to continue to meet a test of destitution and poverty and then give them public assistance. I would suggest that Secretary Folsom has demonstrated he is little concerned with a strong and sound system of economic security for the American people despite his pretentions.

Just take a look at the record to see who oppose these provisions, along with Mr. Folsom. It speaks for itself and you can see that he is talking about a definite minority when he refers to the American people. He is found with those who have always opposed social security—a strange place for the man who runs the social-security system.

How sound does Secretary Folsom want the OASI system to be? I believe that the record clearly indicates a total disregard for any concept of soundness on the part of the Secretary aside from that which is convenient by reasons of political expediency. In an appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 2, 1939, Mr. Folsom, in discussing the funding of the old-age and survivors insurance system presently provided for by the OASI trust fund, made the following observations which clearly indicate his thinking then. Maybe it reveals his thinking now as to a sound OASI system. This is what he said:

> So I think it is very important that steps should be taken to abandon the reserve plan, and to adopt a system which would build up only a small contingency fund, say of about $5 billion, and have the collections each year related fairly closely to the benefits. * * * So long as you have a reserve fund now of $1 billion, if you let that gradually increase to $5 billion, there would be no serious objection, but I don't think it will be necessary to have it reach any larger figure than that.

That was Secretary Folsom, a representative of big business posing as an expert on social security, talking. Let us now examine Mr. Folsom, the fiscal expert, when he was Under Secretary of the Treasury. Most of us present in this Chamber today will recall the tax message which was sent to the Congress by President Eisenhower on May 20, 1953. I will discuss only a small portion of that tax message. It was prepared at

the time Mr. Folsom was Under Secretary of the Treasury and was the principal architect, if I might be charitable, in developing Republican fiscal policy, if again I might be charitable. A portion of that tax message reads as follows:

(3) The increase in the old-age insurance tax from 1½ to 2 percent on both employees and employers, now scheduled to go into effect next January 1, should be postponed until January 1, 1955.

The old-age and survivors trust fund has now reached almost $18 billion. Receipts at present tax rates are currently well in excess of expenditures. The further addition to the fund which would flow from the projected tax increase is not required.

From now on, the old-age tax and trust accounts, while maintaining the contributory principle, should be handled more nearly on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The postponement of the tax increase will reduce the impending tax burden on every covered employee and employer. It will not influence the administrative budget, but it will involve an increase in the cash deficit.

In that recommendation, Mr. Folsom, 14 years after the other reference he made in 1939, was preaching the same gospel of soundly inadequate social-security financing.

After a ground swell of opposition to this recommended tax freeze from the working people throughout the country, whom I consider to be the "American people," the present administration backed off from this recommendation. It is still a matter of record. It was necessary for the workers to insist on a sound system and insist on paying for it out of their wages and incomes in order to protect it from Mr. Folsom's guidance.

In his appearance before the Senate Finance Committee on March 22, 1956, Mr. Folsom said:

The old-age and survivors insurance system is in excellent condition. * * * the system is in approximate acturial balance. It will thus be self-supporting under present estimates, providing taxes are increased as scheduled and benefits are not increased without a corresponding increase in revenue.

Thus, we have a picture of Marion B. Folsom as Undersecretary of the Treasury recommending a freezing of the social-security tax and a picture of Marion B. Folsom as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stating that for the OASI system to be self-supporting, it will be necessary that "taxes are increased as scheduled." Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Mr. Folsom that the House-passed bill not only kept the system self-supporting but it also improved its actuarial soundness.

Mr. Folsom's record on his concern for a sound social-security system leaves plenty to be desired. It shows, as I have recited, that he believes, first, that it is all right to freeze the social-security tax; second, that we need only a minimum trust fund; and, third, that the OASI program cannot be liberalized without a corresponding tax increase but "there is a limit to the tax increases that should be imposed on the people to finance a social-security program." I again refer to the record, present and past, for anyone interested to find out who it is who opposes paying for a soundly financed, liberalized social-security program. It is not the people who want and need the protection.

Mr. Speaker, in his recent appearance before the Senate Finance Committee in opposition to H. R. 7225, Secretary Folsom said that the administration "vigorously supports a strong, sound old-age and survivors insurance system. It is encouraging to note that both political parties, over the years, have supported this effort to keep the system sound." I would suggest that the "vigor" the Secretary claims could more appropriately be termed "rigor."

I am appalled by the Secretary's hypocritical, bland assertion of bipartisan support for the social-security program over the years.

Mr. Speaker, we on the Democratic side were gratified in 1954 to see many of our Republican colleagues, after more than 20 years, vote for the first time in favor of legislation which would strengthen our social-security program. Many of my Democratic colleagues joined me in the hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle had seen the so-called light and that we could work together in the future to make further improvements in the old-age and survivors insurance program. Apparently, instead of seeing the light, they were more affected by what they feared to be the handwriting on the wall, because our hopes for such bipartisan support were shortlived. In 1955 the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means reverted to the traditional Republican policy of obstructing in committee the favorable consideration of social-security legislation. These Republican members advocated delaying tactics that were intended to thwart Democratic efforts to make OASI benefits available to our disabled workers and children and to women at age 62. It is significant to note that the unsuccessful Republican delaying tactics demonstrated that the Republican Party was more interested in procedures than it was in humanitarianism. And Mr. Folsom has proved himself to be a true Republican in the traditional sense of the word.

The over-the-years support of the social-security program that Secretary Folsom claims for the Republican Party is, in fact, sadly lacking in the record and, indeed, in the recollection of man.

In case there are some who may have forgotten, let us take a quick look at the record. In 1935 Republican support for the Democratic-sponsored social-security program took the form of epithets to label the social-security program as "socialistic," "a cruel hoax," "unconstitutional," "enslavement of the worker," "bureaucratic," and "fiscally irresponsible." Fortunately, the Republicans were unsuccessful in their desperate political effort to defeat social security in 1935. In 1936 the Republican Presidential candidate who had termed social security "a cruel hoax" was defeated; and in 1937 the United States Supreme Court repudiated the Republican contention that the social-security law was unconstitutional.

In 1939 the Democratic Congress again succeeded in enacting legislation designed to improve the social-security program in the face of Republican opposition. The period from 1940 to 1947 in the history of the Social Security Act was marked by Republican attempts to wreck the old-age and survivors insurance program indirectly by freezing the payroll taxes which provide the income for the payment of social-security insurance benefits. The freeze amendments became known as the Vandenberg amendments, after Republican Senator Vandenberg.

The Republican-controlled 80th Congress, in the period 1947–48, enacted legislation that impaired the then existing social-security system and most assuredly obstructed further improvements in the social-security law during the time the Republicans were in power. The Republican impairment in the 80th Congress occurred with the adoption of the so-called Gearhart resolution, which took away from hundreds of thousands of our American citizens the protection they had previously been granted under th social-security system. The obstruction to improvements in the OASI program in the Republican 80th Congress occurred in connection with the consideration of an appropriation bill which made it impossible for the Commissioner of Social Security to carry out effectively his statutory responsibilities for studying needed changes in the social-security program.

During the 81st and 82d Congresses the Republican Party continued its efforts to use procedural and parliamentary means to obstruct Democratic humanitarian improvements in the system. Mr. Speaker, that brings us to 1954 which is the first instance in which I believe the Republican Party can honestly claim support of the social-security program, but as I have indicated earlier, in 1955, the Republican Party's true colors showed through again and they reverted to obstructionist tactics in opposing social-security improvements. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what support "over the years" Secretary Folsom was referring to.

In his appearance before the Senate Finance Committee on March 22, 1956, Secretary Folsom testified against lowering the retirement age for women and against the establishment of disability insurance benefits and advocated instead some administrative changes such as the adoption of an interest-rate amendment and an amendment relating to consolidated reporting. This is a true businessman at work. He wants to bring about a business-like approach on the interest earnings of the trust fund, and this is fine, and he wants to save employers some time and money in their paperwork. The disabled worker and the woman beneficiary unfortunately do not share in Mr. Folsom's compassion. The Secretary would substitute his administrative changes for the humanitarian objectives that were so overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, to put it mildly, the Folsom interest-rate amendment and the Folsom consolidated reporting amendment would not provide much subsistence to a disabled worker or a destitute widow even if they may have been an

employer. On the other hand, the Democratic proposals provided in H. R. 7225 to provide disability benefits and to lower the retirement age for women would assuredly mean that these OASI beneficiaries would preserve their self-respect, that many family relationships would remain unimpaired, and would in all cases mean the difference between subsistence and existing.

Secretary Folsom, in opposing the disability insurance provisions of H. R. 7225, cited the questionability about "the wisdom of bringing the new element of cash disability payments into the old-age and survivors insurance program." He went further on in testifying in opposition to the disability insurance benefits as follows:

To decide that a person is eligible for benefits it would be necessary first to determine medically the severity of his impairment. Numerous medical witnesses have testified to this committee as to the great problems which they foresee in evaluating physical and mental conditions for purposes of disability determinations. I believe that the testimony of so many medical experts as to the problems involved in determining disability must be given considerable weight.

In 1939, in appearing before the House Committee on Ways and Means on the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, Mr. Folsom, as treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., had the following to say in regard to his company's pension plan:

We have a provision that if a man has been with us for 15 years and he becomes totally and permanently disabled his annuity will become payable right away.

Then in regard to integrating his company plan with social security, Mr. Folsom said:

We adjusted our pension plan so that in the future he gets part from our plan and part from the Government.

Mr. Speaker, 17 years later Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Folsom attacks the concept of disability insurance benefits because of disability determination problems. I suggest to my colleagues in the House that Secretary Folsom made a politically motivated decision to oppose humanitarian improvement in the social-security law and then desperately cast about for fallacious logic on which to predicate his short-sighted opposition to social progress and humanitarian undertakings.

I was gratified to note that in mouthing the arguments of the American Medical Association against the social-security program, Secretary Folsom at least did not predict that such a legislative step would result in socialized medicine. While on the subject of the AMA, it is most interesting to note that it fully endorses a disability provision in legislation providing favorable tax treatment for doctors upon their disability. This legislation has no standards or guides when compared to the strict provisions in H. R. 7225.

As an example of the specious arguments used by the Secretary against the enactment of disability benefits, I would like to quote the following excerpt from the Secretary's statement:

It would also be necessary, in deciding whether a person is eligible for disability payments, to determine whether his impairment is the cause of his unemployment. This, too, can become a difficult question. It would be particularly difficult in cases involving part-time employees, intermittent workers, and those who do not have strong reasons for continued employment.

Surely, Secretary Folsom is aware that even more stringent eligibility requirements are present in regard to the granting of disability insurance benefits under H. R. 7225 than are present in the disability freeze provision contained in present social-security law as belatedly supported by the Republican Party. Surely, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare knows that the medical determinations of disability that would be made in connection with the payment of disability insurance benefits under the provision of H. R. 7225 would follow the same procedure as is prescribed with respect to the disability freeze provisions of present law. Surely, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare knows that while he is hypocritically engaged in specious argument against disability insurance benefits, there are thousands of American citizens who have sustained "personal disasters inflicted by forces beyond their control"—if I may paraphrase the expression of President Eisenhower that I previously quoted—who are without means of subsistence because of their disabilities and are facing the administration's apathy towards their problems.

In testifying before the Senate Finance Committee against disability insurance benefits, Secretary Folsom suggests that such disability benefits might serve to retard the vocational rehabilitation programs available to our disabled citizens. In his remarks on this subject, Mr. Folsom said, in part, as follows:

Witnesses have testified that cash benefits may reduce the incentive of some disabled persons toward rehabilitation—particularly if the benefits, when combined with other resources of the individual, adequately meet essential needs. Our own experience with the rehabilitation process indicates that the drive and willpower of the individual is the most important single factor in determining his chances of successful rehabilitation. Rehabilitation and establishment in employment are often arduous and difficult experiences. There are, undoubtedly, those among the disabled who would hesitate to move from the security of an assured benefit to the uncertainty of the competitive labor market.

Mr. Speaker, I consider such remarks an insult to the American worker. In this instance Secretary Folsom has rashly undertaken, in part, one of his few departures from the line of the American Medical Association. In connection with vocational rehabilitation, the American Medical Association has recently published a booklet in which it is stated as follows:

More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale or force return to gainful employment in advance of clear-cut medical indications.

Mr. Speaker, like Secretary Folsom, I am not a physician, but I believe that our understanding of our fellow man is sufficient to permit us to know that a man who has the small security and peace of mind that would be given to him through the disability insurance provisions of H. R. 7225 is more susceptible to successful vocational rehabilitation than is a person who is without financial resources.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Folsom was not content to deny a liberalized social security program for our disabled American citizens. Before the Senate Finance Committee, he also opposed liberalizing the provisions of the Social Security Act prescribing the eligibility age for women. Secretary Folsom testified that the provision of H. R. 7225 that lowered the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 is in conflict with the current trend of an increasing life expectancy for women.

Secretary Folsom in giving lip service to life expectancy has completely disregarded the factor of job expectancy. Secretary Folsom chose not to mention the fact that most women age 62 who have the physical and mental ability to work would probably not avail themselves of this earlier opportunity to obtain social security benefits, but that those who are not fortunate enough to have sufficient health to permit their obtaining employment are sorely in need of this liberalization of the social security program. This statement is substantiated by a quote from the Secretary's remarks before the Senate Committee on Finance as follows:

Surveys by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance show that only 5 percent of those receiving old-age benefits consider that they have retired because they wanted to retire; rather, health and other factors had led to their retirement.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the 95 percent of those receiving old age benefits not mentioned by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are drawing their benefits because they are compelled to by reason of health or some other adverse factor.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration has previously gone on record as having a complete disregard for the farmers' well-being, an indifference to the welfare of America's low-income families, and an apathetic attitude toward the problems of labor and small business. The Republican Party has already established a record of tax-favoritism for the rich and a bountiful prosperous America for the selected few who have curried the favor of the Republican administration. Under the Eisenhower administration the record is clear that what might be good for the United States must necessarily be good for General Motors before it receives administration support.

To that list of administration neglect, indifference, and irresponsibility with regard to the welfare of our American citizens, we must now, unfortunately, add a disdain for the problems of our aged women and our disabled. The actions of Secretary Folsom in appearing before the Senate Finance Committee in opposition to humane Democratic amendments liberalizing the Social Security Act cannot be undone by Republican words of sympathy espousing a claim to human understanding solely for political convenience.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the Democratic Party must enact forward-looking legislation designed to serve the needs of all the American people even though administration opposition may be expressed to such legislation. To my colleagues in the House on the Democratic side, and to those colleagues on the Republican side who may care to join in this effort, I call upon you to join with me in dealing with the problems that confront our great country with realism, foresight, and human understanding.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. MEADER, on today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FORAND and to include a draft of a public welfare bill introduced by him today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. MINSHALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER.

Mr. REED of New York on a bill he just introduced (H. R. 10284).

Mr. JOHNSON of California and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address he delivered on the subject of Greek Independence Day.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include editorials.

Mr. DORN of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. CANNON.

Mr. DINGELL.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes;

H. R. 9064. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung;

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction for arson;

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Roy Cowan and others;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), Act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent numbered 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a three-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 226, 84th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 9, 1956.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 226, the House adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a financial report on the Mexican-United States foot-and-mouth disease program for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1687. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to leasehold and construction loans which may be made by national banks"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting supplemental data relating to a monthly report on military prime contracts with business firms in the United States for experimental, developmental, and research work which was submitted on March 17, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1689. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing tabulations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management showing the withdrawals and restorations for the period from January 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, pursuant to the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C. sec. 471, 43 U. S. C., sec. 141 et seq.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1690. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional evidence relating to the case of Loo Wei Yung, A-10245600 (0300-460282), involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 453. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the Department of Defense appropriations for 1957 for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2972. An act to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report on the 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6084. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District; with amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIES: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7732. A bill to amend section 406 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Congress), as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9852. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Fourteenth intermediate report on United States technical assistance in Latin America (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4635. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions; with amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 10283. A bill to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 10284. A bill to amend and improve the child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, to authorize special project grants to institutions of higher education or research in connection with maternal and child health and crippled children's services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 10285. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 10286. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 10287. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10288. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10289. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10290. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to permit the renewal of certain policies of insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Texas:

H. R. 10291. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Sabine River Authority of Texas easements in certain lands of the United States within the Sabine National Forest, Tex.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 10292. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the income-tax exemption allowed each taxpayer, each dependent, and $1,800 for a dependent child (until said child reaches 21 years of age) while attending any business school, college, or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 10293. A bill to prescribe a code of procedure for the conduct of congressional investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 10294. A bill to amend section 1717 of title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make nonmailable certain defamatory and other matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 10295. A bill to provide for the establishment in the executive branch of the Government of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10296. A bill to amend certain laws relating to the provision of housing and the elimination of slums, to establish a National Mortgage Corporation to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 10297. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisibility of establishing the Creek Indian Council House on the grounds which constitute its site as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10298. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing the former Capitol Building of the Cherokee Indian Nation and the grounds which constitute its site, located in Tahlequah, Okla., as a national monument and historic shrine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10299. A bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 10300. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10301. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Terrorities, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 10302. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable the States to establish more adequate public welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 10303. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 10304. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10305. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 10306. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 10307. A bill to provide for the establishment in western North Dakota of a uraniferous lignite buying station and a mill for processing uranium-bearing lignites; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10308. A bill to exempt motor vehicles sold for the use of religious and nonprofit educational institutions from Federal excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10309. A bill to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10310. A bill to provide for the regulation of motor vehicles on the highways of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10311. A bill to prohibit coercion by automobile manufacturers in the sale of parts, accessories, equipment, or tools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10312. A bill to amend title 15 of the United States Code with respect to the operation of speedometers on motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10313. A bill to prevent the sale of automobiles with unauthorized equipment, parts, and accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10314. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements between manufacturers of motor vehicles and their franchised dealers, to permit the establishment of exclusive representation by dealers and to restrict franchised dealers from reselling to certain unauthorized persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 10315. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10316. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10317. A bill to amend the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10318. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters, United States marshals, and collectors of customs, through written competitive examination in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10319. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of certain widows, widowers, and unmarried persons, age 55 years or older, in hardship cases, to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 10320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish new corporate tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 10321. A bill to amend section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide that while butter is in surplus supply, it shall be a part of the ration of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10322. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 10323. A bill to provide for Government loans to enable certain holders of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance to pay the premiums hereafter accruing thereon; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Program; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 454. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of conducting studies, investigations, and inquiries incurred by the Select Committee on the Baltic States, and by the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-exempt Foundations; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation revising and extending the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation designed to insure the construction of a high dam on the lower Cumberland River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of Government, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 10324. A bill for the relief of Cesare Picco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 10325. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Roumanos Germanos and their child, Nofal Germanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 10326. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Consuelo Gonzales Jaminola Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10327. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edward W. McCrary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10328. A bill for the relief of Ellen Scaglione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10329. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francine Corrigan de Jacomé; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10330. A bill for the relief of Frank Konrad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

815. By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Petition of Lloyd LaPlante and others from Brown and Manitowoc Counties, Wis., for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

816. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the Ukranian National Women's League of America, Inc., submitted by Mrs. Rose B. Wecal, president of the Ukranian National Women's League, Branch 29, Woonsocket, R. I., protesting the torturing of millions of slave laborers in U. S. S. R., particularly against murdering of 500 women in concentration camp in Karaganda, Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

817. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of Omer C. Meadows of Hinton, W. Va., and 45 residents of Summers County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

818. Also, petition of James H. Buckland of Alderson, W. Va., and 45 other residents of Monroe County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

819. Also, petition of R. L. Holmes of Renick, W. Va., and 46 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

820. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 45 residents of Franklin County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Public Welfare Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced for appropriate reference the Public Welfare Act of 1956.

This bill proposes to remedy a growing inequity and inadequacy in our total social security system by placing the public welfare program on an up-to-date basis that will make it possible for the State and local public welfare agencies to carry out, in an adequate and constructive way, their assigned task of providing ultimate protection to all people against unmet economic and social needs.

Specifically the bill provides a new title XVI in the Social Security Act, as an optional alternative to its present assistance provisions, under which the States might submit a single comprehensive public welfare plan and receive Federal aid on a more flexible, adequate, and rational basis for assistance to all needy persons and services for all those who require such welfare aid. This bill incorporates principles which have long been advocated by labor unions, public welfare officials, and other social work leaders. It brings up to date similar bills I have offered in previous Congresses.

The actions taken over the past 6 years to strengthen the contributory old-age and survivors insurance program make it especially urgent that we now move to improve the situation of those who still remain in need. Among others we find in this situation the following: First, those who retired from employment or were widowed too early to benefit from the OASI program; second, those whose needs are not adequately met by fixed insurance benefits either because they fall in the minimum benefit category or because they have special needs—as, for example, for medical or nursing care; third, those whose needs arise from situations not provided for in any existing program—as, for example, catastrophic illness or prolonged unemployment or the loss of a farm; and fourth, those whose particular needs require a helping hand to assist the individual get back on his feet, secure the specialized care he requires, or—in the case of a child or badly handicapped adult—be assured the protective care he needs. The plight of many of these groups—so inconsistent with our present unprecedented prosperity—has been sharply pointed up in the recent report of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

In all these situations people are dependent for help on their State and local public welfare agencies in finding an answer to their immediate needs, whatever longtime social remedies may be sought elsewhere. The public welfare agency is the place to which any American can turn when all other sources of help have proved inadequate to his need: his savings, his social insurance benefits, his family, his union, or lodge, his church, voluntary welfare agencies, and many others. We pride ourselves in this country on the fact that no one need go hungry and no one need lack for a helping hand when he needs it. The public welfare program is the instrument through which we translate this community pride into a reality. It does not compete with the means, like social insurance and a full employment economy, through which we seek to prevent need. Nor does it compete with our traditional social institutions: the family, church, private enterprise, and other forms of voluntary association. It underpins and supplements these so that they can better perform their own functions.

At the present time, however, these public-welfare aspects of our social-security program are badly handicapped by certain outdated provisions of the Social Security Act. These provisions, especially those incorporated in the assistance titles I, IV, X, and XIV, served a great pioneering purpose in the days when large categories of persons were excluded from social-insurance coverage and it was necessary clearly to establish their right to public aid. Today, however, as more adequate social-insurance provisions begin to reduce the numbers of persons requiring public assistance, it is imperative that our public-welfare machinery be modernized in order to meet more adequately the special needs of all those who are still excluded from the general national prosperity. It is not only right in principle that we should do so but it is essential to the future strength and health of our Nation that no individuals—and especially no children—should be deprived of their right to share in the American ideal and to find some answer to their most basic needs.

While some of the assistance changes proposed by the present administration move very slightly in the direction of my proposal, especially in making somewhat more adequate provision for medical care for assistance recipients and in giving official recognition to the service factor in administering assistance, they make no approach whatsoever to the basic public-welfare problems with which my bill deals; namely, (a) universal coverage, more adequate levels of aid for all States; (b) a more realistic concept of the scope and purposes of public-welfare services; (c) the simplification of administrative procedures and organization.

In at least one important respect the administration proposals move in the opposite direction by proposing to reduce the Federal aid available to assist those older persons whose OASI benefit falls below the assistance level established as minimal by their States. For all these reasons it has seemed to me of the utmost importance that the Congress should have before it a forward-looking public-welfare bill which incorporates the best thinking of those familiar with this field and reflects our earnest concern for those many Americans whose problems, needs, and hardships still lie outside the range of existing social measures. Only through a measure of scope and vision can we be sure that our general social advance leaves in its wake no forgotten Americans.

In the statement which follows a more detailed explanation of the provisions of this bill is given.

PROVISIONS OF THE PUBLIC WELFARE ACT OF 1956

General: The bill provides a new title XVI for the Social Security Act under which a State could submit a comprehensive public-welfare plan for assistance to needy persons and welfare services as defined in the bill. States that wished to do so could continue to operate programs of assistance under the existing provisions of titles I, IV, X, and XIV, but the new matching provisions described below are applicable only to title XVI and the usual provision is made to preclude assistance payments to any individual under more than one title of the act. For most States the scope, flexibility, and financial provisions of title XVI would probably prove an inducement to change, but the optional feature would ease the transitional process and make it possible for a State, which wished to retain certain programs—as, for example, aid to the blind—on the present basis, to do so.

Coverage for assistance: This bill makes it possible for a State to receive Federal aid for assistance to any needy person and not exclusively for those over 65, blind, permanently and totally disabled, or those meeting the restrictive definition for aid to dependent children—as at present. Administration by categorical groups would, however, be optional with the States, provided the basis for establishing the categories was reasonable. Assistance could not, however, be paid to persons residing in public institutions other than medical institutions nor to patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

Higher assistance levels: This bill would provide a more flexible, rational, and adequate financial base for assistance payments in all States by making the following changes:

First. Ceilings, or the maximum payments subject to Federal aid would be increased to $75 a month for all adults and $37.50 for all children. Present maxima in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are $55 a month; in aid to dependent children the present ceilings are $30 each for the first child and adult caretaker and $21 a month for each additional child. In both cases, however, the amounts are scheduled to be reduced, under existing law, on September 30, 1956.

Second. Matching on the average of all payments rather than in terms of each individual payment as at present would, however, make it possible to receive Federal matching for higher payments in cases of unusual need—provided these were offset by other payments below the maximum level.

Third. A new and simplified matching formula would replace the present complex and inequitable formula which neither recognizes the special needs of low-income States nor the great efforts made by some States to provide more adequately for their own needy. Under the proposed formula the total of all assistance payments—within the average ceilings as shown in 1 above—would receive a 62-percent Federal reimbursement in any State whose average per capita income was the same as that of the United States as a whole. For States above this average the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately decreased but would in no case fall below 50 percent. For States with a lower than average per capita income the percentage of Federal reimbursement would be proportionately increased but the maximum level of reimbursement would be 80 percent. Under this formula the needy in both the high- and low-income States would benefit: the former by the higher reimbursable ceilings and the latter by the higher rate of reimbursement.

Fourth. Welfare services provided by the public welfare agency would be subject to the same rate of reimbursement as assistance payments. Increasingly those persons turning to public welfare agencies for aid are those with special needs requiring knowledgeable service for their solution. Such service can often help speed the return of the individual to self-support, secure for him the care he needs from other sources, prevent serious or long-term future difficulties, and reduce the cost to the public of extended dependency. For example: many people needing medical care or rehabilitative service do not know

what provisions are available or how to go about applying for them: many people are lingering in general or mental hospitals simply because they have no other place to go—and no one to help them find such a place; many people living in areas where their former source of livelihood has ceased to exist need help in moving to areas of new opportunity; many children might be saved from juvenile delinquency or other forms of costly social maladjustment if their parents received helpful guidance at the crucial time or—in cases where substitute family care was necessary—the child welfare services of the public welfare agency could make prompt and adequate provision for their adoptive or foster-care placement. An advantage of this bill to the child-welfare program is the fact that it permits child-welfare workers to apply assistance funds to the placement of needy children requiring foster care. The grave injustice done to this neediest group of children under the present act, which denies assistance to children not living with a close relative, was pointed out by the Welfare report of the Commission on Inter-governmental Relations.

Fifth. Simplified administration, with consequent benefits to those requiring public welfare aid as well as to those who do its work and pay its cost, is provided in this bill in several ways. Matching on the average of all payments, the optional elimination of categorical administration, and the provision of the same reimbursable formula for all types of aid would permit an enormous reduction in paperwork with subsequent reduction in the cost of overhead administration. The bill also requires that the program be administered by a single agency at each level of Government thus eliminating costly duplication, overlapping, and confusion of responsibility. From the point of view of the individual or family requiring help the advantage of a single agency is obvious.

Sixth. Availability of benefits: The bill makes it a condition of the broadened base of Federal financial assistance provided by this new title that its benefits should be available to all qualified persons without residence or citizenship requirements. No public welfare program can be considered to be fulfilling its function as the ultimate guarantee against individual need if it arbirtarily excludes needy persons solely because of their length of residence. The very factors that make it essential for the Federal Government to share the broad public welfare responsibilities of the States make it equally essential that such aid be available to all.

Seventh. The Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico: This bill rights a long-standing injustice toward our fellow American citizens in the Virgin Islands and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by extending to these jurisdictions the same program provisions as apply in the States and Territories.

Eighth. Confidential assistance records: This bill restores to all persons receiving assistance under this title the protection formerly required by all titles that the facts concerning their receipt of assistance be treated as confidential information.

Ninth. Personnel training: The bill recognizes the serious shortages in qualified public welfare personnel by providing special financial aid for training such personnel.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable the States to establish more adequate public welfare programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Public Welfare Act of 1956."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1956, the Social Security Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVI—COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM

"Purpose

"SEC. 1601 (a) The Congress finds and declares that whereas the Nation's strength depends upon the welfare of its individual members and families and whereas, social insurance programs alone cannot anticipate all situations of individual need, therefore a program of public welfare to meet such needs is an essential part of the Nation's program of social security.

"(b) The purpose of this title is to enable each State to develop, as an optional alternative to the present programs of public assistance and child welfare services authorized by titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV. A comprehensive public welfare program providing (1) economic assistance on an individualized basis for those persons or families whose basic needs in accordance with standards established by the States, are not fully met through their own resources, social insurance, or other social measures, (2) welfare services for those who require aid in meeting their own needs, achieving self-support, or discharging their own responsibilities and for those who require special social protection because of youth, age, disability, or other special vulnerability, and (3) community welfare services.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 1602 (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used (1) for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) a State public welfare plan and (2) to enable the Secretary to extend and strengthen facilities for training and to make training available for personnel of State and local public welfare agencies by making grants to State agencies administering plans approved under this title, colleges, universities, and other approved educational institutions.

"State public welfare plans

"SEC. 1603 (a) To be approved under this title a State plan must—

"(1) Provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State and, if administered by them, be mandatory upon them;

"(2) Provide for such financial participation by the State, and for such distribution of funds, as to assure meeting the need of all eligible individuals throughout the State, as determined in accordance with standards established by the State;

"(3) (A) Either provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan, or provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to supervise the local administration of the plan, and (B) provide that there will be not more than one agency of a local subdivision of the State designated or established to administer the plan within such subdivision;

"(4) Provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim for assistance is denied or is not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

"(5) Provide such methods of administration as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods);

"(6) Provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) Provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for assistance, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming assistance;

"(8) Provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the State plan;

"(9) Provide that all individuals wishing to make application for assistance shall have opportunity to do so and that assistance shall be furnished with reasonable promptness to all eligible individuals;

"(10) Provide, if the plan includes payments to or in behalf of individuals in private or public institutions for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such institutions;

"(11) Provide, if assistance is administered by categories, for a reasonable basis for establishing such categories which excludes from assistance no otherwise eligible individual; and

"(1) Provide that no aid will be furnished any individual under the plan with respect to any period with respect to which he is receiving old-age assistance under the State plan approved under section 2 of this act, and to dependent children under the State plan approved under section 402 of this act, aid to the blind under the State plan approved under section 1002 of this act, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan approved under section 1402 of this act.

"(b) The Secretary shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a) except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for assistance or welfare service under the plan (1) any residence requirement which excludes any otherwise eligible individual actually residing, permanently or temporarily, in the State, or (2) any citizenship requirement which excludes a citizen of the United States.

"Payment to States

"SEC. 1604. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan under this title for each quarter after June 30, 1956 an amount, which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan, equal to the Federal percentage for such State (as determined in accordance with section 1607 (a) of the total amounts expended during such quarter under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditures for any month for assistance as exceeds the product of $75 multiplied by the total number of individuals 18

years of age and over who received assistance for such month plus the product of $37.50 times the total number of individuals under the age of 18 who received assistance for such month.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) the Secretary shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter estimate the amount to be paid to such State for such quarter under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such section, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if the sum of such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State under such section is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source from which the difference is expected to be derived; and (B) such other data as to such estimated expenditures and such other investigations as the Secretary may find necessary.

"(2) The Secretary shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Secretary (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum which he finds that his estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which would have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such quarter, and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Secretary, of the net amount recovered during any prior quarter by the State or any political subdivision thereof under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Secretary for such prior quarter; *Provided,* That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof, for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Secretary, the amount so certified.

"Operation of State plans

"SEC. 1605. In the case of any State plan which has been approved by the Secretary, if the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(1) That the plan has been so changed as to impose any requirement prohibited by section 1603 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(2) That in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1603 (a) to be included in the plan; the Secretary shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until he is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer imposed or that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State.

"Definitions

"SEC. 1606. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'assistance' means money payments to or medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of needy individuals who have attained the age of 18 years and are not inmates of a public institution except as a patient in a medical institution and, with respect to needy individuals under the age of 18 years, money payments made to or medical care in behalf of or any type of remedial care recognized under State law in behalf of parents, relatives, or other individuals who assume responsibility for parental care and support of them, if such parents, relatives, or other individuals maintain a family home for such needy individuals: *Provided,* That such needy individuals (whether or not they have attained the age of 18 years) are not individuals who are patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental disease.

"(b) The term 'welfare services' includes personal services performed by persons employed by the agency administering the plan, directed to any of the following ends: assisting the recipient of or applicant for assistance to meet his own needs, establish partial or total self-support, utilize existing resources, more adequately discharge his own family and other social responsibilities, or participate in community life; extending protective services and assuring care to children who are deprived of adequate parental or other responsible adult care; extending services to strengthen the family environment of children, older people, the handicapped, and others with special needs; acting as a source of referral, guidance, and facilitating aid; extending cooperative social services to other public agencies upon their request; stimulating both social agencies and individuals in the community to provide needed social services; establishing and maintaining standards for such services where the State law so provides.

"(c) The term 'medical care' means medical services for needy individuals through payments by the agency administering the plan (including payments of insurance premiums therefor) to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services.

"(d) The term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"Federal percentage

"SEC. 1607 (a) The 'Federal percentage' for any State shall be 100 percent less than the State percentage; and the State percentage shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 38 percent as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the United States, except that the Federal share shall in no case be more than 80 percent or less than 50 percent.

"(b) The Federal percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31, of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall, for purposes of this section, be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall promulgate such percentage as soon as possible after the enactment of this title, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the purpose of this section for each of the four quarters in the period July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1957.

"Administrative provisions

"SEC. 1608. The Secretary is authorized to establish within the Social Security Administration an Office of Public Welfare to administer the provisions of this title."

Use of Tennessee Valley Authority Power Revenues To Meet Growing Power Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including recent correspondenec from Comptroller General Joseph Campbell concerning use by the Tennessee Valley Authority of its power revenues to add generating units to existing projects to meet growing power needs, and a statement which I issued on March 28 commenting upon this correspondence and the facts in the matter.

The statement and correspondence follow:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLARECNCE CANNON, OF MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

The letter from Comptroller General Joseph Campbell to Congressman JOHN TABER on March 26 relative to TVA is completely misleading. His purpose is quite clear, for his letter contains the following statement:

"This letter is not addressed to the question of the TVA's statutory authority * * * except to recommend that the present law be amended."

It will be recalled that Mr. Campbell was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, which approved the Dixon-Yates contract. The terms of that contract got so odious that even its proponents wanted it set aside. Now we find the same Mr. Campbell telling the Congress it should repeal part of the TVA Act. He seeks to do in his new suit what he couldn't do in his old hat.

To support his demand for amending the TVA Act, Mr. Campbell would completely mislead the public as to the situation. It would appear that Mr. Campbell is going out of his way when he uses his position as Comptroller General to press further his views.

It is to be noted, however, that Mr. Campbell—in his letter recognizes that TVA does have the right to use revenues to add additional units at existing plants after meeting its obligations to the Government.

If that were not so, Mr. Campbell would not be urging the Congress to repeal the right of the TVA to meet its growing power needs at existing plants from its revenues. As Mr. Campbell well knows, Congress has refused further direct appropriations and has not passed legislation to enable TVA to meet its growing needs by issuing bonds. The only way left is for TVA to use its power revenues to add units to existing projects.

The Democratic leadership believes the people of the valley have a right to expect its power supplier to plan for the future needs of its service area.

The facts are greatly different from what Mr. Campbell very adroitly implies. The letters of intent issued for the 7 new generating units referred to in Mr. Campbell's letter simply represent the schedule upon which TVA believes capacity should be added to meet the electricity requirements of the area it serves.

Taken as a whole, the Comptroller General's letter appears to be intended to frighten the Congress into a belief that TVA has taken some extraordinary action and has committed the Government to a program

unforeseen and unanticipated. He is wrong. There is no surprise in the fact that new capacity must be added to the TVA system. There is nothing extraordinary about the issuance of letters of intent.

These letters served to place TVA's units on the manufacturers' construction schedules so that when and if firm orders are placed, many months of time will be saved in delivery dates. Substantial price increases were put into effect by the manufacturers of the turbo-generators early in September, but the options were secured at the prices in effect prior to the increase. The saving will run into millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed for your information in connection with pending bill H. R. 10004 is a copy of our letter of today to Hon. JOHN TABER concerning the use by the Tennessee Valley Authority of power proceeds for capital expenditures for power facilities. Attention is particularly called to our recommendation that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of Congress with respect to the use of power proceeds for such purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 26, 1956.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: Reference is made to your letter of March 21, 1956, enclosing a copy of the reports of the Appropriations Committee in connection with H. R. 10004, and directing our attention to the language concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority in both the majority and minority reports. You also request specific information pertaining to TVA's commitments of funds for power projects or parts of projects, the amounts of TVA's revenues in recent years, and the portion of such revenues that resulted from the sale of electricity to the United States Government.

A considerable portion of the language to which you directed our attention, as well as much of the record of the TVA hearings held March 1, 1956, before the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, involves the basic questions of whether TVA has the statutory authority to use its power revenues to install additional generating units at existing powerplants without specific and prior approval of the Congress. The part of the law in question is the following language contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948:

"None of the power revenues of the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress" (61 Stat. 577).

This letter is not addressed to the question of TVA's statutory authority, which has been the subject of considerable discussion and disagreement, except to recommend that the present law be amended to clearly state the intent of the Congress with respect to its control over TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities. We believe such legislation is necessary at this time because, in our opinion, (1) the present law is not clear in this respect, (2) there has been a substantial change in the nature of TVA's capital expenditures for power facilities between 1948 and 1955, and (3) the present law, as currently applied, does not give the Congress effective control over TVA's expenditures of public funds for power facilities. It is our view that the Congress can most effectively control expenditures of this character through appropriations; however, if the Congress wishes TVA to use its power revenues, or funds obtained from other sources, to construct or acquire power facilities, it should require TVA to obtain specific and prior authorization from the Congress for such facilities.

There follows the specific information that you requested, as well as some comments on the significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities between 1948 and 1955.

1. TVA's budget program for fiscal year 1957 was transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget on September 28, 1955, and provided for the use of TVA corporate income to start the installation of 5 additional generating units at 3 existing steam plants. These generating units are: John Sevier (unit 4), Johnsonville (units 7 and 8), Gallatin (units 3 and 4).

Prior to the date of the budget transmittal, TVA had issued letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for unit number 4 at the John Sevier steam plant. These letters of intent provide for cancellation only upon payment of stipulated costs which are currently accruing against TVA. On September 22 1955, the TVA Board of Directors, by a 2 to 1 vote, approved the awarding of these letters of intent based on the advice of the TVA General Counsel that such action was authorized by law.

The Bureau of the Budget did not approve TVA's use of corporate funds to start these five units; however, the Bureau did make the following provision in the President's Budget, dated January 16, 1956, for TVA expansion:

John Sevier (unit 4) (by supplemental appropriation for 1956 and by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

Johnsonville (units 7 and 8) (by issuance of revenue bonds under proposed legislation).

On January 17, 1956, the TVA Board of Directors, by 2 affirmative votes (1 director abstaining), authorized the awarding of letters of intent covering the acquisition of major equipment for 6 additional generating units—units 3 and 4 at the Gallatin steam plant and units 7, 8, 9, and 10 at the Johnsonville steam plant.

The total cost of the equipment covered by the letters of intent that have been authorized for all seven units is approximately $30 million. Other pertinent information pertaining to these seven units is summarized.

Plant	Unit	Capacity (kw's)	Estimated cost
John Sevier	4	180,000	$28,000,000
Johnsonville	7 and 8	270,000	44,000,000
Do	9 and 10	270,000	39,000,000
Gallatin	3 and 4	450,000	67,000,000
Total		1,170,000	178,000,000

In effect, the TVA Board of Directors has authorized the initiation of a major expansion program which will add 1,170,000 kilowatts of installed capacity to its system and will cost an estimated $178 million. The expansion program has not been reviewed or approved by the Congress, and further, it includes four units which have not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. As noted above there has been a significant change in the nature of TVA's power facilities. Prior to 1948 TVA was essentially a hydroelectric power system and additional generating units were of the size of 10,000 kilowatts to 70,000 kilowatts each. Since 1948, however, TVA has added 7 large modern steam plants, and current additional generating units are of the size of from 112,500 kilowatts to 225,000 kilowatts each. The future addition of a number of steam-electric generating units of this size, or larger, represents a substantial increase in generating capacity. At June 30, 1948, the TVA power system was 17 percent steam-electric and 83 percent hydroelectric; after completion of generating units under construction at June 30, 1955, the TVA power system will be 63 percent steam-electric and 37 percent hydroelectric (these percentages, of course, do not include the 7 steam-electric units discussed above).

Further, a single steam-electric generating unit today is very large (the Gallatin units are 225,000 kilowatts each). A single steam-electric generating unit of 225,000 kilowatts is larger than most present-day hydroelectric powerplants or most steam-electric powerplants in 1948. In 1948 the TVA system had only 2 powerplants with an installed capacity as large as 225,000 kilowatts. As of June 30, 1955, excluding TVA's 7 modern steam plants, the TVA system consisted of 44 hydroelectric powerplants and 8 steam-electric powerplants; however, only 3 hydroelectric plants and 1 steam-electric plant have an installed capacity of over 225,000 kilowatts. The average installed capacity of the 44 hydroelectric plants is 80,000 kilowatts and of the 8 smaller steam-electric plants is 55,000 kilowatts. It is significant to note that technical advancements are still being made rapidly in the size of generators, as shown in the March 15, 1956, issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly, which reports:

"The electric utilities now have five generators with nameplate ratings of 300,000 kilowatts or over on order; Consolidated Edison has ordered two 335,000-kilowatt units for installation in 1958–59."

At June 30, 1948, the TVA system had an installed capacity of 2,567,402 kilowatts and during fiscal year 1948 average gross generation was 65 percent of installed capacity. The seven additional units involving the letters of intent discussed above have an installed capacity of 1,170,000 kilowatts, and, being steam-electric units, are sometimes capable of an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity (during fiscal year 1955, Johnsonville, Shawnee, and Widows Creek all had an average gross generation of over 100 percent of installed capacity). Therefore, the present expansion program of 7 additional units, which has not been reviewed by the Congress, involves installed capacity equal to 45 percent of the entire TVA system at June 30, 1948.

3. It is clear that the language of the 1948 Appropriations Act quoted above prohibits TVA from building a new steam-electric plant at a new location without prior congressional approval; however, it should be realized that TVA has the potentiality for expansion at some of its existing steam plants. The largest potentiality is probably at its Gallatin steam plant which at present is a 2-unit plant with an installed capacity of 450,000 kilowatts, but which could be expanded to a 10-unit plant. The following information pertaining to the Gallatin plant is contained in TVA's annual report for fiscal year 1954 (p. 16):

"TVA gave special consideration to the design of the main control and instrument switchboard, since it could ultimately become the centralized control board for a 2,500,000-kilowatt station (the present 1,440,000 installed capacity planned at Kingston makes it the largest station in the world at present)."

4. The final point is a discussion of the financial significance of TVA's power revenues. The TVA system is the largest single integrated electrical system in the country, and it follows that its power revenues are substantial. In the last 5 years, during which period steam generation has become an important factor, there has been a tremendous expansion in TVA's power system, primarily to supply the power needs of the

Atomic Energy Commission. The following tabulation summarizes this growth:

Year	System installed capacity June 30 (kilowatts)	Power revenues, fiscal year		
		Total	Federal agencies	All other
1951	3,181,000	$70,329,580	$8,162,812	$62,166,768
1952	3,859,910	95,004,390	25,230,407	69,773,983
1953	5,102,985	104,877,869	31,505,622	73,372,247
1954	6,075,685	133,947,808	54,368,480	79,579,328
1955	7,809,985	188,162,989	102,962,859	85,200,130

In addition to the rapid growth in TVA's power revenues, as shown above, TVA estimates that its power revenues will continue to increase and that in fiscal year 1957 they will be $231,550,000.

It is significant to note the increase in TVA power revenues that has resulted from the sale of electricity to Government agencies ($8,162,812 in 1951 and $102,962,859 in 1955). During fiscal year 1955 such revenues represented 55 percent of TVA's total power revenues.

Based on estimated figures in TVA's statement of source and disposition of power income appearing in TVA's budget program for 1957 submitted to the Congress, TVA's net power proceeds for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 will be approximately $100 million each year. Such amounts are available for the construction and acquisition of power assets and for the repayment of the Government's investment in the power program. The budget program contemplates that TVA will repay to the Government $59 million in 1956 and $75 million in 1957 out of power revenues; however, it should be realized that the actual amount that will be repaid to the Government will be determined by the TVA Board of Directors and will be the amount of money which in the judgment of the TVA Board will not be needed in the conduct of the TVA power operation. As of June 30, 1955, TVA was several years ahead of the minimum repayment schedule required by the law and was 1 year ahead of an average repayment schedule based on a 40-year amortization period.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General, of the United States.

H. R. 10284, a Bill To Improve the Child Welfare Program of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to improve the child-welfare program of the Federal Government. The improvements contained in my bill have been recommended by President Eisenhower.

Under the present law, Federal child-welfare funds may be used for local child-welfare services only in predominantly rural areas. My bill removes this limitation so that the funds can be used in any part of the State where they will be effective in establishing, extending, and strengthening child-welfare services. Emphasis will continue to be placed on services in rural areas. However, it is obvious that children in urban areas should no longer be denied the benefits of this program.

I strongly believe that problems such as those involved in child welfare must be handled by action at the State or local level. The Federal Government cannot and should not seek to take over the administration of such local responsibilities. My bill continues to recognize this principle. Federal funds are simply made available, on a matching basis, to the States for their use in meeting child-welfare problems. Under my bill, the amount authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child-welfare services would be increased from the present $10 million to $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and to $15 million for each year thereafter.

I am hopeful that this bill will receive prompt consideration by the Congress.

Stanley C. Allyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL F. SCHENCK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal pride that I call attention to my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States of another high and deserving honor bestowed upon one of my good friends in the great and important Third District of Ohio.

President Eisenhower, whose outstanding ability to recognize qualities of leadership in men is a legend, has just appointed Stanley C. Allyn, of Dayton, Ohio, as American representative at the 11th session of the Economic Commission for Europe, which will be held next month.

Chick Allyn, as he is affectionately called by his close associates and friends, brings a great amount of experience, ability, and knowledge to this new responsibility.

Mr. Allyn was born in Madison, Wis., and graduated from the University of Wisconsin. Shortly after his graduation he came to Dayton to work with and for the National Cash Register Co. His steady rise to new responsibilities in this company, whose products are known, purchased, and used throughout the world, has been phenomenal but has never been questioned by his associates because they are poignantly aware of his great capacity for leadership. Mr. Allyn has been president of the National Cash Register Co. since 1940. Mr. Allyn is termed a "global citizen" because of his efforts toward world trade. The National Cash Register Co. has large plant facilities in Dundee, Scotland; Augsburg, Germany; and Bulach, Switzerland. They sell and distribute cash registers and business machines in 90 countries and thus the name and fame of the city of Dayton, Ohio, is known throughout the world. As reported in National Biographic, a publication of the American Institute of Management, he once reduced his formula for successful foreign trade to these terms:

> In order to conduct overseas business, you must understand the peoples, live with the complexities and roll with the punches.

That is not a bad prescription for successful diplomacy, and it should be obvious that Mr. Allyn will bring to his ECE task strengths rooted in attitudes as well as in experience.

Mr. Allyn, in addition to his great responsibilities with the National Cash Register Co. in guiding most successfully their huge domestic and foreign business, is also a member of many boards of directors of other important businesses and organizations. He has not stopped there—he is also deeply interested and very active in many civic activities. He is a former president of the Community Chests and Councils of America; he has been a director of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the International Chamber of Commerce along with many other professional and business organizations. In his own local community of Dayton, Ohio, he has been a tower of strength and an active participant in every forward looking and necessary civic activity. During my many years as president of the Dayton Board of Education he was always available to consider and actively work for any activity leading to the betterment of our schools. He has always also been extremely liberal with his financial help as well as his leadership ability in every worthwhile civic event.

For all of these, and many other reasons which time will not permit me to mention, Mr. Speaker, our entire Miami Valley salutes Stanley C. (Chick) Allyn and want him to know we are deeply grateful for his life and work in our community.

Byelorussian Independence Day, March 25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, to Americans perhaps the least known of all national and religious groups of the Soviet Union are the Byelorussians, or the White Russians, as they have been known to us in the West. There are many reasons for this, but the principal one is that during the last several hundred years Byelorussians have not been the real masters of their own destiny. Though they occupy a distinct area between historic Poland and Muscovite Russia and constitute a distinct national entity with their own tradition and culture, yet from the late 14th cen-

tury until the partition of Poland late in the 18th century, the Byelorussians have been tossed between the Lithuanians, the Poles, and the Russians, and their historic homeland has been not only a field of strife among many rivals but also become the graveyard of many an ambitious and autocratic adventurer.

During all that time Byelorussians were the unfortunate victims of their unwanted and despised overlords. They were subjected to the harsh brutalities of innumerable alien tyrants, and they endured them all with exemplary fortitude and courage. Moreover, in the midst of indescribable tribulations and vicissitudes, they successfully maintained their distinct national traits, their language, and above all their love for independence and freedom.

Toward the end of the First World War, when the decrepit Russian regime was overthrown and the Tsar's empire crumbled, the Byelorussians saw their chance for their national freedom. Finally on March 25 of 1918 their leaders set up their own government and proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The republic thus proclaimed and created did not last long; by 1921 it was engulfed in the Bolshevik revolutionary war, and subsequently was forced into the Soviet Union, yet the proclamation of that independence day has become a veritable landmark in the Byelorussians' history. It is remembered by all Byelorussians as the day on which their cherished national dream was realized, and their national independence attained.

Since 1921 more than 10 million Byelorussians have been chained to the brutal Communist steamroller. The fair land of Byelorussia has become a torture chamber for its unfortunate and helpless peoples. Innocent Byelorussians have been forced out of their homeland by the hundreds of thousands and are exiled to distant and uninviting parts of the Soviet Union. In Byelorussia the idea of freedom and independence have been proscribed; any thought of attaining national political independence is impossible under the watchful eye of the ubiquitous state security police. The unfortunate Byelorussians will not be allowed to celebrate their national independence day. Fortunately, however, those Byelorussians who live in freedom, particularly those in this free and hospitable country, celebrate that memorable day; and we gladly join them on the anniversary of their independence day and in their prayers for those Byelorussians who can celebrate only in secrecy.

Congressman Minshall's Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am releasing the final tabulation of an opinion poll conducted among the registered voters in Ohio's 23d Congressional District.

Questionnaires, prepared at my personal expense, were mailed to the home of every registered voter—Republican, Democrat, and Independent—in the district, and of 66,000 questionnaires mailed, 11,257 were returned.

This unusually large return of 17 percent can be attributed to the vital and tremendous interest the people of this suburban area have in their Government.

The results of the poll follow:

Question and Answer	Percent
1. Regarding the Nation's fiscal policy, check one:	
(a) Balance the budget and reduce national debt before granting any tax reductions	83.5
(b) Reduce taxes before budget is balanced	16.5
2. Regarding a reduction in taxes, check one:	
(a) Across the board reduction for individual taxes only	29.1
(b) Reduction for both individual and business	48.0
(c) Reduction for low-income groups only	22.9
3. Regarding foreign aid, check one:	
(a) Favor President's program expected to be $4.8 billion for next fiscal year starting July 1, 1956	36.3
(b) Favor a reduction in President's program	45.3
(c) Oppose all financial aid to foreign countries	18.4
4. Regarding Federal aid for local schoolroom construction, check one:	
(a) A 5-year program to assist local school systems who are attempting to meet their local classroom shortage but who require additional funds	60.1
(b) A 5-year Federal-aid program with funds to be distributed to local school systems in proportion to their individual enrollments regardless of whether there is local financial participation	12.1
(c) Oppose any Federal aid to local school systems	27.8
5. Regarding the proposed 40,000-mile interstate highway system, check one:	
(a) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by issuing Government bonds	28.1
(b) Approve such a highway program and pay for it by increasing the highway user's tax; i. e., gas tax, rubber tax, etc	25.0
(c) Approve such a highway program and finance it with a combination of (a) and (b)	36.7
(d) Oppose any new Federal interstate highway program	10.2
6. Regarding the annual Post Office Department deficit of one-half billion dollars, check one:	
(a) Increase postage rates to make the Department self-sufficient	73.4
(b) Maintain existing postage rates and accept the deficit as a normal cost of an essential governmental service	26.6
7. Regarding the agricultural policy, check one:	
(a) Continue present flexible support system implemented by President's proposed 9-point program	62.0
(b) Return to rigid 90 percent of parity program	6.8
(c) Oppose any Federal assistance	31.2

The Public Assistance Amendments of 1956 and the Child-Health and Welfare Amendments of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1956, I introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, which would amend the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. I introduced this legislation as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means at the request of the administration. My purpose in introducing H. R. 9120 was to permit public study and comment.

My distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, of New York, introduced similar legislation, H. R. 9091.

I have today announced that the Committee on Ways and Means is tentatively scheduled to begin public hearings on Thursday, April 12, 1956, on these two bills, as well as on H. R. 10283 introduced by me, and H. R. 10284, introduced by Mr. Reed, of New York, relating to amendments to the provisions of the Social Security Act pertaining to child welfare services. These latter two bills were also introduced at the request of the administration. In announcing these hearings I indicated that the committee would also receive testimony on other bills amending the public assistance titles and related provisions of the Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of introducing H. R. 9120, I issued a press release explaining the principal features of the bill. For the benefit of the Members of Congress and other interested persons, I would like to include that release at this point in the RECORD. In addition I would like to include a summary prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Child-Health and Welfare Amendments of 1956, H. R. 10283.

The matters follow:

CHAIRMAN JERE COOPER, DEMOCRAT, OF TENNESSEE, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, TODAY ANNOUNCES INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AMENDING THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TITLES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, H. R. 9120

Hon. JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that he had introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, at the request of the administration to amend the public assistance and related provisions of the Social Security Act. Chairman COOPER'S complete statement is as follows:

"As chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, I have today introduced legislation, H. R. 9120, to amend the public assistance titles and related provisions of the Social Security Act. This legislation was prepared in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and embodies the public assistance recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message and in his budget message. I have introduced this legislation at the request of the administration.

"While no action has yet been scheduled by the Committee on Ways and Means on this legislation, the introduction of the bill will make it available for public study and comment. It is probable that some legislative action will be taken by the Congress this year on public assistance, in view of the fact that the present matching formula (the so-called McFarland amendment) for the payment of Federal funds to the States for public assistance purposes is scheduled to terminate September 30, 1956.

"The principal features of the bill are as follows:

"1. Extension of the 1952 temporary matching formula: The bill would extend from September 30, 1956 to June 30, 1959 the present formula for Federal matching of assistance payments. Under the present formula, the Federal share in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder, within individual maximums of $55. For aid to dependent children, the Federal share is four-fifths of the first $15 of the State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder, with individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child, and $21 for each additional child in a family. In the absence of such an extension of the present matching formula, on October 1, 1956, the Federal share in expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled would be reduced to three-fourths of the first $20 of the average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder up to a maximum of $50 on any individual payment. In aid to dependent children, there would be similar changes in the Federal formula. This extension of the current matching formula would be effective only with respect to persons who are on the public assistance rolls before July 1, 1957 and to those persons who are added to the rolls after that date who are not receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits. It is estimated that this provision will cost $155 million in fiscal year 1957 (9 months' extension) and $210 million annually in fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

"2. Revised matching formula for persons added to the old-age assistance rolls after June 30, 1957 who receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits: The bill would provide a new matching formula with respect to old-age assistance recipients who are added for the first time to the public-assistance rolls after June 30, 1957 and who receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Federal matching-in-assistance payments in regard to persons in this category would be 50 percent of the average monthly payment per recipient up to a maximum of $55 on the payment to any one recipient. It is estimated that this provision will save approximately $6.5 million in fiscal year 1958 and $73 million annually by the year 1967.

"3. Matching of assistance expenditures for medical care: The bill would amend the formula for determining the Federal share of assistance expenditures to provide separate dollar-per-dollar matching of State expenditures for medical care in behalf of assistance recipients, including expenditures for insurance premiums for medical care, up to a specified maximum. This maximum is determined by multiplying $6 a month by the number of adult recipients and $3 a month by the number of child recipients. There is also included in the bill a provision for the establishment of an advisory council on medical care to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. These provisions would be effective as of July 1, 1957. It is expected that the cost of this feature of the bill would be $65 million in fiscal year 1958 and $110 million annually by fiscal year 1967.

"4. Federal assistance for the training of public welfare personnel: The bill would assist the States in paying for the training of skilled workers to deal with the problems of persons receiving assistance. The Federal Government would share in State expenditures for this purpose for a 6-year period with the Federal share being 80 percent for the first 4 years and 66⅔ percent for the remaining years. The funds are to be used by the States to make grants to institutions of higher learning for training of personnel for employment in public assistance programs and for establishing fellowships and special short-term courses of study. The bill would also provide for Federal payment of certain costs connected with research and demonstration projects in social security. It is expected that the cost of these provisions in fiscal year 1957 would be $500,000 and $5 million in fiscal year 1958.

"5. Extension of aid to dependent children: The bill would liberalize the present provisions applicable to the aid to dependent-children program so as to extend the list of relatives with whom a child may live and receive aid to include first cousins, nephews, and nieces. The bill would also eliminate the school attendance requirement for children 16 and 17 years of age thereby permitting disabled children and other children unable to attend school to receive assistance. This provision would be effective July 1, 1957, and would have an annual cost of $2 million.

"6. Limitation on payments to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The bill would increase the dollar limitation now in effect for Federal public assistance grants to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by 25 percent after June 30, 1956. For Puerto Rico the dollar limitation on annual Federal assistance grants would be raised from $4,250,000 to $5,312,500, and for the Virgin Islands $160,000 to $200,000. It is expected that the cost of this provision would be $1,102,500 annually.

"7. Self-support and self-care: The bill would amend the purpose clauses of the public assistance titles to make explicit that restoration of recipients of public assistance to self-support or self-care is a program objective, and that strengthening of family life is an objective in the program of aid to dependent children.

"It is my expectation that thorough public hearings would be held on this legislation in the event a decision is made by the Committee on Ways and Means to give consideration to the bill. I believe it essential that very careful study be given to the bill before it is acted on by the Congress and that careful examination be made of the effect that the financing features of the bill would have on the public assistance programs of the respective States. The humanitarian purposes of the public assistance program, modest as they may be, must be carefully safeguarded and developed so that our Nation's needy may be assured an adequate standard of living and necessary medical care."

SUMMARY OF CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE AMENDMENTS OF 1956—H. R. 10283

The bill would amend part 3 of title V of the Social Security Act, relating to child-welfare services, in a number of respects. It would also amend parts 1 and 2 of that title, relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services, with respect to special project grants. These amendments would be effective July 1, 1956.

CHILD-WELFARE SERVICES

Rural areas: The present limitations requiring that Federal child-welfare funds may be used for local child-welfare services only in predominantly rural areas would be removed. This would give greater flexibility to the States. Federal funds could be used in any part of the State where they are effective in establishing, extending, and strengthening child-welfare services. Emphasis would, however, continue to be placed on services in rural areas, as in the maternal and child health and crippled children's provisions of the present law.

Foster care: The bill would make explicit the authority to use Federal funds for the extension and improvement of foster care.

Amount authorized for annual appropriation: The amount authorized for annual appropriations for grants to the States for child-welfare services would be increased from the present $10 million to $12 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and to $15 million for each year thereafter.

Allotment formula: In order to make the allotment of funds consistent with the above changes concerning rural areas and foster care, the bill would change the present statutory formula under which allotment is made entirely on the basis of rural child population under the age of 18. Allotments to the States of funds appropriated in any year for this purpose would, instead, be made (after a flat allotment) on the basis of the need of each State for financial assistance in carrying out its plan, as determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after considering the relative population under 21 and the relative rural population under that age.

The flat allotment referred to above, which would be made first, would be $40,000 if the appropriation were $10 million. It would be reduced proportionately if the appropriation were less than $10 million and would be raised proportionately if the appropriation were increased to the higher amounts authorized by the bill.

Matching: Each State's allotment would be available for paying the Federal share of the cost of the expenditures under the State plan, with the balance being made up from State and local funds. The Federal share would vary inversely with the State's relative per capita income between a minimum of 33⅓ percent and a maximum of 66⅔ percent, with the share for the State with a per capita income equal to that for the United States being 50 percent. The Federal share for Alaska and Hawaii would be set at 50 percent and for the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico at 66⅔ percent.

Reallotment: A new provision would be added to permit redistribution of Federal funds, after a State certifies that any portion of its allotment will not be required for its program. The portions so certified would be reallotted from time to time to other States which the Secretary determines have need for and will be able to use amounts in excess of their original allotments. The reallotment among these States would be based on their State plans after taking into consideration the relative size of the population under age 21, the relative size of the rural population under such age, and the relative per capita income of the States eligible for the reallotment.

Special project grants: A new provision would authorize up to 15 percent of the funds appropriated for grants for child welfare services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for grants for special projects of regional or national significance. These special project grants would be available to State public-welfare agencies, and, with the concurrence of such agencies, to any public or nonprofit institution of higher education or research.

Return of runaway children: The bill changes the present law by raising the age limit of children who may be returned to their community in another State through the use of Federal child welfare funds from 16 years to 18 years, and adding authorization for the use of these funds for maintaining the children pending their return (for a period not exceeding 15 days). These costs, and the costs of the return of the child, could be met when they cannot be met by those legally responsible for the child's support.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The bill authorizes up to 12½ percent of the annual appropriation for grants for maternal and child health services to be earmarked (in the appropriation) for special projects of regional or national significance. This percentage represents the same proportion of the total annual appropriation as is reserved at present for special projects grants. These special project grants would be available not only to the State agencies administering the State plans, as at present, but also, with their concurrence, to other public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning or research.

SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Amendments, similar to those described above for maternal and child health services, would be made by the bill in the crippled children's provisions of the Social Security Act.

We're Here To Legislate, Not To Play Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of Congress, I have often expressed pride in belonging to the greatest legislative body in the world. It will take more than a few disappointments and setbacks before I would abandon that pride. Some of the experiences over the past year, however, have given me cause to wonder if maybe we are not the greatest political body in the world, a designation which would give me much less cause for pride.

One instance of playing politics on a grand scale is evident in the way Congress has handled farm legislation.

In just 38 days it will be a year since the House passed H. R. 12. In this year, Congress has been in session approximately 6 months. Still we have no farm legislation. In fact, we seem further away from any workable farm bill than ever before.

More is the pity because with the farm economy sagging through no fault of its own, government should take steps to help undue the causes for the farm crisis, most of them fashioned through Federal legislation.

On January 9, 1956, President Eisenhower brought to Congress, as the first item of business, a nine-point program which was hailed by farmers and leading farm organizations as being an instrument for soundness in agriculture.

It provided the way for farmers to adjust to a peacetime economy on a solid, businesslike basis and still be compensated for their efforts. Now, more than 2 months later, the legislation is still under consideration and we have no assurance of when it will be enacted. At the present, it has little prospect of emerging in any form which will reflect the element of statesmanship which Congress is obligated to endow to matters of this kind.

Surely, the farmer, who is fast approaching another planting season, should be free of the quandary in which Congress has placed him. He has no way of anticipating what type of program will be thrust upon him. He cannot plan in advance. He must follow the age-old requirement of keeping in step with nature by preparing the soil and planting the crops in season. It could be that these basics would be legislated from him, however, and he may be required to plant nothing, harvest nothing, and expect nothing. We have an obligation to ourselves no less than we do to all the people engaged in agriculture in this great land of ours. We are here to legislate, not to play politics.

I sincerely hope that, just because 16 of 19 members on the Agriculture Committee of one political faith come from areas where the major interest agriculturally does not fall within the realm where farmers are experiencing the greatest economic difficulty right now, there has not been a lack of interest in the real problem.

I join with other Members who feel that because we have dragged our feet and because we have played politics with the farmer's welfare, that we owe it to him to remain in session until farm legislation is enacted. None of us can enjoy an Easter recess with any peace of mind if we do otherwise.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House the statement of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and the proclamation of Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York City, on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles issued the following statement on February 15:

This year the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will commemorate the 38th anniversaries of their declarations of independence from Russia. On this occasion it is appropriate to call attention once more to the determination and self-sacrifice which the peoples of these countries showed in the community of free nations.

Though the Baltic peoples have been deprived of this freedom, we know that they retain their will to be free.

We continue to believe in the principle that sovereign rights and self-government should be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. We are confident that this principle will one day be realized.

Mayor Robert Wagner, of New York City, issued the following proclamation:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was proclaimed an independent republic by the people of Lithuania, climaxing a long struggle of a courageous and gallant nation for freedom;

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin and ancestry will commemorate this occasion with special services emphasizing their faith in the American way of life and demonstrating their belief in the inalienable rights of freedom-loving peoples; and

Whereas the people of New York City appreciate the contributions the Lithuanian people have made to the cultural heritage and development of this great city since the arrival of the first Lithuanian in New York City, Dr. Alexander Carolius Curtius, who came to teach the classics to the children of the early Dutch Colony of Nieuw Amsterdam (1659), today's New York, and as New York has served as the gateway to the ever-increasing numbers of Lithuanians who came here and became an integral part of our industrial system:

Now, therefore, I, Robert Wagner, of the city of New York, do hereby declare February 16, 1956, Lithuania's Independence Day, in the city of New York and call upon all citizens of our great city to observe this anniversary and pay honor to our Americans of Lithuanian descent.

District of Columbia Mass Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter addressed to the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, relative to the problem of mass transportation in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 28, 1956.

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety, of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, met for more than 2 hours this morning for consideration of the District of Columbia mass transportation problems. We have come to the conclusion that some form of public authority for the operation of a mass transportation system in the District, at least on an interim basis, is necessary if the people of the area are to have adequate transportation services at reasonable cost. Therefore, it is our recommendation that within the next 15 days, the professional staff of the Senate District Committee be instructed to study and prepare whatever revisions of S. 3073, which is the present transit authority bill, may be necessary to accomplish the following legislative objectives:

1. Establish a public transit authority on a 1- to 3-year interim basis with sufficient flexibility to adapt its transit program to the recommendations of the mass transit study now underway. It should be noted that Congress has already authorized the expenditure of approximately $400,000 for

a mass transit study. It appears to your subcommittee that any transit program which is to be adopted by the Congress this year should take into account the need for maintaining whatever flexible powers and jurisdiction that may be necessary to adapt itself to any sound findings and recommendations submitted by the mass transit study.

2. Your subcommittee believes that another essential feature of interim public transit authority should be one which empowers the District Commissioners not only to operate a public transit system for the interim period of 1 to 3 years, but also empowers the Commissioners to transfer the transit system into a private ownership system if during the interim period a sound proposal for private ownership is submitted to the District Commissioners and they find that the proposal would result in providing the people of the District of Columbia with a reliable and efficient transportation system under private ownership.

The members of your subcommittee continue to be of the opinion that private ownership operation of the transportation system is the most desirable if a satisfactory offer from some qualified, competent, and adequately financed company could be obtained. However, your subcommittee is also satisfied that up to this date no such proposal from private interests has been forthcoming and this lack of interest by private capital necessitates the Congress proceeding with all deliberate speed to pass the necessary legislation for a public operation of the transportation system for at least an interim period of 1 to 3 years. It may be that with such extension of time private interests will come forward with an acceptable offer, although your committee feels that it is only fair and proper to point out that it is not too encouraged or optimistic over that prospect. The fact is, and it is an inescapable one, that mass transit systems throughout the country are not an attractive investment possibility and in most instances are either losing money or paying very low returns. Such is even true in many localities where private transit companies are receiving what amounts in fact to various types of subsidies in tax exemptions and public services that are paid for by the taxpayer.

The trend in our country for some years in the field of public transportation has been in some form of public ownership and operation. Even though the members of your committee prefer private operation, we cannot ignore the economic realities of the situation and we feel that the Congress has the obligation of facing up to the transportation needs of the citizens of the District of Columbia. The Federal Government has a vital interest in providing the thousands of Federal employees who work in the District with sufficient and adequate public transportation.

3. It is our recommendation that any interim public transportation authority that is authorized in this session of Congress by legislation should place the authority and responsibility for operating the transportation system squarely in the hands of the District Commissioners, including the authority to give transit priority necessary to insure efficient operation of the transportation system in respect to routing, traffic control, safety, reservation of street lanes, and the many other managerial details that go along with providing the transit riders with satisfactory service.

We wish to call the attention of our colleagues on the Senate District Committee that it is only to the extent that we make a public transportation service attractive to the thousands of the daily potential public transit riders who are now operating private cars that there is any hope of maintaining a self-sustaining and profitable public transportation system.

4. In view of the national trend toward public operation of mass transportation systems in many of our cities, we would point out to the full Committee on the District of Columbia that a subsidy program which in effect seeks to guarantee a private company against financial losses is too high a price to pay for managerial services of such company. A public authority at least has the advantage of complete control over the service rendered the public and is not solely motivated by excessive quick profits.

5. We wish to stress the fact that the time schedule for the handling of the transportation emergency that confronts the District of Columbia should not be ignored by the Congress or by interested groups in the District. We urge that the business interests of the District face the fact that they have a great deal to lose if a satisfactory transportation system is not worked out in the immediate future, so that there will be adequate transportation services available on August 15. Therefore, we hope that the business, professional, and civic interests of the District of Columbia will give favorable consideration to the proposal which we have outlined in this letter and which will be submitted to the full Committee on the District of Columbia in detail as soon as the professional staff of the committee completes its study and prepares the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND SAFETY.
PAT MCNAMARA, *Chairman.*
WAYNE MORSE, *Member.*
CLIFFORD P. CASE, *Member.*

Our Hellenic Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech given by me in the Greek Orthodox Church Assumption Virgin, Manchester. N. H., Sunday, March 25, 1956, in celebration of the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. The speech is entitled "Our Hellenic Heritage":

OUR HELLENIC HERITAGE

(By Congressman CHESTER E. MERROW, Greek Orthodox Church Assumption Virgin, Manchester, N. H., Sunday, March 25, 1956)

I am very grateful for the opportunity to participate in this ceremony commemorating the 135th anniversary of Greek Independence, established on March 25, 1821, when Greece raised the standard of revolt against the Turks. On this occasion we pay tribute to the young men who made the supreme sacrifice in order to help maintain the Independence of Greece. Today we honor Greece for the great contributions made over all the years to the free way of life.

GOVERNOR DWINELL'S PROCLAMATION

The Governor of New Hampshire in his proclamation setting aside Sunday, March 25, 1956, as Hellenic Day, used these words:

"Whereas Greece has contributed much to the advancement of mankind in the field of art, literature, and science in the past 2,500 years, and has been a leader in the preservation of independence; and

"Whereas the Greek nation has taken up arms as our ally in two world wars and is now allied with us in preventing the attempted encroachments of totalitarian powers in Eastern Europe; and

"Whereas Greece stands as the bastion of democracy in the West in preventing communism from spreading its hardships and evils in that part of the world;

"Now, therefore, I, Lane Dwinell, Governor of the State of New Hampshire, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 25, 1956, as Hellenic Day in honor of the 135th anniversary of the Greek independence."

GREECE, THE BIRTHPLACE OF DEMOCRACY

The Greek people and their friends in all the Western World look to this day as a day of rejoicing, a day of retrospection, and a day of rededication to the ideas and ideals that form the foundation of free civilization. The free world, and particularly the Western World, hails Greece as the birthplace of the democratic form of government and of a glorious civilization which, even at the present hour, we are being called upon to maintain and defend.

The United States is the undisputed leader of the Free World in this struggle. We recognize that the roots of our institutions lie deep in the history of Greece. It is the wonder of the world that on the tiny Hellenic peninsula freedom had its birth, and that the developments in Greece form a heritage which has made possible subsequent democracies and the rise to the position of preeminence which we hold today. In all the annals of history, no group of people has had such a far-reaching and powerful influence on the establishment of freedom as have the Greek people.

OUR INDEBTEDNESS TO GREECE

Daniel Webster, in his moving and immortal speech delivered in the United States House of Representatives on January 19, 1823, stated in clear and eloquent language the influence which Greece has had upon the Republic of the United States. These words are as true today as when delivered by one of the world's foremost orators—a man whose eloquence ranks with that of the Greek orator Demosthenes. Said Webster: "We must, indeed, fly beyond the civilized world; we must pass the dominion of law and the boundaries of knowledge; we must, more especially, withdraw ourselves from this place, and the scenes and objects which here surround us—if we would separate ourselves entirely from the influence of all those memorials of herself which ancient Greece has transmitted for the admiration and the benefit of mankind. This free form of government, this popular assembly, the common council held for the common good—where have we contemplated its earliest models? This practice of free debate and public discussion, the contest of mind with mind, and that popular eloquence, which, if it were now here, on a subject like this, would move the stones of the Capitol—whose was the language in which all these were first exhibited? Even the edifice in which we assemble, these proportioned columns, this ornamented architecture, all remind us that Greece has existed, and that we, like the rest of mankind, are greatly her debtors."

GREECE, A BASTION AGAINST TYRANNY

The proud history of Greece stretches into antiquity over a period of 4,000 years. It is a fascinating story of achievement against recurring adversity, and within the memory of millions now living, Greece stands, as she has so nobly done in the past, against the forces of tyranny and despotism. As we recall the history of Greece, there unfolds in our memory the long story of the valiant struggle which spans the centuries as the people of Hellas have defended free civilization against the barbarous onslaughts of tyrannical and despotic power. In ancient days people of lesser cultures looked with envy at the magnificent civilization of the Hellenic city-states. Time and time again the Greeks were forced to defend their very existence to fight for their ideals.

FOUNDERS OF WESTERN CULTURE

During the fifth century B. C. the Persian hordes under Xerxes were repulsed, ushering in with this victory the Golden Age of Greek culture. This was the age of Plato and Aristotle, the age of political, literary, and artistic maturity—the age that produced masterpieces that have since inspired art and thought the world over.

We recall the work of Plato and Aristotle in government, Sophocles in literature, Socrates in philosophy, Meton in astronomy, Ictinus in architecture, Hippocrates in medicine, Herodotus and Thucydides in history, Euripides in drama, and Protagoras in rhetoric. These individuals have played a major role in shaping Western culture and are influencing our way of life to the very hour. The breadth and depth of Greek intellectual accomplishments were so extensive that they form the basis of the free institutions we are defending today. As we recall Greek history on this most significant occasion, we are impressed anew by the ever-present influence of Greek thought on the very society in which we move today.

GREEK THOUGHT AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

Greece has given us a priceless heritage. The Greeks embraced the Christian faith and the first churches in Europe were founded in Macedonia by St. Paul. It was the combination of the Christian faith and the Greek thought that makes up the Greek tradition as we know it—the tradition that has lived on through the centuries—the tradition that forms the basis of free Western civilization. The combination of Greek thought and the Christian faith has produced the freedoms which we enjoy today and the emphasis that Christianity places on the value of the individual is at the core of our civilization.

The Golden Age was followed by that of Alexander the Great who succeeded even in his short lifetime in spreading the Hellenic culture through much of Asia and parts of Africa. As a result of Alexander's conquests, Greek became the common language of the whole Middle East, thus paving the way for the spread of Christianity.

By peaceful evolution this combination of Christianity and Greek thought transformed the eastern part of the Roman Empire into the Greek Byzantine Empire. This empire held the torch of civilization high for more than a thousand years and stood as a rampart between Christian Europe and despotic Asia.

GREECE THROWS OFF THE OTTOMAN YOKE

However, the Byzantine Empire succumbed to the Turks in 1453 with the fall of its capital, Constantinople. By the 16th century, the Ottoman Turks held all of Greece. Freedom and liberty seemed to have been stamped out in this cradle of democracy for the following three centuries. Yet through this long period of Ottoman rule, the Greeks continued to keep their heritage alive in their democratic ideals and their Christian faith. Through the church, they retained hope and resourcefulness. The Greek Orthodox Church has had a long, proud history in building a civilization of freedom and a civilization that places emphasis on the dignity of the individual human being.

When the 19th century opened, Turkey was decadent, with internal weaknesses developing rapidly. Resistance in Greece to the Sultan's rule, which had actually never ceased, began to grow. The Greek people were developing a strong sense of national consciousness. The impact of the superior Greek culture was felt by the Turkish overlords and by all the near neighbors of Greece.

Greek leaders of the rapidly rising middle class were interested not only in revolution against the Turks, but also in the establishment of the type of social and political government at that time advocated by the French revolutionaries. Having endured the hardships of foreign rule for centuries, the Greeks now felt that they could challenge the authority of their hated overlords and when their religious leader, Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the standards of revolt in his monastery against the Turks on March 25, 1821, all Greece joined him in this national struggle. It is most significant that the signal for the war of independence was given by a Greek prelate in a monastery.

Great Britain and France were both eager to see the oppressed Greek people win over the Turks. Even Czarist Russia, in her desire to see the Ottoman Empire weakened, was on the side of the Greeks. As for the United States, the memory of our own fight for independence was still fresh in our hearts and minds, and President Monroe spoke for us all in his annual message of 1823 expressing sympathy for the Greek cause.

With our own moral support and with the aid of a joint French-Russian-British fleet, the Greeks finally won—although the struggle did not end until 1827. Finally, the Turks were utterly defeated at the Battle of Navarino on October 29 of that year. Although they were supported by other friendly nations, the impassioned Greek patriots themselves made great sacrifices in this brutal war of independence. By these sacrifices they won forever the admiration of the American people and the freedom-conscious people everywhere.

GREECE DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The development and progress of the Greek people was suddenly and disastrously interrupted by the Fascist attack on Greece in 1940. When the war first broke out in Europe, Greece had remained neutral. However, its neutrality was violated on October 28, 1940, when the Italians presented an ultimatum and then attacked.

The magnificent resistance offered by the small Greek Army on this occasion was totally unexpected by the Italians. The Greek Army not only kept the enemy at bay throughout the winter of 1940, but were able to capture two forward bases of the Italian forces. Thus the Greeks were able to bottle up the Italian forces for almost 6 months. It was not until the Germans opened up a second front that they were forced to fall back. This heroic stand against the Italian forces recalls an ancient day of glory when the Greeks at the Battle of Salamis in 480 B. C., even though woefully outnumbered by the Persian fleet, were yet able through sheer courage and fortitude to completely cripple and rout the enemy.

On April 6, 1941, the Germans attacked Greece from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. The Greeks received aid from the British, but by April 27 the British force of 57,000 was forced to evacuate. The Greek Army was outflanked and had no alternative but to surrender. By June 1, the whole of Greece was in Axis hands. Her valiant stand against Hitlerite Germany commanded the respect and admiration of freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Before Greece fell into Axis hands, however, the determined Greek resistance had upset the Nazi timetable, which called for an attack on the Soviet Union early in the spring and gave the Allies valuable time to build up their strength. Some historians have also pointed out that the amazing strength shown by the Greek resistance also forced Hitler to keep troops in Greece on occupation duty that might otherwise have been used against the Allies in Sicily and in Italy. In any case, it was obvious that the determined resistance of the Greeks made a considerable contribution to the Allied war effort.

As we contemplate the resistance the Greeks made to the Axis powers, we recall once again Daniel Webster's speech of 133 years ago in which he said: "Does it not become us, then, is it not a duty imposed on us, to give weight to the side of liberty and justice, to let mankind know that we are not tired of our own institutions and to protest against the asserted power of altering at pleasure the law of the civilized world." Magnificently and splendidly Greece has always risen to the occasion and struck telling blows for liberty that will be remembered forever in the annals of freedom.

There was bitter suffering in Greece during the occupation. Thousands of Greeks were killed by the invaders; hundreds of thousands more died of starvation and disease. Destruction was enormous. When Greece was liberated in late 1944, 11 percent of the population was dead either at the hands of the Nazis or from starvation and disease. The country was in a state of indescribable misery. Ninety percent of industrial equipment was destroyed. Farm lands were ravaged; all livestock had perished. The greater part of the Greek merchant fleet, which before the war had been one of the world's largest, was sunk. All that remained was a shell of a country and the shadow of a people.

RESISTANCE TO COMMUNISM

And then, this tragic situation was shamelessly exploited by international communism. Before the Greek people could recover from the chaos of World War II, they plunged into another war, civil rather than international. In the moment of Greece's greatest weakness, in 1945, the Communists struck.

Guerrilla bands had been organized by the Communists during the war to harass the Nazi occupation forces. With the end of the occupation and the setting up of a new government, the Communists had attempted to obtain a dominating position in the new Greek Government. They had failed. So guerrilla forces were sent from the sanctuary of Greece's Communist neighbors. They burned and pillaged 1,700 Greek villages, slaughtered thousands of men, women and children, and kidnaped 28,000 children who were transported behind the Iron Curtain. The Communists intended to take over the government and force the country to accept Communist control. They were almost successful, but the British quickly bolstered the Greek Government forces. Throughout this early period of Communist aggression, the British Government had to bear the major responsibilities.

However, by early 1947 Britain decided that she could no longer carry the burden of assisting Greece in her struggle. Also it had become clear that Greece still faced a long period of warfare. The United States at this time adopted the aid to Greece and Turkey program. On March 3, 1947, I said on the floor of the United States House of Representatives that I was convinced that "Greece and Greece alone is the only hope for democracy in the Balkan area. Greece is the one country in this section where anglo-American ideals and principles have a chance of surviving and spreading. * * * I hope that the United States will do everything in its power to aid Greece."

On May 22, 1947, Congress passed Public Law 75, granting military and economic assistance to Greece and also to neighboring Turkey. This legislation was carefully worked out by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I am happy that as a member of that committee, I supported the legislation vigorously and spoke for its passage when it was considered on the floor of the House. The United States immediately established military and economic missions in Athens. The groundwork was laid for a systematic military campaign to wipe out the Communist force. It was not until 1949, however, that law and order were finally reestablished. In that year a united Greek people, with American assistance, decisively defeated the Communist forces.

REBUILDING THE COUNTRY

Immediately after defeating the Communists, the Greeks turned to the immense task of rebuilding their shattered land. At the same time our own country stepped up its program of aid for the rehabilitation of Greece. In this field again, our assistance was wisely and courageously used. The Greek people, always sturdy, thrifty and hard working, accepted American aid with gratitude and worked with the full measure of their own ability to rebuild their shattered country.

The Greek economy has slowly recovered from the chaos into which it had been plunged. The railroad system has been fully restored and several hundred miles of new track have been added. Two thousand miles of highway have been repaired and resurfaced, and an additional 1,000 miles of highway have been added to the nation's road system. The important Corinth Canal and all Greece's ports have been cleared and put back into operation.

Production in the farmlands has now surpassed prewar levels and thousands of acres of swamp and wasteland in northern Greece have been drained and irrigated for the growing of grain and rice. Great efforts are now being made toward a long-range power development program. Plans are already in operation for the exploitation of Greece's rich mineral deposits.

In spite of the progress that has been made, economic recovery in Greece is still in the making. In per capita income and in natural resources the country is still among the poorest of the Western European family of nations. Yet these sturdy people, our allies in NATO, proceed with their tasks firmly and resolutely, confident that their unity of purpose will bring a steady improvement in their living conditions.

CYPRUS

The same spirit that has characterized the Greek people down through the centuries is evidenced today as they strive for liberty and self-determination on the island of Cyprus. The world is vitally concerned in what is happening on this tiny island and with the future of the Cypriotes, who are striving for self-determination and for union with their mother country, Greece.

I have long been interested and concerned with the situation in Cyprus. In September 1954, I was asked by Mr. Stephen S. Scopas, supreme president, Order of Ahepa, and chairman, Justice for Cyprus Committee, to serve on a national honorary committee entitled, "Justice for Cyprus Committee," composed of prominent Americans to further this democratic and humanitarian cause and to uphold the principle of self-determination. I was pleased and honored to accept. On many occasions I have made my position clear and in letters written to members of the American Hellenic Council of New Hampshire in October 1955, I stated: "At this time I hope to reaffirm my personal views on Cyprus. As you know, they are well known and I have stated them on several occasions. I believe that freedom should be given to the Cypriotes. You can count on my continued interest and cooperation."

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 224

On last Tuesday, the 20th of March, I introduced what is now House Concurrent Resolution 224 which reads as follows:

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage efforts toward independence and self-government truly expressive of the desires of the people and as they show their capability to establish and protect free institutions; and

Whereas the Island of Cyprus, one of the most ancient cradles of Western civilization, is a vital part of the free world area; and

Whereas the island of Cyprus has been since 1925 a crown colony of the United Kingdom; and

Whereas 80 percent of the population of the island of Cyprus is Greek and has always been inhabited by Greeks: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that ways and means should be vigorously explored and found in order to insure the applicability of the principle of self-determination of peoples in the case of the population of the Island of Cyprus."

VIOLENCE MUST CEASE

For the peace and welfare of the entire world, violence must come to an end in Cyprus. The 3 nations primarily concerned are Greece, the United Kingdom, and Turkey. All 3 are our allies through NATO. Greece and Turkey, along with Yugoslavia, are also members of the Balkan Pact. Thus the discord resulting from the situation in Cyprus affects all American interests in that part of the Eastern Mediterranean which borders on the Iron Curtain.

The self-determination of the Cypriotes is a matter in which we are vitally interested. Our own struggle for independence has made us sympathetic to the desire for independence by people wherever they may be. We understand and are sympathetic to the wishes of the Cypriotes for an opportunity to determine their own future, to govern themselves, and to be united with Greece.

Cyprus has become an international question. It is unthinkable that violence should continue on the island, and certainly every effort should be exerted by all the parties concerned in this matter to end violence and to reach a speedy solution to this problem. The Greek people, always dedicated to freedom, are anxious that the Cypriotes determine their own future and until this is accomplished, the problem will not be settled. In my opinion, the removal by the British of Archibishop Makarios from the island of Cyprus was most unfortunate and deeply to be regretted. It is my hope that ways and means will soon be found to enable the highest Cypriote church official of the Greek Orthodox Church, Archbishop Makarios, to return to his people.

It is fervently hoped that all those engaged in the handling of the Cypriote question will do everything possible to terminate violence, that negotiations will be resumed and proceed in good faith, and that Cyprus will soon attain the goal of freedom. Toward the attainment of that goal I pledge my continued efforts.

CONCLUSION

Thus, in commemoration of the aniversary of Greek independence, we see, as we have taken a cursory glance at the history of Greece, both ancient and modern, that there always burns in the heart of every Greek a constant and determined resistance to tyranny. Whether against Darius or Xerxes, the Ottoman empire, the Italian Fascists, the Nazis, or the Communists, the indomitable spirit of the Greek people inspires liberty-loving nations everywhere throughout the world.

So today, as we are engaged in a universal, world-encircling struggle against the evil forces that would destroy the ideas and the ideals that had their birth in Hellas and in Christianity, we receive anew, from the inspiring Hellenic heritage which is a part of the heritage of this republic, the determination and the inspiration to defeat the onslaught of communism against the free world. We will win in this, the greatest struggle for freedom in which men have been engaged.

On this Greek Independence Day in 1956, let all of us dedicate ourselves anew to the ideals of freedom which are at the core of the civilization we cherish. In the development of these ideals, Greece has made an extensive and imperishable contribution. At no time in history has the day we are now commemorating been of deeper significance. The accomplishments made on the Hellenic peninsula are warp and woof of the fabric which constitutes the principles of the free world and the democratic way of life.

Because of Greek accomplishments, the Republic of the United States has been able to develop the greatest democracy the world has ever known. Greece has always carried on a most gallant fight for individual liberty. We salute Greece on this memorable occasion as the freedom-loving nations of the earth march to the future, determined to achieve success in this current universal struggle against communism for the survival of the free world and free men.

Enactment of Poultry Inspection Legislation Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement entitled "Enactment of Poultry Inspection Legislation Imperative."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

The lack of legislation for the mandatory inspection of poultry has in the last few weeks caused bitter consequences in Oregon. Psittacosis or parrot fever, a pneumonia-like illness, has broken out among turkey flocks in the Portland area and has spread to humans.

So far, 2 persons are dead, 24 hospitalized, and 38 ill. The toll may yet be higher. Economic dislocations have resulted in the west coast poultry industry with Washington State clamping a tight embargo on Oregon turkeys and turkey eggs. Consumers, although not necessarily endangered, have probably been sold birds which died of the disease. And the Oregon poultry industry has suffered a severe public relations setback.

These tragic consequences to life and property can be minimized, and perhaps even prevented, by the enactment of poultry inspection legislation. Such legislation is now before the Senate in the form of S. 3176, of which I am a co-author. The Oregon outbreak is a case history in the need for such legislation.

Poultry suffers from some 26 diseases which are transmissible to man. Some of the illnesses are of only academic interest; they are spread so rarely to humans. Others, like psittacosis, cause major epidemics. Texas poultry workers have been the target of several of these outbreaks between 1948 and 1954. The last, in the summer of 1954, hit at least 200 persons with either 1 or 2 fatalities occurring. Outbreaks have also taken place in New Jersey, Nebraska, Virginia, and Iowa.

In February and March the disease came to Oregon in full force. Two turkey breeding flocks, with a total of 10,000 fowls, contracted the illness. These flocks were on farms near Portland on the Columbia River, according to the Portland Oregonian.

The disease soon spread from the turkeys to farm workers. This, by the way, is the first time health officials have found farm workers to have contracted psittacosis from poultry. In previous outbreaks, the United

States Public Health Service reports that only poultry processing workers were affected.

But in Oregon several farmworkers became ill. One died. Although health authorities cannot be certain the death was completely due to psittacosis, they believe the disease was at least a contributing factor.

The diseased poultry was sent to a rendering plant and three processing plants in the Portland area. It spread havoc there. Another man who had been handling the diseased birds died. Other employees became ill with many requiring hospitalization.

The toll now stands at 64. It may actually be higher. Influenza has been prevalent in the Portland area and additional psittacosis cases may have been misdiagnosed for it. The Public Health Service is still sending blood samples from suspect cases to the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga. to determine whether these persons are suffering from the poultry disease.

Psittacosis is a very painful illness, according to medical authorities. I should like to read, Mr. President, a short excerpt of the clinical findings in the Texas outbreaks, as reported in the book, Psittacosis, edited by F. R. Beaudette. It will give the members of this chamber an idea of the human suffering caused by the disease:

"The onset usually was characterized by fever, anorexia, chilly sensations, severe headache, and nausea or vomiting. Unless prompt and vigorous antibiotic treatment was instituted, the disease was slowly progressive and after a few days most patients felt much worse. At the height of the illness the most common complaints were feverishness, headache, cough, weakness, nausea, and loss of appetite. Several patients complained of chills, drenching sweat, and pain or soreness in the chest. Abnormal findings on physical examination usually were negligible at the time of hospitalization, even though the patients were quite toxic, usually with high fever. During the height of illness the patients frequently were delirious or disoriented. The most seriously ill became lethargic or stuperous; this frequently was a cause for comment * * *

"The duration of illness varied from a few days to several weeks. More than half of the patients were ill 2 or 3 weeks. Several patients had relapses; relapses occurred both in treated and untreated cases. Those more seriously ill convalesced slowly, but, excepting the fatal cases, recovery generally was complete and uneventful except for prolonged weakness."

But what about the consumer? So far, he has not been endangered by psittacosis. In fact, no consumer has been reported hurt so far in any American outbreak of this disease. Public health groups emphasize the "so far" however, since they recall that until the Oregon epidemic no farm worker had ever been reported hit by the disease either.

The Portland situation does demonstrate how dead, diseased birds are slaughtered for marketing to consumers just like live healthy ones. In one plant, health authorities found 49 fowls which had previously died of psittacosis were, nevertheless, being processed. Even if psittacosis is definitely found to be nontransmissible to man after the fowl has been killed or has died, I believe the consumer should be protected from unwittingly buying such diseased poultry. There is no reason why he should not be assured of a healthy bird when he pays his hard-earned money.

The psittacosis outbreak has not only caused human suffering, it has also created havoc and fear in agricultural commerce on the west coast. The Washington State Department of Agriculture has clamped a strict embargo agains turkeys and turkey eggs coming from Oregon. Its officials say this bar will be maintained until they are convinced the psittacosis outbreak has been localized.

The embargo is causing considerable hardship to Oregon turkey growers, according to the Oregon Journal. The State is one of the Nation's largest producers of turkeys and turkey eggs and the hatcheries ordinarily sell 60 percent of their products to other States, Washington, Colorado, and Utah usually are the biggest buyers, but now the Washington market has been temporarily shut off.

In addition, the Oregon poultry industry has suffered a serious public relations setback. Needless to say, occurrences such as these, including the dressing of poultry which has previously died of disease, lowers the confidence of the public in poultry. Sales necessarily suffer.

So what is being done about the outbreak? At a conference in San Francisco on March 20, called by the United States Department of Agriculture, it was decided that the fowls be fed antibiotic drugs to wipe out psittacosis among them. A segregation program for diseased or suspect birds was also ordered.

These steps are good as far as they go. But further action must be taken and it is up to us, in Congress, as well as State legislators, to take them.

We, here, must enact a mandatory poultry inspection law, as provided by S. 3176. The before and after slaughter inspection provision of the bill would virtually wipe out the industrial health hazard now posed to poultry workers. We would be able to bring to a minimum, and perhaps completely prevent, deaths and illness, from psittacosis, as are now taking place in Oregon.

The inspection would assure the consumer a clean and healthy product in poultry moving in interstate commerce. He could have complete confidence in the healthfulness and cleanliness of the chickens, the turkeys, and ducks he buys.

The producer and the processor would benefit from a more stable market. And with large outbreaks gone, the embargoes and the resultant economic dislocations would become a thing of the past.

The Oregon psittacosis outbreak demonstrates the imperativeness that we enact S. 3176 as soon as possible. We cannot afford to let human life suffer, as in the Portland area. We cannot afford to let an industry decline. We have a means of dealing with the problem. Let us use it.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the text of an address given by me before the Inland Daily Press Association in Chicago, Ill., on February 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There are many reasons why it is a pleasure for me to speak before the Inland Daily Press Association. It is always a pleasure to appear on a program with our Indiana editor, and my good friend, Stew Riley.

There is a special reason why it is a great satisfaction for me to speak today to this association of newspapermen of our Middle West.

These are not ordinary times. Many things which we have taken for granted are suddenly in jeopardy. Who in the United States, from the days of William Zenger, doubted that freedom of the press had been won for all time? Then suddenly the long hand of Communist power reached out, and seized a quiet Indiana reporter named Bill Oatis. They put him in a Communist jail, subject to we know not what tortures, and kept him there for years, regardless of the power and might of the United States.

Today, we know an ingenious and ruthless enemy of freedom seeks to destroy everything we stand for. But as the danger increases, we learn the old lesson, that we never truly value everything in time of security as we value it in the time of danger.

Even a few years ago, freedom of the press was a legal right, a high point in history, a matter of professional pride—something we could take for granted.

Today, freedom of the press is coming to be as real to all of us as it was in the days of Peter Zenger and John Milton, who won our freedom for us in days of darkness and bitter hate.

About a year and a half ago, I sat in a Senate hearing room and listened to Gen. James A. Van Fleet tell our Subcommittee on Internal Security, how, during the Korean war, we could have beaten Red China, broken the back of communism in Asia, and turned backward the lava flow of communism, for the first time since it erupted in Moscow in November 1917. Standing before a map with a pointer in his hand, General Van Fleet showed us the single railway along the North China coast, which was the only railway the Red Chinese had, to move their troops to Korea and then to supply them. The railway from North China could have been bombed continuously by our Air Force throughout the last 200 miles of its journey to the front.

On our side, the general said, "We had command of the water and air. We had and still have unexcelled bases in Japan and Korea for redeployment. We had a base in Japan fully at our disposal. We had the flank protected by our Navy and all this base here to destroy a Red Chinese Army far from home, well out on the limb, and in great difficulty all the time. That is why I say this was the right place and at the right time, with the wonderful nation of the Koreans, the right ally."

Of course, every one of my listeners knows what happened. Our American boys were not permitted to defend themselves by striking the enemy at his supply lines, his bases, and the bridges across which he sent his troops 24 hours a day.

Another high commanding officer in the Korean theater, Gen. George E. Stratemeyer, described the situation in these historic words, "We were required to lose." Gen. Mark Clark, Adm. C. Turney Joy, and Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, gave our subcommittee more details on this planned disaster. Together with General Van Fleet, they told us how the United Nations violated its own fundamental principle of collective security, when it refused to accept the divisions offered by Chiang Kai-Shek to fight against the aggressors in Korea. Our military leaders showed us how Red China's armies were originally freed to move toward the Yalu, when our Seventh Fleet was ordered by our President to blockade Chiang Kai-Shek on Formosa so he could not strike Red China's flank on the mainland. They showed us how we even put a limit on the number of South Korean soldiers who would be allowed to defend their own country. Of course, that meant more Americans were bound to be killed.

You remember Samson, who was so strong that no one could overcome him, until some one he loved and trusted cut off the long hair, which was the source of his strength.

Like Samson, America was too strong to be defeated except by enemies from within.

All of these limitations and restrictions, all of this policy of shearing Samson's hair, was contrived in Washington. As General Almond expressed it, "It is bad enough to have to fight the enemy; it is terrible to have to fight both the enemy and those that you are supposed to have support from."

We know the excuse given us by the administration in Washington, which conducted itself so that it seemed like an enemy to its own troops in the field. The excuse was that if we allowed American soldiers to fight, as they have always fought at every other time in our history—if we allowed them to fight to win—it might cause the war to spread beyond Korea.

Did this strategy of cutting Samson's hair keep the war from spreading? Or did we really help extend it? If we had whipped Red China in Korea, would she have been able to move against Indo China? If we had whipped Red China in Korea, and released Chiang's forces for an attack on the mainland, would the Red Chinese be building airfields and assembling fleets today, for an attack across Formosa Straits?

These questions answer themselves. But what do they have to do with the subject of my talk here today, namely, "Communist Infiltration of the Press?" They have this to do with it. General MacArthur and every one of the Korean commanders who testified before us unanimously believe that the Red Chinese would never have dared even to enter the Korean war unless they had been told of our "Samson's hair" policy in advance.

Who told them? We don't know for certain who gave the Red Chinese this information, so vital to the course of recent world history. We do know the Communists always cover their penetration in Government offices with parallel penetration into the press. Thus a stream of slanted reports adds to the confusion, while espionage by their agents in the press gives them much unpublished information about what their opponents intend to do.

In London, the head of the American desk in the British Foreign Office was a man named Donald MacLean. "His hand fingered all the crucial inner secrets of the Western Alliance" according to an acknowledgement made on the floor of Parliament itself. Guy Burgess was at the center of British-American secret negotiations in Washington. Today they are both proven Soviet agents living in Moscow.

Fearless reporters in the British press have been tearing away the veil of official secrecy around Burgess and MacLean, since they fled east in 1951. Their findings were finally confirmed by the disclosures in Australia of Vladimir Petrov, a former Soviet spy. From these findings, we learn that MacLean and Burgess were open Communists during their undergraduate days at Cambridge in the 1930's. Even before they left the classroom they traitorously joined, not the Communist Party, but Soviet Intelligence, and provided themselves with a cover by pretending to have abandoned Communism. Note the interply between Government and press. The first job that this concealed Soviet agent, Burgess, obtained, after he left the University, was on a newspaper. He was again trying to get a newspaper job in 1951, when his orders came to head for the Kremlin.

Somewhere in this planned chaos, the Communists were fully informed of our State Department's policy to protect Red China.

How could Americans have accepted this fool's policy? Red China was in the war, not outside. The only question was whether we should attack an enemy already fighting us, or turn the full destructiveness of war upon our friends and allies, the Koreans. This decision to protect Red China made it necessary to bomb the lands and burn the buildings of the brave Korean people, while the territory of Red China was made a privileged sanctuary by our own Government.

Now let's turn the clock back to 1939, when Adolph Hitler was trying to decide whether he would start World War II. The decisive factor in his thinking was this: if we struck toward the West, would he be safe in the East? Would the Soviets be with him or against him? Stalin himself was puzzling over the same question. Whose side would he choose? Would he go along with Britain, France, and Poland in an alliance which could have stayed Hitler's hand, or would he ally himself with Hitler and let loose the Nazi hordes?

Before he made his decision, Stalin had to know what Japan might do. One day, word came to him from Tokyo that Hitler was proposing a German-Japanese alliance against the U. S. S. R. So Stalin moved toward Berlin with a gesture of friendship. That friendship produced the Hitler-Stalin Pact, which started World War II. The man who told Stalin about Hitler's negotiations in Tokyo was one Richard Sorge, who had gone to the Far East years before with the cover of a reporter for Frankfurter Zeitung.

Sorge was the grandson of a man who had been secretary to Karl Marx. He had been an undercover Communist since 1927. The Communist spy ring he organized in the Far East was one of the most deadly in the history of the world. It included Ozaki Hozumi, journalist; Branko De Voukelitch, a journalist; Guenther Stein, a journalist; Kawamura Yoshio, a journalist; Wawi Teikichi, a journalist; Funakshi Hisao, a journalist; Nakanishi Ko, a journalist; and Agnes Smedley, a journalist. At one time or another these men and women had written for Havas News Agency, the Manchurian Daily News, the Berlin Tageblatt, Shankhai Mainichi, the Rengo News Agency, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Times.

Let me dwell for a moment on the case of Agnes Smedley. It is very significant for a number of reasons.

In 1949, the Pentagon published a statement about the Sorge spy ring, based on reports from Major General Willoughby, who was General MacArthur's chief of intelligence in Tokyo. Agnes Smedley was named in this report. She made a tremendous display of outraged indignation. Harold Ickes, who had served so long in the Roosevelt Cabinet, was one of the many powerful people who rushed to her defense. Someone in the War Department backed down, in a shameless display of cowardice, and withdrew the charges against her. Smedley herself threatened to sue General MacArthur, but when General Willoughby publicly stated that he was responsible for the statement that Smedley was a Soviet spy, and he would be delighted to confront her in a lawsuit, she forgot all about her indignation.

She fled to England and died there on the eve of the Korean war. Then it was learned that this "innocent, abused" American journalist had left her ashes and all that she possessed to Chu Teh, the general who was to lead his troops against Smedley's American countrymen only 6 months later.

On the first anniversary of her death, Smedley's ashes arrived in Communist Peiping. An immense celebration was held in her honor. The Communist Kwang Ming Daily contained a whole page of tributes to her from the most important of Red Chinese writers, who praised her without stint for exactly what General Willoughby had said she was, an underground Communist agent through her entire adult life. The Communists boasted of how she had served them as a world propagandist, as an apologist for the Red Chinese army, as a raiser of money for Communist causes, and as an underground agent who used her apartment to hide other agents and send them on their way as couriers for the Communist conspiracy.

Now let's come back a little nearer to the present. You remember, of course, the Australian spy scandals of 1954. You remember how Vladimir Petrov unmasked the Soviet spy ring there. You remember too, that a Royal Commission on Espionage issued a report based on the documents Petrov had given to it.

Here is what that report said on the subject of journalists:

"The interest of the MVD in journalists, and in particular in members of the Parliamentary Press Gallery at Canberra, appears clearly from the material before us. The principal reason for that interest is obvious. Parliamentary journalists are in constant touch with ministers and highly placed officials. They frequently receive 'off the record' and background information, sometimes of an important nature.

"It is apparently the worldwide Soviet practice for Tass representatives to be recruited espionage agents. It certainly was so in Australia, where Nosov, Pakhomov, and Antonov—in succession the Tass men here—were all active MVD cadre workers.

"The study of journalists for the MVD was primarily the task of the Tass representative, who could without exciting attention mix freely with journalists, and would be naturally accepted by them as one of themselves. He is thus in the way of gaining access to such information as they have and may be able to use them as at least unwitting informants."

And only a few short days ago Yuri Rastvorov, another world-famous defector from the Soviets, told our subcommittee that 80 to 90 percent of Tass correspondents are agents of Soviet intelligence.

Against all of this background, which I have detailed to you here, the Subcommittee on Internal Security began last summer an investigation of its own into Communist infiltration of the American press.

Our first witness was Winston Burdett, a well-known commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System, who told us that he had joined a Communist cell on the Brooklyn Eagle in the 1930's. He said the Communist Party had ordered him to become a European correspondent for the Eagle. Why? He told us—in order to perform espionage service for the Kremlin. He also gave us the names of 16 persons whom he had known as Communists, when he belonged to the Brooklyn Eagle cell.

Who were some of those Communists, and what happened to them? One was Alvah Bessie. He went to Hollywood and ultimately became one of the famous "Hollywood Ten." Another was Nat Einhorn. He is now public relations man for the Embassy of Communist Poland. Another was Charles Saul Lewis, whose story is one of those juicy little tidbits we are still finding as we open up new rat holes in this shady business.

Lewis was a $75-a-week copyreader in 1943, when Elmer Davis' OWI put him in its New York office, with responsibility "for direct implementation of United States policy toward allied and neutral countries and the furthering of our aims toward the enemy." Seven months after he landed on the payroll, OWI tried to increase Lewis' salary by nearly 50 percent. The Civil Service Commission raised a howl of protest, but Lewis seems to have known the right people, so the raise went through. A short while after that, he was sent to San Francisco as the personal representative of Elmer Davis to reorganize the San Francisco office. Among his other responsibilities, Lewis "supervised the various language control desks on the output of the Voice of America." He had never been a foreign correspondent. He knew no foreign languages at all when he controlled these language control desks. But there seems to have been something about him, nevertheless, which appealed to the people who ran OWI.

What happened to this former member of the Brooklyn Eagle Communist cell when Germany surrendered? The Office of Military Government took him to Berlin and in a few months he was formulating and directing the implementation of policy governing radio broadcasting in Germany.

German newspapers and political leaders began complaining that the policy our friend Lewis formulated and directed was soft toward communism. The day of the Berlin airlift arrived. It was obvious to anyone that at that moment America needed every possible facility to bring words of freedom and encouragement to the German people. Obvious, that is, to everyone but the man who formulated and directed our broadcasting policy. His method of supporting his country's policy at this perilous moment was to ship a brand new 40,000-watt transmitter out of Berlin itself, just when it was ready to double our broadcasting capacity. Security officials finally caught up with Charles Saul Lewis, but he resigned from Government service rather than face a hearing.

So he came home and returned to private industry. When we put Lewis on the witness stand last summer, he was an employee of a radio station in rural New England. His salary was $70 a week, or $5 less than he was making as a copyreader when OWI clasped him to its bosom back in 1943. Lewis admitted he had been a Communist in the Brooklyn Eagle cell, but he asked us to believe he had renounced communism before he joined OWI, and long before he hustled that radio transmitter away from the Berlin airlift.

Congressional committees are continuously digging out stories like this about Elmer Davis' OWI. It's not hard to understand why Elmer spends so much time in print, on the platform and on the air trying to put congressional committees out of business.

Another witness in our investigation of Communists in the press was Ira Henry Freeman of the New York Times. Mr. Freeman also acknowledged that he had been a Communist in the past, but denied that he was a Communist at present. He gave us the name of the man who had been head of the Times Communist underground in the 1930's. That man bore one of the most famous newspaper names in the United States, but he is dead now. In deference to his family, who are good Americans, the New York Times attorney asked us to leave his name out of public hearings. Against all precedent of the subcommittee, we granted the Times request.

What did the Times do? It published an editorial denouncing the chairman of our subcommittee, Senator EASTLAND, and also the subcommittee counsel, and myself, for daring to call to the witness stand Communists who had been, ever so remotely, connected with the Times. The Times declared that it had been singled out for this attack. Why? Because, the Times said, it was against "many of the things for which Mr. EASTLAND, his colleague, Mr. JENNER, and the subcommittee counsel, stand."

Why did the Times consider it an attack against the Times, when the subcommittee called to the witness stand, certain Communists and ex-Communists who are or had been employed by it? We thought we were attacking, not the New York Times, but the Communist apparatus. We thought the Times would be grateful for the subcommittee's help in getting evidence, under oath, of what they should certainly wish to know.

Why did the Times feel that it was singled out? It is interesting to follow that question. Did the Times mean that other New York newspapers employed as many Communists as the Times employed, but had not been mentioned? If that is what it does mean, will the Times give the subcommittee the names of those Communists on other New York newspapers? But if the charge does not mean this, if the Times has no information about Communists on other New York newspapers, then what is its purpose in trying to persuade its readers all over the world that it has been singled out? Does it by any chance wish us not to subpena those whose Communist activity we have information about, if they are or had been employees of the Times?

The 22d witness was a man who worked on the Times 1 day, and next day became managing editor of the Communist Daily Worker. He told us in vivid detail how the Daily Worker was under the absolute daily discipline of Gerhardt Eisler, the comintern's top agent in the United States. This witness, James Glaser, is presently employed on the New York Post. He has not been a member of the New York Times staff for 21 years. Now, seriously, is it an attack on the New York Times to put this man on the witness stand? Is it an attack on the New York Post to put him on the witness stand? Is the Daily Worker a Communist paper or is it not? We think the testimony James Glaser gave us was vitally important in further uncovering the international Communist conspiracy. Should we have refused to hear him in deference to an employer of 21 years ago?

The 24th witness was Clayton Knowles, who is presently a Times reporter. He told us that he is not a Communist now, but he had been a member of a Communist cell on the Long Island Daily Press in the late 1930's. He gave us important information about that cell. Was it an attack on the New York Times to take his public testimony about a Communist cell on the Long Island Daily Press? Would the Times frankly say it preferred that we let Clayton Knowles testify in secret as a "concealed accuser" of the alleged Communists on the Long Island Daily Press?

The 27th and 28th witnesses were John T. McManus and James Aronson. Both were former Times employees, but they are presently the moving spirits in a weekly newspaper which goes under the title of the National Guardian. And what is the National Guardian? The National Guardian is a direct link with the American brainwashers and torturers, who serve the Chinese Red Army. The National Guardian was the American end of the unspeakably treasonable operation conducted inside Communist China by John W. Powell and his confederates. Powell edited and published the China Review, which the Chinese Communists described to American prisoners of war as "our magazine." American prisoners of war were forced to study and approve the vicious and anti-American lies in Powell's China Review under pain of torture, starvation and death. The National Guardian, was Powell's American agent. Through the Guardian, the Chinese Communists were able to bring pressure on the wives and mothers of American boys held prisoner in Red China. Was it an attack on the New York Times to call John T. McManus and James Aronson to the witness stand? Does the Times mean we should have ignored this service to Red China, in deference to them?

Here are some additional facts which we did not put into the record. I am sure that they will be especially interesting to this audience of newspaper people. You all remember the long hard fight to break the Communist control over the New York Newspaper Guild. You remember that that fight was won in 1947, when John T. McManus was defeated for reelection as president of the New York Guild. "Plain Talk" reported the vote of Times employees in that election. Here is the score, and I quote: "The New York Times (employees) gave the pro-Communist candidate 516 and the anti-Communist candidate 256."

Now let me generalize a moment on this whole question of Communist infiltration of the press. I have told you the facts about Guy Burgess in Washington and London, the Sorge ring in China and Japan, and the Australian apparatus. I have told you the facts about the men who were Communists with Winston Burdett in the United States. What conclusion can we draw from these facts? The conclusion is obvious. The Communist conspiracy is and always has been interested in infiltrating the press, because the press is important. Also a press cover is as good a cover for a Communist agent as any which could be found. Journalists have access to information which never reaches the hands of other citizens. They have opportunities to divert, distract, and misguide public opinion, which are never given to other citizens.

So what should be done to attack this problem? Does it clarify the issues to say that the Subcommittee on Internal Security is against the press, if we hunt out Communist agents who are planted among you? Should those who believe in an independent press raise the cry that the subcommittee is against the press itself? That's the kind of thing some people said back in 1939, when the Dies committee went after Communists in labor unions. They said that Dies was attacking labor itself, didn't they? In the end the CIO had the courage to clean the Communists out of its own ranks, but 10 years had been lost.

What happened when our subcommittee began to hunt Communists in the IPR? We were accused of being the enemy of scholarly research. Guenther Stein and Agnes Smedley were among the IPR "scholars" we were "persecuting." So were Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Frank Coe, Lauchlin Currie, Owen Lattimore, and a whole host of others whose shameful story we put into the record. When we dug out a barrel full of Red agents who had been planted in the faculties of American universities, some people said we were against education. When we dug a barrel full of Communists in the United Nations Secretariat, some people said we were against the United Nations. I don't believe the members of the Inland Daily Press Association think the Subcommittee on Internal Security is against the American press, when we pull the covers off Communists who are hiding within that press. I believe that the members of the Inland Press Association and the great majority of American newspapermen are just as anxious to expose the Communist traitors who have crept in among them as are all other good Americans, regardless of the callings they follow.

I have spoken to you of the Communist efforts to penetrate the press, because that is where your interest lies. We know also of Communist intrigue against our schools, our churches, our labor unions, our business enterprises, and our financial institutions. We know only too well of the unremitting effort to penetrate our political parties, and our Government agencies.

I have spoken of our country as a fortress whose citizens were so just, no decent men wished to attack it, and whose walls were so strong no evil men dared try. Today we are in danger from those who would undermine our walls, and send saboteurs to mingle with us, to destroy us.

It is a lonesome road for those who try to uncover the trail of communism and end its evil power. Every one who has ever touched the Communist evil has paid a high price. But we are beginning to see we are all threatened. We are all needed for defense of the citadel.

We love our country. We would give our lives to save it from destruction. We can save our country against this strange new evil when every American is ready to fight the enemy on his doorstep and ready to work with all other Americans who are defending their own. Then we shall all be soldiers fighting together, to drive this unclean evil force from our land.

H. R. 772

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 29, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I address myself to the proposal which is contained in the bill, H. R. 772, which provides for a modification of the Walter-McCarran Act.

When that bill was before the House, I voted for it. The proposal which I make in my bill would not materially change that bill, but in my opinion, would distinctly eliminate certain inequities to a group of our people. As all of you know, the Walter-McCarran bill followed the same basic principle which had been contained in the Johnson Act of 1925, of which Hiram W. Johnson, our Senator, was one of the coauthors, and Mr. Albert Johnson, of Hoquiam, Wash., was the other coauthor. The principle in the Johnson Act gave preference to the so-called Nordic races, of which I am one and of which I am proud. Also, the classification as to the right of migration into the United States was dated back to 1890 and applied to the population racial pattern at that time. This same principle was carried out in the McCarran Act, which dated back to 1920, in other words, about 30 years back of the time when the bill became effective.

Undoubtedly in the consideration of the bill, it was determined by the evidence before the committee that wrote the bill just how many immigrants we could absorb and be assured that they would readily melt into the population and become good American citizens.

The odd result in both these cases was that, despite the fact that the Nordic races were given preference, they did not take full advantage of the preference given them. This, I understand, was more true when the Walter-McCarran bill was passed than it was at the time the Johnson bill went into effect. However, it is a well-known fact that the Scandinavian countries—Norway, Sweden, and Denmark—scarcely use any of the quota to which they are entitled. This is likewise true of the British Empire. It is also true of the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and to some extent of Germany.

In other words, there are vacancies which could be used by countries that have serious population problems.

I am frank to say that I am speaking of only one country. The one that I am thinking about is Italy. This is due in large part because we have a great many Italians in my congressional district. Many of them, especially the leaders among them, feel that it is unfair to class them as an undesirable group of people who are given a very small quota with no flexibility and a quota that virtually prohibits any migration of their fellow countrymen.

Among the Italian group in my district, I need mention only a few as typical of the kind of people and the part which the Italians contribute in our community life.

Many years ago a lowly fruit peddler migrated from Italy to the United States. He finally landed in San Francisco, and became a peddler of fruit. He made a meager living and later became a businessman who sold fruit wholesale. After he became prosperous, it began to irritate him when he learned of the high rates of interest which the banks at that time charged those who needed to borrow money to invest in their business. This situation grieved him and he decided to find a way to make the borrowing of money a little easier for the borrower who needs credit for his business. In other words, he wished to develop a credit system that he considered equitable. The result was that he and some others acquired a bank, which they called the Bank of Italy, and whose policy it was to make business loans easier for the businessman.

That bank prospered and began to buy up branch banks in various parts of California. It later changed its name to Bank of America, and as perhaps all of you know, today there are 555 branches in California of the parent Bank of America.

There is no doubt in my mind that, if Mr. Giannini had had merely the ambition to become a wealthy man, he could have died worth from ten to fifty million dollars. The instincts of the man became absolutely apparent when his will was probated. It showed that he had a personal wealth of $445,000. It also provided stupendous gifts for agricultural research to the University of California, and to other public, worthy institutions. In other words, the man was not the grasping type that it was anticipated he would be by some people, due to the large bank over which he was the dominant figure.

His son, who later became the president of the bank, and his family carried on the benefactions and policies which Mr. A. P. Giannini started. Is it not natural that those people should feel that they are discriminated against because unfortunately some persons of Italian birth have become criminals. They are as ashamed of that as we are. And it is unfortunate that frequently idle gossip is indulged in that the great mass of Italians in some manner condone the criminal conduct of some of those that have been convicted, and some that have not been convicted but who have been born in Italy and migrated to America.

I need but mention another man, who had much the same kind of a career as Mr. Giannini. He also started as a peddler of fruit and soon became one of the largest agriculturists and most humane agriculturist in the State of California. I refer to Mr. Di Giorgio. This man farmed vast areas of fertile land in the San Joaquin Valley. He raised many different kinds of fruit and nut crops. He had a big office in New York where his goods were distributed to the trade in that large metropolitan area. In the State of California, we have a great many migratory laborers. The reason is that they harvest one crop and then they must go to another place where a different crop comes in. Many of them start in the lower part of California, and work their way through the various stages of the crops clear up to the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

The squalid way in which these workers lived attracted the attention and the sympathy of Mr. Di Giorgio. He realized that they were human just like he was, and that they had families and should have a chance to raise their families in a home environment like all Americans expect.

Consequently, he was one of the pioneers in trying to provide labor for these migrants all through the year. In the wintertime he would have the ranch land plowed; his employees would fix the fences; they would do all kinds of work in the offseason which would keep them busy and also improve the ranch for the owner. Recognizing that the happiness of a family revolves around the home, Mr. Di Giorgio started to build houses for his workers. He sold them for less than they cost, and permitted the persons who bought them to buy on the installment plan. The result was that he had satisfied and contented workers. A group of labor union people at one time boycotted the place, claiming that what he was doing was unfair to labor. Remember there was no strike among the laborers, they were thoroughly satisfied. Apparently the union decided that the laborers must be organized. They were unwilling to become organized as they felt they did not require to be organized to obtain good treatment from Mr. Di Giorgio. The result was that the Labor Committee of the House of Representatives some years ago sent out a group to look into the matter, and they found that every single laborer on the ranch of Mr. Di Giorgio was thoroughly satisfied with the treatment that he was being given, including the wages and the living conditions. The result was that there was no more agitation concerning the workmen on the Di Giorgio ranch.

This man also, upon his death, gave a great deal to charitable institutions. He was a wonderful example for men who are financially successful to leave posterity something as an indication of their gratitude for the opportunity which has been theirs to accumulate funds and to become an important person in the community or in the State and Nation.

I wish to mention one other individual who happens to be a close, personal friend of mine who would not give me permission to do this if I asked him. However, I feel that he is typical of the people of the Italian race that live in our area. His name is Philip Cavalero. He is a lawyer of tremendous ability. His father was a farmer. He went through the schools of San Joaquin County and then he determined to go to Stanford University. This was by his own efforts and by helping his father, who was kind enough to pay him for his work. At Stanford he became one of the best debaters in the university. He won the Carnot medal as the best debater in the college. After completing his academic course, and his law course, he was admitted to the bar of California, and shortly thereafter he became a member of the firm with whom he still works.

The name of the firm is Rutherford, Jacobs, Cavalero, and Dietrich. Mr. Cavalero is one of the best water lawyers in the State of California. He is a thoroughly ethical, capable, successful member of the bar of California.

These are three typical examples of what the Italians are in our area. Also, among them we have some of the finest vegetable crops to be found anywhere. The Italian gardeners of San Joaquin County, and the Italian gardeners of Lodi, Calif., have an organization and once a year they have a great picnic. The output of agriculture crops by these groups staggers the imagination, and it is one of the things that has helped make San Joaquin County, the fifth county in the point of dollar value of their crops in the entire Nation. Frequently I get things from them, such as asparagus, peaches, cherries, and so forth that I distribute to the Members of the House.

This all leads me to say why is it not possible to give the home country of these remarkable persons a little better opportunity to send people to America to occupy the spaces which are not taken by other nationalities. We must look further still to understand really how disappointed the American-Italian feels by virtue of some of the provisions of this law.

I frequently listen to the TV, and I am especially interested in hearing tuneful songs sung by people that know how to do it. One of my favorites is Perry Como. He is a remarkable individual. Just looking at him one could tell that he was modest and kind, as well as extremely capable in his chosen field of endeavor. He is merely symbolic of many others in all fields of endeavor in our life, many of whom were immigrants.

In the long span of history, I doubt if there is any country in the world that has contributed as much as Italy. They contributed Christianity, law, invention, science, architecture. A study of their past shows that in practically every century they have played a dominant part since long before the Christian era in making contributions to mankind. Therefore, I am hoping that the bill, which I have and which a number of other colleagues have, will be given serious consideration to the end that the unfortunate situation in which Italy finds itself, due largely to a mad dictator who domineered and almost ruined the entire nation, makes their population situation that much more difficult. Mussolini could have had a place in history as one of the great men of this era. He had an empire in Africa, which I have visited where he could put his excess population, but he threw it all away in his frenzied demand for political power and domination.

We must consider many of the cultural things that Italians have contributed to the world. Italian artists have contributed their experience and creative talents to the construction and decoration of buildings for monarchs and religious communities since Carlovingian times. Later, the famous masters of Como and campione participated in creating cathedrals in Spain, France, Germany, and Hungary; and the Roman Piero Oderisi of the Cosmati school, built the two earliest tombs destined for English Kings—Edward I and Henry III—in Westminster Abbey, in the 14th century. During this century, Italian artists participated in building the Papal Palace of Avignon, and frescoed it; among these artists, the great Sienese Simone Martini was outstanding. Others were in France and Bohemia at this time, and a follower of Giovanni Pisano built the Mausoleum of Saint Eulalia in the cathedral of Barcelona. Later, Italian artists succeeded in replacing the Gothic style throughout Europe with Renaissance classics. Much more could be said about the influence of these artists. Another group of artists and architects decorated the Chateau of Fontainebleau magnificently, and made of it a model of style, and a school for future French art.

In the 17th century, the celebrated Taj Mahal of Agra, one of the marvels of Indian architecture was built by the Venetian Girolamo Veronese with craftsmen he brought with him.

Italian explorers like Marco Polo unlocked unknown parts of the world.

Marconi discovered wireless telegraphy. An early Italian scientist, Leonardo da Vinci—1452–1519—who was also a sculptor and artist and painter predicted that some day motive power would propel machines in the air to vie with the birds. In the First World War the Italians built Capronis and other models of planes that were used in the prosecution of the war. The author of this statement served in France with Fiorello La Guardia at a French field where we both were learning to fly Nieuports and other French planes. Fiorello was sent to Italy because of his knowledge of the Italian language and I learned that he flew some Capronis in combat on the Italian front.

Italian painters decorated the Capitol Building where we hold our sessions of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate holds their sessions.

We certainly must recognize that Italy, the nation, has made tremendous contributions during the long period of its existence.

We should not discard or ignore these tremendous contributions in every field of endeavor because perchance a few bad men of Italian birth have become criminals or gone sour and disgraced their native land by their un-Christian-like conduct.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Master of us all, midst the tumult of these earth-shaking days with all their angry fury, we come to this shrine of Thy grace seeking the unshaken assurance of those whose minds are stayed on Thee. At this altar of prayer in the radiant afterglow of Easter, with its thrilling message of the risen life, steady us with the realization that back of all the dark tragedy now plaguing the world there is the permament good of Thy purpose for all mankind, in which we may believe and to which we must be loyal if life is to be saved from frustration at last.

And so, returning to the pressing problems of state, we beseech Thee, empower these servants of the Nation's welfare to bring to their waiting tasks minds to be illumined with kindling thoughts that flame for Thee and for all Thy children, lips to be touched by the burning coals of Thy cleansing that Thou mayest speak through them, wills that glow with holy zeal to do Thy will, and eyes that may see the invisible with the far look of a faith in things that shall abide beyond our earthly years. And so we pray that Thou wilt direct, control, suggest, this day, all we design or do or say. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 29, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of March 29, 1956, the following message from the House was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

On March 30, 1956:

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of

the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 28, 1956, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On April 2, 1956:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4909. A bill relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership-corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership-corporations law of the State of New York; with amendments (Rept. No. 1722); ordered to be printed.

On April 3, 1956:

By Mr. SMATHERS, from the Select Committee on Small Business:

A report entitled "Military Procurement—1956—Volume 1" (Rept. No. 1723); ordered to be printed.

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 29, 1956:

On April 7, 1956:

Mr. GEORGE, from the Select Committee for Contribution Investigation, pursuant to Senate Resolution 205 establishing a select committee to investigate circumstances involving alleged improper attempts through political contributions to influence the vote of Senator CASE of South Dakota on the so-called natural-gas bill (Rept. No. 1724); ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of March 29, 1956,

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 30, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On March 29, 1956:

S. 1271. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1272. An act to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes;

S. 1585. An act to provide for the return to the town of Hartford, Vt., of certain land which was donated by such town to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital and which is no longer needed for such purposes; and

S. 3452. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 324), by increasing the appropriation authorization for the aircraft control and warning system.

On April 2, 1956:

S. 760. An act for the relief of Pietro Meduri;

S. 1992. An act to provide for the conveyance of a certain tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association; and

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimate for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Lewis R. Knox to be postmaster at Helena, Mont., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON OPERATION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (Public Law 239, 83d Cong.), I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Operation of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1956.*

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1956.*

(NOTE.—Only copy of report transmitted to the House of Representatives.)

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy, under title 10, United States Code, section 1056, vice the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1595, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire if this is the measure on which an agreement to vote next Wednesday is to be opposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas proposes to propound such a unanimous-consent agreement as soon as there is a quorum call. The Senator from Texas will propound the agreement in accordance with the conversation with the Senator from Arizona.

The Senator from Texas has so drafted the unanimous-consent request, and intends to propound it as soon as the absence of a quorum can be suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request to proceed to the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I have sent to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said concurrent resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said concurrent resolution debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said concurrent resolution, allot additional time to any Senator or Senators during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the conference report on the farm bill probably will reach the Senate on either Wednesday or Thursday of this week. The conference report will be a privileged matter, when it is received, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; it will be a privileged matter, and may be taken up whenever it is received.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Without objection, the agreement is entered.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Wednesday next, it convene at 11 o'clock a. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to state that it is the intention of the leadership on both sides of the aisle to have our action on the unfinished business, the concurrent resolution relating to a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, concluded at an early hour on Wednesday, perhaps at 1:30 or 2 p. m. If the House adopts the conference report on the farm bill by that time, it is the intention of the leadership to have action on the pending concurrent resolution followed immediately by the consideration of the conference report on the farm bill, and to have the Senate remain in session until late that evening, if necessary, in order to try to dispose of that measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the eminent majority leader what his plans are in regard to taking up the so-called bank-holding bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the moment we have no plans in regard to that bill. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling that measure is in Yugoslavia. I called him this morning, to see whether that measure could be brought up today. But until he returns—and I am not informed when he will be ready to have that measure brought before the Senate—I cannot make any definite announcement in that regard. I shall inform my friend, the Senator from Illinois, as soon as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] returns, and we can ascertain the schedule from him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have before me the credentials of the Honorable THOMAS A. WOFFORD, Senator-designate from the State of South Carolina. The credentials are signed by the Governor of our State, the Honorable George Bell Timmerman, Jr. I send the credentials to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read by the legislative clerk, and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Columbia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of South Carolina, I, George Bell Timmerman, Jr., the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint, effective April 5, 1956, the Honorable THOMAS A. WOFFORD a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of the Honorable Strom Thurmond is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Gov. George Bell Timmerman, Jr., and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 20th day of March, the year of our Lord nineteen hundred fifty-six.

GEORGE BELL TIMMERMAN, JR.,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. WOFFORD, escorted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, advanced to the Vice President's desk; and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President, and was subscribed by the new Senator.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour there be a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. Doc. No. 110)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of $752,779, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AVAILABILITY OF EMERGENCY CREDIT TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS WITH COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, Puerto Rico, between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the 6 months from July 1, 1955, through December 31, 1955, no new contracts were negotiated for research and development work; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the period July 1-December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant, to law, a report on the international educational exchange program, Department of State, for the period January 1–June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the international educational exchange program, for the calendar year 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT, RELATING TO CERTAIN PUBLIC NOTICES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA RAILROAD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Little Wood River project, Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINAL PROOF OF SETTLEMENT ON UNSURVEYED PUBLIC LAND IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF HOMESTEAD ALLOTMENTS TO INDIANS OR ESKIMOS IN ALASKA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians or Eskimos in Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1343 OF TITLE 18, U. S. CODE, RELATING TO FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 29, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, Portland, Oreg., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF ANNUAL MEETING OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19–20, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PAYMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CORRECTION OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the payment of claims arising from the correction of military or naval records, for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government, and to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report, for the fiscal year 1955, together with the reports of the annual and special meetings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN DEFECTORS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain alien defectors (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Nikola Mirko Vujosevic or Vujosevich from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 18, 1955, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Tang Tsou from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted by him to the Senate on August 1, 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONFORMATION OF APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION OF CHIEF LEGAL OFFICER, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that society, for the year ended April 1, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation and appropriate moneys as proposed in H. R. 4446, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of domiciliary and hospital buildings of State veterans' homes by a grant to subsidize, in part, the capital outlay cost

"Whereas there is an alarming shortage of hospital and domiciliary beds in California provided by the United States Veterans' Administration for veterans of all wars;

"Whereas the ever-increasing migration of veterans into California from every State in the Nation has brought here hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of veterans; and

"Whereas the veterans population of California stands today as one of if not the largest in the United States; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has recognized assistance given by the States in their care for thousands of disabled war veterans through Federal aid subsidies in part payment for day-by-day operating expenses to maintain establishments for the care of such veterans; and

"Whereas a master-building program of the Veterans' Home of California ultimately will provide hospital and domiciliary beds for 3,300 disabled California veterans; and

"Whereas the construction of four new buildings containing 800 beds for such purposes will be urgently needed in the next few years; and

"Whereas financial assistance in part will be needed from the Federal Government for construction of these buildings: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature of this State respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and appropriate moneys as proposed in H. R. 4446, 84th Congress, 1st session, introduced by the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, Congressman, Eighth District, California, which provides States with Federal aid in part for construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of State-operated soldiers' homes; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature at its 1955 session adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions, relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas the Congress has not, up to this time, enacted such Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation pertaining to the highways of the Nation, which, if enacted by the Congress, will be of great importance to California, not only as to that portion of the national system of interstate highways but to all other public highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation at the current session for the completion of the system of interstate highways, without interfering with the orderly allocation of funds to the other systems of Federal-aid highways, and that such legislation should recognize the principles set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, giving particular emphasis to:

"1. That the formula for the allocation of funds among the various States for the improvement of the system of interstate highways should be based upon the cost of completing the system in each State, as related to the cost of completing the entire national system.

"2. That any provision for credit by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the national system be subordinated to the completion of the entire system and that if credit is to be given to any State therefor, such credit be considered as a portion of the allocation to such State under the above formula.

"3. That in formulating such legislation the Congress give due consideration to the experience and demonstrated ability of the States to perform highway work under existing Federal and State law and procedures that have been promulgated thereunder; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution and copies of Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions, be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the President of the United States has placed before Congress the matter of the improvement of the roads, streets, and highways throughout the Nation, giving special emphasis from the standpoint of national defense to the rapid completion of the Interstate System of Highways; and

"Whereas there are now numerous bills pending before the Congress relating to the improvement of the Federal aid systems of highways; and

"Whereas the Interstate System is now recognized by Federal law as including 40,000 miles of highways throughout the United States but at the present time only 37,600 miles have been designated as being on said system, it being understood that that portion of said remaining 2,400 miles which will be allocated to California will comprise circumferential and other connecting routes in metropolitan areas; and

"Whereas that portion of the Interstate System located within California includes highways most seriously deficient from the standpoint of traffic volumes, traffic safety, and structural inadequacy; and

"Whereas the completion of the Interstate System from Federal funds would permit the more rapid correction of the remaining deficiencies on the public streets and highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation for the completion of the Interstate System within the shortest feasible period of time, and that such legislation should recognize the following principles:

"1. That the provisions for the Federal financing of the Interstate System should

permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

"2. That the program for improving the Interstate System should not interfere with the orderly allocation of funds for the other Federal-aid systems of highways.

"3. That the formula for the allocation of additional funds among the various States for improvement of the Interstate System should be based upon the needs for improvement of that system in the various States, and that such formula should be made definite and certain, so that the various States may plan and construct said Interstate System as rapidly as possible in an orderly manner.

"4. That the provisions requiring States to match Federal funds for the improvement of the Interstate System should not require a greater outlay by the States for such system than was required in amount to match the 1956 allocations for that system under the 1954 Federal Highway Act.

"5. That the preparation of the plans and specifications of projects, their priority, and the handling of the construction work be substantially as has previously been provided under existing Federal-aid legislation.

"6. That if credit is to be given to any State by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the Interstate System, the legislation be so drafted that such credits be taken into consideration in computing the allocation formula, so that no delays will result while such credits are being computed; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

"Whereas the California Legislature at its 1955 session adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, chapter 126 of resolutions, relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas the Congress has not, up to this time, enacted such Federal highway legislation; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress legislation pertaining to the highways of the Nation which, if enacted by the Congress, will be of great importance to California, not only as to that portion of the National System of Interstate Highways but to all other public highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation at the current session for the completion of the National System of Interstate Highways, without interfering with the orderly allocation of funds to the other systems of Federal-aid highways, and that such legislation should recognize the principles set forth in Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, giving particular emphasis to:

"1. That the formula for the allocation of funds among the various States for the improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways should be based upon the cost of completing the system in each State, as related to the cost of completing the entire national system.

"2. That any provision for credit by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the national system be subordinated to the completion of the entire system and that if credit is to be given to any State therefor, such credit be considered as a portion of the allocation to such State under the above formula.

"3. That in formulating such legislation the Congress give due consideration to the experience and demonstrated ability of the States to perform highway work under existing Federal and State law and procedures that have been promulgated thereunder; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution and copies of Senate Joint Resolution No. 28, California 1955 Statutes, Chapter 126 of Resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the 'Status of Forces Treaty'

"Whereas on June 19, 1951, the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, including the United States, entered into an agreement commonly referred to as the 'Status of Forces Treaty,' which was ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953; and

"Whereas, this agreement confers on each of the contracting nations criminal jurisdiction over the military personnel of the other contracting nations stationed in the former; and thus permits American military personnel accused of crime to be tried in the courts and according to the laws of other countries; and

"Whereas, in many countries where American military personnel are stationed the law does not provide the same safeguards as are provided by the courts of this country, including such fundamental requirements of due process as a full statement of the specifications of the crime alleged, right to bail, presentation to the grand jury in all serious cases, fair trial by an unbiased judge and jury, confrontation of witnesses, presumption of innocence, and entitlement to counsel; and

"Whereas foreign military personnel stationed in this country would under the agreement be placed in a better position than our servicemen since they would be entitled to the safeguards mentioned, indicating that the agreement is not truly reciprocal; and

"Whereas there is no justification whatever for this country continuing such an arrangement that is so unfair and unjust to those who are making the greatest sacrifices to serve the Nation and who are entitled to the full protection of our Government; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Members of the Legislature of the State of California take this means to indicate their dissatisfaction with the so-called 'Status of Forces Treaty,' and to urge the Federal Government to terminate that agreement at the earliest possible time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of goverenment, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same

"Whereas the people and the General Assembly of South Carolina have voted to increase substantially outlays and taxes in South Carolina for our public schools and other needed projects which it is the exclusive responsibility of the State to provide; and

"Whereas greater sums will be necessary to meet pressing needs; and

"Whereas with the increase and extension of the scope and magnitude of Federal taxation there is a resulting diminution of revenue sources available to the State and a consequent diminution of revenue sources of remaining to local governments; and

"Whereas it is obvious that the people of the United States are confronted with a financial crisis, unparalleled in history, with our future form of government turning on the decision as to how to finance these vital State and local functions from State and local revenues as they should be under our form of government; and

"Whereas the time has now come for Congress to face this problem realistically and to recognize that an evaluation must be made of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power and the effect thereof upon the three levels of government; and to this end, Congress should initiate such a study by the creation of a joint and representative body which will be vested with the authority and duty to consider and make such recommendations as may be necessary to preserve State sovereignty in this respect, including the consideration, should such be deemed necessary, of an appropriate constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power; and

"Whereas Congress should then effectuate said recommendations to propose such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary or by the proposal of an amendment embodying said recommendations to be submitted to the States for ratification: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully petitioned to institute a study of the Federal taxing power and fiscal policy as they affect each level of government, by the creation of a joint and representative body which will include in its consideration the propriety of a constitutional limitation upon the Federal taxing power in order to preserve State sovereignty.

"2. That the findings and recommendations of such a body by proposing such constitutional amendments as may be deemed necessary and appropriate or by the proposing by Congress of an appropriate constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

"3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from this State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the increased importation of numerous products that come into competition with the output of factories, farms, and mines of Pennsylvania, replacing the products of Pennsylvania's industries, is a constant menace to the State's continuing economic stability; and

"Whereas the lower wages paid abroad make it impossible for many of our smaller and medium-sized producers to compete with imports without resorting to ruinous price cutting, which in turn would result either in financial losses or heavy pressure for wage reductions and outright unemployment; and

"Whereas our national obligations have reached such extreme proportions that the national income must be maintained at its present unprecedented high level, or close thereto, lest we become insolvent; and

"Whereas unemployment caused by the imports of residual oil, which increased 300 percent from an average of 45 million barrels in 1946, to more than 136 million barrels

in 1954, or the yearly equivalent of 33 million tons of coal; and unemployment caused by imports of crude oil; various types of glass, steel, aluminum, brass, and zinc products; pottery and chinaware; granite, tiles, cement, hardboard, plywood, hardware, plumbing, flat glass, and other building supplies; lace, carpets, and all kinds of woolen, cotton, and synthetic fiber manufactured goods; leather and fabric gloves; bicycles; hydraulic turbines; machine tools and other machinery; heavy electrical equipment and other electrical industry products and electronics; watches, clocks, and parts; optical industry products; cutlery; scientific apparatus; pencils and pens; pins, clips, and fasteners; soft fiber; insulation board and manufactured cork products; chemicals; toys, mushrooms; farm, dairy, and dried-milk products; wallpaper, hats, and millinery; printing industry products; ladies handbags and leather goods; nails, wire, screws, bolts, and nuts and many other commodities; will render the upholding of the economy at its highest levels most uncertain and difficult, unless all import trade is placed on a fair competitive basis and the potential injury therefrom thus eliminated; and

"Whereas agricultural products such as wheat, wheat flour, cotton, butter, cheese, and peanuts enjoy the protection of import quotas; and

"Whereas a maximum of satisfactory trade results from a prosperous domestic economy freed from the threat of a breakdown resulting from unfair import competition: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas, against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade-agreements legislation be amended accordingly; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress requesting the passage of legislation requiring the Federal Government to defray costs of cleaning, dredging, and widening the Blackstone River channel

"Whereas there is a dire necessity because of floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God to clean, dredge, and widen the Blackstone River channel, particularly that portion of the river in Massachusetts; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has been unduly burdened with overwhelming expenses because of said floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God; and

"Whereas the defraying by the Federal Government of the costs of such improvements would be of inestimable benefit to the inhabitants of the Blackstone Valley in particular, and to all of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth, in general; and

"Whereas such improvements are a normal and natural function of the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to pass necessary legislation defraying such costs; and be it further

"Resolved, That the State secretary send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Chief Engineer of the War Department."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel

"Whereas the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, and France by a tripartite declaration have guaranteed territorial integrity of the State of Israel; and

"Whereas certain Arabian countries by the acceptance of arms from Communist countries have provided the Soviet Union with the opportunities to advance Communist influence in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the influx of arms into Arabian countries disturbs the military balance of power in the Middle East, and thereby threatens the peace of the world; and

"Whereas the United States has recently shipped tanks to Saudi Arabia in direct violation of the declared United States policy of discouraging an arms race in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the State of Israel has requested from the State Department of the United States permission to purchase certain arms and supplies in order to meet the threat of certain Arabic countries, which request has not been acted upon after a period of 4 months from the time of such request: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to insure the discouragement of a potential arms race in the Middle East; that the United States authorize the sale of arms and supplies to Israel in order to provide for the security of Israel and to establish a balance of military power between Israel and the Arab nations; that further shipment of arms to Arab nations be prohibited; and that steps be taken to enforce the provisions of the tripartite declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France, thereby insuring the territorial integrity of the State of Israel, and that such action be taken as may best promote peace between Israel and the Arab countries and throughout the Middle East; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the United States Secretary of State, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to retirement benefits for certain persons; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Uniontown, Pa., chapter, Order of Ahepa, signed by William Gregory, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization, favoring self-determination by the people of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a public assembly held at St. George Greek Orthodox Memorial Parish House, Springfield, Mass., relating to self-determinatian of Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Tallahassee, Fla., favoring the widespread dissemination of the recommendations and findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from the San Jose Chamber of Commerce, San Jose, Calif., signed by Russell E. Pettit, manager, favoring the continuance for 2 years of the Advisory Committee on Weather Modification; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by Pastorius Unit 38, Steuben Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a complete return of privately owned German and Japanese property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Tallahassee, Fla., favoring a proclamation that all election days be patriotic holidays for the purpose of displaying the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Lima, Ohio, Traffic Club, member of the Associated Traffic Clubs of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram, in the nature of a petition, signed by Mr. B. S. Williams, of Atlanta, Ga., favoring the enactment of legislation to create the office of Second Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A statement adopted by the general executive board of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, relating to the so-called manifesto of southern Congressmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the California Highway Commission, Sacramento, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to complete the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the New York chapter, American Institute of Architects, New York, N. Y., protesting against any alteration of the east front of the Capitol Building in Washington, D. C., to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by Columbus Council 126, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial requesting the Arizona congressional delegation to initiate legislation in the Congress of the United States stabilizing the financial features of the program for the education of Indian children within this State

"To the HONORABLE CARL HAYDEN AND THE HONORABLE BARRY M. GOLDWATER, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES; AND THE HONORABLE JOHN J. RHODES AND THE HONORABLE STEWART L. UDALL, MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The people of the State of Arizona are concerned about the education of Indian children in the public schools of the State.

"In view of the total Indian population of some 70,000 and the anticipated increase in the number of Indian children of school age, and the tremendous amount of land held in trust for the Indian people and which is exempt from State and local taxation, the Federal Government must continue to bear a very substantial part of the cost of integrating the Indian children in the public schools of the State.

"We are aware that the Federal Government has recognized, at least for the time being, that this financial responsibility is theirs.

"We are concerned, however, and rightfully so, over the possibility that the entire financial burden may at any time be shifted to the taxpayers of the State.

"We are justified in this concern because of the recent negotiation of contracts for the

integration of Indian children in our school system. These contracts obligate the school districts of the State to accept such children over a period of 20 years; yet the contracts declare, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, that the life of the contracts depends on the availability of Federal funds.

"The State and the school districts should not be subjected to this uncertainty.

"Hence, we request that you initiate legislation which will insure, as far as is reasonably possible, to this State the continued Federal responsibility for the education of Indian children over the 20-year contractual period now embodied in such contracts."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act as set forth in the provisions of sections 276a through 276a–5, title 40, United States Code annotated

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"It appears that the United States Government may in the near future undertake a huge program of highway construction and a school building-construction program throughout the United States. Moreover, the development of these programs will undoubtedly require the employment of thousands of wage earners in each of the 48 States by contractors who are the successful bidders for the particular work to be performed.

"In view of these circumstances it is important to the economy of our country and for purposes of equity that persons employed be paid wages based on the prevailing wage for corresponding types of work in the geographical area where the work is being performed.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact legislation extending the provisions of sections 276a through 276a–5, title 40, United States Code annotated, known as the Bacon-Davis Act.

"2. The Bacon-Davis Act as now constituted prescribes that the prevailing wages shall be paid to persons employed in constructing, repairing or altering public buildings or public works. The members of the House of Representatives urge that the Bacon-Davis Act be extended to apply in an equal manner to highway construction and school-building programs."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 13

"Memorial requesting Congress to create a program for the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians for the protection and better utilization of the resources of the tribe

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Papago Tribe of Indians, of about 8,000 population, is located on the second largest reservation in the United States, comprising over 2,500,000 acres of desert and mountainous land in southern Arizona. The area, although vast in size, has few known resources. This tribe, because of conditions beyond its control, is in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government.

"A major need of this tribe of Indians is more adequate educational facilities and opportunities. At present the reservation has only 6 Government schools to provide education for about 1,250 children. Some of the schools teach only through the sixth grade; others go to the eighth grade; and only one, the Sells Consolidated School, has a ninth grade. In addition 5 Catholic mission schools serve about 350 children. Some of these schools receive Federal assistance because there are no Government-supported schools near enough so that children in these areas can be served by Government buses. Distances from Papago communities to a Government school are, in some cases, 20 miles. There are no opportunities for Papago children to attend high school on the reservation, and opportunities for the Papagos to attend college anywhere are limited, as is true for all Indians throughout the Western United States.

"While medical facilities have been expanded since the United States Public Health Service assumed the responsibility for the Papago medical program in July 1955, much remains to be done to improve the tragic and deplorable Papago health situation. There are no obstetrical facilities on the entire reservation. It is estimated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that the life expectancy at birth for a reservation Papago is about 20 years and that 1 infant out of every 4 dies during the first year. This infant mortality rate is the worst in the United States.

"A hospital at Sells to replace the one which burned in 1947 is essential. The present necessity of removing sick persons to distant hospitals in Tucson and Phoenix remains as one of the principal barriers to the Papagos accepting modern medicine. Also there is no tuberculosis sanatorium on the entire reservation and the death rate from this disease is about seven times greater than the average throughout the rest of the United States. Another basic health need is the establishment of more field clinics. At present there are only 3 clinics on the entire reservation to care for all the Papagos, 1 at Sells, 1 in Santa Rosa, and 1 in the isolated village of Pisinimo. This last-mentioned clinic, built by the Papago villagers themselves, is an indication of how desperately field clinics are needed on this reservation. These three field clinics are not staffed by doctors, being visited at intervals only by a doctor.

"The Papago Indian Reservation, located in an extremely arid region, has insufficient wells for both stock water and domestic purposes, an average of only about one well per village. While domestic water storage has been improved during the past year, there are still villages where the only sources of drinking water are open ponds and stock tanks. This water, used for household purposes without boiling, is a major health hazard on the reservation.

"Nor does the irrigation problem stand in any better light. There are only about 15,000 acres or less than one-half of 1 percent of the total reservation area, which are irrigable land. This small amount can support at best only about 200 families of the 1,200 families living on the reservation. Additional farmland can be developed only if additional deep wells are drilled.

"The poverty of the reservation makes it necessary that many members of this tribe must seek all or part of their livelihood away from it. Annually, over half of the families move off the reservation for work in the mines and agricultural fields of southern Arizona. However, at present no effort is being made to deevlop this Papago effort to attain economic self-sufficiency. Moreover, this migration results in many children being taken out of school and permitted to work in the fields in violation of the child-labor laws.

"At present, the only Federal program for the development of Papago workers is directed toward relocating them in distant urban areas. Under this high-cost program other States get our best Papago citizens and Arizona is left with many economic-problem cases. Relatively large numbers return to the reservation, some with severe social maladjustments as the result of their experiences. Thus the relocation program is now a detriment to Arizona and there is need of modification of same to a more local program. Federal assistance is needed to assist additional Papagos to find work in agriculture, mining, construction, and industry in areas reasonably near to the reservation. This, together with a program of adult and vocational education, including classes to learn to read, write, and speak English, so that those already employed can be upgraded, would go far toward helping solve these important social and economic problems.

"Any of the above circumstances would of itself be sufficient to justify immediate action by the Federal Government; taken in concert the situation of the Papago is desperate beyond human conception. They underlie fundamental social, economic, and health problems which will become increasingly serious and difficult to cope with if not met comprehensively now.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, respectfully prays:

"1. That, although Congress saw fit to close the Papago Reservation to mineral entry, thus undoing an injustice of long standing, for which the citizens of Arizona, both Indian and non-Indian, are grateful, their mineral resources are of no value to these poverty-stricken Papagos as long as they remain undeveloped.

"2. That a survey of the mineral potential of the Papago Reservation be made; that since the tribe has no funds for this survey, Federal funds be made available therefor.

"3. That sufficient funds be appropriated by Congress to create and make effective a comprehensive rehabilitation program to promote the economic and social development of the Papago Indians, such comprehensive program to include:

"(a) An education survey of the reservation to determine exact needs; enough elementary schools on the reservation to permit a choice between Federal and church schools; funds for construction of dormitories in towns adjacent to the reservation to afford Papago children the opportunity to attend junior and senior high schools, and also the opportunity to attend colleges off the reservation.

"(b) Funds for rigid enforcement of child-labor laws and school-attendance laws.

"(c) Efforts to integrate Papagos into the off-reservation economic life of the State since not all can support themselves on the reservation; funds for surveys of the Papago labor potential, and to provide a special Papago placement program in Arizona which would serve as an alternative to the highly expensive Federal out-of-State relocation program; also a comprehensive program of adult and vocational education, including classes to learn to read, write, and speak English so that Papagos can improve their place among the State's workers.

"(d) A 50-bed general hospital is needed at Sells, staffed with sufficient doctors, dentists, nurses, sanitarians, and health educators; a department in said hospital to maintain vital statistics; also the construction of a number of small clinics in the major Papago communities, to be staffed with medical personnel to administer to the health needs of the Papagos and win their confidence through personalized services.

"(e) More wells for household, stock, and irrigation purposes.

"(f) A revolving credit fund to provide development capital to enable small businesses, mines, and agricultural developments

to be started by the Papagos on the reservation.

"(g) More all-weather roads and market-access roads.

"(h) Range-improvement measures.

"(i) Large-scale survey of all reservation economic resources.

"(j) In general to provide facilities, employment, and essential services in combating hunger, disease, poverty, juvenile delinquency, and demoralization among members of the tribe; to make available the resources of the reservation for use in building up a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities; and to lay a stable foundation upon which the Papagos can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable to those enjoyed by other citizens of the State of Arizona and the United States of America."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS PREPARED BY KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution will be holding their annual convention next week in the Capital of the United States. In preparation for that convention, the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution have prepared a set of resolutions, which have been forwarded to me. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Whereas a true appreciation of American history is important to good citizenship and a bulwark against the infiltration of alien ideologies; and

Whereas a renewed and increased appreciation of great lessons drawn from studying the history of our county creates increased spiritual strength and wisdom; and

Whereas certain youth groups have become special targets of internationalism, one such well known youth organization having designated February as "International Month": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge its chapters to designate February as "American History Month" and urge the Governor of the State of Kansas and city mayors to officially declare February as "American History Month" to help build a durable heritage of faith, fortitude, and righteousness for future generations.

PATRIOTISM IN EDUCATION

Whereas national security depends upon the character of our citizens and a knowledge of the fundamental principles upon which the United States Government was established, and also an understanding of the forces working toward its destruction; and

Whereas the "training of our youth today determines the security of our Nation tomorrow" presupposes the necessity of specialized instruction regarding the advantages of our system of government above others in order to build good future citizens and provide for the security of coming generations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution continue and strengthen its interest in the patriotic education of our youth by the support of laws requiring the teaching of American history, civics and the science of the American form of government in our schools; increased supervision in the selection of instructors and materials used; encouragement of more public meetings for the purpose of increasing interest in patriotic education, and other means for accomplishing the objective stated in this resolution.

UNESCO

Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, has declared among other objectionable things that "nationalism is the major obstacle to the development of world mindedness"; and

Whereas said UNESCO is carrying on powerful propaganda through the American school system and otherwise working toward destruction of the form of government established by the Founding Fathers with the thought of promoting a one world pattern and

Whereas UNESCO is a deliberate plan to create public opinion for world citizenship—especially directed to the school children of the Nation and is patterned exactly after the Communist teaching in Soviet Russia: Therefore be it

Resolved, that the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as supporting the action taken by the recent national convention of the American Legion at Miami, Fla., urging Congress to take appropriate action to completely disassociate the United States Government from the UNESCO program.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm their adamant stand for control of education by the people through their States and local communities only and oppose Federal aid to education.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Whereas we have on previous occasions stated our approval of investigating committees devoted to protecting our country against the invasion of alien ideologies and the operation of subversive forces: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its previous stand in this regard and commend the efforts of those who are exposing subversive activities and request the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the continuance of the courageous campaign by our duly elected legislators and their staffs.

APPENDIX NINE

Whereas a special report prepared some years ago by the House Committee on Un-American Activities when Representative Martin Dies was chairman, known as Appendix Nine consisting of several volumes, has been for some reason taken out of circulation; and

Whereas said report is known to contain vital information designed to alert the American people to dangers of subversive activities: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution urge the Congress of the United States to authorize the reprinting and circulation of this document and appropriate the necessary funds required to complete the project.

THE FBI

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has by its integrity, courage, intelligent leadership, and loyalty to the principles upon which the Republic was founded, helped insalute the American people against foes of many types and descriptions: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reiterate confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its able leadership symbolized by the person of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

KANSAS COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas certain States, notably California, have found it advantageous to set up committees on un-American activities to cooperate with various law-enforcement agencies and departments of the Federal Government such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the House Committee on Un-American Activities; and

Whereas the people of Kansas need to be kept informed regarding the mechanics and machinations of the Communist apparatus, and also alerted to the dangers of Communist infiltration among non-Communist groups including schools, civic clubs, churches, labor unions, and other bodies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual convention of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution suggest that the Kansas State Legislature explore the possibility and advisability of organizing such a committee in Kansas to function along lines comparable to similar committees now existing in other States.

FEDERAL JURY SYSTEM

Whereas the jury system is a fundamental of the American judicial structure and basic to a free society under law and must therefore be protected; and

Whereas recent attempts have been made to undermine and bring this branch of the judicial system into question and disrepute by secretly planting dictaphones in rooms where jurors were deliberating, thereby eavesdropping on their conversations dealing with the innocence or guilt of persons on trial in open court; and

Whereas Attorney General Herbert Brownell proposed on January 10, 1956, that Congress enact a law prohibiting such activities as being inconsistent with the purposes of the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution go on record as condemning said innovations and urge Congress to do everything possible to expedite enactment of the law proposed by Attorney General Brownell.

RIGHT TO WORK

Whereas the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights guarantees to its citizens certain freedoms including the choice of occupation, a fundamental right of the American heritage; and

Whereas totalitarian systems deny their citizens the rights of such choice thereby making those who labor and all others servants of the state: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution recognize and approve the basic right of all Americans to choose their own vocations and at the same time commend those who are trying by legislative processes to preserve and uphold this sacred right.

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the Walter-McCarran Act (Public Law 414) became effective on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas the act has been especially effective in the denaturalization and deportation

of criminals and subversives and is operating in the best interests of the American people; and

Whereas pressure is being placed upon Government officials and Congress by certain groups to change this law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its approval of the Walter-McCarran Act and urge all patriotic Americans to resist any change, weakening amendments or private bills which would destroy its effectuality.

REVIEW OF U. N. CHARTER

Whereas the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution on November 21, 1955, which calls for a Review Conference, and the Security Council voted its concurrence on December 15, 1955; and

Whereas a Committee of the Whole has been created to work with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in fixing a time and place for the Conference, its organization and procedure, and said Committee is to report its recommendation to the 12th Assembly in 1957; and

Whereas proponents of world government are seeking to propagandize the American people into support of converting the United Nations in to a world government wherein the sovereignty of our Republic under constitutional government would be destroyed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its opposition to world government in any form and urge our Congress to carefully investigate charter review and resist any attempt to convert the United Nations Charter into a world government.

SUPPORTING THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Whereas treaties shall be the supreme law on the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby when two-thirds of the Senators concur; and

Whereas executive agreements may have the same prerogatives; and

Whereas the United States is one of the few nations in which a treaty becomes self-executing automatically; and

Whereas specialized agencies of the United Nations an dother entangling alliances can pose special threats through these treaty-making powers; and

Whereas the supremacy of the United Nations Charter over the United States Constitution has already become an issue in some court cases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference, Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its support and endorsement of the Bricker amendment which provides that no treaty or other international agreement can become internal except through laws enacted by elected representatives of the American people; and be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its request that the United States Senate consider the advisability of further amending the Constitution, so as to require either a majority or two-thirds vote of the entire membership before any treaty can be adopted.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

Whereas the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party recently declared it a part of their global program to work inside the capitalist world under the slogan "peace," with Khrushchev declaring there are only two roads, "peaceful coexistence or war," and at the same time stating that violent revolution is not necessary now to bring about a Socialist state; and

Whereas the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives concluded that the history of Czechoslovakia is the history of every government that tried to coexist or cooperate with the Communists; and

Whereas the committee further concluded "that peaceful coexistence is a Communist myth which can be attained only through the complete surrender of our free way of life for one of slavery under Moscow-controlled communism"; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution support a reexamination of the country's foreign policy by the Congress of the United States that America may not succumb to this poisonous formula of peaceful cooexistence distilled by communism; and be it further

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference call upon our Government and its citizens to heed the warning: "When they shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them."

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Whereas the World Council of Churches has on its official roster leaders from the Iron Curtain countries, as for example Prof. Josef L. Hromadka, Prague, Czechosolvakia, a member of the executive committee; Dr. Jan Chadaba, of Czechoslovakia, member of the central committee; Dr. Victor Hajek, of Czechoslovakia, synodical senior of the Church of the Czech Brethren, member of the central committee of the World Council; Bishop Janos Peter, of Hungary, delegate to the World Council; and

Whereas such men are exercising a baneful influence on the Christian program through the world and Communists are known to use the church as a cloak to cover their teachings; and

Whereas Paul the Apostle said "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness and what communion hath light with darkness?": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution call upon its members to be alert and protest any contamination of the holy Christian faith which comes to their attention.

REDEDICATION TO RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES

Whereas by the dispensation of divine grace we are favored to live in a nation founded on a fundamental belief in God; and

Whereas the thought of mankind is today being invaded and poisoned by atheistic philosophies and doctrines designed to destroy faith in the supernatural content of historical and evangelical Christianity, in the name of so-called "liberal theology," the "brotherhood of man," and related teachings: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 58th annual conference of the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution rededicate itself to continued faith, sincere prayer, steadfast belief in the Bible and greater participation in the field of Christian activities.

Mrs. W. HAROLD HAWKINS,
Chairman.
(Miss) MAUDE B. SKINNER,
Cochairman.

PROTECTION OF DOGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Peoples Lobby, Inc., of Washington, D. C., signed by Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, president, relating to the protection of dogs in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 27, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: S. 2015 and H. R. 6680 protect dogs in the District of Columbia. It may be said that this is but a crumb but will Congress deny us even that crumb? Surely, dogs, the beloved of mankind should have sanctuary someplace, sometime, and where better than the Nation's Capital, now. Can one look into his pet's eyes, the one utterly devoted to him in loyalty, and say, "You must be ruthlessly used as a tortured instrument of student practice." Christianity teachers benevolence and surely that extends to man's best friend. He is an unyielding friend even in dire necessity. Is it enough that he lay down his life for us; must he be also tortured?

God be with you in your effort. And may I say that public opinion is with you. Too long have the various societies fought the good fight alone. Overlooked has been public opinion, the average citizen who though not known as a humanitarian or society member is just as much concerned with the welfare of the dog, man's best friend.

There are many humanitarian groups in the United States organized to allay and prevent the unwarranted suffering visited upon animals. Throughout our land self-sacrificing men and women strive unceasingly to better the lot of these defenseless ones. They devote their time and substance to this praiseworthy work, this Christian endeavor. And their accomplishments redound to their credit.

They educate the populace in humane endeavors, they provide animal shelters, they rescue stray animals and return them to their proper owners or find new havens for them. They, in a word, instill into our Christian consciousness an appreciation of God's handiwork.

However, when it comes to the point of reducing concern for animals to protective legislation there is an evident record of lack of accomplishment. The failures may be attributed to two patent defects. First, the lack of unity. There is a wide diversity of opinion amongst the various groups as to which action should be taken. There is no united front of all the friends of animals. This, despite the fact that they are all humanitarians and should consider the enactment of any measure of protective legislation as a step forward even though it is not the actual legislation they favored. Second, public opinion has had no voice. The humanitarian groups, after all, are but a segment of our population and as such do not have sufficient impact in the matter of persuading legislators to their viewpoint. The legislator is elected by majority vote and it follows that he will be influenced, in the main, by majority opinion.

Many of the leaders of movements for animal protective legislation in the past are today discouraged and disheartened. They state that attainment of such legislation is impossible. They state, further, that this is not the psychological moment and that the bulk of the people are antagonistic to any corrective legislation.

We sharply disagree with these defeatists. Public opinion is overwhelmingly opposed to the torture of animals. If ours is a Christian Nation, and it is, can any follower of the all-loving Christ fail to display a benevolent, kindly attitude toward God's lesser creatures? It remains for this public sentiment to be vividly portrayed for the benefit

of legislators. This is the most persuasive factor in the consideration of any legislation.

Peoples Lobby, Inc., Washington 6, D. C., is a nonprofit organization chartered for the sole purpose of procurement of protective legislation for animals. It provides a common ground for unity of legislative action by all society members and other humanitarians, combined with the impact of public opinion.

Our officers are: President, Mrs. Charles Edward Russell, Washington, D. C.; vice presidents, Mrs. Alma T. Opal, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. P. C. Chapman, St. Petersburg, Fla.; trustees, Mrs. Frederick Bertram, Tenafly, N. J.; Mrs. Betty B. Eilers, Phoenix, Ariz.; chairman of the board of directors, Charles M. Davis, Washington 6, D. C.; legislative counsel, Hon. J. Hardin Peterson, Lakeland, Fla.; counsel-treasurer, James M. Barrett, Washington, D. C.; secretary, Emory S. Avant, Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours.

Mrs. THERESA H. RUSSELL,
CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL.
President.

DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAINS CAUSED BY DIVERSION OF MAIL TO TRUCK CARRIERS—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from E. George Siedle, Assistant Postmaster General, relating to the discontinuance of certain trains caused by the diversion of mail to truck carriers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: You, like myself, attended the dinner of the Federation for Railway Progress and heard President Kennedy of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

During the course of his remarks Mr. Kennedy made reference to certain Post Office Department transportation activities regarding which he was either mistaken or misinformed. His remarks have since been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday, March 23, 1956.

Realizing that as a Member of Congress you are vitally interested in the policies and conduct of the postal service, I feel that it is my duty to set the record straight.

Let me point out what Mr. Kennedy said, and show what the actual facts are.

1. Mr. Kennedy stated: "Literally hundreds of passenger trains have been pulled off * * * because the mail has been taken away and awarded to trucks."

The facts are: For the period February 1, 1953, to December 31, 1954 (a typical period), a total of 350 trains were discontinued. Of these, 311 were discontinued because the railroads took positive action to withdraw the trains before any mail was diverted. Only 39 trains were discontinued after mail had been diverted for service or cost reasons.

2. Mr. Kennedy said: "Trucks are obliged to bid against each other as contract carriers, and I am told a very large number of successful bidders have gone broke in their bargain services to the Department."

The facts are: Federal statutes require the Department to award contracts for motor carrier operations to the lowest responsible bidder. Competitive bidding is mandatory. Department records show that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of successful bidders have failed annually.

3. Mr. Kennedy said: "Mail which it (Post Office Department) ships by rail is handled at a profit, and mail by air at a tremendous loss."

The facts are: Since nearly all nonlocal mail is carried by more than one mode of transportation before arrival at destination, it is impracticable to allocate revenues or cost to a single segment of a through movement. For this reason there is no way of determining a "profit" or "loss" on rail movement as against air movement. Revenues and expenses have been allocated, however, as between classes of mail. As shown by our cost ascertainment report, the Department experiences heavy losses on those classes of mail which move by surface means, chiefly by rail. On the other hand, it is on the class of mail which moves principally by air that the Department most nearly breaks even. It is therefore obvious that Mr. Kennedy's statement has no factual basis.

4. Mr. Kennedy said: "Yet, despite this loss, the Post Office Department is engaging in an experiment * * * shipping 3-cent mail between important terminals by air. This action is absolutely illegal except as an experiment."

The facts are: The 3-cent airlift on a nonpriority basis has substantially improved service without added cost to the Department. The legality of the operation was questioned in a suit brought by five principal railroads and it was upheld unanimously by the United States Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia in a decision rendered in December 1955. The court refused to put any limit on the length of time an experiment may be carried on.

As you are aware, it has always been Post Office Department policy to utilize the speediest available means of transportation. The Department must, therefore, take fullest advantage of the new developments in air and highway transport. This does not mean that we are abandoning railroad service. Far from it. Of a total of $439 million expected to be paid by the postal service to all forms of transportation companies in fiscal year 1956, the railroads will receive an estimated $302 million. This is more than twice as much as will be received by all other forms of transportation combined.

In making changes in transportation, the Department is definitely committed to economy as well as service improvement. In pursuance of this policy the total sum paid out to carriers for postal transportation was reduced from $421 million in fiscal 1953 to $378 million in fiscal 1955 even though the volume of mail increased 8.4 percent.

Since you had Mr. Kennedy's remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it occurs to me that you would care likewise to have published this letter giving the Post Office Department's side of the story.

Sincerely yours,

E. GEORGE SIEDLE,
Assistant Postmaster General.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 863) to govern the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas it has been the settled rule of law for nearly a century that water rights in Midwestern and Western States are determined by State law, and not otherwise; and

Whereas it has also been the established rule that control and jurisdiction over the waters of streams and rivers have been vested in the several States subject to whatever control the Federal Government has found necessary to exercise in the case of navigable waters in its regulation of navigation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas section 210 of the constitution of North Dakota provides that "all flowing streams and natural water courses shall forever remain the property of the State for mining, irrigation, and manufacturing purposes," and section 61–0101 of the North Dakota revised code, as amended, provides that "all waters within the limits of the State belong to the public and are subject to appropriation for beneficial use"; and

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent Pelton case, which virtually divested the State of Oregon of complete jurisdiction over the waters of the Deschutes River, a nonnavigable stream therein, threatens to jeopardize and impair the control of States in granting and adjudicating rights to the beneficial use of the waters of their streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Reclamation Associatiotn, Inc., in meeting assembled this 3d day of March 1956, That Congress be, and is hereby urged, to definitely and unambiguously recognize the right and jurisdiction of the several States in and to the waters of streams and natural watercourses therein by speedily enacting into law Senate bill 863 proposed by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, and thereby settle for all time, and beyond question, that the control, use, distribution, and appropriation of the waters of streams and rivers is vested in the States, and not otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator FRANK BARRETT, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, and Congressman OTTO KRUEGER.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that another resolution adopted by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., may be printed in the RECORD. This resolution favors the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in cooperation with the States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the establishment of small irrigation projects in North Dakota and in other States periodically afflicted by drought on account of variation of rainfall is needed to stabilize the production of crops, particularly feed crops, and thereby stabilize the agricultural economy and promote the welfare of the people therein; and

Whereas it has been conservatively estimated, and in fact demonstrated, that because of the routine of specialized detailed investigation, cross checking of design and division of staff into many categories required by Federal regulations, the cost of small irrigation projects, planned, designed, and constructed by the Federal Government is approximately 30-percent larger than the cost of similar projects planned, designed, and constructed by a State or local governmental unit thereof; and

Whereas some Western and Midwestern States, including North Dakota, maintain engineering staffs which, although not specialized, have professional competence in the field of engineering to adequate investigate, plan, design, and construct small multiple-purpose projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota Reclamation Association, Inc., in meeting assembled this 3d day of March 1956, That the association

does hereby recommend and request that Congress enact a bill providing for the establishment of small irrigation projects in cooperation with the States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota; Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota; Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON, New Mexico; Hon. RUSSELL LONG, Louisiana; Hon. ALAN BIBLE, Nevada; Hon. FRANK BARRETT, Wyoming; Hon. ARTHUR WATKINS; Utah; Hon. USHER L. BURDICK, North Dakota; Hon. OTTO KRUEGER, North Dakota; Hon. CLAIR ENGLE, California; Hon. WAYNE ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. LEO O'BRIEN, New York; Hon. A. L. MILLER, Nebraska; Hon. JOHN SAYLOR, Pennsylvania.

GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Emmons County, N. Dak., favoring the withdrawal of all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, authorized the construction of the Garrison Dam in North Dakota to provide urgently needed flood protection, for diversion to the James, Sheyenne, and Souris Rivers for the irrigation of over 1 million acres of land in North and South Dakota, for production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, municipal and industrial use, for municipal and industrial water supplies, stabilization of stream flows for stream pollution abatement and improved downstream navigation, for restoration of lakes, and for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation, and propagation and other multiple benefits; and

Whereas, through the coordinated efforts of the Corps of Engineers, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, and the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, it has been determined that a maximum operating pool level for the Garrison Reservoir of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) is the most economical and will insure a realization of the maximum potential benefits by meeting all requirements of water users and, as a result of this determination, the Corps of Engineers have proceeded to plan, design, and construct the facilities for the project for operation at this pool level; and

Whereas adequate measures have been incorporated in the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project plan and designs for the protection of the city of Williston, the Lewis and Clark and Buford-Trenton irrigation projects from any adverse effects caused by reservoir operation at the maximum pool level of 1,850 feet so that there will not be any interference with the normal use of these areas; and

Whereas the operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) of the Garrison Dam project will insure the maximum production of hydroelectric power for rural electrification, irrigation, municipal and industrial use that, according to studies by the Federal Power Commision, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and other, will be needed by these users as soon as it is available; and

Whereas the additional power revenues that would be earned by the power facilities at Garrison Dam when the reservoir for that project is operated at a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,850 feet as compared to a lower level are needed to permit the maximum development of irrigation as authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the construction of main stem dams on the Missouri River will permit the construction and enhance the feasibility of small irrigation projects below and adjacent to these reservoirs because of the elimination of bank erosion, reduced power costs and flood protection afforded to the lands involved; and

Whereas the diversion of water from the Missouri River into central and eastern North Dakota for irrigation, municipal water supplies, restoration of lakes, stream pollution abatement, and other purposes has been advocated by many people in North Dakota for the past 70 years and a plan under investigation by the United States Bureau of Reclamation to accomplish this diversion by utilizing the waters stored in the Garrison Reservoir has been determined feasible and can be most efficiently accomplished if the Garrison Reservoir is operated at the 1,850-foot pool level; and

Whereas any reduction of the operating pool level of Garrison Reservoir will be a waste of its capacity to store reserve water for irrigation, municipal water supply, hydroelectric power production, and other uses during periods of drought; and

Whereas the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project is now over 80 percent complete and to curtail progress so as to prevent or delay its full utilization by restricting the operation of the reservoir at any elevation below 1,850 feet for flood protection, irrigation, hydroelectric-power production, and other multiple uses would result in major losses of potential benefits to the people of North Dakota and the entire Missouri Basin, and would not be consistent with good conservation practices; and

Whereas the county of Emmons, State of North Dakota, recognizes the need for the complete utilization of water from the Garrison Reservoir in central and eastern North Dakota as provided by the Garrison diversion plan to provide for this county's continued prosperity any economic expansion through the irrigation of large areas which can be accomplished most efficiently and economically if the Garrison Reservoir is operated at a maximum normal pool elevation of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Emmons, N. Dak., do hereby petition and request the Congress of the United States to withdraw all restrictions on the completion of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project to operate at the maximum operating pool level of 1,850 feet (above mean sea level) and to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers to proceed with the project at an efficient rate in procurement of real estate for planning and construction of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, Senator; the Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG, Senator; the Honorable OTTO KRUEGER, Representative; and the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK, Representative.

Dated this 2d day of March 1955 by the board of county commissioners in session.

W. T. GRUNEFELDER,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Emmons County, N. Dak.

Attest:

J. A. ALLENSWORTH,
County Auditor.

RESOLUTION OF SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., FINLEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Finley, N. Dak., protesting against the Hoover Commission proposal relating to the Rural Electrification Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEYENNE VALLEY
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.,
Finley, N. Dak., March 21, 1956.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The following is a resolution adopted by our board of directors at the March 14 meeting:

"HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSAL

"Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration was brought into being by an act of Congress in 1935 for the purpose of bringing electricity to the rural people who were not served by the utilities; and

"Whereas in order that electrification in these thinly populated areas would be feasible, the Federal Government, through the Rural Electrification Act, made finances available to the various rural-electric cooperatives at a 2-percent interest rate; and

"Whereas during the existence of rural electrification the United States Treasury has made a profit from the interest paid on the money borrowed for the development of rural electrification; and

"Whereas the records show that the rural electric cooperatives have been self-supporting and have made electricity available to 90 percent of all rural areas; and

"Whereas if the Rural Electrification Administration was abandoned and in its place the Rural Electrification Corporation was set up, the cost of money would greatly increase and work a hardship on all rural electrics: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative of Finley, N. Dak., urge the 2 Senators and the 2 Representatives from North Dakota to vigorously oppose the Hoover recommendation in its entirety; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the 2 Senators and the 2 Representatives do all in their power to support the present Rural Electrification Act that was adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1935."

Respectfully submitted.

JULIUS ANDERSON,
President.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3575. A bill to repeal all Federal retailers excise taxes, certain manufacturers excise taxes, and the excise taxes on facilities and services; and

S. 3576. A bill to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent child who is a full-time college student; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3577. A bill for the relief of Kew Chan (Chan Kew), Nancy Tsui Mei (Leung) Chan and Cecelia (Oi Fan) Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3578. A bill for the relief of Domenico A. Morin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for Mr. IVES):

S. 3579. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3580. A bill to provide for the construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation by the Secretary of the Interior of certain irrigation works of the Hayden Lake Unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3581. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE:

S. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 235), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds made to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be printed as a Senate document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes, in explanation of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie on the desk until the close of business on Friday of this week, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask what the resolution deals with?

Mr. THYE. It relates to the establishment of a committee within Congress to make certain that we keep abreast of scientific student development and the development of scientists in the United States. I shall make a brief explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Do I understand correctly that it will lie on the desk so that Senators may join as cosponsors?

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. THYE. That privilege will be extended to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, since the release of the initial atomic bomb at the close of World War II, the United States has been placed into a position of world leadership which demands that we pursue two paths of progress which, in a sense, are contrary in purpose but essential to the role in world affairs which we inherited. On the one hand, we represent the free peoples of the world in a quest for peace and freedom. On the other hand, we also represent the bulwark against Communist aggression and domination, which demands the utmost of progress in the development of weapons of modern warfare.

No one can predict at this time whether our destiny is to be written in terms of war or peace. However, it has become obvious that our success in either venture will depend to a great extent on our ability to keep pace with the fabulous and almost unbelievable progress which we are witnessing in the field of scientific and technological advancement. The advent of atomic and nuclear energy has opened up vast new vistas of progress. We see before us the innumerable peacetime uses of atomic and nuclear energy. At the same time, we view the penetrating destructive uses of the same energy which will become a part of any future conflict among nations.

This new scientific and technological era has brought with it difficult problems which have become the responsibility and property of industry, our colleges and universities, our scientists, our teachers, our high schools, the executive branches of the Government, and the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps the most basic problem is that of keeping pace with the rapid strides in these fields which are currently being made. In this connection, we come across another paradox.

At the present time, the United States has taken the lead in scientific and technological development, but at the same time we are faced with a shortage of future manpower in these same fields. We must assume this type of leadership and make certain that it will be retained. That can only be done if we look constantly to the future and make sure that at all times we have the type of highly trained and efficient personnel to continue the advances already begun.

Our best intelligence reports indicate that the Soviet Union today is graduating each year over twice as many engineers and scientists as are being graduated in the United States.

We are faced with a marked and continuing decrease in the number of qualified teachers at the high school and college levels in the basic science fields. As a result of this, we also have fewer and fewer students each year who are pursuing studies in the sciences and in engineering. The number of students taking courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other related subjects is dropping off.

This, then, is the crux of the problem—at the same time that science and technology are moving to a position of unprecedented importance—the manpower to maintain that progress is declining.

It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution to establish a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Scientific Research.

The need for such a committee seems most apparent and urgent. The legislative branch of Government cannot escape the fact that it is going to become more deeply involved and enmeshed in this vast area of activity. We will be called on to legislate on the many problems and issues which are bound to arise. It is incumbent upon the legislative branch to be fully informed on future developments. We will be called upon to work with plans and programs established by the executive branch of Government. In short, we will be, in part, responsible for the success or failure of our country's attempt to advance and expand our leadership in these fields.

None of the committees which we now have are equipped to meet this type of responsibility. Each committee is overburdened with an ever-increasing workload. Present committees do not have the time or the technical staffs to carry out this assignment.

The joint committee, under this resolution, would not have legislative authority. It would be given wide authority in the areas of study and investigation. It would work in cooperation with the executive agencies, industry, and our institutions of learning. It would, as a result of its work, be in a position to advise and counsel the proper legislative committees which will be called upon to legislate in these areas.

There is precedent for this type of committee. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is the most recent and perhaps the most similar precedent. When that committee was established, it was recognized that there was a need for a committee which could devote its energies and time to the study of the many problems involved in the use of atomic energy. There was no standing committee that could meet the need.

The Joint Committee on Scientific Research would embrace an entirely different field than the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. It would be wider in its scope of interest. It would not conflict with the Atomic Energy Committee in any way. This committee's main concern would be the field of manpower in scientific and engineering research and study.

Last week, President Eisenhower established a 19-man committee for the development of scientists and engineers. Some of our outstanding educators and laymen in industry, labor, science, education, and government will serve on

that Executive committee. The President, by his action, demonstrated that he is alert to the problems which I have outlined.

Now, it is up to the Congress to assume its share of responsibiilty and to use the type of vision and foresight which will insure that it will be able to meet its responsibility with maximum intelligence.

I have requested that the resolution be allowed to lay on the desk until the close of business next Friday, April 13, so that as many as care to may join in sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I cannot commend too highly the Senator from Minnesota for introducing his joint resolution. Only a few weeks ago the president of the University of North Dakota, George W. Starcher, one of the ablest educators in America, speaking before the alumni meeting at that university, stated that in the State of North Dakota more than 1,000 high-school graduates are too poor to attend the University of North Dakota or any of the other institutions of learning within the borders of the State.

During the days of the drought, in the 1930's, Mr. President, the Board of Administration of North Dakota borrowed $150,000 from the Bank of North Dakota and made it available to any poor students whose applications were approved by a committee of three and who wished to borrow money, up to $300, for the purpose of attending college. The result was that approximately 1,200 students selected by the presidents of the various institutions of learning in North Dakota were enabled to attend various colleges in the State who otherwise would have been unable to attend, after graduating from high school.

Today, Mr. President, as I go over the State of North Dakota, in almost every city in the State I meet nurses, engineers, doctors, lawyers, or agriculturalists who, because of the money they were able to borrow, attended the university and graduated. The money thus obtained in connection with the money they earned enabled them to complete their college courses.

Mr. President, about a year ago I introduced a bill providing a revolving fund of $1 billion to be made available to the Department of Education for the benefit of poor students throughout the United States of America, regardless of creed, religion, or nationality. That bill is still in committee. If that bill had been passed, it would have solved one of the problems mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Who knows but that some poor boy or girl graduating from high school this year might have a chance to go to college and become another Thomas A. Edison, or an inventor or scientist equally as great, and render a tremendous service to the people of the United States?

I might add, Mr. President, that one of the poor students who, in the 1930's, took advantage of the $300 loan, is now spoken of very favorably in the State of North Dakota for the office of Governor. His name is Arley Bjella, of Williston, N. Dak. He told me that, if it had not been for the loan which he was able to obtain through the Board of Administration of the State of North Dakota, he could not have attended college. Today he is one of the outstanding lawyers of the State.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to commend my friend from Minnesota. It seems to me this action should have been taken a long time ago. Late as it is, it is a step in the right direction.

DEFINITION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES AND THEIR EXPANSION CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this very important amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an editorial from the American Banker for March 27, 1956, and the Independent Bankers Credo for 1956 with names of supporting banks, from the same issue of the American Banker, both of which strongly state the reasons for the adoption of the amendment I am submitting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment, editorial, and Credo will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, editorial, and credo are as follows:

On page 8, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which such bank holding company or subsidiary thereof maintains its principal office and place of business or in which it conducts its principal operations unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication."

[From the American Banker of March 27, 1956]

VITAL VITALITY: INDEPENDENT BANKERS A FORCE FOR GOOD

The vitality of the Independent Bankers Association of America is the important news in American banking today.

Assembled in an even larger convention than last year's at Washington, the members at their 22d annual convention at New Orleans represent a powerful force for good in our dual banking system and for the future of our system of correspondent banking.

Their battle cry is one honored in American history, "Independence." They too want representation when laws affecting the future of banking are made. They march against our modern counterparts of monarchistic power and crown chartered corporations, today's concentrations of financial power and ever threatening drives toward monopoly. They believe in maximum local autonomy and home rule, and in States' rights.

Quite in the American tradition, therefore, is the philosophy of the independent banker.

The strength of that tradition is the real source of the growing membership and power of the Independent Bankers Association, and its west coast twin, the Independent Bankers Association of the 12th Federal Reserve District.

Consciousness that they bespeak traditional American philosophy lends courage to the fight these associations have been making for better banking and independent banking in our land.

There are those who quarrel with the independents' objectives; their right to do so is unquestionable.

But equal right devolves upon the independent unit bankers to muster their strength and present their case against branch banking trends, holding company practices that evade our laws restricting branch banking, tax-exempted competition and tax-subsidized Government lending agencies.

Right now, the major objective of the IBA is passage of an adequate Federal law to place group or chain banking under the same rules that have been enacted in the public interest to control the spread of branch banking. The problem has been with us in growing proportions for well over a half century.

A bit of history may be interesting as background.

A BIT OF HISTORY

Whether the First Security Co., organized as an affiliate of the old First National Bank of the city of New York, meant control of a nationwide chain of banks when it began purchasing blocks of stock of leading banks in major cities some 40 years ago, will probably never be known. But it is a fact that in 1911 the Solicitor General of the United States, Frederick Lehmann, took notice. He ruled that since it was unlawful for a national bank to own stock of another bank or operate a branch, it was therefore illegal to do so indirectly. Despite the vast wealth and power of the men behind the old First National, its security affiliate promptly divested itself of bank share holdings.

Senator Carter Glass, of Virginia, in 1932, declared himself shocked when he learned that this opinion existed but had never been applied to the early bank buying maneuvers with which the institutions were assembled to create the Giannini branch system in California despite opposition of other banks and of the State banking authorities, and also had never been invoked by the national banking authorities in regard to the group banking chains which sprang up in so many places in the 1920's, and which contributed so heavily to the bank failure record in the South in 1926, and all over the country in 1930–33. Senator Glass had the Lehmann opinion published in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 30, 1932.

Present-day parallels of the Lehmann opinion are the ruling of the attorney general of Texas about 2 years ago that affiliate banks violated the Texas law against branch banking, and also the laws passed in Illinois forbidding holding company bank ownership. Illinois, of course, has steadfastly prohibited branch banking in any form.

Today's most important question in banking is whether the holding company minority is strong enough to prevent enactment

of a Federal law to restrain their expansion on the same principles that limit branch bank expansion.

FIGHTING FOR PRINCIPLES

Why do the independent bankers believe they are upholding principles of sound banking and political philosophy? It is because they see how the building of intercity and interstate branch or bank chains offers such a quick and speculatively attractive way in booming times to attain financial power; and because such systems tend toward monopoly, and further, because concentration of the money and credit mechanism of the Nation in private hands invites socialization.

Simply stated, they believe that the locally owned and locally managed bank is a better and more responsive vehicle for administration of the money and credit power than vast aggregations of capital and branches owned and directed by absentees domiciled in a distant city.

Hence, the independent bankers give more than lipservice to the distinctively American dual-banking system, and its unique pattern of closely knit independent correspondent banks.

And it is because of their vital interest in the health of our system that the independent bankers of America at New Orleans are deliberating this week on the problems of banking from the unit bank point of view. They will have their say not only on the holding company and branch banking issue, but also on what they believe is the unfairness of competition between tax-favored savings and loan associations and taxpaying banks, the development of better unit bank management methods and sounder banking policies, and the unwisdom of Government-subsidized loans.

We have our two independent bankers' associations because of the challenges which have risen affecting the future of the unit bank, and of American banking. The two organizations reflect the determination of the independent and smalltown bankers of America not to let drift, complacency and powerful minorities shape the future of American banking.

This week's meeting of the I. B. A. of A., in New Orleans, we can well predict, will be remembered in banking history for the vitality with which the independent bankers of the Nation are attacking the vital issues before them.

What these independents say and achieve will determine greatly the fate of the dual-banking system and correspondent banking in the United States.

[From the American Banker of March 27, 1956]

INDEPENDENT BANKERS CREDO FOR 1956

We believe in the American way.

We believe in the American ideal of independent banking.

We believe in first things first.

In the field of credit and banking, we support the principle of home rule and we respect the principle of States rights.

We oppose all trends which would lead away from these principles toward nationalization or socialization.

We are opposed, therefore, to the unrestricted expansion of multiple banking. Establishment of branches of chartered banks is subject to restriction in every State, and altogether prohibited in many of them by State law and concurrent Federal law. We hold that the local, State, and National interest is best served when banking control and expansion are subject to laws and to supervision designed to eliminate unsound developments.

Inasmuch as the bank holding company constitutes in fact a form of branch banking, the expansion of which is not subject to either Federal of State control, we believe that legislation to halt unrestricted expansion of holding-company ownership of banks is the immediate need in defense of the American tradition of local banking autonomy, independent banking, unit banks, and States rights.

Further, banks are properly restricted to banking. So also should we restrict bank holding companies. The principle that banks refrain from engaging in business outside the field of banking is established in both State and National banking statutes. A bank is arbiter of the credit and is entrusted with the safekeeping of its community's funds; its objectives must not be confused or compromised by ownership of nonbanking types of business, which may well be competitors with its depositors and borrowers.

Independent banking is an American tradition. "Free banking" has been a watchword of free community development. Under its banner, the States have fought for their independent sovereign right to charter State banks, defending our dual system of banking against theorists who would concentrate all banking authority in the Nation in one central Federal agency. The national and independent State banks of our chartered system of free banks of today have survived all the economic storms and depressions of our past, thus demonstrating absolutely their continuing capacity to serve their communities with safety and with credit, locally administered for local development.

Money and credit are the lifeblood of industry and business. Their control should lie in the hands of those most responsive to the needs of the American people in their hometowns and States. The safety of the deposits entrusted by our people to our chartered system of banks should be in the hands of men accountable to their neighbors as well as to the State and National bank supervisors.

We know that when banking concentration expands without limit, and great nationwide chains of financial power can be created by ambitious men, the temptation of power-seeking governments to socialize them is great. History of dictator countries has shown how true this is.

Our system of free and independent banks has stood squarely athwart the intentions of the Socialists and planners who recognize with the Communists that a first step in taking away a people's economic freedom is to take away the freedom of their banks.

Independent banks, therefore, view with alarm the unrestricted way that the holding company has been able to evade the strict limitations which have been set upon branch banking in the national and in the State banking laws. We recall that in the speculative 1920's, financiering holding companies were used as devices for building up top-heavy chains of banks to aggrandiize the financial power of ambitious men. And that the subsequent collapses of certain of these unsupervised and loosely assembled holding-company systems in the 1930–33 period brought distress to millions, and pulled down with them scores of other banks. We urge legislative attention to close every loophole through which this might happen again.

The American banking system has been handed down to us by our banking forefathers as an American institution embodying the principles of free and independent administration of the funds of each local community for local development, subject only to such State and national supervision as our elected representatives deemed necessary.

We believe in first things first, and that the first item in the defense of independent banking and independent communities today is enactment now and without further delay of legislation that will end the uncontrolled status of the bank holding company, restrict it exclusively to banking, and forbid its expansion beyond the limitations which have been placed upon branch banking by Federal and State laws.

We view with great alarm any further delay in enacting bank holding company legislation. It is an invitation to expand banking chains were branch banking is prohibited. It is an open door to the acquisition of banking power outside the banking law. And it is our belief that this is neither desirable nor good for American banking nor for the American bank customer.

We are now in a crucial moment on holding company legislation. Our conviction is stronger than ever that the sound future of American banking makes enactment of the measures before Congress urged by independent bankers' associations mandatory.

This is our credo again for 1956. It is our statement of faith in the American way of liberty and fair play within the law, of freedom founded on principles of justice to which all can give consent.

Underwritten in behalf of the approximately 5,200 members of the Independent Bankers Association by the cooperating banks listed below:

Alabama: The Commercial National Bank of Anniston, Anniston; the Farmers & Merchants Bank, Ashford; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Centre; Bank of Dadeville, Dadeville; the First National Bank of Florence, Florence; Peoples Bank, Frisco City; Peoples Bank of Greensboro, Greensboro; the First National Bank of Guntersville, Guntersville; the First National Bank, Hartford; the First National Bank, Huntsville; Peterman State Bank, Peterman; Bank of Prattville, Prattville; Bank of Reform, Reform; Alabama Exchange Bank, City Bank, Tuskegee; the American National Bank of Union Springs, Union Springs; the First National Bank, Wetumpka; Winfield State Bank, Winfield.

Alaska: The B. M. Behrends Bank, Juneau; Matanuska Valley Bank, Palmer.

Arizona: The First National Bank, Holbrook; Farmers & Stockmen's Bank, Phoenix.

Arkansas: American State Bank, Charleston; the Merchants National Bank, Fort Smith; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Marianna; Merchants & Planters Bank, Warren.

California: Azusa Valley Savings Bank, the First National Bank, Azusa; Beverly Hills National Bank & Trust Co., Beverly Hills; the First National Bank of Dixon, Dixon; the First National Bank, La Verne; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Long Beach; the Farmers & Merchants National Bank, Los Angeles; the First National Bank of Monterey, Monterey; Oakland Bank of Commerce, Oakland; San Fernando Valley Commercial Bank, Pacoima; the First National Bank, Pleasanton; the Mechanics Bank of Richmond, Richmond; Salinas National Bank, Salinas; the Commercial National Bank of Santa Ana, Santa Ana; County National Bank & Trust Co., Santa Barbara; the Bank of Sierra Madre, Sierra Madre; Sun Valley National Bank of Los Angeles, Sun Valley; Security State Bank of Turlock, Turlock; the First National Bank, Vista; the Pajaro Valley National Bank, Watsonville; the First National Bank of Willows, Willows.

Colorado: The Moffat County State Bank, Craig; the Colorado Bank & Trust Co., Delta; the National City Bank, Denver; the First National Bank, Durango; the American State Bank, Granada; United States Bank of Grand Junction, Grand Junction; the First State Bank of Hotchkiss, Hotchkiss; the Colorado Savings & Trust Co., La Junta; the First National Bank, Las Animas; the First National Bank, Salida; the Routt County National Bank of Steamboat Springs, Steamboat Springs; the First National Bank, Strasburg.

Connecticut: The Black Rock Bank & Trust Co., Bridgeport; Danbury National Bank, Danbury; Groton Bank & Trust Co., Groton;

the Union Bank & Trust Co., New London; the Cargill Trust Co., Putnam; the Stratford Trust Co., Stratford.

Florida: The State Bank of Apopka, Apopka; Bank of Blountstown, Blountstown; the Bank of Bonifay, Bonifay; Gadsden County State Bank, Chattahoochee; Levy County State Bank, Chiefland; Peoples Bank of Crescent City, Crescent City; the Bank of Pasco County, Dade City; the Dania Bank, Dania; Commercial Bank of Daytona Beach, Daytona Beach; Bank of Everglades, Everglades; Citizens Bank of Frostproof, Frostproof; First National Bank of Hollywood, Hollywood; American National Bank of Jacksonville, Jacksonville; Peoples Bank of Lakeland, Lakeland; Lake Wales State Bank, Lake Wales; Pinellas Central Bank, Largo; the First National Bank of Leesburg, Leesburg; Pan American Bank of Miami, Riverside Bank, Miami; the Commercial Bank & Trust Co., Ocala; Bank of Pahokee, Pahokee; Citizens Bank & Trust Company of Quincy, the Quincy State Bank, Quincy; Union Trust Co., St. Petersburg; Gulf Beach Bank, St. Petersburg Beach; Capital City National Bank, Tallahassee; Citizens Bank, Titusville; Umatilla State Bank, Umatilla; the Valparaiso State Bank, Valparaiso; the Indian River Citrus Bank, Vero Beach; Bank of Wildwood, Wildwood; the First National Bank of Winter Garden, Winter Garden.

Georgia: The National Bank, Athens; East Atlanta Bank, the First National Bank, the Fulton National Bank, South Side Atlanta, Atlanta; Georgia Railroad Bank & Trust Co., Augusta; Austell Bank, Austell; Baxley State Bank, Baxley; the National Bank of Brunswick, Brunswick; the Citizens State Bank, Butler; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Coolidge; First State Bank in Cordele, Cordele; Bank of Covington & Trust Co., Covington; Granite City Bank, Elberton; the Bank of Heard County, Franklin; Jones County Bank, Haddock; Citizens Banking Co., Hartwell; the Pulaski Bank Co., Hawkinsville; the Hinesville Bank, Hinesville; the Brand Banking Co., First National Bank, Lawrenceville; State Bank, Leesburgh; Citizens Banking Co., Lexington; Bank of Manchester, Manchester; Bank of Millen, Millen; the Bank of Soperton, Soperton; Bulloch County Bank, Sea Island Bank, Statesboro; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Summerville; Commercial Bank, Thomasville; Bank of Villa Rica, Villa Rica; Citizens State Bank, Warner Robins; First National Bank, Waycross.

Idaho: Glenns Ferry Bank, Limited, Glens Ferry; the Weber Bank, Kellogg; Largilliere Company Bankers, Soda Springs.

Illinois: Alton Banking & Trust Co., First National Bank & Trust Co. in Alton, Alton; Farmers State Bank, Beecher; First National Bank, Belleville; First National Bank, Bunker Hill; First Bank and Trust Co., Cairo; Canton State Bank, Canton; Capron State Bank, Capron; First National Bank of Carbondale, Carbondale; the Farmers & Merchants National Bank, Carlinville; the Charleston National Bank, Charleston; Beverly State Savings Bank, Chicago; Central National Bank in Chicago, Chatham Bank, Chicago National Bank, Citizens National Bank of Chicago, Commercial National Bank of Chicago, the District National Bank of Chicago, Marquette National Bank; State Bank of Cowden, Cowden; Home State Bank of Crystal Lake, Crystal Lake; State Bank of East Moline, East Moline; Union National Bank, East St. Louis; Edwardsville National Bank & Trust Co., Edwardsville; First National Bank in Fairbury, Fairbury; Fairview State Banking Co., Fairview; Granite City Trust & Savings Bank, Granite City; the First National Bank, Lacon; State Bank, Lombard; the Union National Bank of Macomb, Macomb; the Bank of Marion, Marion; Central National Bank of Mattoon, Mattoon; Mt. Carroll National Bank, Mt. Carroll; Mount Prospect State Bank, Mount Prospect, the first National Bank of Mt. Pulaski, Mt. Pulaski; the City National Bank, Murphysboro; Oak Park Trust & Savings Bank, Oak Park; the First National Bank, O'Fallon; the Onley Trust & Banking Co., Olney; State Bank of Orion, Orion; the First National Bank, Ottawa; the Central National Bank & Trust Co., Jefferson Trust & Savings Bank of Peoria, South Side Trust & Savings Bank of Peoria, Peoria; Peotone State Bank, Peotone; First National Bank, Raymond; First Trust & Savings Bank, Riverdale; South Holland Trust & Savings Bank, South Holland; the Union National Bank of Streator, Streator; H. F. Gehant Banking Co., the Bank of West Frankfort, West Frankfort; Wheeling State Bank, Wheeling.

Indiana: First Bank of Berne, Berne; the First State Bank, Bourbon; the First State Bank, Decatur; the Etna Bank, Etna Green; First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co., Greencastle; State Bank, Lizton; Madison Bank & Trust Co., Madison; the First National Bank of Mays, Mays; the Floyd County Bank, New Albany; the Citizens State Bank, Newport; the Second National Bank, Richmond; Farmers & Merchants Bank of Rochester, Rochester; the State Bank of Waldron, Waldron; Bank of Whiting, Whiting; First Union Bank & Trust Co., Winamac.

Iowa: The First National Bank, Akron; First Trust & Savings Bank, Armstrong; First Trust & Savings Bank, Aurelia; Farmers State Bank, Charter Oak; the First National Bank, Clarion; Clear Lake Bank & Trust Co., Clear Lake; Clinton National Bank, Iowa State Savings Bank, Clinton; Iowa State Savings Bank, Creston; Crawford County Trust & Savings Bank, Denison; Central National Bank & Trust Co., Des Moines; State Bank of Dumont, Dumont; Iowa Trust & Savings Bank, Emmetsburg; the Emmet County State Bank, Iowa Trust & Savings Bank, Estherville; George State Bank, George; Peoples Trust & Savings Bank, Grand Junction; First National Bank, Hampton; Farmers State Bank, Hawarden; Peoples Trust & Savings Bank, Indianola; Iowa State Bank & Trust Co., Iowa City; Security Savings Bank, Ireton; State Bank of Lawler, Lawler; Commercial State Bank, Marshalltown; Nevada National Bank, Nevada; Taintor Savings Bank, New Sharon; Farmers Savings Bank, North English; the First National Bank of Oelwein, Oelwein; Northwestern State Bank, Orange City; Readlyn Savings Bank, Readlyn; Lyon County State Bank, Rock Rapids; Morningside State Bank, Sioux City; Victor State Bank, Victor; Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Waterloo.

Kansas: The First National Bank, Columbus; the First State Bank of Elkhart, Elkhart; Ellis State Bank, Ellis; Citizens National Bank, Minneapolis; the Midland National Bank, Newton; State Bank of Parsons, Parsons; the First State Bank of Pittsburg, Pittsburg; Russell State Bank, Russell; the Farmers State Bank, Sabetha; Silver Lake State Bank, Silver Lake; the Merchants National Bank of Topeka, the State Savings Bank, Topeka; the Grant County State Bank, Ulysses; the Southwest National Bank, the Union National Bank, Wichita State Bank, Wichita; the First National Bank, Winfield.

Kentucky: The Third National Bank of Ashland, Ashland; the Royal Bank, Louisville; Bank of Middletown, Middletown; Citizens Bank & Trust Co., the Paducah Bank, Paducah.

Louisiana: Security National Bank, Alexandria; American Bank & Trust Co., Baton Rouge; Caddo Trust & Savings Bank, Belcher; the National Bank of Bossier City, Bossier City; Cottonport Bank, Cottonport; Bank of Commerce & Trust Co., Crowley; City Savings Bank & Trust Co., De Ridder; Tri-Parish Bank & Trust Co., Eunice; the St. Mary Bank & Trust Co., Franklin; Bank of Gonzales, Gonzales; the First National Bank of Jefferson Parish, Gretna; the First National Bank, Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Lafayette; the First National Bank of Lake Charles, Gulf National Bank, Lake Charles; Merchants & Farmers Bank & Trust Co., Leesville; Bank of Maringouin, Maringouin; Metarie Savings Bank & Trust Co., Metarie; Moreauville State Bank, Moreauville; the Citizens National Bank, Morgan City; Progressive Bank & Trust Co., New Orleans; Oil City Bank, Oil City; First State Bank, Plain Dealing; Bank of Commerce & Trust Co., St. Francisville; Springhill Bank & Trust Co., Springhill.

Maine: The First National Bank, Fort Kent; the Ocean National Bank, Kennebunk.

Maryland: The First National Bank of Cumberland, Cumberland; the First State Bank of Grantsville, Grantsville; Cecil National Bank, Port Deposit.

Massachusetts: The First National Bank of Amherst, Amherst; Gardner Trust Co., Gardner; the Merchants National Bank, Leominster; Malden Trust Co., Malden; the First National Bank of Marlboro, Marlboro; Home National Bank, Milford; Northampton National Bank, Northampton; the Orange National Bank, Orange; Tanners National Bank in Woburn, Woburn National Bank, Woburn; Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Worcester.

Michigan: First State Bank, Alma; the Peoples State Bank, Alpena; Security National Bank, Battle Creek; the Jipson Carter State Bank, Blissfield; Bank of the Commonwealth, the Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit, Detroit; East Lansing State Bank, East Lansing; Citizens Commercial & Savings Bank, Flint; the State Bank of Fraser, Fraser; Gaylord State Bank, Gaylord; Grand Haven State Bank, Grand Haven; Old Kent Bank, Grand Rapids; Bank of Commerce, Peoples State Bank, Hamtramck; First Security Bank, Ionia; the Commercial National Bank of Ithaca, Ithaca; Bank of Lansing, American State Bank, Lansing; the First National Bank of Lapeer, Lapeer; Security Bank, Lincoln Park; Metamora State Savings Bank, Metamora; Milan State Bank, Milan; Plainwell Bank, Plainwell; River Rouge Savings Bank, River Rouge; the Roscommon State Bank, Roscommon; Commercial State Bank, Roseville; the Wayne Oakland Bank, Royal Oak; Second National Bank & Trust Co., Saginaw; the Peoples State Bank, St. Joseph; Central Savings Bank, Sault Ste. Marie; First-Peoples State Bank, Traverse City; the First National Bank, Watervliet; the National Bank of Wyandotte, Wyandotte.

Minnesota: Security State Bank of Albert Lea, Albert Lea; State Bank, Anoka; Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Appleton; Arlington State Bank, Arlington; Beaver Creek State Bank, Beaver Creek; North American State Bank, Belgrade; State Bank of Belle Plaine, Belle Plaine; Swift County Bank, Benson; Biwabik State Bank, Biwabik; Community State Bank, Bloomington; The First National Bank of Bovey, Bovey; Citizens State Bank of Brainerd, Brainerd; the First National Bank of Brewster, Brewster; State Bank of Bricelyn, Bricelyn; Union State Bank, Browns Valley; Security State Bank, Cannon Falls; Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Clarkfield; Columbia Heights State Bank, Columbia Heights; Detroit State Bank, Detroit Lakes; First State Bank of Dover, Dover; State Bank, Edgerton; First State Bank, Fertile; Security State Bank of Glencoe, Glencoe; Glenwood State Bank, Glenwood; The First National Bank, Good Thunder; Security State Bank, Hector; First National Bank, Le Roy; State Bank of Long Lake, Long Lake; The Bank of Long Prairie, Long Prairie; Citizens National Bank, Farmers State Bank of Madelia, Inc., Madelia; Melrose State Bank, Melrose; Marquette National Bank, Thirteenth Avenue State Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis; American State Bank of Moorhead, Moorhead; First State Bank of New Brighton, New Brighton; State Bank of New Richland, New Richland; Otisco State Bank, Otisco; The Security State Bank, Pine Island; The First National Bank, Pipestone; Farmers State Bank, Raymond;

Richfield State Bank, Richfield; Olmstead County Bank & Trust Company, Rochester; St. Clair State Bank, St. Clair; St. Cloud National Bank, St. Cloud; First State Bank of St. Joseph, St. Joseph; Citizens State Bank, St. Louis Park; Security State Bank of St. Michael, St. Michael; The American National Bank, Cherokee State Bank, St. Paul; First State Bank of Sauk Centre, Sauk Centre; The First National Bank, Shakopee; First National Bank of Starbuck, Starbuck; Northern State Bank of Thief River Falls, Thief River Falls; Triumph State Bank, Triumph; Peoples State Bank, Truman; Waldorf State Bank, Waldorf; Security State Bank, Warroad; Windom State Bank, Windom; The Winona National & Savings Bank, Winona; Citizens State Bank of Winsted, Winsted; State Bank of Wood Lake, Wood Lake.

Mississippi: Hancock Bank, Bay St. Louis; Canton Exchange Bank, Canton; Leflore Bank & Trust Co., Greenwood; Hancock Bank, Gulfport; Citizens Bank of Hattiesburg, Hattiesburg; Deposit Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Jackson; Merchants & Farmers Bank, Kosciusko; the First National Bank of Laurel, Laurel; Magnolia Bank, Magnolia; Bank of Franklin, Meadville; Peoples Bank, Mendenhall; Bank of Morton, Morton; Bank of Pontotoc, Pontotoc; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Vicksburg; the Bank of West Point, West Point; The Bank of Yazoo City, Yazoo City.

Missouri: Arnold Savings Bank, Arnold; Polk County Bank, Bolivar; Farmers State Bank, Cameron; Fenton Bank, Fenton; New Era Bank, Fredericktown; Citizens Bank of Grant City, Grant City; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Green Ridge; the Bank of Houston, Houston; Irondale Bank, Irondale; Central Missouri Trust Co., Jefferson City; the Park National Bank of Kansas City, Kansas City; Citizens National Bank of Maplewood, Maplewood Bank & Trust Co., Maplewood; First National Bank, Mexico; Bank of Perryville, Home Trust Company, Perryville; Washington County Commercial Bank, Potosi; Bremen Bank & Trust Co., Easton-Taylor Trust Co., Gravois Bank, Lemay Bank & Trust Co., Manchester Bank of St. Louis, the Plaza Bank of St. Louis, St. Johns Community Bank, St. Louis; Third National Bank, Sedalia; the Citizens Bank, Springfield; State Bank & Trust Co. of Wellston, Wellston.

Montana: The First National Bank of Billings, Billings; Gallatin Trust and Savings Bank, Bozeman; Security Bank & Trust Co., Bozeman; the First National Bank, Browning; the Yellowstone Bank, Columbus; Farmers State Bank of Conrad, Conrad; Bank of Glacier County, Cut Bank; Deer Lodge Bank & Trust Co., Deer Lodge; First National Bank of Fairfield, Fairfield; the First National Bank, Geraldine; Montana Bank, Great Falls; Citizens State Bank, Hamilton; the Continental National Bank, Harlowton; Citizens Bank of Montana, Havre; the Conrad National Bank, Kalispell; the Yellowstone Bank, Laurel; the First National Bank, Missoula; Basin State Bank, Stanford.

Nebraska: The Commercial National Bank of Ainsworth, Ainsworth; First National Bank, Beemer; the First National Bank, Belden; the Commercial Bank, Blue Hill; Bank of Brule, Brule; Bruning State Bank, Bruning; the First National Bank, Falls City; Bank of Hartington, Hartington; Harvard State Bank, Harvard; Farmers State Bank, Kilgore; the First National Bank of Lincoln, National Bank of Commerce of Lincoln, Lincoln; First National Bank of Newman Grove, Newman Grove; Platte Valley Bank, North Bend; Douglas County Bank of Omaha, First National Bank of Omaha, the Omaha National Bank, Omaha; Nebraska State Bank, Ord; the American National Bank of Sidney, Sidney National Bank, Sidney; Farmers State Bank, Superior; Johnson County Bank, Tecumseh; the First National Bank of Tekamah, Tekamah; the First National Bank of Wahoo, Wahoo.

Nevada: The First National Bank of Ely, Ely.

New Hampshire: First National Bank of Concord, Concord; Siwooganock Guaranty Savings Bank, Lancaster; the Littleton National Bank, Littleton; Pemigewasset National Bank, Plymouth; Savings Bank of Walpole, Walpole.

New Jersey: Bank of Bogota, Bogota; Bound Brook Trust Co., Bound Brook; the Branchville National Bank, Branchville; the Edgewater National Bank, Edgewater; Union County Trust Co., Elizabeth; First National Bank in Garfield; Garfield Trust Co., Garfield; Peoples Bank of Hawthorne, Hawthorne; the Hillsdale National Bank, Hillsdale; Keansburg National Bank, Keansburg; the Leonia Bank & Trust Co., Leonia; Linden Trust Co., Linden; the Maplewood Bank & Trust Co., Maplewood; the Millville National Bank, Millville; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Paulsboro; First Bank & Trust Co., Perth Amboy; the State Trust Company at Plainfield, Plainfield; Ridgefield Park Trust Co., Ridgefield Park; Riverside Trust Co., Riverside; Rutherford Trust Co., Rutherford; Citizens Trust Co., Summit; Swedesboro Trust Co., Swedesboro; the Union Center National Bank, Union; the First National Bank of Westwood, Westwood; the Woodridge National Bank, Woodridge.

New Mexico: First National Bank in Albuquerque, Albuquerque; the First National Bank, Belen; American Bank of Carlsbad, Carlsbad; the Carlsbad National Bank, Carlsbad; the Farmers & Stockmens Bank, Clayton; the Portales National Bank, Portales; First State Bank of Taos, Taos.

New York: The First National Bank, Addison, the Evans National Bank of Angola, Angola; the Citizens Bank, Arcade; the First National Bank and Trust Co., Bay Shore; the Industrial Bank, Binghamton; The Gramatan National Bank & Trust Co., Bronxville; the Peoples National Bank of Brooklyn, Brooklyn; the St. Lawrence County National Bank, Canton; Peninsula National Bank, Cedarhurst; Hayes National Bank, Clinton; Dundee State Bank, Dundee; Erie County Trust Co., East Aurora; Endicott Trust Co., Endicott; the Bank of LeRoy, LeRoy; Citizens State Bank, Lyndonville; the Massena Banking & Trust Co., Massena; the National Union Bank of Monticello, Monticello; Nanuet National Bank, Nanuet; State Bank of Newfane, Newfane; Royal State Bank of New York, New York; the Bank of North Collins, North Collins; the Exchange National Bank, Olean; the Oneida Valley National Bank of Oneida, Oneida; the Red Creek National Bank, Red Creek; the First National Bank, Richfield Springs; Salamanca Trust Co., Salamanca; the Silver Creek National Bank, Silver Creek; the First National Bank, Wayland.

North Carolina: Haywood County Bank, Canton; Durham Industrial Bank, Durham; the Fidelity Bank, Durham; the Citizens Bank, Warrenton.

North Dakota: First National Bank, Bottineau; the Ramsey National Bank of Devils Lake, Devils Lake; the Liberty National Bank, Dickinson; Security State Bank, Dunseith; the Fargo National Bank, Fargo; Walsh County State Bank, Grafton; First State Bank, Harvey; Citizens State Bank, Lankin; the First National Bank, Linton; the First State Bank of Munich, Munich; Stock Growers Bank, Napoleon; Security State Bank, Robinson; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Sheyenne; State Bank of Streeter, Streeter; First International Bank, Watford City; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Wimbledon.

Ohio: The Amsterdam State Bank Co., Amsterdam; the Farmers National Bank, Canfield; the Peoples Bank Co., Carey; Market Exchange Bank, Columbus; the Citizens Bank, Degraff; the Genoa Banking Co., Genoa; the Holgate State Bank, Holgate; the First National Bank, Ironton; the Johnstown Bank, Johnstown; the Firestone Bank, Lisbon; the Farmers Exchange Bank, Lynchburg; the First National Bank of Miamisburg, Miamisburg; the Sterling State Bank, Mount Sterling; the First National Bank of Newcomerstown, Newcomerstown; the Peoples Savings Bank, New Matamoras; the Citizens Banking Co., Perrysburg; the Farmers National Bank, Plain City; the First National Bank, Salem; the Silverton Bank, Silverton; the Miners and Mechanics Savings & Trust Co., Steubenville; the Farmers Savings Bank, Stony Ridge; the Peoples Bank, Tiltonsville; the Wakeman Bank Co., Wakeman; the Washington Savings Bank, Washington Court House; the Woodville State Bank, Woodville.

Oklahoma: The Atoka State Bank, Atoka; the Farmers National Bank, Carnegie; the First State Bank, Ketchum; the First National Bank of Minco, Minco; the First National Bank & Trust Co., Muskogee; the Eastman National Bank, Newkirk; First National Bank in Perry, Perry; the Stillwater National Bank, Stillwater; the First National Bank, Tahlequah; the National Bank, Verden; the First National Bank, Yale.

Oregon: First State Bank, Milwaukee; Bank of St. Helens, St. Helens; Commercial Bank of Salem, Salem.

Pennsylvania: Apollo Trust Co., Apollo; the Farmers National Bank, Beaver Falls; the First National Bank of Bellefonte, Bellefonte; the First National Bank of Berwick, Berwick; the National Bank, Boyerstown; Bank of Brentwood, Brentwood; Delaware Valley Bank & Trust Co., Farmers National Bank, Bristol; the Bryn Mawr Trust Co., Bryn Mawr; the First National Bank, Claysburg; the Conyngham National Bank, Conyngham; the Denver National Bank, Denver; the First National Bank at Derry, Derry; the First National Bank, Ebensburg; Elizabethtown Trust Co., Elizabethtown; the Ephrata National Bank, Ephrata; the Citizens National Bank of Evans City, Evans City; First National Bank, Export; Forty Fort State Bank, Forty Fort; the Old Freeport Bank, Freeport; First National Bank, Greensburg; the Grove City National Bank, Grove City; the Bank of Hartsville, Hartsville; the Hatfield National Bank & Trust Co., Hatfield; the Imperial Bank, Imperial; the Dale National Bank, Johnstown; National Bank & Trust Co., Kennett Square; the National Bank of McKeesport, McKeesport; Merchants National Bank & Trust Co., Meadville; the First National Bank, Milton; the First & Farmers National Bank & Trust Co., Montrose; Muncy Banking Co., Muncy; Beaver County Trust Co., New Brighton; the New Tripoli National Bank, New Tripoli; Citizens Bank of Pleasantville, Pleasantville; the First National Bank, Reynoldsville; McDowell National Bank, Sharon; Smithfield State Bank, Smithfield; First Blair County National Bank, Tyrone; Upper Darby National Bank, Upper Darby; the First National Bank of Wellsborough, Wellsboro; Williamsport National Bank, Williamsport.

South Carolina: Farmers & Merchants Bank, Aiken; the Bank of Barnwell, Barnwell; Guaranty Bank & Trust Co., Florence; the County Bank, Greenwood; Bank of Greer, Greer; Palmetto Bank & Trust Co., Lake City; Palmetto Bank, Laurens; the Southern National Bank, Orangeburg; Peoples Bank & Trust Co., Pageland; Bank of Ridgeland, Ridgeland; Arthur State Bank, Union.

South Dakota: The First National Bank, Beresford; Burke State Bank, Burke; Custer County Bank, Custer; the Bank of Union County, Elk Point; Corn Exchange Bank, Elkton; the Farmers State Bank, Estelline; Community Bank, Hartford; Bank of Hoven, Hoven; Exchange Bank, Lennox; Menno State Bank, Menno; First National Bank, the Pierre National Bank, Pierre; Sioux Valley Bank, Union Savings Bank, Sioux Falls;

Roberts County National Bank, Sisseton; Farmers State Bank, Stickney; Commercial State Bank, Wagner; Wilmot State Bank, Wilmot.

Tennessee: Bank of Adamsville, Adamsville; First National Bank, Athens; Brighton Savings Bank, Brighton; Bank of Camden, Camden; the Ridgedale Bank & Trust Co., Chattanooga; Cleveland Bank & Trust Co., Cleveland; Union Peoples Bank, Clinton; the Middle Tennessee Bank, Columbia; Cottage Grove Bank & Trust Co., Cottage Grove; Citizens Bank, Elizabethton; Bank of Knoxville, Knoxville; Blount National Bank, Maryville; Farmers-Peoples Bank, Milan; Third National Bank in Nashville, Nashville; Merchants & Planters Bank, Newport; First Trust & Savings Bank, Oneida; the Union Bank, Pulaski; the Rutherford Bank, Rutherford.

Texas: Security State Bank & Trust Co., Beaumont; First National Bank, Borger; Citizens National Bank, Brownwood; College Station State Bank, College Station; The First National Bank, Commerce; The Love Field State Bank, Republic National Bank of Dallas, Dallas; Del Rio National Bank, Del Rio; First State Bank, Dumas; Commercial State Bank, El Campo; Farmers and Merchants State Bank, Ferris; The First State Bank, Gainesville; Haskell National Bank, Haskell; Houston Bank & Trust Co., Texas National Bank, Houston; The First National Bank, LaFeria; The Farmers State Bank, Mexia; The First National Bank, Midland; Muenster State Bank, Muenster; The First National Bank of Navasota, Navasota; First National Bank, Orange; First National Bank, Pampa; Pasadena State Bank, Pasadena; Hale County State Bank, Plainview; First State Bank & Trust Co., Rio Grande City; Silsbee State Bank, Silsbee; Union State Bank, South San Antonio; The First State Bank, Taft; The Citizens National Bank, Waco; Wharton Bank & Trust Co., Wharton; The Wolfe City National Bank, Wolfe City; The First National Bank, Woodsboro.

Utah: The First National Bank, Layton; State Bank of Provo, Provo; First National Bank of Salt Lake City, Salt Lake City; Springville Banking Co., Springville.

Vermont: Bradford National Bank, Bradford; Vermont-Peoples National Bank, Brattleboro.

Virginia: First National Bank, Ashland; the Bank of Colonial Heights, Colonial Heights; the First National Bank, Farmville; Vaughan & Co., bankers, Franklin; the Citizens National Bank, Hampton; Farmers & Merchants Bank, Lawrenceville; the National Bank of Manassas, Manassas; Citizens Marine Jefferson Bank, Newport News; Merchants & Planters Bank, Southern Bank of Norfolk, Norfolk; Bank of Norview, Norview; the National Bank, Orange; Bank of Giles County, Pearisburg; Lee Bank & Trust Co., Pennington Gap; Petersburg Savings & American Trust Co., Petersburg; Merchants & Farmers Bank, Portsmouth; Mechanics & Merchants Bank, Richmond; American Bank & Trust Co., National Bank of Suffolk, Suffolk; the Vienna Trust Co., Vienna.

Washington: the Citizens State Bank, Arlington; the Bellingham National Bank, Bellingham; Bothell State Bank, Bothell; Cashmere Valley Bank, Cashmere; the First National Bank, Enumclaw; First National Bank in Montesano, Montesano; Olympia State Bank & Trust Co., Olympia; the First National Bank, Pullman; Citizens State Bank, Puyallup; Skagit Valley State Bank, Sedro Woolley; North Pacific Bank, the Puget Sound National Bank of Tacoma, United Mutual Savings Bank, Tacoma; the Baker-Boyer National Bank, Walla Walla.

West Virginia: the Flat Top National Bank, Bluefield; Bank of Charles Town, Charles Town; Nicholas County Bank, Summersville.

Wisconsin: The Second National Bank, Beloit; the Indianhead State Bank, Chetek; Dairyman's State Bank, Clintonville; The First National Bank, Elkhorn; the First State Bank, Fennimore; First Bank of Grantsburg, Grantsburg; Farmers and Merchants Bank, Greenwood; Iron Exchange Bank, Hurley; Rock County National Bank, Janesville; Exchange State Bank, La Crosse; Lancaster State Bank, Lancaster; the American Exchange Bank, Madison; State Bank of Medford, Medford; West Side Bank, Whitefish Bay State Bank, Milwaukee; the Oshkosh National Bank, Oshkosh; Peshtigo State Bank, Peshtigo; the Port Washington State Bank, Port Washington; Farmers-Merchants National Bank, Princeton; State Bank, Reeseville; St. Nazianz State Bank, St. Nazianz; Bank of Two Rivers, Two Rivers; Union State Bank of West Salem, West Salem.

Wyoming: The Casper National Bank, the Wyoming National Bank of Casper, Casper; the Stock Growers National Bank, Cheyenne; Stockmens Bank, Gillette; the Jackson State Bank, Jackson.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by him on April 3, 1956, before Knights of Columbus in Silver Spring, Md., with relation to the 1956 Olympic games.

Statement by him commemorating anniversary of independence of Greece.

Address by Senator MARTIN before Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society, at Philadelphia, Pa., on March 22, 1956.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF VARIOUS CLASSES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senate received today a list of nominations of persons for appointment as foreign service officers of various classes, consular and/or diplomatic designations for career, staff, and Reserve officers, and one promotion. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to give notice that these nominations will be considered by the committee at the expiration of 6 days.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 29, RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 39, RELATING TO EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 29, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, and Senate Joint Resolution 39, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

FOURTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF BATAAN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for not more than 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Today is Bataan Day, the 14th anniversary of the fall of the historic bastion of freedom in the Philippines. It was a bitter defeat. Yet Bataan has become a synonym of courage and honor. As President Magsaysay observed in setting aside the day as a national holiday, Bataan "has become a shining symbol of courage and heroism to all freedom-loving peoples of the world."

Americans can take special pride in this commemoration of Bataan Day. It marked a military failure, it is true, but it gave us a valuable lesson in how to establish abiding relationship between free peoples. Again I should like to quote President Magsaysay:

"Bataan Day," he said, "has strengthened the everlasting bonds of friendship and cooperation between the Philippines and the United States."

Mr. President, in today's New York Times there appears a very fine editorial, which I should like to quote at this point in my remarks. The editorial, which is entitled "Bataan Day" reads:

BATAAN DAY

Today's observance of Bataan Day in the Philippines and in the United States has some unusual aspects. There is probably not such another political and military commemoration that is noted jointly by two separate nations. It is a national holiday in the Philippines. It might well be one here.

This is also a celebration, not of a military victory, but of a defeat. This is an anniversary of the loss of Bataan to the Japanese. It is not, however, a memorial service nor an occasion for mourning. It is a day of triumph.

What Bataan Day means both there and here is that somehow in the flames of war there was forged a bond between Filipinos and Americans that is worth remembering and celebrating. We were brothers in arms. We were comrades in disaster. We are associates in the new freedom.

What made the joint effort on Bataan possible, and what makes the celebration of this day meaningful, is the fact that we and the Filipinos were joined in the good cause of human liberty. That liberty was threatened by an invader and we and the Filipinos stood side by side to resist the threat. In that moment we were overwhelmed and suffered together. But out of that experience there arose the new sense of comradeship, mutual faith, and mutual loyalty that we celebrate today.

There have been ripples of antagonism on the surface of our association since that time. They are just that, neither a tide nor the deeps that lie beneath. They, too, will

pass, just as the horrors of Bataan have become a memory.

Today is a day for mutual understanding, for deeper sympathy. We remember and honor our glorious dead. We fought in one cause, for one goal. That goal can be realized if we keep faith with those who died on the peninsula.

It is fitting, therefore, that we in our own country observe Bataan Day as a milestone in the unbroken continuity of mankind's march toward human dignity and freedom.

This anniversary of the fall of Bataan finds Americans and Filipinos united in resistance to a new form of tyranny, a godless ideology that is unmoral and ruthless, that recognizes neither faith nor ethics, that enslaves the human mind and soul.

We are witnessing a struggle between freedom and slavery, between democracy and totalitarianism. At stake today, as it was 14 years ago, is human liberty and the dignity of the individual. In this struggle our Filipino friends are fighting shoulder to shoulder with us, just as they did on Bataan, in Leyte, and in Korea.

It is well that we should draw inspiration from the courage of the defenders of Bataan, American and Filipino, who fought aggression more by their physical and spiritual courage rather than with material resources, of which they had very little. Not only do we salute the living and the dead for their sacrifice, but we learn from their stirring example the fortitude and the determination we have to muster to face the future, and successfully fight our enemies of today.

May our Nation and the world recall today that last broadcast from Corregidor by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, then a lieutenant colonel on MacArthur's staff—that unforgettable message of hope and valor which now, as it did then, should galvanize free men into action in defense of their threatened liberties everywhere. General Romulo said:

Bataan has fallen, but the spirit that made it stand—a beacon to all liberty-loving peoples of the world—cannot fail.

The spirit which made Bataan stand is the invincible might that alone can safeguard world peace today. It is this spirit that assures the maintenance of a free world of free men, despite the temporary gains which totalitarian systems—Nazi, Fascist, Communist, or any other—may make.

FINAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE FOR THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last Friday, April 6, the final report of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education was presented to President Eisenhower.

The committee recommended a temporary emergency program of Federal aid for public school construction, for a 5-year period, on a matching basis. The committee urged that such aid be given in such a way that the States and local school districts would be encouraged to make use of their own resources, and that States which have really made an effort to solve their own problem not be penalized.

On January 12 I introduced on behalf of myself and 17 colleagues S. 2905, the administration's school construction bill.

So far, no action has been taken by the Senate on this important measure.

The principles set forth in S. 2905 have now been supported in this final report.

On Saturday, April 7, the New York Times carried an editorial entitled "School Report."

The final paragraph of that editorial reads as follows:

The most practical way of implementing the general philosophy and some of the particular recommendations of the committee is to push for action on the President's school-aid bill. It will need every ounce of strength the administration can muster to get it through and get it through without irrelevant or destructive amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this entire editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

I hope that with this final White House conference report as an impetus, all of us will in the coming weeks increase our efforts, in a bipartisan manner, to see that a school-construction bill receives the prompt consideration of the Senate.

We cannot afford to postpone action on this crucially important subject any longer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL REPORT

The final report growing out of last fall's White House Conference on Education gives a striking picture of the present state of the public schools and provides firm ground for a new and vigorous drive to get the President's school-aid bill through Congress during the current session.

The overwhelming majority of the President's committee found no doubt that a school-building emergency exists, and that Federal aid should be made available on a limited basis to help the States and local school districts overcome that emergency. At the same time the committee urged that Federal money be provided "under the philosophy of encouraging greater use of State and local funds for school purposes" and that each State and district be required "to match Federal funds in proportion to its financial ability." This is a point of view with which we fully agree, and it is embodied in the administration's school-aid bill on which the House of Representatives for many weeks has failed to take action.

The committee found not only that "a few States are so lacking in economic ability that they cannot finance an adequate system of public education * * *" but also that the emergency "is so extensive that no State or Territory escapes it." This is not to say that some States and districts cannot do a great deal better than they are doing. Indeed, they can, and it may surprise some complacent northerners to know that the least effort, as measured by the ratio of total income to expenditure on schools, appears to be in the North and not in the South.

The committee took no definitive position on the highly controversial subject of Federal help for operation, as distinct from construction, of schools. It said the extent to which public funds should be expended in providing basic health and safety services for nonpublic (parochial) schools should be locally determined. On the even more touchy segregation issue, it endorsed a solution "worked out by each community in its own way" but "within the intent" of the Supreme Court decisions.

The most practical way of implementing the general philosophy and some of the particular recommendations of the committee is to push for action on the President's school-aid bill. It will need every ounce of strength the administration can muster to get it through and get it through without irrelevant or destructive amendments.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION AS OF MARCH 31, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a summary of the legislative action of the Senate as of March 31, 1956.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE ACTION AS OF MARCH 31, 1956

The Senate has been far more active in the second session of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress than it was during the comparable sessions of either the 83d or the 80th Congress, both controlled by the Republican Party.

Through March 31 of this session, the Senate has passed a total of 423 pieces of legislation. That compares with 222 bills passed by the Senate during the first 3 months of 1954 and with 301 passed by the Senate during the first 3 months of the second session of the 80th Congress.

At the end of March, the Senate had been in session a total of 355 hours. The score was 304 hours in session during the first 3 months of 1954 and only 227 hours during the comparable period of 1948.

The box score in full follows:

Senate activity—2d sessions of 84th, 83d, 80th Congress, as of March 31, 1956

	84th Cong., 2d sess.	83d Cong., 2d sess.	80th Cong., 2d sess.
Days in session	55	56	50
Hours in session	355:58	304:03	227:42
Total measures passed	423	222	301
Senate bills	164	82	127
House bills	164	84	121
Senate joint resolutions	7	3	8
House joint resolutions	11	5	5
Senate concurrent resolutions	11	8	4
House concurrent resolutions	4	4	11
Senate resolutions	62	46	25
Confirmations	24, 366	8, 412	4, 612

Below is a subject list of the 127 general legislative measures passed as of March 31, 1956.

AGRICULTURE

1. H. R. 12, the farm bill: a bill to provide an improved farm program, and including a soil-bank provision.

2. H. R. 8780, the farm gasoline bill: relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used on the farm, and directs a refund of taxes paid on such gasoline in 1956.

3. H. R. 1855, forest research: authorizes a permanent program of United States contribution to specialized forest, range, and watershed research.

4. H. R. 7236, soil conservation: authorizes Federal assistance in soil-conservation programs to farmers in all areas, not merely arid sections of the United States.

5. H. R. 1726, Federal Seed Act: provides a civil action for violation of the analysis and labeling provisions of the act.

6. H. R. 7030, Sugar Act: extending to December 31, 1962, the legislation under which domestic and imported sugar is controlled in

the United States. Modifies the distribution formula for increased sugar requirements as between domestic and foreign producers and among foreign producers.

7. S. 2884, durum wheat: extends to the 1956 durum wheat crop the increased acreage allotment provided for 1955.

8. H. R. 8320, school milk-brucellosis programs: authorizes an additional $10 million for the school-milk program, or from $50 million to $60 million; and $2 million for the brucellosis program or from $15 million to $17 million through June 30, 1956.

9. S. 1688, prescribes civil penalties for violations of the Federal Seed Act.

10. House Joint Resolution 455, restores the 1955 acreage allotments on burley tobacco quotas.

11. House Joint Resolution 521, restores the 1955 acreage allotments on Maryland tobacco.

12. House Joint Resolution 518 restores the 1955 acreage allotments on dark air-cured and fire-cured tobacco.

APPROPRIATIONS

13. H. R. 9063, urgent deficiency for 1956, appropriating $64,670,201.

14. H. R. 9064, Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act for 1957, appropriating $3,629,139,000.

15. House Joint Resolution 582, authorizing an additional $13 million for unemployment compensation for Federal employees, to be derived from transfer from the appropriation for unemployment compensation for veterans, 1956.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

16. H. R. 6574, motor-vehicle registration plates, reestablishes the former fee of $1 for the transfer of motor-vehicle registration plates from one vehicle to another during the course of a registration year in the District of Columbia.

17. H. R. 9770, Federal contribution, authorizes the annual payment by the Federal Government to be increased $3 million toward the cost of operating the District of Columbia government for fiscal 1957 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

18. S. 3053 extends to May 1, 1956, the time for the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission to submit its report and recommendations regarding construction of a District of Columbia civic auditorium.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

19. S. 1135, Civil Air Patrol, extends the benefits of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to senior CAP members.

20. H. R. 8107, Reserve Act amendment, equalizes the pay scales of reservists called to 6-month training duty with those of National Guard members and provides increased medical and disability benefits.

21. S. 3237, life-insurance coverage, continues coverage under Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act for employees receiving benefits under the Compensation Act so long as the employee is unable to return to work.

22. S. 3315, reemployment requirement: Makes the 1-year reemployment requirement inapplicable to civil servants who die before that year is served, in establishing survivor's benefits.

23. S. 1542. notaries public: Authorizes reimbursement of notaries' fees for Government employees who become notaries for the convenience of the Government.

24. H. R. 3996. Military Personnel Claims Act: Increases from $2,500 to $4,000 the limit on administrative settlement under the act.

FINANCE, COMMERCE, INDUSTRY—INCLUDES TAXATION

25. H. R. 7201, life insurance company tax: Establishes new system of taxing income of life insurance companies; reforms tax laws on investments by life insurance companies; and amends the law regarding new insurance companies.

26. H. R. 6712, tax revision: Amends section 1237 of the code to afford capital gains treatment to corporations or individuals holding foreclosed land for 10 years, subdividing and selling, unless as part of a real-estate trading business.

27. H. R. 2667, Internal Revenue Code: Makes effective December 31, 1947 (now 1950) the estate-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which provide that there shall not be included in a decedent's estate, property previously transferred in trust as to which the decedent retained certain discretionary powers if for at least 3 months prior to December 31, 1947, and up to his death he was under a mental disability.

28. H. R. 4376, duty free: Adds to the free list of the 1930 Tariff Act handwoven fabrics imported by religious societies for use in making vestments.

29. H. R. 4582, amends the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, section 381 (c), to permit parent corporations acquiring subsidiary corporations under the 1939 Revenue Code under tax-free liquidations or mergers to deduct from gross income the unused contributions of the subsidiary to pension funds.

30. H. R. 5428, amends the Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that where a transferee or fiduciary by agreement waives the statute of limitations for the assessment of additional income taxes, the statutory period for credits or refunds shall be similarly extended.

31. H. R. 7054, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide an election for executors of a credit against the estate tax for the amount of tax paid on property which passed to the decedent from a spouse who died within 2 years prior to the decedent's death.

32. H. R. 7094, amends the 1939 code to allow for all taxable years governed by that code an unlimited charitable deduction where in 8 of the 10 preceding years the individual's contributions to charity and his income tax payments are equal to 90 percent or more of his taxable income.

33. H. R. 7247, adds to the 1954 Revenue Code a new section which provides for the recognition of no gain in the recapitalization of a railroad corporation under the bankruptcy laws or in receivership proceedings where the property of a transferor corporation is exchanged solely for securities or stock of the transferee.

34. H. R. 7282, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in the computation of credits allowable for corporate dividends received, dividends paid and Western Hemisphere trade corporations, corporations in determining their adjusted net income shall include their net long-term capital gain income even though it may have been subject to the alternative 25-percent tax rate.

35. H. R. 7364, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the stamp tax the issuance of debt certificates sold under installment arrangements whereby the obligee may not pay more than 20 percent annually of the total maturity value.

36. H. R. 8166, provides a 1-year extension of the present corporate income tax rate and the existing rates of certain excises, which were scheduled for reduction on April 1, 1956.

37. S. 3091, sale of Louisville, Ky., rubber plant and butadiene producing equipment.

38. H. R. 5265, foreign travel tax: exempts from the 10-percent excise tax on transportation of persons, travel to or from a point outside the United States, or that part of Canada and Mexico which is more than 225 miles from the United States.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

39. S. 3116, cultural and athletic exchanges: Provides a permanent program for United States participation in international cultural, athletic, and industrial fairs.

40. Executive Q, 83d, 1st, treaty, commercial samples: Ratified the international convention to facilitate importation of commercial advertising samples.

41. H. R. 8100, submarines to Brazil: Authorizes the loan of two reserve submarines to Brazil, for 5 years, and authorizes MDAP payment of outfitting costs.

42. S. 2562, Fulbright scholars: Amends the act to require of exchange students a return to their home country, or to a cooperating country for 2 years, before they become eligible for naturalization.

43. Executive F: Transfers to the U. N. procedural functions formerly performed by the League of Nations.

44. Executive P: Ratifying a protocol modifying the International Customs Convention, to permit the Bureau to increase its maximum budget from 125,000 gold francs to 500,000 gold francs and increases assessments of members.

45. House Joint Resolution 464, permits duty-free importation of articles exhibited at the State of Washington International Fair.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

46. S. 1146, removes requirement that reasonableness of attorney's fees, in regard to claims under Trading With the Enemy Act, be passed on by Alien Property Office.

47. Senate Joint Resolution 95, authorizes the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, and to make its recommendations on the site and design to Congress as early as practicable.

48. H. R. 6904, establishes a public national memorial for Booker T. Washington, who, through prodigious efforts and many great contributions to his people and all mankind, was elected to the Hall of Fame.

49. H. R. 3557, settling claims against the United States: Amends the act providing for claims up to $1,000 resulting from noncombat injury or damage by extending the statute of limitations to 2 years, broadening circumstances covered by the act, etc.

50. H. R. 6463, Hawaiian lands: Ratifies certain acts of the Hawaiian Legislature, giving abutting property owners preference rights to small tracts of lands.

51. H. R. 6807, Hawaiian lands: Provides for relaxation of certain restrictive covenants on former public lands.

52. H. R. 6808, Hawaiian lands: Provides for a second private sale of public lands after initial auction, at not less than the advertised price.

53. H. R. 6461, Hawaiian lands: Provides for the mandatory inclusion of Government-sold lands in irrigation projects, and assessments therefor.

54. H. R. 5844, passport applications: Increased the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

55. H. R. 8191, New Zealand paintings: Authorized the donation to New Zealand of 25 World War II paintings of New Zealand soldiers, done by German artists.

56. Senate Joint Resolutions 122, 123, 124, to provide for filling of 3 separate vacancies in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of class other than Members of Congress.

57. House Joint Resolution 517, date of electoral vote count: Establishes January 1, 1957, as the date for counting electoral votes, January 6 falling on Sunday.

58. H. R. 1806, Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association: Authorizes consolidation of Theodore Roosevelt Association with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Association.

59. S. 3386, Theodore Roosevelt Centennial: Authorizes an additional $461,000 for the Commission for Celebration of 100th Anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt's birth.

60. H. R. 6112, Colonial Historical Park: Authorizes construction of a sewage disposal system in the park, with some private users paying.

61. H. R. 6022, Trenton Massacre Monument: Authorizes movement of the Monument to a more convenient location nearby.

62. H. R. 5280, Colonial Historical Park: Authorizes certain land exchanges for the park.

63. H. R. 4391, Castle Pinckney Monument: Abolishes the Castle Pinckney National Monument, S. C., and authorizes disposal of the land as surplus Federal property.

64. H. R. 374, Stanislaus Forest: Authorizes the exchange of deeds to 440 acres in the Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., for 440 acres contiguous thereto, to cure defects in the two deeds.

65. S. 1161, Fossil Cycad National Monument: Abolishes the monument after allowing for a period of scientific investigation.

66. S. 1992, Pioneer National Monument, Ky.: Provides for conveyance of a tract of land in Madison County, Ky., to the Pioneer National Monument Association.

67. H. R. 7927, Federal housing projects: Extends to 1 year the time in which Louisiana may make down payments for housing projets.

68. H. R. 6772, Oregon land: Conveys certain Federal land to School District No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.

69. House Joint Resolution 112, South Carolina land: Releases United States reversionary interest in certain improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

70. H. R. 6625. New Mexico land: Transfers back to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo, N. Mex., 1¾ acres taken by the Government for school purposes.

71. H. R. 5889, Georgia land: Transfers back certain lands to Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.

72. H. R. 622, Michigan land: releases United States right-of-way interest in Saginaw County, Mich., land.

73. H. R. 585, California land: authorizes conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of Lower Lake Rancheria, to be used as an airport.

74. S. 2246, South Dakota land: authorizes sale of certain Bankhead-Jones lands to Wall, S. Dak.

75. H. R. 4680, California land: affirms that title to a tract vested in California in 1897.

76. S. 2267, Nevada land: conveys certain public lands to Henderson, Nev.

77. H. R. 6298, war housing projects: permits transfer of war housing projects to Moses Lake, Wash., and other communities similarly situated.

78. S. 2909, Commerce seals: authorizes maintenance of seals of office by branches of the Commerce Department.

79. H. R. 5856, penalty envelopes: repeals requirement that department heads report to Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at year's end.

80. H. R. 5876, Copyright Office: permits deposit of photographic reproductions in the office in lieu of certain published works.

HEALTH

81. S. 2990, polio vaccine: extends to June 30, 1957, authority to make grants to the States, for their free provision of Salk vaccine to children and expectant mothers.

82. Senate Joint Resolution 115, designates February in each year as American Heart Month.

83. S. 3076, authorizes the Public Health Service to make a continuing survey of sickness and disability.

84. S. 3246, increases by $3 million, or from $2 million to $5 million, the amount authorized for erection and equipment of buildings and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research.

INTERNAL SECURITY

85. S. 2887, security of juries: makes a criminal offense the tapping, recording, or unauthorized observance of grand and petit jury deliberations.

86. H. R. 3233, fleeing arson prosecution: Makes it a Federal offense to move across State lines to avoid prosecution or custody for arson.

NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING FLOOD CONTROL

87. House Joint Resolution 471, home-disaster relief: Permits the FHA to provide title 1 repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

88. H. R. 7871, disaster loans: Increases to $375 million the funds available to the Small Business Administration for disaster loans.

89. H. R. 6645, natural-gas bill: Freed independent natural-gas producers from direct Federal (FPC) price control. Vetoed February 17, 1956.

90. H. R. 7930, Russian River project: Authorizes completion of the initial stage of development at Russian River Basin, Calif., a flood-control and irrigation project.

91. S. 500, Colorado River storage: Authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project.

92. Senate Joint Resolution 135, authorizes payment of $5 million to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir project, Montana and Wyoming.

93. H. R. 6309, authorizes construction of the Mississippi River-gulf outlet.

94. H. R. 6268, facilitates the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and similar projects by making irrigation funds available for such works and items.

95. H. R. 7097, provides for reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project to the former owners.

96. H. R. 5556, authorizes a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control.

97. S. 180, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma. Public Law 419, approved February 25, 1956.

98. S. 926, authorizes the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, Calif. Public Law 423, approved March 1, 1956.

SOCIAL WELFARE

99. H. R. 7036, limitation on retirement income: Increases from $900 to $1,200 the amount a person under 72 can earn, before his over-65 retirement credit must be reduced.

100. S. 2438, pensions: Amends the act of 1929 which provided a pension of $125 monthly to Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever by increasing such pensions to $200 per month.

101. S. 51, repeals the provisions of law under which States were empowered to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indian reservations without the consent of or consultation with the Indian tribes involved.

102. S. 1528, authorizes enrolled members of Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands.

103. S. 1555, authorizes restoration to tribal ownership certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

104. S. 2042, restores jurisdiction of the district courts over certain wage claims which were pending in the district courts or in the courts of appeal on October 31, 1951, and which were dismissed solely because the code was amended to remove that jurisdiction.

105. S. 2151, provides for segregating certain funds of Fort Berthold Indians on a basis of membership roll.

106. S. 3259, increases from $250,000 to $400,000 the appropriation to the American Printing House for the Blind and authorizes wider distribution of books and other specialized instructional material to promote the education of the blind.

107. H. R. 4802, authorizes the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land.

108. House Concurrent Resolution 94, favors waiving State residence requirements in certain elections.

109. House Concurrent Resolution 199, extends congressional felicitations to those participating in the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin.

110. House Joint Resolution 194, designates the General Grant tree in King's Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine.

111. House Joint Resolution 443, authorizes additional funds for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

112. S. 2861, emergency highway funds: Authorizes an increase from $10 to $30 million in emergency relief highway funds for fiscal year 1956, as a result of flood and hurricane damage.

113. H. R. 2552, Great Lakes Channels: authorizes the modification of existing connecting channels above Lake Erie, to provide deeper channels on several tributaries.

114. H. R. 5614, FCC complaints: Allows the FCC to demur to protests against the authorization of grants, and to dismiss insubstantial protests, after oral argument, without hearings.

115. S. 1456, FCC procedure: Permits the FCC to dispense with certain duplicatory procedures relating to reports and hearings, where communications carriers are jointly owned or where consolidations are desired.

116. S. 1777, Disabled—Reduced rates: Permits common carriers to transport, for one fare, a disabled person and his attendant, if an attendant is required for such person.

117. S. 898, trip leasing: Defines the legal standards for truck trip leasing by farmers, farm cooperatives and private carriers.

118. S. 1702, clarifies the provisions of law relating to the sale or pledge of stamps by postmasters or postal employees.

119. S. 1871, provides for reimbursement to the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government-mail matter.

120. S. 2210 modifies the project for St. Mary's River, Mich., south canal, in order to repeal the authorization for the alteration of the international bridge as a part of the project.

121. S. 2286 authorizes the utilization of privately owned American shipping services for the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of military personnel.

122. S. 2972 punishes the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft, and attempts to willfully damage or destroy.

123. S. 3269 permits Canadian vessels to continue to serve Alaskan ports until June 30, 1957.

124. S.3422 authorizes transfer of certain amounts from unclaimed payments on United States savings bonds to the fund created for the payment of Government losses in shipment.

125. H. R. 6043 makes permanent the Merchant Marine Academy.

126. S. 2711 authorizes medals and decorations for outstanding service in merchant marine.

127. S. 3452 increases authorization for aircraft control and warning system.

THE PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the course of the recent farm debate, I referred to a poll which the Watertown Daily Times, one of the finest newspapers in upstate New York, has been conducting among the farmers of northern New York on the price-support program.

It is an amazing fact, according to the Watertown Times of Saturday, March 31, that over 90 percent of those

who have thus far participated in the poll voted in opposition to the Benson flexible price-support program. Only 8.76 percent voted in favor. Over 50 percent indicated their support for 90 percent price supports.

Mr. President, I believe the Watertown Daily Times is performing a great public service in conducting this poll. I expect to report to Congress the periodic results of this poll as they are printed in the Watertown Times. At this point, I should like to congratulate the Watertown Times on this undertaking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interim report of March 31 on the dairy farmers poll, as published in Farm and Garden, the farm supplement of the Watertown Daily Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINIONS EMPHATIC IN FARM POLL—FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS DISLIKED—$6 MILK IS STRONGLY FAVORED

(By Boyd W. Moffett)

A 3½ weeks' dairy-farmers' poll, conducted by Farm and Garden to sample northern New York dairy-farmer opinion with respect to issues involved in any Federal farm program, has been concluded.

In tabulating the final results, these highlights stand out:

1. A total of 335 persons responded. There were 331 who sent in ballots and 4 who replied in letter form but did not enclose a ballot.

2. Of the 331 who filed ballots, 302, or 91.24 percent, voted against the Benson flexible price-support plan. A total of 29, or 8.76 percent, marked "Yes" on that No. 1 question on the ballot.

3. To the question: "Are you in favor of subsidies paid to farmers?" there were 254, or 76.74 percent, who answered "Yes." Sixty-eight, or 20.54 percent, said "No." This inquiry was unanswered on 9 ballots, or 2.72 percent.

4. On the parity question, 90 percent price support was the overwhelming favorite. A total of 168, or 50.76 percent, cast their ballots for that figure.

5. Six-dollar milk was the big choice. A total of 154, or 46.53 percent, listed this figure as the price they believed would be fair to them.

6. Although the ballot did not request identification, 82 of the 335 who responded either signed their names and addresses, or dispatched the information in personalized envelopes.

7. There were 37 letters received—33 of them with ballots attached. Twenty-six of the letters bore signatures. And on 112 of the ballots, senders wrote comment in the margins.

8. A total of 73 different northern New York communities were represented in the voting. The area covered extended from Sandy Creek and Lacona, on the south, to Ausable Forks, on the north, and Boonville, on the east.

Farmer opinion on the price-support and subsidy questions was emphatically distinct. With reference to parity, however, the answers were more varied.

While 90 percent was the favorite, with 169 votes, 100 percent ranked second, attracting 89 votes, or 26.89 percent of the 331 total. Eleven farmers, or 3.32 percent, voted for 85 percent of parity, while 10, or 3.02 percent, marked in 95 percent.

There were other scattered figures as follows: Eight in favor of 150 percent, 5 for 75 percent, 2 for 125 percent, and 1 vote each for 200, 110, 104, 98, 82, 60, and 50 percent. Thirty-three failed to answer this question.

Similarly, there were 19 different suggested milk prices. Six dollars per hundredweight led the poll, followed by $5, favored by 76 farmers, or 22.96 percent. A price of $5.50 was chosen by 50 voters, or 15.11 percent. In third position was a figure of $4.50, listed on 15 ballots, or 4.53 percent.

Other scattered price quotations included: $6.50 and $4, by 4 farmers each; $6.94, $4.40, and $4.25, by 3 each; $7, $5.75, and $4.75, by 2 each; and $10, $7.50, $6.35, $6.25, $4.95, $4.85, and $4.70, each with 1 vote. There were only six ballot-senders who did not insert a price choice.

The Dairy Farmers' Poll brought forth many interesting sidelights.

As one Adams section farmer wrote: "I think this is the first time the family-size farmers have had a chance to let people know what they think."

Another, this man a resident of Mannsville, wrote: "What pleases me is when farmers have the right to vote individually, the truth comes out."

The one farmer who asked for $10 per hundred for his milk and 150 percent price support, choice, noted that he preferred subsidies "rather than work for nothing."

Another, who listed $6 milk and 150 percent price support, wrote that "I would like farmers to get $2 per hour."

And still another concluded making out his ballot with this written-in note: "I wonder if what we think ever means anything."

The No. 1 question on the ballot, concerning the Benson flexible price-support plan, seemed to draw the strongest comment. Here are some of the typical notations scribbled along the margins of the ballots:

"I am not in favor of Benson."

"I have no use for Benson. He will wreck the Republican Party."

"We have all of Ike and Benson we want."

"I am a Republican but will vote Democratic. This administration is no good for the farmers."

"We want Democratic times. Most farmers will be on welfare before long, or bankrupt."

"If the GOP loses the eastern farmers' vote they can thank Benson for it."

Then, of course, there were a few who were even more rash in their attack on the Secretary of Agriculture—and even the President. Among those sharp notes were:

"I have no use for Benson."

"Remove Benson."

"Please help kick Benson out."

"I think we have the worst President and Secretary of Agriculture we ever had or ever will. They are out to starve the farmers and help the big shots."

Of the 29 farmers who marked their ballots in favor of the Benson flexible-support plan, a few sent along brief letters or notes. Among the comments were these:

"Benson's flexible plan is the best for the farmer in the long run, but in the meantime milk is still going down."

"While Secretary Benson has made his mistakes, to me he is sincerely trying to straighten out the milk problem. If we stick with Benson it will straighten itself out. It takes more than a couple years to straighten out a mess thas has existed for so long."

"Some people wouldn't have enough if they got $10 a hundred."

The comment on subsidies was not quite as strong, but here again the ballot senders made their voices heard. Many of those who voted in favor of subsidies said:

"If we cannot have a fair price without them," or "as long as other businesses get them."

Several commented that they did not believe in subsidies "for any farm produce," and a number of farmers dislike subsidies of any type.

Comment on the parity question was fairly light. One farmer wrote in: "What is parity? Dealers set the price then."

Another wrote he favored keeping grains and milk at the same support level. And there were many who observed that "if we're going to have supports, the figure should be 100 percent, if any."

Varied comment also was noticed on the milk price inquiry. Scores of the ballots carried the notation that the year-around price should be $5. Some favored $4.50. "If we could get $4.50 the year around for the blend price, we might keep out of the red," wrote 1 farmer.

Still others leaned toward a price of $6 in winter and either $5 or $4 in summer. One man suggested $6 for 3.5 milk for 5 months and $5 for the other 7 months.

Then there were these two notations:

"Five dollar milk with labor at $1 an hour."

"Seven dollars per hundredweight would allow me $1 per hour wages, plus 2 percent interest on investment."

Here are a few of the other general comments which were made on the ballots:

Subsidies should be paid "directly, not to distributors or dealers."

"A thousand times 'no,' (with respect to the flexible price support plan).

"Keep the Government out of agriculture."

"Subsidy money comes from the taxpayer—you and me—not the Government."

"A fair price for his work and investment would be appreciated."

And, to cap the climax, was this one: "Please do something about the poor farmer. Stop to think; that is where all your milk comes from."

The dairy farmers' poll ballot appeared in Farm and Garden on three successive Saturday's—March 3, March 10, and March 17. Previous reports on the progress of the balloting were issued March 10, 17, and 24. All ballots received up to this past Wednesday were included in this final tabulation.

PROBLEMS FACING MAINE FISHERIES

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, recently I received from the Portland Fisheries Association of Portland, Maine, a letter which is an excellent summary of the problems facing Maine fisheries. While the letter pertains especially to local conditions in Portland, the suggestions it contains have application to the problems shared by the fisheries of all sections of our country. These problems merit very careful consideration by the Federal Government, and it is my hope that every Member of Congress will give this letter some careful thought, with particular reference to the corrective measures which have been suggested by the Portland Fisheries Association.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of this letter from the Portland Fisheries Association may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, MAINE, *March 30, 1956.*

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: The undersigned, who are the charter members of an association now in the process of being formed, called Portland Fisheries Association, which association is being organized for the purpose of promoting, protecting, developing and assisting the Maine Fishing Industry,

have drafted this letter to point out to you, our Senator, some of the many problems which the fishing industry, including boat owners, fish plant owners, fishermen, and those connected with the fishing industry in Maine, are facing.

First, we would like to present some facts and figures:

In 1946, the average price of fish per pound, ex vessel, in Maine was as follows:

Haddock	0.081
Hake	.043
Pollock	.037
Redfish	.039
Round whiting	.016
Black backs	.047

In 1956, 10 years later, the price of these same classes of fish is almost exactly the same, with the exception of whiting, which has dropped to between 0.010 and 0.0125 per pound.

Nor has this lack of increase in price been helped much by increase in volume, since the following comparison between the number of pounds of fish landed in Maine in 1946 and those landed in 1955 shows that only the landings of haddock, redfish, and whiting have increased, while the landing of black backs, pollock, and hake have substantially decreased:

Landings, 1946

Haddock	2,814,800
Hake	8,418,400
Pollock	7,098,100
Redfish	41,072,400
Round whiting	5,696,600
Black backs	1,080,100

Landings, 1955

Haddock	4,009,249
Hake	2,398,185
Pollock	5,051,212
Redfish	67,684,954
Round whiting	25,092,249
Black backs	918,000

In spite of the fact that the price per pound of fish is no higher in 1956 than it was in 1946, the cost of operating fishing vessels has more than doubled. P. & I. insurance has increased in cost over the past 4 or 5 years alone from approximately $125 per man per year to approximately $300 per man per year. Hull insurance has increased from approximately 4½ percent to 9 or 10 percent (based on the age of the vessel) and, in addition, prior to 1951 or 1952 the rate included 100-percent valuation with no deductible and full Inchmaree clause. The 1956 rate is based on a $250 deductible, an 80-percent valuation, and a limited Inchmaree clause which no longer covers machinery damage due to negligence of master, mates, pilots, engineers, etc. It is also becoming extremely difficult, if not impossible, to place hull insurance on vessels over 10 years old, and as you may know, most of the Portland fleet are over 10 years old.

Other items which are indispensable to the operation of fishing vessels, and therefore to the whole fishing industry, are repairs, fuel oil, wire rope, and manila line. In 1946 the average wage in shipyards in the Portland area for unskilled labor was $1.50 to $1.75 per hour. Today the average wage is $3 to $3.50 per hour. In 1946 fuel oil was 11 cents per gallon; today it is 14½ cents per gallon. In 1946 wire rope was $17.20 per hundred feet; today it is $27 per hundred feet. In 1946 manila line was 45 cents per pound; today it is 52 cents per pound.

Adding fuel to the flame is the fact that in 1946, the bulk of the fishing out of Portland was done between 60 and 150 miles from Portland, while today the bulk of the fishing is done on the Grand Banks, which are from 800 to 1,000 miles away. You can easily see what this added distance does to the profits of everyone connected with the fishing industry. It means that the boat-owners have 10 times the maintenance and repair expenses that they used to have. The fishermen who have to pay for fuel, ice, and food under our present share system have to pay several times more for these items than they did a few years ago. The fish company's supply becomes erratic, as it is difficult to predict time of landings. This added distance also has an adverse effect on younger men who might want to come into the fishing industry because, whereas in 1946 trips averaged 7 days for a vessel of 150,000–250,000 pounds capacity, today these same vessels are out sometimes 17 days.

To demonstrate the very sad condition of the fishing industry in Portland at the present time, as compared to a few years ago, we present the following facts:

In 1946, 34 vessels were fishing out of Portland; today there are only 19. Of these 19, 2 are 5 years old or newer, 2 are between 5 and 10 years old, 2 are between 10 and 15 years old, 1 is between 15 and 20 years old, and the remaining 12, or the majority of the fleet, are over 20 years old.

Another fact which even better demonstrates conditions in Portland is that in the last 2 years 5 fish companies have been forced to close their doors and go out of business, leaving only 13 active companies at the present time.

In short, the undersigned feel that the following factors are largely responsible for the present unhealthy condition of the Portland fishing industry:

1. The consistently low ex-vessel price of fish, coupled with the long haul to the fishing grounds and the greatly increased cost of operation, make it almost impossible to operate fishing vessels at a profit.

2. The refusal of local banks to extend credit to fish plants and to loan money to fishing-vessel owners secured by first preferred mortgages on the vessels has prevented the modernization of fish plants and deprived vessel owners of enough working capital to properly maintain and repair their vessels. It has also almost completely prevented the construction of new vessels for the fleet. For Portland, only 3 new vessels have been built for the fleet that were over 70 gross tons in size, in the last 10 years. At the present time no new vessels are under construction or even in prospect for Portland.

3. The failure of present conservation methods to prevent the source of supply from moving further and further away from Portland.

4. The importing, without restriction, of fresh fish from foreign countries which, because of a lower standard of living, are underselling Portland fish, which is already priced far too low for the members of the fishing industry to make a decent living.

The undersigned respectfully submit for your consideration the following suggestions that they feel will definitely benefit the Portland fishing industry, the Maine fishing industry, and in fact the whole east coast fishing industry:

1. Have the so-called Jones Act amended so that it does not include crewmen on fishing vessels (which it was never designed for anyway). We feel that fishermen should all be treated equally and that they should be protected and cared for when ill or injured by a compensation act similar to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

2. Establish a governmental lending institution somewhat similar to the RFC which would make loans to fishing vessel owners and to fish plant owners. These loans would be serviced and processed through local banks and would be properly screened. These loans would be available not only for modernization and improvement of fish plants, for maintaining, repairing and improving fishing vessels as well as for the construction of new vessels, but would also be available in time of emergency caused by hurricanes, and so forth.

3. Establish a subsidy plan for fishing vessels, similar to the subsidy available to merchant vessels. After all, fishing vessels are esesntial to our national defense, both as a source of food and as coastal patrol vessels.

4. To have the Government contribute to the high cost of P. & I. and hull insurance, in the event of the Jones Act is not amended to exclude fishing vessels.

5. Have a fisheries commission established in Washington, with branches in the various States in which there are fishing industries. This commission would operate similar to the Agriculture Commission and would be well staffed with trained personnel who could educate the members of the fishing industry and the public in general, if interested, in the most efficiently scientific methods of fishing, processing, and selling, and would also make continuous research into better methods of conservation.

6. Set up a flexible parity system similar to the farm program which would enable the vessel owner and the fisherman to get reasonable returns on their investments, whether it be of money or of time.

7. Curtail the importing of fresh fish from foreign countries to the extent necessary to allow the American fishing industry to survive. This does not apply to frozen fish.

Portland Fisheries Association, by its Charter Members; Bernard F. Harris, A. J. Pedersen, G. I. Lewis, Otis L. Thompson, Mortier D. Harris, Harold Paulson, John E. Willard, Jr. (by H. Paulson).

Attested:

BENJAMIN THOMPSON,
Secretary.

FLOOD INSURANCE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for about 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, for the past 4 weeks I have had my staff reporting to me almost daily on the weather bulletins from upper New York State. These past weeks have been times of momentous world and national developments. Yet there has not been a day during this period when I have not been very deeply concerned to know whether or not it was raining in upper New York State.

Does that sound like a petty matter, Mr. President? I assure you it is not. During these weeks the threat of flood has hovered over New Yorkers like the fabled sword of Damocles—suspended over their heads by a thin hair of chance and the weather. In the early part of this period New York State experienced a succession of heavy blizzards. As a result the disaster operations office of the Federal Civil Defense Administration informed me that there was a potential 12 inches of water on every square foot of the upper Mohawk valley. In the adjacent State of Pennsylvania, Warren County was declared a major disaster area by President Eisenhower. In the rest of New England, there was a heavy snow blanket of varying degrees of thickness. At any moment during this time, a heavy rainfall, a sudden thaw, even a thundersquall could release these tons and tons of water to pour down the valleys and repeat the tragic destruction of the floods of last summer and autumn.

As it happens, Mr. President, we have been lucky. There has been no really heavy rain. There has been no sudden thaw. Rather the warm weather has arrived gradually, and the floods experienced have been only minor. They are what the disaster operations office refers to as local and basement flooding. But even basement flooding can spell tragedy for the person to whom it happens. Let me read a brief fragment from a letter I received from the victim of an earlier so-called minor local flood:

> We borrowed quite a bit of money last fall to put in a new furnace and to make repairs as a result of the flood in March 1955. That money and those repairs are lost, we can't borrow again, we haven't paid off last fall's loan.
>
> We have no heat as yet, our hot water tank is broken, our washing machine is ruined, the basement floor is damaged and everything stored in the basement is lost. These may seem like small matters to some people but to small people like us trying to raise a family it's close to a disaster.
>
> We can't sell this house; we have tried through the real estate dealers. The only thing left is to let the house revert to the bank and lose our GI rights.

That, Mr. President, is what basement flooding can mean.

Can anything be done about such situations? Indeed there can. Flood control projects are a part of the answer. I will have much to say about this at a later date, for the fact is that New York, and her sister States in the Northeast have been consistently shortchanged on flood control appropriations. It has been carefully calculated that my own State has received on the average about one-fifteenth of what she might reasonably expect on the basis of her needs and the peril to which she is exposed. At the same time, New York has cheerfully and willingly supported flood control projects and other Federal benefits all over the Nation. When I say supported, Mr. President, I do not mean merely that New York's Representatives in Congress have voted for these projects. I mean that New York State has paid for them. For New York State furnishes a larger single portion of the total revenues collected by the National Government than does any other State.

But, as I say, Mr. President, flood control is only a part of the answer, for human ingenuity can never anticipate all the combinations of events that may cause a flood. Floods can and do occur where no flood ever occurred before. The other part of the answer therefore is insurance, flood insurance. Perhaps no flood-control structure could prevent the flooding of an occasional basement and the kind of loss the letter I have read describes. Flood control therefore must be buttressed with flood insurance.

The Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate has been working on a proposal for such insurance since early last fall. The problems are many, for this kind of insurance has not been tried heretofore. But we are making good progress. We have held many informative and helpful hearings during the fall and winter. During the past 2 weeks, staff meetings have been resolving the differences between the administration flood insurance bill and the Lehman-Kennedy bill which is cosponsored by many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. It is my hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will be able to report a clean bill to the Senate by the latter part of this month. I have high hopes for this bill, and I trust the Senate will agree that the many months spent in developing its provisions will prove to have been months well spent.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ATTEMPT BY CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION TO INFLUENCE THE VOTE OF A SENATOR

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Select Committee composed of four Senators, and appointed by the Senate to investigate the matter called to the attention of the Senate by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has finished its work.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the record and all files now in the possession of the committee or its counsel be turned over to the Special Committee on Lobbying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Georgia leaves the Chamber, may I, speaking as the acting minority leader, inquire if my understanding is correct, from what the Senator has just said, that all the files will be turned over to the special committee but that the select committee has made or will make a formal report to the Senate, which will be printed and be available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senator from Massachusetts, the report has already been submitted.

Mr. GEORGE. The report has already been filed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

FEDERAL INDIAN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Easter recess I received a reply to my most recent communication to the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, relative to Federal Indian Policy and the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont. In brief, there is nothing new in the letter. The Department continues to refuse to inject any flexibility in its rigid policy toward the American Indian.

I wish to make several brief observations about this letter. The Secretary says that 87.5 percent of all Indian children attended public, Federal, or mission schools in 1955. The national figures for all children—6 to 18, inclusive—in the United States is 97.1 percent. The record of education for Indian children is good, but it can be improved.

In the Secretary's letter to me, dated February 8, 1956, with respect to the relocation program, he stated:

> There has not been a single complaint on this score from the communities.

However in this most recent communication he has qualified his statement with respect to the relocation program, he states now that there is "generally satisfactory adjustment of the individual Indians." Perhaps this qualification is due to recent stories in national periodicals giving another picture of the relocation program.

In my letter to Mr. McKay on February 18, I questioned the discrepancy between his firm stand against aid to Indians who do not live on a reservation and a statement made by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart that the Department would help those Indians who are in need of relief assistance and cannot obtain it from other sources. Secretary McKay regrets the lack of clarity in this matter and has reaffirmed his stand of confining Federal aid to Indians to those residing on Indian reservations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of Interior dated March 20, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington D. C., March 20, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your letter of February 18, 1956, in which you offered further comment upon the situation among the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., as well as upon statements of Bureau policy.

Regarding your question raised in connection with Federal-State cooperation in the education of Indian children, the 49.2 figure is the percent of all Indian children of school age (6–18 inclusive) who were attending public schools in the fiscal year 1955 but does not include the enrollment of Indian children in Federal or mission schools. Comparable figures for Indian children to the National Education Association estimate of 97.1 percent of all children of school age in attendance for the same period is as follows:

Percent Indian children in school	87.5
In public schools	49.2
In Federal schools	30.2
In mission schools	8.1
Percent Indian children not in school	7.7
Percent for which information not received	4.8

It is the desire of the Bureau to extend the services of the relocation program to all agencies and jurisdictions where the Indian people are in need of this service. Our experience in developing the relocation program has indicated that the care taken in giving counseling and guidance to Indian relocatees, both before their departure from reservations and after arrival in metropolitan aeas served by our field relocation offices, is reflected in the generally satisfactory adjustment of the individual Indians. Because of the limited appropriations in the past years for this program, we have necessarily been required to limit the availability of services to those reservations with the greatest need, and to a limited number of metropolitan areas.

We have felt for some time that considerable expansion of relocation activity should take place to provide services to the increasing number who are interested in relocation. Our proposals for this activity for the fiscal year 1957, if approved by Congress, will make available relocation services at

additional reservations and metropolitan areas.

As to the statement on welfare policies quoted from the letter to Mr. T. A. Busey, publisher, the Glacier Reporter, Browning, Mont., the general assistance program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for needy Indians, ineligible for public assistance and not receiving general assistance from their county departments of public welfare, is confined to those residing on Indian reservations. We regret that it was not made entirely clear in the letter to Mr. Busey that the statements applied only to those Indians under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. As we wrote you on February 8, 1956, we believe our proper role is to care for those Indians on reservations who are not cared for by other agencies and to continue our role of working with communities when we can be of assistance in an advisory or cooperative way for those Indians who have moved away from Indian reservations.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Uprooting the Indians," written by Ruth Mulvey Harmer, and published in the March issue of the Atlantic be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. This article by Mrs. Harmer is a very revealing and thought-provoking study of the Department of Interior's Indian relocation program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. MANSFIELD'S remarks.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "The Raid on the Reservations," written by Dorothy Van de Mark, and published in the March issue of Harper's magazine.

EXHIBIT A

UPROOTING THE INDIANS

(By Ruth Mulvey Harmer)

I

Two months ago Little Light, her husband Leonard Bear, and their five children were persons of standing in a Creek Indian community in Oklahoma. They had only 80 acres of poor land and a modest cabin, but except for the hungry seasons they understood their way of life; they were at peace.

Today they are slum dwellers in Los Angeles, without land or home or culture or peace. Leonard Bear and his family have become part of that vast army of displaced persons which has been created by the Government's policy of accelerating the integration of the Indian. Uprooted from their native soil, many without even the weapon of comprehensible language with which to defend themselves, the 400,000 indigenous Americans still living in reservations and small communities are being turned loose upon the asphalt jungles of metropolitan centers in one of the most extraordinary forced migrations in history.

The relocation program being carried out by the Bureau of Indian Affairs was established in 1951 to help the Indians become part of the national economy and part of the national life. However, it did not really become important until August 15, 1953, when President Eisenhower signed Public Law 280. That law, which he branded as most un-Christian, authorizes any State to substitute its own law for Federal Indian law and its own codes for Indian tribal codes. It was enthusiastically hailed in the Western States by persons who had long been seeking legal sanction to move in on Indian lands, superficially poor but rich in subsurface oil and minerals. Further strength was given to the program to dislodge the Indians under the terms of the Watkins bill (Senate 2670), providing that the 177 pure-blood Paiutes who own 45,000 acres of potentially valuable land in Nevada should no longer receive Federal aid protection. Another precedent to weaken the Indians' hold on their whittled-down grants was set by Senate bill 2745, which forcibly removed from trusteeship all individually owned Klamath lands in Oregon and which authorized any enrolled Klamath to force the tribe to sell its corporate holdings in order to buy him out.

Other bills now pending promise to end all Federal services to Indians, to liquidate all tribal organizations, and to dispose of their holdings.

However, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is accomplishing that end so rapidly through the relocation program that additional laws may be simply ex post facto legislative items. A remarkably effective sales campaign is prompting thousands of Indians to abandon their lands and interests for the promised lands of the relocation centers.

In defense of the program, an officer of the Bureau of Indian Affairs points out that some of the new immigrants to the urban centers have become model citizens and are enjoying the fruits of 20th century civilization * * * up to and including television sets. That is true. But the Bureau is curiously vague about the number of maladjustments and even the number of returnees, which well-informed welfare and social workers in several of the centers set at 60 percent.

For every success story, there are a 100 failures. For every former trapper-farmer now adjusted to assembly-line work and city life, there are 99 adrift in a new and hostile environment. Against the optimistic pronouncement of Government agents that with a little proper guidance, Indians have no trouble making the major adjustment from reservation to city life is the bitter cry of Little Light: "So this is the land of sunshine they promised us."

A damning summary of the program was spoken by a woman in the chairless kitchen-dining-living room of a small shanty on the outskirts of Los Angeles. Five children, black eyes round with wonder in their apricot faces, sheltered against her skirt. The walls were unpainted, the floor a patchwork of linoleum. Through an archway, another room was visible where three beds crowded together. A two-burner gas stove stood on a box, and on the only other piece of furniture in the room—a battered table—rested the remains of dinner: some white, grease-soaked bags which had contained hamburgers and fried potatoes prepared by the restaurant a few blocks away.

She answered our questions in an Indian dialect which the woman beside me interpreted. "No, my husband is not here. He went out with some other men. He does every night. They are drinking.

"Yes, he is working. He makes lots of money. One dollar and sixty cents an hour in the airplane factory.

"Yes, the children are in school. All but Zena." She indicated one of the girls, about 10 years old. "Zena is sick. I don't know what sickness. There is no doctor.

"Yes, the food came from that place. I don't go to the store often. Everybody laughs at me.

"Yes, I want to go back. There is not money. We pay $75 a month for this house. We pay for food. We pay for lights. We don't have the money to go back."

Then the patient planes of her face became distorted. "They did not tell us it would be like this."

What had "they" told Little Light and her husband?

A good indication may be found in an article entitled "Relocation News" written by George Shubert for the Fort Berthold Agency and News Bulletin of Newtown, N. Dak., for May 12, 1955. Following a glowing account of jobs for young men and women with a large company in Chicago—"skilled, lifetime jobs * * * with paid vacation, sick benefits, paid pension plan, union membership, protection, etc."—the Indian Affairs officer wrote:

"This office is presently equipped to offer financial assistance to a large number of qualified persons who have an earnest desire to improve their standard of living, by accepting permanent employment and relocation to 1 of 4 large urban areas in the United States; namely Chicago, Ill., Denver, Colo., Oakland, Calif. (including the entire bay area) and Los Angeles, Calif.

"Our offices in those areas are presently able to place on jobs and render any assistance necessary to practically an unlimited number of families. They also state that there is a good selection of employment opportunities and housing facilities available at the present time.

"The rapidly rising waters in the bottom lands of the reservation should remind us of the fact that the Fort Berthold people have lost forever over one-half of the natural resources and practically all of their class 1 and 2 agricultural lands, comprising one-quarter of the area of the entire reservation and one-half of the agricultural resources, thereby rendering the remaining portions of the reservation inadequate to provide subsistence for the remaining members of the tribes, at a standard comparable to the people adjacent to the reservation.

"We feel that a workable solution to the above problem would be to avail yourselves of the opportunities offered by the Relocation Branch of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It must be at least worthy of serious consideration for persons who have ambitions to advance economically and socially and to provide better opportunity for their children."

Undeniably, the pitch is effective. The prospect is given a choice between the nothing of life in Fort Berthold and the glittering something of security and prosperity elsewhere; aid and friendship will be given to those who make the "right" choice. And even if the prospect is reluctant to send in the boxtop for himself, he should think of his children.

For those who cannot be reached by words, there is the poster recently concocted in the Los Angeles Relocation Center picturing a number of pleasant, comfortable houses owned by Indians who are shown demonstrating the wonders of garbage disposals in the assorted kitchens and of television sets in the assorted living rooms.

The salesmanship rates an A plus, but what about the product?

II

First of all, the Government's financial assistance in connection with relocation is limited specifically to one-way travel costs and a weekly allowance until the first pay check comes in. Those monetary aids are made only to persons without any funds; partial grants are given to those who have some reserves. But that even the maximum grant is sufficient is highly debatable: transportation costs and a living allowance for a few weeks might be all that a bright young man moving from San Francisco to New York would need to tide him over the transitional period; it is not enough to cover the period of adjustment needed by a family moving from a pre-Columbian culture into the mechanized 20th century.

"Accepting permanent employment" is another rather meaningless phrase since absolute job security is almost nonexistent.

Moreover, many of the Indians find it impossible to work in foundries or at assembly-line jobs after a history of outdoor experience. The Bureau of Indian Affairs accepts no responsibility for those who wish to transfer from the jobs they took blind when they first arrived.

That the Relocation Offices in the 4 areas are presently able to "render any assistance necessary to practically an unlimited number of families" is an absurdity. In Los Angeles, where between 150 and 200 new arrivals are pouring in each month under Government sponsorship (another 100 are coming on their own), the Relocation Office has a staff of 14 persons, including clerks, receptionist, secretaries, and others who play no active role in the integration. Those who do, necessarily confine themselves to receiving the Indians who show up at the office, making job contracts for them, giving them a living allowance and the address of a vacant dwelling.

This sketchy reception is obviously a prologue to disaster for persons whose acquaintance with the American language is painfully new if it exists at all, who are not accustomed to handling money—most of them have lived in an agricultural environment where barter is the approved method of exchange—who are generally more ignorant of urban ways than a 6-year-old child reared in a city, and who become unutterably lonely removed from the security of tribal identity.

Their first glimpse of city life is rarely happy. In Los Angeles, where there has been an acute housing shortage since the beginning of World War II, the Indians have been hard pressed to find decent accommodations. Many of them are sent to antiquated rooming houses and apartments in the Bunker Hill area, which is now being razed with Federal and municipal funds. Others are sent to trailer courts and dreary buildings in the southern part of the city near the aircraft plants.

For many, a few days is enough; others leave in a few weeks; some stay, and for most the going is rough. A number of the men—particularly the GI's and those who have taken the 5-year training course at Sherman Institute or other Government schools—fare rather well. They know English, they have learned a trade, they have had an extended relationship with white men and white men's ways. But most are hopeless and dangerous misfits.

The Indians in Los Angeles—and there are now 10,000 of them, representing 86 tribes—have had a relatively good police record: a 1 percent arrest, mostly on charges of drunken driving and plain drunk. That figure soared in 1955. During the Memorial Day lost week-end, an estimated 1 out of every 4 of the men haled into court was an Indian. Not long ago, for the first time in the history of Los Angeles an Indian was picked up by the police for child beating—a crime unheard of among them. Recently, and for the first time, a number have been arrested for sex offenses. Women and children have been getting into trouble, too.

III

When a 21-year-old Sioux was brought before a municipal court judge to defend himself on a charge of drunken driving, he apologized: "If I go into a bar and have a couple of drinks everyone is nice to me. Friendly. I feel good then."

At that point, a small, slim Indian woman rose to intercede. "This boy is not delinquent," she told the judge. "We are."

By "we," Stevie Whiteflower Standingbear meant the Los Angeles Indian Center which she heads and which is doing heroic work to make relocation easier for its victims. The center began in 1935 when Myra Bartlett, an Indian, and a singer on the Orpheum Circuit, decided to establish a meeting place for the Indian women working as housemaids whom she encountered each Thursday afternoon gathered at the streetcar terminal for a weekly visit. It was a refugee center during the depression and was reorganized under the American Friends Service Committee in 1948 and supported by that group until last October. Now on its own, with a $20,000 yearly budget and a staff of 2 persons—Mrs. Standingbear and Mary Buck—the center has become an island of security for the Indians in Los Angeles.

One of its main functions is to make available to newly arrived and needy Indians the help of those established in the city. More than 200 volunteers render all kinds of services from baby sitting and practical nursing to loaning or giving money, finding decent living quarters, obtaining medical treatment, and just visiting.

Aside from this emergency work, the center provides a familiar environment for the 10,000 Indians in Los Angeles. Its dances, dinners, classes, clubs, and activities for all age groups have an average weekly attendance of more than 600. The center's chapter of Alcoholics Anonymous has rescued scores of men and women. Although the center itself has little money, it is often able to scrape up a bit to tide destitute persons over a period of immediate want. This is particularly valuable since municipal and State services are not available to persons who have not fulfilled residence requirements. "We can get medical care for some people by taking them—including pregnant women—through the emergency entrance," Stevie Standingbear reports. But those who are not specifically emergency cases must either find a creditor or wait until their sickness becomes acute. A small number obtain some help from one of the professional men and women who aid the center as a charity. The courts parole to the center some of the newer arrivals who have been picked up for drunkenness. "If we can only get to them during the first few weeks they are here, we can save a lot of suffering," Mrs. Standingbear feels.

Occasionally the center makes demands on some of the municipal agencies; several months ago a committee headed by Mrs. Regina Johnson persuaded the Health Department to close and condemn a group of dwellings to which Indian arrivals were being referred by the relocation center. She had found the place while calling on a list of recent arrivals to invite them to a party at the Indian center.

"You don't need to see them. They don't need to go to no parties." The landlady had tried to block her way. "They have all the parties they want right here."

In a sense, she was right. Mrs. Johnson found the shanties where they were staying crammed with mops and floor wax thanks to the Stanley parties given by neighboring women to which the Indians had been threateningly invited and instructed to buy or else. But the parties were the least of the troubles of the 20 families unfortunate enough to land at the Government-approved address. The original building was in fair shape, but not the 20 flimsy "coops" built around it by the enterprising owner. Rent for the 2-room shacks ranged between $60 and $80 a month. Conveniences were minimal. The outdoor toilets were not functioning and the occupants of the 20 apartments had to depend upon the hospitality of 1 woman in the main building who had plumbing in working order and who was willing to permit them to use it. Bad cases of impetigo bred by filth afflicted most of the children, and young and old were generally suffering colds and bronchial disorders.

Why didn't they move? According to one young woman, the landlady announced that anyone who made any trouble would be handed over to the police.

"It was one of the worst things I have ever seen," Mrs Johnson says. She and her husband (a white man), parents of a young soldier son, have been working full time for years to help Indians adjust to Los Angeles. So have a number of other immigrants, like Myron Denetdale, who has been with North American Aviation for 10 years, and his wife Virginia; Pakali and Alex Reifel, a Sioux couple who spend their evenings and week ends visiting the jails trying to aid men and women there; Frank Peshlakai, a Navaho who has been working in a Los Angeles plant for 16 years and who now has his own business.

The dedication of the staff and the volunteers has enabled the center to perform almost incredible tasks. To a large degree, it has permitted the successful integration of hundreds of Indians, and it has minimized the problem of relocation in Los Angeles. Many cities have fared worse. In Minneapolis, Indians, who comprise less than 1 percent of the city's general population, make up more than 10 percent of the inmates at the men's workhouse and almost 70 percent at the women's workhouse. Judge Luther Sletten of that city's municipal court calls it "one of our gravest social problems."

Obviously, something must be done with Indian lands inadequate to support the present and fast-growing population. One solution would be a kind of domestic point 4 program which would enable the Indians to make the most of the rich potential of reservation lands. Instead of being hindered, they should be encouraged to start businesses on reservations and in their communities. Young men with trade and technical training have had to leave home in order to utilize their newly acquired skills. One of the recent applicants for help in finding a job at the Los Angeles Indian Center was a former GI who had attended a barbers' school after his discharge. He returned to his reservation with an enthusiastic plan to open a barbershop, but Government agents said "No." Schools and extension classes should be instituted to help the Indians exploit their resources. If necessary, tribal funds which have been impounded could pay the costs of running them.

If, however, the program to dislodge the Indians is to be an all-out one, some educational program must be established to prevent the creation of another acute minority problem. It is imperative to slow down the relocation until the Indians have been prepared for integration.

The first step would be to institute a comprehensive orientation program in the relocation centers and on the reservations, providing some education and vocational training for the Indians who are to be sent into a mechanized, urban environment.

Secondly, there should be a thorough screening process to make sure that those who are participating in the program are able to make the adjustment physically and mentally. Obviously, a knowledge of the English language is a prerequisite. So is at least fair health. Many of the new arrivals have been women in advanced pregnancy; many have been men with tuberculosis scars and other defects which make them unacceptable to industries.

Instead of being given the rosy picture of the promised land, the Indians who are leaving the security of their old life should have a more realistic picture of what lies before them. Most of them, Mrs. Standingbear says, are "woefully prepared." Few bring changes of clothing, bedding, or even cooking utensils—apparently under the delusion that the centers will "take care of everything."

Courses in household management are a must for women who have never seen electric lights and know nothing about shopping and little about cooking anything but the foods they have always eaten, which are rarely available. One woman was severely burned when her little tot tried to light the unfamiliar gas stove in their city dwelling.

A health insurance program is a must since the limited budgets of unskilled workers settling down in a new environment rarely stretch to cover medical and hospital bills. And the municipalities charged with their integration should make exceptions to residence requirements in order to permit the new arrivals to avail themselves of necessary services. The American Indians, that long-suffering and inarticulate minority, have a great contribution to make to our culture. Unless they are permitted to do that, they will become a social and economic burden of magnitude—a shadow on the national conscience.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said:

Mr. President, just before the Senator from Montana began to discuss the matter of the CIA, he mentioned the fact that Secretary of the Interior McKay had written a letter involving care of Indians. I did not quite clearly understand the attitude of the Secretary of the Interior. Will the Senator tell me exactly what it is?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that I made a few remarks before speaking on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, relative to the position in which the Indians on Hill 57 in Great Falls, Mont., were placed, and I quoted a letter from Secretary McKay which seemed to indicate that, so far as Indians off the reservation were concerned, there was not a great deal the Federal Government could do or that it intended to do for them.

As the Senator from North Dakota well knows, because he has been a true friend of the American Indian during his many years of service in the Congress, we think the Indians off the reservation are entitled at least to relief and succor when they are in need and when they are living in the deplorable circumstances under which they do live, not only in Montana, but in the State of North Dakota and elsewhere.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that the Secretary of the Interior is woefully ignorant of the real situation of the Indians, when he writes that kind of letter. Before the Senator began his remarks on the CIA, he mentioned the Turtle Mountain Reservation, for example, where five or six thousand Indians live on the land in two townships. The Indian Commissioner is saying that they should get jobs, so some of them have been working on the Garrison Dam. If the Indians stay on the reservation and become ill or if their families become destitute, it is the job of the Indian Commissioner to see that hospital facilities are provided and that the families are taken care of. But the moment an Indian goes 20, 30, or 40 miles away from home to get work, because there is no work on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, and he then becomes ill, it is apparently the position of Mr. McKay that the Indian should go to a private hospital and that the Government should not have to pay for his care.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The result is that the Indians do not want jobs off the reservation, where, if they become ill and incur hospital bills, they will have to pay them, when, as the Senator from Montana well knows, the Indians can have hospital care free of charge upon the reservation.

What I have said about the Turtle Mountain Indians is true of the Indians on the Klamath Reservation in Oregon. It is true of Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. There are in the tribes in Arizona and New Mexico Indian veterans who offered their lives for the country. When I was conducting an investigation in those States, we were asked to make it possible for those Indians to obtain jobs on the reservation, by getting industries to locate on the reservations. The wives were saying that the husbands had to go three or four hundred miles away to get a job, and were not able to come home more than once a month, and families were being broken up. We were told that they had millions of acres of land, and that they wanted industries to be established on that land. The Government has not provided one single place on the reservation where Indians can get work. It is even worse than that.

Under the Truman administration—and I am a Republican, Mr. President—one Indian tribe received a loan of $72,000 to enable them to buy cattle. An ordinary Indian veteran coming out of the service cannot get a loan from the Government. As the Senator from Montana well knows, he has no security, because the land in New Mexico and Arizona belongs to the tribes. There may be involved 1 million acres, or 1½ million acres, or 2 million acres, which amounts of land some of the tribes own, as the Senator from Montana well knows, but the Indian veterans who offered their lives for the Government cannot borrow a dollar from the Government. Under the Truman administration $72,000 was loaned to a tribe. The tribe was getting along very well. It paid back every single dollar of the $72,000 except one disputed item of $160. Yet this Republican administration cuts out loans to the Indians and tells them, "Go two or three hundred miles away and get a job, if you can, but if you become ill," according to Secretary McKay, "it is too bad. You will have to pay your own bill, and will not be able to come back to a reservation hospital."

I wish to commend the Senator from Montana for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate this morning because the way these Indians have been abused is a disgrace to the United States Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think there is no question that one of the most shameful chapters in all our history is the way we have treated the American Indian from the very beginning. We are trying to get $5 million appropriated for the Yellowtail Dam site project in the southeasten section of my State of Montana. Some persons are complaining that the Indians are being offered too much for this great and valuable natural resource. In the case of the Indians, I think we ought to recognize that it is better to lean over a little backward than to get right down to a matter of a minimum in dollars and cents. We owe these people so much that we shall never be able to repay them.

As a matter of fact, in the part of Montana to which I have referred, a litte bit to the southeast, is the tribe known as the Northern Cheyennes. It is called the Race of Sorrows, because all they have known is poverty and illness since the white man took control of that area. It is in that area that there is a higher TB rate than in other section of our country. What has happened to the Northern Cheyennes has been duplicated at least in part in a great many of the Indian tribes of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. I cannot imagine that there is a tribe any worse off than is the Papago Tribe in Arizona. Dr. Salisbury testified after the hospital burned in 1947, that of every 100 Indian babies born each year 17 percent died before they were 6 years of age, 42 percent died before they were 16 years of age, and 52 percent died before they were 21 years of age. I cannot imagine an Indian tribe that would have a worse record than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can, so far as TB is concerned.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL—THE STORY OF THE RESCUE OPERATIONS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the March issue of Reader's Digest contains a condensation of the book entitled "Deliver Us From Evil," written by Thomas A. Dooley, lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Navy. The book relates some of the very interesting, worthwhile experiences of Lieutenant Dooley incident to the work performed by the United States Navy in transporting refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam. I call the attention of the Senate not only to the condensation of the book but, more important, to the book itself, which has just been published by Farrar, Straus & Cudahy, Inc.

Lieutenant Dooley has left the Navy. At present he is in Washington; and according to information I have received, he is preparing to return with a medical team to Vietnam to help the people there.

The book itself is inspiring. The work performed by Lieutenant Dooley and other American sailors in the rescue operations should be brought to the attention not only of Congress but of all the American people, as well. It should be noted that the armed services of our country on frequent occasions do many things which are not publicized or glorified. But certainly this humanitarian operation, which was responsible for transporting some 800,000 North Vietnamese to South Vietnam, and to freedom, is worthy of the consideration of the people of the United States. In this instance the American Navy did splendid, outstanding work under terrific conditions.

I take this means to salute the United States Navy, and especially I commend Lt. Thomas A. Dooley for the fine work he did personally, and for the inspiration his brand of ambassadorship and Americanism afforded the North Vietnamese as they were being transported to the south.

If the United States had abroad more ambassadors like Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, I think it not only would be better off, but would be better understood in the countries which are underdeveloped and which need understanding at this time.

His countrymen owe Tom Dooley a vote of thanks for his humanitarian efforts in behalf of a fine people who needed his help. We, in the Senate of the United States are proud of this fine American who has done so much for his country. We wish him Godspeed and good luck in the years ahead.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the condensation of the book, Deliver Us From Evil. written by Lt. Thomas A. Dooley, Medical Corps, United States Navy, containing a foreword by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of United States Naval Operations.

There being no objection, the condensation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELIVER US FROM EVIL

(By Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of U. S. Naval Operations)

FOREWORD

Every American will read with pride of the courageous exploits of young Lt. Tom Dooley, as told in Deliver Us From Evil, the story of an extraordinary rescue operation in turbulent, hostile North Vietnam. Through the tireless work of his small naval unit in a huge refugee camp, under arduous and challenging circumstances, Lieutenant Dooley won for the United States the love and admiration of thousands upon thousands of refugees on their desperate march to freedom.

The Navy's traditions have been built by generations of men like Lieutenant Dooley who were willing and able to act boldly and independently for the common good. The Navy is proud of such traditions and inspired by Lieutenant Dooley's historic contribution to them.

(By Thomas A. Dooley, lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Navy)

One night last spring I lay sleepless and sweltering in the dying city of Haiphong, North Vietnam, asking myself the question that has taunted so many young Americans caught in faraway places: "What in hell am I doing here?"

None of the answers that came to mind seemed wholly satisfying. I was not on this weird bamboo curtain mission by compulsion. Each month the Navy offered me the chance to quit and go back aboard a nice clean ship and perhaps home. Yet each month I volunteered to stay on in this nightmare for still another 30 days. Why? In my depressed mood I cursed myself for a fool.

For as long as I could remember, I had wanted to be a doctor. Now, at 28, I was an M. D., although a very green one. Moreover, I was a Navy doctor, an added distinction I had coveted since serving as a hospital corpsman in the Navy in 1944–46. Finally, I was one young doctor who did not lack patients. God knows, I had more cases than any doctor could possibly handle.

Out there, in the makeshift refugee camp I had set up with United States Army tents, were more than 12,000 wretched, sick, and horribly maimed Vietnamese, most of them either very young or very old. They were fleeing from the Communists of North Vietnam, hoping to reach the doubtful security of Saigon. Before they came, more than 300,000 others had already passed through the camp. The number would exceed the half-million mark before the tragedy ended.

I was treating diseases that most of my classmates would never encounter in a lifetime's practice, performing operations which the textbooks never mention. What do you do for children who have had chopsticks driven into their inner ears? Or for old women whose collarbones have been shattered by riflebutts? Or for kids whose ears have been torn off with pincers? How do you treat a priest who has had nails driven into his skull to make a travesty of the crown of thorns?

Yes, cocky young Dooley, ticketed by the professors at medical school as a future "society doctor," was at last being educated, the hard way.

At Notre Dame the priests had tried valiantly to teach me philosophy. But out here in this Communist hellhole I had learned many more profound and practical facts about the true nature of man. I had watched tough United States sailors become tender nurses for sick babies and dying old women. I had seen inhuman torture and suffering elevate weak men to lofty heights of spiritual nobility. I knew now why organized godlessness can never kill the divine spark that burns within even the humblest human.

That night in Haiphong I tossed fitfully on my cot until, just before dawn, I heard Boatswain's Mate Norman Baker stumble into my tent. "Better get moving, Doc," he said. "We've got another batch—1,000 more." From Baker's tone, I could tell that the newcomers would be like all the rest—filthy, starving, diseased, and maimed in God knows what manner.

Groping for a flashlight and pushing my swollen feet into a pair of muddy boondockers, I instinctively began murmuring the Our Father, as I had every morning since childhood. "* * * and deliver us from evil * * *." I had to pause in the darkness. You O God, that is the people's prayer—to be delivered from evil. At that moment I think I sensed, however dimly, the purpose behind my being there.

"Temporary" assignment

A brandnew Navy doctor, with the 1½ stripes of a lieutenant, junior grade, I was stationed at the United States naval hospital in Yokosuka, Japan, when the orders which got me into it came. Early in July 1954 I was temporarily assigned to the U. S. S. *Montague* AKA 98, for amphibious exercises. The duty seemed likely to be so brief that I allowed a Navy nurse in Yokosuka to drive my new convertible while I was gone, and told my roommate he could wear my best civilian suit. When I got back to Japan, 11 months later, there were 20,000 additional miles on the convertible's speedometer. As for the new suit—well, I couldn't have worn it anyway; I had lost 60 of my 180 pounds.

For a couple of weeks the amphibious exercises had us scrambling down landing nets and storming the sweltering beaches of the Philippines. But on August 12 task force 90 was ordered to "proceed to Haiphong, north Vietnam, anchor in stream and await instructions."

We could only guess the nature of the job before us. Vietnam, of course, suggested the latest tragedy in the Red engulfment of Asia—the fall of the fortress at Dien Bien Phu, the signing of a shameful treaty at Geneva, the partitioning of yet another country. Some of us had even heard that, under the terms of the treaty, the Vietnamese in the Communist north were guaranteed unmolested passage to the non-Communist south. Presumably, Tast Force 90 would lend a hand.

The *Montague* was the first American ship to glide into the Baie d'Along. Soon other ships dropped anchor behind us. The historic "Passage to Freedom" was getting under way.

Beyond the bay lay the city of Haiphong, chief port on the Tonkin Delta, and then the last enclave of freedom in North Vietnam. I stood on deck gazing at the distant, mysterious shoreline, wondering about our prospective human cargo.

Then I heard a shout, and saw the men pointing to a small craft heading toward us, bobbing like a little cork on the rough waters of the bay. We identified it as a French LCT. Such craft are designed to carry 4 or 5 tanks and a few dozen men; but when at last this one pulled alongside the *Montague*, I looked down with horror. Huddled there on the open deck, drenched by the sea and exposed to the cruel sun, were at least 1,000 human beings, many of them babies.

The adults had children on their backs and by the hand, and even the older kids toted babies. Across their shoulders they carried balance poles with shallow baskets at either end. There they had their meager belongings—clothing, rice bowls, heirlooms, and, invariably, a crucifix.

With the help of a French-speaking priest and the elders (whom we called mandarins), we tried to make the ship's rules known; then we herded the people aboard. As I watched them pass, I had to struggle to control the terrible nausea within me. They were filthy, scabrous, or covered with open sores. Many bore the disfigurements of inhuman treatment. From a dimly remembered course in tropical medicine I was able to recognize symptoms that said I had lots of work ahead of me.

But what struck me most was the look of fear, terror, and hostility in the eyes of everyone, young and old. These people were mortally afraid—of us.

Master-touch of evil

The LCT brought another load, and the embarkation was complete. The "ready to get underway" reports went to the skipper, and the *Montague* headed south. I immediately organized sick call. It ran almost continuously thereafter until we reached Saigon 3 days later.

Dr. Dooley now learned at first hand about diseases that had escaped him at school. On the first day I isolated 10 cases of smallpox. I saw yaws, leprosy, beriberi, elephantiasis, skin syphilis—and one case we mentioned only in a whisper: cholera.

In the *Montague's* sick bay I unearthed the secret behind the fear and hostility in the people's eyes. The priests and the mandarins, who had stood watching me for hours, finally told the story. These people were the victims of a master stroke of Communist evil, a fiendishly clever propaganda barrage.

The Vietnamese in the north had been conditioned to believe that to go south was sheer folly—suicide, or even worse. They were told that the Americans, even more than the despised French, were inhuman monsters. The mandarins reached into their sleeves and drew forth the evidence—a number of leaflets that purported to describe what would happen to refugees who took the "Passage to Freedom."

There were never more than 5 or 6 words on a sheet, but the skillfully drawn pictures conveyed the idea perfectly. One picture showed a group of American sailors squatting around a fire, cooking a Vietnamese baby on a spit. Another showed American naval officers at the foot of a gangplank checking off Vietnamese girls for the brothels of Saigon. There was even a picture of a Navy doctor vaccinating the people with deadly germs. But the prize was a graphic drawing of an LST-type ship that carried its passengers far out to sea, then opened its giant maw and spewed them overboard.

Now the mandarins shook their heads solemnly over the enormity of these lies, and apologized that the people had believed them. They promised to work diligently to correct or dispel the groundless fears.

When we reached Saigon, we helped the passengers gather up their babies and

bundles and prepare for the next stage of the journey into the unknown. They were still a sad lot, but somehow they seemed cleaner, brighter, braver than when they came aboard. Their bundles were heavier with all the extra rice, bread and flour that the sailors had purloined from the galley. And what a joy it was to see a Vietnamese mother pat a young sailor on the head and say, "Tot lam"—"Very nice."

We had transported 2,001 people. There were two deaths, two burials at sea. Dr. Dooley had officiated at four births, mothers and babies all doing well—including one little guy who faces life burdened with the name, dreamed up by his proud parents: Thinh Van Montague AKA 98 Ngham.

Before turning in, I stood on deck congratulating myself on being a Navy doctor. "Dooley," I said, "you've seen and done things that are out of this world. You'll never have another experience to top this one in your whole lifetime."

That's what I thought.

Dr. Dooley "volunteers"

We returned to Haiphong, picked up another load of refugees, and made another and no less harrowing round trip—which was to be my last. By now the anchorage in the Baie d'Along was filled with ships. And one day I was invited aboard a newly arrived transport to give a sanitation briefing. While on deck I heard the ship's captain yelling orders in English to a French landing craft alongside. The French coxswain obviously knew no English, and the situation was beautifully fouled up. I speak French, so I decided to go to the bridge and make myself useful.

The skipper glared at me. "Later, doctor, Can't you see I'm busy?"

I cleared my throat. "Beg pardon, sir, but——"

"But, nothing. I told you—later."

There was fire in his eye. "Captain," I said plaintively, "I speak French. Thought I might help."

"Hell's bells, why didn't you say so?" he roared. "Tell that idiot to pull away and come alongside Chinese-fashion."

I shouted the orders in French, and the landing craft came around smoothly with its bow to the transport's stern. I got a grateful salute from the Frenchman and a gruff "Thank you" from the skipper. But as I left the bridge I noticed the calculating predatory look in his eye.

That started it. Word got around that young Dooley could speak French like a native. Soon I was performing all sorts of extra duties that had nothing to do with the practice of medicine. Then I was ordered aboard the flagship to report to Capt. James Grindell, force medical officer of Task Force 90.

Captain Grindell said he was organizing a preventive medicine and sanitation unit to be based in the port city of Haiphong. The place was inundated with refugees, and would soon be infested with all sorts of diseases, including the fancier tropical varieties. The local population would be exposed to plagues and epidemics; but even more serious, there was a strong likelihood of the diseases spreading to the city of Saigon in the south where we were depositing our uprooted humanity.

Then Captain Grindell laid it on the line. "Dr. Dooley," he said, "I'm considering attaching you to this unit as a medical officer and—well, as a sort of interpreter, let's say. You understand, of course, that this is a voluntary duty. Strictly voluntary. So make up your own mind."

When a man with four gold stripes on his arm, and speaking for the admiral, says that he is "considering" a junior lieutenant for something, the lieutenant doesn't have to thing too long. I "volunteered."

Bright and early next morning I went aboard the flagship and met the four officers of the newly minted preventive medicine unit to be commanded by Capt. Julius Amberson. Captain Grindell read the orders, which said, among other things, that we were "to provide humanitarian care and medical attention for the refugees as they came within the orbit of our operation." Even at the time I wondered if we weren't a rather small company for such an ambitious undertaking. But I still didn't suspect that the "humanitarian care and medical attention" of a half-million refugees would soon become my responsibility alone.

"All right, gentlemen, that's it," Captain Grindell concluded. "Lots of luck to you."

We picked up our light kits (how light, O Lord) and went ashore.

Haiphong

Haiphong greeted us with heat, faded grandeur and a mélange of odors that smelled like the quintessence of all Asia. Unlike most port cities, it presents its best aspects on the waterfront, with beautiful modern wharves and warehouses. But after you pass a block or two of gracious homes and parks, the town degenerates rapidly into bazaars, flea markets and indescribable squalor.

Normally, the population was less than 100,000. When we arrived late in August 1954 it had been doubled, at least, by the gray tides of refugees sweeping into the city. They sprawled in the streets, gutters and alleys, and covered the parks like swarming ant heaps. Through this filth and confusion moved detachments of French sailors and Foreign Legionnaires, busily evacuating French military and civilian property from the doomed city.

We reconnoitered Haiphong's two hotels, the Paris and the Continental. One was as bad as the other, so we settled at the Continental in barnlike rooms furnished with faded upholstery and decrepit beds covered with mosquito netting. The place was infested with fighting cockroaches and rats that looked big enough to saddle.

Outside the hotel I had my first encounter with the only really engaging thing about Haiphong—the shoeshine boys. They were filthy, ragged, amusing little beggars, and accomplished thieves, who traveled through the town in small herds and slept on the street corners at night. Somehow we became fast friends. On that first day someone swiped a camera from my room; next morning I merely mentioned it to the shine boys, and by nightfall the camera was returned, as mysteriously as it had disappeared.

While trying to shine my rough combat boots (with a dozen kibitzers telling the shiner how the job should be done), they taught me my first phrases of Vietnamese—a simple, monosyllabic language which I soon spoke fairly well. They tried to pronounce my ridiculous name, but soon gave up. So it was the shine boys who first called me Bac Sy My (American Navy doctor), which henceforth was to be my Vietnamese name.

Later, when things got really rough, these ragged urchins became my dependable corps of volunteers, sleeping in the hotel corridor outside my door or fending for themselves in our camp, always ready to do my bidding as scouts, couriers, and rascals of mercy. During the last days of Haiphong, Roger Ackley of the Foreign Operations Administration watched these eager beavers operating and named them the "little dooleys." I felt deeply honored.

Building the camp

Under the terms of the Geneva Treaty which ended the Indochinese war 6 weeks earlier, Vietnam had been divided at the 17th parallel into two "temporary zones of political influence" until things could be settled by a national plebiscite slated for July 1956. Meanwhile, the southern half, with a population of 10 million, was to be ruled by the national government in Saigon; and the northern half, with a population of 12 million, controlled by the Viet Minh Communists under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh.

An important clause in the cease-fire agreement provided that a crescent-shaped area around Haiphong at the mouth of the Tonkin Delta was to remain an "open zone to both parties." This was to serve as a staging area for the evacuation of those people in the north who preferred exile in South Vietnam to life under the Communists. The agreement was that these people were not only to be allowed but assisted to move south; and a mixed neutral commission, composed of representatives of Canada, Poland, and India, was created to supervise the evacuation.

But this small open zone around Haiphong was scheduled to shrink gradually, and on specified dates, until in the middle of May 1955 the entire area, including the city of Haiphong, would be in the hands of the Commmunists. Obviously, this was a tricky arrangement—just how tricky we would soon learn.

On our second day in Haiphong, Captain Amberson called me in and tossed a sheaf of notes and sketches at me. "Dooley," he said, "your job will be to build refugee camps. There's the general idea. Now get going. And don't bother me about the details."

"Aye, aye, sir," I said. But at that moment I didn't know the difference between a refugee camp and a summer playground for girls.

There was no suitable place in Haiphong for a refugee camp, but I found a reasonably good spot about 4 miles from town, on the road leading to Hanoi. We rounded up a gang of coolies and had them clear the area and dig drainage ditches to keep the place from floating away in the monsoon season. Then I yelled to Mike Adler, Haiphong agent of the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA) for tents and supplies.

I pulled a few prize boners—which Captain Amberson caught in time—like locating the latrine area on the windward side, and putting the water-purifying machinery too near the paddies the people used for other purposes. But we made amazing headway. Only a few days after we had asked for them, Mike Adler flew in my 150 tents from Japan—and prudently threw in 250 spares.

These were Army 60-man tents, but we made each one accommodate 120 refugees. I set them up in rows of 12, with drainage ditches on all four sides of each tent. The first row I reserved for my hospital area—a tent for sick call, a nursery for newborn babies, several supply tents, and 5 or 6 tents for sick patients. I also set aside one tent for the elders, or mandarins, who would act as camp leaders.

Beyond the last row of tents was the latrine area, and 12,000 people can present an enormous problem of daily waste disposal. Despite regular spraying and oil burning, the tents nearest the latrines quickly became uninhabitable. So I devised the system of regularly moving my hospital area forward and shifting the last row of tents to the front of the camp. In this way my camps literally walked toward Haiphong. Later, as the Viet Minh perimeter closed in around us, it was always my latrine area that I surrendered to the Communists.

If medals could be awarded to machines, I would recommend the highest honors for our water-purifying equipment. We had to produce 15,000 gallons of drinking water every day; and that spunky little unit ran for nearly 300 days with a minimum of faltering. The water was drawn from a rice paddy, passed through a sand filter and two chemical feed tanks, and finally through a chlorination gizmo before passing into the big 3,000-gallon rubber storage tank. This was Nuoc My (American water), which the refugees drank with obvious distaste. They much preferred the typhoid flavor of the water in the paddies.

I considered the water machinery a mechanical mystery, to be admired from a distance. Whenever something went wrong I gave Boatswain's Mate Baker my jeep and a carton of cigarettes, and in the voice of command I had learned from Captain Amberson I'd say: "Baker, get that damn thing fixed, and don't bother me with the details!"

Hours later Baker would return with a couple of Legionnaires, all full of cheap brandy and smoking American cigarettes. I never knew where the Frenchmen or the spare parts came from, but the water machine always became as good as new. And Baker always had a hangover.

On being an eager beaver

We processed and evacuated the refugees as quickly as we could. But new refugees kept streaming in, and sometimes we had as many as 14,000. Our primary job was to delouse, vaccinate and inoculate, and to screen out those who had communicable diseases. But there was more to it than that. At the sick-call tent I was seeing between 300 and 400 people every day who were desperately in need of medical treatment. What was I to do? Leave them in the camp to sicken and die? Send them back behind the Bamboo Curtain?

There is a service motto which says (approximately) that a man should keep his mouth shut, his internal system in order, and never volunteer. Fortunately, this is a rule seldom observed when things get tough. In my own case, the breach is widened by an Irish temperament that makes me stick my neck out.

"Doctor," I said to Captain Amberson, "we've got to do something for these sick people. We can't turn back a woman and child to the Communists just because the kid has, say, smallpox. We've got to treat the disease so the family can get aboard ship."

He looked at me wearily, but with obvious understanding. As a doctor he agreed with me, but he just felt sorry for the eager beaver who thought he could lick every problem.

"All right, Dooley," he said. "Do the best you can."

So we stepped up sick call, and I even enlarged my hospital tent for surgery. My enlisted men—some, like Baker, without previous training as corpsmen—learned to spot yaws at 10 paces, and they washed hideous sores, changed dressings, and slapped on ointments as if they had been doing it all their lives. I began treating dysentery, cholera, smallpox, typhoid, trachoma, worm infestations, fungus, and ratbites. But soon I was almost floored by the surgical problems of traumatic injuries induced by fiendish torture.

For the kind of job I had undertaken I needed drugs and dressings and surgical equipment enough to stock a good-sized hospital. I had no authority to requisition the Navy for my needs; nor did the Navy, under the circumstances, have the authority to supply them. But there's always a way of doing things, and the Dooleys have never been cursed with false pride.

With hat in hand

I got what I could from the FOA by the simple expedient of having the Refugee Committee make the requisition (which was regulation) and then turn the supplies over to me. Then we went out to the ships and transports of Task Force 90 to practice what in the Orient is known as cumshaw but in plain American is called scrounging.

Perhaps we played upon the eternal curiosity of men afloat about what goes on ashore. But we had hair-raising tales to tell about conditions they were not allowed ashore to see, and each ship paid us off with what could be spared—a few vials of penicillin, a dozen bottles of vitamin pills, some dressings and bandages. By this means I built up a pretty good pharmacy.

But it still wasn't enough. My needs increased just as the main ships of the task force departed. That's when I stuck my neck out again, and sent Operation Hat-in-Hand stateside. I sat down and wrote letters to every pharmaceutical and surgical supply house that had ever sent me circulars or samples. I told them what I was up against, carefully stressing the fact that I was writing as an individual—Tom Dooley, M. D.—and not as an officer of the United States Navy.

God bless America. Those firms never stopped to investigate. They simply sent me posthaste what I asked. The Pfizer Laboratories of New York rushed 50,000 capsules of terramycin, and later shipments of streptomycin and penicillin. Meade-Johnson, of Evansville, Ind., sent a liquid vitamin preparation. A few drops make a dose, but they sent me gallons—a godsend. Pan American Airways sent 10,000 bars of soap. I wish I could name all those who gave so generously.

After that, whenever we used a medication we were careful to explain: "Day La Vien Tro My"—"This is American aid." And, believe me, those wretched people understood, and were grateful.

Operation Cockroach

By October Captain Amberson had been recalled to Washington and Lt. Comdr. Ed Gleason, a field sanitation expert, and the other officers had finished their chores and departed. Now I was the only remaining officer, with just four enlisted men to help me; Dennis D. Shepard, Peter Kessey, big Ed Maugre and stouthearted Norman Baker, who was to be with me to the bitter end.

Daily, I expected new brass to arrive and take over, but no one came. Much later I learned what had happened. Captain Amberson had said to Rear Adm. Lorenzo S. Sabin, the commander of Task Force 90: "The situation in Haiphong is pretty sticky, and the fewer men we have ashore the better. Young Dooley has the situation well in hand, and can carry on."

Sure enough, in mid-October orders came through designating me "Commander, Task Unit 90.8.6." I was pretty proud of my command until Communications advised us that, for security reasons, we would be known as Operation Cockroach.

There wasn't time to brood about this affront, however. The refugee horde pouring into Haiphong was increasing daily, and as the perimeter tightened, the people came through weaker and more diseased, and showing greater evidence of atrocities. The cease-fire guarantee of free and unmolested passage was now clearly a farce.

Still, the refugees didn't come hailing us as their deliverers. They were fearful, suspicious and sometimes hostile. We had to win them over. Sickness and suffering forced them to seek the hospital tents, so that I was kept busy from sunup to long after dark. But it was like operating in an amphitheater, for crowds gathered and watched every move I made. They wanted to see if I poisoned or mutilated people, as the Communists said.

Baker and I took some beatings at the hands of these misguided and hysterical people. But, remembering the importance of "face" in the Orient, we always were careful to take up where we left off.

One day a woman brought me a baby whose body was covered with ulcers. Yaw ulcers respond miraculously to penicillin: I gave the infant a shot in the buttocks and told the mother to bring it back next day.

A few hours later I heard shouts and curses, and saw the woman holding the baby aloft for the people to see. Here was proof that I was an American murderer. The child had reacted to penicillin with an angry-looking—but harmless—case of hives.

The distraught mother was in no mood for explanations. She handed her baby to a bystander, grabbed a pole, and called up a dozen sympathizers. When my corpsmen rescued me at last, I had three broken ribs, two black eyes, and a lot of miscellaneous bruises.

Next day, with the whole camp watching, I went to the woman's tent alone and unarmed. As I expected, the hives had disappeared, and the ulcers were healing nicely. The woman burst into tears and fell at my feet begging forgiveness. She remained in the camp for weeks, serving as one of my helpers at sick call, always eager to exhibit her nice, clean baby. The effect on the other refugees was worth much more than a couple of fractured ribs.

Although my uniforms now consisted only of a few worn and faded shirts and trousers, I never appeared anywhere without a necktie and my dirty officer's cap, on which the eagle and anchors were corroded almost beyond recognition. This was partly for "face," and partly for carrying the flag. My corpsmen and I were determined to be one unit on foreign soil that would never fail to deliver what we called the American impact.

We constantly impressed upon the refugees that what we were doing for them was being done by the generosity of the American people.

"Yes, the gloves on your hands are good," one refugee would say. "But the eagle on your cap is bad."

"No, the eagle on my cap is good," I would answer. "Without the eagle there would be no doctor gloves. The eagle stands for America. America sends the Navy, which brings you the American Navy doctor. The American Navy takes you to safety in Saigon."

These argument went on interminably at sick call. Sometimes I wished it were possible to work without talking. But this job had to be done.

Wrath of the godless

As the weeks passed I found myself increasingly puzzled, not only by the growing number but by the character of Communist atrocities. They seemed almost to have a religious significance. I was accustomed by now to patching up emasculated men, and women whose breasts had been mutilated, and even little children without fingers or hands. But more and more I was learning that these punishments were linked to the refugees' belief in God.

One night the shoeshine boys came as they did so often, to inform me that I was needed in a little village near the Bamboo Curtain. We drove about 10 miles in the truck, and they they led me to a straw hut. Inside, by the light from a kerosene lamp, I saw an elderly couple and several children kneeling in prayer.

Then I saw a man lying on a bamboo stretcher, writhing in agony, his lips moving in silent prayer. When I pulled away the dirty blanket I found that his body was a mass of blackened flesh from the shoulders to the knees. The belly was hard and distended, and the scrotum swollen to the size of a football. I gave him a shot of morphine, and inserted a large needle in the scrotum in an attempt to draw off some of the fluid.

The old woman said the man was her brother, a Catholic priest, from a little town now within Communist territory. The Viet Minh had told him he could hold only one mass daily, at 6 a. m.—the hour when everyone had to gather in the village square for a daily lecture on the new life. When he persisted in saying mass secretly at night, the Communists decided that he needed re-education.

They hung him by his feet from the rafters of the church, so that his hands just barely touched the floor, and beat him with bamboo rods, concentrating on the genitalia. How long this went on he couldn't remember, but early the next morning the altar boys found him hanging there and cut him down.

They lashed together an arrangement of bamboo poles that could be carried as a litter

and floated as a raft. They hid the old priest near the riverbank. Then, after dark, they swam downstream towing the raft, and carried him to his sister's hut in the still-free zone.

Miraculously he survived the ordeal and for a time served as a chaplain of our camp.

On another gruesome day there came to my hospital tent seven little boys and an emaciated young man who was barely conscious. The children looked like zombies. Thick pus was running from their ears. Two of them still had queer-looking things protruding from their heads. Chopsticks.

We pieced together the story. The young man was a schoolteacher. The Communists had caught him leading his class in the Lord's Prayer. They made him repeat it for them, line by line, and made a mockery of the words.

"Give us this day our daily bread * * *." Then they said to the children, "Who gives you bread? God? No; the state." When the lesson was ended they led the class into the schoolyard and taught the pupils a different kind of lesson.

Two Viet Minh guards held a child by the arms and another grasped his head. Then the leader rammed a chopstick deep into each ear, splitting the canal and shattering the inner ear. When all seven children had been "treated" the guards turned to the teacher. They drew forth his tongue with pincers and sawed it off with a blunt bayonet.

Somehow five of the children had managed to remove the chopsticks from their heads. I had to use an anesthetic before doing the job on the other two. There was little I could do for them but control the infection. The young teacher presented a greater problem. He had lost a great deal of blood and needed a transfusion, but I didn't have the equipment for it. I was able, however, to draw together the edges of his tongue stump and patch it up. Penicillin and the hand of God took care of the rest.

The 8 survived—1 young man who never again would pray aloud, and 7 children who would hear the word of God only in their hearts.

Mother of a thousand

When my spirits were unusually low, I would get in my jeep after sundown and drive into Haiphong to the An Lac (Peace) Orphanage, where there was aways laughter.

Usually there would be other guests for dinner—the French admiral, a few officers of the Foreign Legion or some Haiphong dignitary. But all observed two rules of the house: (1) you ate what was set before you, always a Vietnamese menu, which might consist of fish heads, bat-wing soup, a paste made of sparrows' eyes, or raw pork mixed in ancient fish oil; and (2) you never mentioned war or politics. The latter rule was rigidly enforced by our hostess—Madame Vu Thi Ngai—mother of a thousand children.

Madame Ngai was one of the most remarkable women I shall ever meet. She must have been in her 60's; but with her jet-black hair (dyed), fine-textured skin, wide-set black eyes and beautiful white teeth, she could easily pass as a fashionable 40. She was a big, beautifully proportioned woman, and her ample bosom seemed always to be shaking with laughter.

I became even more devoted to Madame Ngai when I learned her story. She had been a woman of great wealth, with a beautiful home and much land in Thanh Hoa, in southern Tonkin. But Thanh Hoa was one of the first towns ravaged by the Viet Minh in 1946. Madame Ngai's husband was killed, and her home partially destroyed.

She went through Thanh Hoa gathering up waifs and orphans and brought them to her home—the nucleus of the An Lac Orphanage. When the Viet Minh came a second time, Madame Ngai gathered up her brood and fled to Nam Dinh, perhaps 50 miles away. She had only her jewelry and some blocks of gold leaf. But she bought another house in Nam Dinh for her orphans—by now she had 600.

During the next 6 years the An Lac Orphanage was to move five times, from town to town, always a few days ahead of the Communists, until Madame Ngai and company reached Haiphong in 1954. By this time the jewelry was gone, and the hoard of gold leaf was perilously low; but she acquired a house big enough to accommodate her orphans. The first time I made a count in the summer of 1954 they numbered 1,089.

The Americans came into her life in August 1954, and she captivated even those who couldn't understand her exquisite French—including my old chief, Captain Amberson. When he left Haiphong his last words were: "Don't neglect those kids at Madame Ngai's." And that was one of Captain Amberson's orders that Dooley obeyed to the letter.

A leg for lovely Lia

After dinner, while the Frenchmen regaled their hostess with tall tales, I would take my bag and make the rounds of the An Lac Orphanage. There was enough disease and infirmity among these kids to give a man a complete residency in pediatrics, and my visits were busy ones. But there was always time for play, particularly with a favorite pal of mine, little Nguyen.

No one knew Nguyen's last name; he was an abandoned infant when Madame Ngai plucked him from a roadside, and now he was 5. But tuberculosis of the spine had made him one of the most misshapen hunchbacks I've ever seen. He could barely waddle around. He couldn't sit at all, and had to take his meals lying down. Most of the time he just rolled on the floor, but he was always laughing. I once took him aboard an American ship, and when I got him ashore I found that he had swiped 3 sailor caps and 5 cigarette lighters.

But my special love was reserved for Lia, one of the older girls. Since she was now 7, Lia took care of the babies for Madame Ngai, and she looked like a solemn little oriental doll as she went about her duties in the nursery. Still, that was pretty hard work for a 7-year-old who had to get about on a roughhewn crutch. Lia's right leg had been blown off by the land mine that killed both her parents.

When I first visited the orphanage in August 1954, I examined Lia's stump. It was badly healed, with some raw and granulated patches. With minor surgery I got a good secondary closure. Then I asked Lia if she would work with me patiently to make the stump strong, and she said she would because she loved her Bac Sy My. So I taught her how to soak, stretch, and exercise it daily, and by Christmas we had a good, functional stump.

Meanwhile, I had written to A. S. Aloe, a surgical-supply house in St. Louis, describing the case and giving measurements in detail. But Lia was a growing girl, and what she needed was an adjustable limb that could grow with her. That company couldn't fill the bill and consulted the McCarthy-Hanger Co. Then the two of them got together and found a third outfit, in New Jersey, that could produce what we needed.

Several months later Lia's American leg arrived in Haiphong. I put it on her, and, holding onto my hand, she walked for the first time. She smiled radiantly, and then she burst into tears—and Madam Ngai, Boatswain's Mate Baker, and I all burst into tears, too. Everybody was happy.

Now all proper Tonkinese females wear long black trousers which reach to the ankles; and little Lia was probably the most modest child you could find. But for a week after she got her leg she refused to wear any pants at all. One night I came to the orphanage late and tiptoed through the rooms to look at a couple of sick kids. I found Lia asleep on her cot, still wearing the limb.

I woke her. "You must not do this, Lia," I said. "I told you how important it is for you to take care of that stump."

She looked at me with real hurt in her sleepy eyes. "When I sleep," she said, "I do not remove by Vietnamese leg. Why must I take off my American leg?"

Cosmo Invidiato, head of the Cosmevo Surgical Supply Co., in New Jersey, which made Lia's leg (free of charge), wrote "From what I can read between the lines of your letter, conditions must be horrible for the people of that faraway country. It is difficult for us here to understand the sacrifices those people are making and the hardships they are undergoing constantly. Sometimes we fall to musing on our complete uselessness. Perhaps we should all try a little harder. * * *"

We can never repay Mr. Invidiato. But I did send him a little roll of movie film showing Lia and her American leg. And Lia says she remembers him in her prayers each night, and will always.

The days get darker

I seldom made the 4-hour boat trip to the ships in the Baie d'Along any more. With Viet Minh infiltrators itching for trouble, our launches no longer made the trip after dark; and the daylight hours were my busiest. But the lure of a hot bath and a good meal often seemed irresistible. Once I succumbed and, via my walkie-talkie, requested the command ship's helicopter.

When the skipper asked me what was up, I answered boldly, "Sir, I am in desperate need of a hot bath and a decent meal." He merely chuckled. The whole task force knew about Dooley's bathing difficulties, having heard about the time I went aboard the flagship and was invited to luncheon by Admiral Sabin.

I was wearing my tattered khaki shirt and trousers, my hands were stained red with merthiolate, and I needed a bath. Nevertheless, with all those high-ranking officers present, the admiral seated me at the end of the long table, directly facing him. I was obviously flattered, but he brought me up short. "Don't get any ideas, Doctor," said the admiral. "You just smell so bad I want you as far away as possible."

Now the days were getting darker. I was racked by malaria, and had acquired some intestinal parasites that ate more than I did. I was down to skin and bones, and low in spirits. Many times I determined to take up Admiral Sabin on his monthly offer to send someone to replace me, but in my heart I knew I wanted to see this through to the end.

The atrocities were beginning to get me down, and some of them I could never become inured to. One day the shoeshine boys informed me that Father Lopez at the Philippine mission in Haiphong needed me at once. O Lord, I thought, another mutilated priest. But, whatever I expected, I had underestimated the fiendish imagination of godless men.

Father Lopez led me to a tiny room off the mission courtyard. Lying on a straw mat was an old man, moaning in delirium. His head was covered with foul green pus. When I washed it away, I counted 8 swollen and badly infected wounds encircling his skull. In this instance Communist re-education had consisted of tying the priest's hands behind his back and driving eight nails into his skull to simulate the crown of thorns.

The old man had managed to drag himself to a hut, where the peasants had dislodged the nails and then brought him to Haiphong. I gave him tetanus toxoid and huge doses of penicillin, drained the pus pockets and dressed the wounds. He made a remarkable recovery.

But one morning I arrived and found his straw pallet unoccupied. The old priest had disappeared in the night. The note he left for Father Lopez merely said that he had to get back to his flock behind the Bamboo Curtain.

And I remember the day they brought me a number of young boys who had escaped from the town of Bao Lac, near the China border. The Communists had caught them at the perimeter, but had let them pass—after tearing an ear off each young head with pincers.

I trimmed the stumps, dissected the surface of the external canal and sutured the skin of the scalp and face. But the tension on the suture line was so great that I knew those kids would always bear hideous scars.

The horror of experiences like these might have been overwhelming but for the fact that there just wasn't time to dwell upon them. All around us things were coming to a slow boil.

The little hero

One morning Capt. Jerome Cauvin, of the French Navy, who was in charge of patrolling the waters around Haiphong, called to tell me that a seaplane had just sighted several sampans, apparently lashed together, floating mysteriously far out in the Baie d'Along. He was going out on a landing craft. Did I want to go along?

I joined him on the LSM, and 3 hours later we reached the sampans. There were 14 of them, and they were adrift under the blinding noon sunlight because none of the more than 1,000 people we found aboard had strength enough left to navigate.

I clambered from sampan to sampan, examining the most miserable humans I have ever seen. There wasn't much I could do for them right then. They were all green from seasickness, cold and stiff from exposure, their feet and ankles swollen from long immersion, and skin cracked by constant salt spray and blazing sun. We took as many as we could aboard the LSM, and towed the rest back to Haiphong in the sampans.

Captain Cauvin and I found several elders and brought them to the cabin for hot tea. The mandarins told their story in a sad, weary monotone that came to life only when they mentioned the name of Mai Van Thinh, a 12-year-old lad who will always be remembered as the great hero of Cua Lo.

Cua Lo, the old men said, was a little seaside village 300 kilometers south of Haiphong. It had always been a happy place, made fairly prosperous by heavy hauls of fish and good crops from the rich, well-irrigated paddies inland. The people from Cua Lo spoke nostalgically of the French, for, under the French, life had not been so bad.

Then the Communists had taken over Cua Lo, bringing the bright promises of Viet Minh nationalism. The mandarins shook their heads sadly. "They gave us land reform, and it brought only famine," an old man said. "They carted away our fish, which we needed for food. They tried to teach us the new sociology, which we found meant family denunciation, self-criticism, fear, distrust. Oh, it was very bad."

The people of Cua Lo had only one desire: escape. But the newly appointed Viet Minh commissar was determined to keep them captive and had acquired a small garrison of Viet Minh guards.

So escape plans were made secretly and passed in whispers. Food and water were smuggled aboard the sampans bit by bit. Finally, a moonless night was set for the departure. There was only one loophole in the plan: someone would have to divert the Viet Minh guards from the waterfront while the people boarded the sampans. That was when little Mai Van Thinh volunteered.

The youngster was the sole survivor of an old Cua Lo family. His father and mother had been killed in the war. His older brother, Cham, denounced by the Viet Minh as the leader of the local Christian Youth Movement, had been tied to a tree, drenched with gasoline, and burned alive.

Mai offered to remain behind to divert the guards. This was a desperate gamble, but it was Cua Lo's last hope.

On the appointed evening, 1,156 people huddled in the darkness awaiting the signal. Then, on the far side of town, all hell broke loose. Fires started in widely separated places. Mai Van Thinh raced through the village, a screaming phantom, with the entire garrison trying to pin him down. And 1,156 men, women, and children quietly boarded the sampans and slipped away into the dark. One doesn't like to think what must have happened to Mai Van Thinh in the end.

The voyage on the open China Sea took 5 nights and 5 days. Without navigation instruments, and most of the time without food or water, it was a miracle that these refugees ever reached the waters off Haiphong. But now, down in the well deck of the LSM, there were signs of life. The people were softly signing a hymn. One of the mandarins repeated the words for us: "O Lord, we love the beauty of Thy house, and the place where Thy glory dwells. Provide that our days may be spent in peace with Thee."

Evidence from Phat Diem

As the Communist perimeter closed in around Haiphong, there was no longer any doubt that it was being heavily policed. The only people who reached the evacuation zone were those who escaped into it at their peril. The less fortunate were being held captive behind the bamboo curtain. All this, of course, was in flagrant violation of the Geneva agreements.

The International Control Commission (known, from its French title, as CIC) was supposed to see that the Geneva terms were carried out. The CIC was genuinely feared by the Communists. While it had no enforcement powers, it could report violations to Geneva and call upon world opinon. Also, it had mobile teams that could go anywhere, freely and secretly, to investigate conditions. What, then, was wrong?

You must remember that the CIC was a "mixed neutral" commission. Canada, the only truly democratic member, worked valiantly, but at great disadvantage. India was painfully neutral. Poland, of course, was Communist. And the Poles were past masters of obfuscation.

Many times I sent atrocity cases before the CIC in Haiphong. After hours of wrangling, the hapless refugees would be sent back to camp. The Polish member always demanded impossible proof that the people who committed the atrocities were Communists.

For example, we knew that things were pretty bad in Thai Binh, one of the larger cities of the Tonkin. The CIC mobile team went there, secretly. But somehow a "fix" was made. The team held hearings, and the people gave testimony—under the eyes of their Viet Minh masters. So CIC reported back that things were just fine in Thai Binh! The people were happy and prosperous, and no one had the slightest interest in the "passage to freedom."

Captain Cauvin planned a test case and asked our help. We chose the town of Phat Diem, about 50 miles south of Haiphong, because some of my refugees insisted that at least 30,000 people there wanted to escape and couldn't. A few of the strongest, bravest men and women agreed to go back to Phat Diem with this message: "If you want to escape, gather in the churchyard on November 1, the Feast of All Saints. The International Control Commission will visit you there. You will be able to make your declaration, and perhaps gain your freedom."

Meanwhile, Adm. Jean Marie Querville of the French Navy, Admiral Sabin of Task Force 90, powerful Gen. "Iron Mike" O'Daniel in Saigon, and many French and Vietnamese dignitaries used their influence to insure that the CIC would be on hand in Phat Diem on the appointed date. But, as always, something went wrong.

People from all over the canton flocked to the church on November 1. But the CIC team just couldn't make it. Admiral Querville offered them his helicopter, although they had two planes of their own. But they couldn't leave that day, nor the next, nor the next!

In Phat Diem the Viet Minh became suspicious of this prolonged mass observance of the holy day. They ordered the people to go home, but the people refused. So the Viet Minh locked the gates, stationed guards and allowed no food or water to be passed into the churchyard.

The siege went on for 3 days, 6, then 9. The people in the church and churchyard grew weaker, and the wailing of starving children pierced the nights. Hunger, thirst, dysentery and worse diseases cut the people down. Finally, on the 10th day, the CIC team arrived.

A Canadian told me later that even the Poles were appalled by the horror and filth. The CIC took thousands of declarations, and registered a strong protest with the Viet Minh government in Hanoi. The Viet Minh relented—but how.

They set up 4 offices, capable of processing only a hundred people a day. The first office issued passports. The second sold (!) bus tickets to Haiphong at exorbitant prices. And so it went. Not until the 15th of November did the first small group leave Phat Diem. The Viet Minh chose a circuitous route to Haiphong. En route the buses "broke down." During the delays lecturers told the people that they were going to French and American atrocity camps.

Some of the people were transferred to sampans and taken upriver to Hanoi, the Red capital, there to await transportation by truck or train to Haiphong. And, more often than not, they learned that their exit permits had "expired" during these interminable delays.

By our final count, about 5,000 people from Phat Diem gained their freedom—out of 35,000 who made the attempt. Yet those 5,000 people owe a debt of gratitude to Captain Cauvin, the gallant Frenchman who had the courage and determination to toss the Big Lie back into Communist teeth.

Goodby, little Dooleys

April came, and Haiphong was dying block by block. The tightening Communist perimeter had pushed us almost into the heart of the city. The French troops had left, riots were breaking out and one fear began to haunt us all: that Ho Chi Minh, the Viet Minh leader, might take Haiphong before the appointed hour. The time had come to evacuate the An Lac Orphanage.

Madame Ngai perked up perceptibly when we told her that the American Wives' Club in Saigon had assured the future of the orphanage there. Of course, we fibbed a bit—for there was no assurance of anything in Saigon's future; but the American wives had found a building for the children, and we just had to pray that they and their friends at home would somehow make up for the resources Madame Ngai no longer possessed.

So we packed up the orphanage in toto—cribs, cots, bedding, medicine, and toys—and trucked it down to the landing. The children filed aboard the French LSM that would take them out to the U. S. S. *General Brewster*—the babies in the arms of the older girls, under the vigilant eyes of the little mother, Lia; and my carefree pal Nguyen, wearing his white cap cocked over one eye, in the arms of an American sailor.

Madame Ngai was leaving her beloved Tonkin for the first time, forsaking cherished

roots and a way of life she probably would never see again. But hope springs eternal. "We Tonkinese are a brave and militant people," she said. "We know the day will come when our country will be liberated from the Viet Minh. Of that we have no doubt."

Farewell, noble lady. With women such as you to keep the flame alive, no nation can die; surely there will be a new birth of freedom.

We stood there watching until the LSM was only a dot on the horizon. I have never felt so abysmally alone.

I had one more difficult task to perform. The shoeshine boys had to go. For months they had resisted every argument I put in favor of Saigon. I warned them that the Communists were just as hard on thieves as on honest men, and that life under the Viet Minh would be impossible. They only leered at me, as if to say that, after all this time, I still didn't appreciate their skills as artful dodgers.

What convinced them finally, I think, was the matter of shoes. The idea came to me in a flash one day. "Well," I said, "you might as well throw those kits away. There'll be no more shoeshining when the Viet Minh arrive. Or do you think you can make a shine on canvas shoes?"

It was a telling argument. They looked at each other in dismay. From their frequent forays behind the Bamboo Curtain, they knew that canvas sneakers were standard equipment among the Viet Minh. They let me vaccinate them then, and one April morning Baker and I gave the little dooleys a loaf of bread each and a final delousing, and watched them shoulder their shoeshine kits and sullenly file aboard the landing craft.

They arrived safely in Saigon, and I'm sure that city hasn't been the same since.

The conquerors come

The advance guard of the Viet Minh arrived on May 4, according to schedule. It was a committee of experts, 480 strong. They came in brandnew, Russian-made Molotova trucks, and were impeccably dressed in high-collared gray uniforms, pith helmets, and canvas shoes.

The French-speaking leaders were extremely polite and respectful. They urged me to stay on and treat the "true people of Vietnam." I replied that my job was just about over, and that I expected to be leaving soon.

They sent a delegation out to the camp and gave me a bit of dialectical materialism.

"When you treat sick people in America," the leader asked, "do you make any distinction between Democrats and Republicans?"

"Certainly not."

"Very well," he said, "there must be no distinction here between capitalistic dupes and the loyal people of Vietnam."

Then the cheeky so-and-so ordered his men to divide up my pharmaceuticals and surgical supplies—half for me, and half for the "Democratic Republic" of Vietnam. And there wasn't a thing I could do about it.

We took down the tents of our camp and moved the last of our refugees into empty buildings in the heart of Haiphong. May 12 was to be our last loading day, which would bring the total number of evacuees above 600,000. On that morning I had my last grisly experience in Haiphong.

A rickshaw driver rushed up with a teenage boy he had picked up in an alley. Viet Minh guards had seized the kid as he was crossing the line of the demilitarized zone, and stomped their rifle butts on his bare feet. I had no X-ray equipment, but it was obvious that the damage was beyond repair. The feet and ankles felt like moist bags of marbles, and were already gangrenous. I had only a few instruments left, and a little procaine and penicillin. I did the best I could by disarticulating the ankles where they connect with the lower leg. Someone would have to do a more thorough amputation later.

That was my last surgery in Haiphong. We got the boy aboard a boat. Then we turned to the job of loading the landing craft with our last 3,600 refugees. They weren't really the last, of course. There were still several million behind the Bamboo Curtain who never had a chance. But we had done the best we could. And I hope the men who made the deal at that lovely Geneva lakeside are happy with the results.

On the morning of May 18 we stood by solemnly as Gen. René Cogny hauled down the French flag from the standard where it had flown for nearly a hundred years. Thus an era ended. Haiphong was dead, and awaiting the Red vultures. Operation Cockroach was forgotten in the shambles of Asia.

A very important person

When we arrived in Saigon, Capt. Harry Day, chief of the Navy section of the Military Assistance Advisory Group there, provided me with a hot tub and a tall gin-and-tonic, and gave me all the scuttlebutt from Task Force 90.

Then he said: "Dooley, we must find you a clean uniform. You're due at the palace tomorrow morning."

Next day the Premier (now President of the Republic) Dinh Diem, decorated me with the medal of Officier de l'Ordre National de vietnam. Our medical assistance had not only saved many lives for his people, he said, it had also shown them the true goodness and spirit of cooperation that America is showing Vietnam and all the countries of the world who seek to achieve and maintain their freedom. "My people," he concluded, "will long remember their Bac Sy My, his work, and his love."

I went aboard ship and to sick bay now—this time as a patient. My monthly bout with malaria was on, and I had a temperature of 104. When I reached the hospital in Japan, my colleagues ("Where have you been, Dooley?") were less interested in my medal than in my intestinal parasites, which they said were the most interesting they'd ever seen.

The Navy awarded me the Legion of Merit and, after I had been patched up, told me to report to Washington. When I stopped at Pearl Harbor en route I was taken to the headquarters of Adm. Felix Stump, commander in chief in the Pacific, and asked to brief his staff on my experiences in Vietnam. Although I had never seen so much high brass assembled before, I talked for an hour. Then, at the insistence of one of the admirals, I spoke for 30 minutes more about the constructive things we might do in the remaining free areas of southeast Asia. My words may have been brash, but they came from the heart. And I knew they couldn't bust a medical officer any lower than a lieutenant, junior grade.

Afterward, a very spit-and-polish young officer, Ensign Potts (I've changed his name), introduced himself as my aide. "The admiral has ordered VIP treatment for you while you're in Pearl Harbor, sir," he said. "I'm supposed to see that you get it."

Ensign Potts baffled me. He saluted me every time I turned around. When we got into "my" staff car, I would invite him to sit with me. "Thank you, sir," he'd say—and climb in with the driver.

Well, if I was a VIP, I would use my VIP privileges. "Mr. Potts," I said, "there's a sailor somewhere in this yard—Norman Baker, aviation boatswain's mate, third class. I think he's aboard the *Philippine Sea*. Have him in the lobby of the Royal Hawaiian in the morning. Don't mention my name—just 'the admiral's orders.'" Potts gave me an icy stare and said, "Aye, aye, sir."

Next morning I was in the lobby waiting for the fun. A bewildered Baker, looking slick in clean whites, came through the door. "Over here, sailor," I called. He looked, and then let out a yell. "Eeyow—Dooley—beg pardon, Dr. Tom, sir—you sure look like hell." Then we forgot rank and fell on each other's necks.

We enjoyed the best the Royal Hawaiian had to offer that day, and talked for hours about what seemed like the distant past, and about the shoeshine boys and Madame Ngai and Lia and the kids. Then we raised a final glass to an undying friendship. Good old Baker. I was happy to hear later that the Navy awarded him a letter of commendation—an honor he richly deserved.

Baker, a boatswain's mate by grade, was really assigned to me as an interpreter, but he became an excellent medical corpsman. Like so many of the 15,000 officers and sailors of Admiral Sabin's task force, Baker was resourceful, steadfast and never ran out of genuine compassion. Some days my Irish personality would have me wallowing is despair. Baker always pulled me back. He would do any job assigned him, no matter how distasteful. And he would do it well. His sense of humor got him through, and frequently me too. The success of the operation owes much to that boatswain's-mate-become-corpsman, Norman Baker. The greatest tribute I can pay him is to say that, within all the glory of our tradition, he is a fine American Navy man.

But Ensign Potts was getting on my nerves. We were on our way to Hickam Air Force Base to get my number for the flight home. "Mr. Potts, get in the rear seat," I said. "That's an order." He obeyed stiffly.

"Potts, what the hell's wrong with you—or with me?" I asked. "I get along with most people—but you baffle me. What gives?"

"May I speak frankly, sir?"

"Hell's bells, yes."

He opened up. "Well, I can't go for this hogwash you're handing out," he said. "All this love and altruism and better understanding among people. That's not the Navy's job. We've got military responsibilities in this cockeyed world. Big responsibilities. We've got to perform our duties without sentiment. That's what we've been trained for. Love and kindness and slobbering over people is a job for preachers and old women."

He said a lot more that made me shudder. But at least he got it off his chest. I think we both felt better.

Reunion in Hawaii

I got my flight number and was pushing my way back through the crowded terminal when I heard a high-pitched voice: "Chao Ong, Bac Sy My" (Hi, American Navy Doctor). Then a pair of strong arms were around me, and a young Vietnamese was blubbering on my shoulder. About 2 dozen more gathered around and joined in the chorus. I noticed that they were all wearing the uniform of the Vietnamese Air Force.

"Don't you remember me, Bac Sy My?"

Who could remember one from among those half-million faces? Then I noticed—the boy had no left ear. I looked at the others and recognized the hideous scars wrought by Viet Minh cruelty and my own poor ineptness.

"Of course, I remember," I said. "You boys come from Bao Lac." They told me that they were on their way to Texas to be trained as mechanics for the new Vietnamese Air Force.

Quite a crowd, mostly Americans, had been attracted by his highly emotional scene. This was as good a time as any to begin "briefing" my fellow citizens. So I spoke up and told the onlookers what it was all about. I told them where I had come from, a little of what I had seen, and then I satisfied their curiosity as to why some of these air cadets had only one ear apiece. When I finished I was choking back the tears—but there wasn't a dry eye in the crowd.

I turned and looked at Ensign Potts, and saw the tears running unashamedly down his cheeks. "Mr. Potts," I said, "pull yourself together, sir." He came over, grinning through the tears, and wrung my hand.

Ensign Potts had discovered the power of love.

I learned that the Vietnamese cadets were caught in the inevitable foul-up. They had been on the field for days with no one to look after them. Since they knew no English, they had never found the mess hall, and they were hungry. I sought out the Air Force officer in charge; he just shrugged and told me the kids were due to leave on a flight that night. I told him I wanted to be put aboard the same plane.

"Well, now, wouldn't that be nice, lieutenant?" he sneered. "That way you could get home a bit ahead of time, eh?"

The Irish in me boiled, but it wasn't necessary. Ensign Potts moved in with all guns blazing.

"Sir, Dr. Dooley is Admiral Stump's guest, and I have the authority to speak for the admiral," he roared. "The doctor can have anything he wants, including the admiral's own plane. Seems to me the least the Air Force can do is put him on that lousy flight."

And the Air Force did. Roger.

Old Dr. Dooley speaks

The big Constellation was filled with soldiers, sailors, and marines, and—aside from the crew—I was the only officer aboard. When we were airborne, I decided to have some fun. I stood up and told the men that they were in for a lecture, and that they'd have to listen because there was no way of getting out of it at 10,000 feet. They all groaned.

I called up my 26 cadets one by one, and asked each to tell his story while I translated. My captive audience was entranced. Then I asked the cadets to sing some of their mountain songs. Tonkinese music is hauntingly beautiful, something like the ancient Hebrew liturgical chants. The men listened with rapt attention, and afterward sang American songs for the cadets. The Vietnamese loved Shake, Rattle, and Roll the best. Translate that.

That night, high over the Pacific, new bonds of friendship were formed which surmounted the barriers of language. When we finally came in over the Golden Gate the Americans had given up their seats at the windows to the Vietnamese and were excitedly trying to explain the sights by gestures and sign language. And at Travis Air Force Base I watched them file off the plane, each sailor and marine with a cadet in tow.

While I was on the west coast, I decided to visit a high school in San Diego. Its senior class had sent my refugees bundles of clothes, and I wanted to thank the various people and organizations who had responded to Operation Hat-in-Hand. Of course, that senior class was gone now. But the principal and teachers buzzed around, and I found myself scheduled to address the assembled classes of several San Diego schools.

I looked out over that sea of young faces and felt older than Father Abraham. They were noisy kids, dressed in faded blue jeans and leather jackets, some of the gals in full-blown sweaters and many of the boys with long duck-butt haircuts. When I stepped out on the platform, wearing my uniform and ribbons, there was a bedlam of wolfcalls, whistles and stomping feet.

They were tough, so I decided to shoot the works. I gave them the whole sordid story of the refugee camps, the Communist atrocities, the "Passage to Freedom" and the perilious future of southern Vitenam. I talked for an hour. You could have heard a pin drop.

When I was through, they asked questions, earnest, intelligent questions that kept me on my toes. One little girl, who couldn't have been more than 13, had to come down front in order to be heard. She took a wad of gum from her mouth before asking her question with intense seriousness.

"Dr. Dooley, what can we boys and girls really do to help improve the situation in Southeast Asia?"

Dear little girl, put back your gum, and don't be ashamed. Your heart's in the right place. I haven't met a single American who hasn't asked something like that after hearing the facts. But it's a tough question to answer.

We all want to help, but we don't know how. I guess we're all like Ensign Potts, more or less: we need only to glimpse the, truth, and then the scales fall from our eyes. Only then do we begin to realize the extent of our obligations and opportunities. We lose our inhibitions, and we're no longer afraid to speak of love, compassion, generosity. Christ said it all in the three words of His greatest commandment: "Love one another."

I have no magic formula to offer. I know nothing about foreign aid in billion-dollar packages. But I do know that American aid, used wisely and generously by individual hands on a people-to-people basis, can create bonds of friendship that will be hard to sever. And we have several million willing American hands around the world if we want to use them.

Not the Navy alone, but all the services overseas. They're all made up of Bakers and Ambersons and Gleasons—we were not unique. Men in uniform have primary duties to perform in the national defense. But without neglecting those responsibilities we can still serve the folks back home—if they want us to—as instruments of the sympathy, generosity, and love that are hallmarks of the American character.

Unless those intangibles are conveyed to people plainly, however, I'm afraid the costly programs of material aid are often wasted. They needn't be. My meager resources in Indochina did not win the people's hearts, although they helped. What turned the trick were those words "Day la vien tro my" ("This is American aid")—and all that those words conveyed.

I believe that in the long run such plain help can be the decisive factor in bringing about victory for all the sacred things we stand for.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, there be inserted in the RECORD a number of newspaper editorials and articles on the proposal to establish such a joint committee and also letters of approval of the resolution by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report in the western area of the United States and a letter signed by Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, both of which are in favor of the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. I have introduced similar measures on two previous occasions. However, this is the first time the proposal has come to the floor of the Senate for consideration. The concurrent resolution the Senate is considering today was cosponsored by 34 of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate.

The events of the past year have made it imperative that such a committee as is proposed be authorized before the adjournment of Congress this summer. This concurrent resolution was reported to the Senate by a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

To begin with, let me say that because of the very nature of the Central Intelligence Agency, I think it is important that a joint congressional committee be established for the purposes of making continued studies of the activities of the Agency and problems related to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security. The Hoover Commission recommendations, the recent Presidential appointment of a commission to study CIA, the conflict over the site of the new CIA headquarters building, and other incidents in the past year have only intensified my interest in seeing that such a committee is established by the Congress.

I feel that a joint congressional committee should be established and that the CIA should, as a matter of law, keep that committee as fully and as currently informed as possible with respect to its activities.

Allen Dulles, Director of CIA, may make no mistakes in assessing intelligence, but he should not be the lone judge in matters which have to do with the intentions of other nations with respect to war and peace.

Mr. President, as you know, the President recently appointed an eight-man board to review periodically the Nation's intelligence activities. This is a step forward, but not far enough to reach the goal which I and the cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 seek.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator will make a brief statement at this time with regard to the nature of the jurisdiction of the proposed committee and the relationship, if any, between the President's so-called eight-man board and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that there is no relationship between that board and the Congress; that the board has had its lips sealed; that it is supposed to report at least once every six months; and that the report is to be made to the President only. What that means in effect is a further arrogation of power on the part of the Executive and a diminution to that extent of the equality between the executive and the legislative.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a question or two, or does he prefer to complete his remarks before yielding?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am honored to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Montana, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, and I am glad he is discussing it today, because it seems to me that once again it is important that the American people—who, after all, in the last analysis, shall we say, "own" American foreign policy—should be apprised of the fact that there is a Government agency known as the CIA which works and functions in complete secrecy, and over which the Congress really has but little authority or jurisdiction except by way of the purse strings. In my view it is very dangerous to permit such an arrangement to continue, and I think Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2 is essential from the standpoint of maintaining a people's check on American foreign policy, to the extent that the CIA is involved in American foreign policy.

With that statement, I should like to ask a few questions. Does the Senator agree with me that since the CIA organization functions in any country in any part of the world where it may operate with the secrecy that surrounds it, so far as its relationship to the Congress is concerned, it is bound to create the impression upon the leaders of the foreign countries in which it operates that its activities represent the official foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that that is a fairly sound assumption. The officials of the CIA could be considered as agents of American foreign policy, and perhaps they are so considered in some countries; but I could not, on the basis of what I know about the CIA, either prove or disprove the Senator's statement, because there is only limited congressional contact with the agency.

Mr. MORSE. That is so, for the simple reason that Congress, along with the American people, is kept in ignorance about the operation of the CIA. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I have one further question. Has the Senator from Montana, as a colleague of mine on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, ever received any correspondence or information or complaints in regard to the activities of CIA in foreign nations which indicate criticism of American foreign policy abroad?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I must say to the Senator that I have not.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inform the Senator that I have received a series of communications in regard to alleged activities of the CIA which have caused me concern, and make me all the more enthusiastic in support of the Senator's resolution. I think it is highly desirable that we have, by congressional action, the authority which I think this resolution would give us to require this administration, through its CIA, to keep Congress, through the special committee which the Senator proposes to set up, informed as to exactly what it is doing in other countries by way of action that is bound to have some effect on American foreign policy and our standing in those nations.

This all goes back to what as the Senator knows, is a deep conviction of mine. I abhor government by secrecy. I cannot reconcile it with democratic processes. In the Senate of the United States I do not propose by my vote to endorse the action of any administration no matter what the party, that keeps the American people so much in the dark as the American people are being kept in the dark by the present administration in the whole field of foreign policy. As the Senator knows, I do not agree that there can be justification for keeping from the American people by so-called executive committee meetings in the Senate a good deal of information. But I particularly abhor the operation of government by secrecy in such a way that it threatens the liberties of the American people. Whenever there is government by secrecy, the freedom and liberties of the American people are endangered. A mistake by the CIA in some tinderbox area of the world might result in the loss of the lives of millions of our fellow citizens because no opportunity was afforded in advance to place a check on mistaken policies on the part of the CIA or other agencies of our Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his pertinent observations.

Mr. President, the announcement of this new board was released 2 days after the time when the hearing on this bill was set by the Rules Committee. I do not think that was a deliberate attempt to head off the establishment of a congressional watchdog committee on the intelligence agency; I am sure that was only a matter of coincidence. But it does emphasize one thing: it extends and strengthens the executive control over the CIA.

I do not object to the formation of this new Commission, nor do I question the need by the Central Intelligence Agency and all other intelligence agencies in the Government for this kind of supervision. What I am concerned with, however, is the CIA's position of responsibility to none but the National Security Council. I believe this should be changed. The newly appointed board members will have neither power nor control over the CIA; and it appears to me that it is questionable how much this group will be permitted to learn under the agency's broad charter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Concerning the responsibility of the CIA only to the National Security Council, if a change in that situation were to be made, would not a change of law be required, inasmuch as the law Congress passed in 1947, as I recall, requires the CIA to be responsible only to the National Security Council and to the President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. However, instead of changing the law, I think we should establish a joint watchdog committee composed of Members of the House and Members of the Senate. In that way we could provide safeguards in connection with the operation of the CIA, and we could also deal with questions which Members of Congress might have in their minds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, the Senator from Montana will agree with me that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee now have subcommittees with members assigned to follow the activities of the CIA. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of both those committees, I consider I have been informed of the activities of the CIA to the extent that I believe it is wise for me to be informed. As regards further information, let me say that, so far as I know, nothing has been concealed from us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Massachusetts ever informed the Foreign Relations Committee of the information he gained in regard to the CIA?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have never been asked by the Foreign Relations Committee for any such information. We have discussed such matters rather briefly in the Armed Services Committee, in executive session, as I recall, and also, of course, in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. That is just my point. After all, both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee have great responsibilities in regard to foreign policy. The Foreign Relations Committee has no such liaison officer of which I know in respect to CIA, and I think it is very important that there be established the joint committee the Senator from Montana is proposing, with the very definite understanding that the Joint Committee will keep the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Senate as a whole informed. Certainly, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, it is important that we keep ourselves informed regarding what is occurring in connection with American foreign policy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one member of the committee, I reply that to the extent I can do so under security regulations and in accordance with my own knowledge, of course, I shall be very glad to inform the Senator from Oregon or any other Senator, insofar as it is proper for me to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Massachusetts speaks from his heart, but I wonder whether the question I shall ask now

should be asked in public; if not, let the Senator from Massachusetts please refrain from answering it: How many times does the CIA request a meeting with the particular subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and how many times does the Senator from Massachusetts request the CIA to brief him in regard to existing affairs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the correct answer is that at least twice a year that happens in the Armed Services Committee, and at least once a year it happens in the Appropriations Committee. I speak from my knowledge of the situation during the last year or so; I do not attempt to refer to previous periods. Certainly the present administrator and the former administrator, Gen. Bedell Smith, stated that they were ready at all times to answer any questions we might wish to ask them. The difficulty in connection with asking questions and obtaining information is that we might obtain information which I personally would rather not have, unless it was essential for me as a Member of Congress to have it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senator's answer tells the whole story, for he has informed us that a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee has met only twice a year with members of the CIA, and that a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee has met only once a year with members of the CIA. Of course, it is very likely that the meetings in connection with the Appropriations Committee occurred only at a time when the CIA was making requests for appropriations. That information from the Senator from Massachusetts does not indicate to me that there is sufficiently close contact between the congressional committees and the CIA, as such.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In reply, let me state—and I should like to discuss this point more fully when I present my own views on this subject—that it is not a question of reluctance on the part of the CIA officials to speak to us. Instead, it is a question of our reluctance, if you will, to seek information and knowledge on subjects which I personally, as a Member of Congress and as a citizen, would rather not have, unless I believed it to be my responsibility to have it because it might involve the lives of American citizens.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I see. The Senator is to be commended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that no one has greater respect for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] than do I, and what I say now goes only to the point of view he has expressed, and not to the Senator from Massachusetts himself. But it is the very point of view of the Senator from Massachusetts which I protest, because the very procedure for checking the CIA the Senator from Massachusetts has outlined is at best a voluntary one, and is not based upon the establishment by resolution of a mandatory jurisdiction of the Congress in relation to the CIA. That is what is necessary. But it does not exist under the present very loose and voluntary relationship existing between the CIA and the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. What we must do is to write in black and white provisions which will give mandatory jurisdictional power to the Congress in relationship to the CIA.

The second point I wish to mention in connection with a comment made by the Senator from Massachusetts—whom I highly respect, but who has laid down a premise with which I am in total disagreement—is in relation to the argument that some information in this field should be kept from the Members of Congress who serve on the appropriate committees, and that such Members of Congress should not have knowledge of those matters.

Mr. President, let us consider the personnel of the CIA. Who are the supermen of the CIA? They are not elected officials of the Government. Instead, they are appointees of the executive branch of the Government. But the responsibility as the elected representatives of a free people happens to be ours, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, to protect the people, by serving as a check against the administration—and I care not whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration. What is happening today, in connection with the trend toward government by secrecy in America, is that Congress has been standing by and has not been insisting upon exercising its power to check the executive branch of the Government in many fields including foreign policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. The trend to which he has referred began during the Roosevelt administration, if not before, and continued during the Truman administration and down into the present administration. I refer to the trend toward reposing more and more power in the hands of the executive branch of the Government, and less and less power in the hands of the Congress. The Senate must wake up and do something about this matter, because, unless we do so, as time passes the Congress will become less of an equal branch under our constitutional system, and more power will rest in the hands of the Executive. The policy of increased executive power is nonpartisan. The same thing happened under Democratic administrations as is happening under a Republican administration.

Mr. MORSE. For years I sat over on the other side of the aisle and made the same protests under Democratic administrations that I am making today under a Republican administration.

This policy of too much secrecy has been characteristic of administrations of all parties in the executive branch. What we must do is to face up, before it is too late, to the fact that there is an increasing concentration of arbitrary power in the executive branch of the Government. This process has been going on for the past quarter of a century. We must stop it. The CIA issue affords a good example of what I am protesting.

I do not know of a single secret of Government which ought to be vested in the hands and minds of some appointees of the executive branch of Government in the CIA, to the exclusion of the elected representatives of the people. Who are these CIA employees? Many of them are very young, and, from the standpoint of experience, very immature men. Does anyone suggest that it is safe for democracy to vest in them crucial information, and to say that because we are Members of Congress on the Foreign Relations or Armed Services Committee, we should not have or should not want such information? I say that we must insist on getting it, if we are to keep faith with the oath we took when we entered this body, and are properly to discharge our duties and responsibilities as elected representatives of a free people.

Today we are talking about an abstraction in respect to a principle of Government, but the Senator from Montana is to be complimented and commended for raising the issue. He has raised an issue of government under our constitutional system which has been too long lost sight of by too many people in this country.

What is happening now in the United States is similar to what has hapened in the history of other free nations. They flowered in freedom for a long time, and then gradually a small clique of government officials in the executive branch started taking over their rights, freedoms, and liberties. The people woke up too late to discover that they had lost their freedoms, rights, and liberties. It can happen in America, if we do not stand on guard in relation to the principle of checks and balances under the Constitution.

I commend the Senator from Montana. Through this resolution I think he has placed his finger on a very important duty of Members of Congress. We ought to insist that the power which has been vested in the CIA be subjected to an occasional check, as provided by his resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. Under the Roosevelt administration so-called executive agreements were agreed to between this country and Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Nepal. Those executive agreements should have come before the Senate, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, because they were in reality treaties of friendship and commerce.

Under the Truman administration, Congress appropriated sufficient funds to provide for a 70-group Air Force. President Truman impounded the money and allowed only a 48-group Air Force to come into being.

Under this administration, last year Congress appropriated $40 million to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength. What happened? Secretary of Defense Wilson said he would not use the money. He did use a part of it. A part of the cut went into effect. I note from the document asking additional appropriations for the fiscal

year 1956, page 8, that it develops that under the Department of Defense, military functions, the Office of the Secretary of Defense used $769,000—to be derived from where? From transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

The Office of Public Affairs in the Department of Defense used $27,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For Interservice Activities, Court of Military Appeals, $41,400 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For the Department of the Navy, servicewide supply and finance, $7,400,000 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

For servicewide operations in the Department of the Navy, $2,180,000 was used, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

All this was after the Congress unanimously restored $40 million to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength, 223,000 men. What happened to those funds? What happened to the mandate laid down by Congress, which is supposed to control the Armed Forces of the United States, and to provide for them? What happened during the Truman administration when Congress appropriated for a 70-group Air Force? What happened during the Roosevelt administration when, in the field of foreign policy, executive agreements were made which were in reality treaties of commerce and friendship?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, with respect to the executive agreements to which the Senator has referred, let me say that I believe they should have been made in the form of treaties, and should have been brought to the attention of the Senate.

So far as the Marine Corps appropriation is concerned, that question is now before the Committee on Appropriations. I agree with the Senator that if the money was not used for the Marine Corps, if the total strength of the Marine Corps provided for by the Congress was not maintained, and was not necessary, in the opinion of the Department, that money should have gone back to the Treasury, and, if money for other purposes was needed, new appropriations should have been requested. There should have been no transfers. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not approve of the method by which the funds were handled. The question as to whether the strength of the Marine Corps provided for by Congress was necessary is another issue; but certainly the money should not have been transferred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows far better than I, a portion of the Marine Corps cut was restored.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But not to the point mandated by the Congress of the United States. The Senator from Massachusetts also voted last year for the $40 million appropriation to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present strength. The money is being used for other purposes, which in my judgment is contrary to the intent and wish of the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory is correct as to the figures—and I am not sure it is—the number of marines last year was 215,000. The idea was to reduce the number to 195,000, in round figures. Congress directed that the strength be kept at 215,000. I believe that the present figure is 201,000, and that it will be 205,000 at the end of the present fiscal year. I am not quite certain as to the accuracy of those figures, but the present strength is more than 200,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator is approximately correct; but it is still to be noted that the wishes of the Congress were ignored by Mr. Wilson, who is an agent of the President, and the money was used as he saw fit, and not as Congress intended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in complimenting the Senator from Montana for bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate.

I believe that the entire policy of secrecy in this connection is a cancer in the operation of our Government.

Only a short time ago we had the spectacle of Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, telephoning to the Securities and Exchange Commission and holding up for 3 or 4 days a hearing in connection with the Dixon-Yates matter. When we asked why an Assistant to the President should call up an agency of Government and delay a hearing for 3 or 4 days, while in the House an appropriation of $6,500,000 was being considered, we received a letter from the assistant secretary to the effect that this subject was secret.

When the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as chairman of the subcommittee, joined with other members of the subcommittee in a letter requesting the Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, to come before us and tell us the reason for such procedures, we received a very brief letter of 3 or 4 lines in reply.

I fully agree with the Senator from Oregon that the policy of secrecy is resulting in keeping from the Congress and the people matters with which the Congress ought to be thoroughly familiar. We are called upon to enact laws dealing with those subjects, and we are dealing with them, as the Senator from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago, in such a manner that members of the Committee on Armed Services meet only twice a year with representatives of the CIA, and members of the Committee on Appropriations meet with them only once a year, when they need more money. I believe the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Montana and I are members, can testify to the fact that we see those gentlemen, members of the CIA, on very, very rare occasions, and then only when we practically invite them to attend.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator may well be correct. As a matter of fact, I do not recall ever seeing them before the Committee on Foreign Relations, although I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? I shall not interrupt him again after this comment if it can be avoided.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the observations of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from Montana has mentioned the executive agreements which have been made with some Middle East countries, especially Saudi Arabia.

He has referred to agreements about which we were not apprised at the time they were made. I do not believe it can be questioned that in regard to a good many of the agreements which are entered into the CIA has, so to speak, a background part to play, and does play; and it supplies what it believes to be information which ought to be influential in reaching executive decisions. That is why I believe it very important that the Committee on Foreign Relations be kept advised right up to the minute in regard to the findings of the CIA and the recommendations of the CIA as they may affect American foreign policy.

Let us take, for example, the executive agreement to which the Senator from Montana has referred. Now, belatedly, we are beginning to get information, for example, pointing out that in Saudi Arabia human-slavery traffic is rampant in the year 1956. Before the week is over I intend to discuss on the floor of the Senate human-slavery traffic in Saudi Arabia.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the argument is made that we ought to ship military supplies to Saudi Arabia. The argument is made that in order to combat communism we ought to keep an airbase in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. President, I seriously question the whole program of America in Saudi Arabia, so long as evidence can be brought forth that the nation with whom we have the agreements is engaged in human slavery in this year of 1956.

We cannot reconcile that fact with the high moral principles for which we as a nation profess to stand in American foreign policy.

The reason I am pleading for full disclosure to the American people of American foreign policy is that if such disclosure is not made we get into the kind of situation the Senator from Montana has mentioned with regard to so-called executive agreements. That happens whenever we in the Congress do not have all the facts presented to us.

I sat on the Committee on Armed Services for 8 years. What did the brass do? They came before the committee and said, "This is our recommendation.

However, because of the top secrecy involved, we do not want to go into the information and the facts on which the recommendation is based."

What did we do? We used to sit there and say, "Well, we will take you at your word."

In my judgment, we should not do that. In my judgment, in a democracy, the elected representatives of the people are entitled to whatever facts anyone who has brass on his shoulders may have in his head. I for one think we ought to stop the tendency to let the military, the CIA, and a few officials of the State Department determine foreign policy for the American people, without any check on the process by their elected representatives in the Legislative Halls of the Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that what frightens me about the whole matter is the fact that the Senate, particularly, has been willing to give up its share of its responsibility in the Government during the past 15 or 20 years, at least. It is a bad trend. I do not believe it is the President who is arrogating unto himself this added authority. I assume it is in the executive departments and in the praetorian guard in the White House where the authority is being used, to the detriment of the elected representatives of the people in both the House and in the Senate, and against the course laid down under the Constitution of the United States.

It is a very serious constitutional question. I deeply regret that I am not a constitutional lawyer, because I believe there is quite a field for discussion of this subject. I only hope that the Senate will recognize the fact and will take some action to restore the equality which should exist between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield once more? Then, like the Senator from Oregon, I will not interrupt him again. That is, I hope I will not interrupt him again, but I cannot promise that I will not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator will agree with me that the CIA is not a policymaking body but that the policymaking body is the State Department which is an executive agency of the President in the initiation and determination of the foreign policy of the United States. In the same way, under the President, the Defense Department is the initiating body with regard to our national security. I am sure the Senator will agree with me on those primary facts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; except that in the field of foreign policy we do have the advice and consent clause in the Constitution. That clause can be stretched a long, long way. That is what has been happening in recent years, with the result that the Senate has exercised less and less influence in foreign affairs, and with the further result that the executive department has taken under its control more and more of that field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The point I wished to make especially in the present discussion is that the CIA is not a policymaking body of the executive branch of the Government, and that the policymaking body is the State Department. The CIA is one of the agencies which the State Department uses in determining what the foreign policy of the Government shall be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be inclined to take the Senator's word for that. However, I do not know whether the CIA has any part in making policy. The Senator is correct in saying that it is the function of the State Department under the President of the United States to act in that field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The present Administrator of CIA does his utmost to maintain that principle within his agency. In other words, he does not alone determine policy, but carries out the orders which are given to him by the policy-making body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator. In my remarks about the CIA I wish it to be clearly understood that I have nothing but the highest regard for Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of CIA, and for the type of administration which he is carrying on. What I am talking about is the CIA as an executive agency and its relations to Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume that the Administrator of CIA—the present one or any other Administrator, past or present—would come before the Committee on Foreign Relations and discuss with it any subject he could properly discuss within his field, if the committee asked him to appear before it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I know and believe he would be glad to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course the problem of security comes up, both in public and in executive sessions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am always interested in the meaning that is given to words. Of course, when we argue that CIA is not a policymaking body because under the administrative setup it is not charged with making policy, it does not follow that it does not make policy. Let us take a look at Government operations and what happens when we give an assignment to an agency such as CIA.

It proceeds to gather information and to make investigations and studies. On the basis of such studies and investigations and what it discloses to the executive arm of the Government, and what it does not disclose, someone in the Government must then make a determination. The tendency is usually to follow the recommendation of the agency that was asked to do the job of investigating.

One of the reasons why I believe the pending concurrent resolution should be adopted is that we should find out to what extent in fact—not in theory, but in fact—CIA is forming policy. I will tell the Senate my suspicion. My suspicion is that it determines a great deal of policy. I happen to believe we have the duty of finding out whether my suspicion—and I am not the only one who has such a suspicion—is warranted or not. I think we must take it for granted that when we give broad powers to the CIA, which it has been exercising, it has great influence in determining foreign policy. I urge that a check be placed upon it. We ought to know to what extent its recommendations are being generally followed.

I agree with the Senator with respect to Allen Dulles, but I am not in favor of giving him unchecked power. I want to know to what extent the recommendations and the policies made by CIA under Allen Dulles become the policies of John Foster Dulles, his brother, the Secretary of State. I believe we need checks on families as well as checks on men who do not belong to the same families.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not only would that question be interesting, but I am sure the answer to it would also be interesting.

Mr. President, so long as the subject of the power of the executive vis-a-vis the legislative has been brought up, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a communication from the President of the United States to the 84th Congress, 2d session, Document 341, at the top of page 8, under the heading "Department of Defense—Military Functions," be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY FUNCTIONS

Office of the Secretary of Defense: "Salaries and expenses," $769,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

"Office of Public Affairs," $27,500, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

Interservice activities: "Court of Military Appeals," $41,400, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

Department of the Navy:

"Servicewide supply and finance," $7,400,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps";

"Servicewide operations," $2,180,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Military personnel, Marine Corps."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have made a part of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a copy of a speech which I made 2 years ago relative to 3 executive agreements under the Roosevelt administration which should have come before the Senate.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

There is a real issue, and it has troubled me deeply, as I am sure it has troubled other Senators. It is to be found in the power of the executive branch in the field of foreign policy.

The Constitution specifically provides the President with certain unique powers to conduct our foreign relations, just as the other branches of Government have unique powers in other matters. I do not question those

powers which accrue to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

But in one aspect of our foreign relations, the treatymaking power, he does not have unique, but rather concurrent, power shared with the Senate. Treaties are to be made by the President only with the advice and consent of the Senate. The most vital matters involving the relationships of this country with others are or should be conducted within this realm of concurrent power.

But it is precisely in this realm that an extra-constitutional device, the executive agreement, now threatens the fine balance of power which has been maintained under our system of government for a century and a half.

It will be argued, as it has been, that executive agreements are used almost exclusively in pursuance of authority delegated by Congress or to supplement certain valid undertakings growing out of the unique powers of the President. That is true, and I think the device, so used, is necessary and useful and harmless to the principle of balance of powers.

But it is not in the mass of executive agreements that the issue is to be found. It is, rather, in the few, in the very few. For it is in the few, the very few, that this extra-constitutional device can be used to stretch the unique powers of the executive. It is in the few that there lies the danger of usurpation, destruction of the constitutional balance, and in the last analysis, the threat of Executive tyranny.

This is no imaginary fear which haunts me and other members of the Senate. Executive agreements have been used to stretch the powers of the Presidency and unless safeguards are established there is no reason to believe that they will not continue to be so used. If the Senate will bear with me for a few moments longer, I will undertake to prove by specific example how this extra-constitutional device can undermine the power of the Senate in foreign relations. I will endeavor to show how this device can and has been used to erode that power and transfer it painlessly, almost imperceptibly, from this body to the executive branch.

For decades, treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation have been made with other countries by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. As the Senators know, these are basic treaties which establish the framework of our relations with other countries. The Senate has traditionally given advice and consent to such treaties. It still does so, for the most part.

In 1933, however, the Department of State negotiated an agreement of friendship and commerce with Saudi Arabia. As far as I can determine, this was the first time an executive agreement, rather than a treaty, was used for this purpose. To be sure, the agreement with Saudi Arabia was labeled provisional in nature and was to remain in effect, I quote: "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation." Even though it was temporary, however, the State Department must have known that this executive agreement was treading on dangerous constitutional ground for it added the following clause, I quote "Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse."

This executive agreement was never replaced by a definitive treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Though the Senate has never given consent to ratification, it stands in equal force with genuine treaties dealing with the same subject matter, to which the Senate has given approval.

This agreement, Mr. President, established a precedent. Note now how the precedent is reenforced. Thirteen years later, in 1946, the State Department negotiated a similar agreement with the Kingdom of Yemen. The terms of the two agreements were practically identical except for two omissions. The agreement with Yemen no longer carried the phrase indicating that it was to remain in effect only, I quote: "until the entry in force of a definitive treaty of commerce and navigation." Also omitted was the phrase, I quote: "Should the Government of the United States of America be prevented by future action of its Legislature from carrying out the terms of these stipulations the obligations thereof shall thereupon lapse."

In short, the State Department appears, in 13 years, to have reached the conclusion that the power to make treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation had become, at least in some cases, a unique power of the executive branch, that the consent of the Senate was no longer necessary, at least in some of these agreements.

One year later, in 1947, a third agreement of friendship, commerce, and navigation was negotiated with the Kingdom of Nepal. In printing the text of this agreement in its Bulletin, the State Department apparently still had a twinge of nervousness about the procedure it was following. It was constrained to point to two precedents. What were the precedents? The agreements with Yemen and Saudi Arabia.

Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Nepal. These are small, faraway lands. Few of us could locate them quickly on a map. Still fewer have any direct concern with what transpires in them. Yet, the agreements which have been negotiated with them constitute a series of precedents which is of vital importance to our constitutional division of powers. None of them has ever been replaced by a regular treaty, yet all of them cover subject matter which traditionally has been handled by treaty.

Twenty-one years have elapsed since the first of these three agreements was negotiated. Was the failure to replace the agreements by permanent treaty an oversight or a conscious expansion of the unique powers of the executive at the expense of the Senate? Is this example a straw man or a very real case of usurpation of power? Will the President now send these three agreements or their permanent replacements to the Senate for advice or consent or after years and decades is the need still for temporary agreements?

How is the Senate to deal with the disappearance of its prerogatives in this fashion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some illustrations of the use of Executive power in relation to the power of Congress, which I requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to compile for me, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the illustrations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.,

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE USE OF EXECUTIVE POWER IN RELATION TO THE POWER OF CONGRESS

The general nature of the alleged usurpation of the powers of Congress by Executive circumvention of legislative intent has been stated by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH.

Testifying before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress on March 28, 1945, Representative SMITH said:

"Under our Constitution legislation is supposed to be enacted by the Congress. I want to call your attention to what I assert to be a fact, that we now have not only legislation by the Congress, but we have four other types of legislation. I will go into each one of them a little more fully * * *. We have legislation by sanctions; we have legislation by subsidies; we have legislation by Executive regulations, under authority of acts of Congress; and we have legislation by interpretation—interpretations that Congress never dreamed of when we enacted the law.

"I think that that is of very great moment. * * * I do not think the American people realize to what extent our system of government is being changed by these innovations. * * *

"I do not think Congress as a Congress realizes it. On the other hand, I think almost every individual Member of Congress realizes what is going on, and they talk about it and fuss about it, and they say something ought to be done about it, but as a rule Congress does not do anything about it.

"Now, much of this stuff is done in perfectly good faith. I am not here to say that any of it is not done in good faith. It is done under the spur of the emergency, but when we once break down the constitutional boundaries and begin to do things that there is not any authority under the Constitution or the law for, we get into a field that spreads and gets worse, like a spreading disease.

"Personally I am very much disturbed about it and I hope that we can do something to check it and bring us back within the limits of what we ought to do."

Absolute and unequivocal proof of executive circumvention of legislative intent in the interpretation or administration of laws passed by Congress is in most cases impossible to obtain. In some instances disputes arising under these circumstances have been settled by adjudication, but in most cases these conflicts have been characterized by charges and allegations which were sometimes answered and sometimes ignored. Interpretations of what a law means and how it should be administered may very well often require the exercise of subjective judgment. The charges of circumvention may be equally subjective. There may be no conclusive evidence that either party is acting in bad faith, or that the executive is deliberately flouting the law.

Certainly there are some instances where evasion or ignoring of the law was deliberate, but in these cases the President usually acted upon what might be argued to be mitigating circumstances or what he regarded as a more fundamental legal authority. For example, President Jackson felt that his reelection in 1832, after a thorough public discussion of his veto of the bill to recharter the National Bank, justified his withdrawal of public funds from the bank 3 years before its old charter was to expire. Although he acted legally through his Secretary of the Treasury, Jackson knew that he was acting contrary to congressional intent. "Indeed, Congress had already refused to pass a measure authorizing him specifically to do this. * * *"[1]

In a case of historic importance, President Andrew Johnson fired Secretary of War Stanton in deliberate violation of the Tenure of Office Act, which had been passed over his veto, because he "was convinced that the act was unconstitutional and was consequently eager to get it in the courts for the purpose of a test."[2] Although Johnson was impeached primarily for this action and escaped conviction by only one vote, this law was repealed in 1887, and a very similar measure was declared unconstitutional in

[1] Binkley, Wilfred E. The Powers of the President, New York, Doubleday, Doran, 1937, pp. 76–77.

[2] Ibid, p. 149. See also Corwin, Edward S., The President: Office and Powers, New York, New York University Press, 1948, pp. 77–78.

1926 in *Myers* v. *United States* (272 U. S. 52).

The illustrations of alleged executive circumvention or flouting of legislative intent in the following pages of this report do not by any means comprise a definitive listing of examples. They are, rather, cases that could be compiled in the time available, and it is hoped that, taken together, they offer a fairly representative picture of cases of this type.

One other explanatory word is needed. No attempt has been made to present the other side, the answers to charges of executive disregard for legislative intent. Much background material has also been omitted. The political context surrounding each example is held to the absolute minimum.

President Theodore Roosevelt is known as a Chief Executive who believed in using the power of his office to the full. Two examples of his alleged circumvention of legislative intent are recorded here: [3]

In two other instances, although his conduct ultimately received a judicial sanction, [T. R.] Roosevelt aroused the ire of his political opponents by employing the powers granted to him by these statutes to secure a result apparently not intended by these acts, and certainly not approved by Congress. Having failed to convince Congress of the urgency of preventing the acquisition by monopolies of public coal lands at ridiculously low prices, he undertook to remedy this situation by issuing a series of proclamations withdrawing these coal lands from public entry and setting them aside as parts of the national forest reserves. That a doubt existed as to the legality of these orders is attested by the refusal of his successor, Taft, to proceed further without an express sanction of Congress. Again, when an attempt was made to obstruct his efforts at conservation by attaching to an appropriation bill a rider exempting from withdrawal as reserves a large portion of public lands in the Northwest, Roosevelt, without assuming the responsibility of vetoing a financial measure, defeated this effort by setting aside all the timber lands in question before the bill was presented to him for signature.

President Woodrow Wilson was another of the so-called strong Presidents who believed in the vigorous use of all of the powers of his office, as the following excerpt shows: [4]

Even Wilson, staunch advocate that he was of the observance of strictly legitimate procedures, was not averse, on the occasion of impending war, to execute a policy for which statutory authorization, previously solicited from Congress, had been refused. In asking Congress to empower him to arm merchant vessels, Wilson had spoken as follows:

"No doubt I already possess that authority without special warrant of law by the plain implication of my constitutional duties and powers, but I prefer to act not upon implication. I wish to feel that the authority and power of Congress are behind me."

Notwithstanding the defeat of an authorizing statute by the action of 11 willful men, Wilson proceeded to arm merchant vessels in reliance not only upon his constitutional powers but upon the support derived from an obsolete statute of 1819. Where an executive relies on a novel interpretation of an existing statute, which was designed at the date of its adoption to serve a wholly unrelated purpose, it would seem that by an act of repeal, Congress could deprive the executive of the color of authority for his action. Whether the repeal of the law could, of itself, halt the President is probably dependent upon whether his action, through his subordinates, could be made the subject of litigation.

The following excerpt is taken from the annual message of President Warren G. Harding delivered to the Congress on December 6, 1921:

"The previous Congress, deeply concerned in behalf of our merchant marine, in 1920 enacted the existing shipping law, designed for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine. Among other things provided to encourage our shipping on the world's seas, the executive was directed to give notice of the termination of all existing commercial treaties in order to admit of reduced duties on imports carried in American bottoms. During the life of the act no executive has complied with this order of the Congress. When the present administration came into responsibility it began an early inquiry into the failure to execute the expressed purpose of the Jones Act. Only one conclusion has been possible. Frankly, Members of the House and Senate, eager as I am to join you in the making of an American merchant marine commensurate with our commerce, the denouncement of our commercial treaties would involve us in a chaos of trade relationships and add indescribably to the confusion of the already disordered commercial world. Our power to do so is not disputed, but power and ships, without comity of relationship, will not give us the expanded trade which is inseparably linked with a great merchant marine. Moreover, the applied reduction of duty, for which the treaty denouncements were necessary, encouraged only the carrying of dutiable imports to our shores, while the tonnage which unfurls the flag on the seas is both free and dutiable, and the cargoes which make a nation eminent in trade are outgoing, rather than incoming.

"It is not my thought to lay the problem before you in detail today. It is desired only to say to you that the executive branch of the Government, uninfluenced by the protest of any nation, for none has been made, is well convinced that your proposal, highly intended and heartily supported here, is so fraught with difficulties and so marked by tendencies to discourage trade expansion, that I invite your tolerance of noncompliance for only a few weeks until a plan may be presented which contemplates no greater draft upon the Public Treasury, and which, though yet too crude to offer it today, gives such promise of expanding our merchant marine, that it will argue its own approval."

One outstanding authority on the presidency declares that Franklin D. Roosevelt, in a message of September 7, 1942, peremptorily demanded that Congress repeal a certain provision of the Emergency Price Control Act or that he, the President, would treat this provision as repealed. After quoting a passage from the Roosevelt message, Edward S. Corwin goes on to say: [5]

"In a word, the President said to Congress: "Unless you repeal a certain statutory provision forthwith, I shall nevertheless treat it as repealed." On what grounds did Mr. Roosevelt rest his case for power of so transcedent a nature? Although he made a vague gesture toward congressional acts, it is obvious that his principal reliance was, and could only have been, on his powers under the Constitution—that is to say, his conception of these. Presidents have before this in a few instances announced that they did not consider themselves constitutionally obligated by something which Congress had enacted but which, as they contended, trenched on presidential prerogatives. This, for example, was Johnson's position in 1867. But the position advanced by Mr. Roosevelt • • • goes beyond this, claiming as it does for the President the power and right to disregard a statutory provision which he did not venture to deny, and indeed could not possibly have denied, which Congress had complete constitutional authority to enact, and which, therefore, he was obligated by express words of the Constitution to take care should be faithfully executed."

Speaking of the administration of the Internal Security Act, former Senator Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, said: [6]

"There is strong evidence that some officials of this Government are engaged in a studied and deliberate effort to avoid compliance with certain basic provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 which are designed to protect this country against infiltration by Communist agents.

"Notwithstanding these provisions of the Internal Security Act which provide for the exclusion and deportation of aliens whose presence in this country endangers the public security, virtually nothing was being done by the executive department to carry those provisions into effect."

• • • • •

"In the course of the last few days we held an executive session with the officials of the Department of State on this matter including the Chief of the Division of International Administration and the administrative attorney of the Division. So far as I can comprehend their attitude it is this, that the security of the United States should be weighed in the balance against a policy of facilitating our international relations with other nations. I assert that this is not only a direct violation of the Internal Security Act, which these officials are sworn to uphold and which is designed to protect this country, but is a course leading to the practical annulment of the statutory provisions passed by the Congress to protect our internal security.

• • • • •

"So long as certain officials of this Government refuse to heed the warnings of our intelligence agencies and deliberately ignore provisions of the Internal Security Act, we shall have an open door for the infiltration of spies and saboteurs."

Both President Truman and President Eisenhower have been subjected to congressional criticism for impounding funds which have been appropriated by Congress for specific purposes. In 1949 Congress appropriated money for 58 air groups. A Truman order of October 29 specified that funds would be spent for only the 48 air groups he had recommended. This policy was examined by the House Subcommittee on the Department of Defense Appropriations in January 1950. Members of the subcommittee regarded the action as an invasion of congressional authority. Representative SIKES declared: "I would consider that there is a prohibition in the law against the things which now are being done. The Congress under the Constitution decides how much money is to be expended. • • • Anything done contrary to this is in my opinion contrary to the basic law of the land." [7]

Last Summer President Eisenhower was accused by several Senators of acting, or threatening to act, with regard to already appropriated funds, in a manner that was contrary to the wishes and intentions of Congress.[8] In the public works appropriation bill Congress inserted provisions for funds for some projects that did not appear

[3] Small, Norman J., Some Presidential Interpretations of the Presidency, Baltimore, the Johns Hopkins Press, 1932, pp. 148–149.

[4] Memorandum on the Powers of Congress, Short of Impeachment, To Control a President in Matters of the Faithful Execution of Congressional Legislation. Legislative Reference Service Report, October 20, 1942.

[5] Corwin, Edward S., op. cit., pp. 304–305.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, pages 13323–13324.

[7] Executive-Legislative Relations: Examples of Real or Alleged Overstepping, 1920–51, Legislative Reference Service Report, May 28, 1951.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 8, pages 10672–10679.

in the President's budget. "According to the newspaper stories," said Senator MORSE, "the President implied such unbudgeted projects will not be initiated even though the Congress has specifically appropriated the funds until detailed engineering plans have been completed. * * * It will be a sad day for government by law if a President is allowed to thwart the will of Congress as President Eisenhower apparently intimated he might do."

With reference to an aspect of the Dixon-Yates controversy, Senator O'MAHONEY said: "If it shall continue to be true that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can defy the acts of Congress in making appropriations and can say, notwithstanding the appropriations, that the works will not be built because the executive department does not approve of them, although the President has signed the bill, it is useless to talk about saving free government." Referring to the congressional appropriation affecting the Marine Corps, Senator MANSFIELD declared: "Why should Secretary [of Defense] Wilson thwart the will of the Congress by saying he had impounded the $46 million authorized by the Congress to keep the marines at their present strength? * * * This is something the executive branch is doing regardless of the action taken by Congress." On another subject, Senator NEUBERGER said: "The President announces to the world, in a press statement, that, even though the Congress has provided for the Cougar Dam, he evidently does not intend to proceed with the spending of the money for it, although the appropriation has been provided by the Congress."

A question of executive as against legislative authority arose last July when President Eisenhower signed the Defense Department appropriation bill. Section 638 of this measure gave to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House a virtual veto power over certain proposed cutbacks in some of the business enterprises in the Defense Department. The President signed the bill because the Department had to have the money, but he declared in his message of July 13 that section 638 "constitutes an unconstitutional invasion of the province of the Executive. * * * Such section will be regarded as invalid * * * unless otherwise determined by a court of competent jurisdiction."

According to the Washington Star of July 15, Representative SIKES was completely shocked at the President's attitude. "Seldom have I heard such complete and utter disregard for the rights and privileges of Congress or of the constitutional processes of law." He said the President would "in this way seek to place himself above the law and to set aside a section of law that he or someone who speaks for him does not like. This is veto by paragraph, and veto by paragraph is not legal. This is usurpation of the powers of the Congress." House Majority Leader MCCORMACK said: "I had the idea that the Civil War settled the question of nullification in this country, but this is a nullification of an act of Congress."

The following material consists entirely of examples of executive agreements and other international agreements arrived at through executive action. The first 2 excerpts discuss the subject in general terms; the next 4 consist of more specific illustrations:

The first of the general excerpts follows:[9]

"Generally speaking, the interwar period was characterized by the wide use of executive agreements to effect international understandings on matters that seem quite as important as those dignified by the use of the treatymaking process. Approval by two-thirds of the Senate was not required to terminate the First World War, to join the International Labor Organization, to acquire Atlantic naval bases in British territory in return for overage destroyers, to accept the Atlantic Charter, nor to enter into lend-lease agreements."

The second of the general excerpts states:[10]

"The United States annexed Texas and Hawaii, ended the First World War, joined the International Labor Organization, the Universal Postal Union and the Pan American Union, settled over $10 billion worth of post-World War I debts, acquired Atlantic naval bases in British territory during World War II, acquired all financial claims of the Soviet Union in the United States, joined the United Nations pledging itself not to make separate peace in World War II and to accept the Atlantic Charter, submitted over a score of cases to international arbitration, and modified the tariff in numerous reciprocal trade agreements by means other than the treaty-making process."

The more specific illustrations are:

"1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION [11]

"Membership of the United States of America, by proclamation by the President of the United States, September 10, 1934

"Whereas by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America, approved June 19, 1934, the President was authorized to accept membership for the Government of the United States of America in the International Labor Organization, provided that in accepting such membership the President should assume on behalf of the United States of America no obligation under the covenant of the League of Nations. * * *

"2. ACQUISITION OF ATLANTIC NAVAL BASES [12]

"Naval and air bases

"United Kingdom

"Arrangement providing for lease to the United States of naval and air bases in Antigua, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Guiana, Jamaica, Newfoundland, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and for transfer to the United Kingdom of 50 United States Navy destroyers.

"Effected by exchange of notes signed at Washington September 2, 1940.

"Duration: Not stated; leases to run for 99 years.

"Text: (54 Stat. 2405; E. A. S. 181; 203 L. N. T. S. 201). Opinion of the Attorney General.

"Advising that the proposed arrangement might be concluded as an executive agreement and that there was Presidential power to transfer title and possession of the overage destroyers (39 Op. Att. Gen., 484).

"3. ATLANTIC CHARTER [13]

"On August 14, 1941, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, representing the United States and Great Britain, issued a joint declaration of peace aims. * * *

"4. PAN AMERICAN UNION [14]

"The Pan American Union was set up and continues to exist by virtue of a series of resolutions to which the President's plenipotentiaries, as members of international conferences of the American states, gave his and their consent, but in regard to which Congress appears to have exercised no influence other than its power—common to both treaty- and agreement-made unions—to grant or to withhold appropriations for the payment of the recurrent dues."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will this new commission be able to make available to the public and to Congress anything they learn about CIA doing the wrong things or not doing enough of the right things? This commission is responsible to the executive department alone, and lacks the legal authority a congressional inquiry enjoys. An Executive order could conceal any report or recommendation the Board might make on the grounds that revealing such information might injure the country. The Congress would still remain in the dark.

It is true that intelligence services of other major countries operate without direct control of the legislatures. This is understandable in a totalitarian government, such as the Soviet Union. It is even understandable in a parliamentary democracy, such as Great Britain, where the entire administration is a part of and is responsible to Parliament. Our form of Government, however, is based on a system of checks and balances. If this system gets seriously out of balance at any point, the whole system is jeopardized, and the way is opened for the growth of tyranny.

CIA is the only major Federal agency over which Congress exercises no direct and formal control. Its budget and its personnel lists are classified. By law the agency can withhold even such obviously unimportant information as the salaries of its top officials.

It has been the tradition in both Houses of Congress to have individual, but corresponding, committees to handle legislation in both the House and Senate. We have the Committees on Agriculture, Finance, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, and so on. These committees generally correspond to executive departments or agencies in their jurisdiction.

The Congressional Directory lists CIA as an executive agency, directly responsible to the President; however, the other agencies and commissions under this listing are relatively small in number of employees and many act largely in an advisory capacity. We do not know how large CIA is, but according to plans for its new concentrated headquarters, it is no longer a small agency, if it ever was.

CIA is subject to congressional review by four established and fully authorized subcommittees, and I am sure that they are doing a creditable and fine job. But this is not enough. The Senators on these committees have many other things to consider, as members of the full Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. In addition, there is no staff to rely on. The Appropriation Committee's check on CIA is generally, I assume, when the executive budget request is up for consideration. The Armed Services Committee receives a periodic report, or at the committee's request. In addition, several checks have been made by independent groups, as we know. Even the recent Commission set up by the President functions only parttime, and will

[9] Cheever, Daniel, and H. Field Haviland. American Foreign Policy and the Separation of Powers. P. 92.

[10] McDougal, Myres S. and Asher Lans. Treaties and Congressional-Executive or Presidential Agreements: Interchangeable Instruments of National Policy. Yale Law Journal, Vol. 54, no. 2, March 1945. P. 238.

[11] U. S. Congress, 75th Cong., 3d sess., Senate Doc. 134, p. 5531.

[12] U. S. Congress, 76th Cong., 3d sess., House Doc. 943.

[13] Langer, William L., comp. and ed., An Encyclopedia of World History, Boston, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1952, p. 1137.

[14] McClure, Wallace M., International Executive Agreements, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, p. 12.

make only a periodic check on the CIA. That is not what we need; these checks are fine, but we need a continual check on the operations of this agency which seems to be expanding continually. The most efficient method is by a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

There have been a number of reports recently that all is not well with the CIA. The Hoover Commission reported a woeful shortage of information about the Soviet Union, and noted that the agency could stand some internal administrative improvements. These are the sorts of inadequacies which the newly appointed Commission certainly will not allow, but congressional guardians might be able to compel even swifter and surer reform than could an executive committee.

Everything about CIA is clothed in secrecy. CIA is freed from practically every ordinary form of congressional review. Control of its expenditures is exempted from the provisions of law which prevent financial abuses in other Government agencies.

I agree that an intelligence agency must maintain secrecy to be effective. And I certainly do not mean to suggest that CIA should reprint for public consumption every item that comes across the Director's desk. If sources of information were inadvertently revealed, they would quickly dry up. Not only would the flow of information be cut off, but the lives of many would be seriously endangered. In addition, much of the value of the intelligence product would be lost if it were known that we possessed it. For these reasons, secrecy is obviously necessary.

However, there is a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Once secrecy becomes sacrosanct, it invites abuse. If we accept the idea of secrecy for secrecy's sake we will have no way of knowing whether we have a very fine intelligence service or a very poor one.

If a new joint committee is set up as proposed in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, all bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or in the House of Representatives relating primarily to the CIA, would be referred to the joint committee; and the joint committee would, from time to time, make whatever reports are necessary to the Congress concerning its relationship with the CIA.

The enactment of the concurrent resolution would establish a joint committee, composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 Members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. The six House Members would be appointed from the corresponding subcommittees in the House. In each instance, not more than four members shall be of the same political party.

The joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof would be authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and to act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deemed advisable. The committee would be, in addition, empowered to appoint a small, selective staff of persons having the highest possible clearance, and would be authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

The staff which I had envisioned for such a joint committee would be small and would be subject to the most rigorous security regulations. Such a staff of trained, specialized, and dedicated persons would assist the committee members in making checks and appraisals on CIA and its operation. There certainly should be no more risk in trusting classified information to a trusted few connected with a congressional committee than there would be to a trusted many in a Government agency.

It has been pointed out that there is too little legislation to require a committee of this nature. Admittedly, proposed legislation which would be referred to the suggested joint committee might have helped to resolve problems and to make suggestions in the controvery over the site of the proposed CIA building. As to other legislation, it is difficult to know what might have happened. We must remember that a joint committee would also be a defender of CIA against unwarranted and unjustified attacks from within and outside the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the CIA is in somewhat the same category as the Atomic Energy Commission; and just as a special committee, with well-defined authority and powers, has been created on a joint congressional basis to oversee and supervise the interests of AEC, so I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the same purpose in connection with the CIA. I realize full well, because of the very nature of the duties of the CIA, that there has been no public scrutiny of its activities. This may be necessary in this day and age, but I believe that a joint congressional committee should be created for the purpose of making certain that good management is maintained in the CIA and also to keep a constant check on its intelligence policies. It is well, too, that this joint committee should be in a position to criticize any mistakes which the CIA may make.

Until a committee of the kind this resolution proposes is established, there will be no way of knowing what serious flaws in the Central Intelligence Agency may be covered by the curtain of secrecy in which it is shrouded.

The creation of the new executive board to review intelligence fulfills partially the suggestion of the recent Hoover Commission report on intelligence. However, it is only a partial fulfillment of the Hoover Commission recommendations. The Hoover Commission, on two occasions, suggested a bipartisan committee, including Members of both Houses of Congress, empowered by law to ask and get whatever information it thought necessary to aid, guide, or restrain CIA.

Recommendation No. 2 of the recent intelligence activities report of the Hoover Commission reads as follows:

> That a small, permanent, bipartisan commission, composed of Members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost national respect and confidence, to be established by act of Congress to make periodic surveys of the organizations, functions, policies, and results of the Government agencies handling foreign intelligence operations; and to report, under adequate security safeguards, its findings and recommendations to the Congress, and to the President, annually and at such other times as may be necessary or advisable. The proposed watchdog commission should be empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use. It would be patterned after the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission). Appointments by the President of persons from private life to the proposed commission should be made from a select list of distinguished individuals of unquestioned loyalty, integrity, and ability, with records of unselfish service to the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to state again that the appointment of the citizens' board should not preclude the establishment of a continuing and permanent congressional watchdog committee. Such a committee would act as a financial overseer, supervisor, guardian, sponsor, and defender of the CIA. It could give a constant and more thorough supervision to our intelligence activities than could any periodic check.

At the time of my appearance before the Rules Committee in behalf of this concurrent resolution I was informed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that he voted against the creation of the civilian advisory group, and it is his belief that the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] joined him in this decision. Both of them, however, as members of the Hoover Commission, would recommend, according to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee for the CIA.

Two committees, the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee and the Joint Congressional Central Intelligence Committee, would be mutually supporting. They should insure as far as humanly possible, a proper support for and control of our powerful intelligence organizations. This a citizens' committee cannot do alone.

Before concluding my statement in behalf of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, I wish to comment briefly on the determined opposition to this measure being voiced by various members of the executive department. The determined effort to defeat this concurrent resolution is another instance of executive interference with a purely congressional function. In fact the President is

quoted in the press to have said, "It is too sensitive for Congress to take it up."

I am sure that I need not remind my colleagues here in the Senate that a concurrent resolution is not subject to Presidential approval or disapproval. It is the prerogative of the Congress to set up such a joint committee if it so desires.

Executive control has been on the increase in recent years, and I do not feel that this is good for a Federal government whose secure foundation is based upon a system of checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judiciary.

As an illustration—and I have mentioned this before—I wish to remind my colleagues that last year the Congress appropriated an additional $40 million in funds to maintain the Marine Corps budget at a more satisfactory strength, but these funds were not used as directed by Congress. In the American system each important segment of our governmental operation is subject to check by another segment. Such an important agency as CIA should not be left unchecked.

As has been so ably stated by New York Times columnist, Hanson Baldwin:

> If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised.

I firmly believe that it is now more imperative than ever that a joint congressional committee be created at the earliest opportunity. The representatives of the people are the ones who should be given, through a joint committee of Congress, the right to act for the Congress vis-a-vis the CIA, just as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy does at the present time and has done for some years vis-a-vis the Atomic Energy Commission

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The most convincing argument, in my opinion, for the adoption of the concurrent resolution is President Eisenhower's objection to it. When the President of the United States says that the matter of the CIA is too sensitive for Congress to take up, he shows the American people what many of us have long known, namely, his lack of understanding and appreciation of the legislative process of the Government, and the check and balance system of the Constitution.

I say to the President of the United States from the floor today that no topic of Government belonging to all the people of the country is too sensitive for the elected representatives of a free people to handle. It is about time the American people made that clear to the President. What the President needs is a refresher course on the constitutional system of our country.

For the President to say that Congress, acting under the legislative process of a concurrence resolution, seeks to deal with a subject matter which is too delicate for Congress to handle, shows that the President lacks a sensitivity and an understanding of our constitutional system itself. His very criticism of the Senator's concurrent resolution is, in my opinion, a sound reason for the adoption of the concurrent resolution at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the Senate, likewise, should wake up to its responsibilities and should recognize the fact that what we are considering today is a resolution which will not, under any conditions, be sent to the White House. This is a matter for Congress itself to decide. I think Congress can take care of its own housekeeping, and is fully capable of rendering its own decisions and making its own judgments.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with that comment. One of the reasons why I am one of the cosponsors of the concurrent resolution is that it is long overdue that the Congress of the United States should assume its clear responsibility in this matter. We should proceed, without any hesitation, to give the people of the country a service they are entitled to have from us, by adopting the concurrent resolution, thus bringing the CIA under the surveillance of the Congress, and putting an end to this type of government by secrecy on the part of the President of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to agree fully with the viewpoints of the distinguished Senator from Montana.

EXHIBIT I

[From the Wall Street Joural of January 27, 1956]

THE LONE JUDGE

Mr. Allen Dulles, head of the cloak-and-dagger Central Intelligence Agency, opposes a bill now before the Senate which would create a congressional watchdog committee for CIA.

The bill would empower a 12-man committee drawn from the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees to ask CIA how it's doing in intelligence matters and where the money's going that it spends. These are questions Congress cannot now ask.

Mr. Dulles doesn't like the idea; he says that if the bill becomes law there might be leaks of Agency secrets from the committee which might endanger the plans and programs of CIA. We can recall no important leaks from the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee which watchdogs the AEC.

Apparently a number of Senators don't agree with Mr. Dulles' ideas on the subject. Thirty-five of them sponsored the watchdog bill under which Mr. Dulles will have to leak some information to the Congress which created the secret agency. Mr. Dulles may make no mistakes in assessing intelligence; but he should not be the lone judge in matters that have to do with the intentions of other nations for war or peace.

[From the Butte Standard of January 29, 1956]

OUR INTELLIGENCE HAS BEEN FOUND WANTING

A Hoover Commission task force looked into the operations of the highly secretive Central Intelligence Agency last spring and came up with this conclusion: "The task force is deeply concerned over the lack of adequate intelligence data from behind the Iron Curtain."

The task force also found: "Effective intelligence has become increasingly necessary for our protection against propaganda, infiltration and aggressions of the Communist leaders. By trial and error, study and skill, we have made progress; but we must not labor under any complacent delusions."

Reflecting upon this incident, as well as upon the fact that not all of the Hoover commission's recommendations have been carried out, might cause one to wonder if lack of intelligence about what is happening behind the Iron Curtain is not the direct cause of a lot of disorder in Washington.

The number of contradicting statements relative to the armed strength of the Soviet Union would indicate that we don't know very much about what the Soviet has. This fact could easily be the cause of much of the disunity in our own defense department.

If a commander is in the dark about what kind of opposition he is likely to run into, he is in a smilar manner in the dark as to how to prepare for the contingency of conflict.

So, it seems that our intelligence may be at fault, although the Hoover Commission task force found at least 12 major departments and agencies dealing in intelligence in one form or another.

The lack of knowledge would similarly have a blighting effect on the conduct of our foreign policy. It might even cause a war, whereas if our intelligence had been more compete war could have been avoided.

One of the recommendations made by the task force was that the President appoint a committee of experienced citizens to examine and report to him periodically on the work of the Government foreign intelligence activities. It was directed that the President might make public such findings as he saw fit.

Such a committee has just been appointed by President Eisenhower. It includes such personages as Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense.

The other part of the recommendations made public had to do with Congress. It was recommended that the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to that on atomic energy.

It would be the duty of the two committees to collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security.

Congress as yet has not acted.

There was still a third part of the Hoover Commission report which dealt with the highest security classification. It was sent directly to the President.

Needless to say, the American people would rest easier if they knew more about and had greater confidence in our intelligence organizations.

On the reverse side, it has been demonstrated time and again the Communists have a world-wide intelligence system which works at a very high degree of efficiency.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 20, 1956]

CIA LEADERS ARE COOL TO WATCHDOG PROPOSAL

(By Richard Fryklund)

The Central Intelligence Agency enthusiastically obeys the law which imposes strictest secrecy on its activities, but the Agency still is subject to the scrutiny of several outside executive and congressional groups.

Soon—possibly Wednesday—a group with the sole function of watchdogging the CIA is expected to get Senate Rules Committee approval.

Backers of the watchdog committee say that while it is true that four congressional subcommittees, the Budget Bureau and a new presidential commission all do look at some facets of the CIA, no congressional group keeps a close, constant check on it the way the Joint Atomic Energy Committee watches the also-secret Atomic Energy Commission.

COOL TO SCRUTINY

The CIA is reported to be cool toward the watchdog idea. But perhaps the most distasteful part of the expected Rules Committee approval of the bill will be the public attention sure to follow.

The job of the CIA is to gather intelligence and coordinate the intelligence activities of more than a score of other agencies.

The genesis of the CIA goes back to the day Japanese bombs shattered the morning calm at Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941. American intelligence agencies knew that raid was coming, but the information was never properly used.

To protect against future Pearl Harbors, a National Intelligence Authority was set up immediately after the war body created a Central Intelligence Group that grew into the Central Intelligence Agency. The job of the Agency is to gather foreign intelligence, which includes spying in the traditional sense as well as research into more conventional sources; coordinate intelligence activities of other agencies, and assemble the material in usable form and deliver it to the policymakers in time.

WEEKLY MEETINGS

Director of Central Intelligence Allen Dulles meets once a week with the heads of Army, Navy, and Air Force intelligence, the National Security Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the intelligence sections of the executive departments, to draw up summaries of latest estimates of a potential enemy's capabilities and to predict the potential enemy's probable course of action.

These estimates—and often vigorous dissenting opinions—are taken the next day to the National Security Council by Mr. Dulles. Sitting on the council are President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary of State Dulles, Secretary of Defense Wilson, and Office of Defense Mobilization Director Arthur S. Flemming.

How the CIA arrives at the intelligence estimate and the nature of the estimates themselves are things the potenial enemy would very much like to know. To guard that information, the CIA was given unprecedented powers of secrecy by Congress.

CAN SET OWN PAY SCALES

The 1947 act setting up the agency specifies that the director need not make his spending public or explain the agency's organization or the identity of its personnel, its methods of operation or its sources. Mr. Dulles can hire or fire whom he pleases and set his own salary scales. He can bring as many as 100 unidentified aliens into this country every year, and he can hand out bribes to foreign code clerks or finance beautiful blonds in Vienna apartments.

There are some checks on the CIA, however. The agency is directly under the President and the National Security Council and must justify its activities there. And the CIA budget must be defended in detail before a small group of Budget Bureau officials.

An eight-man board of consultants was named by President Eisenhower last month to review semiannually the work of the CIA. Its chairman is Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The group has set up shop with a small staff in the executive offices building. It will report directly to the President, and only a few innocuous parts of each report will be made public.

The CIA also is checked by four subcommittees of Congress, made up of 17 Congressmen, the senior members of the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

The CIA tells the appropriations subcommittees as much as they want to know about the agency's budget. Figures are not made public. They are concealed in the published Federal budget, in fact, by being scattered through appropriations for other agencies.

GET COMPLETE ANSWERS

The Armed Services Subcommittees receive intelligence reports and complete answers, according to Senator RUSSELL, to all questions asked about CIA activities.

The annual spending of the CIA is known only to the Appropriations Subcommittees. Many guesses have been made—ranging from a few hundred million dollars a year up to more than a billion. But the Hoover Commission said other intelligence agencies outspend the CIA, so it is perhaps a fair guess to say the CIA budget is around $100 million and that the agency employs about 15,000 full-time persons.

HEADQUARTERS NO SECRET

Headquarters of the agency is a group of aged brick buildings at 2430 E Street NW. Its location is no secret. Any cab driver can take you there if you just ask for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Once you are there, however, you cannot enter any building unless you're on business. Security restrictions inside, of course, are maximum. No visitor wanders through the halls alone. Guards are everywhere.

Much of the work—perhaps 90 percent—is routine research in unclassified documents—foreign publications, phone books, technical journals, newspapers, and the like. It is not the material, but the way it is put together and the conclusions that can be drawn that are important.

A minor number of employees are engaged in cloak-and-dagger activities abroad.

NO DOMESTIC FUNCTIONS

The CIA has no domestic function, according to the law, but every once in a while a CIA man turns up with a bit of domestic intelligence—such as the time an agent reported erroneously that Far East specialist Owen Lattimore was about to leave the country.

Job applications are mistrusted—they might be from Communits trying to gain entry—and the Agency likes to seek out its own prospective employees. Higher echelon workers are recruited through personal contact.

Of all persons who formally apply for jobs with the CIA, more than 82 percent are rejected by personnel or security officials. Every employee must undergo a full FBI security check.

As director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Dulles, brother of the Secretary of State, is head of the CIA and coordinator of all Government intelligence activities. Mr. Dulles, 62 years old, has had a long career in diplomacy, international law and spying. His exploits as an OSS agent in Switzerland during World War II have become spy-thriller classics.

He is as friendly and shaggy as a St. Bernard, dresses in rumpled tweeds and baggy sweaters, and gestures with a pipe. His appearance creates two impressions valuable to him: He is a man you can trust; he has nothing to hide.

Mr. Dulles' deputy is Lt. Gen. Charles P. Cabell, formerly director of the Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and intelligence director of the Air Force. He is 50 years old.

Head of the CIA's technical intelligence is a former Harvard law professor, Robert Amory, Jr. He is 39.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1956]

PRODUCT OF CIA EXPENSES QUERIED ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Richard Fryklund)

Several Congressmen who are not on 1 of the 4 unpublicized subcommittees which have contact with the Central Intelligence Agency want to know if the country is getting its money's worth out of the supersecret organization.

"The average Member of Congress knows no more about the CIA than what he reads in the papers," said Representative MCCARTHY, Democrat of Minnesota. "We don't know how much the group spends or what it produces, and that disturbs many of us.

"I doubt if even Chairman VINSON, of the Armed Services Subcommittee on the CIA, knows enough about the Agency—and, of course, what he does know he quite properly keeps to himself."

Neither Representative MCCARTHY nor other backers of bills to set up a House-Senate committee to "watchdog" the CIA want the Agency's affairs made public. Nor do they believe the CIA is grossly maladministered.

CHECK IS SOUGHT

But they do believe that the interests of good government require that a standing committee keep a continual check on the CIA.

"Such a committee would not pass on much information either," Mr. MCCARTHY said, "but it could assure other Congressmen and the public that the CIA is operating efficiently."

Whether the CIA is a topflight intelligence organization spending its money judiciously, no one is in a position to say publicly. Most criticism is necessarily uninformed, and the CIA never answers back openly.

Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence, will sometimes call a critic in for a private chat or will drop a note of protest to the editor of a paper which he thinks has attacked the CIA injudiciously.

The most authoritative criticism has come from the Hoover Commission task force, headed by Gen. Mark Clark. The group was given full access to CIA secrets. In a public report filed last June (there was another classified report given to the President) the Commission gave the CIA this indorsement:

"On the basis of its comprehensive studies the task force feels that the American people can and should give their full confidence and support to the intelligence program."

DULLES' BURDEN CITED

But there were also these specific criticisms:

Director Dulles has taken on too many burdensome duties and responsibilities himself.

There is not enough concentration on collection of intelligence information from behind the Iron Curtain.

The glamour and excitement of some aspects of the work sometimes overshadows other vital functions.

There is not enough machinery available for outside surveillance of the CIA.

On the first criticism, the Hoover Commission was whistling into the wind. Mr. Dulles, considered one of the world's master intelligence experts by the cognoscenti, loves his work and is not about to turn the fun over to subordinates. If anything, he has assumed more responsibilities since the Clark report.

Mr. Dulles does not tense up under responsibility. His friends believe he can safely assume more work than could another administrator.

REDS TOUGH TO PENETRATE

The quality of intelligence from the Soviet Union, Red China, and the satellites does not satisfy Mr. Dulles. The Communist countries are tougher to penetrate than Germany was during World War II, and spying there is an exceedingly difficult job.

The problem of glamour versus grubbing always will be with the CIA. Employees have no reward except their Government salaries and inward satisfaction. The occasionally

exciting assignment is what keeps many employees on the job.

A Hoover Commission recommendation for a Presidential panel to examine the CIA periodically was approved by Mr. Dulles, and the panel is now operating. Another recommendation for a congressional watchdog committee has been ignored officially by the CIA.

Senator MANSFIELD, author of a watchdog bill scheduled to be approved by the Senate Rules Committees tomorrow, believes that Mr. Dulles opposes his bill on two grounds: The present intermittent contacts with congressional committees are very satisfactory, and the more persons who know about CIA activities, the more difficult it will be to maintain secrecy.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The proof of the CIA pudding lies, of course, in the eating. What are the successes and failures of the group?

Again one runs into uninformed opinion and "no comment." Critics say the CIA muffed the Red Chinese invasion of North Korea, the release by South Korean President Rhee of the Red prisoners of war during the truce negotiations and the recent Soviet economic penetration of South Asia. They say the CIA has lost friends for America in Burma by maintaining a group of Nationalist Chinese guerrillas there, and the CIA agents have messed unsuccessfully in palace revolutions in several countries.

These are the answers:

No one knows when the CIA muffs because the Agency's responsibility ends when it has gathered and evaluated the intelligence. If this country was caught off base in North Korea, it may be because men responsible for policy and action did not properly use the intelligence available.

There are some well-known successes. The CIA is credited with the overthrow of the Red-oriented government of Guatemala and the Iranian regime of Premier Mossadegh. In both instances, apparently, CIA agents helped organize and supply the opposing, more democratic, forces.

STILL HAS BUGS IN IT

The CIA is a new agency, organized in 1947, so it certainly has bugs to be worked out.

Its biggest administrative problem is personnel. Mr. Dulles pays civil-service wage scales, yet he needs employees of high intellectual quality. A young man who can get money, public prestige, and the admiration of his wife by doing a good job in law or business has little inclination to bury his talents in the CIA—where he can't even boast to his wife.

Relatively low pay and complete anonymity has lost many good men for Mr. Dulles. The Director is sufficiently worried about it that he personally examines the problems of all persons above clerical level who submit resignations.

He does not expect to solve the personnel problem. He hopes to ease it by making working conditions more attractive. That is why he wants a new campus headquarters for the CIA in a pleasant residential area near Langley, Va.

Security within CIA walls is a constant problem. The Hoover Commission said, however, that the CIA handles it well—that there apparently has been no effective Communist penetration of the agency. Lower-level employees have been ousted, however, for alleged subversive associations.

There comes a final area of criticism: The trivial secrecy rules that are always good for laughs at Washington cocktail parties.

CAN'T REVEAL JOB

Except for a half dozen topmost employees, CIA workers are not permitted to say publicly where they work. So frequently when a group of Government people get together to talk shop there will be one man in the crowd who will say, "I can't tell you where I work." The group laughs and says, "CIA."

When one telephones the CIA—the number is in the book—an operator answers with the phone number, under the impression, it seems that she can keep secret the outfit one is calling.

And the CIA used to get along without an identifying sign on the gate—despite the fact most any cab driver can take a passenger there without directions.

The CIA knows everyone is laughing, but maintains there are good reasons for the cloak and dagger stuff. What the reasons are specifically, it won't say, but apparently the agency believes a few extra precautions are worth the general merriment.

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1956]

GOP SENATORS BACK CIA CHECK—POLICY GROUP BRUSHES ASIDE EISENHOWER'S OPPOSITION TO CONGRESSIONAL GROUP

WASHINGTON, February 21.—Senate Republicans brushed aside today President Eisenhower's objections to a special congressional committee to check on the Central Intelligence Agency.

They indicated that they would give active, and possibly unanimous, support to the basic principle of a bill by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, calling for a CIA committee similar to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which keeps watch on the Atomic Energy Commission.

The intelligence agency gathers worldwide information on action and intentions of other nations.

The Republican Senators obviously were miffed by what they regarded as the President's implied lack of trust in Congress' discretion in handling super-secret intelligence matters.

President Eisenhower created a special eight-man citizen's commission on the CIA in January, but it contained no Members of Congress. It also was directed to report directly to the President with no provision for congressional review.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, told reporters after the regular weekly luncheon of all Republican members that the group had been advised the President was "very much opposed" to the MANSFIELD bill.

"He [the President] said it was too sensitive for Congress to take it up," Senator BRIDGES declared.

BRIDGES NOT IMPRESSED

Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California, the Senate Republican leader, told the policy group of the President's views. Senator BRIDGES said that the news did not impress him, nor did it have any noticeable effect on other Republican members.

Senator BRIDGES declared that most of his colleagues seemed to believe the President, in his creation of the citizens' advisory board, had indirectly suggested that intelligence bearing on this country's security was "too delicate" for Congress to handle.

He said that this implication that outsiders were more to be trusted than Members of Congress had "annoyed" the Senators and brought them "much nearer" the Mansfield bill. The measure already has 34 cosponsors on both sides of the aisle.

As matters now stand, the CIA is the only major Federal agency over which Congress exercises no direct and formal control. Its budget and its personnel lists are classified, and the only supervision Congress exercises is through subcommittees of the Senate and House Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. Even these receive only sketchy reports on the agency's activities.

ALLEN DULLES OPPOSES MOVE

The Director of the Agency, Allen W. Dulles, a brother of John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, has argued against creation of a congressional committee on the ground that members might leak vital secrets to the press.

Senator MANSFIELD and other Members of Congress have retorted that members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee have not leaked information about the activities of that highly sensitive agency.

The Mansfield bill would create a 12-man joint committee, to be composed of 3 members each from the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittee. It would be empowered to maintain a constant check on the budget, personnel, and general activities of the Intelligence Agency.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recently urged creation of a permanent bipartisan commission on intelligence that would include Members of both Houses of Congress and other public-spirited citizens * * * empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1956]

THIS ONE IS ESSENTIAL

In its report on our intelligence agencies, and more particularly the Central Intelligence Agency which is overall top dog, the Hoover Commission said in effect we are pretty fair. But—

It was deeply concerned about the lack of adequate information from behind the Iron Curtain.

And it went on to report other findings which led to the conclusion that our intelligence is not as good as it ought to be. It ought to be superlative.

"Intelligence," said the Hoover task force, "deals with all things which should be known in advance of initiating a course of action."

Whatever we do, militarily, politically, diplomatically, economically, in world affairs, is hit or miss unless it is based on facts.

Our ability to exist and survive in this kind of world depends on assembling the facts, faithfully, and promptly, and then on correct evaluation of the facts. There is evidence that we have missed on both points, too often.

That could be fatal.

The Central Intelligence Agency is a big, top secret, costly operation. Nobody in it will tell you the time of day. We don't want 'em to. But—

"The people who support these operations are entitled to assurance that the investment is paying dividends."

So said the Hoover Commission. So, in effect, said President Eisenhower, who then appointed an independent, civilian committee to keep watch on the CIA. An able committee, too.

Now the Senate Rules Committee has cleared a resolution creating a Senate-House committee to do the same thing. This the Hoover Commission also recommended. It makes good sense.

Congress ought to know whether the CIA is doing its job. It ought not to just think it is doing O. K. It ought to know, positively.

This joint committee is the way to know. Senate and House should pass this resolution as an urgent safeguard of our national interest.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 25, 1956]

CHECK IS URGED ON CIA

(By Marshall McNeil)

The chief United States spy and counterspy bureau—the little known and highly secret Central Intelligence Agency—has been

accused by a Senate committee of unquestionably placing itself above other Government departments.

The Senate Rules Committee with this accusation has recommended creation of a permanent congressional committee to keep an eye on CIA. There was one dissenter.

Its recommendation comes after 35 Senators and 25 Members of the House have sponsored bills to provide continuing congressional surveillance of this agency whose every aspect is now, the committee said, beclouded with secrecy.

The pattern for the special "kibitzing" congressional committee was set in the first law turning our atomic-energy enterprise over to civilian control. The atomic "watchdog" committee is generally regarded as having done a first-class job in keeping an eye on our atomic advances.

In World War I, the Rules Committee said, the United States "had no intelligence service equal to the name." Between the two World Wars, reliance in this field was placed upon the military services and the State Department.

As World War II started, the Office of Coordinator of Information was set up to collect and analyze information bearing upon national defense. This was transformed into the Office of Strategic Services. In 1947, Congress established the National Security Council and under it the present CIA.

Although it has immense powers, worldwide operations, and many millons to spend, CIA is listed with four lines of type in the Congressional Directory. These give its name, main address and telephone number, and the names of its two bosses: The Director, Allen W. Dulles, brother of the Secretary of State, and the Deputy Director, Lt. Gen. C. P. Cabell, an Air Force officer.

The Rules Committee found these studies insufficient. "It is not enough," its report says, "that CIA be responsible alone to the White House or the National Security Council. Such responsibility should be shared with Congress in a more complete manner."

"It is agreed that an intelligence agency must maintain secrecy to be effective," the Rules Committee said. "There is, however, a profound difference between an essential degree of secrecy to achieve a specific purpose and secrecy for the mere sake of secrecy. Secrecy now beclouds everything about CIA, its cost, its personnel, its efficiency, its failures, its successes.

"The CIA has unquestionably placed itself above other Government agencies. * * * It is difficult to legislate intelligently if there is a dearth of information upon which Congress must rely * * * to protect the public welfare * * *."

[From the San Francisco Examiner of February 28, 1956]

ANOTHER LOOK

President Eisenhower is reported to be very much opposed to a bill sponsored by Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, and already approved by the Senate Rules Committee, which would set up a joint Senate-House "watchdog" committee to check on the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency.

If this is true, we think the President should take another look at the matter.

He is right that the CIA is a sensitive operation, being mainly concerned with what goes on secretly behind the diplomatic and military scenes at international levels.

But immunity from scrutiny is a dangerous thing to grant under any system of government, and it is particularly repugnant in a democracy where the people are the masters rather than the servants of Government.

It seems to borrow a page out of the book of rules of the authoritarian state, to suggest that neither the people nor their representatives in Congress are entitled to hold any agency of Government accountable for its acts and expenditures.

Every bureaucrat covets that immunity, and most bureaucrats think they could do better jobs under it, and perhaps there are even some who could be safely entrusted with it.

But the bureaucratic aspiration to be free of all responsibility to the people is always the forerunner of tyranny, because it not only gives freedom of action to the sincere and the worthy but it also provides a cover for the mistakes and crimes of the inefficient and the corrupt.

There are many so-called sensitive agencies in Government, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but it is doubtful if blank check authority would increase their usefulness to the Nation.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1956]

CONTROL OVER CIA NOT IMPRACTICAL

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, March 8, 1956)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to recommend to the attention of the membership of this body an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on March 6, 1956, entitled "Some Congressional Control Over CIA Is Not Impractical."

During the last 3 years I have exerted repeated efforts on behalf of the proposal to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters. I have first outlined my proposal on this subject in House Concurrent Resolution 169, 83d Congress, and reintroduced it, in an amended version, in House Concurrent Resolution 28, 84th Congress, together with over a score of my distinguished colleagues.

It is my sincere hope that the House Rules Committee will report House Concurrent Resolution 28 in the near future.

"SOME CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER CIA IS NOT IMPRACTICAL

"For several years there has been a rash of resolutions in Congress calling for an agency to watch over the Central Intelligence Agency, our top cloak and dagger corps.

"The second Hoover Commission called for the same thing. It suggested that a small, permanent Commission composed of a bipartisan representation from Congress and distinguished private citizens handle the job.

"President Eisenhower has gone halfway. He recently named a civilian Commission in the executive branch to serve as watchdog and report to him. But he has shied away from letting Congress in on the act. This hasn't stilled demands that Congress take a hand in watching an agency for which it appropriates money. Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, has come up with a bill to create a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to work with the CIA. The Senate Rules Committee has agreed to congressional action on the bill and it has attracted a large measure of support.

"The Hoover Commission pointed out that the CIA, because it needs a large degree of secrecy to operate, is exempted by law from rules that control other Government agencies. For instance, the General Services Administration, the Government's housekeeper, has no control over CIA at all. CIA is exempted 'from compliance with any provision of law limiting transfers of appropriations; any requirements for publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the agency; and any regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds.'

"Such exemptions are, by and large, proper. The Atomic Energy Commission has similar exemptions. But Congress does have to appropriate funds for the CIA. It created the Agency and set its scope of activities. Surely someone in Congress should be given at least peek enough to make sure that CIA is operating efficiently and properly. This is particularly true because of criticisms—some from the Hoover Commission itself—of some shortcomings in CIA.

"The AEC, which hoards secrets, too, has a joint congressional committee which is given enough of a picture to judge whether the organization is handling Government funds properly. The joint committee has worked exceedingly well, and without weakening national security. The same sort of committee could do the same sort of job for CIA. It wouldn't have to be told everything—and shouldn't.

"But Congress ought to be able to determine whether the dagger is being kept sharp and the cloak is kept cleaned and pressed and buttoned. It's basic that Congress, with control of the purse, must get enough information to make an informed judgment on how the purse is expended.

"That's all MANSFIELD and others want—and it's little enough to ask."

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 18, 1956]

A CHECK ON THE WATCH

Recently President Eisenhower announced the appointment of a committee of eight citizens to serve as watchdog over the Central Intelligence Agency. Their duties will be to review periodically the workings of the supersecret CIA and report their suggestions and give their advice to the Chief Executive. So far so good.

But there is a serious question whether the authority of the committee goes far enough. The CIA is clothed in such secrecy that even the Congress cannot ask about its inner activities. By law it can withhold even such obviously unimportant information as the salaries of its top officials. Its adventures are known only to a few people. The gentlemen serving on Mr. Eisenhower's committee will have neither power nor control over CIA. And there is a question how much they will be permitted to learn under the Agency's broad charter.

There is the further question whether this committee will be able to make public anything they may learn about CIA doing the wrong things or not doing enough of the right things. The reports are to go to the executive department and no executive department under whatever administration likes to see errors or shortcomings publicly revealed. In the case of CIA, an Executive order could clothe in secrecy whatever the watchdog committee thought should be revealed even from the Congress on the ground that revelation might injure the country.

It has been said that the appointment of the committee follows the suggestion of the Hoover Commission. The fact is that it does not. The Hoover Commission suggested a bipartisan committee including Members of both Houses of Congress empowered by law to ask and get whatever information it thought necessary to aid, guide, or restrain CIA.

Though nearly everything CIA does is secret, there is no secret about one thing. CIA is run by men, and though the men who run it may be more intelligent than other men they still may make mistakes as do all other men. Slight errors in intelligence assessment may not, individually, amount to a very great deal; collectively, they could have the most serious consequences. To set a national policy on a wrong course because of compounded errors could be more dangerous than no intelligence agency at all.

We hope no one will read into these remarks a suggestion that CIA run off carbon copies for all who ask about its activities; that would be as silly as it would be unwise to leave CIA answerable only to itself.

Neither do we suggest that CIA is not doing its job properly; we could not so suggest, for even the Congress does not know

whether it is or not. And that is precisely our point.

Surely the Congress, with its power to declare war, has a responsibility to watch carefully over an agency it created to stand watch in that shadowland between peace and war.

[From the New York Times of January 15, 1956]

WATCHDOG OF THE CIA—AN EVALUATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN NAMING BOARD TO REVIEW INTELLIGENCE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The President's appointment last week of an eight-man board to review periodically the Nation's intelligence activities is a step in the right direction. But unfortunately it does not go far enough.

The establishment of the citizen's commission was approved by Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The action will be interpreted on one hand as an attempt to head off the establishment of a congressional watchdog committee on the Intelligence Agency. On the other hand it lends tacit support to frequent and repeated criticisms of our intelligence services, particularly of the CIA.

The recent Hoover Commission report on intelligence activities recommended the establishment of a permanent bipartisan commission on intelligence. But it suggested a different form from that announced last week.

The Hoover Commission urged the inclusion of "Members of both Houses of the Congress and other public-spirited citizens * * * empowered by law to demand and receive any information it needed for its own use."

The President's board has no congressional members. Although it has executive authority for support it does not have the legal authority that congressional enactment could give. In other words, it is not powerful enough or broad enough. Nor will it have sufficient continuity.

CIA UNDER CRITICISM

Nevertheless the reputation, experience, and character of the eight appointees, who include Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, give promise that the board will, in fact, as the President suggested, "make a real contribution to the task of Government." It is well fitted to take a fresh outside look at intelligence, even though it has no authority and will be able merely to suggest and advise rather than to control and supervise.

But there have been so many intelligence failures, so much friction, and such sharp criticism, particularly of the CIA, that the appointment of the citizens board should not preclude the establishment of a continuing and permanent congressional watchdog committee.

Such a committee could act, in the same manner as the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, as purse watcher, supervisor, guardian, sponsor, and defender of the CIA. It could give a constant and more thorough supervision to our intelligence activities than could any periodic check.

The two committees, working together, would be mutually supporting. They should insure as far as human checks and balances can do, a proper support for, and control of, our powerful intelligence organizations. This the citizen committee alone cannot do.

The need for such support and control should be obvious. As the President said, "prompt and accurate intelligence is essential to the policymaking branches of Government." But it is more than that. It could mean national life or death in the atomic age.

On the other hand, uncontrolled secret intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policymaking, and hence government. Their very secrecy gives them power; there are few to accept or reject their findings. Their facts do not pass through the sieve of congressional debate or public inquiry. Few, even in the executive branch, know what they do.

The CIA, for instance, by the very breadth of its charter, is beyond the normal checks and balances of the law. An overpowerful secret intelligence agency is dangerous, not alone to the formulation of sound policy, but to the viability of democratic institutions.

RECORD IS SPOTTY

The intelligence record of the Nation and of the Central Intelligence Agency in particular is spotty. There have been notable successes but also notable failures. The Hoover Commission's public critique was politely critical of some of our shortcomings.

The secret report of the same Hoover Commission task force on intelligence is far more critical.

Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, a member of the President's new board, investigated CIA and other intelligence activities in Germany a year ago and found much overlapping and ineffectiveness.

Late this summer, Maj. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Assistant Chief of Staff of the Army for Intelligence, was relieved after Mr. Dulles had sent a long and detailed bill of complaints against General Trudeau to the Pentagon.

A great many other incidents also suggest that all is not well with our intelligence establishment.

It can only profit from the new committee. But it could profit more from a permanent congressional watchdog committee. If war is too important to be left to the generals, it should be clear that intelligence is too important to be left unsupervised.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: During a recent conference in Helena, Mont., the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report passed a resolution supporting your Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 which implements recommendation No. 1B of the Hoover Commission Report on Intelligence Activities in the Federal Government.

The attached editorial which appeared in the February 28 issue of the San Francisco Examiner also supports your resolution. We would appreciate very much if you would have the Citizens Committee resolution and this editorial inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

HARVEY HANCOCK,
Regional Director.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1956.

The Honorable MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am gratified to learn that you are anxious to have the views of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, that you have introduced in the Senate.

This Concurrent Resolution would create a Joint Congressional Committee on Central Intelligence to "make continuing studies of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government." The Committee would be composed of six Members from each House of Congress.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended in its report on Intelligence Activities:

"That the Congress consider creating a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy."

This recommendation was based on a detailed study of our intelligence activities that was made for the Commission by a group of eminent citizens. This group pointed out concerning the Central Intelligence Agency that:

"The act" (creating it) "exempts the Agency from compliance with any provision of law limiting transfers of appropriations; any requirements for publication or disclosure of the organization, functions, names, official titles, salaries, or numbers of personnel employed by the Agency; and any regulations relating to the expenditure of Government funds. * * *

"The task force fully realizes that the Central Intelligence Agency, as a major fountain of intelligence for the Nation, must of necessity operate in an atmosphere of secrecy and with an unusual amount of freedom and independence. Obviously, it cannot achieve its full purpose if subjected to open scrutiny and the extensive checks and balances which apply to the average governmental agency.

"Because of its peculiar position, the CIA has been freed by the Congress from outside surveillance of its operations and its fiscal accounts. There is always a danger that such freedom from restraints could inspire laxity and abuses which might prove costly to the American people."

Thus, this group of able citizens found that there was no effective control over intelligence agencies. On principle, such a situation is undesirable, but in addition the task force found that there were defects in the organization and function of our intelligence agencies. Thus it concluded that:

"The task force is deeply concerned over the lack of adequate intelligence from behind the Iron Curtain. Proper directional emphasis, aggressive leadership, boldness and persistance are essential to achieve desired results."

* * * * *

"The task force feels that certain administrative flaws have developed in the CIA, which must be corrected to give proper emphasis and direction to its basic responsibilities."

These conclusions of the task force were endorsed by the Commission.

It is significant that the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in 1949 in its report on the National Security Organization recommended (Recommendation 4c):

"That vigorous steps be taken to improve the Central Intelligence Agency and its work."

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in its 1955 report on Intelligence Activities was anxious that Congress have adequate information concerning the operation of our foreign intelligence activities while still preserving the secrecy required for national security.

I am pleased to inform you that the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report believes that House Concurrent Resolution 2, would if enacted implement fully the recommendations of the Commission that there be created a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence.

Yours sincerely,

CLARENCE FRANCIS,
Chairman.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO WEDNESDAY AT 11 O'CLOCK A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to speak very briefly on the subject matter of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. When the Senate discusses the subject again on Wednesday, I hope to make further remarks in more detail concerning it. I may add that I respect the sincerity of the Senator from Montana in submitting the concurrent resolution. He has discussed the matter a number of times, and I know he believes in the objective of the resolution and the creation of such a joint committee as is provided for. Personally, I do not think the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency would be improved by the creation of another joint congressional committee.

Mr. President, all of us want security for our country, and all of us want our country to have the best possible defenses. All of us want the best and most accurate intelligence reports to be obtained. All of us want to protect the lives of those who are engaged in this work. All of us want to protect our sources of information. There is no difference between us in regard to these matters. The difference comes in regard to the methods to be employed.

First, let me say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation—an agency whose work and whose leader all of us respect—provides us with sources of information within the United States. There is no criticism of the FBI of which I know; there is no effort to set up a joint committee to supervise it.

Second, our intelligence sources, which provide us with information from outside the United States are threefold: One is the State Department, which has its ambassadors and consuls and their staffs. Next, there are the armed services, which have their official aides in our embassies. Finally, there is the CIA. In broad outline, that Agency does for us outside the United States the work the FBI does inside the United States.

Let me say that there is complete coordination and almost daily interchange between these two agencies concerning information and intelligence. Naturally, the methods of the CIA are different from those of the FBI. The methods of operation of the CIA vary in the several countries where it operates; but its aim is to provide the United States with information which will help us to be more secure, and to carry out within its jurisdiction the orders which may be given it by the highest executive agency which protects us, namely, the National Security Council.

Some of the work of the CIA may be done in the open. But most of its work is absolutely under cover. If it were not under cover, the CIA would not function, for the simple reason that its sources of information would dry up very quickly; in many places its agents would be quickly liquidated or forcibly evacuated. So one point is crystal clear: There is no secrecy for secrecy's sake. There is secrecy because by means of secrecy, results can be obtained. Without secrecy, nothing would be accomplished, and the lives of many brave men would be sacrificed. In broad outline, that is the situation which confronts us today.

As the majority report points out, before World War II we had no service of this character. Instead, we relied upon our friends in other nations, or upon our guesses, or upon whatever information the State Department or the armed services could pick up. But we soon found that was not enough for the strongest free nation to have, in order to function. So President Roosevelt asked Colonel Donovan to organize the OSS. It functioned under his leadership during the war years. Later, its work was continued by two agencies created by Executive order, until the National Security Act in 1947 created the Central Intelligency Agency, as we know it today. The amendments to the National Security Act of 1947 which were passed in 1949 set up its procedures.

The CIA is essentially an executive agency under the direction of the National Security Council, which is the highest policymaking body for our security. The functions of the CIA are threefold, in broad general outline: First, intelligence, both covert and overt; second, activities ordered by the National Security Council; third, the coordination of intelligence. It coordinates that intelligence in Washington and reports it to the National Security Council. The CIA is not, I repeat, a policymaking body.

As has been pointed out, at the present time the CIA is supervised by subcommittees of the congressional Armed Services Committees, under whose jurisdiction the CIA comes, and by subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. If the work of the Members of Congress who serve on those subcommittees is not well done, the members of those subcommittees should be blamed. Let that be done, instead of creating a new agency to duplicate or take over the work which now is being done by 2 regular, legalized committees of the Senate and 2 regular, legalized committees of the House of Representatives.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said, several commissions have studied the work of the CIA and have submitted reports thereon. That was done by the Hoover Commission, and also by the so-called Clark Commission, headed by General Mark Clark, which I believe served under the Hoover Commission. Its report was made to the President. A portion of it was made public; and a part of it was not made public, for the sake of security.

The Senator from Montana has referred to the establishment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as a precedent for the establishment of a new congressional joint committee on the CIA. Let me point out that there is an essential difference between the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the work of the CIA. The Atomic Energy Commission is a manufacturing commission. It is the first agency of the Government, I believe, which actually is in the manufacturing business. It has continual activities which are subject to congressional consideration, in connection with proposals for legislative changes. The work of the Atomic Energy Commission is constantly changing. The Commission makes annual reports.

On the other hand, the CIA has made very few requests for legislation. As I have stated, it is an executive agency, similar to the Federal Bureau of Investigation or similar to the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior or other executive departments. The CIA does not often have changes made by means of legislation in its fundamental structure.

So the work of Congress in supervising the CIA from a legislative point of view is essentially that of seeing that its funds are properly spent and that its activities are properly carried out in the way intended by Congress. As I have said, such supervision is now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee and a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and is similarly conducted in the House of Representatives.

The Senator from Montana has referred to the functioning of the staff of the proposed joint committee. I do not see how such a staff could possibly conduct investigations of its own. I do not see how the members of such a staff would be able to investigate to any great degree the work of the CIA, for the simple reason that the necessary papers and the personnel with whom it would be essential to have discussions are within the National Security Council. Therefore, unless the matter under inquiry could be discussed openly, the staff members would not be able to obtain any information other than that which the Members of Congress now are able to obtain if they themselves request it.

In other words, the work of the CIA is essentially the work it does under the orders of the President and the National Security Council; and, as such, it must do that work. As I have said, I do not see how the staff members of the proposed joint committee could investigate the work of the CIA or could steer it into new and useful lines of endeavor.

Very briefly, those are the reasons why I oppose the establishment of a new committee. I happen to be a member of both subcommittees to which reference has been made. If the members of the subcommittees are not now doing their work properly, let them take the blame, and let new members be placed on those subcommittees.

On the Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee at present are the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself.

The members of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which subcommittee I was formerly chairman, are the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and, on the Republican side, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself.

We have gone into the subject to the degree we believe necessary to determine that the CIA is functioning properly. If we do not do our work, we should be the ones to be criticized, and we should be given suggestions as to what policies should be carried out.

For those reasons, briefly, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution. This is not a subject that can be discussed at length, because it is surrounded with security problems. I am opposed to the concurrent resolution which the Senator from Montana has submitted, although, as I say, I know that he is sincere, and I hope he accords me the same credit in opposing his resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has a very high credit rating with me, I assure him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted at the high level upon which the Senator has kept the discussion of the concurrent resolution.

Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the National Security Council is the chief policy-determining body of the Nation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. For defense purposes. That is my understanding. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am mistaken. The President, as the head of the executive department, conducts foreign policy through the State Department. He conducts security policies through the Defense Department; and the CIA is an administrative agency which funnels to the National Security Council the information which the State Department, the Defense Department, and the CIA obtain in various parts of the world. The information comes to the National Security Council, where it can be used as a basis for the determination of the policies best fitted to promote our security. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I now understand a little more clearly the question raised by the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator says that if there is any fault, the members of the subcommittees are the ones who should be replaced. I assure the Senator that in my opinion the members of the various subcommittees are not the ones at fault. The concurrent resolution specifically provides that the membership of the new committee shall be composed of Senators and Representatives who at present are members of the CIA subcommittees in both the House and Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have nothing but the highest regard and esteem for all the Members who comprise the subcommittees, both Republicans and Democrats. All I am saying is that this activity should not be conducted on a subcommittee basis, but that a joint committee, with regular standing, should be appointed. It should have a small staff, so that an outlet could be furnished for the Congress, and the security and welfare of the CIA could be further insured.

From the remarks of the Senator, and from our personal conversations, I know that he understands my position on this question. I assure him that I understand his position, and have nothing but the highest regard for him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The sentiment is mutual. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 today. However, I believe the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts make it imperative that they be answered before the Senate adjourns today.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts knows that I hold him in exceptionally high regard. However, I have differed with him many times with regard to the administration of both military and foreign policies. In my judgment, our difference is very basic. As I see it, our difference is that I believe in putting to full and complete use our system of checks and balances. I have interpreted a great many of the positions of the Senator from Massachusetts, as I interpret his position today, as indicating what I consider to be an undue and unsound willingness to delegate to the executive branch of Government control which should always be vested in the people of the country through their elected representatives in the Congress. So I rise now to answer what I consider to be a complete fallacy of argument by false analogy used by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Massachusetts compares the CIA with the FBI, and says that the procedure followed in regard to the FBI corresponds to the procedure followed in respect to the CIA. I deny it. I deny it because of the many checks which we exercise with respect to the FBI as a branch of the Department of Justice and do not exercise in respect to CIA. We are constantly checking the FBI. We check it with full disclosure in connection with appropriations. We check it with full disclosure in regard to the salaries paid by the FBI. We have neither such check on the CIA.

We check the FBI also in respect to its jurisdiction. We check it in respect to the authority we give it, and we check it—although not to the degree I think we should—even in respect to the type of files it maintains and the evidence it collects and the use to which it puts its files. We exercise some check on it even in respect to so-called secret information.

For some years past, in almost every session of Congress, we have gotten into a little difficulty with the FBI over the question whether or not the Congress, as the legislative body of the people of the United States, shall have access to the information we think we are entitled to, when we consider there is a possibility of a wrong being done by the FBI. What happens then? I think the record is replete with instances of at least exercising a check upon the FBI to the extent that representatives of the FBI sit down with the chairmen of the committees concerned, and with the majority and minority representatives of such committees, and make available the material in their possession in connection with some alleged injustice. In such cases Congress has called for the FBI files so that they can be examined in order that we may determine whether or not we should impose further checks on the FBI.

Thus in the operation of the so-called FBI internal police system it is simply not true that we fail to exercise checks upon it, as has been contended by the Senator from Massachusetts this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I respect his sincerity in the position he takes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I see it the checks on the FBI, through the chairmen of committees, or through the ranking members of committees, are the same checks that we exercise with respect to the CIA.

As I say, the information which we obtain as members of the subcommittee is available, so far as it can be made available consistent with security purposes, to Members of the Senate in open debate or in executive session. So I think the procedure is the same in that regard.

Mr. MORSE. There are many rebuttals I could make to the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Consider, for example, reports from the Committee on Appropriations, Compare the FBI reports with the CIA reports, as they relate to the Committee on Appropriations.

The FBI makes full public disclosure to the American people with regard to the amounts appropriated, and the uses to which they are put. That is not true with respect to the CIA. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Massachusetts may know something with respect to the CIA which I, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, do not know, and which the American people do not know. That is what I am protesting against. I see nothing about any Member of the United States Senate which should entitle him to any information which is denied to the entire membership of the Senate as representatives of the American people.

We are dealing with America's spy system when we are dealing with the CIA; and when we are dealing with America's spy system, we had better take care that we do not deal with a police state system. We do not have to fight communism with a police state system. We did not have to fight Naziism with a police state system. We had better keep

on free ground. We had better keep intact the system of checks provided by our form of government.

I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that when he countenances and gives support to the kind of procedure which exists in the handling of CIA—and I say this most respectfully—he is supporting a form of American police state system. Never will my voice be raised in defense of it. I believe the manner in which the American spy system functions ought to be known by all the members of the Armed Services Committee and by all the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. We do not know it today. The Senator from Massachusetts stands on the floor of the Senate today and makes an argument in support of an exclusive system under which certain favorite ones are picked out and given certain secret information. That is not a system of checks and balances, I say most respectfully to the Senator from Massachusetts; it is government by selection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator well knows, I would never support any kind of police state system. That is furthest from my mind. I am trying to support a system which is making an effort to obtain for us the necessary information on which to base our security policies. In doing that we are trying to protect the lives of men who are endeavoring to get the information for us. Those are brave men.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts would not support a system with the label "police state" pinned on it. I say to him again most respectfully that when he defends the present CIA system, he defends a spy system that is based upon a police state procedure. I say that because when such procedures keep away from elected officials of a free people and from the people themselves facts which are important to them, then they constitute, in my judgment, a police state procedure. I shall never support it.

I believe it is very important that we maintain a legislative check on the spy system our Government maintains around the world. I say that because if that spy system miscarries, if it is not based upon sound procedures, it can get us into a great deal of trouble.

I wish to say something about the argument the Senator is making, from the standpoint of security. During my 11 years in the Senate, whenever we try to discuss this subject, some Senator rises, as the Senator from Massachusetts has done, and argues that we have to do a certain thing in the interest of security. I say that is an unsound argument. I feel that America is most secure when there is a full public disclosure made to the elected representatives of the people of the facts about our foreign policy.

We cannot escape the fact that CIA has a great deal to do with forming the foreign policy of the United States. As it makes its report to the Secretary of State, as it makes its report to the National Security Council, and as it makes its report indirectly to the President of the United States, it is bound to influence foreign policies.

That is why the Senator from Massachusetts has heard me say so many times—and I repeat it because it is a truth that must be drummed into the thinking of the American people—that our rights as free people are no better than our procedural rights.

We had better always look at the procedure we are defending. Let us forget labels for a minute. Let us forget all the talk about security. Let us, instead, ask what the procedure is that we countenance.

I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that under the procedure he countenances in regard to the CIA, there are being kept from the American people and their representatives in Congress facts which in my judgment they ought to know. They are facts which go into the formation of American foreign policy. I am worried about America's foreign policy.

If the Senator from Massachusetts wishes to know why I believe the Secretary of State stumbles so much, it is because we do not have sufficient check on him in regard to the policy he follows, which we discover only too late as a result of his stumbling.

I believe the pending concurrent resolution to be of great importance because it would give to the American people, through their representatives in the Congress a check on the activities of the CIA, for the resolution would establish a joint committee which would have as its primary and sole duty checking on the functions of the CIA.

I cast no reflection on the Senator from Massachusetts and on the other members of the subcommittee. However, I wish to say that his membership on the subcommittee is not the major job of the Senator from Massachusetts. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations I do not have any information which has ever been given to me by the Senator's subcommittee with respect to the so-called checks the Senator has made on the CIA. The Senator says that if we had asked him for information he would have always been willing to give it to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I happen to believe—and I say this most respectfully—that, if the Senator claims the subcommittee has been checking on the CIA, then the Senator should have been making reports right along, periodically, to the Committee on Foreign Relations. His subcommittee should have been submitting such reports. It should have been submitting such reports to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committee on Appropriations. The three committees I have mentioned, the Armed Services, the Appropriations, and the Foreign Relations Committees, ought to be kept apprised of the subcommittee's findings and with respect to the information the subcommittee has gathered in regard to its so-called studies of CIA.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield? Then I shall not interrupt him any further.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have never personally—and I make this a personal matter because I do not wish to speak for anyone else—asked the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for any knowledge it may have obtained, either in private or open hearings, because I have always considered that those matters were of primary concern to that joint committee, and that they were handling the matter very well so far as I knew, and therefore I did not wish to have that kind of information given to me if it was not necessary for me to have it.

In the same spirit, we operate with the CIA. We discuss questions with them. If the Senator from Oregon were to ask me about certain information, I might be able to tell him, and tell him reasonably accurately. I have not done so in the past, because the Senator has not asked me. I believe also that he has not asked for such information of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, particularly information which that committee may have obtained in its investigations.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make two observations with respect to what the Senator has commented on. First, I should like to say that there is a great difference in the thinking of the Senator from Massachusetts and myself. How do I know what information I ought to have in regard to CIA that is in the mind of the Senator from Massachusetts and the other members of his subcommittee if he does not volunteer it?

If he has been conducting, as a subcommittee of the Senate, an investigation or a study of the CIA, and acquires information which has a bearing upon American foreign policy, I believe it to be his duty to inform the Committee on Foreign Relations, and not to wait for us to pitch in the dark and say, at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "I wonder whether the subcommittee has something in which we might be interested." I believe, in carrying out my duty as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am entitled to that information.

I go back to the Saudi Arabian matter which I discussed earlier today. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been greatly concerned about what is going on in the Middle East. I believe we ought to have some information on it from the CIA. We ought to have some information as to what is going on in Saudi Arabia and in the other countries in the Middle East. The kind of joint committee that is called for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 will make that kind of information available to us. The joint resolution makes it the clear duty of the CIA to supply such information to us. The Senator's subcommittee has no such mandate from the Senate. I want a committee established that will have that kind of mandate. I want to have established a committee which will have as its duty periodically to report to the committees of the Senate the kind of information they can use.

I close by saying that what is represented in the debate today is a serious difference of opinion in the administration of our Government. Certainly a very dangerous trend has been developing in Government during the past quarter of a century. It is the trend toward Government by secrecy on the part of the executive branch of the Government. I want to know whether that trend is to continue, and whether, as the Senator from Massachusetts argues this afternoon, in the interest of security there is a body of information which ought to be kept secret from the elected representatives of the people.

I deny the premise. I say that under our constitutional system of checks and balances we must watch out for that kind of argument, because in my judgment such an argument indicates that dangerous shoals lie ahead, shoals which can easily wreck our whole ship of freedom which has been built up under our great Constitution.

As this debate proceeds on Wednesday, I think we will have the right to get the answers from the subcommittee to which the Senator from Massachusetts has referred, in regard to some of their findings. If they do not want to give them to us in open session, I think we have the right to get them in executive session, because, Mr. President, when we are dealing with the CIA, we are dealing with America's spy system; and the American people have a right to know what kind of spying we are doing and what kind of policy we have. A spy system, unless it is very rightly handled, can be a major cause of war.

I see that my junior colleague is on the floor, and I shall defer the suggestion of a quorum call, because I understand he wishes to address the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon.

UPPER COLORADO PROJECT GAINS APPROVAL BUT HELLS CANYON PROJECT STILL IS DENIED AUTHORIZATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, approval of the bill to authorize construction of the upper Colorado River storage project promises to become a new landmark in the history of the development of the arid West. The action reaffirmed the 50-year-old concept in the field of reclamation that the multiple-use functions of water resources should be dedicated to the material advancement of all the people within the drainage of a river basin.

I frankly admit that when upper Colorado River project legislation was introduced at this session of Congress, I had many reservations about its economic feasibility and its possible impact on national policy for protection of our national park system. During the course of debate I was especially impressed by the cogent arguments of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] who serves with distinction as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In my opinion, his speech on the coordinate elements of the project and their relationship to the future development of the Rocky Mountain region was an outstanding declaration of the purpose of irrigation in the arid plateaus of the West. The able Senator from New Mexico gave real meaning to the project's usefulness in enhancing the welfare of both the region and the Nation. I became convinced that the upper Colorado River project, although a relatively high-cost development, was justified because of what it will mean to the future advancement of a large segment of our Nation's land area.

FEDERAL POWER REVENUES AID IRRIGATION

The principle established in the upper Colorado River bill for use of power revenues to aid irrigation development is one which, transplanted to the Columbia River region, would provide thousands of new farming opportunities and convert to productive use a vast area of fertile but now arid land. Irrigation developments such as the Crooked River, Bully Creek, Pendleton, John Day, and many other projects in the State of Oregon will be dependent on the use of surplus power revenues for their eventual construction. This form of aid to irrigation is needed to meet the costs which are beyond the ability of water users to pay. It is justified because of the contribution which such development makes to our Nation's supply of food and fiber.

I also thought that the upper Colorado project set forth another principle which should be applied to my native region, the Columbia River Basin. The theory that the interrelated use of water requires a basin wide approach to planning of river-development projects was clearly enunciated in the upper Colorado bill. Unfortunately, the Columbia River Basin—with the greatest potential for beneficial use of all our Nation's waterways—has been subjected to more haphazard treatment. The once-great pattern for Columbia River development—the Army's 308 Report—has been decimated by policies advanced by the present administration. Partnership schemes, surrender of priceless damsites to partial development, and attempts to deauthorize Federal projects have resulted in the shrinking of the Northwest's possibilities for flood control, power, and irrigation development. Perhaps the concept represented by the upper Colorado project will help put back the Columbia River Basin development on the road to proper development.

PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES SHUN COLORADO POWER

I have joined in the approval of the upper Colorado project because the provision has been eliminated which would have drowned out Dinosaur National Monument, a feature which I thought would set a precedent for endangering our entire national park system. Also, I endorsed the belief of upper Colorado project supporters that the area's water resources were in urgent need of immediate development.

However, Mr. President, there are certain aspects of the approval of the project which furnish a contrast that must be called to the attention of the American people.

While Congress has given approval to the upper Colorado project, it has denied approval to the Hells Canyon project. What does this mean? It means that, under this national administration, only those Federal water-resource projects evidently can gain authorization which have the sanction of the private-utility industry.

No private power company would think of undertaking development of the marginal, high-cost waterpower sites involved in the upper Colorado project. A very influential power company, the Idaho Power Co., covets the magnificent hydroelectric site at Hells Canyon, along the Snake River, on the Oregon-Idaho boundary.

Thus, the administration pushes the upper Colorado project, while simultaneously choking the Hells Canyon project.

Approval of the upper Colorado project—combined with denial of approval to the Hells Canyon project—sets the pattern for a program of letting the United States Treasury finance development of the dregs of our national waterpower sites, while the cream of these sites are given away to private utility corporations.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX MILLION DOLLAR PROJECT IS APPROVED, THREE HUNDRED AND EIGHT MILLION DOLLAR PROJECT IS SCUTTLED

There is no other possible interpretation of this contrasting action in the case of the two projects. The sites in the Rocky Mountain area, where there is low and undependable stream flow, are reserved for Uncle Sam. The sites in the Pacific Northwest, where lurks 40 percent of all the untapped hydroelectricity in the United States, are bestowed upon the private utilities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that, apparently, they are reserving those sites because the development of power at those sites would be so expensive that no private utility company would want to undertake their development?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is quite obvious. The sites which this administration is willing to set aside for public development are those which are so uneconomical, so unfeasible that no private utility company would think of risking its capital in trying to develop them.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the sites which are being turned over to private utility companies under this administration are the sites which, under Government operation, could generate power at rates from 2.5 mills to 3.5 mills, whereas private utility companies at the same sites would generate and sell power at from 5 mills to 7 mills?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Even from 5 mills to 9 mills, I will say to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator read in the newspapers that the present Secretary of the Interior says that he has never given anything away?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Evidently, he has never heard of Hells Canyon.

Mr. MORSE. Or, apparently he cannot figure the difference between 2.5 mill to 3.5 mill power and 5 mill power to 7 mill power. Every time he has been a party to making available to private utility companies great multiple-purpose dam sites of great value to the American people, and belonging to the American people, he has given away millions of dollars which, in the last analysis, belong to all the taxpayers of the country. Is not that true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it is true.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that the Secretary of the Interior, in effect, would give away the value of the high dam at Hells Canyon to private companies if they should succeed, in the last analysis, in defeating us in our fight to have the Government develop Hells Canyon?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is too generous in his description of the Secretary's action. Not only did the Secretary of the Interior intervene in the Hells Canyon fight, but he actually intervened on the side of the Idaho Power Co. He stated before the Chamber of Commerce that he believed the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River to be the finest water power site remaining on the North American continent.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator aware that the Secretary, in recent testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report referred to the high Hells Canyon project as a white elephant? The testimony of the Secretary's own engineers before the Senate and House Interior Committees was very explicit that the Hells Canyon Dam is feasible, and the Army engineers have consistently supported the Hells Canyon dam site, as did General Itschner in regard to its flood-control benefits in recent testimony.

I asked General Itschner whether the Army Engineers still held the same opinion as to Hells Canyon Dam, and his answer was in the affirmative. Yet, now, the Secretary of the Interior has turned over, by way of recommendation, the Hells Canyon site, to the Idaho Power Co., a site containing many millions of dollars of value and belonging to all the people of the United States. Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I not only agree totally, but, again, I think the Senator is somewhat too generous. When the Secretary of the Interior used the term "white elephant" to describe the Hells Canyon site he was using the identical language employed by the opponents of Grand Coulee approximately a quarter of a century ago. Yet, Grand Coulee, now in operation, is not only the greatest power producing project anywhere on the face of the earth, and not only has it resulted in thousands of farms where ex-GI's are profitably raising crops, but the Federal Columbia Basin system, including Grand Coulee, is $65 million ahead of schedule in paying back into the Treasury of the United States the investment in its power facilities. Grand Coulee was called a "white elephant," just as the Secretary of the Interior refers to the proposed Hells Canyon high dam as a white elephant. I would say it is a singularly inappropriate choice of language on his part.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague for the speech he is making this afternoon, and I shall make use of it in the months ahead.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am gratified that the Senator feels that it is of value to him.

Mr. President, speaking as a Senator from Oregon, I regard it as significant that the three Republican Members of Congress from my State, who have opposed Federal development of Hells Canyon, all voted for passage of the upper Colorado Federal project.

Mr. President, I believe in development of the Whole West. Occasionally that development requires high-cost and uneconomic projects of the type of the upper Colorado. This has been necessary before in arid and sparsely-settled regions. But, Mr. President, I would not be so inconsistent as to support this $756 million project in the Rocky Mountains and yet abandon a $308 million project, of greater economic worth and validity, on the frontiers of my own State.

Let us study some amazing facts, Mr. President.

Total cost of the three main upper Colorado Dams—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, and Curecanti—is $735,256,000. Of this sum $469,715,000 has been assigned to be paid back out of power revenues. The average net annual output of these three principal upper Colorado dams is 3,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

Total cost of Hells Canyon high dam is $308,500,000, of which $270 million would be assigned to be reimbursed from power revenues. The annual average production of electricity at Hells Canyon would be slightly over 5 billion kilowatt-hours.

Thus, upper Colorado project dams will contain power facilities costing 74 percent more than the power facilities at Hells Canyon, but the upper Colorado plants will generate only 70 percent as much energy. Upper Colorado power, therefore, is about two and a half times more expensive than Hells Canyon power.

This comparison, Mr. President, strips all seven veils from the power program of the present Republican administration. It shows that the marginal and costly sites are reserved for Federal development. The magnificent and low-cost sites are given away on a platter to the private utilities. As we sit here in this Chamber authorizing the upper Colorado project, with its high-cost power, the Idaho Power Co. procceds with preemption of the Hells Canyon hydroelectric site on the Snake River. The administration has backed upper Colorado, it has scuttled Hells Canyon. Skim milk for the public, whipped cream for the private power companies.

SKIM MILK FOR PUBLIC, WHIPPED CREAM FOR THE UTILITIES

Mr. President, this administration in the field of natural resources has turned back the clock half a century, to before the era of Teddy Roosevelt and Pinchot. Nowhere is that tragedy more grippingly emphasized than in the Federal authorization of the upper Colorado project and the denial of Federal authorization to Hells Canyon. My region, the Pacific Northwest, is paying the penalty because its power sites are so valuable. Were the power sites in the Pacific Northwest low in flow and dubious in quality, like those in the upper Colorado Basin, we, too, would be sharing in Federal Government authorization today. We are penalized because our power sites are sterling in quality, and so the private utilities insist upon preempting them.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Partners in Plunder," written by me, and published in the Progressive for July 1955, and also an illuminating editorial entitled "Developing a River," published in the New York Times of March 3, 1956. I call special attention to that portion of the Times editorial which questions why the administration is prepared to build the costly upper Colorado project, but not the Hells Canyon project, "With greater promise of economic returns."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTNERS IN PLUNDER

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Conservatives in the United States sigh with relief these days, now that the Republican administration has stopped the creeping socialism of public-power projects on the great rivers of the Nation. The President even cites approvingly at press conferences a book entitled "Big Dam Foolishness," with the implication that no such foolishness will be tolerated while he resides at No. 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Liberals, conversely, are distressed over the fact that they evidently have seen the last of the great Federal dams as long as the present administration is in office.

Both groups happen to be substantially in error.

The Eisenhower administration is not opposed to public-power projects per se. It is only opposed to those projects which would be located at dependable low-cost sites, sure to pay off handsomely for the United States Treasury. At the same time the administration fervently favors public-power projects at locations where the energy will prove expensive and thus quite likely be a financial liability in decades to come. When historians begin pronouncing judgment on this administration, they are certain to be puzzled by a regime supposedly wedded to fiscal solvency but which, nonetheless, has insisted that the Government ought to develop only hydroelectric sites that promise scant possibility of achieving financial success.

This irony is symbolized by the administration's contrasting attitudes toward the Columbia and the Colorado Rivers.

The Columbia is the grandest stream for hydroelectricity on the continent, perhaps in the world. It carries down to the sea the snows and glaciers that melt all the way from Canada's distant Arctic divide to the Coast Range. The Columbia combines the hurtling gradient of a mountain brook with the massive volume of a Niagara; actually, greater than Niagara. Its flow is reliable and steady. The late J. D. Ross, first Administrator of Bonneville Dam, told me that the Columbia was a coal mine which would never thin out, an oil well that could never run dry. Furthermore, the Columbia's broad bosom is suitable for ocean commerce as far as The Dalles, safely inland of the backbone of the Cascades. In the Columbia and

its tributaries lurks 42 percent of the undeveloped waterpower of this entire Nation.

The Columbia River drains approximately 180 million acre-feet of water to the Pacific. The average flow of the Colorado, by comparison, amounts to merely 16,270,000 acre-feet, or less than 10 percent the drainage of the Columbia. In fact, even the Columbia's principal tributary, the Snake River, has a volume of 37 million acre-feet, which is more than double that of the Colorado. Within the surging reaches of the Columbia and its feeder streams a total of 31,369,000 kilowatts of power remains to be tapped. But undeveloped power in the basin of the Colorado totals only 5,056,000 kilowatts; this is about 16 percent of the residual strength of the Columbia.

On the Columbia River, where generating costs are low because of the Columbia's vast potential, the Eisenhower administration has decided that Federal dams would be ideologically and financially unwise. During the 1954 campaign Secretary of the Interior McKay cited the huge Federal debt as a compelling reason why further Government projects were unlikely in the Columbia Basin. Where was the money to come from? Yet this same administration, through the President and Secretary McKay, is advocating expenditures of $1,659,000,000 for the upper Colorado power and storage project and an additional $156,541,000 for the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in the Colorado area.

"With a $275 million national debt," McKay told an Oregon audience last year, "Congress is not going to put as much money into Northwest power development as we need. We will have to attract risk capital for quickest development of the Northwest's power resources."

Magically, the national debt seemed to be cleared up by the time the Secretary's plane had flown 800 miles eastward to the intermountain region, where sluggish power sites are not coveted by private utilities. All at once, McKay discovered nearly $2 billion in the straitened United States Treasury for unprofitable power development along the upper Colorado.

Why the ambivalence? Why are Federal dams creeping socialism and fiscally unsound in the Columbia Basin but good, solid Republican doctrine in the watershed of the Colorado?

The apparent explanation for the contrast does scant credit to the sincerity of the present national administration.

Power can be produced at Federal dams on the Columbia for as little as 2.1 mills a kilowatt-hour. This is cheaper than Niagara, cheaper than TVA, and barely more than one-third the cost of the 6-mile energy that will be generated at the projects which the Eisenhower regime favor on the upper Colorado. Industrial users are hungry for the low-cost power available from the mighty Columbia. They besiege the Government for more of it, thereby repudiating those private-utility propagandists who confidently predicted Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams would become "white elephants" after F. R. D. gave the go-ahead signal for construction 20 years ago.

In an effort to convince the Nation that new Federal projects should not be built in the Columbia Basin, Secretary McKay has referred to this energy as subsidized power. But he does not read the reports from his own bureau. The 1953 annual report of the Interior Department boasts that the repayment of the Federal investment in the Bonneville Power Administration "is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements." Indeed, the repayment was $65 million ahead of schedule as of June 30, 1954. After only 11 years of full operation, Bonneville Dam is more than 35 percent paid for—principal, plus 2½ percent interest—through revenues to the Federal Treasury from the sale of power.

Paradoxically, this is the kind of dam which the Eisenhower administration no longer can afford to construct—because of the crushing burden of the national debt. Yet this same administration, which shuns profitable dams, is eager to undertake unprofitable dams. Not even Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey has explained how such a policy can possibly have a favorable impact on the fiscal standing of the Government.

Hells Canyon on the Snake River, an awesome gorge over a dizzy mile in depth, is the finest natural hydroelectric power site left in North America. The administration plans to surrender this site to the Idaho Power Co., an absentee-dominated corporation which charges the highest rates of any major company in the Northwest. At recent hearings held in Oregon and Idaho by the Senate Interior Committee, prominent Republicans denounced a bill (S. 1333) for a Federal dam at Hells Canyon as creeping socialism and a threat to our American way of life.

II

No such tirades are directed against the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams which the Republican administration is promoting as part of the upper Colorado project, in spite of the fact that the Echo Park unit would breach the National Park system with a commercial development for the first time in history.

Here are the comparative economics of Hells Canyon and the combined dams at Glen Canyon and Echo Park:

Hells Canyon:	
Cost	$357,000,000
Power production (kilowatt-hours)	5,504,000,000
Glen Canyon and Echo Park:	
Cost	$597,696,000
Power production (kilowatt-hours)	4,830,000,000

Thus, Glen Canyon and Echo Park will cost 67 percent more to construct than Hells Canyon but will generate 14 percent less waterpower.

In my opinion, this ironical situation strips clear down to the seventh veil the administration's pious protestations about "creeping socialism" and fiscal solvency. If a Federal dam on the Columbia River or Snake River is ideologically perilous, what mysterious alchemy makes a Federal dam on the upper Colorado River politically pristine?

The actual reason for not constructing Federal dams in the Columbia Basin today is that private utilities crave these magnificent sites where kilowatts can be produced so cheaply. No power company with management capable of passing a sanity test would think of investing stockholders' funds in concrete poured into the unprofitable and marginal locations along the upper Colorado. In essence, it is a policy of turning over the cream of hydroelectric sites to the power companies and leaving the skim milk for the public.

I am one of those who believes the upper Colorado project (minus Echo Park) should be undertaken by the Government, regardless of the fact it may never pay out. The settlement of the intermountain West probably demands such a capital investment by the rest of the Nation. After all, countless millions have been poured into Mississippi levees and harbor dredging at Chesapeake Bay and New York's East River with no suggestion that direct returns to the Treasury must result. But in my view, it is little short of criminal for the administration to promote Federal responsibility for the arid and extravagant sites on the upper Colorado while it simultaneously disseminates propaganda about creeping socialism and subsidized power to justify Federal abandonment of the great power sites along the Columbia River and kindred streams.

III

At Glen Canyon Dam, construction costs will total $463 for each kilowatt of generating capacity. At Echo Park Dam, which threatens to scar the scenic grandeur of the Dinosaur National Monument, costs will be still higher—$640 per kilowatt. Contrast these figures with the construction sums for two major Federal dams in the Columbia River Basin: $115 per kilowatt at Bonneville, $90 at Grand Coulee. Yet Bonneville and Grand Coulee are the kind of sites which the administration wants to surrender to private power companies.

The surrender takes two separate forms: (1) outright relinquishment, as at Hells Canyon, where the hydroelectric site will be turned over to a utility corporation, and (2) a partnership operation between the Government and power companies, such as the administration advocates at John Day and other sites in the lower reaches of the Columbia Basin.

Partnership is an intriguing gimmick. The Government pays for the deadweight part of a dam, such as fish ladders, flood gates, and navigation locks. A syndicate of utility companies finances the powerhouse and installs the generation equipment. In return, the companies get a monopoly on the dam's power production for half a century. Of course, this completely circumvents the public-power preference clause, which until now has reserved first call on Columbia River energy for farmers' rural electric cooperatives and similar nonprofit agencies. Theodore Roosevelt first conceived the preference clause, in the Reclamation Act of 1906.

Last year Secretary McKay approved a bill that would have given utility companies a 50-year stranglehold on the John Day site in return for a contribution of $164 million toward construction of the dam. Protests by public-power groups, under the leadership of Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, prevented the bill from passing. Now, McKay is backing a new John Day bill increasing the private-utility offer to $273 million—a tacit acknowledgment by him that the 1954 version would have denied the public purse at least $109 million which was its due.

Yet, even with a partnership contribution of $273 million, the abandonment of the John Day power facilities for half a century would be one of the greatest bargains since Manhattan Island was traded off for $24. The Corps of Army Engineers estimates that annual power benefits creditable to John Day Dam will amount to $25,538,000. Over a period of 50 years this would total $1,276,900,000 before company profits are added: a tidy return on the utility's original investment.

From the standpoint of people directly affected—citizens of Oregon and Washington—perhaps the worst feature of the Eisenhower partnership is its adverse economic impact. In my home State of Oregon, the successful Federal power program increased farm electrification from 27 percent to 98 percent. It brought about the only period in Northwest history when our gains in industrial payrolls, from 1939 to 1948, exceeded the national average.

Partnership would return high-cost power to the Pacific Northwest. Private power companies must pay higher interest rates on their borrowings than the Federal Government and a reasonable rate of return to stockholders. Also, partnership projects would be isolated plants outside the Columbia power system and would not benefit by having costs averaged in with low Bonneville and Grand Coulee rates.

These two factors alone would raise the cost of power to consumers. For the Pacific Northwest partnership means higher power rates, less industry, and fewer jobs.

IV

When Theodore Roosevelt occupied the White House, the Rivers and Harbors Board

of the Engineers Corps made this recommendation after a partnership had been proposed between the Government and a power company to develop the Tennessee River: "In general, any partnership relation between the United States and a private corporation is necessarily to be closely scrutinized as the results in the past have been that the Government as party to such agreements usually suffered thereby."

The partnership fostered by the Eisenhower administration classically fits this warning. The public relinquishes to private utilities such majestic sites as Hells Canyon, but the public pays to harness such marginal sites as those in the upper Colorado. At sites earmarked for partnership development, the public gets the watery staircases for migrating salmon and the gates to hold back floods. Utilities get 50-year monopolistic leases on the powerhouses—powerhouses like Bonneville, which have put a gross sum of more than $350 million in the United States Treasury since Federal power sales began on the Columbia and its tributaries.

In fact, the partnership between the American people and the private power companies proposed by President Eisenhower and Secretary of the Interior McKay follows generally the lines of the immortal partnership between the Owl and the Panther described by Lewis Carroll:

"I passed by his garden and marked, with one eye,
How the Owl and the Panther were sharing a pie;
The Panther took piecrust, and gravy, and meat,
While the Owl had the dish as his share of the treat."

[From the New York Times of March 3, 1956]

DEVELOPING A RIVER

House passage of the $756 million bill to harness, store, and use the waters of the upper Colorado makes it virtually certain that this gigantic power and irrigation project will soon be enacted into law.

The President has enthusiastically endorsed the plan in principle and the Senate has passed an even more expensive version of its own. The major—though not the only—difference between Senate and House bills is that the former includes and the latter excludes the highly controversial Echo Park Dam, on which the President showed himself to be misinformed at his press conference Wednesday when he stated that it was fear of damage to wildlife that had aroused hostility to Echo Park Dam. Wildlife had nothing to do with it. The Nation's conservationists were united in their opposition, and with such effect that the entire Colorado project would have died in the House had Echo Park been left in the bill, because this dam would have constituted a direct and unnecessary incursion into the national park system. In addition, the dam would have seriously damaged some of the finest canyon scenery in the West.

The measure as a whole, in both Senate and House versions, provide basically for several major works on the upper Colorado, one of the most important of which would be the enormous Glen Canyon Dam, a large power producer. This and other projects would store water precious to the region, and would provide for the initial irrigation of more than 100,000 acres of land and supplemental irrigation of over 200,000. The project marks the real beginning, for the upper basin States of Utah, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Colorado, of enjoyment of the benefits of that portion of the flow of the Colorado River allocated to them in an interstate compact of 1922. It would undoubtedly be of great economic, industrial, and agricultural advantage to the upper basin States.

Whether or not the project is worth the cost is a matter of dispute between such ardent proponents as Senator WATKINS, of Utah, and such able critics as Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. While we have serious reservations regarding many features of this project, especially the economics of its irrigation and reclamation plans, we think there is no question but that the basic principle of comprehensive, multipurpose development represents the proper approach of exploiting the actual and potential resources of a vast river system. While the actual mechanics must necessarily vary with the specific problems of each region—whether it be the Tennessee, the Missouri, or the Colorado—the basic idea of integrated river-valley planning seems inescapably logical, practical, and desirable. As a matter of fact, one of the criticisms of the pending project is that not all of its component parts have yet been sufficiently studied. Furthermore, there are political hazards that this or any comparable scheme must run, including the insertion of economically doubtful projects in order to get votes. But the principle remains valid that a flowing river should be tackled as a unit, as something greater and more challenging than the mere sum of a large number of isolated and localized parts.

If a stream such as the Colorado is going to be developed with dams, storage reservoirs, powerplants, irrigation projects, and other facilities, it has to be developed with the financial resources of the Federal Government. This the present administration is fully prepared to do at Glen Canyon in the Colorado Basin but not at Hell's Canyon in the Columbia Basin. Of course, the two situations are not identical; but it would seem to us that from the point of view of long-term, regional, comprehensive planning, a high Federal dam in Hell's Canyon makes just as much sense—and with greater promise of economic returns—as a high Federal dam in the upper basin of the Colorado.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very illuminating letter published in the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of March 12, 1956. The author of the letter is Howard Morgan, a former member of our State legislature and now the State chairman of the Democratic Party in the State of Oregon. Mr. Morgan asks a very cogent question. He wants to know why the three Republican Members of the House of Representatives from Oregon voted to pass the costly upper Colorado River project, but are opposing the Hells Canyon project on the borders of Oregon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) Times of March 12, 1956]

CONGRESSMEN FOR POWER IN COLORADO, NOT HERE

EDITOR:

Something new has been added to the power controversy and it raises some important questions.

As we all know, Republican Congressmen NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH have spent the last 3 years parroting the private power line that the Federal Government has stopped building power dams. The record clearly demonstrates that these men have dragged their feet on every authorization or appropriation bill for Federal dams in Oregon and the Northwest.

They offered no help to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Congresswoman GREEN in last year's successful Democratic fight for three new starts on Federal dams in the Northwest. In fact they tried and are still trying to deauthorize every Federal power project so the private power companies, after endless delays, can try to get authorization for gravy-train partnership deals.

VOTE FOR COLORADO

But on March 1, 1956 NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH voted for the enormous all-Federal power project on the upper Colorado River system when the bill passed in the House, 256 to 136. Let's see how this vote stacks up against the pious statements of our 3 Republican Representatives.

They say the Government won't build dams. If so, how did the bill sail through the House with a 120 vote margin? I predict it will pass the Senate with equal ease.

They say the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, for example, costs too much money and we have to balance the budget. But power facilities at Hells Canyon would only cost $270 million while the upper Colorado power facilities will cost $470 million.

Do our Republican statesmen figure Hells Canyon can't produce enough power? It can produce 5 billion kilowatt-hours per year, compared to 3½ billion from the upper Colorado.

POWER COSTS MORE

Get that, please. Hells Canyon power facilities would cost 43 percent less and produce 42 percent more power than the upper Colorado, yet NORBLAD'S, COON'S, and ELLSWORTH'S votes went to the upper Colorado. Where is that hard-headed Republican business sense we've heard so much about?

Do the people of Oregon agree with their Republican Representatives that high-cost power in the Rocky Mountains is a better public investment than low-cost power here at home?

I am not attacking the merits of the upper Colorado project. The people in that area need power and they need water. The upper Colorado project is their best hope of getting either, and the project is undoubtedly worth what it is going to cost. It is soundly engineered and no Member of Congress need apologize for voting in its favor.

ENTITLED TO KNOW

However, the people of Oregon are entitled to know why their Republican Representatives are willing to vote for high-cost Federal power projects a thousand miles from home but are absolutely unwilling to vote for low-cost Federal power projects right here on the boundary and even inside the State of Oregon.

This sort of behavior is not the simple-minded, country-bumpkin type of four-flushing it might appear to be. This is four-flushing with a vengeance and with a purpose. If these men can think up a single, sensible reason for their behavior they ought to do it now and it ought to be good.

HOWARD MORGAN,
State Chairman, Democratic Party.

DANGER IN NEW OREGON VOTING LAWS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written by State Senator Monroe Sweetland, of Milwaukee, Oreg., and published in the Portland Oregonian of February 25, 1956. Senator Sweetland is Democratic national committeeman for the State of Oregon. It seems to me that his letter sets forth very clearly and effectively the danger in new Oregon voting laws which would restrict the right of franchise in our State. Voting is the culminating act in a democracy, as Woodrow Wilson once said. In my opinion, Mr. Sweetlands' letter demonstrates how the Republican Party, which controls the Oregon State Legislature, has made an effort to re-

strict the number of persons who will vote in Oregon in future elections. This is not in keeping with the traditions or aims of our great democracy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian of February 25, 1956]

NEW VOTING LAW CRITICIZED

TO THE EDITOR:

On February 20 you published a letter from Mrs. Jean K. Young, a top official of the Republican Party, defending and explaining the new voting restrictions under which Oregonians will cast ballots this year.

There is no hint in Mrs. Young's letter, written with an air of injured innocence, of how drastic and dangerous the new law is. These changes were fought bitterly by the helpless Democratic minority in the legislature, but Mrs. Young herself masterminded the new law and cracked the whip of discipline over those Republicans at Salem whose uneasy consciences would otherwise have led them to oppose these bushwhacking, partisan amendments.

If our Republic is founded on "consent of the governed," it is the duty of our States to make as simple and easy as possible the accurate recording of that consent. After Senator NEUBERGER'S close victory in 1954, Mrs. Young's little coterie carefully laid their plans to rig Oregon's voting laws with gimmicks to make voting and registration more difficult and dangerous for certain groups of citizens who usually vote Democratic.

Mrs. Young's letter brushes off the new poll book signing law as trivial. Actually, to compel each voter to sign the books twice will approximately double the time now required to cast ballots. One of the great discouragements to voting in Oregon already is the jam at the polls in the big precincts in presidential years. In precincts populated with business and industrial employees (that is, Democratic precincts), the big jam comes between 5 and 8 p. m., when working people return home. Many more thousands will be utterly discouraged under this clumsy new system, and it will cost thousands of Oregonians their votes next fall.

Mrs. Young omitted from her letter any reference to the two most grave assaults on the right to vote.

She skimmed over the fact that the new law has set a trap to try to snare tens of thousands of voters who have kept a permanent address at a property they may own, or a former home, or the residence of a relative. These are mostly construction workers, teachers, loggers, farmworkers, and salesmen, who come back every 2 years to vote. They vote only once. There is no fraud. They seek only, as good citizens, to cast their one ballot. Because Mrs. Young's group knew these people mostly vote Democratic, the law has been rewritten to impose terrific penalties for voting in your home precinct instead of where you are at the moment staying. Many may be intimidated by this, as the Young group hopes.

Then there is the revision of the voters' registration cards, another effort at entrapment and discouragement of voting.

The new law puts on every voter's registration card a dire warning of 2 years imprisonment and $5,000 fine for "any false statements" on this card. Heretofore the voter was held responsible only for any false statements on the card "as to my qualifications as an elector," and many blanks on the card were not essential to his voting. Nonessential information now required to be sworn to include such as place of birth, spouse's full name, parents' full names, and—note this—the "section, township, and range" of all who reside outside numbered-street areas.

We are stuck with this law until the 1957 legislature. This outrage against American democracy is all the more shocking because Oregon already has the worst voting record of any Western or Northern State, with one-third of our eligible adults not voting. We should be making registration and voting more convenient and simple, not more difficult and dangerous.

MONROE SWEETLAND,
State Senator, Clackamas County.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara.

ADOPTION BY WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF NEW GRADING RULES FOR LUMBER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a significant change which occurred on March 15 in the western lumber industry. The West Coast Lumbermen's Association has adopted new grading rules for lumber shaped for the buyer and the consumer. For many years the standard construction grades of lumber were designated as No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4. These did not mean a thing to the consumer, and as a matter of fact he often had the feeling that unless he got No. 1 he was not getting good lumber.

For several years in the West this problem has been under serious study because our lumber industry desires to sell a product which will satisfy the consumer from every standpoint. These lumber grades have been redesignated so that the consumer will have a better idea of exactly what he is getting. The new designations are now construction, standard, utility, and economy. These changes will enable the retail lumberman and the consumer to understand exactly what they are getting. Further, I think it will increase the amount of graded lumber on the market.

The production of lumber has been constantly climbing, and more and more of the tree is being used to manufacture a product which serves all types of consumers. I wish to insert in the RECORD the statement of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association regarding these new grading rules. In so doing, I call attention to some of the increases in the quality of the product under the new grades and the standardization of thicknesses and widths of boards and finished items.

This is a great forward step in sound merchandising, one which will help to keep all segments of the lumber industry healthy. It shows the recognition of a need and a willingness to make changes.

I should like to comment for a moment on the need for many changes in the way in which Federal agencies such as the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, sell their stumpage. An increasing number of western lumber companies depend upon Federal timber to manufacture lumber and other forest products. I think there is plenty of room for improvements in their merchandising starts in the woods. In order standardization in their dealings with the many companies buying their timber for manufacture into lumber.

I think it is axiomatic that good merchandising starts in the woods. In order to be able to satisfy the consumer and to develop outlets for all the things which can be manufactured from a log, the sawmill needs a good analysis of the quality of the raw material. With this the mill will better know what can be manufactured and how best to fill the market with a desired product. I should like to see the Federal agencies develop new merchandising techniques for stumpage to a far greater extent than is being done today. It would be a great boon to proper utilization of our timber.

I reiterate that these new lumber grades, construction, standard, utility, and economy, represent a great advance in providing the American consumer with lumber merchandised to fill their needs.

When the retail yard owner or the consumer asks for grade stumped lumber he is helping himself. The new grades tell them what the lumber they are buying will do for them. When the consumer buys lumber in the proper grade he needs for the job, he profits by getting exactly what he needs at the best price.

We all can make a contribution toward conservation by using our lumber wisely. When the consumer demands clear boards 1 inch by 12 inches by 16 feet long to saw up into 1-inch-by-3-inch material 4 feet long, he is paying a premium for that wide clear board, which is in relatively short supply and is proportionately higher in price. Very often he can buy a utility or economy grade board and get just as usable short boards at a much lower price. He helps himself by showing an interest in a budget-priced product. He creates a market for a product suited to his needs, and one which if not marketed represents a cost to the consumer any way. If he demands and buys only clear lumber, he forces

up the price of that quality. Besides, the mill must tack on to its premium material the cost of handling, storing, and disposing of the other material which does not readily flow to the market, but which is a natural and sizable product in the manufacture of the log.

Lumber is one of our best building materials. If we use it wisely, we will always have an abundance to use freely. The four new grades, construction, standard, utility, and economy, and the story they tell, are a contribution by the western lumber industry to conservation and an abundance of supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks a statement entitled "New West Coast Grading Rules," written by H. V. Simpson, executive vice president, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, and published by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW WEST-COAST GRADING RULES

(By H. V. Simpson)

Beginning March 15, 1956, west-coast lumber will be graded under a new rule—rule No. 15.

The change from rule No. 14 is profound in only one respect. An attempt has been made to write a rule which the purchaser of lumber can readily understand. It is not a technical document decipherable only by professional graders.

The actual change in the grades themselves is minor. You can expect to get in each grade just about what you have been getting in the past. We have made some refinements, of course, which we feel will improve the marketability of the product. More about these in a moment.

The principal and basic change is a change from grade numbers to grade names. But it is not nearly as complicated as it sounds. There are only four things to remember:

No. 1 becomes Construction.

No. 2 becomes Standard.

No. 3 becomes Utility.

No. 4 becomes Economy.

It is reasonable to ask, since the change is so slight, Why bother at all?

Because we believe we can no longer continue practices which make the merchandising of lumber less orderly and less responsible than the merchandising of other building products. Let me quickly say that the irresponsible merchandiser is only a fractional minority. Most lumbermen choose to and do sell the grades they buy. But even they are hampered by the reluctance of the consumer to purchase a third-grade product for a home which he visualizes as first grade in every respect.

It is the numbers which cause the trouble.

The demand for grade stamping is steadily increasing. The demand is coming from retail dealers, Government agencies, builders, and many others.

A number of areas have already refused to accept anything but grade-stamped lumber. Several others are considering a similar prohibition. This trend has the endorsement of west-coast lumber manufacturers. We merely feel that a useful product should not be penalized because it is identified by a number.

Thirty years ago the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association adopted a resolution supporting universal grade stamping. The Southern Pine Association and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association have gone similarly on record. But every effort during the past 30 years to substantially extend the grade stamping of lumber has failed because the public would not accept No. 2 or No. 3 or No. 4.

The NLMA, American Lumber Standards, WCLA's board of directors, the FHA all say, "Let's grade stamp the lumber." Today the tide of demand is stronger than it has ever been before. And this time—with names instead of numbers to sell—every advocate of responsible lumber merchandising has a chance to make it work.

The change to names applies only to the present No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and No. 4 grades of boards and 2-inch and thicker dimension planks and timber. Select Merchantable remains the top grade in boards and Select Structural the top grade in dimension.

The lettering system—"B&Btr.," "C," and "D"—remains in effect on finish, flooring, casing, and other clear items. The only change in this category is that "C&Btr." becomes the top grade of flat-grain clears. This, of course, is merely in line with current practice. Vertical-grain clears continue to be designated "B&Btr.," "C," and "D."

The name of the bureau has been changed to West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau, which is somewhat less cumbersome than West Coast Bureau of Lumber Grades and Inspection.

The format of rule No. 15 has been changed. We have tried to make it more readable and more understandable. Key paragraphs should be easier to find and easier to remember.

The fiber stress value of the present 1450f grade (No. 1) has been increased to 1500f and the fiber stress value of the 1100f grade (No. 2) has been increased to 1200f. In both cases the quality of the product has been improved.

The old rules permitted a full-length skip in No. 2 dimension, which probably caused more difficulty than any other single provision in the rules. FHA, for instance, regarded a full-length skip an intentional scant sawing.

The universal feeling of the industry was that this situation should be cleaned up and that as a matter of good merchandising it should be handled at the manufacturing end. Consequently, rule No. 15 provides that Standard (the old No. 2) may have hit-and-miss skips on the edge, but may not be skipped full length.

The Standard joists and planks grade (2 by 6 and wider) becomes a little better all around, as a matter of fact. As was mentioned a moment ago, the fiber stress value has been upped from 1100f to 1200f. And a medium-grain requirement has been included.

The thickness of boards and finish items has been reduced from 25/32-inch to ¾-inch. Fifty percent of such material is ¾-inch at the present time. There is more value in 25/32-inch material than is needed. The official change merely recognizes current practice. Those who wish to buy 25/32-inch boards may still buy them, of course, and have them grade stamped.

Rule No. 15 will have a standard provision on material 6 inches in width—5½-inch instead of 5⅝-inch as at present. This applies already in the larger sizes—7½-inch, 9½-inch, 11½-inch. The new provision simply makes the practice uniform. It is, of course, in accordance with American Lumber Standards.

There are numerous other changes of lesser importance, but little or nothing to make the lumber you specify and receive under rule No. 15 much different in appearance than the lumber you have been specifying and receiving under the old rules.

In some cases knot sizes have been tightened, in other cases the restrictions on wane or splits have been somewhat eased. Wherever improvements could reasonably be made, they have been made. More than 2 years of the most sincere and painstaking consideration has gone into the development of rule No. 15.

It is, for the first time, a grading rule shaped for the buyer and consumer of lumber rather than the professional grader.

It will, we hope, usher in four words which will long be useful to the retail lumber dealer—Construction, Standard, Utility, and Economy.

Again, the effective date of the new rules will be March 15, 1956, and copies of rule No. 15 will be mailed to all segments of the industry.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Wednesday at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 9, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Kenneth A. Byrns, of Colorado, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Rollin S. Atwood, of Maryland.
Winthrop G. Brown, of Virginia.
Henry J. Tasca, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of Class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Julius Bassin, of New York.
Ben H. Brown, Jr., of South Carolina.
Leon Crutcher, of Texas.
Charles L. Hodge, of Virginia.
Daniel L. Horowitz, of New Jersey.
Fisher Howe, of Illinois.
Boris H. Klosson, of Maryland.
Jesse M. MacKnight, of Maryland.
Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.
George H. Steuart, Jr., of Virginia.
Ides van der Gracht, of New York.
Roswell H. Whitman, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Anthony J. Cefaratti, of Illinois.
Otho T. Colclough, of North Carolina.
Leonard Felsenthal, of the District of Columbia.
Leo M. Goodman, of New York.
Michael G. Kelakos, of Massachusetts.
Richard J. Kerry, of the District of Columbia.
Edward S. Little, of Ohio.
Walter Q. Loehr, of California.
Edwin L. Smith, of Arkansas.
Howard F. Smith, of Michigan.
Jay A. Van Swearingen, of Ohio.
Alberto M. Vázquez, of Virginia.
Jack S. Williams, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Marion W. Worthing, of Maryland.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Herbert W. Baker, of Montana.
John R. Barrow, of California.
Miss Elizabeth Ann Brown, of Oregon.
Phillip B. Dahl, of Illinois.
Robert C. Davis, of Florida.
Frank J. T. Ellis, of Ohio.
Charles B. Ferguson, of Indiana.
Millard L. Gallop, of Virginia.
Edwin J. Garrity, of Virginia.
Loren L. Goldman, of Maryland.
Chester H. Kimrey, of Oklahoma.
James L. Lee, of California.
Francis C. Prescott, of Maine.
Stanley J. Prisbeck, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Montana W. Zbinden, of California.

Charles E. Paine, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Roy O. Carlson, of Illinois, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

Miss Norah H. Alsterlund, of Illinois, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Forest E. Abbuhl, of Ohio.
John W. Anderson, of Texas.
Charles White Bass, of Tennessee.
George R. Bingham, of Florida.
Miss Eleanor Glover Bond, of Florida.
Miss Eleanor R. Borrowdale, of California.
Miss Marie C. Chabot, of Rhode Island.
Philip R. Cook, Jr., of Virginia.
William E. Culbert, of Connecticut.
Rudolph Days, of Maryland.
N. Hunt Heubeck, of Florida.
Andrew John Kauffman II, of Maine.
Miss Marcia N. Lindgren, of California.
Edward S. McClary, of California.
Franklin L. Mewshaw, of New York.
Miss Gertrude M. Meyers, of Minnesota.
H. Miller Elliott, of Pennsylvania.
Lawrence J. Moran, of Massachusetts.
Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.
Miss Janice Plowman, of Missouri.
Kenneth F. Rose, of Florida.
John L. Smith, of Wisconsin.
Miss Bernadine Whitfield, of Oregon.
Jean E. Zimmermann, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Brady G. Barr, of the District of Columbia.
Wesley D. Boles, of California.
Marshall Brement, of Maryland.
Hugh K. Campbell, of Ohio.
Willard A. De Pree, of Michigan.
Richard W. Dye, of New York.
Harold T. Ellis, of California.
Charles E. Exum III, of North Carolina.
Robert Earl Gordon, of Oregon.
Robert W. Huddleston, of New Jersey.
Joseph P. Leahy, of the District of Columbia.
Louis J. Link, of Kansas.
J. Thomas McAndrew, of New York.
W. Wyatt Martin, Jr., of Tennessee.
Robert W. Maule, of Minnesota.
Robert H. Munn, of California.
James C. Nelson, of Illinois.
Robert L. Nelson, of the District of Columbia.
James D. Rosenthal, of California.
Charles E. Rushing, of Illinois.
John D. Scanlan, of Minnesota.
James R. Wachob, of Oregon.
Richard L. Williams, of Indiana.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Walter L. Campbell, of Connecticut.
James C. Flint, of Ohio.
William A. Krauss, of California.
Francis J. McArdle, of New York.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
William H. J. McIntyre, of Pennsylvania.
Allan Nelson, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Daniel P. Oleksiw, of Pennsylvania.
Martin M. Tank, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Frank Ahmed, of Massachusetts.
David H. Cohn, of Florida.
Joseph R. Johnson, of Virginia.
Burton S. Miller, of Connecticut.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Warren Weaver, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1960, vice James Bernard Macelwane, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Floyd Sherman Bryant, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Franklin G. Floete, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Warren E. Burger, resigning.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Thomas Edward Stakem, Jr., of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1958, vice G. Joseph Minetti.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

James R. Duncan, of Virginia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 9, 1959, vice Kathryn McHale, term expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama for a term of 4 years, vice Percy C. Fountain, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. David Haytor Buchanan, O17746, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. David William Heiman, O17094, United States Army.

Col. Eric Hilmer Frithiof Svensson, O17630, United States Army.

Col. Thad Adolphus Broom, O18246, United States Army.

Col. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354, United States Army.

Col. Milton Leonard Ogden, O18687, United States Army.

Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, United States Army.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be major

Mordecai, Lindley R., MC, O1718112.

To be captain

Bridge, Carl J., MC, O1861678.

To be first lieutenants

Belleville, Helen E., ANC, N901757.
Caldwell, William L., MC, O4050745.
Clarke, Robert B., JAGC, O4017173.
Fenstermacher, James M., MC, O2268939.
Laubham, James J., Jr., DC, O2275651.
Mansfield, John O., MC, O4016515.
McCaffrey, Joseph P., MSC, O2049015.
Montgomery, Roena, ANC, N794859.
Staples, Jack E., MC, O2205819.
York, Germaine, ANC, N758821.

To be second lieutenant

Wilson, Shannon D., ANC, N901478.

The following named officer for appointment, by transfer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified.

To be captain

Rouillard, Irving G., O28177.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Brandt, Fred A., O2275375.
Collie, Lamar P., Jr., O2275374.
Davies, Olwyn K., O2275572.
Fagerstrom, Charles D., O2275393.
Groth, Robert C., O2275559.
Haller, Yoel I.
Hartenstein, Paul E., O2275420.
Jacobs, Robert D.
Kuxhausen, Donald L., O2275415.
Lagace, Maurice N.
Lopiano, Michael, A., O2275372.
Miale, August, Jr.
Plaut, Samuel M., O2275597.
Sample, Donald W.
Smith, Neilson, A., O2275352.
Walker, Donald D., O2275456.
Weissbein, A. Sigmund.

The following-named person for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Kelly, James J., O2276573.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Gwaltney, Robert L.
Kuhns, Craig S., O2210734.
Maurer, William W., O2268174.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade

of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Edwards, Charles A.
Hanson, Gene
Hawkins, Charles C., III
Pinson, David L.
Rosecrans, James E.
Sawyer, Frank N., Jr.
Schvaneveldt, Noel S.
Sentell, Joseph W.
Wolf, Walter E.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, 509, and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL TO COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Dundas, Donald Sears, 2448A.
Martin, Charles Patrick, 2449A.
Turner, William Millard, 2694A.
Augustinus, Robert Herman, 2724A.
Klein, Edward Colburn, 2761A.
McCollum, Hugh Archie, 2774A.
Lutz, Simon Michael, Jr., 2808A.
Baker, Robert Britton, Jr., 2814A.
Plihal, Joseph Anton, 2859A.
Brown, Edward Tompkins, 2899A.
Armstrong, Jack Lawrence, 2904A.
Chase, Kenneth Bryant, 2939A.
Bennett, William Albert, Jr., 3067A.
Mabardy, Mitchell Abraham, 19664A.
Packard, Walter Burt, 3205A.
Gugliotta, Philip Anthony, 3254A.
Miller, Fred W., 3257A.
Ellis, Herbert Sargent, 3273A.
Crook, William Ralph, 3282A.
Isbell, James Albert, Jr., 3289A.
Williams, Joseph Bethea, 3463A.
Benjamin, Walter Paul, 3480A.
Savage, Columbus, 3495A.
Sammons, James Nile, 3499A.
Downey, Clyde Jackson, 3502A.
Hamilton, Edwin John, 3503A.
Perkins, Dale, 3505A.
Robinson, Robert Thompson, 3509A.
Workman, Robert Herndon, 3512A.
McColpin, Carrol Warren, 3514A.
Earle, Wilton Haynsworth, 3519A.
Sullivan, Charles Edward, Jr., 3524A.
Tortora, Bernardino Ornorfio, 3528A.
Cosgrove, Charles Patrick, 3530A.
Dickerson, Robert William, 3548A.
Masters, Robert Eugene, 3551A.
McCarter, Elmer Heath, 3553A.
Haggard, Van Buren, 3555A.
Price, Oran Oscar, 3563A.
Walton, Victor Emanuel, 3569A.
LaPlante, Robert William, 3601A.
Greco, Joseph Alfred Lowry, 3603A.
Fackler, Paul Henry, 3606A.
Prodanovich, George, 3608A.
Pedrazzini, Harold Oliver, 3611A.
Clinkscales, Theodore Ross, 3627A.
Wilson, Keith Streeter, 3623A.
McChristy, Albert Jordan, Jr., 3648A.
Friederichs, Gilbert Francis, 3657A.
McFarland, Earl, Jr., 3667A.
Lavell, Walter Wellman, 3671A.
Fisher, Sydney Gilbert, 3672A.
Esau, Charles Gillies, 3675A.
Colligan, Robert Leonard, Jr., 3676A.
Smith, John Joseph, Jr., 3679A.
Rasmussen, James Holland Stephen, 3681A.
Erwin, William Horace Bruce, 3699A.
Kent, Glenn Altran, 3701A.
Zoeckler, John Lewis, 3724A.
Wolke, Gerad George, 3726A.
Swancutt, Woodrow Paul, 3729A.
Nevins, Hugh Jean, 3733A.
Mitchell, John William, 3741A.
Hanford, Samuel Burton, 3744A.
Edwards, Edward Daniel, 3767A.
Riley, Daniel Edward, 3768A.
Lewis, Archie Robert, 3770A.
Banks, William McGowan, 3775A.
Smith, Arthur Edward, Jr., 3779A.
Read, Elkins, Jr., 3780A.
Egan, John Clarence, 3781A.
Smith, Robert Nelson, 3783A.
Wilkinson, Robert Norman, 3804A.
Smyser, Willis Michael, 3806A.
McGehee, Thomas Kendrick, 3809A.
Sluga, Emil Lawrence, 3811A.
Willis, Benjamin Grant, 3815A.
Ireland, Loren Elsworth, 3820A
Paul, Leo Francis, 3822A.
Keeling, Gerald Fay, 3827A.
Vandiver, Ray, 3837A.
Bettinger, Sterling Peter, 3842A.
Carter, Wendell Eugene, 3848A.
Humfeld, Harold Emmett, 3857A.
Davis, Howard Allan, 3860A.
Johnsen, Lester James, 3863A.
Johnson, Herbert Elroy, Jr., 3874.
Hamby, Henry Gordon, Jr., 3891A.
Henry, Stephen Wetherell, 3907A.
Fry, Richard Jefferson, 3915A.
Rasmessen, Edward Bernard, 3927A.
Wood, Frank Preuit, 3928A.
Welsh, Albert Michael, 3929A.
Price, Galen Barger, 3931A.
Scott, Oliver McFarlane, 3943A.
Griffith, Stebbins West, 3944A.
Stanton, LeRoy Moore, 3945A.
Geil, Thomas Wesley, 3970A.
Gibbons, Robert Joseph, 3978A.
Laven, George, Jr., 3984A.
Holstrom, Everett Wayne, 3986A.
Wells, Selmon Willard, 3991A.
Ellis, Richard Nat, 4001A.
Carter, George Albert, 4014A.
Watson, Ralph James, 4016A.
Heaton, Donald Haynes, 4032A.
Seawell, William Thomas, 4034A.
Ascani, Fred John, 4036A.
Dessert, Kenneth O'Reilly, 4037A.
Mayo, Ben Isbel, Jr., 4038A.
Gould, Gordon Thomas, Jr., 4040A.
Silk, Joseph Meryl, 4044A.
Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, 4045A.
Watson, Leroy Hugh, Jr., 4052A.
Kunkel, David Ernest, Jr., 4053A.
Brooks, John Adams, 3d, 4059A.
Mitchell, William LeRoy, Jr., 4063A.
Thompson, Clyde Arnold, 4076A.
Seamans, Charles Sumner, 3d, 4086A.
Brown, George Scratchley, 4090A.
Hicks, George Luther, 3d, 4092A.
Andrus, Burton Curtis, Jr., 4094A.
Corbin, Thomas Goldsborough, 4097A.
Banks, Wilson Harper, 4104A.
Riordan, Robert Polk, 4107A.
Perego, Frank Smith, 4110A.
Haveman, Allen Ernest, 4112A.
Martensen, William Burke, 4113A.
Lyle, Lewis Elton, 4115A.
Best, Everett William, 4121A.
MacNaughton, Franklin H., 4128A.
Henry, John Bailey, Jr., 4129A.
Northamer, Kenneth Walter, 4131A.
Richmond, Luther Henry, 4133A.
Sonnkalb, Charles David, 4136A.
Brock, Russell Keith, 4140A.
Burns, Robert Wiygul, 4142A.
Brown, Grover Cleveland, 4144A.
Sands, Harry James, Jr., 4145A.
Olson, Robert Alroy, 4153A.
Garrison, Edwin Herbert, 4154A.
O'Neill, John William, 4155A.
McCarthy, James Francis, Jr., 4156A.
Bostwick, George Eugene, 4159A.
Bickell, George Ross, 4160A.
Shankle, Willard Mayes, 4161A.
Hook, Fred G,. Jr., 4162A.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., 4163A.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, 4164A.
Oliver, Frank Everell, 4166A.

Medical Corps

Cooper, Elven Ross, 19596A.
Niemi, Osmo Ilmar, 19113A.

Dental Corps

Warren, Frederick Wardwell, 18837A.
Harlan, Maurice Cooper, 18858A.

Medical Service Corps

Korn, Bernard, 19410A.

Chaplain

Hamel, Henri A., 18729A.

FIRST LIEUTENANT TO CAPTAIN

Line of the Air Force

Bach, Roy Elwood, 18810A.

Medical Corps

Willis, Henry Stuart Kendall, Jr., 27605A.
Cobb, Leonard Cowgill, 27606A.
White, Melvin Jeffrey, 27607A.
Greene, John Randall, 27608A.
Marx, Frank George, 27609A.
Pollard, Lawrence Welford, Jr., 27607A.
Catlin, Randolph, Jr., 27610A.
Lincoln, Cicero Lee, Jr., 27984A.

Chaplain

Beckley, Robert Howard, 27663A.
Johnston, Roy Benjamin, 27664A.
Holler, Adlai Cornwell, Jr., 27665A.
Webster, Stanley Blosser, 27666A.

Nurse Corps

Coats, Ada Louise, 21403W.
Chandler, Glenna Loving, 21884W.
Maisey, Alberta Frances, 23243W.
Kennedy, Elizabeth Marie, 21713W.
Matter, Helen Elizabeth, 22088W.
Elser, Florence Frances, 21887W.
Porter, Nan Lee, 25755W.
Gernus, Mildred Irene, 25753W.
Davidson, Emma Mae, 25752W.
Henry, Arland Ruth, 25746W.
Ruhe, Carolyn Helen, 25754W.
Fahrenkopf, Bernadette Kathryn, 25751W.
King, Wanda Mae, 23244W.
Burgess, Julia Marie, 25745W.
Arrington, Agnes Maye, 25743W.
Kessler, Doris Mae, 21711W.
Evans, Bertha Elizabeth, 21717W.
Danowski, Dorothy Dolores, 21890W.
Fineg, Edith Joan Erb, 25757W.
Guitrau, Genevieve Dora, 26655W.
Peden, Louise Seever, 25747W.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Nurse Corps

Thomas, Patricia Ann, 25355W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, the following-named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, United States Navy

Rear Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Frederick G. Adams
Michael C. Ahrens
Sherman G. Alexander
George M. Allen, Jr.
Ronald L. Amon
Allan L. Andrade
Joseph D. Anthony, Jr.
Leonard G. Anton
John DuB. Apple, Jr.
Thomas Ashworth III
Garland O. Audilet
John R. Baals
Robert A. Buchman
LaVon H. Bair
Robert E. Baker
Max M. Baldwin
Glenn F. Ball
Harold D. Barnhart
John M. Bauman
John R. Bellinger
Peter C. Bennett
Thomas C. Benson
Robert F. Berg
Roger S. Betts
Duane U. Beving
William W. Bigler
George E. Biles
Ralph G. Bird
Gregory J. Bittner
James L. Black
James W. Blanchard, Jr.
Frank L. Boebert, Jr.
Arthur C. Boensch
Peter B. Booth

Clifford A. Borden
John L. Bossert
Roger E. Box
Phillip C. Brainerd
Charles J. Brockway, Jr.
Nicholas Brown
Robert H. Brown III
James W. Brunner
James W. Bruso
Thomas E. Bruyere
Charles A. Buchanan, Jr.
William C. Bullis
Howard F. Burdick, Jr.
Edmund Burke III
Mattison A. Burt, Jr.
Russell H. Burt
Vernon R. Bush
Weston H. Byng
John M. Caldwell
James R. Cannon
Walter G. Carlson
David M. Carre, Jr.
Richard C. Carrigan
Stanley G. Catola
Carlos M. Charneco, Jr.
Scott A. Chester
Bruce A. Clark
George G. Clark
James M. Clark
Jack D. Clay
Richard V. Clock
Cornelius E. Coleman, Jr.
Merrill F. Collier
LeRoy Collins, Jr.
Richard D. Cook
Ross E. Cook
Wilmer P. Cook
Julian L. Coolidge II
James L. Cooper
James R. Copeland
Charles W. Corkins, Jr.
Delbert J. Cory
Kenneth L. Costilow
Edward J. Covey
Robert J. Craig
Robert P. Craven
Byron A. Cyr
Rudolph H. Daus
Paul J. Davidson
Nicholas J. DeNunzio
David W. Deutermann
Charles J. DiBona
Kenneth A. Dickerson
Robert E. Diedrich
Edward K. Dillard
Harold J. Doebler II
John F. Donahue
Neil Donovan
Frank J. Drayton, Jr.
Roderick A. Dresser
Donald LeR. Dudrow
Nathaniel B. Dyer, Jr.
Vernon A. Eagye
Joe D. Edwards
James W. Egerton
Michael Elinski, Jr.
Hal R. Ellis III
William W. Elpers
Frederic H. Evans
James A Evans
William A. Everett
Frederick P. Eylar
Armand T. Eyler, Jr.
Jerry W. Fallin
Thomas J. Farren
John H. Fellowes
Robert J. Fesler
Theodore A. Fischer, Jr.
Peter K. Fitzwilliam
Dale L. Fjelsted
Frederick P. Flack
Gerard J. Flannery, Jr.
James H. Flatley III
John W. Flight, Jr.
Everett W. Foote
Robert M. Forster
Paul R. Fournier
Thomas L. Freeman
Henry W. Friedel, Jr.
Gerald A. Fulk
George M. Furlong, Jr.
Richard S. Gaines
Paul R. Gambarani
Charles H. Garrison, Jr.
Elvin L. Gaylor
Walter L. Ghering
James W. Gillman
Michael R. Gluse
Glen E. Good
Paul D. Graf
Frank M. Graham
John C. Grant
Gerald E. Green
William H. Green
Donald L. Grimes
Neil F. Groepler
Frederick W. Hale
Stewart W. Hannah
Donald C. Hanson
Morton H. Hanson
Robert H. Harris
Ross R. Hatch
Douglass F. Hayman, Jr.
Duane L. Heisinger
Roy C. Hejhall
Albert L. Henry, Jr.
John A. Henry, Jr.
William F. Henry
Harry E. Hicks
John R. Hicks
Raymond W. Hill
Fermor W. Hobbs III
Fredrick C. Hoerner
Chauncey F. Hoffman
Herbert F. Hoffman, Jr.
James R. Hogg
Clyde G. Hohenstein
Vernon C. Honsinger
Roger B. Horne, Jr.
Donald L. Horvath
Arthur K. Hovater
William J. Howell
William S. Hull
Harold W. Hussey
Murl E. Husted, Jr.
Frank LeQ. Ingram
Philip D. Isaac
Lyle M. Ishol
Robert H. Jaeger
Ernest W. James
Jack P. Janetatos
Guy C. Jarratt III
Walter E. Jennings
Richard S. Jensen
Gunnar S. Jenson
Andre L. Jernee
James E. Johnson
Donald H. Johnston, Jr.
Donald W. Johnston
Darrell E. Jones
Jerry E. Jones
Henry M. Jordan
Arthur E. Keegan
Robert M. Keller
Frank B. Kelso II
Robert D. Kemper
George W. Kenaston
John H. Kinert
Ben J. Kinney
John H. Kirkpatrick
Melvin A. Klein
Serapheim D. Koutas
Thomas R. Krieger
Herbert B. Kuykendall
William A. LaBarge
Jimmie D. Lakey
John J. Lally
Francis J. LaMotte
John P. Langenheim
Thomas R. Langley, Jr.
Burton R. Laub, Jr.
Philip G. Leahy
Harry F. Lenhardt, Jr.
Richard J. Levendoski
Charles A. Levis
Theodore E. Lewin
Harold S. LeWis
Frederick J. Lind
Donald E. Lindquist
Frederick G. Lippert III
David B. Lloyd
Lawrence A. Lowden
Rex F. McAlister, Jr.
Michael A. McBride
Dale R. McClure
James C. McCoy, Jr.
John R. McCravy, Jr.
Richard J. F. McDermott
Walter I. McDonell, Jr.
John G. McGarry
Daniel R. McGrath
Robert J. McHugh, Jr.
John R. McLaughlin
Lee Q. McMillan
Eugene J. McPartland
Albert A. McPherson
John J. Macan
Malcolm J. Macdonald
Henry L. Maines
Malcolm A. Malloy
Richard J. Mann
Joseph H. Maston III
Douglas S. Mayfield
Samuel E. Mays, Jr.
Channing W. Medwedeff
Danny J. Michaels
Hoyle H. Miller, Jr.
John M. Miller, Jr.
Kenneth L. Miller
Wayne W. Miller
William H. Miller
James L. Milne
David C. Minton III
Harold A. Moore, Jr.
Garner E. Mogan, Jr.
Alexander R. Morris
Charles S. Morris
Robert B. Morris, Jr.
Edmund C. Mortimer
Wallace L. Mossop, Jr.
Richard A. Mozier
Charles S. Mulloy
Frank S. Murray
William M. Musgrove
"L" "D" Nagel
Carl A. Nelson
Paul J. Nelson, Jr.
Sven D. Nelson
Henry H. Neuhard
Alfred C. Newbury
James W. Newcomb, Jr.
Murray M. J. Nicholson, Jr.
Thomas A. Northam, Jr.
Donald B. O'Connell
Jerome A. O'Connell
Kyran M. O'Dwyer
Donald T. Ogram
Douglass J. Ohmen
William J. O'Keefe
Theodore E. Oliverio
Wayne R. Osgood
James L. Owen
Dwight C. Owings
Edgar H. Parker
Stephen M. Pattin
Richard D. Petersen
Karl L. Peterson
Peter C. Peterson, Jr.
Theodore C. Pickel, Jr.
Benjamin L. Poe, Jr.
Wendell W. Powell
William H. Price II
John C. Putnam
Peter N. Randrup
James P. Ransom II
Allen E. Reed, Jr.
Paul J. Reese
Willis S. Rich
Douglas V. Rigler
Charles R. Roberts
Ned C. Roberts
Richard D. Roberts
Hollis E. Robertson
Robert D. Rodgers
Vincent W. Roper
Thomas M. Ryan
Dean R. Sackett, Jr.
Robert J. Sampson
Hugh P. Sams
Stephen E. Sargent
Robert J. Scanlon
Robert G. Schatz
Ernest J. Scheyder
Herbert A. Schick
Edward W. Schildhauer
George F. Schilling
Robert H. Schmidt
Vincent L. Schmidt
Walter L. Schneider III
William M. Schoessel, Jr.
Raymond J. Schreiner
John M. Schulze, Jr.
Ralph C. Schwartz
Melvin B. Schweiger
Thomas P. Scott
William W. Scott
Edward A. Sechrest
John R. Seesholtz
Richard W. Shafer
David A. Shelso
Robert A. Shinn
Benjamin F. Short
Theodore B. Shultz
Robert H. Shumaker
David N. Sibley
James H. Sikes
George T. K. Simpson
William H. Simpson
William T. Slaughter
William D. Sloan
John H. Slough
Robert R. Smiley III
Harold L. Smith, Jr.
James W. Smith
Norman M. Smith
Phillip J. Smith
William R. Smith
Richard C. Snyder
Fred G. Spellman
Peter J. Spink
Walter H. Stammer, Jr.
Christopher M. Stefanou
John C. Sterling
Connelly D. Stevenson
James W. Stinson
Lowell P. Stone
Gene F. Sullivan
Harlan D. Swanson, Jr.
Clarence O. Taff, Jr.
Joseph T. Talbert, Jr.
Richard R. Tarbuck
Frank B. Tatom
David S. Teachout
James G. Thomas
Benton G. Thompson
John D. Thurber
Barrick F. Tibbitts
Edward L. Toohey, Jr.
Donald N. Topping
James B. Townsend
Maurice F. Tyler, Jr.
James M. Van Metre
John A. Wagner
Brian F. Walker
Compton E. Ward
Robert L. Watkins
John A. Webster, Jr.
David Weggeland
Russell H. Weidman
George T. Welsh
Edwin K. Wharton
Laurence A. White, Jr.
Richard F. White
Jack M. Wilbern
John H. Wilde, Jr.
George H. Wilkins
Forrest R. Williams
Charles N. Wilson
Eric J. Wilson
Stephen A. Wise
Marc T. Wolff
Orpheus L. Woodbury III
Gene L. Woodruff
Herbert P. Woods
Carl B. Wootten, Jr.
Joseph M. P. Wright, Jr.
Orville Wright, Jr.
Frank F. Zechlin
Robert W. Zimmerman

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert A. Allen, Jr.
Victor J. Baricev
Jack R. Binns
Stanley L. Booth
John S. Boyd
George D. Broyles
John E. Buckley
Whitmore S. Butts, Jr.
George S. Connolly, Jr.
Donald E. Coyne
James A. Dickey
Harold E. Dolenga
Thomas E. Eaton, Jr.
Jules J. Gervais, Jr.
Robert G. Harmon
Ernest C. M. Higgins
Edward N. Hobson
Robert Houghton
William S. Hunt, Jr.
Lloyd B. W. Kriner
John R. Legendre
William G. Loveday, Jr.
Patrick R. McCool
Lawrence E. McCullers
Franklin D. McMullen, Jr.
Jacob G. Oaks, Jr.
James E. Orange
Douglas C. Osgood
Louis A. Perrone
William A. Peters
Louis J. Pfeiffer
Jan S. Prokop
Donald A. Sacarob
Franklin D. Smith
William H. Stiles
Donald R. Stone
Isidore L'A. Tobin III
Richard S. Walsh
Perry L. Westmoreland
James A. White
Robert L. Williams
Corbin Woodward, Jr.
Eugene A. Wrobel
Edward A. Zabrycki

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles C. Baggs
Paul H. Bradtmiller
Robert E. Quinn, Jr.
Robert A. Schade, Jr.
John J. Shanley, Jr.
James E. Whelan

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns (engineering duty only) in the Navy subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James M. Taylor
Richard L. Thomas

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be ensigns (special duty only) in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard O. Allen, Jr.
Edward I. H. Bennett, Jr.
Donald L. Brown
Joseph W. Harrison
Angus D. McEachen III
Nelson E. Moore
Carl Schleicher
Robert W. Schmitt
Frank D. Scovel
John S. Wilson
Frederick E. Wright

The following-name (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Andre N. Abele
Paul R. Ackerman
Kenneth G. Ackroyd
Benjamin S. Adams
Jerome B. Adams
Richard D. Adams
Robert W. Adams
Thomas C. Adams
James W. Adolphson
William P. Albrecht
Henry C. Alden
Jaime P. Alexander
William H. All III
Frank A. Allard
Corbett U. Allen, Jr.
Edward P. Allen
Frederick J. Allen
John E. Allen
John McL. Allred
James W. Amis, Jr.
James B. Anderson
Paul N. Anderson
Salvatore J. Angelico
Layne B. Anspach
David L. Armstrong
Lloyd R. Armstrong
Thomas F. Arnold
Peter D. Arrowsmith
Robert L. Atkinson
Robert S. Attiyeh
Franklin P. Auwarter
Arthur DeL. Ayrault, Jr.
Arthur A. Bailey, Jr.
John L. Bailey
Evan S. Baker
Robert C. Baker
John W. Ballard
William M. Balliette, Jr.
Harold E. Barnes
Charles E. Barnett
John E. Barrett, Jr.
William L. Barrett, Jr.
Robert L. Barry
Neil J. Barta
Robert H. Bartley
Jerry J. Bass
Charles G. Bassett
Ned P. Baugh
Harold L. Baynes
Robert R. Beach
Lawrence L. Beall
Joseph J. Beard
Nathaniel O. Beasley
Paul F. Beatty

William H. Bedenbaugh
Phillip M. Belisle
John E. Benadum
Philip W. Benediktsson
Earl H. Benser
Richard C. Bensman
John D. Bentley
John L. Berg
Elmer L. Bergstraser
Theodore J. Berntsen
William H. Berry
Fred A. Besel
John M. Beshoar
Albert H. Best III
Francis X. Beytagh, Jr.
Henry E. Bilkey, Jr.
Robert J. Bitts
Josiah H. Blackmore II
Samuel J. Blackwell, Jr.
Benjamin C. Blake, Jr.
Gordon N. Blake
Warren W. Blakely
Jack J. Bland
Robert E. Blank, Jr.
Lurton W. Blassingame
Douglas J. Blatt
Robert B. Bliss
"S" "C" Boggess III
William S. Bolte
Robert L. Bootes
Andrew J. Borcik, Jr.
Gary L. Boshears
William C. Bourke
Raymond J. Bouvin
John C. Bowne
Leonard G. Brackeen, Jr.
Charles T. Bradshaw
Heinz R. Brandt
James W. Brannigan, Jr.
Robert N. Brannock
David M. Brantt
William McK. Braselton, Jr.
Edmond L. Brasseur
Donald J. Brautigam
Ambrose K. Brennan, Jr.
Marc A. Brenner
Walter C. Brestel, Jr.
Richard A. Bright
Sterling M. Brockwell, Jr.
Ora D. Brown III
Robert F. Brown, Jr.
Robert E. Browne
William C. Brumfield
Richard R. Brummett
Paul C. Brunet
Erwine T. Buckenmaier, Jr.
Gary L. Buckwalter
William S. Buehler
Robert F. Bullock
Willard J. Burch
Edward M. Burgess
Robert A. Burke
Paul Burnham
Robert H. Burr
Raymond D. Butler
Ralph L. Button
Michael J. Byrne
Olin R. Cable, Jr.
Richard P. Calhoun
Richard G. Camacho
Alan H. Campbell
Ronald K. Campbell
Ralph A. Capshaw
Joseph W. Carlson, Jr.
Joe D. Carr
William J. Carr, Jr.
James T. Carroll
Michael S. Carswell
John B. Carter
John L. Carter
Richard A. Carter
William O. Carter, Jr.
Harold J. Castner
Wilfred B. Caton
James A. Cavenaugh, Jr.
Leonard H. Caveny
Douglas S. Chalmers
Dean A. Chambers
Donald G. Champlin
Charles W. Chandler
Paul W. Chapman
Kenneth W. Chappell
Duward E. Chastain
Eugene S. Cherry
John Cheston
William S. Chilton
John H. Christ
Philip J. Christensen
Thomas J. Christman
Sylvester G. Chumley
Gilliam Clark, Jr.
Leonard J. Clark, Jr.
Robert W. Clark, Jr.
Ted G. Clause
Steven K. Cochran
Silas B. Coley, Jr.
Charles A. Collins
George A. Coltrane
Craig Comstock
Edmund T. Comstock, III
James H. Conley
Laurence M. Connell
Donald A. Connelly
David W. Conrath
Frank F. Conte
Fred J. Contrata, Jr.
Charles W. Cook, Jr.
Joseph A. Cook
Clyde "F" Coombs, Jr.
Gary O. Cooper
Henry Cox
Gerald G. Craddock
Edward A. Cramer, Jr.
John A. Cramer, Jr.
William R. Crate
Richard L. Crawford
Gene B. Cross
Robert T. Crow
Christopher G. Crowson
James F. Crum
James V. Cuff, Jr.
David H. Cullen
Alan "B" Cutter
John Dale
Joseph M. Daley, Jr.
Kenneth M. Dankel
Harry M. Davidson
John G. Davies
Jackson K. Davis, Jr.
Jacob E. Davis II
Leroy L. Dawson, Jr.
John T. Day, Jr.
William C. Deans
David A. DeBell
Armando Delapaz
David S. Dennis
James E. Dennison
Douglas J. Denton
Richard W. Devane, Jr.
Robert M. Dever
Richard L. Devich
William J. Dick
Robert A. Dole, Jr.
Douglas J. Donohue
Edward W. Donovan, Jr.
Edward E. Doolan
Burton T. Doremus, Jr.
Henry Dormitzer II
Frank C. Dorsey
William R. Dorsey III
William F. Dove
Carl S. Downing
Peter Downs
Robert T. Draughon
Paul J. Driscoll
Frederick H. Duffield, Jr.
Kenneth D. Duncan
Paul E. Dunmire
Charles G. Durfee
Taylor R. Durham
John W. Durr III
Jerry C. Dusthimer
Charles "M" Earnest
Joshua V. Edwards
Theodore J. Elder
Philip S. Elkins
Frank K. Ellis
Peter R. Ellis
Frank F. Embick, Jr.
William J. Engle
James R. English, Jr.
David L. Englund
George B. Enoch
Sheridan B. Ensley
Eugene D. Eppen
Malcolm L. Erich
Kermit R. Escudier, Jr.
Frederick A. Ethridge
David L. Evans
Richard S. Evans
Marvin L. Eyler
Fred F. Farmer
Lawrence R. Farmer
John H. Farris
John H. Farrow, Jr.
Norman A. Felsenthal
Robert LeR. Ferguson
James L. Ferro
William E. Feurer, Jr.
Byron Fielding
George E. Fink
John M. S. Finney
John R. Firth
Edmund W. Fisher, Jr.
John H. Fite, Jr.
Richard B. Fitzpatrick
Charles R. Flather
Samuel A. Fleshman II
Daniel F. Flynn
Nathaniel E. Flynn
Robert H. Ford
Neville D. Fowler
Otis O. Fox
Rector K. Fox III
Irwin Z. Frank
Thomas P. Frank
George M. Fredrickson
Jerre M. Freeman
James C. Freund
Charles H. Frey
Charles L. Fries
Robert E. Fritts
Charles R. Fuller
Edwin P. Gable
Henry H. Gaffney, Jr.
Milton J. Gaines
Gino E. Gallina
George W. Gardner
Robert H. Gardner
Edwin J. Garn
Albert E. Garrett III
John O. Garvey
Donald M. Gay
Robert J. Gebel
Jerry D. Geist
Thomas L. Gibbons
James C. Gibson, Jr.
Robert M. Gifford
William F. Gilchrist
Robert H. Gile
Richard A. Gill
Leonard E. Giuliani
Lawrence MacN. Gleason
Culver C. Godfrey, Jr.
Robert A. Gonsalves
Tarrant A. Gooch
Philip I. Goodman
Winthrop M. Goodwin
Richard T. Gralow
Richard P. Gramley
Freeman A. Grant, Jr.
William E. Green
William H. Griffin
Richard A. Groeneveld
Ronald R. Grove
Robert "C" Grover
John K. Gschwind
William A. Guiffre
Malcolm W. Guild
Stewart E. Gully
Francis S. Hackney
Edwin R. Haering
Dayton R. Hahne
Roger L. Hale
George K. Haley
James W. Hall
Robert A. Hall
Ralph E. Hamilton
Glenn Hanna
Walter L. Hannum
Robert W. Hansen
John L. Hanson, Jr.
George K. Harding, Jr.
Jay H. Hardy
Jack E. Harmon
Buford A. Harris, Jr.
Jack E. Harris
David G. Harscheid
Robert L. Harshman
Donald F. Hart
Douglas Hart
Patrick E. Hart
Hugh B. Haskell
Cleighton J. Hastad
Robert N. Haven
Richard A. Hays
Peter S. Hearst
Robert D. Heatherly
Richard J. Heimer
Richard A. Hein
John P. Helmick, Jr.
Robert L. Hemmerling
James A. Henderson
Richard H. Henderson
Edward Hennessee
Richard D. Hensel
Michael McC. Hercher
Paul H. Herzing
Donald J. Hesketh
Robert M. Hetterly
James M. Hickerson
Owen W. Hickey
John C. Hiebert
Melvin L. Hildebrandt
Richard T. Hill
Walter P. Hines
William H. Hinkes
James W. Hinkley IV
Don G. Hinsvark
Benjamin R. Hippe
Gilbert R. Hitchcock
James R. Hlavin
Charles Hodgate, Jr.
William L. Hodgskiss
John P. Holm
Billy H. Holmes
Leslie K. Y. Hong
William K. Hoskins
John T. Houk, Jr.
John H. Hubbard
Fred P. Hueber
Arthur L. Hufnagel
George Huling, Jr.
Donald E. Huntington, Jr.
William T. Iler
James H. Jacobs
Donald MacI. James
John C. Jamison
Frank R. Janisch
James M. Jeffords
Alexander Jenkins III
Mark J. Jennings
Lawrence C. Jensen
Robert B. Jensen
Keith D. Jewell
Craig I. Johnson
Pierce Johnson, Jr.
Richard M. Johnson
Robert E. Johnson
James R. Johnston
Gordon B. Jolley
John A. Jones
Robert F. Jones
Henry W. Jordan
Crawley F. Joyner III
Thomas A. Kahrl
Richard A. Kammann
Kurt W. Karmin
Alvin R. Karn, Jr.
Grant W. Kearl
Paul L. Kearney
Dennis Keeley
Dennis E. Kennedy
Earl L. Kenworthy
Charles D. Kepner, Jr.
Charles R. Kern
Richard A. Kerr
William T. Kilbourne II
Monte L. Killingsworth
Stanley R. Kingnan, Jr.
James M. Kingsbury
Calvin H. Kinsley
Thomas C. Kirkman, Jr.
Wayne A. Kirkpatrick
John C. Kirscher
Barry D. Kirshbaum
Albert D. Kirwan, Jr.
Frank H. Klein
Peter M. Klein
John A. Kleinheinz
Philipp B. K. Knake, Jr.
Andrew G. Knezich
George H. Knightly
Ernest J. Kohl
Walter A. Kordex
Erich "F" Korman
Roger J. Kowalsky
John R. Kraft
James B. Kramer, Jr.
Rex W. Kramer, Jr.
Donald M. Kresge
John W. Krieger
John J. Krimm
Herbert P. Krog
Ralph E. Kromer
George C. Kronmiller, Jr.
James H. Kruetzfeldt
Algene J. Kuchinka
John W. Kuhl
Trammell C. Lacey, Jr.
Nick J. Ladas
Charles A. Laforge, Jr.
Joseph F. Lake
Arne S. Landaas
Wesley A. Landen, Jr.
Grover W. Lang
John O. Langley
James B. Langworthy
William T. Lanier
James L. Larsen
William V. Laszlo
Peter C. Lauterbach
Robert W. Lawrence
James MacN. LeCuyer
Gerald D. Lehmer
Harold DeW. Lester
John W. Leth
John F. Lewis
Norman H. Lewis
Richard B. Lewis
Robert S. Lewis
Jon C. Liebman
Bruce R. Lippke
George F. Lockeman, Jr.
Cecil P. Loechelt
Harold F. Lombard, Jr.
Mathew R. Loonin
John W. Losa
Donald G. Lowry
Allen H. Loyd
Fitz O. Lufkin, Jr.
Richard E. Luybli
Deane R. Lycan
Byron C. Lynch, Jr.
William M. McAllister
Phillip M. McArthy
Joseph M. McCabe
Robert A. McCaffery
Charles H. McCaghy
Robert C. McClanahan
Jerry McCleskey
William F. McClure
John H. McComb
Richard L. McCormack
Ronald K. McCreight
John J. McDermott
Russell B. McDonough, Jr.
William J. McDonough
James R. McEowen
Paul L. McKaskle
William M. McKeeman
Louis A. McKellar
Mark H. McKinsey, Jr
Charles R. McLean
Gerald L. McMahon
Michael T. McNevin
Bruce G. McPhee
Stanley R. McSwain
Ronald B. MacDiarmid
James D. MacDonald
John M. MacEwen
Arthur J. Mackey, Jr.
John H. Maclaren
Donald T. Maclay
Rankin DeW. Magill
Edward A. Mainland
Michael N. Malitz
John D. Malone
William C. Manes
Thomas D. Marks, Jr.
Merritt R. Marquardt
Michael R. Marron
Richard A. Marseille
Karl E. Martersteck, Jr.
Frank P. Martin
Joseph D. Mathewson
Myron F. Maxson
Charles J. Maxwell
John J. Mayo, Jr.
Alfred W. Medcalf
Johnny G. Medlin, Jr.
Leonard M. Meier
William W. Mellette
Edmund W. Melvin
William W. Melvin
Ronald K. Mengel
Robert E. Merki
Grant C. Merrill
Alan Merson
Donald O. Metcalf
Bruce C. Meyer
Jan H. H. Meyer 3d
Allen W. Miller
Frank Mlodzikowski
Charles W. Moncure
Donald L. Morgan
John J. Morgan
Wilfred T. Morioka
Napoleon L. Morris
Robert J. Morris
Robert L. Morrison
Arnold W. Morton
Richard E. Morton
Thomas F. Mosher
John T. Mullen
Ronald M. Muller
James McA. Murphy
Paul W. Murrill
William A. Musgrove
Richard A. Myers
John R. Neff
Robert A. Nerrie
Walter T. Neubacher
Stephen L. Newnham
David W. Nicholas
Jul M. Nickerson
Willis B. Nickerson, Jr.
John D. Niles
Bertil D. Nordin
Kenneth L. Norman
Thomas W. Nuckols
Harry O. Nutting III
Paul A. Oberbeck
Ronald J. Oberle
Robert K. O'Brien
Edwin A. O'Connor
Darryl D. Olson
John A. Onderdonk, Jr.
James A. O'Rourke
David N. Orrik
Bernard P. Orzech

Robert A. Osborne
William S. Overton III
John M. Page
Thomas W. Page
Charles F. Palmer
Harry F. Palmer
John S. Parke
Thomas R. Parker
James Parmiter
Richard R. Paske
Francis C. Pasquinelli
Alan D. Pasternak
George D. Patterson III
James M. Patton
Douglas A. Peake
Robert F. Peek
James E. Pellettieri, Jr.
Lyle E. Pellock
Joseph W. Penders
Thomas C. Perkins
Albert J. Perry
James F. Peterson
Noel H. Petree, Jr.
Darrell R. Pieper
Richard L. Plaut, Jr.
John K. Poggenburg, Jr.
Clarence R. Polfer
John C. Polking
Parker F. Pond, Jr.
Donald R. Poole
Donald H. Portch
John S. Porter, Jr.
Wells P. Poulsen, Jr.
Leonard F. Powell
LeRoy R. Price
Cornelius B. Prior, Jr.
Reed R. Probst
Ronald M. Propper
William E. Quillinan
James E. Quinn, Jr.
Peter J. Quinn
Roy M. Raja
Harr F. Ranney
Thomas J. Rappel
Philip W. Rathbun
Niels J. Reimers
Kent S. Renshaw
Gerald G. Reppetto
Theodore F. Reusswig, Jr.
Max C. Richardson
Ronald H. Richter
George B. Riefler
John F. Rish
Theodore C. Robbins
Bobby W. Roberts
Gordon J. "A" Roberts
David W. Robinson
Eugene I. Robinson
David M. Rockmore
Garland A. Roe
Charles E. Roegge
David E. Rosenbaum
Joe O. Ross
Rodney S. Rougelot
Carl R. Rundell
Charles W. Runnette III
Charles W. Rusch
William M. Russ, Jr.
John A. Rutgers
Frederick E. Sallade
Arthur Salzfass
Marvin C. Sanders
Dwayne C. Savage
Samuel L. Sayers
Gerhard R. Schade, Jr.
John J. Schang
William A. Schlapper
Kurt G. A. Schlick
Thomas D. Schlobohm
Stuart G. Schmid
Adrian W. Schmidhauser
William F. Schmiedel
Edward A. Schmitt
Daniel N. Schmoker
Maurice T. Schmoll
Howard A. Schneider
Jay W. Schwartz
Hans T. Schwarz
Douglas A. Scott
John P. Scudder
Fred A. Sears
John A. Sears, Jr.
James G. Seebold
Richard H. Setlowe
Philip R. Shafer
James R. Shaid
Roy Shank
Francis P. Shannon, Jr.
Fred H. Sharp, Jr.
George E. Shear
Amos T. Showalter
Joseph L. Showalter
William D. Simerville
Alexander Simkovich
Charles W. Simmons III
Leonard Simpson
Ronald K. Sley
John H. Sloan
Thomas M. Sloan
Herbert E. Smetheram
Bobby E. Smith
Lawrence H. Smith
Robert L. Smith
Sherwood H. Smith, Jr.
Robert E. Snow
Gilbert R. Sommer
William C. Sones
Philip E. Sonnet
Jerry C. Soper
William J. Soss
Lauren M. Soth
Roy G. Sowley
Arnold W. Staedeli
Rex P. Stallings
James S. Stanford
Robert M. Stanford
Kenneth R. Stapleford
Bradley W. Stark
Walter W. Stark
Robert B. Steece
Colin G. Steele, Jr.
Robert E. Stengle
Barr S. Stevenson
John J. St. John
Terry L. Stockham
Sigurd I. Stocking
Robert H. Stotz
Robert H. Stratford
George R. Strohmeyer
Charles E. Strong
John M. Stuhldreher
Newell M. Stultz
James D. Stutz
John L. Sullivan
Michael P. Sullivan
Norman E. Sumner
Jerrold T. Sundt
Gilbert C. Sutton
John P. Swezey
Robert L. Swingle
Ronald H. Swinnerton
Donald P. Swisher
John H. Swope IV
Herman E. Tarnow
Dan L. Taylor
Larry J. Taylor
Carter S. Terrell
Arvel D. Tharp
Alexander Thomas
Charles H. Thomas II
John H. Thomas
Allan R. Thompson
Donald C. Thompson
Donald H. Thompson
Theodore Thomte
Robert E. Thorne
James L. Thorson
Jon S. Thurneysen
John M. Tiderman
Stanley M. Titus
James R. Tracy
Leigh B. Trevor
Robert G. Tripp
Reidar A. Trosdal, Jr.
Adam R. Trupp
Edwin B. Tucker
James E. Tucker
Benjamin B. Turner, Jr.
Charles H. Turner III
Dudley R. Turner
James R. Turner
Peter H. Turner
Robert R. Turner
John A. Turpin
Clinton L. Tuttle
Thomas D. Tuttle
Joseph W. Twinam
Thomas R. Ulrich
Richard J. Urban
Richard C. Ustick
William C. Vail
Kenneth M. Valentine
Daniel A. VanDuyne
Alfred L. VanSickel
Leroy W. Varettoni
Robert E. Vaughan III
Thomas R. Viknelson
Bruce R. Viloudaki
Clifford J. VonHoene
Richard L. Vonier
Joe L. Vowell
Charles H. Waldron
Howard R. Warner
Mitchum E. Warren, Jr.
Robert V. Watkins
Thomas J. Watson
Edward R. Way
Ross A. Webber
Gustave A. Weber, Jr.
James F. Weber
Frederick E. Weicker, Jr.
Frank A. Weidknecht
William M. Weinberger
John L. Welborn
Richard D. Welch
William L. Welch
Hugh A. Weston, Jr.
Harold S. Westphal, Jr.
William F. Whalen
Orville E. Wheeler
Henry M. White, Jr.
James D. Whiteside
Guy K. Whitfield
James W. Whittington
Jerry R. Whittlesey
Frederick P. Whittum
John C. Widman, Jr.
Charles L. Wiedrich
William E. Wiegand
James D. Wilder
Frank E. Williams
Jerome B. Williams
Richard E. Williams
Robert C. Williams
Thomas W. Williams, Jr.
Nicholas J. Willis
Bruce B. Wilson
Charles R. Wilson
Paul G. Wilson
William R. Wilson, Jr.
David E. Winer
John L. Witt
Arthur F. Woeber
Charles R. Wolf
David R. Womack
Bruce R. Wood
Charles L. Wood, Jr.
Rex S. Wood
Lucien C. Woodhouse
Jess B. Woods, Jr.
David B. Woodward
Allan M. Woolson
George Woron
Bruce H. Wyma
Richard A. York
Joseph E. Youmans
Ronald E. Young
Hercules P. Zagoras
Larry E. Zent
Chester A. Zinn, Jr.
William D. Zirbel
Bertram R. Zweig

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Lawrence F. Arnold
Peter C. Babcock
Harvey C. Barragar
Robert J. Bolke
Thomas G. Brown
Edgar G. Bulluck
Carroll J. Campbell
Edwin F. Cooke
Ula H. Cozart III
Franklin D. Crutchfield
Robert Curry
Gerald R. Daughtridge
Charles V. Doherty
Edwin J. Feiler, Jr.
Ernest A. E. Gellhorn
Wayne W. Gerstenberger
William G. Goodwin
Donald B. Gruelle
Newton G. Hardie, Jr.
Louis L. Heil
Philip S. Heinecke
Donald A. Johnston
Robert A. Johnston
Kyle D. Krusemark
Robert D. LaMoreaux
Henry O. Larsen
Frederick D. Lawson
Edwin A. Love
Henry A. McClellan, Jr.
Michael W. McKinnon
Lee N. McMillion
William J. Martin
Richard E. Meredith
James H. Moeller
Stephen A. Moss
John A. Neal
Joseph Y. Nishimura
Denny R. Olivier
Charles E. Quesnoy, Jr.
James A. Raymond
Paul A. Reeder
Robert S. Rexford
Gerald J. Roos
Frederick L. Sorkin
Phillip B. Stevens
Don V. Sweder
Charles F. Vandegrift
David E. Wilson
Ronald A. Young
Stanley A. Young

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Roy G. Brown

LIEUTENANT

Ralph E. MacNaughton

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Richard T. Upton

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT

Joseph L. Sedwitz

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Russell Miller, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Joseph J. Hoyt

LIEUTENANT

Billie F. Outlaw

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

David A. Ferguson
Theodore C. Riegelman

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officers in the United States Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Ault, W–4.
John R. Gorman, W–4.
Albert F. Christener, W–3.
Walter A. Janas, W–3.
John C. Valek, W–3.

Ensign Russell L. Rose, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to and permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade of ensign.

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert L. Allen, Jr.
Homer W. Alton
Charles R. Anderson
George J. Arrighi, Jr.
Paul R. Avery
George M. Bailey
Clifford W. Bandy
William J. Barbour, Jr.
Donald R. Bauer
Harold R. Brenneman
William L. Brennen
Bernard A. Brooks
Elmer L. Browning
Wallace R. Bruns
Charles E. Clynes
Erwin A. Collins
Leo J. Connolly
Francis A. Conti
Harold E. Cox, Jr.
Dean E. Cramer
John Cremo, Jr.
Billy R. Crim
Robert Cross
Donald E. Cunningham
Hilton L. Cutler, Jr.
William F. Denison
Robert E. Driskell
Alton R. Evans
Gerald F. Faircloth
Lynn E. Gee
Donald Gibson
Eugene R. Glenn
Kenneth A. Gregory
Verlie M. Hamilton
William R. Harris
Fremont G. Haswell, Jr.
Newton G. Hayes
Hubert B. Herring
Jimmie E. Hickman
Kenneth E. Hill
James R. Holliday
David E. Hutchinson
William A. Ingram
Jerry V. Jenkins
Guy Keenum
William H. Kersting
Robert L. Kirkwood
Burton L. Knight
Maurice G. LaFave
John V. Laird
Bill Lakin
Arno H. Laux
William A. Leird
Ray M. McDonald
Claude A. McGee
Mercer L. McKinney, Jr.
Robert R. Mayer
Herbert A. Miller
Charles J. Murrell
John A. Norman, Jr.
George H. Overstreet
Ervin E. Padgett, Jr.
Jerry J. Palmer
Thomas W. Parker
Joseph P. Persell
Frederick C. Philipp
Elmer F. Poyet
Moody L. Pritchett
Ralph G. Reid, Jr.
Ellwood B. Reinhardt, Jr.
John R. Rinn
Tommie W. Roberts
George W. Rosendale, Jr.
Claude E. Rush
Frederick R. Sabine
Richard E. Saleh
Ramon A. Sesma
Joseph C. Smith
Thomas F. Smith
Vernon C. Smith
Charles C. Stewart
Elmer M. Stone
Bruce A. Tager
William J. Thomte
Dan "J" Tikalsky
Wade A. Tralla
Rocco D. Vallera
Logan E. VanPool
Edward F. Walder, Jr.
George D. Wehner
Walton E. Wells
Clarence A. White
Nelson E. Windsor
Harold R. Woodside
Robert LeR. Zipse

The following-named officer candidates to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Eric W. H. Bilicke	Kenneth H. Maxwell
Francis W. Carson	Joseph P. Mitts
James R. Durbin	Vincent J. Pistolessi
Douglas L. Erickson	Raymond V. Sullivan
Daniel S. Gregorio	James C. Woodard
Kinner C. Mason	Harold C. Wright

The following-named to be ensigns in the the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification deck, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James E. Ballou	Albert D. Isenberg
Stephen B. Barnett	Walter C. Kurz
James E. Brown	John D. McKinnon
George E. Campbell	Jack L. Reifschneider
Howard C. Davis	Rodney R. Reynolds
Joseph A. Hierholzer	Ronald W. Richardson
Edgbert F. Howard	James W. Warren
William D. Hughes	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George H. Clayton, Jr.	Robert G. O'Donnell
John H. Dolan	Odd B. Pedersen
Richard J. Halloran	Robert E. Peetz
Myron S. Johnson	Robert J. Robertson
Eugene A. Marcoux	Clayton L. Sheppy
William N. Morgan	Robert F. Vincent
Eugene A. Mount	Charles J. Whitbeck
Dorance L. Ochs	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification administration, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lynn B. Bean	Oliver E. Harmon
Richard S. Benoit	Frederick G. Ingalls
Roy A. Berry	Robert D. Jebb
Jesse V. Boyer, Jr.	Edward C. Keeley
Mario J. Cicchetto	Francis S. Paine, Jr.
Paul L. Dennis	Simon A. Roscoe, Jr.
Robert N. England	Delbert A. Sexton
Walter H. Fehrs	Raymond L. Smith
James P. Forgy	Peter P. Vispo
Benjamin W. Gerrald	Floyd H. Whitehorn

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Willie G. Almand	Robert E. Murphy
Leo F. Armstrong	Harold B. O'Connor
Alfred J. Billings	James A. Pardo
James J. Brown	Robert G. Patterson
Leroy Bryant	Emile J. Racek
Gustav F. Builder	Robert S. Repta
Milton N. Cohen	Harry M. Rutherford
Thomas E. Condron	Elmer E. Salo
Ira B. Dement	Robert P. Schmidt
James M. Donley	Herbert "H" Scranton
Edward J. Farrell	Hobart E. Seward
Homer L. Ford, Jr.	Darryl D. Skow
Robert B. Goodman	Bruce L. Slawson
Lawrence C. Gore	Bryce D. Slawson
Carmano J. Gulli	George O. Smith
William J. Hipp	Homer R. Spann
Howard W. Hughes	Michael C. Staats
Alden M. Hutchinson	Leo H. Sweeney
Norman C. Johnson	Glynn A. Waldrop
William J. Landroche, Jr.	James W. Watts
	Ralph W. Welch
Gerald D. McCarthy	Henry W. Whittle
Donald H. Millon	Martin F. Zdolsek
James J. Murphy, Jr.	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification hull, subject to qualification therefore as provided by law:

Milfred C. Berg	Edward C. McConkey
Albert P. Festag	Ralph Motika
Gene Lanham	Eugene J. Schuster

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Raymond W. Ashbacher	Edgar L. James
	Michael J. Judge
Lee E. Barret, Jr.	Edward J. Kasnicki
Charles LeG. Benjamin	Louis A. Kilpatrick
	Herman LeR. Kinsel
Arthur LeV. Bentley	Donald J. Kreutzberger
James T. Boyle	
James W. Brooks	Henry E. Loudermilk
Bruce F. Brown	Richard C. McAllister
Howard E. Bylund	James L. McGlamery
Walter A. Cahill	Paul F. Mademann
Allyn C. Christopher	Irving C. Nielsen
Bernard F. Clausen	William J. O'Halloran
James E. Crickey, Jr.	Gilbert A. O'Rear
Thomas P. David	Howard L. Palmer
George E. Davis	Frank B. Scarlett
Robert R. Dunn	Donald D. Shelton
Jack D. Durham	Jack W. Waddell
Robert N. Elfsten	Theodore R. Weatherby
John R. Griffin	
Bruce C. Haddan	Norman P. West
James L. Haning	Charles R. Witherspoon
Thomas W. Hefferon	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation operations, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George W. Crowe
Llewellyn LeR. Naddy
James I. Pardue

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation ordnance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George F. Biehl	John C. McIlwaine
John E. Campbell	Edward R. Mateer, Jr.
Duane J. Counsell	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation maintenance, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert V. Dawe	Charles Nuanes
John J. Errickson	John H. Richter
Charles E. Farrar	Milton W. Schreck
Clyde W. Holland	William J. Stephens
Charles E. Johnson	James R. Vannice
Edward M. Nowak	Bryce K. Worrock

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aerology, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Claude C. Brown
Richard C. Husted
Stanley W. Stanwick

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification aviation electronics, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert C. Borden, Jr.	Calvin H. Lyle
Jack R. Carpenter	William Maliczowski
Elmer S. Clark, Jr.	Robert L. Miller, Jr.
Jay R. Collins	Ashley A. Myers
Daniel Curran	Odis A. Nicholson
Bernard C. Elliott	Henry B. Perry
George R. Fromm	Jesse W. Quisenberry
Frederick W. Glaeser	John C. Roach
William J. Keith	William P. Yarbrough, Jr.
William P. Koll	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harry Blackwell, Jr.	Lloyd W. Krueger
Walter E. Buck, Jr.	Jamie R. Murphy
George J. Cooney	Robert H. O'Malley
Russell S. Dohmeyer	Harold S. Parr
James F. Erskine	Joseph R. Riser
Wallace J. Hanna	Jettie C. Shuler
James J. Hart, Jr.	James Thompson
Harold S. Hatcher	Blaxton V. Todd
Horald McR. Hughes	Charles A. Vedra
Billy N. Jones	Frank J. Wolfe
Diedrich K. Kriete-meyer	Joseph M. Zepczyk

The following-named to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Lee S. Brooks	Victor H. Kimmons
Robert E. Kenny	Joseph F. Young

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Don E. Aitchison	Raymond M. Kostesky
Ronald L. Amon	Robert S. Lamb
Charles T. Andrews	John L. Landis
William C. Auer, Jr.	Franklin J. Lewis
Harry F. Barnes	Darwin D. Lundberg
Ronald G. Beagle	Jarvis D. Lynch, Jr.
Richard G. Braun	Daniel R. McGrath
James C. Brokaw	Schamyl C. Massey
Robert S. Brown, Jr.	Robert F. Milligan
William C. Bullis	Charles L. Monson, Jr.
Forrest W. Crone	Robert T. Motherway
Timothy J. Cronin, Jr.	James B. Murtland III
William C. Doerner	Cornelius J. O'Shea
Donald M. Douglas	Clarence R. Perry
Thomas R. Edgar	Keith E. Phillips
John J. Egan	Louis G. Sasso
Alex E. Fazekas	William M. Schoessel, Jr.
Pat D. Ford	
Carroll R. Franklin	Richard T. Shigley
Albert L. Granger	James S. Shillinglaw
Roy M. Gulick, Jr.	John Smallman
Milledge A. Hart III	James W. Smith
Richard T. Henry	Daniel L. Sullivan
Dale C. Herndon	Theodore W. Taylor
John I. Hopkins	Anthony Trent
Don E. Kennedy	Richard S. Varney
Cloyd H. Klingensmith	Wayne M. Wills
Charles E. Knettles	Joseph B. Wuertz

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dennis P. Abrahamson	Roger T. Castonguay
Robert T. Adams	Harlan P. Chapman
James D. Alton, Jr.	James L. Clapp
Kenneth F. Anderson	Dale H. Clark
Neil P. Anderson	Carl A. Clay
William D. Andrews	Westray S. Cobb
Harold L. Angle	Fred J. Cone
Richard K. Apple	Charles G. Conway
Keith E. Austin	Robert M. Cook
George M. Ball	James C. Cooley
Leonard S. Baranski	John R. Dailey
Richard H. Barnhardt	Thomas F. Davenport, Jr.
Victor M. Barr	
John E. Bates	Elden R. Davisson
Norbert J. Beckman	Jerry A. Dick
John P. Beggin	Larry L. Dier
Dan A. Bench	Wade D. Dorland
James W. Benson	William P. Dowling
Robert F. Bickel	Terry L. Eikenbery
Charles E. Billips	John S. Evans
Ben C. Blasingame	Hans M. Ewoldsen
James M. Boswell	James E. Felker
Daniel D. Bocklund.	Charles R. Ferree
James C. Boggs, Jr.	Robert L. Formanek
William E. Bower	Otis F. Forsyth
Loren A. Brandt	Clifford G. Fox
Bruce L. Brown	Peter D. Francis
Arnold J. Bur	Armin H. Frank
John C. Burger	Ray M. Franklin
Phillip R. Burnaman	Donald R. Fraser
Robert G. Burnham	Joseph A. Frasier III
Franklin D. Burroughs, Jr.	Larry W. Freeman
	John D. Friske
Richard W. Calfee	Irving L. Fuller, Jr.
Theodore E. Calleton	Donald A. Gazzaniga
James T. Callier, Jr.	Donald P. Geddes, Jr.
Richard G. Camacho	William G. Giles
Joseph G. Campbell, Jr.	Thomas E. Gillespie, Jr.
Floyd E. Cannon	Earle P. Gillette, Jr.
Vincent A. Carbonar	Thaxter L. Goodell
John D. Carlton	John C. Goodman
Harry D. Carroll, Jr.	William T. Graham
Raymond L. Carroll	John L. Griffin
Jared G. Carter	George F. Hager, Jr.

George S. Hamilton
John K. Hammes
John R. Harman
Peter C. Harrity
James B. Hart
Francis M. Hayden
Phillip M. Haymond
John W. Henry, Jr.
John M. Hey
Dean C. Hickox
William R. Hinds
Russell E. Hoffman
William G. Holiday
Lee B. Holmes
Kenneth R. Hook
Peter F. Hovell
Delbert J. Howerton
Guy D. Hughes
Richard D. Hughes, Jr.
Charles J. Hurbis
William D. Jackson
Walter M. Jastrzemski
Bruce W. Johnson
Gordon E. Johnson III
Paul D. Jones
James J. Kent
Paul D. King, Jr.
Ben Kingree III
Joseph A. Kish
George W. Kisker
Eugene J. Klosak
Eugene W. Knobloch
Clement J. Koehler
Alan R. Kosmata
Aaron Kraemer
Ernest R. Kugler
Ludwig G. Kuttner
Jovite Labonte, Jr.
James H. Lane
John F. Laue
Richard J. Lawrence
Bobby A. Lay
Clark M. Leonard
Ronald R. Lethin
John S. Llewellyn, Jr.
Arthur P. Loring
James F. Lowrie
Bruce D. Luedke
Robert Lugannani
Edmund M. Lutes, Jr.
Bruce G. Lynch
John L. MacFarlane
Robert T. Maddox
Earl S. Maeser
John A. Manke
David L. Marble
John T. Marshall
Robert S. Martin, Jr.
Gerald J. Massey
James L. Massey
Harris E. Matthews
Josephus L. Mavretic
Robert J. McAlister
Peter F. McCloskey
George M. McClure
Dudley E. McFadden, Jr.
Jack E. McGregor
Edward P. McManus
Theodore R. McMillin, Jr.
John J. McPhillips
Leon G. Mears
Joseph B. Meiners, Jr.
George F. Meister, Jr.
Howard I. Melton, Jr.
James P. Menton
David A. Merline
Michael Miller
Robert R. Mills, Jr.
Frederick J. Moe
Wesley N. Mollard
William B. Moore
James C. Moreton
Richard C. Movich
Robert G. Munro
Dewey L. Newman
James S. Nist
Richard J. O'Brien
Don J. Ogden
James P. O'Malley
Carl D. Orio
James W. Orr
John K. Palmer
Delos S. Pappas
Blaine R. Park
Charles F. Parke
Richard A. Patterson
Theodore R. Paulson, Jr.
Richard K. Penland
Dayle M. Perkins
Richard I. Peterson
Adolph J. Poche, Jr.
Charles R. Porter
Leonard E. Porter
Floyd T. Pottratz
Robert A. Powers
David T. Pratt
George S. Prescott
Robert N. Rackham
George D. Raitt
James P. Reed
Frank C. Regan
Frank M. Reinecke, Jr.
Milton A. Reinke
James F. Rice
James L. Roach
Jack J. Rogers
John E. Rogler
Carl A. Rohloff
William B. Rourke, Jr.
Eugene B. Russell
Edward F. Ryan
Robert W. Rychlik
Joe P. Sanders
Robert A. Sargeant
Donald E. Schaet
William A. Schaffer
William A. Schoen
Rolf R. Schroeder
Philip A. Schweri
Henry L. Searle
Lawrence D. Sheridan
William H. Shirley
Francis Sistrunk
Phillip G. Slough
Donald A. Smith
Carl Solomonson, Jr.
Charles J. Sonnen II
Richard H. Stableford
Gerald F. Staleton
Michael E. Stein
Benton E. Stephenson, Jr.
Edward E. Stith
Rodney L. Stone
Walter A. Suhre, Jr.
John A. Sullivan
Haskell H. Sumrall, Jr.
M. Ronald Svec
James E. Swab
William J. Swartz
Carter P. Swenson
Ronald E. Tatum
Edward F. Toben, Jr.
Franklin J. Tonini
Edward F. Townley, Jr.
James B. Townsend
Paul G. Toxie
Raymond C. Treat
Donald R. Treicher
Robert H. True
Thomas J. Tully
Jan H. Vangorder
Neil R. VanLeeuwen
Richard J. Vesely
Walter L. Wagenhals
Robert C. Wagner, Jr.
Jay B. Weidler, Jr.
Wayne C. Weld
James P. Williams
John C. Williams III
Robert W. Williams
Anthony M. Wynn
Melvin B. Young III

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Nicholas J. Adamo
George H. Brower
William R. Hopkins
Edmund W. Kaaa, Jr.
William M. Westerman

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Arthur Bergman
Howard A. Christy
Phillip E. Clemente
Ervin J. Crampton
George J. Higginbotham
Billy J. Kahler
Benjamin E. Macha
Robert C. Maher
Carl B. McGuire
Jimmy B. McInroe
Warren L. Melchert
David L. Odom
George E. Peterson
Stanton H. Roberts, Jr.
John B. Schafer
Sylvester D. Smaldone
Richard G. Steffey
Arthur L. Stewart, Jr.
Marvin V. Uthe
Gerald E. Vorrhees
William W. Widener

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jack B. Aldridge
David N. Duncan
Winifred F. Welch

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dennis M. Cantrell

The following-named officer from the temporary disability retired list for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Norman H. Bryant

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Luther Palmer Bean, Clanton, Ala., in place of R. W. Lowe, retired.

Winston S. Morris, Elkmont, Ala., in place of J. T. Evans, transferred.

ALASKA

Michael Shepard, Anchorage, Alaska, in place of H. E. Brown, retired.

ARIZONA

William F. Cole, Maricopa, Ariz., in place of E. B. Green, retired.

Sarah L. Smith, Randolph, Ariz., in place of M. H. Smith, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Boyd B. Hamner, Bradley, Ark., in place of T. S. Reynolds, retired.

Harry Craig, Jonesboro, Ark., in place of F. R. Parr, retired.

Willis E. Varvil, Quitman, Ark., in place of J. O. Woolly, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Laura J. Pawlus, Bridgeville, Calif., in place of G. H. Cox, retired.

Virginia N. Tharp, Esparto, Calif., in place of L. K. Murray, resigned.

Noma Joyce Marshall, Five Points, Calif., in place of O. L. Smith, resigned.

James E. Orr, Lancaster, Calif., in place of L. P. White, transferred.

Charles F. Linck, Ja., Ontario, Calif., in place of C. J. Hase, removed.

Raymond C. Durant, Redondo Beach, Calif., in place of A. M. Schaeffer, declined.

CONNECTICUT

Richard J. Brereton, Wilton, Conn., in place of J. J. Cahill, resigned.

DELAWARE

Mark T. Berryman, Seaford, Del., in place of J. H. Cox, removed.

FLORIDA

Troy K. Smith, Bowling Green, Fla., in place of H. H. Bryan, retired.

L. M. Gallaway, Eustis, Fla., in place of A. O. Jefferis, deceased.

William O. Kennedy, Inverness, Fla., in place of J. S. Savary, deceased.

GEORGIA

William C. Chambers, Jr., Fort Gaines, Ga., in place of J. G. Scaife, deceased.

Samuel H. Henderson, Gray, Ga., in place of U. S. Lancaster, retired.

Carlos M. Sisson, Hapeville, Ga., in place of M. F. Smith, transferred.

William A. Garner, Ray City, Ga., in place of G. L. Webb, removed.

HAWAII

Joe R. Ferreria, Hanamaulu, Hawaii, in place of Antone Nobriga, Jr., retired.

ILLINOIS

Walter B. Tregoning, Carterville, Ill., in place of F. J. Rudloff, removed.

Wilburn R. Spencer, Murrayville, Ill., in place of Nellie Waters, retired.

Alfred E. Leininger, Nauvoo, Ill., in place of P. H. Schenk, removed.

Oliva S. Bradford, Table Grove, Ill., in place of Ruby Maxwell, resigned.

INDIANA

Otto L. Groninger, Akron, Ind., in place of D. L. Slaybaugh, retired.

Robert L. Sieber, Delphi, Ind., in place of W. B. Popejoy, transferred.

Charles F. Hasnerl, Knox, Ind., in place of C. W. Cannon, retired.

Ned Warner, Osceola, Ind., in place of E. T. Jansen, resigned.

Wendell R. Martin, Rensselaer, Ind., in place of H. E. McMahan, resigned.

Alfred L. Howe, Star City, Ind., in place of H. L. Korner, retired.

John D. Gaston, Urbana, Ind., in place of A. O. Hipskind, resigned.

Wilfred E. Shoemaker, Yorktown, Ind., in place of C. E. Jones, retired.

IOWA

Ray H. Aten, Humeston, Iowa, in place of R. W. Gardner, removed.

Charles R. Kremenak, Newell, Iowa, in place of D. N. Layman, retired.

KANSAS

Ralyn M. Hill, Abilene, Kans., in place of J. B. Robson, removed.

Warren L. Hartley, Belle Plaine, Kans., in place of G. L. Savage, resigned.

Myrtle M. McNeive, Emmett, Kans., in place of C. M. Moylan, retired.

Layne B. Lairmore, Newton, Kans., in place of W. F. Decker, deceased.

Bertha I. Elniff, Randall, Kans., in place of R. E. Collier, retired.

Merle E. Popplewell, South Haven, Kans., in place of H. F. Dodson, retired.

KENTUCKY

John D. Miller, Valley Station, Ky., in place of Murray Swindler, retired.

LOUISIANA

Claude Rogers, Saline, La., in place of W. S. Montgomery, retired.

MAINE

Pauline C. Nason, Poland, Maine, in place of E. J. Johnson, retired.

MARYLAND

Beatrice P. Brittingham, Fishing Creek, Md., in place of L. W. Tyler, declined.

Edward F. Boston, Princess Anne, Md., in place of J. E. Morris, retired.

Hugh H. Hassell, Rockville, Md., in place of H. A. Dawson, retired.

Rayola M. Moore, White Marsh, Md., in place of A. A. Kellner, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ernest A. Paradis, Dodgeville, Mass., in place of J. E. Langlois, deceased.

Larz D. Neilson, North Wilmington, Mass., in place of A. E. Gallagher, retired.
Cecil H. Evans, West Hanover, Mass., in place of P. J. Hanberry, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Donald H. Hutchins, Glenn, Mich., in place of G. M. Gerstner, resigned.
Mason Holmes, Idlewild, Mich., in place of M. A. Porter, removed.
Gordon H. Buckner, St. Clair, Mich., in place of J. C. Chamberlin, retired.
Alice R. Cox, Willis, Mich., in place of G. D. Howell, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Loren J. Schendel, Saint Michael, Minn., in place of C. E. Bloms, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Allie Mack Coker, Brookhaven, Miss., in place of Troy McGehee, retired.
Reece L. Cupit, Columbia, Miss., in place of D. W. Colbert, transferred.
Harvey C. Mitchell, Jr., Plantersville, Miss., in place of W. T. Grant, transferred.
Minnie L. Logan, Tinsley, Miss., in place of D. C. Selby, retired.

MISSOURI

Robert E. Hock, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., in place of A. L. York, removed.
Wilma M. Henneke, Leslie, Mo., in place of G. C. Henneke, deceased.
Davis L. Owen, Moberly, Mo., in place of P. K. Weis, retired.
James W. Buzzard, Seneca, Mo., in place of H. B. Anderson, removed.

MONTANA

George W. Duffy, Whitefish, Mont., in place of L. E. Whitmore, retired.
William B. McCracken, Wolf Point, Mont., in place of L. R. Johnson, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Earnest A. Moxham, Chester, Nebr., in place of W. C. Rhea, retired.
Dale B. Morrill, Creighton, Nebr., in place of W. A. Horstman, removed.
Lowell L. Saunders, Dixon, Nebr., in place of H. L. Balser, retired.
Gilbert R. Fletcher, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of E. F. Winter, resigned.
Albert W. Watsek, Humboldt, Nebr., in place of Charles Hynek, deceased.
Alvin O. Jones, Sutherland, Nebr., in place of J. M. McKinley, removed.
Leland D. Dewitz, Wisner, Nebr., in place of W. M. Gross, removed.

NEVADA

Minnie Kennedy Tuxill, Glenbrook, Nev., in place of Frank Schneider, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ives Atherton, Hanover, N. H., in place of J. S. Gould, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harry H. Pedersen, Jr., Absecon, N. J., in place of C. S. Giberson, removed.
George W. Douglass, Cape May Court House, N. J., in place of Preston Fisher, retired.
Gertrude N. Bailey, Dividing Creek, N. J., in place of J. R. Hendricks, removed.
Howard F. Koons, Perth Amboy, N. J., in place of J. J. Quinn, retired.
John J. Picknally, Jr., Sea Bright, N. J., in place of J. L. Garland, resigned.

NEW YORK

Maurice W. Keating, Beacon, N. Y., in place of E. B. Murphy, retired.
Doris M. Robinson, Comstock, N. Y., in place of T. C. Sullivan, retired.
Alice M. Bird, Lake Peekskill, N. Y., in place of Zenobia Carrara, retired.
William R. Costello, Red House, N. Y., in place of Nevil France, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Nelwyn F. Carawan, Bridgeton, N. C., in place of R. J. Weisiger, retired.

OHIO

Glenn M. Price, Gahanna, Ohio, in place of H. C. Reisdorf, resigned.
Ann M. Collins, Hooven, Ohio, in place of L. F. Hayes, retired.
Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.
Victor Ferrari, Sr., Smithfield, Ohio, in place of C. A. Flenniken, removed.
Janice B. Hilborn, Tiro, Ohio, in place of J. L. Snyder, retired.
Nolen E. Stuckey, Van Wert, Ohio, in place of J. I. Miller, retired.
Richard G. Graham, Wapakoneta, Ohio, in place of A. J. Brown, retired.
Owen F. Hartsock, Waynesville, Ohio, in place of E. W. Conner, resigned.
Stephen M. Snouffer, Worthington, Ohio, in place of H. B. Lindimore, retired.

OKLAHOMA

William A. Craig, Miami, Okla., in place of Roy McGhee, removed.
Glen L. Strange, Tonkawa, Okla., in place of H. J. Barclay, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert W. Newton, Blandburg, Pa., in place of A. R. Lovell, retired.
Adrian E. Kibler, Hastings, Pa., in place of P. O. Holtz, retired.
Mary E. Yost, Loganville, Pa., in place of H. P. Shue, deceased.
Norbert C. McDermott, McKees Rocks, Pa., in place of L. A. Donahoe, deceased.
Drue L. Eyer, Nescopeck, Pa., in place of L. A. Parr, retired.
Melvin S. Raudabaugh, New Kingstown, Pa., in place of S. V. Martin, resigned.
Alfred E. Ingram, Norwood, Pa., in place of R. B. Mushler, removed.
Robert D. Esbenshade, Paradise, Pa., in place of S. T. Hershey, retired.
Howard J. Short, Willow Grove, Pa., in place of H. T. McEvoy, removed.
Jack S. Karchner, Woodland, Pa., in place of F. B. Maines, retired.
Samuel P. Zangari, Wrightsville, Pa., in place of M. E. Reisinger, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Euclides Pagan Irizarry, Aquadilla, P. R., in place of Antonio Esteves, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Manly D. Padgett, Edgefield, S. C., in place of J. G. Holland, retired.

TENNESSEE

Josiah A. DeMarcus, Norris, Tenn., in place of R. Q. Williams, deceased.
Ross C. Hopkins, Sneedville, Tenn., in place of C. M. Seal, resigned.

TEXAS

Ponder A. Pickett, Big Wells, Tex., in place of S. A. Armstrong, resigned.
Ernest A. Mullen, Florence, Tex., in place of W. H. Taylor, deceased.
Melvin J. Nagel, Mathis, Tex., in place of N. G. Magowan, retired.
Annie M. Ramsey, Point Comfort, Tex., established January 1, 1955.
Jean F. Walker, Sheridan, Tex., in place of L. A. Botard, removed.
Dewey E. Waggoner, Sundown, Tex., in place of E. F. Oden, resigned.

UTAH

Garnel E. Larsen, Hyrum, Utah, in place of M. R. Liljenquist, retired.
Gordon A. Wood, Monticello, Utah, in place of A. B. Barton, retired.

VERMONT

John William Laramie, North Springfield, Vt., in place of E. J. Chapman, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Charles William Brown, Narrows, Va., in place of H. W. Hale, Jr., transferred.
Raymond N. Kinder, Rural Retreat, Va., in place of F. P. Brown, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Arlow R. Evers, Electric City, Wash., in place of W. M. Ratliff, resigned.
Lawrence G. Luzader, Pe Ell, Wash., in place of H. M. Walker, deceased.
James T. Likes, Rosalia, Wash., in place of H. C. Roberts, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Anna Jean Duncan, Cannelton, W. Va., in place of Roy Palmer, resigned.
Evelyn Wolford, Edgarton, W. Va., in place of L. J. Weaver, resigned.
Johnston Winston Chapman, Montgomery, W. Va., in place of Michael Kandel, transferred.
Leon D. Rishel, Spencer, W. Va., in place of W. H. Miller, transferred.
Erma J. Compton, Volga, W. Va., in place of A. C. Lambert, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Bernice A. Bechard, Bear Creek, Wis., in place of Frank W. Flanagan, retired.
Lawrence W. Paul, Fox Lake, Wis., in place of L. L. Dinkel, transferred.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 9, 1956.

POSTMASTER

Lewis R. Knox to be postmaster at Helena, in the State of Montana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 226.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, by whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained, we thank Thee for Thy protecting care over us during the Easter recess.

Grant that our Speaker and the Members of the Congress may now be abundantly blessed with renewed strength and wisdom as they again turn to their high vocation and the particular business of statecraft.

May we daily feel that it is Thy work in which we are engaged and may it be the goal of all our aspirations and endeavors to be faithful stewards of Thy manifold grace and obedient servants of Thy holy will.

Help us never to interpret the reality and value of life merely in terms of its duration but always by its devotion and consecration to lofty principles and our donations and contributions to the welfare and happiness of all mankind.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 29, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and

joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 19, 1956:

H. J. Res. 582. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1956, and for other purposes.

On March 21, 1956:

H. R. 2552. An act to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Great Lakes on connecting channels above Lake Erie.

On March 24, 1956:

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 5556. An act authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of McGirts Creek, Fla., for flood control;

H. R. 7927. An act to extend the time within which the State of Louisiana may make initial payment on the purchase of certain property from the United States; and

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957.

On March 29, 1956:

H. R. 585. An act to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes;

H. R. 622. An act to provide for the release by the United States of its rights and interests in certain land located in Saginaw County, Mich.;

H. R. 930. An act for the relief of John Daniel Popa;

H. R. 1014. An act for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung;

H. R. 1074. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee);

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane;

H. R. 1104. An act for the relief of Guenther Kaschner;

H. R. 1137. An act for the relief of Harry John Wilson;

H. R. 1209. An act for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay;

H. R. 1323. An act for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo);

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol;

H. R. 1544. An act for the relief of Mrs. Moli (Mali) Sobel;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Jose Canencia-Castanedo;

H. R. 1806. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, as heretofore amended, so as to permit such corporation to consolidate with Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association, Inc.;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich;

H. R. 1923. An act for the relief of Kevin Murphy;

H. R. 1973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Chiu-An Wang (nee Alice Chiacheng Sze);

H. R. 2054. An act for the relief of Induk Pahk;

H. R. 2072. An act for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak);

H. R. 2283. An act for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur;

H. R. 2285. An act for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien;

H. R. 2345. An act for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet;

H. R. 2347. An act for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang;

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass;

H. R. 3057. An act for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis;

H. R. 3557. An act to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed;

H. R. 3723. An act for the relief of Freda H. Sullivan;

H. R. 3845. An act for the relief of Guillermo Pedraza;

H. R. 3869. An act for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of Max Moskowitz;

H. R. 4181. An act for the relief of P. F. Claveau, as successor to the firm of Rodger G. Ritchie Painting & Decorating Co.;

H. R. 4185. An act for the relief of Zabel Vartanian;

H. R. 4391. An act to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4680. An act affirming that title to a certain tract of land in California vested in the State of California on January 21, 1897;

H. R. 4802. An act to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land.

H. R. 5280. An act to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia; and for other purposes;

H. R. 5856. An act to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year;

H. R. 5866. An act for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich;

H. R. 5876. An act to amend the copyright law to permit, in certain classes of works, the deposit of photographs or other identifying reproductions in lieu of copies of published works;

H. R. 6022. An act to provide for the relocation of the Trenton Massacre Canyon Monument presently located near Trenton, Nebr.;

H. R. 6112. An act to authorize the construction of a sewage-disposal system to serve the Yorktown area of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 6309. An act to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet;

H. R. 6363. An act for the relief of Edward Barnett;

H. R. 6532. An act for the relief of John William Scholtes;

H. R. 6617. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 6618. An act for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson;

H. R. 6772. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain federally owned land under his jurisdiction to the School District No. 24 of Lake County, Oreg.;

H. R. 6961. An act to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as Lake Sidney Lanier;

H. R. 7097. An act to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8607. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to David Peters, or to his heirs or assigns, title to land held by the United States in trust for him;

H. R. 9166. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates;

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution to designate the General Grant Tree (known as the Nation's Christmas Tree) in Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., as a national shrine; and

H. J. Res. 443. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

On March 31, 1956:

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On April 2, 1956:

H. R. 944. An act for the relief of Nicola Teodosio;

H. R. 2522. An act for the relief of Isabelle S. Gorrell, Donald E. Gorrell, Mary Owen Gorrell, and Kathryn G. Wright;

H. R. 3265. An act for the relief of Alkista Sfounis;

H. R. 3375. An act for the relief of Dr. James C. S. Lee, his wife, Dora Ting Wei, and their daughter, Vivian Lee;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nisan Sarkis Giritliyan and Virgin Giritliyan;

H. R. 3650. An act to provide for the conveyance to Eilef Rue of certain real property situated in Cassia County, Idaho;

H. R. 3857. An act for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David;

H. R. 4376. An act to exempt from duty the importation of certain handwoven fabrics when used in the making of religious vestments;

H. R. 6904. An act to provide for the establishment of the Booker T. Washington National Monument;

H. R. 8320. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program, the veterans and Armed Forces milk programs, and the brucellosis eradication program;

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes;

H. R. 9064. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 464. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State Fifth International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein;

S. 1687. An act for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson;

S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona;

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3214. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir;

S. 3246. An act to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; and

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved

March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5265. An act to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; and

H. R. 5682. An act to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

APRIL 9, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 29, 1956, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on March 30, 1956, the following messages:

That the Senate has agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1289) entitled "An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate has passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 1667) entitled "An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, announced that that committee had on March 30, 1956, examined and found truly enrolled the bill of the following title:

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Wednesday, March 28, 1956, he did on March 30, 1956, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme.

And enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate as follows:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United State to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

DR. J. WALTER MALONE, PRESIDENT, MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, Dr. J. Walter Malone, president, Millikin University, Decatur, Ill., retired. This good and kindly man has been president of Millikin for 10 years and has done an outstanding job. He has proved to be one of the best presidents in the history of the school.

Dr. Malone has had a long and honorable career in religious and educational service, beginning with his graduation from Western Reserve University in 1909 and from McCormick Theological Seminary in 1919. He also was a fellow at the University of Edinburgh in 1920–21.

I first knew Dr. Malone while he was director of the McKinley Memorial Church and Foundation at the University of Illinois from 1922 to 1941. There he was one of the most popular and able men ever associated with any foundation at the university. He did his job so well there that he was, in January 1946, chosen as president of Millikin University.

In addition to being one of the most popular and enthusiastic presidents in Millikin's history, he has compiled an outstanding record of accomplishments.

Dr. Malone provided much of the leadership in the raising of funds for the new million-dollar Scovill Science Hall which was opened this school year. During his tenure, gifts to the university totaled more than $2,500,000, with most of the money designated for building purposes or endowments. During the last few months as president, Dr. Malone asked the board of trustees to consider new dormitory construction. It appears that this dream of his will become a reality before long.

Dr. Malone fought to bring a larger and better faculty to Millikin. The Ford Foundation recently granted $182,200 for faculty salary increases.

One time in 1947 and 1948, Millikin enrollment reached an alltime high of 1,642. This indeed tested the capacity of the university, but it met that challenge.

Thanks to Dr. Malone's fine work, the university has remained with the small private college characteristics, including strong religious inspiration.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that Dr. Malone was moderator of the Presbyterian Church Synod of Illinois in 1927–28.

It was most appropriate that upon his retirement to faculty and alumni should pay tribute to Dr. Malone.

Roy M. Hamilton of Decatur, president of the board of managers of the university, released a statement praising Dr. Malone in these words:

He—

Dr. Malone—

can pass from its gates with the knowledge that he leaves a task well and nobly performed.

Rev. Horace Batchelor of Mattoon, president of the Millikin board of trustees, said:

We admire his fine Christian, manly spirit and his earnestness in building the lives of young people. His life has been devoted to the development of young people.

Victor C. Dewein of Decatur, president of the Millikin Alumni Association, said:

How fortunate we at Millikin have been to enjoy the wonderful, warm, and friendly personality of Dr. Malone. His personal friendship not only carried into the alumni classes of his time, but to all Millikin alumni. Speaking in behalf of all the alumni, I wish him godspeed and much happiness in the years to come.

I am no minister, but if I were to take a text on Dr. Malone, I am sure it would be: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

No one I know who has performed an outstanding job could more appropriately warrant these words.

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS OF RAISING CROPS FOR THE FEEDING OF LIVESTOCK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the New York State Assembly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on February 20 of this year I introduced a bill which would permit farmers to raise wheat without acreage restrictions when the produce is used exclusively by the producer on his farm. That day I joined several of my colleagues in testifying before the House Agriculture Committee in support of this principle.

Mr. Speaker, that was nearly 2 months ago, and as yet no action has been taken to relieve these farmers who are being forced to curtail their operations or pay the penalty if they fail to meet regulations. After much delay, a farm bill has

emerged from the conference committee, but nowhere in it is there provision to take care of the little farmer who merely wants to raise enough wheat to feed his own stock.

My bill, H. R. 9401, would broaden existing exemptions to include those farmers in commercial wheat-producing areas who harvest more than 15 acres, who use all their wheat on the farm where it is grown for feed and seed, and who do not desire wheat support.

Last week I received a resolution from the Legislature of New York State which supported this idea by urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock. Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting this resolution.

In particular, I call attention to the declaration by the legislature of their belief in the right of farmers to raise their own crops for their own use without Government restriction and their appeal to Congress to abolish or modify certain crop-control laws. I hope Congress will heed this call and do something to remove this inequity which, in effect, punishes the small farmer for practicing his right to use his own produce as he sees fit, even though he does not interfere with the rights of his neighbors or other citizens and does not use that right improperly.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, March 19, 1956.

Assembly Resolution 40

Concurrent resolution urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock

Whereas the right to own and till our soil is one of the basic conceptions of our American way of life; and

Whereas this is construed to mean the right to raise any crop we wish in order to feed ourselves, our cattle and poultry; and

Whereas since 1938 a provision of the Federal crop-control law has restricted and denied this right to farmers; and

Whereas there is every justification that a farmer should be free to grow on his farm whatever crops he deems proper and necessary to feed his own livestock and poultry; and

Whereas the margin of profit, if any, under present prices for milk depends, to a large extent on the amount of feed grown on the farms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the legislature of this State on behalf of all its people go on record as favoring the modification or removal of these restrictions; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the legislature of this State does hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to alleviate the situation above set forth and to modify or remove the crop-control laws which created it; and, be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate March 23, 1956. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

BIPARTISAN COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing two bills suggested by the Attorney General to carry forward the administration's civil rights program. Identical bills are offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

One measure provides for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to study deprivations of the vote and other facets of the civil rights problem. The other proposal would authorize an additional assistant attorney general to direct the Government's activities in the field of civil rights.

Today, the fact that deep emotional overtones surround any approach to the subject of the rights of some of our citizens guaranteed by the Constitution makes it necessary that we approach the whole field with restraint, calm judgment and understanding.

At the same time we can let nothing stand in the way of the guarantee of the right to vote. The vote is a cornerstone of our form of government and affords protection of all our rights. What is needed now is to get at the facts—facts uncharged with emotion.

The establishment of a bipartisan commission to make a full-scale public study seems to be the best manner in which to bring the facts to light in a proper manner.

The proposed legislation provides for a commission of 2 years' duration, consisting of six members, appointed by the President subject to the approval of the Senate. No more than three may be of the same political party.

In addition, the office of Assistant Attorney General should be created with the special responsibility of overseeing the civil rights activities of the Department of Justice. At present, such activities are confined to the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, but modern problems and fairness to all concerned demand that they be given more full treatment in the manner this bill provides.

I am in agreement with the Attorney General that further legislation is needed to provide civil remedies in the field of civil rights, as well as in the criminal field. Later in the week I shall introduce legislation to prevent anyone from threatening, intimidating, or coercing an individual in the exercise of his right to vote; to authorize the Attorney General to bring injunction or other civil proceedings to carry this out; to eliminate the requirement that all State administrative and judicial remedies must be exhausted before access can be had to the Federal court; and legislation to allow the Attorney General to institute civil action in behalf of individuals in cases where certain rights have been infringed.

I hope the Congress will look upon all these proposals in the calm light of reason. It is only by means of a dignified, ordered approach that we shall be able to work together to solve these problems which face the Nation today. I am confident that the creation of a bipartisan commission to study the problem and an Assistant Attorney General for civil rights will be steps in the direction of an intelligent solution to this whole problem.

THE FARM BILL

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, the conference version of the farm bill will be before us this week. It has been estimated that if the Congress passes the bill, and President Eisenhower signs it, farmers' net income for 1956 will be boosted between one and two billion dollars.

One of the best arguments for passing this bill lies in what has happened in Secretary Benson's native town—Preston, Idaho. Secretary Benson was born a couple of miles from Preston, which is the Franklin County seat, and grew up there. He later served as county agricultural agent.

Preston is a typical southeastern Idaho community of about 3,500 people. It is surrounded by highly diversified farms which raise wheat, sugarbeets, vegetables, feed, cattle, hogs, and poultry. It is also a dairying center. The business houses depend almost entirely upon farm trade for their existence.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years 9 major businesses have failed in Preston—a department store, 2 large grocery stores, 2 hardware stores, an automobile agency selling a low-priced popular car, an electronics shop, a sweetshop, and a cafe. The city dads are so worried they have taken out the parking meters in an effort to get the farmfolk to come to town and shop.

The Federal land bank in Preston reports they did a land-office business last year—making the largest number of loans in their history, with an enormous increase in mortgages on family-sized farms.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening in Preston, Idaho, is happening in farm communities throughout the entire country. And we all know that when farm buying power goes down business failures soar and unemployment lines form. A farm recession is like an octopus—it reaches out and drags us all in.

American farm income must be substantially increased. With net farm income down $3 billion since 1952, and with small-business failures up, there is not a single Member of this body who can afford to vote for less than 90 percent of parity—and it should be 100 percent.

The Preston story is like a scarecrow in the field—a warning to both the Congress and the administration.

ULLMAN, PETITIONER, VERSUS U. S. A.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, because I know very few Members of the House have had the opportunity to read the full text of a very important recent decision by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Ullman, petitioner, against U. S. A., which is commonly known as the recent decision on the Immunity Act of 1954, I am, pursuant to consent previously granted, placing most of the text of the decision in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for your guidance.

Secondly, I wish to call your attention to the fact that I am placing in the RECORD today what I believe is a very significant and important letter from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to me in answer to certain questions I asked him because I wanted his opinion to me as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It was in answer to my letter to him of March 29 asking him to give me his letter reply thereto, a copy of which letter to him is hereinafter set forth. He has done so in his letter to me of April 2, and I feel it is so clearly a helpful explanation by this distinguished American of the respective functioning of the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member; and other similar congressional committees, that I am pleased to have you and every one of my distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body promptly know of his analysis, appraisement, and opinion.

One reason I wrote Mr. Hoover and asked him to give me his considered opinion is because of the frequent inquiries I receive asking why the FBI could not also do the work being done by the House Un-American Activities Committee and by the corresponding committee in the United States Senate. Also almost universally the letters I receive about the FBI compliment Mr. Hoover on the work of the FBI, of which he is the distinguished Director. So I therefore assume that this clearcut statement by Mr. Hoover showing the place and importance of these congressional committees will be accepted in full faith and credit by any who have open minds on this subject and really seek the true and correct answers.

MARCH 29, 1956.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I read in the Washington Evening Star for Tuesday, March 20, on page A-3, a quotation by you as to some of your testimony before the House Appropriations Committee. If you have more of the text of your prepared statement available so that I might have a copy of whatever you are able to send me, I will appreciate it very much.

Being a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, your statement, as printed, was naturally very interesting and informative and whatever additional you have along those lines will be welcomely received by me. And if you do communicate with me in the premises I will especially thank you to answer the following inquiry by me: to wit, To what extent do you believe it is valuable and necessary to our national defense and national security against subversive activities of persons or groups in our Nation for such a committee as the House Un-American Activities Committee, or the corresponding Senate committee, to operate vigilantly from day to day.

One reason I ask this is that not infrequently I receive expression of opinion of people questioning the need of both the FBI and the congressional committees herein named. Many of these persons clearly state that they do not see the need of either of these committees functioning because, they claim that the FBI can, could, and should do all the work that is necessary. In your answer, therefore, if you can make it clear as to what you believe to be the function of such congressional committees and why you believe them to be necessary, if you do, I will appreciate it.

I trust you will anticipate from my question to you and the extent of my inquiry that it will be also appreciated if you will make a statement of the value of such committees in the House and Senate, and wherein they do necessary work which the FBI cannot and should not be expected to do.

I write you this letter because I want to be able to show your answer, and if convenient and you have no objection, to insert it in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also release it back to at least these people who write me as above indicated and criticize the existence of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the corresponding Senate Committee.

For your cooperation in this, which I hope may come forward as promptly as convenient, and with personal regards, I have the honor to be

Cordially,

CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1956.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of March 29, 1956, has ben received and I do appreciate your interest in my recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee. Unfortunately, I do not have copies available for distribution, but you may like to make inquiry with the office of the committee for the text.

The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the work over the years of congressional investigating committees. These committees, day after day, secure information vitally needed in the consideration of new legislation. They are indeed indispensable parts of the American legislative process.

Congressional investigating committees, moreover, time after time have brought to the attention of the Nation conditions of fraud, dishonesty, and subversion. This function of awakening public opinion is of the greatest importance in our democratic life—a service not within the province of regularly constituted investigative agencies. Congressional investigating committees, by the very nature of the broad powers vested in them, are enabled to search out the facts and make them available to the citizenry.

We in the FBI have the highest appreciation for the contributions rendered by congressional investigating committees dealing with un-American activities. Each in its own way is serving the American people. The FBI is strictly a fact-gathering agency. It does not express opinions or make recommendations on the information it secures. That is the function of other officials of the Government. As the investigative arm of the Department of Justice, the FBI is charged with the duty of investigating violations of the laws of the United States, collecting evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and performing other duties imposed by law. Its function is not exposure or securing information for legislative purposes. That is the function of the congressional investigating committees.

I feel that both the FBI and congressional investigating committees, in the field of internal security, have important roles to play. We are working for the same goal—protecting our great Nation from enemies who seek to destroy us. Our work is not contradictory, but mutually helpful. That is as it should be.

It was a pleasure to set forth my opinions on this topic and you may feel free to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

ROY COWAN ET AL.—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 370)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 6421, "For the relief of Roy Cowan and others."

The bill directs the payment of sums aggregating $276,568 to 28 individuals in settlement of claims for damage based on the flooding of privately owned lands. The flooding is alleged to have resulted from activiities of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior in the establishment and management of the Lake Alice National Wildlife Refuge in North Dakota.

In my judgment this is a case in which there has been an unfortunate failure in communications between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. A subcommittee of the House conducted a hearing on the ground and made a personal inspection of the area and the construction works involved. Although Department of the Interior engineers testified at the hearing, the views of the Department were not presented at the hearing and the report of the Department on the bill apparently was not received in time for consideration before floor action was taken by the House of Representatives. As a result, the record before me is one of unresolved disagreements of fact and law. Nevertheless, the materials presented by the Department of the Interior convince me that a satisfactory and adequate basis has not been established for appraising the merits and the equity of the claims.

Under the circumstances I believe that I have no choice but to return the bill

without my approval, but with my recommendation that the case be handled either by the referral process frequently used in difficult claims cases or, if warranted, by the enactment of a jurisdictional bill which will preserve the rights and proper defenses of the litigants.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1956.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and, without objection the bill and the message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

FEASIBILITY OF MAINTAINING A PERMANENT DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 371)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of April 21, 1955, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a report entitled: "A Study of the Feasibility of Maintaining a Permanent Domestic Tin-Smelting Industry in the United States."

The study was made for me by the Office of Defense Mobilization with the assistance of a special interagency group comprised of representatives of the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, and Commerce, the General Services Administration, and the United States Tariff Commission.

I concur with the conclusions of the study, and I am also in accord with the recommendation contained in the attached memorandum from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 29, 1956.*

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1956.*

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OPERATION OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT OF 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (Public Law 239, 83d Cong.), I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report of the Operation of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 9, 1956.*

AMENDING THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after section 263 thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 264. Notwithstanding any other provision of law any person called or ordered to perform a period of active duty for training in excess of 30 days under authority of subsections 233 (d) or 262 (c) of this act, shall during such period be deemed to have been called or ordered into active naval or military service by the Federal Government for extended naval or military service in excess of 30 days for the purpose of determining eligibility for any benefit prescribed under Public Law 108, 81st Congress (63 Stat. 201)'."

After line 5, insert:

"SEC. 3. This act shall be effective from August 9, 1955: *Provided*, That no additional basic pay shall be paid to any member by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the first day of the calendar month in which this act is approved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object because I know what the bill purports to do, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana if he will kindly explain the substance not only of what the bill proposes to do but the Senate amendments added by the Senate.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure simply equalizes the pay received by all the reservists under the new Reserve Forces Act of 1954. It seems that the National Guard man called on active duty for 6 months' training received greater pay than the reservist for the armed services who is not a guardsman. This bill would equalize that pay so that the men all receive the same amount of money when they go on active training for 6 months. They would receive the pay of a private and after 4 months get the pay of a private first class; that is, a pfc.

The Senate added two amendments. One of the amendments was to the effect that if a man on active duty training for 6 months received some disease which was injurious and disabling to him or contributed to his death, that this man should be compensated on the basis that the regular is compensated for when he dies or is injured in the service. It also provides under section 3 that the act shall be effective from August 9, 1955. The reason is that the Comptroller asked that we so frame the act so that the repeal is dated back to August 9, 1955, except for pay purposes.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Louisiana I think this is good legislation. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, N. C.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8634) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the Charlotte Park and Recreation Commission, an instrumentality of the city of Charlotte, N. C., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tract of land described in section 2 of this act upon the payment by such commission of an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such tract as determined by the Administrator, less $10,000, the latter sum representing the amount contributed by the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce toward the purchase price paid for such tract and contiguous land by the United States.

SEC. 2. The tract of land referred to in the first section of this act is described as follows:

A parcel of land located two and one-quarter miles east of the center of Charlotte County of Mecklenburg, State of North Carolina, and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a stake at the southeasterly intersection of Central Avenue and Westover Street, and running thence with the southerly line of Central Avenue south 82 degrees 36 feet east 1,200.00 feet to a stake in the southerly line of Central Avenue; thence south 7 degrees 34 feet 30 inches west 1,445 feet, more or less to a stake in the northerly line of McClintock Avenue; thence with the northerly line of McClintock Avenue in a westerly direction 1,325 feet, more

or less, to the easterly line of Westover Street; thence with the easterly line of Westover Street 887 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, containing 32.5 acres, more or less; less and except approximately 7.46 acres transferred March 15, 1956, to the Department of the Army described as follows:

Beginning at the southeasterly intersection of Central Avenue and Westover Street; thence along the southerly line of Central Avenue south 86 degrees 36 feet east 500 feet to a point; thence southerly and parallel with Westover Street 650.00 feet to a point; thence westerly and parallel with Central Avenue to a point in the easterly line of Westover Street; thence northerly with the east line of Westover Street to the point of beginning, being in the city of Charlotte, State of North Carolina, and containing 7.46 acres, more or less; also less and except approximately 4.0 acres transferred March 1, 1955, to the Department of the Air Force described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in the city of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, bounded on the north by land of the United States Government, Department of the Army, east by land of the United States Government, Veterans' Administration, south by McClintock Road; west by Westover Street and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point, said point being the most northwesterly corner of the herein described tract, on the east edge of Westover Street 263.00 feet from the center line of the intersection of McClintock Road and Westover Street; thence from the point of beginning with the land of the Department of the Army, south 86 degrees thirty-six minutes no seconds east 500.00 feet to a point, a corner common to the land of the Department of the Army, and on the property line of the Veterans' Administration; thence with the land of the Veterans' Administration south 3 degrees 34 minutes no seconds west 456.00 feet to the north edge of McClintock Road; thence along the north edge of McClintock Road north 57 degrees 24 minutes 38 seconds west 400.00 feet to the P. C. of a curve; thence along a curve to the left having a length of 124.16 feet and a radius of 322.72 feet to a point on curve; said point being also the P. C. of a curve to the right having a length of 34.47 feet and a radius of 25.00 feet to the P. T. on the east edge of Westover Street; thence along the east edge of Westover Street north 3 degrees 34 minutes 20 seconds east 221.15 feet to the point of beginning, containing 4.0 acres, more or less; also less and except approximately 2.98 acres transferred August 1, 1955, to the Department of the Army, described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in the city of Charlotte, Mecklenburg, North Carolina, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the south right-of-way line of Central Avenue and 500.00 feet easterly along said right-of-way line from the east right-of-way line of Westover Street, said point being a corner of the Charlotte Army Reserve site; thence south 86 degrees 36 minutes east along the south line of Central Avenue 20,000 feet; thence south 3 degrees 34 minutes west 650.00 feet; thence north 86 degrees 36 minutes west 200.00 feet to a corner of the Charlotte Army Reserve training site; thence north 3 degrees 34 minutes east 650.00 feet to the point of beginning, and containing 2.98 acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the Charlotte Park and Recreation Commission, an instrumentality of the city of Charlotte, N. C., 18.06 acres of land, more or less, being that part of a 32.5-acre tract of land acquired by the Veterans' Administration on June 16, 1947, as a hospital site which has not been transferred to other Federal use, exact boundaries of said property to be determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall be made subject to the requirements of section 13 (h) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 770) as added by Public Law 616, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 770.350) (50 U. S. C. App. 1622 (h)): *Provided, however,* That in computation of the amount to be paid by said commission as consideration for the transfer hereby authorized the sum of $10,000 shall be deducted, such sum representing the amount contributed by the Charlotte Chamber of Commerce to the United States toward original acquisition of the aforementioned 32.5-acre tract.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. COOLEY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk; and for other purposes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AINSWORTH UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9132) to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the report approved by the Secretary of the Interior on November 21, 1955, demonstrating the physical and economic feasibility of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, integrated as a part of said project by the act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 757), is hereby approved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCUR EXPENSES BEFORE FOREIGN JUDICIAL TRIBUNALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7646) to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want the RECORD to show that I am unalterably opposed to status of forces treaties and agreements under which American servicemen are tried in foreign courts under foreign judges; that I would do nothing to implement or continue those treaties or agreements. This bill, however, provides for the appointment, as I understand it, of legal counsel to represent American servicemen who are being tried under such conditions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, pointing out at the same time that there would be no necessity for this bill if these un-American treaties and agreements were not in effect.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is an extremely important bill which provides counsel for our men overseas, so I thank the gentleman very much for withdrawing his objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 7646.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Armed Services with the representation that it would be "a means of supplementing the substantial list of protections already secured by the NATO Status of Forces Agreement and related agreements."

I am glad that the gentleman from Louisiana who submitted the report frankly said on the floor of the House, on March 19, that he thought this was unfortunate phraseology. He knows, and I think we all know, that the Status of Forces Agreement and other similar agreements do not afford substantial protection to the servicemen, civilian components and dependents who are subject to it. The agreements do provide substantial deprivations—and the loss of American rights.

This bill is a frank admission by the executive department that the various agreements as to the status of our forces do not protect our people abroad. It is also following typical bureaucratic procedure is not admitting a mistake. Instead of publicly recognizing that the Status of Forces Agreements and similar agreements should never have relinquished to foreign nations the criminal jurisdiction over our citizens, they now make a show of offering our citizens some slight protection against those same agreements.

No one could be more conscious than I am of the plight of any serviceman or civilian who runs afoul of the provisions of one of these agreements, in Japan, in France, in Great Britain, or any other country. Last May I gave this body an opportunity to show its concern by offering House Joint Resolution 309, which would have directed the President to seek a modification of the terms of such agreements. The Foreign Affairs Committee has refused to report this resolution to the House for action. The committee has ignored, also, the identical resolutions offered by 14 of my colleagues—and ignored the prevailing sentiment of the membership which had been expressed last May in the adoption of my amendment to the first Reserve bill.

The committee was obliged to recognize that there were obvious wrongs resulting from these agreements, even though they have not permitted the House to vote on the resolution. Presumably a subcommittee is to be appointed to consider the possibility of congressional action. That seems hopeful, although possibly calculated as a sop to the consciences of some of the members of the committee, or to discourage other affirmative action by the House.

The present bill is, of course, a result of the hearings had last July on my resolution. The Defense Department was prodded into doing many things to help accused men. Things which it had been dilatory about doing earlier. Without this bill I understand that the Department has paid for counsel in a few individual cases where an appeal was made to a Secretary of one of the services. This was in order that one of the top officials could say later in speeches that the Department was doing everything possible for accused servicemen, including the payment of attorney fees.

In sending a draft of the present bill to the Speaker, the Defense Department stated that the authorization was important to the military departments "in order to protect United States personnel against possible disadvantages which may arise as a result of unfamiliarity with local laws, procedures, and language."

I say that the disadvantages referred to are not merely possible, they have already been suffered by every serviceman or civilian who had the misfortune to be accused and tried in foreign courts.

The purposes of the bill are praiseworthy—as far as they go.

They do not go far enough.

This bill will not restore to any accused his right under our Constitution to be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

It will not shift the burden of proof to the prosecution.

It will not protect him against being forced to testify against himself—or having an involuntary confession used against him.

It will not change one iota any provision of foreign criminal codes.

We are not justified in assuming that any prisoner will be released on bail now because the United States will be responsible. Practice in foreign courts so far indicates the contrary.

If the language barrier is to be surmounted in the employment of counsel—the counsel should be an American. As a practical matter it may be difficult to secure the service of an American lawyer versed in foreign laws and admitted to practice in the particular court involved.

The Status of Forces Agreement, and other agreements, do not carry any provision for the appearance of lawyers who may not already be admitted to practice in such foreign court. An American lawyer trying to defend his client by American methods and rules in a foreign court may actually provoke more antagonism for his client. At least—he is butting his head against the proverbial wall.

I have in mind one case reported by an observer in Japan where two servicemen were tried jointly. One was represented by an American lawyer admitted to practice in the court, the other by an attorney appointed by the Japanese court. The American tried to do all possible by American standards to protect his client—the Japanese, as is customary it seems, practically admitted his client's guilt and sought for a mitigation of punishment. The energetic efforts of the American lawyer were of no avail against the procedure and practices of the Japanese court.

We cannot do too much to relieve our servicemen from the effects of the various Status of Forces Agreements. But, it is important that the necessity for piecemeal measures should be ended by a revision of the agreements.

Our men should be treated as Americans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is operating as a service in the Department of the Treasury, may employ counsel, and may pay counsel fees, court costs, bail, and other expenses incident to the representation before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation of persons subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of each of the military departments concerned, and the Department of the Treasury, shall prescribe regulations which shall be uniform to the extent practicable, to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Sections 189 and 365 of the Revised Statutes do not apply to any action taken under this act.

SEC. 4. Appropriations available to the military department concerned and to the Department of the Treasury for the payment of personnel may be used to carry out the terms and provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, insert:

"SEC. 4. No claim for reimbursement shall be made against any person subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice with respect to any payments made on his behalf under the authority of this act: *Provided*, That claim for reimbursement may be made against any such person who is responsible for forfeiture of bail provided on his behalf at Government expense."

Page 2, line 17, strike out "4" and insert "5."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

BATAAN: SYMBOL OF FREEDOM

Mr. Speaker, today is Bataan Day, the historic fall of that Philippine peninsula where 14 years ago American and Filipino soldiers fought side by side to defend freedom to the death against the forces of fascism and totalitarianism.

It is fitting that we should commemorate Filipino loyalty to democracy and American heroism, both of which were displayed at their best by American troops and Filipino soldiers. I recall with what admiration we followed their 3-month unforgettable struggle against odds, how they were outmanned, outgunned, outplaned, how they were starving, many of them dysentery-ridden, some malaria-ridden, and yet they kept on fighting, heroes all of them worthy of every reward that our grateful nations can bestow.

What does Bataan mean to us now in the midst of the present ideological warfare in which we are engaged?

Bataan means that two nations of two different races can treasure the same spiritual values and the same ideals and together fight for them. It shows that an Asian people, 10,000 miles away from the American mainland, can learn to know and appreciate the American way of life and cherish it as if it were its own. It also shows that the American people can learn to like and understand and admire the culture and traditions of an Asian country and so respect them as to give of their genius and their substance to help fortify and enrich those values.

Battan is the most effective refutation to Communist propaganda that America is an imperialist nation because it was in Bataan where the Filipinos fought for freedom because they knew they had a stake in it—America having promised it to them and they knew America's word was her bond. America had fixed a definite date for Philippine independence, this Congress having enacted the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act and we had pledged Philippine freedom for July 4, 1946.

Bataan stands today as the symbol of America's undying friendship for the Filipino people. There may be times when it may appear that as a nation we may not be giving our Filipino friends and allies all the support and all the assistance that they deserve. That would not be for lack of gratitude for what they did for us in our darkest hour in the Pacific because that we will never forget. It would only be because in a global struggle of the proportions such as the one in which we are now engaged, for the security of the free world and in the interest of safeguarding peace for all mankind, it may be imperative for us sometimes that certain needs should claim our preferential consideration. Filipino welfare and Filipino security, however, are just as fundamental to us as our own and we want to assure the people of the Philippines that when the

chips are down they will find the American people as loyal to them as they have been loyal to us.

It was Secretary of State Dulles who, in September 1954, solemnly and formally pledged, for and in behalf of the Government and people of the United States, in an exchange of notes with the government of the Republic of the Phillippines, that in case of attack by an enemy on the Philippines, such an attack would be considered by the United States as a threat to its own security and it would be met with an automatic retaliation by the United States. Secretary Dulles knew that such an assurance has the full backing of the American Congress and that he was speaking for the American people.

The Filipino leader, President Ramon Magsaysay, has the confidence and support of our Government and people. We know how successfully he has defended human freedom in his relentless fight against communism. We know, too, that he is the symbol of integrity in public office and that because of his honesty, his courage and his vision he has the unquestioning support of the Filipino masses. The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, General Carlos P. Romulo is held in affectionate regard all over the United States because we see in his record, in war and in peace, the highest qualities of courage, statesmanship and patriotism. These two men fought as soldiers in the Second World War. We in America cannot forget those who served under the colors and risked their lives for us. To the American people these two men symbolize Bataan, and Bataan is enshrined in every American heart.

Mr. Speaker, to speak of Bataan is to speak of General Douglas MacArthur. History will accord to this great American hero the niche of fame he has earned by his valor and by his incomparable record as a soldier-statesman. When the petty passions of today are forgotten, he will emerge in his full stature as one of America's immortals. True greatness can only be appreciated given the perspective of time. Nothing can dim the luster of his record and his name. To him as well as to all the American and Filipino soldiers who served under his glorious banner, we dedicate today our grateful thoughts.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE AT OGDENSBURG, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8547) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved August 19, 1950, authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the St. Lawrence River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Ogdensburg, be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 4 years and completed within 6 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "1950," insert "heretofore extended by an act approved August 14, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PROJECTS IN MICHIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8807) to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in the first section of the act entitled "An act to revive and reenact the act entitled 'An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada', approved December 16, 1940", approved July 28, 1953 (67 Stat. 225; Public Law 157, 83d Congress), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge, or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, referred to in this act, is commenced on or before July 28, 1959, and completed on or before July 28, 1962."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLFUL DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT OR MOTOR VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 319) to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7913) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo., all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the following described lands lying and being in Cape Girardeau, county of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri: Beginning at a point in the easterly line of Lorimier Street which point is distant 100 feet northwardly from the intersection of the easterly line of Lorimier Street with the center line of Themis Street extended eastwardly; running thence south 82 degrees 59 minutes east, on a line parallel with the center line of Themis Street extended, a distance of 240 feet to a point; thence south 6 degrees and 58 minutes west, on a line parallel with the easterly line of Lorimer Street, a distance of 280 feet to a point; thence north 82 degrees 59 minutes west, on a line parallel with the center line of Themis Street extended, a distance of 240 feet to a point in the easterly line of Lorimier Street; thence north 6 degrees 58 minutes east along the easterly line of Lorimier Street a distance of 280 feet to the point or place of beginning, as shown on plat of Post Office and Court House Site, Cape Girardeau, Mo.; made by Albert J. Chandler, assistant construction engineer, dated June 10, 1941, and by reference made a part thereof; together with the improvements thereon except the library building. As consideration for such conveyance, the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo., shall, concurrent therewith, convey by deed to the United States of America, free of all liens, taxes, and encumbrances, all right, title, and interest of the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo., in and to the following described lands lying and being in Cape Girardeau, county of Cape Girardeau, State of Missouri: Fronting 125.5 feet on the southerly side of Broadway Street and extending of that width in a southwardly direction along the easterly side of Fountain Street a distance of 165.175 feet to the northerly side of a 9-foot ally; being the same premises acquired by the United States November 19, 1907, in condemnation proceedings instituted in the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southeastern Division, Judicial District of Missouri, and designated as Case No. 19 in the records of said court.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized pursuant to this act shall restore all right, title, and interest to lands formerly owned by and exchanged between the United States of America and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo. The Attorney General of the United States of America shall approve in writing the title to the property to be conveyed by the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo., prior to the delivery of the deed from the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7611) to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), those officers of the Naval Reserve—

(a) who were selected for promotion to lieutenant or lieutenant commander by selection boards of officers whose reports were approved by the Secretary of the Navy on April 11, 1952, April 14, 1952, April 22, 1952, April 25, 1952, May 20, 1952, or May 29, 1952; and

(b) who were promoted to the grade for which selected while on active duty,

shall be considered to have been promoted on the date which is stipulated in the appointing orders to be the date of rank in the grade to which promoted, and shall be entitled to pay, allowances, and precedence from this date of rank.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS FOR YELLOW FEVER RESEARCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8390) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2438, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409), is amended by striking out "$125 per month" and inserting in lieu thereof "$200 per month."

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 8390, was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMED SERVICES INTEGRATION ACT OF 1948

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8477) to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 363) is amended by—

(1) amending section 203 to read as follows:

"SEC. 203. Women commissioned in the Regular Navy under the provisions of this title shall not have permanent commissioned grade on the active list of the Regular Navy above that of commander. The number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy in the permanent grades of commander and lieutenant commander shall not exceed 10 percent and 20 percent, respectively, of the number of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy in the grades of ensign and above at any one time. Computations to determine such numbers shall be made at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually. Whenever a final fraction occurs in any computation made pursuant to this section, the nearest whole number shall be taken and if such fraction be one-half the next higher whole number shall be taken. Upon determining such numbers the Secretary of the Navy may further determine the number, which may be a lesser number, of women officers on the active list of the line of the Regular Navy which may serve in each of these grades, and if the number so determined in the grade of commander is less than the computed number the number determined in the grade of lieutenant commander may exceed the computed number by the amount of such difference. The numbers so determined shall be held and considered as the authorized numbers until subsequent computations and determinations are made. No woman officer of the Regular Navy shall be reduced in grade or pay, or be separated from the active list, as the result of any such computation or determination.";

(2) amending section 206 (b) by—

(A) inserting before the word "promotion" the word "permanent"; and

(B) adding at the end of the section the following sentences: "A woman officer of the grade of ensign in the Regular Navy or the Naval Reserve on active duty may be temporarily appointed to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) under regulations prescribed by the President and when so appointed shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of such grade from the date of eligibility for the temporary appointment. The permanent appointment of a woman officer so temporarily appointed shall not be vacated by reason of such temporary appointment.";

(3) amending section 206 (d) by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Women lieutenant commanders and lieutenants of the line of the Regular Navy shall become eligible for consideration by a selection board for promotion to the next higher grade in the fiscal year on June 30 of which they will have completed 4 years of service in their grades and women lieutenants (junior grade) of the line of the Regular Navy shall become so eligible after they will have completed such periods of service in grade as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Women lieutenant commanders, lieutenants, and lieutenants (junior grade) shall retain their eligibility for consideration for selection for promotion until recommended for promotion in the approved report of a board on selection or until separated from the active list.";

(4) amending section 206 (i) by adding the following sentence at the end of the section: "In addition, for a period of 4 years after the effective date of this amendatory act, when determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be required for the needs of the service, there shall be furnished the appropriate selection board the number of those officers in the grade of lieutenant who will complete 13 years of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve in the current fiscal year and who, if not selected for promotion to the next higher grade, may be recommended to be retained on the active list until June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 15 years of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve.";

(5) amending section 206 (k) by changing the period at the end of the section to a semicolon and adding the following: "if such computation produces an indeterminate or inequitable number, the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe a number which is equitable. In addition, for a period of 4 years after the effective date of this amendatory act, when determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be required for the needs of the service, there shall be furnished the appropriate selection board considering women staff officers the number of those officers of the grade of lieutenant who will complete 13 years of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve in the current fiscal year and who, if not selected for promotion to the next higher grade, may be recommended to be retained on the active list until June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 15 years of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve.";

(6) amending section 207 (j) by—

(A) inserting after the words "to the next higher grade" the words "and who have not been recommended for retention on the active list by a selection board pursuant to section 206 (i) or section 206 (k),"; and

(B) adding at the end of the section the following sentence: "Women officers of the grade of lieutenant of the Regular Navy who have been recommended for retention on the active list by a selection board pursuant to section 206 (i) or section 206 (k) shall be honorably discharged on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 15 years of active commissioned service in the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve, with a lump-sum payment computed as prescribed above."; and

(7) amending section 213 by—

(A) adding within the parentheses contained in subsection (a) after the words "Marine Corps" the words "or as otherwise provided in this section";

(B) redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e);

(C) adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) Women commissioned in the Regular Marine Corps under the provisions of this title shall not have permanent commissioned grade on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps above that of lieutenant colonel. The number of women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps in the permanent grades of lieutenant colonel and major shall not exceed 10 percent and 20 percent, respectively, of the number of women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps in the grades of second lieutenant and above at any one time. Computations to determine such numbers shall be made at such times that the needs of the service require but not less than once annually. Whenever a final fraction occurs in any computation made pursuant to this section, the nearest whole number shall be taken and if such fraction be one-half the next higher whole number shall be taken. Upon determining such numbers, the Secretary of the Navy may further determine the number, which may be a lesser number, of women officers on the active list of the Regular Marine Corps which may serve in each

of those grades, and the number so further determined shall be held and considered as the authorized numbers until subsequent computations and determinations are made. No woman officer of the Regular Marine Corps shall be reduced in grade or pay, or be separated from the active list, as the result of any such computation or determination."

(D) adding the following new subsections:

"(f) The number to be furnished the appropriate selection board in respect to the promotion of women officers of the Regular Marine Corps to the grades of lieutenant colonel and major shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy as of the date of the convening of the board and shall be equal to the number of vacancies existing for such officers in the grade concerned, plus the estimated number of such vacancies which will occur during the ensuing 12-month period and minus the number of such officers then on the promotion list."

"(g) Women officers of the grades of captain and first lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps whose names on June 30 of the fiscal year in which they complete 13 and 7 years' active commissioned service, respectively, in the Regular Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve are not then on a promotion list for promotion to the next higher grade shall be honorably discharged from the Marine Corps on that date with a lump-sum payment computed on the basis of 2 months' active-duty pay at the time of their discharge for each year of commissioned service, but not to exceed a total of 2 years' pay. For the purposes of this subsection a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years' commissioned service upon which to base such lump-sum payment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING LAWS RELATING TO GRADE OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND MARINE CORPS UPON RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8904) to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That—

(1) subsections 203 (a) and 203 (e) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1085, 1086) are amended by striking the words "during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946,"; and

(2) section 5 of the act of August 21, 1941, as amended (62 Stat. 1085), is further amended by striking the words "during the period September 9, 1940, to June 30, 1946,".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2 of the act of July 16, 1953 (ch. 203, 67 Stat. 175), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This act takes effect on June 29, 1948."

(b) A retired member of the Army or the Air Force would have been eligible to be retired in a higher grade or advanced to a higher grade on a retired list if the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section had been in effect at the time of his discharge or release from active duty as a commissioned officer, shall, if he applies within 1 year after the effective date of this act, be advanced on the applicable retired list to that higher grade, and be entitled to retired pay on and after the effective date of this act at the rate prescribed by section 5 of the act of July 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 507), as amended, for that grade.

SEC. 3. Section 10 (b) (2) of the act of July 24, 1941, as added by subsection 8 (a) of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 28), is amended by adding after the word "act" the words "or title III of the act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 829)."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection 10 (e) of the act of July 24, 1941, as added by subsection 8 (a) of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 28), is repealed effective February 21, 1946.

(b) Subsection 203 (f) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1086) is repealed.

(c) Section 1 (c) of the act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 615), repealing section 7 (c) of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 26), is effective February 21, 1946.

(d) No part of this act deprives any member or former member of the Armed Forces of entitlement to the retired or retirement pay to which he was entitled on the day before the day on which that part takes effect.

SEC. 5. No person is entitled to advancement on the retired list or to an increase in retired or retirement pay because of this act for any period before the effective date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PROVISIONS OF ACTS AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF 6 MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2005) to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367), as amended (10 U. S. C. 903), authorizing the payment of a 6 months' death gratuity upon the death of certain Army personnel is further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereto the following: "*And provided further*, That the words 'relative' and 'parent,' as used herein, shall include a person who has stood in loco parentis to the decedent at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year."

SEC. 2. The act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended (34 U. S. C. 943), authorizing the payment of a 6 months' death gratuity upon the death of certain naval and Marine Corps personnel, is further amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding thereto the following: "*And provided further*, That the words 'relative' and 'parent,' as used herein, shall include a person who has stood in loco parentis to the decedent at any time prior to the entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply likewise in all cases where a 6 months' death gratuity is now or may hereafter be authorized by law to be paid upon the death of other persons on the same basis as provided in the said act of December 17, 1919, as amended, or the said act of June 4, 1920, as amended.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall apply in all cases of death occurring on and after June 27, 1950, but nothing contained herein shall be construed to authorize any payment of death gratuity when payment on account of death of the decedent shall have been made to any person entitled thereto under the provisions of law in effect at the time of such payment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "by", strike the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: 'The terms "parent" and "relative", as used herein, include a stepparent, parent by adoption, and any person, including a former stepparent, who last stood in loco parentis to the member at any time before his death for at least 5 years'."

On page 2, line 6, after the word "by", strike the remainder of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adding the following new sentence at the end thereof: 'The terms "parent" and "relative", as used herein, include a stepparent, parent by adoption, and any person, including a former stepparent, who last stood in loco parentis to the member at any time before his death for at least 5 years'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD TO USE GRADE AUTHORIZED UNDER WHICH THEY RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1834) to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "*Provided*, That" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That for the purpose of the computation of (b) above, the retired or retirement pay of each commissioned officer of the Coast Guard who, upon retirement, was advanced one grade pursuant to the provisions of the act of January 12, 1923 (Public Law 381, 67th Cong.), shall, unless a higher rank or grade is authorized by any provision of law, be based upon the commissioned officer grade authorized for such officer by such act: *Provided further*, That."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS BETWEEN CERTAIN UNITED STATES PORTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7874) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either di-

rectly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 3269, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1957, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and passengers and merchandise may be transported on Canadian vessels between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 7874, was laid on the table.

GRANTING INCREASE IN ANNUITIES OF CERTAIN FORMER CIVILIAN OFFICIALS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 842) granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each individual receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944, now or hereafter drawing an annuity of less than $2,160 shall be paid an additional amount of $25 a month in the amount such individual now or hereafter otherwise receives under such act but not to exceed 25 percent of his present annuity or an increase of a lesser amount sufficient to bring an individual's annuity up to and not to exceed $2,160.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first month that begins after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF OFFICERS OF THE NURSE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9838) to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during a period of not more than 12 months after enactment of this act, any officer on the active list of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy or any officer of the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve in a permanent grade not above lieutenant who is qualified in one or more of the specialties of dietetics, physical therapy, or occupational therapy, may be, upon her application, transferred to and appointed in the Medical Service Corps of the Regular Navy subject to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy. An officer so transferred shall be appointed in her permanent grade with the precedence held by her at the time of transfer and upon transfer she may be reappointed to a higher permanent or temporary grade which corresponds to a higher temporary grade in which she was serving at the time of transfer. The reappointment in a higher temporary grade of an officer so transferred shall be regarded for all purposes as having been effected under the same authority of law pursuant to which she was serving in a higher temporary grade at time of such transfer. The running mate of an officer transferred in accordance with this authority shall be, upon transfer, a woman line officer or a male officer, as the case may be, of the Regular Navy of appropriate precedence assigned by the Secretary of the Navy. Officers so transferred who at the time of transfer had to their credit leave accrued, but not taken, shall not, by reason of such transfer, lose such accrued leave.

SEC. 2. All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to authorized grades, distribution in grade, selection for promotion, promotion and retirement of women staff officers of the Regular Navy appointed pursuant to the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 356, ch. 449), as amended, or the act of June 24, 1952 (66 Stat. 155, ch. 457) shall be construed to apply in like manner to officers transferred and appointed to the Medical Service Corps under the authority of this act; however, officers transferred and reappointed pursuant to this act shall not be subject to existing provisions of law relating to age limitations for appointments.

SEC. 3. All provisions of law relating to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, and emoluments of women staff officers of the Regular Navy shall apply to officers transferred and appointed to the Medical Service Corps under the authority of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING $100 PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5478) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to pay therefrom $100 to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota who is living at the date of enactment of this act. Such payment shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 2. No money paid to Indians under this act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons. Before any payment is made under this act, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify and accept the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Payments made under this act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2 (a) (7), 402 (a) (7), and 1002 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 42, secs. 302 (a) (7), 602 (a) (7), and 1202 (a) (8)).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TO COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO THE POWER TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN INTERSTATE COMPACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5274) extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 111 of title 4 of the United States Code is amended by inserting "(a)" before "The consent of Congress" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) For the purpose of this section, the term 'States' means the several States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." and substitute in lieu thereof: "Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING INSPECTION AND CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN MECHANICALLY PROPELLED VESSELS CARRYING PASSENGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7952) to require the inspection and certificaton of certain mechanically propelled vessels carrying passengers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act, unless the context requires otherwise—

(a) The term "passenger" means every person carried on board a mechanically propelled vessel other than—

(1) the owner or his representative;

(2) the master and the bona fide members of the crew engaged in the business of

the vessel who have contributed no consideration for their carriage and who are paid for their services;

(3) any employee of the owner of the vessel engaged in the busines of the owner, except when the vessel is operating under a bareboat charter;

(4) any employee of the bareboat charterer of the vessel engaged in the business of the bareboat charterer; or

(5) any guest on board a vessel which is being used exclusively for pleasure purposes who has not contributed any consideration, directly or indirectly, for his carriage.

(b) The term "mechanically propelled vessel" means any vessel propelled in whole or in part by steam or by any form of mechanical or electric power, which is (1) of 15 gross tons or less, or (2) of more than 15 and less than 100 gross tons and not more than 65 feet in length measured from end to end over the deck including sheer. The term includes (1) any domestic vessel operating on the navigable waters of the United States, or on the high seas outside of those waters and within the normal operating range of the vessel, and (2) any foreign vessel departing from a port of the United States. The term does not include (1) any public vessel of the United States or of a foreign state, and (2) any motor propelled lifeboat forming part of a vessel's lifesaving equipment.

(c) The term "International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea" means the "International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1948" or any similar international convention which comes into force and effect after ratification by the United States Senate.

(d) Except as used in subsections (b) and (c) of section 7, the term "carrying passengers" includes only vessels which carry more than six passengers.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall, at least once every 3 years, cause to be inspected each mechanically propelled vessel carrying more than 6 passengers, and shall satisfy himself that every such vessel (1) is of a structure suitable for the service in which it is to be employed; (2) is equipped with the proper appliances for lifesaving and fire protection in accordance with applicable laws, or rules and regulations prescribed by him; (3) has suitable accommodations for passengers and the crew; and (4) is in a condition to warrant the belief that it may be used, operated, and navigated with safety to life in the proposed service and that all applicable requirements of marine safety statutes and regulations thereunder are faithfully complied with.

(b) The Secretary may prescribe reasonable fees or charges for (1) any inspection made and (2) any certificate, license, or permit issued pursuant to this act or the rules and regulations established hereunder.

SEC. 3. In order to secure effective provision against hazard to life created by mechanically propelled vessels carrying passengers and to carry out in the most effective manner the provisions of this act, the Secretary shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary with respect to design, construction, alteration, or repair of such vessels, including the superstructures, hulls, accommodations for passengers and crew, fittings, equipment, appliances, propulsive machinery, auxiliary machinery, and boilers; with respect to all materials used in construction, alteration, or repair of such vessels including the fire prevention and fire retardant characteristics of such materials; with respect to equipment and appliances for lifesaving and fire protection; with respect to the operation of such vessels, including the waters in which they may be navigated and the number of passengers which they may carry; with respect to the requirements of the manning of such vessels and the duties and qualifications of the operators and crews thereof; and with respect to the inspection of any or all the foregoing.

SEC. 4. (a) No mechanically propelled vessel shall be operated or navigated until a certificate of inspection in such form as may be prescribed by the regulations promulgated by the Secretary under the authority of this act, has been issued to the vessel indicating that the vessel is in compliance with the provisions of this act, and the rules and regulations established hereunder; except that when a foreign passenger-carrying vessel belongs to a nation which is signatory to the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, a valid safety certificate issued to the vessel pursuant to the Convention may be accepted in lieu of the required certificate of inspection.

(b) Any mechanically propelled vessel to which a valid certificate of inspection has been issued pursuant to this section shall during the tenure of the certificate be in full compliance with the terms of the certificate.

(c) A certificate of inspection issued pursuant to this section may at any time be voluntarily surrendered and shall be withdrawn and suspended or revoked for noncompliance with any applicable requirements of this act or regulations thereunder.

SEC. 5. Any owner, master, or person in charge of any vessel subject to this act who violates the provisions of this act, or the rules and regulations established hereunder, shall be liable to the United States in a penalty of not more than $1,000 for each such violation, for which sum the passenger-carrying vessel shall be liable and may be seized and proceeded against by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the violation.

SEC. 6. To the extent that any existing provision of law is in conflict with any provision of this act, or with any rule or regulation duly prescribed pursuant hereto, the provisions of this act, and the rules and regulations established hereunder shall prevail.

SEC. 7. (a) The act of January 18, 1897 (29 Stat. 489; 46 U. S. C. 520), is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 4426 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (34 Stat. 193; 46 U. S. C. 404), is amended to read as follows:

"4426. The hulls and boilers of every ferryboat, canal boat, yacht or other small craft or like character propelled by steam, shall be inspected under the provisions of this title. Such other provisions of law for the better security of life as may be applicable to such vessels shall, by the regulations of the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, also be required to be complied with before a certificate of inspection shall be granted, and no such vessel shall be navigated without a licensed engineer and a licensed pilot: *Provided,* That in open steam launches of 10 gross tons and under, one person, if duly qualified, may serve in the double capacity of pilot and engineer. All vessels of above 15 gross tons carrying freight for hire and all vessels of above 15 gross tons and in excess of 65 feet in length carrying passengers for hire, but not engaged in fishing as a regular business, propelled by gas, fluid, naphtha, or electric motors, shall be subject to all the provisions of this section relating to the inspection of hulls and boilers and requiring engineers and pilots, and for any violation of the provisions of title 52 of the Revised Statutes applicable to such vessels, or of rules or regulations lawfully established thereunder, and to the extent to which such provisions of law and regulations are so applicable, the said vessels, their masters, officers, and owners shall be subject to the provisions of sections 4496, 4497, 4498, 4499, and 4500 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 494–498), relating to the imposition and enforcement of penalties and the enforcement of law: *Provided, however,* That until June 30, 1956, no vessel registered or licensed as a vessel of the United States of 15 gross tons or less on December 31, 1953, shall be deemed to be subject to the inspection provisions of this section notwithstanding the fact that such vessel may thereafter be found to have a tonnage in excess of 15 gross tons, unless such finding results from an alteration in the length, breadth, or depth affected after December 31, 1953."

(c) Section 7 of the act of April 25, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 165; 46 U. S. C. 526f), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. No such motorboat, and no other vessel of 15 gross tons or less propelled by machinery other than steam, while carrying passengers for hire, shall be operated or navigated except in charge of a person duly licensed for such service by the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating. Whenever any person applies to be licensed as operator of any motorboat, or of any other vessel of 15 gross tons or less propelled by machinery, carrying passengers for hire, the Secretary shall make diligent inquiry as to his character, and shall carefully examine the applicant orally as well as the proofs which he presents in support of his claim, and if the Secretary is satisfied that his capacity, experience, habits of living, and character are such to warrant the belief that he can safely be entrusted with the duties and responsibilities of the station for which he makes application, the Secretary shall grant him a license authorizing him to discharge such duties on any such motorboat, or on any other vessel of 15 gross tons or less propelled by machinery, carrying passengers for hire, for the term of 5 years. Such license shall be subject to suspension or revocation on the same grounds and in the same manner with like procedure as is provided in the case of suspension or revocation of licenses of officers under the provisions of section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C. 1952 edition, title 46, sec. 239): *Provided,* That motorboats and other vessels of 15 gross tons or less propelled by machinery shall not be required to carry licensed officers except as required in this act: *And provided further,* That licenses herein prescribed shall not be required of motorboats or of any other vessels of 15 gross tons or less propelled by machinery engaged in fishing contests previously arranged and announced."

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to amend, alter, or otherwise affect the requirements of any International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea.

SEC. 9. This act shall become effective on January 1, 1957, or on the first day of the sixth month following the prescription of rules and regulations by the Secretary under section 3, hereof, whichever is later.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 11. If any provisions of this act, or the application of any provision of this act to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this act, shall not be affected thereby.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, delete the words "mechanically propelled" and insert in lieu thereof the words "passenger-carrying."

Page 2, line 11, delete the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (6) any person on board a vessel documented and used for tugboat or tow-

boat service of 50 gross tons or more who has not contributed any consideration, directly or indirectly, for his carriage."

Page 2, lines 12 to 25, inclusive, delete in entirety and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(b) The term 'passenger-carrying vessel' means any vessel which carries more than 6 passengers, and which is (1) propelled in whole or in part by steam or by any form of mechanical or electrical power and is of 15 gross tons or less; (2) propelled in whole or in part by steam or by any form of mechanical or electrical power and is of more than 15 and less than 100 gross tons and not more than 65 feet in length measured from end to end over the deck excluding sheer; (3) propelled by sail and is of 700 gross tons or less; or (4) non-self-propelled and is of 100 gross tons or less; except any public vessel of the United States or of any foreign state, or any lifeboat forming part of a vessel's lifesaving equipment. The term includes (1) any domestic vessel operating on the navigable waters of the United States, or on the high seas outside of those waters and within the normal operating range of the vessel, and (2) any foreign vessel departing from a port of the United States."

Page 3, lines 6 to 8, inclusive, delete in entirety.

Page 3, line 9, delete "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

Page 3, lines 12 and 13, delete the words "mechanically propelled vessel carrying more than 6 passengers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "passenger-carrying vessel."

Page 4, lines 4 and 5, delete the words "mechanically propelled vessels carrying passengers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "passenger-carrying vessels."

Page 4, line 22, delete the words "mechanically propelled" and insert in lieu thereof the words "passenger-carrying."

Page 5, line 10, delete the words "mechanically propelled" and insert in lieu thereof the words "passenger-carrying."

Page 6, lines 4 to 8, inclusive, delete in entirety.

Page 6, line 9, delete "SEC. 7" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 6."

Page 6, line 15, delete the words "or like character" and insert in lieu thereof the words "of like character."

Page 7, line 23, delete the word "affected" and insert in lieu thereof the word "effected."

Page 9, lines 10, 13, 17, and 20, respectively, delete "SEC. 8," "SEC. 9," "SEC. 10," and "SEC. 11," and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 7," "SEC. 8," "SEC. 9," and "SEC. 10," respectively.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 7952.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 7952, as amended, is to require that certain vessels which carry more than six passengers for hire shall be subject to inspection and certification by the United States Coast Guard in the interest of safety. The smaller types of commercial passenger-carrying vessels, such as party-fishing boats and small excursion craft, are not now subject to inspection and certification as to seaworthiness. At present the law only requires that mechanically propelled vessels of 15 gross tons and less, carrying passengers for hire, shall be subject to minimum safety requirements. Similarly, sail vessels of 700 gross tons or less and non-self-propelled vessels of 100 gross tons or less must conform only to the very minimum of safety standards.

While the provisions of the Motorboat Act of 1940 and the regulations thereunder are considered to be necessary minimums for pleasure craft, they are deemed to be wholly inadequate for the safety of motor vessels carrying passengers for hire. Yet, there are in the United States well over 8,000 small passenger-carrying vessels of less than 15 gross tons which are not subject to inspection. Two of the most tragic accidents of recent years occurred off Montauk Point, Long Island, in 1951, involving uninspected vessels of this category, resulting in the loss of 56 lives. Both accidents aroused much concern in the New York area and led to the preparation of the bill now before us.

It was clear from the testimony before our committee, that adequate inspection of small passenger-carrying vessels is needed, because existing requirements are insufficient to provide safeguards against the causes of most marine casualties, that is, first, lack of seaworthiness; and second, overloading. In the words of the commandant of the Coast Guard:

> Lack of seaworthiness and overloading have been the basic causes of some of the more serious casualties—among the small uninspected passenger-carrying vessels.

During the course of the hearings, statistics were introduced to show that, in recent years, casualties on inspected vessels have been relatively minor as compared with those on uninspected vessels. In the light of this background, our committee found that lack of adequate inspection standards for small craft have largely contributed to unnecessary loss of human life. It, therefore, considered that the bill H. R. 7952, as amended, should be enacted into law.

During the hearings, the committee heard from Members of the Congress, representatives of the United States Coast Guard, and the small-boat industry, including private-yacht men. All agreed upon the need for legislation. Passage of this bill will make a big step forward toward insuring safety for the large and growing number of people who patronize small passenger-carrying vessels in the navigable waters of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow the military construction bill will be called up for general debate. Then on Wednesday the conference report on the farm bill will be the first order of business and following that the further consideration of the military construction bill under the 5-minute rule. Of course, there is other legislation, too.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

CHARLES O. FERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 909) for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons enumerated below the sums specified, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States, as reimbursement for personal effects destroyed as a result of the fire which occurred on January 11, 1953, at the Alaska Road Commission camp at Johnson River, Alaska: Charles O. Ferry, $275.50; Stanley R. Buck, $1,339; Ray P. Cady, $150.85; and Arthur T. Hartman, $65.

SEC. 2. No part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATHAN PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1096) for the relief of Nathan Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Nathan Phillips, of 111 Tyler Street, Rochester, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for bond posted for Fuel Pitruszynski in 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or

attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPICER ICE & COAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1476) for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Spicer Ice & Coal Co., Groton, Conn., the sum of $3,354.56, in full satisfaction of the claim of such company against the United States for an amount of additional compensation under contracts numbered T44 cg–10 and T44 cg–11 equal to the difference between the contract prices at which coal was delivered by such company under such contracts to the Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., and the prices which such firm would have bid on such contracts if it had anticipated the termination of legislation under which it received from the Office of Price Administration, during a portion of the time in which deliveries were made under such contracts, a compensatory adjustment to assist such company in defraying the payment of freight charges upon coal so delivered: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OATHER S. HALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Oather S. Hall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., that Oather S. Hall, Clarksville, Ark., is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,270.45 and any interest accrued thereon. Such sum represents the unpaid balance of a loan secured by a Farmers' Home Administration mortgage (dated February 20, 1951), which, through the negligence of the clerk of the local circuit court, was never signed by the borrower. The borrower subsequently sold the livestock, which constituted security under the mortgage, and left the United States; and the said Oather S. Hall has been financially able for such sum because the mortgage was executed by the Farmers' Home Administration in Johnson County, Ark., while he was serving as Farmers' Home Administration county supervisor for that county.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KELMOOR FOX AND FUR FARM, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4851) for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc., of Medina, Ohio, the sum of $14,140. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm against the United States for compensation for the loss of 36 iridium platinum, hybrid, and silver foxes, and for related losses and damage, resulting from the activities of certain aircraft of the United States Army which circled over such farm at a very low altitude on April 17, 1947. Such claims are not cognizable under the tort claims procedures provided in title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike all after the enacting clause, and insert "That notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed (1) to accept and consider any claim filed under the act of July 3, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, by the Kelmoor Fox & Fur Farm, Inc., of Medina, Ohio, for compensation for the loss of iridium platinum, hybrid, and silver foxes, and for related losses and damage, alleged to have resulted from the operation of certain aircraft of the United States Army on April 17, 1947, and (2) to award to the said Kelmoor Fox & Fur Farm, Inc., any amount of compensation payable under such act to which it would have been entitled, had such claim been filed within the time and in the manner provided by such act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. R. ZANES & COMPANY OF LOUISIANA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5382) for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc., is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount erroneously levied as increased customs duty on account of merchandise imported by them, because of a clerical error in the entry of such merchandise (New Orleans consumption entry numbered 3137 of January 29, 1952), such error being perpetuated by an appraisement based thereon which became conclusive with respect to all parties upon the lapse of 30 days after the date of such appraisement.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "amount" insert "of $146,907.45."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF ROBERT BRADFORD BICKERSTAFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5453) for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff (a pilot in the U. S. Army Air Corps who died on January 5, 1945), the sum of $6,896.14 plus interest on such sum computed at 6 percent per annum from September 7, 1950, to the date such sum is paid under this act. The payment of such sum, plus interest, shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States for refund of amounts paid by such estate as income tax and interest under a construction by the Treasury Department of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 which was rejected by the Supreme Court of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. R. ZANES & COMPANY OF LOUISIANA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5813) for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc., the sum of $306.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc., against the United States on account of the erroneous liquidation of the New Orleans consumption entry No. 2804 of December 4, 1952, which entry incorrectly classified the merchandise involved, resulting in excessive custom duties being charged against such merchandise: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in con-

nection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VINCENT N. CALDES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6313) for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vincent N. Caldes, West Point Pleasant, N. J., the sum of $1,240.35. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Vincent N. Caldes was held liable on May 5, 1955, in the courts of the State of New Jersey, as the result of an accident which occurred on February 7, 1952, and which involved a Government vehicle being driven by the said Vincent N. Caldes in the course of his duties as an employee of the Department of the Navy, United States naval ammunition depot, Earle, Red Bank, N. J. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Vincent N. Caldes shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Act", strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-8039686, Bartol, Dimitri.
A-7828332, Blicher, Adolf.
A-7948074, Blicher, Anna.
A-7945613, Crynberg, Natalia.
A-6848437, Chen, Tung-Kei, now Phillip Kei Chen.
A-6973683, Chow, Liang-Yen.
A-8021361, Chu, Pauline Jo-Nan Chou.
A-7095539, Emmus, Roland.
A-7095540, Emmus, Leida Maria.
A-6881711, Hai-Chow, Lee.
A-6779249, Hnykova, Maria Irena.
A-6962958, Hsu, Carlton W.
A-7395104, Iliescu, Maria, formerly Negoita (nee David).
A-6903727, Irany, Fuad Jalil Zend.
A-7138237, Kao, Lindberg Lin Pai.
A-6159692, Korbel, Josef.
A-6159691, Korbel, Anna.
A-7197504, Korbel, Marie Jana.
A-7197503, Korbel, Anna Catherine.
A-7197505, Korbel, Jan Josef.
A-6837688, Kroha, Rudolph Filip.
1300-127922, Lee, Hai.
T-2659454, Mah, Ling Kam.
A-7061846, Onon, Peter, alias Urunoge, Urrounge or Urgunge Onon.
A-7415227, Onon, Nina (nee Pei-Lien Chen or Lien-Chen Pei), alias Lien-Chin Onon, Narangerel Onon, or Lien-Chen Urrounge.
A-7415228, Onon, Sally, alias Salungwa or Salunga Onon.
A-7779057, Pan, Ju Chu.
A-7809055, Patyk, Jozef, also known as Jozef Franciszek Patyk.
A-8001814, Patyk, Julia (nee Julia Katarzyna Assman).
A-8001815, Patyk, Barbara, also known as Barbara Kazimiera Patyk.
A-6967335, Pe-Sheng, Wang.
A-7858205, Radolli, Constantino.
A-6992030, Siu-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Sira.
A-8082043, Sun, Flora H., also known as Hu Ling Feng.
A-6949479, Sutt, Michael or Mihkel.
A-8952903, Teng, Yung Ching Wang.
A-9690989, Tong, Chu or Sun Fong.
A-9568320, Tsu, Teh Kwei.
A-6967742, Chen, Mei Chio.
A-6881784, Chu, Hu-Nan or Chu Hu-nan.
A-6334725, Donat, Alexander, also known as Mojzesz Grunberg.
A-6334726, Donat, Leona, also known as Laja Grunberg (nee Liberman).
A-6334727, Donat, William, also known as Wlodjimierz Grunberg.
A-6381287, Hou, Ling.
A-9734422, Kow, Lai or Lai Gow.
A-7463421, Valvur, Ludvig.
A-7124540, Vcela, Vladimir.
A-6730656, Verhovsky, Andrew.
A-9554376, Wong, Sau or Shau Wong or Wong Sau.
A-7354808, Wu, Wayne, also known as Wai Ye Wu.
0300-399163, Yip, Kin.
A-9542540, Youw, Lee Ah.
A-6848713, Yu, Ting Chi, also known as Richard Ting Chi Yu.
A-8082029, Zec, John, formerly Ivan Sime Zec.
A-9510296, Bacanovic, Jovo.
A-6923147, Balogh, Barna.
A-6702207, Liu, Lillian Hsuan Yu.
A-7985663, Moh, Tan Yoek, also known as Moh Yeak Tan or Tan Yoeh Heh.
A-6944241, Wu, Tien-Hsing or Edward Tien-Hsing Wu.
A-8082839, Tung, Chen Tse.
A-6912324, Wang, Ven Ling, also known as Raymong Wang.
A-7249877, Berzins, Arvids Voldemars.
0300-390570, Chan, Kan Cheong.
A-6848411, Chiu, Jeanne, also known as Chiu Kung-Chen.
A-7863017, Klavins, Arvids Leonids.
0300-425608, Kwai, Chan or Cheng Kay.
V-606154, Lee, Ling Yun.
A-7863009, Pukulis, Andrejs.
A-5928452, Shee, Lai.
A-5963617, Yen, Pao-Ming.
0300-83904, Yeu, Cheng Cho or Cheng Yeu.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 19, at the beginning of the line for the number insert "A".

Page 4, line 21, strike out the name "Raymong" and insert the name "Raymond."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 31) for the relief of Shih Ming Wang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shih Ming Wang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shih Ming Wang, Chih Shing Hwa, Erich Anton Helfert, Eugene Alexander Figueirdo, Rose Hu Chen, Felisa Ho (nee Chang-Kuon), Balbino Acusin Ariasa, and Adel Kamal, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kathleen Schrater shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENITO QUINTANA SEARA

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) withdrawing suspension of deportation of Benito Quintana Seara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress, in accordance with section 246 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. A. 1256 (a)), withdraws the suspension of deportation in the case of Benito Quintana Seara (A–4363045) which was previously granted by the Attorney General and approved by the Congress.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OTTILIE HITZLBERGER LACHELT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 83) for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt and Maria Michela Federico may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorin Ursulesku Baron may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, and the said Dorin Ursulesku Baron shall be classified as a nonquota alien under the provision of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

"SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of three aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIGITTA POBERETSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1255) for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Brigitta Poberetski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Hugo Wendt, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

After line 7, at the end of the bill, add a new section 2 to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nicholas Menis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio N. Panopoulos, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "For the relief of Brigitta Poberetski and Nickolas Menis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEYER URECKI ET AL.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 580) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Meyer Urecki, Estera Urecki, Nathan Urecki, Shanho Ma, Tsui Ou Cheng Ma, George Mechial, Mourkakos, Suingtuk Jacob Kim, Tai Kang Kim, Ruth Sunyung Kim, Luther Sunil Kim, Lydia Kunder, Lee Fay Fan, and Adam M. Macielinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luigia Pelella shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

SEC. 3. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after name "Mechial" strike out the comma.

On page 1, line 7, after the name Kim," strike out the name "Lydia" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Liidia."

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE OF CERTAIN WAR-BUILT CARGO VESSELS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 513) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized during a period of 6 months after the enactment of this joint resolution, to sell to the Alaska Steamship Co. the C1–M–AV1 type cargo vessels *Square Knot* and *Square Sinnet* on an as is, where is, basis. The sales price for the *Square Knot* shall be the sum of $460,499 which sum shall be reduced by $127 per day as depreciation for the period beginning January 16, 1956, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the vessel. The sales price for the *Square Sinnet* shall be the sum of $463,529 which sum shall be reduced by $126 per day as depreciation for the period beginning January 16, 1956, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the vessel.

(b) Each such sale shall be on the basis of the payment by the purchaser of not less than 25 percent of the vessel sales price at the time of the execution of the vessel sales contract, with balance payable in approximately equal annual installments over the remainder of the 20-year economic life of the vessel, with interest on the portion of the vessel sales price remaining unpaid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance, with interest, shall be secured by a preferred mortgage on the vessel in form satisfactory to the Maritime Administrator.

(c) Any contract of sale executed under authority of this act shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of any such vessel, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated sales price under such contract (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon), or the fair and reasonable scrap value of such vessel, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, whichever is the greater; that such determination shall be final; that in computing the depreciated acquisition cost of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury for income-tax purposes as applicable to such vessel; that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States during the remainder of the 20-year economic life of the vessel or as long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period; and that the foregoing provisions respecting the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States, and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, insert at the end of the line the following:

"Except with the prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce any vessel sold under this joint resolution shall, during the period ending December 31, 1965, or so long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the purchase price, whichever is the longer period, be operated only in service between the west coast of the United States and the Territory of Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 581) to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony Asprakis and Michael Alexis Melgunow may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria P. Morra and Lucy (Lucia) Bisanti may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kaare Moe Johnsen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Lopez Aldama and Alice Petrides (also known as Alice Defotiou and Alice Mathews) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act, exemptions provided for herein shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out the following names: "Alice Petrides (also known as Alice Defotiou and Alice Mathews)" and substitute the following: "Alice Mathews (nee Laife)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 591) to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Philip Cheng, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew I. S. Cheng, citizens of the United State.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Grace Cheng shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Andrew I. S. Cheng, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Skeete shall be held to be classifiable as a returning resident alien.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARRETT NORMAN SOULEN AND MICHAEL HARVEY SOULEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1484) for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 310 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen shall be held to meet the residential requirements set forth in section 323 of that act and shall be eligible to have petitions filed in their behalf by their adoptive United States citizen parent or parents in conformity with that section.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That reentry permits issued pursuant to section 223 of the Immigration and Nationality Act for Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen shall be valid until such time as they become 10 years of age, or until such time as their adoptive father, Garrett H. Soulen, resumes permanent residence in the United States, whichever date occurs earlier."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 590) to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Myrtle Richardson Beane, and Finne Bache, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Tyson Campbell, Edson Rhodes Mills, and Aldo Alvarez, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Colin Noyes Clinch-Jones may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 4. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, after the name "Campbell," strike out the name "Edson Rhodes Mills."

On page 2, after line 7, insert a new section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edson Rhodes Mills may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act."

On page 2, line 8, strike out "SEC. 4." and substitute in lieu thereof "SEC. 5."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 592) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ida Kaganowicz, Wonona Wong Chang (or Yit Chen Wong), Giuseppe Rosario DiStefano, Albert Rossi, Mrs. Kama Asato, Mrs. Tomeko Kishi, Fusa Kimura, and Geu Lau shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Doncovio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments.

On page 1, line 6, after the word "and" strike out "Geu."

On page 1, line 7, after the name "Lau" insert the name "Geu."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN CERTAIN INVENTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4635) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, former employee of the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, by means of an appropriate legal instrument, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions made by the said Robert T. C. Rasmussen, consisting of electric smelting processes for production of silicon-aluminum alloys, manganese alloys, and other alloys and metals, and apparatus therefor, as described and claimed in United States Application for Letters Patent filed in United States Patent Office on July 30, 1952, and February 10, 1953, designated as serial numbers 301,810, 336,212, and 336,213: *Provided, however*, That such legal instrument shall reserve to the Government of the United States, and all

agencies thereof, the right to a nonexclusive, irrevocable royalty-free license for all governmental purposes, and the right to grant sublicenses consistent with the law of any foreign country in which the invention may be patented, for the use of such invention in such country, pursuant to procurement or production for mutual defense purposes.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, before the word "and" insert "including military or economic foreign aid."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report on the bill H. R. 12 is called up for consideration on Wednesday next the time be extended for 1 additional hour, making a total of 2 hours for discussion of the conference report and that at the end of the 2-hour period the previous question will be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, in granting this extra hour I hope the gentleman will be more than generous and give us on this side at least half of the time.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman that I will certainly be generous. I do not know whether I will be more than generous, but it will be my purpose to have the bill fairly and properly presented to the House. I am sure the gentleman knows I will be just as fair as circumstances will permit.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and may I say that the gentleman is to be congratulated for having the time extended. The bill in its present form has never been before the House and it should have more than the normal time for discussion. I therefore commend the gentleman for making this request and I know he will be very fair to those of us who are in opposition to the conference report who may want to speak.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES AGAINST ALDO LORENZO ICARDI

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the question of privilege.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 a. m., in the case of the United States of America against Aldo Lorenzo Icardi. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* ALDO LORENZO ICARDI, CRIMINAL CASE NO. 821–55

Spa ad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws.

The President of the United States to Hon. W. STERLING COLE, Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C., or 1610 44th Street NW., Washington 7, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d date of March, A. D., 1956.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JOHN C. CUGAN,
Deputy Clerk.

NOTE.—Report to New Courthouse between Third Street and John Marshall Place on Constitution Avenue NW., courtroom No. 8.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 455) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative W. STERLING COLE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 16th of April, 1956, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi*, criminal case No. 821–55; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative W. STERLING COLE is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CO-OPS GET THE RUNAROUND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, as part of H. R. 9893, authorizing construction at military installations, we are going to authorize the multi-billion-dollar semi-automatic ground environment air defense system.

Before we begin debate on this bill, I wish once again to call to the attention of my colleagues the threat posed by the SAGE system to the rural telephone and rural electric cooperatives.

First, I want to thank the chairman and members of the Committee on Armed Services for the hearing they granted me on this problem and for the protective language they inserted in the bill and in the report.

As I told the committee, to date the Department of Defense and its agents have shown a marked reluctance to deal with the co-ops, in whose immediate service areas some of these SAGE installations are to be built. I presented evidence of attempts to deliberately bypass the cooperatives.

One case I cited was that of the Sheridan County Electric Cooperative of Medicine Lake, Mont. Last summer, that co-op was almost paralled in its own immediate service area—a mile from its line, as a matter of fact. It may be yet.

I also told the committee of the case of the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative at Circle, Mont. This co-op started out late in September to try to find out how it might fit into the SAGE system. It does not know yet—although plans were far enough along in July of last year to permit circulation among the commercial independent companies of a list of proposed sites.

On April 15 last year, the Seattle district engineer asked the Sheridan County Electric Cooperative, which already is furnishing power to one Air Force installation, if it could serve as gap filler in the SAGE system, and if so, for how much.

The cooperative replied that it could, promptly following up with details such as rates.

The Corps of Engineers broke off negotiations about June 17, by which time the co-op, which has a line within 1 mile of the site, had gone to considerable engineering expense, including acquisition of right-of-way.

On June 23, well after the cooperative had made its offer, the district engineer asked the Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., if it were interested in serving the facility. The utility said it was, submitting on July 18 an offer lower than that of the cooperative.

Learning of this, the cooperative came back on August 23 and trimmed its offer to $3,140 a year under the Montana-Dakota figure. This latter offer was not accepted, the Department of the Army told me, because "accepting successive competitive offers from each supplier would delay the utility connection beyond completion date of the facility with only minor savings to the Government."

So the contract was awarded to the commercial utility, subject to approval of the Army power procurement officer.

I questioned this award on several grounds.

First, the installation is in the immediate service area of the cooperative.

Second, $3,140 a year is more than a minor savings.

Then, there was the time element. The cooperative was approached 2 months prior to the commercial utility. The latter came into the picture after the cooperative had made its offer—leading me to wonder if the commercial utility had been furnished details of the cooperative's offer. That question has not yet been answered.

There also was a note of urgency in the initial inquiry to the cooperative, which was told that "it is anticipated that construction of the facility will start about June 15, 1955, and that it will become operative about November 1, 1955." It is difficult to reconcile this with the fact that the initial approach to the commercial utility was dated June 23—or 8 days after construction was anticipated to have started.

In November, I was notified that the Army power procurement officer was withholding approval of the contract and that he would negotiate further with both suppliers.

The case of the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative began early in October when our senior Senator—Senator MURRAY—received an inquiry from that organization. The co-op offered its facilities, personnel and maintenance equipment to the SAGE system. Our Senators and I asked the Air Force about it. We were advised that since the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s long lines department was the prime contractor for this entire project, the inquiry was being forwarded to them.

I then asked the Air Force what provision the prime contract between the Air Force and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. makes for utilization of telephone facilities existing in an area. That resulted in a correction. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. "is not the prime contractor, as I inadvertently stated in my letter to you of October 21, 1955," Maj. Gen. J. W. Kelly wrote me on December 15, "but rather acts as a focal point for overall systems coordination among the Air Defense Command, associated companies of the Bell system and the numerous independent companies."

I do not know the difference between a "prime contractor" and a "focal point." I do know that defense is everybody's business; that we should use all our available facilities in our defense effort.

Now it is proposed that we authorize these SAGE contracts for periods of 10 years, and it is proposed that the investment be amortized in 10 years. So the Federal Government is, in effect, subsidizing the remaining life of the electrict and telephone facilities to be built under the SAGE program.

When these contracts go to others than the companies now serving a particular area, the Government is subsidizing competition to the detriment of the firms now serving the area. If the Federal Government can subsidize duplicating facilities in the service area of a cooperative, it can parallel these facilities in the area of a commercial independent telephone company or a Bell System affiliate or a commercial electric company.

To the best of my knowledge, however, the only companies we would parallel and destroy under the SAGE program, as it has operated to date, are the cooperatives, organized by the people in sparsely settled areas to furnish their own electric or telephone service after the commercial utilities were either unwilling or unable to do so. These cooperatives are repaying money loaned them by our Federal Government. If we subsidize duplicating facilities in their service areas, we will be giving public funds to one group to enable it to destroy another group to which we have loaned public funds.

The Committee on Armed Services was very cooperative, amending the section, authorizing procurement of communication services for the SAGE system, to include these words on page 51 of the printed bill:

> In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communcation common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas.

On page 19 of the report on this bill—House Report No. 1890—the committee called attention to this sentence in these words:

> It might be pointed out at this time that the last sentence of the provision will insure that in the procurement of communication services required in connection with the SAGE project, communication common carriers, including cooperatives, shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the furnishing of such services within their respective service areas. The Air Force is required to utilize to the fullest extent the available facilities and capabilities of such carriers rather than procure the construction of parallel lines which might duplicate such facilities or capabilities. Thus only in the event that a carrier is unwilling or unable to furnish required service within its service areas shall another carrier be requested to provide such service.

I was satisfied that the hearings, the bill and the report would provide for adequate protection of the service areas of both the rural electric and telephone cooperatives. I so wrote the chairman, members of the committee, and the other Members of this body who had written me about this matter.

However, I am beginning to have my doubts. In November of last year, I learned that the long lines department of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. had been advised of the selection by the Air Defense Command in September of two radar sites in the service area of the Mid-Rivers Cooperative.

To date, my files show that the cooperative has been informed of only one of those sites.

Part of the explanation for the delay may be in the prime contractor or focal point, whichever words you wish to use. At least in my part of the country, the Bell System does not have a history of concern for the development of rural telephone cooperatives.

Bell System people hold many key positions in the Defense agencies. For example, the assistant to the head of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.'s international long lines department is Mr. Harold M. Botkin, who returned to A. T. & T. after serving as Office of Defense Mobilization Assistant Director for Telecommunications from September 17, 1954 to July 21, 1955, in a WOC—without compensation— status. In this capacity, on loan from A. T. & T., he advised the ODM director on the development of telecommunications policies, plans and programs for operation in both peacetime and in time of national emergency.

Mr. Botkin served under Mr. Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. During the hearings which proceded this confirmation, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was told that Mr. Cooley was on a semiretirement basis from the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co.

One stock explanation of the delay in notifying the cooperatives of plans for the SAGE system is that "we don't know yet where the installations are going to be."

"We" knew enough about where they were proposed to send out a list of proposed sites to the commercial independent telephone companies early last July. Apparently "we" are in doubt about sites only where the cooperatives are concerned.

This bill establishes at $222 million the maximum contingent liability of the Government under termination provisions of contracts authorized hereunder. If that figure is anywhere near accurate, somebody must know what lines they propose to build and where. If no one knows, then how was that figure arrived at? The engineering is being done by Western Electric, A. T. & T. subsidiary.

Another explanation for the delay may be in the liaison.

Among witnesses before the Armed Services Committee on March 7 was Maj. Gen. Gordon A. Blake, United States Air Force Director of Communications-Electronics. As part of his testimony, he read into the record a letter dated December 7, 1955, from the Rural Electrification Administration to REA telephone borrowers. That letter said in part as follows:

> The USITA, through Col. William C. Henry, USITA military liaison officer, is serving as the coordinating agent for the independent telephone industry and working with the Bell System in carrying out the program.

General Blake said the word "independent" includes cooperatives.

USITA stands for United States Independent Telephone Association. The association bitterly oposed extension of the REA program into the rural telephone field. The 1949 hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are revealing on this point. One of the opposition witnesses at these hearings was Colonel Henry. He and the organization for which he speaks still oppose the rural telephone program.

The commercial independent telephone companies have, and should have, representation on the SAGE General Coordination and sector committees. Their representatives are, and should be, sitting in on discussions which will vitally affect their telephone operations.

But these people, who are not in sympathy with the telephone cooperatives, should not be allowed to speak for the cooperatives. The coperatives are entitled to their own representation, separate and distinct from the USITA, to which the cooperatives do not even belong. I should mention here that this case is the first time I have ever heard of the cooperatives being lumped together with the independents.

Nor can the Rural Electrification Administration speak for its borrowers in SAGE policy discussions.

This is pointed out clearly in a letter to me under date of March 9, 1956 from Mr. C. R. Thiessen, of Lambert, Mont., president of both the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative and the Montana Telephone Association, the State organization of telephone cooperatives.

Mr. Thiessen's letter follows:

This is the letter I promised to write you following our telephone conversation this morning regarding a meeting held at our offices in Circle, Mont., with Mr. K. P. Todd, vice president and general manager; Sid Jones, commercial manager, and Al Sweeney, all of Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. of Helena, Mont., where we discussed working agreement in regard to the SAGE program.

Mr. Todd furnished us with a letter from H. R. Huntley, assistant chief engineer of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. dated February 21, 1956. I want to quote the first paragraph of this letter:

"As the detailed work phase for the establishment of SAGE system communications reaches more operating companies, the requirements for coordination with independent telephone companies are increasing. To care for the necessary general coordination with the Independent part of the industry, representatives of the United States Independent Telephone Association and the Rural Electrification Administration have been invited to join the SAGE General Coordination Committee to represent connecting companies, the independent manufacturers, and the REA telephone borrowers."

We pointed out that the telephone cooperatives were not identified with the USITA, and since the Rural Electrification Administration is merely a lending agency and identified with the same governmental administration as the defense agency handling the SAGE program, we would not be properly identified by either a representative from USITA or from the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. K. P. Todd agreed with us that a person amenable to the National Telephone Cooperative Association should be cleared and seated as a member of the SAGE General Coordination Committee. He further agreed that they would give support to such a proposal and that they would do everything to work in harmony with us to serve these sites located in the telephone cooperatives' areas.

This letter indicates that attempts are being made on a local level to reach a working agreement on the SAGE program.

Unfortunately, however, to date these efforts have been confined to the local level.

Following publication of House Report 1890, Mr. Richard A. Dell, legislative representative for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, which represents the REA electric and telephone borrowers in 45 States and Alaska, offered his services to the Air Force. As of this time, his offer has not been accepted—and doubt has been expressed as to whether it will be.

I could only interpret rejection of his offer as a refusal to abide by the wishes of the committee and of the Congress. The cooperatives are entitled to representation—their own representation—on the SAGE General Coordination and Sector Committees.

USITA cannot speak for the cooperatives, any more than the cooperatives could speak for the commercial independents or the Bell System affiliates. No one in high authority here would even presume to think that the cooperatives could represent the commercial independents or the Bell System.

Mr. Thiessen had pointed out two of the reasons why the Rural Electrification Administration cannot represent the cooperatives—it "is merely a lending agency," and it is "identified with the same governmental administration as the defense agency handling the SAGE program."

The hearings brought out that on December 7, 1955, the REA sent out a general letter to the cooperatives. This, according to the information I have, was the first official word the cooperatives had had on SAGE from 1 of the 2 groups which supposedly were to coordinate with the cooperatives. According to testimony by General Blake, this letter was entitled "To All REA Telephone Borrowers. Subject: Air Defense SAGE System," and was signed in the name of Ancher Nelson, by Fred H. Strong. The letter follows:

You may have already learned of the impending expansion of the aid defense facilities of the United States, commonly known as SAGE—semiautomatic ground environment. Expansion of these facilities require extensive communication circuits and related equipment to be provided by the telephone company serving the areas involved. The USITA, through Col. William C. Henry, USITA military liaison officer, is serving as the coordinating agent for the independent telephone industry and working with the Bell system in carrying out the program.

The general policy which has been agreed upon is that the company serving the territory in which the facilities are to be located has the responsibility for providing the facilities required by the SAGE project. The Bell companies and Western Electric have indicated they will cooperate in every possible way, particularly in providing counsel and technical advice. In some cases it may be necessary for the REA borrower to contract certain technical work with an equipment manufacturer or a Bell company.

It is not possible to determine at present how many REA borrowers will be involved in the SAGE project because of the uncertainty as to where the various facilities will be located. As these locations are determined, the nearest Bell company will notify the REA borrower involved of the need for certain types of circuits and related facilities. As these notifications are made it will be imperative that the company involved take immediate steps to determine how the facilities will be provided in its own service territory.

The investment required will vary according to the type of facilities to be installed. All REA borrowers are advised that REA is ready to provide technical advice and counsel regarding the SAGE system and will consider applications for loans necessary to finance the required facilities.

More details will be made available to you as they become known to us. REA will try to maintain a close liaison with the proper personnel in the Air Force, the USITA and A. T. & T. in order that REA borrowers may be kept informed regarding this matter.

This very general letter was in marked contrast to the specific letter, listing proposed sites, which went to the commercial independents early in July—5 months previously.

As you know, hearings on this bill have begun in the other body.

Our Senators, Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD, are not satisfied that the amended authorization or the House report offer the protection needed by the cooperatives. Neither are several other Senators who have followed the SAGE program from the beginning.

So the senior Senator from Montana—Senator MURRAY—has proposed to substitute these words for the cooperative-protection sentence on page 51 of H. R. 9893:

In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent all the communication facilities and capabilities in the Nation, including rural telephone cooperatives, and, for power supply shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of public utilities and rural electric cooperatives, within each of their respective service areas.

As I read this amendment, it would spell out the protection for cooperatives more completely than does the language in H. R. 9893.

Seventy Members of this body have written me about this problem. I am sure there are others who agree that each of the three suppliers of telephone service—the Bell System, the commercial independents, the cooperatives—has a place in the SAGE system. So do those who supply electricity, public and private alike.

The run-around the Montana cooperatives have been getting is no different from that elsewhere. In Texas, I understand, the situation is about the same.

Now I do not claim to know everything there is to know about SAGE. I have had a certain amount of trouble getting information. Only recently our Senators and I learned for the first time of the selection of a site in central Montana—and we got that information from reading a Montana newspaper. I understand the Appropriations Committee staff did a study of SAGE last year, but I am told I cannot see a copy. The Secretary of Defense told the Appropriations Committee he wanted to see as much of the SAGE material declassified as possible.

Some of this secrecy undoubtedly is necessary. But some of it appears to be for the purpose of covering up blunders like the awarding of contracts for communications services without adequate authority from Congress and at excessive rates.

In view of what has happened, I can only conclude that the statements of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, to the chairman of the Air Force appropriation unit and to the Comptroller General of the United States, was administration policy.

Mr. Garlock said:

The Air Force is acquiring the communications services needed for the SAGE system under contracts with private telephone companies.

If this conclusion is not correct, the administration should clarify its policy toward the cooperatives, so there will be no doubt about the matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE, from April 12, 1956, on account of official work in California as subcommittee chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. GORDON (at the request of Mr. GRAY), on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 1 hour, on Thursday next.

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 30 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DONOHUE (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE and to include appropriate material.

Mr. PRICE and to include appropriate matter.

Mr. KNOX and include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1244. An act for the relief of Eva Gershbein Rubinstein; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1687. An act for the relief of Lydia G. Dickerson; Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona; Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 3076. An act to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3214. An act to authorize adjustment, in the public interest, of rentals under leases entered into for the provision of commercial recreational facilities at the Clark Hill Reservoir; Committee on Public Works.

S. 3246. An act to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes; Committee on Education and Labor.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 29, 1956:

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes;

H. R. 9064. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9770. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On March 30, 1956:

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 10, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1691. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting increases in appropriations for the fiscal year 1957 in the net amount of $547,100,000 for the Department of Defense—Military Functions (H. Doc. No. 373); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1692. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the operations of the Department of State relating to educational exchange activities for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to Public Law 584, 79th Congress (H. Doc. No. 374); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1693. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held at Washington, D. C., September 19–20, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 372); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1694. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 26, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of streams flowing through the Coastal Plains Soil Conservation District, Tex., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and related purposes, including channel and major drainage improvements, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 375); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

1695. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, as amended, so as to extend the availability of emergency credit to farmers and stockmen"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1696. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of violation of administrative control of funds regulation (DD–SD (AR) 170), pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2) Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1697. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1698. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Ninth Semiannual Report of the Department of Defense of payments made arising from the correction of military or naval records, pursuant to Public Law 220, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1699. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the semiannual report on contracts for research and development work negotiated under section 2 (c) (11), and certain industrial mobilization type projects negotiated under section 2 (c) (16), pursuant to Public Law 413, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1700. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1701. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1702. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 42d Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the year 1955, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1703. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Fifth Semi-annual Report of the Small Business Administration covering operations for the period July 1 through December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended (Public Law 163); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1704. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1705. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1706. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the 15th Semiannual Report of

the International Educational Exchange Program for the period ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to section 1008 of Public Law 402 (80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1707. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting the report on the audit of the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1708. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearings cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 29, 1956, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1709. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians or Eskimos in Alaska"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1710. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1711. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1712. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1713. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television"; to the Committee on the Judiciary .

1714. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the annual report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the annual report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to section 604 (a) (4) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1715. A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., United States Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to the act approved June 23, 1934 (18 U. S. C. 4127); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1716. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1717. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 212 (d) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1719. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1720. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Tang Tsou, A–7250943, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1721. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to the case of Nikola Mirko Vujosevic or Vujosevich, A–7044355, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1722. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible into the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1724. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1725. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, aid for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1726. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting a report showing lands acquired by the Commission during the fiscal year 1955 for the development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital and its environs in nearby Maryland and Virginia, pursuant to section 4 of the act of Congress of June 6, 1924 (renumbered sec. 13 by Public Law 592, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on March 28, 1956, the following conference report was filed on April 6, 1956:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of Conference. H. R. 12. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities (Rept. No. 1985). Ordered to be printed.

[*Submitted April 9, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2587. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7891. A bill to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity; with amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7426. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7858. A bill to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9768. A bill relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii, amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889, and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9769. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10331. A bill to prohibit the importation of manufactured articles from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 10332. A bill to preserve the Key deer and other wildlife resources in the Florida Keys by the establishment of a National Key Deer Refuge in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 10333. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 10334. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of

1949 to provide for making payments in lieu of taxes on certain real property of the United States Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 10335. A bill to provide that acts of Congress do not occupy, and shall not be construed to occupy, the field of sedition against the United States to the exclusion of State laws on such subject without express provision by Congress to such effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10336. A bill to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 10337. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent sudden and unreasonable decreases in the price of hogs and cattle which are sold at stockyards or to packers subject to that act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10338. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Coulee Dam and Grand Coulee areas, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10339. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10340. A bill to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10341. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 10342. A bill to provide for the inclusion of United States commissioners within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that in certain instances an interest passing to the surviving spouse within 6 months after the death of the decedent shall not be considered an interest which will terminate or fail in certain instances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10344. A bill to establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 10345. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10346. A bill to provide for the construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation by the Secretary of the Interior of certain irrigation works of the Hayden Lake unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10347. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of antimony in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10348. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10349. A bill to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10350. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10351. A bill to amend section 317 (a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10352. A bill to transfer certain lands to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. J. Res. 598. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. Res. 456. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of material relating to the Central Valley project of California, and additional copies for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the Massachusetts State Senate memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Concurrent resolution of the State of New York Assembly urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting Congress to create a program for the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians for the protection and better utilization of the resources of the tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act as set forth in the provisions of sections 276a through 276a-5, Title 40, United States Code annoted; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Status of Forces Treaty, and to urge the Federal Government to terminate that agreement at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting passage of H. R. 4446, a bill to provide assistance to the States in the construction, modernization, additions, and improvements of domiciliary and hospital buildings of State veterans' homes by a grant to subsidize, in part, the capital outlay cost; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the passage of legislation requiring the Federal Government to defray costs of cleaning, dredging, and widening the Blackstone River Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that adequate safeguards be provided in tariff and trade legislation, including import quotas, against the destruction or lowering of our American standard of living, the labor standard of our workmen, and the stability of our economy by unfair import competition and that the existing trade agreements legislation be amended accordingly; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 10353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianne Koch Everson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 10354. A bill for the relief of Capt. Clarence A. Klaver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10355. A bill for the relief of Jose Da Silva Ferreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 10356. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marina Coralia Castillo Wamba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10357. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Stein Whitsell Ille; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10358. A bill for the relief of Vicente Soto Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 10359. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 10360. A bill for the relief of Mario Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10361. A bill for the relief of Joseph Juda Teuchberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

821. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Frank H. Schaller and others of Stark County, Ohio, for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

822. Also, petition of John Davis and others of Stark and Tuscarawas Counties, Ohio, for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

823. Also, petition of Clementas A. Reed and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

824. Also, petition of Russell E. Owen and others of Stark County, Ohio, for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

825. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of employees of the Bloomsburg Mills Inc., Lock Haven, Pa., bearing 260 signatures, in opposition to

the enactment of H. R. 5550, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

826. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 18 Iowa residents urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

827. Also, petition of Carl Oeltjenbrun, Swaledale, Iowa, and 18 others urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

828. Also, petition of 30 residents of Alden, Iowa, and vicinity urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

829. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the City Council, Boston, Mass., urging that the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and each member of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress to take whatever action is necessary to have the United States Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare speed up the Salk anti-polio vaccine subjection program throughout the United States, and particularly in Massachusetts and the city of Boston; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

830. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Mrs. Grace Kingsolver and 27 others of Chelan County, Wash., urging the passage of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

831. Also, petition of Pete J. MacDermott and 45 other veterans of Spokane and Stevens County, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

832. Also, petition of Forrest A. Corwin and 90 other veterans of Spokane, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

833. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of Walter F. Rose of Bluefield, W. Va., and 46 other residents of Mercer County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

834. Also, petition of G. C. Brewster of Welch, W. Va., and 45 other residents of McDowell County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

835. Also, petition of W. L. Martin of Ronceverte, W. Va., and 45 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

836. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Bessie Eggers and 18 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

837. Also, petition of Edward M. Gerttula and 44 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

838. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Edd Stegall and other citizens of Jasper and Newton Counties, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

839. Also, petition of E. E. Palmer and other citizens urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

840. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Texas Construction Council, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to going on record as opposing title IV, section 403 of S. 3158 and that portion of title V of S. 3302 which seeks to increase the amount of Federal funds for college housing loans from $500 million to $600 million; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

841. Also, petition of the corresponding secretary, Pastorius Unit No. 38, Steuben Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Congress to make complete return of privately owned German and Japanese property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

842. Also, petition of the clerk of the board, office of the Board of Supervisors, County of Santa Clara, San Jose, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the Congress to extend the term of activities of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

843. Also, petition of the grand knights, Columbus Council 126, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing its support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

844. Also, petition of the mayor, Toledo, Ohio, with reference to urging the Congress to pass H. R. 8836; to the Committee on Public Works.

845. Also, petition of the general manager, City Public Service Board, San Antonio, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to providing Federal participation in the cost of right-of-way and for the payment of the cost of relocating public utility lines in the construction of transcontinental and international highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

846. Also, petition of the secretary, Texas Construction Council, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing extreme disapproval of section 11 of H. R. 8836 providing for the payment of wage rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

847. Also, petition of the secretary, New York Chapter, American Institute of Architects, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing any changes which would alter in material or design the central portion of the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, Before Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, over this Nation's long history, few Americans have made a more important contribution to the discussion of vital problems affecting security and other phases of our country's welfare than has the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. His lengthy services in various capacities, affording experience which enables him to evaluate present-day developments, combine to make him an authority on questions which now challenge countrywide attention.

On March 22, in Philadelphia, the Senator from Pennsylvania delivered a most impressive address before the Port of Philadelphia Maritime Society. For the reasons I have stated, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PORT OF PHILADELPHIA MARITIME SOCIETY IN THE BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 22, 1956

It is an honor and a sincere pleasure to be here tonight with the maritime leadership of the Delaware River ports.

I am happy to be here because your organization is taking such an active and vigorous part in building the economic and defensive strength of the United States.

The tremendous industrial expansion that has taken place here in the Delaware Valley is one of the dominant forces in the march of American progress.

It is one of the most spectacular industrial developments of our time.

It is evidence that we have not yet begun to realize the heights of achievement that can be attained under the American system of free enterprise.

Our Nation is growing by leaps and bounds. One of the most spectacular developments has been the surprising increase in our population. We are now a Nation of more than 165 million people. We did not expect to reach that number for many years to come. It represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the last general census of 1950. Since 1940 the population increase has been 25 percent.

Translated into terms of human needs this population increase has imposed upon us many great problems—and one of the most important of these problems is the increased volume of transportation required to meet the needs of an expanding national economy.

For many years I have been deeply interested in transportation, from the military standpoint as well as the needs of commerce and industry.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works I have given a great deal of attention to every form of transportation—highways, railroads, airlines, pipelines, and the great volume of traffic generated by for-

eign and domestic commerce on our rivers and harbors.

One thing stands out clearly. There is not enough railroad equipment and not enough highway capacity in our country to carry the heavy freight of our commerce and industry. We can never build enough railroads or highways to do the job of transportation as economically as it can be done by water.

The only way we can meet our growing needs for the bulk transportation of raw materials and finished products at low cost is by the improvement of waterways all over the country.

Perhaps some of the funds now going abroad to buy unwilling or questionable friendship might be diverted to more profitable purposes if applied to river-and-harbor improvements.

We need a steady stream of strategic ores and other raw materials that are vital to national defense.

We need more ships flying the American flag. We need better, deeper and wider ports, modern inland waterway facilities, and river channels of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest vessels for economical operation.

From its earliest days Pennsylvania has recognized the importance of its waterways. We are fortunate to have within the borders of our Commonwealth three great ports that give access to sealanes of the world.

Here along the Delaware River the highly developed ports of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware serve one of the greatest concentrations of industry in the world.

At Pittsburgh the Monongahela and the Allegheny Rivers join to form the mighty Ohio, giving access to the Mississippi waterways and the Gulf of Mexico. These vital waterways carry millions of tons of freight to and from the greatly diversified industries that line their banks.

The splendid harbor at Erie is one of the busy ports of the Great Lakes.

In my support of river and harbor improvements I have not been restricted to projects that would benefit Pennsylvania alone. I have always regarded the national interest as paramount, and for that reason—because I know it is of vital importance to the whole Nation—I have given every possible assistance in the fight for a deepwater channel in the Delaware River.

I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing the highest praise for the hard work that has been put into this fight by members of your organization as well as other representatives of the civic, commercial, and maritime interests of the Delaware Valley. I have the highest admiration for such men as Harry Schad, Colonel LaBrum, Walter Miller, Joe Costello, Alex Crothers, and many others I could mention. They have carried on the fight with unfailing courage and vigor and in the finest spirit of cooperation.

Our sincere thanks should be extended also to my distinguished colleagues from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware who have put aside all political differences and have battled for the Delaware River in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

It has been a real privilege to be associated with them in the effort to expand the usefulness of the Delaware River to its full capacity as an international highway for commerce and trade with the world.

All share in the credit for the gains we have made, but we must face the fact that final victory is not yet in sight. Much remains to be done.

We must clear away the fog of misconception and misrepresentation that has been allowed to cloud the issue. We must sweep away the misleading arguments that have been advanced by those who oppose the 40-foot channel in the upper Delaware for selfish reasons.

We must continue with increased vigor our fight to uphold the traditional American concept that navigation improvements for the promotion of commerce are the function and responsibility of the Federal Government.

This policy has been adhered to since the beginnings of our existence as a Nation. It is the foundation upon which was built the great foreign and domestic commerce which had such an important part in our economic growth.

The Founding Fathers were wise and far-seeing when they wrote into the Constitution of the United States the provision that vests in the Federal Government the responsibility for commerce and navigation.

Let us see how this policy is applied today. There are under construction in the United States at present 79 navigational projects under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The total estimated cost of these projects is in excess of one billion dollars. To carry them forward there is an allocation of $100 million in the 1957 budget. And let me tell you that in no major project of all those now under construction have private interests been asked to share the cost.

A few weeks ago the Senate Public Works Committee approved legislation authorizing two major navigation projects. The Committee, after hearing lengthy testimony, decided that these projects would be highly beneficial to the areas in which they are located and would contribute to the economic welfare of the Nation.

One bill provides for deepening the Great Lakes connecting channels at an estimated cost of $110 million. The other calls for the construction of a new Mississippi River outlet from New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico at an estimated cost of $88 million. I voted to report them out favorably and let me point out that in neither case was there any recommendation—or even the slightest suggestion from the Corps of Engineers or from the Budget Bureau—that would require a cash contribution from local interests to pay part of the construction costs.

When the legislation authorizing a 40-foot channel depth in the upper Delaware was before our committee the proposal for a local contribution was carefully and thoroughly considered.

As you know, it was rejected as unsound and inconsistent with the national policy which has been followed for many years on navigation projects throughout the country.

In fighting to sustain that policy we are upholding a fundamental principle of the American system of government.

We are supporting the constitutional plan of checks and balances which specifically defines and restricts the functions of the three branches of government, legislative, executive, and judicial.

Under that plan the power to legislate is placed exclusively under the jurisdiction of Congress.

It is, therefore, proper to question the right of the Budget Bureau to encroach upon the legislative function and to usurp the power of Congress.

In the case of the Delaware River the Budget Bureau is not only invading the field of legislation but is actually attempting to defy the will of Congress as expressed in the authorization enacted in the last session.

When Congress rejected the Budget Bureau's philosophy that from some private but not clearly defined source, there should be paid the sum of $18 million, that should have cleared the way for an appropriation to get the job started.

But as I said before, we still have a fight on our hands. We must renew the attack with increased vigor.

We may encounter difficult obstacles, but I am confident that we will win in the end. No barrier to progress has long resisted determined and aggressive attack by civic-minded men who are fighting to advance the prosperity of their fellow citizens.

When I look at the figures showing the tremendous increase in the business of the Delaware River ports in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, I can readily understand your pride in this great natural asset.

No major port of the United States can match the record of progress achieved on the Delaware.

I think our cause would be greatly aided if the whole country could be told what we have here along Delaware River.

Even in the Philadelphia area many of our citizens are unaware that here is the largest fresh-water port in the world.

Here we have the Nations' leading import port, handling almost one-fourth of all the incoming foreign cargo of the United States. In 1955 some 34,600,000 tons of imports were unloaded here, a gain of 14 percent over 1954.

Here on the Delaware River we have the No. 1 ore port of the Nation. Every day an ore boat arrives bringing an average of 7,000 tons of iron ore to feed the furnaces of the biggest steel plant on the Atlantic seaboard.

Here we have the largest oil-refining center east of the Mississippi and the second largest in the world. Recently plans were announced for the construction of a new refinery on the Delaware River that will cost $100 million.

Here on the Delaware River the American Navy was born and the first navy yard established nearly 150 years ago. Today the Philadelphia Naval Base is one of the most important naval centers in the world and includes the largest shipbuilding yard in the world.

In 1955 the total waterborne commerce of the Delaware River ports achieved an all-time high of over 85 million short tons of cargo. This compares with 57 million tons in 1948, an increase of almost 50 percent.

These facts are well known to you, but they are worth repeating because they are positive proof that Delaware Valley, United States of America, is going ahead, and that its continued growth and expansion depends upon a deep-water channel from the upper reaches of the Delaware to the sea.

The only obstacle to industrial development that will pay big dividends in economic progress is the lack of deep water in the upper river.

It is no longer a question of whether we can afford to spend the money needed for a 40-foot channel. The real question is whether we can afford not to make an investment that will add to the wealth of the United States and increase the defensive strength of the American Republic.

Eisenhower Administration Ignores Warnings of Our Military Leaders

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has for the past few years displayed a peculiar aptitude of not appreciating Soviet technological achievements, or to intelligently measure and counteract rapid Soviet military advancements.

It is bad enough that the American people have been and are being hoodwinked and falsely informed of true Soviet capabilities. It is worse when this administration permits itself to be lulled into a feeling of complacency.

Mr. Speaker, this administration, by its shortsightedness and false budgeteering, is permitting this Nation's military strength to deteriorate to the point where we will have a second-rate Air Force. The warnings of our military leaders are being completely ignored.

Mr. Stewart Alsop, in an article in the New York Herald Tribune of March 28, has again clearly described the extent to which this administration has gone in its failure to truly appreciate the Soviet threat to this Nation's security.

Mr. Alsop quotes statements by Generals Twining, White, and Power to the effect that the Soviet Union is rapidly outstripping the United States in strategic airpower. Why, asks Mr. Alsop, why do their warnings and the additional warnings of General LeMay, of the Strategic Air Command, go unheeded?

The plain fact—

Mr. Alsop says—

is that the American Government has officially decided to permit the Soviets to outstrip this country in strategic airpower. Many people refuse to worry about this decision, because Dwight D. Eisenhower is head of the Government. But General Eisenhower's own military experience was in a different field, and he himself has often disclaimed personal infallibility.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am only doing my duty in calling the attention of my colleagues to the frank admissions of these several Air Force generals which are at such strange variation with the decision of the administration. Public apathy in the face of sensational warnings from the highest authority raise the question of public responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the warnings of our military leaders, as reported by Mr. Alsop, must be given the highest degree of consideration. For this reason I am happy that our colleague from Pennsylvania has inserted the Alsop article in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1956, on page A2739. I urge every Member of the House to give his attention to the remarks of Mr. FLOOD.

Full Appropriation for Flood-Control Projects Are in the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to include the statement I presented before the House Appropriations Committee on March 28, 1956.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AT HEARINGS ON NATIONAL AND NEW ENGLAND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS CONTAINED IN THE PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION ACT OF 1957, MARCH 28, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I express my continuing appreciation of your courtesy in granting this opportunity to again appear before you at this hearing on the current public-works program, which, under the civil-functions section, includes appropriations for recommended flood-control and flood-protection projects within my area and the Nation.

Flood control and protection has, indeed, these past few years become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to aid the various States and municipalities of the country in solving that problem is great. The extraordinary and unfortunate rapidity with which the ruinous visitations of the wildest elements of nature have followed one upon another throughout the country and, particularly in New England, has projected the imperative necessity of Federal legislation for assistance in flood control to the height of national and congressional consciousness.

I should like to take this moment to most sincerely thank the chairman and members of this committee, on behalf of my own people and I am sure the people of the country, for devoting so much of your personal and committee time, well beyond the usual hours, to patient, earnest study of this flood-disaster subject and your substantial action in attempting to conscientiously provide sufficient Federal money to grant help where it is needed. It is a trying and difficult job, as we, your colleagues, well know and you have been and are now discharging your obligation in an inspiring manner.

I last presented testimony to you during your January hearings on the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which has now already passed the Congress. The sympathetic understanding you extended to those then coming before you pleading for protection of their people's lives and property and the speed with which this measure was handled is a historical tribute to the intense devotion to legislative duty of each and every one of you.

On this particular occasion, I come before you to plead for your approval of all the funds requested for the recommended projects already initiated and listed and to earnestly ask your further action in approving additional funds in contemplation of particular projects, vitally needed in my area and other areas of the country, which have not yet but may well be authorized before this Congress concludes. As you well realize, many earnest and worthy pleas for flood protection assistance have been placed before you without sponsorship understanding of the technicalities of our required legislative procedure. These people and the general public cannot be expected to know such technicalities of preliminary authorization, officially registered local willingness to participate, the required presurvey by the most efficient Corps of Army Engineers and other procedural standards that should be met before this committee and the Congress can properly consider them for approval. This is quite understandable and excusable because the general public has observed, during the frequent national disasters that have suddenly and violently struck so many areas of the country these past few years, the Army engineers and other executive department agency units move in very quickly and assist them locally. They do not comprehend that this assistance must legally be restricted mainly to temporary relief aid for the emergency protection of American lives and municipally owned public works and buildings. The general public appears, then, to be, unfortunately, under the impression that temporary emergency relief assistance by these Federal Government units is practically the same as Federal participation for permanent relief construction and Federal participation in permanent relief projects may be had by the presentation of a simple and informal request to Congress. In this respect, it would seem that our newspapers and other information agencies could help clear up much of this public misunderstanding by the printing of instructive articles prominently placed on repeated occasions. The newspapers of my home city and surrounding communities have done an excellent job on this score, and they could well be emulated in other sections of the country.

In any case, a great many individual bills for special projects, sponsored by a great many Members of this body on behalf of their people, are now before the House Public Works Committee, and it is possible that many of them may yet be approvingly acted upon. The objectives of these individual measures are as serious as life and death to the localities that will be affected, and it is for that primary reason that I solicit this committee to favorably consider the recommendation of appropriations even more than sufficient to cover all these projects; if the proposals are not eventually approved, nothing will be lost to the Government, while on the other hand, if they are approved and too much time elapses before a further appropriation, the Lord alone knows how many lives may be lost and how much property will be destroyed.

I am, indeed, here sympathetic with an understanding of the supplications of my colleagues from other sections of the country on behalf of the flood-control projects needed in their States, and I exhort your favorable attention to them. Quite naturally and humanly, I am, of course, primarily concerned here with the flood protection and control projects of vital importance to the continuing preservation of the lives and property of the people within my own State and area. Within these past 3 years, Massachusetts and New England have been visited in quick succession with an unprecedented series of unparalleled natural disasters. First it was tornadoes, after which came hurricanes, then raging floods, and finally, three of the greatest blizzards in our history within 10 days. At this moment, in Massachusetts and New England, any quick thaw of the enormous amount of snow presently existing, and that is an ever-threatening danger during this season of changes, would be another major catastrophe, and we are just praying that the good Lord will protect us from any additional floods for which we are still seriously unprepared.

The list of particular flood control projects for Massachusetts which has been recommended by the Army engineers and cleared by the Bureau of the Budget is in your hands, and I am not going to intrude upon the time of this committee with repetitious recitation of the details of their urgency. That has been repeatedly and superbly done already by my esteemed friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman PHILBIN, who has spoken to you on behalf of his own District and as chairman of the Massachusetts Delegation State Flood Control Committee. No one could present a more scholarly or more eloquent explanation than he has and the people of Massachusetts are indeed indebted to him.

He has explained to you the pressing need for the approval of planning funds for the Littleville, the Westville, and particularly, the West Hill Dam, known as the Blackstone Basin. I would like to be permitted to join in his appeal to you for planning funds for all these projects and especially the Blackstone Basin project which is designed to materially control the rising flood heights on the Blackstone River, which is a recurring threat to the lives and property of the people affected by the river as it passes through the Massachusetts towns of Uxbridge, Millville, and Blackstone down into the State of Rhode Island. The people and the businesses in this area have experienced tremendous personal hardships and financial losses because of the repeated floodings and inadequate control barriers during the ex-

traordinarily heavy rainfalls and excessive downward flow from water sources on the river above. This situation is of immediate urgency to thousands of residents and industries and eminently deserves the favorable consideration of your committee for planning funds leading to permanent corrective construction and, meanwhile, to permit the Army engineers to lend their assistance by prompt erection of some temporary controls or dredging.

With respect to my home city of Worcester, Mass., I especially desire to express to this committee the gratitude of myself and my people for your approval in the urgent deficiency appropriation of the sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of the Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project. In this program before you, there is included and recommended the sum of $840,000 to begin the construction of this tunnel next year. When I appeared before this committee last January 18, I presented a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this flood protection project for the safety of the people of my city and area. I am not going to repeat all those details again now, but I would like to emphasize that the authoritative voice of the Army Corps of Engineers has been registered in recommendation of this tunnel as a vitally needed project. They have also testified to you that the project is of superior justification economically because the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and that the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is high above the average that is required. Since the absolute need and the positive merit of the Worcester diversionary tunnel project remain unquestioned and it has received the preliminary approval of this committee, may I respectfully but earnestly ask your speedy approval of this appropriation for construction beginning, because without this continuing appropriation approval, your previous deficiency appropriation approval would be in vain, and indeed, in waste.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, there is indeed no need for me to attempt to dramatically exaggerate the effects upon my State of Massachusetts and the New England area of the natural disasters, particularly of floods, that have been visited upon us these past few years. The truth has been well publicized throughout the country and is impressive in its terribleness. The aftermath of the flood disasters alone in loss of lives, property damage, lost employment, and lost business is staggering to the imagination. Precise figures may never be established, but the financial losses are unquestionably in the billions according to authoritative accountants. The family tragedies through the loss of loved members will never be erased from our consciences if we do not take prompt, sensible steps to prevent death from striking down our people in this manner again, and that is the principal reason I am before you today, in discharge of my moral obligation as an elected Representative, asking for reasonable Federal assistance to my region.

The people of Massachusetts and New England have never evidenced any desire to be simple wards of the Federal Government, nor are we so doing now. We truly believe we have always contributed more than our full share, both in lives and material wealth, to the Federal Government for the general national welfare. It is simply and solely in recognition that our regional problem affects the whole national welfare that we are now asking Federal aid in our flood control and natural disaster problems. Our people can be counted upon now, as always, to exhaust the limit of their own initiative and resources in helping to solve their own area problems.

To extend Federal aid in this manner for this purpose is not in contravention of any congressional tradition or precedent. In my sincere judgment, the whole history of congressional action in relation to water control and waterpower impressively reveals the continuing congressional conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed and controlled in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size, complexity, or potential multiple benefits, are beyond the means of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England water control problem lies; and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem.

The United States has granted, in Christian generosity, untold billions of needed aid to desperate people in foreign lands and as a Christian nation we can be modestly proud of such action. It is, at the very least, a gamble on the side of God. However, the willing and patriotic taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of this Government and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of our New England and other flood-ravaged regions are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster comes again.

I thank the committee for their courtesy to me and demonstrated interest in my people. I know that you will give your utmost consideration to the merit of all the flood-control projects that are before you and that have been proposed. I earnestly hope you will see fit to recommend appropriations sufficient to cover them all and to insure their completion at the earliest practicable date in the national interest.

One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, March 25 was the 135th anniversary of Greek independence. Certainly there is no nation held in higher esteem by the people of America than Greece with its ageless culture and long heritage of freedom and independence. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me commemorating the anniversary of the independence of this noble country be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

One hundred and thirty-five years ago, on March 25, 1821, the Greeks rose against the Ottoman Empire, under the leadership of their beloved Archbishop, Germanos of Patros, and commenced their struggle for freedom and independence. For more than a decade they fought heroically against their oppressors, and ultimately, on May 7, 1833, the Convention of London recognized Greece as an independent nation.

From that day, the Greeks have tenaciously retained their hard-earned independence. However, it has not been an easy task for they have constantly had to resist the predatory designs of their neighbors.

Recent tangible evidence of their determination to preserve their independence can be seen in their struggles against the Nazis is World War II, and even more recently in their battle against the Communists. Their indomitable stand against these totalitarian oppressors has amazed the world. Despite almost insurmountable odds the Greeks have never relinquished their cherished freedom.

In their struggle against Communist tyranny, the Greeks were aided by the United States. We realized that the Greeks' battle against Red infiltration of their country was actually a strife against the spread of communism beyond the Greek borders and a conflict for free world security.

The Greeks' eventual triumph was also a victory for America for it permitted the United States to win the first major contest in the cold war launched by the Kremlin. Furthermore, it served as a source of inspiration for all enslaved people who were suffering under Soviet despotism.

Although victory was attained and freedom secured, the Greeks have not relaxed their vigilance. They are ever conscious of the threat of communism and with the help of United States economic and military aid they have strengthened their economy and armed forces as a safeguard against future aggression. The fact that Greece has been included in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is indicative of their ability to share responsibility in the struggle against Soviet expansion.

The occasion of the celebration of Greek independence is always an auspicious time to emphasize the cultural contributions that the Greeks have bequeathed to civilization in the field of philosophy, science, art, and literature. On this 135th anniversary it is also fitting to emphasize the debt that America and all the free world owes the courageous Greek people for their valiant stand against communism. People of Greece, we congratulate you on this important day, and pray that the strong bonds of friendship between our nations will remain, and grow even stronger during the years to come.

Congressman Clyde Doyle, 23d District, California, Again Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and all of my distinguished colleagues for previously extending me unanimous consent to make these remarks. It is a time-honored custom, a very important and valuable custom, for Members on both sides of our political aisle to make such reports directly back to the people we represent in this, the "greatest legislative body in the world's history." I consider it as my report of my stewardship, of my trusteeship for the people of the congressional district I represent during this, my fifth elective term, in the House of Representatives.

Heretofore on the following dates, I have also sought to report to the people I represent what I could, within the limits allowed by House rules as to time and space, on May 9, 1946, on April 28, 1952, on May 10, 1954. On those dates I made similar reports. Very many of my constituents thanked me and have asked for a report to date. Now, as before, no tax money will pay for the printing of the several thousand copies which will be furnished to the people of the great 23d District, Los Angeles County, Calif. I again repeat what I stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1952, to wit:

The strength of our democracy and the American way of life depends upon the extent to which the American people know the facts about, as Abraham Lincoln said, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

To the people of the 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif.:

MY DEAR FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS: I am pleased and proud to give to you this necessarily brief report of some of my work as your Representative in the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, to April 9, 1956, as follows:

My district and Washington, D. C., office open weekdays for your assistance.

My district office, situated in the Post Office Building, Huntington Park, has been open week days, excepting Saturday afternoons. Miss Ida Reynolds has been in charge, ably assisted by Mrs. Bess Prusso and Mrs. Fannie Leonard. They do whatever is necessary to aid and assist the people in the district, for the Congressman. This is my district staff. My Washington, D. C. office, at 1030 House Office Building, has likewise been open daily, ably staffed for several years now by Miss Margaret Tucker, and Mrs. Nell Talbert. This is my staff here at the Capitol. Since it is generally known that my good wife, Lydia (with whom I observed our 42d wedding anniversary March 21), has materially helped me all these 10 years that I have now served in Congress, it appears pertinent to report that she has never been on the Government payroll. We did not come to Congress to increase our income.

THREE MAIL DELIVERIES DAILY; HEAVY

It averages about 35 letters, numerous printed reports, circulars, postcards, magazines and communications from foreign countries, newspapers, several telegrams, current communications from colleagues and executive agencies, local and long distance phone conversations, etc.

I maintain my 10-year-old habit of reading every first class communication. Frequently I begin this before 8 a. m. Of course, when I am away from the Capitol on official committee work for several days, I cannot personally read and answer them until I return. If you take time to write me as your Congressman, I am glad to take time to personally read and answer it.

I AM ON TWO MAJOR COMMITTEES

As in the 83d Congress, I again serve on two standing committees; both recognized as of major importance; to-wit, Armed Services Committee (35 members), and Un-American Activities Committee (9 members). Since both these committees must often meet the same day and hour, I necessarily miss attendance upon one or the other. Since I preside as subcommittee chairman frequently, I must be there in person. However, I am pleased to report to you that, out of 191 meetings of the Armed Services Committee, I only had 43 absences and these on account of other committee work. The committee clerks advise me my attendance is rated excellent.

I HAVE MADE SPEECHES

My 17 speeches in Congress and the 72 remarks all appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the day occurring. Senators are seldom limited as to time. House Members always have their time fixed before they begin.

NINETY-SEVEN NEIGHBORS FROM 23D DISTRICT VISIT ME

Already this session 97 residents of the 23d District have honored my office, and made me very happy, to have them personally call upon me here at my Washington office. I invite all who come this way to do so. Bring your school and college students, too. Many other folks from California, not residents of the 23d District, also called.

I HAVE SERVED HUNDREDS OF CASES OF WORTHY PEOPLE AND BUSINESSES

More than 200 specific cases of service rendered, many of them involving matters of vital concern to the persons or the businesses (both small and large). In addition, many hundreds of requests for particular information, documents, copies of bills, reports, etc., have been promptly complied with. Hundreds of clubs, chambers of commerce, business and professional groups and committees, churches, patriotic and fraternal orders, etc., have rightfully asked and been cordially served.

TWENTY-THIRD DISTRICT BOYS KEPT AT ACADEMIES

I have actively and cordially cooperated with every boy who was physically and scholastically qualified to try the Academy exams. I am very proud of all the boys, both those who made the grade, and those who will try again. Yes, also of those who tried and failed. I invite any 23d District lad who has the ambition, to let me hear from him; always with the knowledge and consent of parents.

I HAVE COOPERATED WITH SCHOOLS

As in previous years, I have again been pleased to be called upon by most of the school districts in the matter of their need for the prompt receipt of their full entitlement of Federal funds under applicable public laws. These school-district officials always have their applications in tiptop shape, when the mail brings them here. They have received a very substantial sum of many thousands of dollars.

I HAVE COOPERATED WITH VETERANS

I consider it a high honor to be called upon so often by an increasing number of individual veterans and veterans' representatives and organizations. Also, the veterans' service centers at Compton and Huntington Park, in their splendid work, frequently have had my help whenever they have asked it. They do very valuable work.

I PLACED CONGRESSIONAL RECORD IN ALL LIBRARIES

So that the most people in the 23d District could have easiest access to the daily work in Congress and better know what I, as Representative, do and say and how I have voted, too, I had the RECORD placed in all the public libraries, high-school and college libraries from the very first. I'll keep them coming there as long as I am in Congress. Only an informed democracy can act intelligently.

I FILED HELPFUL PRIVATE AND IMPORTANT PUBLIC BILLS

Six private bills were authored by me for the benefit of persons in the 23d District. Eighteen public resolutions were filed by me. Since this 84th Congress is only one-half through, I cannot now report what the final tally may be by July. But I am proud to report that the Doyle resolution, H. Res. 151, passed the House unanimously on March 23, 1955. This did away with one-man investigative committees in the House. It requires at least two committee members present. I am also proud to report that the President of the United States did a few weeks after I had filed two other Doyle resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States make public statements supporting the principle and objective contained in said two proposals by me made. The President did not refer to my resolutions in any way whatsoever. He may not even have known of them.

I HAVE PRESIDED AS TEMPORARY SPEAKER

As in previous Congresses, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House—longer so than any man in history—has placed me in his chair, both as Speaker and also as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. It is always a thrill, naturally.

THE ELDER CITIZENS ARE MY CONCERN, TOO

Even if the span of life in the United States had not already measurably increased, just American humane considerations compel us to arrange so that our increasing number of elder citizens shall not become economic liabilities. I have supported broadening social security, increased elder citizens' pensions, reduction in age to receive social security, increase in amount allowable to earn.

The spirit of people of our Nation constitutes the indestructible wealth of our Nation.

I HAVE SUPPORTED STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE

My guide or thought for each day as your Congressman is as follows: "I daily work and pray for a safe and sound America in a world of enduring peace."

I close each letter with that sentence, before I sign my name. I mean it. But, my friends, with the world as it has been reported to be, I would not have felt I was doing my duty to you—and all the people of our beloved Nation—if I had neglected to vote for funds necessary to keep our country strong enough militarily to resist possible military aggression. But military defense is not the ultimate solution.

It now costs each American family about $105 a year, and President Eisenhower has recently asked a sum from Congress which will increase that to about $125 per year, per family.

I HAVE FREQUENTLY SENT NEWSLETTERS TO YOU

Almost every week until recently when my work load was too much to continue it for a time, I have sent to all the newspapers in the 23rd district a brief newsletter from my desk. It has been nonpartisan. I thank the press for whatever use they have been able to make of it for the information of their readers about Congress. For a few months I have sent home, free, a monthly "newsletter." If you want to also receive it, I'll honor your written request for it.

I DID NOT COME HOME FOR EASTER RECESS

Naturally, I would like to have come home. I was advised that all but two California Congressmen had gone home "to see how matters stood politically, etc." But, I felt it necessary to remain in Washington, D. C., and do two important official pieces of work which could not wait until Easter recess ended, to wit:

1. Work on a few cases which only I, as Congressman, could be effective in, and which could not well wait.

2. Prepare to act as subcommittee chairman, beginning April 16th at Un-American Activities Committee hearings at Los Angeles Federal Building for several days. To be chairman of such an important hearing is considerable of a responsibility in the fight against subversive communism, wherever it raises its ugly head.

Whenever there is a primary election in any State, all Members of Congress are excused to return to that State in ample time to protect their own "political status" in their respective Congressional Districts. No

roll call votes are taken on the primary election date. So, on June 5 comes the primary election in California. No doubt almost all of the 30 Congressmen from California will have been excused from the Halls of Congress so they could come home in due time to campaign a bit for their own reelection. I expect to be home for at least a few days and to personally cast my vote at South Gate. Mrs. Doyle will vote by absentee ballot.

I HAVE EXPERIENCED GREAT EVENTS AND MET GREAT PEOPLE FOR YOU

My membership on the Armed Services Committee has occasioned my witnessing outstanding and inspiring events in connection with our National Security and National Defense. From the supersonic wind tunnel to being submerged off the Atlantic seaboard on the nuclear submarine *Nautilus* for over 12 hours; to cruising on the supercarrier *Forrestal;* to witnessing atomic tests and seeing one "guided missile" "hit the mark" over 10 miles in the sky; to eating luncheon at the White House with the President (before his heart attack) to being present as great foreign nation leaders speak to us in Congress—these and other moments are all occasions when I would be most happy if you and each of you in the great 23d District, could also share the experience.

I often say that our Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

I HAVE BEEN FAITHFUL IN FLOOR ATTENDANCE AS WELL AS COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE

I was either personally present on every "yea" and "nay" rollcall vote, or paired on every "yes" and "nay" rollcall vote from the beginning of the 84th Congress to the date of this "report." As heretofore stated, my official duties as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Un-American Activities Committee, on occasions takes me away from the Capital to other parts of our Nation during the time Congress is in session, on account of important official subcommittee work which it is required to do in connection with our legislative responsibilities. But, on such occasions I have always been able to arrange to be paired on any vote when I was necessarily personally absent. To date there have been 88 "yea" and "nay" rollcall votes. I was necessarily absent on 13 thereof but was paired on everyone of the 13. As to quorum calls (which are not voting occasions) there have been 80 to date. I necessarily missed 17 during the 1st session of this 84th Congress; I have not missed any quorum calls in this second session. The missed quorum calls were occasions for the same reasons which obtained in the manner of the "yea" and "nay" rollcalls. I have never been absent from attendance upon the floor of the House, or upon a committee meeting, nor in answer to a "yea" and "nay" rollcall vote, or a quorum call, or any other congressional duty or responsibility on any occasion during the almost 10 years I have already served in Congress on account of sickness or illness of any sort. I make this frank and full accounting to you of the same as I do of my discharge of every other official responsibility as your Representative in Congress.

I HAVE PERSONALLY TESTIFIED BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

For instance, I personally appeared and testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House, in support of a reasonable increase in pay for the postal workers. Committees set definite dates when Members of Congress will be heard by the committee on pending legislation.

I HAVE KEPT A DIARY OF CONGRESS FOR 10 YEARS

Again during all of this 84th Congress I have daily kept a brief diary of important happenings and events occurring on the floor of Congress. Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader MCCORMACK and Republican Leader MARTIN have told me that such a diary has never been kept by any Member of Congress within their knowledge. I was able to frequently accept invitations to speak to community groups, patriotic organizations, churches, lodges, Y. M. C. A., etc., about Congress.

Space prevents my visiting with you on other subjects which I should like to talk with you about in this report. But, whatever you have in mind to have me tell you about, please write me—or better yet—look me up when I am home this summer and give me the benefit of your opinion on it.

With kind regards to each of you and looking forward to again meeting you whom I already know and you whom I also wish to meet and know, I have the honor to be,

Your Congressman,

CLYDE DOYLE,
23d District, California.

Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Members of the House of Representatives will be called upon to vote on legislation authorizing the defense military construction program for fiscal year 1957. That legislation authorizes construction amounting to a total of $2.2 billion for projects deemed vital to our national security.

It is impossible for us as Members of Congress to be fully familiar with every aspect of this important legislation. However, when an instance arises with respect to such legislation, that threatens to squander the taxpayers' money and irresponsibly retard the development of a defense installation described as urgent by the Department of the Air Force, it is essential that the matter be called promptly to the attention of the membership of this distinguished body. I regret that such an instance is contained in the defense military construction bill, H. R. 9893. I refer specifically to the portion of the bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich.

In the action of the House Armed Services Committee in transferring the location of the base from Kalkaska, Mich., to Manistee, Mich., there can be no question that the American taxpayers' money will be squandered and the defenses of the United States irresponsibly retarded.

The membership of the House may recall that on March 13, 1956, in a speech that I delivered in this Chamber, I first called attention to this matter. My remarks on this subject at that time appear beginning on page 4631 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13.

In that speech I cited the fact that in the early fall of 1954 following thorough study of possible sites by the Department of the Air Force and by the interested committees of Congress, work was begun on a jet interceptor airbase at Kalkaska, Mich. The actual construction work was undertaken only after the Congress had authorized the construction and had appropriated funds for the initial expenditure of $8.6 million with respect to the Kalkaska Base.

The development of the Kalkaska Base was described by the Department of the Air Force as being in the best interest of the Air Force. The importance of immediate development of the base was further described by the Air Force as necessary to meet an urgent air defense requirement. The cost of the Kalkaska Base was estimated to be significantly less in original construction cost and substantially less in annual maintenance cost than similar costs pertaining to any other site considered.

In my remarks of March 13, I went on to relate how certain persons seeking to further their selfish interests had endeavored to have the jet interceptor base transferred from the Kalkaska area to a less satisfactory site near Manistee, Mich. I explained and documented how such a transfer would cause a minimum of 1 year's delay in the completion of a vital link in our northern defense perimeter intended to protect the north central industrial area of the United States from Detroit to Chicago. I also explained and documented the way in which the transfer from Kalkaska to Manistee would not only result in the abandonment of taxpayers' money already spent on the development of the base at Kalkaska but would also significantly increase the total cost of the development of the base. In my remarks of March 13, I also pointed out factors pertaining to troop morale considerations that dictated that the airbase be located at Kalkaska in the interest of promoting troop welfare and furthering our national security.

In my remarks of March 13 I thought that I had fully discussed the reasons why it was essential that the air base be retained at Kalkaska, Mich. and not transferred to Manistee, Mich. However, since that time certain additional matters relating to this subject have been brought to my attention. This additional information makes the motives of the self-seeking individuals endeavoring to transfer the base to Manistee, Mich. even more questionable and the propriety of the methods they have used to accomplish this end even more dubious than these motives and methods had appeared at the time of my previous speech.

The motivation for their efforts to transfer the base relates to their personal convenience and to their abhorrence of possible association with our American boys wearing the uniform of the United States Air Force. Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say on that later.

The self-appointed czar of this minority group effort to obstruct the development of an airbase at Kalkaska, Mich. that the Air Force has termed urgent to our national security, is an occasional summertime resident of the Kalkaska area who owns property in the area assessed at $3,800 in value and who paid $100.70 in taxes on that property for the year 1955. The individual heading this irresponsible obstructionist

movement actually lives in St. Louis, Mo.

This $100 a year summertime taxpayer would deny to the year-around taxpayers of Kalkaska the opportunity of seeing their community prosperity enhanced by virtue of the $5.8 million payroll that would attend locating the jet base at Kalkaska. He would prefer that the community lose that multi-million-dollar payroll so that his summertime peace and tranquility to which he contributes $100 a year would not be disturbed. The Department of the Air Force has expressed a view that because of community and recreational facilities that will be available to Air Force personnel, the Kalkaska site is the most desirable location considered in connection with locating the jet base in northern Michigan. This part-time resident of Kalkaska would sacrifice the morale and welfare of our military personnel for his part-time convenience.

In a letter dated October 5, 1955 which this St. Louis "constituent" sent to citizens in the Kalkaska area soliciting the donation of funds to thwart the Air Force in the development of an Air Force base essential to our national defense stated in his letter as follows:

> We have employed two lawyers in St. Louis and will shortly employ a third one in the State of Michigan.

He goes on to say with reference to the two lawyers in St. Louis:

> Both of these men know their way around Washington and are close to several influential Members of Congress.

The sinister implication of the expression in this St. Louis "constituent's" letter to the effect that the two lawyers in St. Louis are "close to several influential Members of Congress" should be carefully considered by every Member of Congress in his vote as to whether or not this vital air base should be retained at Kalkaska, Mich., as desired by the Air Force or whether it should be transferred to Manistee, Mich., as desired by a few part-time residents of the State of Michigan. I cannot help but wonder why the third lawyer from Michigan that this St. Louis "constituent" proposes to hire is necessary if the two lawyers from St. Louis have the Washington influence that he claims for them. Mr. Speaker, is this another instance of a person seeking to substitute influence for merit, in endeavoring to further a cause before the Congress of the United States? I think it is, Mr. Speaker, and, therefore, I am confident that the Congress will not sustain him in his selfish purpose.

My St. Louis "constituent" recently sent to me a petition allegedly representing the alleged views of approximately 700 signatories in opposition to the location of the air base at Kalkaska. I instigated an investigation to determine the validity of that petition. I have recently received reports on that investigation in the forms of a telegram from the Honorable Merle C. Lutz, President of the Kalkaska Air Base Committee and also a sworn affidavit from the Honorable Hollis W. Morgan, President of the Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I will include the telegram and the affidavit:

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., *March 23, 1956.*
Representative VICTOR A. KNOX,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

March 16, 690 cards addressed to signers of Comfort's petition were mailed at the post office of Traverse City, Mich., as of this date March 26 9:30 a. m., the following returns have been experienced: 94 returned—unknown, 30 returned—moved, 1 returned—deceased, 3 returned—no reason given, 37 returned—no such post office, 21 returned—insufficient address, 53 signers have indicated they are no longer opposed, 136 are still opposed to the site, 8 are undecided.

MERLE C. LUTZ,
President, Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Inc.

KALKASKA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Kalkaska, Mich., March 17, 1956.

To Whom It May Concern:

I, hereby, certify that I have conducted an investigation of the attached petition circulated in protest of the Kalkaska jet base in the summer of 1955 and I submit the following report:

There are 690 signatures entered on the petition of which 536 are reported here. Not one signature bears a Kalkaska address: 294 are found to be property owners, including husband and wife; 59 are year around residents (husband and wife and family); 313 are summer residents, or visitors (weekends to two months); 154 are completely unknown signatures; 9 are duplicate signatures; 1 is deceased for approximately two years; 23 minors (mostly early teenagers including two children of Hartley Comfort).

I hereby certify that the above report is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge.

HOLLIS W. MORGAN,
President, Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce.

Subscribed and sworn to before me a Notary Public in and for Kalkaska County on this 17th day of March 1956.

MILDRED E. SHOEMAKER,
Notary Public, Kalkaska County.
My commission expires August 16, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, these two documents are significant in that they demonstrate the deceit being used by those who would prevent the location of the jet base at Kalkaska.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on this vital subject today, I have documented the facts that, first, the minority group of part-time residents in the Kalkaska area who are seeking to thwart the efforts of the Department of the Air Force to complete the vital link in the air security of our Nation have resorted to the pressures of influence, and, second, have resorted to deceitful misrepresentations, in their efforts to accomplish their purpose.

Mr. Speaker, without attempting to minimize the serious gravity of those two devious methods that have been employed by this minority group that seek the transfer of this jet base to the Manistee area, there is a third factor with respect to their methods that causes me even greater concern and that must be called to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. Speaker, that third factor concerns the effort on the part of the same individual who is purchasing influence and practicing deceit to keep the Kalkaska base from being completed, to attain support for his selfish efforts by making scurrilous and opprobrious attacks upon the moral character of the men and women serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. This individual has expressed opposition to the location of the jet base at Kalkaska for the reason that "Around a military establishment unfortunately are found saloons, taverns, motels of questionable character, bawdy houses, and so forth." This same individual has said: "Traverse City with two bases in its area already can point to an alarming increase in delinquency. Thirty-five cases of illegitimacy, traceable to these bases is something the families do not want in the Chain of Lakes area." I have had both of these allegations carefully checked by the appropriate police officials in the Traverse City area. I have been informed in sworn affidavits from these officials that not only are these allegations untrue but the fact is that the military personnel located in the Traverse City area have a record of rendering substantial community service to the citizens of that area.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to include those affidavits as part of my remarks.

AFFIDAVIT

TRAVERSE CITY, MICH., *March 17, 1956.*

1. That I have been sheriff Grand Traverse County for the past 6 years, and associated with law enforcement for the past 10 years.

2. That during this period, to the best of my knowledge and belief, and especially following a thorough study of record, that the following facts are presented:

A. That there has been no above normal increase in crime, or reason to suspicion that there is, either due to the Empire Air Force Base or to the United States Coast Guard Air Station located in Traverse City.

(a) That, quite to the contrary, both of these installations have been a decided asset as assistance to law enforcement agencies, and that this assistance has been rendered to law enforcement agencies both under the official direction of commanding officers apart and separate from official duty nature, and as individuals during off-duty periods.

(b) That as examples of this assistance to law enforcement are quoted:

(1) The many assistances given in the rescue of resorters encountering trouble on the many lakes of the region.

(2) The assistance given in the finding of lost children, lost hunters, etc.

(3) The assistance given in searches for drowned bodies, and the subsequent finding of same, as a result of their efforts.

(4) The assistance rendered during large fires and other emergencies.

3. That, to the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been absolutely no increase in the rate of illegitimacy, or any related incidents or crimes, within the jurisdiction of this department.

RICHARD WEILER,
Sheriff, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Grand Traverse:

On this 17th day of March 1956 before me, a notary public in and for said county, personally appeared Richard Weiler, known by me to be the sheriff of Grand Traverse County, Mich., and who signed and acknowledged the foregoing instrument as his free act and deed.

MADELYN E. KELSCH,
Notary Public, Grand Traverse County, Mich.
My commission expires March 25, 1956.

AFFIDAVIT

CITY OF TRAVERSE CITY, MICH.,
March 17, 1956.

This is to certify that I, Charles Woodrow, am the chief of police in the city of Traverse City and have been for the past 14 years. I have been in police work in the city of Traverse City for the past 28 years.

In a letter to Mr. Donald Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force, dated August 30, 1955, Mr. Hartley B. Comfort alleges in paragraph No. 8 of this letter: "Traverse City, with two bases in its area, already can point to an alarming increase in delinquency. Thirty-five cases of illegitimacy traceable to these bases is something the families do not want in the 'Chain of Lakes' area."

I would like to make the following statement:

That, to the best of my knowledge and belief, there has been no abnormal increase in crime, delinquency, or illegitimacy since the establishment of these bases, and that, quite on the contrary, the personnel have been extremely well behaved. We have had the utmost cooperation from both bases in the handling of what few minor problems that have come up.

CHARLES WOODROW,
Chief of Police, Traverse City, Mich.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
County of Grand Traverse:

On this 17th day of March 1956 before me, notary public in and for said county, personally appeared Charles Woodrow, known by me to be the chief of police of the city of Traverse City, Mich., who signed and acknowledged the foregoing instrument as his free act and deed.

MADELYN E. KELSCH,
Notary Public, Grand Traverse County, Mich.

My commission expires March 25, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, neither the patriotic people of the Kalkaska area nor I as their Representative in the Congress of the United States initially sought to have the jet air base located in their lovely community. It is typical of the people in that community, however, that when they learned that the Department of the Air Force desired to build an air-base installation in their area that was vital to the defense of the United States, they immediately undertook to cooperate wholeheartedly with the Department of the Air Force in the completion of that project. The people of the community have already spent tens of thousands of dollars acquiring land to be donated to the Federal Government, enlarging school facilities, and improving recreational facilities to assure completion of the base and to assure maintenance of troop morale at a high level for the military personnel to be stationed there. The citizens of Kalkaska demonstrated in a typically American way that they wanted and would welcome the Air Force as an addition to their community.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force also wanted Kalkaska. The reasons for the decision by the Department of the Air Force to locate at Kalkaska can best be summarized by inserting in the RECORD at this point in my remarks excerpts from the testimony of Mr. John M. Ferry, Special Assistant for Installations of the Department of the Air Force before the House Armed Services Committee on March 7, 1956, in connection with that committee's consideration of H. R. 9893, authorizing construction for the military departments for fiscal year 1957.

The Air Force is satisfied with the Kalkaska site, from an operational and community viewpoint. It is the cheapest site for construction of any of those that we have surveyed. It has a great advantage in that the plans for construction are substantially completed. The land is being in the press of being acquired and donated in fee by the community and we have a lease on some 7,000 acres of State land, which we are ready to move in on. * * * It is a matter of importance that this go forward rapidly. Not only because of the need and desirability of establishing a base for our fighters as a protection to the central part of the country, but in order to establish the SAGE installation which is a part of the network of protection for the whole northern border of our country. * * *

The project of the SAGE installation is of the utmost importance. The plans are ready. We could go forward placing contracts within a matter of weeks if it were established that the installation will go at Kalkaska. * * *

In establishing the desirability of our base at Kalkaska, we gave considerable weight to the fact that we had obtained community support. By that I mean housing, schools, churches, social centers, close to our base, which is one of the factors involved in the selection of such a thing.

* * * * *

Mr. FERRY. Without looking at my figures, sir, it is about $18 million cheaper than Cadillac, but in annual costs, which I shall bring out later, it is considerably cheaper than Cadillac because of this SAGE installation.

I would like to point out one fact which is of great importance.

Here is Torch Lake, which Mr. Comfort discussed with you today, and pointed out there are expensive properties around here, which is true.

Here is the relationship of our base to Torch Lake. You will note it is a matter of about 8 miles away.

There is the runway. The pattern will bring planes in on the east-west heading, because there are prevailing winds, which will substantially keep them away from any of the Torch Lake area, so that the possibility of annoyance from noise of these jet planes is very minimal in the Torch Lake area.

I have never been quite clear as to just what the objection the Torch Lake residents was to this, because of the fact that it is relatively remote from their property. * * *

Under these circumstances, sir, I believe that it is in the best interests of the Air Force to expedite the construction of this property that is badly needed. We are ready to go forward with the concurrence of the committee.* * *

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Then the committee can understand after Cadillac had been rejected by the Appropriations Committee you appointed a board to make further studies, and the board made its findings and conclusions and recommended Kalkaska?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did they examine Manistee?

Mr. FERRY. They examined three sites.

The CHAIRMAN. Which three sites?

Mr. FERRY. They are not identifiable geographically other than to say they are relatively close together, and we titled them "Sites 1, 2, 3, in the Manistee area."

The CHAIRMAN. Compare the difference between the Kalkaska site and the Manistee site.

Mr. FERRY. May I refer to my figures to give you accurate cost information, sir?

For the purpose of your information, the cheapest Manistee site—there were three sites developed—the cheapest one was $11,850,000, as compared with the Kalkaska site, $11,652,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, are there any military objections to any one of the three sites?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us the advantage of the Kalkaska site over the Manistee site.

Mr. FERRY. The Kalkaska site is closer to a community, so that in time off that our people may have they will have a good-sized town. It is about a 20,000-inhabitant town—a good-sized town to go for such recreation as they may be able to develop.

The CHAIRMAN. As a military mission, has Kalkaska any advantage over Manistee?

Mr. FERRY. Militarily, with the exception of the fact that Manistee has a difficult soil problem in connection with the runways and foundations for the buildings. It will be difficult to expand the Manistee site in the near future.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Now, then, the other factors that caused you to make your decision, please.

Mr. FERRY. The other factors were cost, community support.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the difference in cost between the Manistee site and Kalkaska site, about $500,000?

Mr. FERRY. About $250,000. In first cost. In first cost.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no difference insofar as the cost is concerned?

Mr. FERRY. The first cost, sir. The annual costs are quite different.

The CHAIRMAN. How does the annual cost increase more at Manistee than at Kalkaska?

Mr. FERRY. The difference is brought about by the cost of the land lines which are used to connect up the SAGE installation into our defense network. The annual charges at Kalkaska are $1,040,000, as compared with $1,500,000 a year—a saving of almost a half million dollars a year in land-line costs.

Mr. DURHAM. Can you give us at this time the amount of money the Government would lose if another site were selected at this time? What are your commitments already, and how much money have you spent?

Mr. FERRY. We have between $400,000 and $500,000 already spent or committed to be spent for the development and completion of the plans and working drawings at the Kalkaska site.

Mr. DURHAM. In other words, you would lose about $500,000?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. DURHAM. Do you have a commitment already on your SAGE project and the contract?

Mr. FERRY. No, sir; and I am most anxious to place it. I am most anxious.

* * * * *

Mr. RIVERS. How much would it cost in delay if we selected another site?

Mr. FERRY. We would lose 1 year.

Mr. RIVERS. That would leave a gap in defense of this country for an additional year?

Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If you desire to expand in the future, can you expand at one base as easily as you can at the other?

Mr. FERRY. No, sir. We can expand more readily at the Kalkaska site than at the Manistee site because of soil conditions. We run into a rather difficult peak situation. It would be difficult to extend our runways.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. You know of the various complaints coming in from cities all over the country about the noise caused by the jets. Why doesn't the Department try to locate these places that have equal military value, where there will be less objection on account of the noise? Why do you want to go into fine sections and have people worried and disturbed, when you could go to a more

isolated section and have the same military defense, and put it there instead of putting it in other places?

Mr. FERRY. I am glad you have raised the question, Mr. Chairman. There are only two answers to that. In the first place, we have put it in an isolated area. We are out in an untouched wilderness, a completely untouched wilderness where we will not disturb any existing residents. There are only 3 or 4 cabins that have to be taken away from this entire area which we are about to occupy, and we are 20 miles away from the town of Traverse City—18 or 20. We are 8 miles away from the residential section which has been so clearly described here, at Torch Lake, and the pattern of our take-off and landing in the summertime is so consistently east-west, that we cannot see where it will cause the slightest major trouble to the people living at Torch Lake.

Mr. Speaker, that is the record that was before the House Armed Services Committee at the time that distinguished group adopted an amendment to H. R. 9893 that would transfer the jet base in northern Michigan from Kalkaska which was supported by the Air Force, to Manistee which was supported by a small minority group of summertime residents in the Kalkaska area.

The views of this minority group endeavoring to obstruct the Department of the Air Force in locating an airbase in Kalkaska is most persuasively offset by the testimony of the representative of the Department of the Air Force before the House Armed Services Committee. It is also persuasively offset by the views expressed by the majority of the citizens affected by the location of the base at Kalkaska. Typical of these expressions of views is a letter signed by Dr. B. B. Breese dated March 20, 1956, addressed to the House Armed Services Committee. At this point in my remarks I will include Dr. Breese's letter:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *March 20, 1956.*
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I have just learned of the decision of your committee to change the jet base location in northern Michigan from Kalkaska. Although I know that your time is precious, as a summer resident of Torch Lake, I should like to express my protest.

I have always considered Hartley Comfort, who has been instrumental in making this change, as a friend and I still do. However, I believe that many of the summer residents, even though they originally signed the petition which he presented to you have changed their views and would favor the base if they knew.

1. That from a defense, and taxation standpoint the Kalkaska area was advisable.

2. That money spent to prepare the site for use was wasted if the base were moved.

3. That the local residents would welcome the base and its personnel.

Apparently all three of these questions can be answered in the affirmative.

I know that I express the sentiment of a large group of resort people, many of whom have told me that that is the case.

My guess would be that if a secret ballot were permitted and the decision were based on the sentiment of the total local and summer resident population that those who favor the base would win. This, however, is not a problem for a referendum.

Although I am in no position to dictate your decision from a national standpoint, the question would seem to be:

Where can the needed base be most effectively and cheaply installed?

If Kalkaska is that spot, feel assured that by and large the base will be welcome.

Very sincerely yours,

B. B. BREESE, M. D.

There has recently appeared in the newspapers in the Kalkaska area a full page ad paid for by public-spirited citizens in the community who have recognized the economic and military need for the location of the airbase at Kalkaska. Because the contents of this ad clearly demonstrate the true feeling of the people in the area with respect to the location of the jet base near their community, I will, Mr. Speaker, include the text as part of my remarks at this point:

AN OUTRAGEOUS DECISION

There is widespread outrage among local residents at the decision of the Armed Services Committee to shift the location of the jet base from Kalkaska to Manistee.

Much of this feeling, too, is directed at one summer resident who, regardless of whether he intended to or not, has in reality put his interests ahead of those who live here year around, as well as ahead of our Nation's defense.

An annual payroll of about $6 million has been thrown away because of an unproved and dubious claim that the jet base would hurt the resort business, and also partly because of a false implication that we who live here don't want it.

Obviously the resorter in question has no concept of the economic problems facing the 10,000 or so year-around residents in Antrim County. He apparently thinks that the largess from the golden egg of a 2-month summer resort business is all—absolutely all—that this area should expect, and all that it needs, to continue living at its usual substandard level.

Fine schools, job and business opportunities, good housing, adequate loan institutions, improved sanitation, well-equipped hospitals close at hand, and many other cultural and economic advantages—all these have apparently been taken for granted by he who lives in the midst of them in the more prosperous area below. For us, these things are still a hope for the future that can only be fulfilled as our economy develops.

The tragedy is that there has been no convincing proof that the jet base and the resort business in this instance cannot be compatible. The Kalkaska site is in wasteland, far enough from the populated lakes region, and the flight patterns from this base were not planned for over the Torch Lake area.

The belief that the air base and our resort enterprise can exist side by site mutually benefiting each other is what has accounted for the silence of most local residents on the jet base issue before this.

Most of them felt that there was no use having an unpleasant argument when it seemed that the base was assured anyway.

Most of them felt that it was a healthy thing for those in opposition to express their opinions along with those who were in favor of it. That's democracy.

But the fact is that the House Armed Services Committee has apparently come to believe the story told it by the summer resorter, who came armed with a 1,200-name petition.

The House Armed Services Committee apparently believes that we are all "up in arms" about the base and don't want it here. What a libel of this area?

The loss of the jet base is not just a loss for those who live here. It's a terrible waste of both time and money for the entire Nation—because, for the most part, of the aggressive and successful action of one man working determinedly to keep the base out of Kalkaska and possibly out of Michigan.

According to news reports, the 1,200-name petition is the weapon that did it—and yet we know how phony petitions can be. We're not saying there's anything wrong with the petition that was presented. No one has had a chance to investigate it yet. But we cannot believe that most of those who signed it wanted it to be interpreted as a mandate for a reactionary treatment of national defense and the welfare of this area.

After all, a great measure of the enjoyment that summer residents have in any resort community depends upon and grows out of the friendly relationships with local residents.

What happens to the pleasure of such a relationship if there is no equality or dignity in it?

Each social group has a right and duty to help the other understand its individual and mutual problems. Discussion, persuasion, education—all are the accepted techniques of making a better society for free men.

But no one person, or small group of individuals, has the right to virtually dictate how this area shall grow, how it shall be developed, or attempt to place a ceiling over it—not without the consent of those living here. That is the basic reason for the outrage at the jet base decision.

We are sure that neither the summer residents nor the local residents are going to let the jet base affect their friendly relationship for the future, but we are also sure this issue is not dead yet.

If you want to help, whether local or summer resident, let the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate know how you feel.

Let them know that you are disgusted with the waste of taxpayers' money running into millions of dollars that would result from such a change.

Let them know that you believe that soldiers and citizens can live together in harmony in America.

Let them know that you believe that our real enemies are abroad and not at home.

Let them know that you want a reversal of the outrageous decision recently made by the House Armed Services Committee.

But act by sending a wire, telephoning, or writing your Congressman now, or it may be too late. (This appeal paid for by local citizens and businessmen interested in the continued economic and cultural development of this area.)

Thus, Mr. Speaker, we have a record of the Department of the Air Force undertaking to establish a vital defense link in the northern perimeter of the United States at a site which was desirable in terms of strategic and military considerations and which would result in the lowest possible cost to the American taxpayer, a record of the American citizens in the community working with the Department of the Air Force in a spirit of patriotism and cooperation. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we also have a record of a small group of persons who had some tenuous claim to residency in the area using influence, deceit, and unwarranted attacks on the character of the men and women wearing the uniforms of the Armed Forces of the United States in order to obstruct the development of this airbase at Kalkaska.

Mr. Speaker, we also have at issue in this matter a question of the confidence and faith that the people of America may place in their Federal Government and more particularly in the Congress of the United States. In my remarks today and in my remarks on March 13 I carefully documented the reliance that the people of Kalkaska placed on the decision to locate the jet base in their

community. The Department of the Air Force and the citizens of Kalkaska were fully justified in proceeding with their cooperative effort to bring to a prompt conclusion the construction of this essential Air Force establishment. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to note that the actions taken in this regard followed the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. This concurrence is documented by correspondence addressed to Defense Department officials from the appropriate committee and subcommittee chairmen expressing congressional approval of the selection of the Kalkaska site. Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I will include copies of those letters:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
July 29, 1955.

Hon. LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force,
Department of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GARLOCK: I have your letter of July 28, 1955, in which you indicate that it is the intention of the Air Force to establish the Traverse City area base at Kalkaska, Mich.

I am gratified that final selection of this base has been made, since I know of its importance to our Air Defense Command.

You request that this committee give its approval for the development of the airbase at the Kalkaska site. This request is somewhat of a surprise to me, since I assume that the site selected is in the Traverse City area and, this being so, this committee has no further function to perform or approval to give. The only remaining matter which would come within the cognizance of this committee would be the acquisition of the land necessary for the base, and I would expect that a project covering this land acquisition will in time be submitted to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
July 28, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This committee has no objection to the Air Force proceeding with the immediate construction of an airbase at the so-called Kalkaska site in Michigan as requested in Mr. Garlock's letter of July 28, 1955. It should be understood that funds can be made available from the appropriation for "Military construction, Air Force," in the amount previously justified and appropriated for an airbase in the Traverse City area.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
August 11, 1955.

Hon. LYLE S. GARLOCK,
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force,
Financial Management, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Chairman RUSSELL has referred to the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction your letter of July 28, 1955, regarding the development of a new airbase in the Traverse City, Mich., area.

As you know, the authorization for this base is designated as "Traverse City area, Michigan." It appears that this authorization is broad enough to support a location at any of the sites mentioned in your letter. The Senate Armed Services Committee was not responsible for the two previous changes in the proposed location of this base and, thus, has not had an opportunity fully to evaluate the comparative merits of the proposed sites. Since under the terms of the authorization act no further action is required on the part of the committees that considered the authorizing legislation, the Senate Armed Services Committee does not desire to impose any further restrictions on the Air Force in its selection of the site that is most advantageous to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN STENNIS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Real
Estate and Military Construction.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
August 4, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Appropriations Committee has this day approved reprograming requests of the Departments of the Army and Air Force for military construction items as submitted and testified to by the Departments concerned.

The enclosed lists marked "Pending Construction Requests" and dated July 28, 1955, indicate the 3 Army projects and the 13 Air Force projects considered and approved.

In addition, the Committee has approved the development of the Kalkaska, Mich., Air Force Base, for which funds have been previously appropriated for a similar project in this area.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. Speaker, the membership of this distinguished body will soon be called upon to exercise its considered judgment on an amendment that I shall offer at the time H. R. 9893 is being considered in the United States House of Representatives. My amendment will provide for the continuation of the jet airbase at Kalkaska in the interest of military and defense economy. My amendment is supported by the Department of the Air Force. My amendment is supported by the vast majority of the citizens residing, part-time and full-time, in the Kalkaska area. My amendment is supported by the urgency of military considerations and the dictates of sound Federal economy. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the House will undertake to join me in this effort to achieve greater national security for our glorious country at less cost to our already overburdened taxpayers.

The 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 9, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech dealing with certain aspects of the 1956 Olympic games, which I delivered on the evening of April 3, 1956, before the Father Rosensteel Council of the Knights of Columbus in Silver Spring, Md.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES

Last June, in Baltimore, I delivered an address on a subject in which I am keenly interested. I discussed certain aspects of a situation which has aroused in me a great deal of indignation.

It is a subject which should make all Americans indignant, regardless of their individual interests.

I spoke at that time on the subject of sports—amateur athletics as they relate to the activities of hundreds of America's goodwill ambassadors who participate in the Olympic games every 4 years.

I say "good-will ambassadors" because that is exactly what they are.

These clean, wholesome, young Americans have traveled to the far corners of the globe every 4 years as outstanding examples of our way of life. They have always been dedicated to the true spirit of amateur competitive sportsmanship. They are living testimonials of the excellence and superiority of the free American system.

More often than not, these exemplary young people have proven themselves to be athletically superior. But, win or lose, they have consistently excelled in sportsmanship. And, regardless of the outcome of their endeavors, America's young men and women have never been found wanting in their valuable roles as representatives of that type of decency, morality, fair play, and courage which underlies the greatness of this Nation.

It can truly be said that America's young athletes—like her soldiers—have never let this Nation down.

There is, however—and it is extremely sad to relate—a growing body of evidence indicating that we, the American people, will, by sheer default, let them down this year at Melbourne, Australia.

This is a serious charge for me to make.

I do not make it in a moment of passion or with tongue in cheek.

Rather, I make it in the cold, clear light of unimpeachable evidence and only after much serious study and consideration.

I am acutely conscious of its far-reaching implications, but it is stated without reservation.

I pointed out a year ago at Baltimore—and have many times since then—that since the revival of the Olympic games in Athens, Greece, in 1896, Olympic committees of every nation have recognized the fact that the true spirit of sportsmanship rules out even the slightest taint of professionalism or commercialism. So insistent are they in this respect that this concept is embodied in their rules and regulations.

I also explained that the spirit of the Olympics as we have known them is the spirit of amateur sportsmanship itself; the spirit that encourages observance of moral laws; the spirit that engenders a wholesome respect for ethical standards; the spirit that is the nourishment of man's growth. It is the ultimate expression of that inborn sense of honesty, integrity, and fair play that can be found and cultivated in the heart of every man regardless of race, creed, political conviction, or social standing.

I further explained that under our free system in the United States this spirit has found fertile soil in which to blossom to fruition. Our young folks, voluntarily, and on their own time, and without monetary compensation, develop their individual athletic skills and freely compete in the spirit of the Olympics.

I charged at Baltimore—and do here again today—that the Soviet Union flagrantly and wantonly perverts that spirit and ignores Olympic rules in international competition.

I warned that the international Communist conspiracy—as an integral part of its world-wide cultural propaganda offensive—has an iron fist ominously pointed at Melbourne, Australia. I declared with all the conviction at my command that this atheistic gang of cutthroats would do everything and anything, honorable and dishonorable, to capture all the honors at that great international amateur athletic event.

I cited chapter and verse to substantiate these dire charges.

Now, I realize that, because of my own athletic activities as a youth and because of my special interest in sports, many of you may think I am making too much of this matter—seeing ghosts under the bed, as it were.

I assure you, had I never held a baseball in my hand, had I never bounced a basketball off a backboard, had I never felt the precarious balance of a javelin or the compelling weight of a discus, or had I never put a pair of track shoes on my feet, I would be as concerned and as indignant as I am at this moment.

I would be as concerned and as indignant—yes. Fighting mad, if you will—because there will be more at stake for this Nation at Melbourne, Australia, than the outcome of a few athletic events.

The 1956 Olympic games will not primarily test the physical prowess and stamina of our voluntary American athletes. Rather, they will show whether or not America can still hold its head high; whether or not we, as a nation, can still boast of moral integrity; whether or not this Nation to whom the rest of the free world looks for leadership still has a soul.

But, if you still think I am merely getting unduly excited about a pet subject, then I beg your indulgence while I quote the opinions of a few very well qualified persons on the subject.

On June 15, 1955, only five days after my remarks in Baltimore, a distinguished colleague of mine, the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, senior Senator from the State of New Hampshire, inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article on Professionalism in Soviet Athletics.

The article was written by John Washburn of Hanover, N. H. It was published in the Concord Monitor, Concord, N. H.

Mr. Washburn, who served in the Army in Korea in 1945 and 1946 as a Russian interpreter, is now a sportswriter for World Tennis and the author of several articles on tennis behind the Iron Curtain. From 1950 to 1953 he was instructor in Russian at Dartmouth College.

Here is what he had to say about the relentless Soviet sports offensive, and I quote:

"The great Soviet Encyclopedia, in its entry on Dynamo, the oldest and most powerful Soviet athletic organization now in existence, confirms the fact that training camps for young Russian athletes do exist by its statement: 'For the training of young cadres of athletes from the youth of Dynamo, the young dynamovite (yuni dinamovets) which has raised many champions and U. S. S. R. recordholders was created.'

"It ought to be noted, in passing, that Dynamo is the athletic organization of the secret police and organs of state security.

"There is considerable material to prove that all top Soviet athletes are professionals, by any definition except the Communist-approved definition.

"The official Soviet Government position on professionalism in athletics was stated in detail by N. K. Antipov back on October 7, 1934, at a meeting of the presidium of the all-union Soviet of physical culture, and, since no other official viewpoint has been publicly expressed, we can assume that it is the official one.

"Said Antipov:

"'Our instructor, by bourgeois concepts, is, of course, a professional. We have thousands of such people, and we shall have even more. How can there be a question about allowing our instructor to enter competitions? In our country an instructor is just as much an athlete as anybody else.'"

Mr. Washburn goes on to point out example after example testifying to the rank professionalism of Soviet athletes.

He proves conclusively that they are paid by the state.

He offers adequate proof that they are official pawns of the government.

He shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are not amateur athletes in any sense of the word.

And, Mr. Washburn advises, and I quote: "While there is still time to avoid another debacle like Yalta from occurring at the 1956 Olympic games," steps should be taken by the International Olympic Committee to determine if Russia will be willing to abide by the rules of the Olympic games. If she will not, Mr. Washburn says—and these are his exact words—"Then Soviet masters of sport should be termed 'professionals,' and banned from Olympic competition."

After I had prepared my Baltimore remarks, the June 1955 issue of Life magazine carried a very illuminating article. It was written by Yuri A. Rastvorov, a former Soviet secret agent, and was entitled "Red Amateurs Are Pros."

I invite your attention to a few pertinent observations of Mr. Rastvorov, and again I quote:

"In the 17 months since my flight from the Russian Intelligence Service I have studied international sports with particular interest from the viewpoint of a fan and a former athlete in the Soviet Union. I was at once amazed by the gulf between the United States and the Soviet attitudes toward sports. I believe that if Americans do not learn just how complete this difference is before next year's Olympic games, they may be in for some rude shocks. Americans have to realize that such terms as 'amateur' and 'voluntary' are totally irrelevant in the U. S. S. R. Soviet teams are not organized; they are assembled as parts of a great State machine. Soviet teams do not play at their sports; they work at them.

"As a member of the Russian generation that grew up after the revolution and later as a member of the Soviet Intelligence Service, I had very full opportunities to observe the total regimentation of Soviet sports. As a youth I was trained in the military skills that were compulsory sports requirements for young Soviet citizens. As a young man I learned of the flagrant special privileges that are given Soviet sports stars, and later in a Siberian prison colony I saw what happened to athletes who were suspected of abusing those privileges. I learned that no Soviet team is sent into foreign competition unless it is practically certain of winning, although this may involve bribing of judges and referees. Finally as an espionage agent I saw how the machinery of Soviet Intelligence is constantly at work evaluating foreign athletic capabilities just as it evaluates foreign military capabilities."

Mr. Rastvorov goes on to emphasize example after horrible example testifying to the indisputable professionalism of the Soviet musclemen who masquerade as amateur athletes.

He proves conclusively that, in flagrant violation of Olympic rules and regulations, they are subsidized by the Kremlin.

He offers adequate proof that they are nothing but monstrous robots following the dictates of the international Communist conspiracy.

He shows beyond any shadow of a doubt that they will have a criminally unfair advantage over our young people who are dedicated to common decency, honesty, and fair play.

Also, after the preparation of my Baltimore remarks, the June 1955 American Legion Magazine featured an article by Arthur Daley. Mr. Daley didn't concern himself particularly with flagrant perversion by Russia of the spirit of the international Olympics. Rather, he boldly outlined the staggering results which this diabolic slave-State has been able to produce.

Here is Mr. Daley's startling revelation as set forth in the pages of the American Legion Magazine, and I quote:

"A decade or so ago the U. S. S. R. was in the Middle Ages, athletically speaking. Now it's in the atomic age.

"If you need a few examples, here are some which should open your eyes. This is what the Soviet athletes did in various championships last year:

"Speed skating: Swept all 5 men's championships and took 4 out of 5 women's titles.

"Skiing: Won 2 men's and 2 women's championships, thus muscling in on the Scandinavian monopoly for the first time.

"Gymnastics: Won 5 of 7 championships for men and 3 of 6 women's. Won both men's and women's team titles.

"Wrestling: Won 3 of 8 championships, more than any other nation.

"Rowing: Won the grand challenge cup at Britain's Henley Regatta.

"Weight lifting: Won 4 of 7 championships and took the team title.

"Shooting: Won 7 of 9 championships and 6 of 9 individual championships.

"The closest thing to a world championship in track and field was the European title games. The Russians won them.

"The comrades also set world records for the 3-mile run, for the 5,000 meters, for the 400-meter hurdles, and for the hammer throw while their Amazons set 9 more world records. Their male swimmers set two.

"And if all these statistics don't give you a chill, it's worth mentioning that there isn't a Russian track and field record—except the high jump—for the 19 standard Olympic events that's older than 4 years. Ten of them were made in 1954."

And so, Mr. Daley dramatically illustrates the results obtained by the Red Soviet overlords as they wantonly befoul the spirit of the Olympics by making a propaganda weapon of amateur sports.

He demonstrates effectively that the athletic Frankenstein monsters of the Soviet regime are, first, last, and always, determined to be ruthless winners by fair means or foul.

He offers adequate proof that their cunning masters within the Kremlin walls have stockpiled them just as surely as they have A- and H-bombs.

He shows beyond any shadow of a doubt that these so-called amateur athletes are not sportsmen in any sense of the word. Just one more devilish weapon in the Communist cold-war arsenal to be used in their relentless drive for superiority in every phase of human existence.

Mr. Daley concludes the second portion of his articles with this dire warning—these are his prophetic words:

"Brace yourselves, boys, and accept an unhappy fact. When the 1956 Olympic games are ended, the Soviet scoreboard will not be blank. It will be heralding its news to the world in letters and in figures of red."

The sports columns of the New York Times of April 3, 1955, gave a graphic illustration of the size of the Soviet athletic program.

In an article written by Clifton Daniel it was asserted that "The Soviet Government has appropriated this year more than 30 billion rubles" for its physical culture program.

Mr. Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, has warned that Russia "is building the greatest mass army of athletes the world has ever known."

I could go on and on and further substantiate my charges that the slave masters of the Kremlin are brazenly befouling the international Olympic games.

But why belabor the issue any longer?

Need I offer any more proof?

Inasmuch as the Russians have already walked away with the seventh winter Olympic games which were recently held in Italy, and since it is a foregone conclusion that they will do the same in Melbourne, it is too late to worry about an intensified program to prime our youth so that they may match the skills of the Russians.

We couldn't do this even if we wanted to.

We follow the rules.

The rules stipulate only 3 weeks of training and a strict amateur status of participants. This automatically precludes the possibility of meeting the Russians on their own terms and on equal grounds.

And, since these animated beasts of propaganda are not even sportsmen or athletes, we shouldn't worry whether we beat them or not.

What, then, is my complaint?

What am I getting excited about?

What do I advise?

Simply this:

This nation should do everything humanly possible to expose this gigantic international fraud and blackmail for what it is.

In fairness to our youth—who have never yet let us down in peace or war—we should do everything humanly possible to ban Russia and her barbaric goon squads from participation in the 1956 summer Olympics at Melbourne, Australia.

For, as I said nearly a year ago, if we allow the push-button athletes of the Soviet Union to run away with all the honors at the 1956 Olympics—without so much as a protest—and we start complaining afterward that they haven't complied with Olympic rules, we will be providing them with a razor-sharp, double-edged propaganda sword with which to run us through.

The winning Russian athlete will be flaunted as a symbol of strength, clean living, fun, courage, and fair play; a superior product of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The complaining Americans will be ruthlessly propagandized as inferior products of a decadent, outmoded, capitalistic system, incapable of winning over the Russian athlete—and a poor loser to boot.

I am grieved by the sad lack of concern shown by American athletic officials—official American—and the American people as a whole, regarding this thoroughly deplorable state of affairs. These unprincipled disciples of the devil walked all over our youth at the winter Olympics and only mild and muted murmurs were heard on this side of the water.

This fact is quite amusing—if pathos is ever funny—in view of the extremely harsh and hasty action which we take against our own athletes.

As was reported in a recent issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C., our athletes cannot reflect the slightest taint of professionalism. If they do, they are banned forever from participation in the Olympic games.

Mr. Shirley Povich, talented sports writer for the Post, in his column, This Morning, outlined the case of famed mile-king Wes Santee.

Santee is a graduate of Kansas University and presently a proud member of the United States Marine Corps. He is alleged to have accepted more money for travel expenses to various track meets than the rules permit.

This, it is alleged, makes him a professional.

The American Athletic Union, which Santee claims offered him the money in the first place, has stripped him of his amateur rating forever. This of course prohibits him from participating in the 1956 Olympic games.

Mr. Povich in suggesting that the American Athletic Union has exploited the amazing talents of Santee to enhance its own gate receipts at various meets, asks this pertinent question, and I quote:

"And how come the AAU did not show the same vigorous interest in investigating those AAU promoters who propositioned Santee into violating the rules? Their sins are down in black and white on the financial statements of the meets they conducted, yet all they drew was a wrist-slapping reminder not to do it again."

Now, it is not my purpose to go into the relative merits of the case of Wes Santee who was this country's best hope in the forthcoming Olympic in the 1,500-meter or mile-run.

However, it does seem incongruous to me that our own athletic officials will mete out extremely harsh and apparently unjustified punishment to an American athlete, but accept the gross insults and deliberate violations of the Russians without a protest.

This is especially provoking because there is more than a reasonable doubt as to the real guilt of the accused. Indeed, my distinguished colleague, United States Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, considers the Santee case worthy of a congressional investigation.

I submit, in view of this case, that if American Olympic officials fail to protest the participation of the Russians in the 1956 Olympics, they will have automatically branded themselves as rank hypocrites.

Their failure to take a strong stand on this issue will be inscribed in athletic history as a personal insult to every American athlete participating in the Olympic games.

This strange silence in the face of Russian violation of the Olympic rules on the part of official America is perhaps understandable in one sense of the word.

I say "one sense of the word" because in these latter days there is a substantial and extremely vocal segment of our society which seems to have forgotten what common morality, integrity, honesty, and decency are.

They are bedeviled by a vast and consuming vision of a brave new world of angels and demons coexisting in peace, prosperity, and universal brotherhood. The collectivist society of their impractical dreams has economic equality and material comfort as its highest attainable goal.

This ridiculous notion has dimmed their senses.

It has darkened their vision.

It has dulled the voice of conscience.

In their mad rush to materialize and make manifest their wild dreams and schemes, they have no time for immutable truth. No time for moral indignation. No time for the unashamed honesty, decency—yes, and patriotism—which shine forth with such brilliance from the pages of our glorious history.

These are the same people who saw nothing wrong in our participation in the Korean war. The flower of our youth was sent to the God-forsaken wastelands of that conflict to suffer without hope and to die without reason. They were forced to fight a war which they were forbidden to win—all for the brave new world of coexistence.

The self-styled architects of this futuristic Armageddon, however, were so blinded by their senseless vision, they could look upon mangled bodies, frozen limbs, and tortured minds without shedding a tear or suffering a twinge of conscience; the shrieks of the dying and the stench of the dead failed to move them.

So, perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll be moved to compassion by the mere prospect of our youth being unfairly pitted against the athletic automatons of Soviet Russia in the forthcoming Olympics.

It is this same vocal group—scared to death of war and enamored of a false peace—which refuses to see anything wrong with sitting in the council chambers of the United Nations—making deals with Russia and her satellites. These people wink at daily violations of the fundamental precepts of the U. N. Charter which they swore to uphold.

Perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll even raise an eyebrow at the mere prospect of violation of the Olympic rules.

And, it is this same vocal group which is eager to extend recognition to the murderous tyrants of Red China—the wholesale slaughterers of American youth.

Perhaps I'm asking too much to expect that they'll be at all concerned about the figurative slaughter of American youth on the athletic field.

But, even though this segment of our society seems to be the dominant factor in our national life, I am convinced that they represent only the temporarily confused mind of America.

I cannot believe and will not believe that they reflect the great spirit of America.

I am convinced that that great spirit has yet to be heard.

It was the spirit of America speaking in the memorable spring of 1775. Patrick Henry was one American who lived by an ideal and had the courage to speak out for it.

Was he willing to supinely acquiesce in the face of British might?

No.

When the Second Revolutionary Convention of Virginia was meeting to determine whether to make an armed resistance to the Red Coats, he asked this question:

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?"

He gave his own answer—an answer which we might profitably ponder at this time.

"I know not what course others may take, but as for me—give me liberty or give me death."

Those were the days when the spirit of America could make itself heard.

We might well ask ourselves today: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of embezzling the pride, the honor, the spirit, the morale, and courage of our youth?"

It was the spirit of America speaking in the early 1800's when Stephen Decatur said: "Our country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country right or wrong."

Today, when there is absolutely no question as to the rightness of our country's position, shall we be less eager to defend her national honor?

Shall we be less eager to defend the honor of her youth?

It was the spirit of America speaking at Springfield, Ill., in 1837. In that proud year of American history, Abraham Lincoln asked a significant question.

"At what point then," he asked, "is the approach of danger (to this Nation) to be expected?" And his answer was one which we might well ponder at this moment.

"If it ever reach us," he said, "it must spring up amongst us, it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time, or die by suicide."

I say at this time without hesitation or qualification that if we are willing to turn our backs on our youth, we have already reached a dangerous junction on the road of national suicide.

And, it was the spirit of America speaking on the deck of the *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay, on September 2, 1945. Speaking of what man

must do to insure peace, justice, and morality in our modern world, General MacArthur said:

"The problem is basically theological * * * it must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

I submit that the great spirit of America should make itself heard in this particular instance.

It is time that we insist on justice, morality, honesty, and integrity instead of just talking about it.

We must expose the Russians for what they are.

We must ban them from the 1956 Olympic games.

We must be done with common cause with the Devil.

We must chart a course of honor and stand behind our youth who are, after all, the America of tomorrow.

Mr. Rastvorov, whose words I have quoted previously, captures the problem in much more profound and lucid terms than my poor power permits.

With your permission, I will quote the conclusion of his article:

"[If the future] is to be productive in the sense that there is a spreading and diffusion of those values upon which our civilization is founded and from which it draws its strength, it will only be because we who are the present custodians embrace them with genuine conviction, live by them, and include them in our legacy to the world of our children * * * it is a matter of loving and hating the proper things; a matter of rejecting that which is false in favor of that which is known to be true; of putting principle before expediency, of cherishing universal values rather than those of limited worth and application. It is a problem of stark realism and honesty in the evaluation of fact * * * the future will depend upon the instruments which we are able to bring to its solution; our moral conviction, our vision, our wisdom, and our will."

I am confident that if and when the spirit of America shall make itself heard, we will not let our young people down.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, inspire us now to wholeheartedly dedicate and devote our capacities and talents, our energies and resources, to the best possible use in solving effectively and rightly our many national and international problems.

We penitently confess that we are frequently indifferent and satisfied with doing and giving our second best for those causes which challenge and demand the consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

Encourage us to go forward bravely and fearlessly in the great adventure of building for humanity a new world of righteousness and justice, of peace and good will.

May we have within us more of the faith and fortitude of the Founding Fathers and daily bear witness to a spirit which places its confidence in the Lord God omnipotent.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of Our Salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEMOCRATS BOOM McCORMACK FOR PRESIDENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it started in Massachusetts about a week ago among the many friends and supporters of House Majority Leader JOHN W. McCORMACK.

What began as a spontaneous move to have the Massachusetts delegation at the Democratic National Convention put John's name in nomination as a favorite son has already spread beyond the borders of his home State.

The Boston Post is carrying the good news to the six New England States and beyond.

His colleagues in the United States House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle, have long known his ability, judgment, and courage.

So have the people of New England.

Now a nationwide constituency is waking up to the fact that JOHN McCORMACK is the logical candidate of the Democratic Party for the highest responsibility and honor that this powerful country can confer.

Two weeks from today, on April 24, in the Bay State presidential primary, his name will be written in by tens of thousands of voters, serving notice to the Nation that the Democrats want a candidate of national stature, and one who is thoroughly familiar with all the domestic and international problems that require the best in leadership.

The popular demand in New England for McCORMACK for President will mushroom to national proportions in the weeks to come.

Our House majority leader is not the kind to promote himself. He is too busy with the great demands of his position, plus the conscientious attention he gives to the people of his Boston district, to think in terms of personal ambition.

But he cannot escape the call of those who recognize his magnificent services to the Nation.

JOHN McCORMACK is a lawyer and a war veteran.

He had to make his way in life through sheer ability, determination, and a faith in those eternal verities that make him a fighter for human decency and human freedom.

Through the Massachusetts House and Massachusetts Senate, he rose to the position of majority leader in the United States House of Representatives which he has held by the common consent and warm approval of his colleagues for a total of many years.

In war and in peace, he has proved equal to every occasion.

Few men in the whole history of Congress have had his knowledge of both sides to every vexing problem in National Government, or his integrity in working for their solution.

All of his colleagues will vouch for this.

Their constituents in every State and district of the Nation will soon learn that they have overlooked, for too long, the great ability and character of a majority leader who is destined, by every standard that we apply to those who are considered for this highest office, to be our next national leader.

Massachusetts proudly presents JOHN W. McCORMACK for President.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to advise my colleagues of the House that I am today introducing a resolution directing the House Committee on Ways and Means to undertake an investigation and study of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. I will be joined in this effort by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] who will introduce the same resolution.

The Members of the House must be aware that we are being asked under the provisions of H. R. 5550 to approve United States membership in this agreement in an indirect way through the approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

May I advise my colleagues that I have asked for 1 hour on Thursday of this week, and I will be joined by some 10 or 12 Members on both sides of the aisle, to try to explain to the Members of the Congress why we should not enter into this agreement until we know just what commitments have been made and how far Congress has been bound by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

THE LATE HALLETT S. WARD

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of a former Member of the House of Representatives, Hon. Hallett S. Ward, who served here during the 67th Congress.

Mr. Ward was born in Gates County, N. C., on August 31, 1869, the son of a Confederate veteran. He was educated at the University of North Carolina and entered the practice of law at Winton, N. C., in 1894. In 1896 he moved to Plymouth, N. C. In addition to practicing in the courts of eastern North Carolina he served as mayor of that city. He was a member of the State senate in 1898 and 1900. In 1904 he was named solicitor of the first solicitorial district of North Carolina and was reelected in 1906. From 1904 until his death his home was in Washington, N. C.

In 1920 he was elected from the First Congressional District of North Carolina to the Congress and retired voluntarily in 1924. Again in 1930 he served in the North Carolina State Legislature. Mr. Ward was a lifelong Democrat and for 34 years taught the men's Bible class in the Episcopal Church at Washington, N. C. He was twice married: First, to Miss Aileen Latham, of Washington County, who died in 1927; second, to Miss Dora Bonner, to which union a son, Hallett Ward, Jr., was born, who is an attorney, a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and now in the armed services. Mr. Ward practiced law for 62 years. He was an able lawyer, a faithful public servant, Christian gentleman, and an interesting conversationalist. The State of North Carolina has lost an able citizen, one who was held in high regard and esteem by all who knew him. To his wife and son I express my deep sympathy.

[From the Washington (N. C.) Daily News]

HALLETT S. WARD

A gentleman of the old school has graduated.

Hallett S. Ward traveled life's highway for 86 years. During all that time he never made a detour and he never stopped to get his bearings. He knew where he was going, and his pathway was filled to overflowing with activity, service, and dedication to mankind.

Few men in this world will ever enjoy the full measure of life that was Mr. Ward's. Until his short illness, his keen insight, prolific wit, and unfailing skill set him apart from the crowd.

As an attorney, legislator, solicitor, and Congressman, Mr. Ward stood ever erect. As a citizen, husband, father, churchman, and beloved Pamlicoan, that erectness and straightforward approach were his finest labels.

It is most difficult for one so immature to pay tribute to one so wise. Trite though it might be, Mr. Ward was a gentleman and a scholar—a gentleman in every sense and a scholar in the truest sense. He made his mark in life—a magnificent one. We may never see his like again.

His travels this way have enriched many lives. His contributions to life have challenged many more. His 86 years of full and active life tell a story more beautiful than words can express. And death has not robbed his life of any of its splendor.

All of us can look at that great life and be inspired.

HOUSING CONGRESS FOR WOMEN

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an interesting document, which is just one more reason why the silliest of all proposals for wasting the taxpayers' money—Housing Administrator Albert Cole's so-called Housing Congress for Women—should be canceled.

I have here a publication entitled "What People Want When They Buy a House," published by the United States Department of Commerce, Office of Technical Services, and released on December 16, 1955, less than 4 months ago. Its purpose is to be a guide for architects and builders.

It was prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and includes a foreword by Albert M. Cole, the Administrator. This is the same Albert M. Cole who is now planning a conference of women—winners of a letter-writing contest—to find out the information contained in this booklet which, if Mr. Cole has not read it, he may purchase for $3 or perhaps be given a copy, as I was.

Since Mr. Cole, if we are to believe the contents of this booklet, already knows what people want when they buy a home, it can only raise a number of doubts about the nature of this coming Congress, and I think he should be called upon for some explanations.

First, Mr. Cole should tell us whether the investigations he is conducting include clearance by the Republican National or State committees; and

Second, he should tell us whether this Congress is interfering with the normal business of his agency; and

Third, is the money he plans to spend to pay the travel expenses of the contest winners being taken from funds which normally would be used for the regular business of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including necessary travel.

I have received a letter from a Philadelphia housewife, who had submitted her ideas to Mr. Cole. She writes, in part, as follows:

Last week a local member of the staff (HHFA) called on me for details of my background. He said the entire staff was called off regular duties to interview every single letter writer, the details to be sent to Washington where a selection would be made of a representative group.

This housewife went on to say that she doubted very much that she would win a trip to Washington because she also happens to be a Democratic committeewoman.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, approximately 7 legislative days ago the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] and I introduced identical resolutions the effect of which would give to the House of Representatives an opportunity to sign a petition to bring to the floor of the House a measure upon which action could be taken on the subject of civil rights. Yesterday the Attorney General of the United States presented to the Speaker of the House and to the Presiding Officer of the other body a program which, in my opinion, is somewhat overdue, but which nevertheless, I think, is a sound program. I hope, therefore, that no hasty action will be taken until such time as the Committee on the Judiciary has had a reasonable opportunity of considering this program. I hope the committee will bring forth a program and a bill which both sides of the aisle can join in supporting. It will then be our determination to take the necessary procedures to see to it that we have an opportunity to vote on this important matter before the adjournment of this session of the Congress.

GENERAL AGREEMENT FOR TARIFF AND TRADE

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to confirm the statement made a few moments ago by my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to the effect that he and I have introduced a resolution which calls in very specific terms for a study by the Committee on Ways and Means of the General Agreement for Tariff and Trade affectionately or unaffectionately known at GATT. This general agreement is having a profound effect upon the American economy. Its effect is particularly disturbing to the New England textile industry or what is left of it, which is still a great factor in the economy of the district which I have the honor to represent. I hope that resolution will be agreed to and that a study will be made as I think the result of such a study cannot fail to be salutary.

FACT FINDING COMMITTEE OF FRIENDS NEIGHBORLY SERVICE CLUB

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include therewith a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a communication from Mr. William N. Galbreth, chairman, Fact Finding Committee of Friends Neighborly Service Club, San Bernardino, Calif., dated March 30, 1956, covering more equitable distribution of surplus commodities to the needy people of this country, which I think is definitely worthy of consideration by those who are governing the distribution of our surplus foods:

FRIENDS NEIGHBORLY SERVICE CLUB,
SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., *March 30, 1956.*

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Inviting your attention to the much publicized, criticized, and confusing reports relative to the cost of storing various articles of surplus food, and the very great amount of confusion in the ranks of the farmers as well as among the rank and file of the already overburdened taxpayers of our Government relative to the cost of storage, and the very, very strong opposition to sending said surplus food to foreign countries, thereby competing with their farmers.

The very fact that there are 16,000 individuals here in San Bernardino County suffering from lack of proper food, not included

in this number are thousands of retired civil service employees (Federal), some who retired before 1948, some from partial as well as total disability, whose retirement annuities are not enough to allow them to live in a semblance of the so-called American standard of life, even if their annuities were based on the 100 percent value of the dollar.

This condition exists in practically every county and parish in the United States. These Federal annuitants along with low wage earners, low social security recipients, as well as other recipients of State dole could use surplus food to keep alive the spark of life and enthusiasm that made this country that you gentlemen so proudly and justly refer to as the greatest democratic government in the world. You can make your words come true by distributing this surplus food to the low wage earners, old-age pensioners, annuitants in the lower brackets from Federal retirement, and senior citizens dependent on State and other charitable dole, thereby reestablishing that feeling of confidence and security that caused us to give the best years of our lives to make it possible for you to be where you are today. Show your appreciation for our labor and efforts by giving us a few square meals before it is too late, because when we cross the bar material food ceases to be of value.

Don't you think we could use and appreciate the butter that was practically given to Italy at 15 cents per pound while here at home the price per pound was beyond the reach of the average citizen? Likewise, the grain stored in warehouses that cost the taxpayers of this country $1 million a day for rent was allowed to deteriorate to the extent that it had to be disposed of to the distillers to make wider, longer, and more enticing the avenue to juvenile delinquency, while millions of our citizens are suffering from malnutrition and undernourishment. Some of the senior citizens, as well as millions of our children, have forgotten the taste of butter as well as rice.

Let it be indelibly impressed on your mind that this is not a socialistic or communistic problem. It is a democratic problem based on Christian humanitarianism born in the hearts and John and Bertha Entrikin, watered and nourished by the spirit of the great Prince of Peace. Let Him come into your lives and your conscience will be at ease and in peace will be your deliberations.

This problem was recognized as one of merit by the Department of Agriculture through the constant and persistent efforts of John and Bertha Entrikin until the Department of Agriculture issued status 32 permitting the distribution of surplus food to low-wage earners, pensioners, etc. The intent was good but the motive was used as a political football. The result, suffering and hardship, causing millions of citizens to ask, "Where is that prosperity and that $117 every citizen is supposed to have?" Gentlemen, reverse your positions, place yourselves in the place of the low-wage earners, old-age pensioners, etc., and be governed accordingly.

We request that legislation be enacted calling for the distribution of all surplus food, above that required by law to be held for emergencies, to the aforementioned people until the supply now in storage be reduced to the level required by law. We are now, as you well know, overtaxed, and the part required for cost of storage can be used for other purposes.

Remove the pangs of hunger and you remove 75 percent of juvenile delinquency and 50 percent of broken homes. Try it and see if the results will not justify the means. Storage costs mount, starvation increases mortality. Reduce both by fair and proper legislation.

Yours respectfully,

FACT FINDING COMMITTEE OF FRIENDS
NEIGHBORLY SERVICE CLUB,
WILLIAM N. GALBRETH, *Chairman.*

THE LATE HARRY M. MOSES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess of the Congress, one of the country's truly great men who contributed much for improving labor-management relations—a man who showed the way—was called to his eternal rest and eternal reward.

I refer to the passing of Harry M. Moses, organizer and president of the Bituminous Coal Operators Association. I knew him well and know much of what he accomplished in his all-too-short life of 59 years. It is with pride that I could call him my personal friend.

Harry was born in Westville, Ill., in my congressional district, and was an outstanding citizen of Danville, Ill., for many years. He got his schooling while working in coal mines. He later went into mine management and worked his way up to become the head of coal subsidiaries of the United States Steel Corp. With this background, a full understanding, and a sympathetic one, of the problems of the miners and a full understanding of the problems of management, Harry Moses brought an end to the long, bitter battles between the two. Disputes were settled by negotiation, without strikes, and both the miners and management profited.

I extend my personal sympathy to the Moses family. I surely share their loss. It is a great one to them, to his untold numbers of friends, and to all of us.

As a part of my remarks I should like to add the following editorial on Harry M. Moses which appeared in the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News and one from the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald:

[From the Danville (Ill.) Commercial-News]

HARRY M. MOSES

A great rock of a man, with a nobility of heart to match his stature, has been removed from Danville and the national scene with the death of Harry M. Moses.

The obituaries told that he was a "close friend" of John L. Lewis—indeed, the only man "Old John" would sit down and negotiate with in the last few years. He was also a close friend to many others.

Although he spent less and less sustained time in Danville in recent years, he was here on many flying visits to see his mother and sister, Mrs. Tom Moses and Mrs. Harold T. Leverenz.

Mr. Moses was stricken by that cruel killer—cancer. He had been seriously ill and in much pain for weeks. The son of Tom Moses who rose from a mule driver in the old Bunsenville mine to general superintendent of the United States Fuel Co., Harry Moses knew the terrible labor conditions which once existed in the industry.

Although he wound up on the management side of the business, he knew from personal experience what the current hit song, Sixteen Tons, meant. It was this knowledge which made him invaluable in dealing with Lewis. And it was mutual trust and understanding which enabled these two to bring peace in a turbulent industry.

He was the first president of the operators' association and as such worked out 3 industrywide labor contracts with Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers. Before 1950, when these 2 began their periodic negotiating sessions, the coal industry went through 9 different strikes and work stoppages in 5 years.

He lived but 59 years, but he served others for most of these. Whether it was Pittsburgh or Washington, he was never too busy to visit with Danville friends. Right to the last he was accessible for a quiet chat, sharing that marvelous twinkle of his merry eye and a heartwarming chuckle.

He always called Danville home and his work in top business circles did much to improve our industrial economy.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post and Times Herald]

HARRY M. MOSES

Under the leadership of Harry M. Moses, an urbane and infinitely patient man, the Bituminous Coal Operators Association was able to help keep peace in the Nation's coal mines and to strengthen what had been a terribly sick industry. From 1950 until his death Sunday, Mr. Moses was president of the association and a guiding spirit in the industry-wide negotiations it conducted with John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America. Few men understood better than Mr. Moses the roars that emanated from both sides in these negotiations and seldom did a man have to show patience in such a full measure as he did. The result was that he had the confidence and respect of operators and union leaders. Sometimes he was criticized for giving in too readily at the expense of higher coal prices, but this criticism needs to be weighed against the economic cost of strikes. He was bamboozled by neither side, and during his presidency of the bituminous association there was never a coal strike. His death at the age of 59 takes from this city one of its most respected industry spokesmen.

THE FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have often wondered if Mr. Eisenhower was actually the President of the United States. There is strong evidence here now, if newspaper reports can be relied upon, that he is not. Here is the headline in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., which appeared recently: "Benson Will Not Accept Farm Bill."

I always thought Ezra was simply the mouthpiece of the President, but I evidently was wrong. He says he will not accept the farm bill as worked out by the conferees. I guess that settles it. There is no use trying to see the President, which I was tempted to do, as a veto of the 90 percent of parity will make the vote picking for the Republicans a precarious undertaking. I hope someone, either Mr. Hall, or someone interested in the Republican Party, will go down and see Mr. Eisenhower and suggest to him in a roundabout way that he, Mr. Eisenhower, is the President, and not Mr. Benson.

Ezra thinks because the National Farm Bureau is out to skin the farmers—which it has been doing for some time—that the sentiment of the farm belt is all for Benson's support. The

funny part of that is that not all the State Farm Bureaus are following the National Farm Bureau in reference to support prices. I do not know how many States have parted company with their parent organization, but I know that the North Dakota Farm Bureau is for support prices. Anyway, Mr. Benson is adamant and arrogant and wants his way—but the only way he should have is his way out of the Department of Agriculture.

Benson's howl about surplus is the most unfair claim that could be imagined, so far as North Dakota is concerned. North Dakota raises her spring wheat and there is not now, and never has been a surplus of that kind of wheat. Bread cannot be successfully made without a good portion of hard spring wheat, and many times in recent years importations of hard spring wheat from Canada were permitted to accommodate millers. Any State that raises winter wheat does not produce hard spring wheat. The Western Pacific States raise a variety that is much harder than the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas wheat, but yet it does not fill the bill. If there is a surplus of the kind of wheat we produce in North Dakota will Mr. Benson tell us just where it is? In his figures on hard wheat he puts the Pacific States wheat on a par with our hard spring wheat, and adding those two figures together and classifying it all as our kind of wheat, there is a surplus. I repeat again that there is no surplus of hard spring wheat.

But Mr. Benson says the present bill is not satisfactory to him, so it looks as though a commissar of Russia is running our farm business. There seems to be a growing tendency here in Washington for the bureaus to take over the functions of government, and Mr. Benson's attitude is proof of this tendency. If this bureau chief can dictate all laws pertaining to agriculture, we could very well get along without a President or a Congress. We still have a Congress, but we appear to have a President who takes his agricultural signals from Benson, hook, line, and sinker. I think this situation exists and I therefore predict a veto on the farm bill which the conferees have worked out. If the bill is vetoed there will be no farm bill. It could, I think, be passed over the veto in the House, but in the Senate it could not pass, as many Republicans will sustain the President on the ground of party loyalty, and if that is not sufficient, the President can round up his 13 Democratic Senators, and thus prevent the passage of the bill.

With no farm bill, what will the situation be? A great many Republican Members who have rendered valuable service to the farm people will be mowed down by the resentment which a veto of the farm bill will fan into a blaze in the farm belt.

If the resentment were confined to farmers alone, the situation would be bad, but not dangerous; but remember in States like North Dakota small towns and even our largest cities are engaged in rendering a needed service to farmers, and the businessmen know they cannot get any money until the farmers get it first.

CITATION CONFERRED UPON HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last night on the occasion of the Bataan Day dinner at the grand ballroom of the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., our distinguished and beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], was signally honored by the Government of the Philippines by having conferred upon him the great honor of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, which is the first time anyone who is a nonresident of the Philippine Islands has had this great honor conferred upon him.

I wish to extend at the close of the legislative RECORD today, in the body of the RECORD, the address delivered by my valued friend and our former colleague, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, and also the address by our distinguished and beloved Speaker, together with a copy of the citation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES v. ICARDI

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 o'clock a. m., in the case of the United States of America against Aldo Lorenzo Icardi. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* ALDO LORENZO ICARDI (CRIMINAL CASE NO. 821–55)

Spa ad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws.

The President of the United States to Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY, Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C., or 3507 Albemarle Street NW., Washington 8, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of March, A. D. 1956.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JOHN C. CROGAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 457) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative PAUL J. KILDAY, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 16th of April 1956, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi*, Criminal Case No. 821–55; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative PAUL J. KILDAY is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 o'clock a. m., in the case of the United States of America against Aldo Lorenzo Icardi. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* ALDO LORENZO ICARDI, CRIMINAL CASE NO. 821–55

Spa ad test: Court of Chief Judge Laws.

The President of the United States to Hon. DEWEY SHORT, Committee on Armed Services, United States House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C., or 2811 34th Place, Washington 7, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, April 16, 1956, at 9 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the United States, and not depart the court without leave of the court or the district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d date of March A. D. 1956.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By JOHN C. CROGAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 458) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative DEWEY SHORT, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 16th of April 1956, in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi*, Criminal Case No. 821–55; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative DEWEY SHORT is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States of America* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That as a respectful answer to the subpena a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN DRAINAGE PROJECTS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, METCALF, SAYLOR, and BERRY.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 444 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 444 provides for an open rule, waiving points of order against the bill, and would allow 4 hours of general debate on the bill.

The total of all authorizations granted in the bill is $2,156,730,000; $133,394,000 is to cover the increased cost of projects previously authorized.

The Army is authorized $304,562,000 for operational, training, maintenance, and production facilities; also medical, administrative, and housing facilities. This amount includes an authorization for the expansion and improvement of the NIKE defense facilities of the continental United States and key overseas bases, and facilities in support of the intermediate range ballistics missile program.

The Navy is authorized $401,194,000. The funds will be used to modernize its shore establishment, for the development of several strategic overseas stations, and to replace certain badly deteriorated structures. Authorization is also included to establish 4 new installations and to make engineering studies with respect to 3 other installations.

The Air Force is authorized $1,137,280,000. Of this amount $80,942,000 is for the continental aircraft control and warning system which includes the so-called SAGE project, the semiautomatic ground-environment air-defense system.

Several new sections were added to the bill. One section is designed to increase construction efficiency by the use of modular design. Another section provides that family housing to be constructed for military and civilian personnel must be justified by the Armed Services Committee; and a third section permits the purchase by the Government of Wherry housing projects which, it is pointed out in the committee report, will effect large savings.

The bill as originally presented totaled approximately $2,174,000,000 and as reported totals $2,156,000,000, or a decrease of $18 million.

In view of the large amount of money involved, adequate time is provided in the resolution for debate on this measure and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 444.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has very ably and very well described H. R. 9893 which the adoption of this resolution, House Resolution 444, will make in order for consideration a little later.

This bill carries authorizations of expenditure of huge funds, up into the billions of dollars, for military construction of different types throughout the country and the world. Members who may be interested in checking the authorizations for military construction within their own States will find in this very able report the complete listing by States, starting on page 34.

The bill contains several items or provisions or authorizations that have been the cause of some concern to a number of us and was gone into rather thoroughly by the Committee on Armed Services and by the Committee on Rules. One of the things that I would like to call to your attention which is contained in this bill is the provision for the purchase of new acreage in the United States by the military forces of a total of 749,099 acres of land to be owned by the Government of the United States. The amount of land now owned by the Government is amazingly and alarmingly large. Yet, as explained by the committee, the purchase of this huge amount of land by the military forces of the country is necessary in order that we may have room for our guided missile testing. However, this continuous and continual accumulation of land by the United States Government is a matter that should give us grave concern, and I hope will be watched closely in the future.

I want to also call to the attention of the House, as mentioned by the gentleman from New York, that this bill carries authorization for the so-called SAGE program, the program for semiautomatic ground environment, air defense system, and IRBM radar system setup so that we can automatically defend the United States through the use of guided missiles and so forth and so on, so that approaching aircraft may be traced through this automatic system. This matter was given considerable attention not only by the Committee on Armed Services but by individual Members of the House and by the Committee on Rules. And, I am happy to be able to report to the House this afternoon that as the result of the discussions that took place between the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Committee on Armed Services and between the members of the Committee on Rules and the discussion that took place during the hearings on this bill between the leadership and the members of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, will offer an amendment at the proper time in the consideration of this bill that will protect the interests of this country in connection with the SAGE program and will save hundreds of millions of dollars for the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have seen in connection with this particular measure the responsibilities of the House and of its various committees are well met. I want to congratulate at this time, if I may, the majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who has taken a personal interest in this matter, as well as an official interest, and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], as well as the members of the Committee on Rules, who joined with him and with the gentleman from Massachusetts in working out this agreed amendment for the benefit of the United States of America.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

ABSENCE OF A QUORUM

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9893, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 55 minutes.

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce that at 3 o'clock I shall move that the Committee rise to enable the minority to hold a very important conference.

After the conference report on the farm bill is agreed upon tomorrow I shall ask that the House again resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the consideration of this bill. I am in hopes that we may be able to dispose of the bill tomorrow; and if not, on Thursday. At the end of the consideration of the bill, I shall ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 9893 is the military construction bill for fiscal year 1957.

Under the provisions of this bill as it appears today, the military departments will get the following authorizations:

Army	$304,562,000
Navy	401,194,000
Air Force	1,137,280,000

In addition to these amounts, which total $1,843,036,000, the bill provides authority for housing for the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and some of his personnel, $300,000; housing for overseas areas under the surplus commodities program, $150 million; and emergency construction, $30 million.

This makes a total so far of $2,023,336,000.

In addition to these authorities, the bill through amendments of prior public works laws grants additional authorities for each of the departments, as follows:

Army	$485,000
Navy	1,250,000
Air Force	131,759,000

The grand total granted by all authorities in the bill is $2,156,730,000.

This amount will be reduced by $72 million by reason of the fact that on March 20 the House passed Senate bill 3452, which contained authority in the amount of $72 million for the distant early warning line. The language of that bill has been extracted from this public-works bill in the interest of having the additional DEW line authority provided at the earliest possible date. I might mention that this bill has also passed the Senate and has been signed by the President. At the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to strike from the bill the authorizing language for the $72 million which was the subject of Senate bill 3452. This will leave the bill with a net authorization of $2,084,730,000.

It has always been my view that when the Congress is faced with a bill of this size—and a bill which involves so much matter of a highly detailed nature—the Congress should be informed as to how the bill was put together and the manner in which it was reviewed by the various authorities with responsibility for scrutinizing it as it is assembled for final submission to Congress. I would like to describe briefly, then, the manner in which the program was originally presented by the field offices of the departments, the review within the military departments themselves, and the review given all three programs by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Lastly, I will mention the review given by the Armed Services Committee.

As I have said, the Army would get $304 million in authorization under the bill. The field, however, requested $600 million. So the Army program as presented to the committee had been cut in half.

The Navy program in the bill is $401 million. The field offices of the Navy had requested $1.8 billion. So the Navy program represents today less than 25 percent of the field requests.

In the case of the Air Force the program in the bill is about $1.1 billion. But the field offices of the Air Force had requested $2.8 billion. The Air Force program, therefore, represents less than 40 percent of the program as submitted by the field. So we have before us in this bill a total program which represents only about 40 percent of what the field offices of the military departments requested. Or to put it another way, the field requests totaled $5.2 billion, while this bill contains authority for about $2.15 billion. There has been a total reduction, then, of over $3 billion from the amount requested by the field down to the bill which we have before us today.

Much of this reduction in the program was done by the Secretaries of the individual military departments, but the Office of the Secretary of Defense reduced the bill by about one-third—or $1 billion—prior to submitting it to the Congress.

The only conclusion I can reach from these figures is that we have before us a very tight and closely scrutinized military construction program. The committee itself made some 75 amendments to the original bill, and in the process eliminated items in the amount of $32 million and added items in the amount of $14 million. The committee's action, therefore, was a net decrease of $18 million. I realize that this does not represent a very great amount when compared to the whole bill, but I do believe it establishes this fact: that the program as submitted simply did not lend itself to any great variation.

It was sound as submitted, and it is even somewhat sounder after the committee's deliberations.

There are about 400 named installations in this bill, the greatest number of them, of course, in the Air Force section. And there are about 2,700 individual line items.

In order that this number of trees wouldn't cause the House to lose sight of the forest, I had the committee report this year prepared in such fashion that I believe any question which any Member of the House might have will find its answer somewhere in the report.

And I feel also that the Member will not have to indulge in any extended search to find his answer because the report is broken down in logical manner so as to lead a questioner pretty directly to the answer he is seeking.

The Army portion of the bill starts on page 2 of the report, the Navy portion starts on page 7, and the Air Force portion starts on page 11.

The portion of the bill headed "General provisions" is dealt with starting on page 22 and the special deliberations which, I believe, contains matter of particular interest to many of the Members begins on page 25.

A complete breakdown by State—and by service—begins on page 34. This tabulation will show exactly how much each of the services proposes to construct in each of the States and in the various overseas areas.

Because the report has been prepared in the manner which I have described, I will deal only briefly with each of the three services and similarly with the general provisions and other matters of particular interest.

ARMY

The Army portion of the bill represents $304,562,000. Eighty-six million dollars of this is in the United States; 30 million is overseas, and almost 190 million is for classified construction.

Almost 140 million of the classified construction is for the tactical defense of cities, military bases, and industrial centers. This is the Nike program.

About $40 million is devoted to construction for the Army's part of the missile program including the Redstone ballistic missile. The rest of the program for the Army is broken down by categories on page 3 of the report and, following that breakdown, by the various technical services and continental armies.

Section 104 would establish certain military installations as permanent. On March 2, Secretary of the Army Brucker took appropriate action to make these stations permanent and I therefore will offer an amendment to strike section 104 from the bill.

Section 105—still in the Army title—refers to a special study relating to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot in Houston, Tex. There is good reason to believe that this depot should be moved for the reason that it constitutes a danger to the surrounding area and is located on land which is extremely valuable for other purposes.

The Army would be authorized to acquire about 28,000 acres at a cost of $1.2 million under the bill. This is a substantial acreage, I realize, but the committee was encouraged to find that this

was substantially less than has been through the last several years.

NAVY

The Navy portion of the bill—title II—calls for authorization in the amount of $401,194,000. For the most part, the Navy program, as was true of the Army program, is for additional facilities at existing installations. The Navy this year, however, does have 4 new bases in the program and 1 base which, although previously used, will be so substantially changed in type and mission as to be virtually a fifth new base.

These new Navy bases are set out on page 25 of the report. There is 1 in Maine, 1 in Mississippi, 1 in California, and 1 in North Carolina. You will also note that amoung the new bases is a flying field for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. This has not been pinpointed as to location since the bill provides authority for a special location study with respect to this installation and two others.

Shipyard facilities of all kinds total about $45 million. Aviation facilities, which comprise over 50 percent of the program, calls for over $205 million. Supply facilities have about $19 million and the Marine Corps gets over $23 million. The rest of the breakdown by type will be found on page 10 of the report under the headings of ordnance facilities, service school facilities, and so forth.

Section 202 of the Navy bill was inserted by the committee for the purpose of authorizing a special study to find a proper bombing target in the Norfolk, Va., area; and objective examination of the Port Chicago, Calif., naval magazine which has been a subject of discussion by the committee for over a year; and the location of the John H. Towers Field at Annapolis which I mentioned before.

The Navy would be granted authority to acquire 713,000 acres at a cost of over $47 million under this bill. Over half of this land is required for two installations, Fallon, Nev. and the marine base at Twenty-nine Palms, Calif. Other substantial acquisitions are as follows: 32,500 acres for the new Navy base at Lemoore, Calif.; 9,500 acres for the new base at Meridian, Miss.; 32,000 acres for a bombing target to be used in conjunction with the Jacksonville Naval Air Station.

I will deal with this land question for each of the services a little later on.

AIR FORCE

Title III of the bill covers the Air Force. As has been true for the past several years, the Air Force program exceeds both of the other two services together. The Air Force would get $1,137,280,000; $661 million of this amount would be for the United States, almost $313 million outside the United States, and $163 million under the category of classified construction.

I mentioned previously that there were about 400 named military installations in the bill not counting the various classified locations which would add substantially to this number. The Air Force under the bill gets authority for construction at 205 major installations of which 144 are in the United States and 61 overseas.

The whole Air Force program is aimed at having the 137 Wing Air Force in being and ready to go in 1957. I have good reason to believe that after next year, the Air Force program will go down rather substantially and will level off within 2 or 3 years.

On page 12 of the report, there is a table which sets out the authorities granted the various commands of the Air Force both inside and outside the United States. The Air Defense Command this year gets by far the largest share of the program, $188 million. The table shows that the Strategic Air Command is next in order followed by the Aircraft Control and Warning System.

Starting at the bottom of page 12 of the report, the missions and principal elements of the various command programs begin with the Air Defense Command first followed by the Air Materiel Command and so forth. On page 17, the program is again broken down by types of things to be constructed. As would be expected, operational and training facilities comprise the largest part of the program—$354 million, or 31 percent of the total. Research and development is next in size followed by housing and community facilities.

The direction of the Air Force program is well pointed up by the fact that administrative facilities comprise only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total program.

Much of the operational and training category is for airfield pavements, principally runway additions for both fighters and bombers. Almost all of this additional pavement is made necessary by reason of the B–52's coming into production together with the so-called Century series fighter planes. These are the F–100, F–102, and so forth.

SAGE

As you are aware, the project called SAGE has received a great deal of public discussion. Because the committee realized the importance of SAGE in our defense system, it made a very special study of it. I believe that SAGE itself is dealt with rather exhaustively in the committee report starting on page 18.

However, since SAGE constitutes only one portion of our air-defense system, it must be considered in connection with our total defense system. I would, therefore, like to take a few minutes to describe the defense system generally and the part that SAGE plays in it.

What does SAGE mean? SAGE is a short title derived from the words "semi-automatic ground environment." Actually, it is nothing more than a project designed to shorten the time between the discovery of an enemy plane and the use of our planes and missiles to bring it down. The idea behind SAGE is not new. SAGE merely provides, as I have said, a semiautomatic operation of our radar-warning system. It replaces, in other words, the manual operation which is now used.

The need for semiautomatic operation becomes evident when one considers the great volume of flight information which must be poured into the system. Surprisingly enough, this volume of information is just about as large in peacetime as it is in wartime. The reason for this is that all aircraft flights must be watched and identified by our defense system.

In the United States, each day there are 30,000 scheduled flights, plus a great many more which are unscheduled. Information concerning these flights is fed into our defense system from 13 different sources.

The first source is the heavy radars within the United States.

The second is the heavy height-finder radars. Height finders are necessary because most radars do not give altitude.

Third, are the small gap-filler radars between the large radars. These cover the areas which the large radar equipment cannot see.

Fourth, with respect to civilian planes, flight plans and other information are released from the Civil Aeronautics Administration flight centers.

Fifth, for military aircraft, similar information is relayed from the military flight service.

The sixth source is the pine tree line. This is the name given that part of the radar fence which laps over into Canada.

Seventh, there are our early warning lines. One is the Mid-Canada line, sometimes called the McGill line, which extends across Canada from British Columbia to Newfoundland. The other is the Dew line—distant early warning—which extends for some 3,000 miles across the top of Alaska and Canada.

Eighth, there are radars in southern Alaska.

Ninth, there are Navy picket ships along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts.

Tenth, supplementing the coverage at sea, are the constellation early warning and control planes which fly out of Newfoundland and Alaska.

Eleventh, is the radar on the Texas towers which are built on ocean shoals off the Atlantic seaboard.

The 12th source of information is the Ground Observer Corps.

The 13th source of information is the Air Weather Service. In order to successfully assign and guide weapons, we must know the weather.

That is the Air Defense System as a whole. What specific part does SAGE play in this system and exactly what is it?

There are three major elements to SAGE. First, there are direction or combat center buildings which house a huge electronic brain. Second, there are leased communication circuits which connect the rest of the air-defense activities with these combat centers. And third, there is equipment at the radar and other sites which converts the raw information which is received into a form which can be sent over the leased circuits.

In the SAGE system, there will be eight combat centers in the United States. These will, in turn, be divided into 32 subsectors. Each of the 40 sectors or subsectors will have a computer building with the electronic brain which I have mentioned. Each of these buildings will be of the blockhouse type and will cost about $3½ million each.

At the risk of oversimplifying of what SAGE does, it can be said that all of the portions of the air-defense system which are in one way or another tied into SAGE

will feed the SAGE system information. The large electronic brains will assimilate this information and provide the military commanders involved with the kind of guidance with respect to speed, direction, height, weather, and every other kind of information required by him to make the decision as to what air base or air bases should send off its planes, what missile sites should be alerted, and whether other combat centers further along the line of flight of the enemy airplane should be fed the information which has been gathered.

Actually, the only portion of the SAGE system which has become a matter of controversy is that relating to the leased telephone circuits which will carry the information in the SAGE system.

Because of the doubt raised by the Comptroller General as to the authority of the Air Force to enter into the large and expensive contracts for communication services involved in SAGE, the committee inserted a new section 303 which you will find on page 51 of the bill. This section would give the positive and affirmative authority of the Congress to the SAGE system and the contracts which are a part of it. Since the time that that section was inserted, better language has been devised and I will offer an amendment to insert this new language in place of the present section 303.

The big question on SAGE is the large contingent liability which the Government might have to assume should the communication contracts be canceled prior to the 10-year period for which they run.

Actually, there is little reason to believe today that the contracts, or any substantial number of them, will be canceled. However, the possibility is always there and the Congress must be aware of it and give its sanction before the possibility is allowed to arise.

On page 20 of the report under the heading "Contingent Liability," I have placed a simple mathematical example as to how the liability could arise. The concept is a fairly complicated one and I felt that this would permit the Members to see just what was involved.

I would like to say that I feel there has been a great deal of apprehension—and I might say, misapprehension—concerning SAGE. I don't know how it arose but I do feel that this is the time to clear up the question once and for all.

It is quite true that the contingent liability which the Government might incur is a large one. But, as I have said, to my mind, it is a highly unlikely one. Indeed, it could most probably arise only if an entirely new air defense system should be developed within the next few years or—such a firm peace should descend upon the world as to make air defense unnecessary. This latter is something which we can almost devoutly wish for but something which I feel all will agree cannot be depended upon.

New language has been proposed for insertion in place of the present section 303 and I believe this new language will allay any fears which may still remain as to excessive rates being charged or excessive benefits in any way accruing to the telephone companies. The language will require the General Services Administration to keep constant surveillance over the rates and to appear before Federal and State regulatory bodies to insure that the Government receives every benefit in the ratemaking process as is possible.

Also, the amendment will give the General Accounting Office a full and free hand in the auditing of all contracts relating to SAGE prior to any final payment being made.

I simply do not know how much further we can go in protecting the Government but I will welcome any suggestions which any Member of the House has toward this end.

Now, I think those remarks coupled with the information which you will find in the report cover SAGE adequately.

I have mentioned the land acquisitions proposed for the Army and the Navy and I would like to refer in similar fashion to the Air Force program in this respect. The Air Force program for land contemplates the acquisition of about 53,000 acres at a cost of about $24½ million.

In view of the continued development of jet aircraft and the need for longer runways and safety zones, I feel the land proposed for acquisition by the Air Force is not excessive.

The general provisions which start on page 58 of the bill are somewhat different this year than they have been in the past and I would like to spend a few minutes describing these provisions and what they do. You will note that the report deals with these in some detail starting on page 22.

Sections 401 through 405 provide no new or unusual authority and are either identical or very similar to previous public works laws.

Section 406 is new in a public works bill but is very similar to authority which has been contained in annual appropriation acts. Simply stated, it permits the military departments to acquire lands which do not exceed $5,000 in cost. This authority will eliminate the literally hundreds of minor land items which are normally contained in public works bills—and many of these acquisitions involve only a few hundred dollars.

Section 407 provides authority for the replacement or restoration of facilities which have been destroyed by negligence or acts of God. This authority has been granted the individual military departments for several years.

Section 408, again, is similar to authority which has been granted in annual appropriation acts. In essence, it grants authority to the military departments for the construction of urgent items which could not—or at least have not—been anticipated. Naturally, these items will occur even under the best of planning. The committee has added a subsection which will give it surveillance over the exercise of this authority.

Section 409 makes provision for housing for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain of his personnel. The House passed this in last year's public works bill but it failed of enactment in conference.

Section 410 is a device whereby old construction authorities are rescinded if not used within a certain period of time. This clears up the books in an automatic fashion.

Section 411 merely extends and increases the authority to use surplus commodities for the construction of family housing overseas. This is the fourth time this authority has appeared in a public works bill.

Section 412 permits the renting of houses at our Nike sites. The authority has been limited to 1,000 units, and this section will increase it to 3,000 units. It is a natural expansion to keep pace with the progress of our Nike defenses.

Section 413 will permit certain family housing at the Air Force Academy to be built on a somewhat larger scale than is otherwise authorized under the law.

Section 414 makes it unnecessary that construction funds for armories and other Reserve facilities be used to pay rentals. This will leave more funds available for new construction.

Section 415 permits the redistribution of certain family housing which has been previously authorized. In other words, the advent of the new title VIII will permit the construction of housing at certain installations where it was previously thought it would be necessary to build appropriated funds housing. This section provides a reasonable latitude in the plan for family housing.

Section 416 could be called the lease-purchase plan for our petroleum storage. It will permit 5-year leases on storage facilities which will be located out of vulnerable areas of the country. Private enterprise was unwilling to engage in construction for this storage under leases which would extend for only 1 year. This is entirely understandable. The section also provides for an option in the Government to purchase these storage facilities, and the rent which has been paid will constitute part of the purchase price.

Again, the committee, pursuant to a subsection inserted by it, will receive periodic reports as to the progress of this petroleum storage program.

SPECIAL DELIBERATIONS

Sections 417, 418, and 419 are new authorities inserted by the committee and represent the committee's view that it fails to perform its proper function if it does not, from time to time, give the departments guidance in certain areas of activity.

Section 417 will encourage the use of modular construction which, simply stated, is the decimal system applied to building materials.

I invite the Members' attention to the description of modular construction which starts on page 25 of the report.

Everyone who has had a house built or even who has built closets, or furniture himself, knows how much lumber or other building material is wasted. The use of a 4-inch module, which is the size contemplated, simply eliminates this kind of waste.

The most everyday example is the new type brick which is 4 inches wide, 4 inches thick, and 8 inches long. All of the lumber which would be used in the construction is simply divisible by 4 inches. Savings up to 15 percent in construction costs are said to be wholly realistic

through the use of this construction method.

Section 418 does two things. First, it requires that any family housing proposed for construction for military use shall be justified to the Armed Services Committees. This part of section 318 has two important advantages. First, it permits the Armed Services Committees to reenter an important military field from which they have been, in a sense, excluded for the past few years. This exclusion was by no means deliberate and was merely what I might call an incidental effect of the housing law.

In any event, the Armed Services Committees will, under this provision, be able to keep their finger on what has become in our modern military force one of the most important elements of our defense from the standpoint of obtaining and keeping the best personnel.

The second effect is that a forum will be provided for discussion of the always-present problem as to whether the military may be overbuilding in the field of family housing in a particular area. This possibility of overbuilding is, of course, a matter of constant concern to local private interests and the provision of an appropriate forum for discussion of this important matter is a highly desirable thing.

The second portion of section 418 limits to 20 years the period of mortgages covering houses built for the military.

Now, I have heard some objections to the insertion of this provision. And I would like, therefore, to explain the basis on which the committee took this action and leave it up to the House to decide whether the committee did the right and proper thing.

Here are the facts: A Capehart house, for example, costing $13,500 to build, will have added to it almost $8,500 in interest during the 25 years which the mortgage will run. This makes the house cost about $22,000.

This same house if amortized over a period of 20 years, costs about $20,064, or $1,878 less.

Now, this $1,800 is not a great deal of money, but when it is multiplied by the 100,000 units already authorized, it means a saving of about $187 million. This saving is doubled to $374 million when one considers that the current plan is to increase the authorization to 200,000 units.

COMPARATIVE HOUSING COSTS

And while I am on the subject of relative costs of family housing for our military, I would like to have the record show the committee's views in this respect.

An appropriated-funds house is amortized through housing allowances in 16 years. The cost of the house is $13,500, plus $3,513 in interest at 3 percent. The total cost of the house is, therefore, $17,013.

The shortest time in which a Capehart house can be amortized is 18 years. The total cost of this house is $19,338. This cost is made up of the original $13,500, plus $5,838 in interest at 4¼ percent. This house, therefore, costs $2,325 more than the appropriated-funds house.

A Capehart house amortized over a period of 20 years costs $20,064. This cost is made up of $13,500 plus $6,564 in interest at 4¼ percent. This house costs $3,051 more than an appropriated-funds house.

A Capehart house amortized over a period of 25 years costs $21,942. This cost is made up of $13,500 plus $8,442 in interest at 4¼ percent. This house costs $4,929 more than an appropriated-funds house.

A Capehart house with a 25-year mortgage costs $1,878 more than a Capehart house with a 20-year mortgage.

In round numbers, then, a Capehart house at 25 years costs $5,000 more than an appropriated-funds house and a Capehart house with a 20-year mortgage costs $2,000 less than one with a 25-year mortgage.

Now, those are the facts.

WHERRY HOUSING

The last section which I wish to deal with is section 419. I will try to cover this briefly since the report contains the complete story on this section. You will find this referred to in the report on page 27 and it extends over to page 30.

Briefly, then, this section would authorize the acquisition of the Wherry housing projects which have been built for military—and in some cases, civilian—use. A Wherry house costs $9,000, or less, to build. The sponsor of the project has a right to future income under his lease for a period of either 50 years or 75 years. During the 50-year period, the Government will appropriate in housing allowances $54,000 before the house is owned by the Government.

This is $54,000 for a $9,000 house.

In the case of the 75-year lease, the $9,000 house will cost $81,000.

I do not believe any of us have ever been aware of how expensive this house is, but since the committee became aware of it, we have been attempting to devise some reasonable way whereby they could be acquired and save the Government literally hundreds of millions of dollars over the years.

There are some 82,000 Wherry houses in existence today and even if we take those with the 50-year leases, the savings are nothing less than fantastic.

Existing law does provide a method whereby these Wherry projects can be acquired. However, since what the Wherry sponsor owns is not physical structures but only the right to future income, an appraisal of fair-market value on a project which has even a moderate vacancy factor, develops an amount of compensation which is so small as to make it unlikely that the sponsor would sell.

In other words, present law would help those who do not need any help, and does not return a fair value to those projects which are already in trouble.

Section 419 provides what the committee believes is a reasonable method of acquisition and will afford the Wherry project owners a fair and equitable value.

At the bottom of page 28 and extending on to page 29, are actual mathematical examples of what a Wherry sponsor would get in the way of compensation should he wish to sell his project to the Government.

KALKASKA-MANISTEE

Now, I believe that there is only one really controversial item in the bill and that is the question of the location of an Air Defense Command base—this is a base for fighter interceptor airplanes—in the northern Michigan area.

Today there is a gap in our defense line across the northern part of the United States and this gap will be filled by the airbase which will be built in what has been called the Traverse City area.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base is about 75 miles south and east of the Traverse City area and Kinross Air Force Base is about the same distance north of the Traverse City area. This means that there is a gap of something in the order of 150 miles which is today not adequately protected.

I think a brief history of the attempts to locate an Air Defense Command base in this part of the country will be helpful.

Public Law 534, dated July 27, 1954, authorized the construction of an Air Defense Command base in what was designated as the "Traverse City area" of Michigan.

The first site selected by the Air Force was known as the Long Lake site. This site was for some reason abandoned and a second site known as the Benzie County site was selected.

Because of complaints that the location of the base at this second site would interfere with the famous Interlochen Music Camp, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee made an on-site inspection and stated as its position that it did not feel the base should be located within less than 15 miles of the music camp.

The Air Force then moved the site to Cadillac, Mich. The Appropriations Committee refused to appropriate funds for the construction of the base at this site and the Air Force selected a fourth site. The fourth site was at Kalkaska, Mich.

Again, objections arose with respect to the selection of this site and the Armed Services Committee, after hearing testimony, both pro and con, decided to exercise its own authority with respect to the location of military installations and placed the base at Manistee.

It should be understood that from a purely tactical standpoint, any one of these sites would appear to be wholly acceptable. The great advantage of the Manistee site, in the opinion of the committee, is the fact that it will not and cannot interfere with the homes, businesses, or other activities in that part of Michigan. The committee hopes that this will settle the matter once and for all.

As I have mentioned before, the committee has 3 amendments of a substantial nature to offer and 1 amendment to correct an error in addition. The first, designed to strike section 104 which appears on page 8 of the bill and relates to the permanent Army stations.

The second, to insert a new section 303 on page 51. This amendment will

provide new language relating to SAGE. This is as follows:

On page 51, strike all of section 303 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section 303:

"SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

" 'The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the Semiautomatic Ground Environment System. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million, and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office, which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A., sec. 481)'."

And the third one will lower the bill by $72 million by reason of the fact that the House has already passed S. 3452, which provides this needed authority for the distant early warning line.

The fourth amendment, which will appear on page 59 of the bill, will merely change two totals which are in error.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. On page 10 of the bill, lines 3, 4, and 5, there is an authorization for the Navy underwater sound laboratory at New London, Conn., research and development facilities and land acquisition. Is it fair to say that in view of this item being in the bill, it is anticipated that this important work in the near future will be carried on in buildings of more permanent nature than those presently used?

Mr. VINSON. It is to be hoped that in all these places that are of a permanent nature the construction will be made permanent as soon as possible and as fast as economy will permit us to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Throughout the bill there is reference to community facilities in the matter of construction. I am curious to know what is meant by the phrase "community facilities."

Mr. VINSON. It means facilities such as chapels, swimming pools, recreation facilities, clubs.

Mr. GROSS. By clubs, does the gentleman mean officers' clubs?

Mr. VINSON. Clubs of various kinds fall within that classification.

Mr. GROSS. One other question, since we are on this Navy phase of the bill; is it provided in this bill that an air-training center shall be established at Annapolis?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. What we are doing in this bill is to set up a commission to locate a suitable place. In view of the fact that over half of the money in title II goes for naval aviation we feel that it is highly important that the men at the Academy have some air training. That must take place at some air base. We hope to be able to convince the committee that the proper thing to do is to provide an airfield for the Naval Academy. It may be, however, that some existing field will be recommended. But the fundamental idea is there must be some naval aviation training at the Naval Academy.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that is going to be tremendously expensive in view of all the naval air training centers we have?

Mr. VINSON. No. The type of training there will be different from the type of training received at the other naval training centers. These are midshipmen. They must be trained in certain things. They must know the planes, they must know what it is to fly before they go on to more advanced training. Eliminations may occur there, and some young men will be found not to have qualifications to fly; therefore, it is one of the economies of this to learn that soon instead of later on.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa, title II having to do with the Navy, properly carries out the mission of the Navy as it is divided in the whole command; is that true?

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Practically all of this appropriation follows out the mission which has been previously assigned to the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. Yes. All three of these services have military missions. This whole bill seeks to carry out the military missions assigned by the Department of Defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In connection with the discussion which the gentleman had with our colleague from Iowa on the John H. Towers Field at Annapolis, it appears in two places. There is an outright authorization for it, including plans and specifications for aviation facilities of $4 million. Then over on page 23 of the bill, section 202, it is listed as among a group of facilities on which the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to obtain information on engineering, location, planning, and so forth.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman reconcile those two items?

Mr. VINSON. There is no conflict at all. On page 15 it is stated:

Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Md.: Land acquisition, and plans for specifications for aviation facilities, $4 million.

That is for the establishment of the field at the Academy, establishing it in broad language. But we do not pinpoint it, and say in what area it is going to be. We do not know at this time just where it should be. That is the purpose of section 202. We hope we will not bother the people there about it, so we thought the best thing to do is to have a board go out and make an examination to see at what point it should be, whether in that county or somewhere else. It may go over into Montgomery County, it may go to some other counties in there. But there is no conflict between those two provisions.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. On page 23 it is confined to what we might call a site study?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; that is right.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. On page 27 of the report, under title VIII, Wherry housing, it is stated:

In the committee's opinion, however, the time has come when this unusually expensive program must be reviewed and action taken which will eliminate costs which are wholly unnecessary.

May I say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services that I agree heartily with that. However, at Stewart Field in my district I have been recently notified that they are going to increase the program in connection with Wherry housing. While we need the housing, I would prefer to see it put on a more permanent basis.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to discuss the Wherry housing phase a little later on. I am glad the gentlewoman raised that question. I shall discuss title VIII, what the gentlewoman refers to as the Capehart bill, and the Wherry bill. I doubt very seriously whether the Department, in view of the Capehart law, will recommend any Wherry housing at the designated place the gentlewoman speaks of, or anywhere else for this reason: A Wherry house cost $9,000, and before the Government owns that house the Government will have spent $54,000 on a house that originally cost $9,000. The Capehart provision is far better, although I do not think the Capehart provision is as good as direct appropriations. However, we have got to provide accommodations, housing facilities, for our armed services or else the morale of the forces is seriously impaired.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. May I say I feel sure that in his very able hands this will be taken care of. I do not think morale is greatly benefited by this Wherry housing proposition which is most unsatisfactory in some instances.

Mr. VINSON. It is not in the interest of the economy of the country to have

the Government spend $54,000 before the Government gets title to a $9,000 home.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. They need good housing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. VINSON. I will do that a little bit later. I am coming to that, and if you will just bear with me, I believe I will cover the matter to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I notice on page 6 of the report reference is made to the NIKE program, and it is stated it will be expanded.

Mr. VINSON. Well, the Nike program is a part of our overall defense system. Nike is located in various cities of the country. We have to go in and defend these communities, and buy properties. We have to rent homes there, too, for the men to live in. That is the system that detects incoming planes, and I am going to discuss all of that a little bit later.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I call the chairman's attention to this, that in the district I have the honor to represent the Nike installation has been placed on the promontory in Jackson Park and while our people are willing to make any sacrifice necessary for the national defense there is a feeling that the installation could have been placed elsewhere advantageously or that in any event some compensation should be made by the Federal Government to provide other recreational facilities to replace those destroyed.

Mr. VINSON. Now, we are in this kind of a position. In many communities that question arises, but the defense of this country is No. 1. It is the paramount duty of the Government to provide adequate defense. If it takes Jackson Park to protect the great city of Chicago and that area, much as we hate to disturb parks, they have to give way to the security of the Nation.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. And the gentleman will agree with me that the Federal Government should play fair with the municipal governments and the park districts?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; and I think the Government does play fair. If they saw some of these prices we have to pay, why, they would have no complaint.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does the gentleman know that no money has been paid Jackson Park and that there is no money to recondition the property for the recreational use of the people? Jackson Park represents a large investment of the money of the people of my community. Why should its lands and facilities be taken over without even a gesture toward paying a token of what would be paid a private owner?

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will come by the committee, we will help you get Jackson Park straightened out. But we have to have Nike sites in the Chicago area.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I at this time merely wish to inquire of the chairman—for whom I share with all Americans a profound admiration—if there is sufficient authorization in the present bill for an appropriation later to provide for payment to the park district.

Mr. VINSON. It is not mentioned in this bill. There is no way by which the Committee on Appropriations could make any money available. Here is an authorization bill, and the Committee on Appropriations cannot go beyond the authorization.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Then will the chairman agree to an amendment to the present bill that will furnish authorization for such an appropriation if later the appropriation should be proposed?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will have to see the amendment and get all the facts. I think if the gentleman will contact the committee counsel and myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], why, we may be able to dispense with an amendment and accomplish what he wants.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate most thoroughly the fine cooperation of the distinguished gentleman, and wish him to know my gratitude.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to express the thanks of the people of the Port Chicago area in California for the consideration the gentleman from Georgia and his great committee have given the problems of the Port Chicago naval ammunition center and your thoughtfulness in sending a subcommittee out into that area. And, I want to take this opportunity also to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD], for the great study they have given to the problem and the thoughtful recommendations that are included in their report. The people in the area involved appreciate the consideration you have shown them.

Mr. VINSON. And I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his cooperation, aid, and assistance in trying to work out a solution of this naval magazine problem in his district.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I notice we still have Mr. Truman's airbase with us in this bill, Grandview, Mo.

Mr. VINSON. I am not going to let the gentleman get me off on that now, but we are all cocked and primed to give the gentleman all that information when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule. I said to my able assistant, Mr. Kelleher, "You be sure to get me all the information about Mr. Truman's airbase." So we will have it here.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have never in the years I have been in this body served with a finer gentleman, abler legislator, a more resourceful and astute tactician, or a harder worker than the gentleman from Georgia, our very distinguished and understanding chairman. CARL VINSON'S business is work, his hobby is work, his recreation and pastime is work. I know of no man who devotes so many hours of serious study and arduous labor to the task before him than does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

How fortunate this country is that we had his services during two world wars and the Korean conflict, and most of all in this postwar period of transition and readjustment which in many respects is the most difficult period we have gone through in this country. I am not prone to flattery nor do I indulge in fulsomeness. I do try to give credit where credit is due.

I happen to know that the gentleman from Georgia and our able and faithful counsel, Mr. Kelleher, whom the gentleman assigned to this piece of legislation, spent endless hours going over these myriad projects—and there are hundreds of these posts and installations in this bill; there are thousands of items connected with each one of these particular projects spelled out in thick volumes of hearings and studies. For a whole week the House Armed Services Committee devoted itself to title I, the Army section of the bill. For another whole week we devoted our efforts to the consideration of title II, the Navy section. Another week was devoted to the consideration of title III, the Air Force section of the bill. But long though we were in session as a full committee, from 10 to 12 in the morning and from 2 to 4 in the afternoon scrutinizing with painstaking care and almost infinite patience, the gentleman from Georgia as chairman of this important committee and Mr. Kelleher our counsel spent endless hours long before the projects were brought to our consideration in the bill now being discussed.

So I am constrained to express my personal thanks and my admiration, and I am sure I speak for all members of our Committee on the Armed Services as I do for the entire membership of this House when I say we shall forever feel indebted to the gentleman from Georgia for his long and distinguished career in this body and for the valuable contributions he has made not only to our national defense but to the strength in every way of our great Nation.

You know the dean of the Congress who served longer than anyone else was the late Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, who served in this body for 46 years. But I want to remind the Members of the House that our beloved Speaker and the distinguished gentleman from Georgia are now rounding out 44 years of service in this body. Sam was elected in a regular election and Carl came to Washington in the same Congress in a special election about 6 months later; but both of them are now challenging the all-time record established by the gentleman from Illinois for length of service in this body. We hope they will excel it. I believe they will.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE. I am curious to know if the gentleman knows of any way by which those of us who share the thoughts he has just expressed, indicating the high esteem in which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, is held by all his colleagues, can join him in making certain those 44 years of service may be extended to not less than 50 years of service.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am trying in my feeble way to do that now. I am willing to contribute in any possible way from my small substance or of my small talents to see that that is consummated, and I think that all other Members of this body likewise would be happy to assist in any way. The gentleman from Georgia, I have discovered a long time ago, is fairly capable of taking care of himself under any and all circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, anything I may say after the exhaustive and lucid analysis of the different sections of this bill would be repetitious. I know that a lot of statistics and figures are not very romantic, entrancing or interesting to the general public. But if the Members of this body could have gone through this particular measure and could have listened to all the hearings I think they would have found the story as it is written in our excellent report, and from what we have been told today, is a very interesting and a very fascinating one. Certainly it is a story that cannot be told too often in these critical days.

Mr. Chairman, this is what is termed a public works bill. It provides in this authorization $304,562,000 for the Army; $401,194,000 for the Navy; and $1,137,280,000 for the Air Force. These amounts, together with Title IV, Housing Authority and Emergency Construction, in the amount of $180,300,000, totals $2,023,336,000.

In addition to the authorizations listed above, the bill through amendments to prior public-works laws to cover increased construction costs, grants additional authorizations to the Army in the amount of $510,000; to the Navy in the amount of $1,250,000; and to the Air Force in the amount of $131,759,000.

The grand total of all authorizations granted by this bill is, therefore, $2,156,730,000.

This bill was considered by the Committee on Armed Services over a period of about a month. There are more than 300 named military installations in the bill, and in addition, there are a great number of unnamed classified installations inside and outside continental United States.

From the above, it is obvious that the presentation of details with respect to the bill would take a long time. We think you will find material to aid you in seeing what the committee had in mind, and the scope of their inquiries, from the report that we have filed.

THE ARMY

Now, let us take up the Army. In the Army title, 45 percent of the program, or $136.9 million, is for tactical facilities. This includes what is known as Nike sites, both in the continental United States and at key bases overseas. As many of the Members know, they are located in defense of our principal industrial centers and major metropolitan areas. An additional $8.5 million, or 2.7 percent, is included for support facilities in the continental United States.

In addition to the above amount, $36.6 million or 12 percent, is for construction in support of the Army's expanded role in guided missile, ballistic missile and rocket development. This request includes $25 million in support of the IRBM, intermediate range ballistic missile. Members will find more details on the Nike and IRBM on pages 6 and 7 of the committee report.

Some $22 million or 7.2 percent of the program is for troop and family housing and community support facilities. The Members will note that this request includes only 3,875 enlisted men's barracks spaces and 196 units of family housing.

The sum of $14.5 million, or 4.8 percent, is for facilities in support of Army aviation.

Some 15.9 percent or $48.3 million, is for overseas construction, exclusive of tactical facilities, in Okinawa, Alaska, Caribbean, Hawaii, Germany, United Kingdom, and Italy.

The remaining $37.7 million or 12.4 percent, is for essential construction of facilities in the fields of research and development, training, medical, and communications necessary to the accomplishment of the Army's mission.

You will find on page 3 of the committee report, the Army's program broken out in detailed categories. It indicates whether the construction is in the continental United States or overseas. Underneath that table, you will note that each of the technical services and each of the continental armies is dealt with individually by the type of facilities to be constructed and the portion of the program it represents. This continues over to page 4, where the Military District of Washington, the Armed Forces special weapons project, and other items are described as well as overseas areas.

Section 102 of the bill contains an authorization of $188,783,000 million, for classified military construction, and section 103 provides an increase of $485,000 in authorization to meet deficiencies granted under the provisions of prior public works laws for construction at Fort Jay, N. Y., and at Adak, Alaska.

Section 104 of the bill declares as permanent installations, Camp Gordon, Ga.; Fort Jackson, S. C.; Camp Stewart, Ga.; Camp Chaffee, Ark.; and Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. The reasons for taking this action is dealt with at length on pages 5 and 6 of the committee report. I am happy to report that the Secretary of the Army, on March 21, 1956, by a general order, has declared these same named installations permanent.

Section 103 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Army to proceed with studies and planning relative to the siting of the ammunition depot at San Jacinto, Tex. On page 32 of the report, the various conflicting interests involved in the locations of ordnance depots and magazines, is dealt with in detail.

THE NAVY

The next part of the bill is title II, for the Navy. The Navy title totals $401 million. This amount will enable the Navy to take another step forward in its planning to keep its shore establishment in phase with the modern ships, aircraft, weapons, and equipment which it must operate and service.

Under this program the Navy would get authority to build nearly 400 units of family housing at isolated overseas stations—they would get their family housing at continental stations under other provisions of law outside this public works bill—and to build bachelor quarters for about 2,300 officers and about 30,400 barracks spaces for enlisted personnel. That last figure for barracks spaces is relatively high for a Navy program. It is due chiefly to their need to replace old, run-down barracks which were built during World War II to last for the duration, but which they have made do only with mounting maintenance costs. In fact, about 20 percent of the whole Navy program is for the replacement of worn out structures. I should say here that the biggest replacement project is that at the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Ill. At that location the temporary wood constructed hospital wards, built in 1943, are to be replaced with a permanent hospital. This will cost an approximate amount of $13 million. It will provide hospital care to Army, Navy, and Air Force personnel serving in the area and their dependents—a population of nearly 70,000 persons.

The introduction of greater numbers of high-performance jet aircraft into the fleet has resulted, directly and indirectly, in the Navy's plan to establish three new air installations and to activate a new jet seaplane base at the site of a small World War II seaplane station. The only other new installation is an important naval radio station in northeast United States similar to the one we authorized a decade ago at Jim Creek in Washington. One of the important things about these new installations, with the possible exception of one, is the evidence that the communities where they are to be located want them. The one for which there may be some doubt of the community's desire would not be definitely located without the concurrence of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. There is a provision in this bill that would require the Navy to have a study made of possible sites and to come back to those two committees with recommendations for the best solution of this problem. That provision is in section 202 of the bill, which also directs the Navy to have studies made and to submit their recommendations to the committees relative to two other controversial land-acquisition projects which are not included in the bill but have been deferred pending completion of the study.

One of the aspects of defense of the country that seems to be of great concern to a large number of our people and has received a great amount of publicity

in recent months is the guided missile. You will be interested in knowing that the Navy's program includes an appreciable amount for facilities in support of that weapon.

Each year the committee makes a very careful study of proposed land aquisitions. This was particularly true this year of the Navy's program—as it was unusually large for the Navy. The members of the committee made very searching inquiry into the need for every area, explored alternative means of meeting their requirements, heard friendly and opposing witnesses, and in every case which we approved, we could come to only one conclusion in the interest of our national defense—that the Navy had to have these lands if it is going to carry out the missions which the country has imposed on them.

What I have been telling you of the Navy's program is summarized at greater length and with more specific detail in the report. In the middle of page 8 of the report is a table which shows the various categories of the program. You will note that the great bulk of their program—about 65 percent—is for operational facilities. These might be called the lifeblood of the Navy's Shore Establishment. They are the types of facilities that permit the docking of the ships for overhaul and repair, replenishment of supplies and ammunition, that allow aircraft to take off and land and keep them flyable, that are used for storage, checking, and issuing of weapons and similar usual functions. I mentioned earlier the troop housing in the program. About 16 percent of the program is for this category. The other categories we consider to have equal importance but each is only a small percentage of the whole.

Following the table on page 8 of the report is a summary of each identifiable portion of the program—or, as the Navy calls them—the sponsors programs. These start with the shipyard facilities and run through the 11 sponsors, including the aviation facilities for approximately 50 percent of the whole Navy program, the Marine Corps facilities and finishes near the top of page 11 with the yards and docks facilities.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force portion of this bill provides for construction of additional facilities in phase with the buildup of the 137-wing Air Force. The construction proposed is essentially that required to provide facilities necessary for effective sustained operations by the strategic, tactical, defense, support, and training forces. Included also are facilities for Air Reserve Forces and other essential air activities such as research and development and early warning systems. Air Force planning for the last several years has been focused upon attaining by the end of fiscal year 1957, the base structure needed to properly house, train, and fight the forces. The program provided by this bill, plus that previously provided, will permit, on a selective basis, substantial completion of the bases required under present concepts to accommodate present types of operational equipment and weapons. However, future programs must also provide large amounts to eliminate deficiencies remaining in the operational and support requirements needed to attain full capability for launching defensive and offensive operations and to make the adjustments needed for phased implementation of new weapons systems.

The Air Force, during the last few years, has greatly increased its striking and defensive capability. At the end of the Korean conflict, July 1953, the Air Force had 106 combat wings. Today, it has 128 and is rapidly increasing to its goal of 137 wings by mid-1957.

Not only have the number of combat wings increased during this period, but the quality of the Air Force has increased as well. The fighter interceptor inventory has been substantially modernized and completely equipped with all-weather jet aircraft. Strategic Air Command's medium bomber and reconnaissance forces have been converted 100 percent to B–47 aircraft and the heavy bomber wings are now replacing their B–36's with B–52's. The total aircraft inventory has increased during this period from 21,300 to 24,800. Additionally, the United States and Canadian early warning networks are well underway and will be in operation by early 1957.

Commensurate with the rapid buildup of the Air Force and combat capability, it was necessary to program a base structure which could be achieved in the most economical and rapid manner possible and at the same time provide the required base capability. The Air Force military construction program is aimed at providing the airbase facilities required for a ready, effective Air Force of 137 wings. This is not a static condition as there are constantly increasing construction requirements for warning systems, extensive test and operational facilities for new weapons systems and facilities to reduce the vulnerability of our retaliatory strike force. For example, the Air Force's fiscal year 1957 military construction request includes facilities for tactical and defensive missile wings which will become a part of the 137-wing force during the fiscal year 1958 and 1959 time period. It includes operational facilities required at existing bases to implement the dispersal of the Strategic Air Command's bomber force.

The development of additional bases necessary to reduce the vulnerability of our retaliatory strike force, as well as sites for strategic long-range missiles will be phased through succeeding construction programs. These new and increasing demands make it appear that Air Force construction must continue at substantially its present level for some time to come.

To accomplish the development of bases needed to meet these objectives, the major portion of the total authorization provided by the bill is for facilities at Air Force bases. Fifty-eight percent or $661,446,000, of the Air Force program total of $1,137,280,000 is for bases inside the United States, 28 percent, or $312,834,000, is for bases outside the United States, and 14 percent, or $163 million, is for classified facilities. In addition, an increase of approximately $132 million in authorizations granted in prior years is included in the Air Force title of the bill to provide for increased costs on certain approved projects, bringing the total amount of additional authorization for the Air Force in the bill to $1,269,039,000, about 60 percent of the total amount of the bill.

The largest portion of the program in continental United States, which amounts to $187,998,000, is for air defense command bases. Almost one-half of this amount is for operational and training facilities, consisting for the most part of runway extensions to provide for the safe sustained operation of the high speed jet fighters assigned to all interceptor units. The air defense command program calls for the construction of one new base near Portland, Oreg., and provides a second increment at the two other new bases, Buckingham Air Force Base in Florida and Richard Bong Air Force Base in Wisconsin, each initially authorized last year. The program also includes $38 million for the establishment of operational sites and facilities for air defense missile systems.

In addition to the $188 million for air defense command bases, $80,958,000 are included to expand the continental aircraft control and warning system. This expansion includes initiation of construction for one new SAGE—semi-automatic ground environment—installation and provision of additional support facilities at one of the SAGE sites started last year. One-fourth of the AC & W program is for family housing, essential if the Air Force is to retain in service the highly skilled technicians who are assigned to isolated AC & W sites. The program also adds facilities at existing permanent and mobile radar sites and constructs 53 new gap-filler sites.

The second largest segment of the continental United States program, $93,684,000, is for Strategic Air Command bases. Actually, the program includes much more than this amount for Strategic Air Command, as many of the Strategic Air Command requirements are included in the base programs of other Air Force commands where Strategic Air Command units are stationed or from which they will be operated. A substantial portion of the Strategic Air Command program is for operations and training facilities necessary for maintaining of Strategic Air Command's constant readiness. Another important part of the Strategic Air Command program provides essential housing and community facilities which, for the most part, will replace substandard and worn-out temporary buildings.

Over half of the Air Training Command program of $80,177,000 is for airfield pavements to provide the capability to train student pilots safely in jet aircraft. Much of this advanced pilot training heretofore has been accomplished in propeller aircraft.

The Research and Development Command program of $77,147,000 provides principally facilities for continuing the development of missiles systems and a nuclear-powered aircraft.

The Air Materiel Command program of $56,712,000 provides facilities to sup-

port the Air Materiel Command mission of depot maintenance and supply. A major portion of the total Air Materiel Command program is for projects supporting air defense and strategic command units stationed on Air Materiel Command bases and for research and development activities.

The Tactical Air Command receives $35,977,000. This is largely for additional airfield pavements and aircraft maintenance facilities.

The other Air Force commands in the continental United States have smaller programs percentagewise, amounting to about 4 percent of the total.

The largest single major command program in the overseas portion, $97,123,000, is for the United States Air Forces in Europe. One-third of this USAFE program consists of operations and training facilities and one-third for utilities projects, principally in Spain and the United Kingdom. Also included in the USAFE program is authorization for construction in Germany where, for the first time appropriated funds are to be provided for required construction which was formerly accomplished by the Deutschemark support program of the Federal Republic of Germany. Under terms of the peace treaty, this support will be discontinued after fiscal year 1956.

The program for Spain continues construction of the 4 phase I bases, the 2 phase II bases, and the area POL system.

The second largest portion of the overseas program, or $70,250,000, is for the Northeast Air Command. Over one-half is for housing and community facilities including 600 units of family housing at Ernest Harmon and Goose Bay. Approximately 30 percent of the program is for operations and training facilities, mainly airfield pavements required to support operations of the strategic forces.

The Military Air Transport Command program of $55,859,000 includes facilities only in the Atlantic area. These Atlantic bases contribute directly and essentially to the missions of the Strategic Air Command.

The smaller Alaskan Air Command program of $36,172,000 consists principally of operations and training facilities, and 250 units of family housing at Eielson Air Force Base, one of the three major bases in Alaska.

The Far East Air Force program of $27,684,000 provides facilities in Japan, Philippine Islands, Okinawa, Hawaii, and other Pacific locations. A major portion of the Far East Air Force program is at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines and at the Okinawa bases.

The overseas program of the strategic air command of $25,746,000 is for bases on Guam and Puerto Rico. The major portion of the program provides operational and aircraft maintenance facilities for the bases on Guam and 400 units of family housing.

In summary, the Air Force's fiscal year 1957 military construction program includes construction items to provide a minimum operational capability at all bases of the 137-wing Air Force; however, a few serious deficiencies required for the existing weapons systems will remain since all important and desirable items cannot be provided in a single year. It includes only the most urgently needed troop housing and recreational facilities and family housing which can be built only by appropriated funds and which directly affects operational capability. It includes research and development facilities essential to carry out important new weapons development and operational facilities required for tactical and defensive missiles. Finally, it provides for a start toward protecting our war-deterrent potential through decreasing its vulnerability by implementing initial dispersal of our strategic bomber striking force.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. In this bill there is authorization for the purchase of Wherry housing. It is my understanding that there have been court decisions establishing the principle that Wherry housing is subject to taxation by local communities and districts. Has the committee given any consideration to the possibility of establishing some type of relief in lieu of tax?

I can cite the example of one community in my district where they have over 900 units of Wherry housing from which the county now receives something over $40,000 per year in taxes. The transfer of those units from the present Wherry setup which makes them taxable, to Government control will cause the loss of a great deal of revenue to the county, in excess of $40,000. Since there is quite an impact on the local economy from this transfer I wonder if the committee has given consideration to some in-lieu tax principle which might be comparable to the in-lieu tax principle for Lanham Act housing?

Mr. SHORT. It will, of course, as the gentleman says, cause a loss of revenue to the local community, but in addition to that, it is unfair, unjust, and discriminatory in my opinion to force the owners or operators of Wherry housing to pay taxes and then compete with tax-free Government-owned property.

Of course there are many provisions in the bill dealing with Wherry housing. The trouble is that the formula is a bit obsolete, I think, in arriving at the fair market value, because the fair market value at the present time is arrived at, I believe, by figuring on the number of occupants in one of these housing units instead of taking into consideration what the houses originally cost or what it would cost the Government to replace them at the present time.

This whole proposition of Wherry housing and Capehart housing is tied in with appropriated-funds housing. Our committee is of the opinion that the cheapest and best way to erect these houses is by appropriated funds; it would be cheaper in the long run, but we simply do not have the money; it would bankrupt the Government, and we are close enough to bankruptcy as it is, but we certainly do not have the money to build all these houses out of appropriated funds. That is the reason there is a tendency to go from Wherry housing to Capehart housing, but attention should be given, of course, to making up for that tax revenue loss to the community.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the question I specifically had in mind, whether the committee has given any consideration to the possibility of some in-lieu tax probably comparable to the type of in-lieu tax principle applying to Lanham Act housing.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; it was mentioned in committee, but it was not discussed to any great length. No definite action has been taken.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman about a phase of Wherry housing. It provides for the construction of streets, sidewalks, sewage disposal, and other utilities; why cannot you figure in it the cost of school buildings? They do everything else except build school buildings.

Mr. SHORT. I know how tremendously interested the gentleman from West Virginia is in schools.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Did the gentleman from West Virginia wish to say something further?

Mr. BAILEY. No; I would just like to have some comment from the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. I am for more and better schools, of course. I believe the gentleman has raised a good point. However, money spent on schools cannot build houses.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. I would like to point out that when the land is transferred to the Federal Government the children living in that Federal property entitle the local community to special school money under the gentleman's bill H. R. 8185; so the local community will benefit to a slight extent anyway.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. Before we get into too deep a discussion of comparisons I wonder if the gentleman can clear up a point for me. The Air Force base at Bunker Hill, Ind., is undoubtedly one of the most outstanding installations of the Tactical Air Command in the United States. All of you should visit it, if possible. They are not going to get enough housing—and I wonder if this is prevalent generally—even to take care of the people presently on the base. This happens to be a new Air Force base and I am wondering if any provision is going to be made in order to take care of this increased Air Force installation.

Mr. SHORT. We have gone about as far as we think we could go in this particular bill. We have provided more housing on these bases at many installations, but we are still suffering from an acute shortage of housing. That along with a lack of adequate medical care for dependents have been the two things

that have contributed more to the deterioration of the morale of our armed services than any other two causes. I repeat, lack of adequate housing and lack of adequate medical care have cut down our enlistments.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. To aid in giving the gentleman from Indiana the correct information, the Armed Services Committee on Friday 2 weeks ago approved 680 Capehart houses for Bunker Hill, which are now under design.

Mr. BEAMER. I think that is a great relief. But because of the situation of the neighboring cities of Peru and Kokomo, there is not sufficient houses to take care of the personnel, the enlisted men and the commissioned officers, and they are going to have the problem of taking care of the men who are coming to the base at the present time.

Mr. SHORT. Lack of adequate housing along with lack of adequate medical care have been two of the things that have contributed more I think to the deterioration of morale in our Armed Forces than any other two factors.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. For the information of the gentleman from Indiana, may I say that I was speaking of Wherry, Capehart housing units on base.

Mr. SHORT. Where we have Capehart, and particularly Wherry housing on base, and then the Government allows the Armed Forces personnel to go out and rent cheaper houses perhaps several miles from the base is unfair and discriminatory against Wherry housing. It also impairs the efficiency of our armed services. It should be stopped.

Mr. BAILEY. A lot of things are unfair and discriminatory.

Mr. SHORT. That is another thing I think we should take up. We already have but we have not achieved worthwhile results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have had two very erudite speeches on this bill. We have had it well discussed from a great many angles and at the present time I imagine a great many of us have formed in a general way our opinion regarding the merits of the measure. So well have these speeches been delivered that I would be loathe to take up the time of this committee here today were it not for the extreme importance which I attach to this bill. I think it is so vital, it means the very safety, well-being and preservation of our country. Therefore, in the 18 minutes allotted to me I am going to discuss some features of the measure that I do not think have been fully exploited up to the present hour.

Mr. Chairman, the Air Force will receive, under this bill, $1,137,280,000 of new construction authority plus an increase of $131,759,000 for projects authorized in prior years or a total of $1,269,039,000. This is almost two-thirds of the total authority provided by the bill. I believe an analysis of the character of the Air Force and the nature of the base facilities to fight and support that force will explain the need for emphasis on the construction of airbase facilities.

First, we must be aware of the key role being played by the Air Force as part of the team providing for the defense of our Nation. Each branch of our splendid forces in uniform, the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps have a definite and essential part in this effort. However, the nature of the Air Force mission and the history of the Air Force buildup create a separate problem when considering base facilities. Most important is the timing of our military actions after the outbreak of hostilities. The Air Force, by its nature must play the principal role during those critical first few days or weeks after a war begins. As such, its bases, as well as its forces, must have their maximum capability in being at the time a war begin if we are to survive that first critical phase and retain the ability to put all of our military forces and resources into play to assure an early and successful conclusion to that war.

In defining the magnitude of the requirement to attain this objective of maximum capability for the bases, consideration must be given, not only to the cost, but also to the number and location of bases involved and the timing of actions involved in the ultimate provision of facilities. The location and timing in the provision of Air Force base facilities are particularly vital since, to a much greater degree than with the other services who operate in the field or on the oceans in event of war, a large share of the bases developed and used by the Air Force in peacetime are also the bases from which their tactical units will fly their missions during that war.

Modern aircraft require extensive facilities for their operations and maintenance such as runways, parking aprons, hangars, and shops, and fuel storage tanks. Due to the long lead-time required for the construction of these facilities, it is essential that they be in place before actual hostilities break out so that, the day the "bell rings," our air defense warning systems can sound the alarm, our fighter interceptor aircraft can rise to repel the attacking bombers, and our strategic air forces can launch their B–52's and B–47's in immediate retaliatory offensive actions. This requires the peacetime construction of bases which are strategically placed around the world and to which our strategic air forces can deploy on D-day and start immediate operations. It also requires the peacetime construction of staging bases between the home bases and targets where the aircraft can refuel and obtain repairs, if necessary; and bases from which immediate air support can be given ground operations of our Army units.

In considering the kinds of facilities and the magnitude of the construction required, certain major factors bearing on these requirements must be recognized.

These factors include:

The relatively small and inadequate facilities available to the Air Force at the conclusion of World War II, and the degree of postwar retrenchment discrepancies;

The rapid increase in size and complexity of weapons, weapons carriers, and their logistic support systems;

The changing concept of air warfare with inherent need for increased range, speed, and payload of aircraft;

The need for the training and preservation of a force of highly skilled technicians capable of maintaining and utilizing highly complex weapons; and

The rising ascendancy of air power as a major force for defense and decisive strategic operations and as a vital component of joint operations.

Consideration of these factors has necessitated the direction of the major portion of the Air Force construction effort to:

Provision of additional facilities at all types of existing bases as well as the construction of completely new bases in all parts of the world;

Provision of large increments of facilities such as hangars, shops, and warehousing required for the maintenance support of aircraft;

Constructing millions of square yards of airfield pavements, and millions of barrels of fuel storage and distribution of facilities in consonance with the increased size, weight, critical takeoff and landing characteristics and increased fuel capacity and consumption of modern aircraft;

Increased emphasis on adequate housing, and welfare and morale facilities as a means to retaining in the service those skilled personnel necessary to maintain an efficient, well-trained force in constant readiness; and

Development of a system of early warning, intercept control, and communications to warn and defend against enemy attacks on this country and on our outlying possessions and interests.

It takes a lot of bases and base facilities to support these forces and to provide the capability needed to insure the national defense.

On June 30, 1950, at the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, principal Air Force installations numbered only a little over 200 and the number of wings had been reduced to 48. With the advent of new-type higher-performance aircraft, even most of these bases were inadequate and required substantial expansion in addition to the need to provide the additional bases required for the new wings being added to create the 137-wing force structure.

The 137 wings which are commonly known as the force level of the Air Force, include only the combat wings such as strategic bombers and fighters; air defense interceptors, and tactical fighters, tactical bombers, and troop-carrier aircraft which support ground operations.

In addition to the operating and staging bases needed for these combat elements, the Air Force construction program also includes bases and facilities

for other flying operations such as Military Air Transport, logistic cargo transport, and pilot and crew training as well as bases for other types of training and indoctrination, logistic support, research and development, and security and administration.

For these activities, the Air Force requires, by the end of fiscal year 1959, facilities at over 3,000 different installations of all types, of which about 360 are major bases. Two hundred and four of these major installations will be inside United States and 156 will be in overseas locations. The some 2,800 ancillary type installations of the Air Force are scattered throughout the world and include the communications and radar warning sites on mountain tops and in the remote frigid reaches of Greenland, northern Canada, Alaska, and the Aleutians.

This bill includes construction at 205 of the major air installations, 104 of which are inside United States and 61 are overseas. In addition, the program provides facilities at a number of other installations and sites, including A. C. & W. network projects, and facilities for the development, testing and operation of missile systems and for the continued development of the nuclear-powered aircraft.

In the years since the outbreak of the Korean war, we have made considerable progress in developing the finest fighting Air Force in the world and the expansion of base facilities to accommodate that force. The Congress has made substantial construction authorizations and appropriations for that purpose during the same period. Since the start of this base buildup program which dates back to 1950, approximately $7 billion have been appropriated. This amount has been put in place or will be under contract by April 1 of this year.

The Air Force installations program, as you know, for the past several years has been aimed at providing airbase facilities required for already, effective Air Force of 137 wings with a goal of having those wings in place by the end of fiscal year 1957. The construction for the Air Force provided by this bill will, with the exception of certain deficiencies, substantially accomplish that original goal. This, however, by no means signifies substantial completion of total Air Force construction requirements. In fact, many things remain to be accomplished in future years. Although this bill is designed to provide an operational capability for all units of the 137-wing force on a minimum basis as planned through fiscal year 1959, many things remain to be done.

These generally fall into two categories. First is improvement of the present base structure. It has been recognized that all important and desirable facilities cannot be provided in a single year or a few years. Even for the present force structure with manned aircraft, additional operational facilities must be provided after this year to attain a higher degree of the combat capability so essential to the security of the United States and its allies.

Also, we must improve the conditions under which our men in uniform and their families must live and work. I am speaking of the so-called things for people—housing, both bachelor and family; welfare and recreational facilities; and adequate medical facilities. We have made progress on this in the last few years and will continue that progress by this bill, but more remains to be done. We have provided substantial amounts of family housing in the last 2 years and this bill provides another increment including 3,144 units for the Air Force. This bill also continues the program to provide needed personnel facilities and to replace the deteriorated and obsolete dormitories and medical facilities which were constructed for temporary use to meet World War II requirements and have now become health and fire hazards and are uneconomical to maintain. Many of these type facilities will still require replacement after this year.

Second, and even more significant in the things still to be done, is the provision of facilities to support new weapons systems, operational concepts, and other technological advances, and, in view of increased enemy capabilities, to insure a greater degree of protection to the existing forces. As I previously stated, this bill substantially meets the initial Air Force goal of bedding down the 137-wing force as originally planned by the end of fiscal year 1957. Actually, the construction planned and programed up to this point for the 137-wing force completes only the first phase of its development and provides a required degree of capability for the present force to defend the country during the preparation for the second phase we are now entering.

This second phase is the awesome era of intercontinental guided missiles, nuclear-powered aircraft, space satellites, and other technological developments to bestir the imagination. This bill contains substantial amounts for facilities to support these types of things and increased amounts will be needed in the next years.

I do not want to dwell further on the details of the requirements to support these weapons and equipment, but we must recognize that that era is rapidly becoming reality. We must pursue the implementation of these new weapons to the utmost if this country is to maintain the technological and military superiority which is so vital to maintenance of our national security.

The construction being provided by this bill is necessary for the Air Force to carry out the responsibilities placed upon it by the American people to fill its role in the defense of this country. I am sure you will agree to its need and to the conclusion that this bill, as part of our defense program, is cheap insurance for that national security.

That concludes my remarks with respect to the bill itself. There is, however, one additional matter which I consider to be of sufficient moment to mention, and that is the extensive acquisitions of property by the three military services during peacetime.

I am aware that as new weapons are developed, land needs change and are in many instances greatly magnified. I do feel, however, that all three departments have utilized the power of eminent domain to an extent which is not wholly consistent with our normal democratic processes.

So many times, we find the Army, Navy, or the Air Force entering an area of the country and in somewhat arbitrary fashion staking out extensive areas of fertile farmland or other valuable property and proceeding to use its power of condemnation to acquire the property—and to acquire it in a manner which sometimes appears to have elements of arbitrariness in it.

It is my strongly held opinion that the whole subject of land acquisitions during peacetime—and particularly through the exercise of eminent domain—should be carefully reexamined by the military departments to the end that local people, whose only contact with the Federal Government in many instances is in connection with the land acquisition, will not have created in their minds a picture of the Federal Government as a landgrabber.

A reasonable admixture of commonsense, good public relations, and truly competent planning, can, in my opinion, eliminate many of the objections which we encounter concerning the land acquisition programs of the military.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill to provide for the building of a new NATO headquarters?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. None that I know of, no.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the very fine statement he is making. It is a very comprehensive and constructive statement concerning the need for these bases not only in the United States but overseas.

We in Oklahoma are particularly proud of the part that two generals from Oklahoma play in this great construction. Maj. Gen. Lee Washbourne, of Jay, Okla., is one of the important men in the installations program of the Air Force. Brig. Gen. Ben Talley, of Mangum, Okla., is the Army engineer in charge of base construction in North Africa. I know from talking to these two gentleman how great an undertaking it is and how important it is to our country that we proceed with it rapidly.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. His great State of Oklahoma has played a vital part in this program. I have seen some of his bases. I commend my colleague who has just spoken for his interest in the activities of the Air Force for the defense of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to say a few words in reference to a matter which has given me considerable concern in the last few years. That is the attitude of our Government and some of its branches in reference to moving

into localities and taking over very often, I think, in an arbitrary manner, land which is needed for public purposes. It is true that in the case of a defense bill, the land taken is vital to the needs of the defense of the United States. In the process of taking this land from the localities, I think our services and agencies of Government could proceed in a little more diplomatic and a little more careful and a little more considerate manner. This bill alone provides for 3,750,000 acres of land to be taken over for use by the Military Establishment. I will say in this particular bill the Navy is the principal offender in taking this land. I think if the defense services must have the land, and if no other land will meet their needs, they should proceed with the least inconvenience to the local people possible under the circumstances. I have seen cases where the services have moved in and taken over areas for bases or for facilities or for other needs where other areas would have cheerfully been given by the local communities for the purposes. So I say our people are defense minded, they are loyal, they are patriotic, but I think our Defense Department and the Bureau of Public Roads, and other departments of the Government, when they need land for public purposes could move in in a diplomatic and considerate manner in taking over this land and in the exercise of the great power of eminent domain. In many instances, this is an extremely harsh remedy which is used by them. If other land is suitable and can be obtained without opposition, it should be given full consideration in the selection of needed locations and needed sites.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly vigorously agree with the statements made in the last few sentences by the gentleman who preceded me with reference to the wide acquisitions of lands by the military department. Because the committee of which I am chairman has jurisdiction of the public lands and the public domain area of the United States, I would like to call the attention of the committee to what has been going on with reference to public land acquisitions by the military in the Far West. During the past several years I have been aware of an increasing concern throughout our Western States over the continued expansion of these single purpose or limited purpose reservations through public domain withdrawals. With a single exception, perhaps, of reservations created for management purposes by some Federal agency, the Defense Department has been and is one of the principal consumers of land for limited purpose utilization.

I have been impressed by these facts: That the Defense Department agencies, other than lands withdrawn for Corps of Engineers civil works purposes, have withdrawn lands which in total area exceed the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware combined; that if the corps civil-works lands are added, you must add an area exceeding the total acreage of 400 Manhattan Islands; and that if present applications by Defense agencies are approved, there will be added to the list of lands held by the military and withdrawn from multiple use and development, a land area greater than the combined acreages of the States of New Jersey and Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia.

The Defense Department today owns 14 million acres of land in the United States, and if all of its applications are approved, it will hold 20 million acres of the land area of our country.

The total land holdings, to include those presently held and those under application by the Defense Department in the continental United States exceed the combined areas of the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, Delaware, New Jersey, and Rhode Island combined, plus 400 Manhattan Islands, and 50 Districts of Columbia.

The Defense Department in this country today owns an area greater than one-half the British Isles, and they claim that they need every square foot of it for their military installations. I have asked how other nations in Europe, Great Britain, and elsewhere throughout the world, maintain their military proficiency when, if you plastered the area owned by the Defense Department on those areas there would not be any area left.

To put the matter another way, the present defense holdings are the equivalent of a strip of land 13 miles wide from New York to San Francisco. Present applications for defense withdrawals are the equivalent of an additional strip of land, from New York to San Francisco, more than 3 miles wide, in addition to present holdings. In other words, if you added what they are asking for to what they now have, you would have a strip of land more than 16 miles wide running from San Francisco to New York.

I point out that the foregoing figures cover only the continental United States and do not include very substantial holdings in Alaska and Hawaii and other offshore areas. As of October 1, 1955, there were pending in the Department of the Interior applications from defense agencies for withdrawal of well in excess of 4 million acres of public lands, with certain other pending applications bringing the real "loss" figure close to 7 million acres. Three such pending applications in the West, the Navy's request for 2.2 million acres in the Black Rock Desert-Salwave in northwestern Nevada, the Navy's request for approximately 1 million acres in the Saline-Panamint Valley are in southeastern California, and the Air Force request for continuation of a withdrawal of 2.5 million acres in the Ojo-Gila Bend-Yuma area in Arizona have generated a real and understandable concern on the part of thousands of citizens living in those areas.

The probable impact of these and other such withdrawals on future multiple-resource utilization, to include forage for grazing, water, fish, wildlife, timber, minerals and materials, and recreational, scenic and wilderness resources brought into sharp focus the need for an early examination into current withdrawal policies and procedures. It was in light of the foregoing that I addressed a letter on October 29, 1955, to the Assistant Secretary for Land Management in the Department of the Interior, asking that his office withhold approval of any requests for further withdrawals of public lands for military reservations or extensions of existing reservations until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House had an opportunity to relate the pending defense application to overall public land policy.

It must be remembered that in the past all they have had to do was to file an application with the Secretary of the Interior for the amount of land they needed, and because no one in any agency of the Federal Government has the knowledge to pass upon defense needs as weighed against other needs of the Nation, those applications were necessarily granted.

It boils down to any agency in the Defense Department, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Army, being able to write out an application for a hundred square miles of the State of Nevada and for all practical purposes by a stroke of the pen taking that area over.

It was in the light of the foregoing that I addressed a letter, on October 29, 1955, to the Assistant Secretary for Land Management, Department of the Interior, asking that his office withhold approval of any request for further withdrawals of public lands for military reservations, or extensions of existing reservations, until the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House had an opportunity to relate the pending defense applications to overall public land policy.

In making this request I assured the Interior Department that we would give prompt consideration to the areas most urgently needed.

On November 4, 1955, Mr. D'Ewart replied in a letter stating that Interior would honor my request and at the same time urging that the projected hearings be held at the earliest practical date in order to minimize delay in the matter of defense withdrawals where the need for it was established.

Without going into detail as to the nature of the testimony received, I believe the following figures will indicate that the conclusions we have set out were not arrived at without a somewhat detailed inquiry.

The full committee took testimony on 10 different days or for a period of approximately 23 hours. Eight hundred and seventy eight pages of testimony were taken, and witness appearances totaled 55.

On January 6, 1956, witnesses for the Department of the Air Force solemnly advised our committee that not only did the Air Force not have too many acres for their needs in the States of Utah, Nevada, New Mexico, and Arizona, but also that their studies indicated that they would need to acquire additional substantial acreage.

When we consulted the Defense Department, they with equal assurance and

solemnity concurred in these declarations of the Air Force.

On February 27 and 28, 1956, witnesses for the Department of the Navy advised the committee that in 1953 and again in 1955 they had sought without success to effectuate joint utilization with the Air Force of 3,500,000 acres of the Nellis Air Force range in southern Nevada.

On February 1, 1956, the committee requested the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force to supply the committee with a justification for the utilization of these public land areas and especially for their refusal to make a joint utilization of the Nellis Air Force Base.

On February 29 the Department of Defense transmitted to the committee as much of the material requested on February 1 as was in existence. That indicated that there was no material in existence which showed that the Defense Department had made any analysis at all of the possible joint utilization of those areas.

On March 1 the Air Force advised the committee, further clarifying their advice of March 14, that 2.2 million acres within the exterior boundaries of the Nellis Air Force Range were being declared surplus to Air Force needs. On March 30 the committee learned, through the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, that the Air Force was declaring surplus to its needs 225,000 acres at Wendover Bombing Range, in Utah and Nevada. In other words, in the 95 days that have elapsed since we called the defense agencies before our committee to find out how they were using these huge public land areas, when the Air Force declared that it could not give up any of the land that it had, nor could it permit joint utilization of this area by the Navy; the Air Force has declared surplus to its needs 2,427,000 acres of land.

To put the matter another way, notwithstanding their declared position on January 6, the Air Force has since that date: Declared surplus to their needs 36.5 percent of the total Air Force public domain holdings in the continental United States.

The rate of release appears to be 110,000 acres per hour of hearings held by the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. The fact of the matter is that the Air Force since the beginning of those hearings has released public lands which it held and which it declared absolutely essential to the defense needs of this country, public-domain lands, at the rate of over 1,000 acres an hour, over 25,000 acres a day since those hearings were first initiated.

We think these facts show that the defense agencies do not know what they have or what they need. How many millions of acres are they still holding or applying for that they can get along without?

As I said in the beginning, these military agencies have the capability of writing upon a piece of paper and taking over these huge public-domain areas. We now have a bill before us that has for its purpose authorizing further land acquisitions by the various defense agencies. Some, if not all, of those are connected in one way or the other with these huge contemplated withdrawals which will approximate 6 million additional public-land acres in the far western part of the United States.

What I am going to ask the Armed Services Committee to do is to give us some help in finding a reasonable method of controlling the land-acquisition requirements of these defense agencies and, further than that, setting up appropriate procedures to hold under surveillance the uses that they are presently making in order that we do not have tremendous areas of the western part of the United States put in what I would call a legal icebox taken away from mining, lumbering, grazing, livestock, and all the other uses to which those areas can be put and reserved for a single-purpose military use when it is not necessary in the defense of the Nation.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the statement that the gentleman just made in propounding the inquiry, let me assure him that as far as the Armed Services Committee is concerned, and we certainly have a strong interest in certain matters connected with the public domain—so has the gentleman—I look with much favor upon his suggestion that some meetings be had to see if a workable plan can be devised between the two committees so that there will not be any friction between the utilization of public domain from the Interior Department and between your committee and the Armed Services Committee. I know we can do this.

Mr. ENGLE. May I ask the distinguished chairman a question? I assume that the authorizations in this bill for the purpose of acquiring private lands have not presupposed nor do they constitute a congressional approval of these pending public-land reservations?

Mr. VINSON. Let me say there is not one line in this bill for authorizing the acquisition of public domain. The only thing this bill will do is this: if public domain is set aside for military purposes, this bill authorizes money to be made available to settle private rights on those public domains. In other words, we cannot get 1 foot of the public domain except by permission of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct under the present procedures.

Mr. VINSON. There is no authorization to take over any public domain. For instance, if he sets aside so many acres of land in the public domain in Nevada, and if there is any private interest in there, there is authorization to settle with those individuals, and that is as far as it goes.

Mr. ENGLE. I realize that.

Mr. VINSON. I understand the gentleman's apprehension, and so does the committee. We do not want to be taking all of the public domain. But, you must bear in mind that the first duty of this Government is self-preservation. If it becomes necessary, we have to do these things, and we regret that the conditions sometimes require us to do them. We cannot do all of our bombing practice out in the ocean, because there is so much world commerce going on that we cannot control. So, we are forced to come back on the mainland, and we only want to take those lands which are absolutely necessary. Not 1 foot should be taken that cannot be clearly justified, and it should be scrutinized very carefully. We will be more than glad to sit down with the gentleman and his committee, which has jurisdiction of this matter, and see that there is a workable understanding reached.

Mr. ENGLE. May I make this closing comment, that I heard what the distinguished chairman had to say with reference to the care with which the committee goes into the matter of the acquisition of these private areas, that is, when money is allowed for condemnation proceedings, and I only hope that a similar careful consideration in the light, of course, of defense needs, will be given when these great public land areas are taken over.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that I will take up with the Department and request that, when they wish to take public domain, it be treated in the same category as our other land acquisitions by referring it to the committee as if it was being purchased.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman very much. We believe there should be congressional approval of the large public land withdrawals.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit during general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate on Thursday and Friday of this week and during sessions of the House next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CITATION CONFERRED UPON HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted today, I include herewith the address by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo and the address by Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, together with a copy of the citation conferred upon the Speaker, at the Bataan Day dinner, Washington, D. C., Monday, April 9, 1956:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO AT THE BATAAN DAY DINNER, GRAND BALLROOM OF THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1956

Mr. Speaker, fellow veterans of Bataan, ladies and gentlemen, 14 years have passed since the fall of Bataan. It seems like 14 centuries. In the passage of time since those grim days, we have gone so far and been through so much that we are able—so soon after the event—to fit the epic of Bataan into the timeless pattern of history.

In the military sense, the defeat at Bataan was not one of the world's great battles. It could even be argued that the course of the great war might not have been radically changed if the outcome had been different. Nor was it, as so often happens in the history of peace-loving nations, the kind of defeat that takes on a deep and emotional meaning simply because brave men fought bravely against brutal odds.

Its importance runs far deeper than this. Bataan was a victory of the human spirit. It was such a victory because it was a strange and wonderful symbol of what the 20th century could mean to the human race. Ever since those terrible days in 1942 we have been aware of this symbolism. But it does no harm to repeat it now—because, like all the great verities, it seems to acquire new truth each time it is repeated.

And so tonight we recall the victory of Bataan: The demonstration to the whole world that people of different races, different origins, different backgrounds, have a common cause in liberty. That the old and despicable balance of mastery and slavery, of colonial power and subject nation, can be wiped out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect. That the men of the West and the men of the East can face a common foe in absolute and unquestioned equality.

That was the victory of Bataan. It was a tribute to the people of the United States, who never carried the mantle of imperialism with ease and who set out, from the moment they arrived in my country, to liberate the very nation that destiny had placed under their aegis. It was a tribute to my fellow countrymen, who had the vision and the courage to continue fighting for their freedom until they had earned it, and at the same time to recognize that from a free and democratic people we could learn much, a country that could not possibly, by the very logic of freedom and democracy, remain as masters in our beloved island homeland.

That was the victory of Bataan. It was a repudiation of the tempting hypocrisy of power-mad men who sang of Asia for the Asians when in fact they sought the domination of the Asian peoples—and of their successors today who, like freaks bearing gifts, seek to persuade the peoples of Asia that their brand of slavery is a new kind of freedom.

That was the victory of Bataan. It was a portent of things to come. For the first time, of their own free and positive choice, an Asian people rose, almost unanimously, to the defense of an Occidental power—not because America was white and Western, but because America was friendly and honest and just and, above all, dedicated to the idea of liberty.

That was the victory of Bataan. It sealed the bond of friendship between Americans and Filipinos—a bond already established through the long years that led up, before the great war came, to the guaranty of national independence. As the long shadows of military defeat fell over those Filipino and American warriors in the tropical night on Bataan, the victory of the free spirit hovered overhead. It foretold the massive and exciting roster of nations that would quickly win their freedom in the years to follow—India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, South Korea, and all the others.

The victory at Bataan showed the way. It was important in time of war. It was even more important in the cold peace that succeeded the war. For we can now place the troubled problems of relationships between nations against the background of the lesson we taught ourselves on Bataan. Today we are faced, not with the menace of imperial Japan, but with the menace of imperialistic communism. The threat is real; it is made even more real by the new and beguiling mask that the Communist leaders have been using during the past few months. Surely none of us can be misled by the current change in the party line; nowhere, in all the meanderings and maneuverings among the Communist leaders anywhere, have we seen any indication that the purpose is altered. Only the methods change, the tactics, the curiously tortured interpretations of things past. The goal remains. It is what it has always been: conquest of the world for the totalitarian philosophy of international communism.

And it is more than ever clear that the tacticians of communism see all of Asia as a fertile field. They have played heavily on the unhappy memories of peoples who still recall the injustices of western colonial rule, who still have a long way to go before they feel themselves to be in full control of their own destinies.

No country with such deep-etched memories, no country with such insecurities, can feel safe from the subversive methods of Communist penetration. But now a new dimension must be added to the Communist menace, and that is the Communist pattern of economy. A new offensive has been launched by the Kremlin, the most dramatic example of which, in recent months, has been the proffer of assistance in the Middle East. In southeast Asia, Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev have traveled far and wide, establishing personal contacts with Asian leaders.

What is behind the new Soviet persuasion? The answer is: A system of economy which could easily be tailored to the needs of impoverished areas. This system cannot be dismissed as a failure. The Soviet salesmen are offering too much tangible assistance, both economic and military, to be dismissed as spokesmen for a hollow shell. And they are getting results. Under a dictatorship, they can act quickly and irresponsibly. Already they have, in a few short months, brought the Middle East to the brink of trouble. By contrast, the slowness and deliberation with which we work—the very characteristic of the free society, in which no government can move faster than the public opinion it represents—seems to be tantalizingly inadequate. In the long run, the free-enterprise, libertarian system will win out—that we know. But it will do so not because we say so, but because we make it so.

There is a clear and present danger that Asia's underdeveloped countries may fall for the Soviet pattern of economy. We in the Philippines are resolved not to allow this to happen. We have been through too much—beginning with Bataan, continuing through the dreary and oppressive years of Japanese occupation, the terrible destruction that accompanied our ultimate liberation, the mountainous difficulties we encountered in reestablishing stable government and a viable economy, and the long and dangerous years of coping with the Communist threat within our own borders—we have been through too much to relax now.

It will not surprise you to learn that we feel that we are not strong enough to cope with the current Communist threat by ourselves. We take seriously the concept of the interrelationship of the entire free world, and—knowing the American people better than any other nation—we have no mental reservations in accepting the leadership of the United States in this free-world coalition.

In the past few weeks, some political figures in the Philippines have been rather outspoken in their criticism of the scope and nature of American assistance to the Philippines. A few go further, and criticize the nature of the basic American relationship with the Philippines. Because we have a free democratic Government, some of these criticisms may be traced directly to politics. I do not apologize for it—I do not need to make any apologies to Americans who are themselves going into the exciting and quarrelsome months of an election year—but I think it is worthwhile to remind ourselves of the fact itself.

Yet I am not sure that it is possible to dismiss the current uproar in Manila as being merely a matter of domestic politics. We must not. We must recognize that any small nation, like the Philippines, will always find itself reexamining the nature of its relationship with a great nation like the United States. To us and to you Bataan was a symbol of the bond between us. Bataan is of the past; but the bond lives, and must never be shaken.

And today we look to America for more than maintenance of that bond. We look to America for a strengthening of the bond. I suppose it is a natural human impulse to pay closest attention to those who waiver rather than to those you trust; to give greater help to the uncertain—the neutralists, if you will—than to the committed. But this impulse, however human, does not always coincide with the realities of world affairs. It is not a device of domestic Philippine politics to remind America of the continuing mutuality of our friendship.

The other day, the New York Times, with journalistic acumen, put its finger on this matter in a direct and healthy way. It discussed the current debate in Manila, and asked whether there were ways in which the United States can give further help to the Philippines without presuming to interfere in our domestic affairs. The Times suggested in its editorial that such help might be given on several fronts:

"One is a cool appraisal of all our policy in and toward the Philippines. This cannot be carried out if we permit side issues and minor matters to take the spotlight. For example, we do no possible good by an irresponsible threat"—I am quoting from the New York Times—"to curtail Philippine sugar in the American market unless the Philippines open up more widely to imports of American leaf tobacco.

"A major problem that urgently needs solution is the question of American military bases in the Philippines. The principle is sound, but until there is fixed agreement there is always the chance of irritating friction. Too much time has already been lost.

"We need also a close coordination of our own activities in the area. This means better liaison in our Army, Navy, and Air Force and with the defense establishment of the Philippines. It means more effective economic and military aid, properly and promptly administered.

"This is a good time for such an appraisal of policy."

I have quoted this editorial, not because it necessarily reflects the views of the Government of the Philippines, but because it is a fine and important illustration of the spirit of Bataan in action, in the United States. It is a typical example of American fair-mindedness. This is the America I wish to commend to my people. For America is a Nation with instincts far closer to the aspirations of our fallible and striving human nature, a Nation whose heart is in the right place or, if it is not there at the moment, soon returns there.

I have always believed that the harmony, the friendship, the blood brotherhood of Bataan, between the Philippines and the United States, form the rock on which the relations between our two countries are founded. This friendship, and the common cause from which it stems, are more important than any difference of opinion which can ever arise between us: the differences are temporary because the friendship is lasting. But it is not enough to recognize that problems do arise between friends. We must go forward to a solution of the problems, precisely because that is what friendship means.

So today, in 1956, we recall the symbolism of Bataan—the spiritual victory that makes the military defeat look puny—and in the remembrance of that great moment in our common history we have the right to stand side by side through all the years to come, certain of the rightness of our cause and the timelessness of our friendship.

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MONDAY NIGHT, APRIL 9, 1956

General Romulo, Mr. Justices, members of the Cabinet, my colleagues of the Senate and the House, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched by the citation which I know is undeserved. I am profoundly grateful and words fail me to express my appreciation. When one is awarded a decoration by a friendly government, we in America give it such great importance that in our Constitution it is provided that it needs congressional sanction before we can accept it. I am receiving this decoration, Mr. Ambassador, and please convey to President Magsaysay my heartfelt thanks. I receive it in behalf of my colleagues of the United States House of Representatives because it is their collective decision that has given the Philippines the legislation that is mentioned in the citation. I receive it in behalf of the American people whom we represent. I will deposit the decoration and the scroll with our State Department and will accept it when Congress gives me its approval. To your Government and to you, General, you who so worthily and so ably represent the Philippines in our country, my profound gratitude.

My mind goes back in retrospect to the days when we had your great leader, Manuel L. Quezon, as your Resident Commissioner. I remember how he fought for the passage of the Jones Act. He was a patriot, and I wish to pay tribute to him tonight. Your country owes him much. He had worthy successors. You were the last Philippine Resident Commissioner, Mr. Ambassador. I will always remember your report to our Congress when you returned from Leyte and described the triumphal return of American and Filipino troops and the reconquest of the Philippines. How you eloquently and patriotically fought on the floor of the House to improve for the welfare of your people the Philippine Trade Act and the Philippine Rehabilitation Act is on the record.

Your speeches in behalf of the Filipino veterans have been most helpful to us in getting the Philippine side. You defended Philippine interests in a way that won our admiration. We treasure our association with you and with the other Resident Commissioners. Here, too, Ocampo and Legarda, Earnshaw and Guevara and Gabaldon, Osias and Paredes, Veyra and Yangco, Elizalde and Delgado worked hard and labored faithfully for the best interests of the Filipino people.

On July 4, 1946, the independent Republic of the Philippines was proclaimed in accordance with the Tydings-McDuffie Act passed by the Congress in 1934, providing for Philippine independence in 1946. This act showed the ancient principle of the Government of the United States; we want no foreign territory and we covet not a foot of ground over which the flag of any other country flies.

Tonight we commemorate the fall of Bataan. It was not a defeat; it was a victory. Our American and Filipino soldiers surrendered their arms; they did not surrender their spirit. They represented the unconquerable spirit of freedom which is invincible. Behind them stood the aroused determination of two peoples welded together by a mutuality of ideals. Bataan is a lesson of courage and friendship, courage of the highest order that withstood overwhelming odds and tested human endurance to the utmost, friendship of two peoples, each loyal to the other in the face of defeat and adversity.

A broad mutuality of interests, a vast community of ideals, a common liberation tradition forged in the fire of war, and an abiding concern for the steady progress of the Philippine Republic have consistently underlined American policy toward the Filipino people.

Through the whole pattern of Philippine-American association, from the passage of the Jones law through a succession of Philippine measures adopted by the United States Congress, notably the Tydings-McDuffie independence law, the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, the Trade Act, the Extension of the Trade Act, and the New Trade Act, the golden thread of interested and profound concern for the welfare of the Philippines runs with flawless consistency.

Nor has that concern been unrecognized and unnoticed. In World War II, particularly in Bataan and on Corregidor, the unswerving devotion and matchless gallantry of the Filipinos in the face of superior force not only contributed immeasurably to the success of the American strategy against advancing totalitarianism, but also gave a new dimension to the story of human freedom, a new and incontestable proof that a people who have known freedom, of whatever race or clime, shall never relinquish that freedom without a fight.

In the cold war, especially in the councils of international diplomacy, the Philippines has always stoutly and firmly stood by the battle stations of liberty. In a seething and doubting continent, peopled by more than half of the human family, our most steadfast friends and allies are the Filipino people. The growing stature of their young nation in the international community is today the best refutation of all the motives of selfishness and imperialism ascribed to American policy and leadership by the Communists. The Philippine Republic is the best evidence that the United States has never sullied her hands with the dross and stain of crass colonialism.

It is to be hoped that the Philippines can hold out as tenaciously as she has done in the past against the blandishments of Communist propaganda, which even now is weaning many peoples away from the beaten path of militant democracy and assertive freedom and into the devious ways of apathy and neutralism. For no people, big or small, can of their own choice stay out of a mortal struggle in which, by its scope and implications, is global and involves the whole human race.

Moreover, with the march of events in Asia, there is no denying the fact that the newly independent nations of the Far East lie in the trajectory of Communist imperialism. The weapons employed at a given time by the adversary scarcely matter in the last reckoning; the ultimate effectiveness of such weapons in the overall Communist objective of enslaving peoples is what counts in any event.

Now, more than ever, it is all to the good that the Filipino and American peoples reaffirm their common resolve to live by and fight for the ideals consecrated by Bataan and Corregidor.

ORDER OF SIKATUNA, LAKAN CLASS, CONFERRED ON SPEAKER SAM RAYBURN

CITATION

Speaker SAM RAYBURN, United States legislator, statesman, patriot, uncompromising fighter for freedom, friend of the Philippines, who now holds the position of Speaker of the United States House of Representatives longer than any man in the history of his country and who voted for and piloted legislation which granted first autonomy and subsequently the complete independence for the Philippines; one whose assistance and counsel have been the guiding inspiration for all Philippine resident commissioners since the time of late Philippine Resident Commissioner Manuel L. Quezon; under whose leadership important trade and rehabilitation measures for the Philippines were approved by the United States Congress.

The Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, is hereby conferred on Speaker SAM RAYBURN in recognition of his services to the free world and as a farseeing statesman whose vision has been unerring in his uncompromising stand against the enemies of freedom.

This is awarded as a token of profound gratitude and admiration of the Filipino people who will be always beholden to him for his constant and consistently friendly interest in their behalf.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY,
President of the Philippines.

THE PUBLIC HAS A RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting thing occurred the other day. A story was filed by Merriman Smith, White House correspondent for the United Press. The story was put on the wire for its client newspapers.

Before the story was printed by the newspapers, the United Press sent out another message to all editors. They were told to kill the story. While most editors did kill the story, one newspaper, to its eternal credit, went ahead and printed it. That newspaper was the Washington Daily News. United Press officials do not say who ordered the story killed or why. However, Reporter Smith, the highly respected dean of White House correspondents said that the story was entirely accurate.

The story is of great interest to the people of this country. It deserves to be considered along with all of the other important criteria for the fitness of Candidate Eisenhower for the Presidency.

For the benefit of the people I insert here in the RECORD the full text of that story:

It happened not long after President Eisenhower announced on February 29 that he

was willing to run again. He was walking from his office to his residential quarters. "I had to say 'Yes,'" Mr. Eisenhower said, "because they told me they didn't have time to build up another candidate."

The inference is clear that the people are being deprived of their right to have full information by desperate men, who are afraid that the full facts might jeopardize their attempts to shoehorn a sick and reluctant candidate into an office which he neither desires nor feels able to carry out.

I hope that the President either will affirm or deny the contents of this story, so that the people of this country may have the full facts as to his decision to run again.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Northeast Airlines, a Boston-based airline, is the smallest of the 13 originally certificated trunklines which now make up the foundation of the Nation's expanding air-transportation system. Yet, despite its excellent record in serving New England for 23 years, Northeast has never had the opportunity to grow and prosper like so many of the other long-established leaders among the scheduled carriers in the United States.

Northeast has a route structure which makes it absolutely impossible for it to be self-sufficient or make a profit. Its routes in New England are too short. Its whole system centers in Boston and extends only 184 miles south to New York, 250 miles northwest to Montreal, and only 340 miles north to northern Maine.

Back in 1951, Northeast applied for extension of its route to Florida because it knew that operating in the New York-Florida market would solve its most critical problems, and make Northeast a sound airline. The 1,100-mile New York-Miami route would provide the needed long-haul profits to offset the losses which are inevitable with Northeast's inherent short-haul routes in the network that covers 36 New England communities.

Northeast has never had a chance at any long-haul traffic, and yet that is the only type of traffic on which airlines can make a profit. Airlines, in general, use the profits from their long-haul operations to offset the losses they incur in providing necessary service on a short-haul pattern, of which New England's is one of the most concentrated and most demanding in the country.

Unless an airline has long-haul routes to produce some profitable operations, it takes Federal subsidy to cover the losses which cannot help but result from short-haul services. In Northeast's case, it requires a subsidy of over $1½ million annually to maintain so creditably the service it has provided all of New England for so many years. Northeast is recognized in New England as a first-rate, capable organization—justly proud of its fine record of outstanding public service since its founding in 1933.

Northeast Airlines is now a participant in the New York-Florida proceeding currently before the Civil Aeronautics Board. It has applied to extend its routes beyond New York to Washington and to Jacksonville, Tampa, and Miami, Fla. The case is now in its 19th month since the prehearing conference was held in September 1954.

Northeast is the only applicant which sought really to expand all of New England's air service. Several other applicants asked for limited New England authorizations—mostly for service rights to Boston only.

At the hearings, which were held in Washington last summer and lasted more than 3 months, Northeast outlined its plans for Florida service. It explained how greatly its proposed service would benefit New England in giving all New England its first direct access, without change of airline, to Washington and Florida. It emphasized how entry into the long-haul and highly profitable New York-Florida market would strengthen Northeast itself and, in turn, enable it to expand and improve its entire operation within New England. In this way Northeast would remove itself from the need for Federal subsidy.

The Northeast presentation made it clear that Northeast has developed an enormous amount of air traffic. Its rate of increase has been greater than the national average, and the company has earned the admiration and respect of all New England.

Testimony at the hearing made it clear that the short-haul limitation in route structure is not Northeast's only serious handicap. In addition, it has the most severe seasonal problem in the airline industry. Summertime traffic is extremely heavy. It reflects a tremendous amount of air travel to and from New England's famous vacation points—places like Cape Cod and the islands of Nantucket and Martha's Vineyard, as well as the many well-known resort areas in our neighboring States of Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

In the summer, Northeast flies full planes, sometimes around the clock. In wintertime, this vacation-bound traffic falls off. Poor weather conditions cut down flying generally. At times during the low winter season, Northeast carries only about 3 passengers for every 10 who fly during the peak summer season. No business can operate economically with such seasonal ups and downs in its volume. If Northeast tries to keep its personnel reasonably related to seasonal trends, it means that each spring many new employees must be trained—only to be laid off in the fall. If facilities are maintained the year round at sufficient level to handle the peak summer demands, there is too much personnel and equipment for wintertime operations.

Transport planes cannot be bought and sold as traffic demands change by the season. Enough expensive equipment must be retained to handle the heavy summer volume—even though winter traffic cannot possibly justify its retention. The only solution to these problems is the balanced route pattern that Northeast is seeking in the New York-Florida proceeding.

The Florida traffic which each year becomes increasingly heavier in the wintertime and drops off somewhat in the summer, would give that necessary balance to level off New England's seasonal demands. Northeast thus would have year-round need for maintenance of a large facility and a large staff, and sufficient traffic in all seasons to utilize such expanded facilities and personnel to economic advantage.

Such was the basis of Northeast's proposal. All New England recognized the soundness of the thinking, and because it made so much sense New England as a whole endorsed Northeast's application. Many prominent New England organizations, as well as individual States and municipalities, strongly supported Northeast. Their representatives, who appeared and testified at the hearing, urged that recognition be given this Boston-based airline for its faithful years of public service.

At the close of the hearing the participating parties filed briefs. One of the briefs filed was by counsel for the Civil Aeronautics Board's Bureau of Air Operations. Bureau Counsel, as this party is called, heartily endorsed Northeast's application and recommended that Northeast, and Northeast alone, be chosen as the additional New York-Florida airline. Bureau Counsel said in his brief that "Northeast, confined to its short-haul routes in New England, and with no logical extensions possible to it, save in this proceeding, might well find itself permanently relegated to the subsidy class." This emphasizes the seriousness and importance of the outcome of this case.

Bureau counsel made many other pertinent and logical observations proving that extension to Florida was the answer to Northeast's economic problem and that if granted the extension, "it is reasonable to believe that Northeast also could achieve self-sufficiency." This was exactly what Northeast has been seeking for itself and for New England as a whole.

Yet on Tuesday, April 3, the hearing officer, Examiner Wrenn, handed down his recommendations in the proceedings. The gist of his recommendation was that New England should, for the most part, receive nothing and that New England's primary and pioneer airline, which also made valuable contributions to the war effort in World War II, should receive absolutely nothing.

The only consolation which Examiner Wrenn is charitable enough to toss to New England is Florida service to 3 cities—and 3 cties only: Boston, Providence, and Hartford—by a tired and overburdened National Airlines, whose record in the case showed it to be hopelessly swamped by the present record-breaking demands for New York-Florida service.

The examiner himself specifically found National to be so overwhelmed by its New York-Miami responsiblity as not to be able to give adequate attention to its other present responsibilities—let alone any added cities. It seems logical to ask, therefore, "When could Boston, Providence, and Hartford reasonably expect to find their service needs being

cared for if the recommendation of the examiner was followed?"

The president of Northeast Airlines said that the examiner has recommended only token improvements in New England service to Florida. It is doubtful that the service recommended can even be called that. The rest of New England is completely ignored by Examiner Wrenn. It would get nothing. The examiner's reasoning is essentially that the rest of New England is not important enough to be deserving of Florida service or even of direct connection with the Nation's Capital.

To what extent the examiner may have been influenced additionally by his personal animosity to Northeast's largest stockholder—Atlas Corp.—is not clear. It is sufficient to say that he attacks Atlas unfairly and unwarrantedly. He gives no recognition whatsoever to the fact that Atlas has been the financial sponsor of New England air transportation when no one else would accept that responsibility for the past 12½ years.

The examiner ignores the recommendation of the Bureau counsel and he ignores the Board itself which said in a decision involving another case only last November that—

> We have little doubt that in the long run a smaller trunk can, provided it operates over a sound route system, attain a fair share of the markets here in question and provide the competitive spur essential to development of a full pattern of air service to the communities they are now authorized to serve.

Nor does it make any sense to have concern about Northeast's ability to compete. An airline is either capable of doing a good job of giving service or it is not. If it can give good service, it will be patronized wherever it operates. The ringing praise which has arisen for Northeast from all over New England leaves no doubt that a Northeast knows the answers, operates as an outstandingly good airline and is capable of giving excellent service.

The examiner passes over Northeast as the third New York-Florida carrier and recommends Delta Airlines, which is destined, in view of other route awards, to become one of the giants of the industry. Thus the examiner again ignores the admonition of the Board itself in the same case that—

> The statutory objective of a sound national air route structure requires, in the selection of a carrier to provide needed new services, consideration of the applicants' competitive positions and their relative need for strengthening.

Examiner Wrenn's recommendations in this New York-Florida proceeding strikes at the very heart of New England's future in air transportation. Three of the region's principal cities are recommended for additional service by an airline with a long history of unwillingness or inability to serve even its present routes. The third- or fourth-rate service which the examiner has proposed for Boston, Providence, and Hartford is the only new service, moreover, which the examiner would permit any part of New England to have. Overlooked is Northeast's proposal to serve these cities with new deluxe four-engine equipment which Northeast has ordered specifically to be able to perform this service. Northeast is the only applicant, in fact, which has bought new equipment for the specific purpose of being able to give New England its needed new services—and promptly.

Northern New England, which now has no direct service beyond New York, is not deserving of any such service, the examiner concludes. All of Maine and New Hampshire, most of Vermont and Massachusetts, and a substantial part of Connecticut must get along, as best they can, without any direct one-carrier service to Philadelphia, Washington, and Florida, even though there are important economic ties between all New England and these other areas.

Obviously, the examiner is not concerned if New England's own airline, Northeast, hopelessly slips into stagnation which the Board itself has said would inevitably result from adoption of a policy granting route awards to the stronger carriers at the expense of the smaller. He is utterly insensitive to Bureau Counsel's warning that Northeast has no logical extensions possible to it, save in this proceeding, and that unless strengthened in this proceeding, Northeast might well find itself permanently relegated to the subsidy class.

The examiner apparently is equally unmindful of the Board's objective—to so strengthen the smaller trunks as to insure that they will in the future be able to continue operations without subsidy even during periods of economic adversity.

Further, it appears the examiner is unaware of the foundation of the Civil Aeronautics Act itself, through which the Congress in 1938 created the Civil Aeronautics Board and admonished that Board to develop a sound national air transportation system. The examiner's recommendations, which go against all the weight of the evidence, policy, and testimony, if approved, could well cripple New England air service instead of developing a sound system.

It is hoped that the Civil Aeronautics Board in its final decision will continue its sound, logical thinking as shown in other recent decisions and ignore the examiner's absurd findings.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCORMACK, for 20 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a copy of a bill being introduced by her today at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. REED and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX, the remarks he expects to make during general debate on H. R. 9893 today, and include in the appropriate place in the RECORD certain extraneous material pertinent to his remarks, as follows:

First. A news release of United States Senator CHARLES E. POTTER dated March 12, 1956.

Second. Affidavit signed by Mrs. Ruth H. Keller, dated April 7, 1956.

Third. A resolution adopted by the Michigan Department of the American Legion dated March 18, 1956.

Fourth. Reprint of a letter published in the Traverse City Record Eagle, Monday, March 27, 1956, by Robert B. Murchie, esquire.

Fifth. Results of the investigation of petition.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include a speech he made at Columbus, Ohio, recently.

Mr. DORN of New York.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ (at the request of Mr. RABAUT).

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. FENTON), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. TOLLEFSON (at the request of Mr. PELLY), on April 11 and 12, 1956, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provision of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1727. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide further protection against the dissemination of diseases of livestock or poultry, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1728. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, relative to an investigation made by a team of veterinarians from the Mexican-United States Commission for the Prevention of Foot-and-Mouth Disease during the month of January, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1729. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Civil Aeronautics Board made by the Division of Audits, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1730. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the United States Coast Guard, an agency of the Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1731. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1732. A letter from the Chairman, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission, transmitting the Eighth Annual Report of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission for the year 1955, pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 232, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1733. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of 10 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of the Interior with rates of compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended and supplemented"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 10387. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10362. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 10363. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10364. A bill to grant certain lands to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10365. A bill to make public facility loans available, under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, to the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10366. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 10367. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10368. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, so as to require that certain reports and other communications of the executive branch to Congress contain information pertaining to the number of civilian officers and employees required to carry out additional or expanded functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 10369. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10370. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10371. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 10372. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10373. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic interstate forest fire protection compact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10374. A bill to amend the act to incorporate the Oak Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 10375. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide recognition for meritorious service by members of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10376. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the construction of school facilities in Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10377. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10378. A bill to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10379. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 10380. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 10381. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10382. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 10383. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 10384. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 10385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an amortization deduction with respect to the demolition of buildings in urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 10386. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, in Mississippi, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 10387. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 10388. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of mica in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10389. A bill to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10390. A bill to provide that every combat veteran awarded the Purple Heart shall be deemed to be 10-percent disabled from service-connected causes in addition

to any other disabilities from which he is suffering; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10391. A bill to amend Public Law 361, 77th Congress, to provide for admission of certain combat veterans to hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities pending adjudication of service connection of the disabilities for which they need treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 10392. A bill to merge production-credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production-credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 10393. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the exception of Federal taxes from a discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10394. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax admissions to theatrical performances conducted by or for the benefit of the American National Theater and Academy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10396. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution providing for the amendment of the Potomac Valley Conservancy District Compact and for the control of pollution in the Potomac River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. J. Res. 600. Joint resolution requesting the President to instruct the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations to request the Security Council without delay to convene the Arab States and the State of Israel and other interested nations in a peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 227. Concurrent resolution providing for the reading of the Declaration of Independence on the Fourth of July; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. Res. 459. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALE:

H. Res. 460. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to investigate and study the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 461. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9067, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of aiding small- and medium-sized business, encouraging industrial expansion, encouraging competition, counteracting forces growing out of the present tax structure which are bringing about widespread corporate mergers and consolidations, and for the purpose of discouraging the growing concentration of business into a few giant corporations, by substituting for the nearly uniform tax rates now applicable to corporations of vastly differing sizes a moderate graduation of tax rates on corporate incomes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. Res. 462. Resolution amending the Rules of the House to create a standing Committee on Administrative Procedure and Practice; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress requesting the passage of legislation requiring the Federal Government to defray costs of cleaning, dredging, and widening the Blackstone River Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Senate, memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant certain aid to Israel and to implement the joint declaration of the United States, Great Britain, and France guaranteeing the peace and security of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress, requesting the passage of legislation requiring the Federal Government to defray costs of cleaning, dredging, and widening the Blackstone River Channel; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on the Chowchilla River and Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to the States the right to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, peace, and good order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to institute proceedings to evaluate the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of Government, and to effectuate such evaluation by the calling of a constitutional convention to consider same; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10397. A bill for the relief of Charles T. Crowder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 10398. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Maria Pucillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10399. A bill for the relief of Roy Cowan and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 10400. A bill for the relief of Soonja Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10401. A bill for the relief of Martin A. McGrory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 10402. A bill for the relief of Tomiko Abiru and her minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 10403. A bill for the relief of Antoni Kopystynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10404. A bill for the relief of Vicente San Joaquin Garcera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 10405. A bill for the relief of Ivo Paiva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10406. A bill for the relief of Gumero Rubalcava-Quezada, also known as Gelasio Juaregi-Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 10407. A bill for the relief of Pietro Trupia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10408. A bill for the relief of Pierina Luicia Baglioni Baptist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10409. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chie Imaizumi Chao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10410. A bill for the relief of Henry T. Quisenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 10411. A bill for the relief of Juan Oro'-Florensa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 228. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 463. Resolution honoring Joseph G. Woodbury; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

848. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of I. LaVerne Lundy and other veterans of Towanda and Bradford County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; also petition of members of post 617, the American Legion, South Williamsport, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

849. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW post of Albia, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for the Veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

850. Also, petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Grinnell, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

851. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition of Fred Richardson of Seattle, Wash., and others, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

852. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Massachusetts, petitioning for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

853. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of C. N. Bryant and 43 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

854. By Mr. POLK: Petition of Homer Merryman, Washington Court House, Ohio, and 44 other citizens of Fayette County and other parts of the Sixth Ohio District, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

855. Also, petition of C. H. Jenkins, Portsmouth, Ohio, and 43 other citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

856. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Silver K. Parrish and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

857. Also, petition of Charles Hamann and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

858. Also, petition of Earl P. Gross and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

859. Also, petition of Stanley Osowski and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

860. Also, petition of John W. Schaff and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

861. Also, petition of Joseph Berant and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

862. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of F. G. Eslinger and other citizens of Ozark County, Mo., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

863. Also, petition of Rev. Paul W. Buchanan and other citizens of Webster County, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on television and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

864. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Roy A. Sullivan and other citizens of Aurora, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on television and radio; to the Committee on Interstate an Foreign Commerce.

865. Also, petition of Mrs. Rilla Richmond and other citizens of Jasper County, Mo., protesting the sale and distribution of inartistic and filthy comic books; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Pay for 6-Month Trainees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly explain the purpose of my bill, H. R. 8107, to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 authorized new special enlistment programs in the Reserve. One of these programs, made available to persons under the age of 18½, authorized enlistments in the Reserve for a period of 8 years. These persons are obligated to perform an initial period of active duty for training of 6 months and thereafter must serve in the Reserve for 7½ years. Section 262 (d) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, limits the pay of these reservists to $50 per month. In contrast, other persons performing active duty for training, including members of the National Guard, receive the pay authorized for their individual grades, in any case, not less than $78 per month. The bill would equalize the pay received by persons undergoing the 6 months' training in the armed services so that all such persons would receive pay at the rate of $78 per month.

The bill also provides that persons who are disabled or die as a result of disease incurred while in training will be qualified for all of the benefits of Public Law 108, 81st Congress, which law extends the reservists and national guardsmen, who qualify thereunder, the same pension, compensation, death gratuity, retirement pay, hospital benefits, and pay and allowances as are authorized by law or regulation for members of the Regular components. Under this same law all persons will also be covered for disability and death as a result of injury received while in training for the 6 months' program.

The bill also is made retroactive to August 9, 1955, which is the effective date of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, except that no additional basic pay shall be paid to any member of the Reserve for any period prior to the first date of the calendar month in which the bill is approved.

The reason these provisions of the bill are necessary is that the Comptroller General has held that because of the restrictive language appearing after clause 3 of subsection 262 (d) reservists undergoing 6 months of active duty for training cannot count this time in determining eligibility for retirement and for retired pay purposes of title III, Public Law 810, 80th Congress. The opinion implies that neither would this time be counted for longevity pay purposes. This produces an incongruous result since these reservists who enlist for a period of 8 years can count the remaining 7½ years, which they spend in the Reserve components, for longevity pay and retirement purposes. By virtue of the language of the bill all persons who have entered the program since its inception and all enlistees in the future will be entitled to compute the 6 months of active duty for training for longevity pay and retirement purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that enactment of H. R. 8107 will give impetus to the 6 months' training program. Undoubtedly, the disparity in pay between reservists, national guardsmen, and others performing initial active training has retarded Reserve enlistments. Even so, I am happy to report that as of April 6, and since October 1, 1955, when the program was first implemented, 17,185 persons have enlisted in the Army Reserve in order to participate in this new training program. For instance, in the period of March 9 to April 6, 5,165 enlisted in the Army Reserve. In the past 2 weeks more than 1,000 trainees throughout the country have been graduated and have returned to their homes to take up training with their home units. The Army intends to graduate trainees in 2-week cycles, and I think we can look forward to young men completing this program and returning to their home units in ever increasing numbers.

Rowland R. Hughes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 of this year, Rowland R. Hughes resigned as director of the Bureau of the Budget to return to private life. In his resignation, the United States Government and the American people as a whole lost the services of one of the finest and most capable men that it has ever been my privilege to know.

Mr. Hughes took office as director of the Bureau of the Budget on April 16, 1954. Prior to his appointment to this post by the President, he served as Deputy Director of the Bureau for 8 months and as Assistant Director for 3 months. Thus, for a period of almost 3 years he was in a position of critical responsibility in the vital task of bringing Federal spending and the Federal budget under control. How well he met this challenge is demonstrated by the fact that today the Federal Government has achieved a balanced budget. For his splendid contribution to this achievement, the American people owe a debt of gratitude to Rowland Hughes.

Before coming to the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes was a vice president of the National City Bank of New York, an institution with which he had been

associated since 1916. He had been a senior official of the bank since 1934, when he was appointed comptroller, an office which he held until 1951. He was assistant comptroller from 1929 to 1934, and inspector of foreign branches in Europe in 1928 and 1929. From 1916 until 1927, when he returned to the head office, he served in the bank's foreign branches in London, Shanghai, Bombay, and Japan.

Long active in tax work, he has been chairman of the committee on the excess profits tax of the American Bankers' Association, chairman of the Federal taxation committee of the Comptrollers' Institute of America, a member of the Committee on Federal Tax Policy, and a member of the tax committees of the Foreign Trade Council and the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. He has served as consultant to various congressional committees. As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 83d Congress, I appointed Mr. Hughes to serve as a member of a Special Advisory Committee on Revision of the Internal Revenue Code. He made especial contributions in the field of foreign-tax problems. In addition, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, I appointed Mr. Hughes to the advisory group on the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

He was born in Oakhurst, N. J., March 28, 1896. He was graduated from Brown University in 1917, and has been a university trustee since 1943. In February 1955 he received the Susan Colver Rosenberger Medal, highest honor awarded by the Brown University faculty. It is given in recognition of specially notable and beneficial achievement in scholarship or public life. In June 1955 the university awarded Mr. Hughes the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Speaker, Rowland Hughes is a close personal friend of mine, and over the years I have developed the highest respect for his splendid character and capability. With his resignation, we have lost a public servant who represents the very finest in every respect. His dedication to the principles of sound government and fiscal integrity will be sorely missed. In this year's balanced budget and the prospect for a continued balanced budget next year, he is leaving a monument of which he can well be proud. I can only hope that, in returning to private life, he will continue to make available to the Congress as well as to the executive branch his wise counsel and great experience.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to a constituent:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

DEAR MR. ———: Your letter in regard to the farm situation, of course, gives me no cause to cheer for I know you have reason to feel as you do at the present time. Many farmers and others, including your humble servant, BEN JENSEN, are now, and have been for the past several years, greatly concerned and worried about the welfare of the farmers.

In justice to the Republican Party we must not lose sight of the fact that the Democratic Party was in full power in the White House and in Congress when Mr. Mike DiSalle, the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, rolled back the price of cattle 10 percent on July 1, 1951, with President Truman's complete approval, and he said I will again roll back cattle prices another 4½ percent on August 1, 1951, and another 4½ percent on October 1, 1951. Why? Because they were very anxious to give the packinghouse workers the 9 percent wage raise which they demanded, and by so doing the price of steaks would not be increased. Immediately after the rollback went into effect the packinghouse workers were granted the wage increase they demanded.

Congressmen from the cattle-producing States took up the fight and we were able to stop all except the 10-percent rollback—but the damage had been done. Even before July 1, 1951 arrived, cattle prices went on the toboggan and took other farm commodities down the grade with cattle prices, and farm commodities kept tumbling down in price until the early spring of 1953 after the Republicans took over the White House and Congress, and abolished the Office of Price Stabilization. Then for several months the price of farm commodities leveled off and stabilized, until Benson and the Farm Bureau heads announced the flexible-support proposal of 75 percent to 90 percent, and again the price of farm commodities began to weaken and slide downward. Please read my speech of May 12, 1954, and my letter to Mr. Benson of September 30, 1955, copies enclosed. In 1954 the Republican Congress passed a farm bill providing, as you know, 82½ percent to 90 percent support prices for our six basic storable farm crops, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts.

We must also be mindful of the fact that the Democrats are right now in full control of both Houses of Congress, just as they were during the last session, which adjourned last August when the House of Representatives passed H. R. 12, amending the Agriculture Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities; that bill passed the House, May 5, 1955, by a vote of 206 yeas to 201 nays, and that bill reinstated the full 90-percent supports for the 6 basic storable farm crops and which I supported, but the Democrat-controlled Senate pigeonholed the bill for purely political reasons and nothing else. But ever since that time they have been very busily engaged in trying to put all the blame on the Republican Party for the decline in farm prices. While all this is water over the dam, it does point up where, and who, is responsible for the farm problem as it exists today. The thing we are interested in today is finding the right solution to the condition in which the farmer finds himself now—not only for the farmers' welfare, but for every American who over the long pull will sooner or later all be in the same boat.

Let us who are directly interested in the welfare of the farmer speak up, and make no bones about it. Let us say to Congress and to everyone who has a responsibility in the matter, that so long as everything the farmer buys at the counter is made or processed under a system of high supported and protected wage costs from the minute the raw product leaves the farm, the mine, or the water, just so long will it be a nation must to give the farmer like protection on the products he markets, for unless the farmers' dollar buys 100 cents worth of manufactured goods at the counter, and soon, I shudder to think of the consequences to our entire Nation.

According to a recent newspaper article, Henry Wallace, now of New York, said he favors flexible parity. Mr. Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture from 1933 to 1940, inclusive. Records show that our total farm income was less during that 8-year period than it was during the 8-year period previous to 1933. And, long after Mr. Wallace plowed under crops and caused little pigs to be destroyed, and after the New Dealers had spent over $19 billion tax dollars trying to prime the pump, top hogs sold on the Chicago market in 1940 for $5.70, and over 10 million Americans were out of work; but all those problems were solved quickly by World War II. All farm prices went up and up, and 14 million Americans were employed, in uniform. Oh, how soon we forget.

Now, I don't want any more of that kind of business. So, I'll continue to cast my lot with the Republicans, and I hope you will do likewise.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress.

Department of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I herewith include the text of a bill I introduced today, at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs. It is similar to a bill which I introduced as H. R. 351 in the 82d Congress and as H. R. 23 in the 83d Congress.

I have long felt that the Veterans' Administration should be a department instead of a bureau and with a Cabinet head. It has a tremendous responsibility to perform in the care and assistance of our veterans. It involves the expenditure of very large sums of money, and the head of the Veterans' Administration is responsible for the administering of six large business activities.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs should be treated with the greatest respect and consideration. It is only fair to the veterans and to the country to do so.

The text of the bill follows:

H. R. 10381

A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and there shall be at the head thereof a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of chapter 1 of title 5 of the United States Code shall be applicable to said Department, and in furtherance of such purpose, section 158

of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 1), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Eleventh. The Department of Veterans' Affairs." The said Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the said Department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

SEC. 2. There shall be in said Department an Under Secretary and five Assistant Secretaries, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That one of such Assistant Secretaries shall be the Surgeon General and another of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the General Counsel. Such Assistant Secretaries shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum each.

SEC. 3. There is hereby transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs all personnel, files, records, property, reservations, and facilities of the Veterans' Administration of both the central office and field stations. The balance of all appropriations and all trust funds of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenditure by the Department in the same manner as if originally specified in the respective statutes authorizing or creating such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. All contracts and agreements entered into, and all orders, rules, regulations, delegations, permits, or other privileges issued or created by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, or terminated. All laws relating to the Veterans' Administration, and those relating to veterans' benefits generally, shall remain in effect except as hereby modified and shall be administered by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

Foreign Minister Artajo, of Spain, in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capitol is graced today and during this week by the presence of the Honorable A. M. Artajo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, who is being officially received and will hold conversations with the Secretary of State on important problems affecting the two nations and the free world.

I take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleagues the intelligent and far-sighted attitude of our distinguished guest and the Spanish Government toward the menace of communism to the free world today.

The Spanish people have experienced, during their civil war, a long and bitter struggle with the forces of communism. As a result, they are well aware of the Soviet methods of penetration and terror.

The fate of the captive nations has always been met in Spain with deep and sympathetic understanding on behalf of both the people and the Government. It might be interesting to call to your attention that the Spanish Government has never recognized the Communist-sponsored regime in Poland, and still gives full accreditation to a Polish Ambassador representing the free prewar government of Poland, now in exile. On many occasions since 1945 official Spanish pronouncements were published to the effect that no lasting peace can be achieved as long as Poland, and the other subjugated nations of Europe, are not free.

Recent declarations by Generalissimo Franco and Foreign Minister Artajo confirm that this attitude in respect to the problems of captive nations is a fundamental principle of Spanish foreign policy.

On June 4, 1955, at the closing session of the International Congress in Escorila, organized by the Centre Européen de Documentation et d'Information, Mr. Artajo, who presided at this meeting, confirmed emphatically that "the liberation of the European countries occupied by communism is—from the point of view of justice—a historical necessity as well as a political one."

In an interview in January, 1956, with the representative of the Spanish paper YA, Mr. Artajo, when asked about the policy of coexistence with the Soviets, answered: "When Russia will liberate the subjugated countries, we will begin to believe in her good will of coexistence." Similar declarations were made by the head of the Spanish Government, Generalissimo Franco.

We will hail the presence of this far-sighted statesman in our presence and hope that his conversations with our Secretary of State will lead to a better understanding of the Communist menace and a more solid basis for a firm and lasting era of peace based on justice.

Aspects of the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with various farm measures under consideration of the House, it is pertinent to note at this time that the idea of taking cropland out of production in order to limit general agricultural output is not new. It was carried on very extensively in the early days of the New Deal by Secretary Wallace.

In fact, the original AAA program very closely resembled present proposals. It will be recalled that the original program was predicated on the allotment or quota system with limits fixed for the output of each farm to be administered by an Agricultural Adjustment Administration proposing to pay farmers for taking their land out of crop production.

As the law first operated in 1933, the individual wheat grower signed a contract with AAA to decrease his wheat acreage by 15 percent in the first contract and then he received a bounty of 30 cents a bushel on a percentage of his crops. Almost at the same time cotton and tobacco were covered and the rental of the land taken out of production was fixed according to the valuation of the land. Cotton growers, for example, were paid from $7 to $20 an acre depending upon the previous average yield of the land.

The Government hoped to take 10 million acres out of cotton then in the ground and actually that quantity of cotton was plowed under and the potential cotton crop for the year thus reduced by 4 million bales. In 1934 a similar program was inaugurated for corn, tying in a hog-reduction program. The objective was to reduce corn output by 20 to 30 percent and hog output by 25 percent. Corngrowers would receive 30 cents a bushel based on the appraised yield of the corn acreage rented. In that 1934 campaign about 1,150,000 signed by producers taking about 13 million acres of corn out of production and reducing hogs by about 13 million.

When these programs were underway, then came one of the worst droughts in a generation. In addition to the production cuts made by the Government, Mother Nature in her own caprice cut the corn crop until the original reduction program of AAA was actually doubled. The result was the smallest crop in 40 years. Because of the relationship between the corn supply and hog production, the raisers of hogs likewise reduced far beyond the intended figures and cut the number of hogs about 28 million head to about 35 percent of the base for 1932–33 production.

The 1934 curtailment operations in corn and hogs cost the Government over $350 million, the bulk of which went into the Corn Belt States, as presumably the bulk of payments under the proposed 1956 soil-bank measure would go. In those 2 years certain growers were paid $200 million for taking acreage out of production. The second cotton curtailment program started in the beginning of 1934 when 2-year contracts were offered to the farmers. Over a million individual contracts were signed under this program in which the Secretary of Agriculture rented and took out of production some 15 million acres and paid the growers about $115 million for cutting down the cotton acreage. The tobacco crop in 1934 at about the same time was reduced about one-third below production in the base years. Rice followed suit.

In the light of the drought of 1934, however, the following year what acreage not only did not shrink any further, but certain growers increased their sowing in 1935 by 6 million acres. You will recall that the Supreme Court decision in January 1936 declared the AAA program unconstitutional and the Department of Agriculture thereupon revamped its program building it around the voluntary system of conservation of land by which farmers were given direct payments for certain soil-conservation practices. The above figures were taken in the main from an article in Hoard's Dairyman magazine by Mr. A. B. Genung, of the New England Farm Foundation, and I believe that the statements presented are correct in every respect.

I desire to illustrate by presenting this statement that, insofar as Congress is concerned regarding the agricultural program, in one part of it at least, we are right back where we started from in 1933 when cotton was plowed under, little pigs were wastefully slaughtered, and the principle of scarcity was pursued as a national agricultural policy.

I think that all Members of this body are exceedingly anxious to help the farmers of the Nation. I would like to state that I, for one, do not believe that this Nation can long remain prosperous if over one-third of its population on the farms and in related activities are suffering from declining income.

It is certainly unsound and unjust to make the farmer buy in a protected market and sell in an unprotected one. It is unfair to apply price fixing to farm products in an otherwise free economy.

But it is also very unsound to tax the American people billions of dollars to support farm prices at a high parity level and as a result roll up in the warehouses of the Nation unprecedented, huge, and growing surpluses that hang like a black cloud over domestic and foreign markets and thereby serve to defer indefinitely the sound, permanent solution of farm problems that must be found some day, if we are to keep the American economy sound, healthy, and free.

On the other hand, I believe that any program we adopt should follow a line of sanity, soundness, and prudence and should be tied to our American enterprise system of which the American farm is probably about the best example. Let us seek solutions, not be along the lines of mass regimentation and price controls because those are the discredited methods of collectivism rather than the successful practices of free enterprise.

I hope that the Congress will work out a satisfactory program to solve the farm problem in the national interest as well as in the interest of the farmers.

A. J. Hodges Gardens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr Speaker, the opening of the A. J. Hodges Gardens in western Louisiana recently was an outstanding occasion for all of those who love beauty in the outdoors and in its natural state. The A. J. Hodges Gardens, located near Many, La., on Highway 171, 90 miles south of my home city of Shreveport, affords an opportunity to the people now for the first time of enjoying the pristine beauty of the pine-clad, clay hills of northern and western Louisiana. A huge lake, several islands, rose and azalea gardens, wildlife pastures and other attractions are most interesting to those who perchance pass in this general area on business or on pleasure.

Mr. A. J. Hodges, the owner of the Hodges Gardens, is a Shreveport, La., man. For years he has been accumulating forest areas in western Louisiana and several years ago he conceived the idea of developing a lovely park area nestled in an especially selected part of what has commonly been referred to as the cut-over pine area of Louisiana.

The gardens are not yet in a full state of completion but they, even at this hour, offer much to the visitor. One more full year's work will be required on the gardens. In the area of the garden park is a 225-acre lake and the forest areas have been stocked with deer, which were once native to that section, and with elk and wild turkey. The entire park area is composed of 4,300 acres and contains beautiful gardens exhibiting native and nonnative types of flowers. Of great interest also is the area of the park devoted to the important pine tree experiments and an air-conditioned laboratory, kept at 70 degrees temperature the year round. All types of tests on pine trees are conducted in this air-conditioned laboratory. An arboretum containing 38 different species of pine trees, some from faraway Japan and Australia, is located near the center of the gardens and provides natural allurement to those interested in beautiful trees.

I am not a fortuneteller nor am I a soothsayer. Louisiana is a lovely State but I will predict in the years to come one of the outstanding places for sheer beauty and loveliness—when nature does its best to outstrip even itself—the A. J. Hodges Gardens, with experimental areas, with game and wildlife refuge, will be known from far and wide as a natural utopia with its cloistered enchantment and its verdant beauty.

U. S. S. "Saratoga" To Be Commissioned April 14, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that on April 14, 1956, the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, CVA 60, will be commissioned at the New York Naval Shipyard. Upon commissioning, she will become the most powerful fighting ship afloat in the entire world. I believe that the *Saratoga* name is entitled to such an honor because the new ship will succeed to the name carried by five previous ships which participated in illustrious and memorable service to the United States. The name was originally taken to commemorate the famous Battle of Saratoga of our Revolutionary War, which proved to be its turning point. All of the ships which have since borne this name have fought with great distinction for the United States.

The first U. S. S. *Saratoga* was an 18 gun continental sloop-of-war which was commissioned in April of 1780. Although her life was a short one, she distinguished herself by capturing several ships carrying heavier armament and taking vessels into port as prizes of war. When last seen, in March of 1781, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* was heading out in pursuit of a strange vessel which had been sighted on the horizon. She disappeared from sight and her fate was never known.

The second U. S. S. *Saratoga* won her fame on Lake Champlain in the War of 1812. Commissioned on April 11, 1814, she was a 26-gun corvette and first saw action on September 11, 1814. At this time a great battle was shaping up for control of the Great Lakes. The British hoped by gaining control of the lakes, they could invade the United States from the north. In one of the decisive battles, the *Saratoga*, as a result of brilliant seamanship on the part of her captain, was able to defeat the British flagship, which carried 39 guns. As a result of this action, the British plans for the northern invasion of the United States were abandoned, and the United States maintained control of the Great Lakes.

The third U. S. S. *Saratoga* was a first class sloop carrying 20 guns. She received her commission in July of 1842 and served as an integral part of the United States Navy from that date until 1907. During this period of 65 years, the *Saratoga* saw action in the Mexican War, was part of Commodore Matthew C. Perry's squadron in 1853 during the negotiations for the treaty which opened Japan to the west, helped blockade the South Atlantic Coast during the Civil War, and served as a training ship for naval apprentices. She was finally sold to the State of Pennsylvania in 1907 for use as a training ship.

The fourth U. S. S. *Saratoga* was so named for only part of her naval career. She was launched in December 1891, as the U. S. S. *New York*, an armored cruiser carrying all the latest naval improvements. She was Admiral Sampson's flagship in the crucial Battle of Santiago in the Spanish-American War. On February 16, 1911, her name was changed to the U. S. S. *Saratoga*, which she carried until December 1, 1917. During this time she served as the flagship of the Asiatic Station. On this date, the vessel's name was again changed to the U. S. S. *Rochester*, and subsequently took part in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1926–31 and other important naval engagements. In 1938, she was stricken from the list of naval vessels.

The fifth U. S. S. *Saratoga* was probably the most famous of all of the ships to bear this illustrious name. She was launched in April of 1925 and was the first United States vessel to be launched as an aircraft carrier. During the years 1925–41, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* served as a training vessel for aircraft carrier pilots and contributed greatly toward the promotion of naval aviation.

On December 7, 1941, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* was in San Diego Harbor. The following day she was dispatched for the South Pacific carrying marine aircraft to bolster the defenses of Wake Island. Wake Island surrendered before help could reach it, and the *Saratoga's* planes

were delivered to Midway Island, where they were of great help in repelling air strikes against the island.

The *Saratoga* next saw action in May of 1942 when she delivered additional aircraft to the carriers which took part in the Battle of Midway. She then became a member of Task Force 17 and served as the flagship of Vice Adm. F. J. Fletcher. From this time until she became a member of the famed Task Force 58, the U. S. S. *Saratoga* carved out a magnificent name for herself. She participated in the landings and capture of Guadalcanal. She conducted successful raids against the eastern Solomon Islands. She was responsible for the sinking of the Japanese aircraft carrier *Ryujo* and for severely damaging the Japanese seaplane carrier *Chitose*. She lent great assistance in the marine strikes in Empress Augusta Bay and later in Tarawa. In March of 1944, she took part in operations against the Japanese-held islands of Java and Sumatra. She then returned to the United States for repairs and joined Task Force 58.

As a member of this notable task force, the *Saratoga* took part in the first carrier-based attack on Tokyo in February 16–17, 1945. She then lent her support to marine units in the invasion of Iwo Jima. During this operation she was severely damaged by 4 suicide planes and 7 bombs. She returned to the United States once again for repairs and spent the rest of the war performing training duties at Pearl Harbor.

The battle-scarred grand old lady of United States aircraft carriers was finally swallowed up by the waters of Bikini Atoll as a result of the underwater blast of the atomic bomb test on July 25, 1946.

The sixth U. S. S. *Saratoga* not only will be the world's most powerful warship, with a 60,000-ton displacement, but will contain all of the latest mechanical improvements since her sister ship, the U. S. S. *Forrestal*, was designed. She has an overall length of 1,039 feet, an extreme beam of 252 feet, and her speed will be in excess of 30 knots—34 miles per hour. She is equipped to carry the latest jet aircraft. Sufficient replenishment-at-sea equipment will allow her to remain away from port for extended periods of time with no loss to battle efficiency.

The ship's complement numbers 3,800 men. These men will be fed by a galley which can dispense 1,100 loaves of bread, 9,400 pounds of vegetables, 1,000 pounds of dairy products, 4,600 pounds of meat, and 12,100 pounds of dry provisions per day. They will be medically cared for by a complete 84-bed modern hospital, and a pharmacy. There are also 6 battle dress stations, 10 decontamination stations, 192 first aid boxes, and 4 dental offices.

The contract for building this vessel was awarded to the New York Naval Shipyard on July 23, 1952. The keel was laid on December 16, 1952.

I believe that a special word of commendation should be given to the men who have worked so diligently on the construction of this vessel. These men of the New York Naval Shipyard have proven that they are a "can do" shipyard and have taken those two words as their motto. They have performed their jobs with such great efficiency and quality that I know that when this vessel is delivered to the United States Navy, it will be as perfect a fighting machine as can be constructed anywhere, any place, any time.

With such a ship in the capable hands of experienced naval personnel, under the command of Capt. Robert J. Stroh as her first commanding officer, the name of the U. S. S. *Saratoga* will go on to greater heights in the annals of our United States Navy. Let us pray that she will win her place in history by her might as a preserver of peace, rather than as a defender in war.

The American Council on Education Endorses Plan for a New Joint Congressional Committee Which Has Bipartisan Support

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the educational exchange program is of deep interest to the American Council on Education and of special concern to the council's commission on education and international affairs which is responsible for coordinating all council activities in the international area.

At its last meeting on March 1–2, 1956, the commission again gave careful consideration to various measures before the 84th Congress which propose the establishment of a joint committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. These measures include House Joint Resolution 474, and Senate Joint Resolution 120 introduced by the Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT for himself and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

House Members who have joined with me in sponsoring this legislation include Representatives HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, ROBERT C. BYRD, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, THOMAS J. DODD, EDITH GREEN, DON HAYWORTH, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, HENRY S. REUSS, GEORGE M. RHODES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., HUGH SCOTT, B. F. SISK, STEWART L. UDALL, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., and HERBERT ZELENKO.

As a result of its study of these measures, the commission on education and international affairs of the American Council on Education took certain actions which are reflected in the following excerpt from the minutes of the meeting held at the beginning of March:

The Commission on Education and International Affairs believes that a well-planned program for the international exchange of persons has and can contribute significantly to international understanding, freedom, and world peace. Major weaknesses of the Government's program have been their intermittent character and the absence of a broad, inclusive, long-range plan. We resolve therefore:

1. That the Commission on Education and International Affairs supports the proposal to establish a special joint committee of the Congress for purposes of making a study of present and proposed exchange programs and of formulating proposals for a comprehensive and continuing program.

2. That the Commission on Educational and International Affairs recommends to the Secretary of State that he take all appropriate measures to achieve the effective coordination of such exchange programs as are authorized by the Congress and to bring them into proper relationship with exchange programs of intergovernmental and private agencies.

3. That the officers of the American Council on Education be asked to arrange for the presentation of these views at the time of public hearings on the proposed legislation.

I include as part of my remarks the text of a letter which I sent to my colleagues in the House of Representatives explaining the purposes of House Joint Resolution 474. Also included here is a short article by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH which appeared in the October 1955 News Bulletin of the Institute of International Education; as well as a brief statement of the history and activities of the American Council on Education.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1956.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. Such a joint committee will be able to make an important contribution to these international exchange programs.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT has introduced a companion measure in the Senate as Senate Joint Resolution 120, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has joined Senator FULBRIGHT as cosponsor of the measure.

I am hopeful that you and many other colleagues of mine from both parties will join with us in introducing this measure in the House. The text of our joint resolution is enclosed herewith for your study.

We believe that international exchange of persons has proved to be a valuable means of developing closer cooperation among the nations of the free world. The need for such cooperation is everyday more apparent. The United States Government is using this technique both for building better understanding of our country abroad and for technical cooperation and economic development. Large exchange programs are now operated by the Department of State. Students, teachers, prominent specialists, and leaders in many fields are exchanged and outstanding cultural performers are sent abroad under these programs. The Congress authorized these programs through the Smith-Mundt Act (P. L. 402, 80th Cong.), the Fulbright Act (P. L. 584, 79th Cong.), and several other acts. American technical experts are sent abroad and foreign nationals are brought to the United States for training under the International Cooperation Administration (formerly FOA and point 4).

The Congress receives reports from the Secretary of State on these programs and reviews their operation annually in connection with appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act also provides for a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange

which reports directly to the Congress on a semiannual basis.

All of these programs are reviewed separately, and by different congressional committees. They are extremely complex both from the point of view of administration and source of funds, and all use dollars and foreign currencies and rely to a large extent on the efficient use of private resources here and abroad.

It is, therefore, not surprising that some confusion has persisted in the Congress as well as in the public mind as to the relationships that exist between these programs. Yet broad public understanding and public acceptance of these exchange programs are essential if Congress is to support them. It is, we believe, imperative that this understanding be achieved and the confusion ended in order that these important activities can achieve the most useful results.

No concerted or continuing review of these programs and their relationships to each other has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Such a review is of the utmost importance and would be of inestimable benefit to the Congress and to the public. It would help all of us to make a more realistic appraisal of these programs.

The Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs which our joint resolution would establish will provide the necessary review to insure the most effective planning, operation, and administration of these important facets of our international relations.

Discussing the perennial crisis of exchange appropriations in Congress, Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, writing in the October 1955 issue of the news bulletin of the Institute of International Education, points out that although private exchange programs long antedate Government activity in this field, the role of the Federal Government is most significant and in recent years has become nearly indispensable.

Over the past few years, as he makes clear, a definite pattern has emerged in the process of getting appropriations for the Government's participation in international educational exchange programs, for instance, the President requests funds for an adequate program; the House of Representatives slashes this figure nearly in half. The Senate restores the full amount; and the final figure is a compromise between the two. The result, the Senator observes, is clearly insufficient appropriations, and he calls for grassroots understanding.

May I hear from you as to your interest in this legislation at your earliest convenience?

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From the News Bulletin of the Institute of International Education for October 1955]

PERENNIAL CRISIS

(By H. ALEXANDER SMITH)

Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, was cosponsor of the Smith-Mundt Act and sponsor of the act, passed in 1949, authorizing the use of payments on World War I debts by Finland for educational activities, including exchange of students between the two countries.

THE CHALLENGE

"As long as we believe that knowledge is better than ignorance, that the truth makes men free, exchange of persons programs should survive and grow." That sentence, taken from the report of the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy on the Goals of Student Exchange, eloquently presents the challenge to those of us who do believe that knowledge and truth are the sound foundations on which to build enduring peace and a free and prosperous world.

Educational exchange plays an important, but by no means exclusive, role in the spreading of knowledge and truth. However, the almost ideal partnership through which we in the United States have combined private and public contributions to international educational exchange is a guiding example to be followed in attacking all aspects of international ignorance, prejudice, and misunderstanding.

THE SMITH-MUNDT ACT

There is no justification for complacency or inattention merely because a program has reached a high level of success. We must constantly review our goals, as did the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, and, of equal importance, continuously inspect the foundation and framework on which we have built.

As readers of this bulletin are well aware, private exchange programs long antedate the Government's activity in this field, and still bear the major share of the burden. However, the governmental role is a significant one, and in recent years has become nearly indispensable. The legislative foundation on which the Government's participation is built consists essentially of two laws: Public Law 584 of the 79th Congress and Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress. The former is popularly known as the Fulbright Act and the latter as the Smith-Mundt Act.

As a cosponsor of the Smith-Mundt Act, I am particularly gratified with the outstanding success of the exchange program. My participation was inspired by the experience that I had personally with the activities of the Belgium American Educational Foundation, established by former President Hoover after World War I. This was an outgrowth of the old CRB—Commission for the Relief of Belgium—which saved Belgium during the First World War. The Belgian American Exchange program has been in continuous operation for a period of over 35 years. It counts among its alumni the leading Belgians in public life today. To it can be attributed directly the abiding friendship today between Belgium and the United States, It has been a model operation for many other private exchange programs.

THE FULBRIGHT ACT

The Fulbright Act inspired by my colleague, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, originally enabled the use, for educational exchange purposes, of some of the foreign currencies available to the United States as a result of the disposal abroad of surplus property. As such it was a temporary program, but free from the necessity of annual appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act provided a framework for a permanent program of much broader scope (in addition to the educational exchange features, this act is also the basis for the activities of the United States Information Agency), but required appropriated funds. Happily the Fulbright program now has available foreign currencies acquired by the United States through other means, and presumably will carry on indefinitely. Less happily, the program must now purchase these funds from the United States Treasury, thus becoming dependent upon appropriated funds.

It is in this context that we legislators who annually find ourselves on the firing line in the battle for appropriations, are forced to examine the foundation and framework on which we have built the Government's participation in educational exchange. For some years now I have had the growing feeling that, while the framework of the administration and programing can always be improved, the immediate problem is a crack in the foundation itself.

APPROPRIATION PATTERN IN THE CONGRESS

Over the past few years a definite pattern has emerged in the process of getting appropriations for the Government's participation in international educational exchange; the President requests funds for a minimal, but adequate, program; the House of Representatives slashes this figure nearly in half; the Senate restores the full amount, and the final figure is a compromise between the two. The result is, of course, a clearly insufficient appropriation.

In passing it should be mentioned that our successes in securing Senate approval of the full budget request have not been easy. The votes, when pressed in committee and on the floor, have been close. Unfortunately, in the House they have gone the other way, and deep cuts have been sustained.

Why? The program is an inspiring one, quick to catch the imagination of intelligent men, and never more important than today. The Congress is a responsible institution of Government, and responsive to the desires of the articulate voter—traditionally the House even more so than the Senate.

SUPPORT AT THE GRASSROOTS

The answer would seem obvious. Public understanding and public acceptance are the sine qua non for any long-range governmental program requiring annual appropriations. In the case of the exchange program we would seem to rely too heavily on an annual flood of testimonials at appropriations time, instead of building up a genuine and thorough year-round understanding of the program.

We have become too parochial, too ingrown. Happily we have had great success in securing wholehearted acceptance at the local level for the exchangees themselves. We must translate this acceptance—which has widely become enthusiasm—into a grassroots understanding of the program itself, and the role of the Government in it. When that has been accomplished, the appropriations should readily be forthcoming.

It is particularly appropriate that we renew our private efforts at this time, for the Geneva Conference, on the initiative of President Eisenhower, directed the Foreign Ministers to study measures to bring about freer contacts and exchanges to the mutual advantage of the countries and peoples concerned. This is one item on the agenda of the October meeting of the Foreign Ministers. We can do no less than give overwhelming support at home to this international interest at the highest levels of Government in promoting that which we believe in so deeply.

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE HISTORY AND ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

WHAT THE COUNCIL IS AND DOES

The American Council on Education is a council of national educational associations; organizations having related interests; approved universities, colleges, teachers colleges, junior colleges, technological schools, and selected private secondary schools; State departments of education; city school systems and private school systems; selected educational departments of business and industrial companies; voluntary associations of higher education in the States; and large public libraries.

The membership as of July 1, 1953, was 1,097 , consisting of 143 national and regional associations, and 954 educational institutions. Today, as in the beginning, membership in the council is by organization or institution, not by individual.

The council operates through its staff and the commissions and committees set up to perform specific services. Outstanding leaders in education, in related fields, and in public life serve on council committees and take an active part in educational conferences and studies.

Through the 35 years since its founding in 1918, the council has been a center of cooperation and coordination for the improvement of education at all levels, with particular emphasis on higher education. Its very existence, its functions as set forth in its constitution, its membership, and its activities reflect the peculiar genius of the American educational system—a system without national control, compromising a large number of autonomous units working together for the establishment and improvement of educational standards, policies, and procedures.

More specifically, the council has been a clearinghouse for the exchange of information and opinion; it has conducted many scientific inquiries and investigations into specific educational problems and has sought to enlist appropriate agencies for the solution of such problems; it has stimulated experimental activities by institutions and groups of institutions; it has kept in constant touch with pending legislation affecting educational matters; it has pioneered in methodology that has become standard practice on a national basis—its extensive series of tests, examinations, and cumulative records are representative achievements; it has acted as liaison agency between the educational institutions of the country and the Federal Government and has undertaken many significant projects at the request of the Army, Navy, and State Departments and other government agencies; and through its publications, now so extensive as to rank well with those of other educational presses of the United States, it has made available to educators and the general public widely used handbooks, informational reports, and many volumes of critical analysis of social and educational problems.

ORIGIN OF THE COUNCIL

The council came into being in 1918 as a direct result of the obvious need to coordinate the services which educational institutions and organizations could contribute to the Government in the national crisis brought on by World War I. The first meeting of educators looking toward that end was held in Chicago January 12 and 13, 1918, attended by members of the executive commitees of the Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, Catholic Educational Association, and the National Association of State Universities. A larger conference was held in Washington on January 30, when an organization was formed and named the "Emergency Council on Education."

Eleven national educational associations were represented at this meeting and comprised the membership of the Emergency Council. They were: American Association of University Professors, Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of State Universities, Association of Urban Universities, Catholic Educational Association, National Education Association, National Council of Education (NEA), Department of Superintendence (NEA), and Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education.

By the time of its next meeting, March 26–27, 1918, three additional associations had joined the Emergency Council: Association of American Medical Colleges, American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Council of Normal School Presidents and Principals.

The members of the Emergency Council on Education had not proceeded far with their work before they realized that there would be as much need for cooperative educational endeavor in time of peace as in time of war. Consequently, early in July 1918 the name of the organization was changed to American Council on Education, thus eliminating its original transient and emergency character, and visualizing its broadened scope in developing better relations with educational institutions abroad. The 14 founding organizations became constituent members of the permanent council.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL

From its inception in January 1918 to the termination of hostilities in November of that year, the activities of the council were centered on the war effort. It performed many special services at the request of the President and various Government agencies, as it did again in World War II.

In peacetime it has broadened and intensified its study of American education, expanded its services to its member institutions and to educational institutions in general, and initiated and supported projects designed to promote better international understanding and relations.

In addition to its numerous services to the Federal Government, the council has made a number of State surveys of education at the request of State officers or legislatures. Among the surveys in recent years are those of Maryland, Illinois, Utah, Delaware, Alabama, Louisiana, and Hawaii.

Some highlights of educational achievement

Some of the council's activities of lasting value to American education are: the psychological examinations for high-school students and college freshmen, issued annually by the council from 1924 through 1947, and the Cooperative Test Service which functioned under the council's sole sponsorship from 1930 to January 1, 1948, when both of these projects were merged into the newly created Educational Testing Service; the National Teacher Examinations, established in 1939—a testing program administered on a nationwide scale; the American Youth Commission, composed of a group of leaders in civic and educational affairs who studied youth problems through a period of years and produced more than 30 volumes of enduring value; the Commission on Teacher Education, a cooperative Nation-wide project in which more than 50 colleges, universities, and public-school systems participated, resulting in a series of 20 published reports on a variety of problems; the Financial Advisory Service, which operated actively for the 5 years between 1935 and 1940, and produced 21 pamphlets on specific financial and business problems of institutions of higher education. The council was also exceedingly active in working for better and more uniform accreditation standards through a long period of years.

Ongoing council projects and committees include the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences established in 1945; the Inter-American Schools Service, established in 1943, and the Committee on Measurement and Evaluation, established in 1949 and continuing in a field in which the council has long been active. Other areas in which council committees have been influential in establishing policy in recent years include educational television, the education of women, intercollegiate athletics, college teaching, international cultural relations, institutional research policy, and religion in education. These activities are briefly described in connection with the responsible committees on pages 11–22.

EXPANSION OF MEMBERSHIP

Although the council originated as an association of national educational organizations, it soon became evident that both the organizations and the institutions of higher education would benefit by working together, and the constitution was therefore amended as early as December 1918 to provide for the inclusion of institutional members, that is, accredited colleges, universities, and technological schools, and for the inclusion of associate members—organizations with interests related to the work of the Council.

In June 1935 membership privileges were further extended to accredited teachers colleges, and later to State departments of education, public and private school systems, private secondary schools, junior colleges, the educational departments of business and industrial concerns, large public libraries, selected institutions of a specialized nature, voluntary associations of colleges within the United States, and selected universities outside the United States of America. The membership of 1,097 on July 1, 1953, comprised the following:

Seventy-nine constituent members (national and regional educational associations).

Sixty-four associate members (national organizations in fields related to education).

Nine hundred and fifty-four institutional members (universities, colleges, selected private secondary schools, public and private school systems, educational departments of industrial concerns, voluntary associations of colleges and universities within the States, large public libraries, etc.).

Almost all of the major educational associations are actively affiliated with the American Council on Education, which also includes institutional members from 47 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

THE MEN WHO HAVE DIRECTED THE COUNCIL

The development of the council naturally has revolved around the men who have served as its chief executive officer. Dr. Samuel P. Capen was its first full-time director, serving from 1919 to 1922, when he accepted the chancellorship of the University of Buffalo. He was succeeded by Dr. Charles R. Mann, who was director until 1934 when he retired. Dr. George F. Zook came to the presidency of the council in 1934 from the position of United States Commissioner of Education, having previously been president of the University of Akron. Dr. Zook served from July 1, 1934, through December 31, 1950. Dr. Arthur S. Adams became president January 1, 1951. Dr. Adams came to the council from the presidency of the University of New Hampshire. He was formerly provost of Cornell University.

Associate directors of the council have been David A. Robertson, who served from 1923 to 1930, John H. MacCracken from 1930 to 1934, C. S. Marsh from 1935 to 1944, and A. J. Brumbaugh, vice president from 1944 to 1950. The titles of director and associate director were changed to president and vice president in 1935. The office of vice president was discontinued in 1951.

The chairmen of the council have always played a most important part in its achievements, and the list of chairmen is a notable rollcall of some of America's greatest leaders in education. The last several chairmen were:

1942–43: Edmund E. Day, president, Cornell University.

1943–44: O. C. Carmichael, chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

1944–45: Herman B. Wells, president, Indiana University.

1945–46: Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia.

1946–47: George D. Stoddard, president, University of Illinois.

1947–48: Leonard Carmichael, president, Tufts College.

1948–49: Herold C. Hunt, superintendent of schools, Chicago.

1949–50: James B. Conant, president, Harvard University.

1950–51: J. L. Morrill, president, University of Minnesota.

1951–52: Everett N. Case, president, Colgate University.

1952–53: Robert L. Stearns, president, University of Colorado.

How To Improve the Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, some individuals today are advocating repeal of the Federal income tax on the ground that it has become too complicated and too erratic in its application. In my opinion, this proposal is like trying to cure the patient by killing him. It is totally unrealistic to talk about abolishing the income tax.

The individual income tax is today producing about $31 billion annually, close to one-half of the general revenues of the Federal Government. The corporation income tax produces another $20 billion. Thus, the income tax as a whole raises about $51 billion annually. We have to face the plain fact that without this source of revenue our Nation would have been crippled during critical years of its history.

Those who suggest abolition of the income tax have not offered any alternative source of revenue. I can only suppose that such an alternative would take the form of a general sales tax or some similar proposal. Primary reliance on such a method of taxation would impose unfair burdens on millions of Americans. Those least able to pay would be those hardest hit. Therefore, to be realistic, we must recognize that, so long as our Government requires billions for our security and other essential operations, the income tax is the only practical and fair method of raising most of this revenue.

This is not to say that there is not room for improvement in our income tax structure. Far from it. In 1954, the Republican 83d Congress enacted the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which I sponsored. That mammoth legislation, covering thousands of changes in the tax laws, corrected countless inequities which had accumulated over the years. Many loopholes which had been permitted to exist in the past were closed. Fairer treatment for millions of taxpayers was provided, including more generous medical deductions, more liberal treatment of dependents, the exemption of sickness and accident benefits, tax advantages for retirement income, and the deduction of child care expenses of working mothers, to mention only a few.

It has been estimated that about 700,000 man-hours of work went into the development of that legislation. Experts from all over the country lent their assistance. There is no question but that the present strength and vitality of our economy is due in no small part to the sounder tax rules which the new law contains. We were successful in developing greater simplicity and clarity in many areas which had confused taxpayers in the past.

The fact remains, and I would be the last to deny it, that the income tax is still complicated and still poses difficult problems for the average taxpayer. We must recognize that every time a new relief provision is enacted, whether for business or for the average individual, and no matter how meritorious, new complexities are created in the tax structure. This is inevitable. Each new amendment designed to promote greater equity in the system as a whole must take the form of an exception to the general rules. Thus, no matter how sound, no matter how fair, each new exception almost invariably creates a new complication.

Moreover, it must not be thought that these special relief provisions are simply for the benefit of the well to do. They are not. The most costly of them are primarily for the benefit of low-income taxpayers. The retirement income tax credit, the extra $600 exemption for those aged 65 and over, and many others are examples of special relief provisions which mainly benefit those with small incomes.

Today, Congress is besieged with demands for further changes in the tax law, each designed to lessen the impact of the income tax in some particular area. I have received hundreds of such suggestions in my own office. They include increased deductions for child care, increased deductions for charitable contributions, larger deductions for dependents, bigger medical expense deductions, the allowance of deductions for tuition and other educational expenses, the deduction of the transportation expenses of handicapped persons; the deduction of life insurance premiums, a deduction for the cost of repairing and maintaining a home, the exemption of pensions generally, the complete exemption of active duty pay of members of the armed services, an additional exemption for the totally disabled, and so forth. These are only a few of the many examples which could be cited. There are countless more. Some involve a negligible loss of revenue. Some involve a potential revenue loss of hundreds of millions of dollars. With many of them I am entirely sympathetic. However, each one, if enacted, would whittle down a little more the total income tax base, and would, thus, to that extent, increase the burden of less fortunate taxpayers. Each one would add a new exception to the tax law. Each one would add a new complication to our already complex income tax forms.

We would seem, therefore, to be faced with this dilemma: Shall we ignore these reasonable and just demands for fair treatment or shall we adopt many of them and by so doing add further complexities to our already complicated tax law? I submit that there is another alternative which would go a long way toward solving this problem.

I believe that the underlying cause of most demands for special relief is the excessive nature of our tax rates. Our lowest tax bracket rate today is 20 percent. Our highest is 91 percent. Think of it. The Government takes over 90 cents out of every dollar earned in the top bracket. No wonder serious hardships arise and special relief becomes necessary.

I realize that some claim that the rates at the very top of the scale are largely fictitious because certain of these taxpayers can avoid the full impact of the rates by taking advantage of relief provisions. There is an element of truth in this argument. Some can avoid the full impact of the tax rates. However, the fact is that many others cannot. It seems to me that this very lack of uniformity in the incidence of the top rates is a compelling argument for their reduction to more reasonable levels.

I do not believe that the average American has any conception of how high our tax rates are. On March 18 of this year, George Gallup released the results of a nationwide poll taken to determine what the public itself believes the proper tax rates should be. The results were startling. The public sets the proper tax level of a family of four with an income of $5,000 at $235. Actually, a family with that income today pays $420 under our present tax rates, almost twice what the public thinks is fair. The public sets the tax level of a similar family with an income of $10,000 at $690, when in actuality that family pays $1,372 under our present law, again about twice as much. Finally, when the public was asked to fix the tax for a family of four with a $50,000 income, it set the tax at $7,125 instead of the $18,294 which it actually is, almost three times as much.

It is these excessive rates which are the villain of the income-tax problem. They stifle initiative. They encourage evasion. They breed disrespect for the tax system. They create severe individual hardships which in turn create the demand for special relief provisions. This, then, is the real cause of our income-tax difficulties. When the rates become too high, as they obviously have, special exceptions necessarily have to be adopted in order to soften their impact. At the same time, special restrictions have to be enacted in order to prevent the evasion and avoidance which excessive rates openly invite. In my opinion, the present complexity of our income-tax system is due almost exclusively to this cause. Those who seek to cure the problem by abolishing the income tax would provide a more worthwhile and constructive public service if they would recognize the true nature of the problem and develop appropriate remedies within the framework of the existing income-tax system.

I propose this program as a first step toward a fairer and simpler income-tax system, to be undertaken as soon as the budget permits:

First. The top bracket rate should be reduced to at least 75 percent.

Second. All other bracket rates, including the bottom, should be graduated downward to conform to the new top rate; and

Third. The law should be simplified by the elimination of as many of the special exceptions as possible.

Certainly it seems reasonable enough that any individual be permitted to keep at least one-quarter of any income he receives. Moreover, this would not need to be a costly program. Substantial reduction in the progressive rates would have relatively little revenue effect, because only a very minor portion of our total revenue today is derived from these high

bracket rates. However, I feel strongly that any such rate revision should be accompanied by a tax reduction benefiting those in the first bracket. Any tax reduction program must help all of our taxpayers. Naturally, across-the-board relief of this kind is much more costly.

For example, of the approximately $31 billion produced by the individual income tax, about $25 billion comes from the first bracket rate of 20 percent applicable to all taxpayers. This fact brings out two important points. First, it shows that the entire progressive element of our income tax—the portion of the rates above 20 percent—produces only $6 billion or 19 percent of the total individual income-tax revenue. Secondly, it shows that any reduction in the first bracket results inevitably in a substantial reduction in revenues.

I point these facts out simply to indicate the revenue implications of the tax program I have proposed. I have no information at this time which would suggest that the budget will permit substantial tax reduction in the immediate future. However, I believe that preparatory work should be begun immediately to develop a constructive program of this type. Excellent studies have been made recently of the economic impact of the income tax. It is time now that the tax committees of the Congress assume the obligation of developing a sound tax program. For this reason, I propose that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation begin immediately to prepare studies and recommendations along the lines of my proposals.

In conclusion, I believe that the advantages of my program are tremendous. It would encourage individual initiative. It would lessen the demands for special treatment. It would simplify the tax laws. It would reduce evasion and avoidance. It would ease the compliance problems of the taxpayer. It would simplify the administrative problems of the Government. It would strengthen public confidence in the income tax.

It is a program that should recommend itself to every Member of Congress, irrespective of party.

Flood Control and River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present an address delivered by me before the annual convention of the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, La., on April 3, 1956, entitled "Flood Control and River Development—Its Progress and Its Objectives":

During the last 15 years, especially, this has been a land of greatly increasing population. During the easy recollection of everyone here, this country has grown from a population of 142 millions of people in 1940 to 166 million people at the present time. This growth has pushed us into a period of prosperity and development the like of which this Nation has not heretofore seen. New houses, new buildings, new factories, new and wider roads, great airports and other means of expansion. Our transportation facilities have been taxed at times to the utmost and our network of roads has been repeatedly expanded and enlarged only to find that our plans, as wild as they appeared to be, were inadequate to meet the burden of traffic placed upon them.

During this period of time, one would naturally think that as a nation our plans should envision an increase in our program of water transportation and that these plans should go forward with the thought that water transportation should carry its full part in the development of the Nation. Strange to say, such has not been the case. We have not developed our water roads as we have developed our macadam and concrete highways.

Just before leaving Washington I obtained figures to indicate the progress we are making in our river and water development throughout the country. I find the following: During the year 1951 we appropriated in Congress, roughly, $505 million for flood control and river and harbor development; during 1952 we reduced and appropriated $477 million; during 1953 we further economized and appropriated $446 million. In 1954 this sum appropriated went down to the alltime low of $366 million. In 1956, I led the fight on the floor of the House for more money and we were able to report for the current year the sum of $477 million, an increase of over $100 million. In addition to the sum of $97 million which the House added to the bill which came out of the Appropriations Committee, the Senate added some 10 to 15 million dollars more.

The United States Army engineers were so surprised at this change of attitude of the Congress that they were hardly prepared to spend this additional money, although it was badly needed in the pushing of the projects which had been pending a long time. As a result, I am told that some of the money appropriated last year will not have been fully expended when this present fiscal year comes to an end.

In spite of all of these facts, I am somewhat disappointed that the Bureau of the Budget failed to recommend at least the sum which Congress had previously appropriated. For the coming fiscal year the budget recommends the appropriation of $457 million—a sum which if appropriated will put us back again on the road to an increasing program of water development.

I am president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and in this capacity I am familiar with the attitude of the people of this country in relation to our present problem. Our organization has recommended to the Congress and to the President that we work for a budget of $1 billion per year for all water resources uses. This means that over the long pull we think that this Nation needs an annual appropriation of $1 billion to continue our work of development and to maintain properly the work previously completed. With the present recommendations of the Budget Bureau, we will have to expand our appropriation some $250 million per year to meet this goal. Our budgeted expenses in regard to almost everything else has increased tremendously—food, labor, clothing, construction, have all increased tremendously; but there seems to be the idea that we can continue the water-development program with the same budget and the same expenditures without an increase. Well, it just can't be done.

It is now apparent that Congress is turning the corner. This change is due to what? Last year, when the Appropriations Committee brought to the floor of the House of Representatives a bill which would have reduced the budget estimated needs of rivers and harbors by some $50 million, some of us connected with the National Rivers and Harbors Congress called a meeting of all Members interested, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building in Washington. At this meeting we had some 60 Members present, and we passed 4 resolutions, asking that I see that they were introduced into the Congress. I am proud to report that every one of these 4 resolutions passed the House and that as a result of this action we restored to the bill some $97 million. This was the first time in 10 years that we had been able to reverse the trend toward diminishing appropriations.

That this is a definite trend is well shown by the fact that I as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress joined with others and succeeded this year in adopting an amendment in a deficiency appropriation bill which gives New England money she is entitled to receive for needed help as a result of three disastrous floods within the last year and a half. Again, we repeated this action in the case of the Carolinas which came to us this year with a plea for help which no sympathetic person could deny. In three instances, therefore, recently we have reversed the trend of appropriations and have been able to give the Nation something like the money needed for these purposes.

It was at an annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress 2 years ago that the President of the United States announced the appointment of a Cabinet committee to work out recommendations for a national water policy. Undoubtedly, some definite policy in furtherance of the development of this great natural resource is needed for our guidance. I look forward to a definite policy stabilized over a period of years which will assure us in advance what is to be expected in our program.

We have made tremendous progress under our present system of handling our program—but in all fairness, I think with better planning, we could have made much more progress. I do not favor the establishment of a new Board of Review to further screen our projects. This was the recommendation of the President's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recently. Such a Board is not necessary and adds to the tremendous number of agencies which already have a part in the screening of projects before they are completed. Do you realize that some 28 separate steps have to be taken in the authorization of a project? These usually require a period of several years, with continual checking and investigating going on until the project is finally screened by Congress and becomes the law of the land. A further process—a new board—could only mean that new and burdensome bureaucratic processes would be added to the careful program we presently have set up.

Rather than add to the number of agencies and processes which must be considered in the authorization of any flood-control project, I would say that our chief problem and my chief concern is our increasing difficulty in obtaining money in the Congress. Year by year this has developed into a great fight; and as a rule, we make the heavy appropriations only after a great catastrophe has struck our economy.

In 1927 when the great flood struck the Mississippi Valley, our total approved civil works program was only $1,200,000,000; and the sum of $800 million had been expended on this program. This left a backlog of only $400 million of work to be done on 1927 prices.

In 1937, following the increasing interest in flood control due to the passage of the 1936 Flood Control Act, which, by the way, was sponsored by my uncle, Senator John Overton, the backlog of construction had

grown from $400 million to $900 million and at 1937 prices. By the year 1947, when we had adopted the concept of basinwide development as applied to our valleys, our backlog of approved projects had grown to $5.4 billion at 1947 prices.

Today, our situation is anything but envious. We have an approved program of civil works construction, approved by Congress, which totals some $19 billion. Of this program, we have spent some $7 billion through the years, leaving us as of this hour $12 billion in unconstructed projects at present-day prices.

Of course, some of these projects are obsolete and some are undoubtedly not necessary because of intervening developments through the years. But even taking into consideration all of these things, I do not believe that anyone will seriously question the fact that our authorized list of projects will exceed $8 billion. This is the situation at a time when we put all of our power and our influence behind a real program to advance the needs of the Nation. This is the situation at a time when our increased population, our larger cities, millions of acres more land in cultivation and in pasturage all cry loudly for an active aggressive and comprehensive program.

There has been talk in Congress about flood insurance. This was in fact the administration recommendation. Much emphasis has been given by Members of Congress to such a program; and I hope that some method will be developed to lighten the heavy burden which falls upon a community, State, and on the Nation when a great disaster like the New England floods visits a section of the country. I am, however, not too optimistic about such a program.

We can approach this matter much better by a frontal attack. The closing the stable door after the horse has fled type of approach may mitigate the suffering and the hardship but it will not prevent the flood. Far better it is for the Congress to approach this matter from the viewpoint of one who wants to prevent the tragedy rather than extend financial sympathy after the pall of death and destruction has fallen.

My friends, the use of water resources by a people is not a new program. It is as old as are the pyramids of Egypt. In fact, the first information which we have after the dawn of history regarding flood control and irrigation comes fom the Middle East. It was along the Euphrates and the Nile Rivers that man first made a serious effort to conquer the floods.

Along the Nile River which traverses desert country for many miles, ancient Egyptians broke the ground, built little irrigation ditches and dams, and tried in a meager way to cultivate a little fringe of land along the banks of the Nile. They tried their peculiar method of controling floods by throwing their children into the muddy waters of this often-swollen stream, to the crocodiles, to appease their gods and have them stop the ravages of their lands and loss of their lives by flood waters. Perhaps it was the information which their engineers gained from developing drainage and flood-control works which later gave them the skill to construct monuments that stand through the ages, as the sphinx and the pyramids.

Much time has passed since then; and we are still fighting the problem which was old to even Egypt itself 5,000 years before Christ. It is for you to judge just how much progress has been made by us since the days of the Pharaohs and the Egyptians. I earnestly believe that had we determinedly set our minds toward the work of eliminating floods in our own land and using our greatest natural resource—water—we would have made much more progress than we can boast of today.

To Socialism by Way of Tax-Exempt Foundations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, thinking that a speech which I made before the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, at Columbus, Ohio, April 6, 1956, might be of interest to the Members, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

TO SOCIALISM BY WAY OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

(By Hon. CARROLL REECE, of Tennessee)

I

In this era in which we live, the old-fashioned virtues grow increasingly unpopular.

Liberal economists tell us that our Government (instead of cutting our suits to fit our cloth) should tax us to the limit of tolerance and then borrow more from us in order to shower us with paternal blessings.

Instead of being taught independence, energy, and enterprise, our youth today is taught to look for security.

The man who believes in individualism, freedom, and self-reliance is ridiculed as antediluvian.

We approach closer and closer to socialism.

Most of those who urge us in this direction suffer the illusion that we can stop at a sort of extended New Deal.

But their British counterparts know better.

They see, and rely upon, the paternal state as a necessary transition—a stage between free enterprise and socialism.

Being evolutionary Socialists, they wish to reach their goal through the democratic process, and this requires the paternal state as a preparation for that goal.

They are confident, once this intermediate stage has been reached, that full socialism will follow inevitably.

But these British collectivists suffer under their own illusion, in turn. They refer to their ideal society as one based on production for use and not for profit. This slogan, also dear to the hearts of so many of our own radical educators, is pure nonsense.

One who works for his own profit is likely to work hard. One who works for the use of others, without profit to himself, is likely not to work any harder than he must.

And so this state which the British Socialists and our liberals envision, in which production will be higher and cheaper, can come into being only under the compulsion of communism or some other form of Socialist dictatorship—if it can come, at all, under any Socialist state.

II

This, then, is the illusion of British socialism, so much respected and aped by our own radicals, that they can stop at the point of democratic socialism.

Communists smile at this, knowing full well that the road to socialism is the road to collectivist dictatorship.

In this process they have materially weakened our people's patriotism. Flag waving is still with us, but patriotism in its deeper significance is fading—sadly fading.

An article in the United States News recently disclosed that fully one-third of the American prisoners of war succumbed to brainwashing without torture.

They were so weak in their patriotism, our schools had given them so little understanding of American principles, that they offered little or no resistance to the blandishments and seduction of Chinese Communist interrogators and propagandists.

Maj. Wm. E. Mayer, an Army psychiatrist, who made the study of brainwashing among 1,000 of our soldiers captured in Korea said he found even many soldiers had lost respect for patriotism. He said:

"I think a great many people feel that references to patriotism and love of country are somewhat embarrassing, unsophisticated, or foolish flag waving. I think this is to a very considerable degree the result both of well-meaning liberals, so-called, as well as others whose intentions are clearly destructive, to create the attitude that we should abandon love of country and patriotic ideals, as being identical with this evil thing called nationalism."

Where is the ruggedness which used to be so characteristic of Americans?

I attach rather clear meaning to terms such as "Americanism" and "the American way."

But to use terms such as these is to bring down a torrent of ridicule from the liberal press, writers, and commentators who dominate communications in the United States. These expressions are "corny" and "horse and buggy."

Behind this is a definite disparagement of patriotism.

Patriotism springs from nationalism, and nationalism has become a vice, not a virtue.

As the National Education Association has so often told our teachers and students, nationalism is an obstacle in the way of achievement of the one world state without which, they say, we cannot have peace.

We are eventually to be merged into an international society—distinctly socialistic in its nature—an international Eden. And nationalism, they say, stands in the way of bringing us to it.

III

The president of the Fund for the Republic, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, eloquently says:

"The Fund for the Republic is a sort of fund for the American dream. I do not think the fund can make the American dream came true, but perhaps it can help keep it alive and clear."

The American dream that is now occupying the attention of the foundation-financed intellectual cartel promotes the idea of government by an elite.

Robert Hutchins and the other members of this self-appointed professional intellectual aristocracy dream of an America governed by social scientists, guided by their benign infallibility under a system which frees the people from the responsibilities of freedom.

This is again illustrated by Mr. Pendleton Herring, of the Social Science Research Council, who wrote in 1947 concerning this matter:

"One of the greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills."

The degree to which this elite even penetrated the Federal Government is indicated by the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

I would like to give you a few significant extracts from that report:

"It will take social science and social engineering to solve the problems of human relations."

"Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field (of social science) as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine and the other sciences."

I would like to say that by no valid definition can sociology and economics identify themselves as true science.

Seven years before this report was issued, one of the members of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Horace M. Kallen, wrote a magazine article entitled "Can We Be Saved by Indoctrination?"

I would like to quote two short paragraphs from that article:

"I find within the babble of plans and plots against the evils of our time one only which does not merely repeat the past; this is the proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's saviors."

After some elaboration, Dr. Kallen concludes, "Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the 'central purpose' of realizing the American dream. They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine."

Change the word "American" to "Fabian" and you are pretty close to the truth.

Another phase of this American dream might be found in another document for professional pedagogues entitled, "Molders of the American Mind," by Professor Norman Woelfel.

Here is one of his admonitions: "The younger generation is on its own, and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church."

And he adds this final touch: "In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalistic profit economy."

All this has behind it the figure of Karl Marx, in one way or another. And this is just the kind of a thing being emphasized by the foundation in the field of social sciences.

There is a theory that the growth of Socialist influence in this country was accelerated by numbers of American professors who studied abroad at the end of the last century and came back to us full of new theories—intriguing, materialistic and social welfare philosophies, rooted in variations of Marxism, and depending upon a strong centralized government.

Whether this be the answer or no, there is no doubt that academicians had much to do with the suborning of public opinion through Marxism. In the long run, much public opinion is made in the universities; ideas generated there filter down through the teaching profession and the students into the general public.

As the egalitarianism of Marxism is attractive to many, socialism could have attracted many followers in America, anyway.

But there is no doubt that it could not possibly have affected us so widely and so deeply as it has, had it not been heavily financed.

This financing was supplied by several of the great fortunes built up by American industrialists under our capitalistic system.

This most certainly was not intended by such men as Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, nor more recently by Henry Ford.

They would truly writhe in their graves if they could know that the foundations which they created have become the principal treasury of the radical movement in their country.

IV

It is difficult for the public to comprehend that this could be possible. The boards of these foundations have always contained many men who could not possibly have lent themselves consciously to an undermining of the free enterprise system. Indeed they did not. They just knew not what they did.

It happened, it began to happen, when these trustees, against sage advice, no longer confined themselves to the direct support of educational institutions, or religion, medicine, public health and science. It is difficult to put to propaganda or political use a grant to a college endowment or for medical research.

But when these foundations launched themselves into what are called the social sciences they made themselves vulnerable to a form of seduction and subversion against which they could not defend themselves.

When they entered the areas of man's relation to man—as the social sciences are so attractively described, they opened the door to political propaganda.

It is not hard to understand why these trustees went along usually without protest.

A great captain of industry is very likely to have just as high an IQ as a professor.

But when the industrialist sits on the board of a foundation which deals with areas which are both highly technical and extremely vague, he is not equipped to make informed decisions.

It is almost inevitable that he bow to the superior understanding of the academic adviser, just as he would to his doctor or lawyer.

Insofar as projects in the politically sensitive social sciences area are concerned, therefore, the decisions of the great foundations have been chiefly the decisions of academic advisers.

And the sad fact is that these advisers have come overwhelmingly from those who have been politically slanted to the left—and many of them far to the left.

One reason for this has been small grants are naturally unattractive to large foundations with large sums of money to dispense. A mass research project is something substantial—something to use up the money.

Yet mass research is rarely attractive to the conservative professor who needs support for individual research but does not want to run a large staff of computing machine operators and poll takers.

V

The liberal leftist educators, however, have become increasingly interested in the purely, or almost purely, empirical methods of research.

They have thought that they could translate some of the research methods of pure science into use in the social sciences.

It has been one of the outstanding fallacies of this large and terrifically influential group that human relationship problems could be solved mechanically and mathematically by what they call factfinding.

They have so often ignored or failed to take into account important and highly mutable factors such as love, patriotism, loyalties, motivations, and individual characteristics which are utterly incapable of measurement and quite beyond the application of a scientific approach.

Jealous, perhaps, of the true scientist in medicine, physics, etc., these men who have pompously and arbitrarily called themselves scientists, have concluded, and pronounced, that they are the only sound technicians. They have made themselves into a self-appointed elite. They call themselves social engineers.

Operating on a grand scale, they ponder mass symptoms and ignore individual diagnosis.

Armed with their punch cards and electronic brains they consider themselves far more competent to lead us into better pastures than the old-fashioned practitioners who permit themselves to be circumscribed by the known limitations of social science.

"This country was not built by an elite and it is inconceivable that it should ever be run by one," as President Jones, of Rutgers, says.

They have become messianic. And they have succeeded materially in their efforts, over the years, to influence our people.

Their approach has been what Professor Colegrove has called pathological.

They are always looking at what may be wrong with us, not for the purpose of improving what we have that is good and making it better, but for the purpose of supplanting it with something else.

These are the extreme followers of the cultural lag theory which assumes that our technological progress requires a new set of ethical values governing man's relation to man, and they are the advisers best equipped to furnish them.

So, in a period when informed men deplore our tragic lack of engineers and technicians, and the extent to which we are falling behind Russia in technological development, they have persuaded the great foundations to spend more on mass research in the social sciences.

The present shortage of engineers, physicists, and chemists is largely attributable to inadequate teaching of mathematics and the physical sciences in the secondary schools.

Young children have been encouraged to take social study courses rather than to accept the discipline of an exact physical science based on rigorous mathematical principles.

Teachers, too, have been encouraged to escape these disciplines, as they can readily major in a so-called social science, supported by a foundation grant, while they are preparing themselves to teach.

It is no wonder that it is becoming more and more difficult for industry or for Government to recruit from our schools the kind of people who can maintain our position in this age of science and technology.

The biggest foundation of all, the Ford Foundation, excluded itself wholly from such areas as science and medical research. The Rockefeller Foundation, last year, gave hundreds of thousands of dollars to a program of empirical research training in the social sciences. And so it goes.

VI

The same academicians to whom I refer, those who now so deeply influence the great foundations, have little respect for tradition and principle.

They are, almost all of them, followers of the theory of moral relativity, that there are no absolutes, whether religious, moral or civil.

What the facts disclose, is right.

They say: If the Rockefeller-financed Kinsey studies disclose that a large percentage of young girls have active sex-experience before marriage, we should change our laws and morals to permit this; if so many people have a touch of sex abnormality in their souls as indicated by Dr. Kinsey, laws against sex deviation should no longer be tolerated; in the economic field, if research indicates, that the Federal Government can do something more efficiently than can the States, the Federal Government should take it over, regardless of what our Constitution may say about the separation of legislative powers.

This discussion, this description, may give you the beginning of an idea of the type of mind of the intellectual whose opinions have directed the great foundations in the social sciences.

But they have not worked alone. There has come into being a new class of men, almost a guild—the professional administrators of foundations.

Selected largely under the advice of "liberal" intellectuals, they have come into practical operating control of these foundations.

These men, in turn, are overwhelmingly of a leftist political position. You would have to look hard to find a conservative among them.

All of them whom I have met, are pleasant, personable and attractive men who give the impression of complete sincerity (which is usually correct) and of complete objectivity (which is not).

There has been a further aid to the process by which socialism has been fed by the foundations. Just as these administrators

have helped the leftwing intellectuals, intermediary organizations have been created to help the administrators—to serve as their advisers and retail distributors of their social science funds.

Typical of these organizations are the Social Research Council and the American Council of Education.

Nor must we forget the nefarious Institute of Pacific Relations, which the Carnegie Corp., the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation used to retail their funds to an aggregate of millions of dollars.

The IPR was Communist dominated and was more responsible than any other factor for the debacle which turned China over to the Communists.

The damage done by the foundations through the IPR cannot be estimated. It may have changed the whole course of history.

Intermediary organizations such as these have also come into the control of those consciously and actively to the left politically.

VII

And although the trustees of the great foundations think they run their foundations, except in the broadest sense, they do not.

Operating in areas substantially beyond their understanding (except in the most peripheral way) they rely on their leftist academic advisers, their leftist professional employees and their leftist-controlled intermediary organizations, to make the decisions which are the most vital part of their trust function.

There is an occasional revolt such as that which, I suppose, occurred when the Ford Foundation made its magnificent grants last year to operating institutions, for which the people should be deeply grateful.

But even the Ford Foundation has not given up its major interest in leftist research in the social sciences nor its basic operating principle of permitting its experts, rather than its trustees, to determine the methods of operation.

I believe it might be safe to say that, in fields such as economics, sociology, and other social-science areas in which political slant can have a deep effect, the major foundations, both directly and through the use of intermediary organizations, have supported leftist thinking and leftist-slanted research and publication in the United States in the proportion of 10 to 1, compared with the support of the conservative or traditional. The proportion may even be very substantially greater.

Occasionable mistakes would be forgivable. But it is difficult to forgive mistakes in such volume. Moreover, mistakes can often be corrected.

And it is one of the most striking features of major foundation history in the United States that no substantial effort has ever been made to correct mistakes.

Let me give a few illustrations of what I mean, out of so many which could be recited.

VIII

There are some foundations which, like the League for Industrial Democracy, have been frank in their advocacy of socialism.

That foundation, originally the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, did not abandon its ardent propaganda for socialism after it changed its name.

This organization is avowedly socialistic and has openly operated as an educational arm of the Socialist Party.

Before the rapprochement between Hitler and Stalin in 1939, when the Socialist and Communist Parties in the United States worked to establish a popular front, many known Communists were assisted in placing their messages before the American people through the tax exemptions granted to the League for Industrial Democracy.

The League for Industrial Democracy is only one of many of the smaller tax-exempt foundations which have come into the control of those cautiously and actively engaged in subversion.

Although we think of foundations in terms of the great foundations such as Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller foundations, there are literally hundreds of smaller tax-exempt organizations which devote almost their entire income to the political area, like the League for Industrial Democracy.

IX

But some of the major foundations have been more subtle than LID and the IPR in their support of leftism.

Perhaps the most vicious and fateful product of foundation financing in our history was the Conclusions of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, published in 1934.

It became a bible of radical educators in our country, and its effects have been cumulatively with us. It has done us inestimable damage. It was financed to the tune of $340,000 by the Carnegie Corp.

Prof. Harold J. Laski, the philosopher of British socialism, said of this report:

"At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America."

And Harold Laski knew socialism when he saw it.

The report was, in fact, an utterly frank call to the teachers of America to use the schools for the purpose of indoctrinating our youth into an acceptance of socialism, which it called by the equivalent but softer name of "collectivism."

This monumental report was produced, not by a cross section of American academic opinion, but by a group overwhelmingly radical in its views, a group itself devoted to socialization. Read it some day, and you will be shocked.

It should shock you more to understand that, after publication of this report, the president of the Carnegie Foundation, which had financed it, made a public statement in which he said that, although he, personally, did not agree with all of the report, he felt the American people should give a vote of thanks to its authors.

You might have thought that, having spent $340,000 to finance an advocacy of socialism in the schools, this great foundation might have supported a counterbalancing project—a study on the defense of capitalism by professors of contrary opinion so that the American people and the American educators could have the benefit of both sides of the argument, at least. Nothing like this was done.

The report was published and widely disseminated and today it stands as an educational charter in the United States.

Almost equally shocking and dangerous is the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences which is regarded as the "bible" or the social sciences. It was sponsored with foundation money.

It is not only heavily slanted to the left but it slanders the free-enterprise system.

It would appear to be clearly designed to promote socialism among teachers and students.

The keyman in its preparation, Alvin Johnson, admitted he had two assistant editors who "asserted they were Socialists" and he said he was "informed" another was a Communist.

X

Do not think that these incidents stand alone.

American foundations contributed some $4 million to the London School of Economics and Political Science, for so many years the operating base of the late Harold J. Laski, and the fountainhead of Fabian socialism.

Devotion to the principle of academic freedom has been a tradition of the American Republic since its establishment. But I think that history has demonstrated that the London School of Economics and Political Science was at once something more and less than an institution of higher learning.

In the years immediately before World War II, it was communism's most respectable and effective forward base in the Western World.

The Carnegie Corp. selected Gunnar Myrdal, a Scandinavian Socialist, to do a major study on the race problem in our South.

Carnegie's Myrdal reported in his An American Dilemma that our Constitution "is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions" and that its adoption was "merely a plot against the common people."

He also stated that Americans have "a relatively low degree of respect for law and order."

And he bemoans the "anarchistic tendency in America's legal culture."

Even before his Carnegie grant, Myrdal was a Rockefeller fellow at the School of International Studies in Geneva.

This is another example of the incredible fact that the fortunes piled up by industrial giants are being used today to discredit our system of enterprise of free labor and free management that gave them birth.

Our form of government, of course, does not appeal to this European Socialist, imported by the Carnegie Foundation to teach us better ways of living.

Another Carnegie unit financed a book called Business as a System of Power, written by Prof. Robert A. Brady, who likened our Messrs. Knudsen, Stettinius, and Bernard Baruch to Hermann Goering, described our business system as a form of feudalism, and opined that "war is necessary for capitalist survival."

Professor Lynd, in his introduction to this important foundation-supported book, stated that "capitalist economic power constitutes a direct, continuous, and fundamental threat to the whole structure of democratic authority everywhere and always."

Another Carnegie-financed item is the Proper Study of Mankind, a book which was designed under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council, the major intermediary organization supported by the great foundations. This influential book, which sold 50,000 copies, was written by Stuart Chase, who has advocated collectivism by name.

XI

Mr. Chase was the selected apologist for many of the theses which those who operate the foundation combine favor, theses which push research and academic opinion to the left.

Among them is the cultural-lag theory, to which I have referred, that we must change our ways of living and even our social concepts because of our advancing civilization.

It may sound reasonable, that theory, but it is actually a medium for questioning our moral standards and our fundamental governmental and social precepts—an ideal way for those who are collectivist minded to undermine our beliefs and faiths.

The Rockefeller Foundation has been frank in its support of this dangerous cultural lag theory.

The Ford Foundation gave a million to the Friends Service Committee, which, in turn, sponsored the World Youth Congress, a Communist front, and sent a delegate to the World Youth Festival in Prague in 1947, an admittedly Communist affair. It also advocated Red China's admission to the United Nations.

Alfred Sloan Foundation financed public-affairs pamphlets, some of which were the next thing to Communist leaflets. They were sold in Communist bookstores but were also distributed to libraries and frequently used in high schools.

The evidence is plain that the leftist movement in this country has penetrated the

foundation world as consciously and intentionally as did the Communists.

It was incontrovertibly established that the American Communists were directed by Moscow to infiltrate American foundations and to use their funds to promote communism in the United States.

We know that they succeeded to some extent, but we may never know the full extent, as their methods are devious. Two well-known foundations had their tax-exempt status lifted by the Treasury because of Communist subversion. And I understand the Fund for the Republic is now under investigation.

But in the case of the infiltration of collectivists or Socialists into the foundations, we know a great deal about it. They have virtually taken over the operating phases of the major foundations, and through them or in conjunction with them have taken over a vast part of the direction of thought and teaching in our educational system.

We have called this use of the foundations for the promotion of socialism by the name "subversion."

For this our enemies have bitterly criticized us.

The Socialist in the United States prefers to have the term "subversion" confined to Communist penetration.

But the term "subversion" denotes an undermining, a chipping away. In this sense the promotion of socialism is clearly subversive of our institutions.

Moreover, it is my opinion, and I am far from alone, that subversion through socialism offers us a far greater internal danger than the threat of communism.

There is no doubt that socialism and communism go hand in hand. The Socialist may hate the Communist, but the Communist loves the Socialist.

The Communist knows that if the Socialist is able to get the upper hand and to destroy a capitalistic system, the Communist can quickly take over.

There is much misconception about the relationship of socialism and communism.

They are the same and identical thing except for one single difference—the Communist believes in establishing the Socialist order by force, while the Socialist is generally content to achieve it through subversive methods—by perverting a democracy.

I wish I had time to give you case after case of socialist propaganda financed by the Carnegie Corp., the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and others, each without repudiation afterward, each without any effort being made to counteract the impact of what had appeared.

XII

As I intimated previously, one can perhaps exonerate the trustees who did not understand what was being done with the money they allocated to such projects—exonerate them for having been uninformed; yes.

But one cannot exonerate them for having abdicated their trust functions by relying upon professional employees and advisers and intermediary organizations to do their thinking for them.

Nor can one forgive them for either not having studied the products of their negligence or else having failed to repudiate or counter the evil which reading must have disclosed.

We must congratulate Mr. Henry Ford II for having finally had the courage to repudiate (in somewhat gentler language than one might have hoped for) the irresponsible and dangerous antics of the Fund for the Republic.

But does this belated and qualified disavowal excuse Mr. Ford and his fellow trustees of the Ford Foundation for having created this Fund for the Republic and placed $15 million in the administrative hands of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Dr. Hutchins knowing from their own experience with them, that they could use it for purposes conforming to their own radical political predilections?

I do not say that foundations should avoid the social sciences. They need support, just as do the true sciences, medicine, public health, the humanities, etc.

But I do say that the social sciences form a dangerous area for foundation activity unless they are approached with the greatest objectivity and realism.

There are perhaps dangers even in direct grants to institutions, such as universities, when these themselves are to select the areas of research and its administrators.

But there are natural protections within most such institutions.

The dangers are limited by its traditions, its academic organizations, its inter-conflicting opinion, and other factors which keep such an institution reasonably on the track of objectivity.

It might be better if foundations which wish to support social science research did so solely through undirected and unselected grants to universities and colleges.

But if they, with the help of their intermediary organizations, decide to design and control such research themselves, they must do so in conformance with their duty to the public to whose service they are, and by law must be, dedicated.

This dedication requires objectivity, which in itself is not easy. There are many excuses for avoiding this responsibility.

XIII

For example, professional foundation managers frequently talk about the desirability of using foundation funds as risk capital, in ventures where the chances of success are too remote to attract normal financing.

This is an intriguing concept, and has great validity when you are talking about medical research, and other basically non-controversial areas.

If, however, risks are to be taken with the form of our society, or with the form of our Government, or with public opinion in fields which affect our morals, ethics, and political theory, then I, for one, do not believe this to be a proper use of public trust funds.

When funds as huge and powerful as those of the Ford Foundation can be focused upon the proliferation of unscientific science, the risks to society are so great that I do not believe we can tolerate such risk-taking.

My time is too short to give you more. I must close with a plea to you and other like you to become alert to what has happened in the foundation world—and what is currently happening.

I close, as well, with a plea to the trustees of the great foundations themselves to give closer attention to their own organizations.

As matters now stand, the tremendous amount of good performed by these foundations is being jeopardized by their delinquencies.

It is possible pressure for legislative control of foundations may increase. I would deplore it if such legislation became necessary.

There is an easier cure, one which would permit these huge organizations to continue independently. They have done so much for the benefit of humanity and should be allowed to continue.

In your field of medicine, for instance, so many great accomplishments have been foundation financed.

But the great aggregate of good they have done cannot excuse the evil for which they have been responsible; and the day may come when society is unwilling to permit them full freedom unless they reform from within.

That is what I hope for, that their trustees will come to understand that they must restore these foundations to the full respect which careful management would entitle them, and to the very useful place in our society which foundations should occupy.

Such reform from within would entail jettisoning, once and for all, the political influences to which they have been subjected. It would demand a general housecleaning, both as to their academic advisers, their professional staffs, and the intermediary organizations which they support financially and use as retailers.

A foundation, by its very public character, must be wholly objective and wholly free from any political influence.

This is particularly true, obviously enough, when the political forces which seek to influence it are those which are seeking to propel us toward a state which they see as ideal but which must inevitably pitch us into slavery of socialism.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallibility in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmity, strengthen us in all noble impulses, and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and knowledge, and true godliness.

Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other nation, may our high estate be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this republic of freemen, all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 9, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On April 6, 1956:

S. 1240. An act for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress;

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of

Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

On April 10, 1956:

S. 101. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 117. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens;

S. 315. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 396. An act to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens;

S. 663. An act for the relief of William T. Collins (Vasilios T. Buzunis);

S. 963. An act for the relief of certain aliens; and

S. 1242. An act for the relief of certain aliens.

On April 11, 1956:

S. 213. An act to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens;

S. 500. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 1289. An act to establish a Domestic Relations Branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

The Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Armed Services Committee was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHAIRMAN OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SENATE RECEPTION ROOM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the appointment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] as a member and as chairman of the Special Committee on the Senate Reception Room, vice the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL SITUATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

A communication from the President of the United States, relating to the personnel situation in the Armed Forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, *April 9, 1956.*

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The attached letter, addressed to me by the Secretary of Defense, reviews the serious nature of the personnel situation in the Armed Forces. It also outlines the major legislative proposals which the administration has presented to the Congress as a means of improving military career incentives.

I urge that this legislation be enacted. Only when we have created a career military service which can compete with the attractive opportunities available in civilian pursuits will we be able to stop the wasteful losses from our Armed Forces and attract individuals to those services. We cannot move too soon in our efforts to increase the number and quality of volunteers for long-term career military service in both enlisted and officer ranks.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AND DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND POST OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 112)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $20 million for the Small Business Administration, $500,000 for the Department of Agriculture, and $16 million for the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION AGAINST DISSEMINATION OF DISEASES OF LIVESTOCK OR POULTRY

A letter from the Acting Secertary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide further protection against the dissemination of diseases of livestock or poultry, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of January 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated March 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Civil Aeronautics Board, dated October 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution urging removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock

"Whereas the right to own and till our soil is one of the basic conceptions of our American way of life; and

"Whereas this is construed to mean the right to raise any crop we wish in order to feed ourselves, our cattle and poultry; and

"Whereas, since 1938, a provision of the Federal crop control law has restricted and denied this right to farmers; and

"Whereas there is every justification that a farmer should be free to grow on his farm whatever crops he deems proper and necessary to feed his own livestock and poultry; and

"Whereas the margin of profit, if any, under present prices for milk depends, to a large extent on the amount of feed grown on the farms: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the legislature of this State on behalf of all its people go on record as favoring the modification or removal of these restrictions; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the legislature of this State does hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to alleviate situation above set forth and to modify or remove the crop control laws which created it; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress duly elected from the State of New York."

Five concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 128

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to the States the right to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, peace, and good order

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. No branch or department of the Federal Government shall limit, abridge or interfere in any manner with the right and power of the States to regulate health, morals, education, marriage, peace, and good order in the States, and exclusive jurisdiction thereof is reserved to the States.

" 'The Congress and the several States shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 130

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the Congress of the United States of American be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty or other international agreement which conflicts with this Constitution, or which is not made in pursuance thereof, shall not be the supreme law of the land nor be of any force or effect.

" 'SEC. 2. A treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement.

" 'SEC. 3. On the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty, the vote shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against shall be entered on the journal of the senate.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall be ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 131

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the election of President and Vice President

"*Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. Each State shall choose a number of electors of the President and Vice President, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress, in the same manner in which its Senators and Representatives are nominated and elected. But no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be chosen elector.

" 'SEC. 2. The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President, one of whom, at least shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate; the President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President shall be the President and the person having the greatest number of votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such numbers be majorities of the whole number of electors chosen.

" 'SEC. 3. If no persons voted for as President of Vice President have a majority of the whole number of electors chosen, then from the person having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the lists of those voted for as President and Vice President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as one body, shall choose immediately from the respective lists the President, and then the Vice President, or either, as the case may be; a quorum for these purposes shall consist of three-fourths of the whole number of the Senators and Representatives, and the persons receiving the greatest number of votes for President and for Vice President on the respective roll calls shall be the President and the Vice President. But no person ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to the office of Vice President'; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 132

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the procedure for amending the Constitution

"*Be it resolved by the Mississsippi State Senate* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall call a convention for proposing amendments; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Provided, that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" 'SEC. 2. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 7 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

" 'SEC. 3. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justifiable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States.

" 'SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an

amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 133

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget

"Be it resolved by the Mississippi State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of receipts. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, it shall not recess or adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until action has been taken necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year: *Provided, however,* That in case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

" 'SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the 1st day of the fiscal year next following the ratification of this article.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, a part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate March 21, 1956.

"CARROLL GARTIN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives March 30, 1956.

"WALTER SILLERS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A current resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relating to the evaluation of the Federal fiscal policy and taxing power as it affects the three levels of government, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on April 9, 1956, p. 5894, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

UTILITY RELOCATION — RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., endorsing section 11 of the Fallon bill, relating to utility relocation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution relating to the utility relocation-cost section of the Fallon bill (H. R. 8836, section 11)

Whereas the Fallon bill (H. R. 8836, section 11) provides for the inclusion of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal highway systems, whenever a State makes provision for paying such costs; and

Whereas the city of Minneapolis has had mutually satisfactory arrangements with the State of Minnesota on the inclusion of such utility costs on projects heretofore carried out in the city: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That the city council endorse the said section 11 of the Fallon bill providing for financing the cost of relocating utility facilities; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the members of the Minnesota delegation in the House and Senate of the United States Congress and to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works.

Passed March 29, 1956.

EUGENE E. STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved April 2, 1956.

ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:

LEONARD A. JOHNSON,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Board of the United States Section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom held a meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3 to 5, 1956, and the following resolution was adopted. I want to bring this to the attention of my colleagues and therefore ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RE THE SENATE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT

The national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., February 3–5, 1956, commends the establishment of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament, chaired by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and welcomes the expressed intention of the committee to study all phases of the problem.

In the findings we hope that the committee will make recommendations based on testimony of nongovernmental organizations with a concern in the field, as well as that of experts. We hope that the committee will be able to extend the opportunity for this expression of citizen opinion by holding hearings throughout the United States.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CO-OP SERVICES, INC., OF NEW YORK MILLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolutions adopted by the members of the Co-op Services, Inc. of New York Mills, Minn., relating to parity prices, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas farmers everywhere are going broke due to falling farm prices and rising costs of production; and

Whereas profiteers and speculators in our economy are inflating prices of food and other goods until consumers cannot afford these items; and

Whereas taxes are sky high due mostly to defense spending from which the common people get little benefit, but which is creating millionaries by the thousands; and

Whereas our shaky economy is being propped up with borrowed money in the form of mortgages, installment buying and loans from high interest-charging loan sharks: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we wake up to the fact that drastic measures are needed to prevent a complete depression; measures such as the Brannon plan with 100 percent of parity for farmers, Federal aid to schools and roads, and also other programs to increase the consuming power of the people. This means greater efforts toward world peace and disarmament and repeal of universal military training with corresponding cuts in spending of tax money for war purposes; this means getting back to real freedom of speech so people can discuss remedies such as the Brannon plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Co-op Services, Inc. assert leadership in the fight for peace and parity; and a real fight for peaceful use of atomic energy, especially for REA powerplants, immediate action on new farm legislation enabling the family-size farm family to survive. Any farmers with over $15,000 yearly gross income should not be protected with 100 percent parity but left to sell on the open market: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Co-op Services, Inc. of New York Mills, Minn., representing 1,880 members and patrons, feeling that the situation among farmers is getting desperate, urge our representatives in Congress to take immediate action to alleviate matters by measures as outlined herein.

VERNER A. ANDERSON,
Secretary, Co-op Services, Inc.

EXPANDED FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution proposed by streets and traffic committee of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, Minneapolis, Minn., supporting an expanded Federal highway program.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON EXPANDED FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Whereas Minnesota and the Nation's highway systems fall steadily behind accelerating traffic needs, and bold construction programs involving all levels of government are an urgent necessity; and

Whereas pending congressional legislation for an expanded Federal-aid highway program properly recognizes national interest in an adequate system of interstate highways for reasons of defense and economic progress; and

Whereas until the interstate highway routes and their rate of development are decided, it is frequently impossible for municipalities in many cases to determine access roads, connecting streets, and highway rights-of-way in and near cities, and delays will cost money, particularly in added right-of-way costs; and

Whereas adoption of the pending expanded Federal highway program along with ratification next fall of Minnesota's proposed amendment No. 2 will provide admirably for the three-way governmental partnership essential to a solution of Minnesota's highway problems, both rural and urban; and

Whereas the need for immediate action may make impossible an official legislative expression by the League of Minnesota Municipalities at its June legislative conference: Be it

Resolved, That the streets and traffic committee of the League of Minnesota Municipalities endorse adoption of the pending expanded Federal highway program in a form which would—

1. Achieve the earliest possible completion of the 40,000-mile interstate highway system along with the highest possible level of construction on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems, having due regard for inflationary pressures resulting from too rapid a construction program;

2. Provide for the assumption of 90 percent of the cost of the interstate system, including urban extensions, with a continuation of present matching formulas for other parts of the Federal-aid program;

3. Properly recognize the needs of rural and urban highways;

4. Provide for getting the expanded highway program adopted and in high gear at the earliest possible time, recognizing that to achieve prompt passage of the expanded program a review of many controversial details of the program can be provided periodically in the course of its execution over the next 15 years; further

Resolved, That if such action will still be timely, the League of Minnesota Municipalities at its legislative conference in Detroit Lakes on June 15, 1956, be asked to adopt this resolution as the official statement of the league and that in the meantime, copies of this resolution as the expression of the league streets and traffic committee be sent to Members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

RESOLUTIONS AND REPORT OF NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the annual meeting of the North Carolina Academy of Science on March 23, 1956, several resolutions were adopted, two of which I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues. I should also like to bring to their attention the report of the conservation and legislative committee of the North Carolina Academy of Science. I ask unanimous consent to have these printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE

Whereas the land now constituting the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge was set aside in 1905 by President Theodore Roosevelt to preserve for future generations this tract as a national forest, and because of the importance of this tract as a wildlife refuge and recreational area it was transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1935; and

Whereas the reduction in the size of the refuge as requested by the Army and proposed by legislation now in Congress will seriously impair, if not destroy, the value of this wildlife refuge which protects one of the largest herds of bison and Texas longhorns on the North American continent; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has firmly opposed suggestions that a portion of the Wichita Refuge be transferred to the Army; and

Whereas, testimony before the Congress by the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY calls attention to the fact that all prominent conservation groups of the State of Oklahoma and every major national conservation group are on record as opposing this transfer which is not essential to the national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Academy of Science, meeting in Chapel Hill on March 23, 1956, vigorously opposes H. R. 9665 by Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, and S. 3360, by Senators A. S. MIKE MONRONEY and ROBERT S. KERR, which would transfer to the Army certain lands from the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the academy's views be sent to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of Congress from North Carolina.

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System is essential to the protection of many endangered species of native birds and mammals and also serves to insure protection for migratory species in critical parts of their range; and

Whereas these refuges were established for the purpose of protecting the remnants of this Nation's once vast wildlife heritage which belongs to all the people; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to dispose of this Nation's wildlife refuges by signing an administrative order without public hearing, without advance notice, or without discussion with the sportsmen and other conservationists whose funds and support were responsible for the establishment of the refuge system for the benefit of the present and future generations; and

Whereas legislation (S. 2101, H. R. 5306, and H. R. 6723) is now being considered which, if passed, will require the Secretary of the Interior to obtain prior approval of the Congress before the Secretary can dispose of or relinquish any of the national wildlife refuges, or parts thereof: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the North Carolina Academy of Science, meeting in Chapel Hill on March 23, 1956, supports in principle S. 2101, introduced by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, H. R. 5306, introduced by Congressman LEE METCALF, and H. R. 6723, introduced by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, and urges the immediate passage of legislation to require the Secretary of the Interior to obtain approval of the Congress before he can dispose of, relinquish, or permit incompatible uses of a national wildlife refuge or parts thereof: And be it further

Resolved, That copies of the academy's views be sent to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a copy of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of Congress from North Carolina.

REPORT OF THE CONSERVATION AND LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, NORTH CAROLINA ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, MARCH 23, 1956

The past several months have been marked by a considerable increase in activity on the part of numerous individuals and groups who wish to exploit or to develop our natural resources. In the opinion of your committee, some of these activities have not been in the public interest.

On November 29, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay announced that the Department was abandoning plans for the controversial Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. This withdrawal by the Secretary represents a major victory by the conservationists in their fight to protect the integrity of the national park system.

The almost successful raid on the public lands by certain grazing interests were finally defeated in conference committee where North Carolina's Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, supported by other conservation-minded Congressmen and Senators, struck out the amendment which had been tied to the totally unrelated farm subsidy bill in the Senate. The amendment was vigorously opposed in the Senate by Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN and several other Senators.

The Al Sarena case, in which Al Sarena Mines, Inc., of Trails, Oreg., became owner of 300 acres of fine Oregon timber worth more than $600,000, by getting the Department of the Interior to approve some questionable mining claims, is being investigated by North Carolina's Senator KERR SCOTT.

What amounts to a lifting of restrictions on the exploration for oil on wildlife refuges by the Secretary of the Interior has created considerable apprehension among wildlife biologists throughout the Nation. It is felt that the manner in which the Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge was opened to Frankfort Oil Co., a subsidiary of Seagrams' Distillers, should be the subject of a thorough congressional investigation.

The attempt by the Army to appropriate a portion of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge as a target area for atomic cannon is of grave concern to conservationists, particularly in view of the fact that public testimony shows that the area is not essential for national defense. If this tract of 10,700 acres is turned over to the Army, it would be possible under current law and practice for it to become a hunting preserve for a select group of Fort Sill and other Army personnel and their guests in addition to its use as an impact area for artillery practice. Fire resulting from shell bursts would be almost impossible to control during certain seasons and would spread to the remainder of the Wichita Refuge. The efforts of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in opposing this transfer is most gratifying to conservationists.

Another resolution for the academy's action deals with the danger to the national wildlife refuge system by the power now vested in the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of any or all of these refuges by signing an administrative order without reference to the Congress or to the public.

The continuation and strengthening of the Water Pollution Control Act (Public Law 845, 80th Cong.), which expires on June 30, 1956, is recommended by your committee. A resolution is submitted for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY LEGRAND,
WANDA S. HUNTER,
T. E. MAKI,
F. S. BARKALOW, Jr.,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1725).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5566. An act to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1727).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, from that committee, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3481) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1726) thereon.

Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed my individual views on the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the legal effect of certain treaties and other international agreements, Calendar No. 1649, as part 2 of Senate Report No. 1716.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Subsequently, Mr. HENNINGS submitted his individual views, which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1716.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice Ross Rizley, resigned; and

Herman H. Druebert, and James C. Sainsbury, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably from that committee the following nominations, which will be placed on the Executive Calendar:

James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be a deputy representative in the Security Council of the United Nations; and

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Sudan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Also from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably the following conventions, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 5) thereon:

Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session: A Convention Concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954; and

Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session: A Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Without objection, the report will be received and the conventions will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 3582. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR:

S. 3583. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Gombard-Liatzky;

S. 3584. A bill for the relief of Helga Binder; and

S. 3585. A bill for the relief of Paz Tupas Meeker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3586. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3587. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KERR when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. FREAR):

S. 3588. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BYRD) (by request):

S. 3589. A bill to carry out the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3590. A bill for the relief of Oather S. Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3591. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3592. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; and

S. 3593. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3594. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3595. A bill for the relief of Irma B. Poellmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (by request):

S. 3596. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Kenrick W. Hackett; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. ALLOTT):

S. 3597. A bill for the relief of Duk Chang Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3598. A bill to provide for the reconveyance of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3599. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to compensate certain civilian employees of the Corps of Engineers who suffered loss of annual leave as the result of being engaged in emergency flood relief work; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3600. A bill for the relief of certain dependents of the late Darwin Philo Taylor; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3601. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Lemhi County, Idaho, to the State of Idaho for the use and benefit of the department of fish and game; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3602. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARTHY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DUFF, Mr. LANGER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. THYE, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 3604. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; and

S. 3605. A bill to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3606. A bill to amend section 4 (a) (11) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 so as to permit the issuance of visas to certain refugees residing in the Far East; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3607. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 3608. A bill establishing the Joint Congressional Commission on Fundamental Farm Policy; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. JENNER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3609. A bill to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3610. A bill to prohibit the importation of manufactured articles from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and other Communist-dominated countries; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3611. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Conicacelaya Cenarruzabeitia; and

S. 3612. A bill for the relief of Gust Madias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3613. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3614. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3615. A bill to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, special disability determinations for railroad employees, and for other purposes; and to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the Special Committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to establish the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation to provide for the construction of a permanent national memorial to the North American Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION

The following resolution was submitted and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators):

S. Res. 236. Resolution directing the Tariff Commission to investigate whether imports of textiles or textile products are affecting injuriously the domestic industry; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he submitted the above resolution, which appeared under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 4, 1955, I introduced, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] the bill (S. 1309) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies.

For some time we have been greatly interested in promoting greater occupational safety within the various agencies of the Federal Government and have been backed up fully in this interest by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, over the past few months, a review has been made of the provisions of S. 1309, and as a result it has been found that certain changes in that bill would be desirable in order to provide for easier and more economical administration of this program.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I am today introducing a new, substitute bill, which will accomplish the same results as S. 1309, but at considerably less expense, and I ask that the bill be appropriately referred.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3582) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 17, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 785), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35. (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the employees' compensation fund which shall consist of such sums as the Congress may from time to time appropriate therefor or transfer thereto, and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this section. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it by appropriation or otherwise, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the compensation, medical benefits, sums advanced as costs for enforcement of liability in third party cases as approved or required or as undertaken by the Secretary pursuant to section 26 of this act, and such other benefits and payments as are provided for by this act or any extension or application thereof, except as may be provided by this act or other acts. The Secretary shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget estimates of the appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the fund.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in this section, or as exempted by the Secretary as he may find necessary or proper in the public interest or to avoid serious impairment of the conduct of Government business, each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States, or other establishment, having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation under this act or any extension or application thereof (hereinafter called 'agency'), shall contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund in the manner herein provided. At the end of each quarter the Secretary shall determine for each agency the total cost of benefits and other payments made in that quarter from the employees' compensation fund on account of cases arising from injury, or death from injury, occurring after July 1, 1956, in such agency under this act or any extension or application thereof. The Secretary shall bill each agency for the amount of the payments made as determined under this section giving such information as may be required to enable the agency to make payments under subsection (d) hereof. If an agency or part thereof or its functions shall be transferred to another agency, the receiving agency shall be billed for undischarged liability to the Employees' Compensation Fund on the same basis as if such liability had been originally incurred by the receiving agency.

"(c) Within 45 days after receipt of the Secretary's bill, the head of each agency shall cause the charges billed to his agency pursuant to this section to be obligated against and paid from the appropriations and funds of the agency and its constituent units, such payments to be placed to the credit of the employees' compensation fund.

"(d) Payments to the employees' compensation fund under this section shall be made from the respective appropriations or funds which are used for payment of salaries, wages, or other compensation of the employees of the several agencies: *Provided*, That the head of each agency may make transfers between such appropriations up to the amounts needed for this purpose.

"(e) Charges billed by the Secretary to each agency for payments made from the fund shall be subject to such readjustment

and correction as may be found necessary: *Provided*, That such readjustment or correction must be made within 120 days after the receipt of the Secretary's bill specified in subsection (c).

"(f) The provisions of this section with respect to contributing to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund shall not apply in cases of persons to whom the benefits under this act or any extension or application thereof are payable from sources other than the employees' compensation fund. Losses or payments arising out of war risk hazard (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) shall not be included in such contributions."

SEC. 2. In addition to the contributions for the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund required by section 1 of this act, any mixed ownership corporation as defined in section 201 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 856), or any corporation or agency (or activity thereof) which is required by law to submit an annual budget pursuant to, or as provided by, the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841–849), shall pay an additional amount for its fair share of the cost of administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as determined by the Secretary of Iabor. With respect to said agencies, the charges billed by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 1 of this act shall include an additional amount for such costs, which shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts from the sources authorized, and in the manner otherwise provided in section 1 of this act.

SEC. 3. All provisions of law, other than those included in this act, which require contribution or payment by any agency to the employees' compensation fund are hereby superseded.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1956.

The explanation presented by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL AMENDING THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT TO PROVIDE FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF COMPENSATION COSTS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

As the largest single employer in the Nation, the Federal Government should utilize every means to reduce accidents among its employees. If the various departments and agencies are made more conscious of both the incidence and costs of accidents in employments within their responsibility, more effective safety measures would be adopted and the number of accidents accordingly reduced. The shifting of costs to the employing agencies is consistent with sound business practice. It will allow the Congress, on a cumulative basis, to evaluate the progress of the agencies toward safer practices.

In furtherance of this objective, the President's 1955 budget message recommended that the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases be shifted from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. A bill (S. 1309 and H. R. 5751) was introduced during the first session of this Congress to accomplish that result. Further study by the Department of Labor has shown that certain changes in the form and substance of the prior bill are desirable. These changes, while retaining the principle expressed in the budget message, would accomplish the result at less administrative expense than under the prior bills.

The most fundamental of these changes concerns the method by which Federal agencies will reimburse the employees' compensation fund established by this bill. Under the provisions of S. 1309 and H. R. 5751, the agencies would contribute to the maintenance of the fund by payment of a premium charge determined in accordance with commercial workmen's compensation insurance practice. This method, however, would be expensive from an administrative point of view. Therefore, the premium charging method has been replaced by a less complex system under which each agency will be charged only for actual payments made from the fund on its account for injuries occurring after July 1, 1956. This would considerably reduce administrative expenses. Under the premium charging method proposed by S. 1309 and H. R. 5751, it was estimated that $1,500,000 in additional administrative costs would result annually. Additional administrative costs under the revised bill are estimated at $50,000 annually. Under the revised bill, administrative costs would not be charged back to the employing agencies, with the exception of corporations or agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act.

The coverage of the revised bill is broader than that of S. 1309 and H. R. 5751. The new bill includes the employees of all agencies, regardless of size (the prior bill excluded those having less than 5,000 employees), and includes military reservists (who were excluded under the prior bill).

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma.

The Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board operates the recreational facilities at Greenleaf Lake and it is now designated as Greenleaf State Park.

A portion of the Gruber Military Reservation, which has been declared surplus, is needed to round out this park.

My bill proposes to give the State of Oklahoma this land for park purposes.

It appears that the State is operating the Greenleaf State Park under a 5-year lease. The leased land consists of 575 acres plus the 900 acres in the lake itself. They desire to secure an additional 1,960 acres adjacent to the property they now operate in order to have adequate land for control of the area and future expansion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3586) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the State of Oklahoma, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ADMISSION, DUTY FREE, OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION AT AMERICAS' NEW FRONTIERS EXPOSITION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The bill has for its purpose to permit articles imported from foreign countries for exhibition purposes in the Americas' New Frontier Exposition at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be free of duty and tax, as long as they are used for exposition purposes.

Americas' New Frontier Exposition is the name used for the exposition to celebrate the 50th anniversary of statehood for Oklahoma.

This procedure is not unusual. It is done regularly in order to attract exhibitions that have outstanding appeal to be used.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3587) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KERR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

COMPULSORY INSPECTION BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. PAYNE], and the Senators from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. FREAR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products. I may want to add 1 or 2 additional cosponsors of the bill before the end of the session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3588) to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION TO FACILITATE THE IMPORTATION OF COMMERCIAL SAMPLES AND ADVERTISING MATTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the Vice President by Herbert Hoover, Jr., Acting Secretary of State, relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3589) to carry out the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Matter, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BYRD) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There are transmitted herewith for your consideration and action copies of a draft of a proposed bill to implement the International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material. The Convention was dated at Geneva, November 7, 1952, and was signed on behalf of the United States on May 28, 1953.

The Convention has been approved by the Senate and will be submitted to the President for ratification at such time as implementing legislation has been enacted. The Convention establishes simpler standards and uniform regulations for customs treatment of imported commercial samples and advertising for the purpose of facilitating their importation with a view to promoting the expansion of international trade.

The following is a summary of the attached draft bill:

Section 1 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide duty-free treatment for advertising material as defined in the Convention.

Section 2 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide duty-free treatment for samples of negligible value. This section also limits the quantity of samples of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products that each consignee may receive.

Section 3 amends the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide temporary duty-free treatment for advertising films.

Section 4 provides for this legislation to become effective when the Convention enters into force for the United States.

In regard to temporary duty-free treatment for samples of more than negligible value provided for in the Convention, it is considered that present United States legislation is sufficient to implement that provision.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT HOOVER, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

EXEMPTION OF FINE ARTS PROGRAMS FROM TAX ON ADMISSIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide relief from the 10-percent nuisance excise tax on the legitimate theater and on fine arts performances, including concerts, operas, ballet, lectures and the like; and I send to the desk a statement I have prepared on the bill.

The bill is a counterpart to H. R. 7109, which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, and to H. R. 7851, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement on the subject be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3609) to exempt fine arts programs from the admissions tax, introduced by Mr. Wiley, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

On March 29, I was pleased to introduce a bill on behalf of myself and my able colleague from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the purpose of providing a National Charter to the National Music Council.

I emphasized at that time the crucial role played by the living theater and by fine arts in American life and, indeed, in the life of all peoples.

As one phase of this field, I had earlier reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an open letter sent to me urging relief from the nuisance excise tax on the stage and fine arts performances. The text of this letter from a group of distinguished leaders (representing the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre and the National Association of Concert Managers) may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23 on page 5441.

TREASURY LOSS OF REVENUE WOULD BE MINOR

The purpose of my action today is to follow through on both the specific and the generalized approach which I have already outlined.

I do not ask for specific tax relief without an appreciation of the Federal Government's revenue problem. Every American realizes that the budget situation of the United States is such that we cannot, willy nilly, slash taxes right and left, particularly if they produce important revenue.

But the fact of the matter is, in this instance, that the net loss to the Treasury of the bill which I am proposing today is approximately $7 million per year. This, while a substantial sum, is modest indeed in relation to our $65 billion budget.

Moreover, even if the present tax produced larger revenue, it is intrinsically objectionable as a crippling burden on the legitimate theater and on fine arts. (After all, they are already hard-pressed from a competitive standpoint by the medium of television.)

As pointed out, in connection with the earlier letter which I had reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the United States is probably the only major power in the world which discriminates against its own fine arts by taxation of this nature. Other countries not only do not tax their theater, their concerts and similar productions, but they provide direct financial support.

DON'T PENALIZE THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

Surely the very least we can do is to help facilitate cultural development in our country.

Recognizing the role of fine arts, Congress had previously completely removed the tax on performances, conducted by nonprofit groups—municipal groups, foundations and the like (a fine category in which my own State, I am glad to say, really abounds).

While I welcome such tax exemption, I do not feel that profit-making bureaus, that is, unsubsidized small-business men, managing these fine arts performances should at the same time be penalized. As everyone is aware who works in this field, it is hardly very lucrative. Men and women engaged in it do so almost exclusively out of love for cultural media, and not out of a desire to become a millionaire.

HOUSE MUST ORIGINATE ACTION

I urge, therefore, prompt action on this legislation this year. I do not believe that the United States Treasury is so poor that it need carry on only on the basis of taxing its fine arts.

I hope that the House of Representatives, whose Ways and Means Committee must initiate action of this nature, will give the Thompson-Celler bill its sympathetic attention and I hope the Senate Finance Committee will at the appropriate time do likewise.

LET'S SEE MORE, NOT FEWER THEATERS

Let's expand the theater and increase the frequency of fine arts performances. All over America, the living stage has, for example, been hard hit by skyrocketing costs. In New York City, fountainhead of the living theater, there is at last an indication that, thanks to far-thinking leadership, a new, modern theater may be constructed. It may be a partial replacement of the many theaters which have unfortunately closed (and/or which have been taken over by TV). Let us see more live theaters open and let Congress help by wiping out this nuisance excise.

I shall incidentally at a later day take up another phase of the entertainment problem—the problem of U. S. motion picture theaters, as such. My commitments today have been addressed to the problem of the legitimate theater.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the ever-growing problem of providing real social security for the people of my country has long been of great concern to me.

Not until the devastating depression of the 1930's did the social conscience of our country stir sufficiently to realize that unless society as a whole was guaranteed some form of security—then no member of society could attain and be sure of keeping any measure of security.

Because hardship, hunger and deprivation descended, not just on a few, but on the majority of our people in those horrible years, an acute social conscience was demanded from our Government.

As a result, our Social Security Act was passed by Congress in 1935.

It was a good beginning. It still is a good beginning. But, anyone who faces the facts knows that it is only a beginning.

Unfortunately, with the advent of prosperity for the majority—social conscience has had conspicuously little or no influence on legislation.

Yet there is today a large segment—a most worthy segment—of our population living under conditions which are in many instances far worse than depression standards. I refer here particularly to the needy aged, blind, physically handicapped and dependent children who come under the Public Assistance Section of the Federal Social Security Act.

These are the forgotten citizens.

I maintain that it is my duty—and it is the duty of each and every Member of

Congress—to be forever seeking to better the social welfare of our country. Only by doing so can we hope to fulfill the trust placed in us by the people we serve.

While improvements have been made from time to time in the Social Security Act pertaining to old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the public assistance section has been almost wholly ignored.

For several months now I have been doing research to find out how we could help these forgotten citizens; where the trouble spots lay, and how the public assistance section could be amended to correct many of the injustices now endured by the needy aged, blind, the physically handicapped, and helpless children.

I have personally talked with many recipents of this aid to determine what the most needed improvements are, and I have received correspondence from aid recipients in every State of the Union telling of their miserable plight.

Of course, the greatest need is for more money. This fact is evident when we take a look at the Social Security Bulletin issued in January 1956 by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and study the amounts paid during the month of October to those on public assistance.

This bulletin reveals that the more than two and a half million recipents of old-age assistance received a nationwide average of only $53.28 per month.

No one in his right mind can say that $53.28 per month is enough to keep body and soul together with the cost of living at its present high.

I think statistics will show that the cost of living varies little in any of the 48 States, but the amount of assistance varies much. Aid to the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children showed the same wide difference of payments between indivdual States and approximately the same low average monthly payment.

The root of the whole trouble and its correction—if you please—lays in the Social Security Act.

Under our present formula, the Federal Government has a ceiling of $55 a month on the matching of Federal funds to the States. This means that the Federal Government will not pay more than a total of $35 toward a recipent to whom the State is paying $55 a month or more.

I say that such a ceiling is most unrealistic. I propose to raise that ceiling to $100. Under present law, where a State pays an aged, blind, or physically handicapped recipent $55 per month or more, the Federal Government pays four-fifths of the first $25 plus one-half of the next $30.

In other words, of the first $55 paid, the Federal share is $35 and the State's share is $20. But the Federal Government contributes not one red penny of any amount granted by the State over and above the $55. Quite obviously, only the more wealthy States can pay over and above the ceiling and some of the poorer States cannot even afford to match up to the present ceiling. So, we end up with a jigsaw puzzle of payments. And in no State are they adequate.

This should make it quite evident that we must also revise parts of our formula. I have worked out an amendment to the Social Security Act which would, I believe, solve this problem to everyone's satisfaction. My formula would peg the Federal grants-in-aid to the States, on a per capita income basis.

For instance, a State whose per capita income is equal to or greater than the per capita income of the continental United States would still be required to match 50–50 with the Federal Government over the first $25, and under the $100 ceiling. This would greatly assist the more wealthy States who are now paying relatively high pensions and carrying the whole burden over $55.

Under my plan, the poorer States would also be able to up their pension payments considerably. This would be possible because the Federal share in no case would be lower than 50 percent and would graduate up to 75 percent, according to the per capita income of the individual State.

For example, the State of Georgia's per capita income in 1954 was only 70 percent as compared to 100 percent for the continental United States. Therefore, Georgia's share of the grant over $25 and under $100 would be 35 percent, with the Federal Government contributing 65 percent.

To take the extreme example, Mississippi, whose per capita income was lowest in the Nation with 49 percent in 1954, would receive the maximum of 75 percent Federal contribution, or three Federal dollars to every State dollar expended on these programs.

Needless to say, this additional Federal money would immeasurably help these poorer States who are from necessity now paying such starvation-level assistance, and would at the same time help to equalize and make more uniform assistance payments throughout the country.

As I said before, the biggest problem these people have to meet is the lack of enough money to keep body and soul together.

Their serious problems, however, only just begin there. I think that probably the other element—the loss of human dignity that a recipient of aid must undergo in order to qualify for assistance—places just as great a moral obligation upon Congress to correct.

I think this has been done because Congress has never established a humane single standard of qualifications for the applicants and recipients of aid, below which no State would go and still receive Federal grants-in-aid.

This accounts for the fact that the public-assistance laws are different in each of the 48 States. It also accounts for the desperately low morale of the poor people who come under these laws, a condition quite evident by the letters I have received asking respite from the harsh restrictions.

For instance, in some States an applicant or recipient of aid must first sign over his home to the State before aid shall be granted.

This practice violates a cardinal principle on which the Social Security Act is based:

That needy persons should not be differentiated by reason of their need and that recipients of assistance have the same right of self-determination by reason of their need in the use of their resources as others in the community.

I propose that Congress spell out in the law that our old pioneers can own a home and that there be no imposition of a lien on such a home as a condition of receiving aid.

Another disgraceful practice is the publishing of the recipients names in an effort to shame them off the assistance rolls. This not only violates cardinal principles of the Social Security Act, but I say it violates our very decency itself. I recommend that this be prohibited.

One of the provisions now in the Social Security Act which desperately needs revision is the clause stating that all "outside income and resources must be deducted from the amount of aid granted." This prohibits recipients from earning even the smallest amount to supplement their pitiful grants.

The standard of living for many who are able to do a little work here and there would most assuredly be improved. And of perhaps as much benefit would be the better mental health of the aged and handicapped—now sentenced to a life of idleness—if these people were allowed to earn up to $50 per month without threat of deduction from their grants. This privilege has already been granted by Congress to the blind.

I also urge that needy children be permitted to earn up to $30 per month. Most assuredly children, especially of school age, should not be sentenced to a life of idleness simply because their parent or guardian, through some circumstance, has had to seek aid to feed the child. It seems to me that such children need more than ever to be encouraged to learn self-reliance and certainly should not be discouraged from seeking part-time employment.

Many are the harsh provisions imposed by the various States, but none so unfair, nor un-American, as the State residence requirement. Under the Social Security Act, this can be and often is a maximum of 5 years' duration.

It is hard to reconcile how such a provision ever became part of the law of this land. Under any other circumstance, the United States is considered to be the legal residence of all of us. We are not citizens of 48 different States. We are all citizens of these United States. No tariffs may be imposed between States. In time of war, no one escapes military duty because of State boundaries.

I propose that the maximum State residence requirement allowable be reduced to 1 year and certainly not more than 3 years; and I further propose that where an otherwise qualified person does not meet State residence requirements, the Federal Government pay its share direct to the person until they have met the residence requirement of the State.

This would at least give some help to these citizens without a State—and under present conidtions—without a country.

Much has been said about lowering the age for women applicants and recipients from 65 to 62 years. I say that this is

not only right, but it is absolutely necessary considering the present pattern of employment and retirement.

Studies show that almost two-thirds of the caseload on public assistance is women and that the dependency rate for women is 1½ times greater than that of men.

The substantially higher dependency rates for women derive from many factors. Among the most important are the following:

First. Women have traditionally assumed a more dependent economic role in our society, concentrating on home management rather than outside employments.

Second. Because of limited employability, they require public assistance at an earlier age. This is confirmed by the fact that there is a larger concentration of women at the younger age levels of 65 years.

Lastly, I would add a few features which may seem minor but which are of the greatest importance to those involved:

First. That the needy not be penalized because of marriage.

Second. No person receiving such public aid shall be deemed a pauper, and no warrant drawn in payment shall contain any reference to indigency or pauperism.

Third. The program is to be administered by each State so as to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions.

The public assistance section of our Social Security Act has been too long neglected. During the last 20 years when we should have been slowly building here, firming there, steadily improving the act, we have instead either lost or ignored our sense of social conscience and all but ignored these unfortunate citizens.

I am not seeking new laws; I am seeking to amend existing laws so as to assure those on public assistance the right to retain their self-respect and, as human beings, their right to human dignity.

The intent of the Social Security Act is to help the American people when they need it. It most assuredly was never meant to act as a form of harassment to people already plagued with distress.

I say it is our duty to God and to our country to provide a decent level of social security for the people of these United States.

MULTIPLE-USE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST AND OTHER LANDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide statutory authority for the multiple-use administration of the one hundred and eighty-odd million acres of national forests and other lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Our national forest lands are presently administered under a system which provides many benefits to a diverse group of users—including timber, grazing, mining, water, wildlife, and recreational interests. However, these various groups need a medium through which they may maintain formal, advisory relationships with the Secretary of Agriculture in the formulation of policy covering these forest lands.

This bill if enacted would write into law the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make the fullest possible use of the rich and varied range, timber, water, mineral, wildlife, and recreational resources of these public lands under a multiple-use system of management. It would also provide for the establishment by the Secretary of multiple-use regional and national citizens' advisory councils, representing the many diverse groups of users of the forest areas, from those interested in timber to those interested in the recreational resources—including wildlife and wilderness.

These multiple-use councils would be of tremendous value in aiding the Department of Agriculture in promoting the maximum appropriate utilization of these valuable lands. The proposed legislation insures adequate consideration of the incalculably valuable recreational assets of our national forests. Recreation is the third major use of these lands, ranking in importance with timber production and watershed protection. Recreational interests and wildlife conservationists would have important representation on the proposed advisory councils.

In the interest of preserving these basic plant, soil, water, and wildlife resources, this bill leaves the Secretary of Agriculture with full authority to control the management practices that are applied by the various individual users of the forest areas. However, it would provide a badly needed means for the democratic expression of the viewpoints of these forest area users, so that these viewpoints can be fully weighed by Department Administrators. While these Administrators will retain final control and authority, the recommendations of the proposed citizens multiple-use councils would aid immeasurably in the formulation of policies designed to serve the best interests of the American people, to whom the forest lands belong.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3615) to recognize and facilitate the administration of the multiple uses of the national forests and others lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last February I had the privilege of discussing on the Senate floor the problem of increasing textile imports and their effect on the domestic textile industry. At that time I urged that continued consideration be given to all possible alternatives for dealing with this problem of increasing imports. As I pointed out at that time, the Tariff Commission was directed by Senate Resolution 121, 84th Congress, to keep fully informed regarding the importation of textiles and textile manufactures. This resolution, which was adopted by the Senate during the last session, did not direct the Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation because the effects of last September's tariff reductions were not known at that time.

It is now evident that imports of cotton manufactures and cotton cloth are continuing to increase. In January 1956 the value of cotton-cloth imports was up 46 percent, and the value of cotton manufactures was up 14 percent over December 1955. A comparison of January 1956 imports with the average monthly imports in 1955 is extremely alarming. It is apparent that the continuing increase of textile imports will result in further injury to the domestic textile industry and the people it employs.

Because of this continued textile import increase, I am submitting a resolution on behalf of myself, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and Senators BRIDGES, COTTON, GREEN, FLANDERS, KENNEDY, PASTORE, PURTELL, SALTONSTALL, GEORGE, WOFFORD, and BUSH, directing the United States Tariff Commission to make an immediate and thoroughgoing investigation to determine what textiles and textile products are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic textile industry. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and that the resolution may lie on the desk until Monday, April 16, to afford other interested Senators an opportunity to join in sponsoring this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The resolution (S. Res. 236) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas substantial reductions have been made in tariff rates on textile products in various trade agreements with foreign countries; and

Whereas the value of imports of cotton manufactures in January 1956 was 14 percent higher than in December 1955 and the value of imports of cotton cloth in January 1956 was 46 percent higher than in December 1955; and

Whereas more than 1 million persons are employed directly in the textile industry of the United States; and

Whereas in many sections of the Nation the entire economy of a community is tied directly to the healthy operation of the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry of the United States is a vital part of our national defense; and

Whereas the United States Senate in Senate Resolution 121, 84th Congress, directed the United States Tariff Commission to keep currently informed regarding the impact of imports of textiles and textile products on the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products in order to be prepared to act promptly on such investigations as may be requested by the President, or directed by resolution of either House of Congress, the Committee on Finance of the Sen-

ate, or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or applied for by any interested party, under section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any product upon which a concession has been granted in a trade agreement is, as a result in whole or in part of the concession, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to make an immediate investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any textiles or textile products are being imported into the United States in such increased quantities, either actual or relative, as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter I have written to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, urging early hearings on the bill (S. 2702) to encourage the sale of cotton for export and to limit imports of manufactured cotton products, be included at this point in the RECORD, together with an exchange of correspondence which I have had with the Lewiston (Maine) Chamber of Commerce on the textile import problem.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

APRIL 10, 1956.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 30, 1955, Senator JAMES EASTLAND introduced a bill, S. 2702, in the Senate for himself and 62 other Senators, including myself. This bill would encourage the sale of cotton for export and limit imports of manufactured cotton products. To date no hearings or other action has been scheduled on this bill by your committee.

On February 27, I spoke on the Senate floor in regard to the effect of increasing cotton textile imports on the domestic textile industry. At that time, I urged that careful attention be devoted to all possible alternatives for alleviating further damage to the domestic textile industry. I further urged that consideration be given to the imposition of import quotas on cotton textile goods should the situation continue to deteriorate.

All available evidence indicates that the influx of imported cotton textiles has not abated. January imports of cotton manufactures and cotton cloth have increased significantly since December. The value of import of cotton manufactures, including such items as velveteen and bedspreads which have previously provided severe competition for the domestic industry, has increased from $7,978,685 to $9,084,949 in a 1-month period. In the same period (December 1955 to January 1956), the value of cotton cloth imports has increased from $4,173,829 to $6,105,558. The increase in the value of imports of cotton manufactures has been nearly 14 percent in 1 month, while in cotton cloth the increase has been approximately 46 percent. It should not be necessary to point out the adverse effects such increases are having and will continue to have on the domestic textile industry.

On March 23 of this year, the Bates Manufacturing Co., one of the largest textile industries in New England, announced that a reduced work schedule had been adopted for employees in 3 of Bates' 5 plants in Lewiston, Augusta, and Saco, Maine. Some shifts have been reduced to a 3- and 4-day week. These cuts have been prompted by an oversupply of goods, which in turn is due, according to the management of Bates Manufacturing Co., "in large measure to the Japanese production of millions of yards of fabric which have been shipped into this country since tariffs were lowered."

It is obvious that in an area where the average hourly wage is $1.30, laborers cannot afford a reduced working week. If layoffs in the textile mills are the result of imports of cotton textiles, then it would seem apparent that the situation has reached alarming proportions.

Recently I received a letter from the Lewiston, Maine, Chamber of Commerce which represents business, mercantile, and industrial groups of Lewiston, urging immediate efforts to insure adequate protection of Maine's textile industries and the people it employs. I am forwarding a copy of this letter for your information and consideration.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has before it a bill (S. 2702) which would, if enacted, control the level of textile imports. Only through extensive hearings on this proposed legislation can the facts of the textile import situation be conclusively established. I, therefore, strongly urge that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry schedule hearings on S. 2702 at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE.

LEWISTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lewiston, Maine, April 6, 1956.

Senator FREDERICK G. PAYNE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PAYNE: This letter is being directed to you in the avowed hope that this appeal by the Lewiston Chamber of Commerce will receive serious consideration by you, and also with the fervent wish that some serious threat to the economy of this community, as well as to the State of Maine in general.

After much deliberation, counsel, and discussion, the chamber has come to the conclusion that some action by our Federal Government is urgently needed to protect our domestic textile industry. As you well know, the economy of this community, and that of a large part of our State, relies heavily on this industry.

Today, this industry, still fighting to keep pace with its competitive counterparts within the United States, finds itself faced with a damaging situation—the rising importation of Japanese textiles into this country. The situation has reached alarming proportions and the industry already is showing effects of the low-cost Japanese textiles products that are glutting our markets. Our State's largest employer, which has plants here and in other Maine communities, has been forced to curtail operations at a number of its factories. Most of the products produced at these plants are in direct competition with those coming into this country from Japan's low-cost manufacturing plants.

The chamber has conferred with representatives of labor and management in the local textile industry, and it is convinced that the only recourse available for relief is through our congressional delegation. You, no doubt, are aware of this serious situation since it has attracted nationwide attention, and has been the subject of debate by some congressional committees.

The Lewiston Chamber of Commerce, as representative of the business, mercantile, and industrial groups of this community, is hereby appealing to our Maine congressional delegation to make every effort to see that this State's textile industry, and the thousands of jobs it provides for our people, are protected.

The chamber, being vitally concerned over this situation, urges that immediate efforts be made to obtain this protection, either through congressional action or by the Federal agencies delegated to administer such matters. The chamber sincerely hopes that this appeal will receive your prompt attention, and that the Maine congressional delegation will move to the forefront with proposals for remedial action.

When you have given this plea for action your consideration, we will expect to receive your observations of action you anticipate taking at your level to meet the existing threat to our textile industry.

Sincerely yours,

LEWISTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
MURRAY SHULTZ, *President.*

APRIL 10, 1956.

MR. MURRAY SHULTZ,
President, Lewiston Chamber of Commerce, Lewiston, Maine.

DEAR MURRAY: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 6, in regard to the effect of textile imports on the domestic industry.

Because the problems of the textile industry have been recurring ones, it might be useful to review what has been done, what is being done, and what can be done for the benefit of the textile industry.

As you have pointed out in your letter, the textile industry in Maine is meeting severe competition, not only from abroad, but also from its competitive counterparts in the United States. Since coming to the Senate in 1953, I have had the opportunity to work for measures to foster fair domestic competition in the textile industry and to prevent unfair foreign competition.

Several measures enacted by the Congress in the past 2 years have had the effect of bringing the terms of competition between the northern and southern segments of the textile industry more nearly into line. The increase of the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour, which went into effect March 1, will result in equalizing labor costs and will bring southern wage scales closer to the higher wage scales prevailing in Maine and the rest of New England, with the effect of more nearly balancing production costs throughout the industry.

In the past 3 years I have been active in securing increased appropriations for the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, so that sufficient funds would be available for adequate enforcement of minimum-wage laws throughout the country. Again this was directed toward insuring fairer competition from the textile industry in lower wage areas. Last year, I also advocated repeal of the Federal tax exemption on municipal bonds issued for industrial purposes. There are several bills now pending in the House, where all tax legislation must originate, which would repeal this exemption. If such a measure should reach the Senate it will receive my full support, with the intent that this action would make it less attractive for northern textile industries to migrate to other areas of the Nation.

During the last session of Congress, Senator JOHN KENNEDY and I jointly sponsored an amendment to the Walsh-Healy Act. This amendment would, in effect, prevent a trend to award Government contracts for uniforms and other textile manufactures to textile industries with lower wage scales. Because of a recent Supreme Court decision, which accomplishes the purpose of the Payne-Kennedy amendment, it is unlikely that congressional action will now be needed on this proposal.

Similarly, the members of the New England delegation have consistently supported measures to prevent unfair foreign competition. In this connection the Senate last summer passed a resolution, which I cosponsored, directing the United States Tariff

Commission to study the effect of imports of textiles and textile products upon the domestic textile industry. On July 30, 1955, Senator JAMES EASTLAND introduced, for himself and 62 other Senators, including myself, a bill (S. 2702) which would impose quota restrictions on cotton textile imports.

Early in this session, I spoke at some length on the Senate floor in regard to the textile industry and the problem of increased imports of textiles. At that time I urged that this problem be given the utmost consideration and that the various possible solutions, including the imposition of import quotas, be fully analyzed with a view toward positive action.

To date no action has been taken on S. 2702 by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Until hearings are held and a full and accurate analysis has been made of the entire problem of textile imports and their effect on the domestic textile industry, it will be impossible to get any favorable action on S. 2702. Because of this lack of action on the part of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have written to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, the committee chairman, urging him to schedule hearings on S. 2702 at the earliest possible date. I have taken the liberty of forwarding a copy of your letter to Chairman ELLENDER, so that he may know how representative groups in Maine, such as your organization, regard the problem of textile imports.

Under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, when an industry, such as the textile industry, feels that increased imports are seriously damaging the domestic industry, the industry may apply for an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission. If the results of the investigation indicate that serious damage is being caused by imports, then the Tariff Commission can recommend that the President invoke the "escape clause" to raise the tariff on the imports causing the serious damage. To date, the domestic textile industry has not requested such an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission.

Because the value of imports of cotton manufactures and of cotton cloth have increased substantially in January of this year, indicating that the domestic textile industry will meet even more severe foreign competition than in 1955, I introduced a resolution for myself and Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, which would direct the United States Tariff Commission to conduct an investigation of the effect of increasing textile imports on the domestic industry. A thoroughgoing investigation by the Tariff Commission should determine to what extent the distress of the domestic industry has been caused by imports, by intraindustry competition, and by competition from cotton-substitute textile industries. If the facts, when clearly established, indicate that the importation of foreign textiles is a primary cause of the current distress of the domestic industry, then the need for protection will be clearly demonstrated. It is my hope that this resolution calling for an investigation by the Tariff Commission will receive the full support of the textile industry, textile labor groups, and other interested parties such as your organization.

If the Senate Committee on Agriculture will act on S. 2702 and if the Senate will direct the Tariff Commission to investigate the effect of increasing imports, then it should be possible to get positive action which will alleviate the distress felt by the domestic textile industry as a result of increasing imports of cotton textiles.

It is regrettable that I cannot answer your letter with the promise of a panacea for this problem. I am sure you will agree that any action taken must be well thought out, and must, in fact, provide the relief the industry is seeking. You may be certain that I shall continue to work in the future, as I have in the past, to promote the welfare of Maine's textile industry and the people it employs.

Enclosed are copies of my letter to Senator ELLENDER, the resolution I introduced in the Senate, and the remarks I made on introducing this resolution.

With very best wishes to you and the members of your organization.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that a table based on Bureau of the Census statistics comparing the monthly average of United States imports of countable cotton cloth for 1955 with January 1956 statistics may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

United States imports of countable cotton cloth, monthly average for 1955 compared with January 1956

	Total	From Japan
Monthly average, 1955	11,095,000	8,294,000
January 1956	24,638,000	19,992,000
Percent increase	122	141
Annual rate, based on January 1956	295,656,000	239,904,000
Percent increase over—		
1953	360	682
1954	302	402
1955	122	141

Source: Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. PAYNE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this morning, at the time I submitted a resolution on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and other Senators, I intended, because of the very great interest he has always displayed in any matter affecting the textile industry, to speak with the distinguished Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore, in connection with the resolution, to determine whether in his judgment it would be desirable for him to join as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Since then I have had an opportunity to discuss the matter with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I understand that he would like very much to be identified with the resolution.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his name may be included in my earlier remarks today, and that he may be listed as one of the original sponsors of the resolution which is now at the desk, and which will remain there until Monday, to give other Senators an opportunity to join as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN SINNISSIPPI LAKE, ILL.—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2831) authorizing the acquisition of certain lands in the Sinnissippi Lake, Ill., in connection with the operation of Illinois and Mississippi Canal, and for other purposes, introduced by me on January 5, 1956.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. GEORGE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, the Chair submits, for appropriate reference, amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7225, the social-security bill. Without objection, the amendments will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and be printed. And, without objection, a statement, prepared by the Chair, relating to the amendment, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

The purpose of this amendment is to enable the State of Georgia to enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System of those employees of the State who are covered by the Georgia State Employees' Retirement System and desire to obtain coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System. Legislation recently adopted by the general assembly of the State contemplated the State's entering into such an agreement under conditions which would not necessitate either the State's or the employees' contributing any additional funds for the cost of retirement benefits. That legislation provided, in effect, that the employees subject to the State employees' retirement system should have the option (1) of being covered under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System and retaining their coverage under the State employees' retirement system but having their benefits under the latter system reduced as a result of the diversion of funds to pay the cost of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System coverage, or (2) of not being covered under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System and continuing their coverage under the State employees' retirement system with no change in benefits. The existing provisions of the Social Security Act do not permit the State of Georgia to enter into an agreement such as was contemplated by the general assembly. However, if the amendment to H. R. 7225 which I am sponsoring is adopted and becomes law, it will be possible for the State to enter into such an agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit six proposed amendments to the House-passed social-security bill, H. R. 7225. Each of these six amendments has been pending before the Senate

Finance Committee in regular bill form since June 1955. In their original version, they are S. 2382, S. 2383, S. 2384, S. 2385, S. 2386, and S. 2389. I have had each of these bills recast as amendments to H. R. 7225 so that committee consideration of them may be simplified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 9429) to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956 — AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on March 7 I offered an amendment to H. R. 7225, the social-security bill. The number of the amendment is 3-7-56-D. The senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has asked to be a cosponsor of that amendment. I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Text of address on the subject of joint disarmament and the foreign-aid program, delivered by him at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of Young Democratic Clubs of Maryland in Baltimore on March 10, 1956.

By Mr. JENNER:

Radio address entitled "The Congress and the Constitution," recently delivered by him.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. HERLANDS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Prior to the above-mentioned date all persons interested in the above nomination should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LIVINGSTON T. MERCHANT TO BE AMBASSADOR TO CANADA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador of the United States to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart. Notice is given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

TRIBUTE TO BASEBALL AND THE MILWAUKEE BRAVES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared under the headline "Tribute to America's National Pastime and to the Milwaukee Braves—Ike's Hurling of First Ball Here Symbolizes United States Sportsmanship."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO AMERICA'S NATIONAL PASTIME AND TO THE MILWAUKEE BRAVES—IKE'S HURLING OF FIRST BALL HERE SYMBOLIZES UNITED STATES SPORTSMANSHIP

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

Next Tuesday, April 17, Americans will take a few hours off from their troubles—from concern about the Middle East and South Asia and farm parity, concern about dieting, gray hair, the cost of braces on the kids' teeth, or any other care. They will turn to our national pastime, baseball.

The folks here in our Nation's Capital will be trooping out to Griffith Stadium to watch the Washington Senators.

And we of Wisconsin will be crowding the Milwaukee County Stadium to watch what we feel is the finest team in the major leagues—the Milwaukee Braves.

Radio and TV sets all over the Badger State will be tuned in as the Braves show off their stuff and, we hope, blast a few "horsehide A-bombs" over the fence.

It will be my pleasure that day to join with Louis Perini, president of the Braves; with Charles B. Perini, first vice president; Joseph F. Cairnes, executive vice president; John J. Quinn, vice president and general manager; Joseph R. Perini, treasurer, in the opening-day ceremonies at the stadium.

To us of the Badger State, the Braves are, of course, more than a mere team. They are a real source of day-to-day inspiration on a great and wholesome sport, a living demonstration of outstanding team spirit.

Charley Grimm and his Battling Braves have proven what the enthusiasm of a hometown can mean in helping to revitalize a ball club and in keeping it in pennant contention.

Even before the Braves came to "wonderful Wisconsin" in 1953, setting a new National League attendance record, Wisconsin was wonderful baseball country. The largest home talent league in the world played in a belt 40 miles wide around metropolitan Milwaukee. In every crossroads there were at least a team of a dozen men and boys. Around our State capital was another large league. The Wisconsin State League played in other cities, and there were dozens of amateur and semipro circuits.

Wisconsin, as we all recall, took the Braves to its heart from the very outset, jam-packing the stadium from cavalcades by bus, rail, plane, car, and every other means. From every part of the State, the fans poured in, as excitement mounted, including, of course, a Portage barber who closed up, hung a sign on the door, saying, "I can't stand it any longer. Closed for 2 days. Gone to see the Braves."

The shot-in-the-arm that this gave to Milwaukee and all Wisconsin's economy was, of course, enormous.

It is, of course, our hope that the Braves will not only win National League honors, but that they will go on to take the World Series, as well.

But series or not Lou Perini and his Braves will be battling every inch of the way and will be serving as a fine example for both major leagues.

Meanwhile, there are well over 80 Wisconsin players in all of organized baseball, including, of course, the Braves' own Andy Pafko, of Boyceville, plus 10 other major leaguers, who are living in Wisconsin or who were born in our State, plus 20 Badger youngsters on Braves' farm clubs, and 60 Badgers on other National or American League farms.

I am hoping that this year will be a peak year for America's national pastime. I hope that it will encourage more of our youngsters to get out on the ball diamond themselves, whether it is in Junior League baseball, unorganized sandlot clubs, or any other type and enjoy the pleasure of swinging the bat at an oncoming ball or trying out to be a future Warren Spahn on the mound.

When President Eisenhower here in our Capital hurls out the opening day ball, he will symbolize America at play, having a good time and enjoying the best of sportsmanship.

ISRAEL IS HERE TO STAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, considerable comment has been caused by an editorial entitled "Israel Is Here To Stay," appearing in Life magazine on March 19, 1956.

I do not agree with everything that the editors of Life say in this editorial but I accept wholeheartedly the editors' main theme—the one stated in the title. If some of the other nations in the Middle East similarly accepted the permanence of the State of Israel, I do not believe that the present Middle Eastern crisis would be nearly as severe as it is.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, the editorial from Life entitled "Israel Is Here To Stay." There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL IS HERE TO STAY—UNLESS THE ARABS ACCEPT THIS, THERE CAN BE NO PEACE

The time has come for friends of the Arabs to tell them, with the bluntness of genuine friendship, something they seem unable to

understand. That something is this: "Israel is here to stay. It is going to stay. The American people, who helped create Israel, who were the first to recognize her, and who hold warm feelings of friendship for her, are going to see to it that she stays. Until you, the Arabs, accept, deep in your hearts, the fact that Israel is here to stay, there can be no real peace in the lands of either."

Something else also needs to be said: "It is you, the Arabs, who insist there is no peace. Israel does not say she intends to destroy the Arab world, but it is you who proclaim your intention to destroy Israel. It is your holy men who cry out for holy wars against her. It is your spokesmen who talk of driving the last Israeli into the sea. It is you who refuse to accept Israel's right to existence. Until you do accept it, you will have no moral case before the world."

A sad and dangerous thing is happening to the Arab nations. They have let their fanatical hatred of the Israelis cause them to open their gates to a piecemeal invasion by the Communists, the new colonial imperialists. Half-priced Communist arms are pouring into Egypt, and Soviet technicians with them. Syria, already deeply penetrated by Communist agents, is in the process of eagerly rising to the same bait to get a bargain whose real price is the eventual destruction of Syria as a sovereign nation.

When the northern tier of nations—Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Pakistan—soberly aline themselves to resist Soviet expansion, it is the oil-rich Saudi Arabians who pass out the bribes to set Jordanians rioting in the streets against the Baghdad Pact. It is the same gold, accompanied by proddings from agents of Egypt's Premier Nasser, which has led Jordan to dismiss the British professional soldier who made and kept the Arab Legion the most efficient military unit in the Arab world.

What is even sadder is that the man most responsible for this chaos in the Middle East, Premier Nasser, is a man who knows better, who had every capacity to become (and showed every indication of becoming) a statesman. He desired to raise his countrymen out of the mire of poverty, but instead he has allowed the anti-Israel clamor to divert him into the course so many other leaders have followed, of subordinating internal problems to external adventuring.

Nasser, the moderate who suppressed the fanatic Moslem Brotherhood, now sacrifices Egypt's welfare to Pan-Arabic political expediency and the avowed nation builder has become a saber rattler. He permits the Cairo radio to shrill incendiary falsehoods throughout the Middle East. This man who now caters to the wave of racial hatred is the same man, who, after being wounded in the disastrous 1948 war against Israel, repeated to his soldiers, "Comrades, our holy war is not here, but at home." Nasser knows, as he once eloquently said, that his true war should be against the ignorance and wretchedness of his people. While he stands mute before the insane cries for jihad, the children of his land go on wasting, as they have done since the days of Joseph, from rickets and trachoma, bilharziasis and starvation. By his rash or cynical expediency he now endangers the very measures—such as American aid—which would do most to help them.

Certainly it is an immensely difficult task for any Arab leader—even if, like Nasser, he is not a fanatical Israeli hater—to stand against this murderous wave and still retain power. Yet this very difficulty should present a challenge for the Arabs to produce the kind of leadership the world would welcome. We say to Gamal Nasser, "Lead your people up, into the light. Do not let the fanatics lead you into the abyss. You have never been known to lose your temper. Do not, then, let your people lose their reason. Instead of following the exploiters of hatred, teach your own patience to your people. Destiny has given you a chance for greatness; do not meanly forfeit or betray it."

We of Life have not hesitated to criticize the Israelis when we thought they were wrong—as they frequently are. We have espoused the Arab cause when we thought it right. We have condemned, repeatedly, Israel's failure to repatriate or compensate the 1 million Arab refugees driven from their homes. We have disapproved the tendency of Harry Truman to let domestic political considerations make him a rubber stamp for Israel, right or wrong. We have welcomed the wisdom of President Eisenhower in redressing the balance by his policy of strict impartiality between Israeli and Arab.

But when Americans recognized Israel it was not merely because, de facto, it had made itself a state. It was because of our debt to their religious traditions, as well as a moral sentiment of their right to a homeland as compensation, if any there could be, for the unspeakable horrors inflicted upon them in other lands. Americans will support their right to live in peace in this homeland. Until the Arabs do the same, giving up their unjust desire to obliterate the Israelis as a state and as a people, there can be no genuine settlement of the just claims the Arabs do possess. They are playing dice with the peace of the whole world by refusing to accept the fact of Israel in their hearts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senate. It is our plan, when we conclude the consideration of the unfinished business, in the event the House has acted upon the conference report on H. R. 12, the farm bill, to proceed to the consideration of the conference report. If it appears possible to finish action on that report this evening, even by running past the dinner hour, the leadership has agreed to do that. If it does not appear that that is possible, the Senate will recess and return tomorrow at 11 o'clock, a. m., if that is agreeable to the Members of the Senate.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is ready to report the supplemental appropriation bill.

Calendar No. 1184, Senate Joint Resolution 97, to amend certain laws relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and Calendar No. 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House, may be taken up later in the week, or may be sandwiched in during times when it is convenient for the Senate to consider them. I want all Senators to be on notice about the program, and particularly to be on notice about the farm conference report.

After consulting with the minority leader, the chairman, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it has been decided to keep the Senate in session, if necessary, until 7 or 8 o'clock, or perhaps even later, this evening. If action on the farm conference report cannot be completed today, we will have the Senate resume consideration of it tomorrow. What will happen will depend on the progress made with the unfinished business today.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an additional opportunity be now afforded to present routine matters, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AVAILABILITY OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS AS "FAVORITE SON" CANDIDATE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on the 10th of April the distinguished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] delivered a very able and eloquent speech which was directed primarily to the people of Texas. In the course of his remarks he not only made a stirring appeal for party unity, but he emphasized the value of the two-party system in our political life. The distinguished majority leader announced his availability to the people of Texas as a favorite son candidate, and

as chairman of the Texas delegation to the Democratic National Convention.

In the course of his remarks he said:

I have made it clear to the leaders of other States that I am seeking none of their delegates.

I cannot refrain from observing that when his name is presented to the convention as a favorite-son candidate from the great State of Texas, it will be impossible to prevent delegations from other States from adopting him as their favorite son.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO DWELL IN UNITY

(Address by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, over television and radio stations in Texas)

My fellow Texans, I want to talk to you tonight about something to which I have given a great deal of thought in the past few weeks. It is on a subject that is important not only to me but to every Texan and every American.

This year is the centennial of President Woodrow Wilson, the first great world leader which this Nation produced.

He was a wise man—a very wise man. It is not surprising to find that more than 40 years ago, he had already said what I want to say to you tonight.

This is what Woodrow Wilson said in 1915:

"This country is not going to use any party that cannot do continuous and consistent teamwork. If any group of men should dare to break the solidarity of the Democratic Party for any purpose or for any motive, theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them. The only party that is serviceable to the Nation is a party that can hold absolutely together and march with the discipline and with the zest of a conquering host."

I want you to think about those wise words of Woodrow Wilson while I am talking with you tonight, because I am going to talk about the delegation which Texas will send to the national convention of the Democratic Party in Chicago next August.

A MEANS TO AN END

Most of us—as Americans—will agree that a political party is only a means to an end. We should be interested in our party because we are interested in our country. We want our Democratic Party to be strong and united because it is the only instrument through which we can act effectively for our Nation.

Through the experience of more than 150 years, we have found that political parties are essential to effective action. We have also learned that they cannot survive if they are torn by factional strife or warfare over personalities.

And when the parties are torn apart, the Nation suffers.

We have in the world today the example of France, sorely troubled by unceasing warfare between a multitude of parties representing factional, rather than national, views.

WITH A UNITED VOICE

In the United States, we have learned—and, I hope, learned well—to conduct our affairs through the two great parties. Neither demands unswerving allegiance to the principles of one small group or one small faction. Therefore, between them, when they speak, they speak the voice of America.

In the Congress, both branches are now controlled by the Democratic Party. I have the honor to lead that party in the Senate. Another Texan—our beloved Speaker RAYBURN—leads the party in the House.

During the past 3 years, the Democrats in both branches have demonstrated that a party can be held together by a desire to serve the Nation—the Nation which belongs to all of us, whether Democrats or Republicans.

At the beginning of the last Congress, there were those who predicted freely that the Democratic Party would fly to pieces. But the hard, factual record demonstrated 77 unanimous party votes during the time I have served as leader of the Democrats—a mark almost without equal.

A CONQUERING HOST

Democratic Senators of widely divergent views—Senator GEORGE and Senator LEHMAN; Senator RUSSELL and Senator HUMPHREY—were able to vote together on principle. These men have not agreed on everything, but they were able to vote together most of the time on principle. Even when they differed, they did not attempt to divide or destroy the party's record for responsibility and patriotic performance. What can be done in the Senate can be done in Texas.

In the words of Woodrow Wilson, we have managed to "march with the discipline and with the zest of a conquering host." Yet we have marched only along the road which we believed would lead to the greatest security and prosperity for the United States.

That march will continue so long as our parties remain strong and vital. But they cannot do so if groups or factions within these parties abandon our traditional system of give-and-take discussion and seek to exercise a veto over all other groups or factions.

THE PROPOSAL

A few weeks ago, our great Speaker RAYBURN proposed that Texas place me in nomination for the Presidency at the Democratic National Convention. He suggested also that I head the Texas delegation to the Chicago convention.

I have given this proposal a great deal of thought. There are many considerations which must go into such a decision.

Frankly, I am not anxious to assume burdens in addition to those already carried. I am even more reluctant—in fact, completely opposed—to entering a popularity contest between Texans.

But this is not basically a question of a popularity contest nor should it become one. It is a question which involves the duties and the obligations that are owed to my friends and fellow Texans who have honored me over the years.

THE WILL OF THE MAJORITY

If it should be the will of the majority of the delegates to the State convention, representing the majority of the people of Texas, that my name be placed in nomination at the Chicago convention, I will be deeply honored. If it is also the will of the delegates to the State convention that I head the Texas delegation to the national convention, I will accept the responsibilities that this post brings, and be grateful for the trust and confidence reposed in me.

AMBITIONS FULFILLED

It should be emphasized once more that this is not a matter of personal ambition. You—the people of Texas—have already fulfilled my ambitions beyond the wildest dreams of my youth. For that, I am grateful beyond the power that any words can express.

I have made it clear to the leaders of other States that I am seeking none of their delegates. I am a Texan seeking to serve the people of Texas. I will have no part of any move that can create tensions and turmoil in our party.

If I can serve as an instrument to strengthen the voice of Texas in the councils of our Nation, I will be content.

BRETHREN IN UNITY

One lesson has been driven home to us. It is best expressed in the words of the 133d Psalm: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Personally, I believe that the people of Texas are united. Most of us, it is clear, are in fundamental agreement in our dreams, in our hopes, and in our yearnings.

We want our State—and our country—to be strong and united. But such unity can come only through our political parties when they are united through the medium of free discussion and by a sense of responsibility.

AN ISSUE OF PRINCIPLE

Texas should send a delegation of men and women to the national convention seeking the nomination of the very best person available in America to lead the Democrats of the Nation. I believe that delegation should abide by the decision of the majority of the convention and return to Texas to work for the election of the nominee.

I have no quarrel with those who want to support another party. I disagree with them but it is disagreement based upon principle and not upon a challenge to their motives or their patriotism.

TEXANS WILL DECIDE

In all of this discussion, there is one point that must be emphasized above all others. It is that Texans themselves will have the opportunity to decide their future.

On May 5, the precinct conventions will be held. They are the first step in the process that ultimately selects our delegation to the national convention.

These precinct conventions are the instruments through which your voices are felt. They give you the opportunity to exercise the American right which is most envied by the people of the world—the right of free choice.

A GLORIOUS HISTORY

From Sam Houston to SAM RAYBURN, Texas has had a glorious history. In time of war, we have produced the military leaders who led our forces to victory. In time of peace, we have produced the industrial and agricultural leaders who made our Nation prosperous.

Texas industrialists have given the world a prime example of efficiency. Texas oil provided the fuel that won two world wars. Texas cattle and cotton are second to none. Our influence in national affairs—since the immortal 40 nominated Woodrow Wilson at Baltimore—has been strong.

A Texan leads the majority in the House, and a Texan leads the majority in the Senate. Texans head the vital committees of Congress, and are in line for other key posts. Our soil is rich and our resources great. Our people have initiative and energy.

LET US REASON TOGETHER

Why cannot we also have the strongest and most effective delegation to the national convention? We can have such a delegation—a delegation of reasonable, loyal, and prudent men and women—if we will accept the words of the prophet Isaiah, who said, "Come now and let us reason together."

Let us, therefore, reason together, and let us go together to the precinct conventions on May 5. I hope that every Texan from every walk of life will be present and make known his or her desires.

Texas is important to me as it is to you. For three generations my ancestors, the Johnsons and the Baineses, have made their living from the soil of our State. I live on a central Texas hill country farm that was founded by my grandfather in the days of Sam Houston. Both of my grandfathers served in the Confederacy.

WE WORK TOGETHER

Through my 25 years of public service, you and I have worked together. Through all those years, I have stood up and been counted on every issue. We have gone together through sunshine and sorrow—through good times and bad times. And this has been the history of Texas—a State which was built by adventurous men with the spirit of the pioneer—by men who could unite—by men who with Benjamin Franklin realized that they must hang together or they would all hang separately.

This is one time when all Texans should come together in the spirit of unity. The right of choice is too sacred to be left to the narrow partisans of any stripe or to those who would place personal ambition or personal disappointment above the common good.

We must all turn out to the precinct, county, and State conventions—turn out with our wives and with our sons and our daughters. Turn out so that for all time to come you can look your fellowman in the eye and tell him that you thought enough of your American heritage to exercise your rights where and when they counted—at the precinct convention.

ALL DEMOCRATS

I am appealing to all Democrats without prefixes or suffixes. May 5 is indeed the day of decision. It is the day upon which the voice of Texas can be heard.

And whatever your decision may be, you know I will abide by it in good faith.

Let me remind you once more of those words of President Wilson:

"This country is not going to use any party that cannot do continuous and consistent teamwork."

This is LYNDON JOHNSON, your Senator. Goodnight, goodby, and God bless you.

JET-AIRPLANE ENGINE FIASCO—PRIZE-WINNING NEWS ARTICLES

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, during the past weekend in Atlantic City a great newspaperman was honored by the National Headliners Club for a superior job of reporting which won for his newspaper the 1955 National Headliners Club award for outstanding public service. Theodore Schafers of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat capped a long series of major stories with his exposé last fall of a serious blunder in the purchase of military jet aircraft, which cost the taxpayers of the United States more than a hundred million dollars.

He revealed that McDonnell Aircraft had delivered to the United States Navy 47 jet fighters, each costing about $2,600,000 which were equipped with Westinghouse engines not powerful enough to lift the planes off the ground. Theodore Schafers has set an example of alert and responsible news gathering which embodies the highest type of public service. His persistent prodding of tight-mouthed public officials and the imaginative scope of his inquiry led to the story which focused public attention on a major fiasco, and led immediately to a congressional investigation. House subcommittee chairman, CHET HOLIFIELD, praised the Globe-Democrat for doing a service to the Nation by publishing the facts as uncovered by Mr. Schafers.

I am proud to join in paying tribute to Theodore Schafers. The American people must rely on their newspapers for the facts they use in evaluating the performance of Government officials. There is no greater service to our democracy than the high standard of reporting which has won for Mr. Schafers and the Globe-Democrat the National Headliners distinguished award.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a news article appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on March 17, 1956, which describes Mr. Schafers' achievements in further detail.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLOBE-DEMOCRAT WINS 1955 HEADLINERS AWARD ON JET SERIES—SCHAFERS' STORIES ON ENGINE FIASCO TAKE PRIZE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

The Globe-Democrat has won the 1955 National Headliners Club award for outstanding public service by a newspaper, it was announced in Atlantic City yesterday.

Theodore Schafers' stories on the Westinghouse-Navy-McDonnell Aircraft jet plane fiasco "exemplified especially" the standard of public service by the Globe-Democrat which earned it the award, the judges said.

Schafers will go to Atlantic City April 6-8 to receive the Headliner silver medallion at the award ceremony, and to be an honor guest at the various dinners and events in the annual three-day Headliner Frolics.

The National Headliners Club, started in 1935 by the Press Club of Atlantic City, salutes those who have distinguished themselves in news coverage.

NINE JUDGES

A total of 1,500 entries from all news media, including foreign and domestic news reporting, radio, television, photography, editorial pages, sports and news magazines, was studied by the 9 judges who selected the 23 winners in various fields.

Only one annual award for outstanding public service by a newspaper is offered by the club, the one which was conferred upon the Globe-Democrat in the 1955 competition.

The Globe-Democrat's jet plane exposé was a story of an amazing military aircraft flop which cost taxpayers at least $122,200,000. This newspaper disclosed, in a series of stories which began last September, that McDonnell had delivered to the Navy 47 jet fighters which were grounded. The planes, each costing about $2,600,000, eventually were carried out of St. Louis by river barges.

ALL CRITICIZED

The failure resulted from use of Westinghouse engines which were not powerful enough for the planes. A congressional subcommittee, investigating after the Globe published the story, criticized McDonnell and the Navy for accepting the engines knowing that they "were below performance specifications for the airframe."

Westinghouse also was censured for not delivering the kind of engine it had promised.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, a California Democrat and chairman of the House Military Operations Subcommittee which conducted the inquiry, said the Globe-Democrat "did a service to the Nation" in bringing the costly blunder to national attention.

Schafers was curious last year when he saw a large group of the planes parked by the McDonnell Aircraft plant, at Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport. He observed, during periodic visits to the area, that the planes apparently were never moved.

DUG FOR FACTS

He started asking questions, and as his prodding increased, logical information sources began to dry up. The lack of cooperation by these sources increased Schafers' suspicions and he kept digging for the facts. He pinned down enough data from his contacts in industrial circles to warrant a Navy explanation on the grounded planes and what would be done with them.

But when Marsh Clark, a member of the Globe-Democrat's Washington bureau, began to press the Navy for this information, he, too, was met with evasive tactics. Meanwhile, in St. Louis, staff writer Carl Major joined with Schafers in running down additional phases of the story.

The persistent efforts of the trio finally yielded the facts which caused the congressional investigation that assessed the taxpayers' losses and fixed the responsibility for what the legislators called a "debacle."

Schafers, 41, became a Globe-Democrat copyboy when he was 14, and he has worked continuously for this newspaper for the last 27 years. While still going to school, he held various jobs on the paper, and learned the newspaper business from the staff members. He was added to the staff in 1938.

Schafers was assigned in 1940 to the Criminal Courts Building, and started a 15-year period of crime-story coverage, which was interrupted by a 2-year service with the Army.

His many news beats included the exclusive interview of John Hager, the taxi driver who tipped police on the Greenlease baby kidnap murderers. He got the story during the early morning hours, too late for the Globe's last edition. He knew that rival newsmen were searching for Hager, as was the Teamster's Union, which wanted to put the cabdriver on a national television show.

HID CABDRIVER

To protect his exclusive interview, Schafers talked Hager into hiding in a hotel until the Globe-Democrat could "break" the story the following night.

Other major stories by Schafers included the series with Globe Staffer Edwin D. Krell on the Missouri State Penitentiary scandal, which caused many major reforms and a multi-million-dollar rehabilitation program; and disclosure of a city jail racket in which big-shot labor racketeers were paying bribes to get special privileges.

Schafers is married and the father of five children. The Schafers live at 6735 Mathew Street, Northwoods. The newsman is a member of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalism fraternity, and of the American Newspaper Guild.

Tom Duffy, editor of the East St. Louis Journal, also is a 1955 headliner award winner. He was cited for "consistently outstanding" feature columns for his daily feature, On the Home Front.

Other headliner awards include:

Michael J. O'Neill, United Press, for outstanding coverage of a major domestic news story, in his articles on Salk polio vaccine.

Andrew Tully, Scripps Howard Newspaper Alliance, for outstanding coverage of major foreign news, and especially for his series, Inside Russia.

Charles E. Shutt, Telenews and INS, for exclusive interviews with Russian leaders, including Malenkov and Bulganin.

Sports Illustrated, best news series in a magazine for its exposé, Boxing's Dirty Business.

Eric Sevareid, CBS, for consistently outstanding news broadcasting in his The World Tonight.

Movietone News and Georges Chassignes, cameraman, for outstanding newsreel coverage of a news event, the Algerian revolt.

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY IN FIFTH NATIONAL LAWRENCE S. MAYERS PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a New York merchant, Mr. Lawrence S. Mayers, awards an annual prize in an

essay contest which is open to seniors in high schools throughout the United States on questions relating to peace and disarmament. I have had the honor of serving on the board of judges for these essays year after year. I believe the prize-winning essay for this year, which was awarded to Miss Janet P. Bellin, of a small town in Oregon, is a particularly good one. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the prize-winning essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My question: "During the next 5 years, what can I do to help bring about permanent world peace?"

I am an 18-year-old farm girl in a small town in Oregon. It is a logging community, and familiar to everyone's ear is the cry of "Timber" and the sound of a power saw snorting its way through the few remaining stands of second-growth fir and cottonwood. How hard it is for me to realize as I hoe in the warm sunshine and feel the firm, sandy soil beneath my feet that this tiny community is part of a clashing, struggling civilization that claws like a wild beast underneath while it clamors on the surface for world peace.

I have lived for 18 years on this earth. During that time my parents have provided me with food and shelter, love and affection, the opportunity to grow up and go to school in a free country. Teachers have taught me from books and opened new horizons of interest. Townspeople have invited me in for a cookie, attended school functions, and were interested in the fact that I was a child growing up. Now, after these years, the time has come for me to do what I can to make the world a better place for the children of tomorrow.

When I was in the fifth grade, Mrs. ——— came to school one day. She had a flag with her. She stepped to the front of the room, and as she unrolled the familiar Stars and Stripes I wondered why she had saved this tattered, faded flag. "Boys and girls"—she cleared her throat, her voice a bit unsteady as the room grew quiet—"Boys and girls, after my son was killed 4 years ago, I kept this flag which covered his grave. I'm leaving it here to fly above your school, and I pray that none of you will ever have to be shipped home dead to your mother from a strange land where you died for your country. Take this flag * * *." She couldn't go on. She left the room crying. I had never seen Mrs. ——— cry before. I'll never forget that moment. I have a twin brother, a boy friend, cousins, and friends. Mrs. ———'s son can only die once.

Next time, perhaps it will be me who stoops to remove a faded flag from a newly turned grave. In 18 years I have been taught to eat, to walk, to talk, to sing, to drive, and a thousand and one other things. But no one has ever taught me what to say in this moment when I ask myself, "What can I do during the next 5 years to promote permanent world peace?"

It does no good to look at the lives of famous people, living and dead, to see what they did to answer the question. They are not I and I am not they. This must be my own solution. However, the question is not mine alone. It belongs to every man, woman, and child everywhere. If each answered it not only in words, but in deeds, to the best of his ability there would be no such question for generations to come.

Next fall I plan to enter college. Surely there will I find an answer to my question. As a freshman, I haven't much choice of courses, but I ought to be able to squeeze in several hours a week for the study of international relations. Learning of the problems of coexistence is not the complete answer. A nationwide organization, the International Relations Club, might also help me to understand my question, even if it won't solve it. Perhaps if I major in political science, studying world politics, international law, European political theory, etc., and after finishing, find my place in one of today's international organizations, I will be doing my job.

It has been said that the people in countries across the sea have a strong dislike for the United States as a country. Part of these feelings are present through misunderstanding. By writing to a pen pal in Ireland, Japan, or another country, I would only be reaching one person, but at least I could tell that one person about this community where I live—so unlike the picture Communist countries paint of the extravagant, imperialistic United States of America.

Like most 18-year-old girls, I dream of someday having my own home and children—in some nice town, not too different from the place I live. If I were to be married next month, how could I use my 5-year time allotment to help promote world peace? Instead of the garden club, and bridge club and the numerous other societies which young wives of today find so attractive, I might join the town's United Nations Club, or if it didn't have one, start one. The American Association for the United Nations is very cooperative in helping such organizations to get on their feet. Such a group could study the U. N., raise money to help support its specialized agencies, provide milk and clothing for children in India and undertake countless other small projects. An even larger one could be sponsoring an exchange student or refugee.

By teaching my children to respect other people and their property, to control their tempers when in an argument, and to make every effort to get along with the other children of the neighborhood, I would be promoting peace—even if it were on a very small scale.

I hope to graduate from college and teach in Oregon schools. Here my peace promoting could operate on a slightly larger scale as I teach students the Golden Rule along with their other courses. In social-studies classes, I could help them to explore the countries which make daily headlines in the American press. Here, though they were influenced by their parents' feelings, they could learn to broaden their opinions and their understanding through group discussion about these trouble spots. Sending pencils to Korean children, soap and washcloths to the children in Panama—these are projects that would help answer my question and would answer it for my students, too.

My question has been presented to me in another way. Jesus said, "Be ye kind one to another." As part of my Christian heritage I must do all that is in my power to promote world peace. Again, it is hard to find an answer to this question which is so overpowering. To what degree shall I give? How hard shall I try to answer it?

A missionary in the steamy jungles of Africa could promote permanent world peace. In 5 years I could complete missionary training and represent my church in a missionary field. I would have to provide not only spiritual help and translations of the teachings of Jesus Christ, but I would also have to be, in part, a medical adviser, a counselor, and a friend—an ambassador of the United States of America.

"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." Perhaps I am overlooking the closest, but most effective way of answering my question. How simple it would be for me to dedicate a few minutes a day to prayer for world peace. Who can tell what power those collected minutes could hold? In this way I would be fulfilling my Christian duty, my duty as a citizen of the United States, and my duty as a citizen of the world.

No one ever thinks he has enough money. No matter what he has, he always needs more. Although my future earnings will certainly never total a million dollars, a small percentage of them could help organizations that are the means by which the average citizen may contribute to possible peace. Agencies such as CARE, and specialized agencies of the U. N.—UNESCO and UNICEF, for example—spend dollars carefully, aiding the most people possible, helping them to become better educated, to be healthier and thus, enable them to better understand why world peace is the route to happier living for all mankind. Because I have visited the United Nations headquarters in New York and spent a week there studying its functions, I am convinced that promoting the U. N. is synonymous with promoting world peace.

I offer no solution for impressing upon people their duty to serve in this capacity. I have invented no secret weapon that will cause the world to "heel" at my command. All I have to offer is the minute bit of knowledge that I have acquired, plus my faith in God and the future.

It's up to me as an individual of this world, who has been lucky enough to attend school for 12 years, to send CARE packages, join the International Relations Club at college, study foreign affairs, write to a foreign pen pal, and be constantly on the lookout for new and more efficient ways to complete my task.

I pray that someday everyone will hear my question, answering it to the best of their ability, and, in some year to come, perhaps the soldier's question will be changed. As he puts aside his gun forever, he may look wonderingly at a comrade and ask in hushed tones, "Why is there peace?" The people who have answered my question will know.

THE DECLINE OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am completely confident that thousands of Princeton alumni read with shame and disappointment a news dispatch this week indicating that Alger Hiss had been invited to speak at Princeton University. It is indeed unfortunate that so great a university should be thus embarrassed and involved.

I rather think, sir, that the Washington Daily News put it both succinctly and significantly in its editorial columns of day before yesterday when it ran the following editorial under the heading of "Hiss." It reads:

This business of inviting Alger Hiss to speak at Princeton strikes us as corny showoff, pure and simple.

Hiss is scheduled to talk before a campus debating society April 26 on the meaning of Geneva. Presumably, he gained special insight to affairs of state from his 4 years in jail for lying about his part in a Communist spy ring.

The debating society takes the usual out that "while it does not approve of Hiss' record," etc., it does want to get his views. It's our guess that, rather than Hiss' views, they are plumping more for public attention for imagined courage in inviting a jailbird to speak before them.

Well, it wasn't so long ago that some Princetonians were winning notoriety by swallowing goldfish. They now think they can get more of it by swallowing Alger Hiss.

Indeed, Mr. President, for university students to engage in goldfish swallowing contests and in pajama wars is bad

enough. But to invite convicted agents of the Communist conspiracy to visit the campus and to advise them on the meaning of Geneva hits an all-time low. Surely a much more appropriate theme for Alger Hiss would be the betrayal at Yalta.

What has happened to our universities? What campus influences are at work thus to seduce the collegiate mind? Where, indeed, is the American spirit of earlier times which would have impelled students themselves to rise up and protest such perversions of a university forum?

Will we next read that Princeton—because of some inane interpretation of academic freedom, I presume—is inviting Lucky Luciano to visit the campus to lecture students about narcotics? Will some Federal convict be asked in to tell them about counterfeiting? If this is modern education or academic freedom, heaven help all of us.

THE SOUTH IS ON THE MOVE AGAIN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the South may be docile but it is not down. Based on personal observations which I have made in addressing southern audiences during the past few years, I am convinced that the proud people of Dixie have reached a point in our national history where they are no longer content to be pushed around and humiliated by the northern politicians who have counted on the southern votes to be "in the bag" for the Democratic Party for so many elections that they have come to believe that southern ideals and aspirations may be ignored without political risk to northern Democratic politicians.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to call attention to a news release which I issued on this subject on April 3 and which was given wide circulation by the Associated Press. It reads as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT NOTES SIGNS THAT THE SOUTH MAY HAVE HAD ENOUGH

"A political uneasiness and uncertainty is pervading all the States of the Old South," Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, told a Capitol Hill reporter here last week. "Beginning as far back as 1944, and gaining strength in each quadrennial election since then, the restlessness of the Southern States at being straitjacketed in the grip of a one party system which rejects its policies, resents its political leadership, and repels some of its convention delegations at the Democratic National Conventions, hits its heights in 1952 when five Southern States voted for Eisenhower and several others came within a few thousand votes of doing the same thing.

"The Presidential election of 1956 is likely to witness a similar revolt on the part of Jeffersonian Democrats in Dixie who have about had enough of the Rooseveltian formula of pitching the party policy to attract northern minorities while relying upon Southern docility and political prejudice to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election to a pyrrhic victory which elects their party but rejects every policy and principle in which the South believes.

"The present controversy over integration versus segregation is but a single manifestation of the wide open split between Southern and Northern Democrats," MUNDT continued. "Actually, there is a whole pattern of programs and policies which Stevenson, Harriman, Kefauver, and the Democratic National Committee offer as 'lures' to Northern voters in big metropolitan eastern cities which are repugnant to the States rights advocates who predominate among Southern voters. Southerners consider the 10th amendment to the Constitution as important as any of the other stipulations of our famed constitutional Bill of Rights whereas, increasingly, New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and modern machine Democrats seek to solve every social and economic problem by increasing the powers of the central government in Washington and decreasing the self-determinative powers of individual citizens and separate States.

"The resentment of the South at their own one-party political trap is increased rather than decreased by realization of the fact that 8 of the 9 Supreme Court Judges who made the segregation decision which they abominate were appointed by the political party which their votes had kept in power for 20 consecutive years. Thus, their recent manifesto signed by nearly 100 Democratic Senators and Congressmen is an unhappy lamentation over their futility and their fate—but proposes no specific course of action to extricate themselves from their self-made trap. However, that manifesto, if it means anything at all, is a warning shot over the prow of the ship manned by Northern Democrats that the days of docility and blind obedience to the demands of their city-machine associates are over. Whether this results in another third party movement in the South or another mass shifting of voters to the support of Eisenhower, it is too early to speculate but it clearly indicates that unless the Democratic National Committee nominates a conservative Democrat (which it won't) the South cannot be counted upon for the type of blind political support it used to provide nor the 100 electoral votes it used to deliver.

"Almost solid Southern support for our recent attempt to win support for a constitutional amendment providing for electoral colleage reform is another indication that the South is weary of riding in a political automobile which it can never steer. Pressure groups playing for the block votes of States with large units of electoral college votes seek to bargain with both parties and sell their support to the one making the highest bid, realizing this, the South may develop a political mechanism of its own for tying together the largest electoral block in America, over 100 votes, and thus cease giving away for nothing a political commodity which could prove to be the determining factor in every political election. Thus, the South may be about to write a new chapter in American political behavior. It is something to be watched."

Mr. President, since the publication of this news item, I have received many letters and communications from the South—by far the vast majority of them expressing agreement with these observations. In addition, I have received numerous editorials from southern newspapers in which the editors concur in my belief that something is stirring in the South and that the good people of that great area have finally learned the basic lesson in politics which teaches that when an area of the country, or any specific segment of our society, gives its votes away by habit or prejudice the politicians who profit by such blind allegiance soon cease listening to the expressed desires of those who sell their franchise so cheaply. Only by remaining or becoming unpredictable can any group of citizens long have any important impact in helping to determine America's long-term destiny.

The Augusta Chronicle, published in Augusta, Ga., carrys on its masthead the significant legend "The South's oldest newspaper." It was established in 1785. For that reason, I have selected from the editorials sent to me an editorial from the April 5 issue of the Augusta Chronicle for incorporation in the RECORD at this point. It refers to my release of April 3 and provides additional evidence that political docility is dying out in Dixie. There is therefore good cause to hope that this great area of the country may once again become important in our national American political scene. If such portents come true, I am confident the effect upon all Americans will be wholesome.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWING RESTLESS

Adlai Stevenson, trying his best to say words that would please southerners, dropped off in Atlanta Tuesday to make a little hay during his brief Georgia stay.

He said among other things, that he stands by his original statement that he opposes any use of force to carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling.

But no sugar-coated words, or half-hearted gestures of appeasement, can mask the Democratic candidate's real feelings about segregation and the racial issue. These were revealed in this direct quotation from Mr. Stevenson's Georgia interview:

"Eliminating segregation in the schools of some of our States presents us today with a national challenge to show our maturity as a people. For my part, as most northerners, I feel that the Supreme Court has decreed what our reason told us was inevitable and our conscience told us was right. I feel equally strongly that whether you agree with that decision or not, it is the law and should be obeyed."

Thus Adlai Stevenson, who is being called the "moderate," comes South to woo the southern electorate which before many months may be called upon to support him as the Democratic candidate for President. He doesn't believe in force, but he does believe in racial integration.

Some distance removed from the South a western Senator perceives the fact that the wool is not being pulled over the eyes of a large and growing segment of the southern population.

Politically, the South is growing restless, rebellious, thinks Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota.

"The South," he says, "is weary of riding in a political automobile which it can never steer. This election year may see a revolt of Jeffersonian Democrats in Dixie. • • • A political uneasiness and uncertainty is pervading all the States of the Old South."

Senator MUNDT added these pertinent thoughts:

"Jeffersonian Democrats in the South have had about enough of the Roseveltian formula of pitching the patry policy to attract northern minorities while relying on southern docility and political prejudice to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election."

Senator MUNDT is right in saying that the Democratic South is becoming uneasy and restive in its political straitjacket. Segregation is merely one manifestation of Deep South restlessness over the course that political events are taking, with southerners

still being called upon to continue their demonstration of loyalty to a party which tells them to stand in the corner every time they ask for some consideration.

Whether this dissatisfaction will be evidenced in the South going Republican, or forming a third party, or doing nothing at all, remains to be seen. But there promises to be an extraordinary violent display of fireworks at the Democratic National Convention.

The South is getting uncomfortable "in the bag," and this is the year that it might want out.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to but one other southern editorial at this time from among the many on this theme which are appearing in the press of the South.

This one is from the Texarkana Gazette, of Texarkana. I have spoken in this delightful and unusual Southern city lying on the border of two of our great and important Southern States, Arkansas and Texas. Texarkana people are as progressive as pioneers and as independent as a Texas rattlesnake. They are also opinionated, proud, and well-informed. Along with millions of other southerners they are growing weary and restless under a political whiplash which drives them in national elections to vote for people and for policies which they know, in advance, will do violence to their traditions and insult the ideals for which they stand. They are reappaising the dimensions of the political trap which for too long has thwarted their purposes and prevented their attaining the political stature to which all areas of the country are entitled, but which has been denied to so many of the South because they have loaned their birthright of a free and unfettered franchise to Northern Democratic bosses to exercise in their own behalf. Such supine support of a party which has ceased to represent their aspirations and their ideals is, in my opinion, about to be terminated by a great new declaration of political independence by the good people of Dixie.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT MAKES A POINT

Senator MUNDT, one of the most politically astute Republicans in Washington, has been planting some seed in the South in recent weeks that may take root.

He has observed what he chooses to call "the restlessness of Southern States at being straitjacketed in the grip of a one-party system which rejects its policies, and resents its political leadership."

MUNDT goes on to say that Southern people are getting fed up with the Rooseveltian formula of pitching Democratic Party politics to attract northern minorities while relying on southern docility and political prejudice against Republicans to furnish over 100 electoral votes in each election.

MUNDT states further that Southern resentment of their one-party political trap is increased by the knowledge that 8 of the 9 Justices of the Supreme Court who handed down the decision against racial segregation in public schools were appointed by New Deal Democratic Presidents.

Although we all know that the political sagacity of MUNDT is dedicated to the proposition of obtaining more Republican votes in the South, the fact remains that he is speaking the truth. The South is the most persecuted of all political minorities and it's getting pretty darn tired of it. If the Democrats refuse—and we believe they will—to nominate a conservative candidate, another third party may be formed in the South. If not, then many southerners may decide to take a walk, which is what Senator MUNDT hopes they will do.

HISTORIC LETTER BY GEORGE WASHINGTON TO THE HEBREW CONGREGATION IN NEWPORT, R. I.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, lately I have had occasion to reread an historic letter written by the Father of Our Country, George Washington, to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R. I. It is not only one of the greatest testaments of liberty I have read, but it is also one of the most beautiful expressions of America's faith in freedom.

It would be well if this letter were required reading in every school and university in the country. But it should be unnecessary to require the reading of this magnificent utterance by the Father of Our Country. It should be read with eagerness and with wonderment at the stirring sentiments so grandly expressed.

Recently I had occasion to address a message to a luncheon meeting of an organization which is engaged in an effort to restore the famous Touro Synagogue in Newport, R. I. In that message I commented on one particular sentence in this letter. I ask unanimous consent that George Washington's letter be printed at this point in my remarks and that, as a minor footnote to this great document, my message to the Touro Synagogue restoration committee be also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and message were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, Rhode Island:

GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your Address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of Citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and a happy people.

The Citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to Mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise, of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my Administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

APRIL 7, 1956.

TOURO SYNAGOGUE RESTORATION COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Mr. William Zeckendorf.)

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I deeply regret that prior engagements make it impossible for me to be with you at the luncheon to consider plans for the restoration of the Touro Synagogue. Yours is a most worthy purpose. The restoration of the Touro Synagogue will certainly be a notable addition to the shrines in Washington, the Nation's Capital.

I am deeply moved to know that at your luncheon the justly famous and inspiring letter from George Washington addressed to the Hebrew congregation in Newport will be on display in its original form and that you are choosing this letter as the theme of your luncheon discussion. I have often reflected on the grace and eloquence of that letter. It is, in my judgment, one of the great documents of the literature of liberty in America.

There is, for instance, the sentence in which the great Father of Our Country said of his fellow citizens: "All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship." The concept of immunities of citizenship was fixed into the 14th amendment to the Constitution where it is provided that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.

In recent years the Supreme Court has been giving renewed life to this language. It is well to remember that this sentence in the 14th amendment has a direct relationship to the reference made by our first President and that in America all citizens should have truly equal rights.

But there is little that I can add to the sermon of liberty and equality contained in George Washington's famous letter. It serves well as the theme of America itself.

I only wish that I could be with you on the occasion of your luncheon to see the original of this historic document.

I scarcely need add that I strongly support the Touro Synagogue restoration project.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

BATAAN DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it was 14 years ago, on April 9, that the American flag was hauled down in defeat and surrender on the mountain stronghold of Bataan in the Philippines. For long and bitter weeks and months, Filipino and American forces—most of them Filipino—had fought side by side in a gallant defense of this famed redoubt, the last but one where American authority remained in the Far East. The last was Corregidor. It seemed incredible to the world, as it was incredible to the Japanese attackers, that the defenders of Bataan should be able to maintain their defense, day after day and week after week, though plagued by

disease, short of ammunition, short of food, short of medicine—short of everything but raw courage.

But it is unnecessary, even today, 14 years later, to retell this great story. The world knows it. The American people remember it.

It was a saga of heroism. But, much more, it was an epic of Philippine-American devotion. Filipino troops fought just as hard, and just as heroically in defense of Bataan, as the Americans. And they were fighting for America.

Four years later, on July 4, 1946, the American flag was hauled down again from the flagstaffs of the Philippines, but this time not in surrender, but in victory. On that occasion we gave the Philippines their independence. That was a great day for America in the Far East. It was a great day for the cause of freedom and democracy. I am referring, of course, to the day when the United States turned over the sovereign control of these islands to the Filipino people.

The Filipino people have justified all the confidence we had in them. They have proved the validity of democracy. They have managed their most pressing economic problems. They have continued to repair the ravages of war and occupation. They have held three national elections. They have remained strictly faithful to the traditions of democracy.

They continue today to be the showcase for democracy in the Far East, reflecting the best lessons we taught them, in the highest traditions of government under law.

Their president, Mr. Ramon Magsaysay, is a great leader of men. But more than that, he is a great believer in, and practitioner of, democratic ways. He is not only a friend of America—he is a friend of the cause of freedom.

I am afraid that we are inclined too much to take the Philippines for granted. We eagerly court our former enemies, while we somewhat neglect our friends. I hope that our Government will give a more attentive ear than it has in the recent past to the needs and aspirations of the Filipino people.

One of the troublesome questions now being dealt with between the Philippine Republic and the United States is the question of title to certain military sites in the Philippines. It seems to me, although I do not know too much about it, that it ill behooves us to stand on fine legalisms in pressing our claims. Let us be more than generous with these faithful friends of ours. No base rights in a foreign country have any meaning except by the full consent and support of the people of the country concerned. It should be our object to continue to cultivate the support and friendship of the Filipino people. That is our chief asset and our chief source of strength in this area.

I am glad to salute the Philippines on the occasion of Bataan Day, and to urge that it be an occasion throughout America for reaffirmation of Philippine-American friendship.

NATURAL RESOURCES POLICIES OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the course of its comprehensive study of the state of our Nation's economy, based upon the economic report of the President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has taken a hard look at the natural resources policies of the present Republican administration. Eight members of this joint committee—the learned chairman, Senator DOUGLAS, the able vice chairman, Representative PATMAN, Senators SPARKMAN, FULBRIGHT, and O'MAHONEY, and Representatives BOLLING, MILLS, and KELLEY—submitted a supplemental report on a number of aspects of our economic situation. In expressing their concern over the administration's attitude toward resource development, these distinguished Members of Congress referred to flood control and conservation of water resources; timber and mining policy; reclamation policy and hydroelectric development.

They say, as I said in a recent speech in this body, that we should favor the building of the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the proposed TVA-type development of the River Jordan. But they continue:

> We wish the administration would show equal concern for domestic projects for water conservation, flood control, and power development. It seems to us utterly illogical to undermine our domestic programs while promoting such projects abroad.

And they correctly point out that this Republican administration's use of the slogans of "free enterprise" in the field of developing the resources of the Federal lands and rivers is only "a platform of inaction" and "a springboard for the parceling out of great resources to unbridled exploitation without regard to the national interest." They conclude:

> We do not believe that development or conservation of our natural resources would constitute "intrusion of government into private affairs." It was not so regarded in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Charles McNary, George Norris, and other distinguished Republicans.

Mr. President, the points made by these able members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report are well taken and important, and I ask unanimous consent that the section on natural resources of their supplemental report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT

(March 1, 1956)

NATURAL RESOURCES

The majority of this committee is deeply concerned with the administration's attitude toward development, utilization, and conservation of our great resources—human and material.

It is crucial that we make the most of the resources we now have, as the committee has observed in point 4. We must also develop those resources which are potentially ours, and expand and accelerate our development of new resources and substitutes for those we now use. The development and efficient utilization of our resources is the key to an expanding economy, to future stability, and to national strength.

Today, the United States has passed from a "have" to a "have not" nation in the matter of raw materials. We are running out of iron ore, copper, oil, lead, bauxite, and many other vital materials. The Paley Commission on Natural Resources reported that this Nation is critically short of 44 strategic and critical materials.

The need for effective flood control and water conservation programs was dramatically illustrated by the 1955 New England floods and this year's floods in California and Oregon. Property losses were more than $1 billion in New England and $100 million in California.

By 1975 the industrial and home demands for water will be doubled. Vast areas of California, Texas, the Middle West, and portions of the East face the limit of their industrial and urban growth unless new supplies of water are provided. In 15 years the problem will be acute. China, India, and Soviet Russia have undertaken mammoth flood control, conservation, irrigation, and hydroelectric programs, and are pushing them with all possible speed.

The United States, however, ranks third in per capita development of electric power, behind Canada and Norway, although it is the greatest industrial nation in the world.

The United States daily consumption of crude oil has risen from a wartime peak of 6.2 million barrels in 1945 to 8.7 million barrels this year. In 1955 we increased our oil imports 18 percent and as we place more automobiles and trucks, tractors, and other power equipment into service in the future the drain on our oil resources will continue to increase.

The United States has never met its timber requirements on a sustained yield basis.

In the face of our resource needs, we find:

Our stockpiling of critical and strategic minerals is being halved.[1]

The Paly Commission report was received, filed, and so far as we can determine, forgotten.

In spite of the enormous flood damages we have sustained, the administration proposes to spend only $20 million in New England next year, and a total of only $157 million for all flood-control projects in 1957.

The policy in relation to water resources is disastrously inadequate over the long term. Our policy now seems to be to pray for rain in the drought areas and to rebuild the damage and pray for drought in the flood-devastated regions of the country.

The Benson-McKay-Wilson committee report to the President on water-resources policy represents a retreat from Federal responsibility for the development and conservation of water resources. It would reverse policies which have been evolved through a series of Federal laws since 1906. The approach recommended in this report would split up the various water resource development programs, assign bits and pieces to a multiplicity of private groups and public agencies, and would inevitably result in less flood control, less navigation, less power development. It would establish a basis for challenging the Federal Government's rights with respect to water resources projects. It would junk completely the river basin development concept which experts agree is the only sound and economical approach to water problems.

There is no program to meet the need for a rapidly expanding supply of water for industrial and residential uses.

Reclamation projects have been sorely restricted, the Tennessee Valley Authority given the shock treatment, and great public reclamation projects reduced or consigned to private interests.

In regard to synthetic fuels to supplement our dwindling supply of petroleum, the administration closed out the Louisiana, Mo., plant experiment for production of oil from

[1] Budget Message of the President, p. M30.

coal, and the Rifle, Colo., plant experiment for production of oil from shale. Both of these experiments offered great promise, and in the case of shale production the cost of producing a gallon of oil had been brought to within a fraction of the cost of producing regular petroleuem.

Secretary McKay stated that added demands are being created for the development and use of public lands and their resources. He said:

"Individuals and corporations want to use and acquire public lands for grazing, logging, mining, farming, industry, commerce, residence, recreation, and other purposes." [2]

Other congressional committees have concerned themselves with the rapacious scalping of our timberlands under mineral leases granted by this administration. We regard such acts as indefensible. We have hitherto suggested that the Government could give impetus to its soil-bank program by withdrawing these lands from exploitation. There is no apparent concert of programs between the Departments of Agriculture and Interior for land and timber use. The present policy is apparently to turn over vast resources of timber for private logging operations.

The majority members of this committee have supported foreign-aid programs. We believe this is a sound investment in national security. We approve the building of the Aswan Dam on the Nile in Egypt at a cost of $1.3 billion, and the proposed TVA development of the River Jordan. We wish the administration would show equal concern for domestic projects for water conservation, flood control, and power development. It seems to us utterly illogical to undermine our domestic programs while promoting such projects abroad. Sound policy calls for progress in both fields.

The Economic Report states that:

"Today, we believe as strongly in economic progress through free and competitive enterprise as our fathers did, and we resent as they did any unnecessary intrusion of Government into private affairs." [3]

Secretary McKay also stressed the Government's "partnership policy" in the development and use of resources. We believe in free and competitive enterprise as strongly as the administration. But we fear that the first statement is something of a platform of inaction; the second a springboard for the parceling out of great resources to unbridled exploitation without regard to the national interest. We do not believe that development or conservation of our national resources would constitute "intrusion of Government into private affairs." It was not so regarded in the time of Theodore Roosevelt, Gifford Pinchot, Charles McNary, George Norris, and other distinguished Republicans. It is apparent that this administration has undertaken, under a variety of slogans, a negation of the historical and continuing resources policy that began with Alexander Hamilton.

TARIFFS ON JEWELED WATCHES AND JEWELED WATCH MOVEMENTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of tariffs on jeweled watches and jeweled watch movements; a letter written by Paul F. Mickey, vice president, American Watch Manufacturers Association, Inc., to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and published in the March 18, 1956, issue of that newspaper; and a letter written by Daniel J. Edwards to the editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and published in the March 30, 1956, issue of that newspaper. The letters are in answer to the arguments made by the Swiss spokesman in the Washington Post and Times Herald article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CURTIS

Constant complaints are heard from the Swiss that American tariffs on jeweled watches and jeweled watch movements are crippling what is a basic industry in their country. No one doubts that the Swiss have every reason to be concerned for their watch industry. After all, the British, French and Germans, to protect their own jeweled watch industry have imposed high tariffs and quotas on Swiss watches. In addition, these countries provide substantial subsidies for their domestic manufacturers of watches and clocks. Moreover, the Russians, long heavy purchasers of Swiss watches, are now making their own watches and clocks.

There is a very good reason for all this. The British, French, Germans, and Russians have learned at great cost, particularly the British and French, that no nation can depend on another nation for the production of timing devices and that the jeweled watch industry is the basic element in the manufacture of timing devices. The jeweled watch industry is the industry that provides the solid core of scientists, engineers, metallurgists and draftsmen needed to develop the methods and machinery needed for the mass production of timing devices in time of war.

As a result of their failure to sell watches to other countries, the Swiss have been engaged in what amounts to a dumping operation in the American jeweled watch market. Recently, a leading spokesman for their watch industry complained in an article in the Washington Post and Times Herald that when President Eisenhower ordered an increase in the tariff on jeweled watches, the Swiss were able to send so few watches here that their economy was seriously damaged.

Was this the fact? Certainly not. Let me quote the Wall Street Journal:

"In 1953, the Swiss shipped an unprecedented 13.5 million watches and movements to the U. S. The first half of 1954 made it clear this unusual pace could not be sustained by demand. The tariff hike became effective in August of that year and got most of the public blame when the 1954 total fell to 10.2 million. But in the past year the Swiss proved able to shove their stateside sales up again to 10.9 million."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 18, 1956]

SWITZERLAND SPEAKS

American watch manufacturers would indeed be gratified if they could obtain as much space, paid or otherwise, in Swiss newspapers to explain their side of the tariff story as the Washington Post and Times Herald made available to the Swiss to explain theirs in the March 11 supplement on Switzerland. This gratification would be compounded if the space were made available in Bern at a time when the Swiss Legislature is in session, in which case our story would have an impact comparable to the impact the Swiss story as told in the Post must have had on Senators, Representatives, members of the White House staff, other Government officials, and national opinion leaders.

That the free exchange of ideas is just as important as the free exchange of goods is indisputable. Yet, it seems that the Swiss believe in neither in spite of their protestations to the contrary.

When President Eisenhower ruled that the tarriff on jeweled watches should be raised, American watchmakers were well aware that the Swiss people might regard this as a discriminatory act. To forestall such misunderstanding an effort was made to place in Swiss newspapers paid advertisements explaining the American view that a sound horological industry is an essential part of any nation's defense production base. The Swiss rejected that advertising and it is difficult to reconcile such action with their claim that Swiss ideals and practices of freedom are like our own.

The Swiss know full well that no nation can afford to be dependent on another nation for its time-keeping equipment and timing devices. England learned this truth too late, with the result that after World War II it was forced to expend a great deal of money, time, and talent reviving the jeweled watch industry it let be swept away by foreign competition between World War I and World War II.

In this connection, it is worth noting that Communist Party boss Nikita Khrushchev told the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. that Russia planned to increase its production of timepieces from the present level of 19.5 million to 33.6 million by 1960.

It is also difficult to reconcile Swiss assertions that they are exponents of free international trade. In his article on Swiss watches and tariffs, G. Ketterer, vice president of the Swiss Federation of Watch Manufacturers Association, writes of the "revival of protectionism in America." For a Swiss to characterize as protectionism the modest efforts which our Government has made to keep alive a small, essential industry is particularly ridiculous since the Swiss themselves have long practiced the most rigid sort of protectionism.

For example, Mr. Ketterer refers to Switzerland as a low tariff country, while Swiss tariffs are on an average 60 percent higher than American tariffs. In addition, the Swiss make extensive use of quotas while the restrictive practices of their watch cartel make the worst of our American monopolists look like amateurs.

It is this cartel, incidentally, that levies a tax of approximately 12 cents on every watch or watch movement manufactured in Switzerland. This fund is used to further Swiss efforts to monopolize the world market for watches, and it is estimated that it amounted to approximately $2.5 million last year.

Mr. Ketterer was certainly evading the facts when he failed to mention that the Swiss now have about 80 percent of the market for jeweled watches in the United States. American jeweled watchmakers have no desire to force the Swiss to give up any substantial part of this market. They want only to be able to sell enough watches in this country to keep production at levels which will insure the adequate use of skilled workers and machinery.

This cannot be considered an unreasonable demand when one considers that the reason the Swiss captured so large a part of the American market was that American manufacturers gave up making jeweled watches during World War II so that they could devote their entire facilities to defense production.

In his article, Mr. Ketterer refers to the American watch industry as a "rival." This Mr. Ketterer must know is patently absurd. The Swiss cartel dominates world trade in jeweled watches. This dominance would be even greater had not England and France found it necessary to increase their tariffs on jeweled watches and impose import quotas. And it will obtain a complete monopoly of the United States' market unless our

[2] Hearings, p. 544.

[3] January 1956 Economic Report of the President, p. 10.

Government continues to keep a watchful eye on the small American industry.

PAUL F. MICKEY,
Vice President, American Watch Manufacturers Association, Inc.
WASHINGTON.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 30, 1956]

SWITZERLAND SPEAKS

When the section on Switzerland was published a couple of weeks ago, I felt that there would be many letters protesting Mr. Ketterer's use of statistics. Not only has no one protested as yet, but not even Mr. Mickey brought this to our attention in his letter.

The questions I have are, first, why did Mr. Ketterer use an absolute reduction in numbers for the entire year without stating from what base this decrease took place? Second, why did he use a percentage figure for only a 6 months period? Was there an increase in imports for the last 6 months? This use of statistics is not consistent and may be misleading.

Then, the following appeared in the Wall Street Journal of the 21st:

"In 1953, the Swiss shipped an unprecedented 13.5 million watches and movements to the United States. The first half of 1954 made it clear this unusual pace could not be sustained by demand. The tariff hike became effective in August of that year and got most of the public blame when the 1954 total fell to 10.2 million. But in the past year the Swiss proved able to shove their stateside sales up again to 10.9 million. This resurgence plus expanding markets in such places as Spain and India have left the Swiss watchmakers today with a solid order backlog and a labor shortage."

There appears to be an inconsistency in somebody's statistics. Can Mr. Ketterer clarify this apparent discrepancy? Are his statistics like his country's famous cheese?

DANIEL J. EDWARDS.

GREENBELT, MD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 31 An act for the relief of Shih Ming Wang;

S. 83. An act for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt; and

S. 1255. An act for the relief or Brigitta Poberetski.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. BERRY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 842. An act granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes;

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Nathan Phillips;

H. R. 1476. An act for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2005. An act to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces;

H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 4851. An act for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc.;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 5813. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes and Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 6313. An act for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes;

H. R. 7611. An act to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander;

H. R. 7646. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation;

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.;

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.";

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.;

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement;

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project;

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provision of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever;

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; and

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 842. An act granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 909. An act for the relief of Charles O. Ferry and other employees of the Alaska Road Commission;

H. R. 1096. An act for the relief of Nathan Phillips;

H. R. 1476. An act for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

H. R. 1484. An act for the relief of Garrett Norman Soulen and Michael Harvey Soulen;

H. R. 2524. An act for the relief of Oather S. Hall;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 4851. An act for the relief of the Kelmoor Fox and Fur Farm, Inc.;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5382. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 5453. An act for the relief of the estate of Robert Bradford Bickerstaff;

H. R. 5813. An act for the relief of W. R. Zanes & Company of Louisiana, Inc.;

H. R. 6313. An act for the relief of Vincent N. Caldes;

H. J. Res. 580. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 581. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 590. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 591. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 592. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2005. An act to further amend the provisions of the acts authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of persons in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 5478. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; and

H. R. 9132. An act to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7611. An act to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander;

H. R. 7646. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation;

H. R. 8477. An act to amend title II of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, by providing flexibility in the distribution of women officers in the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8904. An act to amend certain laws relating to the grade of certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps upon retirement; and

H. R. 9838. An act to authorize transfer of officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve to the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7913. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to effect the exchange of properties between the United States and the city of Cape Girardeau, Mo.; and

H. R. 8634. An act to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in North Carolina to the city of Charlotte, N. C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7952. An act to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers; and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8547. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Ogdensburg Bridge Authority, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near the city of Ogdensburg, N. Y."; and

H. R. 8807. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-8039686, Bartoi, Dimitri.
A-7828332, Blicher, Adolf.
A-7948074, Blicher, Anna.
A-7945613, Crynberg, Natalia.
A-6848437, Chen, Tung-Kei, now Phillip Kei Chen.
A-6973683, Chow, Liang-Yen.
A-8021361, Chu, Pauline Jo-Nan Chou.
A-7095539, Emmus, Roland.
A-7095540, Emmus, Leida Maria.
A-6881711, Hai-Chow, Lee.
A-6779249, Hnykova, Maria Irena.
A-6962958, Hsu, Carlton W.
A-7395104, Iliescu, Maria, formerly Negoita (nee David).
A-6903727, Irany, Fuad Jalil Zend.
A-7138237, Kao, Lindberg Lin Pai.
A-6159692, Korbel, Josef.
A-6159691, Korbel, Anna.
A-7197504, Korbel, Marie Jana.
A-7197503, Korbel, Anna Catherine.
A-7197505, Korbel, Jan Josef.
A-6837688, Kroha, Rudolph Filip.
1300-127922, Lee, Hai.
T-2659454, Mah, Ling Kam.
A-7061846, Onon, Peter, alias Urunoge, Urrounge, or Urgunge Onon.
A-7415227, Onon, Nina (nee Pei-Lien Chen or Lien-Chen Pei), alias Lien-Chin Onon, Narangerel Onon, or Lien-Chen Urrounge.
A-7415228, Onon, Sally, alias Salungwa or Salunga Onon.
A-7779057, Pan, Ju Chu.
A-7809055, Patyk, Jozef, also known as Jozef Franciszek Patyk.
A-8001814, Patyk, Julia (nee Julia Katarzyna Assman).
A-8001815, Patyk, Barbara, also known as Barbara Kazimiera Patyk.
A-6967335, Pe-Sheng, Wang.
A-7858205, Radolli, Constantino.
A-6992030, Siu-Lung, Li or Sister Mary Sira.
A-8082043, Sun, Flora H., also known as Hu Ling Feng.
A-6949479, Sutt, Michael or Mihkel.
A-8952903, Teng, Yung Ching Wang.
A-9690989, Tong, Chu or Sun Fong.
A-9568320, Tsu, Teh Kwei.
A-6967742, Chen, Mei Chio.
A-6881784, Chu, Hu-Nan or Chu Hu-nan.
A-6334725, Donat, Alexander, also known as Mojzesz Grunberg.
A-6334726, Donat, Leona, also known as Laja Grunberg (nee Liberman).
A-6334727, Donat, William, also known as Wlodjimierz Grunberg.
A-6381287, Hou, Ling.
A-9734422, Kow, Lai or Lai Gow.
A-7463421, Valvur, Ludvig.
A-7124540, Vcela, Vladimir.
A-6730656, Verhovsky, Andrew.
A-9554376, Wong, Sau or Shau Wong or Wong Sau.
A-7354808, Wu Wayne, also known as Wai-Ye Wu.
$300-399163, Yip, Kin.
A-9542540, Youw, Lee Ah.
A-6848713, Yu, Ting Chi, also known as Richard Ting Chi Yu.
A-8082029, Zez, John, formerly Ivan Sime Zec.
A-9510296, Bacanovic, Jovo.
A-6923147, Balogh, Barna.
A-6702207, Liu, Lillian Hsuan Yu.
A-7985663, Moh, Tan Yoek, also known as Moh Yeak Tan or Tan Yoeh Heh.
A-6944241, Wu, Tien-Hsing or Edward Tien-Hsing Wu.
A-8082839, Tung, Chen Tse.
A-6912324, Wang, Ven Ling, also known as Raymond Wang.
A-7249877, Berzins, Arvids Voldemars.
0300-390570, Chan, Kan Cheong.
A-6848411, Chiu, Jeanne also known as Chiu Kung-Chen.
A-7863017, Klavins, Arvids Leonids.
0300-425608, Kwai, Chan or Chenk Kay.
V-606154, Lee, Ling Yun.
A-7863009, Pukulis, Andrejs.
A-5928452, Shee, Lai.
A-5963617, Yen, Pao-Ming.
0300-83904, Yeu, Cheng Cho or Cheng Yeu.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 11, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, there are several committee amendments. Under the unanimous consent agreement, debate on any amendment is limited to 1 hour; and the time on each committee amendment is to be controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and by the majority leader or the minority leader. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct. There are about a half dozen committee amendments to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, debate on the resolution itself is limited to 2 hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There are several committee amendments which are to be acted on first. If any Senator desires time, time can be yielded on an amendment; and the unanimous-consent agreement provides also for 1 hour to each side on the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution and have filed minority views. I should like to have some time allotted to me so that I may speak in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator can be yielded time by either the majority leader or the minority leader. Does the Senator wish to have time yielded to him?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to speak for about 5 minutes a little later in the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, would the Senator from Georgia be agreeable to speaking in opposition to a committee amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to make a brief statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may the clerk state the first committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, 21, after "report", it is proposed to strike out "public."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have such high regard for the ability and the patriotism of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is the principal sponsor of the concurrent resolution, that ordinarily I am reluctant to differ with him on legislative matters. But in the case of the pending concurrent resolution, I can but believe that the efforts of the Senator from Montana are based upon a mistake of fact and a misapprehension of the functions of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I was unable to be on the floor Monday when the debate occurred on the concurrent resolution, but I have read in the RECORD all that occurred, and I do not find that there was advanced one substantial argument, predicated on established facts which would justify the Senate in adopting the concurrent resolution.

Some Senators who addressed themselves to the resolution on Monday last seemed to hold the opinion that the CIA was a policymaking agency. That theme ran all through the remarks which were made in advocacy of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. President, the Central Intelligence Agency is far from being a policymaking agency. It makes no policy. It was established to coordinate all the activities of the various agencies of the Government which gather intelligence vital to our national security, to coordinate the intelligence thus obtained, to gather intelligence on its own initiative, appraise it, and present it to a policymaking body, one that is seldom heard of, but which is probably the most important policymaking body in our Government, namely, the National Security Council.

Mr. President, the argument was made that the failure to apprise Members of Congress of the detailed activities of the Central Intelligence Agency was an invasion of the prerogatives of the Congress. I will lay my record in this body, in defense of the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States under the Constitution, against the record of any other Senator who serves here today or who has served during my tenure of office. I have jealously sought to guard every prerogative of the Congress. I complained when I thought those prerogatives were being taken over by the executive branch of the Government, when the President of the United States was a member of my own party, as I have when the President was a member of the Republican Party. I have complained about the invasion of the prerogatives of Congress by the judicial branch of the Government.

But, Mr. President, we go very far afield when we undertake to predicate a resolution of this nature on the right of individual Members of the Congress to know all the details of all the agencies of Government that are working in secrecy in an effort to secure information which would warn us, for instance, of a sneak act which might destroy us, or which would advise us as to the potential strength of the enemies who are arrayed against us.

There have been intelligence agencies in the Army since the beginning of our Government. There have been intelligence agencies in the Navy since the Navy was established. The Air Force has had its intelligence agency since the Department of the Air Force was created. To my knowledge, not once has a Member of Congress risen on the floor and said he was being denied his prerogatives because he was not informed as to all the activities of all the agencies which were seeking to gather vital security information. Now the situation has allegedly changed because, forsooth, the three departments have been coordinated into one. In addition, there has been brought into the picture the OSS, which did invaluable service behind enemy lines in World War II.

I shall not accept that argument. I do not believe we should announce a principle of that nature. I am proud of the Senate of the United States, but I must say that early in my service I became disillusioned on finding that information classified as secret which was given in committees in executive session, within a couple of days had trickled to the press of the Nation. That has been my one disillusionment with the Senate of the United States, and, indeed, with both bodies of the Congress.

I say here today that, in my judgment, it would be more desirable to abolish the CIA and close it up, lock, stock, and barrel, than to adopt any such theory as that all the Members of the Congress of the United States are entitled to know the details of all the activities of this farflung organization.

Mr. President, it was stated in the debate, which I read in the RECORD, that the Central Intelligence Agency does not present to the Congress a detailed budget estimate of all its expenditures. That statement is true. It does not present to the Congress an estimate such as comes from the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department, the Treasury Department, and other departments of government, because to do so would be to give the Soviet Union a blueprint whereby it might readily run down and ascertain the activities and the identity of every person who is risking his life today in an effort to secure information which can be vital to the future of the United States.

I say, and I say it in the full conviction of the correctness of the statement, that one bit of information which has been used on 2 or 3 occasions is well worth the total cost of the administration of all our security agencies. They undoubtedly waste some money. They make mistakes. They have not been able to penetrate behind the Iron Curtain and gather the last detail as to the strength of the Russian forces. Other agencies, such as the British intelligence, which was in existence long before our agency was, have likewise failed. That is certainly no reason for circumscribing the Central Intelligence Agency's efforts and hampering it at the very top, when the program is developing and bringing to us information which is of vital value.

There has been talk about the amount of money involved. I shall not state what it is, but I will state it is a very, very small percentage of the amount of tax money spent each year by the Armed Forces for research and development of new weapons. Certainly, we should not complain about a portion of the amount of money spent for research and development being expended in an effort to keep up with the activities of those arrayed against us in that field. I say no person would risk his life in carrying on this work if every Member

of the Congress and the large staff of a new committee were in a position to know where that person was every day and to know the nature of the work in which he was engaged.

I was interested to learn that the distinguished author of the resolution said it was contemplated that the committee would have only a small staff. Every Senator present has had experience in that field. It is next to impossible, when a committee is created, to keep the staff down to the size intended originally. Every Senator knows of occasions when a committee has started with a small staff, with the assurance that it would be kept small, and in 2 or 3 years it has been extended all over the Capitol. Most of us are, instinctively, empire builders. We build in our own little field whenever we have authority to do so. It would not be long before the staff of the proposed committee would be large.

The point has been raised that there is not any committee supervision over the Agency. The Committee on Armed Services, and its predecessor committees, have, since the inception of the Congress, had jurisdiction over intelligence activities of the various branches of the service. During World War II that committee had supervision over the activities of the OSS. Therefore, it was but natural that the Armed Services Committee would be considered the parent committee of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I hope I have not been derelict in my duty in reference to this very important Agency. I appointed the subcommittee, having jurisdiction over it, which I am confident is composed of as able men as any who sit in this body. The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is vigorously opposed to the resolution, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], are members of that subcommittee.

On at least 2 occasions in each year, and more often on 3, we have had before us the head of the Central Intelligence Agency and his staff. We have never had them fail to respond to a single question we have asked them. They have been forthright and frank.

On the floor of the Senate the statement has been made, in effect, that we have not told all the country about what we have learned from the Central Intelligence Agency; and one Senator said the country was entitled to know. No, Mr. President; we have not told the country, and I do not propose to tell the country in the future, because if there is anything in the United States which should be held sacred behind the curtain of classified matter, it is information regarding the activities of this Agency. I repeat that it would be better to abolish it out of hand than it would be to adopt a theory that such information should be spread and made available to every Member of Congress and to the members of the staff of any committee. Rather than do that, it would be better to abolish the Central Intelligence Agency and, by so doing, to save the money appropriated and the lives of American citizens.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; if I have the time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the time limited?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wished to make an observation and to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Georgia and I have had some mutual experiences along this line. He was a member of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, which was the predecessor of the present Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. At all times since its creation, he has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; and I have shared that experience with him, to my very great benefit. So I am intrigued and interested and very much moved by the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Having served, myself, on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and understanding that an attempt has been made by some Members, on the floor of the Senate, to draw an analogy between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I believe he is utterly correct in what he has said. There is no real parallel between the problems confronting the two groups. The work of the Central Intelligence Agency is vastly different from that of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, even though probably it is not more vital and requires no greater secrecy than some of the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in its dealings with the atomic energy program.

But I myself cannot adopt the philosophy that because we have a Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and because its operations are secret, the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to deal with the Central Intelligence Agency, is justified.

So I commend the Senator from Georgia on his very powerful and forceful argument along this line.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa for bringing out that point, which I had overlooked thus far in my discussion. The point he has mentioned has been raised.

I started serving with the Senator from Iowa on what was first the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, when it was created.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, both of us were on that special committee, which was created to write the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Since that time I have served—with great profit to myself—with the Senator from Iowa on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have also served on the Committee on Naval Affairs, a predecessor of the present Armed Services Committee, since I have been a Member of this body. I state on my responsibility as a Senator that there is no comparison whatever between the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency or the contemplated activities of the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They operate in two different fields. Although secrecy is involved in both, the methods of operation and of accomplishment of the two groups are entirely different.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. For example, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has the duty of maintaining surveillance on a very large and important construction program, under which certain production is had. In that work, thousands of persons, including scientists, are employed, and a large part of that work is devoted to seeing to it that the production program and the construction program of the Atomic Energy Commission are maintained. But nothing whatever of that nature pertains to the secret intelligence work of such a group as the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has placed his finger on one of the most important differences between the two agencies. There are other differences, of course, but I shall not attempt to discuss them at this time. Suffice it to say that the operations of the two groups are fundamentally and basically different, and it is inherent in the operation of the CIA that it be given certain broad powers and authority, subject, in my judgment, to the major supervision of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Of course, the National Security Council has direct supervision over it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. But I wish to reiterate that although Mr. Allen W. Dulles has been before us and although we have asked him very searching questions about some activities which it almost chills the marrow of a man to hear about, he has never failed to answer us forthrightly and frankly in response to any question we have asked him. I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been present at practically every one of those meetings during the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask only one other question, and then I shall conclude.

As the Senator from Georgia well knows, before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we have had Mr. Allen Dulles and his top assistants, in connection with the various categories of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. They have appeared before our committee in connection with matters applicable to our responsibility in the atomic energy field. I also wish to testify, following the statement of the Senator from Georgia, that at no time has Mr. Dulles or any of those under him who are knowledgeable regarding so broad a subject, failed to give us full, complete, and frank answers to our questions regarding the matters which come within our responsibility. Let me say that we,

as a committee, do not attempt to trespass upon the responsibility of other committees in other areas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; Mr. President; that has been the experience of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for the very powerful argument he has made in regard to the differences between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

As the Senator from Georgia well knows, among the other differences is the fact that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created by statute and was given legislative power, as a legislative committee. Matters relating to the Atomic Energy Act go to that committee.

Second, I refer to a fact which must be brought home in this connection: I know that the President of the United States and others in the executive branch of the Government have very grave misgivings regarding the pending concurrent resolution, not only for the reason that the lives of Americans who may be seeking to obtain information which we need for the very defense of our country may be involved, but also because we have cooperative arrangements with other agencies and perhaps with friendly countries, and the slightest leakage of information regarding perhaps just one field of activity might result in the disclosure of all the agents who had been operating there, and might mean their death by hanging or execution in the matter of a few days' time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course they would be liquidated immediately.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell on all of the many differences between the CIA and the Atomic Energy Commission. Instead, I shall point out only one or two.

In the first place, the principal operations of the Atomic Energy Commission are within the United States, whereas most of the operations of the CIA are outside the United States. The Atomic Energy Commission is primarily concerned with preserving security. On the other hand, the CIA is primarily concerned with breaking security and obtaining secrets. There is a great deal of difference between the two groups, when we consider that fundamental of their activities.

I feel very deeply that it would be a serious mistake to approve the concurrent resolution.

The Committee on Appropriations is headed by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency come before the Committee on Appropriations each year. I have been present on 2 or 3 occasions when the committee was hearing the request of the CIA for funds with which to operate. The representatives of that Agency have never failed to answer a question which was asked on any of the occasions when I was present, as to the operations and the use of the money which had been appropriated for the Agency.

Great stress has been laid on the fact that the law does not limit the expenditures for individual personnel, as made by the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I can say here—and I do not think it involves any violation of secrecy—that that question has arisen repeatedly, both in the Appropriations Committee and before the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, when the Director of the CIA appeared before the subcommittee. With the exception of the Director and his assistant, whose salaries are fixed by statute, all the other employees are paid according to civil service scales.

It has been exceedingly difficult to obtain the character of men needed to carry on this work. The CIA cannot send a mere plodder or dullard, however earnest he may be, to do some of the work which is necessary to be done. With the exception of the Director and his assistant, whose salaries are fixed by statute, the agency pays only civil service scales.

Mr. President, I can think of no sound reason which would justify approval of this concurrent resolution. I think it would be just as appropriate to establish a joint committee to deal with foreign policy—or perhaps even more appropriate—as it would be to establish a joint committee to deal with the Central Intelligence Agency.

I shall endeavor, to the best of my ability, to keep in touch with what the CIA is doing. I do not mean to say by that that I intend to undertake to find out whether or not we have an agent in some foreign country—perhaps a satellite—who is tapping the telephone of some foreign embassy, or anything of that nature. However, I shall undertake to exercise as close supervision over this Agency as is ordinarily exercised by the parent committees of the Congress in dealing with the agencies which are responsible to them.

I doubt very much whether the heads of many of the independent agencies have spent more time with the committees to which they are supposed to report, over the course of the average year, than Mr. Dulles, as Director, has spent before my committee.

This is a grave question, and one which should not be considered from the standpoint of politics. It should be considered only from the standpoint of the national interest. In my judgment, the national interest does not require that we create a new joint committee, with a new staff. To do so would result only in increasing the hazards to the lives of those who work for the CIA, and dry up sources of information which are vital to the national security.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree with me that the CIA is essentially a service agency? It is not a policymaking body in any way, as is the Atomic Energy Commission, to which reference has been made. The differences between the two have been pointed out. The CIA is a service agency. The Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, does not make policy. He does not judge conditions. He merely reports to the National Security Council, which is directly under the President, who is the Director's boss.

Mr. RUSSELL. As I undertook to state at the outset of my remarks, I was somewhat dumbfounded to note that the argument had been made that the CIA was a policymaking agency. I think it is far from that. The best analogy I can draw is this: When the National Security Council meets—and there is present in the Chamber at this moment the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a former Vice President of the United States, who sat with that Council through some of the very trying hours in the life of this Republic—it has two primary advisers. The first is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Military Establishment, to advise as to the military situation. The second is the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who gives the National Security Council the results of the efforts of his Agency in relation to the intelligence it has been able to assemble concerning the problem at hand. He is an adviser. He is not even a member of the National Security Council, and by no stretch of the imagination can the CIA be considered a policymaking agency.

In the course of the debate on Monday, which I have read, a number of extraneous questions were brought up. Among other things, it was stated that there had been some secrecy in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract. That was unfortunate. I deplore it, but I hope Members of the Senate will not lay at the feet of the CIA responsibility for any secrecy which may have obtained with respect to a telephone call from someone at the White House regarding the Dixon-Yates contract.

Some question was raised with respect to the signing by the Chief Executive of executive agreements concerning which Congress had no knowledge. I feel as deeply on that subject as do most other Members of the Senate. Perhaps I do not feel quite so deeply about it as does the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], but I have followed him in his efforts to see that such executive agreements were not made. However, we cannot attribute to the CIA responsibility for the fact that executive agreements were made. The CIA has no power even to negotiate executive agreements.

Other arguments were made. Something was said about the impounding of Marine Corps funds. That has no relation whatever to the functions of the CIA, or the desirability of our doing all we can, while still performing our functions as a legislative body, to see that the lives of those who work for this agency are not endangered by any haphazard administration by the large staff of a joint committee, which, in my opinion, would be a very cumbersome fifth wheel.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the acting minority leader have charge of the time in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, the Senator from Montana is in favor of the concurrent resolution, so he would take time on the affirmative side.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are pending 2 or 3 committee amendments, on 1 of which I believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] took time to discuss the concurrent resolution itself. Has any limitation of debate been imposed up to this time with respect to amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the answer is that an hour is allowed on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side, and 2 hours on the concurrent resolution itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am willing to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana. Has the first committee amendment been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has time been consumed on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is now running on that amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has all time been used on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The opposition time is exhausted. Thirty minutes remain on the affirmative side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader controls the time on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. HAYDEN], so he controls only the time in favor of the amendment. Is the Senator from Montana opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not opposed to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the acting minority leader yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield time to the Senator from Montana. I respectfully suggest to the majority leader that I do not think there is any objection to the committee amendments. It seems to me that the Senate could agree to the committee amendments, and then proceed to debate the concurrent resolution itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will permit me to do so, we will charge the time the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has used to the time of the opposition, and I will then yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would it be possible at this time to vote on all the amendments en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent it could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the concurrent resolution itself. I do not know how much time I may want to use, but I do not wish to deprive myself of addressing the Senate on the resolution. If I agreed to the adoption of all the amendments en bloc, that would leave time only on the measure itself, as I understand. May I inquire how I may obtain some time to speak on the resolution, and when I may have that time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Kentucky may have as much time as he wishes to use, if he will indicate to me when he desires to speak, and how much time he may want.

Mr. BARKLEY. I told the Senator from Arizona that I would like not less than 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire to use that time now?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from Kentucky that he will have 10 minutes, and 10 additional minutes if he should desire them.

As this time I do not agree to the adoption of the amendments en bloc. I have yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana. After the Senator from Montana has concluded his remarks, I am prepared to yield time to other Senators. I am now yielding 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not believe I desire to take 10 minutes at this time, because I am beginning to feel a little like David facing Goliath, although I fear the results will not be the same. Inasmuch as I am to be the only one who will speak in favor of the resolution, I do not wish to be squeezed in this early. Therefore, if the majority leader does not mind, I shall wait until the distinguished former Vice President, the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and other Senators, have an opportunity to speak. Then I should like to make some remarks in favor of the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Montana will have ample time to speak. Does he yield back the time I yielded him?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does any other Senator desire time to speak in favor of the committee amendment?

If no other Senator desires time at this time, I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield time to the Senator from Kentucky, if he desires to speak now. Does the Senator from Kentucky desire that I yield him some time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that I shall need 15 minutes. I am very deeply concerned about the resolution. If it were a bill or a joint resolution, instead of a concurrent resolution, I feel very definitely that the President of the United States would have no alternative except to veto it. I sincerely regret to say that I am compelled to disagree with my good friend from Montana about the wisdom of the resolution.

We have before us a concurrent resolution which proposes to set up a committee of 12 members, with a staff. It would cost $250,000 a year. I would not object to that sum of money being appropriated, if the proposed joint committee were needed. In my judgment it is not only not needed, but it would be very unwise on the part of Congress to establish it.

The concurrent resolution would authorize the joint committee to summon members of the Central Intelligence Agency. It would authorize the joint committee to summon all the papers and documents of the Central Intelligence Agency, and to obtain from that Agency all the information the joint committee desired to obtain, which information, of course, would then be public.

I ask my colleagues if the desire to make public, for the benefit of the American people, all the confidential information the CIA obtains all over the world is sufficient reason to justify the danger, to which we would subject ourselves and which we would assume by the creation of such a committee and taking the chances on its operations.

As the Senate knows, Congress enacted a law creating the Central Intelligence Agency. That Agency is a confidential body. It is an arm of the President of the United States for obtaining, not only in the United States, but all over the world, information which is of advantage to him in the protection of the interests and rights of the American people. Being an arm of the President, it is therefore an arm of the National Security Council.

CIA is the information-gathering agency of the National Security Council. The duty of the CIA is to gather from all sources and to lay before the President and the National Security Council information of the most intimate and confidential nature, which will enable the President and the National Security Council to act to protect the security of our own country, without making public the information which this Agency has gathered from all parts of the world.

I sat on the National Security Council for 4 years as Vice President of the United States. The present Vice President has sat on it since his induction into office, on the 20th day of January 1953. Some of the information gathered by the Central Intelligence Agency and laid before the National Security Council itself was so confidential and secret that the very portfolios in which it was contained were under lock and key. The members of the National Security

Council were not even permitted to take those folders and portfolios to their homes. They had to be unlocked in the presence of other members.

One of the distinguished heads of that Agency for 2 or 3 years was Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, the famous soldier and diplomat. During the time when he was the head of the Agency he sat in the National Security Council. The information I received as a member of the National Security Council, in my capacity as Vice President, was so confidential that I would lose my right arm before I would divulge it to anyone, even to members of my own family.

To say that now we should establish a joint committee to pry into and look into secret documents, to submit them before the joint committee, and to make them public seems to me incredible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would appreciate very much the Senator's views on what a staff member of such a committee could do. It seems to me that a staff member could do nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the staff members, whoever they might be, would be under the direction of the joint committee, and perhaps under the chairman of the joint committee, whoever he might be. According to the custom of committees, whether joint or single, the staff members would probably be authorized by the joint committee, if not directed, to invade the precincts of the National Security Council and obtain confidential information for the benefit of the joint committee, preparatory to a public hearing, to which they would have the right to summon members of the Security Council, and for which they would have the right to subpena documents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In that capacity I have received information upon many occasions which I would regard as just as confidential, just as delicate, just as sensitive, as is the information to which the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky has referred. It is difficult for me to draw the line of distinction. How is it that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy can deal with the topmost secrets of the Government and establish a responsible record in doing so, a record both in the retention and safeguarding of secrets given in executive session, and also in the conduct of public hearings, when some other committee could not establish a similarly satisfactory record?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Iowa a moment ago discussed the fundamental difference between the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the proposed Joint Committee on the CIA. The Senator from Tennessee may not have been present at the time the discussion took place, and I should be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia if he wishes to repeat what was said, because I am not a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, a member of the Armed Services Committee, or a member of the Appropriations Committee. Both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee receive information from the CIA and also from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I should prefer that the Senator from Georgia answer the question of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I stated that I was on the original Atomic Energy Committee of the Senate which wrote the legislation creating the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and I have served on that committee, although not so actively as has the Senator from Tennessee, during the past few years. I was on one of the original committees which was superseded by the Committee on Armed Services, and I had been on the Naval Affairs Committee ever since I became a Member of the Senate.

In my opinion, there is no comparison whatever between the activities of the two committees. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is supposed more or less to be a policy-developing agency which deals with tremendous programs of construction and production. Its primary function is to undertake to preserve secrecy within the United States. On the other hand, the CIA, which is a consolidation of the intelligence agencies which existed heretofore, functions outside the United States, and its principal endeavor is to break secrecy and to obtain secrets.

There is a great deal of difference between undertaking to preserve secrets as to what occurs in one of the great plants of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the case of Joe Jones who may be endeavoring to obtain secrets in one of the satellite countries, and who, if his activities were disclosed, would be liquidated immediately.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. A little more than an hour from now a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is scheduled to meet in executive session. One of the great military figures of our country is scheduled to testify before it. He is called to testify on one of the most sensitive and delicate matters of national policy. He is to discuss stockpiling and stockpile needs and requirements. That is just as secret, just as sensitive, just as necessary to be safeguarded as is the information to which the able junior Senator from Georgia has referred.

As I understood his remarks the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky was addressing the Senate on the inadvisability of having a joint committee of the Congress deal with highly secret matters. I rose to point out that the committee on which the junior Senator from Georgia and the junior Senator from Tennessee have the opportunity to serve has established an enviable and almost unblemished record of preserving secrets, dealing with them responsibly, and also holding public hearings so as to enlighten the public on matters which can safely be brought to public notice. I cannot quite draw the line of distinction.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Kentucky will indulge me, I did not make the point he cited. The Central Intelligence Agency does report to the Armed Services Committee when it is requested to do so. I have stated that they have answered frankly, forthrightly, and fully every question asked by the Armed Services Committee. There is no necessity for having the proposed joint committee when there are four committees which are in a satisfactory manner supervising intelligence activities, as has been done since the beginning of the Republic. I stated that there was no need of creating a joint committee, with a staff added, to undertake to delve into the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency overseas.

I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Kentucky, but I must state for the record that I disagree with the Senator from Tennessee that there is no difference between evidence relating to stockpiling in the United States and evidence relating to someone who has succeeded in some satellite country in tapping the telephone of a foreign ambassador. I think there is a considerable difference. If we adopt this kind of policy and establish a new joint committee, we are going to dry up sources of information. Men will not be willing to endanger their lives, and there will be a disruption of the very fine cooperative relations existing between our Agency and the similar agencies of other countries, notably the British Intelligence Agency, which has been one of the best for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was called from the floor and asked me temporarily to function in his absence. I shall be glad to yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

The observations of the junior Senator from Georgia are well taken with reference to the substantial ground on which he has indicated he is opposed to the pending proposal. Other than on the ground that a joint committee cannot be trusted with preserving essential secrecy, I shall not challenge his position. But I would respectfully challenge the position taken by any Senator, if such a position should be taken, that a joint committee could not responsibly deal with the most sensitive secrets of our Government. It was for that purpose that I rose, and I thank my distinguished and able friend from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is one thing which differentiates the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from the proposed committee. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy deals legislatively with atomic energy. I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the manner in which that joint commit-

tee has functioned. But the Central Intelligence Agency deals with all manner of subjects, everywhere throughout the world. It is not limited to any particular form of defense or any particular form of offense. It is the duty of the CIA to encompass the entire world, and to report to the Security Council and the President. On the Security Council the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sits, just as does the chairman of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I feel very deeply and sincerely that to open the records and the personnel of the CIA, which is an intelligence agency that gathers valuable and highly confidential information from all over the world, would handicap the CIA in obtaining the information which is so essential to our defense. The activities of the CIA cover the entire world, and the CIA makes reports on the entire world situation.

Because I believe it is not now necessary to create such a joint committee, and because I believe that to do so would be fraught with great danger, I shall oppose and vote against the concurrent resolution which is now before the Senate.

There is nothing more that I can say, and nothing more that I desire to say, in regard to the matter. I hope the Senate will not agree to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know whether any other Senator, while I am acting temporarily for the Senator from Texas, desires to have me yield him time.

If the Senator from Montana were agreeable, I would have no objection to having the committee amendments agreed to en bloc, and then yielding to the Senator from Montana such time as he might desire as the author of the concurrent resolution.

I may say to the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] wishes to speak for a few minutes. Did the Senator from Montana wish to conclude the debate?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. I shall be glad to follow the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with the agreement of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the acting minority leader, I, as the acting majority leader, ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered as agreed to en bloc, and that the time remaining on the amendments be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 21, after the word "report", to strike out "public"; in line 23, after the word Senate", to strike out "The cost of such services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "Government", to insert "on a reimbusable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration"; in line 11, after the word "paid", to strike out "one-half"; in line 12 after the word "Senate", to strike out "and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives"; and in line 14, after the word "chairman", to strike out "Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of 6 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the Senate, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the 6 members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and 3 shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than 4 members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

"SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

"(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

"SEC. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"SEC. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate.

"SEC. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government on a reimbursable basis with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

"SEC. 6. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $250,000 per year, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would have to yield time to the Senator from Missouri. Although I am very much opposed to the concurrent resolution, I, as the acting majority leader, am supposed to yield time only to Senators who favor the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the committee amendments have been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have been agreed to en bloc. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 10 minutes, or as much of that time as he desires, to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] who wishes to speak in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

As a former member of the National Security Council, I have had considerable experience with the Central Intelligence Agency, which reports to the National Security Council.

In my opinion, it would be a mistake to establish the proposed joint committee. The Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is composed of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as chairman; the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]; the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; the present acting minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the ranking Republican Member of the Senate.

Where could one find a better committee of the Senate?

I do not see why, under the present circumstances, there should be a special joint committee to supervise the Central Intelligence Agency.

I am sorry not to have been present for all the debate, having just returned from Omaha, Nebr., and have just now reached the floor.

This is one of the few times it has been my misfortune not to be able to vote with my able colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Montan [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He knows of my respect and affection for him. Nevertheless, in this case I cannot agree with him.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the junior Senator from Montana as much time as he may desire from the 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall take only 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Montana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish my friend, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, had remained in Omaha. Unfortunately for the concurrent resolution, he has returned and is opposed to it. That means, of course, that the odds are lengthening a little more, because in addition to a former Vice President of the United States, who also was a member of the National Security Council; in addition to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is a great statesman and a fine friend, and is outstanding as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services; in addition to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has served his State ably and well since it achieved statehood, and who also is a very fine friend; in addition to the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and in addition to the minority leader of the House; we find also that the President of the United States and the Central Intelligence Agency itself are opposed to the concurrent resolution.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] suggested that the statement with reference to the $40 million appropriated by Congress last year for the Marine Corps which the executive branch did not use to carry out the unanimous intent and mandate of Congress, had no proper connection with this subject. Of course, it has no connection directly, but it has a connection indirectly.

What is the executive branch trying to do? It is trying to take over, lock, stock, and barrel, as many of the functions of the legislative branch as it possibly can. Let us examine the record, simply to prove that point. The criticism applies to Democratic as well as to Republican administrations.

When President Roosevelt was in office, on three separate occasions he promulgated executive agreements which were, in effect and in fact, treaties of friendship and commerce. Under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution, those treaties should have come before the Senate for consideration and approval. Mind you, Mr. President, there were three executive agreements which should have been negotiated as treaties of friendship and commerce, and which should have come before the Senate for its advice and consent. But what did the Senate do in that respect? The Senate did nothing. It willingly relinquished the authority and the responsibility which were accorded it under the Constitution.

President Truman acted in similar fashion. Again, what did Congress do? Congress appropriated funds for a 70-group Air Force. What happened? President Truman impounded the money and allowed only enough to be spent for a 48-group Air Force. That was just before the Korean war. Do Senators remember that? If that was not a flouting of congressional authority, I do not know what it was. Certainly it meant that the executive branch was not a coequal branch of the Government, but was the predominant branch of the Government.

We find that last year Congress unanimously restored $40 million in order to keep the Marine Corps at its then strength, to prevent its reduction by some 25,000 men in this fiscal year. That was done under the leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who now speaks against the concurrent resolution.

Was it only the Marine Corps which was cut down last year? Not at all. The strength of the Army was reduced by approximately 300,000 men. So on June 30 of this year there will be 1,025,000 men in the Army of the United States. Think of that, notwithstanding the worldwide commitments we have. In addition, the Navy was cut down. Those actions on the part of the administration indicate to me that there is a trend—a strong trend—and a trend to which the Senate and the Congress are acceding—on the part of the executive to take over more and more control.

I cannot understand why the constitutional lawyers in this body do not rise on their hind legs and protest against the loss of power which is being suffered by the Congress, and especially the Senate, and take some action to regain the powers which the Executive, through the praetorian guard it has in the White House, and certain agencies, has taken unto himself. If Senators do not wake up, some day they will find that they are members of a debating society, and not Members of the Senate of the United States, as the Constitution intended them to be.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall yield in a moment. What happened when the resolution was to be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration? Two days before, the President of the United States announced the creation of an 8-man Civilian Board to advise him on the CIA. What kind of powers does that Board have? None, really. It is to meet once every 6 months. To whom is the Board to report? To the President of the United States. Will the members of the Board be able to give out any information to anybody else? No, not at all. In this particular instance where does Congress come in? What type of men are we? Do we have responsibilities? We are elected. We have to fight for these jobs. We represent the people. We are not appointed. We have to make an accounting of the responsibilities which have been thrust upon us.

When word was received that the resolution was going to be considered, the President announced, and I believe hurriedly—and I do not blame him for it—that the Board had been created, and he said he was doing it in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. He was partly right, but only halfway right, because the Hoover Commission said that not only should a civilian board be created, but that a joint congressional committee should be created as well. And that was the second time the Hoover Commission had recommended the creation of a joint congressional committee.

What do we have now? We have the CIA doing everything it possibly can to defeat this resolution—a resolution which is intended to safeguard them and give them some security and an outlet which they do not have now, because the contracts they have with the Congress are very thin, indeed.

What did the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts say on Monday last? Twice a year the CIA appears before the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Once a year it appears before the Appropriations Subcommittee, and at that time the officials of the CIA ask for money. Ask for how much? What do we know about the funds appropriated to them? What do we know about the agency's personnel? We do not know anything. Perhaps we should not, but we ought to have a standing joint committee which can take care of it.

I think it is well to refer to another point, since the distinguished Senator from Georgia has brought it out. The Senator referred to my remarks about a small staff. Of course, that staff would have to have the highest possible clearance. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if in the meetings, having to do with the CIA, which Mr. Allen Dulles and his assistants have with the members of the Armed Services Subcommittee and with members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, staff members are absent and only Members of the Senate are in attendance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall answer the question of the Senator from Montana with a "no," even though he would not permit me to ask a question a moment ago. I have had one staff member present during the course of the hearings. I have had one staff member present, and only one, who has been with the committee since I have been a member of the committee. I have not brought in other staff members of the committee, even though I have full confidence in them, because I see no necessity for it, just as I see no necessity for an appropriation of $150,000 for a new staff which it is proposed to create.

The Senator from Montana has said the Armed Services Committee knows nothing about the agency, and that the Appropriations Committee knows nothing about it. Before the debate is concluded, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] will state that officials of the agency come before the Appropriations Committee, and the committee members know as much about how the agency spends its money as they know in the case of many other agencies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator, and apologize to him for not having yielded when he asked me to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly intended no criticism of the Senator for not yielding to me. I know how it is when the Senator is in the course of making his

remarks, which he has outlined in his mind. I would not have interrupted the Senator, who was making a very eloquent speech, if I had not wanted to call something to his attention, which I have forgotten now. I hope my interruption did not have the effect of annoying the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, indeed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with much of the remarks of the distinguished Senator regarding the encroachment of the executive on the legislative branch of Government. I am sure the Senator knows, in illustrations he gave with respect to the Military Establishment, what my feelings are in those matters. But we have a fine subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee handling the CIA from the standpoint of Senate legislative analysis and determination. I think that committee as capable a committee—and I believe the distinguished Senator from Montana would agree—as could be obtained in the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly would agree with the Senator. It is a good committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If he believes the committee has been remiss in its handling of the CIA, which is a function of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall be very glad to cooperate with my distinguished friend from Montana in any suggestions he may care to make.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, that the one thing he could do to put into effect his offer is to vote for the resolution, because what the resolution proposes to do is to bring the subcommittees together. It would not break the continuity they now have with the CIA. The same persons would be involved, but there would be a standing joint committee, with a small staff, with the highest possible clearance. This committee could furnish an outlet for both the Congress and the CIA. I think this is the best way to handle the matter.

Certainly, I have never advocated that we should exercise undue oversight over the CIA, because I recognize the need for a certain amount of secrecy. I have not even advocated open sessions of the joint committee, if it should be created, because the occasions would be rare when such an instance would arise. Had there been a joint committee at the time the CIA headquarters fight was on, perhaps something could have been done; but otherwise there is no reason I can see why any of the meetings should be open.

There is no reason for anyone to suspect or be suspicious that the sponsors of the resolution want to pry into the secrets of the CIA; but I say to my colleagues that the Senate and the House—the Congress of the United States—have the right, under our system of checks and balances, to exercise some degree of control, not through subcommittees which meet occasionally, but through a regular standing joint committee. I, for one, feel that Members of Congress can be trusted as well as can a group of private citizens who may occasionally be given such information as the Agency wants to put before them. I think Members of the Congress can be trusted just as much as can the members of the National Security Council. Certainly I have every faith in the men and women with whom I am associated in the Congress; and I would say that insofar as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is concerned, it has exercised a high degree of discretion during the many years it has been in operation.

The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], formerly Vice President of the United States, told the Senate about his contacts with the National Security Council while he was Vice President, and he referred to Gen. Walter Bedell Smith. I should like to inform the Members of the Senate that, so far as I know, Walter Bedell Smith is in favor of a measure of this kind, and I believe he has so stated on a number of occasions. I believe that any right-thinking Director of the CIA would welcome such a group, if for no other reason than the agency's security and its protection from unjustified attacks by individuals or groups.

Mr. President, there are other things I should like to discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana as much further time as he may desire to have.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to have 10 more minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today our attention has been called to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and its application to the pending proposal. Let me point out that at the bottom of page 12 of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration in regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, we find the following recommendation—one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That the President appoint a committee of experienced private citizens, who shall have the responsibility to examine and report to him periodically on the work of Government foreign intelligence activities. This committee should also give such information to the public as the President may direct. The Commission should function on a part-time and per diem basis.

The second part of the recommendation of the Hoover Commission is the important one:

(b) That the Congress consider creating a joint congressional committee on foreign intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In such case, the two committees, one Presidential and the other congressional, should collaborate on matters of special importance to the national security.

What did the President do? He appointed a group of private citizens, but he took a stand against the creation of a joint committee; and, according to the newspapers, he said that the CIA was too sensitive for Congress to take up.

Mr. President, who does the President of the United States think the Members of Congress are? In our own way, we have just as much responsibility as he does; and I, for one, intend to do everything I possibly can to see to it that the powers given to Congress by the Constitution are retained by the Congress, and are not whittled down or taken away, and are not willingly given up. I think the Congress is in danger, and we should recognize that fact.

I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that I hold in my hand a letter from Mr. Clarence Francis, chairman of the Committee for the Hoover Report. He was a member of the Hoover Commission when it was in operation. In speaking for the Committee for the Hoover Report, he comes out in wholehearted support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Let me point out that two Members of the Senate were members of the Hoover Commission—the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. According to information given to me by the Senator from New Hampshire, they went on record, during the time when the Commission was in existence, as being opposed to the creation of a civilian commission, and as being in favor of the establishment of a joint congressional committee. Those two Senators were our representatives on the Hoover Commission; and that was their recommendation, as I understand.

Instead of having this matter handled by the two subcommittees to which reference has been made—which meet occasionally, but are not vitally and solely interested in the CIA, for they have many other duties—I certainly believe that a regular, standing joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives should be established to look after the interests of the Congress and also to look after the interests of the people of the United States in this field. I trust those with whom I am associated in the House and the Senate; I trust them, regardless of whether they be Republicans or Democrats.

Certainly we as a body are entitled to as much consideration as are members of the National Security Council or members of a private commission or members of any other group. After all, the Congress has the ultimate responsibility. Congress has the obligation of appropriating the moneys used in the Government service. Congress creates the various agencies, but then sits back and lets the Executive take over as much control as it desires to have. Mr. President, I think it is about time for the Senate to wake up.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but certainly I do not like to have the Senator from Montana leave me in the position of seemingly wishing to surrender any of the powers of the Congress.

What I am trying to have the Congress do is keep where they are now, in

the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, the powers which the Senator from Montana proposes to take from those committees and lodge in the proposed joint committee. I know of nothing such a joint committee could do that the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee cannot do.

The Senator from Montana referred to the Marine Corps fiasco in the executive branch of the government. To the very best of my ability, I have fought to obtain the appropriations for the Marine Corps. I have expressed my grievous and distinct disapproval of the action of the executive branch in not expending those appropriations for the purpose for which they were made by Congress. I have undertaken to—well, Mr. President, I do not like to use a strong word, but I have made it perfectly clear to the Secretary of Defense and to the Joint Chiefs of Staff that I think they have gone directly counter to the clear intent of the Congress. Of course, they added insult to injury by submitting budget estimates by means of which they undertook to have the money we appropriated for the Marine Corps used by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and by other civilian agencies. On yesterday afternoon I had the privilege, in the Appropriations Committee, of making a motion to strike out that language, so as at least to show that we do not propose to stand by and have insult added to injury.

But I must confess that I do not exactly see the relationship between the Marine Corps incident—much as I deplore it and much as I condemn it—and the efforts which are being made to remove these powers of supervision from the committees which now have them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say again—I have already said it many times—that the Marines have never had a better friend than the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. That is a well known and an established fact; and I know he was the one who was primarily responsible, behind the actions of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], last year, in bringing about a restoration of the $40 million which Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, acting for the President, impounded, and later used in part for other purposes in the office of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and a few other of the agencies under his jurisdiction. So I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Georgia did what he did on yesterday. I only hope that he will see to it that if these moneys are not used for the Marine Corps, as they should be, they will be returned to the general Treasury and will not be used for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will indulge me, let me say that I think the funds should be reappropriated, so as again to have the Congress go on record regarding its desire to have the money used for the Marine Corps, and so as again to show that the present Department of Defense, acting under the Chief Executive, has been clearly flouting its responsibility to act in accordance with the directives of the Congress, which has the responsibility of raising and maintaining armies for the defense of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand from what the distinguished Senator says that if he has his way this money is to be used by the Marine Corps for the purposes intended?

Mr. RUSSELL. We shall have to reappropriate it, but I shall certainly make every effort, when the defense bill comes before the Senate, to see that it is reappropriated for the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Referring to the second part of the Senator's question, I did not say that the Marine Corps matter, the 70-group Air Force matter, or the matter of executive agreements was directly connected with the CIA. However, I tried to indicate that indirectly, through the years, both during Democratic and Republican administrations, there has been a tendency on the part of the Executive to assume our responsibility, and to get away from the idea of coequality, as provided by the Constitution. I certainly did not mean to imply any personal responsibility on the part of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom I recognize as one of the great constitutional lawyers of this body. I tried to indicate that that was being done willingly, so far as the Congress as a whole was concerned, because we are not fighting the tendency to shift power away from us.

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the Senator from Georgia is concerned, he will condemn such a trend at every opportunity. I know of no other way to fight it. I regret that there are not more Member of Congress who feel as does the Senator from Montana, who has expressed himself so forcefully.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes in oppositon to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate this afternoon with a great deal of interest. I have been undecided as to whether I would vote for or against the concurrent resolution.

I have profound respect for my colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], with whom I serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee; and likewise for the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Logically there is much truth in what has been said, to the effect that there is little justification for the creation of another joint committee. We have an adequate number of standing committees now, if they function effectively and discharge their duties as they should. It is true, as the Senator from Georgia pointed out, that probably we now have access to information, data, and records of the Central Intelligence Agency through the Armed Services Committee, of which he is the chairman, and likewise through the Appropriations Committee.

I have had some experiences in this connection during the past year. A year ago I was assigned to membership on the subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. For a long time I had had certain misgivings and uncertainty with respect to the operations of the CIA. I was very eager to find out something about the CIA, because it is a very vital and important agency in the executive department of the Government.

When the director of the CIA appeared before the Senate appropriations subcommittee, I was so naive as to think that, as a member of the committee, and a Member of the Senate, I might be entitled to some information.

I ventured to ask certain questions of the director. I was told very emphatically "This information is classified." Information as to the number of personnel is classified, whether there are 1,000, 10,000, or 20,000 employees and officials working for CIA. Oh, Mr. President, that is highly classified information!

Then when I directed questions to the director about the amount of money required to operate the CIA, I was again told, quite forthrightly, "This is classified information." Hush, hush! Members of the Appropriations Committee must be willing to assume that the CIA, as a part of our Defense Establishment, is operating efficiently. We are told that it should not be our concern to inquire whether we are obtaining full value for the several millions of dollars which are appropriated annually for the CIA.

At this point I should like to have the RECORD show that while I do not think it is necessary to establish another committee to ride herd on the CIA, I am wondering whether members of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee are fully informed as to the far-flung operations of the CIA. I wonder whether the former Vice President, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who was formerly the head of the Air Force of our country, are fully informed.

The CIA must operate in a manner which provides the maximum safeguards for the safety of those who place their own lives in jeopardy when they go abroad to work in countries behind the Iron Curtain and obtain information essential to our national defense. But, Mr. President, I think it is the direct responsibility of the Congress and its duly constituted committees to take a profound interest in the operations of the CIA, and to determine whether or not an efficient job is being done. It is not enough to receive assurances from the Director that his agency is doing outstanding work and to say at that point that the Congress of the United States has no further responsibility with respect to the operations of the CIA.

During the past year the CIA personnel near the top level probably have been concerned with many vital questions of intelligence. However, they have not been too busily engaged to avert a controversy concerning the proposed construction of a $50 million showplace across the Potomac in Virginia.

I wonder, if the CIA spreads out its personnel throughout the entire world to

gather this vital information, why it is necessary to build a grand showplace on the Potomac costing $50 million. I do not know how many employees would be housed there, but I leave it to the good judgment of my colleagues to say whether it is necessary to have a $50 million administration building for the CIA. If it is, then obviously it is proposed to house probably several thousand employees. I think the newspapers have indicated that 6,000 or 7,000 employees would be located in this magnificent palace on the banks of the Potomac.

I ask Members of the Senate whether the CIA operatives and officials propose to obtain this vital secret information right here in the National Capital. Why should it be necessary to house 6,000 or 7,000 employees in the National Capital? I had assumed that the primary function of the CIA was to visit the far-flung areas of the world to gather this vital information. I certainly hope the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services will make it his responsibility to find out why it is necessary to have that grand showplace on the Potomac. It is already being called the Little Pentagon.

I remember when some Members of the Senate, especially of my own party, were critical of a Democratic President who had the Pentagon constructed at a cost of about three times the funds that had been originally requested of Congress. We were quite critical, because we thought it was too lavish a building for the military.

Now we are to have a little Pentagon. It may be very difficult to get CIA operating personnel to leave the lush showplace on the banks of the Potomac and undertake dangerous and hazardous missions in countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, last summer, I like many other Americans, read articles in the press and listened to reports over the radio which indicated that possibly in the Soviet Union an economic upheaval of some kind was imminent.

There was confusing information available upon which to base any definite conclusions. Therefore, with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and other Members of the Senate, I made a brief visit behind the Iron Curtain last September. We visited Moscow for 6 days, including 2 hours conferring with Khrushchev and Bulganin, as well as with Ambassador Bohlen and members of his staff.

The most amazing and astounding thing we learned on our visit behind the Iron Curtain was that there was little evidence of an impending economic upheaval or crash of any kind. I was somewhat dumfounded as I viewed the situation there. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will agree with me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who likewise traveled behind the Iron Curtain, made similar observations. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that I spent 17 days in Russia. I went from the Baltic to the Caspian over to the Black Sea, and up to Kiev, through the center of Russia, and I found that there was no impending revolution. If there was, it was certainly well disguised from the eyes of tourists.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the Senator from Georgia see any apparent evidence of the oncoming crash of any kind?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I did not. Of course, under the Soviet system, no one has very much to have a crash with, unless it be a failure of crops. From what I saw, they had fairly good crops when I visited the farms.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the city of Moscow it was apparent that seven or eight million people were enjoying economic security to a large extent. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. They were not enjoying the kind of standard living that Americans have. However, according to their standards, I suppose that is so. They had plenty of bread and enough clothing, so far as I could see.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator for his observation. The only reason I am referring to my experience behind the Iron Curtain is that I was convinced the highly rated CIA, charged with the responsibility of getting information in farflung places, did not have any information, or very little reliable information, concerning the economic status of people behind the Iron Curtain.

Again I ask Members of Congress whether it is not our responsibility to learn whether the millions of dollars which we annually appropriate for CIA are used properly and effectively. If Members of Congress, after spending a few weeks behind the Iron Curtain can come home with definite ideas about the economic conditions in Russia, then certainly it is not expected too much of CIA to be able to gather the information for the people of this country. Congress, the armed services, and the National Security Council should be properly informed about the very vital conditions that exist in the countries which are opposed to our way of life.

I shall not belabor the point, Mr. President, because I feel sure that the concurrent resolution will not be adopted. However, I hope that those who are responsible for the operations of the CIA will not assume that such action is evidence that Congress is not interested in what is done by that agency. Certainly CIA has features which require its operation without complete disclosure of what is being done, but the agency should make reports to standing committees, like the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee. However, I think it is our responsibility, and I charge the two committees and the chairmen of those two committees to see to it that we do not permit the CIA to operate in any but in the most efficient manner, which will justify the appropriations which are being made for its operations. Because the funds for the agency are integrated with the funds appropriated for the armed services, it should not be assumed that Congress is not interested in—or that the American people are not demanding—a full report to the responsible committees of the Congress.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to say that, whether we have a special committee appointed or have standing committees deal with this vital question, I take the position that Members of Congress can be trusted to consider any vital classified information to the same extent that the civilian employees of CIA can be trusted.

Likewise, I hope when the great showplace on the Potomac is completed—its construction has already been authorized—that CIA will not make the tragic blunder of housing surplus employees there and giving them soft berths when they should be operating in the field. It is the responsibility of Congress to make certain that CIA knows what is going on behind the Iron Curtain and that it is aware of conditions that exist everywhere in the world, if it is to function in accordance with its obligations and responsibilities as a vital arm of our defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes in opposition. I wish the RECORD to show in this debate that I am very much opposed to the concurrent resolution. I gave my reasons at length on Monday when I debated the matter with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I merely wish to add at this time that I am opposed to the resolution because it is impractical and because I believe it is unnecessary. It is impractical because it will be a step toward drying up the sources of our information which it is necessary for our intelligence agency to have, and will make it very dangerous for the grave men who are conducting our intelligence activities.

I believe it is unnecessary because two subcommittees of committees of the House and of the Senate now have the responsibility of looking into CIA and its duties and into the way it is carrying out its duties. If Congress is not given sufficient attention, it is the fault of Congress, not the fault of methods of organization. For these reasons and for the reasons I gave last Monday, I am opposed to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes, or as much time as he may need in opposition, to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I filed my individual views in opposition to the pending concurrent resolution, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the debate, and, like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I have very carefully read

the proceedings of last Monday, not being privileged, as he was not, to be present at that time. I was interested in noting that there was a repetition of the idea expressed by the provision in section 2 of the concurrent resolution that "the Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities." It was urged that the information thus disclosed should be made available not only to members of the joint committee, but, it was further stated, to all Members of the Congress and even generally to the American people. How it would be possible to keep the American people fully informed and at the same time keep our Communist enemies in Moscow in the dark, it is difficult to imagine.

There must be secrets. There are men all over the world who are engaged in the service of the CIA. Are we to tell the dictators in Moscow how much money we are spending in employing these men, and where they are employed? If a representative of the Central Intelligence Agency should penetrate into China and obtain information from a Chinese, for which he had to pay, would it be required that the Chinese sign a voucher for it? That CIA cannot do business that way. If it became known that a resident of China gave any information about the widespread human slavery which communism has imposed upon the people there to one of our Central Intelligence agents, he would not live very long.

I was interested in the assertion that we must maintain some kind of supervision and control of congressional prerogatives. A Marine Corps appropriation was used as an illustration. The facts in the Marine Corps case were that Congress appropriated money to maintain the Marine Corps at 215,000 men, and the administration allowed the corps to drop down to less than 200,000 men, and consequently did not spend the money which Congress had appropriated. There is absolutely no way to compel the executive branch to spend money which Congress has appropriated. I found that out when I first became a Member of the House of Representatives. I made my first political campaign in Arizona in an Apperson Jackrabbit automobile, which became stuck in the quicksands of the Gila River and we had to have the help of Apache horsemen who used their ropes and saddle horns to pull us out. At that time I made a vow that if I should be elected to Congress I would try to have a bridge built across the Gila River. When I was elected I proceeded to try to carry out my vow. I introduced a bill, which provided money to build a bridge across the Gila River on the San Carlos Reservation.

When the bill was under discussion, Mr. James R. Mann, the Republican minority leader of the House at that time, insisted that since the Osage Indians who were once very poor but who had become rich through oil discoveries, the San Carlos Apaches might some day become wealthy and in that event should reimburse the Government for the cost of the bridge and his amendment was adopted. The Bureau of Indian Affairs refused to build the bridge so long as that condition was attached; Congress had appropriated the money for it but the bridge was never built.

The Constitution provides that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" but does not fix the time when he shall do so. Congress can appropriate money for maintaining the Marine Corps at full strength but the President does not care to spend it, there is nothing we can do about it. There is no way of compelling any executive department to spend money if it does not wish to do so. Consequently there is no connection between the failure of the administration to spend money appropriated for the Marine Corps and the need for the pending resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no direct connection, but there is a pattern. I tried to point out earlier in the debate that 2 days before we had a hearing the President hurried up his appointment of the private commission recommended by the Hoover Commission. I think he did it to forestall action by the Senate committee and to make certain that he could say, "I followed the Hoover Commission's recommendations," which he did in part, but he did not follow the main part, which was the creation of a joint committee on the CIA, a proposal which had been advocated by both this and the previous Hoover Commission some 5 years before.

The executive department, I submit, is arrogating unto itself more and more power all the time. I stated that under Roosevelt there were executive agreements which were in reality treaties of friendship and commerce and which should have been brought before the Senate. Under Truman, Congress appropriated funds for a 70-group Air Force, but these funds were impounded by the President and enough allowed for only a 48-group Air Force. Under Eisenhower, Congress appropriated $40 million, which Congress said should be used to maintain the Marine Corps at its then present level. So they tie in.

Mr. HAYDEN. In my opinion, there is no tie-in. The Central Intelligence Agency is an arm of the President. Under the Constitution, I feel we have no right to attempt to regulate an agency which is designed solely to provide the President, who, under the Constitution, is responsible for our foreign relations, with information to enable him to make decisions.

There is complaint that the various departments do not tell us all we should know. If that be the case, and they do not give Congress all the information it should receive, why not appoint a watchdog committee to supervise the President's Cabinet? Cabinet members can perform their duties out loud or be quiet about it, but their official actions are included in the responsibility placed upon the executive department. There are three distinct branches of government. I am just as much opposed to congressional invasion of the executive branch as I am to an invasion by the executive of the congressional branch. Each has its place. If we are to place watchdogs elsewhere, why not insist that Congress have a watchdog in attendance at every meeting of the President's Cabinet?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator is taking an extreme view of the resolution. The purpose is not to pry into the secrets of the CIA. The idea, in reality, is to safeguard and secure the CIA in furnishing outlets both ways. I do not see how the Senator can disagree with reference to treaties of friendship and commerce——

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not wish to enter into an argument with my good friend. I know there have been at times efforts on the part of the legislative branch to exercise dominating power. The Senator will remember the attempted impeachment of President Andrew Johnson. The legislative branch can go to extremes and the executive branch can go to extremes. Some complaints have recently been made that the judicial branch has gone to extremes. But there are certain constitutional limitations on all three branches of the Government and, because of those limitations, our Government is today the oldest continuous government in the world. We should keep our Government of divided responsibility the way it is. Nothing of value would be gained by agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that our Government should be conducted as it was intended to be conducted under the Constitution. But am I not correct in assuming that differences relative to the equal division of powers, so-called, and supposedly, between the executive branch and the legislative branch can be settled in the judicial branch by the Supreme Court?

Mr. HAYDEN. Sometimes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that is the case, why not agree to a concurrent resolution, which will be purely congressional action, which does not call for approval by the President of the United States, but which requires only a majority vote of both Houses? Then, if the executive branch thinks that the legislative branch is infringing upon the powers of the Executive under the Constitution, let the matter be taken to the Supreme Court, so that the executive and the legislative branches can ascertain where they both stand.

Mr. HAYDEN. There would be no necessity for the executive branch to take such a matter to the Supreme Court. The Executive could simply refuse to cooperate and Congress could not do anything about it. As I have said when the executive branch does not want to spend appropriated money, it does not have to do so. When the executive branch wants to hold a closed-door

meeting of the Cabinet, it can do so, and Congress can do nothing about it.

EXHIBIT 1

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN

STATEMENT

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 is based upon the mistaken and erroneous assumption that the Congress has maintained little or no control over the expenditures of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and that Senators and Members of Congress who should be informed have been kept in the dark as to its activities because of a veil of secrecy imposed by the executive branch. The truth is that the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives have continuously and do now maintain supervision over the operations of that Agency to an entirely adequate degree. This is made clear by quoting a paragraph from a letter addressed on January 26, 1956, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration by the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services:

"The responsible officials in the Central Intelligence Agency have demonstrated their willingness to keep the Armed Services and Appropriations Subcommittee fully informed on the subject of the Agency's activities and operations. Although I cannot speak with authority on the extent to which all the existing subcommittees on Central Intelligence Agency carry out their functions, I do know that the subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee has had periodic contact with the appropriate Central Intelligence Agency officials. At these meetings the Central Intelligence Agency representatives have candidly furnished the desired information and have responded to the specific complaints and criticisms that have been voiced in Congress and in the press. It is entirely coincidental but it happens that the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee is holding its first meeting of 1956 with Central Intelligence Agency officials on the same date that your committee has scheduled for the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2."

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

While no definite rule has been adopted by either body conferring jurisdiction over legislation relating to the Central Intelligence Agency upon the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives there is a clear precedent which establishes that jurisdiction. The National Security Act of 1947 created the Central Intelligence Agency and since then the 3 subsequent amendments to that act affecting the Agency have all been considered by and reported from those 2 committees.

The functions of the Central Intelligence Agency are essentially functions of an executive character in assisting the President of the United States, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Department of Defense to carry out their responsibilities. If a joint committee of the Congress is established to supervise the work of this executive Agency, it might very well be argued that due to some failure of the standing committees of both branches of Congress properly to perform their duties, a joint committee should be set up for each of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and other executive agencies. If the CIA must have a "watchdog" joint committee, why not have one for the FBI?

THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

Owing to the active interest taken by the ranking members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees in the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, it has not been necessary for like members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees to devote as much attention to what the Agency is doing as would otherwise be required. When submitting requests for funds to carry on its activities, responsible officials of the Agency have demonstrated each year their willingness to keep the designated members of the Appropriations Committees fully informed as to its operations.

There has been open and free exchange of all necessary information required for an adequate liaison between the Congress and the Central Intelligence Agency. No information has been denied and all desired information has been candidly supplied.

I can also personally certify that committee members have, from time to time, refused proffered information because such information has no relation to the normal legislative procedures of Congress. How far to go in seeking detailed information is well stated in this further quotation from Senator RUSSELL'S letter:

"Throughout my tenure in the Senate I have consistently advocated the right of Members of Congress to information that was required for the formulation of legislation. In this instance, the legislation affecting the Central Intelligence Agency is not of sufficient magnitude to be burdensome. On the other hand, the importance of the results of Central Intelligence Agency activities to our national safety can hardly be exaggerated. If there is one agency of the Government in which we must take some matters on faith without a constant examination of its methods and sources, I believe this Agency is the Central Intelligence Agency."

The concurrent resolution leaves little or no room to "take some matters in faith" by specifically directing that—

The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

INVESTIGATIONS OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

As the history in the majority report indicates the Central Intelligence Agency has been intensely and repeatedly investigated by various special commissions during the past 5 years. Reference is made to a number of recommendations by these commissions and the report implies that there is little or no evidence of any action by the Central Intelligence Agency as a result of these recommendations. It is not alleged that the Central Intelligence Agency has failed to cooperate fully with commissions, sponsored both by the Congress and by the Executive, which have investigated its activities, or that it has failed to take positive action on their recommendations and to report such action to the appropriate congressional committees.

For example, the majority report refers to recommendations in the 1949 Hoover Commission report that a top-level evaluation board be set up within the Agency and that the internal structure of the Agency be reorganized and improved. In 1950, such an evaluation board was set up, and the internal structure of the Agency has been reorganized so as to improve its effectiveness. It is a fact that successive commissions which have investigated the Central Intelligence Agency have disagreed with the recommendations of their predecessors. It is also a fact that the Agency has adopted legitimate recommendations made in such reports without disrupting the continuity of its organization and activities.

The majority report also shows that, as recommended in the 1955 Hoover Commission report, the President by an Executive order issued on February 6, 1956, has established a board of consultants consisting of eight distinguished citizens, outside of the Government, to keep him regularly advised on the conduct of activities in the foreign intelligence field and to report its findings at least twice a year. The imposition of another supervisory committee with jurisdiction over the Agency would only serve to complicate matters.

The Congress and the President have given the Central Intelligence Agency a most important job to do. Subcommittees of standing committees of Congress have been created to provide for the appropriate jurisdiction of the Congress over this activity. The greatest service we can do now is to facilitate the important work of the Agency and to let it get its job done without being watchdogged to death.

THERE IS NO SECRECY FOR THE SAKE OF SECRECY

It should be emphasized, most strongly, that secrecy for secrecy's sake does not exist in, nor is it an objective of, the Central Intelligence Agency.

Such confidential and secret procedures and operations necessarily characterize its activities are designed wholly for the security of this Nation, the saving of men's lives and the obtaining of essential information which will achieve these vital ends. There is no present evidence of any policy of secrecy having become sacrosanct. Upon the contrary, such secrecy as is being observed is appropriate and necessary.

Furthermore, I repeat that the Central Intelligence Agency is subject to congressional review by four established and fully authorized subcommittees. The first 2 of these are the subcommittees on the Central Intelligence Agency of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees; the second 2 of these are subcommittees of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. These subcommittees seem clearly to be adequate for such a supervisory purpose and function. If they are not doing their job fully and properly, it should be brought promptly and emphatically to their attention as a more appropriate and effective means of achieving the end desired than the creation of a new joint congressional committee for such a purpose.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE STAFF

It would be almost impossible for the staff of such a joint legislative committee to function helpfully because of the high security demanded in the work of the Central Intelligence Agency. The information given to Members of Congress by officials of the Central Intelligence Agency is given to them personally and their judgment as to what may be properly reported is final.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 empowers the joint committee "to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary" and the majority report states that—

"The establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence will insure the existence of a trained, specialized, and dedicated staff to gather information and make independent checks and appraisals of CIA activities prusuant to the committee's directives and supervision."

This statement appears to contemplate that the staff will do the work and reach conclusions as to how effectively the Central Intelligence Agency is operating.

A new and separate staff of some magnitude must be contemplated since an annual expenditure of $250,000 is authorized. This is almost as much as the $258,000 now available to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which at present maintains a professional and clerical staff of 21 individuals.

There is actually no real need for such a staff either large or small. Despite the flexibility which the Congress has granted to the Central Intelligence Agency in carrying out its unique functions, the Agency has administratively taken measures to control its expenditures in at least as strict a manner as other Government agencies and to require a complete accounting for the use of

all of its funds, vouchered or unvouchered. This system, and the actual use of the funds are described each year to the appropriations subcommittees.

The Central Intelligence Agency is essentially any executive Agency. It is not an arm of the Congress to carry into effect legislative policies as are the Interstate Commerce, the Federal Trade or other like Commissions. The act of July 26, 1947, after first creating a National Security Council to advise the President on natonal security matters then established the Central Intelligence Agency under the National Security Council. The principal functions of the Agency were to correlate and evaluate for the Council information obtained from other departments and agencies of the Government and to keep the Chief Executive informed from day to day as to the activities of foreign governments with whom the Constitution gives the President the sole right to conduct foreign relations and to negotiate treaties.

It is obvious that there is no possible way for the joint committee to keep "fully and currently informed" with respect to all of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency except to have a member of its staff sit in as a "watchdog" at all meetings of the National Security Council, and after each meeting make a report to the joint committee of what he has learned.

THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH CANNOT TAKE OVER AN EXECUTIVE FUNCTION

The creation of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, with the functions and powers provided for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 would be certain to raise a constitutional issue on the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Activities are undertaken by the Central Intelligence Agency only in accordance with directives of the National Security Council. The availability of intelligence of the highest order to the President and to the National Security Council is an essential element in the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States, and in the conduct of foreign relations by the President in carrying out that policy. Any congressional action which seeks to alter the legally established relationship between the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Council would tend to impinge upon the constitutional authority and responsibility of the President in the conduct of foreign affairs.

The provisions of the National Security Act are a recognition by the Congress of the highly sensitive nature of Government intelligence activities. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, if adopted, will not be submitted to the President for approval or disapproval. Consequently, any of its provisions which contravene existing law will have no mandatory effect. The existence of such provisions in a resolution agreed to by both Houses, however, would lead inevitably to continuing difficulties of construction and interpretation which would impair the continuity of sound and proper relationships between the executive and legislative branches in intelligence matters.

THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Central Intelligence Agency and the Atomic Energy Commission have nothing in common except the secrecy which is required because both deal with highly classified matters of the greatest importance to the national security. Beyond that, their functions are not comparable. Through the Commission as its operator, the Government is in the manufacturing business—the business of making nuclear energy. Consequenty, the Congress has a very different relationship with that Commission than any other governmental agency.

The cost of this business operation is enormous. Beginning in 1941 with the Manhattan project, financed first from the emergency fund for the President and later in various hidden amounts in appropriation bills, and continuing with the Atomic Energy Commission since 1947, appropriations have totaled $15,202,600,000, of which $6,806,200,000 has been expended for operations and $8,396,400,000 has been expended for facilities. The total amount made available to the Central Intelligence Agency since it was created in 1947 is only a minor fraction of even the smallest of those vast sums.

There has been need to make only minor changes in the act creating the Central Intelligence Agency, but the problems of atomic energy are constantly changing. Legislation concerning the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission must be frequently brought up to date to permit it to function adequately.

The dynamics of the program for developing peacetime aspects of atomic energy have tremendous potential consequences for major aspects of national policy. The future production of electric power from coal, oil, or natural gas may be vitally affected. Atomic Energy Commission policies can give rise to conflicts of interest between various groups and individuals and the resulting issues must be subjected to legislative scrutiny. For example, bills before the Joint Committee have such subjects as construction of industrial facilities, housing at Oak Ridge and self-government at Hanford, taxation, patents, contract awards, and guaranty of uranium ore prices. No such factors relate to the conduct of foreign intelligence.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was established because of the particular nature of the nuclear problem and the fact that the Federal Government was forced to go into private business on a massive scale. This had important domestic implications in a broad range of fields. The intelligence activities, which it is proposed be subject to a joint committee's scrutiny, are peculiarly the prerogative of the Executive and intimately associated with the conduct of the foreign relations of the country.

I am firmly convinced that Congress now, through its regular Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations has the opportunity to get the necessary information from the Central Intelligence Agency and the designated members of those committees are doing so without in any way endangering the security of the information given them. We must also remember that the Central Intelligence Agency carries on its work outside the United States boundaries. Many of its agents are in constant physical danger. We, as Members of Congress, must do our part to see that the work is carried on wisely, efficiently, and with due security to the persons who are working in the interests of our Government.

The contacts between the Central Intelligence Agency and the Congress should never be allowed to prejudice or compromise the highly secret work of that Agency. What the Congress has needed to know in the past it has been told. What the Congress will require to know in the future it can obtain through means already in existence. A new joint committee will only complicate the process.

For the above stated reasons I voted against reporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 to the Senate and urgently recommend that it be not agreed to.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 2 minutes in opposition to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself fully with the remarks recently made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also with the position so ably taken by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], both in his written individual views and on the floor. I think the Senator from Arizona has made the situation very clear and has covered three important points.

I should like to emphasize, first, that the language of the concurrent resolution seems to me to be utterly impossible of fulfillment when it provides:

> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

I consider it to be absolutely impossible for the Agency to function in that manner. If it tried to do so, it would endanger the lives of Americans who may be in the service of this Government behind the Iron Curtain, and of persons who may be prisoners of war or who may be, indeed, nationals of some of the countries which are behind the Iron Curtain. I think it would be a perilous undertaking, and on that ground alone the concurrent resolution should be rejected.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has pointed out very ably that the Central Intelligence Agency is a functionary of the executive branch and is intimately associated with the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. That, I believe, is true and should be true.

The important thing in connection with the administration of the CIA is that we have as the top Administrator of that organization a man of the highest quality and the greatest ability. I take this opportunity to say that I believe the Government and the country as a whole are very fortunate to have in that position now, in the person of Allen Dulles, a man who is ideally suited by experience, by temperament, and by character to fulfill the obligations of that office.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join very strongly with the distinguished Senator from Arizona in opposing the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest this afternoon to my friends, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut. It was an unusual feature of today's session to hear the Senator from Arizona relate some of the experiences of his early days in politics. I wish to assure the Senator that not only were they apropos, but they were well appreciated.

The Senator from Arizona in his individual views has raised a number of questions, and I should like to try to answer some of them, so long as the report and the individual views of Mr. HAYDEN will be included in the RECORD of today's debate.

On page 24, in the individual views of Mr. HAYDEN, the Senator from Arizona states:

> If the CIA must have a "watchdog" joint committee, why not have one for the FBI?

As I understand the FBI is a part of the Department of Justice. There are committees in both House of Congress whose purpose it is to supervise matters affecting the Department of Justice, of which the FBI is a part.

Further on the same page, the Senator from Arizona states:

> The concurrent resolution leaves little or no room to "take some matters in faith" by specifically directing that—
>
> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

The word "all" is italicized.

I would be willing to agree to the elimination of the word "all," so that the sentence would read:

> The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities.

In that way, a wrong interpretation could not be attached to that particular word.

The question relative to the joint committee staff has been answered in the colloquy between the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself. Once again, all I can state is that I recognize the difficulties which the CIA apprehends, and that the staff to be selected, if the resolution shall be agreed to, should be very small and certainly should have the highest possible clearance.

Reference has been made to the sum of $250,000 provided in the concurrent resolution. I would say that the amount is unimportant; that when I submitted the concurrent resolution, the space for the amount was left blank. The amount of $250,000 was inserted by the Committee on Rules and Administration. So far as I am concerned, $25,000 would do the job. I think that amount would be sufficient.

At the bottom of page 26, the Senator from Arizona states:

> The legislative branch cannot take over an executive function.

I cannot agree with that statement, because I have tried to point out that that is not the purpose of this particular concurrent resolution. The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to retain for Congress the powers which have been granted to it under the Constitution, and to stop the trend of power grabbing which the administrations, both Democratic and Republican, have been following in recent years.

I wish to say again that I think the Senate, and Congress as a whole, ought to wake up to its responsibilities, to guard them, and to guard them well. I wonder if Senators think it odd that the CIA does not want a committee of the kind proposed by the concurrent resolution? Can Senators think of any other agency of the Government which would willingly agree to have a congressional committee supervise it? Not at all. If Senators will examine the legislative history, they will find that all executive agencies do not want to have any congressional supervision, because they feel they will be hamstrung, they will be held down, they will not be allowed to spend as much as they would like to spend. That is the history of bureaucracy under Republican and Democratic administrations.

Do Senators think the executive branch trusts Congress? I think that is immaterial. The question I want to ask is, Does Congress trust itself? Do we think that civilian groups should be given greater authority, and that the Executive should show more confidence in them than we can place in ourselves?

I think we should consider this particular matter and recognize that the concurrent resolution now before the Senate does not call for presidential approval. It is a matter which Congress itself—the Senate and the House—must consider and pass upon. In conclusion, I only say that the choice is ours.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the Mansfield resolution. I thought the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] made a very powerful argument, and I only wish that all the Members of the Senate had been present to hear his remarks and the other debate on the pending concurrent resolution which took place on the floor. The situation with respect to the proposed joint committee is not comparable with that affecting the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as has so ably been pointed out by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without taking it from his time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. While I disagree with the Senator from California, I think the Senate should hear him.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that the time will not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is the request that there be a quorum call, without the time being taken from either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Carlson	Ervin
Allott	Case, N. J.	Flanders
Barkley	Case, S. Dak.	Frear
Barrett	Clements	Fulbright
Beall	Cotton	George
Bender	Curtis	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel	Gore
Bible	Dirksen	Green
Bricker	Douglas	Hayden
Bridges	Duff	Hennings
Bush	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Butler	Eastland	Hill
Capehart	Ellender	Holland
Hruska	Martin, Iowa	Robertson
Humphrey	Martin, Pa.	Russell
Jackson	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Jenner	McClellan	Schoeppel
Johnson, Tex.	McNamara	Scott
Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Kennedy	Mundt	Stennis
Kerr	Murray	Symington
Knowland	Neely	Thye
Kuchel	Neuberger	Watkins
Laird	O'Mahoney	Welker
Langer	Pastore	Wiley
Lehman	Payne	Williams
Malone	Potter	Wofford
Mansfield	Purtell	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, to continue with my statement, let me say that I speak in opposition to adoption of the pending concurrent resolution, which was submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, and which proposes to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Earlier, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] very ably pointed out that the proposed Joint Committee on Central Intelligence and the existing Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are not comparable; and the accuracy of that statement by him was borne out by the distinguished former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was created by statute, and was given legislative powers. It deals with a subject primarily within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Furthermore, as has been pointed out, I think the key to the present situation is to be found in the fact that the Central Intelligence Agency gathers information outside the United States, in hostile areas of the world where the slightest slip, inadvertent though it might be, could result in uncovering our intelligence system in those areas, and would jeopardize not only the lives of American citizens, but also the lives of the citizens of our allies who may be working in cooperation with us, as well as the lives of many other persons. The lives of all those persons would immediately be endangered; and, as a result, the whole fabric of such a system would be destroyed.

It has been pointed out that at the present time supervision of the CIA is being handled, in part, by a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which is under the able leadership of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who has named the members of that subcommittee who have met with Mr. Allen Dulles, the head of the Ceneral Intelligence Agency; and it has been pointed out that such supervision is also shared by a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the senior Members of this body. Those Senators have joined in minority views in opposition to adoption of the pending resolution; and

I hope all Members of the Senate have now read their views. It has also been pointed out that those subcommittees have available to them whatever information may be necessary.

Some Members of the Senate had, I believe, originally intended to support the pending resolution, based on the report of the Hoover Commission. However, I call attention to the fact that on page 9 of the report which Senators have on their desks, it is shown that the recommendation of the Hoover Commission was that there be established a small, permanent, bipartisan commission composed of Members of both Houses of Congress and other public-spirited citizens commanding the utmost respect and public confidence. The Hoover Commission recommended that such a commission be established by act of Congress, that the commission should make periodic surveys, and so forth. However, the joint committee proposed to be established by the pending resolution is not at all of that type.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from California.

Let me say that I was a member of the Hoover Commission, along with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. We went very carefully into this situation. I have always felt that this field of government is a very sensitive one, but I have also felt that some check should be had upon it.

I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is, I know, a very conscientious and a very able Member of the Senate, and is seeking the answer to this problem; and he has proposed one approach to it.

The approach recommended by the Hoover Commission, of which I had the honor to be a member, was a little different. It recommended an approach by means of an act of Congress or a resolution, under which the President of the United States would enter the field, and under which the Members of both Houses of Congress would be represented on a commission, along with other public-spirited citizens.

I find that I do not agree particularly with the way the President has proceeded by appointing an independent group of citizens, without congressional authority. I am not in accord with the proposal made by the Senator from Montana, in connection with the pending concurrent resolution. I believe that the approach recommended by the Hoover Commission is the best one.

However, I concede, first, that the President, in endeavoring to meet the need to deal with this subject, has proceeded according to his best judgment; and I think he has done so in order to fill this vacuum. I think the Senator from Montana has proceeded according to his best judgment. But somewhere between the two approaches the Hoover Commission plan is probably the most equitable and logical answer to the problem. For that reason I commend the Senator from California for bringing out the particular phase of the approach which was recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hold in my hand a letter dated March 13, 1956, addressed to me and signed by Mr. Clarence Francis, Chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, who was, I believe a member of the Hoover Commission. This letter was placed in the RECORD on Monday, but for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader I read the following portion:

> I am pleased to inform you that the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report believes that House Concurrent Resolution 2,

It should be "Senate Concurrent Resolution 2"—

> would if enacted implement fully the recommendations of the Commission that there be created a Joint Congressional Committee on Foreign Intelligence.
>
> Yours sincerely,
>
> CLARENCE FRANCIS,
> *Chairman.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator. Of course, that is not the recommendation which the Hoover Commission made, although obviously the Senator is entitled to his opinion.

I fully concur in what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] says. I have the highest respect for the Senator from Montana. I know that he is concerned with this problem. I know that other Members are concerned with it. But I think there is great merit in what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out. We are dealing with an extremely sensitive field, involving jeopardy to the lives of our own citizens and those with whom we are associated abroad. While I will not go so far, perhaps, as to say, as he did, that we would be better off by abolishing the CIA than by establishing this type of committee, through which we might uncover and destroy the effectiveness of this agency at a time when we are perhaps facing some of the most crucial intelligence problems the country will confront, I think there is much merit in what the Senator from Georgia said.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall certainly be glad to sit down with the Senator from Montana, as I know the able Senator from New Hampshire would be glad to do, and discuss means of meeting some of the very real questions he has in mind.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes, and yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the able Senator from California that, while he has made a very good presentation, I heartily disagree with him.

I wonder if he knows that Mr. Bundy, who contributed $400 to Alger Hiss' defense fund, is now being appointed to a top position in the CIA.

I should also like to say to the able Senator that I have roughly 100 pages of documentation covering incompetence, inefficiency, waste, and Communist infiltration in the CIA, which I am holding in the hope that a committee will be established so that I can turn the information over to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that I do not have the facts which he states he has. However, I respectfully say to the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been deeply concerned by the question of Communist infiltration and Communist expansion in the world, as have other Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, that when it comes to the question of the defense of our country there is no center aisle in this Chamber. I believe that Members on both sides of the aisle are vitally concerned with the ultimate security of our country and the preservation of a free world. However, I know, as well as I know that I stand here, that if the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin were to present the facts to which he has referred to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in whom I know he has great confidence; to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who serves on that committee; to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who serves on the Committee on Appropriations as well as on the Committee on Armed Services; or to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN], on which committee the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin serves, they would be in a position to go into the subject very fully, without the necessity of creating a new joint committee in this manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. The unfortunate situation is that Mr. Dulles takes the position that we cannot call any witnesses from the CIA. I think it would require a committee such as the able Senator from Montana suggests to empower the Senate to subpena the proper witnesses from the CIA.

As the Senator from California knows, the CIA has hundreds of thousands of dollars of unvouchered funds. There is no accounting for those funds. The CIA is making foreign policy, and refuses to respond to subpenas. I do not believe any of the committees the Senator has

mentioned have the power of subpena. I think the able Senator from Montana has arrived at the proper answer to this problem. Without further discussion, let me say that I will heartily support the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin. Of course, he is entitled to his opinion and judgment. However, I believe that under the rules of the Senate the existing Committee on Armed Services has the power of subpena. I think there is no question about it. In any event, Mr. President, I know that the President of the United States, who has had some experience in the field of intelligence, as Supreme Commander in Europe during the war, feels that this proposal would jeopardize the Intelligence Service of this country abroad.

I hope the concurrent resolution will be defeated.

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT IN PENNSYLVANIA ANTISEDITION CASE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I request that either the proponents or the opponents of the concurrent resolution yield me 7 minutes. I have two bills to introduce, and I should like to discuss them very briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator. I now introduce the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 3602. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3603. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a decision by the Supreme Court, announced last week, urgently requires action by Congress.

In the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Nelson, the Court ruled that Pennsylvania's Sedition Act was unconstitutional because the Federal Government had preempted the antisedition field. The effect of this extraordinary ruling is to invalidate all State laws providing for prosecution of subversion and sedition.

The Nelson decision was based primarily on the argument that, in enacting various Federal statutes against subversion, Congress intended to exclude the States from this field. A more ridiculous interpretation of the Federal statutes can hardly be imagined. There is not a word in the United States Code that permits this inference; and, as a matter of fact, one section of the code explicitly recognizes the concurrent jurisdiction of the States.

Fortunately, however, this error can be corrected. When the Supreme Court makes a bad decision as the result of misinterpreting the will of the Congress, Congress can remedy the situation by passing new legislation. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill which will put beyond doubt the intention of Congress to share with the States responsibility for protecting this country against subversion. My bill provides, in effect, that no Federal antisubversion legislation shall be construed to deprive the States of jurisdiction to enforce their own antisubversion or antisedition statutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator by the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

I may say, Mr. President, that I think this matter is of utmost urgency. I hope the Judiciary Committee will report this bill, or one substantially like it, with all possible haste. But I want to say also that I deeply resent the fact that Congress is called upon to enact such legislation. Congress has enough to do without having to spend its time repealing laws enacted by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court's job is to interpret laws, not to make them. And the Court's decision in the Nelson case is the most outrageous instance of judicial legislation that has ever come to my attention.

By no stretch of logic—or even of the fertile imaginations for which this bench is famous—is the Nelson decision a reasonable interpretation of existing laws. The Court's ruling, and the arguments cited to support that ruling, compel the conclusion that the Court simply made up its own mind about what was best for the country, and then set about looking for reasons, however implausible, to support its position. There are some questions on which reasonable men can differ, but I deny that the issue of supersession as raised in the Nelson case is one of them.

Let me review briefly the reasoning cited by the majority of the Court to support its decision. The Court conveniently listed its reasons as "first," "second," and "third," so let us take them in order.

First, the Court contends that, after reviewing all Federal subversion and sedition laws, "the conclusion is inescapable that Congress has intended to occupy the field of sedition." But the Court does not cite a single passage of any Act that supports this contention. It could not because none exists. Beyond this, the majority of the Court completely ignored a provision of the Federal law which explicitly contradicts its contention. The Smith Act of 1940, which the Court cites as primary evidence that the Federal Government meant to preempt the antisedition field, is contained in title 18 of the United States Code. Section 3231 of that title provides that "nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof."

Now, Mr. President, what could be clearer than that?

It cannot be said that the majority of the Court was unaware of this provision for it is cited by the dissenting judges as a "decisive" reason "in and for itself" for upholding the Pennsylvania statute. I do not see how the Supreme Court can look at an enactment of Congress and proclaim that it means exactly the opposite of what the language plainly says, and still maintain the respect of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Second, the Court states that the "Federal interest" in the antisedition field "is so dominant that the Federal system must be assumed to preclude endorsement of State laws on the same subject." The Nelson dissent proves that the cases cited by the majority to support this contention are completely inapplicable to the antisedition laws. But more important, Mr. President: Let us note that the Court is announcing a new and revolutionary doctrine here—namely, that the States do not have a sufficient interest in attempts to overthrow American institutions to justify measures of self-protection. If this doctrine is allowed to stand, we might as well quit talking about a Federal system, and admit that the States have become meaningless political shells. This doctrine is, of course, entirely contrary to our Constitution. Under the Constitution, the States are sovereign bodies except to the extent that they have delegated specific powers to the Federal Government. The States have never delegated to the Federal Government the attribute of sovereignty in question; namely, the right of self-protection. It is perfectly obvious that the States would be powerless to protect themselves if the Federal Government were overthrown by the Communist conspiracy. Therefore, the States have an undeniably legitimate interest in preserving the National Government as well as their own governments. It is for this reason that, until the day of the Nelson decision, it was never doubted that the States shared with the Federal Government a concurrent responsibility for protecting the Federal Government against overthrow by force or violence. To say that the Federal Government has a "dominant" interest in this field so as to preclude concurrent State jurisdiction is to undermine completely the principles of our Constitution.

Third, the Court argues that the enforcement of State sedition acts "presents a serious danger of conflict with the administration of the Federal program." In this instance, the Supreme Court is simply talking off the top of its head. It cites no evidence to support this contention, and conveniently ignores the evidence that proves the contrary.

The best the Court could do by way of supporting its position was to cite a statement by President Roosevelt made in 1939, and another by J. Edgar Hoover,

made in 1940—which were to the effect that it is desirable for local law enforcement agencies to furnish the FBI with evidence of subversive activities. Neither of these statements says a word about it being necessary or advisable for State governments to desist from prosecutions.

The clearly competent and therefore appropriate authority on this point is the Justice Department—the Federal agency which is responsible for the enforcement of Federal sedition laws. Plainly, no one is better qualified to determine whether the efforts of the Justice Department to enforce Federal laws are hampered by State laws than the Justice Department itself. Now, in this very case, the Justice Department filed an amicus curiae brief, which dealt with the point as follows:

> The administration of the various State laws has not, in the course of the 15 years that the Federal and State sedition laws have existed side by side, in fact interfered with, embarrassed, or impeded the enforcement of the Smith Act. The significance of this absence of conflict in administration or enforcement of the Federal and State sedition laws will be appreciated when it is realized that this period has included the stress of wartime security requirements and the Federal investigation and prosecution under the Smith Act of the principal national and regional Communist leaders.

But the majority of the Court failed to even mention the Justice Department's views. Just as the Court second-guesses Congress on the question of what Congress intended, just so the Court second-guesses the Justice Department on the question of whether State sedition laws interfere with the enforcement of Federal sedition laws.

I do not think it is necessary, Mr. President, for me to point out that it is desirable for the Congress to reaffirm the concurrent jurisdiction of the States in the sedition field. For the past 30 years the States have played an important role in investigating and prosecuting those who are involved in the Communist conspiracy. State Governments have aided the Federal Government in this field, not obstructed it. It is clearly in the national interest to have as many competent governmental authorities as possible working on the problem of protecting our institutions against the Communist attack. But there is one further point: Let us note that it is not only State prosecutions of communism, but also State investigations of Communists that are affected by the Supreme Court decision. If the States have no jurisdiction to prosecute Communists, then it would seem to follow that the States are also deprived of jurisdiction to conduct investigations looking toward prosecution of Communists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have one more page. I wonder if the Senator from California will yield me another minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should be glad to, but I have one commitment of 1 minute and another commitment of 2 minutes, and I find I have only 3 minutes remaining. I am sure the acting majority leader will be glad to arrange to give the Senator a few more minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will presume, without any authority, to yield the Senator from Wisconsin 3 minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, unquestionably, some of the most valuable work in exposing the Communist conspiracy has been accomplished by the investigating committees of State legislatures. It is in the national interest that these committees be permitted to continue their work.

Let me say that I associate myself entirely with the sentiments recently expressed by Representative SMITH of Virginia, that the Nelson case is "merely a symptom of the dangerous disease that has threatened to destroy completely the sovereignty of the States." The Nelson decision is just one of a long series of decisions in which the Supreme Court has hacked away at the foundations of our Federal system, and one of the many in which the Court has relied on a spurious interpretation of congressional legislation to support its position. I therefore believe that the bill introduced by Representative SMITH 2 years ago—which forbids the Supreme Court to construe a congressional act of Congress as depriving States of jurisdiction unless Congress expressly states its intention to do so—is necessary and urgent legislation. I do not believe, however, that the Smith bill can deal with the problem raised by the Nelson case, since I doubt whether his bill could be enforced retroactively.

Therefore both my bill and Congressman SMITH's bill are necessary. I hope the Congress will act on both of them during this session.

Let me add, Mr. President, that since I prepared my remarks on the Nelson case, the Supreme Court has handed down another ukase that flagrantly violates States rights. In the Slochower case, the Court reached a new low in judicial irresponsibility. And it has handed another solid victory to the Communist Party. This extraordinary decision forbids a State educational institution to fire a teacher because he refuses, on the grounds of the fifth amendment, to testify before competent authorities with respect to alleged Communist affiliations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin 2 more minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The Supreme Court maintains that it is unreasonable and arbitrary, and thus a violation of due process, for the city of New York to decide that a person who says, "I will not testify about my alleged Communist associations because a truthful answer might tend to incriminate me," is unfit to teach its youth. It is bad enough that a majority of the Justices have fallen hook, line, and sinker for the leftwing view of what taking the fifth amendment implies; but that the Court should have gone further, and said that a contrary interpretation by a competent State body is impermissible is—as a matter of constitutional law—outrageous.

The Slochower and Nelson decisions are only the latest in a recent series of judicial rulings that aid the Communist Party. The Federal judiciary is making a full-scale assault on efforts by various Government authorities to protect American institutions. It is time the American people recognize the seriousness of the threat posed by incompetent and irresponsible judges. It is absolutely essential for State and Federal legislative bodies to work together in seeking means of preventing the judiciary from erecting a wall of protection around the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The whole trend of the actions of the Supreme Court in recent months, including the two decisions which the Senator has mentioned, indicates that the Court has dedicated itself to abolishing completely the States and federalizing the American people. Such actions can only lead to the destruction of the rights and liberties of the American people.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Georgia; and I agree a hundred percent.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Sinister Meaning?" which was published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO SINISTER MEANING?

A five-man majority of the Supreme Court has ruled that New York City cannot dismiss a Brooklyn College professor because he refused to answer a question concerning past Communist affiliations on the ground that a truthful answer might tend to incriminate him.

In a vigorous dissenting opinion, Justice Reed said that this ruling, based on the Federal due process clause, "strikes deep into the authority of New York to protect its local governmental institutions from influences of officials whose conduct does not meet the declared standards for employment." At what point does this intrusion of Federal authority into municipal affairs end? If New York cannot dismiss a professor who refuses to say whether he was a Communist, is its authority equally restricted in the case of a policeman who, on a plea of possible self-incrimination, refuses to say whether he is a grafter? It is true that Justice Clark, speaking for the majority, went on to disclaim any intention of saying that the professor has a constitutional right to serve on the Brooklyn College faculty, and to assert that it "may be that proper inquiry" would show his continued employment to be "inconsistent with a real interest in the State." Just what this may mean is not clear. At the least, however, it means that a city employee cannot be dismissed for refusing to answer questions put to him by a duly qualified investigating agency. To this extent, the freedom of the local authorities to choose their own employees is circumscribed.

There is another aspect of this case worth noting.

The New York board of education said that one of two inferences had to be drawn from the professor's refusal to testify: (1) That a truthful answer to the question would tend to prove him guilty of a crime in some way connected with his official conduct, or (2) that in order to avoid answering the question he falsely invoked the claim of self-incrimination.

This was rejected by the Court, which said that "at the outset we must condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the fifth amendment. * * * The privilege against self-incrimination would be reduced to a hollow mockery if its exercise could be taken as equivalent either to a confession of guilt or a conclusive presumption of perjury."

Does it follow that no inference may be drawn in such a circumstance? When an intelligent man, claiming no misunderstanding and advised by counsel, refuses to answer a proper question on the ground that a truthful answer might incriminate him, is he to be persumed to be innocent of any wrongdoing? It seems to us that the inference which the board of education drew was justified in the circumstances, and that Brooklyn College should have been as free to get rid of this professor as a banker would be free to fire a teller who had refused, on a plea of possible self-incrimination, to say whether he was an embezzler.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I am one of the cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, but I now expect to vote against it. Hence I desire to state briefly the reasons for the vote I shall cast.

I offered my name as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution in the belief that the Central Intelligence Agency needed closer supervision; that it needed to have a sharper sense of responsibility in the spending of money illustrated, for example, by the exorbitant figure they asked for the construction of their new building, and because of other evidence of an indifference to the dollar sign.

I thought it might be desirable also to have joint meetings of the subcommittees of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services and the subcommittees of the Committees on Appropriations which deal with the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it might be desirable to have such meetings in any event, whether the concurrent resolution shall be agreed to or not.

I think it might be desirable also—and I hope that will be the result of this discussion—for the subcommittees which deal with the Central Intelligence Agency to exert a greater sense of responsibility and closer supervision with respect to some of the activities of that agency.

I have concluded to vote against the concurrent resolution because in the broad authority to create a large staff, and in the provision for the borrowing of consultants, experts, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistance from various agencies of the Government, I think I sense possibilities that some very highly classified information might become too widely diffused.

In that connection, I am reminded of the story——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am reminded of the story once told by CHARLIE HALLECK, a Member of the House of Representatives. Mr. HALLECK told of the man who said, "I never have any trouble in keeping a secret. The trouble is that the folks to whom I tell it will not keep their mouths shut."

In this instance, the trouble might be that if we start to borrow clerks and assistants from agencies of the Government to create the kind of staff which would be represented by $250,000, we might be having secrets told to too many people.

I believe, therefore, that the responsibility should rest where it now does, namely, with the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations. But I sincerely hope that as a result of the presentation of the concurrent resolution and the discussion in connection therewith, those committees will exert a closer scrutiny upon the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 5 minutes in connection with the introduction of a joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution for appropriate reference, and I desire to make a brief statement in connection therewith.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information, established pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress, is making public today its 11th semiannual report to Congress as required by law. Congress authorized this Commission in order that the public interest might be adequately represented in the conduct of our international information programs. The five members of the Commission are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chairman of the Commission is Dr. Mark May, director, institute of human relations, Yale University. Other members are Edwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor; Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam; Judge Justin Miller, retired chairman of the board, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters; and Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

This group of distinguished Americans has performed a real public service in their efforts to strengthen our international information programs. The members have been in constant touch with the planning and operations phases of those programs. Periodic visits have been made to the field offices of many of the countries where we maintain an information program in order to learn firsthand the problems which must be met on the local or country level and quickly resolved. They have studied the activities carried on by unfriendly forces abroad to discredit the United States and to confuse the public mind about American intentions. The Commission has never hesitated to be critical of any phase of our information activity where the facts have required such criticism. Above all it has sought to bring stability, efficiency, imagination and public understanding to a function of government which has been forced upon us by circumstances largely beyond our control.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information is to be congratulated for the constructive and pioneer work it has accomplished since its creation in 1948.

It is the practice of the Commission, in connection with its semiannual report to Congress, to set forth a series of recommendations based upon its studies and findings during the preceding 6-month period. Those recommendations are made in order to effectuate the purposes and objectives of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948—Public Law 402. Such recommendations have been directed to the President, Congress, and to the executive responsible for the direction of our international information program. It is encouraging to note that most of the recommendations made by the Commission in previous reports have been acted upon favorably. Members of Congress will want to study carefully, and act upon, the many recommendations made by the Commission specifically to the Congress in part III of today's report.

But there is one item which, I believe, demands our immediate attention and speedy compliance. There is one basic recommendation which has been advanced since 1953 on which no action has been taken as yet. That is the recommendation to Congress that it establish a Joint Committee on International Information Programs.

In its Seventh Semiannual Report to Congress dated February 20, 1953, the Advisory Commission recommended "that a permanent Joint Congressional Committee on International Information be established to provide liaison between the legislative and executive branches." In support of this recommendation the following statement appears in that 1953 report:

The need for such a committee was also apparent in past years. Mr. Elmer Davis, wartime Director of the Office of War Information, in his concluding report to the President, stated that such a joint committee would be needed should the occasion for overseas propaganda operations ever again arise. Such a need is now more than evident to the members of this Commission.

This same recommendation was repeated in the Ninth Semiannual Report under date of February 2, 1954.

In its 10th Semiannual Report dated February 10, 1955 this same recommendation was again repeated.

The 11th Semiannual Report of the Advisory Commission made public today repeats this recommendation once more.

The report carries this statement in support of the recommendation:

> For the past 3 years this Commission has believed that the appointment of such a committee would be instrumental in strengthening the work of the United States Government in this field. We would not ask the Congress to add another committee to the almost overwhelming number that now exist were it not for the inescapable fact that the importance of information in international affairs, and for our own national security, is rapidly increasing.

The Commission report also takes specific notice of House Joint Resolution 433, introduced by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs. The Commission endorses this resolution and now urges the Congress to act favorably on it.

This resolution, identical with House Joint Resolution 433, is very carefully drawn. It emphasizes the need for a bipartisan approach to the conduct of our overseas information work. It calls for an 18-member committee, 9 from the Senate and 9 from the House. Two members, 1 from each party, are to be selected from each of the following Senate Committees: The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations. Provision is made for 3 members at large, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority. This same procedure will be followed in the selection of members from the House.

The joint committee is to elect its own chairman and vice chairman. The chairmanship and vice chairmanship are to rotate between the two Houses with each session of Congress.

The terms of reference of this joint committee are carefully defined so as to avoid the possibility of duplicating the work of any of the standing committees. In addition to inquiring into the extent and effectiveness of our present international information programs, this resolution calls for an examination into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications has progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by our information programs. It also calls for constant study of the technique, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda in order to better understand what we must do to present the true facts about the United States and its policies to all the people of the world.

Through such a joint committee a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States information programs will be built. The regular exchange of views, together with discussion of the major problems facing the information programs or hindering their most effective operation, should bring added stability and strength to the present work.

Since about 1948 a great deal has been said about the "cold war of ideas"; "the struggle for the minds of men"; "the unlimited power of ideals," and the "conflict of ideologies" between the East and the West. In 1950 President Truman called for a worldwide campaign of truth in order to prevent war and to win the peace. In December 1955 President Eisenhower, in a conference with the leaders of Congress, called for a greatly expanded international information program in order to meet the challenge of the latest Russian propaganda offensive. Leaders in practically every walk of life have expressed their opinions on the importance of an adequate information program. Few people today fail to understand how the advancement of science has reduced the size of the earth and made mass communications a new dimension in world affairs. The importance of a sound international information program to our national security is now beyond reasonable debate.

Mr. President, the Congress still has to play a full and useful role in assuring the American people of a sound and adequate international information program. The only opportunity Congress now has to make its contribution to this important work is when the appropriations bill for the USIA is before the Senate or House. This occurs once a year. Individual members have interested themselves in this work and have made splendid contributions to it. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has naturally taken an interest in the information programs. But Congress has not given the attention to this work which its promise for the future both warrants and requires.

With all the arguments advanced to point out the importance of our international information programs, I believe there is one which is more compelling than all others. That is the unwavering belief that mankind can win through to lasting peace despite the present obstacles to that cherished goal. Among those obstacles are ignorance and hatred. Despots and tyrants down through history have always played upon ignorance to generate hatred. No tyrant or despot can thwart the hopes of mankind without his historical allies of ignorance and hatred. Similarly, we as a Nation will advance toward our goal of peace in proportion to the progress we make in removing the factors of ignorance and hatred from the relations between nations and people. The demonstrated capability of modern means of mass communication present a real challenge to all those who work for a better world. That challenge is how we shall best use these modern means of mass communication to attain our cherished goals.

It is for these reasons that I now introduce in the Senate an identical resolution to House Joint Resolution 433. Through the bipartisan spirit expressed in the language of that resolution, I trust that a good number of my colleagues will join in with me in its introduction. Hence, I ask, Mr. President, that the joint resolution remain at the desk until the close of Senate business on Monday, April 16, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the proposal and to cosponsor it if they wish.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution which I am introducing may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the joint resolution will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there shall be a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "joint committee").

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(1) Nine Members of the Senate, appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, 1 from the majority and 1 from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

(B) Three at large from the Senate, 2 from the majority and 1 from the minority party.

(2) Nine Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, 1 from the majority and 1 from the minority party: The Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and

(B) Three at large from the House of Representatives, 2 from the majority party and 1 from the minority party.

(b) No person appointed by the Speaker of the House under section 2 (A) shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee of the House of Representatives of which he was a member when appointed to the joint committee, except that a member who has been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as a member of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(c) A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(d) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members, and the chairmanship and vice chairmanship shall rotate between the two Houses with each session of Congress.

(e) Subject to applicable provisions of law, the joint committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(f) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the

contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall—

(1) conduct public hearings on, and cause studies to be made concerning, the extent and effectiveness of all United States international information programs;

(2) cause studies to be made of the technique, special characteristics, and extent of all types of Communist propaganda, including methods used to penetrate information media of the free world with such propaganda;

(3) inquire into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communications have progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are utilized by the United States international information programs; and

(4) provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the United States international information programs, counsel with executives and policymakers of such programs, and promote a better public understanding of the objectives of such programs.

(b) As used in this joint resolution the term "United States international information program" means any program operated by or financed in whole or in part by any department or agency of the Government utilizing media of communications or other psychological or informational means to inform or to influence opinion among people of other nations.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Congress twice annually (beginning on July 1, or January 1, after the effective date of this act, depending upon which date is nearest) on the extent and effectiveness of United States international information programs and at such other times as the joint committee deems necessary; and shall recommend to the President and to Congress steps considered necessary to improve the quality, coverage, and impact of all such programs.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this joint resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of section 102 to 104, inclusive of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

PRINTING OF INDEX OF REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 111)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would be assuming authority I do not have if I yielded time under the control of the majority leader. I am sure the majority leader will be available in a minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit herewith an index to the report, Various Study Committees, Staff and Survey Reports, and Supporting Documents of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

This index, which covers 16 reports published by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress at the request of the Committee on Government Operations.

Since the Commission inadvertently overlooked the preparation and printing of an index to these reports, which were referred to the Committee on Government Operations, the committee requested the Library of Congress to compile the index and approve its publication as a Senate document, to insure that the reports may be properly utilized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a documentation of incompetence, theft, and Communist infiltration in the CIA. I shall not introduce it into the RECORD, because it may contain some security information. But I want the Chair to know that the minute the proposed committee is established, I will promptly turn over all this information to the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield me 1 minute?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield my friend from North Dakota 2 minutes.

Mr. LANGER. As a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution, I wish to reply to the reference made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that the staff of the committee which would be created could not be trusted. He did not say anything about the 1,000 or 5,000 or 10,000 employees of the CIA. I would trust a staff made up of 5 or 10 or 25 persons as much as I would one, two, three, or five thousand employees working for the CIA, whose names we do not know, not one of whom has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to the other side, because I do not know whether the majority leader has other commitments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I understand the majority leader does not have any other commitments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has about expired. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, with the understanding that the opposition will do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the opposition has expired. The Senator from Texas has yielded back the time under his control.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, as amended. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If the Senator from Virginia were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 59, as follows:

YEAS—27

Barrett	Jenner	Morse
Clements	Kefauver	Mundt
Ervin	Kennedy	Murray
Fulbright	Kerr	Neely
Gore	Langer	Neuberger
Green	Lehman	Pastore
Hill	Mansfield	Payne
Humphrey	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Jackson	McNamara	Welker

NAYS—59

Aiken	Duff	McClellan
Allott	Dworshak	Millikin
Barkley	Eastland	O'Mahoney
Beall	Ellender	Potter
Bender	Flanders	Purtell
Bennett	Frear	Robertson
Bible	Goldwater	Russell
Bricker	Hayden	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hennings	Schoeppel
Bush	Hickenlooper	Scott
Butler	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Hruska	Stennis
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Symington
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Thye
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Watkins
Cotton	Kuchel	Wiley
Curtis	Laird	Williams
Daniel	Malone	Wofford
Dirksen	Martin, Iowa	Young
Douglas	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Ives	Smathers
Byrd	Long	Sparkman
Chavez	Magnuson	
George	Monroney	

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was rejected.

SIGNING OF CONFERENCE REPORTS BY MAJORITY OF THE MANAGERS OF EACH HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the information of the Senate, if I may have the attention of Senators: I am informed that the other body has just rejected a motion to recommit the conference report on the farm bill—doing so by a vote of 238 to 181, or a majority of 57—and that the roll is now being called there on the question of the adoption of the conference report. The vote would indicate that the conference report will be adopted overwhelmingly, and will shortly be before the Senate. Therefore, I inform Senators that in the event the report is approved by the House and is received by the Senate within the next hour or so, it is planned that the Senate shall remain in session until late this evening, in an attempt to dispose of the conference report.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION REGULATION RESPECTING CERTAIN THICKNESSES OF LUMBER

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 6 minutes without the Senator from Indiana losing his right to the floor, on an emergency problem which has arisen in my State, with respect to which I think the Senate should be informed before the Committee on Banking and Currency holds a hearing tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 6 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] will not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like particularly to have the attention of members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member.

Tomorrow morning a subcommittee of that committee will begin writing up the bill relating to the Federal Housing Administration. I shall appear before the subcommittee and ask for the suspension of writing up that bill until we can obtain the facts and correct what I am satisfied Senators will agree is a gross injustice which the FHA is imposing on builders on the west coast. Let me say to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that this regulation will affect California in a matter of a few hours, as well as the State of Washington and my own State.

The situation is this: The FHA has written what, in my judgment, is an order which represents the height of bureaucratic asininity, an order which will stop construction, and is stopping construction this very hour, on many houses in my State. The situation will later spread to the other States, unless they use lumber of a thickness of twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch, instead of the so-called ¾-inch lumber, which is twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch in thickness. The $^{24}/_{32}$-inch thickness of lumber has been used for years in the construction of FHA housing in the West. It is agreed by all, including FHA headquarters in Washington, that a $^{24}/_{32}$-inch board will give a house all the structural strength it needs, and in excess of what it needs. But because there is a so-called standard of $^{25}/_{32}$-inch thickness which is laid down by the American Lumber Standards Committee the Commissioner of the FHA is taking the arbitrary position that until that standard is changed by the American Lumber Standards Committee the FHA will continue to require lumber of $^{25}/_{32}$ inch in thickness. This very afternoon its inspectors are closing down housing projects in Oregon, and I am advised will have to close them down, in the hours immediately ahead, in Washington and California as well because of the delivery of $^{24}/_{32}$-inch lumber to the contractors and builders instead of $^{25}/_{32}$-inch lumber.

This order is perfectly absurd and silly. What we need to do in the Banking and Currency Committee is to bring before that committee immediately the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration for a full disclosure and explanation of this arbitrary ruling on the part of the FHA.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago I released to the Press Gallery a press release on this matter, which reads as follows:

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, issued the following statement today in regard to what he termed irresponsible arbitrariness on the part of the Federal Housing Administration. He stated:

"As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have just listened to frantic appeals from representatives of home builders, contractors, mortgage-loan officials, and homeowners whose homes are in the process of construction, in protest over what must be characterized as an asinine ruling of the Federal Housing Administration at the Washington, D. C., level.

"For years FHA inspectors have approved construction inspection of FHA-financed homes in which boards with a thickness of twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch have been used. On March 13 the Washington office of FHA sent a letter setting forth an order that, effective March 15, board thickness must be twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch. The effective date of order, March 15, had arrived before the letter was even received in Oregon. It is admitted by all that the difference of one-thirty-seconds of an inch in no way affects the structural soundness of the houses. In fact, it is admitted that twenty-four thirty-seconds of an inch thickness produces a house with structural strength much beyond the minimum strength necessary. The physical fact is that much of the so-called twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch lumber coming from the same sawmill will vary more than one thirty-seconds of an inch from cutting to cutting. Yet the FHA is standing behind its arbitrary order, with the result that today construction of FHA houses is being closed down, not only in Oregon, but the work stoppage is spreading up and down the west coast. This action by the FHA threatens the lumber industry of the Northwest and the construction industry of the west coast, and if this order is carried to its logical conclusion would require that the FHA measure every board going into every house that they are guaranteeing.

"This is bureaucratic asininity at its worst. I am appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee tomorrow morning, asking for a cessation of any consideration of the omnibus housing bill now before it until the FHA Administrator appears before the committee to clean up this mess."

I also wish to read to the Senate an article published in the April 6 issue of the Eugene Register-Guard, the newspaper of my home town, dealing with this subject matter, which reads as follows:

Lumbermen said Friday they were confident they would soon settle the controversy that led the Federal Housing Administration to man the ¾-inch-thick boards mills now are producing.

The FHA said it would have to reject loan applications on houses where boards were

stamped with the ¾-inch designation, since the American Lumber Standards organization calls for twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thickness in boards.

Lumbermen and FHA officials were agreed it was a technicality over one-thirty-seconds of an inch that could be straightened out April 30 when the American Lumber Standards Committee meets. If that committee approves ¾-inch-thick boards as the new standard, the FHA also will approve, J. Guy Arrington, Oregon FHA director, said.

Lumbermen said mills have been producing three-quarter boards for some years, but the trouble arises now because the mills have just begun stamping the thickness on the boards.

"Structurally, there is no difference in strength between a ¾-inch board and one twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thick. I don't think we should be stuffy about this. The main thing is we want a structure that is sound within the intent of our mortgage-guaranty program. We are going to rely on our officers. I'm hoping they will use their common sense," said Charles A. Bowser, Assistant Commissioner in charge of underwriting for the FHA in Washington, D. C.

Arrington said, however, his office would not approve loans where it was known ¾-inch board had been used.

"Of course, where a house is already built, we can't see what size is stamped on the boards. And if the boards are unstamped in new construction we probably can't tell the size—water content can make more than one thirty-second of an inch difference," Arrington said.

But Arrington said that where stamped lumber can be seen loan applications will be rejected until the national FHA office puts out a new directive or the American Lumber Standards Committee approves the ¾-inch board.

Mr. President, I have just been in long-distance telephone conference with representatives of homeowners, mortgage-loan bankers, contractors, and lumbermen. They say that this order is perfectly asinine.

On March 13 the FHA sent out a letter announcing that on March 15 the $^{25}/_{32}$-inch-thickness requirement would be laid down. Before the letter reached Oregon the application date had already arrived. Carloads of lumber had already been loaded for shipment to builders and contractors. Lumber was piled up on building sites—$^{24}/_{32}$-inch lumber. But the FHA Administrator is laying down the rule that such lumber cannot go into the houses, because there is a standard laid down by the American Lumber Standards Committee, and the Commissioner is reported to me as having taken the position that it was understood in the industry that the industry should meet the standards of the American Lumber Standards Committee. However, I point out that I have been advised that for years so-called ¾-inch lumber has been used in FHA housing and inspectors for FHA know it and have approved the houses. Now all at once the Commissioner cracks down on the builders.

Mr. President, this order involves a terrific cost to the building-construction industry in the West. All the industry is asking for is a 30 days' suspension of the order—the policy involved has been in effect for years—until, at the Chicago conference of the American Lumber Standards Committee, to be held the latter part of April, this subject can be considered. At this conference it is expected that the old standard of twenty-five thirty-seconds will be changed, permitting ¾-inch lumber to be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

One further point is that it is a physical fact that, day in and day out, lumber which is cut by a particular saw in a mill will vary during the day more than one thirty-second of an inch. The same saw will vary in its cutting. Yet we are confronted with a ruling that unless lumber is stamped in such a manner as to indicate that it is twenty-five thirty-seconds of an inch thick, it cannot go into FHA housing.

Mr. President, this means losses of large sums of money if this order is not suspended until the question can be cleared up. This order and the way it was issued is what I call government by arbitrary edict. It is the kind of arbitrary action which we must stop.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is scheduled for tomorrow morning a committee meeting of the Subcommittee on Housing. If the Senator would like me to do so, I shall be delighted to issue an invitation to the Federal Housing Commissioner to attend the hearing and discuss this question.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the offer of the Senator from Arkansas who is the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. All I ask is an opportunity to bring the Commissioner before the Housing Committee to explain the order, and to answer the questions which I know my constituents will wish to ask him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will see that such an invitation is issued to him this afternoon to attend that meeting.

If the Senator will further yield, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet tomorrow afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much; and I thank the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for his courtesy.

REEXAMINATION OF OUR FARM POLICIES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I send to the desk and ask to have apprcpriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3608) establishing the Joint Congressional Commission on Fundamental Farm Policy, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in view of the action of the House just reported by the majority leader, I should like to discuss for a while the question of a reexamination of our farm policies.

Mr. JENNER. It is time for Congress to get off the treadmill of superficial discussion of the farm problem. We have an emergency farm problem, and I favor vigorous emergency measures to give the farmers whatever help is proper and just. That is why I have given my support to the measure recently passed by the Senate, the conference report on which will be before the Senate in about an hour.

There is no reason why the farmers should bear the brunt of all the errors and omissions made in all our Government policies, through the years.

We also have a long-term farm problem. We have been talking about it for 25 years.

We have spent billions of dollars and we have woven a mesh of governmental and supernational controls over our politically independent farmers, but we have not done one single thing to remedy the basic farm problems. The reason is that we have not yet dealt with fundamentals. We have talked about parity price, but what is parity price?

When we are finished with all the high-sounding explanations, parity price means, simply, that American farmers are smart enough to raise magnificent crops, but are not smart enough to sell them at prices which cover the outlay needed to remain in operation. That I do not believe. I am not willng to believe that American farmers and American businessmen are not smart enough to solve the problems of marketing farm production, but Government bureaucrats are smart enough to solve them, if the farmer leaves everything to them.

Let us look for a moment at the origin of our policy of Government aid to, and direction of agriculture.

In the great depression, we accumulated vast surpluses of cotton and wheat.

Congress set up the Federal Farm Board to dispose of the surpluses, chiefly abroad.

President Hoover appointed an able Board under an able and experienced Chairman, Alexander Legge, president of the International Harvester Co. Mr. Legge made every effort to move the surpluses, but he found farm surpluses could not be sold by Government, traded abroad, or dumped, without causing more evils than they cured.

State trading was no remedy. Only a realistic approach to the underlying factors in the marketing of farm products could give the farmers any higher income than the price they were offered in the world exchanges.

This conclusion, the classical conclusion of non-Socialist economists, means that the income of producers, farmers, or anyone else can be increased only by cutting the costs of the producers, raising the income of consumers, or opening up new markets.

All other remedies are a form of subsidy, open or hidden, which appears first as a gift from the Government to the producer, but ends ultimately in devaluation of the dollars in which the gift is paid.

When President Roosevelt took office in March 1933, the world depression was

8 months past its crisis. World trade was slowly climbing upward.

American farm prices were low enough so that we were recapturing, by simple business competition, foreign markets for cotton and pork which we had lost years before. Farm debts were the heaviest burden.

President Roosevelt inaugurated an excellent program, in the Farm Credit Administration, for quick refinancing of mortgages made at the height of postwar inflated land prices. This was a sound, conservative effort to cut the operating costs of farmers who had bought land during an orgy of land speculation.

It was not in the national interest to have able farmer-operators driven out of production, and farm families driven from the land, while farmlands were bought at distress prices by financial interests.

The Farm Credit Administration was working for a return to complete self-reliance by farmers, as soon as the speculative burden was lifted.

As a remedy for the depression, the normal rise in the business cycle, which was already underway, would have increased employment, and raised farm prices in the domestic market, the largest market for farm output. Farm income would have been pushed up, by fundamental recovery in the consumers' market.

A great many fancy tables and reports apparently prove that, because farm sales were just as high in depression as in prosperity, farmers could not improve their incomes without Government price-fixing. These tables and charts are the statistical mirage with which anything can be proven, if one does not look at fundamentals.

Farm prices, made in a free market, would have responded to the improved demand which was underway in 1933, just as rapidly as they responded to the falling demand which set in, in 1929.

Statistically, a gain in farm income from price manipulation by Government looks as good as a gain in farm income from healthy recovery in the entire economy. The difference is the same as in the case of the revived energy of a sick patient through overstimulating drugs, and his revival through elimination of germs and restored vitality of his body.

In March 1933, American agriculture stood in need of careful thinking by national leaders. We needed a national agricultural policy, to meet three separate problems:

First. The emergency problem causing widespread foreclosures.

Second. The world business depression which caused the steep fall in prices.

Third. The long-term change in the situation of American agriculture, due to the fact that our farmlands were facing heavy competition from new virginal farmlands outside our boundaries.

What went wrong, if the emergency program for refinancing debt was sound, and the cyclical influences were pulling farm income rapidly upward?

The answer is that the Socialist influences within the administration were stronger than those who advocated sound, economic remedies. I will show you this is the problem we have been wrestling with, in this body, in all the intervening years.

We have measured the ears of the elephant, the trunk of the elephant, the legs of the elephant, and the elephant's tail. But we have been blindfolded. We have never looked at the whole elephant, so we could not cope with the real obstacle in all of its many ramifications. We could not return to our proper path as a nation.

How were we persuaded to change to price controls and then production controls? I can give the answer. Within the farm board in 1932, there was a minority group which did not believe in free markets. Among them, Mordecai Ezekiel urged artificial price increases accompanied by production controls.

Part of Mr. Ezekiel's record can be found in a recent publication of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, the report on the Concord papers of Harry D. White.

His Socialist doctrine could make no headway with the marketing experts of the farm board, but after March 4, he found a haven in the Department of Agriculture, where Rexford Guy Tugwell was busy making America over.

Ezekiel and his friends helped draft the agricultural adjustment payments program, and its successors, and devised the Commodity Credit Corporation to serve their purpose—Government control of the marketing of farm products.

I need not remind Senators that a Communist cell had been organized within the Department of Agriculture, during the depression, under Harold Ware, son of one of the top Communist leaders.

I need not remind Senators that the atmosphere of the Department was sufficiently friendly to collectivism so that such admitted Communists as Lee Pressman, later counsel to the National Labor Relations Board, and others, served there for several years on the way to higher responsibilities in the mushrooming Federal executive establishment.

Another of the early members of the cell was Alger Hiss.

Dr. Wirt, a citizen of my own State, has told how the pro-Communists in Washington talked of the revolution to come, after Roosevelt, the American Kerensky, had opened the door of the citadel.

Dr. Wirt was hounded to an early grave by powerful left-wing forces in the administration.

The chairman of a House committee, Representative John O'Connor, was hounded to political extinction by the same forces because he came to regret his part in unjustly smearing Dr. Wirt, and publicly recanted.

It is true that Secretary Wallace purged some of the extremists among the brain trusters in the Department of Agriculture, but we must not take too much hope from that.

In a speech delivered on December 28, 1933, before the American Farm Economic Association, and other economic associations, Mr. Wallace stated again and again that the underlying purpose of the administration's farm program was "social discipline."

As a specific example of the new willingness to modify individual behavior for the larger purposes of society, he cited the current policy of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, to reduce wheat-acreage 15 percent, in line with the London Wheat Agreement, and to pay farmers who complied from tax funds.

When you cut away all the undergrowth is not that just where we are still?

There is always a great deal of plausible argument, wearying detail, and fancy verbiage, about any socialistic program. Otherwise, no one would buy it. But we, in Congress, cannot be deceived by the trimming.

Mr. Wallace said the farm program proved "the desirability of collective action," and he praised the farmers for "their willingness to undergo a certain amount of social discipline for the larger purposes of the group."

America has not become great by assuming a man must join a group in order to be able to think about the "larger purposes" of society. Imagine Franklin or Jefferson or Washington being told they could not think about the larger purposes of the Nation unless they joined a planning collective.

Mr. Wallace frankly referred to the program as "a planned agriculture." He admitted it was to be a long-term program, not a "dream born of the emergency, to evaporate when the emergency disappears."

If we plan, he said, on a nationalist course, "then a huge area of farmland must be kept out of cultivation, certain processing and handling trades will have to adjust themselves to it, and consumer purchasing power will have to be kept at a level high enough to support it. Each and all of these operations demand planning."

Such was the policy of the first two administrations of President Roosevelt.

Mr. Wallace also described "planned agriculture" in an era of internationalism. That is what we adopted with the third term of the Roosevelt administration. He said:

> If we decide for the international course, then there will have to be radical lowering of many tariffs, high-cost industries will have to be eliminated, and foreign purchasing power will consciously have to be increased; this, too, requires planning.

Surely, Mr. President, I do not have to point out to you how neatly Mr. Wallace defined our present policies, even if he did not suggest the names of GATT and OTC, mutual aid, and point 4.

The collectivists knew well what they were doing in 1933, but sometimes I wonder if we know it now.

This planned economy, said Mr. Wallace, "presupposes a social machine. I have always thought of the Agricultural Adjustment Act as fundamentally such a machine."

Such a machine, he said, "demands certain types of plasticity" in people, "vastly different from the little hard human particles which have been so characteristic of the past."

The pioneers who broke the soil would have been human particles much too hard for this planned economy.

Senators will also appreciate the role assigned to Congress in this planned agriculture. Said Mr. Wallace:

> It may be the duty of Congressmen as individuals to speak for specific selfish local interests among their constituents but the administration if it is to do its part in perfecting an enduring social discipline, must use its power, whether dealing with farmers, with wage earners, or with businessmen, to keep each within the bounds dictated by the general welfare.

At that very meeting, Mr. Wallace's description of a planned agriculture for the United States, based on Rex Tugwell's dream of the Soviet heaven on earth, was denounced in urbane but devastating terms by B. H. Hibbard, dean of agriculture at the University of Wisconsin and one of the founders of the original and very distinguished Division of Agriculture Economics in the oldtime Agriculture Department. He urged the need, at that time, for a long-range, fundamental analysis of agriculture.

What did American farmers get by this Government price-fixing and Government intervention in selling their products? They got more dollars, but, as always happens, the value of the dollar was forced down to half.

What was the result politically? Every farm State was subdivided into sections, in which the farmers were to decide on production quotas. But this districting, under the direction of county agents and agricultural officials, meant that the entire farming area of the United States was covered by an administrative grid, controlled from the central powerhouse in Washington.

What was this grid? It was a political machine, by means of which the administration could reach into every agricultural country in the United States, and spread its propaganda, support those local leaders who favored controls, and supply Washington with firsthand reports on political sentiment in each area.

All these things, added up, meant that a political machine centered in Washington, but reaching out to every acre of farmland in the country, was built up by Henry Wallace and his merry men, at the same time Hopkins was building his political machine at the grassroots, through WPA.

Mr. President, do you think President Roosevelt and Henry Wallace did not know they had a combined Gallup poll and Tammany Hall reaching from Washington into every farm community?

Do you think they did not use it to help Senators and Congressmen in their thinking?

Do you think Sidney Hillman missed this opportunity?

Do you think they were too scrupulous to use it to help reelect "good" Representatives and Senators, and help defeat the "reactionaries" who distrusted Government controls?

Do you think they never tried to persuade Senators and Congressmen from the farm areas to vote for nonfarm bills, like the Wagner Act, or later foreign aid, by a friendly reminder of the payments flowing into their districts from the Public Treasury?

Mr. President, what I am saying is that President Roosevelt's socialist advisers knew exactly what they were doing when they chose to help the farmers of this country by Government price controls and Government buying up of surpluses, instead of helping them by lowering costs, finding new markets, and lowering the cost of living for domestic consumers.

The Farm Credit Administration, which spoke for freedom of production and freedom of marketing, fought on for a while, but was soon absorbed by Henry Wallace and his collectivist brigade.

Maybe Senators think that is old stuff, Mr. President, but it is right here with us today.

We have changed the names of our Government buying programs, again and again, but we have never changed their philosophy.

Lend-lease was, in reality, a plan for buying up farm surpluses, as well as industrial surpluses, and then giving them away, to make producers still more dependent on Government aid, and to win political support for the administration. So were UNRRA and the Marshall plan.

I cannot take the time of Senators to show them what they can easily see for themselves.

Under all the outward differences, these programs had one effect—to make the farmers economically dependent on the Government to market their crops, so that farm families would vote to keep the collectivists in power.

I shall have to skip quickly over 25 years of history, but I assure you, Mr. President and Senators, I am charting the direction correctly, even though I do not point out every curve along the way.

During World War II, all the forms of collectivist control which had been perfected by 1940, were stretched to international dimensions. Then these supernational mechanisms were redesigned for postwar survival in the United Nations, the food and agriculture organization, point 4, and the rest. Every one of these agencies was a New Deal agency, in global form.

Mr. President, do any of us here in Congress really understand the intricate mesh of controls which now dominates our agriculture, since the growth of the United Nations, NATO, GATT, the various international commodity agreements, and all the other bits and pieces of supergovernment?

Do any of us understand how much of the price loss the farmers now face is due to economic causes, and how much is due to the political machinations of the Government?

Do any of us know what are the real policies of this supergovernment, or what we are acceding to, when we agree to the bills put before us by the bureaucracy, which leave most of our policies to supernational machinery we cannot control?

I maintain that the collectivist international mechanism is now so well-developed, so completely in control of national governmental policies, that changes in political party labels have virtually no effect whatever.

The American people may vote for changes today, as they did in 1932. But in 1932, when they voted for a change, the whole governmental operation could be changed.

Today, when they vote for a change in the party in power, their vote affects only a little band of national officials such as Cabinet officials, tightly wedged between the supernational agencies above them, and the supporting bureaucracy below.

The elected and Senate-approved officials can move a little, but they can change our real policies hardly at all.

I fully agree with Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee in the House of Representatives.

I believe we have now reached a point, as a result of these supercontrols, where American agriculture is being manipulated to fit a world plan by which we are to be restricted to production for the domestic market only.

We are told that American farmers must reduce their acreage because surpluses are increasingly burdensome and that they depress prices.

Our Government has launched a multi-billion-dollar program of increasing productive acreage throughout the world.

Our Government is doing everything possible to increase agricultural production across the face of the globe.

A substantial portion of our foreign aid appropriations has been devoted to this purpose.

Through the programs, we taxpayers—including, naturally, the farmers—are paying to supply competitor nations with seed, farm machinery of every description, and hundreds of agricultural experts to increase their farm output.

And, while our own farmers have to pay dearly for such equipment and other factors, foreign farmers are getting it all free from the United States.

To top this one, we are also spending vast sums of money to provide irrigation and other soil improvements abroad—again free of charge—which will continue to skyrocket competitive farm production.

We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain about the surplus of cotton in the United States. What has the administration done about it? It has made it possible, through United States money, for Mexico to double its cotton production. It has made it possible for India to increase its cotton production by 50 percent. It has made it possible for cotton-growing Egypt to add 2 million irrigated farm acres when the Aswan Dam is finished.

All this cotton growing is being encouraged by the State Department, at a time when world production, in the past 4-year period for which figures are available, has already increased by more than 5 million bales, all of which competes with United States cotton.

As a result, cotton exports from this country dropped nearly 40 percent in 3 years, while exports by other cotton-growing countries rose 46 percent.

United States wheat exports were cut approximately in half since 1948–49, while production and exports of countries receiving United States aid went up.

We had an opportunity to sell wheat in South America. Our Department of Agriculture wanted to sell it, but the State Department said, "No. We must take it up with our friendly allies."

So Canada was tipped off, and the Canadian Minister of Agriculture went to South America and made the wheat deal. Yet we talk about farm legislation for an emergency.

We hear the Secretary of Agriculture complain even more bitterly that there is a surplus of dairy products. Yet, the action of the administration in helping foreign dairy production to increase rapidly, has forced a drop of nearly 90 percent in United States exports.

This is only the beginning. Money to build up foreign farm competition is flowing as freely as the Mississippi River.

There are almost 750 United States farm experts abroad helping spend the money, helping foreign nations build up their farm production. This must stop if we are going to help American farmers realize an American standard of living. If we want to beggar them to the level of the Asiatic peasant, then the program so diligently pursued by our State Department is well on its way to doing the job.

One other important fact: Congress has provided legal authority to operate in world markets on a competitive basis, but the policies of the Agriculture and State Departments have ignored the law almost entirely.

When the Congress created the Commodity Credit Corporation, it made provision for the sale of agricultural products on the domestic market at a price based on costs, but at a world-competitive price on the world markets.

But what have we done? We have held our prices on the world market high, making an umbrella, and all our competitors have slipped beneath it, while we keep our products rotting in storage.

It was clearly the intent of Congress to offer our surplus commodities at a price which would be competitive in world markets, and so eliminate surpluses at home.

The extent to which the legislative will has been carried out by the bureaucracy is shown in these words of the chairman of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee:

> The Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, has held its commodities off world markets.

Until this fantastic influence of the international network is corrected, no efforts by Congress to write farm legislation will meet the farmers' very real difficulties.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate some of the detailed facts on the manner in which policies of the Government have been used to undermine farm export possibilities, by increasing production in foreign lands, production which is in direct competition with our farm products, and which is in favorable position because of lower production and labor costs.

A part of the lower cost factor derives from the subsidy which American taxpayers are forced to pay foreign producers.

I have already mentioned the extent to which our Government is helping to increase farm production abroad. The actual figures are even more striking. In the 7 years beginning April 1948, the United States foreign-aid program provided, for the promotion of foreign agricultural production, a total of $984,159,436—nearly a billion dollars.

A half billion dollars went for the purchase of agricultural machinery and equipment—all as a gift to foreign farmers who are now able to compete with American farmers, who find no overgenerous Uncle Sam to give them tractors, or reapers, or trucks, or seed, or fertilizer, but who, on the contrary, in addition to the cost of operation of their farm machinery, have to pay the tax bill.

One reason why the cost of farm machinery and other things that the farmer buys is so high is the unbearable tax burden to pay for foreign gifts.

In addition to this billion dollars, the United States has set up over $700 million in counterpart funds, also to help agricultural production.

To make certain foreign farmers get to use this free American equipment, the State Department has sent a division of more than 700 agricultural experts abroad to give aid and advice.

This direct aid is only a part of the total picture. The Government has given tax privileges and other forms of incentives to encourage private investments abroad. Also, the policy of keeping American goods off world markets has, in effect, encouraged private investors to expand production abroad without fear of having any real competition from American farm products.

The 1 million acres of farm lands added to Mexican farm production were financed largely by American money. The story is the same all the way across Latin America.

Here we are, working on a farm bill. We are going through the motions of developing laws that will help the farmers. But we are working in a vacuum, a vacuum created by executive action not consonant with the farm legislation of Congress. We can stay here 24 hours a day, but we shall never work out a farm bill that will solve the real problem.

We are working on one side of a building, which has crumbling walls on the other three sides. No matter how well we build the one wall, how strongly we reinforce it, the wind and rain will destroy it from the other three sides. We are doing that to the American farmer.

Our Government is like Penelope, of Greek legend. Penelope knit by day and unraveled by night. That is what our Government is doing with the farm program. What little is knit by our Agricultural officials is quickly unraveled in the stealth of the night through the State Department. We are working hard and getting nothing done. If you have any doubts, Mr. President, just ask the farmer.

We recently invited over here a party of Russian "private citizens," led by the man already chosen to head their agricultural ministry. We told him everything we knew about seed, fertilizer, equipment, and the more elusive elements of know-how in achieving high farm production.

But note this: the heaviest military handicap of the Soviet system is that they need to keep 3 or 4 workers on the farms to produce what 1 man would produce under our system.

But if we teach Soviet officials how to get more production per man, and thereby free millions of workers from the farms, where will those extra workers go? They will go into the Russian armed forces, into the munitions plans, or into the factories making goods for the Soviet give-away programs in Egypt, India, Afghanistan, and Latin America.

We cannot put all the blame for this folly on our Secretary of Agriculture. Operations of any Federal agency outside of the United States are caught in the many-stranded web of State Department officials interlocking with the supernational agencies.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] has given us the record of GATT, through which the internationalists decide what farm products we may sell. The United States has made commitments to consult with the other nations in GATT on the effect of our laws limiting import of farm products. We must even discuss with them such details as whether the statistical base period used by the United States in setting import quotas under section 22 is a proper one. The other member nations make an annual review of any action by the United States on import quotas. The United States must furnish to these nations a report showing any modification of our restrictions, the restrictions still in effect, and the reasons why they continued to be applied. We also report to these foreign governments on any steps taken to solve the problem of agricultural surpluses.

We have just had a report of that kind from West Virginia, where the President of Mexico was assured of certain things.

The National City Bank, in its letter for June 1955, quotes the President of Australia's National Farmers Union as saying:

> By her irresponsible disposal of agricultural surpluses, the United States is flagrantly breaking the spirit of GATT.

The letter continues:

> Even more terse, the Manchester (England) Guardian pictured the United States as asking GATT for "legal permission to live in a state of sin."

I do not know, Mr. President, what other Senators think of having officials of the executive branch apologize to foreign governments for the laws passed by Congress, to help American farmers. I will not at this moment say what I think, Mr. President, but perhaps you can guess it.

Do you seriously think, Mr. President, that our farmers can carry all the burdens of production and marketing and at the same time follow all the intricate decisions made by the bureaucracy which operates behind a curtain of secrecy, and by former bureaucrats such as Mordecai Ezekiel, who staff the supernational agencies? You know how nearly impossible it is for Members of Congress to know what is going on, although that is our principal responsibility. How much can we expect of operating farmers?

Let me mention in passing, Mr. President, that in the case of nonfarm employment we are following exactly the same policy of helping competitive production. Every American who takes his capital abroad, and, protected by our tax laws, sets up production in foreign countries, is taking part of the domestic market from our farmers, but he is also taking jobs from the workers of the United States, whose prosperity should result in expansion of the farmers' domestic markets.

Industrial workers have been given short-run benefits, such as the dollar minimum wage, collective bargaining, and Government orders for their factories, but these cause the same difficulty as that caused by Government farm aid. The dollar payments increase, but the value of the dollar goes down. Farmers have paid off their mortgages with Government payments, but what of the mortgage that hangs over every family from our unpaid Government debt? That mortgage hangs over every farm family, and over all the nonfarm families who are the principal market of American farmers.

Mr. President, I see nothing but falling real income for both farmers and industrial workers, if we continue to rely on the planned economy of Mr. Wallace and Mr. Tugwell. I see nothing but tragedy for our country when the spell is broken and it is too late to escape.

Every day the gap between landowner and farmer-operator grows wider. Our concern must be with the men who work and produce, not with the financial returns for land ownership.

I understand that in the conference report on the farm bill, all such limits have been removed, so that—without lifting a hand—the great landholders in the West can obtain over $1 million from the taxpayers.

We know that, while farmer-operators are losing their markets abroad, they are also being driven from the land at home.

For 25 years government cash allotments have over-stimulated the tendencies to the use of high-cost equipment, fertilizers, and large acreage. We flog the land. Our policies exert constant pressure toward corporation farming and the hated "latifundia," the huge estates owned by absentee capital, and operated by farmers turned into hired hands.

Government payments have greatly increased the tendency toward the purchase of farmland by financial, nonfarm interests. During the potato scandal, we heard how farms in Maine were being sold by farmers to interests in Boston which had never seen a plow.

At this point I should like to make a proposal more radical than any so far offered. I have lost hope that manipulation of so-called parity prices, to reach any levels, will be of permanent benefit to the American farmer. Why? Because parity price is price control, and price control means price-controllers. Price-control machinery must, in the nature of the case, fall into the hands of the planners, the collectivists, the supernationalists. The first step on that slippery road brings us inevitably to the last step, where we are enmeshed in a web of controls, visible and invisible, which is designed to destroy the superiority of the United States in agriculture, in industry, and in war.

I have the utmost confidence that our Secretary of Agriculture wishes to avoid this web of controls over farming as much as I do, but I do not believe he can ever succeed.

Here in Congress we have worked hard to patch and repair what Henry Wallace and the collectivists set up in our Government. Our present Secretary of Agriculture is trying by means of little improvements here and there, to lead farming back toward freedom. But like an angry boil, this program grows worse every day. It is time to lance it, or the poison may spread throughout the body politic, without hope of cure.

I return, Mr. President, to my suggestion that we must separate our emergency measures and our long-term proposals. It is time for Congress to set up its own machinery for working out a truly American long-term farm program. Our only hope lies in the establishment by Congress of a congressional advisory committee, set up to make the basic studies Congress needs.

The purpose of an American farm policy is not to get so-called parity for farmers with some mythical competing class. That is the Marxian class conflict. Our purpose is to save the American family farm.

Other nations have gone down the road we are traveling. If we stop, look, and listen, I know that no American Congress will willingly choose the road to serfdom.

The family farm is the social basis for our free enterprise, our political liberty, our biological heritage, and our military strength.

The real military strength of the Romans lay in their independent farmers, even more than in their legions. When the farms decayed, Rome was dependent on mercenary armies, recruited from barbarian tribes.

It should not be the purpose of Congress to help corporation farming, or the spread of factory methods to farming. It should not be our purpose to help the city owner who buys farmland to help him avoid taxes. It should not be our purpose to do one single thing to increase the price of farmland.

The price of farmland is a cost to the farmer-operator, which reduces the net income he receives for his work.

Maturing societies must distinguish between the share of farm income which goes for enterprise, and the share which is paid for land because land ownership and land use inevitably grow more and more apart. As the older generations die, and part of the family turns to nonfarm occupations, the income from farming is drained away.

Dependence on rising prices of farmland is financial speculation, just like playing for rising prices in the stock market. The growth of population, alone, exerts a continuing upward pressure on land prices.

Nearly all the so-called remedies for farmers benefit the owner of capital invested in land, and penalize the farmer-producer.

The rising cost of American farmlands, as our society matures, means that we need a fundamental reexamination of our export policies. We need a reexamination of the relations between farming and the domestic market.

I have not mentioned the broad area of savings which could come from tax reductions.

In 1950, before the Korean war, the Federal Government collected $41 billion in taxes. Last year, it collected $69 billion. This increase of nearly $30 billion is paid either by farm families, or by nonfarm families who are their chief customers.

History is full of examples of the tragedy that overtakes the farmer-producer as a society matures, unless the greatest wisdom is used in national policies.

When the farmers of ancient Italy were ruined, the rural families which had given Rome her legions became the beggars in the forum. The farmers of the city-states of Greece had met the same fate.

England ruined her yeoman class; and there are those who date the decline of England's greatness from that weakening of the foundations.

It is time, Mr. President, that we closed the account on the 25-year cycle that began by giving our farmers emergency aid and ended by meshing them into the international agencies which now set so many of our policies.

The global planners can well reduce our farmers to becoming suppliers of commodities for a province of one world whose standard of consumption they will reduce to the lowest common denominator of the world.

We must return to that branch of political philosophy which was discarded by Rex Tugwell and Mordecai Ezekiel, and make it the corner of the temple.

Let us set up a congressional advisory commission which will gather for us the best ideas in the Nation on how to restore our family farms as the foundation of our society, on helping them maintain themselves, without Government aid, by their productive arts, by constant cost cutting, by skill in marketing, and by raising the real income of those domestic producers in nonfarm industries who should buy most of their products.

A truly effective solution of the farm problem will benefit, also, nonfarm producers and their families. It will strengthen the forces of freedom over those of collectivism. It will help extricate us from controls by our own Government and its supranational allies.

It will restore to Congress the legislative function now preempted by the bureaucracy.

It will—perhaps most desperately important of all—restore the foundation under our military strength in time of need.

HOUSE ACTION ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the House has adopted the conference report on the agricultural bill by a vote of 237 to 181, and that the conference report is being sent to the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes.

REGULATION OF WITHDRAWALS OR RESERVATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BENNETT] and myself, I introduce a bill to provide for congressional authorization of withdrawals or reservations of Federal land in excess of 5,000 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3613) to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this bill is being introduced as a companion bill to bills introduced into the House by Chairman ENGLE of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and other Members of the House. The House Committee has just completed some rather extensive hearings on military withdrawals, and I commend our associates in that body for making that study and introducing remedial legislation. I sincerely trust that both bodies now will expedite action on this matter.

The subject matter of this bill will come as no surprise to the Federal agencies involved, because I and the junior Senator from Utah introduced a bill—S. 531—on January 18, 1955, providing for public hearings prior to withdrawals of public lands and establishing a time limit to so-called "temporary" withdrawals. This bill has been under study by the agencies involved in withdrawals and I am sure that this agency study of S. 531 will help expedite any legislation considered on this subject.

Both bills were introduced because of the tremendous size of present and pending public-land withdrawals in the West, and because large additional withdrawals are being pressed by executive departments, especially the Department of Defense. As evidence of this continuing reservation of public lands for defense purposes, I direct your attention to the proposed withdrawal of 2,938,240 acres in the State of Nevada for Navy aerial gunnery ranges.

The area of public land withdrawn for military and other defense purposes as of June 30, 1955, totaled 17,168,843 acres, an area nearly three times as large as the State of Massachusetts. This acreage was distributed among 18 States, but 5 States—one of which is my own State of Utah—each contain in excess of 2 million acres of such reserved lands.

In view of the widespread interest in this subject among the 18 States affected, my colleague and I today submitted a request to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] that he order hearings by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on this new bill and S. 531. It is our hope that the good features of both bills can be consolidated into a final Senate bill that will prove acceptable to our colleagues in the House and expedite action on this needed legislation.

MADE IN MINNESOTA WEEK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week is the State of Minnesota's first Made in Minnesota Week, proclaimed by Gov. Orville L. Freeman, to be highlighted from April 11 to April 15 by the first annual Made in Minnesota International Trade Show in the Minneapolis Auditorium.

Six thousand active and enthusiastic members of the Minnesota Junior Chamber of Commerce have been responsible for this fine effort to bring to the attention of the whole Nation the remarkable advantages enjoyed by Minnesota industries and the widening opportunities for new industry in the North Star State.

Minnesota's outstanding labor force of skilled workmen, its supply of managerial talent, its great banking and credit institutions, its many advantages in terms of natural resources of land, minerals, timber, and water, its remarkable percentage of stable families owning their own homes, its lack of slum and blight areas, its advantages in scenic beauty and recreation, and the friendly welcome Minnesotans have given them have attracted many new industries to Minnesota during the past decade.

With fine rail, water, and truck transportation now being augmented by major advances in low-cost water transportation, including the 9-foot channel of the Mississippi and the prospective emergence of Duluth as an ocean port, with the completion of the Great Lakes seaway, more and more heavy industry is giving careful consideration to the possibility of establishing new plants in Minnesota.

Ingenuity is the watchword of Minnesota industry. This is clearly apparent when one looks at some of the great industries native to Minnesota—Minneapolis-Honeywell, Minneapolis Moline, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing, General Mills, and Pillsbury, to name only a few of the largest. The remarkable new taconite industry, representing the steel industry's conviction that Minnesota will continue to be a major source of iron ore when the open-pit mines of the great Mesabi Range are exhausted, is the product of Minnesota thought and tenacity and support of research.

Minnesota's steadily increasing payroll, almost three and a quarter billion dollars in 1955, is testimony to the expanding opportunities for Minnesota industry.

Minnesota is a wonderful place to work and a wonderful place to live. It is an area of opportunity and wholesome environment. I invite the attention of the whole Nation—particularly American industry—to the celebration of Made in Minnesota Week. This week, through April 15, Minnesota industry is on display. Those who come to Minnesota this week will find the usual warm and friendly welcome, but they will also find their eyes opened, thanks to the initiative and planning of the young businessmen of Minnesota, the Minnesota Jaycees.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE FARM BILL

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, we are all aware of the many opinions which have been expressed by persons with varying interests concerning the farm bill. There is one group, however, whose ideas should be given foremost consideration, and that group, quite logically, is made up of the farmers themselves. They are the ones most affected. They are the ones who know what should be done. Therefore, to show how many Maryland farmers feel, I read a letter addressed to me by C. E. Wise, Jr., secretary-treasurer of the Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.:

DEAR SENATOR BEALL: The Maryland Farm Bureau opposes the conference committee report on the farm bill as unsound legislation that will aggravate the present farm problem.

Provisions we object to are: (a) 90 percent fixed rigid supports for basic crops; (b) the double parity standard; (c) the mandatory three-price wheat-dumping plan; (d) the high support for noncommercial corn and feed grains; (e) the dairy support increase; (f) no control of acres diverted from quota crops.

These provisions will stimulate production and nullify the beneficial effects of the soil bank and other parts of the farm bill. As the soil bank will not be effective his year these price boosts will add much to surpluses under normal crop conditions in 1956.

Unless the objectionable features of the committee report are corrected, agriculture will fare better for the long pull under the present law. We, therefore, urge you to oppose the report in its present form.

Sincerely,

C. E. WISE, Jr.,
Secretary-Treasurer, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN THE PAROLE AND PROBATION SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Senate to the speech delivered yesterday by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the National Parole Conference.

I believe Mr. Hoover has called for certain badly needed changes in the parole and probation systems in this country. Present conditions where a man is arrested, evidence is presented, and a conviction is brought about, only to find that after a short time our criminal authorities are again hunting the same man for another crime—such conditions cry out for improvements.

I found the FBI's figures on the increase in sex crimes absolutely appalling—an increase in sex crimes over the past 20 years of 163 percent. And among them recently appeared a highly celebrated crime in North Dakota where the person convicted of the crime, a veteran discharged from the service as a sex deviate, had asked several times for help "before he hurt someone." Mr. Hoover makes it plain that if a person has a proven record as a sex deviate, there is an immediate responsibility to see to it that the proper authorities are notified and warned of the potential threat in their community.

The recent organized plea on the part of the women of the District of Columbia for better street lighting and an increased police protection after dark are symptomatic of this problem—a problem that exists on a nationwide scale and one that will only be solved through the vigorous action called for in Mr. Hoover's message.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by J. Edgar Hoover may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGES OF CRIME CONTROL

(Address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, April 10, 1956, before the National Parole Conference, Washington, D. C.)

Much has happened to all of us—and the world—since a conference similar to this one was held in Washington 17 years ago. That was in 1939. You will remember, as I do so well, that we were emerging from an era which had witnessed the overthrow of virtual gang control in community after community of our Nation. Then we had the international gangsters who attacked us and who were responsible for a Second World War and the domestic upheavals that follow all wars. We won the war—but we found we still had the problem of crime and criminals with us—a problem that has continued to grow faster than our Nation's growth.

Even though crime increased there was hope that we could do better in the postwar world than we had in the past. That hope is always with those of us who have the duty of dealing with crime and with the problem of parole and probation.

I was hopeful that after the war that steps could be taken to make the worthwhile principles of parole and probation truly effective. This is a humanitarian task. This is a vitally important work and I believe in the objective which you, who are engaged in this work, are seeking and unless you succeed, then our work too often is made ineffective. I want to make that point clear to you—because it seems it has not always been clear to some people in the past who have regarded me as an opponent of parole and probation.

I want to make it clear, too, that my criticism of the workings of parole and probation is for one reason only—to bring about more effective methods of crime control. Your objectives and my objectives can be reached only if probation and parole are worthy of the name and if law enforcement is worthy of its name. My criticism certainly is intended to be constructive for criticism designed only to destroy never helps anyone.

All of us have our dreams of achieving a goal. And to achieve a goal we must be practical. And to be practical we must speak frankly and face facts. As I see it, while progress has been made in many States and in many areas of the country—probation and parole in some areas are not worthy of the name. I say this without antagonism toward either probation or parole. The time has come for us to get together and try to find a solution to this problem which is a grave responsibility allied to law enforcement and to the rehabilitation of criminals.

As I see it, parole presupposes careful selection of those who will benefit by its application. It presupposes that those who are paroled will have careful and competent supervision. And the same principles apply to probation. I think all of us here subscribe to these principles. It is as obvious to me as it is to you that wrongdoers who have learned the error of their ways should be restored to a useful place in society and helped to recognize the values by which they can live at peace with themselves and with others.

From where I stand, parole and probation are only a part of the overall effort to achieve criminal justice. They are a part of our machinery of criminal justice which exists for only one purpose—the protection of society. This machinery fails when any part of it breaks down and leaves society unprotected. When such a breakdown occurs, then somewhere, someone has failed in his responsibility.

Society suffers when any unit of the vast machinery of criminal justice places the interest of the wrongdoer above the protection of society. Those of us who are assigned the responsibility of detecting and apprehending criminals are more and more coming to the view that our efforts, however essential, are but a temporary expedient. We arrest a wrongdoer today, present the evidence which establishes his guilt and bring about his conviction. All too frequently, within a short time thereafter, we are again hunting the same man because he has committed another crime.

Our work is only part of the answer. We know that the time-proven deterrents to crime are certainty of detection and arrest, swift prosecution, and the realization that one must pay for his law violations.

I have condemned what I regard in some prisons as a country club atmosphere. By that description, I mean prisons which permit idleness and which neither punish nor rehabilitate the wrongdoer. Fuzzy and shallow thinking which contributes to maudlin sentimentality helps no one. We frequently hear about the plight of some criminal but little or nothing about his victims or the anguish and disgrace he has brought to his own loved ones.

The press accounts of the Boston prison riot last year are a perfect illustration of the misdirected concern in some quarters for vicious criminals which is inconsistent with our duty to protect society. Much was said about the participants in this riot, and their hope for freedom, but men and nations do not deserve freedom as a handout. They must earn and guard their freedom. In the talk of freedom for these men little appeared about their criminal background and their vicious crimes or whether the general welfare of society justified their freedom or whether they had earned their freedom. It is necessary to examine only two of the cases to make my point.

One of the convicts previously had been given the benefit of both parole and probation. He has been arrested for forgery, larceny, robbery, and other crimes. He was serving a sentence of 15½ to 20 years, with a 25-year Federal sentence for bank robbery awaiting him. Another had been given the benefit of parole, probation, and conditional release. He was serving time for assault, burglary, and rape. His case was aggravated by the fact that he had committed a series of rapes and in his assaults had viciously beaten several of his victims. You cannot serve freedom on a silver platter to men like that.

One of the frequent arguments advanced for probation and parole is the overcrowding in prisons which exists today. But how valid is this argument when the population in State and Federal prisons has increased from 179,047 in 1939 to only 182,051 in 1954, an increase of only 3,000 in a 15-year period? To be sure, it is more economical to release convicts on parole or probation. But let us not put the system on the basis of the cheapest price tag. When you do, you get shoddy merchandise.

One of the most serious problems we face today in the field of crime control is that of the repeater. This problem is brought into sharp focus by looking at the background of the population in Federal prisons where in 1954 of those received under sentences of more than 1 year, 63.8 percent were repeaters. When our people check the fingerprints of arrested persons which are received in the identification division they find that 70 percent have records of previous arrests.

The only way we have at present of dealing with the repeater is to demonstrate to him that truly he can't get away with it. But this is not enough in dealing with those who are unreformed and incapable of rehabilitation without extensive and prolonged mental treatment. If I can judge from the reports which come to my desk daily from every section of the country, there is a growing concern among law enforcement officials over the increase in crimes by repeaters and those who have been improperly selected as beneficiaries of parole, probation and other forms of clemency. I am certain you are just as concerned about this as we are. Parole upon parole and probation upon probation for those who have not reformed are unreasonable and unjustified. I appreciate the fact that for every flagrant mistake in parole and probation there are scores of cases reflecting dynamic reformation and rehabilitation. What I am saying is not that parole and probation are wrong, but that ill-advised parole and probation reflect adversely upon these methods of protecting society. It is the old case of a rotten apple tainting the whole barrel.

I can best illustrate my feelings by referring to a few cases which immediately come to mind. One eastern gang of 11 responsible for a $2½ million holdup had received a total of 20 paroles and 17 probations, and one was pardoned, thereby blocking a deportation case. Another criminal had killed a policeman in 1932 and was given a life term. After the third parole, following the killing of the police officer, he was arrested burglarizing a safe. Another policeman was killed last fall by a criminal who had been paroled the previous month with a criminal record which dated back 15 years. Within the past few months, there was a nationwide manhunt for an individual who killed 6 persons following his parole less than 2 years ago. A group of parolees on a criminal spree, a little over a year ago, engaged in a gun fight with 2 policemen, and 1 of the policemen and 1 of the parolees were killed. Is not this enough to show that there is a need for improvement?

Since we established the widely publicized list of "ten most wanted fugitives" in March 1950, a total of 95 criminals has been on the list. Fifty-two had received paroles on at

least one occasion during their criminal careers. Of the 18 special agents of the FBI who have lost their lives in line of duty, 11 were killed by criminals who had previously received paroles, probation or other forms of clemency. That errors have been made and are being made in the selection of persons to benefit from parole is a proven fact and a matter of grave concern. This is not merely the problem of law enforcement officers, it is your problem also.

The mistakes in selecting the wrong person for release on parole might have been rectified with the type of supervision which the humanitarian principles of parole require. I do not say it is the fault of those who administer parole and probation. But it is the fault of those who permit these conditions to exist.

Politics, poor pay for parole and probation officers, lack of interest by city and State officials and the lack of uniform laws and practices all are involved. Parole supervision too often is a farce and exists in name only in too many cases. Those who have the most expert knowledge of parole hold that proper parole supervision requires a caseload of no more than 50 to 65 for each parole officer. When you face the facts, it is a marvel that parole succeeds as well as it does. This is particularly true when you find parole officers carrying caseloads of as many as 115. In a State where 45 parole and probation officers are required to supervise 2,800 persons on probation and 1,500 on parole it is clear that these overworked men cannot do their jobs properly. But that is only part of the picture. In addition, these 45 officers are required to make investigations in connection with granting of paroles and probation.

In one State, which boasts of an advanced parole system, maximum parole supervision requires a monthly visit to the parolee's home and place of employment. Minimum supervision requires a visit every 3 months either to the home or place of employment. It is no wonder that parole and probation fail so frequently. In one State, it is reported that 50 percent of those granted parole violate the conditions of parole. Figures vary in other States.

The picture is clear. The time has come for public indignation over the failure to give these men and women a chance to do their jobs properly. And, if it hurts some politicians—well, that is just too bad. At least, your conscience will be clear.

Justice is undermined and respect for constituted authority becomes a mockery when judges take it upon themselves to coddle hardened criminals by giving them undeserved probation. To illustrate, I refer to a case where a judge placed a criminal on probation on the charge of car theft and violation of the Federal Firearms Act. This man previously had been arrested for armed robbery and breaking and entering. For this he received a 10-year sentence in a State penitentiary. He escaped and was later arrested in a distant State. He resisted extradition on the grounds of cruel and inhuman punishment in the State penitentiary. The State made a careful investigation and subsequently the criminal's charges were disproved to the satisfaction of a Federal judge who ordered him returned. After serving 3 additional years of his sentence, he was paroled. When later arrested in a Western State with a stolen car, he pleaded guilty but leveled the same old charges of the cruelty of punishment which had already been disproved. The judge placed him on probation for 10 years and told the criminal to behave himself and he would never have to serve the balance of the term for which he was paroled because as the judge told him, he had "an umbrella over you now."

There can be no doubt that many judges are handicapped by not having complete details. Once a wrongdoer is arrested and brought before the courts, there can be no more important investigative function than to place before the judge the facts which will aid him in arriving at his conclusions as to what is best, both for society and the individual offender. We regard this as so important in our service that our various offices are under instructions to furnish all available case information to judges when so requested.

The Federal probation system does an excellent job of developing information to be submitted in its presentence reports. Likewise, some States do an outstanding job in this respect, but there are others where much improvement is sorely needed.

I want to express my deep appreciation for the splendid assistance and cooperation which our special agents are receiving from most parole and probation offices throughout the Nation. It has been a source of gratification to observe that in the past 20 years there has been a gradual improvement in the cooperation between the professional advocates of parole and probation and law-enforcement officers. It must continue to improve. The police officer on the beat, the county and State officer and the Federal investigator are primarily concerned with the protection of society just as you are—and the old frictions should be removed. Fundamentally, there should be an even closer bond of cooperation between those charged with treatment of offenders and those charged with detection and apprehension. After all, our end objective is the same.

Under our legal system there is authority to act in most instances only after a crime has been committed. Somewhere and somehow, a new authority is needed—that of prevention. Let me illustrate. A policeman was killed by a 21-year-old parolee. He had been in and out of institutions on numerous occasions, having escaped and been paroled several times. After he had killed the policeman, the parolee's father disclosed that he had made efforts to have his son's parole revoked to prevent him from becoming further involved in serious crimes.

When parents appeal to authorities, not once but time and time again, to have their son on parole committed in the public interest, it is unbelievable that someone would not take action. Yet this has happened more than once. Last December, a 20-year-old parolee kidnaped a 3-year-old girl. The parolee was an admitted sex offender who had attacked girls ranging from 8 to 13 years of age. He had been committed twice to a mental hospital for examination. Paroles granted this criminal had been violated time and again. The parents saw that their son needed help—and he knew it himself. On the day before he abducted the 3-year-old girl, this sex offender had pleaded with his parole officer to come to see him; but for some reason, the officer did not see him. Cases like this cast a shadow, not on the principle, but upon the administration of parole.

More and more, we are finding the earmarks of crime long before the final act of violence occurs. Day after day, individuals who are mentally ill are committing serious crimes. They are bringing misery, not only to themselves, their relatives and their friends, but also to other innocent men, women, and children.

There are many individuals in America with backgrounds of emotional instability where the danger signals are clear and where the individual is clearly "earmarked for crime." The time has come when some way must be found to take preventive action, and here is the proposal I hope you will consider: When a person has been convicted and sentenced to prison, the authorities today have the ability to determine in many cases whether the wrongdoer is capable of leading a law-abiding life. But when it is clear that due to mental quirks the likelihood of violence exists, then there should be some legally recognized machinery whereby such individuals can be isolated from society to receive preventive treatment.

These are days of stress and strain. Modern society is geared to a fast tempo. Pressures are heavy from all sides, thrusting vast burdens on us all. Nerves become taut, tempers frayed, minds blurred. Abnormalities appear, which if recognized in time, can be treated and perhaps lives can be spared. If action is taken, mentally sick criminals might claim no more victims but, on the other hand, they may be made into useful citizens.

The rise in sex offenses is shocking. Last year, while the total number of crimes was leveling off, rape increased 5.9 percent, and this has been the case for the past 20 years when such crimes have increased 163 percent, according to reports on crimes received from local, county, and State law-enforcement agencies. You who have devoted your lives to treatment of offenders know that there are certain types of persons who are mentally and physically ill and need to be treated as such. You also know that there are types of individuals whose prognosis for normal adjustment is so remote as to be improbable. The time has come when society can better be protected by providing some means of enforced treatment for such people. Public health authorities may legally place a family in quarantine if they have a disease which is dangerous to others. The freedom of that family is restricted for the good of the community. If this is accepted as a proper health measure, then certainly there should be a quarantine for mentally ill criminals who should be released only upon certification of competent medical authorities who can also say when the facts justify it, "This man in mentally ill and we cannot approve his release until this illness is cured. He must be kept in quarantine."

Mental illness, emotional instability, and abnormality are major problems in crime control just as certain diseases are problems in the health of a community. When official agencies receive information that a person convicted of a crime has a mental illness or abnormality which could endanger others, there should be a responsibility to advise proper law-enforcement agencies of the facts. If the case is sufficiently acute, there should be a means, with all the proper safeguards for constitutional rights, whereby treatment could be enforced—even beyond the period of actual sentence, if necessary.

If, for example, the facts are known that a person has a proven record as a sex deviate, there is also a responsibility to see to it that proper authorities are notified so that they may be warned of a potential threat to their community.

If the present trend of fiendish crimes is to be reversed, there is a need for a new attitude and a determination to prevent such acts. It is already the experience of law enforcement that perhaps as many sex crimes go unreported as are reported. If every sex offender knew that his name was on record, this in and of itself would be a powerful deterrent. If every sex offender knew there were ways and means by which he might get corrective treatment, the lives of potential victims as well as offenders and their families might be spared. A person suffering from contagious disease is removed from contact with healthy persons until the danger is past. So should the mentally ill criminal who endangers the safety of the community be treated. Law enforcement, of course, knows when an offender is placed on probation, but it seldom knows when one is placed on parole. It seems to me there is no valid reason why law enforcement officers should not know when a potential offender is released within their jurisdiction, just as health authorities should know when a typhoid carrier is around. The mere fact that a parolee knows that law enforcement has his identity could be another force of deterrence, and law enforcement could be of assistance in giving a

helping hand to make parole more workable. This should be a cooperative effort.

Doubtless some of you already are thinking of reasons why this program I have suggested cannot be done. I could give you right now a dozen reasons why it would be difficult—but it is ridiculous to say it cannot be done to the everlasting benefit of the mentally ill and the community. It can be done if we work together and if you add your pool of ideas.

We complain about high taxes, but last year crime cost every man, woman, and child in these United States $122, or a staggering estimated total of $20 billion. Perhaps this figure could become more meaningful if we realized that for every $1 spent on education, crime cost $1.46; and for every $1 which went to the churches of the Nation, $13 went to crime.

If we could but divert the waste of crime to constructive use—recruit and train the people so sorely needed in every phase of the administration of criminal justice and quarantine the mentally ill criminal until he is cured—the Nation would soon reap a marvelous profit. And there would be the added profit from a decline in sorrow, mental anguish, and outright physical suffering resulting from crime.

The challenge in crime control is a challenge to all of us here this morning. We live with it. It is the responsibility of every citizen, of course, but it is our job—it is our basic responsibility, if we do not find the answers—they will not be found. We must provide the ideas and the leadership.

And we must work together in mutual understanding—or else we fail. We must not fail.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 9, 1956, pages 6110–6125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understood that we were going to have a quorum call.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It was my understanding that there would be a quorum call when the conference report was ready to be discussed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have a quorum call before we begin the discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object, at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show who is prolonging the discussion. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the quorum call.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Allott	George	McNamara
Barkley	Goldwater	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Jackson	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Curtis	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Laird	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report now before the Senate represents a concentrated effort by the committee of conference to agree on a bill which would meet with the approval of both Houses of Congress, and which can be sent to the President as quickly as possible. The committee of conference met during the Easter recess and worked long hours. To use a colloquialism, we "sweated blood" over this conference report.

I realize that the report is not satisfactory to everyone. Nevertheless, it is a fair and workable report, and a good compromise between the Senate and House measures. I believe it embodies reasonable and realistic methods by which the sad economic plight of our farmers can be remedied, both in the months immediately ahead and in the more distant future as well.

I hope Senators will listen carefully as I explain the provisions of the conference report, how it differs from the Senate bill, and the reasons for those differences.

Mr. President, the House bill provided support at 90 percent of parity for the 1955, 1956, and 1957 crops of the basic commodities. Section 301 of the Senate amendment, by providing for setting aside 250 million bushels of corn, and increasing the set-asides for wheat and cotton, would have resulted in minimum 1956 support levels for corn, wheat, and cotton, according to the Department's estimates, of 84 percent, 85 percent, and 88 percent of parity, respectively, and under the flexible-support formula would have continued to affect the price-support levels of these commodities in future years. The conference substitute represents a compromise between these 2 provisions, in that it calls for 90-percent price support for the 1956 crop only. I should like to point out that this provision of the conference substitute does not affect the support price for tobacco, which, under existing law, is required to be supported at 90 percent of parity, or the support price for rice, which, both under the Senate amendment and the conference substitute, will be subject to a 2-price plan in 1956.

Of primary importance to our American farmers, of course, is how the conference bill will affect them pricewise as compared to the present flexible price-support program. The announced support prices for corn and wheat would be raised, respectively, from $1.40 per bushel for corn—81 percent of parity—and $1.81 per bushel for wheat—76 percent of parity—to $1.65 per bushel and $2.27 per bushel, respectively, on the basis of March 15 data and the old parity formula. Ninety percent of old parity for cotton and peanuts would be 31.81 cents per pound and 12.3 cents per pound, respectively.

The provision of the Senate amendment changing the standard grade for cotton was omitted from the conference substitute, so that middling seven-eights inch remains the standard grade and staple for price-support purposes; this change will increase the support price for each grade of cotton about 1.36 cents per pound above what it would be if the average grade and staple were used as the standard, and, of course, provided also it was based on the schedule of premiums and discounts used in 1955.

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided support for milk and butterfat at between 80 and 90 percent of parity. In addition, the Senate amendment provided for the use of a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the period July 1946 to December 1948. Use of this parity equivalent would have increased the support price for manufacturing milk to about $3.25 per hundredweight. In lieu of increasing the support price on a permanent basis through use of this parity equivalent, the conference substitute provides for a specific support price of $3.25 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk, and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat for the current marketing year ending March 31, 1957. The price of 58.6 cents for butterfat is equivalent to the price of $3.25 for manufacturing milk.

The conference report retains the dual parity formula provided by the Senate amendment, but gives the Secretary until January 31, 1957, after Congress has returned next year, to submit his recommendations for an improved formula.

The Senate amendment would have required the filing of this report during the recess of Congress.

The most difficult problems faced by the conferees concerned the provisions with respect to corn and feed grains. Except for clarifying changes, the provisions with respect to corn in the commercial area the same in the conference substitute as in the Senate amendment. The feed grain provisions are substantially those of the Senate amendment in general purpose. The formula contained in the Senate amendment, however, for feed grain support prices was found to be unworkable when the support prices produced by it were examined. Since the historical pattern of feed grain prices does not follow the pattern for corn prices, a provision basing all feed grain prices at each location on corn prices at such location results in serious maladjustment of the feed grain price structure and discrimination between producers on adjoining farms who, in the past, have been accustomed to receive similar prices.

Corn is produced principally in the heavy feeding area, while feed grains are more frequently shipped to port for export, or to other areas for feeding. The conference substitute, therefore, adopts a formula designed to bring feed grain prices into proper relation with corn and with each other, and permit appropriate adjustment for location differentials. The substitute would raise the support price for corn in the noncommercial area from 75 percent of the support level in the commercial area to 85 percent of such level, and provide for support of rye, barley, oats, and grain sorghums at 5 percentage points of parity below the percentage of parity at which corn in the commercial area is supported. Thus, for 1956, corn in the commercial area will be supported at 90 percent of its parity price, established on the basis of the old parity formula; corn outside the commercial area will be supported at 85 percent of the support level in the commercial area, or 76.5 percent of parity; and rye, oats, barley, and grain sorghums will be supported at 85 percent of their respective parity prices, all of which are established on the basis of the modernized parity formula. The feed grain support prices computed in this manner bear a fair feed value relationship to corn support prices and permit appropriate adjustments to conform to the historic price structure. A savings clause in the substitute permits feed grain producers, including corn producers outside the commercial area, who do not comply with the additional price-support requirements of the bill to receive price support at the levels which would have prevailed but for the special feed grain provisions of the bill.

As provided in the Senate amendment, corn producers in the commercial area, to qualify for price support, would have to keep within their farm base acreages and, in addition, devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of their farm base for corn to either the acreage reserve for corn or the conservation reserve. The substitute makes it clear that the producer in the commercial area would have to keep within his farm base, and that land devoted to the acreage reserve would have to be devoted to the acreage reserve for corn, to qualify the producer for corn price support.

Like the Senate amendment, the substitute requires feed grain producers, in order to qualify for feed grain price support, to devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of their feed grain base acreage to the soil bank and not to plant more than 85 percent of their feed grain base acreage. For 1956 the feed grain base acreage would, as provided in the Senate amendment, be the average acreage devoted to feed grains in 1953, 1954, and 1955. However, the conference substitute includes in this requirement corn produced outside the commercial area along with other feed grains. After 1956, a national feed-grain base equal to the average acreage for 1953, 1954, and 1955 would be apportioned among States, counties, and farms in the same manner that wheat acreage allotments are now apportioned. This apportionment would be made on the basis of a 5-year moving base, so that it would take into account shifts in production.

While the Senate amendment required producers to devote acreage to the acreage reserve or conservation reserve in order to qualify for feed-grain price support, the Senate amendment did not provide for putting feed-grain acreage into the acreage reserve. The conference substitute enlarges the acreage reserve to include feed-grain acreage; and any lands put into the acreage reserve, in order to qualify the producers for feed-grain price support, would have to be put in the feed-grain acreage reserve.

The announced support prices for 1956 are $1.80 per hundredweight for grain sorghums, 59 cents per bushel for oats, $1.16 per bushel for rye, 93 cents per bushel for barley, and $1.05 per bushel for corn outside the commercial corn area. Based on parity prices for April, the support prices for 1956 under the conference report would be $2.18 per hundredweight for grain sorghums, 72 cents per bushel for oats, $1.41 per bushel for rye, $1.13 per bushel for barley, and $1.40 per bushel for corn outside the corn commercial area.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. If a producer of feed grains did not wish to comply with the provision by which he would have to cut his base acreage of feed grains by 15 percent, and place that in the soil bank, he would still be eligible to receive the 70 percent price supports we now have, would he not?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct, for 1956. We have included a savings clause in that connection.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the conference report provide for expecting drought years in figuring the base acreage?

Mr. ELLENDER. It does provide for adjustments in alloting feed grain base acreage after 1956. I shall comment on that.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is specifically written into the bill, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Texas.

Another of the major decisions made by the conferees was to make the soil bank voluntary. Except in the case of corn and feed grains, price support is not conditioned upon soil-bank participation under the conference substitute. This was a matter which has been given extensive consideration throughout the period of consideration of the bill. The administration and most of the farm organizations and witnesses before the committee favored a voluntary soil bank. A mandatory provision had been included in the Senate amendment principally because of the corn and feed-grain provisions, so that the conferees would have the entire question before them. However, after careful consideration the conferees felt that while the special base-acreage provisions for corn and feed grains made a mandatory program appropriate for those commodities, a mandatory program was not suitable for the basic commodities already subject to serve acreage restrictions or to the nonbasic commodities which are not subject to any acreage restrictions, and for which insufficient data is available.

The two-price plans for wheat and rice contained in the Senate amendment have been retained in the conference substitute, with mostly minor changes, most of which are of a technical nature. In the case of wheat, the principal changes made by the conference substitute are as follows:

First. The Secretary would determine whether compliance with acreage allotments would be required as a condition of eligibility for price supports and marketing certificates—as provided in the Senate amendment—but if such compliance is required, the acreage allotments would be established in the manner now provided by law;

Second. The Secretary would be required to put a certificate program into effect if approved by producers;

Third. Producers would not be eligible for marketing certificates unless they actually planted wheat;

Fourth. The question as to whether producers desire a wheat-certificate program would be submitted at every marketing quota referendum until such a program is approved. The reason for this change is that the 1957 referendum will be held shortly after the bill is passed, and before wheat producers have had sufficient opportunity to study the plan proposed by the bill. The conferees did not want to delay the referendum or deprive producers of an opportunity to put the program into effect in 1957, but did want to preserve to the producers the opportunity to vote for the plan after they have been fully advised of its advantages.

In the case of rice, the conference substitute would, first, permit the 1956 crop to be supported at more than 55 percent of parity, since the world price at

present is about 65 percent of parity; and, second, limit rice inventory adjustment payments to the amount by which 80 percent of the parity price as of August 1, 1955, exceeds the 1956 support price. The conferees felt that this computation of adjustment payments represented a more realistic appraisal of the loss which otherwise would be suffered by persons holding rough rice on August 1, 1956, as a result of the transition to a two-price plan. The Senate amendment, it was felt, would have given them a measure of relief from a market loss which would have occurred even if the two-price plan were not put into operation.

The provisions of the Senate amendment limiting price-support loans to $100,000, acreage reserve payments to $25,000, and conservation reserve payments to $7,500, are omitted from the conference substitute. While the conferees were sympathetic to the general objective of limiting assistance to those actually in need of such assistance, these provisions did not seem to be effective for that purpose, and appeared likely to be either completely ineffective or, to the extent effective, destructive of the program. If a limitation on price support were feasible, $100,000 would probably be too high. However, since the objective of the program is to support the market price, the few producers who might be directly affected by this limitation could probably derive practically the full benefit of the support program in the market place. If, however, the volume affected by the limitation were such as to break the market price, the small producer who ordinarily does not have adequate storage facilities or, for other reasons, does not put his commodities under loan, would probably be affected in much the same way that the large producer would be affected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may yield to me, so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, and without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following order be entered: that during the further consideration of the conference report on H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, debate on the question of agreeing to said report shall be limited to 3½ hours, to be equally divided, and controlled by the majority and minority leaders, respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the purpose of the soil bank is to retire lands from production, so as to alleviate the surplus and bring about better market conditions for all farmers. To the extent that limitations on participation in the soil bank would prevent farmers from putting their lands into the soil bank, the program would be adversely affected, and the benefits to be obtained from it would be decreased.

The provision of the Senate amendment requiring processors to certify as to prices paid farmers in order to participate in certain price-support and surplus-removal operations is omitted from the conference substitute. This provision would have made many beneficial programs impossible to undertake. For instance, it probably would bar any surplus-removal operation undertaken to clear the market of a prior year's production, and would bar other price-support or removal operations where the processor has no way of obtaining information as to the price paid to the producer.

The conferees also gave extensive consideration to various provisions of the Senate amendment dealing with protection for tenants and sharecroppers. The conferees were most diligent in seeking a formula which would protect both the landlord and the tenant; but in view of the many varied types of arrangements between landlords and tenants, frequently involving much more than the use of the land itself, the conferees were unable to develop a formula which would be fair in all cases. It was felt that the county committees, who are familiar with arrangements customary in their counties, with some general guidance from the Congress and the Department, would be in the best position to determine what would be fair in each case. The various provisions of the Senate amendment on this subject have therefore been consolidated into a single section of the conference substitute, under which arrangements between landlords and tenants for sharing in soil-bank payments would be subject to approval by the county committee.

The provision of the Senate amendment making forfeiture of price-support benefits a penalty for violation of soil-bank contracts was felt by the conferees to impose a penalty having little relation to the offense, since a contract violator might have raised no price-supported crops or might have sold all of them in the market place. The conference substitute, therefore, omits this penalty, and provides instead for forfeiture of all benefits under the contract—instead of just those beginning with the year in which the violation occurred—and, in addition, it provides for payment of a further penalty in the case of grazing or harvesting in violation of the contract, equal to 50 percent of the compensation otherwise payable for the year of violation.

Other changes made by the conference substitute in the soil-bank program include the following:

First. The substitute would require compliance with acreage reduction to be checked before acreage-reserve payments could be made. This would not delay acreage-reserve payments much beyond the planting season, and conforms to the Department's tentative plans for administering the act.

Second. The substitute imposes dollar limits on the acreage-reserve program for each commodity so that the total amount available could not be used entirely for a single commodity. The limit for each commodity was purposely set so that the total limitation for all commodities exceeds the total amount available for any year in order to allow for some adjustment between commodities.

Third. The substitute makes it clear that a producer putting lands devoted to tame hay or other soil-conserving crops in the conservation reserve would not be required to reduce crop production on the balance of his land.

Fourth. Participation by State and county committees in the procedure for terminating conservation reserve contracts has been provided for by the substitute so that the producer can obtain a hearing in a familiar forum before being required to resort to more formal and expensive court procedure.

Fifth. Under the substitute the Secretary would make allowances for drought and other abnormal conditions in establishing yields for the purposes of fixing acreage-reserve compensation. This will make the program more attractive to producers who, despite adversities, continue to base their decisions upon the expectation of making a crop.

Sixth. Compliance with feed-grain base acreages would be a condition of eligibility for acreage-reserve payments for other commodities or for conservation-reserve payments, after 1956, in the same manner that compliance with acreage allotments are a condition of such payments. Such compliance with feed-grain base acreage is not required for 1956 because the Department will not have the data to determine feed-grain base acreages in time to make it applicable to the 1956 program.

Seventh. The provision of the Senate amendment prohibiting leasing of Government lands for agricultural purposes was modified in accordance with suggestions received from the executive branch, which has had the problem under study for some time.

Eighth. The substitute permits Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used until June 30, 1957, to finance soil bank operations instead of switching from corporate funds to appropriated funds on February 1 in the middle of the fiscal year, and permits Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be used after June 30, 1957, to the extent that funds have been appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation for that purpose. These changes will facilitate the operation of the program, but still preserve the control of Congress over the program through appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as

a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me, dated April 5, 1956, from the Department, signed by True D. Morse, Acting Secretary, on this subject, showing the reason why the conference agreed to make the changes suggested in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr.,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am writing to you as chairman of the conference committee on H. R. 12, to call to your attention the urgent need for a further amendment to section 221 (a) of the bill, to change from February 1, 1957, to July 1, 1957, the date for transition from CCC financing of the soil-bank program to appropriation financing.

This section, as it passed the Senate, authorizes the financing of the soil-bank program from CCC funds until February 1, 1957. It also requires the submission of a report prior to February 1, 1957, of all operations which will require the making of expenditures prior to July 1, 1957, and authorizes appropriations to carry out the purposes of the Soil Bank Act, including payments to CCC for costs incurred up to February 1, 1957.

We have no objection to the submission of such a report by February 1 nor to the principle that the soil bank should be financed by direct appropriations as soon as feasible, if that is the desire of Congress. Our original proposal for permanent CCC financing with subsequent appropriations to repay CCC—which was adopted in the Senate committee version of S. 3183—was based primarily on (1) the close relationship of the soil bank to CCC operations, especially the need to reduce the vast accumulation of surpluses so that price support activities can operate effectively, (2) the administrative simplification that would reult from using CCC authorities, especially at the local level, (3) the urgent time element in getting the program in operation, and (4) the ample precedents for this approach, such as the financing of the International Wheat Agreement, titles I and II of Public Law 480, the special milk program, the special brucellosis program, eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, emergency famine relief to friendly peoples, emergency feed assistance to farmers and stockmen in disaster areas, etc.

We understand that the conferees have already agreed on an amendment which would permit the use of CCC funds after February 1 provided the corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of the act. This provision will be most helpful after the transition has been made to an appropriation basis by permitting the continued use of CCC authorities in administering the program.

However, we strongly urge that the transition to an appropriation basis be made on July 1, 1957—the beginning of a new fiscal year—rather than on February 1. As you know, the time element is extremely critical. If the Soil Bank is to be implemented in time to have any material effect on the planting of the 1956 crops, it must be gotten under way at the earliest possible date and immediately upon passage of the basic legislation. However, if the immediate fund availability is limited to February 1, it would cast doubt upon the availability of funds to fulfill commitments and furthermore could have the effect of suspending payments and administrative operations unless an appropriation were actually passed by February 1. It seems extremely doubtful that Congress would be able to review the report of operations, examine a budget estimate, and actually pass an appropriation during the month of January 1957, especially if the usual amount of time is required to organize committees and otherwise make the necessary internal arrangements for the operations of a new Congress.

For these reasons, we believe it imperative to change the transition date to July 1, 1957. On this basis the appropriation estimate can be handled as a part of the regular budget for the fiscal year 1958 without the disruptive effects of shifting the basis of financing in the middle of the fiscal year, and avoiding the risks of suspending the program pending the approval of an appropriation almost immediately upon the convening of the new Congress.

We are furnishing sufficient copies of this letter for your use in advising other members of the conference regarding the need for this change. Your favorable consideration of this matter will be highly appreciated and will assist greatly in the administration of the Soil Bank program.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. Ninth, State game and fish agencies and the Fish and Wildlife Service are specifically included among the agencies to be utilized, and capability surveys as developed by the Soil Conservation Service are specifically included among the land use capability data to be utilized.

Tenth. The substitute specifies the date, March 15, as the date by which the Secretary's report on the conservation reserve program for the preceding year shall be transmitted to Congress.

One paragraph in the statement of managers on the part of the House may need a word of clarification. The paragraph on "Tree Seedlings" should not be taken as showing any intention to exclude State nurseries from participation as fully as private nurseries in supplying seedlings for the conservation reserve program.

The surplus disposal provision of the Senate amendment contained several provisions relating to cotton. The provision directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to encourage sales for export to reestablish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton was omitted from the conference substitute because the corporation already has adequate authority to sell cotton for export, and should do so. The conferees were in agreement that this cotton should be sold, but were not in agreement that this provision was the proper way to accomplish such disposition. The disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks should be conducted in an orderly manner that will encourage continued sales for export and discourage foreign purchasers from withholding their purchases in anticipation of occasional sale programs.

Section 303 of the conference substitute authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries to limit exports to the United States and to issue regulations to carry out such agreements. This provision was incorporated in the substitute in the light of a possible agreement being negotiated with Japan on cotton textiles, although it is applicable to all countries, and all agricultural commodities and their products.

The conference substitute retains the provision of the Senate amendment to include cotton of 1 11/16 inches and longer staple length in the import quota applicable to cotton having a staple length of 1⅛ inches or longer, but requires administration of the quota in a manner that will permit the importation of 1 11/16 inches and longer cotton to conform to normal requirements for such cotton. The overall quota is 95,000 bales, and it is estimated that 16,000 bales of 1 11/16 inches or longer cotton came in ex quota in 1955. In the future the 1 11/16-inch cotton will be required to come in within the 95,000-bale limitation.

The Senate provision requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to encourage the sale of extra long staple cotton has been confined by the conference substitute to the quantity of such cotton which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand, since there is no desire to require it to purchase cotton for export.

Other provisions of the conference substitute dealing with surplus disposal would:

First. Require food stamp and food stockpiling programs to be included along with the surplus disposal program required to be submitted to Congress by the Secretary;

Second. Clarify the ocean freight provision of the Senate amendment;

Third. Make the commission concerned with the industrial use of industrial products a bipartisan commission;

Fourth. Limit the amount of the supplemental section 32 funds which might be devoted to any one commodity to 50 percent of the $500 million authorized; and

Fifth. Limit the penal institution donation provision to donation of food commodities, but permit donations to be made to State corrective institutions for minors.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May commodities be donated to penitentiaries?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That provision has not been changed, except to limit the donations to food. I am sure that is what the Senator would like to do.

Mr. LANGER. Am I correct in understanding that donations to Federal penitentiaries can be taken care of?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. The only change we made was to add State correctional institutions for minors to the amendment which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota had inserted in the bill.

The provision of the Senate amendment exempting wheat produced for feed, food, or seed on the farm where grown from marketing penalties is omitted. The wheat quota law permits any producer to grow 15 acres of wheat without penalty. This very liberal exemption, which is not contained in the marketing quota provisions for any other commodity, has contributed heavily to excess wheat production, and the conferees felt that the still more generous provision of the Senate amendment was

unnecessary and might contribute seriously to the wheat surplus situation.

Other changes in the marketing quota and acreage allotment provisions of the Senate amendment made by the conference substitute would:

First. Permit the Secretary to apportion among small cotton farms in any State in 1956 an acreage equal to the acreage allotted in such State which he estimates will not be planted, put in the soil bank, or considered as planted. Since it is contemplated that very few cotton farmers will underplant their cotton acreage without taking advantage of the acreage reserve program, it is expected that the acreage which might be apportioned under this section would be a very small acreage. This provision of the conference substitute supplements the provision of the Senate amendment providing additional acreage for small cotton farms, effective in 1957 and 1958;

Second. The provision of the Senate amendment for additional peanut acreage allotments in certain cases in States where the acreage devoted to Virginia or Valencia type peanuts is less than 10,000 acres is omitted from the conference substitute. This provision would have given preferential treatment to the States covered by it. The Department has the authority to increase allotments for types of peanuts in short supply and has exercised this authority this year. However, this authority provides for the apportionment of any increase among all States producing the types needed.

Section 602 of the Senate amendment providing for forest products price reporting and research is omitted from the conference substitute, since there was considerable objection to it and further consideration of it appears desirable before adoption.

The provision of the Senate amendment for a survey of existing meat-grading systems was omitted since the Department has ample authority to make such a survey. Objections were raised to the provision and since it was not studied in committee, further consideration appears desirable if it is to be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will take me 10 more minutes to conclude my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I admit that the bill agreed to in conference and which I have explained, is not perfection. It is, however, the best that could be obtained by the Senate conferees after 2 long weeks of discussions with the House managers.

I wish to say this, Mr. President: the conference bill is workable. Aside from our own experts and those from the House, we had many from the Department of Agriculture to help us write a bill that was administratively feasible. It is designed to bring immediate relief to our farmers and, I fervently believe, it will halt the drastic decline in farm income without further aggravating our surpluses.

Now, we have heard that the White House is dissatisfied with this bill. That may or may not be true. I know that in his press conference of April 4, President Eisenhower set up as his main criteria for a farm bill, one designed to do two things; help our farmers over the "long term," as he put it, and, second, "help them now."

These two tests are amply met by the conference bill.

For the "long term," to use the President's words, we have provided a soil bank, one which is designed to reduce plantings on allotted acres and cultivated acres, as well. Unplanted acres will create a scarcity. The soil-bank provisions as embodied in the conference bill are almost identical with those proposed by the President. We have vested the Secretary of Agriculture with broad and ample authority to make the soil bank work. He has sufficient leeway to do so; his discretion is extremely flexible so as to permit him to adjust requirements and participation to meet changing conditions, as he determines them.

But, Mr. President, it would be but an idle gesture for us to expect the soil bank to help farmers adequately this year. It is well into the spring; farmers have planted much of their lands. As President Eisenhower declared in his April 4 press conference:

> Now, the soil-bank portion of the program which we originally thought would help a great deal this year probably can't because it is getting too late.

That was the President's opinion as of April 4; it is now later, and it may become much later, depending on the action taken today. The prospects of the soil bank providing any effective income relief for farmers this year is so remote as to be only a cherished hope of the most ardent supporters of the plan.

Therefore, Mr. President, the choice is clear. Either we can wait another year to give our farmers much-needed relief, by depending upon the soil bank to do the job, or we can approve a method by which plummetting farm income can be arrested and substantially raised this year, by voting for the pending conference report.

I do not believe we can, in good conscience, afford to wait another year. Besides owing a duty to our farmers to see that they are not driven off their lands, we also must face the fact that another year of disastrously low farm income will threaten our whole economy, aside from agriculture.

Mr. President, to bring about this much-needed assistance this year, we have provided in the bill for 90 percent of parity price supports for 1956. We have voted to raise support levels for the basics to 90 percent of parity to tide our farmers over until such time as the soil bank, according to the President's own estimate, will take full effect. Frankly, I doubt that the soil bank will show any appreciable results until the middle of 1957, but I am willing to yield to the President's wishes and accept his prognosis in order to get a bill enacted which will pump life back into our farm economy now.

Let us face facts, Mr. President. Ninety percent of parity price supports for 1956 are not going to increase production. Contrary to Mr. Benson, and his followers, there is no conflict between the 1-year, 1-shot emergency, 90 percent of parity supports in this bill and the soil bank. Here is why:

First, by the President's own admission, the soil bank cannot be effective in 1956. Therefore, as to 1956, there can be no conflict between 90 percent of parity and the soil bank.

Second—and this is most important—90 percent of parity price supports for 1956 will not and cannot bring about any increase in production of the basic commodities.

Every basic commodity to which the 90 percent of parity price supports apply are under tight acreage allotments. By the President's own admission, much of these allotments have been and are now being planted. Thus, since the higher support levels in the conference bill cannot increase acreage, they cannot conceivably increase production.

The argument has been advanced that our present surpluses are the fault of 90 percent of parity price supports. I reiterate most emphatically that they are not; these surpluses exist because the Department of Agriculture, because our Government, called upon farmers to achieve all-out production during the Korean war. Can the farmers be blamed for that, Mr. President?

I hold in my hand a number of clippings on the subject which might be of interest at this time. For example, here is one from the New York Times of October 28, 1950, which bears the caption "Brannan Warns Farmers—They Must Produce or Face Further Controls, he says." Here is another from the October 4, 1950, edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled "Farm Crop Switch: Federal Planners Do About Face—Will Ask Bigger Output in 1951—All Curbs Off for Next Year on Cotton Planting—Talk of More Rice, Corn, Meat—Wheat Goal Is Also Lifted."

Here is another, Mr. President, from the March 20, 1951, edition of the New York Times. It is headed "1951 Crops May Fall Short of United States Needs—Outlook Is Most Disturbing In Corn, With Plantings Seen 5 Percent Below Acreage Goals."

Here is an article taken from Newsweek of October 16, 1950, entitled "Cotton Shortage." It states, in part, that Secretary of Agriculture Brannan decided last week that "there would be no controls of any kind on next year's planting. Farmers were asked to aid at a total output of 16 million bales."

Now, later, Mr. President—just this week, as a matter of fact—the magazine U. S. News & World Report noted that the 1953 crop of supported commodities had not been controlled, and that, as a result, the surpluses shot skyhigh.

Whoever may be to blame for this situation, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, there is one thing certain: Our farmers were not to blame nor can anyone blame it on 90 percent of parity price supports for the basics.

The blame rests upon those planners who declined to impose controls on the 1953 crop. The Democrats were in office in 1952, Mr. President; it was up to the Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, to determine if controls were to be imposed. That determination, it must be noted, had to be made at not later than the dates set opposite the following commodities: Cotton, October 15; corn, November 15; wheat, July 1; rice, December 31.

Thus, the issue of controls or no controls had to be decided during the year 1952, as to whether the 1953 crop would be controlled. Let me remind the Senate that the war in Korea was still in progress at that time. The truce was not signed until July 1953. Hence, during 1952, at the time when the issue of controls or no controls for the 1953 crop had to be decided, it was not known whether war and defense demands for farm commodities would slacken, or whether they would actually increase. Should a truce agreement not have been achieved—and in 1952 the Communists were still bargaining, haggling, and, I might note, threatening an expanded conflict—the prospect of an overwhelming and overnight demand for farm commodities was a distinct probability. Thus, in 1952, when the Secretary had to decide whether to impose controls, he took the prudent course. He determined that it would be better to chance the prospect of future surpluses, than to run the risk that full-scale fighting might break out again and find our country without the food and fiber necessary to prosecute the conflict to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Brannan warned this would be his course in 1950, and he was of the same opinion, I assume, in 1952. The Washington Post quotes former Secretary Brannan to this effect, in August of 1950, shortly after the Korean war broke out, under the headline, "Bumper Crop Goal of Brannan Again."

Secretary Brannan stated:

> I would rather be guilty of building up a huge surplus of agricultural products than to be blamed for a shortage of food and clothing. I have said that repeatedly; I am stronger than ever of that view now, in view of the critical world situation.

Mr. President, can any man honestly say that the Secretary of Agriculture was wrong. "Be prepared" is a motto wisely adopted by the Boy Scouts of America. It is a motto founded on wisdom. It is the keystone of our present defense program. I think the only prudent thing the Secretary could do in 1952, when the truce talks were floundering and the decision on controls had to be made, was to plan for the worst, and hope that the best would happen. That is precisely what he did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can 90 percent of parity be blamed for this? Most emphatically not. The cry of our Government was for more production, more food and fiber: "Food and fiber will win the war," they were told.

Without controls, these farmers produced. Acting at the behest of their Government, they coaxed from their lands an abundance of food and fiber which, had the truce in Korea not been signed, could have well meant the difference between survival or annihilation of American troops battling on that bloody peninsula.

Now, however, we are being told that our farmers, in effect, should be "punished" for overproducing. We are being told that 90 percent of parity price supports are to blame for our surpluses.

If ever a Secretary of Agriculture has been guilty of politicalizing our agriculture, and misrepresenting the facts to our people, then the man who now holds that office should bear that guilt.

Besides his untrue prognostications as to what future years would bring—his optimistic predictions as to what 1953, 1954, and 1955 would bring in the way of increased farm income—Secretary Benson has not proved himself sympathetic to the administration of the farm program which was the law of the land at the time he assumed his office.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to repudiate this relentless politicalizing of our farmers' serious plight. I remind the Senate that the conference bill meets the President's criteria laid down in his April 4 press conference. I state to my colleagues, in all good faith, that the conference has done its level best; we have written a compromise bill which, if administered properly, will be of substantial and immediate assistance to our farmers.

I shall be the first to admit that it is not a rubber stamp of what Secretary Benson, in his doubtful agricultural wisdom, has determined to be best for the farmers. It is nevertheless a bill which, in the judgment of the majority of the conference committee, comes as close as is practically possible toward assuring our farmers of relief, both immediate and long-range. It is a bill the President can and should sign, and I believe he knows so. The fallacious cry raised from the panelled offices of the Secretary of Agriculture to the effect that 90 percent of parity, as written into this bill, will increase production is pure unadulterated buncombe.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the fact that the conference bill must be adopted if our farmers are to avoid the unhappy fate of economic strangulation in an economy which is bursting at the seams in other respects. If the President is a reasonable, realistic man—and I believe he is—then he will sign this bill.

When he signs it, then his next official act should be to obtain the services of one who will administer the bill in accord with the will of the Congress. It would seem to me that Mr. Benson has disqualified himself from administering this program, inasmuch as he declared, only brief hours after the conferees came into agreement, that their report was unacceptable to him. Nothing seems to be acceptable to Mr. Benson, except a continuation of the present program which has spelled disaster to many farmers.

The office of the Secretary of Agriculture needs an administrator who is in harmony with a price-support program; the farmers of our Nation who have seen their income shrink by more than $3 billion since 1952, who have watched the parity ratio plummet from 100 in 1952 to 80 as of January of 1956, deserve a Secretary of Agriculture who will administer the program enacted by Congress in a sympathetic manner.

The conference bill offers our farmers hope for increased income in 1956. It provides our President with a soil-bank program of his own choosing, which he says can be made effective in 1957, since it is a little late for it to become fully effective this year. It in no way, form, or manner involves an increase in production, since acreage allotments have already been fixed and would remain unchanged under this bill. Only income, stimulated by 90 percent of parity price supports on heavily curtailed production, would rise.

If this program is administered wisely and sympathetically, I think it can bring our farmers much relief this year, much more relief next year, and perhaps a return to full economic vigor in subsequent years. If it is placed in the hands of a Secretary who has already passed judgment upon it and found it unacceptable, then it can only bring more of the same economic disaster which has already been visited upon our farmers in such abundance.

This bill must go to the White House, Mr. President; it must be signed into law. It must be made operative as quickly as possible. It is the very least our farmers deserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clippings to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the clippings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1950]

BRANNAN WARNS FARMERS THEY MUST PRODUCE OR FACE FURTHER CONTROLS, HE SAYS

DENVER, October 27.—Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan put this issue directly to the farmer here tonight: Produce or face further controls.

"We need more meat, wool, and feed grains," Mr. Brannan said soon after arriving in his home State to help carry the Democratic campaign, "and the best way for farmers to avoid controls in time of need is to produce fully those items we require."

He admitted that our food reserves are not sufficient to feed all the world. The said, "we must give to countries such as Korea, the know-how to eventually produce their own food as well as temporary supplies."

[From the Wall Street Journal of October 4, 1950]

FARM CROP SWITCH: FEDERAL PLANNERS DO ABOUT FACE—WILL ASK BIGGER OUTPUT IN 1951—ALL CURBS OFF FOR NEXT YEAR ON COTTON PLANTING—TALK OF MORE RICE, CORN, MEAT—WHEAT GOAL IS ALSO LIFTED

(By Kenneth Schelbel)

WASHINGTON.—"About face" is the order of the day at the Agriculture Department.

After 2 years of trying to reduce crops—in a vain effort to stave off mounting surpluses

of everything from wheat and butter to tung nuts—the Agriculture Department will give farmers new, higher crop goals to aim at in 1951.

The trend was spotlighted yesterday when the Agriculture Department dropped all curbs on cotton production in 1951.

Final figures won't come out until next month when Agriculture Department officials hold their annual National Farm Outlook Conference, at which they tell State and local farm leaders what's what in the farm world for the coming year. But right now they're aiming at a 10-percent boost for most crops, while goals for some, like cotton, are being hiked as much as 50 percent or more over this year's output.

MORE ACREAGE

The switch will mean a drastic easing in the rigid acreage restrictions which were slapped on basic crops this year. In some cases, like cotton, the curbs will be dropped entirely. Meantime, farm planners are talking of boosting acreage allotments on rice and corn, to get more production. Greater wheat output next year has already been ordered by Agriculture Secretary Brannon, who ruled out previous plans to trim planting.

Why the reversal? Agriculture Department spokesmen give a variety of answers: Larger crops are needed because of the stepped-up military mobilization. They're needed to help hold down prices of food and to meet the needs of the ever-increasing population—say the planners.

GOALS FOR NEXT YEAR

Here's the Agriculture Department's 1951 goal for each of the major crops:

Wheat: Next year Secretary Brannan wants farmers to produce about 150 million more bushels of wheat than this year. That would mean about 10 billion extra loaves of bread. He's asking for a wheat crop of 1,150,000,000 bushels, compared with a little more than 1 billion bushels turned out this year.

Before the Korean war broke, Mr. Brannan planned to cut next year's wheat acreage to between 60 million and 65 million acres. Now he's asking for 72,800,000 acres.

The 1951 goal, plus 417 million bushels carried over from this year, would cover estimated exports and military needs and provide a safe reserve margin, Mr. Brannan says. Some private grain men say it may mean a burdensome surplus. The average support rate for 1951 wheat has been set at $1.99 a bushel, compared with $1.95 this year.

Cotton: In dropping all curbs on cotton output next year, Mr. Brannan urged growers to produce 16 million bales of the white fiber. That would be 60 percent more than this year's low crop which was badly hit by insect damage. It's indicated at around 9,982,000 bales. This crop, plus present carryover supplies, aren't considered enough to meet United States civilian and military needs, exports and reserves. On the basis of past average yields, farmers will have to sow 25 million to 30 million acres for 1951 if they're to produce the 16 million bales Mr. Brannan wants. They planted 20 million acres this year.

Agriculture Department budget watchers have their fingers crossed about the whole scheme. Helter-skelter production of cotton next year could ruin currently high prices. Committed now to support cotton prices at a high level in 1951, Uncle Sam might wind up owning millions of bales.

MORE CORN

Corn: Agriculture Department officials would like farmers to plant 90 million acres of corn next year, compared to this year's 84 million acres. This should produce a little more than 3,200 million bushels of the grain, against this year's crop of 3,162 million bushels.

Corn production has to remain high, the planners say, as protection against a runaway in the price of meat. The country's supply of pork chops and sirloin steaks depends on the supply of corn for feed, the experts add.

Figures for the corn crop are still tentative, and there's a good chance they'll be hiked even further. Mr. Brannan's cohorts are trying to come up with a goal that will sidestep the possibility of a glutted market and still give them enough grain to keep consumer prices of livestock, poultry, and dairy foods from climbing.

NOT ENOUGH TO GO ROUND

Meat: This energy food is one both the housewife and Federal food experts would like to see more of. "With lots of money in the public's pocketbooks, and with a growing military program, there just isn't enough to go around," say the experts. "The public is buying even the highest-priced cuts as fast as it can get its hands on them."

Farm planners would like to see steak and chop production hiked sharply. This year beef production has amounted to about 63 pounds per person. In 1951, they want to see output boosted to 65 or 66 pounds per person.

Last year pork production was about 67.6 pounds per person. This year it's expected to average about 70 pounds. And the experts are asking farmers to aim at production of between 73 and 75 pounds of pork per person in 1951.

About 8.7 pounds of veal went to each meat eater in 1949, compared with an estimated 8 pounds this year. Experts are hoping for a 1951 production figure of 9 pounds of veal per person.

A BLUE NOTE

One blue note in the meat picture is lamb. Prospects for increasing the amount of super-costly lamb chops are not so good.

Since 1942, United States sheep flocks have shrunk 50 percent and experts say the downtrend will probably continue. Farmers find easier and more lucrative ways of making a living than growing sheep. In 1949, there were only 4.1 pounds of lamb for each of us. There will be about 3.9 pounds this year, and a shade less next year, officials say.

Poultry: The experts are calling for a little more turkey and chicken on dining-room tables next year. This year poultry is being eaten at an annual rate of about 29.3 pounds per person. Next year, the prediction is for 30 pounds.

Fruit: Increased fruit production in 1951 is a must, say the Agriculture Department pundits. The short crops this year, especially of peaches, pears, and citrus fruit, brought supplies to the lowest level since 1943. With attractive prices in the offing, growers are expected to have bigger crops next year, unless they run into bad weather and plant diseases as they did this year.

Lifting of all Government curbs on United States cotton production in 1951 was expected by cotton merchants who anticipate a dangerously low supply of the staple by next spring.

The Government slashed cotton acreage this year to reduce expected surpluses but prospects for a surplus vanished when the Korean war greatly increased demand for cotton goods. At the same time the boll weevil for the second successive year is taking a heavy toll of the crop.

As a result dealers feel the 1950 cotton crop will shrink to around 9 million bales compared with the big 1949 production of 16,128,000 bales. A 9 million bale crop would not even cover domestic consumption, currently running at a rate of better than 10 million bales a year.

In addition to calling for a big crop next year the Department of Agriculture is expected to limit the volume of cotton exports to assure supplies for the domestic textile mills next year until the new crop starts moving in the second half of 1951.

Dealers estimate that if no restrictions were placed on the distribution of cotton, the carryover stock on August 1 next year could be under 1 million bales. The carryover on August 1 (start of the crop season) this year was 6,700,000 bales.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1951]

1951 CROPS MAY FALL SHORT OF UNITED STATES NEEDS—OUTLOOK IS MOST DISTURBING IN CORN, WITH PLANTINGS SEEN 5 PERCENT BELOW ACREAGE GOALS—WHEAT PROVES EXCEPTION—AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT SAYS FEARS OF LABOR SHORTAGE BALKED EXPANSION PLANS

WASHINGTON, March 19.—A Department of Agriculture report indicated today that this year's production of vital food and livestock feed crops may fall considerably short of the Nation's expanding needs under the defense program.

The outlook was most disturbing in the case of corn—the major raw material for production of meat, dairy and poultry products. These are the foods most in demand and bringing the highest prices at retail stores.

The Department said fears of a shortage of labor at harvesting time and a reluctance to plow up lands which have been taken out of cultivation and put into grass in recent years appears to be holding down plans for crop expansion.

In the case of corn, the department had urged plantings of at least 90 million acres compared with 84,370,000 planted last year. Today's report—based upon farmers' plans as of March 1—showed a prospective acreage of only 85,694,000.

PROSPECTS FOR CORN

At relatively high average yields per acre, such plantings would produce a corn crop of only 3,050,000,000 bushels. The Department has said that at least 3,590,000,000 bushels will be needed to maintain current levels of meat, dairy and poultry production.

Reserve supplies of corn are dwindling under a rapidly increasing livestock feeding program, and consequently would not be large enough to make up the possible deficit in this year's crop.

[From Newsweek of October 16, 1950]

COTTON SHORTAGE

King Cotton last week was in a parlous state—from an overdose of planning. The patient would survive, but it would take a strenuous resuscitation effort.

The trouble had its origin more than a year ago, when Congress, after a protracted debate, passed a bill authorizing the Department of Agriculture to limit cotton acreage (for price-support purposes) and impose strict marketing quotas. Those who had planted the crop over the longest period got the biggest acreage allotments, but many southern farmers, who benefited from the law, didn't use the allotments received. Following long-standing Agriculture advice, they diversified their crops, resting the land before the next cotton planting.

Result: the smallest harvest since 1946 from the smallest acreage planted to cotton since 1886. This week the Agriculture Department estimated the 1950 cotton crop at 9,869,000 bales. Officials had been confident, however, that a yield like this, backed by a stockpile of 7 million bales, would avert a shortage.

Their optimism was short lived. Consumption had already been running well ahead of production, when the Korean war and the long-range defense program upset the market. Suddenly, agriculture was faced with a demand for 16 million bales of cotton; this year's short crop and all the surplus would be needed. Last week, Secretary

Brannan, after denouncing the "unworkability" of the present law, announced the inevitable: There would be no controls of any kind on next year's planting. Farmers were asked to aim at a total output of 16 million bales. As usual, they would enjoy price supports—probably at 90 percent of parity.

First reaction from cotton growers was surprisingly gloomy. A goal of 16 million bales would require planting about 30 million growing acres. There were grave doubts that sufficient manpower, after the draft and defense plants take an increasing toll, would be available to handle that big a job.

While cotton is in the tightest position, Secretary Brannan has made or is about to make upward revisions on quotas of other major farm products. Probably, potatoes and peanuts will be the only two crops kept under rigid control. Wheat acreage for next year already has been raised 12 million, up to 72,800,000 acres; a decision on corn, due by February 1, and rice, by December 31, will undoubtedly open the gate for bigger plantings.

[From the Washington Post of August 18, 1950]

BUMPER CROPS GOAL OF BRANNAN AGAIN

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan is shooting for another year of bumper farm production in 1951.

"I would rather be guilty of building up a huge surplus of agricultural products than to be blamed for a shortage of food and clothing," he told the Washington Post. "I have said that repeatedly. I am stronger than ever of that view now, in view of the critical world situation."

To accomplish his goal of plenty, no matter what the future may bring, Brannan is expected to:

1. Announce in a few days a liberal level of price supports for 1951 wheat, and later for the other so-called basic crops of corn, cotton, rice, peanuts and tobacco. The Agricultural Act of 1949 gives Brannan authority to reduce price supports this year from the present 90 percent of parity to 85 percent. Brannan is expected to keep wheat, at least, at the present 90 percent level. He doesn't have to announce support levels for the others for several months.

2. Set liberal acreage allotments on crops where he is required to announce Government goals.

Brannan already has fixed liberal acreage allotments for wheat for next year. This is 72.8 million acres, compared with 60,513,000 acres being harvested this year. (More than 18 percent of the acreage sown to wheat this year was abandoned.)

The proposed increase in wheat acreage is particularly striking for States surrounding the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia are asked to plant more wheat for 1951 harvest than ever before. Maryland is asked to plant 383,412 acres, compared with 328,000 this year and 362,000 in 1949; Virginia 508,354 acres compared with 425,000 this year and 472,000 in 1949, and West Virginia 100,943 compared with 70,000 this year and 77,000 last year.

Prospects are for a corn crop this fall only 95.8 percent of the 1949 crop. Wheat will total only 78.8 percent of last year. Oats, barley, and rye are well above last year, but beans are only 84 percent, peas 64 percent and cotton less than 69 percent of 1949.

Demands of the Armed Forces will cut into supplies, so that the bases for figuring supplies is changed since last year. The law requires that Brannan base his acreage allotments for wheat, for instance, upon a total supply—carryover plus the harvest—equal to normal domestic demands, normal export demands plus 30 percent. Brannan is expected to raise that formula considerably.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] 10 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has given a very good and an impartial explanation of the conference report. However, as one of the Senate conferees, I should like to make a few comments.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been laboring with their farm bill for some four months. It has been a daylong job, day after day. I think the bill in its present form represents one of the best pieces of farm legislation considered by Congress for many, many years. It will go a long way toward helping the farmers over the difficult post-war period in which they presently find themselves.

At the present time, farmers are receiving only 39 percent of the consumer's food dollar. Farm prices in general have sunk to approximately 80 percent of parity. In view of that situation, I am quite sure the President of the United States, who, in my opinion, has always been fair, will sign this bill. I certainly hope he will sign it.

Mr. President, I have in my hand the current issue of the U. S. News and World Report. Let me read a paragraph or two from it:

Just ahead is one more round of wage-and-price inflation, one more turn in the upward spiral that's been going on since World War II ended.

Steel wages are to go up by midyear, maybe 20 cents an hour. Steel prices then will be raised about $10 a ton to offset higher wages and other increases in costs. Freight rates are going up 7 percent. Coal wages have just taken an automatic increase. Coal prices are being marked up accordingly.

Aluminum is up. Copper prices are up. Paper prices have been marked higher. Automobile wages will rise automatically. New-car prices on models to come out later this year are likely to be higher.

The article states further that farm machinery and many other things the farmer has to buy will rise in price in the near future.

Everything the farmer has to buy will go up still further in price. That is simply another reason why the failure of the farm bill to become law would create an impossible situation for the farmers of America.

There are about four provisions of the bill which are in major controversy; 4 or 5 provisions to which I think the Secretary of Agriculture has raised objection.

The bill would extend the 90-percent price supports for basic farm commodities for 1 year. This is only a few percentage points higher than the price at which the Secretary himself has indicated he would like to set the price supports for basic farm commodities. He has indicated that he would give cotton producers a support price of 86 percent of parity for this year. He has already set corn prices at 81 percent of parity. He has indicated that the 90-percent support price should be made permanent for the tobacco producers. The producers of other basic farm commodities, with the exception of wheat, would receive price supports of 80 percent of parity, or above. I do not think, therefore, that the objection of the Secretary of Agriculture is well founded. This is only a 1-year provision.

Another important provision of the bill relates to price supports for the feed grains. Feed grains would receive mandatory support at 80 percent of parity. But in order to secure the 85-percent support, a farmer would have to reduce his acreage 15 percent and place that 15 percent acreage cut in the soil bank. After discussing the soil-bank program with farmers in the last 2 weeks, I find that this provision will do more to place land in the soil-bank program than will any other provision of the bill.

The provision will have another very healthy effect, namely, to increase the price of feed grains. At present, cash prices for barley are 70 percent of parity, oats at 73 percent of parity, rye at 59 percent of parity, and grain sorghums at 72 percent of parity. I believe most agricultural authorities in the United States have come to the conclusion that cheap grain prices are largely responsible for the low prices for hogs, beef, and other meats. One of the purposes of the soil-bank program is to improve the prices of feed grains and other farm commodities by curtailing production of these commodities. If we really want to increase the prices of feed grains, this is the best way I know of to do it. If we really want the soil-bank program to work, this is the way to do it.

Another major provision of the bill is that which affects dairy commodities. The bill would raise dairy support prices for butterfat 2.2 cents per pound. This is a reasonable increase in the support price, in view of the ever-increasing costs of operations of the dairy farmers.

Another important provision is the dual parity formula. This is the provision to which I understand the Secretary of Agriculture is most opposed. To me, it is the most important provision in the entire bill.

The modernized parity formula uses as its major factor in determining parity or a fair price the average price which the farmer received during the previous 10-year period. For example, if farm prices continued at 80 percent of parity for the next 10 years, then the 80-percent price which we now have would become the fair price 10 years from now.

For example, the 75-percent support price of 4 years ago is only one-tenth of 1 percent lower than the 80-percent support price today for dairy commodities. We are certainly moving in the wrong direction.

Business uses the favorable period of 1947 to 1949 to determine similar prices. Labor uses exactly the same period—1947 to 1949. To me, this is the most important provision in the bill. I do not know of a greater disservice that could be rendered to agriculture than to subject farmers permanently to the modernized parity formula. If we lost everything else in the bill, save that one provision, agriculture in the end would stand to gain much more. The dual parity formula has its objectionable features, to be sure. It would be far better, how-

ever, to continue this until the Department of Agriculture can develop a parity formula that will be more fair to farmers than the so-called modernized formula.

Whether there will be a domestic parity or two-price system for wheat will depend on whether two-thirds of the wheat farmers approve such a program. That is a tremendous majority. I doubt that two-thirds of the wheat farmers would approve that kind of program. I believe, however, it would be a far better program than the present flexible price-support program, which will remain in effect if the 90-percent support price program in the bill is not approved.

There are many other good provisions of the bill, which the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] discussed in some detail a while ago.

The bill provides for a trial of the two-price system for rice. I think that is a good provision. I think that kind of program should be tried. It has been discussed for many years. It was a Republican program in the 1920's. It will be found today that a great many farmers still think it is a good idea. I believe such a program should be tried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks on the domestic parity wheat plan some figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The price of wheat has very little influence on the price of a loaf of bread.

In January 1948 the price of wheat was $2.81 a bushel and the national average price of a 1-pound loaf of bread then was 13.8 cents. In February this year (1956) the price of wheat averaged $1.95 and the national average price of a loaf of bread was 17.6 cents. Thus in this 7-year period, while the price of wheat was down 31 percent, the price of the loaf of bread was up 28 percent.

In February of this year, as noted above, the average price of bread was 17.6. The value of wheat in the loaf was 2.7 cents.

If the price of wheat were raised to 90 percent of parity this would add 7 mills to the value of wheat in the loaf, but it cannot be said that this would be passed on to the consumer—if you consider this fact:

In 1955, with the institution of flexible support instead of the old 90 percent, the actual value of the wheat crop (938 million bushels) was placed by the USDA at $1,867 million, whereas if the whole crop had sold at the old 90 percent of parity support level, farmers would have received $2,129 million for the 1955 wheat crop.

Thus the 1955 crop brought $262 million less than would have been the case if the crop had sold at 90 percent of parity. This difference means that wheat was 12 percent (actual value) under 90 percent of parity.

But what happened?

While wheat was down 12 percent under 90 percent, the price of bread in 1955 rose one-half cent a loaf (national average), or 3 percent.

And, while farmers did not receive the $262 million that a 90-percent price would have brought, no advantage whatever accrued to consumers of bread, actually the price of bread advanced. The supposed savings to consumers was more than lost between the farmer and the retail store counter.

This, too, is significant:

In 1914 the average hourly wage of a factory worker would buy 3.5 1-pound loaves of bread; in 1929 it would buy 6.4 loaves; in February of this year the average hourly earnings of an industrial employee would buy 11 loaves of bread.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I do not regard the bill embraced in the pending conference report as perfect, but it is certainly a vast improvement over the present law. It will help farmers greatly to stabilize their income in the future. Certainly it will not immediately give them 100 percent of parity in the market place; it will not give them all they are entitled to; but it will go a long way toward improving farm prices.

I feel that the President of the United States will sign the bill because I feel he is a reasonable man. When he considers all of the factors involved, I hope and feel sure he will sign it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Before he starts, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] wishes to introduce a bill and to make a short statement in connection therewith, not to exceed 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As I understand, the time consumed by the Senator from Massachusetts will not be charged to either side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Massachusetts 1 minute.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be retained in the Secretary's office until the close of business on April 20 for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be held in the office of the Secretary, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Senate Labor Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement, it is my intention to hold hearings on this important legislation at a sufficiently early date to insure action by this Congress before it adjourns.

This bill has already received the unanimous approval of all the standard railway labor organizations, whose responsible recommendations have traditionally been given considerable weight by the Congress in determining the rate and benefit structure of their pension system.

In general, the bill contains four major provisions:

First, all benefits, with the exception of some based upon Social Security levels, are increased 15 percent. Today retired railroad workers receive benefits averaging only $104 a month. Those forced to retire by disability receive on the average only $95 a month; and the averages of the various types of survivor benefits range from $40 to no more than $62 a month. A modest increase of 15 percent is badly needed at once.

Second, to pay for these increased benefits while keeping the Railroad Retirement Fund actuarially sound, the bill would increase both the carrier and the employee contribution by 1 percent of the taxable payroll, making the total contribution of each 7¼ percent or a combined total contribution of 14½ percent of taxable payroll. The results of the latest actuarial valuation of the Railroad Retirement Account admonish against any liberalization of benefits without simultaneously providing additional revenues to defray the cost. We cannot irresponsibly vote generous benefits for those presently retired only to find in subsequent years that we have exhausted the fund to which those presently working had contributed in anticipation of their own secure retirement.

Third, the bill would ease the burden on the active railroad employees of this increased contribution rate by excluding the amount of contributions to the Railroad Retirement Account from income and wages for income-tax purposes. Such a provision is only just. Current railroad employees, who will incur immediately higher costs but no immediate benefits from this bill, will still be paying a higher effective rate of contribution than employees under social security and, of course, private noncontributory pension plans; and the loss in tax revenues to the Federal Government will be considerably less than the loss it would sustain if the system were noncontributory, enabling the carriers to charge off the entire cost as an operating expense on their corporation income tax returns. Even after the increase to 7¼ percent under this bill, the carriers—under current corporate tax rates—would be in effect actually paying only 3.48 percent of payroll while the employee—if he paid any income tax at all, and were within the 20-percent profit—would be paying at an effective rate of 5.8 percent. Employee pension contributions in England and Canada are similarly treated—and the cost of most other industrial pension plans in this Nation, being non-contributory, is entirely deductible for tax purposes.

Fourth, a technical, noncontroversial section of the bill places in the Railroad Retirement Board the authority to make disability freeze determinations for career railroad workers. This classification will facilitate administration of the present act, expedite the adjudication of claims and save administrative costs.

In closing, I should like to urge the Senate to give most careful consideration to the bill that I have introduced in the light of the pressing needs of railroad men and women all over the country for immediate relief. We must not be deterred by any dissuading voices

from keeping our eye on the main objective: that of furnishing needed relief to tens of thousands of retired railroad workers all over the country who are looking to the Congress of the United States for prompt and effective action along the modest lines proposed in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3616) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, special disability determinations for railroad employees, and for other purposes; and to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "2.76", "2.07", and "1.38" and inserting in lieu thereof "3.18", "2.38", and "1.59", respectively.

(b) (1) So much of section 3 (e) of such act as precedes *"Provided, however"* is amended to read as follows: "(e) In the case of an individual having a current connection with the railroad industry, the minimum annuity payable shall, before any reduction pursuant to section 2 (a) 3, be whichever of the following is the least: (1) $4.76 multiplied by the number of his years of service; or (2) $79.35; or (3) his monthly compensation;".

(2) The said section 3 (e) of such act is further amended by adding the following: "For purposes of this subsection and all purposes of the Social Security Act, the Board shall have such authority to determine a 'period of disability' within the meaning of section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, with respect to any employee who will have filed application therefor and (i) have completed 10 years of service or (ii) have been awarded an annuity, as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to determine such a period under such section 216 (i) if the employee would meet the requirements of clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) of such section by considering all his employment as an employee after 1936 to be 'employment' within the meaning of the Social Security Act, and his quarters of coverage were determined by presuming his compensation in a calendar year to have been paid in equal proportions with respect to all months in which he will have been in service as an employee in such calendar year: *Provided*, That no such period of disability shall be deemed to have begun if the employee died before July 1, 1955: *Provided, further*, That an application for an annuity filed with the Board on the basis of disability shall be deemed to be an application to determine such a period of disability, and such an application filed with the Board on or before the enactment of this proviso, shall, for the purpose of this subsection, be deemed filed after December 1954 and before July 1957: *And, provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Board shall have the authority to make such determination on the basis of the records in its possession or evidence otherwise obtained by it, and a determination by the Board with respect to any employee concerning such a 'period of disability,' shall be demed a final decision of the Board determining the rights of persons under this act for purposes of section 11 hereof; and such a determination by the Board of a period of disability for an employee shall, for the purposes of section 5 (k) (2) of this act, be considered a determination of such a period for such employee by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 216 (i), and to meet the conditions of section 222, of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 5 (f) (2) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "and 7 per centum of his or her compensation after December 31, 1946 (exclusive in both cases of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in the latter case in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)", and inserting in lieu thereof "7 per centum of his or her compensation paid after December 31, 1946, and prior to July 1, 1956, and 8 per centum of his or her compensation paid after June 30, 1956 (exclusive of compensation in excess of $300 for any month before July 1, 1954, and in excess of $350 for any month after June 30, 1954)."

(b) Section 5 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "$30", "$160", and "$14" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$34.50", "$184", and "$16.10", respectively.

(c) Section 5 (k) (1) of such act is amended by striking out the phrase "for the purposes of sections 203 and 216 (i) (3) of that act" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "for the purposes of section 203 and, with respect to an employee who will have completed less than 10 years of service, section 216 (i) (3) of that act."

(d) Section 5 (k) (3) of such act is amended by inserting in the first sentence after the word "service" the words ", of determinations under section 3 (e) of this act, or under section 216 (i) of the Social Security Act, of a 'period of disability' within the meaning of such section 216 (i)," and after the phrase "this section" the phrase ", section 3 (e) of this act,".

(e) Section 5 (l) (10) of such act is amended by striking out "40", "10", "$14", "$33.33", "$25", and "$13.33" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "46", "11½", "$16.10", "$38.33", "$28.75", and "$15.33", respectively.

SEC. 3. All pensions under section 6 of the Railroad Retirement Act, all joint and survivor annuities and survivor annuities deriving from joint and survivor annuities under that act awarded before July 1, 1956, and all annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935 are increased by 15 percent.

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 3201, 3202 (a), 3211 and 3221 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each amended by striking out "after December 31, 1954" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 30, 1956", and by striking out "after 1954" and inserting in lieu thereof "after June 1956."

(b) (1) Sections 3201 and 3221 of such act are each amended by striking out "6¼ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "7¼ percent."

(2) Section 3211 of such act is amended by striking out "12½ percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "14½ percent."

SEC. 5. Sections 3201 and 3211 of the Railroad Retirement Tax Act are each further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amount of the tax imposed on the income of any individual by this section shall be excluded from such individual's gross income for purposes of chapter 1 and from individual's 'wages' for purposes of chapter 24."

SEC. 6. (a) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) (1) of the first section of this act and by subsection (b) of section 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities (not including annuities to which section 3 applies) accruing for months after June 1956. The amendments made by subsection (e) of section 2 shall be effective only with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1956 and lump-sum payments (under sec. 5 (f) (1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937) in the case of deaths occurring after June 1956. Section 3 shall be effective only with respect to pensions due in calendar months after July 1956 and annuities accruing for months after June 1956.

(b) The amendments made by section 4 shall be effective only with respect to compensation paid after June 30, 1956, for services rendered after such date. The amendments made by section 5 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1956, but only with respect to compensation paid after such date for services rendered after such date.

SEC. 7. Section 11 (c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is hereby amended by inserting after the phrase "the Board", where this phrase appears the third time in that section, the following: "and expenses, tuition, and salaries of employees designated by the Board to attend courses of instructions or training at institutions whether or not conducted by the United States."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by sections 1 (b) (2) and 2 (d) hereof shall be effective with respect to annuities accruing for months after June 1955.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I had hoped Congress might pass and send to the President's desk a farm bill which would materially improve the lot of the farmers this year, and in the succeeding years would increase their income without doing violence to any agricultural group or to any class of farmers. It appears that my hopes are not to be realized.

Although the bill as it passed the Senate was bad enough, the work of the conference committee has made it worse.

As the bill now stands, it discriminates against the livestock producer, the dairyman, the fruit grower, the poultryman, and the vegetable grower. It even discriminates against a number of farmers who produce grain and who are supposed to benefit most from the bill.

The bill discriminates against the small farmer in favor of the large producer.

The conferees took from the bill provisions inserted by the Senate for the special protection of the tenant farmer.

They removed the limitations on payments which were in the bill as it passed the Senate so that now the sky is the limit on payments to the big producers.

All the small farmer can look forward to, should the bill become law, is higher costs of production and, in the case of many thousands of farmers, the eventual abandonment of their farms.

The livestock producer will find that the safeguards against mis-use of soil bank acres which were in the Senate bill have been deleted. Certainly, the deletions of such safeguards by the

conferees will do little to discourage the grazing of livestock on soil-bank land.

The cottongrower can get little comfort out of the conference report. Originally, the administration had planned a strong program to regain the domestic and foreign cotton market for the American producer. That program would be smashed by this bill. The welfare of both cotton producers and American cotton manufacturers would be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Any claim that the restoration of 90 percent supports and dual parity, as agreed to by the majority of the conferees, will benefit American agriculture must be made with a disregard for the facts. Agricultural income dropped steadily for 5 years. Almost 90 percent of the drop in farm income took place when rigid supports and dual parity were in effect. All of the recovery in farm prices in recent months has taken place since flexible supports have been in effect.

Now I should like to discuss particularly 2 or 3 provisions of the conference bill.

Some assume that the wheatgrowers will be sitting pretty with the provisions of this bill, especially the domestic parity program for wheat.

A couple days ago, I received a letter from Mr. Herbert Hughes, setting forth the virtues of the domestic parity plan for wheat, as he sees them.

I have no doubt that Mr. Hughes understands the wheat business thoroughly. I understand that he is a large and very successful wheat producer, besides having other successful business interests.

It appears to me, however, that Mr. Hughes views this subject through the eyes of a large producer, and without full knowledge of what the plan he so ardently sponsors would do to the small farmer who grows only a few acres of wheat, and perhaps grows that in rotation with other crops.

I wish to quote from Mr. Hughes' letter, and to point out what some of the things which he thinks would be of benefit to large producers would do to the small wheatgrower or the family-size farm.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hughes' letter in full made a part of the RECORD, and then I shall quote excerpts from the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Imperial, Nebr., April 7, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: Soon you are going to vote on a farm bill. It is important to everyone—the laborer, the businessman, and the farmer. Although I am president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, I am first a dirt farmer, doing much of my own work on an average sized farm.

Because it is so important, I hope you will consider carefully the following facts about domestic parity, the program on which wheat producers have worked for many years and in which we believe sincerely. It is supported by other segments of the wheat industry.

Domestic parity will reduce controls by abolishing the marketing quotas which have been so objectionable to farmers. Small farmers in both commercial and noncommercial areas will be able to produce wheat for feed on their own farms without the penalties which marketing quotas have required. Farmers in commercial areas will be encouraged to produce quality wheat.

The same farmers who in the past have voted on marketing quotas will vote for or against domestic parity. There will be no change in the voting procedure which has been in effect since 1939. The referendum on domestic parity will be held at the same time as the marketing quota referendum and will actually give them a choice between two systems.

The corn producer will benefit from the domestic parity program for wheat because the program will work toward a decreased supply of feed grains. Farmers who have been growing barley, oats, or sorghums on their acres diverted from wheat will gradually shift to the soil bank or back to wheat. As you may know, wheat produces a smaller quantity of feed units per acre than other grains.

Poultry and dairy farmers in feed deficit areas, like the East and Northeast, will benefit because they can then produce their own feed or purchase feed wheat produced locally at a price they can afford to pay.

The taxpayer will benefit because he will be relieved of high-level Government support of wheat prices. Wheat moving into export markets will require vastly reduced export subsidies. Wheat for the feed market will carry a very low support level.

The grain trade will benefit because the domestic parity program works toward getting Government out of the business of buying, storing, and selling wheat.

Labor and business will benefit because this program will help stabilize the income of the wheat grower at a level where he will be a good customer for the things they make and sell.

Thank you for taking the time to read what I have had to say about domestic parity. As far as the wheat grower is concerned, it is the most important part of the present farm bill. It is the only program, as we see it, that can be counted on to expand markets over the years, and increase income of producers in the market place.

I sincerely hope we will have your support for domestic parity when it comes to a vote.

Respectfully yours,
HERBERT HUGHES, *President.*

Mr. AIKEN. Now let me quote excerpts from this letter:

Domestic parity will reduce controls by abolishing the marketing quotas which have been so objectionable to farmers.

Mr. President, the so-called domestic parity plan will not reduce controls. True, it would eliminate marketing quotas. But it retains acreage allotments and substitutes domestic food quotas for marketing quotas. From the standpoint of the processor who would be required to buy certificates under this plan, controls would be greatly increased. From the standpoint of the small farmer, the controls required by this plan would be much more burdensome than those now in effect.

Again I quote from Mr. Hughes' letter:

Small farmers in both commercial and noncommercial areas will be able to produce wheat for feed on their own farms without the penalty which marketing quotas have required.

All farmers in the noncommercial wheat area are now permitted to grow wheat for use as feed without penalty. The small wheat farmer in the commercial area would be much worse off under this plan. At the present time the small wheat farmer can grow up to 15 acres of wheat, either to use as feed or to sell, without penalty. The so-called domestic parity plan abolishes this 15 acre minimum acreage protection for the small farmer.

Under subsection 379k (c) of the conference bill, the small farmer can be forced to comply with allotments as small as 1 acre—and perhaps even less—as a condition of eligibility for price support and marketing certificates. Even after he complies, the small farmer will receive marketing certificates for only about one-half of his production.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter:

Farmers in commercial areas will be encouraged to produce quality wheat.

There is not one provision in the conference bill that provides any recognition for quality wheat production.

Under section 379 (c), the domestic wheat quota is to be distributed to all wheat growers on the basis of their historical production, without regard to the quality of wheat they have been growing. The man who produces wheat entirely for use as feed would be entitled to receive domestic food certificates in exactly the same proportion as the man who produces a quality wheat that is used for domestic food consumption. The result will be to tax the quality wheat producer for the benefit of the man who now produces feed wheat on a large scale.

The domestic parity plan makes no allowance for the fact that wheat is not a single commodity. There are five major classes of wheat. Some are largely used for human consumption, while others largely go into export, feed, or Commodity Credit storage.

Statistics show the percentage of production used for domestic human food is five times as high for hard red spring wheat, such as is grown in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana, as it is for white wheat.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table on the use of wheat for domestic flour printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1942–51 average quantity of United States wheat used for domestic flour[1]

Type of wheat	Percentage of production used as flour	Quantity used as flour (millions of bushels)
Hard Red Winter	39.7	206
Soft Red Winter	52.5	95
Hard Red Spring	61.5	134
Durum	63.2	24
White	12.0	16
Average	43.6	475

[1] Does not include 10 million bushels used for breakfast food.

Mr. AIKEN. The table shows that the percentage of hard red winter wheat used as flour is 39.7 percent; of soft red winter wheat, 52.5 percent; of hard red

spring wheat, 61.5 percent; of durum wheat, 63.2 percent; and of white wheat, 12 percent.

Yet, under this domestic parity plan for wheat, growers who now have 63 percent of their crop used for flour and milling purposes will get certificates to sell only approximately 50 percent of their crop for that purpose, and growers who now produce wheat of which only 12 percent is used for milling purposes will also get certificates entitling them to sell 50 percent of their crop for the full 100 percent parity price.

Is it any wonder that the white wheat producers of certain areas are for a plan which would classify about 50 percent of their production as domestic human food, entitled to 100 percent parity price, when the average amounts so used have been only about 12 percent?

I again quote from Mr. Hughes' letter:

The same farmers who in the past have voted on marketing quotas will vote for or against domestic parity.

This is true, but more farmers will be directly affected by the domestic parity plan. Producers with 15 acres or less have been excluded from voting on marketing quotas because of the 15-acre-quota exemption. But there is no 15-acre exemption under the domestic parity plan. All wheat producers would be affected, but only those with more than 15 acres would be allowed to vote. Over one-half of the total wheat producers in the Nation would be disfranchised. And the percentage of growers who would be entitled to vote on whatever kind of program would be set up to serve their destiny ranges from about 95 percent in the State of North Dakota to only 2 percent in the State of Wisconsin. I repeat, only two percent of the wheat growers in the State of Wisconsin would be permitted to vote on what kind of program they want.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot yield, unless I have more time later.

If there is to be a referendum on this plan, equity would require that small wheat growers, whose very existence is at stake, be allowed to vote. Equity would also require that the producers of corn and other feed grains be permitted to vote since the obvious effect of this plan would be to dump wheat surpluses into the domestic feed market.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter. I am quoting Mr. Hughes particularly because he is president of the National Association of Wheat Growers. Mr. Hughes says:

The corn producer will benefit from the domestic parity program for wheat because the program will work toward a decreased supply of feed grains.

He also says:

Poultry and dairy farmers in feed deficit areas, like the East and Northeast, will benefit because they can produce their own feed or purchased feed wheat produced locally at a price they can afford to pay.

He also says:

Wheat for the feed market will carry a very low support level.

These statements are patently contradictory. The feed grain producer certainly, cannot be benefited by a plan that encourages feed deficit areas to produce their own feed, or a plan that makes feed wheat available so cheaply that feed deficit areas cannot afford to buy other grains, particularly corn. The livestock, poultry, and dairy markets are national markets. Increased production of these products in any area affects all areas.

I quote again from Mr. Hughes' letter:

The grain trade will benefit.

He also says:

Labor and business will benefit.

It is the only program as we see it, that can be counted on to expand markets over the years and increase income of producers in the market place.

Mr. President, any benefits that large wheat farmers might reap as a result of this plan—and it is by no means certain that such benefits would actually materialize—would be at the expense of other farmers. This plan would mean, first, reduced income to the small wheat farmers; second, increased surpluses of feed grains; and third, lower livestock and poultry and dairy prices.

It is extremely doubtful that this plan would result in any appreciable increase in our exports of wheat. We are already meeting competition in the world market by subsidizing wheat exports and by selling wheat for foreign currencies under Public Law 480. The real effect of this proposal would be to dump surplus wheat into the domestic feed market. That could only be done at the expense of other farmers who are trying to make a living out of the production of feed grains for livestock, poultry, and dairy products.

Mr. President, on March 13, in the debate in the Senate on S. 3183, later passed as H. R. 12, a letter was placed in the RECORD to prove that the Canadian wheat growers favored the 3-price wheat plan now included in the conference report. The letter, dated March 12, was sent to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] by the same Herbert J. Hughes; and it will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, on page 4580.

I know that the Senator from Kansas inserted the letter in the RECORD in good faith. However, in a telegram which W. J. Parker, president of the Manitoba Pool Elevators, sent under date of April 10 to the Senator from Kansas, there is specific reference to the March 12 letter of Mr. Hughes; and in the telegram it is pointed out that there is a "misunderstanding between Mr. Hughes and Canadians on this matter." It is quite evident that the Canadian wheat producers are not reassured with respect to the domestic parity program, and repudiate representations that they endorse it.

Mr. President, I have already asked consent of the Senator from Kansas to insert the telegram in the RECORD. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram from W. J. Parker to the Senator from Kansas, under date of April 10, 1956, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference Mr. H. J. Hughes letter March 12 addressed you re two price plan wheat. Canadian farm leaders at Geneva understood Mr. Hughes information re proposed legislation was given us as matter of courtesy. Obviously on meager information given verbally by Mr. Hughes, we were not competent to assess ultimate impact of suggested legislation on our competitive position in international wheat market and no considered opinion was expressed by us. We did not understand that Mr. Hughes had been requested by Secretary Benson to seek Canadian farm leaders' opinion of proposed wheat legislation. I greatly regret the evident misunderstanding between Mr. Hughes and Canadians on this matter and trust you will appreciate our position.

W. J. PARKER,
President, Manitoba Pool Elevators.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, now I wish to refer to the two-price plan for rice. The adoption of this plan might well cost us the Cuban market. Cuba is our most important export market for rice. The plan, in effect, imposes a tax on the processing of rice for consumption in the United States and Cuba. A loophole in this bill would permit Cuba to evade this tax by buying rough rice. The plan would not work satisfactorily without the inclusion of Cuba in the primary market.

The value of the proposed certificate exceeds the tariff preference which the United States now has in the Cuban market. Even if Cuba were to increase the tariff preference on United States rice, our ricegrowers would still lose, as the increased price of rice in Cuba would stimulate increased Cuban production.

The rice plan violates our commitments under the general agreement on tariffs and trade. It is of doubtful constitutionality.

On January 15, 1956, the parity price of rough rice was $5.42 per hundredweight. The cost of 1956 marketing certificates per hundredweight of rough rice—35 percent of parity—is $1.90.

Rice shrinks about one-third in the milling process; therefore the cost of certificates would be roughly $2.50 per hundredweight of milled rice. The United States now has a tariff preference of 90 cents per hundredweight of milled rice in the Cuban market. Thus, the certificate plan would destroy our present preference in the Cuban market, and would create an artificial disadvantage of $1.60 per hundredweight of milled rice.

In the 1954–55 marketing year, Cuba took 3,391,000 hundredweight or 34 percent of our total exports of 9,848,000 hundredweight, milled basis.

The provisions in the conference report for the establishment of base acreages for small grains and mandatory supports for small grains are likely to cause trouble not only for the dairy and poultry producers of the country, who would experience a sharp increase in their production costs, but also for the producers of these grains themselves.

On page 4, paragraph (c) of subtitle A, we find this proviso:

(c) For each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, a farm base acreage shall be established for feed grains. For 1956, in the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955; and outside the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

Going over to page 22, we find in paragraph (d) of section 408 the following:

The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support of such feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats) that the producer (1) except in the case of new feed grain farms, devote an acreage on the farm to either the acreage-reserve program for feed grains or the conservation-reserve program equal to 15 percent of the farm base acreage established for such feed grains under section 203 (c) hereof, and (2) not plant a total acreage of such feed grains on the farm in excess of 85 percent of such farm base acreage for feed grains.

Under the provision establishing a base acreage for feed grains, and to qualify for price supports, we find that a very substantial reduction in planning is required for the year 1956.

I have had this matter checked for certain States. There is in the rear of the Chamber a chart showing the percentage by which each State would have to reduce its planting of feed grains in order to qualify for price supports. I shall read into the RECORD some of the percentages. I find that the percentage of reduction from the 1955 planting in each of these States is as follows:

	Percent
Colorado	29
Texas	26
Oklahoma	28
Washington	40
North Dakota	27
New Mexico	35
Montana	30
Missouri	24
Idaho	25
Oregon	26

The result would be about the same in the rest of the country—a 25 to 40 percent mandatory reduction in planting in all States where feed grains are produced and where diversified farming is practiced.

So, in addition to the reduction required in order to establish a base acreage under section 203, we find that under section 408 a further reduction of 15 percent would be necessary if the producer were to get any price support at all for his crop.

For instance, in the State of Washington, in order to qualify for 85 percent of parity price support for oats—or an increase of 15 percent over the present support price as provided for in the conference report a producer of oats or barley in that State would have to reduce his acreage 40 percent. It is obvious that that would be a losing proposition for him.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from California to yield additional time to me; I believe that five minutes more will be all that I shall need.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, what I am trying to point out is that, in addition to the reduction required in order to establish a base acreage under section 203, we find that under section 408 a further reduction of 15 percent is necessary if the producer is to get any price support at all for his crop.

Of course, this latter 15 percent reduction would carry some compensation in the form of soil bank payments.

What I am trying to point out is that with oats, barley, and sorghum supported at 70 percent anyway, under the present law, the increased support to 85 percent provided in this conference report would actually mean a considerable reduction in the income of the producer if he had to reduce his planting one-third in order to get an increased 15 percent in supports.

The effect of the mandatory supports for feed grains as I see it not only would mean greatly increased cost of production for the dairyman, the livestock producer, and the poultry grower, but could actually bring about reduced income for the producer of the grain himself.

Congress has now delayed this legislation so that the soil bank can hardly be effective this year. We have good farm laws on the books at the present time. They have not had much opportunity to work up until now; but since the Agricultural Act of 1954 has taken effect with the crops of 1955, we have seen a steady but gradual rise in the farm price level. It has risen quite substantially during the past 3 months. I believe this rise will continue throughout the remainder of this year, although not in a spectacular manner.

The soil bank would have helped, but with the other provisions added by the Senate and the conferees, nearly every agricultural area in the United States would be more harmed than helped by this bill.

It would be better to do the best we can with the program we now have in operation. The bill as it now stands is completely unacceptable to the administration. I shall vote against the conference report, in the interest of American agriculture, and I strongly urge all other Members of the Senate to do the same.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I am hopeful that we are at the end of what has been a long and trying ordeal.

As we approach the final vote on the new farm bill I ask, with all sincerity, that we pause and give serious thought to what we are trying to do. In the heated debate during the past several weeks fury has replaced reason in some cases, and solutions have been fogged by side issues.

If we keep gnawing the trough there will be no water left.

There is one thing, and one thing alone, that we are setting out to do in writing new farm legislation. We are attempting to help the farmers of this Nation regain their rightful place in our overall economy.

Our farm economy is almost $3 billion a year short of what it should be. It is the responsibility of Congress to bring about conditions that will channel this much money back into the farm economy. In plain words, we must help increase farm income.

For many months now I, along with other members of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, have heard many farmers tell us what their problems are. We have heard many ideas as to how the problems could be solved.

After months of hearings and many hours and weeks of deliberation, we have a farm bill before us. I doubt if any Senator would say that it is a perfect bill. Certainly, there are many things in it that I do not like; but taken as a whole, it will help increase income on this year's crops. After all, that is what we are trying to do.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that we have spent about as much time talking about politics as the issue itself.

To put it bluntly, the effect this legislation has on the November elections is unimportant. The important thing is to get additional purchasing power into the hands of the farmers, and get it there immediately.

In all the debate I have heard on this subject my ears have become a little threadbare with all the talk about whether or not this phrase or that clause is in line with the order of the day from the White House.

Day in and day out, as I listened to debate on this legislation, I was told that this section or that provision would not meet the approval of the President. I heard that this or that would mean a veto.

In all the talk and debate it was hard to find that the administration was concerned about what would meet the needs of the farmer. Instead it has been a question of what would meet the needs of the White House.

From what I have seen and heard, one might think that we were writing a private Eisenhower bill instead of a national farm bill.

Personally, I do not know whether the President would veto the bill as it is now written. I have a strong suspicion that when the time comes he must swallow his pride and sign the bill for the sake of millions of farmers. At least, I hope so.

If the 90-percent parity provision of the bill is against the principles that guide the President, I hope he will see fit to go back to the principles on which he campaigned in 1952.

With no ifs, ands, or buts, to use his own words, he was for the principles involved in this bill in 1952. I can see no reason why the principles of 1952 will not work in 1956.

With these thoughts in mind, I sincerely believe that it is time for us to get down to brass tacks and approve the conference report immediately. Until we do, we are dilly-dallying with the economic well-being of millions of people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, in my judgment, the Senate conferees have done the very best they could. I desire to thank and congratulate our conferees. They have improved the bill as it left the Senate.

I cannot vote for the conference report, for several reasons. I think the economy of the State of Mississippi is dependent upon cotton to a greater extent than is the economy of any other State in the Union. We have had a system by which there has been continual acreage reduction. We have screamed for 90 percent of parity; but, when we consider the acreage reduction, the farmers' income has been drastically less than 90 percent of parity. Today, with acreage reduction, it stands at approximately 52 percent of parity income.

This conference report would continue that system. In my candid judgment it would destroy the American cotton industry.

There are several things which are fundamental. A few years ago the American cotton industry exported between 6 million and 8 million bales of cotton a year, and enjoyed between 50 and 60 percent of the world's export cotton market. Today that has shrunk to less than 30 percent; and if we follow the street we are now following, which is a one-way street, the acreage allotments will become less and less each year.

We have seen that, as we have had acreage reductions in the United States, foreign producers, largely financed by American capital, have expanded their acreage and have taken over markets which were formerly enjoyed by the American cotton farmer.

There is one fundamental factor which underlies the whole program, and that is that the United States Government, with the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation in excess of 7 million bales of cotton—stocks which will reach in time, in my judgment, 10 million bales—must put on an export sales program to assist the American cotton grower in regaining and expanding his share of the cotton market. Such a provision was in the bill which passed the Senate. Not by the fault of the Senate conferees, that provision was deleted from the bill.

What has happened? We have held an umbrella over foreign cotton production. The road is now open for a continuation of that acreage expansion.

It was said that an export sales program would be announced. So it was. However, an export sales program by administrative order is not as effective as an export sales program which is written into the law.

The State Department, as I have said a number of times on the floor of the Senate, is not an American agency of government; it protects and promotes the interests of foreign agriculture against the welfare of the American people. I know that since the export sales provision was stricken from the bill, the State Department has been bringing pressure against the export sales program which would reduce its effectiveness in the interest of the American farmer.

Mr. President, 5 or 6 large international cotton organizations are financing an increase in cotton production in Latin America. I am sorry to say they have more influence in the State Department than has American agriculture.

Therefore I say I do not blame the Senate conferees. They did what they could do. Nevertheless, an export sales program is fundamental to the preservation of the American cotton industry and such a provision should be in the law. It has been stricken from the bill.

I said that we were on a one-way street, that acreage allotments would get lower and lower each year, and that the American cotton industry was on the verge of collapse. We must meet foreign competition abroad; we must have the aid of the American Government, and we must meet the competition of synthetics in the United States on a quality basis.

Under the bill as agreed to in conference, foreign cotton growers will again expand their acreage. It is fundamental that we must prevent further expansion in cotton production abroad. Last year Egypt increased its acreage by 250,000 acres. India increased its acreage by 1,200,000 acres, and it has a program for a much larger acreage expansion. In the past 4 years Mexico has increased its acreage by a million acres, practically doubling its production. These increases have come about at the expense of the American cottongrower.

While we have reduced our acreage, in an attempt to keep world supplies within world demand, foreign countries, which have enjoyed the benefits of our price-support program, have increased their acreage, and have taken our markets away from us.

Let me say that while we will export about 2 million bales of cotton this year, against a normal export of about 6 million bales, half of the 2 million bales will be given away under different aid programs.

The largest market we have left is the domestic market, which amounts to about 9 million bales of cotton a year.

When we fix a price, as the bill does, at a rigid 90 percent, we hold an umbrella over the producers of synthetic fibers, and we deny the cotton producer the opportunity to compete for the domestic market in the fiber field.

Synthetic fiber producers will proceed with current and future planning for expansion under the provisions of the bill. In 1955 alone the equivalent of 978,000 bales of cotton were supplanted by the increase in rayon production. These fibers now enjoy the equivalent of 4,800,000 bales of cotton in the domestic fiber market of the United States. That is largely because the American grown cotton has been priced too high.

Beginning a year ago, and for a 3-year period, contracts were let, and there are now in production new rayon plants to the tune of $155 million. The new rayon production will, in my judgment, supplant about 2 million bales of cotton in the domestic fiber market.

What we must do in the cotton industry is to be more competitive with synthetic fibers in the United States and to be more competitive in the international market. We must have the aid and assistance of the United States Government. When there was stricken from the bill the provision for a mandatory export sales program, which would regain and recapture and expand our normal share of the world cotton market, there was stricken the provision which would be of the greatest benefit to the American cottongrower.

For these reasons, and for the reason that the price support is again linked to seven-eighths inch Middling cotton, I must vote against the conference report. The latter provision would permit the discount in the markets of the short, low-grade cotton, which is not merchantable, and which is grown largely in one congressional district in the United States. It is grown largely for the loan. It is grown largely to be sold to the United States Government. We accumulated a great surplus of such cotton, and that surplus reduced the acreage allotments in every cotton-growing State in the United States.

Mr. President, we shall have, under this bill, the same old surplus which has brought the American cotton industry to the brink of destruction. What we must realize is that acreage allotments must be based on markets, and that in the long run they will be based on markets. Acreage allotments must be based, also, upon our ability to sell a commodity which in the long run will pay. It goes without saying that farmland values will be based upon the market for farm products. So, Mr. President, the road which we must follow is a road which will expand markets and place the cotton industry upon a sound basis.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I shall cast my vote against the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after consultation with the acting majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call without the time being taken out of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the adoption of the conference report. Personally, I feel it is imperative that farm legislation be enacted at this session of Congress. In the face of rising national income, net farm income has fallen 32 percent in the past 4 years.

Despite the strong demand for farm products, the farmer is caught in his own quicksand of surplus production. While it is true that this rather complex piece of legislation affects agriculture directly, it will also affect indirectly all segments of our Nation's economy.

The conference report before the Senate not only carries temporary relief for the farmer this year, but carries many provisions which will be of permanent benefit.

I have no doubt that every Member of this body can find some objectionable feature in the conference report bill, but even one or two or more objectionable features, in my opinion, do not warrant the rejection of this report.

The farmer expects this Congress to enact farm legislation, and this is our opportunity to do so. President Eisenhower, in a special farm message to Congress, stated:

> Although agriculture is our basic industry, farm families find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity.
>
> An oversupply of commodities drives down prices as mounting costs force up from below, generating a severe price-cost squeeze.
>
> Remedies are needed now, and it is up to the administration and the Congress to provide them swiftly. As we seek to go forward, we must not go back to old programs that have failed utterly to protect farm families.

This conference report provides for a 90 percent parity for this year, 1956. It creates for the first time a soil bank program which I think is not only timely but has great long-range possibilities. However, I do not see how it can be effective in getting needed financial relief into the farming areas this year.

Those of us who are familiar with farming operations realize that at this season of the year, the farmers have already made their plans for the planting and harvesting of their crops. It is for that reason that I believe there is sound justification for a loan price support program which will assure the farmers 90 percent of parity for this year. Next year the farmers will have an opportunity to make plans to place some of their acreage in the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs of the soil bank.

I do not believe that either rigid or flexible parity is the solution to the farm program. We have tried both. It is my opinion that we must begin to take a new look at the entire farm picture, with a view of securing for the farmer his fair share of the national income, based on domestic consumption.

This conference report provides machinery for the marketing of two of our farm commodities on a domestic parity or domestic consumption basis.

I believe the day has passed when we can expect the American farmer to buy his farm machinery, his labor, pay his taxes and pay for his utilities on a domestic price level and then even suggest that we have a farm price parity level which will make him sell his commodities at a world level market.

It is for that reason that I believe a sound program for American agriculture must be built on a commodity by commodity approach. In other words, we must fashion a weapon to meet the problems and the needs of each commodity.

Mr. President, the Senate this afternoon has an opportunity to vote for legislation which will give some temporary relief to agriculture, establish for the first time in the Nation's history a soil-bank program and provide for domestic parity on two of our important farm commodities.

The conference bill, if enacted, will give the farmer an opportunity to share in our expanding national prosperity, and, in all fairness, I do not see how we can do less.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I will yield if I have time remaining.

Mr. WELKER. I have noted with much interest the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Kansas. I know he feels, as I feel, that the farmer must be helped. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Kansas can tell me wherein the farmers of Idaho will be helped by the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the great interest the junior Senator from Idaho takes in agriculture and in legislation in behalf of the farmer.

The soil-bank program provided for in the bill has, I think, the possibility of affording long-range benefit to agriculture and to the Nation as a whole; it is a most important step.

I think the 90 percent of parity provision will provide some relief for this year. I do not think the rigid or the flexible parity program is the answer.

The program adopted provides an approach, commodity by commodity, including wheat, which I know is raised in the State of the Senator from Idaho. I am confident that this is the kind of program we shall have to establish in the Nation if we expect to improve the condition of wheat farmers on the basis of domestic production.

Mr. WELKER. I voted with the Senator from Kansas for the parity plan for wheat. I have some scruples with respect to whether or not I voted correctly. Certainly the Senator from Kansas knows the conditions in my State well enough to realize that the soil bank provision of the bill cannot and will not affect my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional minute allotted to the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WELKER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I may have one additional minute.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The time to be allotted to the Senator from Idaho would have to be yielded by the other side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to comment on my statement?

Mr. CARLSON. I have no doubt that agriculture in the great State of Idaho is somewhat different from agriculture in the great Midwest areas, where mostly dry farming is carried on. At the same time, the agricultural program is practically universal. If the junior Senator from Idaho has some better suggestions, then when the opportunity presents itself, I shall vote for them. But this is the only bill before the Senate at present. That is why I am supporting it.

Mr. WELKER. I think that is why I shall have to support it; but the Senator said in his remarks that we would look the matter over. What I fear is that we may look ourselves out of business. That is the sad part of the matter.

I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak against the conference report on H. R. 12. I voted for H. R. 12, as amended by the Senate, on final passage, because I believed there was a chance that the conference committee would present a sound, acceptable bill. This it did not do, in my opinion.

First, the Senate conferees, by agreeing to an extension of 90 percent price supports on the so-called basic commodities, have rendered the President's soil bank program ineffective for all practical purposes. In my opinion, producers, especially of wheat and cotton, simply will find it more profitable to continue and even increase their present production at the high support level rather than to place a portion of their acreage allotment land in the acreage reserve.

The reason for this is that certain fixed costs of production must be met by the producer whether all of his lands are in production or whether a portion of them are kept idle in a soil bank. Since the difference between total costs per acre and total returns per acre is much less at lower price support levels than they would be at the proposed higher support levels, farmers will be more likely to put allotment lands in the acreage reserve at lower support levels. High rigid price supports cancel any possible benefit from the soil bank program, in my opinion.

Second, unless farmers do put a substantial part of their allotment lands in the reserve, we can, at 90 percent price support, expect continued production in excess of our needs of these so-called basic commodities, especially wheat, cotton, and corn. We can also expect to

see the continued production of feed grains greatly in excess of our needs, with increasing livestock numbers and further price declines for beef cattle, hogs, poultry, eggs, and lambs.

As the President pointed out in his economic report:

> Government restrictions on acreage of several crops, notably wheat and cotton, have insufficiently curtailed production of these crops and have led to expansion of others. Huge carryovers have piled up, far beyond liberal estimates of desirable reserves. Government holdings acquired under price-support programs have kept rising, in spite of intensive and effective efforts to dispose of surpluses * * *.
>
> The production-control programs that have been operated for basic commodities, which account for [only] about one-fourth of the total income from farm marketings, have indirectly contributed to lower incomes for the producers of other important commodities. Farmers with acreage diverted from basic crops have deemed it more profitable to produce feed grains or other crops, even at lowered support prices * * *. Many have expanded their hog and beef cattle numbers to use the additional feed thus produced, adding further to the expansion induced by relatively favorable livestock prices in earlier years * * *. These factors have been largely responsible for lower prices of beef cattle and sharply lower prices of hogs in 1955, and a continued increase in production of dairy products.
>
> Unrealistic supports have * * * overstimulated production of several basic products in this country * * * (pp. 54, 56, and 57).

The large inventories of basic commodities and feed grains which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand can be directly traceable to the stimulus given their production by 90 percent of parity price supports.

According to the USDA's most recent release on the status of price-support operations, the CCC had in its inventories as of February 29, 1956: 846,270,626 bushels of wheat, valued at $4,309,484,973; 7,214,630 bales of upland cotton, valued at $1,317,658,448; 744,618,750 bushels of corn, valued at $1,291,422,848.

Its inventories as of the same date contained the following quantities of feed grains: 17,942,345 hundredweight of grain sorghums, valued at $53,643,952; 24,696,408 bushels of barley, valued at $36,314,441; 32,032,375 bushels of oats, valued at $27,985,658.

Such an abundant production of feed grains induced by a rigid 90-percent support program on the basics, especially wheat and cotton, the last few years not only has resulted in surpluses of these commodities, but substantial increases in livestock numbers and lower livestock prices. For example, on January 1, 1956, cattle numbers reached a new high of 97.5 million head. Hog numbers were 9 percent above those of a year earlier.

Yet, even though these so-called basics—wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts, to mention a few—have had mandatory price supports, producers of livestock products have had to get along without price support, even though today the average prices received by them as a percentage of the parity price is lower than the basics I have mentioned. As of March 15, 1956, the producers of the following crops were getting the following supports:

Upland cotton, 90 percent of parity.
Wheat, 82 percent.
Rice, 82 percent.
Peanuts, 90 percent.

Yet, as of the same date, the producers of the following livestock were getting the following supports:

Beef cattle, only 68 percent of parity.
Calves, only 71 percent of parity.
Chickens, only 77 percent of parity.
Hogs, only 58 percent of parity.
Lambs, only 70 percent of parity.
Sheep, only 66 percent of parity.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I am speaking on very limited time, and I wished to get the whole statement in the RECORD. I shall yield at the conclusion of my statement, if I have time.

Mr. President, it should be realized that the production of these basic commodities provides farmers with only 26 percent of their net income. Yet, during the fiscal years 1932–55, the Federal Government has spent $5,632,700,000 on programs primarily for the stabilization of prices and income for basic commodities. Yet, in spite of this cost and preferential price-support treatment, 90-percent price support on the basic commodities has utterly failed to prevent net farm income from declining. As I pointed out in my minority views to the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

> High rigid supports have not facilitated adjustment of production to effective demand; and being applicable to only the basic commodities which provide commercial farmers with only 26 percent of their income, they cannot materially raise farm prices or total net farm income (p. 67).

But there is another reason, as well, why the 90 percent rigid support provision of the conference report will not raise farm income, just as price supports have not done so in the past: Namely, two-thirds of our farms, which are mostly family-type, produce so very little for sale that they cannot materially benefit from price support programs, regardless of the level of price support, be it 75, 90 or 100 percent of parity.

Mr. President, section 104 of the conference report, which eliminates the new parity formula for determining the price support level on basic commodities, will in and of itself serve to keep the support level of the basic commodities at or near 90 percent of old parity and about 100 percent of new parity. Therefore, even though at the end of 1956 the flexible support formula will again be operative, the actual support levels will reflect old parity and are likely to be above 90 percent of new parity which is now in effect for the basic commodities. For example based upon January 15 prices:

Wheat would be supported at 103 percent of new parity.

Corn would be supported at 100 percent of new parity.

Cotton would be supported at 91 percent of new parity.

So with this provision in the bill, after 1956, we can expect farmers to continue to produce wheat, corn, and cotton in excess of demand, and we can expect continued production of feed grains on acres diverted from these basic commodities. This will mean greater livestock numbers and lower livestock prices.

Mr. President, there are also other provisions of the conference report which I doubt the wisdom of enacting into law

First is section 103, which would set the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity, instead of 75 to 90 percent as at present. It seems to me that this is a move in the wrong direction, since under the support formula now in effect, the dairy situation has improved considerably since April, 1954. For example, CCC purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids in 1955 were down 35 percent compared to 1954, when dairy products were supported at 90 percent of parity. Specifically, butter acquisitions were down 50 percent; cheese down 59 percent; nonfat dried milk down 15 percent.

With this new provision enacted into law, we can expect to see milk production soar, while prices and incomes decline. And we also can expect to see again those mountainous CCC inventories of butter and cheese. In 1953, if you recall, Mr. President, we had an inventory of 358.9 million pounds of butter, now only 162.3 million pounds, 3 years later. We also had 291 million pounds of cheese then, instead of 162.3 million pounds today.

I have some reservations also with respect to mandatory price supports on feed grains, and to the two-price plans on wheat and rice. For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel I must vote against adoption of the conference report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point an article entitled "Turkeys Could Provide Wheat Market," from the Utah Farm Bureau News of March 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURKEYS COULD PROVIDE WHEAT MARKET

One of the paradoxes facing Utah agriculture is found in the turkey, poultry, and wheat-growing enterprises.

Turkey growing in Utah in recent years has become a highly important part of the overall agricultural picture, actually bringing into the State in 1954 more money in cash sales than our wheat crop, according to USDA reports.

Total cash income from turkeys in 1954 amounted to $10,635,000, while eggs, chickens, and broilers brought $13,683,000, compared to $10,082,000 from wheat.

The paradox comes in the fact that while wheat is a natural feed for turkeys and chickens there is almost none of it being fed to turkeys and its use is rapidly diminishing in other poultry feeds.

The reason for this is that milo, which is regarded as practically equal to wheat as a poultry feed, can be purchased at a lower cost by about 60 cents per hundredweight. To the turkey, broiler, or egg producer this price differential can well be the difference between success and failure.

Studies show that the turkey industry in Utah would consume 2 million bushels of wheat annually if it could be purchased at a price equal to that being paid for milo. At

that level, wheat growers would receive approximately $1.50 per bushel for their wheat.

The present support price on wheat in Utah ranges from $1.79 to $1.91 per bushel. Under present price-support law wheat is out of reach of turkey growers pricewise. Wheatgrowers who may wish to use presently diverted acres to produce wheat for the turkey industry can do so only under severe penalties. A great many idle wheat acres might be profitably used to provide turkey feed if that could be done.

Average yield of wheat in Utah in 1955 was 19.9 bushels per acre. At that rate Utah grown turkeys could provide a market for nearly 100,000 acres of wheat.

Kansas and Texas are the major producers of milo, which has a crop yield of about equal to wheat. Kansas can grow milo on land diverted from wheat and Texas can grow milo on land diverted from cotton, wheat, peanuts, and rice, all of which are designated as basic crops.

The Utah growing season appears to be too short for milo. Utah wheatgrowers are thus placed at a greater disadvantage from diverted acres than are the producers of the basic crops in many other States.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the writer of the article points out that in Utah alone if wheat prices were such that the farmers could afford to buy it to feed turkeys, they could use 2 million bushels of wheat. The farmers cannot afford to buy wheat, but must buy other feed from Kansas and Texas, because the price of wheat is completely out of line. Yet wheat is stored in Government warehouses, and the farmers have to pay for other feed grains grown in Texas and Kansas.

As a commentary on the present matter before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, March 25, 1956, written by Mr. James M. Haswell, of the Washington bureau staff of that newspaper, entitled "Farm Group Hits Price Supports." The article asks this question: "Is Michigan heeding argument they benefit chiefly big operators?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The belief that Michigan farmers don't profit much from price supports must be getting around. And also the fact that $75 million in grain crop loans last year went to 1,695 farm operators—out of a total of 5,375,034 farmers.

In a poll taken by Representative ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan, in central Michigan, a group of one-third of the farmers said they wanted Congress to abolish farm price supports altogether.

Roughly another third, however, favored flexible supports, and the other third came out for 90-percent supports.

But the news was in the fact that so many farmers—about 500—had swung away altogether from the price-support idea. That was a great change from polls Congressman BENTLEY has taken in other years.

The no-support thinking apparently reflects growing belief in the argument that 3 out of 4 farmers in a State like Michigan have no real stake in price supports. They don't sell the right kind of farm produce, or enough of it.

Two years ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson published a table showing that Michigan farmers obtained only 10 percent of their income from sale of price-supported grains, such as corn and wheat.

But 63 percent of their income, the Secretary showed, was lowered because of the support price on grains used to feed livestock.

At about the same time Representative CHARLES M. BROWNSON, Republican, of Indiana, began a campaign to find out exactly who benefits most from crop loans—the form that grain price supports take.

The Agriculture Department now admits that the top 1 percent of wheat borrowers got 12 percent of the wheat money in 1953—or $63 million.

One percent of the corn borrowers got $3,575,000.

Sixty-six barley borrowers got $6,364,000, an average of $96,424 each.

Altogether 1,695 borrowers—out of 5,375,034 farm operators—got $75 million in rain crop loans that year.

Last month Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, published a study of farm incomes which has had a tremendous impact on the farm debates in Congress.

WATKINS concluded that price supports don't help two-thirds of the American farmers. And these are the two-thirds most needing help.

In order to get price supports, a farmer must have something to sell, and two-thirds of the family-type farms simply do not produce for commercial sale in any significant amount, WATKINS explained.

The men who run America's biggest farms, WATKINS said, do not need unlimited price supports. They could farm at a profit without any supports, he said, and certainly they don't need the unlimited loan privileges they have now.

In 1950 for the first time the Census Bureau classified farms into economic groups. The big division was between farms producing more than $5,000 in farm goods for market annually and those producing less.

Farms in the over-$5,000 group use 60 percent of the harvested cropland; supply 74 percent of all farm production; give the families on them an average income of $5,143. There are 1,200,000 of these farms, supporting about 5 million persons.

But farms in the under-$5,000 group occupy 34.6 percent of the harvested cropland while supplying only 24 percent of farm goods sold. The average family income is only $1,741. There are 2,500,000 of these farms, supporting 10,300,000 persons.

A special study was made in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana.

The amount of land farmed in these three States varied little over a 20-year period.

But the number of farms has shrunk steadily. Meaning that the size of the successful farming enterprises has increased.

The extremes of the farm economic scale show extreme contrasts.

As an example, farms which produce goods worth $10,000 or more a year, supply 51 percent of all farm products marketed. They bring in a quarter of all farm income. The average family income is $6,585.

But farms at the other end of the scale produce only 2.3 percent of farm marketings, and provide average family incomes of but $975 a year.

Almost 1 in 10 Michigan farms fall into this class.

Senator WATKINS argues that only top farm operators have much of a stake in farm price supports.

The rest produce so very little for sale they cannot materially benefit whether the market prices are supported at 75, 90, or 100 percent of parity, he says.

There is a need for effective price-support programs, WATKINS says. But the programs should not be of the kind which give unlimited aid to a few big producers and do not help the great bulk, the farm people.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. If I understood the Senator from Utah correctly, about 25 percent of the farm income in his State is derived from production of basic crops. Is that right?

Mr. WATKINS. No. Only about 7 percent of our crops under price supports are basic, and only 7 percent of our farm income is aided by price supports.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator. That figure is more nearly in line with the situation in Wyoming. I felt certain that our States were similar in that respect and as a matter of fact, our people are fearful that in the end this bill will hurt our farmers and ranchers more than it will help. I certainly agree that some steps should be taken to liquidate the surplus of farm commodities and I would favor the provisions of the soil bank.

Mr. WATKINS. In my State we have to have twice the number of acres for dry-land wheat in order to produce an ideal yield, for the reason that the land has to be summer fallowed and left idle for 1 year. A crop is grown only every other year. The high-price supports are detrimental to the overwhelming number of farmers in Utah, because they have to buy from the Middle West grains and feed for their livestock and poultry, such as corn and other grains, much of which they have to import from Iowa, Texas, and Kansas. So they help pay taxes to get prices up, and then they have to buy at those high prices. So they have to pay twice.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is absolutely correct. In Wyoming about 75 percent of all our agricultural income comes from livestock, both cattle and sheep. The high-price supports on corn has militated against the livestock operator. This bill will make a bad situation much worse.

The feeders in the Corn Belt have lost considerable money feeding this year and they will undoubtedly try to buy their feeder stock at lower prices this fall. It appears now that the cattle situation may become worse as far as the grower is concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator is exactly right. I think that is the situation in most of the Intermountain States. We do not grow basics for market. Wheat is about the only one we grow. The kind of wheat we grow which gets a price support is millable wheat. It is the so-called Turkey Red and other varieties, high in protein content, which are used for milling. There is a very limited acreage in our State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ERVIN in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield 2 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the Senator from Utah 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. I also wanted to call to the Senator's attention the fact that the conference committee has changed the provisions in the soil-bank section with reference to grazing the acres diverted from crop production. As the

Senator well knows the Senate adopted my amendment which provided that if the farmer violates the provision of his contract and permits his cattle to graze on the lands taken out of crops, that he would lose not only the benefits that he might be entitled to under the soil bank, but also any payments that he might be entitled to under the price-support program. The latter provision was eliminated entirely. In my opinion the protective provisions were weakened materially in conference.

Mr. WATKINS. I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Wyoming. That was probably the only benefit our States would have obtained from this measure, and now it has been eliminated.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Also let me point out that two-thirds of the farmers of the Nation will not obtain any substantial benefit from this program; they cannot possibly do so. This program is in the interest of the big operators, not the small farmers; and very few of the smaller family-size farms will obtain any benefit from it.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator is correct. The conference struck out the limitations inserted on the floor of the Senate whereby no individual could receive more than $100,000 in payments from one section of the bill and $50,000 limitation on another section. In fact all limitations were removed.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct; the sky is the limit.

Mr. BARRETT. I would like to see a good constructive farm bill but it seems to me that insofar as our section of the country is concerned we have no choice but to vote against this conference report.

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. The conference report is an economic mess, insofar as we are concerned. There are sound and helpful provisions in the bill as reported from conference, but they have been largely nullified by other provisions adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Utah has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report which has been presented to the Senate by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

First of all, let me commend the conferees for the report they have brought to us. I know that the preparation of the final conference report required a great deal of hard work and detailed effort on the part of the conferees.

Mr. President, I was pleased no end to learn of the action taken by the House of Representatives on the conference report, and of the large vote in the House of Representatives in favor of the report. That vote should indicate to the administration and to the American people that the Congress of the United States is not going to be made the victim of propaganda or political pressure.

As have others, in the days since the Senate passed the agricultural bill, I have watched the press reports, including those relating to the work of the conference committee, and also, of course, the many press reports in regard to statements issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and by some of those who are associated with him. The Secretary of Agriculture and his associates have attempted in every conceivable way to influence the conferees by propagandizing the American people and trying to set up, in connection with this agricultural bill, straw men which they could conveniently knock down.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat honored by the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has seen fit to single me out for political verbal treatment. I welcome that privilege and recognition on the part of the leading agricultural spokesman for the administration. Let me say that at any time the Secretary of Agriculture desires to have me do so, I shall be more than happy to accommodate him in debate upon agricultural matters. I suggest, however, that it might be well to debate in an agricultural area, and not within the confines of one of his selected audiences.

Mr. President, the conference report does not do all I had hoped the bill would do. For example, I had hoped that the bill as reported by the Senate committee would become the law of the land. In that bill we provided for a 2-year extension of 90 percent of parity price supports on basic commodities. We had for the dairy price-support program a formula which was somewhat different from that contained in the conference report. I was also sorry to see eliminated from the final conference report section 602 of the Agricultural Act as passed by the Senate, which related to price reporting on timber products. That particular amendment to the Senate version of the bill was one which was close to my heart, and one which I felt would do a great deal of good to our timber farmers. However, I am happy to note that section 601, which relates to the reforestation program, was sustained and kept in the conference report. At a later time I shall make it my business to try to press for action upon the price-reporting features relating to timber. It is my opinion and belief that they are very essential for our timber farmers. Our timber farmers will increase in number and in significance under the terms of the soil conservation and soil-bank program.

Mr. President, I have noted with particular interest that the administration is putting up quite a howl about the delay in the passage of the farm bill, and I have also noted with considerable interest that some of the spokesmen for the administration have seen fit to level their attack upon the junior Senator from Minnesota. Mr. President, I will place my record in behalf of farm legislation on the line against that of any administration spokesman. This administration did not have a farm program as recently as January 1 or January 15. This administration was never in favor of a soil bank; but now the administration would like to claim the soil bank as its own product. The fact of the matter is that the administration resisted the soil bank from the beginning, but now the American people would be led to believe that the soil bank was a great creation of Eisenhower and Benson. The delay—if any—is due to the lack of cooperation by the Eisenhower administration—the refusal of the administration to present a program until compelled to by action of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, one thing I can say for this administration is that it certainly knows how to reach out and capture the ideas of other persons. It is like the man on the flying trapeze—it "purloins"—with the greatest of ease.

I hesitate to digress, but I noticed that the other day Mr. Brownell came to the Congress with some ideas about civil rights—about as new as last year's calendar. In fact, the very bills the Attorney General brought to the Congress as a great, bold, new program in the field of civil rights have been before the Congress for years. I am the sponsor of these measures, yet the administration has never shown any interest in them. Of course, I am always happy when some political sinner repents and comes forward and asks to be cleansed of his political sins. I do not wish to discourage any of the erring brothers and prodigal sons who now are seeking to return home. Of course, we shall treat them with kindness, generosity, and compassion. The opportunity is at hand on this conference report on the farm bill for those who mistakenly followed the administration's misguided program to, in part, at least, reform and repent by voting for it.

When it comes to the soil bank, as early as 1936 there was legislative, permissive authority for the Department of Agriculture to enter upon an extended soil-bank operation. So there is no need for the present administration to talk about any delays. The only delay is in the mental processes and the will and the conviction of this administration. There has been plenty of delay there by the born obstructionists of the administration, who are obstinate and stubborn. They became interested in the soil bank after the Senate committee hearings, where farmer after farmer and group after group said that the soil bank was what they wanted. As I have said, thereafter the administration made its announcement in the Wall Street Journal—a fine newspaper, but one seldom read by farmers. This administration talks a great deal about peace and prosperity. I suggest to my colleagues there is about as little prosperity in the Midwest as there is peace in the Middle East. In both of these areas the administration's program has been "too little and too late" to be effective.

Mr. President, I shall support the conference report because I think it offers genuine help for the American farmer. But let it be clear, Mr. President, this administration's program offered none. The soil-bank program as endorsed by the administration was, at best, one for replacement of income, not increase of income.

The finest part of the soil bank program is its conservation-reserve feature, calling for long-term soil conservation or soil rebuilding for the arid lands and semiarid lands and marginal lands. However, it was this very section of the soil bank that the administration had the least interest in.

The acreage-reserve section relates to a number of allotted acres, and was included as an attempt on the part of the administration to bail itself out of its own mismanagement.

Mr. President, the conferees have shown great courage and wisdom, and I personally wish to express my gratitude for the job they have done.

I particularly wish to thank them for the 90 percent of parity for 1 year. I had hoped it would be 2 years, but at least we can be thankful for the fact that for 1 year the farmer will have a fighting chance to have improved income.

I wish to thank the conferees for the dairy section, which will mean so much to our dairy farmers. It provides a minimum price of $3.25 a hundredweight. We shall have to look into that section next year again, because this is only temporary relief.

I also congratulate the committee on retaining feed grains under price-support protection, and making them eligible for acreage conservation or acreage reserve benefits.

Mr. LANGER. How about butter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from North Dakota mentions butter. I include butter and butterfat in the dairy products section.

I also wish to say that the opportunity for the two-price plan, both with respect to rice and wheat, is a forward-looking step, because it will give farmers a fair choice, on the basis of 90 percent of parity, with acreage allotments, or the alternative of a two-price system, so that when they make their choice they will have genuine alternatives. In other words, there will be some equity as between the two proposals.

Finally, in the limited time, let me say that no other piece of legislation will be before Congress this year which will be more important than this particular measure. The farmers of America, as we have stated again and again, are in trouble. The other day I read that hog prices were up. They are always up after the farmer has sold his hogs. That is good old Republican economics. The farmer has sold his fall litter. Now the packing houses have the hogs, so hog prices go up—the farmers have the reduced income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I have one-half minute to conclude?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every United States Senator now has an opportunity to declare himself for economic equality for American agriculture. It will do no good for us to listen to the propaganda barrage from the Department of Agriculture. That Department has been negligent in the performance of its duties. I say that if Mr. Benson cannot live with the farm bill as we pass it here tonight, he ought to resign. I say the President ought to sign it, and I think he will sign it, because I am hopeful that the President will think of the national interest, and not merely of partisan interest. If the President signs it, there is only one thing Mr. Benson can do, and that is to resign That will be two good blows for freedom, and economic justice in this country, at one fell swoop.

Mr. HUMPHREY subesquently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks on the conference report, a statement I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

We are soon going to give our final approval to new farm legislation and send it to the President for his signature.

While the President will likely be tugged and hauled in different directions by his various advisers, particularly by those who have already got themselves pretty far out on a limb by unjustified criticism of Democratic efforts to put into the bill something which would benefit farmers this year, I, for one, am confident he will wind up by signing the measure.

Perhaps his aides should do some soul searching before pushing him too far against doing what needs to be done for agriculture.

Just to help them out as they consider his important pending decision, I wish to place at this point in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 29, 1956, headed "Rural Revolt: Liked Ike in 1952, But Plan Switch in 1956, Say Minnesota Farmers." The article is as follows:

"RURAL REVOLT: LIKED IKE IN 1952, BUT PLAN SWITCH IN 1956, SAY MINNESOTA FARMERS—PRESIDENT, NOT BENSON, GETS MOST BLAME FOR SLIDING INCOME, RISING COSTS—POLITICS AND 20-CENT HOGS

"(By Sterling E. Soderlind)

"BLUE EARTH, MINN.—'This is a real farmers' rebellion against Ike, his hired man Benson and their farm program. You bet I'm voting Democratic this fall. I never knew I would hurt myself so much when I voted Republican in 1952.'

"Richard Quaday, a hog and corn farmer near this southern Minnesota town, thus explains his defection from Republican ranks. Shocker for the GOP: Interviews with farmers in this State show that 3 of every 5 who voted for Mr. Eisenhower in 1952 now plan to switch to the Democratic candidate in November.

"The discontent of Mr. Quaday and other Minnesota farmers, which received its first political expression in the March 20 Minnesota presidential primary election, is of growing importance to both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Serious farm dissatisfaction could cost the GOP Congressional seats and electoral votes in key Midwest States in November.

"Politician, pundit views

"Politicians and pundits began arguing the meaning of the Minnesota election results even before the polls closed, Republican leaders generally attributed Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S resounding victory over Adlai Stevenson as a slap at alleged 'dictation' and 'bossism' of the Democratic-Farm-Labor Party and its leaders, Gov. Orville Freeman and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

"Democrats like Senator KEFAUVER and Mr. Stevenson noted that the total Democratic vote was more than double the GOP vote, indicating, they said, an 'agrarian revolt' and 'a smashing repudiation of the present administration.' The Stevenson forces also laid their defeat to thousands of 'Kefauver Republicans,' who, according to their theory, invaded the Democratic primary to 'stop Stevenson' and embarrass D. F. L. leaders.

"Both parties are now at work checking these theories and what they portend for November. Shortly after President Eisenhower said he thought the Minnesota election should be studied to see what it means, the Republican National Committee assigned three staff members to help the State party organization analyze the vote.

"Dissatisfaction deep

"Wall Street Journal interviews with Minnesota voters this week indicate that Republican analysts will find little to be happy about in rural Minnesota. The interviews with nearly fourscore farmers show their dissatisfaction is deep, bearing out the Democrat's theory of agrarian revolt.

"'I switched over from Ike to the Democrats last October when I got as low as $9.45 a hundred for 250 hogs I marketed,' says Francis O'Neil, who farms 240 acres southwest of Blue Earth. 'I've taken a personal beating under the Republicans. As far as I'm concerned they have a mighty tough row to hoe from now on.'

"Farmer Quaday says he waited 3 years 'for Ike to make good his farm promises made right here at Kasson, Minn., in 1952. But nothing is getting better and I have eight kids to support. In 1950 I could have sold out, got a house in town and be sitting pretty. Now I couldn't even pay my debts if I sold the works.'

"Squarely on Ike

"While Secretary Benson takes much of the criticism for lower farm income, many farmers place the blame for their personal predicament squarely on the President. Says an Ortonville farmer as he unloads his hogs at the South St. Paul stockyards: 'I don't know what folks got against Mr. Benson. I wish I had a hired man that good. He does everything the boss tells him to.' The farmer who liked Ike in 1952 crossed over to KEFAUVER in the primary and will vote Democratic this fall.

"Wallace Manthei, who helps his mother run a diversified farm in Kittson County in the extreme northwest corner of Minnesota, says he will change his vote in November 'because Benson seems to think that those of us who have trouble in farming should seek employment elsewhere.' Mr. Manthei says he doesn't expect the Democrats 'will have all the answers either, but at least it will be a change.'

"The seriousness of farm discontent in Minnesota was measured in a statewide survey by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll taken in mid-March, but published after the election. In 'trial heat' pairings, Minnesota farmers favored Senator KEFAUVER over President Eisenhower by 52 percent to 45 percent. In the cities Ike led 56 percent to 40 percent. If they were voting today, the poll showed Ike running ahead of Stevenson, 49 percent to 43 percent among farmers, and 56 percent to 40 percent in cities.

"Farmers union view

"Edwin Christianson, president of left-leaning Minnesota Farmers Union, which has 35,000 members, termed the results a 'decisive repudiation of sliding scale farm policies.' He noted that the combined vote of 'the two candidates favoring firm, adequate farm programs vastly exceeded the combined vote of the two sliding-scale candidates.' (The Democrats polled 422,000 to the Republican's 195,000 in incomplete returns. Individual tallies were KEFAUVER, 239,000; Stevenson, 183,000; Eisenhower, 192,000; KNOWLAND, 3,000.)

"Many Republicans argue that the lower GOP vote in the Minnesota primary, in

comparison with the Democratic total, is easily explained by the fact that, since Senator KNOWLAND pulled out of the race, there was no Republican contest and little incentive for voting. Says Leonard Hall, Republican National Chairman: 'Republicans weren't in the Minnesota primary—we were on the sidewalk watching.'

"But talks with farmers over the back fence, in the feed store and along the streets of Minnesota's rural communities leave little doubt that, despite such factors, the farm revolt is real.

"And another, more surprising fact emerges from these interviews. Until now it was theorized that although some farmers might express discontent by switching their votes from Republican to Democratic Congressmen this fall and by griping about Secretary Benson their devotion to Ike remained strong. Actually, almost the opposite seems to be the case.

"Stand with Congressmen

"Minnesota farmers who plan to switch parties this fall in the presidential election show little inclination at this early date to express their dissatisfaction by voting against the three farm area Republican Congressmen. This is explained by the fact that the Minnesota congressional delegation, with the exception of one Minneapolis Representative, is nearly as outspoken against the administration's farm program as their Democratic colleagues.

"Not all of President Eisenhower's 1952 farm supporters have soured on him, of course. The President enjoys much goodwill among Minnesota farmers for ending the Korean war and bringing peace to the country.

" 'I'd rather be getting half prices and peace instead of full prices and war,' remarks Ernest Frank, as he hefts a box of groceries into a truck to return to his farm near Madison Lake. 'I was for Ike in 1952, and he'll get my vote again in November.'

"When asked what it would take to keep them in the Republican ranks this fall, most farmers who plan to switch parties come up with variations on this theme: 'We have to have higher prices for what we sell and lower prices on what we buy.' Alfred Labf, a Blue Earth County farmer, says hogs would have to climb from the present 13 or 14 cents a pound to 20 cents before he would 'go for Ike again.' Farmer Quaday says he won't vote Republican again no matter what happens. 'It doesn't pay to have a short memory,' he adds.

"Why farmers prefer Estes

"Although Stevenson forces believe the Tennessean beat out Adlai on the Minnesota farm front because he outpromised their candidate, most farmers interviewed gave other reasons as to why they preferred Senator KEFAUVER.

"Comments run along these lines: 'KEFAUVER is just more of a farmers' man'; 'I can't see going for a loser like Stevenson'; and 'me and my friends feel KEFAUVER is more sincere on this farm issue.'

"Few farmers seemed to think that Senator KEFAUVER'S advocacy of 100 percent of parity for low-income farmers gave him any special edge over Mr. Stevenson.

"A Mankato farm-implement dealer said the fine distinction between the two Democrats' farm policies amounted to the feeling they left in their farmer audiences. 'To most of our farmers, Stevenson seemed to be rigid on flexibles, while KEFAUVER was flexible on flexibles.'

"Undoubtedly, many Minnesota Republicans didn't vote in the primary. Yet the GOP total of 195,000 compared not too unfavorably with the total of 290,000 in 1952, considering that there was a Republican contest that year between supporters of Mr. Eisenhower and favorite son Harold Stassen. Ike's vote was a write-in, but his backers were in a contest with Stassen supporters, especially in the final days before the election.

"Republican crossovers

"Some Republican city dwellers freely admit that they took advantage of the primary law which allows voters to cross over into the opposition's primary. Since most of these city crossovers may return to their party in the general election, they are not regarded as posing a serious problem for the Republican Party such as that presented by farmers who have changed allegiance because of an issue.

" 'Sure I switched over,' exclaims Eli Momsen, a salesman for a St. Paul gold-refining firm. 'I could name 20 others who did, too. No good Republican would pass up a chance to put Freeman and Humphrey in their place. Of course, I'm for Ike.'

" 'I crossed over just for fun,' explains Frank W. Wilkens, a Twin Cities insurance agent. 'Stevenson was too glib, and I welcomed a chance to vote against him. Of course, I'm no KEFAUVER lover, either.'

"But such harassing-action crossovers by some urban Republicans can in no way hide the fact that a great share of the switching done in Minnesota was done by farmers and stemmed from deep dissatisfaction with the GOP. Not one farmer was found who had switched his vote just for the harassing effect.

"One Blue Earth farmer summed up the general feeling: 'I think Mr. Eisenhower needs a rest, and I believe we folks around here are going to give it to him.' "

This administration has always kept a pretty alert eye on the Wall Street Journal, so I hope its officials have not missed this significant article.

There is a new popular song out in the Midwest these days. It is called Sixteen Hogs, a parody on Sixteen Tons. Because it describes the situation in the Midwest agriculture so well, I would suggest the President's advisers try singing this tune before talking to the President about vetoing the farm bill.

To make sure that official attention is called to the words of the song entitled "Sixteen Hogs," written by Mr. Irvin Shapiro, I include them now, as follows:

"SIXTEEN HOGS

"(Parody on Sixteen Tons)

"Some people say farmin' is a life of ease,
You plant what you want and you sell what you please
But it ain't so easy when you get to town
And you find that the prices have all gone down.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt.
Mr. Benson won't ya tell me what's happened to me
Since I gave my vote to the GOP.

"Oh Gen-ral Motors made a pile of dough
Their profits just grow and grow and grow
Their prices are the highest in history
It's good for them but it ain't for me!

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
Mr. Benson won't ya tell me 'cause I don't know
How much lower my prices can go.

"In '52 I joined the parade
And cast my vote for the Great Crusade
But in Washington the GOP
Just couldn't remember what they promised me.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
Mr. Benson will you please e-lu-ci-date
What was wrong with the welfare state?

"When I was a boy I went to school
In arith-metic I learned this rule
You can't be a farmer and make a dime
If the market keeps droppin' all the time.

"Chorus

"You raise 16 hogs and what d' you get
Another day older and deeper in debt
The farmer gets less but his wife pays more
When she does her shoppin' at the grocery store."

I have just one more exhibit to offer—one which I think should be read with interest by critics of effective aid for agriculture. It is an article written by a Corning, Iowa, farmer, and is entitled "As I Am Leaving the Farm." The article was published in the Audubon (Iowa) News-Guide, in a column entitled "Corn Meal and Cobs," conducted by Elmer G. Carlson, a member of the Press Columnists of Iowa. The article reads as follows:

"CORN MEAL AND COBS

"(By Elmer G. Carlson)

"As I Am Leaving the Farm

"Today you sold out. Now the crowd has gone and you have loaded the last reluctant cow and stubborn hog out to their various destinations. As the last truckload pulls out of the driveway onto the road, you lean up against the darkened strangely silent barn and smoke thoughtfully.

"Somehow you dread going into the house; the kids, not too long home from school will be noisily asking questions about the sale; questions you don't care to answer. The whole family will be discussing the move to town; a move you hate to think about. You pull your collar a little higher around your ears and hunker down on the leeside of the barn, out of the gusty wind—to think.

"A confused jumble of thoughts run through your head. "Where did I fail? Surely not from lack of hard work." You think of the backbreaking years of toil you and your wife spent. Lack of management? Maybe you could have managed better, but you were always counted a good farmer. You loved the soil and tended it carefully; your carefully terraced fields and neat farmstead vouch for that. Your mouth twitches bitterly as you contemplate the fate of those fields. The man farming your land next year is just adding your little 160 to his already extensive holdings, and a vision of your farmstead, deserted and weed-grown flits through your mind's eye. The new operator—a firm believer in straight rows; you sadly contemplate the fate of your terraced fields and grassed waterways. Oh well, maybe all small farms have to go, that seems to be the trend now, anyway.

"About that move to town. What in the devil are you going to do? You can slop hogs and milk cows, but Omaha doesn't seem to have any demand for those skills. Also you realize that you're a heck of a lot older than you thought you were. Seems like 45 is 10 years too old to be worth a darn for anything as far as getting a job is concerned. You consider the future with a deep aching fear. You can't help it. What if I can't find a job? What will my wife and family do? How will the kids adjust themselves to town life?

"You flick the yard light on. You feel that somehow it will make the silent barn and empty lots less stark. You make the rounds closing the open doors and widely flung gates. Why? Nothing left to get out, but habit is strong.

"You look across the driveway at the crib. In the glare of the yard light, the different-colored sale bills tacked up there today

stand out strangely. There they hang, an even dozen of them, stuck up there by fellow farmers, each one bearing that pathetic hearing 'As I Am Leaving the Farm.' You gaze at those brightly colored scraps of paper. Some of the names on them are men you know, men like yourself being torn from the soil they love and have cherished, to be thrown into a gristmill of a strange and unfriendly environment. Men whose dreams and hopes withered with their crops the last couple of drouth-stricken years, and now, like you, will be walking city pavements when the bluegrass greens the hills next spring. You can't help but wonder about the bright boys; those boys whose heads are fuller of statistics rather than brains; whose answer to the farm problem is 'Let's get rid of the small inefficient farmer.' You wonder how they'd feel if they were in your shoes.

"It's getting cold—you start slowly toward the house. Under the yard light pole lies one of your bills. Your own name in big bold letters at the bottom looks coldly strange. You walk up and idly flip it over with your boot. A gust of wind whirls it and away it goes, across the driveway into the road to disappear in a cloud of dust—into the cold and windy dark.

"ELDON 'ZEKE' ROBERTS.

"CORNING, IOWA."

I urge my colleagues to read that description of a farmer's thoughts after he has gone broke and been forced to sell out at auction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, huge agricultural surpluses have been accumulated as a result of the 90-percent price support program.

At the end of the Korean war the Commodity Credit Corporation had less than $4 billion invested in agricultural commodities. On June 30, 1954, this amount increased to $6,187,000,000. On February 28, 1955, 1 year ago, it had increased to $8,395,000,000; and on February 29, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation had utilized $11,521,000,000 of its borrowing authority.

If we adopt the conference report and accept 90-percent supports for another year we shall inevitably add to the accumulation of these surpluses.

On February 29, 1956, we had an inventory of 1,114,445,000 bushels of corn, at a cost of $1,864,747,000, nearly $2 billion. During 8 months of this fiscal year we have lost on corn alone more than $75 million, and the corn inventory has increased during this same period by 260 million bushels.

Today we have on hand 1,119,542,000 bushels of wheat, at a cost of nearly $3 billion. If we were to reduce both the corn and the wheat to terms of carloads we would find that we would have enough corn today, if we put it into 40-ton cars, to make a trainload of corn 4,200 miles long, or about long enough to reach from Seattle, Wash., to Miami, Fla.

Our inventory of wheat placed in freight cars would form a train long enough to reach from Los Angeles, Calif., to Portland, Maine.

And yet the advocates of the 90-percent support formula still propose that we add to that inventory.

Our cotton inventory has increased more than 5 million bales over and above the inventory 1 year ago. We now have on hand 13,797,000 bales of cotton, representing an investment of $2,385,073,000, or an increase of more than $1 billion over and above the investment a year ago.

Our normal consumption requires only about 9 million bales of cotton, so we have enough cotton, without planting any at all this year, to last us for another 15 months.

We have an inventory of $563,547,000 worth of tobacco in warehouses, or an increase of $150 million over and above the inventory 1 year ago.

We have on hand 114,107,000 pounds of butter, at a cost of $68,034,000 which is lower than the figure of a year ago. However, the reason it is lower than the figure of a year ago is that we have sold our inventory at ridiculously low prices. In the past 8 months we have sustained a loss on butter and butter products of $140,058,653. We have lost $100,344,590 on butter alone in the last 8 months. The other $40 million loss was on butter oil. That is the equivalent of a rate of $17,500,000 a month, or $4,250,000 a week, or almost $600,000 a day during the past 8 months. Yet it is now proposed to again increase the support price on butter and to increase further the inventories.

This is ridiculous. We are allowing butter to become rancid in warehouses. The only way rancid butter can be sold is to soap manufacturers. So far as the housewife is concerned, since butter has been priced out of the market, she has been buying oleo, which is manufactured by the same soap manufacturers. We have a ridiculous situation in which the housewife is giving her baby a bath with soap made with butter, and we are spreading on our bread a byproduct of the same soap manufacturers.

During the first 8 months of fiscal 1956 we have lost $662,989,011 under the Commodity Credit Corporation operations alone. This does not take into consideration any of the losses or expenditures of section 32 funds or that which has been spent under the International Wheat Agreement.

If we consider the Commodity Credit Corporation alone, and forget all the other subsidy programs, our loss for the first 8 months this fiscal year has been at the rate of $100,000 an hour.

We have on hand 103,968,000 bushels of barley, at a cost of $105,642,000. We have lost $31,431,724 on barley in the past 8 months.

On oats we have lost $11,408,732 during the same period.

On cheese we have lost $76,107,510, in order to hold up prices to the American housewife.

At the same time we have not been doing the American farmers any good by the continuous accumulation of surpluses.

If we adopt this report and thereby reestablish the rigid 90 percent supports it will mean the continued accumulation of grain in the warehouses, thereby withholding it from the markets and forcing the feeders of livestock and poultry to pay a substantial increase in the cost of feed.

Yet at the same time this group will continue to sell their product on the free market.

Their situation will be much worse then than it is today. This will bankrupt our poultry and dairy farmers in the Northeast. I now point out how this bill is a bonanza for the large absentee farmer.

The conference report has had removed from it any limitations as to the amount of payment under the soil-bank plan. I cite one example showing that if the bill is passed in its present form one individual in the Montana area, now farming approximately 340,000 acres of wheat, could put 170,000 acres into the soil bank and collect from the United States Government a check for $3,400,000—all for not farming one-half of his acreage. Then on the other half he could continue to raise wheat and sell it to the Government at an increase of 40 cents per bushel over and above what he received last year.

Another section of the bill would give him free lime and fertilizer so as to increase production on the acreage which is left.

All this is being done in the name of the small farmer.

There has also been stricken from the bill the provision which would have prevented the Department of the Interior from continuing its reclamation projects while the soil bank is in operation. We will now have one agency of the Government spending millions of dollars bringing new land into production while at the same time, under the soil-bank plan, we shall be spending hundreds of millions of dollars to take land out of production.

This is the nearest to perpetual motion that the taxpayers can get. The taxpayers are pouring $4 billion or $5 billion a year on this water wheel, and at the same time the farmers are being ground under.

In the interest of the American farmer this conference report should be rejected. Let us recognize the fact that we are unable to get a decent farm bill in an election year. Let us get the election out of the way and come back next year and see if we can get a sound farm program when the eyes of Members of Congress will be off the election.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I understood the Senator to say that the program was costing the taxpayers about $100,000 an hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator believe that high cost has some political significance? Would the Senator recommend turning the matter over to the special select committee on campaign contributions for investigation?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To approach the farm problem with the idea of putting three or four billion dollars into the hands of the American farmers in order to get their vote for either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party is an insult to their intelligence. Certainly the American farmers cannot be bought

and sold like cattle. This bill is an insult to their intelligence and integrity.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams and a letter from farm organizations in the State of Delaware opposing this bill.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELBYVILLE, DEL., *April 11, 1956.*

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

This organization strongly urges opposition to farm bill in its present form. Rigid price support strongly opposed by this organization.

E. BOWEN QUILLEN,
President, Eastern Shore Poultry Growers Exchange.

SELBYVILLE, DEL., *April 11, 1956.*

Senator JOHN WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge opposition to farm bill in present form. Conflicting names seem to make it unworkable and impracticable. Strongly oppose rigid price supports aspects of bill. In the interest of saving time and economy we hope you will be willing to convey our opinions on this important subject to other Members of the Congress from this area. Our organization represents every phase of the poultry industry including allied businesses, merchants, and civic leaders affected by the poultry economy of this peninsula.

RAY E. MURPHY,
President, Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc.

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., April 10, 1956.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: The Delaware Farm Bureau most sincerely urges you to oppose the following undesirable features of the farm bill:

1. Ninety-percent fixed supports for 1956 for basic crops.
2. Double standard parity.
3. Mandatory three-price domestic dumping plan for wheat.
4. Mandatory support of noncommercial area corn at 85 percent of commercial and increase supports from 70 percent to 85 percent parity for oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghum provided 15 percent farm base acreage for such feed grains are put into soil bank.
5. Ten cents per hundredweight increase in 1956 and 80–90 percent mandatory dairy support for 1957 and thereafter.
6. No control of diverted acres of quota crops.

These provisions would nullify the other parts of the bill which might help to adjust the agricultural plant to effective market demand. Since it is too late for the soil bank plan to be effective this year I urge you to use your influence to help Congress to develop a bill more suitable to all farmers.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely,

JAMES H. BAXTER, Jr.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there are really two objectives we are seeking to accomplish through the pending farm bill. The first objective is to lift the farm economy to a higher level, because the farmers' income is out of balance with the national income. The second objective is to effect control of production that is adding annually to the surpluses. The soil bank achieves this objective.

We have seen the farmers' income drop in the postwar years from $17,200,000,000 to a recent figure of $10,200,000,000. That is a $7 billion drop. At the same time the national economy has been rising steadily every year.

The farmer is affected by the rising national income since all the expenses of his operations are thereby increased. This is true in the case of the machines he must buy, the fuel with which to operate the machines, his taxes, as well as all the other incidental expenses which farming involves.

We must bear in mind that because of this drastic drop in the farmer's income we in Congress must try to bring his income back into proper relation with the income in other segments of the Nation's economy. How can we accomplish that? We can only accomplish it by the higher price supports that are proposed in the farm bill.

I made a motion in committee to extend 90 percent price supports for 1 year only. That motion failed. Why did some of us in committee vote for 90 percent supports for this calendar year? I have already answered this question in saying we were working to restore some of the farmer's lost income. I wish to commend the conferees for having reestablished 90 percent price supports for the calendar year 1956. They do not go beyond this year. If we do not reestablish 90 percent supports for this calendar year, wheat will go down 27 cents a bushel, come this next fall when the first applications for commodity loans are filed with the county committees. Corn will go down 18 cents a bushel. Feed grains will go down correspondingly in price to that of wheat and corn, and the farmer will again be on the merry-go-round of receiving less for everything he produces. The farmer's income will be further reduced in the face of the already drastic drop in income he has already suffered.

That is what I see if we do not approve a continuation of 90 percent supports for calendar year 1956.

I find it most unpleasant to go against my administration. I have supported President Eisenhower as strongly, I believe, as has the average Senator on the Republican side. I have supported President Eisenhower in his foreign policies. I have supported him on a great majority of his proposed domestic programs. I might mention that it was the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I who introduced the Federal tax refund bill on gasoline used in farm equipment. We introduced that bill more than a year ago. I was delighted when it became law. I know it will afford relief to the farmer because today he is operating with gasoline, not with hay and grains, as was the case 40 years ago. The farmer's power is now derived from fuel oils and gasoline in combustion engines.

Again I stood in complete support of the administration, or the administration stood in support of me—it may be phrased whichever way one desires—on the school milk program. I introduced last year the bill to continue and expand the school milk program. My bill provided that the program should not only be continued but should be expanded as the administration recommended this year.

I also introduced a bill this year to provide additional funds for the brucellosis control program. This was also sought by the administration.

Therefore I have tried to assist my administration in every conceivable manner.

I have discussed the 90 percent provision in the report and I have done so with the thought in mind that the President would be wholly justified in signing the bill.

Now the other major objective of the bill is the proposed soil-bank program.

If we had enacted such a program 2 years ago, we would not be standing on the floor of the Senate today debating the whole question. I had a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, early in January 1954. I proposed at that time that we control the acres which would be diverted from wheat, corn, cotton, and other basics, because I knew we would never get a reduction of the farm surpluses until we reduced the number of acres harvested.

When I was unsuccessful in convincing the Secretary of Agriculture of the need for controlling the diverted acres—getting them into clover or alfalfa, or some kind of a soil-building crop—I wrote a letter to him under date of January 21, 1954. Here is the evidence of what I proposed to do in order to reduce production so that we would not add to the surpluses, which are today destroying the farmers' markets.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that my letter of January 21, 1954, to Secretary of Agriculture Benson be printed as a part of my remarks. I wish the record to be clear that I did not come only recently to the support of the soil-bank program. I have worked for such a program for a long time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1954.

The Honorable EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing you to outline my views on some phases of our agricultural problem. These views, you will recall, I had indicated to you in our conference prior to the presentation of the proposed program to Congress.

One of the major problems we must recognize is that, in the main, the farmer has suffered too great a drop in his income. The prices that he receives have dropped drastically in many of the commodities and products, while his operating expenses are still on the level to which the Korean war inflation carried them, to say nothing of the higher school taxes levied on real estate and personal property, or township and county taxes. They are all up.

The machines the farmer must purchase in his normal operations are still at those inflationary price levels, likewise the repairs

on his old machinery if he be so unfortunate he cannot afford to buy the new machines. Then there is the high cost of mill feeds, commonly known as high-protein feeds, which he must purchase to supplement his homegrown feeds for his dairy operations, poultry production, or any general livestock feeding operations. How the farmer can further suffer a loss in price and still continue to pay these inflationary costs is a question that we must consider.

I am in support of certain phases of the President's recommendations, such as isolating some of the surplus, placing it in reserve in a stockpile as an assurance against some national or international catastrophe, such as a major drought could bring about.

The first step that we must take here in Congress and administratively is to demonstrate our ability to handle this surplus, whether we isolate, stockpile, or barter it off in the international field. We must show that we can do it, or it will be like a black shadow threatening or weakening our own domestic markets as well as the international market. Our number one problem is to manage this surplus.

Secondly, the farmer last fall voted and agreed to reduce his acreage of wheat planted, in order to manage the surplus in wheat. He has willingly accepted reduction in the number of acres planted to cotton and I know that the producer of corn will likewise agree to a reduction in the number of acres planted to corn. Farmers will agree to put these acres into clover, alfalfa or some type of legume crop that will be soil-building, bringing a higher fertility in the land that will give greater assurance of production in the future if the need arises. With the use of such soil-building practices, farmers would be prepared to take such surplus acres out of production entirely.

These are two essential steps—take care of present surpluses and plan to manage and govern future surpluses. When we have proved our ability in this respect we can take the necessary steps toward the question of price supports and what our price supports should be. If we are successful in the first two steps, it makes no difference what your price supports are, because you will have full parity for agriculture at the market place, but you do not have it today. If you take 90 percent support off the basics, with the exception of pork the prices would drop to the very level you reestablish. If you desire a change in production by adjustment in the price supports, what type of crop or livestock enterprise would you advocate that the producers divert to? I know we have a surplus in every category of grain or products with the exception of the pork. I believe that we don't need to encourage that by price, because pork production will be up in the coming year.

The effect of our agricultural economy is so important—it has its reflected effect not only in the smaller communities of our Nation but in industrial centers. The farmers provide a great outlet for heavy industry such as farm machinery, trucks, etc. I saw too many implement yards full of new machines last fall not to know what was happening to the farmer's purchasing power.

Mr. Secretary, I have just frankly set forth some of my thoughts as I believe I have some understanding in the field of agriculture. I am confident that we will work out an excellent, sound, administratively possible farm program, but we certainly cannot do so unless we are prepared to consider all these phases of the agricultural problem.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. If this bill fails of enactment by either a rejection of the conference report or by a Presidential veto, we shall place in jeopardy every young couple who started farming in the postwar years. Let us consider the plight of these young farm families. They bought their livestock and their machinery and their first year's feed and fuel needed for their farm operation the first year, before the first crop was harvested. They bought all their equipment at inflationary prices. They paid $300 to $400 a head for milk cows. They paid an enormous price for a tractor and for other machinery. In short, they went into debt. They are now trying to meet their financial obligations with a reduced income. They are in trouble.

If we fail these young farm families, and force them for another year to suffer the low income that the farmer has been receiving, we might well force them into a foreclosure sale before the end of the calendar year.

We shall take the heart out of that young farmer. We shall destroy every hope and every incentive he may have had. In many instances, he is the young man who fought for this country during World War II. Mr. President, I live among those people. There is a veteran farming on each side of my own farm, veterans of World War II. They married, they started farming, and they assumed financial obligations. If we permit this farm economy to remain at its present low level, it may well spell ruination for such young men.

Mr. President, the soil bank is the first realistic approach we have ever taken in bringing our production into line with our domestic needs and our export abilities. But we cannot accomplish our objective in this calendar year. The season is too far advanced. Winter wheat was seeded last fall, and much of the southern crop has been planted.

The 90 percent supports this year are a necessity. They will give the farmer time to understand and to adjust himself to the soil-bank program, and by next year we shall have not only compliance, but a reduction in the overall farm plant. We then shall find farm prices in the market place reflecting full parity, and the issue as to whether we should have flexible or fixed supports will be a forgotten one.

Mr. President, it has been asserted that the farm economy has risen under the application of flexible price supports. Nothing could be further from the truth. The price of dairy products dropped 59 cents a hundredweight for fluid milk as soon as the Secretary of Agriculture announced the reduction in price support from 90 to 75 percent. It has never risen 1 cent to the producer, from that first drop in February of 1954. In fact, the market is weaker today than it was in February of 1954.

Mr. President, we had better take a good look at the statistics. The production of dairy products is up more than 4 billion pounds since lower price supports were effected, and we are entering into a period of higher production today than we had a year ago.

Flexible price supports have not gone into effect on 1 commodity or 1 crop other than dairy products. We have not felt the effect on grain or on any of the basic crops, because they were not applied until this calendar year. They have been announced only in the past 6 months on wheat and corn. Then it was announced that wheat would drop 27 cents per bushel this calendar year and an 18-cents-a-bushel drop this calendar year in corn prices would be the result of flexible price supports. Can anyone be expected to understand and to believe the statement that the farm economy will rise under the application of flexible price supports? Nothing could be further from the fact.

It is for that reason that I ask my colleagues to think this question through with exceeding care, because, if we force a further price reduction on the producer, more especially the young couples who have not the financial means or credit to carry on under a depressed farm economy, we shall be confronted with foreclosures. This does not mean that we shall have reduced farm production, because someone with good credit and the financial means will go on producing from the land from which the young farm family was driven.

There is no program except the soil bank which will have any positive and lasting effect upon this agricultural economy of ours. We must reduce production. We can effect a reduction only by decreasing the number of acres harvested. It is for that reason that we have in the bill the best provision that has ever been incorporated into any legislation, namely, the soil bank provision. It will stop the production on acres diverted from corn, cotton, and wheat. We previously have succeeded only in diverting from production of a basic to some feed crop, the result being a greater production of feed than ever before. This feed went into livestock, poultry, and milk production. That is why we have been overburdened with milk supplies, poultry, pork, and we are now threatened with an overproduction of beef.

So, Mr. President, we must think very carefully as to whether we should reject this bill. If it is rejected, we shall be responsible for bringing on a real recession in the agricultural communities of this Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I pretend to no expert knowledge in the field of agriculture, but I am ready to accept my full responsibility in connection with this conference report. I say I pretend to no expert knowledge. I do know, however, when a matter goes in both directions at one and the same time.

As I seek to analyze the measure proposed I think of a man at home who had a balky little mule. The mule lay down on its side, and the man could not do anything with it. Not even building a fire under the little critter would do any good. After a while a veterinarian came by and said, "What is the matter, Joe? Can you not do anything with your mule?"

The man said, "No."

The veterinarian took a syringe and injected some fluid into the mule's hindquarters, and 60 seconds later the mule got up and bounded down the street.

The owner of the mule said to the veterinarian, after looking at him with a big smile like a western sunburst, "How much did that cost?"

The veterinarian said, "About 25 cents."

The man said, "Here is 75 cents. Give me two shots so I can catch that mule." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is said that this bill is designed to reduce acreage. That is an important thing to do. But we encumber it with every known kind of gimmick to offset whatever we have done to bring about acreage reduction. So, Mr. President, we are going in both directions at once.

I think I have a pretty fair idea of the record, and I know of no way to defend this kind of a bill. So I say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that I am very glad indeed to accept my responsibility today.

If I have any time remaining, Mr. President, I should like to say a kind word about the committee and about its distinguished chairman. I can well appreciate, Mr. President, the heartbreaks and the frustrations which go into a conference of this kind. I served for 16 years at the other end of the Capitol. I know how obstinate I could be. I know how I stood on my pride as a Representative in Congress.

When all the conferees sit around the conference table, the Members of each body sharing the pride in their respective body, and the Members of each body acting according to their own lights, I can understand that it is like an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. So I feel we should congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as the other members of the committee of conference.

Finally, I would feel derelict in my duty if I did not raise my voice once more in behalf of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, whose moral stamina and courage I admire very greatly. If the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] were on the floor at this time, I would pose to him the question, whether in an hour like this, when the challenges are so great, he believes former Secretary Wickard, of Indiana, might have stood up under the challenge and the force of the moment.

I have lived in the Government long enough to have served contemporaneously with Henry Wallace, of Iowa, with Claude Wickard, of Indiana, with Charlie Brannan, of Colorado, and with the able and distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], when he was Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have great affection, and for whose discernment I have the greatest respect. But I think agriculture and the country as a whole can be grateful today that a man of courage and a well-defined sense of direction never gave in under political pressure and the verities of the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has had an eye single to the objective he felt must be achieved in the interest of the farmers of the country.

I make this other personal allusion. I cannot always be certain, of course, what the right direction is. Experts in the board of trade have talked to me about what they thought should be in the farm bill. Members of the Grange, of the Farm Bureau, of the Farmers Union, and of the United Farmers have spoken to me on the subject. I have listened patiently to all of them. I have had as many as 150 farm representatives with me in the reception room. I have been threatened with condign political extinction if I did not vote for this measure. I have been threatened with political demise at the polls if I did not support this or that proposal. So I simply fall back on the admonition of Edmund Burke, a sometime great member of the House of Commons, when he said that, finally, he must preserve unto himself his individual judgment as a representative, and to let that judgment be fortified and dictated by the facts in the case.

From everything I see in the conference report, Mr. President, I can do no other than to oppose it, let the chips fall where they may, because I think that in one breath we are going in one direction, and in the next breath we are going in another direction. Therefore, with that kind of conflicting philosophy in a single farm bill, I have no choice except to vote against the conference report.

One final observation: The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made what I thought was a significant statement. He said that next year we shall have to be dealing with this subject all over again. There is a confession, Mr. President, since the junior Senator from Minnesota was so active in the deliberations on the bill. There is a confession that evidently we have not contrived a durable handiwork.

So I accept my responsibility, and I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, so that there will be no misunderstanding about what I shall say, I am going to vote for the conference report. The reason I shall vote for the conference report is that I voted for the bill. How any Senator could have voted for the bill and then could vote against the conference report, I cannot quite understand.

Mr. President, over the last 50 years, the Government has spent billions of dollars and millions upon millions of man hours to teach the American farmer how to grow more and more and more. There is an agent in every county whose work it is to teach the farmer how to grow more. Great agricultural universities exist in every State to teach the farmer how to grow more. I am not complaining about that; I am simply being factual. That is one reason why farm production is away up. Not only is farm production away up but huge surpluses of farm commodities now exist. Likewise, the Government has spent billions of dollars—yes, I think it is in the billions—of the money of the American taxpayers—and I am not complaining about that; again I am being factual—to bring into new production hundreds of thousands of acres in the United States. The taxpayers of Indiana, Illinois, and other States have been taxed for the construction of irrigation projects in Arizona and California. The result is that California and Arizona today, if my facts are correct, produce more cotton than do any of the Southern States.

While we have been doing all these things, we have forgotten one important matter. The one thing we have completely forgotten is, To whom is the farmer going to sell his additional production? Fifty years ago there were 350 million tillable acres in the United States. Today there are still 350 million tillable acres.

Fifty years ago the production from 90 million acres was used to feed horses and mules which were necessary to cultivate the 350 million acres. Therein lies the difference between the surpluses of today and the market demand. It is the 80 million acres. Today we farmers—I am a farmer—buy our horsepower in the form of gasoline. Fifty years ago we produced it on the farm.

We have an economic problem on our hands today, not a political problem. We had better not deal with the problem in a political way. We had better handle it in an economic way.

Whether we like it or not, whether we like 90 percent, 80 percent, or 75 percent of parity—regardless of what we like—we have only one agricultural problem in America today, and that problem has arisen because we have taught and shown the farmers how to grow more than can be disposed of in the markets.

On top of that, we have lost much of our foreign market. I am not complaining about it. I am not complaining about any of these things. But we have lost much of our foreign market because we have been teaching the farmers of other countries to raise more. We have given them tractors and technical aid. Let me say, in all fairness, that the farmers of foreign lands have as much right to grow their own foodstuffs as we have.

So we find ourselves tonight in the position that the American people, Congress, the State governments, the Department of Agriculture——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield me a couple of minutes? That is an important subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. This is not a political matter; it is an economic matter.

We have huge agricultural surpluses on hand, and the capabilities of the American farmer are such that he can produce unlimited amounts of crops. I am not complaining about that; I am happy he can do so. But it will be necessary to deal with the problem now as an economic matter. We shall have to defend, protect, and help the farmer until Congress can pass a bill which has been introduced by a number of Senators, including myself, the purpose of which is to develop new industrial uses for farm products.

The farmers of America need not till all their acres simply to feed the people of America. It will be necessary to find new industrial uses for the surplus agricultural products.

I think the Senate had better accept the conference report. I do not particularly like it; but I do not know of anything better at the moment. I think it will have a tendency to create more surpluses, as a result of the 90 percent of parity price supports, but I am one who does not particularly care, because I do not think 90 percent or 80 percent of parity has too much to do with the problem. The thing which concerns me is the capacity and the capability of the American farmer to produce increasingly larger crops. He is producing, producing, and producing.

So I think the Senate had better agree to the conference report. I voted for the bill on the floor of the Senate a couple of weeks ago. If I voted for it then, why should I not vote for it now? I am one who hopes the President of the United States will sign the bill, and I think he will sign it. I do not think he has any other course, because I do not think there is any other answer at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one additional minute?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield one more minute to the Senator. It will have to be the last.

Mr. CAPEHART. The answer to the farm problem lies in more markets and more uses for the farmer's products. A farmer's well-being cannot be increased by cutting him back. We cannot do that. We have to do the best we can for 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, and maybe 5 years, until the Government, helping the 6 million farmers, can find in industry new uses for their products.

The problem is not a simple one. It will not be solved by the soil bank or by 90 percent of parity supports. The problem will not be solved by 80 percent of parity. The problem will be solved only when the Congress of the United States makes up its mind to appropriate $100 million or $200 million or $500 million to find new uses for farm products in industry. Then the farmer's problem will be solved. The problem will not be solved by the monkey business we are talking about tonight; but let me say there is no better way right now than what we are talking about tonight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know what the President of the United States will do. I do know, however, something about the rules of the United States Senate. I know something about the rules of the House of Representatives. I shall answer the question of my distinguished friend from Indiana. The bill passed the House in May 1955. It was messaged to the Senate, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is where it lodged. When we considered the bill as reported to the Senate, we could either have killed all new farm legislation, or voted for the bill which was before the Senate. Except by passing the bill, there was no other way to get farm legislation into conference and bring back a conference report, in the hope that the difficult questions would be adjusted and there would be something we could accept. So I must familiarize my friend from Indiana with the reasons why there was an almost unanimous vote, except for 2, in the Senate. There was no other way to get the matter into conference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I shall not yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask for a half a minute. There is only one way to get help for the American farmer, and that is to adopt the report. It is planting time in Indiana, if you please. It is planting time all over the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are not going home.

Mr. CAPEHART. But I say to the Senator that in my opinion the conference report presents as good a bill as can be had. The answer to the problem is not in the bill; the answer is in new markets and new uses for agricultural products. That is the answer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one-half hour to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I shall not consume that much time. First I want to say that the conference on the bill was one of the most pleasant I have ever passed through, or survived—maybe that is the better word—and since I could not go to Florida for the Easter vacation, I do not know of any more pleasant place I could have spent the time than in the conference, because it was a delightful experience to find our friends in the conference committee thoroughly bent on revising the bill so as to set forth an appealing program in this political year; it was really enjoyable to watch the situation as it developed.

Mr. President, may I say I have the utmost respect for every conferee who was there, and I have already said I enjoyed the conference; but I want to make it very plain that the bill as it comes back from conference is, in my opinion, a vastly worse bill than it was when it passed the Senate, and it was certainly bad enough at that time.

What are some of the worsenings that took place? I shall mention them as briefly as I can. The first is the 90 percent rigid price support this year for wheat, cotton, corn, and peanuts. My colleagues may recall that the Senate, by a very sizable vote of 54 to 41, voted down the 2-year extension of rigid 90 percent of parity price supports. The members of the committee will recall that in committee we had voted down, by a sizable vote, a 1-year extension because we felt that it would be obvious that in this political year we were playing politics with this vital economic question of the prosperity of the farming population of the Nation if we so extended the program.

We had two votes on this subject in committee. One was on the 1-year extension, which was defeated largely on the ground that it was too patently a political maneuver, and the other was on the 2-year extension which carried in the committee, but when it got to the floor of the Senate, was voted down by a vote of 54 to 41.

In conference we took the political course—and I say "we" without including myself as one who followed that course—of holding the Senate and the Congress up to the fair opinion of the good people of the country by the adoption of a 1-year program, which we might as well have said would expire on November 7, 1956, as to say it would expire on December 31, 1956. We put ourselves and the Congress in the position of playing superb politics with this particular economic measure, which is an unpleasant thing to look at, but that is what it is.

There is not a Member of the Senate and there is not a person in the galleries who does not know perfectly well why the 90 percent price-support provision for 1 year appears in the conference report. I regret that it appears in the conference report for that reason. Perhaps it is too much to expect that it would not appear in the conference report in a political year. It is too bad this important measure could not have come to the floor and have been debated with more deliberation last year, before the political virus, which now seems to be so potent, had infected us in the Congress of the United States. I wish we could have considered the bill without the influence of a political year being upon the Congress. I think it is not to the credit of the Congress of the United States that we have yielded thus supinely to the demand, which comes from a minority of the agricultural producers of the Nation, to insert in the bill a provision for 90 percent of parity price supports for 1 year.

The demand does come from a minority of the producers, and every Senator knows it. They all know perfectly well that the total basic crop production amounts to about 23 cents of every dollar of agricultural production, and nearly 4 cents of that 23 cents represents the production of tobacco. So between 19 and 20 cents of every dollar of agricultural production is represented in the pressure to which I regret to say the Congress has yielded. I do not think it is much of a commentary on our own good sense to yield to a minority pressure of that kind.

I have already called attention on the floor of the Senate to the fact that many agricultural industries in the United States are prosperous, and a great many of them are prosperous because they have not yielded to the inducements and blandishments of price supports, but, instead, have insisted on working out their own salvation as best they could. My own State is full of industries which want nothing of price supports. They think it would be weakening for them to receive price supports. They saw an example of that in the case of Irish potatoes when such supports were destroying the independence and income of potato producers and holding them up to the ridicule of the other producers of the Nation.

Senators who were here then—and they include most of those now present—will recall that the potato producers of Florida along with the potato producers of Louisiana and the potato producers of other States demanded that that program be ended, because they said it was not right, was costing the Government too much money, and was destroying the confidence of the people in any agricultural program, no matter how sound.

Then I come to dual parity, which is a deceptive sort of thing because it operates so differently in the case of different commodities. Let us consider how it operates in the case of wheat. For wheat, 90 percent of parity at the dual parity level means that the wheat industry will get the parity of the horse-and-buggy days of 1910 to 1914, which will mean between 96 and 97 percent by this year's standard. It so happens that the wheat industry is now as highly mechanized, if not more so, as any other industry, whereas in the period from 1910 to 1914 the wheat industry was nowhere near so highly mechanized. It happens that the wheat industry, in being able to claim the advantage of the conditions and the parity levels of the 1910–14 period, is able to claim the advantage of a gimmick which gives that industry a very great advantage over other producing industries.

Mr. President, adoption of dual parity plus the 90 percent price support provision makes for very great inequalities among our commodities, particularly in the case of wheat for this year, because on the basis of present parity levels, that will amount to 96-plus percent of parity. For the next year and the year after, it will be even worse.

I remember that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], whom I see in the Chamber at this time, sold us on the floor of the Senate—as indicated by a very considerable vote, as I recall—on the 2-price system, which really is a 3-price system, for wheat. He did so on the basis of repeating—and he repeated it in a colloquy with the Senator from Florida—that he was simply offering something which might be used, but which the Secretary of Agriculture would always have the right to decline to use if it proved not to be fair. However, instead of being brought forward in that way now, we find that that proposal comes from the conference as a mandatory one, so that if the referendum carries, the Secretary of Agriculture will no longer have the discretion which was provided in the measure as passed by the Senate, in regard to putting that program into effect or not putting it into effect, depending upon how fair it might seem to be. Instead, the conference report makes this provision mandatory. So that constitutes a material change from the bill as passed by the Senate, and a material change which I wish to state for the RECORD, and which I wish to have every Member of the Senate aware of when he casts his vote on the conference report tonight.

Mr. President, I think I should also mention another matter in reference to the wheat program, namely, the completely unfair treatment as between that to be received by the producers of hard and desirable and millable and salable kinds of wheat and the treatment for the producers of the less desirable kinds. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has already made the point—but I shall refer to it again, in passing—that it is a fact that even the area in the Far West which produces white wheat does not send to the mills, for consumption by the American people as a part of their food, more than a very small percentage of its production, approximately 20 percent; and the Senator from Vermont has pointed out that under the conference report, in connection with the three-price system for wheat, if that system is adopted, those who produce such wheat will receive exactly the same kind of certificates as the ones which will be issued to producers of highly desirable kinds of wheat, for approximately 51 percent of their entire production, and that they will be issued at 100 percent of parity at the dual rate, which will run up to approximately 107 or 108 percent, whereas the producers of the fine wheat which is desired by the millers will receive the same kind of treatment. If that is fair, then I do not know the meaning of the word "fair."

Next, Mr. President, I wish to refer to the ⅞-inch staple cotton program. A careful program was worked out by the committee, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], under which we were making a real effort again to have American cotton get into competition with cotton coming from other countries, so that American producers would have a chance to recapture their part of the export market. Likewise, under that program we were trying to get into a competitive position with synthetic fibers produced domestically. The Senator from Vermont has already ably mentioned them.

Mr. President, as a result of those three provisions of the conference report—namely, the 90 percent parity provision, dual parity, and the ⅞-inch staple standard for cotton—on which the Senate conferees have yielded to the House conferees, rather than to insist upon what the Senate wrote into the bill and what came from the Senate committee, the Senate's well laid out program is entirely destroyed. So I am quite unhappy that the benefits of an effort lasting approximately one year, in connection with which most of the elements of the cotton industry have cooperated in working for the development of a common program, have been so ruthlessly destroyed in favor of a sop in the form of a 1-year price support program at 90 percent. If there is anything fair and anything farsighted and anything statesmanlike about that kind of action, I do not know what it is, because the conference report ruthlessly destroys our well-laid-out program and our deliberate plan in the case of the great cotton industry to recapture the American share of the foreign markets and to recapture a competitive position for the synthetics produced in this country.

Mr. President, I wish to mention in particular the weak provision pertaining to the feed grains. I do not know how it will work, and I do not know that anyone else can say that he knows how it will work, but I think I know what will happen, and I wish to state it for the RECORD. I think this program for small grains will do two things which will be hurtful, instead of helpful, aside from hurting the livestock industry, to which I shall refer in a moment.

In the case of the production of corn from the commercial area, let us say, two things which I think will be done will be very hurtful to the commercial corn producers: First, I think the price level which will be created will be so tempting that we shall see Canada devoting hundreds of thousands of acres of land to the production of feed grains, rather than to the production of wheat. We have already had trouble of that sort. I call attention to the fact that the Canadian granaries are full, just as our granaries are full. Hundreds of thousands of acres of land in Canada are available for diversion from wheat production to the production of small grains. Mark my words, Mr. President: We shall see Canada claim an unusually large share of the market in the northern part of our country.

Perhaps there is a good element in that situation, at least insofar as my section of the country is concerned, but it will not be good for the commercial corn growers. I refer to my belief that we shall see the great centers of poultry production and dairy production in the South turn all the more to the production of small grains in the areas which are noncommercial areas in general, rather than to look for their mixed feeds or other feeds to the commercial areas of production. Why should not the poultry industries of Gainesville and Harrisonburg and the dairy industries in the milksheds of Atlanta and Houston and Dallas and New Orleans and the other places which occur to all of us, turn to greater production in their own communities of the small grains which can be produced there, and the production of which can be greatly enlarged there when the price level will be forced up by having the Government buy and buy and buy from the commercial corn producers; and why would it not be a good thing for producers who are further away from the commercial Corn Belt to increase their production? I suspect that we shall see much of that occur.

The fundamental difficulty in the small-grains provisions is that they cannot be added up in any way which will come out right. For instance, in the conference report the corn-producing area is arbitrarily divided into a commercial belt and a noncommercial belt. When we try to work out a formula which would adjust the other four grains to those belts, although the other four grains are not at all indigenous or peculiar or applicable to them, we are bound to have trouble, and we are bound to have a Chinese puzzle which cannot be solved. That is exactly what will happen under the small-grains program.

I see that my time is rapidly running out, and there are several other points which I should like to mention. One of them relates to the manner in which grain production affects the livestock industry, and it is not the only thing in the conference report which adversely affects the livestock industry. In conference we yielded—again I say "we" without including two of us—to the demand of the House to eliminate a provision which I thought afforded the most teeth, namely, the amendment offered by the two Senators from Wyoming, providing a penalty against anyone who grazed lands under the soil bank program. That provision was eliminated. So I can see several scythes cutting off whatever there is left in this bill of prosperity for the livestock producers. There is no way to deny it, because they are there, and he who looks should see.

There is another place where we eliminated salutary provisions. Two entire sections and a part of another section in the Senate version of the bill were designed to protect tenants and sharecroppers. It was an excellent protection. That suffered the same fate as the protection which we had written in for livestock producers. The meat of that provision was eliminated. The provision with respect to forfeiture of anything in the way of price supports was eliminated, as was the provision bringing the tenant into the picture by giving him some right to be consulted with respect to placing into the program land of which he had been the husbandman. That provision, requiring his consent and consultation with him, was eliminated from the bill, along with other portions of the Senate measure which gave full protection to the humble man in the picture.

I do not think it is too much to say that on this point the bill in its present form, as compared with the Senate bill, becomes a landlord bill instead of a fair bill in which the landlord and the tenant receive equal consideration and equal care at the hands of the Federal Government.

Another one of the provisions which was eliminated from the bill was the provision which I had offered, called the compulsion amendment. It sought to require some measure of equality of participation and sacrifice by those who went into the soil bank, so that if they accepted the very great benefits of the soil bank, and particularly the acreage reserve, they would have to place in the program land which came out of their production, and they would have to agree not to put that land into production of other crops which were price supported.

That is the very essence of fairness. It is cross compliance. It is entering into the picture now not as a part of the original program, where it ought to have been, but as an ancillary part of the soil bank program. The Senate voted for it. That provision went out in the conference. So did everything else which tended to require any sort of equitable participation and equal sacrifice by growers of a given commodity, in the very laudable soil bank program.

One further point, and I shall be through. It will be remembered that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] announced to the Senate he proposed to vote—and he did vote—for a certain provision in the bill which is about the only bad provision we finally eliminated in conference. It would have jumped up the set-aside to some ridiculous proportion. He stated that he voted for it because he thought it would bring pressure to bear on the conferees which would compel them to come back with a better surplus-disposal program. He was hoping that we would hold onto what we had by way of a better surplus-disposal program, and build from there.

However, I am sorry to have to report to the Senate that, instead of what he expected to occur, we lost even what we went to conference with.

The Senator from Vermont has already stated that there was taken out of the bill the provision under which the surplus-disposal program would have been strengthened by placing a mandate upon the Secretary of Agriculture, with sole power to make decisions with respect to which he is now hampered by interference from the State Department. I refer to decisions as to the amount or volume of the various surplus commodities which are to be handled in the surplus-disposal program.

I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico is not present to participate in the discussion, because of the fact that, instead of forcing a better surplus-disposal program, and instead of improving it, we come back from conference with a surplus-disposal program which, with the 90 percent of parity price supports and other features, will enhance surpluses, fill up more warehouses and more ships, and cause them to overhang the market with even greater harm than results from the surpluses which now hang over it. After all, we know that the crux of the entire situation is the immense surplus which hangs over our heads and destroys markets.

Mr. President, how much more time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 7 more minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is one further thing to which I should like to refer, and that is the statement which I have often heard made by my distinguished friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who has done such a noble job in the preparation of the bill. I suspect that he is heartsick at the fate of this year of effort. I heard him say repeatedly that the high rigid price support was not adopted as an incentive to greater production, and that it did not result in greater production. I had never heard that argument seriously advanced by anyone before. So I took the pains to examine some of the measures of the wartime, and of the time which followed, to see exactly what were the words of those who had been responsible for the drafting of such legislation during wartime and in the period following, when reference was made to the high rigid price supports, and what was intended to be accomplished by them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of price-support legislation.

In 1941 the sponsor of the so-called Steagall amendment filed for the House Committee, House Report 742, 77th Congress, to accompany the legislation. The report contains this language:

> Recently the Secretary of Agriculture has found it necessary to encourage farmers to increase the production of certain crops in order to obtain additional supplies for export to Great Britain during the present emergency. Under these circumstances, farmers are entitled to some assurance that after they have increased their production upon the encouragement of the Government, the increased supplies will not be allowed to depress the domestic market to a level of unreasonably low prices. In order to meet this obvious need section 4 is included in the bill for the purpose and with the intent of assuring farmers, upon being encouraged by the Secretary to increase their production of any commodity during the present emergency, that the Department of Agriculture will undertake, within the limitations of funds available, to provide through loan programs, purchase programs, and other programs for the maintenance of a price for such commodity of not less than 85 percent of the parity price therefor, or, under certain circumstances in the case of nonbasic commodities, a price comparable to not less than 85 percent of the parity price for other commodities.

Section 4 of the Act (Public Law 147, 77th Congress) reads as follows:

> Whenever during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture finds it necessary to encourage the expansion of production of any nonbasic agricultural commodity, he shall make public announcement thereof and he shall so use the funds made available under section 3 of this act or otherwise made available to him for the disposal of agricultural commodities, through a commodity loan, purchase, or other operation, taking into account the total funds available for such purpose for all commodities, so as to support a price for the producers of any such commodity with respect to which such announcement was made of not less than 85 percent of the parity or comparable price therefor. The comparable price for any such commodity shall be determined and used by the Secretary for the purposes of this section if the production or consumption of such commodity has so changed in extent or character since the base period as to result in a price out of line with parity prices for basic commodities. Any such commodity loan, purchase, or other operation which is undertaken shall be continued until the Secretary has given sufficient public announcement to permit the producers of such commodity to make a readjustment in the production of the commodity. For the purposes of this section, commodities other than cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice shall be deemed to be nonbasic commodities.

In House Report 1776, 80th Congress, filed by Congressman HOPE of Kansas, to accompany the Agriculture Act of 1948, we find the following words which are pertinent to this discussion:

The price-support programs for agricultural commodities which would be modified and continued by this bill came into being principally because of the urgent demands for increased food and fiber production to meet war and essential civilian needs. * * * These programs have been invaluable in obtaining necessary production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield now because of my limited time. I regret it very much. On the 1949 Agricultural Act, the Senate committee report, which was concurred in by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and by most of the present members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reads in part as follows:

Price supports which were incentives for production became an established principle in our wartime program.

There is no question about that being the case.

I ask that all of the quoted material be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REPORT NO. 1091

During the past decade, price supports for agricultural commodities have played important and varying roles in the economy of the country. Prior to World War II, the major purpose of the program was to support and maintain the purchasing power of the farmer at a level which would allow agriculture to play its proper part in a stable economy. During the war the price-support program was used successfully as a national defense measure by encouraging increased production of food and fiber vitally needed by ourselves and our allies. Price supports which were incentives for production became an established principle in our wartime program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I quote from another report filed by Representative SPENCE, in 1952:

In the field of agriculture, we know from experience that unless agricultural producers receive a fair price for the commodities they produce, we are not likely to have the high level production we need (p. 23, H. Rept. 2177, 82d Cong.).

Then the following statement was made by the then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan:

The Nation today is confronted by an emergency calling for high-level production. We need favorable prices and adequate price protection to provide an adequate climate favorable to high-level production.

In connection with other legislation adopted in 1952, the House committee report filed by Representative COOLEY contained the following statement:

It is the belief of the committee that the enactment of this provision—

That has to do with the 90 percent provision—

is absolutely essential to assure the Nation adequate production of these important agricultural commodities during this emergency period. * * * it is certain that the bill will add tremendously to the response that may be expected from farmers to the Government's request for high-level agricultural production.

Mr. President, it cannot be denied that in the report on each extension and in the enactment of the original Bankhead bill it was stated in reports and on the floor and in other ways, by the responsible Members of the House and of the Senate who handled the measures, that high level supports were designed to force heavy production, and that later, after they had accomplished heavy production, they had become the established principle of our Nation's agricultural economy because they had succeeded in bringing about heavy production.

The last language I wish to quote is from a report filed by my distinguished friend the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] in 1952. The statement reads as follows:

Your committee views this legislation as particularly important at this time. Farmers are being asked to achieve record production goals in 1952 and similar record production will be needed in 1953 and perhaps for several years. Without the enactment of S. 2115, large groups of producers face sharp reductions in the parity price for their product in 1954. Farmers cannot be expected to do their best productionwise unless such an adverse situation is prevented.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is another quotation from my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from North Dakota, but I shall not place it in the RECORD at this point. He has already placed it in the RECORD himself as a communication which he sent to his constituents in 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make one more statement, and that is that Senators who force this kind of bill to enactment are ignoring the fact that a large part of our country does not want it, and that a great many people in our country will not stand for it. Further, the whole matter will come back to plague Senators if this bill is passed.

For instance, I have before me a poll taken of country editors throughout the United States by the American Press magazine, which is a trade journal. I ask unanimous consent to have page 12 and the top of page 13 printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I merely read the headline: "Don't Return to Rigid Price Supports for Farmers, Country Editors Warn."

The country editors know pretty well what the sentiment of their people is, and what is good and what is bad for the commodities in their areas. That is the sentiment we are getting from that group of people.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T RETURN TO RIGID PRICE SUPPORTS FOR FARMERS, COUNTRY EDITORS WARN

"Continue Eisenhower's flexible price-support program, or eliminate price supports altogether—but don't return to the 'rigid' price support for farmers.

"Try out the soil bank idea.

"Repeal restrictions on sale of surplus farm products to Iron Curtain countries.

"Exempt farmers from the Federal gasoline tax."

That is the concensus of opinions of the country editors of the Nation on the farm program, as revealed by a poll just completed by the American Press, based on replies received from 653 editors from all sections of the United States.

The poll also showed majority approval of the job being done by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Conducted while discussion of the farm program was at its height, the American Press poll not only asked editors to give their opinion on various proposals, but also asked for their estimate of the opinions of their readers. This second part of the survey showed considerable difference between the opinions of the editors and of their readers.

Whereas only 18 percent of editors favored a return to rigid price supports, for example, 45 percent thought their readers favored the idea of going back to the old support system. And where 61 percent of editors approved the job being done by Secretary Benson, only 31 percent thought their readers approved of his work.

The survey revealed strong opposition among editors to the whole price support idea. Many who voted for the flexible supports emphasized that they should gradually be reduced and the Government should aim at getting rid of all supports as rapidly as possible.

Many of the editors felt that price supports were simply being used by politicians to get votes and stated their belief that the idea is "un-American," that the farmer should stand on his own feet like any other businessman, and that there is no more reason to give "hand-outs" to farmers than to newspaper publishers.

Sentiment in favor of the "soil bank" idea was mild—many of the editors feeling that it is perhaps "the only way out" but not a sound answer to the basic problem of the farmer.

A good many editors who thought some kinds of supports were necessary, felt they should be restricted to small farms—or include ceilings on the amount paid out—in order to help out the family-type farmer who is having a difficult time but to avoid aiding the "factory-type" large farm which, they believe, is well able to take care of itself and which should be discouraged from adding to our surpluses of farm products.

Response to the poll was the greatest of any conducted by the American press so far, indicating a high degree of interest in and knowledge of the farm problem among the country editors. Almost 50 percent of those who received the questionnaire answered it in detail, many making extensive comments on the subjects covered.

Many suggestions were made by the editors for helping to solve the farm problem, ranging from the suggestion that we adopt the plan, explained in the Bible, of a food bank such as was set up by Joseph in Egypt, to the idea that instead of worrying about getting rid of surplus products we center our attention on doing away with surplus farmers, and find jobs for them in industry.

Many other suggestions and views on the general situation are included in the comments published in this issue. A summary of the questions and answers to the poll, broken down by geographic areas, follow:

1. (a) The soil-bank plan, proposed by President Eisenhower, to help deal with the problem of farm surpluses, calls for the Government to pay farmers a yearly rental for each acre of land taken out of production. Are you for or against such a plan?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	47	51	63	52	56
Against	51	47	34	48	41
No answer	2	2	3	0	3

1. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
For	50	60	75	52	65
Against	41	34	22	39	30
No answer	9	6	3	9	5

2. (a) As for farm supports, which of the three choices below appeal to you most?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	44	38	55	48	48
Rigid supports	7	33	17	7	18
No supports	43	26	25	44	30
No answer	6	3	3	0	4

2. (b) How do you think the majority of your readers would vote on this question?

[Percent]

	Northeast	South	North Central	West	Total
Flexible supports	52	24	38	54	39
Rigid supports	15	67	50	24	45
No supports	27	7	7	15	11
No answer	6	2	5	7	5

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum? The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has promised to yield me 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would not the Senator prefer to have more Senators on the floor?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought the Senator from Texas wanted to suggest the absence of a quorum just before the Senate voted on the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would suggest the absence of a quorum so that more Senators may be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Curtis
Allott	Bush	Daniel
Barkley	Butler	Dirksen
Barrett	Capehart	Douglas
Beall	Carlson	Duff
Bender	Case, N. J.	Dworshak
Bennett	Case, S. Dak.	Eastland
Bible	Clements	Ellender
Bricker	Cotton	Ervin
Flanders	Knowland	Payne
Frear	Kuchel	Potter
Fulbright	Laird	Purtell
George	Langer	Robertson
Goldwater	Lehman	Russell
Gore	Long	Saltonstall
Green	Malone	Schoeppel
Hayden	Mansfield	Scott
Hennings	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	Martin, Pa.	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McCarthy	Sparkman
Holland	McClellan	Stennis
Hruska	McNamara	Symington
Humphrey	Millikin	Thye
Jackson	Morse	Watkins
Jenner	Mundt	Welker
Johnson, Tex.	Murray	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	Williams
Kefauver	Neuberger	Wofford
Kennedy	O'Mahoney	Young
Kerr	Pastore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I rise to support the conference report on the agricultural bill. I believe it represents a great improvement over the bill originally proposed by the Eisenhower administration and over the bill originally reported by the Senate committee. Although it does not do all that many of us would like to have done, it will have the effect, in my opinion, of improving economic conditions considerably on the farms. That I consider to be the economic problem number one of the Nation.

I am glad that in this final conference report the matter of the surplus has been separated from the general agricultural program and therefore can be handled in an orderly manner without continually depressing present farm income. The surplus should not forever be used to hold down fair treatment to the farmer, particularly the small farmer.

Under title III of this program, the Secretary, among other things, is directed to submit to Congress recommendations for any other detailed programs necessary to carry out surplus disposal, including programs for a food stamp plan. I think that we should waste no time in putting into operation a food stamp or allotment plan. I have one pending, and the Senator from Oklahome [Mr. KERR] and other Senators have similar plans pending. There is no doubt of the need both from the standpoint of moving the surplus and from the standpoint of improving the diets of many people throughout the Nation.

In my opinion there is no reason for great delay on the Secretary's part in producing such a plan.

I also trust that he will take immediate steps to comply with the spirit of the report in seeking to move the surplus in world markets. Here we have an opportunity not only to move much of our surplus but to do it in a way to improve our international relations.

Mr. President, I am delighted that under this program the 90 percent price level will be maintained. It is my hope that before long our agricultural programs will have special provisions for assisting family-type farming, and I am going to continue working for that. I believe it is essential to our future.

I want to compliment the many Members of the Senate who have worked so hard and so tirelessly in bringing about an acceptable agricultural bill over great obstacles. They have accomplished much in the face of stiff opposition from Mr. Benson and the Agriculture Department.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, of course this bill is not all that anyone wishes to have, but it is a fair bill. The compromise brought forth by the conferees, as I have endeavored to keep in close contact with it day by day, seems to me to be a reasonably fair bill. It really gives to the President his main recommendation which he submitted in his farm message, namely, his recommendation with respect to the soil bank. Already other committees of the House and the Senate have given to the President his recommendation for a reduction of 2 cents a gallon on gasoline for the farmers' machinery.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me it is a reasonably fair bill. It does not do everything everyone wants. It does not perpetuate high support prices except for the current year. Certainly, an industry which has lost from $6 billion to possibly $7½ billion since 1951, in the shrinkage of its prices, is entitled to some consideration.

It may be disturbing to some Members of the Senate that we are about to pass, I hope, this farm bill, imperfect as it may be and inadequate as it may be, as a relief program, but I dare say and I dare remind my colleagues that several million farmers are sitting near their television sets or with their ears to their radios listening to learn what the Senate will do.

It will give some heart to that vast population of farmers to learn that the Senate has followed the lead of the House this afternoon in paying some attention to the problems which confront the people who live on and operate the farms of the United States.

I hope, Mr. President, that we shall by an impressive vote confirm what our conferees have done through the laborious days they remained here during the Easter vacation in an effort to work out a reasonable farm bill for our people.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the very constructive and commendable remarks of the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. GEORGE]. As a member of the committee, I have been one of those who have been working on this bill for almost a year since we began our hearings over the countryside. I think we brought forth a very good bill when it emerged from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Perhaps in the main it was a better farm bill than is the one on which we are now to have an opportunity to vote. I do not think it is the best bill this Congress is able to write, but I believe it to be the best one we can get

during the present session of the Congress. I have been in this business long enough to appreciate the fact that we do not always reach exactly the perfect goal or objective which we seek. If we seek too hard to get a perfect objective we sometimes wind up with nothing.

I invite attention to the fact that the problem of the farmer is a serious one. It needs some immediate constructive action, and we have an opportunity by accepting this conference report, to take a long step in the right direction.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say that I think the Senator from Georgia contributed very greatly to this bill, and I agree with him wholeheartedly?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I think my time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I come from a State where the going is rough, and politics is pretty even, but I am not playing politics with this bill. The Eisenhower administration did not create the present condition. They inherited it. They found it here when they assumed office. Certainly the President and our great Secretary of Agriculture have done as good and as honest a job as they could to solve the problem. I refuse to play politics on this vote. I am voting to support the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. If anyone else has ever come up with any other reasonable solution, I do not know what it is.

Ohio is an important State. It is a great agricultural State, and I believe the people of Ohio respect honesty and respect a man of integrity who inherits a problem and who is trying to do a good job in solving it.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote with the administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to myself.

Because of the limitation of time the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] did not get an opportunity to put into the RECORD a part of an editorial from the Tampa Morning Tribune, and he has requested that I do so. I think the significant paragraph of the editorial is this:

> It just does not make sense—
>
> Speaking of the conference report.
>
> It is equivalent to ordering youngsters at a PTA carnival to engage in a hotdog-eating contest to counteract indigestion caused by prior over-indulgence.

Mr. President, Senators may honestly differ on this issue as on all other issues which come before Congress. Anyone who knows President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson can have no reservation, I believe, in the knowledge that they are vitally interested in all segments of the American economy. The President of the United States is devoted to the American people. He recognizes that what is a disadvantage to any single segment of the national economy will ultimately react upon all its segments.

It is my belief, and I think it is the very strong feeling of the administration, that the conference report which is now before the Senate will not solve the agricultural problems of the Nation but, to the contrary, will multiply them. If the administration thought the bill would do the things which those who have spoken in favor of the conference report seem to think it will do, I believe the adminstration would be favorably disposed toward the measure. But it is my judgment that the bill in the form in which it has finally come from the committee of conference is totally unacceptable to the administration, and that they believe it is unworkable from an administrative point of view.

We have our job to do. In due time the executive branch, of course, will have to assume their responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional minute.

I hope, in the event the bill in its present form does not become the law of the land, that Congress will still proceed to develop additional agricultural legislation for the benefit of the American farmer. The bill in its present form will be, I believe, a disadvantage to the farmers of America. I believe it will be unworkable from an administrative point of view.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I support the conference report. I support the 90 percent of parity program, as I have supported it for many years. On one occasion, when I occupied the chair now occupied by the distinguished Vice President, I broke a tie vote in behalf of the 90-percent formula.

My regret is that the conference report provides for a term of only 1 year, which probably will make it necessary to thresh out the whole question again next year, to determine what sort of agricultural legislation Congress will give to the farmers of the Nation.

It has been charged this evening that the farm bill is before Congress because of politics. If it is here because of politics, it necessarily follows that it is here because of cheap politics. I do not believe that any such charge is justified. I do not believe the great Committees on Agriculture or the conferees of both Houses have brought the measure before Congress because this is a presidential year, and because they wished to curry favor with some group of the American people.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] intimated that the bill was here because the present administration inherited a farm problem from the previous administrations. Mr. President, if it had not been for the previous administrations, the Nation would still be floundering in the bankruptcy which it inherited 2 decades ago.

The bill is not political, any more than anything which is governmental is political.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not the time; I have only 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky declines to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that our duty is plain. I do not know what the President will do with the bill. I have the greatest respect for the President of the United States. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Eisenhower as a person and as President. But I want to discharge my duty now on the floor of the Senate. Whatever the President may do will be his responsibility, and I am sure he will do whatever his conscience dictates he ought to do.

Surely we cannot vote here in fear because the President may veto the bill. If he vetoes the bill, the responsibility will be his, not ours.

Because I believe the farmers of the Nation are entitled to know when they plant their crops what their support will be when they harvest the crops I favor the 90-percent support price. I believe now it is either that or nothing.

Therefore, I shall vote for the conference report, although I agree it is imperfect. But if the conference report shall be rejected now, we cannot hope to get a better bill, or any bill at all, at the present session, and Congress will adjourn, leaving the farmers unprotected in an economy where it is claimed that while the Nation as a whole is blessed with high prices, the economy of agriculture is constantly on the decline.

Mr. President, I decline to be frightened by the fear which seems to have possessed the souls of some of our colleagues with respect to the effects of the bill. I believe that no matter how Senators voted before, whether for rigid high supports or for flexible supports, they now have the obligation to vote the conference report up or down.

I shall support the conference report with pleasure and with some regret because it does not go far enough, in my judgment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

As I see the situation at present, we must do everything we can to help the farmers of the Nation. A few short years ago, the net income of the farmers was $17.2 billion. This year it is $10 billion. Thus there has been a reduction of more than $7 billion in the net income of the farmers.

The committee of conference has tried to hold up the prices received by the farmers, in order to keep their net income from sinking even lower than it is at present.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who also was the chairman of the committee of conference, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He worked faithfully in the endeavor to bring forth a satisfactory bill from conference. Not only that, but he worked week in and week out, month in and month out, to report the bill to the Senate in its original form. I say to him now that we have done a good job in perfecting the bill which has come from conference. I served with the Senator from Louisiana

on the Senate committee and on the committee of conference.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senate will agree to the conference report. But before taking this vote, I remind the Senate that this is a give-and-take bill, and that this is the best possible measure that could be obtained under the circumstances.

We have moulded together the desires of the Senate and the House. We have not achieved all that the Senate desired; neither have we achieved all that the House desired. Certainly the farmers have not achieved all that they need to restore themselves to their rightful place in our Nation's economy. But I must point out that the conference report is much better for the farmers than either of the bills that passed the House and Senate.

I would have not signed the report if I did not think it was the best possible measure obtainable.

We cannot leave the farmers high and dry with no legislation, which is what we would be doing if we failed to agree to the conference report. To do this would be to leave the farmers at the mercy of the Benson Department of Agriculture and its programs, which have slid the farmers down into the muck of a depression while being surrounded by high prosperity on every hand for everyone else.

The House has agreed to the conference report by a vote of 237 to 181. To do our duty to the farmers of this country, we should and must agree to the conference report now before the Senate.

I hope the Senate will agree to the conference report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, had it been possible to enact proper legislation in time, the soil-bank provisions would undoubtedly have contributed immensely to the prosperity of American agriculture this year. However, it is now too late for the soil bank to be particularly effective this year. There have been so many unwise and unsound provisions added to the bill, including certain soil-bank provisions, that it would be a disservice to the farmers of the United States to enact the bill. It would be the kind of legislation which would destroy farm markets, both domestic and foreign, and especially markets for cotton. It would be the kind of legislation which would demoralize our agricultural economy. It would be the kind of legislation which would greatly increase the cost of production for livestock producers, dairymen, and the poultry men, without any assurance at all that the producers of feed would benefit.

If my colleagues will look at the chart in the rear of the Chamber, they will see the percentage of reduction in production which every State would have to make in order to enjoy the so-called benefits given to the producers of livestock feed under the bill.

Mr. President, we have on the books a very good law. It has not had a chance to work yet. If this bill fails to become law, as I am sure it will, the Agricultural Act of 1954 will take effect. We would see agricultural conditions improve under that act, though not nearly to the extent to which they would have improved had not the soil-bank provisions of the bill been emasculated and wrapped up in unsound provisions which are totally unacceptable to the administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the good of the farmers of the United States, I shall vote against the conference report, and I hope the majority of the Members of the Senate will also vote against sending this monstrosity to the White House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself the time remaining on this side.

Mr. President, because I believe it will be in the best interests of the farmers of the United States, I hope this conference report will be adopted. It was with deep regret that I read an article in the New York Times this morning explaining that the food processors have joined the Secretary of Agriculture in his lobbying to keep farm income low. I read a paragraph from the article, as follows:

> Food industry interests opened a campaign yesterday to mobilize consumer sentiment against certain features of the farm bill.
>
> They acted as a result of a telephone conversation between John Q. Adams, chairman of the board of directors of the Coordinating Committee of the Food Industries, and Secretary Benson. The committee was set up by 52 trade associations in various levels of food production, processing and distribution.

I think this article is very revealing as to the forces that are alined against the measure. It is certainly opposed by people who have little interest in the welfare of the farmer, and these people are trying to rally others to their cause.

So far as I am concerned, farm legislation will best benefit the Nation if it benefits the farmer, and not if it is designed only to help the food processors at the expense of the farmer.

This measure deserves the support of everyone who is interested in bolstering lagging farm income.

Mr. President, the bill I repeat is opposed by the food processing industry, according to the article I have just read. It is opposed by everybody except the farmers, and each Senator has a chance tonight to stand up and be counted as to whether he believes in the farmer or in the food processors and the others who have been living off the farmer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the conference report I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASTORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—50

Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Capehart	Hill	Murray
Carlson	Humphrey	Neely
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Neuberger
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Curtis	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Daniel	Kerr	Scott
Douglas	Laird	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Symington
Ervin	Long	Thye
Frear	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
George	McCarthy	Wofford
Gore	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McNamara	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Duff	Millikin
Barrett	Eastland	O'Mahoney
Beall	Flanders	Payne
Bender	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Holland	Purtell
Bricker	Hruska	Saltonstall
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bush	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Knowland	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Kuchel	Williams
Cotton	Malone	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Ives	Pastore
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Magnuson	Smathers
Green	Monroney	

So the conference report on H. R. 12 was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT OF STATE STATUTES PRESCRIBING CERTAIN CRIMINAL PENALTIES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "To amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities."

At the outset, Mr. President, let me state that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has a peculiar interest in the bill because of the fact that introduction of the bill was made imperative by the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Pennsylvania against Steve Nelson. Inasmuch as the case arose in the State which is so well represented by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], he has, as I have said, great interest in this bill. However, due to the fact that the attorney general of my State, a very distinguished attorney, Mr. Louis Wyman, was selected by the National Association of Attorneys General as chief counsel to plead the case before the United States Supreme Court, I am introducing the bill, and in doing so I am joined by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], as cosponsors of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator from New Hampshire be willing to permit other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill? I should like to join as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very happy to have the Senator from California do so. Therefore, I introduced the bill also on behalf of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire also include my name as a cosponsor of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, Mr. President; I also include as a cosponsor the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL].

I wish to provide opportunity for other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill, if they desire to do so.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to be included as a cosponsor of the bill; and I am quite sure that if the Senator from New Hampshire will arrange to have the bill made available so that other Senators may join in sponsoring it there will be a considerable number of other Senators who will wish to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and I am glad to include him as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire permit me to join in sponsoring the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am delighted to do so.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should also like to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Indiana, and I am glad to include his name as a cosponsor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator from New Hampshire request unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until tomorrow, so that other Senators may have a chance to join in sponsoring it? I should like very much to talk to the Senator from New Hampshire about the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I request such permission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not a judge or a great constitutional lawyer, such as some persons in the United States regard themselves as being. Nevertheless, I introduce the bill, which will have the effect of clarifying the part the several States may play in protecting themselves from subversion. I think it essential that that be done. I in no way am attempting to second-guess the Supreme Court of the United States, but this is not a matter which involves intricate legalisms. It is a matter in which the Supreme Court by a divided opinion of 6 to 3 has interpreted the intent of the framers of the Constitution. The men who framed our Constitution were not all men trained in the law. Most of them were elected servants of the people as you and I are, Mr. President. I think, therefore, that it is entirely within my province to introduce the bill, and entirely within the province of the legislative branch to enact legislation which I think is necessary in order to correct a misinterpretation of the intent of our Founding Fathers.

It seems inconceivable to me—considering, as we must, that our Federal Government is based on a grant of power from sovereign States—that they had any intention whatsoever of depriving themselves of the power to deal with attempts at subversion or attempts to overthrow the respective governments of those sovereign States.

In the course of preparing these remarks a few moments ago, it was brought to my attention that the Subversive Activities Liaison Committee of the National Association of Attorneys General, of which New Hampshire's attorney general, Mr. Louis Wyman, is vice president, has just adopted resolutions urging the enactment of amendatory legislation of this type. A meeting of these attorneys general was called today in Washington in response to widespread concern by the law-enforcement officials of the various States in regard to the situation created by the Supreme Court's decision.

Therefore I am very proud, at the request of this committee of attorneys general of the various States, and because the attorney general of my State, the vice president of that organization, has been chosen to plead the case before the Supreme Court, to introduce this bill, and I introduce it on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself.

The bill (S. 3617) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me say that I have read the Senator's bill, and I heartily approve of it. It is along the same line as one which I have introduced today, and I should like to be a cosponsor of the Senator's bill, if he will consent to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall be very happy and delighted to have the Senator join as a cosponsor. As I indicated earlier to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, his bill is aimed at the same objective at which my bill is aimed. I told him that I was introducing it at the request of the Association of Attorneys General. I am very happy to have the Senator join as a cosponsor, because we seek the same objective, namely, to right an injustice which has been brought about by a decision of the Supreme Court which deprives the States of the Union of the opportunity to protect themselves against subversive activities.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator that I think he is performing a great service in introducing the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. I am happy to have him join.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I have joined with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in introducing a bill which would restore to the respective States

the right to prosecute those who would destroy the Government of the United States or of the State. The recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States upholding the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania struck down the sedition statutes of the 42 States and the Territories which have them.

I firmly believe in the right of each sovereign State to have and to enforce such legislation. A study of the debate at the time the Smith Act was approved in 1940 makes clear that Congress did not wish nor intend that it should nullify State sedition laws then existing or to be passed.

Moreover, we have the assurance of the Justice Department and the FBI that the States have administered their sedition statutes in harmony with the Federal law. We know further that information gathered by individual States has been of great value to the Justice Department and the FBI.

I do not intend to criticize or quarrel with our courts, but I believe that Congress should make its intention clear by enacting the bill which has been introduced.

I believe, that each State should have the right to combat sedition within its borders. I believe each should have the right to punish not only those who seek forcible overthrow of the State but also those who would forcibly overthrow the Nation.

These matters are locked together.

No movement can overthrow by force the government of a State and make it stick, unless it also overthrows the governments of all the States and the Nation.

No movement can forcibly overthrow the Federal Government without, at the same time, overthrowing the governments of the States.

And so I join with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire in an effort to plug the hole which the Supreme Court decision has made in the dike protecting our internal security.

REQUIREMENT THAT STATEMENTS ACCOMPANY CONFERENCE REPORTS

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in the event that the unfinished business is disposed of tomorrow, I should like to have Senators on notice that it is planned to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1628, Senate bill 3340, a bill to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State, to be known as the United States Passport Service, to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes.

I also give notice that it is planned to proceed at the earliest possible date with the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill reported today.

Mr. President, there are less than a dozen bills on the calendar. I appeal to the chairmen of committees and the ranking minority members of committees to report any proposed legislation which may be ready for consideration by the Senate.

The majority leader and the minority leader are very desirous of keeping the Senate in session to act upon any necessary legislation as soon as it is reported.

I do not know that I have ever seen a calendar which had as few bills on it as the one we now have.

I expect to hold a meeting of the majority policy committee tomorrow or next day, and clear some of the bills on the calendar for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. STENNIS), by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3617) to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, was authorized to meet tomorrow during the session of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires recognition at this time, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 11 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, vice R. Douglas Stuart.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast been our help in ages past and art our hope for years to come, we rejoice that Thou art able and willing to make our minds and hearts the dwelling place of Thy peace and power.

We pray that we may have that courageous and conquering spirit which knows how to meet and master all the mountains of doubt and difficulty, of fear and frustration, of trial and tribulation.

Grant unto us a greater feeling of sympathy for the suffering and sorrowing and make us eager to share our blessings with all Thy needy children who are finding the struggle of life so strenuous.

Direct us with Thy counsel during the deliberations and decisions of this day and may we seek to establish among all the members of the human family a happier and more peaceful relationship.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANK BOYCE, 13, OF ELIZABETH CITY, N. C., 1956 WINNER OF JUNIOR CITIZENSHIP AWARD OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, Frank Boyce, 13, of Elizabeth City, N. C., the 1956 winner of the junior citizenship award of Boys' Clubs of America, is regarded by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilford Boyce, as just an average American kid.

Frank, a slim lad with brown hair and brown eyes, echoes this view of his father, a truck driver and fruit-stand operator, and his mother. "I reckon I just had a lot more help than many kids," he says.

But the 13-year-old, who is modest in the extreme about his achievements, can scarcely be called "average" by most standards. Those achievements include his selection last year as top player in the Pop Warner Midget Football Conference, an honor he won in competition with 40,000 boys in 266 midget leagues across the country.

In addition, last year he was also named the most valuable baseball player in the Little League in his community. More than 100 schoolmates and fellow Boys' Club members competed in that contest.

Somehow, between his athletic activities, studies, work with the Boys' Club of Elizabeth City—785 members—and

the help he gives his father in his business, Frank is able to squeeze in the operation of a newspaper route, the arduous duties of the presidency of the Junior High School Student Council—550 members—summer-camp counseling and, for extra measure, enlistment in local campaigns of the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other local welfare drives.

The youngster received the junior citizenship award at ceremonies in New York on April 2. During National Boys' Club Week, April 2–8, Frank was to meet a number of celebrities and was scheduled to appear on TV and radio programs commemorating the golden anniversary of Boys' Clubs in America. The organization is observing its 50th anniversary this year.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 22]

Avery	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Osmers
Dawson, Ill.	Lesinski	Powell
Dollinger, N. Y.	McDonough	Prouty
Eberharter	McVey	Scott
Gamble	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Gordon	Mollohan	Tollefson
Grant	Nelson	Velde

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AGRICULTURAL BILL OF 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1986)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Agricultural Act of 1956'.

"TITLE I—PRICE SUPPORT

"Price Support Levels on Basic Commodities

"SEC. 101. Section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(6) Except as provided in section 402, the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1956 crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas'.

"Price Supports—Cottonseed and Soybeans

"SEC. 102. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"'SEC. 203. Whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported under this Act, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market.'

"Price Supports—Manufacturing Milk

"SEC. 103. The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The price of whole milk and butterfat, respectively, shall be supported at a level not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 80 per centum of the parity price therefor: *Provided*, That for the marketing year ending March 31, 1957, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and the price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively.'

"Parity Formula

"SEC. 104. Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (providing for a dual parity formula), is amended by striking out the following: ', as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950,'. The Secretary shall make a thorough study of possible methods of improving the parity formula and report thereon, with specific recommendations, including drafts of necessary legislation to carry out such recommendations, to Congress not later than January 31, 1957.

"Effective Date

"SEC. 105. This title shall take effect with the 1956 crops.

"TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT

"Short title

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Soil Bank Act'.

"Declaration of Policy

"SEC. 202. The Congress hereby finds that the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities depresses the prices and income of farm families; constitutes improper land use and brings about soil erosion, depletion of soil fertility, and too rapid release of water from lands where it falls, thereby adversely affecting the national welfare, impairing the productive facilities necessary for a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities, and endangering an adequate supply of water for agricultural and nonagricultural use; overtaxes the facilities of interstate and foreign transportation; congests terminal markets and handling and processing centers in the flow of commodities from producers to consumers; depresses prices in interstate and foreign commerce; disrupts the orderly marketing of commodities in such commerce; and otherwise affects, burdens, and obstructs interstate and foreign commerce. It is in the interest of the general welfare that the soil and water resources of the Nation be not wasted and depleted in the production of such burdensome surpluses and that interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural commodities be protected from excessive supplies. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress and the purposes of this title to protect and increase farm income, to protect the national soil, water, and forest and wildlife resources from waste and depletion, to protect interstate and foreign commerce from the burdens and obstructions which result from the utilization of farm land for the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to provide for the conservation of such resources and an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of such agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this title programs are herein authorized to assist farmers to divert a portion of their cropland from the production of excessive supplies of agricultural commodities, and to carry out a program of soil, water, forest and wildlife conservation. The activities authorized under this title are supplementary to the acreage allotments and marketing quotas authorized under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and together with such acreage allotments and marketing quotas, constitute an overall program to prevent excessive supplies of agricultural commodities from burdening and obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.

"Subtitle A—Acreage reserve program

"Terms and Conditions

"SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized and directed to formulate and carry out an acreage reserve program for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, other feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye and oats), peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, Maryland tobacco, dark air-cured tobacco, fire-cured tobacco, Virginia sun-cured tobacco, cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, and Ohio cigar filler tobacco types 42, 43, and 44, respectively (hereinafter referred to as 'the commodity'), under which producers shall be compensated for reducing their acreages of the commodity below their farm acreage allotments or their farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable. To be eligible for such compensation the producer (1) shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, whichever may be applicable, within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, (2) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity (hereinafter referred to as the 'reserve acreage'), and (3) shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing. Reserve acreage of a commodity may include acreage whether or not planted to the production of the 1956 crop of the commodity prior to the announcement of the acreage reserve program for the 1956 crop if the crop thereon, if any, shall be plowed under or otherwise physically incorporated into the soil, or clipped, mowed, or cut to prevent maturing so that the reduction in acreage of the commodity below the acreage allotment occurs within 21 days after the enactment of this title, or by such later date as may be fixed by the Secretary. The reserve acreage shall be in addition to any acreage devoted to the conservation reserve program authorized under subtitle B of this title. The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addi-

tion to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program.

"Before any producer is entitled to receive any compensation for participating in the acreage reserve program, he must first enter into a contract with the Secretary, which contract, in addition to such other terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, shall contain provisions by which such producer shall agree:

"(i) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

"(ii) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

"(b) (1) There is hereby established for each year for which an acreage reserve program is in effect for corn a total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area proclaimed under section 327 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, of fifty-one million acres. The total base acreage of corn for the commercial corn-producing area shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in such area on the basis of the acreage of corn in such counties during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made (plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment, conservation, and soil bank programs), with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided,* That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 per centum of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of corn (planted and diverted), tillable acreage crop-rotation practices, types of soil, and topography.

"(2) This subsection (b) shall become inoperative after 1956 if in the referendum conducted pursuant to section 408 (b), producers do not vote in favor of the program provided in subsection (c) of such section.

"(c) For each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, a farm base acreage shall be established for feed grains. For 1956, in the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955; and outside the commercial corn-producing area, such farm base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage on the farm planted to grain sorghums, barley, rye, oats, and corn, for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955. For 1957 and subsequent years in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, there is hereby established a total base acreage for feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats). Such total base acreage for feed grains shall be the average acreage planted to such feed grains for the three years 1953, 1954, and 1955, adjusted to reflect any change in the commercial corn-producing area. The total base acreage of feed grains shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the States on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such States for the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in acreage during such perod. The base acreage of feed grains for each State, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided by this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties on the basis of the acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted) in such counties for the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the apportionment is made, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions, for trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil-conservation practices: *Provided,* That any downward adjustment for the promotion of soil-conservation practices shall not exceed 2 per centum of the total base acreage that would otherwise be apportioned to the county. The base acreage for the county shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on the basis of past acreage of feed grains (planted and diverted), tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The reserve set aside herein shall be apportioned to farms on which feed grains have not been planted for any of the crops for the three years immediately preceding the year for which the apportionment is made (such farms are hereinafter called 'new feed grain farms'). Producers shall not be eligible for compensation under the acreage reserve program for feed grains, on new feed grain farms. For purposes of this subsection, section 214, and section 408 (d) the terms 'plant' or 'planted', as used with respect to feed grains, other than corn, shall mean plant or planted for harvest as grain.

"Extent of Participation in Program

"SEC. 204. For purposes of the acreage reserve program the Secretary shall establish a national reserve acreage goal for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of each commodity specified in section 203 (a). The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve acreage goal and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program, taking into consideration their acreage allotments or farm base acreages, whichever may be applicable, the supply and demand conditions for different classes, grades, and qualities of the commodity, and such other factors as he deems appropriate.

"Compensation of Producers

"SEC. 205. (a) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary (1) in cash upon presentation by the producer or by any holder in due course or (2) at the option of the producer in the case of certificates issued with respect to grains and upon presentation by him, in grains (such grains to be valued by the Secretary at such levels as he determines will not materially impair the market price for such grain yet will, to the maximum extent practicable encourage acceptance of payment in grains in lieu of cash): *Provided,* That disposition of quantities of stocks hereunder in any one year shall be limited to not more than two-thirds of such quantities of such commodities as the Secretary determines would be a reasonable estimate of what would have been produced for marketing during such marketing year on the acreage withheld from production under the provisions of this title: *And provided further,* That such stocks shall not be released prior to the end of the normal harvesting season for the particular commodity being released. Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for reducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal. The Secretary shall make an adjustment in yields for drought, flood, or other abnormal conditions in estimating the loss of production for purposes of establishing rates of compensation. The rates of payment offered under this section shall be such as to encourage producers to underplant their allotments more than one year. Commodities delivered to producers in redemption of such certificates shall not be eligible for tender to Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program.

"(b) No compensation shall be paid to any producer for participating in the acreage reserve program for any year until the Secretary has ascertained that such producer has complied with the acreage reduction requirements of such program for such year.

"(c) The total compensation paid producers for participating in the acreage reserve program with respect to any year's crops shall not exceed $750,000,000, and with respect to any commodity for any year shall not exceed the amount shown below: Wheat, $375,000,000; cotton, $300,000,000; corn in the commercial corn-producing area, $300,000,000; other feed grains, $175,000,000; peanuts, $7,000,000; rice, $23,000,000; and tobacco, $45,000,000. The total amount available for the acreage reserve program for any year's crops shall be apportioned among the various commodities on the basis of the amounts required to achieve the reserve acreage goal for each commodity established under section 204.

"Effect on Acreage Allotments and Quotas

"SEC. 206. (a) In the future establishment of State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or base acreages under this title, reserve acreages applicable to any commodity shall be credited to the State, county, and farm as though such acreage had actually been devoted to the production of the commodity.

"(b) In applying the provisions of paragraph (6) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress (7 U. S. C. 1340 (6)), and sections 326 (b) and 356 (g) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7. U. S. C. 1326 (b), 1356 (g)), relating to reduction of the storage amounts of wheat and rice, the reserve acreage of the commodity on any farm shall be regarded as wheat acreage or rice acreage, as the case may be, on the farm.

"Subtitle B—Conservation reserve program

"Terms and Conditions

"SEC. 207. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than three years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree:

"(1) To establish and maintain for the contract period protective vegetative cover (including but not limited to grass and trees), water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production of

crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage).

"(2) To devote to conserving crops or uses, or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage.

"(3) Not to harvest any crop from the acreage established in protective vegetative cover, excepting timber (in accordance with sound forestry management) and wildlife or other natural products of such acreage which do not increase supplies of feed for domestic animals.

"(4) Not to graze any acreage established in protective vegetative cover prior to January 1, 1959, or such later date as may be provided in the contract, except pursuant to the provisions of section 203 (a) (3) hereof; and if such acreage is grazed at the end of such period, to graze such acreage during the remainder of the period covered by the contract in accordance with sound pasture management.

"(5) Not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, grazing, or other use, to any use specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract.

"(6) (A) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract at any stage during the time such producer has control of the farm and that such violation is of such a substantial nature as to warrant termination of the contract, to forfeit all rights to payments or grants under the contract, and to refund to the United States all payments and grants received by him thereunder.

"(B) In the event that the Secretary determines that there has been a violation of the contract but that such violation is of such a nature as not to warrant termination of the contract, to accept such payment adjustments, forfeit such benefits, and make such refunds to the United States of payments and benefits received by him, under the contract, as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate.

"(7) To such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds.

"(b) In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree:

"(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated; and

"(2) To make an annual payment to the producer for the term of the contract upon determination that he has fulfilled the provisions of the contract entitling him to such payment. The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, taking into consideration the value of the land for the production of commodities customarily grown on such kind of land in the county or area, the prevailing rates for cash rentals for similar land in the county or area, the incentive necessary to obtain contracts covering sufficient acreage for the substantial accomplishment of the purposes of the conservation reserve program, and such other factors as he deems appropriate. Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

"(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

"(d) A contract shall not be terminated under paragraph (6) of subsection (a) unless the nature of the violation is such as to defeat or substantially impair the purposes of the contract. Whenever the State committee believes that there has been a violation which would warrant termination of a contract, the producer shall be given written notice thereof by registered mail or personal service, and the producer shall, if he requests such an opportunity within thirty days after the delivery or service of such notice, be given an opportunity to show cause, in an informal proceeding before the county committee under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, why the contract should not be terminated. If the producer does not request an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated within such thirty-day period, the determination of the State committee made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive. If the producer within such thirty-day period requests an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated, the county committee, at the conclusion of the proceeding, shall submit a report including its recommendations, to the State committee for a determination, on the basis of such report and such other information as is available to the State committee, as to whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. The producer shall be accorded the right, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary, to appear before the State committee in connection with the State committee's determination of the issue. The producer shall be given written notice by registered mail or personal service of the State committee's determination. If the producer feels aggrieved by such determinaton, he may obtain judicial review of such determination by filing a complaint with the United States district court for the district in which the land covered by the contract is located, within ninety days after the delivery or service of notice of such determination, requesting the court to set aside such determination. Service of process in such action shall be made in accordance with the rule for service of process upon the United States prescribed by the Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States District Courts. The copy of the summons and complaint required to be delivered to the officer or agency whose order is being attacked shall be sent to the chairman of the State committee. The action in the United States district court shall be a trial de novo to determine whether there has been a violation which would warrant termination of the contract. If the producer does not seek judicial review of the State committee's determination, within the ninety-day period allowed therefor, the State committee's determination shall be final and conclusive. The terms 'county committee' and 'State committee' as used herein refer to the county and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"Conservation Reserve Goal

"SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for such year. Such goal shall be that percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities during the year preceding the year for which such determination is made, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production as a result of acreage allotments or marketing quotas, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which such determination is made for the production of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and export and an adequate allowance for carry-over. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this title the Secretary shall determine the national conservation acreage goal for 1956.

"(b) In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

"(c) The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress on or before March 15 of each year a report of the scope of the conservation reserve program for the preceding year and the basis for participation in such program in the various States and major crop production regions of the country.

"Authorized Period of Contracts and Expenditures

"SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary is authorized to formulate and announce programs under this subtitle B and to enter into contracts thereunder with producers during the five-year period 1956–1960 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1969, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may continue until December 31, 1974.

"(b) The period covered by any contract shall not exceed ten years, except that contracts for the establishment of tree cover may extend for fifteen years.

"(c) In carrying out the conservation reserve program, the Secretary shall not enter into contracts with producers which would require payments to producers, including the cost of materials and services, in excess of $450,000,000 in any calendar year.

"Termination and Modification of Contracts

"SEC. 210. (a) The Secretary may terminate any contract with a producer by mutual agreement with the producer if the Secretary determines that such termination would be in the public interest.

"(b) The Secretary may agree to such modification of contracts previously entered into as he may determine to be desirable to carry out the purposes of this title and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation reserve program.

"Conservation Materials and Services

"SEC. 211. (a) The Secretary may purchase or produce conservation materials and services and make such materials and services available to producers under the conservation reserve program to aid them in establishing vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B, may reimburse any Fed-

eral, State, or local government agency for conservation materials and services furnished by such agency, and may pay expenses necessary in making such materials, and services available, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery, application, or installation of materials and services.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making conservation materials and services available to producers hereunder, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or who render services to the Secretary in furnishing to producers approved conservation materials or services for the establishment by the producers of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under contracts authorized by this subtitle B. The price at which purchase orders for any conservation material or service are filled may be limited, if the Secretary determines that it is necessary in the interest of producers and the Government, to a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"Effect on Other Programs

"SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) insofar as the acreage of cropland on any farm enters into the determination of acreage allotments and marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the cropland acreage on the farm shall not be deemed to be decreased during the period of any contract entered into under the conservation reserve program by reason of the establishment and maintenance of vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, under such contract; and

"(2) the acreage on any farm which is determined under regulations of the Secretary to have been diverted from the production of any commodity in order to carry out the contract entered into under the conservation reserve program shall be considered acreage devoted to the commodity for the purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and base acreages under this Act.

"Geographical Applicability

"SEC. 213. This subtitle B shall apply to the continental United States, and, if the Secretary determines it to be in the national interest, to one or more of the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and as used in this subtitle B, the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"*Subtitle C—General provisions*

"Compliance With Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 214. No person shall be eligible for payments or compensation under this title with respect to any farm for any year in which (1) the acreage of any basic agricultural commodity other than wheat or corn on the farm exceeds the farm acreage allotment for the commodity under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or (2) the wheat acreage on the farm exceeds the larger of the farm wheat acreage allotment under such title or fifteen acres, or (3) the corn acreage on the farm, in the case of a farm in the commercial corn-producing area, exceeds the farm base acreage for corn or the farm acreage allotment, whichever is in effect, or (4) the acreage planted to feed grains on the farm exceeds the farm base acreage for feed grains, except that such requirement for compliance with the farm base acreage for feed grains shall not apply for 1956. For the purpose of this section, a producer shall not be deemed to have exceeded his farm acreage allotment or farm base acreage, unless such producer knowingly exceeded such allotment or base acreage and, in the case of wheat, unless such producer knowingly exceeded the farm acreage allotment or fifteen acres, whichever is larger.

"Reapportionment Prohibited

"SEC. 215. No acreage diverted from the production of any commodity subject to acreage allotments as a result of participation in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve programs shall be reapportioned or allotted to any other farm.

"Certificate of Claimant

"SEC. 216. Subject to the provisions of section 205 (b), payment or compensation authorized by this title may be made upon the certificate of the claimant, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, that he has complied with all requirements for such payment and that the statements and information contained in the application for payment are correct and true, to the best of his knowledge and belief.

"Utilization of Local and State Committees

"SEC. 217. In administering this title in the continental United States, the Secretary shall utilize the services of local, county, and State committees established under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"Utilization of Other Agencies

"SEC. 218. With respect to conservation aspects of any program under this title, the Secretary shall consult with the soil-conservation districts, State foresters, State game and fish agencies, land-grant colleges, and other appropriate agencies of State governments, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the formulation of program provisions at the State and county levels. The technical resources of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, the land-grant colleges, the State foresters, State game and fish agencies, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other appropriate technical services shall be utilized, so far as practicable, to assure coordination of conservation activities and a solid technical foundation for the program.

"Utilization of Land Use Capability Data

"SEC. 219. In administering this title the Secretary shall utilize to the fullest practicable extent land use capability data, including capability surveys as developed by the Soil Conservation Service, and shall carry forward to completion as rapidly as possible the basic land inventory of the Nation.

"Financing

"SEC. 220. (a) The Secretary is authorized to utilize the facilities, services, authorities, and funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation in discharging his functions and responsibilities under this title, including payment of costs of administration for the programs authorized under this title: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall, prior to February 1, 1957, or such earlier date as may be practicable, submit to the Congress for immediate reference to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a full program of all operations under this title which will require the making of expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958; and, after June 30, 1957, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not make any expenditures for carrying out the purposes of this title unless the Corporation has received funds to cover such expenditures from appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this title. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, including such amounts as may be required to make payments to the Corporation for its actual costs incurred or to be incurred under this section.

"(b) All funds available for carrying out the purposes of this title shall be available for transfer to such agencies of the Federal or State governments as the Secretary may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out this title; and for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out the programs authorized by this title. The Secretary may make such payments in advance of determination of performance.

"Finality of Determinations

"SEC. 221. The facts constituting the basis for any payment or compensation, or the amount thereof, authorized to be made under this title, when officially determined in conformity with applicable regulations prescribed by the Secretary, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any other officer or agency of the Government. In case any producer who is entitled to any payment or compensation dies, becomes incompetent, or disappears before receiving such payment or compensation, or is succeeded by another who renders or completes the required performance, the payment or compensation shall, without regard to any other provisions of law, be made as the Secretary may determine to be fair and reasonable in all the circumstances and so provide by regulations.

"Protection of Tenants and Sharecroppers

"SEC. 222. In the formulation and administration of programs under this title, the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments or compensation under this title, and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm. Applications to participate in any such program shall specify the basis on which the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers are to share in such payments or compensation, and no contract under any such program shall be entered into unless such basis is approved by the county committee and incorporated into the contract. The standards prescribed by the Secretary for the guidance of county committees in determining whether any such basis shall be approved shall include the requirement that consideration be given to the respective contributions which would have been made by the landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers in the production of the crops which would have been produced on the acreage diverted from production under the contract and the basis on which they would have shared in such crops or the proceeds thereof.

"Penalty for Grazing or Harvesting

"SEC. 223. Any producer who knowingly and willfully grazes or harvests any crop from any acreage in violation of a contract entered into under section 203 or 207 shall be subject to a civil penalty equal to 50 per centum of the compensation payable for compliance with such contract for the year in which the violation occurs. Such penalty shall be in addition to any amounts required to be forfeited or refunded under the provisions of such contract, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"Regulations

"SEC. 224. The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"Production on Government Lands Prohibited

"SEC. 225. The President shall, with respect to farmlands now or hereafter owned by the Federal Government, restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of such lands for the production of price supported crops in surplus supply.

"Pooling of Conservation Reserve Land

"SEC. 226. Whenever management of family farms or optimum land use will be aided, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit farmers to pool their rights to participate jointly in the conservation reserve program on property other than their home farms.

"TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

"Program of Orderly Liquidation

"SEC. 301. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, the operation of the price support program, and orderly liquidation, dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it.

"(b) The Secretary shall submit to Congress within ninety days after the enactment of this Act detailed programs, with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs, (1) for the disposition of surplus commodities as required by subsection (a) above; (2) for a food stamp plan or similar program for distribution through States (including the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and local units of Government of future surplus production to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, so as to prevent the accumulation of commodities in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and (3) for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products (A) inside the United States and (B) outside the United States as authorized in section 415 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The Secretary shall report annually on his operations under subsection (a) and such reports shall show—

"(1) the quantities of surplus commodities on hand;

"2) the methods of disposition utilized and the quantities disposed of during the preceding twelve months;

"(3) the methods of disposition to be utilized and the estimated quantities that can be disposed of during the succeeding twelve months;

"(4) a detailed program for the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities through marketing and utilization research and improvement of marketing facilities; and

"(5) recommendations for additional legislation necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section.

"Extra-Long Staple Cotton

"SEC. 302. (a) Hereafter the quota for cotton having a staple length of one and one-eighth inches or more, established September 20, 1939, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, shall apply to the same grades and staple lengths included in the quota when such quota was initially established. Such quota shall provide for cotton having a staple length of one and eleven-sixteenths inches and longer, and shall establish dates for the quota year which will recognize and permit entry to conform to normal marketing practices and requirements for such cotton.

"(b) Beginning not later than August 1, 1956, the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to sell for export at competitive world prices its stocks of domestically produced extra long staple cotton on hand on the date of enactment of this Act. The amount offered and the price accepted by the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be such as to dispose of such quantity in an orderly manner and within a reasonable period of time.

"Agreements Limiting Imports

"SEC. 303. The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended.

"Appropriation To Supplement Section 32 Funds

"SEC. 304. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the sum of $500,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended (7 U. S. C. 612c), subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, except that up to 50 per centum of such $500,000,000 may be devoted during any fiscal year to any one agricultural commodity or the products thereof.

"Transfer of Bartered Materials To Supplemental Stockpile

"SEC. 305. (a) Strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products, unless acquired for the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), or for other purposes shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1704).

"(b) Strategic materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural commodities or products may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, free of duty.

"(c) In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any materials so transferred. The value of any such material for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Surplus Disposal Administrator

"SEC. 306. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator, at a salary rate of not exceeding $15,000 per annum, whose duties shall include such responsibility for activities of the Department, including those of the Commodity Credit Corporation, relating to the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities as the Secretary may direct.

"Use of Voluntary Agencies and Shipping Subsidy for Merchant Marine

"SEC. 307. That the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) The first sentence of section 103 (a) is amended by striking out the word 'and' following the words 'handling costs,' and by inserting immediately before the period the following: 'and, (3) all Commodity Credit Corporation funds expended for ocean freight costs authorized under title II hereof for purposes of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended'.

"(b) Section 201 is amended by striking out 'f. o. b. vessels in United States ports,'.

"(c) The first sentence of section 203 is amended to read as follows: 'Not more than $500,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in such commodities) shall be expended for all such transfers and for other costs authorized by this title.' Section 203 is further amended by adding at the end of the section the following: 'Such transfers may include delivery f. o. b. vessels in United States ports and, upon a determination by the President that it is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title or of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry abroad may be paid from funds available to carry out this title on commodities transferred pursuant hereto or donated under said section 416. Funds required for ocean freight costs authorized under this title may be transferred by the Commodity Credit Corporation to such other Federal agency as may be designated by the President.'

"Commission To Recommend Legislation Providing for Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products

"SEC. 308. (a) (1) There is hereby established a bipartisan Commission on Increased Industrial Use of Agricultural Products (hereafter referred to as 'the Commission'). The Commission shall be composed of five members, of whom not more than three shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the interests of various segments of agriculture. One of the members so appointed shall be designated as Chairman by the President.

"(2) Members of the Commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day and shall be reimbursed for necessary traveling and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

"(3) The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of an executive director and such chemists, engineers, agriculturists, attorneys, and other assistants as it may deem necessary. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide the Commission with necessary office space, and may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any personnel of the Department of Agriculture to assist the Commission in carrying out its work.

"(4) Upon request of the Commission, any other department or agency of the Government having information or data needed by the Commission in carrying out its duties under this section, shall make such information or data available to the Commission for such purposes. The Commission shall take such steps as may be necessary to protect against unauthorized disclosure any such information or data which may be classified for security purposes.

"(5) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission in a technical or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434 or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(b) It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and present to the Congress, not later than June 15, 1957, the necessary recommendations which in its opinion will bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products not needed for human or animal consumption, including, but not limited to, use in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuels, plastics, and other products.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $150,000, as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

"(d) Upon submission of the recommendations referred to in subsection (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

"(e) (1) Any bill or joint resolution embodying the recommendations presented to the Congress under subsection (b) shall, upon introduction in the Senate or House of Representatives, be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, as the case may be. Such committee shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to consider such bill or joint resolution.

"(2) This subsection is enacted by the Congress (A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and (B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as they relate to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

"Donation to Penal and Correctional Institutions

"SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other limitations as to the disposal of surplus commodities acquired through price support operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest, and upon application, to donate food commodities acquired through price support operations to Federal penal and correctional institutions, and to State correctional institutions for minors, other than those in which food service is provided for inmates on a fee, contract, or concession basis.

"Federal Irrigation, Drainage, and Flood-Control Projects

"SEC. 310. (a) For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act, no agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with subsection (c) to be in surplus supply shall receive any crop loans or federal farm payments or benefits if grown on any newly irrigated or drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized unless such lands were used for the production of such commodity prior to the enactment of this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be included, in all irrigation, drainage, or flood-control contracts entered into with respect to Federal irrigation, drainage, or flood-control projects hereafter authorized, such provisions as they may deem necessary to provide for the enforcement of the provisions of this section. For a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed by flood-control projects hereafter authorized and the lands so reclaimed shall be ineligible for any benefits under the soil-bank provisions of this Act and under price support legislation.

"(c) On or before October 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and proclaim the agricultural commodities the supplies of which are in excess of estimated requirements for domestic consumption and export plus adequate reserves for emergencies. The commodities so proclaimed shall be considered to be in surplus supply for the purposes of this section during the succeeding crop year.

"(d) For the purposes of this section the term 'Federal irrigation or drainage project' means any irrigation or drainage project subject to the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) in effect at the date of the adoption of this amendment and any irrigation or drainage project subject to the laws relating to irrigation and drainage administered by the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture.

"Processing of Donated Food Commodities

"SEC. 311. Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: 'In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible.'

"TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

"Extension of Surrender and Reapportionment Provisions for Wheat Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 401. Section 334 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out '1955' wherever it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof '1955, 1956, or 1957'.

"Acreage Allotments for Cotton for 1957 and 1958

"SEC. 402. Section 342 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the national marketing quota for cotton for 1957 and 1958 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment for 1957 and 1958 equal to the national acreage allotment for 1956'.

"Cotton—Small Farm Allotments

"SEC. 403. (a) Section 344 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That there is hereby established a national acreage reserve consisting of one hundred thousand acres which shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment; and such reserve shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), as determined by the Secretary without regard to State and county acreage reserves (except that the amount apportioned to Nevada shall be one thousand acres), and the additional acreage so apportioned to the State shall be apportioned to the counties on the same basis and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 per centum of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreage). Additional acreage apportioned to a State for any year under the foregoing proviso shall not be taken into account in establishing future State acreage allotments. Needs for additional acreage under the foregoing proviso and under the last proviso in subsection (e) shall be determined as though allotments were first computed without regard to subsection (f) (1).'

"(b) Section 344 (e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That if the additional acreage allocated to a State under the proviso in subsection (b) is less than the requirements as determined by the Secretary for establishing minimum farm allotments for the State under subsection (f) (1), the acreage reserved by the State committee under this subsection shall not be less than the smaller of (1) the remaining acreage so determined to be required for establishing minimum farm allotments or (2) 3 per centum of the State acreage allotment; and the acreage which the State committee is required to reserve under this proviso shall be allocated to counties on the basis of their needs for additional acreage for establishing minimum farm allotments under subsection (f) (1), and added to the county acreage allotment for apportionment to farms pursuant to subsection (f) of this section (except that no part of such additional acreage shall be used to increase the county reserve above 15 per centum of the county allotment determined without regard to such additional acreages).'

"(c) Section 344 (f) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by changing paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"'(1) Insofar as such acreage is available, there shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) four acres; or (B) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any year of such three-year period'.

"(d) The first sentence of section 344 (f) (6) of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, if the county committee recommends such action and the Secretary determines that such action will result in a more equitable distribution of the county allotment among farms in the county, the remainder of the county acreage allotment (after making allotments as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection) shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment of such farm under paragraph (1) (A) of this subsection shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county) of the average acreage planted to cotton on the farm during the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined, adjusted as may be necessary for abnormal conditions affecting plantings during such three-year period: *Provided*, That the county committee may in its discretion limit any farm acreage allotment established under the provisions of this paragraph for any year to an acreage not in excess of 50 per centum of the cropland on the farm, as determined pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection: *Provided further*, That any part of the county acreage allotment not apportioned under this paragraph by reason of the initial application of such 50 per centum limitation shall be added to the county acreage reserve under paragraph (3) of this subsection and shall be available for the purposes specified therein.'

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective only with respect to 1957 and 1958 crops. For the 1956 crop, an acreage in each State equal to the acreage allotted in such State which the Secretary determines will not be planted, placed in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve, or considered as planted under section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, may be apportioned by the Secretary among farms in such State having allotments of less than the smaller of the following: (1) four acres, or (2) the highest number of acres planted to cotton in any of the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

"Minimum State Acreage Allotments for 1956 Rice Crop

"SEC. 404. Section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c) a new paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"'(5) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1956 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary, after adding thereto any acreage apportioned to farms in the State from the reserve acreage set aside pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, shall be increased by such amount as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment of not less than 85 per centum of its final allotment

established for 1955. Any additional acreage required to provide such minimum allotment shall be additional to the national acreage allotment. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1956, the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage.'

"Increase in Peanut Marketing Penalties

"SEC. 405. Effective beginning with the 1956 crop, section 359 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by amending the first sentence thereof to read as follows: 'The marketing of any peanuts in excess of the marketing quota for the farm on which such peanuts are produced, or the marketing of peanuts from any farm for which no acreage allotment was determined, shall be subject to a penalty at a rate equal to 75 per centum of the support price for peanuts for the marketing year (August 1–July 31).'

"Collection of Peanut Marketing Penalties

"SEC. 406. Section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding two new subsections as follows:

"'(d) The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty provided by this section shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"'(e) Until the amount of the penalty provided by this section is paid, a lien on the crop of peanuts with respect to which such penalty is incurred, and on any subsequent crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for payment of the penalty has an interest, shall be in effect in favor of the United States.'

"Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments

"SEC. 407. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 376 a new section as follows:

"'Preservation of Unused Acreage Allotments

"'SEC. 377. In any case in which, during any year within the period 1956 to 1959, inclusive, for which acreage allotments are in effect for any commodity under this Act, the acreage planted to such commodity on any farm is less than the acreage allotment for such farm, the entire acreage allotment for such farm shall be considered for purposes of future farm acreage allotments to have been planted to such commodity in such year, but only if the owner or operator of such farm notifies the county committee prior to the sixtieth day preceding the beginning of the marketing year for such commodity of his desire to preserve such allotment. This section shall not be applicable in any case in which the amount of the commodity required to be stored to postpone or avoid payment of penalty has been reduced because the allotment was not fully planted. Nothing herein shall be construed to permit the allotment to any other farm of the acreage with respect to which notice is given under this section.'

"Acreage Requirements for Price Support on Corn and Other Feed Grains

"SEC. 408. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever base acreages are in effect for corn, the Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support on corn, that the producer (1) devote an acreage of cropland (tilled in normal rotation), at the option of the producer, to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program, equal to 15 per centum of such producer's farm base acreage for corn, and (2) not exceed such farm base acreage for corn. Corn acreage allotments shall not be effective for the 1956 crop.

"(b) Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of producers of corn in 1956 in the commercial corn-producing area to determine whether such producers favor a price-support program as provided in subsection (c) of this section for the 1957 and subsequent crops in lieu of acreage allotments as provided in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and price support as provided in section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum conducted pursuant to subsection (b) hereof favor a price-support program as provided in this subsection (c), no acreage allotment of corn shall be established for the commercial corn-producing area, for any county, or for any farm, with respect to the 1957 and subsequent crops, and price support made available for such crops by Commodity Credit Corporation shall be at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each year in which an acreage reserve program will be in effect for corn, the level of price support for corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area shall be 85 per centum of the level of price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, and the level of price support for each of the commodities, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats, shall be a percentage of the parity price for each such commodity which is 5 percentage points less than the percentage of the parity price announced in advance of the planting season pursuant to section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, as the level of price support for corn in the commercial corn-producing area. The Secretary shall require as a condition of eligibility for price support of such feed grains (corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area, grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats) that the producer (1) except in the case of new feed grain farms, devote an acreage on the farm to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program equal to 15 per centum of the farm base acreage established for such feed grains under section 203 (c) hereof, and (2) not plant a total acreage of such feed grains on the farm in excess of 85 percentum of such farm base acreage for feed grains. The acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for feed grains or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for such feed grains shall be in addition to any acreage required to be devoted to either the acreage reserve program for corn or the conservation reserve program as a condition of eligibility for price support for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area. Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at the levels announced prior to the enactment of this subsection, and for the 1956 crop of corn produced outside the commercial corn-producing area at 75 per centum of the level for corn produced in the commercial corn-producing area, to any producer who meets the requirements of eligibility therefor but who does not meet the additional requirements for price support prescribed by this subsection.

"TITLE V—PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR WHEAT AND RICE

"SEC. 501. Title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by changing the designation thereof to read as follows: 'Title III—Loans, Parity Payments, Consumer Safeguards, Marketing Quotas, and Marketing Certificates'; (2) by changing the designation of subtitle D thereof to read as follows: 'Subtitle F— Miscellaneous provisions and appropriations'; and (3) by inserting after subtitle C new subtitles D and E, as follows:

"'*Subtitle D—Domestic parity plan for wheat*

"'Legislative Findings

"'SEC. 379a. Wheat, in addition to being a basic food, is one of the great export crops of American agriculture and its production for domestic consumption and for export is essential to the maintenance of a sound national economy and to the general welfare. The movement of wheat from producer to consumer, in the form of the commodity or any of the products thereof, is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce. That small percentage of wheat which is produced and consumed within the confines of any State is normally commingled with, and always bears a close and intimate commercial and competitive relationship to, that quantity of such commodity which moves in interstate and foreign commerce. For this reason, any regulation of intrastate commerce in wheat is a regulation of commerce which is in competition with, or which otherwise affects, obstructs, or burdens, interstate commerce in that commodity. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of wheat in interstate and foreign commerce and thereby assist farmers in obtaining parity of income by marketing wheat for domestic consumption at parity prices and by increased exports at world prices, and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of wheat at fair prices, it is necessary to regulate all commerce in wheat in the manner provided under the marketing certificate plan set forth in this subtitle.

"'Domestic Food Quota

"'SEC. 379b. Not later than May 15 of each calendar year the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the domestic food quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Such domestic food quota shall be that number of bushels of wheat which the Secretary determines will be consumed as human food in the continental United States during such marketing year.

"'Apportionment of Domestic Food Quota

"'SEC. 379c. (a) The domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 1 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in this subsection, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of total production of wheat in each State during the ten calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed, with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs, for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in production during such period. The reserve quota set aside herein for apportionment by the Secretary shall be used to establish quotas for counties, in addition to the county quotas established under subsection (b) of this section, on the basis of the relative needs of counties for additional quota because of reclamation and other new areas coming into the production of wheat during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed.

"'(b) The State domestic food quota for wheat, less a reserve of not to exceed 3 per centum thereof for apportionment as provided in subsection (c), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the counties in the State on the basis of the total production of wheat in each county during the ten calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed,

with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary for the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs, for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in production during such period.

"'(c) The county domestic food quota for wheat shall be apportioned by the Secretary, through the local committees, among the farms within the county on which wheat has been seeded for the production of wheat during any one or more of the three calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the marketing year for which the quota is proclaimed begins, on the basis of past acreage of wheat, the normal yield, crop rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The reserve provided under subsection (b) shall be used to adjust farm quotas which the county committee determines to be inequitable on the basis of past acreage, if any, planted to wheat and the normal yield for such farm or the average of the county tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography.

"'Marketing Certificates

"'SEC. 379d. (a) Beginning with the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j, the Secretary shall prepare for issuance in each county marketing certificates aggregating the amount of the county domestic food quota. Such certificates shall be issued to cooperators in an amount equal to the domestic food quota established for the farm pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 379c of this Act. The marketing certificates for a farm shall be issued to the farm operator, but the Secretary may authorize the issuance of marketing certificates to individual producers on any farm on the basis of their respective shares in the wheat crop, or the proceeds thereof, produced on the farm. The Secretary shall also issue and sell marketing certificates to processors and importers in such quantities as are required by them in order to meet the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 379e. Marketing certificates shall be transferable only in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary.

"'(b) Whenever a domestic food quota is proclaimed for any marketing year pursuant to section 379b of this Act, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim for such marketing year (1) the estimated parity price, (2) the estimated farm price for wheat, and (3) the value per bushel of the marketing certificate. The value of the marketing certificate shall be equal to the amount by which the estimated parity price exceeds the estimated farm price as determined herein. The value of each marketing certificate shall be computed to the nearest cent by multiplying the value per bushel by the number of bushels thereof. Except as otherwise provided herein, the value of the certificate so determined shall remain constant and shall remain in effect throughout the marketing year for which it is issued. The proclamation required by this subsection shall be made during the month of May immediately preceding the marketing year for which such domestic food quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates issued for any marketing year at the value proclaimed pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. For the purpose of facilitating the purchase and sale of certificates, the Secretary may establish and operate a pool or pools and he may also authorize public and private agencies to act as his agents, either directly or through the pool or pools. Certificates shall be valid to cover sales and importations of products made during the marketing year with respect to which they are issued and after being once used to cover such sales and importations shall be canceled by the Secretary. Any unused certificates shall be redeemed by the Secretary at the price established for such certificates.

"'Marketing Restrictions

"'SEC. 379e. (a) Beginning with the first day of the marketing year in which the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j would normally be marketed, and except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons engaged in the processing of wheat into food products composed wholly or partly of wheat are hereby prohibited from marketing any such product for domestic food consumption or export containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act have been acquired by such person. The quantity of such marketing certificates acquired shall be equivalent to the number of bushels of wheat processed into food products.

"'(b) Beginning with the first day of the marketing year in which the first crop of wheat for which a marketing certificate program is placed in effect under section 379j would normally be marketed and except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, all persons are hereby prohibited from importing or bringing into the continental United States any food products containing wheat in excess of the quantity for which marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act have been acquired by such person.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the continental United States of any food product containing wheat, with respect to which marketing certificates as required herein have been acquired, the Secretary shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the quantity of wheat so exported in the food product. For the purposes of this subsection, the consignor named in the bill of lading, under which the article is exported, shall be considered the exporter: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives claim in favor of such other person.

"'(d) Upon the giving of a bond satisfactory to the Secretary under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe to secure the purchase of and payment for such marketing certificates as may be required, any person required to have a marketing certificate in order to market or import a food product composed wholly or partly of wheat may market or import any such commodity without having first acquired a marketing certificate.

"'(e) As used in this section, (1) the term "marketing" means the sale and the delivery of the food product composed wholly or partly of wheat, and (2) the term "food" means human food.

"'Conversion Factors

"'SEC. 379f. The Secretary shall ascertain and establish conversion factors showing the amount of wheat contained in food products processed wholly or partly from wheat. The conversion factor for any such product shall be determined upon the basis of the weight of wheat used in the processing of such product.

"'Civil Penalties

"'SEC. 379g. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of section 379e of this Act shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'Adjustments in Domestic Food Quotas

"'SEC. 379h. If the Secretary has reason to believe that because of a national emergency or because of a material increase in demand for wheat, the domestic food quota for wheat should be increased or suspended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made to determine whether the increase or suspension is necessary in order to meet such emergency or increase in the demand for wheat. If, on the basis of such investigation, the Secretary finds that such increase or suspension is necessary, he shall immediately proclaim such finding (and if he finds an increase is necessary, the amount of the increase found by him to be necessary) and thereupon such quotas shall be increased or shall be suspended, as the case may be. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is increased under this section, each farm quota for wheat shall be increased in the same ratio and marketing certificates shall be issued therefor in accordance with section 379d of this Act. In case any domestic food quota for wheat is suspended under this section, the Secretary may redetermine the value of marketing certificates issued pursuant to section 379d of this Act.

"'Reports and Records

"'SEC. 379i. (a) The provisions of section 373 (a) of this Act shall apply to all persons, except wheat producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the Act shall apply to all wheat farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'Referendum

"'SEC. 379j. In any referendum held pursuant to section 336 of this Act on the national marketing quota proclaimed for any crop of wheat, the Secretary shall also submit on separate ballots the question whether farmers favor a marketing certificate program under this subtitle in lieu of marketing quotas under subtitle B. If more than two-thirds of the farmers voting in the referendum favor such marketing certificate program, the Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of the national marketing quota proclaimed under subtitle B, suspend the operation of such quota and place into effect a marketing certificate program for that crop and subsequent wheat crops under the provisions of this subtitle, in which event marketing quotas and acreage allotments and the provisions of title III of this Act relating thereto, except as otherwise provided in this section, shall not thereafter be in effect for wheat: *Provided,* That, whenever a marketing certificate program is in effect, the wheat marketing quota provisions and penalties shall remain in effect with respect to prior crops of wheat in the same manner as if marketing quotas were in effect for the current crop of wheat, and the Secretary may, by regulation, prescribe the method for collecting penalties on any such wheat.

"'Price Support

"'SEC. 379k. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"'(a) Whenever a wheat marketing certificate program under this subtitle is in effect, price support for wheat shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section.

"'(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make available through loans, purchases, or other operations, price support to producers of wheat who are cooperators. The amount, terms, conditions, and extent of such price-support operations shall

be determined by the Secretary, except that the level of such support shall be determined after taking into consideration the following factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which corn and other feed grains are being supported and the feed value of such grains in relation to wheat, (3) the provisions of any international agreement approved by the Congress or ratified by the Senate relating to wheat to which the United States is a party, (4) foreign trade policies of friendly wheat exporting countries, and (5) other factors affecting international trade in wheat including exchange rates and currency regulations.

"'(c) Compliance by the producer with acreage allotments may be prescribed and required by the Secretary as a condition of eligibility for price support and for the receipt of wheat marketing certificates. Acreage allotments shall be established in accordance with the provisions of subtitle B, part III of this Act.

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no producer of wheat shall receive certificates for a number of bushels in excess of the number obtained by multiplying the acreage actually planted to wheat by the normal yield.

"'(e) Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm acreage allotment may have such acreage allotment reviewed in accordance with the procedures prescribed by sections 363 to 368, inclusive, for reviewing marketing quotas.

"'*Subtitle E—Rice certificates*

"'Legislative Findings

"'SEC. 380a. The movement of rice from producer to consumer is preponderantly in interstate and foreign commerce, and the small quantity of rice which does not move in interstate or foreign commerce affects such commerce. In order to provide an adequate and balanced flow of rice in interstate and foreign commerce and to assure consumers an adequate and steady supply of rice at fair prices it is necessary to regulate all commerce in rice in the manner provided in this subtitle. These findings are supplemental to and in addition to the findings contained in section 351 of this Act.

"'Effective Date and Termination

"'SEC. 380b. The provisions of this subtitle, unless extended by law, shall apply only to the crops of rice harvested prior to 1958, and sections 380c through 380g (c) shall not be applicable to rice harvested before 1956. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the national acreage allotment of rice for 1957 shall be not less than the national acreage allotment for 1956, including any acreage allotted under section 353 (c) (5) of this Act, and such 1957 national allotment shall be apportioned among the States in the same proportion that they shared in the total acreage allotted in 1956.

"'Rice Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380c. Not later than December 31 of each year, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim the primary market quota for rice for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year, except that for the marketing year beginning in 1956 such determination and proclamation shall be made not later than thirty days after the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1956. The primary market quota shall be the number of hundredweights of rice (on a rough rice basis) which the Secretary determines will be consumed in the United States (including its Territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) or exported to Cuba, during such marketing year. In making this determination the Secretary shall consider the historical consumption in these markets of rice produced in the United States and any expected enlargement in such consumption predicated upon population trends, increased per capita consumption, and other relevant factors.

"'Apportionment of Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380d. (a) The primary market quota for rice shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the average yield per acre of rice in each State during the three years immediately preceding the year for which the quota is proclaimed (or in the case of the apportionment for 1957, during the two years preceding such year) multiplied by the acreage allotment of such State for such year. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the primary market quota for rice shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States for the marketing year beginning in 1956 on the basis of the 1955 production of rice in each State.

"'(b) The State primary market quota shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms on the basis of the acreage allotment established for each farm multiplied by the normal yield per acre for the farm.

"'Review of Primary Market Quota

"'SEC. 380e. Notice of the primary market quota shall be mailed to the operator of the farm to which such quota applies. The farm operator may have such quota reviewed in accordance with the provisions of sections 363 to 368, inclusive, of this Act.

"'Price Support

"'SEC. 380f. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make price support available to cooperators through loans, purchases, or other operations on the 1956 crop of rice at not less than 55 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year and on the 1957 and subsequent crops of rice at such level, not less than 50 per centum or more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor, as the Secretary determines will not discourage or prevent the exportation of rice produced in the United States.

"'(b) Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, shall not apply to price support made available on rice of the 1956 and 1957 crops, but all the other provisions of such Act, to the extent not inconsistent with this subtitle, shall apply to price support operations carried out under this section.

"'Certificates

"'SEC. 380g. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall for each marketing year issue certificates to cooperators for a quantity of rice equal to the primary marketing quota for the farm for such marketing year, but not exceeding the normal yield of the acreage planted to rice on the farm. The certificate shall have the value specified in subsection (e) of this section.

"'(b) The landlord, tenants, and sharecroppers on the farm shall share in the certificates issued with respect to the farm in the same proportion as they share in the rice produced on the farm or the proceeds therefrom.

"'(c) The provisions of section 385 of this Act shall be applicable to certificates issued to producers under this section.

"'(d) The Commodity Credit Corporation shall issue and sell certificates to persons engaged in the processing of rough rice or the importing of processed rice. Each such certificate shall be sold for an amount equal to the value thereof, as specified in subsection (e) of this section.

"'(e) The value of each certificate issued under this section shall be equal to the difference between 90 per centum of the parity price of rice as of the beginning of the marketing year for which the certificate is issued and the level of price support for rice which is in effect during such marketing year, calculated to the nearest cent, multiplied by the quantity of rice for which the certificate is issued. Any certificates not used to cover the processing of rice or the importation of processed rice pursuant to sections 380k and 380l of this Act shall be redeemed by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the value thereof.

"'Inventory Adjustment Payments

"'SEC. 380h. To facilitate the transition from the price support program currently in effect to the program provided for in this subtitle, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make inventory adjustment payments to all persons owning rough rice located in the continental United States as of July 31, 1956, in amounts equal to the amount by which 80 per centum of the parity price of rice as of August 1, 1955, exceeds the support price for the 1956 crop of rice, multiplied by the quantities of such rough rice: *Provided, however,* That such payments shall not be made with respect to rice of the 1956 crop, imported rice, or rice acquired from Commodity Credit Corporation. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payment to Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures pursuant to this section.

"'Rice Set-Aside

"'SEC. 380i. All rough and processed rice in the inventories of Commodity Credit Corporation as of sixty days after the beginning of the 1956 marketing year, not exceeding twenty million hundredweight of rough rice or its equivalent in processed rice may be transferred to and be made a part of the commodity set-aside of rice established pursuant to section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

"'Exemptions

"'SEC. 380j. The provisions of this subtitle shall not apply to nonirrigated rice produced on any farm on which the acreage planted to nonirrigated rice does not exceed three acres, and the provisions of sections 380c through 380g (c) shall not apply to rice produced in Puerto Rico or Hawaii.

"'Processing Restrictions

"'SEC. 380k. (a) Each person who on or after August 1, 1956, engages in the processing of rough rice in the United States shall, upon processing any quantity of rough rice, acquire certificates issued under section 380g of this Act in an amount sufficient to cover such quantity of rough rice.

"'(b) The requirements of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to the processing in Puerto Rico or Hawaii of rough rice grown in Puerto Rico or Hawaii, respectively.

"'(c) Upon the exportation from the United States to any country other than Cuba of any processed rice with respect to which certificates were acquired in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section or section 380l, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall pay to the exporter an amount equal to the value of the certificates for the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice.

"'Import Restrictions

"'SEC. 380l. Each person who, on or after August 1, 1956, imports processed rice into the United States shall acquire certificates issued under section 380g of this Act covering the rough rice equivalent of such processed rice.

"'Regulations

"'SEC. 380m. The Secretary shall prescribe regulations governing the issuance, redemption, acquisition, use, transfer, and disposition of certificates hereunder.

"'Civil Penalties

"'SEC. 380n. Any person who violates or attempts to violate, or who participates or aids in the violation of, any of the provisions of sections 380k or 380l of this Act, or regulations prescribed by the Secretary for the

enforcement of such provisions, shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to three times the market value, at the time of the commission of such act, of the product involved in such violation. Such forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States.

"'Reports and Records

"'SEC. 380o. (a) The provisions of section 373 (a) of this Act shall apply to all persons, except rice producers, who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle, except that any such person failing to make any report or keep any record as required by this section or making any false report or record shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be subject to a fine of not more than $2,000 for each such violation.

"'(b) The provisions of section 373 (b) of the Act shall apply to all rice farmers who are subject to the provisions of this subtitle.

"'Definitions

"'SEC. 380p. For the purposes of this sutitle—

"'(a) "cooperator" shall have the same meaning as under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

"'(b) "processing of rough rice" means subjecting rough rice for the first time to any process which removes the husk or hull from the rice and results in the production of processed rice.

"'(c) "processed rice" means any rice from which the husk or hull has been removed and includes, but is not limited to—

"'(1) whole grain rice,

"'(2) second head milled rice,

"'(3) screenings milled rice,

"'(4) brewers milled rice,

"'(5) undermilled rice or unpolished rice,

"'(6) brown rice,

"'(7) converted rice, malekized rice or parboiled rice, and

"'(8) vitaminized rice or enriched rice.

"'(d) "United States" means the several States, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"'(e) "exporter" means the consignor named in the bill of lading under which the processed rice is exported: *Provided, however,* That any other person may be considered to be the exporter if the consignor named in the bill of lading waives his claim in favor of such other person.

"'(f) "rough rice equivalent" means the quantity of rough rice normally used (as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture) in the production of a particular quantity of processed rice, but shall not be more than one hundred pounds of rough rice for each sixty-eight pounds of processed rice.

"'(g) "import" means to enter, or withdraw from warehouse, for consumption.'

"Normal Yield for Rice

"SEC. 502. Paragraph (13) of section 301 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by (1) redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (G); and (2) striking out subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(D) "Normal yield" for any county, in the case of rice, shall be the average yield per acre of rice for the county during the five calendar years immediately preceding the year for which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in yields. If for any such year data are not available, or there is no actual yield, an appraised yield for such year, determined in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, taking into consideration the yields obtained in surrounding counties during such year and the yield in years for which data are available, shall be used as the actual yield for such year.

"'(E) "Normal yield" for any farm, in the case of rice, shall be the average yield per acre of rice for the farm during the five calendar years immediately preceding the year for which such normal yield is determined, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in yields. If for any such year the data are not available or there is no actual yield, then the normal yield for the farm shall be appraised in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, taking into consideration abnormal weather conditions, trends in yields, the normal yield for the county, the yields obtained on adjacent farms during such year and the yield in years for which data are available.

"'(F) In applying subparagraphs (D) and (E), if on account of drought, flood, insect pests, plant disease, or other uncontrollable natural cause, the yield for any year of such five-year period is less than 75 per centum of the average, 75 percentum of such average shall be substituted therefor in calculating the normal yield per acre. If, on account of abnormally favorable weather conditions, the yield for any year of such five-year period is in excess of 125 per centum of the average, 125 per centum of such average shall be substituted therefor in calculating the normal yield per acre.'

"TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

"Assistance to States for Tree Planting and Reforestation

"SEC. 601. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that building up and maintaining a level of timber growing stocks adequate to meet the Nation's domestic needs for a dependable future supply of industrial wood is essential to the public welfare and security; that assisting in improving and protecting the more than fifty million acres of idle non-Federal and Federal lands for this purpose would not only add to the economic strength of the Nation, but also bring increased public benefits from other values associated with forest cover; and that it is the policy of the Congress that the Secretary of Agriculture in order to encourage, promote, and assure fully adequate future resources of readily available timber should assist the States in undertaking needed programs of tree planting.

"(b) Any State forester or equivalent State official may submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a plan for forest land tree planting and reforestation for the purpose of effecting the policy hereinbefore stated.

"(c) When the Secretary of Agriculture has approved the plan, he is hereby authorized and directed to assist the State in carrying out such plan, which assistance may include giving of advice and technical assistance and furnishing financial contributions: *Provided,* That, for the non-Federal forest land tree planting and reforestation, the financial contribution expended by the Federal Government during any fiscal year to assist the State to carry out the plan shall not exceed the amount expended by the State for the same purposes during the same fiscal year, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make financial contributions on the certificate of the State official in charge of the administration of the plan as to the amount of expenditures made by the State.

"(d) In any plan that coordinates forest lands under the jurisdiction of any Federal agency other than the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture shall obtain the cooperation and assistance of the Federal agency having jurisdiction and the appropriate State forester in the approval and carrying out of the plan.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the objects of this section, such sums to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

H. R. 12 passed the House on May 5, 1955. It consisted of 4 sections: (1) Establishing price supports for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity for the years 1955, 1956, and 1957; (2) establishing the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity; and (3) and (4) extending and providing additional funds for the special school milk program and the brucellosis eradication program. The Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted an amendment consisting of 62 sections comprising some 77 printed pages. The task facing the conferees of reconciling the differences between these two measures has been substantial, particularly since some of the more complicated provisions of the Senate amendment were adopted on the floor without the opportunity for testimony and explanation which takes place in the process of committee consideration.

The committee of conference has reworked the Senate amendment section by section and the bill reported herewith is the Senate amendment with numerous changes and amendments agreed upon by the conferees. The major provisions are: (1) price-support provisions for basic commodities, cottonseed and soybeans, milk, and feed grains; (2) restoration of "dual parity" for basic commodities; (3) authority for a "soil bank" program; (4) various provisions to assist in disposal of surplus commodities including authority to donate such commodities to Federal penal institutions and State penal institutions for minors, substantial additional appropriations to supplement "Section 32" operations, and a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to study and report promptly to Congress on other disposal programs, including a food stamp plan; (5) various provisions relating to acreage allotments and marketing quotas for commodities, chiefly designed to assist the small farm operator; (6) a domestic parity program for wheat and a "two-price" program for rice; and (7) authority for further assistance to States in forestry programs. Following is an explanation of the major provisions of the bill as reported herewith to the House.

Section 101. Price support levels on basic commodities

Establishes the support level for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity for the 1956 crop. The House bill provided support at 90 percent for 3 years. The Senate rejected the 90 percent support provisions but later significantly modified its action by adopting other provisions, including substantial additions to the "set-aside," which would have had the effect of requiring the Secretary to

establish support prices close to the 90 percent level. Under the provisions of the Senate bill it was estimated that the Secretary would have been required to support the basic commodities at the following levels for 1956; tobacco 90 percent, wheat 85 percent, cotton 88 percent, corn 84 percent, rice 90 percent on domestic consumption and not less than 55 percent on the balance, and peanuts 90 percent.

The committee of conference was agreed that falling farm prices, coupled with rising production costs, have created a crisis in farm income that may well become a catastrophe unless strong and effective action is taken to bolster farm income in 1956. Rather than adopt any of the devious devices which have been proposed for raising the level of support prices by indirection (including the set-aside which has been so strongly condemned by the Secretary of Agriculture), the committee of conference agreed that the most effective way of accomplishing this purpose is the simple and straightforward procedure adopted in the conference report of establishing price support levels for the basic commodities at not less than 90 percent of parity for 1956.

Section 102. Price supports—Cottonseed and soybeans

Requires that when the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the price of the other of these closely related crops shall be supported at a comparable level.

Section 103. Price supports—Manufacturing milk

Establishes the support level for milk at 80 to 90 percent of parity (instead of 75 to 90 percent as provided in existing law) and further provides that for the marketing year ending March 31, 1957, the price of milk for manufacturing purposes and price of butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively. This provision replaces a complicated formula for establishing the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk which had been placed in the Senate amendment.

The price of $3.25 per hundredweight for milk for manufacturing (3.95 percent butterfat) is 85 percent of the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing. This is 10 cents per hundredweight higher than the $3.15 support price announced by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 14, 1956. The $3.15 support price is 82 percent of the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for milk for manufacturing.

To accomplish this 10 cent per hundredweight increase in the price of milk for manufacturing by increasing the purchase price of butter would require an increase of 2 cents per pound in the price of butter, which is equivalent to 2.4 cents per pound in the price of butterfat. Adding this 2.4 cents to the 56.2 cents announced support price for butterfat in cream would result in a support price of 58.6 cents per pound. This would be 82 percent of the parity price of butterfat in cream as compared with the February 14, 1956, announced level of 78 percent.

Although the committee amendment omits from the first sentence of section 201 (c) the words "and the products of such commodities", it does not change the present method of supporting milk and butterfat prices through "loans on, or purchases of, milk and the products of milk and butterfat" as provided in the second sentence of the subsection.

Section 104. Parity formula

Provides that the dual method of computing parity for the basic commodities (using both the old and the new parity formula) which has been in effect for the basics from 1949 until this year, is to be used henceforth. The section also recognizes the possibility of shortcomings in both of our existing methods of computing parity and directs the Secretary to make a thorough study of this subject and report thereon to Congress not later than January 31, 1957, with specific recommendations, including drafts of any necessary legislation, for the improvement of our parity system.

Section 105. Effective date

Makes all the foregoing provisions effective with 1956 crops.

TITLE II—SOIL BANK ACT (SECS. 201–227)

Title II comprises the Soil Bank Act. The provisions in the committee report are only slightly modified from those adopted by the Senate which are described in some detail in the committee report on S. 3183 (S. Rept. 1484) on pages 8 to 20. The provisions adopted by the Senate were, in turn, based upon and only slightly modified from the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The soil-bank program authorized in title II consists of two parts: The acreage-reserve program (secs. 203 to 206) and the conservation reserve program (secs. 207 to 214). Sections 215 to 227 are general provisions applying to either or both the conservation reserve and the acreage-reserve programs.

Sections 203–206. Acreage-reserve program

The acreage-reserve program is not a soil-conservation measure but a short-term program designed to curtail production of specific commodities even below the anticipated production from allotment programs. It is authorized only for the 4 crop years 1956–59. It applies only to specified commodities: wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, most kinds of tobacco, and the feed grains (oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, and corn grown in noncommercial corn areas).

The objective of the acreage-reserve program is to induce farmers to reduce their acreages below their allotments or base acreages and to make no other use of the land so retired. The farmer who thus curtails his production will be paid an amount roughly equivalent to his anticipated return from the land had he put it to its intended purpose.

A special provision inserted in the bill by the committee will make it possible for the farmer to participate in the 1956 program even though he may already have planted his 1956 crops or may have been prevented from planting his normal crops because of adverse weather conditions. This latter provision was inserted in order to care for the condition which now exists in a vast area, particularly in the Southwest, where drought has prevented normal planting operations, and it is intended that the farmer who has not been able to plant and has not, therefore, planted will, nonetheless, be allowed to participate in the acreage reserve for 1956.

In general, the rate of payment will be approximately 50 percent of the price support for that quantity of the commodity which would normally be produced on the land placed into the acreage reserve. The specific rate of payment will, of course, vary from commodity to commodity and in different areas, but will be required to be in such amounts as will make the program attractive to farmers. Payment will be made in negotiable certificates redeemable in cash by the Commodity Credit Corporation or, in the case of grains, redeemable in grain at the option of the producer.

The committee proved that in case of unusual weather conditions resulting from either drought, flood, hail, wind, or other natural causes, the Secretary should make adjustments in calculating the normal yield for each farm. The committee was informed by representatives of the Department that the practice would be to eliminate the record of years of abnormally low production in calculating the normal yield for the farm for soil-bank-payment purposes, as well as in the calculation of acreage history of the farm for the determination of acreage allotment or farm base acreage.

The total amount which may be expended on the acreage-reserve program in any one year is $750,000,000. To assure a fair division of funds between the various commodities, the committee has also established maximums for the separate crops: Wheat, $375,000,000; corn, $300,000,000; cotton, $300,000,000; tobacco, $45,000,000; rice, $23,000,000; peanuts, $7,000,000; and feed grains, $175,000,000. The individual commodity limitations add up to more than the overall limit of $750,000,000 in order to permit adjustment of commodity programs to meet operating conditions but to not have the effect of increasing the overall limitation of $750,000,000. The conferees struck out of the Senate amendment a provision which would have limited payments to any one producer to not to exceed $25,000. Also eliminated from the Senate amendment was a provision which would have denied all price supports to a producer who did not participate in the acreage reserve.

The amount of acreage a producer will be permitted to put into the conservation reserve will vary by commodities but generally the program as tentatively formulated by the Department of Agriculture will permit farmers with small acreage allotments to put their entire allotment into the acreage reserve while those with larger allotments will be limited to a maximum percentage of their allotment. For example, a producer with a grain allotment would be permitted to put into the reserve 50 acres or 50 percent of his allotment, whichever is larger. Thus, any farmer with a grain allotment of less than 50 acres could place his entire allotment in the acreage reserve if he chose to do so. In addition, there is nothing in the legislation herewith reported which would prevent a small farmer from putting his maximum allowable acreage in the acreage reserve and then placing the balance of his land in the conservation reserve, providing regulations of the Secretary permit such action.

Preliminary and still tentative estimates of the payments per acre for the various crops or acreage put into the acreage reserve are as follows: Cotton, $48–$60; wheat, $18–$25; corn, $36–$50; rice, $60–$75; peanuts, $50–$70; tobacco, $100–$300; and feed grains, $15–$50. It should be emphasized that these figures are not only tentative, they are national average figures based upon the national average yield per acre of the various crops. The rate of payment an individual farmer can expect will be based not only upon these national average figures but upon the normal yield per acre of the land he is placing into the conservation reserve and other local factors. The two basic principles with respect to payment are: (1) That the rate of payment should generally reflect the actual net income the farmer might expect to receive from the acreage had he planted it to the allotted crop and (2) that rates of payment are to be attractive enough to encourage farmers to place substantial acreages into the acreage reserve and thereby curtail production below national allotments and marketing quotas.

At the request of the committee of conference the Department of Agriculture has made available its latest administrative memorandum on this matter, now being used as the basis for further consultation with State and county committees. The memorandum is printed herewith as appendix A.

Sections 207–214. Conservation reserve program

The conservation reserve program (secs. 207–214) is designed to take out of the production of crops and put into a conservation status on a semipermanent basis specified acreages of land. Croplands, including lands now being devoted to such soil-conserving

crops as tame hay, alfalfa, and clover, are eligible for the conservation reserve. Section 207 (a) (2) of the Senate amendment would have required a producer putting such soil-conserving croplands into the conservation reserve to increase the acreage devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on his remaining land to that previously devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on the entire farm. The conference substitute would change this to require the producer to devote to soil-conserving crops or idleness only an acreage of his remaining land equal to that previously devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle on such remaining land. Thus a producer who normally had 100 acres of tame hay and 10 acres each of oats and barley could put 40 acres of tame hay land into the conservation reserve without being required to reduce his acreage of oats or barley. He would be required to maintain in soil-conserving crops or leave idle that acreage of his land outside the conservation reserve which had previously been devoted to soil-conserving crops or left idle (namely, 60 acres), but he would not be required to increase such acreage by reason of having put 40 acres of tame hay into the conservation reserve.

The program would be carried out on the basis of contracts entered into between the Secretary of Agriculture and the producer. Contract periods would be for not less than 3 years nor more than 10 (except for forestation areas where the period could run for 15 years). In return for the producer agreeing, among other things, not to harvest any crop nor graze the land in the conservation reserve, the Secretary would pay a large part (estimated at approximately 80 percent) of the cost of establishing conservation practices on the land and would pay thereafter an annual amount to the producer roughly equivalent to the rental value of the land.

The total amount of expenditures for the conservation program in any one year is limited to $450,000,000, including the materials and services provided to assist farmers in establishing conservation practices on the land put into the reserve. A provision in the Senate bill which would have limited payments in any year to any producer to not more than $7,500 was removed from the bill by the conference.

Sections 215–227. General provisions

Sections 215–227 contain general provisions relating to the soil-bank program. These provide: (1) No person will be eligible for soil-bank payments in any year in which he exceeds his farm-acreage allotment for any commodity; (2) a prohibition against the reapportionment to any other producer of acreage placed in the acreage reserve or conservation reserve; (3) authority for the Secretary to make payments under the program upon satisfactory proof by the producer that he has complied with his part of the contract; (4) the requirement that in carrying out the program the Secretary make use of local and state ASC committees, other appropriate state and federal agencies, and of the land use capability data developed by the Soil Conservation Service; (5) the provision that until July 1, 1957, the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used for carrying out the soil-bank program but that after that date such funds must come from regular appropriations. This provision does not limit the authority elsewhere conferred for the Secretary to make contracts under the soil-bank program for periods of more than 1 year.

Special provisions

In its endeavor to make the soil-bank program not only practical and successful from the standpoint of conservation and surplus reduction but also one which will be outstandingly fair and equitable to all who participate in it the committee of conference has made a number of changes, amendments, deletions, and additions of special provisions relating to the soil-bank program. Some of these which deserve special mention are:

Protection of tenants and sharecroppers: No single problem connected with the proposed soil bank has caused the committee more concern than that of guaranteeing adequate protection of tenants and sharecroppers under the program. Several provisions referring to tenants and sharecroppers and intended to protect their interests, while at the same time safeguarding the interests of landlords, were scattered throughout the soil-bank portion of the Senate bill. After the most careful consideration, the committee considered them inadequate to afford the protection desired. The committee tried for many hours to devise a specific formula or direction to the Secretary of Agriculture covering the landlord-tenant-sharecropper relationship which would assure by specific legal provision fair treatment of all concerned. It realizes, however, that these relationships are so different in various types of farming areas and in different geographic locations, and even from one farm to the next in the same area, that it is probably impossible to write into the law a formula for equitable sharing in benefits under the soil bank act which will work fairly in all the multitude of individual relationships of this type which exist.

After the most thorough consideration, therefore, the committee of conference reached the conclusion that the safest way to guarantee fair treatment of all participants in the soil bank program is to put into the law the general rules on which the division of benefits under this act is to be made, to require that each landlord in applying for participation in the program stipulate in detail how he proposes to share the benefits with his tenants or sharecroppers, and to require the county committee made up of farmers who are thoroughly familiar with local conditions to approve the proposed division of benefits before the farmer will be permitted to participate in the program. The stipulated and approved proposal for dividing the benefits will then be made a part of the contract and failure or refusal to carry out that provision would subject the producer to the penalties provided by the act.

Forfeiture of price supports benefits: The committee has stricken from the bill language appearing in two sections of the soil-bank title which would have authorized the Secretary to require forfeiture of all price-support benefits for violation of a soil-bank contract. This was a provision desired chiefly by livestock producers as a protection against a farmer placing land into the soil bank, receiving his payment therefor, and then using the land for grazing purposes.

The committee recognizes the problem faced by the livestock industry. Under the soil bank program, it is likely that millions of acres now in crops will be put into grass. The contract signed by the producer placing his acreage into the soil bank will prohibit the using of this land for grazing except under emergency conditions and with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture. Recognizing both that payments for participation in the soil bank probably cannot and should not be deferred until a full year's compliance can be checked, but also that after a farmer has received his payment and the grass on his regular pastures becomes short there will be a substantial temptation to put livestock on the soil-bank acreage in violation of the contract, the committee of conference still believes that the penalty provided in the Senate bill of forfeiture of all benefits under the price support programs is unduly excessive.

Instead, it urges the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the very adequate legal provisions relating to contract violation which remain in the bill, including the additional penalty of 50 percent which was added by the conference committee, to deal quickly and effectively with violators of soil-bank contracts and not to hesitate to resort to court action to enforce the penalties provided by the bill whenever that action seems justified. In addition, administrative regulations should provide as much certainty as is possible that the contract conditions have been and will continue to be adhered to before any payment for performance is made.

Appeal of terminated contract: The committee was not satisfied with the provisions in the bill relating to the right and the procedure of appeal by a producer from a decision by the Secretary terminating a soil-bank contract. The committee has completely rewritten this provision (sec. 207 (d)). As reported herewith it provides that where the State committee believes there has been a violation which would warrant termination of contract, the producer must be given written notice thereof by registered mail, and the producer will have the right within 30 days to appear at an informal proceeding before the county ASC committee to show cause why his contract should not be terminated. At the conclusion of such hearing the county committee will submit a report to the State committee and the producer has the right to appear before the State committee in connection with its determination of the issue.

The State committee must give the producer written notice of its decision in the matter and if the producer feels aggrieved he has the right of immediate appeal to the United States district court and for a trial de novo of the issue before such court.

Voluntary participation: Stricken from the bill is section 226 of the Senate amendment which would have required participation in the soil bank as a condition of eligibility for price support. The committee felt that the soil-bank program and the regular price support program, while they supplement and complement each other, are separate and distinct programs and that no new condition of eligibility for price support (except as to those commodities for which new price support programs directly related to the soil bank are set up in the bill) should be imposed by the soil-bank program.

The soil-bank provisions require that to be eligible for payment under the program a producer must be in compliance with all acreage allotments. In addition, each of the allotment and marketing quota programs carries its own penalty for failure to comply. Removal of section 226 from the bill will make the soil bank a strictly voluntary program, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Tree seedlings: In section 211 the Secretary is authorized to "purchase or produce" conservation materials. The word "produce" is retained in the section for the single purpose of permitting the Department of Agriculture to grow seedling trees for reforestation purposes—and then only to the extent of utilizing existing departmental nursery facilities—or to supply a definite deficiency that cannot be filled by private nurseries. It is not the intention of the committee to put the Department into the seedling producing business, but rather, that seedlings for the soil-bank program should be purchased from private sources to the full extent that such sources are capable of meeting the demand at competitive prices.

Production on Government-owned lands: Section 225 would have prohibited the leasing hereafter, or the renewal or extension of any existing lease, for the production on Government-owned lands of any agricultural commodity determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus supply. As enacted by the Senate the provisions of the section would have been extremely difficult to administer and would have required of the Secretary a separate determination as to the

surplus position of each agricultural commodity.

It is the understanding of the committee that the President has received or is about to receive from a committee appointed by him the report on a thorough study of this problem with recommendations as to its solution. In place of the language in the Senate bill, therefore, the language adopted by the conferees directs the President to carry out a policy of restricting, insofar as practicable, the leasing of such lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

TITLE III—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

Section 301. Program of orderly liquidation

Requires the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its existing authority to dispose as rapidly as possible of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it. Requires the Secretary to submit a detailed program for such disposal and also for preventing the future accumulation of surpluses in the hands of CCC by adoption of a food-stamp plan or similar program, and also for strategic stockpiling of foodstuffs and other agricultural products both inside and outside the United States. These reports are to be made within 90 days after enactment of the act and to include specific legislative recommendations for their accomplishment.

Section 302. Extra long staple cotton

Subsection (a) as passed by the Senate provides that the existing import quota on extra long staple cotton established pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 shall, hereafter, cover the same types of cotton included in the original quota. The effect is to remove the exemption of cotton having a staple length of 1 1/16 inches and longer to bring such cotton back within the quota.

The import of cotton having a staple length of 1 1/16 inches and longer has increased from a level of about 7,000 bales in 1951 to an estimated 16,000 bales in 1955. During this same period, stocks of United States grown extra long staple have increased about 7 times. Any imports of extra long staple cotton above the established quota necessarily materially interferes with and tends to render ineffective the price-support program for United States grown extra long staple cotton.

This section was amended by the committee of conference to require that provision be made for the type of cotton being brought within the existing quota and that dates for the quota year conform to normal marketing practices. The present quota year (February 1 to January 31) conforms to the harvest and marketing season of the cotton now subject to quota control. Cotton stapling 1 1/16 inches and longer is harvested during the summer and is brought into the United States during the later summer and early fall. If the quota were filled at that time, importers of such cotton could not enter any such cotton into the United States until the next quota year. The amendment will require that appropriate provision be made so that importers of this type of cotton will have equal opportunity to import cotton within the quota.

Subsection (b) is the same as it was in the Senate bill except for a clarifying amendment. As amended, this section directs the Commodity Credit Corporation, beginning not later than August 1, 1956, to exercise its existing powers and authorities to encourage the sale for export at competitive world prices, its stocks of extra long staple cotton. These stocks currently amount to about 100,000 bales. The program directed by this section, together with the continued offering of any CCC cotton for domestic use in accordance with the provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949, as amended, will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation within a relatively few years to move its stocks of this type of cotton into consumption in an orderly manner.

Section 303. Agreements limiting imports

Authorizes the President, whenever he determines such action appropriate, to negotiate with foreign countries in an effort to obtain agreements to limit the export from any such country and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity (including, as does sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, products of agricultural commodities such as flour, dairy products, textile products, and other products manufactured or processed from agricultural commodities). In order to carry out any such agreement which may be entered into, the President is authorized to issue such regulations governing the importation of such articles as may be required or appropriate to carry out the arrangements made with such countries to prevent increases in imports of such commodities or products.

This section is desirable in view of section 302, which directs the disposal of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and of the general policies of the Department of Agriculture under which surplus agricultural commodities are made available in world markets at competitive prices which are generally below domestic price levels.

Unless there is some limitation on imports of products manufactured abroad from our surpluses, the sales program may well defeat its own purpose of expanding the total market for our agricultural products. It is the belief of the committee that this objective frequently can be accomplished through friendly negotiations, rather than taking recourse in the first instance under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. However, if it develops that the desired objective cannot be accomplished through negotiations, then it is the belief of the committee that appropriate action should be taken under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended. This section makes it clear that the authority conferred does not in any way limit or restrict the use of section 22.

Section 304. Appropriation to supplement section 32 funds

Authorizes the appropriation annually, beginning July 1, 1956, of not to exceed $500,000,000 to supplement operations under section 32, Public Law 320, 74th Congress, of which not to exceed 50 percent could be used for any one commodity or the products thereof.

Section 305. Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile

Directs the transfer to the supplemental stockpile of strategic materials acquired by CCC as the result of barter or exchange of agricultural products.

Section 306. Surplus Disposal Administrator

Authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture at an annual salary not exceeding $15,000. It is the understanding of the committee that the Secretary now has a capable Administrator doing this job—without benefit of the title here conferred. It is the committee's hope that, with this ratification of such policy, it will be further implemented by appointment of topflight assistants to the Administrator to deal with problem commodities, specifically cotton and wheat.

Section 307. Use of voluntary agencies and shipping subsidy for merchant marine

Increases from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 the limitation on operations under title II of Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Also authorizes the payment of ocean freight from CCC funds for commodities shipped under title II and also for commodities made available under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, if the President finds that payment of ocean freight is necessary to accomplish the purposes of these acts.

Section 308. Commission to recommend legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products

Establishes a five-member bipartisan commission appointed by the President to prepare and present to Congress not later than June 15, 1957, recommendations to bring about the greatest practical use for industrial purposes of agricultural products. Authorizes appropriation of $150,000 for the expenses of the commission.

Section 309. Donation to penal and correctional institutions

Authorizes donation of surplus food commodities to Federal penal and correctional institutions and to State reformatories and other correctional institutions for minors.

Section 310. Federal irrigation, drainage, and flood-control projects

Prohibits for a period of 3 years from the date of the act, payment of "any crop loans or Federal farm payments or benefits" on any agricultural commodity declared by the Secretary to be in surplus supply if grown on any newly irrigated or newly drained lands within any Federal irrigation or drainage project hereafter authorized. It is to be emphasized that this provision applies only to projects "hereafter" authorized, continues only for a period of 3 years, and does not apply to any lands "used for the production of such commodity" before the enactment of this provision. It will not, therefore, apply to any irrigation or drainage projects on which price-supported crops are presently being grown.

Section 311. Processing of donated food commodities

Authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing into a form suitable for home consumption commodities donated under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. Present authority extends only to "reprocessing," which does not include such operations as the grinding of grain into meal or flour. CCC is authorized to carry out such operations now only in connection with the special relief programs authorized by Public Law 311, 84th Congress.

TITLE IV—MARKETING QUOTAS AND ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Section 401. Extension of surrender and reapportionment provisions for wheat acreage allotments

Extends for the crop years 1956 and 1957 authority for the voluntary surrender and reapportionment of wheat acreage allotments.

Section 402. Acreage allotments for cotton for 1957 and 1958

Provides that the national marketing quota for cotton for the 1957 and 1958 crops shall not result in a national acreage allotment for those years smaller than the national acreage allotment for 1956.

Section 403. Cotton—small farm allotments

Establishes for the years 1957 and 1958 for cotton a special national acreage reserve of 100,000 acres to be distributed to States and counties to aid in establishing in all counties minimum farm allotments of 4 acres or the highest acreage planted on the farm in the preceding 3 years, whichever is smaller. The 100,000 acres would be in addition to the national acreage allotment and would not be taken into consideration in establishing future State acreage allotments. In addition, a provision added by the conference committee promises some relief for small farmers in 1956 by authorizing the Secretary to allot in each State acreage which is underplanted and not placed in the soil bank or considered planted by virtue of notification to the county committee, for the purpose of increasing small farm allotments in 1956 to 4 acres or the highest acreage planted in the past 3 years, whichever is smaller.

Section 404. Minimum State acreage allotments for 1956 rice crop

Provides each State with a minimum allotment of rice for 1956 equal to 85 percent of the final allotment established for such State for 1955.

Section 405. Increase in peanut marketing penalties

Beginning with the 1956 crop, establishes peanut marketing penalties at 75 percent of the support price instead of 50 percent under present provisions of law.

Section 406. Collection of peanut marketing penalties

Provides for interest at 6 percent a year on peanut marketing penalties from the date when due until the date of payment and for a lien on any crop of peanuts subject to marketing quotas in which the person liable for the payment of penalty has an interest, until the penalty is paid.

Section 407. Preservation of unused acreage allotments

Provides that beginning in 1956 any producer may underplant an acreage allotment but maintain his history as though the full allotment had been planted, if he makes proper notification to the county committee of his desire to retain his acreage history. The exception would not be granted to any farm on which no acreage of the commodity was planted for 4 successive years or if done to avoid penalties. The acreage not planted could not be reallocated to any other farm.

Sections 408 (a), (b), (c). Corn

No substantial change has been made in the provisions relating to price supports for corn as adopted on the Senate floor. The provisions in this section, together with other correlative provisions of the bill, would make corn acreage allotments inoperative for 1956 and substitute in lieu of the national acreage allotment of 43,281,000 acres a "base acreage" for corn totaling 51,000,000 acres nationally.

To become eligible for price supports under this new program, a corn producer would be required to devote an acreage equal to 15 percent of his farm base acreage for corn to the acreage reserve or the conservation reserve program. By underplanting his corn base acreage 15 percent and placing that land in the acreage reserve, the producer would become eligible for an acreage reserve payment at the corn rate. By planting not to exceed his base acreage in corn and placing an amount of land equivalent to 15 percent of that base acreage in the conservation reserve, he would become eligible for a conservation reserve payment.

Not later than December 15, 1956, the Secretary is directed to conduct a referendum among corn producers in the commercial producing area to determine whether they favor continuation of corn acreage allotments and price supports under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, or no acreage allotments and price supports "at such level as the Secretary determines will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn." The decision reached in the referendum would be effective for 1957 and subsequent years.

Section 408 (d). Feed grains

In lieu of the provisions in the Senate bill relating to feed grains the committee of conference has set up an entirely new provision relating to price supports for feed grains and their inclusion in the soil bank program. The new program has the following major features:

(1) In noncommercial corn areas corn will be classified as a feed grain along with oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum. In commercial corn areas the feed grains will consist of the customary four small grains.

(2) A base acreage allotment for feed grains will be established for each farm. In 1956 this allotment will be the average acreage devoted to feed grains on the farm in the 3 years 1953–55. Thereafter a national base acreage allotment will be determined on the basis of the 1953–55 national acreages of these grains, and this will be allotted to States, counties, and farms in the usual manner of distributing acreage allotments. The apportionment of the county base acreage for feed grains to farms on the basis of past acreage, crop rotation, tillable acreage, type of soil, and topography would be on the basis of the same factors now provided in the establishment of individual farm wheat-acreage allotments. Under this language, any year in which the acreage for a farm is low because of abnormal weather conditions, the acreage for such year would be eliminated from the historic average since the actual acreage planted was below the acreage which would have been planted under the crop-rotation system followed on the farm.

(3) For each year in which there is an acreage reserve program in effect for corn in the commercial corn area, feed grains will be entitled to support on the following basis: Corn grown outside the commercial corn area, 85 percent of the level of price support for corn grown in the commercial area; grain sorghum, barley, rye, and oats, a percentage of the parity for each commodity which is 5 percentage points of parity less than the percentage of parity at which corn is supported in the commercial corn-producing area.

(4) In order to be eligible for such price supports on feed grains, the producer would be required to devote not less than 15 percent of his base acreage to either the acreage reserve program or the conservation reserve, and not to plant a total acreage of feed grains in excess of 85 percent of his base acreage. For 1956, however, producers may remain eligible for the price supports heretofore announced, even if they do not participate in this manner in the soil-bank program and thus become eligible for the higher level price supports provided by this section.

TITLE V—PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR WHEAT AND RICE

Section 501. Wheat marketing certificates

This section provides for a domestic parity plan for wheat almost identical with that which has previously been approved by the House. Producers would receive 100 percent of parity for their share of the wheat crop which is domestically consumed for food and substantially the world price for the balance of their production. Stability of market prices would be assured by a low level loan rate geared primarily to the support level of feed grains and to world market conditions.

Acreage allotments may be continued, and eligibility for domestic marketing certificates would be conditioned both upon compliance with acreage allotments and upon the planting of an acreage of wheat sufficient to fill the producer's domestic quota at normal yields. If acreage allotments are prescribed, they shall be in the amounts and determined in the manner provided by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. The plan would automatically take care of producers who do not ordinarily grow wheat for sale but rather for use as feed. Any such producers would be permitted to grow any quantity of wheat without penalty.

The program would be self-financing. Processors and importers would be required to purchase certificates for the difference between the domestic parity and the established market price of wheat processed or imported by them, and refunds would be made upon the exportation of wheat products. The amounts collected from processors and importers would offset almost identically the amounts paid to producers.

The bill provides that the new program will not go into effect at once but will be the subject of a referendum among wheat-growers whenever referendums are held in the future on marketing quotas. The first such referendum will be held early next summer. If wheat producers vote, in any such referendum, by more than two-thirds in favor of the domestic parity plan, the program will automatically go into effect in place of the present system of acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price supports by loan and purchase programs.

Section 501. Rice—primary marketing certificates

Section 501 (which makes extensive amendments to the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended) also establishes a two-price plan for rice quite similar to that authorized for wheat. Unlike the wheat plan, which calls for a referendum, the rice program would be put into operation in 1956 but would apply only to rice harvested "prior to 1958."

Under this plan, rice producers would be given a primary market quota. Such quota would be based upon the consumption of processed rice in the United States plus the quantity exported to Cuba. The support level for rice would be established for 1956 at 55 to 90 percent of parity and thereafter at 50 to 90 percent of parity, with the Secretary being directed to establish the support price at a level which would not discourage the exportation of rice produced in the United States.

At the beginning of each marketing year rice producers would be issued certificates for the quantity of rice equal to the primary market quota for the farm. The value of such certificates would be the difference between the support level for rice and 90 percent of parity. Processors of rice in the United States would be required to acquire certificates in an amount sufficient to cover the quantity of rough rice processed. Certificates would also be required for the importation of rice. Upon the exportation of processed rice to any country other than Cuba, processors would receive a refund on an equivalent quantity of certificates. This program, like the two-price plan for wheat, would be essentially self-financing since the sale of certificates to processors would substantially cover payments to producers.

The section provides for inventory adjustments to persons owning rice in the United States on the date the program becomes effective, so that they will neither gain nor lose from the anticipated change in general market prices of rice on that date.

Section 502. Normal yield for rice

Establishes new criteria for determining the normal yield for rice for counties and farms. The calculation is to be based on a five-year period adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and trends in yield.

TITLE VI—FORESTRY PROVISIONS

Section 601. Assistance to States for tree planting and reforestation

This section authorizes additional cooperative activity between the Department of Agriculture and the States in tree planting and reforestation. Upon presentation by the proper State official the Secretary is authorized to approve a plan for tree planting and reforestation within the State and thereafter to cooperate technically and financially in such program. With respect to parts of the program carried out on non-Federal lands, the Federal financial contribution cannot exceed that of the State toward the same program. The Secretary is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the appropriate State forester in approving and carrying out such plans.

DELETIONS FROM SENATE BILL

Several sections appearing in the Senate amendment have been deleted by the committee of conference. Among them are the following:

Standard grade for cotton (sec. 103 of Senate bill)

The Senate committee bill contained a provision changing the standard grade for cotton. The committee of conference eliminated this provision from the bill. In considering these standards for cotton the committee was aware of the past practice of the Commodity Credit Corporation of refusing to make the differentials in loan values on spotted cotton which are customarily made by the cotton trade. Specifically, the trade recognizes a very wide differential in value between light and heavy spotted cotton. Most cotton buyers will at all times pay substantially more for light spots than for heavy spots. In some cases this differential amounts to as much as $15 or $20 per bale. By contrast, the CCC has consistently recognized no differential between light and heavy spots and has made their loans on all spotted cotton on the basis of heavy spots. The committee understands that the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation now have the power to make the same differential in commodity credit loans which are normally made by the cotton trade. It is the opinion of the committee that the Department should exercise this power.

Processor certificates (sec. 108 of Senate bill): This section would have required the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain from processors of agricultural commodities purchased for price support or surplus removal certificates stating that producers had received not less than the support price for the raw commodities. It would have applied to funds used "regardless of the source" and would thus have applied to section 32 operations as well as to the regular price-support programs.

Many of these operations are carried out on a bid and purchase basis under conditions where it would be virtually impossible for the processor to certify as to the price paid for the particular products being bought by the Government. It would have rendered virtually impossible most of the operations now being carried out with section 32 funds and many of the regular price-support operations.

The committee believes that the present provision of law (sec. 401 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1949) is adequate if applied with the utmost diligence by the Secretary. The committee is not certain that it has always been applied in this manner but urges that the Secretary utilize this existing authority to the fullest. In this connection, it also urges that where these operations are carried out purchases or loans not be confined to only certain grades of products but that, to the fullest extent practicable, they be made available on all usual grades.

Reestablishment of United States share of world cotton market (sec. 303 of Senate bill): Directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its existing powers and authorities to encourage the sales for export at competitive world prices of such quantities of cotton as well establish and maintain the fair historical share of the world market for United States cotton. The volume to be sold was to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. The section further provided that export sales for foreign currency under section 102 of Public Law 480 be made at competitive world prices.

The Secretary of Agriculture already has ample authority to accomplish the purposes of section 303. Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture announced on February 28, 1956, that cotton will be sold for export after July 31, 1956, on a competitive bid basis. The committee of conference is gratified that action has been taken to inaugurate what it hopes will be a stable and consistent sales program. This section was deleted with the understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture would use such methods as are necessary to achieve the purposes of section 303 and meet his announced goal of exporting at least 5,000,000 bales of cotton annually.

Study of meat grading system (sec. 701 of Senate bill): This section was eliminated from the bill not because the conferees do not agree that the existing system and theories of meat grading require study and review, but because ample authority exists in present law for such a study by the Secretary of Agriculture.

In recent years there have been numerous questions raised about the present system of meat grading—both as it affects livestock producers and as it may affect marketing and distribution systems and consumer buying habits. The Secretary has ample authority to study and examine the meat grading system both under his general authorities and under such specific statutes as the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. The committee recognizes the value of the meat grading system and anticipates its continuation. If it can be improved, however, the Secretary should make such study as he determines necessary and suggests such changes as he finds desirable.

APPENDIX A

PLANS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE SOIL BANK (TENTATIVE)

(Based on H. R. 12)

The season for 1956 crops is so far advanced that the acreage reserve program will not be fully effective.

I. Acreage reserve—objective: Reduction of acreage of designated crops on a voluntary basis

A. Establishment of Normal Yields to Serve as a Basis of Payment

1. Operating procedure:

(a) Use check yields during 1951–55 as a base except for wheat which will be for 1945–54 period. Adjustments will be made for abnormal years.

(b) Establish county check yields on basis of (a) above. In the case of tobacco and peanuts, actual farm yield will be used where available.

(c) County committeemen determine normal yields for community (these should weight out to county normal yields).

(d) Community committeemen may aid the county committee in establishing a normal yield rating for each farm in the community which grows the designated crops. Each such farm will be placed in one of several yield rating categories, ranging above and below the community average. Adjustment procedures may be necessary to bring farm yield into balance with county average.

(e) Individual farmers will then be invited to offer a part of their acreage of the designated crops for the acreage reserve. Such land should be equal in productivity to land used for the allotment crop on their farms. The county committee can then quote them a dollar figure per acre for typical land to be set aside for the acreage reserve for these designated crops for their farm. If the designated land is found to be below average, a lower per acre payment will be made. With the exception of the first year, farmers should indicate their intention to participate prior to planting time.

(f) No crop may be harvested or grazed from reserve acres, except that the Secretary may permit grazing under certain emergency conditions.

B. Preliminary Incentive Rates for the Acreage Reserve Program

1. Possible incentive payment rates: The extent to which these rates need to be varied according to quality, location, and other factors is still under study. (These following figures are preliminary.)

Commodity	Unit	Payments based on H. R. 12				
		Support rate [1]	Rate as percent of 1956 support			
			35	50	60	70
Wheat	Bushel	$2.27	$0.79	$1.14	$1.36	$1.59
Cotton	Pound	.3181	.1113	.1590	.1909	.2227
Rice	Hundredweight	4.90	1.71	2.45	2.94	3.43
Corn (commercial area)	Bushel	1.65	.58	.82	.99	1.14
Corn (noncommercial area)	Bushel	[2] 1.40	.49	.70	.84	.98
Oats	Bushel	.72	.25	.36	.43	.50
Barley	Bushel	1.13	.40	.56	.68	.79
Rye	Bushel	1.41	.49	.70	.85	.99
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	2.18	.76	1.09	1.31	1.53
Peanuts	Pound	.123	.043	.062	.074	.086
Tobacco:						
Flue-cured (11–14)	Pound	.482	.169	.241	.289	.337
Fire-cured (21–24)	Pound	[3] .354	.124	.177	.212	.248
Burley (31)	Pound	.472	.165	.236	.283	.330
Maryland (32)	Pound	.476	.167	.238	.286	.333
Dark air-cured (35–36)	Pound	[4] .315	.110	.158	.189	.220
Sun-cured (37)	Pound	[4] .315	.110	.158	.189	.220
Cigar types: [5]						
42–44	Pound	.230	.081	.115	.138	.161
51	Pound	.516	.181	.258	.310	.361
52	Pound	.483	.169	.242	.290	.338
54	Pound	.226	.079	.113	.136	.158
55	Pound	.290	.101	.145	.174	.203

[1] 90 percent of "old" or "new" parity, whichever is higher as of Mar. 15, 1956, except feed grains and corn in the noncommercial area.
[2] 85 percent of the rate in the commercial area or about 76.5 percent of old parity.
[3] Three-fourths of burley support rate.
[4] Two-thirds of burley support rate.
[5] Preliminary estimate as parity is computed for groups 42–44, 51–5.

2. Maximum and minimum participation:

(a) Maximum:

Grain: 50 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

Cotton and peanuts: 10 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

Tobacco: 5 acres or 50 percent of allotment, whichever is larger.

(b) Minimum:

Grain: 5 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

Cotton and peanuts: 2 acres or allotment, whichever is smaller.

Tobacco: 1 acre or allotment, whichever is smaller.

C. Participation and Cost on a National Basis (Highly Tentative)

	Acres which might come in	National average check yield per acre	Approximate cost per acre [1]	Total cost
	(*Millions*)		(*Dollars*)	(*Million dollars*)
Cotton	3–5	303 pounds	48–60	145–300
Wheat [2]	[3] 12–15	15.8 bushels	18–25	216–375
Corn [2]	4–6	44.2 bushels [4]	36.50	144–300
Other feed grains [5]	2–4	Depends on crop	15–50	75–175
Rice	.3	2,500 pounds	60–75	18–23
Peanuts	.1	900 pounds	50–70	5–7
Tobacco	.15	1,300 pounds	100–300	15–45
Total	21.4–30.55			618–1,225

[1] Based on approximately 90 percent supports and optional parity.
[2] Commercial area only.
[3] Based on both winter and spring crop.
[4] Commercial corn area yield.
[5] Oats, barley, rye, sorghum for grain, and corn in the noncommercial corn area.

The cost per acre of obtaining participation remains in doubt due to the lateness of the season and the changing provisions of the proposed legislation. Surveys previously made of payment rates required are no longer applicable due to the fact that crops are already being planted and the support rate changes.

With every day's delay, the cost of the program increases and the effectiveness decreases.

D. Terms of the "Acreage Reserve" Agreement

1. Voluntary.

2. For 1 year but with terms to encourage participation for more than 1 year.

3. "Acreage reserve" lands must be at least typical quality land for the designated crops on the farm.

4. The acreage of crops covered by the agreement must be reduced below the acreage allotment or the base acreage, whichever is applicable, by the amount of acreage placed in the "acreage reserve."

5. In the case of rented land, compensation is to be divided among interested landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers on the farms in the same proportion as they would have shared in the crop in the absence of an acreage reserve program, unless division on another basis is agreed upon by landlords and tenants and their agreement is approved by the county committee in accordance with standards prescribed by the State committee.

II. Conservation reserve—Objective: reduce the acreage of land in row crops and grains including oil seeds on a voluntary basis and divert such acreage to conservation uses

A. Conservation Reserve Incentives

1. Annual payments and terms of contract:

(a) $10 per acre, per year average for the United States for 3- to 15-year period. Rates established on basis of land productivity, agricultural value of land, and other factors. Rates are designed to encourage farmers to take out their marginal cropland.

(b) County or area rates would vary on the basis of such factors as productivity and value of farmland.

(c) Rates would be established by areas and be based on relative productivity of the land in the area. Farm rates would be established on the basis of the rating of the area in which the specified acreage placed in "conservation reserve" is located.

(d) Eligible land, depending on area, would be land which was used for the production of rotation crops including alfalfa, clover, and other tame hay during the rotation on the farm. The acreage of row crops and grains including oilseeds must be reduced by the number of acres placed on the conservation reserve and the acreage reserve.

(e) All lands placed in the "conservation reserve" must be in or placed in approved conservation uses and may be neither harvested nor grazed except that the Secretary may permit grazing under certain emergency conditions.

1. Some lands may already be in approved types of cover. These lands may be entered in a 3-year contract.

2. Where it is necessary to establish cover, the normal contract will be for 5 years. In the case of land placed in trees, the normal length of the contract will be 10 or 15 years.

3. Costs of practices would be shared, with Government paying up to 80 percent of agreed-upon costs, within maximum limitations for establishment of trees, other cover, or other practices. Due to seed limitations, practices in first year may be modified if soil is protected.

2. Eligible conservation practices and uses:

(a) Practices and rates of payment insofar as possible will be consistent with the present ACP program.

(b) Vegetative cover:

1. Prefer perennial grasses and legumes.

2. Annuals may be permitted when seeded with perennial grasses and legumes.

3. Annuals may be permitted alone when no perennial seed is available if approved practices will follow. Due to seed limitations, some latitude may be needed regarding soil protective practices during the first year.

(c) Trees:

1. Adapted forest trees.

2. Shrubs when interplanted for shelterbelt purposes.

(d) Water storage: Cost of water retention reservoirs shared.

III. Inclusion of full farms

A farmer offering to place his full farm in the "soil bank" may receive payments under the "acreage reserve" for the designated crop acres on the farm (subject to maximum) and under the "conservation reserve" at the appropriate conservation reserve rate which will normally be lower than the acreage reserve rate, for the other acres normally in row crops or grains (including oil seeds). No payment would be made on the number of acres of land normally in conservation uses or normally idle.

IV. Certificates

A. Draw them in terms of dollars.

B. Under certain conditions, to be established by the Secretary, a farmer may purchase CCC grains with his certificates.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 2 hours, at the conclusion of which the previous question on the conference report is considered as ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. I have a motion to recommit, which I presume I will offer at the conclusion of the 2 hours of debate?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman during his remarks let us know what the motion to recommit is?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, but my parliamentary inquiry is, When shall I offer the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. At the conclusion of the debate and when the Chair announces that the previous question is ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to consider a matter of paramount importance. It is rather unfortunate that a matter of such importance to so many people must, of necessity, be considered in an atmosphere which is intensified by partisan politics. I want to say here and now, as I have said from this well on many occasions, that I have taken great pride that the Committee on Agriculture has been almost entirely free from partisan politics during the entire time I have served on that great committee. I started service on that committee under the able leadership of that great statesman from Texas and beloved citizen, Marvin Jones. What I say about the nonpartisan approach to farm legislation applies not only for Marvin Jones but also for every other chairman of the committee under whom I have served. I know that every man on the committee is a devoted friend of the farmers of this Nation. This bill comes before you today not as a bill which was prompted by partisan politics. Ten devoted men, public servants, sat here in this Capitol Building during the entire Easter holiday and we worked every morning and every afternoon and long into the night in a diligent, careful, and cautious effort to present a bill to the House which we thought might be acceptable to you. I know that even while we were sitting here we were accused of trying to write a bill that the President of the United States could not possibly sign. That was a rather unfortunate and unfair accusation to make against men who were laboring long and hard in their efforts to draft a bill which the President of the United States could sign. So, we bring this bill here to you with a conference report and a statement which contains an analysis of the bill. To show you just how impartial and nonpartisan these 10 devoted men were when the conference report was prepared, only 2 out of the 10 refused to sign the report. One was a distinguished Republican and one was a very distinguished Democrat. Eight members signed this report—3 of them are Republicans and 5 of them are Democrats.

The bill comes here as a result of the labors of men who lifted themselves above the prejudices and passions of partisan politics. We tried to write a bill which we believe will serve all of agriculture and will serve all of the people of this great Republic. I believe that we have given to the President the type of soil bank that he asked us to give him—an entirely voluntary program. We have given to him in this bill $1,200,000,000 to implement and make effective the soil bank which he has advocated. In addition to that, we have given him $500 million to expand and to accelerate the surplus-disposal program

which has disturbed and distracted so many people. We have also given to him a special committee of five experts to study the problems of new uses and bigger and better markets for American farmers. We have given to him an Administrator of the Surplus Disposal Program, and we fixed his salary.

Now as to what is left in the bill that is objectionable: When you take into consideration the one thought that all of us know, yes, the President knows, that the downward trend in America's agriculture income is tragically leading the farmers of this Nation to the very brink of bankruptcy, we must realize that the soil bank with its $1,200,000,000 is not even intended to increase the farm income in the year 1956 nor in the year 1957. Its primary purpose is to replace farm income while we reduce our production of crops now in surplus. The only thing in this bill that will increase farm income in 1956, yes, all of the provisions here that are even calculated to increase farm income in this year, will be stricken from this bill if I understand what the motion to recommit will contain. I understand it is proposed to strike out the price support program and to give to the farmers something less than fair treatment. As I understand the motion to recommit, the leadership responsible for offering that motion, will today, here in this House, put the farmers of America on the auction block and try to buy them at the cheapest possible price. If you cannot get them for 75 percent, if you cannot get them for 80 or 85 percent, perhaps you will be willing to go to 82½ percent. Even if you go to 89.9 percent you go out and crow about a victory. What are we fussing about?

I suppose that every man in this House that understands the plight of the American farmer and the terrific impact the loss of income has and is now having upon all the farming industry of this great Nation, would naturally want to increase farm income and to change this tragic downward trend. You know and I know that the problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems, and unless we solve the problems of plenty we are headed for trouble in the days ahead.

The farmers of America have been lambasted and vilified and ridiculed throughout the length and breadth of this Nation as no other group in our economy in all history has ever been lambasted and ridiculed. What have they done?

I need only quote from the lips of your own President when he said in this House in his message of January 9: "Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperitively needed in wartime but unmarketable in peacetime at the same prices and in the same quantity." Who among us could have foreseen that on July 27, 1953, there would be a cessation of hostilities out yonder in Korea? On that day when men ceased fighting, and American boys stopped dying, the American farmers were doing just what they had been persuaded to do; just what their Government called upon them to do. We were told to produce a 16-million-bale cotton crop, to have an abundant production of wheat, corn, and other vital foods; and that is what the American farmer did. Of course our fields flourished. Our crops were harvested.

Then the pipelines were closed. The shooting was over, and these commodities had to go into storage.

Then, the very next year, 1954, what did the farmers do? They did exactly what the experts in the Department of Agriculture told them to do: Drastically reduce wheat acreage by the millions of acres, drastically reduced cotton acreage, yes, by the millions. The farmers have done everything they could possibly do to bring production down in line with consumer demands.

Is that their great crime? Because they were told that food would win the war, food for freedom—yes, at a time when the ancient institutions of freedom were being threatened throughout the world. Now, is that a crime our farmers have committed for which they should be vilified and ridiculed?

Now we are told that within 3 years we have been on the brink of war 3 times. The great Secretary of State did not tell us about it. How do we know that we are not now at this hour on the brink of war? And if we are then we all know that these vital foods and fibers are actually a blessing to all mankind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to quote the President and then say for himself that for years these surpluses that now plague us were built up as a result of the request for war production?

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what he said on January 9.

Mr. HALLECK. Evidently the purpose of this conference report is to propose to go back to the very same sort of incentive to increase production now when there is no war going on.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that my friend from Indiana is one of the most intelligent Members of this House. I am sure he heard me say that the very minute there was a cessation of hostilities we started on this curtailed production program. And let us understand what this support program is. It is not a program just to increase production. It has always operated in a dual fashion: When we need production we offer the high support to bring about the production so as to secure for the farmer the price that he should receive and below which he should not be permitted to go; when we want to reduce acreage we offer him the same inducement if he will curtail his acreage and comply with the Secretary's program. That is the way we are using it now. Cotton acreage came down from twenty-seven or twenty-eight million to 17 million acres; wheat acreage came down from 78 million to about 55 million.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that from the year 1941 to the year 1951, a 10-year period, the six basic farm crops that were supported at 90 percent of parity during that time were considerably above 90 percent of parity? Is that right?

Mr. COOLEY. I might say that during no year from 1942 until 1953 was the general level of agricultural prices ever below 100 percent of parity.

Mr. JENSEN. In answer to that I may say, of course, that any time we have war prices go up naturally; so I am not going to give you credit however much I agree with you on this premise. So the fact is those basic crops were over 90 percent of parity all during that time on an average.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentlemen is exactly right.

Mr. JENSEN. And that has nothing to do with the surplus?

Mr. COOLEY. Not a thing.

Mr. JENSEN. The reason we established this 90-percent floor under the basic storable crops was because we were looking into the future for such a situation as now faces the American farmers?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JENSEN. And agriculture generally, to take care of the very problems that are facing us today. Now, we are asked to reduce the farmers' income when the farmer's dollar is only buying 80 cents worth of merchandise at the counter.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not going along with that kind of business, not only so far as the farmers of America are concerned but so far as industry and business are concerned, especially in the breadbasket section of America. Industry is going to suffer. They are starting to suffer now. The farmer is the basis on which our whole economy operates and sooner or later we will all be in the same boat. Industry, factories, stores, everybody is going to be in the same boat with the farmer unless we take care of the farmer and see that his dollar buys 100 cents worth of merchandise at the counter.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that there is a floor under the acreage on cotton?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. There is a floor under the acreage on wheat?

Mr. COOLEY. What does the gentleman mean by "a floor"?

Mr. ARENDS. I mean the minimum below which that acreage can go.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The law fixes that.

Mr. ARENDS. What about corn?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is an expert on corn.

Mr. ARENDS. There is no acreage limitation on corn. In other words, corn goes bang, bang, bang.

Mr. COOLEY. But corn has not gone bang, bang, bang. Only about 40 percent of your farmers made any effort to go bang, bang, bang.

Mr. ARENDS. I am not talking about price. I am talking about the acreage reduction.

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking about that, too.

Mr. ARENDS. It is down to 43 million acres at this time. It must keep on going down, yet the formula says we have to reduce the acreage. You cannot do that with wheat or cotton. You go to a certain point and stop, but with corn you can go just as far as you want under the present law.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that there is nothing compulsory about the corn program? It is simply an acreage allotment program and the farmers can accept it or not accept it. Other basic commodities accept acreage allotments and controls. Corn is not controlled.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the Members of the House that I am not going to undertake to discuss this complex controversial measure in any great detail.

Here are the major provisions, just the barest highlights, of the conference bill:

First. Ninety percent of parity for 1956 for cotton, wheat, corn, peanuts, and rice. Tobacco supports will continue to be maintained at 90 percent. This at a time when realized net income of farmers has dropped more than $4 billion since 1951 and is at the lowest point since 1942.

Second. Restoration of the old parity formula for those basic crops where modernized parity would bring about reduction in parity levels. At the same time a directive to the Department of Agriculture to restudy the whole subject of parity and make specific recommendations to Congress for a real improvement in our parity formula.

Third. A $1,200,000 a year soil bank in 2 parts:

(a) An acreage reserve designed to reduce acreage of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, tobacco, and feed grains. Payments would be made to farmers to reduce their acreage of these crops below their acreage allotments or below their 3-year average in the case of feed grains. The Department's present estimates of the payments which would be made per acre for this reduction are: Tobacco, $100–300; cotton, $48–60; peanuts, $50–70; wheat, $18–25; corn, $36–50; rice, $60–75; and feed grains, $15–50. A maximum of $750 million per year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 crop years.

(b) A conservation reserve designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual limit of $450 million.

Fourth. The soil bank is substantially improved over the Senate version:

(a) The compulsory features have been removed;

(b) Limits have been put on the amounts which can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds;

(c) Some of the drastic and unfair penalties have been removed; and

(d) Far more adequate provisions have been made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers.

Fifth. A domestic parity plan for wheat that will go into effect if wheat growers vote for such a plan by a two-thirds majority in a referendum. It will give growers 100 percent of parity for wheat consumed domestically and substantially the world market price for the balance of their production.

Sixth. A two-price plan for rice quite similar to that provided for wheat.

Seventh. The minimum support level for dairy products and milk is raised from 75 to 80 percent and the producers of manufacturing milk and butterfat are assured a fairer price proportionately by establishment of a $3.25 support price for manufacturing milk and 58.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

Eighth. For the first time a program designed to bring stability to the rapidly deteriorating feed grain situation is provided. It will cut down the acreage of feed grain and give producers support prices of 85 percent of parity if they comply with the acreage reduction.

Ninth. A somewhat similar program is provided for corn. Corn producers are given an increase of about 9 million acres in their allotments for this year but will be required to put 15 percent of their cropland into the soil bank in order to be eligible for price supports on corn.

Tenth. There are various provisions to improve the disposal of surplus commodities. One provision will make surplus foods available to Federal penal institutions and to State reformatories and institutions for minors. Another provision requires the Secretary to study the various proposals for food stamp plans and make specific recommendations to Congress within 90 days.

I propose to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to discuss the wheat situation, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] to discuss the corn and small grain situation, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] to discuss the cotton section, if there are any questions to be discussed, and to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] to discuss the rice section.

Let me emphasize what the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa just said. The people have been screaming their heads off about these vital foods and fibers in storage. It is claimed that storage is not a market place. But here are the figures that prove conclusively, and they are figures from the Secretary's own department, that when Mr. Benson went into office the price support program on the basic agricultural commodities through the Commodity Credit Corporation did not show a loss. The program showed a net profit of more than $13 million.

Where are we now? At the end of December 1952, there was a profit of $13,011,290 on the overall program for the basic crops. On potatoes, eggs, wool, and everything, we had lost slightly more than a billion dollars, but that was due to World War II and the Korean situation.

Here are the latest figures, February 29, 1956. The loss on basic commodities is $560 million. That is up to the last report.

Now, let me tell you this: In this very bill we are appropriating $500 million to give it away across the seas; not only to give it away but to pay the freight from the place of production to the seaboard and to pay the ocean charges to deliver it on foreign shores. Now, why should the gentleman complain about a $500 million loss on basic commodities taking us through World War II and into Korea and on up to last February, just a few days ago?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not correct to say that the soil bank itself will cost as much in one or maybe one and a quarter years as the entire price support program has cost in 20?

Mr. COOLEY. Why, certainly. And that is the thing that I think the House should know. We give him here in this bill $1.2 billion. He says he needs it and he wants it. Now, that is a figure that is larger than the total losses were in this program that I mentioned in 1953.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. My question deals with the overall bill. It is my understanding that the Senate bill contained a limitation upon the maximum amount of payments which could be made to any one individual. It is also my understanding that there has been a bill proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD, before your committee for some time, setting that limitation at $25,000. Does this conference report contain any such limitation, sir; and, if not, was it considered by the conferees?

Mr. COOLEY. It was carefully considered in conference, and my recollection is the vote was unanimous to take it out, because we know that the little farmer is not the one who is piling up the surpluses or in any way responsible for them. Unless Mr. Benson, through the soil-conservation program, can induce the big operators, those who are operating mechanized farms, to take out large acreages of wheat and cotton and other surplus crops, his program will miserably fail. So, when you put in a limitation, you just restrict him in the operation of the program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. In other words, the loan program then would be designed to extend loans and make payments to the big farmers; is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. Along with all other farmers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, I can give you an illustration here. One company put in 7,000 bales, I believe it was, in a loan, but he took out all but about 65 bales. They paid the Government interest. People get another foolish idea about this thing. When you loan a man money on cotton and corn, it is like going to the bank to borrow. He pays the loan back and he pays the interest on it.

Now, Mr. Benson, unfortunately—and I respect the gentleman and I certainly have a high regard for his high office—does not tell the people of America that on the cotton program alone we have

made a profit of $250 million. He does not tell the people of America that on the sugar program, which is universally popular, we have made a profit of over $300 million. Oh, no; he does not tell them that. He does not tell them this, either, that we are today supporting sugar beets at more than 98 percent of parity. We are supporting wool at 106 percent of parity. Now, those crops grow in Utah. They do not grow down south in North Carolina.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If I understand the gentleman correctly, when cotton is put in for a Government loan upon which interest is paid, the cotton grower then has the choice of either paying his loan, withdrawing it from storage, or of taking the 90 percent parity price at his choice. Is that correct?

Mr. COOLEY. He could take it out and sell it on the open market.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But if he does not, he takes the 90 percent parity price?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. And the Government sells it at the best price obtainable. I just told you, even with Benson or without Benson, we still have a profit of over $200 million. Now, why should you want to take this program away from the farmer?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If he is unable to sell his crop, whether it is wheat, corn, or cotton, on the open market at a price less than the 90 percent or otherwise established parity payment, he can then go to the Government and get the amount of the 90 percent or otherwise established parity payment and turn it over to the Government; is that not correct?

Mr. COOLEY. When his note falls due—it is a nonrecourse loan—the Government takes it over, and the Government then sells it. And today the United States Government is the biggest merchant this world has ever known; and Mr. Benson is charged with the primary responsibility.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But the Government pays him the difference between the loan and the 90 percent or otherwise established parity price; does it not?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I suggest to the gentleman that he get somebody to explain it to him; I do not have the time now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. For example, when I, on my farm in Minnesota, would take out a loan on corn, I would get a loan, up to this previous year, of up to 90 percent of parity. Very well; if I cannot obtain more than 90 percent of parity for my corn, when that note becomes due, naturally I turn it over to the Government, deliver the corn to the Government, just satisfy the note. They do not in any way make up the difference between the loan and so-called parity.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman will recall that with his permission and at my request, the Secretary of Agriculture inserted in the record a statement of the losses on high support price commodities which showed a figure of over $13 billion.

Mr. COOLEY. What is that?

Mr. DIXON. And that that $13 billion figure had been arrived at after taking into account the profits on cotton and sugar. That figure of $13 billion is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I can find it for the gentleman. That figure has never been successfully disputed.

Mr. COOLEY. Let me dispute it once and for all and nail it to the barn door right now. And I am going to do it out of the Secretary's own book. I have it right here. I gave the figures a minute ago. On the basics, the figure is $560,763,769. On the whole business that the gentleman is talking about, the figure is $2,937,445,602.

Mr. DIXON. If the gentleman will give me permission, I would like to get that statement that was submitted to the Committee on Agriculture, for the RECORD.

Mr. COOLEY. I should be glad for the gentleman to put these figures in the RECORD. I am putting these CCC audit reports in the RECORD now. These are the Secretary's figures.

Let me say something to the Members from the dairy districts. We talk about the basic program and the high support level, and so forth. Do these gentlemen know that of this loss that we are talking about here, the loss on dairy products has been over $800 million? They have not lost any money on tobacco and cotton, and they will not lose any on those crops, if the programs are properly administered. The dairy industry pretends that they have had no relief at all.

The champion of our dairy farmers, the gentleman from Minnesota, indicates he wants me to yield to him, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many factors that go into these figures of losses. One is the use of surplus milk in the school lunch program. Another one is the give-away program, which is taking place all over the world, the program under which they give away dairy products.

Mr. COOLEY. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I am not trying to charge these losses up to the American dairy farmer.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Another thing is the markdown from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity, which is also charged up to the American dairy farmer.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend that all of us appreciate his great interest in the dairy farmer. Just last week in this House we passed a bill providing for an expenditure of $75 million per year for 2 years, for milk in the school lunch program. That is $150 million. We gave them $10 million to continue the program for the rest of this year. That is $160 million. We gave them $2 million extra on the brucellosis program. That is $162 million. Then we gave them $20 million a year for the next 2 years under the brucellosis program. That runs it up to over $200 million that we have provided the dairy industry of this country, just in the last week. That is the picture we have here.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman was talking about the profits of the Government in the tobacco and cotton programs. Is it not a fact that those profits, so-called, were brought about only because of large amounts of those commodities shipped overseas in the foreign-aid program?

Mr. COOLEY. Some cotton was shipped in the foreign-aid program. But this by no stretch of the imagination could be called a subsidy to farmers. This profit in the cotton program is an actual bona fide profit, and the money is in the Treasury.

Mr. KEATING. But a large part of it was by credit from one Government Department to another?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The gentleman will find that is not right. The profit in the cotton program is real and the money is right here in the Treasury now. So is that money that came out of the sugar program.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, for our good friends representing city districts, I should like to cite briefly the benefits that have occurred to our great consuming population during the lifetime of our farm program.

The consuming population of the United States, for a smaller percentage of their income, now eats more and better food than ever before in history. It has been in times when food was the cheapest, in relation to other values in our economy, that breadlines in the cities have been the longest.

Today the average hour's wage of a worker in industry buys more food than ever before. In 1929 the hour's wage bought only 6.4 loaves of bread. Now it buys 11 loaves. And I invite my city friends to examine these other figures on the cost of food. An hour's wage bought 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929, now it buys 2.3 pounds; 1.5 pounds of pork chops in 1929, now 2.8 pounds; 1 pound of butter then, now 2.7 pounds; 3.9 quarts of milk then, now 8.2 quarts; 1.1 dozens of eggs then, now 3.3 dozens; 17.7 pounds of potatoes then, 35.1 pounds now. and the average hour's wage bought 1.3 pounds of bacon in 1929, and now it buys 3.6 pounds.

Our friends from the cities also will want to take note of the fact that between 1947 and 1955, farm income decreased 37.7 percent, while the hourly wage of factory workers increased 52 percent, and dividend payments jumped 71 percent.

Our farmers deserve better treatment in this great country of ours. They are entitled to share in the blessings of our free enterprise. They are entitled to a fair share in the Nation's prosperity. That is my philosophy and that is what I am fighting for here today.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do not wish this opportunity go by without thanking the gentleman from North

Carolina, together with the other conferees, for what I think is as good a conference report as can be written in behalf of the farmers of the United States. Certainly this is a compromise. There are changes I would like made. But on the whole this bill means much to agriculture and again I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and his colleagues for a very difficult job well done.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman who has just spoken has said, and I hope it is true, this is not a political measure. There has been some talk otherwise. It should not be, because it is a measure that vitally affects the welfare of not only the farmers of this country but the whole United States. In that spirit we must consider this legislation.

We all want to help the farmer. We all want to see him prosper. We all want to see him get his full share of this great economy. We must further consider that there are 155 million people who also want to see this country conducted on a sane, sensible basis. We do not begrudge the farmer anything he gets because we know he works hard for it. We people who live in the cities know that a successful agriculture is essential to the country. But we do want that money spent properly. This administration believes in helping the farmer. If it were not so, we would not have this bill here today.

The basic soundness of the President's proposal is evident from the fact that, for the greater part, they are still in the conference report. They have survived the most intensive hearings, debate, and conference to which a farm bill has ever been subjected.

The conference report which is before us is a fantastic mixture of good and bad provisions in which the bad features tend to cancel out the good. It contains the soil bank much as it was proposed by the President, though delayed beyond the time when this program could be fully effective in 1956. It contains other provisions which would be self-defeating and would pile up surpluses as fast as the soil bank could pull them down.

The bill as it stands is a many splendored thing, and like the current movie of the same name, is intended as a big box-office attraction. It cannot provide farmers the help they need.

Nor do I see how the President can bring himself to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that every Congressman is vitally interested in givng farmers help this year. I am therefore not ready to give up hope for the passage of sound legislation. I do not believe we have yet exhausted all the possiblities of getting a good bill—a bill the President can sign—a bill that can give farmers the sound help they expect and deserve.

Proceeding from this thought, my motion to recommit H. R. 12 would instruct the House conferees to strip from the bill its self-defeating features, and to retain those provisions that will be permanently helpful to farmers.

The following features now embodied in the conference report, or in the Senate bill in the case of dairy supports, would be retained:

First. The soil bank, which is the very heart of the program, which is highly favored, and is sound. It provides for a $750 million acreage program and a $450 million conservation reserve.

Second. The increase in dairy price supports, as contained in the Senate version of H. R. 12. This will provide a more favorable base period for establishing dairy price supports.

Third. The surplus disposal section, because our goal must be to get rid of the surpluses that depressed farm income by $2 billion last year. This includes the authorization for $500 million additional for surplus removal.

Fourth. Title IV on marketing quotas and acreage allotments would be retained, except for the provision requiring mandatory price supports for feed grains. This includes no reduction in the national acreage allotment for cotton for the next 2 years and special provision for aiding small cotton farmers.

Fifth. Title VI which provides for assistance to the States in reforestation.

All of these—and they are the constructive substance of the bill—would be retained even though they fall short of perfection.

The major controversial feature of the bill is the proposed return, for 1 year, to price supports for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. The language in my motion for recommital would delete this provision. My motion would substitute support for basic crops in 1956 at not less than 82½ percent of parity. This is the same provision which the House wrote into law for the 1955 crops.

Other provisions which are self-defeating, and which would hurt farmers far more than they would help, would be stricken. These include:

First. Dual parity, or the double standard of parity. This provision would give special treatment to four favored commodities out of about 160 on which parity is calculated. There is no justification in logic or equity for this kind of favoritism.

Under the working of the modernized parity formula, the dual parity provision would pull down the parity prices of commodities other than the four favored ones. This is not well understood. All these years farmers producing other crops, livestock, and other farm commodities have been penalized because the law gave more under the old parity to wheat, cotton, peanuts, and corn. I am afraid the provision for dual parity might even destroy the usefulness of the parity concept for any price support calculations.

Second. Mandatory price supports for feed grain would be deleted. The difficulties of establishing needed base acreages and yields would make this provision practically impossible to apply in 1956. Also higher price supports for these crops would soon pile up new and large surpluses. The provision would increase Government relations farm by farm. And it would result in sharp differences in support levels for farmers across the fence from each other.

It would increase costs to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. It would help hold down prices on feeder cattle, lambs, and hogs. If continued, it would tend to dry up markets for the very farmers for whom help is intended.

Congress is not wise enough to arbitrarily step in between the farmers that produce feed grains and those farmers who buy feeds—and set a fair price—with all the many geographic locations and changing supply situations. Vastly more farmers buy feed than produce feed grains to sell.

Third. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would be stricken. This part of the bill was written for the special benefit of large wheat and rice growers. The wheat plan would discriminate against small farmers who produce less than 15 acres of wheat—and that means two-thirds of all wheatgrowers. It would discriminate against them by denying them a vote in the wheat referendum and by giving them a lower price.

Moreover, it would hurt other farmers by forcing down the price of all other grains.

This provision would also increase the price of bread by about 2 cents a loaf. The result would fall most heavily on our low-income families who are the major users of cereal foods and against whom we must not discriminate.

I am in favor of helping wheat and rice producers, but let us continue to do so out of general tax revenues until we are very sure there is a better plan.

These most unwise and unworkable provisions of the conference report before us are the result of shooting from the hip on farm legislation, of trying to write a bill on the floor, and of bypassing the normal process of hearings on fundamental provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the season is now well advanced. Winter wheat is stretching up. Cotton and spring grains are being seeded. Farmers in the Corn Belt will soon be planting corn.

This conference report comes to us at the 11th hour. The usefulness of the soil bank for 1956 has diminished with each passing day.

The President cannot be expected to sign an unsound total bill, just to get the soil bank.

A month or two ago when there was still opportunity for making it fully effective in 1956, the enactment of the soil bank would have meant a real lift for farmers. But the soil bank now looks more and more like a program for 1957 and less and less like a program for 1956.

The Department of Agriculture will do its utmost to put a program into operation. But time is fleeting. At this late date, if a soil bank is put into effect for 1956 spring crops it would become, in substantial part, a plow-up program. And this is hardly an auspicious beginning for a soil bank.

At this late date the signing of the conference report in its present form is less likely, and in the eyes of the public, its veto would be more an act of statesmanship. The press of the country strongly support the changes suggested by the President.

We must pass a constructive bill if we want the President to sign it. And we would be unworthy of our own responsibility if we pass a bill which we know is bad, and which should not—yes, cannot—be signed.

As I have offered my motion to recommit, it incorporates, I think, all that is acceptable to the administration from the conference report. And that part which the motion incorporates is the real heart of a constructive farm program, even though it would still lack the perfection to which the President has referred. On behalf of our farmers and all the people of the United States and in behalf of sound legislation, I urge a favorable vote on my motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN. I wonder if the gentleman could give me some more time.

Mr. COOLEY. I will have to take it away from someone else. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not have time to explain in detail my motion. I call attention to the fact that here we are today with 2 hours of debate and the leader in opposition to the conference report does not have time to adequately present his case. I protest against it.

I want to say in conclusion that I hope this conference report will be recommitted.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. No. I do not have the time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought perhaps I could help. I wanted to yield you my time.

Mr. COOLEY. I told the gentleman I would have to take any time away from somebody in order to give him time. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] for his generosity. I know the fine spirit which prompts it.

In conclusion, I hope that when this House gets around to voting, it will recommit this bill, will send it back to the conference committee where the conferees can once more look the bill over and make other worthy amendments which are very essential if we are to have the right type of bill for the building up of agriculture which must, of course, be the thought of all our people. This motion means that the conferees will bring back the bill without the 90 percent of parity and other features I have outlined in my motion. What is wrong with that? It would be a bill the whole country is looking for. The people of the East, the people of the West, the North and the South are all deeply involved in this bill because it means so much to them. Send it back to the committee and let that committee bring back a bill which the President of the United States can sign. This we would do if we had only the interest of the farmer at heart.

Without disclosing any confidences I am sure the President will not sign this bill. He has said that it does not meet the test of a fair bill, a bill that will help agriculture in the years ahead; a bill that will provide real security; with those views I have no doubt as to the action of the President.

As far as I personally am concerned, if this motion to recommit does not prevail I shall feel constrained to vote against the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief because I have no hope of stopping this nonpartisan stampede to kill the farmer with kindness. In this contest between the Republicans and the Democrats to see which party can make the highest bid for the farm vote, there is no serious consideration given on either side of the House to the fundamental problems of agricultural economics in a free-enterprise system.

The whole argument reflects just a confusion of schemes, each proposing to be the most expeditious way of robbing the taxpayer and putting operating capital into the hands of farmers, with which they will proceed to produce more surpluses. In voting billions to farmers, no one seems to understand that operating capital is just as important as acreage in the production of farm crops, and no one seems to believe that sound principles associated with the law of supply and demand can work in agriculture.

This concept of the present problem is probably due to the fact that the Federal Government has for much too long a time subsidized agricultural production and, thereby, created a distorted monstrosity in the form of Federal management which has almost completely divorced the agricultural economy from the free-enterprise system. Because of this past action, the problem today is very difficult. A quick return to the system where price is determined by the relation of supply to demand and where production is limited by operating capital and profit, would be disastrous. It is equally true, however, that the return to this price and profit system is desirable and inevitable.

This Congress shows no inclination to make the return by gradual reduction of subsidy, so the return is likely to come suddenly some day right here on the floor of the House when the representatives of taxpayers and consumers generally wake up to the fallacy of subsidy and kill the whole farm program in one stroke of legislation.

An equally foolish idea held by this Congress is that 13½ percent of our population can be maintained in agricultural production. Only through complete socialization can they be maintained and that would freeze them all in economic bondage and deny to farmers the benefits of progress by better methods and techniques.

Despite the copious tears shed here on the floor of the House about the poor farmer, farmers are not the poor segment of our society. Their average wealth exceeds that of any other equally large class of our society and greatly exceeds the average wealth of the city worker. City Congressmen whose districts supply most of these billions of farm-subsidy money, and who represent consumers will some day wake up to realize that their support of big farm subsidies is definitely contrary to the interests of their own districts. If you do not believe it, look up the records and see who gets the $3 billion annually which this proposed program will cost. Then, you will understand the motivation of the corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanut, and rice Congressmen.

Consumers finally pay all of the costs of taxation. And do not let anybody fool you into believing that there is anything about this farm subsidy program which makes for lower consumer prices.

Now I want to assure you that I hold no ill will toward the farmer. I grew up in the wheat country where I still have plenty of relatives, and I, myself, have been a Pennsylvania farmer for the last 35 years. I have made a lot of money in farming and have lately lost a lot. Farming, by nature, is a risk business and should stay that way.

If I thought subsidy would, in the long run, do farmers any good, I would not be so opposed to the program. But I do not want guaranteed status quo with socialistic bondage for farmers. Farmers, generally, do not want that. Yes; many of them are glad to take any money handed to them by the Federal Government, but at the same time they sincerely believe that the subsidy system is wrong and that it is not the proper function of the Federal Government to guarantee prices.

I am convinced of this thinking on the part of the farmers, and I am, as a consequence, convinced that the political importance of this problem, to either the Republicans or the Democrats, is largely in the minds of Congressmen who are running scared. Not many people behind the curtain of a voting booth are going to be diverted by bribery from voting their conscience.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to ask a question or two of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. If this bill passes there will be some interest in my section of the country, although of a very minor impact, I am sure, with reference to the conservation reserve feature of the soil bank provisions.

On page 7 of the conference report section (2) states:

> To devote to conserving crops or uses, or allow to remain idle, throughout the contract period an acreage of the remaining land on the farm which is not less than the acreage normally devoted only to conserving crops or uses or normally allowed to remain idle on such remaining acreage.

In an explanation of the bill prepared by the staff, entitled "Differences Between the Conference Substitute, the Senate Amendment and H. R. 12 as Passed by the House," I would like to read and get the gentleman's comment on paragraph No. 13, page 2, reading as follows:

> The substitute makes it clear that a producer putting in the conservation reserve lands devoted to such soil conserving crops as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers would not be

required to increase his acreage of soil conserving crops on the balance of his land, or to reduce the acreage devoted to other crops on the balance of his land. Thus, a producer putting 10 acres of tame hay land in the conservation reserve could continue to use the balance of his land in exactly the same manner as he had previously done, if he so desired.

Now, is it the understanding of the chairman, as one of the managers on the part of the House, that this explanation of this provision of the bill itself is in line with the general agreement in conference?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct; yes.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that this be contained in the legislative record of this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. CRETELLA].

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to follow my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING], because he talked of the impact of this report on the consumer, and that is who I am going to talk about.

The conference report on H. R. 12 although not admitted contains provisions which result in direct food taxes on consumers.

Under title V, the domestic parity plan for wheat would increase consumers' grocery bills by almost a million dollars a day. Next year's food bills would be higher by about $340 million.

This plan is really a consumer tax, which would boost the price of bread about 2 cents a loaf. Higher prices would not be on bread alone, but would hit all food products containing wheat.

Low-income consumers are more dependent on bread and other cereal foods than are the rest of our people. Thus, this provision of the bill before us would fall most heavily on families against whom we must and should not discriminate.

Similarly, the 2-price plan for rice would increase the retail price for this food by 2 cents or more per pound. Consumers would pay about $25 million more per year. And this, too, would most seriously burden our low-income families.

The people unquestionably bear the costs of any price-support program. However, the programs now in effect are financed from the general tax revenue of the Government, and thus do not discriminate especially against the people least able to bear the cost.

The special feed-grain provisions with the sharply reduced acreages required, about 20 percent below the 1955 level—not 15 percent as some people think—accompanied by high price supports is just bad business for the whole Northeast. The effects of this section of the bill will be felt in higher feed costs to the livestock producer. This will mean higher prices to the consumer.

Not only will the consumer have to pay higher prices for the livestock products but he will be levied upon as a taxpayer to pay for the loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation. In addition, it will not be long before the law requires import controls on feed grains from Canada. This will hurt our relations with our friends to the north.

This is triple jeopardy for us in the Northeast.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER].

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I find myself today in a very peculiar situation. In the 5 years that I have been a Member of this House, this is the first time that I have taken the floor against the leadership on my side of the House. In addition to that, this is the first time that I have been able to agree with some of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture. But, I think it is about time that we quit fighting and got on with the business of passing some kind of an agricultural bill.

Now, the soil bank proposal was advanced in January of this year. It will cost considerable money. We were told by Mr. Benson and Mr. Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect, that it was a good program. I was asked to support it. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have supported it. I think it is a good program; at least, I think it will be a good program. If the soil bank program had been adopted in January of this year, it would have cost this year more money than 90 percent parity will cost the taxpayer. The passage of the soil bank program at this time, as far as I am personally concerned and as far as the farmers of my district are concerned, will give no benefit whatsoever during this year's crop, because it will not go into operation in time.

The proposal of the great minority leader to eliminate the two-price system for wheat, for which I have fought since 1932; the reduction of the parity price from 90 percent to 82½ percent, will eliminate every single benefit to my district as far as this year is concerned, even though the soil bank program and the acreage conservation program should turn out to be a success. If that program turns out to be a success, we will not need 90 percent of parity after this year because the soil bank program will make the cash price of commodities go above 90 percent. And that is the objective of every Member of Congress; that the time shall arrive when every farmer can sell his product in the market place at 100 percent of parity without the intervention of the Government in any respect.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is going to explain the two-price system. In the limited time allotted me I cannot undertake to do it but it is the only farm program that will not cost the taxpayer any money. I think it will work; I think it will be a good program.

Our great minority leader has said that the President of the United States will veto this bill if it is approved by the Congress in its present form. I have the highest love and respect not only for the President of the United States, but for the leader of my party. He represents all of the people of the United States. I represent 600,000 of those people. My conscience should tell me what to do. The President's conscience should tell him what to do. He represents a segment of society. I represent a segment of society. If I follow the leadership of the President to the detriment of my 600,000 people, my 600,000 people will be disfranchised as far as having a spokesman is concerned.

With that idea in mind, if the President's conscience tells him to veto this bill, I am not going to criticize him for doing that because it is his duty and responsibility, to follow the dictates of his conscience. I know President Eisenhower well enough to know that he would not ask me, as a Member of Congress, merely to accept his wishes, to the detriment of the people whom I represent here in the Congress. He is too big a man for that.

As long as I am a Member of this Congress I intend to look out for the best interests of the people of my district and the people of the United States. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have a duty and responsibility to the agricultural interests of the entire United States. As the Representative of the First Oklahoma District I have a duty to the farming interests of my district. Today I am discharging that duty.

For the first time, as I say, I am taking the floor in opposition to a motion that I know is going to be made by the minority leader, a man whom I admire and respect and love and whose leadership I have followed. I do that because my conscience tells me to do this and for no other reason. I do that with a heavy heart. I think his motion to recommit is a mistake. I think we should approve this conference report and send the bill down to the President.

That is the way I intend to vote.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. I thought the gentleman was going to yield me 10 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sorry, but every minute of the time has been allotted. I regret it more than I can say. More than 1 hour has been allotted on the gentleman's side of the aisle.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's attitude, but I had arranged to yield some time to the gentleman from Wisconsin from my time, on the assumption I had 10 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very sorry it happened that way. I have 5 minutes I am going to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. Maybe he can yield some time to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I understand I am to be yielded 2 minutes. I should like to accord the gentleman my time if he will give me the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The time is under the control of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In view of what the gentleman from Minnesota has said, I will yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have a preface. I feel positive the motion to recommit will not prevail, consequently I am glad to yield to my majority leader.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes, then.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank you very much.

I am equally sure the other way, may I say to my friend from Minnesota, and I think for good reason.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts pointed out, we all recognize that the farming economy is the one soft spot in the whole national economy, and we all want to do something about it. As fair-minded people we should do something about it. I am just a little afraid that as we have moved to do something, there has been too much shadowboxing and not enough attention paid to the really important factors that are involved.

There are several features in this bill, as was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], which should be brought to quick passage in the interest of the farmers of this country, not only in their interest but in the interest of all the people of the country.

Also, the gentleman from North Carolina knows that while he has responded with his committee to many of the things that the President asked—and may I say that the President's program and his proposals submitted more than 3 months ago meet with the approval not only of the farmers but the great majority of all of our people—he has in this bill many provisions that I am sure he knows himself are not right, which he knows are opposed by the President, and which, I say on my responsibility, if they go down to the White House, should bring a veto of this measure, a veto which will be sustained.

That leads me to suggest that perhaps there has been too much maneuvering for a veto and not enough real action to get a bill that will be acceptable and really helpful to the farmers.

In respect to this motion to recommit, let me say this to many of my friends on the righthand side of the aisle. When that roll is called, a lot of people will be looking to see just how you voted on some of these proposals.

The good things that are staying in the bill have already been recounted. Now what is in this motion to recommit? The first is that it holds the 82.5 percent that we fixed the past year, so we are flexible between 82.5 and 90. But certainly the 90 percent high rigid support price was calculated to be an incentive to increased production in wartime, not increased production in peacetime. I do not care how you argue it, the war is over. We are in peacetime. If you go on and on with the high rigid 90 percent formula, you will continue to pile up surpluses that will continue to plague us and continue to depress prices. I say it is time to get away from that, for the farmer's own good.

Secondly, the motion to recommit would take out the provisions for dual parity. You had arranged in the law for the application of modernized parity and, I think, there was general agreement at that time. The time has arrived to make parity more realistic, and yet here even though you know that it is completely obnoxious to the President of the United States, you insist on putting in dual parity which, I say, should not be in the bill and it ought to go out.

Now you will be doing another thing. You bring feed grains in to increase their support price from 70 percent to 85 percent. I know where most of those feed grains are grown, and maybe some of the Members who want that increase in supports think it is going to be good for the people who produce the feed grains. I seriously doubt that. But, let me say to you, you are going to make it more difficult for the corn farmers in the Middle West who are already under pressure. If you think for a minute that the people out there are not going to take a look at how you vote on this motion to recommit, you have another guess coming. The action which you are seeking to take will pile up feed grains in surplus supply and further depress the price to the farmers.

In addition to that, you put in the bill the 2-price arrangement or the 3-price formula, or whatever it is, for wheat and for rice. There again some people say it is going to be good for the wheat farmers. But, in all likelihood the minimum you will do to the corn farmers in the Middle West with that arrangement is to provide for the dumping of up to 300 million bushels of wheat on an already depressed farm market where corn is in surplus supply.

I hope the provisions of the motion to recommit will be adopted to clean up this bill and to keep the good that is in the bill and to take out the bad—but if this bill goes down to the White House in its present form and is vetoed and the veto is sustained, then those of you who are for this arrangement will go back and explain to your wheat farmers this proposition:

Under existing law, the support price on wheat will be $1.73 a bushel and under the 82½-percent proposal, as provided for in the motion to recommit, it would be $1.97 a bushel. In my book, that is a pretty good support price for wheat.

I trust without regard to partisanship that you will support this motion to recommit because it is good for the farmers and good for the consumers of the entire Nation. So far as I am concerned, there is so much bad in the bill that if we do not do something about it by the motion to recommit, I am going to vote against the conference report and I will vote to sustain the veto of the President.

Mr. Speaker, now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I come from a congressional district which produces more milk and cheese than any congressional district represented here today. I have enjoyed my work on the House Agriculture Committee and I agree with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that as members of the Committee on Agriculture, we should look at farm legislation on a nonpartisan basis. One must also look at agricultural legislation on the basis of what is best for his congressional district.

This conference report discriminates against the family-type dairy farm. The so-called basic commodities are given increases in support level of from 15 to 20 percent. The support for the so-called feed crops are increased by 17 percent. The support level for manufactured dairy products is increased by only 2.5 percent.

In addition to this, the conference report completely eliminates the Senate penalty provisions for violation of soil-bank contracts. Millions of acres will be placed in the soil bank and farmers in the areas producing basic commodities will plant this land in grasses and legumes. In order for the Wisconsin dairy farmer to be adequately protected against the diversion of this land to milk production, adequate penalty provisions were necessary to keep this land from being used for livestock and grazing. Under the conference report a producer of the so-called basic commodities can still continue to receive his price supports even though he grazes the land he has placed in the acreage reserve of the soil bank.

Milk production will be greatly increased in areas of this country outside of our historic dairyland by this conference committee action.

In addition to the objectionable features which I have already outlined as far as the dairy farmer is concerned, the conference report continues the present method of calculating the parity equivalent for manufactured milk.

The computation of the parity price at which manufactured milk is supported must be changed so that dairy farmers are assured of stability in prices. As example, $3.15 per hundredweight for manufactured milk at the beginning of 1954 was about 75 percent of parity, but now that price is approximately 83 percent of parity.

The parity equivalent for manufactured milk as now computed does not reflect a fair ratio of milk prices to farm costs. The parity equivalent for manufactured milk is based on the relationship of the price of manufactured milk to the price of all milk sold at wholesale which includes the price of class I fluid milk. During the base period of 1910–14 there was no such thing as what we know today as class I milk.

Milk used for fluid purposes in the 1910–14 period was probably inferior to present-day manufacturing milk in both quality and in the production standards or facilities required for its handling. Grade A milk as accepted in most fluid markets is a new commodity that has entered the market since 1914. The kind of milk that was produced in 1910–14 and was then sold for fluid purposes is now used almost entirely for manufacturing, a market that is also invaded by Grade A producers as a dumping ground for their surplus produced in excess of fluid needs.

In many instances, prices of fluid milk are established by Federal orders in a way that insures producers equitable incomes. At the same time, manufacturing milk prices are currently and under this conference report supported according to a "parity equivalent for manufacturing milk" that continuously declines in direct relation to rising fluid prices.

Under this conference report parity equivalent for manufacturing milk will continue to be calculated as follows:

First. The parity price of all milk sold at wholesale is computed.

Second. The relation is established between (a) the average price received by farmers for all milk sold at wholesale, and (b) the average f. o. b. plant price for milk sold for use in American cheese, evaporated milk, and butter and milk byproducts. This relation is established for the period from July 1946 through the most recent December, but when such a period exceeds 10 years for only the 10 most recent calendar years.

When fluid milk producers improve their price in relation to manufacturing milk prices, so that the margin is widened between the price of manufactured milk and the price of all milk sold at wholesale, they reduce automatically the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk the next time such parity equivalent is computed by the USDA.

This reduction is most easily illustrated by an example in which the figures are chosen for simplicity rather than by current prices and volume. In the example we will assume that 100 pounds of milk is sold, with 50 pounds going into fluid use at $4 per hundredweight and 50 pounds is sold for manufacturing at $3 per hundredweight, and 100 percent of parity is $3.50 per hundredweight for all milk sold at wholesale. In such circumstances the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be $3/$3.50 or 85 percent of parity for all milk sold at wholesale, and 100 percent of parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be $3 per hundredweight.

Now we will assume that the fluid-milk price for the period is increased to $4.50. Such an increase would bring the average price of all milk sold at wholesale up to $3.75 if there is no change in utilization. If parity for all milk remains unchanged at $3.50 per hundredweight, the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be lowered as follows:

First. The ratio of manufactured milk to all milk would be $3/$3.75 or 80 percent.

Second. Parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be reduced from 85.7 to 80 percent of the parity for all milk sold at wholesale.

Third. Parity equivalent for manufacturing milk would be 80 percent of $3.50, or only $2.80 instead of the $3 that existed before the increase in fluid milk prices.

In actual practice the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk was 88.5 percent of the parity price for all milk wholesale when first computed. It was later reduced to 84.1 percent, then 83.7 percent, and on January 31, 1956, it was further reduced to only 83.3 percent. The parity equivalent of 88 percent is based on the period of the first 30 months following July 1946. The parity equivalent of 83.3 percent is based on the period of July 1946 through December 1955. This reduction has occurred because a diffferent commodity, fluid milk, has been developed since the 1910–14 base period and has been classed in the same category with the ungraded milk of the earlier period, but which because it was a new and different product has been given a higher premium price in the market.

There is no reason for permitting a continuous decline in the level of the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk.

The Senate bill fixed the parity equivalent at the 88 percent of parity price as originally calculated. The conference report calls this method a complicated formula and rejects the Senate amendment which permanently establishes the parity equivalent at 88 percent. By so doing this conference report approves for future marketing years the continuing drop in the parity equivalent and also a much more complicated formula. This will result in a lower minimum dollars and cents support level on manufactured milk. For next year under the conference report the 80 percent of parity will be $3.08 on manufactured milk using the parity equivalent of 83.3 percent. However, in view of the fact that class I priced milk will receive increases during the next few months the parity equivalent will further drop and I predict that by December 31, 1956, the parity equivalent will be 82.7 percent.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] is of utmost importance to a congressional district such as mine which produces its milk almost solely to be manufactured into dairy products. We need to fix the parity equivalent for manufactured milk in line with what parity should represent. This amendment should be supported by every Congressman from a dairy district. The parity equivalent must be established at the 88-percent figure and the only method we can use to insure this action is to reject the conference report and to adopt this important amendment. If this amendment is not adopted, I certainly cannot support the conference report. I cannot sit here today and cast my vote in opposition to this important provision. A vote for the conference report without the Martin amendment is a vote to reduce the minimum support level to at least $3.08 in the next marketing year and undoubtedly with the new parity equivalent calculation which will be made on December 31, a still further reduction in the minimum support level is in the making for the next marketing year.

If the Martin amendment is adopted the parity equivalent for manufactured milk will be pegged at 88 percent of parity on all milk sold at wholesale. The 80 to 90 percent support range for the next marketing year would be from $3.26 to $3.66 per hundredweight. Under the conference report the 80 to 90 percent support range would be from $3.08 to $3.47 per hundredweight based on the present 83.3 percentage parity equivalent. With the increases, however, which are currently in the making for class I milk this dollars-and-cents range will be even lower on December 31, 1956.

The position taken by the majority party in supporting this conference report today is indeed detrimental to the best interests of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. The majority party position regarding the milk producer is directly opposite to the statements made by Democrat politicians campaigning in our State. Action speaks louder than words. If this conference report is approved without the Martin amendment, it will clearly show that the majority party continues to lack a sympathetic understanding of the problems of the Wisconsin dairy farmer. Farmers in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin receive less than 2 percent of their total cash income from agricultural commodities which have been given preferential treatment by this conference report.

I am unwilling to sell the Wisconsin family type dairy farm down the river for political expediency. The dairy farmer deserves more consideration than has been shown to him in this conference report. The dairy farmer is the forgotten man in this conference report.

I am most interested in having a farm bill in this year 1956. The President has indicated that he will sign a farm bill if it includes the provisions as outlined in the Martin amendment. If the provisions of the Martin amendment are not included, it will be vetoed. I therefore urge my colleagues, particularly from dairy districts, to vote "Aye" on the Martin motion. If this motion does not prevail, certainly we will have no other recourse but to vote against this conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], I regret to find myself in opposition to the position of the leadership of my party. I cannot say exactly the same thing he said, that this is the first time, because there have been other times, but I would say there are very few people on the Republican side of this House who have a better record for supporting the program of President Eisenhower than have I.

Of course we all have our responsibilities. The President has his. I would not feel I was doing my full responsibility to my constituents and to the country as a whole at this time if I did not do what I think is the thing that must be done if we are going to keep agriculture in this country on an even keel.

I want to begin my statement by reading a paragraph from a Department of Agriculture publication for March 1956 entitled "The Farm Income Situation."

It reads as follows:

> The farmers' realized net income in 1955 is now estimated at $10,800,000,000; down a billion dollars or 9 percent from 1954 on the basis of more complete information on farm marketings and farm production costs last year.

Now that is what has happened in 1955 as compared with 1954. 1954 was less than 1953. 1953 was less than 1952. I do not know how long this situation can continue and agriculture remain solvent in this country. But I am not going to dwell further on that question because my time is limited.

It is not the farmer alone who is being affected. In every small community, in every county seat town in the United

States, businessmen at this time are beginning to feel the pinch that is coming because of low farm prices and high farm costs.

I hold in my hand a little article that I have taken from this morning's Wall Street Journal, and I want to read a paragraph or two from that. It says:

FARM EQUIPMENT MAKERS PLAN NEW CUTBACKS IN OUTPUT AS SPRING SALES SHOW NO PICKUP—MASSEY-HARRIS ASKS WAGE CUT—HARVESTER TO SLASH PRODUCTION APRIL 30

Spring breezes are blowing cold for farm equipment and tractor producers. Advent of the farm planting season has brought no pickup in lethargic sales of this industry.

So companies are tightening belts still further after earlier production adjustments and layoffs.

Massey-Harris-Ferguson, Inc., yesterday told its nearly 800 workers at its Batavia, N. Y., plant to accept a pay cut to keep the unit operating. International Harvester Co. reports it has scheduled tractor and other farm implement production cutbacks for April 30. Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, reports a 20-percent cut in its tractor production in March, with 100 employees shifted to other departments.

Other farm equipment makers report slow sales and production cuts which are coming on top of earlier slowdowns.

The article goes on and recites how other farm implement companies are cutting back. So you see this is not something that is confined to farmers or to farming communities. It is something that is affecting the very economy of the country itself.

I do not know of anything we can do to help farmers increase their income this year except to depend upon some of the provisions of this bill. I am speaking particularly of dual parity and of the 90 percent of parity provision on basic commodities.

I am for the soil bank. I think it is a splendid idea. I think it will work out, but it will not function to any extent this year. We cannot count on any help from the soil bank except in very restricted areas. So the only way that Congress can do anything this year to stop this constant drop, drop, drop in farm income is to vote down the motion to recommit and adopt this conference report.

I have no information as to what the President will do when this bill is placed upon his desk. But I am sure that he will give consideration to every aspect of the matter and will take into account all of the facts which the conferees and the Congress had before them when the bill was passed.

I want to devote the remainder of my time, if I may, to a discussion of the domestic parity provision, which is one of the items included in this motion to recommit. I think many of you are familiar with it.

This plan is also known by other names, such as the certificate plan and the two-price system. The term "two-price system," however, is a misnomer as applied to the domestic parity plan, because under this plan all wheat would be sold on the market at one price, that is, the going market price. The principles of this plan are in successful operation in the field of dairy products under marketing agreements, and have been discussed in connection with other commodities.

Briefly, the plan and its operation may be described as follows:

First, all wheat would be sold without marketing quotas or restrictions of any kind.

Second, at the beginning of each marketing year the Secretry of Agriculture would make an estimate of the average going market price for that year. He would also announce the parity price of wheat for the year.

Third, the Secretary would estimate the probable amount of wheat which would go into domestic consumption for human food during the marketing year. This amount, which for many years has been approximately 500 million bushels, would then be allotted among the wheat farms of the Nation on substantially the same basis as acreage allotments are made now, except that in this case the acreage would be translated into bushels and the allotment to each farm would be in bushels. Each wheat farmer would receive a certificate stating the number of bushels constituting his share of the estimated domestic consumption of wheat for food.

This certificate would have a value in dollars and cents of the number of bushels which it represented multiplied by the difference between the going market price of wheat as estimated by the Secretary and full parity.

Let us assume for the sake of illustration that the number of bushels represented by this certificate is 1,000 and that the difference between the estimated price of wheat and full parity is 75 cents per bushel. In that event the certificate would have a value of $750.

WHERE WOULD THE MONEY COME FROM?

The next question is how would the farmer realize cash on this certificate and from whence would the money come? The answer to that question is that each miller or other processor of wheat will have to purchase certificates covering the total amount of wheat which he processes for domestic consumption as human food.

It will not be necessary for farmers to deal directly with millers because under the pending legislation the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized through the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy and sell marketing certificates. Thus the Commodity Credit Corporation would act as a clearinghouse. Farmers would turn their certificates in to the Commodity Credit Corporation through the county agricultural stabilization committee and millers in turn would buy certificates from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The program in general would be administered by the county agricultural stabilization committees which administer other agricultural programs. The benefits which may be anticipated from this legislation are numerous and may be summarized as follows:

First. Returns to the farmer will be somewhat greater than under the present program and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets will further increase these returns in the future.

Second. Marketing quotas and penalties will be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly entirely eliminated in the course of time.

Third. Relief to taxpayers will be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction and eventual elimination of practically all the costs of the present program under which export subsidies and storage costs amount in the aggregate to over $400 million per year.

Fourth. To a large extent it will take the Government out of the warehousing and merchandising of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether.

Fifth. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for sale to the Government and would be sold on the basis of quality thus encouraging good farming and the production of superior varieties.

Sixth. Producers of livestock and poultry wherever situated would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices.

Seventh. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape, delays and other obstacles existing at present.

Eighth. It would result in moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels.

Ninth. It will fit in perfectly with the soil bank proposals recently submitted by the President.

Tenth. It will return to the farmer greater freedom and control over the operation of his own farm.

The only real objection that I have heard made to this program, the only one that is substantial, is one that has been made by the producers of feed grains who have felt that perhaps it might result in increasing the supply of feed grains. In reply to that let me call attention to the fact that most of the acres we have taken out of wheat under the present program have gone into the production of feed grains. And let me call your attention to these figures very briefly. Compared with the 10-year average 1944 to 1953, we reduced wheat production by 216 million bushels in 1955. Bear that figure in mind.

But for the same period we increased feed grain production exclusive of corn and soy beans by 482 million bushels—more than twice as many bushels of feed grain were produced on those acres than went out of production of wheat. In other words, if wheat had been grown on that land and every bushel had been fed to livestock we would have fed less than half as many bushels of grain as we actually produced by transferring from wheat to other feed grains.

So if those in the Corn Belt who have a sincere belief that this may interfere with feed grain prices will only consider what has happened and is happening at this time they can see that there is no danger of increasing feed grains supplies; rather, the reverse.

But I want also to call attention to the fact that there is in the bill itself a provision which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may establish acreage allotments on wheat. So he has it in his power to prevent such an expansion of production of wheat as will result in an increase of the total feed grain supply.

Furthermore, the Secretary has the authority to put a low loan upon wheat, and one ingredient of that is the price of corn, so that he has the authority to prevent wheat from coming into unfair competition with corn as a feed grain. There will be less feed grains produced if this proposal is adopted than have been otherwise. Furthermore, this provision does not go into effect automatically; two-thirds of the wheatgrowers voting in a referendum must vote to put it into effect.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. The statement was made a while ago by the gentleman from Connecticut that this would raise the price of food to the people of the United States. It can never raise the price of food beyond 100 percent of parity, and 100 percent of parity merely constitutes a fair price. Nothing in this bill, therefore, would ever raise the price of wheat or the price of bread beyond a fair price to the farmer. That being true, we pass tariff laws on everything else for the very purpose of guaranteeing a fair price, so I do not believe that the people of the United States expect to get their food below a fair price.

Mr. HOPE. Let me say to the gentleman, and I am glad he brought that matter up, that in the 7-year period from 1948 to 1955 wheat prices in this country went down 31 percent while the price of bread went up 28 percent. There is no correlation between the wheat price and the price of a loaf of bread.

Let me call attention also to the fact that in 1914 the average hourly wage of a factory worker would buy 3½ pound loaves of bread, in 1929 it would buy 6.1 loaves of bread and this year the average hourly earnings of the industrial employee will buy 11 loaves of bread.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the gentleman knows there has been some concern about wheat going into feed grain. Will the 90 percent provision for corn, along with the other lending provisions in the conference report for oats, barley and sorghums, offset possibly any detriment that your feed wheat might create in the feed market as against corn?

Mr. HOPE. I think it will to a very large extent.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the corn farmer is adequately protected in the conference report and in the conference bill? Of course, the corn farmer of Iowa, most of them, also raise wheat, oats, barley, and sorghums. Is it not a fact that the provisions of the conference report will greatly benefit the oats, the barley, and the sorghum farmers?

Mr. HOPE. They will. They will not only increase the price support level but they will bring about a reduction which we must have in all our feed grains if we are going to strike a balance.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House vote down the motion to recommit and adopt the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. I wanted to ask the preceding speaker why I have a handful of telegrams from bakers who are alarmed about the two-price wheat system because they say it is going to raise the price of bread.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my speech a statement by the Secretary last February made before the Committee on Agriculture, showing that the basic commodities yielded a net loss, did at that time, of $5,077,000,000 and that the losses in 1954 were three times the losses in 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, testified before the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, February 17, 1955, as follows:

The aggregate realized cost of these programs for the period from 1932 through 1954 was $8,469.2 million, of which $962.5 million represents costs realized in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. The costs in 1954 were almost 3 times those realized during the fiscal year 1953.

Of the $8,469.2 million realized costs of these programs, $5,077.1 million is attributable to the basic commodities, as follows:

	Millions
Corn	$1,228.2
Cotton	1,581.4
Peanuts	163.0
Rice	35.3
Tobacco	97.0
Wheat	1,972.2
Total	5,077.1

This is a far cry from the $500 million figure just quoted as losses on the price support program. If we add to the $8,469,200,000 losses just quoted $4,238,900,000 representing a Government procurement of agricultural commodities for foreign aid programs, we arrive at the total of $12,708,100,000, which is very near the $13 billion which I quoted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the motion made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to recommit with instructions to the House conferees the conference report on H. R. 12. My reasons are as follows:

First. The report repeats and augments the fatal mistakes of the program in effect until 1954, which accounts for our present agricultural distress.

Second. It not only repeats but increases the incentive to further production and as a result means continued over-production and continued declines in farm income as excess production piles up in Government warehouses.

Third. It invites and hastens the tragic day of reckoning by offering a renewed and even stronger effort to completely repeal the law of supply and demand and thereby sacrifice the welfare of all of our farmers for temporary expediency.

Fourth. It renders almost inoperative the soil bank, which is the major if not the only provision in the report designed to go to the heart of all farmers' problems. In other words, the provisions of the report attempt to go in two opposite directions at the same time.

Fifth. It discriminates further in favor of the basic commodities which produce only 25 to 26 percent of the Nation's agricultural income, while at the same time the producers of many of the other agricultural commodities are far worse off than the producers of the basics. There is only one exception here, and that is the dairy industry. It, in my opinion, justifies the recommendation provided in the report because surpluses of butter and dry milk have been consumed and supply and demand appear to be in balance, at least at the present time, and possibly will continue to be so if the soil bank becomes operative and the supply of feed grains is materially reduced.

Let us consider first my last proposition; namely, that the report discriminates further in favor of the basic commodities, and that this discrimination plus the competitive effects of diverted acres from the basic commodities threaten with ruin the producers of many of the other agricultural commodities.

Now, the so-called basics which are accorded this preferential treatment are really not the basics because:

First. They do not provide farmers with the bulk of their income.

Second. They are no more fundamental, and probably not as fundamental to the maintenance of good diets and health as the nonbasics.

Third. They are not the agricultural commodities for which the consuming public is expressing the greatest demand at the meat counter, the local dairy, or the fruit and vegetable market.

As proof of my charge of rank favoritism shown the basic commodities, I call your attention to the contrasts between the percentage of parity received by the basic commodities and the average received by other commodities, as reported by the USDA under date of March 15, 1956, as follows:

First. Upland cotton receives 90 percent of parity.

Second. Wheat 82 percent of parity.

Third. Rice 82 percent of parity.

Fourth. Peanuts 90 percent of parity.

Now, compare these with the parity prices producers receive for the nonbasics:

First. Beef cattle and calves, which alone provide farmers with considerably more income than all of the basics, combined average 68 percent of parity for beef and 71 percent of parity for calves.

Second. Chickens are at 77 percent of parity;

Third. Hogs are at 58 percent of parity;

Fourth. Lambs are at 77 percent of parity;

Fifth. Sheep are at 64 percent of parity.

Mr. Speaker, section 104 of the report also eliminates the new parity formula for determining the price support level on basic commodities. It would permit the use of either old or new parity whichever would give the highest level.

This action once again means added preferential treatment for the producers of basic commodities, commodities which provide farmers with only 25 or 26 percent of total net income. Yet, we produce over 130 different agricultural commodities in this country. For example, based on January 15, 1956, figures:

First. Wheat would be supported at 103 percent of the existing new parity.

Second. Corn would be supported at 100 percent of new parity.

Third. Cotton would be supported at 91 percent of new parity.

In the second place, the report not only increases the favoritism already shown the basic commodities, but worst of all the recommendation of 90 percent of parity upon the basics will render ineffective the only part of this bill which offers any prospect of help to livestock producers. This is the soil bank, in particular the acreage reserve program.

It is extremely doubtful that producers of wheat, cotton, and corn can be induced to put acreage allotment land in the acreage reserve when they can get price support on the quantity they produce at 90 percent of parity but only, as the conference report points out, "approximately 50 percent of the price support for that quantity of the commodity which would normally be produced on the land placed in the acreage reserve"—page 37. Let me explain by pointing out the choice of alternative which Utah wheat producers would face.

Even if the dual parity feature of this conference report does not remain in the bill, the support level on wheat at old parity would be $2.14 per bushel. With an average yield of 16 bushels per acre a farmer could receive $34.24 per acre. If it cost him 80 cents per bushel to raise that 16 bushels, his total cost per acre would be $12.80. So his net return for his wheat on this acre would be $21.54.

Now, if his rate of payment for placing an acre of wheat allotment land in the acreage reserve were one-half that of the support level—$1.07 per bushel, and his average yield were 16 bushels, his payment for placing an acre in the reserve would be $17.12. This would be $5.42 less for putting an acre of land in the acreage reserve than he could get under price support at 90 percent of parity. Now it is true that even if the farmer placed an acre of land in the acreage reserve certain fixed costs would still have to be met. I have not shown that calculation here, since I do not know what portion of that 80 cents per bushel cost figure represents fixed costs. But as long as this factor is held constant, which is the case, in my example comparing the incentives a farmer has to put an acre of land in the reserve at 76 percent of parity with that at 90 percent of parity the comparison is valid.

With price support 76 percent of parity or $1.81 per bushel, as it will be for 1956, and assuming an average yield of 16 bushels to the acre, a farmer could get $28.96 per acre. His cost per acre at 80 cents per bushel would be $12.80 and his net return would be $16.16. On the other hand, if he were given an incentive of one-half the support level to put the same acre in the acreage reserve he would receive $14.48. So that although it would appear at first glance to pay a farmer to put his wheat under price support, and his per-acre return would be $1.68 more, it might not in fact actually pay him to do so, when it is realized that he still would have some fixed costs even on land placed in the acreage reserve.

Thus, it is evident because the difference between total costs per acre and total returns per acre is narrower at lower support levels than at higher levels—90 percent for example, that farmers will not put land in the reserve at higher levels when they will be more inclined to do so at lower levels. I do believe that the incentive level, however, will need to be at least 60 and maybe even 65 percent of the support level in order to induce enough participation to get 12 to 15 million acres of wheat out of production. Furthermore, I would recommend that the Secretary raise this incentive to 60 or 65 percent.

Part of my opposition to both the 90 percent rigid support level and dual parity is that they will operate to prevent participation in the acreage reserve—the only hope we have of balancing supply with the demand for basic products and of getting production of diverted acres out of feed grains.

Furthermore, the committee's statement on page 35 is tantamount to an admission that 13 years of mandatory, rigid, price supports have created "a crisis in farm income that may become a catastrophe unless strong action is taken to bolster farm income." Yet these same people would not only feed the farmer the same medicine which has resulted in a 20-percent loss of income this year due to price depressing surpluses but also would add to his dosage. At the same time they blame the Secretaries of Agriculture for the farmer's sickness and for failure to operate a law that leaders of the agriculture committees have made inoperable and attempt to make still more inoperable.

The time has come when, in the general public interest, to say nothing of the best interests of all American farmers, a majority of the Members of Congress must stop a distinguished minority of its Members, who dominate the agricultural committees and thereby the conference committees, from enacting special-interest legislation for the benefit of the producers of a few select commodities, under the guise that it is good for the entire country.

For 3½ years, this small minority of powerful defenders of 90 percent price support on 6 so-called basic commodities which provide American farmers as a whole with only 25 or 26 percent of their total net income, has prevented the adoption of a sound price support program.

I do not want to be a party to the badgering and abuse which committee leaders have heaped upon the heads of our Secretaries of Agriculture of both political persuasions merely because these leaders have the whip hand. Neither do I want to lead a crusade to bring down the wrath of the people upon the heads of the Secretaries of Agriculture because they try in all sincerity to make operable an unworkable law which they have forced them to administer. I do not want future Secretaries of Agriculture, the farmers who produce the 75 percent of our agricultural commodities, our taxpayers and all consumers whom ratification of this conference report would injure, to suffer from my transgressions.

That is why I plead with you, my colleagues, to support the motion to recommit, to be guided by principle rather than expediency and to clean this bill up and to make it workable. If we think as much of all of the farmers as we say we do we'll get them a good bill and do it now. It is within our power to do so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I would like to know whether or not the committee of conference report authorizes a farmer to grow as much grain, particularly wheat, as he chooses to grow so long as he uses it on his own farm.

Mr. ARENDS. I think that is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Without any equivocation or without any conditions, he may grow as much as he wants?

Mr. ARENDS. I understand that is right.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for giving me these 5 short minutes. That is the best he could do, I know. I wish I had an hour, because, coming from a great agricultural district, I have some understanding of the farmers' problems and of what is proposed in this legislation.

It is my belief the average Member who represents an agricultural district is trying to find a solution to the farm problem. We differ, however, as to what the solution really is. I believe there is a sincere desire on the part of the average Member representing an agricultural district to reach a decision whereby we may have a constructive bill which will benefit the farmer. It is my conviction that will not be accomplished if the conference report is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, in the years I have been in Congress I do not know a single measure that has disturbed me as much as this particular proposal before us. I am not speaking politically or in a partisan manner. I am talking solely from an economic point of view. As I mentioned on this floor before, I am not intelligent enough to vote for a Republican farmer on one side of the road as against a Democratic farmer on the other side of the road or vice versa. It just cannot be done. Either I vote for the benefit of agriculture as a whole, or I vote against the best interests of agriculture as a whole, and what I am attempting to do is to vote in the best interests of all agriculture. Accordingly I think this conference report should be sent back to the committee for further consideration.

The conference report now before us is completely self-contradictory and contains much that could hurt farmers far more than it could help them. Frankly, I do not see how the President could sign this bill if it were passed, and I do not believe he will.

It is imperative that the bad features of the bill should be deleted so that other sound and constructive provisions can bring help to farmers this year.

I came from the so-called Corn Belt. Let me speak about it specifically. The Corn Belt has inherited surplus problems that originated in wheat and cotton. Over 17 million acres diverted out of these crops have gone into oats, barley, and grain sorghums. As a result, the 1954 and 1955 production of these feed grains increased more than 800 million bushels. And what did they supplant? Eight hundred million bushels of corn, thus leading to a buildup of corn carryover and disastrously low acreage allotments for corn in the commercial corn area.

Existing legislation prescribes how corn acreage allotments must be figured. Under these requirements an allotment of 43 million acres has already been announced for 1956—down 22 percent from the planted acreage and 15 percent from the allotted acreage of last year. The Corn Belt cannot live with such severe restrictions, nor can our agricultural heartland any longer bear the brunt of surplus accumulations and acreage restrictions on wheat and cotton.

If we do not pass workable and sound legislation the situation in the Corn Belt becomes worse. That I firmly believe. Existing law prescribes how corn allotments shall be figured. Acreage allotments in subsequent years will be forced lower than the 43 million acres announced for this year, other feed grains will be taking the market and corn stocks will be further accumulated. Put that down in your book and remember it.

Remember always that corn has no minimum allotment as do wheat and cotton. I repeat, corn has no minimum allotment as do wheat and cotton. This year many farmers will be forced to plant more than their acreage allotments which means corn prices could be further depressed.

If we can improve this bill as proposed in the recommittal motion, the Corn Belt could be relieved this year of restrictions that now have become practically intolerable. Simple justice demands relief from the surplus problems of others dumped upon the Corn Belt. We must write a bill the President can sign or we automatically force on our corn farmers a corn allotment too small for them to live with.

The chief difficulty with the provision in the bill for mandatory price support on feed grain will be noncompliance—the same problem we have had on corn.

The way the program provided in this bill now before us is set up, feed grain acreage would have to be reduced sharply below 1955 levels in order for a farmer to participate. In North Dakota the cut would be 27 percent; in Iowa, 14 percent; in Washington, 40 percent; in Texas, 26 percent; in Ohio, 22 percent; in New York, 17 percent, and so on. Nationwide the cut would be 20 percent. With cuts as sharp as this many farmers would choose to stay out of the program.

The result will be that a certain percentage of the farmers would come into the program and turn their crop over to the Government. Others would stay out, and increase production.

Our 1955 experience with low participation in the corn program and low prices will be duplicated here for the other feed grains. Note, that except for 1956, these feed grain producers who do not cut their acreage sharply will not be eligible for any supports. This will hurt not help the corn producer.

In the Midwest, in order to become eligible for the higher support rate, farmers, once they find out their farm base—this cannot be done in less than a month—will have to plow under substantial acreages. The oats will have already been planted.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge that this conference report be recommitted for further consideration. We do not have before us a farm bill, in the true sense of the word, in that it does not solve the farmer's problem—it only complicates it and creates new problems. In my view this is not a farm bill but a mere pretense. I would say that the bill we have before us is more of a political measure than anything else.

I have been in rather intimate touch with all that has transpired during the course of the consideration of this legislation. It has been my privilege to attend the conferences at the White House on the subject and participate in the discussions.

While the President has not said categorically that he would veto this bill if, in its present form, it comes to him for approval, I am confident that he will. I am also confident that he will make certain that the farmers know why and that he will insist upon another measure.

For one, I shall urge upon the President that he explain to the people of this great country why this measure is unacceptable and why this Congress should remain in session, however long, until it deals realistically, objectively, constructively, and economically, rather than politically as here proposed in the bill before us, with the grave farm problem we have before us.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter from the Illinois Agricultural Association and a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1956.

In re H. R. 12.

Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ARENDS: The conference committee recommendations upon H. R. 12, in our opinion, provide very well for the interests of cotton and wheat producers but again pass a major portion of the burden for adjustments in production to the Corn Belt. This is done, notwithstanding the fact that farm income in the Corn Belt already has fallen much lower, proportionately, than farm income in these other areas.

The committee would retain the 2- or 3-price plan for wheat. Wheatgrowers would be assured 100 percent of parity for wheat produced for the domestic market. The remainder of their wheat, which is not exported, could be dumped on the domestic market as feed in competition with corn and other feed grains, which are already in surplus supply. A large portion of the existing surplus of more than 1 billion bushels of wheat, plus an estimated one-half of the future wheat production in the United States, might be sold as feed.

As further evidence of the preferential treatment of wheat and cotton growers, the law now provides a minimum of 55 million acres for wheat and H. R. 12, in effect, would provide a minimum acreage of about 17.4 million acres for cotton. Although the wheat area has diverted approximately 21 million acres out of wheat into soybeans and feed grains, and the cotton area has diverted approximately 8 million acres out of cotton into soybeans and feed grains, the committee struck from the bill the requirement that beginning with 1957 crops, in order to be eligible for price supports, producers must place a percentage of their acreage in the soil bank. The committee retained the provision fixing a 51-million-acre base for corn but with a requirement that in order to qualify for price supports the corn grower must place crop land acreage equal to at least 15 percent of the corn base in the soil bank. The Illinois Agricultural Association feels that the growers of wheat and cotton should be treated in the same manner and that the provision requiring participation in the soil bank, in order to be eligible for price supports, should be retained in the bill.

With respect to feed grains, which compete with corn, the bill would raise the support price. The increased production of soybeans and feed grains has largely occurred in the cotton and wheat areas. This would further encourage increased production of these feed grains. The bill would require the small grain grower to place an acreage equal to 15 percent of the small grain acreage in the soil bank in order to receive price supports. Thus, the Illinois farmer would be required to place an acreage equal to 15 percent of his corn base, plus an acreage equal to 15 percent of the amount usually planted in oats and other grains, in the soil bank. However, in Illinois, oats for 1956 already have been sown.

If we are realistic, we know that it is too late for the bill to be effective in Illinois this year. Small grains for the most part already have been sown. After the bill is passed, at best it will be 3 or 4 weeks before soil bank regulations can be issued and information carried down through the State and county offices to the farm level. By that time, corn will have been planted, too.

We recognize that a majority of the members of the conference committee cannot be familiar with Corn Belt problems. If the interests of the Corn Belt and Illinois are to be protected, this will have to be done on the floor. In view of the fact that the bill can have but little effect this year, we would urge that it be sent back to the conference committee with instructions to bring back a bill that is fair to all areas and particularly with instructions to include provisions which will obtain some control over diverted acres in all areas.

Sincerely,

ILLINOIS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION,
OTTO STEFFEY, *President.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 10, 1956.*

Hon. LESLIE C. ARENDS,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

There is no justification for Congress to rush through ill-considered farm legislation. To accept the conference committee report would be harmful to agriculture. It is too late for the soil bank to be effective this year.

Among the objectionable features of the bill are:

(1) Fixed price supports for the basic commodities for 1956 at 90 percent of parity.

(2) The double standard for computing parity prices.

(3) Title V, price-support program for wheat and rice.

(4) Mandatory support of noncommercial area corn and the mandatory increase in the support prices from 70 percent to 85 percent of parity for oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums.

(5) A 10 cent per hundredweight increase in the 1956 dairy price-support level and 80 to 90 percent mandatory support for dairy products in 1957 and thereafter.

(6) Lack of control of delivered acres.

These provisions nullify other parts of the bill that might help adjust the agricultural plant to effective market demand.

The policy of fixing prices for certain farm commodities has been an important factor contributing to the development of our excess productive capacity and the present unsatisfactory farm-income situation.

One of the main objectives of the soil bank is to shrink the overexpanded agricultural plant. The conference committee report would have the effect of encouraging the production of wasteful and price-depressing surpluses.

We recommend rejection of conference report and enactment of Legislation that will actually help bring supplies in line with effective market demand.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unfair to both the farmer and the general taxpayer. It is a short term sop rather than a long-term solution to the ills besetting our agricultural economy. It is a political potpourri of conflicting proposals.

Every agricultural expert I have talked to blames the present drop in farm income on price-depressing surpluses. These surpluses are directly attributable to the rigid price support program that has been in effect in recent years. This bill we are asked to approve continues and in some cases expands the rigid price support theory. We are giving the farmer more of the medicine in a somewhat stronger form than that which has made him ill.

Let us take the dairy industry as an example. Two years ago, Secretary Benson lowered the price supports on dairy products as he was required to do by law. A hue and cry went up that by so doing, the Secretary was going to destroy our dairy farmers. This did not happen. Today, the dairy industry is in better shape than it has been for 3 years. Milk prices are better than they were when the Secretary lowered the support prices. And—miraculous to say—the Government does not own 1 pound of surplus butter. Yet this bill would junk that program. The dairy farmer would be returned to the straitjacket of high price supports. Surpluses would again begin to pile up as would the resentment of the city taxpayer.

The sensible feature of this legislation—the soil bank—comes too late to benefit many of our farmers. And the purpose of the soil bank—to cut production without penalizing the farmer—has been nullified by other sections of the bill which encourage more production.

The farmers need and are entitled to have sound legislation that will solve their problem on a long-term basis. They must not be at the whim of each succeeding Congress. Provisions of this bill setting high support prices on domestic feed grains benefit temporarily one type of farmer. But at the same time the livestock grower and poultry producer who must buy these feeds is penalized by having to compete with the Government for their purchase.

The continuation of the Government surplus purchase program is unfair to the farmers because it subjects them to criticism from city taxpayers that they do not deserve. Given the help proposed by the soil bank proposal and the conservation reserve, they could work out their own solution. But with this legislation, they will be again plunged into a program which has brought them to grief.

One of the few good features of the legislation as it was approved by the other body was deleted in conference. I am referring to the ceiling limits on the amount of Government purchases any single farm could receive. We are asked to approve this legislation to benefit the family farmer, yet the lion's share of the funds will go to large corporate farms that do not need any Government help. Certainly a $100,000 gross limit on the amount of Government commodity purchases any one farmer could receive would be sufficiently high to include the type of farmer we are trying to help. But this has been taken out of the bill. I can't vote for any legislation that permits the Government to turn over up to $1 million to one corporate farm from taxes collected from our working people at a basic rate of 22 percent of their income.

Let us draft good, sound farm legislation. I have confidence that this is the type of legislation our farmers want. They are tired of being a political prize auctioned off each election year by each succeeding session of Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few feeble remarks in my weak way about this situation. One protest I want to make is that I do not believe it is right to threaten the Congress of the United States with a veto by the President.

We have three distinct divisions of this Government. We started out that way and I hope we are still on that course. The leader of the minority party comes in here today and gives us to understand that if this bill is not passed as they want it there will be a veto.

I have been up against a good many scary things in my life and I have not run yet. That veto does not scare me any, because I do not think the President has anything to do with veto, for, if the papers can be relied on, Mr. Benson says he will not approve this bill, so I do not think it will ever reach the President.

I will tell you the situation we are in in North Dakota. We do not raise 1 bushel of surplus wheat, not 1 bushel, yet everybody that comes out there to talk hollers "Surplus, surplus." If they were wakened in the night suddenly, the first utterance they would make would be "Surplus," when we do not have any. We raise hard spring wheat, not soft wheat, and there never has been and there never will be a surplus of that kind of wheat.

We are limited to a half section of 41 acres to plant. Who can make a living for a family on 41 acres, no matter what the yield is?

Then this bill provides for something that I am opposed to, but the general benefits outweigh the damage. They are gong to have a soil bank. Where are they going to get the soil bank? They are going down into our little limited 41 acres and take it out of that. It just makes the future of the farmer less secure by taking away 8 acres of the 41. How many acres do you have left? Thirty-three.

I wish I had means enough and my friends had means enough to live this thing through and let you chicken feeders on the Atlantic seaboard have another depression. You want "soup lines" again. They appeal to you but commonsense and reason, apparently, do not.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, we have at least 57 different varieties of opinion on farm legislation. Major farm organizations are in disagreement, and there is also great disagreement among Members of Congress. It is very difficult even to find farmer neighbors in agreement as to the proper type of legislation that should be approved by Congress to solve the farm-surplus problem. I respect the judgment and opinions of those who do not agree with me.

The production of food in this country is vital to every person whether they live in the cities or on a farm. Therefore, food and fiber production is also vital to the entire economy and security of our country.

During my service in Congress, I have always taken the position that we need a strong and prosperous agriculture. The buying power of American farmers is essential to the men and women engaged in business, industry, and labor in all of our communities. Farmers now find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which has already had its effect upon those engaged in business and profession in our respective communities. The farmer is a good buyer when his income permits. Therefore, I am approaching the farm problem in the philosophy that we must have a strong and prosperous agriculture for the benefit of the Nation's economy.

I was a minority member of the conference committee on the farm bill. In view of falling farm prices, I sincerely feel that it is necessary to have a satisfactory farm bill enacted during the present session. A conference com-

mittee was delegated to work out a bill, and naturally, we were forced to compromise our individual positions on some issues in order to secure an agreement in the conference report which is being considered today. There are provisions in the conference report which I do not like, and if it were left to me to write a farm bill, it would suit me but there might be many others in disagreement. Other members of the conference committee were in the same position, and we therefore endeavored to compose our differences in order to work out the best kind of a farm bill under the circumstances.

I definitely feel that all farm legislation, as well as other legislative proposals, should be considered on a nonpolitical basis. I have endeavored to follow such a policy in considering the present farm bill. A political farm bill will never be of much value to American agriculture, and I hope that the time is close at hand when Congress can enact legislation, which will place agriculture on an equality basis with other segments of our economy. I signed the conference report in the spirit which I have indicated. It was the best bill that we could get out of the conference.

One impelling reason why I signed the conference report was because it contained a major portion of President Eisenhower's nine-point proposal. The keystone to the President's program created the soil bank which provides for taking tillable acres of land out of production so as to reduce surplus farm products in the United States. I am for the President's nine-point program as publicized in the newspapers.

We have been working on the farm surplus problem ever since I came to Congress. This was when we brought up the first-passed McNary-Haugen bill. At that time, I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The McNary-Haugen bill was never put into operation although twice passed by Congress. It dealt with the removal of surplus farm products. Some of the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill are embodied in the wheat proposal set forth in the conference report.

I feel that this program should be tried. We have tried many other schemes to get rid of surplus wheat without a great deal of success. Of course, the wars that we have been engaged in during the past 40 years have solved our surplus food problem, but I for one, do not want another war to be the solution of this important problem.

Time will not permit me to go into detail over the conference report. This report is available to all of the Members and I hope that you will study it. However, let me reiterate that we need farm legislation now and Congress should not adjourn without passing on this vital issue. I hope that the bill presented in the conference report will be agreed to.

My very distinguished and good friend, who spoke to you a few moments ago, the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE, is now serving his last term in Congress. He has announced his retirement. I have served with him on the Committee on Agriculture for nearly 30 years. While we have had some differences of opinion, we have both worked for what we thought would be for the best interests of American agriculture. I regret that Mr. HOPE is leaving Congress. He has performed outstanding service during the past 30 years for his constituents and the country at large. He is, and has been, a very valuable Member of the House of Representatives—a man of integrity, a good legislator and one who has had the respect of all Members on both sides of the aisle. I am sure that all of my colleagues join with me in wishing Mr. and Mrs. Hope the best of health, happiness, and success when he leaves as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I respect the opinions of others. Although I hope that all people will agree with me, I fully recognize that I sometimes find myself in disagreement with other able Members and officials. In other words, I do not condemn or criticize those who have different opinions than mine. I vote my convictions, and that is the way it should be with all persons who have the country's interest at heart. Although there are certain provisions of the conference report with which I find myself in disagreement, I nevertheless feel that we have done a fairly good job in reaching an agreement and in bringing this conference report to the House of Representatives for a vote.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, certainly in a few minutes I cannot discuss the details of this bill. I am not complaining, for under the rules of the House under which we are operating, we have 2 hours for debate and 435 Members. It certainly is not a perfect bill, but it contains many provisions which in my opinion will help the agricultural people of this country. Some of the provisions will help some sections and not help others; however, after considering the whole bill, I think it should pass and expect to vote for it. Certainly I feel it is the best we can do at this time, for the agricultural problem is one that involves the whole Nation—consumer as well as producer—and it is not an easy matter for 435 Members of Congress from every section to come up with the perfect bill that would satisfy everybody. Any farm bill must of necessity be the result of compromise.

Several things have happened during this debate that are rather astounding to me. I have great respect for the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN]. He comes out with the statement that the greater part of the provisions of the President's bill, sent down here in January, are in this bill. Then following that the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]—and I have served with him for over 20 years during which time he has served twice as chairman of the great Committee on Agriculture and I do not know of a better student of agriculture or a more honorable man or one who thinks more seriously than does he, yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] certainly implied that the President has not called him in to counsel on whether or not he should veto this bill. Others in this House who would not know a potato from an acorn say definitely that the President is going to veto the bill. I simply cannot believe the President will veto this bill and leave agriculture in its present plight. I want to say this, in all seriousness, agriculture in this country is facing a very, very serious situation. We have not tried to stress it in my section of the country, but you cannot dress it up any longer. It is a depression. When hogs are selling for 12 cents a pound and other farm products just as low, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], who opposes this bill, need not be worrying about this bill. He had better be worrying about some hogs with an appetite for his Illinois corn. What does it mean to sell hogs at 12 cents per pound and corn at $1.20 per bushel, less handling charges? Why during the depression hogs were bringing 6 cents per pound and corn 80 cents; but they were dollars worth more than 100 cents to the dollar for there were not many around. Now with dollars worth about 50 cents comparatively speaking the farmer is now back to 6-cent hogs—60-cent corn, and so forth. Remember the last great depression of 1931, 1932, and 1933 started with agriculture; then spread to the cities and all other sections of the country for there was no buying power. In my opinion we should not take such chances, agriculture is entirely too important to the Nation's economy for us to do other than give the problem our best. If we cannot get everything we want, I think we should remember that a part of something is better than a whole lot of nothing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BARDEN. To my district, my State and the Nation this is not only a serious matter but very important. I know it has been regarded as serious with the Committee on Agriculture. When the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, said he is going to beat the bushes to try to defeat this agricultural bill with his motion to recommit, I am going to tell him that he had better find a place to beat rather than in the bushes, because he is going to find some farmers there, and I want him back in this House.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman trying to help me out?

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman is in a very serious situation.

Mr. MARTIN. How is the gentleman's own Committee on Education and Labor? Is that in jeopardy in any way?

Mr. BARDEN. Oh, listen, any man who is chairman of the House Labor Committee is always in jeopardy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the rice provisions of this bill. It is not necessary to outline the cotton provisions. The most

significant cotton changes are known to the membership of this House. I do want to talk for a moment on domestic parity or the so-called two-price plan for rice. This legislation for rice is similar to the provisions for wheat.

The cutback in rice acreage has been drastic over the affected area in the seven States that grow rice. In 1954 there were 2,609,908 acres planted. Under this bill the acreage allotment would be 1,652,596 acres for 1956 and also for 1957 which is about a one-third cut in the short period of 2 years.

I think this House and this Congress acted wisely in keeping the cutback down to 15 percent for 1956. If that provision had not been passed the acreage would have been cut some two-thirds in the current year.

Now as to the export picture. Sales to Pakistan have totaled 3,620,000 hundredweight, and to Indonesia 5,510,000 hundredweight, a total of 9,130,000 hundredweight which were recently consummated. I want to congratulate the Department of Agriculture for pushing those deals through although it was not an easy task. It is a most valuable service to the economy of those States that grow rice.

The volume of rice grown in America amounts to only 1½ percent of the total production of rice throughout the globe.

As we move along I could explain to you some of the provisions of the two-price system for rice that are in this bill. The Secretary would proclaim the primary market quota which would amount to the consumption in America and possessions plus that in Cuba. The apportionment to the States would be on the basis of the average yield to the acre. In 1956 the average yield for 1955 would be used and in 1957 the 1956 average an acre would be the basis. Then the Secretary would apportion to the farms using normal yield on the farm under a formula that has been set up in this conference report.

The support would be 90 percent of parity for the domestic consumption plus the Cuban sales, and not to fall below 55 percent of parity on export sales in 1956. This is a 2-year program. For 1957 the export could not fall below 50 percent of parity, and the producer would obtain 90 percent of parity for rice that would be sold in this country and Cuba.

Certificates would be issued to cooperators for each producer's share of the primary marketing quota. The value of the certificates would be equal to the difference between 90 percent of parity and the level of price support which the Secretary of Agriculture had determined for the particular year, multiplied by the quantity of rice included in the certificate. The actual value of the certificate would amount to about $1.83 per hundredweight. These certificates would be negotiable and the farmer could cash them in prior to the time that his rice would be delivered to the mill.

It is estimated that under the domestic parity or two-price system on rice, the farmer would average somewhere between 78 to 83 percent of parity on the total production on his farm. The domestic consumption, plus the Territories and Cuba, would amount to about 60 percent of the total rice production. On this 60 percent, the farmer would realize 90 percent of parity.

The bill provides for inventory adjustment payments to be made to those individuals or firms who hold rice in their possession on July 31, 1956. These payments are provided so that such person or firm would not suffer a loss by virtue of purchasing the rice during the crop year of 1955 at a higher price than would be provided under the two price or domestic parity plan contained in the bill.

The bill amends the Agricultural Act of 1954 by providing a set-aside for rice. Sixty days after the new marketing year would start, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized, under the rice set-aside provisions of the legislation, to transfer to the set-aside not to exceed 20 million hundredweight of rice.

This two-price system or domestic parity for rice is of vital concern to the States of California, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Missouri. The ricegrowers in these States cannot operate their farms and continue in business under the drastic cuts that are contained in the present law. A plan to move rice consistently into export channels is essential to the well-being of the industry. It is felt that to fix the minimum support level at 55 percent of parity for 1956 and the figure of not lower than 50 percent of parity on such export sales in 1957 should encourage the movement of greater quantities into the channels of trade. These figures of 55 and 50 percent of parity do not mean that the export price would drop to such a figure; they mean that the price could not go lower than 55 percent in 1956 and 50 percent in 1957.

As the fledgling member of the conference on the part of the House, it has been a pleasure to serve with such outstanding Members of this House who have worked for the cause of American agriculture so ably and well for many years.

The conference worked long hours to bring this report to the House today. The farmer needs the relief contained in this legislation. Anxiously does he await the outcome of the vote on this proposal in both bodies of Congress, as well as whatever action that may be taken by the Chief Executive. I trust that the motion to recommit will be voted down and the conference report approved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, just a moment ago someone displayed a handful of telegrams on the left side of the aisle saying that there was great support for this bill. Here are petitions that I received in support of this bill, and not one is from my district or from the State of North Carolina. I have never seen such interest in any measure in my life as the farmers from Minnesota and all over this country have displayed and shown in sending these enormous lists of names here to me. Here are thousands of people throughout this country urging the Members of this House to pass this bill. I only desire to call your attention to this enormous number of petitions During my entire service in Congress, I have never seen anything like this. It will, of course, be utterly impossible for me to acknowledge receipt of these thousands upon thousands of communications. I only hope that those who signed these petitions will understand and appreciate the fact that it will be impossible for me to acknowledge this grand expression of their views and interest in the work which has been done by the conference committee in trying to work out a workable bill.

I think this proves that the farm program is perhaps better understood than some of us in Congress believe.

The time will come in a few moments when the roll will be called and the vote taken. The farmers will then be able to count their true friends 1 by 1 and they will know just what has happened here in this chamber today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I must commence with the established fact that price supports for our farmers are a definite guaranty that they will receive a fair return from their labor on the farm. It is my view that the 90 percent of parity price support to the farmer is proportionately 10 percent less than what the laborer or the factory worker in the city would expect from industry. It is also 10 percent less than what any individual or corporation would expect in return for an investment in a business enterprise.

In short, all that price supports aim to do is to guarantee a minimum return for the farmers to an even lesser degree than is guaranteed to Americans in other industries.

The argument that such protection to the farmers constitutes an increase in the cost of living to the consumers is spurious. Even if it were true, I am certain that the average American consumer would not like to see any farmer lose his farm or quit producing food commodities because of insufficient income, just so that he—the consumer—can save a few pennies during the year. And that is all it amounts to, when we analyze it properly. Actually, however, it is not true that price supports increase the cost of living.

Let me illustrate this point once again, just as I have done many times in the past. A loaf of bread sells for around 16 to 18 cents, but of this amount the farmer gets only about 2½ cents for the wheat in that loaf. The percentage is so small that the price of wheat would have to be reduced by about 80 cents a bushel before it would be possible to get a 1-cent reduction in the price of a loaf of bread.

Or take the case of a cotton shirt which retails in the store for $3.95. The cotton which goes into that shirt is worth less than 24 cents, and that is what the farmer gets for it. If you re-

duce the price of cotton, you can readily see how little it would affect the price of the shirt in the store.

Now, I want to tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I believe we are missing the boat on this whole question. While playing politics and maneuvering for a favorable position, we are simultaneously closing our eyes to the tremendous opportunity which we have to eradicate hunger in the world and the great potential that food surpluses have in winning friends for our side in the struggle against communism. The surpluses of agricultural commodities, which some regard as a burden or even a threat to our economy, are in reality a blessing to our people. It is God's bountiful gift to America which enables us to maintain our country as a secure and prosperous Nation. It also enables us to aid less fortunate nations by helping to alleviate hunger in every part of the world.

There is no reason, no logical or sensible explanation, why these food surpluses should rot in warehouses, on abandoned ships, and on the streets, with the additional waste of millions of dollars every day in storage fees. These surplus commodities should be loaned out, not given away outright, just as we lend money to other nations; and this is to be done under terms which are most favorable to the countries that are able to use these surpluses in order to feed hungry mouths, as well as to keep the Russian bear away from their door.

My bill, H. R. 6868, would do exactly that. The bill seeks to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to authorize the sale of agricultural commodities on credit to be repaid within 10 years of the delivery of the commodities. Public Law 480 has done it to a very limited extent.

At this time, I should like to direct your attention to an even greater potential outlet for these farm surpluses. A few weeks ago, during a series of hearings held by the House Agriculture Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, we heard a representative of the Department of Defense. I was shocked to learn that in the event of a sudden attack or other warlike catastrophe no provision was made to guarantee food supplies either to the civilian population of the United States and its territories, or the other peoples throughout the world. From past experience we know that in such event famine will strike many areas. We also know that wars have been won not only by extending the lines of defense, but perhaps no less also by extending and maintaining the food supply lines.

Last summer, when I was a member of the United States congressional delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference in Paris, I proposed to General Gruenther, the supreme Allied commander, that we store some of our surpluses in strategic areas throughout the world. I submitted the same proposal to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY. Both he and our distinguished colleague from Texas, the Honorable W. R. POAGE, brought up the same suggestion at a meeting of the House Agriculture Committee a few weeks ago.

I wonder if our colleagues here fully realize how important this could prove to be. In carrying through this proposal to store surpluses in strategic areas, we would practically have no surpluses to speak of. To all intents and purposes, it would almost eliminate the problem. But even more important is the fact that, in so doing, we would bolster our lines of defense throughout the world and we would strengthen our allies. This, to me, is one of the most constructive and far-reaching solutions to the farm problem. It is certainly much more preferable than seeking cutbacks in production. It is certainly much more logical than the accumulation of huge surpluses which are rotting away, while millions of people in this country subsist on inadequate diets and untold millions abroad live in constant fear of famine and starvation.

Take the case of the famine in Greece last year, or in the lower provinces in Italy earlier this year. If some of our surpluses would have been stored in that area, they could have been used the moment the emergency struck, instead of having to fly the food in limited quantities from thousands of miles away under tremendous hazards and obstacles. Let me say also that in the event of some disaster or other emergency, I would not even hesitate to feed hungry and starving peoples behind the Iron Curtain, not only as a humanitarian deed, but as the surest way of helping to remove the shackles from those oppressed and enslaved people.

I am convinced that if we pursued a policy along such lines, it would serve to remove the fear and distrust on the part of many people who unfortunately regard us as being in the same category with Russia, namely, that we are only interested in military gains and in extending colonialism over subjugated peoples, but that we are not at all interested in the preservation of the freedom and the independence of these peoples in distressed areas of the world. It would be proof positive that we are very definitely and very seriously concerned with the well-being and preservation of all human beings in any emergency, whether manmade or through natural catastrophe.

I should like to suggest another way to stimulate wider distribution of our food surpluses abroad, not only as a solution to our present surplus problem but also for the future. I propose that at an early date the United States take the initiative in arranging a large international food fair with the participation of as many countries as possible, including the food-surplus countries as well as those who have to rely on outside sources for their food supplies. These food fairs could be held annually, each time in a different country, and the main purposes would be to promote a greater exchange of food commodities, demonstrate ways to increase production and consumption, and provide a better understanding of nutrition.

Let me make it clear that I am more interested in increasing the consumption of food by raising the standards of living for needy people in our own country, as well as abroad, than in cutting back production or controlling output. Let us keep the American farmers producing. There is a crying need throughout the world for our production. Our problem is not overproduction of commodities; the problem is underconsumption of foodstuffs. That perhaps more than anything else explains the great paradox of declining farm income at a time when we are enjoying an abundance of farm products.

I believe we ought to pass this bill now under consideration, notwithstanding the fact that it is not the best bill or the most desirable bill. Nevertheless, it is a measure of relief to the farmers of this Nation, and as such I shall support it. Later on, I trust, it might be possible for us to come up with something better, something more acceptable to all concerned, if only we can permit ourselves to keep politics out of our deliberations.

Thank God, I do not have to play politics with this issue. As all of you well know, I do not have a single farm in my district in Brooklyn. I do not even have a tree in my modest city dwelling. Thank God also that I represent a district which is composed of people of various national origins from nearly every part of the world—but all of them decent, hard working and loyal Americans who only want to see this great country of ours remain united and strong, and whose great dream in life is to see the world truly at peace.

In determining our action today, let the words of John Ruskin, the famous 19th century essayist, serve as our guiding light for the future:

> Therefore when we build, let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight, nor for present use alone; let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for, and let us think, as we lay stone on stone, that a time is come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, "See this our fathers did for us."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks on the conference report at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in considering this great farm bill, the Congress holds in its hand the remedy for one of the major economic problems which now confronts this Nation. Millions of farmers across the country are anxiously awaiting word of our action here today—and we must not fail them for their plight is tragic and their needs are urgent.

This Congress has thus far accomplished much. We have increased the minimum wage to $1 an hour in an effort to improve the welfare of the workers of this Nation. We have enacted many other items of important legislation designed to benefit various groups. But the farmers, who need immediate

aid, are still waiting—we must not let them wait any longer.

This farm bill should not be recommitted.

Our conference committee, which is composed of the leading agriculture specialists of the Congress, has reported an excellent bill which contains many features which will increase farm income and curb declining farm prices. It has been thoroughly studied and discussed by Members of both Houses and explored in great detail by the able conference committee. There is no need for further committee deliberation—but there is a definite need for immediate action.

Farmers this very minute are beginning their annual spring planting and they need to know what Congress is going to do for them this year—not next year.

If we delay here today in approving this farm bill, it probably will mean that these suffering farm families will receive no relief from Congress during this session.

I strongly urge that the House approve this measure as reported by the conference committee without further delay and in doing so the Congress will give our American farmer the type of legislation needed.

The plight of the American farmer is critical and we must not bypass them now because of political differences. The farmers of this Nation no longer discuss their problem in terms of prosperity—now, it is a question of survival.

To many of our farm families, our decision here today will be the deciding factor on whether they remain on the land they have tilled for decades—or whether they will be forced to leave their homes and farms and move to the cities where they can make a decent living.

In 1953, just a few days after Secretary Benson took office, farm parity stood at 94 percent and farm income was $12.3 billion a year. Today the parity ratio has fallen from 94 to 80—the lowest it has been in 15 years—and farm income has dropped more than a billion dollars.

In my own State of Tennessee, cash income of farmers dropped more than $30 million during 1955, and was the lowest since 1950.

A child could read these figures and come to the obvious conclusion that the situation is critical and immediate action should be taken. We have delayed too long already. The legislative process has been too extended on this measure.

It is obvious that declining price support policies, backed by the Republican Party and the Eisenhower administration, have done nothing except plunge the farmer deeper and deeper into the economic crisis which he now faces.

Forced farm sales, bankruptcies, foreclosures and tax sales have increased almost 50 percent during the past 3 years. Farm mortgage debts have increased in excess of $1 billion. The value of the farmer's property has dropped more than $10 billion. This is a far cry from the "prosperity" slogans handed out during the 1952 Presidential campaign.

The Benson manipulation of the farm problem through the flexible price support theory indeed has had a strange history.

In the fall of 1952, President Eisenhower stood in Brookings, S. Dak., a candidate for President, and wooed the farm votes of America by saying:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of 90 percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty of the price support of 90.

This was before the 1952 Presidential election. As history unwound itself—this promise, as did many others—fell by the wayside and the farmer was again forgotten—his vote having been used.

Here is the way the story unfolded.

In July 1953, parity stood at 94 percent. On October 21, 1953, Secretary Benson said, "It is my belief that the major price declines are behind us." The very next month parity ratio fell to 90—this was the minimum the President promised the farmers of America in his South Dakota speech a few months before.

On June 30, 1954, Secretary Benson said that the previous month's decline in farm prices "does not indicate a general weakening in the farm price structure." The next month parity fell to 88.

On June 15, 1955, the Secretary said:

> I am confident we have seen the worst of the transition which agriculture goes through following every major war.

The next month parity stood at 86.

Today, parity stands at 80, 20 percent below the base which President Eisenhower promised the American farmer in his South Dakota speech 4 years before. The present plight of the American farmer is clear evidence of the gross deception practiced upon the farmers of America.

And to further compound the deception, we have indications that the President will veto a high price-support bill if approved by this Congress.

I am reminded of the ancient parable which goes, "Oh, when first we begin to deceive, what a tangled web we weave." And caught in this tangled web is the administration struggling to clear itself of the tentacles of Benson sliding scale price policies for the farmers of America.

But in spite of all the propaganda, the speeches, the glib sayings; the facts are that out of every dollar the housewife spends for food, the farmer receives only 42 cents, compared with 46 cents in the fall of 1952. Farm prices are going down, down, down, and this plunge will not stop until we return to the parity formula previously enjoyed by the farmer under a 20-year, well-tested, and successful farm program sponsored by the Democratic Party.

From the history of declining farm prices, can the President and his Secretary of Agriculture, in spite of the 1952 deception, rightfully conclude that a plan of flexible price supports is the answer to declining farm prices?

It is time for Democrats and Republicans in Congress alike to join hands and bounce bungling Benson from his below parity bandstand.

We have tried the flexible method and it did not get the job done. It is time we quit experimenting with the welfare of our farmers and enact legislation which will give them the relief they need and deserve.

The farmer's plight is not a laboratory case that can be examined under a microscope by the so-called farm expert scientists—it is a real and vital problem affecting the welfare of millions and the economic stability of our entire Nation. It is time we quit playing around with high sounding ideas and get down to the facts of the situation.

Our conference committee has proposed high price supports on basic commodities and a new parity formula based on modern prices. These formulas are aimed at increasing farm income and stabilizing declining farm prices.

Here are the hard, cold facts:

First. The minimum support price of wheat will be increased from $1.78 a bushel to $2.26.

Second. The minimum support price of peanuts will be increased from 10 cents a pound to 12 cents.

Third. The minimum support price of cotton will be increased from 27.6 cents a pound to 33.5.

Fourth. The minimum support price of corn will be increased from $1.30 a bushel to $1.64.

Fifth. Higher support prices will be set up for other feed grains, and quickly—now, not later.

Last year, when the Democrats proposed a soil-bank bill, as a long-range aid to agriculture, the Agriculture Department told Congress that the soil-bank proposal would not work. However, this year the same proposal is placed before Congress and President Eisenhower terms it "imperative." What I cannot figure out is why was it not imperative last year—the trend in farm prices has not changed—they are still going down, down, and down.

In any event, the measure is before us today and I believe just about everyone believes it imperative. This measure is designed to reduce surpluses and to increase farm income. It is a good proposal and to use a hackneyed phrase, "It will help stem the tide in the long pull."

It is estimated that under the acreage-reserve plan, as proposed in this bill, farmers would receive about $100 to $300 an acre for tobacco, $48 to $60 for cotton, $40 to $70 for peanuts, $18 to $25 for wheat, $36 to $50 for corn, and $60 to $75 for rice.

The two-price program for wheat, as proposed in this bill, will give the farmers themselves an opportunity to vote on a plan which they think is best. It is a Democratic proposal—and I mean that in both senses of the term.

Under provisions of this bill, cotton growers are given protection against any cut in their allotments in 1957 and 1958, below the 1956 level. The national cotton allotment this year is 17,891,000 acres. In addition, to protect small planters, a national acreage reserve of 100,000 acres would be set up for the benefit of small growers. They will further benefit because unused cotton acreage allotments within a State in any year

can be turned over to small planters to help them reach the minimum goal.

The same picture will prevail for other types of agriculture if the recommittal motion is defeated and this bill approved.

It is time the administration quit making an economic battlefield out of the American farms—the farmers deserve better. They deserve the benefits of this sound farm program, and I urge that we pass this bill without further delay.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee report submitted to this House undoubtedly represents long hours of consideration and an attempt by farm area lawmakers to find some answers to an admittedly serious economic situation in American agriculture.

However, as a representative of producers and consumers in the State of Rhode Island I must take issue with several of the major items embodied in this proposed legislation.

This bill, with its provision for high rigid Government price supports and increased incentives for surplus production, can mean only higher taxes and rising production costs for the consumers and the farmers of my district. Farmers in this section of the United States can see little benefit in a legislative proposal that would provide increased costs on the feed grains they must have in order to raise—on limited acreage—livestock, poultry, and dairy cattle. At the same time, under the three-price program advanced for wheat the cheap feed that might result to farmers in other sections of the United States—particularly in the grain belt—can only mean greater competition to us by producers not now raising poultry, dairy, and other livestock.

This bill will depress agriculture in Rhode Island. It will further aggravate misunderstandings between consumers in the metropolitan areas and producers in rural and fringe areas.

It is not easy for a Rhode Island farmer, hamstrung by this type of legislation and all the publicity connected with it to explain to a city dweller in my State that he is reaping none of the benefits but, in fact, is finding his income steadily pushed lower and lower by the ever-mounting surpluses of overproduction from other areas of this country.

As many Congressmen from the Northeastern States know, the present program, and the program now before us, while not benefiting northeastern farmers in any discernible respect, impose harmful restrictions on us. Many of our northeastern farmers would like to grow wheat on their farms to use as feed. But if they raise more than 15 acres of wheat, heavy penalties are imposed upon them even though they feed all wheat they produce on livestock on their own farms. If they fail to pay such penalty they are eventually faced with court action compelling them to pay it.

The Legislature of the State of New York recently approved—Assembly Resolution 40, March 19, 1950—a resolution memorializing the Congress to permit farmers who use for livestock or poultry feed all the wheat they produce on their farms to be permitted to do so. These farmers do not receive any benefit from the Federal farm program. They should not be penalized by it. I am disappointed that there is nothing in this conference report that would lift such restrictions.

Farmers do not want this bill; consumers can only be against it. For these reasons, I urge that the conference committee report be rejected.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD the principal reasons why I must vote against acceptance of the conference report on the farm bill, H. R. 12.

That bill imposes high rigid price supports which will be a continuing incentive for overproduction which, in turn, will build up enormous surpluses, all at heavy cost to the taxpayers. Coupled with the acreage limitation scheme for controlling production, such supports produce huge payments to the few operators of very large farms and threaten to eliminate the family-operated farms. Thus, those supports, for which the Democratic leadership claims credit, enrich the large operator and squeeze the small farmer.

This costly subsidy adds heavily to the already burdensome Federal taxation imposed upon the people of the whole State of New York and particularly heavily on the residents of the 15th District of that State, which I represent.

Other provisions in H. R. 12 will increase the prices of food for everybody.

Furthermore, the large farm organizations in New York are on record, as is the nationwide Farm Bureau Federation, in opposition to the rigid price support plan.

Recently, I sent a questionnaire to 12,000 residents of my district. Nearly 2,000 answers have been received. They voted 55 to 45 that a farm subsidy program is not right in principle.

Capping all these are the authoritative and expert opinions of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that rigid price supports are contrary to the national interest.

For all these reasons, I must vote against the bill which the conference report brings before us.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, as a man who came directly from the farms to Congress and as a Member of Congress representing a great agricultural district, I support the bill our conferees have brought before us. My support is not based on any belief that this bill is perfect but it is based on the conviction that it represents the best compromise possible under the circumstances. This conviction is further strengthened by the urgent need for new farm legislation for the benefit of American farmers and the rural business communities which have been so hard hit by the cost-price squeeze in our agricultural economy.

We farm Congressmen recognize, as do the Members from other segments of our Nation, that all legislation is a compromise and it is not often that we get all we want in the way of new laws. We are grateful for the good things this bill contains, and we can perfect the others as their shortcomings become evident.

Much has been said about the defects and deficiencies of this bill. Some of these criticisms are well founded, while others are based primarily upon the judgment or viewpoint of the individual voicing them. Personally, I am more vitally concerned with the good features of the bill.

The President and the Secretary of Agriculture have made the soil bank the cornerstone of any new farm program. Despite minor differences as to details, I am happy to say that all of the major farm organizations have endorsed the idea. I am also gratified that the committees developing this bill, the other body, and now the conferees have brought before us a bill containing a reasonably good soil-bank program along the basic principles of the President's recommendation.

As we stand on the threshhold of victory in this long battle for a better farm program, I am grateful for the acceptance by the President and now by the Congress of a fundamental approach to our farm problems. For me personally, this is a day to long remember as I see the Congress move toward the adoption of a program for which I have long campaigned.

What better solution could we find to our problem of temporary surpluses than a program to help our farmers divert surplus-producing acreages to a soil-building and water-conserving bank of fertility for future needs sure to come? In my judgment, it will take about 3 years for the soil bank to have its full effect on the farm commodity markets, but a beginning must be made somewhere, and that beginning is being made here today.

As most of my farm colleagues know, I began the long, uphill battle for a soil-bank program several years ago. With this problem of temporary surpluses plaguing our Nation and depressing our farm commodity markets, it seemed that some commonsense approach should be developed to overcome this serious problem.

There is nothing new about the principles of the soil bank, but there is definitely something new about the manner in which we propose to apply those time-tested principles for the benefit of our agricultural economy—indeed, for the lasting benefit of our entire economy, for it is not just the farmers who gain from better farm commodity prices.

Three years ago the idea had become so fixed in my own mind that I began discussing it with farm leaders, individual farmers, small-town businessmen, agricultural experts, and others concerned with this problem. Early in January 1954 I arranged a meeting with the Secretary of Agriculture to discuss with him the fundamental principles of the soil-bank idea. It was my thought that if the Secretary could see the wisdom of such a program we might move for its enactment by the 83d Congress that year.

Although my proposal had been enthusiastically received by all with whom it had been discussed, I knew from my experience in the Congress that support

from the administration would be essential to its enactment—and subsequent events have proven the accuracy of that opinion. We saw no real action on this until the President made the soil bank the No. 1 point in his nine-point program for agriculture as set forth in his message of January 9, 1956.

On January 28, 1954, when the Secretary of Agriculture was before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, I again discussed with him—in very general terms—the fundamental principles of the plan and asked his opinion on it. Although no bills had yet been introduced on the subject, and, although the urgent need for such a program was already manifest, I was disappointed in the Secretary's rejection of the basic idea.

Anyone interested in the first official discussion of this proposal in the Congress will find that discussion between myself and the Secretary of Agriculture beginning on page 23 of the 1955 hearings on appropriations for agriculture.

Welcome support came from my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] who has long rendered outstanding service, both in the Congress and in prior service, to the cause of agriculture. My colleague and I, on February 2, 1954, introduced the first bills of record in the 83d Congress to authorize what I had termed a "soil bank of fertility" on acres diverted from production.

These bills were followed on February 26, 1954, by S. 3036 on the same subject by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota; and another, S. 3049, by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota on March 1, 1954. I think it most significant, Mr. Speaker, that all of the soil-bank bills introduced in the 83d Congress came from members of the congressional delegation from Minnesota. Once again, we find Minnesota and its congressional representation in the forefront in the battle for good, constructive farm legislation.

No action having been taken on these proposals by the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I again introduced our bills on January 17, 1955, and we began our campaign for support which has led to the bill we have before us today.

On May 10, 1955, I went before the House Committee on Agriculture to testify in support of the basic principles of my soil-bank bill, and I must acknowledge today that the reception given the idea by that great committee was the most encouraging development to date.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished members of our Committee on Agriculture who have worked so long and hard to bring this bill before us today. On this, as on most farm legislation, they have set aside their partisan and other differences and have joined in the common cause of doing something constructive for agriculture and our farm people. Perhaps in no other committee of the Congress can we find the members so completely dedicated to the responsibilities of their committee.

There are many good features to this bill, and foremost among them is the soil bank.

Give us this program to bring a reasonable balance between production and consumption, back it up with an expanded program of market development, research, and extension, and I confidently predict that within a few short years this deplorable argument over the level of price supports will disappear along with the surplus. Within the framework of this proposed legislation we find necessary provisions which will advance the cause of agriculture immeasurably and bring our otherwise booming prosperity to the rural business communities of America as well as our 5 million farm families.

A new day will dawn for American agriculture when this bill becomes the law of the land. For my farmers of the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota, and the merchants and other businessmen caught in this sinking farm economy, I express my heartfelt thanks for your consideration of our needs.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret the fact that it is not possible for me to follow the leadership of my party on this bill but I shall vote against the recommittal of the conference report today because I feel the bill as worked out by the conference committee will do a better job of improving the economic condition of the farmers of the Middle West than will the bill as is proposed to be amended by the recommittal motion.

The prime purpose of this bill is to close the gap between the price the farmer is required to pay for his necessities and the price of the product he has to sell.

As was stated by President Eisenhower, the purpose of the legislation is to increase farm income. The soil-bank program, proposed by the administration is intended to reduce the burdensome surpluses and permit the law of supply and demand to improve farm income.

We are today faced with the fact that because of the lateness of the season, there can be little if any benefit to farm income this year through the soil-bank plan.

In addition it should be pointed out that farm acreages have already been determined for the 1956 crops, either they have already been planted or will be before this bill takes effect, so that reduced supports or any other price inducement will not affect the production of most corps, either up or down. All that can be done in this legislation is to improve the price of that crop which is produced.

The acreage allotments are in effect and apply to the 1956 crop. These crops cannot be increased.

The only thing this bill can hope to do is to improve the price of the crop that is produced this year on the designated acreages. The higher support prices incorporated in the bill apply to only 1 year.

During the pending year the provisions of the soil bank can be put into effect so that farm income can be maintained in the coming years with even reduced acreages.

In the meantime the wheat farmers of the Nation can pass their judgment upon the domestic parity plan, and put that into effect.

It seems to me that the best interest of agriculture and agricultural areas, as well as the economy of the entire Nation will be best served by voting down this motion to recommit and passing the bill as rewritten by the conference committee.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a suspicion in many quarters that the present farm bill is not good legislation. So-called Christmas-tree legislation in which something has been hung on for everybody is admittedly a bad approach. Why stop with the farm vote when we could include everyone—just tax with the right hand and hand it out with the left wing and hope that everyone will be happy.

Farm legislation, as we know it, began many years ago with the broad general principle of interstate regulation and much was accomplished over the years of a beneficial nature. However, log-rolling and backscratching crept in, as is frequently the case, and bad legislation has resulted.

In my locality the fluid-milk producers are in a bad way and they are being squeezed out through a process of elimination. Corporation farming is encouraged through the current cost-price squeeze and the little fellows are being forced out of business. Production controls are mentioned in some quarters, but many so-called farm experts seem more concerned with the welfare of the middleman who already collects about two-thirds of the consumer dollar. The same holds true of the fruit and poultry industries. This situation is bad and I can see nothing in this bill that will alleviate the problems of the northeastern farmer. Increased consumer costs will surely result.

I hope that Congress will be called upon to produce a better farm bill and at the present session, before adjournment.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H. R. 12, not because I think it is a perfect bill, but because it offers immediate help to agriculture and a start on the long-range solution by the adoption of the administration's soil-bank program.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for any motion to recommit which in any way tends to lessen farm income this year. The motion under consideration does just that. It is this year that agriculture needs help. Since February 1951, agriculture has been caught in a serious price-cost squeeze—the farmers receiving less and less for what they sell and paying just as much as ever for what they buy. According to the Department of Agriculture, farm prices in mid-March were 26.5 percent below the record high reached in February 1951, while on the other hand the prices of the things the farmer must buy were only 2.7 percent below the record high mark reached in May 1952. This condition is not something new but started back in 1951 and gradually has been getting worse each year—in fact, parity dropped 19 percent during the last 2 years of the Truman administration. The time has come when this trend must not only be stopped but reversed. This cannot be done un-

less Congress provides the necessary legislation which will increase farm prices because it looks as though there will be no reduction in operating costs in the immediate future. Wages, taxes, profits, and all other costs are at an all-time high and it looks as though these high operating costs are with us for some time to come. This being true, there is no way that we can ease this price-cost squeeze other than by supporting higher prices for agriculture products, which the conference report on H. R. 12 is designed to do by adding $1 to $2 billion to farm income this year principally through higher price supports.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the reinstatement of the 90 percent mandatory price-support program is not to the liking of some people, but, on the other hand, if it provides the immediate help that agriculture needs we should not question the program unless we can offer a better program that will do the job and to date none has been offered.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides for only a 1-year extension of the 90-percent support program, thereby giving Congress and the executive branch of the Government time to work out some other program that will give to the farmer 100 percent of parity to which he is entitled, and in the interim providing increased income for the farmer to ease the price-cost squeeze he is caught in.

Ever since coming to Congress, I have supported the 90-percent price-support program, not because it is the answer to the dilemma which agriculture finds itself in but because it bridges the gap in this transition period from war to peace when we are trying to reduce our stocks to a reasonable level and at the same time maintain a fair price to producer and consumer alike. It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that our farmers are not to blame for the surplus that today is depressing farm prices and costing the taxpayer roughly a million dollars a day for storage alone. It will be recalled that it was Government itself that pleaded with our farmers during the height of the war to enlarge their plants and produce more in order that we might be able not only to feed ourselves but our allies, too. Our farmers responded patriotically and provided the food and the fiber that was so necessary to win the war, but with peace, when the battlefields were turned into wheatfields, Government failed to adjust production and continued to permit production at wartime levels, thus producing the surplus which has caused the price-cost squeeze that today threatens the stability of our greatest industry, agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot follow the reasoning of those who contend that the present surplus is the direct result of the 90-percent price support program and that a reinstatement of that program will defeat the purpose of the soil bank. The surplus was not caused by the 90-percent price support program but rather by the administration of the program in not curtailing production at the proper time. At the end of the 1952 marketing year, we had on hand 562 million bushels of wheat, 5,600,000 bales of cotton, and 769 million bushels of corn. Instead of curtailing production at that time, our farmers were urged to continue to produce without any restrictions or controls whatsoever, and by the end of the 1953 marketing year, we had 902 million bushels of wheat, 9,700,000 bales of cotton, and 920 million bushels of corn, and we have been in a serious price-cost squeeze ever since.

By reinstating the 90-percent price support program with production controls for our basic commodities (wheat and corn are the only basics grown in South Dakota), we will increase farm income immediately and by adopting the administration's soil bank program, will be tackling the long range program by taking land out of production, reducing surplus, and storing the fertility in the soil for future needs. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that both programs are needed under present circumstances—one program to give the immediate relief that agriculture needs and the other the long range program to bring production in line with demand.

During the past 3 years, steps have been taken under the 90-percent support program to curtail production. The Secretary of Agriculture has already reduced wheat acreage from 78 million acres in 1953 to 62 million acres in 1954 and to 55 million acres in 1955 and 1956, the minimum acreage under the provisions of the support program. In addition, the farmers themselves have voted quotas, which means that if they overplant their acreage allotment they are subject to stiff penalties. In addition, wheat price supports have been reduced from 90 percent of old parity, the rate for 1954 and preceding years, to 82½ percent of old parity in 1955, and 76 percent of transitional parity in 1956, and during all of this time it must be remembered that the operating expenses of the producer have remained at or close to an all-time high. Not only has our farmers' production been cut, but prices, too, and farm income, Mr. Speaker, is production times price, less cost. Industry cuts production for only one purpose; that is to maintain price. Industry never cuts production and price at the same time, and we should not expect that of agriculture, either.

There are many other provisions in the conference report worthy of mention, namely, increased supports for dairy products, mandatory supports for feed grains, retention of dual parity, a trial run on a 2-price system for wheat, $500 million authorized to supplement section 32—Public Law 320, 74th Congress—funds for the purchase of perishable commodities when necessary in order to stabilize price, and several other items, all of which are designed to bolster farm income in 1956 and to bring production in line with demand.

I cannot let this occasion pass without commenting that this body passed a farm bill on May 5, 1955, a bill which reinstated the 90-percent support program for another 3 years. It is now April 11, 1956, almost a year later, and we are just getting around to vote on the farm bill. It is well to call your attention to the timetable. May 5, 1955, H. R. 12 passed the House of Representatives and was sent to the Senate; January 9, 1956, President Eisenhower sent a special farm message to the Congress; the Senate Agriculture Committee did not report out a bill until February 10, 1956; the Senate did not start their debate on the farm bill until February 22, 1956, and did not pass the bill until March 19, 1956. On March 26, 1956, the bill went to conference and today we are voting on the conference report.

During all of this time our farmers tried to lay out their farm plans, make the necessary credit arrangements, and start operations for the 1956 crop year. They have been very severely penalized because of the failure of this Congress to take early action. Truly, the Congress is the greatest deliberative body in the world, but insofar as the farm bill is concerned, there was too much deliberation and too much inaction to assist the farmers in this most trying period. I have contended in the past that agriculture should not become a political football because it would work to the detriment of the farmer. I cannot say categorically that politics has been played with the farm bill this year, but I can say that our farmers have now made what plans they could for this year without having the slightest idea of what kind of farm program they would be operating under. To me, this is a gross injustice and if done with intent should be subjected to the most vigorous censure.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely of the opinion that it is absolutely essential that we adopt the conference report in order to give agriculture the help it needs in 1956, as well as to start the long range program sponsored by the administration which is the provisions of the soil bank.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have carefully read House Report No. 1986, in connection with the agricultural legislation which we in the House are considering today. I have been following the deliberations of the conferees in the past several days, and only during this past week attended several farm meetings in my State of Michigan for the purpose of getting the opinion of my farm constituents in this question.

The general consensus of opinion that I learned from my farm people was that such legislation would do them little good. The average farmer in my district derives his income chiefly from dairy and livestock products. Now there is nothing in this bill for my livestock people. As a matter of fact, it is even worse than the Senate bill which at least contained adequate prohibitions against participants in the conservation reserve violating their contracts and putting livestock on the reserve acreage. If this is done to any extent, it will greatly increase livestock production and further depress prices. The Senate bill contained a provision that such a violator would forfeit all price-support benefits. However, the conference version eliminated this feature which did provide some protection to livestock producers. Therefore, I consider this bill discriminates against our livestock farmers.

The conference report also discriminates against our dairy producers. True, it does establish the support level

for manufacturing milk at between 80 and 90 percent of parity and further provides that the price of manufacturing milk and butterfat shall be supported at not less than $3.25 per hundredweight and 58.6 cents per pound, respectively. This would mean an increase in the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk from 82 to 85 percent, roughly. In dollars and cents, it would mean an approximate 2.5 percent increase to my dairy producers.

But the Senate bill established the parity price at 88 percent and also used a parity equivalent based on the 30-month period from July 1946 to December 1948. This was knocked out by the conferees. The Senate bill also made this parity increase indefinite whereas the conference version specifically limited its meager increase in dairy prices to 1 year.

I understand that section 103 of the conference version dealing with price supports for manufactured milk is acceptable to the administration. However, I regard it as discriminatory against my dairy producers and makes another reason why I cannot support the conference report.

Most of my farmers are small farmers. They are angry at seeing large farmers and large farmers in other parts of the country receiving huge payments from the Federal Government under price-support programs, sometimes extending into 6 or 7 figures. Now most of them are willing to give the soil-bank plan a fair try. But they do not want to see people making large sums of money out of the program.

The Senate bill contained language specifying that participants in the soil bank could only receive maximum payments of $25,000 under the acreage-reserve program, and $7,500 under the conservation reserve. The conference version struck both of these ceilings from the bill. I, therefore, regard this version of the agricultural bill as discriminatory not only against dairy and livestock producers, but also against small farmers in favor of large producers. This is a third reason why I am not going to support this conference version.

As far as the soil bank itself is concerned, a feature which I regard as the most desirable of the entire bill, I feel that the time is too late for it to be of any benefit to farmers this year. I know that the compromise version contains a provision that will permit farmers to participate even if he has already planted his 1956 crops. To do that, he has to plow up the crop which he has already planted. I regard such a practice as wasteful and destructive and completely inadequate. The truth of the matter is that the Congress is too late this year to help the farmer.

But the great objection to the conference version of the farm bill, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, is the proviso providing for 90 percent of parity on the basic commodities.

Michigan farmers derive less than 20 percent of their income from these so-called basic commodities. Incidentally, I recall last week at a farm meeting a farmer asked me how it is determined that a commodity is "basic." I told him that it was simply a question of politics. Now this restoration of high rigid price supports will do little to benefit our Michigan farmers. But it would hurt them in many ways: By piling up surpluses and further depressing market prices, by raising the cost of their feed grains perhaps as much as 15 percent and by continuing and increasing a system of Government controls, regimentation and interference, with which the large majority of my farmers are thoroughly disgusted and tired.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the text of an article which I have prepared for publication in the spring issue of the Republican State National Journal which shows why rigid supports will hurt rather than help the average Michigan farmer:

POLITICAL FARM LEGISLATION

In spite of the efforts made by the Democrat Party to blame the administration for the serious farm problem, the facts tell a different story.

Farm surpluses are generally acknowledged today as being one of the principal causes behind the drop in farm prices. These surpluses came into being as a result of high, rigid price supports which were instituted during World War II to stimulate production and which were never removed even though markets shrunk considerably thereafter. The current drop in farm prices began in 1951 under the previous Democrat administration and under a high price support program which was continued until last year.

Now, after only one year of flexible supports, the Democrats can think of no better solution than to return to high supports which are responsible for the present problems which face the farmer today.

The administration soon realized that flexible supports would not alone solve the farm problem because of the overhanging surpluses that threatened to glut the market. Therefore, the soil bank plan was put forward to effect a sharp reduction in production of surplus crops and also to remove from cultivation much marginal land which came into production only because of the attraction of high supports.

The Democrat-controlled Congress has deliberately delayed action on any new farm legislation, including the soil bank plan, until it was felt certain that the time was too late for any benefits to take effect this year. Further, in spite of the President's express disapproval of any legislation embodying a return to high price supports, such a maneuver was included in the compromise farm legislation, thereby inviting a presidential veto.

The Democrat chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee even admitted that unless farm legislation was passed by the Congress before the end of March, the whole soil-bank plan and indeed all farm legislation might as well be abandoned for any good it would do the farmers in 1956.

Actually, I believe the average Michigan farmer would prefer to forego price supports if he could at the same time relieve himself from Government controls and regulation. Assuming that this is not possible at present, a system of flexible supports to level production and demand off together surely offers more than high supports.

The Democrat bill, for instance, proposed a return to supports at 90 percent of parity on wheat and corn which account for less than 20 percent of the Michigan farmer's income. Our farm people get more than half of their income from dairy and livestock production. Now there is nothing in the Democrat farm bill for livestock or livestock products. There is an increase in the price support level for dairy products, an increase which, in the case of manufactured milk, would amount to roughly 2.5 percent. But at the same time our dairy farmers were getting this small increase in their milk prices, they would be faced with other provisions of the bill which would increase the cost of their feed grains by as much as 10 percent.

I think the foregoing will show our Michigan farmers how much the Democrats know or care about their problems. This is what happens when politicians in Congress try to write farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the conference report was discriminatory against the small farmer. The whole price-support system, especially high supports, definitely discriminates against him. In this connection, I want to read the text of an editorial from the April 7 issue of the Saginaw News entitled "Taxpayers Underwrite Big Farm Operators":

No one ever showed us a check for $1,292,472.25. But that was the size of the Government loan which one king-sized farm outfit drew on its 1954 wheat crop. That's the kind of money a big one-crop operator can pull down in a year without a dollar's worth of risk through this 90 percent of parity price guarantee that American taxpayers are underwriting.

The more Congress delves into the complexities of farm economics the more these fantastic inequities keep coming to light. We'll know soon, when the House-Senate conference bill is reported out, what policy is to prevail, whether the Government will encourage the family-size farm or continue to underwrite these big corporations whose fields run to the horizons with the sky the limit on the size of their guaranteed checks.

More than half of the Nation's 4,782,000 farmers get no benefit from price supports. The bulk of the money goes to the big, one-crop growers of wheat, corn, and cotton.

Considering that only 130,000 of these nearly 5 million farmers have gross incomes of $25,000 or more a year, it is plain to see who is getting the lion's share at the expense of all of us.

The average Government loan on wheat ran only $1,800 a farm. Yet 62 big outfits received more than $100,000 apiece from the Government on their 1954 crops. One big Louisiana rice grower picked up a price-support check totaling $486,725.77.

The family size farm versus the king-size farm has been debated from all angles. The economics of the thing can be turned in most any direction. Those who would build a case for protection of family farms hasten to defend the smaller unit as a way of life which has spiritual and other healthy values centered in land ownership and independence.

Business-minded Americans say big farms are a natural, desirable evolution which only prove that mass production can be brought to agriculture, that fewer and fewer people are required to produce in abundance all the food this Nation requires.

In both instances, advocates touch lightly on the extent of taxpayer subsidy required to make good their cases.

Family farms have been defined by a congressional committee as those yielding an annual income of less than $2,500. To fight for the preservation of this way of life strikes us as the defense of a livelihood hardly measuring up to what we could find pride in perpetuating.

By today's standards, that is marginal living. To subsidize those who produce little more than enough to sustain themselves is to encourage chronic dependency.

But the bigger fallacy, as we see it, is in the staggering subsidy of the big corporate farm outfits. They not only enjoy tariff protections from foreign competition; they also dare engage in huge single-crop farming because they have been guaranteed a mar-

ket for every bushel or bale they produce—at a guaranteed minimum price, cash on the barrel head.

This unrestricted overproduction has hurt agriculture, including the family-size farm, and it will continue as long as Congress makes price supports themselves an incentive of profit, rather than a cushion against a disastrous slump as was the original intent.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at length but I do not believe I need to give additional reasons why this conference report on farm legislation is discriminatory against and damaging to our Michigan farmers and why I will vote against it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, this is an important hour. Millions of farmers have their sights on our actions of today. After 3 years of continuous income decline they are looking to us for relief.

Almost 4 years ago Republicans made campaign promises of better days for American agriculture. All have been broken. This is their last chance to come forward and deliver. This is their last chance to increase agricultural income for 1956. Hereafter it will be too late. It is this or nothing.

Much has been said about the possibility of a veto. That is the President's privilege. However, it is improper to waive the threat of a veto over this body in an attempt to influence our votes.

We were sent here by our respective constituencies. To them we are responsible. We are not responsible to the President. We are not called upon to be his rubberstamps. It is our duty to vote our own convictions. After so doing if upon passage the President vetoes this measure then the responsibility for the consequences is his, not ours.

I am for the conference report. I am supporting it because it will increase farm income this year. I am supporting it because it means a better price for farm commodities now.

I am supporting it also, Mr. Speaker, because it places a floor under the national cotton allotment for the year 1956 and 1957. Cotton farmers cannot stand further acreage reductions. I am supporting it further because it will bring some relief to the small cotton farmer through the provision providing an extra 100,000 acres for allocation among cotton farmers who have been reduced under 4 acres.

I am supporting it for other reasons. It does not reflect my views in every respect. However, it is a reasonably good compromise, as is all legislation of major importance.

The conference report is the handwork of weeks and weeks, yes, months and months, of hard labor by able legislators familiar with the problems of American farmers. We should not cast away their effort and leave our farmers to the hazard of further depressing prices.

It is time that the President, Secretary Benson and most of our Republican colleagues faced up to the situation. They are leading American agriculture right back to the position they left it in 1932.

If a farmer were to have fallen asleep 25 years ago—become sort of a modern-day Rip Van Winkle—and not awakened until 1956, there is little doubt in my mind that he would experience any difficulty in ascertaining which political party is in control of the White House, if all the facts on the current price dilemma farmers find themselves in were sufficiently laid before his eyes.

History of the 1920's and the 1929 to 1932 era is poignantly repeating itself. And farmers under the callously enforced price-depressing policies of this administration, now find themselves once again staring at the bottom of the economic barrel, worried lest that turn out to be flexible, too.

Meanwhile, the giant business organizations of this Nation under the watchful guidance of Cabinet emissaries and the resulting friendly policies of this administration are reaping record-breaking profits.

Prosperity has settled its golden mantle on General Motors, who in 1955 took in net profits of more than $1 billion, and Ford Motor Co., which according to its chairman some weeks ago looked forward to netting more in 1956 than in all the 21 years previous to World War II. Prosperity has come to them and to other segments of business, but not to the farm.

And let me interject at this point that despite the political slogans of the Republican Party, these profits did not come under an economy geared to peace, as they would like us all to believe. I would remind you that about 65 percent of our budget is still geared to a wartime economy.

Speaking of the tremendous profits that have been reported in all of the leading business journals of the Nation, I think that it should be pointed out here and now that the philosophy of this administration is deeply apparent in the paradoxical action it took of lowering the excess-profits tax to big business on the one hand and lowering price supports to farmers on the other hand.

That is the epitome of the motivating philosophy behind this administration's entire domestic program. Once again the Republican Party has proven conclusively that it is not the party of the common man. It has shown little concern for the little people of our land who produce the food and fiber this Nation consumes.

Still, even though farm prices have fallen 36 percent since 1952, we hear plaintive cries of innocence from administration officials whenever someone points an accusing finger at them and their flexible price-support plan.

They rammed it through Congress over the protests of the minority party in 1954. The Republican Party forced this flexible price-support program on farmers, which last year alone cost the people who till the soil nearly one and a half billion dollars in net income, from the year before.

Still, I have read in the papers that the administration and the Republican Party hired a high-powered advertising agency to sell Mr. Benson and the sliding scale to the American people. They have used the slick merchandising techniques, the mass-selling idea—with a Hollywood trimming—because they cannot sell either the Eisenhower farm program or Mr. Benson to the farmer on the basis of fact.

I ask in all seriousness, is this responsibility in Government? Is this the responsibility that the American people have the right to expect, regardless of which political party is in control? The answer to me is very obviously, "No."

For 3 years now, this administration has deliberately and carefully carried out a campaign to convince the American people that farmers have been wards of the Government for the past 2 decades, and that flexible supports or perhaps even a full, free market for agriculture would solve the whole thing and cleanse the supposedly black soul of the farmer.

To carry out this diabolic plan they have refrained from giving the facts on the current farm situation and the entire farm picture to the people.

During the last session of Congress, Under Secretary of Agriculture True Morse told the House Agriculture Committee that his Department did not contemplate offering further legislation in substitution of or amendatory to present legislative authority. In other words, the administration had the authority it wanted. And, it must have been assumed that the authority it had was all that was needed to bring farmers "100 percent of parity at the market place," General Eisenhower's outstanding farm promise of the 1952 campaign.

Morse's attitude, in speaking for Secretary Benson, was embodied in such pie-in-the-sky statements as "the decline has been checked," "things are looking up," and "we are moving in the right direction." In face of the mounting decline, Eisenhower, Benson, and Morse declined to accept the facts. They permitted the situation to roll on and on, down and down, without attempt to check it.

Then came October. With the roof falling in Eisenhower and Benson finally confessed that things were not going well, that farm decline was serious, and that action was demanded. They promised a new program. Oddly enough their new program will not increase farm income. Actually it will, through flexing prices and other devious methods, decrease it.

But even as late as September, only a few weeks prior to the administration's admission of farm distress, the Vice President of the United States, Mr. NIXON, was closely following the technique of refraining from giving the facts on the farm situation. In what the press had billed as a major farm address at the National Plowing Contest at Wabash, Ind., on September 17, NIXON attempted to repaint the administration's usual rosy picture for agriculture.

I wish to discuss a few of the points the Vice President made in this speech, so that we may all have a clearer picture of what this administration is up to.

In the beginning of that speech, Mr. NIXON made among other points these two: First, there is no farm depression in the United States; and second, our agriculture economy is basically sound.

I submit that the Vice President, as they say in the vernacular, was "pulling the wool over the eyes" of the American people, or at least he was trying to. No one was fooled.

If you compare the cash prices of major grain crops as of last October 15, with the average prices of the same crops back in the black year of 1933—following another Republican administration—you will find the following to be true using the same parity formula basis:

Wheat, as of last October 15, was 77 percent of parity; 70 percent in 1933. Barley was 51 percent of parity in October; 58 percent in 1933. Flaxseed was 57 percent of parity in October; 81 percent in 1933. Oats was 50 percent of parity in October; 71 percent in 1933. Rye was 43 percent of parity last October; 73 percent in 1933. Corn was 69 percent of parity in October; 68 percent in 1933.

Still I recall that another administration official not long ago told farmers that they should not expect any more. He said these prices were normal and that the prices of previous administrations were those of a dream world.

Now I ask, in view of the facts just quoted does it sound as if agriculture is basically sound? Is it basically sound when net farm income since 1951 has fallen more than $4 million, to an estimated $10.6 billion this year?

Are farmers in a financially sound position, when their net incomes drop an average of 30 percent in 4 years?

It appears to me that if Mr. NIXON had lived up to the responsibilities of his high office and discharged his duties properly, he would have told the people this is more than ample warning that flexible supports are not the answer to the farm problem and that something must be done immediately to stop the price drop that is driving farm families from their homes and from their land.

The newspapers of rural America, especially in the Midwest are increasingly running big ads, announcing that this or that farmer is selling out. They've been forced to quit because of the sliding scale—the flexible price-support program—that is seemingly more sacred to this administration than are the lives of millions of American farm families.

But, Mr. NIXON, like so many of his coworkers, is more interested in continuing the campaign to keep the administration's ruinous flexible price support law on the books than he is in giving the American people the facts on what is actually happening on the farm.

To continue on with the Vice President's speech, he made this statement:

> Let's lay one mistaken theory to rest right away. The new flexible-parity law cannot by any stretch of the imagination be held responsible for the drop in prices.

My friends, let me read these facts to you and you can draw your own conclusions.

Since 1952 this administration has dropped price-support levels on farm commodities as follows: From $1.22 a bushel on barley to 94 cents a bushel; for oats from 78 cents to 61 cents; for rye from $1.42 to $1.18; for grain sorghum from $2.38 to $1.78; for flaxseed from $3.77 to $2.91; for soybeans from $2.56 to $2.04; and cottonseed from $67 a ton to $46 a ton.

That is not to mention the drop of 15 percent of parity in dairy support prices, that Agriculture Secretary Benson decreed with full approval of President Eisenhower back on April 1, 1954. That drop from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity brought about a 40 percent cut in net family income of producers of manufacturing milk.

Does this sound as if it is a stretch of the imagination to blame the farm price drop on price flexing, as this official speaking for the Eisenhower administration says it is? No one forced them to lower these farm price supports. They did it under their own volition. And they did it in full knowledge, I believe, that farm prices would drop to the support level or lower, the moment they did so.

They did it with little concern for the effects it would have on the family-sized farmers of this Nation, who helped elect a Republican President in 1952 and believed him when he made the promise of parity to farmers at Kasson, Minn., Brookings, S. Dak., and Columbia, S. C., and other places during the political campaign in the fall of 1952.

That promise to agriculture, which was so prominently displayed in banner headlines across the front pages of the Nation's press I would remind you, was repudiated in the congressional session of 1954. And who has benefited from it? No one unless it be the big food processors. Certainly not the consumer and not the farmer.

Now, if I may be permitted to read two more sentences from that major farm policy speech of the Vice President I have been referring to. He was telling the audience how the Eisenhower-Benson farm program was attacking the farm problem on two fronts, and he said:

> On the production front, a new flexible-parity formula has been adopted so that farmers will not be encouraged to grow more crops already in surplus.
>
> On the consumption front, we are finding new markets for farm products.

Surely Mr. NIXON knows that the law this administration passed is nothing new. It is the same old law the 80th Congress passed back in 1948 with the built-in double flex—one through the lowering of price supports, the other through the lowering of the parity level itself. And surely the Department of Agriculture knows that contrary to Mr. NIXON'S statement, farmers seeded more acreage to uncontrolled crops last year than they did the year before. And why? To try and make up for the loss in income through price flexing, that is why.

Now on the matter of boosting consumption and opening new markets, I wish the administration would clarify this point by naming a few markets they have opened up and where consumption has risen.

May I point out, since they have not, that though they lowered price supports on milk, consumption per capita of dairy products in 1952, when supports were 90 percent of parity was 688 pounds per person and during 1955 it was about 682 pounds per person, or about the same.

Exports have dropped on wheat, also on cotton.

Does this sound like the administration is solving the consumption problem?

The farmer and the American people have been sold an empty package, a package bearing the false label of prosperity to the farmer and wrapped in the shiny promise of lower food prices to the consumer.

But the package has been opened and all we have found inside is the warped philosophy of planned scarcity that this great country of ours cast aside nearly a quarter of a century ago. We cannot live up to our responsibilities to our citizens of this country under such a policy, neither can we live up to our world responsibilities.

We as the strongest bulwark of democracy in the world cannot afford to tell the farmers of our country who comprise 13 percent of the total population that less than 4 percent of the total national income is all they have coming, and that they should not ask for more.

We have no moral right to use economic sanctions to drive farmers from the land—whether it be in the trumped up name of "efficiency" or in any other name.

Relief can come only through increased income. The administration's program will not meet the emergency. The conference report will. It should have our support.

Farmers have taken upon their shoulders one of the most important jobs in this Nation or any other nation for that matter. And that is their responsibility to produce the food that you and I and 165 million other Americans eat today. This is a responsibility that lasts 365 days of each year and with each successive year that job gets bigger. They have also produced enough to enable this country to help indigent neighbor nations in this world community and through this means stop the advancement of communism. All we have to do is use it.

Farmers have lived up to their part of the bargain. They have produced food and produced it abundantly. And they have done it without any cost-plus contracts with the Government. As a matter of fact, during World War II and the Korean war they were the only major industry that did so.

Now we must live up to our responsibilities and rid American agriculture of the inflexible thorn of flexible supports and depression level prices, that the Republicans and this administration have so mercilessly pushed into its side.

We must recognize the fact that farmers are entitled to a living standard equal with the rest of the economy and enact legislation that will return to them good prices and a fair income.

I urge you to support the conference report.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think we should frankly recognize this bill for what it is.

It is legislation designed not so much for the farmer as it is for politicians who want the farmer's vote. It is a conglomeration of gimmicks and devices to dump taxpayers' money into the hands of some segments of the farm population prior to election time. In no way can it be considered a solution for the serious prob-

lems which confront American agriculture today.

When this session began, the great question confronting the Nation was whether the Congress would forget politics and try to develop a program which looked to sound, long-range solutions for our agricultural problem or whether it would accept expedients offering only temporary relief lasting through the November elections. History will record, if this bill is passed in its present form, that Congress bowed to expediency at a time when statesmanship was never needed more.

The program submitted by the President offered hope for a long-range solution, encompassing a soil-bank plan which would have provided financial incentive for attacking the causes of agricultural surpluses. Congressional delays in the adoption of the soil bank rendered it almost useless for this crop year. Because of that fact, this bill has been loaded with every conceivable kind of gimmick to increase the price of this or that crop—with the Government paying the bill.

The net effect can only be to aggravate our basic problem of surplus production by encouraging the farmer to use every possible means to increase his output on the acres available to him. If this bill is enacted it will not solve the farm problem. It will aggravate it; it will increase it; it will make its eventual solution more difficult. This bill, in the long run, does a disservice to the farmer. I think he will eventually come to realize that—even though it is the hope of its sponsors to use it to win his support in the election this fall.

For example, the Wisconsin dairy farmer will take a careful look at the effect of this bill upon his operation.

It does offer him a 1-year increase in the support price for manufacturing milk. But for the extra 10 cents he would get over the present support price he may well be paying the most expensive price in his history.

If this bill becomes operative in its present form the Wisconsin dairy farmer will find he has been sacrificed on the altar of the sacrosanct basic crop farmer. Less than 1 percent of Wisconsin's production is in basic crops.

Under the bill, the Wisconsin dairy farmer remains on a flexible-support basis, while the so-called basic crops are put not only at mandatory 90-percent levels but get another boost under the dual parity provisions. He will find his feed costs increased not only by these provisions but by those which place feed grains under a high-level support program. He will watch the corporate farms receive huge checks because of the absence of a limitation on support payments. He will find that there is inadequate protection given to him against increased milk production from acres diverted to the soil bank.

In short, for a small and temporary increase in his milk-support price, he will exchange greatly increased production costs and an increase in competition from the basic crop areas. At the end of the marketing year, when his price reverts back to present levels, he may well be confronted with the same situation he faced when President Eisenhower took office—huge dairy surpluses in Government hands grinding his price down while high basic supports hold his cost of production up.

In the rush to take care of the basic crop areas, largely in the South, the Wisconsin farmer again gets the short end of the stick from a Democratic Congress. It is entirely in keeping with the Democrat record in Wisconsin, where the party orators bemoan the plight of the dairy farmer, while their cohorts in Congress rush through such legislation as the oleomargarine bill, fight the school milk and brucellosis-extension programs, and pass such discriminatory legislation as this.

It is all the more tragic in view of the fact that the dairy farmer's position has been improving while the worst part of his adjustment to peacetime market conditions has taken place. His feed costs are down, his milk prices are increasing, his income position is steadily improving. The effect of this bill upon the demand for his product, upon its production, upon inventory accumulation in Government hands, now improving, can only be adverse.

I shall vote against the bill as it is presently presented to us in the conference report.

A word, Mr. Speaker, about the motion to recommit that will be made by the Republican leader. Let it be noted that this motion is designed to help the dairy farmer as contrasted with the Democrat proposal which would do him injury.

The increase in the support level of manufacturing milk would be permanent, rather than temporary, and would fix a minimum level of support in excess of that provided under the conference report. The motion would also eliminate other provisions of the report which are harmful to the dairy farmer.

Mr. Speaker, a rollcall on the Republican motion to recommit will clearly show what Members are truly interested in the welfare of the dairy farmer. I shall vote for the motion.

CONFERENCE FARM BILL REQUIRES SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO ACT ON FOOD STAMP PLAN FOR DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, exactly 2 weeks ago, following Senate passage of the farm bill, I urged the conferees to bring some sense and some reason to the surplus food disposal program by adopting as part of the compromise bill a food stamp plan such as proposed in my bill, H. R. 5105. As I said then:

> This would assure getting some of the surplus to those in our country who are in need—many of them actualy hungry. Let us feed our own needy as well as the poor of other nations.
>
> We have over 5 million Americans on different forms of public-welfare assistance.

I added:

> Each one needs—actually needs some of this surplus food. These are people who do not now get enough to eat. Let us use this blessed surplus—this abundance—to help feed the hungry here at home as well as abroad.

Mr. Speaker, after I made those comments on the House floor 2 weeks ago, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] graciously invited me to submit some language which could perhaps be incorporated into the conference bill to carry out my proposal. As I had said, the differences between the House bill as originally passed and the Senate version of H. R. 12 were so great that the conferees could have incorporated a specific food stamp plan as part of the disposal machinery.

I know it has been the position of some of the Members who are most expert in agricultural legislation that Secretary Benson already has full authority to establish a food stamp plan under existing law. Whether or not that is so, we all know that the Secretary has taken the flat position that a food stamp plan is not desirable. He prefers the present hit-and-miss system of distribution to the needy, a system which does not have the participation of a number of States including Missouri and which is, according to testimony by those who are participating in the program a cumbersome, ineffectual, and disproportionately expensive one for the States and localities participating.

I give this background, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is very important for us to make clear in connection with this conference bill now before us just what it is we expect the Secretary of Agriculture to do about a food stamp plan. Although the bill does not contain the language I submitted for it which would have created immediately a food stamp plan as provided for in H. R. 5105, the conference bill does provide that the Secretary of Agriculture must submit to Congress within 90 days detailed programs for distribution of surplus food under a food stamp plan or similar program to needy persons in the United States. If he does not have the authority to institute such a program, the bill requires that he submit recommendations for any additional legislation which is necessary.

MUST REPORT ON NEED FOR ANY FURTHER LEGISLATION ON FOOD STAMPS

Now as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the language of section 301 (b) does not say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "Tell us, Mr. Secretary, whether you think a food stamp plan would be a good idea." He has already told us many times that he does not like the food stamp idea—that he would rather continue the present hit-and-miss program which is not succeeding in getting this food to the people who need it. We are not asking him, then, to come back in 3 months and tell us what he has been telling us right along about a food stamp plan—that is, that he does not like it and does not want it. No; we are saying instead, "Come back in 3 months, Mr. Secretary, with a plan for the distribution of surpluses under a food stamp arrangement or similar program; and if you need more legislative authority for instituting such a program, tell us exactly how the law should be written."

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, that this distinction be made clear. The wording of the conference bill may be a little ambiguous, I do not know. I do know that the Secretary of Agriculture

and his people have been so bitterly opposed to the food stamp idea—preferring to give food abroad in preference to the needy in this country—that if there is any loophole at all in this wording, I am afraid they will seize it to avoid carrying out the congressional intent on a food stamp plan.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel it necessary to have this statement in the RECORD in connection with the conference bill. As the sponsor of the food-stamp plan, I am hopeful that the language now in the conference bill will be effective in carrying out the congressional intent of having our surplus disposal program so broadened and so improved through "a food-stamp plan or similar program" for distribution through States and local units of Government of future surplus production "to needy persons in the United States, its Territories, and possessions," as to assure not only the prevention of future surpluses but also the distribution of this food to our needy.

SECTION 301 (B) REQUIRES ACTION PROGRAMS

Title III, surplus disposal, in this bill, calling for a program of orderly liquidation of surplus stocks, requires that the Commodity Credit Corporation, as rapidly as possible consistent with its existing authority, and consistent with the price-support program, and consistent with orderly liquidation, shall dispose of all stocks of agricultural commodities held by it. That is section 301 (a).

Section 301 (b) says that the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress within 90 days detailed programs—not just suggestions or possibilities or alternatives, but detailed programs—with recommendations for any additional legislation needed to carry out such programs for the disposition of surpluses as required by section 301 (a) and for a food stamp plan or similar program for distribution through the States and local units of Government of future surplus production to needy persons. The rest of that section 301 (b) makes it clear that what Congress is asking is for action programs. The Secretary is ordered, in other words, to tell us in 3 months not what he might possibly do but what he is going to do in disposing of this surplus, including disposition under a food stamp plan or similar program for getting this food to the needy in the United States.

While I am sorry that the conferees did not take the language I submitted to establish an immediate food stamp plan with specific procedures outlined, nevertheless I am glad they accepted my plea to provide in this bill for the food-stamp idea.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country, by and large, are fair minded. They want to do the right thing. They do not want the Government, or anybody to do anything for them to which they are not justly entitled. The thing that disturbs the farmers, more than anything is the fact that while industry, business, labor, and other segments are making gains and profits, the farmers are slipping back. Mind you, he does not complain that other groups are making gains. He just does not understand why he is not in position to hold his own in our economy.

It is difficult for the farmer to understand why the big steel companies, for example are expanding and making more profits than ever—even increasing the price of steel, while he is required to take lower prices for his product.

Farmers really don't want "handouts" from their Government. They do read, however, in newspapers that manufacturing companies receive favors by way of tax incentives for building equipment for the defense of our country. He feels his product, food and fiber, are also essential to the defense of our country. Neither does the farmer object to good wages. He is for it. He does feel he is entitled to somewhere a parity price for his product compared with what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. He also hears that steamship lines are provided with subsidies, although not designated by that name.

The farmer observes the stock market is flourishing on the New York Exchange, and higher than in the past. But not so of the livestock market.

It is a little difficult to explain that while railroad stocks are higher and utility costs are more, and stocks cost more, both guaranteed a fair profit by reason of rate charges—and to which they find no fault. They just do not feel they are receiving a fair share of the Nation's income.

According to the USDA report, since 1945 the farmer's share of the consumer's retail food dollar has declined from 55 cents in 1945 to 41 cents in 1955. There are many examples. Some time ago when wheat was selling for $2.80 per bushel, a 1 pound loaf of bread sold for 14 cents. While wheat is selling this year for $2.15 per bushel, a similar loaf sells for 18 cents.

According to a report from the Department of Agriculture, the income of farmers last year was reduced by $1 billion. The average income was reduced from $913 to $860. The income of nonfarmers was more than double this amount. Included in the farm income was consumption of farm products, use of home and other sources.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is not made to indicate in any way that the farmer is griping. Not at all. I do think the farmer has, too many times, been misunderstood. In too many cases he has been unduly criticized. He feels, and rightly so, that he should have a price for his product in the market place on a comparable basis of what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy. Surely there should be nothing unreasonable about that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under the procedure being followed by the House today, there is no way to adequately discuss the proposed new farm bill. I think it appropriate, however, to place in the RECORD a few observations.

One might assume from listening to the debate that about everything in the final draft of the new farm bill now before us is either awfully bad or practically perfect, depending upon the point of view of the Members who have addressed us. The truth is that neither the bill, itself, nor the substitute is all bad or all good. We are confronted with limited choices. We can vote for the bill as represented by the conference report before us; we can vote for the substitute; or we can vote against any bill at all.

The final draft of the bill represents a compromise among the conferees. Everybody knows, or should know, that if this bill becomes the law, it will not produce complete satisfaction among the farmers themselves or among the people. There will be many shortcomings and drawbacks. We are dealing with a difficult and almost insoluble problem. We just have to do the best we can under the circumstances as they exist at the moment. Under these circumstances, I am voting for the bill.

I have in mind many unanswered questions about the pending farm measure, now in final form.

What kind of a soil bank payment will there be to cotton farmers and feed grain farmers who have not been able to make a crop in recent years because of drought?

How fair and equitable will the base acreage figures be for feed grain growers? How will the allotments be determined?

What will be the soil bank position insofar as payments per acre are concerned, of cotton farmers who have had a succession of failures because of drought?

Will abnormal weather conditions be adequately taken into consideration in line with the provision on this subject which is contained in the bill?

How adequate are the provisions in regard to the disposition of farm surpluses?

What will be the division of soil bank payments between landlords and tenants?

When will there be an opportunity to extend beyond the 1-year period the 90 percent of parity support program?

These, and many other questions remain unanswered.

The soil bank plan, while theoretically very sound and attractive, presents a fertile field for friction, abuse, and dissatisfaction among farmers. The whole question is to a considerable extent a matter of administration. The success or failure of the new farm bill will depend to a very, very great extent upon how it is administered, how it is run by the Department of Agriculture. If the program is to work at all, the officials of the Department must approach the problem of administration in a spirit of good will and with a determination to find ways of making the program work rather than finding ways to make the program fail.

Again I say, it should be perfectly obvious that the measure before us today is not the final answer to the problems of agriculture. We must face up to the fact that the compromise measure was in part hastily drawn. We can already foresee inadequacies and others will develop. There are going to be a lot of heartaches and troubles ahead. We must have a sympathetic administration of the program and further efforts must be made to modify the whole farm program, the object being to help the farmer secure a more workable and

effective program and a more adequate income.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the move that is being made here this afternoon to recommit this bill to conference is ill advised. It should be defeated and I predict it will be defeated.

That the Secretary of Agriculture could prevail upon Republican leaders in the House to offer a motion to cut price supports from 90 percent to 82½ percent on corn and other commodities while making a deal to support cotton at 86 to 87 percent, and while supporting wool and sugar at 100 percent or better, is almost beyond belief. It is my belief that the farmers of the Middle West are entitled to at least some of the consideration that is given those in Utah, the Rocky Mountain region, and the South.

I am not satisfied with every provision of the conference report, especially the possibility that wheat may come into competition with corn as a feed grain, but I am convinced that the good that can come from this legislation outweighs that which may prove unsatisfactory.

It is estimated in some quarters that the move to establish 82½ percent of parity could result in a loss of some $2 billion in gross farm income. There can be no doubt that a cut from 90 to 82½ percent of parity will result in a substantial loss. Whatever the amount it would mean that the farmer was again and deliberately being short-changed. I have no intention of being a party to any such deal.

I trust that the Senate will take immediate action to approve the conference report, and that President Eisenhower will promptly sign the bill into law.

It has been suggested by the Republican leadership in the House that Mr. Eisenhower may veto this bill if enacted. If he does so he must then assume the responsibility for no farm legislation this year.

I hope that next year Congress will give consideration to a revival of the principles of the old McNary-Haugen bill and enact permanent legislation that will assure farmers a minimum of their full costs of production, paid in the market places, and with controls upon marketings rather than acres.

The farm problem has been and still is a political football. It is time to stop offering the farmers panaceas and place this great and vital industry on a footing with all other industries.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the 13 years I have been privileged to represent the agricultural area of western Oklahoma, I have kept in close touch with the needs of the farmers. I have farmed myself, and I have served 6 years on the House Agriculture Committee. I have just returned from making an extensive tour of the 23 counties in my district, the Sixth Congressional District of Oklahoma, and I would like to make a few remarks as to the needs and problems of the farmers in our western Oklahoma area.

Our farmers in western Oklahoma have serious doubt as to the value, this year, of the Benson soil-bank plan. Many of the farmers feel that grasslands should be included in this program. However, the vast majority of farmers in the area are for 90 percent of parity.

What we need in Oklahoma is a program that would provide larger allotments to insure economic farm operating units for families. Many of the farmers feel that the allotment should be on a bushel and bale basis and should be increased according to the size of the family.

Our farmers also feel that the loan basis of cotton should not be changed but should be left at ⅞-inch Middling white; that grain sorghum price supports should be as great as price supports on corn; that wheat price supports in Oklahoma should be equivalent to durum wheat price supports in the North; that price supports should be placed on mung beans, castor beans and soybeans; that the peanut allotment should be increased; and that farmers who have had their land in alfalfa a number of years should be allowed to have a cotton or wheat allotment when the alfalfa dies out and has to be plowed under.

Our western Oklahoma farmers are diversified farmers generally speaking. They feel that farmers should be allowed to plant cotton land to wheat and wheat land to cotton in instances where drought, pests, or weather conditions make it impossible to plant wheat or cotton, as the case may be, while the other crop could be planted.

We have had a serious drought in western Oklahoma and need considerable assistance in the form of loans and low-interest rates; assistance in eradicating pests such as greenbugs, bollworms, aphids, wheat lice, army worms, cut worms, web spiders, grasshoppers, and so forth; and better prices for farm commodities.

Our farmers feel that there should be an adjustment in allotments for drought-stricken areas such as western Oklahoma. They also want a better crop insurance program.

Instead of building a big dam in Egypt, the farmers feel that the administration should increase the soil conservation program and Agricultural Conservation Service practices, such as terracing, contouring, the building of ponds, the growing of green manure crops, and so forth; and should enact more upstream flood control measures similar to the Sandstone project on the Washita.

Most of the farmers I am privileged to represent feel that the spread between the producer and consumer is much too great. The price the farmer receives for his products continually decreases, while the price of everything he buys or uses increases.

In view of the fact that our small businesses in western Oklahoma are dependent upon the farm situation and farm income, many of these small businesses find themselves in need of loans. National income is always seven times that of the farm income and anything which adversely affects farm income will adversely affect small business, labor, and eventually large business.

The farmers feel that they should be entitled to make an adjustment on their income tax every 5 years and feel that the exemption for each dependent should be increased to $1,000.

There has been considerable talk about surpluses. If the administration had tried as hard to sell surplus commodities in the last 3½ years as it has in the last 3½ weeks, there would be no surplus. Furthermore, the administration has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of nationwide drought. It has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of an emergency such as war. In this respect, the international situation does not look very healthy on about a half dozen fronts. The administration has failed to give sufficient consideration to the possibility of increased need on the part of countries with whom we could trade surpluses for strategic materials. It has also failed to use as much of the surplus as should be used to supply the aged and needy people at home.

Before we become too critical of the surplus situation, we should reread some of the verses of the Bible wherein the country was overtaken by pestilence and suffered 7 years of drought. We should bear this in mind. The Lord has blessed us with a bountiful supply and this supply should be considered a blessing and not a curse.

The general public in western Oklahoma feels that regulation should not be promulgated from Washington, but that any program should be administered by local committees familiar with local conditions. The farmers feel that Benson has erred in prejudicing the so-called consumer public of the cities against the farmers when the truth of the matter is that the farmers are the greatest per capita consumer group. Our farmers, laborers, and businessmen in western Oklahoma feel that the buying of pork—half of which was gravy—from the big packers at 65 cents a pound—when the farmers were only given about 12 cents a pound for that pork—by Secretary Benson, was not only unjust and unfair both to the farmer and the taxpayer, but was simply ridiculous.

Most of the farmers feel that Secretary Benson should be replaced.

To make matters worse for the farmer, the administration is now making an all-out effort to increase REA rates in violation of sacred contracts and against the sound advice of the directors of the various REA co-ops, against the advice of REA co-op board members, and against the advice of Members of Congress. This will place more hardship upon the farmers.

I will vote with the Democratic leadership for this conference agreement. I will vote for it in view of the fact that it does contain the 90 percent of parity feature and even though I doubt the value of the Benson soil-bank plan. Furthermore, it is my sincere belief that the President will not veto this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, although I am not completely satisfied with all of the provisions contained in H. R. 12, I support the Senate and House conferees and I shall vote for adoption of the conference report. In view of the muddied waters in which Congress has been forced to consider our complex agricultural problem, I believe the conferees should be commended

for their efforts in drafting a compromise bill at this time.

Frankly speaking, I am amazed that the conferees were able to do as well as they did with the bill. All things considered, I am further astonished that we are even able to vote on a farm bill at this time. I am astounded because of the conditions under which the proposed bill has been formulated and debated in Congress.

I am astounded because in the course of the last 3 years a considerable volume and variety of political dust has been thrown into the eyes of farmers, consumers, the general public, and Members of Congress. During the last 3 years we have had the privilege of watching a cleverly conceived program of calculated confusion.

The first part of the confusion program was marked by an operation designed to pit consumers against farmers on the subject of Government-owned surpluses. The second phase of operation confusion was to array farmers against labor by blaming workers for declining farm income.

Secretary Benson has skillfully worked both sides of the street in order to create confusion in the minds of farmers, consumers, and the general public. I presume it was intended that some of the confusion should be transmitted by constituents to Members of Congress. I suspect some of the confusion has brushed off on us and thus made it more difficult to consider objectively the present farm bill, H. R. 12.

There is one fact about which we cannot be confused as we consider H. R. 12. This fact cannot be distorted or obscured by political dust. The fact I refer to is that net realized farm income has been declining for some time. Net realized farm income has declined at a time when the income of every other group in the economy has increased to a greater or lesser degree.

In the last 3 years alone net realized farm income has declined 20 percent—or a total of $3.3 billion. Cold statistics show—without dispute—that farmers have been financially hurt; and contrary to the opinion of some people farmers are still hurting. Present USDA forecasts indicate farm income will drop again this year.

It is this grim economic picture of farm income that provides me with my basic reason for voting for H. R. 12. As we now consider the farm bill, I cannot help but recall that 2 years ago the administration and its spokesmen in Congress rushed through—with great speed—another type of aid bill. The bill I refer to contained a provision to give some of our wealthier citizens tax relief on income derived from dividends.

Two years ago the administration took care of the coupon clippers in a hurry. It was hip, hip, and hurrah and the bill was through. The main argument for giving tax relief to the coupon clippers was that this group needed investment money to stimulate our economy. When it comes to farmers, however, the administration is both stubborn and reluctant to act with the same speed and concern. Does the administration feel that farmers do not need income or investment money? Sometimes I feel that the administration does think such is the case.

Specifically speaking, H. R. 12 contains two items of interest to dairy farmers. The first item raises the minimum level of support prices for whole milk and butterfat from the existing minimum level of 75 percent to 80 percent of parity. The maximum support level is still pegged at 90 percent.

The second item in H. R. 12 provides for supporting manufacturing milk at $3.25 per hundredweight and butterfat at $58.6 cents for the market year ending March 31, 1957. The $3.25 per hundredweight support price in H. R. 12 for manufacturing milk—3.95 percent butterfat—is 85 percent of parity as compared to the February 15, 1956, parity equivalent for manufacturing milk. The $3.25 figure is 10 cents higher than the $3.15 support price announced by Secretary Benson on February 14, 1956.

The 58.6 cents a pound support price on butterfat in H. R. 12 is 2.4 cents above the 56.2 cents figure for butterfat in cream announced on February 14, 1956, by Secretary Benson. The 58.6 cent figure works out to 82 percent of parity compared with the announced level of 78 percent on February 14.

H. R. 12, therefore, does represent some improvement on price supports for dairy products. The increased price support for manufacturing milk is for a period of 1 year, the same period as increased price supports for basic commodities.

Dairy farmers have suffered a decline in income during the last 3 years the same as other farmers. Incidentally, since April 1, 1954, dairy price supports have been flexed down to the lowest level by order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Wisconsin farmers have been particularly hard hit in the last 3 years. National net farm income declined 20 percent in these 3 years as compared to a 30 percent decline in net farm income for Wisconsin. In 1952 total net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $526,100,000. In 1953—the first year in office of the present administration—net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $453,600,000. This represents a decline of $72.5 million over the previous year.

Wisconsin farmers wound up the year of 1954 with another drop in net income. In 1954 net realized farm income in Wisconsin was $402,700,000. The 1954 drop over 1953 farm income for Wisconsin amounted to $50.9 million.

Official USDA statistics on Wisconsin's 1955 net farm income are not available at this time. However, I have employed the same formula used by the USDA in computing its estimates. On the basis of this calculation it appears that Wisconsin's net farm income dropped another $25 million to $35 million in 1955.

The 3-year total drop in net farm income for Wisconsin ranges from $148.4 million to $158.4 million. This sum of money was not spent with our Main Street merchants because the farmers did not have it to spend.

I wonder how concerned the administration would be if 148,000 coupon clippers had each suffered a $1,000 income cut over the last 3 years. On the basis of the administration's past record, I am sure it would be very much concerned. Perhaps the administration would throw another dividend tax-relief bill in the hopper.

Aside from the income factor, the Nation's dairy farmers have been hurt in another way during the last 3 years. On January 1, 1952, the value of the Nation's dairy herds was $5.8 billion. On January 1, 1956, the value of dairy herds was $3.2 billion. This means that dairy farmers have $2.6 billion less collateral to offer when they go to banks and other lending agencies to borrow money.

Dairy farmers in Wisconsin are obviously not buying Cadillacs—and, for that matter, they have never been able to buy Cadillacs.

Earlier I mentioned that a great deal of political dust had been thrown into the eyes of consumers, farmers, and the general public on the farm problem. Some of the political dust has been blown up on the subject of agricultural surpluses.

At this point I wish to keep the record straight on the amount of dairy surpluses inherited by the present administration. On January 19, 1953—which was the last day in office for the former administration—the total value of dairy surpluses held by Commodity Credit Corporation was $34,627,000. This proves conclusively that the present administration did not inherit huge and unwieldly stocks of dairy surpluses.

Secretary Benson constantly declares in his speeches that the present agricultural surpluses are the result of programs inaugurated under laws passed by the previous administration. The former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles Brannan, operated his Department with the same laws.

Mr. Brannan did not spend as much time as Secretary Benson has in talking about surpluses. In numerous speeches—from coast to coast and border to border—Secretary Benson has plaintively talked about surpluses. Perhaps the reason that the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, did not talk so much about surpluses was that the United States Department of Agriculture spent more time on marketing and disposing surpluses.

H. R. 12 contains provisions for a soil bank program—a program that the administration discovered early this year and has adopted with a fanfare of publicity. This is interesting because last year I was one of several Members of Congress introducing a soil bank bill.

Last year the soil bank bill did not appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration. Since last year the administration has had a change of heart and mind. The administration's change of mind was publicly made obvious when thousands of dollars were spent late in February by the National Republican senatorial and congressional committees for newspaper, radio, and TV advertising.

In the Ninth Wisconsin District—which I represent—approximately $1,600

was spent for newspaper ads and from $500 to $1,000 on radio advertising.

The ad in Successful Farming cost $8,000. I do not know how much the advertising blitz cost in other districts, but I imagine this ad program cost at least $250,000. This is the first time to my knowledge that a political party ever engaged in lobbying while Congress was in session.

The ads furnished more political dust over the farm problem. For example, the ads led farmers to believe that if Congress passed the soil bank bill by spring planting time hundreds of millions of dollars would be paid out to farmers. This was a deceptive appeal because no explanation was made that this would not be additional income to recoup previous declines in income. The ads did not inform farmers that the payments would only be replacement income for participating in the soil bank program.

In the 9th Wisconsin district the ads were clearly deceptive in that farmers in my district can only participate to a limited degree in the proposed soil bank program. Farmers in the 9th District of Wisconsin do not raise much in the way of basic crops; therefore they are not able to participate in the acreage reserve program.

The only place where farmers in my district can participate in the soil bank program is under the conservation reserve feature—and even that participation would be on small scale. The ad, then, was clearly political dust in the Ninth Wisconsin District—and on the basis of the limited returns sent to my office I believe farmers in my district recognized it as such.

We are told now through the medium of press conferences that the administration is opposed to H. R. 12 because it is a bad bill. Last year the administration opposed the soil-bank program. This year the same administration includes the soil bank plan in its nine-point farm program. Another item in the administration's nine-point farm program that it did not favor in the past was the gas tax refund for farmers on farm consumed gasoline.

I am beginning to wonder just how reliable the administration's judgment is on farm legislation. Is there any reason to assume that the administration's judgment is any better with respect to H. R. 12? When will the administration realize that the farm situation is critical and that it requires something more concrete and positive than newspaper ads?

I believe the farm situation is critical, and that is why I am supporting H. R. 12.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the conference report on H. R. 12, and I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture who served on the conference committee and who have worked so faithfully to give to us the chance to vote for a measure that I believe will be helpful to the farmers of America. It is needless for me to stress here the points with which all of us are so familiar. We all realize that the farmer's income has been steadily dropping and that this year the total net farmer income will probably be only $10.5 billion. We also realize the fact that the farmers cannot be expected to go it alone and must have the continuing patient concern of Government, because all other segments of the economy are organized. The farmer is faced with spiraling costs and he pays more and more for what he buys, but gets less and less for what he sells. We are familiar with the fact that this year the farmer will get only 39 cents of the consumer's dollar and that fact represents to me what is probably the most important single problem facing the farmer. That is, how can he get a fair share of the consumer's dollar?

I used to think that when farm commodities were in great abundance, you could expect the farmer not to get very much for his product and that the consumer would get a break in the market and the costs for farm commodities would be decreased. This is not true, however, and in my own district, the Eighth District of Florida, last year when our farmers could not give watermelons away for week after week, the price continued to be 5 cents a pound in the market here in Washington. That is one reason, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently voted for 90 percent price supports on the basic commodities, for section 32 funds to help livestock producers and the producers of vegetables and other perishable commodities, and for our various marketing agreements which have proved to be so helpful to our farmers. These programs, I sincerely believe, are fair also to the consumer. If I had the time, I could present a most convincing case to show that although the storage costs on our farm commodities which are in surplus represent, naturally, an expense to the taxpayer, that in the overall picture the presence of this surplus offsets a scarcity scare, decreases speculation, and, in my humble opinion, is responsible for saving the consumer many billions of dollars each year. I should like to refer again, as I did last year, to the coffee scarcity scare when the consumers in America in just a few short months had to spend approximately a billion and a half dollars more for coffee because, I think chiefly, the speculators took advantage of the scarcity scare.

I shall not discuss anymore at length the philosophy of the farm program, but I want to repeat again my appreciation for the conferees who have worked so effectively to give us this chance to help the farmers of America.

I should like to stress again that in this conference report that we are considering, we return to the 90-percent price supports on the basic crops and we permit an authorization of an annual appropriation of $500 million to supplement operations under section 32 which helps farmers who produce perishable crops and, in fact, I think in these two programs we find opportunities for aid to each type of farmer in America. I believe these programs give us the only practical opportunity that is afforded us to give the farmer a fair share of the consumer's dollar and yet, at the same time, to be fair to the consumer. I repeat again this great problem of the farmer getting a fair share of the consumer's dollar is to me the most urgent problem facing the friends of farmers today.

The Soil Bank Act is divided into two parts: the acreage-reserve program and the conservation-reserve program. The acreage-reserve program is designed to curtail production of specified commodities even below the anticipated production from allotment programs. It applies to wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, most kinds of tobacco and the feed grains—oats, rye, barley, grains, sorghums, and corn grown in noncommercial corn areas. This program is to last for only 4 crop years, including the present 1956 crop. The objective of this program is to induce farmers to reduce their acreage below their allotments or base acreages and to make no other use of the land so retired. I am particularly pleased that the small farmers, those with small acreage allotments, may have a chance to put all their allotment into the acreage reserve, while those with larger allotments will be limited to a maximum percentage of their allotment. I am particularly concerned with the plight of the small farmers of America because I believe in the Jeffersonian concept of the desirability of land ownership. I believe in preserving the family-type farm in America because it is as necessary to preserve our Republic as any other unit in this great country of ours. I am pleased that I have the honor at the present time to be a member of the Small Farm Committee, which is a Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

I regret that the conferees struck out of the Senate amendment the provision which would have limited payments to any one producer not to exceed $25,000. I believe that the great emphasis on our farm program should be help to the small size farm. I am particularly pleased that the conference report makes special provision in case of unusual weather conditions resulting from drought, flood, hail, wind, or other natural causes. I have just returned from my Eighth District of Florida and conditions are alarmingly similar to Dust Bowl conditions in the Far West. We have been without normal rainfall for 2 years and our tobacco and other crops are in danger of total destruction. I feel that not only should these unusual weather conditions be taken into consideration in granting more favorable terms to our farmers, but that also all redtape administrative rulings should be resolved in favor of the farmer whenever there is the slightest question of a doubt. In my own district there are 6,000 flue-cured farmers whose very livelihood is dependent on flue-cured tobacco. They should be permitted the maximum of leeway in carrying out combination of allotments in order to provide for irrigation and to make it possible for some of them to cooperate and make a cash crop that is so essential to them. All of our farmers, our livestock producers, our vegetable producers, I repeat, should be

granted the very maximum of consideration now in the face of drought conditions prevailing in my part of the country, as well as in other sections and also in light of the depressed farm income which is common throughout the Nation.

I am pleased that the conferees have taken out the Senate amendment which would have denied all price supports to a producer who did not participate in the acreage reserve. I think we should stress to our farmers this fact. I have always believed in voluntary compliance, but, of course, I know we all realize that there are other provisions in our agricultural laws which protect farmers who live up to their obligations as against some few who might not desire to do so.

The conservation-reserve program is the other part of the soil-bank program and is designed to take out of production of crops and put into a conservation state on a semipermanent basis certain acreages of land. This program may be participated in by all farmers. The acreage-reserve program applies only to specified commodities but the conservation program is an overall opportunity for farmers of America. This program would be for a period of not less than 3 years nor more than 10, except for forest areas where the period could run for 15 years. I regret in this program also that a provision in the Senate bill which would have limited payments in any year to any producer to not more than $7,500 was removed. I feel again that this limitation of payment is most desirable. The conservation reserve, it should be emphasized, is also a voluntary program and there is no required participation as a condition of eligibility for price support. I think this is most desirable and I want to commend the conference committee for doing this, but at the same time recognizing the particular problem that faces our livestock producers. Under the soil-bank program it is likely that millions of acres now in crops will be put into grass. Although the contract signed by the producer placing his acreage into the soil bank will prohibit the using of land for grazing except under emergency conditions and with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture, it is most important that the Secretary of Agriculture utilizes what I consider to be adequate legal provision relating to contract violation which remain in the bill and which I think will help our livestock producers. We must be very careful in our farm program not to legislate for one segment of the farm economy and against the other. I think that we have in this bill an opportunity to vote for all segments of our agricultural economy as well as for the consumer. I think each year that the soil-bank program is in operation we should be very careful to check and double check the problems of livestock producers to see that those participating in the soil-bank program are not competing with the livestock producers as a result of the program. I promise my wholehearted concern to this program and my determination to try in every way possible to help our livestock producers solve this problem.

The participation of our farmers in the soil-bank program in both the acreage reserve portion and the conservation reserve portion will depend, of course, on a proper incentive. In the case of the acreage reserve, depending on varying conditions, a farmer will be given from $100 to $300 an acre to cut out a portion of his tobacco crop, he will be given from $48 to $60 an acre on cotton and from $50 to $70 an acre on peanuts. I think the Secretary of Agriculture will have to be as liberal as the law permits in order to provide the inducement for farmers to participate in the soil-bank program. I am pleased that the conference report will permit farmers who already have planted their crops to participate in the acreage reserve program by plowing up these crops. I want to refer again to the severe drought conditions prevailing in my district and in many parts of the country. It is entirely possible that if we proceed now with full speed ahead many of our farmers will find help in this trying period that they are facing.

The conference report in authorizing an appropriation of $500 million annually for section 32 funds proves again, I think, that we are interested in all of our farmers. Many of our people do not realize that these section 32 funds are a tremendous help to those who are interested in perishable commodities. In an address that I delivered to the House last year, I pointed out that actually up to that time more money had been spent from section 32 funds to help the producers of perishable commodities than had been spent on price support programs for the basic commodities.

Other excellent provisions of the conference report include the establishing of a commission to recommend legislation providing for increased industrial use of agricultural products, the donation to penal and correctional institutions from our surplus food supplies, the prohibition of the use of Federal irrigation, draining and flood-control projects for a period of 3 years to produce surplus crops, the authorization of a more liberal policy in the processing of donated food commodities, the establishment of a special national acreage reserve of a hundred thousand acres of cotton to help particularly our small farmers, a forestry program which I think will be particularly helpful to my section of Florida where industry is based largely on the pine tree, and other provisions that I shall not enumerate.

Full speed ahead, Mr. Speaker. Let us approve this conference report and tell the farmers of America that we have not deserted them. Time is of the essence. Let no man be guilty of a delay which will mean more misery and despair to farmers of America.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, we are all agreed that farm income and farm prices must be raised. The valiant work of our farm-bill conferees has given Members of this body an opportunity to put more money in the farmers' pockets—and to do it immediately.

We have a chance to place major crops back under 90-percent-of-parity price supports and to peg milk prices at a 10-cent increase per hundredweight over present levels. All in all, we can stiffen price props under 10 different farm commodities.

I do not see how any Member who has at heart the welfare of the American farmer can vote against this conference report. In fact, I do not see how any Member who has at heart the welfare of the American worker or the American businessman can vote against it. Farm prosperity is the foundation of prosperity for us all.

Mr. Speaker, the net income of the American farmer has gone down $3 billion since the Republicans came into office. It fell a cool billion dollars last year.

DAIRY LOSSES STAGGERING

The American dairy industry has lost almost a billion dollars since April 1, 1954, when Secretary of Agriculture Benson dropped dairy price supports from 90 to 75 percent of parity. Milk producers in my State of Idaho have lost $14 million since that fateful April Fool's Day. Milk producers in a single creamery in my home county—the Dairymen's Co-op Creamery of Boise Valley—have lost almost $2 million in 21 months.

On top of the loss in milk income, Idaho dairy cows have decreased in value approximately $75 a head. This means an additional loss of about $18 million to our dairy farmers—a staggering loss for one group in one small State.

SURPLUSES GO UP UNDER GOP

You have all heard the argument that reducing the support level on farm commodities, and particularly on dairy products, would reduce production. Many of us thought it would never work, and now we know it will not.

As prices dropped, farmers had to produce more to meet their obligations. Thus, lower flexible price supports have not only hit farmers in their pocketbooks, but have helped build up the surpluses about which the Republican administration constantly complains.

Nearly all of the farm surpluses have accumulated since the Republicans took office. For example, there is 61 times as much butter stored in Government warehouses today as there was in 1952. There is 11 times as much barley in storage, 3 times as much corn, 2½ times as much wheat, almost 5 times as much oats, and 3 times as many soybeans.

At the time Mr. Benson dropped dairy price supports it was forecast that lower milk prices would mean increased milk consumption. This argument has been exploded. Although milk production has increased 3 billion pounds in the last 2 years, the per capita milk consumption has gone up less than 1 percent.

IDAHO FARM PRICES SAGGING

Mr. Speaker, people on Idaho's family-size farms are literally being pressed to the wall by prices they have to take for their products today. Let me read you some of these prices compared to those our Idaho farmers were receiving in

January 1953, when the Republicans took the helm in Washington:

	Unit	Inauguration (Jan. 15, 1953)	Now (Feb. 15, 1956)
Wheat	Bushel	$1.94	$1.83
Rye	do	1.70	1.20
Corn	do	1.80	1.55
Oats	do	.92	.66
Barley	do	1.34	.88
Potatoes	do	1.45	.85
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	7.90	5.70
Milk	do	4.40	3.55
Hogs	do	18.80	12.60
Beef cattle	do	20.10	12.90
Veal calves	do	21.90	16.50
Milk cows	Per head	230.00	155.00
Eggs	Dozen	.490	.350

No wonder farm real estate mortgage debt is up 29 percent over last year, and the number of farm loans has increased 9 percent.

FARMERS CAUGHT IN SQUEEZE

Farmers in Idaho and elsewhere are caught in a gigantic squeeze between falling farm prices and high costs of production and family living expenses. Parity—which measures the relationship between farm prices and costs—has fallen to a 14-year low.

With average per capita farm income at $865 as against a national average for nonfarm people of $1,913, it is easy to see what is happening to farm buying power. Nearly one-third of the total farm income comes from nonfarm sources. Some member of the family has to work off the farm to keep the family on the farm. It is not suprising that a million farmers left their farms last year.

If the Republican flexible price support program had helped the consumer there might be some excuse for it. But we all know that food prices in retail stores have changed very little. And it is an unhappy fact that the farmer is getting an even smaller share of the consumer's food dollar than he was before price supports were lowered. At inauguration time in 1953, the farmer got about 47 cents out of each consumer's dollar; today he gets only 38 cents.

In many instances, there is absolutely no relationship between what the farmer gets and the consumer pays. Ten years ago when wheat was bringing $3 a bushel, bread cost approximately 13 cents a pound. Today, wheat brings $2 a bushel, yet a pound loaf of bread costs about 18 cents.

During the past year the price of live hogs has dropped 38 percent. Yet pork chops have dropped only 14 cents a pound.

If the drop in farm prices is not helping the consumer, who is it helping? Well, we know for one thing there has been a rise in the profits of many food processors. Meat packers, for example, have showed a big income gain.

WHO IS BEING SUBSIDIZED?

Twenty years of farm price supports under the Democrats, with basic crops supported at 90 to over 100 percent of parity, cost about a billion dollars. The bulk of this loss was on nonbasics.

In the 2½ years under the Republicans, with flexible, or lower, price supports in effect during part of that time, our price-support program has cost us over $1½ billion—or more than it cost during 20 Democratic years.

Everybody admits that our farm price-support program has been expensive. But it has never reached more than a fraction of the payments made to industry to enable it to reconvert after the war. A subsidy study prepared by the House Agriculture Committee, which was published in January 1954, showed that business had received almost 40 times as much in subsidies as agriculture had.

SOIL BANK IS TOO SLOW

The Eisenhower administration paid little attention to the farmer's plight until someone in the White House got a 1956 calendar and remembered this is election year. Then they trotted out the soil bank to rescue the farmer with cash payments, and they spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on newspaper ads and radio announcements to urge Congress to vote for these payments before planting time. The fact that the Republican administration turned down two soil bank bills by Democratic Congressmen last year makes many of us wonder whether the Republicans are more concerned with the harvesting of crops or the harvesting of votes.

I think all of us agree that the soil bank has merit as a long-range panacea for some of our farm ills—but the emergency is here and now.

The only new proposal the administration has made this year to help the farmer is to exempt fuel used on the farms from Federal gasoline tax. I was happy to support this bill. I cannot resist pointing out, however, that this proposal also came in a leap year—when the Republicans became strangely liberal. The administration actually opposed this same proposal a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, last session—May 3, 1955—I spoke and voted in favor of a bill to increase dairy supports and to replace flexible price supports with firm 90-percent-of-parity supports on basic commodities. As we all know, the House passed that bill, but the Senate took no action. A year has rolled by and the American farmer is in deeper trouble. His trouble is spreading to others.

THE PRESTON STORY

Mr. Speaker, one of the best arguments for passing this bill lies in what has happened in Secretary of Agriculture Benson's native town, Preston, Idaho. Secretary Benson was born a couple of miles from Preston, which is the Franklin County seat, and grew up there. He later served as county agricultural agent.

Preston is a typical southeastern Idaho community of about 3,500 people. It is surrounded by highly diversified farms which raise wheat, sugar beets, vegetables, feed, cattle, hogs, poultry, and is a dairying center. The business houses depend almost entirely upon farm trade for their existence.

Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years 9 major businesses have failed in Preston, a department store, 2 large grocery stores, 2 hardware stores, an automobile agency selling a low-priced popular car, an electronics shop, a sweet shop, and a cafe. The city dads are so worried they have taken out the parking meters in an effort to get the farm folks to come to town and shop.

The Federal Land Bank in Preston reports they did a land office business last year—making the largest number of loans in their history, with an enormous increase in mortgages on family-sized farms.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening in Preston, Idaho, is happening in farm communities throughout the Nation. And we all know that when farm buying power goes down, business failures soar and unemployment lines form. A farm recession is like an octopus—it reaches out and drags us all in.

Again I repeat—with net farm income down $3 billion since 1952, and with small business failures up, there is not a single Member of this body who can afford to vote for less than 90 percent of parity—and it should be 100 percent.

The Preston story is like a scarecrow in the field—a warning to both the Congress and the administration.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, like nearly every other Member of the House who represents a substantial agricultural district, I have followed the developments on H. R. 12 through this House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, and more recently the deliberation by the other body of Congress, both in the Agriculture Committee and when it was on the floor for amendment and debate. Also through the members of the conference committee I have kept abreast of the deliberations of the House and the Senate conferees in formulating the conference report now before the House.

I do not take the position that it is by any means a perfect bill, nor that it is a complete answer to the many agricultural problems existing in northeast Kansas. I do feel, however, that it offers the best possible opportunity for improving the agricultural economy in my district, and I am going to vote for the adoption of the conference report.

On the matter of parity, my colleagues from the Middle Western States are familiar with the provisions of H. R. 9861, which I recently introduced providing for what is known as a graduated parity on the basic agricultural commodities. I firmly believe that legislation providing for graduated parity as proposed in H. R. 9861, or others similar to it, would be for the best interests of the overall agricultural economy. I also believe that such provision is economically sound and I will continue to support such legislation. I further feel that such parity provision carries more of the benefit to the individual farmer than does rigid 90-percent parity, and at the same time incorporates the advantages of flexible parity now in effect by reducing the incentive on high production. I do feel, however, that supplemental income is mandatory for agriculture in 1956, and the provisions of the conference report now before us appears to be the only alternative.

I further feel that the conference report is remiss in not taking into account the voluntary reduction of basic crops that has taken place, especially on the smaller farms. This has had the effect of lower basic allotments than would normally have occurred, and which have been further reduced in view of our recent surpluses. On the small farms the resulting allotments have become so low that it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain a sound economic farm unit. Continuing on this basis of allotments, we are penalizing the farmers who have adopted good farming practices and favoring the operator who continued to keep every acre possible planted to a cereal crop.

On the matter of domestic parity for wheat, I am willing to present the matter to the farmers for their approval as provided in this conference report, but I seriously question that it will work to the advantage of the First District of Kansas if it is approved by referendum.

Although the $100,000 limitation placed in the bill by the Senate on the amount of a commodity credit loan available to any one operator was not realistic, at least it was a step in the right direction. I regret this deletion was made by the conference committee, as it appears evident to me the program over the years has been most favorable to the big operator at the expense of the family-size farm. In my opinion the maximum commodity credit loan should not have exceeded $50,000, and more probably $25,000 would have been a realistic limitation.

As stated before, however, I am going to vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], vice chairman of our great committee.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The bill as it passed the Senate contained what is known as the Chavez amendment which would increase the acreage of growers of Valencia and Virginia peanuts. The report makes no mention of it but I know that the amendment was deleted by the conferees. I have been advised as to the reasons for it. Will the gentleman please tell the House for the record the thinking of the conferees in eliminating that particular amendment?

Mr. POAGE. The conferees understood, and we do understand, that the Secretary has that power now. The general law gives him the right to add acreage any time if there is a shortage of any type of peanuts. That includes the Valencia. He has a right to increase the acreage of Valencias any time he wants to.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. There is a shortage of Valencia peanuts and Virginia peanuts at the present time. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to clear up 1 or 2 misunderstandings that seem to have arisen in the course of this debate. There has been a great deal of discussion here about what we are trying to accomplish. It seems that there is considerable misunderstanding of what we are trying to accomplish by this legislation.

We are endeavoring in this bill to give some type of aid to our farmers. We are not trying in this bill primarily to reduce Government expenditures although we want to reduce Government expenditures everywhere we can. We are with this bill trying to pass a measure to help the farmers of America. You cannot help the farmers of America simply by taking some more of their land out of cultivation, even though you pay them for the loss they sustain on the land that you take out of production because that merely leaves the farmers where they were financially.

If you have nothing but the soil bank, if you have nothing in the bill except what the motion to recommit would leave in the bill, you will, it is true, have a provision in for the expenditure of $1,200 million that is the cost of the soil bank, but it will not be $1,200 million of added income to farmers. It will be $1,200 million of replacement of money that you have taken away from the farmers. So if you simply pass this motion to recommit you will burden the taxpayers with that amount of additional taxes, new and additional over and above what we have already. You may, it is true, use this money to pay the farmer for the crops he was unable to produce because of placing his land in the soil bank, but you have added nothing to farm income. The only way you can help the farmers is to add to their income. This conference report as it stands adds to their income. The motion to recommit would add nothing.

There is this misunderstanding about whom we are trying to help. The conferees want to help the farmers. As to the motion to recommit, I do not know whom it will help. It will not help the taxpayers. It will add more than a billion dollars to their burden. It alone will not help the farmers. It will spend more tax money but it will not put more money in the farmers' pockets.

Then there was the implication that this bill did nothing to reduce surpluses. Actually, for the first time in our farm history we have a bill brought before us that has an effective way of reducing the production of corn and feed grains. As the gentleman representing the minority told you, the corn farmers have not complied in the past. Why? Because it was not to their financial interest to stay within their acreage allotments. They are just like everybody else. They do the thing they consider to their own interest. Under this bill the corn farmer is going to get paid if he complies with his allotments, not only for putting his land in the soil bank but also he is assured 90 percent of parity price support on his corn in return for his acreage reduction. I think he will reduce his production because he will decide it is profitable to do so.

And what about the feed grain farmer? He has got to reduce his acreage by 15 percent in order to get anything under this bill. This feed grain farmer that we were told about who has been producing a surplus unquestionably is going to have some inducement to reduce his acreage in feed grains. This is the first time we have ever offered him any such inducement. On the other hand, if we should vote to reject this conference report and accept the motion by the gentleman from Massachusetts, we would have absolutely nothing to encourage anybody to reduce his feed grain acreage. Thus at the same time we are giving the farmers of America hope of a fair price. We are giving to the taxpayers of America hope that we will have a better balance in our production. By this bill we offer something to the farmer for reducing, and that is the way to get reduction, that is, the way we ought to get reduction is to offer your farmer something which is to his advantage to reduce, and that is what this bill does. This is what we have so often overlooked. We have said "Go on and reduce and get nothing in return." That is unfair. This bill tries to correct that.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that in the past we have always been able to secure reductions when we have been willing to give the farmer a reasonable return for making reductions, but when we have reduced our support prices we have found we did not get those reductions in production. When the present Secretary of Agriculture became Secretary there was a net profit of $13 million in the price-support account of six basic commodities. Today we have lower supports but there is a loss of more than half a billion on these same commodities. He reduced the support on dairy products, and he sustained a loss of $830 million on dairy products within the past 3 years.

In other words, the lesson of history is clear. If you want to assure that we will bring a balance of production and demand, provide for our farmers a reasonable return on what you allow them to grow, and you can get that balance. We have done it throughout the years in the past. When we ignore that fundamental law of human nature and attempt to require the farmer to reduce without giving him anything in return, we then get more, not less, production. The farmer has no recourse in the face of falling prices except to increase his volume of production or face a lower standard of living.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. I want to commend the gentleman and all the conferees for a job well done.

May I ask the gentleman this question? Is it not true that today, with the average hourly rate of pay for labor, you can buy more food than at any other time in the history of our country?

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly true. And it is also true that when these gentlemen talk about raising the price of bread because perchance we are trying to give the wheat farmer a livelihood they say nothing of the fact that the price of wheat has dropped approximately one-third in the last 10 years and the price of bread has gone up by just about the same figure. Surely there has

been little relation between the farmer's price and the consumer's price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House knows that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has been in the forefront of the fight for agriculture all these years. I want to say, too, that anybody who votes for the motion to recommit here today will be voting to take away $2 billion at least in gross income to the American farmer. And if they do that, let them vote their own conscience.

Mr. POAGE. They will indeed be voting to take away somewhere around $2 billion of income to the American farmer and at the same time adding the $1,200 million of additional cost to the taxpayers without any compensating return to the farmers of America. It is just bad arithmetic; it is just bad public policy to try to do that sort of thing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who does not have a farm in his district I think I can view this proposed legislation and other farm legislation from a purely objective angle. I see 165 million Americans. I see a great Nation consisting of 48 States, north, east, south, and west, with their diverse problems, but all Americans and all interested in the national interest and in the welfare of our country and our people.

I know that the history of depressions of the past 150 years has shown that they start first when there is a depressed financial condition among our farmers and in our agricultural communities. I know that when we find our farmers depressed economically, no matter how plentiful positions may be in the factories and in the cities, it is only a matter of a year or 2 years when the reduced purchasing power of the farmers has an effect upon the worker in the factory, the result being unemployment and economic distress in the cities.

We cannot separate the farmers from the workers nor the workers from the farmers. Anyone who makes such an appeal engages in what I have termed heretofore economic bigotry, arraying American against American because of a difference of residence, so far as the sections of our country are concerned; arraying Americans against Americans because of their economic income, arraying Americans toiling on the soil against those who toil in the factory.

We have one national economy. We are not going to solve the farm problem by reducing the wages of the workers in the factory. This is an overall picture. The man who lives in the city and the man who works in the factory may not realize it, but his security of employment is linked up with the economic prosperity of our farmers and the farmer's economic prosperity is linked up with the security of position of the worker in the factory and in the city.

The decline in the farm income during the past 3 or 4 years is a grave problem not only to the farmer but to our economy as a whole. We know that during the last 3 or 4 years there has been a decline of at least $1 billion a year in the net income of our agricultural community. I know as a student of depressions in our country that that is not a healthy sign. I know it is only a matter of time when there will be a catchup in the cities. I know as a matter of national policy we have to do something to keep a dynamic agriculture. I know that the farmer buys in a protected market and sells his agricultural surpluses in an unprotected market.

I recognize and I support, as do other Members, proper protection for our industries, but proper protection for them has an effect upon our agricultural community. Speaking for myself, I recognize the fact that in this day and era, with our intense economic system and with distance eliminated in the world through the rapidity of travel, there must be some compensating considerations to our farmers in order for America to keep an active and dynamic agriculture.

This bill is not perfect, no, but under the circumstances as I see them, it is about the best bill the House conferees could produce and bring to this body. I hope the motion to recommit will be defeated and the conference report agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of April 9, the previous question on the conference report is considered as ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARTIN moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the following:

1. Amend section 101 by striking "90 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "not less than 82½ percent."

2. Amend section 103 to read:

"The first sentence of subsection (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'The price of whole milk, butterfat, and the products of such commodities, respectively, shall be supported at not less than 80 percent nor more than 90 percent of the parity price therefor using a parity equivalent for manufacturing milk based on the 30-month period July 1946 to December 1948, both inclusive'."

3. Strike section 104.

4. Strike subsection (d) of section 408.

5. Strike all of title V.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Since the motion to recommit applies to several titles and sections of the bill, is it possible under the rules of the House to get a separate vote on the various amendments that seek to strike certain matter from the bill?

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not subject to division.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from North Carolina in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 238, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—181

Adair	Frelinghuysen	Ostertag
Alger	Fulton	Patterson
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Pelly
Allen, Ill.	Gubser	Philbin
Arends	Gwinn	Phillips
Ashley	Hale	Pillion
Auchincloss	Haley	Poff
Ayres	Halleck	Prouty
Baker	Hand	Quigley
Baldwin	Harden	Radwan
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Ray
Bates	Harvey	Reece, Tenn.
Baumhart	Hayworth	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Henderson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Becker	Herlong	Riehlman
Bentley	Heselton	Robsion, Ky.
Betts	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Boland	Hiestand	Sadlak
Bolton, Frances P.	Hill	St. George
	Hillings	Saylor
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hinshaw	Schenck
	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Bosch	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwengel
Bow	Holmes	Scrivner
Bray	Holt	Scudder
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Hyde	Sheehan
Broyhill	Jackson	Short
Budge	James	Siler
Bush	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johansen	Simpson, Pa.
Canfield	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Carrigg	Kean	Taber
Cederberg	Kearney	Taylor
Chenoweth	Kearns	Teague, Calif.
Chiperfield	Keating	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Kilburn	
Clevenger	King, Pa.	Thomson, Wyo.
Cole	Knox	Udall
Corbett	Laird	Utt
Coudert	Latham	Van Pelt
Cramer	Lipscomb	Van Zandt
Cretella	McConnell	Velde
Crumpacker	McCulloch	Vorys
Cunningham	McDonough	Vursell
Curtis, Mass.	McGregor	Wainwright
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Westland
Dague	Macdonald	Wharton
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Ill.	Widnall
Dawson, Utah	Mack, Wash.	Wigglesworth
Derounian	Mailliard	Williams, N. J.
Devereux	Martin	Williams, N. Y.
Dixon	Mason	Wilson, Calif.
Dondero	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
Donohue	Merrow	Withrow
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, Md.	Wolcott
Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton
Fenton	Minshall	Yates
Fino	Morano	Young
Fjare	Mumma	Younger
Fogarty	Nicholson	
Ford	Norblad	

NAYS—238

Abbitt	Bennett, Fla.	Cannon
Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Carlyle
Addonizio	Berry	Carnahan
Albert	Blatnik	Celler
Alexander	Blitch	Chase
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs	Chatham
	Bolling	Chelf
Andresen, August H.	Bonner	Christopher
	Bowler	Chudoff
Andrews	Boykin	Clark
Anfuso	Boyle	Colmer
Ashmore	Brooks, La.	Cooley
Aspinall	Brooks, Tex.	Coon
Avery	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Bailey	Buckley	Davidson
Barden	Burdick	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Burleson	Davis, Tenn.
Bass, Tenn.	Burnside	Dawson, Ill.
Belcher	Byrd	Deane
Bell	Byrne, Pa.	Delaney

Dempsey	Jensen	Polk
Denton	Johnson, Wis.	Preston
Dies	Jonas	Price
Diggs	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Dingell	Jones, Mo.	Rabaut
Dodd	Jones, N. C.	Rains
Dollinger	Karsten	Rees, Kans.
Dolliver	Kee	Reuss
Donovan	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes, Pa.
Dorn, S. C.	Kelly, N. Y.	Richards
Dowdy	Keogh	Riley
Doyle	Kilday	Rivers
Durham	Kilgore	Roberts
Eberharter	King, Calif.	Robeson, Va.
Edmondson	Kirwan	Rodino
Elliott	Klein	Rogers, Colo.
Engle	Kluczynski	Rogers, Fla.
Evins	Knutson	Rogers, Tex.
Fallon	Krueger	Rooney
Fascell	Landrum	Roosevelt
Feighan	Lane	Rutherford
Fernandez	Lanham	Selden
Fisher	Lankford	Shelley
Flood	LeCompte	Sheppard
Flynt	Lesinski	Shuford
Forand	Long	Sieminski
Forrester	Lovre	Sikes
Fountain	McCarthy	Sisk
Frazier	McCormack	Smith, Kans.
Friedel	McDowell	Smith, Miss.
Garmatz	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Gary	Machrowicz	Spence
Gathings	Madden	Springer
George	Magnuson	Staggers
Granahan	Mahon	Steed
Gray	Marshall	Sullivan
Green, Oreg.	Matthews	Talle
Green, Pa.	Metcalf	Teague, Tex.
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas
Griffiths	Mills	Thompson, La.
Gross	Morgan	Thompson, N. J.
Hagen	Morrison	Thompson, Tex.
Hardy	Moss	Thornberry
Harris	Moulder	Trimble
Harrison, Va.	Multer	Tuck
Hays, Ark.	Murray, Ill.	Tumulty
Hays, Ohio	Murray, Tenn.	Vanik
Healey	Natcher	Vinson
Hébert	Norrell	Walter
Hoeven	O'Brien, Ill.	Watts
Holifield	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Holland	O'Hara, Ill.	Whitten
Holtzman	O'Konski	Wickersham
Hope	O'Neill	Wier
Horan	Passman	Williams, Miss.
Huddleston	Patman	Willis
Hull	Perkins	Winstead
Ikard	Pfost	Wright
Jarman	Pilcher	Zablocki
Jennings	Poage	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—14

Gamble	McVey	Osmers
Gentry	Miller, Calif.	Powell
Gordon	Mollohan	Scott
Grant	Nelson	Tollefson
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Tollefson against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Miller of California against.

Mr. McVey for, with Mr. Mollohan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gentry with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. COUDERT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 237, nays 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—237

Abbitt	Durham	Metcalf
Abernethy	Eberharter	Miller, Md.
Adair	Edmondson	Miller, Nebr.
Addonizio	Elliott	Mills
Albert	Evins	Morgan
Alexander	Feighan	Morrison
Andersen, H. Carl	Fernandez	Moss
	Fisher	Moulder
Andresen, August H.	Flood	Multer
	Flynt	Murray, Ill.
Andrews	Forrester	Murray, Tenn.
Anfuso	Fountain	Natcher
Ashley	Frazier	Norrell
Ashmore	Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Gathings	O'Brien, N. Y.
Avery	George	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Granahan	O'Konski
Baker	Gray	Passman
Barden	Green, Oreg.	Patman
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Perkins
Bass, Tenn.	Gregory	Pfost
Baumhart	Griffiths	Pilcher
Beamer	Gross	Poage
Belcher	Hardy	Polk
Bell	Harris	Preston
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Nebr.	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Priest
Berry	Hays, Ark.	Quigley
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	Rabaut
Blitch	Hayworth	Rains
Boggs	Healey	Rees, Kans.
Bolling	Henderson	Reuss
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hill	Riley
	Hoeven	Rivers
Bonner	Holifield	Roberts
Bow	Holland	Rodino
Bowler	Hope	Rogers, Colo.
Boykin	Horan	Rogers, Tex.
Boyle	Huddleston	Rooney
Bray	Hull	Roosevelt
Brooks, La.	Ikard	Rutherford
Brooks, Tex.	Jarman	Schenck
Brown, Ga.	Jenkins	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Jennings	Selden
Buckley	Jensen	Shelley
Budge	Johnson, Wis.	Sheppard
Burdick	Jonas	Shuford
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Sieminski
Byrd	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Ill.
Cannon	Karsten	Sisk
Carlyle	Kee	Smith, Kans.
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Miss.
Celler	Keogh	Spence
Chase	Kilday	Springer
Chatham	Kilgore	Steed
Chelf	King, Calif.	Sullivan
Chenoweth	Kirwan	Talle
Christopher	Klein	Teague, Tex.
Chudoff	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Colmer	Knutson	Thompson, N. J.
Cooley	Krueger	Thompson, Tex.
Coon	Landrum	Thornberry
Cooper	Lanham	Trimble
Cunningham	Lankford	Tuck
Davidson	LeCompte	Tumulty
Davis, Ga.	Lesinski	Vanik
Davis, Tenn.	Long	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Lovre	Watts
Deane	McCarthy	Weaver
Dempsey	McCormack	Whitten
Denton	McDowell	Wickersham
Dies	McMillan	Wier
Diggs	Machrowicz	Williams, Miss.
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Willis
Dollinger	Madden	Wilson, Ind.
Dolliver	Magnuson	Winstead
Dorn, S. C.	Mahon	Wright
Dowdy	Marshall	Zablocki
Doyle	Matthews	Zelenko

NAYS—181

Alger	Bosch	Coudert
Allen, Calif.	Brownson	Cramer
Allen, Ill.	Broyhill	Cretella
Arends	Burnside	Crumpacker
Auchincloss	Bush	Curtis, Mass.
Ayres	Byrnes, Wis.	Curtis, Mo.
Baldwin	Canfield	Dague
Bass, N. H.	Carrigg	Davis, Wis.
Bates	Cederberg	Dawson, Utah
Becker	Chiperfield	Delaney
Bentley	Church	Derounian
Betts	Clark	Devereux
Boland	Clevenger	Dixon
Bolton, Frances P.	Cole	Dodd
	Corbett	Dondero
Donohue	Kearney	Robsion, Ky.
Donovan	Kearns	Rogers, Fla.
Dorn, N. Y.	Keating	Rogers, Mass.
Ellsworth	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Engle	Kilburn	St. George
Fallon	King, Pa.	Saylor
Fascell	Knox	Scherer
Fenton	Laird	Scrivener
Fino	Lane	Scudder
Fjare	Latham	Seely-Brown
Fogarty	Lipscomb	Sheehan
Forand	McConnell	Short
Ford	McCulloch	Siler
Frelinghuysen	McDonough	Simpson, Pa.
Friedel	McGregor	Smith, Va.
Fulton	McIntire	Smith, Wis.
Gary	Macdonald	Staggers
Gavin	Mack, Wash.	Taber
Gubser	Mailliard	Taylor
Gwinn	Martin	Teague, Calif.
Hagen	Mason	Thomas
Hale	Meader	Thompson, Mich.
Haley	Merrow	
Halleck	Miller, N. Y.	Thomson, Wyo.
Hand	Minshall	Udall
Harden	Morano	Utt
Harrison, Va.	Mumma	Van Pelt
Hébert	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Herlong	Norblad	Velde
Heselton	O'Neill	Vorys
Hess	Ostertag	Vursell
Hiestand	Patterson	Wainwright
Hillings	Pelly	Walter
Hinshaw	Philbin	Westland
Hoffman, Ill.	Phillips	Wharton
Hoffman, Mich.	Pillion	Widnall
Holmes	Poff	Wigglesworth
Holt	Prouty	Williams, N. J.
Holtzman	Radwan	Williams, N. Y.
Hosmer	Ray	Wilson, Calif.
Hyde	Reece, Tenn.	Withrow
Jackson	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
James	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wolverton
Johansen	Rhodes, Pa.	Yates
Judd	Riehlman	Young
Kean	Robeson, Va.	Younger

NOT VOTING—15

Gamble	McVey	Osmers
Gentry	Miller, Calif.	Powell
Gordon	Mollohan	Richards
Grant	Nelson	Scott
Johnson, Calif.	O'Hara, Minn.	Tollefson

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Johnson of California against.

Mr. Tollefson for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Grant for, with Mr. Osmers against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. McVey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Gentry with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. SHORT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOMEN'S PREFERENCES IN HOMES

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, no mere man, at least none of my acquaintance, has the temerity to state unequivocally that he is fully acquainted with the thought processes of woman. One of our colleagues, less timorous than

most and certainly more vocal, indicates that what women think, particularly with regard to the choice of a home they wish to occupy, is "silly and useless."

Many things women are: frugal, imaginative, perceptive, sometimes stubborn, and loquacious. They are not, as a gender, silly or useless, nor are the benefits we have all enjoyed as fruits of the feminine thought processes.

I commend Housing Administrator Cole for venturing into the uncharted thought processes of women's preferences in homes, and admire his courage. This is said with no thought of levity as I sincerely believe that a conclave of 100 women, as is contemplated in the program of a Women's Housing Congress, will be of substantial benefit to all concerned.

The housing industry groups, dependent upon Government for direction and stimulation of their commodities, are, with Government, in turn dependent upon consumer choice for a healthy economy. You build for the market, or you fail. Women exercise an influence upon the housing market far beyond their numbers.

That the planned Women's Congress on Housing will be of assistance to the Government agencies concerned is buttressed by the recent statement by FHA Commissioner Norman P. Mason, who said:

> We ought to know what they (women) are thinking * * * the housewives and homemakers are a proper part of this picture.

Commissioner Mason recites the virtues of special advisory groups currently operating throughout the country who advise FHA on portions of housing programs and says:

> We will study carefully all the recommendations suggested by this group. FHA officials plan to attend all the sessions of the Women's Congress on Housing.

I accept the sagacity and, above all, the courage of Messrs. Cole and Mason in this new venture in home-consumer-choice exploration in preference to the press releases of opposition to the idea distributed by those with no experience in the housing field.

INTEREST INCOME EARNED ON GOVERNMENT OBLIGATIONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will remove from tax-exempt status, under Federal income tax law, the interest income earned on governmental obligations of which proceeds are used to finance private business enterprises.

In recent years there has been an increase in the use by governmental units of their special financial advantages in order to attract new industries and business enterprises. This practice has made it possible in some cases for private firms to obtain funds for new construction at interest rates of 2 percent instead of the market rate of approximately 4 percent. State governments, of course, may do as they wish about taxation. What is involved here is the use of a Federal tax advantage, given as an aid to governmental units for the conduct of traditional governmental functions, as a device to give special economic advantages in one area or State. Federal tax exemption on interest earned by bonds issued for industrial and business development makes it possible for State and local governments to give such special advantages to particular businesses and industries. The advantages resulting from this special tax exemption can be just as economically destructive as the imposition of discriminatory taxes.

Section 274 of H. R. 8300, 83d Congress, which passed the House in 1954, contained a provision which indirectly attempted to get at this abuse. The section was not accepted by the Senate and was not agreed to in conference. The House, however, had approved the provision which would have disallowed as a deductible item for income tax purposes rent paid for facilities provided to private businesses through the issuance of tax-exempt governmental securities.

Passage of this legislation would be in keeping with congressional responsibilities in interstate commerce. No State may apply a tariff or other trade restriction to the products of another State. The granting of special financial advantages, in effect a subsidy from exempted Federal tax revenue, does comparable damage to commerce and industry in other States.

This point was recognized and stated clearly in a recent decision of the Florida Supreme Court, in the case of State against Town of North Miami, in these words:

> The financing of private enterprise by means of public funds is entirely foreign to a proper concept of our constitutional system.

The passage of the bill would prevent unchecked and irresponsible bidding among communities for plants and business establishments. It would prevent the development of financial crises such as have developed in some areas as a result of unwise or premature establishment of specially favored businesses. Some of these communities have found themselves obligated to continue subsidies to favored industries at the expense of other taxpayers, including established industries which are not given special preferential treatment. Because of an increased need for public services—police protection, schools, roads, et cetera—resulting from the establishment of the new subsidized industry, fiscal needs of local governmental units have greatly increased without a corresponding increase in the tax base, or available revenue. In these cases essential services must be foregone, or the revenue must be raised through increasingly oppressive and regressive taxes.

This bill would affect only artificial and special inducement, resulting from the indirect use of Federal tax law, in order to attract industry or business. Sound relocation decisions based upon markets, raw materials, power, labor supply, and other economic considerations would not be affected.

Passage of this bill would help to insure economically sound relocations and expansions of business and industry, or permanent benefit to the economy of the Nation and of the localities directly involved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9893, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement. When general debate is concluded I will ask that section 101 be read for amendment, then move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, as we are about to continue consideration of a bill involving the national defense of our country and involving at the same time the lives of every American citizen of all backgrounds and colors, it would seem appropriate and important to comment on a most unfortunate and dastardly action which took place last night.

Nat "King" Cole, a Negro singer and pianist of renowned and outstanding talent, an American who has brought not only acclaim to himself but outstanding recognition for our country all over the world, was brutally attacked, knocked to the floor without provocation, by a small group of white men. Fortunately, Mr. Cole, who is one of my constitutents, was not seriously injured and before going to the hospital for treatment returned to the stage where he had been giving a

concert before 4,000 persons in Birmingham, Ala., and was given a rousing ovation by the entire audience. The action of these true Americans, an entirely white audience, was the best possible answer to those who still adhere to violence and bodily attack in order to display their emotions. The ovation lasted for nearly 10 minutes and it is most fortunate that it was able to take place, for it contrasts well with the dignified, orderly actions of those of the Negro race in another mass action, the bus boycott in the nearby city of Montgomery, Ala.

Thus both white people and Negro people, all American citizens, displayed an example for all of us to remember, to be proud of, and to remain with us as we approach problems which arouse deep emotions and about which individuals differ strongly and sincerely.

Four men have been arrested and are held in custody to answer for their actions in the dastardly attack upon Mr. Cole. I have every confidence that local authority will deal fairly and justly with these individuals. I hope that the ovation accorded Mr. Cole may wipe the memory of this incident from his mind and may encourage him to continue to place before his fellow citizens his unmatched talents. Under any circumstances, we will add to our appreciation our admiration for his courage.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] and the other members of that committee in accepting and offering the amendment relating to certain new language relating to SAGE which amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

"The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the semiautomatic ground environment system. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A. 481)."

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION NEEDS IN ONE PACKAGE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a substantial package.

The grand total of all authorities for military public works recommended by the Committee on Armed Services, reaches a figure of $2,156,730,000.

It is moderate, however, in the light of the overall defense appropriation of $35 billion requested by the President in January.

Even this latter sum is a small price to pay in order to protect our national security and to assist in the defense of the free world.

Our sole reservation may be that we are not spending enough to maintain our lead in airpower, and to accelerate the development of guided missiles.

As for military public works, I am happy to note that the committee, in its own words "is aware of the great need for family housing by all of the military services." And that "It is the view of the committee that it has a direct responsibility for the provision of family housing for military personnel."

This might appear to be a trifling matter, at first glance.

How can houses defend us?

When the need is for superbombs and long-range planes and aircraft carriers and so many big items of military hardware.

In answer to this, I would emphasize the human element.

The officers and the noncommissioned ranks who devote their lives to the Armed Forces, are the very heart of our defense. We rely upon their skill, experience, and devotion to duty, for an alert, well-trained Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. In fact, we rely upon their knowledge and advice in order to keep our Nation ahead in weapons development, and in the ability to employ them effectively when necessary.

The enemy is not only interested in our arms and equipment.

He also evaluates the morale of our professional soldiers.

Are they being compensated for the sacrifices they are making?

Do their families have the accommodations and the oportunities enjoyed by the average civilians?

When a career member of our military forces is transferred to a new duty assignment either in the United States or overseas, he oftentimes finds difficulty in securing suitable accommodations for his family convenient to his post or station.

There has been some dissatisfaction on this point.

It is good that H. R. 9893 has made a start toward the solution of this problem by authorizing the construction of 3,740 family units both here and abroad. This is a small beginning and a small part of the total military construction program—amounting to $80 million in round figures—but it is an acknowledgment of an obligation that has been neglected for too long. This consideration for family-housing needs will improve the morale of our professional soldiers, and will serve to make a career in the Armed Forces more attractive to young men who will thus be able to have their wives and children near them no matter where they may be stationed.

The amendment to the National Housing Act by Congress last year will help, but even when complemented by the construction of military housing recommended by this bill, a large deficit in accommodations will remain.

As the American Legion observed:

The largest portion of the housing in the proposed program is to satisfy Air Force requirements. The major single need by the Air Force for such housing is at aircraft control and warning sites. These sites are, in practically all instances, located in inaccessible areas throughout the country. Normal community support facilities are either nonexistent or inadequate.

As a whole, H. R. 9893 serves to meet the needs of our military plant and facilities. Generally speaking, it may be regarded as a minimum program. While we may take exceptions to an item here or there, this legislation for national security deserves prompt and impressive support.

The Congress will retain its control under subsection (c) of section 408, requiring semiannual reports to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House regarding military public works which may be urgently needed. In this manner, the committee can exercise surveillance over authority, which might otherwise be susceptible to extravagance or abuse.

It is essential to authorize the construction outlined in H. R. 9893, in order for the Armed Forces of the United States to keep their facilities up to date and ready for any emergency.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, there is one provision in this legislation to which I must disagree with the committee. My disagreement places me in a very unenviable position, primarily because almost universally I support the action taken by this committee under the leadership of the distinguished chairman and the distinguished minority leader.

Furthermore, in the main I believe my distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] and I have agreed on most legislation. However, based on the facts as I have been able to determine them, it is my clear duty to disagree with the committee and with my colleague from Michigan.

I disagree for two reasons: First, if the action taken by the committee is sustained, it will cost the Treasury of the United States a minimum of $5,188,950 more; secondly, if the action of the committee is sustained, there will be at least a 1-year delay in the construction of an an essential jet base in the State of Michigan.

The authority for those two categorical statements is the Secretary of the Air Force. I have before me a letter addressed to me dated March 21, 1956, from

the Honorable Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force. I will quote from this letter, in part, the pertinent portions. They are as follows:

The design and acquisition of land at Kalkaska Air Force Base are sufficiently complete to commence the immediate construction of the SAGE project and to permit construction of the runway to begin in July 1956. In addition, this is the only site in the area that can become operational in time to meet an urgent air-defense requirement both for the air base and the SAGE project.

In other words, according to the Secretary of the Air Force, if the Air Force is not permitted to construct this base at Kalkaska, there will be a delay of at least a year. Yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services indicated in his remarks that there was an urgent need for the immediate construction of this base. If the base is not constructed, there will be a gap in our continental defenses. It seems to me it would be unwise for the Congress, under these circumstances, to take action which would delay the construction of this base at least a year.

Secondly, on the question of economy, the Secretary of the Air Force says this:

This site can be developed and operated with less expense than any other site that has been considered within the area of requirement.

I would like to point out where the additional cost will be developed. First, I would like to say this: This problem, or this controversy, has been a long and sordid one. I would be the very first to agree that many people are to blame. There may be some committees which are to blame in this controversy, including my own committee, but when we reach a certain point we have got to wipe out the past record and do what we can to remedy the situation as economically as possible and as quickly as possible.

Last July, the Air Force, after being precluded from going to the one site that they first wanted, by action of the Committee on Armed Services; and secondly, being precluded from going to another site which they wanted, by action of the Committee on Appropriations, selected the Kalkaska site. At that time the Air Force got letters from the chairman of the four pertinent committees in the House and Senate authorizing construction at Kalkaska. I shall read these letters in chronological order.

First, on July 28, 1955, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said this in a letter addressed to the Honorable Harold E. Talbott.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This committee has no objection to the Air Force proceeding with the immediate construction of an airbase at the so-called Kalkaska site in Michigan as requested in Mr. Garlock's letter of July 28, 1955. It should be understood that funds can be made available from the appropriation for "Military construction, Air Force," in the amount previously justified and appropriated for an airbase in the Traverse City area.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

On July 29, 1955, Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, wrote this letter to the Honorable Lyle S. Garlock, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force:

DEAR MR. GARLOCK: I have your letter of July 28, 1955, in which you indicate that it is the intention of the Air Force to establish the Traverse City area base at Kalkaska, Mich.

I am gratified that final selection of this base has been made, since I know of its importance to our Air Defense Command.

You request that this committee give its approval for the development of the airbase at the Kalkaska site. This request is somewhat of a surprise to me, since I assume that the site selected is in the Traverse City area and this being so, this committee has no further function to perform or approval to give. The only remaining matter which would come within the cognizance of this committee would be the acquisition of the land necessary for the base, and I would expect that a project covering this land acquisition will in time be submitted to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

On August 4, 1955, Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, wrote to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Senate Appropriations Committee has this day approved reprograming requests of the Departments of the Army and Air Force for military construction items as submitted and testified to by the Departments concerned.

I omit one paragraph that is of no consequence here.

In addition, the committee has approved the development of the Kalkaska, Mich., Air Force Base, for which funds have been previously appropriated for a similar project in this general area.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL HAYDEN.

Then on August 11, 1955, Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction, wrote to the Honorable Lyle S. Garlock the following:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Chairman RUSSELL has referred to the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction your letter of July 28, 1955, regarding the development of a new airbase in the Traverse City, Mich., area.

As you know, the authorization for this base is designated as "Traverse City area, Mich." It appeals that this authorization is broad enough to support a location at any of the sites mentioned in your letter. The Senate Armed Services Committee was not responsible for the two previous changes in the proposed location of this base and, thus, has not had an opportunity fully to evaluate the comparative merits of the proposed sites.

Then it goes on to say in effect, that "This committee approves the Kalkaska selection."

Following the receipt of those four letters from the responsible chairmen of the pertinent committees, the Air Force in good faith went ahead to initiate construction at Kalkaska.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am wondering if the gentleman will state the purpose of the introduction of those letters which are, after all, in the nature perhaps of public official correspondence, but private letters from chairmen of committees to the Secretary of the Air Force. Are we to conclude that this means that the recipients of those letters cleared them for release here today; or what is the situation in which they are brought to the House floor?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois that these letters are included in the published hearings of the Committee on Armed Services on H. R. 8625 and H. R. 9893, beginning at page 6759.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am very glad to have the gentleman clarify that and give the page and reference number.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I desire to call the Committee's attention to the fact that in the letter, which I wrote with a great deal of care, you will note nowhere that I approve the selection. There is not a line in it where I approve this particular site.

Mr. FORD. I believe the only fair assumption the Air Force could have was that with this letter and the other three they had the authority to proceed to spend funds in the Kalkaska area.

Mr. VINSON. They have authority any place within the Traverse City area that meets the requirement of the statute, but you will not find one letter in my communication where I approve this particular site. I was surprised that they communicated with me because I went under the assumption that they were following the law to put it in that area. That is all I was concerned with.

Mr. FORD. The facts are, of course, that the Kalkaska site was within the area.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The Air Force in good faith proceeded to invest funds in the site at Kalkaska.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true, however, that in a communication from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia to the Secretary of the Air Force he pointed out very definitely that whatever site was selected they would have to come back for approval by the Committee on Armed Services? Therefore they had no right, in my judgment, to expend any funds, as far as the acquisition of land was concerned, or the preparation of land in any way, without having had that prior approval.

Mr. FORD. The facts are that the site at Kalkaska requires the acquisition of no land other than that which is donated. The land that was acquired by the Air Force from the State of Michigan, the Michigan Conservation Commission, 7,100 acres, was given to the Air Force for the compensation of $1. The good citizens of the Traverse City area went out and raised public funds to the extent of $84,000 by private subscription to purchase the additional 1,000 acres which are necessary. That money has

been raised. All or most of the land has been acquired. So the Air Force does not have to put out 1 penny for the acquisition of 8,100 acres in the Kalkaska area. The net result is that there did not have to be any approval of the expenditure of funds for land.

Mr. VINSON. I concur with the statement the gentleman has made. If there had been a purchase it would have had to be cleared, but having been donated it did not have to be cleared.

The gentleman stated a moment ago that he found the difference in the cost to be $5 million. When the Committee on Armed Services went into this matter a few weeks ago we heard the testimony of Mr. Ferry. This is a question I asked him:

> What is the difference in cost between the Manistee site and Kalkaska site?
>
> Mr. FERRY. About $250,000. In first cost.

I am going to put all this in the RECORD. I want this Committee to know all the facts. We have a good case to stand on.

He said:

> The difference is brought about by the cost of the land lines which are used to connect up the SAGE installation into our defense network. The annual charges at Kalkaska are $1,040,000, as compared with $1,500,000 a year, a saving of almost a half a million dollars a year in land-line costs.

That is the only difference in the cost, so Mr. Ferry advised the committee a few weeks ago.

When my time comes, I am going to put his testimony in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. If I may go on to explain how the difference of $5,188,000 is developed, I will give the figures as submitted to me at my request by the Air Force, and I think I can rely on their accuracy. These in turn are accurate.

Mr. VINSON. Well, this is an Assistant Secretary. I assume when he was testifying before the committee he was just as accurate from the facts that he had as the officers who sent the information to the gentleman. Of course I recognize that whenever you call for figures down there in the Department you always get confused and confounded. It all depends on who makes up the figures.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been listening rather intently to the discussion, but I am somewhat confused. What was the intent of these letters that you quoted? Were they written for the purpose of either approving or disapproving this particular project?

Mr. FORD. The letters I have quoted were written to the Secretary of the Air Force for the purpose of clarifying his authority to go ahead and initiate construction. The Air Force had written to the respective chairmen requesting authority to proceed at Kalkaska. The letters were written in reply giving such authority and as a result of the receipt of these letters construction was initiated.

Mr. MARSHALL. But there was nothing in any of these letters that disapproved this project.

Mr. FORD. Certainly nothing that I saw in them disapproved the initiation of construction at Kalkaska.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. I want to ask the gentleman when he can tell us what is going to be the difference in these figures.

Mr. FORD. I will do so right away.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement and one in which I associate myself with him.

Mr. Chairman, like the rest of my colleagues from Michigan, I have been greatly distressed and concerned over this unfortunate controversy regarding the location of an Air Force jet interceptor base in northwestern Michigan.

My own congressional district is not in the slightest way involved over the location of this base. My only consideration, therefore, is of fixing on a final location which is best for the national defense and security of this country. My second consideration is to have this base built efficiently at least cost to the taxpayer.

I understand that controversy rages around several locations and that from a standpoint of military security, 2 or 3 would be of equal value. The dispute seems, however, to center between the so-called Kalkaska location and one near Manistee. I further understand that the Kalkaska site was already selected and that preliminary work to the extent of approximately $500,000 has already been spent here. This has included the clearing of a large amount of valuable timberland.

I also understand that the Air Force has recommended construction at Kalkaska and that annual operating costs at this location are about $460,000 less than at Manistee. From a standpoint of economy, therefore, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind where the best location lies.

Mr. Chairman, the average Michigan citizen does not care particularly where this base is to be built. He is, however, sick of this eternal bickering that has gone on in this matter for the past many months. He wants an airbase built with the best location from the standpoint of national security that is feasible and at the least possible cost that is consonant with national defense. And then he wants his Representatives in Congress to stop this quarreling and get down to other business of national importance. We have other things to do here besides deciding on the location of one airbase.

I have heard that certain part-time residents of the Kalkaska area have objected on the grounds of property damage, noise, and other inconveniences. No doubt it is alarming to have jet planes fly over your cottage at night and at low altitudes. But I wonder if our summer vacationer would rather hear the sound of Communist jets in the skies over his head. As far as I am concerned, I believe that anyone in that situation ought to say a little prayer of thanks to the good Lord that American boys are piloting those planes. I think he ought to be grateful that our own pilots are upstairs there watching over his freedom and the freedom of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, in the absence of compelling arguments and facts in favor of the Manistee site, I intend to vote for the Kalkaska location.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making an excellent statement too, and I think more people should hear it. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan not withhold his point of no quorum? We are going to debate this considerably under the 5-minute rule tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This is very, very vital to Michigan.

Mr. VINSON. We are going to have a full debate on that under the five-minute rule. We are merely trying to conclude the general debate today, and I am going to ask that at least an hour under the 5-minute rule be devoted to this particular item.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but we always get cut off on that 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. No, the gentleman will not be cut off. I trust the gentleman will not insist on his point of order at this time. Let us finish the debate this afternoon, and I assure him that we will have ample time to debate this question tomorrow. There are several Members who want to speak—the gentlewoman wants to speak, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. You, yourself, probably want to speak and I want to speak. Let us try to finish the general debate this afternoon and tomorrow we will have a full debate on this and settle it once and for all. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] A quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ALGER HISS AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today because of an article appearing in the Newark Star-Ledger, on page 1, headed "Princeton Poll Backs Hiss Talk." Excerpting the article, it reads:

> Undergraduates and faculty members of traditionally conservative Princeton Univer-

sity are overwhelmingly in favor of permitting convicted perjurer Alger Hiss to speak here April 26, a straw poll on the campus indicated today.

The former State Department official, jailed 5 years ago for perjury in his witness stand denial of passing secret documents to confessed Communist spy Whittaker Chambers, was invited to Princeton by the American Whig-Cliosophic Society, undergraduate political science and debate organization.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. The article contains criticism by Mr. Livingston T. Merchant and was voiced in a telegram which said that "Hiss' appearance would do lasting and irreparable damage to Princeton."

The article further contains various quotations from this institution on the part of various undergraduates who back the society invitation to Hiss by a 10-to-1 ratio.

For example, such comments as this on the Hiss invitation from students is typical:

"I'd like to have a look at Al Capone, too."

"He served his time, didn't he?" one student asked. "Is that not the all-American way?" another one said.

Typical faculty comment on Hiss' invitation included history professor Eric Goldman's reply:

"Undergraduates, though conservative, are eager to prove that Princeton is genuinely free."

Mr. Speaker, it seems rather strange that a university dedicated to higher learning, a university which has made a record of patriotism and contribution to our country should now have this group of "diaper Dans" invite Alger Hiss to lecture who, while convicted of perjury, is nonetheless conceded to be one of the foremost betrayers in American history. It is inconceivable that the comic book Ciceros extending the invitation should contemplate that they could invite this enemy of our country to their campus, there to honor him. The Hiss inviters in the society, if judged by their actions and comments in the Hiss matter must be so completely bereft of ability that a stuttering sword swallower, with the dagger handle caught in his throat, could talk better. A deaf mute twisting his fingers could outrepartee them. One cannot understand why they have announced the topic that Hiss will discuss, Geneva; the ghost of Yalta returning to haunt another would-be Yalta. Like Mephistopheles, reviving Forest.

Dr. Goldman tells us this, the students feel, prove Princeton is genuinely free. Free from what? Free from good sense? Free from intelligence? Free from a decent regard for the deaths of the Princeton alumni who died on the battlefields of the world to insure that Princeton would continue to train students in loyalty to our country.

If Hiss is to be a proper subject for invitation to Princeton, particularly before so-called American debating society, one wonders how this logic will dictate the selection of future guests. Perhaps there will be a step further and someone may urge a department of treachery set up in the university to be commanded by Alger Hiss himself. If Hiss were going to talk at Princeton and say anything worth while, it would seem the proper subject of his talk should be "How I Betrayed Dead Princeton Alumni Who Died Fighting for Princeton and America." It is there I concede the talk might have been something worth while for the students. But for a man whom we know to be the agent of an enemy power to be invited before an American university to promote the enemy's power and make an attack upon us calls for some explanation.

One wonders if there has not been some discrimination in the handling of the traitor Benedict Arnold. Benedict Arnold betrayed us to Britain, but I feel that if we are to be betrayed to anyone I would prefer being betrayed to Christian Britain rather than to atheistic communism.

Are we to have a posthumous LLD. awarded to Benedict Arnold so he may get equal treatment with Mr. Hiss? Or are we to discriminate only in favor of the 20th century Arnolds and ignore the Revolution betrayer? Such is the observations prompted by the logic of the Hiss inviters.

It seems to me it is time for Princeton University to wake up and see whether or not they have permitted these Katzenjammer commissar fans to put the university in an embarrassing position.

I would hope that Dr. Dodd, the president of the university, would put these kindergarten Ciceros over his knee and there paddle their Red aspirations.

It might be argued that they are free to invite anybody they want to. In that case we are free to speak our minds on the subject, too, with the hope they would invite someone like Chairman Walter of our Committee on Un-American Activities. Why do they not invite him up to their debating society? Perhaps they could learn something.

Why is it that some universities must go out of their way to invite men who have demonstrated a total lack of regard for our Nation? It seems to me that there is a little poison ivy creeping into the Ivy League; and I would hope that the vast body of the Princeton alumni, many of whom fought for our country, many of whom are in the uniformed service of our country today, many of whom have contributed to the founding of this Nation and to its saving—I would hope that in the cloistered halls of this university that at this time my voice could be heard in a loud congressional "Boo", and a loud American hiss spelled "S–S–S–" on this occasion, and I would like to give them a great American "bird" for this absolute disregard of the proprieties in connection with this case.

Hiss has no place in any American university except as an exhibit of what not to be for any loyal American student, or as exhibit 1 in the gallery of traitors.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I, certainly, as the Representative of the district in which Princeton University is located would, were I a member of that society, have voted against the action; I certainly hold no brief for a convicted perjurer for whom I have the utmost contempt. But I must say that it occurs to me that if we are to have the things which all of us fought for and all of us say of the Constitution of the United States and of the body of laws enacted under it, that we would subscribe to what Mr. Voltaire said some years ago: That he might never agree but that he would fight to the death for a man's right to speak. I am not sure that the Whig Society of Princeton University is having Mr. Hiss there for any purpose other than to make an exhibition of him.

Mr. TUMULTY. He is speaking on the subject of Geneva.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would not attend and I doubt if many people in my district would attend; but the university has every right, and the students have every right, whether their judgment is good or bad—and I think it is bad in this case—to invite anyone to address them. We can learn things that way that we certainly are not going to learn by keeping out of our universities, newspapers, and press people with whom we disagree.

Now I reiterate very carefully my personal opposition to Mr. Hiss and everything he stands for. I do think that the university, being one of our great universities, should be absolutely free to decide how it can best serve the Nation. I would not presume to be a censor of its actions.

Mr. TUMULTY. I disagree thoroughly with the gentleman. I do not agree that a university is serving this country properly when it invites a man convicted, in effect, of betraying the country, a man who has advanced the cause of the destruction of this country, down before a debating society consisting of these young men to speak on a matter in which our own country is involved, to wit, the Geneva Conference, where Mr. Hiss will carry on the Soviet line. If you are going to carry your logic to a conclusion, they might also invite men like Sepp Dietrich, the Nazi murderer of our troops at the Malmedy massacre, or the head of the Soviet secret police, on the theory, however depraved they are they have a right to appear at a private university and espouse their depravity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the university must realize that freedom involves responsibility. If the university is going to proceed on this idea of the unlimited right of the enemies of our country to be invited to places where they can do the most damage, we will not have a country for very long. I understand the gentleman's desire, representing the district in which the university

is located, to defend its position. But I am not attacking the university. That university has a long and distinguished record. I am attacking the judgment of whoever is responsible for this foolish idea of inviting Hiss there. How many American lives were lost because of Hiss' actions is unknown. There is American blood on his hands, surely, as there is blood on the hands of Khrushchev, Dietrich and a lot of others. An American university is no place for these enemies of democracy to peddle their wares.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not hear what the gentleman said previously, but I can go along with what he has just stated. It seems to me that the gentleman's point is if there was a real successful chicken thief or sheep thief around, it would be all right to have him talk to the boys and girls in the public schools along that line.

Mr. TUMULTY. Or take a man out of the death house and have him tell how he strangled grandma, and do that before the debating society. It is foolishness. It is absolutely absurd to permit those who would destroy our country this absolute liberty. There is no such absolute liberty, however. Man has a duty to perform. You might as well have the individuals who shot up Congress come in and give us a lecture on foreign policy here in the House of Representatives, and then have the gentlemen who were shot express their views, on the theory we are all free to do as we please, say as we please regardless of consequences.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, the gentleman is not saying that the university has not a right to do this. The gentleman is questioning their judgment?

Mr. TUMULTY. Exactly. They have the physical freedom to commit hari kari, but the moral law prohibits that. They may do very many foolish things. I am free to talk about other people going on a diet, but it would be rather foolish for me to give a lecture on how to lose weight. Yet they are bringing down a man to lecture who has spent 3 or 4 years in the penitentiary for perjury because they could not get him on treason. They are bringing him down to this ivied hallowed tower draping him with respectability again and having him speak on Geneva and our foreign policy, something in which our country is actively engaged. If Hiss is going down there to promote the Soviet cause, and we may have to send our boys to be shot by the Soviet Union, I think that is just plain crazy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of his experience, would it not be better to have him talk on prison life, or, at least, on something about his policies that he advocated before he went to prison?

Mr. TUMULTY. I think that would be an excellent topic. At least, to me he could give some secrets that might be very interesting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They would be helpful.

Mr. TUMULTY. I think if he gave us a discussion on what goes on in labyrinthine mind whose twisted reasoning begets the traitor, that might be an interesting topic.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest, being one of the architects of the United Nations, that he lecture on the subject of the great good the United Nations has accomplished.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes. He might tell us, in answer to the gentleman, why the United Nations did not put in its charter the recognition of God as the lawgiver.

Mr. GROSS. And why only 16 out of 60 nations furnished any troops over in Korea.

Mr. TUMULTY. Also he might tell us why Stalin killed his wife. He might have been in on that secret, too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who believes these various characters have a right to lecture in our universities.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That is precisely why I asked the gentleman to yield. Perhaps he misunderstood.

Mr. TUMULTY. Perhaps I did misunderstand.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I said that I, as an individual, would not have invited Hiss, but I will defend the right of others to do so.

Mr. TUMULTY. Would you want the Nazi, Sepp Dietrich, to talk at Princeton?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not see what harm it would do to have Dietrich talk there. I do not see what harm it does when you know what a person is. No debating society will ever be able to cloak Alger Hiss, and no American could ever cloak him with respectability. I feel that very strongly.

Mr. TUMULTY. Then, Benedict Arnold should have been returned after the Revolution to discuss his betrayal, and to lecture in the universities on the Colonies and the motherland.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I feel equally strongly it is the right of the university, within the confines of its own judgment, whether good or bad, to invite anyone to address them.

Mr. TUMULTY. I disagree with the gentleman. The university is supposed to know something. They are supposed to be training our young men. I do not know what kind of training they are getting at Princeton these days. I assume it is good training. But, if this is an example of it, I am glad I did not go there. I am glad I went to Fordham and Seton Hall.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understood the gentleman, to whom you have just yielded, I understood him as being of the opinion that what Hiss would talk about was not very good, and if that is so, why expose these people to it? Why do you not bring in somebody who has a bad cold or itch or something?

Mr. TUMULTY. I wonder if Princeton would bring in Senator McCarthy. Do you feel that Senator McCarthy should be brought in?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I believe Senator McCarthy or the gentleman from New Jersey or the distinguished gentleman from Michigan would be welcome to discuss any subject at all.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am afraid I would be out of Princeton's class. I fear I would be too heavy to handle easily.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Oh, I think they would enjoy the gentleman very much.

Mr. TUMULTY. I would be very glad to debate the entire debating society, plus Dr. Dodds, right after a heavy lunch.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And they may be able to conjure up a real match for you. I remember when the gentleman debated with some of them, when they were in the World Federation movement.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes, and I was very happy to defeat them, too.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And I respected your right to do it at that time, just as I respect your right to criticize them today.

Mr. TUMULTY. I just think the university ought to have a better sense of responsibility. Incidentally, Princeton, I understand, when the Buchman movement was in its first stages, was banned from the campus by Dr. Hibben then Princeton president. But, I doubt very much that Princeton would be willing to extend an invitation to Nazi Dietrich. I would not be willing to have him come to this shore. I would like to deal with him as he did with some of our boys. We Americans have learned one thing; we are not going to win any cold or hot war by giving the enemies of our country the velvet cloth treatment, by opening up our doors, and neither by the striped pants treatment. Let Hiss go back and examine his conscience and see if he cannot tell us some of the secrets he has in it. Hiss has not shown any penitence yet. He will be advancing the cause of atheistic communism, the cause of the worst enemy of civilization and Christianity in the history of the world, when he lectures on Geneva at Princeton. I say that he should not be permitted there. That is my judgment. If I were Dr. Dodds, I would pick him up by the scruff of the neck and throw him out personally. I would be very happy to do that. I am not arguing that Dr. Dodds need do that. I simply say that the doctor ought to act, and if the doctor does act, I think he will save Princeton a great deal of embarassment.

I think freedom has a responsibility attached to it. I cannot yell fire in this House today and get away with it. I do not think that I would want to bring an arson bug in here to give us a talk on how to set fire to the House of Representatives. I think that would be silly, ridiculous.

I think Old Nassau will be called Old Nausea, if Hiss is allowed to talk there. I say that with all due respect for the university.

Let us have some respect for those who love our country. On the other hand, it seems to me that the competition is to see who is going to sell us out first, in some quarters.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would like to say that I am certain that Princeton University has, during its wonderful history, invited many, many more people whom the gentleman would favor and who were great and wonderful citizens of the world, to speak there, than it has persons with whom he would disagree.

Mr. TUMULTY. I think Princeton University has done that. I think Princeton University is a wonderful university. I think it is being made the victim of some Katzenjammer Kids prank by this society. But Dr. Goldman, a member of their faculty, says, according to the Ledger, that the Hiss invitation proves that Princeton is "genuinely free." In other words, to be "genuinely free," we must invite traitors in to advance the Communist line. Under that logic, this House to prove it is genuinely free would have to invite in Hiss himself to tell us about Geneva. That is the logic. Of course, I know that logic and Princeton University perhaps are not very closely related, in this instance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, what I am driving at is this: Over in Russia they do not do things this way. There is one lesson we can learn from them. They do not parade their traitors around and honor them. I do not say that we should do what they are doing and shoot everybody who disagrees with us. I do not advocate that we should prevent an expression of an honest difference of opinion. An honest difference of opinion, such as has been evidenced in this House just now is welcome. We should welcome all opinions. But where a man has betrayed his trust in a high public position, where the evidence discloses that he has been dealing with the enemies of this Nation, and he has served a sentence for violation of the law—for him to be invited to a university and given the opportunity to talk on the foreign policy of our Government which he betrayed in order to prove that we are free, is the height of absurdity. If we follow that logic then every hate monger, every anti-Christian, every anti-Semite, would be given access to our universites; because, if you did not let them in, then it would prove that you were not free. That is completely and totally wrong thinking. There is no reason for it at all. If the university cannot control its students, in matters of this kind, if the university cannot tell a little student debating society what to do then I submit that the university must bear the criticism.

I do not intend to cast reflection on the great cultural contributions which Princeton has made to our country. But I note that our revolutionary fathers never invited Benedict Arnold to come back and take him on a lecture tour, take him to Fanueil Hall to tell them about foreign policy between the Colonies and England. I have failed to note in my readings that any of the great betrayers of history were taken around to give advice to the betrayed.

This is the first time in history when men seem to feel that they must be supine to those who have betrayed them. It seems to me that if a man is a traitor, the least we can do is to ignore him. You do not even have to imprison him. I simply say do not start taking him around on the academic circuit, because then some egghead will get up and say, "Let us give him a degree—Doctor of Betrayers," because he would not be equal to the man who was debating with him, because the man debating with him has a degree. To be full and equal give betrayer and betrayed equal treatment. Someone will want to give him a mortar board also.

I think it is all the result of the comic-book age. Too many people have been reading Dick Tracy, instead of early American history. Too many university professors have been hiding comic books behind their heavy tomes, and reading them instead. This would never happen in any other part of the world. I did not see Britain urging Burgess and McLean to come back and lecture to the House of Commons or Oxford on how they ran out on the Empire, and other foreign policy matters. I have not read that. I have not read about the Irish looking for anybody who betrayed them to come back and lecture on Irish freedom. This seems to be the only country in the world where this kind of looney business goes on. I do not know. I just get up and say that I think it is terrible.

I suppose someone will want Peron to come up here. They threw him out of the hotel. They may want him lecturing at Princeton, on the theory that he should be heard. It gets to the point, I guess, where if you do not have a criminal record you would not be allowed to lecture at all. If you have not been in jail, maybe you ought not to be heard. That is the way I would conclude.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is quite right when he says Princeton is Republican. It is 3 to 1 Republican. I am not trying to protect anything but my version of freedom of speech.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want the words taken down. If you say these people he is describing are Republicans, that is a reflection on this side of the House. That is not right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will provide the gentleman with a registry list.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think he ought to withdraw that charge. That is worse than anything the Republicans have ever been accused of saying about the Democratic Party. You have given us a terrible picture of those fellows up there. I think you are right about that. I do not think it is fair to the Republican Party to say they are Republicans.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger]

PRINCETON POLL BACKS HISS TALK

PRINCETON, April 10. Undergraduates and faculty members of traditionally conservative Princeton University are overwhelmingly in favor of permitting convicted perjurer Alger Hiss to speak here April 26, a straw poll on the campus indicated today.

The former State Department official, jailed five years ago for perjury in his witness stand denial of passing secret documents to confessed Communist spy Whittaker Chambers, was invited to Princeton by the American Whig-Cliosophic Society, undergraduate political science and debate organization.

Meanwhile, a high-ranking member of the United States State Department tonight urged one Princeton debating group to reconsider its plans.

Livingston T. Merchant, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, said in a telegram that Hiss' appearance "would do lasting and irreparable damage to Princeton." Merchant is a Princeton alumnus, class of 1926.

Hiss, who will be making his first public address since his period of probation expired recently is scheduled to discuss last summer's Geneva Summit Conference.

Although university officials have been besieged by an undisclosed number of influential alumni protesting the Hiss appearance, undergraduates back the society by a 10-to-1 ratio.

Of 149 undergraduates questioned in the poll, 135 were in favor of Hiss' appearance and only 14 were against the scheduled speech.

The ratio of faculty members questioned in the poll was even more predominantly in favor of the Hiss appearance. Twenty faculty members were questioned, and 19 of them supported the student stand.

The poll's question—Do you think Alger Hiss should be allowed to speak on campus?—brought a small proportion of outspoken criticism against the society's invitation to Hiss, however.

DISSENTS HEARD

Several of the dissenting undergraduates said they thought the invitation to Hiss would do the university's name no good in the public eye.

"Besides, I couldn't be sure anything he said would be the truth," one dissenter added.

But the typical undergraduate response was quickly affirmative, although indicating that most of the students were curious rather than sympathetic.

Their answers ranged from "A ridiculous question—of course he should be allowed," to "I'd like to have a look at Al Capone, too."

"He served his time, didn't he?" one student asked.

"Isn't that the all-American way?" another said.

SOME CHANGE VOTE

A small number of dissenters polled admitted they thought Hiss had been convicted for Communist Party membership, and changed their minds when told he was jailed on a perjury charge.

A polling of faculty opinion showed an even heavier agreement with the invitation to Hiss.

Typical faculty comment included history professor Eric Goldman's reply:

"Undergraduates here, though conservative, are eager to prove that Princeton is genuinely free."

The Dairy Princetonian, undergraduate newspaper, has withheld editorial comment

until the university makes an official statement tomorrow concerning alumni reaction.

President Harold W. Dodds said Monday that the university will not interfere with the scheduled Hiss speech because "we think it unwise now to take the responsibility for the decision out of the hands of the student organization."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for the remainder of the week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. CHENOWETH, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. TUMULTY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MASON, for 15 minutes on Monday next, on the subject of the Supreme Court against States rights.

Mr. BOYLE, for 1 hour, on Monday, April 16.

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and include therein certain extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. GWINN in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. DAVIDSON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES in two instances and to include copies of news letters.

Mr. METCALF, the remarks he will make on H. R. 9893 and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois on the death of Peter D. Broom.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. YOUNG) and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 12, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1734. A letter from the Chairman, the United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 11th Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated March 1956, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 376); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1735. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts, by direction of the Supreme Court and pursuant to the act of June 25, 1948 (ch. 645 (62 Stat. 683), as amended by the act of May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 59 (63 Stat. 98), title 18, U. S. C. 3771) (H. Doc. No. 377); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10412. A bill to amend the act for the Protection of Walruses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10413. A bill to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10414. A bill to amend section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to permit certain high-school teachers to perform their obligated period of active duty for training during summer vacation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10415. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of South Dakota for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 10416. A bill to provide for certain adjustments with respect to wages paid to Mexican agricultural workers for work performed during the cotton harvest of 1955; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10417. A bill to amend the Federal Register Act, as amended, so as to provide for the effectiveness and notice to the public of proclamations, orders, regulations, and other documents in a period following an attack or threatened attack upon the continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10418. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10419. A bill to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10420. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 10421. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10422. A bill to amend section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 10423. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 15 acres of land more or less within the Garza-Little Elm project to the city of Lewisville, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 10424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the excise tax on television receivers capable of receiving 50 or more ultra high frequency television channels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10425. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10426. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10427. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 10428. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 10429. A bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to permit a veteran pursuing education and training thereunder to make a change of program, not otherwise authorized, if he is unable to continue the pursuit of his current program because of physical or mental disability or other compelling personal reasons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 10430. A bill for the purpose of constructing at the Dunseith, N. Dak., port of entry Federal facilities for the Bureau of Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 10431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain governmental obligations and of the interest on such obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10432. A bill to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10433. A bill to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 10434. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10435. A bill to strengthen the civil rights statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (by request):

H. R. 10436. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of

1954, as amended, to provide nonoccupational group major medical expense insurance for Federal employees and their dependents and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10437. A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10438. A bill to provide that in determining annual income of a widow or child of a veteran for the purpose of establishing eligibility for pension, amounts spent in the year of death of the veteran for his burial shall be excluded from income for that year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10439. A bill to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 10440. A bill to provide for the construction of a superhighway between Frederick, Md., and Charleston, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10441. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10442. A bill to amend section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse to appraise residential property which is not subject to construction supervision by qualified personnel; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10443. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10444. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10445. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10446. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10447. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 10448. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to require the owners of civil aircraft to be financially responsible for damages arising out of the operation of such aircraft for which they are liable; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 601. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Con. Res. 229. Concurrent resolution to conduct an investigation covering attempts on the part of the United Nations to organize a world government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 464. Resolution authorizing a reprint of House Document No. 367, 81st Congress, 1st session, on Sacramento-San Joaquin Basin Streams, Calif.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to provide for the adjustment of the trust fund account in the Office of the Sergeant at Arms; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to the passage of H. R. 8836, being an act to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriation for continuing the construction of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally refererd as follows:

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Loredana Ramaioli Kaczoroski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10450. A bill for the relief of Mr. Fouzi (Victor) M. Hindaly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10451. A bill for the relief of Kan Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 10452. A bill for the relief of Renee Renauld Claire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 10453. A bill for the relief of Panorea Panos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10454. A bill for the relief of Rafael Portugal-Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 10455. A bill for the relief of Boris F. Navratil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10456. A bill for the relief of William H. Vosburgh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

866. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Sigurd Wisness and other residents of Fargo, N. Dak., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

867. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Clinton County Central Labor Union, Lock Haven, Pa., in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 5550, United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

868. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of W. C. Cooper and 19 other residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

869. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Carroll, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

870. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, New Plymouth, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

871. Also, petition of 80 employees of the Ohio Boys' Industrial School, Lancaster, Ohio, who are ex-servicemen from World War I and II, and the Korean conflict, urging that favorable consideration be given to the passage of the veterans' security bill, known as H. R. 7886; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

872. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW post, of Centerville, Iowa, urging the adoption of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

873. Also, petition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Diagonal, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

874. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Taunton, Mass., requesting separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

875. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Verner J. Libell and 90 other residents of North Lincoln County, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

876. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. Vern Werle, and other citizens of Webster County, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

877. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Conference of Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayer Organizations meeting in Kenosha on March 20, 1956, urging Congress not to interfere in local school financial problems, specifically in the direction of extending financial assistance for school construction or general operations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

878. Also, resolution adopted by the Conference of Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayer Organizations assembled in Kenosha, Wis., on March 20, 1956, urging Congress to adopt and enforce a policy against unnecessary Federal operation of business enterprises in competition with private business as outlined in S. 1003 or similar legislation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

879. Also, resolution of the Building Service Employees Local No. 168, at Kenosha, Wis., on March 27, 1956, in support of a bold, long-range program for highway construction with the cost responsibility spread equally upon the population of the country; to the Committee on Public Works.

880. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Leta Little, Smiths Creek, Mich., and 30 others for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

881. Also, petition of John B. Roth, Vassar, Mich., and 12 others for separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Heritage of Old Age Should Not Be Despair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE HERITAGE OF OLD AGE SHOULD NOT BE DESPAIR—NEWSLETTER NO. 179

APRIL 9, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: The fastest growing population group in our country consists of the men and women age 65 and over. Today there are 13½ million of them. With 1,000 more joining their ranks daily, their number is expected to increase to 20 million by 1975.

For some of them the golden years are the culmination of a rich, rewarding life. They view advancing age with a dignity and charm like that of President John Quincy Adams, who was congratulated on his 81st birthday by a friend who asked: "How is John Quincy Adams today?"

"Quite well, thank you," Adams replied. "John Quincy Adams is quite well. But the house in which he lives is becoming quite dilapidated. Time and the seasons have nearly destroyed it. It is tottering on its foundations and the roof is worn quite thin. Yes, the old tenement is becoming quite uninhabitable and I fear that John Quincy Adams will have to move out of it soon. But he himself is quite well, thank you, quite well."

For most elderly people, however, advancing years bring increased burdens. A recent study by the reliable Twentieth Century Fund reveals that nearly three-fourths of those aged 65 and over either have no income of their own or earn less than $1,000 per year. But this deplorable lack of sufficient funds represents only one aspect of their difficulties. The Council of State Governments reports that they are particularly subject, as well, to unequal opportunity for employment; inferior housing; separation from family and friends; widowhood for more than half the women; inadequate medical care; lack of hospital insurance just when chronic diseases hit; hospitalization in mental institutions because of insufficient nursing homes and rehabilitation facilities; spiritual deterioration because of belief that the community is no longer interested in them. The list is long, the impact heavy.

What is the Federal Government doing to help them? Unfortunately, not very much. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which is supposed to be concerned with their plight, has attacked the matter with all the ferocity and speed of a snail. Last year Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted the Federal Government was 10 years behind in its work on behalf of older persons. Yet she requested a budget of only $65,000 to deal with the enormous task. We hoped for a more sympathetic attitude when Secretary Folsom appeared this year, but there was none. The Secretary said he wanted the same budget and to continue with the same system of using a small general staff and leaving to agencies such as the Social Security Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Department of Labor the responsibility for developing adequate programs to cope with the problem. This was the arrangement which brought sharp criticism by the Appropriations Committee upon the Department for its indifference to the needs of older persons, and the demand that substantial progress be made during the next year. But if the committee expects any improvements after having voted the same inadequate budget, it is indulging in wishful thinking. What is needed is a Bureau of Older Persons established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to help the States make an intensive effort in the field of aging and to coordinate their activities.

A few days ago President Eisenhower announced that he was creating a National Council on Aging whose members would be made up of representatives from each of the agencies now dealing with problems affecting older persons. What this means is that the President has now given a name and status to the present hit-or-miss, decentralized system. Apparently, the same policy of postponement, of drift without direction, is going to continue.

One feels about the President's action the same as Sir Harry Lauder's caddy must have felt after having completed 18 holes of golf with him on a bitterly cold day. The caddy had done a fine job. After paying him the regular fee, Lauder slipped something into the caddy's hand saying: "That's for a glass of hot whiskey, lad." The caddy opened his hand. There in his palm was a lump of sugar.

Almost a century ago Benjamin Disraeli wrote in one of his novels: "Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair." That is still our hope.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Joint Disarmament and the Foreign Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech I recently made concerning mutual reduction of 15 percent in the arms budget of the United States and the Soviet Union with part of the savings to be allocated to the joint foreign aid program administered by the United Nations.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER OF YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MARYLAND, BALTIMORE, MARCH 10, 1956

As we meet here tonight, the representatives of the world's great powers are gathering in London to prepare for the resumption of disarmament talks which have a life-or-death significance for our Nation and for all nations.

The peace-loving peoples of the free world are looking to the United States for responsible leadership in breaking a 10-year-old deadlock on reduction of armament which must be resolved if our way of life is to survive.

I fervently pray that our country's representatives will be inspired to display true leadership when they face up to the Russians during the coming crucial meetings.

It is high time that this Nation began using the weapons of resourcefulness and imagination and initiative in dealing with the Communists.

They are weapons far more powerful than the hydrogen bomb.

They are the only diplomatic weapons with which we can persuade the Russians or maneuver them into joining us in our clearly demonstrated determination to limit the weapons of destruction which are as pressing a burden upon the Russian people as they are upon our own.

I have been a frequent critic of the Eisenhower administration because it has come forward with no plan for disarmament until a few days ago—although Secretary Dulles says that he has reason to believe that the Russians would like some relief from their great burden of armaments.

Harold Stassen is in charge of creating a disarmament plan. He has tried hard to carry out his assignment. But he cannot get the members of the Eisenhower team to agree with him. On one thing, Secretary Dulles disagrees. On another, Secretary of Defense Wilson disagrees. There are varying degrees of disagreement throughout the rest of the administration.

If we had a President other than President Eisenhower, he would have made a decision by now between the opposing forces on the team. But President Eisenhower insists that only unanimous agreements be brought to him. This is the same policy which he has applied with unhappy effect to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The result is that despite the peace offensive of the Soviet Union, the United States is unable to start one of its own.

Our allies are growing restive because of our inaction. It is damaging our prestige in such United Nations gatherings as the forthcoming talks in London. It is eating away at our leadership of free world forces. Yet the team can make no decision and the President will not.

I said earlier that I am a frequent critic of this administration.

I have reason to be—both as a Democrat and as an American.

But I am not so partisan a critic that I will not recognize even a small modicum of inspiration when the administration finally bestirs itself into action rather than merely abiding by its familiar and melancholy waltz pattern of following while the Russians lead.

I think President Eisenhower's letter earlier this week to Russian Premier Bulganin, proposing to negotiate on reductions in the level of nuclear and conventional armaments was a step in that direction.

Like all of you, I was pleased by the Russian Premier's preliminary reaction, which was a grudging concession that the Eisenhower proposal was—and I quote—"good."

I do not think the Eisenhower proposal goes far enough. But if it has elicited this initial Soviet response, then it might provide the basis for fruitful negotiations across the conference tables in London.

Last summer, leaders of this administration went to the "summit" at Geneva full of hope and little more. They returned with nothing but bruised feelings. Their hopes were dashed by Soviet hostility and vastly superior Soviet diplomacy. As a result, we suffered a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

This time the hope must be balanced by a full quota of stern determination to persuade the Soviets that they have nothing to gain by obstructionist behavior. This time, the hope must be supported by positive programs, so skillfully conceived that for the Russians to spurn our honest offers to halt the arms race would hand them a major defeat in the eyes of the world.

But I wonder if the administration's representatives are going to London so armed to meet the Russians?

I refer you to a front page story in yesterday's New York Times, which reported that Harold Stassen was flying to London today with—and I quote—"a new set of disarmament proposals in his briefcase with a suitcase full of hope."

I don't like the comparative weight of his baggage, do you? I wish Mr. Stassen well on his mission, but I was rather disturbed when the New York Times reported a news conference held by Mr. Stassen in these terms—and again I quote:

"The accent was on his hopes, rather than on the substance of the proposals he planned to put before the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament when it's so far fruitless negotiations are resumed in London March 19."

Are we in for another summit disaster?

Is Mr. Stassen, who tries hard enough to wage peace, going to be forced to stuff rejected and inadequate proposals back into his briefcase because the "team" simply lacks the spark needed to create disarmament programs calculated to capture the imagination of peace-loving peoples throughout the world?

Will Mr. Stassen come home with his suitcase barren of hope because the "team" simply can't agree on a program so expertly contructed that the Russians cannot reject it without serious loss of face—particularly in the uncommitted areas of the world where they have seized the initiative from us?

My friends, if ever this Nation needed a change in leadership, the time is now. However, under our democratic processes, that change will not come before next November. But it will come!

In the meantime, November is eight months away. And eight months can be an eternity in the fast-moving world of today. The time to achieve a reduction of armaments is during the next few weeks in London.

One of my chief complaints about this administration is that it has failed to take hold of proposals previously made which offer great hope of achieving peace. I am thinking particularly of a far-sighted proposal by the late Senator Brian McMahon which should be given fresh consideration at this critical moment in history.

The administration is also duty-bound to give careful consideration to fresh programs—whatever their origin and even if they stem from Democratic sources.

The administration has long acted as if it considered the conduct of our international relations its own special preserve. This has been particulary true in the field of armament reduction. Well, it's high time it put the conduct of our foreign relations on a truly bipartisan basis—as we Democrats did.

I have a plan to propose to the Eisenhower administration which would, I believe, put a powerful brake upon the arms race—and, at the same time, help us to meet the new and insistent Soviet challenge of nonviolent expansion in the Middle and the Far East.

I offer it to the administration in a completely unpartisan spirit. Indeed, if the administration accepts this plan, and actively strives to put it into operation, it can become one of the proudest planks in the GOP campaign platform.

And if it succeeds, every Democrat will give this administration credit for a major achievement in helping to secure the peace we Democrats so earnestly desire.

The plan is simple.

I call upon President Eisenhower to instruct our representatives in London to propose that Russia join us in an immediate and mutual reduction of armament expenditures by 15 percent.

Coupled with this proposal, and to be made a binding portion of the arms reduction agreement, would be the condition that one-third of the amount saved will then be put into a pool for economic aid to underdeveloped areas.

This joint point 4 program should be administered by the United Nations in such a manner that neither the Soviet Union nor the United States could individually claim the credit for its successes or be blamed for its failures.

In this manner, the Russians will be prevented from making the sort of inroads in the underdeveloped areas which their propaganda drive is now accomplishing in the Far East.

And—who knows?—perhaps a joint endeavor of this nature, administered impartially by the United Nations and combining a reduction in the tools of war with an increase in the tools of economic self-sufficiency for a third of the world, might constitute our first real advance toward peace in 10 years.

In order to extend the greatest benefits of the program to the underdeveloped nations, the first act in its implementation should be the calling a U. N. sponsored economic conference to permit the underdeveloped nations to determine the most lasting long-term benefits from the sizable economic resources which the mutual cut in armament expenditures would provide.

If the Russians refuse to go along with these proposals, they will not only stand condemned in the eyes of the world as foes of arms reduction and peace but—more important, the peoples of the underdeveloped nations will see them stripped of their pretenses and exposed as aggressors who dangle offers of economic aid only for propaganda purposes.

If they are forced to go along with us, then they will help us to accomplish a task for which there is an urgent need in terms of humanity and which will serve our own democratic purposes by strengthening the defenses of the recipient nations against the economic chaos on which communism thrives.

I do not wish to bore you with figures, but let us examine briefly what the allocation of one-third of the savings in arms would mean to whole populations in other parts of the world whose major concern is keeping 1 day away from hunger:

Our budget for arms is roughly $35 billion. Although a sizable portion of the Soviet outlay for arms is concealed in other expenditures such as heavy industry, all available intelligence indicates that Soviet expenditures approximate our own.

Simple arithmetic shows that this plan would funnel approximately $3 billion into a fund to further freedom and prosperity among the new nations of the world who are struggling desperately to achieve self-sufficiency.

Surely this is a plan in keeping with the forward-looking traditions of the Democratic Party, the party which created the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4.

I am the first to admit that the implementation of this program presents obvious administrative problems. But, for the love of humanity, let us not permit paper problems to stand in the way of creating a new force for good in the world.

From our purely domestic viewpoint this plan has the merit of offering a reduction in the income taxes paid by the average American. With one-third of the savings going to assist young nations in need of help, the other two-thirds could be lopped from our national budget and passed along to the taxpayer who needs relief most—the little fellow.

Importance as they are, however, it is not with reductions in income taxes that I am concerned most.

The question of peace and war is the most crucial of our times. Not only is our own safety involved but the safety of all men everywhere.

Civilization as we know it, and even life itself, may hang in the balance.

The balance has been going against us under this administration.

Let us swing that balance our way and win world opinion through concrete proposals designed to relieve international tensions, improve the economic conditions of the nations, and take the peace propaganda offensive away from the Russians.

I think the plan I have outlined constitutes one such proposal. I commend it to your attention and to the attention of this administration with a warning that time is running out and the time for action is now.

The Congress and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address entitled "The Congress and the Constitution," which I recently made on the radio.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND THE CONSTITUTION

There is one fundamental idea which underlies the structure of our governmental machinery—the unwavering distrust of a strong Executive, be he President, King, Prime Minister, or Governor. The Federal Constitution, as well as the constitutions of the 48 States, contain specific limitations on the powers of their Chief Executive, including limited succession, confirmation of executive nominations, removal of executive officials, restraints on spending, and others.

It is, of course, natural that this should be so. The colonists who tore away from England had had enough of strong executives, of autocratic kings and autocratic governors.

When independence was established, they worked to design a government in which the Executive would be under the control of the people. Their success is visible in the Constitution.

They made the Executive subject to the watchfulness and the will of Congress, subject thereby, to the will of the people. Congress was established as the eyes, ears, and the voice of the people. It performs the noblest function of government; that of making the laws. The function of the Executive is to put those laws into effect exactly as Congress wrote them. Nothing more.

Examination of the Constitution will reveal how carefully the Founding Fathers spelled out the differences between the authority of the people and those of the President. The decisions of the President are always limited by the higher tribunal

of the Congress, but decisions of the Congress—within the Constitution, are final.

The Congress has the conclusive power to pass laws. The President may veto legislation, but his veto is never final. It can be overturned by a two-thirds majority of the Congress and that decision is final.

The President has the power to grant pardons and reprieves. But that power does not include pardon of impeachment which is a decision of the Congress.

The Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States, but he cannot use those Armed Forces in war, except by the action of Congress. The power to declare war is vested, exclusively, in Congress. Again we see that the decisions of policy are those of Congress—the management or administration of those decisions are the President's.

The President negotiates treaties and foreign agreements, but any treaty so concluded is worthless unless two-thirds of the Senate consents to their enactment.

The President can nominate officials and judges, but his power to appoint them depends upon the consent of the Senate.

The complete dependence of the Executive on the approval of the Congress is inherent in the fact that the Congress controls the power of the purse—the raising and spending of funds. Without money, no Executive can operate and without congressional action there is no money.

Finally, we see the intention of the Founding Fathers, to make Congress the supreme authority, in the provision for impeachment. The Congress can remove, by impeachment, any civil official or Federal judge. Why the Congress can, by impeachment, remove the President, himself. But there is no parallel authority to remove Members of Congress. No one can remove a Member of the Congress during his elected term of office. Why? Because he represents the people, and in this land, the people reign supreme over the affairs of Government.

It is for these reasons that Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist papers, speaks eloquently of the "superior weight and influence of the legislative body in a free government." It is upon this superior weight that a free government must rest. Once the balance of influence shifts to the Executive, free government has set foot upon the road of self-destruction.

Yet, that road has already been set upon by our Nation. We are, in fact, well on our way toward its end. The Executive has become superior to the Congress in weight and influence.

As the affairs of the Nation became more numerous and life more complex, there began a trend toward increasing the scope of the Executive. Today, actually, it is the Executive, as represented by the person of the President, who wields virtually all of the power of government. The Congress has helped increase the Presidential power by a direct abdication of its functions.

We have a growing body of laws which vest tremendous powers in the hands of the President, or some Presidential appointee. I recall that in the recent farm bill before the Senate, there were over 20 instances of the delegation of congressional power to the Secretary of Agriculture, including such vital functions as the determination of how much money shall be spent under the various farm-support and soil-bank programs.

A second source of increasing Presidential power is open usurpation. Usurpation was effective because the Congress failed to exercise its powers, especially its powers to remove officers who tried to operate above the law. The recent example of a President making war in Korea without asking for congressional consent, is an example of autocratic Executive power in this country.

When such an act is committed, the Congress has a clear obligation to assert its authority. To declare war is constitutionally the power of Congress alone. Any other method of making war is, therefore, clearly unconstitutional. A President who thus violated the Constitution violated his oath of office to uphold and preserve it. Congress had the power and the duty to act. It did not act and thus another of its powers slipped into the hands of the Executive.

Why is it that Congress has allowed this state of affairs to come about and then to continue? I think the answer is rather simple. The voters, the people for whom the Congress speaks, have been indifferent. We have concentrated increasingly at election time on the Presidency. That has been the star of the whole show, with the congressional candidates all too often playing a secondary role. Yet it is the Congress that makes the laws upon which the Presidency operates.

Perhaps the increasing power of the President is largely due to the changed attitude of the people as a whole. We look now to the Federal Government for the solution of most of our problems, problems which traditionally have been met by the State and local governments, or private initiative. The President is symbolic of the Federal Government as an entity, whereas the Member of Congress represents, first of all, his constituency back home.

A continued weakening of that congressional authority will have as its inevitable result the creation of an all-powerful Executive. In other words, a system of dictatorship.

What is the answer? Because Congress is in your hands as the voting public, so is the answer. The election of a Congress, determined to protect the traditional constitutional concept of Congress and Executive, will automatically restore the balance of power.

We know, from experience, that an aroused Congress is the best defense against the encroachment of Executive power. Even in these times, when the Executive power had reach its high point, Congress, once aroused, has shown the power it can wield.

Twenty years ago a powerful Chief Executive, one who had what many considered a rubberstamp Congress, attempted to destroy the judicial authority of the United States by packing the Supreme Court. No one expected anything but consent from the Congress. Yet a small handful of determined Constitutionalists refused to accept this emasculation of the Constitution. They decided to fight out the issue on the floor of Congress. When the battle was over, a very surprised President found that he had been defeated.

We have seen more recent struggles between President and Congress. Another President took it upon himself to decide the assignment of troops to any part of the globe at his whims. The Congress again took issue and there ensued one of the great historic debates in our history. The result was a reassertion of the right to declare war only by the will of Congress.

When the Internal Security Act of 1950 was passed, it was vetoed by the President and all authority and propaganda of the executive branch of Government was mobilized to make that veto stick. But an aroused Congress, determined to protect the security of the Nation, set aside the veto. The story is the same with the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

In these glorious flashes of reasserted congressional authority, we can see the potential salvation of our Republic. Only the Congress has the constitutional force to oppose Executive dictation, to force a return to limited Presidential power.

But Congress will do the job only if those who make up its membership are dedicated to that cause. Weak, compromising men, men who prefer that the Presidency have both authority and responsibility, will never be able to do that job.

The answer, therefore, lies with the Congress. Those who believe in the traditional constitutional form of government for this land must concentrate their effort on the election of a constitutional Congress. Each Member of Congress is an important link in that chain.

In the selection of candidates to run for Congress in either party, you, as the individual voter, must do everything possible to assure the nomination of candidates unequivocally dedicated to the preservation of constitutional American government.

In your district, a few hundred votes may assure victory to the side of constitutional government, whereas, millions of votes are needed in a nationwide election.

Important as the Presidency is, the restraints Congress can place upon the Chief Executive can render harmless attempts to usurp power.

So, I say to you, make certain that no one is elected in your district who does not adhere to constitutionalism, that no one is elected who believes in globalism, in one-worldism, in unlimited authority for the President. If you do your part, the victory will be ours.

Americans Will Not For Long Remain Immoral and Economically Ridiculous Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House what I said in a speech before the Freedom Club in Los Angeles, Calif., on March 22, 1956, so am repeating for the RECORD what I said then:

AMERICANS WILL NOT FOR LONG REMAIN IMMORAL AND ECONOMICALLY RIDICULOUS TOO

Why do we continue to tolerate the pretense that politicians in Washington have any right or power to take our private incomes and manage them better than we can for ourselves? Slavery for a long time was tolerated because it was claimed by Government to be best for the slaves. In the same way, and for the same reason, our Government now manages our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, etc., or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Those products are losing markets, having to reduce acreage; consumption is falling and prices are unstable. Government housing at half rent, tax exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the Socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. The political party or parties out of power scold us for financing the parties in power and keeping them out. Imagine how mad all Americans would be if Great Britain had spent $3 billion or $4 billion to help Harry Truman stay in power and keep the Republicans out. They've got too much sense to do that.

So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul. It has bought us no friends.

The very idea that our Government should pretend to have the right to seize such powers

was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible because we had a contract with our Government specifically prohibiting all this. We so feared the inevitable evil tendencies of Government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions. We specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the function and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations, and as a result we have not gone Socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties, and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or Government owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our Socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of infiltration, especially of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we've already got. If we fail to somehow wipe it off the books completely we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half Socialist, half free. We can't even be one-quarter or one-tenth Socialist and remain static at that point. For obviously if we socialize corn every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers can't buy Government owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The farmers can't get enough for their products on a free market to buy Government-owned corn boosted far above the free market level. So, Government must give each buyer a subsidy so he can buy subsidized Government corn.

The burden of taxes on 40 million families is $10 billion, or an average of $250 per year on every family to pay the costs of the socialization already mentioned. Still more groups are asking to be brought under new areas of socialization. Indeed, every socialized area makes the socialization of all areas related to it inevitable. For example, you hear the people cry out under our present burden, saying, "After we pay our taxes we haven't enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children, etc."

So, Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take by force from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600 million, and redistribute that largesse to some of the States at the expense of others for classroom construction. It's all done without taxpayers' consent. They are not permitted to vote on the question. Six industrial States in the North and West, viz: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California will be compelled to put up 57.6 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.7 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States.

Whereas Mississippi will get eight classrooms for every one it pays for.

You may ask how can this redistribution of wealth go on and on as it has been going for so many years. Why do the people take it without a fight? The answer is that it is done by the cleverest kind of government deception and organized votes of pressure groups. The individual, unorganized voter is made to feel helpless. In order to arouse the people to write their Congressmen they are told by the government propaganda machine for example that we have a dreadful shortage of classrooms and teachers. The people are made to feel inadequate for their responsibilities; unable to meet the cost. The Federal Government must. Washington is held out as the source of money and mercy and concern for the people. Washington admits that people used to manage themselves but asserts they can't any more.

It should be obvious that no Central Government can know what the total needs for classrooms are in 57,000 separate school districts. Only each local school district can know what its needs are. If it pays for them itself all the needs will be at one figure. If some far-off giveaway Federal aid for free government is to pay for them, the needs will be at least doubled. The United States Office of Education survey of such needs got just such a result. It asked the superintendents of schools, "What are your new classroom needs, assuming, of course, that the Federal Government may pay for them or a part of them?" The answers showing the needs that came back to Washington were fantastic. The report of the Federal Government showed that there was not a single State in the Union on present tax structures that could pay for all the classrooms the professionals said were needed. Bear in mind, not a single school board or taxpayers' group or parents' group or citizens' group who are going to pay for the school buildings somehow, sometime, was consulted. The professionals scrapped a large part of our present school buildings as unfit. You should have seen the needs for new gymnasiums, auditoriums, cafeterias, and extracurricular facilities that showed up.

It was on just such shoddy, strictly professional, one-sided Government reporting that the President was asked to announce to the country that it needed 370,000 classrooms. Hardly a week went by before the Office of Education had to scale down the number by nearly half. While the Government was wrangling, the school districts were themselves building their own schools.

We have a legitimate area for Government functions. All others are illegitimate. Those illegitimate functions I hate as much as anyone.

There is just one legitimate area, and only one, where the Central Government is honorable, and indeed admirable, and, on the whole, honest. That area has to do with the defense of the people's rights and property, the maintenance of law and order, and the sacrifice having to do with national defense.

These are not legitimate functions of Government merely because the Constitution or the contract with Government says so. They are proper functions because the moral and natural law made them so, long before the Constitution. They are in the nature of things. The individual has the same rights and powers with the same limitations imposed on him by the moral and natural law. He can use force to defend himself and his property. And that's the only time he can use force on another person without his consent. He can transfer that right and power to Government as his agent. And since all rights and powers come from the Creator to the individual, he can convey no different or higher right or power to Government than he himself possesses.

Even if people should vote by a majority to give more power to Government than they themselves possess as individuals, the transfer would be no good. When Satan offered to Jesus, in the hour of His greatest temptation, the powers and privileges of the kingdoms of the world, Jesus rejected them utterly. Satan had no such power as he pretended to have to transfer to Jesus. He had simply assumed to have an immoral and illegal power over the people which he had no right to convey.

When the Government goes beyond that restricted area which is the only natural and moral area possible for Government to occupy, then without exception it becomes dishonorable, full of misrepresentation and corruption. It exploits the people to do special favors for special groups in return for their votes. It pretends to be able to manage people and their property better than they can manage for themselves. It attempts to play God in the lives of the people.

It is beginning to dawn upon us that using the force of Government to take other people's property to do good according to Government's notion of what is good is all dead wrong. The fact that the whole world is morally wrong by taking people's private property and making it Government owned emphasizes the extent of the world collapse of morals. And, of course, what is morally wrong is contrary to the laws of God. The world violates them with contempt. When Government violates the laws of God by doing what no individual can morally do, then it is just as guilty of wrong as the individual would be guilty. What we have been doing has always been regarded economically wrong. It is indeed both economically and morally wrong.

For example, a lot of our old neighbors, some of our children, fell in love with the mountains and deserts of the great West. They knew before they went West that there was no water in the deserts. They went anyway. They never dreamed of tapping every eastern family $25 for every billion dollars needed for water. Yet when they organized themselves into political groups they said to their Congressmen, "You go back there and take $25 on the average from every family in the East, or we will not reelect you to Congress." So, the Congressmen have done very well. They have already collected about $150 from each family, or about $6 billion altogether for that purpose.

As another example of the immoral and ridiculous, take a look at TVA in Tennessee. That was our first planting of a Socialist rose in a patch of weeds, otherwise called the free economy. All competition was killed off for its benefit. The rose has had to be artificially fed ever since 1922. And the feeding has cost us in recent years $190 million per year, a total of over $2 billion. That is another $50 per family Government has outrageously presumed to have the power to take from us. It sells power below cost so that 110,000 families heat their houses with electricity at your expense. TVA never can earn a surplus at such rates to build new facilities for a growing population. And Government can never raise the rates and keep the votes of the people. There will always be a shortage of power so long as TVA has to depend on Congress for its life. Industry won't move into Tennessee because they can't depend on Congress to continue to carry such a weakling. Congress can't depend on itself either in that regard. TVA doesn't pay a dime toward the national defense—it's exempt from all taxes. It has been a blight on the State of Tennessee. It has constantly fallen behind all the other 11 southeastern private power-producing States in agricultural products, in manufacturing, in retail sales, in growth of new business, in postal receipts. All this is in accordance to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States survey in 1953.

On all of our Socialist projects above described, the Government spends $10 billion annually, and loses most of it. That's $250 annually per family. And it's growing much worse. There is no restraint or reversal of the trend in sight.

Clearly the President can't stop it. When he runs for reelection this fall, he will be met by a committee at nearly every State line asking, one after the other, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from others to give to us for more power this year?" The President must say, "Well, boys, you've been getting along with about $190 million a year for a good many years. I guess we can't drop below that on this election year."

Then come the corn boys. And at the next State line the wheat boys. And the water boys; the irrigation boys.

On his way home the big city boys say, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from those awful corn boys to give us Government houses, tax exempt, at half rent? How much for Federal aid to education? How much for health and hospitalization? And how much, Mr. President, for our cousins and our uncles and our aunts abroad?" So, 1956 will turn out to be not an election year for a great statesman but the 25th anniversary of the great auction of the people's rights and their property in return for votes. The continued transformation by force of more and more private property into public ownership for the benefit of special groups is leading to our total political corruption.

Congress certainly can't stop it. Congress has tried and failed.

One day the corn boys, the stalwarts from Illinois, appeared in the House and said, "Our consciences hurt. We've got to reduce taxes. We don't dare go back home for election until we throw some group out of the public feed trough. Where shall we start. Which one shall we choose for confession of a sin and the sacrifice?" Which group of voters would you throw out if you were running for Congress on election year? It would have been a beautiful and encouraging thing if the corn boys from Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska had marched down to the Well of the House and sacrificed corn. But it never dawned upon them to do so. They have been feeding on billions of dollars for 17 or 18 years, so that by now they feel that they have a vested right to continue to feed on the public. Their commodity is basic. If they should quit taking subsidies from the people that might cause such a shock as to seriously affect the whole economy. No, sir; we can't have that. You know we have $8 billion worth of surplus corn, wheat, and other commodities in cribs and bins, molding and wasting away. That's $200 per family.

So, corn decided to pick on peanuts for the sacrifice. Peanuts were such a very natural selection. Few losses of Republican votes were involved. The Illinois boys led off with two days of debate. "Why," they said, "this country could get along if we never grew another peanut. They are sort of indigestible anyway."

By this time the Members from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Texas were so furious and their wit so sharp, that they made the corn boys ashamed and they frightened all the other little groups feeding at the public trough. When the vote was taken it was 228 to 170 to keep peanuts in the trough with all the rest and forget the whole business of restoring the free economy and constitutional government.

Apples and other commodities were greatly encouraged. They said, "Why, we're basic commodities. An apple a day keeps the doctor away. We must have our subsidies too." And so it goes on and on.

We are now in somewhat the same position as that of our ancestors just prior to 1789. We, the people, must, as they did then, reassert and redefine, so that even the Supreme Court can't misinterpret, the constitutional limitations on the functions of government. The taxing and spending powers of Congress must be limited again. We must first of all correct the dreadful mistake made in 1913, called the 16th amendment, which gave unlimited power to Congress to tax and spend. We must chain the politicians, as Jefferson said, to the limitations of the Constitution so they can't break away from them.

California would be a good State to lead off now as Virginia and Massachusetts were in the beginning. Many groups are forming, like the Campaign for the 48 States, the American Coalition of Patriot Societies, For America, We the People, to support the Reed-Dirksen amendment to the Constitution. It limits Congress to a top income tax, both corporate and individual, of 25 percent. The tax would start at nothing and go no higher than 25 percent, except in case of war or national emergency. Federal estate and gift taxes would be abolished. Estates should be a special source of taxes for State and local governments, instead of being liquidated by the Federal Government.

This amendment would reduce the spending powers of Congress by about $10 billion, almost exactly what our present socialism costs. It would dry up on our books our socialism which we can't or won't repeal. It would starve out our Socialists and Communists who must continue to breed faster than we can investigate them unless we quit completely operating our own socialism on which they feed.

The proposed 23d amendment would wipe off our books at once 7 or 8 hundred illegitimate Government enterprises. They cover everything from housing, electric-power projects, irrigation, crop subsidies, down to coffee roasting, representing $50 billion, or $1,250 taken per family. This amendment is a California product, proposed 11 years ago by the American Progress Foundation, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. It is now being actively advocated before the State legislatures. Illinois has passed it, others will do so soon, we hope. It's a perfectly splendid idea. So good that I was especially proud to propose it to the House of Representatives. It provides: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution."

There should be adopted the Byrd-Bridges amendment. It will force Congress to stay in session each year until they have balanced the budget. Congress must not spend any more than they are willing to tax the people to pay currently, except, of course, in case of war. That will stop increasing the debt and operating on borrowed money for current expenses.

The Reed-Walter amendment clarifies the Constitution and makes it possible for the States to amend the Constitution by initiating amendments themselves. The Constitution intended that they should have that power to amend.

These amendments should be presented to the State legislatures for action. When 32 of the States send identical resolutions to amend to Congress, Congress must resubmit them to the States. When ratified by 36 of the States, the amendments forthwith become a part of the Constitution.

Thus we can limit the Federal Government's power to tax and spend, just as our local political subdivisions are limited.

Then if we should elect a Socialist President, as we may, he could do no special damage in carrying off our property and violating our rights without limitations.

We should thus be able to look forward possibly to another 150 years of freedom.

The States reserved to themselves the power to amend the Constitution. They defined the powers of the Federal Government in 1789 just as they may redefine and clarify them now. We should by such amendments release again the inventive, productive, creative, even the atomic, energy which lies in the individual mind and heart alone. Government is never creative, or productive except as it protects the creative and productive powers of free men. It can only use force on mankind. We should, by these constitutional measures, take off our backs the unbearable burdens of our incredible Government that has broken out of bounds. It has illegally and immorally seized power over us. We have unwittingly permitted it to grow upon us.

We should make of ourselves a true example of freedom again in the world. It does not exist today. Thus we might hope to repeat the contribution which we made in the past against the police states of the world. Thus we could hope to reestablish peace at home and in the world.

Israel: A Brief History of Recent Arab-Israel Relations and Suggestions for a Lessening of Tensions and Restoring the Balance of Power in the Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the excellent address made by our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, on Sunday evening, April 8, before the Jewish National Fund, Third Seder Celebration in Lakewood, N. J., which is in the district I have the honor to represent. It is a speech containing much wisdom and sound judgment and is a constructive contribution to the problems facing our country in the Near East.

The Third Seder Committee of the Jewish National Fund is headed by Irving L. Kantor who has done an outstanding job in administering his responsibilities. The Third Seder under his leadership has contributed more per capita to the Jewish National Fund than any other comparable community in the United States and this is certainly something to be proud of. Such an achievement does not happen by chance but is the result of outstanding leadership, devotion to duty, and the cooperation of everyone who is interested. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that cooperation is not forthcoming unless there is respect and confidence in the leadership.

Mr. Robert J. Novins, the chairman of the United Jewish Appeal of the Toms River, N. J., community of Jewish farmers, also has contributed much in this undertaking. It is a great privilege for me to represent in the Congress these fine Americans and I am very grateful to my colleague, Congressman MERROW, in meeting with them and bringing to them the wisdom of his experience.

Mr. MERROW's address follows.

TENSION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

The United States is much concerned with the tense situation that exists throughout the Mediterranean area. This section has always played an important role in the history of the world, and today, with the problems in North Africa, the striving for self-determination in Cyprus and the struggle by the young State of Israel to maintain its security, the Mediterranean holds the spotlight in international affairs. It is fervently hoped that satisfactory solutions to these problems may speedily be found. These issues must be resolved so that a general holocaust will not be loosed in this section of the world.

I welcome the opportunity to be here today to speak about one of the critical situations in the Mediterranean area, namely the re-

lationship between Israel and the surrounding Arab States. Since the United States wholeheartedly backed the formation of the State of Israel in accordance with our traditions of freedom and self-determination, we are deeply interested and gravely concerned with the tension that exists in the Middle East. We are resolved that the state shall not be overrun or destroyed, and we seek a peaceful solution to the controversy existing between Israel and the Arab States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL

On May 15, 1948, the new State of Israel was proclaimed an independent nation—a sovereign unit in the ranks of the world powers. Israel was established by a United Nations resolution, vigorously supported by the United States. The Declaration of Independence read by David Ben-Gurion pledged that, "The State of Israel will be based on the precept of liberty, justice, and peace, taught by the Hebrew prophets." Israel is the youngest democracy, and as such, is the great hope of freedom in the Middle East.

Israel has been an energetic and valuable member of the United Nations and has contributed greatly to the development and the success of this organization. I had the privilege of serving as a delegate on the United States Delegation to the 10th General Assembly from September 20 to December 20, 1955, and can attest personally to the valuable and statesmanlike contribution of Israel to the United Nations. Therefore, it is not only the United States which is interested in the welfare of this state, but the United Nations is deeply concerned since Israel was formed under United Nations' aegis.

Faced with weighty internal problems inherent to nationhood, Israel also had to deal externally with problems of far greater moment. The tiny nation found herself wedged between the Mediterranean Sea and unfriendly Arab nations whose harassing border incursions and warlike utterances and actions compelled her to divert a large part of her resources from economic development to the defense of her frontiers. Even though this had to be done in the interest of self-preservation, there has been great economic development in the state of Israel.

On various occasions I have visited the country and have found that the progress is tremendous. It is a modern democratic state, in an area that is much in need of development and democracy. To compound the difficulty, Communist arms and technicians are being supplied to Egypt and to Syria, creating a grave menace to the national survival of the State of Israel. In view of this worsening situation, we will do well to turn our attention to a reexamination of Arab-Israeli relations and the role of the United States in the Middle East.

FIGHT FOR SURVIVAL

At the end of World War II, the centuries-old dream of the Jews for a national homeland came true. Directly after the proclamation of the State of Israel by the United Nations, the states bordering on Israel engaged in open warfare against her. The United Nations immediately began an investigation of the matter, but it was not until many bloody exchanges had occurred and nearly a year of strife had taken place that any reasonable arrangement was found to terminate the bloodshed. On February 24, 1949, an armistice agreement was signed by the interested parties and a momentary truce was instituted. But it was only a reprieve, for the hostile forays of the Arab nations have continued unabatedly from that date to the present time.

It would appear that the enemies of Israel are determined to destroy the tiny state and obliterate her from the Middle Eastern map. The Arab States have steadfastly refused to accept the new State of Israel as a reality and refuse to sit down at the peace conference table with her. This acceptance and conference should and must be forthcoming before the present difficulties can be resolved.

The United Nations has established the state and under no circumstances will we or the other powers allow Israel to be destroyed. Antagonistic groups within the bordering nations continue to boycott, infiltrate and sabotage Israel. At the present moment, Egypt, in making a bid for Arabian leadership in the Eastern Mediterranean, is attempting to use the northern frontier countries of the Baghdad Pact as its principal target.

The Baghdad Pact includes Britain, Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan. The Baghdad powers are scheduled to meet in Tehran from April 16 to April 20. Deputy Under Secretary of State, Mr. Loy Henderson, will be an observer at this meeting. It is felt that the United States must put its weight behind this pact lest under the pressure of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Syria, together with the agitation of the Soviet Union, the pact may disintegrate and then the way would be paved for penetration by the Soviet Union in the Middle East. It is unfortunate that Col. Gamal Nassar, Egyptian Premier who apparently is the main instigator of the opposition to Israel, has served notice on all that the Arabs will not hesitate in using force, even though it may automatically mean war.

BORDER DISPUTES IN 1955

Last summer the Middle Eastern crisis was further aggravated by operations by the Arabs in sporadic forays across Israeli frontiers. Attacks were met with counterattacks, terminating in an interchange of accusations and flagrant truce term violations by all parties. When the United Nations truce commission's investigation was completed, the Security Council held seven meetings between March 4 and April 19, 1955. The decision of the Security Council on March 29, 1955, was a condemnation of Israel's attack on Egyptian forces. The basis of this action was that the United States and the other world powers said the attack was in the nature of a reprisal—a premeditated act. They felt that the fact that Israel's borders had been harassed for months by Egyptian raids and infiltrators was not adequate justification.

TRIPARTITE DECLARATION OF 1950

The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, entered into between the United States, Great Britain, and France, recognized "that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole."

The declaration also stated: "The three governments take this opportunity of declaring their deep interest in and their desire to promote the establishment and maintenance of peace and stability in the area and their unalterable opposition to the use of force or threat of force between any of the states in that area. The three governments, should they find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation."

ANTI-ISRAEL BROADCASTS

By the middle of the summer, the official radio mouthpiece of the Government of Egypt, Saut el Arab, had increased its anti-Israel barrage of slander and vituperation, with such statements as the following: "We cannot always remain in a state of war with Israel. We are therefore compelled to mobilize all Arab potential to exterminate her finally. Therefore let us plant in the hearts of the younger generation a hatred of Israel."

This sort of emotional nationalistic fervor can only lead to further misunderstanding and tension, with the passions rising in an ever ascending crescendo toward war and disaster.

SECRETARY DULLES' SPEECH ON AUGUST 26, 1955

Hoping to break this deadlock which has formed in the Near East, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on August 26 devoted a major policy speech before the Council on Foreign Relations to the problem of how this stalemate might be broken. His proposals were among the most constructive efforts brought forth to stabilize the situation. He suggested that there be compensation for the 900,000 Palestinian refugees by Israel to be financed by an international loan, participated in substantially by the United States. The Secretary stated that security could be assured "only by collective measures which commit decisive power to the deterring of aggression." Mr. Dulles stated that, "President Eisenhower has authorized me to say that, given a solution of the other related problems, he would recommend that the United States join in formal treaty engagements to prevent or thwart any effort by either side to alter by force the boundaries between Israel and its Arab neighbors. I hope that other countries would be willing to join in such a security guaranty, and that it would be sponsored by the United Nations." The Secretary of State pointed out that the existing boundary lines were established by the armistice agreements of 1949. He said that the drawing of permanent boundaries is a difficult task and that the lines fixed by the armistice agreements of 1949 were not designed to be permanent in every respect. He reaffirmed the willingness of the United States to help in reaching a solution to the boundary problem and other matters.

Israel's reaction to this was favorable, of course, but its leaders felt it was only one step toward resolving the dilemma. They pointed out that Israel had always been ready to make peace with the Arabs and offer concessions on the resettlement and compensation of refugees as part of a general peace settlement. However, they insisted that the fact of a united Arab front pledged to destroy Israel as a sovereign state left them no choice but to make Israel stronger militarily and to strengthen its ties with other areas. Israel maintained that if there had been any genuine attempts by the Arab groups to compromise or diminish their intransigent attitude, she would be open to negotiation and suggestions. But Israel could see no such change in the Arab attitude forthcoming.

In July 1955, for example, David Ben-Gurion offered to meet with Premier Gamal Nasser "or any other Egyptian statesman who is ready to meet with me in order to consider ways and means of improving relations between Israel and the Arab States." No reply was made to this, but within the month armed bands of Egyptians were making deep raids into Israeli territory, west and north of the Gaza demarcation line. It has been obvious that from the Arab point of view the war was not over—after all, only an armistice had been agreed to, they argued. It is no wonder that Israel feels that she must do all she can to balance the military strength the Arabs are acquiring from the Communists.

On February 6, 1956, several Republican Members of Congress sent a letter concerning the Israeli-Arab situation to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. I support the views expressed in this letter and to it give my wholehearted endorsement. I quote certain parts of the letter: "Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Government recognized 'that the Arab States and Israel all need to maintain a certain level of armed forces for the purpose of assuring their internal security and their legitimate self-defense

and to permit them to play their part in the defense of the area as a whole.' Because of a fear of growing imbalance of arms, the Government of Israel desires to purchase defensive arms strictly for purposes of self-defense. We have individually, and now collectively, taken the position that Israel as a firm part of the free world should be allowed to obtain in the open market such weapons as would assure her protection against aggression. What is the position of the State Department on this matter?

"We do not contend that tension in the Middle East can be finally resolved by the provision of defensive arms alone. We are convinced that immediate negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty of peace between Israel and the Arab world should be undertaken. These negotiations should be effectively implemented by our Government in association with those governments which joined in the Tripartite Declaration of 1950.

"It is vital that prompt and decisive measures be taken to end the threat of war in the Near East.

"To achieve this end the negotiation of formal treaties guaranteeing the existing frontiers of Israel and the Arab nations is essential, but essential also is a willingness to negotiate such treaties. We believe that a treaty of peace and a guaranty of existing frontiers should be offered to all interested parties in the Middle East and should be implemented promptly as to the frontiers of that nation or those nations which accept the proposed peace terms. Otherwise we continue to be faced with the refusal of some nations to enter into peace negotiations or even to recognize the existence of the State of Israel. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"There are two additional matters as to which we seek information from the Department: first, we do not believe that economic aid should be extended to any nation which is engaging in warlike or aggressive maneuvers against any part of the Free World. Therefore, we would like to go on record as urging our Department of State to consider most carefully further extension of economic aid, denying such aid to those countries which by their actions endanger the peace and security of free nations. What is the position of the State Department in this regard?

"Second, we agree with your August 26, 1955, statement concerning the immediate desirability of economic and technical help in resettling those Arab refugees whose continued presence in their present location delays or impedes the possibility of a total solution of the Arab-Israel problem. What progress has been made by our Government and associated nations toward the solution of this matter?

"We recognize that the continuing effort of our Government to counter the spread of world communism has many facets. Action taken anywhere may have repercussions in all parts of the world. But we do urgently feel that our constituents will be better informed by frank statements of the position of the Department of State wherever that is possible, consistent with national security. As Members of Congress, who support the aims and objectives of this administration, we are particularly anxious that our constituents be advised that the Department is taking positive steps toward the protection of free nations such as Israel and toward the dissolution of dangers which, in threatening the peace of Israel, threaten also the peace of the free world."

UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN 1956

As a further blow to the Israeli efforts to maintain a balance of power in this troubled Mediterranean area, on January 19, 1956, the United Nations Security Council unanimously voted to condemn Israel for an attack on a Syrian military post which took place on December 11, 1955. Even though Israel agreed that United Nations action must be supported, nevertheless, she felt she could not solely depend on the United Nations because the Soviet Union has a veto in the Council. From January on, therefore, the State of Israel has been pressing for more dependable and quicker means to meet the threat of aggression from the Arab States.

On the 4th of April the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously requested Dag Hammarskjold to go to the Middle East. This was done by the adoption of a United States-sponsored resolution. It is hoped that the Secretary General's mission will result in decreasing tensions in that area. Mr. Hammarskjold will endeavor to obtain better compliance with the armistice terms. His recommendations, which are to be reported to the Council within a month, are anxiously awaited.

ISRAEL STRIVING FOR SECURITY

Israeli leaders have been striving persistently for some additional guaranty for her security, especially in the form of a mutual-defense treaty with the United States and military assistance to Israel in order to remove the arms imbalance being created by Communist arms shipments to both Egypt and Syria. Israel is well aware of the long-run value of the Tri-Partite Declaration by the United States, Great Britain, and France to intervene in the event of organized aggression by either side, but, nevertheless, she does feel that at the moment of attack, arms and military materiel will be needed if she is to withstand the initial shock of the aggression for which no big power declaration can effectively act as a substitute. In other words, a security guaranty is not a substitute for defensive strength. As a supplement to arms it would be an excellent idea, but it cannot be considered an alternative solution, but rather as one piece in the whole fabric of security and defense guaranties.

I have always maintained that the Near East is an area vital to the security of the United States and that of the free world. The little State of Israel forms an important bastion of freedom and independence in that area. I feel that it would be perfectly proper and timely for the United States to supply arms to Israel in the context of that nation's legitimate self-defense and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This is possible within the framework of the mutual-security legislation, which is the basic law governing United States military assistance to friendly nations. I have been a firm supporter of this legislation since its first enactment in 1949 and I have consistently supported aid to the State of Israel under the mutual-security program.

Israel is already getting arms and assistance from France. We have taken the position that we have no objection to the shipment of arms to Israel by France and Great Britain. In view of the unwillingness of the Arab States to reach an equitable solution on the frontiers and, in view of the determination to oppose Israel as is evidenced by the attitude of intransigence, Israel should receive arms from the West to guarantee her security. Such arms are necessary in our own national interests.

The shipment of arms to Israel would, in my opinion, serve as a necessary military deterrent, the element which needs to be restored in order to maintain security in the region. Israel, it must be explained, does not insist upon a numerical superiority in arms but only an adjustment of the existing military imbalance resulting from transactions of the Communists. It is my firm conviction that a United States arms shipment would be a positive step to settle, or at least to lessen the present trying conflict, and certainly would further American and world democratic interests in sustaining and strengthening the new democracy of Israel. This is a feeling that is increasing in the United States as the situation in the Near East steadily deteriorates.

CONCLUSION

But apart from the moral and spiritual blow which this would mean to the whole free world, it is only too apparent to us that the loss of the sovereign State of Israel would be a crushing defeat to the United States, since the disappearance of this citadel of freedom would not only break the bonds of world democratic soldarity but would also open up the Near East to Soviet domination. The United States surely will not allow this to happen, and it is becoming a matter of increasing concern to every American.

I feel, as I have stated, that it is proper for us to furnish arms to Israel on the basis of the legitimate self-defense of the nation and within the larger context of the security of the United States. This situation must be settled peacefully, for if war comes it may well destroy not only Israel but may well engulf the entire world. Israel is the bastion of democracy in the Middle East. The state has been established by the United Nations and with our wholehearted support. We were the first to recognize Israel. Our influence and leadership must be used to make the existence of the State of Israel a recognized and accepted fact and we must vigorously oppose any solution to the Near East problem that would interfere with the sovereignty and security of the State of Israel.

The integrity of Israel is essential to our own security. Israel has made a valiant struggle for freedom and democracy. Israel stands foursquare against the Communists and anything that would impair the state would be of assistance to the Communists in their endeavor to firmly establish themselves in the Middle East. Stability in this area must be restored and arms are essential for self-protection. At the same time every effort must be exerted to reach a peaceful and satisfactory solution in this troubled area. If we help Israel build the necessary defensive strength to protect herself against aggression, she will be able to build in peace the model of freedom which I believe firmly will inevitably have a profound influence on the whole area of the Near East. Thus, by setting an example of peace and democracy, Israel will fulfill her historic mission.

Israel is the bulwark of democracy in an area where the Communists are using every effort to secure a foothold. This bastion of freedom is the free world's greatest hope of halting the incursion of communism in an area vital to our security.

A Bill To Amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 requiring that no civilian aircraft should be operated within the territorial limits of the United States, unless the owner thereof has given proof of his ability to respond in damages in such amounts as the Board shall prescribe, for the death or injury to any persons or damage to property resulting from the operation of such aircraft for which the owner thereof may be liable.

Commercial airlines adequately protect the public in this regard. However, the rise in the number of privately owned civilian aircraft with its concurrent rise in accidents have caused a problem somewhat similar, although smaller, to that involving the use and operation of automobiles.

Many thousands of our citizens have been maimed and killed, and their property destroyed in accidents involving the use of privately owned airplanes. Adequate compensation for such damage has not been forthcoming due to the fact that many private owners of such aircraft are not financially responsible. This has resulted in economic privation and permanent suffering of the victims of these accidents who have found themselves with uncollectible judgments or claims.

This bill will provide adequate protection for the public in such situations.

The Quest for Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

THE QUEST FOR UNDERSTANDING—NEWSLETTER
No. 178

MARCH 19, 1956.

DEAR FRIEND: Veteran Congressmen are like doctors in affecting a professional air of poise and self-confidence. Rarely do they seem disturbed. Even though they may be torn inwardly by doubt, fear, or anger, outwardly their attitude is one of totally unruffled composure.

Witness, for example, the ease with which Hanry Clay disposed of a hostile Congressman whom he encountered in one of the narrow corridors of the Capitol. The angry man refused to move over. "I never give way to scoundrels," he snapped as he pressed forward. Clay bowed and stepped aside. "I always do," he retorted as he continued on his way.

Members of the Appropriations Committee, handling as they do the purse strings of Government, generally possess this quality to a great degree. Long experienced in intricate problems of Government finance, they take even the most unusual and extraordinary budget request in stride. However, a hearing before our committee last week subjected us to an extremely rigorous test.

We were visited by a delegation of some of the Nation's most eminent scientists. They were asking for $28 million to complete preparations for the International Geophysical Year, the worldwide scientific exploration which will take place in 1957. They came loaded with charts, graphs, mathematical formulas and a disarmingly simple manner. But as soon as they began their presentation we knew we were going to have a rough time.

Dr. Richard Porter, one of the country's great experts on rockets, was the first witness. He discussed the proposed experiment to launch a small sphere, called the earth satellite, into outer space to revolve around the earth like the moon. Dr. Porter soon had the committee members revolving quite dizzily around him. In response to the blunt question, "How are you going to get the thing up there?" Dr. Porter replied: "We get it up there by rocket propulsion * * *. This is the fundamental equation of the rocket." Turning to the blackboard, he wrote the following:

$$\text{"}\Delta v = Vg \log \frac{m\ 1}{m\ 2}\text{"}$$

Then he proceeded to make the formula clear: "The change in velocity in any kind of rocket," he explained, "discounting gravity and the effects of air, in other words, just the effect of the rocket propulsion, is equal to the exhaust gas velocity times the logarithm of the mass at the beginning, divided by the mass at the end."

Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, of Texas, was equal to the occasion. "That is just simple," he said—"go ahead, Doctor." The doctor went ahead. For a brief period he moved through his complicated processes, and then, as though he had had enough, he summed up: "The satellite stays up because of centrifugal force. It is projected into its orbit by a three-stage rocket weighing 22,000 pounds at takeoff. It probably will be a spherical object about 20 to 30 inches in diameter. The final object will weigh about 20 pounds. It will carry instruments for at least one experiment at a time, which will radio information back to us on earth."

Until this summary, one of the committee members had been wishing for a more simple, if less scholarly explanation, like that of the astronomer who, while observing the heavens through the huge telescope at Mount Wilson Observatory, suddenly announced: "It's going to rain." His students were impressed, and one asked, "How do you know, sir?" Still peering through the telescope, the scientist declared: "Because my corns hurt."

It was the chairman who asked the $28 million question. He wanted to know whether the enormous amounts of time and energy and the scientific brains and effort to be poured into the experiment would bring commensurate results. Dr. Porter's answer was in the affirmative. "The important thing is not knowledge," he said, "but understanding. Understanding comes from knowledge. It comes from all kinds of knowledge. By taking the bits of knowledge we will get from the programs on aurora and air glow, and the upper atmospheric rocket program which gives only spot pieces of information, and by taking the continuing information we will get from the satellite program, I very confidently predict that the greatest upsurge of new scientific understanding of our time will follow."

The committee approved the funds for the experiment. Aware of our own limitations, we did not want to impose restrictions on those who know none—who are looking toward the horizon beyond the horizon—who are looking for greater understanding.

Your friend,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced two more legislative proposals prepared in collaboration with the Department of Justice to supplement the measures introduced Monday as part of the administration's civil-rights program. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], who joined in proposing to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights and a Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department on Monday, are likewise sponsoring this legislation.

One of these bills is designed to, first, prevent anyone from threatening, intimidating, or coercing a voter in any election; second, authorize the Attorney General to institute civil action in such cases; and, third, eliminate the requirement that all other remedies must be exhausted before cases can reach the Federal courts. The second proposal would give the Attorney General authority to bring civil suits against civil-rights conspiracies, such as groups attempting to deprive a citizen of equal treatment. In the past, such suits could be filed only by the injured individual.

Enactment of these 2 measures and the 2 introduced Monday will be an important step forward in guaranteeing the civil rights of all citizens regardless of race, creed, color, or political affiliation. At an appropriate time during the deliberations of the Judiciary Committee next week I shall offer these four proposals in a single bill as a substitute for the omnibus measure which we are now considering.

I trust that serious and open-minded consideration will be given these proposals. If we try to bite off more than we can chew, Congress will get exactly nowhere—as in the past. On the other hand, if we follow the administration's moderate and constructive suggestions on civil rights I am confident we can reach agreement and get favorable action. Solid accomplishment is now possible. Let us not ruin the chances of success by an unrealistic approach to this serious national problem.

Hon. A. M. Artajo, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, Visits Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington is playing host this week to the distinguished Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Spain, the Honorable A. M. Artajo, and to his charming wife and daughter. I join my colleagues on this occasion in expressing the hope that the distinguished foreign visitors will enjoy their stay in Washington, and that the official conferences between Foreign Minister Artajo and Secretary of State Dulles will aid in providing firm groundwork for cooperation between our two nations in coping with the menace of international communism.

I am certain that I need not recall the fact that the Republic of Spain has shown very realistic understanding of the nature and menace of communism.

Perhaps the most prominent evidence of this understanding has been the attitude of the Government of Spain toward the fate of the once-free nations of Europe which are today suffering under Communist domination. On repeated occasions, officials of the Spanish Government have declared their sympathy for the people of those captive nations, expressing their conviction that the principles of justice demand that they be freed from the bonds of Communist enslavement.

Indicative of the position taken on this issue by the Government of Spain is a statement made recently by Foreign Minister Artajo who, when asked to comment on the subject of coexistence with the Soviets, said:

> When Russia will liberate the subjugated countries, we will begin to believe in her good will of coexistence.

This was a forthright and farsighted statement, which offers an open and objective test of Soviet intentions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the exchange of views taking place this week between the representatives of the Republic of Spain and of our Nation will make a constructive contribution to our efforts intended to bring about an era of just and lasting peace in the world.

There Is a Bottom in the Barrel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, rich and powerful as we are, is there a logical reason why we should assume the burden of contributing to the support of the rest of the world? Endeavor through education and force—and don't forget the force—to maintain peace throughout the world?

There are other lands greater in area than the United States. Other nations with far more people. Yet some people assume that we should, and insist that we must, wherever on earth there are those who have less than we, divide with them. That whenever, wherever, nations quarrel, we should step in and, figuratively speaking, knock their heads together, insist they cease fighting. We would be as successful doing that as is the individual who ventures into a neighbor's home to settle a family argument.

Since World War I, we have given other nations more than $51 billion. If all the babies, the helpless, those who for some reason or other do not pay an income or other tax, pay their full share, you and I owe on that contribution around $300 each.

Some nations used 3 billion of the dollars we gave them to decrease their national debt. As we borrowed that $3 billion, we are paying $90 million a year interest on that $3 billion while our debt piles up.

While our national debt in 1916 was but $971,562,590, we have jumped it as of March 20, 1956, to $277,249, 684, 429. You figure how much you owe of that. I'm tired.

Now the Congress is being asked for an additional $4,858,975,000 for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1957.

We can ruin ourselves by imposing an ever-increasing tax burden on ourselves. We can, and eventually we will, if we continue our give-away program, destroy our prosperity, impoverish ourselves, be forced to repudiate our national debt, or find ourselves working, yes, perhaps fighting, for other nations.

There is a bottom to the barrel and, in my judgment, we have reached it.

It would be all very well to borrow money to help others or to furnish our allies munitions of war, if we could be sure that they would in time of need stand with us, oppose our enemies, fight Communism. But experience tells us that when their own interests are involved, other nations forget all about us, each does what it thinks will best preserve its own sovereignty.

Today, while we are sending aid and munitions of war to other countries, hoping to stop communism, those countries are doing business as usual with the Communist-block countries. They have been shipping more than 250 separate items, machines and machine tools, to Communist governments for the past 2 years. That is the report of a Senate committee of which JOHN L. MCCLELLAN is chairman.

Is it not about time we quit pouring our money down a rathole, wasting our substance and munitions in other lands, where eventually they reach the Communists? There are plenty of things which need doing here at home, not the least of which is the perfecting of our own national defense.

Peter D. Vroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was waiting for me on my return from a few days in my district in Chicago a letter telling of the death of Peter D. Vroom. For half a century he was my close friend. For a number of years illness had confined him to his home, but the bonds of a long and dear friendship were kept freshly vibrant by frequent exchange of letters. I shall miss those messages from my friend who now has passed to another and a higher sphere.

Peter D. Vroom was one of the finest newspapermen that I have ever known. He was reporter on the Chicago Tribune during the colorful era of James Keeley. Oldtimers in Chicago will recall Jim Keeley as a powerful and dynamic newspaper editor. Pete Vroom was so close to Jim Keeley that when the latter left the service of the Chicago Tribune to take over the public relations of the Pullman Co., Pete Vroom went with him.

The world in which he was such a vibrant personality has gone. He was past 80 when the hand of death was laid upon him, and most if not all of his associates in the journalism of the period of his prime had preceded him to the grave. I should not want his passing to go unnoticed. He was in every sense of the word a great American, and he lived up to a great and a proud name.

I am happy that the name of Peter D. Vroom will be continued in the generation of the present by his son, also named Peter D. Vroom. Back in colonial days, in the early years of the Republic and in the developing years that followed there has always been a Peter D. Vroom. How many of that name and of that blood served as governors, as judges in the courts and in other high public offices I cannot say with exactness, but the number was large.

One of that family, whose name erroneously is spelled Broom in some published lists of the makers and signers of the Constitution of the United States, was but 35 years of age when he served with Washington, Madison, Hamilton, and the other immortals in the writing of the Constitution of our country. Maj. William Pierce, a fellow delegate to the Constitutional Convention, spells the name correctly "Vroom," in his pen sketches of his fellow delegates.

If my colleagues will turn to page 1959 of the biographical directory of the American Congress they will find that another of the family blood and name, Peter D. Vroom, was elected as a Democrat to the 26th Congress, convening on March 4, 1839. This Peter D. Vroom was elector Governor of New Jersey as a Jackson Democrat in 1829, 1830, 1831, 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836. He was a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Pierce and King in 1852 and also a presidential elector on the Democratic ticket of Seymour and Blair in 1868. He at all times carried proudly the name of Peter D. Vroom. My friend whose death has brought to me a load of grief carried proudly and well in his day and generation that name. To the son, to whom is left the rich heritage of a good and famous name, is presented a challenge that I know he will meet in the spirit of his father and his forebears.

To the widow, Hope, and to the son I extend my deepest sympathy.

Hon. Jonah J. Goldstein 70 Years Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the partial story of a great man and a useful life. Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, of the Court of General Ses-

sions of the City of New York, is this month celebrating his 70th birthday. He is still in every way a young man and a vibrant personality. Through the years, he has dedicated himself to the service of his community and the well-being of others.

At the age of 16, he took charge of a group of youngsters from the lower East Side, accompanying them each summer to Surprise Lake Camp at Storm King on the Hudson. This institution is now known as the Eddie Cantor Camp For this service, Jonah received a little vacation himself—a free ride to and from camp, lunch, and 5 hours in the country. He was the first group boy in the Educational Alliance to serve as a group leader. The group he led was known as the Young Americans. Shortly after this, he helped to organize the Jewish Big Brother movement and served as its volunteer secretary. The Jewish Big Brother movement soon proved its value. Court records showed that 60 percent of youngsters who got into trouble and who had no big brothers, returned to the criminal courts and ended up in adult penal institutions. On the other hand, of those who did have big brothers to guide them, less than 3 percent found difficulty later on. In the course of his big brother work, Jonah acted as a lay rabbi on the high holy days, conducting religious services at the House of Refuge on Randalls Island.

As a young man, he was a resident worker at the University Settlement. A resident worker usually served at least 2 nights a week at the settlement, but Jonah did not limit himself to the 2 nights; more often he served 6 nights a week and all day Sunday.

Shortly after the infamous Becker case and the Rosenthal murder, he helped to organize the East Side Neighborhood Association for the purpose of combating vice and other evil conditions on the lower East Side. Of this association, Dr. Henry Moskowitz was chairman, Miss Lillian Wald was vice chairman, and Jonah was executive director without salary. In 1911, the late lamented Alfred E. Smith was majority leader of the Assembly of the State of New York. He took Jonah to Albany as his secretary and as clerk to the all important ways and means committee of the State legislature. While at the State capitol, Jonah helped draft a bill requiring that children, appearing in the children's court, should receive both physical and psychiatric examination before sentence. It took 3 years before this bill became law. For 2 years the State legislature passed the bill only to have it vetoed by the then governor. Upon the third try, Jonah succeeeded.

Al Smith was extremely fond of his indefatigable coworker and his affection for Jonah was returned in full measure. During this time, Al Smith was chairman of the annual fund raising affair for the Holy Name Centre for Homeless Men. Jonah assisted him. Upon Al Smith's passing, Jonah was asked to step into Al Smith's role as chairman and as director of the Holy Name Centre.

In 1920 he met Harriet B. Lowenstein, who was extremely active as a social-service worker and intimately connected with the Federation, the Joint Distribution Committee, as well as being philanthropic advisor to the late Felix M. Warburg. Harriet and Jonah were married in July of 1920. Ever since, she has been his partner, loyal and loving companion, and the inspiration for all of his many activities. Harriet was for 13 years the comptroller of Federation. When she retired, Jonah was elected a trustee at large. He now is, and for the past 15 years has been, the chairman of Federation's Council of Fraternal Organizations.

In 1929, as representatives of the Jewish Agency and the Joint Distribution Committee, Jonah and Harriet were asked, on 48 hours' notice, to go to Palestine to inaugurate a relief program and investigate the causes of interracial riots in that land.

In 1931, Mayor Walker appointed him a city magistrate. He served as chairman of the committee on reorganization of the magistrate's court, introducing such reforms as the consolidated bail bond, health examinations in the women's court before admission to bail, and the stagger system in traffic court. He was responsible for the organization of the adolescent term of the magistrate's court, over which he presided after regular hours, and he successfully fought for the removal of the criminal stigma theretofore given by the magistrate's court in all family nonsupport cases by turning them over to the newly created domestic relations court. He is the author of many articles on social service and the law, as well as the book entitled "The Family in Court," which is used as a textbook by social service students.

In 1936 Judge Otto A. Rosalsky died. In his place, Gov. Herbert Lehman appointed Jonah a judge of the Court of General Sessions. He was elected to that court in 1939 and has been serving there ever since.

In 1945 Jonah tried, but did not succeed in taking on the bigger job of mayor of the city of New York.

He was one of the organizers of the United Jewish Appeal for Greater New York, created to avoid a multiplicity of campaigns and has served as a member of the board since its inception. He was president for 5 years of the Central Bureau for Jewish Aged and Infirm. For 14 years, he was chairman of the New York Jewish Committee of the Boy Scouts of America and, for 7 years, he served as president of the Jewish Club. He is still active in support of the Harlem branch of the Young Men's Christian Association, but the major portion of his spare time after these many and varied activities is engaged in working for the organization which is closest to his heart—the Grand Street Boys' Association, of which he is now serving his 21st year as president. As a corollary and culmination to his work at Grand Street, his greatest pride is the Grand Street Boys' Foundation to which he has dedicated himself wholeheartedly.

Jonah has been one of the most useful members that our community of New York has ever had. His service has always been effective, unstinted, and given without distinction to race, creed, or national origin.

Mr. Speaker, I have given but a few of the highlights of Jonah's useful life. There are many people who played an important part therein. None, however, bore a greater influence than his dear wife Harriet, whose sacrifices and guidance in large measure made possible Jonah's many accomplishments.

Jonah J. Goldstein, 70 years young, still leading a crowded, busy, useful life, rich in experience, wise, compassionate and eager to help his fellow man—he stands as a tower of strength, whose contributions to society are, in his own words "only my way of paying back for the privilege of living in a great democracy."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, why do we continue to tolerate an alien idea that politicians in Washington can manage our private affairs better than we can ourselves? They now manage our corn, wheat, cotton, rice, butter, cheese, dry milk, tobacco, peanuts, et cetera, or one-third of our agriculture. It is a mess. Government housing at half rent, tax-exempt, is an outrage on the taxpayers and just as bad on the Government tenants. Government socialized power, like TVA, and irrigation projects at taxpayers' expense everywhere are blights on the people who take the money. Our foreign aid, now up to $60 billion, or $1,500 per American family on the average, does not satisfy the Socialist governments to whom it is paid. They want it doubled. Our friends over there out of power scold us for financing their enemies and ours. They are nearly all mad at us. We have bought few friends. So, Government robbing of Peter to pay Paul weakens Peter and demoralizes Paul.

The very idea that our Government should ever exercise such powers was utterly repugnant to us for 140 years. It was thought impossible. We so feared the evil tendencies of government that we drastically limited its functions to its only legitimate sphere, namely, the protection of life and property, keeping law and order. Then, to make doubly sure, we had the politicians chained to these proper and limited functions—we specified in 1789 what Congress could tax and spend. We limited the functions and taxing and spending power of our cities and counties and States, too. Fortunately, we have kept and enforced those limitations and as a result we have not gone Socialist, with few exceptions, in our cities, counties, and States. Our socialism, viz: converting private property into public or government owned and operated property, is confined almost entirely to Washington. We breed our Socialists and Communists there.

After 25 years of their infiltration of one of the old parties in power, Congress is unable to repeal and wipe off the books the socialism we have already got. Unless we are able to somehow wipe it off the books completely, we must go on. For we must be all socialized or all free. There can be no coexistence—half Socialist, half free. Obviously if we socialize corn as we have for 17 years, every living thing that consumes corn must ultimately be socialized. Farmers cannot buy Government owned and controlled corn and sell beef, pork, milk, and eggs in a free market. The burden of an average of $250 per year on every family taxed to pay the $10 billion our present socialization costs makes its extension inevitable. For example, you hear people cry out under this burden and you hear them say: "After we pay our taxes we have not enough left to pay for the care of our sick, our aged, the education of our children," and so forth.

So Mr. KELLEY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, introduces the Kelley bill providing for Federal aid and control of education on a vast scale. It has already passed the House Committee on Education by a vote of 21 to 9. It will likely come before the whole House for action at this session.

It proposes to take from the taxpayers $400 million a year for each of the next 4 fiscal years, a total of $1,600,000,000, and redistribute that largess to some of the States at the expense of others for schoolhouse construction. Six industrial States in the North and West, that is, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and California, would be compelled to put up 57.654 percent of the total tax moneys and get back but 35.747 percent of the benefits as grants for classroom construction in those States. They will pay approximately $928 million in taxes and get back approximately $576 million for the 4-year period. Besides, they will pay additional taxes to cover the overhead cost of the United States Government doing this utterly foolish job of taking our money from us, giving only about half of it back, and giving the rest to other States. Thus the unblushing scheme for the redistribution of the wealth started in 1932 goes on.

It works in detail like this: For example, for the 4-year period New York State will be compelled to give up $299,984,000 toward the $1,600,000,000 and will get back but $128,950,640. Thus New York will lose $171,033,360 in the transaction, plus its share of the overhead costs of the operation mentioned.

The city of New York would pay $134,454,320 and get back $72,480,000 representing a loss of $61,974,320 plus the usual overhead.

Westchester County residents would pay $13,777,920 and the county would get back $7,427,560 for building schoolhouses, a loss of $6,350,360.

And as for Putnam County, the smallest county, the Federal taxes would amount to $287,040 and the county would get back $154,740 in Federal aid, or a loss of $132,300 in the 4-year period. Thus you can readily see, based on the current cost of between $33,000 and $40,000 to construct a classroom, Putnam County will pay in Federal taxes enough to build about 8 classrooms in order to get the Federal funds back to build about 4 classrooms. The Federal Government will decide where to build the other schoolrooms with Putnam County's money.

These figures were compiled by the Empire State Chamber of Commerce at Albany, N. Y. They are available for every county in New York State.

Title II of this Kelley bill would put the Commissioner of Education in the investment banking business by creating a school bond purchase revolving fund with an original appropriation of $300 million and the further authority to purchase "obligations of local educational agencies" in the aggregate principal amount of $750 million. This is on the theory that the school district credit is so bad nobody else would make the loan to them. So, under the Kelley bill, the Federal Government just robs Peter and loans the money to Paul anyway. This so-called revolving fund is to have a life of 4 years. At the end of 4 years the headaches and uncollected balances, together with any cash remaining in the fund, will be transferred to the Treasury Department for them to worry about.

But, Mr. Taxpayer, these two little practice blows of the Kelley bill are just meant to condition you for the third blow. Otherwise title III of the bill would knock you cold.

Title III proposes that the Commissioner of Education may make Federal Government advances not to exceed $6 billion to some, but not all, of the 57,000 school districts. They would be selected according to his judgment as to need and other deserving qualities. So that those States that have sweated out their bond issues to build schools will get none because they no longer need them, while those that have dragged their feet longest, waiting for the Federal Government to take over, will get their loans. What a bonanza. Six billion to play politics with. But that's not all—the Commissioner of Education is authorized under the Kelley bill to "pay, compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, lien, or demand, however acquired or arising under title III."

So, if these borrowing school districts continue to drag their feet and say they "can't pay," why then the Commissioner can forget the loans. What politician wants to sue voters, especially school districts, anyway?

And section 313 (b) provides that the "financial transactions of the Commissioner in making advances pursuant to this title shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government."

This means that the Commissioner's acts are final. There is no appeal from his management even if he never collects a dime of the loans.

Now, all this adds up to $1,600,000,000 under title I, $750 million under title II, and $6 billion under title III, a possible total of $8,350,000,000. There are 40 million American families to pay it. That means that each American family will be taxed $207.75 on the average to provide this new form of Federal aid. Add to that $1,450 per family on the average each one pays now, and add $25 per family for each new billion dollars for new socialization to come, and you will get some notion of what we face.

Those families in New York State and the other States mentioned will get next to nothing under titles II and III because they are not so-called needy States. They can pay but cannot take. Many other States will get back a mere drip at best.

Thus, the Kelley bill, sponsored especially by the National Education Association, takes us the first big step in socializing and controlling the school system, like other areas described above are already socialized.

Below are the losses six industrial States will sustain annually under title I alone. These are normallly Republican States outrageously penalized by every Federal aid program on the books, including this proposed new one.

The overhead is not shown below because it is well-nigh impossible to estimate Government overhead costs. It runs as high as 30 percent in most Government activities. Our 2,400,000 Government employees, their offices, rents, and expenses come high.

We must add to these costs of Federal management of our schools the Federal wage rates of the Bacon-Davis Act. School districts cannot chip in and get volunteer workers, or workers of any kind if they accept Federal funds except generally unionized workers at union wages as determined by the Department of Labor. These additional costs are estimated at from 25 to 30 percent over and above what the school districts would pay without Federal intervention.

State	Pays in percent	Pays in dollars	Gets back aid dollars
California	7.620	$30,480,000	$27,545,819
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
New York	18.749	74,996,000	32,794,708
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Total	57.654	230,616,000	142,988,829

Subtracting the aid received back from what is paid out, the losses in each State are as follows:

California	$2,934,181
Illinois	12,664,738
Michigan	17,785,113
New York	42,201,292
Ohio	6,699,584
Pennsylvania	5,342,263
Total	87,627,171

Compare the losses in the 6 States with the gain in the State of Mississippi. Mississippi will pay in taxes $800,000 toward the Federal-aid program and get back $6,506,886, which is better than an 8-to-1 return.

In spite of that a committee of the Mississippi Legislature investigated and rejected some years ago the idea of Federal aid to education. Yet this proposed bill virtually forces the States to take it whether they want it or not.

There is great variation in the percentage of income which each State spends on education. There is not a single State but that can better afford its own education than can the Federal

Government with its almost bankrupt Treasury. Some States spend twice as much as others. For example, Wyoming spends 3.99 percent of its income and Massachusetts spends 1.88 percent on public education. This makes no allowance, of course, for the private and parochial schools.

The following table shows the percentage of income spent for the school year 1953–54 by each State and the rank of each State on the basis of its current expenditures for schools:

State	Percent of income spent on current expenditures	Rank
Alabama	2.92	18
Arizona	3.14	13
Arkansas	2.49	29–30
California	2.87	19
Colorado	2.76	21
Connecticut	1.90	47
Delaware	1.96	45–46
Florida	2.57	26
Georgia	2.61	25
Idaho	3.18	12
Illinois	2.04	43
Indiana	2.26	33
Iowa	3.34	7
Kansas	2.77	20
Kentucky	2.14	40
Louisiana	3.12	14
Maine	2.25	34
Maryland	2.24	35–36
Massachusetts	1.88	48
Michigan	2.19	37–38
Minnesota	3.24	10–11
Mississippi	3.00	16
Missouri	2.07	42
Montana	3.45	6
Nebraska	2.66	24
Nevada	2.16	39
New Hampshire	2.41	31
New Jersey	2.30	32
New Mexico	3.90	2
New York	2.12	41
North Carolina	3.08	15
North Dakota	3.61	4
Ohio	1.98	44
Oklahoma	3.24	10–11
Oregon	3.25	9
Pennsylvania	2.19	37–38
Rhode Island	1.96	45–46
South Carolina	3.32	8
South Dakota	3.49	5
Tennessee	2.49	29–30
Texas	2.56	27
Utah	3.75	3
Vermont	2.75	22
Virginia	2.51	28
Washington	2.74	23
West Virginia	2.97	17
Wisconsin	2.24	35–36
Wyoming	3.99	1

In some areas two-thirds of the school-age children go to private or parochial schools. They are cut out of aid entirely although the parents must pay the taxes. The Federal Government would, if let alone, flatten out all differences, religious, economic, and political, between the States. Obviously when this process which is now on is completed there will be no taxpayers to pay for our socialized areas. And there will be no private or parochial schools for the same reason. Central governments just cannot endure variety and differences between people, between States, between communities. It cannot endure differences in effort and compensation. It would flatten out everybody and make the industrious look just like the lazy and indifferent—and call the program Federal aid. It no doubt would give all pupils the same grade. There would be no reward for extra effort and skill.

Column 1 of the following table shows the percentage that each State pays of all taxes collected, for whatever purpose; column 2 shows on that basis how much each will contribute annually to the $400-million annual fund; column 3 shows how much each State will get back, according to the United States Office of Education:

State	Percent pay in	Dollars they will pay in	Dollars they will get back
Alabama	0.542	$2,172,000	$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	27,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	$5,152,000	$835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,657
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,600,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.744	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.244	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland [1]	2.726	10,904,000	16,202,148
Massachusetts	2.719	10,876,000	10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.200	800,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.178	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	.152	608,000	2,320,790
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,893,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.108	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington [1]	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions			422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

[1] Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Washington State includes Alaska.

Such taking of private property without due process and transferring it into public or socialized property is, of course, pure socialism, according to the dictionaries.

The Kelley bill is not the administration bill, nor is it a Republican Party measure. It is the proposal of the National Education Association—a teachers' union and lobby—and of the Socialist wing of the Democrat Party.

The bill sets up no formula to guide the redistribution of $8,350,000,000. It writes a blank check. It makes a commissar out of the Commissioner of Education to "do good" with other people's money as he pleases.

This Kelley bill is the last word in a bureaucrat's prayer.

Think of the reams and reams of regulations that can be written around every step in getting this $8,350,000,000 away from the places where it is and out to the favored districts of some of the 57,000 school districts where the Commissioner thinks it should be.

Then just think of the thousands of new bureaucrats that will be needed to administer this section of the bill, to settle and cancel the claims, and do all the other things necessary to satisfy enough of the voters to keep the plan alive and going beyond the deadline of 1960 set forth in the bill. All of this is supposed to end then. But that too is only a part of the Government's deception.

For do we not know by now that a temporary measure in Congress to meet an emergency for schools or anything else becomes one of the most permanent pieces of legislation?

Mr. Eisenhower has said in a letter to me regarding Federal aid to education:

In my own mind I am perfectly clear as to the basic principle and have more than once made public statements to the effect that I definitely oppose every unnecessary intervention of the Federal authority and the Federal Treasury in what should be local business and local responsibility. * * *

I would flatly oppose any grant by the Federal Government to all States in the Union for educational purposes. Such policy would create an ambition—almost a requirement—to spend money freely under the impulse of competition with other localities in the country. It would completely decry and defeat the watchful economy that comes about through local supervision over local expenditures of local revenues.

That is the truth we all know.

Then he warns:

In short, unless we are careful, even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the Central Government.

And to indicate that he is aware of the evils of socializing our local school systems, Mr. Eisenhower had this to say:

If local communities do their job, then there will be no need for additional centralized revenues for nationwide subsidies of an essential local character, and we will avoid the pitfalls of extreme centralization.

Very frankly, I firmly believe that the army of persons who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external threat that can possibly be arrayed against us.

His fear, our fear, lies in the seizure or assumption of power by government over us. We all fear, indeed we witness, the corrupting evils of government promises to do for us what we ought to do for ourselves. It weakens the capacity and the will of the people to manage their affairs for themselves. All of our great leaders have warned us against the evils of the Central Government we are now embracing. Who is so dull that he cannot understand that the Government has not a dime that it does not first take from the people? It corrupts us with our own money. It captures us and takes away our resistance by false promises of something for nothing.

All this adds up to a rule that whatever you add to the power of government you subtract from yourselves. So there is no such thing as Federal aid. For the Government to promise aid as though it has something to give apart from what it takes from the people themselves is a fraud on the people.

Of course, it is a bit natural that the professional schoolman should want the power of money from the Central Government in his hands. Some superintendents naturally want to be relieved of

the slower, more hesitant, and more democratic processes, as well as the mistakes inherent in the exercise of local responsibility. He assumes that in the exercise of the people's responsibility by government, it will make no mistakes.

To maneuver the people into a willingness to put themselves under Government management and control, the Government itself controls the very thoughts of the people by its own propaganda. For example, the Government makes a survey to see if there is a classroom shortage. A Government agency, the United States Office of Education, gathers the information from school superintendents in the States, and not from the parents, taxpayers, or laymen who have no professional interest at stake. The professionals who gather, and those who provide the information for the Government are by and large already committed to Federal aid and have been for years. After they get the information all slanted the way they want it they arrange a White House conference. When the conference is over it is manipulated so that a committee of 2 is appointed, one a former chairman of the Council of Chief State School Officers and now a chief school officer of one of the States, and the other a former chief State school officer, now executive secretary of the National Council of Chief State School Officers—operating in conjunction with the National Education Association. Both are active—almost violent—crusaders for Federal aid. With some considerable difficulty with the stubborn facts growing out of the White House conference of 1,800 delegates, this National Education Association committee of 2 report what they wanted to think was a consensus of the 1,800 delegates at the conference. The Government itself picks up just the right lines and gives them the whole Government propaganda works. The delegates had no opportunity to vote and create news for their side of the case. No one knows how they would have voted. All we have is the above-described consensus report of two prejudiced persons. All the modifying, restrictive, and the downright opposition to Federal aid that was in the White House Conference is buried. Even the great widespread opposition of the professionals themselves is buried at the bottom of the confusion of paperwork. What private citizen or group of so-called free citizens would dare to controvert even the false statements of Government?

The governmental propaganda machine picks out of the consensus report what the professionals who set it up intended for it to emphasize. So all officialdom beats the drums for the Kelley bill. The power of big government smothers individual freedom of thought and resistance.

While the President called the White House Conference in the best of good faith to study the 6 fundamental problems in our educational system, only 1 of the 6, namely Federal aid, got any serious attention. The best thinking of the professionals who manipulated the conference was that there was nothing wrong with education that more money from the taxpayers would not cure.

The laymen, taxpayers, parents, businessmen, farmers, and laborers, a small minority in the conference, asked questions about improving teaching methods. What about the use of television? How about renting school buildings more scientifically built by private capital, just as all the post offices are now being rented instead of owned by the school board? They wanted to know why the inventive creative capacity of the local citizens were not more capable of meeting all their local needs than the Federal Government. They questioned whether the great teachers of unusual skill and ability might not be used through new techniques such as television to reach a greater number of pupils. Could not such teachers be helped by assistants or aids or apprentices at lower cost to free the great teachers of many chores incident to the real job of teaching? They wondered why no particular changes had been made in the teaching techniques and particularly in the number of pupils per class and the costs per pupil while in every other profession tremendous improvements have taken place increasing the number served and reducing the cost of the same. Why should teaching be static?

No answer to any of these questions came out of the conference. The professional and the governmental bureaucratic purpose is to bring down the number of pupils in the class and bring up the number of the classrooms, always at increased cost. Obviously the size of classes must be increased far beyond what has been standard for about a century in order to bring down costs. Many of our colleges are conducting classes of 100 or more. George Washington University has had classes of as high as 1,300. It must not continue to be easier for one of the biggest lobbies in Washington to lobby for taxpayers' money than it is to try to improve education and reduce the cost at the same time.

Our school buildings, highly expensive, are idle much of the time, the weekends and holidays. Their use starts at 8:30 or 9:00 a. m., ends at 4:00 p. m. When William A. Wirt started his plan at Gary, Ind., he pointed out:

> We are handling three times as many pupils and giving each pupil more hours of education than is customary in a high school and that actually the cost per pupil is around 65 percent of the normal cost.

By starting his classes at 8:00 a. m., continuing them through the day and into the evening, 12 months of the year, he was able to give far more effective education at a lower unit cost. A similar plan might be suggested as one of the possible economies.

Local communities, if left alone, with their native American genius, intelligence, necessity, and financial capacity, will find a way to solve their problems. They alone can meet their necessities. They alone know what they are.

Address of Hon. Clair Engle at Annual Convention of National Wildlife Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest meetings in the conservation field is the annual convention of the National Wildlife Federation State affiliates. It is attended by delegates representing 3 million sportsmen and lay conservationists throughout the Nation.

This year's convention was held last month in New Orleans, just prior to the North American Wildlife Conference.

The keynote speaker at the 20th annual convention was our colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A distinguished conservationist, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE, of California, advised members of one of the largest conservation groups to get behind an affirmative program of conservation legislation instead of concentrating on winning negative victories.

An audience of 250 heard his speech. Among them were delegates from State wildlife federations and sportsmen's leagues, together with the leaders of practically all the national conservation organizations—the Izaak Walton League of America; Wildlife Management Institute; International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners; The Wilderness Society; National Parks Association; National Audubon Society; The Wildlife Society; American Fisheries Society; Sport Fishing Institute; Nature Conservancy; American Forestry Association; American Nature Association; Sierra Club, and others.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in this important and timely address, which follows:

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Woodward, for that very complimentary introduction. I am not only flattered by that fine introduction but I am also proud and happy to be here.

I am not quite sure whether or not you are prepared for a serious discussion tonight but I am convinced that within the confines of this room there is a deeper concentration of real conservationists than you could get into a room of comparable size anywhere else in the country.

Of course, I hope that you ladies here do not mind listening to legislation for I have been informed by the toastmaster that the ladies are the real conservationists—they not only believe in it but they have to put up with their husbands who believe in it and go out hunting and fishing and leave them as widows.

I am going to talk to you tonight as a legislator who deals in conservation. Eventually, in all of these problems, we have to get down to the point where somebody writes a bill. I always say to people who talk to me about legislation that I can give them the first line, "Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives," and that is where I stop and say that they can take it from there.

Many of the things you want to achieve as conservationists can only be achieved through legislation. It is important therefore that conservation-minded people be informed on legislation affecting their interests and skilled in the use of the legislative process.

I would like to start with the last session of this Congress and comment briefly on three major pieces of legislation which I know were of great importance to you. One was the mining bill. Another was the defeat of the Echo Park Dam and the third had to do with the Pittman-Robertson funds. I would like to mention each of those, not in detail, because I am sure that most of you are familiar with them, but because they teach a lesson about the problems of legislation.

With reference to the mining legislation, there are two things that I would like to say to you about that. The first is that in that legislation, for the first time, we took a step toward getting ahead of this mining-claim problem so we will not be constantly lagging behind as in the past. Over the last 5 or 6 years, the mining claims filed upon the public-land areas of this country in the national forests and on the public domain have increased from some 4,000 to over 166,000 claims. Quite obviously, if we did not do something about setting up procedures for knocking off the old and stale claims, we were going to fall constantly behind. We got started toward holding even.

The second thing that I want to mention about that legislation—and it is significant—is the kind of support that it had. I would like to read to you what the committee report said about the organizations supporting the legislation:

"The language of the bill, as reported, has been developed with the support and cooperation of both the Departments of Agriculture and Interior.

"Included in a long list of national, State, and local groups and individuals supporting this legislation are the following:

"American Mining Congress, American Federation of Labor, Independent Timber Farmers of America, American Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, National Wildlife Federation, Sports Afield, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, National Farmers Union, Wildlife Management Institute, The Izaak Walton League of America, The National Grange, Northwest Mining Association, Northern Rocky Mountain Sportsmen's Association, Western Forest Industries Association, Western Forestry and Conservation Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, Society of American Foresters, and the American Nature Association."

This seems to me to set an example and a pattern for action for other and further successful legislation that should be followed in the future. When I get down to the next phase of this discussion, the problem still before us, I will further comment with respect to that.

I think this was the finest example of cooperative action among those interested in public land problems in the United States that I have seen in the 13 years that I have been in the Congress. This organization and all of the others that took part have a right not only to be proud of what they accomplished in getting it passed but they also can be proud of the unusual cooperation among the various users of the great public land area that they secured in getting it done.

I refer next to the defeat of the Echo Park Dam by deletion from the upper Colorado River project. This, of course, was a major victory for conservation; it did not occur because you convinced any of the sponsors of the bill that they ought to take it out of there on its merits. It occurred because they were convinced that they could not pass the legislation through the House of Representatives unless it were deleted. That bill passed the Senate Interior Committee by a vote of 11 to 1 with Echo Park in it. Then it passed the United States Senate by a vote of 58 to 23, better than 2 to 1, with Echo Park in it. But then what happened?

This is an interesting commentary as to how things are done legislatively. I walked up to one of my friends from Ohio one day and said, "Are you going to vote for the upper Colorado Basin project?" He said, "No; I cannot do it." I said, "Why can't you do it?" He said, "Because I have a stack of letters from the various conservation groups in my district and I cannot spend all of this next summer explaining to them why I voted for that bill."

It simply boiled down to this: He had no particular interest in the legislation—the project was not in his district—he was not going to gain anything by it for his district or his people; but if he voted for it he suffered a very definite detrimental effect in his area by having to go out and explain to all of the conservation groups why he did it. There were just enough people like that in the House of Representatives so that they could not pass the legislation with Echo Park in it and so it was taken out.

It is to the lasting credit, in my opinion, of those represented here and of the other conservation groups throughout the country, that after Echo Park Dam was taken out and language protecting the national parks was inserted, that these organizations withdrew their opposition.

That was clearly stated on the floor of the House the other day.

Why is it that conservation groups can show such significant power in one instance and then seem to completely spin their wheels in getting action in other instances?

The matter of the Pittman-Robertson funds is simply a lesson that we should not leave money lying around in Washington. We are lucky indeed that we got it in time and that somebody did not lay hands on it and make a distribution of it in other directions. We will not let so many years go by again, I hope, in letting that money pile up.

Now, I think that the conservation groups learned something about their strength in the preceding session of Congress. They have some solid accomplishments to talk about and in which they can certainly take real pride. This session that strength should be consolidated and put into affirmative action.

What do we have coming up in this session? We have legislation relating to funds for recreation in the national forests. Let me give you the history of that legislation going back for 6 years.

We had a Congressman from Arkansas who first introduced that legislation. That was in the 81st Congress, 6 years ago. It was called the Tackett bill and didn't pass. Then it was called the Baker bill and that bill died. Now we have a number of similar bills pending by METCALF and others. We realize the need for that legislation with 45 million recreational visits to the national forests in this land, an acceleration of 2 and 3 times since the end of the last war. We know that the budget for the Forest Service has been inadequate for recreational purposes even though it has been increased in the past several years from $611,000 to $1.6 million in the budget of 1956.

We have a Mission 66 for the Park Service and I am sure that you people are familiar with that, too, if not with all of the details, at least with the general concept and objectives of that legislation.

Why is it that conservation organizations that can defeat the Echo Park Dam legislation and cause amendment to the 1872 mining law cannot move a simple bill calling for earmarking of a percentage of funds, not to exceed $5½ million for forest revenues for recreation?

I think that it is because we have failed to realize what the legislative difficulties are.

For instance, the Appropriations Committee sits there and says, "We don't like this business of earmarking funds for we then do not have any control over them." The members on the Agricultural Committee have also said that they are opposed to doing it. In addition, recreation is hard to sell in Washington. When we were running a thirty-five to forty million-dollar military budget, people thought that they had better get some of this money into the Treasury rather than putting it in recreation. Recreation is a hard program to sell. It is hard to sell to some of these hard-fisted Congressmen who are worrying about the budget and about taxes.

We need some self-help provisions (as I call them) in this legislation. I think that we have got to do two things—first, we have to get around the opposition of the Appropriations Committee and, second, then we have to put in some self help insofar as the national forest users are concerned. If we get those two things put in the bill, then we might begin to move forward. My bill in this respect says that the money shall be earmarked but shall be appropriated each year by the Appropriations Committee. That is not quite as good as just slicing it off in a direct appropriation but it is going a half step. Our experience has been—and this legislation is drafted on the basis of similar legislation for the improving of grazing for I almost took the language right out of the statute and applied it to this situation—that if we ever get an earmarking of funds we are well on the way to getting them.

The history has been that money comes along because the earmarking acts as a mandate to the Appropriations Committee.

I think that we are going to have great difficulty in the self-help field with those provisions which would require a general license for the use of recreational areas in the national forests by all the users. That is something that is hard to administer in the first place and it is also going to get tremendous opposition, I think, from some of the sportsmen's groups.

I had a gimmick out in my area that the Forest Service will not go for but which is a good one. They issue the campfire permits and I said, "Why not charge a dollar for those?" The Forest Service said that they do not issue the permits in all of the States. I said, "So what? Forty percent of the visitations in the national forests occur in the three Western States and if we get that money in and earmark it for recreational activities, at least it will help." Those are just suggestions and there may be other ways of doing it, but in any case provision must be written which will require some user participation in the costs of recreation; that is what I call self-help.

With the Water Pollution Control Act expiring this year, we are going to have to get something done on that. The time is coming very soon when we won't have any game fish in the major streams in this country unless we stop the pollution of those streams. Mr. BLATNIK has that legislation. It is good legislation, and I feel sure that it will get through in some form before the present law expires. I am not so sure that he will get his hundred million annually for construction grants, but he will get something fairly close to it.

Now, in hurrying along I want to talk to you about another subject that will be before you and on which legislation has not as yet been drafted—that is the matter of military reservations on public lands. We have found out that military establishments are stepping out, especially in the Western States, and blocking out huge portions of our country for military uses and in some instances as special hunting preserves.

The Defense Department agencies have withdrawn lands which in total area exceed the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware combined. If the withdrawals of the Corps of Engineers are added, then the total acreage of the State of Connecticut could be added to that. If the present applications of defense agencies are approved, there will be added to the list of lands permanently withdrawn from multiple use and development an area totaling in size the States of New Jersey, Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia. Therefore, if they keep what they now have and what they have applied for, they would have an area equivalent to a strip of land 14 miles wide from New York to San Francisco. I told them that if they couldn't hit that kind of a strip with their bombers, then I don't know how we were going to win any war.

We undertook to find out what kind of an operation we were up against with reference to these military withdrawals and here is what we learned:

We found out that a defense agency, by writing an application, simply by the stroke of the pen, can reserve various areas of lands in the western part of the United States out of the public domain area and that there is no other agency in the Government that has the power or the ability to pass upon the necessity for that military use. The Interior Department appeared before our committee and said they were in no position to weigh the question of military necessity. They said that they simply had to take the word of the Army, Navy, or Air Force for it.

In the hearings we pressed the defense agencies on multiple uses of the withdrawn areas. The Navy in particular began to concede concession after concession. In the beginning they claimed they needed the land forever and no one else could use it.

Now, what they have conceded to date is that withdrawal will not be necessary for longer than 10 years and that the reservations sought are really just for the use of airspace above the land and that grazing could continue on a 12-month basis. They would let the cattle in. If a cow gets killed they can pay for her. They will also allow special periods for spring and fall roundups, when the stockmen themselves can go in. They agree that established seasons for hunting and fishing can be observed under State laws; that game counts and related measures for game conservation can be carried out by responsible State officials in the area; that substantial mining operations can be continued; and that the area can be opened for recreation and prospecting purposes during the weekends.

The result of all this is that by this kind of investigation we have established the basis for multiple use of these defense areas even when they are taken over for defense purposes.

However, in my mind, that does not go to the real root of the problem and we are going to have to do something further. For that reason I am having legislation drafted which will do three things, and when it is drafted I am going to submit it to many of the leaders who are here at this meeting tonight.

The first thing that this legislation will provide is that when public land is taken over by an executive agency under a withdrawal and then thereafter becomes surplus, the land will be returned to the department from which it was taken so that it can again become a part of the public domain. Most people do not know that after they take over these areas and then declare them surplus, the property then goes to the General Services Administration and is put up for sale. I say that this is a fine way to break up the public land areas of this country and it can also be the basis for some high and mighty finagling with reference to taking over valuable pieces of the public land areas of our country. We are going to stop that.

Secondly, the measure will provide that no land can be withdrawn from public domain status by any department or executive agency without approval of the Congress unless the area involved is 5,000 acres or less. The purpose of that provision will be to return and restore control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States.

As a third item, this legislation will require that whenever public land areas are taken over for these special purposes, such as the Navy, Army, or for Air Force use, that publication in the Federal Register will be required to set for the other multiple uses that can be made of it, such as grazing, mining, lumbering, sports activities, recreation, and at what times and under what condition. The purpose of this provision is to require of the executive agencies, where they show a clear need in the public interest for a part of the public domain, that there be a sharing in use when such can occur consistently with the limited use for which the property is taken.

When we draft and pass that legislation I think that we will be a long way toward the settlement of some of these problems.

We are also doing something in connection with the protection of wildlife refuges. No sale or disposition of such lands should be made without the consent of Congress. We want to earmark a portion of the duck stamp funds in order to be sure that that money is used for the acquisition of additional refuges as was intended when the duck hunters supported the duck stamp tax.

Legislation has been drafted for a national wilderness preservation system. I have had an opportunity to examine the legislation in draft form and it will be introduced in one form or another. I am impressed with the importance of that because of a trip I made into the high Sierras this last fall. Even upon the very top of the Sierras there were jeep tracks. The jeep is opening up all of the areas of the public lands, national forests and otherwise, and unless some action is taken we are not going to have for very long a true wilderness area left in this country.

All of this legislation which I mentioned will operate in the same direction. The objective is the limiting of executive control over the public land areas of the Nation and placing the control of those areas more directly in the Congress of the United States. If we say that an area cannot be reserved for military purposes without the consent of Congress, or you say a refuge cannot be sold without consent of Congress, or that wilderness areas once established cannot be changed, abolished or reduced without the consent of Congress, then to that extent we have limited the authority and action of the executive agencies, and placed that discretion in the Congress.

Now, the problem is how far can we go in returning the control and restoring the control of the public lands to the Congress of the United States without destroying or improperly limiting executive freedom of action with reference to the administration of those lands in the public interest. We need a proper balance and in order to determine what that is we are going to have to, in the next few years, reevaluate the whole question of public land use. I am in hopes that some day we can write another piece of legislation which has been in my mind for a good long time which will set up the procedures for establishing the priorities of use of these public land areas for water conservation, recreation, lumbering, grazing, mining and whatever other uses may be made.

I have often said to my conservation friends that in my opinion they spend too much of their time in winning negative victories. I believe it is much more important to have an affirmative program that encompasses all of these things they seek to protect in negative victories. I would like to go one step further and say that I would like to see the conservationists tackle a real affirmative program such as set forth in the bills I have discussed and use your new found strength and unity in putting that affirmative program through Congress.

I would like to say to you, in connection with the 5 or 6 pieces of legislation that I have mentioned, that I hope that this great organization will undertake to follow through and help us in implementing these programs; that you will undertake to study the problems, to aid in drafting, introducing and supporting legislation which is designed to carry out those programs, and that you will continue to maintain an active and vigorous liaison with the other interested groups of all kinds. I hope that you will develop closer and more friendly relationships with the larger mining organizations, the livestock organizations, lumber organizations and water utilization groups with whom such excellent cooperation occurred last year on the multiple use mining bill.

I would like to take this occasion to again thank you for the opportunity of being here and to say to you that I am sure that we are in a position to move forward more constructively, more actively and more aggressively than we have ever done before in the field of conservation with the kind of leadership represented here and with the growing unity, strength and legislative know-how of this and other conservation organizations.

World Trade: Highway to World Peace and Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today, with pride and high hopes, introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held at the New York City Coliseum from April 14 to April 27, 1957. The personal satisfaction and pleasure I have in offering this resolution is twofold: I am honored to take this small part in the World Trade Fair for it is a step toward better international understanding, economic advancement and good will; and because the New York Coliseum is part of a vast new development in my district on Manhattan's West Side. From the Coliseum at 58th Street, north to the Lincoln Square dramatic arts center, we are witnessing a vast rebuilding and redevelopment of a too long neglected area. As a result, the entire West Side is being revitalized. The city of New York, the State, and the Nation will benefit immeasurably.

The United States World Trade Fair will bolster and encourage the economies of our friends throughout the world.

The fair will be one of the first of important events to be held in the Coliseum, and rightly so. It will be the most comprehensive of its kind ever to be held in the United States. Foreign nations will be given an opportunity to exhibit

their products together under one roof, to offer them for sale to the buyers from all of North and South America at our principal port and the hub of our merchandising and marketing industry: New York City.

The well-being of all of us depends upon the ability of each to produce products, goods or services which others need. Without trade we wither and die.

At the close of World War II we recognized this and in an effort to restore the devastated lands we established the Truman and Marshall plans. Point 4 aid enabled millions of people throughout the world to start rebuilding. It is now as it has always been, the policy of the United States to assist others to achieve greater prosperity for themselves through freedom and trade. This is a continuing policy. The dole, the handout is no part of it. Necessity has at times required such measures, both at home and abroad, but it is a well-known fact of life that a policy based on handouts is bankrupt and debilitating; the giver does not like it; the receiver detests it and in time comes to despise the benefactor. We all know this truth.

It is the same in international life as it is in family life. The brother-in-law who needs and gets monetary assistance to overcome temporary financial difficulties does not resent the help at first. But as it goes on, if he continues to accept a weekly gift, he begins to lose self-confidence and self-respect. The giver meanwhile deplores the lack of initiative he sees. How much better it is to help him find a job so that he might earn his own way. Then the formerly dependent in-law becomes a productive, happy, and proud member of the family.

The United States World Trade Fair presents a unique opportunity. At the Coliseum businessmen of all nations will assemble in the most modern exhibition hall in the world. Each will demonstrate what he produces and offer it for sale, proving again what we all know: Every dollar earned in trade is worth hundreds in aid.

The cold war is now being waged in the economic arena. I stressed this fact last June when we considered the foreign-aid bill. Russia has for the time forsaken bluster and force. Now she resorts to guile and economic penetration.

Russia is in reality trying to play our game. Let them play, for we will triumph. By a positive, continuing program in keeping with our historic aims, we can and shall help others to help themselves and to eliminate want and fear, disease and hunger, war and poverty.

The United States World Trade Fair is a tangible demonstration of our desire to work with and help peoples in all nations, through free and competitive enterprise. World trade, the mutual exchange in an international market place of goods and services, of arts, crafts, cultural and scientific ideas and advances is the high road to world peace and world prosperity. No greater goal can be desired. This is our aim.

On the other hand, pure or preponderantly military alliances, as history has demonstrated time and again, are highly perishable.

Economic ties are ties of strength and solidarity when based upon an awareness of common goals and common hopes and will result in the creation throughout the free world of indestructible alliances, freely and openly made, desired by all and impervious to Communist threats or guile.

Let us then join together, here and with our friends abroad, to stride forward with determination, and with hope and strength, confident in the knowledge that through efforts such as this trade fair, part of a continuing, morally forceful and responsible program of international trade, we shall as partners in the free world achieve that ultimate goal: peace, prosperity, and freedom.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, Thou hast summoned the few among the many to serve in this forum of democracy when millions in awaking nations are halting between two opinions. We are keenly conscious that this is an age on ages telling, when the forces of darkness and the armies of light are locked in contest for the bodies and souls of men. Save us, we pray Thee, from panic and despair in a decisive day when the bright prospects of peace and freedom are challenged and seemingly dimmed by malignant forces of destruction. As the battle rages may we be strong and of good courage, enabled by Thy grace to live as well as to defend the truth that alone can make all men free:

"Our strength is dust and ashes, our years a passing hour;
We pray Thee, use our weakness to magnify Thy power."

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 11, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Subcommittee on Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON BILL TO ENCOURAGE THE MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT OF LOW-COST ELECTRIC ENERGY FROM ALL SOURCES, INCLUDING SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I desire to give notice that public hearings will be held on S. 2643 from April 17 to April 20 in committee room G–16 of the Capitol.

This bill seeks to encourage the maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources, including special nuclear material, through amendments to the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Any persons who are interested in testifying are invited to do so, and should so advise the clerk of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General; and

Two hundred and seventeen postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sudan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herman H. Druebert, to be an ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James C. Sainsbury to be an ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am happy the Senate has taken prompt action on the Executive Calendar, as it has this morning, and as it consistently has done during this administration.

I was pleased to make the acquaintance of Mr. James Durfee, of Wisconsin, the nominee for the Civil Aeronautics Board, whom I met only yesterday. He impressed me as being an able and conscientious public servant, and I am glad the Senate has promptly acted to confirm his nomination, because there is no agency of Government that has more important work to do than has this fine Board.

Mr. President, I now ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I request that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and that he be assigned to the Committee on Public Works, to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. President, the assignment of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] to the Public Works Committee is one in which all of us will take particular pleasure.

W. KERR SCOTT is one of the newest Members of the Senate, but already he has established himself in the affections and in the esteem of his colleagues. He is forthright, hard working, diligent, attentive to his duties, and responsive to his obligations and responsibilities.

On the Public Works Committee, he will be backed by a knowledge and an experience that will be excellent for the committee, and productive of good for the Nation. He has displayed a deep interest in the subject matter of the committee's jurisdiction.

This assignment has the unanimous approval of the Senate majority steering committee, and I predict it will have the approval of all who are interested in the vital work of the Public Works Committee.

North Carolina has sent many distinguished Members to this body. Senator SCOTT—like his able senior colleague—walks in their tradition.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas.

The request was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Democratic steering committee, I ask that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] be named to the existing vacancy on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas.

The request was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the appointment of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was approved by the Senate majority steering committee earlier today. The recommendation was based upon his past experience, and upon the qualifications he has demonstrated already, even though his service has been brief.

Mr. President, during the past few years, the majority has operated on the premise that every Senator—regardless of his seniority—should have at least one major committee. This policy has resulted in uncovering talent that otherwise would not have become readily apparent.

We have tried to combine the experience of seniority and the enthusiasm of the youthful Members. The result, I think, has been of benefit to the whole Nation.

The junior Senator from West Virginia is in this pattern. All of us who know him are confident that he will serve with distinction, and will contribute work and thought that is substantial to the committee's deliberations.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by a convention of the southern region of the California Junior Statesmen of America at El Monte, Calif., relating to subscription television, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

BOOKER T. WASHINGTON—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD House Resolution 40, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan. The resolution was submitted by two distinguished members of the Legislature of Michigan, commemorating the birthday of Booker T. Washington.

Under the rule, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 40

Resolution relative to the centennial of the birth of Booker T. Washington

Whereas on April 5, 1856, just 100 years ago tomorrow, there was born to slave parents in a hut on a farm in the State of Virginia a son, then destined to lifelong drudgery in slavery, with education denied to him by law; and

Whereas when that boy, Booker T. Washington, was 9 years old he was emancipated by the triumph of Lincoln's armies and opportunity in life began to beckon the freed boy; and

Whereas that Booker T. Washington grew to be a great educator, a gifted leader of his race, then started on the great highway to fullness of life and an inspiration to those who struggle to success despite tremendous handicaps, overcoming high racial barriers with great benefit to the Nation; and

Whereas, well signalizing the 100th anniversary of that slave boy who came to lead a people and bless a Nation, the United States Congress, by unanimous action in each House, has just sent to the President the bill creating the Booker T. Washington National Monument, comprised of the old plantation where he was born; and

Whereas the State of Virginia by appropriation completed the purchase of the lands of the old home and birthplace, thus giving full recognition of worth, even though in a black skin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this House commends the unanimous recognition by the Congress of this great educator and national leader a century after his slave birth in surroundings of ignorance, and cherishes the hope that the coming century may well obliterate the racial prejudices which tend to handicap the fullest development of our people and their fullest usefulness to the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each House of Congress, to the secretary of state of Virginia, and to the Director of the National Park Service.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3618. A bill for the relief of Jan Mroz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3619. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. IVES):

S. 3620. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 3621. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with reference to the utilization of special nuclear material, atomic energy, and radioactive material by nonprofit eleemosynary or charitable institutions; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kenna Moore (nee McCarthy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER (for himself and Mr. DWORSHAK):

S. 3623. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3624. A bill for the relief of Matsue Harada;

S. 3625. A bill for the relief of Po-ling Liu, his wife, Hsin-cheng Liu, and their minor child, George Yu-teh Liu;

S. 3626. A bill for the relief of Chih Yee Wu, also known as Jerry Wu; and

S. 3627. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Therese Lynch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3628. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain seven units of the Greater Wanatchee Division, Chief Joseph Project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3629. A bill to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to leasehold and construction loans which may be made by national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3630. A bill for the purpose of constructing at the Dunseith, N. Dak., port of entry Federal facilities for the Bureau of Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3631. A bill to amend the Mining Claims Rights Restoration Act of 1955, to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for reclamation reservoir sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (by request):

S. 3632. A bill for the relief of Reas H. Nesrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3633. A bill for the relief of H. G. Purvis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3634. A bill to authorize hospitalization and medical treatment for persons who have served as acting assistant or contract surgeons or contract dental surgeons; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXPANSION OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senators from New York [Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. IVES], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement in explanation of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3620) to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON BILL TO EXPAND TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

There is a great shortage of persons trained to work as teachers of the mentally retarded in both public and private day and residential schools, to supervise in State and local school systems, to serve as administrators, to conduct college and university programs for the preparation of more professional workers, and to do the basic research which is required for real progress in providing appropriate education and training of the mentally retarded.

A mentally retarded person may be defined as one who is deficient in his ability to learn, due to either organic or nonorganic causes. The range of deficiency is great, varying from very mild retardation to very severe. Unfortunately, it is not possible to indicate precisely how many retarded persons there are in the United States. Refinement of the figures is dependent upon further factfinding and more basic research in this neglected field, which constitutes an extensive health, education, and welfare problem. It is estimated that there are some 4 million mentally retarded persons, of whom about 1,500,000 are children. Estimates range from 1½ to 5 percent of the children up to 18 years, with 3 percent being the generally accepted and most nearly verified figure. Of the 1,500,000 children, only about 125,000 are in school, public and private.

Approximately 150,000 mentally retarded children and adults have been placed in institutions. The estimated cost of such institutional care is $50,000 per individual for the lifetime of the severely retarded who are institutionalized.

If all 150,000 of those in institutions were assumed to be school-age children, this would still give a total of only 275,000 currently provided for. Undoubtedly there are among those not receiving education or training many children too severely retarded to be able to profit from it. If the number of those beyond the help of educational programs is estimated at 225,000 and if this number is added to the 275,000 currently being provided for, the total is 500,000. This still leaves perhaps as many as 1 million retarded children who are not now being provided for.

It has been estimated that between 75,000 and 100,000 mentally retarded children are born each year. Even though mental retardation from genetic or hereditary causes is not increasing in proportion to the general population, there is evidence to indicate that the percentage of retardates will increase in relation to the total population. This increase is chiefly the result of improved medical techniques through which the lives of many brain-injured children are saved and the lives of others prolonged. With lower rates of infant mortality and the continuing increase in the expected life span, there will be a resultant increase in the number of retarded children for whom education and training must be provided until the hoped-for day when medical science finds ways to prevent or further alleviate mental retardation.

The schools throughout the Nation are being faced by a steadily increasing volume of urgent requests by parents that specialized attention be provided for mentally retarded children. Special legislation providing funds for the education of the mentally retarded has been enacted in a number of States, in addition to local provisions, in recent years and a number of other jurisdictions are currently considering such enactments. However, the serious nationwide shortage of supervisors of education of the mentally retarded, and the shortage of persons prepared to train teachers of the mentally retarded, indicate clearly that Federal assistance and leadership are necessary if this problem is to be met effectively and with dispatch.

One of the most pressing personnel needs is for teachers who will work directly with mentally retarded children in both public and private schools. At present there is a total of 10,000 teachers employed in such positions. This represents less than 1 percent of all public-school teachers in the country. However, to provide for 1 million retarded children would require approximately 65,000 teachers. (In actual practice there may be from 8 to 20 pupils per teacher, but this estimate is based on a ratio of 15 children to 1 teacher.) If the 10,000 teachers currently employed are subtracted from the estimated need of 65,000, there still remains a shortage of 55,000 teachers to provide education and/or training for mentally retarded children.

In this country there are approximately 141 universities, 732 liberal-arts colleges, and 192 teachers' colleges. However, in 1954 there were only 40 institutions of higher education which reported a sequence of courses on any level for the preparation of teachers of the mentally retarded, and of these only 18 institutions reported students on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The average numbers of students specializing in mental retardation in these institutions was 17 on the undergraduate level and 15 on the graduate level. In the 2 institutions reporting the largest numbers of undergraduate students the ratio of regular faculty members to students was 2 to 60 and 1 to 55. In the 2 institutions reporting the largest numbers of graduate students the ratio was 1 faculty member to 45 students and 1 faculty member (responsible for all areas of exceptionality) to 40 students. Although no direct comparisons can be made, 1 faculty member to 15 students on the undergraduate level and 1 faculty member to 10 students on the graduate level is more nearly typical practice.

Some indication of the quantity as well as the quality of personnel available in a given area of specialization in indicated by the setting up of State certification requirements for teachers. In 1954 more than half the States did not have any such requirements for teachers of the mentally retarded. There were only 21 States which did have

them. Among these 21 States requiring certification there were only 15 which also had institutions of higher education offering teacher training in mental retardation, leaving 6 States which had set up the certification requirements but which did not have teacher-training programs available within their boundaries. Among the 27 States not having special certification requirements for teachers of the mentally retarded in 1954, there were only 3 which had institutions of higher education offering special teacher-training programs in this area.

There are eight States in which no one is employed by the State Department of Education specifically for work either in the broader area of special education (which includes all types of exceptional children) or more specifically in the area of mental retardation. Among the remaining States which do employ someone in either or both of these areas, there are nine reporting vacancies at this time which cannot be filled because there are no qualified personnel available.

Support is urgently needed on the graduate level in order to provide the desired degree of specialization in mental retardation which will qualify individuals to fill supervisory and administrative positions in State programs, to fill positions as faculty members in institutions of higher education, and to engage in research on the basic problems of mental retardation. The vacancies existing in State education departments, the unfavorable ratio of faculty members to students specializing in mental retardation, and the dearth of reliable research findings in this area all serve to emphasize the need for graduate programs.

The need for support is important also at the undergraduate level. The undergraduate programs must be the major source of supply for the 55,000 teachers needed in the educational institutions throughout the country in order to provide for mentally retarded children who are able to benefit from attendance in special classes in public and private schools. In addition, the undergraduate programs must also provide the source of supply from which promising graduate students may be drawn for more advanced training. The present shortage of persons with adequate undergraduate training including a major in mental retardation makes it extremely difficult to recruit any substantial number of master's and doctoral candidates who can qualify for admission in the leading graduate schools without additional preparation.

Deep concern for all the problems of the mentally retarded is shown throughout many of the organizational units which make up the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Services for the mentally retarded are provided by the Social Security Administration, chiefly in the Children's Bureau with its programs of maternal and child health and of child welfare, and in the Bureau of Public Assistance; by the Public Health Service, primarily in the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness; by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in a wide range of services focused toward help for the handicapped in all categories; and by the Office of Education in its services to State educational agencies pertaining to educational programs for mentally retarded children and youth, in its program for research in the education of the mentally retarded, and its support of training programs for those desiring to specialize in the education of the mentally retarded.

This program is coordinated by the Departmental Committee on Exceptional Children which, through its wide representation, is aware of the many pressing needs of mentally retarded children. One vital answer to several of these needs is to be found in programs of education and training which will permit these children to achieve their own maximums of development according to their own capacities. It is the purpose of the proposed legislation to aid in training enough teachers, supervisors, administrators, and researchers to provide more and better programs of education and training for the retarded children who are now denied these benefits.

The enactment of this legislation is an important part of a program which it is firmly believed will insure substantial progress toward achieving the following objectives:

(a) Reducing the number of the mentally retarded who need and require institutional care.

(b) Reducing the degree of dependency of the mentally retarded who live at home.

(c) Makng mentally retarded dependents more nearly self-supporting.

(d) Reducing, by grouping the mentally retarded into special classes for special instruction, the disproportionate amount of time and attention which the mentally retarded inevitably require in the average classroom.

(e) Increasing the significance of life for mentally retarded children.

(f) Bringing added satisfaction to those families of which mentally retarded children are a part.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO USE OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL BY NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with reference to the utilization of special nuclear material, atomic energy, and radioactive material by nonprofit eleemosynary or charitable institutions.

This bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts with universities and colleges and hospitals to assist financially in the construction and operation of reactors and other facilities either for training, for research and development, for the generation of usable energy, or for medical therapy.

The bill specifically permits the institutions, themselves, to use the power produced by such reactors.

Mr. President, this bill performs the necessary function of clarifying the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts of this type. During the recent hearings on the peaceful uses of atomic energy members of the Commission expressed doubt that existing law gives them this authority.

I propose to take out of the realm of doubt the intention of Congress that educational institutions and hospitals should be encouraged by AEC assistance to step up the rate of training nuclear scientists and technicians. This bill amounts to a directive from Congress to the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with such a program.

While there are many educational institutions presently participating in the Nation's atomic energy program, there are a great many more which desire to participate or to participate more fully, but find themselves financially unable to do so.

The University of Washington in my own State is a case in point. The university is about to spend at least $1 million to build an addition to the present steam powerplant for campus heating and electricity. However, this project involves conventional design, either coal or oil-fired.

The university has advised the Atomic Energy Commission that if the Commission would like to have the university construct and operate a nuclear powerplant in place of a conventional-type plant, the university is willing to forego present plans and cooperate with the Commission, providing the Commission underwrite the additional cost involved.

I have been advised by Harold E. Wessman, dean of the College of Engineering at the University of Washington, this is not the only university so situated. A number of State universities are faced with a similar need of expanding and modernizing their campus powerplants. These schools are not in the position to underwrite the additional cost of nuclear power over and above that of a conventional-type steam plant. However, with Atomic Energy Commission assistance they could build reactors that not only would provide the power they need, but also which would provide a new nuclear training facility.

I want to be sure the Commission has authority to enter into contracts of this type, since a major need of our country at this time is for many more nuclear scientists. This need recently has been dramatized by the Library of Congress manpower report prepared for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and by the appointment of the President's Commission on Scientific Manpower; public attention again will be focused on this need next week when Congressman PRICE's Subcommittee on Research and Development, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, begins its hearings on the shortage of scientists.

The bill I have introduced is a step toward increasing the number and quality of our scientists, a step in developing peaceful nuclear power, and a step toward greater understanding of the atom.

I hope the Senate will respond to our nuclear needs by passage of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3621) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with reference to the utilization of special nuclear material, atomic energy, and radioactive material by nonprofit eleemosynary or charitable institutions, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H. G. PURVIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, H. G. Purvis, a resident of my State, was formerly in the employ of a very substantial corporation doing business in the State of Oregon. Mr. Purvis performed the services of an accountant for the corporation, and in that capacity was familiar with transactions that related to the company's income-tax obligations to the Federal Government.

During the course of his employment Mr. Purvis became convinced that the corporation was not paying the Federal Government the full amount due under the internal revenue laws. He resigned

his position with the corporation, reported the alleged corporate income-tax shortages to Internal Revenue officials, and as the result of his disclosures the Bureau of Internal Revenue recovered delinquent taxes from the corporation. Mr. Purvis is convinced that the amount recovered totaled more than $1 million in taxes, penalties, and interest.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code authorizing payments by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for information leading to the recovery of unpaid Federal taxes, Mr. Purvis filed a claim for reward in the sum of $150,000, plus 50 percent of any penalties assessed. The Bureau of Internal Revenue tendered him a check in the amount of $1,250 in full settlement of his claim. Under the circumstances, Mr. Purvis feels that the tender is grossly inadequate.

I have studied this case very thoroughly and have communicated with the Internal Revenue Service and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, and I am convinced that a larger amount should have been paid to Mr. Purvis for his services. The difficulty in arriving at a conclusion in this case centers around the fact that the Internal Revenue Service takes the position that the law does not permit disclosures of the amount that was actually recovered from the corporation as the result of information supplied by Mr. Purvis. However, it is quite obvious that if the Government in fact recovered a million dollars, or even half or a quarter of that amount, Mr. Purvis has not received a fair and just reward for the valuable service he has rendered to the Federal Government.

In fairness to Mr. Purvis, I feel that a committee of the Senate should check into this case very carefully. Accordingly, Mr. President, in order that we may ascertain the facts, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mr. H. G. Purvis. If the facts are as Mr. Purvis alleges, I am sure the committee will report a bill that provides just compensation for this individual. On the other hand, if the committee concludes that Mr. Purvis' claim for a sum in excess of $1,250 cannot be justified, at least we will have the satisfaction of knowing that the Government has been fair in its dealings with him.

The principle in this case is extremely important. On the one hand, we have the policy of the Government expressed in a statute which authorizes the payment of rewards for information leading to the recovery of unpaid tax moneys. On the other hand, we have enormous risks assumed by individuals who supply information pursuant to the Federal statute. To illustrate what I mean I have only to refer to the fact that as the result of the public service performed by Mr. Purvis in this case, he has been unable to find comparable employment in his profession and has lost several years income. Unless the Government scrupulously observes rules of fair play in these cases and indulges in reasonable presumptions in favor of individuals supplying information to the Internal Revenue Service in cases of tax delinquencies, we are likely to find extreme reluctance on the part of the people who possess tax information that could be of great help to their Government.

I trust that the committee to which this bill is referred will go into this matter very thoroughly. I urge the committee's prompt and sympathetic consideration of the bill which I have just introduced.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3633) for the relief of H. G. Purvis, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to H. G. Purvis, of Portland, Oreg., the sum of $100,000. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for information furnished by him to the Bureau of Internal Revenue (now the Internal Revenue Service), in connection with a case involving incorrect tax returns filed by a corporation in Portland, Oreg., for the years 1941 to 1947, inclusive, such information having substantially assisted the Internal Revenue Service to collect from such corporation a large sum in Federal taxes.

(b) The amount authorized to be paid by subsection (a) of this act shall be reduced by any amount heretofore paid the said H. G. Purvis for the information described in such subsection, and shall be paid out of any funds appropriated for rewarding persons who submit information concerning violations of the internal-revenue laws: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OR SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BEALL submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE—RECOMMITTAL OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Order No. 1, Senate Resolution 17, to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have checked the matter with the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him before Shrine Club of La Crosse, Wis., on April 6, 1956.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the information of the Senate. When we conclude action on the unfinished business, Calendar 1193, Senate Concurrent Resolution 36, requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House, I should like to have the Senate be on notice of the possibility of considering Calendar 1184, Senate Joint Resolution 97, to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor; Calendar 1628, Senate bill 3340, to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State; Calendar No. 1745, House bill 4909, relative to consolidation of the National Tax Association; and Calendar 1746, House bill 10004, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Calendar 1746, House bill 10004, is a very important appropriation bill. The reports on it are available for study by all Members of the Senate. Under the rule, the bill would not normally come up until next week. However, if it is the pleasure of the Senate to have the bill brought up this week, it could be scheduled for consideration on tomorrow or Saturday. I am continuing negotiations with the distinguished minority leader and with all other Senators who are interested in this appropriation bill, and I desire to have all Members of the Senate be on notice that the bill has been reported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee, and that so far as I know, there is no great controversy regarding the bill.

Let me ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whether he expects any controversy or floor fight on that supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; apparently everything is peaceful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Let me inquire whether the distinguished ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee so understands.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I believe so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, we are hopeful that we shall be able to clean up the calendar.

I also include in this announcement Calendar 1747, Senate bill 3481, to amend

the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes. We should like to have that bill considered.

That concludes the measures which have been cleared up to the present time, Mr. President.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Texas whether I correctly understood him to say there will be a session on Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, Mr. President; we have no such plan, and we hope to avoid a Saturday session. If it is possible for us to pass the supplemental appropriation bill on tomorrow, Friday, we should like to do that. It may be that, instead, we shall take up the bill on Monday, and thus preclude any possibility of a Saturday session, and make it possible for Senators who, during the week, have made engagements to speak on Saturday, to fulfill those engagements. I think we are away ahead of schedule, anyway.

At any rate, I am hopeful that I shall be able to work out some problems which exist on my side of the aisle, and that the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] will be able to work out some problems which exist on his side of the aisle, so that we shall be able to take up the supplemental appropriation bill on Friday, and pass it on that day. If that is done, of course, we shall not have to have a Saturday session.

APPLICATION OF NORTHEAST AIRLINES FOR ROUTE TO FLORIDA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an initial examiner's decision has just been announced in the so-called New York-Florida proceeding, which has been pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board for the past 19 months. On the day before yesterday, the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, made some remarks which were very pertinent to this subject, and I desire to compliment him upon them.

This morning, a meeting of the Senators, of both political parties, from the six New England States was held, and at the meeting this subject was discussed as a matter of grave concern to all of us.

In the proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Board has the responsibility of determining which one of several scheduled airlines should be permitted to share in the lucrative route, extending north and south along the Atlantic coast, which is now occupied exclusively by two large airlines. It is conceded that the increase in traffic along this route warrants participation by a third carrier, and, in this case, as is so often true under our system of free enterprise, it clearly is in the best interest of the traveling public that a third airline be permitted to compete.

One of the soundest and most deserving applicants in this case is Northeast Airlines, the smallest of the 13 original trunklines in the Nation, but one which has given excellent service to New England for the past 23 years. Many of the original pioneer airlines have been permitted to grow with the increase in air traffic, and to extend their routes in such manner as to become profitable enterprises. Such is not the case with Northeast. This airline has been forced to struggle along with a short-haul route structure which makes profitable operation an absolute impossibility. As a matter of fact, without the help of Government subsidy, it is doubtful if Northeast Airlines could operate at all. It is a matter of grave concern to me that northern New England may be faced with the possible loss of scheduled air service. In my own State of New Hampshire, the loss of commercial air transport would strike a severe blow to the development of small diversified industry, as well as to the recreation business which is so important to our economy. Northeast Airlines has conscientiously given New Hampshire, as well as other New England States, dependable and convenient air service, even on routes which have proven to be uneconomical. We cannot afford to lose this service.

In addition to the economic liabilities imposed by these short-haul routes, Northeast is faced with the handicap of operating under the most difficult seasonal conditions of any scheduled airline. During the summer months, there is extremely heavy traffic into the recreational areas of northern New England, and Northeast has done a commendable job in meeting the demands of these peak months. In the winter, however, there is a much lower volume of vacation traffic, and the situation is complicated further by the greater frequency of adverse flying conditions. In brief, the combination of short-haul routes and seasonal fluctuations in traffic and weather conditions makes it literally impossible for Northeast to operate at a profit.

It is well known throughout the airline industry that a carrier must have the revenues of one or more long-haul routes, if it is to avoid operating at a loss. This is an economic fact of life which long has been recognized by the Civil Aeronautics Board itself.

In 1951, Northeast Airlines made application to extend its route from New York to Washington and then to three points in Florida. Northeast made this application in good faith. As an established scheduled airline of proven capabilities, it was believed that Northeast could supply the type of competitive service which is required to handle the increased traffic between New York and Florida. It was believed also that the public interest demands one-carrier service from New England to points in the South. Finally, it was believed that Northeast, with its trained organization, could engage in successful competition for this traffic; and I, for one, still think so.

Successful competition on the part of Northeast Airlines would not only remove the possibility that New England might lose the fine service which Northeast has provided for many years, but it would also mean that Northeast would be in a position to enlarge and improve that service. It most certainly is in the interest, not only of New England alone, but of the entire country, that every reasonable and legitimate effort be made to improve and stabilize air service to and from the northeast corner of the country. Insofar as I know, Northeast Airlines is the only scheduled carrier which has shown any inclination to give this type of service throughout New England.

Yet, in spite of the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board's own Bureau of Air Operations strongly endorsed the application of Northeast Airlines, and recommended that Northeast, and Northeast alone, be chosen as the additional airline to service the New York-Florida route, the examiner in this case has recommended that Northeast's application should be denied and that the certificate should be awarded to another carrier. In effect, the examiner's recommendations in this case would make a big airline bigger, and would force Northeast Airlines into the position of being permanently subsidized by the taxpayers, at least for so long as it continues to operate.

In my judgment, such a finding is completely inconsistent with what I conceive to be the intentions of the Congress with respect to route assignments by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It shows a thorough disregard for the principles of healthy, competitive development among the public carriers and a total disregard for the needs and requirements of those of us who live in New England.

Time does not permit me to discuss in detail the recommendations in this case. It is sufficient to say, however, that I find something to challenge in practically every one of the examiner's observations. I consider his findings unsound and his recommendations untenable. I know that my views on this matter are shared by the other Senators from the New England States. It is my firm hope and belief that the Civil Aeronautics Board, which has ultimate responsibility for the final decision, will consider this case with its usual logic and commonsense, and will reverse the unsupportable findings of the examiner.

So far as we are concerned, New England is an integral part of this Nation. Sometimes we feel that we are forgotten, that we are in a remote corner of the Nation; but we are a very important part of it and we do not want to be entirely ignored by the Civil Aeronautics Board or any of its examiners. I wish publicly to protest this examiner's decision, and I know that I speak for most of New England when I do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add my word to what the senior Senator from New England on this side of the aisle has said. This is a subject which is very close to the hearts of many of us in New England, particularly in the cities and towns outside the metropolitan area of Boston. I agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire has just stated. I believe that the decision of this examiner should be given very careful consideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I hope the Board, in its final action, will reverse the decision of its examiner.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED AIR LINES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, an anniversary of great significance to the progress and growth of civil aviation was observed on April 6 when United Air Lines, the country's oldest air carrier, marked its 30th birthday, and American aviation passed another important milestone.

It is interesting to recall that my own State of Nevada played an important role in the birth of American air-carrier service. Turning back the pages of time 30 years, we find that Varney Air Lines, predecessor to United Air Lines and awarded one of first Government airmail contracts, flew the 460-mile route between Elko, Nev. and Pasco, Wash., on April 6, 1926.

It should be remembered that Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd, of Antarctic exploration fame, and one of the Navy's early fliers, made a special survey flight before that pioneer mail run.

Thirty years ago it took a pilot 6½ hours to fly the uncharted 460 miles between Elko, Nev., and Pasco, Wash.

Today, United Air Lines flies its DC–7's from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean in 7½ hours. In 1959 United plans to fly jet airliners from ocean to ocean in 5 hours.

This story speaks for itself as it shows the great contribution United Air Lines has made to American civil aviation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article, entitled, "One Man's Flight Into History," printed in the Chicago American on April 5 and commemorating the events about which I have spoken.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S FLIGHT INTO HISTORY—OLDEST AIRLINE MARKS 30TH YEAR

Thirty years of scheduled air service were celebrated April 6 by United Air Lines as the Nation's oldest air carrier. It is also the only major airline headquartered in Chicago.

United had its origin in Varney Air Lines, founded in 1925 by a California aviation enthusiast, Walter T. Varney. As the only bidder for an airmail contract over a barren 460-mile route between Pasco, Wash., and Elko, Nev., Varney received one of the original airmail contracts.

Varney purchased 6 Swallow biplanes and hired an accountant, a traffic promoter, 4 mechanics and 4 pilots, with Leon D. Cuddeback as chief pilot. Charles T. Wrightson, the accountant, is now United's station manager at Fresno, Calif. Cuddeback, who later became a division superintendent for United, today is western area supervisor of the Bureau of Safety Investigation, Civil Aeronautics Board, at Oakland, Calif. Hal E. Nourse, one of the first traffic men for Varney, today is United's vice president for economic controls.

Aviation experts of that day said flying over the route between Pasco, Wash., and Elko, Nev., was impossible. Elko and Boise were separated by great stretches of uninhabited desert and broken volcanic hills in which an emergency landing could be little other than fatal.

From Boise north, the proposed route passed over a short stretch of level farmlands that ended abruptly in bleak badlands leading almost to the foot of the towering Blue Mountains of Oregon, snowclad and subject to severe winter blizzards. Rolling wheatfields led down the north slopes of this range for many miles before a fairly level approach was seen leading into Pasco beside the Columbia River.

NINETY MILES AN HOUR

The first scheduled flight of Varney was completed on April 6, 1926. Cuddeback took off from Pasco at 6 a. m., landed at Boise about 4 hours later, then flew on to Elko, arriving at 12:38 p. m. Averaging less than 90 miles an hour, his storm-buffeted Swallow carried 261 pounds of airmail.

Of the first day's flights, sent off with great ceremony, only 1 of 7 reached its destination. Others were down with motor trouble.

Six months after the operation was started the planes still carried meager loads that did not even approach the operating expenses.

Varney Air Lines for months thereafter staved off collapse and eventually became moderately prosperous. In October 1926, its southern terminus was extended to Salt Lake City. By 1928 Varney Air Lines had 27 employees and a fleet of 9 single-engine biplanes.

Three other pioneer lines became part of United's route structure. Pacific Air Transport began Seattle-Los Angeles operations in September 1926. Boeing Air Transport linked Chicago and San Francisco in July 1927, using 25 single-engined Boeing 40–A's. National Air Transport inaugurated airmail service between Dallas and Chicago in May 1926. It extended eastward to New York in September 1927, flying single-engined Curtis and Douglas planes.

The pioneer companies and Varney subsequently were welded together as United Air Lines, resulting in the Nation's first integrated coast-to-coast system—the main line.

FLYING TIME SLASHED

Boeing 247's, prototype of today's airliners, went in service in 1933, cutting coast-to-coast time to 19½ hours. Successive models, each improving on the other, in turn joined United's fleet—DC–3's, DC–4's, DC–6's, DC–6B's, Mainliner Convairs. DC–7's added in 1954 cut cross-country time to 7½ hours.

Delivery of 45 new planes this year and next will provide United with 220 piston-engine craft. In 1959 the first jets will start scheduled service, flying 4½ hours from Atlantic to Pacific. Jets will span west coast-Chicago route in 3½ hours, Chicago-New York run in 1½ hours.

FAILURE OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE TO DEVELOP ADEQUATE RESERVE PROGRAMS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, for many years now I have been concerned over the failure of the Army and the Air Force to develop realistic and adequate Reserve programs for the security of our country. In contrast I have admired and commended the manner in which the Navy developed and administered its Reserve program. I have repeatedly at committee hearings expressed my disappointment with the Army and the Air Force on this matter and asked if they couldn't learn something from the Navy.

Recent history shows that one explanation between the encouraging record of the Navy on Reserve matters and the disappointing record of the Army and the Air Force is that during World War II the Navy kept its Reserve planning intact and worked diligently on it immediately after the end of hostilities, while the War Department, wherein the Army and Air Force were still housed, literally abandoned any planning or thinking during World War II about future Reserve plans and program and after the war for many years made only half-hearted efforts on a Reserve program.

There are indications that the Air Force is developing a Reserve program consciousness similar to that of the admirable attitude of the Navy. For that I commend the Air Force.

But according to an editorial in the April 1956 issue of the magazine Air Force, roadblocks are being thrown in the way of the Air Force and obstructionist tactics used by the Department of Defense to thwart real progress on an Air Force Reserve program that the Air Force is trying to develop.

I refer to the editorial by Edmund F. Hogan, Reserve affairs editor of the magazine Air Force, titled "Why the Reserve Has No Technicians" on page 30 of the April 1956 issue of that magazine—and I invite the very close attention of every Member of this body to it. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point of my remarks.

Mr. President, the implications of this editorial are so serious that I urge that the Senate Armed Services Committee make a full inquiry into this matter and determine exactly what is the nature and character of the controversy between the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force with respect to this particular phase of the Air Force Reserve program.

Each side of this controversy should be heard. The American people are entitled to know what is going on. Congress, and especially the Senate Armed Services Committee, has a solemn obligation to look into anything that smacks of obstructionist tactics that hamper the development of a realistic Air Force Reserve program so vital to our national security.

There are increasing indications that the Department of Defense is reaching down pretty deep in each of the services to dictate details on service operations instead of sticking to overall policy formulation for which the Unification Act created the Department of Defense. This controversy is one of the latest indications.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Why the Reserve Has No Technicians," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE RESERVE HAS NO TECHNICIANS

(By Edmund F. Hogan)

As we have pointed out before (Air Force, January 1956) the establishment of an air technician program is a basic requirement for the Air Force Reserve.

Briefly, this program uses full-time civilian employees in place of the active-duty Air Force people who are now assigned to Reserve flying units. The civilian employees, however, must be members of the units in which they are employed and go on active duty with their units when mobilized.

The Air National Guard has had a similar program since 1946. The years have proved it to be an unqualified success. There is every reason to believe that this program in

the Air Force Reserve would be equally successful. An air technician plan for the Reserve was developed by Continental Air Command a year ago. It is specifically designed to improve the combat-readiness of the 24 Reserve flying wings. But there are other important byproducts.

First, the technician plan would release some 9,000 active-duty Air Force officers and airmen for assignment elsewhere in the active establishment. Second, it would save about $2 million a year in salaries alone and an estimated $9 million a year in hidden costs required to support the present system.

Last June the Air Force submitted the plan to the Department of Defense, specifically to Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel. Mr. Burgess looked it over and sent it back to the Air Force for answers to questions which had risen from a review of the plan by his staff.

On August 31, Air Force Secretary Quarles sent a memorandum to Mr. Burgess, replying to the questions he had asked. One of these concerned civil service status of the technicians. The legal land technical staffs of the Civil Service Commission agreed to the plan, but the Commission chairman wanted the endorsement of the Department of Defense. Mr. Quarles' memo urged that Department endorsement be conveyed to the Civil Service Commission as soon as possible.

That endorsement is still to come. In fact, every attempt to get Mr. Burgess to approve the plan has failed. Even the recommendation of his own top advisory group, Defense Department's Reserve Forces Policy Board, has not moved Mr. Burgess. This Board, headed by Dr. Milton G. Baker, has approved the air technician plan. Moreover, a few weeks ago Dr. Baker, in a personal appearance before Defense Secretary Wilson's Armed Forces Policy Council, specifically recommended that the air technician plan be given the green light. Still the plan remains pigeonholed.

Recently Congressman ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, asked Mr. Burgess to tell him why he continued to hold up the plan, Mr. Burgess replied as follows:

"The plan is currently being studied in my office both with regard to its intrinsic merits and its relationship to other important elements of the program.

"When our review is completed, a determination will be made as to whether the proposal will contribute to the effectiveness of the Reserve program."

That would indicate that Mr. Burgess has no confidence in his own Reserve Forces Policy Board, much less in the Air Force itself. It would seem that he still is not convinced that the plan "will contribute to the effectiveness of the Reserve program," despite the proved success of the same project in the Air Guard, and despite the fact that everyone else concerned has approved it. But Mr. Burgess is far too smart a man to be so illogical as that.

Why does Mr. Burgess continue to sit on the plan? For the answer to this mystery we apparently must consider a few extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Burgess happens to be directly responsible for the success or failure of the administration's National Reserve plan. This law offers young men a number of options for completing required military service. One option permits a youth to volunteer for 6 months of active-duty training, following which he has a total Reserve obligation of 7½ years.

Up to the moment, at least, the Air Force has wanted no part of this plan, on the grounds that the 6-month training cannot possibly furnish it with the highly complex skills it needs. Mr. Burgess has been almost violent in his insistence that the Air Force use the plan.

So the plot thickens. With the air-technician plan in his bottom drawer, Mr. Burgess has something the Air Force wants. If the Air Force wants the technician plan badly enough it presumably can get it, by accepting the 6-month feature of the National Reserve plan.

Mr. Burgess indicated this himself not long ago. When asked why he was holding up approval of the technician plan, Mr. Burgess replied, in effect:

"When the Air Force shows some good faith to us, we'll show good faith to them."

Now there is no connection between the air-technician plan and the 6-month training program. Each should be considered on its own merits. There is no reason why the Air Force should be required to take 6-month trainees—and jeopardize its recruiting program—in order to get civilian employees for its Ready Reserve. No reason, that is, except Mr. Burgess.

Many times in the past when the Air Force Reserve program has bogged down, it has been difficult to pinpoint those responsible. Not so in this case. The responsibility lies squarely with Carter Burgess.

We think it's high time Secretary Wilson stepped in, and stepped on his ambitious Assistant Secretary.

We hope the Air Force holds tight and refuses to make a deal in order to get air technicians, despite the obvious need for them. Once it becomes party to gangsterism, there'll be no end to it.

Congressman GEORGE MAHON of the House Appropriations Committee has promised to take a full look at the Defense Department's delaying action. We hope this will result in full support of the air-technician program.

Lacking such straight-forward action, many thousands of reservists have every reason to wonder whether they are getting more lipservice than sincere leadership in building a Ready Reserve.

COMMENDATION OF THE WORK OF THE DONOVAN EMERGENCY COMMISSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE, EXPOSING THE COMMUNIST COME-HOME CAMPAIGN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to convey my most earnest commendation of the splendid public service performed by the Emergency Commission of the International Rescue Committee, which investigated the Communist redefection campaign, the so-called come-home drive.

This Commission, ably headed by the distinguished former head of the Office of Strategic Services, Gen. William J. Donovan, has come up with a great many important recommendations for specific United States and allied action to counteract and defeat the treacherous efforts of the Kremlin to lure back behind the Iron Curtain refugees from communism.

I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, along with several of the opening pages of the Donovan Commission's report.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

One of my deep interests has always been in the welfare of those heroic souls who have taken their lives in their hands and fled across the barbed-wire Iron Curtain.

The heart of the American people has been stirred by innumerable stories of the incredible hardships and sacrifices experienced by liberty-loving refugees in order to escape to freedom from either Eastern Europe, North Korea, North Vietnam, Soviet China, or other Red-held areas.

THE HEROISM OF REFUGEES IN ORIGINALLY FLEEING

We may never know how many of these refugees lost their lives while attempting their escape—how many died under Communist rifle and machinegun fire at the borders, from Communist land mines, electrified wire, from tracking down by Communist police dogs, from being betrayed, or by any other means.

We do know, however, from the stories of those who have been successful in their flight, that some of the truly epic stories of human courage and ingenuity, have been written by the refugees who risked all in order to escape from the Red terror.

REDS SQUEEZING PROPAGANDA OUT OF REDEFECTIONS

Of late, however, we have noted with deep concern the infamous redefection campaign, designed to induce a flow from the West back to the East, as conducted by a tremendous variety of means. Moscow has been attempting to lure or threaten back behind the Iron Curtain as many refugees as possible.

The Reds have, of course, been trying to squeeze propaganda value out of each single case of redefection. Moreover, they have been trying to shatter the morale of the mass of refugees who do not redefect.

SPECIFIC INSIDIOUS TECHNIQUES BY SOVIETS

Exactly how are the Soviets trying to induce redefection—return to the Iron Curtain? Basically by maintaining the most complete dossiers on the refugees whom they then subject to merciless pressures tailored to fit each particular case. Specifically, the Reds utilize pamphlets, newspapers, and circulars. They have set up come-home committees asserting that all is changed, all is forgiven in the satellite countries. They have issued so-called amnesty decrees; directed personalized radio broadcasts to individual refugees and camps. They have made mysterious, anonymous phone calls to refugees. There have been unexpected visits from agents of Soviet Embassies and consulates abroad. And the Reds have used signed, personal letters from families and friends.

Moreover, as always, the Reds have used blackmail—threats of vicious reprisal against innocent relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain. When all else has failed the Reds have not hesitated to use direct violence—to kidnap and kill, as in West Berlin.

MORE THAN 1,100 REDEFECTIONS

How successful has the "voluntary" and other redefection campaigns been? Since January 1, 1955, it is estimated that 1,158 refugees, excluding East Germans, Poles from France, and Yugoslavs, have returned behind the Iron Curtain.

But one cannot judge the effectiveness of the Red redefection campaign solely on the basis of statistics. Why? Because, as pointed out by the Donovan Commission, the redefection campaign is but a segment of the overall subtle propaganda drive of the Krushchev clique of the Kremlin.

A single well-publicized redefection can cause immense psychological harm among the innumerable refugees who do not return.

Of course, the overwhelming proportion of refugees have wisely completely resisted Communist redefection efforts thus far. They know from bitter, personal experiences what atheistic communism really means to their homelands. They never want to return until and unless their lands are genuinely free.

Nevertheless, the refugees are entitled right now to reasonable efforts on our part to protect them against the Communist redefection effort; to protect their rights and

liberties in the sanctuary to which they have come.

I point out that the International Convention on Political Asylum, signed by Germany, Austria, Italy, and Greece, adequately safeguards the refugee in case of any official requests by Communist governments for visits with the refugee.

But the refugee has no legal safeguards thus far against the dangers inherent in unofficial contacts by Red Embassy officials and agents.

OVERALL ANTIREDEFECTION CAMPAIGN ESSENTIAL

But we cannot defeat the redefection campaign by any single measure. Rather, it will take comprehensive well-integrated action, designed to frustrate the comprehensive well-integrated Communist plans.

The refugees must, for example, after adequate screening, be more promptly and effectively integrated into free economies. They must not be permitted to languish endlessly in refugee camps. They must be saved from the loneliness and despair in a foreign land and foreign culture, despair which so often arises in refugee hearts.

RED EFFORTS TO LURE BACK POLES

What I am saying, of course, applies to all the refugees from behind the Iron Curtain. I cite, for example, the insidious efforts by the Communists to lure back Polish refugees. In France alone, there are 750,000 Poles, most of them prewar emigrants and their descendants.

The Communist forces have infiltrated innumerable agents among the refugee Poles, spreading false rumors, conveying offers for repatriation, putting direct and subtle pressures, conveying invitations to professors, offering scholarships to youngsters, and the like. Poles in West Germany are subjected to the same type of pressure.

And one could go on, citing the experiences of East Germans, Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians.

I have of course previously commented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the seriousness of the redefection efforts.

LET'S CELEBRATE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY BY ACTION

Under these circumstances, comprehensive action by public and private authorities in the United States becomes imperative now.

I point out that in less than a month, we will celebrate another Polish Constitution Day—May 3. We will pay tribute once more to the devout, freedom-loving land of Paderewski, Kosciusko, Pulaski, Tschaikowski, Curie. What better specific way could we do so than by countering the Communist redefection campaign? Moreover, how better can we repay our overall debt to Poland, than by our intensified message to the millions of enslaved people of Poland, reaffirming our continued desire for their liberation.

That is why I, for one, have on many occasions, sponsored legislation emphasizing the United States' desire for liberation of the Polish and other peoples, and it is why I shall continue my efforts in connection with the Polish-American congress and with Americans of all ancestry who respect what Poland has meant to the world.

OPENING PAGES OF DONOVAN REPORT

There follow now the opening pages of the report of the Donovan Commission and an index of its overall contents:

"MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

"Gen. William J. Donovan, former head of O. S. S., former United States Ambassador to Thailand; partner, Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine.

"Irving Brown, AFL-CIO liaison officer.

"Joseph Buttinger, author; political analyst; vice chairman, IRC.

"Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America; chairman, IRC.

"Hon. Angier Biddle Duke, former United States Ambassador to El Salvador; president, IRC.

"Claiborne Pell, vice president and director, Bell News Corp.

"Herman W. Steinkraus, president, Bridgeport Brass Co.; former president, United States Chamber of Commerce.

"William Vanden Heuvel, associated with Donovan, Leisure, Newton & Irvine.

"Richard R. Salzmann, executive secretary, vice president, IRC.

"This report is based on information gathered by the members of the Commission on a mission to Europe and on written reports submitted to them. In the course of its trip the Commission visited France, Austria, Switzerland, and Germany in February and March 1956. It examined reports on the Communist repatriation campaigns in Belgium, Sweden, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and South America. Developments in the United States were closely watched and are included as part of this report.

"Members of the Commission wish to express their deep appreciation to officials of the governments of the countries visited; officials of the United States Government; to representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and to the directors of numerous private organizations for their hospitality, invaluable cooperation and support, without which this investigation would have been impossible.

"REPORT OF DONOVAN COMMISSION OF IRC ON COMMUNIST REDEFECTION CAMPAIGNS

"I. Introduction

"During recent months there have been increasing reports of Communist pressure on escapees from behind the Iron Curtain, aimed at forcing these escapees to return to Soviet and satellite countries. In Europe the campaign has been intensive—but it has by no means been confined to Europe.

"The International Rescue Committee has received mounting evidence from refugee leaders in the United States that similar pressure is being put on escapees in this country. In the course of examining the problem in the United States and Europe, a pattern emerged. It is clear that we are dealing with a large-scale, well-financed, and well-integrated Communist program with many elements of novel effectiveness.

"An Emergency Citizens Commission was therefore organized under the chairmanship of Gen. William J. Donovan to assess the problem in detail. It was the Commission's intent to study and evaluate the Communist objectives, methods, extent, and effectiveness in these campaigns.

"The results of its personal investigation are the following recommendations for counteraction which are based on the conviction that these redefection efforts are long-term, extravagantly financed, and well-coordinated with Communist agents and agencies throughout the world.

"II. Recommendations

"The following five general recommendations are submitted by the Commission:

"1. A major effort should be made to arouse the free world to the real danger posed by the Communist redefection campaigns, and to the need for more effective counter-action.

"2. It is in the interest of the United States to expand its cooperation with other nations on behalf of refugees from communism. There is an urgent need to coordinate existing programs and equalize the burdens of refugee care, especially in cooperation with such countries of first asylum as Germany, Austria, Greece, and Italy, as well as with France, Belgium, Switzerland, and other nations.

"3. First priority should be given to speeding the processing of refugee and escapee cases. The time of investigation can be shortened. Requirements that must be met by the refugee can be simplified. In these ways the cost of care and maintenance in camps, and the corrosion of morale during waiting periods, can be reduced to a minimum.

"4. Our findings show the need for a program to strengthen morale among the refugees and to provide follow-up counseling for a period of 1 year after settlement.

"5. Special measures for the care of old, ill, and incapacitated refugees who because of injury in escape, illness incurred during long months in refugee camps, death of the breadwinner of the family, and many other similar reasons, are incapable of becoming economically self-sufficient should be introduced by the United States. A special basis of admission of a limited number of such persons into the United States over and above present immigration provisions can be developed as the United States share of the solution to this hard core problem.

"INDEX

"I. Introduction.
"II. Recommendations.
"III. The Communist purpose.
"IV. The methods.
"V. Effectiveness.

"APPENDIX

"Existing counter-measures.
"Survey of methods used.

"EXHIBITS

"1. Brief survey of Soviet repatriation efforts.
"2. Repatriation campaigns among various Nationalists.
"3. Excerpts from satellite amnesty decrees.
"4. Some representative letters urging return.
"5. Thematic analysis of Communist Return to the Homeland publication.
"6. Summary statistics on return.
"7. The Hanke case.
"8. Official statements re '100,000 Soviet Citizens Detailed on German Soil.'
"9. Statement on United States escapee program, eligibility provisions.
"10. Statement of President Eisenhower, February 8, 1956.
"11. A case history of redefection and return.
"12. Poland—A unique approach."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I send forward a statement I have prepared which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point. It relates to certain proposed legislation which has been reported from the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary. I also ask that at the appropriate place in the statement there be printed certain correspondence from the Attorney General of the United States directed to the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and letters addressed to the Attorney General by the late Senator Kilgore.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS

I rise to speak briefly in behalf of those thousands of our fellow American citizens who have long been deprived of their constitutional rights in many localities of our country, and to urge the earliest possible action by this Senate to give them redress of their grievance. These fellow Americans are not in this room, and the only reason that I happen to be here is that I have been called upon to represent a great many of them in their Government, just as other

Senators from other States beyond Missouri are here to represent them.

I know of no elected Member of this assembly who was chosen to come here to represent merely the fortunate, or the privileged, or the secure within his community. I know of no Senator here who was chosen to represent only the white men or only the Negroes within the State which gave him the high privilege and honor of our legislative responsibilities. As for me, I was sent here to represent as best I may an entire community, including rich and poor, young and old, people of diverse faiths, and diverse ancestries. And in particular, it seems to me, a responsibility was laid upon me to speak and to vote and to act on behalf of those people within this American Republic who are wrongfully deprived of their just rights, under our Constitution.

For a long time, now, as chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights within our Judiciary Committee I have been working with other Senators who have my deep esteem, to formulate legislation giving the real protection of Federal law to those thousands of people who need it badly, since in some situations they get inadequate protection under statutes of their local governments. I know that there are a good many other Senators, both Republican and Democratic, who are not members of this committee, who also are working in different ways toward that same objective.

But because of my chairmanship of this Senate subcommittee I have been specially concerned with this matter, and was very happy to be able on February 9 of this year to act with my colleagues, in the prescribed legislative manner, in reporting favorably four civil rights bills for the consideration of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I regret to say that in the work of this subcommittee of yours we received no help whatever from the Attorney General of the United States. We asked for it. We asked him for his recommendations in the matter of protecting the constitutional rights of our fellow citizens now deprived of them. We asked him specifically for his views on legislation which we were considering.

The Attorney General of the United States during his 3 years of tenure has been apparently very busy in handling affairs he must have deemed of more importance than protecting the constitutional rights of American citizens. I must confess I do not know exactly what these affairs were. I certainly have seen no record of the Attorney General's activities in the newspapers, from the time he first was elevated to the rank of a Cabinet officer and placed in charge of the Department of Justice up to this very minute, which would be of any greater importance than upholding the constitutional rights of American citizens.

This Department of Justice was created by our forefathers to see that the people of this country got justice, or else I mistake its basic purpose. Therefore, I suppose, I should have been delighted several days ago to learn that the Attorney General in charge of our Department of Justice was at long last bestirring himself, and at least had recognized the existence of that problem of justice with which your subcommittee and other Senators had been wrestling, without his aid, for many months. Yet after I read on Monday the text of the proposals which he had sent to this Congress, as representing the ablest, constructive thinking of the Republican administration in the matter, I felt no elation. I will have to admit it.

I would like to call attention to the fact that the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights 2 months ago, at almost the very outset of this session, reported favorably a bill to create a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. It also reported favorably a bill to protect the voting rights of all our citizens in Federal elections and primaries. It also reported favorably an antilynching bill. Beyond that the subcommittee reported favorably a bill to protect members of the Armed Forces against bodily attack. And the subcommittee has now pending before it four other measures designed to strengthen the powers of our fellow citizens of every race and color to maintain the rights which they now possess in fact, and to obtain those rights which have been denied them so long as to constitute an international scandal.

Let me repeat that—rights denied them so long as to constitute an international scandal, and a reproach to the good name of our country, and a weakness of our country in its dealings with other nations.

We now have these four measures reported out favorably, and we have others on their way. I would like to assure the Members of the Senate and those thousands of our fellow citizens too long denied the justice due them that our measures go far beyond the proposals now offered from the Department of Justice. I will speak of these proposals of the Attorney General's shortly. But before I speak of them I would like the Senate to have full knowledge of the requests which our subcommittee made of the Attorney General for assistance within the last year. Believe me, we were very solicitous of his cooperation, so that a truly bipartisan support might be given to civil-rights legislation.

At this point I insert into the record of the Congress the entire correspondence between the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, relating to the bills of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, and the Department of Justice. This correspondence consists of the following:

A letter to the Justice Department dated February 8, 1955, requesting its views on S. 904—to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

A letter to the Justice Department dated July 27, 1955, requesting its views on S. 903—to protect the right of every citizen to political participation.

A letter to the Justice Department dated March 22, 1955, requesting its views on S. 902—to establish a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice; S. 905—to amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes; S. 906—to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; S. 907—an omnibus bill containing the major provisions of S. 902, S. 903, S. 904, S. 905, and S. 906.

A reply from the Department of Justice dated April 19, 1955, concerning S. 904 stating that it would have no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

A reply from the Department of Justice dated September 8, 1955, concerning S. 903, stating that whether this particular measure should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

A reply from the Department of Justice dated September 8, 1955, concerning S. 906, stating that whether or not the measure should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

I would like to point out that the Department of Justice has made no response to the committee's request for its views on S. 902, S. 905, and S. 907.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, September 8, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (S. 903) to protect the right to political participation.

Section 594 of title 18 of the United States Code subjects to criminal penalties persons who interfere with the right of other persons to vote in any election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing a candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate or Commissioner from a Territory or possession. As defined in section 591 of the same title, the term "election" does not include a primary election. Section 1 of the bill would amend section 594 so as to make the section hereafter applicable to primary elections.

Section 2004 of the revised statutes, formerly set forth in section 31 of title 8 of the United States Code but now contained in section 1971 of title 42, provides that all citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, Territory, etc., shall be entitled and allowed to vote without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Section 2 of the bill would amend this section in a number of respects. First, it would extend its scope to primary elections. Second, the phrase "previous condition of servitude" would be omitted from the enumeration of factors which are not to form the basis of discrimination and in its place the words "religion or national origin" would be substituted. Third, a new sentence would be added to the section as follows:

"The right to qualify to vote and to vote, as set forth herein, shall be deemed a right within the meaning of, and protected by, the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 242, as amended, section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (8 U. S. C. 43), and other applicable provisions of law."

Section 242 of title 18 imposes criminal penalties upon anyone who, under color of law, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivations of any rights protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (now 42 U. S. C. 1983) provides for civil liability under similar circumstances.

Section 3 of the bill would provide that any persons violating the provisions of the first section shall be subject to suit by the party injured, or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. The section further would provide that the Attorney General may enforce the provisions of the act in the United States district courts, as defined therein. It would also provide that the district courts will have jurisdiction concurrently with State and Territorial courts.

Section 4 of the bill is a customary severability clause.

The purpose of this bill, as stated in its title, is "To protect the right to political participation." This purpose is a laudable one with which the Department of Justice is in full accord. Whether this particular measure should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY,
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, September 8, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of

Justice concerning the bill (S. 906) "to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government."

As indicated in its title, the bill would establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government. The Commission would consist of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Its duties would be "to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic, social, legal, and other developments affecting the civil rights of individuals under the Constitution and laws of the United States; to appraise the policies, practices, and enforcement program of the Federal Government with respect to civil rights; to appraise the activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, and the activities of private individuals and groups, with a view to determining what activities adversely affect civil rights; to assist States, counties, municipalities, and private agencies in conducting studies to protect civil rights of all Americans without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin; and to recommend to the Congress, legislation necessary to safeguard and protect the civil rights of all Americans."

The measure would require the Commission to make an annual report to the President and to the Congress as to its findings and recommendations with respect to civil rights matters. Section 5 would authorize the Commission to establish advisory committees to assist it in its work, and would direct it to utilize the services, facilities and information of Government agencies and private research agencies in the performance of its functions.

The sixth section of the bill (erroneously designated as "Sec. 104") would empower the Commission to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter being studied or investigated by it. Members of the Commission would be empowered by the section to administer oaths and affirmations, and to examine witnesses and receive evidence. The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place in the continental United States or any of its Territories or possessions. Subsection (b) would provide for applications by the Commission to the district courts of the United States to effect compliance with Commission subpenas.

Whether or not this measure should be enacted constitutes a question of policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

FEBRUARY 8, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Judiciary Committee is herewith transmitting S. 904 for your study and report thereon in triplicate.

To facilitate the work of the committee, it is urgently requested that your report be submitted within 20 days. The committee should be formally advised in writing if any delay beyond this time period is necessary.

Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

MARCH 22, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Attached herewith are copies of S. 902, S. 905, S. 906, and S. 907, concerning the protection of civil rights, amending and supplementing existing civil rights statutes, and establishing a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government.

These four bills are now pending before the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, which intends to schedule hearings on all of the above-mentioned measures within the very near future.

Accordingly, it will be appreciated if you will submit to the committee as soon as possible individual reports on each of these measures.

With kindest regards, I am

Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

JULY 27, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
The Attorney General,
Washington, D. C.:

The Judiciary Committee is herewith transmitting S. 903 for your study and report thereon in triplicate.

To facilitate the work of the committee, it is urgently requested that your report be submitted within 20 days. The committee should be formally advised in writing if any delay beyond this time period is necessary.

Most sincerely yours,

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, April 19, 1955.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (S. 904) to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

The bill would amend sections 1581, 1583, and 1584 of title 18 of the United States Code, the provisions of law which relate to peonage and involuntary servitude, so as to make criminal all attempts to commit the acts proscribed by such sections.

The proposal to amend section 1583 would also make the section applicable not only to the enticement of persons to go on board a vessel with the intent that such persons be made slaves but to similar enticement to go on board any other means of transportation.

The Department of Justice would have no objection to the enactment of this legislation.

The committee, however, may wish to consider amending the title of the bill to delete the reference to convict labor since such is not within the scope of the sections to be amended. The 13th amendment to the Constitution expressly exempts involuntary servitude "as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted" from the constitutional prohibitions against slavery and involuntary servitude.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

By this record Senators will see that of the four bills reported by the subcommittee on February 9 of this year, your subcommittee requested Mr. Brownell's views on two. We asked his views more than a year ago. The two bills on which we asked his views are S. 902 and S. 903. The first of these is a bill to create a special division of civil rights within his own department. The second is a bill to protect every citizen's right to full participation in the political life of this country. It is a bill to protect the right to vote. We asked Mr. Brownell's views on these measures on March 22, 1955. Up to the time the committee reported favorably the bill to create a special civil rights division in the Department of Justice, it had received from the Attorney General no reply whatever to its request for his views on the desirability of the legislation. To the subcommittee's request that he speak out on the desirability of a law to protect our fellow citizens' right to vote, Mr. Brownell did, indeed, make a brief reply. He said that this matter concerned a question of policy and therefore he preferred to make no recommendation.

A matter of policy. I would like to pause just a moment so we may consider the full implication of this curious statement. In the view of this Republican administration's Attorney General, the chief of this administration's Department of Justice, the question of whether American citizens should be protected in their right to vote was a matter of policy, as yet undetermined. It was a matter of policy, in which Mr. Brownell would prefer to make no recommendation. Mr. President, high ranking officers of this administration have declined at times to tell the Members of this Senate some of the things we have sought to learn about the manner in which they are conducting affairs of our country. Therefore, I suppose no one would tell just who in this Federal administration decided finally that it was a matter of good and sound public policy to do something or other to protect the constitutional rights of our citizens. I presume, of course, it must have been lately a subject of very earnest conversation among those persons who finally make up the administration's mind on what is good policy, or perhaps even good politics.

When I was a boy I heard it said that honesty was the best policy, and I have never doubted it. I hope you will not take it as unduly partisan of me if I remind Mr. Brownell and whoever else was concerned with this administration's recent determination of policy, that living by an oath of office is always good public policy. And I think we all remember an oath to maintain and uphold the Constitution of these United States which has been taken by members of this administration. It is high time they found it good public policy to advocate giving Federal protection to citizens denied their constitutional rights, and we welcome their decision, belated as it is, to help to do this. If they really mean it.

Since Mr. Brownell and the other members of his administration have been in office, there has been one Congress, the 83d, which was under control of their party. During that Congress, the similar committee which preceded your Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, reported no legislation whatever in all the field of civil rights. That committee had a Republican chairman. The Republican Party had control of this Congress for 2 years, and during all that time this Attorney General, who is chief of the Nation's Department of Justice neglected to bestir himself on any occasion whatever in behalf of legislation to protect the constitutional rights of Negroes in this country, or to give them that justice which has long been denied them.

What do you really suppose is now the reason for this sudden and unexpected interest which Mr. Brownell and other gentlemen in the Republican Party's high command are taking in justice for Negroes, and the protection of their constitutional rights? Let us all hope in our hearts that the fact of 1956 being an election year has not been the reason for this tardy gesture of theirs. This national problem of obtaining justice for those thousands of Negro citizens, long denied it, is too important to our country to be made a political football, or the subject of political maneuvering.

As I look around this Senate, and think of all the Senators here who have been striving

for years to bring equality of political rights to all our citizens I think we have the right to ask Mr. Brownell and the leaders of his party where they have been all this time. What have they been doing? Why have their voices been silent?

It is now more than 20 years since I introduced my first civil-rights bill in the House of Representatives. All through the years of my public life I have been speaking and working to obtain the full equalities of citizenship for all our citizens. At the same time I have been working through such organizations as the Urban League for a better understanding between American citizens of different ancestry to create a social climate throughout our Nation in which the rights of all citizens would be respected. I have done this as the representative of a border State. In my State of Missouri many of our people are linked by unforgettable ties of family and early memories to the people and history of our Southern States. Within my own family were men who fought for the Confederacy. We pay them honor, and it is right that we do. These men who fought for a lost cause were both brave and honorable. But one of the many reasons which I have to love my native State is the way in which its people are progressing toward that great ideal of human equality, under constitutional law. I could not truly represent the spirit of Missourians, both white and Negro, if I did not speak for continued progress. I am doing that now, and I have done it for years. To me, then, there are several aspects of Mr. Brownell's amazing arrival within the past few days at this Nation's Capitol with his so-called civil-rights program. In the first place, Mr. Brownell was well aware that there already was a program here which more than covered those proposals he made in his letters to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice President of the United States. He was well aware also of the nature and the functions of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and of what it was doing. May I remind Mr. Brownell that he has come before the Judiciary Committee on several occasions, and that he has sought the help of the Judiciary Committee in such things as approval of his administration's appointments of Federal judges. May I remind him also that I went to the support of his administration on several of these appointments when they were subject to serious challenge within the Senate.

If he will think it over I am sure the Attorney General will come to the same conclusion I have. He has not been entirely candid with the people of these United States in blowing all the trombones of publicity and banging all its drums for a small part of the program which he knew was already in existence here on this hill. There was something a little less than that political acumen for which the Attorney General is deservedly so highly esteemed and justly celebrated in this 11th hour unveiling but a fraction of a program already advanced by Senators whose cooperation his administration seeks so often—and I am glad to say obtains.

But if Mr. Brownell has finally had a green light given to him by whatever superior is now formulating the administration's policies he can do a great deal to help give our citizens true Federal protection in the exercise of their constitutional rights.

He can help to throw the influence of the administration into the voting on civil rights legislation already before the House and the Senate which more than covers this program he has now announced with such publicity and fanfare. If he will only do that, or if any man in this Republican administration who actually is determining its policies will only do that, we can get some action during this session of Congress.

May I comment briefly on this idea of a new commission to study and report on denial of constitutional rights.

Many months ago when a bill to create a commission was first written within the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, we asked Mr. Brownell's suggestions on it. As the record of correspondence shows, his Deputy Attorney General, Mr. William O. Rogers, replied last September 8 that this was a matter of policy on which the Attorney General would prefer to make no recommendation. What do you suppose has now changed his mind?

There was a very eminent Commission appointed in 1946 by President Harry S. Truman to study this question and the chairman of it was no other than President Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson.

So you can see that it was a bipartisan Commission. If you study the roster of the illustrious citizens who were members of that Commission you will see that it included quite a few of our country's most eminent citizens.

This Commission was appointed by President Truman in 1946 and in November of 1947 brought in a report that is absolutely authoritative, reflecting a great deal of thought and sincerity. Because of that report the methods of denial of constitutional rights are already well known. So are the places where those rights are denied. So are the persons who fight to continue this debasing denial of constitutional rights. Debasing, I say, not only to those thousands of our fellow citizens whose rights are denied but degrading also to those who deny them.

I am perfectly willing to have a continuing commission of study and report, such as the Attorney General is advocating. But what this country needs right now is immediate action on what is now known, as well as further study on what may not be. Any dilatory, spurious, politically minded maneuvers which delay that action are reprehensible and unworthy of sincere public servants.

May I suggest in closing that the administration's leaders and spokesmen join sincerely in passing the legislation already pending within this Congress. Let them help in erasing as soon as we can this blot upon the freedom and dignity of American citizens, which our Nation so proudly proclaims.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

REQUIREMENT THAT STATEMENTS ACCOMPANY CONFERENCE REPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has a brief statement to make in explanation of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution merely provides that all conference reports shall be accompanied by a statement signed by the majority of the managers on the part of each House. At present the House has such a rule, applicable to its own managers, but the Senate has no such rule. The concurrent resolution would provide for a single statement, to be signed by the managers on the part of both Houses. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] are both cosponsors of the concurrent resolution.

I may add that practically the same resolution was twice adopted by the Senate on previous occasions. However, it failed of adoption in the House. The same reason applies for adopting it now as applied then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36), requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall accompany every report of a committee of conference a statement, in writing and signed by at least a majority of the managers on the part of each House, explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the committee.

SEC. 2. The foregoing section shall be a rule of each House, respectively, and shall supersede any other rule thereof but only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such other rule.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1747, Senate bill 3481.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3481) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 3481 is to strengthen the Foreign Service of the United States in order that it may be a more effective instrument for carrying out United States foreign policy, for protecting the lives and property of American citizens, and for advancing the national security of the United States.

Hearings were held on the bill and three witnesses appeared from the State Department in behalf of the bill. It was reported unanimously by the subcommittee appointed to hear the matter, and later the bill was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The purposes of the bill are to effect an increase in salaries of Chiefs of Missions; the addition of two classes to the Foreign Service schedule, and the adjustment of salaries; the removal of the ceiling on lateral entries into the Foreign Service; the computation of retirement benefits; the establishment of commissaries and messes; increased medical benefits for members of the Foreign Service, though still not comparable with those now being received by members of the Military Establishment; and provision for recreational facilities

where such facilities are lacking and where the posts are considered to be on a hardship basis.

I urge the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the committee amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were on page 2, between line 11 and 12, to strike out "Class 8__ 4,100 4,250 4,400 4,550 4,700 4,850 5,000 5,150 5,300." and insert "Class 8__ 4,300 4,450 4,600 4,750 4,900 5,050 5,200 5,350.' "; on page 3, line 8, after the numeral "7", to strike out "by striking out the word 'forty' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one hundred and sixty-five'; by deleting the period at the end of the second sentence of the aforementioned section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "as a Foreign Service officer.'; and by adding a new sentence at the end of the second sentence of the aforementioned section which shall read as follows: 'Notwithstanding the above provisions of this section, the limitation on the maximum number of appointments authorized herein shall not be applicable in the case of any person appointed or assigned by the Secretary of State as a Foreign Service Reserve officer and who thereafter has served in a position of responsibility in such capacity for the required period prior to appointment as a Foreign Service officer.' " and insert "and by deleting the second sentence of section 517."; on page 4, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 11. Section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 902. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, make an allotment of funds to any post to defray the unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of official residences suitable for principal representatives of the United States at that post."

On page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "11" to "12"; on page 6, line 15, after the word "shall," to strike out ", insofar as practicable,"; on page 7, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 12. Section 941 of such act is amended by striking out "941." and inserting "941 (a)" in lieu thereof; and by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph "(b)" which shall read as follows:

"(b) In the event a dependent of a United States citizen officer or employee of the Service who is stationed abroad, incurs an illness or injury while located abroad, which requires hospitalization and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for that portion of the costs of treatment of each such illness or injury at a suitable hospital or clinic that exceeds $35.00 up to a minimum limitation of 120 days of hospitalization for each such illness or injury, except that such maximum limitation shall not apply whenever the Secretary, on the basis of professional medical advice, shall determine that such illness or injury clearly is caused by the fact that such dependent is or has been located abroad."

After line 20, to insert:

SEC. 13. Section 941 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 941. (a) In the event an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States incurs an illness or injury while such person is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for the cost of treatment of such illness or injury.

"(b) In the event a dependent of a United States citizen officer or employee of the Service who is stationed abroad, incurs an illness or injury while such dependent is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for that portion of the cost of treatment of each such illness or injury that exceeds $35 up to a maximum limitation of 120 days of treatment for each such illness or injury, except that such maximum limitation shall not apply whenever the Secretary, on the basis of professional medical advice, shall determine that such illness or injury clearly is caused by the fact that such dependent is or has been located abroad.

"(c) After sufficient experience in the operation of the medical protection plan authorized in subsections (a) and (b) of this section has been obtained, as determined by the Secretary, and if he considers that the benefits so authorized can be provided for as well and as cheaply in other ways, the Secretary may, under such regulations, and for such persons, locations, and conditions as he may deem appropriate, and within the limits prescribed in such subsections, contract for medical care pursuant to such arrangements, insurance, medical service, or health plans as he may deem appropriate."

On page 9, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "13" to "14"; on page 10, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "14" to "15"; on page 11, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 15. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career minister shall receive the salary prescribed for career ministers by section 412 of such act, as amended.

After line 12, to insert:

SEC. 16. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career ambassador and the class of career minister shall receive the salary prescribed for career ambassadors and for career ministers, respectively, by section 412 of such act, as amended.

On page 13, in line 4, after the letter "(f)", to strike out "The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act or on the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1956, whichever shall be later" and insert "The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section and the salary increases for chiefs of mission authorized by section 2 of this act shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act or on the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1956, whichever shall be later."

After line 16, to insert:

SEC. 17. A new section 936 is hereby added to such act as follows:

"APPLICATION OF ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

"SEC. 936. The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2061 and the following), shall apply to career ministers and Foreign Service officers, who are not serving as chiefs of mission or who are not serving in a position in the Department which requires appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to Foreign Service Reserve officers who are commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers, or both, in accordance with section 524 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (c) (1) (A) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended."

And, on page 14, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "16" to "18"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it resolved, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1956."

SEC. 2. Section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence of that section and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "The per annum salaries of chiefs of mission within each class shall be as follows: Class 1, $27,500 per annum; class 2, $25,000; class 3, $22,500; and class 4, $20,000."

SEC. 3. Section 412 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 412. There shall be 10 classes of Foreign Service officers, including the classes of career ambassador and of career minister. The per annum salary of a career ambassador shall be $20,000. The per annum salary of a career minister shall be $17,500. The per annum salaries of Foreign Service officers within each of the other classes shall be as follows:

Class 1	$14,600	$15,000	$15,400	$15,800	$16,200	$16,600	$17,000
Class 2	12,600	12,900	13,200	13,500	13,800	14,100	14,400
Class 3	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,100	12,400
Class 4	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000	10,250	10,500
Class 5	7,400	7,650	7,900	8,150	8,400	8,650	8,900
Class 6	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300
Class 7	5,100	5,250	5,400	5,550	5,700	5,850	6,000
Class 8	4,300	4,450	4,600	4,750	4,900	5,050	5,200
	5,350."						

SEC. 4. Section 414 (a) of such act is amended by striking out the word "six" and inserting the word "eight" in lieu thereof; and by striking out the number "6" and inserting in lieu thereof the number "8".

SEC. 5. Section 516 of such act and the heading thereto is amended by striking the words "class 6" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "class 8" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 6. Section 517 of such act and the heading thereto is amended by striking the heading thereto and substituting in lieu thereof "Admission to classes 1 to 7, inclusive"; by striking in the aforementioned section the number "6" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the number "8"; by striking out in the aforementioned section the number "5" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the number "7"; and by deleting the second sentence of section 517.

SEC. 7. Section 634 (b) of such act is amended by striking the words "classes 4 or 5", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 4, 5, 6 or 7"; by striking the words "class 4" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 4 or 5"; and by striking the words "class 5" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "classes 6 and 7".

SEC. 8. Section 635 of such act and the heading thereto and section 637 (a) of such act are amended by striking the number

"6" wherever it appears therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the number "8".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 821 (a) of such act is amended by striking the word "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-five".

(b) Section 821 (b) of such act is amended by striking the phrase "for the five years next preceding his retirement" and inserting in lieu thereof "for his highest five consecutive years of service".

SEC. 10. Section 871 of such act is amended by striking the word "thirty" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "thirty-five".

SEC. 11. Section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 902. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, make an allotment of funds to any post to defray the unusual expenses incident to the operation and maintenance of official residences suitable for principal representatives of the United States at that post."

SEC. 12. Section 921 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 921. (a) The Secretary may, under such regulations as he may prescribe, establish and maintain Government-operated commissary and mess services at posts abroad, and he may authorize and assist in the establishment, maintenance, and operation, by officers and employees of the Service, of non-Government operated commissary and mess services, including the furnishing of space, utilities, material, stocks, supplies, equipment, or services. Reimbursement shall be made for all space, utilities, material, stocks, supplies, equipment, or services furnished to both types of facilities, and shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. However, in the discretion of the Secretary, space, utilities, or services, other than full-time services, may be furnished without reimbursement. Further, reimbursement shall not be required whenever the Secretary shall certify that substantial losses have been suffered by such commissaries or mess services as a direct result of destructive forces of nature, armed conflict, civil strife, or other causes beyond the control of the officers and employees concerned. Necessary sites, buildings, and equipment may be acquired, and construction, alterations, and repairs may be provided, for the purposes of this section, in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292–300).

"(b) Commissary or mess services established pursuant to this section shall be made available, insofar as practicable, to officers and employees of other Government agencies and their dependents who are stationed abroad. Such commissary or mess services shall not be established in localities where another United States agency operates similar facilities unless the Secretary determines that such additional facilities are necessary. Notwithstanding the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1253, or other law, charges at any post abroad by a commissary or mess service of any Government agency shall be the same rate for all civilian personnel of the Government serviced thereby, and all charges for supplies furnished to such a service abroad by any Government agency shall be at the same rate as that charged by the furnishing agency to its civilian commissary or mess services. If space, utilities, or services are provided on a nonreimbursable basis to any non-Government operated facility established under the provisions of this section, profits accruing to such facility over and above prudent operating reserves, shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts. Periodic audit of non-Government operated facilities shall be conducted in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe."

SEC. 13. Section 941 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 941. (a) In the event an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States incurs an illness or injury while such person is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for the cost of treatment of such illness or injury.

"(b) In the event a dependent of a United States citizen officer or employee of the Service who is stationed abroad, incurs an illness or injury while such dependent is located abroad, which requires hospitalization or similar treatment, and which is not the result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct on his part, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay for that portion of the cost of treatment of each such illness or injury that exceeds $35 up to a maximum limitation of 120 days of treatment for each such illness or injury, except that such maximum limitation shall not apply whenever the Secretary, on the basis of professional medical advice, shall determine that such illness or injury clearly is caused by the fact that such dependent is or has been located abroad.

"(c) After sufficient experience in the operation of the medical protection plan authorized in subsections (a) and (b) of this section has been obtained, as determined by the Secretary, and if he considers that the benefits so authorized can be provided for as well and as cheaply in other ways, the Secretary may, under such regulations, and for such persons, locations, and conditions as he may deem appropriate, and within the limits prescribed in such subsections, contract for medical care pursuant to such arrangements, insurance, medical service, or health plans as he may deem appropriate."

SEC. 14. (a) Section 942 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 942. (a) In the event an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States or his dependent incurs an illness or injury requiring hospitalization, not the result of vicious habits, intemperance or misconduct, while stationed abroad in a locality where there does not exist a suitable hospital or clinic, the Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, pay the travel expenses of such person by whatever means he shall deem appropriate and without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended (68 Stat. 808, 5 U. S. C. 73b), to the nearest locality where a suitable hospital or clinic exists, and on his recovery pay for the travel expenses of his return from such hospital or clinic. If any such officer, employee, or dependent is too ill to travel unattended, the Secretary may also pay the round-trip travel expenses of an attendant or attendants.

"(b) Section 942 (b) of such act is amended by inserting the words "a physician" and a comma immediately following the phrase "the services of"; and by inserting immediately following the words "a nurse" a comma and the phrase "or other medical personnel."

SEC. 15. A new section, "SEC. 951" is hereby added to such act, together with a heading as follows:

"PART F—RECREATION FACILITIES

"SEC. 951. Whenever the Secretary shall certify that adequate recreation facilities are lacking at a post abroad and that the establishment of such facilities is necessary in the interests of morale and efficiency, he may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, establish, maintain, and operate recreation facilities for use by officers and employees of the Service and their dependents who are stationed at such posts. Recreation facilities established pursuant to this section may be made available to officers and employees of other agencies of the Government and their dependents. The Secretary shall make such charges for the use of such recreation facilities as he deems fair and equitable. In no event shall these charges exceed the estimated cost to the Government of such recreation facilities. Any fees so collected shall be deposited into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Necessary sites, buildings, and equipment may be acquired, and construction, alterations, and repairs may be provided, for the purposes of this section, in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292–300). Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)), the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees who are American citizens, and their dependents, to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available."

SEC. 16. (a) Foreign Service officers presently serving in the class of career ambassador and the class of career minister shall receive the salary prescribed for career ambassadors and for career ministers, respectively, by section 412 of such act, as amended.

(b) Foreign Service officers and Reserve Officers in the other classes shall be transferred to the new classes established by section 412 of such act, as amended, as follows: Officers of class 1 to the new class 1; officers of class 2 to the new class 2; officers of class 3 to the new class 3; officers of class 4 to the new classes 4 or 5 as determined by the Secretary, in accordance with the second sentence of this subsection; officers of class 5 to the new class 6; and officers of class 6 to the new class 7. In accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe there shall be transferred to the new class 4 those officers of the present class 4 who either are receiving the sixth through the eighth step rates of the present class 4 or who were eligible and were recommended for promotion by the selection board next preceding the effective date of this act. All remaining officers in the present class 4 shall be transferred to the new class 5.

(c) Each officer transferred pursuant to paragraph (b) of this section shall, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, receive basic salary at that one of the rates of the class to which he is transferred which shall, as nearly as possible, correspond to the salary he is receiving at the time of transfer, except that no officer shall suffer a reduction in basic salary as a result thereof.

(d) Service in a former class shall be considered as constituting service in the new class for the purposes of determining (1) eligibility for promotion, in accordance with the provisions of section 622, and (2) liability for separation, in accordance with the provisions of section 633. Officers who are transferred to new class 7 in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section shall continue to occupy probationary status pursuant to section 635.

(e) Officers transferred in accordance with the provisions of this section shall receive credit for time served in a previous class toward class promotion in accordance with section 625.

(f) The class and salary adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section and the salary increases for chiefs of mission authorized by section 2 of this act shall be made effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act or on the first day of the first pay period which begins after July 1, 1956, whichever shall be later.

SEC. 17. A new section 936 is hereby added to such act as follows:

"APPLICATION OF ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

"SEC. 936. The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2061 and the following), shall apply to career ministers and Foreign Service officers, who are not serving as chiefs of mission or who are not serving in a position in the Department which requires appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and to Foreign Service Reserve officers who are commissioned as diplomatic or consular officers, or both, in accordance with section 524 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, notwithstanding the provisions of section 202 (c) (1) (A) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended."

SEC. 18. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act, existing rules, regulations of or applicable to the Foreign Service of the United States shall remain in effect until revoked or rescinded or until modified or superseded by regulations made in accordance with the provisions of this act, unless clearly inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 12) to provide an improved farm program, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION WITH THE TAX INSTITUTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1745, H. R. 4909.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4909) relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD the complete report of the committee on the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1722) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4909) relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York, after full consideration, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, line 5, insert the word "of" between the words "Code" and "Law."

Page 4, line 8, after the word "Association", insert the following: "or in any proceeding for the enforcement of the rights, if any, of any member of the National Tax Association."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporation law of the State of New York."

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The first section of the bill authorizes the National Tax Association, organized under the provisions of subchapter 3 of chapter 18 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to consolidate with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York. The section further provides that the said corporations may be consolidated so as to form a single corporation under the law of the District of Columbia or under the law of any 1 of the 48 States of the United States of America.

Section 2 of the bill provides that the consolidation shall be effected by the procedure prescribed for the consolidation of foreign and domestic membership corporations by sections 51, 52, and 53 of article VII of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

Section 3 provides that upon the adoption of an agreement for consolidation by the governing bodies of the National Tax Association and the Tax Institute, Inc., as provided by the membership corporations law of the State of New York, the agreement for consolidation shall be submitted to each member of the National Tax Association who has the right to vote for the election of the members of its governing body at a meeting called for the purpose of taking action for the adoption or rejection of such an agreement. Provision is also made for notice of the time, place, and object of said meeting, and the procedure for adopting or rejecting such agreement for consolidation by the voting members of the National Tax Association.

Section 4 of the bill provides that if the consolidated corporation is to be governed by the laws of any State other than the District, that it irrevocably appoint the Commissioners as its agent to accept service of process in any proceeding for the enforcement of any application of the National Tax Association, and it must also file an agreement that it may be served with such process.

Section 5 of the bill provides that nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to prevent Congress from altering, amending, or repealing the same.

EXPLANATION

The National Tax Association is a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia for the general purposes of gathering and disseminating information with respect to tax matters and matters of public finance. It is presently negotiating consolidation with the Tax Institute, Inc., a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and having comparable general purposes. The two corporations anticipate that consolidation will reduce overlapping activities and will further the accomplishment of their stated purposes. During the consolidation negotiations, a question has been raised as to the authority of the National Tax Association to consolidate unless the continuing corporation is organized under the laws of the District. This bill would provide for the consolidation and would permit the continuing corporation to be organized under the laws either of the District or of any one of the States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on the District of Columbia. The purpose of the bill is to enable the National Tax Association, a nonprofit corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of gathering and disseminating information with respect to tax matters, to consolidate with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York. Negotiations looking to a consolidation are now underway. The bill provides that the corporations may be consolidated so as to form a single corporation under the laws of either the District of Columbia or of any of the States of the Union.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the committee be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments of the Committee on the District of Columbia are as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "Code", to insert "of", and on page 4, line 11, after the word "Association", to insert "or in any proceeding for the enforcement of the rights, if any, of any member of the National Tax Association."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York."

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1628, S. 3340.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3340) to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State, to be known as the United States Passport Service to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The pending business is Order 1628, Senate bill 3340; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is the author of this proposed legislation and whose committee reported it, and I should like to have him make a statement with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the bill. It has been reported by the Committee on Government Operations. It was prepared by the committee, in consultation with the staff, as the result of a very careful analysis of the Passport Office, the manner in which it is operating, and the problems which have beset that office over many years.

Later on in the discussion I should like to offer an amendment designed to clarify certain language of the bill. I should like to seek information from the Chair as to whether it is appropriate to offer the amendment at this time, so that the proposal may be before us, since I am sure there will be some discussion of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only difficulty I can see, unless the Senator has prepared mimeographed copies of his amendment, making it available to all Senators, is that, as I understand, the bill in its present form—of course, I do not know whether the amendment would change the situation—is objected to by the State Department and by the Bureau of the Budget.

I understand also that no hearings were held by the committee and that the bill was reported as the result of a staff report. There may be a great many suggestions of merit in the bill the Senator has proposed; but it seems to me that in making an internal change within the State Department, it would at least have been well to have held hearings, in order to give the Department of State an opportunity to appear before the committee and to present what they felt were cogent reasons why the passport fee should not be increased, and why a particular organization should not be set up in the manner proposed by the bill.

The very fact that the staff now suggests that certain amendments be made in itself indicates to me that time might be saved and a more orderly procedure might be followed if the bill were recommitted to the Senator's committee. The Senator could then arrange to have the amendments submitted to the other members of the committee, and then afford the representatives of the Department of State an opportunity to appear and to present their views.

I have read the testimony which Deputy Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson gave when the matter was being discussed before the House Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Henderson raised what appeared to me to be reasons which were entitled to a respectful hearing on the part of the committee, rather than to try to perfect rather intricate legislation in this way on the floor of the Senate, in view of the fact that committee hearings were not held.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to the minority leader that while no hearings were held on the bill, there were several months of staff consultations with representatives designated by the Bureau of the Budget to assist in the reorganization of the Passport Office, the General Accounting Office, the General Services Administration, and members of the committee.

Besides being sponsored by me, the bill is cosponsored by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The issues which the Department of State has raised are such issues as would naturally be raised by an agency which would like to retain the status quo; and that is about what this amounts to.

The amendment I was about to propose is merely a clarifying amendment, to take care of what appears to be an ungrounded, unfounded fear, in the light of the purpose of the bill and the explanation which was made of the bill in the committee. I refer to a feeling on the part of Mr. McLeod, of the Department of State, which is obviously carried up through channels, that the security provisions which are now a part of passport clearance would be in some way weakened by the bill. That, of course, is not true. The bill vests full authority for whatever activities may be necessary relating to passports in the Secretary of State, the Secretary, in turn, can pass on to any of his subordinates or associates the responsibility for the security clearances which relate to passports.

In order to make this intent perfectly clear, I have an amendment which I shall not offer at the moment, but shall merely mention. It provides as follows:

> The Secretary of State may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by the Director of the Service, or by any other officer, or by any agency or employee of the Department of State of any of the functions transferred to the Service pursuant to the first section of this act.

That would give the Secretary of State full responsibility. That is where the responsibility belongs, and it is what the Hoover Commission has recommended. The Hoover Commission recommendations, however, insist that there be a clear line of authority up to the Secretary of State.

When we looked into the Passport Office we found conditions to be unbelievable. We found, for example, that passports were readily within the grasp of individuals visiting in the office. We found a lack of adequate files and a lack of adequate organization. We found an office which had not been improved substantially, in terms of administrative organization, for more than a decade. I believe, in fact, that the last increase in fees for passports occurred in the 1930's, if I am not mistaken.

The question of fees has been brought up by travel agencies. I spoke to the staff director yesterday, and have talked

with some of my colleagues about the matter. Raising the passport fee from $9 to $18, which is doubling the amount, may seem to some persons to be excessive, but I can document the fact today that it is below what it really should be. However, rather than to impose the full increase at one time, I propose to suggest as an amendment that the increase be only to $15.

I shall also propose in due time the above suggested amendment, which will make it specifically clear within the language of the bill itself that the Secretary of State shall have any and all authority to designate an official such as a security officer, to be in charge of such security provisions and protections as may be involved in the issuance of passports.

I have reason to believe there are some officials of the Department of State who think their respective little bureaus will be weakened. That is a foolish thought. What we are looking forward to is having an efficiently functioning office.

Miss Knight, the Director, is doing outstanding work to bring the Passport Office up to date by bringing the service to the people.

The whole proposal has been examined into carefully by the persons concerned with the operations of the State Department, and in particular the Passport Office.

The Office of the Comptroller General has been consulted at length about the matter. The Bureau of the Budget, to be sure, does not approve of this measure because of the departmental resistance; that is exactly the reason for the disapproval by the Bureau of the Budget. But if departments of the Government were reorganized only on the basis of how the departments felt, we would be back in about the 1860's. The attitude of the Bureau of the Budget, from my point of view, is hardly honest.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not believe there is any Senator, on either side of the aisle, who has more jealously guarded the prerogatives of Congress as the legislative arm, as a coequal arm, as a coordinate, and not a subordinate, than has the minority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand; I appreciate what the Senator from California has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only point I raise, and I think it a perfectly valid one, is that no hearings have been held. Frankly, I did not know until today that there had not been hearings held, to which the Department representatives might have been called to testify.

Once there has been an opportunity afforded the Department to present its case to the committee, and to have its representatives examined and cross-examined by Members on both sides of the aisle, if they desire to do so, the bill would then come to the Senate, after the committee had had the official views of the Department. There would be a record of the hearings. The Senate then would have the benefit of the testimony, it could give whatever weight it wished to give to the testimony which was presented, and could then make its decision.

It seems to me that we are more or less reversing the field when we begin to reorganize internally a department, when apparently the heads of the Department have not had the opportunity, at least, to appear before the committee and to make what they feel are valid objections to the bill. I respectfully suggest that even though the end result might be the very same, after the members of the committee had heard the testimony, I think time probably would be saved. I should have preferred the Senator from Minnesota to have raised the point on his own motion, whether it prevailed or not from this side of the aisle, on the ground that the Secretary, or his representatives, as a matter of good legislative procedure, should have the opportunity to testify which, of course, they cannot have on the floor of either the Senate or the House.

I would feel happier if the members of the committee, on both sides of the aisle, had the opportunity to examine and cross-examine Mr. Henderson or whoever else might come from the Department to express the views of the Department, rather than merely to have Mr. Henderson read an ex parte statement, which perhaps might be in error; because, after all, the executive department makes mistakes also, and I am not claiming that Mr. Henderson or anyone else in the Department of State is infallible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to the Senator from California that the bill as reported by the committee is the result of prolonged staff study, and of innumerable complaints made about the Passport Service—complaints about which the State Department did nothing. The junior Senator from Minnesota has written to the Department again and again about the complaints. I became interested, as did the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and other Senators, because of innumerable complaints which were received by my office about the Passport Service. The State Department has shown no interest in the matter, except to oppose the committee's proposal.

The Committee on Government Operations has authority, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, to make post audits for the purpose of reorganization. I am proud of the work of our committee. We have saved the Government millions of dollars.

It is not an unusual performance for the Committee on Government Operations to introduce bills such as this. The committee has presented bill after bill as a result of staff studies and as a result of executive sessions of the full committee. Every member of the committee is cognizant of the reports which have been made.

The last staff memorandum on this bill which was presented to the members of the committee as a result of a staff study is about 10 pages in length. The committee has discussed the bill with representatives of the State Department, and the State Department is opposed to the bill. The State Department is opposed to the bill because the Passport Office, which is now a bureau in the Department, will be established as a special service, subject to the administrative authority of the Secretary of State. The Secretary, therefore, will have direct administrative responsibility for the Passport Office. The day the Passport Office can be looked upon as a simple, little adjunct of government is over. Thousands upon thousands of passports are issued, far beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic travel agency. Next year—I have forgotten the exact figures—it is expected that there will be a 15 or 20 percent increase, or even more, in the number of passports issued.

What the bill does is simple. There is not much to it, except it gives the Secretary of State direct authority to place the Passport Service in the State Department, where the office ought to be, rather than leave it locked down, as it has been locked down from time immemorial.

I may say to the Senator from California that when I visited the office I found it in a basement. I found it with facilities which were such that employees were passing out because of inability to get fresh air. I found it with windows open, and so located that a person walking by could reach in and take a passport, if he wanted to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May I ask how long the office was in that condition?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For years. If there ever was a bipartisan mess, this was it. If there was ever need for a bipartisan revision, this was it. This office was dying on the vine. We were encouraging people to travel and go overseas, and they were waiting 5, 6, and 7 weeks for passports.

When it comes to the question of security, what kind of security was there with respect to passports, which are among the most vital documents which can be had? A person walking on the street by the office could actually reach in the window, if he had long arms, and take a passport. There were not even adequate office machines. The employees were not being treated like human beings.

Those conditions were not due to anyone's diabolical purpose. The office was forgotten. Why was it forgotten? Because it was a little unit or agency of Government. The issuance of passports is becoming a big business. It is vital to the whole program of international policy of the United States.

The bill simply does two things. It says, "Mr. Secretary, the Passport Office should be under your control within your department. What do you want to do with it?" We elevate it to a service rather than a unit, and leave it to the Secretary to put it where it will best serve the Government. Secondly, the bill establishes a revolving fund, so the accounting of funds will be simplified, and adequate flexibility provided to meet seasonal demands for passports. The office gets hundreds of checks back and forth, in connection with its activities, and is required to meet demands for service which fluctuate during the peak travel season.

Revolving funds have been established under many acts of Congress. I may say

the Comptroller General's Office has cooperated very effectively with us in trying to meet these problems. Many of the objections to the original bill have been eliminated, and the bill has been rewritten and rewritten until it has met at least with the overall approval of the Comptroller General's Office.

I know what the opposition to the bill is. By the way, this is not a matter of life and death to the junior Senator from Minnesota. This is not a great policy matter. It is a matter of making the Government operate more efficiently. Where does the opposition come from? I am going to pinpoint it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Where does the opposition come from?

Mr. HUMPHREY. From Mr. McLeod's office, which does not want to lose this unit. I am not criticizing Mr. McLeod. If the Secretary wants to put the unit back under Mr. McLeod, he has the authority to do it under the bill. The bill brings the office directly under the control of the Secretary, and does not leave it out in Mr. O'Malley's barn or pasture, to be looked at occasionally.

By the way, I want the record to be clear that I was not one who supported Miss Knight when I first came to know of her, but I have come to know her, and I know it has been her steadfast purpose to make the office efficient.

I could not imagine that this would be a controversial bill, except that there would be opposition from someone downtown whose rank might be judged by the number of employees in his pool, and who has decided that the bill must be stopped.

Mr. President, I do not believe the bill should be recommitted. It is on the floor, and I think it ought to be voted up or down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In addition to the purposes of the bill which the Senator has mentioned, does the bill not also double the passport fee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The fee is raised by the bill from $9 to $18. I shall suggest an amendment increasing the fee to $15, instead of $18. I shall present facts to show the cost of processing passports has gone up 118 percent since the $9 rate was established. The same arguments which were made in 1932 when the rate was increased from $5 to $9, are being made against the increase now proposed. If a person who is planning to go overseas cannot afford to pay $15 for a passport, I should want to know whether a passport were necessary.

I recognize the fact that travel agencies oppose any increase in passport fees. Nevertheless, in the Committee on Foreign Relations without any hearings we recently doubled those fees which are retained by local and State court officials handling passport matters. The State Department on that occasion objected to the increase in fees. Yet the bill was reported by the committee and was passed by the Senate. In the same committee where the present bill originates, the Committee on Government Operations, one reorganization bill after another, of a technical nature, has been considered without hearings and reported by the committee to the Senate.

If the bill involved a great policy matter, for example, a revision of the immigration laws or the Refugee Act, I would say there should be hearings. The State Department was consulted. The Bureau of the Budget was consulted. The Bureau of the Budget opposes a revolving fund. They always oppose such funds. I have a list of the number of revolving funds Congress has authorized. I think the Congress has authorized 11 or more revolving funds, over the objection of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only point I am raising, which I feel needs to be raised on the floor, is that in view of the circumstances, the fact that there were no hearings, and there are what appeared to me to be cogent reasons against the bill, the officials should have an opportunity to present the reasons to the committee. I wanted to inform the Senator of those circumstances and to express the hope that he might think it more orderly procedure to permit the officials of the department to testify. Then I might agree with him, if that were done, and if the bill were reported to the Senate, either with the amendments the Senator intends to offer, or with additional amendments.

I wish to say most respectfully I think the Senator's committee is one of the able and outstanding committees of the Senate. Certainly we know the committee has reported to the Senate measures of importance with relation to the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government.

I agree with what he says about the present head of the Passport Office. From all I know, I think Miss Knight is doing a fine job. I say most respectfully, regardless of how competent the professional staff of the committee may be—I do not know that they are any more competent and I do not say that they are less competent than the employees who are working 365 days a year within the Department doing this work—it seems to me the responsible heads of the executive departments of the Government at least ought to have an opportunity to give their testimony and be cross examined before the committee. That is the only point I make. Then certainly, as the sole repository of the legislative power under the Constitution, the Congress can take such action as in its judgment it thinks should be taken, regardless of the objection of the Department. But I do not believe in foreclosing the views of the Department from the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from California, first, that the bill is a result of months of study. It is not as the junior Senator from Minnesota has said, a bill which involves a great policy matter. I was asked by the chairman whether or not I would be willing to present it to the Senate. I said I would. I was interested in the matter.

When the language of the bill is understood, I think it will be seen that the State Department is suddenly and belatedly raising objections which apparently it did not feel too strongly about earlier. Only in the last few days did I hear that the State Department was concerned because it had not had an opportunity to testify. The State Department was consulted, and the Bureau of the Budget was consulted. Sometimes it is rather difficult, of course, to obtain a quorum of our colleagues for the purposes of a committee hearing. I have attended many subcommittee hearings at which I have had to hold the hearing alone or with one other member of the subcommittee.

I have discussed the bill with the other members of the committee. The memorandum from the State Department is on file before the committee.

The bill has been rewritten in the light of the objections raised by the Comptroller General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the State Department, without sacrificing our purpose in connection with the bill.

When we read the bill we find that it simply provides:

> That all functions, powers, duties, and authority of the Passport Office of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, together with those funds, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, personnel, properties, and records of the Department of State which the Secretary of State shall determine to be primarily related to, and necessary for, the exercise of such functions, powers, duties, and authority, are hereby transferred to the United States Passport Service, established pursuant to section 2 of this act.

It is to be an integrated unit, I digress to say.

I read further from the bill:

> SEC. 2. There is hereby established in the Department of State an agency to be known as the "United States Passport Service" (hereinafter referred to as the "Service") which shall be headed by a director who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State in accordance with the civil-service laws, and whose position shall be allocated to grade 18 of the General Schedule as prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

It was at that point I wished to have a clarification amendment included, so as to state clearly that the Secretary shall have the right to move this office to wherever he deems desirable, and to designate any other agent of the Department of State or any other agency to perform whatever functions it may be necessary to perform in order to assist this particular service—such as the functions of the Consular Service, for security clearance on passports. So there would be no difference at all in that respect, insofar as concerns the situation following enactment of the bill.

Let me say that the third section of the bill provides for establishment of a revolving fund, so as to tighten up the bookkeeping.

Section 4 provides, in part:

> SEC. 4. In accordance with the provisions of existing law—
>
> (a) the Secretary of State shall prepare and submit an annual business-type budget program for the Service;
>
> (b) there shall be installed and maintained in the Service an integrated system of accounting, including proper features of

internal control, which will (1) assure adequate control over all assets and liabilities of the fund, (2) afford full disclosure with respect to the financial conditions and operations of the fund according to the accrual method of accounting, and (3) supply on the basis of accounting results the data for the annual budget of the Service with respect to the last completed fiscal year. The system of accounting shall conform to principles and standards prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States so as to accomplish the purposes of this section, and shall be subject to such review by the Comptroller General as may be necessary to assure its conformance with the principles and standards prescribed and its effectiveness in operation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps I should have carried the figure in my mind, but it is difficult to do so. Will the Senator from Minnesota state the proposed salary schedule under class 18?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is between $14,000 and $15,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the present salary?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe it is somewhat below that figure, but I shall obtain that information for the Senator from California. The bill will upgrade all of them in the amount of approximately what we might call one step upward in the salary schedule.

Mr. WATKINS rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Utah, who wishes to ask some questions.

Mr. WATKINS. I noted that the Senator from Minnesota said the passport business is now big business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. And I have noticed that there has been proposed a 100-percent increase in the passport fee.

I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that literally thousands of American college students make tours abroad; and the pending bill, if enacted, would add to their difficulties in connection with making those trips.

At the moment I do not say whether the increased fee called for by the bill is a proper one; but I wish to state that it seems to me we should give ample consideration to the situation of those who are to pay the fee; and if the passport business is today big business, hearings on this subject should be held, and we should receive sufficient testimony to show whether the big increase in fees the bill calls for is necessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have that information.

Mr. WATKINS. But the other Members of the Senate do not have the benefit of it, for they do not have the benefit of a hearing record, and thus they are unable to know the views of those who are to do the traveling and who are to pay the fees. Such persons have not had an opportunity to testify about the bill. I am sure that many of our colleagues would like to have an opportunity afforded to numerous persons to appear at a committee hearing and testify in regard to this subject. A number of colleges are in the custom of sending students abroad for a part of their college education, and giving them credit for the courses they take while they are abroad. Those colleges and universities never charge those students the entire amount required for the service they render the students in that conection, and I think the Senator from Minnesota recognizes that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I do.

Mr. WATKINS. Enactment of the bill would handicap such colleges and universities by calling for the expenditure of considerably larger amounts of money.

Let me state to the Senator from Minnesota that I am informed that the fees presently charged bring in sufficient funds to pay the cost of the operation of this bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sorry to disagree, but I must inform the Senator from Utah that information made available to the committee would indicate that that is not correct.

Mr. WATKINS. I was advised by a staff member, I believe, that the amount of money brought in last year by the fees, covered more than the actual cost of operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If one considers only the operation of the Passport Service itself, without considering the costs in connection with security and consular matters which relate to that function, that is true; but if we consider the other costs, the total is much larger than the total of the fees received.

Mr. WATKINS. Of course we have our consular offices overseas, and their operations have now been vastly expanded, although the service they render to traveling Americans is small, as compared to the other work those offices do. I have found that to be a fact from my own experience.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Let me say that I am no Scrooge, and I wish to have the fees made as reasonable as possible. It has been my opinion—judging from my service on the Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve as just a member, with no particular title—that the desire was to have the fees charged for governmental services of an amount sufficient to compensate for or equate to some extent, at least, the costs involved in the processing of the particular documents or in the handling of the particular services. Therefore, let me say very frankly that I am not particularly concerned about a $9 increase in the fee. Whether the fee be $9 or $12 or $15 or $18, I think is a matter of detail, and can be covered by an amendment to be submitted during our consideration of the bill. Certainly the exact amount of the fee does not constitute a major stumbling block.

I believe that the real issue involved in the bill is the organization of the State Department as it relates to the Passport Service. In my opinion that is the real issue.

If the Senator from Utah wishes to submit an amendment in regard to the size of the fee—and let me say that I understand another Senator wishes to offer an amendment relating to the fee—we can vote such an amendment up or down.

Frankly, I have felt that the increase in fees called for by the bill may be a little too high, and I have so stated; and I am preparing to offer an amendment to reduce them. But that is not what the State Department was complaining about.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to point out that the reorganization programs are supposed to result in efficiency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Then I cannot see why we should allow what we do in connection with reorganization to result only in increasing the fees charged, and thus bring in more money for the operation of the agency concerned.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very fine statement on the Passport Division. In particular I commend him for his remarks with respect to Miss Knight. My experience over the years is that that office has been very efficiently operated, and I certainly believe that something of the kind proposed in the bill should be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in believing that the Senator from Minnesota has made an inspection of the Passport Office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not call it a full-scale inspection. However, I have at least taken a look at it, and I have had long talks with members of the staff.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois spent an hour going through the office, and he was greatly pleased with the obvious increase in efficiency which has been effected by Miss Knight, and the very systematic way of handling applications and rendering prompt—and I think just—judgments upon them.

The Senator from Illinois wishes to join the Senator from Minnesota in saying that this service should be recognized by being accorded a greater dignity and a certain degree of greater independence, as well as by an increase in the salary of the Director. When we see a public official doing a good job under great difficulties, I think we should give proper credit. I am not impressed with the contention that because the Office has increased in efficiency it should be denied appropriations. It needs additional appropriations in order that it may have the facilities with which to function.

In this case the workload is increasing. The speed of processing applications has greatly improved, and I believe that good service should be rewarded. I am very happy to support the bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall conclude my discussion with a few brief additional observations.

The bill, as reported by the committee, conforms specifically to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, by establishing, within the Department of State, a United States Passport Service, and by transferring from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs to the Secretary of State those functions which are now carried on by the Passport Office of that Bureau. The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs was established within the Department of State under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and the Passport Office was incorporated as a part of the Bureau pursuant to that act.

Thus the pending bill actually would remove a statutory impediment or a stricture between the Secretary and the Director of the Passport Office, by establishing a United States Passport Service as a separate unit within the Department of State. It would place the Director of the Service under the direct control of the Secretary of State. Since it would in no way alter the existing authority of the Secretatry to delegate the functions involved, and to control the Passport Service, Senate bill 3340 conforms fully to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to which I have referred.

I note that the Hoover Commission's recommendations, in its report on General Management, which were referred to by the Deputy Under Secretary of State in his testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations on March 14, 1956, were as follows:

1. That each department head should receive from Congress administrative authority to organize his department and to place him in control of its administration.

2. That the department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department.

What we are really doing in this bill is going back to the original act relating to the reorganization of the Department of State, which was enacted in either 1951 or 1952. The provisions of that act were upset or altered by the Immigration and Nationality Act provisions, which require that the Passport Office be included in the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

I remind my colleagues that the original act relating to the reorganization of the State Department in accordance with the first Hoover Commission recommendations gave the Secretary the authority to place agencies in the Department within the organizational structure where they would make the most sense and promote the greatest efficiency.

Then the Congress came along with the Immigration and Nationality Act and imposed a block, a stricture, or an impediment in the way of the Secretary being able to design the use of the respective agencies in his Department. This bill would unfreeze that situation.

The bill would provide the Secretary with authority over the Passport Service. It would make the Passport Service a separate unit, and it would permit the Secretary to place the Passport Service in the Department where he deems most desirable from an efficiency and policy point of view.

The point which has been raised with respect to fees can be readily resolved. Furthermore, if the bill passes the Senate, it will be a forward step. It will have to go to the House. There is no reason why the State Department could not be heard before the House Committee on Government Operations, which has a larger staff than our committee has. It has dozens of subcommittees. It has much more time to go into specific problems in detail. The State Department could make its presentation before that committee.

The criticisms of the State Department are twofold. First, there is the belated criticism based upon the fees. Second, there is the criticism based upon the proposal to remove the Passport Office from the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Passport Office is big enough and important enough to have a separate status; and that the Secretary can designate a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs as an auxiliary agency to the Passport Office, to perform whatever functions may be necessary in connection with the issuance of passports.

Insofar as fees are concerned, I am informed that the State Department has had under consideration, practically ever since the Immigration and Nationality Act was amended in 1952, a bill which may be presented to Congress shortly, to increase the rate for passports from $9 to $15, and to extend the time of the original passport from 2 years to 3 years, with a 2-year renewal privilege. That is what the State Department now has under consideration, and according to information developed by the staff of the committee, is about ready to present to the Congress in the form of a bill for its consideration.

What I am suggesting is that, instead of the $18 fee proposed in the bill, which I thought was rather excessive—and which is a subject I have discussed with others—we reduce the fee to $15. Second, since some question has been raised as to the Secretary's authority under the bill to make whatever adjustments may be necessary in the alinement of agencies within the State Department, I am offering what might be called an explanatory amendment, which would read as follows:

The Secretary of State may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by the Director of the Service, or by any other officer, or agency, or employee of the Department of State of any of the functions transferred to the Service pursuant to the first section of this act.

Mr. President, that covers any possibility of there being any difficulty whatsoever, in terms of security clearance, in our consular offices overseas.

Before I yield the floor I wish to present my amendment and ask that it be considered. The amendment would be on page 2, line 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to insert the following:

The Secretary of State may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by the Director of the Service, or by any other officer, or by any agency or employee of the Department of State of any of the functions transferred to the Service pursuant to the first section of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if other Senators will indulge me, I should like to make a brief statement to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thought the Senate would consider the amendment I have presented.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am sorry. I thought the Senator from Minnesota had yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota offered his amendment. After the amendment has been offered and stated, he cannot hold the floor. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not argue the point. At the time I offered the amendment, I did so with the intention of having it acted on. I did not intend to yield the floor. However, I will not argue the point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is in no hurry. He will be glad to yield to his friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I shall return later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement I desire to make on another subject.

Mr. President, one of the outstanding features of the debate on legislation to improve the conditions of farming has been the constant stream of predictions that the bill will be vetoed.

Throughout the discussion, opponents of the legislation have proceeded on the assumption that they had a club in the White House closet. They are begging the President to take that club out and beat the farmers over the head with it.

I do not know whether the President will use his power and veto the bill the Congress has passed. The responsibility of the veto has been granted to him by the Constitution, and there is no one else who can presume to exercise it.

I am not going to join the ranks of the "informed"—or "uninformed"—sources who predict before the bill reaches him what the President will do. Personally, I sympathize with anyone who wakes up every morning to find out that others are telling the world what he is thinking and what he is planning.

But a discussion of the results that would flow from a veto is certainly in order.

A veto at this time would leave America's farmers completely at the mercy of

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. I believe Mr. Benson to be a man of integrity and honesty of purpose, but he is also a man who has made clear his belief in factory farming and low farm income as a way of life.

A veto at this time would transfer the responsibility for low farm income from the Agriculture Department to the White House itself. This would be a Presidential stamp of approval on the conditions which have lost our farmers a minimum of $3 billion in income in the past 3 years.

A veto at this time, the majority leader believes, would cost the farmer a minimum of $2 billion in cash income this year.

A veto at this time would discourage American agriculture and speed up the drift from the farm to the city.

The senior Senator from Texas can understand the perplexity which must bedevil the President at this time.

On the one hand, he has a bill which represents the collective judgment of Congress, and which has been considered by two great committees; debated in both branches; put into final form by a distinguished conference committee representing the House and Senate; approved with the votes of members of both parties; and which has been overwhelmingly approved by the conference committee, with the votes of members of both parties.

On the other hand, he has the necessity of reversing a trend which was set in motion by his own Secretary of Agriculture 3 years ago, and which his own Secretary still apparently sincerely approves.

It is a difficult problem—to save the faith of American farmers in their government or save the face of the Secretary of Agriculture in his cabinet.

I hope the President will ignore the pleas of those who are urging him to use the club in the White House closet. The American economy cannot be sound unless there is a prosperous and healthy agriculture, and the measure which the Congress has passed is needed.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3340) to transfer the functions of the Passport Office to a new agency of the Department of State to be known as the United States Passport Service to establish a passport service fund to finance the operations of the United States Passport Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the statement made by the distinguished minority leader with respect to the necessity of holding hearings on the measure which is now before the Senate. There are many travelers nowadays. The number has been increasing rapidly over the years. In fact, the travel rate to Europe is increasing by leaps and bounds.

As I indicated in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, many of the travelers are young college students who are taking courses prescribed for them involving travel to Europe where they study the cultures of European countries, and the countries themselves. All colleges are not self-supporting. At least, they do not obtain sufficient tuition and other fees to maintain themselves. It would be a heavy burden on these young people, and upon the schools, and would have a bad effect upon the courses which have been outlined for the students, if the fees were increased. That is one of the things which cannot be handled in this so-called reorganization measure. It goes beyond reorganization.

I think the question of fees should be studied further. Statements have been made with respect to necessary reforms to make the Passport Division more efficient. I think, in all fairness, we should have before us the communication from Mr. Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, with reference to the reorganization.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota with respect to the lack of diligence in following through on suggestions. In this connection I think a letter written by Mr. Henderson should be read into the RECORD. It is dated March 24, 1956. It reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: Your Committee on Government Operations has been advised through established channels of the Department's position on S. 3340.

As the officer of the Department responsible for management and administration generally, I want you to know that the Department appreciates the keen interest displayed by your committee and its several members during the past several months in improving the operations of the Passport Office. Indeed, the work of your committee and its staff has done a great deal to help speed up needed changes. The Department has also obtained unusually prompt assistance from several other Departments of the Government.

Many of the recommendations made by your committee and by other agencies of the Government have been placed into effect. High priority has been given to provide the necessary administrative support, including adequate funding to the Passport Office, so that these combined efforts will reach optimum effectiveness. I am pleased with the conspicuously good record of performance by the several administrative units of the Department that have been called upon to assist the Passport Office. In my letter of March 16, 1956, addressed to Senator HAYDEN, a copy of which was sent to you, I advised that the additional $10,000 needed for equipment mentioned in your committee's report had been made available by reprograming funds from other areas of the Department. Similarly $37,885 was recently made available to the Passport Office to meet urgent requirements for printing additional passports.

The studies that have been underway for some time on the matter of passport fees have not been completed. As soon as they are completed the Department will express its views on the level of the fees to be collected and will advise your committee prompty.

Mr. President, I regard that as a very important paragraph. This matter, involving, as it does, so many persons who have the right to travel and who are encouraged by the administration to travel, certainly should have some further study. Representatives of the Department should have an opportunity to appear.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like, first, to finish the reading of the letter before I yield.

I read further from Mr. Henderson's letter:

If the Department's budget request for the next fiscal year is approved by the Congress, adequate provision will be made for meeting any unpredictable developments in passport operations. I refer specifically to the appropriation requested for "Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service" and to the general provision for the transfer of funds from that appropriation to other appropriation accounts to meet unforeseen requirements. It is most important not only for the Passport Office but for a number of other areas of the Department that our 1957 budget provide funds that will give us necessary flexibility to meet emergent and unanticipated demands. Provision has, of course, been made in the budget for the Passport Office for all operations of that Office that can be anticipated at this time.

Much remains to be done in improving the Passport Office's operations. We believe the objectives of S. 3340 to improve that Office can be accomplished in large measure under the present structure. If we find that there are serious impediments in our path we will welcome an opportunity to discuss this problem with your committee at that time.

Sincerely yours,

LOY W. HENDERSON,
Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

Mr. President, that is a statement of the Department's position, and I think the last paragraph indicates a view to which we should give some consideration. It would be well to have these officers before the committee so they can be questioned with respect to the plans they have underway, and whether it is necessary to have this proposed reorganization to improve the efficiency which they themselves wish to bring about and which the committee wishes to bring about.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield at that point?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much impressed with Mr. Henderson's letter, because what it relates is exactly what the committee has done. He tells of the improvement which the State Department made in the Passport Office, and he is kind enough to say that the reason for that is that the committee insisted that the improvement be made.

There is on the desk of every Senator a report in which there is a note as to a very substantial amount of work which was accomplished. I should like the Senator to note that on page 3 of the report it is stated:

In compliance with the request regarding the management supervision of the program, the Bureau of the Budget arranged with Miss Knight and Chairman Young of the Civil Service Commission to have the

Director of the Bureau of Management Services of the Civil Service Commission assigned to work with the Director of the Passport Office (1) in the development and installation of the new reorganization program, (2) in defining the functions of the newly created divisions and sections (3) in fixing responsibilities and delegations of authority, (4) in developing standards of performance and staffing patterns, and (5) in overall improvements in personnel administration and general management.

This is what finally came out of the consultation with the many bureaus of the Department in connection with the management survey, at the prodding of the committee and the committee staff. The bill carries out exactly what the management survey recommends.

In the last paragraph of Mr. Henderson's letter he says:

Much remains to be done in improving the Passport Office's operations.

Mr. WATKINS. I read that, if the Senator will remember.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Here is what Mr. Henderson says:

We believe the objectives of S. 3340 to improve that Office can be accomplished in large measure under the present structure.

Mr. WATKINS. Without additional legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, I may say that through several administrations, Republican and Democratic, as far back as one can point, until Congress has stepped in improvements have not been made. I can show the Senator the hearings in 1920, 1924, 1934, and 1936, and it is always the same.

What is proposed to be established by legislative enactment is a management design in an administrative organization. Basically all we are doing is to go back to the reorganization statute relating to the State Department which was passed, in 1951, as a result of the Hoover Commission recommendations. That statute gives the Secretary the authority to aline the agencies in the Department according to an administrative pattern which the Secretary may design in his own Department. That pattern was obstructed, or an impediment was placed in the way, by the Immigration and Nationality Act, which transferred the Passport Office to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

The bill merely provides that the Secretary of State shall have the power to place the Passport Office where he deems best in the Department, and to elevate the Office to one of service, rather than to have it simply in the status of a unit, and thereby give to it greater stature and position in the Department of State, commensurate with its responsibility.

Mr. WATKINS. I am not trying to argue the merits of the bill, except with respect to the increased fee provided in section 3. I point out that in a matter of this kind, which involves so many persons and regulations, and the like, it seems to me the committee could have made much better progress if it had held a hearing and let those who were interested, such as the persons I have mentioned—college personnel and the literally hundreds of thousands of persons who travel—or their representatives, come before the committee and testify. In a matter which involves such a vast number of persons, it seems to me that the much better way would have been to follow the practice which Congress has followed over the generations, namely, to hold hearings, so that persons interested could present their views.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is a meritorious point.

Mr. WATKINS. Senators then could have heard the discussion and the arguments pro and con about the fees to be charged. They would have heard the discussion by the Bureau of the Budget, and would have heard the give and take between the members of the committee and the representatives of the Department. In that way they would have ascertained the views of the executive department. From the exchange of views, I think the Senate would have had a much better understanding of what is proposed.

I am arguing for that which the distinguished minority leader urged, namely, that hearings he held on the bill, so as to let the persons in the executive departments who are experts in the matter come before the committee and discuss the bill. I think that would be much better than simply to have exchanges of letters and staff studies on which to judge this legislation.

If we are coming to the point of letting staff members hold hearings, with Senators not taking the direct responsibility, we shall be making a great departure from the ordinary Senate procedure, and overall congressional procedure, as well. Such orderly procedure is what I am arguing for at this moment.

In addition to what I have already said, I call the attention of the Senate to a letter which was received from the executive vice president of the American Automobile Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator will permit me to pursue the matter a moment——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to say that this material was presented to the Senator by the committee. It is not as if that had not happened.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that, but certainly I think a mistake was made, if I may be permitted to say so, in not yielding to the suggestion made by the American Automobile Association. The next to the last paragraph of that letter reads:

However, we must disagree with the need of recommendation 3, calling for a 100-percent increase in passport and renewal fees. There appears to be no justification for an increase at this time. It would clearly be a deterrent to foreign travel and in marked contrast of the policies of the Government to facilitate trips made by our citizens abroad.

The American Automobile Association was making a plea to the committee for the very thing which the committee denied. It may well be that the committee did not write them a letter and say their request would be denied; but the association requested a hearing.

I am certain the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget would have liked to have been heard and to have presented their views in an orderly manner. In that way, I think the committee might have drafted a better reorganization plan than has been suggested.

Further, on the matter of reorganization, the way the system now works might very likely be the same way in which it would work if the bill were amended as the Senator has suggested. The Secretary of State under the proposed amendment could designate the identical bureau in the Department of State that now controls the passport unit to have complete control and direction of the Passport Service in the future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There would be some difference.

Mr. WATKINS. I fail to see the difference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Accounting methods are prescribed in the bill.

Mr. WATKINS. That is objected to by the Bureau of the Budget. Whether their reasons are sound or unsound, I do not know.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Bureau of the Budget does not object to the accounting methods; it objects to the revolving fund. I think there will always be an objection to a revolving fund, just as, I suppose, King George III objected to July Fourth. We will always hear objections to a revolving fund.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know the reasons which King George III might have had for objecting to July Fourth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He expressed some objection to the Fourth of July 1776.

Mr. WATKINS. At any rate, I should like to hear the objections made by the Bureau of the Budget, and not leave it to the Senator from Minnesota to say whether they are sound or unsound. I should like to hear a discussion of the matter by the responsible officials of the departments involved.

I still believe it would be a wise move on the part of the Senate to recommit the bill and to hold hearings. Even if only 2 or 3 Senators were present at the hearing, a record could be made, and the Senate then would know what the situation really is. I came into this discussion cold. I have no personal interest in the matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator if he came into the matter at the request of the Department of State?

Mr. WATKINS. I came into it because I was notified that hearings had not been held and that the matter was something which should be considered carefully.

I do not happen to be on the committees, but I happen to be a member of the subcommittee on immigration and have very close connections with the State Department on questions involving immigration and naturalization. It is for that reason, I assume, that my attention was called to the bill. I have made some investigations in Europe and the Near East of the Consular Service and of the way in which the Passport Service operates.

Moreover, the minority leader requested me to take a look at the bill. As a matter of fact, I understand that in the House the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, because a request has already been made to have the bill referred to that committee. In

the Senate the bill was referred to the committee of which the Senator from Minnesota is a member, and not to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill was not referred to the Committee on Government Operations at all; it was born in that committee. Not only was the idea of the bill conceived and given life by that committee, but the committee also reported the bill as a result of its own work.

The report indicates that in July, 1955, a study was undertaken. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the chairman of the committee, at the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], myself, and other Senators, directed the staff to make a study. The committee proceeded to work with the Civil Service Commission, the Department of State, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Services Administration; and, as the Department of State, through Mr. Henderson, acknowledges, substantial reforms and improvements have been made. I say most charitably, kindly, and considerately that those improvements were not made until the committee moved into action.

Mr. WATKINS. Let us give the committee full credit for that. I do not criticize what the Senator and his committee have done up to that point, with respect to the investigations which have been made. I maintain that a mistake was made in not permitting a hearing to be held on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree that the Senator makes a point on that ground. I should be the last person to say that hearings are not generally desired. But the committee received no particular requests for hearings. The bill was under consideration for a long time. The committee report was circulated among the agencies of the Government. The Department of State did not raise any particular fuss about hearings until March 24.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator has just indicated in the colloquy some additional information which I respectfully suggest constitutes an additional reason for what I hope will be the ultimate decision of the Senator from Minnesota himself to ask for hearings. The hearings could be limited in scope.

In the normal course of events, a bill is introduced on the floor and is then printed. Notice of the introduction of of the bill is given to all Senators. Copies of the bill can be obtained by Senators who desire them.

As the Senator stated, quite properly—and I make no criticism of the practice, because many committees follow it—in this instance, the bill originated in the Committee on Government Operations. Apparently it was reported as what might be called a clean bill or a committee bill. Therefore, while the members of the committee might have been advised, while the persons concerned in the executive department might have been advised, and while the committee might have been advised and might have had ample time in which to consider the staff study, nevertheless, so far as the average Member of the Senate was concerned, he would not have been alerted to the fact that the bill was in the hopper, so to speak, until the report of the committee was submitted with the bill. I might say to the Senator it was not until yesterday that I realized for the first time, when the report was available, that there had not been hearings on the bill. That may have been due to an inadvertence on my part. I do not say that in any criticism of the committee, because I think the report is perfectly factual and perfectly proper, but I had assumed the report had been submitted following the normal legislative procedure, that is, after hearings.

I commend the interest the Senator has taken in the passport service. I commend him and the diligence of his committee and the work he has done, but I respectfully state that, from the point of view of normal legislative functioning, to me—while we may disagree with some of the policies of the heads of the great departments of the Government of the United States, which in this instance is the State Department, while we may disagree as to the way they think their internal organization should be set up, yet they should have at least their day in court, so to speak, to present their points of view, or I prefer to say day in committee, so the two branches of the Government can be kept properly separated.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point. I think the viewpoint of the Department would more properly be presented by testimony of Mr. Henderson himself, but I should like to read a brief statement from the Department, so at least the views of the Department may be available in the RECORD; and then I hope that rather than have a motion by some Senator not on the committee, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee may at least offer to take the bill back to committee, give officials of the Department a chance to be heard and be cross examined, and then, if the bill is again reported, we shall be prepared to exercise our constitutional and legislative prerogatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator now hold to this rule on every bill reported to the Senate without hearings?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, I would not say that, because I do not think all bills require hearings, or that the departments would feel there should be hearings; but I do think it is a different case when a bill involves a matter of internal organization, when the matter of fees is involved, which is an indirect tax, or a direct tax, of a kind, on a certain number of American citizens, when certain responsibilities are placed on a department, and when officials of that department want to have their views presented.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask one question, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is a valued member of the Foreign Relations Committee, with whom I sit on that committee. Legislative proposals come before that committee. Sometimes there are hearings. Sometimes there are not formal hearings, in the sense of prolonged public hearings. It depends on what is proposed, and what the facts are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since I understand the department is considering the preparation of a bill which would do the same thing with regard to fees as does the pending bill, and as to which I understand the department will probably recommend a fee of $15 rather than $18, as contained in the bill, if that provision were stricken out would the Senator feel any more kindly or charitable with respect to the bill, since it has to go to the House?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not feel either unkindly or uncharitable about the Senator's proposal. If the officials had a chance to be heard, I might very well support the Senator and be in opposition to the department. It would not be the first time I would be in opposition to the department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has been a valued ally.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator will see his way clear to do what I have suggested.

Mr. President, I should like to read a general statement of the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, Loy W. Henderson, concerning Senate bill 3340:

The Department has made a careful review of the bills recently introduced to provide for reorganizing the Passport Office. The following comments are submitted.

CREATION OF THE UNITED STATES PASSPORT SERVICE

The establishment of a United States Passport Service as a semiautonomous agency within the Department, which would apparently report direct to the Secretary, would place additional responsibilities upon an already over-burdened Secretary and might deprive him of the time and energy which should be available for policy problems. Creation of the Service and determination of its functions by statute would limit the discretion of the Secretary in making future decisions concerning organization of the Department. This action is in conflict with the principle stated by the first Hoover Commission as follows:

"Each department head should receive from the Congress administrative authority to organize his department and to place him in control of its administration. * * * The department head should be given authority to determine the organization within his department."

By making the proposed Passport Service a semiautonomous agency, it would be possible for the Service to provide its own personnel, fiscal and operating facilities. If done, this would result in duplication of services now provided by the Department.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A REVOLVING FUND

On a continuing basis the financial problems of the Passport Office can be resolved through regular budgetary processes. Advanced financial planning, together with a budget submission reflecting that plan, will assure adequate consideration of the needs of the Passport Office by review authorities within and outside the Department. The establishment of a revolving fund cannot be considered as a substitute for adequate planning and will not in itself insure the efficient use of funds.

Because of the nature of its operations the Department of State is constantly faced with unanticipated contingencies. Fluctuations in workload are common to many parts

of the Department as well as to the Passport Office. The workload of the Passport Office can in fact be forecast with a greater degree of accuracy than is possible in many other areas. The problem of meeting workloads, which could not reasonably be anticipated, is departmentwide and the Department is at present giving consideration to ways and means by which it may be met.

The proposed revolving fund would be used to pay only direct costs. The regular appropriations of the Department would meet the indirect costs. This artificial separation of costs would pose a continuing problem to the Department and would make impossible the identifying of related costs within one account.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTING AND INTERNAL AUDIT SYSTEM

Through its regularly established administrative procedures and controls the Department can provide satisfactory accounting service to the Passport Office which will recognize the problems peculiar to that Office. Further, the internal audit of passport activities should be part of the departmentwide internal audit program since the Secretary of State continues to be responsible for them.

ONE HUNDRED PERCENT FEE INCREASE FOR ISSUANCE AND RENEWAL OF PASSPORTS

It is the policy of the executive branch, enunciated in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-25, dated November 5, 1953, to establish fees that will recover to the fullest extent possible the aggregate costs incurred in performing the service for which the fee is collected. This policy was reaffirmed by the President when he stated that special services benefitting individuals should be self-supporting—not profitmaking.

While available costing data does not permit precise calculations, it is apparent that the proposed increase in fees would produce a revenue in excess of that required to pay the costs of the issuance of passports. The establishment of fees at the rates proposed would result in the making of a profit on the issuance of each passport. It would in addition have a negative impact on the program to facilitate international travel. The Department has been studying this problem for some time but its studies to date are not sufficiently conclusive to permit a recommendation for a change in the current level of fees.

CONCLUSIONS

During the past several years as a result of the growing interest in travel abroad and the availability of low-priced and speedy travel facilities the activities of the Passport Office have greatly increased. The Department has not been unmindful of the problem posed by this increased activity. In recognition of the problem steps have been taken to modernize and mechanize the office and to equip it to handle the increased volume of business.

The Department shares the concern displayed by the Senate Committee on Government Operations and will continue the efforts of recent months to improve the effectiveness of the Passport Office to the end that the Office is properly equipped to meet the steadily increasing demands placed upon it and to assure a high standard of service to the public. The Department does not feel, however, that such improvements require the establishment of a semiautonomous agency for passport operations or the financing of such an operation through a revolving fund. Furthermore, the establishment by statute of a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of State would be contrary to the sound principles of management endorsed by the Hoover Commission and by general Government practice.

The Acting Secretary of State has authorized me to state that the Department of States is of the opinion that the passage of this bill would not be in the public interest.

In closing, I should like to submit for the record a copy of a letter from the Bureau of the Budget dated March 9, 1956, setting forth its views on the proposed legislation. The views of the Bureau of the Budget coincide in general with those of the Department.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that after the Secretary or those representing the Department have a chance to appear before the committee, and to be examined by it, and after an opportunity is afforded to submit other information to the committee, it may be that the committee will wish to report the bill in precisely the same form as that in which it is now before us. But I say respectfully, as only one Member of this body, that I would feel much happier, and would believe we were proceeding in the more normal fashion, if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on his own volition would take the bill back to the committee, and would permit such persons to appear before the committee and testify, and if the committee would then report to the Senate whatever bill in its judgment would be sound under the circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am in a somewhat difficult position, because, let me say first of all, this is the committee's bill. I have had the theoretical honor of presenting the bill on the floor, although now I am not so sure it is an honor, for it has become somewhat of a burden. But the committee itself decided on the bill it wished to report. So I am not disposed to take the bill back to the committee on my own volition, because the committee thought the bill was a rather good one.

Let me inquire as to the date of the comments from the Department of State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. March 14.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will do what I have suggested, because, after all, if the committee itself is still of the same mind, it will be able to report the bill again in the same form. On the other hand, if it is then found that the committee desires to make an amendment in the bill, that can be done. After all, we want an improved and an efficient Passport Service, and we want any department or agency of the Government to be mindful of the recommendations of the legislative branch.

If representatives of the Department have an opportunity to testify before the committee and there present their views, and if we then do not agree with them, I would be the first to say that, under the Constitution, all legislative power resides in the Congress of the United States; and I would not feel bound to go against my best judgment, and I do not believe any other Senator would be bound to go against his best judgment, based on what is shown by the facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly the Senator from California takes a very honorable position. But I think he will recognize, with me, that the State Department's representatives testified before the members of the committee, during the first session of this Congress, on the very matter of the reorganization of the Passport Office, which has been the subject of some consideration for a considerable period of time.

Mr. President, instead of continuing at this time, I now wish to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who repeatedly has requested the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to read some comments on the pending measure. These comments are based on a letter which I have received from the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island. I shall read a part of the letter, and then request that the entire letter be placed in the RECORD. The letter relates to the proposed revision of the law regarding applications for passports. I now read from the letter:

As clerk of a United States district court, I am authorized to accept applications and empowered to administer oaths in connection with passport procedure. This is provided for in the United States Code, title 22, section 213. In performance of this duty we have had applicants who as enlisted personnel of the United States Navy were proceeding abroad under Navy orders. The processing of their applications under section 214 of the above-mentioned title requires us to collect the $1 fee for the execution of each application for a passport. The $9 fee for its issuance is waived under the same section, provided the applicant falls within the category above described. The point to be stressed is that it does appear an incongruous requirement wherein a fee for execution is mandatory, in view of the status of the applicant, which is that of an involuntary traveler leaving this country strictly in the performance of a duty on the business of the Government.

In the letter, reference is made to the collection of these fees, particularly as they apply to the large number of applications received from enlisted personnel, many of whom are stationed in Rhode Island, at Quonset Point. When they are sent abroad, in many instances they have to go to the clerk of this court and pay a fee of $1.

In the letter, reference is also made to a number of other regulatory requirements.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND,
Providence, April 3, 1956.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the request of your administrative assistant, Mr. Edward J. Higgins, I am incorporating herein some thoughts on passport application procedure with reference to any proposed revisions of the law on that subject.

As clerk of a United States district court I am authorized to accept applications and empowered to administer oaths in connection with passport procedure. This is provided for in the United States Code, title 22, section

213. In performance of this duty we have had applicants who as enlisted personnel of the United States Navy were proceeding abroad under Navy orders. The processing of their applications under section 214 of the the above-mentioned title requires us to collect the $1 fee for the execution of each application for a passport. The $9 fee for its issuance is waived under the same section, provided the applicant falls within the category above described. The point to be stressed is that it does appear an incongruous requirement wherein a fee for execution is mandatory, in view of the status of the applicant, which is that of an involuntary traveler leaving this country strictly in the performance of a duty on the business of the Government.

In the Clerk's Manual issued by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts at section 11.03 is the sentence: "Clerks shall collect a fee of $1 for their services in connection with the execution of each passport application (22 U. S. C. 213 and 214)." This appears to be the official interpretation of sections 213 and 214 on the fee requirement.

As you can well imagine the demand of the $1 fee by a clerk is looked upon as "usurious" by an enlisted man who has been ordered to proceed abroad in the service of his country and it is with some reluctance that that fee is levied by this clerk.

There are other requirements that are regulatory in nature rather than statutory. These appear to me to be beyond the reasonable record requirements of most other Government agencies. I have specifically in mind that regulation which calls for a birth record to contain an impression seal. The director of health for the State of Rhode Island issues a certificate acknowledging the recording of the birth of an infant in this State at the time of birth. The certificate contains a printed seal which causes it to be rejected for passport purposes even though one of the notations on the reverse side of the certificate informs its holder that it can be used, among other uses, for passport purposes in establishing the nationality of the individual named. The regulation issued by the State Department to clerks of court precludes the use of such an instrument for lack of an impression seal, although all the other State Department requirements are present.

These are a few of the procedures that might bear examination in an effort to relieve some unneecssary hardship. I believe that if Congress were to make the execution fee of $1 discretionary with clerks of court in the cases outlined above, it might be a satisfactory solution to that particular problem.

Any further information or discussion on the subject of passport application procedure will be gladly supplied by me at your request.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

NEALE D. MURPHY.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I now desire to submit an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Chair is informed that another amendment is now pending. So the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is not in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me at this point?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment I offered is a technical and explanatory one. I should like to call it up now. If there is not to be extended debate on the amendment, we can dispose of it now, one way or another, and then consider the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield, for the purpose of permitting action to be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, Mr. President; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island is now in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this amendment would appear at the end of the bill, where a new section would be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Rhode Island will send his amendment to the desk, it will be read by the reading clerk.

Mr. GREEN. Very well, Mr. President; I now submit the amendment and send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920, as amended (22 U. S. C. 214), is amended (1) by striking out *"And provided further"* and inserting in lieu thereof *"Provided further"*, and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"And provided further*, That no fee shall be required hereunder by any officer or employee of the United States or any court of the United States for executing any application for a passport in the case of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States proceeding abroad in the discharge of his official duties, or any member of his immediate family."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that this amendment applies to passports with respect to which the application is made before a Federal official or a Federal court. It does not apply to applications made in State courts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I have previously discussed this subject with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I ask that Senators give attention to the unanimous-consent request which I am about to propound.

I ask unanimous consent that, upon the conclusion of action upon the unfinished business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1746, House bill 10004, notwithstanding the provisions of section 139 (a) of the Reorganization Act.

The bill to which I refer is the supplemental appropriation bill. I have talked with the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, as well as with the distinguished minority whip [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The majority leader discussed the subject with me. The request is agreeable to me. I have discussed it with the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, and it is agreeable to him, if the request meets with the approval of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have sent for the Senator from Delaware, and I note that he is now entering the Chamber.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is another case in which sufficient notice has not been given to the Senate before an appropriation bill is brought up for action.

The rules of the Senate are very specific on this point. I read from section 190 (f) of the General and Permanent Laws Relating to the Senate:

No general appropriation bill shall be considered in either House unless, prior to the consideration of such bill, printed committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least 3 calendar days for the Members of the House in which such bill is to be considered.

In other words, by the Reorganization Act of 1946, 3 days' notice is required after a bill is reported, before it may be considered by the Senate.

The calendar of business which I hold in my hand indicates that this bill, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1956, was reported to the Senate on April 11, which was yesterday. So, in effect, what is being asked is that we should pass upon the second supplemental appropriation bill with only 1 day's opportunity to consider it, and really only a few minutes' opportunity for consideration, because not until I reached my desk a few moments ago did I have a copy of the second supplemental appropriation bill. Prior to that time I did not have any effective opportunity to obtain a copy.

If this were the first time unanimous consent was being requested to take up an appropriations bill out of order, one might acquiesce. But this has happened time and time again.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on the other side of the aisle, and the Senator from Illinois, on this side of the aisle, have tried to enforce the 3-day rule. The procedure is standard each time. We discover that the 3-days' notice has not been given. We give evidence of the fact that we intend to object. Then our good friends come

to us and say, "Won't you make an exception this time? There is a pressing need." Or we are told, "There are personal considerations which make it important that this bill be considered."

The Senator from Illinois, wishing to be a cooperative colleague, and, I am afraid, probably not being able to resist the blandishments and seductions of those who are more skilled in parliamentary procedures than he, always finally yields and succumbs.

The last time the Senator from Illinois yielded to such blandishments was in March, when the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill came up. I was assured by the distinguished Senator from Virginia that if I agreed to permit that bill to be considered, it would never happen again.

The violation of this rule is, indeed, very similar to the practice of Rip Van Winkle, who took a pledge that he would never take another drop of liquor. Then, when a glass or bottle was offered to him, he would take it and say, "But we will not count this time."

So our good friends on the Appropriations Committee always profess that "This is the last time we will ever ask for an exception to the rule." The Senator from Illinois is always placed in the position of rising futilely, make some objection, and then being surrounded by his good friends, who appeal to his sense of kindness; and he yields. But I must admit that each time this happens the steel in the Senator from Illinois increases and his backbone stiffens.

There was a reason why the 3-day provision was inserted in the rules of the Senate. The reason was to afford Members of the Senate an opportunity to examine appropriation bills and determine whether or not they approved of every item.

If the Senate is to be a deliberative body the general membership should have the opportunity, and, if they believe it proper, exercise the right, to question certain items. We have full appreciation of the ability of members of the Appropriations Committee. We appreciate the hard work which they do. We also have a full appreciation of their power. Individually I know them to be gracious and kindly men. But, if we get in their bad graces, although the ax is never threatened, sometime the ax may fall. So Senators are reluctant to challenge the Appropriations Committee. The tendency is to pass these huge appropriation bills, now totaling considerably more than $60 billion a year, as they are reported from the committee.

I may say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that in the old days they used to object to appropriation bills proposed by a Democratic administration; but I do not find most of them having the same zeal for economy now that the appropriation bills are proposed by executive agencies under the control of their party. Some of the fighting zeal for economy seems to have departed from our friends on the other side of the aisle.

From time to time, when adequate notice has been given, the membership of the Senate has been able to effect economies. I remember that the other day a point of order was raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], whose eagle eye detected the fact that there was in the appropriation bill then pending legislation which would have authorized additions to the famous "additional" Senate Office Building, to which the Senator from Louisiana and I objected. The plans seem to grow and swell with the years.

The danger of rushing appropriation bills through without adequate consideration is especially great in the case of supplemental appropriation bills or urgent deficiency appropriation bills. It is said that, "The money is needed right away, and unless it is appropriated, Government services will cease." So, in a sense, the Senate operates with a pistol at its head, held by Government departments and by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, in this particular instance it is no small sum of money we are being asked to appropriate. It amounts to $859 million. However, this is not the first supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year. There was another one at the end of last year, which carried more than $1,600,000,000, or to be precise, $1,656,626,000.

Adding the present supplemental amount to the preceding supplemental amount, the total is two and a half billion dollars. That is not all. There was an urgent deficiency bill also. That was not a supplemental bill; apparently it was considered a special bill which had to be rushed through. That amounted to approximately $65 million. Then there is another bill upon which the Senate will act shortly. That amounts to $13 million.

Therefore we face the fact that more than two and a half billion dollars are being asked for in supplemental and deficiency bills, which amounts were not provided for in the original budget. That raises a very important question of budgetary procedure.

As I have sat here for some years, the suspicion has dawned upon me that frequently executive departments do not ask for all the money they intend to ask for; that they scale down their demands in the original budget and then the administration claims the credit for economies effected. Word goes out to the country of how they have cut the budget. Then in the supplemental bills, which come along later, the departments get additional sums of money, but that money never enters into the computations.

I wish to point out that the budget submitted last year, upon which the administration is taking credit for economy, is two and a half billion dollars short of the amounts which it will ask us finally to appropriate. Mr. President, a great deal of the economy in January or February in one year evaporates by the time the departments get into full swing.

Therefore I am somewhat reluctant to give consent to the consideration of the bill at this time. It is quite possible that the blandishments of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and of the majority leader and of the minority leader may once again cause the Senator from Illinois, in his desire to be obliging, to give consent.

SCHOOL LUNCH FUND SHORTAGE

I should like to say also that along with the extraordinary sums which we are being asked to appropriate, there was one omission which struck me very markedly, and that was the failure of the supplemental budget to carry any additional funds for school lunches. The school lunch program is one of the very best ways we have of spending money, because it gives food to youngsters who need it. It builds up their vitality. It is in the truest sense of the word an investment in national resources.

Yet the school lunch program has run out of funds. In my State the program has stopped on the 7th of April. It is true that the milk program continues; but the slices of bread and the pats of butter and the carrots and potatoes and lettuce and the other vegetables, which should go with an adequate school lunch program, are no longer provided.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has discussed the subject with the leadership on the other side of the aisle. We have fewer than a half dozen bills remaining on the calendar. We felt, since this appropriation bill was a noncontroversial bill, it could be passed this afternoon. If the Senator from Illinois has any deep feeling in the matter, and would prefer, the bill can go over until Monday. The reason we are caught up on all the bills which have been reported is that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was of the opinion that there was little opposition to his bill. It may have to be recommitted. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Illinois, we would like to take up the appropriation bill this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is improper time after time to violate the 3-day rule. However, the Senator from Illinois does not wish to be a "killjoy." On the other hand, I do not wish to have the rules violated so constantly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I do not wish to debate the matter with my friend from Illinois. It is not a matter of violating any rule of the Senate, if the Senate gives its consent. The Senator from Texas is not at all anxious to take up the measure if there is any Senator who does not wish to give his consent.

I had hoped that it would meet with the approval of the Senator from Illinois, because there are several items in the bill which are quite important. However, I do not wish to be unduly persuasive with the Senator. Of course I know I could not be. If the Senator from Illinois would agree to go along with us, I would appreciate it very much. However, if he feels that he conscientiously cannot do so, very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be privileged to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may be permitted to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] without his losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask this question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, whose hard work on the committee we all very deeply appreciate. I should like to ask him whether he considered the question of appropriating additional funds for the school lunch program so that the children of the country may have the usual school lunches for the remainder of the year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That question comes up each year. Congress makes what is estimated to be an adequate appropriation for the school-lunch program. Then it turns out that perhaps some States administer the program carelessly, and some do not; or some schools participate in the program that were not in it originally; and so on. Then the cry is raised that there is not quite enough money. What is the situation the Senator has in mind?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator correct me if I am wrong in my understanding? Am I correct, first, in understanding that for a number of years the appropriations have been about $83 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand further that last year the Secretary of Agriculture, in the budget which he submitted, cut the figure from $83 million to $68 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand also that by motion on the floor the school-lunch appropriation was raised by $15 million, to the former level of $83 million?

Mr. HAYDEN. The correction restoring the amount was made in the House of Representatives. It came over to the Senate in the same amount as the year before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was done in the House by the committee, as I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that is correct. It was restored in the House by the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that during the past few years, although the appropriation for the school-lunch program has been pegged at $83 million, there has been a tremendous increase in the school enrollment, particularly in the lower grades; so that the same amount of money is now being used to feed a greater number of children?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

However, in addition to the amount of money appropriated in the bill under discussion, there have been very large milk donations made otherwise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true with respect to milk. However, I am speaking of programs other than the milk program. Is it not true that the Secretary of Agriculture has not asked for any additional funds for the school-lunch program?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And unless he asked for it, the committee did not feel that an increased appropriation should be made?

Mr. HAYDEN. With donations of food and other things, we assumed that the allotment provided was satisfactory.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to point out a grave error on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. I do not blame the Appropriations Committee, but I do blame the Secretary of Agriculture for not realizing that the number of children to be fed in schools has been increasing, and for failing to request adequate appropriations. I wish to point out, also, that Mr. Benson's request for next year of $83 million, is also inadequate.

I am also puzzled by the fact that while it is said that he is in favor of devising new methods of disposing of agricultural surpluses, here at home is an obvious way of decreasing the surplus. I put the children first, but, of course, there is a secondary factor involved in providing additional outlets for farm products.

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona this question: Would the Senator be willing to add $20½ million, which is the sum needed to continue the school-lunch program for the remainder of the present fiscal year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I should first like to be sure of the amount of money which is actually needed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if we could not have this discussion when the bill comes before the Senate. I have two unanimous-consent requests to make.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Order No. 1628, Senate bill 3340, providing for the reorganization of the Passport Office, be recommitted to the Committee on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not object.

I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the committee [Mr. McCLELLAN], but I wish to serve notice that the State Department representatives will be asked to appear before the committee tomorrow morning, and we will be prepared to report the bill next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Texas is agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 10004, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if he will accept an additional appropriation of $10 million for the purpose which we have discussed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall give it very careful consideration after the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is a man of very cautious speed, but he also holds to his word. The gleam in his eye is kindly and friendly, and with faith in my heart that he will look upon my suggestion with favor, I withdraw any objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I assume the Senator from Illinois has indicated that he has some kind of an amendment which he wishes to offer providing for an additional expenditure of money, if not in astronomical figures, at least, in some substantial figures——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Ten million dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the matter will be carefully considered by the Senate, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as minority leader, I would not want the Senator from Illinois to be under any illusion that there is an advance commitment of $5 million, $10 million, $15 million, or any sum over and above that recommended by the committee. Possibly we can be convinced that such a sum should be included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have examined the bill and I find only one item as to which I have any serious question. That is the item on page 4, lines 11 and 12, providing for $30 million in connection with maritime activities. I have not been able to find adequate evidence to support this item. It is my understanding that if I permit the bill to come up at this time the provision will be eliminated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the understanding of the Senator from Texas, of the minority leader, and of the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Chapter I—Department of Agriculture—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 7, after the word "Research", to strike out "$1,217,530" and insert "$2,217,530".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$1,527,780" and insert "$2,252,780", and in the same line, after the

word "which", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$725,000".

Under the subhead "Farmers' Home Administration—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,620,000."

Under the subhead "Commodity Credit Corporation," on page 3, line 17, after the word "to", to strike out "$30,500,000" and insert "$30,964,000".

Under the heading "Chapter II—Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census—Salaries and Expenses," on page 3, at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$503,000" and insert "$528,000", and in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$100,000".

Under the subhead "Maritime activities," on page 4, after line 3, to strike out:

"SHIP CONSTRUCTION

"The limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, on the number of cargo ships for replacement, for which payment may be made for construction differential subsidy and national defense features, is increased from 5 to 20."

On page 4, after line 12, to insert:

"WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION LIQUIDATION

"The limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available from prior appropriations for the liquidation of certain obligations approved by the General Accounting Office and for the payment of obligations incurred against the working fund titled 'Working fund, Commerce, War Shipping Administration functions, December 31, 1946', is increased from '$5,900,000' to '$24,000,000'. Provided that the amount of such increase shall be available only for Court of Claims and district court judgments and payments to disabled seamen authorized by 56th Statutes at Large, page 758."

On page 5, after line 19, to insert:

"INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

"Small Business Administration

"Revolving fund

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $20,000,000."

On page 7, after line 17, to strike out:

"CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 366 and 69 Stat. 589), $56,000, to remain available through June 30, 1957."

Under the heading "Chapter V—Independent Offices—Civil Service Commission—Administrative Expenses, Employees' Life Insurance Fund," on page 9, line 5, after the word "to", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$135,000".

Under the subhead "Federal Home Loan Bank Board," on page 9, line 18, after the word "to", to strike out "$3,338,800" and insert "$3,438,800".

On page 10, after line 14, to insert:

"ACQUISITION OF LAND AND BUILDING, CHICAGO, ILL.

"For the acquisition of the parcel of land located at 536 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill., together with all improvements thereon and appertaining thereto, including incidental expenses, to remain available until expended, $3,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Sites and planning, purchase contract, and public buildings projects'."

On page 10, after line 22, to insert:

"EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general supply fund,' $450,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Sites and planning, purchase contract, and public buildings projects'."

Under the subhead "National Science Foundation—International Geophysical Year," on page 14, after the word "Year", to strike out "$26,000,000" and insert "$28,000,000".

Under the heading "Chapter VI—Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Research in the Utilization of Saline Water," on page 16, after line 16, to insert:

"OIL AND GAS DIVISION

"For an additional amount for 'Oil and Gas Division,' $35,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources," on page 16, line 23, after the word "resources", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$1,200,000".

At the top of page 17, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'construction,' $2 million, to remain available until expended."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Education and Welfare Services," on page 17, line 7, after the figure "$1,871,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior without exchange of funds, 46 school buses presently on loan to the Bureau of Indian Affairs."

On page 17, after line 11, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'construction,' $240,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the funds herein used for restoration of Indian irrigation facilities shall be nonreimbursable: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $54,000 used for emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of the San Carlos irrigation facilities damaged or destroyed by flood and storm in 1955 shall be nonreimbursable."

Under the subhead "National Park Service—Construction," on page 18, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "For an additional amount for 'construction', $3,000,000". and insert "For an additional amount for 'construction', $360,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 18, after line 5, to insert:

"JONES POINT BRIDGE

"For expenses necessary for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 963, 964), $500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, is hereby merged with this appropriation."

Under the heading "Chapter VII," on page 19, after line 17, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Bureau of Employment Security

"Mexican farm labor program

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program', $65,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Unemployment compensation for veterans'."

Under the heading "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," on page 20, after line 17, to strike out:

"CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

"For construction of a laboratory building for the biologics standards activities of the National Institutes of Health, and for expansion of and additional equipment for the boiler plant, including the preparation of plans, supervision, and fixed equipment, to remain available until expended, $3,190,000, together with not to exceed $310,000 of the unobligated balance of funds previously appropriated under this head."

On page 21, after line 2, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF BIOLOGICS STANDARDS LABORATORY BUILDING

"For construction of a laboratory building for the biologics standards activities of the National Institutes of Health, and for expansion of and additional equipment for the boiler plant, including the preparation of plans, supervision, and fixed equipment, $3,190,000, together with not to exceed $310,000 to be derived by transfer from 'Construction of research facilities'."

On page 21, after line 11, to insert:

"INCREASED PAY COSTS, CAREER INCENTIVE ACT OF 1955

"For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1956, for increased pay costs authorized by the act of March 31, 1955 (Public Law 20), as follows:

" 'Assistance to States, general', $55,000;

" 'Communicable diseases', $55,000;

" 'Sanitary engineering activities', $70,000;

" 'Foreign quarantine service', $20,000;

" 'Retired pay of commissioned officers', $130,000;

"The Surgeon General is authorized to transfer between appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary to meet increased costs authorized by Public Law 20, 84th Congress, but no appropriation shall be increased by more than $10,000 as a result of such transfers."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration—Grants to States for Public Assistance," on page 22, line 6, after the word "assistance", to strike out "$47,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000".

On page 22, after line 10, to insert:

"NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $25,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Arbitration and emergency boards', fiscal year 1956."

Under the heading "Railroad Retirement Board—Salaries and Expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (Trust Fund)," on page 22, line 19, after the word "fund", to strike out "$548,000" and insert "$888,000".

Under the heading "Chapter VIII—Public Works," on page 22, after line 22, to insert:

"TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

"For an additional amount for 'Tennessee Valley Authority', $3,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities," on page 24, line 14, after the word "activities", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$550,000".

Under the subhead "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses," on page 24, line 20, after the numerals "$100,000", to insert a semicolon and "and the limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for compensation and expenses of witnesses or informants, is increased from '$175,000' to '$200,000'."

Under the heading "The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries of Referees," on page 25, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$6,375" and insert "$8,375".

Under the heading "Chapter X," on page 26, after line 16, to insert:

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

"Operations

"For an additional amount for 'Operations,' $16 million: *Provided,* That the Postmaster

General, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, may transfer such sums (not to exceed $2 million) as he deems necessary from any appropriation available to the Post Office Department for the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, to any other such appropriation or appropriations without regard to the limitations imposed by the first proviso contained in the paragraph under the heading 'Operations' in title II of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act of 1956."

Under the heading "Chapter XI—District of Columbia—Department of Public Health," on page 27, line 19, after the word "Health," to strike out "$130,000" and insert "$150,000".

Under the heading "Chapter XII—Legislative Branch," on page 29, after line 14, to insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Lois Lilly Kilgore, widow of Harley M. Kilgore, late a Senator from the State of West Virginia, $22,500."

On page 29, after line 18, to insert:

"SALARIES, OFFICES AND EMPLOYEES

"Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $2,535: *Provided*, That the basic compensation of the assistant to the majority and the assistant to the minority may be fixed by the majority the minority leaders, respectfully, at a rate not to exceed $8,820 per annum; and that effective April 1, 1956, the basic amount available for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is increased by $3,000."

On page 30, after line 2, insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For an additional amount for salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $10,914."

On page 30, after line 6, to insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $600,000."

On page 30, after line 8, to insert:

"Stationery: For an additional amount of stationery, $2,900, and the amount available for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate is hereby increased to $12,900."

On page 30, after line 12, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"The third proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators and committee chairmen to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices or committees, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is amended to read as follows: *'Provided further*, That Senators and committee chairmen, on or before the day on which they are to become effective, shall certify in writing such changes or rearrangements to the disbursing office of the Senate which thereafter shall pay such employees in accordance with such certifications, except that, in the case of any change or rearrangement, other than original appointments, to become effective on or after the first day and prior to the 10th day of any month, such certification may be made at any time not later than the 10th day of such month'."

Under the heading "Chapter XIII—Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments," on page 32, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 110 and"; and in line 11, after the word "Congress," to strike out "$1,614,562" and insert "$2,367,341".

Under the heading "Chapter XIV—Increased Pay Costs," on page 33, after line 11, to insert:

"Senate:

"'Salaries, officers and employees', $3,763,750;

"Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"'Joint Committee on the Economic Report', $10,985;

"'Joint Committee on Atomic Energy', $14,715;

"'Joint Committee on Printing', for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, $140;

"'Vice President's automobile', $325;

"'Automobile for the President pro tempore', $325;

"'Automobiles for majority and minority leaders', $650;

"'Reporting Senate proceedings', $10,925;

"'Folding documents', $2,000;

"'Inquiries and investigations', including $7,500 authorized by Public Law 295, 84th Congress, approved August 9, 1955, $67,880;

"'Miscellaneous items', $15,130."

On page 38, after line 6, to insert:

"National Mediation Board: National Railroad Adjustment Board: 'Salaries and expenses' (decrease of $18,000 in the limitation upon the amount available for compensation and expenses of referees);".

Under the subhead "Department of Defense—Military Functions," on page 42, line 12, after the numerals "$769,000", to strike out the comma and "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Military Personnel, Marine Corps' "; in line 14, after the numerals "$27,500", to strike out the comma and "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Military personnel, Marine Corps' "; and in line 18, after the numerals "$41,400", to strike out the comma and "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Military personnel, Marine Corps' ".

Under the subhead "Department of the Navy," on page 42, in line 21, after the figures "$7,400,000", to strike out the comma and "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Military personnel, Marine Corps' ", and in line 24, after the figures "$2,180,000", to strike out the comma and "to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Military personnel, Marine Corps' ".

Under the subhead "Department of the Interior," on page 46, line 19, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$162,500" and insert "$187,500".

On page 47, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$170,000".

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICES

School-lunch program

For an additional amount for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act, $20,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on the amendment. There has been approximately a 25 percent increase in school enrollment during the past few years. Yet during that period the appropriations for school lunches themselves have been kept at approximately the same figure.

In a number of the States of the Union, including my own State of Illinois, school lunches have been discontinued during the current year because of the lack of funds. In Illinois the school-lunch program was suspended on April 7.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a letter dated March 26, 1956, from Harold A. Wolfe, director of the school-lunch program in the State of Illinois, addressed to the sponsors of the school-lunch program. The letter relates to the discontinuance of the program in Illinois.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Springfield, March 26, 1956.

DEAR SPONSOR: Due to a limited apportionment of Federal funds for reimbursement for type A lunches, and a decided increase in participation, the State agency finds that these funds will be exhausted after approximately 7 operating days in the month of April. Therefore, only a percentage ratio of the type A indemnity will be paid for April's operation.

This in no way affects funds available for the special milk program which will be sufficient to assure the current indemnity rates for the balance of this school year.

Even though this situation exists and the schools will not receive indemnity for type A lunches for the balance of the school year, the Federal agency has notified us that claims must be filed in the same manner, and the same records maintained for the balance of the school year for the following reasons:

1. To assure continued distribution of Government donated food commodities for the balance of the school year.

2. To provide the State agency with the necessary records to comply with the 3 to 1 matching requirements that exist for this 1955–56 fiscal year.

3. To keep the present agreement in effect to avoid any misunderstanding for the next school year's participation.

4. To assure continued reimbursement in the special milk program for the balance of this current school year.

Therefore, the State agency takes this opportunity to impress the sponsors of the type A programs of the necessity of maintaining proper records and of filing their claim forms in the same fashion that they have previously, even though they will only receive a portion of their reimbursement for the month of April and none thereafter for this current school year.

In order to avoid any delay, we would appreciate the cooperation of each sponsor in properly preparing the remaining claim forms for this school year as outlined above.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD A. WOLFE,
Director, School Lunch Program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. The State of Oregon, which I have the honor, in part, to represent, happens to have had one of the largest proportionate increases in school-child population of any State in the entire Nation during the

past few years. As a result, in many sections of the State, I have been informed, the school-lunch program has had to be abandoned entirely because the amount of money available per child per meal has become so small that it is virtually infinitesimal when compared with the amount which is necessary to provide adequate lunches for the children.

Therefore, it seems to me it is incumbent upon Congress to provide some auxiliary funds for the school-lunch program, and I am very much pleased that the Senator from Illinois has seen fit to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, what is the amount provided in the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amount suggested by me is $20 million.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am certain the Senator from Illinois is aware of the fact that recently there was included in another bill a provision for an additional quantity of milk for the school-lunch program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am aware of that. This amount would not be for the milk program; it would be for the school-lunch program. Excellent as milk is, some additional calories are needed.

Mr. HAYDEN. A half pint of milk is provided in the program at present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator wants to make certain that enough milk is made available so as to provide a half pint, as has been the practice in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am, of course, interested in milk; but I think also that carrots, lettuce, and other green vegetables are needed. So I would not like to see the school-lunch program reduced merely to a milk program. Like the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I am for milk; but I am for milk plus.

Mr. HAYDEN. This would be a cash contribution; it could be used for any purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ascertain whether any showing has been made that an additional $20 million is required to keep the school lunch program in operation for the remainder of this year. This is a supplemental appropriation bill. The appropriations made by the bill for this purpose, if any, will be expended in the remaining portion of the year, will they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask if any Senator has information as to the amounts which will be needed to fill out the program for the remainder of the school year; and whether $20 million is too great a sum, a sufficient sum, or an insufficient sum for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that not having the complete data on the subject, perhaps he might suggest half the amount he has proposed—say, $10 million. Then it could be determined in conference whether the funds could come from cash or could be provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I merely point out that about 8 weeks still remain in the normal school term. In a great many States, school lunches have ceased completely. Unless funds shall be added to the bill, probably there will be no more school lunches this year in a large portion of the country. Therefore I hope something will be done to remedy the condition. However, I am perfectly willing to accept $10 million instead of $20 million, with the understanding that the committee of conference will look into the matter at greater length.

Mr. HAYDEN. We will certainly inquire of the Department of Agriculture as to the exact situation in each State as the Department knows the situation to be. The Department will give us the facts on which to work. As to the matter of providing funds, we can then determine whether they will come from cash or from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The funds would have to come from a direct appropriation. As the Senator knows, a few weeks ago Congress provided $10 million for the milk fund. That amount will come from Commodity Credit Corporation funds. But this particular amount must be a direct appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. We can ascertain all the facts in the committee of conference.

Under the circumstances, I shall be glad to accept an amendment providing for $10 million, if the Senator from Illinois will modify his amendment to that extent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois modify his amendment so as to provide for $10 million instead of $20 million?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the committee, am I not correct in my understanding that there has been no request made of Congress by the administration for this amount? The House provided nothing for this item, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations has not considered it in any way.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I want to see the school lunch program carried forward just as everybody else does, but, as the Senator from Florida has said, it should be carried forward in an orderly way. If it is the understanding of the chairman of the committee that the item appropriating additional $10 million will be taken to conference in order to get data concerning the program, that is satisfactory. I should like to make it clear, as one prospective conferee, that if it is found out later that the money is not needed, or that it will be provided in another supplemental appropriation bill, we shall use our best judgment as to whether the item shall stay in or out of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, all I have promised the Senate is that we shall get the facts, and we shall have $10 million to work on until we get the facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me add one fact to the pile of facts the Senator is going to accumulate, namely, that the Federal contribution to the States where the program has been carried out has been reduced from about 9 cents to 5 cents a meal. For some reason or other, the Secretary of Agriculture does not seem to look with favor on the school-lunch program. If we wait until he becomes an advocate of it, we shall wait for a long time. In the meantime children are going to be hungry. I think it is entirely proper for the Senate as a whole to legislate on the matter, and that we should not wait merely until the Secretary's recommendations are handed down. Furthermore, I want to state that in my own State of Illinois, funds for the current year have been exhausted. This is true of some other States as well.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. I do not know whether $10 million is the right amount or not. I assume the conferees will determine what the right amount is and settle on that figure. Also, if more money than is needed is appropriated, it will revert to the Federal Treasury on the first of July.

I also wish to say that it looks rather bad when a statement is made that the Federal contribution per meal has been reduced from 9 to 5 cents a pupil. I point out that during the past few years far more in the way of appropriations and commodities have been made available to school-lunch programs than were ever made available before. As I understand the reason for the reduction in the per capita allowance, it is that the people of the United States have been freed from the threat of war, and there has been a greatly increased interest in community affairs. Among community interests perhaps none has been of more benefit than the school-lunch program. The result is that there are thousands of schools participating in the lunch programs now, which, when we were engaged in war, had to be interested in other matters. There is the tremendous interest in community affairs which people can have when they are freed from the threat of war, and there result programs such as the school-lunch program. Consequently, although record appropriations have been made during the past few years for the school-lunch programs, the amounts appropriated have turned out to be inadequate, and some States are short of funds, and some communities in some States are short of funds. So I am glad to be in favor of the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Vermont is a close friend of the present Secretary of Agriculture, and has been with him on many, many occasions. There is certainly no evidence

that the present Secretary is against the school-lunch program, is there?

Mr. AIKEN. None whatsoever. The Secretary of Agriculture has to cut the cloth to fit the condition. I do not think that is quite the way to say it, but there has been such a tremendous increase in the school-lunch program that, necessarily, he has had to reduce the amount available to each pupil.

I hope the Appropriations Committee, in making the appropriation for next year, will anticipate, so far as possible, what the requirements for fiscal 1957 will be, and will make adequate appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator can be sure that the Senator from Georgia will take the matter up. Hearings on the agricultural appropriation bill will start next week.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that will be done. For years there has not been a vote against an appropriation for the school-lunch program in either House. So far as I know, the appropriations bills have been going through both Houses without a dissenting vote. If one of us has made a mistake on the amount appropriated, the other 95 Senators have also made a mistake.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, it is proposed to strike out lines 10, 11, and 12, as follows:

OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

For an additional amount for "Operating-differential subsidies," $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on the amendment. First, I wish to comment on the previous action of the Senate. The Senator from Illinois made a rather eloquent address in the Senate a few moments ago with regard to the fact that the 84th Congress is giving very little, if any, attention to reducing the appropriation bills. He gave the Senate a rather strong lecture on the need for economy; however, I cannot refrain from calling the attention of my good friend from Illinois to the fact that there is a slight inconsistency between his remarks and the action of the Senate in accepting his amendment. I call attention to the fact that the action of the Senate a few minutes ago in accepting the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, which provided for an appropriation of $10 million, was for an item as to the need for which there was not one bit of evidence, either before the Appropriations Committee or before the Senate as based upon the statement of the Senator from Illinois. That is a glaring instance of fiscal irresponsibility to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. I most respectfully recommend that my friend read his own lecture.

Mr. President, the amendment which I am offering strikes out an appropriation of $30 million for operating-differential subsidies for the merchant marine. The reason I am offering the amendment is that in the bill and the report there is no data which would support the item. I have discussed this with members of the Committee on Appropriations and understand there is agreement to accept my amendment. This amendment would reduce the appropriation by $30 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware on page 4, to strike out lines 10, 11, and 12.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 10004) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret very much that while the second supplemental appropriation bill was being considered by the Senate, I was called off the floor. It was my desire to invite the attention of the Senate to another appropriation of $600,000 for inquiries and investigations. It will be recalled that a total of $900,000 was added to the $1,224,000 that was provided in the regular appropriation bill, bringing the total as of that time to $2,124,000. I wish to call the Senate's attention to the fact that for 1955 the entire amount of money that was appropriated and spent for inquiries and investigations amounted to $2,059,150. With the appropriation that is carried in this second supplemental appropriation bill the sum of money that will be spent this fiscal year for inquiries and investigations will total $2,724,000.

That is almost three-quarters of a million dollars more than was spent last year. I wish to point out that the Committee on Appropriations has very little control over these appropriations, because the expenditures are made and authorized by the Senate, irrespective of what amount happens to be in the contingent fund. The fact is noted on page 21 of the report on the second supplemental appropriation bill.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that it is high time that those committees which require such huge sums for their so-called inquiries and investigations should be required to appear before the Appropriations Committee to justify and prove their case before money is made available to them.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that in the light of these huge expenditures for inquiries and investigations, a little more attention will be paid to the actual necessity for some of these appropriations, not only by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but by the committees which instigate these investigations. It is also my hope that instead of resolutions for investigation expenditures being referred only to the Committee on Rules and Administration by committees of the Senate which seek authority for these investigations, the Appropriations Committee will be permitted to have a say in the matter. I hope to propose the adoption of such a procedure in the next session of the Congress. After all, Mr. President, if the Committee on Appropriations is to fully perform its tasks, it should be permitted to pass upon the need for additional funds. It should not be required to merely rubberstamp a fait accompli.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock meridian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1184, Senate Joint Resolution 97, and that it be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to insert a new section on page 2, after line 5.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate,

I should like to say it is not contemplated that any further business will be transacted today. Under the order previously entered, when the Senate concludes its business today, it will recess until Monday next. It may be that on Monday the unfinished business will be set aside, but I desired to have some business pending, and for that reason I made the request which I have just made.

DISTORTED PICTURE DRAWN BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S REPORT ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding a distorted picture which has been drawn by the Small Business Administration's report on small business.

I am chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. This subcommittee is primarily concerned with legislation governing the program of the Small Business Administration. In the last session of this Congress we acted upon bills to extend and modify the Small Business Act of 1953, and during the early weeks of the present session we reported proposed legislation to expand the disaster loan activity of the Small Business Administration. As Chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee, I maintain a continuing interest in the Small Business Administration; and I feel it a duty to discuss with the Senate a recent action by that agency.

Section 215 of the Small Business Act of 1953 requires that once every 6 months the administration shall make a report upon the activities of the agency, and shall include, among other things, "such comments and recommendations as the administration may deem appropriate." I have before me the Fifth Semiannual Report made by the Small Business Administration; and if the total import were not so tragic, I would be greatly amused by the "comments" deemed "appropriate" in this fourth year of the great Eisenhower crusade.

Mr. President, this document was released on April 2, 1956, with all the fanfare of a soap salesman's announcement of a new product which will wash clothes without getting them wet. I have come to expect exaggerated claims of success from the present caretakers of the executive branch, and it seems that they will never learn the old maxim about not fooling all of the people all of the time.

Mr. President, I am not fooled by this phony advertisement; and I want to spread on the RECORD the dismal picture of how well a big-business administration functions as a small-business undertaker. I shall concentrate on five fantastic claims, supported by half-truths, appearing in the Fifth Semiannual Report of the Small Business Administration.

The principal theme of the report is stated on page 1, as follows:

> The improvement in the position of small business which took form in mid-1954—after a decline in small-business health over several years—continued through the second half of 1955.

The report attempts to support this theme by various economic indicators.

The first supporting statement is that:

> Throughout most of 1955 the trend of business failures was downward.

Let us look at the facts. Here are the statistics on business failures for the last 6 years—President's Economic Report of January 24, 1956, page 231:

1949	9,246
1950	9,162
1951	8,058
1952	7,611
1953	8,862
1954	11,086
1955	10,969

I think that anyone looking for the true significance of these figures could draw three very simple conclusions:

First. The number of business failures was dropping steadily from 1949 through 1952; in fact, the number of failures in 1952 was almost 18 percent lower than the number in 1949;

Second. The number of business failures has been rising significantly from 1952 through 1955; in fact, the number of failures in 1955 was over 44 percent higher than the number in 1952; and

Third. In no year since 1941 have there been more business failures than there were in 1954 and 1955.

Based on these facts, I think the report could have more properly stated that "Although there were 117 fewer business failures in 1955 than there were in 1954, 10,969 failures is alarmingly high. Since virtually all of these failures occur among small businesses, vigorous action is necessary to halt the rising failure rate which began in 1953."

The second supporting statement in the report is that:

> New business incorporations hit a new peak.

Mr. President, everyone knows that our economy is expanding, and that it must expand to accommodate our rising population and our enormous responsibilities in a troubled world. Thus, a realistic indicator of the expansion of our economy is not the number of "new business incorporations", but is the net increase in the number of active business firms. Here are the facts, as revealed on page 231 of the President's Economic Report of January 24, 1956:

Year:	*Net increase of operating businesses*
1949	52,000
1950	50,000
1951	58,000
1952	59,000
1953	26,000
1954	−4,000
1955	(1)

[1] Not available.

Although final figures for 1955 are not available, it appears that the increase in business firms for 1955 will be no higher than that in 1953.

Here are the tragic conclusions which must be drawn from these statistics:

First. From 1949 through 1952, the number of operating businesses was increasing at a rate commensurate with the necessary expansion of our competitive economy, and the average increase was about 55,000 for these 4 years;

Second. Beginning in 1953 the increase in the number of operating businesses declined over 50 percent; and in 1954 there was a net reduction in the number of operating businesses; and

Third. Nineteen hundred and fifty-four is the only year since 1943 in which there has been a reduction in the number of operating businesses in this country.

If the present administration had any inclination to be honest with the American people, the comment in the report should read something like this:

> The sharp drop in the increase of operating businesses experienced in 1953 and 1954 is completely inconsistent with the needs of an expanding competitive economy. While gross national product has reached unprecedented levels, the fruits of this production are becoming concentrated in the hands of fewer entrepreneurs. Consequently, the administration urges the Congress to explore this threat to the survival and growth of larger numbers of business units, and we pledge our support in finding some solution to this inconsistency in the development of our free-enterprise system.

But, Mr. President, what did the Congress receive? A false analysis of the situation, and no recommendation whatsoever.

A third comment by the administration is that:

> There was sharp improvement in small firms' earnings, both before and after taxes.

I do not know why the "before taxes" situation is stressed, when all of us know that earnings "after taxes" constitute the only meaningful measure of business success. Consequently, I shall cite the record on earnings after taxes for large businesses and small businesses, based upon data extracted from the SBA report. The bias in favor of large concerns is a computation which I have made for purpose of comparison:

United States manufacturing corporations earnings (after taxes) by asset size

[Index—1947–49=100]

Year [1]	Assets under $1 million	Assets over $1 million	Bias in favor of large concerns	Average
1947	98	143	45	
1948	103	112	19	
1949	55	90	35	22
1950	122	130	8	
1951	96	106	10	
4th quarter 1952	86	103	17	
4th quarter 1953	49	103	54	
4th quarter 1954	59	119	60	58
1st quarter 1955	68	127	59	

[1] Annually 1947–51.

Mr. President, this record of earnings over the past 9 years shows quite clearly what has happened to small-business earnings since 1953. While the bias in favor of big business averaged only 22 index points for the period 1947–52, this bias averaged almost 58 index points for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955. The bias in earnings in favor of big business has almost tripled throughout the 3 years of this big-business administration. I cannot conceive how anyone could look at

this record and could report to the Congress that "there was a sharp improvement in small firms' earnings." It is true that the small business earnings index is up, as compared with the index for 1954; but the index for 1955 is still far below the index for 1952; and the disparity between the index for small firms and the index for large firms continues to be outrageously high.

The record of earnings on stockholders' equity is equally distressing; and this leads me to the fourth comment by the Small Business Administration. The report, doing its best to paint a rosy picture for small business, contains a feeble statement that—

> Beginning in 1954 and through 1955 there was an improvement for both smaller and larger corporations.

After examining the data on page 16 of the report, I can well understand why the administration shies away from this subject. This is the data on page 16 to which I have added a column showing bias in favor of large concerns:

United States manufacturing corporations earnings (after taxes) on stockholders' equity by asset size

[Expressed in percentage]

Annual rate for year	Assets under $1 million	Assets over $1 million	Bias in favor of large concerns	Average
1947	16.3	15.5	0.8	
1948	12.6	16.3	3.7	
1949	7.0	10.6	3.6	2.8
1950	12.5	15.7	3.2	
1951	9.0	12.6	3.6	
1952	7.9	10.6	2.7	
1953	7.1	10.8	3.7	
1954	5.4	10.3	4.9	4.7
1955	6.9	12.3	5.4	

These data show that the percentage of earnings on stockholders' equity has declined 1 percent for small businesses from 1952 to 1955, but that the percentage for large business has increased 1.7 percent during the same period. Furthermore, the average bias in favor of large firms throughout the period 1947–52 was only 2.8 percent, whereas this bias has averaged 4.7 percent over the years 1953, 1954, and 1955. Why does not the administration admit this sorry record and try to do something about it? No good can come from concealing the truth—even when the truth hurts. It is becoming apparent that the farmers of this Nation are awakening to the truth of the Eisenhower-Benson farm philosophy; and the truth of the Eisenhower-Humphrey-Weeks business philosophy is gradually emerging in spite of the reams of camouflaging propaganda emanating from the executive agencies.

Mr. President, the fifth comment which I wish to discuss in detail concerns the net sales of manufacturing corporations. The SBA report states that—

> Net sales of smaller manufacturing corporations, those with assets under $1 million, continued their recovery during 1955.

With big business sales at such high levels, something had to trickle down to the little fellow. The following statistics are based upon data extracted from page 14 of the report; and I have added a column to show bias in favor of large concerns.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States manufacturing corporations net sales by asset size

[Index—1947–49=100]

Year [1]	Assets under $1 million	Assets over $1 million	Bias in favor of large concerns	Average
1947	94	100	6	
1948	105	107	2	
1949	97	100	3	15
1950	104	120	16	
1951	115	140	25	
4th quarter 1952	115	150	35	
4th quarter 1953	97	146	49	
4th quarter 1954	103	150	47	49
3d quarter 1955	108	158	50	

[1] Annually 1947–51.

Mr. MORSE. These statistics show that the sales of small businesses were slightly better in 1955 than in 1953 and 1954; but small business sales for 1955 are still far below their sales for 1951 and 1952. The true significance of these statistics could be stated as follows:

> The big business bias in the indices of net sales of United States manufacturing corporations has increased alarmingly in recent years. This bias averaged only 15 index points through the years 1947–52, but has jumped to an average of 49 index points for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955. The trend to sales dominance by large firms is consistent with increases in earnings and return on investment which have also characterized big business activity since 1953.

Mr. President, that would be a true story of the big business crusade—or as it is more properly described, the small business funeral march. I could go on at greater length, in rebuttal of the Small Business Administration's claims of success in the fields of financial assistance, Government procurement, production and management assistance, and other activities of the Small Business Administration. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the distressed condition of the small business community is ample proof of the ineffectiveness of the present administration in dealing with small business problems. The record of the last 3 years shows what is bound to happen when a tomcat is expected to look after the goldfish while the family is away from home. When the family returns, there will be no goldfish. And if the policies of the present administration are continued, small businesses can expect to be crushed or swallowed whole by the fat cats of the business world.

Let us hope that the next report of the Small Business Administration will show some awareness of the true situation, and that it will contain some recommendations for dealing with the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in my remarks an article by Ralph Hendershot, financial editor of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, on April 7, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS—BARNES APPLAUDS GAIN IN SALES OF NEW ISSUES BUT FAILS TO REVEAL WHOLE STORY

(By Ralph Hendershot)

In his report to President Eisenhower, Wendell B. Barnes, administrator of the Small Business Administration, appeared to take a great deal of satisfaction from the increase in the amount of new capital raised for companies under his observation in 1955. This total, he said, amounted to $269 million, as compared with $195 million the year before.

Mr. Barnes called 1955 a banner year and observed that "this indicates that new opportunities which have not existed since 1929 have been opened for common stock financing for small companies. This is due to the lessened attractiveness of well-established issues to many investors because of the high levels of the market and the opportunities for capital gains in smaller issues."

This department would like to be as pleased over the 1955 results of security flotations for small companies as Mr. Barnes. But it can't enthuse over market conditions which make it necessary for these small concerns to pay 25 percent or more for their money. Nor can it get excited over the fact that only a small percentage of the enterprises needing long-term capital, even at such high costs, are able to get it.

WHERE FAULT LIES

The fault, of course, does not lie with Mr. Barnes, although we suspect he is but a casual observer in this phase of small company operations. Rather, the basic reason why small companies fare so badly at the new capital feed bunks in Wall Street is that leaders in the investment banking field give such concerns little or no attention.

Small companies and the firms which seek to raise capital for them are the orphans of Wall Street. They are shunned by the better underwriting houses as though they had the plague. This is true no matter how worthy the proposed financing may be. Even the soundest of the little companies seeking financial aid are sent to the other side of the railroad tracks where, if they are lucky, they may get the funds they require.

COULD HELP SITUATION

Wall Street is geared for big business, and the big houses can hardly be expected to bother too much with the smaller concerns. Such financing would cost them money. But the leaders in the field should be sufficiently interested in small corporations to see to it that provisions are made for their accommodations.

It is a big assignment to be sure but it is a highly important one. Our big companies were small once but the majority of them got their start when income taxes were either small or nonexistent. As a result they were able to grow by plowing earnings back into their properties. Those days are gone and our small concerns today have little hope for growth unless they get a lift with long-term capital from the investing public.

We would have been better pleased with Mr. Barnes' report if he had put basic conditions in the new capital field on the line for the President.

Mr. MORSE. While on the subject of recommendations, it seems quite appropriate to remind the Senate of a very significant bill now pending in the Finance Committee. This bill, S. 3129, was introduced by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I was pleased to join the Senator from

Arkansas in this bill, as were several other Senators interested in the problems of small businesses. In addition to the Senator from Arkansas and me, the cosponsors include Senators SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, HUMPHREY, WILEY, KENNEDY, SMATHERS, BEALL, LEHMAN, and DOUGLAS. We are all convinced that this bill gets to the very heart of the difficulties plaguing small businesses.

This Nation has grown strong through the efforts and initiative of thousands of private producers, competing honorably under laws which reward the enterprise of free men. But when these laws become so biased, in their application to business units, that the growth of large units is enhanced and the growth or survival of small units is threatened, then I say that the free economy we have known is in grave danger. I have heard many people bemoan the size of the Federal Government and speak of the "dead hand of bureaucracy," meaning Government bureaucracy. While such a warning deserves our attention, I am far more disturbed at the prospect of big business bureaucracy and the dead hand it lays upon the brow of small business.

Tax relief is a direct answer to this threat, and I believe that S. 3129 proposes a reasonable redistribution of the corporate tax burden, without reducing the overall Federal revenue. At this point in my remarks I ask to have printed a summary of the needs for and the effects of S. 3129, and I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EQUITABLE READJUSTMENT OF TAX BURDEN FOR SMALL BUSINESS WITHOUT REVENUE LOSS

Sponsored by Senators FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, CAPEHART, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, BEALL, DUFF, MORSE, SMATHERS, LEHMAN, DOUGLAS, and WILEY.

Present law provides normal tax rate of 30 percent, surtax rate of 22 percent. The first $25,000 is exempt from surtax.

The amendment reduces the normal corporation tax rate to 22 percent, and increases the surtax to 31 percent. The 31 percent rate would apply to income over $25,000.

Effect on revenue: Increase by $20 million a year.

Effect on corporations: See table. Examples: Corporations with incomes $5,000 and less, save $400, 26.7 percent; $15,000, save $1,200, 26.7 percent; $25,000, save $2000, 26.7 percent; smaller savings on incomes up to $225,000; slight increase on incomes above $225,000.

Number affected: Latent figures (1952 income tax returns) show out of 672,071 active corporations only 13,194 earned over $250,000. This proposal would reduce taxes for 98 percent of all corporations, with no revenue loss.

NEED

Three sources of small business capital: Equity, loans, and retained earnings. Expense of raising equity of $300,000 in securities market; 20 to 30 percent. Large corporation financing may be fraction of 1 percent; 40 to 50 times as expensive to small corporations. Loans: 6 percent or higher for small, 3½ or 4 percent for large.

Small corporations are, therefore, more dependent on retained earnings, yet earn less per dollar of sales. (Second quarter of 1955 corporations with assets under $250,000 earned 1.1 cents per dollar of sales; corporations $100 million and over 7.4 cents per dollar). Smaller corporations also losing out in volume of sales, increased only 3 percent 1954–55, as against 19 percent for large corporations. Large corporation greatly exceeds small in ratios of profit on investment. (Second quarter of 1955: 5.3 percent for small, 13.5 percent for large.)

Number of new firms declines: Annual increase of new firms 55,000, 1948 to 1952; only 28,300 from 1954 to 1955.

Business failures: Increasing, exclusively small businesses. In 1945, 809; 1953, 8,862; 1954, 11,086; 1955, 10,969.

Mergers also increasing. Dexter M. Keezer, vice president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.: "Maintaining this rate (present corporate tax rate) means that you are going to have larger corporate units at the expense of smaller units, a matter of great social, political and economic significance."

Effect of a normal tax rate of 22 percent and a surtax rate of 31 percent

Income subject to normal tax and surtax	Present tax liability (normal rate 30 percent, surtax rate 22 percent)	Proposed tax liability (normal rate 22 percent, surtax rate 31 percent)	Change	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,500	$1,100	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	3,000	2,200	−800	−26.7
$15,000	4,500	3,300	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	6,000	4,400	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	7,500	5,500	−2,000	−26.7
$50,000	20,500	18,750	−1,750	−8.5
$100,000	46,500	45,250	−1,250	−2.7
$225,000	111,500	111,500	(1)	(1)
$500,000	254,500	257,250	+2,750	+1.1
$1,000,000	514,500	522,250	+7,750	+1.5
$10,000,000	5,194,500	5,292,250	+97,750	+1.9
$100,000,000	51,994,500	52,992,250	+997,750	+1.9

[1] No change.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in closing my remarks on this subject, I wish to say, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, that I intend to continue to maintain a vigilant watch over the representations and misrepresentations of the present administration as to the economic condition in which American small business finds itself.

On the basis of hearings before my subcommittee, and on the basis of the record which has been made by small business witnesses who have come from across the country to testify before us, I am convinced that on many of the main streets of America today there is already a deep recession among small-business men. Many businessmen today on the main streets of America are carrying a large percentage of the consumers of their respective communities on the cuff. More than $40 billion of consumer credit is now on the books of the businessmen of the country, with more than $12 billion of it on wheels on the highways of America in unpaid-for cars. Compare the more than $40 billion of consumer credit today with the figure of $7 billion as recently as 1939. In the light of such comparison, I say that it is a great disservice on the part of this administration to the people of the country to mislead them by the kind of soap salesmanship to be found in the pages of the report recently released by the Small Business Administration.

So far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, this is a vital issue which the American people ought to face between now and November if they wish to maintain a healthy economy, to the advantage of small business as well as large business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first I should like to congratulate the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on his analysis of the report of the Small Business Administration. He is a true friend of small business—or, rather, I should say, of a free democratic economy. He has done a great job as chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee. I should also like to express my agreement with his thesis that the present administration is biased in favor of big business and is attempting to cover up this bias with a publicity campaign which seeks to relate the prosperity of all segments of the economy to that which is indisputably being enjoyed by big business.

I have read the press release of the Small Business Administration and note that its opening line is as follows:

> A steady improvement in the position of small business, as smaller firms continued to share in the overall national prosperity, was noted by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The Senator has already analyzed this report and shown this statement to be false, and I shall not repeat his analysis.

However, there is one aspect of the economy which is so bad that even the public-relations people in the administration could not ignore it. The SBA handout and the report itself both say that—

> Small businesses complain of inability to obtain steel, steel scrap, aluminum, copper, nickel, lead, newsprint, plate glass, and other materials.
>
> They complain also of higher prices, such as for steel scrap, which they are unable to absorb. They point out that the historical allotment system used by suppliers discriminates against small firms because they are unable to obtain greater allotments and, if they are new users, sometimes are not able to get supplies at all. Shortages, bottlenecks, and price increases which are characteristic of a boom economy belie the threat of recession, despite the sag in some individual sectors which may occur, like that in the automotive field.

As the Senator knows, the President's economic report and other statements of the administration have spoken in glowing terms about alleged price stability. It is a very simple matter to determine that this price stability has been at the expense of the small businesses and the farmers of this country.

These statements gloss over a serious situation which has been developing and which threatens the ability of small businesses to compete and ultimately threatens the level of consumer prices and the stability of the dollar. This factor is the constant increase in materials prices. As the Senator knows, there are very few small-business producers of basic materials. On the contrary, most small businesses are purchasers of materials which they fabricate or process, or they are wholesalers and retailers.

I have a table which shows industrial whole price indexes, with 1947–49 as 100, for various commodities for the year 1952, for January 1955, and February 1956. I should like to insert into the RECORD a few of these indexes.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

		1952	January 1955	December 1955	February 1956
	All commodities other than farm products and food	113.2	115.0	119.7	120.5
07	Rubber and rubber products	134.0	146.0	151.0	147.1
07-11-02	No. 1 ribbed smoked sheets of natural rubber	191.9	161.5	233.5	185.1
07-21-01	Passenger tires	130.4	144.3	152.7	152.7
07-21-11	Truck and bus tires	136.1	140.8	158.1	158.1
08-1	Lumber	120.5	120.0	126.4	128.2
08-14-01	Red oak flooring	112.6	116.6	133.8	133.8
09	Pulp paper and allied products	119.6	116.3	123.6	125.4
09-1	Woodpulp	111.5	110.0	114.2	116.8
09-52	Paper bags and shipping sacks	114.9	106.2	119.3	120.7
10	Metals and metal products	123.0	130.1	143.9	145.0
10-1	Iron and steel	124.7	135.8	147.2	148.8
10-12	Iron and steel scrap	114.2	94.5	126.4	121.8
10-13	Semifinished steel products	131.2	158.7	170.3	170.6
10-14	Finished steel products	127.2	144.6	154.8	157.1
10-2	Nonferrous metals	123.5	127.9	155.8	157.2
10-22-01	Aluminum ingot	122.0	142.6	153.3	153.3
10-22-06	Copper ingot	116.5	142.6	204.4	204.4
10-25	Nonferrous mill shapes	125.3	136.5	159.1	161.2
10-26	Wire and cable	122.9	124.3	156.0	159.4
10-5	Plumbing equipment	117.4	118.7	133.1	133.1
10-7	Fabricated structural metal products	115.1	117.8	128.0	128.8
11	Machinery and motive products	121.5	125.8	133.0	133.5
11-1	Agricultural machinery and equipment	121.6	121.5	126.5	126.8
11-2	Construction machinery and equipment	125.4	133.2	143.1	143.5
11-3	Metalworking machinery and equipment	128.5	135.1	148.5	151.1
11-4	General purpose machinery and equipment	122.6	123.6	141.5	141.7
13	Nonmetallic minerals, structural	113.6	122.0	125.4	127.2
13-1	Flat glass	114.3	123.9	131.1	131.1
13-22	Cement		129.9	132.3	138.5
13-4	Structural clay products	122.0	135.8	144.6	145.6

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also have noticed in newspapers recent statements of profits of some of the companies which are producers of these materials:

Company	Net income	
	1954	1955
Kennecott Copper	$77,906,288	$125,516,291
Anaconda Co	26,653,085	65,256,306
Phelps Dodge	41,249,391	72,319,224
Aluminum Company of America	46,471,470	87,600,808
Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical	14,015,715	28,565,377
Reynolds Metals Co	20,280,908	34,366,521
Goodrich Tire	38,815,737	46,662,127
United States Steel	195,417,611	370,197,625
Bethlehem Steel	132,837,154	180,191,708

My purpose in pointing out these facts is to show what small businesses, as well as the consumers of this country, are to be faced with. If prices of basic materials continue to rise to sustain the high profits of 1955, then 1 of 2 things will happen—either the small-business man will be squeezed by his inability to raise the price of his products, or the rise will be passed on to consumers and the general consumer index will also rise. To date, the administration has been able to claim stability in the overall price index only because farmers and small-business men are receiving an unfair portion of the national product.

THE MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had planned to discuss the Middle East situation this afternoon, but time will not permit. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the statement which I had planned to make on the Middle East situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

It is reported in the press that the other day Secretary of State Dulles told congressional leaders to be prepared to give the administration authority to use American troops in the Middle East. This presages a new Korea on the other side of the world.

Two months ago, in an advertisement in the New York Times of February 5, the Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism declared:

"The fact is that Russia is turning [the Arabs] into North Koreans. Biblical Gaza will become the new 38th parallel. * * *

"Must we wait until it becomes imperative to send American GIs to fight again in distant lands—to protect America's vital interests in the strategic Middle East?"

Why are America's interests in the Middle East so vital?

Louis Bromfield, until his tragic death last month the chairman of the Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism, explained it in his last public statement, made to a press conference in New York on February 13:

"The Middle East contains more than half the world's known oil reserves. Without this oil, Europe could not survive. If we lose access to these deposits, our own industrial life will be seriously affected. * * * The Middle East is of crucial strategic importance for other reasons than oil. It is the gateway to Africa with its vital strategic resources and millions of people. It is the backdoor to Asia. Russia's entrenchment astride the Suez Canal would constitute a far greater blow to our national security than the loss of Formosa or the Philippines.

"This dangerous situation has developed behind a successful Communist smokescreen which keeps us believing that this is still merely an Arab-Israeli squabble. The fact is that this has become an East-West conflict—or to put it plainly, a Russian-American conflict."

Mr. Bromfield explained:

"The Russians are past masters of the art of infiltration and the fast grab. Only a few months have passed since Colonel Nasser announced that he would limit to 30 the number of Soviet technicians admitted to Egypt to train Egyptian forces in the use of the modern weapons ostensibly sold to Egypt by the Communist bloc. The Associated Press reported from Cairo several weeks ago that there were already 150. We have reliable and undisputed information that the actual number is close to 3,000 select Russian, Czech, Polish, and East German officers posing as technicians.

"In addition to substantial numbers of jet bombers and fighters and other heavy military equipment, Russian submarines supposedly sold to Egypt are going to enter the Mediterranean. Nasser says these are for the purpose of defending Egypt against Israel's fleet. * * * The truth is that they form a constant threat to the American Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. Egypt has never had submarine sailors. These craft will be manned and officered by Russians, just as the whole Egyptian military machine will be directed by the technicians.

"The same mistakes that resulted in the loss of China and most of the Far East to communism are being committed again. Unless we substitute a new bold policy, we will lose the Middle East too."

Although this warning was issued nearly 2 months ago, the most recent utterance by Secretary Dulles on this subject was a defense of Egypt's military dictator, Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser, as a "patriotic nationalist."

And yet this is what Dictator Nasser's Radio Cairo has been trumpeting to his Arab listeners 2 months:

October 11, 1955: "The United States, O Arabs, does not want to offer aid which is not backed by influence. She does not want to loan funds without interest in some form of colonization. * * * Russia on her part, seizes the golden opportunity and begins to express support and get closer, and indeed to offer economic aid, financial or technical, without America's excessive demands. * * * Russia is fully ready to offer aid without desiring to buy consciences, freedoms, or homelands. * * * The United States shuns us, lets us down and prevents aid from reaching us."

And quoting the daily, Al Akhbar, October 14, 1955: "* * * Justice and logic require that we now defend and not attack Russia, and that we now attack and not defend Britain and America, which have shown falsehood, deceit, fallacy and ill will."

And only 3 days ago, the New York Times quoted an Egyptian Minister of State (who could speak only with the Dictator's approval) in another violent attack on "imperialist America" and a spirited defense on "democratic Moscow."

Mr. Bromfield's statement went on to say:

"We call on the State Department to inaugurate a bold and decisive policy in the Middle East. If Nasser really fears a possible Israeli attack upon Egypt's sovereignty, let us guarantee the integrity of Egypt's border against any attack. But, let us not permit him to use this as a pretext to give Russian imperialism a foothold in an area that it has wanted but failed to penetrate since czarist times.

"The other aspect of our mistaken Middle East policy is our attitude toward the strongest military power in the Middle East next to Turkey—the Republic of Israel. To deny arms to Israel for defense against Russian weapons and officers is like denying arms to Formosa, South Korea or Vietnam."

Weeks after this warning was made, the situation had deteriorated still more, and so had our State Department policy. In another advertisement in the New York Times February 29, the Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism declared:

"The one hope of saving the Middle East from communism—and the blood not only of

Arab and Israeli but of American soldiers too—rests in the man who appointed Dulles to the office he now holds. * * * [the handling of] this explosive situation can no longer be delegated to Secretary Dulles and his assistants * * * who have so completely and so conspicuously failed in the eyes of the entire world."

Another month has passed and still the President has done nothing that could possibly hold back the march toward another Korea. His statements have served only to encourage Nasser to provocative acts while the Communists perfect his military machine.

But it may still not be too late. A clear statement by this country that we will back up the only democratic state in the Middle East, not only with a mutual defense treaty but with sufficient defensive weapons to handle the new Russian MIGs and bombers, will suffice to remove all chances of attack by the Arabs against Israel. Russia will not make any overt attack herself; she will act only through stooges, of whom Nasser has become one. But Nasser will not strike at Israel unless he feels he can knock it out quickly. If Israel has, or is likely to have, sufficient strength to stand off a knockout blow at Tel Aviv or Haifa by the fast Ilyushin bombers Russia gave Nasser, Nasser will not strike.

It does not take much. A handful of fast jet fighters, a few jet bombers, some defensive guns and tanks, to bolster up the only dependable ally we have in the area—is that too high a price to pay to spare the blood and lives not only of Israelis and Arabs but of American boys as well?

The Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism reiterates its query of February 5:

"That's why we ask: American arms now, or American armies later? Which will it be?"

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY ON PLUM ISLAND, N. Y.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have received a report from the Department of Agriculture which discloses some of the research accomplishments of the Department's animal disease laboratory on Plum Island, N. Y. I was instrumental in obtaining authorization to create this research laboratory. Much has been accomplished in the field of research.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement on what is being accomplished at the research laboratory conducted by the Department of Agriculture on Plum Island.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

Frequently we fail to recognize the valuable contributions research has made both to the betterment of our living and to the protection of the health and welfare of the American people. It is needless, I know, to point out to my colleagues the many specific achievements that have been made through research, but I am prompted today to mention one particular research project which has recently come to my attention again in connection with a report issued by the Department of Agriculture. The report deals with the progress made on foot-and-mouth disease research in the United States.

The Department reports that "Scientists of the United States Department of Agriculture's Animal Disease Laboratory on Plum Island, N. Y., report success in growing the virus of foot-and-mouth disease in cultures of swine or bovine kidney cells."

The Department further states that this accomplishment is the result of work by Drs. H. L. Bachrach, W. R. Hess, and J. J. Callis, of the Plum Island laboratory staff, and through this research, the Department states that the door is now open to use of practical tissue-culture techniques in (1) diagnosis of the disease and identification of the type of virus present, (2) determination of concentrations of the viruses and antibodies produced in animals, and (3) large-scale production of the virus for fundamental studies and vaccine investigations."

Scientists at the Plum Island laboratory foresee that the application of this new method will allow research to proceed at an accelerated rate so as to achieve eventual control of the disease at an earlier date.

I have long had an interest in this problem, and I am particularly gratified at the recently announced results of research for the reason that it was under the provisions of an enacted bill I introduced in the 80th Congress whereby the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized and directed to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals. Subsequently, the Animal Disease Laboratory on Plum Island of New York was established.

I want to take this opportunity of especially commending and congratulating Drs. Bachrach, Hess, and Callis, who have been primarily responsible for the recent achievement, and I wish to express my commendation of the entire Laboratory staff for their diligent efforts. At the same time, I should like also to say that indeed all of the research activities of the Department of Agriculture, including animal and poultry husbandry research and dairy husbandry research, are deserving of the highest praise and commendation by the American people for the many contributions which have been made to agriculture and to the general welfare of the Nation as a whole.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the learned historian, Arnold Toynbee, has said that history will characterize our epoch not for the immense technological strides which have been made, not as the atomic age, but rather as the period when man for the first time reached across boundaries of race, religion, and nationality, to help his fellow men, for the good of all mankind. If Dr. Toynbee is correct, then the Organization of American States, whose development we will commemorate on April 14, will occupy a place of honor in history. The growth of pan-Americanism, viewed in historical perspective, will surely be considered by posterity as one of the notable achievements of our era.

Pessimism, born of the failure of the League of Nations and nourished by the frustrations of the United Nations, has been corroding our faith in international organizations for maintaining peace. The Organization of American States stands alone, but firm, as proof of the effectiveness of international cooperation. It stands as a beacon light in the dark, inspiring optimism when doubts assail us. It is fitting that we pause each year to reexamine the evolution of that institution, and by so doing, to rekindle our hope that the noble principles motivating it will spread to other parts of the world.

The Organization of American States was not easily arrived at or built over night. A good many obstacles had to be surmounted: fears had to be assuaged, prejudices eradicated, and self-interests repressed before the 21 nations that make up the membership could work together in their collective interest. As far back as 1826 the great South American liberator, Simon Bolivar, conceived of the idea of a union of the democracies of the Western Hemisphere. In those days the newly independent nations were menaced by the Holy Alliance of Austria, Russia, and Prussia; it was Bolivar's idea that by union, the young states could protect themselves against any threat. The rought draft prepared by Bolivar for the conference he called in Panama contains these prophetic words:

This Congress seems destined to form the vastest league, the most extraordinary and the strongest which has ever appeared on earth. * * * No one of (the nations) will be weak in respect to any other; no one will be stronger. A perfect equilibrium would be established in this truly new order of things. The strength of all would come to the aid of any one which might suffer from the aggression of a foreign enemy.

The Panama Conference, as you know, was a dismal failure. Owing to factional opposition in the United States Congress, there was much delay in appointing the American delegates to the gathering. One of two that were finally appointed died on the way to Panama, and the other arrived too late. The politicians in Buenos Aires, jealous of the leading part played by Colombia, declined the invitation. Paraguay, then a principal state, also remained aloof. When the Conference met, only Mexico, Central America, Colombia, and Peru had delegates present. Under the circumstances, Bolivar's magnificent dream of a union of the American nations in the interest of peace, protection, and general advancement, went up in smoke. But it did establish a definite precedent for future inter-American meetings.

Later in the century other attempts were made to get joint action. One gathering in Peru in 1847, with delegates from New Granada, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile in attendance, was directed against the United States who was at war with Mexico. The avowed aim of the Conference was confederation for the purpose of preserving independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. No permanent results came from the meeting, or from other conferences of small groups of Latin American states held later in the century.

In the meantime, some of the South American nations themselves fell into battle with each other. In the 1860's the population of Paraguay was decimated in a war against an alliance consisting of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In 1879, Chile went to war against Peru and Bolivia, and claimed the victor's spoils, which included Peru's nitrate-rich provinces of Tacna and Arica and Bolivia's seacoast. The Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia that began in 1932 killed about 60,000 Bolivans and a good many Paraguayans; continental animosities sharpened when Chile ac-

tively supported Boliva, and Argentina threw its aid to Paraguay.

In spite of the bitterness generated from these flareups, certain unifying forces were at work. The revolutionary struggles by the American States against Spain and England left in their wake powerful sentiments shared by all the people of the New World. They held themselves to be different from those in the Old World, a new race on a new continent. They believed that Europe was old, corrupt, torn by wars, governed by tyranny, pessimistic, and declining. On the other hand, they believed that America was the opposite, young and vigorous and destined to fulfill mankind's utopian dream.

From these basic convictions, a mass of related sentiments derived. It was held that democratic republican government is the best form of government, all others being inclined to tyranny; that States are equal, irrespective of size and power; that being equal, no State has a right to intervene in the affairs of another; that disputes between States could be settled peacefully by substituting the rule of law for that of force; that cooperation would replace competition. So deep seated were these convictions, that they withstood the turbulent years of reorganization and intermittent warfare.

While sometimes lost in the clash of fraternal battle, Bolivar's vision of a family of American nations never completely died. In 1889, a first major step was taken to make the dream a reality. In that year, at an invitation from the United States to meet in Washington to discuss commercial matters, 18 of the then 19 American Republics responded favorably. This was the first of the series of international conferences of American nations. The delegates to that first feeble effort at cooperation on a hemispheric basis did not realize the precedent they were establishing. One contemporary United States newspaper, reflecting the prevailing opinion, even declared that "the Pan American Conference is pronounced a failure by those most concerned." Today, with the advantage of hindsight, we commemorate the 66th anniversary of that conference as the modest beginning of the mighty union we now have.

But not all was clear sailing for the inter-American ship after the first Pan American Conference. In the first decades of the 20th century the United States pursued a course that was bitterly unpopular in Latin America. This policy consisted of unilateral intervention of United States Armed Forces in other American nations to protect United States lives and property, or to prevent real or imagined threats of European intervention; the practice of dollar diplomacy, whereby the United States sought to control the finances of certain of the Caribbean countries; and the decision on the part of the United States to apply the Monroe Doctrine without consulting the other American States. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that progress toward unity was not achieved.

All of us know the happy consequences which resulted when the United States signed the treaty of Montevideo in 1933 pledging nonintervention. With the shift to the good neighbor policy, the whole concept of pan-Americanism had a rebirth. After that, in rapid succession, the sister republics laid the foundations for hemispheric solidarity. When war clouds began to darken the horizon in Europe, the nations of America gathered in Buenos Aires and agreed upon a procedure for consultation in emergencies. Actual outbreak of World War II put the machinery of consultation into effect. During the war, the American nations worked in close cooperation. After the war the 21 republics formalized their system of mutual defense and peaceful settlement of disputes by the Rio and Bogotá pacts.

Today the Organization of American States is a far cry from the timid excursion into inter-American cooperation of 66 years ago. It comes very close to realizing Bolivar's dream of the New World united in defense of the noble principles of freedom and independence.

But today the threat to our institutions comes not only from physical attack, as Bolivar feared from the hands of the Holy Alliance. Instead, every country in the Western Hemisphere is under constant insidious assault. The current enemy, international communism, has created a new dimension in international warfare. Communism attacks at the very moral fibers of a nation. It has developed a modern Trojan horse technique of boring from within, of first spreading dissatisfaction and fear and suspicion, and then presenting itself as the savior.

In Latin America, this precise moment in history is auspicious for the Communist scheme. The people have awakened from their apathy and resignation. They are seething with discontent for their lot, and no longer accept gnawing hunger and disease as their portion. Twelve of the 20 Latin American countries have annual per capita incomes of less than $200 a year, while only in Venezuela does it exceed $400. The life expectancy of a man in Mexico is only 38 years, which is about average for our sister republics. Literacy, too, reflects the low standard of living: 41 percent in Venezuela, 57 percent in the Dominican Republic, 10 percent in Haiti, to mention a few. The Communist defection of Guatemala, however short lived, should serve as a warning that it can happen here. The removal through revolution of Communists from influential posts in Guatemala has done nothing to relieve the conditions that fostered the rise of those Communists in the first place.

All the mutual defense pacts and pledges of solidarity will not halt the war of ideas the Communists are waging. I do not mean by this statement to belittle the effectiveness of the inter-American system. Its continuous and upward growth in the face of difficulties, culminating in the fine Organization of American States which exists today, is an island in the turbulent sea of international relations. I do mean, however, that we must not stop working to make it even more effective. We must not be so satisfied with our handiwork to date that we permit our thinking to ossify. We must keep it fluid so that we are prepared to meet every new challenge in this dynamic and changing world.

Since it is presently unlikely that the Soviet Union will launch physical warfare upon one or more of our sister republics, we must be prepared to combat a different type of assault. The Latin Americans need help to raise the living standards of their people quickly, before they turn in desperation to the false promises held out to them by the Communists. Our full hearted cooperation with Latin America in the economic field is as essential to the preservation of American institutions as is our military and political cooperation.

Yet our showing to date has been meager, indeed. Of the $37 billion total grants and credits in the postwar decade, Latin America received about $1 billion, or approximately 2.5 percent. Our sister republics received only 1 percent of United States grant-aid in the same period. I have noticed that various prominent Latin Americans, among them the Argentine and the Colombian Ambassadors, and the Chilean delegate to the United Nations, have been critical of this tendency to overlook Latin America for critical regions elsewhere. They have coined the name El Continente Olvidado—the forgotten continent—which in this age of slogans certainly well describes the current situation. If we are to meet the threat posed by Communist infiltration and other totalitarian evils, we must take bold, original measures. We must keep our powder dry, yes, but we must keep working at Pan-Americanism with constancy and wholehearted faith.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that the unity of purpose of the sister republics of the Western Hemisphere will be increased and strengthened, and that the nations of the New World, through sincere efforts at cooperation, will march steadily toward the fulfillment of Bolivar's vision of a prosperous and free continent, at peace with the world.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is my intention to move that the Senate take a recess until Monday. Before doing so, I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan, who is the acting minority leader, if he knows of any other business to come before the Senate from his side of the aisle.

Mr. POTTER. It is my understanding that there are no other Senators on this side of the aisle who desire to speak at this time; and that it was intended that the Senate should stand in recess until Monday after the distinguished Senator from Florida had completed his speech.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 16, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 12 (legislative day of April 9, 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

James W. Barco, of Virginia, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Lowell C. Pinkerton, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sudan.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

James Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1960.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named persons for permanent appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be ensigns

Herman H. Druebert
James C. Sainsbury

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, D. D., honorary professor in the University of Santo Domingo, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, author of light and of love, let the brightness of Thy countenance shine radiantly upon the Speaker of this House and upon all the Members of the United States Congress together with their fellow legislators throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Grant a special blessing to the President of the United States of America and to all who counsel him.

Pour out Thy divine graces most abundantly upon that type of exalted Christian leadership in the American Republics that promotes spiritual understanding and an enrichment of those religious values of the Old and the New Testament which help to make all good citizens conscious of their brotherhood under God.

Guide us, dear Saviour, in the ways of righteousness and fairness toward our neighbors in Latin America and in Canada.

We thank Thee, Almighty God, for the presence in our Capital of the talented devout son of the noble nation that brought Christianity to this new world.

Enlighten our minds, we beseech Thee, and fortify our wills that we may enthrone principle over expediency, combining love of country with devotion to mankind.

We implore these divine graces in the name of our most Holy Redeemer, the Christ Jesus of the Andes, who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12) entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk; and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–11.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. THYE, a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy vice the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 466) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 1237 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6712, an act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "business" insert "and only in the case of property described in the last sentence of subsection (b) (3)."

Page 1, strike out lines 10 and 11 and insert:

"(a) In subparagraph (A) strike out 'water or sewer facilities' and insert 'water, sewer, or drainage facilities'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 6712.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the House-passed version of H. R. 6712 amended section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. That section provided special rules for the taxation of gain from the sale of real property to the extent that a taxpayer is not to be considered as holding property primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business solely because he subdivided the tract, subject to certain conditions. Under the 1954 code, section 1237, was limited to real property in the hands of a taxpayer other than a corporation.

H. R. 6712 as passed by the House would extend the scope of the section to include corporations if no shareholder directly or indirectly holds real property for sale to customers in the ordinary course of trade or business.

The second section of the House-passed version of the bill would allow certain property to come within the scope of section 1237 even though the taxpayer had made certain improvements on the property. The bill would provide that the taxpayer could install other public utilities on the subdivided property as well as those listed in the present paragraph (3) (A) of section 1237 without losing the benefit of the section.

The Senate in its consideration of H. R. 6712 adopted two amendments to the bill.

The first of these amendments would extend the treatment to corporations only if the corporation is holding property originally acquired through foreclosure of a lien thereon, or a limited amount of adjacent property. This would include a corporation to which was transferred the foreclosure bid in exchange for all of its stock and other consideration or a corporation was itself the creditor.

The second amendment adopted by the Senate amends the reference to "other public utilities" and substitutes the term "drainage facilities." This Senate amendment narrows the scope of the House-passed version of H. R. 6712 by limiting the types of improvements that the taxpayer may make and remain within the scope of section 1237.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House agree to the Senate amendments which I have just described.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 6712.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6712, introduced by my distinguished colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. BOGGS], was passed by the House on August 1, 1955. The bill amends section 1237 of the Inter-

nal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to real property subdivided for sale.

Under this bill the capital-gains treatment generally granted by section 1237 is extended to certain corporations and other taxpayers who may not qualify under the present section. The bill also allows taxpayers under certain circumstances to make public-utility improvements on the property that is within the scope of this section.

In the form passed by the Senate on March 26, 1956, the bill contains two amendments, which are acceptable. One amendment would permit corporations to qualify only if the corporation is holding property originally acquired through foreclosure of a lien thereon. This would include a corporation to which was transferred the foreclosure bid in exchange for all of its stock and other consideration, or a corporation was itself the creditor. The second amendment removes a reference in the House-passed bill to "other public utilities" and substitutes "drainage facilities." This amendment narrows the scope of the House bill by limiting the types of improvements that the taxpayer may make and remain within the scope of the section in question.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a resolution providing that the House of Representatives designate Thursday, April 12, 1956, as the date to celebrate Pan-American Day, on which day appropriate remarks on the occasion may occur, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 467), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 14, 1956, will mark the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, now the Secretariat of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the House of Representatives, ever since the founding of the Pan American Union, has encouraged and fostered the development of inter-American cooperation and solidarity in the mutual best interests and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere; and

Whereas continued inter-American cooperation and solidarity are essential to the peace and security of this hemisphere and of the free world; and

Whereas the legislatures of the 21 American Republics have traditionally observed April 14 as Pan-American Day: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extend its most cordial greetings to the legislative bodies of each of the other American Republics in honor of Pan-American Day and in recognition of the importance of inter-American cooperation and solidarity to the peace and security of this hemisphere and of the free world.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American Republics and to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to call to the attention of the House the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. It is a fitting tribute to the common interests and working harmony of the 21 member American Republics that they are able to celebrate this long and fruitful association in an atmosphere of close friendship and good fellowship. This organization stands as a remarkable symbol to the world that many millions of people have been able to establish an instrument for achieving peace and cooperation through the years when warfare and belligerence have been the general rule. Pan-American Day serves to remind us of the unique union of the nations in the Western Hemisphere in what is now officially called the Organization of American States.

The Organization of American States dates back to the First International Conference of American States in Washington in 1889–90 and is founded upon the charter signed at the Ninth International Conference of American States on April 30, 1948. The Pan American Union was created as the permanent central organ and General Secretariat on April 14, 1890, and it is this date we honor today. Since the time of its creation, this organization has provided a means for many interchanges between the United States and our sister Republics in economic, social, juridical, and cultural fields. So also has it been the vehicle for achieving regional solidarity, strengthening collaboration, and defending the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence of the member nations, now under the regional agency provisions of the United Nations.

In 1933 President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in his inaugural address:

> In the field of world policy, I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

This was the origin of the good-neighbor policy which has done so much to strengthen the friendly relations between the peoples of this hemisphere through the inter-American system.

This year on April 14, representatives of the 21 American Republics will gather in the Pan American Union to pay tribute to one of our countrymen who was one of the chief architects of this great inter-American system, the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull. On that day a bust of this illustrious American will be unveiled in the Pan American Union. In his lifetime, Cordell Hull worked mightily for the cause of world peace. "Father of the United Nations," his labors earned him the Nobel Peace Prize, but among the peoples of this hemisphere his memory will be particularly cherished for his effective work in making the good-neighbor policy a reality.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman and the Members of this body to the creation of the Cordell Hull Foundation, with which the gentleman is familiar. The Cordell Hull Foundation is sponsored by International House of the city of New Orleans. It has for its purpose the promotion of the ideals and principles of the great Tennessean, Cordell Hull. We are honored in having the Governor of Tennessee, Governor Clement, as president of the Cordell Hull Foundation. One of the principal purposes of the foundation is the promotion of scholarships, for students from the 21 Latin American Republics.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] develop that fact, because, as he so well knows, these young people are carrying back to their countries a reflection of American friendship, and, of course, will contribute greatly to the cause of peace and American unity.

Mr. Speaker, we in the United States may well be proud of the fact that our neighbors have looked to us as the example in patterning their national constitutions and their forms of government. The very creation of the Organization of American States indicates the eager willingness of these young republics to submerge their differences in background and culture in order to obtain the blessings of freedom and dignity, made so infinitely desirable by the experience of the United States. The progress so far made by the American Republics in seeking ways to ground their independence and liberty upon solid foundations has been very gratifying and represents the patient efforts of the farsighted American statesmen who have provided able leadership for their peoples. They have all contributed much to the success of the inter-American system we honor today.

It is the fervent hope of all Americans that the Organization of American States may continue to serve as a model to the world of the deep feelings of understanding and cooperation that are possible of achievement when nations agree to work together in peace.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In connection with the remarks the gentleman is making I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO] may extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. May I modify the gentleman's request to this extent: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that first my colleague from Illinois [Mr. GORDON], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, be permitted to extend his remarks immediately following mine, those to be followed by the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut and then that all Members may be privileged to extend their remarks on this subject.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have here remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] on the subject of Pan American Day and I was going to

ask permission for his remarks to be inserted at this point in the RECORD. I have no remarks of my own to insert.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is included in my request that all Members may extend their remarks, and further that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years, through the cooperation of our Chaplains, Father Joseph F. Thorning has offered the prayer in this body on Pan-American Day.

This is appropriate because the Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning has been described on the floor of this House as "the padre of the Americas." He is a professor of the world-famous University of Santo Domingo, Ciudad Trujillo, in the Dominican Republic. This university, founded in 1538, is the oldest institution of higher learning in the Western Hemisphere. It is a teaching center for philosophy, literature, law, medicine, surgery, dentistry, engineering, fine arts, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and other important subjects.

The rector of the University of Santo Domingo, Dr. Pedro Troncoso Sanchez, is one of the most eminent educators in the world. He has served his country with distinction in many parts of the free world. In the work of the university he has been given every possible facility by His Excellency, Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina, LL. D., guiding genius of the Dominican Republic.

It must be gratifying to these noble leaders in education and in public life to know that Father Joseph F. Thorning, honorary professor in the celebrated University of Santa Domingo and a doctor of divinity in the Catholic University of Chile, Santiago de Chile, has offered the invocation in the United States Capitol on every official celebration of Pan-American Day since the inception of this session dedicated to the cause of inter-American friendship.

In his beautiful and appropriate prayer Father Thorning noted the presence at this time in the United States of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain, Señor Don Alberto Martin Artajo.

Between the people of the United States and the people of Spain there has been a most cordial and friendly feeling throughout the decades. I sincerely hope that Señor Artajo's visit to the United States will be a most happy and pleasant one, as well as one that will be productive of results consistent with the national interest of both countries.

Since 1930, when Pan-American Day was first officially proclaimed to be April the 14th, the spirit of interhemispheric cooperation and friendship has been growing and refurbishing the best of the aims and ideals of the many cultures of the Americas. In fact, the regional organization—known as the Organization of American States—stands as a model today of international cooperation for the rest of the world to study and emulate.

Only a century ago Simón Bolívar, the Latin American leader whose name is identified with early dreams of for inter-American unity, made the prophetic declaration that in the freedom of America lies the hope of the world. In order to further his ideas on continental cooperation and the similar projects of other contemporary American leaders, a congress was convened in Panama in 1826. This congress proved to be premature, but it did succeed in arousing the peoples of North and South America to the possibilities which could eventuate from a pan-American organization based on mutual interests and desires. Several other conferences were convened in South America during the 19th century, but not until the Washington Conference of 1889–90 did a truly hemispheric meeting take place. This was the first pan-American conference and since that time the vision and faith of many people of the Americas have continued to help this system of inter-American cooperation fulfill the highest aims of freedom, independence, and peace.

The International American Conference in Washington of 1889 launched a regional system on its course which, in the short span of 65 years, has made the common goals for hemispheric solidarity a reality. Today the Organization of American States amply demonstrates that the sharing of the responsiblity for the preservation of freedom can result in a reconciliation of divergent opinions and different backgrounds that may serve as a bulwark of security and cooperation. The joint endeavors of the Latin American countries and of the United States in the pan-American field have encountered many obstacles and difficulties throughout the years. Nevertheless all these governments and nations have shared the same common purposes, and in an atmosphere of good neighborliness these countries have been counseling together on mutual problems and reaching decisions and agreements that are redounding to the benefit of all.

The devotion to the ideal of freedom and the belief in the dignity of man are ingrained in the cultures of both groups, and the highest hope for we of the Americas on this Pan-American Day is that the past successes in reciprocal exchanges and mutually benefiting schemes of interhemispheric cooperation will further encourage respect for each others' ideas, convictions, and cultures.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, it is my great pleasure to join with my colleagues in celebration of the 66th birthday of the modern pan-American movement, which has done so much to create a feeling of mutual trust and friendship among the 335 million people of the United States and of the 20 Republics of Latin America.

Officially, it is the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, which is now known as the Organization of American States. The record of this great, hemispheric organization in maintaining the peace and contributing to the economic prosperity and well-being of all of us has been a brilliant one. It has influenced almost every aspect of our lives, and yet a great part of its work is accomplished in a spirit of quiet harmony incompatible with wide or spectacular publicity. For this reason, it may not be amiss to remind ourselves on this occasion of some of the major recent contributions which the OAS has made to a better life for all the people of the Americas, from the Canadian border to the Straits of Magellan.

For example, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro in December 1948, has been applied on four occasions when the peace of our hemisphere has been threatened by internal disputes: twice in controversies between Nicaragua and Costa Rica; in the Caribbean in 1950; and in the Guatemalan situation in 1954.

These controversies have provided the more spectacular examples of the work of the OAS. But meanwhile it has carried on a broad program of activities in less controversial fields, contributing immeasurably to the long-range welfare of all the people of the Americas. These include projects to improve housing, education, agriculture, health, travel facilities, and child welfare, to mention only a few.

In 1950 the OAS began a new program of technical cooperation, under which technicians from several Latin-American republics have been able to study new techniques in farming, teaching, nursing, and housing. Meanwhile, the organization has also devoted a major effort to wiping out illiteracy and expanding free education in the Americas.

Such work is a monument to the spirit of cooperation and mutual assistance which has long been hallmarks of our inter-American system, while providing at the same time an example and an inspiration to other governments and peoples throughout the world. It is positive, demonstrable proof of our historic contention that free nations can live as neighbors in an atmosphere of mutual respect and cooperation, without oppression of the weak by the strong, the prosperous by the less prosperous.

In particular, it should serve as a source of hope—a light in the darkness—for the oppressed peoples of the Iron Curtain countries who have been forced to sacrifice their liberties under the oppression of Soviet communism.

It is, indeed, an honor and a privilege for us all to salute this great organization on Pan-American Day and to tender our respects to the governments and people of the Latin-American republics who have joined their vision and statesmanship with that of our own country to make it possible.

CORDELL HULL: APOSTLE OF PAN-AMERICANISM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, day after tomorrow, on Saturday, April 14, a memorable ceremony will be held here at Washington in the Aztec Garden of the Pan American Union. The occasion will be the official celebration of Pan-Ameri-

can Day. The celebration, which is always an important inter-American event, will have added importance this year because one of its principal events will be the unveiling of a bust of Cordell Hull.

The Ambassadors from the American Republics who form the Council of the Organization of American States voted last year to erect this monument to Secretary Hull in recognition of his long dedication to the cause of hemisphere solidarity and his magnificent accomplishment in that regard. It is most fitting that this monument should stand in the grounds of the Pan American Union which he loved. It is likewise fitting for us to recall today in this body of which he was long an honored member how often and how eloquently Cordell Hull spoke in behalf of the cooperation among the American peoples as an element essential to the freedom and peace of the world. Forty-eight years ago, in 1908, his maiden speech in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress advocated freer flow of trade as a means toward global peace. He saw the regional cooperation of the American Republics as a pattern for all nations. He never deviated from his conviction that the inter-American maintenance of freedom, peace, and justice through voluntary cooperation is for this hemisphere a tower of strength and for the rest of the world a beacon and an example.

Seventeen years ago, in 1939, he spoke of the importance of every individual citizen in furthering our national and bipartisan policy of the good neighbor.

The relations among our nations must not rest merely on contacts between diplomat and diplomat, political leader and political leader, or even between businessman and businessman—

He said—

They must rest also on contacts between teacher and teacher, between student and student, upon the confluence of streams of thought as well as upon more formalized governmental action and constructive business activity.

The bronze bust of Cordell Hull in the Department of State bears President Roosevelt's phrase characterizing him as "the father of the United Nations." The Medal for Merit with an Oak Leaf Cluster presented to Cordell Hull by President Truman cited him for "exceptionally meritorious conduct" in strengthening the forces against aggression and preparing the way for world peace. The proclamation issued by President Eisenhower 1 year ago on the sad occasion of Cordell Hull's death and directing a nationwide tribute of mourning and honor to his memory attested "his integrity of purpose, his high sense of obligation, and his long and fruitful labors in the cause of peace."

Here in these Halls which witnessed so great a part of his service to his country and to the free world, I consider it a privilege to pay this small tribute to Cordell Hull today. And in doing so I wish to express what I am sure is the sense of gratitude of this august body as a whole for the great tribute which will be paid his memory on April 14 at the Pan American Union—a tribute which would have been particularly gratifying to him, since it comes from representatives of the other nations of America in recognition of his services to this hemisphere and to mankind as a public-spirited citizen of the United States and of the world.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the spirit and motive embodied in Pan-American Day which will be observed throughout the Americas on April 14.

At a time in our history when the peace and territorial security of nations is in constant jeopardy, it is comforting to know that the solidarity of the Western Hemisphere is unshakable.

The House of Representatives has long worked toward the goal of ever-increasing inter-American cooperation and friendship. Mutual understanding and a basic bond have led to a union which is normally strong, faithfully dedicated to increased standards of living, economic stability, and the maintenance of peace.

It is fitting that on this special day we take official cognizance of our neighbors and friends to the south, and affirm our desire for continuing cooperation in our common cause.

I am happy to extend cordial greetings to all of the American Republics on the occasion of Pan-American Day.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today's celebration of Pan-American Day is an appropriate occasion on which to direct our attention to the Organization of American States—one of the world's most seasoned and experienced regional organizations, an organization for the mutual defense of the 21 American Republics of this hemisphere, an organization engaged in the development of their cultural and economic resources, and one firmly dedicated to the maintenance of peace in the New World.

One of the distinguishing features of the Organization of American States is the equality of responsibility which is evidenced in its deliberations. Every one of the 21 Republics, regardless of its size or the present state of its economic and political development, is equal to every one of the other American Republics. That is a singular achievement—there is no veto, and in this hemisphere there are no satellites. The further development of broader democratic institutions and of greater respect for the rights of the individual—which are goals of the people of this hemisphere—can best be achieved through the unity of purpose which is exemplified by the Organization of American States.

During recent months, the people of the United States along with the other peoples of the Americas have watched with interest the political developments occurring within one of their sister Republics. After a number of years of growing oppression during which they lost many of their cherished rights, these people have arisen to reestablish themselves in their rightful place within the inter-American system. At the same time, they are engaged in rescuing their economy from the low state to which it has fallen through misguided and corrupt direction over the years. In their evident determination to rebuild their nation on progressive democratic principles and to work in a spirit of friendly cooperation with their neighbors in this hemisphere, these people can be assured that we stand ready to give them the moral and economic support they may need in this tremendous task. With our own background and tradition, the people of the United States are proud to welcome this virile and energetic people back into the ranks of the really free nations of the world and to wish them Godspeed in their efforts toward the more effective development of their immense natural resources for the benefit of themselves and their neighobrs.

We can, today, take note with gratification of the latest step which the Government of the Republic of Argentina has taken to identify itself more solidly with its sister Republics. A few days ago the provisional Government of Argentina deposited with the Pan American Union its instrument of ratification of the Bogotá Charter. This instrument, conceived and agreed to at Bogotá in 1948 by the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, is the basic charter of the inter-American system. With the ratification of Argentina, the roll is now complete—all the 21 Republics have now ratified the charter.

The new Argentine Government has also made known recently its awareness of the threat of international communism, when it became the 20th of the American Republics to ratify the Caracas Declaration of 1954. The Caracas Declaration recognizes that if international communism should get control of the political institutions of any American State it would be a danger to the peace of the entire hemisphere and call for joint action. Only one of the American Republics—Mexico—has not yet ratified this Caracas Declaration.

Let there be no misunderstanding however. The interest of the people of the United States is not limited to any single nation or group of nations in the hemisphere. The United States hopes to make a real and useful contribution to the efforts of all of our sister Republics to build stronger national economies and to raise the standards of living of their people. In doing so we serve our own national interest. Our contribution toward the economic development of the hemisphere is being made through programs designed to strengthen and increase inter-American trade, to spread more widely within the hemisphere our common store of technical knowledge and experience, to encourage our private investors to enter those areas where they are welcomed, and to intensify the activity of the Export-Import Bank in loans for economic development. In all of this, we act in a way consistent with our basic philosophy that private enterprise and initiative can do far more than governments can to build strong economies and better living standards.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday we are privileged once again to celebrate Pan-American Day. It is an appropriate occasion on which to call particular attention to the

common goals of the 21 republics of this hemisphere. It is the day on which we give expression to the good will, mutual respect, and understanding which unites us with our southern neighbors.

Likewise it is a day on which we appropriately bring to the attention of our own people an evaluation of the recent progress made in inter-American relations. They are indicative of the spirit and achievements of the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The past year has seen notable progress being made in strengthening and making more effective the Organization of American States. This regional organization has come to occupy a unique position in the world today. In the Organization of American States the 21 American Republics meet as equals to discuss their problems and find mutually satisfactory solutions. So effective have they been in this undertaking that the OAS has come to be the most solid international organization of free people on earth.

In the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance the peoples of this hemisphere have an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace in this hemisphere. This treaty, which was the outcome of the meeting of foreign ministers in 1947, not only binds the Americans together against aggression from abroad but also provides machinery for the settlement of disputes between two or more of the American Republics. Unfortunately such disputes do arise. But how fortunate it is—and what an example to the rest of the world—that we in our 21 republics have devised the means of resolving them. It is well that we take note today that now all of the 21 republics have ratified the Bogota Charter, the basic document of the inter-American system. Only a few days ago the new provisional government of Argentina deposited with the OAS its instrument of ratification, thereby making ratification hemispherewide.

So effective has the machinery of the Organization of American States become that this active cooperation of the American Republics has served as a working model for other areas. The structure of the United Nations itself benefited from the experience which had been gained by the Americas in the development of the OAS.

In the economic field, as in the political field, we can derive satisfaction from the closer ties which have developed among the American Republics in recent years. Latin America is now experiencing a phenomenal growth and development. The strength and resources of its nations have not been wasted in war. Their past achievement is largely intact to support further advancement. Our Government and our private industry are aiding in this further development by providing stable markets for Latin America's exports, by capital investments, by developmental loans, and by the exchange of technical know-how.

On this 66th anniversary of Pan-American Day we join with our Latin-American friends to give fitting recognition to the strength and the importance of the inter-American system through which we work for our common security and our common welfare. For the best interests of all of the Americas I sincerely hope that through mutually sharing of the responsibilities and the benefits of closer cooperation and friendship among all of the sister American Republics we can build an even better life for all of the peoples of this hemisphere.

THE POLICY OF FRIENDSHIP

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the United States has always taken pride and satisfaction in its relations with the other Republics of this hemisphere. It is a national pride, which both our great political parties and all our national administrations justly share.

Thomas Jefferson, who was our first Secretary of State, expressed this when he said, regarding Latin America:

> We have the same object, the success of representative government. Nor are we acting for ourselves alone, but for the whole human race.

Secretary John Foster Dulles expressed it in another way on Pan-American Day last year, saying:

> This great inter-American system, which was first a vision and a dream and then an experience of faith, has become in our own time the most solid international organization of free peoples on earth—beneficial to all mankind.

At the International American Conference at Washington in 1889, from the sessions of which our present mighty Organization of American States has derived, Secretary of State James G. Blaine defined the hemisphere of the American peoples as a policy of "friendship and not force."

Secretary Elihu Root, at the Third International Conference of American States at Rio de Janeiro in 1906, called on the American peoples to show the world that liberty is the twin sister of justice and peace.

> Let us unite—

He urged—

> in creating and maintaining and making effective an all-American public opinion whose power shall influence international wrong, bring us ever nearer to the perfection of ordered liberty.

A generation ago, in 1925, Secretary Charles Evans Hughes reaffirmed this tenacious belief of the global impact of our inter-American system of partnership. He emphasized the fact that hemisphere cooperation, while based on the primary and mutual interest among the American Republics in a special relationship, does not isolate our peoples from the rest of the world. On the contrary, he said, our hemisphere cooperation "in itself constitutes a most important contribution to world peace."

One dozen years ago, on Pan-American Day in 1944, Cordell Hull, who is being so fittingly commemorated at the Pan American Union this week, made the following characteristic statement:

> As the years have gone on, the true principles underlying inter-American unity have been made more specific as one inter-American conference has followed another. In the years between the World Wars the trust and confidence between the American nations grew ever stronger, while elsewhere the growth of ambitions of conquest by force brought division and fear. It is the common pride of the American Republics and the good fortune of all mankind that the torch of international cooperation has burned at its brightest in the affairs of this hemisphere precisely at a time when it was being blacked out elsewhere. It is natural that the history of an international association which has endured longer than any other should provide encouraging guidance for the future.

The view that the American family of nations affords a practical example of international relationships for the family of man is in truth so well established as to be looked on as a matter of fact. Our Congress in both its Houses, and without regard to political party lines, has long proved itself to be of this mind. From our beginnings as a nation to the present day, our Chiefs of State—again Thomas Jefferson, John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower—have voiced this same belief in the kindling, the inspiring power of the inter-American achievement. At every period of our history our leaders have voiced the same view, well expressed. We find it as long ago as 1826 in President Adams' prophetic confidence in the opportunities through inter-American cooperation to "promote the prevalence in future ages of peace on earth and good will to man." We find it as recently as 1956 in President Eisenhower's statement that—

> In our hemisphere, the inter-American system has continued showing its vitality in maintaining peace and collective outlook on world problems.

Our cherished inter-American relationship of the good neighbor, the good partner, is the unshakable foundation of hemisphere solidarity. It is the most effective guaranty of the increasing progress, the continuing independence, and the sustaining freedom of our 21 Republics. It has been said, and justly said, that inter-American neighborliness and partnership are not only established policies of all our Governments but states of mind of all our peoples. While we have made traditional the excellent practice of publicly proclaiming this fact anew every year on Pan-American Day, the important thing is that this state of mind shall guide our actions on each of the 365 days of the year.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1890, was an historic day, for it marked the inauguration of the great hemispheric association of free peoples which is today called the Organization of American States.

It is fitting that we should pay special tribute today to that organization, and to the 335 million Americans whom it represents. These peoples, diverse as to racial origins, languages, and cultures, are joined together by the common bond of their devotion to liberty, democracy, and the proud free enterprise institutions of the western world.

From the Canadian border to Cape Horn, we live in a community of 21 American Republics which, to quote our Secretary of State, "avoids on the one hand the snares and delusions of alien

domination and on the other the pitfalls af narrow nationalism."

The unity of spirit and purpose has not been easily won, and perhaps too many people in our own country are inclined to take it for granted. In fact, it represents the end product of over a century of slow and often painful progress starting with the first Congress of Panama convoked by the great American patriot and liberator, Simon Bolivar in 1826.

The governments and peoples of the United States and the 20 Latin American Republics have traveled a long road indeed since Bolivar's day, marked as it was by the struggles of infant nations to gain their freedom from colonialism and secure a firm economic foothold in what was then largely a virgin wilderness.

How different a spectacle today. Along the coasts of Central and South America, on the pampas of Argentina, and in the jungles of Brazil, great modern cities have arisen. Fleets of ships and airplanes carry the commerce of the Americas from one nation to another in this hemisphere, and around the rest of the world. Indeed, in the case of Brazil an entire era of progress, as it developed in the United States—the western push of the railroads—may be bypassed and made unnecessary by the rapid expansion there of commercial aviation.

Meanwhile our sister republics are increasing their population at the remarkable rate of 2½ percent a year. The population of Latin America has doubled since 1915, and is expected to reach 500 million by the end of the century—just 44 years away. Meanwhile, in a single generation, these people have attained an economic development which the older industrialized nations took 150 years to achieve.

It is with a sense of justifiable pride that we pause to reflect this Pan-American Day on the contribution which the people of the United States have been privileged to make in the economic and technical development of this vast area, while at the same time we contemplate with appreciation and respect the many benefits which have accrued to our country from our association with the peoples of Latin America.

Out of our association in the council of the Organization of American States, our treaties of mutual defense and reciprocal assistance, our trade and our cultural contacts, has developed an ever-growing sense of partnership and common purpose.

I am sure that in the years to come the people of the United States will bend their best efforts to support and strengthen this relationship, in the interests not alone of the people of the western hemisphere but the entire free world, to whom the inter-American system has become a symbol of the cooperation and mutual respect which it is possible to develop in a community of free and independent nations.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, April 14 will mark the 66th anniversary of the inter-American system which governs the relations between the 21 American Republics of this hemisphere. On April 14, 1890, the Pan American Union was formed, and now, 66 years later, we can look back with pride at the increasing friendship and increasing trade and cultural relations which have taken place between the United States and our sister Republics of the south. This could not have been achieved were it not for the combined efforts in our mutual interests of the Latin American Republics and ourselves through the instrumentality of this great international organization, the Pan American Union, which now serves as the secretariat to the Organization of American States.

One of the functions of the inter-American system which is seldom mentioned is the mutual defense arrangement which exists for the defense of the hemisphere. Along with other regional defense systems, the inter-American system, exemplified by and through the American States, constitutes an important bulwark of defense and security for the United States and the free world.

It is well for us on this day to greet our fellow legislative bodies in Latin America and to reassure the peoples of the 20 Latin American Republics of the friendship which our people hold for them.

This is also a fitting occasion for us to take stock of the ways and means by which we can increase the mutual understanding and friendship between us so that we may stand together as pillars of a strong free world which is constantly being menaced by a ruthless international communism. This will require not only mutual understanding but mutual effort and mutual sacrifices as well. May the inter-American system flourish and grow in strength, understanding, prosperity, and free world solidarity.

THE EXPANSION OF PAN-AMERICANISM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it was Simon Bolivar who was the principal author of the idea of inter-American cooperation, which we celebrate today. At the Congress of Panama in 1832, he urged the 21 American Republics to unite and to establish a system of pan-Americanism based on the ideals of peace, freedom, and justice.

Bolivar's hopes were fulfilled at the first Inter-American Congress, held in Washington in 1890; for at this gathering of American nations the first concrete step toward the establishment of our inter-American system was taken with the formation of the International Union of American Republics. This association, based on the principles of equality of all members and mutual cooperation for the welfare and security of the hemisphere, provided a firm foundation for the growing Pan American structure.

Successive inter-American conferences strengthened the bonds that united the republics. The system became mature as the American nations continued to share responsibility for the promotion of peace and security and the development of economic, social, and cultural endeavors. Finally, at the Ninth Inter-American Conference, held at Bogata in 1948, the Community of American Nations became a permanent structure with the formation of the Organization of American States. This organization solidified the initial purposes and principles of inter-Americanism which had been developing since 1890.

Today, on the anniversary of pan-Americanism, the American Republics appropriately and proudly celebrate the progress made by their community. In the short span of 66 years, they have succeeded in maintaining peace and security on the continents; they have raised the health and living standards of the American states; they have cooperated in the development of resources, industry, and trade for their mutual benefit; they have, collectively, made the Americas better lands in which to live. With such a record of accomplishments, they look forward to still greater inter-American cooperation in the future.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, President Eisenhower has issued a proclamation designating April 14 as Pan-American Day, and the period April 8–14 as Pan-American Week. It has become customary for the President to set aside such a period each year, during which we pay special tribute to the inter-American system of friendship and mutual cooperation which has served the peoples of the Western Hemisphere so well since it was first formalized 66 years ago with the establishment of the Pan American Union—now the Organization of American States—which has its permanent seat in Washington and of which the United States and the 20 Latin American republics are members.

It is customary also in connection with this annual occasion for the people of the United States, individually and through their Government, to salute the 175 million people of the Latin American republics who over the years have contributed so much to the enrichment of our culture, the maintenance of our economic prosperity and the safeguarding of the security of the hemisphere.

We American people are realizing a genuine comprehension of the importance of our mutual association in this hemisphere. The average United States citizen hears much about the difficulties and the dangers which beset our relations with other parts of the world, but we hear too little about the dynamic progress and manifold opportunities of our neighbors of the new world.

In part this may be attributed to the old adage that good news does not make headlines as often as bad. I hope we Americans will never take for granted the friendship of our sister nations in this hemisphere, and focus our attention solely on critical problems elsewhere.

The members of our Foreign Affairs Committee and Foreign Relations Committee who are responsible under the President's leadership for the conduct of our foreign policy, and the millions of our private citizens who have business contacts in Latin America, are clearly conscious of the importance of Latin America to the defense of the hemisphere, and to the economic well-being of our good country.

This is evident in the tone of President Eisenhower's Pan-American Day proclamation, which is an eloquent statement of the interdependence of all American republics in maintaining the peace and the freedom of the Western Hemisphere, and of the importance of

maintaining our traditional friendship with our sister nations in Latin America.

Among private or governmental people whose work brings them into contact with Latin America there is no need to underscore the importance of this great area to the United States, nor is it necessary to list the reasons for our growing interdependence. The facts are too self-evident. They know that the population of Latin America is growing at the rate of about 2.5 percent a year, and at that rate may hit 500 million by the end of the century, just 44 years from now. They read the trade figures, which show that Latin America accounts for 22 percent of our total exports, and 32 percent of our total imports, and that 35 percent of all United States direct foreign investment is there or approximately $6,256,000,000.

They know also that the Communist nations do not underestimate the importance either of the area or its people. Far from attempting to conceal their interest, the Soviets have stated frankly and publicly that they hope to develop closer economic, cultural, and political ties with the Latin America republics.

These are some of the considerations that we should all bear in mind while we celebrate this Pan-American Day. It is not only an occasion for festivities and rejoicing. It is an opportunity to pause and think seriously of the breadth and the depth of inter-American interdependence. For each American, in North America and South America, to ask himself what he can contribute personally to the solidarity of the free peoples of our wonderful Western Hemisphere, really the new world.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 14, 1956, marks the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union. This oldest international association in the world has grown into what we now know as the Organization of American States. On this date we pause each year to contemplate the handiwork that built this union, and I think we may be pardoned for our pride. That such a union of 21 independent, sovereign nations of many races, and diverse cultures and languages, should have been conceived of in the first place is remarkable indeed. That it has endured and grown stronger over the years in spite of occasional conflicts between its member states and the world shaking effect of 2 major world wars is truly extraordinary. I take this opportunity to congratulate the other republics of the inter-American family on another year of earnest work toward perfecting our mutual alliance. The existence of the organization should be an inspiration to the world that where good will and patience reign; international understanding and cooperation are possible.

All of us know, however, that the success of an international organization in promoting peace and prosperity depends, in the main, on the public support it enjoys. No matter how fine a building it occupies or how devoted are its employees, an international organization of sovereign states can do no more than reflect public opinion. We in Florida feel, perhaps, a particular concern for the progress and well-being of the OAS. Florida's historical and cultural ties with her Latin American neighbors have deep roots. Even the name of our great State reflects its Spanish heritage.

For this reason, Florida has made great efforts to promote inter-American relations on the level of individual citizens. The University of Florida, for instance, has become one of the major centers for studying all aspects of Latin America—political, economic, historical, geographical, and cultural. A new and novel project for getting the American people—both north and south of the Rio Grande—better acquainted is presently taking shape on Biscayne Bay in Miami. We are building an Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, 1,800 acres of beautiful fairgrounds to house industrial and handicraft exhibits of the 21 sister republics. We hope it will become a meeting ground for exporters and importers throughout the hemisphere. We hope, too, that the fine products on display will help the many people who visit Florida each year to get some idea of the wonderful people we call our neighbors.

On this threshold of the 67th year of the existence of the union of Pan-American republics, it is fitting that we recall Bolivar's prophetic statement:

Freedom of the Americas is the hope of the universe.

For it is only by our working diligently and harmoniously together that our beloved freedoms can be secured. Let us, then, rededicate ourselves today to the lofty principles and high ideals embodied in the Organization of American States as we wish it a "Happy Birthday" and Godspeed in the year to come.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE DETROIT AREA AIRPORTS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House resolution for the purpose of creating a select committee of three Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a full and complete investigation relating to the problems of the Detroit area airports, both civilian and military.

The resolution calls for recommendations by the committee as to which airport should be utilized to the utmost for civilian purposes and for proper military relocation. It also calls for complete hearings and the subpenaing of any witnesses, records, documents, and other evidence as necessary.

As you see, the resolution is not intended to prove a point, but simply to find out all the facts relating to the many contradictory statements about the situation involving the subject airports. In order to project a practical resolution of this vexing problem, it is essential that all of the facts be known.

As we know, the airlines exert a tremendous influence upon Congress. I have received a rumor that no action will be taken on this resolution. If this is true, it will be obvious to the public that the airlines are getting the same preferential treatment that the railroads received many years ago.

My intention is not to force anyone into a position that is improper, but to bring about a solution by which the public will be properly served.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 3 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) whether the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport should be developed and utilized as the major civil air terminal serving the Detroit area, (2) whether the scheduled air carriers now using the Willow Run Airport should transfer their operations to the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport, (3) whether the Willow Run Airport should continue to be operated under civil ownership as a joint civil and military airport, (4) whether Air Force Reserve fighter squadrons should be relocated from Selridge Air Force Base and established on the Willow Run Airport, (5) whether the naval air station should be relocated from Grosse Ile and established on the Willow Run Airport, (6) whether the Air National Guard squadrons now stationed at Detroit-Wayne Major Airport should be transferred to the Willow Run Airport, and (7) whether a master plan of all the airports in the Detroit metropolitan area can and should be established in order to most effectively utilize their facilities.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

BATAAN DAY COMMEMORATION DINNER

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to include a Bataan Day message from President Dwight D. Eisenhower to President Ramon Magsaysay and also message from President Ramon Magsaysay to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be present the other evening at the Bataan Day commemoration dinner at the Mayflower Hotel given by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo and the Philippine Association. It was a pleasure to see in attendance a large number of Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, Justices of the Supreme Court, the high echelon of the State Department, our Armed Forces, leading businessmen and industrialists, with their ladies, all of them gathered together to honor the American and Filipino soldiers who put up that magnificent display of courage and heroism in Bataan.

It was a splendidly arranged dinner worthy of the historic occasion for which it was held. Two addresses were delivered, one by the host and the other by the guest of honor, our own Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who was at the same time conferred the highest decoration in the gift of the Government of the Philippines. These two addresses and the citation were inserted in the RECORD by our distinguished colleague, the Representative of Massachusetts, Congressman MCCORMACK, April 10, 1956.

I wish to comment on General Romulo's speech because I believe it is a good example of how to talk to the American people. It was a forceful and vigorous one because it highlighted what we should do in the Philippines that we are not now doing, but it was done in such a graceful, friendly way that no one can take exception to any part of it. There were no threats, no attempts at intimidation, no straining for political effect, no oratorical lamentations over our supposed failures. But it was clear and emphatic in its statement of facts of what our Filipino friends feel and want, as subtle as it was gentle, as diplomatic as it was effective. It was sober and restrained, with a dignity that cannot help but command respect and admiration.

I underscore General Romulo's speech, its tone and its style, because too often some of our foreign friends seem to think that to impress us they must either talk tough or adopt theatrical attitudes of disenchantment at what they magnify as our neglect of friends. They do not know or they choose to ignore that the American people cannot be intimidated and that an appeal to our inherent sense of fairness goes a long way with us because it is always our endeavor to be reasonable and just. The standing ovation given General Romulo showed that he achieved the result he wanted to get. His speech was really an invitation to each of us in Congress to indulge in a searching national introspection.

Two messages were read during the evening that revealed statesmanship of the highest order. I include the message of President Eisenhower to President Magsaysay and the latter's reply:

BATAAN DAY MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

President RAMON MAGSAYSAY:

I send greetings, on behalf of the people of the United States, to our friends in the Philippines on this day of memories and dedication. It is fitting that Bataan Day should be the chosen time to commemorate Philippine-American friendship for it reminds us of the unity that was ours in times of stress and trial.

The ensuing 14 years have brought ever-increasing understanding and cooperation. This year you will mark the 10th anniversary of the independence of your nation. We can be justly proud of the example of international brotherhood which we, together, have provided during the past decade.

Our hearts should be filled with gratitude toward those brave men whom we remember on this day—not only for their service in war, but for the legacy of courage and inspiration which they left for us to follow in time of peace.

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

APRIL 9, 1956.

BATAAN DAY MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT RAMON MAGSAYSAY

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER:

I am grateful to you for your message commemorating Bataan Day and I wish to reciprocate your cordial greetings. Our two peoples are united by an imperishable bond that was forged in Bataan by the courage and heroism of our soldiers.

We have fought together in war and are cooperating with each other in peace to uphold freedom and democracy. Ours is a friendship based on mutual respect and being on such a firm basis it is an enduring one.

It is my hope that our close collaboration in working for the peace and security of the free world will continue to demonstrate that whatever inevitable temporary and superficial differences we may have from time to time, they are no barrier to the mutuality of our responsibility to serve the best interests of our respective countries and our common dedication to fight for the democratic ideal.

As we commemorate a historic event which signalizes a spiritual victory over a military defeat I wish to reiterate my people's faith in the righteousness and invincibility of the cause of freedom and human dignity to which we are dedicated.

RAMON MAGSAYSAY.

APRIL 9, 1956.

THE EXORBITANT PRICE OF SCRAP STEEL

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House and the entire country to a condition that has arisen and that is persisting in reference to the prices of steel and iron scrap. It happens that in the fifth district of Indiana which I have the privilege to represent we have some semi-integrated steel plants which have found it necessary to purchase most of their supply of material for smelting purposes from people who are charging exorbitant prices for scrap steel.

This exorbitant increase in the price of scrap steel results from the large exportation of this scrap to other countries. In fact, since 1953 it has multiplied nearly 15 times. I hope that the Department of Commerce and other interested agencies will investigate this serious situation.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman. I am very much interested in this subject and had inserted in the RECORD the other day a compilation showing the tremendous increase in the amount of scrap metal being sent abroad. The gentleman says it has increased more than 15 times in a period of 2 years, from a little over 300,000 tons to over 5 million tons. The gentleman addresses the House on a very important subject.

Mr. BEAMER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

ALGER HISS AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, you will find, beginning on page 6162 of yesterday's RECORD, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] expressed some criticism of the judgment of officials of Princeton University because they had agreed to permit a Mr. Hiss to address the student body. Unfortunately, as I understood, I agreed with the gentleman because I thought he was only criticizing their judgment.

Thinking over his argument and the principle involved last night, and this morning I am convinced that something more than a question of policy is involved.

I want to go one step further than we did yesterday and go along with the idea that it is improper for any institution of learning to bring in a speaker, especially one who is known throughout the Nation and who has heretofore publicly been engaged in an effort to overthrow our Government by force and violence who has been convicted of deliberately intentionally giving false testimony to speak before and advise a student or any other group as to the foreign policy we should follow on a matter where he has heretofore served the interest of an enemy country. I think we might just as well bring in an embezzler who was seeking a position in a bank to explain banking procedure. It is my purpose to withdraw any thought or expression of opinion that you were right in only questioning their judgment. I think we should have gone further and asserted that no one who was an advocate of a policy or program the adoption of which would mean the end of our form of government has the right to express such views publicly.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, in answer to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], may I say that I agree quite thoroughly with him. I spoke extemporaneously yesterday, and I thought I made myself clear. I said I thought that Dr. Dodds, the president of Princeton University, should take Mr. Hiss and throw him out by the scruff of the neck. I do not concede that educators have the right to permit the universities under their control to be used by the enemies of our country to advance their cause. I assume an educator is supposed to teach his students, and I assume when students do something wrong, whether they are children of 6 or children of 18, the educator would and should reprove them. I said I thought Dr. Dodd, president of Princeton, should put the "children" involved—because that is what they are—over his knee and paddle their Red aspirations thoroughly. So, I agree with the gentleman, and thank him for his interest as he is a distinguished American.

Students having such a disregard for college and country should be disciplined by the faculty—if the faculty is doing its duty to the students and their parents.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9893, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the time I was speaking yesterday, I pointed out that if the action of the committee stands as it is, the construction of this vitally important jet base in the State of Michigan will be delayed 1 year, and, secondly, an additional cost of a minimum of $5,188,950 will be involved.

At this time I should like to point out again that the statement as to delay is predicated on a letter I received from the Secretary of the Air Force on March 21, 1956. I quoted the pertinent portions of the letter in my remarks yesterday.

At this point I should like to turn specifically to the cost factor. The testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services indicates first that if the Air Force is required to change the site from what is known as the Kalkaska site, which is here [indicating on chart] to the Manistee site, which is here, the loss in dollars will be a minimum of $350,000 and probably closer to $500,000. The reason for that wasteful expenditure is precisely this. The Air Force last August got concurrence from the respective committees of the House and Senate for the initiation of construction at the so-called Kalkaska site. The Air Force in good faith went ahead with that construction. They have done design work on the runways. They have made definite plans. They have signed contracts. There is no doubt that they have spent at least $350,000 and probably closer to $500,000, which amount of money will be totally wasted if the base is changed from Kalkaska to Manistee.

Secondly, this base is a very important part of our national-defense picture. It is tied in with what we call the SAGE system; that is, semiautomatic ground environment program. It is a 10-year lease between the Air Force and Western Electric and constituent companies of the A. T. & T. When you figure the cost on the SAGE system, you have to figure what the operational cost will be over a 10-year period. There will be a minimum annual excessive cost if the site is at Manistee over Kalkaska of $270,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes additional.

Mr. FORD. There is a very distinct possibility that the annual excessive cost could go up to $460,000. So, if you take $270,000 times 10, it is an excess cost $2,700,000. Or, if you use the figure $460,000 and multiply it by 10, it comes to $4,600,000.

I am sure that many Members wonder why there is a differential on an annual basis. The reason is very simple. The SAGE system ties into certain basic vital trunklines that the telephone company has throughout the country. It so happens that at the present time the Michigan Bell Telephone Co. has a major trunkline which runs more or less up through the Cadillac area, northward into Michigan. The SAGE system communication lines are tied into that trunkline. The facts and figures indicate that from this trunkline which runs up like this [indicating on chart] the Kalkaska site is approximately 24 miles closer to the trunkline than the Manistee site would be. It is purely a mathematical problem, measuring the distance from each site to the trunkline. If you take the rate which is identical for each site and multiply it by the distance, you arrive at the figure. As I indicated, the 10-year differential between the two sites in dollars will be a minimum of $2,700,000 and potentially it could be $4,600,000.

Those facts and figures can be substantiated by the Air Force. I have asked them to check and doublecheck with the people who will do the construction, and there is no question in my mind that they are accurate.

The third factor that involves this $5 million excessive cost is this: In the letter from Secretary of the Air Force Quarles on March 21, after I asked him as to the comparative cost figures for initial construction, he indicated that the Kalkaska site initial construction cost would be $938,950 cheaper than the Manistee site.

When you add it all up, the picture is precisely this: If we move from Kalkaska to Manistee we throw away at least $350,000 and possibly $500,000. If we move from Kalkaska to Manistee we charge ourselves, the Federal Government, at least $2,700,000 more and possibly $4,600,000 more over a 10-year period. If we move from Kalkaska to Manistee we find that in the latest figures submitted by the Air Force there is a differential in cost of construction of almost $1 million. When you take the cost and the delay, it seems to me that the position of the committee was in error.

I intend to offer an amendment to restore the language the way the Air Force proposed. I would certainly hope that the members of this committee would support this amendment. It has been a very unfortunate situation that has developed over a period of about 2½ years. I dislike very greatly getting into this problem, but when you see the facts and figures I feel that you cannot help but take the course of action I have taken.

There is one point I should like to bring out. It has been stated, and I think it is accurate, that the former Secretary of the Air Force promised the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] that this base would be constructed in her district. It was originally proposed that the base be in what was called the Long Lake area, which is somewhere around here as indicated on this map. That was vetoed because it was felt it would be too close to a very famous music camp. Then the Air Force proposed that it be built in what we call the Benzie site. The Committee on Armed Services through one of its subcommittees vetoed that site.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is not accurate when he says the Committee on Armed Services vetoed the Benzie site. What the Committee on Armed Services did after our own investigation was determine that it should not be located within 15 miles of the music center.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Georgia is very correct. The net effect, however, is that the Benzie site was vetoed. When the Benzie site was removed as a possible site, the Air Force then went down to what we call the Cadillac site. The Benzie site and the Cadillac site are both within Miss THOMPSON'S district. The district line runs right here. Here is the 11th District and here is the 9th District.

In December of 1954 or in January of 1955 the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], according to her testimony in these hearings, contacted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and other members of the Committee on Appropriations indicating her objection to the Cadillac site. Our committee, the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, at the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] undertook a thorough inves-

tigation of the cost and the selection of this site. The committee requested from the Air Force all the factual data we could accumulate. That factual data was submitted to our committee, and our committee felt, after looking at the information, that we as a committee could not approve the construction of this site. In effect we agreed with the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

The Air Force then had two alternatives left. They could go to the Kalkaska site, or they could go to the Manistee site. The Air Force then decided on their own that they would select the Kalkaska site. They were not directed by Mr. VINSON's committee, nor were they directed by Mr. CANNON's committee, nor by the subcommittee under the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The Air Force selected this site out of these two alternatives. Then they got permission to go ahead, and they did invest this money to get construction started. They have a contract for 7,100 acres of State-owned land in this area. The State conservation commission approved the contract. They have it on a $1-a-year lease. Actually, they have to clear considerable fine timberland. They went ahead and cleared one-third of it when this committee action was taken about 3 weeks ago.

I might say one further thing. The gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] was promised that this base would be in her district. On this chart you see the dividing line between the gentlewoman's district and the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. This base is 1 mile from Miss THOMPSON's district, and Traverse City is a sizable community in her district. I would say with complete assurance that probably 90 percent of the economic benefits and impact would accrue in the following way. Here you see a town of 1,250 people, and here is a community with 16,900 people. The answer is that most of the economic benefit will accrue that way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The fact of the matter is that even if she were assured that this air base would be in her district, it might just as well be 100 miles away as 1 mile away. The fact remains that according to your proposal, it will not be located in her district; is that not correct?

Mr. FORD. Technically, you are correct, but I do not think we can justify the expenditure of $5 million extra and the delay of 1 year because a base is geographically situated 1 mile across a congressional district line.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does the distinguished gentleman from Michigan not think that it comes with poor grace for him to be discussing the matter of delay?

Mr. FORD. I am very glad that the gentleman raises that question.

Mr. VINSON. If I may finish my question—in the first instance, the Air Force put it at Cadillac and the gentleman and his committee delayed it until this present day.

Mr. FORD. I am pleased the gentleman from Georgia raised that question because our committee was not asked to take any action on this problem until the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan requested such action. She is a highly respected Member of this body and when she made the charges, which she did, it was incumbent upon a responsible committee of this body to look at the facts. We did that, and after getting the facts from the responsible authorities in the Air Force, we agreed with the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

Mr. VINSON. May I say in view of that statement, let us not talk about delay because the committee which refused to appropriate the money delayed it and it is still delayed. As a matter of fact, it may be that after a while it may be decided that the security of the country does not require any base up there at all. But, for the time being, let us forget about delay because I do not think it comes with good grace for our good friend to be talking about delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, it is with some regret that I find myself constrained today to take the well of this House in the name of the people of this Nation, and also in the cause of national security, but I feel constrained to do so because this recommendation of the Committee on Armed Services will cause the taxpayers of this Nation to forfeit a half-million dollars that has already been spent on a site that was selected by the Air Force. As Mr. FORD has said, it had the approval of the four committees which have jurisdiction over such facts.

Mr. Chairman, in the very able remarks by my distinguished and esteemed chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on Tuesday on the pending legislation, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] very properly pointed out to the Members of this body the vital character of this base in the Traverse City area. The distinguished chairman discussed with the Members the fact that approximately 150 miles of vital industrial area will be left unguarded until such time as the base in this area is completed. His very able remarks bear repeating at this time. I quote from the distinguished gentleman's remarks of Tuesday:

> Today there is a gap in our defense line across the northern part of the United States and this gap will be filled by the airbase which will be built in what has been called the Traverse City area.
>
> Wurtsmith Air Force Base is about 75 miles south and east of the Traverse City area and Kinross Air Force Base is about the same distance north of the Traverse City area. This means that there is a gap of something in the order of 150 miles which is today not adequately protected.

That is the end of the quotation from my distinguished friend's remarks of Tuesday.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I support the concern expressed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on this project.

On January 18, 1955, I wrote Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the following letter:

> As the Representative of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan, I have been called upon to request of your committee, an appointment for a delegation from Traverse City, Grand Traverse County, and the city of Kalkaska, Kalkaska County, for the purpose of conveying to the Armed Services Committee their position on the location of the proposed jet airbase which was authorized by Congress on July 27, 1954.
>
> Both groups are interested in giving the committee all of the factual information they have, and which they believe to be in the best interest as far as the jet base is concerned.
>
> It is my hope that you will look kindly upon this request and inform me at your earliest convenience of the date set for the Traverse City and Kalkaska delegations to meet with you.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, replied to me immediately, and I should like to quote from that letter which the chairman sent to my office.

I quote from Mr. VINSON's letter as follows:

> The committee has been faced in the past on several occasions with the same problem which exists here, that is, the selection by one of the departments of a site for a military installation only to have the site selected unsatisfactory to people in the immediate or adjoining areas.
>
> It has been the experience of the committee that unless there are obvious and compelling reasons for reconsideration of the site selected, and these reasons should, in the last analysis relate directly to our defense, no useful purpose is served by engaging in action which can well be construed as substituting the judgment of the committee for the qualified people in the military departments.

It is my judgment that the defense posture of the United States and our military greatness may in large part be attributable to the efforts and wisdom of the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. I believe his counsel merits great attention by the Members of the House.

Therefore I believe it is essential that the base in the Traverse City area be completed with the utmost expedition at the location to be selected by the Department of the Air Force based on considerations of military suitability and economy. These objectives can only be realized by continuing the base at Kalkaska.

Mr. Chairman, when the military construction bill is read for amendment I shall join with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. FORD] in offering an amendment to section 301 of H. R. 9893, to provide for the continuation of construction already begun on a jet interceptor base at Kalkaska, Mich., rather than to start all over again at a new location with a jet base at a site to be selected at Manistee, Mich. Not to continue the base at Kalkaska will mean a 1 year's delay in the completion of a jet base so vital and urgent to our northern defense perimeter by the Department of the Air Force.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention an article appearing in the Washington Post of April 6 entitled "A Wonder of the World Takes Form in the Arctic." This article brings to the attention of our country the 3,000-mile radar defense system known as DEW line. If this new radar system is going to accomplish its purpose, then it is most essential that we have the necessary jet interceptor bases along the northern perimeter of the United States to receive the alert from the radar to intercept the enemy before he can strike with his devastating bombs on the industrial centers of the United States, which are the nerve centers of the production of weapons and material for our security.

The Kalkaska base site is one of the overall vital installations in this system according to the Department of the Air Force.

We once again go back to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee which he well documented in his statement on Tuesday, that there is this gap and that unless it is filled we will be vulnerable as far as any enemy may be concerned.

Our amendment to continue the base at Kalkaska will save the American taxpayers millions of dollars in construction and maintenance costs. So, as an aside, the savings will benefit the same taxpayers who in a few days will be called upon to make their final tax accounting for the year 1955.

Our amendment to continue the base at Kalkaska will be in accord with the expert strategical and military judgment of the Department of the Air Force and will be in accord with the House and Senate Committees on the Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations, which have previously specifically and expressly approved the location of the jet base in the Kalkaska area. The amendment that will be offered to retain the jet base at Kalkaska has the support of the Department of the Air Force because of urgent defense considerations. It has the support of Senator POTTER of Michigan and a large majority of the members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress.

Senator POTTER gave a release and I am going to read the release that Senator POTTER issued to the press on Monday, March 12, in which the Senator said:

> There is but one paramount consideration in the construction of this base and that is our effort in furthering the defense of our entire country. Such a base should not be located or relocated for any reasons of local interests. An air base is a matter of national concern. My position has always been, and still is, what is in the best interests of our national defense—

And he continued on.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. I served as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handled the hearings on this base in northern Michigan. I was interested personally in a base in my district, this identical base, but after going over the facts with the Air Force I came to the conclusion, reluctantly I may say, and I am not so sure that the Air Force was right, that they should have put it in my district, but nevertheless we have reached the point now where the Kalkaska site should be maintained. The very fact that the Michigan Department of Conservation has already leased some seven or eight thousand acres to the Federal Government for this site, the clearing of the site is under way at the present time, the fact that it will cost more to have the base located in Manistee than it will at Kalkaska, is something that this Congress ought to take into consideration, and that includes not only the original cost, but the accruing annual costs which are a factor here. It seems to me that this body in its wisdom ought to restore the Kalkaska site because it is the logical site from the national defense point of view. I do not think we ought to delay this airbase 1 year longer.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. In reply to the statement of the distinguished gentleman, I read from the record the testimony of Mr. Ferry of the Department of Defense. I asked this question:

> From the military standpoint are they equal?
>
> Mr. FERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I believe that from a military standpoint that may be true; however, there are economic factors involved here as far as costs are concerned that some are not familiar with.

Mr. VINSON. I will put in a telegram I received this morning from some telephone people up in that section which assures me that we need not be disturbed by any excessive charges on account of the operation regardless of the site chosen. The telegram says:

> In the opinion of the Michigan Independent Telephone Association, the telephone section of the Michigan Public Utility Commission and our office, we assure the Congress and the Air Force of approximately the same operational costs of the SAGE device at Manistee as at Kalkaska.

Mr. CEDERBERG. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question? I would not dispute those figures, although I understand the Air Force has figures that do not quite bear that out. In view of the fact that the State Department of Conservation has already leased some seven or eight thousand acres, should that not be taken into consideration?

Mr. VINSON. May I call attention to the fact that it was developed in the committee, by witnesses who testified, that litigation is now in process on account of this land being made available. Is that the fact? I ask the distinguished gentleman, is that not the fact?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to answer that question. There is no litigation as far as the 8,000 acres of land is concerned. The Conservation Department has leased 8,000 acres of State-owned lands at a cost to the Federal Government of $1 a year for a 99-year term lease. Now, the rest of the property, which is privately owned, is being purchased by a group of citizens who have put up their own dollars in order to acquire the property to be deeded in title to the Federal Government for airport purposes. Now, there has been some $19,000 of that money expended at this time, Mr. Chairman, and I believe further proeeedings have ceased since the action of the committee.

Mr. VINSON. It is true, is it not, that we accorded you, as we do all Members, the privilege of testifying, and you heard the witnesses testify that litigation was taking place now by citizens of that community involving either taxes or use of money in connection with the establishment of this base?

Mr. KNOX. I believe, Mr. Chairman, you have reference to what we in Michigan know as the swamp tax fund. The State of Michigan pays back to the school districts of each district in the State of Michigan 10 cents an acre for all of those lands that are held by the State of Michigan in title, which they can use for school and township purposes. Now, I understand that Mr. Comfort of St. Louis, Mo., has gone into the courts and is endeavoring to get an injunction to restrain the county from releasing those funds that were dedicated for school purposes and compel the State to pay them. Now, that is a matter of local concern; that is not any concern of the Congress at all.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to state very definitely that my district is not involved in this in any manner. And, I am sure that the chairman will agree with me in this, that the location of airbases, when you come to decide whether you are going to put an airbase in a given location, is an area proposition and not pinpointed. It is not whether a military base could not be built here or there or anywhere. In fact, is it not a fact that the Air Force has stated that there will be a 1-year delay if there is a change of location in this area?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with you that we designate an area, the Traverse City area, and following that out, it ultimately was decided it would be Cadillac, and the gentleman's committee said, "No, we are not going to let you place it at Cadillac; you must go somewhere else" Now, is that not a fact?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Let me say this. I was not on the subcommittee at that time. I had left the subcommittee when that decision had been made. But, just let me say this: Originally the Traverse City area was decided upon. Kalkaska is closer to the Traverse City area than any other location. Is that not correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. VINSON. That may be, but this other site is in the same area, too, and Cadillac was in the same area, and your committee was the one that said, "No, we are not going to let it go to Cadillac," and that is in the area. Now, I do say, and I repeat, with all deference to my

good friend from Michigan, it does not come with good grace for any of you to talk about delay.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. It also should be pointed out, however, that the first delay in this controversy resulted from action taken by the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services when they drew a 15-mile circle around the Interlochen Music Camp. That decision by the committee then forced the Air Force to go to Cadillac.

Mr. VINSON. Then, when we drew a limitation of 15 miles, then you stepped into the picture and said, "Now, the Air Force has made a further survey, and we are not going to let you go down to Cadillac." So, it may not be becoming to me to talk about delay, but I think certainly is not becoming to you to talk about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. VINSON and Mr. SHORT) was permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KNOX. I yield.

Mr. FORD. To conclude my comment, we all admit that this action by the committee will result in a year's delay. There does not seem to be any doubt about that. So, I am willing to assume some responsibility for the delay, and I presume that the members of the Armed Services Committee will likewise assume some responsibility. The delay that came about through our Committee on Appropriation resulted from a request of the gentlewoman from Michigan to Mr. CANNON and Mr. MAHON to investigate the selection at Cadillac. At her request the committee did go into the matter. We did not get into it until we were specifically asked to do so. We did not initiate the inquiry.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KNOX. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I had resolved to say not one word before the House on this matter because of the awful mess we are in. The grave mistake was made after I, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, named Mr. Shafer, Mr. Rivers, and Mr. Wickersham as a subcommittee and sent our counsel, Mr. Blandford, to Michigan to inspect these sites. That subcommittee reported to the full committee. The full committee on their recommendation and after a personal inspection by the Secretary of the Air Force, decided to send it to Cadillac. When the matter came to the Committee on Appropriations the Subcommittee on Appropriations arrogated to themselves by an unlawful transgression upon the jurisdiction of a standing legislative committee of this House the power to say, "No, we will not vote funds to send this to Cadillac."

We could have avoided this nasty fight and bitterness if the will of the Committee on Armed Services after they had explored the matter and after the decision had been made by the Secretary of the Air Force, had been carried out. We have reached the point where I do not care how the House votes on the matter, but I wanted to get just a little dime's worth in the RECORD in order that truth might be known.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, the question of delay, of course, is a very important one as far as I am concerned. The fact that the airbase is located in my district was not my doing. It was the doing of the Air Force and had been approved by these committees. I hold in my hand affidavits from people in the area who have expanded their business, who have contracted for new dwellings, new facilities, amounting to $462,685. These people acted in good faith. The Air Force informed them that the airbase was going to be constructed there. They also informed the Corps of Engineers that they should proceed with the acquisition of the privately owned land. Everything went along in accord with the best interests of the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, if this committee recommendation should prevail, you are going to break faith with the people who took Congress at their word as of 1 year ago and approved this jet interceptor base in the Kalkaska area. These people have no method of recovery. They will have to take their loss. There is one man contracted for $150,000 in order to get necessary facilities in there which would go along with the needs as far as the Air Force is concerned.

I think it is very vital that this question be settled once and for all so that we should not cause a 1-year's delay, plus the fact that we would be wasting half a million dollars that the Air Force has already spent at the Kalkaska site; also the fact that the Air Force has said that it will cost from $270,000 to $500,000 more annually to operate at the Manistee site than it will at the Kalkaska site where they are now located.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring to your attention a statement in the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM], a member of the committee, speaking to Mr. Ferry said:

> If you desire to expand in the future can you expand at one base as easily as you can at the other?
>
> Mr. FERRY. No, sir. We can expand more readily at the Kalkaska site than at the Manistee site because of soil conditions. We run into a rather difficult peak situation. It would be difficult to extend our runways.

Those are not my words, those are the words of the military experts. I do not believe that they should be ignored. We are rapidly developing new weapons coming in with our new-type planes that have been known to fly close to 1,000 miles an hour. You know that when they come to put these planes on the bases they must extend present runways. It is impossible for them to operate off the same runways we are operating from today, where our planes are flying only 450 to 600 miles an hour.

The amendment that will be offered is supported by the people of the community of Kalkaska and Traverse City, Mich., because of their patriotic awareness of the vital part that such a base would play in the Nation's defense against an enemy attack. The people of Kalkaska are virtually unanimous in their view that if the Air Force wants Kalkaska, Kalkaska wants the Air Force.

I have here a letter that I should like to read to the Members. This is addressed to Merle C. Lutz, president of the Kalkaska Air Base Committee, Inc.:

> DEAR SIR: Last summer I was only able to spend about 2 weeks up at Torch Lake. For 3 days out of those 2 weeks, I carried a petition around opposing the airbase. As I talked to the various types of people up there, that is renters, owners, and permanent residents, I became aware of the fact that there were two sides to the story. However, I am of the opinion now that there are three sides to the story: The permanent residents', those of us who are summer resorters', and the Air Force. As I talked about the airbase with different people, I became less sold on my side of the story. I felt like an aristocrat robbing the less fortunate of their right to make a living. This was the argument used by the residents. They said that the airbase would bring business to them. I don't believe that this would be the case, because from my experience with the Armed Forces I have found that they don't use too many civilians.
>
> I have now had a chance to look at the situation objectively, and I feel that we, as citizens of the United States, have an obligation to our country. That obligation is to back our Armed Forces. I have two brothers who have served, and I have many friends who have, and are now in the service. I have talked with them and heard of their experiences. I think that it is the least we, who do not have to spend 2 or 3 years out of our lives (important years, I might add) in this type of service can do.
>
> The men who will be stationed at this base are of the highest caliber. They are risking their lives so that the Midwest area will be safe from enemy attack. With this in mind, I have come to the conclusion that we need this base, and if the Air Force thinks that the Kalkaska site is the best, then let them put it there. The only thing we as resorters and permanent residents can do is make them welcome and ignore the few who may, on occasion, misbehave.
>
> I do not know on what side of this issue you and your committee stand, but I have put a great deal of thought into this situation, and I feel that I must take this position.

This letter is signed by J. L. Anderson.

Here is a young lady who on request circulated a petition to oppose the airbase at Kalkaska but now she has a completely different view of the Air Force and has withdrawn all of her objections to the Air Force being located at Kalkaska.

After testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services in the support of the Kalkaska site, the Air Force representatives informed the committee that the Kalkaska area was desirable from an operational and community support viewpoint meeting every criteria of the Air Force. They stated that Kalkaska represented the cheapest site for construction of any of those that could be considered. They also referred to the substantial work that already had been done at Kalkaska. They have described the project as being urgent and of the utmost importance. These representatives stated to the committee that one of the reasons for the Air Force support of the Kalkaska site

over any other site was the fact that Kalkaska had the most to offer in terms of community support—with respect to housing, schools, churches, and social centers close to their base, which is one of the factors in the selection of such a thing. That committee was informed by the Department of the Air Force that the development of the base at Kalkaska in terms of original construction costs would be $200,000 less than the cheapest Manistee site, and that furthermore there would be annual savings in maintenance costs of $250,000 to $500,000 by locating the base at Kalkaska as compared with the Manistee site. With respect to cost, the Air Force representative also informed the committee, which I have stated before, that the Federal Government has already invested approximately $500,000 in the project at Kalkaska. They also went into the question of delay of 1 year. I certainly do not have any forewarning, nor do I believe any Member of the Congress has, that the enemy is going to withhold striking at this Nation for 1 year until we have an Air Force base constructed in this vital spot so far as the protection of the United States is concerned.

I also want to say I do not believe I could conscientiously go along with the proposition of once again putting the needle into the taxpayer's arm and giving him another injection saying we are just going to toss away $500,000 of your money and move it from that particular site over to another site and then say once again we are going to put the needle in and take out some more blood in the form of $270,000 to $500,000 for every year and then on as long as that base is in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that we have that kind of money in the United States of America to willfully waste when we have the documents from the Air Force as to the amount of money that they have spent and the amount of additional money it is going to take in order to construct this base at Manistee plus the fact that you cannot expand at Manistee—according to the Air Force, and these are not my words but the words of the Air Force officials—they are not able to expand in that area.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said on the floor that the State of Michigan made available to the Air Force on a 99 year lease base approximately 8,000 acres of State-owned lands and has already cut a large part of the timber located on that land. I am informed that if the Congress sustains the action of the Committee on Armed Services and provides for the transfer of this jet base from Kalkaska to Manistee that the State Conservation Commission which has full control and jurisdiction over the property in the State of Michigan, and which also takes in this area in Manistee, will be prone not to make additional land available for the base.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOX. In connection with the essentiality of this jet interceptor base to our national security, the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Michigan, at a meeting held in Detroit on March 18, 1956, adopted a resolution expressing the views of their great patriotic organization that the base should be retained at Kalkaska. This resolution is on the subject of air-defense site, and it reads:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the air-defense program of the United States, and in particular the defense of the Great Lakes area, including Michigan, may be seriously impaired by a controversy involving the location of an airbase in Michigan; and

Whereas if permitted to become a political issue, rather than standing exclusively as a problem in national security, we of this area may lose a vital segment of our northern defense line: Therefore be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in spring meeting assembled in Detroit, Mich., this 18th day of March 1956, That the Department of Defense and particularly the Department of the Air Force should be the determining agencies as to the location of this important air-defense site based on its strategic mission and the economic formulas within which our military organization must operate; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Michigan, does through this instrument call to the attention of each member of Michigan's congressional delegation the need for a united front in aiding the Department of the Air Force to locate as expeditiously and as economically as possible the needed air-defense base in northern Michigan that will meet the specifications and requirements of the Air Force.

(Approved by the National Security Commission, March 17, 1956.)

Unanimously adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Michigan, at a meeting held in Detroit, Mich., March 18, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, this question comes up about the location, whether we go to Manistee or let the base remain in Kalkaska. There have been many statements made on the floor of the House with respect to the delay, costs, and so on. I might say that the committee is not in a particularly good position to talk about costs. All the facts and figures are in the hands of the Air Force. But one particular point I would like to address myself to is the question of the continuing cost, as far as SAGE is concerned. Apparently they did not think of that when they recommended the base at Benzie, which would be just as far removed from this cross-State telephone cable as the proposed base at Manistee.

On the question of responsibility for delays, I think, too, the Air Force must shoulder a very definite responsibility. They knew the thinking of the committee, the Congress, and despite the number of assurances given to Miss THOMPSON, they deliberately located the base outside of that particular congressional district. Many of us have talked about the question of national concern. I might say I was the member of the committee who moved that the base be relocated from Kalkaska to Manistee. The reason I made that motion was simply this, and I think it is a matter of national concern, too: If the executive department can make certain commitments to a Member of the legislative branch, as apparently they did—and nobody has refuted it yet—then they are placing the Member in such position as to seriously embarrass him.

If we allow this sort of thing to go on we then permit the executive branch of the Government to exercise authority which they have no right to exercise; in other words, they can go to any one of us and have us stick our necks out, have us go forth and say the Department's going to do such and such in an area. The individual Member would naturally publicize that and without any aye, yes, or no, or justification the Department would say they had changed their mind and were going to locate this particular base some other place.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. It is a matter of record, is it not, that the former Secretary of the Air Force stated to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], that this base would be located in her district?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That was certainly my understanding; and the testimony that we have before us from the gentlewoman from Michigan bears that out. As I have said, nobody yet has refuted it.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Maryland has stated, I believe, that he offered the motion to make this change in designated sites.

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Another question: Is it not a fact that when that motion was made the roll was called and 21 members of the Committee on the Armed Services voted to make the change?

Mr. DEVEREUX. That is correct. Mr. Chairman, I think this is something extremely vital.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman is making the most important statement that has been made in this debate on the subject of the authority or lack of authority of the Air Force to change the location of bases at its whim and caprice.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. It is certainly true that to allow this to go on would make it possible for the executive branch to put any Member in a most embarrassing position if they were, so to speak, to pull the rug out from under him. To carry this a little further, suppose the executive branch found 1, 2, or 3 Members of this body who did not go along with them, did not believe in some of their proposals; it would be a very very simple matter to put that Member of this body in a position so that they could go out and embarrass him politically to the extent that they could get rid of him. I do not suggest that that factor is present in this case, but I do suggest the possibility, and I do direct to your attention the fact that we should be on guard against such a move.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I have heard a good deal of debate to the effect that this kind of installation is of benefit to the local community. I have a jet air base in my district near Pittsburgh. It is anything but a benefit; as a matter of fact the people of the area wish they would take it some place else. We would like to have the jet Air Force base removed from the immediate Pittsburgh area. I ask it for the people of my district, and I ask it on behalf of the people of the city of Pittsburgh and of the county commission.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I can appreciate the gentleman's statement as far as benefits are concerned. I must say, however, that I believe the Kalkaska location will be just as beneficial to the 9th Congressional District as it will be to the 11th, and without all the headaches and noise.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment on that?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. When these new jets are taking off, when they are maneuvering, when they swoop low and come in low over chimney tops, when they stand and rev up beginning before the crack of dawn, it has depressed property values around our airport. Likewise, it interferes with civilian and commercial aviation. Our air base in the Pittsburgh area should be considered solely on the basis of national security and the conditions existing in our community.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The question of delay and the action of the Armed Services Committee suggests allowing a gap to exist in the defenses of our country. That I cannot subscribe to despite the fact there have been letters read supporting that position. If any delay exists I think that much of it must be ascribed immediately to the Air Force.

Knowing what the situation was, they have never yet justified not having located at Manistee, which was one of the sites being considered. From a military point of view we have had testimony to the effect that both sites are equally suitable. So my question is, Under such conditions and with such a background why did the Air Force then not locate at Manistee rather than at Kalkaska?

If they went ahead with their plans and so on I would suggest they have made an error, though they were technically within the law, I grant that, but they were in error in policy in not having located at Manistee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as a citizen of the State of West Virginia and as one of the State's Representatives in the Congress of the United States, if I failed at this time to register a vigorous protest against the pending legislation. I speak not only for myself but I speak the sentiments of the entire West Virginia delegation.

Some 2 years ago when we were considering a military construction bill, I had projects proposed for West Virginia. I was told at that time if I did not press those projects there would be something included in the next proposal. I find, Mr. Chairman, considering this particular bill, H. R. 9893, and the committee report accompanying it, that once more West Virginia is being treated not only as a stepchild, as I said 2 years ago, but now we are down to the category of a foster child and soon we will be just a ward of the Government.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from the Sixth District of West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman who represents the Third District of West Virginia, on his forthright and timely remarks. He has been trying for a long time to have recognition given toward West Virginia as a State which has many advantages to offer in regard to certain types of military installations. I, too, have been disturbed and concerned at not finding anything listed in this bill for West Virginia. My State, of all the 48 States, is the 1 State that has apparently been omitted, and I know that this cannot be a matter of oversight. The citizens of my State have made their share of the contributions to our national welfare in time of peace, and they have made their share of the sacrifices in time of war. They rightfully expect to receive a just proportion of the appropriations for military installations, but they have been disappointed. It is common knowledge that the economy of West Virginia has been seriously impaired by the closing down of coal mines throughout the past 3 or 4 years. Inasmuch as we have heard it said that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, is it not important to the economy of the body politic that every segment of that economy be healthy and stable? Is it not important to the economy of the whole Nation that the economy of a single State like West Virginia be lifted out of the doldrums? I should think that this would be imperative, not only from the standpoint of the economic welfare of the country but also from the standpoint of our country's defense. I, therefore, add my protest to that of my distinguished colleague, and I hope that our protests will be heard by those whose responsibility it is to give consideration to the location of military installations, and consideration to the authorization of expenditures for military projects. West Virginians do not ask for mercy. We only ask to be given justice.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. May I state to the Committee, to the distinguished gentlemen from West Virginia, and to the country at large, that there is an item in this bill for West Virginia. It is a classified item, it is one of the most classified in all of the classified items referred to in the bill, and it involves immediately an expenditure of about $1,500,000, and will ultimately cost $20 million. I cannot discuss any more about it. West Virginia has not a single military installation in it until this bill becomes law.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave one further thought. Back in World War I the Government came into West Virginia and invested $134 million in an armor plate plant at Charleston. It was operated during World War I. It was operated partially for a couple of years during World War II. It is now in mothballs and is costing the Government nearly $1 million a year in maintenance. They came in in World War II and built an ammonia plant in the city of Morgantown, and that today is rented out to private capital and the Government is getting about a quarter of a million dollars a year rent. It is time we were getting plants for jobs for our people.

We authorized some $3 billion for military installations at home and abroad, only 2 years ago. Now we propose another $2 billion and not a single cent is allocated for West Virginia. In view of the statement of Chairman VINSON that our State is to have an installation out of the present authorization I shall withhold an amendment I have to ask approval of one of the projects rejected by the committee 2 years ago.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, being an advocate of economy, I expected, and fully, to go along with my colleague from the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I understood from the statement that he made that we, by adopting his amendment, would save something like, oh, over $400,000 a year on the telephone service. Now I find—at least, my figures show or my information is—that that is not correct.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you give me another minute, I will yield for a question.

Mr. FORD. If I had the time I would be very glad to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FORD. On that question, I have in my hand a communication from the Secretary of the Air Force which reads as follows:

> The Kaleva Telephone Co. has offered to relinquish without cost that portion of their franchise area as directly affects the SAGE land line rental at the Manistee location. This offer would not reduce the difference to any sizable degree inasmuch as the difference in cost is based upon a requirement to install additional communication facilities and the distances involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think you read that yesterday, did you not?

Mr. FORD. I do not believe I did yesterday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think so.

Mr. FORD. I made the statement without referring to the specific location.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Anyway, we all know how and

where you get your figures, and I know the gentleman would not intentionally mislead me, and I know he did not. He may be right, but I just do not accept those figures. It is a little bit like a lawsuit I tried once. We had a fellow on the witness stand and we tried to get him to tell the fair market price of junk. The lawyers tried, but we could not get an answer. The question related to the fair market price of junk. We could not get anything out of him. Finally Judge Sessions, later a Federal judge at Grand Rapids, tried for an answer. And all anyone got out of that gentleman, all we got out of him when we asked him to give us the fair market price of junk was, "Do you want to buy, do you want to sell?" Now, there you are. You get all sorts of figures at different times from different sources. The gentleman gets his figures from the Air Force. I get mine from the hearings and from the Committee on Armed Services.

I listened to my friend from Grand Rapids. I admire him, because he is able, industrious, and always endeavoring to do a better and better job. I have great admiration for my colleague from the Upper Peninsula, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. He served 16 years in the Legislature of Michigan. He was speaker for 6 years. He is an astute politician, and I know of no one in Michigan that I would rather have support me in the coming election in Michigan in the Fourth Congressional District. But here is a lady in distress because of the action of the Secretary of the Air Force. There is merit in her claim. I know where I will have to go. I will just have to do it, notwithstanding my personal desire to vote with my other colleagues from Michigan. The Air Force and the gentlemen have outmaneuvered her. There is no question about that. They are adroit. They are capable. They are experienced. They are good at this political game. And that is all right. I have no complaint, but I think the northern peninsula of Michigan has enough up there just now. It has no need for political patronage for the 11th District, nor will anything be saved or the security of the Nation be advanced by building the base at Kalkaska. I go along with the general, the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREAUX, who just preceded me a minute ago. I think there will not be a gap in our national defense if the base goes where the armed services said it should, to Manistee. That location is less than 80 miles from Kalkaska. After all, the Armed Services Committee represents all of our national-defense organizations, not just the Air Force. The judgment of that committee and of those upon whom it relied I rather accept than the reported statement of the Air Force.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. To my esteemed colleague from Michigan, I might say to him that I have not tried to outmaneuver anyone at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I think you have been negligent if you have not, if you thought the base should remain at Kalkaska. There is nothing wrong in outmaneuvering somebody. That is what the armed services try to do all the time, and it is only because of their success that we won and maintain our freedom.

Mr. KNOX. I agree with you. In this particular case they have endeavored to outmaneuver the Air Force, which caused great injury to the people I represent, who pledged themselves to bring community support to that base which is sorely needed in any Air Force base selected throughout this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right. You have done very well for them, and I know they will be lucky to be able to keep you. Look what you have done for them. You have an airport—a jet base—over here at the Soo [pointing to the map], just a little bit southeast, a whale of a big one. I have been up there. I have seen it. It is a fine one.

They have an airport over here in the other district, the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]. He is another good man. They will keep him here if they are wise. Frank Hook is running against him.

Then they have this one at Marquette. Then they have one which is not marked on this chart, up here. They have a field there that I think is 2 or 3 miles long and about a mile and a half wide. However, there are no buildings there. They put that up there during the war to defend Mr. KNOX's locks, or more accurately, the Nation's locks.

Then, over and above everything else, if my information is correct, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] has up there the best trout-fishing stream that there is in the world. And they moved another big plant up there. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] is a real go-getter.

What is the sense of putting all up there in one spot where all can be destroyed in one raid when they do not need them all up there? Will you accept the judgment of the Committee on the Armed Services instead of the judgment of the Air Force spokesman?

I will say to the gentleman, I sympathize with you; my heart goes out to you. I hope you tell those bureaucrats at the powerplant at the Soo, at St. Marys, the next time I come up there to fish on that river, instead of sending their patrol boat out to drive me off, that they give me permission to fish there as does the Coast Guard the plant employees. They let the people who live there at the Soo and the gentleman himself fish up there. All he has to do is to go over there and they recognize him, at least they should, and they say to him—at least they should because he is their good and faithful servant—"Here is your rod, here is the boat, there is the motor, and we will send somebody along to fish with you." Me, I have to sneak in around the edge and when they catch me, I have to call Washington and get somebody to rescue me.

I go along with the General from Maryland who served with much distinction with the Marines. Here they promised to put this base in the Sixth District of Michigan. Of course, that should not stand in the way of our national defense, if that was involved; but it is not. It is just a question of who gets the pie. I should like to see it located in the district Miss THOMPSON represents, because we all admire her and we know the value of her services here. And located there it will cost no more to be as efficient as elsewhere. Moreover, the executive department should be made aware of the fact that they should give us an honest, sound opinion in the first instance and cannot without reason disregard a solemn promise.

What do you think about it? You are not going to turn down a woman Member who asks for something like that which has been promised to her or a Member when the keeping of the commitment will serve the interests of the country, are you, just because we have on the other side the gentleman from Michigan? I know my friend, Mr. FORD, the gentleman from the Fifth District. He is a great economist. He in effect says you are going to pour this money down a rathole if you vote with the armed services. I do not think so. That is not according to the testimony we get here. But if it is true—if it is true, there are a lot of ratholes we are pouring money down and if tax dollars are to go down a rathole I would rather have one of my own selection and one in Michigan than 3 or 4 thousand miles away. The committee says the amendment will not save anything, will not weaken our defense. I will go along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this to those Members of the House who refer to these jet Air Force bases as benefits. In my district south of Pittsburgh we have one of the largest jet Air Force bases in the world. These jet plane installations near large industrial and residential areas are not unmixed blessings because of crowding air lanes and excessive noise from takeoffs and tuning up planes.

I formally ask the Committee on Armed Services, through the chairman and the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] as well as all of the members of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Department of Defense, to make a survey to find the best strategic location for the jet airbase at the Greater Pittsburgh Airport. The present Air Force base is causing unavoidable trouble on the matter of air traffic, noise, and danger, and has caused real concern in our district.

I ask that attention be given to this serious problem that has been studied by the Allegheny County Aeronautics Commission, as well as by the Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County and civic groups, each of whom want action for relocation. The Air Force jet base to protect our area should be located where it should be for defense and strategically, not just because it may be in my own or any congressional district.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, in the absence of anyone else speaking on this matter, we should be delighted to have the base in Oklahoma.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I think there is enough noise in Oklahoma now. Let us send it to the quiet State of Texas.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should like to say to the gentleman I surely would like to have the Committee on Armed Services consider that base for the Eighth District of Florida. We have many communities that would be delighted to have the base.

Mr. FULTON. No Federal installations should be located by the Department of Defense except for strategic purposes, and for efficiency and economy.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question about the feeling of the people in the different communities. The testimony before our committee indicated that there was opposition from a group of people from Kalkaska as to locating the base there, whereas the people from Manistee who appeared before our committee were in favor. I know some people will say that the groups that appeared before us in opposition to the Kalkaska site were not representative, but there is no question about the fact that there was a definite feeling among some people who had an interest in Kalkaska that they did not want it, whereas at Manistee the people who appeared before us did want it.

Mr. FULTON. May I close by saying that these Air Force bases that use these modern jets that start revving up around 4 or 5 in the morning and go right through from time to time to midnight, should be placed farther away from the great industrial and residential centers than they are now. I wish the Committee on Armed Services would take that into consideration. Especially these jet and missile bases should be located away from residential centers and a survey made as to how close to the centers of defense areas, these new-type speedier planes, and guided missile installations, should be built for best defense. I cannot see how the boundaries of a congressional district get mixed into the decisions on these vital strategic matters, and they should not be any factor where the security of an area, or of the whole American people is involved.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, on page 13 of the pending legislation there is contained an item of some $8,304,000 for the purpose of expanding the naval auxiliary air station at Fallon, Nev.

I might say in a prefatory manner that there is no lack of unity in Nevada's delegation in the House of Representatives with regard to this project. Last week, after much deliberation, I came out in favor of it. But I think there are certain circumstances surrounding the selection of this area that warrant the attention of the members of the committee.

My remarks might be entitled "The Expansion of the Fallon Naval Auxiliary Air Station," or "Why Did the Air Force Change Its Mind"? or "What Will Happen With Regard to 1,800,000 Acres of Contaminated Land in Southern Nevada"?

Last year in August the Navy filed an application for some 2,846,000 acres in northwestern Nevada for the purpose of establishing two gunnery ranges, one 23 by 50 miles and the other 30 by 50 miles in size. In the 1957 budget there was contained an additional request for some 300,000 acres, bringing the total to about 3,100,000. When the final area is selected, I am sure this amount will be reduced to a minimum, considerably below this total.

Considerable opposition arose among my constitutents following this announcement. In contrast to West Virginia, Nevada has some 14 installations varying in size from 3 acres to about 3 million acres. About 10 percent of our land area is now either held by the military or included in applications which are now pending. Sometimes there is almost a sardonic twist in Nevada's motto, which is "All for our country."

There was some difficulty in getting information in regard to this application last fall. However, I do want to commend the Navy for its cooperation since the beginning of this year.

I think most people who considered the desirability of this installation approached the problem with three questions in mind: First, is there a need for this installation? Second, was the area selected in fact the best area in which to locate these two gunnery ranges? Third, if the answers to those two questions are in the affirmative, what can be done to lessen the impact upon the local nonmilitary use?

I think the Navy has convincingly proved it has a need for this area. They are flying at the present time only 34.5 percent of the necessary sorties on the west coast. However, when considering this need, I could not help reflecting occasionally on a statement I overheard a few months ago in an elevator in the House Office Building. A passenger asked one of the riders, a military colonel, how things were. The colonel responded, "Fine; we have crises we not even used yet."

I feel, though, on balance, that the Navy did demonstrate convincing need for this area.

Another question presented was this: Is the area being sought in northwestern Nevada of 3,100,000 acres in fact the best area? One of the most persistent inquiries that was heard in my State was this: Why cannot the Air Force or the Navy Air Force use jointly with the Air Force some 3,300,000 acres that have already been withdrawn in the southern part of the State? The Air Force, in response to a Navy inquiry in 1953 and again in 1955, stated categorically there was no possibility of any joint use. The Department of Defense and the Air Force before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in January again reiterated that statement. It was with some surprise that on March 1 we received word from the Air Force that slightly in excess of 1 million acres would be made available for joint use by other agencies. Mr. Chairman, it was quite a bit in excess of 1 million acres. As a matter of fact, the total released for joint use was approximately 2,200,000 acres. This, of course, was somewhat embarrassing to the Navy, which was then forced to reexamine the plans made with regard to acquisitions which they were seeking in northern Nevada. Had the Air Force, when the Navy previously requested joint use of the southern Nevada range, indicated such use was possible, perhaps, the Navy would not have been justified in spending some $11 million at Fallon and currently carrying out a program of about $5 million to improve the facilities at the Fallon Airbase. But, acting on the assurance of the Air Force that joint use was not possible in southern Nevada, the Navy then proceeded to expand the facilities at Fallon. If they were now to move to southern Nevada, there would be a waste of about $15 million and delay in obtaining the ranges necessary to carry out their air-to-air gunnery training. So for this reason I feel, then, that the acquisition in northern Nevada should be supported. What will happen to the land that has been released by the Air Force of some 2,200,000 acres? Fortunately, the Atomic Energy Commission apparently desires to take over some 341,000 acres and is considering an additional 240,000 acres. There would then be 1,800,000 acres remaining for joint use by other services. Why cannot this be turned back to the Department of the Interior or to the General Services Administration and used for mining, grazing, or recreation? The reason it cannot be turned back is simply this: It has been contaminated by unexploded ordnance. There are approximately 1,800,000 acres in southern Nevada which are not suited for farming nor for mining, nor is it safe for recreational use or hunting. It would cost about $18 million to decontaminate this land and again make it suitable for use for nonmilitary purposes. I would like to suggest to the Committee on Armed Services that they very carefully scrutinize requests that have been submitted by other branches of the armed services to make sure that there is no possibility of using the 1,800,000 acres which is now contaminated in southern Nevada.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Would the gentleman indicate why the Navy cannot fly its airplanes for gunnery practice over this 1 million acres of land or in excess of 1 million acres of land which is contaminated? As I understand it, they do not want the surface anyway, but they just want the air space there to fly around in. Why can they not go down to the other area at Las Vegas and have their gunnery practice and use this contaminated area?

Mr. YOUNG. It is contended by the Navy that there are plans currently under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission for the establishment of a joint ballistics range in that vicinity for the next 2 years according to the information received by us, and they will fly some 50 to 70 missions or sorties each year, requiring the use of that range for about 10 days out of each month. Because of this the Navy claims that it is not usable so far as their purposes are concerned.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the answer to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is that the Navy base is too far removed from the area to make a round trip by jet plane, to the training area and perform the training mission over the area.

Mr. ENGLE. That is what I understood to be the reason, but I figured out how long it would take them to go down there in a modern jet, and it seemed to me it would take about 4 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. The Navy is also seeking to get 800,000 acres within the gentleman's district. I am sure the gentleman does not desire them in his district. Perhaps the Navy would do well to investigate the 1,800,000 acres now lying contaminated in southern Nevada.

I would like to discuss one more aspect of this problem. The Navy has requested a standard withdrawal order with regard to the millions of acres they are seeking in northern Nevada. Many of the sportsmen, nonmilitary users, miners, and sportsmen are reluctant to see a standard withdrawal order given the Navy. Even if they acquiesce in the Navy's request for the land, they would like to see inserted in the withdrawal order, which will be written by the Secretary of Interior, certain safeguards and provisos which will assure to them the fact that they will have an opportunity to use this area along with the military service.

I would like to include at this point certain suggested provisos and comments of the Navy thereon. I will recommend that provisos such as these be included in any withdrawal order issued by the Department of the Interior, affecting this land:

The following general statement is considered as an essential part of the answers to questions 4, 5, and 6 which follow and it must be considered along with all answers which pertain to other uses of the areas in question insofar as time is concerned. In seeking the use of these areas to reduce its training deficit the Navy has computed the capacities of these proposed ranges as:

Black Rock (30 by 50 nautical miles): 18,600 annual sorties.

Sahwave (23 by 50 nautical miles): 16,000 annual sorties.

These capacities were not computed on full year-round naval use but on partial use, time-wise, to accommodate the various interests desiring to use them. For the two areas, computations were:

Black Rock: Estimated utilization 180 week days. Not used about 1 month in the spring and 1 month in the fall for cattle roundups. Not used at other times during the year for stock inspection, provision of salt, etc.

Sahwave: Estimated utilization 143 week days. Not used during January, February, and March during sheep grazing. Not used 1 month in the spring and 1 month in the fall for cattle roundups. Not used at other times for stock inspection, provision of salt, etc.

Bearing on questions 5 and 6 is the Navy's previously stated position that land withdrawals should be standard by public-land order with certain exceptions hereinafter indicated and that the requirements of all local interests and the Navy be determined locally, and detailed arrangements worked out locally.

4. Question. Would there be any objection to the conduct of geologic exploration activities on the area withdrawn if it did not interfere with training activities of the base?

Answer. No objection as long as the exploration is conducted during the time when the range is being used for sheep grazing and cattle roundup.

5. Question. In the event that the Navy's request for withdrawal is approved, the following provisos for withdrawal orders have been suggested with respect to grazing, taking wildlife, water, timber harvesting, materials, etc. Would such provisos be objected to by the Navy? If so, why? If included, would they interfere with the training objectives of the Navy?

Answer. Subject to comments made above, the Department of the Navy prefers that withdrawal be accomplished by a standard withdrawal order as stated in answer 41 previously submitted.

GRAZING

Question. Grazing use of the lands shall be administered by the Bureau of Land Management under the provisions of the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1267), as amended by the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976; 43 U. S. C. 315, et seq.), at such times and in such manner as may be agreed upon by the Bureau of Land Management and the Department of the Navy.

Answer. The Department of the Navy has no objection.

Question. The lands shall continue under the administration of the Bureau of Land Management for grazing purposes except for such times as their exclusive use is required for the purpose for which they are reserved by this order.

Answer. The Department of the Navy has no objection provided the agreement mentioned in the question above is included in this question.

Question. Grazing use of the withdrawn lands shall be administered by the Bureau of Land Management. Such use shall be permitted at the discretion of the official of the Bureau of Land Management in charge, during the period from _____ to _____ of each year, during which season no use of the lands for bombing or gunnery shall be permitted; provided that the Navy officer in charge may authorize grazing use earlier or later in all or part of the withdrawn lands if such use will not interfere with military use of the lands.

Answer. The Department of the Navy has no objection provided minimum time required, as stated above, will not be decreased. It is not planned to use these ranges for bombing purposes.

TAKING WILDLIFE

Question. The taking of all species of wildlife upon the withdrawn lands shall be strictly in accordance with the game laws of the State of Nevada, and the Department of the Navy shall take appropriate measures to assure the continual enforcement of such laws.

Answer. The Department of the Navy concurs that the taking of all species of wildlife should be in accordance with the laws of Nevada, but will not undertake to assure the continual enforcement of such laws as far as nonmilitary personnel are concerned, but will issue appropriate directives to its personnel.

Question. Except for training purposes or the security of the military project and its personnel, the use of firearms for any purpose is prohibited on the withdrawn lands and all of the lands shall be closed to the taking of wildlife.

Answer. The Department of the Navy concurs as a preferable alternate to the question above.

WATER

Question. The withdrawal made by this order shall not extend to any nonnavigable waters in or upon the lands. Any such waters not heretofore appropriated shall continue subject to such appropriation, including appropriation by the Department of the Navy, as may be authorized by applicable law.

Answer. The Department of the Navy does not contemplate development of water resources within the ranges. The position of the Department of the Navy was stated by the general counsel of the Navy in his statement of January 28.

TIMBER HARVESTING

Question. The timber resources on the lands shall be subject to management and disposal by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to applicable law.

Answer. The Department of the Navy has no objection provided harvesting does not conflict with operational requirements.

MATERIALS

Question. The mineral materials in or on the lands shall be subject to disposal by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681) as amended by the act of July 23, 1955 (69 Stat. 367; 30 U. S. C. 601, et seq.) under such reasonable restrictions as may be required by the use of the lands for military purposes, and as may be agreed upon by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy.

Answer. The Department of the Navy has no objection, provided the mining of mineral materials does not conflict with operations requirements.

ALL INCLUSIVE

Question. The Bureau of Land Management may issue leases or permits for the surface use of such lands and conduct sales of timber or other materials thereon, under applicable laws, and otherwise administer the lands, provided that all documents authorizing the use of or access to the lands shall provide that every person occupying the lands under authority thereof shall vacate them during the periods of firing or other conflicting use by the Army, without compensation for loss of use of the lands or for damages caused by Army use.

Answer. The Department of the Navy concurs except to change the word "Army" to Navy and provide that the administration of the lands is subject to the same provision as that applying to documents.

6. Question. The following have been suggested as provisos to be inserted in a withdrawal order with respect to management and harvest of game in the area being sought. Would these provisos be objected to by the Navy? If so, why? If included, would they interfere with the training objectives of the Navy? If not acceptable in present form, would you suggest amendments which would make them acceptable?

(a) Provision should be made for an open hunting season of 6 weeks starting about October 1.

(b) A provision for approximately a 2 weeks' hunting season on antelope and sage hen.

(c) Permission for wardens to conduct periodic inspections of the areas, including wildlife surveys, in cooperation with the Navy.

(d) No special privileges to military personnel in connection with hunting and fishing.

(e) Fish and game laws of the State to be adhered to at all times, including regulations set up by the commission.

(f) Operations for predator control shall be provided by mutual agreement.

(g) Other mutual problems shall be arranged in cooperation with the Navy.

Answer. The Department of the Navy concurs in questions (a), (b), and (c), provided the restrictions would not decrease the time that ranges would be available, and subject to the Navy desire that a standard withdrawal order be issued.

(d), (e), (f), and (g): The Department of the Navy has no objection.

I think from the investigation which has been conducted under the very able leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of this House, a number of important conclusions can be drawn and observations made.

First, the fact that approximately 2½ million acres have been released by the Air Force since the committee hearings began early in January justifies the suspicion that perhaps more land was being held than was actually needed. Land has been released since the commencement of the January hearings at the rate of 25,000 acres per day, over 1,000 acres per hour, or almost 17 acres per minute.

Secondly, this astonishing rate of release might suggest that the method of review by the armed services and Department of Defense of its military holdings has not been adequate or effective.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG] has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly take this time, but I feel it is necessary to cool the air and probably get some of the facts before you in these last moments.

I want to say definitely that as far as I am concerned, and I am sure I speak for my colleagues [Mr. FORD and Mr. BENTLEY] who have also spoken on this matter that we have no personal considerations in this affair whatsoever. There are none as far as I am concerned. However, we have facts here that I think we ought to consider. I notice my good friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] when he made his remarks, said:

If we change the present location from Kalkaska to Manistee.

I think the general was right when he said "Present location," for to all intents and purposes the present location is at Kalkaska. I am interested in nothing but the facts. The State Department of Conservation in Michigan has already leased approximately 8,000 acres to the Air Force. They have made contracts for clearing the land. As a matter of fact, the land is in the process of clearance at the present time. There have been very definite statements made that any change in this location will delay the operational date of the base by 1 year. That is a factor that I think this House should take into consideration.

Secondly, there are disputes as to whether or not there will be any additional cost. The Air Force has stated that the cost will be between $270,000 and $500,000 per year more to operate the base at Manistee over Kalkaska. Those are facts that I think this body ought to take into consideration. Personalities should mean absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, I have several constituents who have cottages at Torch Lake. They write me and say they do not want the base at Kalkaska. I write them back and say I am sorry but as far as I am concerned I think that Kalkaska is the logical place for it. I will read what I wrote to one of my constituents:

While I appreciate your personal interest in this matter due to the location of your summer home at Torch Lake, my personal opinion from having diligently studied all of the facts is that the base should be located in Kalkaska County for economic as well as tactical reasons.

I think the tactical reason is the 1 year's delay in this very vital important network of our Air Force. The President has just sent a request for half a billion dollars more for our continental defense and I do not see how this body can intelligently suggest that we ought to take this base from Kalkaska, and put it over at Manistee in view of the fact that to do so would mean 1 year's delay in making it operational. That is my own opinion and the very fact that there are dollars involved here from the United States Treasury is something that we as responsible Members of this body ought to take into consideration.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am tremendously impressed with the earnestness of the gentleman, but there is a practical matter in which I am very much interested; namely, the variation in the estimate of cost. I am wondering if those estimating cannot get any closer to an estimate than the difference between $200,000 and $500,000. That is a very loose estimate, and therefore in my mind is subject to great question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In response to the inquiry by the gentlewoman from Illinois, I have before me data prepared for the Air Force by the company that probably will provide these facilities. They indicate that the Manistee site in question is simply farther away from the main trunkline. If you use 383 circuits the cost differential per year is $270,000. If you use 683 circuits the cost differential per year is $390,000.

Mrs. CHURCH. I appreciate that, but I hope the gentleman will let me make the suggestion that it seems very remarkable that business people cannot come any closer than the difference between $200,000 and $500,000. Such a guess cannot be effective in influencing the decision of thoughtful Members.

Mr. FORD. I can give the gentlewoman the answer to that. The Air Force and Western Electric felt they had to have 613 circuits between the main trunkline and the base at either site or at any site. On subsequent analysis, however, they decided they could reduce it from 616 circuits to 383. That is why there is a variation of between $270,000 and $460,000 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to say in view of the costs involved, whether it be $270,000 or $460,000, that one of the important facts we overlook, I think, is the 1-year delay in making this base operational. I think that is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Technical Services Facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Training and storage facilities, $147,000.

Jet propulsion laboratory (California Institute of Technology), California: Research and development facility, $143,000.

Pueblo Ordnance Depot, Colorado: Maintenance facility, $2,142,000.

Seneca Ordnance Depot, New York: Utilities, $88,000.

Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Oregon: Storage facilities, $258,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $5,259,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, New Mexico: Utilities, $693,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $832,000.

Columbia Quartermaster Center, South Carolina: Administrative facility, $98,000.

Fort Worth General Depot, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $1,285,000.

New Cumberland General Depot, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, $631,000.

Sharpe General Depot, Calif.: Maintenance facilities, $655,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Troop housing, community facility, and operational facility, $889,000.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Storage facilities and utilities, $913,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research and development facilities and utilities, $867,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Troop housing, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, administrative facility, and utilities, $6,856,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Storage facility, training facility, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, and utilities, $492,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Va.: Operational facility, maintenance facility, and utilities, $1,231,000.

(Medical Corps)

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Research and development facility and community facility, $4,209,000.

Field Forces Facilities

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens (Camp Wellfleet), Mass.: Land acquisition, $302,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Training facility, $54,000.

Oswego, N. Y.: Training facilities and land acquisition, $583,000.

Fort Totten, N. Y.: Troop Housing, storage facilities, and utilities $1,212,000.

(Second Army Area)

Fort Knox, Ky.: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,698,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facility, troop housing, and utilities, $5,885,000.

South Park Military Reservation, Pa.: Administrative facility, storage facilities, and utilities, $190,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, communications facilities, and community facilities, $422,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Administrative facilities, operational facility, and utilities, $645,000.

Charlotte Armed Forces Induction Station, N. C.: Administrative facility, $302,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Troop housing, training facility, and community facility, $397,000.

Fort Rucker, Ala.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, training facilities, storage facilities, administrative facilities, trailer site facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $7,300,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $5,301,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Community facilities, maintenance facilities, and storage facilities, $2,457,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Training facilities, $4,173,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Carson, Colo.: Storage facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, training facilities, and land acquisition, $3,253,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Troop housing, $140,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: Communications facilities and troop housing, $1,092,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Administrative facilities, community facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,519,000.

St. Louis Support Center, Mo.: Administrative facility, $3,346,000.

(Sixth Army Area)

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Community facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, family housing, and utilities, $3,022,000.

Fort Ord, Calif.: Maintenance facility and community facility, $223,000.

United States Disciplinary Barracks, Calif.: Community facility, $197,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Troop housing, research and development facility, and storage facility, $1,520,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort McNair, D. C.: Academic facilities, $4,111,000.

(Armed Forces special weapons project)

Various installations: Utilities, $478,000.

(Tactical site support facilities)

Various locations: Administrative facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, and land acquisition, $8,506,000.

Outside the United States

(Alaskan Area)

Ladd Air Force Base: Troop housing and maintenance facilities, $1,688,000.

Fort Richardson: Storage facilities, $2,333,000.

Whittier: Storage facilities and training facilities, $2,849,000.

Wildwood Station (Kenai): Storage facility, $352,000.

(Far East Command Area)

Okinawa: Storage facilities, operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $540,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Alimanu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Land acquisition, $143,000.

Helemano, Hawaii: Community facility, land acquisition and utilities, $136,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Family housing and land acquisition, $2,668,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Panama Canal Zone: Sewage disposal system for Army, Navy, and Air Force facilities, $1,060,000.

(United States Army, Europe)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, storage facilities, training facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $17,994,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in a total amount of $188,783,000.

SEC. 103. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended with respect to Fort Jay, N. Y., under the heading "Continental United States" and subheadings "Field Forces Facities (First Army Area)" in section 101, by striking out "$731,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,081,000," and in clause (1) of section 502, by striking out "$224,927,000" and "$533,904,000" and inserting in place thereof "$225,277,000" and "$534,254,000," respectively.

(b) So much of section 401 of Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as reads "Adak Station, Alaska: Operational Facilities (including troop housing), $70,000" is amended to read "Adak Station, Alaska: Operational facilities (including troop housing), $180,000" and clause (4) of section 502 thereof, is amended by striking the figure "$462,600" and inserting in place thereof "$572,600."

SEC. 104. The Secretary of the Army shall make all necessary studies, by contract or otherwise, to determine an appropriate site for the relocation of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, Texas; such studies to be completed by January 31, 1957. Expenditure of $25,000 out of appropriations available to the Department of the Army is authorized for such studies.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Replacement of pier, and plans and specifications for drydock facilities, $7,332,000.

Naval shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Dredging equipment, $148,000.

Naval minecraft base, Charleston, S. C.: Operational facilities, personnel facilities, training facilities, maintenance facilities, storage facilities, community facilities, security facilities, and utilities, $7,902,000.

Naval shipyard, Long Beach, Calif.: Facilities for remedying effects of ground subsidence and waterfront facilities, $5,984,000.

Navy underwater sound laboratory, New London, Conn.: Research and development facilities and land acquisition, $340,000.

Harbor defense base, Norfolk, Va.: Personnel facilities, $300,000.

Naval shipyard, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities and land acquisition, $244,000.

Navy mine defense laboratory, Panama City, Fla.: Medical facilities, $84,000.

Naval shipyard, San Francisco, Calif.: Plans and specifications for drydock facilities, $1,300,000.

Naval industrial reserve shipyard, Tampa, Fla.: Land acquisition, $200,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval station, Key West, Fla.: Utilities, $927,000.

Naval station, Long Beach, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, $2,256,000.

Naval station, New Orleans, La.: Utilities, $226,000.

Naval station, Newport, R. I.: Waterfront facilities, personnel facilities, community facilities and utilities, $11,672,000.

Naval station, Norfolk, Va.: Personnel facilities, $2,844,000.

Naval station, Orange, Tex.: Flood-protection facilities, including land acquisition, $265,000.

Aviation Facilities

(Naval air training stations)

Naval Auxiliary landing field, Alice-Orange Grove, Tex.: Airfield pavements, $2,242,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Chase Field, Tex.: Personnel facilities, operational facilities, community facilities, station and aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,247,000.

Naval air station, Glynco, Ga.: Airfield pavements, personnel facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, fuel pipeline and storage facilities, and land acquisition, $4,003,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Kingsville, Tex.: Personnel facilities, training facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,610,000.

Naval air station, Memphis, Tenn.: Fuel storage facilities, and aircraft maintenance facilities, $511,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Meridian, Miss.: Site preparation, utilities, plans and specifications for jet aircraft training facilities, and land acquisition, $8,231,000.

Naval air station, Pensacola, Fla.: Community facilities and plans and specifications for waterfront facilities, $347,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Whiting Field, Fla.: Land acquisition, $13,000.

(Fleet support air stations)

Naval air station, Alameda, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $2,675,000.

Naval air station, Atlantic City, N. J.: Navigational aids and land acquisition, $421,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Brown Field, Calif.: Personnel facilities and utilities, $778,000.

Naval air station, Brunswick, Maine: Personnel facilities, airfield pavements, station maintenance facilities, community facilities, and storage facilities, $3,738,000.

Naval air station, Cecil Field, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, storage facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,052,000.

Naval air station, Chincoteague, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Edenton, N. C.: Aircraft and station maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, fuel dispensing facilities, operational facilities, administrative facilities, personnel facilities, communications facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $13,926,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition including not to exceed $660,000 to be paid to Imperial County, Calif., to partially defray the county's cost in relocating the Niland-Blythe Road, $831,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.: Training facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, community facilities, and land acquisition, $8,304,000.

Naval air facility, Harvey Point, N. C.: Airfield pavements, waterfront facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids, aircraft, and station maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $6 million.

Naval air station, Jacksonville, Fla.: Navigational aids, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $2,380,000.

Naval air station, Key West, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval air station, Lemoore, Calif.: Plans and specifications for development of master jet aircraft facilities, and land acquisition, $10,089,000.

Naval air station, Miramar, Calif.: Personnel facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, ordnance facilities, land acquisition, and obstruction removal for flight clearance, $8,835,000.

Naval air station, Moffett Field, Calif.: Land acquisition, $89,000.

Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Naval air station, North Island, San Diego, Calif.: Airfield pavements, ordnance and ammunition storage facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, operational facilities, navigational aids, and land acquisition, $13,072,000.

Naval air station Oceana, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, operational facilities, community facilities, training facilities, ordnance facilities, open storage facilities, security facilities, utilities, and relocation of Coast Guard facilities, $5,286,000.

Naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and navigational aids, $2,753,000.

Naval auxiliary air station, Sanford, Fla.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, personnel facilities, and utilities, $6,926,000.

Naval air station, Whidbey Island, Wash.: Utilities, $149,000.

(Marine Corps air stations)

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Beaufort, S. C.: Aircraft and station maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, medical facilities, personnel facilities, training facilities, operational facilities, covered and cold storage facilities, community facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, and utilities, $17,384,000.

Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $170,000.

Marine Corps air station, El Toro, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, airfield pavements, storage facilities, ammunition storage facilities, medical facilities, training facilities, personnel facilities, operational facilities, and utilities, $6,863,000.

Marine Corps auxiliary air station, Mojave, Calif.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, personnel facilities, training facilities, community facilities, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $12,556,000.

(Special purpose air stations)

Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Md.: Land acquisition, and plans for specifications for aviation facilities, $4 million.

Naval air development center, Johnsville, Pa.: Plans and specifications for research and development facilities, $693,000.

Naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.: Research and development facilities and equipment maintenance facilities, $6,438,000.

Naval air station, Patuxent River, Md.: Aircraft maintenance facilities and research and development facilities, $475,000.

Naval air missile test center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Waterfront facilities, fuel dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,682,000.

Naval air turbine test station, Trenton, N. J.: Research and development facilities, $128,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval supply depot, Clearfield, Utah: Utilities, $149,000.

Naval supply depot, Newport, R. I.: Storage facilities, $390,000.

Naval supply center, Oakland, Calif.: Utilities, $50,000.

Naval supply depot, Seattle, Wash.: Replacement of seawall, $199,000.

Marine Corps Facilities

Marine Corps supply center, Albany, Ga.: Storage facilities, personnel facilities, maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,742,000.

Marine Corps supply center, Barstow, Calif.: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $3,436,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Lejeune, N. C.: Personnel facilities, administrative facilities, training facilities, community facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and utilities, $5,092,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, Parris Island, S. C.: Personnel facilities, administrative facilities, storage facilities, training facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $4,266,000.

Marine Corps base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.: Utilities, boat basin facilities, and land acquisition, $3,429,000.

Marine Corps cold weather battalion, Bridgeport, Calif.: Utilities $294,000.

Marine Corps training center, Twentynine Palms, Calif.: Community facilities and land acquisition, $1,165,000.

Marine Corps supply forwarding annex, Portsmouth, Va.: Security facilities, $91,000.

Marine Corps schools, Quantico, Va.: Training facilities, ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,178,000.

Marine Corps recruit depot, San Diego, Calif.: Personnel facilities and community facilities, $1,679,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Bangor, Wash.: Ordnance facilities, $1,100,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Charleston, S. C.: Ordnance facilities, $404,000.

Naval ordnance test station, China Lake, Calif.: Research and development facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements and fuel storage and dispensing facilities, $6,028,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Earle, N. J.: Ordnance facilities, $600,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Fallbrook, Calif.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, $1,584,000.

Naval ammunition depot, Hingham, Mass.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities, $993,000.

Naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.: Ordnance facilities, $2,176,000.

Naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va.: Ammunition storage and ordnance facilities and utilities, $3,480,000.

Service School Facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Earthwork and land acquisition, $7,469,000.

Naval training center, Brainbridge, Md.: Personnel facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $6,569,000.

Naval receiving station, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Personnel facilities, $97,000.

Naval amphibious base, Coronado, Calif.: Training facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $5,660,000.

Fleet air defense training center, Dam Neck, Va.: Personnel facilities, $237,000.

Naval training center, Great Lakes, Ill.: Personnel facilities, and training facilities, $8,413,000.

Medical Facilities

Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.: Medical facilities, $12,730,000.

Naval hospital, Portsmouth, N. H.: Hospital elevator, $57,000.

Communications Facilities

Naval radio station, Cheltenham, Md.: Communications facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $2,489,000.

Naval radio station, Maine: Utilities and land acquisition, $2,450,000.

Naval communication station, San Francisco, Calif.: Communications facilities, and personnel facilities, $2,029,000.

Naval communication station, Seattle, Wash.: Communications facilities, $45,000.

Naval radio station, Winter Harbor, Maine: Communications facilities, $83,000.

Office of Naval Research Facilities

Naval research laboratory, District of Columbia: Plans and specifications for research and development facilities, $1,300,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Public-works center, Norfolk, Va.: Utilities and land acquisition, $443,000.

Naval construction battalion center, Port Hueneme, Calif.: Replacement of wharf, and storage facilities, $2,581,000.

Outside the United States

Shipyard Facilities

Naval ship repair facility, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Waterfront facilities, $1,637,000.

Naval base, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Utilities at Olongapo, flood control and drainage facilities and community facilities, $9,378,000.

Fleet Base Facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Operational facilities, and laundry and dry cleaning facilities, $2,351,000.

Naval station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Utilities, $680,000.

Aviation Facilities

Naval air station, Atsugi, Japan: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, fuel storage facilities, personnel facilities, and utilities, $1,961,000.

Naval air station, Barber's Point, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Personnel facilities and aircraft maintenance facilities, $870,000.

Naval air station, Cubi Point, Philippine Islands: Personnel facilities, $1,264,000.

Naval air station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Aircraft maintenance facilities, personnel facilities, communications facilities, family housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,572,000.

Naval air station, Iwakuni, Japan: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, dredging, navigational aids, and fuel-storage facilities, $1,704,000.

Marine Corps air station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfield pavements, and operational facilities, $1,045,000.

Naval air facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Aircraft maintenance facilities, and family housing, $1,401,000.

Naval station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Aircraft maintenance facilities, airfied pavements, fuel storage facilities, ordnance facilities, personnel facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $4,470,000.

Naval air station, Sangley Point, Philippine Islands: Airfield pavements, breakwater, and personnel facilities, $3,811,000.

Supply Facilities

Naval station, Adak, Alaska: Replacement of fuel storage facilities, $5,000,000.

Naval station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Fuel storage facilities, $1,599,000.

Naval supply depot, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Covered and cold storage facilities, administrative facilities, operational facilities, maintenance facilities, waterfront facilities, and utilities, $11,598,000.

Ordnance Facilities

Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Ordnance facilities, $971,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Port Lyautey, French Morocco: Ordnance facilities, $245,000.

Naval ordnance facility, Yokosuka, Japan: Ordnance facilities, $241,000.

Communications Facilities

Naval communication unit, Futema, Okinawa: Communications facilities, $75,000.

Naval communication station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Communication facilities, $222,000.

Naval communication facility, Philippine Islands: Communications facilities, and land acquisition, $4,320,000.

Yards and Docks Facilities

Fifteenth naval district, Canal Zone: Utilities, $2,210,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to obtain, by contract such engineering, location, and site planning studies as may be necessary to enable him to determine the feasibility and advisability of establishing, continuing, or relocating the following facilities: Naval air station, Norfolk, Va. (bombing targets); Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Md.; Naval magazine, Port Chicago, Calif. Expenditures not to exceed $100,000 for such studies may be made out of the appropriation "Military Construction, Navy." The Secretary of the Navy shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the conclusions of these studies together with such recommendations as he shall consider appropriate.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $42,997,000.

SEC. 204. Public Law 155, 82d Congress, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, as amended, strike out so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Supply Facilities" as reads as follows:

"Harpswell Neck Fuel Facility, Portland, Maine, area: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage; $2,766,500"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Harpswell Neck Fuel Facility, Portland, Maine, area: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage and land acquisition, $2,766,500."

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Outside Continental United States" and subheading "Communication Facilities", strike out so much thereof as read as follows:

"Naval communication station, Philippine Islands: Consolidated communication facilities; $2,694,500"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval communication station, Philippine Islands: Consolidated communications, facilities, and land acquisition, $2,694,500."

SEC. 205. Public Law 534, 83d Congress is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities", change the amount for "Naval air missile test center (San Nicolas Island), Point Mugu, Calif.", from "$1,132,000" to "$1,816,000."

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Ordnance Facilities," change the amount for "Naval ammunition depot, Hawthorne, Nev." from "$308,000" to "$538,000."

(c) In section 502, clause (2), change the amount for public works authorized by title II for inside continental United States from "$102,042,000" to "$102,956,000"; and total amount from "$201,893,000" to "$202,807,000."

SEC. 206. Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended as follows:

(a) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Shipyard Facilities," change the amount for "Naval electronics laboratory, San Diego, Calif.", from "$143,000" to "$162,000."

(b) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Fleet Base Facilities," change the amount for "Navy Department, District of Columbia", from "$81,000" to "$114,000."

(c) In section 201, under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Aviation Facilities," change the amount for "naval auxiliary air station, El Centro, Calif." from "$366,000" to "$450,000"; strike out so much thereof as reads as follows:

"Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities, $4,660,000"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval air station, Norfolk, Va.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, communication facilities, operational facilities, and land acquisition, $4,660,000."

(d) In section 201, under the heading "Outside Continental United States" and subheading "Ordnance Facilities," strike out so much thereof as reads as follows:

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Testing facilities, and railroad facilities and barricades, $1,132,000"; and insert in place thereof the following:

"Naval ammunition depot, Oahu, T. H.: Testing facilities, railroad facilities and barricades, and land acquisition, $1,132,000."

(e) In section 502, clause (2), change the amount for public works authorized by title II for inside continental United States from "$299,690,600" to "$299,826,600"; and the total amount from "$564,224,300" to "$564,360,300."

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, for the following projects:

Inside the United States

Air Defense Command

Buckingham Air Force Base, Fort Myers, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvement, $13,168,000.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquistion, $863,000.

Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo.: Housing and community facilities, $342,000.

Ethan Allen Air Force Base, Winooski, Vt.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $4,211,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, and family housing, $2,827,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and group improvements, land acquisition and family housing, $2,470,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,999,000.

Grandview Air Force Base, Kansas City, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,673,000.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Corapolis, Pa.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,087,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,966,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $5,051,000.

Manistee Air Force Base, Manistee, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,906,000.

Kinross Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,156,000.

Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,130,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,514,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,054,000.

Major Field, Greenville, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $440,000: *Provided, however*, That none of the funds here authorized for appropriation shall be expended until the field has been recaptured by the United States.

Minneapolis-Saint Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minn.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $3,015,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, N. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,215,000.

Newcastle County Airport, Wilmington, Del.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $6,184,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Operational and training facili-

ties, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,030,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition and family housing, $11,577,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,292,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $4,127,000.

Greater Portland, Oreg., area: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $13,508,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $8,057,000.

Richard Bong Air Force Base, Kansasville, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,801,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $2,494,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,288,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,802,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $5,441,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $2,874,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition and family housing, $3,278,000.

Youngstown Municipal Airport, Youngstown, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,255,000.

Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $3,545,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $37,760,000.

Air Materiel Command

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,541,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $17,966,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements and land acquisition, $1,339,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,570,000.

Marietta Air Force Station, Marietta, Pa.: Supply facilities, $52,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,424,000.

Mukilteo Fuel Storage Station, Mukilteo, Wash.: Land acquisition, $4,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,572,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,983,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,478,000.

Searsport Fuel Storage Station, Searsport, Maine: Supply facilities, $473,000.

Tacoma Fuel Storage Station, Tacoma, Wash.: Supply facilities, $129,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,498,000.

Wilkins Air Force Station, Shelby, Ohio: Family housing, $89,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $17,138,000.

Various locations: Administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $444,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,094,000.

Air Training Command

Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.: Housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,288,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $18,000.

Edward Gary Air Force Base, San Marcos, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, $783,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston Tex.: Land acquisition, $63,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyo.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,654,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $8,804,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $4,687,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Miss.: Land acquisition, $34,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, $3,440,000.

Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex.: Utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $225,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities $212,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.: Land acquisition, $1,587,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $2,902,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $21,650,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Land acquisition, $396,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,848,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $3,456,000.

Parks Air Force Base, Pleasanton, Calif.: Utilities and ground improvements, $111,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $2,260,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Land acquisition, $133,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $4,164,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $3,296,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Tex.: Hospital and medical facilities, and housing and community facilities, $6,842,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,221,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $716,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $977,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, $90,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $6,347,000.

Air University

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $215,000.

Continental Air Command

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $9,563,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $237,000.

Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Housing and community facilities, $345,000.

Mitchel Air Force Base, Hempstead, N. Y.: Utilities and ground improvements, $205,000.

Headquarters Command

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Utilities and ground improvements, $8,000.

Military Air Transport Command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Md.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $7,335,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $868,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administration facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,195,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,169,000.

Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,545,000.

Vint Hill Farm Station, Warrenton, Va.: Operational and training facilities, $768,000.

Research and Development Command

Canal Air Force Plant No. 62, Hartford, Conn.: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $22,445,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif.: Research, development, and test facilities, and housing and community facilities, $5,488,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamagordo, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and housing and community facilities, $7,877,000.

Indian Springs Air Force Base, Indian Springs, Nev.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements and family housing, $961,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $5,481,000.

Laredo Test Site, Laredo, Tex.: Research, development, and test facilities, and land acquisitions, $1,219,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $6,939,000.

National reactor test station, Idaho Falls, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $11,415,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, research, development and test facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $15,169,000.

Sacramento Peak Observatory, Sacramento Peak, N. Mex.: Family housing $153,000.

Strategic Air Command

Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,043,000.

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla.: Housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,003,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $2,117,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $531,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $922,000.

Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky.: Operational and training facilities, and utilities and ground improvments, $479,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,438,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,179,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $7,004,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,654,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $503,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,665,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $943,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,457,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,271,000.

Gray Air Force Base, Killeen, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, $23,000.

Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $2,483,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,694,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,131,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,552,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,685,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $1,528,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $4,952,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,522,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,262,000.

Malstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,236,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $5,156,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,064,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition and family housing, $5,697,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $786,000.

Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y.: Housing and community facilities, $1,491,000.

Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H.: Operational and training facilities, and housing and community facilities, $661,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Operational and training facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $3,882,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $923,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Ga.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, and land acquisition, $781,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,791,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $9,315,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $815,000.

Tactical Air Command

Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla.: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and land acquisition, $330,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark.: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $933,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Ind.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities and removal of hazard, $2,169,000.

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing and community facilities, and relocation of structure, $4,505,000.

Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, $2,428,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, La.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and housing and community facilities, $2,919,000.

Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $952,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, Calif.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,144,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $2,613,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Operational and training facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,111,000.

Myrtle Beach Municipal Airport, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and housing and community facilities, $1,665,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,106,000.

Sewart Air Force Base, Smyrna, Tenn.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition, $1,583,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administra-

tive facilities, and housing and community facilities, $6,637,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, S. C.: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and housing and community facilities, $3,805,000.

Wendover Air Force Base, Wendover, Utah: Operational and training facilities, $67,000.

Special Facilities

Various locations: Research, development and test facilities, administrative facilities, and land acquisition, $1,240,000.

Aircraft Control and Warning System

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing, and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and land acquisition and family housing, $80,942,000.

Outside the United States

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and family housing, $14,984,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,444,000.

Galena Airfield: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $1,772,000.

King Salmon Airport: Operational and training facilities, $289,000.

Ladd Air Force Base: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,055,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, $6,628,000.

Far East Air Forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational and training facilities, $991,000.

Johnston Island Air Force Base, Johnston Island: Operational and training facilities and housing and community facilities, $724,000.

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, utilities and ground improvements, land acquisition, and family housing, $25,969,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $55,859,000.

Northeast Air Command

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and family housing, $70,250,000.

Strategic Air Command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, housing and community facilities, utilites and ground improvements, and family housing, $23,980,000.

Harmon Air Force Base, Guam: Land acquisition, $14,000.

Northwest Air Force Base, Guam: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $229,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $1,523,000.

United States Air Forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital and medical facilities, administrative facilities, housing and community facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and erection of prefabricated structures, $97,123,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities and equipment, in the total amount of $163 million.

SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

"The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the Semiautomatic Ground Environment System. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million, and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A. sec. 481)."

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

Under the subheading "Air Defense Command"—

(1) with respect to Buckingham Weapons Center, Fort Myers, Fla., strike out "$11,577,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,462,000."

(2) with respect to Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn., strike out "$1,200,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,623,000."

(3) with respect to Grand Forks site, North Dakota, strike out "$5,822,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,709,000."

(4) with respect to Greater Milwaukee area, Wisconsin, airbase to be known as "Richard Bong Air Force Base", strike out "$16,608,000" and insert in place thereof "$23,859,000."

(5) with respect to Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa., strike out "$404,000" and insert in place thereof "$525,000."

(6) with respect to Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif., strike out "$1,501,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,229,000."

(7) with respect to Klamath Falls Municipal Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., strike out "$2,042,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,656,000."

(8) with respect to McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn., strike out "$582,000" and insert in place thereof "$817,000."

(9) with respect to Minot site, North Dakota, strike out "$5,339,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,603,000."

(10) with respect to Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y., strike out "$1,748,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,575,000."

(11) with respect to Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Wash., strike out "$1,039,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,199,000."

Under the subheading "Air Materiel Command"—with respect to Searsport Air Force Tank Farm, Searsport, Maine, strike out "$133,000" and insert in place thereof "$329,000."

Under the subheading "Air Training Command"—

(1) with respect to Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex., strike out "$2,816,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,438,000."

(2) with respect to Greenville Air Force Base, Greenville, Miss., strike out "$349,000" and insert in place thereof "$500,000."

(3) with respect to Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz., strike out "$1,557,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,923,000."

(4) with respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev., strike out "$1,153,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,837,000."

(5) with respect to Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex., strike out "$956,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,210,000."

(6) with respect to Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "$549,000" and insert in place thereof "$730,000."

(7) with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill., strike out "$1,247,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,862,000."

(8) with respect to Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla., strike out "$478,000" and insert in place thereof "$534,000."

(9) with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla., strike out "$871,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,181,000."

(10) with respect to Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz., strike out "$1,045,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,215,000."

Under the subheading "Air University"—With respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala., strike out "$2,661,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,031,000."

Under the subheading "Continental Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., strike out "$590,000" and insert in place thereof "$697,000."

(2) with respect to Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga., strike out "$758,000" and insert in place thereof "$859,000."

Under the subheading "Military Air Transport Service"—With respect to Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, S. C., strike out "$4,032,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,306,000."

Under the subheading "Research and Development Command"—

(1) with respect to Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, Calif., strike out "$12,429,000" and insert in place thereof "$13,299,000."

(2) with respect to Hartford Research Facility, Hartford, Conn., strike out "$22,375,000" and insert in place thereof "$25,780,000."

(3) with respect to Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex., strike out "$4,965,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,637,000."

Under the subheading "Strategic Air Command"—

(1) with respect to Abilene Air Force Base, Abilene, Tex., strike out "$4,214,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,656,000."

(2) with respect to Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak., strike out "$12,380,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,186,000".

(3) with respect to Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans., strike out "$4,753,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,885,000."

(4) with respect to Great Falls Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont., strike out "$5,435,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,713,000."

(5) with respect to Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga., strike out "$4,115,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,951,000."

(6) with respect to Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla., strike out "$4,118,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,559,000."

Under the subheading "Tactical Air Command"—With respect to Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash., strike out "$3,574,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,724,000."

Under the subheading "Aircraft Control and Warning System"—With respect to "Various locations" strike out "$100,382,000" and insert in place thereof "$120,382,000."

(b) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, is amended, under the heading "Outside Continental United States" in section 301, as follows:

(1) With respect to Kenai Airfield under the subheading "Alaskan Air Command" strike out "$356,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,247,000."

(c) Public Law 161, 84th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$743,989,000", "$530,563,000" and "$1,279,902,000" and inserting in place thereof "$800,913,000", "$532,454,000" and "$1,338,717,000", respectively.

(d) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, is amended, under the heading "Continental United States" in section 301, as follows: Under the subheading "Air Defense Command" with respect to Klamath Falls Airport, Klamath Falls, Oreg., strike out "$4,133,000" and insert in place thereof "$5,077,000."

(e) Public Law 534, 83d Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts "$405,176,000" and "$415,005,000" and inserting in place thereof "$406,120,000" and "$415,949,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

General Provisions

SEC. 401. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this act without regard to sections 1136, 3648, and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to provide family housing includes authority to acquire such land as the Secretary concerned determines, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to be necessary in connection with that housing. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 402. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, and III shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $86,016,000; outside the United States $29,763,000; section 102, $188,783,000; or a total of $304,562,000;

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $298,572,000; outside the United States, $61,625,000; section 203, $42,997,000, or a total of $401,194,000; and

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $661,446,000; outside the United States, $312,834,000; section 302, $163 million; or a total of $1,137,280,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the amounts named in title I, II, or III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 percent for projects inside the United States and by 10 percent for projects outside the United States. However, the total cost of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 404. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 4 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 153 (c)) for contracts made under this act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 405. Contracts made by the United States under this act shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 153 et seq.).

SEC. 406. The Secretaries of the military departments may acquire land, and interests in land, not exceeding $5,000 in cost (exclusive of administrative costs and deficiency judgment awards), which the Secretary concerned determines to be urgently required in the interests of national defense. The authority under this section may not, however, be used to acquire more than one parcel of land unless the parcels are noncontiguous or, if contiguous, do not exceed $5,000 in total cost.

SEC. 407. The Secretaries of the military departments may, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, acquire, construct, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, to restore or replace facilities damaged or destroyed in a total amount not to exceed $30 million.

SEC. 408. (a) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for military construction such amounts as may be required for the establishment and development of military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing (except family quarters), converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works determined to be urgently required, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for projects not otherwise authorized by law when the cost of the project is in excess of $25,000 but not in excess of $200,000, subject to the following limitations:

(1) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of $50,000, shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) No such project, the cost of which is in excess of $25,000 shall be authorized unless approved in advance by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

(3) Not more than one allotment may be made for any project authorized under this section.

(4) The cost of conversion of existing structures to family quarters may not exceed $50,000 in any fiscal year at any single facility.

(b) The Secretaries of the military departments may expend out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation amounts necessary to accomplish a project which, except for the fact that its cost does not exceed $25,000, would otherwise be authorized to be accomplished under subsection (a).

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall report in detail semiannually to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the exercise of the authorities granted by this section.

(d) Section 26 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 853, 856; 34 U. S. C. 559), is repealed.

SEC. 409. (a) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of a military department, may provide family housing for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and certain commissioned officers and enlisted personnel attached to his staff by the construction or rehabilitation of five sets of family housing, and emergency communication facilities, without regard to the second proviso of section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (62 Stat. 375, 379), or section 3 of the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459, 462).

(b) Appropriations not to exceed $300,000 available to the military departments for military construction may be utilized for the purposes of this section without regard to the limitations on the cost of family housing otherwise prescribed by law.

SEC. 410. As of July 1, 1957, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in acts enacted before July 15, 1952, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1957, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guaranty for family housing in the amount of $100 million that is contained in section 302 of Public Law 534, Eighty-second Congress; and

(4) the authorizations for public works and the appropriation of funds that are contained in the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 881 and the following).

SEC. 411. (a) The first paragraph of section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"In addition to family housing and community facilities otherwise authorized to be constructed or acquired by the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense is authorized, subject to the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to construct, or acquire by lease or otherwise, family housing for occupancy as public quarters, and community facilities, in foreign countries through housing and community facilities projects which utilize foreign currencies to a value not to exceed $250 million acquired pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 454) or through other commodity transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation."

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretaries of the military departments such amounts other than foreign currencies as are necessary for the construction, or acquisition by lease or otherwise, of family housing and community facilities projects in foreign countries that are authorized by section 407 of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), as amended, but the amount so appropriated for any such project may not be more than 25 percent of the total cost of that project.

SEC. 412. Section 515 of the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During the fiscal years 1956, 1957, and 1958 the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military tactical installations for assignments as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense or his designee that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military tactical installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than 3,000 of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental for such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 413. The net floor area limitations prescribed by section 3 of the act of June 12, 1948 (5 U. S. C. 626p) do not apply to 47 units of the housing authorized to be constructed at the United States Air Force Academy by the act of April 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 47). The net floor area limitations for those 47 units are as follows: 5,000 square feet for 1 unit for the superintendent; 3,000 square feet for each 2 units for deans; and 1,750 square feet for each of 44 units for department heads.

SEC. 414. Section 3 of the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, as amended (50 U. S. C. 882), is further amended by striking out clause (a) and inserting in place thereof the following:

"(a) acquire by purchase, lease, or transfer, construct, expand, rehabilitate, convert and equip such facilities as he shall determine to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, except that expenditures for the leasing of property for such purposes may be made from appropriations otherwise available for the payment of rentals and without regard to the monetary limitation otherwise imposed by this section;".

SEC. 415. To the extent that housing is to be constructed at a military installation under title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 635, 646), any outstanding authority under the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1119), the act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324), and this act to provide housing at that installation may be exercised at other military installations of the department concerned.

SEC. 416. The Secretaries of the military departments are authorized to contract for the storage, handling, and distribution of liquid fuels for periods not exceeding 5 years, with option to renew for additional periods not exceeding 5 years, for a total not to exceed 20 years. This authority is limited to facilities which conform to the criteria prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for protection, including dispersal, and also are included in a program approved by the Secretary of Defense for the protection of petroleum facilities. Such contracts may provide that the Government at the expiration or termination thereof shall have the option to purchase the facility under contract without regard to sections 1136, 3648, and 3734 or the Revised Statutes, as amended, and prior to approval of title to the underlying land by the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That the Secretaries of the military departments shall report to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to the names of the contractors and the terms of the contracts, the reports to be furnished at times and in such form as may be agreed upon between the Secretaries of the military departments and the Committees on Armed Services.

SEC. 417. In the design of the family housing and other repetitive-type buildings in the Continental United States authorized by this act, the military departments shall, to the extent deemed practicable, use the principle of modular design in order that the facility may be built by conventional construction, on site fabrication or factory fabrication, whichever the successful bidder may elect.

SEC. 418. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no contract shall be entered into by the United States for the construction of family housing units by or for the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military services of the Department of Defense unless such housing has been justified to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 419. Section 404 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 404. Whenever the Secretary of Defense or his designee deem it necessary for the purposes of this title, he may acquire by purchase, donation, or other means of transfer (but not by condemnation), any land or (with the approval of the Federal Housing Commissioner) any housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The purchase price of any such housing shall not exceed the actual cost (as that term is defined in section 227 (c) of the National Housing Act with respect to new construction) of the housing as determined by the Commissioner less depreciation thereon at a rate of 2 percent per annum, less the amount of accumulated unexpended reserves for replacement, and less the principal amount and accrued interest under any mortgage or other indebtedness outstanding thereon and assumed by the Government. Property acquired under this section may be occupied, used, and improved for the purposes of this section prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, as required by section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended. The authority so to acquire housing may be exercised by acquiring the capital stock of a corporation owning and operating housing financed with mortgages insured under the provisions of title III of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the enactment of the Housing Amendments of 1955, but without deduction for such reserves for replacement as are held by the corporation at the time of the transfer of the capital stock to the Government."

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point and be open to amendment at any point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 8, strike all of section 104 and on line 25, change "SEC. 105" so as to read "SEC. 104".

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of the amendment just offered, may I say that section 104 designated certain camps as permanent installations. In view of a communication received on March 21 from the Secretary of the Army designating, in his capacity as Secretary of the Army, the identical camps as permanent, I, therefore, desire to strike from the bill section 104.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the letter received from the Secretary of the Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

MARCH 21, 1956.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter will confirm my personal conference with you this morning.

You will recall that General Taylor and I, in January of this year, discussed with you Army plans for a review of Army installations. At that time I agreed that the Army would be prepared to inform you by April 15 of those posts within the continental United States which it felt justified as designating permanent installations.

I am pleased to be able to inform you that the Army studies on this subject have been completed. After a careful review of the recommendations of the Army staff, I am today designating Camp Gordon, Ga., Camp Stewart, Ga., Fort Jackson, S. C., Camp Chaffee, Ark., and Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., as permanent Army installations. My decision with respect to these five stations is based entirely upon military requirements and long-range estimates pertaining to the strength of the Army. I am confident that you and the members of your committee will support my decision in this respect.

The designation of the five stations mentioned in the preceding paragraph represents a maximum estimate as to future requirements for Army Forces in the United States under planned worldwide deployments. I do not anticipate that any extension of permanent Army establishments, including the five stations in question, can be justified within the foreseeable future.

Sincerely yours,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 29, following line 21, insert the following language:

"Majors Field, Greenville, Tex.: Operational and training facilities, and land acquisition, $440,000: *Provided, however*, That none of the funds here authorized for appropriation shall be expended until the field has been recaptured by the United States."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to have the Air Force recapture a field at this designated point in Texas. After it has been recaptured and the title to the field is back in the Government, then we authorize an expenditure of $440,000 for improvement of the base.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because during the early part of general debate I asked the gentleman from Georgia a question concerning the Grandview Air Force Base, which I prefer to call the Truman Airport at Kansas City. The gentleman from Georgia at that time said he would have some information later. My question is, How much has been expended on this Truman Airport at Kansas City up to this time?

Mr. VINSON. Knowing the interest of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa in a great many of these things, and knowing he would propound some inquiry along this line, here are the facts: The total amount of construction authorized for this installation for the fiscal year 1955 is $3,402,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is the airbase?

Mr. VINSON. Total amount of funds applied to this authorization through fiscal year 1955 is $15,600,000. The fiscal year 1956 military construction program contains line items in the amount of $3,402,000. I knew the gentleman was going to ask for that information, so I am happy to give it to him.

Mr. GROSS. That is the deal that started out at $9 million, then went to $13

million, and now is going to come to what?—$19 million or something like that before they get through with it?

Mr. VINSON. Well, I will give you the whole history if you want it.

Mr. GROSS. No; I do not want the whole history. But, would you mind answering this question? Have they gotten rid of the septic tanks out there?

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry. I do not know. But I will ask my committee to designate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], or someone else, to go down and find out.

Mr. GROSS. Another question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Has the Continental Air Command been moved down there yet?

Mr. VINSON. No, it has not.

Mr. GROSS. And never will be, will it?

Mr. VINSON. I doubt it.

Mr. GROSS. And we were sold this bill of goods on the premise that the Continental Air Command would be moved to Grandview?

Mr. VINSON. This is a very important base to that great section of the country. I think all of this information should place the gentleman in a very receptive mood so that he will take the viewpoint of the Committee on Armed Services on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I have fought this deal for a long time, but I think I know when I am licked, so I am not going to offer an amendment to the Grandview appropriation. Now I see a provision in this bill for a $300,000 appropriation to build a housing setup for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I wonder if the gentleman would explain that.

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure. In the last authorization bill that same item appeared, but when it reached the Senate it was deleted and we could not place it back in conference. So, again this year we bring it before the Committee for its consideration. Now, the plan is this: There is no permanent residence for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is proposed to construct on what is known as the Naval Observatory site up on Massachusetts Avenue two or three buildings for him and his assistants which will cost in the neighborhood of $300,000. This includes a very important communications center. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff must have some of his officers with him all the time, and it is highly important that facilities be made available to his close personnel who must carry out his orders promptly.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think he is going overboard with a $300,000 appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, it does not mean just one building; it means several houses up there will cost that much. Those and the important communications facility.

Mr. GROSS. Even if you divide 5 into $300,000, you have some pretty expensive buildings going up there to house the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the people that attend him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, there are 59 officers in this area that have homes provided by the Congress and maintained. Now, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has no permanent domicile fixed by the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. In further answer, we all know that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has a very fine residence here in Washington, as well as the Chief of Naval Operations. These buildings provided for in this authorization will be erected on ground already owned by the Government. Not only will the money be spent on the homes, but a rather extensive communications system will be set up. And, if we should ever have another Pearl Harbor, we would not want the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the most powerful military man not only in our own Nation but perhaps in the world, to be without adequate quarters.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think we would like to see the Vice President of the United States wiped out in a bombing raid, either, but we do not provide him with a $300,000 home.

Mr. SHORT. They should have done it a long time ago.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with the gentleman. In my opinion, there are plenty of houses available, for instance, at Fort McNair. What is wrong with those houses?

Mr. SHORT. Well, those houses are already occupied. They have a shortage.

Mr. GROSS. Then, let us move somebody out.

Mr. SHORT. Certainly we should have a respectable, decent home for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that is commensurate with his dignity and importance in the management of affairs of the most powerful nation on earth.

Mr. GROSS. The question is, Should we pay out money at the rate of $300,000 for a house?

Mr. SHORT. This $300,000 is not for a house. It is for houses and an intercommunication system.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman well knows that the bulk of the $300,000 will go into a house.

Mr. SHORT. It should.

Mr. GROSS. For one person, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. SHORT. It should.

Mr. GROSS. That is for 1 house, to house 1 man and his family. I do not agree with that at all. I think you are going far overboard. You are going to build something here that will come close to being goldplated. I do not think we are in a position in this country today to finance that sort of thing.

Mr. SHORT. Today $300,000 does not build too fine a house in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Missouri says that $300,000 does not build a good house?

Mr. SHORT. It is the same as an item we approved last year.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I intend to offer an amendment to strike it out. It probably will not succeed.

Mr. SHORT. I do not think it will.

Mr. GROSS. I am certainly going to try to stop it. I do not seem to have much luck on items of that kind, but I shall try.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee this question. Do I understand that there is $800 million in this bill for overseas bases?

Mr. VINSON. The total amount for the Army overseas is $29,763,000; for the Navy, $61,625,000; for the Air Force, $312,834,000. About $400 million of the $2 billion represent authorizations outside of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, approximately half a billion dollars will go for installations outside the United States?

Mr. VINSON. For various things.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot tell us where those bases are? I suppose that is classified.

Mr. VINSON. I may say that they are all over the world. If the gentleman will examine the report, the report will give him as much information as to where they are located as it is possible to divulge publicly.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us whether there is any money in this bill to expand or to build airbases in Iceland?

Mr. VINSON. It is not listed.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will allow, the gentleman will get a complete list of these projects if he will turn to the report at pages 42 and 43.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much interested in the proposed expenditure for overseas purposes.

Mr. SHORT. We all are.

Mr. GROSS. Because we are learning that many of these nations are going neutral on us. I wonder what is going to happen to the installations for which we are making expenditures if these nations become neutrals at a time when we are going to need them most. I wonder how much of this money ought to be expended on overseas bases.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not think the gentleman need worry about this item as much as some of the others, because they cannot transfer this house to Russia or any other nation. It is going to be in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I was not talking about that $300,000 house; I was talking about the military installations in foreign countries upon which we have already expended billions of dollars and upon which it is now proposed to spend another half billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I desire to state to the

Committee that this is what is known as the SAGE amendment which was printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 51, strike all of section 303 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section 303:

"SEC. 303. Section 1 of the act of March 30, 1949 (ch. 41, 50 U. S. C. 491), is amended by the addition of the following:

" 'The Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to procure communication services required for the Semiautomatic Ground Environment System. No contract for such services may be for a period of more than 10 years from the date communication services are first furnished under such contract. The aggregate contingent liability of the Government under the termination provisions of all contracts authorized hereunder may not exceed a total of $222 million, and no termination payment shall be final until audited and approved by the General Accounting Office, which shall have access to such carrier records and accounts as it may deem necessary for the purpose. In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. A., sec. 481)'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was discussed during the presentation of the rule and also when I addressed the Committee during general debate. The amendment was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on last Tuesday. I understand that it is in thorough accord with the viewpoints of all the gentlemen who have interested themselves with the Committee on Armed Services on this matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does this amendment apply to the matter of SAGE that was discussed on the floor during general debate, at which time the gentleman paid a very kindly tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and myself?

Mr. VINSON. It does, and I am going to do so again.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I intended to show my wife that kindly reference in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I could not find it in the RECORD. I just wondered if the gentleman would be willing to reinsert it in the RECORD so that Mrs. Brown and Mrs. McCormack could know that Mr. MCCORMACK and I were doing something that was of benefit to our country.

Mr. VINSON. I am going to do that right now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And will the gentleman permit it to remain in the RECORD? I would appreciate having that comment again.

Mr. VINSON. Recognizing the fact that I have to be before the Rules Committee in a few days, I will be sure to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We are waiting for the gentleman's appearance before the Rules Committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In the rapid reading by the Clerk of the amendment, I was not able to catch all of the last phrase about appearance before State and Federal regulatory bodies.

Mr. VINSON. We are following the law as it is today.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Would the gentleman mind stating briefly what this section 201 is about? I am not familiar with it myself.

Mr. VINSON. The amendment reads in part as follows:

In procuring such services, the Secretary of the Air Force shall utilize to the fullest extent the facilities and capabilities of communication common carriers, including cooperatives, within their respective service areas. Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949.

The basic act reads:

Provided, That contracts for public utility services may be made for periods not exceeding 10 years; and

(4) with respect to transportation and other public utility services for the use of executive agencies, represent such agencies in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities and in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies;

Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may from time to time, and unless the President shall otherwise direct, exempt the National Military Establishment from action taken or which may be taken by the Administrator under clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) above whenever he determines such exemption to be in the best interests of national security.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very well prepared statement giving some detail about this amendment, and it is as follows:

I wish to draw the particular attention of the House to the last sentence of the amendment which I have just offered. That sentence reads as follows:

Negotiations with communication common carriers, including cooperatives, and representation in proceedings involving such carriers before Federal and State regulatory bodies where such negotiations or proceedings involve contracts authorized by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the provisions of section 201 of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (40 USCA, sec. 481).

The law which I have cited gives the Administrator of General Services Administration authority to represent agencies of the Government, including the Defense Department, in negotiations with carriers and other public utilities and in proceedings involving carriers or other public utilities before Federal and State regulatory bodies.

So far the authority granted is entirely clear. However, the language in the law immediately following that which I have just quoted permits the Secretary of Defense, on his own initiative, to exempt the Department of Defense from the exercise of the authority granted to the Administrator of General Services. That means that when the Secretary has exempted himself, the General Services is excluded from any of the activities which are the subject of the law which I quoted.

The only thing which can prevent the Secretary of Defense from exempting himself is for the President to "otherwise direct." If the President otherwise directs, then the General Services steps in the picture and performs all of the functions which are described in the law.

The authority given the General Services Administration is an important authority and it was granted to that agency by the Congress with the thought that the General Services Administration should maintain a proper surveillance of the utility contracts entered into by the United States. I believe this was a wise provision of law.

I am aware that former President Truman took proper and strong action to prevent any exemption by the Department of Defense under section 201 (a), which was to the effect that General Services Administration should participate actively in these utility contracts. However, President Eisenhower revoked former President Truman's letter so that today the Secretary of Defense is free to exempt himself, and, therefore, General Services Administration has no voice in these matters.

If the Secretary of Defense does exempt himself, it simply means that the Department of Defense is in the position of being both the contracting party and the representative of the Federal Government.

I might say that it is the intention of the committee to closely follow and watch any rates charged for communication services in any contracts made under the provisions of this section and, particularly so, if the Secretary of Defense should exempt the Defense Department from any jurisdiction by the Administrator of General Services, and if the President does not direct otherwise. The committee is cooperating as effectively as possible with the Defense Department, but recognizes that this field is a very delicate one, in which the interest of the Federal Government should be adequately and thoroughly protected.

I sincerely trust that the Secretary of Defense will not exempt the Department of Defense. The effect of that would be to eliminate the General Services Administration from any consideration of these very important matters. If the Secretary seeks to exempt himself, I sincerely trust that President Eisenhower will, in accordance with the law and the intent of the law, "direct otherwise" and thereby bring the General Services Administration into the picture.

I believe that the House and the country owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from

Virginia, Judge SMITH, and to the House Armed Services Committee for the devoted manner in which we both have studied and pursued all of the phases relating to the SAGE system. It is through their combined efforts that the estimated annual cost of communication services for SAGE, after it is in full operation, have been cut from $240 million a year to $157 million a year. This is a savings of $83 million per year, or a savings of $830 million over the 10-year period.

I repeat, in my judgment the House and the country owe a debt of gratitude to our distinguished colleague, to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and I wish to so state publicly.

Again, I want to take this opportunity publicly to express my appreciation and I am sure the thanks of the Congress and the country at large for the deep interest that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the distinguished gentleman from Viriginia [Mr. SMITH], and the entire 37 members of the Committee on Armed Services have shown and the part they have played in bringing about a reduction from $240 million in annual charges down to $157 million or a saving of some $83 million a year. As this is a 10-year contract, the scrutiny by these gentlemen and others will bring about a saving of $830 million. I think all who played any part in this are entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the country for that saving. I think this bears the repetition I have given it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 59, lines 3 and 4, strike "$292,572,000" and insert "$296,572,000"; and on line 5, strike "$397,194,000" and insert "$401,194,000."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical amendment merely correcting certain figures in the bill. The bill is loaded down with figures of all sorts and, of course, they must be made accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a little earlier in the day the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] made some very effective remarks during which he said in substance that the Department of Defense at times places Members of the Congress in a very bad position by some of the things that are done. The delegation from the State of Massachusetts can well subscribe to that fact. We have in Massachusetts the Murphy Army General Hospital. The Members are well acquainted with that hospital because the Department of Defense for the last 2 fiscal years have been trying to close it. But the House of Representatives very wisely and very kindly and very generously followed the request and the recommendation of the united Massachusetts delegation in this body and put in the appropriation bill the necessary money to keep the Murphy Army General Hospital open during the last fiscal year, and the present fiscal year. We received assurances that if the appropriations necessary were put into the bill that the hospital would be kept open during the fiscal year for which funds were appropriated. They kept that promise in the last fiscal year. For the present fiscal year, money has been appropriated to keep it open until June 30, 1956. But, we are faced with a rather unpleasant situation where the Department of Defense has utilized some of the space in the Murphy Army General Hospital for Air Force activities, and while that is inconsistent with the understanding which we thought existed, nevertheless, it was not a sufficient occupation of space to destroy completely the effectiveness of the hospital as such.

We now find that they are going to move the Army engineers in there, and that plans are under way to do so, and that this is being done administratively. Now if that is done before June 30, and before we have an opportunity to pass upon the Defense Department appropriation bill, at least as one member of the Massachusetts delegation, I shall consider that such action is inconsistent with the expressed or implied promises made to the Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, because the Arkansas delegation is in a similar situation.

Mr. NORRELL. I would like to say that the entire delegation from Arkansas goes along with you on your Massachusetts hospital, as well as that great Army and Navy hospital in Arkansas. Those two hospitals ought not to be closed, and I hope that the Armed Services will see to it that as far as they are concerned they are not closed, and I am sure the Appropriations Committee will do likewise.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems incredible to me that this hospital should be closed at this time. When we hear that civilian defense is asking for more beds and more hospitals, when all of our hospitals in Massachusetts are so crowded that we cannot get people in, then to close it when the East is so inflamed, it seems to me incredible. I do not understand it. My own feeling is that many of the people who have suggested closing it will regret it. What on earth will we do if we suddenly have a lot of wounded people, or if we have an epidemic? I have tried to get people into civilian hospitals and could not do it, and in two instances they died. I speak with great feeling.

Mr. MCCORMACK. May I ask the gentlewoman if the statement I just made, that the Massachusetts delegation understood, either expressly or by implication, that if the Congress put in the necessary appropriation to keep the hospital open for this fiscal year, they would do so during the fiscal year?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. That was my very definite understanding. One reason they did not have more patients at the Army hospital is because they have been shipping them out everywhere where they should not go. There are a great many women who expect to have their babies there. I do not know where they can go if they cannot go to this hospital.

Mr. MCCORMACK. So, we are faced with this situation, that administratively they are moving in there other activities for nonhospital purposes. I have no controversy with the Army engineers, because they have to go where they are told to go, but if they go in the hospital, then the hospital is destroyed for hospital purposes. If the money is carried in the next appropriation bill to keep it open, they will say "Why, the hospital is closed."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCORMACK was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is closed. May I make one further observation? Several weeks ago we passed a bill unanimously to provide additional medical services for dependents of men in the service. We wisely did so. Men who are in the service in all parts of the world, serving their country, must know their dependents are taken care of. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] handled that bill, and it was a very, very fine bill, and it was passed unanimously. Naturally, that bill will require additional hospitalization.

I wrote the Secretary of the Army calling his attention to that fact in relation to Murphy General Hospital, and I suggest that my friend from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] keep that bill in mind also in relation to the hospital in Arkansas.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has had to say about the Murphy General Hospital and I concur in everything the gentleman has stated. As a member of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, several years ago we spent several days visiting Murphy General Hospital. There has been an attempt made to close that hospital for the past several years. I agree with what you have to say about the hospital. Murphy General Hospital is a very important segment of the hospital program in the Boston area. It is a facility that is greatly needed throughout that section of the country. It is utilized and necessary. What the objective is to close the hospital I cannot understand, but several years ago we conducted a very thorough investigation of the Murphy General Hospital and the committee determined

it was essential to the hospital program in the entire Boston area. I assure the gentleman that I will be only too pleased to cooperate in any way I can to see that the Murphy General Hospital remains in operation. It is doing a great and needed work and it is essential that it should be continued. It would be in my opinion a serious mistake to close this institution. This matter should be pursued futher to see that this hospital remains in operation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

May I say the Army Engineer Headquarters should be in Boston. The hospital is out in Waltham, and it will cost four or five hundred thousand dollars for the Army engineers to go in there. There is a new Federal lease-purchase building proposed for Boston, and it is intended that the Army engineers will occupy at least 100,000 square feet of space in there, if a certificate of deed comes from the Defense Department. The Army Engineer Headquarters belongs properly in Boston.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want to associate myself completely with the most appropriate remarks made by the majority leader. Repeatedly, year after year, we have been assured by the Defense Department that the Murphy General Hospital would remain open to serve our armed services personnel and their dependents. There is a real, urgent need for it. If it is to be deactivated, as is now proposed, and steps are already under way to that end—the equipment is being moved; patients are refused admission; personnel is being reassigned, then we will be without a general Army hospital in Massachusetts for the first time in a great many years.

In these circumstances, it will be necessary for those requiring medical treatment to which they are entitled as members of the armed services in an Army general hospital, to travel all the way to Phoenixville, Pa., to secure it.

I think this situation is something that requires our careful, immediate attention. I would like to commend the able majority leader for setting forth the facts and the urgency so clearly, succinctly, and forcefully. I assure him of my complete cooperation and hope his and our combined efforts to clear and settle this question will be successful at a very early date.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Do I understand the distinguished majority leader to say that the hospital is still operating but that currently military installations are being put in the same building?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am most interested in that because at the time of the closing of the Percy Jones Hospital in Battle Creek, my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Shafer, sought to secure the transfer to Percy Jones of the Armed Services Medical Program Agency with the understanding that a military plant or hospital would be maintained in that Government-owned installation. At that time he was told by the Defense Department that it was impossible to have a military installation in the same property as a hospital because it would deny to that hospital the protection of the Geneva Convention. At that time my distinguished predecessor responded to that argument that it was completely farcical and fantastic. I want to know whether that argument is still relied on by the Defense Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman's statement I may say that there was a distinct understanding that this hospital would be operated during this fiscal year. Plans are now under way to occupy a great majority of the space there so there will be no hospital and then when we make an effort to get appropriations for next year they will make the argument that there is no hospital there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to remind the House that some years ago when the Murphy General Hospital was closed at great expense, a few months afterwards war was declared and it had to be reopened at great expense. I am very suspicious and superstitious that they should want to close this hospital with the situation as difficult and precarious as it is today regarding a world conflagration.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I ask is that they agree to keep this hospital open the balance of this year until Congress has an opportunity of determining whether or not there should be appropriations made to keep it open during the next fiscal year.

My remarks apply also to the Arkansas Hospital. I think good faith requires them to keep the expressed or implied promise they have given to the Massachusetts delegation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, has the amendment been voted on?

The CHAIRMAN. Not yet.

Mr. VINSON. I ask for a vote on the Vinson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 57, strike all of lines 6 through 9 and on line 10 following the word "Congress," insert the words "as amended,"; and on lines 12 and 13, strike the figures "$458,563,000" and "$1,207,902,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$530,563,000" and "$1,279,902,000".

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a reduction of $72 million in the bill due to the fact that that item was taken from this bill and put in another bill which has already passed the House and Senate and has been signed by the President. The $72 million, therefore, should come out of the pending bill.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join in the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, about the saving as a result of the alertness of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in connection with these SAGE contracts. I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial taken from the Boston Sunday Post of April 8, 1956:

McCORMACK'S SCRUTINY OF SAGE CONTRACTS RESULTS IN PROJECTED $830 MILLION SAVING

(By John Kelso)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—House Majority leader JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Boston, has made a projected saving of $830 million for the American taxpayers.

This whopping pre-April 15 saving resulted from the close scrutiny McCORMACK gave the contracts setting up the multi-billion-dollar program known as SAGE—semi-automatic ground environment.

SAGE will complement DEW—distant early warning line—to form a protective radar screen in the atomic age around the United States.

When plans for SAGE first hit Capitol Hill one figure in them called for an annual 10-year expenditure of $240 million.

This has since been pruned to $157 million—a saving of $83 million a year, or $830 million for 10 years.

McCORMACK stood virtually alone in Congress in his determination to get a much closer look at the costs involved in SAGE.

His fight has also meant that Congress first must authorize the project before any funds can be appropriated for it. It was planned originally to push SAGE through by means of a budget item.

Legislation which would authorize SAGE will reach the House floor this coming Thursday. There is a distinct possibility, it was said, that further cuts in the program will be made after this open debate.

The exact item on which the $83 million annual cut was made, acording to a transcript of a hearing, involved the yearly payments of the Government for the use of telephone lines essential to the continental defense project.

Mr. Chairman, as a result of the publicity that the distinguished majority leader gave to this last fall, the rural telephone companies throughout the United States were aware of their part in this SAGE organization. Some of them wrote to me. I have taken the floor and come down to the well of the House twice to discuss this matter with Members of the House and members of this committee. As a result of the publicity initiated by the majority leader, the rural telephone companies were aware of the part they were going to play in this vast SAGE organization.

When I presented the matter to the committee, the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, and the members of that committee, gave me a very courteous and attentive hearing and wrote into this bill and into the report language which I believe protects to the utmost the interest of the rural telephone companies. However, after the hearing before the committee and after the courtesy that was shown and after the distinguished gentleman from Georgia directed the Armed Forces to permit the rural telephone companies to participate in SAGE, a representative of the rural telephone companies had a conference with a representative of the Air Force. That was an unsatisfactory conference because the Air Force said: "Well, you, the rural telephone companies, are represented by the Bell System, or you are represented by the independent telephone companies."

As a result of that, the head of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, who was representing the rural telephone companies, said:

Our people do not feel they are getting a fair shake in this matter. They want some representation in the SAGE project other than that of the Bell companies and the United States Independent Telephone Association.

Since then, however, the Bell companies have by letter to Mr. Riggs Shepperd, president, National Telephone Cooperative Association, said:

I have been asked by this company—

American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—

to inform you that it would be happy to have a representative of your organization as one of its members—

Of the Industry Committee.

After I received a copy of this letter yesterday I called the Air Force and they said they would be happy also to have a representative of the Rural Telephone Association on the Industry Committee. So I feel as a result of the activities of the Armed Services Committee and its distinguished chairman, and as a result of the publicity that the distinguished majority leader gave this matter last year, the interests of the rural telephone companies are now adequately and amply protected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I want to thank the gentleman for the contribution he has made, for it was he who brought to the attention of the House and the committee the importance of including the local telephones and the co-ops in this SAGE program.

Mr. METCALF. And the gentleman from Georgia deserves and merits the thanks of the rural telephone companies everywhere for his contribution.

(The letter to Mr. Sheppard is as follows:)

APRIL 10, 1956.

Mr. RIGGS SHEPPARD,
President, National Telephone Cooperative Association, South West Texas Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Hondo, Tex.

DEAR RIGGS: I had expected to hear from you before this time with regard to the selection of a representative of the National Telephone Cooperative Association for the Industry Coordinating Committee for SAGE. As we discussed on April 3, following Mr. Thiessen's request to Mr. Todd, of the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. that your association be represented, this committee asked me to inform you that it would be happy to have a representative of your organization as one of its members assuming he has the necessary security clearance.

The industry committee, as I mentioned to you, includes representatives from the Lincoln Laboratories, Bell Laboratories, the Air Defense Engineering Service, Western Electric, manufacturers of independent telephone equipment, USITA, and Rural Electrification Administration as well as representatives of the operations and engineering department of A. T. & T. The committee's primary responsibility is to consider industry proposals and coordinate the provision of telephone facilities and equipment for the various SAGE sites. Their activities relate principally to the technical considerations involved in the installation and maintenance of the telephone and signaling equipment required.

As explained to you the committee has no responsibility for the location of SAGE sites and only comes into the picture after a site has been established by the Air Defense Command and the orders have been issued by the ADC for the provision of the facilities required. It was my impression after we had discussed the committee's responsibility that you would like to check further with some of your members and officials and would let me know your desires.

As I indicated in our telephone conversation, we will be very happy to assist your association in any way practical in obtaining security clearance for your representative if it is decided that you would like to have someone on the Industry Committee.

We also discussed the possibility of furnishing you with site location information, facility requirements, etc., as soon as such advice is received from the Air Defense Command and it is determined that the location is in the operating area of one of your members. As you probably know, for the convenience of the Air Force, this information is generally furnished through the Long Lines Military Communications Office of this company to the associated companies who in turn notify the independent companies or cooperatives involved. I find that in addition our Long Lines people can readily furnish direct to you the information relating to your members if you will kindly give me a list of them.

It would be helpful to have your decision regarding the selection of a committee member as soon as possible. In the meantime if there are any questions in connection with the SAGE project as it affects your telephone cooperative association or any of its members or if I can help in any other way, please do not hesitate to call me.

Your very truly,

L. L. MOODY.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 68, line 1, strike out "(a)" and strike out all of subsection (b) which appears on line 8 through line 12.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the amendment is this: Under the Capehart law the life of the military housing mortgage is 25 years. The Committee on Armed Services reduced it to 20 years. We abandoned the position we had previously taken, and we are restoring it back to 25 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 68, section 418, there is this language:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no contract shall be entered into by the United States for the construction of family housing units by or for the use of military or civilian personnel of any of the military services of the Department of Defense unless such housing has been justified to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

I wonder why that language.

Mr. VINSON. I will tell you why. Under the Capehart amendment it is provided for the construction of 100,000 units for the armed services. The Armed Services Committee feel that they should know and have knowledge of what construction is going on for the armed personnel. Now, we will have Wherry houses, we have private-enterprise houses, and we have Capehart houses, and we want to be sure that there are not going to be too many houses and that they will not be put in places where they are not warranted or justified. The other day the Air Force asked for over 30,000 units, and we had to break that down. Here it is broken down. We took up each one of these items at each installation, and we found out how many Wherry houses there were, how many private-enterprise houses there were, and how many other houses, to see whether or not they were justified in building Capehart houses.

Mr. GROSS. Have there been serious abuses?

Mr. VINSON. Well, it just started. It is just going into effect. It just started, and we want to put our finger on it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I know that recently the Army, the Air Force, and so forth have recommended the building of 50,000 units at various places. A great many of them were to be at places where there are Wherry houses. Now, I want to ask the gentleman if he and his committee are going to keep their hands on this thing so that when there are Wherry houses, with the Government making a 90 percent guaranty on the loan, whether or not his committee and those working with him are going to see to it that where these Wherry houses are built and are sufficient that their value is not going to be destroyed by building other houses by the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the honorable Speaker of the House, that is the very purpose of section 418. Were it not for that section, the Congress would have no control over it at all, because strictly speaking today they can build 100,000 units without coming before the committee. But, we had an understand-

ing that they must clear these things even before this bill goes into law. Therefore, the Air Force appeared before the committee the other day and asked for several thousand units, and we made them break it down to where Wherry houses are to be built, where private enterprise houses are to be built, and that is the purpose of it. We will watch it very closely. If the House passes this bill in the language it is in, you can rest assured that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], and myself, and others who constitute the subcommittee will look into this closely. We will be satisfied that there is an absolute bona fide need before we approve any one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 15, line 21, insert:

"Naval air facility, John H. Towers Field, Annapolis, Md.: Land acquisition, and plans for specifications for aviation facilities, $4,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that those are all the committee amendments. I offer a suggestion to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], that he offer his amendment at this time.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 29, line 3, strike the words "Manistee Air Force Base, Manistee, Mich.," and insert in lieu thereof the words, "Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if it is possible to reach an agreement on time on this amendment. I am very anxious that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] be permitted to address the Committee for at least 20 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized now for 5 minutes. I should like 5 minutes myself, and I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] would like 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is offering a unanimous-consent request, reserving the right to object, I very much desire to have 3 minutes in order to apologize to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendents thereto close in 45 minutes with the understanding that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] will have at least 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment puts the airbase back where the Air Force has been constructing an airbase for the past 7 or 8 months. The question legitimately is asked, Why did the Air Force initiate construction at that base? The Air Force did it in good faith because on July 28, 1955, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations by letter approved construction at Kalkaska. The Air Force initiated construction in August of last year at the Kalkaska site because on July 29, 1955, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, in a letter to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, said:

I am gratified that final selection of this base has been made, since I know of its importance to our Air Defense Command.

The Air Force initiated construction last August because on August 11 the 1955, Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in a similar letter said:

In addition, the committee has approved the development of Kalkaska, Mich., Air Force Base.

The Air Force initiated construction last August because on August 11, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Construction, the Real Estate Subcommittee, in a letter to the Air Force told them to go ahead.

The Air Force in good faith initiated this construction in August of 1955, spending taxpayers' money to get the job done. Now we find that they in effect are told they must change to another site.

If the Manistee site is selected, we will find this will be the result: In the first place, the Air Force will waste at least $500,000 of funds which in good faith they have spent on the Kalkaska site. In addition, there will be an increased cost at Manistee on an annual basis for a 10-year period of $3,900,000. That is the additional cost of SAGE at Manistee over Kalkaska.

In addition, if the Air Force cannot construct its base at Kalkaska and has to do it at Manistee, there will be $938,000 in additional initial construction cost. In other words, you are going to find, if this amendment is not agreed to, that at least $5 million more will be spent on the Manistee site than would be spent on the Kalkaska site.

Furthermore, we have another problem. The people of Traverse City, Mich., a community of 18,000, after getting word that the Air Force would proceed and authority was given by the responsible chairmen of the various committees, went out and raised on their own $84,000 to buy land for the Air Force. That land is in the process of being procured.

I am told that the community of Manistee, the alternative site, has refused to offer any funds for the procurement of land, and that that will put an additional $134,000 burden on the Federal Treasury.

How can we in good faith, after these people in this community have gone out and raised $84,000, tell them, "No, we are changing the base"? I cannot understand that.

Thirdly, the Michigan State Conservation Commission agreed to make 7,100 acres of State-owned timberland available to the Air Force to build this airbase at Kalkaska. A contract was signed. They started to cut the land. Now this committee says they cannot proceed.

The State Conservation Commission has said, and I have in my hand a newspaper article concerning it, that they will not sign a contract with the Air Force for any other locality. If you move the airbase to the Manistee site, the Air Force has to procure 5,400 acres from the State Conservation Commission, and they say they will not authorize it. I do not blame them, because we have broken faith with them already, if this amendment is not agreed to. They cannot have any faith in our judgment if we are going to sign a contract and then the Air Force is told they cannot carry out its responsibilities. I am reliably informed they will not make any other contract with the Air Force for State-owned land.

In conclusion, let me say just this: On the basis of dollars, on the basis of time, on the basis of good faith with the State Conservation Commission, and the people of Traverse City, in my humble judgment we ought to agree to this amendment permitting the Air Force to continue construction at a site where they have been building since August of 1955.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] for 20 minutes.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of speaking before the House on a subject that has become very controversial in my district, and which I sincerely hope may be resolved by this great body. I am not here to ask for anything that is unfair, or that is not right.

On February 10, 1954, I received a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, Harold E. Talbott, stating that a jet air base would be located in the Ninth Congressional District, in the Traverse City area. Not knowing the probable pros and cons in relation to a jet airbase, I was very happy and expressed my approval. Of course, it never occurred to me to influence the Secretary in the exact choice of the site. That was his business, and to have it within my district was enough for me.

The Air Force engineers first explored the possibility of placing the base in the Long Lake area, Grand Traverse County, but immediately Dr. Joseph E. Maddy, owner and operator of the National Music Camp, and some others, protested against that site because of its nearness to that institution—a distance of about 10 miles. At this point, I want to call your attention to the fact that the Air Force withdrew from the Long Lake site because of its proximity to an established resort area.

After the Secretary received the above objections, he ordered the Air Force engineers to recommend another site. They then proposed the Benzie County

site in Homestead Township. Immediately Dr. Maddy objected to that site stating that it would also be objectionable to the music camp.

Representative Paul Shafer, of Michigan; Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma; and Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina, all members of the House Armed Services Committee, sustained his objections.

When the Homestead site was ruled out by the Shafer subcommittee, the Secretary had to select another site. He designated Cadillac on December 2, 1954. At this point, the Secretary became very angry because I had accused him of not being honest with me. From then on he refused to answer my daily telephone calls over a period of 5 days. I then wrote him a letter and waited 10 days for a reply. None came. My colleagues will appreciate my position at that time. Six months after the selection of the Benzie site was made public, the Secretary abruptly switched sites with no explanation to me. During those 6 months he repeatedly assured me that the base would be built in Benzie County. On his advice, I relayed this information to my constituents. To say the least, I was subjected to embarrassment and a feeling that pressures, unknown to me, had been brought to bear on Secretary Talbott.

I then saw Secretary Wilson and as a result, Secretary Talbott called me. He suggested that I should go ahead and do whatever I thought would be best. I went to Congressman MAHON and he suggested that I should state my case before him and Chairman VINSON. I did so to them and in the presence of Secretary Talbott, General Hipps of the Air Force, and committee counsel. The Secretary neither confirmed nor denied the statements which I made to him in repeating his earlier conversations with me and his promises.

In July 1955, the House Appropriations Committee ruled out Cadillac.

The next step was for the Secretary to designate Kalkaska or Manistee, even though the Kalkaska site had been rejected as early as June 1954 because of the need for development of a highway to Traverse City upon which it would be dependent for community support. Secretary Talbott chose Kalkaska, out of my district, and refused to survey the Manistee site until ordered to do so by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Appropriations Committee, Hon. GEORGE MAHON. Within a few days, the President accepted Secretary Talbott's resignation because of alleged irregularities in office. When the new Secretary Donald A. Quarles, took over, he stated to me that he had no reason to rescind Secretary Talbott's decision. This reply was to my plea to Quarles in favor of a site in the ninth district.

The 11th District—Kalkaska—has a population of 227,810, considerably less than the Ninth District, which has 275,109 people. In spite of that difference, the 11th District already has a jet air base at Kinross, and has been awarded an International Pulpwood mill at the Sault. The Ninth District has no Federal installations.

The Manistee site, which has been designated by the House Armed Services Committee for development, has many advantages. Located in the north-central portion of Manistee County, it is almost equidistant from four cities, namely, Manistee, Frankfort, Traverse City, and Cadillac. In the center of a square served by these four communities, the site can draw on their joint community support. The cultural, educational, recreational, hospital, and retail facilities of all four will be available to personnel of the proposed interceptor base. In addition, the nearby villages of Kaleva, Copemish, Brethren, Bear Lake, Onekama, Benzonia, Beulah, Honor, Mesick, and Wellston willingly offer community support. The townspeople of these cities and villages have officially expressed a welcome to the Air Force and pledged their cooperation in making the existence of airmen at the base as comfortable and enjoyable as possible. Organized conservation groups, agricultural groups, and business people in Manistee County have publicly promised support. There is no foreseeable objection to be raised by groups or individuals to the location of the base in Manistee County, as have been at other sites.

From a transportation standpoint, the Manistee site has excellent facilities. Four motor freight lines and two railroads coming into the area would provide the Air Force with maximum freight service. One of these railroads and two bus lines provide passenger service. Capital Airlines, based nearby at Traverse City, now furnishes air connection to any point in the world. The cities of Manistee and Frankfort have developed harbors on Lake Michigan which could economically be the terminals for fuel pipelines from the base, using Great Lakes tankers. Passengers may embark from either Frankfort or Ludington by way of ferry to Wisconsin ports. Five paved roads provide a network linking the communities in the area for automobile travel. In summary, all phases of transportation are available to a degree not found anywhere else in northwestern Michigan.

From the communications angle, Manistee is the only site which has offered the free use of telephone facilities to the Air Force. The Kaleva Telephone Co. has agreed, in writing, to make available its franchise for SAGE installations at no cost.

The House should give great weight to the statements of the Air Force, made before the House Armed Services Committee as late as March 7, 1956, to the effect that any and all of the sites that have been surveyed in the Traverse City area are acceptable from the standpoint of national defense. All of the Manistee sites can serve the defense perimeter established by the Air Defense Command in northern Michigan. I desire to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the one and only requirement of the Air Force was that a jet base be built in the vicinity of Traverse City. The Manistee site is approximately 30 miles from Traverse City, and meets all operational requirements.

When I came to Congress in 1951 I did not know a single Member of the Congress of the United States. I went into the House dining room one morning and the only person there was my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Paul Shafer. I would like to read a letter which I have, written by Mr. Shafer before he died. It is dated August 12, 1954, and is addressed to the Honorable Harold E. Talbott, Secretary of the Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am taking the liberty of commenting further with reference to the jet interceptor base to be located in the Traverse City area, Mich.

Let me say first of all, that I am sorry, Mr. Secretary, that differences developed between us and that our tempers caused our discussion to become rather heated.

I am most anxious to see this problem resolved in the best interests of our defense program and to the satisfaction of the greatest number of interested persons possible.

Naturally I cannot alter the decision of the Armed Services Committee, and have no desire to do so, but perhaps a compromise solution is possible.

My sole interest throughout has been that of protecting the National Music Camp at Interlochen. For that reason I have avoided suggesting any specific alternate site.

However, it is my hope that a solution is possible which will still locate the base within the Ninth Congressional District. I believe this is possible, since I know you have surveyed and considered at least one other such site.

If it is possible to locate a site within the Ninth District which meets your requirements and conforms to the committee recommendations, I will be entirely satisfied.

I sincerely trust that you and I will see eye to eye on any future matters which may require our joint consideration.

Cordially,

PAUL SHAFER.

Mr. Shafer wrote this letter on August 12, 1954. He died on August 17, 1954.

Mr. Chairman, in view of this situation, I respectfully urge the House to confirm action taken by the House Armed Services Committee, and direct that the Air Force build the proposed base at the Manistee site, which is obviously the most desirable from a noise, safety, construction, and operational viewpoint.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I was tremendously impressed with the statement of the very able and splendid gentlewoman from Michigan, Judge THOMPSON, and as I listened I felt I could not do anything else but vote to have the site in her district as a matter of simple justice and I should know if I did not do so that I would have no protection in the future from promises by one of the services that an installation would go into my district. It seems to me that as a matter of honor and fair play the site should be placed in the district of the gentlewoman from Michigan. It would be very unfair not to do so and I am very sure that Secretary Quarles if he understood the situation would agree with that.

I have a very fine airfield in my own district. I have found Secretary Quarles extremely fair and very helpful and always cooperative when he understands a situation. It seems to me clearly that justice is on her side, and I believe that she will be successful and that the Congress will support her.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What was the vote in the Armed Services Committee to designate the Manistee site?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Here is what the record shows, and this is from the minutes of the committee. It is permissible to use this.

The committee considered the item for Kalkaska Air Force Base, Kalkaska, Mich. It was moved and seconded that this air defense base be relocated at Manistee, Mich., rather than at Kalkaska. A rollcall vote on this motion was as follows:

Yeas—Mr. Vinson, Mr. Short, Mr. Cole, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Gavin, Mr. Hébert, Mr. Van Zandt, Mr. Price, Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Bates, Mr. Hess, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Devereux, Mr. O'Konski, Mr. Miller, Mr. Bray, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Huddleston.

Twenty-one Members voted to locate the site as in the bill.

Those voting in the negative are as follows:

Mr. Durham (proxy), Mr. Rivers (proxy), Mr. Winstead, Mr. Hardy, and Mr. Green (proxy).

Present, Mr. Wickersham.

Twenty-one Members voted to change the site based upon the testimony that there is no military difference between them. What happened? I asked Mr. Forry this question:

From a military standpoint, they are equal?

Mr. FORRY. Yes, sir.

When he stated that from a military standpoint they were equal, then as one member of that committee I wanted to cast my vote to help right a wrong that had been done an honorable Member of this House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. As I understand it, the proposed site is in the center of a locality in which there are a number of cities and towns?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. Would that not obviate the necessity of constructing the usual facilities that must be constructed when a new base is erected anywhere?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I would think so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the able gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTLEY. We have heard some information about the amount of money that has already been invested in the Kalkaska site by the Air Force, about a half million dollars. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what this investment consists of?

Mr. KNOX. To my distinguished colleague, I will say that the investment is mostly in plant, engineering, and surveys that have been made by the Air Force with a view to getting the base under construction in July of this year as authorized by the Congress and as so urgently demanded by our national security.

Mr. BENTLEY. Has there been any actual physical work done on that Kalkaska site?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, by the Department of Conservation of the State of Michigan who have given a 99-year lease. The timber was taken to such an extent that the conservation department people now feel they will have to continue the cutting of this timber in order that they can do some replanting.

Mr. BENTLEY. How much timber has been cut approximately?

Mr. KNOX. I cannot say in acreage, but better than one-third of the cutting operations have been completed.

Mr. BENTLEY. Right up to this moment?

Mr. KNOX. Right up to this moment, that is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. We have heard the statement that the military aspects of both sites are the same. The Kalkaska site is in the Senate bill, the military location is all the same, the State has granted leases to 8,000 acres of land; we have spent a half million dollars. I cannot understand why we should change the location.

Mr. KNOX. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. However, I would point out that the military aspects are not the same in that the Manistee site, according to Air Force testimony, cannot be as readily expanded as can the Kalkaska site.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman asks, "In view of the fact this military installation is the same, why are you making the change?" I will tell you the reason why. Twenty-one Members voted to make the change. As I said a moment ago, we wanted to do right by a Member of this House who had been the victim of unfortunate circumstances. That is the reason. And I base my vote entirely upon that ground.

Mr. KNOX. I may say, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, that I am carrying no torch for the former Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say this: I know this situation from the very beginning, and I want to say again the only way that this House can do justice to the gentlewoman from Michigan is to vote down the amendment that has been proposed by your colleague.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I should make it clear that I served notice on the House membership in this past week that I was going to offer an amendment to the bill.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has offered the same amendment that I was to offer, and therefore I am supporting his amendment. The main reason I am supporting the amendment is in the cause of national security and the need for keeping faith with the patriotic citizens in the Traverse City area of Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to my point that a defense gap is left today in our northern defense perimeter for the security of the metropolitan areas of Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. I would repeat, as I stated before on the floor of this chamber, that the 1-year delay, in my estimation, could create circumstances leading to another Pearl Harbor. The Communist menace is such that we can ill afford complacency with respect to any gaps in our defenses. I believe it is time that we recognize the fact that we leave to the Air Force matters involving of judgment that is peculiarly in the competence of military experts. In building air bases abroad it is the Air Force that selects sites in all foreign countries. We do not dictate to them where they shall build that foreign base, on what section of ground, in what country, or any other matter. We give the Air Force that prerogative. They are the military experts, and I for one today am not going to substitute my judgment for that of the military experts. We have an Air Force today that we expect to be in complete command of the skies. Why? Just so that we will never have a catastrophe in this country that would be equal to some of those in foreign countries. I am quite disturbed over the entire situation, and I do hope that the membership will support the Ford amendment when it comes time to vote on its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I probably will not take the 5 minutes. I do not believe it is necessary, since we have had a great deal of discussion about this whole proposition. I must simply reiterate my position on it, that we cannot allow the Executive to take such action as it did in the case of the gentlewoman from Michigan. If they can do that we certainly are not keeping faith with the gentlewoman from Michigan or the Congress. The Air Force made a commitment and promised that this jet base would be located in her district. I think they should have gone through with it. And, if we allow ourselves to be placed in a position like this, we will be derelict in our duty insofar as the overall picture of our Government is concerned.

Now, I would like to quote just one little paragraph from a release from the

chief of the Michigan Conservation Department, forestry division, dated March 10, 1956.

No material damage has been caused by timber-cutting operations which started on the site (Kalkaska) 2 weeks ago.

A swath of jackpine was being cut to clear space for a runway at the rate of 40 cords per day. However, the Department immediately sent out word to successful bidders to hold up any cutting of red pine. The jackpine already cut was mostly mature timber and ready to be cut anyway. The cutting "might even improve the area from a game standpoint," he said.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say this, that as far as the site is concerned, if it were within my power certainly I would be willing to dedicate that part of Kalkaska County to the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan, if it would help any. I am concerned about one factor only and that is the national security of my country.

Mr. DEVEREAUX. I think it has been demonstrated that the Committee on Armed Services also is concerned with the national security of our country. We considered this whole proposition at some length and came to the conclusion, by a vote of 21 to 5, that this is the proper thing to do. National security does not rest necessarily upon the location of a jet base at one place or another. There are other considerations to be kept in mind. I think the support of a Member of this House is also a matter of national security; the question whether we are going to carry out our traditional legislative responsibility or whether we are going to abdicate our responsibility and allow an executive department to dictate however they will.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. On March 16, 1956, the Michigan State Conservation Commission said this:

The State Conservation Commission declared itself today as unanimously and emphatically opposed to any shift of the proposed Northern Lower Peninsula Jet Air Base from Kalkaska to Manistee area.

Here is what several members were quoted as saying when this matter was brought up. Commissioner Lawrence J. Gotschall of Baldwin, Mich., said:

I went for it once but I wouldn't go for it again.

Other members of the Commission chimed in and said, "Good, good, good."

Mr. DEVEREUX. It seems to me that is simply an expression of pressure on the House of Representatives as to the action they shall take.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 3 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to most humbly and sincerely apologize to my good friend and colleague from northern Michigan [Mr. KNOX]. He has taken time to express disapproval of what I said earlier. I never questioned his ability, his patriotism, his effectiveness, his sincerity, nor his desire that the security of our Nation be advanced or protected. That was not my purpose. I am very sorry if he took offense when I said that he went out fishing. I hoped that his constituents had a high enough opinion of his value to them and to the district to take him fishing. They should. I never knew that it was a fault to be a fisherman. St. Mark tells us that both Simon and Andrew, his brother, were fishers in the Sea of Galilee and Jesus said that if they would come after Him, He would make them fishers of men. The only thing wrong with the fishermen of today is that they are inclined a little bit to exaggerate, or so it has been said. But I noticed here today that others than fishermen followed along the same line of exaggeration.

Figures do not mean a thing today. It all depends on the source from which the figures are derived. When you talk about security, what nonsense that is. Look at this chart. Here is Kalkaska [indicating on the map]. Now it is proposed to move the base over here to Manistee—about 75 miles. If you listen to my colleague from the northern peninsula, you would think that the whole Nation was going to be threatened because the base was going to be moved a few miles southwest.

This talk about timber being wasted is all nonsense. Does timber become valueless when it is cut? Certainly not.

There is no question of national defense here today. Nor is there an economy issue unless we accept without question the figures of the Air Force—I will accept the record made by the committee and its report and recommendation. The question is as was indicated by the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX, and by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. When an executive department makes a promise as to what will be done and then just arbitrarily changes its mind without good cause, are we going to let it switch us back and forth? It is the Supreme Court that kicks us around most of the time. Now, again an executive department is trying it. When, if ever, will we assert ourselves and take over our functions, express our will and say to these people to whom we give jobs and authority through our appropriations and legislation that they must keep their word as given to us? That is the issue here and it is the only real substantial one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Michigan has been the victim of an unfortunate series of circumstances beyond our control. The way to right that is to vote down this amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 52, noes 85.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 62, strike out lines 11 through 24.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out lines 11 through 24, the provision in the bill which would provide for a $300,000 housing setup for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The section apparently provides for 5 housing units, 1 for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and 4 other structures. This seems to me to be a pretty plush expenditure for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If the expenditure were divided evenly among five structures it would be $60,000 for each structure, but I do not think anyone in this Chamber believes that the noncommissioned officers who will be stationed there are going to have a $60,000 house to live in. We have no detailed information from the committee concerning this expenditure. The report does not break it down as to how much the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is going to get for his housing, so it is reasonable to assume that the bulk of the expenditure will go for a mansion for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we could very well house the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Fort Meyer. There are some pretty good buildings there, or down at Fort McNair. There are some good building units there. They are nicely located. I would not mind living in one of those houses between the Anacostia and the Potomac. I see no reason why simply because a mistake was made in providing houses for other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that we have to go overboard and spend $300,000 on this kind of enterprise. I do not know what the reason was which made the other body refuse to approve the appropriation that was in this bill last year for this purpose, but I have an idea, however, that the reason was that it would be throwing money away pretty fast.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the chairman if he can shed some light on this expenditure.

Mr. VINSON. In connection with the action of the other body, later as the body gathered information about this, they were willing to bring in a separate bill to cover it. But I suggested to let it ride for the year so that it would be brought in this year as it is now. Of course, you can say that a $300,000 house is a very expensive house—and it is a very expensive house. But, this is being built in accordance with the dignity and responsibility and high office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. There will not be just one house, there will be a series of homes, and this is necessary. I want this country, the greatest Nation in the world, to house its officials in the proper kind of dwelling. I do not want it to be said

that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the right-hand advisers of the Congress on military matters as well as of the President, has to live in some hothouse or some rented house. The Government ought to provide it. Of course, $300,000 is a considerable amount of money for a house. The gentleman from Iowa does not have that kind of a home and neither do I, nor do other Members of the Congress, but the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is under the obligation of entertaining officials. His dwelling must be a place of dignity. It must be an imposing home, and in addition to that there are 3 or 4 other houses for his aides to live in. The gentleman should look at it in the light that this is almost a public building, you might say.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman that this goes beyond just satisfying the dignity of an officer in the United States Army. It seems to me that with this kind of legislation, we are establishing some kind of military royalty in this country.

Mr. VINSON. We are doing nothing of the kind. Let us have a vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I am perfectly willing for the Members to vote on my amendment, but I must say that I will have no part in building this $300,000 home for officers of the United States Army when we have plenty of military housing now available in this area in which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or any other military officer can live in dignity and comfort.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, may I point out to my distinguished friend that this provision of $300,000 would not be before us if it provided for a dwelling place for just one individual. This is a series of houses. There will probably be 4 or 5 houses which will be built on Government-owned land.

Mr. GROSS. What is it proposed to spend on the house for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? The gentleman must know that.

Mr. VINSON. The entire thing cannot exceed $300,000.

Mr. GROSS. But what is proposed to be spent on this one house?

Mr. VINSON. I regret that I do not have the breakdown on that, but the entire group of houses will not exceed $300,000.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that perfectly, but I would like to know what you are going to spend on this plush establishment. I am willing to bet that before you get through, you will spend a half to two-thirds of the $300,000 on a home for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am saying to you that the taxpayers of the United States do not have that kind of money.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that as the facts have been developed that the Committee will vote this amendment down. I want to make this statement. This request comes directly from the other end of the avenue. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 34, noes 54.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: On page 58, immediately after line 20, insert:

"SEC. 402. (a) In the case of the construction of any tactical installation and facilities performed before or after the date of enactment of this act in a portion of a park located in a municipality, which portion is leased for such purpose, or is being used under a license or other arrangement, for a nominal consideration, the Secretary of the military department having jurisdiction over such installation shall pay a reasonable rental (as determined by impartial appraisal, or as agreed to by the local agency having jurisdiction over such park) for the use of such portion, without regard to any provision of such lease, license, or arrangement, specifying a nominal consideration for such use.

"(b) In the case of the construction of any tactical installation and facilities performed before or after the date of enactment of this act in a portion of a park located in a municipality, the Secretary of the military department having responsibility for such construction shall perform such construction, or in the case of construction performed before the date of enactment of this act shall modify such construction, so as to make such installation consistent with the continued use of such park as a park and recreational area, through landscaping, alteration of buildings or construction of buildings, planting or replanting of trees and shrubs, and otherwise improving the area surrounding such construction. The Secretary concerned is also authorized in any such case (1) to reimburse the local agency having jurisdiction over such park, from sums appropriated therefor, for the cost to such agency of providing additions to the park, or of providing additional park and recreational facilities elsewhere, comparable to the portion of the park on which the construction has been performed, or (2) to provide such additions, or additional park and recreational facilities, directly from sums appropriated therefor."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to state that in the event the Committee on Armed Services does not approve of this amendment and the chairman of that great committee makes a clarifying and satisfactory statement I shall not press further this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Is the gentleman predicting defeat for his amendment?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would prefer to talk about that after I have presented the case of the people of the district I have the honor to represent and the distinguished chairman has given his assurance, as I believe he will, that there is within the committee the power and the will to accomplish what is sought in my amendment.

Nevertheless, I have felt this was a matter that should be brought to the attention of the House. The situation is not peculiar to Chicago. Something of the sort obtains in many of the large cities of the country. There are many Members who have an interest in the subject springing from the concern of their constituents.

In our program of tactical installations, which those responsible for our national security believe necessary, we are selecting sites in the hearts of our cities. These installations are attended with deposits of explosives of high power, and there is definitely a certain degree of danger.

Whether these installations will be outmoded within the next year or two no one knows. From the progress we are making it is presumed they may be. Also we have heard the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from this well state that in the event of a war none of these installations would be effective, that the decisive blow would have been struck within a matter of hours or a day. I concede that we in prudence and in good commonsense can take no chance, but we are in a field where there is little historic background and everything is more or less experimental and, we hope, temporary.

Let me say that in the Second Congressional District of Illinois everyone wishes to make every sacrifice necessary for our national defense, but we do not wish steps to be taken that are not necessary and that destroy the recreational facilities that have been built at great expense to the taxpayers of our community. This does not mean that if necessity and well-considered judgment command, we will not willingly make every sacrifice.

The site for this installation which is regarded as necessary by the Department of Defense—and I am not criticizing the judgment of men who have training and experience as well as a great responsibility—is on one of the spots of greatest scenic attraction in Jackson Park. I am told the site could have been located as far south as 97th Street. To condemn private property entails a large expenditure of money; I think they figure something like $1,200,000, whereas by having a site in Jackson Park the cost would be almost nothing.

Whether the site could or could not have been located elsewhere—and I do not presume to pass upon that question—is not moot, as the site already has been taken over. What I am concerned in now is that there should be money available for some recompense to the people, perhaps in the development of other park recreational facilities to replace those taken over, and in any event to dress up and maintain in the most presentable manner possible the landscape surrounding the installation. There should be provision, too, for the removal of the installation when no longer needed and the restoration of the land to its former condition.

I repeat, I think provision should be made to recompense these park districts in some way by establishing somewhere else in the parks recreational facilities to take the place of those taken over by the Government. There also should be an appropriation to beautify these sites and to see that everything is done to keep from spoiling the beauty of the parks.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. VINSON. I may state to the gentleman and for the benefit of the committee that 81 Nike sites have been constructed in parks in cities all over the United States, and the people have received many dollars for every one they have contributed as their share of the defense. That is the record right here.

Now may I say one thing further; of course the gentleman's amendment goes far beyond Jackson Park, but in Jackson Park I find that we paid $85,000 for trees that were cut down. We usually take 6 acres, but at Jackson Park we took only 2 acres. I was very happy to give the distinguished gentleman from Illinois a hearing before the committee. We tried to work out the situation. I sympathize with him, but to go along with him I cannot. I hope that we may work out something satisfactory to him in a hearing before the committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his words of cooperation and for his courtesy at all times in trying to understand our problem. Here is what concerns me, and I have discussed this with the chairman. Later on an appropriation may be proposed to cover certain restoration of these park districts and I wanted to be sure there was sufficient authorization in this bill for an appropriation should it be proposed and should it become necessary. On that the chairman has assured me. While he does not see any authorization in the bill as it now stands, he thinks money can be obtained for that purpose from some fund now available. He would know more about where he can get the money than I would.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman can tell his people in Chicago that we will be more than delighted to give the gentleman a hearing, at which he may give minute details with reference to Jackson Park or a general policy in reference to all of these 78 sites over the country. We would consider a bill if he will introduce one, or if the facts warrant it I will introduce it myself.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am much concerned over the argument and criticism of our missile program, particularly the partisan attacks in the other body and elsewhere concerning research design of missiles and the size of the appropriations for missile production.

Our Armed Services Committee, here in the House of Representatives, is working harmoniously for the common good of our country. This may be a "do nothing" Congress as some claim, but the Armed Services is a "do plenty" committee. We have turned out to date under our Democratic committee leadership, 39 legislative projects this year alone in support of the Eisenhower administration's defense program. I wish to compliment my committee associates in both parties and our distinguished chairman and minority leader the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for the harmonious, nonpartisan way in which so much has been accomplished in this field.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I think the distinguished gentleman from California anticipated what was running through my mind. I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that notwithstanding the letter that appeared in the paper a few days ago about various bills, of those 5 bills referred to, 3 of them have already passed the House. We have been in session hardly 90 days, yet we have passed over 40 bills reported by the Committee on Armed Services involving an authorization of around $4 billion. There is no committee in the House that has kept this floor as busy as has the Armed Services Committee. We have been here so often that sometimes I think we will wear out our welcome.

Mr. WILSON of California. I might say that we are always under the whiplash of the chairman of our committee.

I do not pose as an expert on guided missiles, or ballistic missiles, but as a member of the Armed Services Committee I believe I have about as much general information on the program as any Member of either body of Congress. San Diego, which I represent, might well be called the missile production capital of the world. Therefore, I possess some insight into the missile situation and some firsthand knowledge about missiles as weapons in our armament. Criticism, I assert, is both misdirected and unwarranted.

In this missile controversy, our military chiefs are in an untenable position. They cannot defend our current situation, since to defend would be to reveal basic information of value to our enemies.

I can say, however, that more Army expenditure is going into the procurement of missiles than into all other conventional weapons combined.

As for Army public works, $305 million in this bill is authorized for construction. Nearly half, or 47 percent, is earmarked for missile installations.

The real tragedy in our missile program was our foolishness at the end of World War II, in allowing Russia to hire any of the German rocket and missile scientists.

Therefore, when an investigation of the missile situation is started in the other body, as anticipated, the inquiry should begin with Pennemunde and the day the German missile production center was captured.

One of the most vociferous critics of our present defense preparedness was himself an active participant and director in the first stages of our missile program.

What were the facts?

In 1946, we brought in 35 scientists but Russia took a few more than we did. We selected about 270 for our needs and a year later increased this selection to 1,000. Ultimately, we brought over about 800, but Russia took a few more than we did.

However, between 1947 and 1950, we were more concerned with cutting down our military strength from the 70 air wings authorized by the 80th Congress to 48 air wings. That was August in 1949 when one of the contemporary missile critics was Secretary of the Air Force.

And 48 wings we had when we were faced in June of 1950 with war in Korea. We were tragically unprepared.

Likewise, it was this period of time when we allowed basic research on missiles to wither and almost die. Only the foresight of a few scientists and aircraft manufacturers kept us from losing two priceless years of development.

We had no missile or rocket program worth mentioning in 1949, or 1947 for that matter. Up to 1950, nothing was authorized for missile production, then $26 million was appropriated.

Missile production during the fiscal years of 1951–52 amounted to an expenditure of $189 million. Under the first 2 fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration, the outlay grew to $799 million. For the 2 years ending this coming June, we will spend $1,550 million.

Is that a record of weakness in preparedness, or a record of factual military accomplishment?

Furthermore, I am at liberty to report that facilities for actual production of the intercontinental ballistics missile, the ultimate weapon, so-called, are under way.

In San Diego today, we are humming with missile production because Eisenhower raised the missile program from class 2 priority to class 1 early in 1953.

We can speed up the spending on the missile program, but we cannot speed up the brainwork; trying to force-feed scientific research is like trying to speed up the blossoming of a delicate bud. All talent that can be spared from other essential programs is now concentrated on the perfection of missiles. I say this without qualification.

I must repeat, however, what a pity, what a national shame it was, that we did not take all of the Pennemunde scientists when we had the opportunity back in 1946 and 1947.

In spite of our folly, I am confident we are still leading the world in the race for missile supremacy, and I am proud of the accomplishment of the Eisenhower administration in this regard.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] on the very splendid and timely statements he has made. He is one of the most faithful, hard-working, and earnest members of our Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question in connection with the military construction bill which we are considering that is important to many of my constituents. I have asked for this time to secure an opinion from the very able chairman of the committee handling this bill as to the liability of the Federal Government for school bonds which cover part of the property to be acquired for the erection of a jet interceptor base.

Plans are under way to purchase or condemn a considerable number of acres at a village called Kansasville, which is in Racine and Kenosha Counties. At the present time the State and local school officials are concerned about school bonds affecting the property to be acquired.

The State superintendent of schools in a letter to me has stated there is no Federal law which would relieve outstanding bonded indebtedness for a local school district where the Federal Government acquired property for a Federal building.

To me this presents an inequitable situation in view of the possibility that the burden of the bonds would be shifted from Government-owned property to the remaining property owners in the school district. In view of that situation I would ask the chairman if that question has ever been raised in committee.

Mr. VINSON. That question never has been raised. I should not like to give an opinion on it. That is a legal question. That is, where there are bonds of a certain character on certain property and the Government acquires the property, the question raised by the gentleman is, Do those bonds continue to follow even though the ownership is in the Federal Government?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right, sir.

Mr. VINSON. That is a very important question, but I am frank that I would rather not risk an opinion on it, because there are so many able lawyers present, such as my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. If he were not here perhaps I might venture an opinion.

I will say to the gentleman that we shall try to get some information on the question and advise the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. If the gentleman has no objection, I should like to submit a statement on the situation so that I may assure my people that the Committee on Armed Services is doing all it possibly can to settle the question satisfactorily to my constituents.

Mr. VINSON. We shall make inquiry not only of the Department of Defense but of the Attorney General.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there is entirely too much fat and blubber in this bill for me to accept it, and if there is not going to be a rollcall vote, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed.

There is $4 million in this bill for what appears to be the start of a naval air academy at Annapolis despite all the air training facilities presently being operated by the Navy Department. No one seems to know how many more millions will be expended upon this project. It is this duplication and waste to which I strenuously object.

It is my understanding that there is nearly a half billion dollars for construction and expansion of new and already established bases in foreign countries upon which billions have already been expended. How much further is it proposed to go with this construction in foreign countries which give little evidence of having any real desire to defend themselves? The record shows that despite all of our spending, more and more of our bases and installations are being jeopardized as more and more countries move into the orbit of neutralism.

Then there is the provision in this bill to provide $300,000 for the construction of a facility to house the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Have we lost our minds? Have we lost all regard for the ability of the taxpayers to pay the bills? It is beyond belief that we should authorize the construction of a mansion for just one officer in the Military Establishment that will cost any substantial part of $300,000. And yet that is what is proposed and what you will approve if you vote for this bill.

I have consistently voted for the adequate defense of this country, but here is a bill that calls for the spending of more than $2 billion for construction purposes alone. As far as I am able to determine, this huge spending provides for not a single weapon as such. This burden is becoming intolerable. There are thousands of citizens in the Third District of Iowa who, because of the farm depression and its effect upon business, will pay little or no Federal income taxes this year. I am convinced that wise use of facilities already available, both in this country and abroad, could have resulted in a substantial reduction in this spending. It is for the reasons I have stated and others that I must oppose passage of this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentlemen that I intend to ask for a rollcall vote when the question is put on final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military establishments, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 444, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 377, nays 3, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—377

Abbitt	Carrigg	Gathings
Abernethy	Cederberg	Gavin
Adair	Celler	Gentry
Addonizio	Chase	George
Albert	Chelf	Granahan
Alexander	Chiperfield	Gray
Alger	Chudoff	Green, Oreg.
Allen, Calif.	Church	Green, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Clark	Gregory
Andresen, August H.	Clevenger	Griffiths
	Cole	Gubser
Andrews	Colmer	Hagen
Arends	Coon	Halleck
Ashley	Cooper	Hand
Ashmore	Corbett	Harden
Aspinall	Cramer	Hardy
Auchincloss	Cretella	Harris
Avery	Crumpacker	Harrison, Nebr.
Ayres	Cunningham	Harrison, Va.
Bailey	Curtis, Mo.	Harvey
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Hays, Ark.
Baldwin	Davis, Tenn.	Hays, Ohio
Barden	Davis, Wis.	Hayworth
Barrett	Dawson, Ill.	Healey
Bass, N. H.	Deane	Hébert
Bass, Tenn.	Delaney	Henderson
Bates	Dempsey	Herlong
Baumhart	Denton	Heselton
Beamer	Derounian	Hess
Becker	Devereux	Hiestand
Belcher	Dies	Hill
Bell	Diggs	Hillings
Bennett, Fla.	Dingell	Hoeven
Bennett, Mich.	Dixon	Hoffman, Mich.
Bentley	Dollinger	Holifield
Berry	Dolliver	Holland
Betts	Dondero	Holmes
Blatnik	Donohue	Holt
Boggs	Dorn, N. Y.	Holtzman
Boland	Dorn, S. C.	Hope
Bolling	Dowdy	Horan
Bolton, Frances P.	Durham	Hosmer
	Edmondson	Huddleston
Bolton, Oliver P.	Elliott	Hull
	Ellsworth	Hyde
Bonner	Engle	Ikard
Bosch	Evins	Jackson
Bow	Fallon	Jarman
Bowler	Fascell	Jenkins
Boyle	Feighan	Jennings
Bray	Fenton	Jensen
Brooks, La.	Fernandez	Johansen
Brooks, Tex.	Fino	Johnson, Wis.
Brown, Ga.	Fisher	Jonas
Brown, Ohio	Fjare	Jones, Ala.
Brownson	Flood	Jones, Mo.
Broyhill	Flynt	Jones, N. C.
Budge	Fogarty	Judd
Burdick	Forand	Karsten
Burleson	Ford	Kean
Burnside	Forrester	Kearney
Bush	Fountain	Kearns
Byrd	Frazier	Keating
Byrne, Pa.	Frelinghuysen	Kee
Byrnes, Wis.	Friedel	Kelley, Pa.
Cannon	Fulton	Kelly, N. Y.
Carlyle	Garmatz	Kilburn
Carnahan	Gary	Kilday

Kilgore	Patman	Smith, Kans.
King, Calif.	Patterson	Smith, Miss.
Kirwan	Pelly	Smith, Va.
Kluczynski	Perkins	Smith, Wis.
Knox	Pfost	Spence
Knutson	Philbin	Staggers
Krueger	Phillips	Steed
Laird	Pilcher	Sullivan
Landrum	Pillion	Taber
Lane	Poage	Talle
Lanham	Poff	Taylor
Lankford	Polk	Teague, Calif.
Latham	Preston	Thomas
LeCompte	Price	Thompson, La.
Lesinski	Priest	Thompson, Mich.
Lipscomb	Prouty	Thompson, N. J.
Long	Quigley	Thompson, Tex.
Lovre	Rabaut	Thomson, Wyo.
McCarthy	Radwan	Thornberry
McConnell	Rains	Tollefson
McCormack	Ray	Trimble
McCulloch	Reece, Tenn.	Tuck
McDonough	Reed, N. Y.	Tumulty
McDowell	Rees, Kans.	Udall
McGregor	Reuss	Utt
McMillan	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
Macdonald	Rhodes, Pa.	Van Pelt
Machrowicz	Richards	Van Zandt
Mack, Ill.	Riley	Velde
Mack, Wash.	Rivers	Vinson
Magnuson	Roberts	Vorys
Mahon	Robeson, Va.	Vursell
Mailliard	Robsion, Ky.	Wainwright
Martin	Rodino	Walter
Mason	Rogers, Fla.	Watts
Matthews	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
Merrow	Rogers, Tex.	Westland
Metcalf	Rooney	Wharton
Miller, Md.	Roosevelt	Whitten
Miller, Nebr.	Rutherford	Wickersham
Miller, N. Y.	Sadlak	Widnall
Mills	St. George	Wier
Morrison	Saylor	Wigglesworth
Moss	Schenck	Williams, Miss.
Moulder	Scherer	Williams, N. J.
Mumma	Schwengel	Williams, N. Y.
Murray, Ill.	Scudder	Willis
Murray, Tenn.	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
Natcher	Selden	Wilson, Ind.
Nicholson	Sheehan	Winstead
Norblad	Shelley	Withrow
Norrell	Short	Wolcott
O'Brien, Ill.	Shuford	Wolverton
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sieminski	Wright
O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes	Yates
O'Konski	Siler	Young
O'Neill	Simpson, Ill.	Younger
Ostertag	Simpson, Pa.	Zablocki
Passman	Sisk	

NAYS—3

Andersen, H. Carl	Gross	Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Scrivner

NOT VOTING—52

Anfuso	Gamble	Minshall
Blitch	Gordon	Mollohan
Boykin	Grant	Morano
Buckley	Gwinn	Morgan
Canfield	Hale	Multer
Chatham	Haley	Nelson
Chenoweth	Hinshaw	O'Hara, Minn.
Christopher	Hoffman, Ill.	Osmers
Cooley	James	Powell
Coudert	Johnson, Calif.	Riehlman
Curtis, Mass.	Keogh	Rogers, Colo.
Dague	King, Pa.	Scott
Davidson	Klein	Sheppard
Dawson, Utah	McIntire	Springer
Dodd	McVey	Teague, Tex.
Donovan	Madden	Zelenko
Doyle	Meader	
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Christopher with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. James.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr Dodd with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Multer with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Dawson of Utah.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hinshaw.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING AN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 470, Rept. No. 1996), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9824) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

UNITED STATES v. ALDO LORENZO ICARDI

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

APRIL 12, 1956.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi* (No. 821–55), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum, produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, United States House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *v.* ALDO LORENZO ICARDI, NO. CR. 821–55

TO RALPH R. ROBERTS, Clerk, United States House of Representatives, Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., in the city of Washington on the fourth floor, courtroom 8, 16th day of April 1956 at 10 o'clock a. m. to testify in the case of *United States* v. *Aldo Lorenzo Icardi* and bring with you certified copies of the documents described on the attached list.

This subpena is issued upon application of the United States.

April 11, 1956.

MARVIN B. SEGAL,
Attorney for the United States, Department of Justice.

HARRY HULL, *Clerk,*
By LAWRENCE PROCTOR,
Deputy Clerk.

[Attached list]

Certified copies of:

(1) House Resolution 2, 84th Congress.

(2) Extract of the Journal of the House of Representatives showing the establishment of the Armed Services Committee of the 83d Congress and the membership thereof during the months of January, February, March of 1953.

(3) Minutes of the Committee on Armed Services dated January 27, 1953.

(4) Report of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of House of Representatives under the authority of House Resolution 125 (83d Cong., 1st sess.), printed for use of the Committee on Armed Services.

(5) Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1st session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 471) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the United States of America against Aldo Lorenzo Icardi (criminal case No. 821–55), pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, a subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 16th day of April 1956, at 10 a. m. and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such con-

trol or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice, or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in possession of the Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, A copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 472, Rept. No. 1997), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2972) to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. After the reading of the first section of such bill it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the committee amendment recommended in the bill H. R. 319 as reported to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary and all points of order against such amendment are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill S. 2972 the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

SPECIAL ORDER EXTENDED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next I have a special order for 15 minutes. Because of the general interest in it on the part of my southern colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that the 15 minutes be extended to 30 minutes, not in order for me to speak longer but for some of the others who may desire to be heard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he might tell us about the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to accede to my friend's request.

On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar. There will also be two suspensions: H. R. 9424, prior notification corporate mergers, and House Resolution 370, continue United States policy regarding injustices in the world.

I am also informed that there is a conference report, submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], on S. 1287, the so-called annuities bill.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day, but there are no bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday be dispensed with.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I shall not object—I should like to ask relative to the proposed suspension of the rules for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9424. May I ask what bill is that?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. That is a bill that requires notice to be given to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission before there can be consummation of the merger of any two corporations where the resulting combined assets would be more than $10 million flowing from the merger. The bill has the approval of the White House. The White House recommended such legislation.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate that, and I am for the bill. But several members of the Committee on Rules have advised me that it would not be discreet to bring it up on Monday next.

Mr. McCORMACK. For Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday I have programmed the following bills:

S. 1188, examination of national banks.

S. 1736, qualifications of national bank directors.

H. R. 9285, to extend authority; the direct purchase bill.

This bill is on the program for this week:

H. R. 5299, authorizing the Virgin Islands National Park.

The following bills may be brought up if they are reported and rules for their consideration are granted:

H. R. 10387, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission on certain projects.

H. R. 8836, the highway construction bill.

I make the usual reservations, that any further program will be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield, I wonder what has happened to the scheduling of the watershed bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill could not be reached this week, anyway. I will bring it up just as soon as I possibly can.

Mr. POAGE. Are we to understand it is going to be put off, or are we going to bring it up any time soon?

Mr. McCORMACK. It will be brought up in the near future, but not next week.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman explain why it will not be brought up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have this other legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; but this was scheduled before the others.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. Every one of these bills I have scheduled for next week preceded the watershed bill, with the exception of the Atomic Energy Commission authorization and the road bill.

Mr. POAGE. That is right, and they have not even been reported out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that any further program will be announced. If those bills are not reported out and we dispose of the other bills, then the bill to which the gentleman refers is in order for my announcing it to the House.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentleman intend to ask unanimous consent to adjourn over until Monday, after the completion of the next bill on the program for today?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week and the following week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF GI HOME LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing legislation which is extremely important to the overall economy of our great country. It is an extension of the GI home-loan program for World War II veterans.

This legislation amends section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans. It will provide the disabled veteran with an opportunity to exercise his right of purchasing a home under this law for a period of an additional 3 years from the present termination date which is July 25, 1957. It further provides a 1-month extension of eligibility for each 2 full months of service for those who served actively after September 15, 1940, and before July 26, 1947.

An abrupt termination of the GI home-loan program such as is now provided in the law would have an unhealthy and inflationary effect upon the entire Nation's economy. It would be almost certain to create a heavy housing demand which would result in highly inflated prices. It would be humanly impossible to obtain materials, equipment, manpower, or financing to build the homes that would be required if the expiration date is not extended.

However, a simple extension of the program is not the answer. Therefore, this bill provides for an orderly termination of the program over a period of 3 years. This would soften the shock of an abrupt end, spread out the demand for new housing over the period of several years, allow the veteran who has served his country more time to exercise his rights, and still answer those who state that if the plan is extended for 1 or 2 years, that extension would go on ad infinitum.

I want to make it clear that I firmly believe that the veterans' program must expire within a reasonable period, but it would be unfair to our Nation's veterans and our entire population to permit such an abrupt termination. I think this is a practical solution to a difficult problem and I urge the support of veterans groups and all others for this bill.

The need is borne out by the fact that 11,224,089 World War II veterans have not yet reached the state of financial stability which would permit them to purchase a home of their own.

NUMBER OF VETERANS WHO HAVE USED THEIR GI RIGHTS

As of February 1956 there were 22,226,000 veterans in civilian life; 15,385,000 World War II; 4,469,000 with Korean service. Of whom 849,000 also had World War II service leaving only 3,620,000 with Korean service only. Of this number, 4,353,310 had received guaranteed home loans, 292,399 of whom were Korean veterans. And the total amount of loans guaranteed reached $32,955,000,000, of which Korean veterans loans were valued at $2,765,000,000; and World War II veterans had loans for an amount of $30,190,000,000.

The overall figures on home loans are misleading. Although 26 percent of the eligible veterans have used their home-loan entitlement, the distribution has varied widely in different areas of the country. For example, for the 10 years ending in 1954, only 11.5 percent of the veterans in the Chicago metropolitan area had received home loans, compared with 56 percent in Wichita, Kans.

The following table I is a table showing for 75 metropolitan areas, the total number of home loans closed in the 10-year period 1944–54, and the percent of home loans to the veteran population in those areas.

TABLE I.—*VA guaranteed home loans in 75 metropolitan areas, 1944–54*

Standard metropolitan area	Estimated veteran population October 1953 (World War II and Korea) [1]	Total number of home loans closed, 1944 through December 1954 [2]	Percent of home loans to VA population	Standard metropolitan area	Estimated veteran population October 1953 (World War II and Korea) [1]	Total number of home loans closed, 1944 through December 1954 [2]	Percent of home loans to VA population
Akron, Ohio	55,030	14,967	27.2	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	144,880	48,197	33.3
Albany, N. Y	62,780	15,180	24.2	Mobile, Ala	23,800	4,255	17.9
Albuquerque, N. Mex	20,900	9,535	45.6	Nashville, Tenn	37,920	14,829	39.1
Allentown, Pa	50,100	10,688	21.3	New Orleans, La	79,320	17,062	21.5
Atlanta, Ga	81,780	31,853	38.9	New York, N. Y. and N. J	1,556,650	342,080	21.8
Augusta, Ga	20,000	6,853	34.3	Norfolk, Va	49,570	9,472	19.1
Austin, Tex	20,540	5,439	26.5	Oklahoma City, Okla	44,800	32,374	72.3
Baltimore, Md	157,490	52,398	33.3	Omaha, Nebr	42,200	10,742	25.5
Baton Rouge, La	19,700	6,732	34.2	Orlando, Fla	13,400	3,821	28.5
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex	24,310	6,896	28.4	Philadelphia, Pa	443,630	141,553	31.9
Birmingham, Ala	63,510	17,987	28.2	Phoenix, Ariz	37,000	8,379	22.6
Boston, Mass	349,280	119,339	34.2	Pittsburgh, Pa	292,930	50,749	17.3
Bridgeport, Conn	62,900	13,302	21.1	Portland, Oreg	85,190	13,576	15.9
Buffalo, N. Y	127,730	42,990	33.7	Providence, R. I	90,730	14,682	16.2
Charlotte, N. C	22,230	7,732	34.8	Richmond, Va	38,700	13,700	35.4
Chicago, Ill	677,830	77,738	11.5	Rochester, N. Y	56,000	22,395	40.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	102,160	15,725	15.4	Sacramento, Calif	38,350	16,197	42.2
Cleveland, Ohio	179,920	38,451	21.4	St. Louis, Mo	188,780	32,006	17.0
Columbus, Ohio	60,960	11,274	18.5	Salt Lake City, Utah	35,010	8,670	24.8
Corpus Christi, Tex	21,400	8,644	40.4	San Antonio, Tex	55,880	21,038	37.6
Dallas, Tex	83,760	32,433	38.7	San Bernardino, Calif	34,000	13,969	41.0
Dayton, Ohio	52,270	12,406	23.7	San Diego, Calif	72,330	20,450	28.3
Denver, Colo	76,430	26,912	35.2	San Francisco, Calif	288,450	102,696	35.6
Detroit, Mich	367,770	99,104	26.9	San Jose, Calif	40,000	21,013	52.5
El Paso, Tex	23,020	6,024	26.2	Seattle, Wash	85,830	33,360	38.9
Flint, Mich	33,780	6,338	18.8	Spokane, Wash	22,530	7,274	32.3
Fort Worth, Tex	45,800	15,075	32.9	Springfield, Mass	57,600	18,650	32.4
Fresno, Calif	32,340	7,544	23.3	Stockton, Calif	22,750	6,059	26.6
Grand Rapids, Mich	33,820	5,559	16.4	Syracuse, N. Y	40,300	16,217	40.2
Hartford, Conn	65,500	15,242	23.3	Tacoma, Wash	33,200	14,400	43.4
Houston, Tex	111,800	53,284	47.6	Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	46,890	10,465	22.3
Indianapolis, Ind	68,500	13,960	20.4	Toledo, Ohio	49,260	10,647	21.6
Jacksonville, Fla	37,440	16,490	44.0	Washington, D. C	196,070	53,078	27.1
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	102,570	32,818	32.0	Wichita, Kans	32,900	18,447	56.0
Knoxville, Tenn	40,290	6,670	16.6	Youngstown, Ohio	67,390	13,744	20.4
Los Angeles, Calif	547,700	217,948	39.8	75 metropolitan area			
Louisville, Ky	68,070	14,443	21.2	Total	8,639,350	2,355,637	27.3
Memphis, Tenn	55,400	25,165	45.4	United States total	17,005,000	3,607,101	21.2
Miami, Fla	67,660	31,336	46.3				
Milwaukee, Wis	100,640	17,005	16.9				

[1] The veteran population estimates by counties are based on the 1950 census adjusted to prevailing conditions in the second half of 1953. Some of the estimates may appear conservative due to difficulty to appraise fully migratory trends in fast expanding areas.

[2] As of the end of 1954, most of the VA home loans closed were for World War II veterans. The share of Korean veterans was nominal but it was increasing steadily in relative importance. While less than 4 percent of the cumulative total of home loans closed through 1954 were for Korean veterans, such loans accounted for about a quarter of all home loans guaranteed in 1954 alone.

Sources: Loan Guaranty Section and Reports and Statistics Service of the Veterans' Administration.

As this table clearly indicates, there are still many areas of the country where veterans have, as yet, not had full opportunity to exercise their home loan guaranty benefits:

TABLE II.—*Veteran participation in VA loan program in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties (cumulative as of end of December 1955)*

	Number of counties	Estimated veteran population December 1955	Total number loans made	Loans made as percent of veteran population guaranteed loans		Estimated number of veterans who have not used entitlement
				Home loans	Direct loans	
All United States counties	3,074	18,894,000	4,623,716	22.5	0.4	14,270,300
Metropolitan counties [1]	282	11,761,500	3,519,257	28.3	.1	8,242,200
Nonmetropolitan counties, medium size [2]	148	1,281,000	288,908	20.9	.6	992,100
Nonmetropolitan counties, small [3]	2,644	5,851,500	815,551	11.0	1.1	5,036,000
Small nonmetropolitan counties which are wholly eligible, by veteran population size groups:						
5,000 and over	45	371,200	47,256	10.8	1.3	323,900
2,500 to 5,000	284	1,199,400	142,721	9.1	1.5	1,056,700
1,000 to 2,500	959	1,930,300	201,711	6.9	1.4	1,728,600
Under 1,000	1,018	750,900	63,827	4.4	1.5	687,000

[1] Metropolitan counties, as classified by Bureau of Census.
[2] Nonmetropolitan counties where 1950 population of largest city was between 25,000 and 50,000.
[3] Nonmetropolitan counties where 1950 population of largest city was less than 25,000.

As table II shows, they have been more prone to exercise their rights in metropolitan areas, and the larger ones at that, than in open country outside the metropolitan areas or in the smaller towns. For example, 28.3 percent of those living in the larger cities have used their rights, whereas only 11 percent of those living in the smaller metropolitan counties have done so, and less than 10 percent of those living in counties with less than 5,000 population. This clearly indicates that whether or not the veteran has exercised his right depends on the availability of housing under GI terms; because financing under GI terms has not been so readily available in the smaller towns, the veterans in those towns have been denied a full opportunity to exercise the privileges which the Congress granted them. To close out the program before they had received fuller opportunity to exercise these rights would not only be a denial of their rights, but would be distinctly unfair treatment as compared with veterans who happened to be living in the larger cities. This would be particularly unfortunate at a time when VHMCP and the direct-loan VA program appear to be offering a remedy, in part, to this inequity.

Moreover, many of the veterans who have obtained home loans still have remaining substantial portions of their entitlement; at least 90 percent of all veterans, particularly, those receiving their home-loan guarantees before August 1954, have some entitlement left. As a matter of fact, 2 out 3 vets who have used their entitlement have from $3,500 to $5,500 left of the $7,500 entitlement available to them.

TABLE III.—*Percent of entitlement used and remaining for VA home loans (cumulative through August 1954)*

Number of loans:
Total 3,703,000
Home 3,420,000

Amount of entitlement used	Percent	Entitlement remaining
Up to $2,000	18	$5,500 or more.
$2,000 to $4,000	48	$5,500 to $3,500.
$4,000 to $6,000	22	$3,500 to $1,500.
$6,000 to $7,500	12	$1,500 or less.

Probably most of the loans closed since August 1954, have been for the full entitlement or nearly so.

HOW MANY VETS ARE LIKELY TO USE THEIR GI BILL IN THE FUTURE?

No specifics are available on this outside of the Bradley study figures.

However, we can make some estimates based on age of the veteran population. The typical home-buying veteran, according to a survey made last year by the VA, was 32 years old.

As of December 31, 1955, there were 2,218,000 veterans under 29 years of age in the veteran population; and an additional 5,062 were between 30 and 34 years of age, giving a total in the home-buying age range of over 7½ million veterans.

The VA has prepared additional data which show by age groups the number of veterans who have not exercised their veterans' benefits. See table IV following:

TABLE IV.—*Use of GI home loan guaranty by vets with World War II service*

[Numbers in thousands]

Age	Total	Have used entitlement		Have not used entitlement	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25 years and under	65	7	10.7	58	89.3
26 to 29	1,888	408	21.6	1,480	78.4
30 to 34	4,765	1,322	27.8	3,443	72.2
35 to 39	3,902	1,187	30.4	2,715	69.6
40 to 44	2,066	533	25.8	1,533	74.2
45 and over	1,862	325	17.5	1,537	82.5
All	14,548	3,782	26.0	10,766	74.0
Median age		35.6		35.7	
35.7 years					

On the basis of the figures in table IV, it is evident that there is a very large number of veterans, over 5 million in the home-buying age group—under 35—who have not yet used their entitlements and will lose them under terms of the current law.

This fact is emphasized by the large number of this group under 29 years of age—1,538,000—who are well below the average home-buying age and who, in many cases, have not yet arrived in their personal lives at the state where they are ready to be homeowners.

TABLE V.—*Median age of World War II vets who have used their entitlement for home loans by year of loan origination*

Year of loan origination	Total of all ages	Median age end of year loan made
	Thousands	
1944–45	20	29.3
1946	389	29.0
1947	506	29.4
1948	329	30.0
1949	252	30.3
1950	469	30.5
1951	439	31.1
1952	292	31.4
1953	278	32.0
1954	332	32.7
1955	476	33.6

OLDER VETS ARE NOW USING THEIR ENTITLEMENT

Moreover, as table V shows, the median shows, the median age of the vet using his entitlement has steadily risen. In 1946 the typical vet who received his entitlement was 29 years old; each year the age has risen, and by 1955 the typical vet who received a VA guaranteed home loan was 33.6 years of age. This indicates the likelihood that a large number of those in the 30–35-year age group who have not yet made use of their entitlement would probably do so if the opportunity were available through extension of the benefits beyond the current cutoff date. Thus, in the earlier days of the program its major value was to the veterans just approaching 30, who had already reached the family status where home ownership became desirable. In more recent years, maximum usage has been evident by somewhat older veterans who have taken somewhat longer—perhaps because of educational requirements—to make their permanent living arrangements.

Assuming that 400,000 veterans exercise their rights between now and July 25, 1957, this leaves a total of 4.6 million still potentially in the market.

Apply further the rule of thumb that 1 out of 4 veterans will exercise their rights—more than 1 in 4 in the under 35-age group—but this group does include some who have already made relatively permanent arrangements. On this basis, it is assumed that if the benefits are extended for 3 years, that over a million more veterans will take advantage of their GI rights to purchase a home if the program is extended to 1960.

The statistics clearly indicate that in recent years the program has had even more importance for veterans and for the home-building economy than in earlier years, that it has gradually come to be one of the really significant props for our economy.

TABLE VI.—*Total private housing starts and starts under VA as percent of private starts*

Year	Total private starts	VA starts	Number of home loans closed		
			Total	New	Existing
	Thousands	*Percent*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	*Thousands*
1951	892.2	14.6	447.3	286.4	122.8
1952	939.1	13.2	306.4	192.2	109.4
1953	932.8	14.7	322.0	202.8	115.2
1954	1,077.3	25.5	410.7	243.1	164.1
1955	1,190.2	30.0	649.4	387.6	255.5

As the table VI shows, year by year since 1951, the program has been of more and more use to veterans. One in every 7 homes started in 1951 was under the VA program; close to 1 in 3 last year was GI. The total number of home loans closed mounted steadily in those years, from 447,373 in 1951 to 649,412 in 1955. At the same time, an increasing proportion of these were for new homes, increasing from 286,432 to 387,647 in 1955. The 1955 totals of home loans closed, both new and existing were at all-time highs for the program.

These are scarcely the characteristic features of a program on its way to expiration. They reflect a program which has been of increasing use to the veteran, never more than in the past year, and one which will probably continue to be of value to him unless the stopper is pulled. As a matter of fact, if abruptly terminated, the program will terminate at the height of its usefulness to the veterans in our population.

In the opening months of 1956, this pace, though down somewhat, has continued, with the volume of starts and home loans closed all continuing at very high levels indeed.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT

Entirely apart from the hardship on the individual veterans who, for valid personal reasons, may have been prevented from exercising—prior to June 1957—the housing opportunities open to millions of other veterans, the cessation of the program on that date will have far reaching economic impact.

The years from 1955 through 1960 are the so-called soft years in the housing market. They are the years when the low birth rates of the 1930's will show up in a lower net family formation, certainly below the 1950–55 level. The impact on housing demand from this negative factor will, undoubtedly, be a factor until the war and post-war baby crop starts forming their own families in the 1960's at which time a surge in new family formation can be expected.

In the years right after the war, net household—nonfarm—formation rose to 1.5 million; in 1950, it was 1.6 million, but by 1955, it had fallen to about 850,000, and will continue at that level or slightly lower for the rest of the decade.

To remove the added stimulus that can be given by the continuing availability of GI benefits at this time will have a more severe effect on the home building economy than it will have in the years after 1960, and then it might have had in the earlier years of great housing shortage and consequent high demand.

To eliminate the GI program at this period is to restrict housing aids at the very time when liberal terms are most needed.

The overall housing economy in the last few years has been greatly influenced by the availability of the GI programs. Housing started under the VA program has, in recent years, been an increasingly larger part of the total as the table shows:

TABLE VII

Year	New private starts	VA starts	VA as percent of total
	Thousands		
1950	1,150.7	(1)	(1)
1951	892.2	148.7	14.6
1952	939.1	141.3	13.2
1953	932.8	156.6	14.7
1954	1,077.3	307.0	25.5
1955	1,190.2	392.8	30.0

[1] Not available.

These figures clearly indicate the uptrend in the relationship of VA starts to total new home building. That relationship is more significant now than at any time in the past, and any abrupt shift—such as will be occasioned if the law is allowed to terminate on June 25, 1957—will have a very serious impact on the home building as well as the overall national economy.

At 392,800 units, 1955's new GI housing accounted for over $4 billion of our national product, provided over 400,000 man-years of employment on site—at least an equivalent amount of offsite employment.

A careful review of the situation indicates that at the very least the consequences of allowing the law to terminate, as scheduled next year, will mean a severe disruption of home building in many areas of the country, as well as an inevitably sharp cutback in total housing production and employment.

VA PROGRAM HAS BEEN BENEFICIAL IN HELPING TO PROVIDE A VOLUME OF MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

Despite a continuing increase in sales price, the typical VA house has still been priced somewhat under the conventionally financed home. In 1954, the average veteran paid $11,640 for his home compared with a Bureau of Labor Statistics average for all homes of $12,300. Since the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures include the VA, it is obvious that the VA program has held the overall average down, and the average for houses financed outside the VA and FHA programs would be even higher than $12,300. In 1955, the typical VA house sold at $12,476, compared with $13,700 reported for all houses by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Thus, elimination of the program moves in precisely the opposite direction from the trends of housing legislation in recent years. Its elimination will make even more difficult the task of providing good private housing for lower and middle income families, and will mean a step backward in the achievement of the goal of providing good housing opportunities for all Americans.

Nonveterans, too, have profited as a result of the VA loan guaranty program. Millions have been provided with an opportunity to purchase homes that would otherwise not have been available had this program not been in existence. It has enabled the builders to produce a home at a price commensurate with the family income. This was accomplished largely because of the builders' ability to purchase large quantities of materials and to develop mass production techniques in building. This mass building program has provided financial stability for the building tradesman, kept him steadily employed at the highest income levels he has ever experienced, therefore enabling him and the other millions of middle-income families to purchase numbers of homes never before possible in the history of the country.

IMPACT OF AN ARBITRARY CUT-OFF DATE

Although it has been known for some time that the law was scheduled to terminate in mid-1957, it is clear that the full impact of this onrushing date has not been anticipated by individual builders and suppliers in the industry. Few, for example, realize that its effects will begin to be felt in the early fall of 1956, since the July 25, 1957, cut-off date applies to the guaranty, not the housing start. Thus, if the termination date stands, it will be an abrupt shock for the private home building industry, one which will create a substantial amount of dislocation, and eventually of severe economic difficulties for many builders and suppliers and related industry groups, their millions of employees, and the veterans and nonveterans alike, since it comes at a time when homes started under the VA program amount to from 25 to 30 percent of the total.

It will also mean an enormous jam-up in most VA offices in the late months of 1956 and early months of 1957, as it becomes known more generally that the GI program is about to expire. It is scarcely necessary to point out the unfavorable consequences such logjam would have on the smoothness of operation not only in the offices, but in the home building economy.

Also, earlier figures have indicated that wide range of difference in the use of the GI program. This points to the additional fact that those areas in which GI home loans have been an important part of the construction economy will feel the impact of termination even more than other areas where it has not yet played an important part. For example, in some of the areas of rapid growth, such as the west coast and southwestern areas, the GI program has, in recent years, accounted for close to 40 or 50 percent of all new home building. The impact on the economy of these localities will, undoubtedly, be severe.

Cities such as Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas, Houston, and so forth, have all suffered from the impact of the recent change in mid-1955 on FHA and VA maturities and downpayments. It is not difficult to understand how much more direct and devastating an effect elimination of the entire VA program for World War II vets will have in these and similar communities all over the land.

FHA CANNOT TAKE OVER THE VA WORKLOAD

The argument is sometimes made that much of the potential VA volume after the cutoff date will go to FHA. FHA volume of new units in applications is now running about two-thirds of the VA total in appraisal requests for new homes. FHA certainly does not have the staff or office facilities in most areas of the country to take on overnight a 150-percent increase in their workload. To add such

a staggering addition will mean swamping the offices as well as inevitably months of confusion in recruiting and training new personnel, even assuming that the FHA is given timely authority to expand its services, receives the necessary congressional appropriations, and can hire qualified personnel.

CONTINGENT LIABILITY EXPOSURE OF UNITED STATES TREASURY

It is sometimes argued that the contingent liability being assumed by the Federal Government under the GI program imposes an excessive burden on the Government fiscal status.

A 3-year extension, during which time volume will probably taper off—as indicated by the increasing age of World War II veterans—would impose little or no additonal liability on the Federal Government.

Payoffs on GI loans during 1955 amounted to about $2 billion. They are sure to increase in the years ahead, inasmuch as the mortgage schedule in effect makes for gradually increasing amounts of the monthly payment to go into mortgage reduction rather than interest with each year on the mortgage's life.

On the assumption that the level of new loans made will ease off in the next 3 years—in the event of an extension—to about 300,000 per year, then the level of new contingent liability arising out of these loans will be close to the level of payoffs on earlier mortgages, meaning no increase in total contingent liability.

VETERANS HAVE BEEN GOOD CREDIT RISKS

The VA loan guaranty program has not been a burden on the taxpayer.

By and large, veterans have made an astoundingly good record on their GI home loans. By January 31, 1956, the millionth veteran had repaid his GI loan in full; 809,511 of the repaid loans for a total of $4.6 billion, were GI home loans.

In the 10-year life—through December 1955—of the program, VA has had to pay claims on only 24,168 of the 4,353,000 loans made. It has paid out $66.3 million on these but has recovered to date $47.3 million, leaving a net loss—subject to still further recovery—of $18.6 million. Its loss on these loans has amounted to only 0.06 percent of the total amount of over $32 billion GI loans. Moreover, by the end of 1955, less than 1 percent—0.97 percent—of all loans outstanding were in default, a percentage which has declined year by year under the program; and of the 33,346 loans in default, only one-tenth of those were in serious trouble; on most of the rest of the loans in default status, it was anticipated that the defaults would be cured before they ran into serious trouble. That less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the outstanding VA loans are in serious default is truly a remarkable tribute to the stability of the GI program and the typical American veteran.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press carries the following story:

> The student newspaper at Princeton University said today that cancellation of a campus talk by Alger Hiss would mean that Princeton "can be browbeaten by outside pressure groups."

Apparently this is an admission that the invitation to Mr. Hiss is an inside job. What the students forget is that Hiss represents an outside pressure group, Soviet Russia. I might say to the professors at Princeton, "You ought to go back to kindergarten to teach the students to think a little better."

WASTE OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest that one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—a member in good standing of the political party that has for so long now made a big thing of preaching economy in Government—yesterday commended Housing Administrator Cole for having the courage to plan and schedule the forthcoming Women's Congress on Housing.

I, too, want to make note of Mr. Cole's courage in this instance. I think Mr. Cole is a most courageous man. It takes an awful lot of intestinal fortitude to publicly squander the taxpayers money in such a flagrant manner as Mr. Cole is doing. And speaking of courage, I wish to congratulate my Republican colleague for being so daring as to publicly defend Mr. Cole's waste of our tax dollars—and to do this even in an election year. I deeply regret that my admiration for my colleague's courage cannot, however, extend to his sense of fairness or accuracy. In his remarks yesterday the gentleman indicated that I indicated "that what women think, particularly with regard to the choice of a home they wish to occupy is 'silly and useless.'" Nothing could be further from the truth. Anyone who will do me the courtesy of reviewing each and everyone of my pronouncements on Mr. Cole's "Housing Contest" will quickly and surely see how completely out of context my colleague has quoted me.

My use of the words "silly and useless" were never directed at Mr. Cole's recognition that the women of America were the best possible experts on the subject of what should be in a house. I denounced—and still do—as "silly and useless" Mr. Cole's need to gather this information from the ladies and, even more important, the wasteful method by which he proposes to do it. I question the need for Mr. Cole to gather this information; first, because the Government agency he heads does not build homes—it insures mortgages and supervises local authorities in the construction of public housing units; second, because Mr. Cole already has on hand enough information on What People Want When They Buy a House to publish—less than 4 months ago—a whole book on the subject.

However, if Mr. Cole feels compelled to learn all over again what people want when they buy a house, I submit that he should obtain all his information by standard business methods which would cost the taxpayers far less than his "Housing Contest."

Surely my Republican colleague remembers a few years back when Mr. Harlow H. Curtice was head of the Buick division of General Motors and each year the automobile owners of America received a questionnaire in which they could check off—with or without comment—the features they would like to have incorporated in their next car. Seeing what has since happened to both Buick sales and to Mr. Curtice, I suggested to Mr. Cole that he too might adopt this proven approach of General Motors as a substitute for his silly, useless, and expensive contest gimmick. This truly might be one instance where what is good for General Motors is good for the United States.

JONQUILS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my gratitude and appreciation to the gentleman from the great and beautiful State of Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and to his very thoughtful constituent for the very beautiful daffodils or jonquils, which they have provided for us in the restaurants and other rooms of the Capitol. They brought sunshine and cheer to us, and I enjoy them so much. This is only one of the many courteous and kind things my colleague, Mr. TOLLEFSON, has done for the Congress.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers this morning informed us that President Eisenhower, in signing the upper Colorado River bill, remarked:

> This bill represents what I believe in—treating a whole river valley as a unit, as a whole thing.

As one who has long supported this country's oldest and most outstanding example of comprehensive, basinwide resource development—the Tennessee

Valley Authority—I want to express my gratification that the President has finally come to the realization he expressed yesterday.

If the President really believes this—and I have no reason to doubt it—then this is great news for the TVA and those who support it.

The principles of comprehensive, unified river development, first expressed over 50 years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt, were written into the TVA Act 23 years ago and have been faithfully followed ever since. Now that President Eisenhower has reaffirmed these principles and stated his belief in them I am hopeful that the TVA can look forward to more deserving treatment at the hands of the Eisenhower administration.

Those of us who support TVA and also voted for the upper Colorado—and there were many of us—are in favor of comprehensive river-valley development wherever it is feasible. We agree with President Eisenhower that a whole river valley ought to be treated as a unit. We are now ready for him to take the next step and act as responsibly toward the Tennessee Valley Authority as he has toward the upper Colorado.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 9052.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me today be vacated and that the same privilege be extended to me at the conclusion of the legislative business on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR THE COAL INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 400) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study on the possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States. In particular, the committee or subcommittee shall seek to determine—

(1) whether or not there is a possibility of developing under existing law, a cooperative research venture in which the Federal Government, interested and affected State governments, as well as industry, labor organizations and private corporations might participate; and ascertain what part the agencies might play in a research and development program and in what fields Federal or State governments might best cooperate;

(2) whether or not there is a possibility that an effective research program for coal might be developed in the same magnitude, and on the same general organizational basis, as those which have been and are now currently conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the National Science Foundation, and similar groups;

(3) and investigate fields of research into which such a program might delve in order to accomplish the best and most expeditious results for an economic revival of the bituminous coal industry. Such fields of research should cover the general categories of coal production, coal transportation, coal distribution (market studies, and so forth), coal utilization in conventional forms, development of new and expanded uses of coal, including gasification, chemical production and a general appraisal of all coal technology;

(4) what progress has heretofore been made in the production of synthetic liquid fuel in the overall energy program and what advances in our present knowledge and skills with respect to the production of synthetic liquid fuel may be reasonably anticipated in the future; and

(5) whether the public interest would be served by the construction of a plant for the conversion of coal into a synthetic fuel to permit more rapid development of techniques for the production of synthetic liquid fuels, since it is inevitable that the exhaustion or conservation of other fuels will require synthesis fuels to assume major importance in supplying the energy requirements of the Nation in time of war and peace.

Economic projections of future industrial requirements are in general accord that, so far as the energy supply is concerned, greater dependency must be placed on coal which has the largest reserve of any of our known fuel sources. Paradoxically, the Federal Government is appropriating billions of dollars for research and development projects in the field of new energy sources, but little or no consideration is given to a study of the possibilities for wider utilization of coal.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 10, strike out all of line 10, down to and including line 18.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield for my friend to make a statement. I have no knowledge of his proposed amendment. It has never been submitted to me. I do not know what it is all about.

Mr. FENTON. I am sorry. It is just a clarifying amendment to strike out one word "bituminous."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will let me have it for a few minutes, as soon as I get through with my remarks, I will be glad to look it over.

Mr. FENTON. It just strikes out the word "bituminous."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield for the gentleman's amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think it would be wiser for the gentleman from Virginia to offer the amendment; otherwise he might lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the Chair for calling my attention to the parliamentary situation. I would not want to lose the floor.

Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 13, after the word "the" strike out the word "bituminous".

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the word bituminous, was inserted through error. The preamble of the resolution calls for a study of the coal industry, and nowhere throughout the whole resolution except at that one point does the word "bituminous" appear. I spoke to the author of the resolution. He has agreed to the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. For what purpose does the gentleman want time?

Mr. FULTON. I just want to place myself on record as being in favor of the resolution and hoping that it passes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution providing for an investigation of the coal industry with respect to research that might be conducted that would lead to further uses of that valuable national resource. It has been felt for some time by the coal industry that comprehensive research might well develop many uses for coal that are not now known that would be of great assistance to the industry. The matter was very ably presented to the Rules Committee and it was the unanimous opinion of that committee that the resolution was desirable and the committee recommended it.

The amendment to strike out the word "bituminous" is simply in order to make it plain that this resolution is to foster research in all types of coal, bituminous as well as anthracite. That was the purpose of the author of the resolution, and that is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] asked me to yield him a minute so he could get away. I do not see him on the floor.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] has requested that I insert his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. For what purpose?

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to comment on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will yield to the gentleman in due course.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am in full agreement with the purposes of House Resolution 400, which would authorize a study leading to the establishment of a research and development program for the coal industry. I wish to commend my colleague [Mr. SAYLOR] for introducing this resolution, and the House Rules Committee for reporting it to the floor for action. This is a worthy undertaking, one that will mean much to the coal-producing areas of the Nation. It has my full support.

We are all aware that the coal industry is vital to the welfare of our Nation. However, in recent months this important, basic industry has suffered a declining market and unemployment has resulted. This resolution will aid the industry, which has made considerable recovery in recent weeks, to continue these strides. It will help to assure that the industry remains strong and able to provide the huge quantities of coal needed in our Nation's economic life.

My own State of Virginia is a large producer of bituminous coal, and this production is concentrated in my congressional district. The economy in certain of my southwest Virginia counties is based on coal, which has played a steadily important role in the economy since the first trainload was hauled from the area 70 years ago. Coal is Virginia's most valuable mineral asset, accounting for considerably more sales than all other minerals lumped together.

I strongly contend that the future of the Nation's and Virginia's coal would be strengthened by the adoption of this resolution. It will authorize a study leading to the establishment of a cooperative research and development program. The need for such research in the general categories of production, transportation, distribution — market studies—coal utilization in conventional forms, development of new and expanded uses of coal, including gasification, and a general appraisal of all coal technology, is generally recognized. This resolution is the first step in getting such a broad program of research started.

The distant outlook for coal cannot be forecast with any degree of accuracy. However, I believe that without a doubt the Nation can expect an enormous increase in the consumption of its energy resources during the next 20 years. It seems to me that coal will continue to play an important, major role as a source of this energy.

I urge adoption of this resolution as a means of getting under way the necessary research and development of our coal industry, so that we will be ready as the need continues to grow. Technological advances, I am sure, can operate in many ways to brighten coal's future. The program envisioned in this resolution will hasten these technological advances.

WEST VIRGINIA NEEDS A FEDERAL COAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today I believe to be one of the most important proposals to come before us in this session. Our industrial civilization is in constant search of new sources of energy and additional supplies of raw materials. These are the very life blood of the technology which supports our Nation.

In recent years, we have been greatly preoccupied with the development of atomic energy. This new source of power has fired the imagination of all of us. We have spent and are spending untold billions to harness the energy of the atom. It is money well spent, but in our enthusiasm, I believe, we have lost perspective and failed to realize the enormous possibilities of chemical fuels—particularly coal. Our fabulous coal resources, if exploited fully and intelligently, can provide an abundance of low-cost power and thousands of products as yet undreamed of.

The promise of atomic energy is an exciting one. However, there are many difficult problems in its exploitation, some of which are unlikely to yield to early solution. For example, the massive shielding now needed for protection from radioactivity rules out the application of atomic power in small powerplants such as are needed for automobiles, trucks, farm tractors, and so forth. No promise of solution is in sight.

An even more serious problem exists in the disposal of atomic wastes. Presently, they are being dropped in deep excavations, then embedded in concrete and the site then fenced off as a dangerous radioactive area. It has been suggested that these wastes be placed in rockets and shot off into space.

It is generally conceded that even with the solution of many of these problems, atomic power will still be more expensive than power generated by chemical fuels in areas where chemical fuels are abundant. In our country, fabulous reserves of coal are distributed through 23 of the 48 States. These reserves are estimated, at the present rate of extraction, to be sufficient to serve the needs of several generations.

As a fuel, coal has been most effectively used in the generation of electric power. A ton of coal today produces three times as much electric power as it did a generation ago—the result of painstaking and intelligent research.

However, energy is but one of a multitude of products available from coal. It is perhaps the most versatile raw material on earth. The aspirin tablet you take for a headache, the rayon cord in the tires on your automobile, the dye which colors the clothes you wear, and hundreds of other products you use, are coal derivatives. The door of this treasure house has barely been cracked. It can be opened wide through research.

Some aspects of coal development and research cannot be delayed. Each year our demands for petroleum products climb—and over the years our dependence on foreign sources has steadily increased. At the present time we procure about 10 percent of our petroleum from foreign nations. The bitter experiences of World War II with shocking tanker losses by enemy submarines demonstrated the folly of dependence on petroleum supplies from abroad which must be shipped by sea.

There is no need for this heavy leaning on petroleum supplies from overseas. Research already completed demonstrates the feasibility of converting coal into petroleum products.

Some processes using coal already approach costs which are competitive with fuels refined from crude oil. Additional research can bring this price down even further. In view of steadily rising costs of petroleum exploration, it is not inconceivable that eventually coal can provide liquid fuels at lower prices than crude oil.

The general welfare and our national security will benefit immeasurably from a coal research program to extend its uses and reduce production costs.

The research program must also have a conservation objective. While our coal reserves are enormous, they are not inexhaustible. Research is needed to constantly increase the rate of recovery in mining operations and to devise economic methods for extracting coal from deep and narrow seams. Research must be applied more intensively to achieve maximum use of the energy in coal.

H. Res. 400 calls for coal research on a scale comparable to that now being applied to fissionable materials and atomic energy. I believe that this proposed program will be immensely rewarding and will achieve results at a far more rapid rate than current research programs on atomic energy. The demands of our technological economy and civilization on our natural resources are growing at a fantastic rate. Let us now undertake a research program in coal, our most valuable resource, and prepare not only for current demands, but for the needs of generations to come.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]

for his initiative in bringing to the floor House Resolution 400, which, if approved, will authorize a complete study by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows, the Nation's supply of bituminous coal is adequate to meet the needs of our people for hundreds of years to come, but the question is, How can it be used to the best advantage from an economic, industrial, and social standpoint?

Already much research is under way in the coal industry, and it is my opinion that House Resolution 400 and the study it authorizes will not only open up new fields f research and development but will also coordinate the present program and the results obtained to date.

Like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], I represent a district located in the heart of the bituminous coalfields of Pennsylvania, where coal is a basic industry.

Suffering from unemployment over a period of years because of the inroads made by substitute fuels, we welcome this effort to further explore the potential usages of the great deposits of coal that are part of the great resources of this Nation.

In studying House Resolution 400, I find that it is primarily for research and development, and while my suggestion may be foreign to the intent of this resolution, I hope that the study will reveal, among other things, the glaring inequities that exist in regard to freight rates and other preferential treatment enjoyed by competitive fuels which have destroyed numerous markets of the coal industry in this country.

If the coal industry of this country is treated fairly by the Federal Government, and if new usages are found for coal, there is no doubt in my mind that the coal industry again will take its rightful place as a basic industry of the United States, and a pillar, both in the field of national defense and in the economy of our Nation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I heartily approve of the objectives expressed in Representative SAYLOR'S resolution, House Resolution 400. I regret that it was cleared for House action with the words "and directed" stricken from the measure. The aims of a coal research and development program are so important to our economy that we should permit no opportunity for delay in beginning the study. The future for the coal industry has brightened since the low ebb of 1954 and its present improved position is due to the favorable climate provided by the present administration. I would like to draw the House's attention to the problem faced by the coal producers through the loss of markets in the dieselization of the railroads and the shift to gas and oil for household purposes—a loss which amounted to about 35 percent of the market. It is gratifying to report that much of this loss is being set aside by increased demand of the steel and utility industries. The most important gain, though, has been made in the export market which has increased threefold since 1954. In fact, exports this year are likely to total some 50 million tons.

The future of coal is so important to our economy that I feel the House should authorize the study provided for in Representative SAYLOR'S measure. Yet, I am bound to say, I do not believe the Congress should be content with an Interior and Insular Affairs Committee study, as valuable as it may be. The Congress should authorize a broader search for new uses for coal and its byproducts and for new markets. I am of the opinion this can best be done by the Secretary of the Interior and have introduced a joint resolution directing such a study be made. The joint resolution would also authorize the funds necessary to pursuit of the research program. I have included in my joint resolution a provision for a study of methods of preventing the deterioration of the physical plants of idle coal mines—plants idled for the lack of markets. It is important to maintain our coal-producing facilities as a ready reserve in the event of a national emergency.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] Chairman of the Rules Committee, for granting a rule on this resolution and bringing it before the House at this time. I personally know that this action is appreciated by all the Members from coal-producing areas. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished Majority Leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] for having this resolution called up at this time so that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee can begin to work on this great problem.

Regardless of the section of the country which an individual Member may represent, it is unlikely that he will find any objectionable provisions in House Resolution 400. True, the objectives of this resolution are applicable to an industry that is currently producing in only 26 of our States; yet every area and every community of this Nation will become progressively more dependent upon the productive capacity of this industry as the years go by.

If my colleagues from States far removed from the Nation's coal districts are inclined to question this assertion, let me make it clear that I am not necessarily implying that at some time in the future you will be getting coal shipped right into your home areas. It is of course understood that every person in the Nation uses coal in some form or another—whether it is in clothing that comes from coal chemicals, or in plastics, medicines, and the thousand and one other items whose origin is in bituminous coal. Even if somehow we were able to distinguish between whether these products came from a coal or a petroleum base, there is no escaping the fact that the steel and steel products in your home, automobile, and other everyday facilities were produced through the use of bituminous coal. Without coal, there would be no steel. The steel industry consumes a ton of bituminous coal for every ton of steel that comes from its mills.

When I say that the coal industry will become a progressively more important part of your life in the years to come, I refer to other considerations which Congress cannot overlook and which Congress should not delay in resolving. We are all aware of the fact that the country's reserves of oil and natural gas make up only a very small proportion of the total energy resources in nature's storehouse. Together, they account for somewhat less than 2 percent of the reserves of traditional fuels. Solid fuel reserves, on the other hand, are so abundant that the 1⅓ trillion tons of mineable coal remaining amounts to perhaps 90 percent of the overall total. Oil shale accounts for most of the remainder.

Our great petroleum and natural gas industries are doing a remarkable job in uncovering new reserve pockets of these valuable fuels. The fact remains, however, that the United States and the world are consuming more and more petroleum and natural gas, and fuel experts do not hesitate to remind the general public that stocks are being depleted at an enormous rate. The need for supplementing domestic oil and gas supplies is always spotlighted as the reason for importing great quantities of these products. The quantity of imports and the types of fuels that are admitted into this country are a constant source of controversy right here among us, so that issue is one with which we are all familiar.

What happens as our supplies of petroleum and natural gas begin to fall below demand? The answer has been provided by engineers within the Government, the petroleum and natural-gas industries, and the coal industry. We will get our liquid and gaseous fuels from oil shale and coal by synthesis. I believe that the following two paragraphs from the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission of 1952 explain very emphatically what I mean when I say that the constituency of every one of our 435 Members will be dependent to a greater extent upon coal at some time not too far away. Let me quote these paragraphs:

> At some point beyond 1975, however, more serious problems are likely to arise when natural gas supplies will eventually have shrunk to the point that the general uses in gas-producing areas and special uses in all areas are forced to shift to substitute fuels. Costly dislocations may result in the economy of the Southwest, heavy capital costs of conversion will be forced upon nearby and distant customers, and the extensive transportation, distribution, and utilization systems may be rendered useless.
>
> The impact could be reduced if it becomes economic to manufacture gas for at least some of these gas customers, presumably from coal, which could then be distributed through portions of existing transmission and distribution lines, though large segments of such lines would probably be no longer used.

The same analysis may eventually be applied in the case of oil and oil products. Even before it is necessary to begin ship-

ping synthetic fuel substitutes into areas in which oil and natural gas are native resources, gas and oil by synthesis will have to supplement supplies in other parts of the country; otherwise, you would find shortages right in your own backyards, and I am sure that conservation laws within the individual producing States are going to prevent the exportation of materials needed in your home communities.

In addition to this economic implication, coal must be ready at all times—as long as ruthless international aggressors are on the prowl—to take over a greater part of the energy load at a moment's notice. If an emergency develops, the military machine will make such tremendous demands upon the petroleum industry, in particular, that great quantities of coal will have to be diverted as replacement fuel; in addition, coal's own markets will call for vastly increased supplies. Coal, then, is of vital importance to the national economy and the national security.

For the further elucidation of the Members of the House, I should like to offer a quotation from the White House Report on Energy Supply and Resources Policy. This report was issued in Februray 1955, after an exhaustive survey which included meetings and discussions with representatives of all the fuel industries as well as disinterested economists representing government and other segments of our economy:

7. Research and development program for coal: We recognize that coal is a great national asset and endorse a cooperative study to determine what research and development could be undertaken. The coal industry and both Federal and State Governments should participate in this study and its cost.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for keeping the coal industry in a vigorous condition and for assuring that it will reach points, where and when needed, is now an accepted economic principle. House Resolution 400, which I introduced and is now being considered, covers not only the production, transportation, and distribution phases, but also includes utilization and other ramifications affecting the industry, its labor forces, and—in effect—the public welfare.

House Resolution 400 proposes only that a study of the possibilities for a research and development program for the United States coal industry be authorized and directed. After the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had an opportunity to carry out such a study, the House will of course be presented with whatever recommendations may evolve and will thus be able to decide upon the feasibility of these proposals. No commitment of any kind is contained or implied in House Resolution 400, other than the actual study described therein.

I trust, therefore, that this resolution will receive the unanimous approval of the House of Representatives at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support the Saylor resolution. This resolution calls for a study of the coal industry. The study would deal with the production, transportation, and distribution of coal, as well as its utilization.

The information gained by this study would not be the sensational type that occasionally comes out of Congress, but it would be a report which would be of great value, not only to the coal miners and coal companies but to our entire national economy. All too little attention has been paid to the coal industry, by our Government. This is not intended as criticism of our present administration any more than of the past administration. For many years the coal industry has been a neglected stepchild of each administration. No protection was given to the coal industry from the importation of residual fuel oil from South America. Billions of dollars have been spent to subsidize hydroelectric powerplants which have at times been constructed in the midst of coalfields. In spite of all this, coal is essential to the economic and industrial life of America in an increasing degree. Today production of coal is steadily increasing. Practically all of the hydroelectric power in the Midwest has already been developed. The needs and demands for power by industry is increasing at a rapid rate and in the foreseeable future this power can only be obtained from coal. The entire chemical industry is becoming more and more dependent upon coal and research in the use of coal may well discover many new uses. The gas and oil reserves of the United States are being depleted at a rapid rate and at the present time constitute less than 2 percent of our total fuel reserves. On the other hand, 92 percent of our fuel reserve consists of coal. Only approximately 3 percent of our entire coal supply has as yet been mined and there is in the United States at this time more than a thousand billion tons of minable coal. There is another possible development which our country is in no way preparing to meet. If for some reason the oil from South America and the Near East should be denied us, the rationing of oil and gas becomes immediately necessary, and our coal reserves take on even greater significance. The coal industry should be maintained in a manner which would permit it to expand quickly in an emergency, not only for heat and power but as the best product to be used in the manufacture of synthetic gasoline.

While there is abundant coal in our country, mines have deteriorated and for years we have not been training young men to be coal miners. This entire situation should be brought to the attention of all concerned as soon as possible.

The investigation called for in the Saylor resolution should place before all America the present and future use of coal. There are in southwestern Indiana, especially in the Seventh District which I represent, great economic possibilities. This area suffered economically when coal production decreased.

Seven of the eleven counties in my district have great coal resources. This entire area has the capabilities of enormous industrial development and has, as I previously stated, an almost unlimited supply of coal—coal especially valuable for the production of power. We already have great power production in that area and it can be increased to an almost unlimited extent at a reasonable price. This area also has ample water supply, excellent transportation facilities, both by rail and road, and greatest of all there is a surplus of labor of proven stability and efficiency.

I believe that America has before it a period of great industrial expansion, and I believe that a substantial part of that industrial expansion is going to center in the areas where there is ready access to coal, for coal means power, and America's future economy is a power economy. Those areas which have been forgotten in our economic development are going to become of increasing importance. The adoption of this resolution is a step in the proper direction.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the passage of this resolution and feel that this investigation will be most helpful to the coal industry.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the chairman of the Rules Committee in permitting me to offer my amendment to House Resolution 400 in addition to the amendments offered by the Rules Committee.

As stated before, it was an apparent oversight to use the word "bituminous" on page 2, line 13, since it was the only place in the whole resolution in which it appeared.

I am sure that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will do a fine job in their investigation and studies on the possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States which, of course, means bituminous, anthracite, lignite, and all types of coal.

The anthracite coal industry has indeed been in very dire straits for a great many years.

Our unemployment has been such that the anthracite area of Pennsylvania has been designated as a distressed labor area for quite a number of years.

With our vast coal reserves throughout the United States it is imperative, in my opinion, that a study be made such as contemplated in House Resolution 400.

I want to congratulate our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for introducing the resolution and concur wholeheartedly with him.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Our industrial development has reached a stage at which almost all future improvements will depend on detailed and complete research programs. In the past we have taken our good fortunes, in the form of almost unlimited natural resources, for granted, making little effort to develop sound industrial research programs. These great natural resources have enabled us to attain an outstanding position in world economy, even though a minimum of research was carried on by governmental agencies.

That policy, or rather lack of any research policy, was changed during wartime and a number of major research projects were initiated. The atomic age was initiated by the expenditure of billions of dollars in public funds for the most daring and courageous research program in the history of the world. We continue to pour hundreds and millions of dollars annually into research on industrial use of atomic energy, but we have dismally failed to continue our other industrial research programs. We have all but given away such outstanding projects as our synthetic-rubber-research plants, our coal-to-oil research programs, and other major projects which were established in the time of need. The Louisiana, Missouri, coal-to-oil research plant was able to produce gasoline with a cost of only 2 cents above the standard commercial production cost of gasoline, yet this plant was all but given away and has been dismantled. There is every reason to believe that had the research project been continued, the process developed would have been able to successfully compete with current prices and remain a ready substitute for gasoline as our oil reserves become depleted. This new use of coal would have been a real boon to the coal industry and at the same time the increase of reserves for future production of gasoline, which is essential at all times. Such projects should not be limited to our war effort, and research into industrial uses of a major source of power such as coal is fully justified in both peace and war.

House Resolution 400, introduced by the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, proposes an industrial research program designed to study the byproducts of coal and develop new uses such as the production of oil and gasoline from this fuel which has proven to be the best source of power our country has. Our fossil fuels, which have served as the major source of power for our great industrial development, may be utilized to a much greater extent than they have in the past. It is time to apply at least a portion of our national income to research programs for a more complete utilization of coal and its products. Our coal resources, while best developed in the eastern mountains, are available in almost unlimited quantities in every geographical region of the country. We should not stand by in the fond hope that our atomic research will make this new source of power available for all industrial needs but, rather, look at it as a source of energy for future generations and plan for more intensive and intelligent use of established resources such as coal.

Our known recoverable coal reserves are sufficient to maintain the current rate of production for several hundred years. On the other hand, known reserves of oil and natural gas, chief energy fuels that can be used as a substitute for coal, are sufficient to maintain the current rate of production for only 25 years. Considerable study has been made on the production of oil from coal and oil shale. In fact, this Congress authorized the expenditure of $89,600,000 on such a reserve program from 1944 to 1955, inclusive. This work was discontinued during the past 2 years, even though the progress was such that many of the scientists working on the program felt that it should have been considered successful, and, at the worst, was on the threshold of a successful completion.

Almost two-thirds of our electric power is produced from coal and less than one-third by hydroelectric installations. Oil and gas play a minor role in the production of electric power. During the 35 years from 1920 to 1954, hydroelectric power production increased fivefold while steam-generated electricity increased twelvefold. This ratio has undoubtedly continued the trend toward dependency on steam-generated electricity during the last 2 years which have seen the greatest increase in the production of steam-generated electricity of any 2-year period in our history with no major new installations for hydroelectric production being either completed or under construction.

In the face of this future shortage of oil and gas fuels and the current policy limiting the development of hydroelectric power, it is a must that we give more attention to coal and its uses.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, coming from the Nation's largest coal-producing State, the State of West Virginia, and realizing the bad situation surrounding the coal industry at the present time, I want to be recorded as being in hearty accord with the intent and objective of this resolution. Knowing, too, that the anthracite coal industry is in difficulties, I can also go along with the amendment that was added to the resolution making it broad enough so that it will cover all of the different categories of coal.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for his efforts, also to the gentleman from California who sponsored the resolution, to the Rules Committee for making it possible for it to be considered on the floor today and to the leadership for permitting it to be brought up at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending resolution to authorize a study leading to the establishment of a research and development program for the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, in each Congress since the 81st I have introduced a resolution calling for a broad study of the coal industry. The resolution before us is not as all inclusive as mine was, but it, nevertheless, is a good, big step in the right direction, and it is entitled to the support of the entire membership of the House.

The resolution gives the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the necessary authority to "conduct a full and complete study on the possibilities of a research and development program for the coal industry of the United States."

For a long time now, the distress, the unemployment, the hunger, and the misery in America's coalfields have called for an investigation. Not only that, the conditions that exist in America's coalfields call for such remedial and helpful legislation as the Congress may consider and pass.

I have been disappointed that the Congress has failed to consider and pass remedial legislation. The Members here present know that I have urged it to do so. It would be in keeping with the history and practice of American Government that our Government show the distressed coalfields some special consideration. You ask what can be done? Here is what the Federal could do. It could favor the distressed areas with building programs, such as improvements of the rivers of the areas involved. Housing programs could be geared to favor such areas. The unsuitable, and oftentimes unfit, school buildings of the distressed areas could be rebuilt. Needed highways could be built. There are many approaches to the problem. The Government could, as an official policy, encourage industries to locate their expanded plants in such areas.

Mr. Speaker, our Government is pursuing a feeble policy with respect to rebuilding the economy of our coalfields. We are wonderfully blessed with coal. We have enough to do a thousand years. It is a potential source of liquid fuels for the future. The resolution before us should be passed. Then, we should go on to do much more to relieve the unemployment of the coalfields.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that there is not a lump of coal mined in South Carolina, but we are very much in favor of this resolution in the national interest of this country.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if there are no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FURTHER PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in announcing the program a little earlier, I overlooked mentioning the fact that Tuesday is primary day in New Jersey, and if there are any rollcalls on that day, they will go over until Wednesday. I have conferred on this matter with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. While I doubt there will be any rollcalls on Monday, if there are, we have agreed that they go over until Wednesday, also.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit all of next week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be vacated and be rescheduled for Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PETITIONS TO FORCE CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 11 TO HELP HOMETOWN MERCHANTS AND OTHER SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has made much of the point that the discharge petition was filed for the consideration of H. R. 11 after a date for hearings had been announced. Incidentally, a Member told me today he had just signed and his number was 173. We lack 45 more names to make the needed 218.

The fact is, there is no necessary relationship between the discharge petition and his announcement to hold hearings on the bill. I am sure it was announced by me that a discharge petition would be filed before the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] called hearings on this bill for the latter part of April, too late to be effective this session.

The gentleman's main point is that the discharge petition is unnecessary.

I suggest that the discharge petition will still be necessary after the committee of which he is chairman, has held hearings.

Necessary for what? The gentleman from New York has not indicated for what purpose the discharge petition is unnecessary. If our purpose is merely to let small-business people come in and repeat what they have already said many many times to the Judiciary Committee and to a number of other committees of Congress on this issue, then I would agree that the discharge petition is unnecessary. But this is an extremely grave matter to small business people. They will not be content just to come in to speak their piece. Small business wants the bill passed. Many of us here in the House want the bill passed; and I suggest that if it is passed the discharge petition, with 218 names on it, will be necessary.

NO NEW ISSUES INVOLVED

If this were a new issue, or if the language of the bill were new, that would be a horse of another color. The fact is that the precise issue presented by H. R. 11 has been the subject of almost continuous hearings, study, and debate in the Congress over the past 8 years. Before that the precise issue was the subject of hearings and debate in 1935 and 1936, when we finally passed the Robinson-Patman Act. And before that, the precise issue was the subject of hearings and debate in 1914 when the original Clayton Act was passed. Before that, the Supreme Court thrashed the issue over in several famous antitrust cases during the first decade of this century. I dare say that there is no other single business problem which has been so much debated and so fully understood.

NEW HEARINGS UNNECESSARY

Beginning with hearings and debates of 1935 and 1936, the gentleman from New York has had his fingers continuously on this problem; he has in fact played a big role in all of these debates. During the past 8 years, the Committee on the Judiciary has, on several occasions, held hearings on the precise issue presented by H. R. 11. As late as May of last year, the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which subcommittee is chaired by the distinguished gentleman from New York, heard the arguments and pleas of all of the small business organizations on the precise issue presented by H. R. 11, and H. R. 11 itself. The subcommittee also heard the principal spokesmen in opposition to H. R. 11. Surely the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee knows the temper of his committee on this issue. He is as intimately acquainted with the 42-year history of this legislation as any man alive. I should think that by now that he even knows the temper of his own mind and knows how he stands on the issue.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION MUST BE PREVENTED

What is the issue? It is quite simple. It is the practice of price discrimination. This is a practice by which big business abuses its power—its sheer size—to take unfair advantage and to destroy small business. Big suppliers destroy small suppliers. Big buyers get unearned advantages in the prices they pay, and these advantages add to their ability to squeeze out smaller buyers. Since all business firms are both buyers and sellers, unchecked discriminations in price give big business a double unfair advantage over small business. Small businesses are destroyed without respect to their efficiency—as several hundred small business firms now are being destroyed in each week of the month that rolls by.

COMPARE WITH CHAIRMAN CELLER'S BILL

Now the distinguished gentleman from New York is the author of an antimerger law. I believe that he now has a bill pending for strengthening the procedures for enforcing that law. His antimerger law does not prohibit all mergers. But it does prohibit mergers where, and I quote:

> The effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

Now would it not be absurd if we tacked another qualifying amendment onto this law which says that it is all right for big corporations to merge with the effect of substantially lessening competition and creating a monopoly if the corporations merge in good faith?

Yet that is precisely the absurdity which has been attached to the antiprice discrimination law. It was attached to the law by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil of Indiana case in 1951.

H. R. 11 removes that absurdity. It uses precisely the same language that appears in the antimerger law. It says simply this: Good faith is no excuse for violating the antiprice discrimination law where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

NINETEEN FORTY-NINE EFFORT TO NULLIFY ACT

In 1949 some of the opponents of the Robinson-Patman Act undertook to nullify the act as to its real purpose—which purpose was to give small-business protection against the abuse of big-business power. Senator CAPEHART headed a subcommittee which held extensive hearings, and S. 1008 was the result.

On the Senate floor it was pointed out that the good-faith defense in S. 1008 would nullify the Robinson-Patman Act as an instrument for protecting small business. It would have, as reported to the Senate, made good faith an excuse for price discriminations even though the discriminations substantially lessened competition and tended to create a monopoly. The bill was amended on the floor of the Senate, by what was known as the Kefauver amendment. That amendment allowed the good-faith proviso of the bill to stand, but added to it the following proviso:

> Except where the effect will be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

In September 1949, the House Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on S. 1008. It took out the safeguarding Kefauver amendment and substituted some ineffective language. On the floor

of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] pointed out that the committee's language would restore good faith as an excuse for abusing power to the extent of substantially lessening competition and tending to create a monopoly. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] offered a substitute amendment which I believe is the same language which is in H. R. 11 today. That Carroll amendment was fully debated on the floor of the House. The distinguished gentleman from New York then opposed it, but the House adopted it.

CHAIRMAN CELLER HAS RECORD AGAINST H. R. 11

There was then a conference with the Senate and the distinguished gentleman from New York headed up the House conferees. The conferees reported the bill, neither the Carroll or Kefauver amendments, but substituted language which would tend to nullify the law. Many of us felt that the conference report was outside the limits set by the House and the Senate bills and the parliamentary question was raised in the Senate on this point. The President of the Senate however ruled in favor of the conference report, saying that he thought that the conference language was within the general spirit of the language of both the Senate and House bills. S. 1008 passed but fortunately President Truman vetoed it.

NINETEEN FIFTY-ONE STANDARD OIL CASE

Then in the Standard Oil of Indiana opinion in 1951, the Supreme Court did precisely what the opponents of the Robinson-Patman Act had been trying to do. It ruled that the discriminatory practices carried on in good faith are exempt from the law even though these practices substantially lessen competition and create a monopoly. Further than that, the Court made a partial construction of the phrase "good faith." The Court declared that one supplier is justified in discriminating to meet another supplier's price, if the second supplier's price is a lawful one. In other words, the ruling was that one competitor's obeying the law justifies another competitor's breaking the law. I hardly think that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary needs give this proposition very deep study to find that such a construction of law nullifies the law.

Following the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana, there was a rash of bills introduced to do what was called to confirm this decision, and cement it into law. Naturally the opponents of the anti-price-discrimination laws had great fears and apprehensions that the Court would rather promptly have an opportunity to catch its error, and that it would reverse the Standard Oil of Indiana opinion. There was a bill in the Senate for this purpose, S. 719, and a companion bill was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] H. R. 2820. At that time the Committee on the Judiciary considered this issue and a subcommittee of that committee held hearings on S. 719 and a companion bill H. R. 2820. The committee did not report the bills; and as time has proved, it was unnecessary to cement the Standard Oil of Indiana opinion into law. It is now cemented into law, and as a result every week that passes several hundred small businesses are destroyed.

NUMEROUS HEARINGS ON QUESTION INVOLVED

Here are a few of the hearings which have been held in recent years on the precise issue presented by H. R. 11:

In January and February 1949, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on S. 236, the main issue being the same as that presented by H. R. 11 today.

In June 1949, a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on S. 1008, the principal issue being precisely the same presented by H. R. 11 today.

In June 1949 the full Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on S. 1008.

In June and July 1949 the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearing on S. 1008.

In July 1951 the Senate Small Business Committee held hearings on S. 719; the main issue being precisely the same as presented by H. R. 11 today.

In July and September 1951, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on S. 719 and a companion bill H. R. 2820, the main issue again being the same issue presented by H. R. 11 today.

In May, June, and September, 1955, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held extensive hearings on several monopoly problems, including extensive hearings on the same issue presented by H. R. 11 today. Representatives of all the small business associations testified on this issue, and opponents of the Robinson-Patman Act testified.

In May 1955 the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings at which representatives of all the small-business associations testified on the issue presented by H. R. 11 today; and the principal big-business spokesmen on this issue also testified.

In November 1955, the House Small Business Committee held hearings at which representatives of all the small business associations, as well as labor and farm organizations, testified on the same issue presented by H. R. 11 today. The big business spokesmen also testified.

Surely there has been enough testifying on this very simple issue: Should the law allow big business to abuse its power to the extent of substantially lessening competition and creating monopoly, or should small business have some protection against this deadly abuse of power?

GOOD FAITH DEFENSE

When the Robinson-Patman Act was being debated, the principal issue was the same "good faith" defense. The "good faith" defense had nullified the old Clayton Act. The principal purpose of the Robinson-Patman Act was to put a severe limitation on this defense and remove the loophole in the old Clayton Act.

The distinguished gentleman from New York opposed the Robinson-Patman Act. He led the fight against it. The bill did pass the House by a vote of 290 to 16. Prior to that there was a long history of the good faith defense under the original Clayton Act.

In 1914 Congress set about to pass a bill which would curb price discrimination and give small business somewhat a fairer chance to survive. Section 2 of the old Clayton Act was however amended to include the good faith defense. The result was, as you know, precisely the same situation we are in today. During the 1920's we had an unprecedented prosperity of big business, while small businesses were being destroyed by the tens of thousands.

A. & P. TEA CO. OPPOSES BILL H. R. 11

In terms of numbers, by far the greatest losses were among independent retailers and wholesalers. Tens of thousands of independent local merchants were destroyed for the benefit of a few big chains, and the greatest beneficiary of this monopoly practice was the Great A. & P. Tea Co. The hearings and investigations of our committee revealed unjustified discriminations made in the favor of A. & P. of such monstrous scope, that within a few more years there would have been no independent grocers left in this country.

It was a habit of many political orators in the 1920 decade to praise farmers and small businesses as the backbone of America. But farmers enjoyed a severe depression; and small business was well on the way to extinction; while only big business prospered.

In the first quarter of this year big business profits and stock-market prices have been at an all-time high. Small business failures on the other hand have been the greatest for any period since before World War II.

We are back where we were in the 1920's.

The issue is quite simple. I suggest it does not require any further hearings and consideration for Members to make up their minds. It is simply a question of which side we are on. Are we so much on the side of big business that we want big business to have the deadly advantage of a monopolistic practice, in addition to all the other advantages which big business enjoys? Or are we sufficiently on the side of small business, and the consumer, and our ideals of political freedom, that we will give small business some chance to survive and help maintain a competitive system of private business?

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States Advisory Commission on Information, established by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, yesterday submitted its seventh semiannual report. The law requires this Commission to transmit to Congress such semiannual reports concerning the policies and programs car-

ried on under authority of the act, including appraisals when feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs, and such recommendations as it deems necessary.

This Advisory Commission is made up of five public-spirited citizens who serve without pay and represent a cross section of professional and business experience in the communications field. The members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Dr. Mark May, director of the Institute of Human Relations, Yale University, is Chairman. The other members of the Commission are Edwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor; Siegurd S. Larmon, president of Young & Rubicam, Inc.; Judge Justin Miller, of Pacific Palisades, Calif.; and Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of directors of General Electric Co. I have had the opportunity to observe the work of the Advisory Commission firsthand and have come to know its able Chairman, Dr. May, and other members of the Commission. These men have carried on this most important work at great personal sacrifice to themselves. As professional men and experts in this field, they know the importance of an adequate United States international information program, the importance to our national security, and to the winning of a just and lasting peace. The members of the Advisory Commission are to be commended for the fine contributions they have made in strengthening the security of the United States and increasing the prospects of peace.

The Advisory Commission's report is divided into three principal parts. The first part addresses itself to an appraisal of the need for, and the work of the United States Information Agency. The second part is addressed to recommendations to the Director and actions taken on them. The third part of the report is devoted to recommendations to the Congress.

In part 1 an examination is made of the present challenge presented by the latest propaganda offensive of the Kremlin. It points out that events of 1955 have made it clear that the case of communism versus freedom will be tried in the court of world opinion. The Russian leaders have publicly stated that while their ultimate goal of world conquest remains unchanged, greater emphasis is to be placed upon the use of peaceful means for attaining their goal rather than acts of armed aggression which have become the international trademark of communism. It points out that Communist propaganda will now be presented with a smile and that a smiling Communist leader is a far more formidable opponent than a scowling one. The report emphasizes that the Kremlin leaders will continue to present their case in the so-called "spirit of Geneva" which, ever since the summit meeting, has been overworked as a Soviet propaganda theme. The Russians will try to delude people all over the world into believing that the "spirit of Geneva" is the harbinger of a stable peace. It is certain that the devious zigzag which has characterized Communist maneuvers in the past will continue on and will only be adjusted to fit the Communist goal for world conquest.

I would like to quote a part of this report which I believe sums up one of the greatest problems confronting us and other nations of the free world:

> Our military defenses, strong as they are, our economic aid to others, much as it is needed; our diplomacy, clever as it may be, are not in themselves enough to assure our national security. The effectiveness of our defenses, economic aid, and diplomacy depend to a large extent on how our acts and words are understood—the meaning they have to others.

All of this means the task that lies ahead for the United States Information Agency is a heavier one, and a far more difficult mission than it has ever before undertaken. To win the contest against Communist propaganda, the United States will be required to prepare and present its side of the case with the greatest possible skill and courage. We will be required to take positive and constructive steps to maintain free world alliances, to demonstrate to the so-called neutral nations, that it is impossible to dance with the Russian bear without losing one's national sovereignty and independence of action and at the same time, maintain the confidence of those hundreds of millions of people behind the Communist Iron Curtains who have had faith in us and in the cause of human freedom.

The advisory commission has made a number of recommendations to the director of the United States Information Agency and to the Congress as steps that should be taken in order to strengthen programs now being carried out by the United States Information Agency and to lay the foundation from which it will be possible to launch a winning program in what has so often been called the battle for the minds of men. The first recommendation to Congress is as follows:

> That the 84th Congress, 2d session, appoint a Joint House-Senate Committee on International Information.

The Advisory Commission has advanced the following arguments in support of this recommendation:

> For the past 3 years this Commission has believed that the appointment of such a committee would be instrumental in strengthening the work of the United States Government in this field. We would not ask the Congress to add another committee to the almost overwhelming number that now exists, were it not for the inescapable fact that the importance of information in international affairs, and for our own national security, is rapidly increasing. One sign of this is the fact that more and more Members of Congress are concerning themselves with the overseas work of our Government by making trips to the field.

For some time I have advocated that Congress establish such a joint committee. I have been aware that the Advisory Commission has made this same recommendation in three previous reports to Congress. As a member of the former Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, I became convinced, after a most intensive study of the international conspiracy of communism, that the importance of our international information programs justified the creation of such a joint committee. More recently and in recognition of the serious threat posed by the latest Russian propaganda offensive, I have become convinced that such a committee is an absolute necessity. During the last session of Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 433, which provides for the establishment of a Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs.

I am encouraged to note that this latest report of the Advisory Commission recommends that Congress take favorable action on my resolution—House Joint Resolution 433—during the present session.

House Joint Resolution 433 sets forth the purposes and duties of the joint committee which I have proposed. The purposes, very briefly, are as follows:

First. To conduct public hearings on and cause studies to be made concerning the extent and effectiveness of all United States international information programs. It is important for us to know whether or not the extent of current programs is sufficient to meet the worldwide challenge being made by the master propagandists of the Kremlin. It is important for Congress to determine, so far as feasible, the effectiveness of current programs in carrying out the mission which is set forth in Public Law 402, 80th Congress.

Second. To cause studies to be made of the techniques, special characteristics, and the various types of Communist propaganda. It is absolutely necessary for us to know in as much detail as possible what the Communist propaganda campaign is in every country of the world, just as it is important for us to identify the techniques and the special characteristics of their work. This basic information is necessary in order that we will be able to adequately and fairly judge the extent and effectiveness of our present international information programs. In addition, it is important that the American people be told about the tricks, the zigs and zags, and all other features of Communist propaganda, not only that which reaches our shores but also that which seeks to cause other people of the world to hate the American people. At the present time this important function is not given full time or regular attention by any committee of the Congress.

Third. To inquire into the extent to which scientific research and development in the field of mass communication has progressed in the United States and the degree to which such scientific advances are used in our international information programs. It is a well-known fact that the Russians are working overtime on new types and facilities of mass communications in the hope that they will develop devices which, for all practical purposes, will make all the people of the world a captive audience. The Russians attach as much, if not more, importance to progress in the field of mass communications as they do to the development of an intercontinental guided missile. The United States must not be allowed to lag in any way in either scientific research or development in the field

of mass communications. This committee would make certain, by methods of inquiry and consultation, that we do not fall behind and that our information programs are making maximum use of all the scientific advances in the field of mass communications. No committee of Congress is at this time concerned with these very important questions.

Fourth. To provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between Congress and the information programs through regular discussions and conferences with the executives and policymakers of such programs. Members of Congress have individually made substantial contributions to the work of our information agencies. Many other Members, I know, feel that Congress can make an ever-increasing contribution to this important work. I am certain that the executives in charge of our information programs would welcome the opportunity for regular consultation and exchange of views with a joint committee of Congress which takes the time to study and understand the grave problems which they must face up to and which must be quickly resolved.

I also believe Congress can and should develop a better public understanding of both the need for, as well as the objectives of our international information programs. The tremendous advancement of science in the last 50 years has, for practical purposes, so reduced the size of this earth that the vast expanse of the past is gone. Long and tedious journeys of the past have been reduced to but hours of luxury travel. Communications which once took many months are now carried out in a matter of seconds. Science has made possible communications on a mass scale which at times defy the imagination. It is no longer a luxury to have an adequate international information program. It is an absolute necessity. That is the kind of world we are living in.

Fifth. It is a well established fact that in any undertaking or program which seeks to accomplish anything worthwhile, errors and mistakes are likely to occur. This is a fact which is immediately recognized by anyone who has attempted to do anything at all worthwhile. It is only reasonable to expect that in a public undertaking as important as the mission assigned to our international information programs, that some mistakes are bound to occur. I say this because such undertakings and programs of necessity are required to pioneer into fields of activity which are new or untried by American free enterprise. I believe that if our information programs are worth the investment we make in them, they are certain to make some errors. But what is important is that Congress and the executives of our international information programs know when an error or mistake has been made and move rapidly to correct it. Moreover, we must make allowances for an honest difference of opinion on what may be the best course for us to follow in a given situation. In some instances involving important issues, the answer as to which should be the proper course to follow may not be determined until a course of action is well under way and the practical results begin to appear. I am sure that my colleagues will agree that the more important the issue, very often this makes more difficult the decision as to the course of action to be taken, and consequently any error that occurs in these circumstances is almost always a grave one. A joint committee of the Congress would, in my opinion, serve the purpose of catching mistakes at an early date so that corrective action can be taken as well as making unnecessary public attack upon the work of any of our information programs as a means of bringing about corrective action. Perhaps more important in this connection is that a joint committee, working with the executives in charge of our information programs, will minimize the probability of errors and mistakes in the conduct of our information programs.

And finally I should like to point out that President Eisenhower, in a meeting with the leaders of Congress during December 1955, called for a vastly expanded effort in our international information programs in order to meet the latest propaganda challenge being made by the Kremlin conspiracy. President Eisenhower, in calling for added support from Congress for this program, received the assurance of our distinguished Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, that Congress would not be found wanting in facing up to this grave problem. Speaker RAYBURN, following their conference at the White House, publicly stated that Congress should strengthen our foreign information program and he pointed out that in this field—"I think we have been lagging. We have been defeated all over the world in propaganda."

Our foresighted majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK, has, on innumerable occasions, pointed out the need to expose the evil conspiracy of communism and to present to all the people of the world the truth concerning the United States hopes and aspirations for all the people of the world, together with our willingness to make every sacrifice to attain that great goal of peace and freedom.

The very able chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. RICHARDS] has also called for an expanded effort on the part of our international information programs in order to meet the duplicitous worldwide challenge of communism. All of us know the great dedication that Mr. RICHARDS has brought to the work of our Foreign Affairs Committee, and the great contribution he has made by his careful analysis of and objective approach to those grave dangers which confront our American way of life. I cannot help but express at this time my regret that this able and dedicated leader is retiring from Congress and that in future sessions, we will not be able to count upon his always profound and sage advice.

All of these leaders have made it abundantly clear that our own national security demands that we face up to the worldwide challenge to human freedom now being made by the Russian leaders in the Kremlin. It is most fitting, therefore, that we, as Members of Congress, should respond to the call for assistance made by President Eisenhower, and the urging of our congressional leaders for an expanded and vastly strengthened international information program.

I want to pay tribute to the fine work which has already been accomplished in the information field by the chairman [Mr. ROONEY] and members of the subcommittee on appropriations. Members of Congress are aware that despite the many other important tasks assigned to that subcommittee, the chairman and its members have made noteworthy contributions to the development of sound and more effective international information programs.

I am very encouraged that a distinguished Member of the other House yesterday introduced in the Senate a resolution identical to House Joint Resolution 433. I hope that a goodly number of other Senators will have the opportunity to study the purposes of this resolution and will join in support of its introduction. I feel certain that those Members who have long been interested in the development of a sound and winning international information program, will see the merit as well as the urgent need for Congress to take favorable action on that resolution.

I hope that every Member of this House will take the time to read this very significant and timely report which was made to Congress yesterday. It carries a message which bears upon the security and well-being of the American people and the hopes of all mankind for a peace with justice for all. I am hopeful that Congress will see fit to increase our participation in the important work carried on through our information programs. One way we can do that is by putting into affect the recommendations to Congress made by the Advisory Commission on Information, which Congress itself set up to make certain that the purposes and spirit of Public Law 402, 80th Congress, were carried out. I hope that before this session of Congress ends, authorizing legislation will have passed for the establishment of a joint committee on international information programs along the lines set forth in House Joint Resolution 433.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who has made a remarkable contribution to the improvement of our international information programs by his advocacy of a project which all of us have come to know as the Classics of Democracy.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. What the gentleman is interested in, as I take it, is winning the battle for the minds and hearts of men the world over?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, indeed. I firmly believe that the great opportunity is ours for the taking, to win a just and lasting peace, and to prevent world war III. To do this it is my conviction that we must engage in positive and imaginative and practical programs calculated to win the minds and hearts of men the world over.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman realizes, and I believe the distinguished Committee of which Dr. May is Chairman, that at the present time we seem to be losing in that battle. I am convinced that we will certainly lose that

battle unless we attach to our international information programs the importance that I believe they deserve. We have got to make certain that the executives in charge of those programs are provided with the wherewithall to carry on a winning program.

But, as I understand it, there is no similarity between the resolution offered by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and the resolution offered in the Senate by the gentleman from Montana to create a joint committee to overlook the work of the CIA.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The gentleman is correct. The resolution which I have proposed has nothing to do with the work of our intelligence agencies. Moreover, it has nothing to do with the work carried on by our established security agencies. This resolution addresses itself exclusively to the work carried on by our international information programs. I should like to make another point clear. The joint committee which I have proposed is not in any sense to be considered a watchdog committee. The joint committee which I have proposed has a much more important mission, and that is why I have taken the time today to spell out in my opening remarks the purposes of the joint committee.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thought it was well that the gentleman should make that very clear. This is merely to study and to augment and aid the work of the Congress, the work we are already doing in that field?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. My colleague from Illinois is absolutely correct in stressing the positive aspects of the work which the joint committee which I have proposed will carry on.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I was very much interested in reading in that remarkable report by Dr. May's Commission that the recommendation was made that the 84th Congress adopt a resolution providing for a joint committee in this field.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. I was most encouraged to see that the Commission for the fourth time has made this same recommendation to Congress. In my judgment, this latest action by the Advisory Commission emphasizes the importance of this recommendation which they first made as far back as February 1953. I hope that Members of Congress will take into account the persistent effort made by the United States Advisory Commission on Information in support of the creation of a joint committee of Congress on international information programs.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I was also interested in reading the recognition given to the work, of which I am a humble part, the greater part belonging to the great citizens of Chicago who started it, that provide for translation into inexpensive editions of the Classics of American Democracy, to be distributed all over the world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I believe that the Advisory Commission is to be complimented on bringing added public attention to the work of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] by making very favorable and specific reference to the Classics of American Democracy in its report to Congress yesterday.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. When the idea of a project for Classics of Democracy was presented to editors, educators, labor leaders, capitalists, leaders in all our activities, the verdict was unanimous that such a work should be undertaken.

It was surprising to me when I first went into it to find that even the Federalists papers had been translated, and that inadequately, into only 1 or 2 languages. Following the interest shown by the leaders of America who responded to the questionnaire the United States Information Agency organized a pilot project to test out the idea of conveying in approximately 10 foreign languages, the basic political and social concepts which form the foundation of American life. For example, the Federalists were translated into Italian. Within several weeks some 40,000 or 50,000 copies of that translated version were sold to the Italian public who welcomed literature of this type because it was most inspiring to them as well as comforting to them in meeting many of the problems which they must face each day.

I mention that as only one small phase of what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio contemplates in his resolution; that is, that in all these fields where we can get to the minds and hearts of men we want to do it; and, of course, in the doing of that efficiently and promptly there should be it seems to me as proposed by the gentleman from Ohio the guiding and the advising of a joint committee of this Congress.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think the joint committee which I have proposed would be of inestimable value in helping the executives in charge of our international information programs in carrying out many projects similar to that proposed by our colleague from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Incidentally, I want to tell the Members of the House that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois was the one who started this idea of translation of the Classics of Democracy into many languages of the world for distribution at a very cheap price, certainly in an edition within the financial reach of working people throughout the world. I am confident that projects such as this are an excellent means by which we can convey to the people of the world a true picture of our political institutions, our social system, our customs, ideals, economy, and aspirations.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for the diligence he has shown in pursuing his objectives in this, and I certainly hope that his resolution is adopted by the other body and that within the course of the next month or six weeks this joint committee can be created and be in operation during the present session. I say this because it is my conviction that we will lose the fight against the intensified worldwide Russian Communist propaganda program if we delay any longer in having Congress accept a full and responsible role in the development of our international information programs.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think the creation of the joint committee which I have proposed will go a long way in helping us to win that fight. I have said on many occasions in the past that the struggle between the forces of human freedom and those of Communist slavery is the most dangerous fight that has ever faced mankind in the history of the world. The outcome of this struggle may very well determine the destiny of all mankind for hundreds and hundreds of years. It is time for Congress to accord adequate recognition to our international information programs because the people responsible for running those programs occupy the front lines in the struggle for the minds and hearts of men. If that front line is broken, we are almost certain to be plunged into a devastating world war III. If that line is held successfully, it can avert World War III, and bring us to an era of peace, prosperity, and freedom.

I urge you, my colleagues, to read and give your most careful attention to the proposal which I have made for the creation of a Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs.

ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the political problems of Israel are closely related to the physical aspect of the country and to the type of civilization which has so recently been developed there. A visit there is, therefore, of unusual importance in affording an insight into the problems of the area.

Two recent visits have given me an opportunity to see the setting in which the problems of Israel arise, and to form certain judgments about them.

The most vivid impression following such a visit was that here had arisen a modern democracy with a bustling type of machine-age life similar to what one might find in an American community. This remarkable development had taken place in a short period of time, and stood out the more because of the less developed aspect of some of the other areas in that corner of the world.

The next most vivid impression was of the courage and determination of the people who had built up this land, and were taming the deserts and the rocky hillsides, much as American frontiersmen had developed our own country. This courage and initiative is evident in the faces and bearing of the people. They carry themselves proudly as become a people who are making such rapid strides.

A third impression is that here is a small country where intensive efforts are needed to make the land productive, where every acre is important, and where the frontiers are always but a short distance away.

It follows that frontier incidents and border disputes, which might be of minor consequence to a large nation, affect the very vitals of this much smaller nation.

It follows also that such a country is vulnerable to sudden attack, that the lines must be held right at the frontiers, and that defensive arms and measures are of unusual importance.

Difficult conditions now confront Israel as the result of a recent war with her neighbors, terminated only by an uneasy armistice. The country faces blockade of its land communications on all sides. War in the area is threatened, and that is now upsetting the whole world.

Our own Government has authoritatively stated that the continued existence of Israel is a basic tenet of American policy. That policy of course implies much more than existence. It means existence in an atmosphere of peace and friendliness with opportunity for prosperous trade and all the rights which other nations enjoy.

If that be American policy, the time has come for us to reassure ourselves that we are taking the best and wisest steps to implement that policy and to aid in bringing about peace in the area.

Secretary of State Dulles in his speech of last August 26 stated that the United States would participate in an international loan to enable Israel to pay compensation to refugees, and also to make possible irrigation and water development projects, and would be willing under certain conditions to join in collective security measures for the area.

But it seems now that more is needed. I was impressed by the remarks of Senator DUFF of Pennsylvania at a dinner held by the conference of American Jewish organizations in Washington on January 18, 1956. He stated that now was the time for decisive action in the Near East, and urged that the free world "should guarantee the existing borders between the disputants," and should "offset arms to Egypt by arms to Israel—not to encourage an arms race but to maintain a proper balance between them."

Since then there have been many similar expressions in editorials and articles. The opinion has been expressed that present American policy has not been effective, and only the other day a leading New York newspaper called for a "bold, new policy."

I agree with that, and, speaking only as an individual, urge the following action:

First. The United States should sell defensive arms to Israel in order to maintain the balance of arms in the area and to offset the recent flow of arms from Iron Curtain countries to Egypt. Even if help from the outside could be expected in case of aggression against Israel, arms would still be necessary to ward off immediate attack and until effective help could arrive.

Second. The United States should furnish no arms to Israel's neighbors so long as they refuse to negotiate in good faith for peace.

Third. The leading nations of the free world should offer a security pact to Israel which would be open also to her neighbors; and if this cannot be arranged, then the United States should make such an offer. The Tripartite Declaration of 1950 is only a declaration, and should be backed up by a more definite commitment, which only a pact or treaty can provide.

Fourth. In view of the fact that the Tripartite Declaration contemplates the possible use of force, congressional authorization should be sought by the request for passage of a Formosa-type of declaration, giving advance authority for military measures in a defined area and under defined conditions, if later found necessary.

Finally, the policies announced by Secretary Dulles in his speech of August 26 last, referred to above, should be implemented and vigorously carried forward.

This is the type of bold, new policy which will bring the greatest benefit both to the United States and to the Middle East area. It is also clearly in the interest of the Western World to aid and preserve this western-oriented democracy and outpost of the free world. This policy will sustain and preserve a nation with which the United States has had mutual friendship since its birth as a nation, and in whose development the United States and her citizens have played such an important part.

This is a dynamic program which will answer the charge that our policy has been indecisive, and which will go far to assure peace in the Middle East.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), for April 12 and 13, on account of official business.

Mr. CANFIELD for April 12 and 13, on account of official business (member, Board of Visitors to Air Force Academy).

Mr. JACKSON for 10 days commencing Monday, April 16, on account of official business (Los Angeles, Calif., hearings of House Committee on Un-American Activities).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SADLAK, for 15 minutes, on May 3.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 45 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. BAILEY, for 1 hour on Wednesday next, vacating special order for Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ZELENKO.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BAILEY and include a news dispatch from Nagoya, Japan.

Mr. LONG and to include related material.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $240.

Mr. HARRIS and to include a speech.

Mr. ELLSWORTH and to include a letter.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 12. An act to provide an improved farm program.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 12. An act to provide an improved farm program; and

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 16, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1736. A communication from the President of the United States, relative to urging that legislation be enacted such as is outlined in a letter by the Secretary of Defense, reviewing the serious nature of the personnel situation in the Armed Forces. It also outlines the major legislative proposals which the administration has presented to the Congress as a means of improving military career incentives (H. Doc. No. 378); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

1737. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on our examination of the United States assistance program for Egypt which the International Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and the predecessor agencies have conducted, pursuant to the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 832) and pertinent prior legislation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1738. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1739. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-count indictment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1740. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington covering the period July through December, 1955, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1741. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1957 for the Small Business Administration involving a net increase of $19,600,000, and proposed revisions in 1957 programs of the Department of Defense "Civil functions" (H. Doc. No. 379); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7850. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9511. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 470. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9824, a bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution for consideration of S. 2972, an act to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9052. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949 to continue for an additional period of 3 years the authority provided thereunder for the regulation of exports; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10457. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the matching formulas for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10458. A bill to provide for the prevention of the erosion of the banks of the Bayou Barataria; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10459. A bill to improve the United States Code by enacting into law title 26 entitled "Internal Revenue"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 10460. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 10461. A bill creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10462. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10463. A bill to provide for a term of court of the fifth circuit court of appeals to be held at Miami, Fla., in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 10464. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to remove existing limitations on the total amounts which may be made available to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands under the public-assistance programs in that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10465. A bill to relieve certain veterans from liability for repayment of amounts erroneously paid to them while members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10466. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10467. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 10468. A bill creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10469. A bill to amend section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide an additional period for World War II veterans to obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 10470. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 10471. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, relating to venue generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 10472. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 10473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the benefits of section 1231 shall be available with respect to livestock held for any purpose by a taxpayer for 6 months or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 10474. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide immediate annuities to widows without dependent children of employees who die in the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10475. A bill to establish a Veterans Preference Employees Appeals Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas (by request):

H. R. 10476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide a soil exhaustion allowance for land used in farming; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 10477. A bill to prohibit the payment of pension to persons confined in penal institutions for periods longer than 61 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10478. A bill to amend section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, to provide for the disposition of certain benefits which are unpaid at the death of the intended beneficiary; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10479. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the county of Galveston, Tex.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H. R. 10480. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 13, 1953, relating to the amendment of farm units on Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on H. R. 5550 for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution to provide that the United States delegation in the United Nations request free elections in the Slovak nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 468. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to employ one additional employee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 469. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the various means of utilizing the civil and military airports in the Detroit, Mich., area; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging arms for Israel due to threat of Arab aggression with Communist arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary for the removal of certain Federal restrictions on the raising of crops for the feeding of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 10481. A bill for the relief of Magoji and Eiju Nakashima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10482. A bill for the relief of Biagio Vertuccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 10483. A bill for the relief of Aloisia and Margarete Herzog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 10484. A bill for the relief of Myrrine and Fitzgerald Christie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 10485. A bill for the relief of Kan Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 10486. A bill for the relief of Theodore Triantafillopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10487. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James B. Daunais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10488. A bill for the relief of Simeon Krammer also known as Sidney Krammer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10489. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mrs. James T. Worley, Andrews, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10490. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mr. John W. Cadenhead of Meadow, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10491. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mathew G. Mathews, Denver City, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10492. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Mrs. Lillian Beal Williams, Tokio, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10493. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Marvin B. King, Bledsoe, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10494. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to the descendants of James H. Haney, Bledsoe, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 10495. A bill for the relief of Dennis Da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 10496. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Kreen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10497. A bill for the relief of Franca Van Landingham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10498. A bill for the relief of Tsuruichi and Hatsu Shibata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10499. A bill for the relief of Raul Banuelos-Felix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

882. By Mr. BOW: Petition of George C. Tyler and others of Tuscarawas County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

883. By Mrs. GRIFFITHS: Petition of all organized groups of Ukrainian women in metropolitan Detroit in cooperation with branches of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of Detroit and the Federation of American Ukrainians of Michigan, urging the enactment of legislation to institute appropriate action in the United Nations, with the object of firm defense of millions of political prisoners in U. S. S. R., tortured, in overt violation of the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

884. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. R. B. Cash, Little Rock, Ark., and others urging favorable consideration of H. R. 4264 which grants a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I who are 60 years of age and which authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe regulations to carry out these provisions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

885. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of P. C. Brown, Renick, W. Va., and 40 other residents of Greenbrier County, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

886 By Mr. KING of California: Petition of the Angel City Branch No. 24, National Association of Letter Carriers, containing the signatures of approximately 3,000 Los Angeles letter carriers opposing coordination of civil service retirement with the old age and survivors' insurance (social security) as embodied in the Reed bill, H. R. 9090, and the Carlson bill, S. 3041, and favoring liberalization of civil service retirement as contained in the Morrison bill, H. R. 8812, and the Johnston bill, S. 2875; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

887. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of VFW post, Sully, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

888. Also, petition of VFW post, Hedrick, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

889. By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of residents of Massachusetts requesting separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

890. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of Donald P. Ryde, Grosse Pointe Park, Mich., and other residents of Detroit, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

891. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of J. W. Wasson and other citizens of Jasper County protesting the passage of H. R. 9075 in its present form; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

892. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. Rebecca J. Williams and 1,173 other residents of Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, California, Illinois, Indiana, New York, and Egypt urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

893. By Mr. VORYS: Petition of 44 residents of Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

894. Also, petition of 90 residents of Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

895. Also, petition of 45 residents of Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

896. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Henry B. Williams, of Anchorville, Mich., and 44 others, urging enactment of legislation providing for a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War II, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before La Crosse, Wis., Shrine Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege recently to deliver an address before the Shrine Club of La Crosse, Wis. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from that address.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES 10-POINT PROGRAM FOR WISCONSIN DEVELOPMENT

(Excerpts of address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, at Shrine Club, La Crosse, Wis., April 6, 1956)

COMPETITIVE RACE WILL BE INTENSIFYING IN 48 STATES

These days, we hear a great deal about competitive coexistence between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I need not comment in detail to you, the members of the Shrine (who know the great patriotic record of our own Shrine organization), how significant is this coexistence race. We of this country must make sure in this jet-atomic age that we stay ahead in the race for national survival. We must make sure that we are well prepared—on the home and foreign fronts—against any danger that may arise.

PATRIOTIC RECORD OF THE SHRINE

The Shrine, as we all know, is the playground of Masonry.

But the Shrine has its serious moments too. And throughout all Shrine activity, there runs the undertone and overtone of patriotic service, of promoting civic welfare and human betterment whether it be on behalf of crippled children or any other worthy cause.

And, of course, there is no cause more worthy, more essential than national survival—the greatest single obligations of this Republic—which is the great beacon to mankind.

THE RACE AMONG THE 48 STATES

I would like to point out, however, to my brother Shriners, that there is another type of competitive race—over and above our race with the Soviet Union. It occurs right in our own country. It is the race among the 48 States for progress and prosperity.

Every day, new developments are occurring in this competitive race. Factories move from one State to another. Companies start new plants or subsidiaries in one State or another.

We of the Badger State are anxious to keep our State to the fore. We want to move up—not to fall back—in the competitive race.

We want more contracts for Wisconsin, more and steadier jobs, fuller pay envelopes, more jingling tunes in the cash registers, more tourist income, more farm sales.

To achieve this, we'll require action, planning, teamwork, cooperation.

WE ARE INTERESTED IN QUALITY

Of course, we are definitely not trying to get the largest population, we are not trying to attract any type of plant, just for the sake of piling up big statistics of new business.

We are interested in quality. We want the best type of industry in Wisconsin. We want our own existing population to enjoy ever higher income. We don't want to sacrifice living standards but rather to raise them.

For these purposes, I am in continuous contact with the officials of our State government, with our governor, our State planning commission, and with other State officials.

I would like to spell out now a 10-point program for making sure that Wisconsin keeps moving forward in 1956 and in the years to come.

This is by no means a complete list, but it will indicate to you the sort of things which must be done.

CAPITALIZE ON MISSISSIPPI AND THE LAKES

1. Further use the great natural arteries available to us. That means the mighty Mississippi. It means the Great Lakes.

It means roads along the Mississippi and river traffic on the Mississippi, roads alongside the lakes and commerce on the lakes.

We must capitalize on these assets to the fullest. We must get all the possible traffic we can out of them—out of barge traffic and along the lakes, out of deepwater traffic.

2. For full lake benefits, we must secure the prompt deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels. This means we must make all possible speed in securing congressional approval of the initial $5 million (out of the overall $110 million authorized) to deepen and improve the Great Lakes connecting channels west of Lake Erie.

EXPAND CREDIT FOR SMALL BUSINESS

3. Utilize the splendid facility of the Wisconsin Credit Development Corp. This is the organization designed at Madison, by our State officials with the cooperation of our State's banking profession, to provide needed capital wherever necessary, and otherwise unavailable, so as to expand industry or bring in new industry.

4. Further develop our Wisconsin highway system, which is so vital to our tourist industry, as well as to inexpensive transportation of our farm and business products.

Under Federal aid, the highway legislation now before the House, Wisconsin will get an estimated $345 million in the coming 13-year period for road improvement.

5. Strengthen Wisconsin aviation—meaning improve our airport system, our navigational aids. Facilitate the work of North Central Airlines, Northwest Airlines, and other fine airline companies serving our State. Expand the number of our pilots and civilian planes, as may be necessary.

MORE CONTRACTS FOR BADGERS

6. Bring in more Federal contracts wherever possible to utilize the skills and abilities of Wisconsin industry and workers for defense purposes.

7. Utilize Wisconsin camp facilities—like Camp McCoy—to the fullest. This has been my constant aim in Washington.

WISCONSIN WANTS FAIR-PRICED NATURAL GAS

8. Increase the amount of the fuel at good prices available to our citizens.

Right now, there are, as you know, numerous applications pending before the Federal Power Commission for bringing in more natural gas pipelines to Wisconsin. I, for one, want every additional cubic foot of natural gas we can get and use—for our homes, offices, stores, and factories. And I want it at good, competitive prices.

Thanks to President Eisenhower's wise veto of the Harris-Fulbright bill, we can feel reasonably assured that we are going to get fuel at a fair price. Had that bill not been vetoed, Wisconsin would have paid through the nose to the gas monopoly.

Fuel is a mighty important factor that is considered when a company weighs moving a plant to a particular State. We don't want Wisconsin companies moving to the South or anywhere else, so as to get cheaper fuel, subsidized by the Federal Government.

We want adequate fuel and/or fair private enterprise prices, for our State.

9. Keep Wisconsin ahead in scientific research, both through our great private laboratory teams, as well as through the marvelous research conducted by the University of Wisconsin and other splendid educational institutions.

This is a scientific age, and the State with scientific and technical know-how will forge ahead of other States which lag in scientific development.

KEEP WISCONSIN INDUSTRIAL PEACE

10. Last but not least, let's keep Wisconsin as a model of cooperation between labor and management, industry and agriculture, farm and city.

As we look elsewhere, we see first right now, as you know, the South is paying a bitter price because of racial tension.

Here in our own State, let's make sure of cooperation between all groups. Let's try to avoid the type of industrial warfare which crippled the great Westinghouse Corp. for 156 days, the kind of heated labor-management bickering which causes losses to all, particularly the public, as a whole.

These then, are but 10 points in our "Forward, Wisconsin" program. You and I can and will add many more points as we seek to assure rising and lasting prosperity for the Badger State.

Trade Mission to Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to certain practices being used by the Department of Commerce. I refer specifically to their sending representatives of the Commerce Department on a trade mission to Japan.

In this connection, I would like to read a dispatch from Nagoya, Japan, under date of March 29:

Japanese businessmen asked the visiting United States trade mission to use its influence to prevent any increase in American tariff or other restrictions against Japanese pottery, plywood, and sewing machines. The mission in turn said, "There is plenty of room to increase American imports of these products." The mission is headed by Mr. Eugene Braderman, United States Department of Commerce.

I am today writing the Department of Commerce demanding to know what is the purpose of this mission, who appointed them, why American businessmen who must compete with foreign imports are not officially notified by the Department of Commerce when such trade missions were sent abroad, and the purpose for which they are being sent.

This, Mr. Speaker, is just another instance of the "high-handed" bureaucratic methods being used by some of our executive departments.

Dateline Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, my Louisiana colleagues and I have the pleasure of participating regularly in a filmed television program, Dateline Washington, presented every other week as a public service to our constituencies by station WDSU-TV of New Orleans.

This is a half hour, unrehearsed discussion program, produced and moderated by Miss Ann Corrick, Washington correspondent for WDSU. It alternates weekly with a local program, Dateline New Orleans, in which WDSU-TV presents local personalities in discussions of civic and other matters of interest to the citizens of the New Orleans area.

Dateline Washington concentrates on national and international issues which affect—directly or indirectly—the lives of all Americans, with particular emphasis on matters under consideration in Congress.

We invite as our guest a personality expert in his field, and devote the half hour program to an informal discussion and exchange of ideas. In this way, we are able to present to the people of south Louisiana all sides of an issue, so they may form their own opinions on the vital issues of our times.

In the past 2 years, on this program, we have presented the up-to-date facts on such vital issues as the peacetime uses of atomic energy; the state of our national defenses; the problems and needs of American education; the development of the Salk antipolio vaccine program; the operation of our foreign policy; the extent of narcotic addiction and its causes, and timely reviews of the ever-changing political situation. Dateline

Washington has presented interviews with such topnotch authorities as U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge; Administrator Theodore Streibert, of the United States Information Agency; Maj. Gen. Samuel Sturgis, Chief of the Army Engineers; Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey; Treasury Secretary Humphrey; Sir Roger Makins, the British Ambassador; House Speaker Rayburn; CBS Overseas Correspondent Howard K. Smith; and, of course, many of our able and informed Democratic and Republican Members of House and Senate. In order to present an unbiased picture of the political situation, we have had as our guests both Leonard Hall, Republican National Committee chairman, and Paul Butler, Democratic National Committee chairman. Many of these programs have made front-page news throughout the country.

In recognition of the consistently factual, timely, and public interest offerings of the Dateline Washington series over the last 2 years, the Sylvania television award panel last November awarded Dateline Washington and WDSU–TV a special citation for local public service.

In consonance with the high standards maintained by this program, on Sunday, April 8, Dateline Washington presented a guest and topic of such importance and inspiration that I herewith submit the transcript of this discussion so others may benefit from its content.

Our guest was Maj. Gen. Melvin Maas, former Member of the House from Minnesota, whose brilliant career with the United States Marine Corps was cut short a few years ago when he lost his eyesight. General Maas' account of his work as Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped should give heart and hope to other disabled persons who have every right to work and live with the dignity we in this country accord to all our citizens.

The discussion with General Maas follows:

Miss CORRICK. Good afternoon. This is WDSU's Washington correspondent, Ann Corrick.

Thirty million American citizens are physically d'sabled in one way or another. Most are completely helpless. But an estimated 2 million disabled persons, if they knew how, or if they had the proper training, could be gainfully and usefully employed. Congress recognized this possibility in 1945, and, 2 years later, established the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Through the efforts of this Committee many thousands of disabled persons each year are restored to gainful employment. Dateline Washington's guest today is the Chairman of the President's Committee, retired Marine Corps Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas. He fully understands the problems of disabled persons, for, in 1951, 1 year before he retired from the Marines, General Maas was overtaken with total blindness. Although this dropped the curtain on three separate careers, for General Maas it opened up a new and rewarding challenge for his tremendous and unselfish energies. He became Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped in 1954.

Last year he was elected national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

General Maas' first career was in business back in his native State of Minnesota, where he organized his own insurance firm. He spent 16 years in Congress as a Republican Member of the House from Minnesota, from 1927 to 1943. However, during that period he took time out to pursue another, overlapping career in the Marine Corps, where he specialized in marine aviation. He served as a private in World War I; as the youngest Marine Corps colonel in uniform in World War II, and he put on his uniform again in the Korean war to help revise the entire Reserve program.

The general made many friends while he was here in Congress, and here with us today are two who served with him—New Orleans Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, chairman of the House Armed Services Investigating Committee, and HALE BOGGS, member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Now, the general has been decorated many times for his services, and among his medals is the Carnegie Silver Medal for heroism, and there is quite a story behind that medal. It is legend, especially here on Capitol Hill, because the battlefield on which that medal was earned was the House of Representatives. It waa in 1933, was it not, General——

General MAAS. No; 1932.

Miss CORRICK. That a man appeared in the House gallery with a loaded revolver and he threatened to shoot up the Congressmen. What did you do?

General MAAS. Ann, you mentioned an incident that has always been embarrassing to me, getting this Carnegie medal for it. I think I will reveal to you now the truth of what actually happened that day.

Miss CORRICK. I wish you would.

General MAAS. This nut in Congress—I mean the one up in the gallery—was waving this gun around. I did not see him to begin with. We were having a teller vote and I was one of the tellers. All of a sudden there was a great deal of confusion and everybody left suddenly.

Then Fiorello La Guardia grabbed me by the arm and said, "Come on, Mel, let's get him," and with that he pointed up in the gallery. That is the first time I saw this bird waving this pistol around.

To get to him, you had to run up the aisle, out some swinging doors, around the halls and up some marble steps.

Just as we got to the door, La Guardia went on out and I took one last look over there and I saw that this bird put his foot up on the rail. I was sure he was going to jump, and probably break a leg, so I had nothing more heroic in mind that running over and jumping on the guy when he was down—but when I got under him, the darn fool had not jumped. Here I was standing looking up at him, and he spotted me and waved the gun at me, and he said, "Will you give me 20 minutes to make a speech?"

Give him 20 minutes, I would have given him the shirt off my back. I said, "Yes, yes, yes, but it is against the rules to speak with a gun in the House. Give me the gun and you can make your speech."

He said, "I will give it to you," and with that he cocked it. It looked like a .75 millimeter cannon about that time.

The newspapers commented afterward how remarkable it was that I disarmed him with a smile. It was not a smile—it was a darn silly grin.

Congressman HÉBERT. What would have happened if he had not thrown you the gun?

General MAAS. Instead of running for Congress as I used to, I think I would have run from Congress.

Suddenly he changed his mind and did drop the gun to me. As soon as he dropped the gun, the cops all jumped out from behind the seats and grabbed him.

Congressman BOGGS. Mel, that is quite an interesting and very great career you have had. Why don't you tell us a little bit about the work you are doing now.

General MAAS. Well, Hale, I am actually in the most rewarding work that I have ever done. I do not mean financially because all of us on the President's Committee serve without any compensation of any sort. However, I am receiving more compensation in the way of gratification, feeling that I am making a contribution, more so than I have ever felt by doing anything else.

The work of the President's Committee is educational and informational. We are not a Government agency. We have a small Federal staff, but the Committee is made up of about 300 organizations representing the heart of America. All of the great labor unions are members, all of the great employer groups like the Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, are members, all of the veterans' groups, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the medical profession, social workers, and just dedicated men and women.

What we are doing is trying to educate employers and the labor unions and the general public as to the employability of handicapped men and women.

There are so many people who think that just because some of us have a personal physical inconvenience we cannot work. This is not true at all. We have to overcome centuries of prejudice and intolerance and discrimination against men and women who have a physical handicap.

It is tremendously heartwarming to see the growing increase in interest and awareness and desire to help in this campaign.

Congressman HÉBERT. The work which you are doing with this Committee is very interesting and, of course, very constructive; but what is your feeling about a program which would educate people to prevent the accidents which cause disability?

General MAAS. Eddie, of course that is one of the disgraces in this country. However, the vast majority of those for whom we have to find jobs, strangely enough, are not handicapped by way of industrial accidents. Of course, these accidents are deplorable, but the vast majority of these handicapped people have become so handicapped by reason of illness and disease.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is exactly what I was hoping you were going to say, Mel. I think the work of the President's Committee is quite creditable and laudable and you are indeed doing a splendid job with respect to rehabilitating these people.

I think the big problem is, however—and I would like your comment on this—is educating through research and prevention. As I put it the other day in New Orleans when I was down there to dedicate the Lighthouse for the Blind, we all run to the man who has a white stick in his hand, but our greatest efforts should be given to preventing him from getting the white stick.

General MAAS. Of course, that is true, and we are tremendously interested in these research programs and their development. If the proper job is done in preventive campaigns—the biggest single number that we have are cardiac cases—if we can lick them at the beginning, then you would not have any need for the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. What suggestions do you have? What program do you have for prevention?

General MAAS. I believe a great deal more intensified research must be done. Once you know how to prevent a disease or cure it, then the matter becomes routine. But the greatest mass of people who are physically handicapped are continuing—actually it is about 275,000 a year added to these rolls of

the seriously physically handicapped. We need more research.

Congressman BOGGS. It seems to me in your work you have two basic problems: One is to convince an employer that a handicapped person can be a satisfactory employee, and the other, it would seem to me, would be the psychological problem with the handicapped person himself to convince him that he is still a useful member of society and can perform gainful employment of some kind or another.

How do you approach those two separate problems, the individual problem and then the employer problem?

General MAAS. You have identified them. They are the big problems. There is a third one, too, and that is educating those who are nonhandicapped workers to accepting a handicapped worker beside them.

Today there is considerable resistance among workers who just do not want handicapped workers working near them for fear that the handicapped person will cause an accident that will involve the nonhandicapped. Just to dispose of that, we have checked all of the records, and as far as we could determine throughout the country, we have yet to find one single case where a handicapped worker has involved a fellow worker, so the nonhandicapped do not have to worry about that.

The problem of educating the employer is our major problem, of course. The other problem is a social one, getting the handicapped to find out that there is such a thing as opportunity for rehabilitation; that they can be given vocational training so that they can become self-supporting. Some work is being done along those lines, but what the Congress has charged our Committee with is primarily in the field of educating employers and labor unions, because there are problems involving labor contracts in this matter—educating them as to the desirability of giving the handicapped an opportunity to work and then convincing them that a well-trained, properly placed handicapped worker is not only as good as the average but, in most cases, they become superior. Being trained in a specialty, they become very expert in that specialty. The handicapped man or woman who is given a job is grateful for it, for one thing, and there is much less tendency to switch jobs.

Miss CORRICK. In what fields of endeavor are the handicapped people finding places today?

General MAAS. Actually, everywhere. There isn't any kind of a job today in this country that is not being performed by some kind of a handicapped person.

Miss CORRICK. Mostly in industry?

General MAAS. I would say the preponderance of the absorption of the physically handicapped has been so far in industry. In fact, we are quite concerned at the failure of the professions to accept them. I am thinking particularly now of the blind. With the critical teacher shortage in this country, there are hundreds of blind men and women who are qualified educationally and by temperament to teach—and yet through prejudice they cannot get jobs as teachers. Yet, there are many very fine blind teachers, not only in the colleges but in the secondary schools and even in the primary schools.

Congressman HÉBERT. I think the figures show in this country today there are some 314,000 blind people. In referring to the blind, Mel—and I know you are not sensitive about your affliction at all, and I think you and I both know that—I think it would be most interesting and most informative and certainly most inspirational if you would take a moment to tell us exactly what your reaction was when you went blind. I knew you and served with you when you had good eyesight, and I have known you for the years that you have been blind. It intrigued me as I am sure it intrigued those of the audience who watched you light that cigar just now; and what you told us before the program about the book you're writing called "How to Eat Soup With a Fork." To me, it is an inspiration. Just what did you do after you went blind and how did you rehabilitate yourself?

General MAAS. I was in the hospital at the time it happened for an entirely different thing. I had developed violent stomach pains which turned out to be an ulcer, and it was while I was being treated for the ulcer that my eyesight failed. Failed in one eye within a week and in the left eye within a couple of months, but it failed quite rapidly.

When the doctors gave me the verdict that I was going to be blind and it was going to be permanent blindness, actually for the first couple of days I wanted to die. I conceived of myself as just a blind, helpless old man. About the second morning I was lying in bed in a cold sweat. I could still see. I got up and went into the bathroom, took my shower, shaved, and dressed, keeping my eyes closed the entire time, and I suddenly realized that it was not going to be as bad as I thought. I could do normal things.

Then actually, Eddie, from then on, I was so busy that I never had time to think of it again. I was handling liaison with the Congress at the time and handling this Reserve legislation that we had up and they were sending people out from the Pentagon to see me, and you Congressmen were calling me and sending your secretaries up, so I had them put in a telephone next to my bed, and from then on I continued to carry on on the telephone 8 or 9 hours a day. Then I was sent to rehabilitation. I think learning about rehabilitation very early, before I was totally blind, was a tremendous lift. I learned that I could go to Hines, Ill.——

Congressman HÉBERT. I would like for you to develop that point just a bit because I think that must be one of the secrets of this whole program—your own rehabilitation and how you apply it to other people in your work today.

General MAAS. When I learned that I was going to be able to be trained to get about pretty much normally, and that I would learn to substitute a cane for eyesight for traveling, that I was going to learn typing so that I could communicate written messages to other people, and I would learn Braille, it was a tremendous lift to me.

When I got to the rehabilitation center I found how practical all of these solutions were—in fact, they had a slogan to the effect that when you finished this course you could do anything that you did before except drive a car. I made suckers out of them on that, because I drove a car.

Congressman HÉBERT. A lot of people are driving now who think they can see.

General MAAS. In fact, it was a whole new challenge to me.

You mentioned how I lit a cigar. I was getting quite frustrated. You know, being an old Congressman, I have to smoke my cigars. I was so frustrated that I was about to quit smoking. I took a match and just drove it up into the bottom of the cigar and struck it. It lit, but I had to laugh at myself because I had to smoke the wood. Then I got to experimenting and found that by holding a match underneath I could make it work every time.

In developing those things like dialing a telephone, I learned that if I put a little adhesive tape on the fifth dial of the telephone, then I could count very fast because I had four places to count from. I will bet you that I can dial a telephone faster than you can or anybody else with eyesight, because I do not have to waste time looking at the numbers.

Congressman HÉBERT. With my eyesight, I cannot dial a phone at all, as you well know. I am in the same position.

The reason I had a personal interest in asking you about these things was that I hope when the day comes when I am in the same position, I will have the courage to be as brave as you.

General MAAS. EDDIE, it isn't that. You have great vitality and you will carry on.

I found, in fact, that I am able to travel more extensively now than when I had good eyesight. Last year, I traveled 150,000 miles and I do all of my traveling alone.

Congressman HÉBERT. You went to New Orleans alone last year to make the November 11th address.

General MAAS. I have no difficulty getting around. With radio and the wonderful "talking books" that Congress provides for the blind, I am doing more reading now and better reading than I did when I had sight.

For instance, I get the Reader's Digest each month on these "talking books."

Congressman HÉBERT. Is that a Braille book?

General MAAS. No, a "talking book" consists of long-playing records. They have marvelous voices. They get the best actors and actresses and radio personalities, and they read books. Right now, I am reading The Robe on "talking books." The Government, through the Library of Congress, will furnish any of these "talking books" to a blind person. They do not have to be a veteran. They will also furnish the recording machine for playing these records. They lend it to them for life and then these long-playing records are put in fiber cases and they are mailed to the blind person, the regular catalog, without cost. When the blind person has read the book, he gives it back to the Post Office Department and the books are mailed back to the Library of Congress. It is like a circulating library.

Congressman HÉBERT. Exactly what is the procedure for receiving those "talking books," Mel? I think that is most interesting to blind people. Of course, they can write to their Congressmen, I know, but let us tell them how to get the books themselves.

General MAAS. All they have to do is get a doctor's certificate that they are totally blind or unable to read. With just that certificate they can write to the Library of Congress or, in fact, they can get the information through their local library in most cases. Otherwise, they can write directly to the Library of Congress, Washington 25, D. C.

Congressman BOGGS. What do you do at these meetings you attend all of the time?

General MAAS. Talk about the problems of hiring the handicapped and cite to them cases of employers who have hired the handicapped and what good employees they are. The most enthusiastic supporters of this program are the employers who have hired some handicapped people. They are good workers and they are not troublemakers. They have fewer accidents and their safety record is high. Their absenteeism is perhaps even a little less than the average worker.

Congressman BOGGS. I am certain that you must have the figures, but it seems to me that there must be a tremendous gap in the situation where you have a handicapped person who can earn a gainful living or a handicapped person who is dependent either upon his family or the State or the Government in some capacity. What is the difference?

General MAAS. I am awfully glad you asked that, because it is quite dramatic.

The average throughout the Nation—and this will vary in different States and different cities—for maintaining a person on welfare is about $1,500 a year. That goes on forever as long as you are maintaining that

person. The average cost for rehabilitation, however, is about $600, and that is a one-shot expenditure. So take a $1,500 welfare person, give him rehabilitation and get him on the job, and you have not only saved the $1,500 but you have started receiving taxes from such an individual because these rehabilitated persons, both men and women who are on the job, very soon become themselves taxpayers.

Last year alone the men and women who became rehabilitated and were placed on jobs in the aggregate earned $115 million and paid somewhere between $9 million to $15 million in taxes. Whereas, the year before they had been costing the country nearly $50 million.

Congressman BOGGS. That is remarkable.

Congressman HÉBERT. Mel, in your program to educate people, it has been called to my attention that you hold annual essay contests. I have here the list of youngsters in Louisiana who won this year's contests:

First place: Sally Bett Grace, 304 South Holly Street, Hammond, La.: Southeastern High School.

Second place: Caroline Gayle Morgan, route 4, Joor Road, Baton Rouge, La., Central High.

Third place: Marie Massimini, 2130 Jena Street, New Orleans, Fortier Senior High.

Fourth place: Urline Andoni, 8335 Birch Street, New Orleans, Redemptorist High.

Fifth place: A tie by Juanita Matherne, 1508 Riviera Drive, New Orleans, Holy Angels Academy, and Charles Barry Hillebrandt, 1920 Second Street, Lake Charles, La., Lake Charles High School.

What were those essays?

General MAAS. It is a wonderful program, EDDIE. We sponsor nationally—and, incidentally, the DAV, which Ann mentioned, of which I am national commander, has put up the money for the essay winners. The first prize is $1,000, and they pay the expenses of the five winners to Washington to have their prizes presented to them at our annual meeting. It is a wonderful project because these youngsters write on some phase of the handicapped. We set the subject each year. Of course, it is the first time they have thought much about it, and they take it home and discuss it with their parents. Well, it is the first time that most of the parents have even thought about the problem or knew that there was such a problem. It also gives these kids a lot more confidence in knowing that if anything should happen to them, they can be taken care of. They have now learned that life will not be a blank for them. They have learned that the blind, the crippled, the amputees, can lead a perfectly normal life. As each generation comes along, they are learning more and more about it. They are going to be the employers and the employees of the future, so we feel that it is a most wonderful project.

Congressman BOGGS. Mel, is there some coordination in your work with the other programs like the program for retarded children, and that sort of thing?

General MAAS. We are not in the mental deficiency side of it, because we are chartered only for the physically handicapped.

I think that will come along in time. We are paving the way.

As we open up opportunities for the physically handicapped and educate the country to the acceptance of the physically handicapped, we feel it will open the path for the rehabilitated and retarded person.

Congressman BOGGS. In conjunction with the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, the Lousiana State Unemployment Service has a special division for the employment of the physically handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. I think they all do.

General MAAS. Every State now does; in fact, in every local employment office there will be a specialist on the problems of placing the handicapped.

Congressman HÉBERT. In New Orleans, they go one step further, Hale, and I am sure you are familiar with this. I think they call it the Good Will Industries.

Stella Hanlon is the head of it down there.

Congressman BOGGS. They have that in all the States?

General MAAS. That is international.

Congressman BOGGS. And then they give the physically handicapped employment and very gainful employment.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is a fine thing; it is operated everywhere. That is a private operation.

Miss CORRICK. The general was honored recently by the Good Will Industries.

General MAAS. Yes, I was very proud to receive their international achievement award.

Congressman HÉBERT. That is another deserved honor.

Miss CORRICK. General, in your travels, you go overseas quite frequently, and I wondered if you could tell us what countries overseas are doing for their handicapped people.

General MAAS. There are some programs, but they are nowhere near what we do. We are beginning to stimulate them and it is giving them quite a lift and quite a challenge.

I have been particularly interested in Asian and African countries where traditionally nothing was ever done for handicapped people. They were ashamed of handicapped people, and yet they have great numbers of them because of malnutrition, disease, and illness. Our program is giving them a tremendous lift.

Incidentally, an entirely new and different concept of America has been brought to their attention which is quite the contrary to the concept they were getting from Communist propaganda.

I attended these international conferences on rehabilitation of the World Veterans Federation. We now have 30 nations in it. I talked with delegates from Thailand, Ceylon, Pakistan, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, Israel, and Egypt, and they are tremendously impressed with what we are doing for our handicapped. When they learn that these great volunteer teams like the President's Committee and Governors' committee take the cripples, as they call them, and give them medical restoration, vocational rehabilitation, and then actually get them jobs—to them, that is almost unbelievable. It is having a tremendous impact upon them.

I have had so many of them tell me, "Well, General, if your people think so much of the dignity of the individual that you take your cripples and restore them so that they can have dignity, then we believe that you are decent people and the Communists have been lying to us. The Communists have said that you are nothing but money-mad dollar-grabbing people. But those kinds of people do not worry about the dignity of individuals. So, if they have been lying to us about that, maybe they are lying to us about a lot of other things." So you see this program is having a very wonderful impact on the rest of the world.

Miss CORRICK. In helping to combat Communist propaganda against us?

General MAAS. Yes.

The one thing that these Asians and Africans want after centuries of suppression and colonization is not the Communist thinking of just more money and better clothing and more housing.

Miss CORRICK. I am awfully sorry, General Maas, but the clock is running out on us, and we must stop.

Thank you so much for being here on Dateline Washington, General Melvin Maas, with Congressmen Hale Boggs and F. Edward Hébert.

This is Ann Corrick.

Inter-American Solidarity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, in celebrating this Pan American Day, we are celebrating the 66th anniversary of that day in 1890 when the American Republics united to form an association now known as the Organization of American States—an organization which constitutes the oldest international association of the world. In commemorating this event symbolic in the history of the Western Hemisphere—and indeed the whole world—Americans throughout the 21 American Republics may well take pride in the significance and importance of their continuous efforts in achieving the inter-American solidarity which exists today. For this deep-seated solidarity has many roots and has survived many difficulties.

Even before the end of the colonial period, during the last quarter of the 18th and first quarter of the 19th centuries, certain concepts were evolving throughout the Western Hemisphere which have provided a unique framework for the special relationship characteristic of inter-American relations from 1823 through modern times. This unique framework was compounded, first, from a feeling of distinctness from the Europeans, Asians, Africans, and others; second, from a heritage common to all peoples who have shared in chiseling out of a formidable wilderness a new way of life built upon courage, self-reliance, and determination; and, finally, from the mutual respect and understanding common to peoples who have freed themselves from colonial domination.

The history of inter-American relations which began in the early 19th century, falls essentially into three eras. The first, 1810–95, was highlighted by the evolvement in 1823 of the Monroe Doctrine—a doctrine designed primarily to protect the Western Hemisphere from European interference. However, during this period each of the Republics was concerned with its internal affairs. In the United States attention was concentrated during the middle of the century on its Civil War and subsequently upon the mighty western movement. In Latin America in the early part of the 19th century, upheaval was rampant. Until 1825 when the last of the Republics had freed themselves from European political domination, waves of revolution swept from the Isthmus of Panama to the Straits of Magellan. Following that great convulsion, the nations of the new free world were still concerned that European powers would return and reconquer their hard-won lands. To offset such a threat, Simon Bolivar, the great liberator of northern Latin America, convened a congress in Panama in 1826 to discuss measures for hemispheric defense. And out of this congress, came

a treaty of perpetual union, league and confederation. The treaty related to means for common defense, peaceful settlement of disputes and the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the members of the confederation—a theme which in essence has permeated all subsequent conferences. However, the hopes envisioned in the purpose of that significant congress and its subsequent treaty were not quickly realized. As in the United States, the new Republics were busy with their internal affairs, and the period from 1826 was punctuated with civil wars and intrahemispheric clashes. Nonetheless, still faced with the possibility of reconquest by Spain, the various Republics continued to meet from time to time to consider defense measures, the peaceful settlement of disputes, cooperation in commerce and navigation, and, later, questions of law and the control of contagious diseases. Thus, the dream of inter-American cooperation was far from lost.

The second major era in inter-American relations began in 1889 when the United States invited the American Republics to the first International Conference of American States here in Washington. This conference—the first of the series of modern conferences—was called to consider peaceful means of settling disputes and means of improving commercial relations among the American countries. From this conference came a multilateral treaty for the arbitration of disputes and the establishment of that momentous "International Union of American Republics" which we commemorate today. This International union was not a political Union, but, rather, a commercial one. A permanent bureau which constituted its secretariat was located in Washington. In 1910 this bureau was renamed the Pan American Union, and its terms of reference were expanded in keeping with the broadened scope of the cooperative plans of the International Union which as the years passed had moved into the realm of economic, social, and cultural affairs as well as the purely commercial. All of these factors contributed to and were indicative of closer understanding and hemispheric solidarity.

However, the real high tide of inter-American relations was during the period 1933–1956, which constitutes the third era of these relations. Before this time, though there had been a steady development in the direction of inter-American solidarity along cultural and economic lines, there had been political difficulties which at times had been serious enough to threaten the International Union. But with the shift of position by the United States at the Montevideo Conference in 1933 concerning the question of intervention and with the conclusion there of a convention on the rights and duties of states more in accord with the views of the Latin American states than had been our stand in the past, the good-neighbor policy was launched. In the subsequent period from 1933 to 1946 numerous conferences were held, each resulting in stronger declarations of solidarity than before. With the outbreak of World War II all but one of the Latin American nations contributed its full cooperation to the war effort. The Chapultepec Conference held in 1945 provided for continued joint defense of all the states of the hemisphere in case of aggression against any one of them, for steps to strengthen the inter-American system by increasing the authority of the Pan American Union, and for the establishment of an Inter-American Economic and Social Council. But the meetings in 1947 and 1948 not only put the cooperation which had existed during the war years on a permanent basis, but also reaffirmed the principles of inter-American solidarity which had been developing over the entire century. At the conference in Brazil in 1947, the American states adopted the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance which provided for permanent collective self-defense in the event of an armed attack or threat against the peace and security of any one of the signatories, from within or from outside the hemisphere. At the Conference in Colombia in 1948, they adopted the Bogotá pact which consolidated and coordinated the many earlier agreements on arbitration and other peaceful means for settling disputes among member states. It was also at this conference that the Inter-American system was given its new name—the Organization of American States. The new charter, in addition to tightening the administrative organization, reaffirmed the Organization's concern with cultural, social, and intellectual matters. The Organization of American States has already effectively proved its strength in times of crisis as exemplified by its swift action and dramatic success in connection with various controversies and threatening situations which have arisen since 1948.

But aside from the happy example to the world of a group of 21 nations living side by side, not always agreeing, but still managing to work out our differences within the framework of an effective inter-American system, the influence of this remarkable system reaches far beyond the confines of its hemispheric borders in still other ways. It was upon the insistence of the Latin American countries that adequate provision was included in the United Nations Charter for the continued existence and operation of the regional organization system upon which so much emphasis has been placed in recent years. In fact, the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance was the first regional agreement signed under the provision of article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Moreover, it was upon this regional agreement that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself was later modeled.

In the area of technical assistance and economic cooperation, the inter-American system has also proved of particular significance. For the United States sponsored program of extensive cultural and technical interchange with Latin American countries under the aegis of the good-neighbor policy in effect served as a proving ground for the many successful technical-assistance programs which have since been launched throughout the world.

The impressive spectacle of 21 independent and individualistic Republics quietly, steadily, and persistently working together in an atmosphere of dignity and harmony for the cause of peace and democracy, has always been a source of pride in the Western Hemisphere and a source of admiration in hemispheres other than our own. But today, with the threat of communism as great if not greater throughout the world than it has ever been in the past, we dare not rest on our laurels. We must, at every level of our international relations—the political, the economic, the cultural, and the social—rededicate ourselves to the service of that solidarity on which our splendid inter-American system stands, and in so doing rededicate ourselves to the service of the cause of world peace and progress.

Free Government Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, today I recorded a speech for Radio Liberation, a democratic, anti-Communist radio station broadcasting to the peoples of the Soviet Union in 17 languages.

I gave my talk on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Russia's first parliament, the State Duma. I took that opportunity to point out that now more than ever Russia needs a freely elected government, a government which will heed the needs and aspirations of the people. Only such a government can respect the dignity of the individual, the right to dissent without fear of punishment, and the right to worship as one pleases. My listeners behind the Iron Curtain were told that not being a military man, I did not understand fully all the implications of an open inspection of one another's military installations, but as a legislator I know for sure that an open inspection of each other's election procedures by all the nations of the world would be the best guaranty for peace and freedom in the world.

We in this country, of course, do not fear the examination of our election procedures. As a matter of fact, we encourage the world to follow them. I believe the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries would be more apt to accept an open inspection of their military installations than of their voting procedures, for such an inspection would shake to the very foundations the fundamental principles of a totalitarian Communist government. However, if they would consent to it, I am sure that by the next election we would have free governments behind the Iron Curtain truly representing the people.

Peacetime Application of Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the current news about the experimental gas turbine test automobile now on a cross-country tour comes at a time when Members of Congress are concerned with another type of industrial development in which the Federal Government has become deeply involved. Apparently the new car is still so much in the research stage that it is impossible to predict what the ultimate results will be. What is important is that further scientific and research developments may lead to an actual revolution in the automotive industry, so far as the propelling force is concerned.

This turbine power engine in the automobile now on tour has been developed by the Chrysler Corp. without assistance from the Federal Government. It is an example of what can be accomplished under free enterprise through the courage of investors and the creative genius of America's technicians. How much longer will be required to put this kind of motorcar on a practical operating basis is not known. The Chrysler Corp. no doubt has earmarked a special fund for this project, which will continue to be carried out on a schedule based on practicability and on budgetary considerations. Management knows how much can and should be spent in this work.

Now let us look at the other industrial development to which I have referred: the peacetime application of atomic power. As everyone realizes, the Federal Government went into the business of putting the atom to use for defense purposes. With the realization that fissionable materials might be utilized in a number of ways other than for destruction, the Government began a research program to learn just what could be expected of the atom in a peacetime economy.

A great deal has been learned and a great many billions of dollars have been expended since the Federal Government undertook this program. We have, in fact, reached a point where the whole effort now needs to be reappraised. Through research, it has been determined that electrical power can be generated by using the atom as a fuel. That revelation is a welcome one. We are all enthusiastic at the possibilities opened through development of reactors which can be used to produce light and heat and power in contributing to a better life for all of us.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: Now that the way for atomic-produced electric power has been opened, how much more of the taxpayers' money should be expended in this field? It is estimated that reactors now in the process of construction will be able to create electric power at perhaps 10 times the price of what it would cost to do the same job through the use of coal. Our experts are convinced that this cost will be progressively reduced as more is learned about the atom and how to handle it. I do not think that anyone would challenge this conjecture. It is entirely possible that at some time in the future electricity from atomic plants will be competitive—pricewise—with that which comes from steam plants using coal. Perhaps America's public-utilities industry will be able to accomplish this reduction in price through their own research and development programs. In any case, I believe that it is time for the Federal Government to stop going to the Treasury so that such a program can be expedited.

Let us have another look at the Chrysler research car. That car is a creation of private industry. If the Government were to invest several billion dollars to bring about the consummation of the work envisioned in this developmental program, I am confident that the gas turbine automobile could be on the showrooms floors throughout the country within a very short time. Similarly, if the Government continues to invest more Federal funds in the reactor program, America is certain to get a good supply of atomic generated electricity much quicker than if the electric utilities were forced to run on their own resources. I therefore suggest that Congress hesitate before approving of any further expenditures by the Atomic Energy Commission in this direction. The electric power company in my district of West Virginia has done all that can be asked of it without resorting to Federal contributions. When demand for greater supply of electricity has arisen, the Appalachian Electric Power Co. has increased its capacity. It will continue to do so in the future.

We in the Fifth Congressional District are making every effort possible to attract more industry. Our vast coal reserves, which are the power behind electric power, are one of the inviting features of the area.

If the public utilities want to invest more of their earnings in the atomic energy program, the people of West Virginia are certainly not going to oppose the plan. We object, however, when the Government insists upon contributing to a project which actually will create unemployment. I have come to the conclusion that it is time for private industry to withdraw the hand that is accepting—under the garb of free enterprise—these Federal handouts in the so-called participating projects. It is at least obligatory upon the Congress to object to the Atomic Energy Commission's continued use of public funds for this purpose.

I call your attention to a letter which presumably went to the entire membership of the House from Mr. Tom Pickett, executive vice president of the National Coal Association. Mr. Pickett, who distinguished himself in the House of Representatives as a Congressman from Texas, gave this brief explanation of the coal industry's position with respect to the commercial development of atomic generated power:

> The Government should conduct basic and applied research;
>
> Government sponsorship of the development phases of a power generation program is justified on the grounds that it may provide economically feasible nuclear power for underdeveloped or power-short nations;
>
> There is no urgency for the domestic development of atomic-generated power—an adequate supply of coal reserves guarantees a continued adequate supply of low-cost electric power;
>
> Government subsidies should not extend beyond the development stages, and the amount of such subsidies be made public information.

It appears to me that Mr. Pickett has gone just as far as he possibly could in accepting the proposals for Government experimentation in the commercial application of nuclear power. It may be, in fact, that the Atomic Energy Commission is allowed too much latitude, especially in the light of its ambitious attempts to push the electric power program beyond the bounds of reason.

In the latter part of November of last year, President John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America, appeared before a Senate subcommittee and expressed this opinion regarding peacetime application of atomic power:

> Atomic power, if, as, and when it comes, and if, as, and when we can survive its arrival, will only be able to produce energy for a very small percentage of our economic and industry requirements. As a matter of fact, I think it is a safe assumption that the amount of dollars that is being put in and will be put into the development of atomic energy is much more than atomic energy will ever render American industry. Because by the time they encompass all of the problems and make atomic power relatively efficient and learn how to coexist with atomic power—which has not yet been done—then some genius is going to harness the sun or harness the tides, or perform some other modern miracle that will render atomic power obsolete.
>
> In the meantime, we have to keep warm and keep our economy functioning. So we will do it with coal. The coal industry for the first time for a long time is facing a clear road ahead. Modern mines, well designed, well managed, well financed with commercial outlets and credit are offering, today, as attractive opportunity for American investment as can be offered within the limitation of our economy.

Congress must take these views into consideration before giving the Atomic Energy Commission a free hand to invest taxpayers' money in what should be a commercial business enterprise. By contributing most of the construction and agreeing to provide the fuels for operation of atomic plants, the Atomic Energy Commission is in fact taking away traditional coal markets, whether or not these markets are within close proximity of coal-producing areas. Despite the encouraging increase in coal production for last year over 1954, we still have a very great number of unemployed miners in West Virginia. Some of them have not had employment for a long time, and their families have had to depend upon surplus food and upon other such items which they are willing to accept only because they have been deprived of an opportunity to earn their own subsistence. Government and private fuel experts have promised that consumption of bituminous coal in the United States by 1975 will be approximately twice that of the present time. Although output per man-day has been

increasing steadily, it will still require a large force of skilled technicians to extract the coal necessary to meet rising demands; it is, therefore, illogical for us to permit the Government to follow policies that would discourage our mining families from remaining in the coal-producing areas. Our families have established their homes within working distance of the mines and they are quite naturally opposed to any Federal program that calls for using Government subsidies to drive them out of their jobs.

What also must be taken into account is that it is unfair for taxpayers to assume so much of the financial risk in this whole undertaking. If the Federal Government completes the research, builds the reactors, underwrites the risks involved, and provides other subsidies, then turns over everything—plants and know-how—to private companies, how can such transactions be conducted in the name of free enterprise?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Members of Congress keep these facts in mind when they read more about the gas turbine automobile engine. As a creation of private enterprise, it will be produced if it is proven to be feasible and practicable; if not, the conventional motors will remain in our cars until some newer development comes about. If the electric utilities, through their own finances and ingenuity, are able to provide electricity from the atom at rates lower than those of coal-fired steam plants, America will welcome this progress. Until that day arrives, however, it is incumbent upon the electric power companies to use traditional fuels.

The Overton-Red River Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a clipping from the Alexandria Daily Town Talk Times:

HARDIN AGREES WITH REPRESENTATIVE LONG ON CANAL STUDY

SHREVEPORT, LA.—Maj. Gen. John R. Hardin agreed with Representative GEORGE S. LONG Tuesday in suggesting a new survey of the proposed Overton-Red River Waterway.

General Hardin, Lower Mississippi Valley Division engineer of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, told members of the Red River Valley Association a reevaluation of the economics of the waterway would be necessary before it can be built.

"Great changes in the economy of the region to be served by the Overton-Red River Waterway and increased construction costs have made it necessary," Gen. Hardin said.

LONG NOT OPPOSED

Earlier, Representative LONG, an opponent of the canal project as now planned, told delegates from 4 States he was not opposed to the project in principle. But he said he wanted a new survey before giving it his full backing.

General Hardin further elaborated by saying, "When the initial report was made recommending the waterway, an economic study of costs and benefits, prepared in 1944, was a most important part of the supporting data. A comparison of costs and benefits arrived at 12 years ago must be reexamined before we can say that what was a good investment for our country then is still good in 1956.

"We are required, as a matter of long-standing policy, to demonstrate to the Chief of Engineers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the congressional committees that the project is sound before construction funds are requested," the general said.

BENEFITS VERSUS COSTS

"The economic analysis is a weighing of benefits against costs and comparing it to business studies for plant expansion or enlargement of sales territory," General Hardin said.

The study involves a survey of current potential transportation savings, drainage benefits, up-to-date detailed construction cost estimates, and a determination of the costs of relocating bridges, gas lines, power and telephone lines, roads, real estate costs for rights-of-way, and spoil-disposal areas.

On the profit side of the ledger is a commerce analysis. He said that a study is being made of existing commerce that might reasonably be expected to move into or out of the area by water.

Despite General Hardin's suggestion not to get too hasty in building was ignored by the meeting of the association.

EXTENSION SOUGHT

Ending its second day of work, the association called for a speedier release of an engineer's report on a proposal to extend the inland canal from Shreveport to Texarkana and Jefferson, Tex.

The Members also passed a resolution requesting a speedup on a final status report by the United States Corps of Engineers detailing the possibilities of the long-sought Overton-Red River canal project.

Fred Webb of Shreveport was elected president of the association.

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. GEORGE S. LONG, OF LOUISIANA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION, SHREVEPORT, LA., APRIL 2, 1956

Mr. Webb, members of the Red River Valley Association, my colleagues in Congress, and honored guests, I am sure that I can safely speak for every member of the Red River Valley congressional delegation when I say that we Members of Congress look forward with great anticipation to this time in the spring when we have high hopes to be invited to the Red River Valley Association's annual meeting. It is indeed a high point in our life. So, Roy, let me insist that no meetings be held unless we are asked to attend.

Almost every one of our friends here today can be classified as expert on flood control and related subjects and we are bound by a desire toward a common goal—that is, protection from one of mankind's most relentless enemies—uncontrolled water. However, I believe the time is now when we can at long last, look down the road and see a glimmer of light shining on this protection. I believe the Congress, the Chief Executive, the Bureau of the Budget, and all other official agencies, and the heads of whatever party might happen to be in majority, has come to the conclusion that we can no longer afford to ignore the need for protection against floods. It is just this simple—floods are much too expensive to tolerate. I am sure that the members of Appropriations Committees who have ever visited the mighty Mississippi when it was bank full and rampaging; who have ever visited the Arkansas, the Red, and the other rivers in this great Southwest of ours in times of spring floods, cannot fail to be impressed with the absolute necessity for sufficient funds to protect this fertile valley which is indeed the breadbasket of America.

Now, my friends, much has been printed in the newspapers in recent weeks about the stand I have taken in connection with the Overton-Red River Lateral Waterway. I want to assure the assembled guests, the Corps of Engineers, and the Red River Valley Association that I have never made the statement that I am opposed to this project, or any other project which might bring industry and progress to our section. What I have said is this: I am opposed to this or any other project which cannot stand the light of day upon it; I am opposed to any proposal which will damage beyond estimate the many in order to benefit the few.

I have asked the Corps of Engineers to furnish me with certain information which, to date, they have not done. The data being used to justify the Overton-Red River Lateral Canal was put together in 1946, according to my information, not by the Corps of Engineers, but by another agency hired to do the work. Times have changed since 1946 and it could well be that reexamination will show a different picture altogether. So let me say in conclusion, my friends, that I want to endorse this project; by the same token I want the committees to have access to the data and evidence used in their survey. I want the findings presented to the newspapers and TV and radio in order that the people can be informed. I want a detailed estimate of what it will cost local interest and I want the cost-to-benefit ratio well discussed and justified. Then my friends of the Red River Valley Association and of the Corps of Engineers, you will find GEORGE LONG in your corner. Thank you.

The Oregon Corrupt Practices Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for Monday, April 9, there appeared in the Senate proceedings a letter published in an Oregon newspaper signed by the State chairman of the Democratic Party. The same letter was apparently submitted to many Oregon newspapers and printed in several of them. I saw the letter in the Portland (Oregon) Journal. It is a political effort but contained so many untruths that I thought it should be answered. The Oregon Journal very kindly printed nearly all of the letter I wrote in reply. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I present the full text of my letter to the Journal which was printed in part in its The People Speak column April 3:

MARCH 28, 1956.

To the EDITOR, OREGON JOURNAL,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: A letter to the editor which was printed in the Oregon Journal Sunday, March 18, 1956, signed by Howard Morgan, chairman of the Democratic Party of Oregon, impells me to call your attention to a paragraph of the Oregon corrupt practice law. It read as follows:

"260.370. Political criminal libel; penalty: (1) No letter, circular, poster, bill, publication or placard shall contain any false

statement or charges reflecting on any candidate's character, morality, or integrity. The author and every person printing or knowingly assisting in the circulation of the matter described in this section shall be guilty of political criminal libel; (2) violation of this section is punishable, upon conviction, by imprisonment in the penitentiary for not more than 3 years."

The Morgan letter certainly contains false statements reflecting on my character and integrity, and I am a candidate.

The Morgan letter says: "Representatives NORBLAD, COON, and ELLSWORTH have spent the last 3 years parroting the private power line that the Federal Government has stopped building power dams."

No such statement has been made by any of us.

The Morgan letter says: "The record demonstrates that these men have dragged their feet on every authorization or appropriation bill for Federal dams in the Northwest."

That is totally an untruth. I introduced and secured passage by the House of the bills to authorize the Cougar and Green Peter Dams and the Talent irrigation project as Federal multiple-purpose projects, including power. I have vigorously supported all such authorization bills. I have battled consistently for appropriations for these projects for 10 years and am doing so this year. Written records easily available prove this statement.

The Morgan letter says: "They offered no help to Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Representative GREEN in last year's successful Democratic fight for three new starts on Federal dams in the Northwest."

That is an untruth. I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee strongly urging appropriations for those dams. The Democrat Members of Congress made similar testimony some 2 weeks later.

The Morgan letter says: "They tried to deauthorize every Federal power project so the private power companies, after endless delays, can try to get authorization for gravy-train partnership deals."

This is likewise a falsehood. There has been no attempt to deauthorize Federal projects by Oregon Republicans.

Those printed statements are clearly "false statements or charges reflecting" on my "character, morality, or integrity"—to use the language of the law quoted above.

It was obviously the intention of the Oregon Legislature in passing that law to protect the public against untruthful statements and to protect candidates against such character assassination as contained in the Morgan letter quoted here.

Apparently, our opposition will, in desperation, continue to make such attacks. This seems to be the New Look in Oregon politics. I hope you, and the other editors and publishers in Oregon will give most careful attention to all political material offered for publication to the end that the spirit as well as the letter of the Oregon law is not again violated.

Sincerely yours,

HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

Development Little River Basin, Ark.-Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of Congress, I was invited to speak to the annual meeting of the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, La., Monday, April 2, 1956. It was my privilege to speak to the delegates of the association that afternoon.

The Little River and its tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma are a tributary of the Red River, which traverses several States, including Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana. The development of the Little River Basin for flood control and water conservation is a part of the comprehensive Red River program.

There is a lot of interest in the development of this watershed and since the major part of the program would be in my district, I spoke to the association on this problem. Because of its importance and the interest of the people throughout the area, I presented a plan which I believe should be a basis to compromise the differences and get this development under way. As a matter of public information and because of its importance, I include the speech I made at that time in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. OREN HARRIS BEFORE RED RIVER VALLEY ASSOCIATION ON APRIL 2, 1956

Mr. Chairman, members of the Red River Valley Association, distinguished guests of the Corps of Engineers, and friends, it is good to be back with you for this annual occasion. I consider it a signal honor and privilege to have the opportunity of this visit and to participate in this program. I appreciate the courtesy of your kind invitation.

This second session of the 84th Congress is about half over. These few days of respite give us an opportunity to reorganize and reinforce our vigor and vitality, which we hope will be conducive to more formidable results toward the best interest of our Nation. We are hopeful that out of the maze of activity, we will experience the best possible decisions for the betterment of the American people.

I want to commend this association for your efforts and continued progress toward the development of the Red River Basin. I know it appears sometimes that progress in this development is slow. It is sometimes discouraging but through the patience, understanding and determination of your officers and members, and with the drive of your able and forceful executive vice president and manager, Roy Matthias, you have achieved some very fine results.

It has been my pleasure to work with and cooperate with you and the people throughout the Red River Basin on those programs so necessary and imperative.

To be sure there are differences here and there which are only natural and to be expected in an area as big as Red River and which traverses some 4 or 5 States. The end result is the more important, however, as it always provides benefits and protection that bring advantages and economic opportunities to the people. We have worked together before the committees of the Congress in authorizing these important projects and obtaining appropriations for their development.

I have been an ardent supporter of the programs for flood control and to develop our rivers and streams, and in the conservation of our water resources throughout my years of service in the Congress of the United States. It means so very much to the protection and economic opportunities of our people and thus strength to our Nation. I have personally observed what it has meant to the localities and the areas affected by such development.

Permit me to say that we have the finest support in these justified and worthwhile projects of our Corps of Engineers. I am glad to see such a good representation of the corps here today. I want to commend them for the fine service they are performing for our country and to express my appreciation for the cooperation I always find them willing to give when at all possible.

We are deeply appreciative of the fact that we have been well received and had fine support and understanding from our congressional committees on this program for the development of the Red River Basin. The Public Works Committee and Appropriations Committee have both been quite considerate of our problem. Some of the major projects have been completed, as you know, such as, Bodcaw, Texarkana Dam and Ferrell's Bridge, which is now under way, and there are many others.

There are others to be developed. The major and most important ones necessary to the comprehensive Red River program are those in the Little River Basin, a major tributary of the Red River. The major part of this proposed development is in my district. In view of the circumstances and the importance of controlling and utilizing the waters of the Little River Basin, I feel it is appropriate for me to discuss it on this occasion.

In the first place, I want to make it very clear that I am not an engineer and do not claim any capabilities as an engineer. We maintain a Corps of Engineers for engineering data and information.

I also wish to say that I do not claim to know all the answers or to be in the position of determining myself what should or should not be done. It requires joint effort on so huge a task.

My mail has been exceedingly heavy, indicating the tremendous importance of this program. A lot of people, good people, with good intentions have contacted me about it. I am always glad to have such expressions of interest.

Also, let me say that I fully recognize the differences of opinion that prevail over the method of this proposed development. I am fully aware of the intense interest that exists and to the extent that many are apparently alarmed.

I cannot help but feel that some of the tension which exists is the result of some misunderstanding, some misinformation, and some fears of sophistry which in my opinion are not present, together with some prejudices in the minds of a few well-meaning citizens to the extent this has almost become an obsession.

I wish that I was capable of presenting the facts on which calm judgment would be exercised and just decisions made. I think I know most of the people affected and I know them well enough that they want to do what is right and best for all concerned.

I am going to undertake then to present this in a way, based on the knowledge and facts that I have, which I hope will be understood and considered accordingly. I want it perfectly understood that neither I, nor do I believe anyone else would want to do any injustice to anyone, or any area.

I have been quite familiar with this problem since its inception. I, therefore, believe I know something about the facts and the problems involved.

Let me give you something of the background of this matter for information. The Corps of Engineers reported some years ago a program for the comprehensive development of the Red River Basin below Denison necessary to protect the lives and property of the people throughout the basin and its tributaries, including the Little River in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

In 1945, we experienced the biggest and most devasting flood in recorded history of the valley. As a result, the Congress authorized a number of projects in the Flood Control Act of 1946. Millwood Dam in my

area was one of those major projects. The major part of this program being in my district, imposes terrific responsibility on me as your Congressman, which I am glad to assume, I feel it my duty to do the best I can for my people.

It was authorized as a flood-control project only. There were no provisions made for conservation or water supply. In fact, there was no request for it at that time. I supported the authorization of the project, along with others then, and do not recall any serious objection being offered. This was in 1946.

In 1950, there was a budget request of $150,000 for planning funds of the project. The Appropriations Committee of the House approved the planning funds and it was included in the bill reported by the committee.

At this stage, opposition to the project as authorized began to show, and an amendment on the floor of the House was offered to strike the planning funds. It was defeated.

The bill went to the Senate and the opposition had become more forceful and came to a head before the Senate Committee. The opposition was based on a desire for the development of upstream reservoirs and a reduced facility in the vicinity of Millwood.

As a result of the controversy, the Senate Appropriations Committee provided an additional $200,000 and directed the Corps of Engineers to make a further study as to the economic feasibility and justification of developing a number of upstream projects.

Remember, this happened in 1950, and no further progress has been or can be made until the report of the Engineers which was authorized at that time is filed with the Congress. The Congress has not yet had the benefit of the report from this additional study and now 6 years have elapsed.

In 1954, this question unfortunately was injected into a political campaign in my district. When you inject politics into one of these type problems, so often nobody wins and everybody loses.

I thought I saw what would be necessary if we were ever to be able to work out a solution.

I endeavored to obtain engineering data and information from our Corps of Engineers to be used as a basis for a decision which I believed to be best. Therefore, I took a definite position on the courthouse front at DeQueen, in Sevier County, and outlined a program that I would support, should it be economically feasible, as determined by the Engineers.

I stated publicly then and unequivocally that I would support the development of upstream dams with modification or reduction of Millwood making it a much smaller project. I had been advised by the Division Engineers Office that it might be possible and that such a program, if it could be worked out, would reduce the Millwood project by some 25 or more percent of its original authorized capacity. This was 2 years ago.

I have not changed my position since that announcement, as I have had no further information that any other plan would be more feasible, justified, or acceptable.

A year ago, the Red River Valley Association included a request to the Appropriations Committee, $250,000 for planning of the presently authorized Millwood project. There was no budget request before us. I appeared with your group representing this association and opposed the request to the committee for planning funds at that time. I did so on the basis that the Congress had previously provided for and directed the Engineers to make the survey of the upstream projects and report. I urged the committees then of both the House and the Senate to join me in requesting the Engineers to get their report in to the Congress.

Last September, the district engineers and the southwest division in Dallas submitted technical data and information to the Chief of Engineers' Office in Washington, with certain recommendations. This information will be on the basis of the final report. Some seem to think that the information and data filed, together with the recommendation of the field engineer is the final decision. This is not necessarily true at all.

Under established procedure, it is yet to be considered by the Board of Rivers and Harbors, composed of top officers in the Corps of Army Engineers. It is then submitted to the governors of the States affected for comment and the Federal agencies.

The Chief of Engineers will consider all of this information as he makes his decision, which will be final and which decision will be included in his report filed with the Congress.

Now, as to the present status. The division engineer has announced the submission of their data and information, together with their suggestions to the Board of Rivers and Harbors in Washington. The announcement explains the recommendations of the district engineer. In addition, it invites attention that there may be further consideration given to the justification of including (1) Lukfata in Oklahoma, and (2) water supply at Millwood. It invites interested parties to present views on these two questions along with the other suggestions in the report. Comments are to be received by the Board of Rivers and Harbors by April 17.

Following this public notice, the Board has issued a notice of public hearing to be held in Washington on April 25. All who are interested or may be affected by the plan of improvement to be considered are invited to appear.

Now, as to the question of what should be done in the best interest of all who may be affected. I should like to give you what I honestly believe would be in the best interest and call on all parties today to consider it with reason, calm, sound judgment, and on a practical and realistic basis.

It is a compromise proposal which I submit as a basis of agreement and as a joint and united effort.

In considering this compromise proposal I wish to remind you that there are two proposed methods for the development of the Little River Basin. (1) Millwood Dam and Reservoir as authorized in 1946, which would require the taking over by the Government a huge reservoir area of 107,000 acres of land, and (2) the construction of some six upstream reservoirs with a greatly reduced Millwood in capacity and acreage requirement.

In presenting this proposal for your consideration, let me ask you to keep in mind three basic facts. These three basic facts from my information cannot be denied or refuted. They are the basis for determining the method of properly and adequately controlling the waters of the Little River Basin to better serve the interest of all the people.

The first basic fact we must keep in mind is that the waters of the Little River Basin will inevitably and ultimately have to be controlled as a part of the comprehensive flood-control program of the Red River Basin. This is recognized by most everyone familiar with this problem. It is an accepted fact.

To meet this problem and to provide adequate flood protection, water conservation and water supply I think the public would be better served by providing for the construction of upstream reservoirs to be supplemented with a reduced facility at Millwood.

Therefore, I think the upstream reservoirs should be authorized and constructed as a basic part of this program. I think all six of the proposed dams in the upstream areas should be included as a comprehensive program in the upper reaches of the Little River Valley. This would include Lukfata Dam in Oklahoma, about which there seems to be some close economic question.

I think there should be as much flood-control protection in these six upstream reservoirs as they can provide.

I think each of these upstream dams should have as much water supply as the reservoirs can provide for the use and benefit of any possible development in the areas affected. For this water supply the upstream reservoirs would have first call on the water that could be impounded in them for this use.

Many people have asked me in letters and through other contacts to support the construction of upstream dams. This is a part of my proposal which I believe should influence people in this area to accept this compromise plan and join me in getting it under way. To give assurances for the upstream dams and supply of water I would be favorable to specific provisions in the act as a safeguard, similar to the language contained in the authorization of Denison some years ago.

If the people of Oklahoma and in my area in western Arkansas affected want these benefits and heavens knows they need them, I will lend my wholehearted support to obtain them, just as I said I would 2 years ago.

The second basic fact which must be considered is that to economically justify and provide adequate flood protection it will be necessary to have modification of the presently authorized Millwood project. This is a fact confirmed in every report or statement of the Engineers.

Some people have been led to believe and sincerely feel that it would be sufficient to satisfy the program by the development of these six upstream projects and thus make it unnecessary to have any facility at Millwood.

I am informed by the people who know, that is, the Corps of Engineers, that in the first place it is not possible to provide sufficient flood protection by these several smaller projects, and in the second place, unless there is a modified facility at Millwood, the Government could not justify the expenditure of the funds necessary for the construction of the upstream projects.

I am informed that in addition to the flood protection that can be provided by upstream projects, there should be a facility at Millwood sufficient to provide maximum flood protection of 1,666,000 acre feet. This would be a reduction in capacity of that facility by a little more than 25 percent from the original proposal.

With the construction of such a facility to provide this minimum requirement, some are fearful that it would adversely affect present highways, railroads, and some existing industry. I want to here and now allay any such fears.

Highway 71 would remain where it is. It would be raised slightly in varying amounts for a distance of 5.5 miles, I am advised.

The G. N. & A. Railroad from Nashville to Ashdown would not be relocated. It would be raised by varying amounts for a distance of about 14 miles. The service it provides would not be impaired or affected, in any way.

Neither would the Missouri Pacific Railroad or the Kansas City Southern Railroad be affected at all.

The town of Okay would not be affected because it is located above the reservoir area.

The Okay Cement Plant would not be endangered or affected. It would be adequately protected by a levee more than 8,000 feet long.

The town of Mineral Springs and the town of Horatio would not be adversely affected or ever be threatened in any way with floodwaters.

Another thing, some of our Oklahoma friends are fearful that some of their lands will be submerged by a Millwood facility.

With a modified Millwood, not 1 foot of land in Oklahoma would be flooded with even a maximum flood.

This is not my word as a layman, but it is assurances from the Engineers who know what the facts are.

Therefore, if anyone has any such fears on these questions let them pass from your minds.

Now, then, another important question is, how much area would be affected?

Under the original proposal which was authorized in 1946, 107,000 acres of land would have been subject to floods. That amount of property would for all practical purposes have been useless except for flood protection.

Therefore, the third basic fact is that with a modified Millwood complementing the upstream dams, the 5 year flood line would include an area of approximately 63,500 acres of land. This acreage would be required whether the project would be an open, so-called dry dam, or a closed, so-called wet reservoir.

This land would become useless for all practical purposes other than flood control. A small percentage of it could perhaps be usable for pasture purposes. This is a reduction of some 40 percent of the acreage involved as originally contemplated in the authorized project.

Nevertheless, this sixty-odd thousand acres of land would be necessary to the project as a necessary part of the overall program, regardless of whether it would be an open or closed dam.

Should, in addition, a water supply be included in Millwood for utilization in the area, it would require an additional estimated 7,300 acres of land, or less, depending upon the amount of water supply.

Therefore, whether there would be an available supply of water for municipal, industrial, and other purposes, or it would be a dry dam used only for flood protection involving only some 7,000 acres of land.

I think these are facts that ought to be understood by everyone in the consideration of this question.

Another fact, which is apparently misunderstood, if my mail is any indication, is that of the acreage which would be affected by the project, either wet or dry, only about 10 percent are cultivatable lands. A few acres, about 1,000 in fact, of this cultivatable land affected are located in Howard County. Only 2,000 acres or less in Sevier County and some 3,000 in Little River County. The rest of it is wooded lands, with a goodly portion of timber already cut out.

I repeat that this will be the effect, whether the project would be open or closed.

Another question which has been so highly exaggerated and misunderstood according to my mail, is the effect it would have on continuous timber harvesting operations. Some have been led to believe, and honestly feel, that there are enormous amounts of timberlands involved with the issue.

As it is in the case of the acreage, it would only amount to some 7,300 acres, or less, dependent on the amount of water supply. No one could seriously contend that this relatively small acreage could have any great effect on any large timber operation.

I am assured by the Engineers that there is plenty of water for all the storage supply that can be provided by the upstream dams and an amount in Millwood depending on the acreage of storage supply available. Therefore, even if water supply were to be included in the Millwood Reservoir, it would not deprive the upstream projects of 1 gallon of water.

Thus, the entire issue hinges on a difference of only 5,000 to 10,000 acres of land involved, dependent upon the amount of water supply and most of this would be cut-over timbered lands.

This to me, when all the facts are recognized, should not be of sufficient consequence to cause such grave concern or a proper and just settlement to fail.

Therefore, it is my intention to go before the Board of Rivers and Harbors, on the 25th of April, in support of a program based on these facts for the construction of all six upstream reservoirs for such flood protection and water supply as they will provide; as necessary to complement them, I will support and recommend a modified Millwood Dam with flood protection of 1,500,000 acre-feet capacity.

This is 166,000 acre-feet less than suggested by the district engineer, which would be converted to and to provide for a water supply for municipal, agricultural and industrial purposes in the area.

If this were to be accepted, no additional acres of land would be involved by the water supply storage. The same number of acres of land would be required with this proposal as if it were to be a dry or open dam suggested in the data and information of the Division Engineer.

In my opinion, this would not materially affect, if at all, flood protection. In fact, it would provide over 600,000 acre-feet more of flood capacity than the original Millwood proposal would have provided.

If this recommendation is unacceptable to the Engineers, as an alternate plan, I will suggest that the additional acres necessary of some 5,000 to 10,000 acres be included to provide such water supply depending upon the amount engineeringly feasible.

If, as has been established, this would not affect the highway, the railroads, the cement company, or these communities adversely, and would not deprive any of the upstream reservoirs of any part of their water supply, and thus not interfere with any opportunity for the development of industry, and would not involve but a few additional acres of land, if any, that would in no way impair or affect timber or mill operations, there could be no legitimate objection to this approach to the problem.

Again, I call on all of those throughout the area affected, to seriously consider this approach as a practical and realistic method of determining this question.

If we could have unity and united effort, we could get this to the Congress and authorized this year. If not, it will be most difficult and perhaps impossible to get it in this year's omnibus authorization.

If this or some similar approach is not accepted the alternative will be tragic to our area. We may very well be faced with a problem which would be beyond our reach.

As I have already said, Millwood Dam is presently authorized for flood control protection only. If we fail to reach some acceptable compromise there will inevitably be a budget request for this presently authorized project.

The Engineers, the Government and the Congress, no doubt would conclude that since we have not reached an agreement the presently authorized project at Millwood should be constructed. Certainly the Red River Valley Association will be urging it. Should a budget be submitted to the Congress to initiate its construction it would very likely be accepted regardless of our efforts. This is so, because as I have said, as a basic fact, the waters of the Little River Basin will inevitably be controlled.

Should this happen we would never be able to get any of the upstream reservoirs. We would in fact be barred forever of making them economically feasible.

Should this happen there would be no water supply in the Millwood Reservoir. The people throughout all of the area would be forever barred of any water supply so badly needed and necessary if we are to have any future development.

Therefore, you can see why I plead for some acceptable compromise in order that we will not lose the greatest economic opportunity ever afforded for the future of this area.

The only objection in my opinion that could be seriously entertained against this solution would be on the question of pollution. I cannot conceive of anyone advocating that this river be used as a sewer disposal. If so, they might as well change their thinking.

This river has been one of the finest streams for recreation in the country. The people are not going to permit it to be so destroyed. Our State and the Conservation Department of Arkansas, in my opinion, would never permit.

In fact, industry throughout the country is fast coming to a full realization that polluting the streams must come to a halt and other methods of disposal adopted. There is urgency now for legislation to prevent pollution, both in the States and in the National Congress. This is a policy the country might as well in my judgment get ready for. I hope it will so be understood at the outset in this particular instance.

I earnestly solicit serious consideration of the members of the Red River Valley Association and of all those who may be affected throughout the area of this position which I take, and these recommendations; which I believe would do justice to all concerned.

There is no area anywhere in greater need of economic opportunities and development than the area affected by this watershed in Oklahoma and Arkansas. There has never been a water project developed anywhere that did not bring opportunities for economic development to it. I want to see some of these advantages brought to our part of the country, and I am thoroughly convinced that if the people throughout the area would join together with me in this development, it would enhance our economy manyfold. It is our chance, let us take advantage of it.

Analysis of Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 12, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the agriculture bill of 1956 represents the combined judgment of 10 top men on the Senate and House Agriculture Committees. They worked many days and nights diligently and carefully in order to produce a bill that would be acceptable to the administration. It is very difficult to write an agriculture bill that will fit all parts of our agriculture economy in the 48 States. There were conflicting ideas that had to be compromised.

I believe the bill the conferees brought to the House was brought by men who lifted themselves above prejudices and partisan politics. They tried to write a bill that would serve agriculture, but they naturally did not please all sections of agriculture. Indeed, the three great farm organizations do not see eye to eye on the question of accepting or rejecting the bill. I have listened carefully to the debate; I have read the bill, and I am of the opinion that there is more good in the bill than there is bad. There are some things that I would have liked to have taken out of the bill—there are some things that I would have kept in

the bill. It seems to be the best measure we can get.

I voted against recommitting the farm bill because the only provisions that would increase the farm income for 1956 would have been stricken from the bill had it been recommitted.

The President, in his message to Conress on January 9, 1956, set up a 9-point program and urged prompt action in order to increase the farmer's income this year. The soil bank would have placed about $1.2 billion in the pocket of the farmer. It is too late for the soil bank to take effect in 1956. It seemed to me that the only way to carry out the President's wishes to raise the income of the farmer this year would be by keeping parity prices up for 1 more year. Without this provision there would have been a reduction in the parity prices as well as in the acreage. You cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production, and at the same time reducing the prices he receives.

I feel there is more good in the bill than bad. The soil bank, which will go into effect next year, is designed to pay the farmer for taking land out of production. The present bill contains a domestic parity plan for wheat. This must be voted on in 1957 and carry, by two-thirds vote of the wheat farmers, in order to become effective. The bill carries a dual, modern price system for 1 year. This is designed to raise farm income until the soil bank can become effective. It contains a provision for $500 million to process surplus crops and get them into channels of relief both in this country and in foreign countries. It contains a provision for a commission to study the proposition of converting surplus crops into industrial alcohol. It contains a provision to prohibit production of supported commodities on Government-owned land.

I am convinced that the buying power of the farmer is essential to the men and women in labor, industry, and business in all communities. Farmers find themselves in a price-squeeze situation which in many towns has severely affected all business.

Farm income was estimated in 1955 to be about $10.8 billion. That is down 9 percent from 1954. In 1954 farm income was less than it was in 1953. The 1953 income was less than in 1952. The President said in his January 9 message, "Farm prices and incomes are depressing; unless corrected, these economic reverses are a direct threat to all of our people." I believe this bill as enacted, with the dual modern parity system, will bring income to the farmer this year. Dual parity and 90-percent parity will be the only means for a year to assure the farmer additional income. This is the only way you can carry out the President's desire to raise the income of the farmer, because the soil bank, which would have cost $1.2 billion, cannot become effective this year. The 90-percent parity will cost less than the soil bank.

If the farmer approves the domestic parity plan for wheat by his vote in 1957, it will not cost the Government one thin dime. I think it is a good provision. There are some consumers who claim it will increase the cost of bread and flour, but the evidence shows that from 1948 to 1955 wheat prices declined 31 percent, while the price of bread went up 28 percent.

Under the present farm bill, wool and sugar are supported at about 100 percent parity; cotton, tobacco, and peanuts at about 90 percent parity. The only crops not being supported at near 90 percent parity would be corn and wheat.

When the soil-bank provisions become effective, there ought to be a reevaluation and a restudy of the parity situation.

I repeat, you cannot help the farmer by taking land out of production or by reducing the parity price he receives. I trust the President will consider this when he decides the question of signing or vetoing the bill. I trust his advisers will point out that the soil bank cannot become effective this year, and that if he really wishes to keep the income of the farmer in balance, then the dual-parity and the 90-percent-parity provisions in the bill will be in existence this year. They are only for 1 year's duration.

There are some provisions in the bill that I do not particularly like; but when you consider that 10 earnest, sincere men worked many days on the compromise, you must conclude that there is more good in the bill than harm. It cannot please everyone. Each Member of Congress has a duty to perform to his district, State, and Nation. I have followed the dictates of my conscience. I hope the advisers to the President will weigh carefully the pros and cons of the bill, particularly in the light of the President's message of January 9 this year.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles Duell Kean, D. D., rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful God, who art the Sovereign Lord of men and nations, in whose hand the rise and fall of empires are but as grains of sand, yet who carest in infinite love for all Thy children;

We pray Thee for the Senate of these United States assembled in Thy presence, that Thou wilt bless its Members in the performance of their duties, and that Thou wilt prosper their undertakings as these can be related to Thy divine providence.

Give to the several Members of the Senate, we pray Thee, O Lord, wisdom, courage, and consecration; overcome their fears, support them when they are tormented by anxiety; enlighten them when they are perplexed and uncertain; strengthen them when they are under pressure; and comfort them when they face misunderstanding.

Relate their deliberations and counsels, O Lord, to the welfare of this Nation and the physical, moral, and spiritual health of all its people; use their endeavors to bring peace and harmony in all the length and breadth of this land; and make their achievements serve Thy sovereign purpose through contributing to the wider peace of the world.

All this we pray in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Kibbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until a week from today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed

to the consideration of executive business and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Warren E. Burger, resigning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations today confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of two appropriation allotments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CANDIDATES SELECTED FOR 1956 NROTC PROGRAM

A letter from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of principal and alternate candidates selected for the 1956 regular NROTC program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS UNDER SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of operations under the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, dated April 13, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that bank, for the period July–December 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation, for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR EGYPT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the United States assistance program for Egypt, International Cooperation Administration, Department of State, dated June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the Crooked River project, Oregon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CONFINEMENT IN CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE GRANT OF PROBATION

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-count indictment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Karl Yu from a report transmitted to the Senate on July 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to Armed Forces bombing and artillery ranges

"Whereas extensive areas of land and water within the State of California have been designated as bombing and artillery ranges and training areas for the Armed Forces; and

"Whereas use of land as a bombing area and artillery range precludes its use for other purposes; and

"Whereas many citizens believe that the Armed Forces do not have a program of maximum integrated land use in effect relating to areas which have been, or may be, designated as bombing and artillery ranges; and

"Whereas in order to insure the continued growth of California and prosperity of its residents it is mandatory that, in view of the limited areas of land within the State and the needs of future land development, further military use of such land be kept at a minimum: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to require that all Armed Forces requests for additional bombing and artillery ranges be accompanied by proof that all areas presently under their control suitable for use as bombing and artillery ranges are being utilized to their fullest extent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from

California in the Congress of the United States."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to providing increased benefits for survivors of military personnel

"Whereas action is now pending in the United States Senate on H. R. 7089, the Hardy bill, which provides for substantially increased benefits for survivors of military personnel; and

"Whereas in view of the reduced purchasing power of the dollar it is imperative that the benefits payable to survivors of military personnel be increased so that these people will not become a burden upon the communities in which they live; and

"Whereas although the cost of living has greatly increased in the past few years and, in line with such increase, most employees have received substantial raises in pay, nothing yet has been done to increase the meager benefits now payable to survivors of military personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 7089; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to continuance of increased grants-in-aid for old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits

"Whereas the California Legislature at the 1952 second extraordinary session increased the old-age security and aid-to-the-blind benefits to California recipients by the maximum amount of $5 per month by passing on to them the increase in Federal grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas this increase was made contingent upon the continuation of the increased grants-in-aid by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the increase in the Federal grants-in-aid will expire unless Congress enacts legislation at the current session continuing the increase; and

"Whereas the Governor of California, the Honorable Goodwin Knight, has requested the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California to support Federal legislation continuing the increased grants-in-aid; and

"Whereas at the 1955 session of the legislature senate bill No. 398 was enacted and signed by the Governor providing that if an additional $5 per month increase in grants-in-aid for old-age security and blind aid is provided by Congress such increase would be immediately passed on to old-age security and blind-aid recipients in this State; and

"Whereas high living costs and the maintenance of a reasonably adequate and fair old-age security and aid-to-the-blind program in California warrant the continuation of the present $5 increase as well as the authorization of an additional $5 increase; and

"Whereas legislation is pending in the Congress of the United States which would accomplish these two objectives for the recipients of old-age security and aid to the blind: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States enact legislation at this session continuing the increased grants-in-aid passed in 1952 and give careful consideration to an additional $5 increase, and that support be given such legislation by the Senators and Representatives in Congress from California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relative to permitting recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 per month in addition to such aid

"Whereas in 1950 the Congress of the United States amended the social-security law to provide that the first $50 per month of income earned by a blind person shall be disregarded in computing aid to such person, thereby allowing a blind person to earn this amount in addition to his aid; and

"Whereas legislation is presently before the Congress of the United States which would extend this same benefit to recipients of aid to the aged; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Legislature of the State of California that there is an abundance of odd jobs and temporary employment in this State that could be capably filled by aged persons; and

"Whereas the present public-assistance program discourages these aged persons from seeking such employment by requiring that any and all earnings be deducted from their aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to permit recipients of aid to the aged to earn $50 a month, which amount shall not be taken into consideration in computing aid to such recipients; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to Federal disability payments for aged and needy veterans

"Whereas there are in this country today thousands of aged and disabled needy war veterans who are unemployable and who have little or no income on which to live; and

"Whereas the laws enacted by Congress to assist such veterans are being defeated by arbitrary and unjust interpretations given them by the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas it is particularly deplorable and discriminatory that the Veterans' Administration has ruled that a 65-year-old veteran, suffering from the disabilities and ailments that come with old age, remains employable if he can eke out a few dollars here and there by part-time work to supplement an otherwise inadequate income, and on that ground denies disability payments to such veterans; and

"Whereas the rise in the cost of living that has occurred since the scale for veterans' payments was established some years ago has also resulted in hardships on those who are aged and disabled; and

"Whereas the American Legion is solidly behind a program to correct these inequities by raising the monthly benefits for disabled veterans to bring them more in line with today's increased living costs, by raising the limitation on the annual income which a veteran may receive and still remain eligible for disability benefits, and by amending the present law to include the automatic presumption that a veteran at the age of 65 becomes unemployable due to advancing years and physical infirmities and thus entitled to security benefits provided he can meet the income limitation and other requirements; and

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress the War Veterans Security bill, H. R. 7886, which embodies these provisions and will give some much needed help to these veterans who are now old and infirm, but who in their younger days answered their country's call: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 7886; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed Washoe project

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress legislation to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, which project involves the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers, and which project originates in California, with some of its principal features located in California; and

"Whereas most of the benefits of this project, as planned by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, accrue to the State of Nevada, and the legislation before Congress contains no provisions to protect the State of California with respect to the potential future development of the areas in this State which may possibly necessitate the use of waters involved in this project; and

"Whereas the State Engineer of California has recommended at hearings before congressional committees (1) that storage and water supply for the Washoe project be based on stream runoff in the Truckee and Carson River basins as impaired by present and future use of water in the areas of origin in California, (2) that the amount of water to be available to the Washoe project be defined in an interstate compact and the project operated in conformance therewith, and (3) that the Washoe project provide a dependable water supply to lands in the Carson Valley in California as well as to lands in the same valley in Nevada, but such recommendations have not been adopted in pending legislation; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California believes that the storage and distribution of waters which affect the interests of two or more States should be accomplished in conformity with the desires of the States involved and in pursuance of this policy has created a commission to cooperate with a similar commission from the State of Nevada in formulating an interstate compact relative to the distribution and use of the waters of, among others, the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas the interstate compact now under negotiation between the commissions of the State of California and the State of Nevada will determine the amount of water that can reasonably be made available for future development in the areas of origin in California; and

"Whereas it is not contemplated or believed that the provisions of such compact will have a detrimental effect upon the operation of the proposed Washoe project or that the negotiation of such compact should be cause for delay of authorization of the

project by the Congress if appropriate safeguards are included therein; and

"Whereas amendments have been proposed to S. 497, 84th Congress, first session, one of the congressional bills to authorize the construction of the Washoe project, to provide protection for the future development in the areas of origin in California and to provide that the operation of the Washoe project shall be in conformance with any interstate compact formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and

"Whereas there is precedent for the inclusion in statutes authorizing Federal reclamation projects of a provision subjecting project operation to requirements of State law, as exemplified by the statute authorizing the Santa Maria project (68 Stat. 1190); and

"Whereas it is not the intention of the Legislature of the State of California in adopting this resolution to voice opposition to the authorization of the proposed Washoe project, which project the legislature firmly believes is a desirable and necessary development, but rather only to urge that provision be made in the legislation authorizing such project to protect the future development of the areas in California involved in this project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the construction of the Washoe project with appropriate statutory provisions to (a) afford water users in Alpine County, Calif., the opportunity to contract for project water made available by the Watasheamu Reservoir before that water is made available for the development of any new land in Nevada, with the right of such Alpine County water users to exchange the water so secured for existing rights to the natural flow or stored water of the West Carson River; (b) provide that the use of the waters of the Little Truckee River solely for the generation of electric power by the Washoe project shall be subject to appropriation in the future for beneficial consumptive uses within the Little Truckee River watershed in California to the same extent that such waters may be presently available for appropriation in the State of California, unless and until an interstate compact is formulated and approved, covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers; and (c) provide that the dam at the Stampede site shall be so constructed as to permit its ultimate enlargement to a height at which the reservoir behind it will have a capacity of approximately 175,000 acre-feet; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to compliance with State water laws

"Whereas under the California State water resources law of 1945, as amended, the State water resources board was authorized and directed to prepare a comprehensive and coordinated plan for the full development of California water resources, for which purpose said board has expended nearly $4 million to date; and

"Whereas such comprehensive plan, known as the California water plan, pursuant to the direction of said board, is under formulation by the division of water resources and is approaching completion, and a preview thereof has been published; and

"Whereas in recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing the Federal Power Act, it has been held that licenses of the Federal Power Commission may construct and operate hydroelectric projects without compliance with State laws relating to the development and use of water; and

"Whereas application and extension of the precedents established in said cases might result in Federal domination of the use and development of the water resources of the States; and

"Whereas such precedents constitute an impediment to the continued exercise of the traditional rights of the States to control and develop their water resources in the public interest; and

"Whereas it appears that remedial legislation by the Congress is necessary in order to protect and preserve such traditional rights of the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to promptly enact Federal legislation to require all Federal agencies and their licensees to comply with State laws relating to the development and use of water.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to national minerals policy

"Whereas the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference was called by Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of California, in Sacramento, Calif., on November 7 and 8 1955, after consultation by Governor Knight with Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada, who is chairman of the Western Governors Advisory Council; and

"Whereas this conference and the subsequent meetings of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council produced the following recommendations for the development of a national minerals policy:

"'MINERAL ECONOMICS—RECOMMENDATIONS ON MINERAL COMMODITIES

"'1. Gold

"'The council calls attention to the following conditions in regard to gold:

"'1. The absolute and arbitrary control exercised by the United States Treasury over the production, disposition, and holding of domestic gold is in direct violation of the rights of personal liberty, personal security, and personal ownership of private property.

"'2. The Government has usurped the right of individuals to sell newly mined gold to industry and to the arts, and has denied individuals the right to own, buy, or sell this commodity in a free market.

"'3. The sale of gold from our Federal gold reserve for other than monetary use annually exceeds the total domestic gold production and is dissipating the United States monetary reserves.

"'4. By making itself the sole buyer of newly mined gold in processed form and by fixing its arbitrary and low price, the United States Government imposes such hardships on the domestic gold producer that 95 percent of the primary gold mines have been forced to close operations.

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. Congress be urged to enact legislation to discontinue the sale of Government-owned gold from the monetary reserve to private industry and to restore to the people of the United States the right freely to buy, possess, sell, and otherwise treat gold. Such legislation is now pending in the Congress, but references to gold therein should be amended so as to not limit the measure to newly mined gold.

"'2. The respective State legislatures be requested to urge the Congress to support such legislation.

"'2. Silver

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. The existing policy, whereby newly mined domestic silver may be tendered to the Treasury Department for coinage purposes, be continued.

"'2. Senate bill 1427, "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver and for other purposes," be rejected by the Congress.

"'3. As longer range objectives, the council further recommends that:

"'(a) The sale of Government-owned silver by the Treasury Department at less than its coinage value of $1.2929 per troy ounce be prohibited; and

"'(b) The seigniorage retained by the Treasury Department be progressively reduced in recognition of the steadily mounting cost of producing silver.

"'(4) The council highly commends the governors and the legislators of the Western States for the vigorous support which they have given to the silver mining industry, and we respectfully call to their attention the fact that their continued support is urgently needed.

"'3. Lead and zinc

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. An excise tax of 2 cents per pound be established on imports of zinc and lead to take effect whenever the price of zinc falls below 14 cents, East St. Louis, and the price of lead to 16 cents, New York.

"'2. The present stockpiling of lead and zinc should be continued until such an excise tax is put into effect.

"'4. Copper

"'The council recommends that:

"'The present excise tax on imported copper be maintained.

"'5. Molybdenum

"'The council recommends that:

"'The national stockpile program on molybdenum concentrates be continued until maximum emergency defense requirements are met.

"'6. Fluorspar

"'The council recommends that:

"'The fluorspare industry be afforded tariff protection and/or restriction of fluorspar imports sufficient to permit its survival.

"'7. Uranium—Vanadium

"'The council strongly urges that:

"'The Atomic Energy Commission make a prompt public declaration regarding the continuation and extension of its uranium-purchase program. Upon the announcement of its proposed program the domestic industry at large should be provided an opportunity to appraise and evaluate said proposed program and to submit further recommendations before its final adoption. Meantime, so long as the Government retains control of the purchase and use of uranium, the council looks to the Atomic Energy Commission to maintain an adequate purchase program and to prepare plans for an orderly transition from the current monopolies to the period when industrial requirements predominate.

"'The council strongly urges that more access and mine-to-market roads be planned and completed with all possible speed.

"'The council favors the continued curtailment by the Atomic Energy Commission of its exploration drilling program and urges that funds hitherto allocated for that purpose be made available to the Defense Mineral Exploration Administration.

"'The council further recommends that:

"'The security program be reexamined in order that maximum information be made available to the industry for effective future planning.

"'The Atomic Energy Commission should arrange to facilitate and plan continuity of studies of problems of the industry related to the marketing of uranium ores, in particular: (a) penalties now being imposed for high lime content; (b) the disposition of other metals produced in association with uranium including vanadium, copper, et cetera, and (c) the feasibility of establishing fixed uniform prices for uranium concentrates. These studies should enlist the personnel and experience of the Atomic Energy Commission, appropriate State and Federal agencies as well as private research organizations and the producing industry.

"'The council urges that:

"'In all future raw material purchase programs that the domestic uranium industry be given paramount consideration.

"'8. Rare earths and thorium

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. The Atomic Energy Commission should establish a price and buying schedule for thorium similar to that for uranium, since it has complete control of both these fissionable materials.

"'2. A tariff be placed on foreign monazite, bastnasite, and rare earth compounds which is sufficiently high to permit domestic producers to survive. A tariff of 10 cents per pound on contained rare earths metals is suggested.

"'3. Until Nos. 1 and 2 above are effective the Federal Government should make new contracts to purchase monazite and bastnasite concentrates in sufficient quantities and at a price which will maintain an adequate mobilization base for the industry.

"'9. Quicksilver

"'The council calls attention to the fact the market for mercury is assured by GSA purchases until December 31, 1957, but it has no knowledge of any definite demand which could assure the continuation of the domestic industry much beyond that date.

"'The council recommends:

"'1. The establishment of a tariff equivalent in protection and at the same percentage of the selling price as at the time the present tariff was established (1922).

"'2. If this is not possible, there should be established a plan of distributing the tariff paid by foreign producers to domestic producers in accordance with their production with the tariff adjusted from 25 cents per pound to 35 cents per pound.

"'3. In the absence of 1 or 2 above then the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued until the present appropriation is expended.

"'10. Tungsten

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. An adequate tariff be established to enable the domestic tungsten mining industry to stand on its own feet and compete with the low-cost foreign producers.

"'2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then an adequate tariff on imported tungsten ore should be established, the proceeds of which must be distributed to the producers of domestic tungsten produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"'3. A purchase program for a reasonable period be established providing for reduced Government purchases at lower than current floor prices, based on the grade and impurities of the concentrates purchased, and with gradually reducing amounts and prices to enable complete withdrawal of the United States Government from the program by the end of that period.

"'4. Until 1, or 2, and 3 above are put into effect, the principles and purpose, as expressed in H. R. 6373 (84th Cong.), be reaffirmed as desirable objectives to provide a continuing and prosperous tungsten mining industry in order that an adequate mobilization base might be maintained.

"'The council suggests:

"'That the Department of Defense be advised that it is no longer necessary to "design around" tungsten. It should be used wherever and whenever it is best suited to the defense problem in hand.

"'11. Chrome

"'The council recommends that:

"'In order to prevent the domestic chrome industry from being shut down in the fall of 1956 and in order that the industry might continue as a mobilization base for possible emergency, that:

"'1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore;

"'2. If it is impossible to obtain such a tariff, then a tariff equal to five-eighths cent per pound on contained chromium metal in imported chromite ore should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of chromite produced and sold within the United States in proportion to their production. Then the chrome industry could continue into the foreseeable future as a strong, healthy industry, capable of expansion and able to act as a mobilization base in time of national emergency;

"'3. Until such a long term program as outlined under 1 or 2, is adopted and put into effect, the General Services Administration purchase program should be continued on its present basis.

"'12. Manganese

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. A tariff be established of 5 cents per pound of contained manganese in imported foreign ores;

"'2. If the stipulation in paragraph 1 is impossible, then a tariff equivalent to one-half cent per pound of contained manganese be imposed, the proceeds being distributed to domestic producers on the basis of each domestic producer's unit production produced and sold;

"'3. The limitation of 10,000 tons on the carlot program be eliminated until the provisions of either paragraph 1 or 2 are adopted;

"'4. If the recommendations in paragraphs 1 and 2 are impossible, then a program similar to the present carlot program should be put into effect over a long term of years.

"'The council suggests that;

"'Every effort be made to obtain a treatment plant at either the Deming, N. Mex., or the Wenden, Ariz., depot to beneficiate stockpile ores to usable grade.

"'13. Antimony

"'In order to reactivate domestic antimony production the council recommends that:

"'1. Minimum tariff rates be established.

"'(a) On antimony ore and concentrates at not less than 15 cents per pound of contained antimony; and

"'(b) On antimony smelter products at not less than 30 cents per pound of contained antimony.

"'2. If it is not possible to obtain such tariffs then a tariff of 6 cents per pound on contained antimony metal in imported antimony metal, ores or concentrates should be established. The proceeds of this tariff must be distributed to the producers of primary antimony, produced and sold within the United States, in proportion to their production.

"'14. Asbestos

"'The council recommends that:

"'1. Unused funds now earmarked for the purchase of No. 3 fiber be made available to purchase additional No. 1 and No. 2 high grade fiber, thereby making usable all of the funds allocated to the G. S. A. Globe warehouse. The purchase of No. 3 should be continued on the present ratio of 3 tons of No. 3 purchased to each ton of No. 1 or No. 2 (approximately $1 million remains in the No. 3 fund to supply funds for the above change in the program).

"'2. Fiber of national stockpile quality now in the Globe warehouse be transferred to the national stockpile and the Globe warehouse be credited accordingly;

"'3. The life of the asbestos program be extended. This can be done by making available to Arizona asbestos producers part of the funds allocated to the national stockpile and changing the present Globe warehouse program as in No. 1 above;

"'4. The inspection of fiber for transfer to the national stockpile be done by G. S. A. classifiers now inspecting Globe warehouse fiber;

"'5. Fiber of national stockpile quality and sold to the national stockpile to be checked in at the Globe warehouse and paid for as now being done through San Francisco office of G. S. A.;

"'6. The present standards of quality be retained.

"'15. Coal

"'The council recommends that:

"'The governors give equal consideration to all of the available energy resources—uranium, coal, oil, gas, oil shale and water—before deciding which is to be used as the source of generating power in any given area.

"'16. Aggregates—Clay—Talc

"'The council recommends that:

"'The congressional committees on interstate and foreign commerce be urged to investigate the encroachment by the I. C. C. regulations on many minerals and mineral aggregate in intrastate commerce.

"'Lands and Water

"'The council considers the objective of the general mining laws to be the discovery and development of the mineral resources of the public domain by private enterprise. To effect this objective the laws invite citizens to prospect for minerals and upon discovery to locate valid mining claims. The mining laws also provide for protection of valid claims and the possessory rights thereunder prior to patent, and for transfer of legal title to private ownership by patent. History has proven the soundness of this system, and the council reaffirms its confidence in it.

"'The council holds that public lands are not the property of the Government of the United States or of any of its agencies but instead are lands held in trust for the people of the United States, and are destined for their eventual use under the principles of free enterprise. Vast areas of the West have in prospect many present and future uses, but they are most likely to find best use as a source of the national mineral wealth.

"'The continued inroads upon the use of this land which are made by Federal withdrawal of the land from mineral entry, or by acquisition by various agencies of the Federal Government, have long been adverse to the economy of the West. Such inroads have been tremendously augmented in recent years by military acquisition of huge areas in the Western States. This has served to curtail seriously the productivity of private enterprise within the State, and to reduce State and Federal income, as well as the supply of materials for the defense of the country. Under present laws, no Federal-land State has the power effectively to resist such inroads.

"'For those cogent reasons the council recommends that:

"'1. As to Federal land withdrawals:

"'(a) The western governors urge an immediate congressional investigation of Federal lands now withdrawn from mineral entry and other beneficial uses, whether withdrawn for military or other purposes, and

of western lands otherwise acquired by the various agencies of the Federal Government; that among other things such investigation determine the necessity for and the authenticity of the withdrawal, whether the land is still serving the purpose for which it was withdrawn or acquired and whether portions of it or the whole of it may be returned to the public domain or to private owners (with priority right for repurchase given to original owners); and that such investigation determine whether the various agencies and military units cannot combine their activities as to the use of such lands rather than making separate use thereof, in order to give such land the highest possible usefulness.

"'(b) Congress be urged by the governors to explore the possibility of Federal legislation requiring the cooperation and approval of any State for any Federal withdrawal or acquisition within its boundaries.

"'(c) The western governors request Congress to enact legislation to provide that in all further Federal-land withdrawals, for military use or otherwise:

"'(1) Public hearings be held on the proposed withdrawals.

"'(2) These hearings be held in at least one community within or near the area proposed for withdrawal.

"'(3) Notice of these hearings be published in the Federal Register and in a newspaper having maximum circulation in affected areas, at least 90 days in advance of the hearings.

"'(4) These hearings shall seek to determine the relative beneficial use of the land involved, and whether excessive acreages are being proposed for withdrawal.

"'2. As to the Oil and Gas Leasing Act:

"'The western governors opposed any further amendment of the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 30 U. S. C. A. 181, et seq.), or any other legislative proposals which would add any further classes of lessees or any minerals or mineral deposits to those now named in said act.

"'3. As to Mineral Leasing Act:

"'The western governors urge the Department of Interior to reappraise the maximum acreage limitations presently existing on the leasing of Federal mineral lands withdrawn from location and increase the acreage to meet the requirements of modern mining and refining needs. Illustrative of such need is phosphate.

"'It is the considered opinion of the council that no further restriction should be placed upon the noncompetitive lease rules and regulations and that such regulations should be so administered as to encourage the investment of venture capital.

"'4. As to restrictive Federal legislation:

"'(a) The western governors oppose any and all legislation in the Congress that promotes further control and withdrawal of Federal lands from the public domain.

"'(b) The governors urge the Congress of the United States to return to the first principles laid down by our Founding Fathers, that the Federal lands of the United States are for the benefit of the citizens and should be sold and disposed of to the citizens as rapidly as is practically possible, so that those lands may be made the subject of private ownership by our citizenry and the subject of taxation for the support of local and State governments.

"'(c) The western governors advocate the annulment of the rules and regulations promulgated by the many departments of Government withdrawing and otherwise prohibiting possession of public lands by the citizens of this Nation, so that the citizens may again be free to take up the land under the original laws relating to mining or agricultural classification and carry that land through to patent without interference by a multitude of governmental agencies.

"'5. As to geophysical exploration:

"'The governors urge Congress to give prompt consideration of constructive changes in the discovery provisions of the General Mining Laws so as to afford a reasonable period of protection to those who in good faith seek a mineral discovery where the object of exploration is a deep or hidden deposit and discovery can only be made following prolonged use of expensive equipment and modern scientific methods of prospecting.

"'6. As to "in lieu" lands:

"'The western governors recommend to Congress a thorough study of the need for legislation serving to permit the public land States to make "in lieu" selection from mineral lands, for the mineral lands lost to the State because of the preemption of numbered school sections before the State's right to such sections was determined by survey.

"'7. As to State mining laws:

"'The western governors investigate the desirability of making more uniform the laws of the various States governing location and annual assessment work, and other mineral land matters within their jurisdiction.

"'Taxes

"'The council holds that the continuance of a healthy and prosperous mining industry and the contributions it can and should make to the public revenue, to employment, to national security, and to the general welfare, depends upon continuing production from now operating mines and the continuing discovery and development of new deposits. Essential to this is the hope for profits commensurate with the difficulties, the effort, and the risks of losses involved. The inherent risks in mining cannot be avoided, and taxes should not be imposed in nature or amounts as will kill incentives for incurring these risks and will result in loss of Government revenues and harm to the domestic economy.

"'The council recommends:

"'1. As to depletion:

"'(a) Full and adequate allowance for percentage as well as cost depletion should be provided for all minerals on a fair and equitable basis, not less favorable than present rates. We particularly note the necessity of such allowances in the development of so-called oil shales in the Western States.

"'(b) Depletion should be recognized as an allowance to stockholders in determining the taxability of dividends they receive as well as being allowed to the corporation in determining its taxable income.

"'2. As to exploration costs:

"'Cost of exploration, as well as development, should be allowed as a deduction without the limitations imposed by present law.

"'3. As to depreciation:

"'The provisions for more reasonable depreciation contained in present law should be retained without fundamental changes. No amount should be considered as recovered by depreciation deductions which has not effectively reduced the taxpayer's income subject to tax.

"'4. As to operating loss:

"'The more equitable allowance of net operating losses provided by present law should be maintained.

"'5. As to research expenditures:

"'The allowance under present law as a deduction of expenditures on research and experimentation should be preserved.

"'6. As to double taxation of corporate earnings:

"'The small step recently taken to minimize double taxation of corporate earnings should be enlarged.

"'7. As to new mines:

"'New mines should be exempted from income taxes for 3 years after commercial production begins.

"'8. As to capital gains:

"'A further reduction of the rate on net long-term capital gains would be economically beneficial to the mining industry and, on the basis of past experience, would increase net revenue collected.

"'9. As to severance taxes:

"'In State taxation, no particular tax nor the combined Federal, State and local taxes should be such as to discourage the exploration and development or production of minerals. Severance taxes or taxes based on or measured by gross output should be avoided.

"'Research

"'The council recommends to the governors serious consideration of the following discussed facts and conditions affecting industry research.

"'Research is the very foundation upon which growth of the mineral industries must depend. For the future health of the mineral industries and of the entire national economy, there should be vigorous research activity supported directly by private industry as well as by State and Federal agencies, each working in the sphere for which it is best fitted; and

"'With respect to privately supported industrial research, economic factors should be such as to give maximum encouragement to industrial expenditures for research. This viewpoint is embodied in a recommendation on taxes, shared in by the research committee; and

"'Since many research projects involve financial commitments over a long period of years, the lack of a clearly stated national mineral policy, has limited industry's willingness to undertake such long-term projects. It follows that the adoption of such a national policy, to which all these recommendations are devoted, will do much to encourage industrial research.

"'With respect to State and Federal research, the council recommends the following:

"'1. Establish at Federal level, and at State level where desirable, permanent minerals research advisory boards. These boards should consider and recommend initiation of research programs which, in their opinion, are particularly needed.

"'2. Encourage Federal and State mineral research programs at appropriate State agencies, universities, and nonprofit research foundations.

"'3. Expand or establish in each of the mining States a clearinghouse or library of pertinent technical information and records dealing with all phases of the mineral industries.

"'The mineral industries of many of the Western States, particularly the small-mine operators, need some form of central clearinghouse for pertinent technical information which would be readily available in suitable form.

"'4. Continue support of existing long-range research in Federal and State agencies.

"'Geological and topographic mapping should be accelerated as an essential part of this long-range program.

"'Public Information

"'When and if the governors approve the recommendations the council recommends that the western governors authorize the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council to undertake the following public relations activities to attain the widest possible public understanding of the policies adopted by them as a result of the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference:

"'1. Distribute to all related and interested organizations the recommendations on national mineral policy affecting the mining industry as adopted by the governors as a result of this conference.

"'2. Distribute basic information related to the recommendations necessary to promote the broadest possible public reception and understanding.

"'3. Continue to distribute such additional information as should subsequently develop relating to those recommendations.

"'4. Obtain the full cooperation of all organizations and agencies, private and public, whose interests are related directly or indirectly to the mining industry.'

"Whereas these recommendations constitute a basic national minerals policy designed to strengthen the mining industry and the national security: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the legislature recommend to the executive and legislative branches of the United States the consideration of the national minerals policy formulated by the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference and the effectuation of such recommendations; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to petitioning the Federal Maritime Board for allocation of shipbuilding and ship repair

"Whereas the maintenance of a nucleus of skilled workers and shipbuilding facilities on the west coast is considered by national military leaders to be vital to national defense; and

"Whereas in recognition of the importance of maintaining the ability of west coast shipyards to respond immediately to a national emergency, west coast shipyards receive a 6-percent differential in bidding against eastern yards on Government merchant-ship construction, with the thought that thereby at least a minimum of experienced workers would be available immediately in a crisis; and

"Whereas the importance of maintaining the west coast shipbuilding industry, at least at a minimal level, is not merely a matter of regional interest but it is in the interest of national security; and

"Whereas bids on proposal OSC–11 T4 and T5 tankers have recently been opened and Pacific coast companies have submitted a bid on the T4's only $5,000 higher than the Ingalls' bid (and $203,900 higher on the T5's); and

"Whereas although this construction does not fall under the 6-percent limitation, it does involve public funds and consideration should be given to the desperate need for shipyard work on this Pacific coast; and

"Whereas whatever the efforts have been of our congressional delegation in Washington, the fact remains that we have not seen shipbuilding or ship repair work brought to this Pacific coast and the entire industry is imperiled by this dangerous situation we now face: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the members of this legislature do hereby respectfully petition the Federal Maritime Board to allocate some portion of this tanker work to the Pacific coast; and be it further

"Resolved, That each Senator and Representative from California in Congress is requested to vigorously campaign for the assignment of a substantial portion of shipbuilding and ship repair to the San Francisco Bay area and to other shipyards in California, wherever located; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each member of the Federal Maritime Commission, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to Federal legislation respecting the tunafish industry

"Whereas the fishing industry, which constitutes an important element of the economy of the United States, is in dire need of legislation to establish a national program for the stabilization of the industry; and

"Whereas there have been a number of measures introduced at the present session of Congress, among them being S. 3339, H. R. 9552, H. R. 9607, House Resolution 377, House Resolution 378, and Senate Resolution 186; and

"Whereas these measures contain various provisions to assist the fishing industry by establishing a top-level policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen and fixing quotas on the importation of fish, shellfish, and their products; and

"Whereas the legislature has been informed that representatives of the fishing industry in California, New England and the Gulf States are in agreement that such remedial legislation is greatly needed; and

"Whereas it is particularly urgent that a quota formula for imports be enacted to prevent the threatened ruin of the southern California tuna industry by the American market being taken over by cheaper Japanese imports: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting the country's fishing industry by establishing a policymaking United States Fisheries Commission, creating a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation empowered to make loans to fishermen, and fixing quotas on imports of fish, shellfish, and the products thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to prohibiting minors, unaccompanied by a parent or guardian, from crossing the United States-Mexico border without a permit for such purposes

"Whereas there is pending in Congress action on two particular bills concerning the crossing of the United States-Mexico border by unescorted minors; and

"Whereas either H. R. 5108, introduced by Representative WILSON of California, or House Joint Resolution 168, introduced by Representative HOSMER of California, would require that a minor be accompanied by a parent of guardian before he could cross the border into Mexico; also H. R. 5108 would allow unescorted minors to cross the border if they had a proper permit issued by the United States Attorney General, and House Joint Resolution 168 would allow such minors to cross the border if it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the appropriate immigration officers that the purpose of crossing the border is legitimate and not for the purpose of obtaining narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas under existing laws there is no restriction on minors who cross the border and many of such minors are entering Mexico for one paramount reason, to get free access to narcotic drugs; and

"Whereas the alarming increase in the use of narcotics by the youth of our country seriously threatens to undermine the foundation of our citizenry, the youngster of today—the voter of tomorrow; and

"Whereas many of our youths who could otherwise lead a constructive life are being consigned by the use of narcotics to a living death; and

"Whereas these bills, which would ban border crossings by unescorted minors, are deserving of full congressional support, and passage of either of them would be a tremendous stride in correcting this evil: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact either H. R. 5108 or H. J. Res. 168 or in the alternative to enact such legislation as is necessary to close the border between the United States and the Republic of Mexico until corrective action is taken by the citizens of Mexico to prevent the simple and easy acquisition of narcotics and their derivatives; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution commending the Boy Scouts of America and supporting the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge

"Whereas the Boy Scouts of America, one of the greatest character-building institutions in the world, is holding its Fourth National Jamboree, at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and

"Whereas based upon the experience of the three prior national jamborees held under the auspices of the Boy Scouts of America it has been proven that there are innumerable benefits to the boyhood of America through such national jamborees, such as:

"1. An unforgettable scouting experience for approximately 50,000 American boys;

"2. An opportunity to see some of the wonderful country in which we live, and visit historic shrines located at Valley Forge and at Washington, D. C., and in places en route and returning from the jamboree;

"3. A practical method of teaching Americanism, good citizenship, and leadership training;

"4. A realistic opportunity to teach Boy Scouts the value of the Scout Law—A Scout is Thrifty, and encourage him to earn his own way to the jamboree; and

"5. For an unrivaled opportunity to accelerate the whole character-building program of the Boy Scouts of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California, in full recognition of the success of the Boy Scouts of America, earnestly requests the Congress of the United States, State legislatures, State executive officers, boards of supervisors, city councils, and other governmental bodies and officers to give the fullest support and endorsement to the Boy Scouts of America and the Fourth National Jamboree to be held at Valley Forge Park, Pennsylvania, July 12 to 18, 1957; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representatives from California in the Congress of the

United States, to the County Supervisors Association of California, to the League of California Cities."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to flood control on the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers

"Whereas the most devastating floods on record struck the lands of the northern coastal area of this State which lie along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers during December of 1955; and

"Whereas many communities were completely demolished by these flood waters which caused immense property damage and indescribable human suffering that is difficult to comprehend even after visual inspection; and

"Whereas adequate flood-control measures could have completely saved this area from these losses; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has been authorized to make a comprehensive survey for flood control on the Eel River and a preliminary examination and survey with respect to Redwood Creek but no money has been appropriated therefor; and

"Whereas there is a like need for appropriate authorization and appropriation for flood-control examination and survey on the Mad, the South Fork of the Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps to provide adequate safeguards against any recurrence of the devastating floods along the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers, including the appropriation of funds for the already authorized surveys and examinations on the Eel River and Redwood Creek and authorization of surveys on the Mad River, South Fork of Eel River, the Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers and necessary appropriation therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of flood conditions in the Napa Valley

"Whereas during the year 1955 extensive loss of life and property occurred as the result of flood waters in California; and

"Whereas if proper measures are not taken to control streams and rivers floods may be expected at any time in the future with resultant losses; and

"Whereas it is in the mutual interest of this State and Nation to prevent the depredations of flood waters as they affect the people and property of this country; and

"Whereas in order to prevent recurring flood conditions extensive planning and construction is called for both to prevent floods and control and utilize the vast power that is unleashed upon such occasions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to take the necessary measures to prevent future floods in the Napa Valley and city of Napa area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the United States Army Engineers, the governor of California, and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Senate Joint Resolution 7

"Joint resolution relating to the construction of a dam on the San Luis Rey River

"Whereas the city of Carlsbad and the surrounding territory depends upon water from the San Luis Rey River, in the area known as Mission Basin, which is located between Bonsall Narrows and the Pacific Ocean; and

"Whereas the water supply for the city of Oceanside is also located in this same area; and

"Whereas the experience of this area has been that following prolonged periods of drought periods of extreme floods may be expected, and since a severe drought has existed in this area for approximately the last 10 years, it appears almost certain that a period of destructive floods can be expected which will cause extensive damage to persons and property located in this basin, and will also endanger the water supply of both the cities of Carlsbad and Oceanside; and

"Whereas studies by the Carlsbad Mutual Water Co. and the Division of Water Resources of the State of California indicate that a favorable site exists at Bonsall Narrows, on the San Luis Rey River, for a dam which would control these destructive flood waters, and would also permit these waters to be conserved for future use by way of controlled release into the Mission Basin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, the State water resources board, and the State of California Department of Public Works are hereby respectfully requested to consider and take all necessary steps to provide for the necessary studies for a dam on the San Luis Rey River, and immediate construction of the dam if it is found to be feasible; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Army Corps of Engineers, to the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of California, the State water resources board, and to the Honorable Frank B. Durkee, director of the Department of Public Works of the State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the prevention of floods in the Napa Valley area

"Whereas the people of the Napa Valley area were recently subjected to one of the worst floods in the history of California; and

"Whereas unless proper measures are taken to control and direct the heavy rains which may occur during any year losses of private and public property will again result; and

"Whereas flood-control dams and other measures taken for the protection of residents of this area in addition to alleviating the flood problem would also become a source of water or power if a scarcity of one or both should occur; and

"Whereas there is a need for immediate action in order that comprehensive studies may be made in order to ascertain the most favorable method and means of flood control so that, in turn, construction may be initiated at the earliest possible time: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the United States Army Engineers and Department of Public Works, State of California, are hereby requested to consider and take action regarding flood-control measures in Napa Valley and the city of Napa; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor of California and to the Department of Public Works, State of California."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to flood-control project authorization by the United States Congress

"Whereas the recent disastrous floods made even more imperative than ever the immediate construction of flood-control works in the area between Chico Landing and Red Bluff; and

"Whereas House Document 272, 84th Congress, 2d session, sets forth the protection necessary for this area; and

"Whereas immediate authorization by the Congress of the United States for the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project has been recommended by the Division of Water Resources in its publication Floods of December 1955 in California; and

"Whereas State water resources board has recommended that this project be authorized; and

"Whereas bill No. H. R. 9595, introduced in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, would authorize the construction of these necessary flood-control works: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take immediate steps for the authorization of the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project by favorable consideration of H. R. 9595; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Concurrent Resolution 42

"Concurrent resolution relative to the observance of Pan-American Week

"Whereas on April 14, 1890, the First International Conference of American States met in Washington, D. C., and adopted a resolution which resulted in the creation of the organization known as the Pan American Union; and

"Whereas the aims of the Pan American Union, known today as the Organization of American States, have been and continue to be the defense and mutual benefit of the 21 American Republics comprising the members of this organization; and

"Whereas the need for confidence and strength resulting from the affiliation of peoples with common ideals continues to be of the greatest importance in this age in which we live; and

"Whereas the Organization of American States has ably shown for 66 years that friendship and understanding together with a mutual desire for peace can forge a powerful unit of defense and in addition can lead to amicable and just settlements in all areas of dispute; and

"Whereas Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has proclaimed Saturday, April 14, 1956, as Pan American Day and urges the people of this Nation on that day and throughout the period of April 8 through April 14, 1956, to give expression to their cordial good will toward the peoples of the other American Republics and of their intention to maintain the principles of freedom and equality fundamental to all: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California (the Senate thereof concurring), That the people of California are hereby requested to observe Pan American Day and Pan American Week in the spirit outlined by the President of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States."

A report of the Joint House and Senate Committee on Insurance Investigation of the General Assembly of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of legislation to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Club of Castro Valley, Calif., favoring the enactment of the Dirksen amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treatymaking power; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, various individuals in Montana have written to me relative to a certain legislative proposal in which they are interested, namely, the Langer bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. At their request I ask unanimous consent that their petition, and the names signed thereto, may be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

Mary Downs, Iola M. Dunn, Mrs. Frank Ravnik, Mrs. Frank Lamb, John W. Fredrick, Vera M. Fredrick, Mrs. A. P. Lundbacg, Mrs. I. W. Martinson, Mrs. Merritt F. Maddux, Mrs. John Romell, Mrs. Arnold Iverson, William R. Schneider, Arnold L. Iverson, Dorothy J. Kindrick, Frances E. Baker, all of Helena, Mont.

E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Helen J. Roemer, Harold Kenison, Alma Kenison, W. J. Harper, Beulah Rood, Jerry Rood, Doris Altimus, Helen Potts, Cora Busby, Livingston, Mont.; Jeannette Busby, Bozeman, Mont.; Carl W. Rose, Virginia Rose, Rebecca Watt, P. A. Watt, Helen D. Ferris, J. J. Case, Mrs. J. F. Johnson, Livingston, Mont.; C. W. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Howard E. Harper, Mary Belle Harper, Hilda Harper, Elva Skillman, C. T. Skillman, Livingston, Mont.; Harold A. Rose, Clyde Park, Mont.; Mrs. Mabel Raab, Mrs. Carrie Bray, Mrs. Fanny E. Niles, Livingston, Mont.

Lauretta King, Majorie Nielsen, J. W. Griffin, Olive Powell, Mrs. Earl Wyman, Earl Wyman, C. V. Henderson, Mrs. J. C. Neely, Mrs. A. T. Ault, R. Blarnsworth, M. D., Melvin F. Kurtz, C. W. Eybert, C. O. Nystrom, Mrs. C. W. Egbert, Mrs. G. E. Surface, G E. Surface, Mrs. Emmett Carter, Joseph Jomseson, W. O. Kurtz, Mrs. D. A. Julson, Mrs. Dewey Brown, Mrs. Lucile Fry, Lydia Ehman, Dewey Brown, Eileen Allaway, Genvie McHenry, Lorna Kellison, David A. Julson, Mrs. M. E. Smith, Frank D. King, Mrs. W. O. Kurtz, Robert Alloway, Mr. W. L. Parker, L. W. Taft, E. Ehman, Mrs. W. L. Parker, William J. McHenry, Homer L. Morrison, Mrs. L. W. Taft, all of Bozeman, Mont.

Ernest P. Schaak, Mrs. Ernest Schaak, Elva M. Spes, Mrs. Bessie Surdal, Mrs. G. W. Lutes; Mr. K. Boucher, Thomas M. Sipes, Howard C. Lund, Mrs. Elmer Hadland, Elmer Hadland, Mrs. Dorris Taggart, Ferna Allen, Alfred Surdahl, Andrew Roedel, Paul E. Limerick, Mrs. Charles J. Hoffman, C. J. Hoffman, Mrs. Andrew Roedel, Mrs. Grace Adkin, Miss Beth Thomas, Mrs. Della M. Butts, all of Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Bill Black, Gateway, Mont.

Mrs. E. H. Tucker, Bozeman, Mont.; Mrs. Carrie Groom, Mrs. Josie Hanson, Carolina Albertson, Mrs. Jessie M. Peterson, Mrs. Gladys Fallang, Gale S. Wick, Mrs. Gale Wick, Evelyn Schereshy, Mrs. Onie Davis, Mr. Onie Davis, Mrs. Palmer Lomeland, Mrs. Harry McComb, Rudolph Fallang, Palmer Lomeland, Big Timber, Mont.

Mrs. H. G. Handford, Mildred H. Grawe, Mabel Felix, Rosetta M. Voelker, Bessie Chrisinger, Clara E. Olson, Mrs. Bessie Eichelberger, Mrs. Anna Marie Ziss, Carolyn C. Patterson, Vesta A. Perry, Rudah C. Enger, Mildred H. Carpenter, Alma Larson, Mrs. W. H. Rieman, Mabel O'Neil, Bertha W. Schnaidt, Caroline Walchli, Margaret F. Clifford, Gwladys E. Kramer, Mrs. Dean King, Mrs. E. B. Noble, Mrs. Amelia Withrow, Mrs. Frieda E. O'Neil, Mrs. C. W. Short, Mrs. Richard C. Mattson, Kalispell, Mont.

Rev. C. F. Crowe, Bernie Heare, Mrs. Bernie Heare, Mrs. Collene Pedersen, Mrs. Peter Backema, Mrs. George Rawl, Mr. and Mrs. N. G. Hudson, Mrs. Al Eidet, T. B. Foreman, Mrs. Gertrude Wahl, Mrs. Andrew Pressman, Mrs. F. Kampschior, Marion L. Cox, R. M. Mart, Glendive, Mont.; Marjorie Hoffmeyer, Billings, Mont.; G. B. Cox, Glendive, Mont.; Floyd Uglow, Savage, Mont.; Don Arnhart, Mrs. Roy Glasscock, Roy Glasscock, Mrs. E. C. Andrews, E. C. Andrews, Hugh R. Atwood, Mrs. Floyd Ewing, F. T. Ewing, Mrs. Tom Henderson, S. J. Daniel, Mrs. S. J. Daniel, Mrs. Ray Lowe, all of Glendive, Mont.

Mrs. Eva Sahn, Miss Jeanette Leland, Mrs. Einar Dahl, Miss Marion Leland, Glendive, Mont.; Mrs. Charles Barnaby, Wibaux, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. George Finkbein, Mr. and Mrs. O. F. Roberts, Mrs. David Wold, Mrs. Pearl G. Eckes, Mr. and Mrs. Bill Bacon, Mrs. Grace Lanktree, Pete Tady, Lorene I. Tady, Mrs. R. H. Johnson, Mrs. Ada Wilson, Mrs. E. H. Rigley, Arthur Kitchen, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leon Anderson, Lindsay, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Leo Finkbiner, Albert L. Aker, Glendive, Mont.; Mr. and Mrs. Charles Green, Mildred, Mont.; Stella A. Eckes, Claude Robinson, Luella Robinson, Mrs. S. D. Blackwell, Glendive, Mont.

O. D. Harris, Mary Ridenour, Mrs. B. E. Horstman, Shelby F. Snell, Bessie M. Snell, Louise M. Storey, Alvena, Lyford, C. Wayne Mahugh, Dora W. Mahugh, Kalispell, Mont.; Allon R. Clark, Phyllis L. Clark, Creston, Mont.; Leslie A. Gunderson, Audrey V. Gunderson, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Iola M. Ruegsegger, Mrs. Caleb Jackson, Mrs. Ora Miller, Mrs. E. H. Beller, Kalispell, Mont.; Miss Florence Green, Mrs. Chas. De Voe, Somers, Mont.; Mrs. Ida Davis, Mrs. R. W. Carr, Irma P. Wagener, Mrs. A. Lyford, Augusta M. Rhodes, Mrs. L. E. Fry, Chester M. Mahugh, Clyde Williams, Eunice Chapin, Elizabeth Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Pete Hoffman, Don Pack, Milo W. Naylor, Kalispell, Mont.; Marjory Pack, Marion, Mont.; Mrs. Eva Dygert, Mr. and Mrs. L. E. Clayton, Ronnie Pack, Evelyn Naylor, Cletys M. Peterson, Thomas H. Shelton, Columbia Falls, Mont.

Grace Powell, Kalispell, Mont.; Mrs. Stanley Nees, Poplar, Mont.; Mrs. Lizzie Stubbs, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Marshall, Mrs. Robert Haven, Mrs. Carrie Claridge, Lulu Barnard, Esther Ober, Mrs. Roy Verity, Mrs. Fern Adams, Mrs. T. W. Wagner, Lois Magar, E. R. Haven, Tom Wagner, W. Dan Adams, Mrs. Andy Christianson, Keith M. Snodgrass, Anna E. Dale, Marie W. Lawrence, J. O. Lawrence, Mrs. Keith Snodgrass, Kalispell, Mont.; Gertrude Chubb, Columbia Falls, Mont.; J. O. Shew, Mrs. Maude D. Shew, Mavis Shew, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. L. E. Mapig, Mrs. N. E. Gray, Elizabeth Nicholson, Mrs. Verne Lien, Mrs. Harry Viegut, Erma S. Bensington, Loree Williams, Sally Kennedy, Alice Deck, Lewis L. Bennington, Irvin W. Hirning, W. O. Hirning, Mrs. Lee Trowbridge, Lee Trowbridge, Missoula, Mont.; J. J. Hirning, Mrs. John Hirning, Lolo, Mont.; L. E. Magsic, Mrs. Mary E. Watt, Missoula, Mont.

C. J. Gustafson, Mrs. F. W. Buck, Mrs. Geo. C. Johnson, W. W. Wetzel, Mrs. Roy Young, Maxine Dollens, Judy Carter, Roy T. Young, Mattie Needham, May Ellen Henk, Mrs. Jim Ranger, Pearl W. Mack, Cora L. Millard, A. C. Millard, E. A. Ludwig, Mrs. J. D. Ruddy, Mrs. H. C. Koch, Benita Mahugh, Jim Johnston, Mrs. H. A. McDonald, Daniel Aaron Bradshaw, Signe Franzen, Ella Schloss, Gertrude D. Farth, Sallie B. Hollenay, Isabella W. Murphy, J. D. Holly, Mary A. Giles, Charlotte N. Wright, Ida J. Gertison, Kenneth F. Johnson, John A. Schloss, Mrs. John Holm, John Holm, Glendive, Mont.

Elizabeth Dunn, Harriet Jeffries, Albert Woods, Marjorie Birky, Mrs. Chas. W. Short, Mrs. Lizzie Dunham, Mrs. Julia Knudson, Mrs. M. R. Wood, Mrs. Christine Buch, Mildred D. Boline, Mrs. Paul Birky, Mrs. H. Madsen, Kalispell, Mont.

Mrs. F. S. P. Foss, Mrs. D. J. Healy, D. J. Healy, Glendive, Mont.; Father Patrick J. Ryan, assistant at Sacred Heart Church; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. A. Pettit, pastor of Sacred Heart Church; Elizabeth Yundoglialo, Mrs. Edward Holzworth, Mrs. Mark Scarff, Glendive, Mont.; Vanda Knels, Mrs. Ray Lowe, WCTU president, Bloomfield, Mont.

Allen F. Potter, Bertha I. Maher, Helen Hedman, Pat Doyle, Clarence R. Nelson, Mrs. R. R. Hark, Lanora C. Wallace, Roy Wallace, Bertha Stephenson, Ira M. Olaon, Mrs. D. L. Sherman, Elmer Wellhouse, Mrs. Angeline Adams, John F. Reagan, Irene M. Reagan, Mrs. Robert Hunter, Mrs. Orville Walters, Mrs. Henry E. Lee, Mrs. Ed Hedman, Mrs. O. Williamson, Mrs. R. R. Haake, Mrs. Myrtle Bowdish, Mrs. Harold Hawley, Mrs. Jeani Patton, Mrs. M. E. Woods, Mrs. C. R. Nelson, Bertha L. Peterson, Mrs. H. H. Maher, Mrs.

Alfred Walters, Mrs. W. E. Forcum, Olivia Forcum, Bertha B. Larter, all of Whitefish, Mont.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the United Nations Association, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the promotion of peace in the Near East by the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS PRESENT AT THE MARCH MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, LOS ANGELES CHAPTER

To President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER:

Whereas the present local political tensions in the Near East endanger the peace of the entire world; and

Whereas the Arab countries believe that the United Nations is better able to deal with Near East problems and resolve these tensions; and

Whereas our Government helped in founding the United Nations for the purpose of promoting peace and has used the United Nations as an important instrument of our foreign policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge President Eisenhower to use the agencies of the United Nations to the fullest extent in his efforts to bring peace to the Near East.

Submitted on behalf of the Los Angeles Chapter, American Association for the United Nations.

CHARLES MACKINTOSH,
President.

MARCH 1956.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Josephine C. Wheat, of Hollis, N. Y., transmitting a petition signed by sundry citizens of the States of Pennsylvania and New York, relating to the prohibition of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLIS, N. Y., *April 6, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR: These 50 names also ask that the Civil Aeronautics Board requesting the Board to forbid alcohol service in the air.

We are shocked to hear that alcohol is allowed on the planes.

No wonder so much loss of life by plane.

Yours for the cause.

JOSEPHINE C. WHEAT.

PETITION

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out of 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

(Signed by Mrs. A. E. Buckner and 49 other citizens of Pennsylvania and New York.)

THE ADMINISTRATION OF GENERALISSIMO TRUJILLO — RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, relating the the administration of Generalissimo Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

On March 12, 1956, Dr. Jesus de Galindez, valiant and effective fighter against all dictatorships whether Communist or neo-Fascist, vanished under circumstances which make it overwhelmingly certain that he was abducted and probably murdered. Dr. de Galindez had left written records, including his doctoral dissertation, the Era of Trujillo, exposing Generalissimo Trujillo's tyranny in the Dominican Republic. He had received numerous threats because of his activity in bringing to light Trujillo's crimes. Clearly his disappearance fits into the long series of crimes of violence, including murder, committed in this country and in Cuba against opponents of the generalissimo's regime: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we friends, associates, and colleagues of Dr. Jesus de Galindez, sorely stricken by his probable murder, petition:

1. That all police enforcement agencies, Federal, State, municipal, and international vigilantly prosecute investigation for the apprehension and punishment of the perpetrators of this crime;

2. That the press seek out and publish every development in this case and in related matters pertaining to the safety of political opponents of dictators;

3. That public and private support be enlisted for publication and distribution of Dr. de Galindez' writings, especially his thesis, The Era of Trujillo;

4. That Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress be urged to initiate measures for the greater security of democratic political exiles here in the United States and in other member nations of the Organization of American States.

THE HOXSEY CANCER TREATMENT—LETTER AND TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter and telegram sent me by Dr. Gerald B. Winrod, of Wichita, Kans., relating to the Hoxsey cancer treatment.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDERS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,
Wichita, Kans., April 3, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: A local representative of the Associated Press called me a few minutes ago to say that the Food and Drug Administration is issuing Wednesday of this week a formal public warning against the Hoxsey cancer treatment and lists among sponsors of the treatment Gerald B. Winrod.

He told me that the Washington office of the Associated Press requested a comment.

Thereupon I issued the following statement:

"The Hoxsey cancer treatment is precious to my heart because it saved my life as a boy at the age of 9 by removing a malignant growth near the jugular vein from which I have carried a scar for almost a half century. The treatment was in those days administered by the father of the present Dr. Harry M. Hoxsey."

With every good wish,

Faithfully yours,

GERALD B. WINROD.

WICHITA, KANS., *April 4, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

There is a reason why I would appreciate having you give consideration to inserting my letter sent yesterday in the RECORD. Thanks and regards.

WINROD.

WAR VETERANS SECURITY ACT OF 1956—LETTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Charles Hartman Post, 134, American Legion, Stanley, N. Dak., signed by Ralph Hamre, post adjutant, embodying a telegram adopted by that post, favoring the enactment of House bill 7886, the so-called War Veterans Security Act of 1956.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN LEGION,
CHARLES HARTMAN POST, NO. 134,
Stanley, N. Dak., April 13, 1956.

Senator BILL LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the resolution passed at our last Legion meeting urging passage of H. R. 7886:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress H. R. 7886, commonly known as the War Veterans Security Act of 1956; and

"Whereas the passage of this bill will eliminate the confusion, redtape, and cost of administration of the present law and regulations by the Veterans' Administration as it pertains to World War I veterans who have reached their 65th birthday; and

"Whereas this bill now before the Congress would grant pensions to veterans over 65 years of age who are unemployable and meet income and service requirements; and

"Whereas as far as equity, justice, and previous Government policy regarding veterans of other wars are concerned, it must be remembered that World War I veterans were given no consideration when separated from service and faced two depressions at a time when they were attempting to establish themselves in civilian life; and

"Whereas the plight of many of these World War I veterans today is very serious, and the passage of this act would guarantee to them the security that they preserved for their Nation in time of war; and

"Whereas the passage of this legislation would entail no financial burden upon the increased economy of this Nation and would render justice to those veterans who are in dire need: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Charles Hartmann Post, No. 134, of Stanley, N. Dak., of the North Dakota Department of the American Legion,

meeting at Stanley, N. Dak., this 2d day of April 1956, That we vigorously support the passage of H. R. 7886; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to North Dakota's congressional delegation and members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in Congress."

Sincerely yours,

RALPH HAMBRE,
Post Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 2424. A bill to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam (Rept. No. 1728).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 2712. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash. (Rept. No. 1729).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 2091. A bill authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill. (Rept. No. 1730); and

S. 2092. A bill transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal (Rept. No. 1731).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1733).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 146. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tre (Rept. No. 1739);

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis (Rept. No. 1740);

S. 1885. A bill for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife (Rept. No. 1741);

S. 2095. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Culcasi (Rept. No. 1742);

S. 2244. A bill for the relief of Maria Novak (Rept. No. 1743);

S. 2563. A bill for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo (Rept. No. 1744);

H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung (Rept. No. 1745);

H. R. 1179. A bill for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon (Rept. No. 1746);

H. R. 2796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel (Rept. No. 1747);

H. R. 2948. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella (Rept. No. 1748);

H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) (Rept. No. 1749);

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Lois O. Jennings (Rept. No. 1750); and

H. R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Antonio Penna (Rept. No. 1751).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 586. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada (Rept. No. 1752);

S. 1013. A bill for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales (Rept. No. 1753); and

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Martino Palmeri (Rept. No. 1754).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 1755).

By Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3025. A bill to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1735).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey (Rept. No. 1736).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson (Rept. No. 1737).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1756).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 2854. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (Rept. No. 1757).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. 2855. A bill to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1758); and

S. 2859. A bill to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1759).

INCREASE AND REVISIONS IN GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1732)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended.

Last fall and early this year various sections of our country, particularly the northeastern and western areas, were subject to unprecedented and disastrous floods. Many lives were lost and damages totaling almost $1 billion were sustained. Large cities were inundated, communities were paralyzed, major industries were shut down, in some cases for several months, and all activities were at a standstill.

Existing laws permit repair of existing flood-control structures and highways and emergency restoration of essential public utilities and cleanup work after such floods. Such laws also provide for construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by Congress, with a limitation of allotment of $150,000 for any single project at a locality and total of $3 million for such work during any 1 fiscal year.

There exists the urgent need for expanding and broadening the present authority for construction of emergency flood-control projects to care for flood problems in many localities and to prevent widespread damage and suffering caused by these severe floods, without the delay necessitated by surveys and investigations, and their specific authorization by the Congress under regularly established procedures.

These recent floods in the New England, New York, and Pennsylvania areas, in my own State of New Mexico, particularly at Albuquerque, and in California, Oregon, and Nevada, have caused tremendous damages, and these areas are still subject to recurring floods and consequent heavy losses.

S. 3273 would amend section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for construction of projects, with an estimated cost of $500,000 for any single project and a limitation of $15 million for allotment for any 1 fiscal year for such projects. This increased authorization will take care of the increase in price levels that have taken place in the last few years and broaden and expand the present law to permit flood protection at critical locations that cannot now be covered.

The committee held extensive hearings on this bill. There was no opposition whatever to it. The committee reports it unanimously and believes it thoroughly warranted and desirable. It is hoped that the measure will be enacted into law at an early date to relieve the flood hazard that now exists at many localities in our Nation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original joint resolution, granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1738) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' SECURITY PROGRAM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1760)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, I submit a preliminary report of that committee's Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Federal Security Program. I ask that the report be printed.

This is the first of at least two reports which will be made pursuant to Senate Resolution 20 and Senate Resolution 154. This first preliminary report was

adopted unanimously by the full Senate committee at its meeting last week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS AND STATEMENT (S. REPT. NO. 1734)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes on the report of the Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit the final report of the investigation of employee welfare plans and pension funds conducted by its Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds pursant to Senate Resolution 225 of the 83d Congress, as amended, and Senate Resolution 40 of the 84th Congress, as amended, together with the supplemental views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and a statement by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

In submitting this report to the Senate in compliance with the above resolutions, may I point out that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare other than those who have served on the subcommittee have not found it possible to review and consider the subcommittee report within the time limits fixed by the resolutions, as amended, but transmit it to the Senate for the preliminary consideration of the Congress and the public while reserving judgment on the recommendations made by the subcommittee.

I also wish to thank the members of the staff, headed by Mr. Paul J. Cotter, as counsel, who worked with great ability and faithfulness in the preparation of this report.

I also wish to thank my colleagues, including my colleagues from the other side of the aisle, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The Subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds, whose authority expired on April 15, has been conducting studies and investigations in the welfare and pension fund field since May 1954, first under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and, beginning in February 1955, under the leadership and direction of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. Committee membership since the latter date has included, besides the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

Legislation is being drafted to embody the recommendations of the subcommittee and will be shortly introduced, and it is hoped that it may be passed at this session of Congress.

The subcommittee also released the printed record of its hearings held in July, November, and December 1955.

Interim reports were filed in January and July 1955 with the subcommittee's initial findings. The final report comprises over 360 pages based, as the committee notes, on its studies of hundreds of individual welfare and pension plans. In this last report the subcommittee has submitted summaries of welfare and pension plans in a number of major industries and more detailed reports of the weaknesses and abuses in the welfare and pension plan operations of particular insurance companies, unions, and employers.

In its final report the subcommittee recommended the enactment of a Federal Registration, Reporting, and Disclosure Act to be effective for 3 years. Under the proposals advanced in the report, the Federal agency administering the act would, prior to its termination, and based upon 2 years' experience, make a comprehensive report to the Congress, outlining its findings, its evaluation of the act, and its recommendations with respect to the continuance, simplification, or modification of the legislation.

The recommendations call for registration by all types of employee welfare and pension plans covering 25 or more employees. Annual reports, based upon an audit and covering the complete financial operations, would be filed with a Federal agency by all plans including 100 or more employees, and also by plans which, though they have less than 100 employees, are operated or administered on some common basis with other plans and which in the aggregate include 100 or more employees. Pension plans would file a summary statement of investments, broken down by type of security and property, with the aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower. Investments by a pension plan in securities or property of interested parties, investments of more than 5 percent of the fund in any one security or property, or investment of more than 10 percent of the fund in the securities or obligations of any one issuer, would be listed in detail.

Disclosure of the information in the annual report would be required by having copies available at the principal office of the plan and the public document room of the administrative agency, and by furnishing all the beneficiaries with information from the report in prescribed summary form by personal delivery or mail. The administrative agency would be given discretion to require reporting and disclosure by any plan covering between 25 and 100 employees if deemed necessary to accomplish the objectives of the act.

The subcommittee reported it had no strong feeling as to what executive agency should administer the act. After considering the various possibilities, it indicated that for the present it favored the Securities and Exchange Commission because of its organizational setup and its established success in the administration of disclosure type statutes.

Recommendations of the subcommittee also provide for an advisory council of 13 members to assist the Federal agency. Members of this council would include representatives of insurance, 1, banking, 1, and management, 2, to be appointed by the administering agency; labor representatives, 3, to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor; public members, 3, to be appointed by the President; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as ex officio members.

Federal jurisdiction for requiring enforcement of the act would be based upon the taxing authority, the general welfare provisions, and the interstate character of the many elements connected with such plans.

The report pointed out that over 75 million persons are now covered in some measure by employee welfare and pension programs, with annual contributions being made to them of over $6.8 billion, and that there are between $20 and $25 billion in pension reserves at the present time. It was pointed out that private employee welfare and pension programs have grown to such proportions in this country and involve the use of such large tax-exempt funds as to place upon the Government a grave responsibility for their sound operation and the protection of the equities of the beneficiaries and the public interest.

The report stated that—

> While the great majority of welfare and pension programs are being responsibly and honestly administered, the rights and equities of the beneficiaries in many instances are being dangerously ignored. In other cases, the funds of the programs are being dissipated and at times become the hunting ground for the unscrupulous.

It was also observed that—

> The lack of standards and the inadequacies of State and Federal laws have permitted employee welfare and pension programs to operate in such manner as to give rise to many abuses, problems, weaknesses, and unsound practices which could jeopardize the operation of this system and give insufficient protection to the rights and equities of the employee-beneficiaries.

A major problem, it was stated, is one "of assuring the immediate and long-range stability of private pension and welfare programs * * in order that they may better withstand the contingencies against which they were established. The breakdown of any significant part of either the pension or the welfare programs could, and undoubtedly would, amount to a major setback to our economy."

We do not propose Federal regulation. Regulation is left to the States. However, we do propose disclosure of essential information to a responsible Federal agency, believing that disclosure will be a preventive of most possible abuses in the future.

According to the report, the subcommittee felt that the proposed act is a moderate and sound approach, definitely necessary in the light of the evidence received, but still leaving room for action on the part of the respective States.

The subcommittee recommended criminal penalties for willful failure to com-

ply with, or violation of, the provisions of the act or the regulations promulgated thereunder, for a false statement or misrepresentation of a material fact, and for the unlawful and willful theft, abstraction, conversion, or embezzlement of the funds or property of any plan.

The subcommittee emphasized that it did not want to leave the impression that there is something wrong with every welfare and pension plan as "that is not the case." The report said:

Perhaps too little has been said of the many sound practices found in the great majority of these plans and of the conscientious and ingenious efforts on the part of industry, labor, insurance and banking to bring benefits to scores of millions of employees at low cost.

The subcommittee observed however, that it "is convinced that without some legislative direction the abuses, problems and weaknesses which do exist will not be self-correcting."

The report took note of the fact that labor had "condemned dishonesty, created committees on ethical practices established codes of ethics for the operation of employee welfare and pension plans, and recommended legislation toward that end." The subcommittee expressed the belief that such efforts would have a salutary effect but did not feel that the objectives would be quickly achieved by voluntary methods alone. The report further pointed out that representatives of labor had been involved in some of the worst abuses found to exist and, in some cases, had been found unprepared for the responsibilities of trusteeship under these programs.

Also taken up in the report was the fact that the insurance industry, while opposing Federal control or supervision, had not even set up a code of ethical practices to condemn the unscrupulous. The report concluded that—

Many of the worst abuses found in welfare-plan operations involve certain insurance practices. These abuses include high commissions, excessive administrative fees, high insurance company retentions, unequal treatment of the policyholders, activities of unscrupulous brokers and agents, including embezzlement of premiums, sometimes in collusion with union officials or management—mostly the result of inadequate control and nondisclosure to the interested parties.

Management, too, came in for its share of criticism, the report pointing out that it, management, "shares the responsibility for many of the serious problems and abuses" found, and that "management, as well as labor, has at times been unreasonable and unsound in positions taken with respect to benefit programs." Employers, it was stated, "in too many cases have abdicated their responsibilities under jointly managed plans."

With reference to the banking industry, the report observed that banks, while recognized as competently managing pension investments under corporate trusts, do not have the responsibility for actuarial soundness, often have too little control over proper investments, but still sell the features of this type of pension plan without assuming all of the responsibilities necessarily inherent in a complete pension plan.

According to the report, by far the largest percentage of employees included in health and welfare programs are covered in unilateral employer administered plans. In including this type of plan in those which should report and disclose detailed information, the report stated—

Since Congress has stated and the courts have held that employer contributions toward welfare and pension benefits are in the nature of compensation to employees, it must be concluded that whether the funds for such programs are contributed by the employers, the employees, or both, the employees have a right to know the financial details of such plans as well as to have their interest in such plans protected.

In support of its position, the subcommittee cited the Internal Revenue Code, the Defense Production Act of 1950, and court decisions which treated costs of and contributions to welfare and pension plans as part of employee compensation.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] filed supplemental views to the report, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who, because of other duties, had been unable to take an active part in preparation of the report, reserved judgment on the recommendations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has just referred to what I think is a fine piece of work, which has just been completed by the subcommittee on Welfare and Pension Funds of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I think I would be a little remiss if I did not comment on the fine work which has been done by the chairman and by the other members of that subcommittee.

While there are slight differences with respect to a few conclusions in the report as it is submitted, the subcommittee has approached the work and developed the report in a spirit of complete nonpartisanship, which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has been very careful to nurture and maintain throughout all the months of arduous work. I wish to pay tribute to him, as well as to the other members of the subcommittee, for the fine work they have done in this field, which I believe will result in shedding light upon a problem which has needed light for a long time. I believe that this effort will eventually lead to good Federal legislation covering this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his overgenerous remarks. No one could have been more cooperative than he was during the investigation. He worked extremely hard. I think he attended almost every hearing. He went into the details of the report with great care, and it was a pleasure to work with him. I think the country owes him a great debt.

The work was begun under the chairmanship of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. Initially the staff was engaged by him, and the preliminary report was the result of work conducted by the subcommittee prior to that time. We benefited greatly from the counsel and advice of the distinguished Senator from New York.

I think this is a very happy occasion on which members of both parties can cooperate in good faith in solving a very perplexing problem. It has been a very fine experience for me. Again I wish to thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I said, I do not have the good fortune of being a member of the subcommittee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. However, I am a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I have had an opportunity to observe the great skill and devotion to duty and the energy and industry which the Senator and his colleagues on the subcommittee have brought to bear on this very important subject. The work which has been done by the subcommittee will make a great contribution to the welfare of our country. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Illinois and other members of the subcommittee on the work they have so well performed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

I submit the report and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3635. A bill to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 3636. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese-bearing ores and concentrates in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 3637. A bill to establish an advisory board to assist the commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3638. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3639. A bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3640. A bill to provide for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds under the supervision and direction of the Farm Credit Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3641. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to permit common carriers subject to such act to provide reduced rate transportation to individuals 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3642. A bill to transfer to the government of the District of Columbia the Public Employment Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 3643. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DUFF:

S. 3644. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the teaching profession on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the National Education Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 3645. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution to designate May 30, 1956, as a day on which to pay respects to the four surviving veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, AND LIMITING SERVICE OF SENATORS ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES

Mr. DWORSHAK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 237), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That, commencing with the 85th Congress, rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section 1;

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section 1;

(3) inserting in section 1 after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life.";

(4) striking out section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 19 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 7 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1734, RELATING TO WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 238), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,500 additional copies of Senate Report 1734, a report on welfare and pension funds, for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG THE INDIANS"

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians."

Many requests have come to the subcommittee for copies of its report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians. In a large number of cases the inquiries for these reports came from Senators from Indian States. The subcommittee supply of this report—S. Rept. 1483—has been exhausted for some time. I feel that considering the interest in this Senate document, especially from Senators from States having Indian populations, that it should receive favorable consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the report No. 1483, 84th Congress, of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS ON FOURTH-CLASS (PARCEL-POST) MAIL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish uniformity of parcel-post size and weight at 65 pounds and 100 inches, length and girth combined.

I hesitated for some time before deciding to take this action, because the Railway Express workers in my State were told that a reduction in parcel-post service was a guarantee of prosperity for the express agency, and that, conversely, any move toward restoring parcel-post standards to those which prevailed before 1952 would hurt Railway Express.

However, the figures prepared by the Railway Express Agency and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission do not show any discernible relationship between Railway Express volume and parcel-post volume. I would like to include those figures, together with the Post Office Department's figures on parcel-post volume, in the RECORD at this point so that my colleagues may see the facts for themselves.

	Total	Railway express shipments		Number of parcel post packages
		Carload	Less than carload	
1951	78,546,366	12,746	78,533,620	1,046,944,222
1952	93,158,470	14,160	93,144,319	1,046,575,603
1953	86,871,382	14,456	86,856,926	1,042,750,517
1954	76,247,001	11,973	76,235,028	994,750,517
1955	83,474,754	(1)	(1)	948,220,164

[1] Breakdown not available.

NOTE.—The less than carload lot shipments are the only ones which could conceivably compare with parcel post.

On the other hand, both the farm and urban people in North Carolina have been hurt by the size and weight limitations enacted in 1951. The Post Office Department states that parcel-post rates are 10 percent higher than they would have had to be had the 1951 limitations not been enacted. The added expense and the inconvenience of the present law is a continuing harassment to the small merchant and the city dweller.

The farmer has not only this extra cost but the constant danger of enactment of uniform size and weight limits which will seriously hamper his operations. The bushel of seed corn, for example, could, with the sack it is shipped in, weigh from 62 to 63 pounds.

I think our citizens are entitled to uniform size and weight limitations in the parcel-post service and it is important that they be set at figures which will meet the farmers' needs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3635) to readjust size and weight limitations on fourth-class (parcel post) mail, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADVISORY BOARD ON NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish an advisory board to assist in considering a site and design for a national memorial stadium in the District of Columbia. This board, representatives of which would be selected from sports, civic, and other organizations, would work closely with the commission on a national stadium which was authorized by Congress in 1944.

I think it is high time that the intent of Congress in 1944 be carried out. Our National Capital needs such a stadium, not only as a memorial to the heroic dead of both World Wars and the Korean hostilities, but as a living memorial for the use of sports groups nationally and locally. As Washington is the Capital of the Nation, this stadium could be the national capital of sports, to encourage recreation and participation, and as a solid weapon against juvenile delinquency.

The selection of representatives to this advisory board from leading national organizations would truly make the purposes of the stadium national in scope.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3637) to establish an advisory board to assist the Commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in considering a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO PROMOTION OF THE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. This bill is a consolidation of S. 2410, which I introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. MUNDT on July 5, 1955, and S. 631 which Senator MUNDT and I introduced on January 21, 1955. S. 631 was also a proposal to amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948.

The bill which we are introducing today is almost identical with the March 7, 1956, committee print of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that we are introducing this bill at the request of the administration in order that the proposals contained therein may receive the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee this week. It is my understanding that certain changes will be suggested by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee. Although we are in general agreement with the purposes of this bill, we reserve the right to offer amendments to it in committee, or to question provisions which we feel need further explanation.

In general, this bill has two purposes: First, it contains provisions designed to make more effective our educational exchange program with other nations.

Second, it provides for a new career program for the personnel of the United States Information Agency along the lines of the Foreign Service career program of the State Department.

In introducing this measure today, we wish to state that we are acting in cooperation with the State Department, the United States Information Agency, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3638) to promote the foreign policy of the United States by amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Public Law 402, 80th Cong.), introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) so much of section 2 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 as precedes paragraph (1) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States of America to increase in other countries respect for and confidence in the United States, its purposes, its democratic practices, culture, and society, to increase mutual understanding, respect, and confidence between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries, and to broaden the areas of cooperation between them in the educational exchange, cultural, and information fields. Among other means in achieving these objectives, the Secretary of State is authorized to establish—."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 2 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) an educational exchange service to cooperate with other nations in—

"(a) the interchange of knowledge, skills, information, and experiences;

"(b) the interchange of technical and other services;

"(c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, sciences, and professions; and

"(d) the development of projects of interest and value to the United States and the other countries involved through diffusion of knowledge."

SEC. 2. (a) The heading of title II of such act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND EXPERIENCE

(b) Section 201 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Persons

"SEC. 201. (a) As a means of insuring interchange on a cooperative basis of leaders and potential leaders between the United States and other countries, the Secretary is authorized to provide for and otherwise facilitate programs for the exchange of (1) students and trainees; (2) teachers, fellows, and lecturers; (3) professors and research scholars; (4) specialists in any of the arts, sciences, trades, or professions; and (5) leaders of thought and opinion at the national, State, or local level. Such exchanges shall be for the purpose of long- or short-term study or practical training, teaching, lecturing, or research, and observation, consultation, or other experience or activity which may be essential to the successful operation of the programs and which will not deprive American citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence of opportunities for gainful employment or professional training. The Secretary is also authorized to bring foreign nationals to the United States to interpret and present the art and culture of cooperating countries. The Secretary may also provide for the attendance of nationals of one cooperating country at selected institutions of learning or places of study in another cooperating country when he determines that urgent foreign relations objectives would be served thereby. The Secretary shall, wherever possible in connection with these programs, utilize the services of existing reputable agencies which are successfully engaged in such activity.

"(b) The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services and materials in the case of persons coming to the United States from other countries and going to other countries from the United States under provisions of this act or for other purposes which the Secretary determines to be in furtherance of the objectives of this act.

"(c) When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in the program provided herein the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States.

"(d) The foreign-exchange visitors provided for in this section shall be admitted as nonimmigrants under section 101 (a) (15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General. Exchange visitors so admitted shall not be eligible for a change of status under the provisions of section 248 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, nor for adjustment of status under provisions of section 245 of that act. An exchange visitor who fails to maintain nonimmigrant status and exchange visitor classification or who fails to depart from the United States on the termination of such status or classification, shall, upon warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported pursuant to sections 241, 242, and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Exchange visitors who engage in activities of a political nature detrimental to the interests of the United States, or in activities not consistent with security of the United States shall be considered to have failed to maintain exchange visitor classification. Deportation proceedings under this section shall be summary and the findings of the Attorney General as to matters of fact shall be conclusive. Exchange visitors shall not be eligible for suspension of deportation under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. No person admitted as an exchange visitor under this section or acquiring exchange visitor status after admission shall be eligible to apply for an immigrant visa or for a nonimmigrant visa under section 101 (a) (15) (H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, until it is established that such person has resided and been physically present in a

cooperating country or countries for an aggregate of at least 2 years following departure from the United States: *Provided*, That upon request of an interested Government agency and the recommendation of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General may waive such 2-year period of residence abroad in the case of any alien whose admission to the United States is found by the Attorney General to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to those persons acquiring exchange visitor status or, who, having such status, obtain an extension of stay thereunder, subsequent to the date of the enactment hereof."

SEC. 3. Section 202 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"Books and materials

"SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including Government publications, and for the preparation, publication, distribution, translation, and interchange of such writings and other cultural and educational materials, including visual and auditory materials of all kinds."

SEC. 4. Section 601 of such act is amended by inserting after the words *"Provided, however,"* the following: "That the Commission on Educational Exchange shall recommend policies and programs to further cultural relations with participating countries by means of exchange of persons and other means, and shall recommend criteria for the selection of persons for participation in exchange programs under this act: *And provided further,"* .

SEC. 5. (a) Section 602 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That no office under a State university, land-grant college, or other similar educational institution shall be deemed to be a compensated Federal or State office for the purposes of this subsection."

(b) Section 602 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the words "and public service" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "public service, professional, business, agriculture, and labor."

(c) Section 602 (h) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Department is authorized to provide the necessary professional, technical, secretarial, and clerical assistance for the Commissions."

SEC. 6. Section 603 of such act is amended by sriking out the words "a semiannual" and substituting the words "an annual" therefor.

SEC. 7. Title VI of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 604. The Secretary is authorized to establish in any country in which a program under this act is in effect an advisory commission which may be composed of citizens of such country or citizens of the United States, or both. It shall be the function of any commission so established to advise the Secretary with respect to matters concerning the administration of such program. The Secretary is also authorized, wherever practicable, to utilize in the administration of exchange programs under this act the services of any binational commission established under authority of any other law providing similar exchange programs. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available to the Secretary for payment of the expenses of any commission established or utilized pursuant to this section."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 801 (6) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(6) to create, with the approval of the Commission on Information and the Commission on Educational Exchange, such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act; and from time to time to hold meetings of representatives of United States cultural and educational institutions and other organizations interested in programs under this act for the purpose of making reports on, and obtaining comments and suggestions with respect to, such programs. Such persons will not be considered as persons 'employed or assigned to duties by the Government' within the meaning of the act. No such member of an advisory committee or representative of any such institution or organization shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services, but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the rate prescribed by or established pursuant to section 5 of the Administrative Expense Act of 1946, as amended (5 U. S. C. 73 b–2) while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions."

(b) Section 801 of such act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (5), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by adding at the end of the section the following new paragraphs:

"(7) to engage the services of experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 55a), and individuals so engaged may be compensated at rates not in excess of $50 per day and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be paid travel expenses, including per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence at the rates provided for in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations."

SEC. 9. Section 802 of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 802.";

(2) by inserting "contracts of insurance, guaranty, and indemnity, and" after "including" in paragraph (2);

(3) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and by adding after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

"(5) to pay emergency medical expenses and expenses of travel incurred by reason of illness; and

"(6) to pay the travel expenses, including a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, of alien employees and their dependents when such employees are authorized to travel in connection with appointment, change of duty, or separation."; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The Department and any Government agency conducting any nonmilitary exchange of persons program or any program of furnishing technical information and assistance are authorized to pay, in the case of foreign nationals participating in such program, amounts necessary to meet United States income taxes where, except for participation in such program, the liability for such tax would not have been incurred."

SEC. 10. The first sentence of section 902 of such act is amended to read as follows: "If any other Government or any international organization shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any specific part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services."

SEC. 11. Section 1008 of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that the report concerning activities under the educational exchange programs authorized by this act shall be submitted annually on or before the 31st day of December of each year to apply to activities conducted during the previous fiscal year."

SEC. 12. The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 is further amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"Payment of certain claims

"SEC. 1012. For the purpose of promoting and maintaining friendly relations abroad by the prompt settlement of meritorious claims arising in a foreign country, the Secretary of State and the Director of the United States Information Agency, and such other officers as they may designate for such purposes, and under such regulations as they may prescribe, are hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and make payments, where accepted by the claimants in full satisfaction and in final settlement, of claims on account of damage to or loss or destruction of public or private property both real and personal or on account of personal injury or death, including claims respecting personal property bailed to the Government and claims for damages incident to the use and occupancy of real property, whether under a lease, express or implied, or otherwise, whenever caused by any instrumentality, officer, agent or employee of the Department or Agency, incident to the performance of any official functions for the United States, when the amount of such claim does not exceed $5,000: *Provided*, That in cases where the amount exceeds $2,500 but does not exceed $5,000, payment shall be made only after approval by the Secretary or Director.

"The Secretary or Director may certify to Congress any meritorious claim or portion thereof which is in excess of $5,000 as may be deemed to be just and reasonable for payment out of appropriations that may be made by Congress therefor.

"No claim shall be considered unless presented within 1 year after the claim arose, except for good cause shown that the claim could not have been presented within that period of time.

"Every claim settled under the authority of this act shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"United States Information Officers

"SEC. 1013. (a) In accordance with regulations prescribed by him and after suitable examination, the Director of the United States Information Agency may appoint persons to be known as United States Information Officers. Such officers shall be appointed, promoted, and retained on the basis of merit and fitness and may be separated only in accordance with law. Except for the limitations of time contained in sections 522 and 527 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, all provisions of law not inconsistent herewith which are applicable to Foreign Service Reserve officers shall be applicable to United States information officers, and the Director shall be guided by the policies and principles prescribed in those sections. The Director shall establish such examining and selection boards or panels as may be necessary for use in the appointment, promotion, and separation of United States Information Officers.

"(b) Any United States Information Officer may be separated by the Director for unsatisfactory performance of duties, but only after a review of his case by, and opportunity for a hearing before, an impartial advisory board appointed by the Director. The Director shall also provide for the periodic appraisal of such officers and, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, may separate those who are consistently

ranked below a minimum level prescribed for their class.

"(c) The Director may establish an independent retirement and disability system for the benefit of United States Information Officers based on the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as heretofore or hereafter amended. Any officer separated pursuant to subsection (b) hereof shall be entitled to the payments or retirement benefits prescribed in sections 634 or 637 of that act, as appropriate.

"United States Information Service

"SEC. 1014. The agency established by section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, shall hereafter be known as the 'United States Information Service,' and all references in such reorganization plan or in any statute, regulation, agreement, or other legal instrument to the 'United States Information Agency' shall be construed to refer to the 'United States Information Service.' Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter or affect in any way the functions, authorities, or responsibilities of the agency."

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, which would extend by 3 years the deadline for the GI home loan program for World War II veterans.

Unless legislation of this nature is enacted, the entire GI home loan program will, for all intents and purposes come to en end by the end of this year, even though the actual termination date is July 25, 1957.

No further commitments will be made, however, by the Veterans' Administration, beyond the end of this year, according to Thomas J. Sweeney, director of the VA's loan guaranty service.

I present a brief statement prepared by me, stressing the importance of at least a 3-year extension of the deadline. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3639) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I am introducing this bill for a great many purposes:

1. To assure justice for the millions of veterans who have not as yet availed themselves of this fine opportunity to own a home of their own.

It is estimated that 11¼ million World War II veterans have not utilized their GI home-loan privilege. In most instances, they simply have not reached the financial state where they feel they would be in a position to purchase and maintain a home of their own.

Only 26 percent of all eligible United States veterans have used their entitlement. But this percentage varies from city to city and from State to State. In Milwaukee, for example, less than 17 percent of the veterans have used their privilege—17,000 out of more than 100,000 veterans in Wisconsin's largest city.

2. My second reason for introducing this bill is because I believe in the principle of home ownership in our country.

To my way of thinking, there are few things finer than to give a man and his family genuine roots—to give them an opportunity to call a piece of ground and a building on it their own—an opportunity to beautify it, improve it, and to contribute to the community in which they reside.

We are all aware that some folks will continue to like apartment dwelling, for a variety of reasons. But I feel that the rising percentage of Americans who own their own homes is one of the soundest single factors on the national scene.

Of course, we don't want people to go in financially over their heads. We don't want them to take on financial liabilities which they cannot meet. But we do believe that a sound home construction program is essential for the moral and spiritual values of the American people—wholly aside from the material advantages.

3. My third reason for doing so is to provide a continued stimulus to the great American construction industry.

One million two hundred thousand homes will be built this year. I am anxious that this level be maintained and, indeed, increased.

There are those who think that we have reached our peak of home construction. I believe to the contrary. I believe that millions of Americans who are now in old and often obsolete homes will want new homes, and that millions who do not own their own homes will want to buy homes—new or old.

Moreover, there are literally millions of homes which must be improved throughout our country.

If the construction industry falters, the entire American economy will feel the effects. If the construction industry continues to roll in high gear, it will pump economic health into every community of our land.

I have been in continuous contact with the Wisconsin Home Builders Association, with realtor groups through my State, and throughout the rest of the Nation, and I know how important a role all of the home industry plays in the life of America at its grassroots.

I should like to point out that the VA loan guarantee program has not been a burden on the taxpayer. More than a million veterans have already repaid their GI loans in full. In the 10-year life of the program, there has been almost an absolute minimum of defaults on home loans. Losses to the VA have amounted to 0.06 percent of the total amount of over $32 billion in GI loans.

At the end of 1955, less than 1 percent of all outstanding loans were in default.

From time to time, various shortcomings have been found in the loan program. No program this large could possibly be infallible. But, in each instance where shortcomings have been found, after proper analysis and investigation, steps have always been taken to remedy such shortcomings.

I hope, therefore, that this extension legislation will now be promptly enacted in the public interest.

We only have a few months remaining in this second session of the Congress. If we do nothing, the program will lapse for all intents and purposes at the end of this year.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FRAUD BY WIRE, RADIO, OR TELEVISION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit prosecution of perpetrators of fraud who circumvent present laws by operating from outside the borders of the United States in either Canada or Mexico.

This proposed legislation has wisely been suggested in letters to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Attorney General has specifically recommended that title 18 of the United States Code be amended by adding a new section, 1343, so as to proscribe the use of foreign communication for purposes of fraud to the present law, which merely covers the use of interstate wire, radio, or television.

In the House of Representatives on April 9, Representative KENNETH KEATING announced introduction of a bill for this purpose. Mr. KEATING acted, however, to increase the proposed penalty for this interstate or foreign crime from $1,000 to $10,000. The Attorney General had proposed the figure of $1,000, since that is now the figure in the law which is the penalty for fraud involving the use of mail.

To my way of thinking, Representative KEATING has raised a sound point in urging that these swindlers be hit by a penalty of $10,000, rather than the lower figure of $1,000.

Until such time, however, as the existing law is amended (so as to assure complete uniformity between the penalty for mail fraud and the penalty for fraud conducted through other means), I believe that the Attorney General's version should be the one which should be introduced and considered.

I am hoping, however, that the Senate and House Judiciary Committees will simultaneously take action to make the law uniform and hard-hitting by increasing penalties for all mail and wire frauds.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a release which the Attorney General sent out at the beginning of this month, emphasizing the importance of this proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3645) to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1343 of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television: Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

The release presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., today asked Congress for legislation to permit prosecution of fraudulent stock promoters who circumvent present law by operating from Canada and Mexico.

The request was made in identical letters to the Vice President and the House Speaker. The text of the letters and of a proposed bill follow:

"Section 18 (a) of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (66 Stat. 711, 722) amended title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section 1343 as follows:

" 'Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme, or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of interstate wire, radio, or television communication, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.'

"Last year a case arose in which it was alleged that the subject in the execution of a scheme to defraud used the telephone, calling from a point in Mexico to Los Angeles, Calif. Because of the limitation in the statute to frauds involving "interstate" wire, radio, or television communication it was concluded that the telephone call from Mexico, being not an interstate communication but rather a foreign communication, was not covered by the section.

"This case demonstrates the need for amending the statute so that it will reach not only interstate communications but foreign communications as well. If so amended, the statute will cover, for example, telephone calls from Canada made by fraudulent stock promoters to victims residing in the United States. Furthermore, the amendment would remove any doubt as to the applicability of the statute to a communication between a State and a Territory or between a State and the District of Columbia.

"A draft of a bill to accomplish the suggested amendment is enclosed for your consideration and appropriate action.

"The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation."

DESIGNATION OF MAY 30, 1956, AS A DAY TO PAY RESPECTS TO FOUR SURVIVING VETERANS OF CIVIL WAR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the eminent senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which calls attention to the fact that four surviving veterans of the Civil War are alive today. Three of them are members of the former Confederate Army and one of the Union Army. All of them are over 100 years of age and represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes.

All of them have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace. These men are William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army.

We ask that the Congress of the United States designate May 30, 1956, as the day on which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to these four men in recognition of the blessings of the unity and domestic tranquillity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas there are as of this day 4 surviving veterans of the Civil War, 3 from the Army of the Confederacy, and 1 from the Union Army; and

Whereas these Americans, each over 100 years of age, represent the final remnant of the millions of Americans who, almost a century ago, served in these great armies out of a deep sense of duty and conviction of the rightness of their causes; and

Whereas these men have outlived the struggles and the issues which divided this great Nation, and have lived to enjoy the blessings of unity and peace; and

Whereas William A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; John Salling, of Slant, Va., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; Walter W. Williams, of Franklin, Tex., formerly of the Army of the Confederacy; and Albert Woolson, of Duluth, Minn., formerly of the Union Army, being the 4 surviving participants of the Civil War: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America does designate the day of May 30, 1956, as one during which one Nation, indivisible, and with liberty and justice for all, shall pay its grateful respects to William A. Lundy, John Salling, Walter W. Williams, and Albert Woolson, in recognition of the blessings of unity and domestic tranquillity: And be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the said surviving veterans referred to in this resolution.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I wish to give notice that we have made a slight technical change in the amendment submitted by us to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests. The amendment is identified as "4-9-56-A." The purpose of the change in the amendment is to eliminate what may be a loophole in the bill. We ask that the amendment in its new form be substituted for the text of the previous amendment, and be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOBILES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 28, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3543) to protect the public in the operation, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive, or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. PAYNE) on March 28, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 9, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 159) to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. LANGER) on April 9, 1956.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR JOINT RESOLUTION TO REMAIN AT DESK FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to establish a joint congressional committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Information Programs, be held at the desk until April 24 for the purpose of cosponsorship by other Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON NIAGARA RIVER, BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, AND BUFFALO HARBOR, N. Y. (S. DOC. NO. 113)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report, dated December 8, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Niagara River, N. Y.; Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.; and Buffalo Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of June 5, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that the reports be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by him at the Rodger Young Auditorium in Los Angeles on the subject American Doctrine for American Progress.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is celebrated as the eighth independence day of our sister republic, Israel. On this occasion, all freedom-loving men, everywhere, and certainly all Americans, have reason to take note of and to rejoice in the fact that Israel continues, as it has in the past, to defy the buffets of adversity to which it has been subjected from the moment of its rebirth.

Never—not since those heroic days of 1948, when the collective might of the Arab world, seeking to thwart the will of the United Nations, was focused and concentrated on the extinction of the vastly outnumbered defenders of the tiny state—not since those days has Israel faced greater dangers and difficulties than it does today.

But just as Israel survived the onslaughts directed against its creation in 1948, and has survived the hazards, both economic and political, which have loomed up since then, so will Israel, I am confident, survive the dangers that are gathered today.

There is a rope of faith to which all who wish for Israel's welfare may cling in these dark days. That faith is a faith in freedom, which is stronger than tyranny; in democracy, which is stronger than totalitarianism; and in moral law, which is stronger than jungle law.

These are but words, but in these words there is a truth which has shone through all recorded history. All free men, and all who love freedom, will stand with Israel now, in her present danger.

The Soviets will not be permitted to succeed in their design of using the Arab States as cats paws to stir up conflict and war and destruction in this part of the world. And those elements of the Arab leadership who dream of Jeddah, and plan to achieve their own ambitions at the expense of the small democratic State of Israel, will not prevail. The conscience of mankind, which I believe to be stronger than the atom bomb itself, will not let this happen.

Israel will survive and prosper. She will observe her ninth independence day, and many, many more after that. Israel will survive, thrive, and prosper, and men of all nations will be glad of the fact.

Today, the urgent need is for defensive arms for Israel, so that she may be strong enough to deter aggression, and thus to prevent it. But as we scan the horizon of the future, we look for the time to come for Israel, as for our own country, when swords will be beaten into plowshares and the threat of war will be no more.

I am sure that peace will come. The Arab peoples will see the folly of their hates and prejudices. This I firmly believe. This I predict on the basis of my faith in mankind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. On this day of celebration I am happy to join with millions of other Americans in expressing my sincere hope that the people of Israel will have many more years of freedom and independence, and that this small, new nation may have a great future in the family of nations.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to extend greetings to the nation of Israel on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its founding. We in New Jersey have always had a warm feeling toward this young nation; journalists have frequently compared the size of Israel with that of our tiny State.

But, more significantly, we have been proud—as Jews and as gentiles—of the vigor and progress of this nation. With a population only a third that of New Jersey, she has managed to establish a government in the democratic tradition. And, by the tireless work of her pioneers, she has proceeded to build a fine economy. In addition to setting a model for other nations of the Middle East, Israel has been a humanitarian refuge for those fleeing from the Nazi tyranny.

It has been interesting to me that even though surrounded by many nations whose intentions have been far from friendly, Israel has been able to improve its own standard of living, increase literacy, health facilities, sanitation and education, and even stimulate culture. The contribution of the Israeli people to art and music are well known in this country.

It is most regrettable that what should be a happy occasion—a birthday of a young nation—should find it in the midst of great tension and uncertainty. These are difficult times, for the Israeli people perhaps more than any other, but I do know that Israel is here to stay. Our country and the other great nations of the world who were present at the birth of the new nation will not stand by and see it go under. I am sure that Israel will live to celebrate many more birthdays—happier ones, I am sure.

Mr. President, with further reference to this anniversary, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

April 16 marks the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel. As one who was active in the establishment of the State of Israel, I am proud to salute her gallant people and her great achievements on this important occasion.

It is appropriate on this occasion to reemphasize the strong bonds of kinship which underlie the relationship between the United States and Israel. Their destinies are inexorably bound together, for they arise from the same ideals and principles and the abiding faith in the dignity of man, upon which nations are firmly built.

As the acknowledged leader of the free nations of the world the United States must point the way to the establishment of peaceful conditions in the Middle East through the encouragement of a settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

More than any other nation, the United States was responsible for the creation of Israel. Whether by providing arms or by a mutual security pact or by any other effective means, we must now recognize and accept that responsibility. We must not let Israel down.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is generally agreed that there is a need for a review and reappraisal of the foreign policy of the United States. On occasion I have addressed the Senate on foreign policy, as have other Members of the Senate; and I am sure that in the months to come we shall have considerably more discussion of the world situation. It is my thought that out of such debate and review will come new ideas to fill the vacuum so as to stop the dangerous drift which has settled over foreign policy.

It is with this thought in mind that I recommend to all my colleagues in the Senate a series of searching articles on United States foreign policy which appeared in the New York Times during the past week. This paper has, in undertaking this series, performed an outstanding public service.

The correspondents of the New York Times have obtained the views of foreign and American officials and other competent observers on the strong and weak points of United States foreign policy and their suggestions for its improvement. The findings of this study were presented in a series of regional reports on Europe, the Middle East, foreign aid in Asia, southwest and southeast Asia, the Far East, Latin America, and a concluding survey.

This is the finest survey of the present world situation, as it affects America, that has come to my attention. The

Times' correspondents approach the regional situations with objectivity, reporting the strong points in our foreign policy, as well as pointing out areas where we are weak, and making appropriate recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this series of articles be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all may have an opportunity to study this survey in its entirety.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 8, 1956]

EUROPE FINDS UNITED STATES POLICY TOO RIGID, SURVEY SHOWS—TENDENCY TO BLAME DULLES IN TACTICAL LAG DISCLOSED—STRESS ON ECONOMIC WARFARE SUGGESTED AS A REMEDY

(By Harold Callender)

(First of a series)

PARIS, April 7.—Europeans are convinced that American foreign policy has lost much of the vision, resourcefulness, and flexibility that distinguished it from 1947 onward, when the United States departed from its traditions by accepting far-reaching commitments to check Soviet imperialism.

Many believe the far-sighted, imaginative bipartisan policy then developed in Washington probably saved Western Europe, the region of primary American concern. A far greater number, an overwhelming majority of informed observers, contend that this policy—a work of genius in its beginnings—has failed to move and evolve with the times.

That this view is held with something not far from unanimity by these Europeans best qualified to judge seems confirmed by a survey made in Western Europe's capitals by correspondents of the New York Times.

The survey was designed to elicit what competent observers, official and nonofficial, really believe in contradistinction to what may be said officially or publicly. It reflects rather what diplomats and others say when off duty.

The makers of United States foreign policy are widely suspected of failing fully to recognize that Stalin is dead, that the strategy or at least the tactics of Moscow have changed, that war probably is less imminent than in 1950, and that western policy (without neglecting security) requires corresponding readaptation.

If Moscow seems to maneuver faster and more adroitly than the West and to excel in propaganda by talking peace while the West emphasizes armaments, if the free world has been slow to react appropriately to Soviet proffers of economic aid as a means of penetration of uncommitted regions, the blame is placed largely upon what is called the rigidity and lack of imagination of current United States policy. Many interpret this policy as sustaining a static situation in most parts of the world, including Germany.

As one diplomat expressed it, "We have built a hedge about ourselves in the Atlantic alliance with no thought of what we should do when the hedge was completed."

This military solidarity has not been supplemented by a corresponding economic solidarity. The dominant partner in the alliance, the United States, is accused of pursuing in the economic field the nationalistic isolation that it has abandoned in the political field.

Half its economic aid to its allies must be delivered in American ships, even to nations having surplus shipping. The escape clause in American tariff legislation is a threat that if these allies manage to earn more dollars by exports to replace aid, they may find the tariff rising to prevent this form of self-help.

Washington leaders are accused of a tendency to speak and act independently of their allies, and to pay too much attention to domestic politics in shaping foreign policy while paying too little attention to European needs, views, and sensibilities.

They are accused of overindulgence in diplomacy by speeches and press conferences, which often display conflicting views within the administration that bewilder allies with whom the United States is committed to cooperate. Yet it appears to Europeans that when these public debates produce a given policy, Washington assumes the discussion is over and that it only remains for its allies to accept the United States decision even if they have not been consulted.

There is little tendency to criticize President Eisenhower. There is a virtually universal disposition to blame Secretary of State Dulles for taking too rigid positions; for speaking too often, too extemporaneously and without due regard for the ideas and interests of the other allies; for confusing his own reflections or impulses with settled Western policy.

When such criticisms of the policies and methods of the United States are made in Europe, the criterion by which they are judged is that established by the United States itself when it accepted what may be called a community of power in the form of the North Atlantic alliance.

TWO UNITED STATES ACTIONS PRAISED

What Europeans consider the merits and defects of United States policy are yardsticks giving approximate measurements of the adherence to or the deviations from the doctrine of Western unity adopted by the United States early in the cold war. This doctrine crystallized in two acts of high statesmanship that Europeans never cease to praise: the Marshall plan of economic aid and the North Atlantic alliance extending a United States guaranty of security over Western Europe.

The fairly sudden and involuntary acquisition of the predominant power by the United States was accompanied by a decline of European power. The United States sought to correct this accident of history by restoring to Europe some of its former strength and independence—not as an act of pure generosity but because the United States, as powerful as it was, needed allies.

It could not risk the loss to the Soviet Union of the vast industrial resources of Western Europe. So it agreed to pool and dilute to some extent its own power with the smaller but vital power of Western Europe to create a balance of power on a worldwide scale.

This principle was difficult to apply. The United States bears about 80 percent of the cost of Atlantic defense and its officials do not always live up to the necessary diplomatic fiction that the alliance is one of equals. The Nation most noted for its advertising skill is not used to understating its power or its virtues. The bright labels pasted on every piece of Marshall plan machinery to show its origin were understandable, but hardly conformed to the need to use American wealth and power in an unobtrusive manner, if the alliance were to work well.

A similar overindulgence in publicity was seen by Europeans in Mr. Dulles' statement that he had brought the United States, and with it the Western World, to the brink of war—a place where Europe certainly did not care to go. The earlier talk in Washington of massive retaliation seemed another way of moving to the same brink without the prior approval of the allies of the United States.

Such Washington tendencies to forget that the United States has allies are regarded as having taken extreme forms in Asia. In refusing to recognize the regime that effectively rules China, the United States has created a complete breach with its European allies, all of whom consider this a hopelessly unrealistic policy dictated mainly by domestic political pressure. This policy, too, seemed to entail moving to the brink of war when Washington appeared ready to risk a conflict over the Chinese offshore islands and Taiwan (Formosa). This was an example of the rigidity of which Europeans complain.

KENNAN ADVICE UNHEEDED

Much of this rigidity is attributed to what Europeans call a moralistic and semireligious coloring given to United States policy largely by Mr. Dulles, contrary to the advice of George F. Kennan, former head of policy planning in the State Department. A similar propensity to preach is seen in the propaganda on the American way of life, which Europeans believe is neither attainable nor necessarily desired by other nations, which have their own ways of life but can be loyal allies for all that.

This way of life is associated by Europeans with the unique form of capitalism in the United States. It seems to have disproved Socialist doctrines as regards North America and to have prevented any extensive American understanding of the important Socialist movements in Europe, which were responses to a very different brand of capitalism.

In the United States, which enjoys a semi-socialized private capitalism, creeping socialism is widely abhorred as close to communism. In Europe, where socialization had to be done by the state, the resulting mixed economies reveal extensive creeping by socialism. For good or ill, this is a part of European life, and many consider socialism one of the best safeguards against communism.

This view is little understood by United States policymakers, or so Europeans believe. The socialistic British Labor Party suspects that Washington would do what it could to prevent that party again governing Britain.

The principal force working against United States policy is Soviet imperialism operating through Communist groups. Some European economists believe the test will come if the Soviet economy can offer to the Russians a few years hence standards of living above those of Western Europe.

The race, therefore, is regarded as one between Soviet and European productivity. This view lends weight to the contention that United States policy should concentrate in the economic field.

The disunity of Western Europe, handicapping its productivity, is, therefore, considered by many to be another obstacle to United States policy, which has sought to strengthen Europe by uniting it.

In resisting this union in the form of a single tariffless market, British governments have been motivated by concern for their links with the Commonwealth. They have also been influenced by the conviction that what Britons call the Anglo-American alliance entitles Britain to a rating above the continental nations of the wider Atlantic alliance.

BRITISH PRIDE HURT

Britain's pride was wounded when the United States lumped her with lesser nations as a recipient of Marshall aid. The British tend to believe they could use more skillfully the vast power that has fallen to the United States. They claim a special position in relations with the United States.

The French think this special position already exists to their disadvantage. They suspect that Washington and London get together behind their backs. The French complain of American anticolonialism, which they say injects a disruptive ideological element into the Atlantic alliance. But the Greeks, who are in the same alliance, wish that United States anticolonialism would

result in pressure on Britain for self-government in Cyprus.

The French sense of frustration in both North Africa and Europe, expressed mainly in indictments of United States policy, led to the recent statements by Premier Guy Mollet urging a more positive United States attitude toward the Soviet Union. By this he meant chiefly a more favorable response to his idea of trying to escape from the Geneva deadlock by giving priority to negoations for reduction of armaments.

BONN OUTWARDLY CONTENT

This was criticized as coming close to the policy of the Soviet Union, which sought to put security agreements ahead of German unity. The West Germans want nothing put ahead of German unity.

West Germany officially appears a more contented ally. The Germans consider their Federal Republic was created by the United States—which, however, errs in apparently considering it more than just a provisional state pending an all-German state. Yet Germans believe the United States is the only power that may 1 day persuade Moscow to accept this all-German state. Privately, many Germans agree with the widespread European view that United States policy is too static, especially as regards Germany.

In Spain, too, many look to the United States to help them toward a new kind of state, one that would succeed the Franco regime. They complain that Washington pays too exclusive attention to the powers that be and not enough to the masses of the people, who may prefer and eventually obtain a different regime.

This seems to be a plea for United States interference in the internal affairs of a European State. Elsewhere in Europe the belief prevails that there has been too much of such interference. Thus there are numerous crosscurrents and still much nationalism in Europe, so that the United States could scarcely please everybody, whatever its policy.

RECOMMENDED REMEDIES

From the remarkably similar criticisms of the United States foreign policy noted by correspondents of the New York Times in the capitals of Western Europe there emerge suggestions for improvement. Each of the criticisms cited above is at the same time a recommended remedy. In addition, many critics replied to the question: How could United States policy be improved? There was no great diversity of replies except in emphasis.

While the general lines of policy laid down in the late 1940's are sound, there have been faults, delays, and confusion in their application. Strategy is good but tactics defective. There was wide agreement, often expressed in the same terms, that the United States, without abandoning the instruments of security, should now direct its attention more to a kind of economic warfare in which the Soviet Union is considered to have taken the initiative.

Just as the United States shifted its emphasis from Marshall plan aid to defense aid after 1950, it should now shift back again to economic aid, this time not mainly in Europe but in the so-called uncommitted areas where Soviet influence penetrates.

To do this effectively some suggest that perhaps Washington needs an independent agency for foreign aid, as was recommended by Paul G. Hoffman, former Economic Cooperation Administrator, so that this function will not get tangled up between the State Department and the Treasury. At any rate, policy should be clearer and more vigorous, in the view of European critics.

The almost universal emphasis placed on economic policy was equally by that on the need for greater flexibility in foreign policy generally. For this some suggested a return to secret diplomacy would be necessary, since publicly taken positions tend to become nonnegotiable.

Greater assurance of continuity of policy—of policies not subject to change with the election returns—was urged, especially in Britain, where this continuity has been largely achieved. The suggestion was that the world ought to be sure that there would be as much American thinking about foreign policy in 1957 as in 1947, when major decisions were boldly taken. The impression is that lately the United States has become the prisoner of cold war slogans, and that the professional diplomats should have more independence in shaping policy.

It was suggested that the United States would do well not to expect gratitude from allies and other aided countries. Although aid is seen as including a substantial admixture of generosity, it is regarded as being granted primarily in the interests of the United States, as Congress specified. Advanced European nations dislike aid. They would prefer to get dollars through trade if the United States would lower some of its bars. To remind them that they are aided injures their dignity, especially since they believe the need for aid is partly a result of United States protectionist policies.

The late President Roosevelt said the purpose of lend lease was to remove the dollar sign from the relations of the United States and Britain, and later with other countries. For that sign is the mark of the predominant United States power, which many Europeans and Americans believe will be the more effective if used without being flaunted before those who, having lost power, may naturally be slightly envious.

In the Atlantic alliance, that power has been somewhat diluted and disguised. In the North Atlantic Council, Foreign Ministers of small nations speak as freely as those of great powers, and wisdom is not necessarily in exact proportion to power or wealth.

In this council, originally for defense but now for political discussion also, the United States has occasionally taken its allies into its confidence regarding its foreign policy. The council has discussed policies not only in Europe but in the Middle and Far East. It is thus a community of power and of intelligence. Some Europeans believe the most important cure for the United States foreign policy errors cited in this article would be more frequent and more thorough consultation in this council on policy in all parts of the world.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]

PRECISE UNITED STATES POLICY ASKED IN MIDEAST—SURVEY OF AREA FINDS MIDDLE COURSE TOO OFTEN TAKEN FOR INDECISIVENESS

(By Sam Pope Brewer)

(Second of a series)

BEIRUT, LEBANON, April 8.—Any American who travels in these times has to get used to being taken to task over United States foreign policy.

The bases of criticism vary with different areas and even inside an area critics do not agree on what the faults are or how they should be remedied. Still there are certain criticisms and suggestions that recur more often than others.

The traveling Americans, for their part, tend to feel that much of the trouble arises from the lack of any firm and definite policy rather than from the existence of a mistaken one.

In the Arab world and the rest of the Middle East, from Gibraltar to India and from the Black Sea down to the Sudan, the United States has unquestionably lost heavily in prestige and friendship in the last few years. In the Arab countries, at least, that trend is continuing.

The reasons given by critics vary but the best simple generalization might be summed up as "too much and too little." The United States has aided nationalist aspirations and fought colonialism enough to annoy and harm its British and French allies and not enough to win the solid friendship of local nationalists.

TECHNICAL AID WELCOMED

The Americans have given generously and yet have hesitated enough, made enough conditions, and refused enough requests to irritate those who are receiving the gifts and loans.

The phase of United States policy that has won the most favorable comments and made the most friends has been the technical and educational aid that is being so widely given.

Against that, the most criticized factor in United States policy is unquestionably its support of Israel. The Arab world looks on the United States as the principal force in the creation and protection of Israel as a state. When one sees how bitterly the Arabs feel about that, the most surprising point is that there is still so much friendliness for the United States.

Balanced Arab opinion does not hold now that it is possible to do away with Israel. But it does reproach the United States for what the Arabs believe to be a consistently strong bias in favor of Israel as against her Moslem neighbors.

The Israelis on their side feel the United States could assure their survival in peace by arming them heavily.

If the United States gave in on that point, there would be extreme alarm on the Arab side and an immediate rush to the Soviet bloc for arms that have been offered and that have been bought on a small scale.

The Israelis approve economic-aid policies and the plan advanced by Eric Johnston, President Eisenhower's representative, for rational development of Jordan Valley waterpower and irrigation resources.

They think the United States should arm them and keep arms from the Arab countries. They believe the United States puts too much faith in the ability of the United Nations to prevent a major war in the Middle East.

As an improvement on present policies, they urge heavy defensive armament for Israel and the use of all possible pressures to impose a settlement of Israel's frontiers that would involve recognition of Israel's existence as a state.

The Arabs oppose such a settlement, because they feel their whole position rests on the fact they have never consented to the establishment of a foreign state in an area inhabited by Arabs. Recognition of Israel, they believe, would weaken their claim to the area involved.

Special reports from correspondents of the New York Times in North Africa indicate that there, too, the United States has failed in an effort to be moderate, though not entirely neutral.

Nationalists think the Americans have made too little effort to back up their ideals of independence and self-determination for all.

The French think their American allies have betrayed them by encouraging nationalist aspirations. That is why feeling rose so high that a mob of infuriated Frenchmen wrecked the United States Consulate and Information Service library in Tunis early in March.

The nationalists in Morocco and Tunisia are less critical of the United States than are the French. But one qualified American observer remarked that "even the nationalists are a little cynical about us because they feel they cannot count on us against the French."

In Egypt, the Israeli question is the pivot of the attitude toward the United States. The Egyptians are elated with the success of their revolution. They believe Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser outmaneuvered the

United States when he obtained arms from Czechoslovakia.

Now they would be satisfied with no lesser change in United States policy than complete abandonment of Israel and full support of Premier Nasser's new Egypt in her aspirations to dominate the Arab world.

ALTERNATIVE IS LACKING

In common with other Arabs, they talk vaguely about the United States refusal to "face realities," but they produce no workable alternative to present American policy.

The Baghdad Pact provides an example of the vacillation that has brought criticism of the United States from all sides.

United States refusal to join has irritated and alarmed the member countries, organized for defense against Soviet aggression. The members, Britain, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey, feel that the success or failure of the alliance depends on the active membership or absence of the United States, which first suggested it.

Foes of the pact include the Soviet bloc and "neutralist" countries, with Egypt leading the chorus of criticism. They resent United States moral support of this pact, even though it has not gone beyond lip service.

One senior United States diplomat commented bitterly recently that it was impossible to know where the United States stood as long as it refused to join the pact, although the State Department periodically proclaimed its support of the alliance.

A result is that the United States incurs the ill will of both opposed camps.

The Turks, too, have criticisms of United States policy, but they do not hinge on the Israeli question.

Turkey's objections are connected chiefly with financial questions. They accuse the United States of trying to shape everybody into the American mold. That criticism is heard elsewhere and Americans living abroad generally concede there is some justice in it.

The Turks are in financial difficulties and feel that the United States has been too reluctant to bail them out and unduly critical of some of the conduct that has landed them in that position.

In all these countries, another criticism frequently heard is that the United States focuses all its attention on the fight against communism and opposes even commercial relations with the Soviet Union and its satellites.

They believe the United States exaggerates the Red menace and they suspect mercenary motives behind the objections to their trade with the Soviet bloc.

The forces with which United States policy has to deal in the Arab world, Turkey, Iran, and the rest of the Middle East are multiple. Communism is not the most conspicuous.

Nationalism is the most notable force and in these countries has become virtually synonymous with anti-Western sentiment. For hundreds of years most of this area was ruled by the Turks. When World War I ended Turkish rule (even before that in some areas) the Turks were replaced by British, French, or Italian overlords.

Now that they are sovereign countries, the Arab States intend to exercise their rights. The United States as an ally of Britain and France is suspect in the present period of struggle.

One Arab jurist said recently to this correspondent:

"After generations of being taught that the Western Powers were their oppressors, the common people of our countries cannot be convinced that those same powers have suddenly become their friends and protectors."

PERIL IN COOPERATION

The Communists manipulate those nationalist forces. Sometimes the Reds pose as having nationalist aims themselves. Sometimes they convince the nationalists that "after all we have the same enemies—the Western imperialists—and party names do not matter."

Communism as an open political force is not dangerous in most of these countries. The danger lies in the fact that the nationalists think they can cooperate with the Communists as long as it suits them and then drop them. The nationalists overlook the damage done meanwhile.

In Syria, for example, there appears to be strong Communist influence though the party as such does not amount to much. There is one Communist member of Parliament, Khaled Bagdash, but the greatest danger again lies not in him but in some of the young officers and officials who believe Communist agitation and Communist aid from abroad are useful weapons against the Western Powers and who do not realize the danger of falling into the Communists' grip.

In the Arab countries, simple hostility to Israel and fear of her supposed ambitions for expansion may also be classed as a specific force working against the United States. Until after World War II Americans were known in these countries only as benefactors. They had neither colonies nor mandates. They did provide schools and colleges, encourage the Arab political revival and send aid when there were disasters.

That vast fund of goodwill is not exhausted but it is depleted by the struggle over Israel and because of United States inability to abandon its French and British allies to please the Arab nationalists.

In north Africa, the effort to steer a middle course brings the United States up against another force—the reaction of French colonials to the alleged American encouragement of the Arab forces that are fighting a guerrilla war with the French.

The nationalists remember that the United States, especially in the Franklin D. Roosevest administrations, encouraged aspirations to independence. They are not getting the support they would like from Washington but they do not look on Americans as enemies.

FRENCH COLONIALS BITTER

Embattled French colonial officials and settlers also remember United States encouragement of such movements and they are bitter about it.

Their view was expressed by Pierre Vignau, a French landowner and member of the Algerian Assembly, who said to a correspondent of the Times:

"The question now is whether the United States intends to change its policy regarding north Africa and the Middle East. If the United States means to continue and reinforce the defense of the West, it must not only be on the side of France in her efforts to restore security in Algeria but must also undertake a concerted action designed to help bring Tunisia and Morocco back into the European-Africa bloc. Such a bloc is indispensable to western defense and desirable also in the interests of native populations for independence has put Morocco and Tunisia on the road to anarchy."

Each group offers simple and impractical solutions to its complaints about United States policy. The Arabs want Israel dropped. The Israelis want unqualified support against the Arab States. The nationalists want aid in the fight for independence. The French want help in suppressing rebellious natives.

All want money in loans and grants and all object to the policy that requires a check on what is done with the money after they get it.

The United States obviously would not gain by plunging recklessly onto one side or the other in each controversy, or by ladling out money without knowing what was being done with it.

There do stand out in the opinions from various countries certain calls for policy changes that seem to occur to many persons of different groups.

DEFINITE POLICY URGED

The basic one is a plea to decide on some definite policy, whatever it may be. In most cases, this means a demand for a policy backing up the speaker's particular group.

In the instances mentioned above, it is clear the United States cannot well drop its moderate position and back one side fully. But the so-called middle-of-the-road position too often looks like indecision.

The call is for a clear-cut policy. It would still not please the partisan groups but they would have fewer false hopes.

On less general lines, there are clear indications that money put into education facilities, libraries, and technical aid is well spent. There are different views about the efficiency of existing operations in that field but there is no doubt about the demand among Middle Eastern peoples for the facilities provided.

That effectiveness is presumably why the United States Information Service library in any city is normally the first target of hoodlums whenever political disturbances start. The Communists invariably seize the chance to steer violence into channels that suit their purpose, and the American library is almost invariably their first objective.

The library in Amman, Jordan, for instance, has been wrecked twice. However, a high Jordanian Government official, when asked what he thought was the most useful work the United States carried on in this area replied: "Education and books." He then drew a handful of United States magazines and pamphlets from his desk drawer.

Several observers think policies on loans and grants might be reviewed.

The Soviet Union has been making much headway directly and through satellites in providing underdeveloped countries with things they want, whether arey are arms, industrial equipment, or other material. They give no gifts but make business deals on terms that amount to the same thing without calling for acknowledgment of that fact. Payment may be in surplus products the aid recipients could not sell elsewhere or in weak currencies and spread over a long period.

The Soviet does not moralize about whether a country should have the arms it seeks or whether it needs the type of factory it wants.

A result is that each deal creates much goodwill at relatively low cost. Carefully supervised American loans and gifts, however lavish they may be, tend to leave the recipients with the feeling of the tramp who is required to sing a hymn to get a free cup of coffee.

[From the New York Times of April 9, 1956]

AFRICAN ISSUES LOOMING

(By Leonard Ingalls)

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, April 8.—In Africa south of the Sahara, the foreign policy of the United States is not particularly strong or well defined beyond the fundamental attitude of good neighborliness. The chief aim is to keep Africa alined with the West.

Very soon, however, the United States probably will be forced to take a more vigorous stand in a number of developing situations. These include both white and African nationalism, the emergence into independence of such places as the Gold Coast, the spread of communism, and the new interest the Soviet Union is taking in the difficulties African Negroes are having in rising above a position of extreme underprivilege and the continuation of colonial rule.

Of all the problems troubling this part of the continent, nationalism is perhaps the most serious. It is the basis of sub-Sahara Africa's greatest conflict. On one hand are

whites striving to maintain their identity and position as rulers. On the other are Negroes clamoring for political, economic, and social recognition, and in some places, such as Uganda, for outright control of their homelands.

The force of Negro nationalism throughout the continent is not yet great because the majority of Africans are primitive and illiterate. In South Africa the picture is further complicated by the intense rivalry for national predominance between the white descendants of English and Dutch settlers. Meanwhile, in the Central African Federation, and Kenya and Tanganyika, efforts are being made to establish multiracial nationalism through governments in which all races are represented.

Thus far in this complex and sometimes baffling situation United States policy has been one of almost complete noninterference and at most gentle suggestion. State Department representatives here, in the absence of a precise African policy from Washington, act as observers and do what they can to stimulate trade and further the prestige of the United States. Their activities, however, and the whole impact of United States operations in sub-Sahara Africa are severely restricted by a shortage of funds.

American financial aid in sub-Sahara Africa, an area desperately in need of money for such things as education and communications, has been small compared with direct Government grants elsewhere. The tightly limited opportunities for Africans to study and travel in the United States at Government expense have caused some resentment among Negroes.

Present United States African policy seems to have offended no one in official positions. However, African leaders frequently ask why the United States does not help them more in the United Nations in their struggle for human rights.

Africa's dilemma arising from conflicting racial aspirations also creates a dilemma for the United States. Should it, for example, ignore the plight of the Negro in South Africa and antagonize Africans all over the continent, or should it denounce apartheid (racial segregation) and risk losing South Africa as a strategic and commercial partner?

The most effective policy for the United States in Africa, observers here believe, appears to be one that would provide tangible support and encouragement to sincere efforts at multiracial governments and societies, with emphasis on equality of opportunity. Assistance to independent Negro states to enable them to achieve stable governments and sound economies, it is believed, also would be in harmony with such a policy.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1956]

ASIA SURVEY FINDS NEED OF MORE AID—SOME SEE CUT IN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARD TO PROVIDE HELP

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

(Third of a series)

COLOMBO, CEYLON, April 9.—The great challenge, and the great opportunity, facing United States foreign policy is communism's eager pursuit of nationalist movements all over the world.

The challenge springs from the fact that the Russians have grasped the enormous emotional and political drive behind what Asians like to call the age of nationalism.

Not long ago, at one of those earnest diplomatic garden parties that make up a good deal of New Delhi's official social life, an Indian Foreign Office man was talking about a favorite topic—where the United States goes wrong.

"You don't seem to be able to realize that countries see the world in different ways, that problems unimportant to you are primary to us," he said.

"That's why you are finding yourself losing out to the Russians on this colonialism business," he continued. "They have the wit to see that nationalism is the force of this decade. Intellectually you see it, too, certainly. But you expect the impossible. You expect Algerians, for instance, to take a world view, not the Algerian view."

The United States is no longer counted a sure friend of nationalist movements.

This is a bitter thought for the United States, remembering that freedom was given to the Philippines, and help to India and Indonesia. It is made more bitter by the fear that the Western age of colonialism is being replaced by Soviet political and military conquests.

But there is no point in giving argument for argument. It is enough that Asians have lost trust.

The national elections in Ceylon, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the openly pro-Western Government, were fought on domestic rather than international issues. But certainly they showed that being identified with the West has nc great political asset to an Asian politician. And they showed, too, that the West's policies had not struck a real spark in the minds of the Ceylonese.

This is a problem made infinitely more acute by the fact that the Russians, with no political commitments to the colonial powers, can and do eagerly push themselves forward as friends of nationalism everywhere.

The opportunity springs from the challenge. It is the opinion of many Asians and some important United States officials in this area that the United States, in its concern for physical and military security, is letting the political battle go by default. They believes too that Americans do not realize that good will toward the United States is ebbing. But they believe that the plain threat that the Communists will be able to identify themselves with nationalism may prod the United States into restating its own traditional friendship for independence movements.

Among some Americans here there is a belief that the best step the United States could take now would be a straight and unequivocal statement of its intention to see that every land capable of self-government attains it.

For the sake of political effect, it might help the United States to bring up the issue itself at the United Nations. It certainly would help if a declaration were made formally by the President of the United States.

This reporter has not heard that last suggestion put in as many words by Indian or United States officials. But there have been many comments that the time has come for clarification of United States policy. Putting that hope together with the fact that President Eisenhower's personal prestige is high here, it is obvious that a Presidential declaration would have more force than any other kind.

ALL CANNOT BE PLEASED

It is the opinion of most westerners in India that for the time being at least the United States cannot evolve a foreign policy that will make New Delhi or all other Asian capitals entirely happy. The reason is in the basic difference in attitude toward the Communist philosophy and toward the danger of that philosophy.

India and other Asian countries are ready to believe the danger of military aggression has passed. As far as the United States is concerned, military containment and preparedness will have to remain the skeletal structure of United States foreign policy. That means something the Indians will never like—military pacts in which their neighbors are armed.

It has to be recognized—and this comes from a number of Asians—that the United States cannot satisfy all Asians' wishes.

But, especially in connection with nationalism, Asians say that Americans must also recognize that they need not keep all their allies happy all the time.

The United States would have to pay a price for meeting the Soviet challenge on nationalism head on—the anger of some United States allies.

But the history of the last 10 years has proved that sooner or later the United States has had to take public stands that its Western allies did not like, and that too often—Cyprus, for instance—those stands were taken too late for maximum political effect. Put another way, opinion in this part of the world is that the time has come for the United States to lead the parade instead of running after the Soviet Union.

The nationalist question cannot, of course, be considered without taking the free world's military security into account. But if the last decade has shown anything—consider Suez, Cyprus, Indochina, and North Africa—it is that military security depends on political security and that democratic countries cannot hold down military bases surrounded by hostile populations.

This is not a suggestion for abandoning military security but for reconsidering the essentials for military security. To give just one example, there are United States military men in Saigon who believed that the presence of the French expeditionary corps in South Vietnam was such a political liability that it amounted to a threat to military security.

And it is being asked whether the British naval base on Cyprus is more secure now than it would have been if the British had given up sovereignty and signed a long-term lease-treaty with the willing Greeks.

ECONOMICS AN ESSENTIAL

Some American officials in Asia might disagree with the emphasis on pushing to the front on the colonialism issue. But few would disagree that economics becomes every day a more essential part of our foreign policy. One obvious reason, of course, is that the Russians have entered the picture—in Egypt, India, Syria, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Burma, the Sudan, and Yemen.

But just as important is the fact that the newly independent countries are aware more sharply than ever before of the gap between them and the developed countries. That gap is growing because Western industrialization is outpacing the painful development efforts of Asia and the Middle East.

Sooner or later in a discussion of foreign policy, the talk boils down to this: The United States will have to spend still more money and share still more of its wealth with Asia.

What is more, there is a belief among Americans in Asia that the time may be coming when the United States will have to cut down its continually rising standard of living to meet Soviet competition and to help underdeveloped countries get ahead. Indian businessmen say the United States is pricing itself out of the market.

An example among many: The Tata Iron & Steel Co., part of the biggest industrial-commercial enterprise in India, was negotiating with the United States Export-Import Bank for a loan to double its steel producing plant. The negotiations fell through because under a loan, say the Tata spokesmen, the concern would have been obliged to buy all its equipment in the United States and prices were too high, when measured against the high interest rate demanded by the bank.

One of the problems the United States must face in Asia is a drift toward nationalization of economies. Nearly everyone believes it would be unwise and impossible to try to pressure India, for instance, away from socialism.

But among Americans there is the opinion that, without interfering with Asian lands bent on some form of socialism, there is a great deal Washington can do to promote the spirit and philosophy of enlightened private enterprise.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

One American businessman said in New Delhi recently that since the United States was willing to give hundreds of millions of dollars to governments, it should be willing to give private Asian industry a hand by making low-interest-rate loans. He mentioned the Tata episode as a case in point.

The Tata organization is now negotiating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. That means the Indian Government would have to stand behind the loan and would have a stronger voice in Tata affairs.

The point this businessman and others made was that where opportunities presented themselves to help reliable private enterprises in Asia, the United States should take them.

High United States prices and interest rates take on political importance because the Soviet Union will make sacrifices to supply goods at prices underdeveloped countries can afford.

There is a feeling among westerners that sometime soon the people of the United States may have to learn the painful lesson that continuously rising wages and profits may wreck their country's ability to compete with the Soviet Union in the economic struggle for Asia. Already India is buying most of her cement from Communist countries. Multiply this by a hundred products and the political consequences need no underlining.

The job of strengthening the economic foundations of underdeveloped countries was started by the United States a decade ago. Still the insistence of western and Asian officials is that more and more money must be appropriated because on this now hangs the future of Asia. Not only more money is needed but more imagination and more planning.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

So far, planning and spending have been on a national basis and sometimes without clear goals in mind. There are United States officials here who believe that one of the things the United States could do would be to call a technical-level conference to work intensively to map out Asia's needs, resources, foreign-aid requirements, and attainable objectives. There is a good chance the United States would find itself ahead of the Asian countries in the desire for regional planning, but there is nothing wrong with leading the field.

India needs more money, large quantities of it. If the United States was willing to lend India the money—$1 billion, at the least—it could assure that her own democratic way to a mixture of socialism plus private enterprise had stood the test when compared with Communist China's totalitarian economy.

It is in the interest of the United States to help noncommitted countries, but there is no reason why it should be ashamed of making a special economic effort for its allies—Pakistan, for instance. The recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization at Karachi expressed some fond hopes about emphasizing the economic aspects of the alliance. But beyond appointing one economist the conference did nothing about it. Here, too, is a field for United States imaginativeness.

The problem of Afghanistan is one of the most difficult the United States faces. For one thing, the Soviet loan of $100 million faces Washington with a decision as to whether to be drawn into the endless, sapping process of trying to outbid the Soviet on loans. That is just what leaders of this area think Washington did in the case of the Aswan high dam in Egypt, and the action did not enhance the reputation of the United States.

But the bigger problem the United States faces in Afghanistan is the same one it must deal with in many countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia. That is whether United States funds are to be used to bolster dictatorial governments just because they happen to be in power.

There is no easy answer to this. The Russians certainly have no compunctions about supporting any government in power so long as it suits their purpose. But whether that approach and that philosophy in the long run suit the objectives of freedom is questioned by many Asian friends of the United States.

Assuredly the United States cannot change the governments of the world to suit itself. But it would be in keeping with United States traditions to make it clear through Presidential statements that Washington is not ready to build up dictatorships of the right in its fight against dictatorships of the left.

The world struggle is as much as anything a struggle for minds and attitudes. And there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be welcomed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. This correspondent has met many Asians who have lived in the United States and virtually every one has returned with more understanding and sympathy toward United States goals.

Many Asians feel that knowledge of their lands is almost nonexistent in the United States. An increasing number of Americans living in Asia could do much to remedy that.

It might help prevent incidents like the one involving the Member of the United States Congress interviewed at the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

[From the New York Times of April 11, 1956]

UNITED STATES NEEDS TO EMPHASIZE PEACE, SURVEY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA SHOWS

(By Robert Alden)

(Fourth of a series)

SINGAPORE, April 10.—The tides of change are running strong in southeast Asia. The newly sovereign states just emerged from cast-off colonial shells are in danger of being swept away in the shifting groundswells.

The most important currents that tug at the nations of southeast Asia and shape their thinking are nationalism, hatred of war and a feeling of pride that Asia and the Asian people are now taking a deserved place of importance in the world.

In the last several months, this correspondent has talked with 50 or more persons here in southeast Asia with regard to the effectiveness of United States foreign policy in southeast Asia.

Some of these persons were American State Department personnel, others foreign government leaders. Some were newspapermen, local and foreign.

There was a virtual unanimity of opinion that these main forces at work in Asia must be fully appreciated if the United States is to shape an effective foreign policy for the area.

After years of living under the rule of strangers and seeing their wealth exploited by those strangers, the people here are choosing their own leaders and trying to run their own countries.

There are poverty, illiteracy, and disease in these countries. They need help to overcome these burdens. But they do not want that help if it is going to rob them of their hard-won independence.

The hatred of war is a dominant force in shaping the thinking of these countries. All have experienced war. Burma, Indonesia, Malaya, Laos, and South Vietnam are even now plagued by internal strife.

For these people, war means burned-out villages, sudden death, and the fear of sudden death. They want an end to it.

Linked with their nationalism and hatred of war is a feeling of pride in Asia itself. The dark-skinned and yellow-skinned peoples are coming into their own.

These peoples find unity in a feeling that their culture is older than the white man's, in a common past experience and common present problems. Thus any achievement in any country of Asia develops now a shared pride of achievement.

What can the United States do to harness these main forces now at work in southeast Asia so that these countries will not become the dupes of communism?

PRINCIPAL SUGGESTIONS

The general opinion was that, in spite of its global commitments, the United States, recognizing that colonialism is dead, must denounce it in clear terms.

As Secretary of State Dulles did during his visit to Indonesia, the fact should be emphasized that the United States once suffered under colonial rule itself; that it threw off that rule by force of arms and that, because it has shared their experiences, it understands the problems of the newly sovereign states.

The opinion was that the United States should support the principle that the people should have the right to choose who should govern them.

Such a stand, it was felt, is in the democratic tradition of the United States, and the Asian people should be helped to understand that this is the traditional United States position.

It is felt in diplomatic circles here that Mr. Dulles cannot uphold the principles of the United States Declaration of Independence in Indonesia while the United States Ambassador to France, C. Douglas Dillon, speaks of United States support for the French in north Africa.

The day after Mr. Dillon spoke in Paris his remarks were printed in the Communist Indonesian press parallel to those of Mr. Dulles. The Communist press considered the remarks as proof that Secretary Dulles was lying and that here was fresh evidence that the United States traditionally supported—and supported with arms—the colonial powers.

EMPHASIS ON PEACE URGED

The comment of a missionary's son who has spent all of his life in Asia represents a fair cross-section of opinion. He said:

"Putting aside the traditional American position with regard to independence and to colonialism, do we really think that in the long run the French, with all the arms at their disposal, will be able to wipe out nationalist feeling in north Africa any more than they were able to do it in Indochina or the Dutch were able to do it in Indonesia?"

He went on to say:

"If there is one lesson we should have learned in Asia, if we hadn't already learned it during the American Revolution, it's that you don't stop popular movements by killing people. You only provide martyrs and that means that there will be even more devoted followers of the cause of the revolution.

"The United States should not lose out to communism by backing unworthy causes that are already lost."

As a second point, emphasis should be put on the United States love of peace, its desire

to disarm, and President Eisenhower's "open-sky" plan for mutual aerial inspection of atomic arsenals. The feeling was that an end should be made to the continual United States talk about its armed might, its military alliances and its atomic striking power.

While diplomats in this area probably more keenly than most realize the need for such military strength, they also feel that it does great harm to publicize United States strength. It lends credence to the Communist propaganda line that the United States is bent on destroying peace in the area.

American aid is badly needed here, but it was felt the United States must not give the impression that it is trying to buy the goodwill of the Asians.

NEED FOR VIEW OF GOOD WILL

It was agreed that men of good will and ability are worth more than hundreds of millions blindly poured into the area in the hope that somehow the countries of Asia will resist communism.

There was complete agreement among those interviewed that the United States overseas-aid program must be streamlined and improved. Redtape must be cut away so that needed supplies, equipment, and men can be put at the disposal of countries quickly and efficiently.

In this connection, one idea that had been put forward met with wide approval. It was suggested that to accomplish the program the United States must call on the technical and manpower resources of American industry on a patriotic basis.

In most instances, the United States is not putting its best foot forward in recipient countries.

The proposal, therefore, is that personnel should be borrowed from large industry, with industry agreeing to lend some of its good employees to the Government for a year or two at a time to help the Asian countries and thus, in turn, help win the "cold war" for the United States.

In that way, the southeast Asian countries would have the advantage of utilizing the full abilities of good American technicians. The recommendations of the people in the field should then be trusted so that much of the Washington redtape, which now often holds up projects for a year or more, could be eliminated.

There was virtual unanimity of opinion also that the United States should stress more its own cultural and intellectual achievements. In this way, a greater appeal would be made to the students of southeast Asia, who are the potential leaders of the area.

More of these students should be sent to the United States to study, not for a few months or a year but for a full 4-year college course. It has been found that the United States is well able to "sell" itself to such visitors.

LESS TALK OF REDS ASKED

Another point that was made frequently, particularly by Asians, was that the United States should cut down sharply on the talk about communism. The United States has already made it clear that communism is a dangerous and evil system.

The feeling is that harping on communism gives Asians an impression that the United States is a narrowminded and undemocratic nation.

Sympathetic Asian officials maintain that, instead of concentrating its fire on communism, the United States should now give more emphasis to its own positive accomplishments, its rising standard of living for working people and the high health and education standards for its children.

In connection with this matter of continual emphasis on communism, one Asia newspaper editor said:

"It seems to us that the United States will not take any stand in world affairs—including the matter of colonialism—without first relating the subject to communism and mentioning the matter of communism. We get fed up with America's one-track mind."

Despite these suggestions as to redirection of United States foreign policy, there is agreement that the present policy has achieved some results in Asia.

Much of the United States effort has stressed the essential evil of communism and the trap that communism sets for unwary people. The United States has had some success in propagating this idea and many Asians have learned to recognize and detest communism.

But communism is not yet a bad word in Asia. A villager in Indonesia, just as a villager in Thailand, might very well go out and vote for a Communist in an election if the Communist promised him things that he desired.

However, probably the most important achievement of United States foreign policy has been the propping up of newly sovereign states. These states were thus able to withstand the internal pressure of communism and the external threat of aggression.

DANGER SEEN IN ALLIANCE

If it were not for United States aid, South Vietnam would almost certainly have collapsed, as might Laos and Cambodia. Aid to Indonesia in the early days of independence helped that republic to survive.

The United States has also succeeded in shaping a military alliance whose purpose is physical containment of communism and thus serves as a deterrent to war.

However, Asians in neutral countries are not kindly disposed toward the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. They are afraid it might cause rather than prevent a war.

Among those countries sensitive to foreign interference, the fact that there are only 3 Asian members as compared to 5 non-Asian participants is a glaring weakness of the pact. That imbalance leads credence to the Communist position that the alliance represents an outside threat to the peace of Asia.

The members are the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. The agreement covers their territories and in addition those of Cambodia, Laos and South Vietnam.

Many persons interviewed compared what the United States had accomplished by its foreign policy with what the Communists had accomplished.

It is apparent that the Communists have concentrated on trying to channel the main currents in Asia to their advantage. Thus they talk continually of their desire for peace. Conversely they try to link the United States with the word "war." In this repect, United States saberrattling has helped them.

Colonialism is continually denounced by the Communists and every effort is made to link the United States with colonialism. Mr. Dulles' statement on Goa gave the Communists good material with which to work. From it New Delhi inferred that the United States upheld Portuguese colonialism in India.

PAN-ASIANISM EMPHASIZED

Both the Russians and the Chinese have been laboring hard on the Pan-Asia idea. Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party's First Secretary, told the Burmese flatly: "We Russians are Asians."

Chou En-lai, Red China's Premier and Foreign Minister, took a leading role in last year's Asian-African Conference.

During his tour through south and southeast Asia, however, Mr. Dulles appeared to gain a better grasp of the situation and now seems ready to modify United States policy, at least in some measure. Some elements of the problems, however, appear to resist easy solution.

Among these is the fact that the neutral countries of southeast Asia are wary of the United States close relationships with President Syngman Rhee of South Korea and President Chiang Kai-shek of Nationalist China.

It is not that they object to the anti-Communist programs of those leaders but the fact that both avowedly would like to start a war to reunify their countries. Close American support of these leaders links the United States with a threat to touch off a third world war.

Conflict of interest within the United States has also snarled American foreign policy in Asia. Thus Burma made the point that she would not accept technical assistance from the United States unless she were allowed to pay for such assistance. She could pay only with her surplus rice crop. Washington was perfectly willing to give free technical assistance but it could not accept rice because the United States had its own rice surplus.

It was not until the Soviet Union sent technicians in exchange for Burmese rice that the United States became alarmed to the point where it would take some Burmese rice in exchange for assistance.

The United States foreign policy program needs flexibility, in the eyes of those familiar with the Asian scene. Required is a flexibility that will allow the United States to give as much economic aid as possible to a neutral Burma or an Indonesia, where it appears it will do some good, and a flexibility that will allow it to cut off military aid to Cambodia, where military aid appears wasted.

[From the New York Times of April 12, 1956]

UNITED STATES SAID TO LACK TACT IN FAR EAST—SURVEY IN REGION SHOWS MOST ALLIES FEEL THEY ARE CAST IN JUNIOR PARTNER ROLE—TALK OF WAR DEPLORED—CLARIFIED AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD TAIWAN'S DEFENSE EVIDENTLY IS DESIRED

(By Robert Trumbull)

(Fifth of a series)

TOKYO, April 11.—Among America's best friends in Asia, Washington's apparent disregard of Asian nationalist motivations is one of the principal complaints against United States foreign policy affecting the area.

There seems to be a feeling in most of the countries of this region that Washington, instead of soliciting local opinion and tailoring policy accordingly, is inclined "to tell 'em, not ask 'em."

Where United States foreign policy has accommodated itself to this rising nationalism, it has succeeded. Where it has not done so, it has failed.

There is no basic difference in principle with the United States or its announced aims among the four countries of Northeast Asia—Japan, Korea, Nationalist China, and the Philippines. All are opposed to communism, as is the United States. All practice democracy, in varying degrees. All are seeking to raise the living standards of their people and appreciate the help the United States is giving them to do so.

POINTS MADE BY CRITICS

In these four countries, friendly critics of Washington policy as now practiced list these points of criticism, in addition to the failure of United States officials to take Asians fully into their confidence.

Too much accent on military strength and not enough on the economic and social advancement of the area.

Too much talk of war and not enough of peace.

An unclear attitude, or a failure to make it clear, just how far the United States would go in defense of Taiwan (Formosa) and its western approaches.

Last, but none the less important, what is construed as a lack of tact in administering aid programs.

A COMMON DENOMINATOR

All four countries have in common one characteristic that helps explain their sensitivity to any slight to their pride: All have been freed of foreign domination in recent years.

Korea and Taiwan were Japanese colonies till the end of World War II. The Philippine Islands were separated from United States rule only in 1946. And Japan, though never a colony, emerged 4 years ago from a brief but nonetheless humiliating military occupation by the United States.

Compared with the problems in other Asian countries, such as India, the obstructions facing United States foreign policy in the East Asian group are relatively minor. But conversations with local officials and competent foreign observers here, and the reports from correspondents of the New York Times in the other capitals, indicate that fundmental weaknesses in the American approach elsewhere may be highlighted by the apparent failures in this most friendly area of all.

In all four countries, the strength of United States policy seems to lie in its inflexible determination to support the free nations of Asia in opposition to Communist expansionism. The four friendly governments frankly recognize their dependence upon the United States for military support to maintain their democratic integrity.

The effect of some policies of the United States is to make its allies feel like junior partners. Their sense of nationalism cries out for equality in consultations. Sometimes, as the following country-by-country analysis may show, local attitudes may call for some forebearance and understanding in Washington if the Asian sense of propriety is to be appeased.

OPINIONS OF THE JAPANESE

The Japanese feel that the Americans still think of Japan, perhaps unconsciously, in terms of the occupation and of the Korean war—in other words, as a base for American military excursions elsewhere. The use of United States troops stationed in Japan for the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization demonstration in far-off Bangkok furthered this impression.

There has been too much public emphasis by the Americans on the buildup of Japan's own defense forces, and too little on the strengthening of Japan's economy. Officially, Washington's policy today is to avoid pushing Japanese military expansion at the expense of economic and political stability. But the United States has not yet succeeded in making this clear to the Japanese public.

The Japanese people, 4 years ago after the San Francisco peace treaty came into effect, still don't feel independent, and it galls them.

The security arrangements between the United States and Japan appear to the Japanese to have been forced upon their Government as a price of the treaty. They recognize their inability to defend themselves without United States help, but they would like the present agreement, under which United States forces are stationed here, to be superseded by a new defense pact in which Japan could have a sense of equal partnership instead of dependence.

What many Americans forget is that the present pact neither obligates the United States to defend Japan, nor Japan to come to the assistance of the United States. It merely gives the United States the use of Japanese bases to preserve peace and stability in the Pacific.

The free world's strictures on trade with Communist China, to which Japan adheres, are an embarrassment to the Tokyo Government in the fact of local business interests. Japan would like the embargoes reduced at least to the levels governing Western trade with the Soviet Union.

More irritating than that, however, is a feeling that Washington may at any time make an important decision relative to Communist China, one of utmost concern to Japan. Without consulting Tokyo or even informing the Japanese Government in advance. For some reason, hard to pin down but obviously traceable to developments in the past, Japanese leaders lack this confidence in Washington.

PATIENCE NEEDED IN KOREA

The South Koreans also feel some sensitivity in what they conceive to be their subordinate role to United States officials. The situation in Korea, a country that plunged almost overnight from 35 years of colonial rule into devastating war, no doubt calls for patience and understanding on both sides.

In its simplest terms, the Korean policy under President Syngman Rhee is for the sternest possible military attitude against the Communists, who control the country north of the 38th parallel, and for a policy toward Japan that carries caution to the point of suspicion.

Aside from these two questions, the comments of Korean officials on United States policy in East Asia tended to criticize the tact with which it is administered in Korea, but not its substance.

TAIPEI FINDS UNCERTAINTY

As viewed from Taipei, United States policy on the China question appears to be marked by confusion and uncertainty. Continual exploitation of the China problem in domestic American politics has produced an impression of complete indecision, which in turn has led to a feeling of frustration among our Nationalist Chinese allies.

What is Washington's long-range policy on the whole China question? Will the United States defend the offshore islands? Is the United States really trying to make Taiwan self-sustaining economically or is it merely maintaining the island as a military base against mainland China?

All our allies—and many Americans—would like to know the answers to these questions.

Informed Filipinos, looking at Asia's problems from offshore and yet from the viewpoint of an Asian people long influenced by Western thought, agree with Japanese critics that the United States places too much emphasis on the military phase of the world ideological struggle. This is from a country that is one of the three Asian partners in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

The Filipinos want to see Taiwan and Japan defended against communism, for those islands are on the flanks of the Philippines. But, in the opinion of astute observers in Manila, the United States does so much talking about the military protection extended by Americans that the Filipinos feel a sense of inferiority.

SLOGAN GALLS FILIPINOS

"And let's forget about the slogan 'Show Window of Democracy,'" a Philippine Government official says, "We are a democracy all right, but when Americans call us a show window other Asians think we are just puppets."

In none of the East Asian countries is communism the principal opposing force to be considered in formulating United States policy, except as the military power and growing prestige of Communist China among other Asians constitute an influence counter to that of the United States. This is indeed a major factor, or should be, in guiding the American approach to Asians.

A survey in this area leads to the conclusion that issues stemming from nationalism are the basic conditioners of Asian thinking. Defense of the region's integrity against aggressive communism is one factor. But no less important to the healthy development of a free Asia are economic and social improvement, as Secretary of State Dulles said on his most recent visit here.

Underlying all these considerations must be a genuine solicitude for national consciousness. United States popularity suffers because of the feeling of junior partnership that permeates the East Asian free nations today.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN NATIONALISM CHALLENGES POLICY OF UNITED STATES, SURVEY INDICATES

(By Tad Szulc)

(Sixth of a series)

RIO DE JANEIRO, April 12.—There are signs of restlessness in the huge land mass that is South America. As it does elsewhere, the United States faces there a challenge to its leadership and foreign policy.

The challenge stems from a rising nationalism that is sweeping the continent from the Panama Canal to the bleakness of Tierra del Fuego. It takes various forms and seeks various expressions in accordance with the needs and conditions of each republic. On the whole, it is a new type of nationalism, finding its roots in the dynamism of the immense development of South America in recent decades, and particularly since the end of World War II.

It is not an exaggeration to say that a social and economic revolution is under way on this continent.

As the most powerful force now in being here, nationalism can be directed into channels useful to the South American countries themselves and can further strengthen the inter-American system and democracy in the hemisphere.

COMMUNISTS AWAIT CHANCE

But if allowed to take the wrong course, it could spill over into extremisms of left or right and the general harm that could ensue would be beyond estimation. Communism, its influence already growing noticeably in some parts of the continent, stands ready to take advantage of any such turn of events.

The challenge thus facing United States foreign policy in South America is to come to terms with the formidable new force of nationalism so it can be used for the common benefit.

Yet in the opinion of thoughtful South Americans and of many United States diplomats stationed in the region the problem does not often receive the urgent attention it deserves.

In their considered view, the United States lacks so far a coherent long-range policy tailored to meet the new situation. In this view, the present policy, too often based on improvisations, falls short of meeting the challenge.

A dramatic New Look policy, it is felt, requires a readjustment of political as well as economic relationships between the United States and its South American neighbors.

The two form part of an overall policy approach, of course, and any adjustments in the economic field are bound to have political repercussions. Of this the Soviet Union is keenly aware, as seen in Moscow's recent overtures for greater trade with Latin America and for possible technical aid.

These overtures are not likely to turn Latin America into an area of Soviet influfluence in the foreseeable future, but they have had political echoes the United States would be wise not to underestimate.

COLONIALISM MAJOR ISSUE

This is how United States problems of foreign policy in South America break down:

In the political field, South Americans no longer want to be taken for granted. They

resent being looked upon by Washington as an automatic majority in the United Nations and insist that more attention be given to their views in world affairs. This, they say, should mean more consultations with their diplomats in New York and Washington and more personal attention to the continent as a whole.

Though the consultations process has been improved lately, South Americans take offense at the fact that in 4 years Secretary Dulles has visited South America only once despite his extensive globetrotting.

One area of global policy where South Americans are growing particularly restless is the question of colonialism. Though their natural sympathy lies mainly with the colonial peoples, they often vote in the United Nations with the so-called colonial powers because of United States pressure. But there have been deep breaks in this front in recent votes in New York.

In terms of the East-West conflict, Washington has been successful in welding the continent into a solid anti-Communist bloc. South American traditions and the influence of the Roman Catholic Church have been helpful in this endeavor. But at the same time there is a growing feeling that United States policy is negative insofar as it concentrates on anticommunism and has little else to offer.

What looms as the most important and yet most difficult aspect of political relations is the question of democracy versus dictatorship in Latin America as a whole.

In a speech in New Orleans last October, Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, stated United States policy objectives in the hemisphere as follows:

"Consistent with our inter-American treaties and the principle of nonintervention, we shall try always to help those who work to perfect political institutions based on spiritual and moral principles, institutions that stand for personal freedom, and the sanctity of every man and woman."

However, liberal friends of the United States in South America contend that Washington has not lived up to this principle entirely. They deplore what they call the tacit support given by the United States to the existing dictatorships in Latin America—as well as to that of Juan D. Peron in Argentina before his ouster last September.

They contend the United States has been doing more than maintaining correct relations with these dictatorial regimes. This, they say, does not harmonize with the United States tradition of supporting democracy everywhere. It is, incidentally, also a strong argument for the Communists in those countries where they do not work along with the dictator, as was the case in Argentina at different times.

Local liberals are often dismayed when the United States seemingly goes out of its way to pat a dictatorial regime on the back. The award of the Legion of Merit to Venezuela's President Marcos Perez Jiminez is a case in point.

One experienced United States diplomat commented in this connection that relationships should be maintained with existing governments, such as they may be, but without appearing to endorse dictatorships.

It is evidently a difficult political undertaking and one that has plagued the Department of State for many years. But in the face of growing Communist infiltration in South America some form of solution is urgent if the liberals and the still uncommitted masses are to be kept on the side of democracy.

What is seen by many as a great failing of United States policy is that it is not employing its immense influence to encourage democracy and democratic processes in South America before communism and other extremisms make further inroads.

With political ferment in South America stemming from the growing social and economic pressures that follow the continent's development, extremisms are on the rise and some think it may soon become too late to check them altogether.

Thus in the political field, the United States must take care to maintain good relations with South America on the level of both world and domestic policies.

South Americans are beginning to have second thoughts about their relationship with the "colossus of the north." While nothing has happened so far to alter the basic policy orientations here and the reservoir of good will toward the United States is still brimful, it is imperative to maintain these orientations and good will in the face of changing conditions.

JUNIOR STATUS DISLIKED

South Americans who complain that they are treated as junior partners in political relations offer the same grievance about economic treatment from the United States.

Though their claim that they are kept down as suppliers of raw materials and obligatory consumers of United States finished goods is exaggerated, there is a powerful feeling among South Americans that they are not receiving the share of United States aid they deem necessary for orderly and rapid development.

They are bitter that the economic aid channeled to South America since the end of World War II is insignificant in comparison with what the United States has been spending elsewhere. This hurts nationalistic feelings here and the complaint is widely heard that Latin America's importance is not sufficiently recognized by the United States.

The contention is that, with pressing economic and social problems in this region, the United States should be as concerned over what is happening in its own backyard as it is elsewhere. This viewpoint, on both the economic and political level, finds considerable private support among veteran United States diplomats in this area. There is also resentment that too many promises have been left unfulfilled. South Americans would prefer less talk and more deeds.

A remark often repeated here half jestingly is that South America needs a bad Communist situation to attract United States attention. More seriously, the quick economic aid given Guatemala after the overthrow of her pro-Communist regime in 1954 is adduced as proof that there might be something to the remark.

South Americans—governments and private persons alike—also take exception to the basic philosophy of the Eisenhower administration toward aid to Latin America.

This philosophy is that the bulk of the aid should take the form of investments by private United States capital, with the Washington Government providing funds, usually as loans, only where private capital is unavailable and to create investment conditions.

But the South American problem is that where money is most needed is for such unprofitable yet fundamental projects as railroads, ports, highways, and dams, for which private investments are not forthcoming. Though the Export-Import Bank, a United States Government agency, has liberalized greatly its lending policies in Latin America in the last 2 years, it is felt that even these loans hardly scratch the surface of this continent's pressing development needs. This also holds true of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which also has recently expanded its operations in this region.

The current United States approach also has a side effect of attracting European competition to South America. Whereas loans from the Export-Import Bank usually finance United States equipment and technicians, European equipment is coming here at an increasing rate as European financial syndicates makes easy-term loans available to find export markets for their heavy products.

By far the brightest phase of United States aid here has been the point 4 program.

Working with limited funds, the program has done marvels in helping in basic economic and social projects in the American Republics. It also has generated much vitally needed good will for the United States. Policy specialists feel that a considerable expansion of this program would be an essential part of any "new look" hemisphere policy.

Thus the big problem facing Washington policymakers in South America is how to work out an adjustment to the enlightened nationalism that is rising here. That nationalism is backed by the power of 100 million awakening people and their immense natural resources. It is clamoring for recognition.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

LATIN-AMERICAN ISSUES

(By Paul P. Kennedy)

MEXICO CITY, April 12.—United States foreign policy for the Latin-American area north of Colombia is basically the same as that applying to the south, but there are differences of emphasis because of the region's geographic and historic position.

Policy in this region, which includes Panama, the five Central American Republics and Mexico is aimed more pronouncedly at the two objectives of establishing a solid community of interests and combating Communist encroachment.

In many respects, particularly in technical and educational assistance, the implementation of United States policy in this region generally has been highly successful. In other respects, particularly the economic field, the United States appears to be losing ground.

Aside from advances in technical and educational assistance, the most rewarding United States operation in this region is an increasing willingness to listen to the troubles of the seven nations and sincere attempts to do something about them.

This means an alacrity not only to iron out differences within the framework of the inter-American system but also to furnish material assistance where it is proved to be wanted and needed.

The weaknesses of foreign policy involve many factors, some of them beyond the control of policy planners. This is particularly true in the matter of price stabilization of commodities and the sale of United States surpluses abroad. The fluctuations in the prices of this region's basic export commodities can and usually do leave a residue of sourness toward the United States that goes far toward neutralizing the good will accumulated by those policies that have proved successful.

GROWING NATIONALISM

Growing nationalism, especially in Panama, Guatemala, and Mexico, is being generated largely because of the region's proximity to the United States and the latter's vast influence over the entire area. Essentially this growth points to a lack of that community of interests that is one of the basic objectives of United States policy.

Responsible Latin Americans of this region who are nominally friendly to the United States feel there are a number of ways to improve the potential of United States policy.

To begin with, they say, Washington, could strive for greater understanding and sympathy for Latin-American problems, not from the North American point of view but from the Latin point of view. In this connection it is felt that Europe, which is not remotely so involved in this region's welfare as is the

United States, has a far greater understanding of the area's problems.

Another area in which it is felt United States policy could be improved is the abandonment of what is viewed as an increasing tendency to trade financial and technical assistance for political advantage in the inter-American system. This is felt to be diametrically opposed to the original concept of the assistance program.

Many responsible observers, North American as well at Latin American, are convinced some of the United States policy planners see a moral lapse in any country that accepts assistance but disagrees with any of Washington's views on American affairs.

[From the New York Times of April 13, 1956]

METHODS IRK CANADA

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, April 12.—With the broad over-all aims of United States foreign policy, most Canadians, official and unofficial, are in complete sympathy. Indeed these aims are almost identical. However, the application of these policies often occasions surprise and sometimes suspicion.

Responsible officials here are wary of criticizing the action of their big neighbor and partner in defense. However, among some of them and among Western diplomats and students of foreign affairs there is a growing feeling that all is not so rosy for the West and the free world as it has been painted recently in Washington.

It is feared that Washington has been lacking in bold, daring leadership and that the policy of containing the Soviet Union has become too rigid and inflexible and that too great a reliance has been placed on military alliances without accomanying political understanding. The feeling is strong that to meet the new Soviet challenge in the Middle East and Far East new "policies and methods" must be evolved, although there is little agreement on what form they should take.

Canadians would like to see greater coordination of policy between the United States and its allies on such matters as the Middle East crisis, more emphasis on economic cooperation and less stress and reliance on military alliances.

Canadians feel that there is no future for Chiang Kai-shek. They see no possibility of his returning to the mainland short of a general war. They would be happier if the United States were not so firmly committed to him. The idea of the ultimate evolution of two Chinas is received with skepticism.

Lester B. Pearson, Secretary of State for External Affairs, frequently has dissociated Canada from any commitments in the Far East other than as a member of the United Nations. He also has said that while the future of Taiwan (Formosa) remains to be settled, he regards Matsu and Quemoy as part of mainland China.

In most quarters here, it is felt that the United States would be wise to adopt a similar view. Mr. Pearson also has said often that sooner or later the West must recognize the reality of Communist control of China.

Canadians are inclined to dislike the boastfulness and bombast with which policy is sometimes enunciated in the United States. They feel also that military leaders are inclined too much to make policy statements. Secretary of State Dulles comes in for a good deal of editorial criticism for talking too much.

The chief problem for the United States in dealing with Canada is to avoid offending national sensibilities. Since the war Canada has grown in stature. Sometimes it is felt here that the United States is inclined to act as if Canada were an appendage of the United States that need be neither considered nor consulted—just told.

There is no Communist movement in Canada worthy of the name and, in fact, socialism is on the wane.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1956]

UNITED STATES AIDES MAINLY REJECT FOREIGN POLICY CRITICISMS—HOWEVER, CONSENSUS IN WASHINGTON SEEMS TO ACCEPT NEED FOR REEVALUATION OF NATION'S COLD WAR STRATEGY

(By James Reston)

(Final of a series)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Uncle Sam, policeman, banker, and babysitter to the world, is defensive and a little resentful about all the recent overseas criticism of his foreign policy.

As the old gentleman sees it, here he is with the Communists at the back door, a house full of complaining relatives, politicians yawping all over the place, the dishes piled high in the kitchen sink—and instead of appreciating his efforts, everybody criticizes him and nobody loves him.

That is the official attitude, and well-informed observers here are more sympathetic than their fellow grumblers in other capitals. They agree with most of the criticisms reported in this series of articles by correspondents of the New York Times, but they think these criticisms must be evaluated against this background:

This is a time of extraordinary change. The strategy of the cold war, the location of the struggle, even the nature of power itself are all in transition.

British power has declined beyond all Washington's calculations.

The same with French power, only worse.

German and Japanese power, which contained the expansion of communism in Central Europe and Asia for most of this century, has collapsed.

Since 1947, 2,800,000,000 people—half the population of the world—have changed their form of government. Most of them have achieved independence for the first time, and are struggling with misery and clamoring to be heard.

The post-Stalin rulers of the Soviet Union, allied to the might of Communist China, have changed their methods and the arena of the "cold war." Their tactics of wooing the Socialists in Europe and exploiting the anti-Western, anti-Israel sentiments of the Middle East and South Asia are much more cunning than Stalin's.

The United States, engaged in a national election campaign, with underdeveloped areas of its own to worry about, is the only nation in the free world with power equal to the power of the Communists. And it is administered by a party that has a long tradition of opposing the collective security, low tariff and foreign aid policies it is now supporting.

CRITICISMS HEARD IN CAPITAL

Against this background, what is the reaction of well-informed men in and out of the Government in Washington to the major criticisms reported in this series? This reporter has discussed them with 18 of the most experienced diplomats and officials in the capital. What follows are the major criticisms and a summary of their observations:

Criticism No. 1: The United States has been slow and ineffective in reacting to the smiling subversion of the Communists, and has placed too much emphasis on military solutions and not enough emphasis on political, economic and social solutions to present world problems.

Officials here reject this criticism. As a matter of fact, it should be said at the outset that the official line here is to reject almost all adverse criticism as ill-informed and unfair.

This reporter has not found a single official who has read all the articles. The Secretary of State would make no comment about them, and the officials who discussed them did so on the condition that they were talking for background and could not be quoted.

However, the official line is this:

The military balance has not changed. The Soviet Union retains its objectives of world conquest and its capacity to attempt that conquest by force of arms. Therefore, someone has to maintain the military balance and oppose the drift in the free world to mental and military disarmament.

From July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955, the United States net expenditures for foreign military and economic aid totaled $51,300 million. It gross expenditures in the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1956, will be $4,200 million for the same purpose, making a total of $55,500 million for the 11-year period.

The United States has maintained a high level of military expenditures for a permanent Military Establishment, based on conscription, without which nobody would have the freedom or energy today to criticize Washington.

ARMED FORCE EMPHASIZED

These expenditures since the Eisenhower administration came to power were: fiscal 1954, $40,300,000,000; fiscal 1955, $35,500,000,000; fiscal 1956 (estimated), $34,600,000,000; fiscal 1957 (estimated), $35,900,000,000.

The United States has emphasized military defense, because this is the primary deterrent to an attempt by the Communists to achieve their aims by force of arms. Maybe it has overemphasized this side of the cold war in the light of changing circumstances, but it has done so because of the natural tendency in free societies to let down whenever fear of imminent war declines.

At the same time, despite opposition in the Republican Party to foreign economic aid, the Eisenhower administration has made the following expenditures for foreign economic aid:

Fiscal 1954: $1,300,000,000 (military, $3,600,000,000); fiscal 1955: $2,000,000,000 (military, $2,300,000,000); fiscal 1956 (estimated), $1,700,000,000 (military $2,500,000,000); fiscal 1957 (estimated), $1,800,000,000 (military $2,500,000,000).

Moreover, officials here emphasize that by his atoms-for-peace plan and his insistence on dramatizing the peaceful rather than the military aspects of the atom, the President has produced the most imaginative nonmilitary international plan since the Marshall plan, and has been the first American politician to announce publicly that foreign aid has to be placed on a more or less permanent basis.

This, then, is the answer of the officials. The reaction of the non-Government observers to all this is that the administration was right in backing these programs, but that it was imprudent to emphasize them as much as it did.

MAJOR STRATEGIC DEFEAT

The result of this emphasis, these officials feel, was to damage the cause of the United States in Asian eyes by raising fears of war. They feel this worked greatly to the advantage of the Communists in the so-called uncommitted parts of the world; and that it was unfair to the peaceful objectives and great economic sacrifices of the American people.

Beyond this, many non-Government observers here believe that President Eisenhower, more than anybody else in the world, was responsible at the Big Four meeting in Geneva for encouraging the wishful thinking about the Communists his administration now deplores.

Almost all agree that he enjoyed a great personal success at Geneva but suffered a major strategic defeat. For it was there that the Communists really dramatized their policy and propaganda for peaceful coexistence, and got the pictures of President Eisenhower and Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin that

they scattered all over the world with General Eisenhower's public statement that he believed the Russians were as sincerely devoted to peace as anybody else.

Indeed, the fact that the Eisenhower administration is now turning around and trying to emphasize the economic, political, and social aspects of the world struggle is taken as concrete evidence that the previous emphasis on massive retaliation with atomic weapons was unwise.

Veteran diplomats here are constantly saying that history is full of evidence of policies that were good at one time and in one place but not so good or worse at another time and another place. They point to the North Atlantic Treaty as a vital military deterrent, which did much to create stability in Europe.

But they contend that Mr. Dulles' insistence on extending this same policy to the alliances involving Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan did not change the military balance in this area. These diplomats contend it resulted in infuriating the Indians, the Egyptians and finally the Russians, who leapfrogged over it into the new Moscow policy of economic and political penetration in the Middle East.

Criticism No. 2: The United States foreign economic policy has not kept pace with its policy of military solidarity, and the United States, meanwhile, has been urging upon its allies trade and political-union policies it is not prepared to adopt itself.

On this one there is little difference in Washington between Government and non-Government opinion. The Eisenhower administration is not happy about its policies on trade, ship subsidies or customs, or at least some members of it are not. The President, for example, favors a more liberal trade and aid policy.

One Cabinet member said to this reporter: "We don't have one foreign economic policy; we have 49 different foreign economic policies, some of them administered by one department and some by another. The whole thing needs to be pulled together."

He added that this should be done very slowly and carefully. His point was that the United States was probably approaching the fiercest competition from the Soviet Union, West Germany, Britain, and Japan since before World War I, and that it had to be extremely careful that it did not give away its weapons in this field.

As to the political-union pressure on the allies out of Washington, everybody here agrees that this is a good idea for Europe but out of the question, politically, here. Good idea but bad politics, Washington says. And, of course, that is what London and Paris say, too.

Criticism No. 3: The United States has been the prisoner of its own domestic political slogans in the presidential election campaign of 1952 and of the cold war slogans of liberation and massive retaliation thereafter.

It is generally admitted here, at least by observers outside the Government, that this is a valid criticism. The Republicans had been out of power for 20 years. They concentrated in the 1952 campaign, as all political parties do, on the weakness of the opposition. The best target in that opposition was that China had been taken over by the Communists during President Harry S. Truman's last term, and the Republicans set out to exploit this historic development.

In the process, they contended that this loss was the Democrats' fault, that the liberal New Deal, being oriented to the left, was soft on communism, that this was proved by Washington's half-way war in Korea, and by its policy of bridling Chiang Kai-shek, and its policy of "containment." This last was portrayed as a policy of acquiescing to the vast wartime gains of the Soviet Union.

Probably none of this was as potent in the 1952 election as the popularity of General Eisenhower, the fierce antipathy among the people to the bloodshed in Korea and the general public boredom with a party that had been in power for a generation.

WARLIKE TALK CONTINUED

Nevertheless, the combination of all these factors broke the Roosevelt coalition of the Deep South and the minority groups in the large urban areas of the North. So the Republicans carried on the aggressive talk after they got into office, while at the same time cutting their economic commitments.

Thus, they unleashed General Chiang, threatened massive retaliation, and warned the French that if Paris did not accept the European Defense Community as a means to the political union of Europe, Washington would undertake an "agonizing reappraisal" about its whole policy of alliance with Western Europe.

At no time, however, did this administration ever have the courage of its propaganda. It soon leashed President Chiang when the consequences of unleashing him became apparent. It aquiesced in the partition of Indochina. It swallowed France's rejection of EDC, and when it took a hard look at the consequences of trying to "liberate" territories taken over by the armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China, it withdrew in a torrent of aggrieved rhetoric.

Nevertheless, it hung on to its cold war slogans about Communist China, put pro-Chiang figures in key positions in the State Department (Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, for example) and placated the bloc embracing Mr. Robertson and Senator William F. Knowland, Republican, of California; Senator Styles Bridges, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These four leaders opposed any change in the legal status of China.

Thus the administration found itself frozen between its allies who wanted to recognize Communist China and its political opposition within the Republican Party, which wanted an aggressive policy toward Peiping. This compromise pleased nobody—not President Chiang or the Taiwan bloc in the party, or the Chinese Communists, or the Asian neutrals.

Criticism No. 4: The leaders of the free world coalition in Washington have no effective plan for waging the more subtle second phase of the cold war. They are inflexible and inexperienced moralizers who preach against the old pragmatic diplomacy of the past but have nothing practical to put in its place.

Again the Government officials reject and resent this criticism but the non-Government observers think there is a lot to it. The view of the Government officials is that the United States is between the acts in the great world drama, and that the critics should wait until the United States, which is a democracy that must move by persuasion and congressional consent, gets the stage properties in order for the next act.

It is true that after years of experimenting with planning boards at the State Department level, and at the Cabinet level, psychological warfare experts, cold war strategists in the White House, and the National Security Council, the United States still operates largely on a temporary basis, one crisis at a time.

UNITED STATES MUDDLING THROUGH

Washington put pressure on the British to get out of Suez without insisting on a quid pro quo. It was enamored first with King Farouk, and then with Farouk's two dictator successors, Gen. Mohammed Naguib and Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser. It took credit for settling the Suez situation, which is now creating havoc with the whole Western coalition.

It risked the defection of India to placate Nationalist China and Pakistan, and by getting itself involved everywhere on a mediator basis, found itself in trouble with the Arabs and the Israelis, the French and the Algerians, the Portuguese and the Indians (over Goa), the British and the Greeks, and the Turks (over Cyprus), and the Dutch and the Indonesians (over New Guinea).

Thus, say Mr. Dulles' critics, the United States has merely replaced London's "muddling through" with Washington's "muddling through," and has sought to please everybody and ended by pleasing nobody.

Much of this is laid to the Secretary of State. The general feeling here is that the President leaves almost everything to him unless it is an issue of peace or war, and that Mr. Dulles has a weakness for trying to please the side he is talking to at the moment, and a fatal flaw of talking and moralizing too much the rest of the time.

One diplomat, who is friendly to the Secretary of State, put it this way:

"It is obviously impossible for Mr. Dulles to please everybody or to follow a consistent policy in situations all over the world which are contradictory. If he would only proceed in a hardheaded way, and with a series of clear priorities, to do precisely what he thought was in the best interests of the United States, he would get along better.

"He wouldn't be liked for that, but in the end, he would be respected, for the selfish pursuit of a nation's interests is a reality everybody with any experience understands."

In summary, the general feeling here is that there is a need in Washington for a reevaluation of the United States cold war policies, and particularly its tactics and public attitudes. There has been a loss of confidence in American leadership. This much is widely felt here, but all knowledgeable observers go back to the big point:

In short, to be policeman, banker, and babysitter to a restless and changing world when the coalescing force of fear has been largely removed, is a tough assignment.

[From the New York Times of April 15, 1956]

THE UNITED STATES AND ITS CRITICS

During the past week this newspaper completed a survey by its correspondents of the impacts and impressions made by American foreign policy on free public opinion in five continents. The survey registered so much, and such diverse, criticism as to suggest a certain failure by this Nation, which prides itself on its advertising genius, to sell its own policy or to meet Soviet competition in this field.

Some of the criticism seems to us to be justified and well worth heeding. Some of it derives from emotion, ideology, or self-interest, but mere refutation does not solve the problem. All of it should be made subject to further analysis, deliberation and consultation with our friends and allies to correct faults, to devise remedies and thereby to strengthen free world unity.

Two central facts emerge. One is that the United States, because of its wealth and power, must assume primary responsibility for the destiny of the free world. The other is that, barring only occasional suspicions to the contrary, the United States is not being accused of any selfish ambitions for conquest or self-aggrandizement. On the contrary, our contributions to economic rehabilitation and military security are freely acknowledged, even if without gratitude in some cases or full realization of the contrast between our policy and the predatory policy of the Soviets.

Taking these central facts into account, the most common criticism boils down to this—that in contrast to the bold and even revolutionary policies represented by the Marshall plan and the North Atlantic alliance, which saved Western Europe, our policy

has become too static, too rigid, and even too timid to solve the world's pressing problems. Some of this criticism may sound strange to American ears, considering President Eisenhower's efforts at Geneva, his bold atoms-for-peace, open sky, and other disarmament proposals, and his pressure for an expanded, continuous, and more flexible foreign-aid program.

But the criticism is not directed against the aims of our policy, nor even its strategy, but rather, against our tactics. Here we are being criticized both for doing too much and for doing too little. In the eyes of Europe, especially its leftist elements, and even more in the eyes of neutralist Asia, we concern ourselves too much with the Communist menace, now said to be reduced by Stalin's death, and concentrate too much on military security to the point of saber rattling. Europe still values its alliances with us, but neutralist Asia fails to realize that only the protective umbrella of these alliances permits it to be neutral with impunity.

On the other hand, we are being criticized for not doing enough by refusing to take sides in quarrels between our friends and allies, which disappoints both sides; by failing to give adequate support to anticolonial nationalism and also to colonial powers seeking to suppress rebellion, which makes both sides mistrust us; above all, by failing to share both our power and our wealth even more freely than heretofore. Much of this criticism is obviously contradictory and cancels itself. Some of it goes beyond practical possibilities. If this survey makes some of our critics realize this, it will have served both us and them.

All this, however, still leaves room for improvement. We firmly believe that we are more realistic about the Communist menace than our critics, and we shall continue to maintain and develop our military power and our alliances to deter Communist aggression. But it is still a good maxim to speak softly when carrying a big stick, and to do that will prevent the Soviets from exploiting unwise remarks for the benefit of their "peace offensive." We will also have to develop new and more comprehensive programs not only for foreign aid but also for foreign trade, investment, and development to meet the Soviet economic offensive without impairing the interests or offending the sensibilities of other nations.

Such programs can be developed only in consultation and cooperation with the rest of the free world. But the initiative will have to come from the United States, and this fact confronts us with a task worthy of the best brains we can command.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, President Eisenhower has again demonstrated the courage of his convictions in vetoing H. R. 12, the so-called farm bill.

It was with keen disappointment that the President felt impelled to veto a bill containing the soil-bank provisions which he himself had recommended. However, in deciding whether to approve or disapprove proposed legislation, all provisions of a bill must be taken into account, not just its good features. In the case of H. R. 12, the President found that the bad features of the bill outweighed the good, and he made his decision accordingly.

The fact that there may be no general farm legislation this year, as predicted by the majority leadership in the event of a veto, does not mean there will be no marked improvement in the farm situation. The Agricultural Act of 1954 is on the statute books, and has recently taken full effect. Under this and other existing legislation, it will be possible to do administratively many things to make conditions better. The President has already indicated what some of these steps will be.

Had the soil-bank provisions not been encumbered by other provisions which many of us consider to be unsound and actually income-reducing, and had the bill been enacted early enough, it could conceivably have made 1956 a record year for agricultural income. However, we may still look forward optimistically to a good year—a far better year than 1955. Producers of livestock, dairy and poultry products, feed grains, and basic commodities will all benefit by the programs which the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have already approved. Markets should be recovered and expanded for some commodities.

Above all else, the farm people may be assured that their administration is constantly on the alert for means to enhance the general level of farm income.

Like President Eisenhower, many of us still hope that Congress will decide to approve a sound soil-bank program not encumbered by barnacles of either defeatism or fear.

Whether this eventuates or not, however, we have reached the point from which the American farmer, under the inspiring leadership of a great President and his Secretary of Agriculture, may look to the future with greater confidence.

FARM INCOME AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this occasion it seems to me only appropriate that we consider some of the fundamental things the farmers themselves are thinking about. One of the fine publications in the western section of the Nation is Western Farm Life, which has just conducted a poll in regard to Government subsidies, limit payments, livestock shows, and farm income. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial showing the results of the poll.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WFL's ACROSS THE FENCE—A SURVEY OF FARM AND RANCH OPINION IN THE INTERMOUNTAIN REGION

Government subsidies: Do you believe agriculture would be better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies?

	Percent
Yes	56.8
No	37.6
No comment	5.6

Limit payments: Would you favor stopping all Government payments to farmers and ranchers who have a net income from all sources of more than $5,000?

	Percent
Yes	71.7
No	24.6
No comment	3.7

Livestock shows: Do you think the major livestock shows which are held around the country are a benefit to the livestock industry?

	Percent
Yes	77.4
No	16
No comment	6.6

Farm income: Do you think your farm or ranch income will be more, or less, or remain the same in 1956, compared with 1955?

	Percent
More	14.2
Less	47.1
Same	33.9
No comment	4.8

Over 50 percent of the farmers and ranchers of the West, who took the time to answer a recent Western Farm Life survey, believe agriculture would be much better off going it alone in a free market with no Government regulations and no Government payments in the form of subsidies.

An Idaho farmer says the methods used by our lawmakers and the Department of Agriculture are not doing the farmers and ranchers any good, but keep getting us into more difficulties in every attempt.

An operator from Montana thinks subsidies and regulations should go. He believes there would be more competition and the inefficient operator would be forced to quit. And, better still, city farmers would be forced to quit because they would no longer be guaranteed a price for their commodities.

A Nevada producer says it might be tough on some for a short time, but as soon as the markets reached their levels everyone would be better off.

With labor and industry organized to protect their interests, the family-type farm cannot survive without subsidies, is the opinion of a farmer from Wyoming.

A Nebraskan thinks that we should not only keep our present subsidies but increase supports to 90–100 percent.

Nearly three fourths of western farmers and ranchers can't understand why the Government should pay subsidies to anyone with a net income of over $5,000.

A Wyoming farmer says the big operators are running the little fellow out of business as it is without paying him subsidies. A New Mexico lady said she couldn't see why business and professional men, who own farms or ranches, should be paid farm subsidies when their net income is already well above the average farmer.

An Idaho producer can't see any reason for holding down farmers when $5,000 is just a starter in many businesses. A Colorado farmer wants to continue large subsidies as long as other industries receive large Government payments.

A large majority of western farmers and ranchers believe the major livestock shows around the country are a benefit to the livestock industry. A Utah rancher says the shows encourage better breeding which in turn brings better prices to stockmen. An Arizona breeder says the shows give other people an idea of what better breeding can do for livestock.

A Colorado rancher doesn't think much of the shows because no commercial grades are shown and therefore shows do no good for the great bulk of the cattle industry. A Montana cowman says that in his opinion this is an altogether different industry than raising cattle for slaughter.

Most westerners feel their income will remain the same or be less in the coming year. A Utah farmer said besides the cost-price squeeze he is faced with a water shortage. A Nevada farmer says his income will be the same if costs remain the same. And a Colorado farmer says if his income doesn't go up it will be the first time in 7 years.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until Wednesday next at noon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may be authorized to file its report on House bill 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may not be in session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL (H. DOC. NO. 380)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a veto message which is now being read in the House of Representatives, whereby the President returns without his approval H. R. 12, designated as the "Agricultural Act of 1956."

Mr. President, the veto of the farm bill can be described only as a crushing blow to the hopes and the legitimate desires of American agriculture.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my statement will be very brief, and at its close I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. President, the President has now drawn a line which puts his administration without any ifs, ands, or buts on the side of those who believe that low farm prices are the answer to the agricultural problems of the day. Farmers are now—by the President's own decision today—completely at the mercy of Ezra Taft Benson.

In return for depriving the farmers of more than $2 billion in income this year, the President holds forth a bone. He says Secretary Benson will set price supports on the basics at 82½ percent of parity and increase the supports on milk and butter.

Mr. President, what is significant is that, after 3 years of falling farm income and after the Congress has debated the bill for weeks, yes, even months, the administration is finally going to use administrative powers it has had all along to help the farmers. And while it accuses us in the Congress of passing a farm bill which it says is inconsistent, how does it propose to help the farmers? It proposes to help them by raising price-support levels. The only difference is that the administration's price-support levels are not quite so high as are the price-support levels set by the Congress.

Mr. President, I do not believe our farmers will find that their very real and pressing needs are met by this compromise of principle. In effect, it is merely a rigid price support set at a level too low to be useful.

The President offers to abandon the principle of flexibility if Congress will abandon the principle of adequate farm income. This cannot be considered a justified compromise in any honorable sense of the word.

In the course of his statement, the President requests Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as soon as possible. This is a strange request to be making at this late date.

The President himself—by deciding to set rigid price supports at 82½ percent of parity—has already conceded that it is not enough to solve our agricultural problems. If he truly wants—or truly has wanted—the soil bank, he has had ample authority to institute one all along.

All he had to do under existing law is to request funds and go ahead.

I deeply regret the action the President has taken. It is not responsive to the needs of agriculture, but it is obvious that this administration does not want to meet these needs.

By his veto, the President has created a stalemate. I have talked to prominent Members of the Senate who are deeply involved in agricultural legislation.

They are not receptive to the prospects of another long, frustrating effort to compromise what cannot apparently be compromised.

Congress is seeking to raise farm income to adequate levels. The administration is seeking to keep farm income down. There can be no answer until one or the other is changed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, while the message itself has been read in the House, or is to be read—I assume it is now being read—in view of the statements made by the distinguished majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that there may appear in the RECORD at this point—because the veto message is not long—the message of the President of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The veto message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956.

It is with intense disappointment and regret that I must take this action. I assure you my decision has been reached only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems. This bill does not meet their needs.

I am disappointed at the long delays which this legislation encountered. My first special request in this session of the Congress was for prompt remedial farm legislation. A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action. It was a program that came from the grass roots. Suggestions and criticisms from large numbers of farm people, in every type of agriculture, from every section of the country, were analyzed and used. It offered no magic panacea because, we can all agree, there is none. It did strike directly at the root of the low price—low-income problem.

The problem is price-depressing surpluses. Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued. Any forward looking, sound program to meet the needs of farm people must remove the burden of these accumulations. They are depressing net farm income by many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people.

The bill is self-defeating. The soil-bank proposal has been incorporated. This would be constructive, had it not been encumbered by contradictory provisions. The soil bank would provide an income incentive to farmers to reduce production temporarily so that surplus stocks might be reduced. Other provisions of this bill, however, would result in an equal or greater incentive to increase production and accumulate more surplus.

Among the provisions which make this bill unacceptable are: (1) The return to a wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities; (2) dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts; (3) mandatory price supports for feed grains; (4) multiple price plans for wheat and rice. The effect of these provisions would be to increase the amount of Government control and further add to our price-depressing surpluses.

Specific objections relative to each of these provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Price supports at wartime 90 percent of parity on basic crops were in effect in each year from 1944 through 1954. They were not responsible for the high commodity prices and high farm income of wartime and the immediate postwar years. Prices were then above support levels, due to wartime inflation and the insatiable markets associated with war. Neither did 90-percent supports prevent prices from falling as postwar surplus stocks began to accumulate.

Price supports at wartime 90 percent on the 6 designated basic crops did encourage production of these crops relative to others. At the same time, consumption was discouraged and the use of substitutes was stimulated. Market outlets shrank and surplus accumulations mounted. Acreage controls had to be invoked, thereby rationing the right to produce. Wheat acreage was

reduced from 79 to an allotment of 62 and then to the present 55 million acres. Cotton was cut from 25 to 20 and then on down to the present 17 million acres. These drastic reductions, forced by the application of the price-support law, penalized many farmers directly by resulting in shrunken volume and uneconomic farming operations. In addition, acreage diverted from the basic crops shifted surplus problems into many other crops and livestock. Now almost every farmer is adversely affected, regardless of what crops or livestock he raises.

If wartime rigid 90-percent supports were the answer to the problem of our farm families, there would now be no problem.

Farm incomes have declined in every year except one between 1947 and 1954, and in all these years 90-percent supports were in effect.

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income, which is affected by volume and costs as well as by price. The 90-percent-of-parity approach focuses on support price alone.

To return now to wartime 90-percent supports would be wrong. Production would be stimulated. Markets would be further destroyed, instead of expanded, as must be done. More surplus would accumulate—and surpluses are price depressing. Regimentation by ever-stricter production controls would be the end result.

It is inconceivable that we should ask farm families to go deeper into this self-defeating round of cause and effect.

2. The provision for dual parity would result in a permanent double standard of parity for determining price supports. Four crops would receive preferential treatment out of 160 products for which parity prices are figured. There is no justification in logic or in equity for such preferential treatment.

Particularly is this true because, under the working of the modernized parity formula enacted by the Congress, increasing the parity prices of some commodities automatically lowers the parity prices of all other commodities. If parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton and peanuts are to be higher, then parity prices of the other products must be lower.

To whatever degree prices would be further artifically raised there would be a corresponding stimulus to production, more controls on farmers, reduced consumption, increased accumulations, and lower prices in the market.

Such a device for parity manipulations could destroy the parity concept itself. It places a potent weapon in the hands of opponents of all price supports for farmers. We have no right to place the welfare of our farm families in such jeopardy.

3. The provision for mandatory supports on the feed grains would create more problems for farmers. The market for feed grains would shrink as livestock production would come to depend more on forage and less on grain. The flow of feed grains into government stocks would increase and production controls would necessarily be intensified. Price relationships between feed, livestock and livestock products would be distorted. Producers of feeder cattle, feeder lambs, and feeder pigs would be faced with downward pressure on prices. An imbalance would develop between feed crops and livestock products, with all its adverse consequences.

4. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would have adverse effects upon producers of other crops, upon our relations with friendly foreign nations, and upon our consumers.

There are other serious defects in the bill such as certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry. Still other features are administratively bad and would require the hiring of thousands of additional inspectors and enforcers.

I recognize that the restoration by H. R. 12 of wartime mandatory 90-percent price supports applies only to 1956 crops. This, in combination with other objectionable features of the bill, would put us back on the old road which has proved so harmful to farmers.

Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the Nation.

After the most careful analysis I conclude that the bill is contradictory and self-defeating even as an emergency relief measure and it would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and the welfare of our farm people.

Because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families.

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Neither that act, nor any other, can become fully effective so long as it is smothered under the vast surpluses that have accumulated. We imperatively need remedial legislation to remove this burden and enable the fundamentally sound program provided in the act of 1954 to become workable. Such remedial measures were proposed in my message of January 9.

I am keenly mindful that the failure of the Congress to enact a good new farm bill can have unfavorable effects on farm income in 1956, unless prompt administrative efforts to offset them are made immediately. Particularly the failure to enact a soil bank before planting time this year makes such administrative efforts imperative.

Consequently we are going to take prompt and decisive administrative action to improve farm income now. I have conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration is moving immediately on four major fronts:

1. In 1956 price supports on five of the basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and peanuts—will be set at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity. Tobacco will be supported as voted in the referendum in accordance with existing law.

Within this range of price support flexibility, the administration intends to set minimum support levels that will result in a national average of wheat at $2 a bushel, corn at $1.50 a bushel, rice at $4.50 per hundred pounds.

A separate support for corn not under acreage control in the commercial corn area will be announced at an early date.

Price supports on cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced but will be at least 82½ percent of parity.

The Secretary of Agriculture will announce shortly the details of the new cotton export sales program.

2. For this year the support price of manufacturing milk will be increased to $3.25 per hundred pounds. The support price of butter fat will be increased to 58.6 cents a pound.

3. We will use Department of Agriculture funds, where assistance will be constructive, to strengthen the prices of perishable farm commodities. We will have well over $400 million for that purpose for the year beginning July 1.

These actions, the administration will take immediately.

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1956.*

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not think anyone in this country believes the President of the United States desires to keep farm income down. There apparently is, as is the case with most public questions, an honest difference of opinion as to how the agricultural problem can best be met. But certainly, President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have a desire to have an American agriculture that is participating in the national economy along with all other segments of the national economy.

The President feels that the piling up of the huge surpluses which have amounted to more than $9 billion have been detrimental to a sound American agriculture. Great efforts have been made, and successfully so, to eliminate many of these surpluses, and such efforts will continue to be made by the administration, and, I hope, with the full support of the Congress of the United States. Only time will tell which procedure would be best for the Nation. I have a deep conviction that President Eisenhower has as vital an interest in American agriculture, and in seeing to it that the farmers receive a greater share of the national income, as has any Member of this body on either side of the aisle.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I deeply regret the action taken by the President in vetoing the farm bill. Heretofore, Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been blamed for the present depressed plight of our agriculture, but now the farmers of the country will blame the President. They have no other alternative; the choice was the President's. He has chosen to let our farm population dangle at the end of Secretary Benson's flexible noose.

As was pointed out by the majority leader, the President has found it necessary to repudiate the flexible price-support principle and has fixed, or will fix, administratively, rigid price supports on all basics at 82½ percent of parity, with the exception, of course, of tobacco, which will remain at 90 percent.

Mr. President, I am sure that President Eisenhower was not fully acquainted with the contents of the bill. It may be he was too busily engaged in playing golf at Augusta to give our bill the study and consideration it obviously deserved; and it is my personal opinion that he had little or nothing to do with the writing of this veto message. The veto message expresses in almost identical words the position heretofore taken by Secretary Benson. The idea of the President stating in his veto message that 90-percent price supports would increase production. The idea of the President blaming Congress for being slow in enacting a farm bill. Mr. President, the

inferences are both unconscionable. All acres for the basic crops this year have already been either allocated or planted.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held extensive grass-roots hearings for nearly 2 months last fall. We went to the farmers of this country. We took their views, and from those views we hammered out a farm bill which was reported to the Senate on February 10. Of course, the Senate was unable to act upon this report immediately. Why? Because a "recess" for Lincoln Day speeches had to be taken.

The Senate passed a farm bill on March 19. All during the Easter recess, the Senate-House conference committee worked to iron out our differences. We came into agreement on April 6. On April 11 the House and Senate both passed a conference bill and sent it to the President.

Now, he has vetoed it. Now, he blames the Congress for delay. He shall not evade the responsibility for his premeditated action by seeking to place the blame on Congress. If there was any delay, Mr. President, it was the delay of Secretary Benson to recognize the economic plight of our farmers. It was his consistent effort to raise farm income with rosy words, broad generalities, and partisan politics, instead of taking action.

As I have stated, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry began hearings last October, in order to be able to present a bill to Congress in January. As chairman of the committee, I invited the Secretary of Agriculture to send some of his experts to the hearings. He took advantage of the invitation and sent two men. The basis of the President's message to Congress on January 9 was those hearings. If they had not been held, the President would not have conceived the soil-bank idea. As a matter of fact, his Department of Agriculture was opposed to a soil bank as recently as July 7, 1955.

I am not here to blame anyone for delay; but, as every Senator knows, I, as the chairman of the committee, set a goal of February 15 as the date on which to introduce an omnibus farm bill in the Senate; I expected and hoped to have it enacted before March. I did not have in mind then that the usual Lincoln birthday holidays would take place. Because of them the Senate was delayed for from 10 to 12 days.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and also the House Committee on Agriculture worked hard and diligently on the bill all during the Easter recess. It was a complicated measure; our chore was not an easy or pleasant one, but we worked at it nevertheless. I regret, I repeat, that the President did not sign the bill we agreed upon. It was a good bill; I am sorry that the President relied upon his Secretary of Agriculture's judgment instead of asking a few dirt farmers for their thoughts.

So far as price supports are concerned, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate only a few days ago, the inclusion of 90 percent of parity price supports was the only provision in the bill which offered immediate income relief to the farmers of the Nation. Yet the President has vetoed this bill, he has cast aside 90 percent of parity in favor of 82½ percent of parity. How can the Secretary of Agriculture, who has already set the price support for wheat at 76 percent of parity, now raise the support level to 82½ percent? Such action is simply beyond my comprehension. If it is his prerogative to do so now, then the Secretary could have set the support price at 89 percent, 87 percent, or even 90 percent a long time ago, why has he waited until now to think about raising farm income, Mr. President? I simply cannot understand his proposed action except to assume that it is a calculated effort to forestall the inevitable political upheaval which will take place among the farmers of the Nation because of the action taken by the President—by his decision to toss the farmers a crumb instead of giving them their due. The President and Mr. Benson are obviously attempting to buy the good will of our farmers by offering them now, at this late date, 82½ percent of parity. This proposal, Mr. President, is a political sop and I think our farmers will realize what it is.

If the Secretary can now, by some administrative sleight of hand, raise support prices, raise farm income, then he could have done so a year ago. Think of the small farmers he could have assisted if he had chosen to do so.

The President's veto message states there are other serious defects in the bill, such as certain provisions in the section dealing with the dairy industry.

Mr. President, the provision to which he refers merely would have done by legislation what the President says he expects to do administratively in regard to the price of manufactured milk, namely, to raise the support price to $3.25 a hundredweight. That was all the bill provided. There were no other provisions in the bill which affected the administration of the milk program; the sole provision was that which set the price support for manufactured milk during 1956 at $3.25 a hundredweight, and fixed the support for butterfat at 58.6 cents per pound.

Here we have a pure anomaly—one typical of this entire veto message—in that the President has criticized the legislative provision affecting the dairy industry, while administratively he intends to do what Congress proposed to do in the bill.

The veto message criticizes the price support which would have been afforded the growers of small grains. I predict that with the 70-percent price support, which the President has heretofore ordered to be administratively fixed for small grains, the Treasury will lose many more millions of dollars than would have been the case if the bill had been signed—if our small-grain provision had been enacted. It is true that in the bill the price support for small grains was raised; but in order to have been able to obtain high price supports, it would have been necessary for the growers of the small grains to cut back their base acreage by 15 percent. They would have had to restrict their planting to 85 percent of their base acres in order to make themselves eligible for price supports. But today the door is wide open. The producers of the small grains can grow all they desire, but the support price will be at 70 percent of parity. They get 70 percent on 100 percent or more of their base acreage instead of 85 percent on 85 percent of their base acreage.

I repeat, I cannot understand the President's position on this bill. I am confident he did not know what the bill contained. He was told, I presume, by Mr. Benson last Saturday that it was a bad bill. I am wondering why it was that the President did not seek advice from some of the Members of Congress of his own party, who worked hard and diligently on the bill; but he seems to have shunned them.

The President criticizes the two-price systems for wheat and rice which the conference bill contained. In order for the two-price wheat program to have become effective, a two-thirds affirmative vote of the wheat-producing farmers would have been required. There was nothing mandatory in the two-price plan for wheat. The choice would have been up to the farmers. The President has denied them that choice. I feel confident, as I stated during debate on that provision, that it probably would have been a long time before the two-price wheat program would have become effective, for the simple reason—and I am certain the President must not have been advised of this—that the program, if it had gone into effect, would have meant continued curtailment of acreage. Acreage would have been controlled, notwithstanding the fact that there was a two-price system in effect. Some advocates of a two-price system for wheat have fostered the plan as a means of planting all the acres they might desire to plant; but the bill as we sent it to the President did not provide for that unlimited planting.

The two-price system for rice was to have gone into effect automatically, but only on a trial basis. It was a plan which I personally discussed with members of the administration. They said that although they could not support it openly, nevertheless they thought, since there was so much talk about two-price plans for basic commodities, that rice was a good commodity with which to start the system. It was an effective method of giving the two-price-plan theory a trial run, so to speak.

The President suggests that Congress should enact a soil-bank program without delay. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it is my belief that the President now has ample authority to proceed with some kind of soil-bank program under existing law. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to assist him in that respect all I can. However, there can be no justification for the President seeking passage of a soil-bank bill this year. The President said on April 4 that a soil bank could not become effective this year, even if one were provided in the bill which was subsequently passed, because of the lateness of the year. It is my belief that we can wait until next year for a soil bank.

I am very hopeful that there will be a change in the administration by that

time, and that we shall then be able to take the matter up on an effective basis. It is entirely possible that next year the occupant of the White House may be more sympathetic to an effective way of assisting the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to ask one question, if the Senator will yield to me. Are all the things which the President says he and Secretary Benson are now going to do responsive to some suddenly discovered powers, or have they had such powers for the past 3 years and 3 months—powers which, if they had been put into operation, would have helped the farmer and have stopped the decline in farm income, which has been in excess of 20 percent under the present administration during the past 3 years and 3 months? Are they newly discovered powers, or are they old powers?

Mr. ELLENDER. The powers must have been available for quite some time, since they require no new legislation. They have been available for at least 2 years, since the passage of the 1954 act. What prompts their mention at this time, I shall leave to the Senator to judge. As I indicated a while ago, the price support for wheat was announced months ago as 76 percent of parity. Now, with all the surpluses we have on hand, the price is going to be raised to 82½ percent. I think it might require a little investigation to find out how the laws which are now on the statute books can be so manipulated. I myself would like to find out how it is possible to increases the support level of wheat from 76 percent to 82½ percent, when wheat is coming out of our ears and the storage facilities are strained. That is under the same law under which the support price was fixed at 76 percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield further, I want to say to him that the Senator has a point there. I hope that, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, he will look into this particular matter and find out why nothing has been done for 3 years and 3 months by this administration to assist the farmers.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am going to try to get Mr. Benson, within the next 48 hours, if possible, to find out how he can do so, and if he can, why he did not help our farmers a year ago, by raising their income instead of relying upon a barrage of rosy predictions and partisan attacks to do the job.

I would also like to ascertain how he manages to square his theory of flexible price supports, which the President cited as one of the compelling reasons for his veto, with the fixing by administrative action of rigid 82½ percent price supports. Certainly the principle involved is the same, whether support prices are fixed at 82½ or 90 percent of parity. The only difference is in degree—and thus, in the amount of increase in income our farmers will receive next year.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, from his ivory tower at the Augusta Country Club, where he has been completely insulated from the voice of the people, the President has again acted on the advice of little men who made his decision for him, and has vetoed the farm bill passed by the Congress. With complete disregard of the economic depression and threatened bankruptcy of millions of farm families, he has crucified them on the cross erected by Benson, Aiken, True D. Morse, and others.

The bill which Congress passed, Mr. President, provided the only available way to increase the income of the average farmer this year. It would have increased farm income $3 billion in 1956 above the pitiful low of 1955. When men talk about the degree to which farm income has decreased, they should advise themselves of reality. They should disregard the myths being foisted upon the American people by the Department of Agriculture. The reality is that the take-home pay of the farm families of our country is down 40 percent in 3 years.

A few days ago in Oklahoma, Mr. President, representatives of the Federal Reserve bank district of which Oklahoma is a part participated in a panel discussion before a convention of Oklahoma bankers. The headline in a great metropolitan Oklahoma newspaper read: "Bankers Find Farm Income Drastically Reduced." I think it is marvelous that the bankers of that convention, after deterioration had been progressively in operation for over 3 years, finally found it. God grant that someday the President of the United States will find it, Mr. President.

The report of the panel of economists from the Federal Reserve district headquarters was to the effect that the average annual income of farm families in Oklahoma in 1955 was $1,200, a decrease of $1,000 a farm family in 3 years. That is the reality of the degree to which farm income has decreased, Mr. President. By Eisenhower's veto, he has imposed on American farmers an economic penalty which will result in still further declines this year. At the same time, all costs of business operations, including farm costs, are still rising, and national prosperity, other than for farmers, is at an all-time high.

The farm bill as passed by Congress would have increased farm income in Oklahoma at least $75 million this year over last year. The veto of the President will drive it down below the level of last year. So, Mr. President, by the act of the President of the United States, he has imposed on Oklahoma farmers an economic penalty of a minimum of $100 million for this year.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figures given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma are, in my opinion, conservative as to the difference it would make in the income of the farmers of the country had the President signed the farm bill. Most significant to me is the effect the action of the President will have on the independent farmer who operates the family sized farm. He was the type of farmer I think most of the Members of this body were undertaking to preserve and save in passing the bill, so that farm income for such farmers could be stimulated and be brought back to somewhere near where it was at the time this administration assumed power in January 1953.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, one of the most tragic days the farmers of the Nation have ever known was the day President Eisenhower changed his farm advisers. He had some good advisers during the political campaign of 1952. He stated that the Republican Party was committed to 90 percent support prices for all the basics and that the party would make good on that pledge. In another speech in Minnesota he even indicated he would seek to get 100 percent of parity for the basic commodities. Somewhere along the line, after the election, the President changed his farm advisers, and brought gloom, despair, and, indeed, actual suffering into many farm homes. We should not forget there are more than 1½ million farm families in the United States—not farmers, but farm families—whose gross cash income is less than $1,000 a year, who would have benefited by the bill. It would have enabled those people to hold up their heads and to be thankful they were American citizens.

Mr. President, I wish we might be able to ascertain the exact date when the President changed his farm advisers. Under the existing order of things, it will not be long until we shall be compelled, if we have any respect for the independent family-size farm operator, to build a memorial to him, because if present conditions continue he will soon be extinct. So I wish we could ascertain the exact date—in order that we might carve it on such a memorial—when the President changed his farm advisers from those who guided him during the campaign to those whose advice has resulted in the present change in the farm policy under this administration.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his remarks. I would make one correction in what he said. He stated that the total farm income of 1 million farm families averaged less than $1,000 a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. A million and a half farm families, Mr. President. We received evidence of the truth of the statement just this morning, in the Appropriations Committee, where a representative of the Department of Agriculture testified.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Let me say that I remember that on the floor of the Senate, 2 years ago, the distinguished Senator quoted from a report of the Census Bureau, according to which at that time the average cash income of one-fourth of the American farm families did not exceed $1,000 a year. I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia if it is not a known fact that last year the income of American farm families was substantially lower than it was in the year to which that report of the Census Bureau applied.

Mr. RUSSELL. Unquestionably it was lower, and this year it will be much lower.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only will it be lower, but there will be a larger number who will have been brought within the lower bracket.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Georgia is eminently correct, and that development is a direct result of the policy of the present administration.

Mr. President, I wish we could learn when the President changed his farm advisers.

While we are having the benefit of eminent medical counsel in giving the people information about the physical health of the President, I should like to have eminent medical counsel find out, if they could, whether the President was mentally aware of what happened at the time when he changed his farm advisers. I do not know on what date that occurred; but I do know that April 16, 1956, will go down in history as the darkest day American agriculture has known during my lifetime; and when the obituaries of the present administration are written, let the record show that it was on that date that the economic crime of 1956 was committed—and committed by the hand of President Eisenhower himself.

Mr. President, it was in line with the policy of President Eisenhower's administration and his Department of Agriculture, that True D. Morse said, when speaking for Mr. Benson, "The marginal farmer must be eliminated." How successful the administration has been in doing that, Mr. President! The farmers know it, and they also know that this administration has been more successful in creating marginal farmers than it has been in eliminating marginal farmers.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Oklahoma stated that this economic crime was committed by the hand of the President himself. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator this question: While it was done by the hand of the President, are not the words of the veto message the words of his Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. They are. I say to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that a little later I had intended to say something in that regard. However, I shall say it now: The Bible refers to the hand of Esau but the voice of Jacob. I wish to say that, this time, it was the hand of Jacob, but the voice of Esau. And with reference to the policy of this administration, it was declared on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], when the farm bill was before the Senate—as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24, 1956, at page 3319:

> The soil-bank proposal as written would permit some small marginal farms to be taken out of production altogether, and the owners of such farms would be enabled to take other jobs which would pay them enough so that they could make a better living, and at the same time be sure of some income from the marginal lands from which they have been trying to make a livelihood.

Mr. President, the veto is in line with the announced and steadfast policy of this administration to eliminate the marginal farmers, to plow them under, for they have been here long enough.

Mr. President, there are those who say that Mr. Eisenhower has given up any hope of getting any farm votes, and wants to eliminate as many of them as he possibly can between now and the election in November. I wish to say, Mr. President, that he is eliminating them as productive units in our farm economy; but he is going to get the shock of his life when he receives the returns from their voting, next November.

A while ago the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said he feared the President had vetoed the bill without knowing what was in it. I wish to say that I am convinced that the President vetoed the bill without knowing what was in either the bill or in the veto message. I would challenge him to hold a press conference and let the representatives of the press ask him what was in the bill and what was in his veto message. If that were done, I do not have the slightest fear that he would be able to give a comprehensive answer to either question.

Mr. President, I read these words in the second paragraph of the veto message:

> A sound, constructive 9-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action.

He was talking about the so-called farm program which he submitted to the Congress.

Then he said:

> It was a program that came from the grassroots.

The grassroots of what, Mr. President? The grassroots of what golf course? I wonder if that is where the President's farm message came from. Certainly it did not come from the grassroots of the farm families of the Nation.

I wish to say that that statement in the veto message is an insult to the House and the Senate and to the Agricultural Committees of both bodies and to every Member of the Congress who voted for the conference report on the farm bill. It is an insult to the 15 distinguished Republican Senators who voted for the conference report. I wish to say that any one of them knows more about the grassroots sentiments among the farm families of this country in regard to farm matters than either Mr. Eisenhower or any of the persons in the top echelons of his Department of Agriculture will ever learn. Furthermore, I wish to state that each of the 48 Members of the House who voted for the conference report on the farm bill knows more about the sentiments of the grassroots farmers of this country than the President could ever even conceive of.

Mr. President, I desire to state that the shock which would come to the President, great man that he is, if he were really to receive the information about the grassroots sentiment in this country in regard to his farm policies, would be so terrific that I would even be uneasy about the health of the senior Republican member of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

If the scintillating brilliance of the truth with respect to the sentiment at the grassroots should ever penetrate the insulated walls of the White House, as presently occupied, the shock would be so terrific that the citizenship of this District would think that an atomic bomb had landed there and exploded. The President is allergic to sentiment from the grassroots, unfamiliar with it, and uninterested about it. He says in his veto message:

> The problem is price-depressing surpluses.

Undoubtedly there is some degree of fact in that statement.

> Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued.

Yet by his veto of the farm bill he has increased that problem. He did not diminish it. The farm bill as passed had within it provisions whereby that surplus could be curtailed and future production limited. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana so ably said:

> the veto of this bill will not reduce the production of farm products in this country. It will increase it.

The President complains about the price support for feed grains and grain sorghums. The provision of the bill relating to them was the only effective approach ever made by the Government of the United States to bring about an equitable reduction of acreage planted to feed grains and grain sorghums.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that this is the best provision of the entire bill, from three standpoints: first, from the standpoint of bettering the actual cash price of feed grains; second, from the standpoint of reducing surpluses; and third, from the standpoint of making the soil-bank program work. We might add a fourth. This program would do more for the small farmer than any other provision in the bill. In order for a farmer to get the 85-percent supports for small grains he would have to put 15 percent of his small grains acreage under the soil bank. We would get more acreage in the soil bank under this part of the bill than under all the other provisions together.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. What a tragedy it is that that information would come as such a shock to the President of the United States, if he were ever permitted to learn the truth of what the great Senator from North Dakota has just said.

On the third page of the President's veto message I find this language:

> We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954.

Nearly everything else in the message disputes that statement. The action of the Congress disputed that statement.

Every farm family in America knows that that statement is false. The President, by his announcement as to what the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do, conclusively proved that that statement was false.

At the same time he vetoes the act of 1956 he promises to spurn the act of 1954. In the very same message in which he refers to the act of 1954 as "sound and forward-looking legislation," he sets forth in detail the means whereby he expects to ignore it, override it, and spurn it. Thus even a child would know that his statement about the act of 1954 is not sincere.

It has been proved false by experience, and that proof is pointed up and verified by what the President himself says as to what he and the Secretary of Agriculture intend to do in 1956, which does not conform to the act which he himself says is sound.

There is this to be said: The President acted with dispatch. If being on the golf course in Augusta, Ga., enables him to handle big questions as expeditiously as he handled this one, he ought to spend the rest of his term there.

Members of our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry worked for more than a year on the bill. They began intensive hearings last October, which lasted for months. They started extensive sessions when the Congress convened, which sessions lasted for weeks. The Congress debated and worked on the bill for months, and hammered out on the anvil of hearings, through the voice of the people, information from the grassroots, and debate in the committee and in the Senate, not a perfect bill, but a great bill. The President of the United States vetoed it in 15 minutes.

Distinguished Republican Governors from States in the agricultural area called and requested an audience. I understand from the press that they were at the White House this very morning. The President told them to come to the White House and he would talk to them about whether or not he would veto the bill. Yes, it had already been vetoed for days. Benson carried the veto message to Georgia. The press told us that the Secretary went down there to talk about it with the President. He went down there to give the President the veto message.

I see from the press that 15 distinguished Republican Senators petitioned the President to sign the bill. His reaction was about like that of a justice of the peace in Oklahoma in the early days. He had a case before him. The attorney for the plaintiff presented his argument. Then the attorney for the defendant rose and started to make his argument. The judge said, "Go right ahead and make your argument. Speak as long as you like, and say anything you wish to say; document it as you will. When you finish, you will find my decision in this top drawer, but I must leave now to attend to other matters."

The President is too busy recovering from one vacation and getting ready for another to listen to 15 Republican Senators or 4 Republican governors petitioning him with pleas from the grassroots.

No longer can any outraged American say that Eisenhower is not to blame for the farm policy of this administration, for the acts of Secretary Benson, and for the veto of this bill. Mr. Benson has a great many skirts. I shall not assert what shape they are in, but Ike can no longer hide behind them. The mask of hypocrisy has been stripped, and now he must stand forth in the full glitter of the shining truth that he is the implementor and architect of this farm policy. The nails that have been driven into the farmer's hands, the cross upon which he is being crucified, may have been furnished by Benson, but the hammer that drove those nails into the farmer's hands was wielded by the hand of Eisenhower. The hand that placed the crown of thorns upon the farmer's head was the hand of Eisenhower.

It would be tragic indeed, Mr. President, if the action of the President was the result of a conviction that he is against fixed price supports. However, he cannot even have that refuge for his action. In his recommendation for the Dixon-Yates contract, he proved that he was not against fixed price supports, or against 100 percent of parity. By his direction, the Atomic Energy Commission wrote the contract with the Southern Power group by which they were guaranteed 125 percent of parity for 25 years.

The Federal Reserve Bank recently again increased the discount rate on commercial paper, with the result that interest rates will again go up in every financial transaction in the commercial marts of this Nation.

Therefore, President Eisenhower is not against fixed price supports, and he is not against 100 percent of parity, as a general principle. He is against them only as applied to the American farmer.

I believe the most tragic domestic act of this administration was this ill-conceived, unwarranted, unjustified, and penalizing veto by the President of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is a tragic day. Within a few weeks Republicans from all corners of this country the Republicans will meet in the State so ably represented by the Senator who is the acting minority leader at the moment, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and draw up a platform. They will send that platform all over the Nation, and appeal for votes for the Republican Party.

Mr. President, only the greatest optimist, I may say to my distinguished friend the acting minority leader, would believe a single plank in that platform. A man who will deceive you once will deceive you again. The Republican Party set up a platform in 1952, and the man it nominated for President of the United States, running on that platform, went to Kasson, Minn., and said, "I am for 90 percent of parity, and it should be 100 percent." Then on October 4, 1952, he came to the Field House of our State college at Fargo, N. Dak., and repeated that he was for 90 percent and that it should be 100 percent, and the farmers there believed him. Then he went to South Dakota and Iowa, and day after day repeated that he was for 90 percent of parity, and that it should be 100 percent. Who will believe the Republican candidate? At the first opportunity the President has to make his word good, he reneges. What does anyone suppose the people will say to him, if a candidate makes such promises and does not keep them?

Why, Mr. President, only a short time ago the Vice President, Mr. NIXON, who had run with Eisenhower on that same platform, and was familiar with the promises made by the President of the United States when he was a candidate, cast the vote that broke the tie in the Senate against a 90 percent of parity provision in the farm bill.

Mr. President, the farmers are not as dumb as the leaders of the Republican Party think they are. Within a few days after Mr. NIXON cast his vote as Vice President, I received word that a big sign had been erected in North Dakota, and on it was printed, "He lied to us."

I do not have the least doubt that in the next campaign the Democrats will have signs erected in the farming States which will enunciate that same doctrine, and which will say, "He lied to us." It is a tragic day when the people of the United States cannot rely upon the word of the President or of the Vice President of this great Nation.

Therefore I say to the distinguished acting minority leader, "I do not care what you put in your platform. You can promise everything from the bottom of the earth to the top of the moon. Those farmers who have been lied to once are going to look askance at future promises made to the farmers of this great Nation."

I am happy in the fact that as the representative of the Abraham Lincoln-Theodore Roosevelt-Bob La Follette-George Norris-Republican Party, I have time and time again enunciated the doctrine of those great men on the floor of the Senate. Can anyone imagine any one of those great men, running on a platform and going all through the farming area and making a definite promise, saying to the voters, "Vote for me if you want 90 percent of parity, because that is what I stand for," and can anyone imagine having the candidate for Vice President of the United States follow in his wake echoing that promise, and then at the first opportunity either one of them had, breaking that promise made to the farmers of this country?

For the third time I want to tell the acting minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], my distinguished friend, "You can have a committee from now until the day of your convention drawing up platforms and putting in paragraphs that may appeal to certain groups of voters in this country. They will not believe you, no matter what you put in your platform."

I had accepted an invitation to attend tomorrow night the dinner given by the Republican Party, which will be addressed by the Chief Executive of this great Nation. Mr. President, I would be ashamed to go there. The farmers of my State would be ashamed to have their senior Senator attend that banquet.

I wish to compliment the Republican members of the Committee on Agricul-

ture and Forestry, particularly my distinguished colleague from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. He fought very hard to make the Republican Party carry out its promises. Certainly, the veto of the President of the United States cannot be held against my distinguished colleague. He fought on the floor of the Senate and he fought in committee. He fought openly, and he even antagonized the Secretary of Agriculture in his fight for the farmers of the State of North Dakota and for all the farmers of this great Nation.

Mr. President, some of my Republican colleagues who voted for the bill which the President has vetoed kept faith with the promises made by the leader of the Republican Party, temporarily.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I simply wish to state once more that I believe a campaign promise made by a President or a Vice President during their campaign should be kept.

On that note, Mr. President, I close these remarks.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, first of all, I wish personally to welcome to the Senate the present Presiding Officer [Mr. WOFFORD in the chair]. I hope that during the time the present Presiding Officer remains a Member of the Senate he will derive the same enjoyment from his service here that I have experienced in growing degree during the past 3 years.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that the type of utterances heard on the floor today, in my judgment, are a little bit lower, a little bit uglier, than those to which I have been accustomed to listen in my days here. We are governed in the Senate by rules, some of which are a little loose, and I suppose some of which are ambiguous. Some, in my view are wrong. But they govern us. There are some regulations with respect to the quality of one's utterances, and, I think, implicit in the rules of the Senate is some injunction that one ought to debate free of rancor or bitterness, and upon a reasonably decent plane.

Of course, Mr. President, there is one precedent which was established a year or so ago when a majority of the Senate saw fit to censure a Member for some utterances he had made off the Senate floor. But, apparently, Mr. President, there are some things a Senator can do with complete impunity in the Senate of the United States. He can, it will be observed, revile the President of this free country, if he wants to, and, apparently, no rule is broken by his doing so. A Senator can obtain the floor and can besmirch and vilify and condemn the President of the United States because he goes to church. A Senator can use the rostrum, as has been done, to assert that the President is physically incapable of discharging the duties of his public office. A Senator can, apparently, under the rules, vent as much spleen as he desires against the Chief Executive of this country.

Mr. President, I thought some of the comments this morning on the presidential veto of the farm bill were almost frenetic, and certainly were fantastic.

I hurriedly wrote down one of the phrases of my good friend, the majority leader. The present national administration, so says the Senator from Texas, believes that low farm prices are the answer to the farmers' problems. That statement is so patently wrong as hardly to require denial. I think my good friend from Texas was a little bit overly inclined politically when he made that statement.

At any rate, I do not think anyone can question the fact that Dwight Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill because he decided that to do so was in the best interests of the country; and I do not think anyone can accuse him of trying to obtain the farm vote by the action which he took today.

My friend from North Dakota made some comments just a few moments ago, and indicated that the platform which will be written this year by the Republican Party will not be believed by the American farmer or by the American people generally. I do not know how many people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any more, and I sometimes wonder if Senators are needlessly taking the time of the Senate in making comments in the Senate.

But let the RECORD show that in 1948, the Democratic national platform promised the people of the United States flexible price-support legislation for basic farm commodities. That was a solemn promise to the people of the United States. It so happened that in 1948 the Republican platform made exactly the same compact with the American people. President Truman was reelected, and, to his everlasting credit, in 1949, he asked the Congress of the United States which was in control of the party to which he belonged to fulfill the commitment which the Democratic Party had made to the people of the Nation. It did not do it. It refused to do it. Four years later, Dwight Eisenhower asked a Republican Congress to adopt flexible price-support legislation, and it did.

Who on the floor is responsible in great measure for the fact that 2 years ago we adopted flexible price-support legislation? Mr. President, he is a great American. He is a member of the Democratic Party, and he was Secretary of Agriculture during the administration of President Truman. I respect CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, Mr. President, for standing up and treating American agricultural legislation as an American and in urging the Congress to do that which he had urged and which his chief had urged when the Senator from New Mexico was a member of the Cabinet. He helped lead the successful bipartisan fight for flexible price-support legislation 2 years ago, and the successful bipartisan fight against rigid price support this year in the Senate.

Mr. President, farm legislation is not going to be too much of a partisan issue in the coming campaign. When the other day we had an opportunity to vote for or against the conference report on the farm bill, most Republicans voted against it and a number of my brethren on the other side of the aisle voted against it. I think some of them will speak on the floor a little later on this afternoon. But let the record show, Mr. President, that it was a bipartisan Senate majority 2 years ago which adopted flexible price support legislation, and when the attempt was made in all its nakedness in this session to have the Senate approve 90 percent of parity, a bipartisan majority turned that down too.

Mr. President, I become a little tired of hearing some of my brethren call the President of the United States all kinds of terrible names. But, as I say, Mr. President, apparently that can be done in this great and august body. Senators can remain immune from any type of censure or stricture or admonitory taps on the back of the hand so long as they confine their epithets to the President of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning, entitled "What Kind of Veto?" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KIND OF VETO?

President Eisenhower's decision on the farm bill is extremely difficult because Congress seems to have left him only a choice of evils. If he should sign the bill, he would again write into law principles which he and a very large portion of the people (farmers, consumers, and economists alike) believe to be unsound. If he should veto the bill, it is said that he would deny the farmer any additional relief this year from what is admittedly a serious economic plight. No wonder the President is deeply perturbed by this dilemma. There is, however, another way of approaching the problem.

We think the country will not be satisfied by acquiescence in either of the two abovementioned extremes. Despite the sharp division over support prices at 90 percent of parity, the country wants farm legislation. Specifically, it wants the soil bank embodied in the present bill. This is evident from the widespread support given the soil bank in both political parties and the almost complete absence of opposition, although there are many differing views as to its effectiveness in reducing farm production. If the President vetoes the bill, therefore, we do not think he should accept the assumption that no other farm legislation will be passed this year.

This newspaper has already expressed the view that a veto is desirable. But the veto need not be merely negative. The administration has extensive authority to alter price supports within the 75 to 90 percent formula now on the books. The President could raise basic support levels for this year only without upsetting the principle of flexibility, and he could make such action contingent upon the passage of a new soil bank bill by Congress. A simple bill for that purpose could be enacted within a week if Congress made the effort. The result would be constructive relief of the farmer's plight instead of mere political warfare to win votes.

To our way of thinking, such a compromise would be preferable either to the signing of a basically unsound bill or to a veto that would merely toss the problem into the lap of the next Congress. Additional aid to agriculture is urgent now. The President can return this unacceptable bill to Congress along with a powerful plea for enactment of the soil bank to which there is virtually no opposition. If the administration shows its willingness to meet Congress half way, we cannot believe that Congress would turn a cold shoulder to the only farm measure that has a chance of approval.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President has seen fit to veto a bill with reference to which we have met constantly in committee since last August, hearing farmers and groups representing farmers. Yet the President sees fit to help farmers in foreign lands to the extent of $4,859,000,975, and denying our American farmers about $2 billion.

DECLINE OF DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS A RESULT OF A NEW INDUSTRY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drinking and Delinquency Decline Among North Dakota Indians as Result of New Industry," published in the Lewistown (Mont.) Daily News of March 21, 1956.

I take great pride in calling attention to the role being played by the Bulova jewel bearing plant at Rolla, N. Dak., in curbing delinquency. Various hearings held throughout the country by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency have shown the beneficial effects of industry in depressed areas through better living conditions with, consequently, less delinquency. I might point out that Senate bill 2663, on which hearings are being held by the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], provides for the relief of depressed areas through industry, and the Senator from Illinois has agreed with the Senators from Montana and North Dakota to include Indian reservations within the purpose of the act. If the results as shown in North Dakota are any indication, then initiating industry in depressed areas throughout the country should cause a great improvement in living conditions, and it necessarily follows that there will be less juvenile delinquency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRINKING AND DELINQUENCY DECLINE AMONG NORTH DAKOTA INDIANS AS RESULT OF NEW INDUSTRY

Drinking among Indians and delinquency among their children has been a much discussed subject in Montana.

Not that these problems are exclusively Indian—they're not, as everyone knows they also much concern whites, everywhere in the Nation as well as in Montana.

This editorial discusses drinking among Indians, and delinquency among their children, because of the remarkable progress that has been made in lessening these problems at the Turtle Mountain Reservation near Rolla, N. Dak., since the establishment there a few years ago of a jewel bearing plant by Bulova.

The company had been asked to come in to provide employment for idle Indians.

The Lewistown Daily News has taken a great interest in this plant because of the fine precedent it has established.

It has proven that Indians are able and faithful workers once they are given the chance. It has demonstrated that certain types of industry may be established, with much success, on or adjoining Indian reservations. It reveals that this means can be used effectively in enabling Indians to become useful, prosperous, and self-supporting citizens even though living on reservations where there had previously been little opportunity.

Now there are two new and equally pleasing revelations as a result of the Rolla plant. Drinking among Indians has tapered off considerably, and delinquency among Indian children has decreased about 60 percent.

The authority for this startling statement is Clarence Johnson, sheriff of Rolette County, where the Turtle Mountain Reservation is located.

Since a letter he wrote on the subject is so revealing, and offers so much hope for the Indians if similar developments can be secured on or adjoining Montana reservations, the Daily News reprints the entire letter as follows:

ROLLA, N. DAK., *February 3, 1956.*

Mrs. STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Minot, N. Dak.

DEAR MRS. SAUGSTAD: The juvenile delinquency on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation among the Indian people has decreased about 60 percent in the past 2 years. I have figures to this effect. I think the reason for these figures is the employment in the jewel bearing plant, which is located here in Rolla, N. Dak.

When John B. Hart, who is an attorney in Rolla and also executive secretary of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission, began working to get a factory of some sort for these people to work in, he had to make several trips to Washington, D. C., in order to get something built for them. After much work on his part, the jewel bearing plant was built in Rolla and it has proven to be the most wonderful thing that has ever happened to the Indian people in this area. The first year there were only about 60 people employed in the plant, but a year later an addition was built. I talked to Mr. Anderson, superintendent of the plant, and he states that they now have 136 employees, nearly all Indians. They expect to employ more soon. The starting salary now is $1 per hour. It is a busy little factory; everyone comes to work at 8 a. m. Some bring their lunches with them and others eat at the local cafes. They also have some bus service and others drive their own cars to work.

We have about 5,000 Indians living on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation. Before the jewel plant started, we had all sorts of trouble. Things were unorganized and nearly all the Indian families were on some type of welfare help—either through grants from the Indian agency at Belcourt or through the county welfare program. This was all being done to keep them in existence, but the homelife among the people was getting to be a critical situation. There was nothing to keep the family together and because there was no work in the immediate area, the husband or wife could leave the home at any time. No one had any responsibilities in providing necessities for the home. Many homes were broken up this way, therefore it caused hardships to the children and quite naturally, it did not help the juvenile delinquency problem.

I have personally visited the homes of these people, both before and after their employment at the jewel bearing plant. I find that the homes are now more stable because of self-support and hard work. Although the salaries are not large, planning in the home is fairly good. They manage with what they get. For instance, the families take their children to a show once or twice a week and possibly to some other social gathering once or twice weekly as well. A certain amount of security has now come into the homes. I absolutely think there is less drinking among those who are employed, because they have their jobs to think of and they know they have to get up early to get to them. If, as in most cases, the wife works, the husband has to gather wood and take care of the household while his wife is away for the day. This works out fine. Before, the children were left alone a good deal of the time. Much drinking and dancing was carried on in the homes until all hours of the night. The younger people saw all this and naturally followed the same routine, and as a result they would be constantly missing school.

I have noticed that since the plant was opened, the homes are in better condition and the people have better furnishings in their homes. This all has a lot to do with juvenile delinquency in as far as the parents now have taken back the responsibility of their families, which in my estimation, was their biggest problem to begin with.

The Indian people have received too freely from the different welfare agencies, and for this reason they have lost their sense of responsibility. I fully realize that the welfare agencies are doing a fine job in helping those who are in need of their services. But the point is this, when families are receiving assistance, a case worker is sent to their homes to survey their needs, to arrange for any medical program that might be necessary for different members of their families and in short, to solve all their problems for them. In these cases, they no longer have to think for themselves and that is why I feel that they had lost their sense of responsibility.

After these people become employed in places such as the jewel bearing plant, they have the satisfaction of earning their own money and they learn to manage with what they have. Therefore, they take over the responsibility for their families and create more secure homes. This has proven very helpful in controlling juvenile delinquency in this area.

I have been here over 3 years and have experienced what I am writing. Thank you.

Yours very sincerely,

CLARENCE JOHNSON,
Sheriff of Rolette County, Rolla, N. Dak.

There is reason for real encouragement from Sheriff Johnson's observations.

A better opportunity and life for Indians, a better break for their children.

Bulova deserves credit for its taking a chance and pioneering in bringing industry to the Indians.

The Indians on the Turtle Mountain reservation have proven overwhelmingly what they can and will do when they have the chance.

So here is an achievement—a guide as to what can be done on other reservations.

Carl Beck, of Indian Service, is working hard and efficiently on trying to secure other industries for Indian reservations.

He, and the program, deserve the support of all of us in Montana, and particularly in the communities near Indian reservations.

Indians and whites alike will benefit greatly from continued development along this line.

NOMINATION OF GEORGE COCHRAN DOUB TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am honored to report that the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, by a unanimous vote, recommended the confirmation of the nomination of my good friend and fellow Marylander, George Cochran Doub, to be Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice.

I have known Mr. Doub for many years. We attended the same law school, from which we were graduated in 1926.

Before his nomination to be an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Doub

served as United States Attorney for the District of Maryland. His work in that position was of such a nature that he immediately came to the attention of the Attorney General, who asked him to head the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, following the appointment of former Assistant Attorney General Burger as a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FRAZIER, Mr. TUCK, and Mr. HILLINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. PRESTON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. JENSEN, and Mr. CLEVENGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6712) to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

MORALS AND ETHICS SURROUNDING LEGISLATIVE AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF CONGRESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am reluctant to impose upon the business of the Senate at this time to discuss a matter which may be somewhat discomforting to some Members of this body, particularly those on the other side of the aisle.

In the present atmosphere of concern over the morals and ethics surrounding both the legislative and political activities of the Congress, however, I believe it is imperative that the American people be told the whole truth about the motives which govern the statements and actions of those individuals in public life who carry the responsibility for providing inspiration and leadership in our governmental affairs.

It was my hope that men of integrity more clearly and closely connected with the incidents which I propose to discuss would come forward willingly to expose and condemn the abominable hoax which was perpetrated upon, and enthusiastically accepted by, the high command of the Democrat National Committee at the expense of the honor and dignity of the United States Senate.

Yet, to this hour, no voice has been raised in either explanation or apology. Not one person even remotely associated with this scurrilous effacement of political integrity has experienced a sufficient stirring of conscience to clear the record before his party and his country.

For this reason, I am presuming upon the time and patience of my colleagues to tell for others more properly qualified a story of deception which they will not tell for themselves.

Mr. President, the Senate is currently pursuing an investigation into improper pressures and influences upon Members of Congress. I am privileged to serve on the special committee which has been established to conduct this study. Perhaps, as a result of our efforts, new legislation will be devised to correct certain inequities in our election laws and to strengthen the safeguards against arrogant pressure tactics employed by those few individuals and groups who would create or defeat legislation according to the pattern of their own self-interest.

Notwithstanding the effects of our investigation, the principal question at issue is one of political courage and, as I said in a statement at the time of my appointment to the special committee, we cannot legislate courage. So it is particularly appropriate, I think, that we turn our attentions now to this most recent violation of ethical conduct on the part of the Democrat National Committee.

Let me reiterate my reluctance to present the grave charges which are founded upon this episode. I know that many of my colleagues across the aisle—indeed, many Democrats throughout the country—are as repulsed as I am by such shocking evidences of political opportunism.

If we are to maintain the essential vigilance that is required for the strength and security of our political and governmental institutions, however, we cannot permit the ardor of personal loyalties to obscure our higher regard for truth and decency and the rights and freedoms of the citizens of our country.

The Members of the Senate, Mr. President, are disturbed over charges of bribery. They have rightly elected to bare their official souls in order to plug every loophole through which unscrupulous pressures might gain entrance to the legislative councils of America.

It is only reasonable, therefore, that they should be mightily concerned by activities of the National Committee of one of our two great political parties which not only come within the definition of bribery, but also involve an effort to defame the duly-established processes of the Senate.

I refer, of course, to the case of the United States against Paul Hughes, which was described in the opening statement of the prosecuting attorney as "one of the most fantastic schemes to make money in the annals of political intrigue."

The role of the Democrat National Committee in this sordid conspiracy—and specifically the part played by Mr. Clayton Fritchey, deputy chairman of the Committee and editor of the Democratic Digest—is so malicious and unscrupulous as to make even the most hardened and biased Democrat partisan blush with shame. Indeed, the fact that the righteous indignation of sincere and principled Democrats has not compelled them to protect their party's reputation from the vile implications of this offense is, to me, almost as astonishing as the incident itself.

Here was a case, Mr. President, which resulted in the defendant, Paul Hughes, being acquitted on two counts of perjury. The jury deadlocked on four other counts. Mr. Hughes is an admitted liar.

The jury which freed him apparently felt that the testimony given under oath by several witnesses was of such a conflicting nature that they did not know whom to believe. There can be no other conclusion as a result of the trial testimony and the verdict.

The facts of the Hughes case, mysterious and complex though they are, undoubtedly are familiar to most of the Members of this body. A detailed recitation of them is not essential to the present discussion. They are, in truth, only descriptive images which simplify our comprehension of the subtle pattern

of political treachery which engulfed the frenzied opportunism of Mr. Hughes.

Any examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey's clandestine dealings with Hughes must be weighed against the background of the official publication of the Democrat National Committee, which, at Fritchey's command, speaks to the American people in words purported to be Democrat gospel.

It is ironic that such a monumental blunder should be exposed to the light of public scrutiny in an election year during which our citizens will be particularly perceptive of evidences of political integrity. By their actions at the polls in November, as I am sure the Senators well know, they will express their conclusions as to which party they believe is best equipped—intellectually, philosophically, and morally—to provide the best Government for the United States.

They will be interested in the form and direction of persuasions employed by the candidates of both parties. Still more will they be impressed by the words and arguments which carry the force of truth and proof.

I am wondering how they will regard the uninhibited participation of Mr. Fritchey in the Hughes deception. Will this preacher of the new Democrat dogma cast a creditable reflection of character upon the candidates of his party?

I think not, Mr. President, and that is the reason I believe my colleagues across the aisle should heed the warnings of this episode with due alarm and precaution—just as they will undoubtedly be heeded by resentful citizens at the polls on election day.

No layman can properly evaluate the personality of Paul Hughes. Certainly, his unbounded imagination combined conveniently with his pathological addiction to lying to pave a broad highway for the achievement of his monetary aspirations.

The ambivalent routing of his prevarications leaves little doubt that the object of his labors was financial reward, and that he was burdened by no restraints of conscience in the pursuit of this goal. Having been rejected in the self-assumed role of an Air Force investigator desiring to give assistance to a committee of the Senate, he recast himself—with almost casual ease—in the character of a disgruntled employee of that same Senate committee who, for a price, of course, stood ready to tell all about the scandalous operations of that committee.

Naturally, when Hughes offered his services to the spewers of political venom in the Democrat National Committee, he struck the kind of pay dirt for which he had been groping. There was, at the beginning, an understandable skepticism concerning his qualifications; but the fanatic desire of Mr. Clayton Fritchey to realize the potential of this secret informer, this spy from the ranks of a Senate committee whose very purpose and existence he abhorred, quickly overrode any valid objections to Hughes or his "information."

Even when Hughes himself retracted a portion of his earlier biography, Fritchey refused to loosen his grasp on his new-found scheme to blacken the character of a United States Senator, a committee of the Senate and, ultimately, the Republican Party.

Fritchey provided Hughes with every convenience for the unfolding of his fabric of lies. Hughes, caught in the whirlpool of his demented ambitions and suddenly reaping the financial harvest of his mental images, continued to cough up his astounding allegations.

Perhaps the Senators were not taken in by such tales as that of the arsenal buried in the basement of their own office building, awaiting only the signal for an armed uprising in the corridors of the Senate. Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. Fritchey honestly was. At the very least, the possibility was too real for him to abandon such fiction.

In addition to being paid by Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, liar Hughes was loaned a typewriter, property of the Democrat National Committee, and a dictating machine on which he recorded his phoney exposés. He was also, through the courtesy of Mr. Fritchey, given free access to the facilities of the Democrat National Committee.

During the time that Fritchey was listening wide-eyed—and believing with cash-backed astonishment—to the lies being peddled by Hughes, he was, in the pages of the Democratic Digest, pleading for truth and purity in political campaigns. He also reprinted, with obvious pride, a letter from Adlai Stevenson, in the June 1954 issue, which praised the publication for its "carefully documented information and its insight into current affairs."

We can be justified, I believe, in assuming that Candidate Stevenson may want to take another look at Editor Fritchey's outpourings as a result of the revelations of the Hughes trial. In fact, I suggest that "Candidate Anybody" on the Democrat ticket would do well, in view of the activities of the Democrat National Committee in this liefest, to view with face-saving apprehension the political contortions of this curiously motivated organization.

In all, Mr. Fritchey handed over $2,300 to Hughes, and his friend Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., of ADA left-wing fame, tossed an additional $8,500 in the till to keep Hughes' imagination well oiled so that the supply of scandalous memoranda would not dry up.

That Hughes also came under the sponsorship of the Americans for Democratic Action in the course of his sinister dealings with the Democrat National Committee was apparently a logical consequence of Clayton Fritchey's insatiable yearning to smear, by the foulest devices, the Republican Party. The fact that he pursued this ambition at the expense of the reputation of his own party and the United States Senate was obviously of no concern to him.

The ADA's Mr. Rauh, however, was not entirely satisfied with Fritchey's exploitation of liar Hughes. Rauh sought, in addition, to assist Hughes' recollections to the extent of directing him to produce "evidence" to accompany his revelations. This "evidence," of course, was created from the same brand of fiction that guided Hughes' whole effort.

One does not need a crystal ball to realize that, while the activities of both Rauh and Fritchey with respect to Hughes were essentially the same, Rauh's ideological compass did not point in the direction of the Democrat National Committee. The goal of Mr. Rauh, and the goal of ADA, is the total revamping of the American system of free enterprise. Fritchey and his fellow apostles at the Democrat National Committee are ostensibly concerned only with the election of Democrats to places of leadership within our existing governmental structure.

Of course, as I have already indicated, Fritchey was so dedicated to his responsibilities in the Hughes affair that he was willing to join forces with Mr. Rauh, no doubt in the delusion that he could have his cake and eat it, too. Such was not the case.

We find, instead, that Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey was not only an enthusiastic dupe as far as Paul Hughes was concerned, but that he also danced with naive grace to the music of the ADA and Joseph L. Rauh, Jr.

I wonder, Mr. President, how my Democrat friends in this body, and Democrat faithful throughout the country, feel about the quality of Mr. Fritchey's efforts in their behalf. I am sure they know that, notwithstanding the "individual" nature of his project with Mr. Hughes, he has placed an albatross around the neck of their party which no amount of hedging or whitewash can remove. The facts are here and they add up to as disgraceful a breach of political morals as this Nation has ever witnessed.

It has been suggested that what Mr. Fritchey and his contemporaries really need is fewer Americans for Democratic Action and many more Democrats for American Action.

In the clamor of this election year, I devoutly hope, for the sake of our country, that Mr. Fritchey and his immediate superior, Mr. Paul Butler, will harken to this advice. It would be a major step toward answering the unshakable challenge created by the Democratic National Committee's guidance of liar Hughes.

In his trial testimony, Fritchey repeatedly described the vigorous activity at the Democrat National Committee which accompanied the Hughes narrations. Stenographers, researchers, and secret messengers supplied from the committee staff, and acting on priority orders, participated in the project. Yet, Fritchey avowed that it was not a committee project, but rather his own "individual" effort.

Fritchey also told the jury that all the Democrat Party had was a deficit. Still, he was able to tap his own till, he tells us, and that of several committee employees, for sums ranging up to $800, to further his private project.

This arms-length attitude of a stiff-necked virtue in keeping the project en-

tirely unofficial, led the defense attorney at the trial to conclude:

In other words, in effect, Clayton Fritchey, the individual, kept such information from Clayton Fritchey, the deputy chairman of the Democratic Committee, in effect?

To this query, the Government prosecutor appropriately commented:

That is a pretty hard question to answer.

The disgusting moral tone of the project and the corrupt principles which actuated Fritchey to cast his lot with Hughes were revealed in open court.

The defense attorney asked Mr. Fritchey concerning his encounter with Hughes:

When you arranged to meet him, you had information which would lead you to believe that he was closely associated with Senator McCarthy and that you might be able to have a spy in the Senator's camp, right?"

Mr. Fritchey answered:

Yes.

The defense counsel continued:

And that didn't disturb you any, did it, that you should have a spy in the Senator's camp?"

Mr. Fritchey said:

Well, I would say that if this had resulted in his being able to prove the charges that he was making and to demonstrate to the public that a senior official of the Government was corrupting the Government, I would have considered it a signal public service.

Defense counsel asked:

In other words, the means would justify the end?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

Correct.

Now, Mr. President, that answer by Mr. Fritchey points up vividly the whole paradox of this affair. We find the tacitly self-righteous Deputy Democrat National Chairman actively condoning the use of spies, subterfuge, and secret informers which, out of the other side of his mouth, he condemned as a part of the so-called "terrible tactics" of the Senator whom he sought to crucify.

We should remember, too, that the loudest anti-McCarthy criticism by the likes of Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh followed the line: "We approve of his objectives, but we don't like his methods." In other words, the tactics ascribed to Senator McCarthy by his left-wing antagonists did not justify the patriotic aims of Senator McCarthy; but, when employed by these shining knights of the Democrat National Committee and the ADA, in a morally deceptive affair of political chicanery, they constituted, in Mr. Fritchey's own words, "a signal public service."

I would remind the Senators, also, of the analogy given by the junior Senator from Wisconsin in answer to the critics of his "methods" in ferreting out Communists. He said—and we all remember it—"You can't go skunk-hunting in a high silk hat."

How much more noble and truthful it would have been for Fritchey and Rauh—second to none among the "McCarthy haters"—to have applied a similar admission to the object of their detestable assaults. Surely, being on the opposite side of the political and ideological fence from Senator McCarthy, they hold no less contempt for him than he evidences for the cause which they—unwittingly, of course—support.

Continuing with the Defense Counsel's cross examination of Deputy Democrat National Chairman Fritchey, we find this question:

Do you recall whether Hughes at any time expressed any opinions which caused you seriously to doubt his ethics or morality?

Mr. Fritchey replied:

No, not one single thing, no.

No comment of mine upon this answer could speak as eloquently or decisively as the following excerpt from a December 1953 memorandum from Hughes to Fritchey which was an exhibit, and part of the evidence, in the trial:

Phone taps can be utilized (against McCarthy) * * * Don't discount the tremendous value in just bargaining power of recorded phone discussions.

The memorandum continued:

A program of this type, although not nice, can result in harm to no one except (McCarthy) * * * As mentioned earlier, being nice, too ethical, or squeamish, will accomplish less than nothing, where McCarthy is concerned. McCarthy has stated many times, "Ethics went out the window with button shoes." So therefore I don't see the necessity for us to send a boy to do a man's work. If both Federal and civil law-enforcement agencies use the same unethical procedures to bring to justice criminals, are we not justified in using similar methods to expose (McCarthy) * * *? It is most easy to prove and document (McCarthy's guilt) by relaxing somewhat on ethics. This is probably what I'm best suited for.

There, Mr. President, in one brief quotation, is revealed the shocking issue in this discussion: Paul Hughes, admittedly a liar and self-professed expert on unethical procedures, received payment from an official of the Democrat National Committee to supply that official with false and defamatory information concerning a duly elected Member of the United States Senate in the performance of his official and patriotic duties.

At another point in the trial the Defense Counsel asked Mr. Fritchey:

Did you ever attempt to check with anybody, Mr. Fritchey, on the authenticity of any of the material that was given you?

To this Fritchey replied:

No; I don't think * * * Not beyond our own scrutiny of it.

At another time during the trial Mr. Fritchey said that he had taken some of the material Hughes gave him to a notary and made an affidavit that he had received it from Hughes "before a certain date."

The defense counsel asked in this regard:

Now, you said that you had taken certain of these transcriptions and those typed things to a notary so as to indicate that you had received them before a certain date, right?

Mr. Fritchey:

Correct.

Defense attorney:

Did you ever suggest taking Hughes along so he could swear that they were true before the same notary?

Mr. Fritchey:

No.

It is, indeed, a sordid tale. Clayton Fritchey is the Deputy Chairman of the Democrat National Committee. He is the editor of the Democratic Digest, which is sold on newsstands and sent through the mails to subscribers. He is the Democrat National Committee's principal "seeker after the truth."

Yet, Mr. President, the facts of the Hughes case prove beyond any reasonable doubt that Clayton Fritchey is either a blind fool or one of the most unscrupulous and unethical political beavers in the history of our country. He may be all of one or all of the other, or he may be a little bit of both. In any case, he is certainly a questionable pacesetter for loyal Democrats of principle and integrity.

In summing up the case to the jury the defense counsel, Mr. Erdmann, had this to say about Mr. Fritchey:

The first man or major witness that I want to discuss, although he was called somewhat late in the proceeding, is Clayton Fritchey because, as the defendant contends and we urge, Clayton Fritchey was in at the beginning.

The Hughes case, then, clearly and unquestionably, involves an attempt to discredit a committee of the United States Senate—not to discredit it legitimately, but, rather, to do it with a mountain of scandalous and fabricated information and with the sponsorship of sworn enemies of congressional efforts to expose the Communist conspiracy.

We have here a secret informer being paid for double-crossing his alleged employer. In this, I see bribery in its most flagrant form.

We have here under-the-table payments in cash for the most absurd batch of lies ever concocted.

We have here a working arrangement between the Democrat National Committee and the leader of the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action.

Are not my Democrat colleagues in the Senate concerned about this deplorable episode? Is Mr. Fritchey really the kind of man my friends on the other side of the aisle wish to have superintending the activities of their national political organization and conducting its public relations? Does the Democrat candidate for President in 1956, whoever he may be, wish to come before the American people and ask their confidence with this monstrous deception hovering above his head?

Perhaps Mr. Paul Butler, the quite vocal chairman of the Democrat National Committee has not had the time to read the trial testimony that is available to him. Certainly, to this hour, he has attempted no explanations or apologies for the actions of Clayton Fritchey, his deputy. Perhaps Mr. Butler has not even availed himself of the opportunity

of reading the press comments on this fiasco. His silence implies either shame or ignorance. If he is not aware of what has been going on in the ranks of his committee staff, or if he is not concerned about the consequences of the Hughes hoax, he is surely laying the political integrity of a great political organization on the block of public censure.

It would seem on the surface to be an unnecessary gesture to call to the attention of the Democrat national chairman this case of the secret informer and his financial mentor and guiding angel, Mr. Fritchey.

It is the job of the Democrat Party to police its own house. It owes that much to the American people and to its faithful partisans throughout the country.

Perhaps, on the other hand, Mr. President, Mr. Butler's silence is of greater shame than we suspect. Perhaps Mr. Fritchey's influence inside the councils of the Democrat Party weighs more heavily upon Democrat policy than has yet been admitted publicly.

After all, Mr. Butler himself has never shown any aversion to the application of highhanded political tactics. This was clearly demonstrated by his brazen suggestion that legislation, however discriminatory, should be pushed in the Congress to aid in the election of Democrat Senators and Representatives in areas where appropriations for the expenditure of Federal funds on public projects would endear the proponents of such measures to the voters of the affected States. In other words, like Mr. Fritchey, Mr. Butler seems to regard the function of Congress as purely a political one. He mentions, for instance, that the Niagara bill is of "tremendous importance to the reelection of Senator LEHMAN," and that the $500 million Federal plan for Hells Canyon should be passed, since it will be "a vital factor in the reelection of Senator MORSE and Representative EDITH GREEN."

Mr. President, it could be that I have misjudged Chairman Butler, but in view of the proven tendencies of his understudy, Mr. Fritchey, I find this comparative speculation worthy of the closest scrutiny by the American people.

What I should like to leave with the Senate, in concluding this discussion, Mr. President, is this question: Does the "cops and robbers" technique of Deputy Chairman Fritchey constitute the Democrat National Committee's answer to its search for issues in the coming campaign? If it does, then I suggest that the choice before the American voters in this election year will be distinctly one of political courage and integrity. Indeed, Chairman Butler and his committee need look no further for an issue for their campaign. Mr. Fritchey has provided a classic one, and, by his silence, Mr. Butler has endorsed it.

It will be interesting to observe how my Democrat colleagues respond to this challenge, which, though inspired by their own national committee, will be hurled at them by an aroused citizenry during the coming months.

I hope, Mr. President, that the perpetrators of this intrigue will find their punishment in the wrath of men of character and integrity within the Democrat Party.

It is disturbing, however, even to a Republican, to consider that such punishment might overflow its banks and swamp the service of those Members on the other side of the aisle who are themselves innocent of this blight upon the record of their party.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to take about 30 seconds to thank the very able Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] for the comments he has made today regarding the Hughes case.

I wish he had gone a bit further and had discussed the part the Washington Post took in this case. The Washington Post, which has been criticizing the methods of McCARTHY, took part in this payment and took part in this conspiracy—Wiggins, Friendly, and Murrey Marder. I think Marder was less responsible than were Wiggins and Friendly. Wiggins certainly took a major part in the conspiracy. And up to this time they have not apologized. They have not admitted their part in the conspiracy, even though it has been proven in court that they took a major part in it—one of the most irresponsible acts on the part of a newspaper that I have seen.

I again thank the very able Senator from Arizona for his discussion of this case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish the Senator from Wisconsin had been in the Chamber when I had the floor and was making my short speech. I wish to tell the Senator from Wisconsin that I have heard—in fact, I have read—something of the implication of the various newspapers in this dastardly plot with Mr. Fritchey and Mr. Rauh. I did not feel I knew enough about it, from the evidence I was able to see, to speak competently on the floor about it. I suggest, therefore, that if the case can be further developed, certainly it would be enlightening to the people of America to have the Senator from Wisconsin discuss the newspaper angle. I wish I had felt competent enough to do it, but I did not desire to explore in that area—an area about which I knew so little.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the Attorney General's office will go into that case and procure indictments of those engaged in the conspiracy. If the Senator or I had been guilty of what these men did, we would have been indicted long since. I think there is a very definite duty on the part of the Attorney General to act as I have suggested.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the veto message of the President of the United States on the farm bill, which I strongly approve, presumably brings an end to one of the hardest legislative fights, in which the greatest difference of opinion was manifested, in connection with any issue which has been decided by the Congress in recent years.

In order that the RECORD may clearly reflect how keen was this difference, both in committee and elsewhere, I wish to recite a few facts at this time.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry consists of 15 members, 8 of us being Democrats and 7 Republicans. On the issue which became perhaps the dominant issue as the bill was considered, the issue of the restoration of the 90 percent rigid price supports, the committee divided 8 to 7. Not only was that division in the committee as close as it could possibly be, but the members of the committee on both sides of the table were as evenly divided as it was possible for them to be and still leave an 8-to-7 vote on this particular issue. As to the Republican members of the committee, sitting on the opposite side of the table from myself, they were divided 4 against the restoration of rigid price supports and 3 in favor of restoration. As to the Democratic members of that committee, we were divided 5 to 3, that is, 5 for the restoration of rigid high level price supports and 3 against that issue.

Not only was that close division found in our committee, but likewise, in the conference committee, the representatives from the Senate were divided on this issue as evenly as they could be, that is, 3 to 2.

I invite attention to these facts at this time preliminary to saying that I was present much of the time at all stages of the debate in the field, in the committee, and in the conference committee, as this measure was heard and determined. I wish to say for the record that I do not believe any member of the committee, or of the conference committee, changed his mind in the slightest upon this particular issue, and upon most other vital farm issues, throughout nearly a year of discussion. Apparently the conviction of the Members was very deep.

So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accord to Senators who did not feel as I do, the depth of conviction and the soundness of conscience which I hope they will accord to me. The difference of opinion was very real. The depth of conviction was very great. There was not a single change of position in this important field during the course of the hearings, the debate, and the conference.

I have made these statements preliminary to the making of another which it seems to me hardly needs to be made, and that is that I think those members of our committee and those Members of the Senate and House who attributed to the President of the United States a smaller degree of conviction and a lesser degree of courage than they themselves had were wrong from the beginning. They should have known from the beginning, and particularly in these closing weeks, that the attitude of the President would be exactly as he has stated it in his veto message. Any other conclusion than that would leave us in the position of claiming for ourselves some exalted height of conscientious determination and conviction which we were not willing to accord as being present in the mind and heart of the President of the United States. From the very beginning

it has seemed to me, we would necessarily stand on unsound ground if we assumed that the President by reason of the force of pressure, would change what he had long shown to be his very deep conviction and would approve the bill.

The nonpartisan or bipartisan nature of the support of the bill showed up throughout the debates, both in the committee and in the conference, and was reflected by the votes upon the floor of the Senate. I wish the record now to show that upon the final vote on the conference report 10 Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle showed their continuing disapproval of the measure. I have searched in the press in vain for any indication that more than four Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle failed to approve the conference report.

The records of the Senate show very clearly that four Members of the Senate who are Democrats voted against the conference report, namely, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Florida, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. But the records show with equal clarity that 4 Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle, and who, I think, are as sound Democrats as any we have, paired in such a way as to show their continuing and unalterable opposition to the conference report, those 4 being the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Unfortunately two Members of the Senate who sit on this side of the aisle could not be present for the final vote. One was recovering from surgery in Bethesda, and the other was absent in the course of his campaign for reelection. Those two Senators, namely, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and my own distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], saw to it that their position of opposition to the conference report was shown on the RECORD of the Senate where all might see it, not only that day, as did those who heard the sound of the yeas and nays, but throughout the history of this Nation.

In addition to those 10 on this side of the aisle who clearly showed their continuing opposition to this measure, there were 3 other Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle who, for reasons sufficient to themselves—and I honor those reasons—felt, when the conference report was submitted, good as it was in part, and bad as it was in part, that they preferred, in weight, the good values, and therefore voted for the conference report. The same three Members of the Senate, who sit on this side of the aisle, by repeated votes during the course of the debate and the development of this measure, had shown their opposition to rigid price supports, and to many of the other objectionable features of the bill. The three Senators to whom I refer are the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I wish that fact to show upon the RECORD because, notwithstanding all the talk of politics which has entered into the consideration of this measure since the conference report reached the floor—and I think there are abundant evidences to justify the charge of politics, at least since that time—I want it to be clear from the RECORD that there were men who, for one reason or another, satisfactory to themselves, felt that it was their duty to vote, in soundness of conscience and in depth of conviction, in favor of the conference report, although they had voted against certain provisions which were contained in it during the debate when those individual issues were presented.

I return to the position I took a while ago, and say again that, with all the depth of conviction and soundness of conscience that were shown during the debate, and with the unwillingness of any member of the committee—divided, as it was, 8 to 7, and divided as evenly as it could be on both sides of the table—to change his position upon these critical issues, I think those who jumped to the conclusion that the President of the United States, when the bill reached him, would display a poorer conscience and a weaker conviction than they themselves had evidenced were bound to be disappointed. I believe that anyone who has thought for weeks that the President of the United States would do anything else than he has done was leaning on the weakest kind of a reed, and based his opinion largely on wishful thinking.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator no doubt has had occasion to recall the statement the President made in Brookings, S. Dak., when he referred expressly to a pledge to maintain 90 percent of parity support for the basic commodities. The Senator from Florida never made such a statement, but I am sure he will agree that any man who makes that kind of pledge should keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, I was not present at Brookings. In the second place, I was not following with great interest the statements made by the then candidate of the Republican Party, because I was not supporting him. Furthermore, I have heard from many sources that the statement which the present President of the United States made at that time differed in some detail from the statement which has been mentioned by the Senator from Louisiana. I repeat, I was not present, and what I say is based on hearsay, but my understanding was that the present President and the then candidate of the Republican Party said his party was committed to the temporary 90-percent price support that was then provided in the law on the statute books, and that he wanted to make it clear that he would stand by that commitment until the provision expired.

However, I certainly do not wish to argue the point with the Senator from Louisiana, because neither he nor I was present on the occasion when the statement was made. Fine lawyer that the Senator from Louisiana is, he realizes that we would be on unsound ground to argue the matter. Besides that, I do not believe that either of us is interested either in besmirching the character of our President or in upholding his every statement, because his statements will have to stand on the record.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that the statements the present President of the United States made, when he was campaigning in Kasson, Minn., and also in Columbia, S. C., showed that those statements left no doubt, as I am sure the Senator from Florida will agree, that the candidate would support the 90 percent of parity program. That being the case, some of us were certainly entitled to rely upon a statement made on at least three occasions by the candidate. Perhaps we should not believe what a man says while he is a candidate. However, certainly some of us had reason to hope that he would keep his promise.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would neither defend nor decry the position taken by the President of the United States. I certainly was not present when he made either one of the statements to which the Senator has referred. However, I call the attention of my good friend to the fact that there are areas in this Nation which have not supported rigid price supports and have strongly favored flexible supports, but they nevertheless strongly supported the President. Therefore there could not have been much understanding on their part that that was the candidate's position.

However, I go back to what I said—and I think it will hold up, and that it cannot be broken down—that the men who were claiming for themselves the right to stand by their convictions—and not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry changed his position on this important issue—were standing on unsound ground when they assumed that the President of the United States would follow any different course than he followed today, since repeatedly, in the course of the last year, he had stated his conviction that high rigid price supports had contributed very greatly to the building up of farm surpluses and to the disastrous condition in which agriculture finds itself. Certainly I have not heard anything even remotely indicating that he was sliding from that conviction.

I believe that my friend from Louisiana and other Senators—and I have the highest respect for them—who felt that the President of the United States, despite his conviction and the dictates of his conscience, would do other than what he did today, were standing on shifting sand. I say that because the President had repeatedly stated that he was going to stand up to his conviction, in spite of various efforts in different parts of the Nation, by men who wanted high rigid price supports, who threatened political reprisal if the President failed to support them. One of them, as I recall, the President of the National Farmers Union, went so far as to deliver to the press, before it was received by

the President of the United States, a very insulting and derogatory telegram, which, if anything had been needed to sustain the President of the United States in the firmness of his conviction, would have served to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like first to continue my comments on this point and to yield further to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator believes that some of us stood on unsound ground when we thought the President would sign the natural gas bill, which he vetoed, even though he said it was a good bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know too much about that, or as much as some of my distinguished friends know about it, particularly those Senators who are lucky enough to have natural gas deposits in their States. I should also like very much to have it appear in the RECORD that I do not put forth as much gas on the floor of the Senate, but I am afraid that I could not truthfully say that. [Laughter.]

Let me say on that issue that a great diversion came up which created in some minds, though not in mine, the fear that perhaps there was general corruption, so to speak, behind the efforts of some of those who were urging the passage of the natural gas bill. I voted with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for its passage.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? While I disagree with much he has said, I believe he is making a very important speech, and I believe more Senators should hear it. Therefore, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to extend that courtesy to me. However, I would rather proceed with my rather brief remarks. Then the Senator from Wisconsin, on his own time, may be heard and I shall be very glad to suggest the absence of a quorum for him after I have concluded my remarks, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. President, so much for what has happened up to now in this matter. I said on the floor of the Senate, when the conference report was being passed upon by the Senate, that I thought Senators and Members of the House were overlooking a very real point in the whole issue, and that was the position of the general public throughout the Nation.

I remember placing in the RECORD an analysis of the opinions of country editors throughout the United States, taken from the trade journal which serves that group of very fine people. I remember that that analysis showed, even in the areas where the sentiment for rigid price support was high, that, as a rule, the country editors were shaking their heads and saying that there is not any soundness in continuing that provision which creates overproduction and oversupply and the unremitting buildup of agricultural surpluses.

I have said several times on the floor of the Senate that, so far as the press in my State, the agricultural organizations in my State, and the general public in my State are concerned, I feel that the tremendous majority is strongly against the restoration of rigid price supports, and that there can be no question as to their position in that regard. I have stated in appearances I have made on the floor—and I am afraid I made too many appearances on the floor on this bill—that the Farm Bureau Federation of my State, which is the only organization with a general membership of farmers, throughout the State, the citrus industry organizations, such as the Florida Citrus Exchange and the Florida Citrus Mutual, the vegetable organizations of Florida, particularly the Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, and the State Cattlemen's Association had repeatedly gone on record in such a way that no one could question or misunderstand how they stood on this important issue. They do not want high price supports reinstated, and, in fact, many of them are against all price supports.

I have always held that reasonable price supports for storable basics, not calculated to create and maintain surpluses, are necessary at this time when we are moving out of the war period. But, unfortunately, Mr. President, many good people, farmers, throughout the Nation, have learned to rely so heavily upon the weak stick of high price supports that they are unwilling or unable to plan for themselves and to produce in such a way as not to oversupply the market.

Of course, no one in Florida knew until today what the President's decision was going to be, but in order that there may be some showing on the RECORD that the people of that State, which produces $600 million worth of agricultural products each year, have rather strong convictions on this subject, as represented by newspapers in the centers of agricultural production and as represented, as I have already stated, in farm organizations which I have mentioned. I wish to place in the RECORD some editorials which have come to my attention, which were published the latter part of last week and reflect the attitude of Florida people, I think, correctly.

The first is an editorial from the Tampa Daily Times which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in toto as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE, DON'T HESITATE; VETO THE FARM BILL

President Eisenhower should veto the farm bill.

All of the talk about getting no farm legislation this session unless he allows the monstrosity passed yesterday to become law is far-down, low-grade politics designed to put Mr. Eisenhower on the spot in this election year.

But the truth of the matter is that if he blocks this legislation by a veto and it is not overridden he will have left just what he wants because the present farm law which his administration fought for so bitterly and won two years ago would continue in force.

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

The vicious determination to continue rigid price supports if not vetoed by the President will mean the piling up of more farm surpluses instead of bringing relief. It is a complete contradiction of the theory behind the soil bank idea which was approved in the same measure. The purpose of the soil bank obviously is to help restrict production, yet 90 percent of parity guarantees will defeat that objective.

President Eisenhower should take his cue on whether to veto the bill from the results of Tuesday's primary voting in Illinois. The President's evident strength downstate where he outran Stevenson 2 to 1 shows no real revolt among farmers against the administration.

The mock concern of the Democrats and some of the farm State Republican Senators and House members for the plight of the farmers shows they are not being realistic because the farmers themselves have been disproving the assertions that they are against the administration.

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote two small paragraphs of the editorial, and I assure the Members of the Senate that they are representative of the sense and meaning of the editorial. The first is as follows:

Congressional action on this new, definitely costly and destructive farm bill has been the worst kind of presidential year politics. There has been far more evidence of designing the measure for farm votes than for farmers.

Then the closing paragraphs:

The President should not weaken at this last minute in his previous resolve to fight rigid prices. He knows the consequences of rigid supports. His failure to veto would indicate he had yielded to political pressure and would mean he was deserting the public interest hoping to catch a few more votes.

A courageous stand will bring him far more respect.

The next editorial is from the Tampa Morning Tribune, a morning newspaper published in that area of my State which is the greatest citrus producing section, one of the greatest small-vegetable producing sections, and the greatest cattle producing section. It is an editorial entitled "Integrity Versus Political Pork." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, published on April 13, 1956, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRITY VERSUS POLITICAL PORK

It is hard to figure how Congress could pass a more thoroughly bad piece of legislation, or one loaded with more pure political pork, than the election-year farm bill it has just sent to the White House.

If a measure ever merited a Presidential veto, this one is it.

Those Democrats and the farm State Republicans who approved it may try to say with a straight face that it will provide long-run help for the farmer. Actually it

is clearly fashioned to use him as a political football.

Supporters of the bill realized the President wants the so-called soil-bank plan which is authorized in the legislation. That plan is designed to reduce the present farm surplus. But the congressional majority coupled it with a provision restoring flat 90 percent price supports, the discredited system which brought on more production than the free market could absorb and so accounted for the present surplus. The bill thus is a self-contradiction, an antisurplus measure that would inevitably encourage the production of more price-depressing surplus commodities.

Mr. Eisenhower has frequently spoken out sharply against the rigid parity system. But Democratic strategists consider they have him backed into a corner this time.

If he lets the legislation slide through, they figure to go to the hustings as the party that demonstrated its concern for the welfare of the farmer. If he vetoes the bill on the ground it violates the principles for which he stands, they plan to make the farm bill the main issue of the campaign.

The political dilemma confronting the President is obvious. We may be sure a good deal of pressure will be applied by members of his own party in the farm belt as he mulls over the question the next few days at Augusta. They will argue he must sign the bill if threatened GOP congressional candidates in the farm areas are to be helped and strategic States in the Midwest are to be carried in order to win the Presidency in November.

But the price these fellow Republicans and many Democrats are asking him to pay is far too high. For his signature on the farm bill would mean a bowing to political expediency. It would blemish the integrity of his administration. It would throw into sharp reverse the long-range plan he and Secretary of Agriculture Benson have prepared for reducing farm surplus.

Certainly, Mr. Eisenhower has made it clear that he is a leader capable of rising above political pressure. His recent veto of the natural-gas bill was only one of many such demonstrations.

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I quote a part of the editorial, as follows:

May he—

Meaning the President—

May he rise above the pressure this time and accompany a veto of the farm bill with a frank and full statement that the upholding of integrity and sound economic principles is far more important than the fate of farm-belt politicians. That course of action may lose the votes of some already disgruntled farmers, but it will kill a bad bill and win the respect, confidence, and support of the country as a whole.

Mr. President, the next editorial is peculiarly interesting, because it was published in the Miami Daily News, a newspaper identified with former Gov. James M. Cox, of Ohio, at one time the Democratic candidate for President. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP REAL LOSER OVER FARM BILL

The repudiation of the Eisenhower farm policies, not only by the opposition in Congress, but by many Republicans as well, would normally be taken as a political setback for the President.

In the case of President Eisenhower, it seems to be different, however. People generally appear to place him above party politics and the blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

This is a political phenomenon which enrages the Democratic politicians, yet it is one of the realities in this election. We don't presume to know what the President will do about the farm bill, but whether he signs or vetoes it the congressional candidates will be the ones mostly affected.

If the President vetoes the new farm legislation on the ground it restores rigid high price supports for basic crops, Republican candidates in the farm belt will feel the effects of his action. If he signs it on the theory it is better than a return to the present price support law under which farm income has declined a billion dollars in a year, then Democratic candidates will claim credit for reversing administration policy.

In any case, the Democrats who framed the hodge-podge measure passed by both Houses of Congress yesterday, and the Republicans who voted for it, have little reason for pride. As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day it's strictly for the birds.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read from the editorial two excerpts which I think may cause some searching of souls here, Mr. President, since they come from the source I have mentioned.

As passed, the 1956 farm bill is an undisguised political measure hopefully designed to garner votes, with little regard for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. In the parlance of the day, it's strictly for the birds.

Earlier in the editorial there are these words:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will reread that part of the editorial very carefully, because I so firmly believe it to be true, particularly when we have a veto message which invites Congress speedily to consider and report a bill setting up the soil bank and perhaps other commendable features, so that it may be promptly passed. I think the general public, if Congress fails to follow that course, will come indisputably to the conclusion that most of the Members of the Congress were interested in votes rather than in farm support.

I again quote the portion of the editorial which I just read:

The blame for an unworkable farm measure, or none at all if the President vetoes it, will mostly rest with Congress.

Mr. President, the next editorial is from the Miami Herald of April 13, 1956, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM BILL CONFOUNDS FARM CONFUSION

The political analysts are hard at it interpreting the farm bill which Congress passed over expressed Executive displeasure.

The President most likely will veto the measure, although Democrats and Farm Belt Republicans say that there is no way open to him—electionwise—but to sign it.

If the President vetoes the measure the session will probably end without any farm-relief legislation.

That would not be all to the bad. Congress enacts a lot of bills that would better serve the country if tossed into the wastebasket before they got to the discussion stage.

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather, it has incorporated some provisions previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I read a few paragraphs from the editorial:

The farm bill is an amorphous creation. It seethes with confusion.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will look up the meaning of the word "amorphous." I looked it up and was delighted to find what it means.

I read further from the editorial:

Actually, it does nothing to stabilize the agricultural industry.

Rather it has incorporated some provisions, previously tried, which in themselves are largely responsible for the problems which this new bill purports to solve.

The President said before Congress passed the measure it was not a good bill. It isn't.

Mr. President, the last of the editorials which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD is from the Orlando Sentinel of April 11, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that the short editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARAGRAPHS

Secretary Benson will have no truck with the thing called a farm bill which the politically minded House and Senate have passed. And we're glad to see that Senator HOLLAND would not sign the conference committee report either. It would only add to the farmers' problems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Congress has it within its power now to have submitted to it quickly from committee and to pass a bill which will create a soil bank. Is there need for a soil bank? I think there is very great need for it. I heard a statement made on this floor within the hour to the effect that all the planting had been accomplished in connection with all the basic commodities. I think that statement was thoughtlessly made, because everyone knows it is not completely correct as to the wheat industry. Anyone can plant up to 15 acres of wheat anywhere that wheat can be produced in this Nation and not be under the provisions of the present allotment program. So there

will be an unbridled invitation for the planting of wheat, and there would have been if the bill had been passed as it was. It seems to me there is a need for soil bank diversion of wheat, and there would be if the soil bank provision were separately considered and passed by the Congress.

Likewise, in the case of corn there is plenty of its acreage and mostly in the commercial areas that has not yet been planted. There is plenty of time to make good use of the soil bank in the case of corn if Congress has the will to do so.

Congress again is challenged. Shall we not live up to our opportunity to create a soil bank?

Mr. President, I have been reading in newspapers within the past few days about the terrific destruction accomplished in the Wheat Belt, in six States, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Nebraska, by the recent dust storms. The amount of wheat which has been blown out of the ground is stupendous. I do not suppose anyone knows the exact amount. It certainly must total many hundreds of thousands of acres, and, probably, from what I have read, 2 or 3 million acres. There is a need, right now, for the soil bank.

There are other situations, none, I am glad to say, so acute as that which I have just mentioned, which likewise call for the use of the soil bank to reduce production and to give useful employment for many acres in such a way as will enable farmers to get their land out of production and claim the beneficent effects of the soil bank.

Mr. President, we are about to conclude, so far as Congress is concerned, unless someone should be so unwise as to call up the Presidential veto and to attempt to override it in either House of Congress. I think there is no advocate of this monstrous bill in its present form who would be so unwise as to do that. If so, I think the result would be eye-opening, because I believe it would show a majority of both Houses clearly holding up the hands of those who now realize, and who have realized for a long while, that the provisions of the bill simply are not sound, and would not stablize the agricultural industry of the Nation, but instead would create greater surpluses and greater difficulties, and would add to the dependency of our people upon the Government.

Mr. President, I cannot too strongly urge that in the whole field of agricultural legislation one of the points we must always keep in mind is that the farm areas where there have been high rigid price supports, first in the war years, then in the year that followed, are the areas in which too many farmers have shown continuing inability to plan for themselves, continuing unwillingness to work out their own problems, and continuing failure to cut their production to fit consumption needs.

Throughout the Nation, many other agricultural industries which are being called upon to plan for themselves and to produce wisely, are prosperous and are doing well. Not only do they not want help, but they have seen the baneful effects of the too-great assistance which has been given in other places, and they do not want to subject themselves to the effects of the overuse of high support prices, as they see those effects developing, and unfortunately as such effects have already been greatly overdeveloped in some parts of our Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONFUSION SURROUNDING THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED PARTNERSHIP POWER PROGRAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, so much confusion and misinformation circulates around the present administration's so-called partnership power program that citizens directly affected are hard put to understand the full meaning of its implications. In my home State of Oregon, the efforts on behalf of partnership have been directed toward needed multiple-purpose projects which are already authorized by Congress for construction as units in the Federal system.

I have attempted to clarify this aspect of the drive for partnership in a recent letter replying to an editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard of April 8, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my reply to the editorial which appeared April 8, 1956, and the text of the editorial at issue.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of April 8, 1956]

SENATORS BLOCK EUGENE WATER AND ELECTRIC BOARD FROM COUGAR

There have been many people who have asked in recent weeks about the chances of the Eugene Water and Electric Board gaining approval for partnership participation in Cougar Dam on the South Fork of the McKenzie.

It is a good question. Ray Boals, superintendent for Eugene Water and Electric Board, says that work currently being done on the project by the Army engineers will not prevent the local utility from participating in the project later on. But the chances of partnership authorization getting through this session of Congress are indeed slim. A bill for partnership by Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH was approved in subcommittee but has been held from the full committee by the subcommittee chairman, JAMES DAVIS, Democrat of Georgia. Even if the bill reached the floor of the House and passed it would never pass the Senate because it would be blocked by Oregon's Senators, as it was once before by Senator MORSE after passing the House.

They believe it will wreck Federal power development in the Northwest and cut off the region from cheap hydroelectric power which they say is vital to attract industry.

In the case of aluminum and a few other industries this might be the case. But to contend that it would stop industrial development generally is pure poppycock. (To belabor this point, it hasn't stopped industrial development in California where private steam generation handles most of the power load.)

Our Senators want all-Federal development within the Bonneville system. But with the needs that are foreseen in the next 10 to 15 years, it is not realistic to believe that Congress will appropriate all the funds necessary to do the job.

Private capital, and capital from municipal utilities such as Eugene Water and Electric Board, is needed to take up the slack. Vital flood control dams are traditionally a Federal cost and it takes some doing to get appropriations for these.

So again, we must ask, what's wrong with the idea of partnership development of some of these projects? Is it an unfair use of a natural resource? We don't see how. Falling water is used to generate electricity to meet the needs of the population. If Eugene Water and Electric Board developed the power facilities at Cougar it would provide power for this area that would not have to be taken from the Bonneville system. Either way we get the power for the Northwest region. But with partnership development we get it now or in the near future when we will need it. In fact, it is our opinion that if we wait for all-Federal development we shall never meet our requirements, whether there is a Democratic or Republican administration. In the past 20 years the Federal Government has put about $2 billion into the Bonnevile system. Can we logically expect about $8 billion in the next 10 to 15 years? That is the estimated need to meet our requirements.

Opponents of partnership argue that private and municipal firms desiring to develop electric power would be taking all the profit from multi-purpose projects. This is a flimsy argument. When the Government builds the power features of a dam, the sale of the power over 50 years pays back the cost of the power part of the structure. It does not pay back the cost of the flood control features.

Under partnership, at Cougar for instance, Eugene Water and Electric Board would pay the costs of the propect allocated to power. It would be constructed under specifications acceptable to the Government and the Government would own all of the project except the powerhouse and the generators. Eugene Water and Electric Board would have the right to use the power for 50 years under a Federal Power Commission license. The Government would pay for the costs allocated to flood control and construct the project with Eugene Water and Electric Board and Federal funds.

At Cougar and at Green Peter-White Bridge on the Santiam the Government would be saved the expenditure of an estimated $40 million on power allocations, a sum that could well be applied to Libby or a number of other Federal projects so urgently needed.

If our Senators desire to aid development of the Northwest, they should get off their all-Federal power high-horse and take the lead on partnership development, particularly on some of the smaller multi-purpose projects. Their argument for all-Federal development is a political pipe dream and they know it.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 11, 1956.

To the EDITOR OF THE EUGENE REGISTER-GUARD:

Your recent editorial asked why Senator MORSE and I are blocking partnership construction of Cougar Dam. For your information, Cougar Dam is presently authorized and construction is underway as a Federal project. The law must be changed for it to become a partnership proposition. Why, I ask, are McKay, Ellsworth, Coon, and Norblad blocking Federal construction of Cougar which has already started? Why are the Republicans generally opposed to continuing the Federal program that has been so successful?

When Cougar Dam's powerplant is integrated into the Bonneville Power System, the Eugene Water and Electric Board will share—along with other public and private utilities of the region—in the new power supply. Contrast this with what happens under a partnership in which the Eugene

Water and Electric Board would own all the power. How would the power consumers of the Springfield Utility Board, Lane County Electric Co-op, Blachly-Lane County Co-op, and Pacific Power & Light Co. fare under a partnership which gave all the power to Eugene?

The Eugene customers, like those elsewhere, should receive a fair share of the Cougar power, and that's what they will get when Cougar is completed as a Federal project. I do not agree with your belief that customers of the Eugene Water and Electric Board have a greater right to Cougar power than those who reside outside the city limits. I think the power should be shared equitably, and this can best be accomplished with Cougar Dam as a Federal project.

Your editorial headline: "Senators Block Eugene Water and Electric Board from Cougar," can only have been motivated by political partisanship. Let's look at the record. The President's budget for 1956 requested $100,000 for Cougar Dam planning. The House, of which Mr. ELLSWORTH is a Member, approved the $100,000. Following this less-than-desirable action, Senator MORSE and I urgently requested the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase the funds so construction on Cougar could be started, and the day advanced when Eugene and other Bonneville customers could share in the Cougar power supply. The Senate approved an increase to $500,000 and work on Cougar has begun. Perhaps it is only during election years that words can be twisted so that work toward starting a project can mean that it is being blocked.

With great political fanfare, President Eisenhower recently signed the bill authorizing $785 million worth of Federal power projects in the upper Colorado Basin. The same Oregon Republicans, who plead so fervently for partnership in our region, were quite enthusiastic about Federal projects in the upper Colorado. Why are they blocking Federal projects in Oregon? Is the answer to be found in the fact that no private utilities would have the poor Colorado power sites, whereas the fine hydroelectric sites in Oregon's Columbia Basin are desired by so-called local interests?

The Federal-power program has brought the Northwest the cheapest electricity in the United States, as well as irrigation, navigation, and flood-control benefits. It is remarkable that every partnership proposal represents a retreat from these comprehensive values. Why do our Republican Congressmen lament that they cannot secure more funds for Federal development in the Northwest, when they themselves have helped push through $785 million worth of development for the upper Colorado?

It is true that Senator MORSE and I voted for the upper Colorado program, but we also are fighting hard for Federal projects in our own region. We would never be so hypocritical as to favor $785 million worth of upper Colorado Federal construction, while lamenting lugubriously that Congress would refuse further Federal funds in our own area. That, however, is the record of the Oregon Republicans—a record which some Oregon daily newspapers, ironically, find quite commendable.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

CONSTRUCTION BY IDAHO POWER CO. OF DAM IN HELLS CANYON STRETCH OF SNAKE RIVER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, only a few months ago the supporters of the Idaho Power Co., seeking to block construction of a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon, claimed that the water rights of irrigators which were established by State law would be impaired if a Federal project spanned the canyons of the Snake. These spokesmen for the company represented the Federal Government as some kind of a predator, crouched to override the water laws of the upstream States.

How quickly the leopard can change its spots.

The Idaho Power Co. has proceeded with the construction of a dam in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River in defiance of the laws of the State of Oregon. It now contends that its license received from the Federal Power Commission places it above the jurisdiction of the State, that permission of the State of Oregon is not necessary when the company appropriates a water resource of the State after receiving a Federal license.

What has happened to those stanch defenders of States rights who, before the Federal licenses were granted to the Idaho Power Co. for the dams in Hells Canyon, pictured the high Federal dam as a form of piracy threatening the farmers' water rights? Their silence is proof of the falseness of their claims.

The legislation to authorize the construction of a Federal dam at Hells Canyon specifically subordinated the operation of its power facilities to the water rights of upstream irrigators. The laws of the States were to govern in this respect.

The contrast between the respect for State law which would have been provided under the Federal construction of a dam in Hells Canyon and the defiance of State law which has resulted from licensing of Idaho Power Co. projects is pointedly discussed in an editorial from an outstanding Oregon newspaper.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Is This Case Different?" published in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., of April 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the East Oregonian of April 6, 1956]

IS THIS CASE DIFFERENT?

When Douglas McKay was governor of Oregon he said to a luncheon meeting in Walla Walla, "You know, I find that I have to remind Len Jordan that the State of Oregon has quite an interest, too, in the Snake River." It was at a meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee at which Idaho's Governor Jordan was present. Mr. McKay was speaking, of course, of Mr. Jordan's oft repeated statement that the State of Idaho must protect its rights to Snake River water by opposing Hells Canyon Dam. Mr. Jordan did not concede that Oregon might have some interest in Snake River waters that flowed between the borders of Idaho and Oregon.

In recent days the attorney general of the State of Oregon has decided that the Idaho Power Co. should have asked permission of the State of Oregon to construct Brownlee Dam on the Snake River. He has started proceedings to force the company to seek that permission. Idaho Power Co. has said that the only permission it considers necessary is that granted by the Federal Power Commission. The company so thoroughly believes it that it undertook construction of a bridge over the Snake without asking permission of the Corps of Engineers.

When Idaho's Governor Jordan was doing everything possible to prevent the construction of Hells Canyon Dam he and his followers warned that the high dam would encroach upon State rights. Now that Idaho Power Co. flaunts the rights of the State of Oregon, those same people in the State of Idaho are strangely silent.

In the State of Oregon some of the stoutest defenders of State rights see in the attorney general's action a political motivation. The same citizens see in a different light the move of Portland General Electric Co. to build a dam on the Deschutes River that has been opposed by the State hydroelectric commission.

Apparently, it is all a matter of whose ox is being gored.

Our hope is that we never shall see the day that Oregon's attorney general will not guard the rights of the State in the use of any and all waters in which the State has an interest.

The Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune has some interesting comments on the State of Oregon versus Idaho Power Co. case:

"The supporters of the 3 dams the Idaho Power Co. hopes to build as a substitute for a high Hells Canyon Dam have devoted several million words in recent years to the threat of Federal encroachment upon State rights. The theme had infinite variations. Every effort to reassure the public, particularly in southern Idaho, that a Federal high dam would operate in compliance with State law was drowned in the flood of 'man your floodgates' oratory. The Federal Government was pictured as the fearsome ogre which would crush all State rights in its sweep toward domination of the region. The Idaho Power Co., by contrast, was pictured as a local interest under full supervision and control by State agencies and dedicated unswervingly to preservation of State rights.

"The question arises, of course, as to why the Idaho Power Co. currently is paying such devoted attention to the wierdly reasoned decision of a Federal agency, the FPC, and so little attention to the protests of the Oregon attorney general. The answer, of course, is that the FPC opinion is favorable to Idaho Power's objectives, and the Oregon attorney general's protests are unfavorable to those objectives.

"The rest is campaign oratory, as most of it has been throughout the Hells Canyon battle. The crusade for State's rights' does not happen to have much bearing at the moment upon Idaho Power's plans. Therefore, it can be ignored for the time being while construction of Brownlee goes ahead at full speed.

"There is nothing particularly alarming about this situation. Idaho Power's approach seems to be realistic and logical. Its objectives have been clear enough to anyone who cared to see them. It is proceeding toward those objectives according to plan.

"The disturbing thing has always been the uncritical acceptance by thousands of people of the image of Idaho Power as the stalwart champion of State's rights and protector of the people from their own Federal Government.

"The slight disagreement between the Oregon attorney general and Idaho Power would be mainly useful if it persuaded some of these people to make a belated reexamination of some of the campaign oratory."

DUPLICITY OF ADMINISTRATION'S ACTIVITIES IN FIELD OF WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the duplicity of the present administration's activities in the field of water-resource development is reflected in many recent developments. The claims of the administration spokesman that there is not sufficient money in the Treasury for

Hells Canyon Dam is contradicted by approval of the $750 million Upper Colorado storage project. The administration contends that the magnificent Columbia River basin dam sites can be developed only by private power company partners, but at the same time gives its full backing to wholly Federal construction on the Colorado. What is the reason for this Jekyll-and-Hyde philosophy in a field of vital concern to our national welfare? Are powerful pressures at work which require one pattern for development of one river system, and a completely different approach to another?

The method by which word and action often differ in the present administration's power policy is discussed in a recent column by the distinguished journalist, Thomas L. Stokes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article written by Mr. Stokes, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORD AND ACTION SOMETIMES DIFFER—EISENHOWER O. K. OF COLORADO RIVER BILL VIEWED AS RUNNING COUNTER TO POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It's easy to understand how our people can be fooled about what goes on here. Often there's a difference in what is said about policy and what is actually done.

An example is what President Eisenhower said at Augusta, Ga., when he signed into law the bill recently passed by Congress for the mammoth upper Colorado River storage project to be developed by the Federal Government.

"This," he said, "represents something I believe in." It follows his idea, he explained, of "treating river valleys as a whole thing—it goes from top to bottom—it recognizes that one thing is certainly true—water is getting to be one of our most valuable resources."

Such an aim first was expressed half a centry ago by President Theodore Roosevelt. He told Congress in his first message of the need for great storage works to equalize the flow of streams which, he said, were too big to be undertaken by private interests, as is the case with the Colorado River project. In a later message to Congress, Theodore Roosevelt advocated integrated public development of our river systems for navigation, flood control, reclamation, and production of electric power.

It was not until many years later that his vision began to come true in great public projects—Boulder Canyon Dam in Nevada during the Hoover administration, later renamed Hoover Dam, and, in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, a whole bevy of giant projects—TVA in the South, Bonneville in Oregon, Grand Coulee in Washington, Shasta in California, Hungry Horse in Montana, and so on.

But, if President Eisenhower believes in treating river valleys as a whole thing, he either has not told the responsible officials in his administration or they have not followed his instructions. For, until the upper Colorado, in which special factors are involved, the administration's policy had been contrary to treating river valleys as a whole thing. That's why conservationists have so bitterly attacked the administration policy.

In letter or spirit the principle now espoused by the President has been violated in numerous instances. Perhaps the most graphic illustration is in the case of another great river system like the Colorado—the Columbia, which spans our Pacific Northwest. Both Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are on it. When built in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration they were envisaged as part of a series to develop the Columbia system from top to bottom. A grand plan for unified and integrated development of the Columbia Basin was completed by the Army Engineer Corps in 1950 after Bonneville and Grand Coulee were built.

But the Eisenhower administration has scrapped this in the so-called "partnership" of Federal Government with private utilities proclaimed by President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign speech at Seattle and faithfully executed by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

This violation of "treating river valleys as a whole thing began at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a Columbia tributary, along the Oregon-Idaho border. The Army engineers had recommended a high dam there to be built by the Federal Government to utilize the full potential of the river and fit Hells Canyon most effectively into the Columbia River plan. But Secretary McKay stopped this. He withdrew an application for a license for Federal development submitted by the Interior Department in the Truman administration to the Federal Power Commission to carry out the Army engineer plan. That opened the way for a private power company, Idaho Power, to put in its bid to build, instead, three small dams, which subsequently was granted by the FPC. This would mean piecemeal development that would throw the whole Army engineer plan askew.

Though this was represented as "partnership" with a local power company, that came to be a joke around here. For Idaho Power stock is owned mostly in the East, and stockholders were, in fact, holding their annual meeting at Augusta, Maine, the day that Secretary McKay opened the way for them to cut in on Hells Canyon by withdrawing the application for a license to carry out the Army engineer plan. In turn, this discarding of the Army engineer plan at Hells Canyon led to other private utility companies coming forward with plans for small "partnership" dams at other points in the Columbia system. That, if carried through, would prevent the building of larger dams called for by the Army engineers. It can only be stopped through a suit now pending in the courts brought by the Hells Canyon Association to invalidate the license of the Idaho Power Co. or by Congress acting on bills which have been bottled up.

Thus far the utilities have been successful in fighting the public development of the Columbia as projected by the Army engineers and are making a mockery out of the Eisenhower theory of "treating river valleys as a whole thing." In the case of the upper Colorado, the utilities were not interested, as this is not to be utilized for power on the same scope and does not offer the rich profits of the Columbia and so they were content to let the Government develop it.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, for the reasons so well outlined in the President's message, a veto was the only course open to him on the farm bill. Enactment of the bill would have resulted in further piling up of surpluses, restricting markets, and bringing about more restrictive controls.

In 1957 the cotton industry will be faced with further acreage reductions to the overall tune of 8.9 percent, as the reductions would affect each State, according to a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States	1956 allotment	1957 allotment	Acreage reduction for 1957	Percentage reduction from 1956 to 1957
Alabama	1,025,141	905,503	119,638	11.7
Arizona	343,640	328,995	14,645	4.3
Arkansas	1,424,511	1,271,412	153,099	10.7
California	782,405	737,294	44,111	5.8
Florida	36,974	34,111	2,863	7.7
Georgia	903,221	805,369	97,852	10.8
Illinois	3,110	3,110	0	
Kansas	29	29	0	
Kentucky	7,799	6,841	958	12.3
Louisiana	610,891	543,435	67,456	11.0
Maryland	25	25	0	
Mississippi	1,646,562	1,458,671	187,891	11.4
Missouri	378,055	341,192	36,863	9.8
Nevada	2,324	2,324	0	
New Mexico	179,378	167,373	12,005	6.7
North Carolina	483,932	428,152	55,780	11.5
Oklahoma	845,616	755,397	90,219	10.7
South Carolina	726,193	649,484	76,709	10.6
Tennessee	563,491	510,836	52,605	9.3
Texas	7,410,893	6,877,025	533,868	7.2
Virginia	17,114	14,956	2,158	12.6
Total	17,391,304	15,841,584	1,549,720	8.9

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as for cotton, the most depressing problem facing cotton farmers and the cotton industry was the need for regaining and maintaining our traditional and historic export markets.

This could be done only by meeting the price competition of foreign-produced cotton and foreign synthetics in the foreign markets. Cotton producer organizations from one end of the Cotton Belt to the other clearly recognized that fact last fall, and agreed that if the Secretary of Agriculture would exercise the authority vested in him by Congress to make United States cotton competitive, pricewise, in the export market, the cotton producers would make their contribution toward the solution of the overall problem by accepting a moderately lower support price, thereby improving cotton's competitive position with synthetics in the domestic market.

The cotton growers' organizations agreed to accept price reductions of from 3 to 3½ cents a pound in order to make cotton competitive with rayon. Under the 82½ percent of parity, which was announced today in the President's veto message, cotton prices will be reduced only about 2½ cents a pound. That is a rough estimate, which is very close to being correct.

So far as cotton is concerned, the main thing wrong with H. R. 12 was that it would have provided a return to a rigid system of price supports, thereby holding a price umbrella over domestic synthetic fiber production, which would have made impossible an improvement in the position of cotton in competition with rayon in the domestic market, and would have seriously impaired our chances for obtaining the kind of export program for cotton which would have been really adequate in effectively meeting foreign price competition from foreign-produced cotton and synthetics.

It was for this reason, which dealt with the very heart of cotton's most serious problem, that I felt compelled to vote against the conference report. That is not to say that there were not a number of provisions in H. R. 12 which were constructive and urgently needed, so far as cotton is concerned.

Mr. President, what is necessary is to establish a minimum acreage allotment for cotton for the years 1957 and 1958. Otherwise, there will be an additional reduction in the acreage allotment for 1957 of 8.9 percent, as I have said, and a further acreage reduction in 1958 of, roughly, 6 percent. Mississippi would take an acreage reduction of, roughly, 8 percent. Acreage reductions are destructive of the industry, tend to pull down farm income, and, if continued, there will be no way whereby a cotton farm can be operated at a profit.

Furthermore, in the South there are millions of small farmers who plant 4 acres of cotton or less. They must be provided for by appropriate legislation.

Third, H. R. 12 contained a provision which would clear up the question as to whether the President had the authority to deal with the problem of textile imports by negotiation with the individual countries from which such imports emanate.

Fourth, the bill contained a provision to rectify a very serious injustice which is being worked upon the producers of extra long staple cotton.

Fifth, the bill contained provisions for the soil bank, which would have made possible further voluntary reductions in production, without the loss of net income to farmers.

Mr. President, I therefore feel that the most constructive course we could now pursue would be to delete from H. R. 12 the specific provisions to which the President has objected so seriously, and return to him the remainder of the bill without further delay.

It would be a simple matter for the Congress to follow this course, and place upon the President's desk a farm bill which he could sign before the end of this week.

I urge my colleagues to take such action as is necessary to bring this about.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—DOCUMENTS FURNISHED BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wish to give the Senate some information.

A few days ago when the Senate was considering the CIA joint resolution I stated that if the resolution were passed I would turn over to the proposed new joint committee some 50 or more documents having to do with everything from incompetence to communism in the CIA. The resolution failed, and the joint committee was not established.

The question arose as to whether the information should go to the Armed Services Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, headed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], or to the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. I felt that the Internal Security Subcommittee had the most complete jurisdiction of the subject, so I have turned over the documents, as of today, to the subcommittee of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], not because I preferred that subcommittee to the other committee but because I thought that it had unquestionable jurisdiction on the subject.

I know they will have difficulty getting the witnesses from the CIA. They refused to appear before our committee. However, I hope that we will test on the Senate floor the right of the Internal Security Subcommittee to get the necessary information. For that reason I have turned over all the pertinent material to the Eastland committee.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 97. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, this joint resolution authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million a year to $3 million a year. It also authorizes an increase in the ceiling on the authorized contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year.

The joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations on July 27 of last year. It was considered briefly in the Senate July 30, but no action was taken in the adjournment rush.

When Congress reconvened in January, the Committee on Foreign Relations again considered the matter in the light of developments in the intervening months. After discussion with Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox and Assistant Secretary of Labor J. Ernest Wilkins, and after further consideration, the committee saw no reason to change the position which it had taken last July—namely, that the resolution is a meritorious one and should be passed.

Indeed, Mr. President, passage of the resolution is daily becoming more urgent, particularly so far as the ILO is concerned. Let me review the situation briefly for the Senate.

At a meeting in March of this year, the ILO governing body adopted a budget for the calandar year 1957 amounting to a net of $7.6 million. The vote, by the way, was 28 to 10, with the United States voting "No." This budget will be presented to the ILO Conference in June for final approval; but in view of the almost three to one vote in the governing body, there is little reason to anticipate contrary action by the Conference.

On the basis of 25 percent, which is the current rate of assessment of the United States in the ILO this budget will call for a United States contribution of $1.9 million. The net contribution can be reduced to $1.8 million by taking advantage of an expected credit accruing from earlier years; but, even so, our assessment will be $50,000 above the existing statutory ceiling.

Thus, it is clear that the United States will be confronted with an assessment which it cannot pay unless Congress raises the ceiling. Although this budget is for 1957, and we would not actually be in default until that time, our influence at the June conference would obviously be at a low ebb if we went there with the whole world knowing that we would be unable to meet our obligations. An organization does not pay much attention to the thoughts of a member who is avowedly about to refuse to pay his dues.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, our delinquency might turn out to be even greater than the figure of $50,000 which I mentioned. That figure was based on a calculation of our assessment at the rate of 25 percent. That rate has been in effect since 1951, and there has been growing pressure within the ILO to revise all assessments to bring them more into line with the United Nations scale, under which the United States pays 33.3 percent. I do not think that the ILO would undertake such a drastic revision in one step, but I do think we have to anticipate some increase in the percentage of our assessment.

The question has been raised as to whether we should continue to participate at all in the ILO; or, if we do continue to participate, whether we should increase our contributions. To state the question another way, we have three possible courses of action:

First. We can withdraw entirely from the ILO. For reasons which I shall elaborate on a little later, this would not be a wise course for us to take, but it would

at least have the merits of being forthright and unequivocal.

Second. We can defeat this bill and continue in the ILO under our present legislation. This, I think, is probably the worst thing we could do. We would be half in, half out, delinquent in our assessments, utterly without influence, and in general offering an altogether sorry spectacle for a Nation which is supposed to be in a position of world leadership.

Third. We can pass this measure and continue to participate in the ILO on a vigorous, wholehearted, full-membership basis. This seems to me to be clearly the wisest course for us to take. If we are going to belong to an organization as important as the ILO, we ought to belong to it all the way—we ought to work in it and try to get our ideas adopted by it. We ought to take a seat up in front, and not one by the door, where we can walk out every time something does not go to suit us or where the other members can throw us out for nonpayment of dues.

The ILO is unique among international organizations in that its delegates represent private groups, as well as governments. Each member of the ILO has two government delegates, plus one delegate representing employers, and one representing workers. The organization was established in 1919 to promote the voluntary cooperation of nations in improving working and living conditions. The United States has been a member since 1934.

The principal impetus for United States withdrawal from the ILO at this time comes from Mr. William McGrath, who was the American employer delegate in 1954 and 1955. In his public statements, Mr. McGrath has voiced numerous complaints about the ILO; but so far as I can determine, all of them come under three main headings:

First, a great many foolish proposals are advanced in the ILO. While Mr. McGrath evidently differs with a good many persons, even in his own country, as to what is foolish and what is not, I think we can all agree that there are some foolish proposals advanced in the ILO. Well, Mr. President, there are some foolish proposals advanced in every organization—even in the Congress of the United States; but I never heard of an individual's refusing to serve in Congress because of that fact. The truth is that most of the foolish proposals in the ILO meet the same fate as those in Congress: They are buried, and never are adopted.

The few which may be adopted can be farmful to the United States only to the extent that we ourselves are foolish enough to put them into effect. This fact destroys the validity of Mr. McGrath's second major complaint, which is that the ILO is an international lawmaking body bent upon legislating socialism into existence throughout the world. This can only be described as plain nonsense. The ILO has no power whatsoever over any sovereign country on the face of the world. The ILO can only act through recommendations, which do not have to be followed, or through conventions, which do not have to be ratified, and which, of course, are not binding unless they are ratified.

Finally, Mr. McGrath complains that the employer and worker delegates from the Soviet Union and other Communist countries are, in fact, merely additional government delegates, and do not represent free employers and free workers. This is a valid point, and I disagree with Mr. McGrath only as to the conclusion to be drawn from it. He thinks we ought to get out of the ILO. I think we ought to stay in it, and fight harder than ever to show up this Communist fiction for what it is.

Incidentally, Mr. President, I may say that at the present time there is within the International Labor Ogranization a subcommittee looking into the matter of so-called employer representation on the part of the Communist states which happen to be members of the Organization.

I am not alone in believing that we should remain in the ILO. The executive council of the AFL–CIO thinks so. It recently said:

> We regard the ILO as a vital forum through which to promote the cause of freedom and democracy in the world. We take this opportunity to officially reiterate our full and unqualified support of the ILO and of United States membership and active participation therein.
>
> We urge the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 97.

The Catholic Church thinks so. I quote from an editorial of March 16, 1956, issue of the New World, official Catholic paper of the archdiocese of Chicago and the diocese of Joliet:

> The Holy See has been one of the ILO's strongest supporters from the very beginning of the Organization. In November 1954, the Holy Father enthusiastically welcomed the members of the ILO governing body in a special audience at the Vatican and, echoing the sentiments of his predecessor, vigorously endorsed the important work that they are doing for the cause of social justice. * * *
>
> Moreover, as recently as January of this year, a French Jesuit, Father Joblin, was appointed to the staff of the ILO with the advice and consent of the Holy See. * * * The fact that Father Joblin's appointment was made long after the problem of Communist representation in the ILO became a public issue is an obvious indication that the Holy See is not in favor of scuttling the Organization merely because of the fact that Russia and some of her satellites are included in its membership.

Further, Mr. President, as recently as April 4, less than 2 weeks ago, the economic subcommittee of the Catholic Association for International Peace found that American withdrawal from the ILO "would play directly into the hands of the Communists."

Finally, Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers—the two groups who nominate our employer delegate—have decided to continue their participation this year. Although they are not without some misgivings about the matter, they have rejected Mr. McGrath's proposal for immediate withdrawal from the ILO.

Mr. President, let me say just a word about the paragraph of the joint resolution relating to the Food and Agriculture Organization. I think there would be general agreement that this agency has done one of the best jobs of any of the UN specialized agencies. It certainly has one of the most important jobs—namely, that of keeping food production up with population increases in underdeveloped countries.

The FAO Conference last fall voted a budget of $6.6 million for 1956 and of $6.8 million for 1957. The vote, incidentally, was 24 to 23, with the United States voting "No." After taking account of small miscellaneous income, the amount of these budgets which will have to be met by assessments is $6.5 million in 1956 and $6.7 million in 1957. The United States assessment for each of these years is 31.5 percent. These assessments can be met within the existing ceiling by taking advantage of a credit which has accrued to the United States in the FAO Working Capital Fund.

It is apparent, however, that the United States is operating on a very thin margin, that our 1958 assessment will breach our ceiling, that the ceiling would therefore have to be raised next year in any event, and that in the meantime our whole position in the FAO will be strengthened by timely action to raise the ceiling now.

Mr. President, the amounts of money involved here are not large. The total increase provided for by this resolution to be spread over a period of years is less than half of one one-thousandth of the unexpended balances of appropriations for military assistance. The amounts involved here appear even more trifling when considered in relation to the damage our international position would suffer if we were to fail to play our full part in both the ILO and FAO.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously reported the joint resolution. I know I express the hope of the chairman and of other members of the committee when I urge the Senate to pass the joint resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the Senator that I intend to support the joint resolution, either with or without some of the amendments which have been suggested, depending upon the discussion which may follow.

However, I think it is only fair to say that in the Committee on Foreign Relations there was the feeling that both the FOA and the ILO had a part to play, despite the objections, and perhaps some of the legitimate criticisms which have been raised. The viewpoint of the American Federation of Labor and the CIO as to their usefulness was pointed out. While the representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce had some questions, they felt, as I understood, that perhaps the ILO should be continued for another year or so, and

that perhaps further studies should be made by the Congress as to its value.

While the representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers were perhaps not so enthusiastic, I think it may be said that many of them felt that the organization should not be terminated without further investigation, and that perhaps it was too early to terminate it. For that reason I do not believe it should be terminated at this time.

However, I think it is only fair to say that there was considerable discussion in the Foreign Relations Committee apropos of the question of the percentages which the United States might properly contribute to these agencies and to the overall situation.

At one time we were contributing considerably more than 33⅓ percent for the total United Nations operation until, at the instigation of the late Senator Vandenberg and other members of the Committee on Foreign Relations at the time, and also members of the Appropriations Committee, a limitation of 33⅓ percent, as I recall, was established.

In the discussions before the Committee on Foreign Relations—I know it has been true in the Appropriations Committee—it has been pointed out that this figure was not necessarily intended to be a permanent level, and that it might properly be 30 percent or 25 percent. I do not know just what the amount might properly be. However, it seems to me that there are other nations which are not carrying their fair share of the load, and there are some which, for various reasons, have not been able to pay their assessments. At least we have been doing that, within the limitations established.

I hope the Department of State will bear in mind that there may very well arise—and properly so—in the Congress a feeling that 33⅓ percent for support of the independent agencies and the United Nations itself is too much, and that the figure should perhaps move toward 25 percent, rather than upward, or rather than necessarily remaining stationary.

I thought that the discussion today should at least point out the fact that that particular topic was the subject of considerable discussion in our committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished minority leader has just said is true. He has given us a very good, though very brief, résumé of the discussions which took place in the committee relative to this particular subject. I can corroborate every statement he has made.

Of course, we are all in accord with his idea that at the first favorable opportunity we should do what we can to reduce our contributions, if we can do so legitimately and within reason, and not be wedded to a figure of 33⅓ percent, or a higher figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Louisiana that an amendment offered by him is already pending before the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the amendment I have just sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Possibly it is the same amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the same amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment has been pending since July of last year. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the ratio of (a) the contributions made hereafter by the United States in any year to defray the expenses of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, or of the International Labor Organization, to (b) the total contributions made by all nations in such year for such purpose shall not exceed the ratio of (1) the contributions made by the United States for such purpose in the year in which this section is enacted to (2) the total contributions made by all nations for such purpose in that year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that for the past few years the Committee on Appropriations has been carefully examining these contributions in an effort to make them uniform, if possible, and to not further increase the amounts percentagewise. That is now being done with respect to the various international organizations.

It will be recalled that when the United Nations was first organized, the contribution made by the United States amounted to almost 40 percent of the entire amount required to operate that organization. Over the years the amount has been decreased percentagewise, to where it is now 33⅓ percent of the total.

Great Britain is, as of now, contributing 8.55 percent. The U. S. S. R. is contributing 15.28 percent. France is contributing 6.23 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point tables showing the contributions being made by all members of the United Nations.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*United Nations: Scale of assessments*

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.08	33,040	0.08	31,712	0.06	28,998
Argentina	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.28	618,624
Australia	1.75	722,750	1.80	713,520	1.80	869,940
Belgium	1.38	569,940	1.38	547,032	1.38	666,954
Bolivia	.06	24,780	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Brazil	1.40	578,200	1.32	523,248	1.20	579,960
Burma	.13	53,690	.13	51,532	.11	53,163
Byelorussian S. S. R.	.50	206,500	.53	210,092	.53	256,149
Canada	3.30	1,362,900	3.63	1,438,932	3.63	1,754,379
Chile	.33	136,290	.30	118,920	.33	159,489
China	5.62	2,321,060	5.62	2,227,768	5.62	2,716,146
Colombia	.41	169,330	.41	162,524	.41	198,153
Costa Rica	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Cuba	.34	140,420	.30	118,920	.30	144,990
Czechoslovakia	1.05	433,650	.94	372,616	.92	444,636
Denmark	.78	322,140	.74	293,336	.72	347,976
Dominican Republic	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Ecuador	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.05	24,165
Egypt	.47	194,110	.40	158,560	.40	193,320
El Salvador	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998
Ethiopia	.10	41,300	.12	47,568	.12	57,996
France	5.75	2,374,750	5.90	2,338,760	6.23	3,010,959
Greece	0.21	86,730	0.21	83,244	0.22	106,326
Guatemala	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,831
Haiti	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Honduras	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Iceland	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
India	3.40	1,404,200	3.30	1,308,120	3.25	1,570,725
Indonesia	.60	247,800	.56	221,984	.56	270,648
Iran	.28	115,640	.25	99,100	.30	144,990
Iraq	.12	49,560	.11	43,604	.13	62,829
Israel	.17	70,210	.17	67,388	.17	82,161
Lebanon	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Liberia	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Luxembourg	.06	24,780	.06	23,784	.06	28,998
Mexico	.75	309,750	.80	317,120	.77	372,141
Netherlands	1.25	516,250	1.25	495,500	1.25	604,125
New Zealand	.48	198,240	.48	190,272	.48	231,984
Nicaragua	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Norway	.50	206,500	.50	198,200	.54	260,982
Pakistan	.75	309,750	.67	265,588	.60	289,980
Panama	.05	20,650	.05	19,820	.05	24,165
Paraguay	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Peru	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.16	77,328
Philippines	0.45	185,850	0.45	178,380	0.45	217,485
Poland	1.73	714,490	1.73	685,772	1.70	821,610
Saudi Arabia	.07	28,910	.07	27,748	.07	33,831
Sweden	1.65	681,450	1.59	630,276	1.59	768,447
Syria	.08	33,040	.08	31,712	.08	38,664
Thailand	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
Turkey	.65	268,450	.65	257,660	.69	333,477
Ukrainian S. S. R.	1.88	776,440	2.00	792,800	2.02	976,266
Union of South Africa	.78	322,140	.78	309,192	.78	376,974
United Kingdom	9.80	4,047,400	8.85	3,508,140	8.55	4,132,215
United States	33.33	13,765,290	33.33	13,212,012	33.33	16,108,389
Uruguay	.18	74,340	.18	71,352	.18	86,994
U. S. S. R.	14.15	5,843,950	15.08	5,977,712	15.28	7,384,824
Venezuela	.39	161,070	.44	174,416	.47	227,151
Yemen	.04	16,520	.04	15,856	.04	19,332
Yugoslavia	.44	181,720	.44	174,416	.40	193,320
Total	100.00	[1] 41,300,000	100.00	[1] 39,640,000	100.00	[2] 48,330,000

[1] 60 members.
[2] 76 members. New members admitted in December 1955; assessments not yet determined: Austria, Albania, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, Rumania, Spain.

TABLE 3.—*Food and Agriculture Organization: Scale of assessments*

Member countries	Calendar year 1954		Calendar year 1955		Calendar year 1956	
	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment	Percent	Assessment
Afghanistan	0.16	$9,481	0.12	$7,068	0.08	$5,168
Argentina	1.83	108,437	1.60	94,240	1.63	105,298
Australia	2.00	118,510	2.06	121,334	2.29	147,934
Austria	.38	22,517	.55	32,395	.49	31,654
Belgium	1.78	105,474	1.76	103,664	1.75	113,050
Bolivia	.06	3,555	.08	4,712	.06	3,876
Brazil	1.52	90,067	1.71	100,719	1.52	98,192
Burma	.16	9,481	.15	8,835	.14	9,044
Cambodia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Canada	4.76	282,054	5.69	335,141	4.61	297,806
Ceylon	.13	7,703	.20	11,780	.15	9,690
Chile	.31	18,369	.41	24,149	.42	27,132
Colombia	.40	23,702	.65	38,285	.52	33,592
Costa Rica	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Cuba	.46	27,257	.50	29,450	.38	24,548
Denmark	1.08	63,995	.91	53,599	.91	58,786
Dominican Republic	.05	2,963	.07	4,123	.06	3,876
Ecuador	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876
Egypt	.55	32,590	.60	35,340	.51	32,946
El Salvador	.05	2,963	.08	4,712	.08	5,168
Ethiopia	.15	8,888	.13	7,657	.15	9,690
Finland	.43	25,480	.56	32,984	.52	33,592
France	6.70	397,008	7.49	441,161	7.91	510,986
Germany	4.73	280,276	5.66	333,374	5.85	377,910
Greece	.27	15,999	.38	22,382	.28	18,088
Guatemala	.08	4,740	.10	5,890	.09	5,814
Haiti	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Honduras	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Iceland	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
India	5.18	306,941	4.55	267,995	4.13	266,798
Indonesia	.52	30,813	.83	48,887	.71	45,866
Iran			.34	20,026	.38	24,548
Iraq	.12	7,111	.12	7,068	.16	10,336
Ireland	.40	23,702	.27	15,903	.27	17,442
Israel	.13	7,703	.19	11,191	.22	14,212
Italy	3.19	189,023	2.99	176,111	2.88	186,048
Japan	2.25	133,324	2.79	164,331	2.73	176,358
Jordan	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Korea	0.09	$5,333	0.16	$9,424	0.11	$7,106
Laos	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Lebanon	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.06	3,876
Liberia	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Libya			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Luxembourg	.06	3,555	.07	4,123	.08	5,168
Mexico	.81	47,996	1.14	67,146	.98	63,308
Nepal	.10	5,925	.08	4,712	.04	2,584
Netherlands	1.70	100,733	1.26	74,214	1.59	102,714
New Zeland	.65	38,516	.58	34,162	.61	39,406
Nicaragua	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Norway	.66	39,108	.65	38,285	.69	44,574
Pakistan	.98	58,070	1.15	67,735	.76	49,096
Panama	.05	2,963	.06	3,534	.06	3,876
Paraguay	.05	2,963	.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Peru			.21	12,369	.20	12,920
Philippines	.22	13,036	.74	43,586	.57	36,822
Portugal	.65	38,516	.37	21,793	.34	21,964
Saudi Arabia	.06	3,555	.09	5,301	.09	5,814
Spain	1.37	81,179	1.62	95,418	1.59	102,714
Sweden	2.11	125,028	1.97	116,033	2.02	130,492
Switzerland	1.56	92,438	1.54	90,706	1.60	103,360
Syria	.10	5,925	.10	5,890	.10	6,460
Thailand	.17	10,073	.30	17,670	.23	14,858
Tunisia					.06	3,876
Turkey	.66	39,108	.79	46,531	.88	56,848
Union of South Africa	.95	56,292	.77	45,353	.99	63,954
United Kingdom	15.03	890,603	10.49	617,861	10.87	702,202
United States of America	30.00	1,777,650	30.00	1,767,000	31.50	2,034,900
Uruguay	.25	14,814	.23	13,547	.23	14,858
Venezuela	.45	26,665	.57	33,573	.60	38,760
Vietnam	.23	13,629	.21	12,369	.22	14,212
Yemen			.05	2,945	.04	2,584
Yugoslavia	.66	39,108	.60	35,340	.51	32,946
Total	100.00	[1] 5,925,500	100.00	[2] 5,890,000	100.00	[3] 6,460,000

[1] 67 members.
[2] 71 members.
[3] 72 members.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the joint resolution we are now considering is passed, we will automatically have abandoned the proposition that many of us have advanced in the past, to decrease the amounts of our contributions percentagewise, or at least, to hold them at present levels. The total amount of the contribution that is now assessed against the United States for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is $2 million. Percentagewise we are now furnishing 31.5 percent. If we increase the amount to $3 million, as is being asked in the joint resolution, it is entirely possible that the amount of the contribution percentagewise will be much greater than the overall limitation on contributions of 33⅓ percent, the goal toward which we have been aiming for several years.

If with our contribution of $2 million, we have now reached the percentagewise level of 31½ percent, then with $3 million the percentage may well climb to 37 or 38 percent of the total.

Therefore the suggestion I would make is that instead of fixing the amount at so many millions of dollars for the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization, we limit, percentagewise, the amounts to be contributed. The amount, as I have indicated, that we are contributing to the Food and Agriculture Organization is 31½ percent. With respect to ILO, we are now contributing 25 percent. The limitation that is now on the statute books is $1,750,000. If we raise the amount to $3 million, it is entirely possible that our contribution will be in excess of the overall limitation on U. N. contributions of 33⅓ percent which is certainly an ample burden for us to bear.

I do not wish to withdraw from any of these organizations. However, I do believe that our contributions should be within reason, and that if increased expenditures are necessary, that other nations should contribute a pro rata share of those increases.

With respect to all these organizations, our contribution is far in excess of that of any other country in the world.

For example, the contribution we are making to the Organization of American States is in the neighborhood of 66 percent of the total budget. In the United Nations, in connection with the technical aid program, we have been contributing as much as 65 percent for that program. That is entirely aside from any amount that we contribute directly to the various nations of the world through our own technical aid and mutual assistance programs.

As was stated by my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], instead of increasing the amounts percentagewise, it strikes me that we should let them stand where they are or fix a ceiling of, at the maximum, 33½ percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has made what I believe to be a very meritorious and worthwhile suggestion. I have discussed the matter with the distinguished minority leader and with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], both of whom are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and they have proposed the possibility of offering an amendment from the committee which would read as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agriculture Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

That does not mean that that percentage should be reached automatically, but it does set a ceiling. Of course, it would be the intent of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and especially of the Committee on Appropriations, of which the Senator from Louisiana is a member, as well as of Congress as a whole, to make certain that our requirements be held down to the most reasonable minimum.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator concedes that if we should put a limitation of $3 million instead of the $2 million in the joint resolution, it would be entirely possible that the amount we might contribute to the Food and Agriculture Organization would be in excess of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same would be true with respect to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact it is probable that such would be the situation if we raised the contribution from $1,750,000 to $3 million.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator's point is a good one. If we had a dollar limitation alone, it might

have—depending on what the size of the budget was—the tendency to do what the Senator suggests. I think the amendment which the Senator from Montana has suggested would at least keep the figures from getting out of line with the other percentages.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator—I do not know whether he was in the Chamber when I spoke on this subject earlier today—that we must make a close study of the situation to determine if we cannot get the percentages to move downward, instead of upward. At least the amendment would tend to keep them in conformity with the efforts which Congress has heretofore made, to keep the top limitation at 33⅓ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment I offered is to fix the percentagewise contribution at its present level. However, I realize that it may be a little difficult to do that. Instead of using dollar figures, the Senator would limit the amount percentagewise to make the amount not over 33⅓ percent, the ceiling which we have been trying to apply with respect to other organizations. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that that would be correct. However, I am inclined to believe—and I would also wish to check the matter with our staff—that unless we add a dollar amount, the problem would not be solved, because there is already a dollar restriction in effect. Therefore, it seems to me that the suggestion of the Senator from Montana, to let the dollar figure stand but to provide also that in no event shall the amount exceed 33⅓ percent, would take care of the situation at both ends.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated earlier, the Senate should not abandon the idea of not increasing the amounts, percentagewise, of our contributions to these agencies; on the contrary, we should adopt those limitations. In the past 4 or 5 year the Senate Appropriations Committee has been able to considerably reduce the amounts we have been contributing to various international organizations, and particularly with reference to the specialized agencies of United Nations. If the amendment which I have proposed should be adopted, it would mean that the amount could be increased—that is, if the agency budget were increased—but, percentagewise, our contributions would remain fixed at the present levels. With respect to the International Labor Organization, it would remain at 25 percent, and with respect to the Food and Agriculture Organization, it would remain at 31½ percent, if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I hesitate to take a backward step, but rather than passing a bill under which it may be possible to go above the 33⅓ percent which has been our goal, I would much prefer that the measure be amended as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, to limit the amount percentagewise, so that in no event can either of those organizations obtain a larger contribution for this Nation than 33⅓ percent of the total agency budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment and asking that it be read?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is pending, it might be well if the Senator would temporarily withdraw his amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, which would be placed at the end of the joint resolution, would fix the maximum at 33⅓ percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I am a fair compromiser. I should like to see my amendment adopted, of course, but, with so many apparently against it, I shall withdraw it with the understanding that a limitation will be imposed, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Montana, so that the amounts to be contributed cannot exceed 33⅓ percent of the budgets.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the language is very clear, because it is proposed to add section 2, reading as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization will not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the understanding that the amendment will be offered and adopted, I shall withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana is withdrawn. The Senator from Montana has an amendment at the desk, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution, it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of this act, the payments by the United States to the Food and Agricultural Organization and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the amendment is a wise one, but I wish to be certain as to what is proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are now proposing to fix a percentage ceiling, a question which has been discussed among the members of the committee. We think it is quite agreeable and is probably the best compromise which can be reached at this time.

It means, of course, that, if necessary, in the case of the ILO the amount could be raised from approximately 25 percent to as much as 33⅓ percent. As I recall, the amount contributed for FAO is now approximately 31.5 percent. I think it should be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, if in the event of the allocation to this country of its share the expenditure for ILO were raised to 33⅓ percent, which is provided for by the amendment of the Senator from Montana, there would be sufficient money——

Mr. MANSFIELD. There would be more than sufficient money so far as the dollar amount is concerned, but that would be a matter for the Committee on Appropriations to decide, based on the facts made available to them as to how much would or would not be appropriated to these subsidiary organizations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The reason why I press the question is because in the statement submitted by the Department of State, explaining the reasons for the proposed legislation in great detail, I find the last paragraph reads as follows:

If the present ceiling of $1,750,000 remains, the United States will have little or no flexibility for negotiation, particularly as regards the assessment scale when this issue is considered by the governing body in November. The Department of State and the Department of Labor believe that the United States would be in a better position to obtain a reasonable solution on this issue, and on other financial and substantive issues, if this Government were not forced to take a completely negative stand on these matters. The proposed increase in the statutory ceiling to $3 million would provide the flexibility which is required.

I have never been a delegate to the meetings of the ILO or the FAO, but I have been a delegate to the World Health Organization. The same question arose in 1951 or 1952. We wanted it to have a certain amount of flexibility and the arrangement which was made was in the interest of this country. But there was no limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proposal has been discussed, has been agreed on, and has been considered as containing much in the way of merit.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to call up my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 5, to change the period to a comma, and insert the following: "and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *'Provided, however,* That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization'."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in support of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an article entitled "How Useful Is the ILO?" written by George Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956. The article points out the need for the amendment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am fearful of the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Montana, because it is an open invitation to increase our contribution to the amount set forth as the maximum. I feel quite assured that that is what ultimately would happen. Furthermore, I am supported in this position by the American delegations to both the FAO and ILO. They voted against the increases which are here provided for.

Senate Joint Resolution 97 would:

First. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization from $2 million to $3 million; and

Second. Increase the ceiling on United States annual contributions to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $3,000,000.

I do not oppose the recommended increase in the statutory ceiling on contributions to the FAO. To the best of my knowledge and belief, FAO has done a good job. Our participation in that U. N. agency is relatively noncontroversial. FAO assessments on the United States for the calendar year 1956 may exceed the existing ceiling figure.

I may say, in connection with the Food and Agricultural Organization, that much has been done by private organizations throughout the country, by voluntary contribution, to promote the building up of productivity in the various countries of the world where there is great need for food and agricultural production.

Entirely different considerations arise with respect to the ceiling on contributions to the International Labor Organization. First, continued participation by the United States in ILO is a highly controversial issue. And, secondly, the committee report indicates that the ILO ceiling will not be pierced until the calendar year 1957. Accordingly, I believe that the Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking out subsection (b) concerned with United States contributions to the ILO.

I am advised that no public hearings were held by the committee in regard to the increased appropriations. There are very important organizations in the country which are entitled to have and ought to have a voice. They should be heard, and a record ought to be made. It is my understanding that conferences were held in executive session between the committee and representatives of the State Department and, perhaps, of the Department of Labor, in regard to the increased contribution, all of which will be paid by the taxpayers of the United States.

If the pending resolution is limited to the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can then make a full investigation of the International Labor Organization. No hearings have been held on Senate Joint Resolution 97. It is an original joint resolution reported favorably from the committee at the request of the State, Agriculture, and Labor Departments.

Why should we authorize the spending of more money for the International Labor Organization when public hearings on the question have not been held, when the need for increased funds will not arise before the calendar year 1957, and when United States participation in the ILO is a matter of growing public concern? The Senate should amend Senate Joint Resolution 97 by striking therefrom subsection (b), page 2, lines 1 through 5.

If Senate Joint Resolution 97 is not so amended, the Senate must face this question: Why should the International Labor Organization be rewarded for an intolerable act of Communist appeasement? I refer to the action of the ILO Conference in 1955 which seated employer and employee representatives from Communist countries and granted them voting privileges. If the ceiling on United States contributions to the ILO is raised, the following condition should be imposed:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

Each member of ILO is represented by four delegates. Under the ILO constitution, 2 delegates represent government; 1 delegate represents employees; and 1 delegate represents the employers of his country. Under this tripartite arrangement the nongovernment delegates must be free of government dictation; that is, they must be truly representative of free, voluntary associations of employers and employees.

The United States employer delegate is nominated by the National Association of Manufacturers and by the United States Chamber of Commerce. The United States employee delegate is nominated by the AFL–CIO. The two Government delegates are nominated by the Secretary of Labor.

At the ILO Conference in Geneva in 1955, so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries were seated and granted voting privileges. The United States Government and employee delegates protested this action but bowed to the will of the majority. In contrast to this rather feeble protest, the United States employer delegate, Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, refused to sit with so-called employer representatives from Communist Russia and its satellites. Had he done so, he would have declared, in effect, that employer associations in Communist countries are free and voluntary associations; that their representatives have just as much right to participate in ILO deliberations as employer delegates from the free nations of the world. In other words, Mr. McGrath stood on principle. He refused to act out a lie. The question now is: Will Congress support his stand? I hope so.

Why should the Senate reward the ILO by raising the statutory ceiling on United States contributions from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year? I shall not vote for this increase unless its effectiveness is conditioned on the ILO unseating so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries. In addition, I hope Congress will take a new look at the ILO technical assistance program and at all other U. N. technical assistance programs in which Communist "experts" are financed—directly or indirectly, in whole or in part—with the dollars of American taxpayers.

It is perfectly proper for President Eisenhower to sit at the conference table with Bulganin or for Secretary Dulles to meet with Molotov. No matter how much we despise the fact, the fact is that Bulganin and Molotov represent the Government of Communist Russia. Moreover, except for the slim hope of revolution in Russia, the only alternative to war is patient negotiation with the rulers of the Kremlin. I believe that both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles should be commended for their efforts along this line.

Although heads of government must maintain diplomatic intercourse, this does not mean that the great organizations of American business and labor must stultify themselves by having their representatives treat so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist Russia as coequals. These phony delegates from Communist Russia do not resemble free employers or free employees any more than Outer Mongolia resembles a sovereign nation.

We have been told that the United States must continue to be a member of the ILO no matter how that Organization handles the Communist issue. We have been told that this must be done in the interest of universality. So far as I can tell, universality in internationalist lingo usually means that honorable men and free nations should abandon their principles for the privilege of associating in the same club with Communists, atheists, and barbarians. That is what the argument for universality in the International Labor Organization really means.

The National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have voted for employer participation in the International Labor Organization for 1 more year. According to my information, the United States employer delegate will not sit in committees in Geneva with Communist agents masquerading as representatives of free employers. Both the NAM and the chamber have asked the President to appoint a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in ILO. The concern of

American business organizations is reflected in the following resolution adopted by the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 28, 1956:

Whereas the Chamber of Commerce of the United States reaffirms its belief in the fundamental objectives of the original constitution of the International Labor Organization which were:

"Universal and lasting peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice.

"Conditions of labor exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperiled."

Whereas since 1934 we have cooperated and participated in the efforts of the International Labor Organization to effectuate these principles;

Whereas our participation has convinced us that the International Labor Organization is not accomplishing these objectives, but instead has shown that—

1. The activities of the International Labor Organization have gone far afield from the original concept of the achievement of social justice within the field of labor-management relations;

2. There has been undue interference with the internal affairs of nations, beyond the proper scope of international agreement;

3. The International Labor Organization is being used as a propaganda forum for statism and socialism;

4. The technical-assistance program has been subverted to the distribution of statist and Socialist ideologies and propaganda;

5. The tripartite system of representation by Government, employer and worker delegates is a failure;

6. The entry of the Soviet Union and its satellites into the International Labor Organization has made a mockery of free and independent employer and worker representation;

7. By and large the staff of the International Labor Organization is nonobjective and dangerously devoted to the accomplishment of statist and Socialist ideologies;

8. The proper functions of the International Labor Organization are now or could be performed by various other agencies now in existence;

Therefore, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is convinced that continued support of the International Labor Organization by the taxpayers and by the Government of the United States should be questioned seriously at this time, and recommends—

1. That the executive department should reexamine the activities of the International Labor Organization;

2. That there should be an immediate and thorough congressional investigation of the activities and structure of the International Labor Organization, to determine whether the United States should continue its support of and participation in this organization;

3. That, pending such investigation and subsequent decision, the United States should not increase its financial support or participation; and

4. Pending this investigation and decision at the request of representatives of the United States Government, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States will again participate in the nomination of employer delegations to the International Labor Organization for the year 1956.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is making a very important and very powerful argument. I wish to explore with him precisely the meaning of his amendment. As I understand the viewpoint of the Senator and of the organizations to which he has referred, it is that presumably the ILO was to consist of certain delegates representing governments as governments, certain delegates representing employers as employers, entirely independent of governments, and certain delegates representing labor movements which were free labor movements, independent of either employers or governments. Is that the concept the Senator has of what ILO should be and what he believes was the original intent?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader, is exactly right. That was the original concept of the International Labor Organization when we joined it and in its early days. Much could be accomplished if it were actually organized in that way; but last year, over the protest of the American delegation, and I think the delegation as a whole, the representatives of labor, of industry, and of government in Russia were seated, with four votes, just as the United States had. That means Soviet Russia has four times as many votes on one side as we have, because they all vote as a unit. They do not represent free employers, because there is no such thing in Russia as free employers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Or free labor.

Mr. BRICKER. And they do not represent free labor, because there is no such thing in Russia as freedom of labor, as we understand it, and as the original concept of the International Labor Organization contemplated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what I understood the Senator's point to be. Now I am trying to find out for the RECORD the meaning of the Senator's amendment, if the Senator does not object to this interruption.

Mr. BRICKER. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment reads as follows:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000—

I may say parenthetically that is the limit now in effect.

Mr. BRICKER. That is right.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment continues:

shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956—

So this would not apply until the subsequent year.

Mr. BRICKER. That is correct, and it is not needed in 1956, anyway.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I continue to read from the amendment:

, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

What I am trying to do is get the Senator's intent. It would still be possible for the representatives of Government to be seated, but only so long as they were not masquerading as delegates purporting to represent free employees, free labor, or free employers, neither one of which exists in the Soviet Union or under the Communist union. Am I correct?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is correct in that interpretation. In other words, the amendment would hold the appropriations for the years ahead to what they are at the present time, without increasing them—the vote now being completely unbalanced in favor of the Soviet philosophy—until the things asked for could be accomplished, and until there could be a hearing by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in regard to this very important field, so that there might be a reappraisal of our position, and representatives from industry and labor might be questioned by the committee. That could be done in the next year, and no harm would be caused, because the ceiling would not be pierced until 1957.

Furthermore, I suggest that the executive department completely reexamine its position, so that the United States delegates and free employees and free employers may know exactly where it stands with regard to the International Labor Organization. At the present time it is working on treaties and executive agreements to be entered into, many of which are opposed to our concept of free employers and free employees and the private enterprise system of our people and Government; and many of which tend toward the socialization of the country, which many of us fear at this time, under the leadership of the radicals, Socialists, Communists, and the totalitarians who now dominate, in voting power, the philosophy and the actions of the International Labor Organization.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In effect, the message which might go out behind the Iron Curtain might very well be that what we were doing was looking after the interests of a real free labor movement behind the Iron Curtain, and whenever they had that opportunity they would be able to be represented in the International Labor Organization. Is that the Senator's point?

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator is exactly correct. If we were to increase the amount, it would be a source of encouragement to Soviet Russia, because it would dominate the activities. It would have a single voice in four votes, and we would be at a disadvantage.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield again at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Ohio has the answer to the question I have in mind, I shall be glad to have him state it. Let us consider one of the countries—there are several of them—in which, although there is not a totalitarian dictatorship, in the sense that such a dictatorship exists in the Soviet Union, nevertheless, any semblance of a free labor movement or of free employers, for that matter, has been

completely eliminated, although the government is freely elected by the people, even though they may be under a Socialist system, as we understand it, under which there is a large degree of government ownership. In such a case, of course, there would still be a free labor movement, presumably.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; to a degree, although not to the degree in which it exists in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course. Nevertheless, to that extent they would be independent.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes; and they could objectively approach their responsibilities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. I presume that in such instances the railroads, the mines, and so forth, would be government owned and government operated, but certain businesses would be privately owned. In the case of such a country, what has been the custom in the ILO? Does such a country have in the ILO one representative from the state-owned industries and another representative from the privately owned industries?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know. It may be that that information is in the possession of the Foreign Relations Committee. I judge that the staff of the committee would have the information.

In my opinion such a country's two delegates would represent its government, and there would not be an additional delegate to represent the free employers, for in case there were a delegate representing the free employers, the country would have in the ILO three representatives, instead of two. At least, if the original plan of the ILO were followed in that case, that would be the situation.

Mr. President, American labor leaders seem to favor continued participation in ILO, notwithstanding ILO recognition of Communist agents as representatives of free associations of employees behind the Iron Curtain. I do not understand such a position. Consistently, and to their great credit, leaders of American labor unions have fought the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions—WFTU—and have joined with free trade unionists abroad to create the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

For American labor, the question of continued United States' participation in the ILO presents this issue: Shall representatives of free American labor deal on a basis of equality with phony employee representatives from Communist Russia and her satellites? When a Member of Congress suggested to Mr. George Meany that he get all maritime unions, including Harry Bridges' longshoreman's union, together on industry problems, Meany declared that the AFL-CIO have no intention of sitting down "with Commies and gangsters"—Seafarers' Log, February 17, 1956.

That is the issue in connection with the International Labor Organization at this very moment, Mr. President.

Delegates representing the Government of the United States also protested the seating of so-called employer and employee representatives from Communist countries. For example, Mr. Warren Burger, then Assistant Attorney General of the United States, said at the 1954 ILO Conference:

> Every step which the majority report asks you to take toward accepting employer's or worker's delegates who are completely controlled by a government is a step towards changing the essential nature of the ILO. It is precisely because the United States Government does not want this to happen that we raise our voice today in warning.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington, said:

> We are confronted with a bloc of 7 Iron Curtain countries, 7 countries who do not know the meaning of freedom—7 countries whose 28 ILO representatives function as 1. There is ample evidence to show that the delegates sent to this peaceful forum from these countries do not conform with the spirit of this organization.
>
> It is plainly ridiculous to speak of "worker's" representatives or "employer's" representatives from these countries.

In other words, the official position of representatives of the United States Government at the 1954 conference was that Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates are mere mouthpieces of government, and are, therefore, ineligible under the ILO constitution to vote in ILO meetings. The ILO has not finally ruled on the eligibility of Communist "employer" and "worker" delegates to participate in the work of the Organization. That is one more reason why the Senate of the United States should not now raise the ceiling on appropriations to the ILO.

If United States labor, business, and Government delegates to the ILO do not stand firm on this Communist issue, they will approve by their deeds the following statement from Trud, published by the Central Headquarters of the Soviet Trade Union Organization:

> In the course of recent years, hundreds of workers' delegations and people of different political or religious convictions have visited the Soviet Union. All are agreed in finding that there is full freedom of association in the U. S. S. R. The Soviet unions are the center of organization for millions of workers and employees, constituted on a basis of freely acquired consent. They reflect the inflexible will of the workers of our country to build up the splendid organization of Communist society. They protect the interests of the workers and the employees and seek to improve their living and working conditions. The administration of social insurance, to which the Soviet Government subscribes millions of rubles, is in their hands. In the Socialist countries, where the power lies in the hands of the people, there are and could be no breaches of trade union rights or liberties; antilabor or antidemocratic laws, such as the infamous Taft-Hartley Act, laid down by the reactionary bosses of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, cannot exist.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I strongly urge the Senate to take one of the following courses of action:

First. Keep the statutory ceiling for the ILO at its present figure, pending hearings on the advisability of raising the ceiling and on the desirability of continued United States participation; or

Second. Make any increase in the statutory ceiling contingent on ILO rejection of Communist agents as bona fide employer and worker delegates. This is the effect of the amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 which I proposed on January 12, 1956.

Mr. President, I think my amendment should be willingly accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee members know as well as I do that we are completely out of sympathy with the position taken by the Communist governments of the world in regard to employer-employee relationships. As a matter of fact, in the Communist countries there are no such relationships; all such relationships are completely eliminated, and all employee groups are dictated to by the governments controlling those countries at the time. So it would stultify the position of free business and free labor in the United States, as well as the position of our Government itself, if our representatives to the ILO were to sit around the conference table with representatives of the Communist countries, for the consideration of the very important matters connected with employer-labor relationships. At such a conference our delegates would be greatly out-numbered and out-voted by the delegates representing the Communist governments, just as our representatives to the ILO now are out-numbered and out-voted in connection with the positions the Soviet and Communist governments take, whereas we should be able to oppose them effectively.

Mr. President, the way for the United States to take affirmative steps in the best interests of free labor and free business is for us to say that we are not going to increase by 1 cent the United States' contribution to the International Labor Organization, for which we are now paying more than our share, until the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate hold a public hearing on this subject, so that, first, the American people will be able to know what the issues are; and, second, until the representatives of those tyrannical governments are excluded from the consideration of the rights and relationships of free workers and free business in the world.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 5, 1956]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

HOW USEFUL IS THE ILO?

The United States has become a member of a large number of international organizations in addition to the United Nations. Most of these organizations come quite expensive because the United States quota usually runs to about one-third of the budget. It is difficult to assess the value of all these international efforts; some are useful, others are only continuous.

The International Labor Organization is one of the least useful and effective. Because of the increase of government-owned enterprises throughout the world, the nature of employment has changed in many countries to such a degree that slavery has been restored. The ILO was established during a capitalistic era; much of the world is now socialistic.

As the American employer representative, W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, says in his report:

"At annual ILO conferences Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69

nations about the decadence of the free-enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the workingman by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better ready-made vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?"

To many careless readers throughout the world, such publication by an international body will give the impression that the material is not Russian propaganda, but is the conclusion reached and assented to by the body.

McGrath objected to seating the Russian employer delegates. As all industry in Soviet Russia is owned by the Government, who are these employers? How, in a country which forbids private ownership of an industry, can there be an employer?

This may not be an exciting argument, except that the reason for the existence of the ILO is to have government, employers, and labor-union heads meet together to lay down certain policies concerning labor and working conditions on a universal basis. That this cannot be accomplished with the varieties of standards of living in the various countries is obvious from the small accomplishments of the ILO, but the excuse that is being given for its continued existence is that it is useful to have such a cooperative body.

In fact, the Marxian aim of Soviet Russia is to abolish the private ownership of enterprise throughout the world so that employers will not be permitted anywhere. Why then does such a country hold membership in an international organization which recognizes the right of an employer to exist, to hire labor and to bargain with a free labor union?

McGrath says:

"If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda, financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Ohio; and I dislike it the more because there is a good deal of truth and merit in what he says. However, I invite his attention to the fact that financially the ILO is operated on a calendar-year basis. Its appropriations are effective on the first of January each year.

It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has said, that there have been no public hearings on the pending joint resolution; but, as I recall—and I should like to be corrected if I am mistaken—the reason why there were no public hearings is that there were no requests on the part of anyone to come before the committee at that time.

I point out to the senior Senator from Ohio that the administration sent to the committee representatives of the State and Labor Departments, and that those representatives were quite urgent in their request to us that we report the joint resolution favorably. It was reported unanimously from the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Senator from Ohio has mentioned something about our being outvoted. I do not believe that is exactly true, because while there are eight Communist countries in the ILO, they have, as I understand, 32 votes out of a total of 284 votes. I think we ought to recognize the fact that we are in a pretty tough scrap with communism and with the Soviet Union.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. How many votes has the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Four, as I understand.

It is my feeling that we should remain in an organization of this sort and not get out, because if we were to show our pique, if we were to refuse the necessary funds, and refuse to cooperate with other freedom-minded members of the organization, I feel that the end result would be the creation of a vacuum into which the Soviet Union and its satellites would move. I think we ought to recognize the fact that, while it is true that so-called employee and employer delegates are fictions so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, nevertheless, at the present time the ILO does have a committee looking into this particular subject and trying to find out what can be done to bring about a clear declaration regarding the Soviet Union and its captive states, so that this myth or fiction of so-called employer and employee delegates can be done away with.

I think the Senator from Ohio made a sound suggestion when he said that the President should create a commission to study the question of further participation by the United States in the ILO, based upon the arguments advanced. It is my hope that the joint resolution will be passed without the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, that the President will appoint a commission, and that we can go along, in the interest of harmony in this country between labor, management, and Government, because I understand that the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated their delegate for this year. It seems to me that what we should do is to fight out the issue in this particular Organization, and not back out and allow the Soviet Union and its captive states to come in. So I sincerely hope that, even though there is a great deal of merit in what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has said in offering his amendment, the joint resolution will be approved as it is, and that we shall proceed to work out some of the details later.

Inasmuch as the Government is in the process of appointing its delegates; inasmuch as the AFL-CIO is participating; and inasmuch as employers have appointed their delegate, let us go ahead and give this program a chance. Let us try to do what we can by fighting within the Organization, instead of trying to withdraw and allowing the Soviet Union and its satellites to take over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio—and I must say that during the course of the discussion today I have somewhat changed my views with respect to it, in the light of the statement of the Senator from Ohio—he is not proposing that the United States withdraw from the organization. So I do not believe that point is at issue. Certainly he is not proposing that we withdraw at this time. While some people on the outside had suggested that possibility at one time, and while it may still be suggested by our former representatives in the ILO, that is not the issue before the Senate today.

We have adopted an amendment which increases the amounts for the Food and Agricultural Organization up to the maximum of 33⅓ percent. By that amendment, as I view the legislative picture, we have contingently increased the ILO amount up to 33⅓ percent.

The continguency or proviso in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio is that that not be done until two things have happened—first, until the Senate and the executive branch of the Government shall have had an opportunity to review the situation growing out of the action by the ILO in obviously going counter to what had been the original intent, of having representatives of free labor, free employers, and the Government, rather than to have the Government unilaterally voting for all three when, in fact, free labor and free employers are nonexistent.

Secondly, after the executive branch and the Congress shall have had an opportunity to study the problem, our representatives will still be on hand, as the Senator from Montana points out, to carry on the battle, to see if the problem cannot be solved within the ILO itself.

If that can be done, the Congress of the United States will certainly be in a position next January to act. The contingency will be removed, because if the ILO solves the problem, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will not apply. If, on the other hand, despite nonaction by the ILO, hearings bring out the desirability of continuing in the Organization on the basis of a contribution of 33⅓ percent, at that point the Senate and the House could, in effect, strike out the proviso.

I must say, in all fairness both to the Senate and to the distinguished Senator from Montana, that I do not purport, as minority leader, to speak for the administration in this connection. I agree with the Senator that the administration made it very clear before the committee that it thought the amount should be increased; and the Senator is quite properly carrying out the mandate of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, on my own responsibility, let me say that I think the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Ohio are very persuasive. I believe that a question of moral principle is involved. I believe that at some point we shall have to draw the line and say that we cannot continue to have the Soviet

Government, in effect, making a dead letter of what has been the intent and the normal practice, of having free labor and free industry represented.

As a result of the discussion today, I have personally come to the conclusion that I will support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to answer the distinguished minority leader first before I yield to the Senator from New York. I can well understand the reasons for the consideration given by the Senator from California to the suggestions of the Senator from Ohio. It is true, of course, that the so-called employee and employer delegates representing the Soviet Union in the ILO are phonies and myths, and that it is all a fiction, and does not stand up. However, I would like to point out to the Senate that the issue of the Soviet Union employer and worker representation in the ILO became acute at the ILO Conference in 1954. At that time, the United States Government, employer, and worker delegates all supported challenges that had been filed to the Soviet employer and worker delegates on the grounds that they were in fact representatives of the Soviet Government and not of free employers and free workers. Nonetheless, the Soviet were seated.

Subsequently, in March 1955, the ILO governing body appointed a committee, headed by Lord Arnold D. McNair, former president of the International Court of Justice, to study the question of the freedom of employer and worker organizations in each of the ILO member countries. That committee made a voluminous report shortly before the March 1956 meeting of the governing body. Because of the shortness of time, the governing body decided to postpone full discussion of the problem until its November 1956 meeting. In the meantime, however, the governing body is proposing that the ILO Conference in June discuss the question, not with the purpose of taking formal decisions, but in order to give the governing body the benefit of the delegates' views.

The problem is by no means so simple as it might appear. There is reason to hope that in time it can be worked out to our satisfaction, but the approach embodied in this amendment will certainly not contribute to such a solution.

I should like respectfully to suggest to the Senate that at this time the amendment be rejected, and that the joint resolution be passed as it is. In the meantime, we should follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio that the President set up a commission, that the Committee on Foreign Relation consider the matter and hold public hearings—which I must insist again have not been requested up to this time—and that the ILO itself, through a subcommittee, keep looking into this question, so that there may be demolished the myth of Soviet employer and employee representation. Of course, there are other things to be considered also.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that his arguments would be quite persuasive if the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator had suggested that either the United States withdraw at this time under those circumstances, or indeed if an amendment had been offered which would cut the amounts which the United States is now contributing to ILO. But that is not the situation which confronts us. In either case the Senator's arguments would be persuasive under the present circumstances, and such an amendment could properly be rejected by the Senate.

However, the situation confronting us—and what I say now is in addition to the statement made earlier—is that for the first time the Senate is being asked affirmatively to put what may be termed its stamp of endorsement upon the changed condition in the ILO, and to indicate what might be considered to be full approval of the action which has been taken.

It seems to me that there is an entirely different situation confronting us in view of the event which took place a year or so ago. As the Senator has pointed out, a committee has been appointed, which is to make its report in March of this year, and the matter is to be considered presumably in June and perhaps in November, or whenever the organization next meets. Therefore it seems to me that under those circumstances—and I admit this is true in the present situation, as it is in the case of many other issues which come before the Senate—there is ample room for an honest difference of opinion on this subject. No one can speak dogmatically on it and insist that his solution is the proper one. However, it seems to me, in view of the facts which have been presented—the outline by the Senator from Ohio, and the fact that it is not being proposed that we withdraw from the organization, or that we so much as cut a single penny from our contribution—that there is certainly great concern felt, not only among the employers of our country but also among our labor organizations as well. Although our labor organizations feel very strongly that we should not withdraw from ILO, I do not believe any inference should be left that the American Federation of Labor—if I know that organization and Mr. Meany, or even the CIO organization, or any other labor organization—believes that the method of letting the Soviet Government or any other Communist government represent both its employers and its employees is the right approach to the situation. On the contrary, they would be very adamant in opposing such an approach.

Therefore, it seems to me that, under the circumstances, the Senate would be justified in accepting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. It is for those reasons—and I must say that it has been brought out by discussion here today, and I am not speaking as a party leader, but only on my own responsibility—that I feel there are strong reasons to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator from California has said, there are two sides to every question, and there is room for an honest difference of opinion.

However, I feel that if we pass the joint resolution as is, what we will be doing will be to back up the employer and employee delegates representing our country. Certainly there is no reason why the situation should be regarded as being as dangerous as some people think it is. If the commission the Senator from Ohio has suggested is appointed, if the committee appointed by ILO itself looks into the matter, and if perhaps also the Committee on Foreign Relations looks into it—especially if the committee were to hold public hearings and look into the matter—plus the constant watchdog attitude of the Committee on Appropriations, I think we would probably be in a better position next year to find out how this matter is coming out and what would be the best way to fight against some things we do not like at this time.

However, as I say, and as the minority leader says, it is purely a matter of opinion.

Mr. LEHMAN. I rise to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. It seems to me we ought to pass the joint resolution as it reads in its amended form, although I sympathize with the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio that the matter be studied and investigated by the administration, by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and by the ILO itself. Certainly no harm would come from passing the joint resolution as it reads in amended form. There will be ample opportunity to take action next year if it is considered desirable, as necessary to do so.

I wish to point out that nothing dangerous has developed in connection with this entire situation. I wish to read from a statement submitted by the Department of State, which explains the joint resolution and states the reason for the support of the joint resolution by the Department of State. It reads as follows:

> Since 1950, there have been significant developments in the ILO program which have increased the costs of the Organization. Four ILO operational field offices have been established on a regional basis to permit more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, etc. In addition, the ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers' paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to

weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious and unsubstantiated.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that what the ILO has accomplished along the lines of breaking down and refuting false statements and false propaganda is highly important. I think we would be making a serious mistake if we should undertake to give the impression that we are seeking to take unilateral action. The voting strength of the Soviet bloc in ILO, I believe, represents numerically one-seventh or one-eighth of the voting strength of the non-Communist countries having membership in the ILO. I consider the ILO highly important and effective. This organization has done much to break down the myths and the false propaganda employed by the Communists regarding the position of labor in Communist countries and in refuting the claim that they represent democratic principles. We all know that such a claim is completely untrue. I think the work of ILO is tremendously important and we must not handicap it.

I do not believe the resolution as it now stands, with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana, would in any way jeopardize the rights of this country which are already recognized by the representatives who have been selected to sit as members of the United States delegation in the ILO. I hope the resolution as amended by the Senator from Montana will be agreed to.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to say, further, that if there has been anything accomplished in breaking down, as the Senator from New York has said, the myth of Soviet imperialism and the lack of freedom of labor and business in communistic countries, it has been done without their participation, because up to this time they have not been members at all of the Organization. So that any work that has been done has been done on the part of the other nations before the Soviet Republic was represented.

The Senator from New York says that the Organization has only one-eighth of the voting power of the other nations represented; but when we add to that the fact that there are totalitarian countries which do not agree with us with respect to the right of labor and business to be free and to bargain collectively, and the like, I might point out the fact that the Soviet countries have eight times as many votes in this Organization as has the United States. Furthermore, if we increase the appropriation, what the Senate will be doing is saying to representatives who have voted against us that we are going to increase the amount, willy-nilly, and, in fact, it will weaken our position when we come to confer with employer and employee delegations. It will weaken the hands of the United States representatives in carrying out the plan and purpose of maybe getting rid of the captive representatives who will vote against us on every possible occasion. It will further nullify the effectiveness of the ILO in calling to the attention of the world the default in the Soviet system of imperialistic control and domination of the rights of labor in those countries and the complete servility of their people.

Mr. President, I have searched the records to find out what justification there is for the increase. There was no testimony, so far as I know, concerning it. There is certainly nothing in the report to justify it except the vote of the ILO Council itself asking that the United States increase its appropriation. It may be that since Soviet Russia and her satellites are in the Organization, they want their share of clerks and stenographers, their share of propagandists in the ILO, so that they may multiply their influence and say to the United States and other countries and to the Organization itself, "We are in now, and we are entitled to an appropriation proportionate to the number of employees of the Organization who are sympathetic to our philosophy and who will agree with us when our representatives vote."

I do not know what the justification is, except that they voted for it against the vote of the representatives of the United States Government, United States business, and United States labor.

So, Mr. President, I think my amendment should be agreed to. There should be a full record of what justification there may be for it, and then let our representatives try to work out, with the strength of the position of the Senate behind them, the proper place for Russian labor and Russian business in the councils of the ILO.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished acting majority leader permit me to ask a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The hour is getting late, and I think the Senator may have given some consideration to a recess, under the previous order. I have understood, from previous conversation with the Senator, that he did not intend to ask for a vote this evening on the question, and that, according to the earlier announcement by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], when the Senate concluded its labors today, it would go over until Wednesday. So I was wondering, in order that Senators may be on notice, whether we might have a yea-and-nay vote ordered, the vote to be taken when the Senate assembles on Wednesday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays may be ordered on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been my purpose to make a statement supporting the position of the Senator from Montana on the joint resolution. When the Senate agreed to the amendment which was stimulated by the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], most of the argument I had intended to make has been taken care of.

The matter which the Senator from Ohio brings up is of great interest to me, and I sympathize with the sentiments he has so ably expressed, but I wish to make the RECORD clear on this point.

In my judgment, the ILO has done one of the most important international jobs since we began work of this kind. It antedates the United Nations, as the Senator from Ohio knows. I have discussed it with the Labor Department representatives, including the Secretary of Labor, and it is perfectly clear that if we take any steps which may sabotage this work entirely, we may destroy one of the best instruments we have for international understanding.

Although one can understand the natural reaction of many people who say that we should refuse to participate with Soviet bloc countries in organizations such as the ILO, I feel strongly that it would be a mistake for us to act on such an impulse. At this time, with the Russians shifting the emphasis in their tactics in the cold war, it is particularly important that we do not quit the field and give them the battle by default.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I may suggest to the Senator that that was not the import of my amendment at all.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I understand. However, I want to make it clear that I do not believe we should do anything which would in any way jeopardize the position of the ILO.

I wish also to make this point: It has been said that we are outvoted in the ILO by the Communists. Eight Soviet bloc countries are members of the ILO, and they have 4 votes apiece, or a total of 32 votes. The United States also has 4 votes—2 for our Government delegates and 1 each for our employer and worker delegates. But besides the Soviet bloc and the United States, there are 62 other members of the ILO, also with 4 votes each. Of the 284 votes in the ILO, the Soviet bloc has 32, and the free world has 252.

I have had the responsibility of being a delegate to the United Nations. The very question which the Senator from Ohio has raised today comes up all the time with regard to United Nations votes. We are in a very difficult position there, with our limited vote in the Assembly. The United States has only one vote in the Assembly. But the vast majority of the members have been loyal to the United States leadership in opposing the attempts made by the Soviet bloc to outvote us. Therefore, I have such faith in the justice of our cause as to be confident that by strong and vigorous leadership we can continue to win an overwhelming majority of the 252 non-Communist votes in the ILO.

It has also been said that the ILO is a forum for the propagation of communism. Every single day I was in attendance at the U. N. Assembly the Communists had propaganda efforts under way. Of course, the Communists attempt to use the ILO as a propaganda sounding board, just as they attempt to use every other international organization. But so far, in the ILO, they have had little success. The fact is that far from being a forum for the propagation of communism, the ILO is a forum for the exposure of communism.

Through its careful, meticulously factual studies of forced labor, the ILO has

shown up the Soviet bloc as one big concentration camp, instead of as the workers' paradise that Moscow propagandists try to picture.

At the moment, we are on top of the situation. Through its participation in the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program, and through its regular activities, as well, the ILO has made a real contribution to increasing worker productivity and improving managerial skill not only in Western Europe but also in the underdeveloped countries.

This, it seems to me, is one of the most valuable services which the ILO performs, and one which redounds markedly to the interest of the United States. It is the kind of positive approach which can be extremely effective over a period of years and will help the labor situation in the United States. It is one of the reasons why our big labor organizations have been so strongly in support of the continuation of the ILO.

I regret that I was unable personally to attend as a delegate, when the Secretary of Labor asked me some time ago.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] attended last year. I regret that he is not present today to relate his experience, but he has said that he was convinced of the value of the Organization and that nothing should be done to undermine its effectiveness. I am not certain that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio would result in undermining the effectiveness of the Organization, but we should think the matter through very carefully to see whether we should not give a vote of confidence to our colleagues in the ILO, and the nations supporting our point of view, and not try to tie them down by some mandate from Congress at a time when we have heretofore, in a general way, accepted our share of what the whole group decided would be the budget for the year.

I am simply suggesting this because it seems to me that if there is any implication that we do not trust our colleagues, we may lose some of the support we have had so effectively right up to this time. I believe, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has said—and I support his position—that it would be wise for us this year to create a new ceiling.

The resolution will not increase the amount in one big jump; it will simply place a new ceiling on the amount and will give our representatives in the ILO, and our representatives in the United Nations, who are supporting the ILO representatives, the flexibility and ability to negotiate for the kind of budget which will be decided upon for the coming years.

All the proposal really amounts to is the giving of our representatives the freedom to work with those who have worked with us before, without saying to them, "We are imposing this mandate upon you because you are not behaving yourselves. This is all you can do."

Thus, I feel it would be wise to support the proposal which has been made, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], especially since the ceilings have been set percentagewise. A maximum of 33⅓ percent is all that we can possibly contribute; but at the same time we will be saying to our representatives, "We shall trust you to handle the matter."

So I shall support the position of the Senator from Montana in his able presentation of the case for the committee. I say at the same time to the Senator from Ohio that I think I agree with the criticisms he has made about what is going on. Nevertheless, I think we are on top of the situation; and when we are on top of it, I do not believe we should tell our partners that we do not trust them to play the game as they have played it heretofore.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROVED EFFICACY OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I know that the entire Congress and all the people of the United States are very much interested in the degree to which we may be achieving success in wiping out poliomyelitis in this country.

Last week marked the first anniversary of the announcement of the proved efficacy of the Salk vaccine. On this anniversary Mr. Basil O'Connor, president of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, to whose valiant and successful work in this field all of us owe so much, issued a report addressed to all physicians in the United States.

That report sums up the gratifying opinion of the Foundation that paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in 1956 and practically eliminated in 1957. It carefully analyzes the situation with respect to our current knowledge of the production and utilization of Salk vaccine and concludes that the problem of preventing paralytic polio is no longer a problem of medical science but simply one of logistics. This being so, Mr. Basil O'Connor explains in his brief but careful and analytic report how and when we can achieve the goal of wiping out paralytic polio if all concerned with achieving this objective put forth carefully coordinated efforts in the remaining months of this year.

I believe Mr. Basil O'Connor's report is of tremendous importance to all of us, and I ask unanimous consent that it be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO PHYSICIANS—CAN PARALYTIC POLIO BE PREVENTED IN 1957?

(Statement by Basil O'Connor, president, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis)

Paralytic polio in the United States can be cut in half in the epidemic period in 1956 and can be reduced to a negligible amount in 1957 if there is a coordinated effort during the remaining months of 1956 by all concerned: the public, the public health services, the doctors, and the manufacturers. It may be properly assumed that such coordination can be had.

The primary interest of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is to wipe out paralytic polio. Everyone joins in that wish. If it is possible to accomplish that result, all people would unquestionably be willing to do their part to bring it about. Any suggestion or plan as to how that end may be reached ought to be carefully examined and receive full consideration.

The program needed to accomplish the desired result can be divided into two time periods—from now through July 10, 1956, called the first period—and from July 10, 1956 through December 31, 1956, called the second period.

The manufacturers of Salk vaccine estimate that between March 1, 1956 and December 31, 1956, they will produce 203 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. It is estimated that 92 million of these 203 million cubic centimeters will be produced between March 1, 1956 and July 10, 1956, and 111 million cubic centimeters between July 10, 1956 and December 31, 1956.

The manufacturers have had 1 year's experience in producing vaccine. One has a right to use their estimates of production for purposes of calculation. Using their estimates, the problem of preventing paralytic polio becomes one of logistics and not one of medical science.

To reduce paralytic polio in 1957 to a negligible amount, an effort should first be made to immunize those groups which have the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio. Eighty percent of our paralytic polio is in the 0 to 19 age group and pregnant women. The first period of the plan should be devoted to immunizing these groups.

In the age group 0 to 19 inclusive there are 61 million individuals.

In the pregnant women group there are 4 million women.

These two groups make a total of 65 million individuals.

In these two groups we have 80 percent of our paralytic polio.

Assuming an 80-percent acceptance of the vaccine this would mean that 52 million of the 65 million in these 2 groups would receive the vaccine. On a 90 percent effective basis this would likewise mean preventing at least 50 percent of all paralytic polio that might otherwise occur in the epidemic season of 1956. Immunizing such a large number in the groups having the highest incidence rate of paralytic polio should have the effect of reducing paralytic polio in the nonvaccinated.

The present estimates of the manufacturers making Salk vaccine indicate that between now and July 10, 1956, there will be enough vaccine to give 2 shots to the 52 million available individuals in these 2 groups. This would require a total of 104 million cubic centimeters of vaccine.

Between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine were released for use. This vaccine has either been used or is available for use within these two groups.

The manufacturers estimate that between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, they will produce 92 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
March	12,811,272
April	19,242,626
May	18,930,790
June	40,821,240
Total	91,805,928

The 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine actually released between April 12, 1955, and March 1, 1956, and the estimated production of 92 million cubic centimeters between March 1, 1956, and June 25, 1956, total 134 million cubic centimeters of vaccine available between April 12, 1955, and July 10, 1956, or enough to give 67 million people 2 shots of vaccine. This is 15 million more people than those considered available for vaccine in the 0 to 19 group and pregnant women group, which total 52 million. This indicates a safety margin of 30 million cubic centimeters, over and above the number of

cubic centimeters required for 2 shots for the available in 0 to 19 and pregnant women groups.

It seems proper to conclude that by July 10, 1956, there will have been manufactured and released for use adequate vaccine to give 2 shots to all available in the 2 groups referred to and thus reduce by at least one-half the incidence of paralytic polio in the epidemic period of 1956.

Of the 42 million cubic centimeters of vaccine already released, probably 20 million have been used to give 10 million individuals in these 2 groups 2 shots each, leaving 22 million cubic centimeters which have been used or are available for use to give 1 shot to 22 million of the 52 million in these 2 groups, leaving 20 million in this group who have not received any shots. These 20 million could be given 1 shot from the March and April production totaling 32 million cubic centimeters, leaving 12 million cubic centimeters which could be used as second shots for those in the 22 million group who had received 1 shot. This would leave 30 million yet to receive a second shot and these could be taken care of by the May production of 19 million cubic centimeters and the production of the first 2 weeks in June which totals 18 million cubic centimeters. There would still remain an excess of 30 million cubic centimeters from the production to June 25 after giving the 52 million availables in both groups 2 shots of vaccine.

With reference to the second period, July 10, 1956 to December 31, 1956, the manufacturers estimate they will produce 111 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. The estimated monthly rate of this production is as follows:

	Cubic centimeters
July	17,500,000
August	18,040,000
September	18,220,000
October	19,000,000
November	19,000,000
December	19,000,000
Total	110,760,000

If we add to the total estimated production for the last 6 months of 1956, namely 111 million cubic centimeters, the 30 million cubic centimeters not used in the period ending July 10, 1956, there is an estimated 141 million cubic centimeters available for use during the period July 10, 1956, and December 31, 1956. This would be adequate to give the third shot to the 52 million in the two groups referred to herein and two shots to approximately 45 million additional persons—or a total of at least 2 shots to 97 million individuals out of a total of 167 million in this country—or 80 percent of the population aged 0–45. Less than 2 percent of all paralytic polio is in the age groups over 45.

The job is a big one logistically, but it can be done if all those interested cooperate fully. In an effort of such public health significance we can assume—

1. That the manufacturers will make every effort to live up to their production estimates;

2. That the United States Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health will be ready to release promptly for public use all properly manufactured vaccine presented to it;

3. That parents of children in the 0 to 19 group will have the vaccine given to their children when and as it becomes available and not wait until June when its administration to such a large group will present insuperable practical difficulties;

4. That local public health officials and doctors will let the public know promptly when vaccine is available; and

5. That doctors will not hold in reserve vaccine for second shots, but will give one shot to as many individuals as possible in the two groups referred to, relying on the second shot to be available before June 30, 1956.

There is every reason to expect that such cooperation will be gladly given in view of the importance of the result to be obtained.

To give 97 million people at least 2 shots of Salk vaccine before December 31, 1956, is not an impossibility but the logistics of such an operation must be worked out by the Public Health officials and the medical society in each State on the basis of an emergency health program.

The intelligent use in 1956 of the vaccine estimated to be available during that year would indicate that cases of paralytic polio in the United States in the year 1957 should be very few.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce the appointment by him of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 21, 1957, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 of the 84th Congress.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9, 1956):

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1960. (Reappointment.)

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Harry L. Bolen, of Illinois, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Egbert Alfred Smith, deceased.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

William L. Maloney
Ralph R. Curry
Arthur L. Dickert
Clifford R. Maclean
Henry F. Stolfi
George P. Kenney
Leonard T. Jones
Searcy J. Lowrey
Samuel L. Denty
George W. Dick
Charles B. Arrington
Charles E. Brush
Robert T. Alexander
Edward A. Eve, Jr.
Eric A. Anderson
Marion Amos
William D. Shields
Chester L. Harding
Richard E. Morell
Aden C. Unger
Victor F. Tydlacka
George I. Holt
Simon R. Sands, Jr.
Donald M. Morrison
Philip A. Ovenden
Christopher C. Knapp
Joseph E. Madacey
James B. Rucker
Henry U. Scholl
Rufus E. Mroczkowski
Oscar C. B. Wev
Harold B. Roberts
Ned W. Sprow
William I. Swanston
William E. Creedon
Henry A. Meyer
Preston B. Mavor
Quentin M. Greeley
Charles P. Murphy
Richard C. Foutter

The following named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Edwin B. Ing
Donald V. Reardon
Toralv A. Berg
Winslow H. Buxton
Lewis L. Whittemore
Arthur R. Hoglund
Harry C. Gifford
Edmund B. Redington
Robert W. Goehring
Wesley W. Wood
Felix S. DeSoboll
John H. Phinney
William A. McFaull
William E. Pratt
Harry L. Morgan
George S. Beck
Lee O. Moyer
Vitus G. Niebergall
John H. Cleary
Alfred W. Medcalf
John D. McCubbin
Earl C. Young
Elmer J. Bodenlos
John H. Holm
Joseph E. Mallett
Lawrence D. Connor
Ross P. Bullard
Isaac R. Boothby
Archibald H. McComb, Jr.
James B. McCarty, Jr.
Leonard E. Penso
Orvan R. Smeder
Thomas P. McMaster
Paul E. Savonis
George C. Steinman
John W. Anderson
Ernest S. Rasmussen
Victor Pfeiffer
Arthur M. Vrooman
Bertram J. Tuckey
Leonard C. Walen
William L. Morrison
George J. Monteverdi
James M. Caulk
George M. Russell
William T. Coyle
Edwin W. Wickham
David W. Sinclair
Adam A. Klein
Edward E. Dickey
Robert R. Russell
John P. Fox
Edward W. Kirkpatrick
Carl A. Anderson
Ellery H. Capen
Vincent H. Casey
Charles E. Masters, Jr.
Emilio G. Oliotti
Karl A. Bergman
James C. Campbell
William J. Willman
James N. Schrader
Harry F. Frazer
Benjamin Malloch
William J. Tracy
Viggo A. Madsen
Lester W. Raynes
Glenn W. Ellis
Charles C. Phillips
Francis J. Swan
George E. Ross
Martin Spain
George E. Holland
Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
Thomas McCusker
Maurice D. Melanphy
Martin J. Dean
William R. Riedel
Mark L. Hocking
Clement B. Cozad
James H. McDowell
Fred M. Cronan
John R. Silliman
Louis B. Kendall
John A. Fagan
Harold O. Rasmussen
Jesse E. Eastman
Gorman W. Larsen
Sylvius Pellegrini
Robert B. Scott
Charles P. McFaull
Ralph M. West
Clifford A. Anderson
Robert Murdoch
Arthur E. Wilcox
Curtis A. Alexander
Charles E. Sharp
Gilbert Hinchcliffe
George A. Butler
William C. Mahoney
John D. Hill
Julius Schuler
Lynn Parker
Louis A. Grundler
Julian J. Shingler
Ellie D. Baker
Byron I. Reynolds
Francis B. Ford
Robert J. Ernst
Robert Flockhart
Edwin J. Lautermilch
Bertrand J. Henesey
Claude G. Winstead
Thomas G. Byrne
Leslie G. Haverland
George W. Nantau
Robert H. Burtt
Peter Snyder
Gustav E. Johansen
Theodore LeBlanc
Elvin C. Hawley
Emery H. Joyce
Casimer J. Bernas
William Barkalow
Douglas R. Shambeau
William D. Brimner
James L. Thompson
Paul H. Browne
Daniel C. Dickert
John H. Wildhack
Frank McLaughlin
Donald G. Elliott
Lloyd R. Morrison
Cyril L. Heyliger
Frank F. Elliott
Paul Olson
Charles H. Freericks
Newton W. Winberg
Kenneth H. Hellweg
Herbert J. Kelly
William S. Vaughn
George W. Stedman, Jr.
Joseph Mazzotta
Jonas T. Hagglove
Lionel H. DeSanty
Ashton H. Barnes
Thomas N. Kelley
Arthur M. Davison
William R. Sayer
Joseph J. McClelland
Raymond G. Miller
John P. Latimer
Robert E. Hammond
Clyde R. Burton
Ottis T. Estes, Jr.
James F. Bills
Edwin C. Crosby
Ira H. McMullan
William C. Foster
James W. Paine
James A. Cornish
William K. Earle
Edward H. Houghtaling
William D. Strauch, Jr.
Robert F. Barber

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

George H. Lawrence
Robert E. Emerson
Hersey C. Forehand, Jr.
Sherman K. Frick
Marcus H. McGarity
John E. Day
Fletcher W. Brown, Jr.
Charles W. Scharff
Charles M. Shepard III
Francis D. Heyward
Arthur C. Hoene, Jr.
Edward F. Cotter
Paul F. Foye
Raymond J. Perry
Ephraim P. Rivard
James V. DeBergh
Thomas F. Dunham, Jr.
Francis J. Malloy
James W. Booze
Ernest R. Challender
James W. Conway
Claude W. Bailey
Andrew P. Hopewell
George W. McClure
Charles L. Turner
Stewart R. Graham
James F. Phair
Robert A. Copeland, Jr.
Walter C. Bolton
Kenneth M. Bilderback
Clinton J. Maguire
Roger B. Clark
George W. Walker
Bruce W. Clark
Sidney K. Broussard
Louis J. Glatz
Frank D. Hilditch
Arthur M. Watson
Arthur H. Sheppard
Raymond W. Siegel
Harry A. Solberg
Robert O. Bracken
John W. Hume
Herbert Krause
Errol H. Seegers
Forrest H. Willoughby
Robert D. Burkheimer
Jack E. Forrester
Lewis R. Davison
John H. Hawley
Carol L. Mason
Franklin A. Colburn
Robert S. Wilson
Charles E. MacDowell
Elmer P. Mathison
Warren C. Mitchell
Henry A. Campbell, Jr.
Armand J. Bush
Lester A. Levine
John J. Omeara
Glenn O. Thompson
Arthur F. Heffelfinger
Eugene F. Walsh
Lloyd E. Franke
Samuel E. Taylor
Richard C. Wilkie
George A. Philbrick
George J. Bodie
Henry W. Stinson, Jr.
Earl E. Broussard
John F. Fitzgerald
Emerson Hayes, Jr.
John Wilfred McCurdy
William Kesler, Jr.
William P. Williams
Edward A. Richardson
Warren F. Stevenson
Peter E. Gibney
Lewis R. Lavalley
James P. VanEtten
Joseph R. Steele
Edward M. F. Kirchner
Mitchell A. Perry
Garth H. Read
William E. Dennis
Robert J. Loforte
Owen W. Siler
Arthur Hancock
Richard A. Pasciuti
William S. Allan, Jr.
Robert B. Moore
Wallace C. Dahlgren
Harry H. Carter
Bernard E. Kolkhorst
Donald M. Reed
George W. Sohm
Carl L. Parrott
Frederick J. Hancox
Robert A. Adams
William M. Benkert
Robert A. Schulz
Warren E. Rast
Curtis J. Kelly
Austin F. Hubbard
Ward R. Emigh
William J. Zinck
Richard E. Hoover
William N. Banks
Keith Low
Daniel J. Scalabrini
Edward R. Tharp
Wilfred N. Derby, Jr.
Alden E. Lewis
Robert T. Norris
Frank B. Carter
Frank M. Fisher, Jr.
Rufus S. Drury
John J. Doherty
David L. Davies, Jr.
Donald A. Caswell
Donald J. P. Evans
Lewis F. Lovell
David C. Kierbow
Lloyd M. Logan
Albert S. Frevola
Edwin J. Brummeler
Nathan L. Fendig
Edwin S. Radford
Andrew J. Grogard
Clyde J. Miller
Alfred J. Unger
John M. Nagy
Jason S. Kobler
William H. E. Schroeder
Robert E. Foley
James D. Doyle
James E. Fleming
David R. Permar
Harry G. Kosky
Neale O. Westfall
Edward P. Sawyer
Henry E. Steel
Francis J. Mann
Norman L. Miley

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Orville C. Hinnen
Byron M. Wineke
Adam Stanzak
Paul A. Berg
Olaf T. Sturdy
Thomas B. Prather
James G. Cowart
Ronald S. Krueger
Harry S. Raleigh
Leo J. A. King
Henry J. Pfeiffer
Thomas C. Pennock
Hugh E. McCullough
Alvin J. Boxwell
Francis Twarog
Willard E. Carlson
Hugh J. LeBlanc
Thurston L. Willis
Bernard B. Wood
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
Samuel W. Branin
Jack E. Stewart
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
John Vukic
Norman P. Weinert
James A. Emery
Owen B. Smith
Paul L. Anderson
William C. Carber
Rubin E. Young, Jr.
Fred J. Michalson
Richard C. Green
James B. Reynolds
Wesley J. Quamme
William C. Akers
Philip S. Bell
Donald D. Davison
Ivan C. McLean
Edward G. Taylor
Franklin F. Bohlk
Louis E. Price
Jerry Komorech
John W. Cherry
Vincent J. Wernig
James C. Norman
Franklin J. Miller
Russell W. Lentner
Harold A. French
William H. Yates
Sam Pisicchio
Robert D. Parkhurst
Otto F. Unsinn
Walter O. Henry
Verne D. Finks
William L. Aitkenhead
Charles F. Baker
James P. Stewart
James H. Swint
Shirl J. Stephany
George F. Rodgers
Leslie D. High
George H. P. Bursley
Frank E. Parker
Leland C. Batdorf
William F. Tighe, Jr.
Bruce H. Edwards
Roy K. Angell
Robert C. Krulish
William J. Kirkley
Edward E. Chambers
Robert W. Johnson
Charles Scot Marple
Wilfred F. Raes
Albert H. Clough
Randolph Ross, Jr.
Robert W. Smith
David E. Perkins
Robertson P. O. Dinsmore
Alfred J. Tatman
Malcolm E. Clark
Richard M. Underwood, Jr.
Charles M. Mayes
Dan Rayacich
David P. Bates, Jr.
Rudolph E. Lenczyk
William L. Faulkenberry
Donald C. Davis
John H. Bruce
James H. MacDonald
Donald R. Vaughn
Thomas W. Powers
Archibald B. How
Herbert H. Sharpe, Jr.
Michael B. Lemly
Glenn M. Loboudger
John E. V. Murray
Vincent A. Bogucki
Robert A. Lee
Lloyd W. Goddu, Jr.
Donald J. McCann
Edward D. Cassidy
John B. Hayes
Robert L. Davis, Jr.
Glenn R. Taylor
Walter F. Guy
Warren S. Petterson
Harold E. DeLong
William C. Wallace
Henry G. Cassel
Raymond M. Miller
Hardy M. Willis
Fred E. Wilson
Clarence G. Porter
Leroy Flatt
Charles R. Howell
Robert E. Bracken
William A. Mayberry
Rollin T. Young
Cornelius G. Farley
Francis L. Brittan
Philip A. Hogue
Eugene Carlson, Jr.
Paul Richard Happel
Edric S. Bates
John William Yager
Thomas W. Wolfe
Gerard J. Perron
Elliot S. Shafer
Robert E. Ogin
Samuel R. Early
Nelson W. Allen
Roger J. Dahlby
Charles A. Haley
Everett B. Kopp
Edward P. Boyle
William M. Barney
William C. Behan
Edward F. Oliver
William L. Russon, Jr.
Edwin Lee Knowles
Robert E. Wolfard
Michael J. Holland
John F. Mundy, Jr.
Frank E. McLean
Roland P. Amateis, Jr.
Roy M. Wimer
Robert F. Hornbeck
Robert H. Scarborough
Roland J. Frappier
Edward J. Geissler
Thomas L. Wakefield
John H. Hedetniemi
William C. Jefferies
John C. Parker
Edward G. Ware
Dale J. Henderson
Frederick C. Thomas
Kenneth B. Hofstra
Edward O. Wille
Robert H. Sabin
John F. O'Connell
Emmett G. McCarthy
Robert H. Werthman
Leonard M. Unterein
Edgar W. Dorr
Joseph C. Fox, Jr.
Nathaniel F. Main
Vincent J. Mitchell
Richard T. Houlette
Andrew S. Skucy
Thomas C. Duncan, Jr.
Adam S. Zabinski
William J. Brasier
Edwin Allen Schmidt
Arthur G. Taylor
Richard S. Wohlgemuth
Walter E. Johnson
Ross Lynn Moore
Harry A. Davenport III
John D. Crowley
Virgil W. Rinehart
Robert E. Dolliver
Robert S. Hall
Robert W. Durfey
Robert J. Bosnak
William P. Butler, Jr.
Luigi Colucciello
Robert F. Goebel
Edward L. Hauff
Robert A. Duin
Alfred Prunski
James B. Brook
William H. Fitzgerald, Jr.
James R. Hope
Herbert E. Lindemann
Philippe C. Gaucher
George Schmidt
Stuart S. Beckwith
Carl S. Mathews
Wayne E. Caldwell
Samuel M. Moore III
Stuart T. Scharfenstein
Bernie E. Thompson
Harry F. Gregg
Howard W. Pagel
Robert E. Walsh
Clarence R. Hallberg
Darrel W. Starr
John K. Byerlein
Joseph C. Dorsky
Thomas T. Wetmore III
Norman P. Ensrud
James T. Clune
Charles B. Hathaway
Donald M. Chapman
Leroy Reinburg, Jr.
Walter C. Ochman
Maxwell S. Charleston
Paul W. Tifft, Jr.
William R. Weadon
Henry J. Burness
Raymond C. Hertica

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Anthony A. Alloggio
Paul T. Anderson
Warren D. Andrews
Darrell L. Babcock
Kenneth E. Barrett
Laurence O. Bates
Murray W. Boggs, Jr.
Paul H. Breed
Dan H. Briganti
Roger A. Britt
William B. Clark
Dan A. Colussy, Jr.
James H. Conrad
Edmund L. Cope
Charles L. Crane, Jr.
Calvin E. Crouch
Richard P. Cueroni
Edwin H. Daniels
Ted O. DeYoung
Richard A. Donnelly,
Vaughan W. Driggers
James R. Erwin
George Everett
Edward C. Farmer, Jr.
Rolland A. Faucher
Henry C. Fisher
Jerome V. Flanagan
Thomas J. Flood
Galloway B. Foster
Walter D. Fox
Frank A. Frauenfelder
Donald D. Garnett
Gregory C. Gaski
James E. Grabb
George K. Greiner, Jr.
Donald Grim
Ralph C. Hill
Donald C. Hintze
Roger A. Holmes
David G. Howland
Bernard A. Hoyland
Robert E. Iden
James C. Irwin
James A. Kearney
Joseph M. Kelly
Marinus F. Keyzer
William L. King
Walter W. Kohl, Jr.
William E. Lehr, Jr.
Charles W. Linn
Herbert G. Lipsett
Richard V. Littlefield
Roger L. Madson
Max S. Maire
Graeme Mann
William D. Markle, Jr.
Charles W. Matherly
Charles E. Mathieu
Charles F. Merritt
Roger W. Mowell
Edward Nelson, Jr.
Harry J. Oldford, Jr.
Hal F. Olson
Walter E. Paulsen
Harris A. Pledger, Jr.
William P. Reilly
Dean A. Ridyard
Arthur P. Roberts
Ernest E. Rowland, Jr.
William Russell
Keith B Schumacher
Thomas M. Sing
Donald W. Smith
William E. Smith
Arthur Solvang
Nathaniel C. Spadaform
Frederic C. Sponholz, Jr.
Charles G. Stadlander
Raymond L. Stevens
Albert C. Stirling
David E. Stryffeler
Norman A. Toon
Eugene F. Trainor
Alfred H. Walter
Robert E. L. West
Lloyd O. Westphal
Theodore J. Wojnar
Glenn F. Young
David T. Zurzuski, Jr.

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Michael Abarbanell
Ernest Charles Allen
Gilbert Lawrence Aumon
John Donat Basque
Don Stewart Bellis
Neal Hugh Bernard Benjamin
Robert Allan Biller
Richard Andrew Blackford
Lawrence Francis Bond
Robert Loring Bristol
William Jasper Brogdon, Jr.
Gilbert Edward Brown, Jr.
John Lavelle Callahan
Donald Thompson Campbell
Joseph Canzoneri
Norman Edgar Cutts
John Edward DeCarteret
Alan Charles Dempsey
William Manlove Devlin

John Richard Ehrmann
Charles Wesley Faircloth
William Murray Flanders
Donald Lee Frantz
Bruce Stephen Gathy
Robert Gillespie
Wesley Goodwin
James Arthur Granger
Basil Davis Harrington
Roger Putnam Hartgen
Lynn Neal Hein
Paul Dana Henneberry
William Gardner Hicks
Arthur Klaus Hounslea
Floyd Dore Hunter
Vernon Costen Jones
Kirk Robert Kellogg
Robert Joseph Ketchel
Bruce James Kichline
Laurence Crawford Kindbom
Thomas Wightman Kirkpatrick
Ronald Charles Kollmeyer
Richard Jay Kyte
Norman Burleigh Lynch
John Neil MacDonald
Ernest George Marsh
Robert Emmett McKew
James Irving McLeaish
Robert Garland McMahan
LeRoy Clifford Melberg, Jr.
William Firman Merlin
William Bryan Mohin
Charles Edward Moorhead, Jr.
Parker Dennis Morris
George Robert Oberholtzer
Richard Duane Olsen
Lawrence Joseph O'Pezio
Kennard Miller Palfrey, Jr.
David Clyatt Pendergrass, Jr.
Robert Ira Plattus
Donald LeRoy Prince
Edward Joseph Quinn
George Leith Rettie
James Edward Rivard, Jr.
Barry Christie Roberts
William Fitch Roland
James Joseph Rooney III
Richard Ignatius Rybacki
Richard Eugene Sardeson
Thomas Patrick Schaefer
Benjamin Keith Schaeffer
Brinton Roger Shannon
Clifton Raymond Smith
Joseph Francis Smith
Bruce Lee Solomon
John Gerard Stanley
Earl Lorain Sullivan, Jr.
David Arthur Sumi
Arnold Swagerty
Donald Melvin Taub
Paul Thomas Thevenin
Robert Richard Tutt
George Francis Viveiros, Jr.
Arthur Henry Wagner
James Weiskittel
Walter William White
Raymond Earl Womack
Joseph Henry Wubbold III

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Maurice E. Stans, of Illinois, to be Deputy Postmaster General.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Ignatious E. Self, Decatur.
Lee J. Ledbetter, Troy.

ARKANSAS

Teddy E. Miller, McCrory.

CALIFORNIA

Raymond E. Balch, Angwin.
Alan H. Miller, Belmont.
Elmo Nicoli, Ben Lomond.
Esther M. Dauer, Biola.
William B. Evans, Bridgeport.
Jule M. Ashworth, Calistoga.
Chester G. Umberham, El Modeno.
Walter J. Wieger, Grass Valley.
Etta A. Y. Wilbanks, Lebec.
Olsen O. Wheeler, Loma Linda.
Doris L. Johnson, Madison.
James W. Bristow, Mentone.
Thelma E. Jacobs, Parker Dam.
Dick A. Willey, Pollock Pines.
Juanita A. Lombardi, Rockaway Beach.
Russell K. Bates, San Bernardino.
Lowell B. Chapman, San Pedro.
Charles E. Louk, Sierra Madre.
Alfred H. Willhoit, Templeton.
Mary Eleanor Lennie, Thousand Palms.
Axel A. Granstrom, Weed.
Robert L. Reifel, Willows.

COLORADO

Foster A. Rose, Elizabeth.
William L. Robbins, Grover.
Earl K. Downing, Littleton.
Robert A. Clark, Mead.
Ira G. Cook, Milliken.

CONNECTICUT

Leroy M. Beaujon, Canaan.
Milford L. Carson, Enfield.
Frank A. Lattanzi, New Haven.
Wesley J. Gilbert, New Preston.
Joseph P. LeVasseur, Rocky Hill.
George A. Lamb, Sharon.
Norma K. Schaefer, Weatogue.

FLORIDA

Alfred R. Dickey, Auburndale.
Ray L. Mercer, Bunnell.
Sidney Pennington Smith, Everglades.
James R. Harris, Plant City.

GEORGIA

Scott Walters, Sr., East Point.
James Harold Carlyle, Jr., Norcross.

ILLINOIS

Samuel W. Goers, Altamont.
James Haney, Arthur.
Clyde C. Norton, Cordova.
Robert W. Miller, Du Quoin.
Merle L. Miller, Fairview.
Patricia Ann Higar, German Valley.
Harvey Ellet Calame, Godfrey.
Karl Max Hoover, Lovington.
Paul O. Davis, Mason.
John R. Simpson, Park Ridge.
Milo L. Pearson, Pleasant Hill.
George Harlin Sloan, Rankin.
Paul J. Michael, Somonauk.
Frank P. Campbell, Techny.
Delbert R. Britt, Ullin.

INDIANA

Marcus O. Lane, English.

IOWA

Robert E. Shultz, Allison.
Louis E. Pfaff, Aurelia.
George L. Beeler, Bellevue.
George E. Jenison, Belmond.
Herbert G. Martin, Clermont.
Maurice M. Neal, Dexter.
Hollis E. Scott, Elkhart.
Charles E. Powers, Exira.
Charles H. Worsley, Farnhamville.
Alexander W. Mihm, Fort Atkinson.
Russell H. Oviatt, Goldfield.
Emory A. Smith, Lakota.
Donald Lyle Youngers, Le Claire.
John N. Moore, Leon.
Clark M. Sexton, Oakville.
Joseph A. Nowatzke, Panama.
Clifton Lee Schmidt, Rockford.
Doris N. Hatheway, Sabula.
Eugene M. Clark, Stockport.

KANSAS

Charles E. Brown, Glasco.
Helen G. Lacy, Humboldt.
Henry Michel, Lakin.
Elery N. Stevens, Lane.
Mabelle E. Mettling, Lewis.
Arline D. Wright, Maple Hill.
Lowell E. Sohm, Otis.
John M. Hampton, Parker.
Harold B. Vernon, Simpson.
Glen G. Shook, Virgil.

LOUISIANA

Laurence M. Carmadelle, Barataria.
Effie E. Bickham, Blanchard.
John N. F. Martin, Kenner.
Michael J. Byrne, Marrero.
Homer M. Delacroix, Jr., Plaquemine.
Carey O. Fairbanks, Sicily Island.
Homer B. Roark, West Monroe.

MAINE

Wilbur F. Moulton, Limerick.
Richmond S. Hooper, York.

MARYLAND

Gertrude E. Grabis, Byrans Road.
James F. Wallace, Jr., Easton.
Edgar Marine Belt, Hampstead.
William C. Coakley, Havre de Grace.
Samuel Ahmuty, Jr., Odenton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Norma G. Scothorne, Accord.
Beatrice M. O'Brien, Ballard, Vale.
Albert Foster, East Freetown.
Merle L. Hunt, Hudson.
Jean T. Nelson, Ocean Bluff.
John Wesley Warren, Sheffield.

MICHIGAN

Earl M. Halsey, Almont.
Jeannette J. Reider, Big Bay.
Harold W. Bobb, Genesee.
Clarence L. Meredith, Hudson.
Russell J. Strazzulla, Newport.
George P. Donner, Jr., Spring Lake.
Earl L. Gray, Williamsburg.

MISSISSIPPI

James A. Fellows, McComb.
Ethelyn B. Weldy, McLain.
Herman Alexander Smith, Ripley.

MISSOURI

Linne O. Stemmons, Avilla.
Winston H. Watt, Bosworth.
Lessie H. Bray, Clarksdale.
Harry F. Rickhoff, New Florence.
Delvan M. Mahurin, Novinger.

NEBRASKA

Wayne A. Shaneyfelt, Aurora.
Jack K. Pugh, Bradshaw.
Lloyd E. Scheer, Cook.
Eugene L. Tarr, Gothenburg.
Wilmer R. McConnell, Imperial.
Lawrence L. Valentine, McCool Junction.
Elmer E. Kasper, Prague.

NEVADA

Frank M. Compston, Jr., Yerington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lauretta L. Sumner, Grasmere.
Carrie S. McDonald, Harrisville.

NEW JERSEY

Elmer Stanton Holmes, Jr., Avalon.
Moses N. Strader, Newton.
Elizabeth K. Simpson, Saddle River.
Holloway W. Case, Sussex.

NEW MEXICO

Edward M. Berardinelli, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK

Howard E. Guinnip, Angelica.
Viola M. Comstock, Sodus Point.

OHIO

Helen E. Smith, Adelphi.
Richard J. Gamble, Alliance.
Earl A. Smith, Berlin Center.
John Clifton Richards, Delaware.
Robert E. Trout, Edison.
Nicholas W. Smith, Elyria.
Mary E. Ayres, Goshen.

Roland M. Dorr, Kensington.
Oliver Wolcott, Kent.
Robert J. House, Killbuck.
Ernest L. McConnell, Kirkersville.
John W. Meadows, Lucasville.
Arthur R. Miller, Madison.
Bernard W. Iffland, Metamora.
Glenn W. Duffy, Morristown.
Samuel H. Wolf, New Paris.
Albert F. Warnecke, Ottoville.
Murry N. Johnson, Pataskala.
Margaret L. Hess, Petersburg.
John F. Crawford, Sardinia.
Virgil O. Hutchison, Smithville.
William O. Ochsner, Strongville.
Richard A. Campbell, Sylvania.
William Paul Wilcoxon, Uhrichsville.
Edward J. Oswald, Unionport.
Seth W. Huntley, Vinton.
Harold D. Brenneman, Warsaw.
Clark Wickensimer, Washington Court House.
Everett J. Pearson, West Milton.

OREGON

Clarence A. Christianson, Cornelius.
Lyle B. Dannen, Halsey.
Myrtle E. Gibbs, Long Creek.
Ruth E. McLeod, Maupin.
Wayne E. Dexter, Scappoose.

PENNSYLVANIA

Francis E. Redding, McSherrystown.
Wilbur M. Hall, Montgomery.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Nellie E. Hodge, Alcolu.
John W. Stevenson, Carlisle.
Sara M. Campbell, Clio.
John M. Harrelson, Drayton.
Joseph W. Milling, Jr., Ridgeway.
B. George Price III, Walterboro.

TENNESSEE

Cordie L. Majors, Ramer.

VERMONT

Perley C. Brainerd, Bradford.
Roy H. Jarvis, Grafton.
Ralph S. Nealy, Jericho.
Kenneth H. Neill, Johnson.
Ballou L. Towne, Morrisville.
Alice P. Waterman, North Thetford.

VIRGINIA

Merrel M. Nash, Jr., Bayside.
Mary G. Arnold, Bishop.
Emerson N. Lamb, Blue Ridge.
Radford C. Montgomery, Buchanan.
Ivan L. Potts, Colonial Heights.
Daniel Jackson Kilby, Culpeper.
Ray W. Redd, Draper.
Thomas E. Caldwell, Fincastle.
Allen S. Trevvett, Glenallen.
Harry H. Kimberly, Jr., Hampton.
John H. Norris, Jr., Kinsale.
Robert H. Sipe, McGaheysville.
Elna T. Gooding, Oakton.
Fred M. Mullins, Pound.
Irving L. Wood, Ridgeway.
Nancy E. Wood, Rock Castle.
Francis A. Holdren, Vinton.

WISCONSIN

Jean E. Herschleb, Arlington.
Helen G. Klus, Armstrong Creek.
Glenn W. Meyer, Birnamwood.
Martin N. Ross, Cambria.
John A. Wimme, Nelsonville.
George W. Gessert, Plymouth.

WYOMING

Emilene A. Weisenberger, Bairoil.
Virginia C. Bennion, Cokeville.
Priscilla Butwell, Frontier.
Dale E. Howery, LaGrange.
Harry L. Estes, Thermopolis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 16, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Myron C. Cole, D. D., First Christian Church, Portland, Oreg., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whom we live and move and have our being, grant Thy divine benediction upon us. As the builders of a great nation, we have inherited that which is truth, beauty, and goodness; therefore, impel us ever forward with the motives upon which our Nation was founded and that which will make America great.

Our Heavenly Father, forgive us where we err. Let us not indulge in pious phrases, but let us be ever bound together in the search for the truth which makes men free and we will give Thee the honor and the glory.

We pray for the leaders of our Nation. Bestow upon them honor, integrity, and all that which is of Thy nature and will bring Thy will upon the earth.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 12, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 6, 1956:

H. R. 374. An act to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1082. An act for the relief of Golda I. Stegner;

H. R. 1855. An act to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes";

H. R. 2946. An act for the relief of Eugene Dus;

H. R. 3233. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to make it a criminal offense to move or travel in interstate commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, for arson;

H. R. 5889. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.;

H. R. 6461. An act to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6463. An act to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, section 1 (b), Act 12, Sessions Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6625. An act to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6807. An act to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6808. An act to amend section 73 (l) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 6824. An act to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent No. 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the county of Hawaii, T. H.;

H. R. 7236. An act to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water conservation practices;

H. R. 8100. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Brazil; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

On April 9, 1956:

H. R. 1892. An act for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung.

On April 10, 1956:

H. R. 1005. An act for the relief of Alice Duckett;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1667. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; and

H. R. 4039. An act for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4909. An act relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10004. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10004) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, PRESTON, RABAUT, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, JENSEN, and CLEVENGER.

THE ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FRAZIER, TUCK, and HILLINGS.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to extend congratulations to the Israeli people upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

Events in the intervening years have proved that the friendship between Israel and the United States has been one of the vital partnerships in the free world. On this historic day we are reminded of the fact that in a brief span of 8 years the State of Israel has made tremendous social, political, and cultural gains and is today recognized as a bulwark of democracy, and has proved to be our faithful and loyal ally in the Middle East.

The astounding progress made in this relatively short period of time has electrified the world, as it was achieved in the face of an uphill fight against what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles. The people of Israel have conclusively demonstrated their devotion to a cause demanding rigid austerity and great sacrifices.

The Government of Israel must continue to have the encouragement and help of our country. I have always derived great satisfaction in supporting legislation extending assistance to the valiant people of this young nation.

We are all aware of the fact that there is presently an alarming situation in the Middle East which affects not only the security of the United States but the peace and tranquillity of the entire free world. The security of the State of Israel and the stability of the Middle East are vital to the defense of the free world against Communist aggression and are consequently American interests of the highest priority.

I am convinced that we must take immediate preventive action to overcome the threats of war in that vital region of the world. The first and most essential step would be to permit Israel to purchase defensive arms in this country to counterbalance the delivery of Soviet arms to Egypt.

This administration should immediately consider entering into a mutual security pact with Israel and should institute a complete and immediate investigation of all aspects of our Middle East policy with a view to resisting Communist imperialism in that vital area of the world.

LOSSES FOR SALE

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day one of my constituents mailed me a copy of a communication to stockholders from the chairman of the board of Botany Mills, seeking proxies for approval of a recapitalization plan for the company. Upon obtaining the necessary number of proxies, Botany's management proposed to acquire a profit-making, taxpaying company. It was anticipated that Botany's losses could then be deducted from the other company's profits so that neither would pay any taxes.

Our most important asset—

Said the chairman of Botany Mills in his request for proxies—

is our Federal tax loss carry forward of over $13 million.

The loser in this operation is the United States Treasury and the taxpayers of the Nation.

The foregoing is no isolated example of smart management or sharp lawyers taking advantage of a hitherto undisclosed loophole in the tax law. For a decade and a half, deals of this kind have been in progress. And the practice goes on. A perfectly legitimate section of the tax law designed to permit the losses of 1 year to offset the profits of preceding and succeeding years, is being perverted by speculators who have seized upon the merger device to offset the gains of one corporation with the losses of another.

The result is that the Government loses money, or the legitimate burdens of one group of taxpayers are shifted to other taxpayers already shouldering their fair share. Another consequence is that the merger movement is accelerated beyond reasonable needs. This often results in the closing of mills, creation of unemployment, demoralization of whole communities. In addition, this unwholesome practice is laying the foundation for further disrespect for the tax law. It adds to the growing feeling that our high tax rates are but a sham designed to spring the trap on the unwary and those whose taxes are withheld at the source, but to allow the well-informed schemer a loophole through which he can escape.

Lest you think that the example I cited is an isolated one, I refer you to almost any issue of the Wall Street Journal. Here are some advertisements that appeared last Monday:

Three hundred thousand tax loss carryover for sale or merger.

For sale or merger: Long-established truck and trailer parts company—good expansion potential—tax loss.

The composer of an advertisement the week before must have had his tongue in his cheek as he wrote that he would sell his large tax loss at a sacrifice:

For sale: Finest fancy grocery and liquor business. Large tax loss carryover. Sacrifice for quick sale.

The opening paragraph of an article in a commercial journal recently had this to say:

Prior to the passage of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, businessmen and their lawyers in seeking to acquire corporate ventures were often confronted with the anomalous situation that the purchase price of a business increased in inverse proportion to its success in operation, i. e., the greater the operating losses the higher the asking price. The answer to this financial paradox quite obviously is found in the tax benefits afforded the purchaser by the loss carryover provisions of the then existing revenue laws.

Let us briefly look at the law which makes possible this deviation from normalcy. The Congress long ago recognized that there was a problem to be dealt with. For more than 15 years, the law has permitted the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to disallow any deduction, credit, or other allowance where the principal purpose of the acquisition of another corporation is the evasion or avoidance of Federal income tax. The originators of this provision thought they had licked a rapidly growing practice for avoiding wartime income and excess-profits taxes. The trouble was, however, that the courts would not agree with the Commissioner as to when the principal purpose of the acquisition was the evasion or avoidance of taxes. In the 1954 revision of the Internal Revenue Code, further steps in the tightening-up process were taken. The new law established a prima facie presumption that the principal purpose is tax evasion or avoidance where the consideration paid in acquiring a corporation or its property is substantially disproportionate to the tax basis of the property acquired plus the tax value of other benefits, such as loss carryovers. The law also denied the carryover if all of the three following factors exist: First, if 50 percent or more

of a corporation's stock changes ownership during a period of 2 years; and, second, such change occurs as a result of a purchase or redemption of stock; and, third, the corporation does not continue to carry on a trade or business substantially the same as before the stock-ownership change.

That the new law does not go far enough is amply evidenced by what I have just said and quoted. If any further proof is needed, let me cite the opening words of an address before the eighth annual Federal tax conference of the University of Chicago Law School:

Despite the sustained efforts of the Treasury Department and the Congress to prevent the use of loss corporations for tax avoidance, corporations with large operating loss carryovers continue to be sold at a premium.

It is my conviction that the Treasury and the tax-writing committees of the Congress are still not prepared to go far enough to protect the rights of the taxpayers of the Nation. Those of us who like to see independent small businesses preserved and who fear the steady rise in mergers and consolidations, look with concern on these mergers and consolidations which are inspired by the operation of the tax law. We are concerned, too, with the effect on the spirit of enterprise itself. It is, indeed, unwholesome when a company which has a bad year or two, instead of trying to work out its own problem and get back on to the black side of the ledger, turns instead to an effort to make a good deal at the expense of the Government just by selling out or merging with someone in search of a tax situation.

It is my firm conviction that income taxes should apply to all who have income. No corporation should be permitted to avoid its fair share by selling to, or buying out, another corporation just because it has a tax loss. Fair taxation involves paying taxes on profits earned by corporations; it abhors their ability to escape the payment of taxes by manipulation of capital structure. I call on the Treasury Department and the tax-writing committees of this Congress to draft a tax law which will preserve the legitimate deduction of losses by corporations which have suffered them, but will at the same time prevent tax-inspired mergers which must offend the conscience of any right-thinking man. Congress should make it impossible for any corporation to boast that our operating loss is our most important asset.

A BILLION-DOLLAR DANGER

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most important crops, which had a total value in 1955 of $1,230,895,000, is under attack today by a small Mediterranean invader which threatens the destruction of America's alfalfa production.

I am speaking of a little insect no larger than the head of a pin, which is known as the spotted alfalfa aphid. First reported in 1954, when it is suspected the aphid was brought in as an unwelcome hitch-hiker on an American bomber flying from the Mediterranean area, the aphid caused a loss in the first year to alfalfa growers of $4 million in New Mexico, one-half million in Arizona, and one-third million dollars in California.

Apparently the condition was abated somewhat in 1955, but early reports this year from throughout the country indicate that the aphid has spread to the following States: California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Nebraska, and Louisiana.

In my own State of Oklahoma, where I met last week with State and Federal agricultural officials, alfalfa growers and feed dealers, an entomologist of the Oklahoma A. and M. College informed us that the loss in Oklahoma alone could easily reach $16 million this year, if drastic control measures are not started at once.

The tragic part of it is that the infestation is heaviest in drought hit areas, where many farmers are financially unable to pay the bill for control measures, which involve repeated spraying by airplane at heavy cost per acre.

Unless all farmers in an infested area join in control measures, spraying by a portion of the farmers is of little value because the aphid reproduces at a phenomenal rate and a crop completely cleared in 1 week may be completely reinfested by a neighboring field 8 or 10 days later.

In order to meet this danger, which experts tell us could threaten the alfalfa production of the Nation in a short time, the entire Oklahoma delegation in the House and the Senate today will introduce an emergency control bill. This bill will authorize expenditure of $15 million for control measures between now and June 30, and such additional sums as may be necessary in the new fiscal year. It also provides for $5 million to be expended on a crash-research program as to control method.

Several members of the House Agriculture Committee are joining in sponsorship of this legislation, and we earnestly hope it will receive early favorable consideration in this Congress.

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to invite the Members of the House to participate, on Saturday, April 28, in a motor pilgrimage to Staunton, Va., the birthplace of Woodrow Wilson.

As a feature of the observance of the 100th anniversary of Mr. Wilson's birth, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, which is a bipartisan Federal agency, will join next week in a program recalling the achievements and ideals of this great Christian statesman and educator.

On the 28th, which is the anniversary of the adoption of the League of Nations Covenant, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, as the personal representative of President Eisenhower, will speak on Today's Significance of the Ideals and Achievements of Woodrow Wilson.

Members of the House who desire to take the pleasant drive to Staunton, in the valley of Virginia, on that day, will be guests of the Federal and Virginia Commissions at luncheon.

The motorcade will form at 8:45 a. m. in front of the gates of Arlington National Cemetery, at the terminus of the avenue leading from the Virginia end of the Memorial Bridge.

Members of the House planning to participate should make their intentions known to Mr. Edward K. Moss, of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, Sterling 3-6969.

I should like to read the program for Wilson Week in Staunton, as follows:

STAUNTON WEEK CALENDAR APRIL 22-29

SUNDAY, APRIL 22

11: Morning worship, First Presbyterian Church, Rev. Graham G. Lacy, minister, Central Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

4:30 Interdenominational hymn festival, First Presbyterian Church. Choirs of area participating.

TUESDAY, APRIL 24

9-5: Tour of homes and gardens.[1] Auspices Augusta Garden Club in cooperation with Historic Garden Week, Garden Club of Virginia. Block tickets include lunch, 12 to 2. Feature attraction: Fashion Parade of a Century, 1856-1956, home of Mrs. W. J. Perry, Jr.

7:30: Trifaith panel, King Auditorium, Mary Baldwin College. Speakers: Father George B. Ford, Corpus Christi Church, New York City; Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Chicago Sinai Congregation; Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, Christ Church, New York City.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25

9-5: Tour of homes and gardens.[1] (Same program as Tuesday.)

3:30-9: Spring flower show.[1] Theme: "We Honor Woodrow Wilson." Auspices Federated Garden Clubs of Staunton, Garden Center, Gypsy Hill Park.

THURSDAY, APRIL 26

9-5: Open house, Woodrow Wilson birthplace.

10-9: Spring flower show[1] (same program as Wednesday).

10:30-4: Woodrow Wilson Institute. Chairman, Virginius Dabney, editor, Richmond Times-Dispatch. Music, Mary Baldwin College Choir.

10:30: Morning speakers: Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; T. J. Wertenbaker, professor emeritus, Princeton University; Sir Leslie Munro, New Zealand Ambassador.

12:30: Intermission: luncheon for out-of-town guests. Exhibit: Woodrow Wilson documents, Memorabilia of 1856.

2:30: Afternoon speakers: Arthur Krock, New York Times; Robert C. Clothier, president emeritus, Rutgers University.

[1] Charge for admission.

FRIDAY, APRIL 27

10–9: Spring flower show[1] (same program as Wednesday).

SATURDAY, APRIL 28

Joint centennial event: United States Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission–Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission.

9–2: Open house, Woodrow Wilson Birthplace.

2: Festival parade.

3:30: Commemorative ceremony, 37th anniversary of the adoption of the League of Nations Covenant. Speaker: Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State.

8: Music for Young American Concert. National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell, conductor. College choral festival, auspices Virginia Federation of Music Clubs.

10: Festival ball.[1] Staunton Military Academy. Orchestra: V. M. I. Commanders.

SUNDAY, APRIL 29

11: Commemorative service, First Presbyterian Church, Rev. D. Elton Trueblood, Earlham College.

OMNIBUS FLOOD CONTROL BILL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on Tuesday, May 1, on projects eligible for consideration for inclusion in an omnibus flood-control bill. The hearings will start each morning at 10 o'clock and be held in room 1302, New House Office Building. The schedule for the first week in May is as follows:

May 1: Chevreuil Bayou, La., House Document No. 347; Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River, N. Y., Senate Document No. 103.

May 2: Eau Galle River, Wis., Senate Document No. 52; Mississippi River at Winona, Minn., House Document No. 324; Saline River, Ill., House Document No. 316.

May 3: Tombigbee River, Miss, and Ala., House Document No. 167; Milk River, Glasgow, Mont., Senate Document No. 70; Bad River, Wis., House Document No. 165.

May 4: Purgatoire River, Colo., House Document No. 325; Weber Basin, Utah, House Document No. 158.

There will be additional hearings on May 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 16 and the schedule of projects to be considered on those dates will be announced later. Members interested in presenting witnesses with respect to any eligible projects are asked to communicate with the chief clerk of the Committee on Public Works to facilitate the development of hearing schedules.

It is my suggestion that local interests desiring to appear on any project arrange with their Member of Congress to have one spokesman present their testimony in order to conserve the committee's time. If desired, others will be permitted to submit prepared statements for the record.

[1] Charge for admission.

NEW BARGAINING AGENT REQUESTED

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, an Associated Press news story in the Atlanta Constitution of Saturday, April 14, states that 1,500 employees of Hayes Aircraft Corp., in Birmingham, Ala., will ask the National Labor Relations Board for an election to replace the United Automobile Workers as their bargaining agent.

These aircraft workers are angered at the AFL-CIO because of its continued attempts to break down segregation in the South.

This action on the part of these Birmingham UAW members is not just an isolated instance. Resentment has been growing in many sections of the South for sometime because of the attitude of Meany, Reuther and the heads of some other union leaders on the question of segregation.

When I was at home during the Easter recess, a copy of a letter was given to me which had been written to President Walter Reuther of the UAW and signed by approximately 1,200 employees of General Motors Corp., in Atlanta, protesting the action of the UAW in using funds contributed by UAW members to assist the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in attacking segregation. The letter to Mr. Reuther signed by these UAW members is as follows:

To Walter Reuther, President, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C.

From Members, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The following resolutions have been signed by members of locals, CIO, whose names are affixed hereto:

Whereas funds collected in the form of dues by the CIO are intended solely for the necessary operating expenses of the CIO or for other purposes closely connected with the welfare of the organization and its members; and

Whereas the question of segregation of white and Negro pupils in the public schools of the several States is a political and social issue having no direct connection with the welfare of union labor; and

Whereas the membership of the CIO includes many individuals who are strenuously opposed to the mixing of the two races in the public schools; and

Whereas the public press has reported that large amounts of funds from the treasury of the CIO have been diverted to the support of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for the purpose of forcing the mixing of the two races in the public schools:

Therefore, we, the undersigned members of locals, CIO, do hereby strenuously protest the reported diversion of these funds for a purpose having no connection with the welfare of the union labor; and

Further, we declare our position as being strongly opposed to any further diversion of the national funds of CIO to the NAACP or any other organization taking part in the controversy that has arisen over segregation in the public schools of the several States.

The action which has been taken on this subject by the heads of some unions has been taken without regard to the wishes of the rank-and-file members.

In Memphis, Tenn., recently union members vigorously resented remarks of the national representative of their union on the subject of segregation, and told this representative in no uncertain language that they would tolerate no dictation from the national headquarters on this subject.

A number of steelworkers in Atlanta recently protested vigorously the action of some of the leaders in the Steelworkers Union national headquarters, and threatened to withdraw from the Atlanta local if attacks on segregation were continued by the national officers.

The article in Saturday's Atlanta Constitution is as follows:

WORKERS QUIT UAW, SET UP DIXIE UNION

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 13.—A group of aircraft workers, accusing national union leaders of attempting to break down southern tradition, plans to challenge the powerful United Automobile Workers (AFL-CIO) with an independent southern union.

Spokesmen for the newly formed Southern Aircraft Workers, Inc., said they will ask for a National Labor Relations Board election in an effort to replace the UAW as bargaining representative of Hayes Aircraft Corp.'s 5,800 workers in Birmingham.

The group claims at least 1,500 signed memberships at Hayes, and says it is getting more at the rate of 50 a day. The UAW lists 3,000 members at the plant.

A number of southern union members have protested statements by AFL-CIO President George Meany and Vice President Walter Reuther which they consider attacks on the southern tradition of racial segregation. Reuther is president of the United Automobile Workers.

This, however, was believed the first, or among the very first, definite move toward a labor secession movement in the South over the bitter racial controversy.

Organizers said the independent union will not be segregated though it will be based "upon southern traditions."

"We firmly believe in the protection of the colored worker," said a spokesman, "but we do not believe in Walter Reuther's left-wing integration.

"Equal opportunity but not social equality will be a principle of the new union," he added.

Members of the group insisted the segregation question wasn't the only reason for their rebellion but was "the straw that broke the camel's back."

One of its leaders said workers became dissatisfield with the UAW-CIO last year while a new contract was being negotiated. They strongly objected to a special $20 assessment by the UAW to build a $26-million strike fund for the automobile workers.

Althought the aircraft workers paid the assessment they could not have drawn on the fund had they decided on a walkout.

Leaders plan to call a meeting of southern aircraft worker members in about 10 days to approve a constitution and elect officers. Incorporation papers already have been filed.

The UAW contract with Hayes Aircraft runs until April 30, 1957, but an attorney said this would not prevent an NLRB election from being called. He said the new group would become the bargaining agent of Hayes employees immediately if it won.

EXEMPTING FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TRANSPORTATION TAX

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on transportation of persons, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOPER, MILLS, GREGORY, REED of New York, and JENKINS.

SALUTE TO ISRAEL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the Republic of Israel on the historic occasion of its eighth anniversary. Particularly on behalf of the people of the First Congressional District of Washington State and with all American citizens generally I extend best wishes to the Israeli people.

At times, Mr. Speaker, because of international pressures and the delicate political world situation, the citizens of Israel may question our motives and the extent of United States support, but I hope any such disappointments will in no way obscure from them the warm interest and friendship of the American people. Governmental omission or commission does not dim or deter the desire of the United States to support and secure the permanent military and economic survival of Israel as established by the United Nations.

The problems which more than a century and a half ago beset our own Republic in its infancy lend special significance to the observance of Israel's eighth anniversary. Also this is so because of the importance of the contribution to our culture and economic development by so many American citizens of Jewish blood. This gives Israel and the United States a close tie of interest. Finally let me say, the determination of the United States to prevent Soviet aggression and the spread of international communistic revolution, unites our two freedom loving peoples in a common bond. In this spirit America salutes Israel on this 16 day of April 1956. So it is on this historic observance for and from my constituents I express lasting friendship, support and good will.

APPROVE BILLS REGARDING CREDIT BANKS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I received a resolution from the group directors' conference of the New York State Production Credit Associations expressing approval of a number of bills which have been introduced regarding credit banks and associations. The resolution was adopted at a meeting held in Syracuse, N. Y., on April 3, 1956. In view of the fact that these bills received the unanimous approval of the directors, who represent 17,500 New York State farmers, I am presenting this resolution for the careful consideration of all Members.

The resolution follows:

APRIL 10, 1956.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The directors of all of the production credit associations of New York State, meeting in conference in Syracuse, N. Y., on April 3, 1956, considered and unanimously approved the following resolution as presented by the committee consisting of Homer Shepard, of Cazenovia; Harold Giles, of Union Springs; Glenn Widger, of Ellicottville, and James H. Park, of Batavia:

"*Be it resolved,* That the directors herein assembled in conference representing all of the 15 production credit associations in New York State with total membership of 17,500 New York State farmers unanimously support legislative bills as proposed by the Federal Farm Credit Board known as H. R. 10285, H. R. 10286, H. R. 10315, and S. 3564; be it further

"*Resolved,* That James H. Park, secretary-treasurer of Farmers Production Credit Association of Western New York, be directed to mail copies of this resolution to Representative COOLEY, chairman of House Committee on Agriculture; Representative HOPE, of Kansas; Representative POAGE, of Texas; Senator ELLENDER, chairman of Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; all Congressmen and Senators from New York State; George Hill, secretary-treasurer, Jefferson City Production Credit Association; and others directed by the committee."

We would appreciate your favorable consideration and support.

Very truly yours,

JAMES H. PARK,
Farmers Production Credit Association of Western New York.

ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a telegram and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, the Members of Congress and those in the executive branch are so busy, in this atomic and jet age, with all its tensions and problems, with our Nation's economy expanding at rapid pace, that we often fail to take the time to look back to the grassroots of our country to realize the influence and power of the spiritual and moral force of millions of humble people, whose lives and deeds go unheralded and unsung—yet, who are without doubt making the greatest contribution to the spiritual, moral, and material force of the Nation.

America, the greatest Nation in the world, rests upon, and has drawn its towering strength from millions of American homes. Millions of women in these American homes wield the first and most tremendous influence in instilling into the child the spiritual values, which have long been recognized as the most powerful strength, collectively, of the American people.

The teachings and direction of the women in the early formative years of the children, and associating them in the Sunday schools and churches, starts them on the right road for the future—all of whom continue to contribute and permeate the fabric of American life and American Government, from its base to the summit of the Government—the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have been moved to make the above statements, and to take this time of the House today, because there has come to me a gripping story that so well illustrates the thought which, in my humble way, I am trying to present—a story I believe will be of interest to the Members of Congress—a story of womanhood at its best—a story of an humble woman born and reared in my congressional district.

The subject of this story is Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, 78, of Greenwich, Ill., twice widowed, mother and stepmother of 13 children, who has been given the honor of Illinois Mother of the Year, 1956.

Mrs. Carroll was selected by the American Mothers' Committee. She has honored her county, State, and Nation, and I want the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to carry this story, officially, to every congressional district in the Nation.

Governor William G. Stratton presented Mrs. Carroll a citation at fitting ceremonies on Sunday afternoon, April 15, at the Carrie T. Burritt Hall, Greenville College, Greenville, Ill. Sponsors were the president of the college, Dr. H. J. Long, Mayor Paul E. Zebb, and various groups and organizations of the committee.

Mrs. Carroll will go to New York for the selection of National Mother of the Year, May 7 to 10. Mothers from all 48 States will be contestants for the National Mother of the Year award.

For a more detailed story of the rich and fruitful life of this honored citizen, I am inserting with my remarks a very interesting and factual story written by Mrs. Carroll's neighbor, the local editor

of the Greenville Advocate, Greenville, Ill., on March 19, 1956:

GREENVILLE WOMAN IS NAMED ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR FOR 1956—MRS. ADDIE CARROLL TO BE CONSIDERED FOR UNITED STATES TITLE—WIDOW OF METHODIST MINISTER HAS LIVED HERE SINCE 1933

Orchids to Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, of Greenville.

Signal honor, well deserved, came to a Greenville woman Thursday, when Mrs. Addie Crouse Carroll, 79, a resident of Greenville for the past 23 years, was named 1956 Illinois Mother of the Year, at Springfield, as briefly noted in the Advocate that day.

Mrs. Carroll, widow of the late Rev. E. T. Carroll, a Methodist minister, resides in a modest, comfortable home at 415 South Elm Street, that is when she isn't doing practical nursing or taking care of new-born babies and their mothers, or doing a baby sitting chore. Mrs. Carroll is the mother of 8 children and the stepmother of 5, but so far as the Carroll family is concerned there were no "steps" nor "halves", they were all one big family. And a big family it was, too. For many years there were 15 living in the Illinois Methodist parsonages as the Rev. Mr. Carroll was transferred from church to church. The number included the Rev. and Mrs. Carroll, their 12 children and Rev. Carroll's mother.

Ten of the Carroll children have collegiate training and 5 have degrees. The oldest son, Frank, is a retired major general of the Air Force. Eleven children are living and married and there are 21 grandchildren and 15 great grandchildren.

The children are:

Frank, a retired major general in the Air Force, Boulder, Colo.

Ben, publisher of the Reporter-Dispatch, White Plains, N. Y.

Paul, advertising manager for the American Brakeshoe Co., New York.

Stanley, Tulsa, Okla., in the aircraft industry.

Robert, Worthington, Ohio, in the aircraft industry.

Donald, farmer near Kent.

Mrs. Ella Finkenbinder, Stockton, former teacher.

Mrs. Leona Kendall, Coral Hills, Md., former teacher.

Mrs. Gladys Warren, Decatur, former teacher and now senior visitor for the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Mrs. May Metcalf, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Mrs. Helen Finch, Cape Girardeau, Mo., former secretary.

A son, Vincent, who died in 1948, was a Greenville businessman.

Mrs. Carroll will be presented a plaque in recognition of being chosen mother of the year sometime in April with Gov. William G. Stratton coming to Greenville to make the presentation.

She was chosen by an Illinois committee consisting of the presidents of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs and Women's Christian Temperance Union, Federation of Home Bureaus, the American Legion auxiliaries, and the Christian Women's Association.

She was nominated for the Illinois title by members of the Atlas Sunday School class which she teaches at the First Methodist Church of this city.

Largely through the efforts of Mrs. Nina B. Bruns, home adviser of Bond County, and Mrs. Roy Finley, and members of the Atlas Sunday School class, was the activity started which resulted in the naming of Mrs. Carroll, Illinois mother of the year.

Mrs. Carroll will be considered now by the American Mothers Committee for the nationwide title.

Addie Belle, daughter of Benjamin and Mary Crouse, was born near Ingraham in Clay County, February 13, 1877, the fifth of nine children. She calls her people "not outstanding—just pioneer, hardworking, honest, Godfearing people. I'm proud of them."

Her first husband, Samuel O. Kepley, was a rural schoolmaster and her teacher whom she married in 1897. She was 20. He entered the ministry and served his first pastorate at Hagarstown, with a yearly salary of $300.

When her husband died 6 years later in January 1903 while en route to New Mexico for the benefit of his health, she had 3 children. The proceeds of an insurance policy bought a 50-acre farm which she operated with the aid of her father and brothers. Six weeks after the father died one of the little daughters died.

She married the Reverend E. T. Carroll, pastor of the Methodist church at Grayville, a widower with five children, on Thanksgiving Day in 1906. Five more children were born to them.

"We had to make sacrifices but the children did too," said Mrs. Carroll, recalling how the children were encouraged to complete college education.

The Carrolls came to Greenville in the fall of 1918 and the Reverend Mr. Carroll served the Greenville church 4 years, being sent from Greenville to Salem in 1922.

When the Reverend Mr. Carroll died at his last pastorate in Kinmundy on November 17, 1933, Mrs. Carroll returned to their own house in Greenville later that month, and took up practical nursing to support her family, which then consisted of 2 sons, 1 in high school and 1 in the grades.

Last month Mrs. Carroll was honored at a community dinner in Greenville at which nine of her children were present.

Present were many of the children she had cared for as newborn babies and their parents.

For her service to the community she was given a high-fidelity record player and a This Is Your Life booklet containing pictures of many of "her babies."

I am also including the following telegram of congratulations to Mrs. Carroll from Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois:

APRIL 13, 1956.

Mrs. ADDIE CROUSE CARROLL,
Greenville, Ill.

MY DEAR MRS. CARROLL: I know of no higher honor and no richer award that can come to any woman than to be selected as Mother of the Year for a great State like Illinois. Several things impress me about the selection. The first is that there are so many wonderful mothers who have done so much for family, community, and country, and therefore to be selected as Mother of the Year for the State carries with it high distinction. It is a reward that must be deserved as I have learned in other years and so I congratulate you most sincerely and salute you for your contribution to the well being of family life, community life, and the needs of a free country.

With warm personal wishes,

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOODS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, we should be informed on what the United States Department of Agriculture is doing in the disposing of surplus foods.

They are working at the job, and the first 9 months of this fiscal year—July through March—a 65-percent increase in the distribution of surplus foods is recorded by the United States Department of Agriculture as announced on April 12, 1956. These donations of food are made to recipients in this country as well as abroad. The programs are conducted by the Agricultural Marketing Service.

Eligible recipients in this country received 42.9 percent more in the 9 months' period than they did the previous year. Gains were made in all categories of recipients. Schools, a 25.4 percent increase; donations to needy persons, 89.3 percent increase.

Eleven million schoolchildren, 1,300,000 needy persons in charitable institutions, and 2,929,000 needy persons in family units received surplus food.

Foods are being distributed to needy persons in 74 foreign countries through 19 private United States welfare agencies. A total during the 9 months of 840,300,000 pounds of food was distributed overseas, an 84-percent increase over the same period a year ago.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE: ADAMS CORPORATION, A LIVING EXAMPLE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the blessings which have flowed to the American people as a result of the private enterprise system cannot be fully appraised. We do know that from the beginning of our greation Nation men and women, because they have been free, have put their minds and efforts to work in creating an economy that has not been matched in the history of mankind.

In my own congressional district at Beloit, Wis., there is a small but vigorous company named the Adams Corp. The ingenuity, foresight, and ability of the men behind that company has brought to the American economy a product which is rather new but yet is one that today reaches all parts of the world. I refer specifically to a variety of products packed in small cellophane bags called Adams Korn Kurls, Adams Caramel Corn, and Adams Cheese Wafers. On Friday last week in the House dining room, the Members of this great body had an opportunity to sample these products through the courtesy of Mr. Allan W. Adams, president of the corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the products of this young company is as I have indicated above, going to all parts of the world, Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. These are tasty tidbits that our young men and women in the Armed Forces serving abroad are able to purchase in the commissaries and canteens.

It is with some pride that in the cheese wafers this firm is using dehydrated Wisconsin natural Cheddar cheese and it is

thereby helping to reduce the surplus of Cheddar cheese which is produced so extensively in our great State.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country, I am sure, are proud of the men and women who are identified with private business and private industry today. They are the ones who make the jobs which provide employment for more than 65 million people without any help from the Federal Government. These same men and women are responsible for the high standards of living we enjoy and for the unlimited opportunity of every citizen in this Republic.

EXEMPTION FROM INCOME TAX OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1956, I introduced H. R. 9765, to protect farmers and other persons who are required to treat patronage dividends as income for Federal income tax purposes by providing for the collection of income tax at source on such dividends and to provide tax equity.

At the time of introducing this bill I stated:

> Finally, I would say this: There has been considerable talk about corporations paying a withholding type of tax on dividends they declare, to their stockholders. Estimates have been made indicating that in this area also there has been a loss of legal revenue to the Federal Government. This principle seems to have bearing on this present situation. With that in mind, I am preparing a bill to accomplish this further purpose and, if it seems in order that its subject matter is sufficiently similar to that set forth in this bill, I would agree to join the two bills together.

Accordingly, today I have introduced a bill to provide for the collection of income tax at source on dividends.

Here now are two bills which will raise additional revenue by closing two loopholes in our tax administration and collection. Closing loopholes not only produces more revenue but it also creates a healthier attitude of the public toward the taxes they are required to pay. Nothing undermines the public attitude toward tax payment as much as preferential treatment to one group of citizens over another.

INCOME TAX REDUCTION FOR INSTITUTIONAL CARE OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of mentally retarded children of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income tax purposes.

The problem of mental retardation is indeed national in scope. The problem is vast and its magnitude is only now commencing to make an impression upon public-minded citizens and professional leaders. We are gradually recognizing the fact that mentally retarded children can be helped.

Mental retardation has no boundaries. It may strike, and does strike, families regardless of economic or fiscal status, race, or color. It is staggering to realize the frequency of occurrence and the number of people directly involved. The National Association for Retarded Children estimates that 300 of the children born every day in the United States are destined to be mentally retarded. Mental retardation is beyond question the most extensive of the crippling conditions which affect our Nation's children. For each 100,000 persons in our population, an estimated 200 are blind, 300 are permanently crippled by polio, 350 by cerebral palsy and 700 by rheumatic heart conditions and 3,000 individuals are mentally retarded. Estimates reveal that 3 percent of our total population or approximately 4,800,000 United States citizens are retarded to some substantial handicapped degree.

These figures readily show the immensity of one of this country's most extensive health, education, and welfare problems, and I might add, probably the most neglected.

Statistics are not available to show exactly the number of retarded persons there are but on the basis of the most authoritative studies thus far, estimates show that one out of every thousand of our total population is so severely retarded as to require hourly supervision. Four in every thousand persons are capable of being trained to self-care and social adaptability. Twenty-five in every thousand can, with proper schooling, vocational and social guidance, perform useful and productive jobs in our national economy. I call attention to the fact that in each of these three categories, schooling that is specialized so as to provide the social, vocational and self-care training is most vital to the welfare of these handicapped children.

I should also like to mention that the increasing birthrate in our country, together with the longer life span of the severely retarded adds to the numbers of persons for whom provisions of all types of care and schooling is required. In our country in which we are dedicated to providing equal opportunity for all, a climate must be made available in which the individual regardless of mental or physical limitations, can realize the full development of his capabilities.

The problem of adequate schooling of the proper nature for the mentally retarded children of this country is something that is only currently and slowly gaining national attention and momentum. Public institutions provide for the care and training of some 153,000 mentally retarded and epileptics in 1953 according to the United States Public Health Service. There is no adequate statistic available to show the number of mentally retarded children in specialized private schooling facilities. However, it is estimated that the United States Public Health Service found that in 1950–51 approximately $127 million was spent in operating 91 public institutions for the mentally retarded children while the National Association for Retarded Children estimates that perhaps $150 million a year is spent for the retardation in both public and private institutions.

The immediate problem with which I am greatly concerned today is the amount of money expended by parents of mentally retarded children in their care and training in institutions and schools. The economic inroads on family incomes cannot be accurately assessed, but they, nevertheless, are real and disrupting to any family so involved. Such expenses, depending upon the institution or school, may range from several hundred dollars to several thousand dollars per year and such costs may be occasioned in both public institutions as well as private schools. From the time parents suspect something may be wrong with their child, that is, their child is not developing at a normal rate, to final acceptance of the condition, the parents have expended large sums of money and depleted their financial resources in search of competent diagnosis, counsel, and treatment. The toll upon the finances and mental health of the parents is frequently so severe as to permanently disrupt family relations. Such obstacles to family companionship and unity may affect even and often do, the normal children in the family and the experience of being the parent of a mentally retarded child is sometimes so disturbing that even religious faith is taxed. It is quite important that we not only recognize the problems that confront such parents, but that we give as much encouragement as we can to them in meeting these problems. After all, it is the parents who through love and other fine emotions keep the number of retarded children on the public assistance rolls as low as it is.

It is true that in this country there is indeed a lack of adequate training and teaching facilities, both public and private. In the great State of Missouri, this lack of adequate facilities has been superbly illustrated by a series of articles written by Mr. Morton Mintz which appeared last July and August in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat. For the information of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and for the interested public, I am inserting these articles for printing in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Rhode Island, Congressman FOGARTY, has been most helpful in the initiation of a new program for the mentally retarded children of this country. As you know, in the consideration of the bill—H. R. 9720—making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, moneys are provided for medical research, a new education program, and items of maternal and child health for the mentally retarded.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman BOLAND, pointed out on March 5, that the immensity of the mental retardation problem is beginning to drawn upon the people of the country and with the dawning is the growing desires of our people to help solve or at least alleviate the courageous burden families are carrying. He further indicated the problem was too big and too severe for individuals or even groups to master and that the responsibility rests upon the Government to shoulder the bulk of the program.

It is my feeling and firm belief that parents who are able and willing to pay for schooling, care, and training of their children, should do so. Such care and training is directly in the nature of a medical expense in the broad sense and in this connection the existing provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are not sufficiently broad that a taxpayer may deduct for income tax purposes his expenses for the school care of a mentally retarded dependent.

As pointed out earlier, many of the retarded children in such schools require hourly attention and are unable to provide themselves with even the simplest of their requirements. Others with adequate schooling and care and training can be made marginally independent. In both extremes, medical counseling and treatment is of vital importance in alleviation and mitigation of the condition.

Section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code presently allows a deduction of certain medical care expenses of the taxpayer and these are defined to mean amounts paid for diagnosis, care, mitigation, treatment, and prevention of disease. Amounts expended for such care and training designed to alleviate mental or physically handicapped are also deductible. However, amounts paid for care in a specialized school for the handicapped are not specifically included as allowable deductions for income tax purposes. I feel such expenditures for institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child should be classified as permissible deductions for Federal income tax purposes and I submit that the bill which I have introduced today will encourage, lend support, and give some measure of relief to those parents who are able to participate by the extension of schooling to their mentally retarded offspring. This bill is but a small, though important, step in the path of advancement now being made in the field of mental retardation.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ISRAEL

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the eighth anniversary of the founding of the gallant little nation of Israel.

We in the United States have looked with sympathy on its aspirations. We have admired its achievements.

But today war clouds hover over Israel and its valiant sons and daughters. Many of its neighbors are looking upon Israel with hostile eyes. Some say the spur for that hostility comes from outside of the Middle East.

But no matter where the truth lies, all of the nations of the world and their leaders must be made to realize unequivocally that Israel is here to stay.

There can be no compromise on that score and as Secretary of State John Foster Dulles so clearly stated just a few weeks ago:

> The preservation of Israel is a basic tenet of American foreign policy.

I stand foursquare for that stated policy.

Peaceful cooperation is the best answer for the troubled Middle East and for all the world. Through it improved conditions of life can be achieved by both Arab and Jew.

I have confidence that that good sense of the peoples of the Middle East will in the long run bring about this cooperation for the good of all—and for the maintenance of peace in that troubled corner of the world.

It is fervently hoped that one result of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold's present visit to the Middle East will be the creation of the atmosphere necessary for the development of this peaceful cooperation.

In the meantime, I salute Israel's birthday and wish it well with the firm conviction this gallant nation will live on forever as an important member in the world family of nations.

TRAINING OF MARINES

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, although I do not desire at this time or at any time to prejudge any action involving our military services, I have been thinking a great deal of the tragedy which occurred in the training of our marines at Parris Island last week. It is not my purpose to condemn, nor is it my purpose to justify the tragedy which occurred, but it is my purpose to try, if I may, to show the importance of exercising great caution in regard to this whole situation.

Six young men died last week at the United States Marine training camp at Parris Island. It cannot be said they died because the training was too rigorous. It cannot be said they died because of a failure in judgment. It cannot be said they died because of the system employed. It might be said that probably their tragic deaths are due almost wholly to accident. Now there is no argument about the fact that accidents generally happen because of the failure to act or because of incorrect action or because of a fault.

The finest military organization in the world today is the United States Marine Corps. Their tremendous accomplishments in time of war, their heroism, their courage, their driving force represent a mountain of evidence as to the greatness of their quality. An examination of history will disclose that never on the field of human conflict has the ability, the courage and the power of the United States Marine Corps ever been equaled.

This eminent record of achievement has not come about easily. It is the result of the terrific attention to training of each individual Marine, a training to defend himself as well as to win out in any conflict with an enemy, a training to handle himself completely, individually, or in a group, a training to make each marine completely dependent upon himself, a training with others in the form of a team. Because of this training and the great accomplishments of the Marines for the United States of America, and for the cause of freedom, there is an esprit de corps in the United States Marine Corps unequaled in the entire world.

The training is rigorous. It is tough. It is demanding. It is strenuous. It requires full employment of a young man's mental and physical qualities. The one thing that we must not forget is that because of this training when a marine is facing his enemy, he has the advantage. The marine has a better chance to survive than does his enemy because he is the better trained. Only survivors win wars. The men who die pay for them, but they do not win them.

In our thinking about this tragedy at Parris Island, let us not lose our focus upon the objective, and that is to train these young men so that they might live when they are face to face with the enemy. In our other military forces, we train pilots and men to operate all kinds of machines of war. In the training of these men deaths occur due to accidents. Because of these accidents, however, the training of the men who follow is always just a little better. So it is and will be in the Marine Corps because of these tragic deaths at Parris Island. Let us make sure, let us be certain the young men who follow in training in the Marine Corps will be better trained.

It is easy to say, "Oh, this training is too difficult." It certainly sounds difficult to the average person sitting comfortably before his television in his comfortable living room. But it is not too difficult when the rigors of modern warfare are considered. In this connection, no training is too difficult. The training of our men must be on such a basis that it will prepare them to have the advantage over the enemy in time of war. Upon this their lives depend.

This morning, it was my pleasure to have breakfast with a wonderfully fine group of boys and girls from Groton, Mass., a part of my district. As we were together, I could not refrain from thinking about the future of these fine boys sitting to my right and to my left in the

breakfast room. In this regard I want to emphasize that if any of these fine young men had to go into combat in the defense of their country I would want them to go with the best possible training and the best equipment our country could give them. In this way, I believe they not only would be of great service to their country but they would be able to defend themselves and to prevail against their enemies.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize again that I hope the Congress and the people of America will bear in mind that our country, the United States of America, requests and demands a very high level of ability, knowledge, courage, and forceful determination from the men who wear the uniform of the United States Marine Corps. As a Nation, we expect them to do the impossible and the United States Marine Corps has never let this Nation down, for they have done the impossible time after time after time.

My plea today then is a plea of caution. Let us not be too hasty to form unwarranted conclusions. At the same time I extend to the families and loved ones of these young men my heartfelt sympathy and assure them these boys have contributed greatly to the efficiency and the quality that we respect so highly in the United States Marine Corps. Let us hold fast to the great qualities of the Marine Corps. Let us bring more and more wisdom into the training of our young men. Let us provide them with the knowledge, the ability, the assurance, together with the faith in themselves and their military service. Do not destroy that which has been nobly constructed out of the fury and fire of victory. May men continue to be proud—proud they are marines.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 380)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 12, designated as the Agricultural Act of 1956.

It is with intense disappointment and regret that I must take this action. I assure you my decision has been reached only after thorough consideration and searching my mind and my conscience. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems. This bill does not meet their needs.

I am disappointed at the long delays which this legislation encountered. My first special request in this session of the Congress was for prompt remedial farm legislation. A sound, constructive nine-point program to this end was submitted on January 9, with an urgent request for action. It was a program that came from the grassroots. Suggestions and criticisms from large numbers of farm people, in every type of agriculture, from every section of the country, were analyzed and used. It offered no magic panacea because, we can all agree, there is none. It did strike directly at the root of the low-price low-income problem.

The problem is price-depressing surpluses. Excess stocks of certain farm commodities have mounted to market-destroying, price-depressing size as a result of wartime price incentives too long continued. Any forward-looking, sound program to meet the needs of farm people must remove the burden of these accumulations. They are depressing net farm income by many hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people.

The bill is self-defeating. The soil-bank proposal has been incorporated. This would be constructive, had it not been encumbered by contradictory provisions. The soil bank would provide an income incentive to farmers to reduce production temporarily so that surplus stocks might be reduced. Other provisions of this bill, however, would result in an equal or greater incentive to increase production and accumulate more surplus.

Among the provisions which make this bill unacceptable are: (1) the return to wartime rigid 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities; (2) dual parity for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts; (3) mandatory price supports for feed grains; (4) multiple-price plans for wheat and rice. The effect of these provisions would be to increase the amount of Government control and further add to our price-depressing surpluses.

Specific objections relative to each of these provisions may be summarized as follows:

1. Price supports at wartime 90 percent of parity on basic crops were in effect in each year from 1944 through 1954. They were not responsible for the high commodity prices and high farm income of wartime and the immediate postwar years. Prices were then above support levels due to wartime inflation and the insatiable markets associated with war. Neither did 90 percent supports prevent prices from falling as postwar surplus stocks began to accumulate.

Price supports at wartime 90 percent on the 6 designated basic crops did encourage production of these crops relative to others. At the same time consumption was discouraged and the use of substitutes was stimulated. Market outlets shrank, and surplus accumulations mounted. Acreage controls had to be invoked, thereby rationing the right to produce. Wheat acreage was reduced from 79 to an allotment of 62 and then to the present 55 million acres. Cotton was cut from 25 to 20 and then on down to the present 17 million acres. These drastic reductions, forced by the application of the price-support law, penalized many farmers directly by resulting in shrunken volume and uneconomic farming operations. In addition, acreage diverted from the basic crops shifted surplus problems into many other crops and livestock. Now almost every farmer is adversely affected, regardless of what crops or livestock he raises.

If wartime rigid 90 percent supports were the answer to the problem of our farm families, there would now be no problem.

Farm incomes have declined in every year except one between 1947 and 1954, and in all these years 90 percent supports were in effect.

Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income, which is affected by volume and costs as well as by price. The 90 percent of parity approach focuses on support price alone.

To return now to wartime 90 percent supports would be wrong. Production would be stimulated. Markets would be further destroyed, instead of expanded as must be done. More surplus would accumulate—and surpluses are price depressing. Regimentation by ever stricter production controls would be the end result.

It is inconceivable that we should ask farm families to go deeper into this self-defeating round of cause and effect.

2. The provision for dual parity would result in a permanent double standard of parity for determining price supports. Four crops would receive preferential treatment out of 160 products for which parity prices are figured. There is no justification in logic or in equity for such preferential treatment.

Particularly is this true because, under the working of the modernized parity formula enacted by the Congress, increasing the parity prices of some commodities automatically lowers the parity prices of all other commodities. If parity prices for wheat, corn, cotton, and peanuts are to be higher, then parity prices of the other products must be lower.

To whatever degree prices would be further artificially raised there would be a corresponding stimulus to production, more controls on farmers, reduced consumption, increased accumulations, and lower prices in the market. Such a device for parity manipulations could destroy the parity concept itself. It places a potent weapon in the hands of opponents of all price supports for farmers. We have no right to place the welfare of our farm families in such jeopardy.

3. The provision for mandatory supports on the feed grains would create more problems for farmers. The market for feed grains would shrink as livestock production would come to depend more on forage and less on grain. The flow of feed grains into Government stocks would increase and production controls would necessarily be intensified. Price relationships between feed, livestock and livestock products would be distorted. Producers of feeder cattle, feeder lambs, and feeder pigs would be faced with downward pressure on prices. An imbalance would develop between feed crops and livestock products, with all its adverse consequences.

4. The multiple-price plans for wheat and rice would have adverse effects upon producers of other crops, upon our re-

lations with friendly foreign nations, and upon our consumers.

There are other serious defects in the bill such as certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry. Still other features are administratively bad and would require the hiring of thousands of additional inspectors and enforcers.

I recognize that the restoration by H. R. 12 of wartime mandatory 90 percent price supports applies only to 1956 crops. This, in combination with other objectionable features of the bill, would put us back on the old road which has proved so harmful to farmers.

Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the Nation.

After the most careful analysis I conclude that the bill is contradictory and self-defeating even as an emergency relief measure and it would lead to such serious consequences in additional surpluses and production controls as to further threaten the income and the welfare of our farm people.

Because the good features of the bill are combined with so much that would be detrimental to farmers' welfare, to sign it would be to retreat rather than advance toward a brighter future for our farm families.

We now have sound and forward-looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954. Neither that act, nor any other, can become fully effective so long as it is smothered under the vast surpluses that have accumulated. We imperatively need remedial legislation to remove this burden and enable the fundamentally sound program provided in the act of 1954 to become workable. Such remedial measures were proposed in my message of January 9.

I am keenly mindful that the failure of the Congress to enact a good new farm bill can have unfavorable effects on farm income in 1956, unless prompt administrative efforts to offset them are made immediately. Particularly, the failure to enact a Soil Bank before planting time this year makes such administrative efforts imperative.

Consequently, we are going to take prompt and decisive administrative action to improve farm income now. I have conferred with the Secretary of Agriculture and the administration is moving immediately on four major fronts:

1. In 1956, price supports on five of the basic crops—wheat, corn, cotton, rice and peanuts—will be set at a level of at least 82½ percent of parity. Tobacco will be supported as voted in the referendum in accordance with existing law.

Within this range of price support flexibility, the administration intends to set minimum support levels that will result in a national average of:

Wheat at $2 a bushel.

Corn at $1.50 a bushel.

Rice at $4.50 per hundred pounds.

A separate support for corn not under acreage control in the commercial corn area will be announced at an early date.

Price supports on cotton and peanuts have not yet been announced but will be at least 82½ percent of parity.

The Secretary of Agriculture will announce shortly the details of the new cotton export sales program.

2. For this year the support price of manufacturing milk will be increased to $3.25 per hundred pounds. The support price of butterfat will be increased to 58.6 cents a pound.

3. We will use Department of Agriculture funds, where assistance will be constructive, to strengthen the prices of perishable farm commodities. We will have well over $400 million for that purpose for the year beginning July 1.

These actions the administration will take immediately.

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound Soil Bank Act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 16, 1956.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and without objection the bill and message will be ordered printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the message be postponed until Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

DISPOSAL OF LANDS UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2364) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WILLFUL DESTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT OR MOTOR VEHICLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 319) to punish the malicious destruction of aircraft and attempts to destroy aircraft.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL MOTTO

The Clerk read the resolution (H. J. Res. 396) to establish a national motto of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the national motto of the United States is hereby declared to be "In God we trust."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7679) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Muskogee, Okla., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing approximately nine acres located north of the existing Veterans' Administration hospital reservation situate in Muskogee County, State of Oklahoma, likewise being a portion of certain lands conveyed to the United States by the city of Muskogee by warranty deed dated March 17, 1945, recorded in the office of the clerk of Muskogee County on June 23, 1945, in book 839, pages 432 to 434, the exact courses and distances of the perimeter of which shall be determined and approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The city of Muskogee shall pay the cost of surveys as may be required by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in determining the required legal description.

SEC. 2. There shall be reserved to the United States all minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized for conveyance by section 1, and the deed of conveyance shall continue such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 3. The deed of conveyance shall provide that the tract of land authorized to be conveyed by section 1 of this act shall be used by the city of Muskogee, Okla., for such purposes as will not, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate, interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Muskogee, Okla., and that if such

provision is violated, title to the tract shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "nine" and insert "eight and sixteen one-hundredths."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFERRED TO ROSEBURG, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to section 2 of this act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to quitclaim to the city of Roseburg, Oreg., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing 125 acres, more or less, situated in the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation in that city, the exact legal description of which shall be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act (1) shall provide that the tract of land so conveyed shall be used for park purposes, and shall be available for recreational use by the patients of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Roseburg, Oreg., under the same conditions as it may be made available to the public, so long as the property is used for the purpose conveyed, and if it shall ever cease to be used for such park purposes the title to such property shall revert to the United States, which shall have immediate right of reentry thereon, (2) shall reserve to the United States all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land so conveyed, and (3) may contain such additional terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Veterans' Affairs" and insert "General Services."

Page 2, line 16, strike out "Veterans' Affairs" and insert "General Services."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: On page 1, line 7, after the word "and", strike out "twenty-five" and insert "sixty-three."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Is it true that the amount originally included in the bill and the amount in this bill was donated to the Federal Government by the city of Roseburg?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Yes, that is correct. The city of Roseburg in 1932 donated to the Federal Government 413.7 acres of land. The Veterans' Administration now find that they have no further use for the total of 163 acres of land which the city of Roseburg is ready and willing to make into a park, and the bill requires that the land, when transferred to the city, be used for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND TRANSFER TO BONHAM, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8490) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Bonham, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LAND TRANSFER TO THE CITY OF BILOXI, MISS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8674) to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the author of the bill or the chairman of the committee this question. This land, as I understand it, was originally donated to the Federal Government by the city of Biloxi; is that correct?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the distinguished gentleman that that is correct, with the exception of 3 or 4 acres. In other words, the bill authorizes the conveyance of 144 acres, 139 of which were conveyed by the city to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. FORD. The net result is that the Federal Government is transferring back a small portion of the total which was originally donated by the city of Biloxi?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is true. The Federal Government paid something for a part of this land but the land is to be used for a park in connection with the hospital. Certainly the hospital will gain something from that. Most of the land was donated by the city of Biloxi to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the chairman of the committee. One hundred and thirty-nine acres were donated outright, out of the total of 144.

Mr. FORD. I assume that in this deed any of the ordinary rights under which the Government protects itself would be included?

Mr. COLMER. I assume so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to section 2 of this act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reconvey to the city of Biloxi, Miss., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land containing 144 acres, more or less, which constitutes a portion of land heretofore given to the United States by the city of Biloxi, and is located in the Veterans' Administration reservation in that city. The exact legal description of the land to be conveyed shall be determined by the Administrator.

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act may contain such terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "reconvey" and insert "convey".

On page 1, line 7, after the word "less", insert "one hundred thirty-nine acres of".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "constitutes" and insert "constitute".

On page 1, line 11, strike the period, insert a comma, and the following, "and in the event a survey is required in order to make such determination, the city of Biloxi shall bear the expense thereof."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE III OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is in a way a very laudable bill and one which in all probability would pass by almost a unanimous vote in the House. However, it is opposed by the Veterans' Administration. It is a complicated bill dealing with the loan title of the GI bill of rights. It is one that in my opinion every Member of the House should be fully informed upon before it is passed and should have an opportunity to express himself on it and probably there should be a record vote. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not a proper bill to be considered on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXPEDITING PROCESSING DIRECT LOAN APPLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9263) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to remove certain im-

pediments to the processing of applications for Veterans' Administration direct loans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM LAW GOVERNING PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 10046) to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEATING. Reserving the right to object, and I do not think I will object, will the gentleman from Texas explain what this bill does?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to place in one law all the laws now on the statute books providing for payment on service-connected disabilities or for the compensation of veterans and their dependents. The bill is the result of an extensive study by the staff of the committee and representatives of the Veterans' Administration. It would not increase any rate of compensation nor would it decrease any rate of compensation. The four major veterans' organizations all approve the bill. The Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office all indicate their approval. There will be no additional cost involved and, perhaps, there will be some saving.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is a very constructive measure because this will enable veterans' organizations or individual Members of the Congress to look in one place to find out what law controls as to compensation for service-connected disability or death. I commend the committee for reporting this bill. I think it is a fine measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

Short Title

SEC. 101. This act may be cited as the "Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

Statement of Policy

SEC. 102. It is the intent of the Congress in enacting this legislation (a) to simplify and make more nearly uniform the extensive body of existing legislation authorizing and governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death to persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict or during peacetime service, and to their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents; (b) to incorporate in one act, insofar as practicable, the provisions of law relating to compensation and the ancillary benefits of financial assistance for specially adapted housing and automobiles to certain disabled veterans; and (d) to repeal those provisions of law relating to such benefits which are obsolete, executed, or in conflict with the provisions of this act.

TITLE II—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(b) The term "military, naval, or air service" means service in the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard (on or after January 28, 1915), including the Reserve components thereof.

(c) The term "veteran" means a person who served in the active military, naval, or air service and who was separated therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, or who died during such service.

(d) The term "period of war" means any of the following periods:

(1) Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion: April 21, 1898, through July 4, 1902. If the veteran was serving with the United States military forces engaged in the hostilities in the Moro Province, the foregoing period shall be extended through July 15, 1903;

(2) World War I: April 6, 1917, through November 11, 1918. Where there was service after November 11, 1918, which comenced on or before that date, the war period shall be extended through July 1, 1921. If the veteran was serving with the United States military forces in Russia, the foregoing period ending November 11, 1918, shall be extended through April 1, 1920. Service prior to July 2, 1921, in a reenlistment on or after November 12, 1918, and prior to July 2, 1921, where there was prior service between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918 shall be considered World War I service;

(3) World War II: December 7, 1941, through December 31, 1946. Where there was service after December 31, 1946, which commenced on or before that date, the war period shall be extended through July 25, 1947;

(4) Korean conflict: June 27, 1950, through January 31, 1955.

(5) The period beginning with any future declaration of war by the Congress and terminating on a date fixed by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

(e) The term "widow" means a woman—

(1) who was married to the deceased veteran prior to the expiration of ten years subsequent to his separation from the period of service during which the injury or disease, on account of which claim is being filed, was incurred or aggravated, or

(2) who was married to the deceased veteran for ten or more years prior to the date of his death;

and who lived with him continuously from the date of marriage to the date of his death, except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the veteran without the fault of the woman, and who has not remarried;

(f) The term "child" means a person who is unmarried, and—

(1) who is under the age of eighteen years, or

(2) who, prior to reaching the age of eighteen years, becomes or has become permanently incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect, or

(3) who, after reaching the age of 18 years and until completion of education or training (but not after reaching the age of 21 years), is or may hereafter be pursuing a course of instruction at a school, college, academy, seminary, technical institute, or university, particularly designated by him and approved by the Administrator, which shall have agreed to report to the Administrator the termination of attendance of such child, and if any such institution of learning fails to make such report promptly the approval shall be withdrawn

and who is a legitimate child; a child legally adopted; a stepchild if a member of the veteran's household; or an illegitimate child but as to the father, only if acknowledged in writing, signed by him, or if he has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to the child's support or has been, prior to his death, judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child, or if he is otherwise shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be the putative father of such child;

(g) (1) The term "parent" means a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a veteran at any time prior to entry into active service, for a period of not less than 1 year. Not more than 1 father and 1 mother shall be recognized in any case, and preference shall be given to such father and mother who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of, or most nearly prior to, the date of entry into active service by the veteran.

(2) The dependency of a parent, which may arise either prior or subsequent to the death of the veteran, shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That the dependency of a parent shall not be denied solely because of remarriage: *Provided further*, That the dependency of a parent shall not be denied in any case where the monthly income for a mother or father, not living together, does not exceed $105, or where the monthly income for a mother and father, living together, does not exceed $175, plus, in either case, $45, for each additional member of the family whom the father or mother is under moral or legal obligation to support, as determined by the Administrator. In determining monthly income, any payments by the United States Government because of disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration shall not be considered.

(h) The term "chronic disease" includes—

Anemia, primary
Arteriosclerosis
Arthritis
Atrophy, progressive muscular
Brain hemorrhage
Brain thrombosis
Bronchiectasis
Calculi of the kidney, bladder, or gallbladder
Cardiovascular-renal disease, including hypertension
Cirrhosis of the liver
Coccidioidomycosis
Diabetes mellitus
Encephalitis lethargica residuals
Endocarditis
Endocrinopathies
Epilepsies
Hodgkin's disease
Leprosy
Leukemia
Myasthenia gravis
Myelitis
Myocarditis
Nephritis
Other organic diseases of the nervous system
Osteitis deformans (Paget's disease)
Osteomalacia
Palsy, bulbar
Paralysis agitans
Psychoses
Purpura idiopathic, hemorrhage
Raynaud's disease
Sarcoidosis
Scleroderma
Sclerosis, amyotrophic lateral
Sclerosis, multiple
Syringomyelia
Thromboangiitis obliterans (Buerger's disease)
Tuberculosis, active

Tumors, malignant, or of the brain or spinal cord or peripheral nerves
Ulcers, peptic (gastric or duodenal)

and such other chronic diseases as the Administrator may add to this list;

(i) The term "tropical disease" includes—
Amebiasis
Blackwater fever
Cholera
Dracontiasis
Dysentery
Filiariasis
Leishmaniasis, including kala-azar
Leprosy
Loiasis
Malaria
Onchocerciasis
Oroya fever
Pinta
Plague
Schistosomiasis
Yaws
Yellow fever

and such other tropical diseases as the Administrator may add to this list.

TITLE III—COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OR DEATH

Part I—Wartime disability compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 301. For disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, in the active military, naval, or air service, during a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as hereinafter provided in this part, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct.

Provisional Acceptance

SEC. 302. Any person, who, on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 12, 1918, (a) applied for enlistment or enrollment in the active military, naval, or air service and was provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such service, or (b) was drafted for military, naval, or air service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local draft board and prior to rejection, or (c) after being called into the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service, suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service. Such person and his dependents will be entitled to compensation provided by this title for veterans of World War I and their dependents.

Presumptions

SEC. 303. For the purposes of section 301 hereof, every veteran shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where clear and unmistakable evidence demonstrates that the injury or disease existed prior to acceptance and enrollment and was not aggravated by such service.

SEC. 304. For the purposes of section 301 hereof, and subject to the provisions of section 305 hereof, in the case of any veteran who served for 90 days or more during a period of war—

(a) a chronic disease becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percentum or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service;

(b) a tropical disease, and the resultant disorders or disease originating because of therapy, administered in connection with such diseases, or as a preventative thereof, becoming manifest to a degree of 10 percentum or more within 1 year from the date of separation from such service, or at a time when standard or accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during such service;

(c) active tuberculous disease developing a 10 percent degree of disability or more within 3 years from the date of separation from such service;

(d) multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percentum degree of disability or more within 2 years from the date of separation from such service;

shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service, notwithstanding there is no record of evidence of such disease during the period of service.

SEC. 305. (a) Where there is affirmative evidence to the contrary, or evidence to establish that an intercurrent injury or disease which is a recognized cause of any of the diseases within the purview of section 304 hereof, has been suffered between the date of separation from service and the onset of any of such diseases, or the disability is due to the veteran's own misconduct, service connection pursuant to section 304 hereof will not be in order.

(b) Nothing in section 304 or subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to prevent the granting of service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service.

Rates

SEC. 306. For the purposes of section 301 of this act—

(a) if and while the disability is rated 10 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $17;

(b) if and while the disability is rated 20 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $33;

(c) if and while the disability is rated 30 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $50;

(d) if and while the disability is rated 40 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $66;

(e) if and while the disability is rated 50 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $91;

(f) if and while the disability is rated 60 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $109;

(g) if and while the disability is rated 70 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $127;

(h) if and while the disability is rated 80 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $145;

(i) if and while the disability is rated 90 percentum the monthly compensation shall be $163;

(j) if and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be $181;

(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j) of this section; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ, or one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $420 per month;

(l) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly compensation shall be $279;

(m) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly compensation shall be $329;

(n) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly compensation shall be $371;

(o) if the veteran, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of subsections (l) through (n) of section 306, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly compensation shall be $420;

(p) in the event the veteran's service-incurred disabilities exceeded the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $420; and

(q) if the veteran is shown to have had a service-incurred disability resulting from an active tuberculous disease, which disease in the judgment of the Administrator has reached a condition of complete arrest, the monthly compensation shall be not less than $67.

SEC. 307. (a) Any veteran entitled to compensation at the rates provided in section 306 of this Act, and whose disability is rated not less than 50 percentum, shall be entitled to additional compensation for dependents in the following monthly amounts:

(1) If and while rated totally disabled and—

(a) has a wife but no child living, $21;

(b) has a wife and one child living, $35;

(c) has a wife and two children living, $45.50;

(d) has a wife and three or more children living, $56;

(e) has no wife but one child living, $14;

(f) has no wife but two children living, $24.50;

(g) has no wife but three or more children living, $35; and

(h) has a mother or father, either or both dependent upon him for support, then, in addition to the above amounts, $17.50 for each parent so dependent.

(2) If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 50 percentum, in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in subsection (1) hereof as the degree of his disability bears to total disability.

(b) The additional compensation for a dependent or dependents provided by this section shall not be payable to any veteran during any period he is in receipt of an increased rate of subsistence allowance or education and training allowance on account of a dependent or dependents under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The veteran may elect to receive whichever is the greater.

Part II—Wartime death compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 311. The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent parent or parents of any veteran who died as the result of injury

or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service in line of duty during a period of war, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the monthly rates specified in section 312.

Rates

SEC. 312. The monthly rates of death compensation shall be as follows:

(a) Widow but no child, $87;

(b) Widow with one child, $121 (with $29 for each additional child);

(c) No widow but one child, $67;

(d) No widow but two children, $94 (equally divided);

(e) No widow but three children, $122 (equally divided) (with $23 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided);

(f) Dependent mother or father, $75;

(g) Dependent mother and father, $40 each.

Part III—Peacetime disability compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 321. For disability resulting from personal injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty, or for aggravation of a preexisting injury suffered or disease contracted in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service during other than a period of war, the United States will pay to any veteran thus disabled and who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable from the period of service in which said injury or disease was incurred, or preexisting injury or disease was aggravated, compensation as hereinafter provided in this part, but no compensation shall be paid if the disability is the result of the veteran's own willful misconduct.

Provisional Acceptance

SEC. 322. Any person who, on or after August 27, 1940, and prior to January 1, 1947, or during the Korean conflict period (a) applied for enlistment or enrollment in the active military, naval, or air service and was provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such service, (b) was selected for military, naval, or air service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local draft board and prior to rejection, or (c) after being called into the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service, suffered an injury or contracted a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service. Such person and his dependents will be entitled to compensation provided by this title for veterans of service during other than a period of war and their dependents. If the disability was incurred on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to January 1, 1947, or during the Korean conflict period, the applicable rates of compensation provided by parts I and II hereof shall be payable.

Presumptions

SEC. 323. For the purposes of section 321 hereof, every person employed in the active military, naval, or air service for 6 months or more shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, infirmities, or disorders noted at the time of the examination, acceptance, and enrollment, or where evidence or medical judgment is such as to warrant a finding that the disease or injury existed prior to acceptance and enrollment.

SEC. 324. (a) For the purposes of section 321, and subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, any veteran who served for 6 months or more and contracts a tropical disease or a resultant disorder or disease originating because of therapy administered in connection with a tropical disease, or as a preventative thereof, shall be deemed to have incurred such disability in the active military, naval, or air service when it is shown to exist within 1 year after separation from active service, or at a time when standard and accepted treatises indicate that the incubation period thereof commenced during active service.

(b) Service connection shall not be granted pursuant to subsection (a), in any case where the disease or disorder is shown by clear and unmistakable evidence to have had its inception prior or subsequent to active service.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the granting of service connection for any disease or disorder otherwise shown by sound judgment to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service.

Rates

SEC. 325. For the purposes of section 321 of this act, the compensation payable for the disability shall be equal to 80 percentum of the compensation now or hereafter payable for such disability under section 306 of this act, adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar.

SEC. 326. Any veteran entitled to compensation at the rates provided in section 325 of this act, and whose disability is rated not less than 50 percentum, shall be entitled to additional monthly compensation for dependents equal to 80 percentum of the additional compensation for dependents provided in section 307, and subject to the limitations thereof.

SEC. 327. Any veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of this part shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in sections 306 and 307 of this act, if the disability of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) on or after January 1, 1947, and prior to July 26, 1947.

Part IV—Peacetime death compensation

Basic Entitlement

SEC. 331. The surviving widow, child or children, and dependent parent or parents of any veteran who died as the result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service, in line of duty, during other than a period of war, shall be entitled to receive compensation as hereinafter provided in this part.

Rates

SEC. 332. For the purposes of section 331 of this act, the death compensation payable shall be equal to 80 percentum of the compensation now of hereafter payable under section 312 of this act.

SEC. 333. The dependents of any deceased veteran otherwise entitled to compensation under the provisions of this part shall be entitled to receive the rate of compensation provided in section 312 of this act, if the death of such veteran resulted from an injury or disease received in line of duty (1) as a direct result of armed conflict, (2) while engaged in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war, or (3) on or after January 1, 1947, and prior to July 26, 1947, or (4) while the United States was engaged in any war prior to April 21, 1898.

Part V—General compensation provisions

Persons Heretofore Having a Compensable Status

SEC. 341. The death and disability benefits of title III of this act shall, notwithstanding the service requirements of said title, be granted to persons heretofore recognized by law as having a compensable status, including persons whose claims are based on war or peacetime service rendered prior to April 21, 1898.

Philippine Army and Philippine Scouts

SEC. 342. (a) For the purposes of this title, service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, while such forces were in the service of the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President of the United States dated July 26, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1946, shall be deemed to be active military, naval, or air service: *Provided*, That payments of disability or death compensation based upon such service shall be paid at the rate of 1 Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under this title.

(b) Payments of disability or death compensation based upon service in the Philippine Scouts, under the provisions of section 14 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 543), as amended (10 U. S. C. 637), shall be paid at the rate of 1 Philippine peso for each dollar authorized to be paid under this title.

Provisions for Filing Claims

SEC. 343. A specific claim for benefits under this title must be filed with the Veterans' Administration, on a form prescribed by the Administrator, by a claimant who is not already on the compensation or pension rolls of the Veterans' Administration.

Certain Bars To Benefits

SEC. 344. (a) The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court-martial of any person from the military, naval, or air service, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed, under this act: *Provided*, That in the case of any such person, if it be established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense such person was insane, he shall not be precluded from benefits to which he is otherwise entitled under this act.

(b) The discharge or dismissal of any person from the military, naval, or air service on the grounds that he was guilty of mutiny, treason, spying, or any offense involving moral turpitude, or willful and persistent misconduct of which he was found guilty by a court-martial, or that he was an alien, or a deserter, shall bar all rights to any compensation under this title: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to an alien who volunteered or who was drafted into or who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to July 2, 1921, who was discharged subsequent to November 11, 1918, or who was not discharged from the service on or prior to November 11, 1918, on his own application or solicitation, by reason of his being an alien, and whose service was honest and faithful: *Provided further*, That in case any person has been discharged or dismissed from the military, naval, or air service as a result of a court-martial trial, and it is thereafter established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in such court-martial trial and discharge such person was insane, such person shall be entitled to compensation under title III hereof: *Provided further*, That discharge or dismissal or finding of guilt for any of the offenses specified in this subsection shall not affect the payment of compensation for disabilities incurred in or aggravated by service in any prior or subsequent enlistment: *And provided further*, That no compensation shall be payable for death inflicted as a lawful punishment for crime or military offense, except when inflicted by the enemy.

(c) Any person shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to be guilty of

mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy of the United States or of its allies shall forfeit all accrued or future benefits under this Act: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may apportion and pay any part of such benefits to the dependents of such person not exceeding the amount to which each dependent would be entitled if such person were dead.

Line of Duty and Misconduct

SEC. 345. An injury or disease incurred during military, naval, or air service will be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty and not the result of the veteran's own misconduct when the person on whose account benefits are claimed was, at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted, in active military, naval, or air service, whether on active duty or on authorized leave, unless such injury or disease was the result of his own willful misconduct: *Provided*, That venereal disease shall not be presumed to be due to willful misconduct if the person in service complies with the regulations of the appropriate service department requiring him to report and receive treatment for such disease: *Provided further*, That the requirement for line of duty will not be met if it appears that at the time the injury was suffered or disease contracted the person on whose account benefits are claimed (1) was avoiding duty by deserting the service, or by absenting himself without leave materially interfering with the performance of military duties; or (2) was confined under sentence of court-martial or civil court: *Provided, however*, That disease, injury, or death incurred without willful misconduct on the part of the service person shall be deemed to have been incurred in line of duty if the sentence of the court-martial did not involved an unremitted dishonorable discharge or if the offense for which convicted by civil court did not involve a felony as defined under the laws of the jurisdiction where the service person was convicted by such civil court.

Aggravation

SEC. 346. A preexisting injury or disease will be considered to have been aggravated by active military, naval, or air service, where there is an increase in disability during active service, unless there is a specific finding that the increase in disability is due to the natural progress of the disease.

Consideration To Be Accorded Time, Place, and Circumstances of Service

SEC. 347. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to include in the regulations pertaining to service-connection of disabilities, additional provisions in effect requiring that in each case where a veteran is seeking service-connection for any disability due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of his service as shown by his service record, the official history of each organization in which he served, his medical records, and all pertinent medical and lay evidence.

(b) In the case of any veteran who engaged in combat with the enemy in active service with a military, naval, or air organization of the United States during a period of war, campaign, or expedition, the Administrator is authorized and directed to accept as sufficient proof of service connection of any disease or injury alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service satisfactory lay or other evidence of service incurrence or aggravation of such injury or disease, if consistent with the circumstances, conditions, or hardships of such service, notwithstanding the fact that there is no official record of such incurrence or aggravation in such service, and, to that end, shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of the veteran. Service connection of such injury or disease may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary. The reasons for granting or denying service connection in each case shall be recorded in full.

Authority for Schedule for Rating Disabilities

SEC. 348. The Administrator is authorized and directed to adopt and apply a schedule of ratings of reductions in earning capacity from specific injuries or combination of injuries. The ratings shall be based, as far as practicable, upon the average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations. The schedule shall be constructed so as to provide ten grades of disability and no more, upon which payments of compensation shall be based, namely, 10 percentum, 20 percentum, 30 percentum, 40 percentum, 50 percentum, 60 percentum, 70 percentum, 80 percentum, 90 percentum, and total, 100 percentum. The Administrator shall from time to time readjust this schedule of ratings in accordance with experience.

Minimum Rating for Arrested Tuberculosis

SEC. 349. Any veteran shown to have active tuberculosis which is compensable under this title, who in the judgment of the Administrator has reached a condition of complete arrest, shall be rated as totally disabled for a period of 2 years following such date of arrest, as 50 percentum disabled for an additional period of 4 years, and 30 percentum for a further 5 years. Following far advanced active lesions the permanent rating shall be 30 percentum, and following moderately advanced lesions, the permanent rating, after 11 years, shall be 20 percentum, provided there is continued disability, dyspnea on exertion, impairment of health, and so forth; otherwise the rating shall be zero percentum. The total disability rating herein provided for the 2 years following a complete rest may be reduced to 50 percentum for failure to follow prescribed treatment or to submit to examination when requested. This section shall not be construed as requiring a reduction of compensation authorized under any other provision of this title.

Combination of Certain Ratings

SEC. 350. The Administrator is authorized and directed to provide for the combination of ratings and to pay compensation at the rates prescribed in part I of this title to those veterans who served during a period of war and during any other time, who have suffered disability in line of duty in each period of service.

Permanent Ratings

SEC. 351. A rating of total disability which has been made for compensation purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and which has been continuously in force for 20 or more years shall not be reduced thereafter, except upon a showing that such rating was based on fraud.

Effective Dates of Awards

SEC. 352. The effective date of an award of compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that—

(a) subject to the provisions of subsections (a) (1), (2), and (3) hereof, no award of disability or death compensation shall be effective prior to the date of the veteran's separation from service, date of the veteran's death, date of happening of the contingency upon which disability or death compensation is allowed, or the date of receipt of application therefor, whichever is the later date—

(1) disability compensation shall be payable from the date of discharge of the veteran if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from discharge;

(2) death compensation shall be payable as of the day following the date of death of the veteran if claim therefor is filed within 1 year after the death of the veteran;

(3) where a report or a finding of death of any person in the active military, naval, or air service has been made by the Secretary of the Department concerned, the effective date of an award of death compensation shall be the day following the date fixed by the Secretary as the date of death in such report or finding: *Provided*, That claim be filed prior to 1 year after report or finding of death is made: *And provided further*, That death compensation shall not be payable to any dependent for any period for which such dependent has received, or is entitled to receive, an allowance, allotment, or service pay of the deceased;

(b) in the event the claimant's application is not complete at the time of original submission, the Veterans' Administration will notify the claimant of the evidence necessary to complete the application, and if such evidence is not received within 1 year from the date of request therefor, compensation may not be paid by virtue of that application; and

(c) where a claim has been finally disallowed, a subsequent claim on the same factual basis, if supported by new and material evidence, shall have the attributes of a new claim, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph II, part II, of Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a).

SEC. 353. (a) The effective date of an award of increased compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that no award of increased compensation may be effective for any period prior to the date of receipt of the evidence showing entitlement thereto.

(b) For the purposes of this section, an award of increased compensation shall mean any award of compensation, amending, reopening, or supplementing a previous award, authorizing any payments not theretofore authorized to the particular individual involved.

SEC. 354. The effective date of reduction or discontinuance of compensation under this title shall be fixed in accordance with the facts found, except that—

(a) where disability or death compensation has been awarded, and a reduction or discontinuance is thereafter effected as to rates, such reduction or discontinuance shall be effective the last day of the month in which the reduction or discontinuance is approved;

(b) reductions or discontinuances because of the death of a disabled person receiving compensation shall be effective as of the date of death;

(c) discontinuance of compensation because of remarriage or death of a widow shall be effective the date next preceding the date of her remarriage, or upon the date of her death;

(d) discontinuance or reduction of compensation to or because of a child reaching the age of 18 years, or being married, or dying, shall be effective the date next preceding the 18th birthday or next preceding the date of marriage or upon the date of death;

(e) where there is fraud shown to have been committed by the person receiving compensation, or with his or her knowledge, the effective date of discontinuance shall be as of the effective date of the award to such person; and

(f) discontinuance of compensation because of the receipt of active service or retirement pay shall be effective as of the date next preceding the date of commencement of such pay.

Election of Benefits

SEC. 355. Any person who is receiving pay pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement of persons in the regular military, naval, or air service, or pursuant to any provision of law relating to the retirement for disability of persons in other than the regular military, naval, or air service, and who would be eligible to receive compensation under this title if he were not receiving such retired pay shall be entitled to receive such compensation upon the filing by such person

with the department by which such retired pay is paid of a waiver of so much of his retired pay and allowances as is equal in amount to such compensation. To prevent duplication of payments, the department with which any such waiver is filed shall notify the Veterans' Administration of the receipt of such waiver, the amount waived, and the effective date of the reduction in retired pay.

Concurrent Payment of Benefits

SEC. 356. (a) Except to the extent that retirement pay is waived under other laws, compensation under this title, based on the claimant's own service, shall not be payable concurrently with pension, or retirement pay, based on his own service. The receipt of compensation under this title by a widow, child, or parent on account of the death of any person, or receipt by any person of compensation under this title on account of his own service, shall not bar the payment of compensation under this title on account of the death or disability of any other person.

(b) Compensation under this title on account of his own service shall not be paid while the person is in receipt of active service pay.

Renouncement of Benefits

SEC. 357. Any person entitled to compensation under this title may renounce his right thereto. The application renouncing the right shall be in writing over the person's signature and, upon filing of such application, payment of such benefits and the right thereto shall be terminated and he shall be denied any and all rights thereto from date of receipt of such application by the Veterans' Administration. The renouncement provided for herein shall not preclude the person from filing a new application for compensation at a future date but such application shall have the attributes of an original application and no payment will be made for any period prior to the date thereof.

Disappearance

SEC. 358. Where an incompetent veteran receiving compensation under this title disappears, the Administrator, in his discretion, may pay to the dependents of such veteran the applicable amount of compensation provided by section 312 or 332 of this act for the dependents of such veterans: *Provided*, That in no event shall payments under this section in any claim exceed the amount of compensation payable at the time of disappearance.

Accrued Benefits

SEC. 359. (a) Compensation authorized under this title, to which a person was entitled prior to the date of his death, and not paid during his lifetime, and due and unpaid for a period not to exceed 1 year prior to the death under existing ratings or decisions, or those based on evidence in the file at date of death, shall, upon the death of such person, be paid as hereinafter set forth:

(1) Upon the death of a person receiving an apportioned share of the veteran's compensation, all or any part of such unpaid amount, to the veteran or to any other dependent or dependents as may be determined by the Administrator;

(2) Upon the death of a veteran, to the surviving spouse; or if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children, dependent mother or father in the order named;

(3) Upon the death of a widow, to the veteran's child or children;

(4) Upon the death of a child, to the surviving child or children of the veteran, entitled to death compensation;

(5) In all other cases, only so much of the unpaid compensation may be paid as may be necessary to reimburse a person who bore the expense of last sickness and burial: *Provided*, That no part of any of the accrued compensation shall be used to reimburse any political subdivision of the United States for expense incurred in the last sickness or burial of such person; and

(6) Payment of the benefits authorized by this section will not be made unless claim therefor be received in the Veterans' Administration within 1 year from the date of death of the beneficiary, and such claim is perfected by the submission of the necessary evidence within 1 year from the date of the request therefor by the Veterans' Administration. A claim for compensation by an apportionee, widow, child, or dependent parent shall be deemed to include claim for any accrued benefits.

(b) A check received by a payee in payment of compensation shall, in the event of the death of the payee on or after the last day of the period covered by such check and unless negotiated by the payee or the duly appointed representative of his estate, be returned to the Veterans' Administration and canceled. The amount represented by any check returned and canceled pursuant to the foregoing or any amount recovered by reason of improper negotiation of any such check shall constitute accrued benefits payable pursuant to the provisions of subsection 359 (a) of this act: *Provided*, That the 1-year limitations of subsection 359 (a) shall not apply: *And provided further*, That any amount not so paid shall be paid upon settlement by the General Accounting Office to the estate of the deceased payee, if such estate will not escheat.

TITLE IV—SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING FOR DISABLED VETERANS

SEC. 401. The Administrator is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to assist any veteran, who is entitled to compensation under title III of this act, based on service on or after April 21, 1898, for permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss, or loss of use, by reason of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheel chair, in acquiring a suitable housing unit with special fixtures or movable facilities made necessary by the nature of the veteran's disability, and necessary land therefor. The regulations of the Administrator shall include, but not be limited to, provisions requiring findings that (a) it is medically feasible for such veteran to reside in the proposed housing unit and in the proposed locality; (b) the proposed housing unit bears a proper relation to the veteran's present and anticipated income and expenses; and (c) the nature and condition of the proposed housing unit are such as to be suitable to the veteran's needs for dwelling purposes.

SEC. 402. The assistance authorized by section 401 shall be limited in the case of any veteran to 1 housing unit and necessary land therefor, and shall be afforded under 1 of the following plans, at the option of the veteran, but shall not exceed $10,000 in any one case—

(a) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land to be acquired by him, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed 50 percentum of the total cost to the veteran of (1) the housing unit and (2) the necessary land upon which it is to be situated;

(b) where the veteran elects to construct a housing unit on land acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this title, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percentum of the total cost to the veteran of the housing unit and the land necessary for such housing unit, or (2) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of the housing unit plus the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of the land necessary for such housing unit;

(c) where the veteran elects to remodel a dwelling, which is not adapted to the requirements of his disability, acquired by him prior to application for assistance under this title, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the total of (1) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such remodeling, plus (2) the smaller of the following sums: (A) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the it is situated, or (B) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such dwelling and the necessary land upon which it is situated; and

(d) where the veteran has acquired a suitable housing unit, the Administrator shall pay not to exceed the smaller of the following sums: (1) 50 percentum of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated, or (2) the full amount of the unpaid balance, if any, of the cost to the veteran of such housing unit and the necessary land upon which it is situated.

SEC. 403. The Administrator is authorized to furnish to veterans eligible for assistance under this title, without cost to the veterans, model plans and specifications of suitable housing units.

SEC. 404. Any veteran who accepts the benefits of this title shall not by reason thereof be denied the benefits of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 405. The Government of the United States shall have no liability in connection with any housing unit, or necessary land therefor, acquired under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 406. The assistance authorized by this title shall not be available to any veteran who has received financial assistance under part IX of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a).

SEC. 407. Any amounts heretofore appropriated for the Veterans' Administration for payments authorized by part IX of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary therefor.

TITLE V—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

SEC. 501. Subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth in this title, the Administrator is authorized and directed, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran who is entitled to compensation under title III of this act for any of the following due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during the period of World War II or the Korean conflict period:

(a) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

(b) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

(c) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than 20 degrees in the better eye.

SEC. 502. No payment shall be made under this title for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it

is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided*, That a veteran who served who cannot qualify to operate a vehicle shall nevertheless be entitled to the payment of not to exceed $1,600 on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, as provided in section 501, to be operated for him by another person, provided such veteran meets the other eligibility requirements set forth in this title.

SEC. 503. The furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of $1,600, or the amount of $1,600, if the total purchase price is in excess of $1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

SEC. 504. No veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this title and no veteran who has received or who hereafter receives an automobile or other conveyance under (a) the provisions of the paragraph under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, (b) the act of September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 894), or (c) the act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 574), shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 505. The benefits provided in this title shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after October 20, 1951, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after October 20, 1951.

SEC. 506. (a) Any amounts heretofore appropriated for the Veterans' Administration under the heading "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans" are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary therefor.

(b) Notwithstanding the repeal by section 802 of this act of any laws relating to automobiles or other conveyances for disabled veterans, any amount heretofore appropriated for the purposes of such acts, and which have been obligated but not expended, shall remain available until expended.

TITLE VI—PENALTIES AND FORFEITURES

SEC. 601. Whoever, in any claim for benefits under this act, makes any sworn statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 602. If any person entitled to payment of compensation under title III of this act, whose right to payment thereunder ceases upon the happening of any contingency, thereafter fraudulently accepts any such payment, he shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 603. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or compensation under this act, without being entitled to the same, and with intent to defraud the United States or any beneficiary of the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 604. Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made, or conspire, combine, aid, or assist in, agree to, arrange for, or in any way procure the making or presentation of a false or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, statement, voucher, or paper, or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for benefits under this act, shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this act, and benefits (other than contracts of insurance) under any other law administered by the Veterans' Administration, and, in addition to any and all other penalties imposed by law, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 605. When disability compensation based upon service-connected disability has been forfeited by a veteran, under section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 1312), as amended (38 U. S. C. 555), section 15 of the act of March 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 11; 38 U. S. C. 715), or section 604 of this act compensation payable except for the forfeiture, from and after the date of suspension of payments to the veteran, shall be paid to his wife, child, or children, and/or dependent parents, such payments not to exceed the amount payable in case such veteran had died from such service-connected disability: *Provided*, That no compensation shall be paid to any dependent who has participated in the fraud for which the forfeiture was imposed.

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, promulgate, and publish such rules and regulations as are consistent with the provisions of this act, and necessary to carry out its purposes.

SEC. 702. The Administrator is authorized in carrying out the provisions of this act to delegate authority to render decisions to such person or persons as he may find necessary. Within the limitations of such delegations, any decisions rendered by such person or persons shall have the same force and effect as though rendered by the Administrator.

SEC. 703. There shall be no recovery of payments made under this act from any person who, in the judgment of the Administrator, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer or certifying officer shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

TITLE VIII—AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS

Amendments

SEC. 801. (a) Paragraph II, part IV, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "a pension under part I or part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "compensation under the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(b) Subparagraphs I (c) and (d), part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, are hereby amended by deleting "part I" in each subparagraph and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph I, Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended."

(c) Section 212 (b) of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "during an enlistment or employment as provided in Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part I, paragraph I." and inserting in lieu thereof the language "during a period of war as defined in section 201 of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(d) Section 31 of the act of March 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 526; 38 U. S. C. 501a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "of Public Law No. 78, and of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "and of title III of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(e) Section 2 of the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 609; 38 U. S. C. 556a), is hereby amended by deleting the language "the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act, as amended, the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, the pension laws in effect prior to March 20, 1933, Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended, Public Law No. 484, 73d Congress, or under any act or acts amendatory of such acts," and inserting in lieu thereof the language "any laws now or hereafter administered by the Veterans' Administration."

(f) The second paragraph of section 9 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1196; 38 U. S. C. 555a), is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress" the language "or section 604 of the Veterans Compensation Act of 1955."

(g) Section 12 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1197; 38 U. S. C. 501a–1), is hereby amended by substituting a comma for the period following "March 28, 1934" and inserting the language "as now or hereafter amended."

(h) The act of December 28, 1950 (64 Stat. 1121), as amended (38 U. S. C. 701a), is is hereby amended by deleting the language "part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended" and inserting in lieu thereof the language "part I of title II of the Veterans' Compensation Act of 1955."

(i) Section 15 of the act of March 20, 1933 (38 U. S. C. 715), is amended by inserting before the words "and, in addition", the words "and under the Veterans' Compensation Act of 1955."

Repeals

SEC. 802. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) In the Revised Statutes, as amended: Sections 4692 (38 U. S. C. 151); 4693 (38 U. S. C. 152); 4694 (38 U. S. C. 155); 4695 (38 U. S. C. 153); 4696 (38 U. S. C. 154); 4697 (38 U. S. C. 155a); 4698 (38 U. S. C. 156); 4698½ (38 U. S. C. 53); 4699 (38 U. S. C. 177); 4702 (38 U. S. C. 191); 4703 (38 U. S. C. 193); 4705 (38 U. S. C. 198); 4706 (38 U. S. C. 200); 4707 (38 U. S. C. 203, 204); 4712 (38 U. S. C. 21); 4713 (38 U. S. C. 95); 4722 (38 U. S. C. 23); 4728 (38 U. S. C. 221); 4729 (38 U. S. C. 223); 4735 (38 U. S. C. 201); and 4776 (38 U. S. C. 74).

(2) Act of June 18, 1874 (18 Stat. 78; 38 U. S. C. 157).

(3) Act of February 28, 1877 (19 Stat. 264; 38 U. S. C. 164).

(4) Act of March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 403; 38 U. S. C. 222).

(5) Act of June 17, 1878 (20 Stat. 144; 38 U. S. C. 159).

(6) Act of June 18, 1878 (20 Stat. 166; 38 U. S. C. 153).

(7) Act of January 25, 1879 (20 Stat. 265; 38 U. S. C. 91).

(8) Section 2 of the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 470; 38 U. S. C. 92, 93).

(9) Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 484; 38 U. S. C. 159).

(10) The proviso to the first sentence of section 3 of the act of June 21, 1879 (21 Stat. 30 ; 38 U. S. C. 58).

(11) Act of June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 281; 38 U. S. C. 153).

(12) Act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 453; 38 U. S. C. 165, 169, 179).

(13) Act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 437).

(14) The second proviso to the third paragraph of the act of March 3, 1885 (23 Stat. 362; 38 U. S. C. 24).

(15) Act of March 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 5; 38 U. S. C. 195, 196).

(16) Act of August 4, 1886 (24 Stat. 220; 38 U. S. C. 166).

(17) The second proviso to the second paragraph of the act of June 7, 1888 (25 Stat. 173; 38 U. S. C. 94).

(18) Act of August 27, 1888 (25 Stat. 449; 38 U. S. C. 171, 173).

(19) Act of February 12, 1889 (25 Stat. 659; 38 U. S. C. 163).

(20) Act of March 4, 1890 (26 Stat. 16; 38 U. S. C. 174).

(21) Section 1 of the act of June 27, 1890 (26 Stat. 182; 38 U. S. C. 203).

(22) Act of July 14, 1892 (27 Stat. 149; 38 U. S. C. 175).

(23) The last two provisos of the third paragraph of the act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 704; 38 U. S. C. 176).

(24) Act of January 15, 1903 (32 Stat. 773; 38 U. S. C. 172).

(25) Act of March 2, 1903 (32 Stat. 944; 38 U. S. C. 162, 167).

(26) Act of April 8, 1904 (33 Stat. 163; 38 U. S. C. 160).

(27) The third proviso of the second paragraph of the act of March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1406; 38 U. S. C. 178).

(28) The last sentence, sixth paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", of the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 940), as amended (38 U. S. C. 179).

(29) Section 313 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 408), as amended (38 U. S. C. 502).

(30) Sections 3 and 5 of the act of May 1, 1920 (41 Stat. 586, 587; 38 U. S. C. 168, 312, 314).

(31) Section 3 of the act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 982; 38 U. S. C. 161, 168).

(32) Section 3 of the act of September 1, 1922 (42 Stat. 835; 38 U. S. C. 354).

(33) In the World War Veterans Act, 1924 (act of June 7, 1924; 43 Stat. 607): Sections 200, as amended (38 U. S. C. 471); 201, as amended (38 U. S. C. 472); 202, as amended (38 U. S. C. 473–480, 482–491); 203, as amended (38 U. S. C. 492); 204 (38 U. S. C. 493); 205 (38 U. S. C. 494); 207 (38 U. S. C. 496); 210, as amended (38 U. S. C. 499); 211 (38 U. S. C. 500); 212, as amended (38 U. S. C. 422); 213 (38 U. S. C. 501); and 214, as added by section 21, act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1000), as amended (38 U. S. C. 501b).

(34) Act of May 5, 1926 (44 Stat. 396; 38 U. S. C. 168b).

(35) Section 1 of the act of February 11, 1927 (44 Stat. 1085; 38 U. S. C. 168a).

(36) Act of April 27, 1928 (45 Stat. 466; 38 U. S. C. 232).

(37) Sections 1 and 2 of the act of July 2, 1930 (46 Stat. 847; 38 U. S. C. 238, 238 (a)).

(38) In the act of March 20, 1933 (48 Stat. 8): Subsections 1 (a) and 1 (c) (38 U. S. C. 701); 1 (g), as added by section 1 of the Act of June 19, 1948 (62 Stat. 500), as amended (38 U. S. C. 701); sections 2, 3, and 4 (38 U. S. C. 702–704); and 38 (U. S. C. 719).

(39) In the Veterans Regulations, as amended (38 U. S. C. ch. 12A)—

(a) parts I. II, VI, IX, and paragraph I of part IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a);

(b) subparagraph III (a) of part I, and part III of Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a);

(c) Veterans Regulation No. 3 (a);

(d) Veterans Regulation No. 4;

(e) paragraphs VIII, XII, XV, and XVIII of Veterans Regulation No. 10; and

(f) Veterans Regulation No. 12.

(40) The first, third, and fourth paragraphs of section 20 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 309), as amended (38 U. S. C. 722).

(41) Section 4 of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 508).

(42) Sections 26, 27, and 34 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935 (48 Stat. 524, 526; 38 U. S. C. 473a, 471a, 723).

(43) Section 2 of the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat 869; 38 U. S. C. 724).

(44) Act of June 24, 1936 (49 Stat. 1910; 38 U. S. C. 703a).

(45) Section 400 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2034; 38 U. S. C. 472a).

(46) Sections 3 and 8 of the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 660, 662; 38 U. S. C. 472b, 472e).

(47) Act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1214; 38 U. S. C. 35).

(48) Act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1067), as amended (38 U. S. C. 703b, 703c).

(49) Section 5 of the act of July 19, 1939 (53 Stat. 1070), as amended (38 U. S. C. 472b).

(50) Act of June 6, 1940 (54 Stat. 237).

(51) Sections 6 and 8 and the first paragraph of section 9 of the act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1196; 38 U. S. C. 473, 703b, note, 555a).

(52) Section 1 of the act of July 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 608; 38 U. S. C. 725).

(53) Section 1 of the act of August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 665; 38 U. S. C. 357b).

(54) Sections 2 and 3 of the act of December 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 844).

(55) Act of December 20, 1941 (55 Stat. 847; 38 U. S. C. 726).

(56) Section 10 of the act of July 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 659; 38 U. S. C. 472b–1).

(57) Act of July 30, 1942 (56 Stat. 731).

(58) Sections 14 and 17 of the act of July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 558, 560), as amended (38 U. S. C. 731, 732).

(59) Section 1 of the act of May 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 229; 38 U. S. C. 471a–1).

(60) Act of September 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 728; 38 U. S. C. 733).

(61) Act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 797; 38 U. S. C. 471a–2).

(62) Act of June 27, 1946 (60 Stat. 319; 38 U. S. C. 736–738).

(63) Section 2 of the act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 910; 38 U. S. C. 471a–3).

(64) The paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 101, title I, First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 915; 38 U. S. C. 252).

(65) The second paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 1 of the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948 (61 Stat. 244; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(66) The second paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration," in section 101 of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948 (62 Stat. 1035; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(67) Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1219; 38 U. S. C. 740–743).

(68) Act of August 1, 1949 (63 Stat. 484; 38 U. S. C. 744).

(69) Sections 1 and 2 of the act of October 10, 1949 (63 Stat. 731, 732; 38 U. S. C. 722, 740, 741).

(70) The paragraph following the heading "Veterans' Administration" in section 101 of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 744; 38 U. S. C. 252, note).

(71) Act of October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1026; 38 U. S. C. 471a–4, 471a–4 note).

(72) Act of September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 894; 38 U. S. C. 252).

(73) Act of October 20, 1951 (65 Stat. 574; 38 U. S. C. 252a–252e, 252a note.)

(74 Section 1 of the act of May 23, 1952 (66 Stat. 90; 38 U .S. C. 4a–5).

(75) Subsections (B) through (E) of section 1 and sections 3 through 6 of the act of June 30, 1952 (66 Stat. 295, 296; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12A, 473, 473 note, 478, 480).

(76) Section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954 (Public Law 463, 83d Cong., 68 Stat. 360).

(77) The act of August 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 915; 38 U. S. C. 748, 749).

TITLE IX—SAVINGS PROVISIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Savings Provisions

SEC. 901. A claim for compensation which is pending in the Veterans' Administration on the effective date of this act, shall be adjudicated under the laws in effect on the day preceding the effective date of this act with respect to the period prior to that date and, except as provided in subsection 902 (b), under this act thereafter. If a disallowance is required under such laws but entitlement is shown under this act, the pending claim shall be considered a claim under this act. A claim for assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing or an automobile or other conveyance which is pending in the Veterans' Administration on the effective date of this act shall be considered a claim for such assistance under this act.

SEC. 902. (a) Any person who is receiving compensation on the day prior to the effective date of this act at a rate equal to or less than that to which he would be entitled under the provisions of this act shall, except where there was fraud, clear and unmistakable error as to conclusions of fact or law, or misrepresentation of material facts, be paid compensation under this act beginning with the effective date of this act.

(b) Any person who is receiving compensation on the day prior to the effective date of this act under the laws in effect on that day and who is not entitled to compensation under this act, or who is entitled to compensation at a higher rate under such laws than that to which he would be entitled under this act, shall, except where there was fraud, clear and unmistakable error as to conclusion of fact or law, or misrepresentation of material facts, continue to be paid the rate of compensation payable on the day prior to the effective date of this act, so long as the conditions warranting such payment under those laws continue. In the event there is a change in such conditions, the entitlement thereafter of such person to compensation will be determined, except as to service connection, without regard to the laws repealed by section 802 of this act. The provisions of this subsection shall apply to those claims within the purview of section 901 of this act in which it is determined on or after the effective date of this act that compensation is payable for the day prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 903. A claim for disability compensation filed on or after the effective date of this act and within 1 year from the date of the veteran's separation during the year immediately preceding such effective date from active military, naval, or air service, or a claim for death compensation filed on or after the effective date of this act and within 1 year from the date of the veteran's death occurring in the year immediately preceding such effective date will be adjudicated under title III of this act and the laws in effect on the day preceding such effective date. If entitlement is established, compensation will be paid under such laws for the appropriate period prior to the effective date of this act and under this act thereafter.

SEC. 904. All offenses committed and all penalties or forfeiture incurred under the laws repealed by section 802 of this act may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if said repeal had not been made and any person who forfeited rights to benefits under any such laws shall not be entitled to any benefits under this act.

Effective Date

SEC. 905. This act shall take effect on the 1st day of the 13th calendar month following the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 2, line 11, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

On page 47, line 13, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 47, line 25, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 48, line 5, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 48, line 22, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 49, line 8, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

On page 49, line 12, strike out "1955" and insert "1956."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6084) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the consent of the tribal council of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell to the Palm Springs Unified School District of the State of California, in consideration of the payment by such school district of an amount agreed to by such tribal council, the Secretary of the Interior, and such school district all of the right, title, and interest of the United States and of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians in and to that tract of land containing 10 acres, and more particularly described as follows: Southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter, section 14, township 4 south, range 4 east, San Bernardino base and meridian.

SEC. 2. The proceeds of such sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike the word "Indians." and insert in lieu thereof the words "Indians, and such proceeds, when distributed to individual members of said band, shall not be subject to Federal income tax."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 406 OF THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7732) to amend section 406 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong.), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 406 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Public Law 717, 75th Cong.) (52 Stat. 1049), as amended, be, and the same is hereby amended by adding after subsection (b) of section 406 a new subsection as follows:

"SEC. 406. (c) The Secretary shall promulgate regulations providing for the lifting of coal tar color for use in the coloring of the outside of oranges meeting the standards of maturity and grade of the United States of America and the respective States where used and which are safe in the manner in which used and suitable for such use, and for the certification of batches of such color, with or without diluents which are not unsafe in the manner in which used.

"The coal tar color designated as FD & C Red No. 32 shall be included in the above category and shall continue to be listed until a color or colors which is or are more acceptable on the basis of standards set up by the Secretary may be listed and made available for use."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That paragraph (c) of section 402 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not apply to oranges meeting minimum maturity standards established by or under the laws of the States in which the oranges were grown and not intended for processing (other than oranges designated by the trade as "packing house elimination"), the skins of which have been colored at any time prior to March 1, 1959, with the coal-tar color certified prior to the enactment of this proviso as FD&C Red 32, or certified after such enactment as External D&C Red 14 in accordance with 21 Code of Federal Regulations, part 9: *And provided further*, That the preceding proviso shall have no further effect if prior to March 1, 1959, another coal-tar color suitable for coloring oranges is listed under section 406'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF A PORTION OF FORMER PRISONER OF WAR CAMP NEAR DOUGLAS, CONVERSE COUNTY, WYO., TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed, upon certification to him by the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of Wyoming that the property described in section 2 of this act is needed for the training or support of the National Guard of Wyoming, to convey the property to the State of Wyoming, by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration therefor, upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be necessary to properly protest the interests of the United States: *Provided, however*, That such deed of conveyance by express term shall—

(a) reserve to the United States all mineral rights including gas and oil;

(b) reserve to the United States right of exclusive use without charge therefor of such property together with any improvements thereon during any period of national emergency; and

(c) specify that said property shall be used for the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes, and in the event of nonuse for such purpose, shall, in its then existing condition together with any improvements thereon, at the option of the United States as determined and exercised by the Secretary of Defense, revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming is described as follows:

All the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, township 32 north, range 71 west, except seventy-four one-hundredths acre in the southwest corner of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, such excepted portion being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, bearing north 60 degrees 53 minutes east a distance of 1,504.2 feet; thence south 29 degrees 10 minutes east on present fence line a distance of 124 feet; thence south no degrees 21 minutes east on present fence line to the south boundary of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence south 89 degrees 28 minutes west on present fence line a distance of 58.33 feet to a point on the west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence north no degrees 28 minutes west on said west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 7, a distance of 590 feet to the point of beginning; and containing in all thirty-nine and twenty-six one-hundredths acres, more or less, subject to aneasement granted to the town of Douglas, Converse County, Wyoming, for a pipeline for transportation of water, together with the right of ingress and egress, said pipeline running parallel with and distant 27 feet west of the centerline of the LePrele County Road.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized herein shall be borne by the State of Wyoming.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2587) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 216 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 217) is amended to read as follows:

"USE OF SERVICE IN TIME OF WAR OR EMERGENCY

"SEC. 16. In time of war, or of emergency proclaimed by the President, he may utilize the Service to such extent and in such manner as shall in his judgment promote the public interest. In time of war, or of emergency involving the national defense proclaimed by the President, he may by Executive order declare the commissioned corps of the Service to be a military service. Upon such declaration, and during the period of such war or such emergency or such part thereof as the President shall prescribe, the commissioned corps (a) shall constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, (b) shall, to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and (c) shall continue to operate as part of the Service except to the extent

that the President may direct as Commander in Chief."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 214) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 213. An allowance of $250 for uniforms and equipment is authorized to be paid to each commissioned officer of the Service on active duty when required by directive of the Surgeon General to wear a uniform, if at such time the officer is receiving the pay of the junior assistant, assistant, or senior assistant grade; except that no officer who has received such an allowance from the Service shall at any time thereafter be entitled to any further allowance."

(b) Section 707 of the Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 713), so renumbered by section 5 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049; 42 U. S. C. 214, note), is repealed.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 201 (a) (1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 209 (a) (1)) is amended by striking out the words "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) and (e)."

(b) Section 207 of such act (42 U. S. C. 209) is amended by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) respectively and by adding immediately following section (d) a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) (1) A former officer of the Regular Corps may, if application for appointment is made within 2 years after the date of the termination of his prior commission in the Regular Corps, be reappointed to the Regular Corps without examination, except as the Surgeon General may otherwise prescribe, and without regard to the numerical limitations of subsection (b).

"(2) Reappointments pursuant to this subsection may be made to the permanent grade held by the former officer at the time of the termination of his prior commission, or to the next higher grade if such officer meets the eligibility requirements prescribed by regulation for original appointment to such higher grade. For purposes of pay, promotion, and seniority in grade, such reappointed officer shall receive the credits for service to which he would be entitled if such appointment were an original appointment, but in no event less than the credits he held at the time his prior commission was terminated, except that if such officer is reappointed to the next higher grade he shall receive no credit for seniority in grade.

"(3) No former officer shall be reappointed pursuant to this subsection unless he shall meet such standards as the Secretary may prescribe."

(c) (1) Section 207 (a) (2) of such act (42 U. S. C. 209 (a) (2)) is amended by striking out "a period of not more than 5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "an indefinite period."

(2) The enactment of paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not affect the term of the commission of any officer in the Reserve Corps in effect on the date of such enactment unless such officer consents in writing to the extension of his commission for an indefinite period, in which event his commission shall be so extended without the necessity of a new appointment.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 210 (d) (2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 211 (a) (2)) is amended by striking out "pay period and for purposes of."

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of section 211 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 212 (a)) is amended by striking out "active commissioned service" and inserting in lieu thereof "active commissioned or noncommissioned service."

(b) Section 211 (b) (1) of such act (42 U. S. C. 212 (b) (1)) is amended by striking out "active commissioned service, including any such service in the Army, Navy, or Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof "active commissioned or noncommissioned service in the Service including any active commissioned service in the Armed Forces."

(c) Section 211 (c) of such act (42 U. S. C. 212 (c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A commissioned officer who has been retired under the provisions of this section may, (1) if an officer of the Regular Corps, be involuntarily recalled to active duty during such times as the Corps may constitute a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States, and (2) if an officer of either the Regular Corps or the Reserve Corps, be recalled to active duty at any time with his consent."

(d) The proviso of the paragraph headed "Retired Pay of Commissioned Officers," in chapter 296, 67 Statutes at Large 245, which appears at page 254 (42 U. S. C. 212b) and which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That hereafter a commissioned officer of the Public Health Service who has been retired may be recalled to active duty, other than in time of war, with his consent," is repealed.

(e) Section 706 of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 713), so renumbered by section 5 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), as amended (42 U. S. C. 230), is repealed.

SEC. 6. (a) Section 218 (a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 218a (a)) is amended (1) by striking out the words "in the Regular Corps," and (2) by striking out the words "any educational institution" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any Federal or non-Federal educational institution or training program."

(b) Section 218 (b) of such act (42 U. S. C. 218a (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any officer whose tuition and fees are paid pursuant to subsection (a) while attending an educational institution or training program for a period in excess of 30 days shall be obligated to reimburse the Service for such tuition and fees if thereafter he voluntarily leaves the service within whichever of the following periods of active service is the greater: (1) 6 months, or (2) twice the period of such attendance but in no event more than 2 years. Such subsequent period of service shall commence upon the cessation of such attendance and of any for other continuous period of training duty for which no tuition and fees are paid by the service and which is part of the officer's prescribed formal training program, whether such further training is at a service facility or otherwise. The Surgeon General may waive, in whole or in part, any reimbursement which may be required by this subsection upon a determination that such reimbursement would be inequitable or would not be in the public interest."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING EXCHANGES OF SALES OF PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN OR ADJACENT TO DISTRICT OF PUNA, T. H.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7891) to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized and directed to exchange public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for lands destroyed by volcanic activity occurring during March and April 1955. The Territory may not convey lands exceeding 40 acres in area or $5,000 in value. For the purposes of the exchange the destroyed lands are to be appraised at the market value just prior to the time of destruction, but the value of improvements such as crops and buildings shall be excluded therefrom.

SEC. 2. After the limits of exchange have been exhausted the Commissioner is authorized to sell to those who have been unable to replace all the lands destroyed public lands not exceeding 80 acres in area, or the area of destroyed land, whichever is less, deducting therefrom the area conveyed by the Territory by exchange as provided in section 1. Such a sale shall be made without public auction, drawing or lot or the approval of the board of public lands.

SEC. 3. If the lessor of any destroyed lands should fail to exchange or purchase lands to replace his destroyed lands, his lessee may purchase under the provisions of this act public lands not exceeding 80 acres in area or the area of destroyed land leased by him, whichever is less.

SEC. 4. In order to come within the provisions of this act, persons must file applications showing the area and approximate value of lands, owned or leased by them, which were destroyed by volcanic activity, within 2 years of the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 5. Except as changed herein, all applicable provisions of the Organic Act of Hawaii remain in force.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, following the word "lands" insert the words "within the county of Hawaii."

Page 2, line 7, following the word "lands" insert the words "within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORMER PRISONER OF WAR CAMP NEAR DOUGLAS, CONVERSE COUNTY, WYO.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes, was passed, were vacated.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8404) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed, upon certification to him by the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of Wyoming that the property described in section 2 of this act is needed for the training or support of the National Guard of Wyoming, to convey the property to the State of Wyoming, by quitclaim deed, without monetary consideration therefor, upon such terms and conditions as the Administrator determines

to be necessary to properly protect the interests of the United States: *Provided, however,* That such deed of conveyance by express term shall—

(a) reserve to the United States all mineral rights including gas and oil;

(b) reserve to the United States right of exclusive use without charge therefor of such property together with any improvements thereon during any period of national emergency; and

(c) specify that said property shall be used for the training of the National Guard or for other military purposes, and in the event of nonuse for such purpose, shall, in its then existing condition together with any improvements thereon, at the option of the United States as determined and exercised by the Secretary of Defense, revert to the United States.

SEC. 2. The real property to be conveyed to the State of Wyoming is described as follows:

All the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, township 32 north, range 71 west, except seventy-four one-hundredths acre in the southwest corner of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, such excepted portion being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of said northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7, bearing north 60 degrees, 53 minutes east a distance of 1,504.2 feet; thence south 29 degrees 10 minutes east on present fence line a distance of 124 feet; thence south no degrees 21 minutes east on present fence line to the south boundary of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence south 89 degrees 28 minutes west on present fence line a distance of 58.33 feet to a point on the west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; thence north no degrees 28 minutes west on said west line of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of said section 7, a distance of 590 feet to the point of beginning; and containing in all thirty-nine and twenty-six one-hundreds acres, more or less, subject to an easement granted to the town of Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., for a pipeline for transportation of water, together with the right of ingress and egress, said pipeline running parallel with and distant 27 feet west of the centerline of the LaPrele County Road.

SEC. 3. The cost of any surveys necessary as an incident of the conveyance authorized shall be borne by the State of Wyoming.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Texas: On page 2, line 1, strike out the word "protest" and insert "protect."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RATIFYING AND CONFIRMING ACT 249 OF THE SESSION LAWS OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7426) to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue highway revenue bonds in a sum not to exceed $50 million payable from funds derived from highway vehicle fuel taxes, for the purpose of providing for the construction and maintenance of highways in the Territory. The issuance of such revenue bonds shall not constiute the incurrence of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and shall not require the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 2. All bonds issued under authority of section 1 shall be issued pursuant to legislation enacted by the legislature of the Territory which shall provide (1) that, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding, highway vehicle fuel taxes shall be levied and collected in amounts at least sufficient, to provide for the payment of the principal of the bonds and the interest thereon, as such principal and interest become due (except that interest due upon any such bonds during the first year after their date of issuance may be paid from the proceeds of sale of the bonds), and that Federal aid funds may also be used for payments of the principal of the bonds and interest thereon; (2) that the superintendent of public works of the Territory, or any officer or agency succeeding to his powers and duties in respect to highways, shall have the power to issue and sell the bonds and to expend the proceeds and provide for the repayment thereof, in accordance with standards and pursuant to provisions which shall be set forth in such legislation; and (3) that the office of the superintendent of public works, or an office or agency succeeding to the powers and duties of that office in respect of highways, shall be continued in existence and shall retain the powers and duties set forth in such legislation, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" means taxes in respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, but in the event the legislation providing for such tax levies the same in respect of other fuel and does not provide for the segregation of the taxes in respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, then the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" includes as well all such taxes in respect to fuel as are commingled with the taxes in respect of the fuel used, or to be used on the highways.

SEC. 4. Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, is hereby amended to the extent of inserting section 5961 therein set forth the public law number as may be assigned to this bill upon its enactment.

SEC. 5. Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended by section 4 above is hereby approved and ratified.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike the words "and maintenance."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike the words "sufficient, to" and insert the words "sufficient to."

Page 2, line 13, change the comma to a semicolon and strike the words "and that Federal-aid funds may also be used for payments of the principal of the bonds and interest thereon."

Page 3, line 3, strike all of section 3 and insert the following new sections 3 and 4:

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prevent the application of Federal-aid highway funds to aid in the retirement of said bonds, to the extent now or hereafter permitted by the acts of Congress relating to the use of such funds.

"SEC. 4. As used in this act, the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" means taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways, as defined and imposed by the laws of the Territory of Hawaii, but in the event the legislation providing for such tax levies the same in respect to other fuel and does not provide for the segregation of the taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways, then the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" includes as well all such taxes in respect to fuel as are commingled with the taxes in respect to the fuel for operating a motor vehicle or motor vehicles upon the highways."

Page 3, line 13, Renumber "Sec. 4." to read "Sec. 5."

Page 3, line 14, Following the word "inserting" insert the word "in."

Page 3, line 17, Renumber "Sec. 5." to read "Sec. 6."

Page 3, line 18, strike the numeral "4" and insert the numeral "5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING RESERVOIR ABOVE THE MONTICELLO DAM IN CALIFORNIA AS LAKE BERRYESSA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7858) to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate bill (S. 2755).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, S. 2755, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir located above the Monticello Dam in Napa County, Calif., shall hereafter be known as Lake Berryessa, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Berryessa.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 7858, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENT BONDS FOR SCHOOLS IN HONOLULU AND THE COUNTY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9768) relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 640 of the 83d Congress, approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889), is hereby amended by deleting the proviso from the

first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided, however,* That the total indebtedness of such Territory shall not exceed $95 million or the amount of total indebtedness authorized by the Hawaiian Organic Act, whichever is the higher."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of Public Law 643 of the 83d Congress, approved August 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 785, ch. 892) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. During the years 1954 to 1959, inclusive, the Territory of Hawaii is authorized to issue, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, public improvement bonds in such amounts as will not cause the total indebtedness of such Territory to exceed $95 million or the amount of total indebtedness authorized by the Hawaiian Organic Act, whichever is the higher.

"In applying the Territory's debt limitation, whether prescribed by this or other specific act of Congress or by the Hawaiian Organic Act, the computation of the amount to which the total indebtedness of the Territory may be extended at any time shall include all general obligation bonds, whether for public improvements or for other purposes for which general obligation bonds are or may be authorized to be issued by the Congress: *Provided,* That during the year 1960 and thereafter if the Territory's debt limitation prescribed by the Hawaiian Organic Act shall be less than $95 million there shall be added to the Territory's debt limitation so prescribed by the Hawaiian Organic Act such amount as represents the outstanding indebtedness incurred for the purposes authorized by Public Law 640, 83d Congress, as amended, but such addition shall not cause the total indebtedness of the Territory to exceed $95 million.

"Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude the issuance of bonds after 1959 under Public Law 640 of the 83d Congress, as amended, in accordance with the authorization therein set forth."

SEC. 3. Section 5, subsections (a) to (e), inclusive, and section 6 subsections (a) to (e), inclusive, of Act 273 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, being an act relating to public improvements and for other purposes, are hereby ratified and confirmed, subject to the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 643, 83d Congress, as amended. The bonds so authorized, when issued in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of Public Law 643, 83d Congress, as amended, shall be valid notwithstanding any other provision of law as to debt limitations.

All bonds issued pursuant to this section shall be serial bonds payable in substantially equal annual installments, with the first such installment maturing not later than 5 years from the date of issue and the last such installment maturing not later than 30 years from such date.

Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 9769) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any law of the Territory of Hawaii, or any Act of the Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, Acts 145, 199, 210, and 223 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, authorizing the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city and county of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, are hereby ratified and confirmed, subject to the provisions of this act, such authorization to be over and above any limitations on the amount of the bonded debt of the city and county of Honolulu and on the amount of the debt which may be incurred by said city and county in any one year imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act, and such authorization shall also be in addition to all other issues authorized by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to prohibit the amendment of said acts of said Territory by the legislature thereof, from time to time, to provide for changes in the improvements authorized by said acts.

SEC. 2. Any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, the Territory of Hawaii may authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds for public improvements in an amount not exceeding $14 million, in any single calendar year: *Provided,* That the total indebtedness of said city and county shall not exceed $70 million, at any one time: *Provided further,* That any indebtedness incurred pursuant to specific authorization of the Congress, including indebtedness incurred pursuant to section 1 hereof, shall be included in computing such total indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be serial bonds payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "$14,000,000," and insert "2 percentum of the assessed valuation of the real estate or $14,000,000, whichever is the greater";

Page 2, line 19, strike "$70,000,000" and insert "10 percentum of the assessed valuation of the real estate of $70,000,000, whichever is the greater."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of the annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1869)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the annuity of an annuitant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1924 (43 Stat. 140), as amended, or the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), as amended, shall be increased the first day of the second month following enactment of this Act in accordance with the following rules:

"If the annuitant was formerly a participant in the system, the annuity to which he is entitled shall be increased $324, provided he retired before July 1, 1949.

"SEC. 2. In the case of an officer who retired before July 1, 1949, and elected a reduced annuity at time of retirement, and who availed himself of the restoration clause in section 821 (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, such officer shall be entitled to receive the increase provided by the first section of this Act.

"SEC. 3. If the annuitant is receiving an annuity on the effective date of this Act as the survivor of a former participant in the system who retired before July 1, 1949, the annuity shall be increased in the amount of $324 or in such larger amount as may be necessary to make the total annuity equal to $1,200; except that in no event shall such annuity be increased by any amount in excess of $324 if such increase would result in a total annuity greater than the annuity which such survivor would have been entitled to receive (as determined by the Secretary of State, taking into consideration any generally applicable pay increases but not any in-class increases or possible additional years of service) immediately prior to the effective date of this Act is such former participant had retired on November 13, 1950 (the date specified in Public Law 348, Eighty-second Congress).

"SEC. 4. If the wife of a Foreign Service officer who retired prior to July 1, 1949, becomes an annuitant subsequent to the effective date of this Act, as a result of the election made by the officer at time of retirement, such widow's annuity shall be increased in the amount of $324.

"SEC. 5. In any case where a participant under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system died before August 29, 1954, leaving a widow who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the system; the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to grant such widow an annuity of not to exceed $1,200 per annum, if he finds that such widow (whether remarried or not) is in actual need and without other adequate means of support.

"SEC. 6. In no case shall an annuity increased under this Act exceed the maximum annuity payable under section 821 (a) or (b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

"SEC. 7. No annuity currently payable to any annuitant under the Foreign Service

retirement and disability system shall be reduced as a result of the provisions of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.,
JOHN M. VORYS,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House, at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clarifying, clerical, and necessary conforming changes, the differences between the House amendment and the substitute amendment are noted below:

ADJUSTMENT FOR WIDOW ANNUITANTS

Section 3 takes care of seven widows whose husbands retired from the Foreign Service before July 1, 1949. Five of them will receive $324 plus such additional amount as is necessary to give them an annuity of $1,200. The conferees agreed upon the language in this section as a device that would provide a measure of relief for windows now getting a small annuity and permit them to receive a maximum of $1,200. It was not the intention of the conferees, however, to make an adjustment that would give to these widows a higher annuity than that received by a widow whose husband remained in service long enough to benefit by the several pay increases received by Foreign Service officers that would be reflected in his annuity. Only two widows are covered by this provision. One will receive $329 instead of $324, the other will receive only the $324.

The language of this section is a substitute for the House language which would have permitted the Secretary of State to make loans or grants to enable these seven widows to receive up to $1,200 per year.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS TO WIDOWS NOT NOW ELIGIBLE

Section 5 is a substitute for the House language to take care of those widows who are not now eligible to receive an annuity. The conferees deleted any reference to loans or grants to assist them and substituted a provision for an annuity. Under the language agreed upon no widow covered by this section may receive more than $1,200 per year. As in the House amendment, the Secretary of State must find that a widow must be in actual need and without other adequate means of support. It is not expected that intensive inquiries of a social casework nature will be required in order to make any determination. Estimates supplied the committee when this section was under consideration indicate that about six widows may benefit from this provision.

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr.,
JOHN M. VORYS,
ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is to accompany S. 1287, a bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the foreign service retirement and disability system.

On January 13, 1955, I introduced H. R. 2097 for the same purpose. This bill was reported out by the Foreign Affairs Committee on July 26 and passed the House on August 1 with amendments. The proceedings were then vacated and S. 1287, with the amended text of H. R. 2097, was passed in lieu thereof.

The conference committee agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment as contained in its report of March 12, 1956. I will explain the differences later on after giving a brief résumé of the bill itself.

The basic purpose of this legislation is to adjust the annuities of foreign service officers who retired prior to July 1, 1949, and the widows of such officers. Not more than 250 officers and widows are affected thereby and they receive an approximate annual increase of $324.

It should be pointed out that, under the Foreign Service Act of 1946, foreign services officers who retire at the present time have their annuities computed on the higher salaries that are paid as a result of various salary increases over the last 10 years. Such increases have not been available to those who retired prior to 1946 or shortly thereafter.

The figure of $324 which was not contained in the original language of the bill was adopted as an amendment in committee since it paralleled the increase granted by Congress in 1952 to those civil service employees receiving low annuities. The committee felt that this across-the-board increase would be easier to justify to the Congress than would other increases based on percentages and which, in some cases, resulted in disproportionate raises of annuities.

On the basis of about 250 officers and widows receiving an annual increase of $324, this legislation would result in an initial annual cost of about $81,000. However, because of the advanced age of most of the beneficiaries, this annual cost would decrease very rapidly and should not extend much beyond a 20-year period.

I want to emphasize that even this small sum represents no cost to the Government since payments would be made from the foreign service retirement and disability fund. As of June 30, 1955, the fund contained an amount in excess of $16.5 million.

Now as to the action in conference. This consisted of amendments to sections 3 and 5 which relate to a handful of widows, 7 of whom are presently receiving annuities, and a few others who are now not eligible for annuities. In respect to the first category, their annuities are increased to an extent which will permit them to receive up to $1,200 per year and the second group, numbering about half a dozen needy widows, will receive an annuity not to exceed that amount.

In brief, Mr. Speaker, what we have tried to do here is to pass legislation which would give modest increases, at no cost to the Government, to certain foreign service officers and their widows. These are, without exception, persons who devoted many years of faithful service to the Government, often under extreme conditions of hardship. They are people who have been retired for at least 7 years and whose annuities are definitely inferior to those of their younger colleagues. They are persons who, for the most part, find it difficult to live even modestly on their present annuity scales. And, finally, they are, also for the most part, persons in the later years of their lives. In the 3 years that I have been trying to get this legislation through the Congress, several of them have passed away.

I feel sure that the House will approve the adoption of this conference report on the basis of the facts as I have stated them.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL INJUSTICES IN THE WORLD

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Res. 370) as amended.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas, in the world today, grave injustices to many peoples and countries still remain uncorrected; and

Whereas the United States Government and the American people must not, by any sanction or seeming accession, help to perpetuate these wrongs; and

Whereas the present oppressive divisions of the German, Korean, and Vietnamese people constitute unjust and oppressive denials of the desire of these people for, and their inalienable right to, reunification of these respective countries under terms and conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence; and

Whereas the exclusion of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Repubuic of Vietnam by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations constitutes an arbitrary and inequitable act contrary to the best interests of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam as well as the United Nations in view of the fact that Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam are fully qualified for membership therein; and

Whereas millions of people still exist in bondage under Soviet and Chinese Communist tyranny; and

Whereas such conditions threaten the achievement of international peace and security toward which the policy of this Government and the entire free world is directed; and

Whereas this Government has a duty to keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness; and

Whereas this Government seeks to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and a secure peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about the reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam under conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to

be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about the entrance of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations.

SEC. 3. It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in support of the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist bondage.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill, but in order to have a hearing I demand a second.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support House Resolution 370, which expresses the sense of the House that it should be the policy of the United States to exert its effort respecting certain grave international injustices which exist in the world.

House Resolution 370 expresses the sense of Congress on three things:

First, it states the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength to bring about reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam;

Second, it affirms the policy of the United States Government to bring Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations; and

Third, it emphasizes the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in support of peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by peoples now under Soviet and Communist bondage.

At present the German people remain divided. So are the Korean people. And the same is true of the Vietnamese. These divisions are unnatural and contrary to the best interests of these peoples. However, we all want the right kind of reunification to take place—a fair and just reunification, and not one under Communist domination. Thus, section 1 of the resolution expresses the sense of this House that our Government shall continue its policy of exercising leadership, both material and spiritual, in helping bring about the reunification of these peoples. But this is to be accomplished, in the language of the resolution, "under conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination, and independence."

The next injustice covered by the resolution concerns the Soviet Union's arbitrary exclusion from membership in the United Nations of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam. The Soviet Union has been consistent in its abuse of the veto power in order to keep these three countries out of the United Nations. In all, the Soviet Union has exercised the veto power 7 times with respect to these 3 countries. The resolution in section 2 expresses the sense of the House that United States policy shall be continued to bring about the entrance of these three countries into the United Nations.

The resolution in its last section expresses the sense of the House that United States policy shall continue to support the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist enslavement. This House has on many occasions expressed its sentiment with respect to continuing in the hearts and minds of these enslaved peoples their hope for ultimate freedom and independence. We must continue to nurture this hope in every possible way through expressions by the executive branch, through expressions by the Congress, and through public expressions.

This resolution deserves the full support of every Member of this House. It is a resolution, in the truest sense, in the American tradition of fairness and justice. It will give notice that we in the United States are essentially a moral and spiritual people and that we cannot sit idly by while serious international injustices continue.

May our leadership play a significant part in bringing about the end of such injustices for the good of mankind.

This resolution is very ably authored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY], to whom I now yield the floor, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the very pleasant although perhaps somewhat unique position of being down here in the well today urging the House to pass foreign-policy legislation which I think will support the administration at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 370, which I introduced on January 12 and which was unanimously reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee on March 13, is designed to lend the support of the House of Representatives to President Eisenhower and the administraiton in certain respects of this Government's foreign policy. As the State Department said:

> The Department is in complete agreement with the premises from which the resolution proceeds, and with the aims expressed in its operative paragraphs. These are indeed the policies of the United States Government, in the formulation and implementation of which the Department of State has been largely concerned. Adoption of the resolution would support the Department in its firm intention to promote these policies by all practicable means.

In his state of the Union message on January 5, President Eisenhower made the following remarks which form the basis for House Resolution 370:

> In all things, change is the inexorable law of life. In much of the world the ferment of change is working strongly; but grave injustices are still uncorrected. We must not, by any sanction of ours, help to perpetuate these wrongs. I have particularly in mind the oppressive division of the German people, the bondage of millions elsewhere, and the exclusion of Japan from United Nations membership.
>
> We shall keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness and seek to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and secure peace.

I should now like to discuss the three specific international injustices to which House Resolution 370 refers. First of all, the "oppressive divisions of the German, Korean, and Vietnamese people."

The President's message only referred to the division of the German people. The House will recall that when the four heads of government from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union met at Geneva last summer, there was an expression of agreement that Germany should be reunified by means of free elections. This was put in the form of a directive to the foreign ministers for the October meeting at Geneva and at that time we, the British, and the French, put forth specific plans which would provide for the reunification of Germany in a framework of European security and by means of free elections in both West and East Germany.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the House will also recall that the Soviets refused to provide for free elections in East Germany since they feared that their East German satellite government would be overthrown. It is the Soviet Union, therefore, that is directly standing in the way of a unified Germany today. However, the pressure of world opinion may yet force a change in the Soviet resistance. If we focus and continue to focus public attention on this question, as the President did and as House Resolution 370 does, the Soviets may eventually be unwilling to shoulder the responsibility for continuing to keep Germany divided.

The language of House Resolution 370 also points to the division of the Korean and Vietnamese people which, in my opinion, is no less a grave international injustice than in the case of Germany. The United Nations itself has consistently supported the objective of a unified Korea. In 1947 this Government proposed the holding of free elections throughout Korea under U. N. supervision, a proposal which was then adopted by the General Assembly and which has been endorsed repeatedly. However, the Communists have rejected this idea, very likely for the same reason as in Germany. Again it must be our stated policy to focus world public opinion on this grave injustice. At the recent 10th General Assembly, a United States resolution was adpoted in reaffirmation to these objectives and Soviet opposition thereto was overwhelmingly defeated. In Korea, no less than in Germany, we must continue to show the principles for which we stand and how they are being prevented and thwarted by Soviet obstructionism and Communist reluctance to see their satellite regimes take their own chances in a free election.

The present division of the Vietnamese people was effected through the 1954 Geneva conference to which the United States was not a party. The House will recall that the accords reached at that time envisioned the eventual reunification of Vietnam through free and secret elections conducted throughout that country. It has become plainly evident, However, that in Vietnam, as in Germany and Korea, the Communists have no intention of permitting free elections in that part of the country which they control. Again it must be shown that we stand for the right of peoples everywhere to a free choice of their own political institutions, just as it must be shown that in each case it is the Communists who continue to deny that right of free choice. I hope that the passage of House Resolution 370 will serve to reemphasize this fact before the eyes of the world.

The second international wrong covered under this resolution is the exclusion by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam. This is of course, through the use, or the misuse, of the veto power. The President's remarks only referred to Japan and the original language of the resolution was drafted accordingly. However, the committee felt that South Korea and South Vietnam are equally qualified for membership in the U. N. and that their exclusion by Soviet vetoes was no less of an arbitrary injustice than in the case of Japan.

The House will recall that the Soviet Union vetoed the admission of South Korea in April of 1949 and December of 1955. The admission of Vietnam in September of 1952 and December of 1955 and the admission of Japan in September of 1952 and twice in December of 1955. This Government has, of course, fully espoused and endorsed the admission of these three countries to United Nation's membership and the attention of the world should again be directed to the fact that they are being blocked only through Soviet intransigence. This is yet another objective of House Resolution 370.

The third injustice mentioned in this resolution the continued existence of millions of people under Communist bondage is one which has many times been brought to the attention of the House and of the Congress. Yet I believe its reemphasis is important at this time. This Government has repeatedly condemned the suppression of human rights and political freedoms among peoples who were formerly free and independent. It raised the matter with the Soviet Union last summer at Geneva and again in October at the Foreign Minister's Conference. No satisfaction was gained but the anxiety and concern reflected in the Soviet reaction gave ground for much speculation concerning the true conditions among the captive peoples.

Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that, when President Eisenhower sent a message of encouragement to the captive peoples last Christmas, Mr. Khrushchev protested violently against what he termed "internal interference" in the affairs of the satellite states. The House will recall that Mr. Hagerty in reply issued the statement that the peaceful liberation of the captive peoples is and remains a goal of United States foreign policy.

In the midst of the developments, both political and ideological, which are taking place today within the Soviet Union, developments whose effects could conceivably be felt among the captive peoples, it is important that we again reassure them that our hope and belief in their peaceful liberation and political freedom remains constant and unchanging. In view of what has occurred in the past, it is also important to remind them that this Government will make no agreement which would in the slightest degree tend to confirm their present temporary state of captivity and slavery. The fact that we consider this captivity as one of the great international wrongs existing in the world today was clearly stated by the President last January 5 and deserves to be repeated by the House today. It is so important, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, to convince these people of our hope and concern for their freedom that we cannot repeat these sentiments too often.

In retrospect, therefore, the adoption of House Resolution 370 today by the House will signify the following:

That we recognize that there are in this modern world grave injustices to many peoples and many countries which still remain uncorrected. That we are convinced that the United States Government and the American people, whose Representatives we are, must not, by any sanction of seeming accession, help to perpetuate these wrongs.

It will mean that we believe that the present oppressive divisions of the German, Korean and Vietnamese people constitute unjust and oppressive denials of the desire of these people for, and their inalienable right to, reunification of these respective countries under terms and conditions which guarantee political freedom, self-determination and independence for all. Free election, for example, should be a prerequisite.

It will mean that we believe that the exclusion of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam by the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations constitutes an arbitrary and inequitable act which is contrary to the best interests of these three countries as well as the United Nations itself. The three countries mentioned here are fully qualified for membership in the United Nations and I believe they are not only more qualified than countries such as Communist Poland and Communist Czechoslovakia, for example, but I believe they are better qualified for membership than is the Soviet Union itself.

It will mean that we recognize the fact that there are millions of people throughout the world who still exist in bondage under Soviet and Chinese Communist tyranny. It will mean that we believe that such conditions as all of the foregoing threaten the achievement of international peace and security toward which the policy of this Government and the entire free world is directed. It will mean that we believe that this Government has a duty to keep these injustices in the forefront of human consciousness. And it will mean that we support this Government in seeking to maintain the pressure of world opinion to right these vast wrongs in the interest both of justice and a secure peace.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge it to be the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of the United States Government to exercise its leadership and moral strength in the righting of these international wrongs and injustices that still exist in the world today.

In closing, I would like to express my thanks to the distinguished chairman of my committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, whom we shall sorely miss here after this year, as well as to the leadership on both sides, for their kindness and cooperation in permitting me to bring this resolution to the floor of the House today. I have sometimes heard it expressed that in matters dealing with foreign policy, the House of Representatives tends to find itself overlooked or by-passed. I think that the passage of this resolution today will show that the House is also aware of its responsibility in this important field and that it is in support of President Eisenhower in his announced intention to keep these wrongs before the conscience of world opinion and to seek to ally the pressure of world opinion to right these wrongs. I urge, Mr. Speaker, the adoption of House Resolution 370.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor of the bill) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To continue the policy of the United States concerning the reunification of certain peoples, the admission of Japan, Korea, and Vietnam into the United Nations, and regarding Communist enslavement."

AMENDING THE CLAYTON ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9424) to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 7 and 15 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731 and 736, as amended, 15 U. S. C. 18 and 25) are amended as follows:

SECTION 1. That section 7 of said act is amended by striking the first, second, and third paragraphs, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new paragraphs:

"No corporation shall acquire, direct or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital and no corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and no bank, banking association, or trust company shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the assets of one or more corporations engaged in commerce, where in any line of commerce in any section of the

country the effect of such acquisition of such stock or assets, or the use of such stock by the voting or granting of proxies or otherwise, may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.

"No corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock, other share capital or assets of one or more corporations engaged in commerce, where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the acquiring and the acquired corporations are in excess of $10 million until 90 days after delivery to the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under the first paragraph of section 11 of this act and to the Attorney General of notice of the proposed acquisition. Such notice shall set forth the names and addresses, nature of business, products or services sold or distributed, total assets, net sales, and trading areas of both the acquiring and the acquired corporations. The parties shall furnish within 30 days after request therefor, such additional relevant information as may be required by the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act or by the Attorney General. Any corporation willfully failing to give the notice or to furnish the required information shall be subject to a penalty of not less than $5,000 or more than $50,000, which may be recovered in a civil action brought by the Attorney General. Failure by the Federal Trade Commission, the Attorney General or other appropriate agency to interpose objection to such acquisition within the 90-day period shall not bar the institution at any time of any action or proceeding with respect to such acquisition under any provision of law. The Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction under section 11 of this act, after consultation with and upon approval of the Attorney General, may establish procedures for the waiver of all or part of the waiting requirement in appropriate cases.

"The preceding paragraph shall not apply to corporations purchasing stock solely for investment when the stock acquired or held does not exceed 5 per centum of the outstanding stock or other share capital of the corporation in which the investment is made; nor to the acquisition by one corporation of the assets of any other corporation if such assets do not equal more than the sum of $5 million or more than 5 percent of the capital, surplus, and undivided profits of either the acquired or the acquiring corporation, whichever is less. The term 'assets' as used in this paragraph shall not include stock in trade sold or held for sale by a corporation in the ordinary course of its business.

"Except for the provisions of the two preceding paragraphs this section shall not apply to corporations purchasing stock solely for investment and not using the same by voting or otherwise to bring about, or in attempting to bring about, the substantial lessening of competition. Nor shall anything contained in this section prevent a corporation engaged in commerce from causing the formation of subsidiary corporations for the actual carrying on of their immediate lawful business, or the natural and legitimate branches or extensions thereof, or from owning and holding all or a part of the stock of such subsidiary corporations, when the effect of such formation is not to substantially lessen competition."

SEC. 2. That section 15 of said act is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following paragraph:

"Whenever the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe—

"(1) that any corporation subject to its jurisdiction is acquiring or has acquired stock or assets of another corporation in violation of the provisions of section 7 of this act; and

"(2) that the enjoining of such acquisition or the maintenance of the status quo after acquisition pending the issuance of a complaint or the completion of proceedings pursuant to a complaint by the Commission under this section and until such complaint is dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, would be to the interest of the public,

the Commission, by any of its attorneys designated by it for such purpose, may bring suit in a district court of the United States to prevent and restrain violation of section 7 of this act or to require maintenance of the status quo. Any such suit may be brought in any district in which the acquiring or the acquired corporation resides or transacts business. Upon proper showing, a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond. In any case where injunction or restraining order is granted under this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall proceed as soon as may be to the issuance of the complaint and to the hearing and determination of the case."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend the Clayton Act by requiring prior notification of certain corporate mergers, and by authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining the consummation of mergers pending final Commission action.

We have all observed the alarming rate at which corporate mergers have been taking place recently. In the year just ended, for example, the number of mergers set a 25-year record and proceeded at a rate four times that of 1949. What is more, since 1951 over 3,000 independent concerns have disappeared through merger activity, which has played a most important part in hastening the reduction of competition in many areas and promoting a growing concentration of economic power.

Members will recall that the Congress in December 1950 enacted the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act, to amend the Clayton Act and to strengthen the provisions of the antitrust laws governing mergers. Five years' experience in administering the Antimerger Act has demonstrated the basic need for the present legislation, which is strongly supported by the President, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. The President had this to say in his economic report submitted to the Congress in January 1956:

Nevertheless, mergers have become more numerous of late and an eye, at once vigilant and discriminating, must be kept on such developments. Many mergers have a solid economic justification and serve the general interest by increasing competition; others have neutral effects; while still others place obstacles in the path of effective competition. Over the years Americans have wisely viewed excessive business concentration, or any other undue concentration of economic power, with uneasiness. To serve the basic American desire for an economy in which business opportunities are increasing and in which economic control is widely diffused, it is desirable to strengthen our antitrust laws and provide larger appropriations for their enforcement.

Toward this end, the following revisions of antitrust legislation are recommended. First, all firms of significant size that are engaging in interstate commerce and plan to merge should be required to give advance notice of the proposed merger to the antitrust agencies, and to supply the information needed to assess its probable impact on competition.

That is exactly what we do in this bill. We require that where there is a proposed merger of two or more companies in an unregulated industry and the combined capital structure of the companies is $10 million or more, then notice must be given 90 days prior to the merger's consummation to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. When the merger involves companies in a regulated industry, notice must be given to the appropriate Federal commission and the Attorney General. Air carriers proposing to merge, for example, would notify the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Attorney General. If the merger involves railroads, notice must be given to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Attorney General.

There is a provision for a 90-day waiting period. In other words, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and the regulatory agencies would have 90 days to consider the proposed merger.

There is a civil penalty ranging from $5,000 to $50,000 in the event that corporations seeking to merge willfully fail to give due notice in pursuance of the act, to the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Justice, or the appropriate regulatory body.

What is behind the President's recommendation in addition to what I have indicated? Many of these mergers occur in secret which means that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission are unable to get any information about them. And in other instances these agencies have to rely on trade journals, newspaper clippings, financial periodicals to get information as to a proposed merger. This haphazard method is very unsatisfactory. Also it places a most difficult burden upon the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission.

This bill would require corporations that propose to merge to give appropriate notice to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. It may be noted that even if the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission does not take legal action within 90 days, they are not barred from proceeding thereafter in the event the merger constitutes a violation of the antitrust laws.

In addition, the bill grants to the Federal Trade Commission power to seek a preliminary court injunction against any proposed merger. The Department of Justice has that right now; in fact, the Federal Trade Commission

has the right to proceed by way of preliminary injunction in a certain limited field under section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. We expand that field now so that in the event of a proposed merger, the Federal Trade Commission can step in and endeavor to prevent a merger.

Why do we ask that? Because in many instances the Federal Trade Commission is presented with a merger which is a fait accompli. In many instances the acquired corporation is swallowed up and its identity is lost. This makes it impossible thereafter for the Commission to unscramble the eggs. Under the bill the Federal Trade Commission will be armed with sufficient authority to prevent the merger from taking place until there has been a determination of its legality.

In light of the fact that the President, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Department of Justice have asked for the bill—there has only been inconsequential opposition to it—I do, indeed, hope that we suspend the rules and pass H. R. 9424.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that the first order of business on Wednesday next will be the consideration of, and the vote on, the veto message of the President in relation to the farm bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H. R. 9424.

This bill would amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to require corporations proposing to merge to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission 90 days in advance of the transaction. Within 30 days after the notice is given, the companies would have to furnish the enforcement agencies such additional information as may be needed to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. These provisions apply only to mergers where the combined assets of the merging companies exceed $10 million. Willful failure to submit the notification or furnish the required information would subject the offender to a civil penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

This bill would also amend section 15 of the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a preliminary court injunction to restrain completion of a merger until adjudication of its legality.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation has been emphasized in recent years by the almost alarming tendency toward the merging of corporations in this country. Our American traditions of fair play and protection of the small-business man demand that we scrutinize such developments carefully. As President Eisenhower stated in his Economic Report of January 24, 1956, we must be "at once vigilant and discriminating" in our approach to the problem of mergers today.

I fully recognize that many mergers are entirely feasible and desirable from the viewpoint of the good of the national economy, since they may tend to increase competition. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that vicious monopolistic tactics, which may tend to lessen competition, are inherent in some mergers.

The bill we are considering today provides the Government with a means of effectively judging how to tiptoe along that tightrope line which must be drawn between a corporate consolidation which is good for the economy and one which has harmful effects. It is my feeling that this measure, H. R. 9424, gives the Government the vigilant, yet discriminating means of alleviating the traditional uneasiness with which Americans view excessive business concentration. To that end we must strengthen our antitrust laws and provide more adequately for their enforcement.

The idea of requiring notice of proposed corporate action which might infringe upon legislative policy is not a new one. Both the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 contain comparable provisions. Under these laws a registration statement relating to the issuance of a new security must be filed with the Securities Exchange Commission 20 days before its effective date and the Commission has the power to issue a stop order within that period. Similar proceedings are also practiced with respect to the publication of railway rates.

Five years of experience in the administering of the provisions of the antimerger law of 1950 have demonstrated the need for some sort of legislation to provide for premerger notification. At present the necessity for advance study of mergers is met in a most inefficient manner which imposes needless burdens on the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission. Under existing statutes, staffs of these agencies must scan a wide variety of periodicals, trade journals, and other publications to learn of proposed or pending consolidations. Such procedures are made doubly unsatisfactory by the fact that many mergers may be consummated without adequate or timely notice in the press and because the agencies involved have to compile economic data concerning the contemplated merger in order to determine whether a full-scale economic investigation should be undertaken.

The measure before us today would correct this situation. At the same time it will not constitute a hardship on the companies involved since the data needed by the agencies can be supplied by those involved without undue difficulty.

There is also the additional consideration that premerger notification will benefit the business community itself. A number of lawyers representing merging companies have stated that disruption of business plans is lessened by Department action before merger consummation. Furthermore, with this requirement incorporated in the statute, the company which tries to obey the law and seeks advance clearance from the Federal Trade Commission and Justice Department will no longer have to stand by and watch its competitor, who chooses to remain silent, carry out a merger. In many of these cases, those who would circumvent the law rely on the natural indisposition of the enforcement agency to unscramble the commingled assets, and in the meantime pile up huge profits.

There has been some complaint about the inequity in enforcement authority of section 15 of the Clayton Act, which now exists between the FTC and Justice Department. Since the Commission has concurrent responsibility with the Attorney General to enforce that act, it should follow that the Commission has the same authority to invoke injunctions to prevent and restrain violators. In fact, the Commission right now even lacks the authority which private parties have to petition a Federal district court to enjoin the consummation of what may be an illegal merger causing irreparable injury.

Logic and the demands of sound policy dictate that this serious loophole in the Antimerger Act be closed, as this bill provides. Passage of H. R. 9424 will give the FTC coexistent authority to invoke the injunctive powers of a district court upon an appropriate show of necessity.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to bear in mind that not all mergers are covered by the notification and reporting requirements of the present bill. To avoid any burden upon small-business consolidations, advance notification is required only where the combined capital structure of the merging corporations exceeds $10 million. This figure will probably cover most mergers that have a significant economic effect and at the same time will relieve from the notification requirements a large number of transactions which have no particular significance from an antitrust standpoint.

The measure under consideration is supported in principle by the President, the Attorney General, and the Federal Trade Commission. It is similar to a number of bills introduced by other Members including myself. Its passage will relieve the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission of cumbersome and unnecessary burdens and at the same time apportion enforcement authority more equitably.

The Clayton Act has come to be regarded as one of the bulwarks of our free economy. Its provisions represent a mighty weapon in our arsenal to prevent this country from going down the road toward socialism. In order to bring the Clayton Act up to date and alter it to meet the challenges of present-day business practices, while at the same time preserving our proud heritage of free opportunity and enterprise, we should act swiftly and favorably on H. R. 9424.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I am wondering whether there would be danger here, if you had to have a premerger filing, of a sort of raid by minority stockholders such as we have seen at times, where sort of nuisance attacks are made on the whole business. Has the committee considered that possibility?

Mr. KEATING. The committee did discuss that, among other things in con-

sidering this bill, and considered it very fully. I point out to the gentleman that there is a 90-day period which elapses between the time when the notice is given and the merger is to be consummated. Some business concerns raised the point that that might cause a delay and might give an opportunity for minority elements or other disgruntled elements to raise some such question.

There has been put in the bill a provision which permits the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission to set up a system of waiving the 90-day requirement so that in the case of a merger of not too great consequence which is not going to have an adverse effect in their judgment on restraint of trade they would be able to waive that period and allow the merger to go through right away. I do not think that the fear which the gentleman has voiced is likely to be serious in this bill.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure he will agree with me that there is nothing necessarily evil in the attempts of minority stockholders or others to investigate and prevent a merger if it injures them.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. It strikes me that it might be possible to make it difficult to prevent some sort of mental or other form of restraint until it can be determined what the purpose is of the one who is using the technicalities to attempt to defeat a merger when it is obvious that his purpose is for revenue only.

Mr. KEATING. I think that should be taken care of by the enforcement agencies who ought to be in a position to appraise the merits of his position and allow the merger to go through if the objections are totally lacking in merit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

IN SUPPORT OF THE CELLER ANTIMERGER BILL, H. R. 9424

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in support of H. R. 9424 which would amend the antimerger law. Specifically, the bill amends section 7 of the Clayton Act, as previously amended. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is to be congratulated for introducing this bill and giving us an opportunity to consider it. It should be passed promptly.

I think I could not illustrate my long-standing sympathy and support of the provisions of this bill better than to point out that almost 10 months ago, on June 9 of last year, I introduced a somewhat more comprehensive bill on the same subject. This is H. R. 6748, which I believe was a forerunner of the several bills to improve the antimerger law, which have been introduced in this Congress.

H. R. 9424 WILL NOT EXCUSE MERGERS MADE IN GOOD FAITH

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, prohibits the acquisition of the stock or assets of 1 corporation by another corporation, under 1 crucial circumstance. This circumstance is—and I quote the statute—"where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

That seems to me to be a modest and reasonable check on a monopolistic activity. I am highly gratified, therefore, that this single test of the law, which makes corporate mergers illegal if the effect may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly, is not to be saddled with an added good-faith defense which would make it legal for corporations to go ahead and merge in good faith, even though the effect of the merger is to substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly. If the Government's hands were to be tied so that it could neither prevent a merger nor bring about the dissolution of a merger which creates monopoly by reason of the fact that the merger was consummated in good faith, we would, of course, have an absurd law, and an extremely ineffective instrument for preventing monopoly.

Another section of the Clayton Act which deals with an equally important—and perhaps more important—monopolistic practice has indeed been saddled with this very absurdity. I refer, of course, to section 2 of the Clayton antitrust law, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. This section of the law contains the prohibition against discriminating in price.

The original prohibition on this monopolistic practice was drafted in the Clayton antitrust bill of 1914, but before that bill passed it was amended to contain a proviso which justified price discriminations made in good faith to meet competition. Twenty-two years of practical experience with that law provided a superabundance of proof that the good-faith defense rendered the law a practical nullity. Consequently, in 1936, when we amended the price-discrimination law by passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, it was intended to make a sharp contraction of the good-faith loophole, and to rewrite the good-faith defense so as to put it on a reasonable and workable basis.

In a closely divided opinion in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, however, the Supreme Court, in 1951, put the good-faith defense back into the law on price discrimination about as it was before the Robinson-Patman Act was passed. The majority opinion of the Court went even further and defined one business circumstance in which good faith would always prevail, and in doing so the Court made one of the most intriguing pronouncements of all times. The nub of the Court's pronouncement is that one seller's obeying the law completely justifies his competitors in breaking the law.

I do not think I need elaborate on the practical effects of this decision. I only point out that over the years past there appears to have been an extreme reluctance on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary to recommend removal of the "good faith" absurdity from the law on price discrimination.

In point of fact, the Committee on the Judiciary has had before it, since the opening of the last session of this Congress, a bill which would modify the "good faith" absurdity to this extent: It would adopt precisely the same language which describes an illegal merger and make this same language describe an illegal price discrimination. This language is set out in H. R. 11. It would make a price discrimination illegal where the effect of the discrimination "may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly."

Under H. R. 11, there would be no further qualification in the law as to good faith, or bad faith, or any other kind of faith with which the discriminatory practice is carried on. I hope that before this session of Congress ends we will have an opportunity to consider H. R. 11 and then vote on the question whether price discriminations should be justified by good faith even when they substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

The need for improving the antimerger law, is I think, obvious. The country is witnessing a great wave of corporate mergers which if not checked will soon lead us to a definitive state of monopoly capitalism. I should like to point out, however, that the failure of the present merger law has not been due entirely to the inadequacy of the present law nor would the best antimerger law conceivably solve the basic problems underlying the merger movement.

THE FAILURE HAS BEEN IN ENFORCEMENT

The utter failure which the antimerger law has met with to date, is in no way a measure of the inadequacy of the law. The failure has been in enforcement. The great wave of corporate mergers and consolidations which has been taking place during the past 3 years, and continuing now, has elicited from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission not even a wholehearted pretense at enforcing the law. No matter how much the law might be improved therefore, the practical effect will be inconsequential so long as the enforcement agencies refuse to enforce it.

No antimerger law would get at the root causes of the present wave of mergers, even if the enforcement agencies were devoted and skillful in their assigned tasks. These causes lie in the realm of finance, and it is absurd to think that the Federal Government can adopt a set of economic policies, then hold back the tide of inevitable consequences of those policies by passing an antitrust law.

TAX POLICIES ARE PRINCIPAL CAUSE OF MERGERS

The principal impetus for the merger movement is coming from the fact that today the lion's share of the investment funds are being channeled to the giant industrial corporations. These corporations have been given the function of investment bankers. This has resulted, for the most part, from the 1953 and 1954 changes in the tax laws which shifted the income shares to favor big corporations and high-income families. The administration sponsored these changes on the theory that they would stimulate investment in new productive capacity. The effect has been to stimulate the big corporations to an orgy of buying up previously existing capacity.

The effect has also been, conversely, to create a necessity for many small firms to sell out. The tax changes, particularly removal of the excess-profits tax, which were supposed to stimulate investment in new capacity have also provided the monopoly industries with an incentive for raising prices and taking more profits. Faced with a continuous inflation in big business prices and profits, the administration has maintained the overall buying power of the dollar by bringing about rapid deflation in the more competitive segments of the economy—namely, the small business and farm segments. This has left less savings among small investors, and has left small business even more capital starved than before.

More than that, the administration's technique for combating inflation is principally that of contracting the money supply, by Federal Reserve actions to contract commercial bank credit. And unfortunately it is principally the commercial banks that small business must depend upon, both for operating funds and long-term capital.

We are now being swept along a current which, if not checked, will end with a few giant corporations owning all of the wealth of the country. The economic bust for which we are rapidly heading will not check this trend. When the wave of bankruptcies starts, it will be the smaller businesses that go bankrupt, and the concentration of productive wealth into the hands of the corporate giants will continue.

CORRECTIONS NEEDED IN TAXES AND FINANCE

If we are serious about checking the merger movement, as well as other movements which are concentrating business, then I think we must do two things.

First, we must make substantial changes in the corporate tax rates. Specifically, I would recommend reducing the normal tax rate from the present 30 percent to a rate of not more than 22 percent. Then to retain present levels of revenue, I would recommend that the surtax be moderately graduated throughout the whole size range of corporate incomes, so that progressively larger incomes will be subject to progressively higher tax rates. In short, I am recommending an end to the insane tax policy which takes the same percentage of the income of a corporation receiving an income of, say a million dollars, as one receiving $2 billion—or one which is 2,000 times as big. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 9067 which incorporates these recommendations, and I hope that we will have an opportunity to consider and pass that bill during this session.

In addition, there are several less important, but quite direct incentives to merger built into our present law. These too should be corrected.

The second thing we must do to check the amalgamation of wealth into the giant corporations is to help create an organization which will make accessible to small- and medium-sized firms a larger share of the funds which are available for long-term-business investment. The country does not now have such an organization, either private or public. The problem is not to create more money; the problem is to create a market place, as it were, where funds which are available for investment will come together with the small- and medium-size businesses seeking such funds.

These two things would, I think, solve most of the merger problem, as well as some of the deeper problems of which mergers are only a symptom.

ANTIMERGER LAW NEEDS IMPROVEMENT

Even if all of the incentives to merger are removed from our tax laws however, and even if the follies of our other economic policies are correct, we would of course still need an antimerger law. We would still have the old problem of some mergers being generated from on substantial cause except that competition will be lessened and corporate profits enhanced.

For this purpose, the law should be improved.

MERGERS ARE NOT REPORTED

Perhaps the simplest and clearest way of showing why H. R. 9424 is needed is first to outline the enforcement procedures now being followed, and then explain how I believe these procedures would be amended by the bill.

Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, makes it illegal for one corporation to acquire the stock or assets of another corporation where the effect is a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to monopoly. There is, however, no requirement that merging corporations make the merger known to the enforcement agencies, either before a merger is consummated or after a merger is consummated. There is moreover, no penalty for making an illegal merger, except possibly the losses which may be incurred in disposing of assets, should there later be an order of divestiture. But as I shall show in a moment, there will be situations where the purpose of an illegal merger can be fully accomplished even should there later be an order of divestiture.

The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have concurrent jurisdiction. The Federal Trade Commission has no power to stop a merger before it takes place. The Department of Justice has injunctive power, but this is effective only where the Department learns of a proposed merger in sufficient time, and is able to gather sufficient market information to show the probable effects of the merger, before the merger is consummated.

Let us consider then what the major procedural steps are in the Federal Trade Commission.

First, the FTC has to ascertain that a merger has taken place. For this purpose it has a staff of several people engaged full time in screening newspapers, trade journals, such commercial references as Moody's Industrial Manual, and other sources of public information, just making up lists of the names of companies which are reported to have merged.

DELAYING AND WITHHOLDING INFORMATION

The second step is, then, to gather up enough information about the companies and the products involved to make a preliminary determination as to whether the merger is an inconsequential matter, or whether a thorough investigation should be made. This involves finding a mailing address for the companies in question and sending them a brief questionnaire. Where the merger has already taken place, the companies in question are of course in no hurry to answer the questionnaire; nor are they particularly desirous to answer it fully. Collecting these questionnaires also involves a great loss of time as well as Government expense which should be unnecessary.

Third, in the case of mergers which look as though they may run counter to the law, on the basis of abbreviated information, there is the problem of making a more complete investigation. This involves collecting information as to the companies' production or operations, the markets in which they operate, the proportion of the market affected, the patents that might be involved, and a variety of other matters. Here again a major part, and a vital part of the information must come from the companies themselves. And here again the companies are in no hurry to supply the information; and they are under no compulsion to supply the information in a form which is most revealing on the question whether competition will be adversely affected. On the contrary, they have every incentive to delay and evade. Certainly they have no incentive to gather or organize original data which they are in the best position to supply, and which perhaps only they can supply. In other words, the merger has already taken place, and the companies in question are certainly not anxious to help build a case against themselves.

PROLONGING THE LITIGATION

Next, there is the problem of litigation. Here again companies which have already merged have good reason to delay and drag out the proceedings, and these proceedings are lengthy at best.

Look, for example, at the first case brought under the new law. The Pillsbury mergers took place in June of 1951. After a year of investigation, the Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint, in June of 1952. Shortly thereafter hearings started before an FTC hearing examiner, and these hearings are still going on. In other words, the mergers took place almost 5 years ago, litigation has been going on for 4 years, and the end of the litigation is nowhere in sight.

I do not, of course, want to argue the merits of the Pillsbury case; and I do not want to say anything which could be taken as an expression of my attitude on the merits of that case. I simply make this point: If the presumption on which the FTC brought that case is correct, then the public interest has been injured—competition has been lessened. Is it not absurd then, that the public should be denied the benefits of competition for almost 5 years, when the issue could have been settled before the mergers took place?

Certainly this experience indicates that merger litigations can be kept going almost indefinitely. And it should be obvious that when large corporations are

involved in these litigations, where tens or hundreds of millions of dollars of sales are at stake, the simple expedient is to put a small legal staff on the payroll and treat the matter as a more or less permanent cost of doing business.

In any event, the longer the matter is delayed the less likely it is that the Federal Trade Commission will issue a dissolution order, and the less likely it is that the courts will sustain a dissolution order. As we know, antitrust issues quickly become moot in the eyes of the courts. As a practical matter, the courts are not willing to try to undo things which have occurred in what they regard as the remote past.

Allow me to sum up my points so far: Present procedures are unnecessarily costly to the Government, which fact dilutes the effectiveness of the enforcement dollar; these procedures result in protracted delays while the public interest suffers; they yield less complete and satisfactory market facts on which to base finding and dissolution decrees; and they result in untimely decrees which are unlikely to be sustained, assuming that under present procedures effective dissolution decrees can be drawn. This brings me to the next problem.

COMPETITION CANNOT BE RE-CREATED

Actually our courts and our enforcement agencies have had little experience in trying to draw dissolution orders. As yet they have had no experience in trying to draw an order under the Celler-Kefauver antimerger law. As for that matter, there have been relatively few dissolution decrees under the Sherman Act during the 65 years that law has been on the books. But experience under the Sherman Act has demonstrated that it is about as difficult to unscramble the assets of a corporation as it is to unscramble an egg. In addition to this difficulty, however, there is a vital weakness in the law which attempts to undo mergers rather than to prevent mergers. The law is not concerned with assets as such. Its purpose is to maintain competition. Yet the remedy in the law deals in fact with assets, and not with attaining the purpose of the law. In short, the law contains powers for ordering the divestiture of assets but there are no powers for re-creating competition or even recreating a competitor. There are no powers for saying to whom the assets shall be sold or for what purpose they shall be used. Let me illustrate with two cases in which the Federal Trade Commission is now involved.

It is generally agreed that Pillsbury's purpose in acquiring the Ballard Co. was to acquire a readymade market for its flour in the southeastern United States. Ballard had an established market in this section, its brand name enjoyed wide consumer acceptance, and Ballard's sales organization had long enjoyed the confidence and good will of the wholesale and retail merchants. Ballard's principal assets, insofar as Pillsbury was concerned, were its sales organization and the consumer acceptance which its brand name enjoyed.

Of course, Pillsbury might have used other methods to attain volume sales in the Southeastern States. It might have reduced its prices, for the benefit of consumers, or put on advertising campaigns, or done a variety of legitimate things to try to take business away from Ballard. This would have been competition, which is what we want to maintain.

ASSETS ARE FREQUENTLY NOT TRANSFERABLE

Now let us assume that the FTC ultimately tries to write an order requiring Pillsbury to divest itself of Ballard.

One fact is, I am told, that Pillsbury has now added its own brand name along with Ballard's brand name on the cartons in which its flour is sold. Pillsbury's name has now acquired the popularity and the consumer acceptance which formerly attached to Ballard's trade name.

A second fact is, I am also told, that Ballard's salesmen and other personnel are now absorbed into the Pillsbury organization.

How then can an order be written which will take away the consumer acceptance which Pillsbury's brand name has now acquired and invest that consumer acceptance in a competitor. And how can an order be written which would, contrary to our constitutional limitations on involuntary servitude, transfer Ballard's old salesmen to some new competitor? In short, what are the assets which the Government could order Pillsbury to divest itself of that would restore a competitor?

Now consider the Farm Journal-Country Gentlemen-Better Farming merger. Here we had two competing magazines where we now have one magazine. The magazines themselves have been merged into a single publication. The new publication has an identity and character of its own, and there is now a single subscription list. This merger took place more than 9 months ago, and we can expect many months more to pass before litigation is completed and a decision is rendered. I would assume that after a year's time, certainly, even the advertising contracts will have expired and new contracts will have been entered into. Furthermore, there is the same problem of people—writers, editors, makeup people, and so forth—as we have in the Pillsbury matter.

What then are the assets that could be unscrambled? There may or may not be some printing equipment which could be sold for printing operations of one kind or another. I am told that there is no printing equipment and the acquired magazines hired their printing done. But in any event, I can conceive of no order of divestiture which would create two magazines where there is now one.

H. R. 9424 REQUIRES ADVANCE NOTICE OF MERGER

As I understand the main features of H. R. 9424, they would go a long way toward overcoming the procedural difficulties I have described. First of all, the bill would require certain corporations otherwise subject to the provisions of the act to notify the enforcement authorities of their proposed merger 90 days prior to the date on which the merger could be consummated. Those corporations which will be required to file such advance notification are those whose combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits are in excess of $10 million.

Personally I would prefer the limitation of my bill on this subject, which would require advance notice where the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits are in excess of $1 million. I think this more inclusive standard would be better and would not put an undue burden on business firms. It is manifest however that, as a rule, it is the mergers of larger corporations that are more likely to bring about a substantial lessening of competition, and I shall be content to see if the standard set forth in H. R. 9424 will accomplish substantially all that is needed on this point. As I understand this provision, it is to serve merely as an aid to the enforcement authorities in learning properly about proposed mergers, and this provision in no way changes the standard set forth in the present law as to what constitutes an illegal merger.

I hope that it is understood and clearly understood, that by adopting $10 million or more of combined assets as a requirement for advance notification, the courts and the enforcement agencies will in no way take this to mean that mergers of lesser corporations are not fully subject to all of the other provisions and limitations of the bill. In plain words, insofar as I am concerned, the congressional intent in passing this bill—if it does pass—is clearly not that mergers of lesser corporations are unimportant; on the contrary, it is my understanding that mergers of lesser corporations may well result in a substantial lessening of competition or a tendency to create monopoly, in which case such mergers will violate the prohibitions of the bill.

MERGING CORPORATIONS MUST SUPPLY PERTINENT INFORMATION

A second major feature of the bill is that it would require corporations proposing to merge to furnish such additional and relevant information as the enforcement agencies may require, within 30 days after the request for such information is made. This is to be, as I understand it, the kind of information which the enforcement agencies will need in order to appraise the competitive effects of the proposed merger, and thus to reach a decision before the merger is made whether or not the merger will contravene the statute.

Unfortunately the bill appears to contain no provisions for compelling the submission of such information, except that the enforcement agency may seek an injunction in a Federal district court on the ground that the required information has not been furnished.

Here again I prefer the provisions of the bill I introduced, which provisions are of such a nature to serve as an estoppel against the merger until such time as the requested information is furnished.

The provision of H. R. 9424 on this point appears however to be a considerable improvement over present law, and I shall be content to see how it works out in practice.

ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES MAY SEEK INJUNCTIONS

Under the present law the Attorney General may seek an injunction in a Federal court to restrain and prevent the consummation of a proposed merger. The bill would give such authority also to the Federal Trade Commission, as well as to the Federal Reserve Board with reference to mergers of financial institutions under its peculiar jurisdiction.

Here again I would prefer the provision of the bill I introduced. That provision is of such a nature that the institution of litigation by an enforcement agency would itself serve as an injunction against consummation of the merger, until such time as the litigation is completed. In my view moreover, a provision of this kind would be highly preferable to the provision of H. R. 9424. It is no easy matter to persuade the Federal courts to grant injunctions; and to do so places upon the enforcement agencies, prematurely, substantially the same burden as proving a violation of the statute. The provisions of H. R. 9424 make a substantial improvement over present law however, and I am for the bill.

THE LAW WOULD APPLY TO BANKS

Finally, H. R. 9424 will make one important substantive change in law, in that the scope of the law will be widened to cover banking institutions. Bank mergers were of course subject to the original section 7 of the Clayton Act which prohibited the acquisition of one corporation's stock by that of another. But the amendment to the act of 1950 which runs against acquisitions of assets as well as acquisitions of stock was not written to cover banks. This improvement offered by H. R. 9424 is badly needed and long overdue. I am for it.

I have not presumed of course to try to give a definitive interpretation of H. R. 9424. Such explanation and definitive interpretation must come from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is author of the bill. I have tried only to describe the gist of the bill, as I understand it. I recognize that the bill contains a number of limitations and refinements which I have not touched upon. These appear to me however to be reasonable and adequate. I am for the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include related statements and material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the principle of premerger notification is sound. It is not a threat to any segment of our business economy. On the contrary, I firmly believe that prior notice of a contemplated merger is in the public interest. If there is a fault in our antimonopoly laws it lies in their failure to "nip monopoly in the bud." Just as grievous is the failure over the past 15 years to provide the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with adequate enforcement funds. The importance of the Celler premerger notification measure lies in the fact that the history of American business indicates the place to halt monopoly is at the merger level.

In considering a prior notice provision for our antimonopoly laws, I think that we should keep in mind just what it is we set out to do. The basis of the American economic system is the belief in free private competition. Our goal is an economy that places its chief reliance on individual initiative and decision. As a people we have from time to time permitted the Government to step in and limit the area in which individual economic decision can operate. But in the main we strive to maintain the freedom of the individual to decide for himself.

The American dream, in economic terms, pictures a way of life in which individuals are free to enter business ventures of their own choice and workers are at liberty to shift from job to job as they see fit. We have tried to translate this dream into a system that says, in essence, that the distribution of workers and capital is best determined by the consumer's desires. The prime mover in all this is, of course, price competition.

Monopolies have generally come about through the human tendency to combine in order to place restraints on competition. Combinations may have had other motives at their beginning, but as they have grown bigger they have sought to take advantage of their power and drive their rivals from the marketplace. Bitter experience has taught us that the danger of monopoly lies in this kind of bigness. Experience has also shown us that bigness in itself is not necessarily an evil. What is it then we fear? It is the bigness that begets the lust for power. When that lust takes hold, every goal of our free private competitive system is threatened.

I do not overlook the fact that we live in an age of bigness. It is big government, big labor unions, big farms, big business. Whether it is big government or big business we ought to be wary of the potential danger, for bigness is close to monopoly wherever it is found. Western Europe is a living witness to the results of monopoly power—whether it be in government or in business cartels. Industrialists and economists agree that America has the world's highest standard of living largely because we have avoided the depressing results of monopoly.

Our interest in mergers stems from the ever growing threat of monopolistic control in our economy. I am well aware that mergers per se are not necessarily bad, but I am even more aware of their latent danger where the motive is part and parcel of the lust for power.

The Democrat Party politicians and the members of the ADA now engaged in hot primary fights and a skillful propaganda game are accusing the Republican Party of being the tool of big business at the expense of the little man. The cold facts of history give the lie to this kind of talk. The antitrust laws were born under a Republican administration. The first big drive against the trusts and monopolies was under a Republican President, "Teddy" Roosevelt. When did these giant monopolies get so big? Just since 1953? Of course not. The Democrat Party had 20 years to do something about them. It did nothing. In fact all it did by way of controls and regulations was to make it financially impossible for the little man to compete against the giant industries.

I mentioned a moment ago that failure to provide adequate enforcement funds to the FTC and the Department of Justice for the past 15 or more years has been a primary factor in the recent merger move. The Democrat Party had control of these funds over most of these years.

What the Celler premerger notification bill sets out to do is to halt mergers where the prime motive is the desire for monopoly. I am in accord with this aim. But I do not believe the Celler bill goes far enough. It charts a course that is worthy, but one that is totally unrealistic in view of the magnitude of current mergers.

The Celler bill ought to reach farther down the scale and include corporations with a combined capital, surplus, and undivided profit of $5 million or more. I think, too, the Celler bill fails in not requiring a premerger notification from the corporation engaged in commerce which contemplates the acquistion of intrastate concerns.

The Celler amendments to the Clayton Act are most remiss in the penalty provisions. I believe that any corporation willfully failing to give notice or to furnish the required premerger information should be subject to a penalty of not less than $5,000 or more than $500,000. The provisions controlling the acquisition of stock solely for investment should also be changed to a sum more in keeping with the magnitude of the merger danger. I would have the Celler bill changed at this point and place the asset exemption at $500,000.

I have included these proposed changes in a bill, H. R. 9968, which was duly introduced by me. I am enough of a realist to know that my bill is not likely to be before the Members this session. But the threat of monopoly in the present mad race to merge is so great, that I believe a bill as inadequate as the one now under consideration is better than no action by this Congress.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOVIET SEAMEN'S REDEFECTION CALLS FOR POSITIVE ACTION BY UNITED STATES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the redefection to the Soviet Union on April 8 of five Soviet seamen who had previously elected to stay in this country dramatizes the problem facing this country in fulfilling the hopes of refugees from Communist countries. The recent study by the Donovan Commission of the International Rescue Committee, which I referred to in the RECORD of March 29, 1956, pointed out that more than 1,000 such persons have returned to their countries of origin in a recent 13-month period. The most recent redefections will be of inestimable propaganda value to the Communists but perhaps also of some value to us in underlining the deficiencies in our handling of such people. Gen. William J. Donovan, the former OSS Chief, announced yesterday the formation of a national committee to combat redefection campaigns. I commend this enterprise.

It should be recognized that governmental and private agencies which encourage defections by Communist citizens assume the risk that redefection may take place later on, and they should therefore recognize their obligation to exert every effort consistent with a free society to avoid such redefections. American agencies, however laudable their intentions, should not manufacture propaganda for the Communists by unwittingly setting the stage for redefections and failing to prevent them.

The number of Federal agencies involved in the reception and resettlement of refugees from communism is considerable, ranging from the President's special escapee program to the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of State, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Doubtless, too, our Central Intelligence Agency plays a considerable role in such matters. As the Donovan Commission of the International Rescue Committee pointed out, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department could also play an important part in assisting refugees to become more quickly adjusted to life in our country.

A successful program of receiving and holding the allegiance of such refugees clearly requires the sound coordination of many agencies. In addition to governmental bodies, private religious and nationality welfare groups also make a very important contribution. Yet, when the five Soviet sailors left for the Soviet Union on April 8, the United States Immigration officials held a brief hearing at which the only counsel available to the redefectors was supplied by the Soviet Embassy. The private agency which had shared in assisting the seamen in this country, was, apparently, given short shrift by the immigration officials. Neither the State Department nor the Justice Department have added any light to the question of why the redefections took place. If this matter was conducted in accordance with a coordinated Federal policy, surely that policy could be better explained to the American public than has been done to date.

On the other hand, if the redefection of the Soviet seamen represents a failure of United States policy, as it clearly seems to do on the evidence available at this time, the Federal agencies which might have helped to avoid this deplorable incident should reconsider their conduct in the matter. If the Central Intelligence Agency, for example, shared in the responsibility for integrating these unfortunate refugees into American life, then this surely illustrates the need for a check on that Agency in addition to the Presidential one.

Perhaps this unfortunate incident reflects not only mismanagement by the administration but also is indicative of the somewhat callous attitudes toward refugees which animates some of our laws in this area. The rigid health and job requirements for entrance into this country under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 have disillusioned most of the 220,000 fugitives from Eastern Europe who still live in squalid camps on the edge of the Iron Curtain, thereby blunting the substantial accomplishments of these laws. Congress should not remain indifferent to the fate of these remaining victims of Communist tyranny. The Refugee Relief Act should not be allowed to expire without compensatory immigration opportunities being provided for these special cases. Unless this is done and done quickly, can we reasonably expect that the rate of Communist propaganda victories, such as the redefection of these five Soviet seamen, will decrease rather than increase?

I include as part of my remarks the text of two letters which I have just received from Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, the executive director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Roland Elliott, director of the immigration services of Church World Service, Inc., of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
April 9, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: It was very kind and thoughtful of you to send me sufficient copies of your remarks of March 28 on the redefection problem for distribution to the members of our refugee relief committee. I am sure they will be just as interested in what you had to say as I was. You are to be highly congratulated for taking this further opportunity to point up the problem.

It is unfortunate that the Refugee Relief Act program has not brought the relief to refugees that was expected of it, and we are naturally very hopeful that by amendment for its extension, Congress will give us a further opportunity to make better use of it. I am going to have your remarks reviewed by our committee, and I will see that any comments they have to make will be forwarded to you shortly.

I wish to assure you again of our very deep appreciation of your great interest and cooperation in our attempts to help resolve some of the problems with which the poor refugees are still struggling.

With every best wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,
(Rt. Rev. Msgr.) EDWARD E. SWANSTROM,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U. S. A.,
CHURCH WORLD SERVICE, INC.,
April 13, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Your letter to Monsignor Swanstrom acknowledging our joint agency letter of February 16, 1956, to the President is deeply appreciated by us in Church World Service.

Your remarks, in my judgment, based on our intimate experience with escapees and refugees in recent years, are most pertinent and urgently important. Our experience last week with five redefecting Russian sailors is but one case in point which demonstrates the urgency of our strengthening our policies and procedure to deal more adequately with this problem.

At the moment, it would seem that budget pressures are endangering the work of the United States escapee program; I hope you can look into this.

With high regard, I am,
Cordially yours,
ROLAND ELLIOTT,
Director, Immigration Services.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the bill, S. 1287, and also on House Resolution 370 at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I supported House Resolution 370, introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY]. The able chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has given a most explicit explanation of the purposes of House Resolution 370. He has pointed out that the purpose of this resolution is to make clear the policy of the United States with respect to Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and the basic policy of our Government toward all people who are today denied human freedom and the right to national independence.

Germany, Korea, and Vietnam all stand as victims of a crude experiment in Russian surgery. Each of these nations has been divided by Russian military action and Communist aggression. Germany was divided during the twilight sleep of the West when the Russians were posing as our allies and when it was believed that a defeated enemy could only be controlled by four-power occupation. The Western Powers many years back recognized that the German people had demonstrated a fine capacity for democratic self-government and that there was no further reason to maintain occupation forces in that country. But the cunning Russians who seek neither a democratic Germany nor a representative government in Germany, have continued to occupy a part of Germany and have even set up a stooge government in the part of Germany they occupy for the purpose of carrying out subversive and other illegal activities against free Germany. Thus the Russian Communists

alone are responsible for an unnatural and unjust division of the German people.

In Korea we find practically the same set of circumstances applying as those which brought about the division of Germany. The Russians were granted military jurisdiction of Korea north of the 38th parallel until such time as a treaty of peace was arranged with Japan and stability established in the Far East.

Moscow used this advantage granted by the West in order to launch a war of aggression against free Korea and in particular, against its former allies, the United States, Great Britain, and France. The Communist war of aggression in Korea brought great suffering and hardship to the Korean people. We Americans will never forget that thousands of our youth died a hero's death in the defense of freedom on the cold battlefields of Korea. It is with sadness that we recall to memory the fact that a precarious truce which was arranged in 1953 still recognizes the cruel handiwork of the Russian Communists which continues the division of the Korean nation.

In Vietnam the agents of Moscow got control of the national independence movement which opposed French colonial rule and ultimately brought about a state of war. The same Russian agents were supplied with arms, ammunition, tanks, and soldiers by the Communist Chinese, and their Russian bosses. This same unholy trio brought about a Geneva Conference in which the French Government ceded part of Vietnam to Communist occupation. In the southern part of Vietnam, which remained in French hands, there has lately arisen a great and patriotic leader of the people who is completely dedicated to democratic principles and to government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This new leader, President Diem, is dedicated to the goal of a free, independent, and united Vietnam.

The people of Germany, the people of Korea, and the people of Vietnam seek the common goals of political freedom, self-determination and independence. It is in this spirit that they seek reunification of their homelands now divided by the tyranny of Russian surgery.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] that the people of Germany, Korea, Vietnam, and Japan should, and of right ought to be represented in the councils of the United Nations. The Russian efforts to deny the German people, the Korean people, the Vietnamese people, and the Japanese people this right deserves the condemnation of all mankind.

This resolution reaffirms the long-standing policy of the United States Government in support of all people who seek freedom and independence from Russian and Chinese Communist bondage. The now famous McCormack resolution, which Congress passed unanimously last year, stated, in unmistakable terms, the rights of all people and nations to freedom, self-determination, and independence. House resolution 370 gives specific application to the principles of the McCormack resolution to the people of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam. These are time-honored principles in support of which the people of the United States have shed their blood here at home and on foreign battlefields, and our unwavering support of which have brought us the approbation and prayerful thanks of people everywhere in the world.

The distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], has summarized the compelling purposes of this resolution by stating that we must continue to nurture in the hearts and minds of the enslaved peoples their hopes for freedom and independence and that this can best be done through expressions of the executive branch, through expressions of Congress, and through public expressions. Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] points out that passage of this resolution has served notice on the world, at a time when a massive effort is being made to bury the long and cruel record of Communist crimes against humanity, that we continue to recognize that there are in this modern world grave injustices which remain uncorrected. He emphasizes that we, as a Nation and people, must avoid any action which will tend to perpetuate these wrongs and must engage in undertakings which give promise of correcting the inhumanities and grave injustices which now bar the way to a just and lasting peace.

AMENDMENT TO REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Liberalization of the act, and of the program established by it, has been sought by interested civic and political leaders for some time. The current Refugee Relief Program is due to expire at the end of this year. It will be terminated with approximately 40,000 of the visas earmarked by Congress for issuance to refugees, unused and unusable.

Thus, it appears necessary to lengthen the life of the program and to facilitate its administration.

In my bill, I have provided for the extension of the Refugee Relief Program until December 31, 1960. Visas not allocated on the termination date of the current law, December 31, 1956, are to be reallocated on a proportional basis to any prospective entrants covered in the original act.

The current law provides for the issuance of 205,000 refugee visas. I feel that this number is unnecessarily small and fails to tap the true potentialities of the United States as a haven for victims of oppression and natural calamity. Thus, the bill I have introduced provides an additional 15,000 visas for allocation under the program.

One of the great problems in the current law is that entrance is denied to victims of tuberculosis. In the United States, this disease is no longer the scourge it is elsewhere. It can, and has, been treated. Yet, because of the bar against its victims, numerous refugee families, in dire need of resettlement, refuse admission rather than leave behind a relative who has been found to have tuberculosis. My bill provides for the admisson of 1,000 such sufferers, providing that they are members of a family group being admitted under the act and will not endanger the public health or become public charges.

It has been currently estimated that from 6 to 9 months are required to process each alien applying for admission under the act. Such a delay brings hardship to the refugees waiting to come to this land, and to the persons in the United States who are sponsoring them. Thus, I have suggested several administrative changes to eliminate the complicated and time-consuming procedures now operative. I have provided that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General may waive the passports and other travel documents now required under the act. People who have escaped from tyranny often have no such papers and scant means of obtaining them. Furthermore, even if such documents are obtainable, months often elapse in the process of getting them. Hence, administrative waiver in certain deserving cases certainly seems necessary.

Another provision which hampers administration of the act also is changed by my bill. Under the present law, a visa cannot be issued a prospective refugee unless he can provide documentary evidence of his activities for 2 years prior to his application. Obviously, many Iron Curtain escapees and disaster victims cannot comply with this requirement. Consequently, these persons are forced to wait out the 2 years in refugee camps in order to provide themselves with the necessary documentation. It seems only just to eliminate this restrictive requirement.

Other changes are needed. Under the current program, refugee applicants must be sponsored by individual citizens. This means that the numerous voluntary agencies, which operated so well under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act, are now prevented from sponsoring refugees. These agencies have the means and the know-how to sponsor and provide for resettlement of aliens. Barring agency activity tends to cut down the number of aliens entering under the program. Thus, on the basis of fairness, and of sound administration, my bill provides that accredited voluntary agencies can give sponsorship to refugees admittable under the act.

My bill provides for a major change in the administration of the Refugee Relief Act. At the present time, the program is directed by the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department. This official has numerous governmental responsibilities, with which the Refugee Relief Program must compete for time and attention. Yet administration of this vital activity is a complicated job,

requiring the full efforts of a skilled Administrator. Therefore, it appears to me to be necessary to have the President appoint an administrator for the refugee relief program, whose sole responsibility would be getting the victims of oppression and calamity into this Nation as simply and speedily as possible.

My entire bill has this end in view. I urge early congressional passage on this basis.

THE LATE COMPTON I. WHITE

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, both the country and my State of Idaho lost a dedicated and industrious public servant in the death earlier this month of Compton I. White. "Comp," as he was known to all, held for 16 years the congressional seat I now hold—and few Members of Congress have ever done a better job for the people back home.

"Comp" White's name was synonymous with service while he was in the Congress. No Member was ever more responsive to the needs of the people he represented, and no Member ever worked with more vigor and persuasion for the things he believed would develop his State. He was a veritable juggernaut of force and persistence when he wanted something. He literally camped in the office of a Government official until he got some injustice straightened out or some problem cleared.

Compton White was born in Baton Rouge, La., in 1877, and spent his boyhood there. When he was 13 his family moved to Clark Fork which is in Bonner County, in the Idaho panhandle. He pioneered with his father in reclaiming a farm from logged-off land, and in operating a sawmill business.

His family sent him off to business college in Chicago, and then to Gonzaga University in Spokane. He was in the railway service for a while as telegrapher, trainman, and conductor, but his love for the land brought him back to Clark Fork where he engaged in agricultural, lumbering, and mining activities.

Throughout his life, "Comp" White was devoted to the development of the West. He was a fervent advocate of the free coinage of silver, and served as chairman of the Coinage, Weights, and Measures Committee. His other committee assignments also gave him an opportunity to best serve the section of the country he loved so deeply—he held membership on the Indian Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Public Lands Committees.

"Comp" White was a colorful and effective Member of Congress. He wrote a record of accomplishment which those of us who follow him will find it difficult to equal. He will be long remembered in both Idaho and Washington.

THE SUPREME COURT VERSUS STATES' RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have 30 minutes, but my statement will only take 15 minutes. The other 15 minutes I hope will be taken by reaction from my statement. As you Members all know, I am not a lawyer, and therefore my statement, while it is on the Supreme Court with reference to States' rights, will not be expressed in legal language. It will be expressed in layman's language.

Most of you Members know that I do not take the floor on any question outside of my own field. I have done it once before in 20 years in this House, and that was back in 1937 when the Supreme Court packing plan was brought before the House, and I just could not resist at that time. I feel the same today, and that is the reason I am taking this time, calling attention to the recent Supreme Court decisions and their effect upon States' rights.

Mr. Speaker, over a long period of time the Supreme Court has ruled that when Congress enacts legislation on any subject, Federal jurisdiction over that subject becomes exclusive; thereafter the States are deprived of power to enact or enforce similar laws, even if those laws are not in conflict with the Federal law.

During the past 20 years a New Deal Congress has legislated "all over the waterfront." Congress has stretched the Interstate Commerce Clause and the welfare clause of the Constitution to the point where they now embrace all the ills and the needs of mankind—and a New Deal-appointed Supreme Court has upheld such legislation. Under this program it is only a question of time before all power and all sovereignty residing in the States to enact and enforce laws will be taken over by the Federal Government.

THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA *v.* STEVE NELSON

Mr. Speaker, a case in point is the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court upholding a decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in the Steve Nelson case—a Communist convicted and sentenced under the sedition law of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania reversed the decision of the lower court in the case, on the ground that the Smith Sedition Act passed by Congress preempted the field of sedition, and deprived the State of Pennsylvania of all jurisdiction in that field. The United States Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania on substantially the same grounds.

Both the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania and the United States Supreme Court in rendering their decisions completely overlooked or deliberately ignored the clear intent of Congress as expressed plainly and specifically in a clause of the Smith Sedition Act which states:

> Nothing in this title shall be held to take away or impair the jurisdiction of the courts of the several States under the laws thereof.

Mr. Speaker, this clause clearly states that the passage of the Smith Act did not and should not take away from the States the responsibility and jurisdiction over sedition under the laws of the various States, as long as there is no conflict with the Federal judiciary. In their dissenting opinion Justices Reed, Burton, and Minton pointed out that this clause clearly stated the intent of Congress, and could not be ignored. They stated also that there was no conflict in the Steve Nelson case with the Federal law nor with the Federal judiciary.

Congress now must pass legislation that will in effect veto or nullify the Supreme Court decision in this case, and state again in language that cannot be misunderstood—even by a New Deal-appointed Court—what the congressional intent is in this matter. Congress has had to act at least a dozen times in the last 10 years to correct decisions of the Supreme Court, where the Court clearly ignored the intent of the Congress. The natural-gas decision is one example.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. Speaker, in the decision of the Court on segregation in the public schools, the Court overruled a 60-year-old decision of the Supreme Court giving approval to "separate but equal" facilities and services for white and colored in the public schools. The Court also overruled other recent decisions that approved the same formula, a formula under which the Negroes of the South have made steady and peaceful progress for more than half a century. Today's Court has now established a new formula—integration of races in the public schools.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court in this case was presented in the form of a thesis, a thesis supported mostly by citations from college professors, sociologists, and psychologists, but not supported by citations from eminent lawyers or by previous Court decisions. The Court did not say that "separate but equal school facilities" was bad law. What the Court did say in effect was that "separate but equal schools" was bad sociology and bad psychology.

The Court rendered its decision without any implementing legislation being passed by the Congress. In fact, the Court entirely disregarded or overlooked legislation passed by Congress setting up the school lunch program, wherein Congress specifically acknowledged and accepted "separate but equal schools" for colored children. In that legislation Congress stated that in dispensing school lunch aid in States that maintained separate but equal schools for white and colored pupils, the school lunch aid should be distributed equitably as between the separate schools.

Under the 10th amendment to the Constitution, control over the public schools was specifically reserved to the States. Under the 14th amendment no State could discriminate between colored and white pupils with reference to school facilities. Therefore, it is the function and the responsibility of

the States to provide schools, to regulate them, and to have full control over them; the only requirement being that the schools shall provide equal educational opportunities for the pupils, whether colored or white.

Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution, the United States Supreme Court is the final arbiter as to the meaning of the Constitution, and also whether legislation passed by Congress is constitutional or not. Any and all decisions of the Court become the law of the land. The Court's decisions are to all intent and purposes as much a part of the Constitution as if they had been written into that document in the first place.

For today's Court, therefore, to overrule a previous decision of the Court is the same, in effect, as if the Court amended the Constitution itself—which the Court has no power to do. If the Court has the power to overrule or change at will a previous decision of the Court, then it becomes, willy-nilly, a Court of whims and caprices, with its decisions made on the basis of political, social, or ideological theories, not based upon the provisions of the Constitution and the law.

DR. HARRY SLOCHOWER *v.* BROOKLYN CITY COLLEGE

Mr. Speaker, now comes the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Dr. Harry Slochower against Brooklyn City College, New York City. Dr. Slochower was fired by the college authorities because he invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer the questions of the Senate Internal Security Committee concerning his previous Communist affiliations. By a 5-to-4 decision the Court ruled that Dr. Slochower had been fired illegally because in his case "the due process of law" had not been strictly followed.

The college acted legally and properly under a provision of the New York City charter that provides for the automatic discharge of any city employee who under questioning by an official investigating committee invokes the fifth amendment. This Supreme Court decision—so the four dissenting Justices claim—"interferes with the right of New York City to protect its local government institutions from the influences of officials who do not meet the required standards for employment."

Mr. Speaker, where is the usurpation of States' rights by the United States Supreme Court going to end? It is only a question of time before the States will be deprived of all power and sovereignty in the enactment of laws for the protection of health, of welfare, of education, of labor, and so forth.

H. R. 3, by Congressman HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, goes to the heart of this matter. If passed it would be a long way toward stopping this rapidly increasing usurpation of States' rights by means of United States Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman SMITH's bill, H. R. 3, should be passed without further delay.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois upon the statement which he has just made to the House. I concur fully with the gentleman's support of H. R. 3. He has made a very clear and lucid statement regarding the pattern which the Supreme Court has set up in the last 20 years to establish a judicial dictatorship. I began to point this out in speeches on the floor of the House in 1949. The record of the Supreme Court in the past two decades is replete with factual evidence which demonstrates the Court's intention to change the Constitution whenever it desires, through judicial decisions, in utter disregard of the procedure required by law to amend that instrument.

In the course of those years the Court has abolished the right of political parties to set their own rules for membership. It has declared that the right to protect transfers of real estate by restrictive clauses in deeds is a violation of the Constitution. It overruled the construction of the Constitution, as the gentleman pointed out, that had been sustained for nearly 70 years when it arbitrarily declared that segregated schools violated the 14th amendment. In these cases and in other cases decided in the last 20 years the Court has overruled many more longstanding cases, and in so doing has undertaken to change the meaning of the Constitution as effectively as if it had been duly amended according to the method provided in the instrument itself.

In a step-by-step process, the Supreme Court has usurped the functions of the legislative branch of Government. It is apparent that the ultimate intention of the Supreme Court is to abolish every vestige of States' rights and replace those rights with a central bureaucracy in Washington.

Two recent decisions by the political Justices on this bench provide additional proof, if any is needed, that the Supreme Court is driving this country closer to a complete judicial dictatorship.

As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, on Monday, April 9, 1956, the Supreme Court ruled that a college in New York could not discharge an employee because he invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about the Communist Party. In this case, Dr. Harry Slochower refused to state before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in a 1952 investigation, whether he had or had not been a Communist in 1940 and 1941. His employer, Brooklyn College, took the only reasonable course and discharged him. Now the Supreme Court has denied the right of an educational institution to determine upon what grounds an employee may be discharged. With a total lack of legal precedent, the Supreme Court has undertaken to further extend its control of local educational institutions.

Colleges, like other employers, may reasonably conclude that failure to furnish appropriate information at an official inquiry is grounds for disqualifying a person for a position of public trust.

Furthermore, such employment is not a right. It is a privilege. In the first place, the State may make known membership in an organization dedicated to overthrow of the Government by force a ground for disqualifying a school teacher. If, in the determination of this policy, a school official refuses to cooperate to the extent that necessary information may be obtained, then this in itself is grounds for dismissal.

The important question here is unmistakably one of unlawful encroachment on States' rights, and not of protecting the individual rights of citizens as the Court, in its customary smokescreen manner, would have us believe.

Either through apathy, indifference, or lack of essential knowledge, many people in the remaining 47 States will meekly accept this ruling as the unquestioned law of the land. The mere fact that this decision has no personal effect on them will cause many people to regard it as of no importance.

To adopt either of these attitudes would only invite still further encroachment on States' rights in cases affecting other States and in matters of personal concern to them.

When the Supreme Court invades the reserved rights of the separate States; when the Supreme Court acts in a manner wholly disregarding the 10th amendment of the Constitution; this invasion should be met with a solid wall of resistance by the people in all of the 48 States. For, while in one instance the justices may unlawfully encroach upon the rights of only a single State, unless challenged in their abortive assumption of excessive power, it can be reasonably concluded that the Court, whenever it sees fit to do so, will also trample upon the rights of the remaining 47 States.

The Supreme Court took still another slice of the reserved powers of the States in the so-called Steve Nelson case.

In this case, the Federal Supreme Court reversed a Pennsylvania court conviction of a known Communist, supposedly on the basis that the intent of Congress at the time it passed the Smith Act was that the Federal Government should occupy the whole field against subversion, and preempt State laws on the subject.

This is a palpable and dangerous extension of congressional statute. There is no such congressional mandate present in the Smith Act. In fact, there is nothing which so much as suggests that the Federal Government intended to occupy the entire field.

The 10th amendment reserves to the States, or to the people, all powers not granted to the Federal Government. The creator, which in this case is the several States, gave to the creature, which is the Federal Government, certain powers. Extension of these powers would indicate that the creature has become larger than the creator which, of course, it cannot do.

For the Supreme Court to invalidate the sedition laws of the State of Pennsylvania, when it is obvious that it was never the intent of Congress that the Federal law should pre-empt the State law, is a brazen and irresponsible attack on the sovereignty of all of the States.

It points up in no uncertain terms that this Supreme Court has dedicated itself to the complete destruction of the States.

It states, in language too obvious to be denied, that the ultimate intention of the Supreme Court is to erase the State boundaries and create in their place a type of superbureaucratic State with Washington as the focal point.

If the integrity of our constitutional form of Government is to survive, then the sovereignty of our separate States must be maintained.

No act outside of the law, which would destroy the lines that separate the States, must be recognized. For, if we do recognize such lawless acts, we can fully expect additional usurpation of States' sovereignty until eventually the States will be powerless to administer their own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his most scholarly statement. He said he was not a lawyer, but after listening to this address no one would believe it. As a matter of fact I can state that he is a better lawyer than many who are now members of the Supreme Court. I just wish we had some lawyers like him on our Supreme Court.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman from Georgia means to say is he wishes we had some lawyers on the Court.

Mr. LANHAM. Some lawyers; that is exactly right. By the way, I wonder how many of you know that there are absolutely no requirements, no qualifications, other than age, in the law or the Constitution for members of the Supreme Court. The President of the United States has to be a native-born American, but the same provision does not apply to members of the Supreme Court.

Now we have seen come to pass just exactly what was predicted years ago by our Founding Fathers, and if the gentleman will permit I would like to read into the RECORD just a few brief statements, the first by George Washington, the Father of Our Country, when he warned us as follows:

> It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of Government, a real despotism. * * * If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.

And Jefferson, in speaking of the Supreme Court, had this to say:

> The legislative and executive branches may sometimes err, but elections and independent people will bring them to rights.
>
> The judiciary branch is the instrument which, working like gravity, without intermission, is the one which may some day press us into tyranny.
>
> The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot, and unalarming advance, gaining ground step by step, and holding what it gains, is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them.
>
> It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. It is one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy. * * * The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots.

Mr. MASON. May I say before I yield further that my only purpose in taking time today was to try to strike a little spark that would spread into a prairie fire if the legal-minded Members of this body would only carry on and keep this before the people, because they do not know what is being done to them by the Supreme Court decisions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn that the gentleman was not a lawyer, because having observed his forensic ability here over a number of years, I just assumed that he was. He is a better lawyer than many of us who are licensed to practice. I do want to make 1 or 2 comments on the statement that the gentleman has just made because he referred to a bill of which I am the author, H. R. 3, to correct a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Steve Nelson and other cases. I am glad to announce at this moment that I have been advised the Judiciary Committee will proceed to conclude hearings on the bill this coming Friday. I do hope that the House will have that bill before it in a reasonable time so that we may explore the situation much further.

The gentleman referred to the segregation case. The bill which I have before the Judiciary Committee has no relationship to the segregation case. The passage of that bill would have no effect on it whatsoever. I do not think it has any effect upon the New York school teacher case either. But I would like for the Members of the House to understand that all the bill, H. R. 3, does is the Congress says to the Supreme Court that we do not intend to affect any State law unless the Congress says so. It is just about that in plain terms, it is just that simple.

I introduced the bill, H. R. 3, in another form in the last Congress and under another number immediately after the decision in the Steve Nelson case. I did not draft the bill to correct merely the Steve Nelson case. That is just one phase of a very broad situation, a situation where the Supreme Court has assumed out of a clear sky to say what the Congress intended when the Congress has not said it. If anything is to be done upon this subject, I think it is very important that we have a general law which will simply say that when Congress means to do away with State laws the Congress shall say so. If your bill is going to correct one Supreme Court decision at a time, we are just neglecting our constitutional duty and we are placing just a shin plaster on a broken leg.

I do hope that the House will realize the situation and if we pass any law at all, let us pass a general law. If you are not willing to stand up and be counted on a general law to correct this situation which we all know is wrong, then let us fight the thing out. I would rather have nothing than a bill which merely corrects decision by decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MASON. I agree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to congratulate the gentleman for bringing to the House very classically his feeling about the Supreme Court. His observation is a very fine example of what a sensible layman thinks of that outfit now occupying the black robes of the Supreme Court. They are not any more lawyers than the man in the moon. State by State they are abolishing States. The latest were the States of Pennsylvania and New York. The gentleman says that no lawyers agree with them. Not a single self-respecting lawyer in this country has written an opinion justifying the segregation decision. The American Bar Association has an outstanding offer now to any lawyer who can justify that decision, and there are no takers.

Mr. Speaker, something has got to be done to stop that Supreme Court. They are a greater threat to this Union than the entire confines of Soviet Russia. If some way is not found to stop them, God help us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, not only for the brilliance and logic of his presentation, but also for having the courage to make it. I agree with the gentleman completely, of course, with reference to H. R. 3, and I trust that the Congress will pass that legislation prior to adjournment.

I have always considered strict adherence to the constitutional limitations imposed upon the Federal establishment and the rigid protection of the reserved rights of the States to be our strongest bulwarks against despotism. It is alarming, indeed, to find that an irresponsible Supreme Court is eating these bulwarks away as fast as they can.

If the States do not use legal constitutional right of interposition against these illegal attempts by the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution, and if Congress does not act to protect the rights of the States when they are assaulted in such decisions as in the Nelson case, then I predict that even this generation will live to see the day when individual human liberty and freedom

will become nothing more than a sacred memory.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my commendations to those of the other gentlemen who have spoken for the splendid presentation made by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MASON. All thinking Americans everywhere, who really love this county, in every single one of the 48 States of the American Union should be grateful for the remarks you made in this House here today.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made. About 10 days ago one of the most distinguished lawyers in America, a former president of the American Bar Association, appeared before our committee and made the statement that 98 percent of the good lawyers of America had no respect for the legal ability of the present members of the Supreme Court. This is a sad situation in this country, when the leaders of the bar feel that way toward the present members of the Court.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman that he has made a wonderful contribution to our form of government here today. I certainly join with him in the hope that the position he is taking is going to spread like wildfire all over our great country while there is yet time. I am sure that the gentleman knows that our Supreme Court some time ago made the statement that there were no restraints whatsoever upon them except those that they imposed upon themselves. Now, I know that the gentleman disputes that, and so do I, because we have a Constitution, and that Court is bound by the Constitution the same as you and I. Now, I might also say to the gentleman that 1 or 2 years ago there was a bill introduced and passed in the Senate which came over to our Committee on the Judiciary, and I say to the distinguished gentleman that, if I never do anything else whatsoever during the time that I am in Congress, I will always thank God that I was permitted to be here and to read that bill and to lead the fight to kill it, because that bill provided that the Supreme Court would have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions of both law and fact, period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuing this matter further, I want to say to the gentleman that thank God our present Constitution provides that the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction on all constitutional questions, both law and fact, subject to such exceptions and regulations as this Congress might make. What I am saying to the gentleman is that a year or two ago there was a bill which would have deprived this Congress of the power to make any exceptions or any regulations. We have that power now and it is time for the Members of Congress to rise up and exercise that power under the duty and responsibility that they owe to the people of the United States. I thank God that the gentleman is in the vanguard. I appreciate that.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add, for whatever it is worth, my little contribution to what has already been said about the splendid statement made by the gentleman from Illinois, a gentleman whose actions in this House I have long watched with much approbation.

What I wanted to say to the gentleman is this, that it is most refreshing to see that the gentleman, from one of our so-called Northern States, has so much in common with so many from the so-called Southern States here today.

Mr. MASON. May I interject this comment, that the last decision in the Pennsylvania case and the decision in the New York case and the one in the natural-gas case affect the whole country, not merely the South. It is only that one case that seems to apply to the South more than the North.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has stated what I was trying to lead up to. The constitutional provision providing a tripartite division of the functions of Government is not something that only the South believes in. It is something upon which this great and glorious Republic was built, and on which it has thrived and prospered. The point I am trying to make is that it is so encouraging to see a stalwart American such as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] rise here and expound the views that some of us from my section of the country perhaps expound too much, if that be possible. Perhaps, sometimes, there are those who think that we, from my section, feel that we have a monopoly in the field of maintaining State sovereignty.

I agree with the gentleman in his references to the bill which has been under discussion here briefly, H. R. 3, by the very distinguished and outstanding statesman of this Congress, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I introduced a similar bill, but it is his bill and I am not trying to take any credit for that. But that bill does not affect the South any more than it affects Illinois, New York, or any other State. It attempts to raise the "halt" sign—the "stop, look, and listen" sign for the Supreme Court to see. This Congress, if it believes in what we talk about so much, in a division of the powers of Government and in the sovereignty of the several States, had better do something about it and just quit this lip service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend and stalwart colleague, a great American, for the contribution he has made here today.

Mr. MASON. I thank the gentleman.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL EIGHTH ANNIVERARY OF INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Israel celebrate the eighth anniversary of their independence. On this occasion, I want to extend best wishes to this new nation and to her energetic people and leaders. I want to commend them for the remarkable achievements and progress in the establishment of a strong and democratic state in an area—the Middle East—which has been and remains to be of vital importance to the free world. It is satisfying indeed to reflect that the United States and her citizens have contributed moral support as well as material support to the young Republic of Israel to enable her to achieve a certain degree of the economic stability that is so vital for a healthy democracy. Today after 8 years of hard work, the people of Israel continue in their endeavors to prove that their new nation is worthy of its membership in the international community of free nations.

The history of the Jewish people has been a continuous struggle for freedom, peace, and security. It has been a history of oppression and persecution—most recently, by totalitarian dictatorships. Now in the 20th century, after many long years of suffering, they have once again acquired freedom and have been able to fulfill their hopes and cherished dreams in the establishment of a Jewish homeland.

But as the Jewish people seem to have fulfilled their dreams we find that the Communists, experts and past masters of creating tournaments of hate in every area offering an opportunity for maximum disorder, not only offer arms, but economic aid as well, in an effort to establish themselves in the Middle East. So another threat has been added to the existence of a Jewish homeland.

Since 1948, when the Jews won their independence on the battlefield, many cultural, social, and economic feats have been accomplished by the new republic of the Middle East. The dreams of yesterday have become the realities of today. The displaced Jews of Europe have been absorbed and amalgamated in the new state. They have been provided with jobs in an expanding economy. They have been given the opportunity to make a new life for themselves and

their families. They have been given a different outlook on life which holds more encouraging prospects for the future.

In its short period of existence, the Republic of Israel has made notable progress in industry and agriculture. Since 1948, population has increased from 650,000 to 1,789,000. Her industrial output has increased each year—1955 output 12 percent above 1954, with 76 new industries established in first 9 months of 1955. It has been successful in providing new farmlands for its increasing population. New crops such as cotton and peanuts helped raise farm production by more than one-third last year. By their ingenuity, the Jews have succeeded in changing barren lands into productive food-raising centers. The transportation system which plays such an important part in the economy of a nation has also been improved. A 48-mile railroad was completed last year, connecting the Negev with Jerusalem and the port of Haifa. All of these programs are to the credit of this new democracy and give testimony to the fact that the people of Israel are dynamic and progressive. Their nation, with the highest living standard in the Middle East, is worthy of being called a true modern democratic state, and entitled to its place in the family of nations under international law.

My remarks thus far have been directed toward the accomplishments and the successes that Israel, with her limited resources, has achieved during her short existence. But what does the future hold for this determined nation? What are the problems she will have to face and overcome in order to prosper? Unfortunately, they are many, and some are most complex.

Probably the most difficult problem of Israel today is the problem of defending its borders. Although the Israelis won the war for their independence in 1948 and signed an armistice agreement with the Arabs, the fighting has not stopped. The Israelis live in the constant fear that the Arabs will provoke further hostilities which will only lead to more unnecessary bloodshed. Since 1948, there have been several border incidents which make this fear even more real. The recent purchase of arms by the Arabs from the Communist bloc has added to the danger. Is it any wonder the leaders of a newly created state, if they are rational, should take cognizance of these facts and attempt to arm their own homeland—a homeland which has taken so many trying years to achieve? Therefore, in an effort to defend their borders, the officials of the Israeli Government requested permission from the United States to buy certain defensive arms. It has been over 3 months now, since this request was first made, and the State Department has yet to give either a "Yes" or "No" answer. While our State Department takes the request under advisement the Communists are active and the Soviet Union, studying closely all the varying interests in every Near East country, continues in its policy of creating unrest and tensions in the area by playing one faction against the other. Long have they been expert in appraising and evaluating conditions which readily admit of creating a maximum of disorder. The Communists have applied a new tactic in their efforts to further international communism and dominate the world. This time they offer not only arms, but economic aid as well, in an effort to establish themselves in the Middle East. While the Communists are making these moves and furthering their own cause, the State Department has yet to create or put into practice any countering plans to keep the Middle East in the Western camp. If something is not done soon, the consequences will be grim at best. Time is of the utmost importance—at this very moment and hour it is working to the advantage of the Communists and the disadvantage of the West. The loss of the Middle East with all of its vast resources and strategic location, if it should ever come, will have a tremendous effect. If it is to avoid disaster, the West must counter the moves of the Soviet Union.

In February 1956, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on conditions in the Middle East, Secretary of State Dulles stated that Israel could not win an arms race with the Arabs. The Secretary of State based this statement on the fact that Israel is small in both size and in population and that the Arabs, numbering some 40 millions, have access to large stocks of armaments from the Communist-bloc nations. What this line of reasoning overlooks is that determination, skills, and weapons are more important in modern war than mere numbers. Israel itself demonstrated this when it fought for and won its independence in 1948. It seems to me that one sure way to bring about war in the Middle East is to let the Arabs get so far ahead of Israel in armaments, that they would be tempted by the thought of an easy victory. Our Secretary of State should immediately grant to the State of Israel the $50 million worth of armaments which she needs for her vital defense.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. If the admonitions of our Secretary of State are cogent then we have no right to offer any aid whatsoever to the small nation presided over by Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa, because the population of Formosa is a minuscule in comparison to that of Red China on the mainland.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank my distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for that very pointed analogous observation.

A second problem confronting Israel today is that posed by the Arab refugees. This is one of the main factors of contention between the Israelis and her Arab neighbors. The Arabs have charged that Israel displaced 900,000 Arabs and that she has refused to either invite them back or to pay a just compensation for the loss of their land. The Republic of Israel has shown good faith in this matter by offering to discuss the problem with the Arabs, but thus far, the Israeli proposal has fallen on deaf ears. The Arab States continue not to recognize the independent State of Israel—which was created by the United Nations—and continue to refuse to enter into any discussions which might resolve the factors of contentions on both sides. If these discussions could be approached with sincerity by both parties, they could lead to an easing of the growing tensions and bring about stability to an area that is vital to the free world.

Third, too long have some irresponsible Arab leaders themed and oversold the nonsensical stated objective of extirpating the Jewish State. This insidious aim is impossible of accomplishment but having fanned the fires of hatred for political and selfish reasons they now find themselves enmeshed in its conflagration and they are in fact its very prisoners.

Lastly, the State of Israel is confronted with the problem of expanding her economy in the fields of industry and agriculture. Israel has accomplished feats that might almost be called miraculous. This success is due primarily to her dynamic and resourceful people. Their aim is to establish their nation on a firm footing so that it might support its own economy, and they are willing to make sacrifices to accomplish this goal.

In the past Israel has suffered from the Arab boycott and blockade, which has forced her to use too much of her foreign exchange income by trading elsewhere. Because of the boycott, furthermore, firms operating in the Arab States hesitate to do business with Israel. Despite these obstacles, however, Israel is beginning to overcome her economic problems. Although she has made great progress, much is still to be done. Of her current foreign exchange requirements, Israel earns only about two-fifths. There is thus a need to utilize her resources more fully and to develop her industries.

All of these tasks will take time, but the courageous people of Israel have the drive and determination and intensity of purpose that is needed. They will, I am sure, succeed in their aim to make the new Republic of Israel a self-supporting nation, free and secure, and in so doing they will assist in the development of the resources of the entire region and make it prosperous and proof against Communist infiltration.

In closing I would like to include the following telegrams received today from some of the Jewish leaders of my community:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As president of organization Machne Israel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Meracham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

MACHNE ISREAL,
1535 West Touhy Avenue.
Rabbi S. HECHT,
Director.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Kehilas Jacob Beth Shmuel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and school in the Holy Land auspices of his eminence Chief Rabbi Menachan Schneersohn head of Lubavitcher Chasidic movement which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer, in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION KEHILAS JACOB BETH SHMUEL,
3701 West Devon.
Rabbi JOSEPH KAGAN,
SAMUEL T. COHEN, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Shaarei Tfilo Anshei Maariv which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION SHAAREI TFILO ANSHEI MAARIV,
1234 West Devon Avenue.
Rabbi B. ROSENTHAL,
ISIDORE TAITZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 15, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Beth David, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH DAVID,
4900 North Bernard.
Rabbi LAZAR MEISELS.
SIDNEY GENZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Anshei Motele, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION ANSHEI MOTELE,
6520 North California Avenue.
Rabbi L. KAPLAN,
JACOB KOHN, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Yisroel which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic Movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION OF YISROEL,
4610 North Kedzie Avenue,
Rabbi D. LIEBERMAN,
LOUIS BELL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Beth Jacob of Albany Park, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institution in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH JACOB OF ALBANY PARK,
4920 North Kimball Avenue.
Rabbi HASKELL LEHRFIELD.
BEN STIEBEL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Anshei Lubavitch, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April. 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGRESSMAN AMSHEI LUBAVITCH,
7424 North Paulina Street.
Rabbi S. HECHT,
JACOB KARZ, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Agudas Chabad, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION AGUDAS CHABAD,
5021 North Winthrop Avenue.
Rabbi HAROLD SHUSTERMAN,
MAX MARCUS, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of congregation Beth Hamidroch Keser Mariv Anshei Luknik, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of His Eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Habidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH HAMIDROSH KESER MARIV ANSHEI LUKNIK,
6418 North Greenview Avenue.
Rabbi ZEV WEIN,
M. MOSHEL, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Lev Semach, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION LEV SEMACH,
5555 North Bernard.
Rabbi H. TWERSKY.
SAM FISHMAN, *President.*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today is the eighth anniversary of the founding of the infant State of Israel. Israel represents 8 years of heroic acts, 8 years of unremitting efforts, 8 years of unique achievements amidst triumphs, frustrations, hopes, and deferred hopes fulfilled. And all this has been accompanied by a wondrous courage on the part of her people, a wondrous faith and a great determination, a determination as firm as the rock you hold in your hands. But, of course, Israel, a land of history has now had history gathered back under it for permanent abode.

Not all is good in Israel and not all is bad. To each obverse there is a reverse. But if tremendous faith and hard work and courage are the criteria, then the metal that eventually will emerge from the mold will be brighter than Israel's own Mediterranean Sea.

I have been there, and I have seen much of Israel. The Israelis had a shortage of food, yet they fed more. They had little of clothes, yet they clothed more. They fretted how they could house everyone, yet they opened the door to more, and those portals have never been closed to the driven Jew theretofore cast about throughout the nations for centuries like dried leaves before the chilly autumn's blasts. It is a story, indeed, that tugs at one's heart and only the heartless can remain indifferent and only the selfish can refuse to look with kindly eye.

I was at a farm over there and I saw wondrous potatoes being grown. I said to the farmer, "With what do you mix your soil that you can get those potatoes which rival our own Idaho and Maine potatoes?" His answer was simple. His answer was "brains, that is what we mix our soil with." And because of the use of ingenuity and resourcefulness the Israelis have done much in that short space of 8 years.

They have even developed an Atomic Energy Commission. They have developed new processes for developing and utilizing solar energy. They extract energy from the sun and are manipulating with that energy small engines. I could go on and tell you of the vast resourcefulness and the technological know-how of these people.

But, unfortunately, they are surrounded by bellicose and extremely hostile neighbors. The frontiers are everywhere. Look out, you are told, that hill is in Syria. Do not go near it. Be careful that you do not cross the Mandelbaum gate between Jerusalem and Jordan. But, that gate is merely a railroad gate. At Acre I was told, "Be careful. This path leads to Lebanon. We do not travel that path at dusk. It is too close to the frontier of Syria, and it is dangerous to get too close. You may be sniped at by hostile Arabs." And, we now hear of the terrible plight of the Israelis as the result of the letting loose into Israel of the so-called commando squads, the suicide squads of the Arabs.

And I read to you from a press dispatch. It is called Death in Schoolhouse:

> In a small schoolhouse in Shafrir, a group of teen-aged boys were standing stiffly erect, reading their evening prayers. Out of the darkness, three figures crept silently onto the schoolhouse porch. One of them edged forward and kicked open the schoolhouse door. As it swung back, he raked the schoolroom with a burst of automatic fire. Three of the boys and their instructor were killed.

And many, many more of these lads, these innocent lads at prayer, have been wounded. This has been going on night after night in Israel, but the Israelis have shown wondrous restraint, a restraint that has elicited from United States Ambassador Edward B. Lawson, words of praise.

He said he was amazed at "Israel's patience and restraint in the face of continuing terror and night marauder squads." He said he hoped that the world appreciated Israel's behavior in this crisis.

Israel has asked for arms from the United States, but the United States, through a benighted policy, or in accordance with a benighted and shortsighted inequitable policy emanating from the White House and the State Department denies Israel's rights to purchase arms, although arms are being supplied to all the neighbors of Israel.

Even the United States has sent to Saudi Arabia, which has refused to enter into peace negotiations with Israel, tanks, the most modern tanks, and England and Czechoslovakia have supplied the most modern arms, including jet planes and Centurion tanks to Egypt and Iran and Iraq, which have refused to even enter into armistice agreements with Israel, much less peace negotiations. All of these Arab nations are well armed as the result of their purchases of arms from many countries in Europe, including Sweden and, now I am informed, Japan. Yet, Israel has its application for arms vetoed by the President. He said it would be an arms race if the United States supplied arms to Israel, but it would not be an arms race if Britain and France supplied arms. I cannot understand that upside-down logic if logic it is at all. It is just a lot of "malarkey" to say that there is no arms race if Britain and France supply arms to Egypt, but to Israel it is an arms race if the United States supplies arms. Well, this is a rather unusual arms race, if all the contestants sprint around the track at top speed save Israel. Israel is held down by shackles on her ankles at the very start of the race, when the President and Secretary of State Dulles with unhappy irony say that the United Nations will take care of you, dear little Israel. Until the United Nations could act, Israel would be destroyed. The United Nations debating society would take God knows how many days until it could come to any kind of conclusion, and I do not want to speculate as to what that conclusion may be. But, remember also, in the United Nations Russia has the veto power, and Russia is supplying these arms to Egypt.

So there is no recourse, so far as the cessation of Israel's travail is concerned, in the United Nations. It would be a hopeless application. When Israel is told, "Well, you should wait and maybe something will be done," it reminds me of a story of a pauper who lamented to his rabbi that his wife was sick and his children hungry. The rabbi said, "Go home, God will help you." That is what the rabbi assured him. The pauper said, "Thank you, rabbi. I am sure God will help, but until he does, will you lend me 5 rubles?"

That is what Israel wants, until help can come. Give her the arms so she can defend herself. She does not want United States Marines in close proximity to her land. She does not want foreign troops on her soil to fight her battle. She wants no foreign blood to be shed on her land. She wants herself to fight and she can fight if she is given the wherewithal, if she is given the arms to do so.

David Ben-Gurion, the very doughty Prime Minister of Israel, said in a news dispatch this morning that Egypt was planning to "slaughter" Israel and he called on the security forces to continue to deliver "two blows for one." He went on to say:

> A heavy responsibility toward the history of humanity has been assumed by powers that are supplying aggressive arms to the Egyptian dictator and also by those powers that deny defensive arms to Israel.

He meant thereby the United States. Also he said:

> The conscience of the great powers failed when the Nazi dictator sent to slaughter 6 million Jews of Europe. Will that conscience fail again now that this Egyptian dictator and his allies are planning to do the same thing to Israel in her own land?

You must remember, there is an old saying that on the plains of hesitation lie the countless bones of millions. It is because we hesitated when Hitler first showed his teeth and when Mussolini first showed signs of aggression and then invaded Ethiopia; when Hitler took over the Ruhr land and the iron and steel industries, that the results were tragic. Are we going to hesitate again in the case of this new dictator who is arising in Africa, whose ambition is to control the entire Near East and the Middle East if not the Far East? I remind the President and I remind Mr. Dulles of recent history when freedom bowed in fear before ruthlessness.

However, Colonel Nasser's successes to date are, we are told, merely the first act in the drama of glory which is to come. The Cairo press envisions an Egyptian empire surpassing the realm of the Pharaohs and the conquests of Mehemid Ali.

Yes, he is very ambitious. In the meanwhile, what are we doing in the face of that ambition and the marauding and rapine and plunder inspired by Nasser? I would say that our foreign policy vis-a-vis Egypt and Israel lacks forthrightness, lacks courage and is replete with hesitation. We seem to be frightened. We are constantly hesitant. Our failure to act may have most tragic consequences following in its train.

Dulles seems to be incapable of any firm decision. The price of drift is enormously dangerous. We are now told, in a recent dispatch, that the Sudan has made application for the purchase of arms from Czechoslovakia or Russia. That means that not only in Egypt but in the Sudan, adjacent to important British and French possessions, there will be Communist arms, because I can assure you that Czechoslovakia will send those arms into the Sudan. And in the meanwhile our Secretary of State does not know what to do. I think Fletcher Knebel had it right when he said the following:

> The Eisenhower team says it will fight aggression in the Middle East. However, there will be a slight pause while Secretary Dulles flips a coin to find out which side we are on.

I think that hits it right on the head. I do not think he knows himself what side he is on. I know what side he should be on. He should be on the side of democracy. Israel is the only democracy in the Near East and wherever that flame of democracy burns, we should do our utmost to nurture that flame of democracy, otherwise, it will be blotted out by Nasser and his gang. Yes, Mr. Dulles thinks that all evil including the Russian evil in the Middle East can be stopped by his lofty preachings and all the ballyhoo about moral precepts. All he does is hope for the best, or vaguely appeal to the United Nations. How long will the President dodge his responsibility in this regard and arm Israel? When will they cease taking refuge in mere words of ridiculous optimism and bland generality? Maybe if the President

played a little less golf and paid a little more attention to the serious functions of his office—and I say that advisedly—it is not an offhand statement on my part—and if Mr. Dulles sifted the situation most cautiously and with prudence and with an eye to humanity, maybe we would get some forthright action and arms would be sent to Israel presently in the most desperate plight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for giving me this opportunity, and for his foresight in getting an hour's time to discuss the question of Israel, particularly on the 8th anniversary of the founding of the first democracy in the Middle East—the free State of Israel.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the remarks of my friend and colleague, the distinguished Member from Illinois. Neither his sound and constructive remarks nor his eloquence can come as a surprise to those of us who have listened to him on past occasions.

On this eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel, it seems to me that it is a time for us, as a Nation, to refrain from the usual congratulatory platitudes and, instead, to reaffirm the fundamental principles upon which our friendship and support for the democratic State of Israel is based.

Eight short years ago, Israel came into existence through action taken by the United Nations, and with the concurrence of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

The nature of our friendship and the principle upon which it was established was reiterated in 1950 when the United States, with Great Britain and France, issued the tripartite agreement which, among other things, declared it to be the policy of the signatory nations to act either within the United Nations or jointly against agression in the Middle East. This agreement also spelled out the policy of maintaining a balance of armaments as between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

With this friendship and support, the prospects for Israel 6 years ago were bright indeed, but in the short span of less than a decade, the positions of both Israel and the United States in the Middle East have disintegrated beyond recognition. Our policy of impartial friendship toward the Arab nations and Israel has been reciprocated by growing suspicion, cynicism, and animosity. When we are willing to face facts, we will realize that we are being damned in some quarters and scoffed at in others for our lack of resolution, our loss of political courage, and our compromise of principle.

One development in the United States attitude toward the strife-torn Middle East is the State Department's current move to downgrade the tripartite agreement of 1950—in which these powers promised to take action within and without the United Nations to keep peace in Palestine. As short a time as 6 weeks ago, there followed from the Eisenhower-Eden conferences in Washington the general, if somewhat ambiguous, affirmation of the tripartite agreement, and only 2 weeks ago, President Eisenhower was emphasizing the importance and possibilities of that pact. But today, it is conspicuous only by its omission from practically all diplomatic conversation. The closest we have come was the recent statement on behalf of the President that "the United States is likewise determined to support and assist any nation which might be subjected to such aggression."

I sincerely question the scuttling of the tripartite agreement, because I believe it was based upon principle. All of us are aware that circumstances have altered radically in the Middle East since that agreement was signed, and that additional methods must be explored to prevent aggression in light of the changed circumstances.

In light of the emergence of the Soviet Union's influence in the Middle East, it is difficult to explain the all-out effort of the administration to handle the Israeli-Arab situation exclusively through the United Nations—where Russia holds the veto power as a member of the Security Council. While all of us share the hope that a solution may be found through the United Nations, there still remains the question of the character of United States leadership in coping with Mideast tensions and the nature of our policy in this area.

These are questions which at present lack any kind of definition. We seem resolved to avoid unpleasantness at any cost, even the abdication of principle upon which our leadership has been based. We are not willing to sell arms to Israel; yet, we make it plain that we have no objection to our allies doing so. So today, we find Saudi Arabia armed with Soviet jets, American tanks, and British artillery pieces. To offset this increasing military advantage, Israel must turn to France, of all nations, for needed defensive air strength. If this is the basis of our "impartial friendship," can we expect anything other than loss of face and rebuff throughout the Mideast and throughout the world?

The time has come to speak plainly and to again return to the kind of principle for which the United States has long been respected. The problems ahead of us are complex and difficult, but they will find no solution by our failure to meet them forthrightly and honestly. It is time that our policy in the Middle East be made known not only to the nations involved in that area, but to the American people as well.

Until we do this, felicitations to the gallant State of Israel upon her eighth anniversary of independence will be hollow indeed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy to have this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleague from California in expressing by sincerest friendship and encouragement to the people of Israel on this 8th anniversary of their independence. The gallant State of Israel can be everlastingly proud of its achievements, as they recall their desperate bid for independence and international recognition 8 years ago. Born out of the utmost adversity, the Israeli nation has grown and strengthened itself during these short 8 years in a manner which has astounded the world and heartened all believers in democratic institutions.

It is particularly appropriate at this moment for the friends of the Israeli people to signify their desire to see them continue their inspiring struggle to create a thriving democratic nation in an area replete with deterrents to such an enterprise. In addition to the natural drawbacks of their desert land and their unavoidably inflated rate of immigration, the Israeli people must contend along their entire frontiers with hostile Arab neighbors. In their economic relations with other countries they are severely handicapped by the boycotts and restrictions of the Arab bloc, which sits astride the Suez Canal. Under such conditions the determination of the Israeli people to demonstrate to all the world the permanence of their magnificent accomplishments has remained unwavering.

I wish to pay tribute to this determination, as well as to the economic and political accomplishments which it has fostered. My views on the imperative need for the United States to prevent any aggressor from destroying Israel are clearly on record. The balance of military capabilities between the Arab bloc and Israel should not be permitted to tip in favor of a restless and ambitious set of military leaders. It is encouraging to see our President go on record to put more teeth into the tripartite policy of Britain, France, and the United States to prevent any aggression in the Middle Eastern area from succeeding. It is also important that we are working through the United Nations to the same purpose. It is the hope of all freedom-loving people that no aggression will ever be attempted. It is my personal hope and desire that the State of Israel will continue to prosper in the next 8 years of its independence in a fashion far superior to the past time of troubles, and I look forward to tributes being paid to this intrepid and inspiring nation on its Independence Day for as long as this House continues to meet.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate greatly the opportunity of following the two distinguished addresses which have been made here today congratulating the State of Israel on its eighth anniversary of freedom and inde-

pendence. It would seem to me that it is quite significant that the first gentleman who spoke, the gentleman from Illinois, represents one of the great districts in the Middle West, coming as he does from the great city of Chicago, and that the gentleman who has just preceded me represents a district from one of the greatest cities in the world, New York City, on the east coast of our country, and I have the privilege of representing a district from the west coast in the city of Los Angeles. It seems fitting, indeed, that Israel should know that her support comes from every part of our great country and it is most important, I believe, in these days when she faces such trials and tribulations that everyone who has the opportunity to do so should send her not only best wishes but should send her the knowledge of our determination to stand behind her and not to let her down in her most difficult hour. We should not forget—we Americans—that we were the first nation to grant recognition to the newest of all democratic nations, the State of Israel. It would seem to me a great shame that, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has so eloquently stated, our policy today before the world is one of confusion; is one which is worse than confusion, because it gives help and encouragement to the enemies of democracy. How can we who joined with France and Great Britain in the tripartite agreement of 1950 say to our allies "It is all right for you to go ahead and give arms to the State of Israel but we will not do it." It is an open secret that the reason we have given for such a mistaken policy is that we are afraid that any action on our part might bring Russia into the picture in the Middle East. How dense and how stupid can we be? Russia is already in the Middle East. It is her technicians, it is the arms of her satellites who are today causing all of the disturbance that in a word we fear a third world war might start.

In this country we have voted billions of dollars under the principle that if one remains strong enough we defer aggressive military action by our enemies, and yet when it comes to the state of Israel we have turned around and done exactly the opposite. Here we hope perhaps reasonableness and sweetness and a fair sense of justice will be enough to deter aggression against the tiny state of Israel. We know better than that, and it is time we began to practice what we preach. I believe with all my heart that if those who will look at the broad picture will only begin to realize it, Russia is in the Middle East because she wants to take advantage of the tremendous hatred on the part of the Arabs against the democratic institutions of that little but brave and wonderful state; that she wants to go further than that and she wants to wipe out all of the American Air Force bases in North Africa, within Arab countries, which are today the great protection that we in America have against any aggressive attitude on the part of the Russian authorities. This is a bigger question than just Israel itself. It comes down to the long last hope to avert war and to establish peace. But under the leadership of the present administration there has been seemingly no consciousness of what has already taken place and what can take place if we do not quickly determine to stand by the State of Israel and let the whole world know it, so that there can be no question that any act of aggression will result in instantaneous action on our part.

How discouraging our present policy must be to those people who have to suffer indignities and terrors, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] so brilliantly described. How discouraging it must be to be told that America may move if Congress can be summoned quickly enough to pass the necessary legislation. How her people must feel who know that it takes 8 minutes to fly from Cairo to the cities of Israel—8 minutes to drop a bomb that will wipe out almost all vestige of a civilization which has been built up by the sweat and by the courage and by the sacrifices of the men and women of Israel. Those 8 minutes will not wait. Those 8 minutes that might destroy all the hopes of democracy in the area where democracy must grow if eventually we are to have a buffer against the despotism of that great giant to the north.

So I say that in this time when we give happy birthday greetings to the State of Israel we give it with the hope that our country may soon come forward with the same kind of encouragement which came to us as a tiny nation and that when that encouragement comes that we will be able to give the signal to the whole world that we are working at last toward a permanent and lasting peace throughout the world under a system of liberty and freedom for all men everywhere.

I congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for what he has said, and I hope that his words and those of others who will speak today will have effect in our country and will convey a sense not only of our gratitude for what has been done so bravely by the people of Israel, but may also carry to them the determination of many of us that Israel shall not fall, and that we shall do our part to sustain her in the years to come.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], has asked that his remarks be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. I therefore request that this may be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am aghast at the outrages that are being perpetrated on the State of Israel, 8 years old today, and the good men and women of that land, who are striving with vision, determination and unsurpassed bravery to build a fortress of democracy in that troubled area in the pattern of our own great democracy. Israel's cause is our cause. If we permit Israel, sorely beset by ruthless enemies, to fall we will not be guiltless of responsibility for one of the catastrophic tragedies of history. In Israel is a government, like our own, that respects the dignity of man and the divine purpose in the creation of man. It stands in its zone of influence for the things for which we in our zone stand. Any blow struck at Israel is a blow struck at us.

I am glad that my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] has obtained this time on the birthday of Israel in order that we here in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States can make our position as Israel's friend so crystal-clear and so militantly positive that all the world must take notice, and especially that part of the world now in conspiracy to wipe Israel from the face of the world. Let the enemies of Israel know once and for all that the United States stands determinedly between Israel and the execution of that diabolic conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this point to read four telegrams that were handed me as I left my office to come to this Chamber. The wording in all the telegrams is the same, the signatures only being different, but the message is so potent and commanding that it will stand being read four times. I wish that message to sink well into the minds of my colleagues. The oftener it is read the better.

MESSAGE FROM FOUR RABBIS

Here are the telegrams that pinpoint the dangers Israel is in, the diabolical lengths to which her enemies will go, and the need of firm and prompt action by the United States.

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Amschod, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION AMSCHOD,
814 East 51st Street.
Rabbi MALVIN RUSH,
HAROLD ORLINSKI, *President.*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As Rabbi and president of Congregation B'Nei Bezalel, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION B'NEI BEZALEL,
7549 South Phillips Avenue.
Rabbi EFRAIM PROMBAUN.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 13, 1965.*

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Congregation Beth Yosef, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we

register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

CONGREGATION BETH YOSEF,
1508 East 70th Street.
Rabbi ZELIG STARR.
ISIDORE KORETZKY, *President,*

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 16, 1956.*
Congressman BARRATT O'HARA,
Washington, D. C.:

As rabbi and president of Torah Synagogue, which is in close affinity to the religious institutions and schools in the Holy Land, auspices of his eminence, Chief Rabbi Menacham Schneersohn, head of Lubavitcher Hasidic movement, which has its center in the United States of America, we register our horror at brutal slaying of our young brothers at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, April 11. We demand our Government take immediate steps to prevent repetition and safeguard life and property of our sacred institutions in the Holy Land.

TORAH SYNAGOGUE,
2357 East 75th Street.
Rabbi M. LITOFF.
H. ROSENSON, *President.*

EIGHT YEARS OLD TODAY

It was 8 years ago that the tiny State of Israel was proclaimed a new nation among the world's powers. Since then, it has been struggling for survival and development against tremendous odds, working amidst a swirl of pressures from the conflicting great powers on the one hand and a growing Arab nationalism on the other. The fact that the Israeli nation, however, has progressed in spite of these obstacles, modernizing and developing, makes us all very proud. We warmly congratulate the Israeli people on this triumphant record produced against such great odds.

In view of these achievements, it is heartbreaking that Israel finds herself today at the vortex of a crisis that threatens to embroil the entire world in war. Let us review briefly the events that have placed her in this position. First, the British, who had formerly had the task of holding the lid on the Middle East, underwent a steady dimunition of their power.

By virtue of the fact that the United States was the only nation in the West that had the requisite strength to take over this task of preserving our common interests, we Americans found ourselves abruptly projected into the role of leader in the Middle East as in other areas. Almost immediately, the United States realized that peace in the area could be built only on a stable balance of power. However, the tensions produced by the political fragmentation and internal instabilities made this difficult indeed to realize. The center of unrest within the area—that is, as distinguished from the threat of communism and the Soviet Union—was the situation that developed with the creation of the State of Israel.

ARABS WAR ON ISREAL

The Arabs met the Israelis with war. In 1949 Egypt, and eventually the States of Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria, signed U. N.-sponsored armistices with Israel. Peace, however, was not forthcoming with the truce, and the anti-Israeli campaign of the Arabs was increasingly more belligerent and destructive. In the absence of an effective peace settlement, the United States, Great Britain, and France signed a tripartite resolution in 1950 in which it was acknowledged that the Arab States and Israel needed to maintain a certain level of armed forces for internal security, legitimate self-defense, and a participation in the defense of the area as a whole. In point 3 of this tripartite declaration the three Governments further stated the following terms: "should they"—the United States, France, and Britain—"find that any of these states was preparing to violate frontiers or armistice lines, they would, consistently with their obligations as members of the United Nations, immediately take action, both within and outside the United Nations, to prevent such violation." This resolution, however, which was intended to prevent the type of situation which has recently developed, never had teeth put into it, and it has been gradually fading into the background. It seems to me that the United States has failed in the Middle East, that its actions have actually had the effect of encouraging the Arabs to believe that they can start a new war with Israel without fear of effective interference. In calling for peace by negotiation under U. N. auspices yet failing to make a resort to arms unprofitable by announcing our determination to give the tripartite declaration teeth, we lead the Arabs—and the Soviets—to think we will not act until too late.

The British have made the tripartite declaration fundamental to their Middle Eastern policy, as we all agreed to do, and are apparently prepared to back it up. According to recent news dispatches they are now beginning to fear that inadequate United States support of that declaration has served to undermine the whole Western position. In the meantime, the Soviet Union has been encouraged by our indecisive stand and doubtless anticipates a war from which she can profit in her usual way.

WAR TO AVOID BIG WAR

It seems to me that if we are to avoid the big war we must avoid or limit small ones. In these days of crisis diplomacy when world powers must make mature and sure decisions practically on the spur of the moment, there must be agreement on basic foreign policy objectives operating within an area and our leadership must be firm. In the area of the Middle East, especially in regard to Israel, the United States must accept the responsibilities incurred from our original advocacy for the creation of a new nation-state.

Today, as never before, the United States must support the Israeli nation and people in their moment of greatest trial. It is no time for weak gestures and tongue-in-both-cheeks conversation. We are on Israel's side and all the world should know it.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of inserting their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the founding of the new democratic, freedom-loving State of Israel in the land of Palestine is a notable event for the world, and for America where so many of her citizens look to Israel as their spiritual homeland.

The joy with which such an event should be celebrated is, however, tinged with sadness by the dark shadows which now overhang the Middle East. We know, however, that America is taking effective steps to help dispel those shadows; and we are confident that Israel will have the glorious future so richly deserved because of the fortitude, sacrifice, and patriotism of her people.

Two recent visits to Israel have enabled me to witness in person the remarkable developments in this land. Here the people are taming the deserts and the rocky hillsides much as American frontiersmen developed our own country.

Those visits enabled me also to see the physical aspect of the country and to appreciate the value to this small republic of every acre of land within its borders; to appreciate that frontier disputes which might be of relatively small consequence to larger nations are of the utmost consequence to this smaller nation; to realize the difficulties of defense in a land where in meeting hostile attack, there can be no retreat from the frontiers.

For these reasons, I have publicly urged that Israel be granted defensive arms, that the United States participate with other nations in a security pact covering that region, and that America be prepared to stand back of its policy of opposition to aggression in that area by granting advance authority for the use of force, if found necessary, by means of a Formosa-type declaration.

America wishes Israel well on this her day of anniversary, and hopes that Israel may yet receive that priceless gift, which has indeed become a word of greeting in that hospitable land—shalom, peace.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Israel's eighth anniversary as an independent and sovereign state comes at a crucial time. During the past year the situation in the Middle East has deteriorated badly, so that the area has been kept in a constant state of tension and its peoples know no peace. It all began when Egypt concluded an agreement with the Soviet bloc some 7 or 8 months ago to obtain the newest and most modern arms from the Communist countries. Since then the entire region has been in turmoil.

The military balance of this strategic area, which is so vital to our defense structure against any possible onslaught from communism in the future, has been upset by Egypt's action in giving Soviet Russia a foothold in the Middle East. For all practical purposes, Russia has made important inroads into the area and will not be easily or quickly dis-

lodged. Egypt and its opportunistic leaders will have to bear the full blame and responsibility for this deed, for which the free world may some day have to pay a big price.

The continuing grave crisis in the Middle East threatens the existence of Israel and, in fact, the peace and security of the free world. It is now exactly 8 years since that historic day, May 14, 1948, when Israel was established as an independent state. During these 8 years the people and the Government of the United States have given Israel material and moral support and have helped that little country to build a free and democratic society and way of life which is very much like ours. Close ties of friendship have been cemented between the two countries, so that today there is not the least doubt in anyone's mind that Israel is one of our best and most sincere allies in that part of the world.

In the present crucial situation, we cannot ignore Israel's plight, nor can we afford to stand aloof when its very existence is being threatened by an aggressive neighbor who opened the door of the Middle East to Communist Russia. The Arab leaders maintain that they desire peace in the Middle East, yet they refuse to enter into peace negotiations with Israel. Their lip service and uncompromising attitude is only encouraging Soviet Russia to exploit every opportunity for further intrusion into the area—an intrusion from which the Arab people will be the first to suffer.

On several occasions during the past few months I have urged the United States Government to adopt a firmer policy in the Middle East and to end the policy of appeasement of the Arabs. The more we appease the Arabs, the less support we get from them. The more material aid we give to Egypt, to Saudi Arabia and to Syria, the less respect they seem to have for us.

This firmer stand on our part should be expressed in another way, that is, to make available to Israel the necessary arms for legitimate self-defense in the event of aggression from her Arab neighbors. It does not make sense when we provide arms to Iraq and Saudi Arabia, but we refuse to sell arms to Israel. This is not impartiality, but it constitutes a very definite and partial pro-Arab attitude. This is not the traditional American policy in that area and is not what the American people want.

On the occasion of Israel's eighth anniversary of its independence, we in the United States take note of this event with great pride because of the important role played by our country in the creation of the State of Israel and in helping it achieve a more solid economic foundation during these 8 years. We have found in Israel a devoted ally to the cause of freedom. We wish for the people of Israel that the year ahead may be a year of peace, security, and happiness.

I extend my sincerest greetings to the government and people of Israel and pray that their efforts to attain genuine peace may be realized in the very near future, so that they may continue to build up their ancient homeland. I also send my greetings to the Jews of America who deserve much praise for their continued help to Israel, for their moral and material support which is in itself a glorious chapter in the annals of humanitarianism.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of real pleasure to join with my colleagues to the State of Israel as it observes its eighth anniversary of statehood.

It is most fitting that at this time we extend our hand in a symbolic gesture of everlasting friendship to the gallant people of Israel. We have watched with pride as the State of Israel has labored arduously to develop into a strong and free nation, and we have thrilled at its magnificent progress during its brief existence. We are saddened today at the troubles which have come upon the Israeli people. They are a people in jeopardy, a nation exposed to the gravest peril. Their cause is our cause—the universal cause of freedom and justice.

Our course is clear. We must act with dispatch and with energy. We must support Israel for the sake of peace and decency among nations. Let us approach this problem on the high plane of prudent statesmanship and farsighted diplomacy and muster all the energies within us to resolve this dispute honorably and wisely.

More than just a small, independent nation is involved in this Middle Eastern crisis. To be sure America has a strong sense of moral compulsion to safeguard Israel. We have watched hopefully while that young independent nation grew and prospered since her declaration of independence in 1948. But our interests extend to far broader dimensions than the borders of Israel. Our own national interest is involved in this crisis.

It is vital that we act decisively to end the threat of war in the Near East. The American people will not tolerate anything so immoral as the sacrifice of Israel to Communist infiltration of the Near East.

As we send our warmest greetings to the State of Israel on this eighth anniversay, may she be heartened and encouraged by the knowledge that the sympathy and support of the American people are with her in this hour of grave danger to her continued existence as a free and valiant nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having this opportunity to extend to the people of Israel my most sincere congratulations on the anniversary of the founding of their country. Eight years ago today, the State of Israel came into being—the final culmination of centuries of earnest hope and prayer.

The world will long remember the valiant struggle for freedom which led to their declaration of independence when the new State of Israel was established just 8 years ago. It is not necessary for me to go into the history of the political struggle of the Jews in Palestine to establish their new homeland. That has already been done by other speakers here in the House of Representatives today. It is, however, well to recall that in accordance with the decision of the United Nations in November 1947, the territory that was mandated was to be divided into a Jewish and an Arab State. This mandate ended in 1948 and the youngest democracy in the world, the State of Israel then declared its independence.

The progress made by this new democratic country since that date has indeed been phenomenal. The new nation can well be proud of the courage it has displayed in hewing to the line laid down for it by its founding fathers. We, too, have a right to share in that pride by virtue of the contribution we in the United States, Jews and Christians alike, have made to insure the successful launching of the Israeli ship of state. We must, however, in justice continue our efforts to guarantee that Israel, the one country in the Middle East that has proven itself steadfast in the fight for democracy, shall not fall before the critical onslaught with which she is presently faced. For such to happen would be an international tragedy.

It was with this thought in mind that on December 27 of 1955 I wrote to the President of the United States as follows:

> The furnishing of large quantities of Communist arms to Egypt has created a grave crisis in the Middle East and threatens not only the very existence of the State of Israel but poses a distinct threat to world peace.
>
> The situation appears to be worsening with each passing day. The free world cannot afford to let Israel, the single bastion of democracy in the Near East, become another Korea. It cannot afford to allow the Communists to gain a foothold in the Middle East. The United States must take direct and positive action to counteract the gravity of the pending situation and prevent the conflagration of large-scale war in that area.
>
> I strongly urge (1) that the United States take immediate steps to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by furnishing the necessary arms to Israel for self-defense and (2) that the United States offer to enter into mutual-security pacts with both Israel and the Arab States, guaranteeing the borders of those countries.

Since the date of my letter to the President, the threat to Israel has increased and the tension and possibility of armed warfare greatly aggravated. I am convinced that this Soviet action poses a distinct threat, not only to Israel, but to our own national interest as well. I believe that it is in the best interests of the United States that immediate action be taken by this country to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East. Our entire heritage and tradition tells us that we must stand with the free nations of the world.

We must not turn our backs on the people of Israel who so desperately need our help.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Israel are observing their eighth anniversary as a free and independent nation. I am happy to salute her and it is gratifying to know that millions of my fellow Americans send their best wishes and greetings to the new state on this occasion.

Israel has concluded 8 years of extreme hardship, struggle against overwhelming odds, enmity and aggression by her neighbors. Although she has not been permitted to enjoy peace, for which she

has begged, she has managed to hold her own. She has made tremendous strides in building her economy, reclaiming lands, developing her agricultural program, and expanding her industries in spite of the fact that she has had to deflect a major portion of her assets, resources, and manpower to the building of her defenses against enemy neighbors who have sworn her defeat and extinction.

We cannot use the word celebrate in connection with Israel's eighth anniversary for she is now in her darkest hour. The threat of war was never more ominous; her enemies are mightily armed. The small State of Israel stands alone and, in view of the military might of her aggressors, defenseless. So, in this time of crisis, Israel needs more than our expressions of friendship; she needs our help, she needs our prayers.

At this point, when the moral isolation of Israel has been very largely achieved, it will be of great comfort to her citizens to know that they have the good wishes of encouragement and the prayers of so many Americans. The Israelis have a right to a homeland; Americans recognize their right to have peace in their homeland. This is our opportunity to let her know of our confidence in her prowess as a state, in the courage and ideals of her citizens, and our conviction that Israel is here to stay. It is going to stay. The American people, who helped create Israel, who were the first to recognize her, and who hold warm feelings of friendship for her, are going to see to it that she stays.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a new country is being built today in the heart of the most ancient cradle of civilization. Israel is a pioneer land. Looking back into our own history, we are proud that our country offered a haven to the persecuted and an opportunity for those seeking a better life. Now, in the mid-20th century, it is Israel which is a citadel of hope and opportunity for the oppressed and the ill-advantaged. More than that, Israel, like our own country, is a bastion of the democratic heritage. There is no question in my mind but that Israel's devotion to political freedom has been the cornerstone of all her progress in her 8 years of independence, for it has inspired the support of her own people, and of people all over the world, for the great material advances of less than a decade. It is this same dedication to freedom which makes Israel such a stanch ally of the United States today. In these days of tension, the American people will never lose sight of this basic fact.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these grim days of tension in the Middle East, it is most fitting to mark the eighth anniversary of the founding of the independent State of Israel and to hail the advancements which the people of this democratic outpost in the strategically important area have made in these 8 short years.

Israel today stands as a model of enlightened progress in the spirit of free democratic government. The evil forces of world communism are attempting to destroy this symbol of democracy by incitement of the racial and nationalistic prejudices of its neighbors. Israel has stood firm for freedom and resisted the blandishments of the Communists. It has also fiercely resisted harassing border raids from its hostile neighboring countries and has reaffirmed its intention of maintaining at all costs its freedom and territorial integrity won in bitter conflict only a few short years ago.

The United States played an important role in the founding and recognition of Israel as an independent nation. Under the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, our Nation recognized the importance of military preparedness among both the Arab States and Israel, in the defense of their own nations against aggression. Military assistance has been given to the anti-Communist nations of the Middle East in the past. But the threat posed to the continued independence of Israel by the recent shipment of arms from Communist Czechoslovakia to the Egyptian Government raises a serious new problem which must be met by the United States in a positive and decisive manner. We must face this immediate crisis by making available supplies and weapons for the defense of Israel by its embattled citizens.

Our Nation has a significant opportunity to demonstrate to the world its determination to assist free peoples in the defense of their homeland, while at the same time offering to all the downtrodden peoples of the Middle East a positive alternative to the Communist efforts to sacrifice them in another move for world conquest.

We must renew our efforts to erase the age-old marks of poverty, misery, sickness, and economic exploitation which still haunt these peoples and nations. We must convince them that the bright new tomorrow which they seek does not lie down the road toward war against Israel, with the blind and forlorn hopes of economic reward and plunder. Instead, we must make every possible effort to channel their fierce nationalism and desire for economic abundance along the road toward the constructive realization of these goals, through self-help, technical assistance, and economic rebuilding programs.

In this way we can reveal the true intent of the calculated Soviet power manuever in the Middle East in all of its cold-blooded deceit and cynical promises and win a smashing victory for the free world in its struggle against Communist imperialism.

Israel, the people of the United States commend you for your valor and high resolve in the name of freedom. We salute you for your significant accomplishments in these past 8 years. We pledge ourselves to strengthen your people in our common struggle and to make every effort to assist in the preservation of your hard-won freedom and independence.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in the tribute that Members of this House are paying today to the gallant nation of Israel on her 8th anniversary. It would be a far happier occasion if, in paying our tribute, we could see, for the people of Israel, a time of peace and mutually beneficial relations with neighboring nations as they begin this, the 9th year of their existence as a nation. But we can see no such prospect. Surrounded by hostile nations dedicated to her destruction, this small but brave nation has endured in the past several weeks some of the worst depredations of her short but war-torn existence. Lawless and brutal gangs have invaded even the quiet of children at prayer to wipe out young lives in this terrible contest.

Yet we can and should, I think speak some words of hope to this gallant nation today. We too were once a small and struggling people, threatened in our early years by hostile powers that coveted our land. We have good reason to stand as a loyal friend to others who are working, as we worked to become strong and to secure to their children the blessings of peace and abundance. Many of us have watched, with great concern, in the past several years, the increase of tension and violence in the Middle East and the growing threat of war. We have urged our own leaders to take firm and vigorous action to forestall the terrible prospect of war. In recent days, we have finally seen signs that this administration is awakening to the danger that looms there and is stirring from its lethargy to do what should have been long since done. So I think that we can say today, with some assurance, to our friends in Israel that we will not stand idly by and watch their destruction. Like them, we are determined that there shall be peace in the Middle East. We are determined that no nation shall be destroyed by the aggression of her neighbors. We are determined to shoulder responsibility and to do our share in building, where now there is violence and distrust, relations of peace and mutual help, to the end that Israel and her neighbors may some day share in the kind of peaceful interchange that will mean stability and prosperity and a happier future for all the people of the Middle East.

That, I think, is the best pledge we can make to the people of Israel on their 8th anniversary. I, for one, am ready to work wholeheartedly to redeem that pledge. As the people of Israel celebrate this day, our hearts should go out to them, in compassion, for the trials they are now suffering. Our purpose should be firm to do everything in our power to bring their trials to a speedy end and everything in our power to help them and their neighbors to build a better and happier future.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, April 16, 1956, marks the anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. Eight years ago a new nation arose from the depths of despair and oppression to walk vigorously in a new light of hope, fulfilling a dream of 2,000 years. If we could persuade some individuals in this country to forget for a moment the envy, hate, and animosity indiscriminately hurled against the young nation of Israel, if we could remind them how similar are the struggles and sufferings undergone by Israel to those experienced by our Founding Fathers when they fled religious oppression and persecution to establish a peaceful haven in this country, if we could remember how much we appreciated the sympathies and help of some European countries in the struggle

to secure our independence, we would all then be better disposed toward Israel. We would understand that she has only one desire—and that is to live peaceably alongside her hostile neighbors. Because there is this striking similarity in the history of our people and that of the Israeli nation, the American people have deeply sympathized with the cause of Israel and have given liberally to help her in every possible way.

Nevertheless, against this tangible and most generous proof given by a majority of the American public in support of the righteousness of Israel's aspirations, there stands the ill will of a few who nest themselves behind the shield of a Government agency, the Department of State. These do everything to promote hostility rather than peace. They have encouraged Arab belligerency over Israel's protests; they have rejected Israel's request for equal treatment—in short, they have done their best to provoke another war. Our Secretary of State has proved himself insensitive and insensible to the facts and moralities of the area.

How can they ignore the fact that at the very time that the representative of the United Nations was pleading in Cairo for peace, Egyptian murderers shot down in cold blood children at prayer in Israel?

Can we in good faith claim that the best interests of the United States are served by the few in the Department of State whose actions result in encouraging feuding among nations? Why should they be so anxious to appease the Arabs at the expense of Israel? If we agree to extend military assistance to one, we should in fairness grant the same to the other. Are we to have more faith in the Arabs than in Israel? Has not this young state clearly demonstrated how seriously and efficiently she has been working and progressing during the past 8 years?

Israel's record is proof of her aim for peaceful existence to carry on her programs of agricultural and industrial improvement. In her struggle Israel aspires to become again the promised land for thousands and thousands of refugees, so that all people can say, with the Prophet Ezekiel:

> This land that was untilled is become as a garden of pleasure, and the cities that were abandoned and desolate and destroyed are peopled and fenced.

Israel has become the most progressive and energetic state in the Middle East. In the last 8 years more than 400 new agricultural settlements have been created in a small area, compared to less than 300 in the 70 years prior to Israel's coming into existence. Every type of industry has bloomed; transportation and housing have flourished—but beyond this material success, Israel is today the symbol of courage and expectation for all humanity who secretly hope and pray that in this chosen land, the people of the earth, if God touches their hearts and enlightens their minds, might finally reach a mutual understanding and establish the foundation of a new era of everlasting peace for the entire world.

In rejoicing over the recurrence of the birth of Israel, we also voice the prayer that the relations between the United States and Israel will be strengthened and more closely bound.

We pray that the benighted officials in our executive department will open their eyes and their hearts and that they will lend the might and power of our great country, material and spiritual, to establishing true peace in the world.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today one of the most ancient lands observes its status as the youngest of free nations.

Israel observes its eighth anniversary on this April 16, 1956, its indepenedence threatened by unfriendly neighbors. In this hour of trial I believe the great majority of American join me in the devout prayer that this new democracy will prevail.

Eight years ago the United States was the first to recognize the new nation of Israel. On this anniversary I am happy to see other Members of Congress joining me in an expression of reassurance to Israel that its people still have our friendship and support.

The threat to Israel's survival is a threat to all free nations, and the increasing tension in the Middle East is a threat to world peace. I share the disappointment of the people of Israel over our State Department's delay on Israel's urgent plea for defensive arms.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I would like to insert the following statement in the RECORD on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel:

I am happy to join in extending my heartfelt congratulations to Israel on the eighth anniversary of its proclamation as a state. Americans everywhere can be proud of their contribution to this achievement.

As we look back upon the events since May 14, 1948, when Israel again achieved statehood after an exile of over 2,000 years, we find a remarkable record of progress and accomplishment. Here is a country which has given shelter to hundreds of thousands of homeless people, most of whom were victims of the war, and provided them with a chance to live productive lives. On the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, the State of Israel was built, a great new outpost of Western democracy, on a foundation of freedom and liberty.

Israel is an example of democracy in action whose accomplishments for human welfare and civilization in 8 years rivals anything done in countries ruled by dictators. Israel has made this progress without paying the totalitarian price of slave labor and ruthless pressure.

The people of Israel have come from all parts of the world, speaking many languages and representing many cultures. Like the immigrants who came to this country, they have joined in a common endeavor, learned to speak a common language and helped to build a common civilization. This is in miniature a repetition of the great American experiment in creating a civilization out of a wilderness with men and women whose common heritage is their humanity. And, indeed, many Americans have recognized in the people of Israel a spirit that closely resembles that of our pioneers a century ago.

Today Israel is threatened as never before by the forces of dictatorship and oppression. Yet it has maintained the rights and liberties of its people despite the danger of invasion and has constantly sought and worked for peace. At the same time, it has realistically been compelled to provide for its defense against the growing arsenal in Arab lands.

The United States has done much to foster and encourage the development of Israel, and the people of Israel have repeatedly demonstrated their appreciation. Our country has made a firm commitment to preserve the integrity of the State of Israel, and I am sure that we have every intention of standing by that commitment. Many of us in Congress, however, are convinced that one of the steps we must take without delay is to restore the military balance in the Middle East. We can do this by allowing Israel to purchase the defensive weapons she must have to discourage would-be aggressors.

The fact that Moscow has shipped modern weapons to Egypt and other Arab States in quantity makes it imperative that our country take the lead in helping Israel to defend itself. The press has reported that France, Italy, Canada, and other nations are ready to help this fellow democracy with jet fighter planes and other arms for defense, but I should like to see my country demonstrate its willingness to go further than others in releasing arms to a beleaguered ally. All the world looks to us for the example to follow, and we dare not yield our responsibility to any other nation.

I recognize, of course, that defensive arms to Israel are not a solution to the problem of achieving peace in the Middle East, but their deterrent effect can avert war and give us time to work for peace, time in which tensions may be relaxed and reason prevail. Let no one be deceived into thinking that this is an isolated conflict between the Arabs and Israel. It cannot be localized. Our civilization is so constituted that the problems of the Middle East reflect the worldwide conflict of ideas between the East and the West, and whatever happens between Israel and her neighbors will inevitably affect the lives of all Americans.

As Israel enters the ninth year of its existence, we hope and pray that a beginning shall be made toward the establishment of peace, not only in that troubled area, but for all people all over the world. With firmness and resolution we can defeat the Communist threat of war and bring about the initial steps to a lasting peace. On this anniversary we can bring to the people of Israel an assurance that they do not stand alone in their gallant fight to create a nation of free people under God and that we stand with them against the enemies of democracy.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my distinguished colleagues and say a word with regard

to the observation of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel. I am unable to say "happy birthday" for this is not a happy day for the little democracy which is surrounded on all sides by hostile, aggressive, and threatening neighbors.

I wonder how long the State of Israel will have to stand on guard. I wonder for what period of time she will have to continue to spend practically all of her substance on armament and a military establishment. This is the state which cheerfully burdened itself with a program of immigration for distressed and homeless people and sought to work out an economy amidst most inhospitable surroundings. From a harsh, cruel, and unyielding desert of sand, Israel's people have brought forth a citrus industry. They have worked the farms so that now her people are self-sufficient insofar as vegetables are concerned.

Israel has worked and has accomplished much to educate and give medical ministrations to the people of the Middle East. She has given dignity and self-respect to people who have heretofore despaired of any further whatsoever. All the while she has had to stand guard. Farming, with a rifle ready at hand. Teaching children with a lookout on the hill. Nursing the sick with an armed guard on the roof of the hospital.

Israel has endeavored and succeeded in making a great humanitarian contribution to a benighted and backward part of the world. She is entitled to a happier birthday than the one she celebrates today.

I wish merely to say, Mr. Speaker, that if Israel's requests for defensive arms are granted by this country, Israel will have a happy birthday because war will be averted. There will be no conflagration in the Middle East with the fearsome possibility of its spreading throughout the world. Stability will take the place of impending chaos. There will be no need for foreign intervention. And I must here repeat, Israel is not asking that the United States send its soldiers to fight her battle. Israel wants to defend itself, or better yet, ward off and avert Nasser's threatened aggression.

President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, you, gentlemen, can make this a happy birthday for Israel, and at the same time, you can serve the cause of world peace, democracy, and fair play. As Winston Churchill has recently put it, you can discharge an obligation which this country owes to the democracy of Israel as a matter of honor.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic day for the people of Israel, for it was 8 years ago that the dynamic democracy now known as the State of Israel was established. Once merely a dream and an idea in the minds and hearts of many who now call it their homeland it is now a reality. The courage and the fortitude displayed by these people in their great struggle brought about this gallant little nation which is now a matter of history. Their spirit of freedom and their desire for peace, their determination to live as a truly democratic nation among the family of free nations, is worthy of their great heritage.

Today, as I have done before, I salute the State of Israel and its proud people. Theirs is a record of achievement and accomplishment during 8 short years of existence.

But today this bulwark of democracy in the Middle East is threatened. It is threatened by the shadow of international communism which has been reaching out over the Middle East fomenting hostilities and creating tensions. We know that this is a threat not alone to the security and peace of Israel—the Middle East—but to the whole free world. For pulling the strings behind the whole Arab-Israeli conflict are the Soviet agents who by their offer of arms and economic aid to the Arabs seek to establish themselves in the Middle East.

We must not permit this nation to fall at the hands of the Communist conspirators. The United States should take immediate steps to maintain the balance of power in the Middle East by providing Israel with defensive arms. We must in justice to the name of democracy, in the interest of world peace and freedom, help to preserve the integrity of Israel as a nation. The people of Israel look to us—as the champions of democracy—we cannot and must not turn our backs on them. Let us help to maintain this fortress of freedom.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my most heartfelt and sincere felicitations to the gallant people of Israel on this the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the State of Israel as a free and independent nation.

The tremendous social, political, and cultural accomplishments that have transpired in Israel since its independence was declared in 1948 are an inspiration to every democratic form of government in the world as an example of what free men can do under the flag of democracy.

Today the State of Israel stands as the bulwark of democracy in the Middle East.

Yet, in the face of all these accomplishments, this tiny democracy is confronted with an alarming situation which affects not only the peace and tranquillity of the Middle East, but the peace and tranquillity of the entire free world. This crisis in the Middle East has been brought about by the steadfast refusal of the Arab States to recognize Israel as a democracy, recently aided and abetted by the creeping shadow of international communism.

We cannot permit this nation to fail at the hands of the Communist conspirators. We in the West are faced with the necessity of taking decisive steps to prevent an all-out war in this area. This can be done quickly and effectively if the Arab countries can only be made to realize that Israel herself is interested only in peace. If the Arab leaders can be convinced of this, and be persuaded to make peace with Israel, the economic, spiritual, and social benefits reaped by all the countries in the areas will be overwhelming.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to add my sentiments to those of my distinguished colleagues in the House and Senate in congratulations to the State of Israel upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of its establishment as a free, independent, and sovereign state.

This is a singularly happy occasion that shines out like a star of hope in a dark-clouded sky. In a world beset by confusion, aggressions, and subversions, in a world where the democratic ideal is so often under attack, it is an exhilarating satisfaction to call attention to one new nation that has from the beginning manifested its adherence to the ideas and ideals of a democratic society.

It is also gratifying to know that this new nation has exhibited a generosity of national spirit that has solved a problem of homelessness for hundreds of thousands of people to whom it opened its doors in welcome. The great humanitarian service that Israel has rendered in converting desperate people from the category of "refugees" to that of upright, free citizens will always shine as a bright page in the history of our times.

In saluting the State of Israel and extending to it our good wishes, I cannot help but draw parallels with the early history of our own country, the United States of America. We, too, started as a new young Republic after the embroilment of war, with a devotion to independence and democracy and in need of understanding and friendship. It is heartening to know that the social and spiritual concepts that marked the birth of the United States have their parallels in the State of Israel.

I hope that the views expressed by Members of both Houses will give notice to the world at large of American friendship and support for the State of Israel. Those with aggressive designs on the security and independence of Israel might do well to read the record of the United States Congress and reconcile themselves to the bonds of friendship and mutual regard that link the people of the United States of America and the people of the State of Israel.

This occasion, however, must not be noted without regard for the threats of an actual aggression that hover like a calamitous cloud over the State of Israel. The cry of the victims reaches out to us and calls upon us to reassert vigorously our national policy to prevent aggression and to warn and, if need be, punish aggressors.

The security of the State of Israel is vital to the stability of the entire area of the Middle East and this in turn is basic to America's own defense and the defense of the free world. This calls for an administrative policy of action rather than of inaction; and of direct, friendly, and timely intervention rather than by a nod to our allies. It calls for prompt and sympathetic action as to the defense needs of the State of Israel, out of the same considerations that justify our provision for our own defense needs and for those of the Western World.

It calls for an ample and timely counterweight to the armaments furnished by the Communist and satellite governments.

Above all, it calls for a clear unambiguous assertion on the highest level that the United States is committed to the proposition that peace is indivisible

and that peace and the safeguards of peace for the State of Israel are basic in our national policy.

NEGOTIATED CONSENT DECREES IN ANTITRUST CASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, acting on the basis of complaints of small-business men, Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman and the Honorable TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, Republican, of Illinois, are members, held hearings on March 28 and 29, 1956, on the effect on small business of consent decree procedures in Government antitrust actions against large corporate defendants.

In the preparation for and during these hearings I had the opportunity to study the antitrust consent decree negotiated between the Government as plaintiff and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Western Electric Co. as defendants, which was entered into by the Attorney General on January 23, 1956.

I am convinced that this consent decree represents the lowest point in modern times in the disposition of major antitrust litigation.

The A. T. & T. consent decree cannot be reconciled with the purpose of the Government in filing the original action. It cannot be reconciled with present facts. It cannot be reconciled with Judge Barnes' position in other major antitrust litigations. It cannot be reconciled with any known philosophy of antitrust enforcement.

The only conclusion possible from the facts is that A. T. & T. has been given favored and special treatment by the present administration and Attorney General Brownell.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I take it that it is the gentleman's point that in the decree there should have been divestiture and Western Electric should have been separated and truncated from American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee is absolutely correct. I am going to cover that in full and it will be noted that in the testimony before the subcommittee, Judge Barnes admitted that the original purposes for which the suit was filed were completely forgotten.

Mr. CELLER. As for myself I embrace the gentleman's point of view in that regard.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his statement very much.

Because the implications of this decree go far beyond the jurisdiction of the House Small Business Committee, I feel it is my duty to report all the facts within my knowledge to the Congress and to recommend that a thorough and complete investigation be made, not only as to the reasons why A. T. & T. received favored and special treatment in the consent judgment, but also the extent to which special privileges have been afforded A. T. & T. by other Government agencies to enhance its monopoly power and monopoly profits.

While the operations of A. T. & T. are subject to public utility regulation, those of its wholly owned subsidiary, Western Electric, are meant to be in the area of our free enterprise economy. The Government's complaint against A. T. & T. and Western Electric was to put an end to Western Electric's illegal monopoly existing under the protection of the monopoly at A. T. & T. as a public utility. The Government's complaint was preceded by a very long, careful investigation by the Federal Communications Commission of the problems generated by this monopoly which resulted in a comprehensive report, containing findings and recommendations in great detail.

The complaint filed in 1949 charged that Western Electric manufactures and supplies more than 90 percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus and equipment sold in the United States. It also charged that A. T. & T. required its operating companies as well as its Long Line Department to buy substantially all of its equipment from Western Electric. The significance of this is indicated by the fact that A. T. & T. owns and operates more than 98 percent of the long distance telephone facilities in the United States, and owns and controls operating companies which furnish approximately 85 percent of the country's local telephone service.

To remedy the almost complete lack of competition in the manufacture, distribution and sale of telephone equipment, the complaint sought a separation of Western Electric from A. T. & T. and a dissolution of Western Electric into three competing, manufacturing concerns. Relief of this kind was the principal reason the case was brought. This relief was essential to thwart the monopoly and to protect the public.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Judge Barnes, admits all of these facts. He states that A. T. & T. has "practically a 100-percent monopoly" on the facilities used in the rendition of long distance service in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. owns and controls operating telephone companies which furnish approximately 85 percent of all local telephone service in the United States.

He admits that Western Electric manufactures and sells between eighty to ninety percent of all telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment sold in the United States.

He admits that A. T. & T. requires its operating companies, as well as its long-lines department, to buy virtually all of their telephone equipment from Western Electric.

He admits that as a part of an alleged conspiracy between A. T. & T. and Western Electric to monopolize the telephonic industry that they bought up or otherwise eliminated competitive manufacturers of telephones, telephone apparatus, and equipment. Judge Barnes states that this "is a matter of record."

Finally, Judge Barnes admits that in filing the complaint "the purpose certainly was to restore competition. The charge was that it"—Western Electric—"should be broken up."

Judge Barnes nevertheless testified that the original purpose of the suit to separate A. T. & T. and Western Electric had to be abandoned because there was insufficient evidence. In the face of his own admissions as to the facts involved, this excuse defies creditability.

Certain there can be no question that the facts stated to be true by Judge Barnes are more than sufficient to prove the prima facie case that Western Electric is a monopoly of formidable proportions and as such is illegal under the antitrust laws of the United States.

What then does the consent decree do to break up this monopoly as charged in the original complaint filed in 1949 and as stated by Judge Barnes in the hearings before our subcommittee on March 29, 1956? The answer is that the consent decree is worse than nothing. For the consent decree solidifies and gives Government sanction to the very monopoly which the complaint was designed to break up, and makes impossible the bringing of any further action by future administrations.

What justification can there be for such a shocking consent decree against the public interest and against all known philosophies of antitrust enforcement?

The feebleness of the explanation given by the Department of Justice serves only to emphasize the conclusion that the administration has granted A. T. & T. favored and special treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD an article by John Harriman appearing in the Boston Daily Globe April 2, 1956.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

Last week Antitrust Chief Stanley Barnes announced an action by the Department of Justice against the American Radiator and Standard Sanitary Co. and Mullins Manufacturing Corp.

This is the sixth major antitrust action, of which Mr. Barnes spoke early in the week before the House Small Business Committee. (Another said to be cooking on back of the fire is General Motors.) So far these suits are in the style of trust busting initiated under the present administration.

FASHION NOWADAYS TO NEGOTIATE

Nowadays it is the fashion in these actions not to go to trial. What happens is that the Department of Justice works up its case, and then sits down with the defendant and talks things over. In most cases a meeting of the minds is arrived at, and the defendant consents to certain demands in the Government's case. These consents are then incorporated in a decree, and all is settled amicably.

This, of course, makes for good feeling all around, and provides a nice show of newspaper headlines of the sort which in an election year never hurt anybody.

But there are those who look at these consent decrees, and utter a mild horse laugh. This, they say, is trust busting a la mode,

with the ice cream going to the Government and the pie to the offending company.

In short, say the skeptics, this isn't really trust busting at all, but the giving of what amounts in effect to immunity from further prosecution to companies at a very small cost to them.

For instance, no other administration, it is being pointed out, will now bring an antitrust action against the Bell System, which has just submitted to one of Mr. Barnes' consent decrees. And Bell, it is argued, may be very satisfied to have put itself in this position by yielding to Mr. Barnes on points which were relatively minor.

BELL MADE PATENTS AVAILABLE TO ALL

Originally the Government's suit sought to force Bell to divest itself of Western Electric, its manufacturing subsidiary. But in the consent decree entered, there were mighty compromises.

Western Electric was left with Bell, which was only required to drop certain activities which in toto are estimated to account for not much more than 1 percent of the parent company's gross revenues.

All the Government really won was that Bell should make its patents available to all. And this, say some, is of no great importance, as Bell is the main customer for the products made under these patents, and Bell will presumably buy only from its own subsidiary.

It was these facts which cause the major victory claimed by the Department of Justice in this case, to look to the penetrating eyes of Business Week like "little more than a slap on the wrist."

It will be interesting to see the nature of the Government's suit against General Motors, it comes off. We hear that it will be concerned not with that company's position in the whole automobile field—just in its activities in supplying 80 percent of the bus market.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the two major points made by the Department of Justice in attempting to justify the consent decree is that the cost of Western Electric equipment sold to A. T. & T. is subject to public utility regulation and that such regulation is made easier by the decree. Why is this purported to be so? Because, according to the Department of Justice, the consent decree provides that Western Electric must—and I quote and emphasize—"maintain cost accounting methods that conform with such accounting practices as may be generally accepted, taking into account the magnitude and the complexity of the operations involved." This provision is useless and meaningless. I asked Judge Barnes what changes it would make in Western Electric's accounting methods. He replied "We do not necessarily know that it will make any." Further, it is obvious that this provision is so broad, vague, and ambiguous that no court could ever hold Western Electric in contempt for violation.

But even more important, the purpose of the antitrust laws and the duty of the Attorney General is to restore competition in those fields of our free enterprise economy where it does not exist. The fact that A. T. & T. is subject to public utility regulation gives no immunity to Western Electric from the antitrust laws. In the Government's antitrust case against the Pullman Co., the court ordered the separation of Pullman's unregulated monopoly in the manufacture and sale of sleeping cars from its monopoly of sleeping cars service, the latter being subject to Federal regulation. Since the court did break up the Pullman monopoly, what conceivable reasons could lead Judge Barnes to believe that the court could not similarly break up the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly?

The Attorney General through Judge Barnes does not dispute the fact that there is a monopoly in the manufacture and sale of telephonic equipment, materials, and apparatus, that this monopoly is not protected by public utility legislation and is subject to the full force of our antitrust laws. The consent decree, however, allows Western Electric to remain a monopoly. This is a betrayal of the most basic principles of our antitrust laws which Attorney General Brownell has sworn to uphold. This betrayal cannot be justified. It must be censured.

The second point made by the Attorney General in his attempt to justify the decree is that a measure of patent relief has been granted in the electronics field. The suit was not brought for this purpose. The suit was brought to restore competition in the manufacture and sale of telephonic equipment and all the patent relief in the world cannot restore competition as long as Western Electric is left with some 80 to 90 percent control of the market and as long as A. T. & T. will purchase its equipment only from Western Electric.

But even so, the patent relief contained in the consent decree is completely imaginary. Judge Barnes states that the decree requires royalty free licensing to all applicants on some 8,600 existing patents of A. T. & T. But in the same breath he was forced to admit that A. T. & T. under the decree could still make a charge to licensees for "know-how" and that this could be virtually the same as the royalty charge. Judge Barnes was read a statement made by Dr. Vannevar A. Bush, a director of A. T. & T., in which he pointed out "that the royalty rate charged by A. T. & T. for its patents subject to the decree had been based upon the know-how that went with the patents." Judge Barnes then admitted that the charge for know-how and technical information which can still be made under the consent decree could be as much as the former royalty.

Secondly, the decree accomplishes very little in requiring the licensing of the patents involved, since the Bell System Co. has had a licensing policy since 1949 to license anyone for any purpose.

Thirdly, with respect to the alleged 8,600 patents involved in the consent decree, RCA has the unrestricted right to sublicense, retain royalties, and sue for infringement on a substantial number of these patents—the exact ones being unknown to the Department of Justice. The consent decree does not affect these rights of RCA.

Fourthly, a substantial number of the patents involved in the consent decree have expired.

Finally, a substantial number of the patents involved in the consent decree are not sufficient to enable the licensee to manufacture and sell FM and TV commercial broadcast transmitters or receivers without an RCA package license. In brief, Judge Barnes admits that many of the licenses allegedly made available to others by the consent decree are worthless because, and I quote Judge Barnes' testimony, "in the RCA pool there are patents over and beyond A. T. & T. or Bell Laboratories patents which may well be necessary before you can get into an open-handed, free, and easy production of electronic devices."

Mr. Brownell stated in his press release accompanying the signing of the A. T. & T. consent decree that—

> The patent relief obtained in this decree is a long stride forward in the efforts of the Department of Justice to destroy the divisions of patent rights * * * in electronics. The decree makes available to any citizen all inventions and know-how of the Bell System.

But Judge Barnes testified before the subcommittee:

> I would certainly agree with you, sir, that the entire field of electronic patented articles cannot be freed to universal competition until and unless something is done in the RCA case.

The key to patent relief in electronics is, therefore, in the pending RCA case, and not in the A. T. & T. consent decree.

What then is left of the consent decree? I submit there is nothing—except an urgent need for a complete explanation from Mr. Brownell as to why he and several of his subordinates abdicated their responsibilities and lent themselves to the preservation of the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly.

In this connection an attorney in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, familiar with the case, recently stated that Mr. Brownell, himself, established the policy that a consent decree was to be negotiated with A. T. & T. and Western Electric without separating the two. Instructions to this effect were made known by Mr. Brownell's office to the members of the Antitrust Division. This official has stated that the Antitrust Division was put into a straitjacket in negotiating the decree by virtue of these instructions.

What is more, the consent decree was signed and negotiated by the first assistant to Judge Barnes, who has a reputation, both within and without the Department, for his softness toward antitrust enforcement and solicitude for big business. I believe it can be established that he was placed in the Antitrust Division at the request of highly placed, big business officials close to the administration. Was there secret connivance between him and Mr. Brownell? It has been reported that these two met in private to determine policy as to the consent decree at the very time Judge Barnes was absent from the city.

True, some attorneys in the Antitrust Division realized that the proposed consent decree would in effect give Government sanction to Western Electric's monopoly and prevent further prosecution. They recommended that the lesser evil would be to dismiss the suit entirely, but were overruled.

Relevant in this regard is the testimony of Judge Barnes before our Subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee on March 29, 1956. The judge stated that high Government officials insisted that A. T. & T. and West-

ern Electric could not be separated and Western Electric split up because, and again I quote directly from Judge Barnes:

> You have got a situation where you have got research half way between manufacture and operations, and so tied up, according to certain allegations, that from a practical standpoint they have to be together. Now, I am not buying that. I am just saying that is an argument which has been expressed, and very violently expressed, by people in high places in the Government.

Whether Judge Barnes, himself, bought this argument is immaterial since the decree gave A. T. & T. precisely what these people in high places in the Government wanted. The decree also gave A. T. & T. what it wanted. As reported in the February 6, 1956, issue of Newsweek:

> How much was A. T. & T. harmed by its consent judgment? Nothing really hurts, A. T. & T. President C. F. Craig implied, so long as the whole team—Bell Telephone Laboratories, Western Electric, and the Bell System—remain intact, instead of being split up as the Government originally demanded.

The question remains unanswered. Who were the people in high places in the Government who violently expressed the argument that A. T. & T. and Western Electric could not be separated? And if Judge Barnes did not buy their argument, why did the Department of Justice still accede to their request.

Let us open Pandora's box and see who are some of the people in high places in the Government who would have had the greatest governmental interest—and the greatest private interest—in the A. T. & T. consent decree. Here is the rollcall of the officials or directors of A. T. & T. or its subsidiary companies who have held policymaking and influential positions in the United States Government under the present administration:

Cole A. Armstrong, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Donald R. Belcher, first assistant, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Harold M. Botkin, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Robert Burgess, Director of the Census.

Albert J. Carey, Office of Defense Mobilization.

A. B. Clark, National Security Agency.

Victor E. Cooley, Deputy Administrator, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Stanley Damkroeger, Department of Commerce.

William Means Day, Department of the Army.

John M. Ferry, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of the Air Force.

G. D. Garner, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

Frederick J. Given, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

R. Karl Honaman, Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Department of Commerce.

George Ireland, Department of Commerce.

Dr. Marvin J. Kelly, Department of the Air Force and the National Bureau of Standards.

George A. Landry, Office of Defense Mobilization.

George B. Larkin, Office of the Assistant Secretaary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

Walter A. MacNair, Department of the Army.

George C. McConnaughey, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.

William H. Martin, Director of Research and Development, Department of the Army, and prior to that appointment Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Stewart E. Miller, Department of the Air Force.

Arthur W. Page, Cabinet Committee on Transportation Policy and Organization.

Charles W. Potter, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Donald A. Quarles, Secretary of the Air Force.

Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army.

Joseph D. Stockton, Office of Defense Mobilization.

William A. Vanstory, Department of Commerce.

Charles E. Wampler, Office of Defense Mobilization.

Benjamin F. Young, Office of the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

This list, while not complete, is nevertheless illustrative of the force and influence that A. T. & T. can exert upon Government policy and Government actions. Indeed, there appears to be no area of Government whose activity affects A. T. & T. where an A. T. & T. official is not in a position of influence or control.

This infiltration of A. T. & T. officials throughout the top levels of the administration, whether accomplished with the best or the worst of motives, represents a real threat and danger to our democratic processes.

A. T. & T. officials in Government have been in a position, for instance, to control or influence Government policy in relation to the SAGE project. But thanks to the vigilance of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, to the vigilance of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable CARL VINSON, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, the American people were saved the sum of $830 million which otherwise would have improperly gone to the A. T. & T. monopoly.

And thanks to my distinguished colleague from Montana, the Honorable LEE METCALF, provisions have been made so that rural electric cooperatives will not be excluded by the A. T. & T. from participating in the Government work to be done in connection with the SAGE project.

I can only say with the deepest regret that the full implications of the A. T. & T. consent decree, entered into by Mr. Brownell, were not similarly recognized and action taken by the Congress before it became a fait accompli. However, the A. T. & T. consent decree does raise a warning for the future which, I believe, cannot be ignored. I, therefore, respectfully recommend to the House that a thoroughgoing investigation be made of the influence of A. T. & T. upon Government and in particular upon the Department of Defense, the Department of the Air Force, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Department of Justice.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. In this situation it is not a question that we do not have enough laws on the statute books to cope with the situation. The trouble lies in the fact that we do not use the laws we have. Is that not right?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I completely agree with the distinguished gentleman, and I point out that if the original purposes for which this suit was filed had been adhered to there would have been no such case as can now be made. I do not think it is a question of needing new legislation. I think it is a real and not an imaginary enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, for the generous references he made to me in his very able speech. I also want to congratulate my friend from California for the tremendous work he has done in connection with this important matter and in the powerful address he has just made, conveying to the House and to the country very important information which all adds up toward the one powerful message of big business control of our country through this administration and also discrimination against small and independent businessmen.

The gentleman from California is chairman of a subcommittee of the Special Committee on Small Business. The special committee itself has done outstanding work. The subcommittee of which the gentleman from California is chairman has also done outstanding work and I extend my hearty congratulations to him and the other members of his subcommittee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the statement of the gentleman with a great deal of interest and I join with my friend from Massachusetts, the distinguished majority leader, in extending congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from California for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The gentleman has said that some of the scope of the matter is beyond the jurisdiction of our committee, but certainly it is not beyond the jurisdiction, as the gentleman has pointed out, to censure this procedure; and I commend the gentleman for it.

It would seem to me that the lengthy list of the men whose names he has called, former employees or people closely associated with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is indicative of the influence which they exert in this

administration and of the great power which no doubt has been exercised in the bringing about of this consent decree.

It would also seem to me that, while the present administration is opposed to 90 percent of parity for the farmers, it is in favor of 90 percent plus in the form of monopoly for the A. T. & T.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my distinguished colleagues of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to join in commending the gentleman from California for the outstanding statement he has just made in bringing the A. T. & T. case to the attention of the country and also its relation to this present administration.

Only 2 weeks ago the Armed Services Committee appeared before the Rules Committee on a piece of legislation that would protect small industry and small business as far as their applications for procurement and contracts through the Defense Department were concerned. The most astounding revelation that Chairman VINSON of the Armed Services Committee brought out before the Rules Committee was that approximately 94 percent of the procurement and the contracts that have been given by the Secretary of Defense went through without competitive bids being asked for by the head of the Defense Department. If the Defense Department under former President Truman defied the law and procurement regulations in this way, the newspapers would be demanding his impeachment.

The fact is that 94 percent of approximately three billion and some odd hundred million dollars worth of contracts was released by negotiation without any competitive bids being called for on the part of the Secretary of Defense.

The legislation that passed this House will, we hope, in future give small industrial competitors as against General Motors an opportunity to participate in some of the defense contracts and procurement purchases in the future. I do hope this new law will help small business to be recognized by the Secretary of Defense as competitors against big business and particularly General Motors.

I again want to commend the gentleman from California for the outstanding contributions he has made for the benefit of American taxpayers in his remarks to the House this afternoon.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much. I would reemphasize again, sir, that if we are going to survive as a democracy we must have competition, not only competition which allows small business to exist, but in this particular instance I would be perfectly happy if they would let a few big people compete in order to get some of these large contracts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman will agree with me that it is much better for our country and our national economy if we have more companies rather that less companies.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Exactly. That is the only way we can stop an economic dictatorship and I think the gentleman will agree with me that economic dictatorship is, unfortunately, the forerunner of political dictatorship, and that is what we must fight with all our might.

THE CASE OF SPENCER WELSH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the more eloquent and most effective declarations of fundamental American principles was made, in my opinion, by President Eisenhower on the night of November 23, 1953. On that date he was addressing a dinner, at which he received an award, conducted by the B'nai B'rith Antidefamation League, at the Mayflower Hotel, here in Washington. The President's remarks on that occasion were carried to millions of Americans by radio and television.

Speaking very informally, Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that our pride in being Americans was a spiritual rather than a material thing. Then he went on to say, according to the text reproduced in the New York Times of November 24, 1953:

> We are proud first of all because from the beginning of this Nation a man can walk upright, no matter who he is, or who she is. He can walk upright and meet his friend or his enemy, and he does not fear that because that enemy may be in a position of great power that he can suddenly be thrown in jail to rot there without charges and with no recourse of justice.
>
> We have the Habeas Corpus Act and we respect it.
>
> I was raised in a little town of which most of you have never heard. But in the West it's a famous place. It's called Abilene, Kans. We had as our marshal for a long time a man named Wild Bill Hickock. If you don't know about him, read your westerns more.
>
> Now that town had a code, and I was raised as a boy to prize that code. It was: Meet anyone face to face with whom you disagree. You could not sneak up on him from behind, do any damage to him without suffering the penalty of an outraged citizenry. If you met him face to face and took the same risk he did, you could get away with almost anything, as long as the bullet was in front.
>
> And today, although none of you have the great fortune, I think, of being from Abilene, Kans., you live, after all, by that same code in your ideals and in the respect you give to certain qualities.
>
> In this country, if someone dislikes you or accuses you, he must come up in front. He cannot hide behind the shadows, he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry would inflict.

These remarks by the President were universally well received. The people accepted this declaration as a muchly needed expression of the philosophy of Mr. Eisenhower and as ground rules for the conduct of his administration.

Earlier this year, however, my attention was invited to a situation where President Eisenhower's subordinates—the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—were doing great violence to the "code of Abilene." As a consequence, on February 28 I addressed the following letter to the President:

> The PRESIDENT,
> *The White House.*
>
> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The purpose of this letter is to bring to your attention the situation in which one Spencer Welsh now finds himself. Mr. Welsh is a young veteran who resides in York County, Pa., not too many miles from your home in Gettysburg, and, as such, he is one of my constituents. I hasten to add this latter fact does not in itself justify this letter, but it does explain how I became aware of Mr. Welsh's present predicament. However, the frightful implications of things destructive to fundamental American concepts inherent in this young man's case, in my opinion, more than justify this appeal to you as President of the United States.
>
> Very briefly Mr. Welsh's situation is this: In March of 1950, at the age of 17, he enlisted in the United States Army. Eventually he reached Korea and landed in a Communist prison camp. He remained in Communist prison camps for 34 months before he was released under the Korean truce prisoner exchange agreement. Following his release, he was honorably discharged. In addition, Mr. Welsh received the Good Conduct Medal, and at present he receives Veterans' Administration compensation for a 10-percent disability. Beyond this, Mr. Welsh applied for and received approval by the Veterans' Administration for a GI loan. Accordingly, it would seem that the United States Army and the Veterans' Administration considered Mr. Welsh a good soldier and a deserving veteran, and until very recently he was considered to be both by all of his friends and neighbors. However, this was before the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission was heard from. This Commission recently ruled that Mr. Welsh is not entitled to the prisoner of war compensation payable to ex-POW's under Public Law 615, because he had not proven to the Commission's satisfaction that during the course of his imprisonment in Korea he had not collaborated with the enemy.
>
> Mr. President, I think you will agree that no more serious charge than collaborating with the enemy could possibly be made against any American citizen. I know further that you will agree that when such a serious charge is made the accused should be given every conceivable right to defend himself in a fair hearing after having been advised as to the true basis of the charge against him and that, most important of all, the accused should be given the right to confront and cross-examine his accusers. I regret to advise you that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the case of Mr. Welsh, saw fit to observe none of these fundamental American precepts of fair play and justice. Charges made against Mr. Welsh by the Commission were couched in the vaguest and most general terms without any specifics as to the time and place of his alleged collaboration. To this date, Mr. Welsh does not know whether in the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's files he has one or many accusers and, while he was given what the Commission called a hearing in which he was represented by counsel, this hearing made a mockery of the traditions of American justice. At the hearing no one appeared to testify against Mr. Welsh, and the entire burden of proving his innocence was upon Mr. Welsh.
>
> In reviewing the manner in which this case was handled, I want to make it crystal clear that I am, in no way, passing on the guilt or innocence of Mr. Welsh. It seems to me if I were to do that without hearing all the evidence I would be guilty of the same shoddy un-American conduct as the Commission itself.

If Mr. Welsh's situation were the only case of its kind, I think it would demand your personal attention. However, I regret to further inform you that I have been advised that there are at least 250 other exprisoners of war whose cases have been handled in a similar manner by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. President, I know I do not have to point out to you that what is involved here is a flagrant violation of one of the things that makes this country really great. What that something is has been expressed in many ways, but seldom more eloquently than you yourself expressed it in your famous speech about the Code of Abilene. I am sorely afraid that the members of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission never heard of that code, let alone of Abilene. On the basis of their conduct in this case, I am not certain that they even heard of Kansas and, if they heard of America, I'm afraid that its true meaning and real purpose managed to escape them completely.

It is my present plan to support legislation in the Congress which would abolish the kangaroo-court proceedings now being pursued by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. I further understand that the appropriate committee of the United States Senate contemplates holding public hearings on the manner in which the Commision has administered the act. However, it appears to me that this is a situation which should not and need not require legislative action. Since the members of the Commission were appointed by you, this should be a matter which could be corrected once and for all if you did nothing more than indicate to the Commission members your great displeasure that they are administering the law in a manner which violates sacred fundamental American principles. Such action on your part, I am certain, would guarantee to these American combat veterans the rights for which they fought and, if it didn't, I am confident you would not hesitate to replace the present members of the Commission with Americans who give more than lip service to our American ideals.

Sincerely,

JAMES M. QUIGLEY,
Member of Congress.

It took the White House 5 weeks to answer that letter. Why it took so long I will never know; perhaps a lack of courage, perhaps a lack of convictions. When the answer finally did come I found out it was both. And when the answer finally did come it came, not from the President, but from Gerald D. Morgan, his special counsel.

Mr. Morgan wrote:

The President asked me to look into the matter you wrote about under date of February 28, and to reply to your letter.

The administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision contained in the bill that became Public Law 615 requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to pass upon the serious charge of collaboration in connection with its consideration of a claim for prisoner of war compensation. It is still opposed to having the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, in the absence of a final determination by the armed service concerned, pass upon such a serious matter, and hopes that the Congress will see fit to amend the law.

With respect to the claim of Mr. Spencer Welsh, the chairman of the Commission has advised me that no finding of collaboration was in fact made, and that no inference of such a finding is to be drawn from the Commission's decision in his case.

Let us examine these White House weasel words; let us contrast them with the big, bold language of the code of Abilene.

Mr. Morgan says:

The administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision contained in the bill that became Public Law 615 requiring the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to pass upon the serious charge of collaboration in connection with its consideration of a claim for prisoner of war compensation.

The administration was opposed, we are told; but what odd opposition. Insofar as I have been able to find out, the record shows that no such opposition was ever made known to Congress. In the 83d Congress, the President did submit a reorganization message to the Congress changing the name of the War Claims Commission to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. In that message he recommended that legislation be adopted extending compensation to Korean POW's, just as it had been granted to POW's of World War II.

The House passed a bill which went to the Senate, where it was accepted by the Judiciary Committee and the Senate without amendment. It was signed into law by the President. The 83d Congress was controlled by the President's own party. Now I recognize that the 83d Congress gave the President a great deal less than wholehearted support and cooperation, but I do not believe we can blame the 83d Congress for failure to read the President's mind. It would seem to have been the easiest matter in the world for the President, or one of his assistants, to have picked up a telephone, to have communicated with some of the able Republican leaders, and to have had that provision removed. He could have vetoed the bill and requested new legislation. He did none of these things. Yet, Mr. Morgan tells us now that "the administration was from the beginning opposed to the provision."

Mr. Morgan, presumably speaking for the President, goes on to inform me that the administration is still opposed to this provision and "hopes that the Congress will see fit to amend the law."

If this is the attitude of the administration, I have found nothing in the record to show that Congress has been so advised. This Congress has been in existence since January 5, 1955—a matter of 15 months and 2 weeks. I find no communication from the President or anyone else in the administration expressing opposition to this provision of Public Law 615, 83d Congress, and asking that it be eliminated.

In both these matters, I can be in error. If I am, I hope that the documents may be produced to show that my search of the record has not been complete.

In Mr. Morgan's final paragraph he informs me that the Commission made no finding that Mr. Spencer Welsh had been a collaborator, and further that no such inference is intended.

This was further clarified when a member of my staff discussed this case, by telephone, with Mr. Andrew T. McGuire, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission counsel. News dispatches appearing in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily indicate that Mr. McGuire made much the same comment to that paper's Washington correspondent.

Mr. McGuire pointed out that while a finding of collaboration made a claimant ineligible, there were two other reasons for denying claims. These were failure to prove that a prisoner was mistreated, or underfed.

Mr. McGuire further explained that the Commission did not specify why claimants were denied compensation in order to avoid tainting a veteran with suspicion of collaboration.

I felt then that my efforts had not been completely in vain, that something had been accomplished. Mr. Welsh could once more face his friends and neighbors, secure in the knowledge that his government was not branding him as a collaborator.

An indication of how this clean bill—no matter how difficult it was to pry it loose—was received is contained in a letter I have received from Eugene H. Stauffer, who was until last week, commander, West York Memorial Post, No. 8951, Veterans of Foreign Wars. The VFW, it might be noted, first approached me to ask that I intercede in behalf of Mr. Welsh. In his letter, Commander Stauffer said in part:

I want to commend you on your very fine efforts and services in bringing to the attention of the President of the United States the case of Spencer Welsh and the injustice done to him by denying him his POW bonus. Although the injustice has been by no means corrected as yet, and I know you have not relinquished your efforts to have them corrected, the fact that the President's reply to your letter stated that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission Chairman said and I quote "no finding of collaboration was in fact made and that no inference of such finding is to be drawn from the commissioner's decision in this case," does remove a stigma that would have been placed over Comrade Welsh's head for the rest of his life and would have been a question as to his loyalty to the United States Government. This in itself is a partial victory as I said before when I conferred with you in the presence of Comrade Welsh that this stigma was one of the reasons for objecting to this injustice. However I am by no means satisfied that the injustice done to Comrade Welsh has been corrected by these statements. From your past efforts and interest shown in this case, I am cognizant that you will continue through other means to correct it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the "partial victory" which Commander Stauffer hailed has been short lived. Last Tuesday evening Whitney Gillilland, chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, addressed a meeting of joint veterans' organizations in Council Bluffs, Iowa. According to the text of his remarks, as released to the press, he said, in part:

Now it will be noted that anyone who might have been guilty of outright disloyalty, that is, voluntarily, knowingly and without duress, collaborating with the enemy, would in any event be excluded by either the provisions (1) concerning food and mistreatment or (2) those precluding payment to anyone who voluntarily, knowingly and without duress at any time or in any manner served such hostile forces. Therefore, it never became necessary to pass on the issue of collaboration and no claim was rejected

on that ground. Therefore, no inference is to be drawn that any particular individual denied benefits was disloyal.

On the other hand, it will have been apparent that any collaborators would be included among those claimants denied for the two mentioned grounds and that the total number of collaborators could in no event have exceeded the total number of claims denied on those two grounds.

Despite the pious claim that Foreign Claims Settlement Commission did not wish to taint the character of any claimant; and although technically these veterans are not charged with being collaborators, what Mr. Gillilland is saying is that every one turned down was a collaborator.

When President Eisenhower made his "Abilene code" speech I was under the impression he was talking off the cuff but from the heart. But when the chips are down the President hides behind the shadow of a White House aide and Foreign Claims Settlement Commission's chairman hides behind the shadows of legal technicalities and bureaucratic doubletalk. Everybody has something to hide behind except the veteran. The veteran who went out to fight to defend his Government and the Code and is now rewarded for that effort by having that Government assassinate his character from behind.

I have seen their victim and I can assure "Wild Ike" Eisenhower and his partner "Jingles" Gillilland that the bullet was not in the front.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will have the courage to act where others have faltered, that we will step into the breach and enact legislation which will grant Mr. Welsh and all the others in his circumstances—men who braved enemy gunfire and suffered the rigors of Communist prison camps—the chance to have their day in court; the opportunity to meet their accusers, face to face, in accord with the Code of Abilene.

THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the six Republican Wisconsin Members of Congress, Messrs. SMITH, BYRNES, DAVIS, WITHROW, VAN PELT, and myself, I wish to commend President Eisenhower for his veto message which was read this morning to the House of Representatives. The Wisconsin farmers whom we represent will be ever indebted to President Eisenhower for his action in promptly vetoing H. R. 12.

The farm bill as it was placed on the President's desk by this Democrat Congress would have meant loss of income to the Wisconsin farmers of over $12 million and would have materially aggravated the cost-price squeeze. In 1955, Wisconsin farmers paid $130 million for feed used but not produced on their farms. Under the vetoed farm bill, Wisconsin farmers' costs would have been increased by 20 percent to at least $156 million because of the increase in feed grains support levels required by the legislation. Wisconsin farmers, under the terms of H. R. 12, would have received $14 million by the increase which was granted in the farm bill in the manufacturing milk support price. This entire increase of $14 million would have been wiped out and plowed under by the $26 million increase in their feed bills.

The President in vetoing the farm bill and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price of manufacturing milk to $3.25 per hundred pounds and the support price of butter fat to 58.6 cents a pound, has truly befriended the Wisconsin farmer.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, the text of the letter to President Eisenhower from six Wisconsin Republican Representatives, urging his veto of H. R. 12, the farm bill, is included at this point in the RECORD:

TEXT OF LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FROM SIX WISCONSIN REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATIVES URGING HIS VETO OF H. R. 12, THE FARM BILL

APRIL 15, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We feel it our duty as Representatives from a State which derives over half of its cash farm receipts from dairy products, to point out to you the dangers to the dairy farmer inherent in H. R. 12, the farm bill now on your desk.

H. R. 12 was written for the basic crop farmer, particularly the commercial producers of peanuts, rice, cotton, tobacco, corn and wheat. It is loaded with all manner of devices to increase, through Government payments, the prices of these products. While we have no quarrel with these farmers, we must protest when legislation discriminates to heavily in their favor to the detriment of the majority of other farmers in the Nation, particularly the dairy farmer.

There is little need for us to elaborate on the importance of the dairy and livestock industries to American agriculture. Next to receipts from cattle and calves (a good share of which is derived as a byproduct of dairying) the single largest source of cash receipts for American farmers is dairy products. Farmers receive almost as much cash from dairy products as from cotton, tobacco, rice and peanuts combined. Cash income from the closely-allied dairy and beef industries is almost $2 billion more annually than from all of the basic crops together.

In States like Wisconsin, the relative importance of dairying and livestock is even more striking. In our State, 50 percent of the farmer's cash receipts is derived from dairy products. Seventy-two percent of our farm cash receipts come from three sources—dairy products, cattle, and poultry. Eighty-seven percent of our farm income is derived from livestock and its products. In contrast, only 2½ percent of our farm cash income comes from basic crops.

You can, we believe, understand our concern over a bill which will prove temporarily beneficial only to those farmers producing less than a quarter of our cash crops nationwide and only at the expense of major elements of American agriculture, particularly the dairy industry. A bill which sacrifices the dairy farmer on the altar of the basic crop farmer should be summarily rejected.

The harmful effect upon the dairy farmer of H. R. 12's bias in favor of the basic crop farmer may be summarized as follows:

1. The bill raises the general support level of basic crops, and feed grains, by 15 to 20 percent while providing only a temporary 2½ percent increase in the support level of milk.

There can be no logic, or fairness, in a national farm program which so discriminates against a major segment of our farm population. If increases in the support level are necessary, they should be uniform. Crops which represent income to some farmers represent costs to others. A dairy farmer's net income is based not only on his milk check but upon his feed bill as well.

It should be understood that, for the first time, feed grains are required to be supported at a fixed support price level pegged to the basic commodities. This raises the price of feed in excess of 20 percent.

The discrimination in support levels will cost the Wisconsin dairy farmer, for example, $12 million in 1956. The estimated $14 million Wisconsin farmers will receive from the raise in their milk support price will be wiped out and plowed under by a $26 million increase in their feed bill. In 1955, Wisconsin farmers paid $130 million for feed used but not produced on their farms. Under H. R. 12, this bill will be increased 20 percent to at least $156 million because of the increase in feed grain support levels the legislation requires.

The impact of this $1 million a month loss upon Wisconsin producers of milk, poultry, beef and hogs will be disastrous.

2. The bill requires the support of certain basic crops at the higher of two methods of computing parity. Manufacturing milk, on the other hand, would be supported, in future marketing years, under a formula which leads to a constantly decreasing minimum support price.

The dual parity provision for basic crops, in effect, throws out the parity theory in an effort to get the highest possible support price for these favored crops. The bill, on the other hand, approves, after the current marketing year, a formula producing a constantly reduced support price for manufacturing milk. At that time, manufacturing milk supports would be calculated under a formula which leads to a constantly lower parity equivalent because of the growing disparity between the price of fluid and manufacturing milk. In our State, 80 percent of our milk production goes into manufactured dairy products, and the combination of increasing basic crop support prices and constantly decreasing manufacturing milk prices would be economically disastrous. Our efforts to stabilize the parity equivalent for manufacturing milk, by providing a representative rather than a moving base period, were fought and defeated in the House by the Democratic leadership.

3. The bill provides no protection to the dairy farmer from the production of milk by basic crop farmers on land under acreage allotment, and worse, adds immeasurably to this problem by failing to provide adequate protection on land put in the soil bank.

Twenty yearse ago, a distinguished Wisconsin Representative, now Judge Gerald Boileau, pointed out the need for dealing with the problem created by acres taken out of production of basic crops under acreage allotments, converted to feed production, either of grains or roughage, and then utilized to produce milk. This problem has never been dealt with by Congress and it is not dealt with in H. R. 12. Wisconsin farmers are able and willing to compete with farmers in other areas of the country on a freely competitive basis but they cannot do so if other farmers are being paid out of the Treasury for withholding acres from the production of certain crops while being at liberty to use those acres for the production of livestock and milk.

H. R. 12 not only fails to deal with this problem; it compounds it by creating a new diverted acreage problem. It provides no real safeguards against the use of soil-bank acreage for milk and livestock production. The conference report itself states that the conference committee struck from the bill "a provision desired chiefly by livestock pro-

ducers as a protection against a farmer placing land into the soil bank, receiving his payment therefor, and then using the land for grazing purposes."

The dairyland is composed of farmers who devote their lives to providing the Nation with pure, wholesome milk. It constantly strives to keep its production in line with demand. Milk production will surge, and depress prices everywhere, as long as farmers outside the dairy area are subsidized by the Government to go into the dairy business.

These, Mr. President, are the principal reasons why we fought and voted against H. R. 12. It will be injurious to the farmers we represent and to the dairy and livestock industries which form the backbone of American agriculture. These same reasons, we are confident, will lead you to the conclusion that H. R. 12 would prove a disservice to agriculture and the Nation at large. We urge your prompt veto of the bill.

Congress can still pass sound farm legislation if it forgets politics and buckles down to it. We suggest, therefore, that you not only veto H. R. 12 but that you urge the Congress to pass forthwith legislation which will provide a sound, long-range solution to the farm problem, dealing equitably with all segments of agriculture.

H. R. 12, if amended by the motion to recommit which we supported in the House, forms the basis for such legislation. It would embody the far-seeing proposals you made to Congress early in this session. It would remove the bulk of the objection we raise in this letter on behalf of the dairy farmer.

That motion to recommit, you will recall, would have:

(1) Removed the discriminations in favor of basic crop farmers and detrimental to dairy and livestock farmers by eliminating mandatory 90 percent supports for basic crops and striking out the dual parity provision.

(2) Lowered basic feed costs by eliminating mandatory price supports for feed grains.

(3) Provide a sound and permanent formula for computing the parity equivalent of manufacturing milk. It would have provided an immediate price support increase for manufacturing milk, prevented the drop which can take place next April and assured the dairy farmer of stability of price.

We can have sound farm legislation this year. It can best be obtained by a veto of H. R. 12 and a plea by you to Congress to assume its responsibilities for the welfare of all American farmers.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member of Congress, Second District. Wisconsin.

GARDNER R. WITHROW,
Third District, Wisconsin.

LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
First District, Wisconsin.

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress, Eighth District, Wisconsin.

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Member of Congress, Seventh District, Wisconsin.

WILLIAM K. VAN PELT,
Member of Congress, Sixth District, Wisconsin.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire today to add my voice to the voice of my distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and my good friend from the State of Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], in congratulating the infant State of Israel on its eighth birthday. As you know, Mr. Speaker, we in this country and we in this Congress had a great deal to do not only with the formation of the State of Israel but with the wonderful growth which the people of Israel have enjoyed since the formation of that state. It was my late father, Congressman John Dingell of Michigan, who introduced one of the first pieces of legislation which was aimed at aiding the infant State of Israel during its time of trouble after our great former President, Harry Truman, extended to that state the recognition which made its present existence possible.

Today Israel is 8 years old. An article recognizing its eighth birthday yesterday in one of the Washington papers appeared in the same section which had to do with the obituaries of certain of our prominent citizens. It is my hope that we in this Congress and this country will not permit those two facts to have any significance.

Israel today is faced by 40 million hostile Arabs. Israel has a population in its own country of slightly in excess of a million, odds of 40 to 1. Each day Israel's enemies grow stronger. They are getting arms which are furnished to them by Communist Russia, an enemy not only of our own country but an enemy of the freedom of all countries throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, one fact which I think many people overlook in their appraisal of the present Middle Eastern situation is that Israel, being the size of the State of Massachusetts, some 8,000 square miles, is so small that it could be overrun before the United States could send aid to help Israel against an aggressor. Our foreign policy overlooks the fact today that before the U. N., which has been supervising the attempts of the world to solve the problems of the Middle East, could arrive on the scene to determine who is the aggressor, Israel probably would not only have been overrun but its people would have been exterminated under a pogram of the type that has shamed Russia for so many years. The administration has consistently delayed the delivery of arms to Israel or any consideration of the subject. Yet during this time substantial amounts of arms have flowed to the Arab nations and in one instance 18 tanks were delivered to Saudi Arabia. It is interesting to note that not only does Saudi Arabia ally itself with Egypt, but that its troops are being led by Egyptian army officers and that its whole economy is infiltrated by the Egyptians with economic advisers, much in the same manner, as a matter of fact, as the Russians infiltrate an area when they send their economic advisers in to guide and to control the destiny of a country. We seem to overlook in this country the series of incidents which have been provoked by the Arabs during the recent weeks. On some of these occasions, Israel has acted in the only way that a country dare act. They have retaliated strongly, and they have retaliated as a deterrent to protect themselves against further depredations. Now, the Arabs want war, Mr. Speaker. Nassar himself said that the Arab world will not rest until—and I am quoting from Mr. Nassar now—"until the Israel cancer has been cut from the Arab heart." Everyone knows that that is the same man that endorsed the candidacy of Mr. Eisenhower for President.

Now, Israel asks for only one thing, that we furnish her with the arms that she requires to protect herself in time of trouble. She has asked us for arms. There are many in this Congress, myself included, who advocate that Israel not only receive these arms but that she be accorded the protection which the United States could give her by including her in a defensive alliance, in NATO or in SEATO or in any alliance or organization which would offer the security she so desperately needs. Yet, nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker, there is something that this Congress should take very serious cognizance of. While the administration has been vacillating and doing nothing, Mr. Dulles and Mr. Eisenhower have come out and told the Congress that we, the Congress, are expected to come forward and to approve the sending of troops into this area, after the administration, through its present policy of muddle and delay, has arrived at a situation where the peace of the world is endangered and where the peace of the Middle East is probably reaching its last days. We, according to the White House, may expect, in this Congress, after this policy of muddle and delay, to send American troops to fight in an area where that fighting would not be necessary had arms been sent in time so that Israel could have been sufficiently strong to defend herself.

Now, I want our people to know about this because we are, in this Congress, being asked to ratify a muddled administration policy and are being asked to place our stamp of approval on that policy. We are being asked to send American troops into an area where there is no necessity for them being there if we had acted vigorously in the time in which we should act. Now, this country can do much yet to head off the war that is impending. We read in the intelligence reports that Egypt will probably have assimilated its arms from the Soviet bloc by late summer. By that time there are a large number of people, who know much about the area, who expect that Israel will be attacked by Egypt. There have been a large number of people who are well familiar with the area who have told us that Egypt could and possible would attack the Israelis as early as 2 weeks hence. These things our people must know.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again call to the attention of the administration the fact that a large number of Members of this House and a large number of Members of the other body are on record at this time as favoring furnishing military aid to Israel and to furnish that aid at an early date. I hope that the administration will take that counsel, and I hope that the administration will see to it that Israel gets the arms which she needs, so

that our sister democracy's next celebration of its independence day will be in sufficient strength that Israel and her friends will know that it will continue to exist as we and the free world so strongly hope.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on this eighth anniversary of the rebirth of Israel, I am happy to join in saluting that gallant little nation. Americans naturally and traditionally have had a special regard for a nation that has fought for and won its independence, but this is an occasion for special pride and rejoicing. For in the face of mammoth physical odds and the ruthless hostility of her neighbors, Israel has made tremendous progress in the short space of 8 years, and has vindicated the democratic ideal in an area where feudalism and corrupt dictatorship have flourished.

A year ago I stood on the floor of the House and recounted some of Israel's achievements. I am proud to be able to say that during the last 12 months Israel has continued that forward march, an eloquent tribute to the courage and spirit of her people. They bring to mind our own hardy pioneers who overcame the obstacles of nature and man to carve out the great Nation America is today. The people of Israel, with their indomitable spirit, have likewise built a new nation in the face of even greater natural hazards and man-made obstacles. They have converted a desert into a nation of thriving industry and agricultural settlements.

Israel has won for her people a standard of living which is today the highest in the Middle East. Over 75 new industries alone were established last year. Israel has built additional rail facilities and increased the size of its merchant marine fleet. This progress, remarkable as it is, is even more impressive when we consider that Israel has been compelled to divert a good part of its resources and manpower from peaceful civilian pursuits in order to defend herself against the constant threat of attack. How much further could Israel have advanced if her Arab neighbors had accepted Israel's repeated pleas for peace.

But this story of Israel's material progress is only a part of the story. It neglects the human side. It does not tell how Israel in the 8 years of its existence has opened wide its doors to over 800,000 immigrants, most of whom were refugees from Nazi and Soviet concentration camps. It does not tell the story of how Israel has given life new meaning for these immigrants where once they faced only a hopeless future. It does not tell the story of the magnificent scientific, educational, and medical achievements of the young state, and it does not tell the story of her democracy in an area surrounded by feudal dictators more interested in preserving their own power than in the welfare of their impoverished subjects.

Israel today has a government that in spirit and ideal is very much like our own. Her people enjoy a free press, free speech, and a freely elected representative government, with Moslem, Christian, and Jewish officials. In the 8 years which have passed since its independence, Israel has proved itself to be the most stable and representative government in the Middle East.

Israel's eighth birthday is, indeed, an occasion for pride and joy for Americans, because the United States played such a significant role in its establishment, in the development of its economy, and in making it the strong state which it is today. Former President Harry S. Truman, in the name of the United States, 8 years ago, promptly recognized the new nation and welcomed it into the family of nations; and in the years since, this country, I am proud to say, has included Israel in its economic assistance program. And Israel has amply justified America's confidence and support by her steadfast defense of freedom and her determination to fight for the democratic way of life.

But our joy on this occasion, great as it is, is nevertheless tempered because Israel today is in the hour of its greatest peril. It faces a threat even greater than any since it declared its independence. Then five Arab armies marched on Israel but the Israelis repelled the invaders and threw them back. Today, however, they face a militarily stronger foe, a foe armed and trained by the Kremlin. Israel looks to the nations of the free world for needed assistance to halt this threat of Arab-Soviet aggression to its own borders and, indeed, to the peace of the world.

Just a little over 2 months ago I joined with many Members of this body in urging our Government to make defensive arms available to Israel to deter this threat of war in the Middle East. At that time we said:

> While we are opposed to an arms race in the Near East, we believe that the military capability for safeguarding Israel's national existence must be maintained. We believe that the danger of war will be seriously increased if the Arab nations attain a military preponderance capable of use for aggression because of the Communist initiative.

Unfortunately events since that time have made this statement even truer today. The continuing flow of Communist arms to the Arab States has encouraged Premier Nasser of Egypt to undertake a series of military incursions into Israel, and to intensify his campaign against the West by stirring up trouble for France in north Africa and by playing a sinister part in Glubb Pasha's ouster from Jordan.

I realize, of course, Mr. Speaker, that an arms race will not bring peace to the Middle East. But we are not suggesting such an arms race and that is not the issue. A recent New York Times editorial defined the issue so simply that I think it well to refer to it at this time. The editorial said:

> We say we will not furnish arms to Israel because we do not want to see an arms race. This merely confuses the issue. How have we kept the peace in the world against Russia since the war except by arming ourselves and our allies to the point where the Russians do not dare to start a war? It is not an arms race to let Israel acquire fighter planes for defense against the Ilyushin bombers the Czechs have sold to Egypt? There may well be war in the Middle East if one side gets much stronger than the other.

If we were to furnish defensive arms to Israel, we would be doing no more than what we have done elsewhere in the world in order to deter the Soviet aggressor. In Korea, in Greece, in Formosa, in Southeast Asia, and in many other parts of the world we proved our readiness to take the lead in the defense of freedom. Now it is Israel that is being threatened by the Cairo-Kremlin axis which seeks to overrun the entire Middle East, and we must meet that challenge by permitting Israel to get the weapons she needs to defend herself. It is time for action and deeds, not words.

I recognize, of course, that we need the friendship of the Arab States. I realize, too, how important Middle East oil is to our own security and how important it is to keep that oil out of Russian hands. But I submit that our Middle East policy today—if it can be called a policy—is bringing about the very result which we are seeking to avoid. Each day we see further evidence that, while we pursue a policy of drift and improvisation, the Middle East is being gradually turned over to the Communist sphere of influence. We saw only too well how drift and appeasement failed before World War II. They will not work now. The dictator, whether he be Russian, Nazi, or the feudal despot, respects only courage and principle backed by determination. We can win the respect of the Kremlin-Cairo axis only if we show our resolve to prevent Israel's destruction, and we can show that determination by giving Israel the necessary arms to defend herself.

The administration policy—or lack of policy—has served only to embolden the Arab States. We all know of the flagrant discrimination which Saudi Arabia and the other Arab States have practiced against Americans of the Jewish faith. They have denied visas to Americans because they happen to be Jews. They have instituted boycotts against American business firms which are owned in part by Americans of the Jewish faith. They have now gone so far as to dictate to us which American soldiers we should send to our airbase at Dharan by requiring us not to send American soldiers of the Jewish faith.

How can this country expect to win the respect of the Arab States when we submit to such degrading demands? What we need today is a policy which is based on moral principles rather than expediency.

We do well to recall the words of a great Democrat whose hundredth anni-

versary of his birth we celebrate this year—Woodrow Wilson. In 1911 the Russian Government was practicing an offensive discrimination against Americans of the Jewish faith, and Wilson demanded that we resist it, saying:

Russia cannot respect us when she sees us * * * preferring our interests to our rights. * * * An intolerable situation will be remedied just as soon as Russia is convinced that for us it is indeed intolerable.

These eloquent words are worth remembering today. They point the moral for our problem in the Middle East. It is only when we assert our rights and principles that the Arab States will really respect us. Then and only then will we be able to win a friendship based on respect. Then and only then can we help to build peace in this area and make a contribution in the finest tradition of American diplomacy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an editorial, "Storm in the Middle East," appearing in the New York Times of April 10, 1956:

STORM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

As the Secretary General of the United Nations hastens eastward on his peace mission into the face of the gathering storm, the war clouds are rolling up again around Israel's embattled borders. The latest outbursts, involving the death of at least 75 persons, are the most serious in several months. A special session of the Israeli Parliament has been called. There is no doubt that the situation is dangerous.

Border clashes between Egyptian and Israeli troops last week led to the shelling of Gaza, and this in turn led to the penetration of Israel by Arab "commando" raiders. Cease-fires have been arranged only to be broken. Tension is high. Each side, as usual, accuses the other of starting the affray, and each side is committed to a policy of retaliation. The Premier of Israel said Sunday there would be no reprisal for 48 hours, pending certain assurances from Egypt; if the raids—whether from Egypt or Jordan or both—are not curbed by the Arab Governments involved in conformity with the cease-fire, there is no telling what will happen.

What is of paramount importance in the present crisis, similar to and yet different from the many crises that have preceded it, is that the shooting, the border-crossing, the murders be halted. These border incidents have in them the potentiality of blowing the Middle East sky high; and the first duty incumbent upon Cairo, upon Tel Aviv, upon Amman, is to call them off. They can and must be stopped. If they are, the deep-seated quarrel between Israel and the Arabs will be no nearer a solution; but it will be further from the ultimate folly, the anarchy of war.

Peace in the eastern Mediterranean will not be easy to come by, but it is still not too late for effective action. It is still not too late for the United States to allow the sale of defensive arms to Israel; it is still not too late for us to join the Baghdad Pact that we ourselves inspired; it is still not too late for us to make it clear that we are prepared to implement the tripartite agreement by intervening with force if necessary to forestall an aggressive war in the Middle East, which would be the best guaranty that it would not become necessary.

In his statement yesterday that the United States would observe its commitments under this and other agreements to oppose any aggression within constitutional means, the President moved in the direction of a more forceful enunciation of American policy; and the meeting of congressional leaders with Secretary Dulles today is designed to strengthen it still further. We believe the President should ask for specific congressional endorsement of the use of troops in the Middle East in view of the fact that he once before felt obliged to ask similar congressional approval in respect to the Far East. Up to the present, the American position has been too nebulous, vague, and uncertain to afford the vigorous leadership required in this critical juncture in Middle Eastern and in world affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio), from April 16 through April 20, on account of official committee business.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for Monday, April 16, and Tuesday, April 17, on account of death of his mother.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. PRICE, for 15 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. POWELL, for 30 minutes, on April 17, and for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 18.

Mr. CELLER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. LAIRD, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. POAGE, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROONEY, with regard to Pan-American Day.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include the partial result of a poll recently taken.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an article.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requiring conference reports to be accompanied by statements signed by a majority of the managers of each House; to the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6712. An act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 17, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1742. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, relative to reporting that there have been no significant developments to report for the month of February relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1743. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of over-obligation of two allotments, pursuant to section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, and administrative regulations promulgated thereunder by the Department of Agriculture and procedures of the former Production and Marketing Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1744. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1745. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1746. A letter from the Secretary of State transmitting a copy of a special resolution concerning the late Honorable Chauncey W. Reed adopted by the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration at its meeting on February 20, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1747. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Little Wood River project, Idaho, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 381); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1748. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case to Karl Yu, A-8870546, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1749. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 382); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1750. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the second report of the Attorney General of the United States, pursuant to section 207 (a) of the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House on April 12, 1956, the following resolutions were reported on April 13, 1956:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 473. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 501, a joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; without amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 474. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10387. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the House Calendar.

[*Submitted April 16, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3897. A bill to relieve the Secretary of the Interior of certain reporting requirements in connection with proposed National Park Service awards of concession leases and contracts, including renewals thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10500. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make certain payments to the counties of Dinwiddie, Nottoway, Brunswick, and Lunenburg, Va., from the proceeds of sales of timber located on lands within Camp Pickett, Va.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10501. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make certain payments to the county of Mecklenburg, Va., from the proceeds of sales of timber located on that portion of the land within the John H. Kerr Reservoir, Va. and N. C., situated in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 10502. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10503. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10504. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10505. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians or Eskimos in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10506. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 10507. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain agricultural commodities which are in surplus supply; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 10508. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 10509. A bill to provide for the collection of income tax at source on dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10510. A bill to allow amounts paid for the institutional care and training of a mentally retarded child of a taxpayer to be deducted for Federal income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10511. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 to redefine the term "refugee", to admit (subject to adequate safeguards) certain aliens afflicted with tuberculosis, to provide for agency assurances, to eliminate readmission requirements, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 10512. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 10513. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 10514. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 10515. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 10516. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 10517. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Tax Court in abnormality relief cases arising under the World War II Excess Profits Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 10518. A bill to amend section 6 of Public, No. 2, 73d Congress, to establish a priority for combat and overseas war veterans in obtaining hospitalization from the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10519. A bill to amend section 304 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the disposition of certain imported articles which have been seized and condemned; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 10520. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Seattle, Wash., as the George E. Flood Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10521. A bill to amend section 172 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the net operating loss deduction in case of taxable years beginning in 1953 and ending in 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 10522. A bill to allow certain persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid for meals and lodging and travel when employed away from home for temporary periods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 10523. A bill to confirm the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 10524. A bill to amend section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to place certain restrictions upon ownership or control of broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10525. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to place a maximum limitation on the 3-percent tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10526. A bill to provide for the disposition of certain property of the United States heretofore conveyed to the Housing Authority of the city of Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 10527. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 10528. A bill to amend section 13 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to clarify the authority of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 10529. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the use of broadcasting stations by Presidential, Vice Presidential, and congressional candidates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 10530. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 10531. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World

War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 10532. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 10533. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10534. A bill to amend chapter V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which World War II veterans may obtain guaranteed loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10535. A bill to include the present area of Zion National Monument within Zion National Park, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10536. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10537. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10538. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees' compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10539. A bill to adjust the limitations imposed on veterans outpatient dental care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 10540. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10541. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 10542. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 10543. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10544. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 10545. A bill to provide for the modification of the Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10546. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 10547. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10548. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 10549. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. J. Res. 603. Joint resolution transferring to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico certain archives and records in possession of the National Archives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 475. Resolution of inquiry regarding settlement of tax claim in case against American Distilling Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Armed Forces bombing and artillery ranges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the Boy Scouts of America and supporting the 1957 Boy Scout Jamboree at Valley Forge; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposed Washoe project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to flood control on the Mad and Eel Rivers, South Fork of Eel River, Redwood Creek, Klamath, Mattole, Russian, Smith, and Van Duzen Rivers; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 10550. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Losco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 10551. A bill for the relief of Santiago S. Nazareta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10552. A bill for the relief of Miss Adria Del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10553. A bill for the relief of Miss Emilia M. Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10554. A bill for the relief of Geronimo Navarrete-Rivera; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

H. R. 10555. A bill for the relief of Jose Mariscal Avina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10556. A bill for the relief of Husam Amin Darwazh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 10557. A bill for the relief of Herman Skiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 10558. A bill for the relief of Marian Anthony Rotnicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10559. For the relief of Henry G. Chalkley, et al.: to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

897. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Helmer Twito and other North Dakotans urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

898. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of 45 residents of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

899. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. John Zulpo, Bigelow, Ark., and others urging a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

900. Also, petition of J. Orville Cheney, secretary, Arkansas State Racing Commission, expressing the opposition of the commission to H. R. 8781 and S. 3043, which would reduce to $5,000 the maximum amount of deduction allowable to individuals in the recomputation of taxable income in a trade or business carried on for 5 consecutive taxable years in the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

901. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of approximately 160 citizens of Pasadena and southern California urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

902. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary of Osceola, Iowa, urging enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

903. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of naturalized American citizens of Greek origin and descent, of Beloit, Wis., urging Congress to carefully study the present Cyprus situation and to take immediate action to promote the interest of freedom and justice, thereby to avoid the unrest and bloodshed now rampant and to bring both to Cyprus and to Greece itself, America's traditional and historic friend, the peace, freedom and tranquillity which they deserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

904. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Iova D. Alexander, Centerline, Mich., and 45 others for separate pension program for World War I Veterans and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

905. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Clerk, the California Junior Statesmen of America, Southern Region, Santa Barbara, Calif., petitioning consideration of their

resolution with reference to requesting that they be placed on record as opposing the adoption of any system of subscription television for the home; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

906. Also, petition of Clifford Grail, Cincinnati, Ohio, stating certain grievances against the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and the Governor of Ohio, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

907. Also, petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Honolulu, T. H., requesting that the Hawaiian Organic Act be amended so as to provide for reapportionment of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii substantially upon the basis set forth in the proposed Hawaii State Constitution ratified by the voters of the Territory of Hawaii in 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

American Doctrine for American Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 10, I had the pleasure of speaking in Los Angeles at the Rodger Young Auditorium, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks which I made at that time.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DOCTRINE FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS

I cannot tell you how grateful I am to meet with all of you today. I am proud to be introduced by a distinguished American, Mr. Manchester Boddy, lifelong Democrat, and former publisher of a great daily newspaper in Los Angeles.

This is not a personal meeting. It represents, rather, a typical American opportunity for all of us—regardless of political party—to voice our agreement on some fundamentals by which we hope our Federal Government will be guided in the future, and through which we pray the cause of American freedom will be strengthened and the cause of a just and enduring peace in the world will be advanced.

We believe in the freedom of man. We are devoted to the American constitutional system whose goal is to preserve our free American society, and to guarantee to each citizen in our Nation the right to live his own life and do as he wishes with those opportunities which may present themselves to him. The civil rights written into our Constitution belong to each of us, and belong, also to our Nation. We decline to be pushed around as citizens or as a people. In the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, we intend to pursue happiness, to enjoy life as we may, all under the liberty which our Republic was founded to maintain.

Ours has been a magnificent history. I think we rather convincingly demonstrated in 1776 that Americans intend to be citizens and not subjects. That was the year, you know, when we first rejected colonialism and laid down the precept that Americans believe in the self-determination of peoples. And ever since the rebellious American colonists wrote a Constitution, and conceived the free society of the Republic of the United States, we have overcome the dangers which new situations have placed before us. Each succeeding American generation has preserved American freedom, and has resolutely clung to the same self-evident truths which the patriots laid down at Philadelphia 170 years ago.

All in all, ours has been a history of progress, and we mean, under the providence of God, to continue that progress in the years and generations which lie ahead.

We are now well embarked into a new era on the globe. Unhappily, the struggle for freedom must continue. Almost entirely from the Red ideology of communism stems the current danger to freedom which our generation must overcome. This is the era of the atom and of thermonuclear energy. Men have discovered the secrets of unbelieveable physical power. It is available, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, for either evil or for good. It can annihilate the whole world and all its peoples, or it can be the source of a truly amazing new age of happiness. It can turn wheels, supply power, and wondrously contribute to man's health. One of our great challenges is to assure the use of it in the cause of peace and not in the cause of war.

It is in that background that we can assess our lot in 1956. Our country is at peace. The Korean war ended a little less than 3 years ago. We can be grateful that no American casualty lists are being published. And a very great man, a very humble man, is leading our Government in a dedicated search for the achievement of peace with justice among all nations.

There are many sorely troubled areas around the globe. The insidious policies of Communist Russia in the Middle East are an appalling and heavy factor in the strife and bloodshed in that unhappy area. Russia's aim is to become a power in the Middle East. A conflict of arms between the Israelis and the Arabs poses a most tragic danger to the cause of freedom everywhere. Positive steps must be taken to avert it.

The travail on Cyprus seriously disconcerts all of us. Greece and Turkey, as well as Great Britain, are all our friends, and are all implacable foes of communism. Now, to find them embroiled in a bitter conflict is almost unthinkable.

The Middle East and Cyprus, indeed each sector of the world, must have the closest attention of our Government. Through the United Nations, and also through arrangements with our free friends, which have been made and which are being made, all our actions are designed to bring about a just and enduring peace among all nations.

I sincerely believe that war was averted a year ago in the Far East by the bold leadership of our President, in which Congress, controlled by one political party, and the executive branch by another, stood firmly together in approving an official American policy—the Formosa resolution—which made unmistakably clear our firm and inflexible decision that Free China shall not be overrun by communism. I mention this here because I hope, and I believe, that politics must still stop at the water's edge. And I hope, and I believe, that almost all the people of the United States are knit closely together in their desire to maintain a foreign policy free from partisanship—or from extremes—designed solely for our own people's security in a world of peace and justice.

Those are my views, and I feel assured that they are yours as well. Extremes and extremists, either left or right, must be avoided, as they are being avoided, in all our foreign policy decisions, and, for that matter, in our domestic decisions as well.

Every facet of our foreign policy must be determined on the basis of our own American self-interest, albeit an enlightened self-interest. We are a peaceful nation. We are a free nation. We intend, as Americans, not as partisans, to determine a course that is best for us, as Americans, to pursue. It is to our own interests to promote peace in the world and comradeship among free peoples. That is what we are doing, that is what we propose to do.

That is what this Nation was doing when President Eisenhower last year voiced his electrifying proposal for "open sky" reciprocal air inspection for both Communist territory and the free world. Just a few days ago at the meeting of the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament at London, and for the first time, the Soviet apparently announced some tentative acceptance of the Presidential plan. Their deeds, rather than their words will, however, still be the measure of their sincerity.

"What we are trying to do here," said a Western representative at the London Conference, "is to establish some common ground with the Russians. * * * In this nuclear age, if you can devise a sure guard against surprise attack, there will be no attack. And if there is no attack, there will be no war."

In the last 2 years, substantial progress has been made in our mutual-security agreements. Over the violent protests of Mr. Molotov and Russia, our Government led the way in granting sovereignty to the Federal German Republic and approved—with our fellow members—her entrance into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—a real achievement. How the Russians hate it and fear it.

Austria's sovereignty has been restored, not, it is true, as an active ally of the West, but certainly not a partner of Moscow. I feel reasonably assured that Austria's spirit and prayers are entirely with the free nations and entirely against the Communist nations. And on the other side of the world in Southeast Asia, the multilateral mutual security pact continues to furnish the means for friendly cooperation and for agreement to stand firm against aggression.

So, I repeat, our generation continues making progress in determining and overcoming those modern dangers to the cause of our freedom. There are some deadly serious questions remaining with which we must deal, and deal firmly. But the basic hazards of Communist aggression and intrigue is not one for the people of the United States alone. They are the concern of all free peoples, and it will be in concert with them that we shall continue to oppose the Communist ideology.

Meanwhile, the whole world now knows of the fantastic changes in the Communist line. Almost deified in his lifetime, Stalin now is reviled by the Kremlin as a sadist and a wanton murderer. I suppose we will have to wait some time before understanding the full implications of this abrupt change in Soviet philosophy.

There is one part in the Communist line here in California, which remains steadfast. I am proud to tell you that the Communist newspapers in California say a lot of terrible things about me. They are asking our

people to defeat me. I can't tell you how glad I am that this is true. A man is known by the company he keeps. I never have kept company with communism and the Communist press in the past, and I promise all the people of my State I will not keep company with them in the future. We, all of us, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, are agreed on our uncompromising objection to this godless creed. We shall together oppose communism and all those who fraternize with it.

I am not a witch hunter. I have voted in the Senate for the strongest kind of laws to stamp out all kinds of subversion. And subversion is being stamped out in this country, in my judgment. Our Federal Department of Justice and our Federal Bureau of Investigation are working steadfastly toward that end.

All I can say is that I shall continue, so long as I remain in the United States Senate, to vote for an enlightened foreign policy which is in the best interests of the American people and which promotes the cause of a just peace among all nations. My vote will be free of political concern and partisan concern.

Closely alined with America's international relations is the question of the defense of our people. How have I cast my vote in the Senate on this important question? How have I discharged this obligation to my 13 million fellow Californians? I have done it by voting consistently in favor of the recommendations of President Eisenhower. Preeminently qualified himself in this important field, he has advising him a group of the foremost military men in our country. Chief among them is Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a veteran of more than 40 years of military experience. Here is what he said last year:

"I feel as of today that we are better prepared to meet any emergency than we ever have been during my service in the Armed Forces.

"In fact the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary."

Ten days ago, in Washington, I asked Admiral Radford if his opinion was the same today. He replied that it is, with the continuing understandable proviso that world conditions do not materially change for the worse.

Here at home we have much to be thankful for. We enjoy the highest level of economy in all our history. More people are employed in California and in the Nation than ever before. Part of the responsibility of a United States Senator is to work to continue that kind of healthy, dynamic economy. I promise each of you I shall do just that.

These last 3 years I have introduced legislation, now the law, to construct irrigation projects, dams, storage reservoirs, and good flood-control works to improve the lot of our people. But they'll do more than that. They'll also provide jobs for our people.

The care of our disabled American veterans is a just responsibility of the Nation. America can never fully discharge it. I have interested myself in the welfare of our former servicemen. I am glad to tell you that I successfully urged the Senate to approve my request for an $8 million hospital at Long Beach for our paraplegic veterans. And for northern California the Senate agreed to approve a new 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital for veterans of our wars. These two new institutions will soon be a reality.

I am a coauthor of pending legislation to permit veterans to reinstate their GI insurance. This is of particular interest to Californians, with our country's second largest veterans' population. I shall work for early action on this in the Senate.

There continues to be the most urgent need for Federal legislation providing for the construction of a modern, efficient interstate highway system in America. Last year more people were killed on our highways than died in the entire Korean war. We need this legislation not only to deal with this monstrous problem, but also because of the military and defense needs of our Nation. I promise the people of my State to continue to work diligently for the passage of this long overdue and vital legislation.

Our tuna-fishing industry has suffered woeful deterioration by reason of what I believe to be unfair competition through unlimited and spiraling importation of foreign tuna. I do not quarrel with trade between nations. Indeed, I have enthusiastically supported reciprocal trade legislation. But that very legislation provides for peril points to protect our domestic economy. It should be crystal clear that the peril point has long since been reached and passed as respects the American—the Californian—who makes his living farming the sea. I have cosponsored legislation to assist that industry in the Congress, and I have very much hope that we can receive legislative and Executive approval of it.

I had the honor to be chairman of a Senate subcommittee which wrote the Federal lease-purchase legislation. With appropriate safeguards to protect the public interest, this law permits the Federal Government to use its rental monies to buy necessary public buildings on a time-payment plan. A new customhouse for Los Angeles is in the mill under this legislation. A $40 million Federal building for San Francisco is about ready for bids. Many other of our communities will be the recipients of new Federal structures built by private enterprise which thus will provide new avenues of employment.

Under this legislation, the Government will pay to construction employees the prevailing wages which obtain in the area of construction. This is a sound principle in my judgment. Thus, construction for Uncle Sam will not depress the market in those towns where Uncle Sam becomes a property owner. The theory of paying prevailing wages on public construction in each area of the country ought to apply, in my view, to all Federal undertakings.

Our President has said that there must be no second-class citizenship in America. You and I agree. And I here repeat what I said earlier in our State: I believe that we have made more solid progress these last 3 years in honoring the Biblical tenets of the brotherhood of man than in any comparable period since Abraham Lincoln's day.

Many other problems confront us in this year's election. I shall discuss them in detail in the days ahead. If California can unite, as I believe it will, on its hopes and aspirations for herself, our country, and the goal of a just peace in the world, we will contribute markedly toward their attainment in the city of Washington.

My father once said that one's success in life is attained in great part, by the help of his friends. That is also true of principles. In the coming months, I shall wage a vigorous and an intensive campaign, and I shall do it on the basis of principles you and I share. But I will need the help of friends like you. I thank you for coming here today. I will keep your faith.

Conference Report (Farm Bill) No Help to the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, in December 1955, I submitted a questionnaire to the people of the 17th District. The newspapers, through the courtesy of their owners and editors, in our district carried this questionnaire, giving approximately everyone an opportunity to sign their name, their occupation, and their views. Many items were covered but I especially want to call your attention to the results of the voting on one particular subject—the farm program. I submit those results for your consideration:

THE FARM PROGRAM: WHICH PLAN DO YOU FAVOR?

(a) 100-percent price support with acreage control:
Total replies: 0.7 percent yes, 99.3 percent no.
Farmers voted: 23 percent yes, 77 percent no.

(b) Flexible price support with acreage control:
Total replies: 37 percent yes, 63 percent no.
Farmers voted: 17 percent yes, 83 percent no.

(c) Elimination of all price supports and acreage controls:
Total replies: 54 percent yes, 46 percent no.
Farmers voted: 63 percent yes, 37 percent no.

On April 11 the House Conferees on Agriculture submitted to us, and asked for our approval, a bill which is not fair, a bill that would hurt the majority of the farmers and give preferential treatment to a few. The bill would increase cost to dairy, poultry, and livestock farmers. It would help hold down prices on feeder cattle, lambs, and hogs, and without question it would tend to dry up markets for the very farmers for whom help is needed. I voted "no" on the recent conference farm bill, H. R. 12, for the following reasons:

It would put the American farmers more under Federal control and domination.

It would keep the farmers from growing wheat that is necessary for them to feed and use as seed on their own farm.

It would prevent all farmers from voting on a wheat referendum and crop control.

It would continue to permit a sky-the-limit program for loans and payments.

This conference report, as passed, is a one-crop big-farmer bill, helping only the Far West and South and would definitely be detrimental to the rotation farmers, which are so essential to our economy. Very little financial assistance is given to the small-acreage farmer. The Campbell Farming Corp., of Hardin, Mont., received $430,691. The Chandler Co., Saragosa, Tex., received $814,041. One king-size farm drew $1,292,475.25 on his 1954 wheat crop. Thirty-seven

loans, Mr. Speaker, exceed $200,000. The records clearly show that the big one-crop farm operators of the South and West are able to get bigger by Uncle Sam underwriting most of the expenses while the small farmers of our State and area are paying the bill.

We want the equitable treatment and freedom, Mr. Speaker, that many of us fought for; which certainly is not contained in the conference report for the farm bill, H. R. 12.

Finland's Ambassador Visits Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1956, the people of my district were honored by a visit from the Honorable Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary from the Republic of Finland to the United States of America and the United States of Mexico.

This visit was arranged by the junior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable WILLIAM A. PURTELL, in the interest of the National Finnish-American Marathon Committee, but unfortunately it was not possible for Senator PURTELL to be present on the occasion of Ambassador Nykopp's visit.

Upon the Ambassador's arrival from Washington, a small reception in his honor took place at my home in Pomfret, where he also had an opportunity to be interviewed by members of the press.

The national chairman of the Finnish-American Marathon Committee, Otto L. Pussinen, is a constituent of mine, and one whose friendship I have long valued. He and his committee conducted the successful project for sponsoring and financing the visit to this country of two athletes from Finland, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, who are to participate in the 30th annual Boston Marathon on April 19, 1956.

These young men have been living in my district since their arrival from Finland several weeks ago, and they have been doing their training for the Boston marathon on the roads in and around Plainfield.

A reception in their honor, attended by more than 1,000 citizens of my district, most of them of Finnish birth or ancestry, as well as by visitors from Massachusetts and elsewhere, took place on Saturday evening, March 31, in the town hall at Plainfield, at which time it was my privilege to introduce Ambassador Nykopp.

Ambassador Nykopp extended a greeting to the athletes from Finland, and from those who had gathered to honor them. After his return to Washington, the Ambassador made some interesting comments about his visit to Connecticut, which I am pleased, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, to insert at this point in the RECORD:

The marathon-benefit night at Plainfield town hall, March 31, 1956, offered me the possibility to learn about the splendid activities of the Finnish-American Athletic Club. For the past 4 years the marathon committee of the club has been raising funds to bring Finland's best marathon runners to compete against the world's foremost athletes in the annual Boston marathon.

The fund has not only made participation possible but also the opportunity for the Finnish sportsmen to arrive early before the competition, to get used to the conditions. The work of the committee, headed by Mr. Otto L. Pussinen, proves how strongly the sport spirit lives among the people of Connecticut.

In this connection I extend my sincere thanks to Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL and Congressman HORACE SEELY-BROWN, who have warmly supported this good activity of Americans of Finnish origin.

In 1954 the Finnish runner Veikko Karvonen won the marathon, and I am sure that the Finnish participants this year, Eino Oksanen and Antti Viskari, will do their best to defend the Finnish marathon traditions.

At Washington, D. C., April 5, 1956.

JOHAN A. NYKOPP,
Ambassador of Finland.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to many previous appeals which our delegation flood committee and other members have made to the House Appropriations Committee respecting the flood-relief program for Massachusetts and the Northeast, we hereby respectfully again urge that the House Appropriations Committee take early action to expedite approval of various specific and general remedial and protective projects now under consideration.

Recent severe snowfalls in our area have increased our deep concern. The periodic recurrence of flood disasters requires expeditious action to set up comprehensive and appropriate flood protection.

As we have pointed out, delay in acting upon feasible measures proposed will merely serve to increase the risk of future damaging floods and thus constitute great peril to many communities already sorely beset by the heavy floods of last year.

We respectfully urge that the Appropriations Committee, in the exercise of its wise discretion, after considering the evidence, establish its own standards as to what may constitute adequate funds to inaugurate planning, construction, and general flood protection work on a basis of efficiency, speed, and generosity.

We further urge that the hearings be expedited as much as possible in order that suitable legislation may be reported to the House at an early date for consideration and action in order to accelerate the progress of vital projects in the area.

The pertinent recommendations follow:

The Massachusetts congressional delegation presents the following recommendations with reference to pending legislation and respectfully urges the adoption of the following program:

1. For construction, operation, and maintenance appropriations:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Adams	$1,976,000	$1,976,000
Barre Falls	1,150,000	1,150,000
Birch Hill (maintenance and operation)	13,000	13,000
Buffumville	1,200,000	1,200,000
East Brimfield	340,000	340,000
Hodges Village	360,000	360,000
Knightsville (operation and maintenance)	16,000	16,000
North Adams	2,000,000	2,000,000
Tully (operation and maintenance)	13,000	13,000
Worcester diversion	840,000	840,000

2. For engineering and planning:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Westville (authorized)	None	[1] $100,000
West Hill (authorized)	None	[2] 100,000
Littleville (State concurrence given)	None	[3] 100,000

[1] State concurrence given.
[2] Subject to State concurrence.
[3] Subject to authorization.

3. For the Army engineers snagging and stream clearance fund and section 212 projects for general operations in all Massachusetts river basins:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommendation
Snagging and clearing	$500,000	[1] $5,000,000
Sec. 212	1,000,000	[1] 5,000,000

[1] Subject to completion of current engineering studies.

Snagging and clearing projects, up to $100,000, are authorized by section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1954. This section permits stream clearance, up to $100,000 on any one stream, without specific congressional authorization.

Section 212 projects are authorized by section 212 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. This section permits small flood prevention projects, up to $150,000, without specific congressional authorization. The project must be complete within itself, be economically justified and not be in an area intended to be protected by a larger flood-control project.

Snagging and clearing and section 212 funds would supplement Operation Noah rehabilitation measures already undertaken by the Engineers in the flood-disaster areas of Massachusetts by providing permanent flood-prevention works in the following basins:

Connecticut, Thames, Blackstone, Merrimac, Charles, Neponset, Housatonic, Hoosic, Ipswitch, Mystic, Little, and other streams and waterways in the State where the Army engineers deem protective measures to be necessary.[1]

[1] Merrimac Basin: $90,000 for removal of sandbar in the Merrimac at its mouth near Newburyport (request of Mr. BATES): $500,000 for local flood-prevention projects (request of Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. LANE).

Charles River Basin: Stream clearance of the Charles River near Newton (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

4. On the following navigation and beach erosion projects, your committee recommends:

	Budgeted item, 1957 fiscal year	Recommended
Fall River Harbor	$500,000	$1,000,000
Mystic River	1,500,000	1,500,000
Town River	302,000	302,000
Fore River (Weymouth)	500,000	500,000
Revere Beach shore protection	75,000	75,000

And we also urge upon the Appropriations Committee early favorable action on pending requests for appropriations for all other navigation and beach erosion projects in our State.

5. The delegation urges immediate consideration of H. R. 7870, introduced by Mr. McCORMACK, and companion bills, approved in principle by Secretary of the Army Brucker, and designed to give the Engineers authority to complete urgently necessary projects costing up to $500,000 without further specific congressional authorization.

6. We favor the principle of disaster insurance and urge the Congress to continue its consideration of and report upon pending measures in this field so that action may be taken during this session.

7. For the various recommendations of the New England Governors' Conference, and the New England Council, we once again bespeak every possible consideration by the Appropriations Committee.

8. Thirty thousand dollars for survey of the Neponset and Charles Rivers (request of Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts).

Let's Stick to the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when a man is elected to the post of governor of a State, the electorate expects him to hold the interests of his State above all else. We in New York State have a strange situation in this regard.

Governor Harriman stated early this week about the President's veto of the farm bill, that the veto marked a black day for the New York dairy farmer.

Actually, the facts of the matter point to a directly opposite conclusion. I am shocked that the governor of a great State like New York should make these intemperate remarks about an important segment of his State's population without looking into the facts of the matter and with complete disregard for the welfare of the farmers of his own State.

The figures illustrate plainly that the cost-price squeeze on New York farmers would have been greatly aggravated had the crazy-quilt farm bill passed by this Congress been signed by the President. Under the terms of that bill, the dairy farmers of my State would have paid $32 million in increased feed costs to get approximately $2,650,000 in increased income from higher price supports on dairy products. If you subtract the $2,650,000 increased income from the threatened loss of $32 million, it is clear that the New York State farmer would be on the short end of the stick to the tune of nearly $30 million. Obviously, the President has done a great service to the farmers of my State by vetoing this bill.

The President has provided for increasing the income to New York farmers by the same $2,650,000 as in the vetoed bill by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support price on dairy products. But he has not saddled on them these added costs.

The facts of the matter are plain. The President has not only acted in the best interests of the whole country in vetoing the bill, but in particular his action has saved the farmers of my State a great deal of money.

Eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert the following letter which I wrote on April 9 to Mr. DeVere Kostoff, chairman of the Committee for the Celebration of Israel Independence Day in Saginaw, Mich., in connection with the eighth anniversary of the independence of Israel which was observed there last Thursday, April 12:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1956.

Mr. DEVERE KOSTOFF,
Chairman, Independence Day Committee, Temple B'nai Israel, Saginaw, Mich.

DEAR MR. KOSTOFF: I take pleasure in replying to your letter of April 5 in connection with the celebration of Israel Independence Day by the Saginaw Jewish community.

I have had occasion in the past to express to my Jewish friends in Saginaw my own feelings with respect to the question of Israel. It is, therefore, a real pleasure to reaffirm my own feelings which are to the effect that all freedom-loving people in this country and throughout the world should rejoice at this passage of another milestone in Israel's brief history of independence. I am confident that our own Government strongly shares this feeling and is making every effort to bring peace and security to the Middle East so that Israel may turn her efforts from defense to peaceful ends.

The continued free existence of Israel is a "must" in any consideration of the problems of this part of the world. Any negotiations with the opposing sides must accept this fact as a foregone conclusion—it should not be a subject for international discussion. If our position in this matter is made sufficiently clear to the Arab leaders, I hope that other differences can be ironed out providing that both sides are prepared to make honorable concessions for the sake of mutual peace.

The national security of this country would be imperiled were Israel to be defeated and overrun by her enemies. I am confident that the administration realizes this. I promise you that my own work on the House Foreign Affairs Committee will be guided along these lines.

With congratulations and best wishes to all in attendance, I remain

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

Billion-Dollar Prescription

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH introduced a bill to provide additional funds for medical research, medical research facilities, and assistance to medical education. There appears in the current Saturday Review a short article giving a succinct, clear statement covering the situation as it now is and the grave need of assistance that exists. Trusting the House membership will take the trouble to read it, I am inserting it as part of my remarks:

BILLION-DOLLAR PRESCRIPTION

(By MARGARET CHASE SMITH)

We human beings act strangely. With the exception of our moral and spiritual values, the obviously most important thing to us is life—our own life and the lives of our dear ones and our friends. Yet we don't act that way. We pay little attention to our health. We take our health for granted. We don't get concerned about it until we have lost part of it. And sometimes that is too late.

Here in America last year we spent $10 billion for cocktails and other spiritous liquors. We spent $5 billion for tobacco. We spent $264 million for chewing gum. But when I advocated on the floor of the United States Senate that we spend an extra $200 million a year for the next 5 years on the better care of our health, some people were shocked.

"How could you possibly spend that much money?" these people have asked. "Why $200 million a year for 5 years is $1 billion." Indeed it is. One billion. Forty-nine billion less than our drinking bill during those same 5 years. Twenty-four billion less than our smoking bill. More than $250 million less than our bill for chewing gum.

Having made that comparison, I ask my questioners a question:

"Is $1 billion really a huge sum to spend to help protect and perhaps prolong 165 million American lives?"

I think most people will agree that it is not. And here is my prescription:

1. For medical research, spend $500 million.

2. For medical research facilities, spend $150 million.

3. For assistance to medical education, spend $350 million.

I believe that my prescription is unique in one very important respect. It is long-range medicine—something that we in this country have never attempted before.

As I am not a doctor, or even a nurse, I may be suspected of snap diagnosis. This, however, is not the case. I have been concerned with medical research for a long time. I do want to acknowledge, though, that my thinking was crystallized by an editorial in a great Maine neswpaper, the Bangor Daily News. The title the editorial writer chose was "How About $1 Billion for Health?"

The most thorough study to date of the impact of illness upon our national economy was made in a 6-month-long investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 and 1954. I have leaned heavily upon my readings of those hearings in reaching my own conclusions. More recently, criticism of inadequate Federal support for medical research has come from the distinguished reports of the Hoover Commission. In these reports there is a recurrent plea for a 5-year program. I am frank to state that the arguments of the Commission have had a great influence upon me. But the detailed dosage that follows is my own formula.

1. MEDICAL RESEARCH

At present the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health have a current budget of approximately $100 million a year. I would double this budget, making it $200 million a year, an added 5-year cost of $500 million.

Perhaps I should explain, for the benefit of those who are not so close to Government as I am, that the National Institutes of Health together make up the foremost research agency of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They have extensive laboratories of their own, probably the finest laboratories in the world, certainly the best Government laboratories anywhere. But two-thirds of their funds are spent in support of research and training in non-Federal medical institutions. In this extramural research and training each Institute (there are seven: cancer, heart, mental health, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases, and blindness, dental, and microbiological) is aided by a National Advisory Council. Council members are citizens outstanding in medical science, education, and public affairs. They review all applications for grants, and make recommendations on these to the Surgeon General, who in his turn requests appropriations from Congress.

Historically the councils have been hampered by our system of annual appropriations. Frequently they have not been able to attract the most qualified men to short-term jobs. And many research projects have been turned down because their continuance over the necessary span of time could not be guaranteed.

The more fundamental research becomes—and all the experts agree that it is fundamental (sometimes called "pure") research we need above all else—the less predictable is the time involved. Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee early in 1956 reminded us, for instance, that 33 years passed between (a) the time that the pancreas was found to contain the secret of diabetes and (b) the time when the secret was identified as insulin. Would anyone today begrudge the money spent in hunting down that elusive chemical, which, when finally discovered, saved millions of lives?

By making $500 million more available to the National Institutes of Health, I do not claim to solve the problem of basic research. But I do feel that the Institutes would be given a degree of flexibility in supporting long-range studies. It seems pertinent to note, at this point, that long-range investigation means most in the little understood metabolic diseases which have their worst crippling effects in our growing proportion of older citizens.

2. MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Early this year Senators LISTER HILL and STYLES BRIDGES introduced a bill to provide $90 million over the next three years to match construction grants for medical research facilities in medical schools, hospitals, and private foundations in all parts of the country. The Senate passed the bill unanimously and the measure is now before the House. Under my 5-year prescription I would extend this 3-year proposal to cover 5 years at the same annual rate of $30 million; a total of $150 million.

3. MEDICAL EDUCATION ASSISTANCE

Senator HILL also introduced, together with a dozen other Senators, another bill to provide $250 million to match grants for construction of medical-school buildings. This bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association and almost unanimously by medical school deans. I would increase this appropriation by $20 million a year—from $50 million to $70 million—for a 5-year total of $350 million. That total approximates two estimates made by the National Fund for Medical Education (of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president) regarding the needs of the Nation's medical schools.

My billion-dollar prescription is now complete.

I admit that $1 billion may appear to be a large amount for taxpayers to carry in addition to the burden they carry at present. But I call your attention to the fact that the American people unhesitantly footed a 1954 bill of $1,700,000,000 for research on military weapons alone. This is eight-and-one-half times the annual rate I propose for medical research expansion. May I point out that our national defense and our national security are no stronger than our national health, on which our Federal Government's research spending is less than 1 percent of the national budget?

Compare the current $100 million research and training budget of the National Institutes of Health with the $90 million appropriated at the last session of Congress for research activities in the Department of Agriculture. Add to this $90 million the sum of $250 million which is paid out to farmers for soil conservation. I do not want to imply that I am not heartily in favor of greatly expanded agricultural research. I know, of course, that much of such research benefits us in our studies of the diseases of man. And I have always supported farm-research activities. But I think it is about time this country brought research on human lives up to the level of research on animals and plants.

I referred earlier to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the impact of disease on the national economy. The committee found that four diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or $30 billion a year. Alongside that enormous loss, my proposed expenditure of $200 million a year would seem a very modest investment.

Would it be a sound investment for a banker?

Over the last decade alone medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other battlers against disease. These miraculous products of medical research, along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripplers:

	Percent
Influenza	77
Appendicitis	69
Acute rheumatic fever	66
Syphilis	56
Tuberculosis	50
Pneumonia	50
Kidney diseases	43

Now let us translate this into economic terms. The National Office of Vital Statistics reported that in 1954 approximately 350,000 Americans under the age of 65 died of cancer and heart disease alone. This is greater than the total of Americans who lost their lives in the Armed Forces during the Second World War and the Korean war together. Remember that those wars lasted not 1 year but approximately 7 years.

Those 350,000 deaths of 1954 occurred, as I have stated, among people under 65, people in their productive years who otherwise would have been at work, earning money, producing goods and services, and consuming as well. Moreover, these people would have been paying taxes which would have gone, in part, to pay for research which would have helped to preserve their own and other lives.

In an earlier year—the year 1951—a study of federally aided rehabilitation revealed that 8,000 people who were returned to work had been on public assistance prior to rehabilitation, at a cost of $5,700,000 annually. The cost of their rehabilitation was $4 million. These people are now employed. Instead of being tax-consumers they are taxpayers.

When we consider that chronic diseases account for 88 percent of the disability of the approximately 2 million physically handicapped people in the United States, we can see that the economic benefits to be derived from medical research on disabling diseases would be vast. The research would more than pay for itself.

I have been asked whether my billion dollar prescription for our national health amounts to socialized medicine. I have publicly and privately stated for many, many years that I am opposed to socialized medicine. The 5-year program that I propose would have no aspects of socialized medicine. It is in keeping with recommendations and endorsements made by the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, medical-school deans, and such outstanding doctors as Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower.

Perhaps because he is the heart doctor of the President, Dr. White's own words have a great dramatic and impressive meaning to the American people on the need for expansion of medical research. Dr. White has pointed out that current heart research is severely limited because of lack of money. Testifying before a Senate committee, as a member of the advisory council of the National Heart Institute, Dr. White said he had been forced to use his own money for research because there were not sufficient Government funds.

His was only one of a tremendous backlog of worthy projects, running into millions of dollars, for which the advisory councils have no money. As long as this backlog exists qualified people are being denied the opportunity to save life.

If one of the Armed Forces can build up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and if another can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly, I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

People of the 15th District Express Their Views on Major Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently requested the people of my district to share their opinions with me on several of the vital and important issues

under consideration by Congress. The response and interest in this questionnaire which was sent to all sections of the 15th District and to people in all types of business and professions as well as to wage earners, housewives, and those on retirement was an amazing indication of the personal interest the people of the 15th District have in these major issues.

The great response to my questionnaire was an example of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and convinced me that the people back home are seriously thinking and want to participate in the affairs of good government by expressing their opinions on these vital issues.

It was very encouraging to me to have this widespread opinion from the people of my district on these vital issues. In many cases I not only received the answers to the questions submitted, but additional opinions on many other subjects.

The satisfaction and gratification that I have received from the replies to my questionnaire is that the replies of the majority have confirmed my opinion and belief on these issues, and in the case of rigid or flexible farm supports, I voted as the majority indicated for flexible farm price supports.

The following are the results of the replies I received on my questionnaire:

[Percent]

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor a greater reduction in foreign aid?	79.0	21.0
2. Will the consolidation of the CIO–AFL be of greater benefit to the average wage earner?	27.5	72.5
3. Should our public school system be left free from Federal aid?	74.1	25.9
4. Should taxes be reduced with a high public debt and unbalanced budget?	24.1	75.9
5. Do you favor rigid or flexible farm price supports?		
Rigid?	10.8	------
Flexible?	89.2	------
6. Should the unlimited power of the Federal Government to levy taxes be restricted by a constitutional amendment?	71.5	28.5
7. Do you believe that wire tapping should be made legal?	49.5	50.5
8. Should secret recordings of jury deliberations be outlawed?	75.8	24.2

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the above review of my questionnaire will be of great interest to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Outpost of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on this 8th anniversary of the establishment of Israel as a state, I wish to join with my colleagues in saluting the brave and beleaguered nation that stands as an outpost of freedom on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean.

Israel's history has been turbulent and harsh, but it has also been studded with inspiring accomplishments. With calm courage, indomitable will and prodigious industry, she has established herself firmly, against the hostile designs both of man and of nature.

While the future holds vast problems for her—both economic and military—Israel has proved that her spirit and morale are equal to the challenge. As a nation which experienced similar hardships and struggles in another century, we in the United States have every reason to feel the strongest bonds of sympathy with the Israelis, and to rejoice in each passing birthday.

It is a source of satisfaction and reassurance that the statesmen of the West, both within and outside the United Nations, are today bringing all the arts of diplomacy to bear on the problem of maintaining the geographical integrity of Israel and of her neighbors, as we are pledged to do.

While the intermittent hostilities along Israel's borders have created a high degree of tension in the Middle East, Israel, on her eighth birthday, has every reason to be proud of her past and confident of her future.

Pan-American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Pan-American Day, the day before yesterday, should have reminded us of the reasons that bring together the various American Republics and cause them on this historic day to celebrate their solidarity and the common interests that bind them together.

One hundred and thirty years ago, Simon Bolivar gave impetus to the idea of pan-Americanism at the Congress of Panama. It was chiefly through his efforts, at this Congress, that the blueprint for inter-American cooperation was drawn.

Bolivar's dream became a reality at the first Inter-American Conference, held in Washington, in 1890; for it was at this assemblage of American States that the cornerstone of pan-Americanism was laid with the establishment of the Pan American Union.

Later Inter-American Conferences provided a firm foundation for the growth and expansion of hemispheric cooperation, and at Bogota in 1948, the Ninth Inter-American Conference gave permanent structure and authority to the already proven system of pan-Americanism by establishing the Organization of American States.

Each successive conference contributed positive achievements to the structure. As the system grew the American Republics have shown their ability to work together to promote peace and security; they have agreed that international law and good faith should govern their future relations; and they have provided for cooperative action for economic, social, and cultural development.

It was appropriate that on the 66th anniversary of the establishment of the Pan American Union that the American Republics should express their confidence that this inter-American system, which is based on the equality of all American States and has promoted fellowship and mutual cooperation amongst its members for so many years, shall continue to progress and to contribute to hemispheric welfare and security in the future.

America Salutes Israel Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 29, a mammoth America Salutes Israel Celebration is being staged at Yankee Stadium. With Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz as general chairman, the following national organizations are sponsoring this event: Farband Labor Zionist Order, B'nai Zion Order, American Trade Union Council for Labor Israel, and United States Committee for Sports in Israel.

A program of speeches, plus musical and sports events is planned. A highlight of the afternoon will be a soccer match between the Israeli Oympic team and the American League All-Stars.

Mr. Speaker, this commendable occasion will serve as an eloquent testimonial to the determination of the United States to maintain Israel's place in the free world as a sovereign and democratic state.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a message I have prepared for the occasion:

It is with a great deal of deep personal satisfaction that I join in the America Salutes Israel Celebration. An anniversary is always a great occasion, but the eighth anniversary of Israel's independence is an especially significant milestone.

It is a milestone which attests to the determination, the will to survive, the courage of the people of this bastion of democracy. It is a milestone which has particular significance to all Americans. For democracy in Israel is, like democracy in the United States, a divine incentive—the inescapable logic of her whole destiny.

This stake—the survival of a fellow democracy—forms the indissoluble bond, the moral bridge which is far more durable than that which might unite us with any other people.

America's ties with Israel are also spiritual, personal, human, and humanitarian. And as long as our Western civilization endures, the priceless heritage of the religion which was cradled in Jerusalem will bind us to her destiny.

The new nation of Israel numbers among its citizens immigrants from every modern community of the free world. Its roots are as nearly universal as those of any existing community of free men. A little of America and all the rest of the countries of the world are there and each segment merged into the whole there endures a mutual bond of understanding and affection.

Most Americans are pioneers at heart. Compared with the rest of the world, our national history is comparatively short, and most of our heritage glorifies the bold contest with nature and adversity we have been witnessing in Israel these last 8 years. Living Americans have in their memories the satisfaction of seeing wilderness change to benevolent living space, of watching homes and buildings and cities grow where nothing stood before, and of seeing deserts flower and hardy new generations rise up to populate an empty land.

These things are close to us and dear to us. We understand the problems and disappointments of Israel as other nations, much further removed from the atmosphere of the frontier, will never understand.

We applaud on this day Israel's miraculous achievements during 8 years of troubled existence. Everywhere there is progress. Everywhere the functions of government are performed with efficiency and skill. Law and order rule supreme within the borders. The humanitarian impulse and a willingness to build together a state based on justice, equality, and peace are the order of the day. This is Israel, 1956. That these conditions exist bodes well for a successful future.

We pray to God on this significant occasion for the continued progress of Israel's spiritual adventure to secure the permanent freedom of her ancient home. We pray to God that she will be able to continue to live a life consecrated to the universal vision of fraternity and peace. If Israel will continue to serve this ideal, the new era of her freedom will be worthy of the inheritance of those who have gone before.

Our hearts go out today to those many miles away who strive so sturdily and courageously for the survival of the Holy Land. We thank God for successes so far and pray for continued prosperity.

Eighth Anniversary of Israel Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel are to be congratulated on this eighth anniversary of their independence. The road has been rough and rocky and even at times discouraging, but Israel is making great progress with a united people, and is known as one of the strongest friends of the United States among the democratic nations.

We people with friends and relatives in Israel wish to encourage them with a friendly pat on the back at this time, and reassure them that United States Secretary of State Dulles has stated repeatedly that the existence of the State of Israel is one of the basic premises of United States foreign policy.

We hope that in this period of tension, that the threats to Israel's survival will disappear, and that both sides may be able with United Nations assistance to work out agreements by which each may live in peace for the economic progress and development of the Middle East, in which both the United States and Israel can be such key factors.

Our warm regards go to you at this significant anniversary time, and with our hearty congratulations to the people of Israel on their courage and devotion to the cause of freedom.

Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein my own remarks, in part, delivered at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence Day at Fitchburg, Mass., on March 25, 1956.

This memorable event was arranged and very ably conducted by the Greek Orthodox Community at Fitchburg and was attended by the distinguished mayor of the city, Hon. Hedley Bray; the prominent and capable Greek-American leader and businessman, Mr. Charles Kotsilibas Davis; the beloved pastor of the church, Rev. John Michalides, who gave the invocation; and a large number of representative citizens of the community and city.

I was most graciously introduced on the inspiring occasion by the able radio announcer and commentator, Chris M. Nikitas, of station WEIM, which carried my address on its facilities:

REMARKS IN PART OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AT 135TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE AT FITCHBURG, MARCH 25, 1956

"The forcible removal, exile, and imprisonment of Archbishop Makarios, a great spiritual leader and prelate, who exemplifies the political ideals as well as the profound religious beliefs of millions of honest, law-abiding, democratic-minded people, is shocking to the conscience of the free world," said Congressman PHILBIN at the 135th anniversary celebration of Greek Independence held at Fitchburg last night.

"This outrage parallels the cases of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac, who were so shamefully persecuted by Red Communists. It is almost beyond belief that such ruthless persecution could occur in the free world," he said.

"It is most deplorable that our Government should have been linked to this disgraceful incident in any way, but recent events demonstrate that in the minds of many people overseas," he asserted, "we are sharing the blame with the perpetrators of this dastardly act, and other abuses of colonialism."

"The charge that communism is responsible for Cyprus is ridiculous. The Greeks have fought communism with great vigor and success. Cyprus is the product of a brave people's aspirations for self-government," said PHILBIN.

"It is not enough for our Government to express sympathetic concern. If we would promote peace and collective security in the Middle East, we should move vigorously to secure the release of Archbishop Makarios, and to urge that the Cyprus question be considered on a basis of decency and fairness, and that no further violence and brutality be visited upon religious leaders and others who are seeking by legitimate means to secure the historic right of self-determination for which many nations have struggled and sacrificed.

"I have urged the State Department not only to use its good offices, but to do everything in its power to bring about the release of Archbishop Makarios and a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem, and also to strive for collective security so urgently needed in the Middle East," PHILBIN declared.

PHILBIN hailed the Greek people in this country for their "loyal citizenship and their eagerness to serve the Nation in war and peace." "You may well be proud of your fine contributions," he said.

"Greek Independence Day brings vividly to mind," PHILBIN continued, "the tireless and unselfish devotion of the Greek people to the cause of liberty and recalls the great debt which democracy and civilization owe to Greece for its imperishable benefits to every field of our way of life throughout the ages."

Tracing world history, the Clinton congressman said: "Take the Greeks out of history and there would be no civilization. Classic Greek culture developed and gave to the world the philosophy, the ethics, the science, the art and literature, the medicine, the astronomy, the mathematics, the principles of government and politics, and spiritual values that form an indispensable foundation stone of our modern society. You must ever be proud of this heritage of grandeur. The American people will ever be grateful for it."

President Eisenhower and Agricultural Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the American people need no assurance from anyone of the complete honesty, integrity, and devotion to the public interest of President Eisenhower.

He has demonstrated again those qualities in his courageous and unanswerable message accompanying his veto of H. R. 12.

During recent days, he has been confronted with a tremendously difficult problem. Neither he nor anyone else doubted the complete sincerity of many who supported H. R. 12. The fact that most of those Members of Congress have not joined in the specious and shallow criticism today of his action is convincing proof that they recognize his candid approach to this important problem, just as he recognizes their conscientiousness in reaching their decisions.

Any fair-minded person who will read the veto message must concede not only the President's grasp of this perplexing problem but his determination to act, so far as he can, in the best interests of those engaged in agriculture and of this Nation as a whole.

One paragraph states concisely the basic defect of H. R. 12, which was recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike when the conference report on it was before this House last Wednesday. Before quoting this paragraph from the message, I commend to all those interested a reading of portions of the RECORD of April 11, from page 6110 to page 6158,

and, particularly, the short, excellent statement of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] at page 6143. Certainly he expressed concisely and forcibly the overwhelming opinion of the farmers and consumers of New England and of the entire Northeast when he said: "Farmers do not want this bill; consumers can only be against it." There is every reason to believe that an increasing number of farmers elsewhere and the great body of American consumers will share emphatically that point of view as the President's veto message becomes more widely read and understood.

The paragraph to which I have referred is as follows:

H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good news for farmers and fair to all our people.

It is depressing and regrettable that a few, who should know better, have indulged in personalities and have resorted to shabby tactics in commenting upon the President's message this afternoon.

But quite apart from these trivial, self-seeking, and defensive comments by certain persons who were primarily responsible for the monstrosity which was presented to Congress and the President, the challenge is now quite specific and inescapable. In the hope that a reading of the RECORD will assist in spreading actual information as to the President's message, I want to quote the three concluding paragraphs, which were as follows:

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

This combined program of administrative action and legislation enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families.

Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

The President demonstrated that the executive branch of the Federal Government recognizes both the problem and the challenge confronting it. There is an equal responsibility now resting upon the Congress, and both the farmers and the consumers have every right to insist upon the prompt legislative action recommended by the President.

The Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, I would like to remind the Congress that I represent an important congressional district in which there are numerous small-business concerns. As we all know, the small-business man is the backbone of the American industrial system of free enterprise. It is the small-business man that is the very core of our economic life today—the man upon whom we have depended during the past century to elevate our Nation to a position where we now stand foremost among the earth's free republics.

Today, Mr. Speaker, quite understandably the small-business men of America are strongly concerned about their participation in the atomic-energy program on a prime contract level in the present race to develop peaceful uses of atomic energy. One of the very first spokesmen for small business to focus congressional attention on current problems of the small-business man was Mr. K. W. Van Eman, vice president of the Skinner Engine Co., of Erie, Pa.

Significantly, the Skinner Engine Co. has rendered outstanding service to our Nation since 1868 and is the builder of the world's largest marine uniflow engines. This great small-business enterprise has made outstanding contributions to the military and industrial life of our Nation now for more than 88 years.

In his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 5, Mr. Van Eman made crystal clear the need for immediate action by Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission to move forward with all possible speed toward the application of nuclear power for merchant marine surface vessels. With all the emphasis at his command, Mr. Van Eman also urged the Congress to assist small business in realining our program for atomic power plants and insisted that small business be permitted to join the parade of progress in the development of peaceful uses of man's most destructive force.

However, Mr. Speaker, during the course of his testimony Mr. Van Eman also issued an important warning to the Congress, and his admonition should not go unheeded.

Listen to his sage advice which I quote:

(1) The arrival of nuclear power is making obsolete not a minor industry but a very large industry in the United States today.

(2) The use of nuclear power will mean the rebuilding of our merchant fleet due to technological changes, age, and obsolescence.

(3) Small business in the maritime and powerplant industry will die on the vine because of lack of help and assistance to realine our program for atomic powerplants and join in the progress parade of the atomic field. In other words, as we see it, we are in the living or dying era so to speak, and will perish unless the doors are open to us.

Referring to the strategic vessels on our Great Lakes, Mr. Van Eman also pointed out that: "207 larger vessels on the Great Lakes are over 35 years of age. It has been the custom and accepted practice in the maritime industry since its inception to engage in prototype development. Herein lies the key to small business participation in the field of atomic development along commercial lines."

Much to the point, Mr. Van Eman further warned the Congress of the Soviet atomic race and quoted Mr. Kurchatov who heads the Soviet atomic development. He pointed out that an atomic-powered ice breaker is scheduled to be built before 1960 that is designed so that it would be refueled only once every 2 or 3 years.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was gratified to learn that our distinguished colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Armed Services Committee, has also focused public attention on the problems now confronting small business in the current atomic energy peacetime program. I have read with great interest the article written by Congressman PATTERSON that appears in the current issue of the authoritative Washington Atomic Energy Report. So significant is this article by Congressman PATTERSON that I wish to here include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN AND THE PEACETIME ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

(By JAMES T. PATTERSON, Representative in Congress from Connecticut and member of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee; written expressly for Washington Atomic Energy Report)

Arising from the new and glorious age in which man is transforming the most destructive force of nature into the most powerful source of energy for peaceful uses, is the problem of wider participation of American small-business men in the atomic energy program. Day by day, small-business men of America are intensifying their demands that our Government permit them to enter the current race to develop peaceful uses of the atom. We in Government cannot ignore these demands; for it was the small-business men who struggled unceasingly to elevate America to its present and unprecedented sphere of greatness.

As Representative of a congressional district that is largely industrial—and one in which small-business concerns abound—I am strongly concerned with the welfare of small business. Their economic welfare determines the livelihood of thousands upon thousands of residents of the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut that I have represented in Congress for almost 10 years. Of equal concern to me, of course, is the welfare of our entire Nation.

Participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of atomic energy gives rise to two fundamental questions: (1) Shall we liberalize present security policies of the Atomic Energy Commission, to facilitate the participation of small business, or (2) shall we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry on the peacetime program?

Concerning the question of liberalizing present security policies of the AEC, it is noteworthy that during World War II when a "crash" program was needed to develop atomic weapons, there was imperative need for top secrecy and utilization of a limited number of individuals to participate in the "Manhattan Project." Also, there was need to call upon our largest industries, for they were at the time better prepared to participate in such a "crash" program. However, the situation is somewhat different today with respect to peaceful uses of the atom.

For example, there is no longer any secrecy about the fundamentals of atomic energy. The basic theory was in fact known as early as 1906 when Albert Einstein wrote his celebrated theory: $E=MC^2$. Today the average high school student knows that controlled

fission from a properly sized mass of uranium will produce almost incredible heat and energy. In fact, numerous books have been written for high-school students since 1945 that explain in detail the fundamentals of atomic energy and reactors.

Top secrecy must be maintained with regard to the further development of atomic weapons. But in the field of peaceful uses of the atom, such secrecy is no longer necessary. It is my conviction that only through participation of small business in developing peaceful uses of the atom can the manifold applications of the atom be ultimately realized. To me it is obvious that the manifold peaceful applications of atomic energy cannot be enjoyed in their greatest extent so long as we continue to rely upon a comparatively small number of companies to carry forward the program of development. Further, in my opinion, many small-business concerns will be doomed if they are denied participation in developing peaceful uses of the atom. This feeling is shared by many small-business men.

Consequently, I believe that we must reexamine our policies and set a goal that will provide for early participation of small-business men in the program for development of peaceful uses of the atom.

A Just and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 16, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD an address I made on Easter Sunday, April 1, over Radio Station WHK, in Cleveland, on a just and lasting peace:

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE

Today is Easter Sunday. For the whole Christian world, this means that Christ, the King, has arisen. This is a period of prayerful rejoicing. It is a time when all good Christians take renewed hope for a better future for all mankind.

This year the Jewish Passover comes at the same time as the Christian Easter Holy Week. For the Jews, the season of the Passover is a time of thanksgiving for relief from the persecution of King Pharaoh. For them it is a time to remember the plagues which struck Pharaoh for his cruel persecution of the Jews. It is a time when all Jews renew their faith in the fatherhod of God and the brotherhod of man.

I believe, therefore, this to be an excellent occasion for us to take an inventory and to examine the prospects for a better future for all mankind.

Most of the people of the world yearn for an era of genuine peace. The Christian-Judean world strives for a just and lasting peace, and that is a peace built upon immutable moral principles. Other religions of the world such as the Moslems, the Buddahists, and the Hindu, seek a similar goal.

On the other hand, the leaders of world communism continue their cruel warfare against all civilization. These same leaders proclaim the doctrine that if needs be, three-quarters of all mankind must perish in order that communism may prevail throughout the world.

Against this background, I am going to explore the prospects for a just and lasting peace. Last summer, all the world witnessed what became known as the meeting at the summit. There President Eisenhower, the leaders of France and Great Britain, and the rulers of Soviet Russia met in what was described as an effort to reduce world tensions.

At Geneva hundreds of pictures were taken of the Russian rulers with President Eisenhower and other leaders of the free world. These pictures emphasized positions and postures of warm friendship. At the climax point of this so-called meeting at the summit President Eisenhower announced to the world his belief that the Russian Communists were as sincere in their desire for peace as were the leaders of the free world.

From these events which were explained over and over again to all the people of the free world, there developed a great uplift in the hopes of the American people for that era of peace to which they so ardently aspired. There was talk about a spirit of Geneva which carried with it great promises of things to come. When the Geneva Conference at the so-called summit ended, people of the free world heaved a sigh of relief. There appeared to be an almost immediate relaxation among the nations which had found it necessary to rearm, to maintain large standing armies, and to build alliances in order to hold back the tidal wave of communism.

Upon his return to Great Britain, Prime Minister Anthony Eden announced at the London Airport that the cold war was over and that a new era for all the people of the world had been ushered in. He assured the British people of peace in our time.

Upon his return to France, Minister Pinay assured the French people that the danger of war had passed and that world tensions, many of which beset the French Empire, would soon settle down. The new spirit of Geneva held out for the French people hopes which they had not enjoyed since the days between the great wars.

Here in the United States, great optimism was expressed in the belief that the Russian Communists were prepared to amend their ways and to begin acting like responsible members of civilization. Here and there a note of caution was raised that we had best await the carrying into effect of the Geneva spirit by concrete deeds rather than the platitudes of promises which had been generated at the luncheons and the press conferences attending the meetings at Geneva.

It was but a few days after the breakup of the Geneva Conference that word leaked out from Russian-occupied East Germany to the effect that Communist Party boss Khrushchev, en route from Geneva to Moscow, had made it known to the Communist elite that there was no change whatever in fundamental Communist doctrine or policy. To some, this news was shocking because Khrushchev had been one of those who took part in the Geneva Conference. Still others brushed aside this startling news, charging it off to those elements of society who are unwilling to try to find a modus vivendi with the Communist rulers.

Shortly thereafter, the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union met at the historic summit of Geneva to work out the details of the spirit of Geneva in order that the dangerous tensions which gripped the world could be eliminated and the way opened to a just and lasting peace. It was soon discovered, however, that when the conferences moved from pleasant lunches and press conferences to the business of agreeing to specific methods for removing world tensions, the spirit of Geneva burst like a toy balloon in the hands of a mischievous child. The Russian Communists made it crystal clear that what they meant by the spirit of Geneva was that the West should accept their program of peaceful coexistence—their program of peaceful coexistence being nothing short of complete surrender on the part of the free world.

Thus the Communist leaders demonstrated their complete insincerity in their claims to support a program for relaxation of world tensions and for a just world peace.

Only a few months later on, the world was shocked when Communist Party boss Khrushchev and his traveling companion, Bulganin, both of whom had been the spokesmen for the Russian rulers at Geneva, engaged in a provocative propaganda campaign against the United States, Great Britain, and France.

This was done on the occasion of their visits to India, Burma, and Afghanistan. These same rulers branded the American people as imperialists and exploiters as well as warmongers.

But still the propaganda drums of the Kremlin beat out the dirge of peaceful coexistence. The protestations of the Kremlin leaders for peace and good will become louder with each successive attack they make against the sincerity and integrity of all the leaders of the free world.

In February of this year the 20th socalled congress meeting of the Communist Party was held in Moscow. At this meeting the official policy of the world Communist movement was set forth as well as the tactics to be employed in carrying out those policies. The decisions taken at that meeting serve as instructions to members of the Communist movement everywhere in the world.

The key policy speech was given by Communist Party boss Khrushchev, and I just want to quote one small part of Khrushchev's 6-hour speech because it clearly explains the true Communist intention toward the goal of a just and lasting peace:

"Intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all the ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature, and art."

In addition, instructions were given that steps of subversion and violence were to be increased in those nations which offered the greatest resistance to Communist takeover. Thus the leaders in the Kremlin single out the United States as a specific victim of their new tactics to conquer the world for communism.

You and I can see from this summary of basic events which have taken place within the past 9 months that the Christian-Judean world is still a long way off from its goal of a just and lasting peace. It is becoming increasingly clear that the hope of all mankind which reached an almost unprecedented pinnacle in response to the proclamation of the spirit of Geneva, have been dashed upon the dangerous rocks of false promises.

It may be a bit too early to measure the full damage done to the hopes of all mankind for a just and lasting peace as a consequence of the meetings which took place at Geneva between President Eisenhower and other leaders of the West and the Russian rulers, but it is not too late for the free world to learn some valuable lessons from the broken spirit of Geneva.

In my judgment, the first lesson we must relearn is that basic Communist doctrine holds that peace in the world is only possible when all the world is under Communist rule. The Communist leaders have made it clear that they have not changed in the least this basic doctrine. Communist Party Boss Khrushchev stated that there is no more chance for change in the basic Communist doctrine than there is in developing a shrimp that can whistle.

The Communists will shift their tactics at any time in order to confuse and mislead their intended victims. Stalin once said that it is sometimes necessary to take 1 step back in order to take 2 steps forward. This is a typical example of the Russian strategy that was employed at the so-called conferences at Geneva.

The just and lasting peace which the Christian and Judean world so earnestly yearns and strives for, cannot be won by the simple utterances of high sounding phrases or by platitudinous promises sealed by a toast accompanied by the clinking of glasses filled with martini cocktails. That just and lasting peace can be won and maintained only by the acceptance of those moral principles which support civilized mankind everywhere in the world.

In the true spirit of Eastertide, we must find renewed hope for a better future for all mankind. Our faith in God demands that we never lose courage in the face of difficulties. On this Easter Sunday, man's spirits must be raised up and dedicated to the emancipation of all those nations which today still suffer the degradation of enslavement and tyranny by the Russian Communists.

With a firm faith in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, we will somehow find our way through to that golden era of a universal, just and lasting peace.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Malcolm E. Nygren, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Bless our country, O Lord.

Protect it, we pray, not only from the strength of its enemies, but from the weakness of those who love it.

Guide us as we bear the dangerous responsibility of being free men. Deliver us from the temptation to degrade the freedom to do what we think right into the freedom to do as we please.

Help us to build in our country a future that is worthy of its past. Grant us Thy guidance for difficult decisions, Thy strength in times that call for courage, Thy hope when our hopes fail; that we may serve Thy will as free men ought. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POLISH PORK

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, upon occasion nearly all of us like ham sandwiches, but sandwiches made out of Red, spelled with a capital "R," ham coming from communistic satellite of Poland are unpalatable and leave a bitter taste in the mouth.

The majority, that is Democrat, leadership in the Congress, House and Senate, can by a very simple amendment stop the competition of Red Poland's pork with American pork products now in surplus.

With one simple amendment, the majority—Democrat—party in Congress can help not only the American farmer but the American taxpayer by making unnecessary the purchase of 20 million pounds of American surplus pork.

Without such an amendment, the administration and the Department of Agriculture are powerless to stop the flood of Polish pork into the United States of America.

In 1954, Poland pork products arriving in this country amounted to 20,305,000 pounds, valued at $17,483,000.

In 1955, the imports were 24,864,000; the value $19,173,000.

Theoretically, Poland was to use the proceeds of these sales to buy American agricultural surpluses.

In 1954, Poland bought $4,000 worth; in 1955, $700,000.

What did Poland buy with all these other millions and where did she spend these United States dollars? Your guess is as good as mine.

I hope immediate relief from this flood of Red pork is forthcoming. Were Poland free, as it once was, and we hope and pray it will again be, the situation we face would be different.

The Democrats—now in the majority—have the votes to do it, if they but have the desire and will to do so.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE CORPORATE TAX BURDEN

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the need for tax relief by the small business concerns of this country admittedly is not a new subject. For years we have recognized the need of these enterprises for additional funds with which to expand operations, to modernize plant and equipment, to develop new products and markets and for other legitimate business purposes. The Congress has long supported the thesis that a Federal agency was necessary to fill the gap for intermediate and long-term loans to small business which could not be supplied by private financial institutions. The volume of small business loans made by the RFC and the SBA has been clearly indicative of the need by small firms for this additional financing.

Despite the recognized need for such credit, Mr. Speaker, it does not get at the root of the financial problems of small business. The demand of small business concerns for longer-term credit is almost entirely the result of an oppressive tax burden. We must give these firms the lawful right to retain a greater portion of their earnings. If this is done, there will be a tremendous strengthening of competitive position of small business. This course of action will enable small business to make a greater contribution to the defense effort and will place our peacetime economy on a more firm foundation.

Tax benefits did accrue to small firms during the 83d Congress when we had an extensive revision of the Internal Revenue Code. Small firms have benefitted from changes in methods of computing depreciation, dividends received credit, partnership filings, handling of research and experimental expenditures, net operating loss deductions and other provisions. The Small Business Committee of the 83d Congress earnestly supported all of these revisions.

In its final report to the 83d Congress—House Report 2683—however, the Small Business Committee stated that current tax rates had acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small-business enterprises, and I quote from a portion of that report—pages 59–60:

> This committee is of the opinion that current tax rates have acted as a major deterrent to an improved competitive status for small-business enterprises. As mentioned earlier, many small concerns have been unable to retain sufficient earnings after taxes to finance necessary expansion through additoins to working capital and fixed assets. Lack of capital has, therefore, placed undue emphasis on longer-term borrowing which in itself has been difficult to obtain. It is felt that a healthier climate for small business might be achieved through further relief fom the tax burden.
>
> Many beneficial changes have resulted from congressional action on H. R. 8300 which produced revisions in the Internal Revenue Code of both a substantive and procedural nature. Financial benefits have also accrued to small concerns through reduction in personal income tax rates and in excise and sales taxes. Many small corporations also benefited by the expiration of the excess-profits tax. The committee believes, nevertheless, that a continuing study must be conducted to determine how more effective relief may be achieved, with particular attention paid to the possibility of higher exemptions or reduced income-tax rates for small firms.

I should like to point out to my colleagues that these statements were made after a careful examination of the financial problems of small concerns, through subcommittee hearings, consultation with individual small-business men and staff studies.

As we all know the corporate tax consists of a normal tax of 30 percent and a surtax of 22 percent on that part of a corporation's income in excess of $25,000 and that an extension has been passed which carries these tax rates through March 31, 1957. It is quite obvious that such high rates cannot long continue to be absorbed by small corporations in the lower income groups. We are now talking about some 80 percent of the corporate tax returns filed for 1952 which were on net income of $25,000 and less. But, it is almost as obvious for the 13.6 percent of corporations earning from $25,000 to $100,000.

Mr. Speaker, can anyone tell me that when the Federal Government takes almost a third of your $25,000 that what remains is enough to permit the purchase of even two machines, the addition of a wing to the present factory structure or the introduction of a new product into the market? It is absurd to ex-

pect a small concern to improve its competitive position through the use of retained earnings when 30 percent of its income is taken away, if it is a poor year, and when 52 percent of its income is taken, if it has had a reasonably profitable year.

Our subcommittee in the 83d Congress learned that a small firm has difficulty compensating for loss years which frequently occur during the early years after organization of the company. Similarly after having established a place for itself in our competitive system, it is unable to improve on its growth. For a small firm to stand still is to lose the competitive battle and eventually to give up entirely.

I wish to cite from our subcommittee's tax report of 1953 a good illustration of the difficulty encountered by a small firm in its effort to grow. This company's growth was demonstrated by an increase in sales of from $35,700 in 1946 to $896,500 in 1952. During this time there were 2 loss years but in the last year taxable earnings amounted to $66,600. Now if a major portion of those earnings had been allowed to remain with the company for reinvestment we would have had no complaint. But, of course, this did not happen. The Federal Government took $39,000, leaving a little over $27,000. In fact, we were told that for 7 years of operation the company had taxable earnings of some $241,000, of which the Federal Government took almost $111,000. Certainly no one can deny that this company was being penalized for its efficient management and that its incentive to further growth under these circumstances would be reduced or destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, we need this kind of a company in our economy. Give them a chance to compete on equal terms with firms which became large during earlier years when tax rates were lower. Otherwise, the big will get bigger and the small will get smaller or disappear altogether.

H. R. 9851 will answer the greater problem of incorporated small businesses, namely, the opportunity to grow and expand through earnings.

POLISH HAMS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman from Kansas who made such an eloquent plea on the subject of the importation of Polish hams and said that the Democrats could stop it if they had the desire to do so, that it is not necessary for the Congress to take any action at all. There is adequate legislation on the books, and the administration can stop the thing in 5 minutes, if they so desire. So I would like to pass the buck back to the gentleman from Kansas. If there is any blame involved, the blame lies with the administration, and not with the Congress.

AMENDING UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the admission of single persons to federally assisted low rent housing projects.

I want to bring this to the attention of my colleagues in the conviction that the considerations that led to the passage of the Housing Act itself and their undoubted concern for the welfare of aged people who are single or who have lost a husband or wife will persuade them to support this measure.

It is a subject that is of profound concern to me and that justifies the concern of all of us.

The aged widows and widowers and other single people who have reached an advanced age are an integral part of the American people. Their well-being should be and is important to us; indeed, elementary considerations of human sympathy and a decent respect for the difficulties and trials of old-age justify prompt action in their behalf.

With the rise in the general age level of the American people, the group of elderly men and women is growing and their condition is knocking at our consciences. We must not fail them. We must at the very least make adequate provision for such aged, single people to be able to live in the public housing that take the place of the slum buildings from which, in many cases, they have had to remove.

To require them to take up quarters in a completely new neighborhood alien to their past memories and personal histories is to add still another burden to the many heavy burdens of old age. To impose upon them drastic alternatives requiring, in many cases, that they live with a member of their family is to complicate their lives and the lives of their family still further.

It appears to me only fitting and proper that the Congress of the United States as representative of all of the people, not just of the young or middle-aged and not just of those with families, should give due consideration to the plight of these single elderly men and women.

My bill makes the required provision for them. I hope it will be acted upon promptly and favorably and I appeal for the support of all the Congressmen of both parties for this essential relief.

HERB PLEWS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be out in Griffith Stadium this afternoon for the opening game of the American League season.

One of the reasons is that I would like to see a Montana boy in action again. He is Herb Plews, one of the few Montanans ever to make the major leagues.

Herb, a second baseman from East Helena, recently came to the Senators from Denver, where he batted .302 last year.

Herb went to grade school in East Helena, high school in Helena. He attended the University of Illinois, where he captained the baseball team his senior year.

As a neighbor, I saw Herb play sandlot and American League junior baseball. His joining the Washington Baseball Club has made Senator fans all over western Montana. They will follow the team with interest this year.

I am proud of Herb. The people of the Helena area are proud of him. His will be a bright future.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in this information about Herb Plews from the press-radio-TV guide of the Washington Nationals:

Plews, Herbert E.: Born June 14, 1928, at Helena, Mont.; 5 feet 11 inches; 165 pounds; bats left and throws right; wears glasses. Herbie's a pesky, spray-type hitter, patterned on the lines of Nelson Fox and Billy Goodman. He's a good playmaker around second base but plays third base well also. A hustler who never walks when he can run, he came to the Nats from the Yankee organization in a seven-player trade last winter.

Year	Club	BA
1950	Quincy	.295
1951–52	In military service	
1953	Binghamton	.215
1953	Norfolk	.304
1954	Birmingham	.299
1955	Denver	.302

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include therewith extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire at this point as to the program for today?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad my friend, the gentleman from New York, makes that inquiry. There will be no legislative business today. I am glad that the gentleman has given me this opportunity to advise the Members of that fact.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman. The information is very illuminating.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECRUITMENT OF YOUNG MEN FOR OUR FOREIGN SERVICE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you and to the House for the opportunity to speak today. It might sound paradoxical to say I have waited 8 years to make these remarks in this particular place because I have made them in a hundred places throughout the country before college students, veterans' organizations, businessmen, women's organizations and many other groups. All of them embraced at least the germ of what I propose. All of us know that we are now engaged in a new form of the cold war. It has been called an economic war. All of us know that to fight this particular phase of the cold war requires what a distinguished gentleman has called an agonizing reappraisal.

Yesterday I heard three great reporters just returned from Asia, where they visited Japan, India, Pakistan, and other places, stating coldly and factually that we are losing the cold war in Asia.

The other day I read an item in a Washington paper which stated that American industry is sending more talent scouts than ever before to colleges and universities this year in a scramble for the most valuable of raw materials, eager, educated young men and women. One company alone, the Bell Telephone System, expects to interview 13,000 students on 300 campuses, and to employ 3,200 of them at salaries of between $350 and $400 a month. The United States Steel has 56 men touring the campuses looking for 1,000 graduates. General Motors is seeking 2,800. General Electric expects to put on 1,000, or 20 percent more than last year.

I suppose on those campuses there are some rather lonely figures representing the State Department of the United States Government, but I am very sure that they are in the minority and I am very sure that they are not and cannot bring into this great economic war the eager, intelligent young men and women that we so desperately need.

It has been suggested from time to time in Washington and elsewhere that we should create in this country a sort of West Point for diplomacy. It is a pleasant idea, revived every 2 or 3 years, but nothing ever happens. Even if tomorrow the go-ahead signal was given for such a college, it would take from 10 to 15 years to bring into our Foreign Service the full weight of the knowledge acquired by those students.

I wonder if anyone here or elsewhere would say that we can afford to wait 12 or 15 years in this economic war.

I suggest that the United States Government reach out, as does private industry, to the campuses of our Nation, recruiting several thousand young men and women and then giving them on-the-job training. I do not propose that we send those young people to the various continents as handout boys, as just additional hands to give away of our sustenance. I suggest that we send them out as economic troops, as young people who not only can make sure that our way of life and our way of thinking is taught to the people of those countries, but also can look for opportunities for the investment of private capital from our country in those other countries.

I think this is a job not for Congress alone but for the Congress, the President, the State Department, and the American people. It may be asked why, if I am so interested in this, I have not introduced a bill. The reason is quite simple. I do not believe that a bill introduced by an individual Member of this House who is not a member of a powerful committee, who has not great seniority, would get very far. I think the time has arrived in the current of world affairs when we should cast partisanship entirely aside and forge the weapons we need in this economic cold war. Then we could proceed to fashion them from the material we have at hand.

It would seem very absurd to all of us if the Russians tomorrow were to challenge, say, the New York Yankees, whom I understand are helping open the season here today, to a world series. We would say that such a series would be duck soup for us, that we could beat the Russians handily. It should be equally absurd for the Russians to challenge us to an economic war. They are challenging us at the point of what should be our greatest strength, and yet observers who have just come back from these far-off places tell us that at least in the opening round of the economic war we are losing, losing in many places.

I have often felt that the young people of our country, and there are many of them in Washington at this time of the year, have felt consciously or subconsciously that there is a silken curtain between them and opportunity to serve their country in foreign fields unless that opportunity is accompanied by the obligation to carry a rifle into those places. When my son was in college I was intrigued when I heard him and his young friends talk about what they were going to do when they received their diplomas. Some were planning to be lawyers, some doctors or businessmen, some newspapermen, but in all those conversations upon which I eavesdropped, I never heard one of those young men suggest that he wanted to go into the Foreign Service of the United States.

I know there are many people who will say that the young people do not want to go into the State Department because you get kicked around too much there, you are accused of disloyalty, and so forth. I do not think that is true. I think the reason the young people do not aim for those particular jobs is they feel they are reserved for certain people in our society, that you must have money, social background, or political pull, that it is much easier to become a scientist or a doctor than it is to become a representative of the Government of the United States in the foreign field.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Gladly.

Mr. BOW. I should like to say to the gentleman I appreciate what he is talking about, the Foreign Service. Recently I have been receiving letters from my congressional district from students asking me about the Foreign Service. The principal of one of the high schools asked me if I would speak to the high-school group on the Foreign Service.

I checked with the State Department and found that they have several people who are willing to and do go out to address high schools and colleges to explain the Foreign Service to them and try to get recruits from all over the country.

I suggest this to the gentleman at this point so that other Members who have similar requests may know that the State Department is interested in the recruiting of young men all over the country and are willing to speak to groups of them.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I thank the gentleman. If my remarks can in any way be interpreted as a criticism of the State Department, I regret it. I do believe that the State Department is doing exactly what the gentleman says, but it is doing it in a very limited way, because we ourselves by law have limited opportunities in the Foreign Service. We do not hesitate, if the cold war takes a hot turn, to build bigger and better bombs; we do not hesitate to invest tens of millions of dollars in new battleships we hope will never have to fire a gun in anger.

I suggest that the economic war, in the final long race between the free world and the Communist world, is just as important as the other phases of the cold war. The State Department—and I shall point out later why I believe so—would, in my opinion, welcome it if the Congress and the President jointly would say: We are going to create a division of economic cooperation in the State Department; we are going to recruit that division from our colleges and from the ranks of discharged servicemen, and we are going to send them out to speak for Main Street and Cripple Creek in the United States.

We have all had the experience when we lose a battle in a war of hearing people in our community say reluctantly: We lost that battle. Why do we say "We"? Because our sons or our neighbors' sons were in the ranks or even commanded troops. But when we lose a diplomatic battle we do not say "We." We say "They." We disassociate ourselves as a people from those who represent us in foreign affairs, unconsciously, perhaps, but we do it.

That is why I say that not only do we need the intelligence and the zeal of our young people but we also need Main Street in our Foreign Service so that we will support it just as zealously as we do our troops in combat.

I have great admiration for the State Department but I think it is being forced to function under outdated rules, pre-atomic-age rules, and, in my opinion, the time has come when we must take our Foreign Service out of the drawing room and send it into the market place where American genius has always triumphed.

I cannot help thinking of a memorandum I sent 3 years ago on this subject to a friend of mine in the White House. I hoped it would come to the attention

of the President. I said that it was possible under our system for a young man from Kansas or elsewhere to aspire to be and become the top general in our Army, and it was possible for him also to aspire to be and become President of the United States, but that, perhaps, with the difficulties in the way, it was just as well for that young man if he did not aspire to the Foreign Service or to become an ambassador.

I know that a plan of this kind costs money, but I know also that every year we vote 35 or 40 billion here for national defense. I know that in the very near future we are going to have a rather heated discussion here about foreign aid, a proposed $4,900,000,000 appropriation in that field. I say to you that what we should do in the foreign field diplomatically and economically is a national-defense problem and is in a sense a foreign-aid problem. In my opinion, we would be just as much justified in using some of these funds for this division in the economic war as we are in using them for a battleship that we hope we will not have to use or for aid to a foreign country. If we embark upon this plan we should make very clear that we do not want a division limited to Phi Beta Kappas, although I admire Phi Beta Kappas, never having reached that particular goal myself.

I think we have a new form of diplomacy in the world today, a diplomacy which involves more than the knowledge of a dozen languages or more than the graceful art of dangling a teacup precisely. I think there are places throughout this world where we could use a rough, tough halfback from the University of Michigan, for example. I think we have in our young people the greatest missionaries anywhere in the world. I would like to see them go out and take on this issue of nationalism, for example. That, as we know, has been most difficult to handle, because nationalism in and of itself is not bad. We are a great Nation today because we believed firmly in nationalism. But, nationalism is being perverted in this cold war. It is being used as a tool for evil purposes, and by the Communists. I think some of our young people could spread very well indeed the idea, the conviction, that we are not interested in this country in colonialism. I think they could spread before the peoples of those countries, and talk their languages while they are doing it, that our own country has backed away at every step from colonialism.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say that this should be done all at once. I know the difficulties involved. I know that it is a plan that will require the best efforts of the best minds in our Government, but I do feel that we should not wait too long. Perhaps this year we should attempt a pilot plan. Let us get out to those campuses or to the places where our young men are discharged from the services and enroll, recruit, perhaps 500 of them this year. Give them this on-the-job training and send them out, and then we will have an opportunity to see if the plan will really work. I think it is an opportunity for a real demontration of bipartisanship in connection with foreign policy.

You might ask if I have ever talked about this with anyone in the State Department. The answer is "Yes"; not with the Secretary of State, but about 3 years ago I happened to be at an affair which was attended by a very able diplomat, a very able member of our State Department. His name was John Peurifoy. We know that he met a tragic end not too long ago. I had the temerity to ask John Peurifoy where he went to school. He told me that he had an appointment to West Point and that after a year he became ill. He had a lung infection or something of that sort. He could not go back to West Point when he left the hospital, and he obtained a job as assistant manager of a diner in Queens County, New York City. He came to Washington as a laborer in the Botanical Garden. Finally he obtained a job as clerk in the State Department and went on to a record of which we are all proud. John Peurifoy was the kind of man that I have in mind as I speak today. We know what he did for us in Greece, in Guatemala, and what he was doing for us at the time of his death in Thailand. And I think one reason he was so successful was that he spoke the language of the people of this country; and if you speak the language of the people of this country, of Main Street, you will be surprised at how readily that language is accepted by the people of Main Street anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have in our country among our fine young people 10,000 potential John Peurifoys. Nine thousand or more of them will become doctors or lawyers or businessmen. They will listen to the Bell Telephone Co., General Electric Co., or General Motors. They will not think of a place in the Foreign Service because they believe it is closed to them. I say we should reach out for them and enlist them in the most important undertaking before our country today. I think we should send salesmen for Americanism into every corner of the earth. I think we would, at far less cost than other courses, bring a successful end to the economic cold war.

NINTH ANNUAL RAVENSWOOD BANQUET

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the Members of this distinguished body to come to West Virginia, in the heart of the beautiful Ohio River Valley, to attend the ninth annual Ravenswood $5 banquet.

In 1948, the Ravenswood townspeople decided that they would raise some money for the local schools by having a banquet. They formed the Ravenswood School Improvement Association and asked the president of West Virginia University to be the first speaker. They also decided that their banquet would be different. They would get all the food and all the work donated, and then turn around and require everyone—cooks, waiters, school officials, and even the honored guests—to pay $5 for his meal. West Virginia University's president came, spoke, and paid his $5. Financially the banquet was successful and the Ravenswood group decided to make it an annual affair. Since that spring in 1948 there have been seven other banquets. Each has increased in size. Each has brought in more money for the Ravenswood schools. Some of the speakers at this banquet have been a Governor of West Virginia; Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky; and the industrialist, Henry J. Kaiser. By the way, Ravenswood is the site of the Kaiser aluminum sheet and ore reduction plants now being built at a cost of $216 million.

This year, America's greatest electrical engineer, Phillip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Co., is the speaker at the banquet, which will be held at the Ravenswood High School gymnasium on April 23. A former Member of the House, Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, will be the toastmaster.

There are five reasons that I would like you to accompany me to Ravenswood for this ninth annual banquet:

First, we need your $5.

Secondly, your distinguished presence will contribute to the success of the affair.

Thirdly, you should come to West Virginia to see how the people in this Eden of America do things and, consequently, will be in a better position to help your own more backward district.

Fourthly, you will be doing yourself a great disfavor if you miss the unmatchable cooking of the ladies of Ravenswood, and

Finally, we need your $5.

GENERAL GRUENTHER'S RETIREMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the announcement from the White House that General Gruenther is retiring at the end of 1956 came as a great shock, I am sure, to most Members of Congress, and particularly to those Members who have had an opportunity to know him.

Only 3 weeks ago, General Gruenther was in Washington and appeared before congressional committees urging a continuation of the foreign aid program.

According to the White House announcement, General Gruenther is retiring at 57 years of age in good health with an accumulation of wisdom and experience as an officer of the United States Army, and as Supreme Commander of NATO for personal reasons.

It is my belief that every Member of Congress who has had an opportunity to know General Gruenther rates him as a first-class intellect in our military establishment. The United States has a great investment in General Gruenther. It educated him, trained him, and sustained him throughout his entire life. At the height of his career, in the full flower of his vigor, and with a vast accumulation of knowledge, it is announced that he is retiring, and no better excuse is offered than that of personal reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to know exactly why General Gruenther is retiring, and I think General Gruenther owes the people of the United States a more adequate explanation than has been made.

I am gravely concerned about the welfare of our Nation if our top generals are to leave us in this way at a most critical time in our history. I cannot believe that the General himself would walk out without the most compelling reasons for doing so.

At 57 years of age, I think it is not too much to expect that an officer who has attained the rank of full general should be expected to continue to give his services to his country if his health is good.

I believe that General Gruenther is truly an outstanding man. I have great admiration for him. I am deeply distressed over his departure from active duty, at a time when there is such a dearth of greatness and leadership in the free world.

We should know why he is leaving us.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower sent his message of veto of H. R. 12 to the House on yesterday, he wrecked the hopes of literally hundreds of thousands of American farm families. For practical purposes he took the shoes off millions of farm children throughout this Nation. He blasted the fond hopes of hundreds of thousands of farm wives that they might have paper on their walls or covers on their floors. He laid the Nation open to the possibility of the repetition of the debacle of 1929.

The President's veto of the farm bill came as a cruel blow to the men and women who are dependent on the production of food and fiber for their livelihood.

For 5 years, many of the farmers of the West and particularly of the Southwest have battled searing drought. This spring their prospects are the darkest since that country was placed in cultivation.

For an equal period of time, the farmers of the eastern seaboard have had to contend with recurrent hurricanes. Each year their losses mount.

Farmers realize that their Government is not responsible for the weather, but they have rather naturally hoped their Government would be a little more, not less, interested in their welfare at a time when nature seems to have forsaken them.

The period of economic readjustment after a great war, is always difficult. It is not less difficult for farmers than it is for industry, but our Government has at all times recognized the problems of industrial readjustment. At the close of World War II we paid our industries $41 billion in round figures, for losses on contracts which were never completed because the need no longer existed. A few years later, when the Korean war broke out, we had to pay many of these same industries to reconvert to war work. Right now, in the year of 1956 we are extending to them more than $800 million, per year in the way of accelerated tax write-offs. I am not criticizing. I think we should deal fairly with industry but I have heard some of the very beneficiaries of this costly arrangement speak very sneeringly of our efforts to give farmers a comparable reconversion program.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman, who certainly is one of the best-informed members of the Committee on Agriculture as well as a conferee on H. R. 12, agree that the biggest issue so far as the farm problem is concerned is the question of farm income and the question of farm income this year?

Mr. POAGE. That is it exactly.

Mr. ALBERT. The question of the disposition of surpluses, while it is an important question, is not as important immediately as the question of raising farm income.

Mr. POAGE. Of course not.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not a fact that the soil bank, which, through the acreage-reserve program, will eat up a part of the allotted acreage, is actually an income-depressing device in that you take out of production a part of the allotted crops, rather than an income-increasing device?

Mr. POAGE. It will indeed. I hope to elaborate on that and to show to everyone who is interested that the soil bank alone when operated without combination with some other program will actually reduce the income of the entire United States by exactly the amount that is spent on the soil bank, which is estimated to be $1,200,000,000.

Here let me take just a moment to review the events which led up to our overgenerous farm production of recent years. Actually when World War II broke out, we had a full generation of first class but unused research and scientific knowledge neatly catalogued and filed. All during the twenties and thirties farm income had been so low that farmers had not been able to apply the practices they knew were desirable. We were farming as well as we could afford, not as well as we knew how. Crop yields were not much higher in 1940 than they were in 1920.

Then came the war. The world needed food and fiber. Prices shot up. So did our patriotic fervor. Farmers were urged to produce as a patriotic duty. "Food will win the war and write the peace." Farmers believed this. They went to work determined to do their full part.

The same war gave a tremendous impetus to the production of nitrates for explosives. Shortly, those new cheaper nitrates were showing up as fertilizers. Farmers poured them into the soil. Production zoomed. Farmers, short of help, invested in all kinds of new machinery, till the investment per worker in American agriculture is today $14,389, compared with an investment of only $13,000 per worker in industry.

Of course, industry tooled up also but when the war ended, the Government never looked back. It paid the bill for reconversion.

When the war came labor demanded and received higher wages, a longer work week and greatly enlarged fringe benefits. When the war ended labor found that our economy did not need the production of a 48-hour week. The hours were cut back, but not the take-home pay. Again, I am not complaining or criticizing. I think labor should receive generous treatment. I only ask, how can the farmer exist if he is not treated somewhat comparably with labor and industry?

Has the farmer received too much? The President seems to think so. Actually the per capita income of farm people from all sources stands at only $865 per year as against a national average for nonfarm people of $1,913 per year, and nearly one-third of that meager income attributed to farmers was earned from nonfarm sources. In other words, a great many farmers are able to stay on the farm only because they or some member of their family works off the farm.

Of course, the misfortunes of the farmer should not be used as an excuse to impose on the consumer. So, maybe we should see just how the consumer has fared under 90-percent supports and how he is doing today. The consumer is paying a constantly decreasing share of his—or her—food dollar to the farmer—38 cents today as against 53 cents in 1946. Yet during that time, gross national production has increased by 50 percent, wages are up 60 percent, and corporate profits are up 74 percent. And still the American public is able to buy more food in exchange for less hours of labor than any people at any time in history.

In most of those cases where there is complaint about retail prices it might be well to look before we condemn the farmer as the culprit. Within the last few days, I have had a number of wires calling on me to oppose this farm bill on the theory that it would raise the price of wheat and would therefore "place a tax on bread." This is an ingenious argument. It looks sound on its face. I fear the President has accepted it. Let us look at the facts.

Ten years ago wheat was selling for $3 per bushel in the United States. Bread sold for an average of 13.3 cents per pound. Today wheat is bringing about $2 per bushel and bread is selling for an average of about 18 cents per pound. No farm program caused that rise. During the past year the price of

hogs has dropped 38 percent. The retail price of pork has dropped only 14 percent during the same time. The shirt I am wearing cost, I believe, $4.95. Twenty years ago it would have cost no more than $1.50. At today's price of cotton it contains about 25 cents worth of cotton. The farmers' 90-percent support could hardly account for the 300-percent increase in the price.

But I believe the need of the farmer is too clear to need further argument.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express my appreciation for the splendid analysis which the gentleman is making of the farm situation today, and to ask him this question: Can the gentleman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, tell me what magical new qualities and provisions have been added to the soil bank in the last few months which makes it acceptable, when about 9 months ago the Secretary of Agriculture was informing the Congress that the same proposal would not work?

Mr. POAGE. I doubt that anything significant has been added during the last months, at least up until last night. I see 2 gentlemen on the floor, 1 on the Democratic side, 1 on the Republican side, who introduced soil-bank legislation more than a year ago, I believe it was a year ago last January; was it not?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Two years ago.

Mr. POAGE. Two years ago. I have here with me today a copy of letters from the Department of Agriculture written less than 9 months ago condemning this soil bank, in which the Secretary advises the Committee on Agriculture that he then considered it too expensive and unworkable.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The hearings before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture will show that on January 28, 1954, Mr. Benson in direct answer to a question I asked with reference to what was wrong with the general principle of establishing such a soil bank informed us that in his opinion it was unworkable. He said there were many things wrong with the principles of such a program.

Mr. POAGE. Yes; and yet he was for it in January 1956.

The gentleman from Oklahoma asked me what has happened recently; I will tell him what happened. Last night I listened to the President's speech over the radio, that campaign speech he delivered last night, and I will tell you what happened then. It was not in the veto message that he sent up here yesterday, but last night he proposed to place the farmers further in debt and that we should go into 1957 and take 50 percent of the funds he proposed to pay to farmers for soil-bank compliance in 1957 and to pay them out before the election in 1956. Maybe that is the answer to the gentleman's question; maybe that is what has happened in recent days, in recent hours to make the soil bank more acceptable to some individuals than it was heretofore.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I was just wondering if in view of what the gentleman has just said about the soil bank that he will personally support the President's suggestion that following the veto vote tomorrow we promptly enact the soil bank.

Mr. POAGE. I expect we will go along with a soil bank. I served on the committee, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania did, that wrote H. R. 12; but I voted for it and I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania did.

I served on the conference committee and worked out the bill that we brought to the Congress. We had in it a soil bank which I believe, as I stated to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], would help make any support program work more efficiently and more easily.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. POAGE. Surely.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is one point that I believe the President was not aware of and that is that when the conferees agreed to the 85 percent protection under feed grains at the very same time that the individual farmer took advantage of that he would have had to put 15 percent of his normal feed grain acreage into the acreage reserve portion of the soil bank, and that in itself would have brought many millions of acres under the soil bank feature.

Mr. POAGE. Of course. The gentleman from Minnesota is so right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the conference report as agreed to by the House and the Senate had in it a very fine and effective soil-bank provision.

Mr. POAGE. I think it was excellent and I am hopeful that we may yet enact equally good legislation.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman with pleasure.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Assuming we do with your generous support enact the soil bank and put a billion dollars into the hands of the farmers, what do you think they are going to do with it with respect to productive operations this year?

Mr. POAGE. What are they going to do with the billion dollars?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Are they going to use the billion dollars in the production of more surpluses, or are they going to salt it away?

Mr. POAGE. They will probably use most of it to pay their debts, if I know farmers.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The farmers are not the segment of our society which has the debts, you know.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman may have his ideas about that, and the gentleman is a very substantial farmer, I understand, but I am talking about the kind of farmers who owe debts. Down my way that is most farmers.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is it not a fact that the mortgage debt of the farm population in the United States has increased at least a billion dollars in each year for the past 3 years?

Mr. POAGE. I think that is substantially correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That statement on its face does not mean too much, unless you also tell us the difference in the assets of the farmers in the course of that same period of time. But what I really wanted to ask the gentleman about, in defending the action on H. R. 12, is as to why the conferees saw fit to take out the only important protection for the dairy farmers of the northern part of this country. That was the protection against the use of diverted acres for the production of cheap feed for dairying in other parts of the country.

Mr. POAGE. I do not know just what the gentleman refers to, but I presume he means the cross compliance.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is part of it. There is no protection at all, of course, against farmers taking their land out of the acreage allotments and putting them into forage and pasture that could be used to produce other crops, mainly dairy products that would strictly compete against Wisconsin.

Mr. POAGE. Apparently this illustrates one of the reasons why the President vetoed the bill. Apparently certain Members as well as those in the executive department have not read the bill. It does provide specifically a 150-percent penalty for those who use any part of the land placed in the soil bank for any kind of crop, grazing, or otherwise.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I would like to inform the House that today I have introduced a bill along the lines of the President's soil-bank suggestion and I have lifted the language out of the conference report exactly.

Mr. POAGE. I am glad the gentleman has read the conference report.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Just one more question with respect to the worth of the farmers. Is it not true, regardless of the mortgage debt, that the net wealth after all indebtedness of the farmers today is the highest in history and higher than any other class of our society of equal size?

Mr. POAGE. The answer to the second part of the question is "No." Possibly in the first part of his statement the gentleman is correct because we have, whether I should say "enjoyed" or "suf-

fered" I do not know, but we have experienced a considerable degree of inflation particularly in the field of real estate. That inflation is reflected in the book value of our farm assets, but it has added absolutely nothing to the living income of the farmer. It has put no clothes on his children, it has put no rugs on his floors, and it has put no gasoline in his car.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] was referring to the provision which was taken out of the conference report providing that the support payments would still be made even if the soil-bank contract was violated.

What I wanted to address my question to is this: We in Wisconsin have a State in which we have a feed deficit, feed that is not produced on the farms. Our dairy farmers purchase this feed and the dairying and livestock consists of about 82 percent of our farm cash income. Our Wisconsin farmers purchased for their farms about $130 million worth of feed last year. The provisions of the conference report would have raised the feed cost in excess of 20 percent of $26 million. The provisions of the bill as far as supports are concerned merely raised the income of our farmers by $14 million, leaving us a deficit as far as cash income to our farmers in Wisconsin are concerned of $20 million. It seems to me we should not be put in the position wherein by legislation we hurt one segment of agriculture to the benefit of another. I think that is the main objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin. It was my objection to the bill as it finally passed.

Mr. POAGE. I will be happy to discuss the question of feed prices in just a moment. I would like to suggest in passing in regard to the dairy situation that the largest investment that I as an individual have is in a dairy. I myself have been supporting a dairy, and I say "supporting" because probably I could not have done if it I had not had this job for a number of years. I certainly do not want to injure the dairy industry. Actually, those of us on the conference, following the practice of a good many of us on the Committee on Agriculture, relied upon our Members from the strictly dairy areas. I think it will be admitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin that his colleague across the river in Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], who has served on our committee more years than any other Member, is rather conversant with the dairy situation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] signed the conference report and supported it and voted for it, and I felt that as one from the cotton area I was in reasonably good company as far as the dairymen were concerned when I followed the lead of my distinguished Republican colleague from Minnesota on matters of dairying. And, with all the great deference I have for the knowledge that the gentleman from Wisconsin has of the dairy situation, I felt that when there are arguments between the people in the dairy area, as there obviously are, and when the gentleman proposed to me a group of questions relating to local situations in Wisconsin and Minnesota that I should not be condemned when I look to the knowledge of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota who has served so long on our committee.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. We in Minnesota, of course, recognize our colleague, Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, as having complete knowledge of the dairy problems. I would like to call the attention of my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin, whom I have had the pleasure of serving with on a subcommittee, to the fact that the last issue of Wallace's Farmer, in Iowa, carried a rather interesting article pointing out that because of the uncertainty of grain prices and because of the uncertainty of livestock prices that there was a great demand for dairy cows in the State of Iowa, and in parts of Minnesota, I might add. It would appear to me that the gentleman from Minnesota might take cognizance of that. Since they have the feed, they very likely have the livestock industry, particularly the dairy industry, in that particular area. Furthermore, I would like to point out that nationwide no segment of our agricultural prosperity gains when you pull down the economy of any other segment of our argricultural economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding again. I wish to comment on the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota, whom I have served with on the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations and for whom I have a great deal of respect. I commend him on his statement, because that is the reason we in Wisconsin could not go along with the bill. H. R. 12 did bring down cash-farm income in our State, and we do not feel that you can adversely affect one section of agriculture without having an adverse effect upon all agriculture. That is the reason that we could not go along with the bill. Now, a person that represents a State with a feed deficit is in a much different position than our distinguished and beloved colleague from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] because figures as far as Minnesota is concerned are somewhat different than they are in Wisconsin.

Certainly we in Wisconsin could not support any type of legislation that would result to the detriment of one section of agriculture as it did to Wisconsin agriculture.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, if my friend would yield to me, I was going to ask if he had observed any great movement of cows from Wisconsin to the State of Iowa?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker. That is the reason we were very much interested in having tight grazing safeguards written into the soil bank proposal. We do not feel it is right to establish supports for some sections of the country at a high level without also putting certain controls on the use of land taken from production. We were most interested in having the agriculture support program tied in with the soil bank so that we would not be threatened with that diverted acreage problem.

Mr. POAGE. Having discussed the dairy question, now let us turn to the veto message. What has the President vetoed? He has vetoed the only present hope of a higher income for American farmers this year.

True, he says that he wants a soil bank and he suggests that a soil bank alone would in some unexplained manner add to farm income. How would it increase farm income? The President does not tell us. The truth is, while the soil bank will, if intelligently administered, make any price support program work more effectively, it only proposes to directly reimburse the farmer for the net income he is expected to lose as a result of his participation. Suppose you have 100 acres of allotted cropland eligible to go into the acreage reserve. Suppose your average net income from that land has been $25 per acre. Suppose you put 20 acres into the soil bank. For this you would expect to get 20 times $25 which would be $500. Presumably this would equal but not exceed the profit you could have otherwise made by growing and selling a crop from this land. Where is your new or additional income? Of course, it isn't there. The soil bank does not add to farm income per se.

But it does greatly reduce national income. In the first place it is expected to cost $1,200,000,000 of tax money in 1 year. That is more than twice as much as the whole 90-percent support program on all six of the basic commodities has cost for the past 23 years. See Mr. Benson's own statement in the January 31 analysis of program results published by the Commodity Credit Corporation. But it is not the expenditure of this vast sum which disturbs me as much as the fact that it will actually reduce gross farm income by at least as much as the expenditures for the soil bank.

Again think of the 100-acre farmer who puts 20 acres in the acreage reserve. Had he grown a cotton or corn crop on those 20 acres he would have expected to gross $50 per acre—$1,000 in all. Regardless of his net, if any, this $1,000 is going to be spent in the community. It is going to pay for labor, for fertilizer, for machinery, for gasoline. It is going to turn the wheels of commerce, but under the soil bank alone there is not going to be $1,000. There is only going to be $500. The total money produced

and spent into the economic blood stream is going to be cut exactly in half. Certainly, the farmer as an individual is going to have the same net on the acres he had before, but the community is not going to have but 50 percent as much gross.

The farmer clearly needs an increased net. He does not get it under the President's proposal. The community—and in the final analysis the Nation—needs to continue the gross at least where it is. The President would reduce this gross.

In addition, the President's proposal would reduce the income from every acre of basic crops the farmer produces. Here is a table showing just what the present law offers the producer of each of our basic commodities. It first shows the farmers' returns under the present law as administered prior to the veto message.

It then shows what the farmer would receive under the farm bill the President has vetoed, H. R. 12. Then is shown the payments the President offers in his veto message. It then shows just how much farmers are going to lose by the President's plan as compared with the farm bill we passed:

Analysis of the estimated effects in 1956 of the administration's preveto announced farm support program, of H. R. 12, passed by the Congress and vetoed, and of the President's veto message prices

[Percentage of parity support level is shown beside dollar figures in (1), (2), (3)]

	Unit of quantity	Preveto announced program under present law (1)	H. R. 12 (2)	Postveto announced in veto message (3)	Estimated 1956 crop values under preveto program (4)	Estimated crop values H. R. 12 (5)	Estimated 1956 crop values under postveto program (6)
					Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*
Basic crops:							
Cotton	Pound	$0.2623 (75)	$0.3181 (90)	$0.2885 (82½)	$1,923	$2,332	$2,115
Wheat	Bushel	1.81 (76)	2.27 (90)	2.00 (84)	1,698	2,129	1,876
Corn (commercial)	do	1.40 (81)	1.65 (90)	1.50 (86)	2,395	3,350	2,566
Rice	Hundredweight	4.04 (75)	4.90 [1](90)	4.50 (83)	216	230	230
Peanuts	Pound	.91 (80)	.123 (90)	.107 (82½)	147	198	172
Feed grains:							
Oats	Bushel	.59 (70)	.72 (85)	.59 (70)	930	1,050	930
Barley	do	.93 (70)	1.13 (85)	.93 (70)	364	409	364
Rye	do	1.16 (70)	1.41 (85)	1.16 (70)	34	38	34
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	1.80 (70)	2.18 (85)	1.80 (70)	419	471	419
Noncommercial area corn	Bushel	1.05 [2](75)	1.40 [3](85)	1.125 [4](75)	728	890	780
Dairy industry:							
Butterfat		.562 (78)	.586 (81)	.586 (81)	[5]	[5]	[5]
Manufacturing		3.15 (82)	3.25 (84)	3.25 (84)	[5]	[5]	[5]
Total					8,854	11,097	9,486

[1] 90 percent for United States and Cuba, lower for export.
[2] 75 percent of commercial corn support.
[3] 85 percent of commercial area corn support.
[4] 75 percent of commercial area corn support.
[5] Figures on milk production not available.

On these calculations, not including figures on butter and manufacturing milk, H. R. 12 gives the farmer $2,243,000,000 more, in terms of the crop values in 1956, than the administration supports announced prior to the veto. H. R. 12 gives the farmer $1,611,000,000 more than the crop value to be reflected in prices announced by the President in his veto message.

The President's action yesterday will, if it is allowed to stand, cost cotton farmers exactly $15 per bale, or a net loss of $217 million. It will lessen the value of the corn crop of the commercial corn area by $784 million. It will cost the growers of corn in the noncommercial corn area 35 cents per bushel or around $110 million, and the growers of other feed grains from 38 cents per 100 pounds of grain sorghum, to 13 cents per bushel on oats, 20 cents per bushel on barley and 23 cents per bushel on rye. These grains will suffer a total loss of about $221 million. Wheat will lose $253 million, plus the opportunity to increase the volume of export wheat.

The above computations are on the basis of 1955 production except in the case of corn the 43-million-acre allotment for 1956 is used in computing the estimated crop value under the administration's pre- and post-veto programs, and the 51-million-acre allotment which would have been provided for corn in H. R. 12 is used in computing income under the bill passed by Congress and vetoed. In the case of cotton and peanuts for which no definite programs have been announced, support levels of 75 percent for cotton and 80 percent for peanuts are supplied for the purpose of computing the preveto programs and 82½ percent is used for both crops in the postveto figures, since the President said the 1956 supports would not be less than 82½ percent. In the case of feed grains, including corn in the noncommercial area the income estimate assumes that one-half of the 15 percent acreage reduction loss to farmers would have been recovered under H. R. 12 through soil bank payments. In the absence of any estimates of soil bank participation through H. R. 12, these computations assume participation in the acreage reserve only where such would have been required as a condition for higher level price supports.

However, the requirement of a 15-percent reduction of acreage of both noncommercial corn and of other feed grains contained in the bill as passed is not contained in the President's plan. Apparently he would go back to the old program of planting feed without limit and then piously wonder why the Government had to take so much corn into the loan. The President offers corn growers in the commercial area 86 percent of parity supports with no effective controls on production.

Mr. Speaker, a fourth-grade child could tell General Eisenhower that if you have no production controls on feed grains—and practically none on corn, and the President proposes no new controls—that we will, of course, grow too much feed; and a fifth-grade child could tell him that if we grow too much feed, that we are going to have too many hogs and cattle. Cheap feed makes cheap livestock. I have been in the cattle business, at least in a very small way, all my life, and I never made a dollar on cattle when everybody's feed was cheap. I do not believe many other growers have, either. In fact, one important and practical thing this bill contains for livestock growers is a limit on the overwhelming flood of cheap feed which has been destroying our markets in recent years. We had no 10-cent hogs until we had cheap corn. The bill the Congress passed required a reduction in both corn and feed grains—a thing that Mr. Eisenhower's low 70-percent supports had not heretofore been able to accomplish. Remember, feed grains have long been supported at only 70 percent of parity, but their production has increased phenomenally.

While I am speaking of the failure of low support prices to control the production of feed grains, I wonder if we might not right here examine the utter fallacy of the President's whole charge and the charge of so many uniformed writers and commentators that high rigid support prices built up our present surpluses and account for most of our losses on our previous support programs. Doubtless most people who have never studied the question believe that, including the President. It sounds reasonable. Why would a farmer plant more if he knew that the price was going down? That is a good question and it deserves a fair answer. I will tell you why.

Farmers are just like other people. They do the best they can to care for their loved ones just as city people do. Suppose you were a cotton farmer. Not, necessarily, one of the smallest but suppose you grew 10 bales. Last year, the price of cotton was 31 cents—nearly $160 per bale. For this 10 bales you got roughly $1,600 gross. Suppose you learned that next year the price of cotton would be only half as much, or $80 per bale. The President assumes you would cut your production of cotton. Of course, he assumes you would go into

some more profitable line of farming. That would be fine but for two things—in the first place, the price of all crops is depressed. There are no profitable alternatives. And in the second place, as a cottongrower you doubtless live in a one-crop country. There is no other cash crop available to you. You cannot grow oranges. If you are a wheat farmer you cannot grow asparagus. No, my friends, these six basic crops are called basic because they are, each in its own area, so basic to the economy of the area in which produced. Peanuts, rice, and tobacco are small in total value but they are of tremendous importance to the man who lives in their area of production. They are each, indeed, basic to those who must depend on them for a living. So as a cottongrower you simply cannot shift. Your only recourse, if you are to maintain the living standard of your family, is to grow more, not less, cotton.

This is exactly what the farmer will do. We grew our largest cotton crop when we had 52 percent of parity supports. According to General Eisenhower we should have been importing cotton that year.

It is the failure to understand this simple economic fact which has caused so many people to be so critical of our 90-percent supports. It has been and is this misunderstanding which has caused so many people to make the mistake the President has made and to charge that what they call high rigid supports have caused the accumulation of vast surpluses at great loss to the Government.

Of course, 90-percent supports are not high. They are only nine-tenths of a fair price. Would our labor unions settle for nine-tenths of a fair wage? Would the Bell Telephone Co. take a rate which gave them only nine-tenths of a fair return?

They are not rigid, because parity itself is a changing figure. It comes down whenever farmers' costs come down and it can never go up until after farmers' costs have gone up.

But let us look at the record. I again quote the January 31, 1956, statement of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It shows that as of that date our total losses on all 6 of the basic commodities was only $522,433,922. This, incidentally, compares with a net profit on these 6 commodities of over $13 million the day General Eisenhower became President. On that same date we had lost just about $120 million on milk and milk products. As of last January our losses on milk and milk products alone stood at $958,606,000—and supports on milk have been flexible every day since the program began.

Two things stand out—the great bulk of all losses has been sustained under the present administration, which has constantly insisted that it was going to lose money—insisted so strenuously that it had to lose money to make good its own claim—and second, the great bulk of the losses have been sustained in supporting commodities which have been on a flexible basis. Why should we condemn the program which has lost the least money and embrace the one which has proven itself to be the greatest loser? That is exactly what the President asks us to do.

Let us now look a moment at the veto message itself. The President expresses his bitter disappointment at the long delays "which this legislation encountered." Actually, this conference report was passed by both Houses just 3 months and 2 days from the date the President made public his first rough outline of his wishes. I submit this is almost record time for any major legislation. It could not have been achieved had this House not last year foreseen the necessity for relief for our farmers. Just 2 weeks more than a year ago we passed H. R. 12.

That was not an election year. We were merely trying to do what we knew should be done for the farmer. We had no help at that time from the White House. Not even a kind word. General Eisenhower was not then interested in a soil bank or any other farm program. In fact, our committee submitted 2 soil-bank bills—one by a Democrat and an identical one by a Republican to Mr. Eisenhower's Department of Agriculture. We asked for comments and recommendations. We submitted the bills on January 17, 1955. It was not until July 27, 1955, that we got a reply. The reply was that a soil bank was too expensive. The administration did not then support it.

On October 31, 1955, our chairman, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, wired Mr. Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture and offered to call the Agriculture Committee of the House to consider any suggestions the administration cared to submit. Mr. COOLEY explained that he did this in the interest of time. On November 9, 1955, the Secretary replied that he had no suggestions to offer and that he would have none until in January. He sarcastically added that perhaps our committee would want to ask Mr. Walter Reuther for a farm plan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include copies of the above-mentioned exchange of messages at the end of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Thus the record is clear proof that for a full year this House has sought to come to grips with this farm program but that it was not until the 9th day of this year that we were given the vaguest outline of the President's wishes and it was the 27th day of February before our committee received a completed bill from the Department. Where, Mr. Speaker, where Mr. President, has been the delay?

I realize that I have already spoken at length. I can only ask my friends to bear with me very briefly while I refer to the ugly phase of the veto message. We could forgive the failure of a great general to understand the economies of a cotton farm, but when it is implied, as it is implied by this message, and as it has been stated by so many of the administration stalwarts, that the Congress passed a political bill hoping for a veto, I must resent the implication.

With many others, Republicans as well as Democrats, I worked long and hard on this bill. I have never seen a conference committee work harder. We brought to our respective Houses a bill which I sincerely believe will help our farmers and will help stabilize our whole economy. Evidently many of our Republican colleagues thought so last week when 48 Republican Members of this House and 15 Republican Members of the other House voted for this bill. I assume that those men all voted for this bill because they believed it to be a good bill. I assume that those men voted for what they thought was in the best interests of their people, just as I did. Conditions have not changed during the last 6 days. Unless those men now believe that General Eisenhower knows farm conditions better than they themselves do there can be no reason for them to now change their votes. If they will but recognize as I do, that they know agriculture better than does the general, then they will vote with us tomorrow and we will together override this veto and move on to a better day on the American farm.

The Congress passed a bill remarkably free of any partisan politics. We gave the President the soil bank he has so recently embraced, and we gave him the same support program we had heretofore given to President Roosevelt and to President Truman. No one cried "foul" when we sent similar bills to former Presidents. There has been no change in the congressional determination to assure all producers who accept acreage restrictions of 90-percent support. Why should we now be suddenly charged with partisan politics? I do not believe that charge is fair. I do not believe this veto message is sound. I have an idea that the President's inability to clearly analyze the alleged defects of this bill prompted the use of more generalities in his message, and the unfounded charge of "politics" by his political spokesmen. I do not believe that the 48 thoughtful Republican Representatives who less than 1 week ago voted for this bill will allow someone else, anyone else, to cast their vote for them this week. I believe we can and should override the veto.

OCTOBER 31, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports indicate that you have definite recommendations to make which will tend to improve the deplorable situation in which the farmers of America now find themselves. Press reports further indicate that President Eisenhower will make constructive recommendations to Congress when it convenes in January. If either you or President Eisenhower have recommendations to make which may even tend to improve or check the downward trend of farm income, I shall appreciate your advising me. The House of Representatives, by appropriate resolution in the last session of Congress, authorized me to call meetings of the House Committee on Agriculture at any time and authorized our committee "to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside of the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations * * * as it deems necessary." As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I here and now advise you that I

deem it necessary to hold meetings of the committee for the purpose of receiving, considering, and acting upon any and all recommendations which either you or President Eisenhower may desire to make and to have considered by the House Committee on Agriculture.

If either you or President Eisenhower have recommendations to make to Congress which you believe, if adopted, will tend to improve the tragic situation in which American agriculture now finds itself, and if you believe that legislation is needed, you should not wait. You should act now and be prepared to present legislation to Congress when it convenes in January. Unless you request a hearing before our committee, I shall assume that neither you nor President Eisenhower have recommendations to make and that the administration does not believe that new legislation is now needed. The farmers of America can no longer live on promises. If, after the many months you have been in office, you have new and constructive recommendations to make, I am certain that the members of the House Committee on Agriculture will be glad to meet at any time and place that will suit your convenience, and to consider such legislation as may be recommended. If additional authority is either necessary or desirable, I regret that you did not advise us before the first session of the 84th Congress adjourned. The farmers of America are ready, willing, and anxious to cooperate in any program which may tend to improve the pitiful plight in which they now find themselves. The problems of agriculture are paramount. Delayed action may prove to be disastrous to the entire economy of our country. As you know, Congress cannot act upon such recommendations as you may have to make until our committee has approved such recommendations. The situation is desperate. We should act without delay.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 9, 1955.

Reurtel October 31 you have correctly interpreted press report indicating this administration will make definite recommendations aimed at strengthening and improving present agricultural legislation. These recommendations are now in the process of preparation. I would anticipate they will be presented to Congress by President in traditional message form next January. The specific suggestions would, I assume, then be referred to the agricultural committees of the Senate and House and to some other interested committees in the usual way. Meanwhile, I would be happy to receive from you any new suggestions which you may have for alleviating the farm price-cost squeeze. Perhaps Mr. Walter Reuther, whose appearance before your committee drew such high praise from you earlier this year could be helpful in suggesting means of checking the advancing cost of goods and services farmers must buy. As you know, it is this factor of inflexible high operating expense that is largely responsible for the economic difficulties faced by farmers.

In your telegram you expressed regret you were not advised earlier that additional legislation "is either necessary or desirable." Your committee files will show that I urged you to hold hearings on a number of bills carrying Department of Agriculture endorsement. For example, not once but twice I implored you to schedule hearings on badly needed legislation which would have exempted from marketing quota penalties farmers who produced wheat exclusively for use on the farm where grown. As you know, hundreds of legal actions are now pending against individual farmers throughout the country whose only crime was that they grew wheat to feed to their own livestock on their own farm. Since you have released the contents of your telegram to the press I am taking the liberty of doing the same.

EZRA TAFT BENSON.

THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the military security of the United States is today, as always, a matter of paramount and overriding concern to the American people.

In 1956, however, there is a new dimension to that concern.

Atomic Energy Commissioner Murray defined the new dimension clearly as early as 1953, when he bluntly stated:

> There can no longer be any doubt that mankind now has in its grasp the power to destroy the human race.

The awe-inspiring potential of atomic weapons in today's world was expressed on January 25 by Air Secretary Donald Quarles when he listed as the number one offensive force of this country "a Strategic Air Command capable of delivering on an aggressor, in 1 week, 1,000 times as much explosive force as hit Germany in all of World War II."

Mr. Speaker, many of us have had the opportunity, in the years following World War II, to see at first hand the terrible destruction of German industry and economy which was inflicted during the war years, in large part by aerial bombardment.

It is difficult to contemplate an explosive force 1,000 times as great as the terrible power which reduced mighty Berlin to rubble and leveled sprawling Frankfurt.

It is almost as difficult to picture the aerial armada necessary to do this thousandfold job of destruction, and to do in 1 week many times the damage which required years of terrible sacrifice and effort in World War II.

When the mind succeeds in grasping these awful pictures, we then have some comprehension of Commissioner Murray's fearful assessment of our present atomic power.

At the same time, we should also have an immediate and compelling respect for the arm of American military power which today carries the major responsibility for delivery of this awesome force—the Strategic Air Command.

What is the Strategic Air Command?

Who is the man who leads it, and what do we know about him and his concept of SAC responsibility?

What is the principal job of the American general in the nuclear age, as defined by SAC's commander?

What are the most dependable aerial weapons of SAC today, and their likely replacements?

What are our major problems in maintaining air supremacy in the nuclear age?

Do we need the expensive foreign bases which appear at strange parts of the world today?

How does United States airpower compare with Soviet airpower in 1956?

These are a few of the questions which come to mind, as one takes a careful look at the principal offensive striking power of the Air Force today. Schoolboys know the answers to some of these questions, and some of them can already discuss the relative merits of F–94's and F–89's, or B–36's, and B–47's.

Among the American people at large, however, there is a great and continuing curiosity concerning the Strategic Air Command—its men, its mission, and its future.

A great motion picture was made on this subject not long ago, and millions of Americans lined up at the theaters of our country to learn more about the force known as SAC.

Recently, a well-known radio and television personality, Arthur Godfrey, described in a program an important magazine article on the subject of the Strategic Air Command, which appeared in Air Force magazine for April 1956.

There followed a great flood of requests to Air Force Association, publishers of this magazine, for copies of this article, one of the most authoritative reports ever written on the subject of SAC. The American people wanted to know more about the command which held in its grasp the awful force of atomic war—which a great British statesman had described as the best peace insurance in the world today.

The Air Force magazine article is authoritative because it is written in very large part by the men who know SAC best—the men who fly the planes and man the guns of the Strategic Air Command.

For example, there is an enlightening section on the Bomber's Role in Diplomacy, by Maj. Gen. James C. Selser, Jr., deputy commander of the 8th Air Force in SAC.

There is an eye-opening discussion of How SAC Tackles Its Security Problem, by Brig. Gen. David Wade, SAC inspector general.

Col. David C. Schilling has written about the fighters of 1956 and the future, and as a Harmon Trophy winner he writes as an authority.

The importance of aerial reconnaissance has been pictured vividly by Brig. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, commander of the 801st Air Division.

Concluding the great series of articles, which include a number of other discussions by leading air experts, is a penetrating summary by the Commander in Chief of SAC, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, entitled "SAC's Readiness Is Our Peace Insurance Policy."

The entire series is of such compelling public interest today, and of such great importance in a full understanding of our military picture, that I welcome this opportunity to read it into the RECORD of this Congress:

SAC: MEN WITH A MISSION

(By Ed Mack Miller)

Shortly after 1900, Maj. Gen. Leonard Wood, United States Army, then commander of the Department of the East, was asked by

a reporter if "Airplanes such as are now in operation could be used in direct attack?"

"Hardly," General Wood replied, "for the airplane, wonderful as it is, has simply reached a point as yet where it is able to travel with a minimum burden, at a comparatively low elevation, and for a comparatively brief space of time. It has not yet essayed to carry more than 2 persons, the mental and physical activities of at least 1 of whom are constantly engrossed in the task of manipulation and control. The airplane of today must have certain definite conditions to insure a successful start and successful alighting. As a factor in warfare, the airplane has not yet demonstrated its utility."

"Someday," the good general added, however, "the airplane is likely to become a device that will have to be reckoned with."

General Wood was indeed more perceptive than another general who, years later, while testifying before the Morrow Board in 1925, said, "I see no reason why the range of a military airplane should ever exceed 3 days' march for the infantry."

Fortunately, there were men of vision in the early years of the century who clearly foresaw the tremendous impact strategic aviation would have on the history of the world—Douhet, the Italian strategist; Count Caproni di Taliedo, builder of the Caproni bombers of World War I, who said, "No resistance is possible against the domain of the air"; and America's Brig. Gen. Billy Mitchell, who told the Congress: "Remember, gentlemen, that national defense in the next war will be measured primarily by airpower."

And nothing thus far has weakened the reply that Mitchell made to the House committee chairman who asked: "Do you mean to say that aircraft will dominate all arms of defense?"

Mitchell's answer: "I mean that aircraft can go straight to their destination, no matter where they may be. Nothing known at present can stop them."

The dropping of the atomic bomb by a B–29 on Hiroshima offered undebatable proof of the capabilities of the strategic air arm, and in so doing vindicated the foresight of its proponents.

This devastating strike brought about the first capitulation of a major enemy homeland without full-scale invasion by ground troops, thus saving the lives of thousands of Allied soldiers, who were even then on the Japanese doorstep, poised for the traditional invasion.

Strategic bombing as a tactic of war came to fruition in the World War II. One of the pioneers of the new type of warfare was Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, later to become first Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force. General Spaatz commanded the Eighth Air Force during its formative days as a strategic bombing unit. He later became commanding general of the United States Army Air Forces in Europe, heading the combined Eighth and Fifteenth Air Forces. This was in 1944, when Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, who earlier had headed the North African Strategic Air Forces, was commander of the Eighth Air Force.

After the huge and powerful air forces of the United States had helped whip Hitler, General Spaatz took over command of United States Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, and from his headquarters on Guam oversaw the final devastating aerial assault on the Japanese homeland.

Here one of his top commanders, as head of the 20th Air Force and later Spaatz's chief of staff, was the man who now heads the United States Air Forces Strategic Air Command.

Curtis E. LeMay, a native of Columbus, Ohio, and a graduate of Ohio State University with an engineering degree, received his pilot's wings in October 1929. Before becoming our top B–29 commander he had served under Spaatz in Europe. He commanded the 305th Bomb Group, one of the First United States Air Force's bombardment units to enter European combat, and pioneered numerous strategic bombing tactics, including the straight-in bomb run and formation pattern bombing.

He initiated the lead crew system whereby all planes on strike were guided by one crew and developed a new bomber combat formation which cut combat losses throughout World War II. General LeMay led the 1943 shuttle mission of Flying Fortresses from England to Regensberg, Germany, and in August of 1944 was given the 20th Bomber Command, where he used techniques developed over Europe to increase the number of B–29 raids in the China-Burma-India theater. Other Pacific area assignments followed, including command of the Marianna-based 20th Air Force, and General Spaatz's chief of staff until September 1945.

After the war he served as Deputy Chief of Air Staff for research and development. From October 1947 to October 1948 he commanded United States Air Forces in Europe, where he began the Berlin airlift, after which he returned to the United States, taking over the Strategic Air Command in October of 1948.

LeMay, the man, is a dedicated airman who thoroughly learned the lessons taught by General Mitchell, Arnold, and Spaatz. A matter-of-fact person who does not easily tolerate small talk or small ideas; he dislikes speeches and publicity. His life is in the Air Force and SAC.

Although those men close to LeMay say that too much fiction has already been fabricated about the SAC Commander in Chief's cigar-in-jaw toughness (they say he is a pretty regular fellow who has the sense to know that in his world-guarding job he must be without feelings or sentiment or fear), they admit that in fulfilling his mission, Curtis LeMay has had to be as hard as the job that faced him in building the world's greatest aerial deterrent force, the Strategic Air Command.

"At our bases," he has said, "There is a certain urgency in our operations. That is because the training in this command must simulate combat conditions as accurately as possible. The continuing job of all of us, whether airman or officer, is to use the resources we are provided to give the Nation full value in combat capability. Our Nation's air strength always must be kept great enough to maintain peace by discouraging global war—or in the event of a war, strong enough to discharge its mission effectively.

"In the event of war, the long-range bomber and the nuclear weapon enable us to carry to an enemy's heartland the greatest destructive power the world has ever known. The airplane can reach over and beyond the masses of manpower the Communist world has mobilized behind the Iron Curtain.

"It is the only means by which we can bring our full power to bear directly against his muscle and heart. As long as we maintain superior air strength, we will probably never have to use it."

When SAC was activated in March of 1946 at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C., its first commander was Gen. George C. Kenney. Then SAC had only three jet planes—Lockheed P–80s. Its total manpower was about 37,000 persons. It had a total of 600 planes, of which 250 were obsolescent bombers. Under its command were 18 active bases.

Now, 10 years later—10 years in which the growth of SAC's power has unquestionably been the prime deterrent to Soviet aggression—the Strategic Air Command can list some proud accomplishments. It now has more than five times the number of personnel it had 10 years ago (and its critical problems today are centered in long-term retention of the best). It also has five times the number of planes it had then—and most of them are jets, ranging from nuclear-bomb-carrying fighters to the world-spanning B–52. SAC now has more than 30 bases in the United States and more than 10 overseas operating bases, and is ready to go at any time—when, as the men of SAC say, "the whistle blows."

General LeMay wants the world to know his boys are good but like every other sensible citizen, he doesn't want a showdown if a showdown can be averted.

The world of SAC is controlled from Offutt Air Force Base at Omaha, Nebr., where General LeMay keeps C–97 command transports in constant readiness for quick inspection trips to any part of his farflung domain.

That domain includes 3 major subordinate commands and 3 air divisions: The 2d, 8th, and 15th Air Forces in the continental United States; the 3d Air Division on Guam; the 5th Air Division in north Africa; and the 7th Air Division in the United Kingdom.

The 51 wings in the command train constantly, with an atmosphere of wartime urgency governing all their actions. Through a vast system of global communications, SAC measures its efficiency in its ability to get in touch with a single plane flying anywhere in the world.

And if it takes longer than 20 minutes to contact him, there may be a little hell to pay.

For Commander LeMay must figure that if he can't reach all of his outfit, wherever they may be, in that length of time it may be too late.

When SAC was organized 10 years ago, global capability became its primary objective, and the combined brains of American scientists, industrialists, fliers, and statesmen pushed toward it from several directions.

The first was foreign bases. As SAC moved its big planes across the oceans in the years following 1946 and found bases close to the periphery of Soviet territory from which they could operate, its dynamic character began to take shape.

The second way took a leaf from Norse mythology. The eldest son of Woden, king of the Norse gods, was Thor, a strong, brave, and kind warrior who wore iron gloves (like the one on the SAC crest) and a belt of strength around his waist. His chariot wheels made thunder as he rode through the sky, and in his strong right hand he held the strongest weapon of all—his magic hammer, which would return when thrown.

SAC's second answer then, to the problem of deterring an enemy who lived across the world, was a mighty bomber, the B–56. It could carry enough fuel so, like Thor's hammer, it could do its work of combat and still fly back to its master.

They called the B–36 the peacemaker because it was the big deterrent in America's peace policy in the years after 1947. It helped build a belt of strength around the globe and, like Thor's chariot, its sound of thunder made the men who might have toppled the world into a bath of blood think twice.

The B–36, with its 6 conventional and 4 jet engines, a range of 10,000 miles, an altitude capability of above 40,000 feet, and, at reduced range, a bomb capacity of 40 tons, became a high-flying symbol of security. The B–36 will be replaced in the SAC program over the next several years by the newer all-jet B–52.

And, although it may have never dropped a bomb in anger, no one will be the sadder, for it will have accomplished its mission perfectly—as a world-spanning peacemaker, flying its beat in protection of the rights of freemen.

The third method developed to assure that SAC crews could bomb anywhere in the world and still return to home base was aerial refueling of medium bombers.

Of course, none of these advances were made without much trial and more error.

But, in the face of a driving necessity for a boomerang bomber force, the men of SAC have done much since 1946.

The global-mobility aspect posed many headaches, because to move an entire combat unit, complete with everything from spare engines to spark plugs—and do it on an hour's notice—is no mean trick. But constant planning and training have given a pattern to the operation so that now SAC bosses can almost time the entire business with a stopwatch, even to the point of prescribing that the equipment be set up on arrival within a specified number of hours.

Planes and equipment are maintained in a constant state of readiness. Essential unit equipment—the minimum immediately required for short-term operation at a forward base—is packaged and ready to go at any time.

Flyaway kits, or aluminum bins on casters, are packed with critical aircraft spares for quick hoisting into bomb bays and movement to forward areas. These kits always accompany combat aircraft on foreign rotations and will support a wing for 30 days of operation.

In addition, personnel are always ready. All medical inoculations are kept up-to-date. Those whose jobs require special tools, such as radio and radar technicians, have their own flyaway kits packed and ready to go at all times.

When the order comes, an entire wing—planes, crews, maintenance parts, and records, as well as support planes and personnel—is soon in the air, moving quickly to forward bases. Only a few items and a few people are left. Large and heavy types of maintenance equipment which combat aircraft cannot carry are handled either by SAC's own cargo airlift capability in C–124's or by MATS plants which also move critical personnel who can't be taken in the combat planes.

General LeMay says, "Moving an entire combat wing is comparable to picking up one of our major domestic airlines, moving it across an ocean, and putting it back in operation all within a matter of hours. This is now accomplished as a routine training deployment."

Since actual experience is the most realistic form of training, each SAC combat wing conducts annual maneuvers as a unit at an advance base. This training outside the United States is usually for a 3-month period, and SAC crewmen quickly become familiar with the geography, customs, and operating conditions in different parts of the world.

SAC mobility is continually demonstrated as wings deploy from United States fields to advance bases in foreign lands as part of normal training, often crossing each other's path of flight as the armadas switch bases. Jets and prop-driven aircraft take part in the mass flights across the oceans of the world, and fighter aircraft, such as the F–84G, cover almost the same distances on their nonstop missions.

General LeMay and his commanders have tried to think of every angle in the "quick-haul, bomb-drop business." And they have found the best way to train is to consider every day M–day and every hour Zero-hour.

With the B–50 already long since retired and the B–36 playing out its last years of service, the SAC arsenal is moving into the pure jet field rapidly.

The workhorse of LeMay's command now is, of course, the B–47 stratojet, that beautiful, sweptwing, tall-country tiger that has been such a good airplane that its crew chiefs say it's like maintaining a B–29 without engines. Powered by six General Electric J–47 turbojet engines, the B–47 is in the 600-miles-per-hour class and has established several impressive times and distance records. Its range with inflight refueling is restricted only by the endurance of the crew. Larger than the heavy bombers of World War II—its wings span 116 feet and its fuselage measures 106 feet and 8 inches—the B–47 is manned by a crew of 3. All SAC medium bombardment and reconnaissance wings are now equipped with B–47's.

SAC's Big Bertha is the B–52 Stratofortress. The jet-propelled B–52 possesses the greatest combat potential ever built into a United States Air Force heavy bomber. Designed to cruise at over 600 miles per hour for 6,000 miles without refueling (it can, however, refuel in the air, too), it weighs as much as 120 automobiles. It is big, with wings long enough to span the width of a football field—plus 25 feet. It is powerful, with 8 Pratt & Whitney J–57 jet engines producing the power of 30 diesel locomotives. And is is so fast that few jet fighters can match it at altitude.

Designed to meet exacting requirements of Strategic Air Command's long-range operations, this newest heavy weight is being delivered to SAC as rapidly as the ships are produced, which is not nearly rapidly enough. The first of the B–52's was delivered in June 1955.

Ultimately to replace the Republic F–84F fighters will be the F–101A Voodoo, developed by the Air Force in conjunction with McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and designed to meet SAC requirements for a long-range strategic fighter. The most powerful United States aircraft of its type, the Voodoo is supersonic and can be refueled in flight. It is capable of carrying nuclear weapons.

Coming along as a replacement for the workhorse Boeing KC–97 tanker is an advanced version of the Boeing 707 jet tanker-transport now in production for SAC. The Air Force has designated its first jet tanker plane the KC–135 Stratotanker. The KC–135 will be used to refuel both the B–52 and the B–47, adding greatly to the strike potential of the sleek bombers.

A 707 prototype already has demonstrated its ability to refuel the B–52 at high speeds and altitude, which means that the fast jet bombers won't have to drop to low altitude and low airspeed to refuel, as is the case with the KC–97 flying gas station. In flight tests conducted by Boeing the aircraft has frequently cruised at altitudes higher than 42,000 feet and at speeds greater than 500 miles per hour.

The big baby in the hauling department remains the Douglas C–124 Globemaster II, largest production transport in the Air Force. It is used by SAC to perform a variety of long-range cargo missions all over the world. The heavy-duty carriers are capable of speeds around 250 miles per hour and have a range of up to 4,000 miles. They make up the strategic support squadrons which give global logistic back-up to SAC combat elements.

The improvement of aircraft types will, of course, make SAC less dependent on foreign bases when newer and bigger planes, truly intercontinental bombers like the B–52, become available in really adequate numbers.

This is not to say that SAC should give up any of its advance bases. Although die-hard isolationists shout that it is the logical thing to do, commonsense dictates that fighting a war from United States bases with medium bombers should be the last resort.

SAC is in the hauling business, and a short haul is always more efficient than a long one. The turn-around time is doubled or more, and so, in a given period of time, less destructive force is placed on the targets.

Another advantage in substantial numbers of foreign bases is that, in addition to complicating his problem of effective action against the United States, it gives the free nations greater flexibility in that they know that the Communist is going to be able to get a relatively much smaller portion of bases—so that we, therefore, have many more to operate out of, which gives us many different approaches to the target area.

The problem of defense posed to the Soviets, then, is tremendous. They know that jet bombers can come from all directions, so they have the problem of moving their fighter force, and setting up their static defenses, their missiles, and their flak so that they can defend themselves efficiently. Obviously, they would be spread quite thin if the United States has a vast number of advanced bases. Of course, there is little intelligence available on the enemy defensive force. It is known that they have good fighters in abundance, and that their force is improving rapidly in quantity and quality. Their radar may be good, too—but, as General Mitchell said: "You cannot stop a determined bombing attack once it has started." You can punish it severely, however, and attrition is another SAC headache.

The men of SAC are the best bomb droppers in the world. Their test missions are deadly serious. On the ground, every bomb run is accurately charted with electronic devices by a radar bomb-scoring detachment so that accuracy can be proved—and improved. Planes from SAC bases are in the air each day, each night, week after week—roaring along at better than 600 miles per hour as crews go through all the procedures they would use on an actual bombing mission in war.

Weather makes little difference. In actual combat, planes and crews would fly their missions regardless of weather conditions. So SAC continues its missions in rain, fog, snow, windstorms, and clouded visibility, day and night, for with radar bombing equipment, it is not necessary to see the target to bomb with accuracy—and war might occur in any weather.

Flying at altitudes of 8 miles or higher, each bomber heads in on an American city. Then an observer presses a bomb-release button. Another target is theoretically destroyed and a SAC crew has carried out a bombing mission realistically similar to one it might someday have to fly against an enemy. For the crews, this is routine.

Each year industrial targets in almost every American city with a population of more than 25,000 are theoretically destroyed by SAC planes. San Francisco alone has been the target for 495 attacks during 1 month.

Once each year, top bomb teams are tested in the annual bombing and navigation competition, a tense week-long duel which crews have dubbed the "SAC World Series."

The main concern of bombing and navigation training—and the annual meet—has been to step up accuracy. Every year has seen an increase in overall accuracy until today SAC planes can bomb with precision well within the limits of their weapons from high altitudes.

The competitions have generated a great deal of interest, have aided in development of new techniques, and have served as proving grounds for planes, men, and equipment.

The coming-of-age of the B–47 is a good example. Up to 1955, piston-engine planes like the B–36, had taken most of the honors. Some critics or skeptics doubted that a high-speed jet could match the accuracy of the big, more stable platform.

But their case was smashed in 1955 as medium bomber crews from B–47 wings swept the competition. Their victories formed a definite cleavage separating the jet-bombing age from the World War II era. With giant B–52 long-range jet bombers now coming into the command, the world can expect strategic air to rely on jets completely in the near future.

In 1952, Strategic Air Command also inaugurated the annual SAC reconnaissance and navigation competition as a means of promoting competitive spirit and determining the capabilities of reconnaissance wings and crews.

Every reconnaissance wing is represented in the yearly 6-day meet. Each crew runs day and night celestial navigation missions, radar target photography, aerial target and photoflash photography.

At present Strategic Air Command uses the RB–36, the RB–47, and RF–84F's as its reconnaissance planes. The first two are stripped-down versions of bombers with the same numerical designation, while the latter is a reconnaissance counterpart of the F–84 fighter.

The combat crews in SAC are about the best in the business. The average officer on a select or lead crew is 33 years old, and the average airman, 27. SAC has a fairly unique system in the selection of leaders. Crews are rated as "select," "lead," or "combat-ready." Select and lead crews have demonstrated a capability higher than their colleagues, and represent the cream of the force. Naturally, they draw the most difficult and the most important targets.

To become a select crew, a flight team must meet certain standards in training. When it does, everybody on the crew gets a spot promotion, everybody goes up one rank. They hold that spot promotion just so long as they retain their efficiency. If performance drops below the standard, they immediately go on probation, and within a matter of 3 or 4 months they are given rigid tests in all phases. If they do not measure up to select crew standards, everyone loses his promotion.

Lead crews actually are usually as good as the select crews. However, there are only so many promotions, and SAC can't promote everybody. If a select crew falls below the standard, then a lead crew will move up to replace it, and assume the new designation of select crew.

The combat-ready crews, which make up the majority of the force are usually not far below the bombing capability of the two top categories. All can bomb well within the limits of the weapons they are using.

Select, lead, or combat ready, they're the finest airmen in the world.

Recently Mr. Rex Madeira, sales manager of the Spartan School of Aeronautics, in Tulsa, Okla., told this writer: "The Strategic Air Command constantly amazes me. It has one of the best systems of business practices I have ever seen inside or outside the military."

The compliment had its base in fact. When Curtis LeMay took over SAC, he appointed a committee of officers to investigate the business methods of major United States civilian businesses. From each he took the best practices he could find and shaped them to fit SAC's operation.

The command's management improvement program is considered a model of its type, as is the famed SAC rating system, which is so thorough that IBM cards are kept on every man in the command. Every individual performance shows up for what it is.

Management boards give instant visual checks on the in-commission status of SAC's arsenal of aircraft, and if the readiness graph dips below the acceptable combat potential line, things really start buzzing until the trouble is remedied.

Another objective of the management program is the education of workers, supervisors, and executives in sound operating principles. This is accomplished by seminars, base management indoctrination courses at every installation, NCO Academies, commanders' financial management courses, and other special training.

SAC fully exploits industrial methods in work measurement, production-control systems, human relations research, and the best thinking of the universities in assisting it in many ways.

Top management officers consistently apply modern techniques to command problems. Command representatives attend meetings of the Society for the Advancement of Management and other professional groups to assure that no new development is overlooked.

The problems of the Strategic Air Command are, of course, many and complex. Its biggest headache is the continuing loss of trained manpower to industry—this is the weakest link in an otherwise strong chain. There are community relations problems always nagging at the commanders. The jet noise problem is always a thorny one, and the increasing speeds of SAC planes has brought on burdensome high-altitude traffic-control problems in weather. On any one of a hundred fronts, running a global hauling business is no picnic; but then the hard core of men of SAC are no ordinary men, either.

Neither is working for Curtis LeMay & Co. an easy job. The grumblers and the goldbricks in SAC are soon sharpened up. But that is not to say that the good soldiers do not grouse. They do, many of them. Some would like to get out of SAC, they say. It's too hard on their families, their being away so much. The pay isn't commensurate with the danger of flying fast jet bombers and fighters. "It'd sure be nice to just have to put in 40 hours a week and then settle down to a little golf and gardening" is a phrase some SAC men have been heard to mumble. In fact, you always get the worst from a SAC airman first. Then slowly, the good comes out. And pretty soon you are getting the business that is known as being "SAC-indoctrinated." You find out that these men, under their curtain of callousness, are pretty proud of everything about the job SAC does.

Looking into SAC's future, the next step in the natural progression of our weapon spectrum would be fully intercontinental-type bombers, completely independent of air refueling or forward bases. Following the intercontinental bomber SAC will probably gradually phase into missiles, but only when the intercontinental ballistic missile can meet the accuracy, yield, and reliability of the long-range nuclear bomber.

But along with the development of the ICBM, bomber leaders warn that the intercontinental bomber development must not be relaxed—until it is certain that the ICBM can do as good or better a job. These experts are worried that present preoccupation with pushbutton warfare might delude many people into letting our present force in being deteriorate before an adequate substitute is tested, poised, and ready. This, they say, could be a serious threat to our continent and the free world.

Not that SAC is in any way opposed to a crash program for the development of the ICBM. It is a strong supporter of such a program. SAC men say with emphatic sincerity, that they'll be only too glad to get an instrument that will help do the job without their getting shot at. And who can fight that kind of reasoning?

Just as long as we continue our development program so that the SAC arsenal can fly faster, higher, can carry bigger bombs than Soviet aircraft, there will be peace. Even if the day comes when the Soviet force and the United States force are equal in capability—providing that the United States force is continually modernized and dispersed, SAC will still be an effective deterrent, and seems to be the best if not only means of preventing war.

This, of course, involves the "force in being" concept, the concept whereby men and machines are poised and ready to go at any time. It is entirely possible that from now throughout the course of civilization it may be necessary to maintain a deterrent force on this status. No one likes to live that way—no one likes to pay the bill, but it will be a necessity unless some means of guaranteeing a lasting peace other than the deterrent force is hit upon.

That is why it is said of SAC that its greatest victory will come if war never occurs between the two great powers in the world today—Communist Russia and the United States of America.

SAC's Achilles Heel

(By John G. Norris)

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Fla.—Dawn is breaking as your B–47 leaves the runway. As the airplane levels off upstairs, you get out of your parachute harness, hook on an oxygen bottle, and crawl to the bombardier-navigator's post in the nose.

First Lt. Glenn F. Morgan, Jr., gestures at the radar scope. The instrument is the main element of the airplane's K-system—the magic black box that makes it possible to bomb individual buildings accurately from above 40,000 feet through darkness or clouds. Both of you fasten your oxygen masks so that you can talk on the intercom.

The 32-year-old bombardier-navigator-radar operator—misnamed an "observer"—explains that the B–47 is turning to start its visual bombing run. From the preflight briefings, you know that this 7½-hour training mission simulates an actual nuclear attack on an enemy target thousands of miles across the world.

That includes flying a precision point-to-point course back and forth over the Southeastern States, navigating by the stars; a rendezvous with a tanker plane for in-flight refueling; actual visual bomb drops of 500-pound conventional bombs to make sure the release mechanism works; and—the climax—the radar bomb run on the main target.

At lunch the day before Col. Mike McCoy introduced you to the bomber crew. He told you that it cost the Government $616,000 to qualify one B–47 pilot. You believe it.

Capt. Edward J. Albers, 34, the copilot, saw extensive World War II service, like Morgan. Both were recalled when the Korean war broke out. The aircraft commander, Capt. John W. Rosenbalm, 27, had served in the Air Force continuously since becoming an air cadet after the war. A typical B–47 crew has an average age just over 30, each is married and has a child.

You wonder what keeps the three top-flight men—still Reservists without assurance of an Air Force career—on the job. Then you recall what General LeMay had said about his dedicated people.

Rosenbalm asks if you'd like to fly the airplane and gingerly you take Albers' seat. The bomber handles like your Buick. Then comes the approach to the target. Not Moscow, but Charlotte, N. C., where there is a radar bomb-scoring squadron, able to tell just where the B–47's load would land.

Morgan starts his bomb run, eyes glued to the radar scope. Countless hours of study of aerial photographs, he hopes, will enable him to pick out the obscure target through the clouds.

Morgan's major problem is target identification. His target is unidentifiable on the scope; so he aims for some oil tanks a known distance away. He sets the "black box" for such "offset" bombing and adjusts for wind, speed, altitude, etc. The electronic brain should do the rest.

But the "black box" fails. Only one of the many instruments goes out—the true-speed indicator—but it is enough. Morgan squeezes past you and checks his equipment. Finally he fixes it. But it is too late. The mission is an "abort."

Some green airman mechanic had failed to adjust a set-screw properly and an overworked sergeant-supervisor had missed it. So the combined skills and efforts of the men who built the plane and base, planned the mission, readied the plane for flight, and then flew it well, all came to naught.

You begin to appreciate what had been stressed so strongly during the briefings here and at SAC Headquarters in Omaha—the grave shortage of skilled mechanics and the exceptionally high turnover of newly trained technicians. Too many B–47s are temporarily out of operation each day because of mechanical difficulties. Too many training missions cannot be completed satisfactorily because something goes wrong in the air.

What was it General LeMay had said?

"The situation is critical and is our chief worry today. We still can carry out our mission, but at a high cost in efficiency and effort."

Already, the manpower problem has seriously lowered the combat readiness of the Air Force's long-range nuclear striking arm. It represents an ominous weakness in the Nation's defenses today. For if one small but vital element of SAC's vast, complex, fighting machine breaks down, the end result could be catastrophic.

For the most part, SAC combat crews today still are experienced and fully qualified to do their job. But the experience and skill level among SAC maintenance crews is low. Ninety-one percent of all SAC enlisted airmen have been in the command less than 4 years. One day, a wing at one base had nearly a third of its B–47's out of service due to K-system maintenance because of a lack of skilled technicians.

This is terribly costly both in dollars and in efficiency. SAC represents a tremendous investment—$8 billion worth of planes, bases, and other property alone. It costs $1 billion a year to operate, plus several additional billions for new planes and bases. The Nation has $724 million invested in each B–47 air division—counting trained personnel, planes, bases, and equipment.

During the last fiscal year, 1,900 SAC officers and 35,800 airmen left the service. SAC figures it had $777 million invested in them. That represents the cost of replacing them in their various specialties, including recruiting, training, paying, and supporting new people to bring them to the proper skill levels to do their jobs.

Foreseeing this loss, the Air Force last year had to start pumping in new people to replace them. The Air Training Command provided SAC with 12,000 basic airmen at a cost of nearly $20 million, 12,600 apprentice mechanics at a cost of $31.5 million, and 4,500 technicians, returned to schools for advanced training at a cost of $24 million.

In addition, SAC itself had to conduct on-the-job training to upgrade 67,000 airmen to fill the vacant specialties. SAC estimates that this cost $52 million, because scarce supervisors and skilled technicians had to be pulled away from their regular work to train them, and the trainees were unproductive during this period.

The initial cost last year to start replacing the 35,800 sergeants and airmen who left the service during that period, therefore, totaled an additional $127 million.

But the money aspect is relatively unimportant, as a detailed comparison of four B–47 wings shows. It was made to determine the precise effect of inadequately trained ground crews on the operational capability of combat units. All four were combat ready and 100 percent manned.

Two of the wings were SAC's best-staffed units, being 85 percent effectively manned in the airmen technical skills. The other two were at the bottom, from a ground-crew standpoint, being only 66 percent effectively manned in hard-core skills.

The poorest-manned units were able to keep their B–47's in the air only 80 percent of the time they were supposed to. They completed 87 percent of their training missions, only 75 percent of them satisfactorily.

On the other hand, the two best-manned units flew 99 percent of their prescribed flying hours, completed 98 percent of their training minimums, and 91 percent of these were acceptable to LeMay's rigid standards.

It cost the two poorest-manned wings $468 per flying hour to operate, and the two best $415.

But the real payoff came in the vital quarterly Unit Simulated Combat Mission. The two poorest-manned wings were 20 percent less effective in this big test of combat capability than the two units with the best ground crews.

"In other words," said a SAC officer, "under wartime conditions, scratch 20 percent of the targets assigned to the two wings with the less-skilled ground crews."

Why is the Air Force so pressed by the lack of a relatively small number of technicians? Take the black box, for example. In the first place, it takes a man with a fairly high IQ to be accepted for the K-system basic-training school. Yet the Air Force has to take all sorts. It takes about 2 years of school and on-the-job training to advance such a man from apprentice to mechanic rating. During their fourth year, after advanced schooling, some gain the skill for upgrading to technician level and promotion to staff sergeant. By the end of the 4-year enlistment the Air Force will have spent $22,500 on such a mechanic in training, pay, and allowances. It will have received 18 months' productive service from him and given him 2½ years of highly marketable training.

If he reenlists, it costs the Government $20,500 only for his pay and other maintenance for the next 4 years and SAC gets full value received—92 percent of his time in productive effort.

But only 20 percent of the black-box men are signing up for a second enlistment.

Why do they leave?

An airman first class says he wants to go back to college when his 4-year enlistment expires.

An airman second class says he plans to marry and get an engineering degree under the GI bill.

Service newspapers are full of ads reading, "Leaving the service? See us."

Turnover in other key aircraft maintenance fields is as critical as among men servicing the black boxes. Lt. Col. Edwin J. Caudill, 813th Air Division personnel director, is concerned about his mechanics. His questionnaires show that 121 of 306 plane mechanics are eligible for discharge in June and July and only 16 say they will reenlist.

Pinecastle AFB has only 60 percent of its authorized instrument maintenance men. By mid-April, this will drop to 50 percent. Of an authorized 14 men to maintain its IBM machines, a vital factor in mission planning, only 10 are assigned and but 3 of these are "effectives." Only 1 out of the 4 comptometer repairmen allowed is "on board."

The Air Force makes a strong effort to sell airmen on reenlisting. All airmen are interviewed on their future plans. Armed with full data about the cost of living, wage scales, etc., in the airman's hometown, the interviewing officer stresses the advantages of an Air Force career.

Fifty to sixty percent of those who leave say they are going into industry. Some have a job already lined up. Ten percent declare they are quitting for "family reasons," and the rest say they are going back to school.

All the evidence indicates these factors are pulling airmen back into civilian life just as they become most valuable to SAC:

Competition from industry.

The GI education bill.

Housing shortages at most bases.

Periodic movement of servicemen, interfering with family life.

General dislike of military service.

The generally low esteem and prestige accorded an enlisted career by the American public.

SAC has a broad plan of action designed to cope with the problem. Some proposals require congressional or top Pentagon action.

One phase calls for less complicated, easier to maintain equipment. "We can get geniuses to design them but can't have an Air Force of geniuses to service them," said a SAC officer.

Another proposal is to let the Air Force raise its recruiting standards. Department of Defense regulations now force it to take a proportionate share of lower I. Q. men. SAC says many of the men it receives are untrainable.

Other recommendations are aimed at making life in SAC more attractive. Last year's pay raise and increase in reenlistment allowance helped, boosting the SAC reenlistment rate from 26 to 35 percent.

But the trouble is that the percentage varies widely in various specialties. Sixty percent of SAC cooks are signing up for another term when their enlistments expire, while only 10 percent of the Command's skilled radarmen are reenlisting.

"By civilian standards we are overpaying some people and underpaying others," said a SAC personnel officer. "Surveys show that the wage scale for cooks on the outside is $1.80 an hour or less, while an electronics supervisor gets $2.60 per hour.

"But the top pay of an Air Force cook and an Air Force electronics supervisor, both master sergeants, is the same—$2.35 an hour based on a 40-hour week. We have 239 job specialties and only 7 pay grades."

The plan, not yet in final form, would apply to officers as well as airmen. Personnel officers stressed that SAC aircraft commanders make only $500 to $700 a month, while a commercial airline pilot makes from $15,000 to $20,000 a year—more than SAC's top generals.

Other proposals urged to improve career attractiveness include:

More family and military housing.

Medical care for all dependents.

Expansion of commissaries and PX's and cancellation of the present restrictions on the goods they can carry and prices charged.

Amendment of the GI Educational Act, so that men who remain in service can go to school in off-duty hours at Government expense.

Correction of a present situation that is causing much bitterness among many airmen. Officers receive a subsistence allowance on a monthly basis, enlisted men on a daily basis. When individuals or units leave their permanent base on temporary duty at schools or other stations—and this is frequent in SAC—the airmen lose their allowance and the officers don't.

Additional allowance to ease rough spots, such as extension of quarters allowances for airmen with dependents, per diem payments while on maneuvers, and raising rental and subsistence allowances in high-cost-of-living areas.

Much has been done during recent years to make life more attractive to servicemen and to boost reenlistment rates. Congress has raised pay and allowances. The Defense Department and Air Force Headquarters have taken other action. General LeMay has established hobby shops, designed new and more livable barracks, set up SAC flying clubs, and dependents' assistance programs, and taken many other morale-building moves.

All these things help. But SAC needs assistance to solve its critical manpower problem. It must have sympathetic and prompt attention to its proposals by top-level Pentagon officials and Congress. And public understanding and support.

For too much rides on SAC's combat readiness in the world today to let correctible weaknesses continue. Survival is everyone's business.

THE BOMBER'S ROLE IN DIPLOMACY

(By Maj. Gen. James C. Selser, Jr., Deputy Commander, Eighth Air Force, SAC)

The Strategic Air Command's role as a deterrent to aggression is so well established today that it is easy to forget that the interrelationship of airpower and diplomacy is a relatively new concept. SAC bombers first became an instrument of international diplomacy when 6 Boeing B–29's of the 43d Bombardment Group, 8th Air Force, flew a secret mission to the American Zone in Germany in November 1946.

For centuries naval forces have been considered as the primary military arm of our foreign policy. One of the first, and certainly the most colorful, illustrations of the use of a military force as an instrument of diplomacy occurred when President Theodore Roosevelt sent a fleet of 16 battleships on a cruise around the world. Although the maneuver was termed a practice cruise, it was generally associated with the administration's Japanese policy. Roosevelt later concluded that sending the fleet around the world was the most important service that I rendered to peace. The Navy became Roosevelt's big stick.

However, the atomic age ushered in a new era in international diplomacy through airpower. The then-exclusive ability of SAC to deliver atomic attacks of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki variety placed it in a position to challenge the Navy's traditional role as the strong arm of the State Department. When two American C–47's were shot down over Yugoslavia in August 1946, the Army Air Forces through the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, W. STUART SYMINGTON, sought approval for an around-the-world flight of B–29's as a demonstration of American airpower. Secretary SYMINGTON wanted his planes to be recognized as an instrument of international policymaking. This project was disapproved by the State Department, but a flight of six B–29's to Germany was approved. As commander of the 43d Bomb Group, I had the good fortune to lead the Superforts to Europe.

On November 8, 1946, only 5 days before X-day, the 43d Bombardment Group was alerted to prepare for a special mission to an unknown destination. Eight B–29's, including 2 spares, and 2 Douglas C–54 Skymasters were to be prepared for the mission. The instructions required that the B–29's carry enough equipment and spare parts to operate independently for 30 days.

Requisitioning the necessary supplies proved to be the major problem. The B–29's were of the latest series and had fuel shutoff valves unlike any of their predecessors. Neither the aircraft nor the special values were being manufactured at that time, and as a result, we had to cannibalize other aircraft of the same type at Davis-Monthan Field, Ariz. In addition, the propeller governors were being modified at Oklahoma City Air Depot, and only eight governors were ready in time for the mission.

Our first destination, Morrison Field, West Palm Beach, Fla., was not disclosed to all members of the flight until the general briefing was held—only 4 hours before takeoff. Even then rigid security restrictions limited the briefing. However, the role of the combat crews as a "show team" was stressed.

At 2 o'clock on November 13, 1946, seven of our B–29's left Davis-Monthan at 1-minute intervals. One takeoff was delayed an hour and thirty minutes when a prop governor needed changing. Average time for the flight to Morrison Field was 7 hours and 3 minutes. The complete flight was made at 15,000 feet, and the weather on this first leg of the mission was excellent.

On arrival at Morrison Field, I was told by Strategic Air Command Headquarters that the flight across the Atlantic was to be so scheduled that not more than two B–29's would be at Langens Field (now Lajes Air Base), Azores, at any one time. As a result we had to devise a system whereby each group of two aircraft arriving at Lagens would relay its departure plans to Morrison Field so that the succeeding group could plan its flight accordingly. A failure of communications between Morrison Field and Lagens resulted in considerable delay in scheduling succeeding groups. The two spare B–29's were directed to stand by at Morrison until we had arrived at our ultimate destination—Frankfurt, Germany.

Inadequate communications also made weather forecasting over the Atlantic extremely uncertain. In addition, all forecasts in the Azores were at least 6 hours old and accurate weather information beyond Orly Field, Paris, France, was not available.

After we left the Azores, all designated alternate airfields in Europe and North Africa were reported to be below established weather minimums. Thus, we were forced to land at our planned destination, Rhein-Main Airfield, Frankfurt, Germany, even though the ceiling of 200 feet and half-mile visibility presented serious problems. Approach control and tower personnel at Rhein-Main, who were not familiar with the approach speeds and landing patterns for B–29s, further complicated the situation. Therefore, we had to assist them in directing all subsequent approaches and landings.

On arrival in Frankfurt, the Superforts were quickly prepared for possible immediate combat. Operational missions conducted in Europe were carefully planned and briefed. These included flights along the borders of Soviet-occupied territory, display of the aircraft and crews at the capitals of free European countries, and surveys of suitable airdromes for compilation of data to be used by succeeding SAC organizations.

After approximately 12 days in Europe, we departed on November 29 and returned to Davis-Monthan.

To properly evaluate the diplomatic import of this mission, one must remember that this token force represented the only atomic striking power in the world. The international situation at that time was particularly tense, and the base of Western allied power had not yet been laid. The spirit of allied cooperation had not yet been supplanted by a realistic appraisal of Russia's imperialistic goals; Soviet domination of all Eastern Europe was not yet an accomplished fact; and the effects of almost complete demobilization in the United States were still apparent.

The intractible attitude of the Soviet representatives at high-level conferences in 1946 had increased international tension. Relations already strained were stretched almost to the breaking point when two Army Air Transport Service C–47 aircraft were shot down over Yugoslavia in August 1946. The second of these incidents resulted in the death of five Americans.

The feeling was widespread in America that Russia and her satellites were taking advantage of United States military weakness.

In view of then-existing world conditions, our unprecedented flight of even a small group of B–29's to Europe was a significant event. Although the flight itself could not have been interpreted as a threat to Russia, the implications were obvious to thoughtful observers. Our B–29 was widely recognized as the aircraft capable of delivering the atomic bomb. Furthermore, the appearance of B–29's in Europe was certain to cause speculation about the possibility of stationing the superfortresses there permanently.

Although not publicized at that time, we conducted a survey of European airfields to determine which might be suited to B–29 operations. It seems probable that the Soviet Union anticipated the complete withdrawal of United States forces from Western Europe, leaving a vacuum which the Soviets hoped to fill. This flight could be regarded as symbolic of the growing sentiment in the United States against creating such a vacuum.

It is a matter of record that Mr. Molotov adopted a more amenable attitude during the course of the meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers, held in New York City in November 1946.

This mission firmly convinced us that SAC units should deploy periodically to overseas bases for tactical training. This practice soon became an integral part of SAC's training program. Entire wings of B–36's and B–47's, present-day workhorses of the Strategic Air Command, now rotate periodically to overseas bases for intensified operations under simulated wartime conditions. Capable of delivering any air weapons in the nuclear arsenal, the aircraft, their crews, support personnel and equipment are maintained in a constant state of readiness. Along with new developments in aircraft and weapons have come refinements in operational techniques, crew training, maintenance, and supply. SAC bombers deploy in a matter of hours with sufficient spare parts and supplies to operate under sustained wartime conditions for at least 30 days. SAC's global capability has certainly been a major factor in the formulation of American foreign policy.

HOW SAC TACKLES ITS SECURITY PROBLEM

(By Brig. Gen. David Wade, inspector general, SAC)

It was still raining when the bus stopped at the corner. A man got off and ran for the shelter of the drugstore doorway. Across the street a young kid was unlocking the pumps at a filling station. Next door the windows of a cafe were a yellow glow in the early morning darkness.

The man shoved a newspaper-wrapped package under his raincoat to keep it dry and ran across the street to the cafe. It was warm inside and there were smells of hot coffee, ham and eggs. He stamped water from his shoes and moved toward a booth at the end of the room.

They were waiting for him. "Mike the Wrench" and Jack. Mike grinned, "Look at the white overalls. You a painter looking for a job?"

"What else?" He sat down. "You guys all set? Anyone suspicious?"

"Naw," Mike said, "we're old hands, Neal. I'll have a wrench on one of those bombers before they know we're around."

"How about the lieutenant?" Jack asked.

"He's all set. Reports to the wing this afternoon with bona fide orders. Almost bona fide, anyway. Sergeant Thomas reported into headquarters squadron last last." Neal stood up. "Everybody straight? O. K., see you guys around. Be careful, move slow and stay out of jail."

It was light outside and the rain had stopped when Neal left the cafe. He carried his raincoat over one arm, the package half hidden under it.

Neal watched the other painters carefully. So far so good. He was on the base, temporarily hired to help with a rush paint job in the communications building. He wondered if they had noticed he was a little clumsy with the brush. Probably don't care, he thought. It's just another 8 hours to them, and I'm a temporary flunky helping out. He glanced at his watch—nearly noon.

It was 12:30 when the alert sirens cut loose. The painters had gone to lunch and Neal was alone in the new wing of the building. Through a window he could see men running. From within the communication center he heard steel bang on steel as safes were closed and locked. He grinned. What

a lousy time for the base to go on alert. Chow time. Meals half finished. Skeleton forces on duty. Everyone out of position and off guard.

He walked quickly through the passageway joining the wing to the main building. Only a few people were around during the noon hour. "What's up, Sarge?" he asked the first man he saw.

"It's a sabotage alert. Condition Red." Airman Third Class Rawlings was important with his knowledge. "They caught a guy monkeying with a plane down the line. Guess there's a penetration team on base."

"What do we do? I mean, can I keep on working?"

"Well."

"I'm supposed to check equipment for scaling paint and rust. O. K. if I go ahead?"

"Yeah, guess so. Sergeant Ramsey isn't here now, but he'll be back in a few minutes. You been here all morning. We're supposed to check everybody, you know, in an alert, but you been here, so sure go ahead."

"Thanks." Neal moved away quickly. He wouldn't be there when Sergeant Ramsey came back.

The provost marshal wasted no words into the phone. "Hello, Fox One? Got two guys here. A1c. Michael J. Rodski, AF 15677231, and M. Sgt. Neal B. Turnbull, AF 35972843. Know 'em?"

He listened a moment, let out what passed for an affirmative grunt, and turned to Mike and Neal. "O. K. Your command post identifies you as legitimate penetration team members. You're free to go." He looked at Mike. "I've heard of you, Rodski. You say you can lay a wrench on any SAC plane, huh? We nailed you quick enough, didn't we?"

"That crew chief was tough, Major. Didn't buy my story, and when I tried to get away, that sonuvagun tackled me right on the concrete. Skinned my knees and tore my coveralls."

The major glared at Neal. "Didn't you do enough damage in the comm center? Were you going to try to blow up the whole base? You had enough simulated explosive devices in that package to do it."

"No, just the ammo area if I could get in. How'd you get me so quick after I left the center?"

"Sergeant Ramsey got there in time to see you leave and when the kid told him you'd poked around through the building he called us and then Installations to check you. You checked out phony. Ramsey and my boys found your three devices in time, we figure, to disarm them, but Ramsey was still mad about you getting loose in there. Understand he threatened the kid with night duty for the rest of his life."

The major reached for his cap. He felt pretty good. Two penetrators caught, two more to go, and his boys were closing in on one right now. A mysterious lieutenant had been spotted in wing ops. "One of my cars will give you a lift into town." He smiled for the first time, "Catch you guys on my base again and I'll put you under the guardhouse."

In room 305 in the Hotel Royal downtown Neal sat by a telephone. He was now in charge of the team's command post, Fox One, and he or Mike would have to stay by the phone until the rest of the team were caught.

Eight months before, M. Sgt. Neal Turnbull had little interest in penetration teams, except for the trouble they caused when they got on his base in Texas. Then every man on the base became a policeman-in-fact, suspicious of every stranger, watchful for the slightest thing out of order. When a penetration team was on the loose, base security was everybody's business.

Now he was winding up his last job as a penetrator. He had visited nearly a dozen Strategic Air Command bases, including two overseas, punching as many holes as he could in SAC's security defenses. He'd be glad to get back to regular duty.

Back in 1949, when Neal Turnbull was a MATS flight engineer, flying out of Washington, the Strategic Air Command was only 3 years old. Even then it was beginning to worry about the security of its combat forces.

Before 1949 the SAC air policeman worked at time-honored provost functions, gave little if any concern to the protection of the combat force. But, as international pressures built up, the security problem grew.

The policing concept began to cover protection of the whole land area of each SAC base, patrolling the entire perimeter, and stationing point guards at each aircraft. SAC needed 7,800 men to do the job, and $2.7 million worth of fences, towers, lights, and patrol roads.

The program grew slowly until the Korean war in 1950. Enlistees and experienced Reserves were suddenly made available—and Sergeant Turnbull was transferred to a B–29 outfit in the Far East.

A security officer recruiting program got under way in 1951 and at Fort Carson, Colo., young airmen were trained in the rudiments of security and airbase defense in a new SAC security school.

A security intelligence program, giving SAC commanders subversive intelligence, was begun to aid in developing local security plans and to indicate the overall subversive problem. A basic manual, kept current through quarterly supplements, furnished information relative to the worldwide security situation.

In mid-1953 the vulnerability testing program began. This idea, which later turned Sergeant Turnbull into a skilled "enemy" agent, became one of the greatest single factors in strengthening SAC security. Tests conducted by the Office of Special Investigations and by teams of carefully picked SAC men began measuring the adequacy of the Command's developing security program. Tests were aimed at showing how bad, not how good, the internal defenses were. Combat organizations on the bases were rated and their scores compared.

The penetration teams hit hard, using every means available to throw base defenses off guard. They forged orders and passes, climbed over and under fences, stole base vehicles, posed as milkmen and Coca-Cola salesmen, as air policemen on duty and aircraft company tech reps—anything and any way to get on base and get to a sensitive area to simulate attempted sabotage.

At one western base a pickup truck drove slowly across the flight line after the base alert had sounded. In the middle of a long line of aircraft the truck sputtered to a stop. The driver poked around under the hood a few minutes, then asked a nearby crew chief where the nearest phone was. For an hour and a half the truck, theoretically loaded with explosives, stood unmolested among millions of dollars' worth of airplanes.

On another base a team member posed as a security courier. He walked into base communications, said he was grounded for several hours due to engine trouble, and would the sergeant be so kind as to put his briefcase of classified documents in the vault for safekeeping? The briefcase, the vault, and the sergeant were, theoretically, scattered all over the landscape a few hours later.

Here's another gimmick used successfully at several bases. An officer and a civilian represent themselves as technicians from Air Materiel Command—probably with a faked operational TWX (teletype message). Once on the line they sabotage every aircraft they can. At each they leave a 10-inch roll of white paper, symbols of explosive devices an enemy agent might plant.

Another test team posed as a surveying party and surveyed its way across the outer fence, the runways, and eventually found its way into the aircraft parking ramp.

But it is harder going now to fool SAC men. At Bergstrom AFB, Tex., four agents approached a flight-line gate. Three were admitted but the air policeman on duty stopped the fourth for further check. He looked too old for an airman first class. All four were caught.

Sometimes a team will make a bad mistake. At Lake Charles Air Force Base, La., a member of a penetration team from Lockbourne Air Force Base, Ohio, discovered that the only apparent difference between flight-line passes was the base name. The team mutilated their Lockbourne passes to look like Lake Charles. One by one they attempted to enter the flight-line area. Each was promptly arrested. The Lockbourne pass was pink, the Lake Charles pass, gray. The reconnoitering team member was colorblind.

One moonlight night at Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., a test team leader tried to get on the base by swimming across bordering Lake Worth. As he neared the dark shoreline a shot and a ricocheting rifle bullet changed his mind and he made the trip back in near record time.

And at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla., a "saboteur" spotted a sentry dog and his handler. He swarmed back over the fence so quickly he ripped his hand on the barbed wire. Actually he got away that night, but the air police figured he would have the hand treated at the base hospital. They nabbed him when he came in.

Two years of such attacks, as often as six times a year at each station, have brought about a noticeable improvement in individual base security systems. Every successful sabotage attempt has resulted in immediate steps to plug a loophole and alter the system.

In addition, an attack by a penetration team is part of every unit simulated combat mission carried out by a combat wing. These teams, usually 1 officer and 4 airmen, are hand-picked for their ingenuity and special abilities. They are thoroughly briefed on the installation and the community, and are armed with rosters of key personnel. However, a team gets no information which could not be obtained by an enemy agent.

Fifteen days before a unit simulated combat mission the team arrives in the area, but confines its activities to espionage. Five days before the mission the team leader, per regulation, phones the base commander that his team is in position. He gives the base commander the code name and telephone number of the team's command post, which is manned as long as any team member is at large. This is to eliminate the possibility of an enemy agent posing as a team member.

Strategic Air Command plays this game in earnest. Air policemen, if negligent, can be reduced in grade. And no wing commander likes to explain why his organization's security has been penetrated.

In 1954 SAC faced another problem bearing directly on its security program. A personnel shortage was developing while the command was still building up. Career men like Sergeant Turnbull were staying in, but thousands of younger men pulled in for the Korean crisis were returning to civilian life.

As a result, SAC's original plan—to protect the entire land area of a base—had to be reduced to minimum patrol requirements. The bulk of security forces were drawn around combat aircraft and other essential supporting facilities. Seventy percent of the air police force was assigned exclusively to security functions.

Even this concentration of forces left much to be desired. Something else was needed to increase the effectiveness of the man on the guard post. Sentry dogs seemed to be the answer.

Tests conducted at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., confirmed previous successful experiences with sentry dogs in overseas opera-

tions, and during 1955 the sentry dog began to appear on stateside SAC bases. Each trained dog more than doubled the effectiveness of his sentry-handler. By the end of 1955, 350 dogs were on duty. That number continues to grow, to the discomfort of SAC's penetration teams.

The dogs give a tremendous psychological boost to the AP patrolling a lonely post, but their most valuable contribution is their keen sense of smell. Primary task of these teams is to detect an intruder and sound the alarm, and then to apprehend the trespasser.

Once the alarm is sounded, the security control center dispatches an alert force to the trouble spot. If there is evidence of a sabotage attempt, all squadrons are alerted to "Condition Red." Thousands of eyes suddenly become suspicious of every man. The general order for every officer and airman is seize, search, and secure.

Should an attack in force be indicated, the sabotage alert immediately becomes an air base defense activity, and a defense in depth is established around vital elements of the combat striking force. Meanwhile combat operations sections have readied the crews and aircraft for possible action.

This is the goal of Strategic Air Command's security system, a base kept secure and standing ready to perform its primary mission.

The maintenance of wartime security in a peacetime era is a new idea, but it is one in which SAC strongly believes. And SAC men learned long ago that the command holds each of them responsible for its security.

M. Sgt. Neal B.Turnbull, penetrator, learned this the hard way. In a small town near a Southern base he found a technical sergeant one night propped on a bar stool and happily downing his bourbon and brandy. It looked like easy information and Turnbull, neatly dressed in a flannel suit, struck up conversation, bought the sergeant a drink, and tactfully guided the talk into more informative channels. In his report of the incident Turnbull stated that finally the sergeant stood up and said, "Buddy, you've asked just one question too many about my base and business and I'm going to punch you in the nose!" Turnbull's report concludes, "which he proceeded to do."

THE WORLD'S WEATHER—HOW SAC FINDS OUT ABOUT IT

(By Col. Frederick J. Cole, commander, First Weather Group)

The age of weather forecasting began when man first appeared on earth. He found a world already shaped by weather—blackened by fire, frozen by giant ice flows, eroded by rain and flood. Lightning flashed above, powerful storms swept across the earth, and there were long periods of alternating heat and cold. Man was quick to understand that weather was an ever-present force that he had to reckon with in his daily life.

But until the age of flight, man was not greatly concerned with predicting weather's vagaries. His was a local problem of rain, snow, or sunshine. His only interest in a storm several hundred miles away was how much that storm might later affect his own locality.

Then came the airplane.

In 50-odd years aviation has developed at such a fantastic rate that today Air Force weathermen working in support of the Strategic Air Command are charged with forefasting worldwide weather. The jet aircraft of SAC, flying at 600 miles per hour 8 to 10 miles above the earth, span oceans and continents in a matter of hours in routine operations. Obviously this type of flying involves extensive weather support.

Since 1951 the First Weather Group has been assigned the task of furnishing weather support to SAC's global operations. Before then weather forecasting had been done on a regional basis, and the primary job of a forecasting center was to provide weather data about its particular area of responsibility. When the Air Weather Service was reorganized under MATS in 1951, a functional concept of forecasting was adopted. This meant that a specific weather unit—the First Weather Group in the case of SAC—was charged with supporting all operations of a specific function. Detachments from the First Weather Group were assigned to SAC bases in the United States and overseas. Similar groups were assigned to support the other Air Force commands. From SAC's point of view, the changeover was a great improvement, for it allowed specialized support for SAC's specialized purposes.

The requirements of the Strategic Air Command present the most interesting and challenging assignment any weatherman ever had. Sixteen percent of SAC's aircraft are in the air day and night the year around. They fly long hours and many miles over flight paths of infinite variety. Every 3½ minutes around the clock one of these jet bombers meets a tanker plane for a refueling rendezvous, as often over the trackless waste of an ocean as over land. Wherever they go, on this or the far side of the world, the SAC planes and crews must have accurate and detailed information about the weather along their flight paths. Since a mission may be ordered to any place, at any time, weather information must be immediately available when needed.

In order to meet these stringent requirements, weather personnel have to work closely with operational units, providing weather support at the level at which missions are planned and carried out. As a result, about 75 percent of all missions flown by a wing are directly supported by the base weather station. There is a close tie-in between the operations section of the bomb wing and the station, and the weather detachment commander and the wing weather officers are key people. When a wing deploys overseas for short periods of temporary duty or for 90-day rotations, wing weather officers go along and, through overseas facilities, provide the essential weather service. This arrangement assures a continuity of reliable weather support at home base as well as overseas.

Contrary to the popular belief, the weatherman's job is not over when the air crews take off on a mission. As the mission goes on (many last more than 24 hours) the weather is carefully watched for any changes that might affect the safety of flight. Under marginal conditions, when certain bases might be closed in by bad weather before the mission ends, the weather at all possible alternate bases is constantly checked by operations and weather personnel. This information is checked against a "how-goes-it" analysis of the mission in progress and how much fuel is left in case an alternate base must be used. If a change in weather dictates a change in mission plans, the information is already at hand to eliminate weather hazards.

A weather analysis of SAC's aircraft accident rate during the past 5 years (see chart) shows that while the total number of accidents has continued downward during the period, the number of accidents involving weather has followed an erratic pattern. For the most part, however, this erratic behavior reflects flight limitations of aircraft. For example, an accident resulted when an F–84F lost power while in a cloud because the supercooled water in the atmosphere had a contracting effect on the rotating shroud of the jet turbine. To weathermen the most significant figures in this chart are the "Number of Accidents Involving a Determined Weather Deficiency." The man who decides whether or not to charge an accident against a weather deficiency is the Director of Flight Safety Research at Norton Air Force Base, Calif. Any such deficiency must be corrected or eliminated immediately.

As control of an operation moves upward, so does responsibility for weather support. When more than one wing or division is involved in the planning and execution of an operation, direct control generally is exercised by one of SAC's three numbered air forces. If more than one air force is involved, SAC headquarters generally assumes direct control.

In a like manner responsibility for weather support is changed from a base weather station to a forecast center at a numbered air force and, finally, to the Offutt Weather Central at SAC headquarters. Forecast centers have a partial hemispheric capability, while the Offutt Central's forecast capability covers the entire hemisphere.

With its hemispheric capability, Offutt Weather Central carries as high as 25 percent of the weather support load of each base by making the forecast for any mission or any part of a mission beyond the capability of the base weather stations. The chart showing the forecast load of the Offutt Weather Central shows an increase from 450 forecasts in a 6-month period in 1952 to 1,450 forecasts during the last 6 months of 1955, reflecting the rate at which SAC operations have increased since 1952.

The weatherman's basic tools—maps and charts recording current national and hemispheric weather data—are supplied daily to SAC weather stations by the facsimile network originating at the National Weather Analysis Center at Suitland, Md. The center and its network support nearly all military and civilian weather organizations in the United States. Reception of the basic charts from a central source allows SAC weathermen to concentrate their efforts on the specialized charts and forecasts required by their chief customers—the combat crews and the men who plan their missions.

Forecasting for flights from stateside bases to North Africa, England, Greenland, Alaska, or Pacific bases is routine for SAC stations. The major problem in this kind of forecasting is much the same as it always has been: lack of sufficient weather data because there just are not enough weather stations in the empty expanses of the oceans. In addition, since the planes on many of these missions may be hours apart, SAC weathermen and combat crews have developed a technique whereby enroute weather data accumulated by one flight is quickly appraised and included in forecasts for following flights. The professional ability of SAC crews to translate the weather they meet into accurate in-flight reports increases the accuracy of subsequent forecasts.

However, these in-flight reports are often not as detailed as weathermen would like, and there are hopes that sometime in the future aircraft will carry lightweight, digital recorders which will automatically log enroute data.

Studies of the jet stream and its effects on aircraft operations in 1954 showed the value of such airborne weather observing platforms. With the cooperation of Pan American World Airways and Mr. S. Serebreny, Pan AM's technical supervisor of meteorology, two specially instrumented B–36s were flown from Japan to Maine along the course of the jet stream. One aircraft was intentionally flown in the jet stream while the other followed a winding course along its axis. Information gathered on this and many other flights has made it possible to capitalize on the benefits of the jet stream and to minimize its disadvantages.

In a similar manner, through Mr. H. Harrison, United Air Lines; Mr. J. George, Eastern Air Lines; Mr. C. N. Touart, Air Force Cambridge Research Center; and Dr. R. Fletcher, Air Weather Service, SAC pursues a continuous and aggressive flight research program designed to improve forecasting capabilities.

With more and more emphasis on jet operations, today's forecaster is confronted

by problems that arise because modern aircraft operate at tremendous heights and speeds in a medium that man still has much to learn about. The cruise-climb profile of jet aircraft—the flight path that gives a jet its best range and efficiency—requires planes to operate at altitudes that were only dreamed about 10 years ago and demands weather forecasts once called impossible to make. The weatherman's chief concern is lack of sufficient data.

Most of the available upper air weather data is centered around the 500-millibar or 20,000-foot level. Altitudewise this fails to satisfy even the lower limits of normal cruise-climb profiles. However, from a weather analyst's point of view, it furnishes a common upper level which, when correlated with surface conditions, gives a three-dimensional picture of the atmosphere. Within certain limitations, the analyst has learned to build his weather picture up and down from the 20,000-foot level. In building upward he was soon confronted with the fact that his constructed picture did not conform with high-altitude conditions flight crews reported. This was particularly true in the tropopause area separating the lower and upper atmospheres.

The tropopause is extremely unstable as a transition zone between two atmospheres and their respective weathers. The tropopause may fall nearly as low as 30,000 feet behind a weather front, or it may ride upward to 50,000 feet over violent thunderstorms in the lower atmosphere. Such varied effects of one atmosphere upon the other at altitudes where it is difficult to obtain accurate weather data taxes the ability of SAC's forecasters—for these are the altitudes at which planes of the command must operate.

That SAC's men continue to fly round-the-clock missions through these comparatively unexplored regions high above the earth is evidence of the efficiency of the command's weather support.

The vastness of the weatherman's laboratory makes his fund of knowledge seem terribly small. Still, the job must be done, the forecasts made. In doing the job, impossible as it once seemed, SAC's forecasters of the world's weather learn a little more every day about the atmosphere. What they learn today makes tomorrow's forecast more accurate and adds that much more to the effectiveness of the Strategic Air Command.

Clancy Lowers the Boom

(By Col. E. D. Reynolds, commander, 4050th Air Refueling Wing, SAC)

The Irish couldn't be prouder of their Clancys than the Strategic Air Command is of a select group of men who answer to the same name—although, really, their names run from Adams to Zegdrowski. It was inevitable that the boom operator of a SAC tanker would be dubbed "Clancy" after the character of the same name. When the Clancy of the song wanted to straighten things out, he really lowered the boom. For peace in our time, "Clancy" of the Strategic Air Command's tankers daily lowers a giant-sized 48-foot aluminum tube. Lying prone on a sponge rubber mat in the tail of a KC–97 aerial tanker, Clancy guides his boom into the gas-filler nozzle of SAC's B–47 and B–52 bombers, as well as the strategic F–84 fighters. As the jet fuel flows into the receiver plane's tank at hundreds of gallons per minute, it is obvious that Clancy is doing his part in providing the "seven league boots" for SAC's nuclear striking force.

Let's listen in on the radio for a minute and see what happens when "Clancy lowers the boom." This is a routine training exercise, held daily to insure that our strategic bomber forces can take off from a base in the United States and fly nonstop to any spot in the world and return.

Esquire Fifty-six is the tanker and he's in his orbit area waiting for business.

"Pigtail Ninety-nine, this is Esquire Fifty-six—do you read?"

"Reading you five square. Fifty-six. Revised ETA [estimated time of arrival] for rendezvous is fifty past the hour."

"Navigator to aircraft commander. I've been listening in and I have him on the scope at one six zero miles."

"O. K., old boy, take over."

"P–T Ninety-nine, I have you at range one six zero."

"Roger, Fifty-six."

(A little aircraft commander-navigator conversation is usually necessary about this time to make sure that all headings are correct.)

"P–T Ninety-nine, you're now one two zero—correct 10° left."

"Roger, Fifty-six—10° left."

"P–T Ninety-nine, range one hundred—what will be your descent range for formating speed?"

"Fifty-six, descent range thirty-seven, formating speed one ninety-five knots indicated."

"Ninety-nine, range six zero—correct three left."

"AC, Ninety-nine is at six zero—start your turn left to two four zero and depart orbit at completion of turn."

"O. K., Nav, turning left to two four zero."

"Ninety-nine range three zero—take course two four zero."

"Roger, Fifty-six."

At 12 miles the tanker stabilizes at 195 knots indicated—the navigator continues to direct the receiver up to a 1-mile range and then clears "Clancy to lower the boom"—after that it's "Contact Tanker" and "Contact Receiver."

No sweat. All in a day's work.

This tanker crew had a sense of humor, too. For in large letters painted on the ruddevators (combination rudders and elevators) of Clancy's boom was "All credit cards accepted." (Credit card or no credit card, you can always get gas if you say "LeMay sent me.")

What used to be a stunt has now been developed into an exact science. During 1955 the forces of the Strategic Air Command accomplished an average of 1 aerial refueling every 3½ minutes throughout the entire year. This was done in all kinds of weather, both day and night, in summer and in winter. Single airplanes and mass formations were all refueled on schedule. That's not a stunt.

Aerial refueling, which has brought the entire world within the range of SAC's atom-bomb-carrying airplanes, was first tried more than 20 years ago, but became a practical, everyday technique within the last 5.

Basically, aerial refueling was a military development. It was first done successfully over San Diego in June 1923 by two young lieutenants—Lt. Lowell H. Smith, and Lt. John P. Richter—who used a makeshift hose and a funnel rig to transfer a mere 25 gallons of gasoline from one airplane to another. Six years later, young officers exploited the refueling idea by setting an endurance record of 150 hours, 40 minutes, and 15 seconds in the Question Mark, a Fokker trimotor. During World War II three of the officers on this historymaking aerial refueling flight gained international fame. These three enterprising pilots were Maj. Carl (Tooey) Spaatz, Capt. Ira Eaker, and Lt. Elwood Quesada.

After World War II, SAC began working on its refueling technique, using B–50 bombers and a modified refueling system developed by the British. The British gravity flow system proved too slow, so United States technicians added pressure to it, making it possible to pump over 500 gallons of fuel per minute. The boom replaced the earlier hose, and it brought "Clancy" into the picture.

The old expression, "There's nothing new under the sun," certainly doesn't hold true in this aerial filling station business. As fighters and bombers fly faster and higher, we in the refueling business are hard-pressed to give them a load of fuel in mid-air and let them continue on the mission with just as little interference as possible. Just a few years ago we were dangling a rubber hose out the rear end of a modified B–29, sometimes taking up to an hour and one-half to offload comparatively few gallons of fuel by the gravity feed method. Today we've got a jet prototype tanker, the KC–135, which can refuel our planes at speeds above 500 miles an hour and at altitudes in excess of 35,000 feet. SAC's aerial refueling is something like an advertising slogan used by a roadside hamburger stand on the Houston-San Antonio road. The sign says: "He didn't invent the hamburger, but he did perfect it." SAC didn't invent aerial refueling, but it certainly perfected the technique.

On March 2, 1949, an 8th Air Force B–50 Superfortress, Lucky Lady II, piloted by Capt. James Gallagher, touched down on the runway at Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex., completing man's first nonstop flight around the world.

The B–50 left Carswell shortly after noon on February 26, 1949, and returned to its base 94 hours and 1 minute later after a flight of 23,450 miles at an average speed of 249 miles per hour. It had been refueled four times by KC–29 tankers from bases in the Azores, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, and Hawaii. This mission was a big factor in establishing new refueling procedures and improving all equipment. Other missions flown in the Arctic tested the operating capability of the hose equipment. Units equipped with this system were sent to all parts of the world for further testing.

Using this equipment many types of formation refuelings were attempted, but not with the mass results desired. The success of this type of air refueling depended upon the tanker aircraft commander's skill in formation flying. To train tanker aircraft commanders was requiring more flying time than is now allotted to train an entire tanker crew. Realizing the limitations of the adapted British hose equipment, SAC headquarters called on Boeing Airplane Co.

In 1950, the B–29, later designated the KB–29P, was equipped with the Boeing flying boom.

The boom system gave us a much faster rate of fuel flow and more flexibility in selecting favorable weather and altitudes. With a telescoping boom that could be flown up, down, or to either side, the positive position of the tanker and receiver aircraft could vary to some degree. This system reduced by half the time required to train a tanker pilot.

Some major malfunctions had to be corrected later as Strategic Air Command crews and maintenance personnel became better acquainted with the system.

Besides improving refueling, the flying boom provided an added dividend that wasn't in the book. Recently an F–84 had a flameout while being refueled. Attempts at an air start proved unsuccessful, so the enterprising tanker crew towed the fighter pilot past his home base where he was turned loose and glided in for a dead-stick landing.

Until March of 1951, our only tankers were modified World War II bombers, but Boeing's KC–97A Stratofreighter tanker, which successfully refueled a B–47 jet bomber in flight on March 15, 1951, proved a major factor in making full-scale air refueling feasible. Although KB–29's would continue to be used for some time, aerial refueling had come of age and the tanker was no longer a mutation—it was an aircraft type in its own right, as much so as a fighter, a bomber, or a transport.

General LeMay, although long an exponent of the truly international bomber, recog-

nized that such an aircraft would not be available in the immediate future. So he turned his efforts to the development of our capability to conduct intercontinental bombing through refueling. This meant that the tanker would have to become an integral part of the bomber's mission and all uncertainty would have to be eliminated from the technique. We could not afford to base our strategy solely on a network of foreign bases over which we could not definitely be assured of positive control. Neither could we base our strategy on an operational procedure that was not foolproof.

Therefore, in early 1952, it was realized that the tanker procurement program, both for aircraft and crews, must be increased. Such a high priority was placed on this program that bombardment crews training at Randolph Air Force Base for participation in the Korean conflict were withdrawn and replaced by a higher priority program—the transitioning to the KC–97.

The KC–97 extended the range of the B–47 by one-third to one-half. Between 1952 and early 1954, however, when tanker squadrons began to become combat ready, most B–47 aerial refuelings were merely token offloads in comparison to those of today. It was not until the latter part of 1954 that we began planning missions whose success depended entirely upon a successful air refueling. By the end of that year, tactics had been developed whereby large flights of B–47's could be refueled in formation, dependent, however, upon daylight flying and relatively clear weather.

During this time, many records were being established. A transoceanic mass jet flight completed by 58 F–84 Thunderjets of the 31st Fighter-Escort Wing further demonstrated the place of aerial refueling in modern military aviation.

In October of 1952, 75 F–84's of the 27th Fighter-Escort Wing completed the longest known over-water flight by single-engine jet fighters from Midway to Japan. The first flight, led by Col. John Blakeslee, refueled in air and covered 2,575 miles.

In January 1955, SAC Headquarters concluded that the aerial refueling problem during daylight hours and good weather was practically solved. Missions could be planned doubling the range of the B–47. However, to increase the range still further and to guarantee proper timing, training missions calling for mass night refueling and poor visibility conditions were necessary. Tanker crews in the 15th and Second Air Forces had been experimenting with certain tactics to enable formations of tankers to refuel formations of bombers at night with visibility down to 1 mile. These tactics were tested between March 1955 and August 1955, when they were placed in the tactical doctrine and became standard operating procedure for all of the Strategic Air Command.

Since August 1955, enormous strides have been made. Today it is common to schedule a B–47 to fly three times its maximum capable range by scheduling two or more air refuelings en route. Strategic Air Command air crews now are averaging 2,880 contacts a week—one aerial refueling every 3½ minutes around the clock.

Our present high degree of skill in the art of aerial refueling is the result of painstaking staff work and countless hours and days of experimenting. The number of actual hookups are numbered in the six figures.

Last year SAC introduced a new concept in tanker organization. Two 8th Air Force bases—Westover Air Force Base, Mass., and Dow Air Force Base, Maine—became the homes of air refueling wings, completely independent of SAC bomber wings. These wings were given a geographical area of responsibility. Instead of refueling the aircraft of one tactical organization, these wings now are responsible for all refueling within their area.

This was done for several reasons. Tanker squadrons are often called upon for support missions on TDY (temporary duty) movements, beyond their bomber wing commitments. By establishing a refueling wing, the problem of refueling at home while a squadron is absent on TDY has been solved since the rest of the wing remains in place. Furthermore, the consolidation of tanker units is more efficient because all personnel have only one job—air refueling.

The current production models of the KC–97G serve not only as tankers, but also as personnel and cargo transports. As SAC converted to jet bombers, the need for a jet tanker became evident. Experiments in air refueling between two B–47's proved the feasibility of a jet tanker. The Boeing Airplane Co. was again given the job. The Air Force has now standardized and placed into production an advanced tanker version of the Boeing model 707 jet prototype, to be known as the KC–135. These will be available in quantity in the near future.

The KC–97G carries its fuel for transfer in 15 tanks located on the upper and lower decks of the double lobe fuselage and in 2 wing tanks. The 7 tanks on the main deck are stacked 2 high along the left side of the airplane. This arrangement is an improvement over the KC–97E and F models which carried the transferable fuel in four large tanks installed in the upper deck only. With the new configuration, ample room remains in the upper deck for transporting cargo or personnel without removing the tanks. This greatly increases the mobility of the Strategic Air Command tanker fleet.

The result of all of this is a professional tanker force, with flexibility as its keynote and reliability its stock in trade. Its one mission in life is the accomplishment of the bombing mission, because the tanker has a bombing mission as surely as the bomber. The pilots of our tanker force are proud of their mission, and they're prouder still of their contribution to the security of our Nation.

Veteran of the Dry-Run War

(By Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Broadhurst, commander, 57th Air Division, SAC)

The story of the B–36 begins in 1941, several months before Pearl Harbor. One must think back about the world situation at that time to realize what prompted the building of the B–36. In Europe, Hitler's armies were moving into the free territories at a frightening rate. Britain, fighting against overwhelming odds, seemed near defeat.

The situation faced the United States with an awesome prospect—having to contend with the Nazi war machine almost singlehandedly. Without European allies, the United States would have been left without any airbases from which to launch an attack against a European battlefield.

If the worst came, as appeared probable, America would need to be able to wage aerial war from the North American Continent. At first this requirement seemed insurmountable. But the prospect of an airplane that could take off from available bases and hit the Axis was too valuable an idea for us to lay aside without exploring every possibility. And so it happened that 8 months before Pearl Harbor the Army Air Corps set up requirements for the bomber which would change the concept of war.

Specifically, the Army Air Corps was asking American engineers for a bomber that could carry a 10,000-pound bomb load to a target 5,000 miles away, and return, nonstop; haul 72,000 pounds of bombs at reduced range; travel 300 to 400 miles per hour; and take off and land on a 5,000-foot runway.

Design competition for this first intercontinental bomber began on April 11, 1941. In October of the same year Consolidated Aircraft Corp. submitted a proposal to "develop and construct 2 experimental long-range, high-altitude bombardment airplanes," with 6 pusher-type engines, which the company believed would meet all specifications.

In meeting these design specifications, and knowing the role the airplane was to play as a tactical bomber in a strategic fleet, the designers came up with the largest airplane ever built. The planning and design, however, were to offer one of the major objectives of aircraft design—maximum growth potential. This potential and versatility insured the planners that the aircraft could be modified and improved as newer and larger weapons were produced for aerial delivery.

As our European and Pacific campaigns progressed, the production of other aircraft was necessarily emphasized. These aircraft were using overseas bases which permitted short-range attacks against the enemy, a type of operation made possible because the enemy had chosen to concentrate on developing and producing fighters for close support rather than bombers for strategic uses.

World War II came to a climactic ending in August 1945, when a B–29 of our aerial fleet dropped a new weapon on Japan. To most of us, "atomic bomb" was a new term. We had to be told again and again about the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki before we could really comprehend the bomb's significance.

The atomic bomb changed the concept of aerial warfare. American leaders, accepting this fact, realized that in its initial phase any future war would be limited to the delivery of massive destruction to the heartland of participating nations. The initial blow might come without warning, and the size of the initial wave could well determine a nation's future existence.

The United States Air Force, then, had to develop a powerful strategic force in being, able to deliver such massive retaliation that any aggressor nation would hesitate to launch an attack against our homeland. Part of the fleet had to be able to launch additional sizable strikes from our North American bases. The B–36 gave us this capability. The concept was adopted as our national policy, and the B–36 was brought into SAC to serve as the backbone of this new force.

What started with the nucleus of planners and designers in 1941 was to become the key to American defense in a new era of atomic warfare. At the war's end, engineering manpower was shifted to the B–36 program, and on August 8, 1946, the XB–36 roared into the air on its maiden flight.

With the initial reaction to the new concepts of atomic aerial warfare behind, history now provides air planners with the factual story of how the B–36 has enabled us to live for 10 years free from aggression.

Early estimates of the airplane's capabilities have been conservative. As more powerful engines and better equipment became available, Convair incorporated improvements in the early models. One modification, first flown in 1949, was equipped with 4 jet engines as well as 6 piston engines, almost doubling the amount of power of the aircraft. With these improvements, we now had an aircraft capable of gross weight takeoffs in excess of 400,000 pounds. We had an aircraft that could defend itself with its 16 20-millimeter cannons—more firepower than any other known bomber. In its final modified form, the huge bomber dropped 84,000 pounds of bombs, climbed above 45,000 feet, flew more than 400 miles per hour, and, in general, proved to the world that the United States had a "big stick" for defense.

Another very important development was the conversion of the bomber to a high-priority reconnaissance aircraft, designated as the RB–36. In addition to bombs, the

RB–36 carried the large cameras and other special equipment needed for long-range, high-altitude reconnaissance. In the forward bomb bay, for example, were 14 different cameras, including one with a 42-inch focal length lens, capable of mapping a strip of land 30 miles wide and 3,000 miles long. This was probably the largest photographic setup ever designed for an airplane.

Delivery of the final B–36 meant that all 10 of SAC's B–36 wings—from Maine to California and from Washington to Puerto Rico—were fully equipped, and the Sunday punch of SAC had been realized.

When the B–36 was accepted, it not only met the basic requirements but could be adapted to newer and larger weapons. These modifications—increased engine power and greater gas-carrying capacities—gave us an air weapon that could meet a variety of requirements for conducting strategic aerial warfare. We could now carry any of the entire family of atomic and thermonuclear weapons to strategic portions of the globe. We had a plane that could carry larger and more effective photographic equipment to survey possible enemy targets. We had a tough, reliable aircraft that sustained the convictions of the leaders who placed a major responsibility for global airpower on its broad wings, and the crew that manned her.

All during the 10-year period since the end of World War II, weapon advancement was constantly under way. Scientific and industrial know-how produced new and larger weapons. Again, the big bomber proved to have been a wise selection because the B–36 was the only aircraft that could carry the thermonuclear weapon within her bomb bays. Never before in the short history of airpower has an air force possessed a machine that was so adaptable to rapidly changing weapons systems and engine developments.

The manner in which SAC crews have used the B–36 to carry out the assignment of preserving the peace is worth examining.

In 1953, for example, the 92d Bombardment Wing, based at Fairchild AFB, Wash., took part in a mission called Operation Big Stick, which took the wing to the Pacific area on a 30-day exercise. The B–36's, in this instance, were poised at a strategic time during international tension, and in a manner which could leave no doubt that this country intended to use every method available to preserve world peace. By flying nonstop from the United States to bases in Japan and the Far East, our airmen showed unfriendly nations that this fleet of bombers could have easily flown to any enemy targets and have landed at these same bases. The 92d Bombardment Wing received an outstanding unit citation for its part in the maneuver.

This maneuver was not the only occasion on which the peacemaker fleet was deployed to the right place at the right time. The Stragetic Air Command is continually rotating tactical units to strategic locations for operational training, which gives us an upper hand for delivering a lethal blow in the event world hostilities become a reality. Today a portion of the B–36 fleet may be in the Arctic; tomorrow, the Pacific; and next week, in the Atlantic Ocean area. These forward elements as well as the remaining fleet at home bases are ever ready to accomplish the missions assigned to them.

SAC training programs include a varied array of competitions between tactical units within the command. The best known of these is the annual SAC bombing and navigation competition. During this "World Series" crack crews are flying and "bombing" against each other on a point by point system, in a contest where precision teamwork alone can bring forth a winner. High performance standards of SAC crews are maintained through these competitions, which also are valuable in showing what the aircraft can or cannot do.

The flexibility of the B–36 and the essential role assigned under emergency war plan, places stringent requirements on her crews in order to keep SAC fully prepared. Many hours of flying time are involved in addition to the continual training before an officer fulfills the extensive requirements for an aircraft commander, pilot, navigator, or radar operator. Each crew member must be intimately familiar with the airplane, including more than 30 miles of wiring, an anticing system that could heat 120 5-room houses, engines that deliver the power output equal to 9 locomotives, the 68,000 different shop-made parts, and enough vacuum tubes to build about 100 television sets.

Military planners are confident that the B–36 can absorb battle damage and still continue the mission to which it has been assigned. Thousands of hours of trial and operation have given proof of the B–36's ruggedness. In July 1955, an RB–36 from Fairchild's 99th Bombardment Wing lost its rudder in a low-altitude, high-speed flyover near Denver, Colo. Expert handling plus the airplane's natural stability enabled this B–36 to fly more than 200 miles and land without mishap. Loss of the rudder necessitated the use of only ailerons and elevators to control the huge airplane, and yet it was possible to maintain a long flight and set the hundreds of tons down safely.

The sturdy aircraft got another test when bad weather forced a B–36 to land in an open plowed field in England. With a few minor repairs, the bomber was towed to the runway and made a normal takeoff.

Today, the Peacemaker is programed for retirement from its role in the SAC fleet. In its place, Boeing's B–52, powered by eight jet engines, with greater speed and increased altitude, is gradually replacing the B–36. The flexibility of this new bomber will continue to give the United States Air Force, and the Strategic Air Command, an air carrier that can keep pace with munition advancements and changes in strategic requirements.

The B–36 has cast a shadow on aggression for nearly a decade now; yet, never has a B–36 dropped a bomb in anger. Its poised might has been deterrent enough to help preserve peace. The history and life of this fabulous airplane have been long and successful. From the drawing board in April of 1941, through its production, tests, modifications, and remodifications, it has combined talents, forces, and power with America's striking arm—the Strategic Air Command—to provide and maintain peace for the United States and the free world. From its conception to its birth, from its birth through its improvements at present, and from the present into the near future, the B–36 has given, and still gives, a sound basis for the free world to hope for continued peace through strength.

Breaking in the Stratojet

(By Col. Michael N. W. McCoy, commander, 321st Bomb Wing, SAC)

This story begins in January 1950 at Goose Bay, Labrador, where I was SAC project officer for a cold-weather air-to-air refueling test.

One Saturday I received a message to report to Omaha the next day. After scheduling an aircraft, I began to wonder what kind of trouble I was in now.

My interview at SAC headquarters was short and to the point. I was advised that I had been placed on the school list, but I was too old to go to school, and would I rather go to school than be the commander of the 306th Bombardment Group, which was to be the first B–47 outfit in the Air Force.

I thought at the time that it was a stupid question. However, in the years that followed I often thought my answer was equally stupid, which was, "When do I report?" The reply was, "Day before yesterday."

I had been in SAC long enough to know that things move fast, but this was a little faster than I was used to. However, I reported to MacDill Air Force Base, near Tampa, Fla., in a few days, fully expecting to see the ramp littered with B–47's. After getting settled and being briefed on the situation, I found that the B–47 program was far from being ready, at least as far as SAC was concerned. We were to face many, many months of ground training, schools of all sorts in various places in the United States, such as Ellington AFB, Mather AFB, and Wichita, Kans., before we were to even set foot in a B–47. In the meantime, we kept ourselves busy training B–29 and B–50 students and organizing a Strategic Evaluation Squadron.

There were many conferences held to determine the support equipment and personnel necessary, plus all of the intangibles concerning the B–47 that were unknown at the time.

We found that many of the items available in the B–29 and B–50 programs could still be used, but you just can't tow a B–47 with an ordinary tow bar. It must have wheels and be telescopic so you carry it with you. An ordinary power ground generator wasn't good enough—it had to put out three different kinds of electricity. All of those things had to be taken into consideration.

It wasn't until April 1951 that I was able to go to the factory school and learn what made this airplane tick. While there I discovered that SAC had a good chance of receiving its first B–47 in a few months.

SAC Headquarters gave me a priority on personnel and supplies. I started out to recruit the best talent I could find. I called on each of SAC's numbered Air Force headquarters. At Headquarters Fifteenth Air Force, March AFB, Calif., I struck pay dirt. It seems as though all the pilots who had been trained to be radar operators, navigators, and bombardiers—we called them the four-headed monsters—had been graduated at Mather AFB and for some strange reason had been unable to get out of California.

I was able to pick up about 30 of the most experienced pilots in SAC, and to this day I dodge Gen. "Rosie" O'Donnell when I see him coming, because he thinks I'm an outright thief.

At the same time training command was attempting to start a school at Wichita and was training instructors. We were fortunate enough to get myself and Col. Don Hillman, my deputy, and five other pilots into the transition checkout phase, which was much like the blind leading the blind. Nobody knew too much about the aircraft in those days.

We finally got the big word that our first plane would be ready to pick up on October 24, 1951. Major Prieve and I went to the Wichita factory and picked up the first SAC B–47, number 008. I don't think there has ever been a ferry flight so well monitored by higher headquarters. No one wanted us to break anything. At MacDill, there was a welcoming committee headed by Maj. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, Jr., our division commander, lined up on the ramp ready to greet the new aircraft. We landed without incident and turned off the end of the runway, shutting down the four outboard engines just like the book said.

In those days the General Electric J–47–11 engines had the habit of continuing to smoke after being shut down. The young lad driving the follow-me jeep tried to do something about the smoking engine. He jumped out of his vehicle, grabbed the fire extinguisher and sprayed the engines with foam. We were worried about the damage to the hot engines, so we shut down the other two. Fortunately, the fire extinguisher was almost

empty, and no damage was done. The welcoming committee was waiting about a mile away, and some 40 minutes later we were greeted as we were towed in. Not a very auspicious beginning.

We had heard a lot about this aircraft from Mr. J. E. Schaefer, a Boeing vice president and manager of the Wichita division, and Mr. N. D. Showalter, chief engineer at the Wichita division, who know their flying machines and who are also excellent salesmen. Some things we believed and some we were doubtful about at first. However, we were able to fly this plane for 13 straight days without any maintenance, which is the sort of performance that melts doubt away. Colonel Hillman and I finally checked out 7 instructors, and we proceeded to train the 306th Bomb Wing. We personally checked everybody, both day and night.

There were amusing experiences, and some not so amusing.

We had set up a runway control radio vehicle, in order to better supervise flying, requiring a supervisory officer on the radio vehicle at all times. In case something unusual went wrong this supervisory controller could read it out of the book and advise the pilot. We believe that this procedure prevented at least 3 accidents and in 1 case possibly saved 3 lives.

Our first accident occurred when a student mismanaged his fuel system, and the airplane had six engines flame out on the downwind leg. I was in the runway-control vehicle at the time, and was talking to Captain Williamson, the instructor in the back seat. There wasn't much he could do as the fuel controls were in the front seat, but he made an attempt to get it on the runway. While he was on his base leg, I noticed the nose start to rise, and told him to land straight ahead. Whether he heard me or not, his judgment told him he wasn't going to make it. He did roll out and landed straight ahead—in 5 feet of water. Everyone got out of the aircraft safely.

Another incident occurred with this same instructor when he was first getting started. He had been sent to the factory to ferry an aircraft. On the way he had shut down No. 5 engine. When he came in for a landing there was a considerable crosswind, which kept him busy. To top it all off, when he pulled the throttles back he missed No. 6 throttle and found himself going down the runway with his No. 6 engine at 80-percent power and a crosswind that didn't help. Capt. J. D. Brashear was in the radio-control vehicle and immediately diagnosed the trouble. Brashear called: "Cut No. 6, Willie." And Willie did, just in time to keep from going off the end of the runway. Experiences like this kept life interesting in those days.

We experimented with the B–47 by scheduling cross-country missions, while training crews, to find out some of the problems we would encounter in bad weather and turbulence.

I remember one night particularly. I was checking out Lt. Col. Benny Klose and his operations officer Lt. Col. Charles Joyce, when we hit a particularly rough thunderstorm. Both students were in the advanced stage of training, and I was riding in the nose. We hit this thunderhead at night, and the plane began to buffet. I could hear both pilots on the interphone trying to decide whether we were buffeting from a stall or high-speed buffet. I was having a hard time staying in my seat, so I called back and said: "One of you get out of the seat. I am going to get in one of the pilot's seats"—and we all met in the aisle.

Things went along pretty well until July 1952. By this time we had received our observers, and they were flying with their crews. Then on July 2, 1952, we began to get the grim taste of trouble.

One of our squadron commanders, Lt. Col. Howard Weeks, took off with a crew for a normal training mission and crashed from about 17,000 feet, just south of the base. We never did definitely determine what happened, but we suspected the canopy had come off in flight and injured the two pilots. That same month, about 3 weeks later, we had another one go in at Marianna, Fla., from 35,000 feet. In each case there were 4 people on board and in each case 4 fatalities. After this last accident, all B–47's were grounded until we could determine what caused these two accidents. During the inspection, we found considerable trouble with our fuel cells, and it was decided to replace all fuel cells due to the excessive number of leaks. After this was done, we started flying the aircraft again.

In January 1953, we ran a service test called Project Sky-Try on our B–47's. We considered it the best service test ever run on any aircraft in the length of time allowed. The operations order from SAC said: "Beginning 22 January 1953, a simulated combat operation, maximum effort, will be flown each 3 days for a 30-day period, utilizing only the 15 assigned aircraft and crews of the 367th Bomb Squadron." We designed missions that would cover all phases of operation, including single and double air refueling missions, night and day bombing and everything that the B–47 was designed to do. A high priority was assigned to this squadron for personnel and supplies. A big staff, military and civilian, was set up to monitor the test and keep records on the results.

We scheduled and flew 150 missions during this period without one ground abort, every aircraft taking off as scheduled. We flew 1,300 hours in 22 days in this one squadron, and in the meantime, the other two squadrons in the wing continued their normal flying. We turned in stacks of incident reports and some necessary unsatisfactory reports. We compiled consumption data on supply requirements and maintenance hours versus flying hours.

For many months, we had been querying Air Materiel Command and the Boeing people about what would happen if we had our tip tanks full and they failed first to feed and then to release. They just hadn't got around to testing this, and during one of our night missions we finally had an aircraft with full tip tanks that wouldn't feed. The pilot came back over the field to talk about it and I told him to go out to the salvo area and drop them. One dropped and the other stayed on, and he found himself facing a night landing with no tank on one side and a full one on the other. He made a skillful landing, which was uneventful until he was down to 40 knots and the outrigger tire on the heavy side blew out. The aircraft came to rest on the runway without damage.

It wasn't 10 minutes later that another aircraft called in with the same trouble. He received the same instructions, but neither tank would come off, and he made his landing with two full tip tanks without incident and with no damage. I informed the authorities that the tests had been completed and we knew we could land with any configuration of tip tanks.

Overall the things we learned in Project Sky-Try advanced our B–47 know-how considerably.

The next event worthy of note was when we took two B–47's to England in April 1953. This was the first time the Stratojet had been overseas, and it created considerable interest in the United Kingdom. Both aircraft, one piloted by myself and one by Lieutenant Colonel Klose, broke the existing transatlantic speed record.

We wanted to survey the European area for our forthcoming wing rotation, and discovered many things that would have to be improved or changed to accommodate the B–47, the most outstanding being radio aids.

For example, we learned right away that the low-frequency type homer or range station was clearly inadequate. I was homing in on the Fairford low-frequency station and let down through an overcast. I broke out at about 2,000 feet and saw a beautiful runway appear straight ahead. I considered the letdown a success and proceeded to land. However, I was on the wrong field, some 9 miles beyond my destination. My station passage had been unreliable.

We also found that the runways in the United Kingdom had to be repaired due to roughness.

Upon our return to MacDill from England speed records again went tumbling. Everywhere you went in those days you almost automatically set new speed marks.

We began to prepare the wing for rotation to the United Kingdom.

This would be the first of many B–47 wing rotations, and it was being watched with keen interest by higher authorities. It turned out to be the finest rotation of any wing in SAC up to that time. It went off with the least amount of trouble and the least amount of time, and clearly demonstrated to the top air echelons that SAC had something really hot.

Although our British base was not completed, we were able to operate with good efficiency for the full 90 days of our programed rotation. But success never comes cost-free—it was while on this foreign duty that we had our third fatal accident. The aircraft had been sent to another base for a training exercise and the pilot stalled out of a steep turn to the final approach, and went in.

Our 90-day rotation matured the wing into a well-knit outfit. The refueling squadron, tactical squadrons, and maintenance squadrons were still speaking to each other and were ready to go any place any time. From then on, it was a matter of refining our training, perfecting our bombing, air refueling, navigation, and all the things that go with continually being ready.

We had nicknamed the B–47 "Droopy" because it looked like a wet hen sitting on the ramp. We hear a lot about push-button warfare, but the push button that will push "Droopy" out of the picture is a long way off.

This is only the first installment of the SAC B–47 story. The story is still being written in the skies all over the world.

SAC'S NEWEST RECRUIT: THE STRATOJET

(By Brig. Gen. William E. Eubank, Jr., commander, 93d Heavy Bomb Wing, SAC)

The base is Castle Air Force Base, Calif., the wing is the 93d Bombardment Wing, and the airplane is the big one, the Boeing B–52 Stratofortress. These are the three elements that go to make up the first combat-ready B–52 unit in SAC. Let me tell you about all three.

Although the Castle story may not be exactly typical, it is certainly symbolic of the rapid growth and expansion of SAC's combat potential. It is the story of a combat wing which in mid-1949 was a typical B–29 unit. In 1950 it had become a powerful B–50 outfit with many times the striking power it had possessed a year before. From 1950 until 1954 it was one of several veteran B–50 combat wings.

In 1954 the 93d Bomb Wing joined the rapidly growing B–47 medium bomber force, with striking power, flexibility, and versatility many times greater than it ever possessed before.

During the 20 months that the wing operated B–47's (June 1954 to January 1956) it flew 24,439 hours without an accident.

In mid-1955 the wing became the first B–52 heavy bombardment unit in the Strategic Air Command.

Thus, in 6 years, from mid-1949 to mid-1955, the 93d Bombardment Wing had developed from the B–29, with its limited striking power and potential, to the most deadly

nuclear striking weapon known in the world today. Throughout this 6-year period of transition and growth from one stage to another in the Strategic Air Command plan, the 93d was maintained as a combat-ready unit, prepared at all times to carry out a war mission if directed.

Although it may seem elementary, the first question to be answered is "Where is Castle Air Force Base anyway?"

Believe it or not, that's the question most frequently asked. Castle Air Force Base is near Merced, Calif., in the middle of the San Joaquin Valley. Translated into Air Force language, it is about two-thirds of the way from March Air Force Base to Hamilton Air Force Base—just far enough from San Francisco that the wives can't go shopping every week—just every other week.

The base is named for Brig. Gen. Frederick W. Castle, whom many Eighth Air Force veterans will remember as a heroic combat division commander who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously for valor in action over Germany in World War II. Merced Army Air Field, as it was known in World War II, trained 13,000 cadets in BT–13 aircraft from 1941–45.

Castle is a single-wing base of the 15th Air Force. Besides being the home of the 93d Bombardment Wing, it also houses the 2d Strategic Support Squadron and the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron. This latter squadron, an integral part of the 93d Wing, trains all combat crews for SAC B–52 wings.

As SAC began picking up the pieces of what was left after the World War II demobilization, the 93d Bomb Group, as it was then called, was assigned to Castle in May 1947. It was equipped with B–29 aircraft and crews, and comparatively speaking, was considered one of the strongest of the Strategic Air Command combat organizations of that time.

In January 1951 the group was designated the 93d Bombardment Wing in the new terminology of the Strategic Air Command organizational plan. From 1947 until the present, the 93d has been led by some of the most famous Strategic Air Command officers, among them Maj. Gen. Robert H. Terrill, Brig. Gen. David Wade, and Brig. Gen. Richard H. Carmichael.

Several years ago, when the B–52 program was still in the planning stages at higher levels, it was decided to convert the 93d into SAC's first B–52 wing. At the same time it was decided that the wing would train all crews for succeeding B–52 combat wings.

To accomplish this it was planned to organize the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron, and attach it to the 93d Bombardment Wing for this purpose.

We occasionally hear the question: "Why hasn't this training responsibility been assigned to the Air Training Command, as it was with the B–47 program?" Here is the answer—to make B–52 aircraft available within Strategic Air Command at the earliest possible date it was advisable for the command to handle the training for its own crews.

Thus, the total number of aircraft available within SAC for combat purposes includes those B–52's used for crew training.

In other words, it was not necessary to decrease the SAC inventory of combat aircraft to support the training function. Many Strategic Air Command personnel will remember that this same procedure was used in the B–36 training program at Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., using a unit also designated 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron.

The 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron is an operations and training squadron only and has no unit aircraft. The aircraft belong to the three bombardment squadrons of the 93d and are maintained by these units. Training sorties are furnished to the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron to fulfill the training requirements of that unit.

Extensive construction work to support B–52 operations began at Castle in March 1954, and all major construction has been completed. To those who knew Castle Air Force Base in World War II, the operating portion, such as the ramp, taxiways, and runways, are no longer distinguishable. They've been swallowed up in one or another of the several modernization programs.

Even to those who may have known Castle in the B–29 and B–50 days, many of the old features are hardly recognizable. The main runway has been strengthened and considerably lengthened, as well as widened. It was also necessary to strengthen and widen the taxiways and the warm-up aprons at each end of this runway.

The entire main parking ramp has been completely overlaid with 16 inches of concrete. And there are many new buildings, such as the king-size maintenance hangar, base operations, technical training building, crash station, wing headquarters, new squadron engineering buildings, and the aircraft and engine buildings.

At present the only major construction still in progress in the operating area is the project for postflight and periodic inspection docks. These docks simplify the maintenance problem to a remarkable degree in that the aircraft can be nosed into the dock itself and all major components and accessories are completely available for maintenance purposes.

A remarkable fact is that at no time has construction handicapped day-to-day operations to the extent that the conversion program slowed down.

The conversion of the 93d Bomb Wing into the first combat-ready B–52 wing actually involved two conversion programs.

The 93d began converting from B–50's into B–47's in March 1954, and while the B–47 switch was still in progress wing planning agencies were paving the way for the next conversion to the B–52.

The 93d became combat-ready in B–47's in record time, in the fall of 1954. Many projects relating directly to the B–52 were already in progress at that time, and in June 1955 the aircraft began to arrive at Castle. By then the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron was ready to begin retraining the 93d's crews.

Instructor crew personnel of the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron had received their B–52 checkout training at Edwards Air Force Base in early 1955 while the Air Force Flight Test Center was conducting phase VI evaluation tests on the new bomber. The overall programing plan included the requirement for 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron instructor personnel to receive their preliminary training at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., and in so doing support the needs of the Flight Test Center for flight personnel to handle testing operations. Wing maintenance personnel, more than 200 in all, also supported the testing phase at Edwards and in the process gained invaluable B–52 maintenance training.

With such background for key flight instructor and maintenance people, the 93d was fully ready for the influx of B–52 aircraft when it began.

Extensive training operations started immediately on the arrival of the first new bomber, and continued on schedule until all 93d combat crews had completed their conversion training.

Today the mission of the 93d is to maintain a state of combat readiness at all times to handle its mission in the Strategic Air Command emergency war plan, and also to support the 4017th Combat Crew Training Squadron in the training of combat crews for succeeding B–52 combat wings.

Today the B–52 is no longer a strange sight in the western part of the country. Nor is it unfamiliar to CAA control personnel, or to fighter-interceptor units of the Western Air Defense Force.

The new bomber looks and performs like its older but smaller brother, the B–47, and is just as much a pilot's airplane.

There are many who say the B–52 is easier to fly than a B–47, but whether it is or not is inconsequential—both aircraft are equally well liked by SAC pilots.

Naturally the B–52 has better performance than the B–47. It is a later aircraft. Although they look alike, there are many radical differences in the systems of these two planes. Beyond their size, the most obvious difference is the side-by-side pilot configuration in the B–52 as compared to the tandem seating arrangement in the B–47. Experience on the B–47 had indicated that side-by-side seating would improve crew coordination and afford more space.

Another innovation introduced in the B–52 is the use of high-pressure "bleed air" from the engines as a source of power. Extensive studies conducted by Boeing indicated that such a system would be lighter than other systems designed to do the same job. Although many developmental problems were encountered in perfecting this new system, it has been highly successful in the operation of the B–52.

Such standard accessories as engine starters, hydraulic power packs, alternator packs, and anti-icing system all use—as the primary source of power—high-pressure "bleed air" from the engines themselves. In the engine-starting system, for example, a small jet-type engine on a cart must be used as a source of high-pressure air to start 2 of the 8 jet engines. Once 2 of the engines have been started, the "bleed air" from the internal source can then be used to start the remaining engines.

Whereas the B–47 has all boost-operated control surfaces, the B–52 was designed with manually controlled elevator, rudders, and ailerons to introduce a greater reliability factor. The only power-operated control surfaces are the spoilers on the upper surface of each wing. These work in conjunction with the ailerons to provide greater lateral control.

Instead of the familiar bicycle gear on the B–47, the B–52 has a quadricycle gear which retracts forward and aft into the fuselage, with two outrigger gears retracting into the wings.

Another innovation of the jet age is the crosswind steering capability of the B–52. Crosswind positioning of all four main gears is standard equipment on the B–52. It is controlled from a single knob in the cockpit. This feature eliminates all of the critical factors inherent in crosswind landings in all previous types of aircraft. Any experienced pilot will agree that this is a major advance in aircraft design from a flying safety standpoint.

The B–52 carries a crew of 6 as compared to the B–47's 3-man team. This includes two pilots, radar observer, navigator, radioman, and tail gunner. The pilots and the radio operator occupy the upper flight deck compartment; the observers, the lower flight deck; and the gunner rides in "solitary" in the tail.

Eight years were spent in development of the B–52. The prototype was first flown in April 1952, and by that date more than 3 million engineering hours had been spent on the design.

The first production model was ready on August 5, 1954, and cost in the neighborhood of $12 million. Today, with the tooling completed and the production line in business, the price of each unit has decreased considerably.

The B–52's eight Pratt & Whitney J–57 engines, the most powerful in mass production today, produce a thrust approaching the equivalent of 100,000 horsepower.

The B–52 gives America the first jet intercontinental capability in history. It can fly a bomb load to targets on the other side of the world and return, at altitudes above 50,000 feet. Its wingspan and length are

both greater than the width of a football field, and the top of its rudder towers almost five stories above the ground. It cruises at more than 600 miles per hour, yet its landing speed compares favorably with conventional airplanes of like size.

Forward crew positions are equipped with the latest type of ejection seat. The crew member has only to pull the "go" handle to find himself floating in space.

Under normal conditions the cabin pressure can be maintained at less than 10,000 feet pressure altitude, even at the most extreme heights.

When the first production model of the B–52 left Boeing's Seattle factory, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, the Air Force Chief of Staff, compared it with the long-rifle of frontier days, which he called "the great weapon of the day" that "kept the savage red men from killing our people."

As General Twining has stated so well, the B–52 is truly the long-rifle of our Armed Forces today. Never before in history has so much striking power been concentrated in one weapon.

The B–52 represents a big investment in money, but if it buys the peace with honor, we all desire, it is well worth the cost. The B–52 force is the safest investment I know of today for this Nation and the American people.

THE BIRTH OF A BOMBER

(By Col. Donald E. Hillman)

The first B–52 wing is now equipped and operational. SAC's combat capability has received a significant boost. The combat crews are happy with it—the airplane has lived up to its advance notices. It's exciting to see this powerful and beautiful, 200-ton weapon take the air. But it was a long time getting here.

The general requirements for an intercontinental bomber were established in 1941. The Convair B–36 and Northrop B–35 Flying Wing were developed from these requirements. As defensive techniques improved, it became evident that an intercontinental bomber must have more range, speed, and altitude performance than either the B–36 or B–35 offered. In January 1946, the Air Force released a new set of heavy bomber requirements and invited the aircraft industry to submit proposals. There were two items of particular significance at that time. First, the need for higher performance forced these new standards before either the B–36 or B–35 had flown. Second, the new performance standards appeared possible because of enthusiastic reports on turboprop engine developments.

In June 1946, Boeing was awarded a development contract to include a full-scale mockup. The competition airplane of 1946 bore little resemblance to the B–52 of today. It had a conventional wing planform with a span of 221 feet, was to be powered by 6 Wright T–35 turboprop engines (each rated at 5,500 horsepower), had an initial design gross weight of 400,000 pounds, mounted 5 turrets containing 12 20-millimeter cannons, and had a crew of 10.

Although this design was good enough to win the competition, it fell far short of desired range objectives for a number of reasons—the lack of satisfactory propeller-engine combination, the weight of the armament system, and too large a bomb bay. Numerous configurations were examined during the summer of 1946, but none looked good until a new and more powerful Wright engine was promised. The design was then changed to a smaller, more efficient 4-engine airplane, even though additional equipment had been incorporated; the crew had been increased to 11, and the bomb-carrying capability increased considerably. The engines were still too high in specific fuel consumption and the airplane also fell short in the critical area of range.

The Air Force finally decided that the only way to get the needed range was to design a special-purpose airplane, its only mission the strategic delivery of a nuclear bomb. This allowed reductions in armament, bomb-bay size, and number of crew. It was even planned to drop part of the landing gear after take-off. This was the first design to approach intercontinental range. Late in 1947 the contract called for a new full-scale mockup, plus numerous cockpit mockups with tandem pilot seating chosen.

New strategic requirements demanded that the B–52 be capable of deep penetration into enemy territory. Although its speed was now much faster than that spelled out in the 1946 design requirements, it was still relatively slow. About this time air-to-air refueling made it possible to design an even smaller airplane with substantially higher speeds. A new Boeing contract included the construction of a mockup and 2 prototype airplanes powered by 4 T–35–W–3 turbines, each producing 8,900 equivalent shaft horsepower and driving 19-foot dual rotation propellers. There was to be a crew of seven with a manned tail turret.

Continued engine-propeller difficulties were brought to light in the summer of 1948. Obviously, an extended turboprop development program was necessary before such a design would be practical for strategic operation. Studies were made involving temporary substitution of J–40's.

The B–52 picture was muddled and quite black.

A strike at Boeing slowed mockup work and completely stopped prototype airplane construction. Prototype engine and propeller deliveries appeared to be at least 4 years away.

Then, on October 21, 1948, Boeing engineers Ed Wells, George Schairer, Maynard Penell, Art Carlsen, and Vaughn Blumenthal arrived at Wright Field to confer on their XB–52 turboprop airplane.

AMC welcomed them with a request for a preliminary study of an entirely new airplane to be powered by a new high pressure-ratio turbojet engine—the XJ–57 proposed by Pratt & Whitney.

The Boeing representatives retired to a Dayton hotel room and went to work.

They worked night and day, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, October 22–24, 1948. On Monday morning they submitted a 33-page report and a hand-carved model of their proposed configuration. It embodied 35° wing sweepback, 8 XJ–57 P–1 turbojet engines slung in pairs on 4 pylons under the wing, additional fuel, 1 tail turret, and elimination of certain equipment called for in prior designs. Within a relatively short time work started on a new mockup and two experimental airplanes. More detailed engineering resulted in an airplane virtually identical to the model that came out of a weekend of hectic work in a Dayton hotel room.

Major changes from that first model have been relatively few. As a result of wind tunnel tests and XB–47 flight data, the slats were removed from the wing, and spoilers and small ailerons were added. A quadricycle gear gave enough lateral stabilization so that the outrigger need only serve as tip protection gear. In 1951 the Air Force decided to change the cockpit to side-by-side seating. The gross weight was increased to gain more range and take advantage of predicted engine improvements.

Research and preliminary design on the B–52 airplane took 34 months. This is longer than would normally be expected. However, the time was well spent because the present configuration represents a far more advanced design than appeared possible earlier.

Experimental design to production go-ahead took 28 months. Extremely satisfactory B–47 flight test reports made this possible since the two airplanes are quite similar in configuration except for size. B–52 production approval was granted before the first flight of a prototype airplane. Another 40 months was added before the Air Force accepted the first flight test article.

The XB–52 airplane was moved out of the factory in November 1951. Engine and system ground tests were complete in January of 1952. Taxi tests were finished near the middle of March 1952, but the airplane had to be returned to the factory for incorporation of equipment not previously available. When the YB–52 left the factory in March 1952 most of the modifications had been completed. The airplane first flew on April 15, 1952.

COL. PAT FLEMING

(The first crash of a B–52 in February took the life of Col. Patrick J. Fleming, one of the most dedicated of SAC's dedicated airmen. His good friend, Beirne Lay, Jr., the well-known screen writer, wrote this tribute to him and sent it to us. Fleming, Lay told us, was an airman who sought and found complete mastery of his trade. He was a pro. All this is in the record. What will not appear in the record, unless I set it down here, are the events of three Sunday mornings.—THE EDITOR.)

The bare facts of the official record in war and peacetime of Col. Pat Fleming, deputy commander of the 93d Bombardment Wing, Castle Air Force Base, Calif., who met his death in the first crash of a B–52, add up to a portrait of a dedicated professional perfectionist.

A naval aviator and fighter ace in the Pacific before transferring to the Air Force after World War II, a test pilot, and finally a specialist in the B–47 and the B–52, he couldn't bear the thought that there was any airplane around that he hadn't flown. So he flew them all.

After 7 years of marriage, Pat had never found time for his honeymoon with Neville until General LeMay was persuaded to lend him to Paramount Pictures for 2 weeks as a tech adviser on Strategic Air Command, while the script was being prepared in 1954. Pat and Neville arrived in balmy Hollywood on a Sunday morning, looking forward to a rest by comparison with Pat's Air Force grind. He needed a rest. He was thin and gray with fatigue. He hadn't had a day's leave since the end of the war. The phone rang. It was Washington. They wanted him to hustle on up to Seattle for consultations on the first air refueling tests with the new Boeing jet tanker. Pat hadn't even unpacked his bag.

He shoved off at once, borrowing a B–26 from nearby March Air Force Base, and flew himself to Seattle, arriving half-frozen and still more tired. The heaters had quit on him and he'd had to remain at high altitude because of stiff headwinds lower down. He switched immediately from his B–26 to a B–47 and took off at dusk to rendezvous with the jet tanker, flying until after midnight and completing 23 refueling contacts. Then he climbed back into his B–26, without sleep, and flew back to Los Angeles. He walked into my office at Paramount.

"What are you doing here?" I asked. I hadn't expected him back for 2 or 3 days.

"It's Monday morning, isn't it?" he said. "I'm supposed to be working for Paramount."

A year later, on a Sunday morning, Pat and Neville pulled into my driveway with their three little girls and the family car piled high with vacation gear. They were on their way to Laguna Beach for 2 weeks' leave. Two weeks later, I arrived at Castle AFB at the tail end of a 15-day tour of active duty in my Reserve assignment with SAC. Pat was the first guy I ran into. It developed that he just couldn't stay away from those B–52s. After a few days at the beach, he cut his vacation short. He'd been flying 5 nights in a row, checking on the new crews in training. Each sortie meant

a 7- or 8-hour mission, beginning with stations at 0300. I went on one of these missions the next morning with Pat. It was a rugged 7½ hours at altitude. Once a week would be often enough to suit most pilots just fine. At one point on the flight, I crumpled an empty cigarette package and, seeing no container handy, tossed it on the flight deck. Pat was on the interphone immediately.

"Put it in your knee pocket," he said. "The crew chief on this aircraft's got enough to do." But the rebuke didn't sting. He was so right. And it was typical of him. But what I remember best about that flight was the way Pat was all over that airplane, knowing every man's job cold. Each crew member was a sharp, picked veteran of the B–47 program, but Pat's probing eyes and questions kept them sweating. "What do you do if you lose electrical power?" he'd ask. The man had better know the answer.

And then there was a Sunday morning in February. Pat had been one of the four listed as missing since the explosion of a B–52. When they found him his 'chute was missing, apparently burned off, after he remained in the cockpit too long, applying emergency procedures, helping the others get out. My friend on the phone added a tragic footnote. Pat was scheduled to leave in less than 2 weeks for a desk job at SAC headquarters as director of requirements. He had already compiled hundreds of hours of B–52-pilot time, flying far in excess of the normal requirement of his job. But instead of easing off during those final 2 weeks, he was squeezing in every possible hour in the air. He wanted, when he reached that desk in Omaha, to speak from the vantage point of his own, inner conception of a real "pro."

SAC's Little Fighters and How They Grew

(By Col. David C. Schilling, inspector general, 7th Air Division, SAC)

Looking back to 1946, when the Strategic Air Command got all of its fighter support from a few leftover World War II propeller jobs, we fighter pilots feel much like the atomic artillery officers with their memories of 75-millimeter pack howitzers carried by mules.

Except for one thing, perhaps, the fighter as an arm of SAC might have gone the way of the pack mule. That factor was the rapid development of fighter-type aircraft which, in 10 years, has brought the fighter to its present-day long-range strategic capability and has greatly added to the complexity and importance of its mission as an air weapon.

When SAC was organized in 1946, and given a global responsibility for strategic air operations, our North American F–51 and Republic F–47 fighter planes were assigned the mission for which they had been designed—fighter escort. There was little else they could do, but in succeeding years the mission of SAC's fighter commands has grown in importance with each delivery of a new, improved fighter plane.

These changes began in 1948 with the replacement of our F–51's and F–47's with a long-range propeller-driven fighter, the North American F–82 Twin Mustang and the Lockheed F–80 Shooting Star—SAC's first jet fighter. The F–80, however, was limited in range.

A year later the command's first long-range jet fighter, the Republic F–84E, was delivered. Its range was further extended by the delivery of the G model, which had an aerial refueling capability.

Our fighter wings now are equipped with the sweptback F–84F, which greatly increased performance capabilities while retaining range characteristics of earlier models.

As a direct result of fighter development, the primary mission of strategic fighter wings today is the delivery of nuclear weapons in support of the strategic offensive. Secondary missions of the versatile jet fighters are several, including air defense responsibilities, use of conventional weapons, and an escort function when required.

Fighter wings, equipped with nuclear weapons, are in themselves powerful striking forces which may be strategically used independently of bomber forces or in areas where bomber forces are not committed. Their power is such that it would take more than 10,000 B–17's loaded with conventional weapons to equal the destructive force of a nuclear attack which could be delivered by one SAC fighter.

With the advent of the nuclear weapon, and its later adaptation to fighter use, probably the most important aids to development of fighter capability was the development of the aerial refueling technique.

Increased integral range, plus an in-flight refueling capability, gave fighters the mobility they needed to cross oceans in hours rathers than days; to deploy from one side of the globe to the other, just as bomber wings deployed.

The importance of the mobility factor can be realized if we remember that in 1946 our 56th Fighter Group—the command's only fighter wing—was equipped with 21 worn-out F–47's and 10 borrowed F–51's. Yet World War II tactics would have had to be employed if ever an emergency sent these aircraft into action in support of bomber operations. This was a period before jets were integrated in the United States Air Force, and unfortunately it was an era when the United States was awash with "demobilization consciousness."

Two years later, however, the picture had changed. The Czechoslovakia coup, the Berlin blockade, and other Communist moves in Western Europe once more focused attention on America's air arm as the only weapon in the hands of the free world that could match the strength of the huge Red Army.

Before our jet fighters could effectively support SAC bombers in their global missions, a way had to be found to get them quickly from the ZI to either Europe or the Far East. Otherwise, the advantage of speed would be lost in a lot of overnight stops. The answer, of course, was air refueling, whereby fighters could leave the United States and in 12 hours or less be located on overseas bases in Europe. But before the perfection of air refueling for fighters and the 12-hour Atlantic flight, a lot of groundwork had to be covered. From 1948 through the Korean war years, SAC pioneered the nonstop ocean hops, which in 1956 have come to be accepted as routine.

The first of these pioneer flights was Fox Able One, flown in July of 1948 by a flight of our 56th Fighter Group F–80s from Selfridge AFB, Mich., to the United States Zone in Germany. This flight was not a nonstop trip, but it had its problems. Although the F–80s were to land at Goose Bay, BW–1, Greenland, Keflavik, Iceland, and Stornoway, Scotland, on the transatlantic hop, earlier surveys had shown that there were no facilities whatsoever east of Bangor, Maine, and west of Stornoway, Scotland, for support of jet aircraft.

This severe lack of facilities meant that refueling filter carts along with other parts and equipment had to be carried along, and due to the exigencies of the Berlin airlift, we were limited to 1 C–54 and 1 C–47 for transport. Faced with this airlift shortage, we had to use great care in selection of spare parts, ground power, and ground handling equipment, a job that was accomplished to perfection by Capt. Frank Klibbe.

Execution of Fox Able One from Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich., to Furstenfeldbruck, Germany, took 12 days, including a 6-day delay at Goose Bay and overnight stops at BW–1, Keflavik, Stornoway, and RAF Station Odham in England.

We remained at Furstenfeldbruck for 2 weeks of flight training in Germany and then flew back to Selfridge Air Force Base, making the same stops as going over. On the deployment over and back we had Navy weather surface vessels and B–17 rescue aircraft patrolling our route.

Fox Able One was the United States Air Force's first mass overwater deployment of fighter aircraft, and it was strictly a SAC show. The ferry route, along with rescue and communications procedures we established on the flight, are still SOP for other commands deploying jet fighters to Europe, and back to the ZI. They are still the guide for the ferrying of jets as replacements for our units in Europe and as unit equipment to the air forces of the NATO countries.

Further use of Fox Able One reports and procedures was made by SAC in 1949 when 15 F–80's were flown to Europe. In 1950, the 27th Strategic Fighter Wing flew one-hundred-and-seventy-odd F–84's over the same route without losing an aircraft.

These deployments across the Atlantic Ocean, although much faster than the old method of transporting fighters by aircraft carrier or disassembled in crates, were still much too slow to fit into SAC's global mobility plans. What we needed was a jet fighter aircraft with air refueling capability.

Republic gave us the F–84 in 1951 and we were in the air-refueling business. SAC units started receiving them in September of that year and our 31st Strategic Fighter Wing was among the first units to get them. However, plans for overwater deployments had to be sidetracked because it took us the rest of 1951 and the early part of 1952 to get the bugs out of the air-refueling system.

While we were working with Republic technical representatives at Turner Air Force Base, Ga., on the F–84G air-refueling system, we were extremely fortunate in getting one of the world's foremost authorities on fighter navigation assigned to the wing. The man was Col. Charles F. Blair, United States Air Force Reserve, a captain for Pan American Airways who had flown an F–51 Mustang from Norway to Alaska in 1951, using his new navigation system. (At the 1952 AFA Convention, Colonel Blair received an AFA Citation of Honor for this flight.—The editors). He found an attentive audience at every one of his lectures in the 31st SFW briefing room.

Charlie had a completely new approach to celestial navigation which employed precomputed running two-star fixes instead of the old, cumbersome three-star fixes. Using this system, only two new pieces of equipment were necessary—an automatic pilot and a suitable sextant. Lear, Inc., came through with the auto pilot and the Kollsman Instrument Co. with a hand-held version of the periscopic sextant developed by them for the B–47.

We modified six F–84G's and accomplished a considerable amount of celestial navigation training during the time we were perfecting the air-refueling system. When we had mastered both, we started planning a nonstop flight from Georgia to French Morocco. Our plans were to utilize air refueling over Bermuda, between Bermuda and the Azores, over the Azores and then straight into a SAC base in French Morocco.

About mid-June of 1952 we were ready and approached General LeMay for permission. His reply was that the Strategic Air Command had some plans for long overwater fighter deployments and that he would let us know when he was ready to give us the green light to proceed.

Three days later he did.

I was at Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., attending a special orientation course when my deputy, Col. Dingy Dunham, called saying a message had been received from SAC headquarters which necessitated my immediate return to Turner. I knew Dingy well enough to know that something "hot" had been received, so I headed south for Albany as soon as I grabbed my toothbrush.

The message flashed to Turner from Omaha was for the 31st Strategic Fighter Wing to execute "Fox Peter One"—the deployment of 60 F–84G's and all support equipment and personnel from Turner to Misawa, Japan.

Eight days after receiving the initial flash, 60 aircraft, 1,000 men and 380,000 pounds of equipment were on the way—a far cry from our initial "Fox Able One" deployment in 1948.

The "Fox Peter One" route directed by the SAC operations order called for a practice refueling hookup over Wink, Tex., and then into Travis Air Force Base, Calif., for final staging before going across the Pacific.

From Travis, we were directed to fly the 2,142 miles to Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, utilizing air refueling at a point some 600 nautical miles west of the California coast For safety, emergency tankers were stationed 600 miles east of Hawaii. From Hawaii to Japan, we were directed to island-hop by way of Midway, Wake, Eniwetok, Guam, and Iwo Jima into Japan.

It is a matter of history that things got a little more than somewhat fouled up on the practice air refueling leg over Wink, Tex., and this required quick modification of the original plan. We saw the causes of our difficulties, remedied them, and it is also a matter of history that our final plan is now SOP for mass air refueling of fighters throughout SAC and the United States Air Force in general.

In contrast to Fox Able One, where we had 1 C–54 and 1 C–47 as support aircraft, we were given 4 MATS C–74 support planes which enabled us to carry sufficient spare parts and ground handling equipment, plus enough ground personnel to preposition this material along our route.

After rounding up all the strays from our Wink, Tex., adventure and getting them safely into Travis, we were ready to start across the Pacific. There are some incidents of the Fox Peter One deployment which should be mentioned.

On July 6, the 307th Squadron roared down the long runway at Travis and headed west. Maj. Bob Keen commanded the 370th, but he flew as my deputy that day. The squadron encountered no trouble effecting a rendezvous with our tankers as planned, but I didn't get to Hawaii on that first flight.

The tanker I was assigned to had made the mistake of coming out with an oversize nozzle on the boom. The first attempted contact sheared the pins in the slipway toggles and resulted in a disconnect which prevented the taking on of any fuel. There was no alternative but to do a quick 180 and head back to Travis. Major Keen led the squadron safely into Hickam.

On July 7, the 308th Squadron, commanded by Maj. Jerreld Vivian, took off for Hawaii and I tagged along with them. Again, I had refueling difficulties and did not receive as much fuel as the boom operator said he had delivered. This forced me to tap the emergency tanker east of Hawaii.

Lt. Col. Chuck Lenfest led the 309th Squadron into Hickam on July 8, and the wing had completed the most dangerous leg without a serious incident.

After a day of rest, we were ready to resume our westward flight. We flew to Midway, a distance of 1,141 miles, without incident, allowing a 20-minute interval between squadrons.

Midway is a reserve for gooney birds, and there were literally thousands of them on the island. This caused us great concern as we feared our jets would inhale the birds and damage our engines. When we left Midway on the morning of July 11, we all left safely, but only after clobbering many goonies. High scorer in the wing was Capt. Hank Mierdierck, who fried 4 or 5 when he took off. Nobody would come near old Hank when he landed at Wake because he smelled like burned gooney bird meat and feathers.

Our ground personnel really got a workout on Wake Island. Due to limited parking and refueling facilities, we flew out of Midway with a 2-hour interval between squadrons. The first squadron landed at Wake had to refuel and take off before the second squadron could land, and this squadron had to refuel and be in the air before the third squadron could land. From Wake we made a short hop of 536 miles to Eniwetok.

Somewhere between Midway and Wake, pilots of the 307th Squadron experienced a nerve-racking minute. One of the boys lost his main tank boost pump and had a flameout when he switched to his auxiliary tank. He glided from 32,000 feet down below 20,000 before he got his fire lit and climbed back to join his greatly relieved buddies.

On July 13, we were ready to depart Eniwetok and our JATO takeoffs furnished a picturesque scene. Everybody fired their two JATO bottles and got off with no sweat, except me. I forgot my JATO arming switch and had to stagger off without the added thrust. After reaching the desired airspeed while rolling down the runway, I hit the switch and nothing happened. The imprint of the toggle switch was still on my left index finger when we landed at Guam 3½ hours later. A fortunate up-current of air at the end of the runway got my Thunderjet in the air, and I had to skim over the water for several minutes before I built up enough airspeed to start a climbing turn and head for Guam.

When everybody arrived at Guam, we found a very tired group of ground-support personnel. Since they had left Hickam 3 days before, there was little chance to sleep other than in a bucket seat when being moved from one stop to the next.

We departed Guam on July 15 for Iwo Jima and just after the first aircraft of the 308th Squadron landed, one of my finest officers, Lt. Col. Elmer Da Rosa, crashed and was killed. He was about 3,000 feet over the center of the island when he pitched slightly upward, then down, rolled over on his back and went straight in.

We sailed into Japan the next day, landing at Yokota Air Force Base, to successfully complete the first mass deployment of an entire fighter wing utilizing air refueling. We proved that fighters based in the ZI could be in a battle zone in a very short time.

After 1 day of rest, the 31st SFW went on a standard air defense alert and also began to get our guns and sights in shape for the FEAF gunnery meet. Ten days later, our boys won the meet by a wide margin and had a celebration that almost equalled the party we pitched to celebrate the end of Fox Peter One.

Some 90 days later, the 27th SFW from Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex., replaced the 31st at Misawa. This outfit executed a magnificent flight of four legs from Bergstrom to Travis to Hickam to Midway and direct to Japan. There were no delays, no losses, and the mission was accomplished as planned and briefed. We were happy to see that SAC's planning and briefing for the flight utilized all the recommendations and experience gained by the 31st SFW, who recommended that such a four-leg route be flown on future deployments.

The value of Fox Peter One to the United States Air Force was indicated in the fall of 1952 when Air Force Secretary Harold G. Talbott presented the Outstanding Unit award to the 31st SFW for the successful deployment. This was a new award and we were the first wing in USAF to get it.

Fox Peter One, the flight of the 31st SFW to Japan, and Fox Peter Two, the 27th SFW deployment, established beyond doubt the global mobility of SAC fighters.

Before leaving Fox Peter One, it should be pointed out that the deployment was not an attempt for a speed record. General LeMay directed that we get the 31st SFW to Japan as soon as possible, but further directed that the movement be commensurate with good flying safety practices.

Again in 1953, the 31st SFW was tapped to perform another nonstop over-water deployment utilizing air refueling. We were part of a two-phase deployment called "Operation Longstride." The order directed us to send 8 F–84G's from our base in Georgia to French Morocco—a distance of 4,470 miles. Meanwhile, our sister wing at Turner, the 508th SFW, was to deploy 20 fighters nonstop to England.

Our route was direct to Bermuda, the Azores, and into a SAC base at French Morocco with air refueling over Bermuda, between Bermuda and the Azores, and over the Azores. The 508th was to refuel near Boston, Goose Bay, and Keflavik, Iceland. The flights were to be accomplished simultaneously. Our eight Thunderjets landed in Morocco without incident after a flight of 10 hours, 20 minutes, and 21 seconds—21 seconds later than our briefed flight plan. The 508th had two refueling aborts over Iceland, but both pilots landed safely at Keflavik and joined their group in England the next day. This group flew 4,485 miles in less than 12 hours.

Air refueling for this nonstop hop was a serious business, but it had one advantage. What would have been a monotonous 10 hours of nothing but watching some 500 miles of ocean and clouds pass under our planes every hour was brightened by the business of transferring fuel to our thirsty tanks. The three air refuelings certainly squeezed the boredom out of the flight.

Along with the ability to refuel SAC's fighters in the air, I'd say that Charlie Blair's new approach to celestial navigation was an immense contribution toward attaining the global mobility SAC's fighters enjoy today. We of the 31st SFW encountered no navigation problems in Fox Peter One and Operation Longstride, nor do I think any fighter pilot properly trained in his method will run into trouble.

SAC now regards deployment of fighters and bombers to all parts of the free world as routine training maneuvers. In a matter of hours, the B–47's and F–84's can pop up in England, North Africa, Japan, and other points in the Pacific.

No longer do we have to depend on aircraft carriers and other slow surface ships to transport our planes.

Addition of the new McDonnell F–101 Voodoo to the SAC fighter inventory will give us a greatly increased fighter potential—so great that security precludes further mention.

Looking back on the growth of fighter capability in SAC since 1946, we can view an amazing 10 years of development. From the World War II F–47 Thunderbolt and F–51 Mustangs, we graduated into the F–80 Shooting Star, then the F–84E and later the F–84G with its air refueling capability and atomic delivery capability. After the F–84G, we got the sweptwing F–84F, and now the F–101 Voodoo is coming up.

Looking back, we can also observe that the Strategic Air Command, whose main mission is to conduct intercontinental strategic bombing missions, has taken the lead in the development of the fighter potential as an effective weapon in modern strategy.

The Eyes of the Strategists

(By Brig. Gen. Hewitt T. Wheless, commander, 801st Air Division, SAC)

Reconnaissance is as old as warfare, which is to say, probably, as old as the human race. Joshua, the great Hebrew commander, once took a beating at Ai, because he was misled by the reports of his scouts. They told him it wasn't necessary to send his whole army against the place, as it was poorly defended.

He took their word for it, and his small force was ignominiously defeated, much to Joshua's humiliation and distress. The Hessians at Trenton failed to observe the movements of George Washington, who crossed the Delaware and captured the lot of them. In the numerous Indian wars which accompanied the opening of this country to civilization, pioneer Indian scouts like Daniel Boone and Kit Carson played a leading role.

With the coming of global "total" warfare, a new type of reconnaissance is called for. In modern war, only a small part of the conflict is waged by the men who slug it out in the front lines. It is now possible, with long-range aircraft and nuclear weapons, to strike at the enemy's homeland, to wreck his means of production, to cripple his transportation, to break his morale, and to render a mighty military establishment impotent for lack of weapons to carry on the fight. To do this successfully, we need to know what and where are the vital targets. And this, in brief, is the function we know as strategic reconnaissance.

Strategic reconnaissance, then, is the examination and survey of territory, on a broad scale, to gain advantage in war. It is distinguished from tactical reconnaissance, which deals principally with support of the front-line armies, by two factors—the range at which it is carried on, and the use to which the information is to be put once it is obtained. It is concerned with missions beyond the front lines—with securing information which will make possible a long-range plan of attack, which will inflict the greatest amount of damage on the enemy, in the places where it will hurt him the most.

There's not a whale of a lot of glory to the reconnaissance mission, but it's a highly important job—one which demands resourcefulness, accuracy of detail, technical skill, and devotion to duty.

There are other elements involved in strategic reconnaissance besides the primary one of collecting target information. There is the important function of bomb damage assessment—reporting on the degree of success achieved by a bombing mission. That is something everyone, from the President of the United States to John Doe's office boy, will want to know, when and if it again becomes necessary to use our weapons against any enemy: Was the target hit? Was it destroyed? Will we have to go back and hit it again? Strategic reconnaissance must provide the answers.

How does strategic reconnaissance operate? Obviously, it must be carried on in the air. Only from the air is it possible to make the observations needed to provide detailed information of broad scope; only through the air, in time of war at least, can an observer approach the target on which information is wanted. Therefore, we find strategic reconnaissance conducted by the 2d, 8th, and 15th Air Forces, using the newest and best of the Air Force's long-range aircraft, and under the direction of the Strategic Air Command.

Obviously, too, strategic reconnaissance must involve photography. The human memory cannot absorb and retain the quantity of detail that is required; nor would the human tongue be able to adequately report it. Therefore, we find our Air Force planes equipped with specially designed cameras, capable of producing accurate pictures from high altitudes.

Aerial photography began a little more than a hundred years ago when Aimé Laussedat, a French engineering officer, in 1849 took photographs with cameras supported by a string of kites. Laussedat also was first to advance the idea, ridiculed at first, of using photographs in making topographic maps—the basis on which the whole important science of photogrammetry (measurement from photographs) has been built.

Another Frenchman, Nadar, explored the possibility of using aerial photos to make planimetric maps; and he took the first aerial photographs for military purposes. In 1859, the kingdom of Sardinia was at war with Austria, with France giving active aid to Sardinia. Nadar, whose real name was Gaspard Félix Tournachon, in the service of the Sardinian Army, photographed the Austrian position at Salferino from a tent in the basket of a balloon.

Balloons were fine for peacetime aerial photography during the last half of the 19th century, and in 1893 an American named Adams patented a method of making maps from such photos. Kites and skyrockets were also used experimentally. Long before the airplane, men had envisioned training teams of eagles to carry them into the sky; and some fanciful souls dreamed up the idea of an automatic camera, to be taken up by a properly trained bird. One man did, in fact, rig up a tiny camera to be attached to a carrier pigeon, with a mechanism to make exposures at regular intervals, the location to be calculated from the speed of the bird.

All these ideas were more remarkable for their ingenuity than for any practical results. They are mentioned here to show that man had set his mind to the problem of taking pictures from the air, and that he was not going to rest until he had done it.

The invention of the airplane coincided with a rapid advance in camera and film techniques to provide a solution to the problem. About 1900 Capt. Theodor Scheimpflug developed the multilens camera, which afforded more coverage at one time. Wilbur Wright made the first known photos from a plane at Centocelle, Italy, on April 24, 1909. Four years later, Capt. Cesare Tardivo, an Italian, presented a map of the city of Bengasi, constructed from aerial photographs, at a meeting of the International Society of Photogrammetry in Vienna.

The value of aerial photography for military purposes was demonstrated in World War I. The German Army had already taken notice of its possibilities, and a Scheimpflug Kammerer eight-lens camera, mounted on the basket of a balloon, was used in their maneuvers of 1911.

Ground cameras held in the slip stream of open cockpits took the first reconnaissance shots. The next step was fastening the cameras to the side of the fuselage. Sturdier cameras and more satisfactory mounts had to be developed. Experiments were carried out at various focal lengths. By the end of the war vertical cameras mounted in the bottom of the fuselage were in use.

The trimetrogon process, first suggested in 1941 by Col. Merle E. Parks, is now in general use in the United States Air Force. It involves three single-lens cameras, one mounted vertically, the other two mounted obliquely at an angle of 60°, one to the right, the other to the left. This arrangement permits complete recording of a strip of terrain from one horizon to the other in a single operation, and has proven particularly desirable in charting photography.

At the beginning of World War II the need for more strategic information was immediately apparent. Less than one-tenth of the earth's surface had been charted. Bombing missions were going out with inadequate information on their targets, and even without the navigational aids needed to find their way in and out of hostile territory.

As the war spread and the probability increased that the United States would become involved, the importance of a trained and equipped aerial photography organization became vital. The new organization, which was to develop into the Second Air Force, had its beginning in February 1940, when it was activated as the First Photographic Squadron, with six flights, each in a different section of the country.

By June 1941 the squadron had become the First Photographic Group, and the flights became squadrons. Later other squadrons were added, another group—the 11th Photo Group—was organized, and the two groups combined as the 311th Photo Wing, mapping and charting. This was the organization which became successively the 311th Reconnaissance Wing, the 311th Air Division, and eventually the Second Air Force.

There is no room here for a detailed account of the numerous missions flown, the hazards encountered, the difficulties overcome, and the results accomplished by these reconnaissance men during the World War II.

However, it became increasingly obvious that the expanded geographic scope of aerial warfare had established a real need for a stepped-up strategic reconnaissance capability. This led to the creation, in 1947, of the first strategic reconnaissance unit, commanded by the late Brig. Gen. P. T. Cullen. Simultaneously, a program was set up to develop the aerial cameras and accessories that would support the mission of the new command. As part of the program, more B–29's were modified as reconnaissance aircraft, and close liaison was maintained with the Research and Development Branch of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to work on high-altitude photography equipment, and with the aircraft industry in the development of aircraft for suitable camera platforms. This coordination resulted in the first aircraft that was truly a strategic reconnaissance type when it left the assembly line—the Boeing RB–50.

The RB–50 was the first aircraft suitable for high-altitude, long-range, reconnaissance missions. Even this aircraft, however, quickly began its losing fight with obsolescence and was supplemented with a wing of North American RB–45's, the first multijet-type aircraft capable of performing strategic reconnaissance missions, although they were classed as "mediums" because of limited range. Even the RB–50's were not technically designated as long-range strategic reconnaissance aircraft, and it was not until the Convair RB–36 came along that units of long-range reconnaissance were phased into the strategic picture. During the same period, 1951–52, the six-jet Boeing RB–47 was accepted as a medium reconnaissance aircraft.

In-flight refueling converted the RB–47's, in effect, from medium to long-range reconnaissance aircraft. At present, SAC has five reconnaissance wings.

During this decade of security through global airpower, one of the most difficult tasks was that of balancing the development of the air platform with the reconnaissance tools which give the platform its reason for being. The photographic industry, aware of strategic reconnaissance problems, began to increase the capabilities of our cameras, optics, sensitized materials, and processing equipment. Due to the need for meeting immediate requirements, the majority of this equipment was not new but merely modified.

Strategic reconnaissance has made tremendous strides since the introduction of the RB–29 into the program, but the never-ending search continues for even more effective reconnaissance weapons systems. Current developments reflect the wish to adapt standard aircraft for reconnaissance missions. An example is the use of a "capsule" which, in a minimum of man-hours, can convert a B–52 into a reconnaissance aircraft. The capsule contains all the equipment necessary to perform a reconnaissance mission, thereby creating a dual-purpose aircraft at low cost.

No story of strategic reconnaissance would be complete without mentioning the role of the reconnaissance technical squadrons. Their job is to process the vast amount of film taken by the reconnaissance crews, and, in addition, interpret the photos and disseminate the information to the using agency. At present, with their automatic

equipment, these units can quickly deliver the reconnaissance photos and intelligence to those dependent upon the information for the success of their mission.

The future of aerial reconnaissance envisages a time when remote-controlled aircraft will perform reconnaissance deep into enemy territory with cameras corrected for drift, yaw, and pitch; when automatic devices to compute exposure and shutter speeds at extremely high, as well as low, altitudes will become available; when blur caused by high speeds in relation to target being photographed, will be eliminated; when excellent night photography at great heights will become possible; when scenes will be automatically flashed electronically to a control room where commanders can make immediate decisions for bomber crews either awaiting takeoff, or even for crews already en route. This could be the ultimate in reconnaissance. In the meantime, many interim problems will have to be solved in order to maintain the reconnaissance arm of the Strategic Air Command as one of the vital elements of the United States Air Force.

SAC'S READINESS IS OUR PEACE INSURANCE POLICY

(By Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commander in chief, SAC)

For centuries it has been the job of the general to win wars. In the nuclear air age his job must be to prevent wars. There is good reason to believe that the military solution to the problem is relatively simple—superior long-range nuclear airpower and adequate defensive airpower in being, combat ready on a continuing basis. This airpower must be strong enough to win, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the decision in any global nuclear war. Without this kind of force in being we cannot expect to keep the peace. This is perhaps the most significant military fact of today.

Therefore, all training, all operations, in the Strategic Air Command add up to one simple purpose—readiness for combat on an instant's warning, anywhere in the world. If we are not ready—in terms of trained men, modern equipment, and effective organization—then SAC is wasting its time.

Military power, in any form, has always been a matter of men, and for the foreseeable future it will continue to be. The day of the pilotless long-range bomber and the guided missile is coming. As they become available they will augment the manned force and, very slowly, may even replace it.

But in SAC we can take no comfort in the prospects of being combat ready 5 years from now, or 1 year from now, or even tomorrow. Our prime interest is in readiness today, this instant. To do so we need men of the highest caliber, trained to the peak of perfection, armed with sufficient quantities of the best equipment the Nation can supply them.

Among the almost 200,000 personnel of the command, motivations naturally vary greatly from person to person, yet there is one attribute that is common to almost all SAC people. This is the satisfaction they derive from knowing that the force they have helped to build, and which they maintain in a state of constant readiness, is vital to the security of the free world. They know that they are making a contribution toward the achievement of lasting peace. These people represent the finest in the military tradition—these who choose service to their country above all other considerations.

Building the Strategic Air Command to its present high state of readiness was essentially a matter of bringing the men and the aircraft together and exercising them constantly on combat training missions, which duplicate actual war requirements. Realistic training is our greatest continuing need, and many hundreds of hours of study are required to master today's highly complicated air equipments.

Consider, for example, the fact that 3 men in a B–47 bomber do substantially the same jobs that 11 men did in the World War II B–29. Their training has to be broader and more technical, and the demands on each man are greater. Not only must everyone achieve high standards of proficiency in his own job—he is often cross trained to the other jobs as well.

Ever since the Strategic Air Command was activated, it has been necessary to work on the assumption that a war might start at any time. It is a fact that hours—even minutes—might spell the difference between victory and defeat. Therefore, there has always been a certain urgency to our operations. It is essential to be ready to go—not next week, nor tomorrow, but today—now, if the need arises.

It is our responsibility to know how well the combat crewmen of SAC can do their jobs. In determining this we have had to ask—and answer—three questions. We would like to give you both questions and answers, for they bear on our conclusions.

First, can SAC combat crewmen, flying from bases here and overseas, find their targets with certainty? The answer is an unqualified "Yes." On celestial navigation alone, our crews can fly to within 15 miles of any spot on earth, and from there move on their targets with precision by means of radar navigation.

Second, when they arrive over their targets, can they destroy them? Again, the answer is an unqualified "Yes." By means of carefully scored bombing runs, each of these crews has proved its ability on hundreds of occasions. I should like to point out that their targets are not cities—they are often specific corners of buildings within military target areas. By a combination of radar and radio, we can tell with what degree of accuracy any given crew is bombing.

Third, having destroyed their targets, will these crews get back? Again, the answer is "Yes." In World War II, using mass formations of bombers, subject to massed attack, our percentage of losses was less than 2 percent. With many hundreds of jet bombers utilizing optimum tactics, in small formations or on single-plane penetrations, the odds are equally in favor of our bombers.

Today we have a combat-ready force in being—and I think there is good reason to hope it may never have to be used. The strength it poses to any potential enemy as of now is so great it is very probable that he will not risk its blows. There is no profit in aggression if it bring on self-destruction. Therefore, we may well regard the Strategic Air Command as peace insurance, and the premiums we must pay to keep it more modern than the strategic air force of any nation are not high. If we never have to use the power we have built into SAC it will have justified its cost many times over.

We must face squarely the fact that the United States no longer enjoys a monopoly on long-range nuclear airpower. It was inevitable, of course, that the Communists would build this most potent type of force as quickly as they could. The fact they now have such a force, however, in no way detracts from the deterrent power of our own. It is not likely that any major attack could be made on the United States without the aggressor nation suffering disaster. As long as a potential aggressor is convinced of this, I do not think we have to worry about a major war. Our main job is to keep him convinced.

We are not a belligerent people. We prefer to devote our inventive natures and our industrial capacity to providing better lives for ourselves and for others. In the past this inclination has been mistaken for weakness, and as a result, we have been drawn into two World Wars in a single generation.

I would not say to you that SAC is the ultimate of military tools. Today, it is our best and most formidable military expression, and for the foreseeable future it appears clear that the long-range bomber and the nuclear bomb will be required in sufficient numbers, and of superior quality, as a national insurance policy. We must keep it that way, at the same time pushing forward our research and development programs on advanced type aircraft and guided missiles to guarantee future leadership in the air.

The airman knows the futility of war and his job today is to help prevent war from happening. We can and must insure our security by our continuing efforts toward a peaceful solution to world problems, backed up with the type of military strength our potential enemies fear most. In such an atmosphere, with that strength behind our position of moral leadership in the world, we can look to the future with confidence.

Mr. Speaker, to my way of thinking the most important words in General LeMay's summary are these:

We must face squarely that the United States no longer enjoys a monopoly on long-range nuclear airpower.

In recent months, there has been more and more evidence of a Soviet buildup in this field, and the President's recent request for an additional half billion dollars, of which roughly half is scheduled, to step up our B–52 production, is certainly recognition of this truth.

We cannot afford to lag behind the Communist world in this critical area.

In the words of LeMay:

We may well regard the Strategic Air Command as peace insurance, and the premiums we must pay to keep it more modern than the strategic air force of any nation are not high. If we never have to use the power we have built into SAC, it will have justified its cost many times over.

Knowing that the power of atomic and nuclear war is "the power to destroy the human race," can there be any question of the fact that tax dollars spent to assure and guarantee American superiority in this vital field are dollars well spent?

There will be no time for "muddling through" in atomic war.

The nation that has "too little, too late" will probably not exist to bemoan its false economy.

Nor does this imply, as many falsely assume, that we should forget about all other branches of our Armed Forces and concentrate all military funds in a gigantic additional buildup of SAC.

For one thing, the American Air Force is a balanced and integrated fighting machine, with important missions assigned to the Tactical Air Command and the Air Defense Command, which also have critical roles in the defense of our country. The Air Reserve and the Air National Guard are major components of America's air readiness, and provide a trained and ready pool of fighting manpower.

And, in the words of Maj. Gen. William E. Hall:

No responsible Air Force spokesman has ever implied that foot soldiers or sailors have become obsolete. When the peak of the atomic exchange has been passed, the surface forces that can exercise and exploit control of land and sea will begin to play an important part in the combat.

It is in this initial exchange of atomic and nuclear weapons however—in the terrible event it should come to pass—

that the role of the Strategic Air Command assumes its enormous and critical proportions.

You do not have to visit more than one SAC base to become aware, at once of the sense of responsibility, and of urgency which the men of SAC share today.

It is present in the penetrating look of the security officer, in the measured words of the base commander, in the hurried step and crisp efficiency of the maintenance crews.

It is a sense of responsibility, and a sense of urgency, which we in the Congress, and the American people, must fully share at this hour.

We must keep our peace insurance fully paid up, and provide the best protection available for our homes and our freedom.

A very great measure of that insurance, and that protection, can be found in the Strategic Air Command.

Americans today, and in the future, will owe a great debt to the men of that command.

DRASTIC ACTION OF FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ARBITRARILY INCREASING INTEREST RATES

The Speaker pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System gave its approval to a very severe interest rate increase. The rediscount rate, which is the anchor of the whole structure of interest rates, was raised from 2½ percent to 2¾ percent for 10 Federal Reserve banks and to 3 percent for 2 other banks. I would like to comment on the results we may expect from this action.

First of all, let me say that I do not doubt the sincerity of the Federal Reserve. They must have been greatly alarmed by the recent industrial price rises and the impending steel price increases. They must also have been disturbed by the sharp increase in the demand for credit to finance inventory and speculation in expectation of the steel price rise.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Federal Reserve action, which was very severe, will not prevent a steel price rise nor will it get at the inventory speculators. It will make borrowing more costly and in the process increase the interest earnings of the commercial banks by several hundred million dollars.

It will not get at the main culprits, the big corporations who, nourished on fat defense contracts, quick tax write-offs, and free of excess-profits taxes, are raising prices and profits and sparking a vast investment boom.

Let us see what it will do.

First, there are the millions of farmers in the depression-ridden agricultural sector of our economy. This credit squeeze will mean two things to them. First, their loans will cost them more.

Second, if the local bank is overloaned and needs reserves, it will hesitate to sell its Government securities because they are way down in price and will entail a heavy capital loss. So our farmers stand a good chance of having their loans called or not renewed.

Next let us consider the millions of small-business men. What will the credit tightening mean to them? The Small Business Administration recently issued its fifth semiannual report, covering the 6 months ending December 31, 1955. Mr. Wendell Barnes stated at the opening of this report that—

> Many small firms complain also of the tightening of bank credit.

And again:

> Small firms report that they continue to face a problem of finding equity capital financing.

This situation prevailed prior to the recent severe interest-rate increase. Consequently we may reasonably conclude that the position of small firms with respect to their financing needs has been worsened as a result of this Federal Reserve action.

Mr. Speaker, on page 14 of Mr. Barnes fifth semiannual report, he states:

> Another serious disadvantage of smaller corporations is lack of adequate assets to finance properly their receivables and inventories.

Thus the curbing of credit for financing inventories and receivables will result in an even greater disadvantage for smaller corporations than existed last year.

Small firms are handicapped by a shortage of equity or venture capital.

How will the Federal Reserve action affect the ability of small business to obtain equity or venture capital?

Mr. Harold B. Dorsey, author of the column Economic View, which appears in the Washington Post and Times Herald writes—April 16, 1956—that—

> In the current effort to curb inflationary tendencies by making credit less readily available to business * * * one of the indirect results is to make less money available for investments.

This results, as Mr. Dorsey points out, from the fact that the enforced liquidation of bond holdings drives their prices down and as yields rise investors will tend to put their money into bonds and top quality preferred stocks in preference to lower yielding consumer stocks.

So the net effect is to reduce the supply of venture capital and to channel more and more savings into triple A bonds.

I insert Mr. Dorsey's article at this point in my remarks:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 16, 1956]

ECONOMIC VIEW

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

SEVERAL FACTORS TIGHTEN MONEY SUPPLY

The behavior of the stock market last week points up the fact that the forces influencing stock prices should be divided into two major categories: (1) those that determine earnings and earnings prospects—unit volume of business activity, prices, costs, profit margins, and the like, and (2) those forces which influence the capitalization of earnings in terms of market price—confidence and money supply, primarily. This last item seems to be of outstanding significance at the moment.

It must be remembered that part of the stock price increase that has taken place in the last couple of years can be explained by rising earnings, but another important part of the stock price improvement has been the result of a higher capitalization of earnings—a higher price-times-earnings ratio, in the Wall Street lingo. It probably is more than a coincidence that sharp increases in money supply in the summer of 1953 and again in the summer of 1954 (resulting from a reduction in bank reserve requirements) was accompanied by a rising trend of price earnings ratios from the latter part of 1953 through most of 1954, in spite of the fact that earnings were trending downward through much of that period. Of course, there are other factors that influence the price earnings ratios, but the availability of investment money must be an element worth considering.

Especially is this aspect of the situation worthy of consideration at the moment because, as discussed in last week's article, credit policies are currently in the direction of keeping the supply of money and credit tight in relation to the economy's need for money and credit. The Federal Reserve Board's action Thursday again increasing the rediscount rate serves to underscore this direction in the monetary authorities' policy.

The supply of money available for common stock investment is far from being a static quantity. This kind of capital tends to flow toward the segments of the economy where it is needed most and where it promises to be most profitably employed. That is why money supply tends to have an effect on price earnings ratios, and that is why the money situation carries a very practical significance today.

In the current effort to curb inflationary tendencies by making credit less readily available to business for overexpanding inventories and capital expenditures, one of the indirect results is to make less money available for investments. This evidences itself in several different ways.

First, the banks have been selling their investments to obtain funds to lend to their regular customers. After all, the primary function of a commercial bank is to lend money, and investments are secondary. As nonbank investors buy the securities sold by the banks, they have less money to invest in something else.

Second, the very fact that business borrowings are rising means that more money is needed in business operations. Therefore, businesses that might temporarily place their surplus funds in investments will tend to liquidate such investments at a time like the present so that they may reemploy the funds in their regular operations.

Third, since it is becoming increasingly difficult to borrow money from the banks, business tries to obtain its funds in the new capital market, thereby increasing the total of securities.

Fourth, there is a secondary effect as the liquidation of bond investments drives down the prices of such securities and thereby makes them more attractive relative to other types of investment. For example, some of the marketable Government issues would now seem to be more attractive than savings bonds and deposits in savings banks. If the yields on marketable Government and corporate bonds and good quality preferred stocks become even more attractive, some investors may tend to put their money into such issues in preference to lower yielding common stocks.

The weakness in the stock market last week was probably reflecting the effects of the credit tightening process along the foregoing lines. The strength of these effects, and

potential effects, are impossible to measure. After all, stock price behavior is the net result of a blending of many forces and the money supply factor is only one of these. As such, it is operating on the negative side; other things being equal, it tends to result in a lower price earnings ratio.

However, the condition does not mean that there must be a sharply lower price earnings ratio. The whole purpose of the restraining credit policy is to try to eliminate those excesses in the economy that are contributing to the inflationary pressure. The purpose is not to cause a period of deflation and a bearish stock market, even though there may be a desire to curb a bullish stock market that would contribute to the inflation psychology.

Aside from the foregoing direct effects of tighter credit policies on security prices and price earnings ratios, we will have to look out for the effects on business activity and other earnings determinants. Up to the moment, we have not seen any serious signs that tighter credit, by itself, is responsible for curbing purchases of goods and services, or causing a reduction in the rate of forward commitments. But, one of the purposes of the tighter credit policy is to reduce the extent of anticipatory buying, especially during the second quarter when the incentive to buy before prices and costs rise further promises to continue rather strong. Just how excessive such purchases may be between now and the midyear, in spite of tight credit, is difficult to predict. An excessive degree of such buying in the next couple of months would probably be offset by correspondingly lower purchases in the third quarter. Even so, there still seem to be some rather strong reasons for anticipating that fourth quarter activity will be in a recovery phase.

Mr. Speaker, the probable impact of the latest Federal Reserve action was well summed up by Mr. Herbert Koshetz in his column The Merchant's Point of View, which appeared in the New York Times Sunday, April 15, 1956.

He stated:

CAPITAL MOVES CONFUSE

The businessman here is finding it difficult to understand certain moves in Washington. On Thursday, the Federal Reserve Board announced an increase in the discount rate. The move stemmed from an effort to shrink business loans and if it accomplishes this, there will probably be some slowing of plant expansion and order taking. The theory behind the move is that if the cost of money rises—banks having to pay more for their money from the Federal Reserve will pass the increase along to borrowers—the rate of inventory accumulation and of speculation in one form or another will be slowed.

It was explained that the move on the part of the Federal Reserve Board was psychological rather than punitive. An increase in interest charges on outstanding loans, while amounting to many millions of dollars, is not in itself a deterrent. But, as is usual in instances where basic costs of doing business go up, the small-business man will feel the effects more keenly than the large companies.

Small enterprises, working as they do on limited capital, must rely on bank credit, loans on receivables, and chattels to get ahead or just to keep going. When money tightens, as it has just now, the little fellow finds it harder and harder to increase bank lines of credit, and he is often forced to pay exorbitant interest for necessary funds. It appears possible, therefore, that the higher rates for money will be reflected in an increase in bankruptcies and business liquidations, mostly at the expense of the smaller operator.

Mr. Speaker, even prior to the interest-rate increase by the Federal Reserve, the rate of small business bankruptcies had risen above the 1954 and 1955 level. So this Federal Reserve action will aggravate the rising trend in the rate of small-business failures.

We have seen that the position of the farmers and the small-business men, two groups which have notably not shared in the big business boom, will be worsened as a result of the Federal Reserve credit action.

Now let us consider the effect of the Federal Reserve action on the economy as a whole. Despite the industrial price increases and the expansion of plant and equipment investment which are characteristics of the big business boom, there are a number of sags in industrial sectors of the economy which belie the threat of a runaway boom and may even presage the makings of a recession.

I am referring first of all to the automotive and the housing industries. Activity in both these sectors has been declining. In both industries the availability of credit and credit terms influence demand considerably.

Let us examine the housing situation. The tightening of the money market in 1955 prior to the Federal Reserve's latest move resulted in a marked decline in housing starts. Here are the quarterly averages of privately financed new housing starts:

Seasonally adjusted annual rates

1955:	
1st quarter	1,384,000
2d quarter	1,361,000
3d quarter	1,281,000
4th quarter	1,200,000
1956: 1st quarter	1,170,000

It is evident that there has been a steady and uninterrupted decline in the annual rate of new housing starts since early 1955. Compared with March of last year, the annual rate of private starts, seasonally adjusted, was down by 17 percent this March. Further tightening of the money market will undoubtedly cause new starts to fall some more.

The latest figures on unemployment reveal 100,000 unemployed in Michigan, the automobile center of the Nation. Dealers sales of new cars in March were up about 4 percent from February, but were 18 percent less than a year ago. Moreover, the February to March increase was considerably smaller than the rise over the same months in the past 3 years.

Dealers inventories in March were reduced slightly to 870,000 cars. This was equivalent to 41 days of sales at the March rate. Further credit tightening is bound to have a depressing effect on automobile sales. A decline in sales will lead to a rise in inventories and may necessitate further cuts in production.

In addition to the evident sagging in the housing and automotive industry there are signs of a weakening of demand in the leather, textiles, and apparel industries and in electrical machinery reflected in cutbacks in television.

Production worker employment and average weekly hours in textiles, apparel, and leather have been declining for the past 4 months.

In March both employment and hours declined more than seasonally in these industries.

Compared with March last year the average workweek in all manufacturing was down by three-tenths of an hour. More than half of the major industries were working fewer hours. The sharpest drop was in the automotive industry.

Mr. Speaker, the evidence of slackening demand in the housing, automobile, textiles, apparel, leather, and the electrical machinery industries raises a serious question in my mind as to the wisdom of the Federal Reserve's severe interest rate action. I am reminded of the situation in the spring of 1953 when the Board was similarly alarmed by inventory accumulation and impending price rises in basic industrial commodities. In a post mortem analysis of the situation the chairman of the Board conceded they had made a miscalculation.

I well remember the spring of 1953. For I was among a handful who protested the interest-boosting and credit tightening actions in the early months of 1953. Then we were called the advocates of inflation. I am happy to report that I am not alone today in questioning the Federal Reserve's restrictive credit action. The Washington Post, which is not usually in accord with my views on monetary and credit policies, does, however, raise a question about the wisdom of the Reserve Board's policy. I should like to conclude my remarks by inserting the editorial, Inflation or Not? which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, April 15, 1956:

INFLATION OR NOT?

The sum of the available evidence suggests that we have passed the point of greatest inflationary danger—that we passed it successfully as a result of the wise policy of mild restraint which the Federal Reserve System and other Government agencies adopted last year. Yet the Federal Reserve has raised the discount rate again because it believes that inflationary forces once more are active. The increase in the discount rate charged member banks is from 2½ percent to 2¾ percent in some areas and from 2½ percent to 3 percent in others. A move from 2½ to 3 percent is not an insignificant increase. Coupled with the Reserve Board's recent policy of reducing its holdings of Government securities, the change in the discount rate adds up to a fairly tight policy.

It would be very foolish to say dogmatically that the Federal Reserve has made a serious mistake. Last year there were some respectable economists who believed that the board tightened credit too much, but the record is overwhelmingly against those critics. The bank's policy has been vindicated by events. Now, however, it is at least necessary to raise a question about the wisdom of the Reserve Board's policy.

Every few days, it is true, the financial pages have been reporting speeches by businessmen and bankers warning against inflation. In a boom period like the present it is never easy to avoid the Scylla of inflation on the one hand or the Charybdis of deflation on the other. Some rise in industrial prices in recent months has caused serious problems, although the value of the dollar has not deteriorated. Since President Eisenhower's decision to run again and the official forecast of greatly expanded business spending for plant and equipment, there has been more optimism but there have been new fears of inflation.

It must be said in the Reserve Board's behalf that the promised increase in the price of steel is highly disturbing, that stock prices are high, that many basic industries are working at capacity and already have raised or are preparing to raise prices, that business loans have spurted up and that there is a marked upsurge of confidence. All these factors influenced the Federal Reserve in its decision to tighten the reins. But we think the New York Journal of Commerce was right last Wednesday when it said that inflation talk should not be regarded seriously, although the price level may move up further this spring.

What do other statistics show? A most important fact is that Federal, State, and local expenditures now, for the first time since 1952, are less than receipts, so they are exerting a somewhat deflationary pressure. In addition, farm prices are still soft, consumer goods prices are off slightly, and consumer credit outstanding is down from last year's alltime high. There has been a drop in auto and housing construction. For at least 3 or 4 months the economy has been on a plateau, with the Federal Reserve Board's own index of industrial production stable since September.

With the economy as strong as it now seems to be, no alarming damage could be done by the Reserve's action, and it could be reversed if clear proof is adduced that money is too tight. The important thing now is for the Board not to become inflexible or overimpressed by the gloomy prophets of inflation. The chief trouble with an increase in the interest rate at the present time is that it probably affects adversely the auto and housing industries more than any others, and it probably does not much discourage businessmen who are accumulating inventories at too fast a pace.

I cannot understand why the Federal Reserve Board did not increase reserve requirements of banks if they desired to take some action to curtail credit. Such action would have diminished credit, but would not have arbitrarily raised interest rates.

The Board took the action that required higher interest rates. It was not necessary to deal with any dangers of inflation in that way. In fact, higher interest is itself inflationary. Higher interest unbalances all budgets immediately from the Federal Government, including States, counties, cities, and political subdivisions. It also unbalances the budgets of corporations, partnerships, individuals, and all family units. It is a cruel approach to a problem that can be met in a more satisfactory way.

PUBLIC HEALTH SCHOOLS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, problems of public health and medical care are pressing inexorably upon the Congress and the country. They must be tackled by the Congress.

While probably no higher standards of general health, medical skill and hospital facilities and related services, exist anywhere in the world—in fact, we are daily assured that ours are the highest—mounting costs of medical and hospital services have become a matter of grave concern and heavy burden to the American people.

As the situation develops, it is apparent that vigorous, drastic action must be taken to encourage and sustain in the private, voluntary plans which seek to provide some more adequate answer for the ordinary individual and his family for worrisome medical and hospital problems.

I have been greatly concerned about these problems ever since I came to Congress and more so in recent time, because it seems to me that it is absolutely imperative for the Congress to take bold, sweeping action as promptly as we can to insure that our fellow citizens of every station, and particularly the working people of the Nation, shall be enabled to provide the kind and extent of these services which they may require for personal well-being without onerous and excessive drain upon their financial resources.

A vital portion, indeed, of the overall health and medical program is presented by the proposed Emergency Health Training Act of 1956 as set forth in H. R. 8859 and S. 1859, which are measures to firm up and step up the supply of qualified public health specialists and to expand the facilities for training and developing this class of personnel so indispensable to a modern, well-rounded public-health system.

The objectives of these bills strike me as being particularly meritorious and praiseworthy because they aim directly at the solution of one of the great problems we have in this field, namely, providing sufficient men and women possessed of the training, skill, experience and ability fittingly to cope with the great responsibility which devolves upon our public-health instrumentalities.

Briefly stated, these bills would make available $1 million a year for the next 5 years toward the cost of instruction in the 10 schools of public health throughout the Nation, and also certain monetary allowances on a per capita basis for students enrolled in these schools.

In addition to financial support of the cost of instruction, $1 million a year for 5 years would be provided toward the cost of construction and equipment in public-health schools on a 50 percent matching basis.

Moreover, a fund of $250,000 would be allocated for direct scholarship aid to qualified, regularly admitted, graduate students in the 10 schools of public health, and the act itself would be administered by the United States Public Health Service Surgeon General with advice and recommendations from the National Advisory Health Council.

Dr. John C. Snyder, M. D., dean of the Harvard School of Public Health, and a distinguished expert in this field, has taken an active and significant interest in fostering the objectives of these measures, and I am indebted to him for valuable information and data which he has furnished to me relative to the proposed program.

Dr. Snyder is of the view that these measures are not only justified, but absolutely necessary if we are to protect the health of our fellow citizens, our communities, and the Nation itself, and successfully to pursue the urgent tasks of preventing disease, accidents, and keeping people well and, of course, he would also add caring for and healing the sick and afflicted.

Dr. Snyder states, for example, that—

> Preventive medicine and public-health promotion constitute a medical specialty for which specialized postgraduate training is required.

Pointing to the fact that there is a serious shortage of postgraduate-trained public-health personnel in this country, that the only source of these exceptionally qualified skilled men and women is the 10 accredited schools of public health in the country, that each school in its enrollment draws students from all parts of the Nation and that its graduates serve in key health posts throughout the country and abroad, he declares that these 10 schools at the present time are inadequately financed and housed and their total output is only about one-fifth of the number that should be trained each year to meet the Nation's civilian health needs, not even considering our broader military health needs at home and abroad.

I find myself in complete agreement with Dr. Snyder's views and conclusions that if the potential of these health schools is to be realized in any truly effective degree, some way must be found to give them additional long-range financing in order to stabilize basic operations, add physical facilities, and increase enrollment.

Dr. Snyder also stresses the necessity of recruiting public health students and assisting them in financing their public health education. He states that:

> Most public health students have already graduated from a basic professional school, or have done postgraduate work in some branch of science and cannot afford to sacrifice opportunities to earn while at the same time paying for further education in public health. Most public health students are mature people (average age is 34) with families to support, other financial obligations, and limited future income prospects.

There can be no doubt that as Dr. Snyder says that our schools of public health are unique in that only 10 schools serve the entire Nation. Clearly, there is a definite shortage of trained public health workers and that means a shortage in numerous professions, not only physicians, but sanitarians, nurses, engineers, dentists, veterinarians, nutritionists, health educators, nonmedical administrators, laboratory workers, statisticians, and others who comprise the class of highly skilled specialists who fall into this particular category.

I am also informed that the average tuition in these public health schools is $500 per year, whereas it costs about $4,100 per year to provide this type of advanced training.

I am further advised that the deans of all 10 schools of public health favor direct Federal grants and the Hoover Task Force analysis recommended support of graduate public health education in the national interest.

Of greatest interest to Members of Congress who are always eager to promote economy and efficiency in the Government as well as to advance the general welfare of the Nation is the state-

ment of Dr. Snyder of the very high percentage of public health graduates who engage in governmental health work. These figures are so revealing and impressive that I am constrained to set them forth in my remarks because they point up the need and emphasize the urgency in my opinion of early congressional action in support of this most essential phase of our national health program.

Sixty-seven and four-tenths percent of the Harvard School are engaged in full-time governmental health work; 62.5 percent of California; 84 percent of Johns Hopkins; 70 percent of North Carolina; 88.5 percent of Michigan; presumably, as I understand it, also a high percentage of the graduates of the other public health schools are now giving full-time services in the important governmental field of health work.

In conclusion, may I not respectfully suggest to my colleagues on the committee and of the House to give immediate and sober consideration to the proposals looking toward the national health benefit which I urge so strongly upon you today. Let us not temporize with or further delay the enactment of these measures. Let them be brought to the floor of the House for early debate, so that the House membership can work its will upon them and make such changes and amendments as may appear agreeable and place the seal of approval upon the principles of these measures, which are so very essential at this time if we are to move forward with the march of human progress and betterment in the Nation and fully discharge our profound responsibility to guard and try to improve the health of the American people and set even higher standards that will be a guide and boon for the world as well.

I desire to thank and commend Dr. Snyder and his group for the vigor, ability, and public spirit they have demonstrated in advocating and pressing this most worthy cause. Let us all get behind it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 45 minutes today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOYLE.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1751. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1752. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1753. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1754. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon road network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 637. An act to provide for the conveyance of Camp Livingston, Camp Beauregard and Esler Field, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5268. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8290. A bill to provide for the appointment and promotion of the director and assistant directors of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2004). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8693. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, in relation to the refund of reenlistment bonuses; without amendment (Rept. No. 2005). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 8922. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services; without amendment (Rept. No. 2006). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 10560. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10561. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 10562. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10563. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 10564. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10565. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 10566. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 10567. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 10568. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 10569. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 10570. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 10571. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 10572. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability;

to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 10573. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 10574. A bill to provide that the Blue Ridge Parkway shall be toll free; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10575. A bill to provide for the establishment of a uraniferous lignite buying program for uranium-bearing lignites; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 10576. A bill to exempt from the tax on club dues amounts paid with respect to any nonprofit neighborhood swimming pool; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 10577. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 10578. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10579. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Attorney General; to establish a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government; to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to strengthen the Civil Rights Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10580. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the admission of single persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10581. A bill to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 10582. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10583. A bill to prohibit certain unfair practices with respect to the cancellation of franchises held by automobile dealers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 10584. A bill to establish a soil bank; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of the Report of the Joint Committee on Insurance Investigation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 10585. A bill for the relief of Felipe Tovar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 10586. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ether Kwang-Tzu Yang and his wife, Heather Ah-Nam Hsu Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H. R. 10587. A bill for the relief of Charlie Gardener Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. R. 10588. A bill for the relief of John E. King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 10589. A bill for the relief of Pierre Marcas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 10590. A bill for the relief of Kuo Hsien La, also known as Catherine Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H. R. 10591. A bill for the relief of Eskil K. Hassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

908. By Mr. BOW: Petition of H. Smutts and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

909. Also, petition of R. A. Hickman and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

910. Also, petition of B. M. Ayers and others of Stark and Mahoning Counties, Ohio, for a a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

911. Also, petition of J. R. Gillespie and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

912. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Local Union No. 812, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Williamsport, Pa., protesting the continuance of the 20-percent amusement tax imposed upon the entertainment industry and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

913. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Mishawaka Post No. 360, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mishawaka, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

914. Also, petition of Thomas D. Jordan, of Granger, Ind., and 44 other residents of St. Joseph County, Ind., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

915. By Mr. HARDY: Resolution of the Portsmouth Retail Merchants Association, Inc., of Portsmouth, Va., in support of H. R. 9566; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

916. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Virgil J. Gibbs, Conway, Ark., and others urging a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

917. By Mr. LECOMPTE. Petition of VFW Post 775 of Ottumwa, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for the veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

918. By Mr. RABAUT: Petition of J. A. Schiappacasse, and other residents of Detroit, Mich., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

919. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. I. Murphy, Sr., Garland, Ark., relative to the proposed construction of so-called Barkman Creek-McKinney Bayou drainage project; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lee De Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the "Father of Radio," Mr. Lee De Forest, invented the vacuum tube. His inventions helped make radio and TV possible, and he has won recognition as a leader in the field of electronic communication. Other inventions of his assisted in the development of the wireless telegraph in America. In the fields of wireless telegraphy, radio telephone, wire telephone, sound-on-film talking pictures, high-speed facsimile and picture transmission, and television, he has some 300 patented inventions to his credit. "Radiotherapy" for physicians is another of his accomplishments; the two-electrode—radio—tube which can be used as radio detector, radio and telephone amplifier, and as oscillator in "feed-back" or regeneration circuit, was developed by Mr. De Forest. The invention of "noiseless recording" positive prints in talking pictures, "glow-light" recording of sound on films, and so forth, are other of Mr. De Forest's many contributions. Broadcasts by radio of the voice of Caruso in 1910 and the first broadcast of radio news in 1916 are among his accomplishments. Time does not permit detailing the countless awards and honors which have attested his contribution to our society.

My district and I are very proud of the fact that the office of the American Television Co., with which Mr. De Forest is so closely associated, is located in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois. Mr. De Forest is today being honored by the Radio Pioneers of America, and from the floor of the House I also wish to salute him. The inventions and other work that he has done have helped make ours the great Nation that it is.

Retention of Section 638 in Department of Defense Appropriations, 1957

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement made by me before the Subcommittee on Defense, House Appropriations Committee, April 16, favoring retention of section 638 in Department of Defense appropriations, 1957:

Mr. Chairman, if the Government were as careful in screening every small item of procurement contracts awarded to private industry as it is in determining the threat to private industry and the waste of taxpayers money involved in the employment of a civilian cobbler at X air base, what a wonderful world this would be.

The stated issue is that of alleged Government competition with private business. The general policy of this administration is that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

To date a total of 56 facilities have been recommended for discontinuance by the Department of Defense. These would result in the displacement of 540 civilian workers.

The controversial projects number 7, covering 264 civilian personnel.

On the face of it there seems to be much ado about little.

It is the hidden trend that disturbs me. A little here and a little there gradually adds up to the practice of private industry taking over Government itself.

If that philosophy were carried all the way, we might just as well turn the Armed Forces over to private management, although how they could make a profit out of public service is hard to conceive at the moment.

I do not go along with the deification of private enterprise to the point where all public problems—including those involving national defense—are subordinated to it.

I reiterate that, although the facilities they want to discontinue are small in number and may appear to be unimportant, the precedent that may be established on this minor scale by its proponents will lead to further encroachments on the role of our defense services that would make them dependent upon mercenary interests.

We in Massachusetts are not only worried by the fact that they are trying to ease out the work done at the ropewalk and in the chain shop at the Boston Naval Shipyard to private interests, but by the fact that this subtle slide-away policy—unless arrested at the very start—will lead to the closing down of the Watertown Arsenal and the Murphy Army Hospital.

Even career officers in the Armed Forces appear to be knuckling under to pressure exerted by their civilian superiors in the Department of Defense to rubber-stamp policies against their professional judgment.

At the hearings conducted by the subcommittee early this year, the secretary of the Cordage Institute, in answer to a question regarding the 125-year-old ropewalk at the Boston Naval Shipyard, testified: "Yes; it has a fine record in terms of improved productivity and in terms of economy. It has a fine staff of skilled workers. It has been regarded all these years as an integral part of the Navy."

The question of integration is also important.

Experience has proved the wisdom of maintaining key bases and installations, and as self-sufficient as they can be, even during peacetime.

To be implemented by private industry only during emergencies.

The military have special responsibilities. For this they must maintain bases on which the smallest function or convenience has a present use and is in readiness for expansion to meet emergency needs.

We cannot afford to break up this integration.

If this attempt to transfer certain work over to private enterprise gains headway, the logical result would be for the military to discontinue the practice of supplying uniforms for Armed Forces personnel. Instead, they would be given an allowance to purchase uniforms from merchants on the outside.

Under section 638 of Public Law 157 which must be retained so that Congress will have knowledge in advance of any plans by the Defense Department to discontinue facilities, or to transfer them to private enterprise, there is some dissatisfaction concerning the cooperation we are supposed to get from the Defense Department. Evasive tactics show through.

The Defense Department must justify such disposals or transfers of work that, for a period of 3 years or more, has been performed by civilian personnel of the Department. This must be done 90 days in advance of such proposals. Disapproval by either committee of the Senate or the House shall prevent such disposal or transfer.

The ropewalk and the chain shop at the Boston Naval Shipyard are representatives of similar facilities throughout our Defense Establishment that are scheduled for a gradual sellout to private industry.

This trend is dangerous to our national security and is unfair to the loyal workers whose skills will be missing in the event of an emergency.

I join with other Members of Congress in opposing any proposed transfer or disposal of time-tested defense functions.

The profit motive must not be permitted to take over the operation of the largest Department of the Federal Government whose responsibility is to protect our Nation and its people from potential enemies.

The opening wedge must be closed at once.

Nickel Problem: "Almost Completely Insolvable," Weeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions lately I have called the attention of this body to the black market situation which has developed with respect to nickel for manufacturing purposes in the United States.

I am placing in the RECORD an amazing letter which the Secretary of Commerce has written to Mr. Willard F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Spring & Axle Co. Mr. Rockwell's company is one of the large users of nickel for plating purposes and he informs me that his company, last year, spent $750,000 for nickel in the gray market and this year spent $780,000 in the first quarter since sufficient 64½-cent nickel is available only to his company through black and gray market sources at some 300 percent of market price.

In response to Mr. Rockwell's complaint, the Secretary of Commerce on April 7 wrote to him and stated:

This in a general way seems to me to be the story and, as aforesaid, if you find yourself in Washington, we'll be glad to go through it with you to the *n*th degree and give you all of our thinking about a problem which is very difficult and, as I presently see it, almost completely insolvable.

This is an amazing statement in view of the fact that studies by the Secretary's own Department indicate that there have been diversions of defense-rated nickel and that his Department is studying as to what enforcement measures are necessary. Amazing also is the fact that the Department of Commerce has responsibility to check the books of the producers and allocators of nickel to see that there is equitable distribution of this important commodity. It is also amazing that many business concerns are paying unconscionable high prices for black market nickel which seems to be abundant at such prices. It is also amazing to me that the Department of Commerce which has the responsibility to aid and foster industry is standing back contending that the nickel situation is insolvable at a time when businesses large and small are closing down, laying off employees or otherwise curtailing their activities because of inability to obtain nickel.

To my knowledge the Secretary of Commerce has not denied that he is one of the individuals responsible for solving this problem, nor has he recommended legislation which may be necessary to establish necessary controls.

The above-mentioned letter follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, April 7, 1956.

Mr. WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board,
Rockwell Spring & Axle Co.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. ROCKWELL: I have just been through a long and exhaustive study of the nickel question this morning (Saturday, April 7) and if you would care to come down sometime in the near future, we'll see that you have the complete story and understand just how things seem to shape up. I think, however, that I must tell you that I'm afraid you'll be disappointed in the net result.

Generally speaking, the forecasted 1956 supply of nickel for the civilian economy is short—even short of what it was on an average for the 3 years preceding Korea—and if certain use developments take place in the defense area the situation may be even worse.

Currently, the civilian economy is paying three prices for available nickel—the so-called market price of 65 cents approximately, the price ranging from $1 to $1.35 for Government set-aside supplies, and say $2.50 to $3 for approximately 10 percent of the civilian supply. Most of this latter grouping is composed of nickel-bearing scrap alloys and foreign production—France, Japan, etc.

We find no evidence of importance of any misappropriation of defense-rated nickel

supplies. Our procedures for following defense-rated orders adequately confirm this view, although despite this fact we are planning some procedural changes which should give us even closer supervision.

The end of it all is that there just is not enough nickel available to take care of defense requirements and the civilian economy (the stockpile take will be substantially decreased this year). The controls which you urge will not get anybody any more nickel and the undoubted result of such controls would probably bring into operation use determinations and specifically might very well result in the complete elimination of the use of nickel for decorative purposes.

There is some further increase of nickel supply in sight for 1957. What effect it will have on civilian availability will largely depend on the military requirements at that time.

This in a general way seems to me to be the story and, as aforesaid, if you find yourself in Washington, we'll be glad to go through it with you to the *nth* degree and give you all of our thinking about a problem which is very difficult and, as I presently see it, almost completely insolvable.

Most sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Honor Hon. Victor Wickersham, of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 17, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am pleased to inform the House that Mr. Rutherford Day, chairman, Loyalty Day Committee, Department of the District of Columbia, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D. C., announced today that my colleague Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Democrat, of Oklahoma, has been unanimously selected from a group of all outstanding leaders, including Senators and Congressmen, to receive the annual Loyalty Day award given by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Day stated that this award is made annually to a figure of national prominence who works in the District of Columbia and that this is the first time that the award has been made to a Member of Congress, either on the Senate or House side. The award consists of a plaque, with the following inscription:

TO VICTOR WICKERSHAM for exhibiting those qualities in private and public life which make for a greater America.

In advising Congressman WICKERSHAM of his selection to receive the annual Loyalty Day award on May 1, Mr. Day stated:

It is the unanimous opinion of the committee, which opinion is concurred in by the Department of the District of Columbia, that no finer a man could be found to whom the award might be made. By Congressman WICKERSHAM'S sincere application to duty and to the interests of his congressional district, as well as to those of the Nation, and with a solid record of achievement in committee and other work, he has proven to be the type of man who is the basic strength of our great United States of America.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend John Prescott Robertson, minister, First Congregational Church, Braintree, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who speakest to Thy creation in the glory of the dawn and in the holy hush of eventide, speak to us now as we pause in prayer at noonday to invoke Thy guidance and Thy divine blessing.

Problems face us here, in committee rooms and in our offices, that try the limits of our wisdom; tasks abound that summon up the full measure of our strength; demands galore call for patience and endurance of the highest order. Amidst these stark realities we rejoice in our responsibilities and our opportunities for Thou, O God, changeless and eternal, art the sole source of peace and righteousness.

Wilt Thou be graciously pleased to look upon us now with Thy most holy favor and Thy fatherly benediction. So may we ever realize that while we are toilers in time we are likewise builders for eternity. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CLEMENTS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 16, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 16, 1956,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, on April 17, 1956, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which report was ordered to be printed, and the bill placed on the calendar.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 7426. An act to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.;

H. R. 9424. An act to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers;

H. R. 9768. An act relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii;

H. R. 9769. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds;

H. R. 10046. An act to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were

signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6084. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, to the Palm Springs Unified School District;

H. R. 7426. An act to ratify and confirm Act 249 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, as amended, and to authorize the issuance of certain highway revenue bonds by the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 9768. An act relating to general obligation bonds of the Territory of Hawaii amending Public Laws 640 and 643 of the 83d Congress (68 Stat. 782, ch. 889 and 68 Stat. 785, ch. 892), and ratifying certain provisions of Act 273, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1955, which authorizes issuance of public improvement bonds for schools in the city and county of Honolulu and the county of Hawaii; and

H. R. 9769. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7679. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to the city of Muskogee, Okla.;

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges;

H. R. 8123. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; and

H. R. 8674. An act to provide for the return of certain property to the city of Biloxi, Miss.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 8404. An act to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the former prisoner of war camp, near Douglas, Converse County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 9424. An act to amend the Clayton Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of corporate mergers; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10046. An act to simplify and make more nearly uniform the laws governing the payment of compensation for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 18, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2587. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; and

S. 2755. An act to designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam in California as Lake Berryessa.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which began its hearing this morning on the proposed judicial appointment of Mr. William B. Herlands to the District Court, Southern District of New York, was unable to finish its hearing this morning. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may continue its hearing this afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. PASTORE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce having under consideration Senate bill 2643, to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the people of the United States by encouraging maximum development of low-cost electric energy from all sources of power, including atomic energy, coal, oil, natural gas, and water, and for other purposes, was authorized to meet this afternoon, during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to sit tomorrow afternoon while the Senate is in session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when the Senator from Arkansas is in attendance at that subcommittee meeting, will he be willing to look into the matter of the interest rates on housing?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be delighted if the Senator from Arkansas will do so.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. WOFFORD] be assigned to service on the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Committee on Public Works.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with a limitation of 2 minutes on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON THURSDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make for the information of the Senate, and I call the attention of the minority leader to the request I am about to make. I request unanimous consent that on Thursday, immediately following the completion of morning business, there be a call of the unobjected-to-measures on the calendar, and that the call begin at the point where the last calendar call ended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have all Members of the Senate on notice that calendar No. 1780, H. R. 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill, will be taken up on next Monday, April 23. That bill is ready to be considered now, but in view of the provision of the Reorganization Act requiring that appropriation bills lie over for 3 days, the bill could not be brought up until the end of the week. In order that every Senator may have ample time to study it, it is the plan of the leadership to schedule it for April 23. It is my understanding that this is a noncontroversial bill and that it provides for a total appropriation of $433,851,400, which is $1,290,900 less than was requested by the Budget Bureau.

I might also mention, for the information of the Senate, that last year the Interior Department appropriation bill was reported to the Senate on May 2 and was passed on May 5. As of this time, the Senate has completed action on 4 appropriation bills this year, 3 of which have become public laws—the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1957, the urgent deficiency, and the additional Labor appropriation for 1956. The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1956 will soon be out of conference, and I am sure will be finally completed at an early date.

Last year at this time the Senate had acted upon 3 appropriation bills, only 1 of which had become a public law; so it is clear that we are substantially ahead of schedule this year. I know that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses are moving forward on their heavy workload expeditiously and vigorously. I am confident that final action on all appropriation bills will be completed well ahead of schedule this year.

I should like to give notice that following the morning business it is planned to take up the following measures:

Calendar No. 1749, S. 2424, to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be

known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam;

Calendar No. 1750, S. 2712, a bill to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.;

Calendar No. 1751, S. 2091, authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.;

Calendar No. 1752, S. 2092, transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal;

Calendar No. 1753, S. 3272, to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948;

Calendar No. 1776, H. R. 9428, to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1777, S. 2854, to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

Calendar No. 1778, S. 2855, to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes; and

Calendar No. 1779, S. 2859, to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes.

As I have previously announced, on Thursday there will be a call of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, so that we can clear the calendar of private bills which are ready to be considered.

I also wish to announce that the three treaties on the Executive Calendar will be considered on Thursday, immediately following the morning business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3238 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Attorney General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

The petition of Henry H. Ettinger, of New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide old-age assistance to honorably discharged veterans of World War I, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact certain legislation

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary for establishing proper flood-control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; reducing the age at which women may receive benefits under the Social Security Act from 65 to 62; reducing the age at which widows may receive such benefits from 65 to 62; reducing the eligibility age of persons entitled to old-age assistance to 60 years; providing for a study of the number of Veterans' Administration general medical and general surgical hospital beds within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with a view to increasing such facilities; providing that paid-up policies of insurance be issued to such veterans of World War I who have paid into the Treasury of the United States premiums in excess of the amount of the face value of such term policies and that thereafter all premiums thereon shall be waived; providing for two deliveries of mail daily by the post office department; providing that a pension of not less than $100 be paid monthly to citizens who are over the age of 65 and have retired; providing that no concession be granted on the import of textiles from foreign countries; granting loans to private and public utilities so that they may place all cables and lines underground as a precautionary measure against the effect of storms and hurricanes; establishing a system of disaster insurance to protect against loss or damage of homes and industries caused by flood, hurricane, or other disaster; providing for the construction of Federal housing projects in the west, south and north end sections of the city of Boston; providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan; repealing the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, and enacting an immigration act in which there shall be no quota system based on national origins; granting aid in the form of arms to the government of Israel; preventing racial discrimination and to see that such laws are enforced, particularly in certain Southern States; establishing a program of Federal grants to States or political subdivisions thereof as an aid to education, whereby the reimbursement or payment of a specific sum be made to each student being provided with formal education; incorporating the Franco-American War Veterans; and pertaining to the repeal of a treaty relative to the prosecution of members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries for alleged violations of the law of such countries; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to ensure that the Postmaster General issue a postage stamp in memory of the late Herman Melville, author of Moby Dick, the classic American novel of the sea and the whaling industry, and a postage stamp commemorating the 150th anniversary of the founding of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF LIMA, OHIO, TRAFFIC CLUB

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Lima Traffic Club, of Lima, Ohio, signed by Eugene A. Jackson, secretary, transmitting a resolution adopted by that club, relating to amendment of the Administrative Procedures Act.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMA TRAFFIC CLUB,
Lima, Ohio, April 6, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Judiciary Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The Lima Traffic Club, Lima, Ohio, has adopted the enclosed resolution which is submitted for your favorable consideration.

Most respectfully,

EUGENE A. JACKSON,
Secretary.

Whereas the Lima Traffic Club, composed of more than 195 representatives of shippers, railroads, motor, air, and water carriers, by its board of governors in regular session at Lima, Ohio, on March 21, 1956, has considered the provisions of bills H. R. 6114 and S. 2541, covering a proposed "Administrative Code," now pending before the Congress and which are designed to make drastic changes in the laws governing administrative agency procedures; and

Whereas there is no public demand for changes in the present Administrative Procedures Act as concerns administrative processes under said act, as is amply supported by the fact that such changes were not approved by six members of the special Hoover Committee, including the Attorney General, who stated: "We did not vote for these recommendations (Nos. 29 to 48) because of their possible consequences and possible increase in expenditures of the Government"; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the officers and members of the board of governors of this organization that the provisions of these bills would do injury to the general public by way of increased cost in handling and retarded disposition of matters before administrative agencies and, at

the same time, destroy practices and procedures developed over a long period of time; and

Whereas among the many changes proposed by these bills are provisions which would make unlawful practice by qualified persons, other than attorneys-at-law, before administrative agencies and also void existing authority, for instance, of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate practice before it; and

Whereas under existing authority the Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, permits employees of shippers to appear for their own concerns and has fixed standards of education and experience for those appearing in a representative capacity, who must offer proof by test of their qualifications; and

Whereas the traffic and transportation profession is highly specialized where legal training, as the term is used in legal circles, is not a requisite to practice before certain administrative agencies who treat, in particular, traffic and transportation matters, but may be of assistance to said agencies only when combined with and used in conjunction with knowledge of traffic and transportation gained by practical experience in the field. In this connection Attorney General Brownell said, in effect, "It follows that those who make a specialty of such work are entitled to greater weight than is accorded to a nonspecialized person," and to require confinement of practice before such administrative agencies to attorneys-at-law would be not only unwise, but also inefficient, more costly, discriminatory and unreasonable; and

Whereas the Lima Traffic Club and other similar organizations have sponsored education in the field of traffic and transportation for many years and interest therein is great with result that a number of institutions of higher learning now offer a major in traffic and transportation and show a growing enrollment therein, all of which would be seriously retarded, if not destroyed, by the enactment of these bills and thereby do injury to both students and their employers; and

Whereas it is clear the provisions of these bills would hamper administration by agencies, created by the Congress to function in its behalf, and require substitution of judicial processes for legislative functions; and

Whereas the interest of the public in matters considered by administrative agencies far outweighs that of any special class and any legislation which would require such agencies to permit only certain persons to practice before them, regardless of qualifications and by changing procedures developed by experience for efficient handling, is to be condemned as detrimental to the general welfare: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lima Traffic Club records its opposition to bills H. R. 6114 and S. 2541 as being unsound and contrary to the public interest and they should not be enacted; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the area represented by this organization and to members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Adopted March 21, 1956.

LIMA TRAFFIC CLUB,
LIMA, OHIO,
HARRY SHRINER,
President.
J. D. STAPLETON,
Vice President.
A. W. MORTON,
Treasurer.
E. A. JACKSON,
Secretary.
D. C. O'CONNOR,
C. M. CREIGHTON,
HAROLD H. BALK,
Members, Board of Governors.

RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 863, the Water Rights Settlement Act of 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been the settled rule of law for nearly a century that water rights in Midwestern and Western States are determined by State law, and not otherwise; and

Whereas it has also been the established rule that control and jurisdiction over the waters of streams and rivers have been vested in the several States subject to whatever control the Federal Government has found necessary to exercise in the case of navigable waters in its regulation of navigation under the commerce clause of the United States Constitution; and

Whereas section 210 of the constitution of North Dakota provides that "all flowing streams and natural water courses shall forever remain the property of the State for mining, irrigation, and manufacturing purposes," and section 61-0101 of the North Dakota Revised Code, as amended, provides that "all waters within the limits of the State belong to the public and are subject to appropriation for beneficial use," and

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the recent Pelton case, which virtually divested the State of Oregon of complete jurisdiction over the waters of the Deschutes River, a nonnavigable stream therein, threatens to jeopardize and impair the control of States in granting and adjudicating rights to the beneficial use of the waters of their streams: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, in meeting regularly assembled this 9th day of March 1956, That Congress be, and is hereby urged, to definitely and unambiguously recognize the right and jurisdiction of the several States in and to the waters of streams and natural watercourses therein by speedily enacting into law Senate bill 863 proposed by Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, and thereby settle for all time, and beyond question, that the control, use, distribution, and appropriation of the waters of streams and rivers is vested in the States, and not otherwise; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator BARRETT and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

PREDICAMENT OF THE INDIANS—RESOLUTION OF CASS COUNTY (MINN.) WELFARE BOARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have frequently directed the Senate's attention to the serious predicament faced by our American Indians, particularly those in my own State of Minnesota. In some cases the situation during the past winter became critical. For that reason, I have been watching the resolutions from Minnesota county welfare agencies with particular attention. One such resolution has just arrived from the Cass County Welfare Board of Walker, Minn., and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On December 9, 1955, a meeting was held with regard to Indians. There were four counties represented at this meeting; namely, Beltrami, Cass, Mahnomen, and Becker. Several areas of the Indian problem were discussed.

1. It appeared that the most immediate problem for the care of Indians was financial, and in discussing this problem several areas were discovered in variance.

(a) There appears to be a variation in the methods of reimbursement. It was discovered that Becker County had been, up until January 1, 1955, reimbursed 100 percent for Indian costs where the other counties had not been.

(b) Employment opportunities in all four counties was limited with respect to hiring Indian labor.

(c) Very indefinite policies were discovered as it pertained to the medical care for Indians. Since July 1, Indian Service medical care is under the supervision or administered by the United States Public Health Service and seems to be confined to medical needs which might occur on tribal lands. University hospital care or other related services would not be provided by the United States Public Health Service.

2. There were several items on which the four counties agreed that were represented at this meeting.

(a) It was mutually agreed the Indians are yet the responsibility of the Federal Government, and if they withdraw this responsibility it then becomes the responsibility of the State of Minnesota. Not any of the counties in which the Indians reside could assume the full responsibility for their support.

(b) The financial responsibility of the State or Federal Government to the counties involved should be on not less than 100-percent reimbursement basis.

(c) This reimbursement should be for all money expended for the care of Indians.

(d) All Indians to be eligible for reimbursement when they are found to be in need and aid is provided for them.

(e) The State of Minnesota should take the initiative to explore all avenues for the permanent solution to the Indian problem with the cooperation of all counties involved.

(f) That this report be presented to Mr. Morris Hursh, commissioner of the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Minnesota.

3. The recommendations made for financing are to meet the current situation. They are not intended as a solution to the Indian problem and for this reason some are made toward long-term planning.

(a) The continuation and expansion of the relocation project which is Federal and asking that closer cooperation with the welfare department be utilized.

(b) Studies made for permanent employment opportunities be made available in all reservation counties for Indians.

(c) That an honest effort be made in the settlement of Indian claims, an honest determination if they do have a claim, and that the Indian be informed of his status with this regard once and for all.

4. Summary: What has been submitted by the group is not in itself an all-inclusive report. It merely represents the thinking of the four counties, mainly of immediate needs. It was recognized the Indian problem cannot be solved by one agency alone. It will require the leadership of the State department of public welfare, together with the other State agencies who are concerned with the financial, educational, health, social, and moral factors for the well being and improvement of this minority group within our State. No single agency can meet this

problem but it is by a long-range program with Federal and State funds and the support of all agencies involved you make great strides in improving the Indian's lot.

RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL CHAPTER, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the St. Paul Chapter of the Disabled American Veterans adopted a resolution urging the Veterans' Administration to convert the Veterans' Administration Annex at Fort Snelling into a domiciling and nursing hospital. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ACTION TAKEN BY ST. PAUL CHAPTER, DAV, AT REGULAR MEETING ON MARCH 13, 1956

Whereas the Veterans' Administration is planning to evacuate the Veterans' Administration Annex at Fort Snelling; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration now has no domiciliary facility in this area to care for such terminal cases as heart, cancer, arthritis, or other lingering diseases; and

Whereas it is believed that Fort Snelling Annex can be converted into domiciliary and nursing hospital at nominal cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That St. Paul Chapter, Disabled American Veterans, does earnestly endorse and support the resolution of Minneapolis Chapter, Disabled American Veterans, to urge the Veterans' Administration to accomplish such conversion in order that the many disabled veterans in this area, who are in dire need of such domiciliary care, and are now forced to rely on charity for such care that charity provides may receive the care and treatment that they are rightfully entitled to; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Minnesota Senators and congressional Representatives with an urgent request that they lend their support to the effort to establish such domiciliary and nursing hospital at Fort Snelling Annex.

JOHN F. KALLAND, PDC,
Chairman.
A. M. HERRIGES, PDC.
LAWRENCE J. FOLEY, PCC.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 3338. A bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects (Rept. No. 1764).

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2822. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District Numbered 8, Mohave County, Ariz. (Rept. No. 1762).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S. 3515. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 1777).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 924. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law (Rept. No. 1767); and

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride (Rept. No. 1783).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government (Rept. No. 1768).

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2498. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument (Rept. No. 1776).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2305. A bill to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property (Rept. No. 1770);

S. 2512. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces (Rept. No. 1784);

S. 3254. A bill to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States (Rept. No. 1771);

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla. (Rept. No. 1772);

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service (Rept. No. 1773); and

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians (Rept. No. 1769).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion, in order to authorize the renewal of such lease (Rept. No. 1773);

S. 2144. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Incorporated (Rept. No. 1775); and

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1785).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2517. A bill to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska (Rept. No. 1778);

H. R. 6162. A bill to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii (Rept. No. 1779); and

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges (Rept. No. 1780).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 4047. A bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1781).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 4781. A bill to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1782).

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 239. Resolution to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on Juvenile Delinquency Among the Indians.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 238. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 1734 on welfare and pensions funds.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 8957. A bill to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1786).

REVISION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2875) to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, and I submit a report (No. 1787) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. President, there have been so many requests for copies of this report that I ask unanimous consent that 5,000 copies of the report on the retirement bill be furnished the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Because of the unprecedented demand for this information the committee feels that this request is necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF PROPERTIES

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I report, favorably, an original bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1763) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3673) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

CITATION OF MARY KNOWLES FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Mary Knowles, and I submit a report (No. 1765) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 240) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify, under the Seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Knowles, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Mary Knowles may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

CITATION OF HERMAN LIVERIGHT FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report, favorably, an original resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Liveright, and I submit a report (No. 1766) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify, under the Seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, the report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Herman Liveright, before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate, to answer questions pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, to the end that the said Herman Liveright may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

MARY MARGARET O'HARA

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 242), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret O'Hara, widow of Robert E. O'Hara, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RENA V. PELLEGRINI

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 243), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Rena V. Pellegrini, widow of Frank Pellegrini, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RUTH M. HAEFNER

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 244), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ruth M. Haefner, daughter of Florence R. McKeever, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 245), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook" be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3646. A bill to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 3647. A bill for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3648. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (relating to public facility loans) to authorize additional financial assistance in connection with public projects made necessary by certain activities related to the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3649. A bill to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHAVEZ when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE:

S. 3650. A bill for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PAYNE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 3651. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources, and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOLLAND when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 3652. A bill to provide for the extension of rural mail delivery service; and

S. 3653. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to conduct an investigation and survey to determine the number of residences not now receiving direct-to-home mail service and to recommend methods and means of providing such rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENDER (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3654. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN:

S. 3655. A bill to amend section 172 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to the net operating loss deduction in the case of taxable years beginning in 1953 and ending in 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 3656. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and for sector headquarters for the Immigration Border Patrol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 3657. A bill for the relief of Nelson Shu-Yung Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3658. A bill to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347) so as to authorize,

by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 3659. A bill to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus stocks of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3660. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Paganis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 3661. A bill to establish an acreage allotment for 1956 for corn in the commercial corn-producing area of 51 million acres; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 3662. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3663. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Columbia Historical Society in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3664. A bill to conform the appointment and compensation of the chief legal officer of the Post Office Department to the method of appointment and rate of compensation provided for comparable positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3665. A bill to allow a homesteader settling on unsurveyed public land in Alaska to make single final proof prior to survey of the lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3666. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Englessos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3667. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3668. A bill to provide further protection against the dissemination of diseases of livestock or poultry, and for other purposes; and

S. 3669. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3670. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WOFFORD):

S. 3671. A bill to prescribe minimum acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 3672. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small business concerns to engage in foreign trade; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 3673. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; placed on calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he reported the above bill, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3674. A bill to amend section 1343 of title 18, United States Code, relating to fraud by wire, radio, or television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3675. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 3676. A bill relating to cotton acreage allotments and limitations on imports; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3677. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding thereto new provisions relating to civil aviation medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3678. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3679. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3680. A bill to provide a minimum 53 million acreage allotment for corn; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3681. A bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission To Study Election Finances and Related Aspects of Elections to Federal Offices; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were reported and placed on the Calendar:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 240. Citing Mary Knowles for contempt of the Senate; and

S. Res. 241. Citing Herman Liveright for contempt of the Senate.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he reported the above resolutions, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 242. To pay a gratuity to Mary Margaret O'Hara;

S. Res. 243. To pay a gratuity to Rena V. Pellegrini;

S. Res. 244. To pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Haefner;

S. Res. 245. To provide for the printing of the revised edition of document entitled "Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document; and

S. Res. 246. To provide for the printing of the annual report of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

(See resolutions printed in full under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PREVENTION OF RACKETEERING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, together with a memorandum, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3646) to prevent racketeering, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and memorandum presented by Mr. LANGER are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

I strongly favor and shall advocate amendments to the Hobbs Act for I believe them essential to the free economy of our people. While I shall always champion all laws restricting force, violence, robbery, and extortion, I shall with equal vigor oppose any unusual rule, unintended and undesirable judicial construction of those laws in situations where they were never meant to apply. The amendments which I favor will carefully preserve all of the drastic criminal pen-

alties to be invoked against persons guilty of robbery or extortion induced by force, violence, or the threats thereof, but will at the same time eliminate the present danger of the Hobbs Act being used as a weapon to destroy the traditional activities or organized labor. The obvious implications of recent judicial decisions construing and applying the provisions of the Hobbs Act are frightening in their possibilities. I deem it essential to guarantee against the possibility, nay, probability, that the economic interests in power in our Government at any one time may avail themselves of the court interpretations of the law as a means of resisting the efforts of the trade labor movement to obtain improved wages, hours, or working conditions. The amendments which I advocate are requisite to a balancing of the inequities which exist between the right of employers to run their businesses free from union interferences and the right of unions to better the wages, hours, and working conditions of their members.

I have always understood that in providing severe penalties for robbery and extortion the Hobbs Act sought to represent those engaged in blackmail and racketeering for their own personal benefit or for the benefit of those acting in concert with them. The legislative history of the act certainly bears me out in this understanding. But by the recent judicial interpretation of the act by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S.* v. *Green* (No. 54 of March 26, 1956), it now appears that a labor leader may be successfully prosecuted under the act even when it clearly appears that he seeks no personal benefit whatsoever. In the Green case, it was successfully contended that the Hobbs Act was violated when the object of the undertaking consisted only in seeking "money, in the form of wages to be paid for imposed, unwanted, superfluous, and fictitious services of laborers commonly known as swampers * * *." I have always understood that it is traditional and legitimate for labor leaders to seek the employment of union members and that it is not even illegal for them to do so under the threat and compulsion of a strike. If personal benefit is not an essential element of the crime of robbery or extortion under the Hobbs Act then it seems to me that leaders of organized labor will be forced to discontinue their efforts to seek employment and improve wages, hours, and working conditions for their members for fear that if someone of the group makes a threat of some kind during the course of the effort or if there is any element of violence whatsoever, those labor leaders will be subjected to imprisonment for 20 years for their activities on behalf of their members. I am convinced that the absence of an amendment requiring that personal benefit or gain be sought by the undertaking will necessarily result in a prosecution of the legitimate activities of trade labor leaders.

Nor is the Green case the only judicial example of the unjust and unintended application of the Hobbs Act. In the case of *U. S.* v. *Kemble* (198 F. 2d 889), the conviction of a labor leader was affirmed where all he sought was to induce the employment of a trucking concern of a competent union helper to do the unloading of said truck, during the course of which he uttered a threat to the driver of the truck and some unknown person let air out of the tires of the truck. During the prosecution of the case the Government conceded that Kemble was not interested in protection money from the trucking concern and took the position, which was concurred in by the majority of the United States Court of Appeals, that even though the purposes of Kemble were to secure work for the members of his union, he would still be guilty under the Hobbs Act if his demand was accompanied by any violence or threats.

I find myself in accord with the dissenting opinions of Judges McLaughlin and Staley in the Kemble case. Judge McLaughlin pointed out that the prosecution arose from a reputable union's genuine attempt to organize a trucking corporation, and that the position of Kemble was to procure work for capable union men, whereas the Hobbs Act was directed at blackmail and racketeering. He further observed that if violence occurs in connection with union activities otherwise legitimate, such violence should be left to State supervision.

In a separate dissenting opinion, Judge Staley observed that if the majority opinion were sound law, a union and its officers and members who strike in violation of a no-strike clause or who engage in any strike or picketing for any unlawful purpose, criminal or otherwise, can be indicted, prosecuted, and convicted under the Hobbs Act simply because the strike constitutes the use of force to obtain the property of another.

The foregoing are but a few of the many reasons why it is unjust to extend the scope of the Hobbs Act to activities of union representatives when they are not seeking any personal advantage or gain whatsoever but instead, are merely attempting to better the conditions of their members. Under the interpretation of the law by the courts, legal and legitimate labor activities may become violations of the Hobbs Act through the simple threat of a strike or by the inadvertent and careless threat of some union person. I am convinced that the seeking of personal benefit or gain is essential as an amendment to the act in order to eliminate this problem.

I can conceive of even greater injustices to organized labor under the court interpretations of the act. As written, the act refers to robbery or extortion induced by the means of "wrongful use of actual or threatened * * * fear." The courts have construed fear to mean that it is sufficient for the purposes of the law that an employer be in fear of economic losses to his business resulting from the activity of labor organizations. The courts have even held that the fear need not be actually done or threatened. It is sufficient that an employer be aware of strikes of other employers and even in other industries which might in turn happen in his case should he not accede to the wishes of a union. When this factor is coupled with the reasoning of the United States Supreme Court in the Green case to the effect that extortion may consist of the imposition of unwanted, superfluous, and fictitious services, it is easy to see how practically every union which bargains for a contract with every employer is necessarily violating the provisions of the Hobbs Act. For example, a union which is bargaining with an employer may propose that its individuals be employed to do a particular job whereas only one performed that job in the past. Perhaps the union may feel that the work is too heavy for one person or that it is too dangerous for one person to perform. But whatever the reason may be, the fact remains that the additional employee would be unwanted by the employer and perhaps, in the opinion of the employer, superfluous. That being the case, and as the employer must necessarily fear an economic loss to his business if the union strikes in furtherance of its demands, it also follows that those union officials making the demands and acting on behalf of their members may very well serve 20 years in a Federal penitentiary for their efforts.

I do not by any means intend this statement as an exhaustive analysis of my reasons, for supporting amendments to the Hobbs Act. There are numerous other reasons and arguments supporting my position and these are intended only to highlight what I consider to be the two strongest reasons in support of amendments.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ANTI-RACKETEERING ACT (HOBBS ACT)

The legislative history of title 18, United States Code, section 1951, properly known as the Hobbs Act, demonstrates conclusively that the act was intended by Congress to curtail and render more difficult the activities of predatory criminal gangs of the Kelly and Dillinger types. That legislative history further shows that it was never the intent of Congress that the act should be used to hamper, interfere with, or restrain in any way legitimate activities of labor unions, and their officers and agents directed toward lawful, legitimate union activities. Notwithstanding such legislative history and congressional intent, union officers and members have been indicted, prosecuted and convicted under the Hobbs Act for activities which had always been considered as lawful and in furtherance of legitimate union aims and objectives. An example of the misinterpretation of the purposes of this act is the case of *United States* v. *Kemble* (198 F. 2d 889), in which one Aaron Kemble, a business agent for Teamsters Local No. 676 of Camden, N. J., was indicted, prosecuted and convicted under said act, because, in the exercise of his duties as business agent, he sought to induce the employment by a trucking firm of a union helper to do the unloading of a truck, and in so doing uttered a threat to the driver, and at the same time someone let air out of his tires. In this prosecution, the Government conceded that no inference could be drawn that either the union or Kemble was interested in protection money from the trucking concern, but took the position, which was adopted by the majority of the court, that even though the purposes of Kemble were to secure work for members of his union, he would still be guilty, under the Hobbs Act, if the demand was accompanied by any violence or threats. In a dissenting opinion in the Kemble case, Judge McLaughlin pointed out that the prosecution arose from a reputable union's genuine attempt to organize a trucking corporation, and that the sole purpose of Kemble was to procure work for capable union men, whereas the Hobbs Act was directed at blackmail and racketeering. He further held that if violence occurs in connection with union activities, such violence or other misconduct should be left to State supervision. In a separate dissenting opinion, issued in the same case, Judge Staley pointed out that if the majority opinion was sound, a union and its officers and members, who struck in violation of a no-strike clause or who were engaged in a strike and picketing for any unlawful purpose, could be indicted, prosecuted and convicted under the Hobbs Act because any strike constitutes the use of force to obtain property of another.

Such a construction of the Hobbs Act as was made by the majority of the court in the Kemble case encourages indictments and prosecutions of union officers, engaged in the pursuit in what have long been considered as legitimate union objectives. If such prosecutions and indictments are unchecked, it could well result in officers and members of labor unions being reluctant to engage in any strikes or picketing where interstate commerce is involved, because of the possibility that the purpose thereof may be declared to be unlawful and because violence might ensue as tempers flared.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, deplores the interpretation of the Hobbs Act which has been made by our courts in cases such as the Kemble case and calls upon Congress to amend the Hobbs Act so as to remove any possibility that officers or members may be indicted, prosecuted or convicted under said act for activities directed at what have traditionally been

considered as lawful and legitimate union objectives. To this end the proposed draft, which is attached, is submitted.

HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to govern hunting, fishing, and trapping on areas under Federal jurisdiction. The bill is aimed particularly at military lands.

This bill was drafted in consultation with the game and fish commissioners and game and fish wardens of the States. It is an improvement over a bill on the same matter which I introduced previously.

The major difference in this bill and the earlier one is that it provides for enforcement of the game, fish, and trapping laws of the States. Specifically, the bill will provide that on Federal lands the fish, game, and trapping laws of the particular State shall apply.

The Senate understands that the game and fish laws of the States are conservation measures. We will apply those regulations to all Federal land where hunting, fishing or trapping is allowed.

The first bill which I introduced on this matter was Senate bill 2777, was referred to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I hope the committee will take no action on Senate bill 2777, but will consider this new bill as a substitute and will proceed to hearings promptly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3649) to require that hunting and fishing on military reservations, when permitted, shall be in full compliance with the game and fish laws of the State or Territory wherein such military reservations are located, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TOWN OF FREEPORT, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize payment of $2,500 to the town of Freeport, Maine, by the Federal Government in full satisfaction of the claims of the town of Freeport for Federal compensation for hurricane damage.

During the hurricanes of 1954 a bridge was washed out in the town of Freeport. Under emergency State legislation and Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress the State and Federal Governments would each have borne half of the cost of replacement. The cost of restoration of the washed-out bridge was determined to be $8,000, so the State of Maine would have paid $4,000. However, the bridge in question served only a single resident beyond the washout.

After discussion with appropriate officials, the town of Freeport decided to attempt to reduce the sum of $8,000 by purchasing the property served by the washed-out bridge and then reselling it with a stipulation that the bridge would not be replaced. The town proceeded to purchase the land for $10,000 and then sold it, under an agreement with the buyer that he would not require reconstruction of the bridge, for $5,000. The net deficit then was $5,000, or $3,000 less than the cost of replacement of the bridge.

The State of Maine adopted a liberal construction of its disaster-relief laws and reimbursed the town for half the cost of this transaction. The town then submitted an application for Federal reimbursement through the manager of the Civil Defense Disaster Office. This official felt that the claim should be paid, but it was disapproved by the officer in charge of the Maine task force of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and this disapproval was affirmed by Federal civil-defense headquarters. The manager of the Civil Defense Disaster Office stated in a letter to the officer in charge of the Maine task force as follows:

> Naturally with this being a roads and bridge project with both State and Federal participation, it was felt that as long as it was agreeable with the State highway commission it would be acceptable with the FCDA.

While the Federal Civil Defense Administration is probably technically correct in its interpretation of the Federal Disaster Act, it would appear that the effect is to penalize the town of Freeport, Maine, for making a commendable effort to reduce disaster losses. Therefore, it is believed that in this instance the relief of a private bill to authorize reimbursement of the town is clearly warranted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3650) for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine, introduced by Mr. PAYNE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a soil-bank bill in the precise form in which that program was incorporated in the bill recently passed by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3651) to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks earlier today relative to the soil-bank bill, which I introduced for myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and later cosponsored, I believe, by some distinguished Senators from the other side of the aisle, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial bearing on the soil bank which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune. I make that unanimous-consent request.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING THE SOIL BANK

Democratic Party leadership would be well advised to have second thoughts before concluding that they have sure-fire election ammunition in President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill. The President uncompromisingly rejected a hypocritical piece of legislation, but he was not content to rest there. By immediately requesting that the soil bank, the one constructive part of the bill, be enacted independently, the President has returned the responsibility where it belongs.

More important, it shows that the chief concern of the administration is the plight of the American farmers. The soil-bank program would add $1.2 billion to farm income in return for withdrawing excess acreage from cultivation for conservation purposes. It would thus directly attack the accumulation of gigantic surpluses, which are the basic cause of the farmers' troubles. By a special provision, farmers could benefit substantially from the soil bank this year, even though spring planting has already started in many parts of the country.

The farm bill is effectively dead. What are the chances of congressional approval of the soil bank alone? There had been definite warnings that if Mr. Eisenhower exercised his veto, he would get no farm legislation whatsoever, soil bank or anything else. The influential Democratic Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, put it bluntly 10 days ago: "I don't believe there will be any farm bill this year if this one is vetoed." The idea apparently will be to denounce the President as the farmers' enemy because he refused to approve a bill which even its supporters would hardly maintain was worthy of either the farmers or the country. Such ideas often boomerang. So far the farm reaction to the President's courageous act has been a good deal less negative than his opponents hoped.

Questions of political advantage aside, the problems of American agriculture are still no nearer a national solution. The soil bank, the most positive approach, is once again before Congress. Senators and Representatives have made their political hay; they have gone on record as they saw fit; they have the campaign issues they think they need. There is still time for them to make a genuine contribution toward remedying the Nation's No. 1 economic malady.

LIQUIDATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION'S SURPLUS STOCK OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, ETC.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation surplus stocks of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus administrator. I desire to point out that provision for

these three items was contained in the farm bill as it passed the Senate, and in the bill I am now introducing the language which was adopted by the Senate is not changed.

I believe the bill strikes at the problem of the disposal of surpluses, and I hope it will be considered by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3659) to provide for the liquidation of Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus stock of agricultural commodities, to amend the Agricultural Trade and Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint an agricultural surplus disposal administrator, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CORN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish the 1956 corn-acreage allotment at not less than 51 million acres—the amount approved by the Congress in the farm bill vetoed by the President.

Without this legislation, apparently, corn growers will be faced with a 43-million-acre allotment originally ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary knows as well as anyone else that the 43-million-acre allotment will not be complied with. This extreme cutback was ordered, in my opinion, as a deliberate part of efforts to wreck the corn program and create a protest from farmers to take off allotments entirely.

The Secretary and other officials of the Department have already indicated by their testimony before our committees, their willingness to accept a higher level, and have expressed a willingness to accept up to 56 million acres on the basis of originally announced support levels.

Actually, there is no reason why the Secretary cannot himself change this allotment to the 51 million acres, which would permit almost exactly the same individual farm allotments in the commercial corn area as provided last year. Of course, the only reason why he will not change the allotment is that he will not change it; he is just stubborn about it. If he can arbitrarily change support levels after once announcing them, as the President has asked him to do, the Secretary can change the allotment under his discretionary authority to reach a realistic total offering greater chance of compliance.

Fifty-one million acres will not produce as much corn as unlimited production which the Secretary was willing to accept.

The Department appears determined to break down this program instead of make it work.

The $1.50 support level announced by the President is meaningless if it is based upon such a small allotment no corn-grower will comply with it.

In fact, the administration now indicates it may support all corn at from $1.21 to $1.28 regardless of compliance with any allotments, showing they do not expect the 43 million allotment to mean anything.

Such a move rewards farmers who have failed to comply instead of those who have cooperated in keeping production down.

Instead of opening the floodgates to all the corn that can be produced at lower prices, I ask adoption of a 51-million-acre allotment upon which farmers could at least be assured the meager $1.50 support level this administration is willing to grudgingly give.

Any other course is directly inconsistent and unprincipled. The administration cannot cry about surpluses out of one side of its mouth, then out of the other side of its mouth say that corn shall be completely uncontrolled. The 51-million-acre allotment I have proposed will bring greater compliance, and mean less corn produced that the unrealistic 43-million-acre allotment which nobody will observe.

While I intend to comment at greater length today on the farm-bill veto, I wanted first to move at once to correct this gross inequity and injustice brought about by that veto, on an inconsistent and unprincipled basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3661) to establish an acreage allotment for 1956 for corn in the commercial corn-producing area of 51 million acres, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONSTRUCTION OF AUBURN UNIT, AMERICAN RIVER DIVISION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

The bill, if enacted would authorize a multiple-purpose dam on the American River near Auburn, Calif., as a unit of the Central Valley project.

It would also provide 900,000 acre-feet of storage, making available a new supply of irrigation and domestic water for a rapidly growing section of California. This area includes Sacramento, Placer, El Dorado and part of Sutter Counties.

Moreover, the dam will be situated at a point on the American River which will not interfere with the preservation of the site of the discovery of gold. This site is near Coloma, in El Dorado County, and is a shrine for the loyal sons and daughters of California.

The proposed project is based on a study by the Water Resources Board of the State of California. It will be included in the California State water plan, which is now under preparation. Introduction of its bill will permit the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with making a report on the project, which is much desired by the State of California.

In addition to water storage, the project will include a 180,000-kilowatt powerplant. I have been advised that the total cost of the project will be between seventy and one hundred million dollars.

The area to be served is both agricultural and industrial. A large part of the pear crop of California is grown there.

The project would be operated in conjunction with the Folsom Dam unit of the Central Valley project as one of the means by which the capital city of my State, Sacramento, and other communities may have adequate protection from the hazard of floods such as those which recently visited California with grievous results.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3662) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn unit, American River Division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF STATE AND COUNTY COMMITTEES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to extend some of the benefits of civil service to employees of State and county agricultural stabilization committees. It would permit these employees to participate on a voluntary basis in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930.

This bill also provides that any person who has served for at least 2 years as an employee of a State or county ASC committee and who is separated from such service shall acquire, upon passing a noncompetitive examination, a classified civil-service status. This would permit such an employee to transfer to a position in classified civil service within 1 year following the date of his separation from service with the ASC committee. This provision, Mr. President, is substantially the same as that relating to legislative employees of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have long felt that these Government employees are entitled to at least a portion of the benefits other Government employees enjoy under civil service. This bill would in no way affect

the hiring of people to fill the positions with these committees. It would merely give them retirement benefits plus the right to civil-service status upon leaving the employ of these committees.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3670) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to permit certain officers and employees of State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"This act shall also apply to all regular employees of State and county committees established pursuant to section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any such employee until he gives notice in writing to the officer by whom his salary is paid of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of an employee in the service of such a committee on the date of enactment of this paragraph, such notice of desire must be given within the calendar year 1956. In the case of an employee of such a committee who enters the service after the date of enactment of this paragraph, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of entrance in the service."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 5 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting, after the words "Pan American Sanitary Bureau," the following: "or as an employee of a State or county committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."

SEC. 3. Any person who shall have served for at least 2 years as an employee of a State or county committee established under section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and who is separated from such service, shall acquire upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, a classified civil service status for transfer, within 1 year following the date of such separation, to a position in the classified civil service.

MINIMUM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR COTTON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the veto of the farm bill by the President leaves us without new legislation so badly needed to assist our farm people. Our farmers are still faced with the most serious problem of our times. They are faced with competition and declining markets, depressed prices, and increased cost of production. The fact that the President has vetoed the farm bill does not eliminate or solve our farm problem.

In the case of cotton, we are now faced with a reduction in price and a reduction in acreage. Our farmers cannot possibly make ends meet under a program which reduces both volume and price. I believe that we should take a constructive approach to this situation and put together a new bill. From the standpoint of the welfare of our farmers, it is extremely important that legislation be enacted to give some relief to their pressing need.

It is already too late to get the soil bank enacted in time to give any relief to the spring planted crops. The planting of cotton and other crops is already well under way and our farmers cannot be expected to take the risk of losing an entire crop based solely on the hope that the soil bank will be forthcoming and provisions included which would give relief for the 1956 crop. I think that this measure should be given further consideration looking to the fall planted crops and crops for 1957.

Among the many needs for farm legislation at this session is the need for preventing further acreage reductions.

Cotton farmers have been forced to reduce their cotton acreage from 27 million acres in 1953 to an allotment of 21,379,358 acres in 1954, to 18,113,208 acres in 1955, to 17,391,304 in 1956. This represents a total reduction of 37 percent since 1953. Because of unusual weather conditions and other favorable factors our cotton farmers in 1955 made a bumper crop and did not feel the full impact of the almost 3.3 million acres reduction in 1955. This reduction, combined with the 700,000 reduction in 1956, will come with crushing effect upon our local economy. Even more serious is the scheduled reduction in acres for 1957, amounting to over 1,500,000 acres with possibly even greater reduction in 1958. Since 1953, our cotton acreage has been reduced by 10.5 million acres and brings us to a point where neither the farmer nor the cotton industry can absorb further reduction in acreage.

Cotton acreage in Mississippi has been reduced over 40 percent in the last 3 years and faces an additional reduction of 11.4 percent in 1957. Reductions in many of our counties and on individual farms have been even greater.

Reduction in acreage in Mississippi

Year	Planted acreage	
	Acreage	Percentage reduction
1953	2,671,000	
1954	1,960,000	26
1955	1,703,000	36
1956	[1] 1,600,000	40.1
1957	[1] 1,395,000	47.8

[1] Estimated, based on 2-year average underplanting.

If this situation is not corrected by the amendment to hold cotton acreage at the 1956 level, the farm program originally designed to assist the small- and medium-size farm will work to the disadvantage of the very people the program was originally designed to help.

I am also particularly interested in the small-farm provison which provides for 100,000 acres for 1957 and 100,000 acres for 1958 for assistance to the small farm of 4 cotton acres or less. I continue to receive reports that thousands of our small farmers are being forced to abandon their farms and seek employment elsewhere. Of course, we recognize some shifts in farm population are desirable, but there is a question in my mind how fast we can make these shifts and maintain a proper balance. The reduced acreage allotment has seriously reduced the income of all farmers, but has inflicted a greater toll on the small farmer. The large farmers have been successful in making tremendous strides to increase efficiency, reduce costs, and increase yields which have enabled them to absorb some of the loss of acreage. However, the small farm units, because of inadequate credit and other limitations, have not made this rapid progress and are again placed in a most unfavorable situation.

The amendment designed to hold the cotton acreage allotment at the 1956 level for 1957 and 1958, and the amendment providing 100,000 additional acres over and above the national allotment for the farmer who has 4 cotton acres or less have been thoroughly justified and approved by the Senate. They were accepted by the conference committee and were a part of the farm bill vetoed by the President. These provisions are sound and desirable.

On behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. WOFFORD], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I reintroduce, for appropriate reference, the acreage bill today, and I urge the Senate Agriculture Committee to include these measures in an overall farm bill or act on them as a separate measure at the earliest possible date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3671) to prescribe minimum acreage allotments for cotton, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO ENCOURAGE SMALL-BUSINESS CONCERNS TO ENGAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend what is known as the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act, or section 921 of the 1942 General Revenue Act.

Mr. President, I will have much more to say about this bill when the Senate Finance Committee considers the bill, and I hope that such action by the committee can be scheduled in the near future.

At this time, I merely want to explain that all this bill will do is give the smaller manufacturers in the United States the same opportunities on the export markets of the Western Hemi-

sphere which have been enjoyed only by the largest of our manufacturing concerns.

This bill will put in legislative words the intent which was obvious in the Senate Finance Committee's report on the original amendment to the General Revenue Act.

That report said, in part, and I quote:

American companies trading in foreign countries within the Western Hemisphere are placed at a considerable competitive disadvantage with foreign corporations under the tax rates provided by the bill. To alleviate this competitive inequality, the committee bill relieves such corporations from surtax liability.

As I said previously, Mr. President, there is much more to be detailed about this bill in committee, and I am prepared, along with my cosponsor, to present sufficient material to the committee to convince the Members of this Senate that administration of this act in the past several years, due to the loose construction of the act, has denied the smaller manufacturer that equality of competition on the export market which the committee intended, while the largest manufacturers had that equality of competition.

There is admitted discrepancy of privilege and benefit as a result of administrative interpretations on this act, and I am certain in that the Senate never intended that the smaller manufacturer be burdened and the largest manufacturer be relieved in its effort to give United States businessmen equal opportunity with Foreign manufacturers on Western Hemisphere markets.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3672) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small business concerns to engage in foreign trade, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. FREAR), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 921 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (P. L. 591, 83d Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"§ 921. Definition of Western Hemisphere trade corporations.

"For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'Western Hemisphere trade corporation' means a domestic corporation all of whose business (other than incidental purchases) is done in any country or countries in North, Central, or South America, or in the West Indies, and which satisfied the following conditions:

"(1) if 95 percent or more of the gross income of such domestic corporation for the 1-year period immediately preceding the close of the taxable year (or for such part of such period during which the corporation was in existence) was derived from sources without the United States; the sources of gross income shall in general be determined in accordance with the provisions of Section 862, provided, however, that for the purposes of this section, where personal property is manufactured within the United States and sold, either by the manufacturer or by a wholly owned subsidiary of the manufacturer, for use or consumption in and actually shipped in due course to a Western Hemisphere country, the seller's income from such transactions shall be treated as derived entirely from sources other than sources within the United States; and

"(2) if 90 percent or more of its gross income for such period or such part thereof was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

For any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1954, the determination as to whether any corporation meets the requirements of section 109 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall be made as if this section had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that this section is not expressly made applicable with respect to taxable years beginning prior to January 1, 1954."

HOLDING OF MAIL FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases. The Postmaster General has requested that this bill be introduced.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3679) to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HOLDING MORE THAN ONE OFFICE UNDER THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. The bill does nothing but give to enlisted men what we gave last year to officers. Through oversight the enlisted men were left out.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3681) to modify certain restrictions with respect to holding more than one office under the United States, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMMISSION TO STUDY ELECTIONS FINANCES AND RELATED ASPECTS OF ELECTIONS TO FEDERAL OFFICES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a joint resolution and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it, in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when the Select Committee for Contribution Investigation filed its report on April 7 on the famous episode of the attempted $2,500 natural gas bill contribution to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], it marked completion of the first stage of the Senate's program for action on the issue of money in politics, which that episode brought to the forefront of public attention. Another committee investigation and a modernized elections bill are two steps of that program now before the Senate. I wish to discuss today another proposal which I believe is urgently needed in order to assure really effective progress in this field—namely the creation of an independent citizens' commission on election finances, completely divorced from Government and politics.

I first made this suggestion in the Senate on March 9, about 6 weeks ago. Today, Mr. President, I submit it in the form of a joint resolution, which I now send to the desk, with the request that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) to provide for the establishment of a Commission To Study Election Finances and Related Aspects of Elections to Federal Offices, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Congress finds that the manner in which the costs of election campaigns and other political processes are financed has important significance for democratic government.

In order for the Federal Government to function, under the Constitution, in response to the interests of the majority of the electorate, the choice among candidates for Federal elective office should not be obscured by the effects of disproportionate campaign expenditures. The rising cost of access to the most compelling media of public information increases this threat to an informed and considered choice by the electorate among such candidates.

Popular confidence in democratic government requires the assurance that the public actions of holders of or candidates for Federal elective office reflect only their own free judgment of the public interest, wholly unaffected by any need for concern about the financing of election campaigns.

ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established a Commission on Election Finances and Related Matters (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission").

(b) The Commission shall conduct a thorough, impartial, and continuing study and investigation of the following:

(1) The actual costs of modern campaigns for nomination and election to Federal elective offices (including any such campaigns

which may occur during the period of operations of the Commission);

(2) Current practices with respect to the financing of such campaign costs, of lobbying costs, and of other political activities;

(3) The relationship, if any, between the amount of campaign expenditures made in behalf of different candidates and their success at the polls;

(4) The relationship, if any, between sources of political financing, lobbying activities, and the public policies espoused and supported by holders of and candidates for Federal elective offices;

(5) Reforms which have been or may be proposed for the purpose of assuring the financing of the Nation's political processes by means consistent with the objectives of section 1 hereof.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall be composed of a Chairman and 14 members, to be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States.

(b) The Chairman and members of the Commission shall be citizens of the United States (1) who, by reason of demonstrated interest in good government, or training, or experience, are well qualified to carry out in an impartial manner the duties of the Commission, and (2) who neither actively occupy nor are candidates for a public office or position and who are not actively engaged in partisan politics.

(c) The Commission shall establish rules for its procedure.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled by the Commission pursuant to rules adopted by the Commission for such purpose.

(e) The Chairman and members of the Commission shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of the personnel it deems necessary for a thorough and comprehensive study, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(3) The Commission is authorized without regard to any other provision of law to reimburse employees, experts, and consultants for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties and to make reasonable advances to such persons for such purposes.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee including not less than three members thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subject to rules of the Commission adopted under section 3 hereof, subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or the chairman of any subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of such subcommittee and may be served by any person designated by such chairman. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission may authorize the Chairman to make the expenditures herein authorized and such other expenditures as the Commission may deem advisable. When the Commission ceases its activities it shall submit to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives a statement of its fiscal transactions properly audited by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(c) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. The Commission may submit interim reports to the Congress at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1957, at which time the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I shall explain why I believe the establishment of such an independent commission is needed if we are to get to the bottom of the real problems of election financing.

So far as information available to the public is concerned, the financing of our expensive biennial election campaigns may well be called the dark continent of American politics. The crude antics of Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff in connection with the natural gas bill on behalf of Mr. Keck, of the Superior Oil Co., have given the public a glimpse into one particular jungle; and now the public demands the kind of thorough exploration which is long overdue.

In this speech I have no intention of reciting the history of the $2,500 episode. But the Senate and the country are indebted to the distinguished chairman [Mr. GEORGE] and the other members of the select committee for their investigation of that episode; and I want to cite some of the findings in their report which startlingly illustrate the kind of operations which so thoroughly obscure the true picture of political finance in our country.

TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLAR CASE SHOWS NEED FOR ANSWERS ABOUT CAMPAIGN FUNDS

First, the average citizen, who has made a personal sacrifice in the cause of democratic self-government when he gives $5, or $10, or even $1, to the campaign of a candidate of his choice, is probably startled and, no doubt, discouraged at the sums involved. The select committee finds that Mr. Keck, the president of Superior Oil Co. of California, turned over to one of the company's employees, Mr. Patman, for political purposes an average of $5,000 to $6,000 a year. The committee finds that "a sum approaching $50,000 has been distributed in political contributions by Elmer Patman"; and that in 1955 he received either $8,500 or $9,500 from Mr. Keck. It is significant for those who have confidence in our reporting laws in this respect that, according to the committee report—

Keck was unable to establish the exact amount. It was testified that this discrepancy was caused by the fact that neither Patman nor Keck maintained any records, and Patman, under the arrangement, accounted to Keck orally when he happened to see him.

Who today can tell the public whether this is an isolated instance or whether it is typical of the manner in which money gets into politics? The channeling of sums of the magnitude of this oilman's $50,000 into election campaign funds is of central significance for our political system. Yet, except for what the oil companies must regard as a deplorable accident, it would never have come to light.

Second, the committee's finding in this instance illustrate graphically the difficulty of knowing the source of funds such as those offered by Mr. Neff all over the West Central States. True, people might learn that Mr. Neff was interested in the natural gas bill. According to the committee—

Mr. Neff, in a space of 4 months, covered 5 States and sought out the attitude of 10 United States Senators concerning a single piece of legislation. A sum totaling $10,000 was at least considered and spoken of by Mr. Neff as contributions, and $5,000 of this was actually contributed.

But who, today, can tell the public with assurance on whose behalf men such as Mr. Neff offer their contributions? Where does the money for such large contributions really come from? The committee asks in its report:

Was the $2,500 contribution to Senator CASE's campaign fund made by the Superior Oil Company of California?

And in reply, it can only report:

The testimony is that this money and in fact all of the $7,500 which Mr. Patman gave to Mr. Neff in this situation was the personal money of Mr. Keck and was not that of Superior Oil. The committee, however, had no opportunity to audit the record of Superior Oil and is entirely dependent upon the statements made in the record concerning this point.

Third, perhaps it is relatively easy for Mr. Keck to obtain adequate compensation from the Superior Oil Co., so as to permit $5,000 campaign contributions to be made, legally, by him, rather than illegally by the company. Equally significant, however, is the glimpse which this case study affords the public of the use of company personnel, on company time, for political purposes. The select committee reports:

The circumstances here have raised the question of whether there was a political contribution by a corporation, in a sense different from that discussed above. The select committee has considered this. The Superior Oil Company of California paid all of the salary and expenses of Mr. Patman and bargained for all of his time. This same

corporation paid Mr. Neff's fees and expenses. To the extent that Mr. Patman and Mr. Neff devoted their time to the dispensing of Mr. Keck's funds for political campaigns, was the Superior Oil Company of California making a political contribution? The select committee does not believe that this constituted a political contribution and was not proscribed by the law governing elections and political activities nor was in any other sense illegal.

The Superior Oil Company of California paid two employees to spend their time traveling around and dispensing the political largess of the president of the company. This may not be illegal. But, Mr. President, of more immediate importance is this question: Who would even know about it, under our present system, if it had not been for the deplorable accident of disclosure in this particular instance?

WHAT IS ROLE OF MONEY IN THE POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT TODAY?

In its summation, the select committee properly characterizes the methods which Mr. Keck chose to exercise his legal privilege of making political contributions as "a case of irresponsibility run riot." In the course of this riot of irresponsibility, Mr. Neff had tried to make to the children of the United States attorney for Nebraska money gifts, which that gentlemen returned. The committee reported that the United States attorney's conduct "is not reproachable and that he was merely a victim of an environment created by Mr. Neff."

Mr. President, this is a telling phrase. Beyond the question of lobbying, beyond any isolated instance of attempted corrupt influence on legislation, there is the pervasive question of the environment in which our political processes must operate. What does the increasing expense of every election, which must be financed from campaign contributions, do to that environment? How do the sky-rocketing election costs give money a role in the political environment which makes operations such as Mr. Neff's possible? These are the fundamental facts which the public is entitled to know, and which it demands to know. Who, today, can give the public these facts?

Mr. President, the truth is that, today, nobody knows how much money it costs to carry out one of our biennial national elections. These elections are the decisive events of our democratic system of self-government—the many local decisions, all over the country, by which we review and determine the direction of our national affairs and policies. Information and public debate of opposing points of view are the essence of such a system. But the expense of bringing this information and debate to the public is multiplying year by year. Today, there is a premium on access to the most expensive medium of them all—television. And no one today knows the facts about the effects of these unprecedented election costs, the need for raising campaign funds to meet them, and the accompanying inequalities between parties and candidates.

FACTS ABOUT ELECTION COSTS ARE NOWHERE AVAILABLE

Mr. President, I have tried hard to find some reliable data on campaign spending, and in my search I have found that other efforts have been made to collect such data. For example, on December 1, 1952, the New York Times published a State-by-State survey of expenditures in the 1952 election campaigns, so far as they could be determined from the records available to the Times' correspondents. The Times came up with the report that "at least $32,155,251 had been spent by political organizations, independent groups and candidates," and that in at least a dozen States, campaign spending exceeded $1 million. But the Times added:

> This was a rock-bottom figure. * * * The figure the survey shows is by no means the total that was spent. That total probably never will be ascertained.

Another example has been the efforts of the impartial Congressional Quarterly to report campaign expenditures after each national election. In its issue of April 15, 1955, the Congressional Quarterly stated $13,700,000 as the ascertainable cost of electing the 84th Congress; but, like the New York Times, the Congressional Quarterly pointed out that this sum bore little relation to reality, and stated:

> This, at least, is the sum of spending reported to Congress. * * * As much or more spending, most observers agree, was not reported or reported only to State authorities.

Similarly, widely recognized political scientists, such as Prof. Louise Overacker, of Wellesley College and Prof. Hugh A. Bone, of the University of Washington—who served on the staff of the Senate committee investigating expenditures in the 1940 election—have for years studied campaign spending. Yet their findings, based on publicly available data, have necessarily been fragmentary; and reference to their reports does not give us any clearer picture of the actual totals of campaign spending than the one we obtain from the newspapers.

This universal lack of information on election finances is inevitable under our present system, and it reduces us to guesses which may be more or less informed. Thus, recent estimates I have seen that the 1956 elections will cost over $100 million, cannot be described as extravagant. But when it takes sums of that magnitude every 2 or 4 years to conduct our democratic system, it is time to take a good look at what modern election costs are doing to our ideas of popular self-government, based on the principle of 1 person, 1 vote.

THOROUGH INVESTIGATION OF FACTS ESSENTIAL FIRST STEP TOWARD REFORM

Mr. President, I submit that the first step toward effective action to modernize our system of election financing must be a thorough exploration of the present system. Many valuable improvements in the corrupt practices laws are proposed in bills now before the Senate. I have introduced some additional proposals myself. But we cannot legislate intelligently in ignorance of the facts, and at the present time the facts about election financing are no more available to Congress than they are to the public. That is why I make my proposal for an independent citizens' study commission, empowered to get the facts, as an essential first step toward reform.

A look at the joint resolution I have introduced will show that it makes a very simple proposal. The proposed Commission on Election Finances and Related Matters would be composed of 15 private citizens of demonstrated qualifications for the task. My joint resolution specifies that they shall be persons who "neither actively occupy nor are candidates for a public office or position and who are not actively engaged in partisan politics."

The Commission would be instructed to investigate the following:

First. The actual costs of modern campaigns for nomination and election to Federal elective offices, including any such campaigns which may occur during the period of operations of the Commission.

Second. Current practices with respect to the financing of such campaign costs, of lobbying costs, and of other political activities.

Third. The relationship, if any, between the amount of campaign expenditures made in behalf of different candidates and their success at the polls.

Fourth. The relationship, if any, between sources of political financing, lobbying activities, and the public policies espoused and supported by holders of and candidates for Federal elective office.

Fifth. Reforms which have been or may be proposed for the purpose of assuring the financing of the Nation's political processes.

The Commission would have authority and staff adequate to carry out such an investigation.

The only aspect of my proposal which may require a brief explanation is the method of selection of the members of the Commission. Under my resolution, the chairman and the initial membership of the Commission would be chosen by the Chief Justice of the United States.

SELECTION BY CHIEF JUSTICE WOULD ASSURE INSULATION FROM POLITICS

Mr. President, I am as concerned as anyone—perhaps more than some persons—to maintain the separation of our highest judicial tribunal from the ordinary processes of Government and politics. Accordingly, I hesitated for some time before proposing this method of selecting the Commission. But I consider it imperative that a commission to study the financing of our elections and related political processes be itself as far removed as possible from elections and politics. Not only must it not include persons who are present or prospective beneficiaries of campaign contributions, its members should not be the appointees of men in politics, who have such a personal stake in the matter of campaign contributions—from President Eisenhower on down. I sought in vain for some alternative method of selection; but, finally, I concluded that precisely because the Commission would be so removed from politics, it would not be inappropriate, in this exceptional case, to

have the appointments made by the Chief Justice.

The Chief Justice would act only once. He would select only the initial members and the chairman, who, I think, might be a distinguished retired jurist or a person of similarly self-evident impartiality and competence. After these initial selections, the Commission would itself have the power to fill any subsequent vacancies which might occur; it would adopt its own rules of procedure and, of course, select its own staff. Thus, I believe that my proposal would not be an undue imposition on the Chief Justice, while it would go further than any other method I can imagine toward assuring the public of the complete political independence of the Commission and its work.

I repeat, Mr. President, as I stated in the Senate on March 9, that insulation from the elective process is the sine qua non of an effective investigation of election spending, in which the public will have real confidence. The establishment of a citizens' commission was approved in an editorial in the New York Times of March 10, 1956; and on March 13, the Winston-Salem Journal editorially endorsed my recommendation. I ask unanimous consent to have my statement of March 9 and these editorials printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement and editorials may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

NO CONFLICT WITH SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE

Mr. NEUBERGER. In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to point out that the establishment of a Special Commission on Election Finances would in no way be inconsistent with the work of the Special Committee To Investigate Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas. This is a committee of eight outstanding Members of the Senate, and I was particularly impressed with the statement of its distinguished chairman in undertaking the assignment. However, having been set up in direct response to the "$2,500 episode" and other events surrounding the passage of the natural-gas bill, and to the President's allusions in vetoing that bill, this special committee of the Senate will of necessity be particularly concerned with lobbying and with the relationship of campaign contributions to legislation. In other words, it may be expected that the special committee will have a major task in studying, on the general plane, the same issues as were raised by the specific investigation and report of the $2,500 incident by the select committee. The chairman of the special committee has already called for any evidence of wrongdoing. But lobbying and instances of wrongdoing and of possible corrupt practices as such would not necessarily be an important target of the independent citizens' commission. On the other hand, the Commission could undertake the essential task of making a detailed and continuing factual survey, State by State, of the costs of election campaigns and the manner in which they are actually financed—a procedure which cannot be expected of a Senate committee. Thus, Mr. President, if there is any overlapping of functions, it would be slight.

Let me summarize the reasons why an independent Commission on Election Finances is necessary:

First. Increasing costs have made the role of money in elections a serious threat to our democratic processes.

Second. Nobody today knows or can find out how much is spent in election campaigns, how it is spent, where the money really comes from, and why it is contributed. The public is entitled to these facts.

Third. The Congress also needs to have these facts. We cannot know whether or not we are legislating intelligently in this field until this "dark continent" of American politics is explored and mapped.

Fourth. An independent commission could devote its full time and attention to this single, important problem until the job is done.

Fifth. A commission with this single assignment, if established now, could operate through the entire 1956 campaign and make a thorough, factual case study of this year's elections throughout the country, which are certain to be the most expensive in the history of our Nation.

Sixth. For obvious reasons, a really penetrating study of our present system of election spending and campaign contributions should be undertaken by persons whose selection and whose own personal interests are as thoroughly insulated from this system as possible. A commission composed and selected in the manner I propose would clearly have this study as its single, undivided objective. Its work would be assured of the public support and confidence which is essential to success in this vital undertaking.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I introduce my joint resolution and hope that it may win an early hearing in the Rules Committee and in the Senate.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1956]

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, ETC.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, ever since the Senate decided to set up a special 8-man committee to inquire into the broad problems of lobbying, of campaign expenditures, and their relationship, I have had serious misgivings about my vote in favor of the resolution creating the committee. I say this without any reflection on any of the Members who were appointed to the special committee, because they are outstanding Senators. I would have had the same misgivings no matter which Senators might serve on such a committee.

Now, after listening to the thoughtful and even-tempered explanation by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] of developments which have occurred since the appointment of the special committee, and the cogent remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], I have concluded that I made a mistake when I voted for the resolution to turn over these crucial issues to a special committee of the Senate. A new Member must learn by experience, and there was not much time for thorough reflection before the vote. I believe now that the Senate should not have bypassed its regular standing committees in dealing with the aspects of these problems which fall within their normal legislative functions and responsibilities.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my firm conviction that the people of this country demand a thorough and impartial study of the whole matter of our methods of financing political campaigns and their relationship to lobbying—a matter which, because of recent events, is now getting the public attention it has long deserved. Already there have been heard suggestions that the Senate cannot investigate itself, any more than any other agency of government can investigate itself. In all candor, people wonder how Senators who were elected with substantial campaign funds raised by large, private contributions can inquire into other Senators' campaign exchequers. That question applies to all here, the junior Senator from Oregon included.

Speaking only for myself, Mr. President, I personally am ready to turn over to an outside commission, nonpartisan and broadly representative in character this entire problem for a thorough airing and for a study of constructive alternatives to our present approach to political finances. As I have had occasion to say before, in the Senate and elsewhere, this question of political campaign financing is rapidly becoming the central problem of our democratic processes, increasingly so every year as the cost of modern methods of campaigning skyrocket.

Such a commission, Mr. President, should include members from many walks of life—after all, every American is intimately affected by the actions and decisions of his representatives in Congress, whether he be a businessman or a workingman, a teacher, a farmer, a writer, or a scientist. It might include some eminent political scientists; and I suggest that it be headed by a retired jurist whose ability and nonpartisanship were beyond question.

I would turn over to such a commission, Mr. President, the function of finding out the facts about our present methods of political financing, and about the related aspects of lobbying. I would give such a commission the authority, the personnel, and the money to enable it to make the proper inquiry, and to stay with it during the present election year so as to accumulate a meaningful body of information about the problem. There are many precedents for the use of special commissions to make thorough studies of specific areas of public concern, and I believe a special commission, removed from the political arena, is needed to restore the confidence of the American people that they are, in fact, being told the full truth about their processes of government and politics.

At the same time, Mr. President, I would leave to the regular, standing committees of Congress the responsibility for acting now on pending legislative proposals for constructive and long-overdue steps to improve the situation with respect to campaign financing—steps which can and should be taken before the political campaigns of this presidential election year. These standing committees and the Congress can act constructively on legislative reforms without getting bogged down in controversy which will inevitably accompany efforts at senatorial investigation of this problem.

[From the New York Times of March 10, 1956]

GET ON WITH THE INQUIRY

When the special bipartisan Senate Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures and Lobbying Activities was set up 2 weeks ago, Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON observed that it "would go to the hard core

of our form of constitutional government—the confidence of the people in our institutions."

Although Senator JOHNSON, as well as the Republicans, had, in our opinion, been far too slow in seeing the need for a full-scale inquiry, he did hit the nail on the head with this comment. The proposed investigation is necessary and important, particularly for the reason he gave, particularly because this is an election year.

What happened? An 8-man committee was appointed, consisting of 4 Democrats and 4 Republicans, and from that day to this they haven't been able to organize because neither side is willing to allow the other to be put in a position of control. The logical choice for chairman of the committee was Senator GORE, who had earlier pressed for a full-scale investigation. However, he would have become a chairman without a chair if the ranking Republican Senator BRIDGES, could have had his way. Apparently Mr. BRIDGES, a politician's politician if there ever was one, doesn't want to give the Democrats free rein in an election year to poke around in the dynamite-laden field of lobbies and campaign contributions. We wonder why the GOP is now reportedly willing to accept Senator MCCLELLAN as chairman but not Senator GORE.

The idea of a bipartisan committee is theoretically sound for the task at hand, allowing neither party to gain undue advantage over the other in what could be a sensational investigation. But if bipartisanship in this area should prove beyond the capacity of human nature, there would be other ways in which the same end could be accomplished. Senator GORE (and others) originally proposed an inquiry by one of the standing subcommittees of the Senate. That would necessarily involve party control, but it would also involve party responsibility; and if the inquiry took an unfairly partisan direction it could lose its effectiveness and in fact would probably backfire on the majority.

Another and better method came yesterday from Senator NEUBERGER, who suggested establishment of a citizens' commission to look into the whole matter, headed perhaps by "a retired jurist of unquestioned nonpartisanship and ability." We think that is a good solution, certainly preferable to continuance of the present impasse or to agreement on a bipartisan inquiry so hamstrung as to be ineffective.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal of March 13, 1956]

ANOTHER SUPERFICIAL INQUIRY?

At long last the Senate's special committee to investigate lobbying and campaign contributions has picked a chairman and adoped rules. It is now quite apparent that the lawmakers who do not want a truly searching inquiry have won out.

The choice for chairman, Senator MCCLELLAN, was reluctant to take on what he called a "most disagreeable and difficult task." He made it plain that he is a compromise selection. The four Republican members of the committee simply would not accept Senator GORE without tying his hands with impossible restrictions.

The Senate did not want this investigation in the first place. It hoped to confine its job to looking into pressures surrounding the natural gas bill. But the special, four-man committee which undertook that limited investigation quickly found that the field was vast in scope: that it was very difficult to stick to its limited agenda.

To Senator BRIDGES and his three Republican colleagues, Senator GORE was a possibly dangerous man. They openly warned against "a runaway" committee. No such problem is posed by Senator MCCLELLAN, the Arkansas Democrat who made a name for himself in the McCarthy-Army hearings. He is a strong party man, a conservative fairly close to the GOP position.

As historians have noted, Congress has investigated lobbying seven times since 1854—and produced one law, in 1946. And the weaknesses of that law have produced the reasons for the current investigation.

Can we expect any real results this time around? It would take a real optimist to think so. First, it's election year. Secondly, the investigation will touch on sore spots perilously close to every Congressman—sore spots that could be exploited even though the lawmakers try to bend over backwards to resist monied influences. And finally, the fact that it took three weeks for the committee even to organize itself, after bitter backstage feuding between supposedly "bipartisan" members, is a sad augury of things to come.

Next time around we might give serious thought to Senator NEUBERGER'S suggestion for a way out of the impasse. He has proposed creation of a special nonpartisan, citizens' commission to do the job—in view of "suggestions that the Senate cannot investigate itself" with complete candor.

Such a commission, he suggests, is needed to restore public confidence—to assure the people they are "being told the full truth about their process of government and politics."

This idea has merit. It does not remove the desirability for the present committee to conduct a full investigation and propose sweeping changes in existing laws. But no one should be greatly surprised if the McClellan committee follows the path of its ineffectual predecessors.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MCCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3238) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

EXEMPTION FROM TAX IMPOSED FOR TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS OF AMOUNTS NOT EXCEEDING 60 CENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7634) to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the following amendments, namely:

Page 11 in lines 1 through 4 strike out the following: "and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.," and insert "and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia, without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c))."

Page 15, line 16, after "$15,250,000", insert ", of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Page 16, line 15, after "(69 Stat. 242)", insert ": *Provided*, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities, and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Page 39, line 25, after "(66 Stat. 781)", insert ": *Provided further*, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the year ending June 30, 1957, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944, AS AMENDED—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3602) amending section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee, which I understand from the Parliamentarian, to be the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECT OF IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 11, 1956,

The names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator

from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 236) directing the Tariff Commission to investigate whether imports of textiles or textile products are affecting injuriously the domestic industry, submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself and other Senators) on April 11, 1956.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Address entitled "Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?" delivered by him at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics, at Rochester, N. Y., on April 6, 1956.

Address entitled "Some Aspects of Law in the Atomic Age," delivered by him at the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association, at Hartford, Conn., on April 16, 1956.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him before Conference of Organizations on the United Nations, at Washington, D. C., on February 27, 1956.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Address delivered by Senator ANDERSON at the annual meeting of the Western Cotton Shippers Association, in El Paso, Tex., on April 12, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 23, PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO TAXES ON INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1956, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 23, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. Such persons should contact the subcommittee counsel at the earliest possible date in order to arrange an appearance. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself. The chairman of the subcommittee has designated me to preside over these hearings.

CONFISCATION OF GERMAN PROPERTY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on February 1, in a speech on the Senate floor dealing with confiscation of German property, I said I had written a letter to Mr. John J. McCloy, and that as soon as I received his reply I would put it in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the letter I received from Mr. McCloy, the letter written to Mr. Finucane by Mr. McCloy, and an article which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, dealing with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letters and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 27, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I have just had an opportunity to read your letter to me dated February 13. The letter came after I had left for a somewhat extended tour of the Middle East, from which I have very recently returned. I have also read with interest your references to me contained in the speech that you made to the Senate on February 1, which references are contained on page 1795 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which you were good enough to send to me.

Unfortunately, I do not have ready access to many of the records which were made at the time of the meeting to which you refer. My personal records are scattered about and so I would have to reply to you at the present time purely from memory. My recollection of the meeting in Mr. Hull's office to which you refer is, however, very vivid. I also recall very well the paper which was initialed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill and the manner in which it was presented to the group by Mr. Morgenthau.

This paper set out the general principles under which Germany was to be administered after the expected victory was accomplished. There had been considerable discussion regarding the principles of our policy respecting defeated Germany. The discussions took place in the War Department, the State Department and, to some extent, in the Treasury Department. If my recollection serves me right, the War Department was the first one to initiate any draft directives on this subject as it was presumably their responsibility to administer defeated Germany. However, the State Department proceeded to draw up some principles under which Germany was to be governed and the Treasury Department did likewise. Both of these proposals shocked Mr. Stimson, the proposal of Mr. Hull only a little less than that of Mr. Morgenthau. For Mr. Stimson's reaction to the Hull and the Morgenthau proposals and my part in it all I would refer you to Mr. Stimson's book entitled "On Active Service in Peace and War." If you will refer to page 568 of this book you will there find a discussion of the so-called Morgenthau plan. It is an entirely accurate account so far as I can now recall.

Mr. Morgenthau had apparently pressed upon Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill at Quebec an endorsement of his views as to how conquered Germany should be administered. On his return to Washington he brought with him the initialed memorandum which you referred to in your speech. He laid it before Mr. Hull and Mr. Stimson in the former's office in the State Department. I was present in Mr. Hull's office when the document was presented. I have no record to confirm it but I believe I recall that Mr. White was also present at this meeting. I say this because Mr. White was usually present at meetings which Mr. Morgenthau attended dealing with the administration of Germany. The initialled agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill is set forth in full at the bottom of page 576 and the top of page 577 of Mr. Stimson's book. I saw the original and it conformed to the copy in the Stimson book.

I took part in the drafting of all the memorandums which Mr. Stimson submitted to his colleagues in protest to the so-called Morgenthau plan, as well as to the original Hull plan.

As you will see from the initialed agreement as it is set forth on pages 576–7 of Mr. Stimson's book, there is no reference made to the confiscation of German assets throughout the world. Though I think the original initialed memorandum has disappeared, there is no doubt that the reproduction of it in Mr. Stimson's book is complete and accurate. I believe that a number of photostatic copies still remain in existence.

I believe the foregoing gives you the essential data that you are seeking in regard to the initialed agreement and to Mr. Stimson's and my connection with it. The record, I think, is quite clear that Mr. Stimson and I, from the beginning, were in strong disagreement with the so-called Morgenthau plan, particularly as it was reflected in the agreement between Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill which was initialed in Quebec; but it contained no reference to German assets throughout the world. If there is any further information that you seek and I am in a position to supply it, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 27, 1956.*

Mr. JAMES FINUCANE,
Executive Secretary, Committee for the Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FINUCANE: I have your letters of February 6 and 24 in regard to the statements made by Senator LANGER on the floor of the Senate in regard to the initialed agreement of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill respecting the policies to be applied to Germany in the postwar period. I received a letter from Senator LANGER asking me to state what I know of this memorandum and I have replied in the form attached.

As you will see from my reply to Senator LANGER, the initialed document which was presented to the meeting in Mr. Hull's office was as set out in Mr. Stimson's book. I think Mr. Morgenthau had the original copy with him and displayed it to us. He also had some photostatic copies. The agreement, as he presented it to us, had nothing to say about the confiscation of German assets throughout the world, nor did I ever hear it suggested that Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill advocated such a policy. Subsequently, I heard that some attempt was made to find the original initialed copy but it could not be located. I always had a feeling that someone in the White House—not Mr. Roosevelt—had destroyed it after all the criticism of the policy had appeared in the newspapers. I am certain the original was initialed in the handwriting of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, both of whose handwriting I was familiar with. There were also several photostatic copies about. The text of the initialed statement was just as it appeared in Mr. Stimson's book—no more, no less.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. MCCLOY.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

LANGER SEEKS FACTS BEHIND HARSH POLICY—AGREEMENT DRAWN AT QUEBEC

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—The original Quebec memorandum, initialed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, of Britain, which defined postwar policy toward Germany, has disappeared.

The disappearance of the document was reported today in letters to Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, and James Finucane, executive secretary of the Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, from John J. McCloy, former assistant war Secretary and former High Commissioner to Germany. The Quebec Conference was held in September 1944.

LANGER had demanded the original initialed document to determine whether the harsh peace policy against Germany had originated at the Churchill-Roosevelt level. The strong peace policy against postwar Germany has been attributed in large measure to the late Harry Dexter White, Treasury aid, who died mysteriously while his Communist associations were under investigation.

FBI WARNINGS IGNORED

The Federal Bureau of Investigation had warned the White House on White's Communist associations. Former President Truman ignored the warnings and named him United States executive director of the International Monetary Fund. White is credited with having given American occupation money printing plates to Russia. Use of the plates by the Russians to turn out money in occupied Germany cost American taxpayers an estimated $250 million.

McCloy denied that the original document contained any reference to confiscation of German property throughout the world. He intimated that the document was destroyed in the White House by persons apparently anxious to hide the fact that Roosevelt had not called for confiscation and other harsh measures imposed on Germany.

LANGER interpreted McCloy's letter as fixing responsibility for confiscation of German property at Federal echelons lower than Roosevelt or his successor, Harry S. Truman. McCloy said he was certain that White was aware of the exact language of the Quebec memorandum, which embraced only part of the Morgenthau harsh peace plan.

SUSPECTED DESTRUCTION

"I heard that some attempt was made to find the original initialed copy, but it could not be located," McCloy wrote the committee on return of confiscated property. "I always had a feeling that someone in the White House, not Mr. Roosevelt, had destroyed it after all the criticisms of the policy [the Morgenthau plan] had appeared in the newspapers."

Proponents and defenders of the confiscation policy insisted that it originated with Roosevelt and Churchill. Critics of the policy insisted that the policy originated at middle- or upper-level bureaucracy without Presidential knowledge or approval. In a speech read to the Senate last February 1, LANGER demanded that the original document be produced to settle the clouded question.

"The [Quebec] agreement as he [Treasury Secretary Morgenthau] presented it to us had nothing to say about the confiscation of German assets throughout the world, nor did I ever hear it suggested that Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Churchill advocated such a policy," McCloy wrote the committee.

SAYS HE RECALLS MEMO

In his letter to LANGER, McCloy reiterated his insistence the original document, which he said he recalled very well, included the initials of Roosevelt and Churchill.

"The paper set out the general principles under which Germany was to be administered after the expected victory was accomplished. There had been considerable discussion regarding the principles of our policy respecting defeated Germany.

"The discussions took place in the War Department, the State Department and, to some extent, in the Treasury Department. If my recollection serves me right, the War Department was the first one to initiate any draft directives on the subject as it was presumably their responsibility to administer defeated Germany.

"WHITE USUALLY PRESENT

"However, the State Department proceeded to draw up some principles under which Germany was to be governed and the Treasury Department did likewise. Both of these principles shocked Mr. Stimson (War Secretary Henry Stimson), the proposal of Mr. Hull (State Secretary Cordell Hull) only a little less than that of Mr. Morgenthau."

McCloy recalled that Roosevelt brought the original Quebec document to Washington and laid it before Hull and Stimson. McCloy said:

"I have no record to confirm it, but I believe I recall Mr. White was also present at this meeting. I say this because Mr. White was usually present at meetings which Mr. Morgenthau attended dealing with the administration in Germany."

McCloy said he and Stimson were in strong disagreement with the Morgenthau plan particularly as it was reflected in the Quebec agreement. But he insisted the agreement did not authorize confiscation of German property.

COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION—ADDRESS BY W. P. KENNEDY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago, on March 28, at Bismarck, N. Dak., a very interesting address dealing with the subject of collective political action, was delivered by W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION

Mr. Chairman and friends, North Dakota holds a warm and enchanted place in my heart. It was on the Dakota division of the Great Northern Railroad where I obtained my first job as a railroad brakeman in 1909. I worked in and out of Grand Forks to Fargo, Devil's Lake, and Neche.

It was in North Dakota where I joined the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen and began the career in the collective efforts with my fellow trainmen. I shall always remember that beginning which started me in brotherhood activities more than 46 years ago.

I served as a brakeman on the Oriental Limited, that famous passenger train, the first trip the locomotive was equipped with an electric headlight.

That brilliant, shining electric beam seemed to have lighted a new pathway across the State, for it was not long after its first rays pierced the darkness of the Dakota nights until farmers began their first successful venture into the political limelight of the Nation and of the world.

You may be sure that it was a pleasure for me to accept the invitation to be with you on this momentous occasion. Happy as I am to be here today there is the full realization of the grave importance of your convention—especially the convention of this year, a most important political year—for the people of North Dakota and for the Nation, and it could also be very important for the people of the world.

FARMERS DISCONTENT

While this is my first visit to a convention of the league, it is not my first knowledge of the great good you have accomplished throughout the years in keeping the cooperative endeavors alive and active for the advancement of the people economically, socially, and politically.

As a brakeman years ago switching grain cars to and from the elevators along the Great Northern tracks, I often heard the grumbling discontent of the farmers, as they vainly tried to get justice in the grading and docking of the wheat, barley, flax, and oats they were selling to the big grain companies of that day. There never seemed to be any first grade grain grown in North Dakota—the high grades of the grain did not seem to develop until they reached the markets of the Twin Cities, Chicago, and the East.

I also learned of the excessive gouging of the big insurance companies on the rates and settlements on hail and crop insurances. Then, too, there were the banks with the high interest rate, often coupled with added premiums to make borrowing of money all the more difficult for the struggling farmers.

COLLECTIVE POLITICAL ACTION

It was most encouraging to note that the aroused and embittered farmers met the challenges of unfair grading and docking of grain with the resultant low prices, the unreasonable insurance charges and the excessive interest rates, by organizing, building, and fighting for the Non-Partisan League.

In the League those fighting stalwart pioneers develop facility for independent political action. It was a bitter struggle in the slow and difficult climb to the success of obtaining a majority in the legislature and placing friends in other public offices.

Those early organizers in the League virtually faced the furies of hell in their efforts to reach the farmers out on the prairies. The leaders of the political party in control at the time fought like demons against any encroachment on their political domain—the newspapers, the banks, the insurance companies, the railroads, and the grain brokers were all aligned together as a solid phalanx against those determined farmers.

Although activity in the Brotherhood work took me away from my original employment on the railroad in North Dakota, I have always kept in close contact with the work here. With great interest I have watched the League grow in importance and influence. Some of my close contacts have been Elric and Agnes Geelan, of Enderlin, along with Arthur Ford and Bill Dolan, of Bismarck, our vice president. These fine people have been helpful in keeping me supplied with details of your good work throughout the years.

LABOR SUPPORTS THE LEAGUE

The league officers and members have always had the support of the workers in labor unions in the cities and on the railroads of North Dakota. For the first time in the State it was clearly demonstrated that the industrial and political enemies of the farmers were also the enemies of the union workers. Strange as it may seem to be, that situation has not changed materially during the intervening years. Our enemies are still the enemies of the farmers, who want and are willing to fight for justice.

Some of the farmers who battled for justice 40 years ago still recount the difficulties faced in attempting to get redress for their grievances from the politicians in control of the State government. I can imagine that there are many of you here today who have had similar difficulties with the more modern type of controlled politician elected when the farmers failed to vote collectively for the interests of the people.

POLITICAL PRAIRIE FIRE

Recently I read the book "Political Prairie Fire" by Robert Morlan and "Farmers Political Action in North Dakota" by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK. They were good and interesting reading. They served as sort of

detailed refreshers of many things I had general knowledge of at the time of the occurrences. It might be a good thing, if all persons interested in preserving our freedoms and our economic, social, and political gains, would review the events of those trying days, when league organizers were denied the use of public meeting places, and were even run out of the counties, were tarred and feathered, and were jailed, often held without bond. They were not only mistreated, beaten and slandered, but were often denied the constitutional guarantees. Yes, that all took place in America—in North Dakota and in Minnesota—on many occasions. The big business interests and their political stooges did not like the idea of farmers organizing. It was abhorrent to think of farmers taking collective political action, or making any other collective efforts in their own behalf. In recalling the eventful days of the early organiaztion of the league I shall always remember and revere the names of George S. Loftus, Arthur C. Townley, Lynn J. Frazier, Edwin F. Ladd, and Magnus Johnson for the part they took in that great move for political freedom.

Oh, yes, there are many thousands of others who stood faithfully and solidly with those sturdy leaders as they bore the brunt of the fierce onslaughts. Each and every one who stood loyally with the collective effort deserves high praise for their noble deeds.

The battle they fought is not over—it never will be over. They began the collective effort to work and fight together for the common good of the people. That was a battle for security, for social equality and for political freedom. You and I must carry it along and do our part—our children and their children must do likewise, if we are to keep this State, this Nation and the world as places where human beings can live and prosper as God intended it to be.

The history of the Nonpartisan League shows conclusively that it has earned its right to existence, for the great good accomplished throughout the many years. It has been and is today of great economic value to the people of North Dakota—I mean all of the people—the workers in industry, in the shops, mills, mines, factories, stores, on the railroads, and the housekeepers, as well as the farmers out on the prairies.

NAME CALLING

The league provides common grounds on which we can all meet to discuss our economic and political problems in the interests of the majority of the people.

When we meet and act collectively to solve our mutual problems we may expect to be called all sorts of names by those whose self-interests are in conflict with the public good.

It can be recalled that in the early days the political stooges called the organizers of the league Socialists and termed the league's objectives as being socialistic. That name-calling did not stop those who dared to fight for the right—it seemed to spur them on to greater and more determined efforts.

Name-calling must not stop you in 1956 or in any future campaign. Always remember that for centuries past the stooges of the oppressors have name-called with what seemed to be the most unpopular, vile and scare names at the time. It is almost unbelievable but some persons are still using the scare names of socialists, socialistic and socialism in an attempt to frighten people away from ideals, issues and actions that are to the best interests of all.

The present national administration in Washington is no exception in its efforts to destroy the public gains made in flood control, conservation, recreation, irrigation and public power. In the Northwest we have good examples of what length the administration will go to in order to serve their friendly interests—who always seem to be those who made large and impressive campaign contributions. First and most outstanding in the Northwest is the Hells Canyon project for public power, flood control, conservation, irrigation and recreation, and, second, is the persistent efforts to give away the public natural resources in the grazing land, timber, minerals and oil, much of which has already been allotted in national parks and national preserves. And there's that Dixon-Yates smelly deal in an attempt to throttle the greatest and most successful public development, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I thought they reached a new low in name-calling not so long ago when the President was asked what he thought of the Tennessee Valley Authority. According to press reports he termed that great beneficial achievement as "Creeping socialism."

TVA BRINGS NEW LIFE

The TVA has created a new order of fruitful life in the Tennessee River Valley which stands out as one of the great public accomplishments of modern civilization. Its abundant resources have made formerly barren and flooded areas prosper alike. Thousands upon thousands of farm and workers' homes have electric light and power that would not have had them without that great public improvement.

None of the private corporations offered to finance such developments on a scale large enough to serve multiple purposes of flood control, power conservation, and recreation. It remained a job for the people through the Federal Government. The Federal expenditures for TVA are being repaid ahead of schedule. The powerful utility corporations in that territory opposed and are still fighting TVA despite the fact that TVA has brought them more prosperous times than they ever knew before.

I say to you, TVA is not socialism, creeping, crawling or any other kind. It is just plain good comon sense for the people to do for themselves that which cannot be done so well by others. There must be more public developments similar to TVA in all places where there is need of flood control, power and irrigation. The progress made in the Columbia River Valley must be continued. The Hells Canyon project should be revived and completed as a public project in the interests of the people. The Missouri and other river basins should be developed where disastrous floods will be unknown.

FLOODS CAN BE PREVENTED

The disastrous floods such as that which did so much damage in Yuba City, Calif., and other places can be prevented, if the national administration will quit its little dam foolishness and start building large multiple purpose dams, to serve and to save the people from flood disasters and power shortages. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I was referring to the good accomplished by TVA and not IVA.

I am sure the record will show conclusively that the farmers, the business people in farm communities and the workers have benefited alike in the statewide program adopted as a result of the activities of the non-partisan league. The State hail insurance, the State bank of North Dakota, the State mill and elevator, the State workmen's compensation bureau, and the State guarantee of bank deposits were all pioneering efforts in an attempt to serve the people in methods and ways in which the corporations had failed miserably. Many of those primary efforts have been adopted nationally and are now important assurances in our economy.

If the people of the United States were given an opportunity to express themselves on the matter of guarantee of bank deposits, the vote would be overwhelmingly in the affirmative—yet, it has not been so very long ago that great improvement in stabilizing our banks was termed socalistic. The same thing was true in the State's establishment of grain grades and requirements of testing grains. So, I repeat, we must be prepared now and in the future, against any and all sorts of name calling; this election year will be no exception, and especially so should you decide to support candidates other than those sponsored by the political stooges of the powerful corporations.

The farm organizations have made great progress in their cooperative efforts since the formation of the nonpartisan league. The Farmers Union deserves great credit for its farsightedness in taking over the equity cooperative exchange when the big corporations were beating it down. Through the unceasing labors of M. W. Thatcher that splendid effort was saved in the organization of the successful Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul with its far flung operations in the northwest.

The Farmers Union, the Grange, and the Farm Bureau all have important parts in keeping alive and building the spirit of cooperation among the agricultural producers of our time.

DECLINING FARM PRICES

I know you are greatly concerned over the decline in farm income during the past few years. It should be the concern of all who believe in a continued prosperous America. The records of the Department of Agriculture in Washington show that the realized net income of farm operators in North Dakota declined from $222.5 million in 1951 to $134.6 million in 1954, a 39-percent decline. This decline is largely due to the fall in cash receipts in farm marketings, which were $563.8 million in 1951 and only $465.2 million in 1954 in the State.

The decline in farm income is a very real problem affecting farmers in all States. In 1951 the Nation's farmers realized net income of $14.8 billion. The Department of Agriculture has just reported the realized net income for 1955 was only $10.8 billion. A billion-dollar loss for each of the 4 years.

A recent Department of Agriculture statement says that farmers retained as net income in 1955 only 32½ percent of their realized gross income, and further states that except for 1932, that was the smallest percentage on record. The few figures just quoted are sufficient to show the danger signals in the economic pathway ahead.

What is being done to avert disaster? Not very much—nothing substantial—except in this, an important political campaign year, they are getting a little worried about the attitude of the farmers. Farmers have votes in election years—something had to be done quickly and effectively—change the parity payments in line with the previous campaign promises? No, that is out of date. The immediate remedy was to follow the pattern set by the State Department, employ a prominent public-relations firm, build a perfectly bright shining halo of favorable publicity around the Secretary of Agriculture; let the farmers and all others see the Secretary in the light of a saviour of the farmers' economic ills. The second phase of the publicity consists of trying to lay the blame for depressed farm prices on others.

BENSON WRONG AGAIN

It appears to be a plan on Secretary Benson's part to make farmers believe that increases in prices of materials and equipment they buy is hurting them more than decline in the price of farm products they sell. Its purpose is to antagonize the farmer against the worker, thereby to divert the farmer's attention from the declining prices of farm products.

It is not my intention today to pass final judgment on the extent the administration has fulfilled or failed to fulfill its preelection promises. Ordinarily an officer of a labor union stays within his own field and does not make speeches on agricultural problems.

My remarks here today are not intended as an exception to that rule. However, I do believe it quite appropriate to state the facts with regard to the unfair and unjustified insinuations of Secretary Benson, in his attempt to lay blame on the workers for his failure to act promptly, wisely, and prudently in the matter of declining farm produce prices. As an American and an officer of a labor organization, I believe it is out of place for any Government official to attempt to create discord between farmers and industrial workers on no more basis than Secretary Benson has shown to date. I must point out to you that the logic of the Secretary's position is that wage increases are wrong, that the farmer is in a worsening position because of past wage increases, and the only way the farmer can be helped is by recalling wage increases and instituting a great program of wage and consumer commodity price reductions. The chief purpose of such a program appears to be that of focusing everyone's attention on the wage policies of labor unions as the primary factor in the farmer's declining income situation. The attempt of Secretary Benson to drive a wedge between the farmers and organized labor is not a new thing. We have had recurring attempts to plant seeds of distrust and antagonism between the farmers and the industrial workers.

REAL ISSUE IS FARM PRICES

It can be recalled that in a similar condition existing in the 1920's, farm produce prices were down; workers wages were used as the scapegoat of that time. A great crusade of wage cutting developed. Unemployed and low-wage workers were not good customers for farm produce. The produce prices fell lower and lower, and farm mortgage foreclosures increased so fast that the situation became a national disgrace. The situation became so tense in some States that the county sheriffs didn't dare to make any further farm mortgage foreclosure sales. Does the Secretary of Agriculture hope to bring back a similar situation as a result of his great campaign of publicity—to blame workers' wages for the low farm produce prices?

Although I have no intention of recommending any definite farm policy, I am convinced that far more constructive things can be done than trying to make organized labor the scapegoat in this serious situation. The lesson revealed by statistics is clear; there was only a slight increase in the expenses of producing farm income between 1951 and 1955; while there was more than $4 billion decrease in the gross income received by farmers from the sale of farm products. Really, I believe it to be more sensible to bolster the prices received by the farmers than to place blame on the farmers' expenses which in 1955 were practically at the same level as in 1951.

INTERDEPENDENCE OF FARMERS-WORKERS

Secretary Benson and his cohorts in the Administration, appear to overlook or disregard the interdependence between farmers and industrial workers. There was nothing more characteristic of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt than his oft-repeated insistence in and out of Presidential campaigns, in messages to the Congress, in his writings and in informal conversations on the basic interdependence between agriculture and industry; between farmers and industrial workers.

I have always considered that the late President and his administrations constituted a valuable educational force that advanced real understanding by the farmers of the urban industrial worker and the industrial worker of the farmer. It was during his administration that price-support programs for agricultural products were first adopted, and farming was taken out of those risky year-by-year ventures without any assurances whatsoever. It was also in that era the industrial workers were encouraged to organize in unions with objectives, among others, of increasing income of both industrial workers, and because of their increased purchasing power, the income of the farmers.

We are all well aware of the favorable results. It did not hurt the economy of the Nation for the farmer and the industrial worker to be prosperous. That more than anything else has guided our Nation into our greatest overall economic prosperity. Shall we follow the pattern of the twenties—take the solution offered by Secretary Benson, reduce the wages of industrial workers in a vain and foolish effort to help farmers out of the present difficulties—or shall we progressively move forward to solutions that will work and will restore farm incomes? The first essentials are those of maintaining purchasing power of those who need and use the farm products and keep farm produce prices at parities necessary to maintain prosperous conditions, on the farms of America, and that includes the farms of North Dakota.

I have interestingly watched Senator WILLIAM LANGER and Congressman USHER BURDICK in their efforts in the Congress to obtain fair and reasonable consideration of the farm produce price conditions. May I take this occasion to point out that the labor unions have supported legislation desired by agricultural interests for the direct benefit of the farmers. In recent years we have found some of the farmer organizations lined up with the enemies of labor unions in supporting legislation which would destroy some of the long-established activities of the unions in their pursuits to adequately serve the workers in industry.

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING NECESSARY

We need a return to the mutual understanding that existed in the time of the late President Roosevelt. We must have a positive program to restore the health of agriculture. The downward spiral of farm income must be stopped. We know from our experiences in the twenties that we need not act out of consideration for the farmers alone, because our welfare, and the welfare of the Nation, are inseparably tied to the welfare of the farmers. Historically we know that depressed agriculture brings depression in the entire community. We can see the sickening emphasis on the farmers worsening position in the latest figures on per capita income as between agricultural and nonagricultural.

We are sorry that the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to see or to heed the danger signals. Now on the eve of an important national election they come forward with some effort. Are we again to witness "too little, too late"?

CONSUMER COSTS AND FARM PRICES

Senator LANGER made a good move when he tried to secure an investigation of the price spread between what the farmer gets for food products and what the consumer has to pay. The administration has never given a satisfactory answer for its opposition to such an investigation. You on the farms and we of the urban centers should know what such an investigation would reveal.

The whole sum and substance of what to do and how to do it best, hinges largely, if not entirely, upon why you are meeting in this convention of the nonpartisan league. It is now as it was 40 years ago when George Loftus, Arthur Townley and their associates discovered that the only redress possible for justice was in collective political action by the citizens in the rural and urban communities. This is 1956, 40 years after their discovery, and their bold, but determined efforts to take political action collectively, for the common good of all. The old-guard politicians will not like what you do in this convention for the good of the people of North Dakota; they didn't like it 40 years ago. There will be combinations, and alinements of the old guard with their newest additions in their efforts to keep control of the State government and of the destinies of the people. We cannot falter or fail now in our collective political efforts. We must go forward. A step backward could mean terrific losses, hard to regain.

This is 1956, a year of political destiny. You can make it one—for the people of this great State. May God grant you the wisdom to do so.

EIGHTY-FIVE AMERICAN YEARS—BOOK WRITTEN BY HENRY CARL LUCKEY, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Mr. Henry Carl Luckey served Nebraska as a Representative in Congress in the 74th and 75th Congresses. Although Mr. Luckey was born in 1868, he still possesses remarkable vigor and insight and capabilities.

Former Representative Luckey has recently published a book entitled "Eighty-Five American Years." This book is filled with history of interest not only to Nebraskans but to all Americans. There is running through Mr. Luckey's book a profound belief in and devotion to the American traditional system. Some very interesting political matters are related. I am sure that many will find, as I found, that Mr. Luckey's book is worthwhile reading.

THE SOIL BANK PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE PORTLAND EVENING EXPRESS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last Saturday the Portland Evening Express, of Portland, Maine, printed an editorial setting forth the merits of the soil-bank program. The editorial particularly referred to the contribution a soil-bank program would make to the conservation of wildlife, timber, and water resources. Quoting from the National Wildlife Federation, the editorial states:

> The stage can be set for a well-rounded program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation with benefits that would accrue to the general public as well as to the farmer under the soil-bank plan.

Because all of us are in general agreement as to the worth of such a soil-bank program, it is my hope that we can still enact within the very near future a soil-bank program which will prove to be of substantial benefit to the agricultural community and to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial entitled "The Soil Bank," which I have cited above, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> One of the merits of the soil-bank proposal made by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson has received scant attention in the debates, such as they were, and in the press. It has generally been the thought that taking land out of cultivation would

decrease production, as it would; but there is something else that is good in the plan.

The National Wildlife Federation declares that the soil-bank program could become the greatest boon to farm game restoration ever devised by the Government. Previous Federal payments to farmers for conservation practices have been rather narrowly restricted to erosion control and soil management phases. In some instances, wildlife, timber, and water resources have been neglected or even abused under subsidization by the Federal Government with agricultural conservation payments. Under the new proposal, says the Federation, "the stage can be set for a well-rounded program of soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation with benefits that would accrue to the general public as well as to the farmer under the soil-bank plan."

That seems to make sense. There might come many areas that eventually would become forested, and many of them might provide the windbreaks that could promote not only more beauty and comfort for the farm family, but might even lessen the danger of dust storms. It ought to be recalled that President Roosevelt early in his administration suggested a vast tree-planting program out on the flat plains, a program to be paid for out of Federal funds which in those days were by some considered inexhaustible. His proposal was treated with derision, but it had no trifling amount of commonsense behind it. Though in a smaller way, the soil-bank plan could prove a boon in almost every way to the farmer, and even while it defends against the piling up of additional surpluses.

The New York Times, Friday, quoted sources close to the White House as predicting that President Eisenhower will veto the farm bill which the Congress, playing politics in an election year, crammed through, and will go directly to the people via radio and television next Thursday to explain why he had to veto the bill.

If those sources are correct, the soil-bank section of the measure will suffer veto as well as the features that the President and Secretary Benson deplore, for it is impossible to pick and choose out of an entire act of Congress. That is inescapable. That being so, the National Wildlife Federation and the general public can but feel aggrieved at a Congress which has yielded to politics what it owed to the Nation.

CONDITION OF THE BUDGET

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release I have prepared about the condition of the budget be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART today called to the attention of the Senate figures bearing out his prediction that the administration probably will balance the budget and show a surplus for this fiscal year.

The Senator based his remarks on information contained in a memorandum released today by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—a memorandum prepared by the committee staff from information contained in the publication Economic Indicators for April.

Senator CAPEHART quoted the following two paragraphs from the memorandum:

"1. Reports through mid-April indicate that the Federal budget will show an administrative surplus of about $2 billion and a cash surplus of perhaps $4 billion for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. These committee staff estimates represent increases in receipts of about $3 billion over estimates in the January budget, which were reaffirmed in February by the Secretary of the Treasury. Expenditures may be about $1 billion higher (due mainly to handling CCC payments inside the budget rather than by sale of notes to commercial banks).

"2. For the fiscal year 1957, the surplus will probably be larger than estimated in the January budget unless: (a) business conditions deteriorate, or (b) legislation increases expenditures significantly more than estimated."

"These figures bear out what I have been anticipating and predicting for some time," Senator CAPEHART said. "This, of course, is a healthy sign and reflects the institution of improved administrative procedures which have made possible a balanced budget and a surplus in our Government finances for the first time in many years.

"I congratulate those responsible and express the sincere hope that the picture in 1957 and in the years ahead will be even brighter," Senator CAPEHART said.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE NEGRO'S DECLARATION OF INTENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Rev. J. W. Hayes, president of the Missionary Baptist State Convention of Kansas, and pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, of Wichita, Kans., forwarded to me an article written on April 3, 1956, by Rev. Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, and pastor of the Olivet Baptist Church, Chicago, Ill. The article is entitled "The Negro's Declaration of Intention."

Dr. Jackson prepared this article after conferring with Negro citizens from all walks of life in all parts of the country. After getting the views of these people, together with his own impressions, he wrote this statement.

Inasmuch as Dr. Jackson is one of the outstanding leaders of the Negro race, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION

1. At all times, we intend to support the Federal Constitution, to obey the laws of the land, to avoid contempt of courts, and to respect the judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and to always abide by the same.

2. Whatever is said or done against the United States of America by enemies, foreign or domestic; we will ever oppose with all of our heart, mind, body, soul, and strength.

3. We intend to continue to teach our children that this Nation is a great free republic of law and order, with a system of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And any person who disobeys the laws of the land and teaches others to do so, is a declared enemy of this Nation, and is working for its overthrow; and hence, does not deserve the right of free participation in the Nation's life, and is unworthy of the security that the country gives, and is subject to the penalties of the law. We shall also teach our children that this Nation under God, was founded in the spirit of justice, freedom, and due regard for moral law, and cannot survive without remaining true to its foundation principles.

4. We intend to participate in the total cultural life of the Nation, both for personal growth and development, and for the further progress of the country itself.

5. We intend always, to cherish and to give thanks for those natural endowments and special gifts that have made our race great; and pledge all of our talents and resources in the building of a better social order and a more democratic world.

6. In spite of the doctrine of the segregationist, we shall always believe that the basic quality of real distinction is character, not color; and the stature of a person is determined by the power of his mind, the purity of his heart, and the highest possible dedication of his life.

7. We intend to crusade against all the evils in our society that are designed to poison creative human relationships, and to crush the constructive growth of human personality, and to fight against the false doctrine which claims that some men are by origin, birth, and nature, superior to others.

8. While we shall recognize a need for the patience that accompanies growth, we intend at all times to reject that doctrine of gradualism which implies that the established laws of the land should be gradually applied, and gradually obeyed, in order to respect the unjust traditions of men, and to give free reign and honor to destructive prejudices.

9. We intend to take every legal step to employ every constructive measure, and to cooperate with every group of loyal Americans in the struggle to preserve all of the Nation's ideals, and to overcome every eco-

nomic, political, and cultural stumbling block that hinders the further progress of this great republic.

10. With love for our Nation, good will toward all, utter devotion to the Federal Constitution, and undying faith in God; we intend to continue our struggle for the complete victory of freedom on every front, and the preservation of the soul of the Nation whatever the cost. And if we are slain by the forces of oppression before our high purpose is achieved, we pray that we shall sleep under the shadows of the flag that we love, and our sacred dust shall be a silent testimony and a lasting memorial to our eternal quest for justice, peace, and good will.

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for 20 years, Lowell Mason, a member of the Federal Trade Commission, has given an annual luncheon on the opening day of the baseball season. Yesterday, at the luncheon, there were in attendance members of the courts, members of the executive branch of the Government, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the House of Representatives. At the luncheon, Lowell Mason said what I think is a very beautiful grace, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the grace was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWELL MASON'S GRACE

Our Father, Who shall say that those who make and those who administer our laws may serve without Thy help.

And who shall say they may receive it, except they be simple, gentle and humble, becoming as little children.

For no nation can be truly great whose servants do not have something childlike in their lives.

We must renew our youth with simple joys that re-create the jaded mind and revive the burdened soul.

This, we seek to do, here at this table where the armaments of life are absent.

Grant us this day the saving touch of friendship, for in times of conflict, friendship is the quality that keeps open the lines of communication. May this happy noontime help to refill the reservoirs of our spirit, give us courage greater than our fears and strength more adequate to our tasks.

Bless and guide our President and all who direct and lead our Nation that it may carry out Thy purpose. Amen.

THE LONG-RANGE APPROACH TO MEDICAL LEARNING

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the health of our people is the most important resource belong to the United States. Unless men, women, and children are protected from the ravages of disease, our entire Nation is poor indeed. Few Members of Congress have been more conscientious and diligent in advocating a sound research and medical program to safeguard the health of Americans than the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

In the April 21, 1956, issue of the Saturday Review, Senator SMITH has written a cogent and effective article proposing that $1 billion be spent to improve our knowledge of disease and in the means of preventing it. I doubt if anyone could read her impressive argument without being convinced by it.

So that all Members of the Senate may be enlightened by the excellent article written by the senior Senator from Maine, I ask unanimous consent that the article by the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH, entitled "Billion-Dollar Prescription", from the April 21 issue of the Saturday Review, be reprinted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We human beings act strangely. With the exception of our moral and spiritual values, the obviously most important thing to us is life, our own life and the lives of our dear ones and our friends. Yet we don't act that way. We pay little attention to our health. We take our health for granted. We don't get concerned about it until we have lost part of it. And sometimes that is too late.

Here in America last year we spent $10 billion for cocktails and other spirituous liquors. We spent $5 billion for tobacco. We spent $264 million for chewing gum. But when I advocated on the floor of the United States Senate that we spend an extra $200 million a year for the next 5 years on the better care of our health, some people were shocked.

"How could you possibly spend that much money?" these people have asked. "Why $200 million a year for 5 years is $1 billion!" Indeed it is. One billion. Forty-nine billions less than our drinking bill during those same 5 years. Twenty-four billions less than our smoking bill. More than $250 million less than our bill for chewing gum.

Having made that comparison, I ask my questioners a question:

"Is $1 billion really a huge sum to spend to help protect and perhaps prolong 165 million American lives?"

I think most people will agree that it is not. And here is my prescription:

1. For medical research, spend $500 million.
2. For medical research facilities, spend $150 million.
3. For assistance to medical education, spend $350 million.

I believe that my prescription is unique in one very important respect. It is long-range medicine, something that we in this country have never attempted before.

As I am not a doctor, or even a nurse, I may be suspected of snap diagnosis. This, however, is not the case. I have been concerned with medical research for a long time. I do want to acknowledge, though, that my thinking was crystallized by an editorial in a great Maine newspaper, the Bangor Daily News. The title the editorial writer chose was "How About $1 Billion for Health?"

The most thorough study to date of the impact of illness upon our national economy was made in a 6-month-long investigation by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1953 and 1954. I have leaned heavily upon my readings of those hearings in reaching my own conclusions. More recently, criticism of inadequate Federal support for medical research has come from the distinguished reports of the Hoover Commission. In these reports there is a recurrent plea for a 5-year program. I am frank to state that the arguments of the Commission have had a great influence upon me. But the detailed dosage that follows is my own formula.

1. MEDICAL RESEARCH

At present the research and training programs of the National Institutes of Health have a current budget of approximately $100 million a year. I would double this budget, making it $200 million a year, an added 5-year cost of $500 million.

Perhaps I should explain, for the benefit of those who are not so close to Government as I am, that the National Institutes of Health together make up the foremost research agency of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They have extensive laboratories of their own, probably the finest laboratories in the world, certainly the best Government laboratories anywhere. But two-thirds of their funds are spent in support of research and training in non-Federal medical institutions. In this extramural research and training each institute (there are seven—cancer, heart, mental health, arthritis and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and blindness, dental, and microbiological) is aided by a National Advisory Council. Council members are citizens outstanding in medical science, education, and public affairs. They review all applications for grants and make recommendations on these to the Surgeon General, who in his turn requests appropriations from Congress.

Historically, the Councils have been hampered by our system of annual appropriations. Frequently they have not been able to attract the most qualified men to short-term jobs. And many research projects have been turned down because their continuance over the necessary span of time could not be guaranteed.

The more fundamental research becomes—and all the experts agree that it is fundamental (sometimes called pure) research we need above all else—the less predictable is the time involved. Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee early in 1956 reminded us, for instance, that 33 years passed between (a) the time that the pancreas was found to contain the secret of diabetes and (b) the time when the secret was identified as insulin. Would anyone today begrudge the money spent in hunting down that elusive chemical which, when finally discovered, saved millions of lives?

By making $500 million more available to the National Institutes of Health, I do not claim to solve the problem of basic research. But I do feel that the Institutes would be given a degree of flexibility in supporting long-range studies. It seems pertinent to note at this point that long-range investigation means most in the little-understood metabolic diseases which have their worst crippling effects in our growing proportion of older citizens.

2. MEDICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Early this year Senators LISTER HILL and STYLES BRIDGES introduced a bill to provide $90 million over the next 3 years to match construction grants for medical research facilities in medical schools, hospitals, and private foundations in all parts of the country. The Senate passed the bill unanimously, and the measure is now before the House. Under my 5-year prescription, I would extend this 3-year proposal to cover 5 years at the same annual rate of $30 million—a total of $150 million.

3. MEDICAL EDUCATION AND ASSISTANCE

Senator HILL also introduced, together with a dozen other Senators, another bill to provide $250 million to match grants for construction of medical-school buildings. This bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association and almost unanimously by medical school deans. I would increase this appropriation by $20 million a year—from $50 million to $70 million—for a 5-year total of $350 million. That total approximates two estimates made by the National Fund for Medical Education (of which Herbert Hoover is honorary president) regarding the needs of the Nation's medical schools.

My billion-dollar prescription is now complete.

I admit that $1 billion may appear to be a large amount for taxpayers to carry in addition to the burden they carry at present. But I call your attention to the fact that the American people unhesitantly footed a 1954 bill of $1,700,000,000 for research on military weapons alone. This is eight-and-one-half times the annual rate I propose for medical research expansion. May I point out that our national defense and our national security are no stronger than our national health, on which our Federal Government's research spending is less than 1 percent of the national budget?

Compare the current $100 million research and training budget of the National Institutes of Health with the $90 million appropriated at the last session of Congress for research activities in the Department of Agriculture. Add to this $90 million the sum of $250 million which is paid out to farmers for soil conservation. I do not want to imply that I am not heartily in favor of greatly expanded agricultural research. I know, of course, that much of such research benefits us in our studies of the diseases of man. And I have always supported farm-research activities. But I think it is about time this country brought research on human lives up to the level of research on animals and plants.

I referred earlier to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the impact of disease on the national economy. The committee found that four diseases alone—heart, cancer, tuberculosis, and arthritis—have resulted in an annual loss of 370 million man-days of work and that the annual cost to the Nation from all illnesses is roughly equivalent to the total income-tax revenue, or $30 billion a year. Alongside that enormous loss, my proposed expenditures of $200 million a year would seem a very modest investment.

Would it be a sound investment for a banker?

Over the last decade alone medical research has added 5 full years to the life expectancy of the average American. We all know something of the wonders of penicillin, streptomycin, isoniazid, cortisone, and a host of other battlers against disease. These miraculous products of medical research, along with new surgical techniques and blood plasma, have brought about these percentage reductions in the death rates of some of the major killers and cripplers:

	Percent
Influenza	77
Appendicitis	69
Acute rheumatic fever	66
Syphilis	56
Tuberculosis	50
Pneumonia	50
Kidney diseases	43

Now let us translate this into economic terms. The National Office of Vital Statistics reported that in 1954 approximately 350,000 Americans under the age of 65 died of cancer and heart disease alone. This is greater than the total of Americans who lost their lives in the Armed Forces during the Second World War and the Korean war together. Remember that those wars last not 1 year but approximately 7 years.

Those 350,000 deaths of 1954 occurred, as I have stated, among people under 65, people in their productive years who otherwise would have been at work, earning money, producing goods and services, and consuming as well. Moreover, these people would have been paying taxes which would have gone, in part, to pay for research which would have helped to preserve their own and other lives.

In an earlier year—the year 1951—a study of federally aided rehabilitation revealed that 8,000 people who were returned to work had been on public assistance prior to rehabilitation, at a cost of $5,700,000 annually. The cost of their rehabilitation was $4 million. These people are now employed. Instead of being tax-consumers they are taxpayers.

When we consider that chronic diseases account for 88 percent of the disability of the approximately 2 million physically handicapped people in the United States, we can see that the economic benefits to be derived from medical research on disabling diseases would be vast. The research would more than pay for itself.

I have been asked whether my billion dollar prescription for our national health amounts to socialized medicine. I have publicly and privately stated for many, many years that I am opposed to socialized medicine. The 5-year program that I propose would have no aspects of socialized medicine. It is in keeping with recommendations and endorsements made by the Hoover Commission, the American Medical Association, medical-school deans, and such outstanding doctors as Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who treated President Eisenhower.

Perhaps because he is the heart doctor of the President, Dr. White's own words have a great dramatic and impressive meaning to the American people on the need for expansion of medical research. Dr. White has pointed out that current heart research is severely limited because of lack of money. Testifying before a Senate committee, as a member of the advisory council of the National Heart Institute, Dr. White said he had been forced to use his own money for research because there were not sufficient Government funds.

His was only one of a tremendous backlog of worthy projects, running into millions of dollars, for which the advisory councils have no money. As long as this backlog exists qualified people are being denied the opportunity to save life.

If one of the Armed Forces can build up a 25-year supply of hamburgers, and if another can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on a fighter plane that could not fly, I say we can afford to appropriate funds to give our children and our children's children the best in medicine.

STUDY OF 19TH SOVIET PARTY CONFERENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, several months before Stalin died, the Research Institute of America, Inc., made an extensive study of the 19th Soviet Party Congress. My colleagues may remember that I brought this study to the attention of the Senate, as well as to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations. This study caused considerable comment in the Congress and around the country. The same Institute, under the executive direction of Mr. Leo Cherne, has recently completed another such study entitled "Toughest Challenge Yet in New Soviet Strategy." This study, like its predecessor, is an instructive analysis of the new challenge facing us. The fact that it is frightening as well, makes it all the more imperative that we take it seriously.

I would certainly welcome the comments of the State Department upon the analysis which has been made by the Research Institute of America. I regret to say that the Department did not give us a response to a similar analysis and study which I presented in the Senate about a year and a half ago. I can think of no subject matter which is more important than the one to which I refer.

Furthermore, the Research Institute of America is an accredited, respected, acknowledged, competent research establishment in the field of foreign affairs. The study which I bring to the attention of my colleagues is one which I think will bear their closest examination. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that this study, as it appeared in a special report to the members of the Research Institute of America, Inc., be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGHEST CHALLENGE YET IN NEW SOVIET STRATEGY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—These are the hard facts: economic and military strength of the Moscow-directed one-third of the globe is rising steadily. The new Soviet leaders' domestic and foreign policies are far more subtle and shrewd than those of Stalin. Most important, the new Soviet policies have been astonishingly successful. It adds up to this: right now, we and our allies are losing the battle against world communism.)

For a bird's eye view of how Soviet strategy threatens United States supply of key raw materials today, take a look at the map on pages 6 and 7 of this report. Then, ask yourself these questions:

How did this happen? Which events are really responsible for this state of affairs? Do we know what the Soviet Union plans to do in the coming months? Is there still time to thwart the Kremlin's plans? How can the West prevent the present military stalemate from becoming a checkmate?

Here are the conclusions of the Research Institute's experts who, with Harry Schwartz, the New York Times specialist on Russia, have been closely following developments behind the Iron Curtain—the shifting events which culminated in the new policy statements proclaimed at the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow this February.

The Soviet leadership

When Stalin ruled the Soviet empire with an iron fist, Khrushchev and Bulganin helped execute his policies—and his opponents. When the aging Stalin conducted Soviet foreign policy in full battle dress, Khrushchev and Bulganin were among his toughest lieutenants. But Stalin's rigidities during his last years resulted in strong anti-Communist countermoves by the West. So, in order to weaken Western resistance to the Communist advance, the new Soviet leaders have gone back to the more flexible—and effective—policies that Stalin himself used in the 1930's, while pretending to repudiate Stalin's policies and actually destroying his place in Soviet mythology.

Chalking up Communist gains in India, Indonesia, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, the new Soviet leaders have also largely resolved the domestic problem of Stalin's succession, and they have done so without wrecking the Stalinist system and without an excess of bloodshed and purges. Only one of the original contenders for Stalin's throne, Beria, had to be shot, and only two, Malenkov and Molotov, had to be humiliated publicly.

Although a muted struggle for power in the Soviet hierarchy must continue until all possible opposition to a single dictator has been silenced, for all practical purposes Nikita S. Khrushchev—First Secretary of the Communist Party—is Stalin's successor today.

Despite the talk in Moscow about "collective leadership," the fact is that Khrushchev controls the reins of power. He alone in the Soviet Union today stands above criticism and need not acknowledge past mistakes (all errors can now be blamed on

Stalin and Beria, who are safely dead), even though at least one colossal Khrushchev boner—the enormous program to plow and plant 75 million acres of grain in arid parts of Siberia—proved to be an expensive folly last year.

Khrushchev, like Stalin in the early days, is busy accruing personal prestige and downgrading possible opponents while putting his own followers into positions of power. He does not yet have the enormous prestige that Stalin enjoyed after he led Russia to victory against Hitler. Khrushchev may not have the time to win a comparable position of absolute supremacy—he is over 60, Stalin was well under 50 when control slipped from Lenin's dying hands. Khrushchev, unlike Stalin, has to listen to—even if not heed—the members of his "team" before making decisions. But Khrushchev has the tremendous advantage of Stalin's experience and can therefore avoid the foreign policy blunders of his predecessor while working for absolute dictatorial control.

Khrushchev—unlike Stalin—must take notice of the interests of key groups who control great power levers in the state, particularly the army. The unprecedented elevation of Marshal Zhukov to the top dozen of Soviet rulers is the most vivid proof. Stalin was far too aware of the possibility of a military coup d'etat to give such stature to a military man. Today, the promotion of Zhukov to a high-party post assures solid military support of the regime; also, some of Zhukov's immense popularity, won in wartime, now rubs off on the ruling clique. But Zhukov's promotion puts him too close to the throne for Khrushchev's comfort—if anything goes wrong.

Khrushchev—limited dictator

To sum up: Khrushchev rules Russia today, but only with the advice and consent of his immediate colleagues in the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The members of this body give every evidence of understanding that an out-and-out battle among them could destroy the whole Soviet power position as well as endanger their own lives. There are still rivalries and disagreements, but these are now being subordinated to the task of increasing worldwide Communist power.

Should Khrushchev die, should Soviet foreign policy be forced to suffer a major setback, the quiescent struggle for Stalin's mantle could flare up again, as it did in the spring of 1953. But for the time being, there is stability—a tremendous asset to the Soviet state.

Within Russia: less unrest

One of the great assets of the West after World War II was the restlessness and resentment of the stanchest anti-Communists of all: the people of Russia who live under the boot of totalitarianism. A Western policy of strength kept alive the spark of freedom in the Russian people. That spark may now be going out because of the inertia of the West. Should it expire, the West will have lost its army of allies who live on the enemy's home ground.

Why has this happened? First, at Geneva last summer, whatever the intent of the Western leaders, the impression was given to the whole world, including the people behind the Iron Curtain, that we actually believed in the possibility that the Russian leaders wanted to coexist with us. The people most discouraged by the spurious spirit of Geneva were the anti-Communists behind the Russian curtain.

Second, Stalin's successors have realized that accumulated pressure under a sewer cover can blow the lid sky high. To lessen the pressure under their regime, they have gone part of the way toward meeting some of the basic grievances of the Russian people.

The new leaders have sharply increased peasants' incomes by raising prices paid for farm produce, including grain, livestock products, potatoes, etc. They have increased the supply of food and consumer goods for the population, going so far even as to buy large quantities of meat and butter abroad to make up for deficient home production. They have given greater priority to housing construction. And they have cut the average workweek down to 46 hours, with further reduction promised.

They have curbed the power of the secret police and executed some of the highest police leaders. They have loosened the shackles on the intellectuals so that writers can write somewhat more freely and scientists can communicate more easily with foreign scientists.

They have promised a number of major additional concessions in the next year or two: the end of tuition fees in high schools and colleges, higher pay for the lowest paid workers, higher pensions for the millions of aged pensioners whose government payments now are so completely inadequate that even men and women of 75 and 80 must work to avoid starvation.

The upper ranks of the Soviet bureaucracy have been given a device to permit them to pass on their superior status to their children. This is the system of boarding schools—Soviet Etons and Harrows—which Khrushchev announced will be set up to train the Soviet leaders of tomorrow.

An effort is being made to heal the deep wounds left by Stalin's purges of the 1930's. Many of the victims are to be rehabilitated, and where such rehabilitation is posthumous, suitable recompense will presumably be made to the victims' surviving families. The sickening adulation of Stalin and the most obvious falsification of history are to be ended; at least, that is the promise.

All this adds up to a considerable revolution for a period of 3 years. It has not been accomplished without cost, including a substantial inflationary pressure which is causing Khrushchev great concern. The economic concessions—which still leave the Soviet standard of living and the degree of freedom in the Soviet Union far from satisfactory to its own people—have probably strengthened the regime at home on balance, but they raise the question of whether the population will not demand more. The problem will be particularly acute in the next few years when the Soviet leaders expect to be able to reduce high prices only slowly. A great deal depends on what the West will do to increase the internal pressures against the Red regime. Strong opposition to Soviet moves in Asia and the Middle East would help to reactivate a spirit of resistance inside the Iron Curtain.

Red military strength

Stalin's successors have essentially ended American nuclear monopoly and created what is for all practical purposes a military stalemate. In the past 3 years they have produced powerful hydrogen bombs, and long-distance jet bombers capable of delivering such bombs to American cities. They hint, and possibly not without some justification, that they are ahead of the United States in developing long-range guided and ballistic missiles. These are historic accomplishments. They have fundamentally changed the world balance of power as against what it was when Stalin died in March 1953. In these accomplishments lies much of the explanation for the Soviet leaders' present genuine confidence.

Red diplomacy ascending

Stalin's successors have made deep inroads among the neutral nations of the world. Khrushchev and Bulganin's trip to India, Burma, and Afghanistan raised Soviet prestige greatly in those countries. The swap of Czechoslovakia arms for Egyptian cotton, plus the all-out Kremlin support for the Arab nations in their dispute with Israel, have greatly heightened Soviet influence throughout the strategic and oil-rich Middle East. Pakistan, a key link to the free world chain of alliances in Asia, has been softened up by trade offers from Russia and sweet words from Communist China. Marshal Tito's regime in Yugoslavia, once clearly an ally of the free world because of Stalin's excommunication of Tito, has been nudged out of the Western camp closer to the Soviet bloc. The result of these and similar measures has been that the prestige of the West, particularly the United States, has plummeted in many parts of the world while Moscow's and Peiping's influence has soared.

It is clear even from the brief recital above that we now face a much more dangerous and wily foe than we did in Stalin's last years. His successors, on his passing, took a penetrating look at the legacy he had left. They identified the weak spots in their positions at home and abroad, and took drastic action to revise their policy accordingly. All this has resulted in a new chapter of modern history to which Western policy has not adequately adjusted itself.

THE COMMUNIST PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

At the 20th Communist Party Congress in Moscow in February 1956, Khrushchev and company unveiled their plans for exploiting the new world situation for their own benefit. The long-range Communist strategy is now based on the following premises:

No major nuclear war is likely for the foreseeable future. This is the meaning of Khrushchev's new dictum that there is no "fatal inevitability" of war. Russia intends to keep militarily strong, and its leaders do not exclude the possibility of little wars which might grow into big ones. Soviet leaders now base their plans on the assumption that a military stalemate exists between them and the free world, and that therefore, other weapons—political and economic in the main—must be relied on to attain their goals.

Soviet progress to date

The economic power of the Soviet bloc will grow very rapidly during the foreseeable future, increasing the Communist potential for victory. This rapid growth is already exerting a tremendous magnetic effect upon the underdeveloped countries now searching for quick roads to industrialization. Communist influence will grow in the underdeveloped countries if the Communist nations can show the ability to increase production, raise standards of living, health, and education, and to modernize formerly backward areas. You should know that particular importance is being attached to North Korea where, with great cooperation from other Communist countries, Moscow is trying to create a showplace of economic recovery intended to contrast with inflation-ridden South Korea. Should the plan succeed, it could exercise tremendous influence over all Asia.

The Communist confidence in their ability to grow rapidly in the future is largely based on the beanstalking of the Soviet economy in the past 10 years. Perhaps the most dramatic evidence—though not entirely pertinent to the future—is the record of the Soviet production increase between 1945 and 1955 as shown below:

Commodity	Unit	1945	1955
Coal	Million metric tons.	149.3	390.1
Petroleum	do	19.4	70.7
Electricity	Billion kilowatt-hours.	43.2	170.2
Pig iron	Million metric tons.	8.9	33.3
Steel	do	12.3	45.2
Cotton cloth	Billion meters	1.6	5.9
Leather shoes	Million pairs	64.5	297.4

The expansion shown in this table cannot be sustained since it was the result of very special conditions. It was easier to rebuild war damaged plants after 1945 than it is to build new ones from scratch. The Russians moved billions of dollars worth of machinery and raw materials from Eastern Europe and Manchuria to their own factories. The level of productivity in the early postwar years was so low that it was comparatively easy to raise it rapidly. Yet, even after allowance has been made for such special factors, it is clear that an impressive job of industrial reconstruction and expansion was accomplished in Russia this past decade.

New Russian economic goals

The Soviet leadership fully realizes that their country has tremendous reserves of untapped raw materials, particularly in the area beyond the Urals. In the past few years they have found extensive deposits of iron ore, coal, petroleum, bauxite, rare metals, uranium, and the like. The great rivers of Siberia have an enormous electric power potential. All these vast resources are scheduled to be exploited in the years immediately ahead. The final goal is not only to outproduce the United States but also to turn out more steel, coal, electricity, and the like, per capita, than this country.

Of course, these ambitious goals are set in comparison with present United States output figures. They ignore the further expansion which will inevitably occur in this country. However, even in these terms, the advances which Soviet leaders are seeking are impressive (same units as above):

United States 1955 actual	Commodity	Soviet Russia		
		1955 actual	1960 goal	1965 probable goal [1]
448	Coal	390.1	593	700
332	Petroleum	70.7	135	200
623	Electricity	170.2	320	600
70.9	Pig iron	33.3	53	70
106	Steel	45.2	68.3	90

[1] Research Institute estimates based on Soviet statements.

The essential point of this table is that by 1965 Soviet leaders hope to come very close to the output levels now prevailing in the United States. This means that unless we can maintain an equal rate of expansion the gap between the two economies will have been narrowed significantly within these next 10 years.

Moreover, since the great bulk of Soviet production goes for capital equipment and arms—not for passenger cars and other consumer durable goods—they expect to surpass the United States in machinery output earlier than 1965. So far as armaments go, of course, the maintenance of a high level of preparedness will be far less burdensome on the Soviet economy when and if it produces seventy to ninety million tons of steel, than is true now.

Of course there is no certainty that the Soviet leaders will reach the indicated goals by 1960 and 1965. They are counting on a substantial increase in productivity through the widespread introduction of automation, and on an ability to continue giving heavy industry a higher priority than consumer goods. The odds are that rapid Soviet economic growth will continue.

The Soviet leaders' perspectives go beyond their own country to the Communist bloc as a whole—a bloc which now embraces over one-third of mankind. For the longer pull, Moscow hopes that Communist China will become one of the world's great economic powers. Already the addition to Communist power provided by Eastern Europe and Communist Asia is not negligible, and the Communists intend it shall grow as the following table shows (same units as above):

United States, Britain, France, West Germany 1955 actual	Commodity	Total Soviet bloc 1955 actual [1]	Total Soviet bloc 1960 goal [1]
862.5	Coal	830	1,255
336	Petroleum	85	163
823	Electricity	240	425
160.2	Steel	60	91

[1] Research Institute estimates.

Soviet strategy against the West

The Communist leaders believe that the phenomenal economic progress of the free world, particularly the United States, is nearing its end, and a major capitalist depression is in the offing. Khrushchev ended his analysis of the current state of world capitalism with the declaration that "capitalism is steadily moving towards new economic and social upheavals." If the difficulties they hope for come, the Soviet Union and its allies will know full well how to take advantage of the economic, social, and political disorganization they would produce.

It does not matter that Soviet hopes for a full-scale depression are doomed to disappointment—at least as far as the United States is concerned. Several of the economies of Western Europe continue to show a slower rate of economic progress; even more significant is the fact that they are far more vulnerable to the possibility of recession than is the United States. And Russia is no longer betting blindly on the inevitability of an economic collapse in the West.

Soviet leaders now regret Stalin's earlier adventures—such as the Korean war—which forced the West to rearm. This rearmament, they have now come to believe, is the main reason why the depression has not come about. In part, the Soviet campaign for disarmament now is motivated by the belief that any substantial decline of Western arms production could really mean a collapse of Western economies; at the same time they argue publicly that for them a decline in arms would be helpful in freeing resources for developing their economy.

The result of this caution is that Communist theorists have decided that world capitalism—meaning the United States and Western Europe—has a fatal weakness aside from the possibility of a full-scale depression. This is the United States and Western dependence on imported raw materials from Asia, Africa, and South America. A writer in Pravda recently pointed out that well over half of all the free world's reserves of such vital resources as oil, iron ore, manganese, chrome, tin, diamonds, cobalt, copper, bauxite, uranium, lithium, graphite, natural rubber, and other major raw materials is to be found in the underdeveloped countries. In the Communist view, any tactic which tends to cut the United States and Western Europe off from these raw materials sources strikes at the real foundations of Western strength. Also, the narrower the raw material base available to the Western World the narrower the market for the West's manufactured products and the more intense the rivalries of western countries for the available sources and markets. It is from this reasoning that the current, and so far effective, Communist propaganda and aid campaign has proceeded in the underdeveloped countries.

On the basis of all these factors, Communist leaders now believe that, by using a varied series of tactics, they can conquer world capitalism without exposing themselves unduly to the risk of an all-out nuclear war. With greatly expanded resources at their disposal, the Communists now are ready to play for the long pull as they have never done before, taking temporary disadvantages in stride if that be necessary. Economic, psychological, and political warfare—all closely coordinated—will be stepped up. The objective will be to wreck all western political and military alliances, weaken or destroy political and economic links among free nations, incite wars or near-wars wherever possible, and create Communist or Communist-dominated governments wherever possible.

The targets and pattern of this intensified Communist onslaught on the sources of our strategic raw materials throughout the world are dramatically illustrated in the map which you will find in the centerfold (pp. 6 and 7) of this report.

The new economic war

Economic weapons to be used against us include:

Communist offers of greatly increased trade to countries which drop the embargo on strategic exports to the Communist bloc.

Offers of Soviet aid in industrialization—in the form of technicians, know-how, and capital goods in return for domestic agricultural and raw material surpluses. Available, too, will be Communist loans on easy terms with long repayment periods and interest at 2 percent or less. Atomic energy will spearhead this aspect of the Soviet offensive. Reactors, uranium, and atomic know-how will be offered to every underdeveloped country that will play ball with Moscow. Egypt and Yugoslavia have already accepted such offers.

No country is going to get Soviet aid as charity. Along with the technicians will come the ready crew of agents, spies, and propagandists. Every gift grant will be tied to Soviet strategy. The difference is that the strings on Soviet aid are unobtrusive while the reasons for United States aid are ventilated in the Halls of Congress, in the columns of the press, and in the redtaped chambers of bureaucracy. Moreover, we often don't get legitimate credit for our aid, while local Communists in recipient countries make sure that every incoming Soviet brick sounds like a housing development.

Offers of stable markets in Communist areas at prices guaranteed for long terms to countries having particularly valuable raw materials. This tactic will be particularly attractive to underdeveloped countries now enjoying the high prices of the present boom period, but fearful of a possible bust around the corner.

Where politically desirable, and taking the other extreme, the Communists will be ready to dump other key commodities at prices well below comparable western levels. Cost of production will be ignored in such dumping where the political prize is important enough.

Disorganization of some international markets which is likely to result from American disposal of some agricultural surpluses—cotton almost immediately—will be used by the Communists to cement economic bonds with countries hurt by the American program. The Communist maneuvers with respect to Egyptian cotton and Burmese rice already illustrate these possibilities.

In all this, remember the great Communist advantage: the state has a free hand in disposing of its resources. Neither the necessity of making a profit nor the domestic needs of the people hamper the Kremlin's ability to engage in freewheeling economic warfare. In the past, the Soviet Union promised much, delivered little. But now we can expect fewer token deliveries, fewer empty promises. Instead, there will be genuine offers of long-term aid—with completion of delivery contingent on the continuation of a favorable attitude toward the Soviet Union, thus tying long-term apron strings to the U. S. S. R. Moscow puts such high priority on the political gains it expects to win from these tactics, that it will make delivery even at great cost. But Soviet resources are not

limitless, and the magnitude of what the Communists can do in this direction will grow only as their domestic production increases. Any sharp setback in their domestic economies—such as a major crop failure—would necessarily affect this campaign. But for the time being the outlook is for an indefinite and rapid expansion of this kind of economic warfare—starting, to be sure, from a very low present level of foreign trade and assistance.

The new political war

At the 20th party congress, Khrushchev acknowledged that: "there may be different roads to socialism. Rather than all countries being bound by the Soviet pattern, Moscow now calls for Communist united fronts with all leftists, Socialists, and the like all over the world."

This is not a new line, as some suppose, but the reactivation of one of Lenin's early policies. It was also used effectively by the Stalin regime during the "popular front" period of the late 1930's. For the most part, however, under Stalin even the slightest deviation from his line was denounced and severely punished. Notably, the powerful Socialist parties of Western Europe were denounced as Fascists, agents of the capitalists, etc., and where the Communists seized power in Eastern Europe, Socialists were among the first victims murdered or imprisoned. The result has been that this past decade the Socialist parties of West Europe, except in Italy, have been among the most important anti-Communist bulwarks.

Now Khrushchev has changed the line and is wooing the Socialists, inviting their leaders to Moscow, and loudly asserting that the important thing is the unity of all workers' parties. The immediate chief target is France, where the goal is the formation of a Communist-Socialist government which would take France out of NATO. But ultimately the campaign could have repercussions all over the world, from Japan to England, the Soviets hope, with leftist Socialists and Communists working together in far stronger force than the Communists could attain alone.

Some top Socialist leaders in Europe have already indicated they will not allow the wool to be pulled over their eyes. But there is less understanding of the true nature of communism among the leaders of the new Asian countries, such as India, Burma, and Indonesia, who are primarily socialistic in their orientation. Communist assurances that how a nation becomes Socialist is unimportant can be a potent force in bringing those countries closer to the Soviet Union. Addressing the British workers, the Soviet leaders take the position that past hostility to the Laborites was Beria's crime, and say in effect that Russia wants nothing more than a Labor Britain.

It should be noted that on this issue, the Soviet leaders have pretended to take a leaf from Tito's book. Actually, the policy is Lenin's but Khrushchev knows that countries like India prefer to think it's Tito's, hence this expedient camouflage—made possible by the fact that Tito has been urging such proposals for a year or more.

The new psychological war

The desegregation crisis in the Southern States has given the world Communist movement a giant propaganda handle which it has latched on to with its customary resourcefulness. Every new tension between Negroes and whites in the South is being publicized among the majority of the world's people who are colored. Needless to say, the extraordinary progress made by the Negro in the United States over the last 90 years and particularly in the most recent past, is virtually unknown among the nations being beset by Soviet propaganda. The result has already been a greater and greater hostility to the United States. To a lesser but still significant extent the similar struggle in South Africa is serving the Communist cause. And because the United States is a major buyer of South African uranium, diamonds, and other minerals, this country will be blamed more and more for not exerting economic pressure against the rulers of South Africa. The South African problem is a particularly potent propaganda weapon in India, because Indian natives of South Africa are among the victims of South Africa's policies.

SOVIET PROBLEMS AND WEAKNESSES

The picture painted above is not an encouraging one, but it is offset to some extent by the difficulties faced by the Communist leaders.

1. Soviet agriculture is still very sick. Khrushchev has staked his prestige on being able to just about double Soviet food production by 1960 through his virgin lands wheat program, his corn-hog program and other measures. Most of his program failed last year, but an extraordinarily good harvest in the Ukraine saved the day. He is now gambling that weather in Siberia will permit his virgin lands program to begin producing results this year. Another repetition of last year's drought there, plus a poorer harvest in the Ukraine, could shake even his position. But there is no foreseeable danger of widespread starvation. The Soviet Union has enough bread; what its people want are more meat and dairy products for a better quality diet.

2. Khrushchev's ambitious industrialization program for the next 5 years, plus his aid commitments to China, Eastern Europe, and such countries as India, are likely to strain the Soviet economy greatly. A tremendous capital-construction program must be carried out in the now unpopulated wastes of Siberia to achieve the production goals. Khrushchev is counting on major productivity gains, but he may soon find he cannot do all the things his program calls for and that he will have to cut back on some elements of his economic plans. Traditionally in such a situation the Communists have cut down consumer goods and investment in agriculture. But to do so again would raise serious problems of popular morale as well as throw more fuel on fires of domestic inflation. The pledge to raise low wage rates and low pensions will have to be fulfilled soon and will add appreciably to the gap between consumer demand and available goods.

3. The entire system of wages and salaries must be revised in order to raise work norms and to increase the pressure on workers and executives to do a good job. But any such wholesale revision in the wage and salary structure inevitably means stepping on many toes. Kaganovich has already said the changes must be made slowly, a sure tipoff of the Soviet leaders' fears on the matter.

4. The Chinese Communists have recently socialized their industry and trade and collectivized their agriculture with a speed that is without parallel, and so far with only relatively minor resistance. But as the full implications of this socialization are felt by the people affected, resistance may rise sharply. Peiping's demands on its people are sharpening as industrialization and its capital requirements are speeded up. There could be internal difficulties in China which would cause Peiping to turn to Moscow for more help—appeals that might well come at a time when Moscow's own resources are strained. As the Chinese hear about Soviet offers of assistance all over the world, some of them at least must wonder why there isn't more generous aid for China.

5. One weakness, not to be discounted, is the Kremlin's adherence to Communist dogma. For instance, after the 20th party congress, Khrushchev announced his intention of proceeding with the abolition of personal farm plots, even though these have proved to be much more productive per acre than the collective farms.

Here, realism is being ditched for dogma, a step which must be chalked up as a weakness of the system.

THE CHALLENGES TO THE UNITED STATES

On balance, it's difficult to be encouraging about the foreseeable future, even when the weaknesses of the Communist world are taken into account. However, the free world's great assets of wealth and freedom are still as important as ever. If they have recently been less effective than in the past, it is because our policy has not used our assets as ruthlessly, cleverly, and with the same willingness to sacrifice as the Communists have used theirs. To a large extent, the outcome will depend on the kind of policy Washington and its allies formulate in response to a whole range of sharpened challenges from the Kremlin.

1. Who will win the educational race? The Russians expect to overtake our economic superiority by producing more engineers, technicians, and scientists. This manpower challenge is already near the point of crisis. With a current shortage of engineers, we find fewer high schools teaching mathematics, physics, and so forth, so that fewer graduates are eligible for scientific study in the colleges. The vicious cycle finds fewer teachers available because the qualified men have found it more profitable to spend their time in industry.

The Russians, on the other hand, are concentrating their state-controlled educational system on producing technicians, to the neglect of other studies. The importance of their lead is sometimes exaggerated. Too many Russian technicians spend their time at paper work, and thus largely waste their training. Also, Russian technicians tend to overspecialize, thus making themselves obsolete when retooling and conversion are required. Nevertheless, Russian gains in the training of technicians make our own deficiencies seem appalling. In the immediate future, American businessmen will be asked by Washington to reverse the tide by releasing some of their best brains to instruct a new generation of scientists and technicians.

2. Who will win the economic race? We must resist the temptation to scoff at Russian hopes that their production will ever outstrip ours. There are clear warnings, both in the past and in the present:

The Russian hopes for a collapse of the United States economy are doomed to be disappointed. And yet, even a series of recessions, slowing down our growth, could be an invaluable aid to the Soviets during these next 10 years. The extent to which Communist plans have been realized in recent years definitely means that they can count on further sharp advances.

It may never become necessary for the Russians to fully match United States economic strength. The moment of historic peril will actually come much sooner: if and when the Russian workers' standard of living can be raised above that of the French and Italian working class. Our task really is to prevent even that much of a narrowing of the gap between the West and the Soviets.

Historically, the main challenge may well be whether or not we can continue to expand our own economy and those of our Western allies, maintain the well-being of business, provide new jobs for a growing population, increase investments for new industries and raise purchasing power to absorb more consumer goods.

3. Foreign trade and investment. We are already engaged in competition for trade ties with other countries. Foreign aid giveaways are not a sufficient answer to this challenge. Postwar gifts aimed at emergency stabilization did their job in preventing Communist capture of depressed and disillusioned countries. But for the long

haul, the pattern will have to be "trade not aid."

Here the challenge is who can offer the best terms, who can absorb more of the products that the underdeveloped countries want to sell—the state economy of Russia or the free economy of the West?

The Russians are free to use their maneuverability as a world weapon. Part of our problem is that domestic investment may well be more profitable and involve less risk during the critical years than investment in the underdeveloped areas. Look for increased Washington action along the lines of point 4 to meet the challenge of Russian bids. Also expect some increased Government regulation aimed at restraining American businessmen from competing with the economic interests of countries we are wooing, especially in the Middle East and Asia. Current legal requirements like the Buy-American Act and provisions for shipping foreign-aid goods in American bottoms may go by the board. In general, disparities between private business practices and the policies of the State Department will come in for a strong scrutiny—and this will be true regardless of which political party is in power.

4. Can Russia choke us off from vital raw materials? Clearer recognition of this Soviet policy (as pictured on the map in the center fold of this report) will bring a variety of responses from the United States. More attention will be given to stockpiling and to the development of substitute materials. But the main test will continue to be whether Americans are sufficiently adept at the international game to keep our lifelines open in the face of a 5-fold pincer action by the Russians:

Guerrilla warfare, as in the jungles of Malaya, whose tin and rubber we need.

Bribery, with gold or guns, as in the Middle East where oil is the prize.

Support of nationalist aspirations, as in North Africa, whose territory provides important military bases or impinges on commercial lanes for the West.

Endorsement of territorial claims—for example, to Kashmir and Goa, in the case of India which is the source of most of our manganese.

Political penetration through neutralism or popular front governments—techniques that have been cultivated in France, Italy, Indonesia, Ceylon, etc.

5. The need for domestic unity. The Russians are not abandoning any of their old weapons merely because they have devised new ones. They will continue to use the fifth column tactics of espionage and infiltration into Government agencies, unions, political parties, church groups, fraternal organizations, etc. The popular front tactic that proved so successful in the thirties has been dusted off again. Inside the United States, the Communists will seek every opportunity to enlarge and exploit new internal tensions like those in the South over integration. Part of the new challenge is whether or not our domestic disputes can be resolved quickly and with a minimum of violence.

6. Who will win the psychological war? The Kremlin's effort now is to identify Russians as blood-brothers of the Asians. They are utilizing history effectively—identifying the West with colonialism; reminding Asians that Russia only recently emerged from the status of an underdeveloped nation herself; stressing the United States exclusion of immigration under the McCarran Act, etc. These are keyed to immediate pressures felt by the Asians.

We have valid and persuasive answers. And yet, we have labored under a real handicap, and continue to do so. Washington's psychological warfare has emphasized appeals that are valued in our culture—freedom, respect for the individual, self-government, competition. All of these have—or will some day have—appeal. But we must adapt to the fact that the ambitions and needs of the people we are appealing to today are more basic and urgent. They are of necessity material. And, conditioned by centuries of authoritarian regimes, most of these underdeveloped nations cannot yet be expected to respond to the ideological appeal of Western democracies over the authoritarian call of the Russians. Ignorance abroad is a major Soviet asset, which they compound with their propaganda. As an illustration, India's first public opinion poll in West Bengal showed 31 percent thinking the United States was "willfully preparing for war" and only 2 percent thinking the Soviet was preparing.

7. Is time on the Kremlin's side? The Russians have reason to believe that the longer the current situation lasts, the more tempted people in many countries will be to accommodate themselves to a pattern that favors the Soviet. This trend has already started in Asia. Cambodia has broken her ties with the United States on the assumption that Red China's star is ascending. Great Britain has written off Formosa on the assumption that Chiang Kai-shek can't win. Even Pakistan, which the United States has helped at the price of increased Indian hostility, is interested in deals with Russia. Trade paves the way to political accommodation. Unless we can counter this trend, the danger is that our allies will drift into neutralism, and the neutrals will drift into a pro-Soviet orientation.

Washington and the free world are not without resources to oppose these challenges successfully. We're still far out front as an economic power; we have no designs on the well-being of other nations; we do not seek to impose our ideology on Asians.

These assets have not yet been brought to bear effectively in the war of resistance to Communist domination. Internal political considerations, party and regional interests, particular industry needs, have so far prevented a consistent national policy. Whether we can close ranks and intensify our resistance on a more organized basis is the fundamental challenge of our time, it is now clear.

8. Can the United States take the lead? The basis for a potentially powerful counter-offensive is sketched out in Bertram D. Wolfe's Six Keys to the Soviet System, published this month. Wolfe points out that we, not the Communists, are today the advocates of agrarian reform. We, not they, are the advocates of a genuine peace, with disarmament under full safeguards and controls. We, not they, are the champions of the rights and freedom of the worker—freedom to move, to change jobs, to organize, to assemble, to elect and control his own officials, to strike. It is we, not they, who support the most powerful loyalty in the modern world—nationalism—and who are the advocates of self-determination. "In short," says Wolfe, "the main weapons that the Bolsheviks thought they could use in the early days against the rest of the world—nationalism, labor rights, agrarian reform, abolition of poverty, an economy of abundance, anti-imperialism—are now in our hands."

It is up to us to use them.

LEASING OF INDIAN LANDS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last year Congress in its wisdom passed legislation allowing the Indian tribes of my State and other States to engage in 25-year leases. After nearly a year the regulations governing the issuing of these leases have been formulated by the Interior Department and tomorrow will appear in the Federal Register, and shortly thereafter will be available to all people who are interested. This step opens a broad new vista for the Indian, whose lands formerly have been restricted to his own use—a use which in many cases could not be utilized by the Indian. Now when the land is leased to another Indian or to a white man it will produce revenue for the tribal fund. Congress, in its constant efforts to make better the lives of our Indian brothers, can well feel proud of this accomplishment, and I know that as the years roll by and the lease moneys roll into the coffers of the Indian funds, the Indians, too, will thank us for our action of last year.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article published in the Arizona Republic of Sunday, April 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FIVE-YEAR LEASES PUT INDIANS IN SPOT TO BID FOR CAPITAL—MILLIONS POSSIBLE IN STATE

(By Gig Kneeland)

Vast free-enterprise developments on the Nation's 53 million acres of Indian lands are forecast as the result of new leasing regulations just announced by the Federal Government.

Agricultural and recreational improvements in Arizona alone could amount to many millions of dollars, it is believed.

Frederick M. Haverland, director of the Phoenix area Indian Office which supervises all reservations in Arizona, Utah, and Nevada except the Navaho, said first development under the long-term leasing law might be on the Colorado River Reservation near Parker.

Haverland's office is the Government's directing agency for some 8,700,000 acres of reservation lands in this State.

The huge Navaho Reservation, mostly in Arizona, but including parts of New Mexico and Utah, is under jurisdiction of the Gallup, N. Mex., area office.

The new leasing regulations, which put into effect an act of Congress approved last August, provide that some Indian lands may be leased for up to 25 years, with provision for a 25-year renewal.

The lease term-limit had been 5 years.

In all cases, approval of the tribal governments is required.

Under the new regulations, the long-term leases are available for business, recreational, and agricultural development.

Haverland said this could result in placing some 60,000 acres of river-bottom land under cultivation in the Colorado River Indian Reservation near Parker.

He also said it could mean the construction of lodges, boat landings, and other recreational facilities along the river, with the Indians getting the benefit of this long-range development.

Haverland said also that it could mean construction of feeder pens, and other developments on this State's reservation lands.

The Fort Apache Reservation, with headquarters at Whiteriver, already has developed some of its recreational areas as a tribal enterprise. The new regulations will permit the tribe to offer the long-term leases to non-Indians.

It also makes possible venture money in construction of motels and lodges on the San Carlos Apache Reservation.

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, in announcing the new regulations, said that the former 5-year limitation on leases had retarded development of the reservation areas.

"For many years," he said, "there has been little or no interest in leasing Indian lands for business, recreational, or other purposes that involved substantial investments which could be amortized only over a comparatively long period.

"As a result many Indian land owners have been deprived of valuable rental income from properties that are well situated for long-term leasing."

Duration of nonagricultural leases will be determined in each case by the money invested and the requirements for amortization, but agricultural leases are for 10 years except in special cases where the Interior Department may approve those up to 25 years.

THE VICIOUS PHYSICAL ATTACK ON VICTOR RIESEL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a courageous man lies in a hospital in New York, not knowing this day whether tomorrow will bring darkness or light. Pain is his reward for courage. But courage has many rewards, and while the moment of pain and doubt may be his medallion of bravery, the gratitude and admiration of millions of people will be his permanent recognition. I refer to Victor Riesel, whose fearless attempts to call to the attention of the public the racketeering practices of certain labor unions resulted in his being subjected to an attack with acid.

Mr. President, this attack represents a challenge to the new labor merger. Will this style of reprisal be allowed to go unchallenged and to continue within the framework of the unions, or will the leaders of that movement pay heed to the dangers which are incident to such attacks?

The American people have been awakened by this event. They rightfully ask the leaders of labor to place a check on the irresponsibility that allowed this attack to happen.

If the union leaders are not diligent in their duties in this respect, it can but bring disfavor on their other efforts. I am hopeful that investigation will bring to light those responsibile for the attack on Mr. Riesel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks several newspaper editorials concerning the attack on Mr. Riesel, and several articles which have been written by Mr. Riesel's staff, in carrying on the courageous work he started.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News]

GET THIS RAT

The cowardly acid-throwing attack early yesterday morning on labor columnist Victor Riesel occurred about 2 hours after he had broadcast a radio discussion of labor racketeering on Long Island.

Riesel also has been working with United States Attorney Paul W. Williams in his probe into rackets in various industries.

These circumstances of course do not prove that the acid-throwing was procured or inspired by some labor leader(s) who didn't like what Riesel was dishing.

The circumstances of the attack do indicate that it will be to the vital public-relations interest of every labor leader hereabout to cooperate to the hilt with the police, the FBI, the Manhattan and Federal prosecutors, and every other law-enforcement agency concerned in tracking down the guilty thug—and whoever sent him.

[From the New York Times]

STREET ATTACK

The cowardly and vicious acid-throwing attack yesterday on Victor Riesel a well-known commentator on labor affairs, should bring the complacent citizens of this metropolis up with a start. An outrage like this, perpetrated on the street in the very heart of the city, is gangsterism that cannot and will not be tolerated.

The thug who sidled up to Mr. Riesel and doused his face with a chemical that may cost him his sight was committing an assault not only on a law-abiding citizen but also on the free press of this city and on free labor as well. We do not know what the actual motive was for this barbaric act; but it will certainly be widely interpreted as reprisal both for what Mr. Riesel has said and written about racketeering in certain labor unions and for whatever assistance he gave or was about to give to the United States attorney in the current grand jury investigation into labor rackets. A broadcast he had made just prior to the attack dealt with racketeering in a notorious Long Island building construction union.

The search for the criminal who made the attack and for the person or persons who were behind him must be pursued with tireless diligence by the law enforcement agencies concerned. It must also have the wholehearted support of every honest labor union official; for in the last analysis the greatest damage done by an incident like this is to the good name of labor and to the cause of decent unionism.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of April 6, 1956]

OUTRAGE BY THE UNDERWORLD

The dastardly attack on Victor Riesel was a horrible thing. A civilized community composed overwhelmingly of decent, law-abiding citizens has been outraged. For what has happened here? Mr. Riesel, a newspaper columnist with a distinguished record of fighting crooks and criminals in the labor movement, was the victim of a bottle of acid flung in his face. He had just participated in a radio program which dealt forthrightly with the Union of Operating Engineers, the outfit that has been directed by such time-serving extortionists as Joey Fay and Bill DeKoning, Sr. He had been cooperating with the Federal investigation of racketeering in the garment, trucking and food industries.

It is barely possible, of course, that the acid assault which may well leave Mr. Riesel blind for life had nothing to do with such matters. But we don't believe it. United States Attorney Paul W. Williams says this was "an out-and-out threat and a black effort to intimidate witnesses." It is, then, a parallel to the recent unsuccessful attempt to exterminate Louis Saperstein, the key figure in a big union welfare-fund racket who was giving District Attorney Frank S. Hogan valuable assistance. In short, this is the voice of the underworld serving notice that the racket octopus does not wish to be disturbed in its profitable and parasitical attentions to trade unionism.

As every newspaper reader must be aware, the local air has been thick with charges and counter-charges, court actions, prosecutors' warnings and investigations, all having to do with the central subject of power politics and a considerable degree of criminal infringement on the integrity of organized labor. One way or another there must be a housecleaning—from without or within, or both. The waterfront has long been a prime example of criminal infestation, and now, as District Attorney Hogan has already pointed out, the underworld is making a determined effort to seize control of the Joint Council of Teamsters and thereby take the trucking industry as a hunting ground for tribute to the rackets.

The Riesel outrage, as we see it, states the challenge to law and order in the most direct terms. Mr. Riesel has the sympathy of everyone; the perpetrator of this shocking crime must be brought to justice. But, even more important, this deed is a challenge to all New York which demands to be acted upon with all possible force of legal and moral indignation. Let it be understood that this community will not tolerate rule by racketeers.

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column is being written by Victor Riesel's staff after a dramatic bedside conference almost immediately after the injured columnist recovered from heavy sedation administered to ease the pain of the acid burns on his face and eyes.)

Victor Riesel, face scarred by acid burns, eyes puffed and painful, awoke from a merciful drugged sleep only an hour ago. His first coherent conversation was with his two staff members who have been at his bedside from the moment they were first notified of the sneak attack which may cost Riesel his sight.

The measure of this brave newspaperman is in the words he first spoke. "How are Bill Wilkens and Pete Batalias (the two leaders of the reform group fighting against labor czar Bill DeKoning of the Operating Engineers Union)—are they O. K.? Did anything happen to them? Tell them to take care."

His first thought, in his first moment of rational consciousness, was for the safety of these two working Joes whose fight for decency he supported so brilliantly in his columns for the past year.

His next words were the measure of a newsman's newsman. "Don't stop the column now. We'll discuss it each day when I'm awake. Then you two write it. Don't stop it and don't use guest columns. I can't see now, but I can still talk."

Typed or dictated, the exposures of corruption and indecency will go on. Previous columns by Riesel have been called in by several law enforcement agencies. They are being read carefully to see what Riesel may have written to provoke the acid attack. For there is general agreement now that his hard-hitting exposés were coming too close to home for comfort for certain elements.

At least three law enforcement agencies have called for all of the columns written by Victor Riesel in the last year. Their experts are poring over the many exposures contained in them—paying particular attention to situations and names pinpointed in the past 6 months.

A spokesman for one of these law groups told Riesel's staff that "We are pretty much convinced that the attack had to stem from something relatively recent that the column exposed." This same official pointed out that if the assault related to something written longer back it would have happened sooner. In addition to the columns, the texts of Riesel's recent broadcasts, in which he swung heavily at racketeering, in general, and racketeering inside labor, in particular, were also under close scrutiny for possible clues.

There is no question in the minds either of Riesel's staff members or the many law enforcement officials to whom they have spoken that the brutal attack is linked to some phase of labor racketeering laid bare by Riesel. Most of these officials have also ruled out speculation that the attack was the work of some "crank" or "amateur" working on his own.

They point out that Riesel and his escorts were carefully followed from the scene of the broadcast to the site of the actual attack. His car was carefully noted. The assailant was spotted at the precise point where the car was parked. And the acid tosser had been briefed to recognize Riesel on sight.

The preparation of the acid was a professional job, too. Most amateurs use lye or some lye solution. More often than not they toss it from the original can. This solution was highly concentrated sulfuric acid carefully carried in a special jar with a wide, open mouth. That the acid was tossed directly into Riesel's eyes in a practiced upward motion is also the mark of the "pro," they added.

Many of the columns under close scrutiny discuss mob activities with national ramifications. Others deal with lush underworld operations centered primarily in the New York area. All involve men with long police records or with associates who are known criminals.

Nor are the law agencies overlooking some of the hard-hitting columns that exposed recent Communist directives to its cadres across the country. Or the exposures of the cooperation between pro-Soviet agents and underworld representatives on the New York waterfront.

One Federal official told Riesel's staff that everyone found to be involved in any way with the activities exposed by Riesel or connected with persons involved will be carefully investigated and/or questioned. Special attention will be paid to "alibis" for the time of the attack on Riesel.

Among the columns under scrutiny, this official indicated, are those dealing with the garment and trucking rackets, waterfront and narcotics rackets, Communist activities, CP-mob tieups, perishable food industry extortion, sale of charters, sale of members of one union hood to another for a fee and terrorization of small-business men whose employees are primarily Puerto Rican.

Somewhere in these fighting columns, they believe, lies the significant clue to those behind the attack on Riesel. Who are they? Only time, wide publicity, and effective police work will tell.

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column was written by Victor Riesel's staff after a bedside conference with the stricken columnist in St. Clare's Hospital.)

Skilled investigators busily checking recent columns by Victor Riesel in a search for leads to the assailant who hurled sulfuric acid into his face admitted to his staff Sunday that "we were amazed at his courage in tackling some of the situations he uncovered and appalled at the number of persons or groups who might have real desire to put him out of business."

One prober added that they were convinced that the attack, aside from attempting to halt Riesel's exposures, was aimed at so horrifying and terrifying potential witnesses before the newly empaneled grand juries digging into rackets, that the prosecutors would be unable to win convictions and might not even be able to get enough evidence for indictments.

A veteran law officer told Riesel's staff that "a beating might have scared off a few. A shooting might have scared some. But the effect of such attacks would have worn off before too long and some witnesses would still come forth. But the horror of acid in the eyes has such a permanent frightening effect that the probes may collapse."

In a column that appeared just three days before the attack, Riesel had pinpointed the nature of extortion devices in many fields, including the garment industry. He mentioned one of the devices used when an employer balked at payoffs was to sprinkle valuable shipments of clothes with acid. Grimly enough the acid throwers in the garment field specialized in the use of sulfuric acid, the same kind used in the attempt to blind Riesel.

The day after that column appeared there was widespread reaction among the men deep in garment center crime circles. An intimate of an ex-con, described as the common denominator in a score of rackets, was overheard cursing Riesel.

He is quoted as heatedly shouting to a group around him, "Did you see what that ------ Riesel is trying to do to the garment center?"

But the easy-money boys in the garment and trucking fields are not the only ones who had cause to hate and fear Riesel.

Only last week, for the first time anywhere, Riesel exposed the shakedown techniques of racket unions in New York which concentrate on small businesses in the New York City and Long Island areas. Riesel disclosed:

"The biggest shot in the arm to smaller hoods has been the influx of non-English-speaking Puerto Ricans into big eastern cities. These poor workers rarely know what is happening because of language difficulties and because they're understandably frightened of the new land and its processes.

"They are literally bought and sold.

"The boss is forced by local unions, many of them phony, to pay dues and initiation fees for the Puerto Ricans. This money is taken out of their wages. No meetings are called. No union really exists. The boys pocket most of the money just because they happen to own a charter."

A rundown of at least 10 of such racket unions described by Riesel reveals that many of their officials have long police records for crimes ranging from larceny to assault to bookmaking to narcotics raps to attempted murder. Many of them are punks who got their sleazy start in the older gangs that infested the food and garment industries and specialized, among other things, in hurling acid on dresses, meats, and other commodities if not persons.

With the stakes that high, with the principals involved born and steeped in the crudest techniques of violence, many anti-crime experts have told Riesel's staff that they believe the fiendish attack on him might well have originated in this area. Especially since the boys, emboldened by the size of the take in this area, were discussing seriously the establishment of branch offices with their comrades in crime in other large cities with heavy populations of non-English-speaking workers.

Why the concentration on Riesel's columns? Obviously because the authorities are convinced the attack stems from the mobs. Proof of this is seen in the fact that Manhattan's District Attorney Hogan assigned the case to his rackets bureau instead of one of the other departments in his office.

INSIDE LABOR

(By Victor Riesel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This column is being written by Victor Riesel's staff after a conference at his bedside in St. Clare's Hospital.)

We have just left Vic Riesel's bedside. He is in excellent spirits. He joked with us. He had a million ideas about the column. His outlook and his courage are tremendous.

But we're glad he had the patches over his eyes, for we'd rather he couldn't see us sitting there next to him with tears streaming down our cheeks.

We cried at the bravery he is displaying. We cried because he was concerned about our morale and was cheering us up.

And we cried, for, even as he talked, we sat hypnotized by the horrible acid burns that cover his face—the face which, under normal circumstances at this time of the day, he'd be stroking with his electric razor. For Vic Riesel is always on the go and invariably he races for the office in the morning without stopping to shave.

And each day, just about the time we sat with him, he plugs in his battered razor and gives himself the "once-over" while we kick around the column for the day.

Vic's face is a mass of ugly burns and red welts. His forehead is covered. Both sides of his face are burned. His lips are seared and talking is tough for him. Even the side of his nose and the inner parts of his nostrils are etched with the acid splashed across his face.

Even yet he is in pain. We know that. But some casual observer would never guess it, for not a word of complaint passes his lips.

Vic is still very concerned about the safety of Pete Batallas and Bill Wilkens, the leaders of the fight against William DeKoning, Jr., of the Operating Engineers Union. He urged us to make sure that they and their families are protected.

What he didn't know—and we didn't tell him for fear it would upset him too much—was that these two ex-GI's, now in Chicago for the union's convention, were again threatened on Monday and warned to "stay away from Riesel and the other papers, if you want to leave town alive."

Another threat warned them to "pack your bags and get out of town quick. You had a family when you left home. Get out of here fast if you want one when you get back."

If we had told him of these latest threats against these two brave boys we would not have been able to restrain him from at least getting on the phone to contact the authorities and demand immediate action.

For, sick as he is, uncertain as his future sight is at the moment, Vic is full of fight.

In less than 10 minutes of talk he outlined a series of columns he thought we ought to do in the week ahead. He was able to toss at us, with amazing accuracy, the essence of a raft of memos we had compiled about the situations he wanted us to handle in the columns.

We've been with him a long time but even we were just amazed at his vitality in the face of pain and his eagerness to get back into the swing of things again—to pick up where he left off before the sneak attack on him.

We hesitated to ask him how he felt. We were frankly afraid to raise the delicate question of whether he was in pain. Characteristically, he solved the problem for us. He began to tell us how it felt.

"When this punk first threw the acid on me," he said, "I thought he had tossed a glass of water at me. There was no immediate sensation except wetness. It took perhaps 2 or 3 minutes for me to realize, when the stinging sensations began that it might have been acid.

"Even then the full horror of it didn't quite sink in for perhaps another minute or two. And then it hit me like a ton of bricks. I guess I conked out although I was conscious. I knew what was happening around me. I heard myself talking and knew I was talking but if you ask me now what I said, I couldn't tell you for sure. They tell me I made certain statements. Maybe so. But I don't remember them. I was in a numbed shock. All I could think of was my eyes.

"I think I called out Evelyn's name (his wife) and the kids' names. I'm not sure. I do know that I was thinking to myself 'what will happen to them if I do go blind?' and then everything is a real blur until early Friday morning.

"Now I lie here and thank God that at least so far I can see faces and recognize them. Maybe that means I'll keep my sight. I don't know. I like to think so. I'd be kid-

ding you and myself if I said that the prospect doesn't frighten me. But whether I see fully again—or at all—I'll go back to the column, and if they think they had cause to blind me before now, they'll have a dozen more reasons to kill me when I get back to the column."

When he finished, we left—still crying. This much we knew—Inside Labor always covered the biggest labor stories of the day. And we're doing just that now, for the biggest labor story of the day is that brave little guy, racked with pain on his hospital bed—Vic Riesel.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The Hall Syndicate and the New York Mirror are offering a $10,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the acid throwing assailant who attacked labor columnist Victor Riesel early this morning (April 5).

The announcement was made by Charles B. McCabe, publisher of the Mirror, and Robert M. Hall, president of the Hall Syndicate, which distributes Riesel's column.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF LOCK AND DAM NO. 17 ON THE BLACK WARRIOR RIVER, ALA., AS THE JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD LOCK AND DAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1749, Senate bill 2424.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2424) to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to designate lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Alabama, as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam, in honor of our late beloved colleague, Senator Bankhead.

The site of lock and dam No. 17 is on the Black Warrior River 379 miles upstream from Mobile, Ala. It was authorized in 1907, and opened to traffic in 1915. The lock has a double lift, the total lift being 72 feet.

It is fitting and proper that this lock and dam bear the name of John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam in honor of the great statesman from Alabama who so ably served his State and the Nation in the United States Senate from 1931 to 1946.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in honor of the late Senator John Hollis Bankhead, and in recognition of his outstanding service in securing the improvement of the Black Warrior River, Ala., lock and dam No. 17 on such river shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam, and shall be dedicated to his memory as a monument to his distinguished public service. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is designated or referred to as lock and dam No. 17 shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam under and by the name of the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam.

TOLLS ON THE MANETTE BRIDGE IN BREMERTON, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1750, Senate bill 2712.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2712) to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment on page 2, line 20, after the word "the", to strike out "Manette Bridge" and insert "bridges", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to W. E. Buell, of Seattle, Wash., to construct a bridge across Port Washington Narrows within the city of Bremerton in the State of Washington," approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 744), authority is hereby granted to the Washington Toll Bridge Authority as an agency of the State of Washington to fix and charge tolls over the bridge constructed pursuant to such act (hereinafter referred to as the "Manette Bridge").

SEC. 2. The rates of the tolls authorized by the first section of this act shall be so adjusted that the amounts collected from the tolls on the Manette Bridge together with the amounts collected from the tolls imposed on not more than one additional bridge hereafter to be constructed by such Authority adjacent to the Manette Bridge and across Port Washington Narrows from within the city of Bremerton, Wash., will provide (a) a fund sufficient to pay the cost of the maintenance and operation of both such bridges, and (b) a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of reconstructing and improving the Manette Bridge and of constructing such additional bridge and the approaches thereto, including interest and financing costs, within a period of not more than 30 years after the date such reconstruction, or construction and improvement is commenced, whichever first occurs. After there has been collected from such tolls an amount sufficient to provide such funds, the bridges shall be maintained and operated free of tolls.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the passage of the bill the statement of purpose of the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 2712 is to authorize the Washington Toll Bridge Authority, as an agency of the State of Washington, to fix and charge tolls on the existing Manette Bridge across Port Washington Narrows at Bremerton, Wash., notwithstanding any provision to the contrary contained in the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 744). Tolls would be collected on the Manette Bridge, and not more than one additional bridge hereafter to be constructed by such authority adjacent to the Manette Bridge, to provide a fund sufficient to pay the cost of the maintenance and operation of both such bridges, and provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of reconstructing and improving the Manette Bridge and of constructing such additional bridge and the approaches thereto, including interest and financing costs, within a period of not more than 30 years after such reconstruction or construction and improvement is commenced. After amortization, both bridges would be maintained and operated free of tolls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT OR NEAR ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1751, Senate bill 2091.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2091) authorizing reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 2, line 15, after the word "bridge", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That such approaches shall include only those necessary portions of streets, avenues, and boulevards which are directly connected with the bridge, or which are located immediately adjacent thereto, and whose principal use is to provide access to the bridge"; and on page 3, at the beginning of line 17, to insert "free of tolls", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge

across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill., and to a place at or near the city of Davenport, Iowa," approved March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The city of Rock Island, Ill., or any State or political subdivision thereof which may have acquired the bridge constructed pursuant to the subsection (a) of this section, is hereby authorized, subject to the prior approval of the plans by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, to reconstruct and enlarge such bridge and to reconstruct, enlarge, and extend the approaches to such bridge, including, but not limiting the generality of the foregoing, the altering, widening, laying out, opening, or constructing of any streets, avenues, or boulevards within or without any municipality deemed necessary by said city, or any State, public agency, or political subdivision that may take over or acquire said bridge in order to provide adequate traffic regulations and approach or approaches to the said bridge: *Provided*, That such approaches shall include only those necessary portions of streets, avenues, and boulevards which are directly connected with the bridge, or which are located immediately adjacent thereto, and whose principal use is to provide access to the bridge."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended by inserting "(including reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches)" after "and its approaches."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act of March 18, 1938, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches (including the reasonable cost of reconstructing, enlarging, and extending such bridge and its approaches) under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the completion of the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of such bridge and its approaches as provided in subsection (b) of the first section of this act. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls in accordance with such arrangement as may be agreed upon by the city of Rock Island, Ill., or its assigns, and the State highway departments or other appropriate agencies of the States of Iowa and Illinois. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches; the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same; the expenditures for reconstructing, enlarging, and extending the same; and all of the daily tolls collected shall be available for the information of all persons interested."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 2091 is to amend the act approved March 18, 1938 (52 Stat. 110), which authorized the city of Rock Island, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, by authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of said bridge and its approaches, including the altering, widening, laying out, opening, or construction of streets to provide adequate approaches to the bridge; to provide for adjustment or tolls to cover the cost of such reconstruction work within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of its completion; and upon amortization of the proposed improvements to maintain and operate the bridge free of tolls.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE BETWEEN FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION IN KANSAS AND PLATTE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1752, Senate bill 2092.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2092) transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation in Kansas, and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "bridge", to strike out "if and when" and insert "as"; and in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to insert "Government-owned", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer back to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., connecting the military reservation with the lands belonging to the Department of Justice in Platte County, Mo.

SEC. 2. The provisions in the Second Deficiency Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 687) requiring that said bridge shall be open to use by the public under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Attorney General is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The Department of the Army is authorized to remove the said bridge as it constitutes an unreasonable obstruction to navigation and such appropriation is hereby authorized as may be necessary for its removal and the relocation of the Government-owned utilities now carried by said bridge serving the lands belonging to the Department of Justice in Platte County, Mo.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to transfer back to the Department of the Army jurisdiction over the existing bridge across the Missouri River at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., which connects the military reservation with lands of the Department of Justice; repeal a proviso of the Second Deficiency Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 687), requiring the bridge to be open to public use; and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to remove said bridge and relocate Government-owned utilities now carried by the bridge, including authorization of appropriation of necessary funds for such work.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISIONS IN THE GENERAL AUTHORIZATION FOR SMALL FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS IN FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1753, Senate bill 3272.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3272) to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorizations for small flood control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to allot not to exceed $15 million in any 1 fiscal year for construction of flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers such work is warranted. Such allotment would be subject to the following conditions: (1) That not more than $500,000 shall be allotted to a single project during any one fiscal year, (2) that the provisions of local cooperation of section 3 of the 1936 Flood Control Act, as amended, shall apply, (3) that State and local concurrence shall be obtained for each project prior to commencing construction, and (4) that the work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to additional improvements. The Secretary would be required to report to the Senate and House Committees on Public Works on any project costing over $150,000, 30 days before starting construction.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be inserted the testimony of General Fleming, New England Chief, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, because of its educational value in connection with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator's request, and I appreciate his observation.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BUSH. General, I think rather than run through this, we should submit this to the Chief of Engineers' office, General Itschner, and let them supply this information. This has to be carefully worked out. He can supply the answers to this list of questions when he comes down next Thursday. Wouldn't that save time?

General FLEMING. I think so.

Senator BUSH. General, I have no questions to ask you. You are of course familiar with the situation up there, much more so than anybody I could think of. So if you would care to express yourself in your own way as to your views on this measure, you may do so.

General FLEMING. I would like to start off, Senator, by saying that I am here solely to discuss the specific problem as concerns New England. Representatives of the Chief of Engineers, my superiors, General Itschner and others, will testify as far as the Chief of Engineers is concerned on the national aspects of this proposed bill. So my comments will be entirely on the situation as involves my area in New England.

My comments also, as I make them, will be colored by the fact as I see the problem in New England. I plead guilty to the fact that I do not know what the situation is in the rest of the country. But unfortunately, however, I am overly familiar with the flood situation and the particular critical problem which faces the New England States at this particular time. Therefore as I give my story I probably cannot but help be colored a little bit by my intimacy with that particular problem.

I think we have a situation in New England which, when the flood control legislation was passed by the Congress, throughout the years, was never contemplated. On public works projects the procedure imposed by Congress has included a very thorough engineering analysis which, in addition to figuring out the feasible thing from an engineering standpoint, also went into hydrological factors, economic factors, and things like that, in attempt to forecast what might happen. You needed that forecast in order to design protective works.

The situation we now have in New England is that nature has done most of that preliminary work for us. The floods in August were about 3 to 3½ or 4 times the previous maximum floods of record. There are scars in the valleys of New England now, particularly in the Farmington River in Connecticut, the Naugatuck River in Connecticut, the Blackstone, which flows through Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the Thames River Basin which originates in Massachusetts and flows into Connecticut, and in certain tributaries of the Connecticut River in Massachusetts, largely the Westfield and Chicopee, there are scars which the floodwaters have carved on the landscape. We have there visible and ready to read the engineering factors which could be obtained only after very laborious computations in the past.

The Congress has rightfully prescribed a procedure for public works projects, whereby a survey report is directed, a report is rendered to the committee which authorizes us to make the report, through the Bureau of the Budget and then is considered by the committee and finally authorized by both Houses of Congress, I think in my own opinion that that administrative detail and routine was prescribed by the Congress to insure that no hasty, ill-advised work was done. In order to have that insurance it imposed a time delay, in the process of getting a project written up in acceptable form and then the time necessary to have it considered by the entire Congress. The point I am trying to make is that nature in New England in this last flood has actually shown us in many cases what should be done.

I think that we are now up against a situation where we are fighting time. As a result of the work under Public Law 875, and I received very liberal instructions in interpreting that law, we have done on various streams in New England work which in normal times we would have done under a permanent flood-control project. These were such things as channel clearance and actually increasing capacities at various places where bridges had gone out. We couldn't leave the wrecked bridge and rubble in, so we widened the channel and improved the hydraulic characteristics. In doing that we have taken the material that we have excavated out of the streams and piled it at the nearest place we could. We have piled it along the stream banks in what are actually embryo dikes. They are a start toward permanent dikes. We did this very hurriedly. We were not able to make detailed analyses of the soil mechanics of the earth we put into those dikes. We weren't always able, even under the most liberal interpretation of Public Law 875, to convert those things into permanent works. The result is that now in several of the communities in New England, we have these embryo dikes which have not been faced on the outside with riprap or stone. In many cases they aren't tied back into high ground because of the existence of a road at a different grade from the top of the dike. We had no authority to change any elevations in roads, nor do we have any authority if the road has to stay in the same place, to construct a permanent stop log structure which could be used as a block through that gap.

A typical project, typical situation, which we have right now is, for example, the city of Torrington, Conn. Even after the expedited program of authorized flood-control projects is constructed, Torrington will still be vulnerable because it is upstream from the only presently authorized project on the Naugatuck River. Torrington now has these dikes, embryo dikes—I would like to emphasize that—it has had certain channels cleared and widened, it has had bends enlarged where bridges formerly constricted the stream, and various things of that sort. If we have a recurrence in Torrington, not of the high water of last August, but of, say, water which would approximate the flows of the previous flood of record of 1948 in the Naugatuck Valley, or the storm which we had in October following the August storm which was almost 30 percent greater than the previous flood of record, we would lose a large part of the temporary work which has already been done because it does not have the strength built into it to withstand ordinary high water.

The States are participating in this program, or are prepared to participate in it. The State of Massachusetts has an appropriation, I believe, of $5 million for flood-control work, and you might say, drainage work inside of communities affected by the last flood, which they are going to use to expand any efforts the Federal Government makes. Connecticut has already made available, with a smaller problem due only to the smaller size of Connecticut compared to Massachusetts, the sum of $1 million.

Rhode Island has appropriated similar sums. I don't know exactly how much it now has available, for State participation in this. The city of Torrington, if I may go back to use that illustration, has already bonded itself to the tune of about $450,000 just so it can buy properties, buy rights-of-way and things like that, to give us the right to go in and make these temporary improvements.

I don't think anywhere in New England is there a lack of local participation. There is right now a delay being encountered because the local authorities in the three States affected by the floods don't know what the Federal Government is going to do. Due to the time lag in getting a project through the study phase and through the authorization phase, it will be some time before we can tell them what the Federal Government is planning to do.

Senator BUSH. Is it not true that the action that this bill would permit are among the uncertain factors, too?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. Incidentally, and parenthetical to your remarks, have you any estimate as to how much of the $15 million annually authorized under S. 3272 might be needed in New England immediately?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. We figure that, assuming the bill passes, assuming the appropriation is made, we estimate—this may be a liberal estimate again because I am optimistic in this thing—we estimate that there would be about eight projects in the category that we could complete in fiscal year 1957.

In other words, between the first of July of this year and June 30 of 1957, there are about 8 of these projects which would cost somewhere around the neighborhood of $3.2 million.

Senator BUSH. An average of about $400,000 per project?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSH. Go ahead. I didn't want to break your train of thought.

General FLEMING. With the States having the money appropriated and available, they are up against the situation of not knowing what the Federal Government will do in the future.

Under the present procedure, which imposes this time of authorization, it is going to be some time, frankly, in my opinion, before we can tell them what authorized projects there are going to be. I think that they are vulnerable. The States are desperately anxious to get started. We have done some work which, with every day that passes, will bring us closer to the next high-water period. With every day that passes that work is going to be vulnerable and we are apt to lose it for the lack of some additional measures which we weren't able to do under Public Law 875.

The procedure, of course, sir, imposed by the Congress, now has under section 212 of the flood control law the authority for the Chief of Engineers to authorize—not to authorize projects, but Congress delegated to him the power to approve projects where the total cost is about $150,000 and the money can be spent in 1 fiscal year. I believe that last year about $800,000 was appropriated for that for the country as a whole.

Senator BUSH. There is a limit there.

General FLEMING. There is a limit of $150,000 for each project.

Senator BUSH. And there is an overall limit?

General FLEMING. There is an overall limit. It is the appropriations which they make each year. Last year it was in the neighborhood of $800,000.

The problem in New England, sir, is this: The projects we have, the work we did under Public Law 785, in various communities is so extensive that where I said there were 8 that could be done—averaging about $400,000, depending on the limit Congress puts on it—if the limit were held at $150,000 there are probably only 3 that could be done. Unless, which Congress wouldn't permit, we could pyramid one on top of the other. That would be a subterfuge and I don't believe it should be done.

Senator BUSH. So you are faced with a real limitation, then, unless something is done right away in the way of legislation to permit you to go ahead.

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I think there is a very great potential danger of losing a

lot of work which has already been done. These nine places that I am talking about are locations where flood threat would not be decreased by the construction of any now authorized flood-control work, because they are located upstream from reservoirs.

Senator BUSH. Is it possible for you to give us the names of the nine locations that you do have in mind? Have you them in mind so you can give them for the record now?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I would like to submit that for the record later.

Senator BUSH. We will be glad to have that.

General FLEMING. I can give you 2 or 4 illustrations now. Torrington, Conn. is obviously one situation. New Hartford, Conn., and another is the extension of the presently authorized project through Woonsocket, R. I. There is one up around the town of Palmer in Massachusetts.

(The information referred to is as follows:)

"The nine locations previously referred to are as follows: Naugatuck, Conn.; Seymour, Conn.; Derby, Conn.; Union City, Conn.; West Branch, Naugatuck River, Conn.; East Branch, Naugatuck River, Conn.; Torrington, Conn.; New Hartford, Conn.; and Ware, Mass.

Senator BUSH. Wouldn't a lot of work going on in the Naugatuck River, below Waterbury, where those temporary dikes are just thrown up, would they be eligible for work under this bill?

General FLEMING. I would hope that they would be, sir.

Senator BUSH. Permanent work?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. Because the Thomaston Dam in the Naugatuck Valley controls roughly about 31 percent of the basin. If we had had—leaving the August flood out of consideration and just talking about the October flood in the Naugatuck Valley—even had Thomaston Reservoir been operating in the October flood, there still would have been some very serious damage in the towns of Naugatuck and Ansonia.

We have thrown up these temporary dikes in those two communities. Additional protection is going to be required in Ansonia and Naugatuck in addition to the protection of Thomaston Reservoir.

For example, I have the figures here. At the city of Naugatuck in October the flow, assuming the Thomaston Dam had been built, would have been 22,500 second-feet. It actually reached about 35,000 second-feet. So the effect of Thomaston, downriver as far as Naugatuck, really knocks off about one-third of October flood. The previous flood at Naugatuck was 28,500 second-feet in 1948. The point I make is that even with the recurrence of the October flood, and Thomaston Reservoir having been built, Naugatuck would still get almost as much water as it got in the previous flood or record in 1948. So I think at Naugatuck and Ansonia both, additional protection will eventually be required. Some work has already been done at both of those places under Public Law 875 which could be converted into a permanent improvement.

Senator BUSH. That is what I had in mind.

General, is that all that you have to observe this morning?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir. I will answer any questions that you have.

Senator BUSH. The committee thanks you for coming down here to testify. As I have said many times before, New England certainly owes you a very great debt of gratitude for your constant and faithful interest in our problems during the past year. We don't know sometimes what we would have done without you.

General FLEMING. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared with reference to Senate bill 3272 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KUCHEL

The bill S. 3272, providing general authorization for small flood-control projects, will plug a serious hole in the system of administrative and legislative dikes by which the Congress and the Federal Government have attempted to protect the people of the United States, their land, homes, livestock, transportation, and utility systems, and other possessions against the rampages of nature.

I am happy to join as cosponsor of this measure because tragic happenings in my own State of California, in New England, in the Middle Atlantic region, and other sections of the country have demonstrated an urgent need for a law which will make it possible in building flood-prevention works to keep pace with the growth of our Nation and the development of various areas where in past years heavy rains and snowmelt could run harmlessly to the sea without endangering life and property.

All of us on this committee are gravely concerned about the importance of pressing forward as rapidly as finances, manpower, and planning allow with the comprehensive system of flood-control projects which have been authorized at previous sessions of Congress. We also are thoroughly aware that the presently authorized works will not extend protection to all communities and sections which are entitled to the benefits of such projects. At the same time, we realize that the amount of imagination and foresight will enable either Congress or the administrative agencies of the Government, particularly the Army Corps of Engineers, to anticipate conditions which may make additional projects both desirable and economically feasible.

During recent history, it has been customary for Congress every few years to hold long hearings and draft a bulky omnibus bill authorizing a number of projects which it is intended will be built over a period of following years. Those projects are approved on the strength of evidence about the threat of danger to different areas measured by a yardstick of possible loss in terms of life and dollars which is applied against the estimated cost of protective works.

The writing and enactment of such a bill is laborious and a time-consuming process. Inevitably many proposed projects are left on the shelf because time did not permit consideration of the need and the merit.

The omnibus bills, such as those of 1936, 1944, 1946, 1950, and 1954, were designed to provide protection against conditions as they existed at those particular times. They did not—because they could not—take into consideration the possible expansion of cities in stream valleys, the development of farms in lands made possible of cultivation by irrigation and reclamation projects, the construction of new highways and relocation of old ones over more direct routes, and the vagaries of weather which every so often seems to be following a pattern different than in the past.

The capital investments which the Congress in the past 20 years has authorized—which exceed $3,500 million not including the vast lower Mississippi program—have paid big dividends and justified the expenditure. Yet, the growth and development of our Nation has proceeded faster than it is possible for Congress to authorize, and the Federal Government to obtain money with which to build, additional projects that are sorely needed.

The reason why legislation such as S. 3272 is warranted can be illustrated by references to conditions in my own State of California. The ambitious flood-control program for Los Angeles County has had to be modified and revised repeatedly because of the way population has jumped and suburban areas have come into being. The completion of the great Central Valley project has opened up vast acreages which formerly could not be cultivated because of insufficient or unstable water supplies. As people have spread into the foothills of the mountains of southern California and onto the lands in the Central Valley they have occupied tracts of land which are susceptible to flooding whenever extraordinary rains and thaws occur. In many instances the threat to these more recently settled places comes from small streams and isolated canyons which are not parts of any major river systems or in a recognized drainage basin.

If the Army engineers in the past have had the authority to plan, engineer, and build projects of the sort contemplated in S. 3272 very probably there already would be in existence a number of small projects—dikes, retarding dams, and debris basins—which would safeguard these newly created residential communities and lately developed farming areas against just such unforeseen and uncontrollable natural catastrophes as occurred in California during the past winter.

This bill is sound. It would give flexibility to the continuing effort to protect the people of our Nation against floods. The discretionary authority we provide to construct without the necessity of getting specific authorization projects costing not over $500,000, and which are complete entities in themselves will enable the Army engineers to initiate works as new demands arise.

Any chances that this power would be misused to launch work which might lead to continuing expenditures and that the bill would provide a foot-in-the-door approach toward big commitments to make future appropriations are offset by the limitations that projects costing between $150,000 and $500,000 must be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Committees of Congress and by the ceiling of $15 million on the outlay in any fiscal year. The requirements of local participation, involving substantial contributions by the people who would benefit, insure that no boondoggles could be undertaken.

During the past 3 years major floods have occurred in 18 different States. In a number of the affected areas no flood-control projects ever were authorized, presumably because the possible threat was not considered grave enough to warrant including authorization in one of the omnibus bills that have been enacted in the past two decades or the proposed projects were deemed too small for serious consideration. Experience has shown, however, that those affected areas cannot be ignored, and when disaster strikes once it easily can hit again. The Army engineers under our legislation could swing into action to provide future protection against a repetition of heavy damage in such sections of our Nation.

This legislation would be a logical supplement to present statutes and in all probability a moneysaving step in the long run. Congress has authorized the Army engineers, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and other agencies to engage in emergency rescue and rehabilitation work, and it has provided Federal credit through the Small Business Administration for rebuilding homes and farms and businesses. It seems only good sense to give the Army engineers this kind of discretionary power to build small projects which could avert disasters and thus minimize the need for spending Federal funds to fight floods and get people back on their feet.

This legislation would apply the time-tested principle that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3272) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to allot, from any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for flood control, not to exceed $15 million for any 1 fiscal year for the construction of flood control projects not specifically authorized by law when, in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) Not more than $500,000 shall be alloted for this purpose for any single project for expenditure during any 1 fiscal year;

"(2) The provisions of local cooperation specified in section 3 of the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, as amended, shall apply;

"(3) Concurrence shall be obtained from the affected State or political subdivision, or both, prior to the commencement of construction of each proposed project; and

"(4) The work shall be complete in itself and shall not commit the United States to any additional improvement to insure its successful operation except as may result from the normal procedure applying to projects authorized after submission of preliminary examination and survey reports.

"(b) (1) Before work is initiated under this section on any flood control project or other flood protective measure which the Secretary of the Army estimates will cost in excess of $150,000 for any 1 fiscal year, he shall submit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives a report outlining the proposed plan of protection together with an analysis of the justification therefor. The report shall be delivered to both committees on the same day and while each House is in session. No work shall be initiated on any project or other measure with respect to which such a report is made until the expiration of the first period of 30 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the report is transmitted to the committees.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(B) in the computation of the 30-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1777, Senate bill 2854.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2854) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 217 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$4,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,060,000,000."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 203 (h) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$7,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have a brief explanation of the bill before it is acted upon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill would amend section 203 (h) of the National Housing Act, as amended, which authorizes the FHA to insure a mortgage for an individual whose home, regardless of whether he owned or rented, was damaged or destroyed by disaster. Under present law, the FHA can insure such a mortgage up to 100 percent of the appraised value of the property and up to $7,000. This bill would increase the dollar limit from $7,000 to $12,000.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to say that the floods of last year show that $7,000 was completely unrealistic. There is no objection to the figure of $12,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORITY TO STOCKPILE TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1778, Senate bill 2855.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2855) to provide authority to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, for emergency production and delivery of housing and equipment in the event of a major disaster as defined in section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended. Such housing and equipment may be made available to local public agencies, the American Red Cross, or other nonprofit relief organizations, without charge, to provide shelter for victims of any such disaster. The Commissioner is also authorized and directed to prepare procedures for emergency mobilization of local services and property to provide emergency shelter including the preparation of sites for emergency dwellings.

SEC. 2. Nothwithstanding the provisions of any other law except provisions enacted hereafter which refer specifically to this act, the Commissioner is authorized to use for the purposes of this act not to exceed $5 million of funds made available by section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. All receipts of the Public Housing Administration under this act and any reimbursements to the Administration pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, shall be applied to repayment of the note or notes of the Public Housing Administration executed and delivered in connection with funds obtained pursuant to said section 20, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall credit as a payment upon such note or notes an amount equal to the amount certified by the Commissioner as having been expended under this act and which the Administration has not repaid out of such receipts or reimbursements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is there any estimate of the cost involved? Does the bill contemplate assembling housing, tents—or what?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my understanding is that it authorizes not to exceed $5 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, as amended, (1) provides authority for the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for emergency production and delivery of housing and equipment into a location declared by the President to be a major disaster area, and (2) authorizes the Commissioner to use $5 million of funds which he can borrow from the Treasury under section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (which makes loan funds available for low-rent public housing) with which to purchase the emergency housing and equipment.

Annually, in one form or another, the Nation is subjected to the violent forces of nature which cause millions of dollars of damage to property and untold misery, exposure, and death to many of the Nation's families. During 1955 alone, the United States suffered two of the worst flood disasters recorded in our history. From time to time the Congress, taking into consideration the needs of the victims of these disasters, immediately following the devastation, has enacted legislation to provide funds and other assistance for these victims.

In numerous instances, however, the assistance provided does not reach the victim at the time the need is the greatest. This is especially true of housing. Existing law authorizes the various Federal housing agencies to provide temporary or emergency housing in disaster areas. However, the difficulties of locating and preparing sites and locating, moving, and erecting housing in the disaster areas are very time consuming.

The bill, as amended, is designed to provide a flexible plan under which housing can be made available to disaster victims as early as possible after the need occurs. The agency contemplates that under the authority granted by this bill, contracts could be entered into on a standby or emergency basis

for emergency production and delivery of approximately 2,000 movable housing units, consisting of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom trailers, which would be available for occupancy in the disaster area within a minimum period of time after the President declares the area to be a disaster area.

The bill authorizes the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration to use up to $5 million of funds now available for the low-rent public housing program. The Public Housing Administration would be required to repay the Treasury from receipts under the bill, if any, and reimbursements received pursuant to the provisions of the disaster assistance act (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950). The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to forgive the difference between such receipts and reimbursements, and the amount expended by the Public Housing Administration for the purpose of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Housing to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for housing to provide shelter for disaster victims, and for other purposes."

RENT-FREE ACCOMMODATIONS IN LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECTS FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1779, Senate bill 2859.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2859) to provide rent-free accommodations in low-rent housing projects for disaster victims.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title II of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, is hereby amended by striking the last sentence of section 204 thereof and substituting the following therefor: "During the period when the President determines that in any locality there is an acute need for housing to assure the availability of dwellings for persons engaged in national defense activities or for victims of a major disaster (as defined in sec. 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended), dwellings in a low-rent project developed, assisted, or operated in said locality pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which are devoted to the purposes of providing housing for such persons or victims shall not be subject to any of the eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and during such period such projects shall be deemed projects of a low-rent character for the purpose of any of the applicable provisions of the said act: *Provided*, That the Authority shall not require any public housing agency to obtain any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to the rent-paying ability of a disaster victim as a condition of admission to such a project."

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to contract with public housing agencies for advance payment or reimbursement for the furnishing of housing to victims of a major disaster as defined in section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat 1109), as amended, including the furnishing of such housing free of charge to needy disaster victims during the period covered by the determination of the President under section 204 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law except provisions enacted hereafter which refer specifically to this act, the Commissioner is authorized to use for the purpose of this act not to exceed $500,000 of funds made available by section 20 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended. Any reimbursements to the Public Housing Administration pursuant to the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109), as amended, shall be applied to repayment of the note or notes of the Administration executed and delivered in connection with funds obtained pursuant to the said section 20, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall credit as a payment upon such note or notes an amount equal to the amount certified by the Commissioner as having been expended under this act and which the Administration has not repaid out of such reimbursements.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement with reference to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill amends title II of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended, to permit victims of a major disaster, as declared by the President, as well as persons engaged in national-defense activities, to be considered for accommodations in low-rent public housing projects without respect to (a) any of the eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and (b) any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to the rent-paying ability of a disaster victim as a condition of admission to such project.

The bill further authorizes the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts with local agencies for advance payment or reimbursement for low-rent housing furnished to disaster victims. An expenditure not to exceed $500,000 from funds made available to the agency for low-rent public housing is authorized for this purpose. Such housing may be furnished rent-free to disaster victims during the disaster period as determined by the President.

Under the present eligibility or preference provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, disaster victims may be precluded from obtaining shelter in low-rent housing projects, even though vacancies may exist in such projects. This bill suspends the eligibility or preference provisions of that act in order that low-rent housing projects may be occupied by disaster victims.

In addition, a disaster victim would be permitted to occupy a low-rent housing unit without any advance guaranty of rent or determination as to his rent-paying ability as a condition of admission to such project.

The bill would also permit the Federal Government to bear the expense of the emergency shelter furnished to needy victims of disaster in such low-rent housing projects. To meet the expense of providing rent-free accommodations, the Commissioner of PHA is authorized to use up to $500,000 of the funds now available for the low-rent public housing program. The Public Housing Administrator would be required to repay the Treasury from receipts under the bill, if any, and reimbursements received pursuant to the provisions of the disaster assistance act (Public Law 875, 81st Cong., approved September 30, 1950). The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to forgive the difference between such receipts and reimbursements, and the amount expended by PHA for the purpose of this bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATIVE TO COUNSEL EMPLOYED BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1754, Senate Joint Resolution 160.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas, to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, under Senate Resolution 219 a special committee was created by this body to investigate lobbying, campaign contributions, and other related activities. The committee, appointed under that resolution, will expire on January 31 next; and in undertaking to select a chief counsel for the committee, one who is competent to fill that responsibility, we were confronted with the problem of the conflict of interest statute which would prohibit the attorney who accepted this employment from handling any matters against the Federal Government within 2 years after his employment.

The purpose of the joint resolution is to provide for the temporary employment of counsel. This assignment will be temporary. This is not a position which will be permanent; it is not a position in which one would seek permanent em-

ployment. Because the position will be temporary, in order to obtain the quality of counsel which the committee thinks it should have to meet its heavy responsibilities, the committee is asking that, with reference to the appointment of the chief counsel of the special committee, the conflict of interest statute be suspended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of the person first duly appointed as counsel for the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 22, 1956, shall not constitute service or employment subjecting such person to the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, United States Code, or to the provisions of any other law of the United States imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceding, or matter involving the United States.

PROCUREMENT OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1776, H. R. 9428.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill undertakes to deal with one of the most serious problems affecting the armed services of the country today. The purpose of the bill, known as the Medical and Dental Officer Career Incentive Act, is to reverse the alarming rate of losses among career medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces, and to attempt to induce a greater number of these officers to volunteer for a military career.

The question might be raised—and it is one which is worthy of consideration—why medical and dental officers should be singled out of all the various categories of officers in the armed services for substantially increased compensation. There is a very simple answer to the question. We have called to the colors approximately 3 million young Americans. Every Member of Congress has a direct responsibility to make certain that they and their dependents are afforded medical care; and such a measure as this is absolutely necessary in order to meet the problem of securing adequate medical and dental aid for the men in the armed services and their dependents.

It so happens that the medical and dental officers, more than any other military group, are affected by conditions in the civilian medical and dental economy. This country does not have military medical schools. For their source of graduates in medicine and dentistry, therefore, the military services are dependent on the limited output of our civilian medical schools. Moreover, the practice of medicine and dentistry is basically no different in military life than it is in civilian life, with the result that it is no great problem for a medical officer to resign and make the transition to civilian practice.

The increased pay for career officers under the bill, which ranges from about $50 to $200 a month, attempts to make the military compensation more competitive with that of civilian doctors and dentists of similar experience, and thereby to attract the minimum number of officers needed for the career medical and dental corps of the armed services.

In the past 2 fiscal years, the military services have lost about 25 percent of their regular medical personnel, the number being about 1,000 medical officers. Of this number, 808 resigned from the service, and the remainder were lost because of death or retirement. During the period while we were losing 808 medical officers, only 350 new officers were taken into the regular corps; and experience indicates that a large portion of this number will resign their commissions after completing their obligated service.

In the Army during the past 2 fiscal years, of those eligible to resign, the following percentages of career medical officers have resigned: 75 percent of the captains, 66 percent of the majors, 24 percent of the lieutenant colonels, and even 2 percent of the colonels.

Senators are familiar with the necessity which drove Congress to enact a draft bill for medical officers. Since the enactment of that bill in 1950, the Department of Defense has depended on the doctor-draft legislation for two-thirds of its medical officers. Of about 10,000 medical officers on duty in the Department of Defense at present, only about 3,300 are career personnel. The pool of older physicians not otherwise liable under the regular Draft Act will be substantially exhausted by the time the doctor draft act expires on July 1, 1957. We are, therefore, driven to the enactment of legislation of this nature in order to increase the size of the career medical corps.

The Department of Defense has expressed the hope that as a result of the incentives provided in the bill, the size of the Medical Corps will be increased from one-third to two-thirds of the total requirement. It is certainly noteworthy that if an additional 3,000 career officers could be procured on a career basis as a result of the bill, the Department of Defense could avoid the drafting of 12,000 doctors over the next years.

The Department of Defense has conducted an extensive study to determine the reasons why the military services are failing to attract medical officers into the career branch of the medical-dental corps. It was the Department's finding that the principal reason was the disparity between military compensation and the compensation received by civilian physicians having comparable experience. The committee was advised that the average civilian physician who has completed 10 years of practice receives a net income, after office expenses, of approximately $16,500 a year. The average medical officer who is out of medical school 10 years, probably will be a major or a lieutenant commander. His total compensation, including all allowances and the special pay of $100 a month, is $8,640 a year.

The compensation of medical officers in the armed services also compares unfavorably with that of the civilians employed in the Federal civil service and the Veterans' Administration. A physician having 10 years of civilian practice is eligible for a civil-service appointment in grade GS–15 with an annual compensation of $12,690. In the case of the Veterans' Administration, the beginning salaries may be even higher, if the physician is a board-certified specialist.

The committee in its study of the problem realized that other factors are involved in the lack of interest in a military carcer, such as frequent reassignments, inadequate housing, or a general dislike for military life.

The Department of Defense assured the committee that every possible administrative action was being taken to meet these complaints.

It might be noted with regard to the assignment problem that the average medical officer can expect to be reassigned about twice as often as career officers in other fields. This condition exists because of the tremendous turnover resulting from the doctor draft, which requires only 2 years of service, and from the resignation rate of officers from the medical services. Most of the regular medical officers can expect reassignment every 2 years, and it is not at all unusual for them to be reassigned once every year.

There are also certain inherent responsibilities which may make the military medical services comparatively unattractive as a medical career. The military services, in order to provide medical service for about 3 million members, maintain throughout the world a total of about 2,000 medical units. Many of these stations are in remote and undesirable locations. We must bear in mind that one-third of all United States military personnel are stationed either overseas or on the seas. Medical care for almost 400,000 dependents overseas can be provided only by military doctors. The duty assignments and the long working hours involved in serving in many of these locations make a military career as a medical officer unattractive when compared with that of a civilian physician. It might also be noted that medical officers stationed overseas, in addition to their other duties, have the

obligation of caring for many civilian employees of the United States Government who are assigned to those areas.

The experience of the departments with respect to procurement and retention of dental officers is similar to that regarding medical officers.

MAJOR FEATURES

Mr. President, in order to accomplish its purpose, H. R. 9428 contains three distinct features:

First, it authorizes for medical and dental officers a 1-year increase in constructive service for permanent promotion seniority purposes. This service is increased from 4 to 5 years for physicians who have completed internships, and from 3 to 4 years for dentists. This increase would serve to recognize the required period which the physicians and dentists must spend in professional training after leaving undergradute school.

Second, this same medical educational period up to 5 years would be credited for pay longevity purposes—5 years for the medical officers who completed internships and 4 years for dental officers. This provision will place them on the same longevity basis as their line officer contemporaries who entered military service at the same time as physicians entered medical school. The average increase under this provision is about $50 per month, with a maximum of $85 per month. The additional annual cost of the pay credit will be $9,577,000.

The last feature of this bill authorizes an increase in the special pay of physicians and dentists based on length of active service as a medical or dental officer. At the present time all medical and dental officers receive special pay of $100 per month. Under this bill, medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active service will continue to receive the $100 per month. Those with between 2 and 6 years of active service will receive $150 per month in special pay; those with between 6 and 10 years, $200 per month; and those with more than 10 years, $250 per month. The purpose of these graduated increases is to make the military compensation more competitive with that of civilian physicians of similar experience and to provide a greater inducement to remain on active duty. We hope it will provide the inducement which will cause medical and dental officers to remain on active duty and make a career of the armed services.

The committee amended the bill so as to place the first increase at the end of 2 years, rather than after 3 years of active duty. The term of service under the doctor draft law is 2 years, and more than 90 percent of those entering under that law leave the service as their 2-year period expires. It appeared that a greater number might remain if the first increase were offered at the end of the obligated period. The additional estimated cost of this provision is $9,878,200. The total cost of this bill for the first fiscal year following enactment is expected to be $19,455,200.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense and the committees of Congress which are charged with the primary responsibility of recommending legislation which will assure medical and dental aid to the men in the armed services have exhausted every available recourse in an effort to provide an adequate number of doctors and dentists for the armed services. We have resorted to the draft, and it now appears that the pool available from the draft is about to be exhausted.

I only wish we had some other means than that provided by this bill, but no other course apparently is available to us than to increase the compensation, as an incentive for doctors and dentists to make a career of the Armed Forces.

We cannot fail in our responsibility to those whom we have called into the service, many of them against their will, to see that they have adequate medical and dental treatment.

I hope the Senate will pass the bill unanimously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add a few words to what the chairman of the committee has said. He and I have considered this subject for a considerable number of years. The previous bill which was passed was an incentive bill. That bill has not succeeded in holding doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces. This is an additional incentive bill, which we hope will be successful in causing doctors and dentists to make a career of the service and provide needed medical attention for the boys of America who are now serving and who will be called upon to serve in the Armed Forces.

I commend the chairman of the committee for what he has said. I agree with him heartily. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee. We believe it is the only step which can be taken.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee for his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 1, line 9.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "make", to strike out "original"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date"; in line 6, after the word "the", to insert "effective"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "effective"; in the same line, after the word "date", to strike out "of enactment"; on page 4, line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date"; on page 5, line 23, after the word "such", to insert "medical"; on page 6, after line 5, to strike out "and the service credit authorized by this clause shall not be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from the service, under any provision of law" and insert "and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the service credit authorized by this clause shall not—

"(A) be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from the service, under any provision of law;

"(B) increase the retired or retirement pay of a person who became entitled to such pay prior to May 1, 1956; or

"(C) increase the retired pay of a person who becomes entitled to such pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1087), on or after May 1, 1956, but who does not perform active duty after May 1, 1956."

After line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. Title II of the Public Health Service Act (act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 683), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PROMOTION CREDIT—ASSISTANT GRADE

"SEC. 220. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—

On page 7, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "(1)" and insert "(1) (A)"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "(2)" and insert "(2)"; in line 20, after the word "such", to strike out "date." and insert "date." "; after line 23, to strike out:

(1) By repealing so much of sections 211 (e) (1) and 311 (d) (3) as relates to officers of the Medical Corps and Dental Corps of the Navy.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(1) By inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 211 (e) and in the first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 311 (d), after the words "a staff corps", the words "other than the Medical and Dental Corps", and deleting in those sentences the words "if of other than the Medical Corps, and in the preceding calendar year if of the Medical Corps."

On page 8, line 18, after the numeral "5", to insert "(a)"; in line 25, after the word "completed", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; on page 9, line 3, after the word "those", to insert "veterinary"; in line 7, after the word "least", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; after line 19, to insert:

(b) Section 203 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out the following words in the third proviso: "of $100 per month as is."

After line 22, to insert:

SEC. 6. Any person who, on the day before the effective date of this act, has not completed 18 years of service creditable in the computation of active duty pay in the uniformed service of which he is a member and who, as a result of the enactment of this act, is upon the effective date of this act credited with more than 17 years of such service shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be allowed 12 months from the effective date of this act within which to make the election provided for in section 3 (a) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 502).

And, on page 10, at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "6" to "7."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 9428) was read the third time, and passed.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that the yeas and nays on the pending amendment have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1287) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of April 16, 1956, p. 6371, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement to make on the report.

Late last session the Senate passed Senate bill 1287, which made certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement system. Subsequently the House of Representatives amended the bill. Prior to adjournment it was impossible to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate versions of Senate bill 1287.

A conference has now been held; and the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report.

The House and Senate versions of Senate bill 1287 differed in two respects.

In the first place, the Senate version provided for a graduated system of increases to be given to the annuitants under the system. The House version gave annuitants an across-the-board, cost-of-living increase in their annuities in an amount not to exceed $324 a year.

The Senate conferees accepted the House version, which provides for a flat across-the-board increase in annuities for annuitants who retired prior to July 1, 1949. This increase in annuities will give Foreign Service officers the same increase in annuities which was given to civil-service employees in 1952.

The second difference between the House version of Senate bill 1287 and the Senate version related to a House provision which would have authorized the Secretary of State to make loans or grants to certain categories of widows of retired Foreign Service officers. The Senate conferees felt that this provision would establish a bad precedent and might get the Secretary of State into the loan business.

As a result of the conference, changes were made in Senate bill 1287, and these changes will make it possible for a limited class of needy widows of Foreign Service officers to receive annuities of up to $1,200 a year.

The Senate conferees are satisfied that the conference report on Senate bill 1287 represents a reasonable compromise between provisions of the House version of the bill and the Senate version. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the subject of the President's veto of the farm bill.

American farmers are rightfully indignant and deeply shocked by the unwise action of our President in vetoing the urgently needed farm bill.

They have had a chance now to read the President's veto message, and to hear his personal explanation.

I submit they are still shocked. They have every right to be.

If anything, the President's radio and television message of explanation compounded the inconsistencies and inaccuracies of his veto message.

Farmers, as fellow citizens, have a right to expect their President not to mislead them, not to distort the facts.

The glib assumptions of the President's message and his political appeal supporting it have not been upheld in the record of debate on this floor; they are not upheld by the official facts and figures of the Department of Agriculture; they are not warranted by the actual experience of farmers themselves under our farm programs.

It is an amazing sight to see a President of the United States go before the American people on television and insist he will not tolerate any "politics" on farm issues, when he knows better. If he does not, it is only a greater reflection upon him and upon those around him.

If ever there has been partisan politics injected into a farm policy decision, it has been done so by President Eisenhower's own administration.

The White House, Secretary Benson, and spokesmen for Republican farm policy on this floor have consistently and continually refused to work with a Democratic Congress in a true bipartisan sense to develop constructive farm legislation.

Instead, they have come to us and said, in effect, "This is our program—take it or leave it. If you have any ideas of your own to improve it, we will toss the whole thing out the window."

And that is just what they have now done.

The farm bill sent to the White House was worked out by the Democratic leadership with effective bipartisan cooperation on our appropriate committees and supported by farm State representatives of both parties on the floor of the Senate and the House.

Forty-eight Republican Members of the House from the great farming areas of the Nation voted for it.

Fifteen Republican Senators representing key farm States supported it.

Five out of the seven Republican Members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture voted for the conference bill sent to the President for approval.

I submit, Mr. President, that that is bipartisanship at the congressional level on the part of those most responsible for farm legislation. Yet the President turned it down because it was not the "party line" that he and his prime minister Sherman Adams, and his Republican Party leaders had laid down.

If the President now tries to publicly wash his hands of partisanship in this farm fight, what does he have to say about the great advertising campaign of the Senate and House Republican campaign committees in support of the "Eisenhower-Republican farm program?"

That was the advertising campaign under which farmers were to send in a coupon and get the Eisenhower program.

If the President now tries to project himself into the role of a man standing firmly on principle, worried about surpluses, what does he have to say about his own Secretary of Agriculture wheeling and dealing for Senate votes by offering concessions of increased acreage allotments and higher prices in a brazen

attempt to influence Senators to help him save face, whatever the loss to America's farmers and American taxpayers.

There could be no more misleading propaganda perpetrated upon the American people than the President's attempt to lay on the Democrats in the Congress the blame for "delay" on effective action to halt the farm recession.

How many times, Mr. President, have we heard that there was great delay? Yet, the President received the bill on Wednesday, after it was passed by the Senate, but it was not until Monday that any final action by the President was taken.

Where was his concern for a soil bank on September 30, last fall, when his own executive department Bureau of the Budget concurred in the Department of Agriculture's report opposing soil bank legislation which I had introduced a year ago?

The President rejected a soil-bank proposal which was almost identical to the one passed by both Houses.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. That is a point which seems to have escaped the attention of some people. If the President wants to lay blame for delay, he should accept blame for delaying the matter for 3 years, because for the first 3 years of the present administration the President and his administration opposed the soil bank concept.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. He opposed specific legislative proposals. There were 2 or 3 such proposals in the Senate and half a dozen or more in the House. I shall show in this address that the President's own administration could have had a soil bank under existing law if he had wanted to, and can still have.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, I should like to call the Senator's attention to something which occurred in the House yesterday, and which is covered at page 6422 of the RECORD, dealing with the same subject. I was just reading the debate.

A very fine Representative from Minnesota, with whom I served in the House and whom I know quite well, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, who is a member of the Republican Party, said this in talking about the soil bank. First, I shall read what Representative POAGE of Texas said:

> Mr. POAGE. I have here with me today a copy of letters from the Department of Agriculture written less than 9 months ago condemning this soil bank, in which the Secretary advises the Committee on Agriculture that he then considered it too expensive and unworkable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be interested to know that we were talking about $500 million and the President wanted a billion and a quarter dollars?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me read what Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN said:

> Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
>
> Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentlemn from Minnesota.
>
> Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The hearings before my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture will show that on January 28, 1954, Mr. Benson in direct answer to a question I asked with reference to what was wrong with the general principle of establishing such a soil bank informed us that in his opinion it was unworkable. He said there were many things wrong with the principles of such a program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Alabama and, also, the Representative from Minnesota.

Mr. President, where was the President's concern over delay in getting started when his own Secretary of Agriculture came before our Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on January 12 of this year and admitted they had not yet worked out detailed suggestions or recommendations on the workings of a soil bank, but were just then rushing to get them prepared?

Where was his concern over delay when the Senate deferred action after the Senate Committee reported its bill February 10, to allow a 10-day period for Republican orators to tour the country making Lincoln Day fund-raising speeches for the Republican Party?

I am not objecting to that. That is done under a gentlemen's understanding, and it is entirely appropriate. But it always seems that when there is a delay the President finds it convenient to lay the blame on the Democratic side.

Where was his concern over the economic plight of farmers when his Secretary of Agriculture established new low support levels for 1956 crops—levels the President now offers grudgingly to partially raise in return for depriving farmers of the fair price levels Congress determined they were entitled to?

If the Eisenhower administration finds justification and authority now to voluntarily increase farm price-support levels to some degree after veto of the farm bill which would have provided far more effective farm income protection, why did not the same justification and authority exist when Secretary Benson earlier established the lower support levels?

Mr. President, I think that is a fair question. The President is establishing new support levels—he announced it in his veto message and on the radio and on the television—on the basis of the law of 1954. That law, Mr. President, was in effect in January, February, March, and April of this year. It has not been changed.

How does it happen that wheat was 76 percent of parity before the veto and has gone up to 84 percent of parity after the veto?

Mr. President, the law laid down eight criteria for the Secretary to use in deciding on support levels. He is obligated to use them. If he does not, he must make a public explanation.

I should like to know what has happened in the past 2 weeks in connection with the surplus of wheat and the production of wheat which allowed the President administratively to raise support levels. The only thing that has happened is the approach of an election.

I say, here and now, that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture have an obligation under the law, which I shall read subsequently, to announce why they made these decisions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wondered if it had occurred to the Senator from Minnesota that the idea behind raising the support level was that an election is in prospect? We are now seeing some indication of the many things which could have been done during the past 3 years to help the farmers, and which the administration has deliberately refrained from doing. In other words, it is possible that many things which the administration is proceeding to do now, could have been done during the past 3 years in order to increase farm income by more than a billlion dollars a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on the most important factor in the debate and squabble on farm legislation. It is now obvious to every farmer that the administration has been crudely, rudely, and in a Scrooge-like manner, denying to farmers reasonable prices for their products. We now have evidence, by way of the veto message, that any time the President wants to raise the support levels, he can do so. So it can only be that he purposely, and with design, forced prices down. Now, with Mr. Eisenhower's willful action, administratively, under the same law, the price support level is raised—or, more correctly, not lowered as much as they originally planned—as a means of throwing a sop to the farmers' well-being, thinking that they will forget the many months of depressed prices they have had to suffer.

What has been the change in the economic facts involved in the conflicting decisions other than the belated election year recognition of farm protests against the administration's gross neglect of agriculture? President Eisenhower says, "We now have sound, forward looking legislation in the Agricultural Act of 1954." Yet it was under that Act that Secretary Benson fixed the support levels originally announced for 1956. It must be assumed that Secretary Benson used the criteria established in the act in arriving at the announced price support levels. Whatever discretionary authority the President or the Secretary now has to make adjustments related to economic conditions in agriculture, he also had before. Whatever information the administration officials now have about depressed conditions in agriculture they had available then—if they had cared to consider that vital fact.

Does the President now say that the Secretary of Agriculture grossly misjudged the factors involved in setting the lower support levels under the flexible support theory? Is the President saying to the people of America and to Congress, via his veto message, his radio

program, and his television program, that Ezra Taft Benson not only is a poor Secretary of Agriculture, but that he does not even know arithmetic?

The support levels announced by Secretary Benson were announced under the President's authority. It is Mr. Eisenhower's farm program, not poor Benson's. It is Mr. Eisenhower who is responsible. Is Mr. Eisenhower saying to the farmer that he did not know what was in the Agricultural Act of 1954? Is he saying to the farmer that even if he had known what was in the Act of 1954, he thought the farmers ought to suffer a little more? Is that why he cut the support levels down? Is that why he pulled down the support level for wheat? Is that why it was cut down for corn? I want some explanation from this "principled administration."

Is the President of the United States saying that the flexible support theory should not be quite so flexible in an election year? Is that what he is saying? Is he saying that a little of the flex ought to be taken out every time a presidential election comes around? Or is he saying, "We are going to dip into the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the Republican campaign expenses"? That is what he was saying in the veto message.

I was of the opinion that Congress wrote the law. I was of the opinion that once a law was in operation, a law such as the act of 1954, there had to be some continuity to it. But no. By one simple twist of the dial, by a television script, by a veto message, farm prices are raised overnight in Washington, administratively, from the White House—and under the same old law.

Mr. President, I say this is not "principled" action. I say that, at best, it shows one of two things: Either the Department of Agriculture or the President did not know what was being done before last week; therefore, they have now come around to admitting their grievous errors of judgment at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the American farmers and the American economy. Or they are merely playing politics by changing the support levels overnight, in order to ease the blow of an unjustified veto.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota inform the junior Senator from Tennessee whether the old price support levels, the price support levels previously announced by Secretary Benson, are in conformity with the formulas and the requirements of the 1954 act; or whether the new, recently announced, politically announced, price support levels are in conformity with the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Rather than to pose as a judge in that matter, let me say that if the new announced support levels are supported by the criteria in the 1954 act, then, indeed, the levels of last week were not supported by the criteria. If that is the case, then we ought to get a new Department of Agriculture, starting with the Secretary; and it might be well, also, to get someone new at the top, through a change in the White House, namely, a new President; because if the President can be that wrong, and if his Secretary of Agriculture can be that wrong, then this is too expensive an administration, because its actions have cost the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Would it be reasonable to deduce from these circumstances that one of the inequities of the flexible-price-support program is that it is subject to political manipulation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How right the Senator from Tennessee is. The program seems to become much more firm in its flexibility in about April, May, and June of a presidential election year. One of the real reasons for a mandatory price-support program is that it does not make any difference whether a farmer votes or not; he is under a price-support level provided by the law passed by Congress. It does not make any difference whether he is a Republican or a Democrat; he gets the price-support level provided by the law passed by Congress.

I charge on the floor now that the administration is openly playing politics with the price-support program of 1954.

Mr. GORE. That being true, would the Senator not think the farmers could more safely rely upon the price-support levels determined by Congress, as contained in the law, than to leave their fate to the political manipulations of the party bosses in an election year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Tennessee is absolutely correct. Again I may say that his perception is equal to his good judgment, and both are superlative.

Mr. President, some of the press critics of effective farm legislation so jubilant over the President's veto need to do a little soul searching before they jump to such hasty conclusions as they have as to who is standing on principle and who is not, who is being consistent and who is not, who is doing what is really best for our economy and who is not.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that the Wall Street Journal has endorsed the President's action in this matter?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have not been fully aware of that fact, but I may say I am not surprised. I would rather have expected it, since many of the announcements of the administration on agriculture have come from that great newspaper.

Mr. KERR. In view of the fact that Benson and the Wall Street Journal have agreed on what the farm policy ought to be, and that the President has come out with such a program, does the Senator not feel that perhaps he should evaluate his position, and see if he would be justified in taking a position inconsistent with the one they take?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is a valuable suggestion for the President. I may say if the President would evaluate anything he has done, it would be helpful to the American people.

Mr. KERR. I agree with the Senator, but in view of the fact that the Wall Street Journal has endorsed his position so completely, is it not possible that the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oklahoma, who have been so positive in their condemnation of the President, might reevaluate the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Wall Street Journal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has a point. I gather his point is that after hearing from the Wall Street Journal's "experts" in the field of agriculture, we might want to reevaluate our own criticisms of the President's action?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the reasons why the President and the Wall Street Journal were interested in the farm bill was that the bill had the words "soil bank" in it. Immediately there was a great reaction in the administration. They said, "A bank! A bank! It must be good." Immediately financial publications, such as Barron's Weekly, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Journal of Commerce, said, "A bank!" The word "soil" did not mean too much, but the word "bank" set up a whole chain reaction. The President, along with Benson, his great Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, who, by the way, is not related to me biologically or politically, saw the word "bank" in the bill, and said, "It must be good." The Federal Reserve banks have been constantly fooling around with the discount rate; and that is what the administration has been doing with the price supports.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will yield, I should like to point out that they are related on the basis of an inverse ratio, interest rates going up, and price supports going down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true. Price supports for financial institutions have gone up, and price supports for farmers have gone down. Do not think the administration is not for price supports. It depends on who would be affected by them. We do not want to be unkind to them. They are really for price supports.

Mr. KERR. And for Dixon-Yates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For Dixon-Yates.

Mr. KERR. And high interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. High interest rates; discount rates; and for price supports, but not for farmers.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I suppose the Senator noticed over the past weekend, while the President was considering vetoing the farm bill, that his administration increased the rediscount interest rates by one-half of one percent. Did he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration did that; and they did not have to have any hearings on it; there was no delay.

Mr. LONG. Before the day was over, the Chase National Bank also raised its interest rates to keep them in line with those of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is always cooperating with the administration.

Mr. LONG. I am sure that by Monday every bank of any consequence had raised the interest rates which will be charged farmers and other individuals, including interest rates charged the Federal Government for interest on the Government's own debt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They will cooperate to the last digit and the last nickel on increased interest rates they can get from everyone.

Mr. LONG. One of these days I hope to compute how much the increases in the interest rates by the administration have cost the farmers and the general consumers of the Nation. I would assume the figure to be somewhere between $1½ billion and $2 billion. Someone should take a look at the cost of the increased interest rates the administration has imposed on the people, without consultation with Congress or anyone else, but to help out those who lend money, at the expense of the Government and most of the people who have borrowed money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the Senator will admit that the administration has been efficient and there has been no delay in fulfilling its obligation to provide price supports. It did not make clear, price supports on what. The first act of the administration in 1953 was to raise interest rates for agriculture.

Mr. LONG. Over the weekend the administration did not see anything wrong in increasing the interest rates charged to those who borrow money, by one-half of one percent, while at the same time it killed the bill to benefit the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. These are matters which have been discussed before the Committee on Finance. At least, they have been discussed after the fact. I regret the Senator's advice was not sought beforehand, but the administration likes to move rapidly.

Mr. LONG. Banks got an increase in their price supports at the same time farmers got a decrease in their price supports.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a perfectly consistent action on the part of the administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure there is any relation to the question of parity, but I wonder if the increase in interest rates which was put into effect over the weekend, while the President was deciding to veto price supports for farmers, was a 90-percent support price, or was it approaching 100 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I take it the administration is approaching the great goal of 100 percent in the market place. It is the market, but not the livestock market. It is the stock market, the blue-chip market.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator from Minnesota which market place he was referring to, but now he has answered the question I intended to ask him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who has been so much a part of the struggle to obtain equality for agriculture, will agree with me that generally, when a Republican President is in the White House and when the Republican Party is feeling its strength, there are two obvious economic facts in American life: low agricultural prices and high New York stock-market prices—or, at least, for a while; sometimes they decline, as occurred in 1932.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the Chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The result of the first interest-rate manipulation was to reduce from three to two the number of bedrooms in a house a veteran could purchase with a given payment. The junior Senator from Tennessee would like to know how many bedrooms there are in the house a veteran can buy now with the same amount of money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure what the decrease will be in the number of bedrooms; but I suggest that such a veteran will be rather crowded in living in the few bedrooms he will have left, because the walls are tightening in on him as a result of the last little "deal" to which the Senator from Louisiana referred.

Furthermore, I recall the report made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] in regard to what I believe was a $14,000 home. The action of the administration resulted in reducing the size of such a home by one bedroom. In short, the administration said, "If you have a large family, you will have to crowd up a little bit."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me suggest that in that process, still another room has been removed from the house such a person could afford, because in the last year the average price of homes in the United States rose $1,400, and the price is still rising.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if that continues, some folk will have to sleep in the parks.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that is one of the considerations back of the proposal to prevent further increases in the population of the United States—because there would be no place for them to sleep.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly that is a very helpful comment in connection with this discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to a Senator on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; for I wish to be fair to Senators on that side of the aisle.

However, Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Indiana, I should like to give the Senator from Indiana several little tidbits on which he will be able to chew for a while.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, since the Senator from Minnesota is trying to straighten out his understanding of this matter, I shall be glad to throw a little more light on it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have the Senator from Indiana do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to help keep the record straight. Let me point out that in the 3½ years since Mr. Eisenhower has been President of the United States, there has not been an increase in the cost of living. In other words, what the people buy today costs no more than it would have cost 3 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me interrupt the Senator from Indiana at that point. I think the statement he has made is a fair one, but I think a word of explanation in that connection might be helpful. As the prices of processed and manufactured goods have risen and as interest rates have risen—and they have—and as the carrying charges which farmers have to pay have risen and as the wages of other groups of the population have risen, the prices of farm commodities have gone down. So the administration has been able to keep some sort of economic balance, by having the prices of some things go up, and the prices of others go down. Of course, that development unbalances the situation of some folk, although it makes a fairly good statistical picture.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Minnesota also said that when the Republicans are in power, farm prices go down and New York Stock Market prices go up.

Let me say that during my lifetime there have been three Democratic Presidents—Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. All three of them involved the United States in war. Therefore, let me ask the Senator from Minnesota this question: Is it just as honest to say that when we have a Democratic President, we are involved in war, as it is to say that when we have a Republican President, farm prices are low and New York Stock Market prices are high? Is one statement as honest as the other?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Indiana has asked me the question, and I would reply by saying "No." [Laughter.] That is a simple and an honest answer.

I have always been interested in the knowledge of history that my Republican friends have. They have a wonderful way of being able to ignore any chapters of history that are slightly distasteful to them. For instance, they ignore the existence of such a person as Hitler. In the minds of our Republican friends, such a person never existed. Likewise, so far as my Republican friends are concerned, Pearl Harbor never happened—or, if it did, it was only another Republican parade with firecrackers. Similarly, in the minds of my Repulican friends, there never were such persons as Tojo or Stalin.

Such a point of view on the part of my Republican friends indicates to me that

if one is able to close his mind to certain chapters of history, he can live a rather blissful, peaceful life.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, to permit me to ask two questions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Indiana called attention to the fact that the cost of living has been about the same for the past 3 years. Is it not a definite and accepted fact that the American farmer is the goat of that situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not also a fact that the American farmer has had to suffer the depressing influence of reduced agricultural prices, and that the prices of agricultural commodities have been reduced in order to absorb the increase which has occurred in the prices of all commodities except those produced on the farms?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct; and the statement he has made is supported by all the statistical data which comes from the Government.

Mr. KERR. Now let me refer to 100 percent of parity in the market place, insofar as the farmer is concerned. Is it not a fact that the one time during the past three decades when the farmer had full parity in the market place for his products was during the administration of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator please repeat his question? The suggestion he makes in it is a rather shocking one.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that the only time in the past three decades when the farmer has had full parity in the market place—that is to say, the full benefit of the law of supply and demand, and also as regards the operations of the speculators and the full evil effect of such operations—was during the administration of Herbert Hoover?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think he came as close to reaching that objective as any man I know of.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that no effort was made to prevent the prices of farm products from finding whatever level the operation of the law of supply and demand and the operations of the speculators would drive them to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, except I wish to point out that in order to keep the record straight, we should say that in 1930 and 1931 the old Federal Farm Board engaged in some activities which were too little and too late—which is another chapter in the book of the Republican doxology.

Mr. KERR. Was that the Board which advocated helping the wheat farmer by placing a bonus on the price of flour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is seems to me that something of that sort was involved.

Mr. KERR. Just as Secretary Benson has tried to help the livestock producers by giving a bonus to the packers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. There seems to be a strange similarity and affinity there.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall that the Farm Board was created and that $500 million was appropriated by Congress for the operations of the Board. But the $500 million and the farmers all went down the drain together as a result.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what we call a great engineering feat—ditching the dam and draining the country in one fell swoop.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the statement has been made that the cost of living today is about the same as it has been during the past 3 years, it might be well to point out that, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, in that process some persons have done better and some persons have done worse. For example, the corporations with assets of more than $100 million have seen their profits increase by 27 percent. Those are the figures of the Eisenhower administration. Those with assets of $250,000 or less have seen their profits reduced by 39 percent, while the farmer has seen his income reduced by $4 billion. The persons who collect interest on money have seen their incomes increased by approximately $2 billion. So the cost of living is the same. It has only been shifted. Those in the upper brackets are making more and those in the lower brackets are making less. At least, some people can be happy. The economy is balanced. Some are getting more and some are getting less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He is always on the job when it comes to economic analysis. I know of no Senator who has contributed more to an objective, accurate appraisal of these figures than has the Senator from Louisiana. I accept his figures. I am sure they are supported by the reports of the Senator's own Committee on Small Business.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In order that the statement of our distinguished colleague from Louisiana may be understood, the decrease of $4 billion which the farmer has suffered is a decrease in his take-home pay, his take-home income, or net.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. It is a $4 billion net decrease.

Mr. KERR. That is, according to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. A few days ago a panel of economists from the Reserve board headquarters in the district of which Oklahoma is a part conducted a panel discussion in a bankers' convention in Oklahoma. They announced that the average farm income in Oklahoma for 1955 was $1,200 per family, which represented a decrease of $1,000 per family in 3 years. That demonstrates that actually the take-home pay of the average farm family during the past 3 years has been reduced nearly one-half.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that observation. I am sure the Senator would be interested in knowing that the college of agriculture at Ames, Iowa, in a recent study in Iowa, demonstrated that last year there was a 50-percent reduction in cash income of Iowa farmers. In Minnesota we have seen a very substantial reduction in income of farmers, and a rise in indebtedness.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Oklahoma made the statement a few moments ago that the Department of Agriculture had undertaken to support the price of hogs by a bonus to the packers. If that be true, what kind of products would the Senator from Minnesota or the senior Senator from Oklahoma say the Department of Agriculture actually bought?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall make one comment, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The study which we placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which was a review of statistical evidence relating to purchases by the Department of finished pork products from packers, revealed that every time the Department of Agriculture bought pork products, the price of pork went up and the price of hogs went down. That is shown by the records of the Department of Agriculture. That was true in every instance, with 1 or 2 exceptions. I think there were two times when the purchase program resulted in an increase in the return to the producer of hogs.

I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he must give the Department of Agriculture full credit. It has boosted the price of canned pork gravy to the packer more than 10 percent as a result of this operation.

Today the Department of Agriculture, after having bought more than $100 million worth of pork products, including a very substantial amount of canned pork gravy, has succeeded in lifting the price of the delectable, desirable, incomparable product of pork gravy to the point where it is paying nearly 70 cents a pound. When the program started, it was at the pitifully low price of about 62 cents.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] once said, the Department was proving that, although the man who raised the hog and kept him for 7 months received only 10 cents a pound, the packer, for keeping him about 30 minutes, was getting a differential of more than 50 cents a pound. As the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma said, the hog could have stayed at the Waldorf-Astoria for an equal length of time for less.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Oklahoma for their very delightful and enlightening contribution on the subject of political gravy. That is apparently what has been the result, when we consider the President's veto in the light of some of the recent actions with respect to the farm-price-support level.

If we consider the veto message line by line, we find it filled with inconsistencies. The President professes worry

about accumulating more surpluses of feed grains, then vetoes the first action this Congress has ever taken to cut back production of feed grains.

I wish to be charitable to the President. I am sure he did not know that there was something in the bill which would have cut back the production of feed grains. The bill would have made a mandatory reduction of 15 percent in the acreage of feed grains. That would not have resulted in the production of more feed grains, but less feed grains. However, for what the farmer did produce, he would receive a fair and reasonable price.

So, if the President wishes to reconsider the veto message—I do not know whether there is precedent for it—if he will look into the feed-grain section of the bill as passed by Congress, he will find that for the first time in the history of the Congress a measure was enacted by Congress to cut back the production of feed grains. Yet the President went on the radio and television and told the people that the bill would expand the production of feed grains. I am sure he meant it. I am sure he thought it would. I am sure Benson never told him to the contrary. Sherman Adams undoubtedly did not know about it, because he does not produce enough feed grains to enable him to know about it. I am sure no one told the President about it, or he would not have misled the American people. I do not say that the President purposely or intentionally misleads the people. I simply say that he did not know what was in the bill. If he did know, he would be guilty of a purposeful deception of the American people. However, I do not think he would do so.

It is time someone really challenged the fiction this administration is peddling as fact about all the depressed farm prices being the result of surpluses.

It is not Government-owned surpluses that depress prices; it is how the Government handles those surpluses.

How can commodities in the Government's hands depress the cash markets below support levels if the law requires, as it does, that the Government shall not sell those commodities at less than the full support price plus 5 percent and carrying charges?

I will tell Senators how it happens. It happens only because the administration uses every loophole to avoid that law, and to dump products on the market in direct competition with the producer at cutrate competition.

Before the President does much more talking about surpluses, I ask once again for him to tell this Congress just what really is surplus and what is not. His own Secretary was unable to do so, and his own Office of Defense Mobilization was unable to do so.

What a strange situation confronts us. Here we are in Congress, asked to spend billions to correct a situation of surpluses, and yet this administration has never, to my knowledge, informed either the Congress or its committees where it draws the line between what is surplus and what is normal safe reserves for the protection of the Nation's interest.

If the Government regards everything that passes through its hands in the Commodity Credit Corporation as surplus then it is hopelessly confused.

For this administration, by embarking on policies of bringing farm prices down on the one hand while supposedly trying to keep them up through loan programs on the other, has driven more and more commodities into its own hands and taken over more and more of the normal marketing functions of private producers and private traders.

The result of this Department's bungling administration has been less free trade and less free markets, not more.

The Government itself has cornered the market, and has steered it downward, instead of upward. Its actions have devalued its own commodity holdings and expanded losses to the taxpayers, as well as expanding loss to farmers.

I would like to ask one simple question: Does anyone think that if any one smart private trader in this country had control of as great a proportion of our farm commodities as the Department of Agriculture has, he could not influence the market upward or downward?

Imagine, Mr. President, a trader in a particular commodity getting literally a corner on the market. Does any Senator believe that such a trader would not force prices up, instead of down? Of course he would. Yet our Government, which has these great quantities of commodities, says it will not use them to build a better price structure. Instead, Mr. President, it will use them to depress the price structure.

I say on the floor of the Senate, as a Member of the Senate and on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that anyone who goes to the Chicago Board of Trade or to the Minneapolis Grain Exchange and speaks to the men in those exchanges, who are actually in the market, will be told by them that the present administration has done more to usurp the powers of a normal free trade in the grain market than has any other administration in our history. They will make clear that our Department of Agriculture has purposely and intentionally depressed prices. I have submitted for the RECORD in months past, letters, telegrams, and other communications from boards of trade and from important exporters and traders in the field of agricultural commodities which show that to be the fact.

We have far lower farm prices than economically necessary under existing conditions simply because the Department of Agriculture has refused to "freeze" its holdings to force prices up to support levels.

We have more commodities going through the Government's hands and being labeled "surplus" because of just such mismanagement.

Unless farmers call a halt to it in November, it is now obvious that we are in for more mismanagement and more low prices despite anything Congress tries to do about it.

Farmers needed the bill sent to the White House by this Congress. Our country needed it.

As I said earlier in my remarks, more than 40 Republican Members of the House of Representatives and 15 Republican Members of the Senate joined with the Democrats in Congress in getting that bill to the President. Those are men who live in farm areas. They are men who understand farm problems. They worked hard and conscientiously to bring about good legislation.

Conscientious men worked long and hard to develop that bill to meet acute problems in our economy. It is a dangerous disservice to intimate, as some have mistakenly done, that it was a mere gesture deliberately developed to force a Presidential veto.

I do not know a supporter of that bill who did not urge that it be signed into law.

In fact, I thought the bill would be signed. I could not conceive the President of the United States vetoing it, when, at the most, there was only a 1-year extension of what he thought were high support levels, and when at the same time he was getting almost everything else he had asked for, and particularly when the 1954 act was not being basically repealed or amended. Nevertheless, the President vetoed the bill.

It was Republican opponents of the bill who urged its veto, not Democratic supporters.

I can hardly conceive of our Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle cooperating so readily in obtaining this veto if, as some have tried to say, it was Democratic strategy to get a veto.

Certainly, I am convinced a veto will be politically beneficial to the Democratic Party. Because it emphasizes more than our words could do the underlying philosophy of this administration against effective aid for agriculture.

But there could be no better test of putting farm welfare above political advantage than the serious effort made by a Democratic Congress to enact an effective, workable farm bill in a election year, so the Republican President would not have to campaign for reelection in quite as bad an economic climate in our rural areas.

We put the well-being of our farmers above our politics. We put the country's interest first. Seldom has there been such solid nonpartisan cooperation in the great Midwest farm areas. Yet our guidance is spurned. Our efforts are rejected. And our intelligence—and the intelligence of farmers—is insulted by the President's explanation of his actions.

Apparently, this veto was felt required, whatever the cost in human suffering to our farm population, to perpetuate the myth that "Republicans can do no wrong." They had hewed to a party line based on preconceived notions, and refused to face the facts that now confront them proving they have been wrong.

My deepest regret, of course, is for our farmers themselves.

My next deepest regret is for Republican members of the Senate and House from farm areas, who have been betrayed by the leaders of their own party, and have had exposed for all their constituents to see how little consideration

the President gives to the views of his own party's representatives from the great rural States most vitally hit by this action.

Even governors of rural States pleaded with the President to sign the bill. No one said it was a perfect bill. No one said that every part of the bill was the last word in legislative perfection. No piece of legislation is perfect. However, at least the bill approached the goal and the objective of a sounder agricultural economy than we have today.

The crowning climax has been the President's suggestion of an advance payment to farmers this year—Mr. President, I ask Senators to listen to this particularly—the crowning climax has been the President's suggestion of an advance payment to farmers this year if they will agree to participate in a soil bank next year. I have never heard of such a reckless proposal relating to the public Treasury. It is a proposal to advance payments to farmers for doing something next year. What if they do not follow through next year, after they get their advanced payment this year? Are we to have district attorneys and marshals running willy-nilly over the countryside prosecuting farmers?

It is nothing more than a brazenly ridiculous election-year-bribe attempt that farmers will resent as insulting.

I think I know our Midwest farmers. Farmers will not like being denied decent prices for what they produce in one breath, and then being promised a charity check for doing nothing in the next breath, in the apparent hope they can be bribed into silence instead of fighting for equity and justice.

No one wants improved farm legislation this year, as quickly as possible, any more than I do. I include myself in the majority of the Senate who want action as quickly as possible.

But the President knows—or should know—that he has killed the best Congress can offer this year.

When this bill was before the Senate, Senator after Senator offered amendment after amendment trying desperately to obtain further improvement for farmers in his particular State. Those men represent farm people. That is what we have legislatures for. We have a representative Government, not a rubber stamp Government.

According to the President's action, we do not even need to be here to represent our people. I suggest that we know a little more about the intimate and detailed needs of our farm economy in our respective areas than some adviser in the White House. There are more advisers at the White House than there have ever been there before, although they are not so good as some have been in the past. The quantity has gone up, but the quality has gone down. Advisers are not always as closely identified with the needs of the people as those who have worked with the people year after year and who are privileged to serve the people as elected officials.

The offering of the many amendments to the farm bill was no idle gesture; it was a sincere effort to take care of the economic problems of the people by representatives who were elected to serve them.

It was not only Democrats who offered such amendments. Republicans offered as many as Democrats did, reflecting their own conviction that farmers of their respective areas needed something better than this administration had to offer.

One of the objections offered by the President to signing the farm bill, for example, was its two-price plans for wheat and rice. It was a Republican Senator, stanch supporter of the President, who in good faith offered the amendment to add a two-price plan for wheat to protect the farmers of his State. And I am sure some of my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, if they are not now too embarrassed to tell the truth, could tell us that certain spokesmen for the White House gave them the "green light" to vote for that amendment, assuring them the White House had no objection. Of course, another spokesman for the White House was busy assuring opponents of the amendment at the same time that the White House agreed with them. In other words, the White House was working both sides of the street, and apparently from both sides of the White House. That was only one of the many tragic inconsistencies of the White House on this entire farm policy action.

The members of the press corps know that what I have said is true. They know that one representative of the White House contacted Members of Congress urging them to vote for the two-price plan, saying that the plan was agreeable to the administration.

But the White House knows well that any new attempt to bring soil bank legislation before this Congress would only result in renewed attempts by Members of Congress—by Republicans as well as Democrats—to amend it further to include provisions they feel necessary to take care of the needs of their farmer constituents. When it was all over, we would be right back where we started from.

The new White House appeal for separate soil bank action is merely a hollow political gesture, an unfair political gesture.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator realizes that if a bill providing for a soil bank were brought before the Congress today—and I hope we can divorce it from what the Senator thinks is a wholly political gesture—and if, as a result of the very solid conviction the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I, and other Senators, have on the subject, we could pass such a soil bank bill, the benefits of such a program would be made available to the farmers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe in the soil-bank program. I am talking about the hue and cry that it can be done only by new legislation, and I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to bear with me a few moments, and I think he will see the merit of my position.

Mr. President, if this administration feels as strongly about the need for a soil-bank program for production adjustment, why has it not put one into effect long ago?

Why did it not accept the proposal we had before it last year?

Why did it not submit budget requests for carrying out such a program under existing authorization?

I will challenge this administration to say it has no authority now to carry out the very same soil-bank program, merely by asking for necessary appropriations and perhaps expanding the appropriation authority.

Why has it deceived farmers and the American people into thinking it could not do a thing without a new act?

Everyone in the Department of Agriculture knows better. The Department of Agriculture's general counsel knows they have general authority for such a program—even specific direction for it. The Secretary of Agriculture knows it, even if the President does not.

Furthermore, Mr. President, they know they have been talking about it within the past 3 days. They know there have been meetings in the Department, and they found that authority. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture does not seem to be able to act. One of the purposes of a soil-bank bill, the sort of bill which we may adopt, is not to rely upon the discretion of the Secretary, but to furnish congressional guidelines as to how it should be done.

The Secretary apparently wants merely to be able to lay blame on the Congress for not giving him a soil bank act, so he can have an excuse on which to hereafter blame all his troubles.

The public is entitled to know these facts. It is wrong for the President of the United States to mislead the people about this soil bank situation.

I respectfully challenge the press to look up the law for itself, if the President or the Secretary of Agriculture will not tell us about it.

Read the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended—the law now in full force and effect.

Sections 1 to 6 have been on the statute books since April 27, 1935.

They give the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers to carry out intensive conservation efforts, including specific provisions for "changes in use of land."

The third point of the introductory section 1 says:

> (3) To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he (the Secretary) may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act.

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary." Not even a limitation. Yet has Secretary Benson or President Eisenhower ever asked for such appropriations?

But if that is not broad enough authority—and competent counsel indicates it is—let us read further in this same act, through sections 7 and 8.

Section 7 (a) says:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include—

(1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility;

(2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land;

(3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources;

and, after a fourth point on protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion, adds:

(5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio.

Section 8 (a) of the act makes clear this authority exists in force until the end of this year.

Section 8 (b) says:

Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, or the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); of (5) any combination of the above.

That is the law on the books. That law was there last year. It was there when this administration was supposedly desperately struggling to find a way to help the farmers. It was there when the President's message was sent to Congress. It is still on the books.

In layman's language, what does that law provide? It specifically authorizes payments to farmers for changes in land use, so as to avoid the exploitation or wasteful use of land resources for production unneeded for domestic consumption. That is what the soil-bank program will do. That is its whole purpose.

Note, however, that the language is permissive, not mandatory. I say that anyone who reads the language of the Conservation Act and the Domestic Allotment Act, with amendments up to date, going back to as early as 1935, will find in them all the authority which is necessary for effective soil conservation or a soil conservation reserve program.

When my own soil bank bill was introduced, my purpose was to direct the Secretary to carry out such a program, in view of his failure to take such action on his own initiative. If the Secretary wanted such a program, if the President wanted such a program, why was it not included in this year's budget under authority which now exists? Why was it made into a political football?

The veto now makes the answers rather obvious. The administration was more interested in having something to propose with which to counter what Congress might develop than it was in getting a real program started.

To be sure, the existing authorization covers only this year. It would have been a simple matter to extend it, if the administration had asked for it. It has been extended numerous times before, and will likely be extended in any event this year, in order to assure the continuation of our regular agricultural program, now carried on under the act.

The act also includes a limitation of $500 million for any one year for the sections 7 and 8 provisions; but it would be far simpler for the President and the Secretary to start an immediate program at the beginning of the year, under the existing authority, than it would be merely to ask Congress to double that amount in order to obtain the necessary funds which now appear to be required to do a creditable job.

In view of this existing authority, the President's dramatic appeal for "action" on the soil bank has a hollow ring. Why does not the administration simply ask for a supplemental appropriation, together with a request to expand the authority it now has? Is the administration afraid to do that, because it would mean admitting publicly that it has had such authority all along, and could have started the program January 1, instead of using the program as a mere political device to talk about? It is time the President answered a few of these questions. If he is too busy, or if he is away, let the Secretary of Agriculture answer them.

All the huckstering the administration's spokesmen can do will not change the simple fact that President Eisenhower, by his own decision—regardless of who may have guided it—has taken almost a $2 billion slice out of farm income for this year.

Despite the belated gestures of the President in offering to give back pennies for the dollars he is taking away from the farmers, the fact remains that America's farmers will get about $2,416 million less this year than would have been conservatively anticipated under the measure which the President vetoed.

This figure is not an idle guess. It is the considered judgment of competent economists who have been working on these estimates for me ever since the President vetoed the bill. It is my intention to substantiate that figure with tabulations from which it was compiled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD tabulations and statistical charts which will furnish the background for my statement that the veto has cost the American farmers not less than $2,416 million on estimated production of this year's crops, according to the Department of Agriculture's own estimates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, would the distinguished Senator from Minnesota indicate to the Senate, so that we might know what reliance may be placed upon the charts, whether the statistics were compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, by the Treasury Department, or by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; they were not; they are tables which were developed by three members of my own staff and myself, together with representatives of the National Farmers Union, and by economists who have helped me.

One of those whose assistance I received formerly worked in the Department of Agriculture. My own administrative assistant worked for many years in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota. When Senators examine the tables in the RECORD, they will know what the background of them is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The tables reveal simple arithmetic. The Department of Agriculture has estimated the crop production for the coming year. The Department of Agriculture knew what the price support levels would have been under the Senate-House bill. The Department of Agriculture knew what the price support levels were prior to the President's veto message. The Department of Agriculture knows what the price support levels will be as announced in the President's veto message. All that is necessary is to put them down: First, the price support levels under the 1954 act, before Eisenhower gave them a little political jump; the price support levels under the conference report; the production estimates, which can be arrived at by taking the amount per pound or per bushel and multiplying it by the number of bushels or pounds under the 1954 flexible price support schedule, which was prevailing until Mr. Eisenhower spoke on television and radio Monday night. Place those figures alongside those which were provided in the bill, and we will come fairly close to the estimates.

There are other factors involved which are explained in the tables.

Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD 13 tables comparing the farm income-improving provisions of H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, which the President vetoed, with the same provisions of both the pre- and post-veto Eisenhower programs—the programs which the President originally

sent to Congress—and the makeshift program he is now offering in his veto message.

The Eisenhower preveto program was computed on the basis of the announcements of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the recommendations in President Eisenhower's 1956 message on agriculture. The postveto Eisenhower program is the program announced by the President at the time he vetoed H. R. 12. The source of the figures and the bases of calculations are shown in appropriate footnotes.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Summary table of increased farm income improving provisions and added value of CCC stocks of H. R. 12 (Agricultural Act of 1956) compared with Eisenhower proposals*

[Millions of dollars]

Provision	Reference table	Net farm income provided by H. R. 12 more than by Eisenhower programs	
		Veto announcements	Original proposals
Milk supports	II	0	$108
Conservation reserve	III	$700	510
Wheat provisions	IV	239	175
Cotton provisions	V	230	275
Peanuts	VI	12	17
Corn (commercial area)	VII	768	248
Corn (noncommercial)	VIII	127	146
Grain sorghum	IX	38	38
Oats	X	116	116
Barley	XI	32	32
Rye	XII	4	4
Hogs, cattle	XIII	150	150
Total		2,416	1,819

TABLE II.—*Income from sale of milk in 1956–57*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price per hundredweight	$3.25	$3.25	[1] $3.15
Farm marketings (billion pounds)	108	108	108
Gross income from milk sales (million dollars)	[2] $3,510	[2] $3,510	[2] $3,402
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars)	0	0	$108

[1] Amended by Secretary of Agriculture.

[2] Understates value of total sales since all milk is valued at manufacturing milk price, whereas about ½ goes into fluid retail sales. However, the latter are usually governed by State or Federal milk marketing orders or regulations with formulas basing fluid milk prices on manufacturing milk market averages.

TABLE III.—*Increased income from conservation reserve*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Authorized appropriations (millions of dollars)	$450	0	$350
Estimated cut in production (percent) [1]	3	0	2

[1] Of crops not under acreage reserve.

TABLE III.—*Increased income from conservation reserve*—Continued

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Estimated surplus at 1955 support prices (percent) [2]	2	0	2
Additional cut in supply (percent)	1	0	0
Price raising effect (percent)	[3] 6	0	0
Production index (percent) [4]	97	0	98
Price index (percent) [5]	106	0	100
Gross income index (percent) [6]	103	0	98
Farm gross income (millions of dollars) [1]	$8,446	$8,196	$8,036
Reserve payments (millions of dollars)	$450	0	$350
Total gross (millions of dollars)	$8,896	$8,196	$8,386
Less than H. R. 12 (millions of dollars)	0	$700	$510

[2] Estimate used by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in speech at Moorhead-Fargo as 1953 surplus at 1955 prices. A cut of production of this magnitude would not raise prices above deplorably low support prices; the only effect would be to stop flow of commodities to CCC. Only production cuts above this 2 percent would raise farm price above the support level.

[3] Based upon research results of Drs. Karl Fox and Willard W. Cochrane, professors of agricultural economics at Iowa State College and University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, respectively.

[4] Production without program equals 100.

[5] Price without program equals 100.

[6] Gross income without program equals 100.

TABLE IV.—*Wheat*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price, per bushel	[1] $2.51	[2] $2.38	[2] $2.38
Support percentage	90	84	76
Support price, per bushel	$2.26	[3] $2	$1.81
CCC sales price percentage	[4] 105	105	[4] 100
Market price, per bushel	[4] $2.39	$2	[4] $1.81
1955 production (million bushels)	938	---------	938
Cut by acreage reserve (million bushels)	[5] 322	0	[5] 417
1956 production (million bushels)	616	938	521
Gross income from wheat (million dollars)	$1,472	$1,876	$943
Operating expense (million dollars)	[6] $982	[5] $1,250	$628
Net income (million dollars)	$490	$626	$315
Reserve payments (million dollars)	$375	0	$375
Total net income from wheatland (million dollars)	$865	$626	$690
Less than H. R. 12	---------	$239	$175

[1] Old parity.

[2] Transitional parity.

[3] Announced.

[4] Both H. R. 12 and Eisenhower original proposal would pay wheat farmers approximately $375 million not to grow wheat. This would cut annual production below annual market needs and thus require market to buy CCC stocks. Under the circumstances the CCC sale price sets the market price. Eisenhower initially recommended sales at market but backed down on that after thunderstorm of protests and substituted 100 percent of support price. Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12 sets 105 percent of support as CCC minimum sale price.

[5] $2.26 times 50 percent (estimated payment per bushel cut) equals $1.13; $375 million divided by $1.13 equals 322 million bushels.

[6] $1.81 time 50 percent equals $0.91; $375 million plus 91 equals 417 million bushels.

TABLE V.—*Cotton*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal [1]
Parity price official grade, per pound	[2] $0.352	$0.348	[3] $0.348
Adjustments for ⅞-inch Middling, per pound	[4] $0.02	$0.02	[4] 0
Parity price, average grade, per pound	[4] $0.372	$0.368	[4] $0.348
Support percentage	90	82½	81
Support price, average grade, per pound	$0.337	$0.304	$0.282
CCC sales price percentage	[5] 105	105	[5] 100
Market price, average grade, per pound	[5] $0.354	$0.304	[5] $0.282
1956 production with acreage reserve (million bales)	13.2	13.2	13.2
Cut in production by acreage reserve (million bales)	[6] 3.6	0	[7] 4.3
1956 production (million bales)	9.6	13.2	8.9
Gross income from cotton sales (million dollars)	$1,795	$2,006	$1,254
Operating expenses (million dollars)	$1,196	$1,337	$930
Net income from sales (million dollars)	$599	$669	$324
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars)	$300	0	$300
Total net income (million dollars)	$899	$669	$624
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars)	0	$230	$275

[1] Offers and askings included in the "Dear George" (Aiken letter signed by Secretary Benson).

[2] Old parity.

[3] Modernized parity.

[4] Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12, specifies that ⅞-inch Middling shall be the official grade for parity price and support purposes; this adds 2 cents per pound. Eisenhower recommended that repeal of this provision.

[5] Acreage reserve cut in production would require market to buy at CCC sales prices. Existing law, continued in force by H. R. 12, set this at not less than 105 percent support. With the market partially dependent on CCC, the CCC sales price would set market price.

[6] 0.337 times 500 equals $168.50; $168.50 divided by 2 equals $84.15; $300 million divided by $84.25 equals 36 million bales.

[7] 282 times 500 equals $141; 141 divided by 2 equals $70.50; $300 million divided by $70.50 equals 4.3 million bales.

TABLE VI.—*Peanuts*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price, per pound	[1] $0.14	[2] $0.13	[2] $0.13
Support percentage	90	82½	75
Support price	$0.126	$0.107	$0.098
1955 production (million pounds)	1,610	1,610	1,010
Cut by acreage reserve (million pounds)	[3] 111	0	0
1956 production (million pounds)	1,500	1,610	1,610
Gross income from peanuts (million dollars)	$189	$172	$157
Operating expenses (million dollars)	$126	$114	$104
Net income (million dollars)	$63	$58	$53
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars)	$7	0	0
Total net income (million dollars)	$70	$58	$53
Decrease below H. R. 12 (million dollars)	0	$12	$17

[1] Old parity.

[2] Transitional parity.

[3] 126 divided by 2 equals 0.063; $7 million divided by .063 equals 111 million pounds.

TABLE VII.—*Corn (commercial-corn area)*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price	[1] $1.82	[2] $1.73	[2] $1.73
Support percentage	90	81	81
Support price	$1.64	$1.50	$1.40
CCC sales price percentage	105	100	100
Market price	[3] $1.72	$1.40	[4] $1.40
1955 production (million bushels)	2,400	2,400	2,400
Cut by acreage reserve (million bushels)	350	0	430
1956 production (million bushels)	2,050	[5] 1,800	1,970
Gross income from corn (million dollars)	$3,506	$2,700	$2,758
Operating expenses (million dollars)	$2,338	$2,000	$1,838
Net income from sales (million dollars)	$1,168	$700	$920
Acreage reserve payment (million dollars)	$1,300	0	$300
Total net income (million dollars)	$1,468	$700	$1,220
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars)		$768	$248

[1] Old parity.
[2] Transitional parity.
[3] Acreage reserve would cut production sufficiently that market would have to draw on CCC stocks at 105 percent of support sales price.
[4] Acreage reserve would cut production sufficiently that market would have to draw on CCC stocks at 100 percent of support sales price.
[5] Production estimate based on 43 million acre allotment announced by Secretary compared with 51 million acre allotment included in H. R. 12.

TABLE VIII.—*Corn in noncommercial areas*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Parity price, per bushel	$1.82	$1.73	$1.73
Support percentage	[1] 76.5	[2] 60.7	60.7
Support price, per bushel	[1] $1.40	[3] $1.12	$1.05
Market price	[4] $1.64	[3] $1.12	$1.05
1955 production (millions of bushels)	785	785	785
Cut by H. R. 12 (millions of bushels)	[5] 118	0	0
1956 production (millions of bushels)	667	785	785
Gross income from corn (millions of dollars)	$1,084	$879	$824
Operating expenses (millions of dollars)	$722	$586	$550
Net income from corn sales (millions of dollars)	$362	$293	$274
Acreage reserve payments (millions of dollars)	$58	0	0
Total net income from corn land (millions of dollars)	$420	$293	$274
Less than H. R. 12		127	146

[1] 85 percent of 90 percent of old parity price of corn.
[2] 75 percent of 81 percent of transitional parity price of corn.
[3] 75 percent of $1.50 announced in veto message.
[4] Owing to operation of acreage reserve for commercial corn and other feed grains, noncommercial areas would become deficit areas and need to import corn thus raising local market price to at least equal the commercial area price.
[5] 15 percent cut in acres required by law.

TABLE IX.—*Grain sorghum*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price, per hundredweight	[1] $2.18	$1.80	[2] $1.80
Market price	[3] $2.30	$1.80	$1.80

TABLE IX.—*Grain sorghum*—Continued

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
1955 production (million bushels)	233	233	233
Cut by H. R. 12 (million bushels)	[4] 47	0	0
1956 production (million bushels)	186	233	233
Gross from grain sorghum (million dollars)	$428	$419	$419
Operating expenses (million dollars)	$286	$280	$280
Net income from sales (million dollars)	$142	$139	$139
Acreage reserve payments (million dollars)	$35	0	0
Total net income (million dollars)	$177	$139	$139
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars)	0	$38	$38

[1] 85 percent of modernized parity.
[2] Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.
[3] With 15-percent cuts in feed grain production, feed grain prices will rise to competitive relation with corn.
[4] Estimated 20 percent cut from 1955 acreage.

TABLE X.—*Oats*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price, per bushel	[1] $0.72	[2] $0.59	[2] $0.59
Market price, per bushel	[2] $0.80	$0.59	$0.59
1955 production (million bushels)	1,576	1,576	1,576
Cut required by H. R. 12 (million bushels)	[4] 236	0	0
1956 production (million bushels)	1,340	1,576	1,576
Gross from oats (million dollars)	$1,072	$930	$930
Operating expenses (million dollars)	$714	$620	$620
Net income from sales (million dollars)	$358	$310	$310
Acreage reserve payments (million dollars)	$58	0	0
Total net income	$416	$310	$310
Less than H. R. 12	0	116	116

[1] 85 percent of modernized parity.
[2] Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.
[3] Owing to cut in feed grain production market prices would be competitive with corn at 90 percent of parity.
[4] 15 percent cut in acreage.

TABLE XI.—*Barley*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price, per bushel	[1] $1.13	[2] $0.93	[2] $0.93
Market price, per bushel	[2] $1.24	$0.93	$0.93
1955 production, million bushels	391	391	391
Cut required by H. R. 12, million bushels	[4] 59	0	0
1956 production, million bushels	332	391	391
Gross from barley, million dollars	$412	$364	$364
Operating expenses, million dollars	$288	$242	$242
Net income from sales, million dollars	$124	$122	$122
Acreage reserve payment, million dollars	$30	0	0
Total net income, million dollars	$154	$122	$122
Less than H. R. 12, million dollars	0	$32	$32

[1] 85 percent of modernized parity.
[2] Announced by Secretary of Agriculture.
[3] Competitive with corn level in view of acreage cuts in feed grains.
[4] 15-percent cut in acreage.

TABLE XII.—*Rye*

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Support price, per bushel	[1] $1.41	[2] $1.16	[2] $1.16
Market price, per bushel	[3] $1.50	$1.16	$1.16
1955 production, million bushels	29	29	29
Cut required by H. R. 12, million bushels	[4] 4	0	0
1956 production, million bushels	25	29	29
Gross from rye, million dollars	$38	$34	$34
Operating expenses, million dollars	$13	$11	$11
Net from sales, million dollars	$25	$23	$23
Acreage reserve payment, million dollars	$2	0	0
Total net income, million dollars	$27	$23	$23
Less than H. R. 12, million dollars	$0	$4	$4

[1] 85 percent of modernized parity.
[2] Announced by Secretary of Agriculture Benson.
[3] Competitive market with wheat and corn whose acreage is deeply cut by acreage reserve.
[4] 15-percent cut required by H. R. 12.

TABLE XIII.—*Hogs, cattle, and other perishables* [1]

	H. R. 12 Agricultural Act of 1956	Eisenhower program	
		Veto announcement	Original proposal
Added sec. 32 funds (million dollars)	$500	0	0
Farmers share (percent)	30	30	30
Increased hog and cattle, gross (million dollars)	$150	0	0
Less than H. R. 12 (million dollars)	0	$150	$150

[1] This table relates only to the direct price support purchases of meat products from the $500 million increase provided by H. R. 12 in appropriation for sec. 32 funds. It takes no account of the income-improving effect upon livestock producers of a reduction in supply and increase in price of feed grains.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I cannot help digressing to say that it somewhat amuses me when I recall that the administration prides itself on its businesslike efficiency. The administration really has made considerable political capital from its alleged businesslike efficiency. This would lead one to believe that when the administration prepares statistics, when it makes analyses of economic matters, it comes up with prompt answers which are efficient and accurate.

Yet, I must say again that I would like to have an explanation from the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the new economic factors which they have found between last Friday, when the Department closed its doors for the weekend, or since last Saturday, if the Department worked on Saturday, and Monday, when the President issued his veto message; because the price of one commodity after another was lifted overnight under support levels by the sheer announcement of the President, who says he believes in a free economy, in the law of supply and demand; who says he is efficient and that his administration is efficient.

I repeat: Either the Secretary of Agriculture did not know what he was doing last week, and therefore should be dismissed this week; or, if the Secretary knew what he was doing last week, and had honest answers, under the 1954 Act and the criteria established therein, to questions relating to the establishment of price support levels, there is only one other explanation, namely, that the President must have picked figures out of the air to justify his veto, and to pump money back into the economy quickly, without any legislative power or directive.

Furthermore, the advance-payment idea is one of the most unusual programs of which I have ever heard. It is a program of advance payments for something that has not even, as yet, been agreed to by the farmers who will participate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, in reply to the Senator from California, the able minority leader, that the sources of the figures are to be found, for example, in the reports of the Agricultural Marketing Service, or the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the indexes reports received by the Congress; and also, for example, based on results of research by Dr. Karl Fox and Dr. Willard W. Cochrane, professors of agricultural economics at Iowa State College and University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, respectively.

Mr. President, I have completed my remarks, with the exception of yielding for the purpose of questions.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desired to ask the Senator a question based on the President's veto message, which reads, in part:

> Farmers are not interested in price alone. What they really want for their families is more net income.

In his veto message and in his speech following the message the President recommended that Congress enact quickly a soil-bank program, nothing else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the Senator this question. As a matter of fact, does the soil-bank program, standing alone, increase net income? Rather, does it not depress the income?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At best, it is replacement income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At best.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At best, it is replacement income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But even for it to be replacement income, we must assume the farmer will get out of participation in the program as much as he would have gotten out of tilling the same number of acres. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is one other factor, namely, that if the soil-bank program could be widely enough adopted, and sufficient acreage could be cut back at one time so that the amount of land in production could be limited, it would have the indirect effect of lifting prices.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the program has to be projected one crop ahead, in order to accomplish that purpose. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the immediate result is not to increase net income. Is not that a strong argument in favor of many of the other provisions which were carried in the bill the President vetoed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say "Yes." The Senator from Florida and the Senator from New Mexico, who are now present, both advanced arguments for the compulsory type of soil bank, namely, that if farmers were to partake of the benefits, they would have to participate in the soil-bank proposal. I say to them that the administration did not want a compulsory program. It wanted a voluntary program. It said the incentive payments would be big enough to get farmers to come into the program. So the Anderson-Holland proposal was not accepted in committee. It was accepted on the floor, after Senators heard debate about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it was modified in conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may have been misguided, although I think not; but as an individual and as one Senator, I submit that one reason why I voted for higher supports, with soil-bank provisions, was that the benefit payments for soil-bank participation were to be at 50 percent of the support level. When support levels are decreased, the total payments are decreased. If there were to be a soil bank program on a voluntary principle—and it is highly debatable whether that is desirable, but that is what the administration wished—with incentives or benefits, then the benefits would have to be increased, and the only way the benefits could be increased, under the administration's own proposal, would be to get the prices up. I say that theory and the logic behind it can lead to but one conclusion, namely, that there was a bit of hypocrisy involved, because if lower price supports are going to be received, lower benefits are going to be received, and if benefits of soil-bank participation are lowered, participation will be lowered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And net income will be lowered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If one were really for the Anderson-Holland proposal, then he ought to be for higher supports to encourage soil-bank participation, because that is the only way it would work.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following with interest and appreciation the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I want to bring him good news and cheerful news in at least one respect, namely, that the soil bank bill today introduced by the Senator from Florida for himself, the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Mississippi, does contain the compulsory features. I understand some Senators on the other side of the aisle have joined us, whom we are happy to have associated with us. The Senator from Florida is glad to hear that the Senator from Minnesota now favors that feature.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I said I thought it had considerable merit, and I am prone to support it if the administration can be kept from recommending it, which I say because I have found the administration's recommendations to be completely unreliable. If the Senator can present it on his own, perhaps he will get my support.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry the Senator says only that he is coming to the point where he is almost persuaded. I hope before long he will be completely persuaded and will join us. I want to assure him there is a place on the team for him. We shall need his help in pulling the wagon. We shall welcome his signature on the bill, if he desires to join in sponsoring it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. The proposal reminds me—not this particular proposal, but as it is related to the total farm program—of one who was invited to participate in a canoe trip, but then was told, "We are short of canoes, but we have peanut shucks." We cannot sail in what the Senator suggests. It is a tidbit of the total program.

As one who has learned the hard way that one does not always get what he wants, or should get, or needs, perhaps we shall have to do the best we can to satisfy the immediate needs of the farmers, the very limited needs, not all of them. If the President is really so anxious—and I gather there is a frenzy of activity in the White House and they can hardly wait to get out of town—if they really want to do something, there is already a law on the books to authorize them to start a soil-bank program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to go further and commend the distinguished Senator for having himself introduced a soil-bank bill last year, but I regret to say there were no compulsory features in the bill. I hope he will reconsider his position and join us in supporting the compulsory features. I think the distinguished Senator last year recognized what others of us have recognized this year, that the preferred way to approach the problem, big as it was, which involved $1,200,000,000 a year, was to ask for authorization from Congress for this particular effort.

I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have actually a chance to pass on a budget in acting on appropriations. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, of which I happen to be a member, is now sitting. If the Senator has a program for a $1,200,000,000 program which he would like to add to the budget, that avenue is open to him. It was open to him last year. I think the Senator was showing his good sense when he approached the matter last year by offering an authorization bill. I am sorry the bill was not considered or approved then, with any changes that may have been made, including the feature of compulsion, as to which I hope the Senator will join us.

The point I bring to the Senator's attention is that this administration has submitted to the Congress, as every administration must under the law, a budget showing what amount is expected to be spent under the legislation which is now on the books, to which the distinguished Senator has referred, and that we have from year to year—including last year, and also including this year, by means of action already taken at the other end of the Capitol—approved those budgets rather closely. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and all the others of us must realize that before entering into a program involving additional expenditures—expenditures six times as large as the normal expenditures for the program which now is on the statute books—it was wise and it was good government for the administration to seek legislative approval, and that it would have been regarded as almost utter folly for this administration or the preceding one or any other administration to seek to proceed with such a program without obtaining legislative approval of it, particularly when so many of the features of the program were additions to existing law—as, for instance, the features of the acreage reserve program in the soil bank, which involves making payments by way of inducement.

Upon a careful reading of the bill now on the statute books, I have not been able to find in it any provisions which would have justified action on the part of executive officers, without prior approval by the Congress, in paying out more than the product involved was worth, in order to get farmers to agree to abandon production for 1 year on their particular land; and I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that there are in the measure which Congress passed, in the case of the soil-bank program, features which not only greatly transcend in amount, but also greatly transcend in their details and in respect to some of the objectives sought to be carried out, those embraced in the present law. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree with those statements?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not fully, I say most kindly.

First, I wish to say that under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, there is authority to engage in a much larger soil conservation program than the one the administration is engaging in at the present time. I believe that under sections 7 and 8 of that act there is a $5 million authorization. So the administration could have requested an expanded authorization. The smart lawyers in the executive departments should know what the present authorization is. The departments have large staffs of so-called experts who should be familiar with those details.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Florida to wait a moment, please.

Furthermore, Mr. President, let me say that insofar as the soil-conservation program is concerned, if I am not mistaken the Appropriations Committee from time to time, at the request of the Department of Agriculture—and after holding hearings for the purpose, and obtaining testimony from the Department of Agriculture—has included in the appropriation bills, even though such provisions may have amounted to legislative language, all kinds of directions regarding the use of funds. Let me say most respectfully to the Senator from Florida that if the Secretary of Agriculture believes that this matter is so urgent and that time is wasting—and let me point out that we shall not be able to report such a bill in several days—at least at long last the Department of Agriculture knows a little about soil conservation and the soil-bank program. Apparently the Department did not know anything about them on January 12, because I have read from the testimony given before our committee, where both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Under Secretary of Agriculture said they were unprepared with the details of such a program. But now they are prepared with the details; and I say that many of those details can be worked out under existing law. I say, further, that the Department of Agriculture is considering the matter right now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that the Department of Agriculture has within it some able men. But I am not willing to admit that the Department has any abler men than the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] or many other Members of this body. I call the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that last year, when he thought some provision should be made for this program, he did not request that such a provision be handled by the Appropriations Committee—and I think he was wise in taking that position—and he did not offer on the floor of the Senate an amendment to achieve soil-bank legislation by way of indirection—and I think he was wise in that decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But let me say I supported other appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. And the Senator from Minnesota had not attempted to proceed by indirection in this instance.

Inasmuch as I should now be in attendance at the committee session, I must make my remarks rather brief; but I wish to say that I believe the approach adopted by the Senator from Minnesota, in proposing specific legislation, was the wise and the only proper one, in view of the large size of the program and the fact that it called for a departure from existing programs. I would not agree that by means of setting up a committee and later by means of action taken at the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee, a program involving $1,200,000,000 and covering many details which certainly are not covered by existing law, should have been initiated.

I think the best way the Senator from Minnesota can accomplish his purpose is for him to jump right in with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Florida, and other Senators who now are supporting proposed soil-bank legislation by itself, and to help to have it passed by the Congress speedily and sent to the President for his signature. So I extend the warmest possible invitation to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, to join in that effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I realize the warmth of the invitation, and I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by saying that, first, I introduced the soil-bank bill because I felt that it was essential to have permanent, mandatory legislation on that subject.

I am frank to say that as a Member of the Senate I myself did not fully appreciate the significance of all the language in the act of 1935, as amended, as regards conservation and what we term the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I do not profess to be a lawyer or an expert on agricultural law; but I say that the Department of Agriculture is simply loaded with such lawyers and experts, who supposedly know what is in the law.

Furthermore, Mr. President, my argument is that at first this administration was opopsed to a soil bank, but suddenly the administration got a passion for it, when it felt the soil bank was popular. And now the administration has a super-passion for the soil bank, when it thinks it can cause trouble for others by taking that position.

I repeat, that under the existing act of 1935, as amended, there already is authority for the administration's soil-bank proposal, or at least authority for many phases of it. Under existing law, the administration could have doubled the payments proposed to be made to farmers for taking crops out of production. Specific language on that point is to be found in the existing law. But the administration, which had complained about the soil bank when it was proposed by others, did not even know that under existing law there was already authority for the establishment of a soil bank. Furthermore, when others proposed the creation of a soil bank, by means of appropriate legislation, the administration said, "No," and said that a soil bank would be too expensive. At that time the administration thought it would cost $400 million to establish a soil bank, and at that time the administration thought a soil bank would be too expensive.

Now the administration says that $1,200,000,000 is needed for a soil bank, and that such a soil bank will not be too expensive. Instead of being too expensive, Mr. President, the administration now wants $1,200,000,000 made available at once for a soil bank. In fact, Mr. President, the administration wants to get a soil-bank program into operation so quickly that it is willing to send out checks for payments in connection with

the soil bank before anyone agrees to participate in the soil bank. That would be exactly like having an insurance company make payments on an accident insurance policy before the policy was taken out, or before an accident occurred. An insurance company which attempted to operate on that basis would not be in business very long, Mr. President. I have never heard of so ridiculous a proposal.

This administration is supposed to have financial and fiscal responsibility; but this proposal by it is the epitome of irresponsibility. This administration says it has "bold, new programs;" but it did not even know what was included in the old program, much less in the new one. The administration is like the man on the flying trapeze: It flies through the air with the greatest of ease, and then purloins someone else's proposals.

In 1954 the administration made use of surplus set-asides, even though previously it had objected to them; when they were called for in a bill which previously was before the Congress, the administraiton opposed them bitterly. In short, when anyone else advocated them, the administration branded the attempt as "economic opportunism."

Mr. President, I am sick and tired of such attitudes on the part of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. I am sick and tired of having statistics misused by the President and his Secretary of Agriculture. I say they did not understand what was in the farm bill the President vetoed; and they have not been willing to work with the Congress on an effective program. Instead, they balk and drag their feet and refuse and become stubborn. Today we find that the very proposals which they proclaim as the salvation of the economy are the same as proposals which 5 months ago they denounced—the very proposals with respect to which they had no details to offer as late as the middle of January 1956. This is politics at its best—or worst. Look at it either way. At best, it is shabby politics. The farmers will see through it. They will ask questions. The wheat farmers are going to ask, "Why was the price support level 76 percent of parity in the first 2 weeks of April, but 84 percent afterward?" Why did the dairy farmer receive less for his milk just a few days ago than he will receive in line with the President's announcement in the veto message?

Perhaps we have done some good in the Senate by this fight. Perhaps, at long last, we have aroused the President to a realization that he made some commitments in his campaign in 1952. Perhaps, at long last, we have aroused Mr. Benson to understand that there is trouble in rural America. Perhaps, at long last, he realizes that a price of $3.15 a hundred for milk is unfair. Perhaps, at long last, he will understand that $1.81 for wheat under price supports is unfair. Perhaps he will realize that he cannot play footloose and fancy free in the Senate, "wheeling and dealing" on corn, cotton, and other crops.

Consider the announcement of the President of $1.50 a bushel for corn in commercial areas, with an acreage allotment of 43 million acres. If the President does not know that that is unworkable, someone should inform him. According to the testimony, with 49 million allotted acres of corn, there was very limited compliance with the program, and very limited participation.

Fifty-one million acres was the recommendation of many of the administration's own statisticians. Now they are to have an acreage allotment of 43 million acres, with a price of $1.50 a bushel in the commercial corn area, with the remainder at a price ranging from about $1.25 to $1.28. This Senator, who comes from a State which produces a great abundance of agricultural commodities, makes the statement at this time that the price of corn in the Midwest will be from $1.25 to $1.28. The farmer will find out about the price. The program advanced by the administration is not only unworkable; it is uneconomic and unjustifiable.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, 84th Congress, the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed himself, Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and Mr. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 12) to provide an improved farm program, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and it was resolved that the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

REVIEW OF FOREIGN POLICY—IV—A CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last January I began a series of discussions in the Senate on various aspects of the international situation. I have since outlined the issues, as I understand the issues, which confront us in southeast Asia and in the north African crisis.

When I began these discussions last January, I stated:

> If the national interest requires us to rise above political considerations in matters of foreign policy, it also requires us to undertake a vigorous review of that policy. It requires us to make an unremitting search for facts and ideas which may guide us in dealing with difficulties abroad.

It is in that spirit that I address the Senate.

The need for constant Senate review of policy is nowhere more clearly evident today than in connection with the Middle East. There is universal recognition of the real and imminent danger of war in that part of the world. Skirmishes are taking place along the borders of Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Syria, and even air duels have been fought.

The President and the Secretary of State have repeatedly made clear the deep concern of the United States over these trends toward all-out conflict. Additional marines and a division of destroyers have been sent to the Mediterranean, and elements of the United States 6th Fleet are even now patrolling off Israeli and Arab ports.

I do not question either the concern or the actions of the executive branch in this matter. What disturbs me, however, is that they relate to a situation the significance of which is little understood in this country. Yet the need for public understanding is very great. It is even more; it is absolutely essential, if there is to be public acceptance and support of policies which will serve the totality of American interests in the Middle East.

When we speak of the Middle East, we are speaking of one of the decisive political regions of the world. It ranks among the great crossroads of the earth, providing passage by land, sea, and air between Europe, Asia, and Africa. Today the Middle East is emerging from a sweeping political transition. At the close of World War I, the region was transferred from Turkish authority into the hands of Great Britain and France. In turn, European political control, weakened by World War II, has now virtually disappeared. Where that control has not been withdrawn willingly, it has been forced out by the rising tides of militant nationalism and popular unrest.

France has gone completely from the area. British power remains at Cyprus in the eastern Mediterranean. The British also maintain a tenuous foothold in Aden, at the base of the Arabian Peninsula, and in a group of small sheikdoms along the Persian Gulf.

In place of European domination in the Middle East, there have emerged a number of independent states. These include the Jewish homeland of Israel and the Arab countries of Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia. On the political spectrum, the new states range from western-type democracy to absolute monarchy.

There is great wealth for a few in the Middle East. For the many, however, life is a grim struggle against natural and manmade elements for the barest subsistence. The wealth comes from inequitable economic systems. It also comes from petroleum; much of the region floats on a sea of foil containing perhaps two-thirds of the world's resources in this vital source of power. The Western companies drill it and pay enormous royalties for the privilege, only a trickle of which filters down to the impoverished people.

Mr. President, a far-reaching political transition in a setting of this kind can

hardly take place without shock and dislocation. The lid of external restraint cannot be removed from over 40 million diverse people without a dangerous boiling over of the ambitions, the angers, the fears, and the rivalries which the lid has long held submerged.

It is not surprising, then, that the threat of full-scale conflict between Israel and the Arab States hangs over the Middle East. It is not surprising that a bitter antiwesternism seethes through much of the region. It is not surprising that obscure rivalries pulsate beneath the apparent unity of the Arab States as they vie with one another for leadership. It is not surprising that the restless millions throughout the area can be led to strike out first in one direction and then in another in their blind and incomprehending fury against the burden of poverty and exploitation which they have carried for so long.

We cannot stop these churning forces in the Middle East. But what this country does or does not do will have a profound impact on the situation in the Middle East. Our policies will either ease or intensify the present tensions. Our policies will either contribute to the impending explosion or act to prevent it.

It seems to me, however, that before we do anything we need to have clearly in mind what our interests are in that area. Only on that basis can we hope to build an intelligible and acceptable policy, a constructive policy for the American people to pursue.

Our direct economic interests in the Middle East are substantial. American business holds petroleum concessions of great potential value in that area. Americans have invested more than a billion dollars in these undertakings. The air and sea routes which pass through the region are also of considerable importance to our commerce.

In the event of war, access to these routes and even to land passages in the Middle East would be of great significance. It is conceivable, too, that our airbase concession at Dharan in Saudi Arabia might also be useful in wartime. We should bear in mind, however, that the utility of that base is already sharply restricted by the Government of Saudi Arabia and there is no assurance that the concession which expires shortly will be continued.

The United States also has a human interest in the Middle Eastern people. It has been expressed in our contribution to the U. N. relief program for the Arab refugees. It has been expressed in assistance of various kinds to the Arab States and to Israel totaling half a billion dollars.

The human interest of the United States in the Middle East extends to both Arabs and Israelis. In the case of the Arabs it goes back many decades to the work of religious and educational foundations which have long been active in the region. These early influences still permeate the policies of this country.

With respect to the Israelis, our concern is of more recent origin, but it is nonetheless important. This country supported the re-creation of a Jewish homeland in the Middle East. We were the first to recognize the new State of Israel in 1948.

On April 16, only a few days ago, Israel celebrated its eighth anniversary as a free and democratic nation.

It has sometimes been said that we have favored in our policies Arab over Jew, or Jew over Arab. We may well have differentiated at times between governments which we believed were working toward peace or against peace in the Middle East, and I hope that we shall continue to do so. That differentiation should not apply, however, to the common people of the Middle East; they are all—Arab and Jew alike—caught up in the same gathering web of tragedy.

We have not become so callous to the brutality of this era of history that we are indifferent to the threatened religious war in the Middle East. We will not acquiesce, nor will decent mankind acquiesce, in the senseless slaughter of thousands of innocent people whether they be Jews or Arabs.

If I may sum up, then, our interests in the Middle East are of considerable extent and importance. They are not in themselves, however, sufficient to explain the deep concern of the United States in this region. They do not begin to measure the full scope of the importance of the Middle East to this country.

There are other interests, derivative interests, but nonetheless real and vital interests. For years now, the United States has been closely linked with other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Far from being a burden as some have contended, these ties have kept the cost of the national defense of the United States within the bounds of the possible. I go further. In my opinion these ties have forestalled the outbreak of world war III.

During the last year, however, the cement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has steadily crumbled. NATO has shown signs of decline. It may well be that it is disintegrating faster than the threat which brought it into being is subsiding. That such is the case is clearly evident in the recent request of Iceland that we withdraw our forces from the island. It is evident in the recent withdrawal of all of France's NATO divisions from Europe to North Africa. It is evident in the growing antagonism between Greece and Turkey. It is evident in the inability to find a satisfactory solution to the Cyprus question. It is evident in the testimony of Admiral Radford before the Foreign Affairs Committee a few days ago, and it is evident in the testimony of General Bradley before the Symington committee. I wonder if it is evident downtown, though, when the President, at a press conference a few weeks ago, stated that in his opinion NATO was in the best shape ever, or words to that effect.

Let me make it clear, Mr. President, that I am not suggesting by these observations that NATO or any commitment or policy of this country should be clothed in an inflexibility which admits of no alteration. We must always be prepared to make changes to meet changing circumstances. What disturbs me, however, is the erosion of NATO. The organization has not changed very much outwardly, but I believe it has nevertheless changed in the sense that it has lost its spirit, its drive, and its leadership.

If that is already the case, then what further damage will be done to the organization by the crisis in the Middle East? Could this pillar of peace hold together in the event of a war, even a local war, in that area? What would be the effect of such a war on the unresolved problems of the eastern wing of NATO, on Greece, Turkey, and Britain?

And what would be the impact of violence and chaos in the Middle East on the Western European members? Only recently recovered from World War II, they would face the loss of petroleum sources in the Middle East on which their present economic stability heavily depends. Would they not be catapulted into a serious rivalry among themselves which would make a mockery of European unity? It is not without significance in this connection that recent Russian trade overtures to Western Europe have contained hints of growing sources of petroleum for export in the Soviet bloc.

Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point. I believe it is clear what a conflict in the Middle East would do to NATO. It would tear it apart.

Nor would the difficulties end at that point. Old and new forms of totalitarianism would stalk the ruins of war in the Middle East. They would look beyond the Arab world. Opening before the eyes of would-be conquerors would be the vast Moslem community which extends from the Atlantic coast of North Africa through central and southern Asia as far as Indonesia and the southern Philippines in the Pacific, a community of 800 million people. Could we stand by idly in these circumstances? Could others?

The problem which confronts us in the Middle East, then, is greater than the saving of American oil concessions, routes of passage, or air bases, however important any or all of these may be. It is greater than human sympathy for Arabs or Jews, however deeply and sincerely we may feel that sympathy. The real dimension of the problem in the last analysis is the preservation of the foundations of world peace with all that implies for us and other nations in a nuclear age.

The simple fact appears to be that we cannot afford to permit a major conflict to take place in the Middle East. The Western European nations cannot afford it. In the last analysis, it is even possible that the Russians cannot afford it.

It is one thing for them to play the ancient game of arms-traffic diplomacy, when the danger of self-entrapment is remote. It is another when the game threatens to touch off fires beyond control, fires which may spread and fuse into a worldwide conflagration from which the Soviet Union along with others will find no escape.

That moment may be fast approaching. The time to curb the fires may be soon or never. I do not know what course the Russian will now take. One can only hope that they will see the danger, as others have seen it, in the

political merchandising of armaments in the Middle East. It is to be hoped that, in view of their statement released yesterday, they too see this danger and its implication for them.

Regardless of what the Russians do or do not do, however, it seems to me that it is essential for this country to have a clear understanding of where we ourselves are headed in the Middle East. It is essential that we have a constructive policy which will enable us to get there.

Neither a clear understanding nor a constructive policy is possible without an answer to a fundamental question. I cannot answer it. Other Senators cannot answer it. The Congress cannot answer it. The American people individually cannot answer it. Only the President, on behalf of all the people, can answer it.

The question is basic. It is simply this: Is the preservation of peace in the Middle East of vital importance to the interests of the United States?

I have tried to indicate some of the factors which must go into the answer. Others have done the same. The President alone, however, is in the position to lead in this matter. He alone can weigh all the factors.

Because this question has yet to be answered, clearly and unequivocally, our policies have faltered in the Middle East. We have dabbled in Cyprus while seeking to placate all sides. We have gingerly touched the edges of the Baghdad Pact. We have preached generalities on peace to Arab and Israeli while the war clouds have gathered. We have come close to a servile appeasement of arrogance in at least one instance in our desire to preserve peace. We have called on the United Nations for action but have not defined what we mean by action.

Time is running short to alter the dangerous and futile indecision which has plagued our Middle Eastern policies. I believe the trend toward war in the Middle East can still be halted. It can be halted only if there is a clear understanding of what must be done to preserve peace in that region, and only if there is the courage and the leadership to do it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Senator from Montana willing to yield for a question, or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want to interrupt the Senator's train of thought; but in his last observations he seemed to be very much disturbed about the situation in the Middle East. However, it is my impression that the Secretary of State believes that conditions are much better in the Middle East than they were 2 years ago, and he so stated to the Committee on Foreign Relations a short time ago. There seems to be some difference of opinion as to whether conditions now are serious.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall the instance brought to mind by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas; but I suggest that perhaps a lot of water has gone over the dam in the past month or so, and that conditions in the Middle East may have changed for the worse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator think conditions have changed so much for the worse, or was the Secretary's statement that matters have improved greatly in that area in the past year a sound judgment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Arkansas knows my position. I have not agreed with the Secretary of State that world conditions were looking rosier. As a matter of fact, it has been my long-held opinion that in the last year conditions have become steadily worse, not only in the Middle East, but all over the world, as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said, on page 9 of his statement:

> We have gingerly touched the edges of the Baghdad pact.

It was my understanding that the Secretary of State was one of the prime movers in the origin of the Baghdad Pact. Is not that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That was my understanding, too.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have done a great deal more than to touch it gingerly; we have really promoted it, although we have not joined it. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In that connection, is it not a very serious matter that dominating our whole policy in the Middle East and in southeast Asia has been the emphasis upon military assistance, beginning with the Pakistan assistance, and continuing through the SEATO organization and the Baghdad Pact?

I should like to ask the Senator if he does not believe the present administration is placing entirely too much emphasis upon purely military affairs, and too little on political and economic considerations in that area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have felt for a long time that the policy of containment—a Democratic policy in its origin—has perhaps outlived its usefulness, and has become a sort of diplomatic Maginot Line. However, that policy has been followed, and its strength is based upon the defensive military aspect.

In the creation, under the Baghdad Pact, of the so-called northern tier of nations, we find Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, and Britain allied together; and we find the United States, one of the countries most responsible for the pact, staying outside and showing no indication of joining. So far as I am concerned, I believe the United States should not join the Baghdad Pact, although I note, according to the press, that Under Secretary of State Loy Henderson, who is at present in either Baghdad or Teheran—I forget which—while representing the United States at a Baghdad pact meeting, assured the members of the pact that this country was willing to give additional economic assistance, but indicated that the United States is not interested, at this time, at least, in joining the pact itself. Secretary Henderson is, incidentally, one of our best diplomats and is an expert on middle eastern affairs. Secretary Dulles is to be commended for making good use of the services of this outstanding man.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall not delay the Senator further, except to congratulate and encourage him upon this kind of discussion, which is a part of the series he has carried on.

I interpreted his remarks of a moment ago as a plea to the President to exert some leadership in the formulation of a policy in the area of the Middle East. I certainly wish to encourage the Senator from Montana in his efforts to do that.

Under our system of government, it is virtually impossible for the Senate to initiate foreign policy. We have neither the machinery nor the access to the information which comes daily from all over the world; but we are interested in foreign policy. I think the Senator is performing a valuable service in urging the administration to consider seriously the situation in the Middle East and to develop policies which have some greater relationship to the realities in that area, rather than to try to deceive us into believing that everything is rosy, that the Russian policy is collapsing, and that we are about to prevail in all the areas of the Middle East.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the Senator from Arkansas has said. I look upon him as one of the great statesmen of our time. Certainly he is a keen student of international affairs, not only in the Middle East, but in other parts of the world, as well.

The purpose of my speech today, as has been the purpose of the previous three speeches, is to point out the difficulties, but at the same time to try to be constructive, so that in the field of foreign policy the administration and Congress together can seek ways and means to overcome the tremendous difficulties which confront this country and the rest of the free world at present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana is a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was delighted when he was added to the committee in recent years. He has performed useful service on the committee. The Senator approaches problems of foreign policy with fairness, and he has made a very fine contribution to our foreign policy. He has visited the Far East, and was one of the representatives of the United States, together with the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], during the negotiation of one of the pacts.

But I would not want the record to stand as it does with respect to a statement which was made by the Senator, and I believe the question should be raised. On page 9 of his statement, the Senator from Montana said:

> The question is basic. It is simply this: Is the preservation of peace in the Middle East of vital importance to the interests of the United States?

As the Senator will recall, that statement deals with a question which only the President of the United States can answer. I believe it has been answered by the President. I believe the leadership in both Houses of Congress, the

chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the ranking minority member of that committee, and the Committee on Foreign Relations as a whole, have been informed of developments in the area of the world called the Middle East.

I think the policies which the Government of the United States has followed have basically been aimed at preserving the peace of the world not only in the Middle East, but in other sections of the globe as well.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that, as one of the charter members of the United Nations, I think the Government of the United States took a very constructive stand and assumed leadership in the adoption by the Security Council of the resolution, which was at first objected to by the representatives of the Soviet Union, which provided for the visit of Mr. Hammarskjold to the Middle East. He is now there. Consultations have been going on. I do not believe the Secretary of State has ever argued, at least he has never done so in my presence, either in a public meeting or a private meeting, that there were not difficulties in that area of the world, or that there were not tensions or dangers there.

I think the policies our Government has followed, in operating through the United Nations, a charter member of which we, as well as other powers, happen to be, in urging that organization to use its good offices as well as the good offices of the Government of the United States, have been good policies. Certainly the implication should not be left that that matter has not had very close attention, and that the Government of the United States, exercising its foreign policy through the President and the Secretary of State, has not been mindful of the problems which confront the peace of the world, as well as of the countries which may be immediately involved.

I may say it is one thing to raise the issues, and I think they should be raised; it is quite another thing to find the ideal solution of the problem. As the Senator has quite properly pointed out, the countries in that area of the world were for a long time under the domination of one power or another. There is a restlessness all over the world. In my judgment, colonialism is dead, and I do not believe a policy based on colonialism can, in the long run, be a success. I believe that has been demonstrated in the Far East. I think it will be demonstrated in North Africa.

But I wish to say to the Senator that I do not believe, and I do not think the Senator from Montana believes, that we have a right unilaterally to go into the Middle East and impose our will on the countries of that area, and attempt to lay down a dictum which would require other nations to conform to our views on what might be the thinking at the moment, either in the Government of the United States, or among 1 or 2 other powers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can find very little fault with what the distinguished minority leader has just said. I believe he is raising questions which perhaps he would not suggest if he listened to my speech to its conclusion.

I wish to have it clearly understood that, so far as I am concerned, I am not discussing foreign policy because of any political intent. I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and I shall certainly see that that is done; but at the same time I believe certain issues should be raised, certain difficulties should be pointed out. If possible, we may, together, be able to offer some suggestions. I shall do what I can to help the administration in the field of foreign policy, and I know that is the attitude of the Democratic Party as well.

We recognize the dangers inherent in a biased foreign policy. We recognize that in this particular field we are in it together, win or lose, and we hope to act accordingly. If I may continue with my speech, I think the answers to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader will become evident.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to developing a foreign policy, I have made it quite clear heretofore that I think this administration goes much too far in its reliance on purely military means to contain the expansion of Russia, or, to put it in another way, to prevent the outbreak of war in the area we have been discussing.

The Pakistan arms agreement did not have to be brought before the Senate, but we were advised of it. At that time I stated my views on the floor of the Senate. I still feel the same way about our foreign aid programs. When the administration is asking for $4,900 million for military hardware or direct military support, it is a great mistake; there is a mistaken reliance on force.

I think the purpose of a discussion, insofar as we can perform any service, is at least to give voice to our views. If officials of the administration do not care to give heed to those views, that is their business. But I still think the Senator's discussion and our questions are realistic. They are not political in motivation. They are intended, so far as I am concerned, to persuade the administration to give a little more attention to the nonmilitary aspects of our foreign policy, specifically economic assistance, and, also specifically, cultural activities in this field, which I think would be much more likely to influence the political management and political relations of the Middle East with the West, ourselves and our Western allies, than would purely military aid. We have tried military measures, and in my opinion, they have failed. As a matter of fact, this administration, some 2 or 3 years ago, offered aid to Pakistan in creating the Northern Tier. Now it is a failure, and we run to the United Nations and ask their help. I approve of that. But we contributed to that condition. I think the situation is the outgrowth of historical activities. We have failed to meet the situation with the proper methods.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have failed, up to now, to come up with the right policy. I do not have the answer, but I hope that, with our collective thinking, we may give the administration some suggestions which will help them, in the interest of peace in that area of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has expressed my view much better than I could present it. The point I am trying to make is that there are other methods than purely military measures to be considered, and I hope some attention will be given to them. I cannot overlook the fact that for the first time since it was started, budget requests for the exchange program have been cut. That is an example of failure of those shaping our foreign policy to realize other aspects of our relations.

At the same time, the administration is proposing enormous increases in purely military assistance. That is the point I am trying to make. It is not done from any political motivation. I do not think the administration should be so sensitive to every criticism in Congress as being motivated by political considerations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, as the Senator knows, increasing military expenditures is the easiest way to get things done, but it is not necessarily the best way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I apologize for taking more of the Senator's time, but I shall leave the floor, and may not have an opportunity to make the statement I have in mind.

I wish to compliment and commend the able Senator from Montana for his very scholarly discussion of the most vexing problem engaging his attention. His is a very fine presentation. I have read the Senator's speech in its entirety.

I may be getting a little ahead of the Senator in the presentation of his address, but there is one matter he touches upon which perhaps may not have received the attention of the public generally which it should have received in the present trouble conditions in the Middle East.

We hear over the radio today, for instance, and we read in the newspapers, that prospects for peace are looking better in the Near East; but they are looking better for one reason, namely, that Russia has come forward with a proposal. For the first time now—certainly in recent years—Russia is to be recognized as one of the great powers or forces in the Middle East. Heretofore those powers have been England, France, and the United States, primarily.

For years Russia has been trying to get into the Middle East. Of course, for many, many years Russia has been trying to reach a warm-water port. Now she has moved right in, without effort. In fact, the Middle East is virtually being given to her. I feel that that is due very largely to our not having had, many months ago, a definite, firm policy in regard to the Middle East. So we have defaulted; by our neglect we have more or less created a vacuum, when we knew that Russia would move in, as she does everywhere else, where a vacuum is created. We created a vacuum, and now Russia has a foothold in that area; in my opinion she is there to stay.

I hope the Senator from Montana will comment on that situation. In his

speech he refers to our failure to contain Russia. I do not wish to interject politics into this discussion; but I cannot help remembering that in the 1952 campaign we were severely criticized regarding the policy of containment, and our opponents said that was not sufficient, and that they were going to liberate. However, they have not liberated; they have not even contained.

We see the same sort of policy followed in Indochina. When the Geneva Conference was held, we took no part in it. In that way we were helping create a vacuum, and today the Communists have moved in. Not only are they there, but they are recognized. The northern part of Vietnam belongs to them—all as a result of the Geneva Conference.

Now what has happened in the Middle East? England has lost a great deal of her prestige and power there, as has France; and the United States simply sits back and says nothing that would give the world notice that we had a firm policy on which we would stand. In other words, we helped create the vacuum, and now Russia has moved in; and in my opinion she is there to stay. All the talk has been about arms and whether boundaries would be changed and whether the arms imbalance would be cured, and there has been talk about the arms race and about war and about similar things. But during all that time Russia was very expertly working her way in, without any trouble whatever.

Today I read in the newspapers and I hear on the radio that peace in the Middle East looks more possible because we have agreed, or it is expected we shall agree, to go along with Russia in her proposal to maintain peace in the Middle East. So, instead of our being the great peace stabilizer there, Russia is the one. She is where she has wanted to be for so long, and it did not cost her anything at all to get there.

I hope the Senator from Montana will discuss that matter, because I value very highly his extremely valuable views regarding all such matters and problems.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I have to agree with him that the Soviet Union is in the Middle East, and in my opinion is in both the Middle East and in Africa to stay. I think we have overlooked the importance of the Bandung Conference of April 1955, and the fusing together of the Arab, Asian, and African nations, and the fact that since that time in the United Nations the Asian-African bloc has constantly become stronger. That is the decisive factor in some instances.

We know that since the Czech arms were sold to Egypt, there has been further Soviet and satellite penetration of Africa. Only the other day there came out a story that Russian technical assistance and Czech arms would go into the Sudan. We know that a week or so ago, Soviet Union made an offer of technical assistance to Libya, but Libya turned it down. Why? According to what I can learn from reading the newspapers, because we offered Libya $5 million more than we already were giving her. I do not think that is the way to meet the Russian threat. I think we should spend our dollars wisely, and should spend less dollars, not more. We should generate something in the way of ideas and understanding, and we should proceed on that basis to work with the people of other countries. In that way we should develop a policy on the basis of which we shall be accepted by other peoples—instead of making gifts for which we expect gratitude.

Mr. President, these things are facts, and we must recognize them. I say to the Senator from Alabama, that in my opinion the Soviet Union is in the Middle East and is in Africa, and is in both places to stay, and that will have to be recognized as a factor in those areas in the years to come, as well as at the present time.

Mr. President, peace in the Middle East has two facets. On the one hand, there can be no durable peace unless the tensions which threaten are relaxed and ultimately dissolved. In this connection, a stable and lasting peace will require a genuine political settlement, not merely a truce, between the Arab States and Israel. It will require the correction of ancient social and economic inequities in the Middle Eastern states. It will require the development of responsible government where presently there is little or none. It will require the determined use of modern skills and technical knowledge in an effort to turn empty deserts into fruitful, healthy lands—as Iraq, a member of the Baghdad pact, is now doing—which can sustain the millions of Middle Eastern peoples. It will require a growing unity among the states of the Middle East, a unity aimed at constructive mutual ends, rather than at political manipulation and domination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have listened with very great interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana. He is rendering a splendid service in bringing some of the truth of this situation to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The Senator from Montana is also rendering a great service to the American people by making this information available to them.

It seems to me that the Senator from Montana has, in the last statements he has made, placed his finger on an extremely important factor in the entire situation. He has said that:

> A stable and lasting peace will require a genuine political settlement, not merely a truce, between the Arab States and Israel.

I am very glad indeed that at long last the United Nations has intervened in the Middle East situation. But all of us know that the terms of reference given the United Nations are very limited, indeed. I do not believe there is a possibility that the United Nations alone will be able to secure the kind of lasting peace which I know the Senator from Montana contemplates, and which in my opinion is the only thing that will have effective value in this strife-stricken area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from New York that I agree with him that some of the duties we push on to the United Nations are really beyond its control and responsibility. I would remind the Senator from New York that the United Nations was created to come into existence and operation once peace was achieved, following the Second World War. However, during all these years there has been no peace. Consequently, we place certain responsibilities on the shoulders of the United Nations, and expect it at times to do the impossible.

I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from New York has brought out the fact that the United Nations by itself cannot do what many persons seem to expect it to do. As a matter of fact, I think that down through the years the United Nations has exceeded all expectations, in view of the difficulties under which it as an organization has had to labor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as I have said, I am very glad indeed that the United Nations has intervened. I am sure—and I am confident that the Senator from Montana will agree—that although a truce is a means of gaining time, a truce is by no means a solution of the situation. It is merely a palliative of probably short duration.

It seems to me that, Russia having stepped into the vacuum which we have created through our inaction, she will be able to block any farflung political settlement in the United Nations which, in her opinion, would weaken her position and her power of creating and fomenting trouble in this torn part of the world.

So it does not seem to me that the United Nations alone can accomplish the task that must be done. We seem to be placing all our hope in the United Nations. It does not appear to me that there is any likelihood or possibility of the United Nations bringing about a lasting peace, such as that contemplated by the Senator from Montana, and which is strongly in my mind as the only real and permanent settlement of this question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish it were possible through the United Nations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The United Nations certainly cannot cure the situation which will cause trouble so long as Russia is in the Far East, and so long as the Arab States declare their hatred against Israel and their implacable determination to wipe out the little democracy and drive its inhabitants into the sea. The many troubled relationships between the Arab States and Israel, must be solved as promptly as possible. I believe that our good offices, and the very definite and vigorous stand our country could take if it were willing to do so, represent the only hope we have for a lasting settlement and lasting peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York is correct when he states that the United Nations cannot be expected to solve the problem of peace in the Middle East. But it is doing a good job. We hope it can do better. But we should

not expect too much of the United Nations at this time.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the fact that unity is required in the states of the Middle East, a unity aimed at constructive mutual ends rather than political manipulation and domination.

These changes may seem impossible to achieve. Yet in time they must be achieved. Unless they are, there will be no peace in the Middle East except one imposed from outside the region. Mr. President, I have not pointed out anything new in citing those long-range problems of stability in the Middle East. They are well-known and they have been widely discussed. Many of our past policies have consisted of a groping for ways to assist in dealing with them.

As I have noted, however, peace in the Middle East has not 1 but 2 parts. It consists of these long-range problems, but it also has an immediate aspect. The immediate aspect is to provide a margin of time, an opportunity to deal with the long-range problems. It is precisely this margin of time, this chance, which is threatened by the present crisis between Israel and Egypt. Even if this crisis should pass, there are likely to be others, unless further steps are taken to forestall them.

In these circumstances, it seems to me that a constructive policy for the Middle East must proceed on two levels. It requires a willingness on our part to cooperate with others in dealing with the long-range problems of peace in the Middle East. It also requires us to make unmistakably clear, however, our determination to join with others in doing what may be necessary to maintain a lid on the tensions which threaten the peace of the region and the world, until they can be eased and dissolved.

If the problem of peace in the Middle East is viewed in the framework of these two principles—joint action to ease the tensions from within, and joint action to restrain them from without—then I believe we have a basis on which to maintain a constructive policy in the Middle East.

Before considering the positive aspects of such a policy, I should like to discuss certain negatives. There are elements in our present policy which have no place in a constructive policy and the sooner they are eliminated, the better the chances will be to preserve peace.

First, a constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be built on an eagerness to please everyone. That has been tried, and it has failed miserably. We have ended by pleasing no one. The way to peace in the Middle East, no less than elsewhere, is a hard one, and we shall do well to concentrate on what must be done rather than on who likes or dislikes what is done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Montana, in a characteristically delicate way, has, I think, put his finger on one of the many weaknesses in our foreign policy, namely, the desire to please everyone. Is it not true that Mr. Dulles, on the one hand, seemed to support Portugal in its claims to the permanent possession of Goa? Then, when the opposition of India was aroused, he went to India and tried to smooth down that country.

On the one hand he gave encouragement to Pakistan, and then, to please India, made certain general statements there.

He went to Indonesia and implied help to the Indonesians in their conflicts with the Dutch over western New Guinea. Then, to placate the Dutch, he implied that he did not mean it.

In north Africa, in order to support the French, he threw cold water upon the spirit of nationalism and then implied at the same time that he was against colonialism.

In Cyprus he indicated first that we were with the Greeks, and then with the British, but he did not wish to estrange the Turks. He is for Israel, but sells arms to Saudi Arabia.

So may it not be said that in our foreign policy Mr. Dulles and the State Department have been furiously in earnest on all sides of every question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has gone into some detail in emphasizing that point. However, I think we ought to recognize that it is an impossibility to be a popular Secretary of State. We know that no Democrat could be a popular Secretary of State any more than any Republican could.

It so happens that, in the light of the times in which we live, problems are many and difficulties are great. However, I think we have gone down the middle of the road.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we gone down the middle of the road, or have we wobbled from one side to the other like a drunken sailor trying to negotiate a path in the darkness of the night?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One can go down the middle of the road and wobble from side to side at the same time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we weaved or have we not staggered and spent most of our time going sideways?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I prefer the use of the term "weave," because the word "stagger" implies something which I am sure the Senator from Illinois does not have in mind.

However, let me say that in the case of Goa, for example, it will be recalled that the Portuguese Foreign Secretary came over here at that time on an official visit. I assume that one of the things which were discussed was the renewal of the American lease in the Azores, which expires in September. It may be—and this is all assumption—that the Portuguese Foreign Minister said, "Mr. Secretary, this lease is coming up in September, covering Lagens and certain other fields in the Azores. We are very agreeable to the idea. How about saying a nice word about us in Goa?"

I think Mr. Dulles probably was in a position from which he could not extricate himself in one way or the other.

What he did, I think—and this is all assumption—was to get together with his staff, perhaps, and draft a fine document. He has a good legal mind, and he is quick with words. What he brought forth was a document which said, in effect, that we recognize the fact that Goa has been a province of Portugal for more than 400 years. Perhaps Mr. Dulles thought that would get him out of his predicament, because he was not saying that he favored the retention of Goa by Portugal.

As soon as the news hit India, it created quite a furor which has not subsided since but has, as a matter of record, been further accentuated by the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin.

This cause celebre is something which the Indians, who are very conscious of their newly won freedom and their aspirations, have not lost sight of since.

However, I should like again to call to the attention of the Senator that it was not many months later before the Russian team of Bulganin and Khrushchev began to do in another part of the world what Mr. Dulles had done vis-a-vis Goa. Khrushchev and Bulganin said to the Indians that Goa should belong to India. They went to Afghanistan and said that Pushtoonistan should belong to Afghanistan. Then they went back to India and said that Kashmir should belong to India, not to Pakistan. Therefore, what we have is a game going on on both sides. The only difference is that whereas we go down the middle of the road, the Russians go in either direction, depending on whatever suits them.

They are as flexible—and we hear that word a great deal today—as can be. They have no Congress to answer to, no committees to appear before, and they have no electorate to which they must report.

Therefore, we must recognize the fact that, regardless of what administration is in power the ways of a Secretary of State are extremely difficult in this day and age.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, we Democrats realize that. As a matter of fact, we have observed much greater tolerance and much greater friendliness to Mr. Dulles than our Republican friends observed toward Mr. Acheson.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about that. That is to the credit of the Democratic Party, because it indicates we are a party of responsible people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. I should like to say also that in my judgment Mr. Dulles would be a better Secretary of State if he did not talk quite so much, and if he did not give so many interviews. Every time he opens his mouth, he seems he put his foot into it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was interested in what the Senator said about Goa—that Goa had been settled by the Portuguese more than 400 years ago, and had been constantly occupied by Portugal since that time. I desire to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Montana that the oldest settlement in the continental United States, St. Augustine, in the State of Florida, was settled not quite 400 years ago, but we are hopeful of celebrating—that is, if the Indians have not taken us back by that time—

our 400th anniversary in 1965. I wish the RECORD to show that we in the State of Florida—and we hope all of the people of the United States—will continue to look forward to 1965 in the belief that the occupancy of that fine area for all this time has given us some right to stay there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Florida has just said. However, I remind the Senator that the first claim to St. Augustine, I believe, was made by Spain. I wonder what the reaction would be if Spain were to resurrect that claim of 400 years ago and try to reclaim St. Augustine as a part of its overseas empire.

Mr. HOLLAND. I did not know that Spain had any overseas empire now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. She could under this assumption, reacquire the old one.

Mr. HOLLAND. If she did, I believe we would have to hold that we have rights, which may not be quite 400 years old, and that we paid Spain what we thought Florida was worth in 1821. We did not obtain our rights from Spain by conquest, but by purchase.

Therefore, I believe the argument would really have to go back to the Indians of 400 years ago. I prefer to believe that anyone who takes history seriously at all would not contend that we had not, by the development which has taken place and all the other things which have occurred since then, built good title to that very interesting and, we believe, lovable part of the earth, St. Augustine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I want to do complete justice to the Secretary of State. Let the RECORD show that I am certain he will not give St. Augustine back to the Indians.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Montana will yield to me, I merely wish to say that, knowing the closeness of the relations between the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the Secretary of State, I am highly relieved to have that good news. I know that we can rely upon it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have said that a constructive foreign policy cannot be built on an eagerness to please everyone, and that by doing so we usually end up by pleasing no one. I am not suggesting that our policy can or should ignore the human interest of the people of this country in the peoples of the Middle East. That factor is a part of our interest in the region and it must have a place in our policy. But it is a part, not the totality. I have enough faith in the good sense of all our citizens to believe that they will understand that concept, if it is clear that we mean to take the steps necessary to keep the peace in the Middle East.

Second, a constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained unless it is clear that this country does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel. Conversely, it must also be clear that we shall not support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to me that if we cut away all the underbrush, the last paragraph which has been read by the distinguished Senator from Montana really is the crux of the whole situation. I wish to quote it, because it is highly important in the consideration of this very complex question. It reads as follows:

> A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained unless it is clear that this country does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel. Conversely, it must also be clear that we shall not support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States.

I wish to ask the Senator from Montana whether to his knowledge our Government—and the responsibility is that of our Government—has taken any steps whatever to give assurance that it does not intend to permit the annihilation of Israel or to support Israeli expansion at the expense of the Arab States. I know of none. I know that some very beautiful words have been uttered by our Secretary of State. However, I know of no assurance that is effective or controlling, or that has been convincing to anyone, that affirmative steps will be taken to prevent the annihilation of Israel and, conversely, the expansion of Israel at the expense of its hostile neighbors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to my good friend from New York that the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 would indicate to me that there is an interest in seeing to it that preparations are not made for an aggressive attack. The only difficulty is how to define the expression "preparing to violate frontiers," and so forth.

I was assured, although not as fully as I should like to be, by the White House statement on the Middle East policy, which to me was a reiteration in great part of the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, and also the reference to the use of constitutional measures in case it was necessary to engage in hostilities.

It is true that the declarations have not been strong enough, I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York.

At the same time, declarations have been made, and there have been a number of meetings with congressional groups, with the idea in mind of keeping them informed, and that shows that the State Department at least is aware of the difficulties and the dangers in the powder keg atmosphere of the Middle East.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to know that our Government has kept the Committee on Foreign Relations informed. I have the greatest admiration for the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

It does not seem to me, however, that any steps have been taken to correct the imbalance in military power which has taken place in the Middle East, since the agreement was reached between Soviet-controlled Czechoslovakia, and Egypt to send to the Middle East large supplies of arms. This growing imbalance has been permitted to go on, and has not been counterbalanced in any way by our Government. In other words, our Government has sanctioned the building up of a great superiority in power which is destroying the balance of military power which had existed for many years in the Middle East. That imbalance is bound to continue to be a vital and terrifying threat to the people of Israel.

I know of no steps whatsoever that our Government has taken to remedy the imbalance in power which has already taken place or to prevent even a further increase in it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think we have faced up courageously to that question. We have approached it too indirectly. We have told the French that we have no opposition whatever; that as a matter of fact, we would approve their shipping of 12 jet planes to Israel. We have even told Canada, according to the press, that we would not be opposed to selling 30 or 40 jet planes to Israel. That, I think, is indicating an interest indirectly. That is not the proper way to do it. Either we are going to maintain the balance, or we are not; and when we approach the subject in that way, we are losing out on both sides, and not achieving anything, in the long run, so far as respect, prestige, and leadership are concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I, of course, am not speaking from personal knowledge with regard to the shipment of arms to Israel. I am depending on reports of reputable and responsible newspapers and also on reports which have been made to me by members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

It seems to me to be a perfectly unbelievable thing that we say to our allies, whose interests should be identical with our own as ours should be identical with theirs, "Go ahead, boys. We will wink at your sending arms to the Middle East, but we are not willing to say publicly that we approve of the sending of arms."

I cannot understand how a great Nation such as ours, which has been built on high morals, which I hope will always be maintained, can take such a position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Such a roundabout policy on the basis described by the Senator from New York does this country no credit in the long run.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that so far from checking the growing power of the anti-Israel bloc, we have actually increased the power of that bloc by the sale of tanks by our Government to Saudi Arabia? However it may be explained away, the fact remains that those tanks were sold by our Government. The sale was discovered, and, because of objections of some Members of the Senate, led by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the export was temporarily suspended. But after 2 days the Department allowed them to go through. But whatever the justification, namely, that we felt we had to continue to hold the airbase in Saudi Arabia and we felt bound by previous agreements, certainly the practical effect of our own direct efforts has been to increase the military power of the Arabian bloc. Is that not correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot answer that question, but I see my friend, the Senator from Minnesota is present. He has followed that question more closely than have I. The information I have gathered from statements of the Secretary of State before the committee indicates that arms were shipped to both sides, the total being somewhere in the vicinity of $90 million worth, of which something like $30 million worth was shipped to Israel and the balance to Arab States.

Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have the exact figures. From Mr. Hoover, Under Secretary of State, we have information as to the quality of arms, as well as the nature of them, such as tanks, heavy guns, light guns, and so forth. As to whether we have sold arms to Israel within the past year——

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is over a 5-year period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have sold some; I think, much more to the Arab countries than to Israel. But it is fair to say that other countries have been selling right along to both sides.

The Senator may recall in reference to the French planes which at the time the Under Secretary, Mr. Hoover, appeared—his first appearance was after the Saudi-Arabian tank matter—he indicated that there was no official decision on the part of our Government relating to the then alleged sale of the planes by the Government of France. I recall that, because I was trying to pin it down as to whether the news story was accurate, whether it was based upon rumor or upon facts, and the Under Secretary indicated that the Department did not have any information as to that. Yet, 2 days later, it was confirmed in the press.

It is that sort of thing which does not please me. I cannot help but believe that the State Department did know, through one of its consular officials or its Ambassador or through some of its diplomatic channels, that this negotiation was going on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we did not know it we should have known it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and particularly in view of the Tripartite Agreement.

This roundabout way, as the Senator has termed it, of giving concurrence in and tacit support for the sale of arms to either the Arabian States or to Israel, on the part of our Government is at best a very faulty and, at times, could be a very dangerous policy. It does not make us any friends. It makes us look as if we were not a world leader, but a bystander. No other nation has so much at stake in the Middle East as has America. It is at the crux of the whole issue of world peace at the present time. I am really alarmed.

I have talked with some of the more responsible members of the State Department about it, and the answer I got in reference to our refusal openly to sell to Israel at their request—and the sum involved was only $15 million—is that if we sold, then maybe the Soviet Union would sell.

What kind of nonsense is that? The Soviet Union is selling. It controls Czechoslovakia as surely as General Motors controls Delco batteries. I think we are deluding ourselves.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana remember the aphorism of Sir Henry Wotton, who was not only a very fine English poet of the 17th century, but was also a diplomat, who defined a diplomat as "an honorable man sent abroad to lie for the good of his country"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is an old and a well-known saying. I do not know how true it is today, but I am quite certain that during the period of diplomatic history beginning with the Venetians it was a time-honored tradition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana feel that that definition has been completely invalidated by recent developments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Montana feel that, if not untruths, at least statements of less than the truth have been given to the American public?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not believe any deliberate untruths have been given.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois did not make such a charge.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think words have been used which have created the wrong impressions. I think wrong interpretations have been given covering certain sets of factors. But I have enough faith and confidence in the American people and in the press of the Nation to believe that the information will seep through, and that the American people perhaps know a good deal more about the actual facts of life as they exist in the world than the accounts which are issued through the various propaganda organs in Government agencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Montana is a very optimistic man.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. So far as the field of foreign affairs is concerned, and its relation to the press, I think, by and large, the American press has done an excellent job in disseminating information from various parts of the world.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Montana recalls a press conference which the President held some two or three weeks ago, at which he was asked about the shipment of arms to Israel purely for its own defense. He said, No, he did not believe there would be any additional arms shipped at the present time. He did not justify that decision in any way on the ground that the arms might conceivably be a threat to Egypt or to the other Arab countries, but merely on the ground that a country as small as Israel could not absorb more arms. I wonder whether the Senator from Montana recalls that statement made by the President in a press conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not recall that particular statement; but on the basis of all the information I have, it appears to me that Israel would have no trouble at all, in view of all the circumstances, in absorbing that amount of arms at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to point out from my own observation or point of view that it seems to me the possibility of American open involvement in this area upon any responsibility for arms strength would be very much limited and eased if we could restore the balance of military power. The more the area gets out of balance militarily, the greater the element of danger is to the United States, first of all in terms of our own leadership in the world, or our role of responsibility; secondly, in terms of the use of American manpower, which we hope and pray will never be necessary.

I think it is fair to say that the Israeli Government has never asked for American manpower. I think that fact ought to be clearly pointed out. Certainly no Arab State has asked for American manpower.

What the Israeli Government has asked for is the weapons with which to defend themselves. I think it is very important to note that of all the countries with which we have worked in foreign policy, a great many of them have never been willing to raise their own defense forces. I shall not embarrass anyone by going down the list, but I ask Senators in their own meditations to think of all the countries in which the United States has placed military equipment, economic aid, and all other forms of assistance, only to find, time after time, that those countries have never been able or willing—I should prefer to say "able"—to train forces to defend themselves. That is perfectly true in the Asian areas and in other areas, as well.

But Israel is a country which is willing to pay for its weapons. It has 50,000 trained troops, some of the best troops in the world, and two hundred and some thousand others which they can put into uniform over night, or within 24 hours. It is a country which is willing to defend its own borders; it is willing to agree to a nonaggression pact; it is willing to accept a truce; it is willing to sit down and negotiate; it is willing, possibly, to do anything which anyone would be willing to do to bring peace to the area.

It is willing to stand its own ground without asking for one American soldier, or even one American military training mission.

It seems somewhat foolhardy to deny to a country like that the tools with which to maintain the balance of power, provided firm commitments of nonaggression are obtained.

I think our Government's obligation, under the Tripartite Agreement, as Winston Churchill said 2 days ago, is a matter of honor. In the Tripartite Agreement of 1950, we pledged ourselves to make certain that those borders remained inviolate until such time as there could be a settlement of any boundary disputes. The United States, Great Britain, and France agreed that those

borders should remain inviolate until a peaceful settlement was made.

Until that matter can be settled peacefully, the least that ought to be done, it seems to me, is to sell to a willing, democratic nation, a free nation, a nation of freedom-loving people, the tools with which to take care of themselves. I think that is the objective of our foreign policy.

I submit that if that shall not be done, and Israel should be overrun, then, because of the indirect political commitments of this country, the United States will be directly involved. I hope and pray that that will not happen.

I want the American people to know that one of the best ways of preventing the United States from becoming involved in hostilities is to let other countries have the means with which to defend themselves. We will then be in the position of saying there shall be no aggression; that there will be peaceful settlement, economic growth and political stability, rather than hostilities.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is not that what the Soviet Union does with its satellites and other countries in which it is interested? The Soviet looks out for itself, while letting the other countries carry out what is, in effect, Russian policy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Montana upon his able speech. I am coming to him, really, for help. As the Senator may know, in times past I have supported proposals for foreign military and economic aid, because I have believed they were both a part of the defense of the United States. I did so under a Democratic administration, and I have done so under a Republican administration.

Incidentally, every time I supported foreign aid, as requested by the Republican administration, when I have gone back to my own State of Illinois, I have found myself publicly and bitterly attacked by the Illinois Republicans. So I have taken such action to support the administration at considerable risk to myself. There is a certain irony in the matter; namely, that when one supports the Republican administration, then all the smudge-pots of the Republican Party are turned loose upon him. The Republican administration does not thank him; on the contrary, they try to defeat him and join in the assault.

I have, however, been trying to make up my mind about what I shall do this year. I have been studying the testimony given by Secretary Dulles before the Committee on Foreign Relations on February 24 of this year. I hold a copy of those hearings in my hand. I find that the Senator from Montana was present at that meeting, as he generally is at such meetings. I should like to ask him if the impression which he received from the testimony is the same as the impression which I have gained from a reading of the transcript of the testimony.

Secretary Dulles implied that Russia was weak internally in certain vital respects—agriculturally, in the field of consumers' goods, and so on. The implication which I drew was that Russia was diminishing in strength. Is the Senator from Illinois correct in that assumption?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Secretary Dulles, stated, at page 22 of the hearings, that he had confidence that the policies espoused by Chancellor Adenauer would continue to prevail in Germany.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; the Secretary said that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secretary implied that we need not worry about the French situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I believe he said that. He mentioned something about the permanent French civil service, as I recall his testimony.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He implied that we need not be worried about the conditions in Jordan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assume that is so; I do not recall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, almost immediately afterward, Colonel Glubb was ousted from Jordan.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; within a month or so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Secretary Dulles implied, in response to a question asked by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that the fears of the Israeli that they might be exterminated were unfounded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; that is correct. In general, the Secretary said things were not too bad; they could be worse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, at page 59 of the hearings, the Secretary implied that the forces of liberalization were setting in within the Soviet Union.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I observe, by reading the RECORD, that that statement is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the general impression given by him was that the strength of the United States and the free world had increased during the past year, and that the strength of the Soviet Union had diminished, and that there was not much to worry about?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what I gathered from the newspapers, and it is what I gather from studying in detail a transcript of the testimony.

Is it not also true that at just about the same time Secretary Dulles was testifying everything was going well, he also proposed a bill asking for $4,900,000,000 for foreign aid, or about twice the amount asked in previous years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. That is a little different. The figure is correct, but I think at a meeting of the leaders on December 13, Mr. Dulles did tell the leaders he was going to ask for about $100 million more this year; but Secretary of Defense Wilson did not tell the leaders the Defense Department was going to ask for $2 billion more for defense assistance. That is where the figure of $2 billion comes from. The total is $4.9 billion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which is almost twice the amount requested last year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And it does not fit in with the rosy picture painted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Whom is the Senator from Illinois to believe? If he believes the Secretary of State in his testimony, he will have to vote against foreign aid, because, quite obviously, if things are improving, we do not need twice as much money.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would suggest that the Senator from Illinois do his best to fuse contrasting and contradictory testimony and then do what he believes in.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And what is that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the Senator make up his own mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must judge by the testimony of persons who are supposed to know. I had always thought the Secretary of State was the official spokesman for this Government on foreign affairs. On the one hand, he says things are improving. On the other hand, he asks us to vote almost twice as much money as we voted last year. Am I to believe Secretary Dulles on the 24th of February, and vote for a big cut in foreign aid, or am I to believe him on some other day, when he comes up to Congress and asks for a doubling of foreign aid? Which statement am I to believe, or whom am I to believe, or is Secretary Dulles not one, but many persons?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois really has hold of a complex problem, but I am quite certain the Senator from Illinois will, as he does in all matters, come to the right conclusion, and vote accordingly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secretary of State and the administration have those of us on the Democratic side who want to help them over a barrel. On the one hand, if we do not vote for $4.9 billion, they will say we are not cooperating with them. On the other hand, if we vote for $4.9 billion, we know we are going to be attacked by the Republican Party for wasting money in efforts which are not needed, in view of the world situation. Secretary Dulles' testimony of February 24 will then be thrown back at us. I suggest that if our Republican friends want cooperation from those of us on this side of the aisle, they should tell us what the actual facts are. While I have been very sympathetic to foreign aid in the past, I shall want to know the truth before I shall vote for the $4.9 billion. If there are any members of the State Department in the gallery, as I assume there are, let them carry that message back. Some of us are being "fed up" with being used as pawns in this matter, and having our good faith and desire to cooperate abused. We do not relish being treated as simpletons and being alternately gulled and reviled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to say the Senator from Illinois has expressed the sentiments which I have heard expressed in the cloakroom and elsewhere. I see heads being nodded in assent. I am sure the Senator particularly well recalls the difficulty we had last year, with respect to the foreign-aid bill, in getting accurate information with respect to so-called unobligated funds. In fact, the Senator may recall that on

the very day we were voting on the foreign-aid bill, the amount of the funds which were still unexpended were changing by the hour. I recall the Senator received cabled information from one of our commanders overseas—I believe it was General Gruenther—as to funds which were still unobligated or unexpended, which had not been reported to us by the State Department or Defense Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall that very well. One billion two hundred million dolars was not reported, because, as I remember, the Defense Department officials told us they would have a carryover of only $100 million. When we got through, it turned out to be $1,300,000,000. And in the last 5 hours of the last day of the last fiscal year, the Defense Establishment reserved $614 million, which could just as easily be unreserved the next day, the first day of the new fiscal year.

Oh, yes, this aid program can stand a lot of probing, and I am delighted that the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has seen fit to bring before us, during the last several weeks, a proposal to carry on a thorough investigation of the entire foreign-aid program, so we shall know where we are going, what our objectives are, and just how useful this kind of program really is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not fair to suggest that one of the aspects of the foreign-aid program which needs to be laid bare to the Senate is the budgeting, the accounting, the disbursing, and the expenditures, because it is in that field that we have always received so little information and so much inaccurate information—the amount of carry-over, unexpended balances, and what is in the so-called pipeline of movement of supplies and equipment from the previous year's appropriation?

I do not think Congress can be expected to legislate on such matters unless all the necessary information is in its possession. I think one other point which the Senator from Illinois may have raised, and which I did not immediately detect, is the fact that last year and the year before we were told the foreign aid bill would be reduced, and that next year it would be reduced further, that the next year it would go down some more, and it was hoped that we would get out of this business. In fact, that was said last year. What happened this year was that the unexpended balances which had been carried over from previous years and the previous administration had been sorely depleted. It is like the fellow who inherited some money. He finally got around to spending his inheritance. One day he had to go to work.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean the administration is now working on the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration is asking for money—not to give more foreign aid. We are not going to give more foreign aid; we are only going to keep up what we are now doing. But the administration has to ask for more money because it spent that which was in the cash register, and which the administration inherited. Sooner or later we will have to take stock. If we have not been misled, we also have not been properly informed.

Also, with respect to the so-called long-term aid program which has been publicized so much, I call attention to the fact that there is provided only $100 million in the whole bill. When one reads of the President's proposal, he would think the President had a great, new, imaginative program, of worldwide impact and effect. There is provided in the foreign aid bill a total of only $100 million of long-term economic aid, unless I am sorely misinformed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is groping for the truth, and he finds himself greatly mystified by the conflicting policies of this administration. The Senator from Illinois is going to put the welfare of the country first, but he is quite certain, whatever he does, the Republican Party will choose some phase of the testimony with which to defeat and revile any Democrat who takes any stand on any issue. If we believe the Secretary of State, then we shall be accused of not cooperating with the President. If we believe the President, we shall be accused of ignoring the advice of the Secretary of State. So they have us coming and going. I only hope the American people realize the kind of shell game that is being played.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope we can help them realize it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps what we Democrats should do is to refuse to vote and let the administration see if they can carry their measures with only Republican votes. In self-respect that is perhaps what we should do.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Illinois has given a very fair, clear, and persuasive analysis of this situation and of what the Republican Party will seek to do.

However, I am not very much in doubt personally about my position in this matter. I think I know what I shall do, and I have no hesitation in stating it now. I do not believe for a moment in the optimistic and rosy reports, which have come to us from the State Department, in regard to the world situation. I think the situation, instead of improving has deteriorated. I believe that today we are in as great danger as we have ever been in since the end of the Second World War.

Mr. President, because I do not believe those optimistic and rosy reports, I shall vote for a larger appropriation this year, compared to the appropriations in recent years, because I think an increased appropriation is absolutely necessary. However, I wish to know more regarding the division that will be made of the funds. I want authoritative information. I am not by any means certain that most of the increase in the appropriation should be made available for military aid. Instead, it seems to me that increased amounts should be made available for economic, technical, and social aid, so as to improve living conditions in the countries we seek to help, and thus keep them from coming under the influence of the Soviet Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that the analysis made by the Senator from New York is an appropriate one, and represents good, sound judgment.

I desire to emphasize that the open military budget, this year, of the Soviets—their military budget available to all the world to see, and not including any hidden figures—indicates that for this year the military expenditures by the Soviet Union will be increased 12 percent. Therefore, I believe it incumbent upon us to weigh that fact at all times as we consider our defenses and our foreign-aid program.

The smiles of Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev are backed up by cold steel; and the little black suitcase they carry does not have campaign contributions in it. Instead, that little suitcase is but a reminder of the military strength of the Soviet Union—which makes their smile all the more threatening and diabolical.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to continue with my remarks. I come to my third point, as follows:

Third. A constructive policy in the Middle East cannot be maintained if it is concentrated on the protection of our economic interests in the Middle East to the virtual exclusion of all others. Earlier in my remarks, I addressed myself to the importance of these interests. They are of the greatest importance, and I believe we should make every reasonable effort to retain and even enlarge them. We are not likely to be successful in this effort, however, if their retention becomes a be-all and an end-all. If our foreign policy speaks with the full voice of the people of the United States, that will not be the case. It will be clear to any who may have thought otherwise, that whatever the importance of these American economic interests, it is not such that we will make a craven sacrifice of other peoples' interests, of our own total interests, and of world peace.

Fourth. A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained by seeking to buy peace or good will in that region. As I have already noted, economic development is a key factor in developing conditions of stability. We have assisted in this process in the middle eastern states in the past, and we should continue willingly to assist.

There can be no economic development, however, if violence stalks the region. Economic development cannot take place unless there exists on the part of the people directly involved a desire to

turn from destructive to constructive objectives. We cannot instill that desire. If it is there, we can help; and we should help if help is sought. But there can be no bargaining, no bribery, no trading of a TVA Jordan River development or an Aswan Dam in Egypt, for example, in the expectation that in this fashion we shall please possible aggressors. A policy based on an appeasement of that kind is more likely to feed the flames of destructive ambition, rather than to quell them.

Fifth. A constructive policy in the Middle East, Mr. President, cannot be maintained without a clearer evaluation on the part of the executive branch than so far evident, of the changed tactics of the Soviet Union and the implications of the changes for ourselves and other free nations. In the Middle East, as elsewhere, our policies have been built largely on a base of the mililtary containment of possible military aggression by the Soviet Union. The Baghdad Pact, which links the United Kingdom, Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq, and Iran, is part of the defensive pattern which evolved from these policies. So, too, is the Balkan Pact of Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. We have supported both of these pacts. We have aided the members individually to build both their economic and their defensive strength.

The policy of emphasis on military containment was correct, in my opinion, 8 years ago, 5 years ago, 3 years ago. Military containment is still essential today; but the question we must answer with logic, rather than with slogans, is whether the emphasis on military factors in total policy for the Middle East should be the same today as it was 3, 5, or 8 years ago. Frankly, I do not know. I wonder whether the executive branch knows.

Certainly, it is idle to ignore the fact that the Communists have jumped the wall of containment in the Middle East, not with military power, but with a powerful diplomatic, economic, and cultural offensive which has driven all the way from Syria to the Sudan. It is just as idle to suggest that the sole answer to these new tactics is necessarily a response in kind on our part. From the point of view of constructive policy we need first to have a perceptive understanding and evaluation of these new Soviet policies; and if adjustments in our present approach are indicated, the executive branch should make that clear to the American people.

Sixth. A constructive policy, Mr. President, cannot be built on an absolute reliance on the United Nations to maintain peace in the Middle East. The United Nations has already made a major contribution. Even now, the Secretary-General of the organization is in the Middle East attempting to conciliate the contending forces. His mission has the endorsement of the great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States included.

It may well be that if the great powers continue to agree, all that needs to be done can be done through the United Nations. We ought not to place impossible burdens on that organization, however, and then be dismayed when it cannot carry them. We ought not to forget that the United Nations is powerless, except as a voice of world opinion, in the event there is disagreement among the great powers.

It seems to me a matter of elementary prudence that while we hope for the agreement and cooperation of the Soviet Union and others in keeping the peace of the Middle East through the United Nations, we prepare ourselves for disagreement and noncooperation. We may well face a situation which will require action in accord with the charter of the United Nations, to be sure, but outside the United Nations.

I should like to turn now from the negative to the positive aspects of a constructive policy in the Middle East. It seems to me that if we are to have such a policy it must be built around these elements.

First. We should have a clear pledge by the President of the United States that this Nation shall join with all others willing to cooperate in preventing any changes by force in the present boundary demarcations between Israel and the surrounding Arab States. This pledge should not prejudge a final settlement of this question.

Second. We should begin now, in cooperation with others, to plan the measures which may be necessary to prevent a major outbreak of violence in the Middle East or to stop one if it should occur. The Tripartite Declaration of 1950, in my opinion, is inadequate to meet the needs of the present situation. Dangerous and difficult measures may be required to keep the peace and the sacrifices entailed should be shared on the widest possible scale.

Until evidence of unwillingness to accept the responsibilities for maintaining peace in the Middle Eastern situation is unmistakably clear, no nation should be excluded from participating in carrying out those responsibilities. The logical site for considering this question is in the United Nations. If necessary, however, the President should be prepared to meet in a Big 4 Conference with the Soviet Union, France, and the United Kingdom, or in a Seven-Nation Conference which would also include India, Turkey, and Pakistan, to consider measures necessary to prevent an outbreak of war in the Middle East.

Third. We should call at once a conference of the Western European nations which depend on middle-eastern petroleum, and the oil-producing nations of this hemisphere. If the peace is to be kept in that area, measures may have to be taken which will shut off, at least temporarily, Western Europe's major source of petroleum. The immediate problem is to find alternatives not only to the oil but to the income which the production and processing of oil represents to certain Western European countries.

In a similar vein, the American people need to have a clearer understanding of the part which American oil production in the Middle East has played in the situation there. The press is full of reports as to how royalties paid in advance have been used in political manipulations to finance preparations for war, and in other dubious ways. We need the facts in this situation, and Congress has the power to get them if necessary.

We also have an obligation to the investors in those American enterprises in the Middle East. Measures of policy which may have to be taken could entail heavy sacrifices on their part, and the United States Government should be prepared to ease these sacrifices.

Fourth. We should reexamine now our need for bases and alinements in the Middle East, in the light of shifting Soviet tactics and the progress in weapons development. We should consider abandoning those which may no longer be essential or which can be retained only on dishonorable terms.

Fifth. We should develop a new concept of aid programs in the Middle East. It should be aid after, not before, it is clear that any given nation means to turn from the path of war to the path of peace, and we ought not hesitate to shut off aid entirely if it is evident that war is the objective of any state in that region. Nor should fear of what the Soviets may do or not do in this matter cause us to swerve from a determination to supply aid in this pattern. Least of all can we have aid policies based on a craven submission to blackmail in the mistaken belief that it will buy peace.

Sixth. We should recognize, in the Cyprus situation, that the present crisis in the Middle East requires the presence of British military power on the island. We can do so without prejudicing the claims—and the rights—of the Cypriotes to self-determination.

I believe this country's friendship and behavior over the past decade toward Greece, Turkey, and Britain gives us the right to enjoin restraint on them in the Cyprus question. Even more, our common dedication to NATO requires that we do so.

The positive measures which I have been discussing, Mr. President, contain only the outlines and suggestions of a constructive policy. They concern largely the pressure from without which is necessary to hold in check the tensions in the Middle East. There is still the whole range of questions which must be dealt with to ease the tensions from within. I believe, however, that whatever influence this country can exert on those long-range problems will be more usefully and effectively felt once our own position is made clear.

Mr. President, let me say in closing that I do not underestimate the fearful responsibilities which fall to the President in the Middle Eastern crisis. Under our system of Government, they can fall nowhere else, not even in the National Security Council, not in the Senate, and not in the Congress. The President can come to the legislative branch for reassurance, if he feels that he requires it, as he did in the case of Formosa.

In the end, however, the responsibility for the execution of our foreign policy is his. He cannot share that responsibility of his office without doing violence to the Constitution, and without jeopardizing the safety of the Nation. The Senate can advise—and ultimately its consent is essential—but it is for the President to act. If he acts with clarity, with firmness, within the framework of total interests of the United States, we shall have a constructive policy for peace in the Middle East. It will be a policy that shall not lack for support from the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE CITATION OF WENDELL H. FURRY FOR CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

During the delivery of Mr. MANSFIELD'S speech,

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me so that I may make an unusual request? I have just left a hearing of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and the chairman has asked me to return immediately so that a quorum may be maintained.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The chairman of the subcommittee has asked me to return immediately so that a quorum may be maintained. I have a three-page explanation to make with regard to my refusal to testify in a contempt case. I very much dislike to make this request of the Senator from Montana, but I would very much appreciate the Senator's yielding to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been giving up my time all afternoon. Therefore I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin to make his remarks, provided I do not lose the floor and that the interruption appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we are again confronted with a situation where an irresponsible judge is obstructing efforts by the Senate to investigate and expose Communists. On August 11, 1954, the Senate unanimously cited Mr. Wendell H. Furry for contempt of Congress for his refusal to testify before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning his former Communist associates. Yet it will be impossible to get a conviction because the case is to be heard by Judge Bailey Aldrich, a demonstrably incompetent and irresponsible judge, whose past conduct proves that he will not rule fairly and objectively in a Communist case.

I say to my friend, the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who has been kind enough to yield to me so that I may make this statement, that I rise to explain why I will refuse to testify in this case. It is something that I must explain to the Senate. I will refuse to testify unless the Senate asks me to do so.

As the chairman of the subcommittee before which Furry committed contempt of Congress, I have been requested by the Justice Department to testify in the Furry case. While I would be very glad to testify if the case were going to be heard by an unbiased judge, I am advising the Justice Department that I will not testify unless Judge Aldrich withdraws from the case. I will not, if I can help it, be a party to the miscarriage of justice that is bound to occur in Judge Aldrich's court in any case involving communism.

Let me be very clear, Mr. President, as to reasons why Judge Aldrich is unqualified to hear this case. Last fall, an almost identical case was heard before Judge Aldrich's court, the case of U. S. against Leon J. Kamin. Kamin, like Furry, had been unanimously cited by the Senate for contempt of Congress for refusing to divulge the names of his former Communist associates. But thanks to Judge Aldrich's completely irresponsible conduct, and his almost incredible rulings, Kamin was acquitted.

To begin with, Judge Aldrich refused to let a jury hear the case. A jury had been impaneled, but Aldrich used as an excuse for discharging the jury the fact that I had been applauded in the corridors of the courthouse as I was coming to testify. Then, after he had arbitrarily given himself complete control of the case, Aldrich made a number of ridiculous rulings that assured Kamin's acquittal. His decisive and most absurd ruling was that a subcommittee which had been authorized to investigate "the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency" had exceeded its jurisdiction when it investigated communism in defense plants that were supplied with Government funds and which were under the security supervision of Government security officers.

I thought at the time that these extraordinary rulings could be explained only by the fact that Judge Aldrich was prejudiced. Several months later these suspicions were confirmed when I learned that Judge Aldrich had refused to sign a non-Communist oath several weeks before the Kamin trial. He refused to sign an affidavit saying, No. 1, "I am not a member of the Communist Party," and No. 2, "I am not now, nor have I ever been, nor shall I ever knowingly become a member of any organization that believes in, or advocates, the overthrow by force of our American form of government." Judge Aldrich finally signed this affidavit only after heavy pressure had been exerted on him by Massachusetts government officials.

Clearly this rebellious attitude against signing a non-Communist oath indicated prejudice on Judge Aldrich's part in cases involving Communists. Yet he failed to disqualify himself on grounds of bias, as any responsible judge would have done in a Communist case.

Mr. President, in the Furry matter we have an almost identical case. It is therefore a foregone conclusion that Judge Aldrich will acquit Furry just as he acquitted Kamin. Under the circumstances, it would be an utter waste of time for me or any other Senator to testify. If there were any chance of getting a fair hearing of the case, it would be a different matter. But in Judge Aldrich's kangaroo court, the Government has not the slightest hope of obtaining a conviction. Not only that: Judge Aldrich, in the Kamin case, insulted the Senate by refusing to uphold its contempt citation; we should not give Aldrich the opportunity to insult the Senate again. We should not invite a repetition of that shameful spectacle.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the United States attorney in Boston, Mr. Anthony Julian, and his assistant, Mr. John M. Harrington, Jr., have done a splendid job in preparing the Kamin and Furry cases. It would be unfortunate if their hard work should come to naught because of the willful irresponsibility of Judge Aldrich.

The correct thing for Judge Aldrich to do is withdraw from this case and permit it to be heard by another judge. I hope he does so. I hope that Judge Aldrich realizes that his conduct in the Kamin case was a disgrace to the whole Federal judiciary, and that the public's confidence in the judiciary will be further shaken if he fails to withdraw from the Furry case.

Mr. President, let me make it very clear to the Senate that while I think it would be a grave mistake for me to appear in Judge Aldrich's court to testify, when we know that there cannot be a conviction in a Communist case, if the Senate feels that I, as chairman of the subcommittee, and after it has voted contempt in the case, should go to the court and make this useless gesture, I shall accede to the Senate's request.

May I say to the able Senator from Montana that I greatly appreciate his yielding time for me to make these comments so that I can return to the investigating subcommittee. I hope I can return the favor at some time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator may have that opportunity.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a proposed unanimous consent agreement, which is submitted on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I ask that the proposed agreement be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, April 19, 1956, after the conclusion of routine morning business, the call of the legislative calendar, and the treaties on the Executive Calendar, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution, debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 11 a. m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELIEF FROM FLOOD DISASTERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to my colleagues in the Senate for their action today in unanimously approving four of my bills arising from the flood disasters which afflicted my own State of Connecticut and other States in the Northeast during 1955.

Three of the bills should help speed the task of relief and rehabilitation should we have the misfortune to suffer a repetition of disaster. These bills would: First, authorize an increase in FHA mortgage insurance for 100 percent guaranteed disaster loans for repair or replacement of homes from $7,000 to $12,000; second, provide for rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy disaster victims; and, third, permit stockpiling of temporary housing for disaster relief.

The fourth, most important of all, is S. 3272, to expedite the construction of small flood-control works for the protection of our communities. This bill, when finally enacted, will enable the Army engineers to break through the bottleneck of time which has been the most serious obstruction to speedy action for permanent flood protection.

It is my hope that the House of Representatives will act promptly on all of these measures. Together with bills previously approved by the Senate, they are an important part of our over-all program to provide the people the protection against the ravages of floods for which the need was so tragically demonstrated in 1955.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have read with great alarm President Eisenhower's farm bill veto message. With equal alarm and bitter disappointment, that I am sure is shared by the farmers of America, I listened to his nationwide broadcast on this matter.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee that held extensive hearings with farmers on farm problems all over America last year, as one who helped draft the Senate Agriculture Committee's version of a farm bill, as a member of the conference committee that drafted the final measure agreed upon by both Houses of Congress which President Eisenhower vetoed, and as the senior Senator from a State that is chiefly agricultural and whose agrarian population is principally made up of small farmers, depending greatly upon the agricultural policy of government, I feel dutybound to take the President of the United States to task for his veto, his reasoning behind his veto, his report to the people on his action, and his request for soil-bank legislation.

President Eisenhower said in his television message to the people that he was not a politician and that his veto was based upon what is best for the farmers and what is best for the entire Nation.

His implication was that we in Congress played politics in writing the farm bill. That is political slander. I am afraid Mr. Eisenhower is too much of a general to understand that we in Congress represent and work for the interests of a diversity of people from various sections of the Nation that grow a vast variety of agricultural commodities. Certainly there were many amendments offered by many Senators to the farm bill. Many were adopted and many were voted down. In committee we gave and took legislation, always in the best possible interest of the people of this Nation as a whole.

If any Senator or Representative wanted to play politics with farm legislation he would certainly choose an easier way to do it than to spend months in the field listening to the problems of the farmers from the farmers, and then more months attempting to forge out a bill reflecting the needs of the farmers, as we in the Congress did.

On the contrary, in speaking of politics and farmers, I am wondering if Mr. Eisenhower has ever listened to farmers and if he has once looked into the farm bill he vetoed and figured out what he has deprived the farmers of in dollars and cents by his action.

The fact is that by vetoing the farm bill, President Eisenhower has literally taken $2,334,000,000 out of the farmers' pockets. His veto will cost farmers $2,334,000,000 in reduced income. He did not tell the people this the other night. No. He did not tell the people that by vetoing 90 percent of parity he had reduced farmers' cash income by $490 million on basic commodities alone, and $144 million in grain feeds, and $1,700,000,000 in conservation and soil bank payments that would have functioned with rigid controls and 90 percent of parity backing up the farmer in his participation of that program.

President Eisenhower did not tell the people that cotton under the 90 percent of parity bill passed by Congress would bring the farmers $1,717,000,000, but that under the program President Eisenhower will manage, the farmer will only net $1,558,000,000, realizing a loss of $159 million. Broken down simply, it means that the President's principle of less income for the farmer is best for the farmers and that neither the farmers nor Congress know anything about agricultural problems. This veto of Mr. Eisenhower's is costing farmers a loss of approximately $9 per acre of cotton they grow; $10 per acre of rice; $9 per acre of peanuts; $4 per acre of wheat; and $2 per acre of commercial corn.

Under the bill passed by Congress, corn farmers would have received $957 million. But because of the President's veto, they will receive 84 percent of parity, or $870 million, realizing a loss of $87 million. Wheat, under the congressional 90 percent of parity, would bring $1,768,000,000, but, as a result of President Eisenhower's veto, will bring the farmers only $1,558,000,000, realizing a loss of $210 million. On peanuts, the farmers would have received $162 million, but because of the President's veto they will get only $144 million, realizing a loss of $18 million. As for rice, the story is the same. Under the bill passed by Congress farmers would have received $200 million, but because of President Eisenhower they will get only $184 million, realizing a loss of $16 million. These figures can be verified by the Legislative Research and Reference Division of the Library of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table prepared by the Legislative Research and Reference Division of the Library of Congress.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Support prices and indicated value of marketings for 1956

[Based upon average yield from acreage allotments (cotton) and intentions to plant (parity as of Mar. 15, 1956)]

[Millions of dollars]

Commodity	Indicated marketings		90 percent of the higher parity provided by Congress	Value to farmer	President proposes resulting from veto	Value to farmer	Total loss in basic commodity income to farmers resulting from veto
	Unit	Quantity					
Cotton	Million bales	10.8	0.3180	1,717	(0.2885)	1,558	159
Wheat	Million bushels	779	2.27	1,768	2.00	1,558	210
Corn	do	580	1.65	957	1.50	870	87
Rice	Thousand hundredweight	40,876	4.90	200	4.50	184	16
Peanuts	Million pounds	1,350	.12	162	.107	144	18
Total				4,804		4,314	490
Feed grain losses resulting from veto							144
Total loss in grains and basic commodities resulting from veto							634
Loss in soil bank and conservation payments resulting from veto							1,700
Grand total veto loss to farmers							2,334

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on and on the difference goes and up and up mounts the loss in income to farmers. Surely the President does not think the farmers of America will swallow his story claiming that he has done what is best for the farmers. He said 90 percent of parity was best for the farmers in 1952. He should have traveled with the Senate Agriculture Committee last fall if he wanted to know something about farm problems. He speaks of grass-roots movements in his veto message. He is probably an authority on grass roots; but I am inclined to believe that the only grass roots on which he is an authority are on the golf greens. What he should know is something about the farmers' cost of living versus the farmers' shrinking income. If he had wanted really to help the farmers he would have approved the bill, which would have given the farmers more than $2¼ billion.

He has completely broken his word and faith with the farmers of the Nation. I am not calling him a political liar. If he were not the President of the United States, I do not know how far I would go. In Columbia, S. C., in his campaign speech, he promised the people he would back 90 percent of parity without any "ifs, ands, or buts." Since then he said he meant 90 percent of parity in the marketplace. This is not what he promised, and to keep the record straight I will quote now exactly what he said in Columbia, S. C., on October 1, 1952, when he was seeking the farmers' vote:

> For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Candidate Eisenhower did not say he favored a program. He did not say he favored 90 percent of parity in the marketplace. He did not say he favored some sort of a program, and certainly he made no mention of sliding parity. He specifically said he favored the "present program" of 90-percent price supports, and the "present program" at that time was the same 90-percent support program Congress passed last week, and which President Eisenhower said was a major cause of his veto. He talks of principles and people. What kind of principle is it that makes a man say he is for the farmers, promise them continuation of a program, and then after election kills the bill that would do what he had promised, and reduces the farmers' income by more than $2 billion? He has confused principles with military tactics, for certainly no man would do such a thing except for expediency to win a point or to win a battle. And in this case the point is covering up his own failures with confusion.

This does not sound like the same man that vetoed the 90 percent of parity farm bill in the White House does it? Well, its the very same Ike who promised a lot of other things. I must say, either the man in the White House has purposely for political reasons misguided the people or he does not even know what he reads that others write for him.

Robert Montgomery is a good movie actor, but is a very poor adviser on farm problems.

The President wants the soil-bank program, but he does not want 90 percent of parity. Well, he might as well know now that one will not work without the other. The farmer has got to have protection in the form of income for what he does grow before he can ever justify retiring his acreage out of production. It stands to reason that the less a man makes per acre of soil the more he will be inclined to plant, and the less he will retire into the soil bank.

To understand this problem, let us look at what happened with sliding parity prices and acreages. Mr. Eisenhower claims, as one of his reasons for the veto, that 90 percent of parity induces production and mounts surpluses. He does not know what he is talking about.

On every hand where sliding parity supports were applied to commodities—and the parity dropped as it always does in sliding programs—production skyrocketed. Proof of this is shown in the following figures regarding 10 commodities from 1952 to 1955:

Crop	Support level, percent down	Production, percent up
Oats	22	30
Sorghum grain	24	173
Soybeans	20	30
Milk	17	9
Barley	23	71
Flaxseed	23	42
Rye	17	75
Rice	8	2
Corn	1	5

Again, all we have to do is look at the 1954–55 figures on some of these same commodities to see that President Eisenhower does not know what he is talking about when he says by replacing 90 percent of parity with sliding low parity that production will be cut.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which I have before me may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crop	Support level, percent down	Production, percent up
Corn	3	7
Oats	5	9
Sorghum grain	15	11
Soybeans	10	13
Milk	15	3
Barley	15	4
Flaxseed	5	4
Rye	15	21

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to the contrary, the production records under 90 percent of parity, when it was in operation, show a distinct stability in production.

One point I would like to make here in particular is the moral obligation the Congress and anyone who is President owes to the farmers.

At the outset of World War II, we were faced with the need for tremendous expansion on all fronts, including trained manpower, more industry output, and more food than ever before in our history.

All sorts of programs were instituted by the Government to train people for defense jobs and inducements were handed out to get manpower to shift around the country as the need arose. Necessary gigantic expansion of industry was induced by governmental offers of Government-financed factories, tax concessions, conversion payments, cost-plus contracts, all effectively guaranteeing profits and eliminating risks. After the war, the Government gave industry reconversion subsidies and sold whole factories for a few cents on the dollar value. In short, industries' so-called wartime surplus capacity was practically a cost-free net gain on many fronts financed by the taxpayers.

All together, aside from hidden dollars not accounted for, the Government gave outright to industry for its reconversion between 40 and 50 billion dollars, but not so with the farmers.

On the other hand, farmers, who had expanded their output to meet wartime requirements, had been induced solely by appeals to their patriotism and the possibilities of improved income. No financing and subsidies were offered to farmers. Agriculture output rose 32 percent per man over 1935–39 levels. Farmers of our Nation produced more food than ever before in our history.

The only thing the farmer received was a promise to provide 90 percent price supports to aid him in adjusting back to normal times.

As to a great many of these commodities, the Government made money. On cotton, for instance, the Government, up to the first of this year, made a net profit of $258 million.

But we have never really returned to normal times, and will not for years to come. Now, the President has broken his word—that is a nice way of saying it—his promise, and his faith with the farmers. He has forgotten people and principles. He is totally infected with the disease of the Republican Party that has plagued the little people of this country since the first Republican drew breath.

Another thing is the ridiculous proposal of the President to get Congress to pass a soil-bank program by itself with no high supports to protect the farmers' income while they are retiring some of their soil into the soil-bank or conservation program.

Take cotton, for instance. The national average acre of cotton brings the farmer around $110 under the 90 percent of parity bill we passed in Congress.

Under the program by the President, this same acre of cotton with 82½ percent of parity will bring the farmer only $101.75. The President, under his plan, wants the farmers to place some of their cotton acreage under the soil-bank program. For this, President Eisenhower will pay him a certain percentage of the existing parity value of the cotton. Estimates from the Department of Agriculture indicate that Mr. Benson will pay the farmers 50 percent of the parity value of each acre of cotton placed into the soil-bank program. This would mean a farmer would be entitled to get about $50.87 per acre of cotton, placed into the soil bank.

But, as the President announced, he will only give the farmer one-half of this amount in 1956 and the other half in 1957. This means that for each acre of cotton put out of commission into the soil bank that President Eisenhower will give the participating farmer about $25.44.

In effect, what the President is saying is this: Ninety percent of parity which would bring the farmers $110 per acre of cotton in 1956 is bad for the farmers and their sagging economy. Let me help you out. You put that $110 crop into my bank and I will give you $25.44 and you will not have to even work for it.

There are many small farmers in my State who plant less than 4 acres of cotton.

I have just ascertained by telephone that there are in South Carolina approximately 18,630 farmers who have under 4 acres of cotton planted.

What President Eisenhower is asking them to do is to exchange a 4-acre cotton crop—under 90 percent of parity worth $440—for 4 acres of nothing worth $91.76. This sounds like some kind of Russian agricultural roulette game which will result in sure-fire suicide for our small farmers. To me or to anyone else who understands the farmers and their needs, it certainly does not sound like a bank, free enterprise, good government, or good business.

The farmers' income a few years ago was $17,200,000,000. Now it is less than $10 billion this means he has lost over $7 billion in income.

Every year income has been reduced approximately 38 percent. During the same time, I find that the things which the farmer has had to buy have skyrocketed in price; they have gone up approximately 60 percent.

This points out the ridiculous nature of the President's proposals for a soil bank without 90 percent of parity to back it up. In effect, he is saying "I know you need help, so, to replace your lost $7 billion, I offer you a $500 million soil-bank program. But before you can get this," he tells the farmer, "you must cut your income further by reducing the crops you grow."

No, it does not make sense—at least, to me. I do not think it makes sense to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. President, I have in my hand an excellent editorial entitled "The Farmer's Dilemma, and printed in The State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S. C., on April 17, 1956. The editorial points up most clearly some of the problems which the farmers are facing at this time. It is refreshing to see a large daily newspaper take the fair approach to the problem, as The State has done. I take the opportunity to commend this newspaper for its factual representation.

I may say further, Mr. President, that the Columbia State was one of the newspapers which was very fair to General Eisenhower when he campaigned in 1952.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S DILEMMA

The businessman cannot see why the Government should subsidize the farmer and leave him to shift for himself. The farmer is sometimes pictured as living in the lap of luxury, being paid with public funds not to produce or to fill in his losses.

We believe we have mentioned the fact that farmers in this vicinity now say that it is almost impossible to give away a milk cow, the prices being lower than they were in the depths of the depression. We also heard one ex-farmer say he had lost $50,000 feeding hogs.

Now come two simultaneous magazine articles giving the farmer's point of view. Both are from the Middle West.

Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, who comes in contact with many farmers in his travels over the State and in his office, points out in the American magazine that farm income in the United States has dropped 9 percent in the last 3 years, and much more in the Southwest, due to droughts and falling cattle prices, with the consequence that many small livestock farmers, including large numbers in southeastern Kansas, have taken outside jobs to feed their families while waiting for a break to better times. Some, however, have sold their farms.

He points out, as was done in our columns some time ago, the large original investment necessary to set up farming. He cites one farmer in eastern Kansas whose 160-acre farm is worth $25,000 with $15,000 tied up in machinery. From this $40,000 investment and a 48-hour workweek he earned a net of $4,500 in 1947, his best year, but only $2,500 in 1955, for a 10-year average of $3,000, or about $60 a week. His housing would cost $1,000 a year in town and he saves probably $500 in food bills from his garden and chickens. But they do not come up to the interest he loses by having his money invested in a farm. At 4 percent it would bring him $1,600 a year without work. His brother, with no investment nor business ulcers, makes more than $100 a week in 40 hours as a carpenter. A former schoolmate makes $90 a week driving an oil truck.

He goes on to point out that we no longer live in a completely free economy. Nearly every segment of the industrial population benefits directly or indirectly from heavy Government spending and has been since early 1940, when the Nation went on an artificial wartime economy which has continued through the cold war. Uncle Sam is pouring out billions to industry for defense purposes, only a small trickle of which sifts down to the farmer. Farmers, he says, will continue to insist on direct Federal aid so long as industry is subsidized. He quotes a State representative who operates a 300-acre farm as saying farmers would be willing to go back to a free enterprise if the rest of the country would, but can't be the only free enterprisers in a controlled economy.

Many Western wheat farmers, he says, would like to have a two-price system, raising all they could without restrictions, guaranteed a good price for the portion needed for normal American consumption and granted the right to store the surplus on their own farms as a hedge against future poor crops or for sale at whatever prices they could get on foreign or domestic markets.

Many also say they need Federal loans to help them buy more land, machinery, and fertilizers if they are ever to get out of their low returns to decent income levels.

An even more discouraging picture is painted by a farm housewife from near Columbia, Mo., Winifred Bryan Horner, in the Saturday Evening Post for April 14. She says that while farm income has dropped 38 percent since 1947, nonfarm income has gone up 68 percent.

Her husband, an agricultural college graduate, built up a sizable operation. But in 1951 things began getting tough till they were trying to figure out a budget on an income of minus $2,000 a year. Her husband got a job outside, first in air conditioning, "the mechanical approach" to the weather, as Mrs. Horner wittily remarks, and then as a meteorologist, "the scientific approach," still unable to escape the weather. He works 40 hours a week on his job and 40 on the farm. This, we figure, leaves 88 hours a week, or 12.5 hours a day for sleep, eating, recreation and the rest of it.

With expenses increasing, the water problem critical, income decreasing, indebtedness mounting, Mrs. Horner wonders, as her title puts it, "How Long Can We Stay on the Farm?"

Apparently, the same general situation prevails throughout the land. We can't run all farmers out of business and still eat and wear the same kinds of clothes. The farm problem concerns everyone.

PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES—THE SOIL BANK PLAN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of 44 of my colleagues and myself, I have today introduced a bill providing for the soil bank plan which was referred to by the President in his veto message and his address to the Nation on the 16th of this month. I regret that I did not have an opportunity to communicate with all the Members of the Senate to ascertain whether they desired to be cosponsors of the bill; I simply spoke with all Senators whom I had time to meet, and there were 44 of them.

The bill is, in effect, title II of the bill which was vetoed by the President, together with the perfecting amendments and the prepayment provisions recommended by the President.

Congress already is deeply aware of the significance of the proposed legislation, the urgency of its enactment, and the need for action now, with the least possible legislative maneuvering and hearings.

Inasmuch as the subject has already had months of intensive congressional study and has already received the support of a large majority of the Members of Congress only a short time ago, there can now be no valid reason for delaying its passage any longer.

The bill could have been enacted at the end of February or early in March, so that it would have been fully effective in implementing farm income, reducing farm surpluses to proper size, and bringing farm production into line with requirements this year. However, that was not done. The bill was delayed, and cannot be fully effective, of course, in this crop year.

Nevertheless, the combining of the soil bank provisions of the bill with the prepayment feature, which has now been included in the bill, will permit prompt payments to be made to the farmers this crop year—the year 1956 has been retained in the bill—and there is no doubt that if the bill can be passed promptly, substantial assistance will accrue to the farmers this year.

Therefore, we who are endorsing the measure join with the President in urging that no further delay be permitted.

As I have said, a great many of my colleagues have joined in introducing the measure. It is evidence of our earnest conviction that swift action is imperative, and is indicative of our sincere desire to cooperate fully with the President in producing immediately an instrument which will attack at the roots the problem of agricultural surpluses.

I believe I can say on behalf of every Senator who has joined in sponsoring the bill that it is our hope, and it will be our combined effort to make certain, that action will be taken by the committee and by Congress as quickly as possible. The bill has already been thoroughly considered and has been approved by a great majority of the Members of Congress; so it should be possible, without any delay, to send to the President a workable, sound soil-bank and forestry program.

It is likewise my hope that, since the proposed legislation has had such thorough consideration and study, there will be no substantial tendency on the part of Senators generally to amend the bill. Such efforts could result in additional unfortunate, harmful delays to the measures. I presume that such efforts would be futile, since most of the amendments which might be proposed have already been considered and rejected either by Congress or by the President himself.

I remind the Senate that the soil-bank provision was not in serious controversy. We can have the bill on the President's desk within a week if we wish to do so. If we want to delay it, I suppose there are those who are in a position to impede it further. But the bill can be on the President's desk within a week if we wish to act promptly. If we do, the farmers of the Nation will receive substantial benefits from it this year.

The farmers need help now. The President has already signified his willingness and his desire to approve the soil-bank measure. In these circumstances, I find no reason why Congress should withhold immediate favorable action; and such action, I think, and I feel certain a large majority of the Senate agree with me, must be forthcoming.

Mr. President, with the introduction of the bill, an opportunity is afforded to place promptly on the President's desk a sound, workable soil-bank program.

If there is delay in action on the bill, I hope those responsible for the delay will be willing to accept full responsibility for holding down the income of the farmers of the country this year.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I am very pleased to cosponser the bill described by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and also a bill introduced today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which are designed to create a soil bank for the farmers of America. I have a particular interest in these proposals. It was almost exactly 2 years ago that I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives calling for the establishment of a soil fertility bank. My bill was introduced on April 15, 1954. A few days later, on the 7th of May, I appeared as a witness before the House Committee on Agriculture. During those hearings I characterized the soil bank in these words:

> I believe this approach to the problems of adjusting farm production to effective demand holds much promise. Certainly it is far better to store fertility in the soil than to produce crops beyond market need.

I believed in the principles of the soil bank in 1954. Today, 2 years later, I still believe in these principles. The soil bank plan that would be created under the provisions of the bills I have cosponsored today holds much promise for the future welfare and benefit of the American farmer. But we cannot wish the soil bank into existence. We must take legislative action.

I am certain the overwhelming majority of my colleagues realize the problems that face agriculture today. We have heard speech after speech, outlining the situation and defining the extent of the agricultural problem. Now it is time for us to act. Now it is time to substitute the helping hand for the worried tongue. Now it is time to demonstrate to the farmer that our concern for his welfare, so often the subject of our Senate speeches, is also the object of our specific legislative action.

I sincerely hope these bills will not become mired in the quicksand of partisan considerations. Most of us realize the farmer has a problem. Most of us believe the soil bank will go a long way toward solving that problem. Let us now put those two considerations together and put our legislative shoulders to the wheel. The farmers deserve this help.

RECESS TO 11 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18 (legislative day of April 9), 1956.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker, O15950, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be captains

Abagis, Kenneth M., O71433.
Abele, Louis E., O59231.
Abt, Frederick T., O70244.
Adams, Charles M., O59126.
Adams, Earl R., Jr., O58288.
Adams, Pritchard G., Jr., O60248.
Adkins, Virgil S., Jr., O59987.
Allen, Boyde W., Jr., O59203.
Allen, Robert A., O59986.
Alloway, Curtis H., O59772.
Alter, George M., O58290.
Alvarez, Theodore P., O60787.
Anderegg, Harold R., O59281.
Anders, Curtis L., O59302.
Andreen, Robert B., O59149.
Ankley, William J., O65259.
Appel, Edward J., O60846.
Armour, Thomas M., O65281.
Armstrong, Andrew J., O61102.
Armstrong, Frank H., O60273.
Arnette, John Q., O59418.
Bailey, Horace E., O65230.
Ballou, DeForrest, 3d, O58299.
Balmer, Jesmond D., Jr., O59219.
Bamford, Thomas F., O59166.
Barclay, Kenneth K., O65285.
Barlow, Raymon C., Jr., O59287.
Barnes, Metullus A., Jr., O58302.

Barry, Clarence D., O58303.
Baskin, Ronald R., O70264.
Battreall, Raymond R., Jr., O59108.
Baumann, Lewis R., O62808.
Bayard, Louis P., O59097.
Becker, Henry C., Jr., O63389.
Bell, Cleo O., O65190.
Bell, Clyde B., Jr., O59227.
Bender, John A., O59317.
Bercaw, Woodson W., Jr., O59077.
Berens, Robert J., O58306.
Bernard, Carl F., O69589.
Bernhard, Alexander H., O63419.
Bertholf, Cheney L., Jr., O65202.
Betts, Earl C., O59300.
Betts, Edward E., O65950.
Birrell, John H., O59147.
Bivens, Courtland C., Jr., O65237.
Black, George S., O65953.
Black, Robert W., O59350.
Black, William L., O63412.
Blackmore, Robert P., O59473.
Blake, Thomas B., O58311.
Blankenship, Alan W., O60125.
Boland, Herman T., Jr., O59092.
Bolen, Charles M., Jr., O63417.
Bolte, David E., O59307.
Bonwell, Donald R., O59297.
Bounds, Marcellus W., O59262.
Boyes, John H., O65269.
Bracey, Spencer M., O58317.
Bradley, Robert L., O59244.
Braunstein, Howard H., O65196.
Breitenberg, Eugene H., O62819.
Brian, Adrian B., O59332.
Brister, Alan A., O65742.
Brockmyer, James J., O63401.
Brower, Wesley H., O58320.
Brown, Latham H., O58321.
Bruce, Wesley D., Jr., O70289.
Brunkhorst, Harold H., O58324.
Buchanan, John O., O58846.
Buck, James H., O62845.
Buckingham, Clay T., O59247.
Bull, Kenneth R., O60895.
Bunch, James E., O58325.
Bundy, Richard N., O59169.
Burns, Robert J., O65258.
Burt, Thomas H., O59416.
Bush, Louis S., O59264.
Butler, Donald A., O59909.
Butler, James F., O65960.
Byrd, Roy T., O59415.
Calhoun, Leon J., O65613.
Campbell, James G., Jr., O58330.
Campbell, Robert M., O65736.
Caraplis, Louis A., Jr., O59980.
Carlisle, Wilford B., O65069.
Carr, John L., O59206.
Carrigan, Mark C., O63414.
Carswell, Bruce MacD., O59132.
Carter, Robert P., O63396.
Carty, Robert T., O65188.
Casper, Richard F., O58331.
Cave, Edmund H., O59411.
Cayce, Bryce T., O65189.
Cerny, Edward V., O59845.
Chabot, Richard C., O69616.
Chadbourne, James F., Jr., O65962.
Chamberlain, Donald E., O60823.
Chandler, David J., O59271.
Chandler, John P., O59095.
Christensen, Hal S., O63420.
Christianson, J. Milton, O65965.
Church, William M., O58336.
Clark, James M., O58338.
Clark, Warren M., O65294.
Clarke, Frank P., O59144.
Clayton, Charles C., O60852.
Clinedinst, Clinton R., O65225.
Cloud, James C., O65743.
Coates, Norman W., O69623.
Coatney, Loren C., O58340.
Cobb, Joseph F., O59990.
Coghlan, James J., Jr., O59342.
Cohn, Frank, O58341.
Cohn, Merrill R., O58342.
Cole, Grady A., O58343.
Collins, John J., Jr., O65243.
Collins, Thomas E., O69624.
Connell, Richard M., O59098.
Conner, Judson J., O59242.
Cook, Robert E., O60162.
Corcoran, Edward F., O65239.
Cordova, William R., O70308.
Cory, Rennie M., O65207.
Costa, John J., O59112.
Costen, Charles B., O58350.
Couch, Roy E., O58351.
Coughlin, Thomas B., O59323.
Council, Ranald D., O59179.
Covell, Charles R., O58284.
Cox, Cleatus J., O59243.
Craig, Richard S., O59401.
Creel, Elnomac V., O65238.
Croonquist, Henry T., O59152.
Crowley, Edwin K., Jr., O65614.
Crozier, Ted A., O70317.
Custer, George A., O58356.
Dabbs, Ralph T., O65244.
Davis, Dan W., O60854.
Davis, Harold O., O60242.
Davis, Ovid M., O58360.
Davis, Preston A., O58361.
Day, Bartley E., O59201.
Day, Seth S., O59288.
Dearing, John W., O65201.
de Correvont, Leon L., O59258.
Deeley, William R., O65977.
DeFiori, Victor A., O71667.
DeLoach, William M., O59978.
Denend, William L., O58365.
Denham, Ernest W., Jr., O59373.
de Rusha, Richard A., O63416.
Dibrell, Jack H., O65979.
DiCiro, Charles M., O59991.
Dickerson, Paul J., O58368.
Dickinson, Dean B., O59160.
Dickinson, Hillman, O59090.
Diehl, Robert C., O65980.
DiGennaro, Michael A., Jr., O65497.
Dilts, Andrew S., O59353.
Dittamore, Rex T., O70326.
Dixon, Ralph P., Jr., O58371.
Dodd, Stephen F., O58372.
Doherty, Richard J., O58373.
Doiron, Henry D., O57850.
Donohoe, Patrick J., O59102.
Dorsey, Ralph M., O63394.
Driscoll, Arthur R., Jr., O59228.
Dunn, John M., O65252.
Dunphy, Richard T., O59392.
DuRant, Billy C., O58376.
Duray, Joseph B., O65257.
Dye, Clarence C., O58377.
Eagers, Joseph A., Jr., O59367.
East, Charles M., Jr., O70329.
Ednie, Robert L., O60243.
Edwards, Henry B., Jr., O58130.
Eichelsdoerfer, Howard H., O60718.
Emery, John R., O59992.
Emery, Thomas D., O69640.
Engle, Marshall G., O65747.
English, Allan J., Jr., O59316.
Erbe, Robert L., O59196.
Estes, Robert K., O59187.
Evans, Alexander R., O65494.
Evans, Bryan, Jr., O58897.
Evans, Thomas C., O58382.
Faistenhammer, Ludwig, Jr., O65249.
Falkenbury, Stephen D., Jr., O59508.
Fallon, Robert T., O59239.
Fancher, Paul T., O65205.
Farnsworth, John A., O65612.
Fatum, John J., O59380.
Fay, Dean W., O65746.
Feir, Philip R., O59189.
Ferguson, James W., O59659.
Finnegan, Marcus B., O59109.
Fischman, Kurt, O65744.
Fisher, Robert W., O58386.
Fitz, Harold C., Jr., O59159.
Flagg, Austin T., O58387.
Fleri, Paul C., Jr., O59251.
Florio, John D., O63398.
Fluckey, Wallace N., O58389.
Foley, John J., Jr., O65209.
Ford, Earl P., O59233.
Ford, Edward A., O70338.
Ford, George L., Jr., O58391.
Forrest, John F., O59269.
Francis, Charles S., O65254.
Frandsen, Donald P., O58396.
Frandsen, Oscar R., O58397.
Fraser, Carlos L., O65495.
Freeman, Belvin S., O69649.
Freeman, David G., O59393.
Fuller, Marvin D., O59993.
Fullerton, Avery S., O59124.
Gappa, Casimer S., O58401.
Garber, Robert A., O65277.
Garcia, Oscar M., O58402.
Garitty, Lyle J., Jr., O58403.
Garner, Francis, O65268.
Garofalo, William E., O63409.
Garties, Richard G., O71347.
Gentille, Paul J., O63415.
Geohagan, Hilton E., O65233.
Gess, Robert H., O59188.
Gibbs, Marvin H., O58405.
Gibson, Joseph T., O59184.
Giglio, Rudolph F. L., O63399.
Gillespie, Berkley S., Jr., O59829.
Gillespie, Richard E., O59172.
Gilliatt, Donald L., O59994.
Gilroy, Robert J., O59355.
Godfrey, Carl F., O58410.
Goessling, Ward C., Jr., O59224.
Good, Robert E., O59995.
Goodwin, William H., O59195.
Gordanier, Robert S., O65256.
Gordon, William I., O59996.
Gower, Donald N., O59246.
Graves, Francis P., Jr., O60252.
Gray, Homer E., Jr., O65198.
Gray, John E., O58411.
Green, Charles E., O70347.
Greenbaum, Bernard, O59141.
Greene, Paul L., O68006.
Greer, Robert W., O59983.
Gregg, John B., O59825.
Grieger, Allen J., O61088.
Griffith, Harry A., O59089.
Groves, Thurman M., O65270.
Guelzo, Carl M., O58416.
Haden, Clinton B., O65177.
Hale, Alfred B., O59217.
Hall, Allen K., O58421.
Hall, Reginald W., O65741.
Hallman, Thomas J., O59997.
Hammel, Richard L., O61087.
Hammes, Norman W., O70360.
Hammonds, Eugene, O65179.
Hampton, Kenneth R., O59982.
Harkins, Donald E., O65217.
Harpold, Harry H., Jr., O66008.
Harrington, James L., O65221.
Harrington, Lonnie E., Jr., O57681.
Harris, Richard E., O59979.
Harris, Ronald V., O69670.
Harrison, Oscar J., O58428.
Hassman, Phillip E., O59972.
Hathaway, Thomas C., Jr., O58429.
Hayes, Duane, O58430.
Hayes, John G., O66160.
Hayes Joseph W., Jr., O66012.
Hayne, Jack R., O59362.
Healy, Michael D., O70368.
Hefti, James C., O59830.
Heiden, Charles K., O59117.
Heller, Thomas J., O57924.
Henderson, Glenn H., O69674.
Henderson, Hubert H., Jr., O70373.
Hendricks, Meredith E., O59129.
Herbert, James M., Jr., O60159.
Hervey, Theodore E., O59208.
Heyer, Charles J., O60245.
Hickey, Pennell J., O59361.
Hiestand, William C., O59113.
Hilburn, Jack B., O65224.
Hill, Robert W., O65227.
Hilyer, William J., O65739.
Hindman, Edward R., O59114.
Hjorth, George E., O58440.
Hodes, John T., O59261.
Hoffman, William H., O59279.
Hoffmaster, George C., Jr., O59222.
Holloway, Kennth H., O58441.
Holt, James H., O59185.
Hoot, Herbert L., Jr., O59292.
Hopkins, Norman B., Jr., O59385.
Horey, Robert L., O58442.
Howard, Edward B., O59223.
Howell, Martin D., O59181.
Hubbard, Jack A., O71370.

Huber, Leo K., O59250.
Huber, William E., O59088.
Hughes, Billy D., O65236.
Hughes, James E., O58444.
Hughes, James E. Jr., O58445.
Hull, James M., O65733.
Hunt, John E., Jr., O65745.
Huntzinger, Harvey W., O70387.
Hussey, John W., O59999.
Hynes, Joseph D., O63390.
Irish, Wilfred E., Jr., O65271.
Ivey, Benjamin F., Jr., O58448.
Jacobs, Winston R., O58449.
Jacques, Jasper P., O65180.
James, Charles A. 3d, O60000.
Janasiewicz, Thadeus S., O65266.
Jartman, Marc R., O59253.
Jenkins, Willie H., Jr., O62809.
Jensen, Hubert J., O58452.
Jensen, Reed G., O59358.
Johnson, Lawrence H., Jr., O69702.
Johnson, Maurice A., Jr., O65262.
Johnson, Robert J., O59357.
Johnson, Ross LeR., O59176.
Johnson, Thomas L., O58453.
Jones, Clinton K., O70394.
Jones, Douglas C., O58454.
Jones, George M. D., O58456.
Jones, Ogden S., Jr., O59237.
Jones, Philip D., O70395.
Joyce, Marion D., O65229.
Judd, James J., O69704.
Jurgens, Francis M., O70397.
Kapec, Andrew J., O62278.
Keith, Donald R., O59170.
Kemble, Charles R., O59143.
Kennedy, Neal D., O58463.
Kennedy, William J., O59235.
Key, Milton E., O58464.
King, John E., O69712.
King, Lemuel G., O58465.
King, Melvin E., O59661.
Kingdom, Arthur J., O59202.
Kinghorn, Alan, O66175.
Kingston, Joseph P., O59386.
Kinne, Harold C., Jr., O61212.
Kirby, Gilbert W., Jr., O59134.
Kirk, Richard L., O65276.
Kirk, Robert J., O59974.
Kitlas, Albert C., O58466.
Klim, Henry L., O60458.
Knapp, Theron W., Jr., O59186.
Knipling, Louis H., Jr., O58467.
Koeckert, William F., O69715.
Kolster, Jim H., O65265.
Kooker, Donald E., Jr., O70403.
Kostka, Bohuslav Z., O65611.
Koziel, Richard J., O65235.
Krasko, John, O59406.
Krstulich, Karl J., O65251.
Kuefler, Kenneth T., O59493.
Kuntze, Robert A., O65203.
Kurtz, Maurice K., Jr., O59107.
Lamar, Kirby, O59257.
Lambert, Robert O., O63400.
Lamp, Russell J., O59115.
Lampros, James L., O59283.
Landis, Charles M., O65193.
Landre, Lowell H., O66035.
Landseadel, Robert J., Jr., O65496.
Lansing, Ernest J., O63113.
LaPorte, Arthur E., Jr., O58472.
Larsen, Narian G., O58473.
Larson, Gale L., O65185.
Larson, Lyle R., O65218.
Lauber, Robert W., O58475.
Lauer, Jerry B., O59164.
Lawrence, Douglas M., O65275.
Layser, John D., Jr., O59507.
Lee, Charles B., O59305.
Legg, Elbert E., O58477.
LeGro, William E., Jr., O67837.
Lehner, Charles R., Jr., O59241.
Leister, James W., O65738.
Leneten, Charles C., Jr., O63114.
Lentini, Anthony R., O58479.
LeTellier, Carroll N., O60118.
Lewis, Addison L., O65216.
Lewis, Malcolm K., O59234.
Lewis, Murray M., O66036.
Lewis, Samuel A., O65191.
Liffiton, William T., O65248.
Llichow, Robert E., O59174.
Lind, Thomas D., O58483.
Lindeman, Arthur H., Jr., O59177.
Lippincott, John C., O65732.
Little, Robert A., O70409.
Livingston, Leon R., Jr., O58487.
Lochhead, Earl J., O59336.
Lombard, Harold F., O59205.
Lombardi, Arthur P., O69730.
Long, Eldredge R., Jr., O58122.
Long, Homer S., Jr., O59158.
Love, Richard M., O67717.
Lowrey, Willis H., O59148.
Luebbert, William F., O59096.
Lynch, Hugh J., O60001.
Lynch, Robert E., O59893.
Lynch, Robert O., O59346.
Macatee, William F., O58491.
Mack, Richard E., O58492.
MacKenzie, Thomas R., O59119.
Mackert, John R., O59146.
MacNeill, Francis W., O70416.
Madison, John H., Jr., O59212.
Maggio, Christopher S., O59975.
Magnotti, John F., Jr., O59200.
Maihafer, Harry J., O59167.
Mallory, Phillip L., O59769.
Marder, Eugene, O62807.
Mariconda, Alexander F., O59984.
Marley. John T., O59314.
Marshall, Francis R., O58496.
Martin, Stuart F., O59368.
Mathews, Amos C., O59104.
Mathews, Wayne C., O70422.
Maurer, John A., O59225.
Mautz, Wayne A., O65228.
Mayer, Arthur J., O59221.
Mayer, Jack, O60240.
McAfee, Glen R., O63410.
McAloon, James J., O65263.
McArdle, John F., O59135.
McCarron, Dean J., O59218.
McCarthy, James L., O58502.
McClaran, Jack L., O70425.
McClenaghan, Robert S., O65283.
McClure, Bruce, O65211.
McClure, George W., Jr., O58504.
McConaghy, David D., O58506.
McCrary, Charles E., O58507.
McCrary, Earl C., O70426.
McCulloch, Robert C., O60723.
McGarey, Richard V., O58508.
McGinnis, Charles I., O58509.
McGowan, Edgar, O63404.
McGuinn, Michael E., 3d, O65734.
McIntosh, James F., O65210.
McIntosh, Robert B., Jr., O62006.
McIntyre, Kenneth E., O59087.
Mears, Joe G., O66052.
Medsger, Gerald W., O57080.
Meek, Carroll S., O59274.
Melner, Sinclair L., O58513.
Mesick, Robert A., O60610.
Messer, Melvin, O69744.
Messinger, Lucien E., 3d, O59294.
Metzger, J. Hayes, O59340.
Miller, Charles F., O65222.
Miller, Robert C., O59303.
Miller, Rowlan L., O58517.
Mitchell, John D., Jr., O59116.
Moller, Andreas J., O58520.
Monahan, Lawrence P., Jr., O59190.
Moon, Virgil C., O61132.
Moore, James T., O58522.
Moore, Merl M., Jr., O58523.
Moore, William T., O59120.
Moran, Clayton L., O59298.
Moreau, Donald W., O69752.
Morgan, Ernest H., O65260.
Morgan, Rex S., O59496.
Morley, Richard H., O65250.
Morris, Charles E., O65206.
Morris, David O'N., O69753.
Morrissey, John J., O70439.
Morton, Richard L., O59313.
Moses, Thomas L., O59280.
Motola, Mario V., O63406.
Muckerman, Joseph E., 2d, O59356.
Muenker, James E., O59497.
Mullens, Robert M., O65246.
Mullins, Orbra G., O63353.
Munn, Richard A., Jr., O59461.
Murphy, Edward L., Jr., O58527.
Murray, Clive E., Jr., O58529.
Myers, William G., O59658.
Nath, Robert E., O60002.
Neil, James M., O59101.
Nelson, Knute R., O61220.
Nelson, Neil G., O59660.
Nelson, Robert B., O59211.
Nelson, Robert C., O59091.
Nelson, Wallace W., O69757.
Nelson, William J., O58532.
Newell, Arthur, O69533.
Nielsen, Jack W., O58534.
Nikas, Nick J., O67733.
Nix, Charles E., O61137.
Noce, Robert W., O59175.
Norcom, Henry C., O70455.
Nordin, William H., O59137.
Norman, William C., O59296.
Norris, Charles J., O65255.
Norton, Dunbar S., O65199.
Norwalk, John W., O59833.
Nowak, George A., O58539.
Nulsen, Charles K., Jr., O59260.
Nunnally, Stephens W., O59110.
Nyquist, Joel B., Jr., O65107.
Oberst, Tom C., O59178.
O'Brien, Richard E., O65187.
O'Brien, Robert T., O59136.
Odom, Louie W., O65231.
Ogden, Lawrence J., O59372.
Olentine, Charles G., O59125.
Olson, Robert E., O58542.
Ormes, Sidney E., Jr., O58544.
Osato, Timothy, O60241.
Owsley, Homer, Jr., O59498.
Pack, Charles R., O60160.
Padalino, Martin L., O70463.
Page, James MacM., Jr., O70465.
Palmer, Charles D., O59348.
Palmer, Richard A., O58546.
Panzer, Dwayne A., O58547.
Parr, Bertram L., O69766.
Patrick, Stephen J., Jr., O69538.
Patterson, Loren S., O59309.
Paulson, Paul A., O59318.
Peixotto, Roland E., O59263.
Pence, Edward W., O58552.
Perfect, Burns I., O70470.
Peters, Elmer B., O59198.
Petranck, John J., O59236.
Peyton, Dallas M., Jr., O65186.
Pfeffer, William J., O60593.
Phillips, Eugene, Jr., O65242.
Poerner, Homer W., O65219.
Pollin, George A., Jr., O59168.
Post, Sterling T., Jr., O67855.
Powell, Roger D., O58560.
Powers, Terence A., O59286.
Prather, Lewis D., O69772.
Price, Wallace W., O65030.
Price, Wilbur F., O60847.
Price, William S., O65247.
Prichard, Chesley D., O58562.
Proctor, William B., Jr., O58563.
Prout, William L., O59977.
Puckett, Ralph, Jr., O59165.
Pugh, Albert S., 3d, O66074.
Quigley, Quentin D., O60909.
Rafferty, Arthur J., O58566.
Rank, William A., O59099.
Rasmussen, John W., Jr., O59193.
Rasmussen, Raymond J., O59161.
Rast, Jim F., O60117.
Ray, John L., O58570.
Ream, Forrest D., O59503.
Reiner, Raphael A., O70487.
Rennie, John C. G., O59767.
Rhodes, Clifford D., O65589.
Rice, William H., O69776.
Rich, Charles E., O70489.
Riddle, Hugh H., O66194.
Rives, James C., O61138.
Roberts, Ernst E., O59229.
Roebuck, Charles G., O59154.
Rogers, David B., Jr., O59341.
Rohde, Lynn O., O65278.
Rooks, David L., O63391.
Rose, Robert M., O59127.
Ross, Edgar B., Jr., O59220.

Ross, Marion C., O59273.
Rowan, Elwyn P., O59407.
Rowe, Gordon D., O58583.
Royal, Everett C., O58584.
Russell, David C., O62279.
Ruzich, Rudolph L., O65178.
Ryan, Charles L., Jr., O60004.
Sadler, Jack R., O59081.
Sanders, Robert C., O59272.
Sarsfield, Francis L., O59312.
Savage, Paul L., O58589.
Scherer, John W., O66093.
Scheumann, Marcus C., Jr., O66094.
Schmalzel, Joseph L., Jr., O59252.
Schmidt, Norbert O., O59123.
Schoen, Harry P., Jr., O60848.
Schulz, Gerhard W., O59121.
Schungel, Daniel F., O65286.
Schwarz, Robert H., O59310.
Sedlacek, LeRoy V., O65272.
Seibert, Donald W., O63413.
Selby, Lewis S., O63402.
Semmens, Gervies L., O59976.
Semsch, Philip L., O58596.
Shaw, Harold E., O58600.
Sheets, Henry B., Jr., O59268.
Sheldon, Dwight MacF., O58601.
Shelnut, James R., O60725.
Shelton, Louis H., O58602.
Sherblom, Harry G., O65284.
Sherman, Robert, O61101.
Shields, Lawrence D., O66097.
Sickafoose, Keith E., O59138.
Singletary, Albert W., O59180.
Singleton, William T., O70504.
Smith, Charles L., O59399.
Smith, Clayton J., O60005.
Smith, Duane H., O59191.
Smith, Harold F., Jr., O66101.
Smith, James F., Jr., O63422.
Smith, Simeon M., Jr., O59338.
Smith, Wayne C., Jr., O59382.
Snipan, George, O62264.
Soucek, Leo E., O60006.
Spence, Ralph W., O58145.
Spencer, Orton F., O59240.
Spettel, Charles L., O59128.
Spivey, Ray V., O63489.
Spoede, Robert W., O58610.
Springer, Robert M., Jr., O59210.
Stagner, Clyde H., O65183.
Staples, Franklin E., O65616.
Stauffer, Joseph R., O59103.
Steel, James H., O59324.
Steenburn, Donald H., O58614.
Sterrett, John D., O59474.
Stickley, Douglas P., Jr., O59387.
Stockton, Thomes W., O59199.
Stone, Warren C., O69807.
Strauss, George H., O58618.
Streett, St. Clair, Jr., O59163.
Strohecker, Howard L., O59084.
Struthers, James C., O69809.
Stukhart, George, Jr., O59139.
Sturdivant, Leslie W., O58620.
Sugg, Leon H., Jr., O65226.
Summers, George D., O59194.
Surut, Lee E., O59150.
Suther, Russell J., O58623.
Suttle, Albert B., Jr., O59182.
Sutton, John E., O59155.
Swain, Quentin S., Jr., O65267.
Swartz, Stanley P., O63421.
Swett, Trevor W., Jr., O59321.
Synolds, Donald L., O57670.
Tallman, Richard J., O59277.
Tatasciore, Joseph W., O65615.
Templeman, James M., O60007.
Terry, Charles A., O58628.
Thacker, Paul R., O59050.
Thams, Robert W., O65609.
Thoma, William C., O63397.
Thomas, Jack D., O59255.
Thompson, Donald E., O59226.
Thompson, Ward A., O65194.
Tice, Raphael D., O70530.
Timmerberg, Paul M., O70531.
Tobin, Richard E., O59329.
Townroe, Frederick M., O63395.
Townsley, Edwin S., O59094.
Trabue, Earl N., O58635.
Tracy, George W., O59145.
Trinkle, Frank W., O65204.
Turley, Joseph McL., O59404.
Turman, Robert L., O58636.
Turnbull, Francis W., O63112.
Turner, Albert F., O59293.
Turner, Frederick C., Jr., O58637.
Turner, Glenn E., Jr., O58638.
Twitchell, Blaine E., O606161.
Tyler, John E., O70540.
Tyson, William P., Jr., O71423.
Underwood, Arthur R., Jr., O59370.
Unger, Guinn E., O58641.
Van Hook, James McN., O59768.
Van Meter, Jack D., O65182.
Van Patten, Allen E., O65261.
Van Sant, Jesse F., O65280.
Vargovick, William S., O59285.
Vaughn, James B., O65181.
Vincent, Caleb R., O60813.
Vollmer, John P., O59284.
Waddell, Jack L., O66114.
Wagner, Richard H., O59122.
Walker, Albert L., O58644.
Wallace, Bruce E., O65610.
Walsh, John J., Jr., O70549.
Walters, Edwin S., O58646.
Walton, John M., O58647.
Walz, Charles, O59216.
Warlick, William F., Jr.. O65213.
Warnke, John J., Jr., O58649.
Watling, Edward T., O59506.
Watson, Henry, Jr., O71892.
Weber, Robert J., O65208.
Wellborn, Charles G., Jr., O65273.
Wesolowski, Stanley, O58655.
West, William F., O58656.
Wheelock, Alton R , O59334.
Whelan, Raymond A., O69829.
Whichard, William A., O65212.
Whistler, Donald E., O59204.
Whitlock, Thomas D., O65195.
Wightman, John D., O59381.
Wilkins, Frank E., O63408.
Williams, Alton G., O60251.
Williams, Edwin J., Jr., O58660.
Williams, Murray W., O59197.
Williamson, Dan H., Jr., O59173.
Williamson, William G., O60010.
Wilmot, Fred W., O59770.
Wilson, Floyd M., O58663.
Wilson, Francis B., O65737.
Winn, Charles C., O58664.
Wise, William A., 2d, O60855.
Withers, Langhorne P., O68062.
Wolak, Francis A., O59086.
Womble, Phelps R., O66647.
Woolshlager, Richard J., O58667.
Wren, John J., O58669.
Wright, Billy R., O69838.
Wright, George, O58670.
Wright, William M., O70574.
Wyruchowski, Edward P., Jr., O65241.
Yacker, Everett J., O59153.
Yadon, James C., O58671.
Yeats, Joseph J., Jr., O59151.
Yellman, Edward K., O59364.
Yepsen, John H., O59267.
Younger, Ralph K., O58673.
Youngren, Arthur W., O65279.
Zartner, Bertram L., O67889.
Zollicoffer, Marion B., O65184.
Zumwalt, Charles B., O58679.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Abbott, Walter H., O68852.
Ackerman, Arthur H., O68413.
Adams, David G., O68853.
Adams, Harold E., O68854.
Adamson, George W., O68855.
Ades, LeRoy P., O68414.
Agather, Frederic G., O68415.
Aguilar, William P., O68856.
Ain, Milton, O68858.
Ainslie, Robert E., O69844.
Albert, Robert J., O68416.
Alch, Wayne F., O68417.
Alexander, Robert L., O68418.
Allebach, Victor L., O70130.
Allen, Stanley C., O72809.
Alston, Lonnie N., O68860.
Ambrose, Thomas J., O71753.
Ames, William I., Jr., O68861.
Anderson, Benjamin H., Jr., O70160.
Anderson, James C., O68863.
Anderson, Thurman E., O69847.
Andre, Nick J., O68864.
Andrews, Edward P., O68419.
Andrews, Wilson P., O72813.
Angstadt, John P., O68420.
Appleton, James L., Jr., O68421.
Arduna, Arthur A., O68422.
Armstrong, Raymond L., O68867.
Arnhym, Rolfe G., O68423.
Ash, Philip L., Jr., O68868.
Atkinson, Ellis O., Jr., O68869.
Atwell, Billy J., O68870.
Atwood, John B., O68871.
Atwood, Thomas W. W., O68872.
Auer, Charles H., O68873.
Avveduti, Paul R., O68874.
Ayers, Robert E., O68424.
Ayers, Theodore F., O68875.
Bacey, Algirdas S., O71756.
Bailey, Rusian B., O68212.
Baker, Russell A., Jr., O68425.
Balistreri, Leo A., O68876.
Ball, Duard D., O68213.
Bambery, James R., O68426.
Banks, Douglas T., O68877.
Barcelo, Antonio R., O68878.
Barnes, Vernon, Jr., O68881.
Barnet, Lionel, O68284.
Barnett, Walter L., O68214.
Barrentine, Charles D., O68883.
Barrett, Robert E., O68884.
Bartlett, Robert G., O68427.
Barton, Robert E., O68428.
Basic, Nick J., O72817.
Battey, Edward, 3d, O68215.
Bauer, Harold E., Jr., O68429.
Baughman, Larry J., O71442.
Bauman, William F., O68430.
Baynard, Richard A., O71641.
Beall, George F., O68887.
Bean, John F., O68888.
Beardsley, William M., O68889.
Becker, Donald H., O68431.
Beers, John R., O70164.
Bell, Robert R., O68890.
Bell, William R., O68432.
Bellows, Robert E., O69856.
Bennett, Lloyd P., O68891.
Bennett, William L., O68892.
Bentley, Ernest E., Jr., O68893.
Benz, Richard A., O68433.
Berkey, Ronald R., O71443.
Berzinec, William E., O68894.
Best, David A., O68434.
Bickmore, Jesse O., Jr., O68897.
Bidstrup, Graham P., O68435.
Biggerstaff, Allan C., O68436.
Bigham, Jim C., O68898.
Billy, Myron D., O68900.
Birchler, Norman W., O68437.
Bishop, Edward L. P., O68438.
Black, William T., O68904.
Blackledge, David W., O68905.
Blalock, Charlie L., O72821.
Blanton, Clay E., O71447.
Blastos, Constantine J., O68439.
Blauvelt, Richard B., O68906.
Bledsoe, Roy A., Jr., O69594.
Bleecker, James F., O68440.
Blocher, Ashley S., O68907.
Blottie, Donald L., O70131.
Blum, Robert W., O68441.
Boggs, Joseph C., O72823.
Boggs, William L., O73291.
Bohlin, Harry J., O68909.
Bolch, Adrian D., Jr., O68910.
Bonnett, Thomas J., O68911.
Boone, Louis C., Jr., O68442.
Boring, Landin F., O68913.
Born, Keith L., O68443.
Boucher, Leo P., Jr., O68914.

Bowen, James E., 3d, O68444.
Bowers, James M., O68219.
Bowers, Richard E., O68915.
Boxell, Robert A., O68445.
Boyle, Daniel E., O68916.
Boyle, Richard D., O68446.
Brain, Tom H., O68447.
Breckenridge, Robert C., O68448.
Brewbaker, Chalmers L., O68450.
Brewer, Curtis A., O68451.
Brewster, Harold R., O70168.
Brewster, Lawrence C., O68917.
Bricker, James W., O68918.
Bringham, John L. B., O68452.
Brinsko, John A., O68453.
Brock, Mervin E., O68919.
Brogan, Thomas W., O68920.
Brooker, Clarence B., Jr., O68221.
Brookshire, Grail L., O70133.
Brophy, Jeremiah J., O68454.
Brosious, George D., O68455.
Brotman, Robert, O68921.
Brown, Arthur E., Jr., O68456.
Brown, Charles W., O69869.
Brown, Donald S., O68457.
Brown, Elmer A., O69870.
Brown, Gerald W., O71766.
Brown, Thomas D., O68458.
Bruce, Miles E., O68924.
Bumbaugh, James W., O68926.
Bunting, Wilber J., O68927.
Burdeau, Edward K., O68459.
Burdeshaw, William B., O68460.
Burkhardt, William A., O68461.
Burkland, James M., O68462.
Burr, Richard A., O69873.
Butler, Don A., O72833.
Butler, Phillip C., O68929.
Butler, Robert E., O68463.
Byrnes, Vincent F., Jr., O68931.
Byrom, Robert, O68222.
Cahill, Philip J., O68792.
Caldwell, James K., O68932.
Callahan, Bernard L. J., O68934.
Callis, Bennie E., O72410.
Campbell, George S., O68935.
Campbell, James G., O68936.
Canedy, Charles E., O68937.
Canham, Thomas R., O68464.
Cannon, Lee B., Jr., O68223.
Canonico, John N., Jr., O68938.
Cantrell, Waniford A., O68939.
Carbonetti, James A., O68940.
Carr, Gordon W., O68941.
Carr, John C., O68942.
Carrillo, Armando E., O68944.
Carter, Robert A., O68465.
Carter, Sidney W., O68466.
Caruso, John P., O68945.
Cash, William McK., O68946.
Cassidy, Thomas K., O68947.
Cates, Arthur J., O68467.
Catudal, Joseph U., O70080.
Ceglowski, John P., O68468.
Chabot, Don W., O73063.
Chaffin, Jimmie M., O68948.
Chafin, Leonard D., O68811.
Chambers, Earl L., O68469.
Charlton, James S., O68812.
Cheves, Charles J., Jr., O68470.
Childs, John O., O70174.
Ching, Harry L. F., O68949.
Chojnowski, Milton A., O68471.
Chomko, Gene N., O68813.
Christian, James A., O68950.
Christman, Daniel P., O68472.
Churchill, Johnny J., O68334.
Cipriani, Lawrence J., O68951.
Clark, David R., O68952.
Clark, Gene E., O68954.
Clarke, William T., O68955.
Clift, Milton L., O68956.
Cochran, Reubin W., O68474.
Coffey, Vernon C., Jr., O71463.
Cole, William A., O68475.
Coleman, George E., Jr., O68957.
Coleman, James P., O69884.
Collier, Alvis W., O68958.
Collins, Ashby F., O68959.
Collinsworth, Coy M., O68226.
Colonna, Gary S., O68476.
Colson, Alfred B., Jr., O69887.
Colson, James B., Jr., O68960.
Colvin, William R., O68477.
Comer, Ralph L., O68961.
Conder, Raymond C., Jr., O68478.
Connell, Charles R., 3d, O68962.
Conover, Nelson P., O70082.
Conway, Edward S., O68964.
Conzelman, Peter S., O68479.
Cook, Robert C., Jr., O69888.
Cooper, John H., O68480.
Cooper, John O., 3d., O68481.
Cordill, Richard W., O68482.
Corprew, Gerald W., O68483.
Cottingham, John B., Jr., O68966.
Coughlin, Charles L., O69889.
Cousland, Walter C., O68484.
Coverdale, Craig G., O68485.
Cox, Edwin, O68967.
Cragun, Benjamin M., O68968.
Craig, Robert B., O71775.
Craighead, Doyle T., O69890.
Craver, Roger H., O72330.
Creighton, Neal, O68486.
Crerar, John H., 2d, O68487.
Crevoiserat, Laurence W., O68488.
Crim, William T., O68489.
Cristan, Anthony F., O68969.
Crosby, Robert L., O68490.
Cross, George M., O68970.
Crouch, Roby E., Jr., O68971.
Crowell, William B., O68972.
Crown, Ray H., O70083.
Curran, Gordon A., O68491.
Currie, James A., O68492.
Currier, Eugene R., O68493.
Daggett, Robert W., O73312.
Daggit, Edward A., O68494.
Dahl, Bruce E., O69895.
Daly, Robert F., O68495.
Dammicci, Anthony E., O68973.
Dancause, Philip T., O68974.
Daniels, Tolbert A., Jr., O68975.
Daniels, Walter C., O68976.
Dare, James T., O68496.
Davis, Dale E., O68497.
Davis, Donald F., O68498.
Davis, Edward E., O73315.
Davis, Edwin G., O71477.
Davis, Lauren S., O68499.
Davis, Richard R., O68500.
Davis, Robley W., Jr., O68978.
Davis, Thomas C., O68501.
Davis, Willys E., O68815.
Davisson, Henry L., Jr., O68502.
Dawson, Earl N., Jr., O68979.
Dawson, Kenneth E., Jr., O68503.
Dawson, Wallace H., 3d, O71779.
Day, Robert G., O68504.
Dean, Frank M. S., O70084.
Delahanty, Raymond A., Jr., O68981.
Delbridge, Norman G., Jr., O68505.
Del Santo, Michael J., O68982.
DeLuca, Anthony P., O68506.
Demand, Erhart E., Jr., O68507.
Dennis, Donald A., O68508.
Denton, Walter M., O70180.
Derrick, George E., O68985.
de Silva, Ernest B., Jr., O68983.
Dewberry, Dale, O68229.
Dick, Harvey M., O68230.
Dickey, Eugene C., Jr., O69903.
Dickson, Lee C., O68986.
Dierdorff, H. Beecher, Jr., O68509.
Dimtsios, George J., O68510.
Dinges, Edward A., O68511.
DiSimone, Frank B., O71341.
Dodge, Griffin N., O68987.
Dolan, Robert W., O68988.
Dombrowski, Anthony J., O68989.
Donahue, James G., O68512.
Donnal, John A., O68990.
Donnell, Henry K., O73319.
Doran, Fred R., O71780.
Doty, Benjamin E., O68991.
Dowling, Drew, O68513.
Doyle, Francis J., O68514.
Dozier, Ollin K., O68515.
Dresner, Gerald E., O68516.
Duffy, James P., Jr., O68994.
Duffy, Thomas A., O68995.
Duisterhof, Gordon J., O68996.
Dukkony, Stephen J., O68997.
Duncan, Ross E., O68998.
Dunlap, Rufus T., Jr., O68999.
Dunn, Charles H., O72860.
Dunnuck, Donald W., O68517.
Durham, Richard L., O68518.
Dyer, James M., O69001.
Ealer, George L., O69002.
Earl, George L., O68817.
Earle, Thomas B., Jr., O69003.
Eastham, Frederick L., O69004.
Eaton, Prescott, O70089.
Eckhart, John W., 3d, O71487.
Eckles, Donald R., O68233.
Edward, Charles E. H., O68519.
Edwards, Jerry S., O73323.
Edwards, William H., O69909.
Egbert, George L., Jr., O68520.
Ehlers, O. Kirk, O68521.
Eineigl, Raymond J., O68522.
Elder, Robert L., Jr., O69005.
Elliott, Harry L., O69007.
Elliott, James W., O69008.
Ellis, Greeley H., Jr., O68523.
Ellman, Roger P., O68524.
Elmore, Louis N., Jr., O69010.
Endler, James R., O68525.
Eskew, Thomas F., O69014.
Esser, Henry J., Jr., O69015.
Etheridge, James R., O70182.
Eubanks, James A., O68526.
Evans, Ira K., Jr., O72862.
Evans, James L., O68234.
Evers, John H., O69016.
Fargason, William H., Jr., O69919.
Farlow, Wilbur M., O69017.
Farrar, Robert G., O69018.
Faust, Elden Q., Jr., O68527.
Feilke, Glenn T., O69019.
Feiock, Ray D., O69020.
Fell, Richard W., O69021.
Fellabaum, John N., O69022.
Felton, Robert G., O69023.
Ferguson, William P., O68343.
Fernandez, Robert N., O68528.
Ferrara, Leonard S., O69025.
Fewell, Oscar C., Jr., O68235.
Fiala, Charles J., O68529.
Fifer, William A., O69026.
Fike, Edward C., O68344.
Filaseta, Bart M., O68530.
Fischer, Richard F., O68531.
Fisher, Samuel H., Jr., O68532.
Fitch, John B., O68533.
Fitchett, Horace B., O69027.
Fitzsimmons, Eugene L., O68534.
Flaherty, William J., O69028.
Flake, Jackson L., Jr., O70136.
Flanagan, John S., O69029.
Flather, Richard W., O68535.
Flertzheim, Henry A., Jr., O68536.
Floyd, Paul E., O68537.
Fluitt, John L., O69032.
Ford, Richard L., O69922.
Forrest, Ernest E., Jr., O71495.
Foster, Andrew J., Jr., O71789.
Fowler, Roy, O68538.
Fox, Joseph H., O68237.
Franklin, James D., O70091.
Franseen, Leonard R., O69033.
Frazer, Bruce W., O69034.
Freimark, Gaillard A., O68539.
French, Rodney M., O68540.
Frenier, Julius A., O72872.
Friedersdorff, Louis C., Jr., O68541.
Friesen, Herbert E., O68542.
Froede, Carl R., O69036.
Fukumoto, George M., O69037.
Fuller, Elbert E., Jr., O68543.
Fuqua, Donald G., O68544.
Gabel, James M., O70092.
Gaita, Ronald J., O69038.
Garcia, John L., O69927.
Garrett, Samuel J., O69040.
Gassaway, Kenton C., O69931.
Gaumond, Robert J., O71791.
Geringer, Robert F., O69932.
Gibbons, William C., O69041.
Giedeman, Louis A., Jr., O69042.
Gil, Osvaldo L., O70093.

Gillis, John B., O69043.
Gilmartin, Frederick G., Jr., O68545.
Ginsburg, Howard D., O69044.
Gioiosa, Thomas E., O69045.
Glasgow, Robert E., O68546.
Glauner, Frederick W., O68547.
Godas, David M., O69048.
Godwin, William C., O69049.
Goetsch, Elmer A., O68241.
Goetz, Jerald L., O68548.
Gorvad, Peter L., O69051.
Graham, Harl G., O68549.
Grant, Samuel J., Jr., O68243.
Gray, Ralph S., O69052.
Greeley, Leonard J., O68550.
Green, Richard D., O69053.
Greenberg, Joseph, O69054.
Greenquist, James C., O68244.
Greer, Ralph S., O68551.
Gregg, John M., O69055.
Gregory, Clark S., Jr., O69056.
Greyhosky, August, O69057.
Greynolds, William A., O69058.
Griswold, Donald E., O69059.
Gruen, Robert W., O69060.
Grum, Allen F., O68552.
Gunnett, Robert E., O70094.
Haas, George A., Jr., O63553.
Hall, Hugh J., Jr., O68554.
Hall, John C., O68555.
Hallock, Richard G., O69062.
Halterman, Harry W., Jr., O68556.
Hamby, Dolph F., O68245.
Hamilla, Donald J., O68557.
Hammond, Carl L., O68558.
Hanel, Kenneth G., O69063.
Hardy, Alvis S., O69064.
Hardy, Bruce B., O68559.
Hare, Edward B., O68246.
Harrick, Stephen R., O69065.
Harris, James H., O68560.
Harris, Wesley L., O69066.
Harris, William H., O68561.
Harsant, James A., O68248.
Haskell, John H. F., Jr., O68562.
Hassebroek, DeWayne J., O69067.
Hawks, Thomas E., O69068.
Hawlk, Robert C., O69069.
Hayes, Alva W., O69070.
Hayes, Jack O., O68563.
Hayward, Barton M., O68819.
Hazlett, Howard, 3d, O68564.
Heath, Bobby R., O72894.
Heiberg, Elvin R., 3d, O68565.
Heilig, Frank T., O69073.
Heitzke, Kenneth S., O68566.
Henderson, Walter, O68567.
Hendricks, Arthur D., O72896.
Hendricks, James Y., O69074.
Herman, John L., O69075.
Herndon, Phillip H., O69076.
Hickey, Ralph E., O68568.
Higgins, James W., O71803.
Higgins, Wiley T., Jr., O69078.
Hight, Adolph A., O69948.
Hilley, William W., O68569.
Hillsman, Dan A., O69080.
Hino, Peter J., O69081.
Hodges, Albert P., O68250.
Hoerning, Richard E., O69083.
Hoffman, Thomas, O68570.
Hogan, John E., O68571.
Hogg, James W., O68572.
Holcombe, Thomas W., O68573.
Holdcroft, Roger T., O69085.
Holden, Bobby G., O69086.
Holley, James P., O69087.
Holliday, Donald W., O69088.
Holman, Carson E. R., O68574.
Holtz, Dennis C., O69090.
Horner, David DuB., O68575.
Horton, William D., Jr., O68576.
Horwedel, Alan T., O68577.
Houk, William H., O69091.
Houy, Edward W., Jr., O69092.
Hove, James G., O68578.
Hovis, Warren A., Jr., O69093.
Howard, Newman A., Jr., O69094.
Howe, Roderick R., O69095.
Hoyle, Frank E., O72902.
Hoyt, Francis R., O68579.
Hrecz, Joseph, O69952.
Hubbard, William S., O69096.
Hudson, Charles F., Jr., O68363.
Hudson, Paul C., O69097.
Hughes, Bernard C,. O68580.
Hughes, Charles M., O72492.
Hughes, John W., O68581.
Hull, Clark R., O69098.
Hungerford, Franklin McD., O71810.
Hurd, Philip S., O71525.
Hurless, Bernard F., Jr., O68582.
Hutchenson, Dwight R., O69099.
Hutchinson, Cary B., Jr., O68583.
Hutson, Arthur C., Jr., O69100.
Iacobucci, Frank A., O68584.
Ice, Ronald E., O69101.
Ideman, James M., O68252.
Ingram, Thomas A., O69102.
Irons, Martin H., O69104.
Iverson, Harold E., O69105.
Jackson, Franklin R., O69107.
Jackson, James L., O68585.
Jackson, Wilfred A., O69108.
Jacquez, Oscar S., O70100.
James, Stanley L., O69109.
Jamieson, John F., O68586.
Jenes, Theodore G., Jr., O70138.
Jennings, Robert H., O69111.
Jewell, William M., Jr., O68587.
Johns, Jack E., O68588.
Johnson, Harold R., Jr., O68364.
Johnson, Robert H., O70102.
Johnson, Roland H., O69113.
Jolley, Alvin L., O71683.
Jones, Franklin R., Jr., O69116.
Jones, Herbert H., O69117.
Jones, Robert P., O69958.
Jones, Thomas H., Sr., O68589.
Jones, William D., O68590.
Joyce, Robert M., O68591.
Joyce, Thomas F., Jr., O68365.
Juve, Eugene H., O69119.
Kahl, Keith G., O68592.
Kallelis, James S., O69120.
Kallman, Michael E., O68593.
Kamakahi, Ronald D., O69121.
Kaplan, Robert L., O68594.
Kaufman, Louis A., O68595.
Kay, Joe E., O69123.
Kelley, Kent C., O39124.
Kelley, William B., O69125.
Kenyon, Robert B., O69126.
Kenzie, Ross B., O68503.
Ketzler, Kenneth LeR., O69127.
Kiefer, Charles A., O69129.
Kimball, Douglas S., O68597.
Kincaid, Frank C., Jr., O68598.
King, William W., O70201.
Kinne, Milton J., Jr., O71819.
Kinnie, Irvin G., Jr., O68599.
Kitchin, Herbert A., O69131.
Kloke, John G., O70139.
Kmiotek, George V., O69132.
Knoebel, Frederick W., O68257.
Knox, James R., O68600.
Koch, Ralph A., Jr., O68601.
Kofoed, Everett F., O69964.
Koontz, William E., O71538.
Koval, Emil D., O69134.
Kramer, John C., O68823.
Kratsch, Charles H., O69966.
Kretzer, Alonzo S., O69135.
Kuhn, Robert J., O70140.
Kurtz, Francis S., O69136.
Kvernes, Roger W., O69137.
LaBrash, Francis G., O68602.
Lacquement, Hubert W., O68603.
Ladd, Earl M., Jr., O68825.
Lafiam, Robert J., O68604.
Lammie, James L., O68605.
Lamport, Bert J., Jr., O69144.
Land, Joe E., Jr., O68258.
Landry, Clifford J., O68606.
Lane, James C., Jr., O69146.
LaNoue, Carol L., O71825.
Larason, Charles E., O68370.
Larson, Richard A., O69147.
Larson, Walter R., O69148.
Laskiewicz, Henry, O69149.
Laucirica, Xavier A., Jr., O69150.
Lauer, Robert D., O69151.
Laundry, Melburn E., O68607.
Law, Donald C., O69152.
Lawrence, Herbert L., O69153.
Lawrence, Richard D., O68608.
Lawrence, William J., O70104.
Lawson, Lary F. O., O70205.
Laybourn, William E., O69154.
Leaf, Edwin B., Jr., O69155.
Leander, Richard C., O69156.
Lee, Lynn L., O73364.
Lee, Wallace A., O69157.
Leedy, George F., O69158.
Leisinger, Richard W., O69159.
Lenard, Stanley, O69161.
Leonard, Richard E., O68609.
Lesinski, Raymond J., O68610.
Leuppert, Fred W., O68262.
Lindgren, Gordon F., O69166.
Lindholm, Allen T., O68611.
Linka, James E., O68612.
Liveoak, Felix L., Jr., O68613.
Loedding, James A., O68614.
Logan, Francis S., O72921.
Lohrli, G. Gerald, O68615.
Lowman, Charles J., Jr., O68616.
Lowry, Montecue J., O68617.
Luby, Victor, O68618.
Luck, Leland P., O68619.
Lutz, Charles W., O69169.
Lynch, Gordon P., O72923.
Lynch, Homer M., O69170.
MacLennan, Robert G., O69187.
Macomber, Michael D., O68263.
Mactagone, Serafin G., O69188.
Maddux, Franklin W., O69189.
Maehr, Robert B., O68620.
Magnuson, Robert N., O69190.
Maher, John P., O68621.
Mahoney, Francis X., O70106.
Mallet, Henri-Gerard, O71831.
Malone, Dandridge M., O71832.
Mamoyac, Robert B., O69191.
Manfre, Louis E., O68622.
Mangels, Robert L., O68623.
Mann, Kenneth L., O68380.
Manning, James A., O69193.
Manning, Monroe L., O69194.
Manning, William J. H., Jr., O69195.
Maranville, Robert L., O68264.
Marotta, Francis X., O69977.
Marshall, James L., Jr., O69197.
Martch, Henry B., Jr., O69198.
Martin, Donald R., O68624.
Martin, Haywood H., Jr., O69199.
Martin, John F., O68625.
Martin, Robert N., O68626.
Massey, Joseph O., Jr., O69979.
Mast, Stanley I., O68266.
Masters, Barrie P., O72759.
Matson, Howard R., O68627.
Matthews, Charles C., Jr., O68827.
Mayer, Adolph E., O68628.
Mayhew, Charles H., 3d, O69201.
McBee, Michael A., O69173.
McBee, Willie H., O70107.
McCarthy, Richard J., O70108.
McClaren, Sherwood W., 3d, O70109.
McClelland, Thomas M., O71700.
McCluskey, James F., O68629.
McCormack, Robert F., 3d, O69174.
McCoy, Don S., O69176.
McDaniel, Theodore L., Jr., O68267.
McDonald, John R., O68630.
McDougal, H. A., O69177.
McElmoyl, Frank B., Jr., O69178.
McGee, Robert L., O69180.
McGovern, Joseph F., O68631.
McGraw, Russell M., O69181.
McGregor, Rob R., O68632.
McGregor, Thomas, O68633.
McGuffin, Robert F., O70212.
McGurl, Peter W., O71940.
McIntosh, John H., O72936.
McIntyre, Graham W., O68634.
McKay, Jack G., O69182.
McKenna, Thomas P., O68635.
McKenzie, Colin W., Jr., O72939.
McKenzie, Moran A., O69985.
McKie, Robert G., O69183.
McLain, James L., O69184.
McLennan, Stuart G., Jr., O68636.

McLeod, John S., O69185.
McNeese, Luna V., Jr., O68268.
McNutt, Donald L., O68637.
McReynolds, J. Carroll, O68269.
McSorley, Lester F., O71559.
Meadows, Benjamin T., O72942.
Meadows, Thomas R., O69202.
Meanor, John E., O68270.
Medbury, Paul R., O69203.
Meek, James W., O69204.
Meggison, Robert H., O69205.
Meglen, John D., O68638.
Meinert, Maurice E., Jr., O69206.
Meister, Eugene C., O69207.
Meloy, Guy S., 3d, O68639.
Menzies, Neil A., O69210.
Merrigan, Jack A., O68640.
Merritt, Allen S., O68641.
Merritt, Jack N., O71396.
Metcalfe, Robert W., O69211.
Metzcher, Edward C., O68642.
Meyer, Donald L., O68643.
Meyer, Richard M., O69212.
Michel, Charles P., O69214.
Michener, Richard E., O69215.
Mihas, Leo B., O69217.
Mikle, Franklin O., O69218.
Miley, James F., O68644.
Miller, David H., O69219.
Miller, Leon M., O69220.
Miller, Richard A., O68645.
Miller, Thomas A., Jr., O70112.
Miotke, William A., O68646.
Mitchell, Alphonso, O70143.
Mizell, Dan J., O70214.
Mleko, Frank A., O68647.
Moffitt, John S., O69222.
Mollichelli, Edward V., O72626.
Monclova, Irving, O69223.
Montgomery, Robert S., 3d, O70144.
Moody, Theodore R., O68387.
Moore, Gordon E., O70145.
Moore, James B., O69224.
Moore, Jere N., Jr., O69225.
Moore, Patrick J., O69226.
Moore, Pierce M., O69227.
Moore, Richard E., O69228.
Moore, Robert L., O72420.
Moore, Robert O., O69229.
Moore, Wilbur A., Jr., O69230.
Moretti, Francis C., O69231.
Morris, George A., Jr., O69232.
Morris, Ralph C., O69234.
Morrison, Clyde L., O69235.
Morrison, Patton N., O68648.
Morsey, James A., O69236.
Morton, Jack E., O68649.
Moses, William C., O69994.
Mott, Carl M., Jr., O69995.
Motycka, David L., O68650.
Mullins, Robert R., O69238.
Mullins, Thomas E., O70441.
Murrell, Maxwell R., O68651.
Myrah, Halvor H., Jr., O68652.
Neal, Charles O., O68653.
Neilson, Clifford C., O68654.
Nemec, James G., O69239.
Nerone, Francis A., O68655.
Nesbitt, Hugh D., O69240.
Nesbitt, Thomas E., O68656.
Neu, Dick D., O68657.
Neuberger, Jack A., O68658.
New, Guy E., O68276.
Newman, Francisco B., Jr., O69241.
Newton, Walter H., O69242.
Nickell, Morton C., O69244.
Nicks, Jerry W., O68659.
Nields, Charles A., Jr., O69246.
Noah, Max W., O68660.
Noeding, John P., O68834.
Nolin, Edmond R., O70004.
Noll, Wallace W., O68661.
Noll, William S., O69247.
Nordgren, Courtland C., Jr., O68662.
Nugent, Thomas J., O68663.
Nutter, Robert H., O68664.
Oates, James H., O69248.
Oblinger, John B., Jr., O68665.
O'Brien, Jack E., O69249.
Ochs, Charles C., O69250.
O'Connell, Leo A., O69251.
O'Connor, Edward C., O72955.
O'Connor, Mortimer L., O68666.
Odiorne, David W., Jr., O69252.
O'Donohue, John D., O72956.
Ogg, Robert D., O68278.
O'Hair, Edgar A., Jr., O68667.
Olmsted, James H., O69254.
Olsen, Lamoin A., O70006.
Olson, Joseph C., O68279.
Ondina, Jorge H., O69255.
O'Quinn, James J., O69256.
Otis, Glenn K., O68668.
Outland, Robert R., O69257.
Overstreet, Charles W., O68280.
Owens, Bidwell A., O68281.
Owens, Warren R., O69259.
Padilla, Manuel, O69261.
Panageas, Dan P., O70007.
Pardee, G. Winfield, O69262.
Park, William H., O69263.
Parker, Hassel L., O73385.
Parker, Walter E., O68669.
Patton, William W., Jr., O73183.
Paulekas, Alfred E., O68670.
Pauley, Francis L., O69264.
Pavey, Albert E., Jr., O69265.
Pearce, Richard H., O69266.
Peckham, Herbert D., O68671.
Pehota, Edward E., O69267.
Perlow, Joseph P., O68672.
Peterson, Thorwald R., O68673.
Phair, John M., O69268.
Philbrick, Donald F., O72774.
Phillips, Harry LeR., Jr., O68836.
Phillips, John C., O68674.
Pies, Donald A., O70016.
Pigg, Jimmy L., O68675.
Pistenma, David A., O68676.
Pneuman, Frederick C., O69271.
Pollard, Louis M., Jr., O69273.
Ponder, Arno L., Jr., O71590.
Porter, Clair E., O72968.
Portteus, Willard L., Jr., O70114.
Potash, Charles, O69274.
Potter, Edwin J., O69275.
Pratt, Joseph B., O71952.
Pratt, Theodore W., O68283.
Price, Tommy E., O70115.
Prillaman, John P., O69280.
Prime, Charles W., O68677.
Proietti, Raymond A., O69281.
Puffer, William B., O69282.
Pulsifer, Donald W., O69283.
Pulsipher, Elwin D., O69284.
Pulver, Elmer W., O72972.
Purcell, Henry, 3d, O68678.
Quinn, Paul D., O69285.
Rainey, David M., O70116.
Ralls, Dan H., O70023.
Ramsay, Donald A., O68679.
Ranney, Frederick J., O71859.
Rathburn, Vinton L., O72779.
Rathjen, Arthur H., O69288.
Rathnau, Donald P., O70024.
Rawlings, Charles R., O70026.
Rawlinson, William E., Jr., O68680.
Ray, William D., O69289.
Rears, Joseph T., O68681.
Redditt, Robert H., O68396.
Reed, Adrian P., O68682.
Reed, Edwin, Jr., O68683.
Reinbold, John A., O69292.
Renner, William D., O68684.
Rew, Leland C., Jr., O68685.
Reynolds, Frederick P., 3d, O68686.
Rhiddlehoover, Bruce H., O69293.
Rhyne, Hal B., O68687.
Rice, David K., O68688.
Rice, Harrold E., O73389.
Richard, Donald W., O69294.
Rickard, Daniel S., O68689.
Riede, James R., O69295.
Riefler, Richard B., O69296.
Rieth, Kenneth L., O69297.
Rife, Byard W., O69298.
Riggs, Harold B., O72975.
Riley, Clemens A., O72976.
Riley, Frank J., O70027.
Riley, Otto N., Jr., O68690.
Riley, Walter G., Jr., O70227.
Rinehart, Jack L., O68287.
Rittgers, Forest S., Jr., O69299.
Ritz, James H., Jr., O70117.
Rivera, Roberto, O70028.
Roberts, Vaughn G., O69301.
Robinson, Edgar B., Jr., O72978.
Robinson, James B., Jr., O70029.
Roderick, Roger L., O68691.
Rodgers, Sterling McG., O69305.
Rogers, Alfred R., O69307.
Rogers, Ellietson D., O68692.
Rogers, Robert F., O68693.
Rogers, Robert F., O70030.
Rollinger, Jack R., O69308.
Romedy, Cornelius S., Jr., O69309.
Rose, Robert D., O68694.
Rosen, Leslie M., O69310.
Ross, James K., O69311.
Roy, John O., O70119.
Rudser, John L., O69312.
Rumbough, David H., O68695.
Rumph, Horry L., O69313.
Rush, Early J., 3d, O68696.
Rush, Robert L., O68697.
Russell, Cledie B., O70149.
Sachs, Arthur, O71864.
Samuelson, Dennis L., O69318.
Sanders, Drexel E., O71595.
Sanders, Ralph L., Jr., O68698.
Sandy, Roger D., O69319.
Sarbacher, Harold J., O68699.
Satchell, Max E., O68700.
Satterfield, James R., O68288.
Schaenzer, John E., O68839.
Schlom, John S., O70033.
Schmidt, Donald R., O68701.
Schmidt, Herbert R., O68702.
Schmidt, Theodore H., O69321.
Schmidt, Walter H., Jr., O68703.
Schnarr, Charles A., O72984.
Schoening, George W., O71718.
Schoonover, Jack E., O69322.
Schotanus, Merle W., O69323.
Schriever, Byron N., O68291.
Schroeder, Robert L., O68704.
Schuver, Rudy P., O68289.
Schwalje, Donald D., O69327.
Schwartz, Jules J., O69325.
Schweitzer, Glenn E., O68705.
Scoblick, John J. P., Jr., O68706.
Scofield, Robert E., O68707.
Scott, Frank T., O70121.
Scoville, Roger C., O69328.
Searls, Billie E., O69329.
Seegmueller, Gene A., O68708.
Segal, Robert, O68709.
Seigle, John W., O68710.
Selavka, Carl, O69330.
Semerjian, Sarkis, O68711.
Senich, Donald, O69331.
Serven, Harold M., Jr., O70035.
Seto, Sam C., Jr., O69332.
Shaw, Donald E., O68712.
Shaw, Joseph N., O69334.
Sheard, Joe H., O68713.
Shedden, Eckols L., O70036.
Sherman, William G., O71869.
Sholar, Michael B., O69335.
Shortridge, Douglass R., O69336.
Sibley, James S., O68714.
Siebert, Frederick J., O68715.
Sievers, Ralph H., Jr., O69337.
Sifford, William F., Jr., O68716.
Simko, Andrew M., O68717.
Simmons, Marvin E., O69338.
Simons, Frank D., O69339.
Simpson, Claude S., Jr., O69340.
Singleton, Russell K., Jr., O69341.
Skidmore, Lowell H., O68718.
Slater, James J., O69342.
Slusar, Peter, O69344.
Smartt, Richard W., O69347.
Smith, Bailey B., 3d, O68293.
Smith, Bill J., O70039.
Smith, Clyde O., Jr., O69348.
Smith, David C., O68719.
Smith, Donald E., O68294.
Smith, Donald H., O69349.
Smith, Donald L., O69350.
Smith, Edgar H., Jr., O68720.
Smith, Fred L., O68721.
Smith, James D., O68295.

Smith, Julian H., O69351.
Smith, Loyce N., O69352.
Smith, Perry A., O70042.
Smith, Raymond C., O69353.
Smith, Robert LaF., O68722.
Smith, Rodney H., O68723.
Smith, Vernard J., O68296.
Smith, William F., O71963.
Smythe, John D., O68724.
Snead, William K., O68725.
Snyder, Francis, O68726.
Soja, Eugene R., O68727.
Solomon, Robert B., O72990.
Sorenson, Darwin H., O68297.
Sorrels, Charles V., O70122.
Soukup, John P., O69354.
Spears, Gilbert, Jr., O69355.
Speir, Montgomery T., O68728.
Spotts, Rodney W., O69357.
Stallings, Joseph L., O69358.
Stanberry, Billy M., O71876.
Stanford, Thomas L., Jr., O68405.
Stanley, George F., O68298.
Starke, John B., O69359.
Stein, Henry J., Jr., O69360.
Stelter, James A., O69362.
Stembridge, William A., O69363.
Stepanek, Walter F., O68729.
Stern, Jack M., O71607.
Sterzik, Wilfred L., O69364.
Stevens, Richard W., O68844.
Stevenson, Leroy P., O69366.
Stewart, David T., O72992.
Stewart, John R., O69367.
Stewart, Karl R., O68730.
Stieffel, Ray H., Jr., O73410.
Stinson, William C., Jr., O68731.
Stone, Hardy R., 3d, O69368.
Stoneburner, John F., O68732.
Stotser, Don M., O69370.
Stoudemire, Harry B., O69371.
Stoutamire, David F., Jr., O68300.
Stretcher, Baxter R., O70152.
Stuart, James R., Jr., O68733.
Sullivan, Roland R., O68734.
Sullivan, Roy L., 2d, O68735.
Suplizio, Paul E., O68736.
Sutton, Thomas R., O68407.
Sutton, William J., 3d, O68737.
Swain, Carroll E., O68302.
Swank, David, O69374.
Swanson, Carl O., Jr., O68303.
Swanson, James R., O69375.
Sweeney, Kenneth J., O68738.
Sydnor, Elliott P., Jr., O72656.
Takahashi, Lawrence M., O69376.
Talley, Clarence E., Jr., O68739.
Talley, John D., Jr., O70050.
Tant, Benjamin E., Jr., O68740.
Tanzer, John B., O68741.
Tapley, Curtis T., O69377.
Tate, Penfield W., 2d, O69378.
Taylor, Cedric DeV., O69379.
Taylor, Thomas T., O69380.
Tchon, Richard J., O68742.
Teller, Floyd E., O69381.
Temp, John R., O68743.
Terry, Robert S., O69382.
Thomas, Donald R., O69383.
Thomas, Hiram J., O68304.
Thomas, Robert J., O68744.
Thomas, Samuel M., Jr., O68745.
Thompson, Fred K., O68746.
Thompson, Harry L., O68305.
Thompson, Horace E., O69384.
Thompson, Howard B., O68747.
Thompson, Kenneth R., O69385.
Thompson, Richard W., O71733.
Thompson, William J., O69386.
Thurman, Maxwell R., O70125.
Tighe, Charles J., O68748.
Tilley, Victor M., O69387.
Tolbert, James R., O69388.
Toman, John, O68749.
Tomlingson, Paul D., O68750.
Tompkins, Hiram K., O68751.
Touchstone, Stanford M., O68752.
Tower, John B., O71615.
Tuck, William A., O69389.
Tullar, Thomas A., O69390.
Tullos, Kenneth W., O68307.
Tumperi, John R. E., O68753.
Turner, James McV., Jr., O70240.
Tutek, Henry G., O70053.
van den Berg, Egerton K., O68754.
Vander Meer, Richard G., O68755.
Van Deusen, Frederick F., O68756.
Vawter, Raymond M., O68308.
Ventrella, Rocco F., Jr., O68757.
Vernon, Graham D., O68758.
Vet, Maarten, O68759.
Viereck, Ennis A., Jr., O68760.
Vilas, John R., O69394.
Volker, Gilbert A., O68761.
Volpe, Joseph J., O68762.
Vose, Paul C., O68763.
Wade, James P., Jr., O68764.
Waldrop, Max L., O69397.
Walker, Daniel E., O68765.
Walker, James H., O69398.
Walker, James T., Jr., O68309.
Walker, William E., O68766.
Wallace, Festus E., O71887.
Wallingford, Ralph E., O70060.
Walls, Glenn E., O68409.
Walsh, Eugene R., O69399.
Walters, Monty W., O68767.
Ward, Edward W., O73004.
Wardlaw, Worth L., Jr., O68768.
Warner, Paul B., O73058.
Warren, James R., O71890.
Wasiewski, Richard F., O69403.
Waters, Douglas G., O68769.
Waters, George D., O68770.
Watkins, William W., Jr., O73422.
Watson, James M., O69405.
Watson, Woody B., O69406.
Watts, Allen H., Jr., O70241.
Weall, Robert H., O69408.
Wearn, Robert M., Jr., O69409.
Weatherly, Norman F., O70061.
Webb, Jimmy R., O69410.
Weidenthal, Carlton P., O69412.
Weihmiller, William W., O68771.
Wells, Arthur D., O68772.
Wells, David T., O68773.
Wells, William T., O69413.
Welsh, Robert W., O69414.
West, Charles R., O68847.
Westbrook, Thomas J., O69415.
Wettlaufer, Andrew C., O69416.
Whalen, Dennis D., O68774.
Whann, John T., O69417.
Whitaker, Malvern R., O71299.
White, Robert N., Jr., O68775.
Whitesel, Thomas K., Jr., O69421.
Whittington, Richard H., O69422.
Whittington, Wesley E., O69423.
Wieland, Kay L., O69424.
Wielga, Stanley V., Jr., O68776.
Wilcox, Robert L., Jr., O70066.
Wilkins, Eugene E., O69425.
Wilkins, Julian A., O69426.
Williams, Franklin A., O69427.
Williams, George F., O68777.
Williams, Grady W., O68848.
Williams, Howard M., O70158.
Williams, John H., O70242.
Williams, Ronald E., O68314.
Williams, Thomas E., O68778.
Williamson, Richard E., O69428.
Williamson, William E., O69429.
Willis, Richard S., O69430.
Wills, John T., O69431.
Wilson, Alvin T., Jr., O69432.
Wilson, Charles C., Jr., O69433.
Wilson, Dennis F., O69434.
Wilson, Donald L., O68779.
Wilson, Dwight L., O70067.
Wilson, Francis V., O69435.
Wilson, Gene F., O71746.
Wilson, Gerald F., O69436.
Wilson, Jack D., O68780.
Wilson, Joel F., O69437.
Wilson, Joseph C., O68781.
Wilson, Robert E., O71307.
Winegar, Lucien T., O72666.
Wise, John E., O68782.
Wolfe, Oren, O70069.
Wollenberg, William F., O69439.
Worthy, Clifford, Jr., O68783.
Wright, Robert W., O69442.
Wubbena, William L., Jr., O68784.
Yetter, Greyson T., O68317.
Yoder, Charles D., O68318.
Young, Clyde A., Jr., O70070.
Young, George D., O73433.
Young, John H., Jr., O68785.
Young, John W., O69443.
Young, Richard A., O68786.
Young, Roy J., O70129.
Youngker, Joe L., O68320.
Yuengel, William W., O68787.
Yunker, Sylvester J., O71900.
Zargan, Robert T., O68788.
Zembsch, Robert J., O69446.
Zimmer, Leon S., O68789.
Zimmerman, William K., O70073.
Zipp, Charles W., O68790.
Zoeckler, William R., O73015.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Austin, Lloyd K., O69852.
Bomberger, Robert W., Jr., O71904.
Brandt, Clarke M., O70132.
Bullock, Howard R., O73023.
Campbell, William J., O73089.
Fowler, Harland W., Jr., O73031.
Ginsberg, David M., O71922.
Heath, Jack F., O73036.
Hoggan, Malcolm D., O73037.
Johnson, Wirt, VanM., O73040.
Kellel, Frank, Jr., O72393.
Mateer, Charles A., O69200.
Mhyre, Noel L., O69213.
Riggs, Albert C., Jr., O71956.
Rigney, Max E., O71957.
Rocke, Donald C., O69304.
Rodriguez, James G., O69306.
Rusiewicz, Lawrence L., O69316.
Schwartz, Charles R., O69324.
Thomas, Tommy, O70051.
Walker, James F., O70058.
Yoran, Darwin E., O68319.

To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

DeLozier, Dorothy M., L455.
Fisher, Audrey A., L470.
McCarney, Alice M., L484.
Mykleby, Phyllis R., L471.
Oliver, Williemae M., L479.
Russell, Marilyn J., L461.
Schmerling, Doris M., L473.
Smith, Ann B., L474.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Dyson, Barbara J., N2597.
Evans, Mary L., N2639.
Gipson, Marguerite L., N2596.
Henschen, Retha M., N2683.
LeBlanc, Eunice M., N2593.
Light, Lucile M., N2667.
Lothian, Elizabeth E., N2594.
May, Eleanore G., N2599.
McCarthy, Rosemary T., N2622.
Osborne, Rose M., N2684.
Paradis, Madeleine V., N2600.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Accountius, Patricia L., R10158.
Anthony, Frances J., R10160.
Damsbo, Ann M., M10158.
Estrada, Betty A., R10159.
Galt, Elizabeth A., M10149.
Gregory, Rita T., M10162.
McVay, Mary R., J79.
O'Brien, Elizabeth A., J80.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Aboosh, Norman D., O32171.
Ackert, Thomas W., O32005.

Adams, William L., Jr., O43651.
Albert, George E., O32279.
Albert, Jack F., O32097.
Albert, Joseph L., O40344.
Allen, Arthur W., Jr., O22034.
Allen, Ben E., O32103.
Allen, Raymond W., Jr., O21810.
Alley, John A., Jr., O52203.
Allwine, Franklin N., O43661.
Ambron, Tyrus R., O32215.
Anderson, Leland E., O52216.
Angster, Robert C., O32124.
Archer, Norman R., O38968.
Armstrong, Edward B., O32267.
Arnold, Bryan C., O20801.
Arnold, Thomas St. J., O32040.
Arthur, Frank M., O32290.
Attaway, Elmer J., O40321.
Auerbach, Alvin B., O20547.
Austin, Wallace, O32191.
Ax, Clarence F., O32198.
Ayres, Laurence T., Jr., O43715.
Bachelor, Donald M., O43723.
Bailey, Harle G., Jr., O32167.
Ball, Arthur C., O32070.
Bane, John C., O21897.
Barber, Homer G., O22130.
Barkman, William E., O38899.
Barnett, William H., O22104.
Barrell, Richard, O32104.
Bartholet, John C., O43845.
Bartow, Charles P., O52310.
Bary, Robert S., O32296.
Bauer, Elmer H., O43502.
Baumgartner, John W., O43642.
Beardsley, Ford M., O40311.
Bearss, Ernest H., O32020.
Beattie, Fountain F., Jr., O52265.
Beckedorff, Lawrence LeR., O21781.
Beere, Donald C., O21893.
Beeson, John J., 3d, O32013.
Belon, Ralph G., O43746.
Benjamin, Roy F., O32062.
Beplat, James A., O43694.
Bieri, George A., O40298.
Billups, James S., Jr., O21932.
Bird, Robert J., O32343.
Black, Daniel N., O52309.
Black, George W., O32192.
Blair, John H., 3d, O44388.
Blocker, Jack S., O32118.
Blue, Daniel L., O31997.
Bogardus, Allan L., O43853.
Bogart, Frank A., O40325.
Boles, John K., Jr., O22025.
Booth, Cornell D., O52271.
Boswell, Charles B., O38976.
Bowers, William S., O38973.
Bowie, Richard T., O21921.
Bowman, Harold M., Jr., O43601.
Boy, Pierre D., O32297.
Boye, Frederic W., Jr., O21891.
Boyer, Jack W., O32145.
Boylan, Vincent L., O22162.
Boyle, Joseph E., O40188.
Boyle, William J., O21953.
Boyles, Samuel J., O32168.
Bradley, William T., O21768.
Brady, Stuart F., O32329.
Brannon, John M., O32156.
Briggs, Merritt W., O38964.
Brinker, Walter E., O21776.
Brinkerhoff, William A., O43708.
Bristol, Matt C. C., Jr., O22027.
Brockman, Ernest F., O22147.
Brown, John P., O43653.
Brown, Paul J., O38959.
Brown, Richard K., O32333.
Brown, Shannon D., O52247.
Brownfield, Albert R., O21905.
Bruehl, Paul E., O32270.
Bruni, Albert V., O32195.
Bruns, Stockton D., O32292.
Buechner, Carl A., Jr., O22155.
Burk, Walter J. O32043.
Burnett, Darrell H., O32177.
Burr, Wesley H., O32019.
Bush, Sterling C., O43914.
Butts, Robert E., O32286.
Byrd, William H., Jr., O52267.
Byrne, John D., O21837.
Calvert, Charles W., O52232.
Camp, Robert H., O21798.
Campbell, Charles H., O32031.
Campbell, Charles S., O43615.
Campbell, Charles T., O32180.
Campbell, John, Jr., O43649.
Canon, Jack Y., O43830.
Cantrell, James L., O21758.
Capers, Thomas S., Jr., O32004.
Carlisle, Gerald, O40324.
Carnes, Hughes A., O43674.
Carter, George W., Jr., O32349.
Carter, Sam, O38955.
Carvey, James B., O22095.
Case, Charles C., Jr., O43824.
Casey, Charles W., O32356.
Cassidy, Robert F., O21783.
Casto, Carl S., O32007.
Caulder, Bruce B., O43626.
Cella, Andrew, O52269.
Chamblin, Francis A., O32255.
Chapla, Benjamin C., O22170.
Chapman, Oren D., O40328.
Chapman, Warren C., O21939.
Cheek, Andrew R., O32306.
Christianson, Charles V., O43913.
Clark, James P., O40342.
Clark, Sam J., O40064.
Claypool, Charles B., O43693.
Cleverly, Richard deF., O21862.
Clifford, Paul T., O22135.
Clough, Casper, Jr., O21979.
Clowes, George C., O32367.
Coates, Charles E., Jr., O21746.
Cochran, James M., O21945.
Coffey, Joseph I., O21904.
Cole, George R., O20842.
Coleman, Robert M., O22008.
Colley, Martin H., O38982.
Collins, James L., Jr., O21788.
Collins, Kenneth W., O22169.
Commerford, Leon, Jr., O40293.
Compton, Thomas C., O20692.
Cone, Sidney L., O40362.
Conley, Charles D., O52260.
Conner, Haskett L., Jr., O21855.
Convery, William J., O52244.
Cook, James S., Jr., O43655.
Cookson, George M., O32021.
Cooperider, Howard V., O22035.
Corgan, Francis H., O42885.
Cosgrove, Sherman D., O38990.
Cowan, Kay K., O52217.
Coyne, Christopher C., O21879.
Cramer, Frederic M., O52273.
Crandall, Riel S., O21767.
Crawford, Alfred H., Jr., O32229.
Crawford, Harold M., O21840.
Crawford, Thomas M., O21983.
Croft, Lucian C., O32189.
Cromwell, Samuel M., O32176.
Crouch, Robert L., Jr., O43777.
Crowell, Albert W., O52319.
Currier, Don O., O40318.
Dameron, Ernest C., O32376.
Daniel, Roy E., Jr., O38954.
Dannemiller, Edward McC., O21822.
Daugherty, Francis, O52222.
Davidson, Henry E., Jr., O32295.
Davidson, Michael S., O22051.
Davidson, Phillip B., Jr., O21969.
Davis, John N., O22070.
Davis, Thomas W., 3d, O22059.
Davis, Walter W., O20878.
Davitt, James H., O43490.
Dawley, Jay P., O21750.
D'Elosua, Ramon F., O43713.
Deshon, George E., O21362.
Dickerson, John O., O22071.
Dietz, Carroll W., O21836.
Dillard, David S., O22175.
Dix, Jewett A., O32049.
Dixon, Jobie J., O31744.
Dobson, John W., O21851.
Dodge, Roy T., O21468.
Doering, Sam F., O53058.
Dolle, Walter C., O21813.
Dolvin, Welborn G., O21980.
Donald, Herbert P., O52223.
Donaldson, John H., Jr., O32721.
Donlon, James D., Jr., O32039.
Dooley, Thomas, O32159.
Dowd, Maxim J., O32210.
Drake, Leland R., O43894.
Drake, William D., O32158.
Drazen, Leonard, O40336.
Drouillard, Eugene G., O32125.
Dudley, Edward F., O40374.
Dueker, Fred E., O32051.
Duke, Charles M., O21753.
Dunlap, Nicholas, O32094.
Durgin, Chesley F., O32363.
Dziuban, Stanley W., O21738.
Eckland, Kenneth E., O32334.
Eckstein, Paul A., O40331.
Edgerton, Eric R., O43850.
Edwards, Edward G., O32048.
Edwards, Irwin A., O32149.
Ehrhardt, Clarence P., O43644.
Etka, Dale L., O43898.
Evans, Belmont S., Jr., O21811.
Evans, John T., O32142.
Ewell, Julian J., O21791.
Fair, Felder L., O31984.
Fargo, Lynn D., O32242.
Farrell, Norman, O21759.
Farris, Stephen C., O22022.
Feliz, James E., O43752.
Fishkin, Leon J., O52215.
Fives, Paul E., O32170.
Flint, Charles W., O43656.
Florance, Charles W., Jr., O22119.
Flynn, Stanley F., O43765.
Forrest, Frank G., O22101.
Fox, Elmer W., Jr., O52318.
Francis, Harrison S., O52233.
Fredericks, Charles G., O22092.
Frederickson, Erwin C., O32347.
Fromer, Paul S., O32141.
Fry, Clayton T., O43904.
Fuller, Carl W., O31689.
Funchess, Linwood E., O20875.
Gallagher, Edward J., O21775.
Galt, Edward A., O43743.
Garvey, Dale M., O43910.
Geary, Edward M., O21887.
George, Robert D., O43815.
George, William C., O21913.
Gerber, Fred E., O32023.
Gerety, John S., O43605.
Gibbons, Ulrich G., O21874.
Gibbs, Charles H., O43764.
Gierlak, Michael P., O40363.
Gilbert, Vernon G., O21850.
Gilchrist, Malcolm F., Jr., O22077.
Giles, Tommy H., Jr., O52120.
Gillespie, John J., O32143.
Glade, Kenneth, O21181.
Glenn, Ned W., O22107.
Gnau, William D., O43828.
Goetz, John B. M., O43696.
Golden, Barney, O40337.
Goodpaster, Andrew J., Jr., O21739.
Goodwin, David B., O21914.
Gorski, Andrew G., O31993.
Grace, William Van N., O40365.
Graff, Laverne W., O52239.
Graham, Robert O., Jr., O32064.
Graham, Thomas A., Jr., O32231.
Grant, Walter H., O22093.
Gray, Millard G., O32137.
Green, James D., O22182.
Greening, Orlando L., O43906.
Greer, Harry A., O43685.
Gregg, Francis H., O32037.
Guenther, Edgar T., O32206.
Guerdrum, Thorvald J., O43829.
Haberer, Walter J., Jr., O52278.
Haberstroh, Herbert L., O52210.
Hackett, Charles J., O21954.
Haffa, Robert P., O21809.
Hale, William H., O22184.
Hall, DeWitt N., O22083.
Hanchin, Ralph J., O21895.
Hand, Robert D., O32294.
Hanks, Joseph E., O43866.
Hanson, Ellwood F., O52281.
Harding, Stanley L., O32134.
Haskins, George D., O32110.
Hassett, Burrell C., O38987.
Hatchell, Henry C., O32200.
Hawksworth, Frederick W., O43619.

Hayes, John J., O32309.
Haynes, Charley W., O43719.
Healton, Curtis E., O32275.
Heiser, Joseph M., Jr., O43773.
Hennessey, James T., O32274.
Henry, William J., O21928.
Hickman, Mahlon D., O32355.
Hicks, Paul S., O32028.
Higgins, Walter M., Jr., O21987.
Hill, Robert J., Jr., O21933.
Hillis, William T., O40369.
Hinternhoff, William A., O21844.
Hixson, Nathan H., O52254.
Hoard, Maurice A., Jr., O43729.
Hodges, Carroll B., O43751.
Hogan, Julian L., O32178.
Hollerbach, Eugene J., O32076.
Hollis, Charles H., O38981.
Holmes, William W., O32247.
Holt, Arthur E., O32326.
Holt, Frank T., O21908.
Holtz, Werner, O32209.
Hooker, Howard C., O43717.
Hoppenstein, Isaac, O32373.
Hoskins, Harry D., Jr., O43846.
Houlson, Keith H., O52229.
Houser, Harold H., O32050.
Hudgins, Seth F., O21947.
Huff, Hotenel J., O43868.
Hughes, William McC., O32322.
Hull, Donald F., O22067.
Hull, Keith M., O21885.
Huppert, George H., Jr., O32277.
Hustead, Charles L., Jr., O43711.
Huston, Fred R. O43812.
Hutson, Richard K., O32212.
Innes, William H., O43867.
Jackson, John H., O52204.
Jackson, Robert J., Jr., O38986.
Jacobs, Stanley E., O52256.
Jameson, Roy A., O32072.
Janowski, Raymond A., O21869.
Jarrold, Milton, O43699.
Jefferds, Jerome S., O52283.
Jeffrey, Paul R., O40358.
Jenkins, Park T., O32218.
Johnson, James E., O43704.
Johnson, James M., O52276.
Johnson, John G., O21929.
Johnson, John P., O43677.
Johnson, Sterling R., O21873.
Johnson, Warren R., O43697.
Jones, David W., Jr., O43631.
Jones, Gordon C., O32320.
Jordan, Ralph E., O21911.
Judson, William J., O31769.
Juskalian, George, O32371.
Kail, Samuel G., O22072.
Katin, Joseph G., O43758.
Keefe, James H., O43634.
Keller, James H., O21871.
Kellett, Donald T., O40323.
Kellner, Fred W., O32358.
Kelly, Harold L., Jr., O52292.
Kelly, John J., O22185.
Kennedy, Justus C., O43856.
Kerwin, Walter T., Jr., O21963.
Ketcham, Edward P., Jr., O38963.
Kiely, John J., Jr., O32069.
Kingman, Dan C., O32045.
Kinnard, Harry W. O., Jr., O21990.
Kinney, Oliver G., O32067.
Kirby, Lee M., O22048.
Kirby-Smith, Edmund, O21745.
Klein, Phillip I., O32113.
Kling, Carl V., O40366.
Knight, Darce R., O43887.
Koch, Otto R., Jr., O32074.
Koerner, Rudolph C., O52211.
Kooken, Willis E., O43658.
Koreman, Edward H., O38953.
Kostanski, Henry S., O43755.
Kouns, Charles W., O22129.
Kreighbaum, Eugene C., O43883.
Krisman, Michael J., O21880.
Kronke, Charles J., Jr., O40371.
Kulp, John C., Jr., O43768.
Kunzig, Louis A., Jr., O21741.
Kurth, Edward H., O21807.
Kurtz, Josiah S., O22171.
Lain, Dalton W., O40302.
Lake, Gerald A., O43901.
La Mee, William S., 3d, O32364.
Lampert, Lester L., Jr., O22100.
Lane, Barton G., Jr., O21876.
Lane, Douglas H., O40338.
Larsen, Stanley R., O22094.
Lasché, Ernest P., O22073.
Lavell, Robert G., O32080.
Lavoie, Leon F., O32127.
Law, William, O32169.
Lawrance, Jackson S., Jr., O32003.
Lawrence, Charles E., O52261.
Leckie, William E., O40296.
Lee, Levin L., O22172.
Leighton, Ralph E., O43688.
Lennhoff, Charles D. T., O21882.
Lentz, Carl, 2d, O21993.
Lerette, Earle L., O22133.
Lerner, Gerald P., O32199.
Lesneski, Stanley V., O32053.
Levin, Edward, O51910.
Levine, Lester H., O32155.
Liakos, Elias F., O32238.
Lilly, Roger M., O21924.
Linvill, Robert R., O40305.
Livermore, Francis S., O32203.
Lluy, Jorge J., O56898.
Long, Floyd K., O43778.
Long, Herbert S., Jr., O31985.
Looney, Jack R., O22164.
Lyke, James P., O43731
Lyle, Clayton B., Jr., O40306.
Lyle, James B., O32348.
MacDonough, John E., O52208.
Macken, John J., O40304.
Mancuso, Stephen J., O22006.
Marlin, Raymond B., O21899.
Marsden, Henry H., Jr., O43643.
Marshall, David N., O52221.
Martens, Howard W., O32324.
Martin, Lawrence A., O43665.
Martin, Sidney T., O21772.
Martin, Talbert I., O43893.
Maslowski, Ladislaus C., O21789.
Matheson, Davis M., O21757.
Matter, Robert A., O22132.
Maxwell, John B., 2d, O21942.
McCaffrey, William J., O22065.
McChristian, Joseph A., O21966.
McClellan, Harry W., O22173.
McClure, Myron, O32241.
McCollam, Albert E., O21748.
McConnell, Edward T., O21996.
McConnell, William J., O22052.
McCool, Edward J., O32024.
McCrorey, James L., Jr., O22158.
McCutchen, George, O40341.
McCutchen, Wilmot R., O21744.
McElroy, Virgil M., O43269.
McFerren, Carl D., O21923.
McKenzie, Walter B., O32264.
McMahon, Robert E., O22137.
McMillin, Dan S., O32010.
McWilliams, John K., O32257.
Medinnis, Charles L. P., O22023.
Medusky, John W., O21756.
Megica, Martin G., O21881.
Meyer, John H., O22179.
Mial, John P., O22157.
Michaels, Charles E., O38972
Milburn, William R., O31599.
Mildren, Frank T., O21992.
Miller, Clifford L., 2d, O22149.
Miller, Donald B., O22018.
Minahan, Daniel J., Jr., O21799.
Mist, Ellis H., O52255.
Mitchell, Arlo W., O43772.
Mitchell, John E., Jr., O52328.
Mitchell, Leonard D., O31625.
Mize, Paul H., O32335.
Montgomery, Brian O., O32529.
Moore, Robert E., O32244.
Mosheim, Emil L., O32272.
Motter, John C., O32288.
Mouchet, William D., O43802.
Mounsey, Glen A., O31607.
Mount, Charles McN., Jr., O21849.
Moushegian, Richard, O22109.
Muir, James I., Jr., O21802.
Mulcahy, Patrick D., O22015.
Mullen, John M., O43896.
Mullinix, Joseph B., O32086.
Munro, Perry A., O32090.
Murch, Gordon E., O31651.
Murphy, William D., O20944.
Murr, Arnold P., O43720.
Murray, Harry L., Jr., O22140.
Murray, Robert M., O52094.
Myers, Harry McN., O21835.
Myers, William M., O32160.
Nanney, David Y., O21866.
Napier, Jack P., O43657.
Naudts, Morris J., O32265.
Nelson, Lloyd S., O52325.
Nelson, William H., Jr., O31992.
Nestlerode, Howard E., Jr., O32282.
Newcomb, Fidelis D., O22056.
Newcomer, Francis K., Jr., O21898.
Niccolls, Robert S., O32317.
Nolan, Daniel A., Jr., O21988.
Noland, Marion B., O43603.
Norling, Ralph L., O32112.
Norris, Jack K., O21865.
Oakley, Samuel H., O43841.
Oberst, Donald A., O31451.
O'Brien, Francis W., O32196.
Odom, Herbert R., O22086.
O'Farrell, Hugh R., O43888.
O'Hara, Lewis B., O31887.
Olson, John E., O22125.
Olson, Roy I., O52117.
Osborne, Robert J. C., O43819.
Osborne, William L., O32154.
Ostrom, Herbert N., O43614.
Outlaw, Fredrick B., O32089.
Owen, Henry M., Jr., O32083.
Owens, Owen W., O38958.
Pachomski, John, O40252.
Paden, Bill W., O52291.
Page, Robert W., Jr., O22120.
Palik, Ted J., O43611.
Palsrok, John, O43722.
Papa, Anthony E., O52294.
Paraska, Nicholas, O21765.
Pardue, Norman C., O40354.
Parker, Howard C., O32108.
Parsons, Charles J., Jr., O22183.
Patterson, William G., O32278.
Patterson, William H., O22110.
Paul, Thurston T., Jr., O32243.
Pavick, John J., O21780.
Payne, Leslie M., O43797.
Peacock, Earl G., O43873.
Pence, James L., O43875.
Pennell, Robert, O22139.
Perry, Edwin A., O32030.
Perry, Fred E., O38974.
Pershall, William R., O43825.
Pertl, Martin C., O40349.
Peters, Clifton A., O32202.
Peterson, Kenneth J., O31794.
Pflanz, Louis W., Jr., O43600.
Phillips, Royal E., O32136.
Pickett, George E., O21938.
Pierre, George H., Jr., O32258.
Pille, Roy F., O52311.
Ploger, Robert R., O21760.
Poinier, Arthur D., O21999.
Preston, William M., O22099.
Price, David B., O43842.
Price, William H., Jr., O21903.
Pridgen, Claude L., O38965.
Queenin, Hugh F., O40367.
Rager, Edward E., O22116.
Rankin, Alexander J., O32166.
Rankin, John A., O32140.
Ray, John, O21821.
Reagan, Bruce W., O38975.
Redman, Charles L., Jr., O32311.
Reed, Arthur W., O21878.
Reese, Arthur W., O43818.
Reeves, Joseph R., O21820.
Register, William F., Jr., O43757.
Reilly, William R., O22163.
Reynolds, Maurice J., O43793.
Reynolds, Norman G., O32099.
Rice, John A., O43635.
Richardson, James D., O21761.
Richmond. Jack B., O43519.
Riggs, Dan E., O52285.
Rippert, Jacob K., O22115.
Roberts, James F., O21920.
Robideaux, Robert J., O32066.

Robinette, Albert L. O21892.
Roder, Charles C., O43664.
Roe, Theodore W., O52205.
Rogers, James LeR., O22076.
Rollins, Albert F., O21823.
Rolph, Herbert F., O32091.
Ronan, Charles E., O43750.
Roosa, James A., O22138.
Rose, Ralph E., O32079.
Routledge, Rodham C., O40143.
Royce, Philip M., O21814.
Rundquist, Eric A., O43843.
Rutledge, Hugh M., O32201.
Ryneska, Joseph F., O32017.
Saffold, Eugene, O43660.
St. Clair, Howard B., O22017.
Salada, Reuben N., O32261.
Sandell, Bertil B., O32153.
Sapp, John D., O32109.
Saxe, Robert K., O43790.
Schellman, Robert H., O22002.
Schiltz, Howard F., O38956.
Schmidt, Herman A., O52322.
Scholl, William P. Jr., O32281.
Schoonover, James F., O32304.
Schrader, John R., Jr., O21818.
Schroeder, Edgar W., O22166.
Schwenk, James T. L., O22106.
Scott, Emmett G., O43760.
Scott, John B., O32213.
Scott, Kenneth L., O22121.
Scott, Lionel E., O32046.
Scott, Robert S., O43712.
Scroggs, John P., O21863.
Seaburn, Eugene T., O32314.
Seaver, Philip R., O21916.
Seekins, Earl I., O32362.
Seifert, Raymond A., O52253.
Serrem, Edward MacD., O22090.
Shanley, Thomas J. B., O21828.
Sharp, Hobert W., O43678.
Sharpe, Harold H., O43682.
Shepard, Claude L., Jr., O21931.
Shepherd, James McM., O21868.
Showalter, Wilbur E., O21794.
Shultz, Vester M., O21974.
Simon, Lincoln A., O21961.
Simpson, Donald M., O21986.
Sinclair, Lachlan M., O32369.
Skillman, Charles S., O38989.
Slad, Harry A., O32088.
Slimp, Jack B., O43608.
Slover, Robert H., O43638.
Small, Arthur C., O52214.
Smith, Byron S., O43860.
Smith, Charles B., O22113.
Smith, David C., Jr., O43394.
Smith, Edward P., O22063.
Smith, Francis J., Jr., O43826.
Smith, Harry T., O22001.
Smith, James W., O32128.
Smith, Matthew C., O22038.
Smith, Richard S., O32305.
Smith, Woods B., O43433.
Solomon, Edward M., O32351.
Sory, Carl G., O43670.
Specht, James T., Jr., O32321.
Spiedel, Robert C., Jr., O32044.
Spragins, Robert B., O22080.
Stahler, Charles L., O32197.
Staley, Mortimer R., O43620.
Stanford, William A., O43808.
Staver, Robert LeR., O43650.
Steckla, Paul R., O32366.
Stegall, Oscar, Jr., O32014.
Stoddard, Ayres W., O43652.
Stotlar, William G., O43662.
Studer, Robert W., O21786.
Sullivan, Robert E., O43745.
Sullivan, William B., O20352.
Sutton, Alexander G., Jr., O43663.
Swett, Daniel H., O38984.
Taranto, Salvador F., O40372.
Taylor, Livingston N., Jr., O21853.
Taylor, Robert R., Jr., O31619.
Teaboldt, Chase R., O32082.
Teeters, Bernard G., O22081.
Tenhagen, Carl B., O43785.
Thomason, Joel F., O21867.
Thompson, Robert M., O43794.
Thrasher, Warren A., O32733.
Tomlin, John W., Jr., O32249.
Trahan, Eugene A., O21967.
Trimble, Aaron U., O43675.
Troiano, Constant A., O22180.
Turner, Ian F., O32318.
Tuttle, Paul V., Jr., O21896.
Twomey, Lawrence A., O32126.
Tyler, John S., O43602.
Ulans, Roman I., O52302.
Urban, John G., O21825.
VanCourt, Lloyd P., O38966.
Vandenberg, Robert E., O38979.
Van Harlingen, William M., Jr., O22016.
Vann, Walter MacR., O21812.
Veale, Joseph E., O21435.
Veatch, John E., O32047.
Vinson, Frank M., Jr., O31990.
Von Benge, Herman H., O32237.
von Rohr, Arthur D., O43774.
Wald, John J., O21804.
Wales, John E., 3d, O40315.
Walker, Jack K., O32225.
Walker, Joel T., O22007.
Walker, John W., O22011.
Wallace, Kenneth W., O32338.
Wallace, Lee, O32065.
Wallace, Milton I., O21467.
Wallach, Marshall, O21977.
Waller, Marvin E., O40294.
Wardner, Wallace C., O52212.
Ware, Lawrence R., O52317.
Warren, Shields, Jr., O22103.
Watt, John, O21901.
Way, David W., O32341.
Weaver, Maynard B., O32120.
Webster, Montgomery L., O21751.
Weigand, Jack L., O32315.
Weisemann, Heinz, O21956.
Wells, Walter J., O21736.
Wendorf, Hulen D., O21919.
Wendt, Walter W., O32190.
West, William W., 3d, O21922.
Whipple, John L., O43714.
White, Howard S., O32041.
Whitehead, Arthur K., O43612.
Wickboldt, Walter C., O22047.
Wicker, Karl J., O32033.
Wikoff, William H., O32301.
Wilcox, Leslie R., O32251.
Wild, Herman B., O40333.
Willey, Wilford L., O38961.
Williams, Frank von P., O40334.
Williams, Gardner A., O40301.
Williams, George W., O32077.
Williams, Robert C., O40352.
Williams, Robert C., Jr., O22091.
Williams, Robert M., O21801.
Williams, Walter H., O38967.
Wills, Lloyd E., O32060.
Wilson, Franklin L., O32350.
Wilson, Harold G., O32370.
Wilson, Jasper J., O21829.
Wilson, Lawrence M., O38978.
Wilson, Paul F., O38971.
Wilson, Weldon W., O32054.
Wilson, Woodrow W., O21755.
Winegar, Walter L., O21764.
Winton, George P. Jr., O21819.
Wisdom, Wiley B., Jr., O21985.
Witte, Carl G., O32303.
Witter, Vincent M., O32172.
Wohlfeil, Carl H., O21907.
Wolfe, Richard D., O21743.
Wolfson, Jack D., O40307.
Wood, Benjamin F., O32001.
Wood, Oliver E., O21998.
Woodrow, Charles E., O32011.
Wright, Frederick S., Jr., O21328.
Wyatt, William L., O32310.
Yarnall, Kenneth L., O21864.
Young, Robert W., O31891.
Yow, John W., O32361.
Zeoli, Richard F., O32345.
Zitzer, Frederick, O21444.

To be lieutenant colonels, chaplains

Ames, Kenneth L., O30864.
Anderson, Wilber K., O43126.
Chapdelaine, Albert J., O51956.
Heuer, Herman H., O30895.
Hundley, Maury, Jr., O26424.
Jungfer, Richard W., Jr., O25850.
Kendall, Rex S., O43123.
Knight, Lonnie W., O30885.
Lock, Gregory J., O51957.
Marsh, Arthur H., O26441.
Murphy, Charles J., O30879.
Rhea, John I., O43117.
Schliesser, Luther G. H., O40099.
Sparks, John W., O30900.

To be lieutenant colonels, Women's Army Corps

Elliott, Robin, L64.
Lyons, Catherine J., L73.
Miller, Edna R., L38.
Ochoa, Lois W., L63.
Rutledge, Elizabeth A., L59.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Bauer, Albert J., O25839.
Bauer, Frank L., O26430.
Beckjord, Philip R., O31051.
Bell, James A., O26452.
Bell, Robert F., O63470.
Bernucci, Robert J., O63148.
Blair, Joseph R., O52007.
Bogosian, Armen, O62895.
Brackett, Morris E., O25162.
Brennan, John J., O31150.
Brown, William J., O24315.
Buchanan, Arren C., Jr., O63709.
Campbell, Donald, O31122.
Cavendar, Savino W., O31005.
Christianson, Charles S., O56824.
Collins, William A., Jr., O58178.
Cooch, Joseph W., O63707.
Cressler, John C., O25157.
Dailey, Jeremiah A., O58242.
Dein, Harry L., O58752.
Dunnington, William G., O61059.
Eaker, Alan B., O43146.
Edwards, Walton M., O24377.
Evans, Jon P., O52010.
Finch, Charles S., Jr., O61169.
Flinter, Marcus H., O61168.
Francis, Donald J., O59423.
Giesecke, Carl G., O63469.
Goldstein, Joseph D., O62894.
Gonzalez-Rodriguez, Juan, O58014.
Gronbeck, Christian, Jr., O26470.
Harris, John F., O58751.
Hoeffler, Hugh B., O51983.
Hoffman, Charles W., Jr., O58243.
Hollingsworth, Charles E., O58075.
Hornisher, Charles J., O26461.
Hume, Wayne S., O59422.
Jennings, Hal B., Jr., O26995.
Jesurun, Harold M., O26439.
Kiehl, Paul V., O26397.
King, Everett G., O61170.
Lanard, Francis W., O25155.
Lane, Thomas H., O51992.
Lull, George F., Jr., O31114.
MacMillan, Karl D., O63822.
Maret, Raymond, O63666.
Markowitz, Isidor, O59511.
McNerney, Jules J., O26453.
Meyer, Jules O., O60014.
Miller, Sidney, O60015.
Montgomery, Albert E., O57698.
Moore, Bernard J., O58685.
Moring, John B., O25424.
Mulholland, Richard F., O31124.
Neeseman, Arthur C., O57816.
Neiman, Watson E., O31072.
Noel, Philip J., Jr., O25164.
Opsahl, Harold E., O61057.
Orr, Kenneth D., O31042.
Perlmutter, Nick, O60731.
Pfeffer, John F., O26468.
Pickhardt, Woodrow L., O39497.
Plum, John B., O61929.
Psaki, Raoul C., Jr., O26467.
Ransom, Charles H., O25841.
Ratcliffe, Harold E., O56840.
Rogers, Frank B., O26466.
Rogers, James T., O58074.
Roque, Francisco T., O63704.
Sandifer, Samuel H., O25158.
Schrader, Paul J., O62897.
Scoles, Peter S., O63705.
Smith, Max L., O38853.
Sprinz, Helmuth, O30919.

Stalk, Theodore, O63208.
Steele, Lowell R., O25167.
Steer, Arthur, O57815.
Stein, William, O63775.
Stokes, Robert C., O57887.
Sumner, John W., Jr., O31133.
Tackett, Orville H., O58683.
Tegtmeyer, Charles E., O63706.
Tenery, John H., O43172.
Thalmann, William G., Jr., O24303.
Throm, Urban L., 2d, O26465.
Tillotson, James K., O52001.
Timmerman, Frederick W., O63210.
Travis, LeRoy O., O24368.
Twineham, Walter C., O24635.
Vaughan, Sanford M., O60732.
Vita, Frank J., O59664.
Vogel, Edward H., Jr., O24321.
Wallace, John K., 2d, O31131.
Weeks, Bertram A., O26368.
Whiteley, Edward J., O24627.
Wilson, William J., Jr., O57701.
Ziperman, H. Haskell, O63149.
Zuelzer, Wilhelm A., O60730.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Boudreaux, Raymond E., O23344.
Brown, Pearson W., O23610.
Chase, Edward D., O30936.
Chipps, James E., O22743.
Garner, James R., O30933.
Hazard, David C., O24335.
Lister, Franklin S., O22747.
Madden, Raymond H., O30950.
Montgomery, Lee E., O30958.
Moser, Ernest H., O30960.
Ogle, Merle W., O22261.
Powers, Walter J., O24369.
Ramage, Chester K., O23348.
Snyder, Harry G., O38854.
Tornstrom, Clifford H., O43138.
Walsh, Robert L., O23677.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Christensen, Nels F., O40100.
Crawford, James P., O30906.
Gollehon, Charles W., O30918.
Hasson, David S., O22884.
Sibert, Herbert F., O30922.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Harry J., O43191.
Andersen, Herman S., O31265.
Anderson, Edward J., Jr., O31256.
Antley, Hampton L., O31107.
Austin, Paul F., O43213.
Baker, Thomas E., O31244.
Blythe, Vernon E., O40133.
Brandt, Jerome N., O31245.
Burns, John E., O31205.
Clary, John J., O31108.
Correll, Walter D., O40122.
Covey, William T., O31100.
Cummings, Harold L., O31194.
Curtis, George B., O31129.
Czaja, Rudolph P., O31267.
Darling, James O., O31271.
Davis, Chester H., O31182.
Egger, Floyd C., O52065.
Foster, Ivan M., O31215.
Freeman, Richard R., O56189.
Grove, Lee A., O56187.
Gruver, George A., O31207.
Hack, Vincent I., O43206.
Hampton, Wade F., O43190.
Hitchings, Donald L., O52081.
Homs, Jose M., O31249.
Houser, Jack, O31263.
Ingram, James L., O31201.
Irving, Glenn C., O43197.
James, Willard W., O31167.
Johnston, George W., O31184.
Jones, Gordon A., O31090.
Kegerreis, John B., O31242.
La Fors, Claud D., O21704.
LeMoon, Ralph G., O31264.
Lewis, Converse R., Jr., O43203.
McAlpine, Arthur R., O56188.
McCaslin, Kermit J., O31096.
McIntyre, Edward J., O31152.
Molyneaux, Harold G., O56193.
Montague, Ernest K., O56890.
Moore, Arlice J., O31154.
Mudgett, Louis E., O31069.
Nedds, Ivan L., O31268.
Nibbelink, Arion B., O31246.
Nicolary, Carl W., O31226.
Oettinger, Vernon S., O31262.
Peake, Ben F., O31168.
Peterson, Emmett L., O31138.
Ransom, John P., O31140.
Rawlins, William A., O31258.
Roerig, Richard N., O43180.
Rustigian, Barj A., O31068.
Shealey, Percy R., O31164.
Sheridan, John W., O43156.
Smith, Marlo E., O56924.
Stack, Andrew J., O31126.
Steed, Oliver H., O43177.
Strode, Alfred C., O40129.
Sweet, Fred W., Jr., O31266.
Taro, Alfred L., O56882.
Tatch, David, O31116.
Taylor, Victor B., O40130.
Vire, Howard F., O56923.
Wiley, Irving B., O31132.
Wilkin, Wendell R., O52080.
Wright, Elwood M., O31192.
Yates, Virgil T., O52069.

To be majors

Aaron, Harold R., O26207.
Abernathy, William C., O37308.
Adams, Dwight L., O36323.
Adams, Harold D., O37281.
Adie, John R., O47634.
Agers, Robert D., O40905.
Albright, Charles R., O36502.
Aleveras, James A., O25835.
Alexander, George L., O26021.
Alfano, Charles F., O25640.
Ancker, Jack P., O37217.
Anders, Charles T., O36679.
Anderson, Edward G., Jr., O36391.
Anderson, Gordon V., O47345.
Anderson, John V., O36984.
Anderson, Jonathan W., Jr., O25820.
Anderson, Ralph C., O54269.
Anderson, Ralph W., O36305.
Antonioli, Virginio L., O25663.
Aquilina, Raymond F., O36782.
Archer, Theodore W., O48383.
Ardery, Edward R., O25503.
Armstrong, John W., O25686.
Arn, Robert M., O48366.
Arnold, William E., Jr., O36388.
Arthur, Robert E., O40963.
Ash, Laurence W., O54165.
Askey, Robert F., O47707.
Atkinson, Quintus C., O26317.
Aurit, Samuel, O47925.
Austin, George A., Jr., O25420.
Avery, Philip S., O36241.
Baatz, David C., O41048.
Baber, Ben L., O25567.
Baden, Robert E., O25671.
Baen, Spencer R., O27005.
Balcer, Charles I., O36519.
Baldwin, Clarke T., Jr., O26037.
Baltes, Paul A., O39285.
Bammer, Wyndham H., O36903.
Barber, Henry A., 3d, O25568.
Barber, Robert K., O36728.
Barickman, Robert J., O25932.
Barkovich, Anthony, O54530.
Barner, John H., O36700.
Barnhart, Frank H., Jr., O36516.
Barraclough, Donald F., O36996.
Barrett, Laurence O., O36652.
Barrett, Robert F., Jr., O37161.
Barrios, Willie W. J., O36748.
Bass, Roy H., Jr., O39311.
Bates, James M., O36565.
Batson, Richard T., O25434.
Baughman, Claude G., O37173.
Beach, John B., O25978.
Beem, Samuel M., O54685.
Beightler, Robert S., Jr., O25642.
Bell, Benjamin C., O48708.
Bell, John C., O25937.
Bellino, Joe O., Jr., O41047.
Bennett, Edward E., O25463.
Bennett, Ralph O., O36860.
Benson, Charles E., O26263.
Benson, Joseph W., O25601.
Berenzweig, Marvin J., O25811.
Berger, Casper, O41052.
Berte, Samuel C., O48711.
Bertram, Roger A., O25508.
Betts, George, O26204.
Betts, James A., O25891.
Bibby, William L., O26276.
Bielecki, Edward J., O25465.
Bisset, David A., Jr., O47274.
Bixby, Willis W., O36104.
Black, Garland C., Jr., O26106.
Black, Joseph E., O39268.
Blackwell, John L., O36378.
Blair, John D., 3d, O37272.
Blake, Robert T., O25837.
Blakely, Larry A., O36426.
Blanchett, Leo M., Jr., O25585.
Blatt, Raymond C., Jr., O26186.
Bliss, Arthur McC., O36852.
Bloecker, Victor, Jr., O41058.
Blount, LeVerne E., O25939.
Blum, Charles K., O36898.
Blume, Robert F., O37024.
Boatner, Mark M., 3d, O26248.
Bockoven, Frederic T., O37354.
Bogan, Lucian D., Jr., O25810.
Boller, Quellen D., O26050.
Bolling, Alexander R., Jr., O26066.
Bond, John B., O26077.
Botts, Luther B., O36752.
Bowden, Henry C., Jr., O47536.
Boyd, William H., O37205.
Boyea, Gerald E., O37258.
Boyer, Richard J., O37202.
Boyle, Harry F., O39258.
Boyle, Joseph F., O26347.
Brabson, William H., Jr., O26069.
Brady, John S., O26064.
Brandt, Roland A., O25901.
Branson, Roy E., O37149.
Branton, Harold M., O37345.
Bray, Edward, O48259.
Breitenbach, Frank P., O26365.
Bressler, Howard E., O40967.
Brier, John K., O26185.
Brigham, Robert L., O37326.
Bright, Charles W., O37159.
Brill, Heber C., O26162.
Brindley, Arthur F., O36504.
Brinson, Arthur, O47740.
Briscoe, William T., O54688.
Britt, Robert C., O54425.
Brooks, Waldo W., Jr., O54679.
Brown, George H., O48840.
Brown, Luther E., O27054.
Brown, Percy D., Jr., O37255.
Brown, Stephen O., O26105.
Bryant, Harold F., O36886.
Bryant, Robert E., O54484.
Buchanan, Earl W., O36352.
Buchanan, Russell B., Jr., O37291.
Buell, Kenneth E., O25772.
Buelow, Wallace R., O36319.
Bugg, George G., O26175.
Bullard, Robert L., 3d, O25774.
Burdett, Allen M., Jr., O26048.
Burgasser, Francis X., O37061.
Burlin, Robert B., O25484.
Burr, Charles H., Jr., O25758.
Burr, Edward, 2d, O26009.
Burrows, Robert E., Jr., O25918.
Burt, William A., O36940.
Buth, William H., O54312.
Butler, Farley P., Sr., O39321.
Butler, James W., O54157.
Butler, John L., O40980.
Butterfield, John L., O26194.
Buyers, John F., O25862.
Buzalski, Ernest A., O25906.
Byrne, Robert G., O36854.
Byrnes, Laurence G., O54163.
Bzdek, Beverly M., O39269.
Cabassa, Jaime L., O48569.
Cain, James W., O26208.
Calnan, William M., O26120.
Calvert, Ross H., Jr., O47933.
Camp, Eugene C., O37072.
Campbell, George T., Jr., O26084.
Campbell, Robert H., O26074.
Canning, Austin J., Jr., O26277.

Cantlay, George G., Jr., O25979.
Caple, Dayton F., O49054.
Carberry, Edmund J., O25565.
Carey, Robert E., O47519.
Carroll, Benjamin L., O37321.
Carter, Hamlet R., Jr., O26134.
Carter, William C., O54761.
Carter, William C., Jr., O37290.
Casey, Edgar L., O36324.
Cawthra, James H., O36981.
Challen, Henry G., O40902.
Chance, Francis A., Jr., O36784.
Changaris, James S., O25819.
Chapin, Neil McK., O55006.
Chase, David M., O26212.
Chase, James E., O47642.
Chaufty, Joseph V., O25969.
Chesebro, John S., O47284.
Chessnoe, Michael, O48968.
Chmar, Paul, O37640.
Christy, James V., O25909.
Churchwell, Alvin McL., O41055.
Clark, Howard L., O40928.
Clark, Lyman H., O37019.
Clark, Robert W., O26032.
Clark, William K., O41001.
Cleary, Edward R., O26304.
Cleary, Louis X., O54965.
Cleveland, Robert E., O36664.
Clifford, Richard W., O36761.
Cline, Charles L., O36543.
Clyde, Gordon F., O47271.
Coady, Gerald G., O54223.
Cobb, James J., O25629.
Cobb, John H., Jr., O26233.
Cobey, Earl J., O54909.
Cochran, Collins L., O40964.
Cochran, John H., Jr., O54787.
Cochran, John H., Jr., O26115.
Coffman, Howard B., Jr., O25941.
Cole, Caleb A., O26171.
Cole, Charles B., Jr., O39304.
Collins, John W., 3d., O26079.
Conard, David B., O25885.
Conarty, Roger L., O26067.
Conmy, Joseph B., Jr., O25645.
Connolly, George I., Jr., O36666.
Conway, Lewis W., O37021.
Cook, Robert M., O25690.
Cook, Walter H., Jr., O25466.
Cool, William C., O54108.
Coonly, William J., Jr., O36724.
Cosgrove, Gerard V., O25683.
Cover, William W., O26287.
Cox, Charles T., O36699.
Cox, Emmett W., Jr., O37200.
Crane, Hal P., Jr., O54794.
Creighton, James R., O36498.
Croonquist, Arvid P., Jr., O25639.
Crowe, Robert E., O47805.
Cullinane, Daniel B., Jr., O26145.
Cumbie, Walter P., O54718.
Cunningham, Donald H., O36799
Cunningham, Hubert S., O39303.
Cunningham, Robert K., O37120.
Curry, James A., Jr., O54865.
Curtin, Paul J., O26361.
Curtis, Elbert R., O36547.
Curtis, Wesley J., O25792.
Dadisman, Chester E., O36497.
Daems, Leonard R., Jr., O47270.
Dakin, Myron H., O25733.
Daley, Edward J., O36418.
Danforth, Robert D., O26081.
Darden, James R., O26142.
Davenport, Robert J., O26089.
Davidson, Paul W., O54119.
Davidson, Shirley, O37122.
Davis, Claiborne W., Jr., O37001.
Davis, Mike B., O26188.
Davis, Paul A., Jr., O36887.
Davis, Paul W., O36375.
Davis, Robert LeV., O25661.
Davis, Young J., O47572.
Deadwyler, William H., Jr., O36298.
Deaver, John Q., O54765.
DeBow, Duane L., O40970.
DeBrocke, William P., O25986.
deCamp, John T., Jr., O26040.
Deekle, William C., Jr., O26310.
DeGiovanni, Joseph I., O36866.
Dehner, Vernon E., O37147.
Del Zoppo, Roger A., O39243.
Dennison, Robert C., Jr., O49010.
Des Jarlais, Robert W., O47377.
Dettmar, Henry G., O37117.
Dickinson, Charles W., O26033.
Dickson, Jean H., O36606.
Dingwall, Allan G., Jr., O37249.
Dirkes, Francis J., O25887.
Doerfler, Eugene A., O37211.
Dollard, Edmund J., O47369.
Donahue, Franklyn W., O41071.
Donahue, Patrick H., O34885.
Donaldson, Thomas Q., O25480.
Donnelly, Ross I., O36533.
Donovan, Charles W., O36500.
Doran, Edward A., O25782.
Dornacker, Charles H., O36370.
Dowell, Richard W., O39225.
Dozier, William T., O48008.
Drinkard, Harry V., O40888.
Drum, Vernon B., O39318.
Duffy, Jack W., O37349.
Duke, Robert C., O36697.
Duke, Thomas A., Jr., O37062.
Dunn, James E., O36137.
Dunstan, Henry V., O40953.
Dunwoody, Harold H., O26197.
Durbon, Roy C., O37219.
Duvall, Clifford P., O39270.
Dwan, Robert D., O26052.
Dworak, John L., O25757.
Dyke, Harold H., Jr., O53334.
Dysinger, William C., O54976.
Eager, George, Jr., O36766.
Earnest, Clyde T., O25923.
Eastham, Warren C., O37025.
Ebrey, Henry J., Jr., O25627.
Eddy, George G., Jr., O54991.
Edrington, Bethell, O26329.
Eisler, Walter J., O36919.
Ellingsworth, James B., Jr., O47793.
Elliott, Howard D., O25445.
Elliott, Mayo J., O26179.
Erdman, George W., O37350.
Ernst, Russell W., O37256.
Erskine, Jasper N., O36768.
Evans, Edward J., O37374.
Ewald, William, O36949.
Falck, William D., O25893.
Farley, Clare F., O25915.
Farnsworth, Frank A., O37216.
Faust, Edmond L., Jr., O25450.
Ferrell, Robert M., O53808.
Field, Kenneth S., O36932.
Files, Vernon, O37086.
Finlayson, Harold C., O41028.
Finney, Perry S., Jr., O48263.
Fischgrund, Harold S., O37183.
Fishback, Jesse LeR., O25858.
Fiss, Robert E., O25511.
Flanagan, John J., O47734.
Flatley, Thomas W., O25638.
Fleury, Vernon G., O48249.
Flint, Robert P., O40921.
Fox, George F., O36234.
Fox, Ogden R., O47943.
Fraleigh, Charles S., Jr., O36862.
Francisco, Louis S., O26280.
Frank, Fred J., O54078.
Frankenstein, Leonard S., O54172.
Franklin, Victor A., O25658.
Fraser, Bruce H., O37276.
Frauenheim, Walter G., Jr., O48978.
Frazier, Frank W., O37085.
Frederick, Floyd, O36243.
Fredericks, Edgar J., O26302.
Fredericks, John L., O47721.
Freer, Arthur L., O25451.
Freestone, James E., O36937.
French, Jack S., O48380.
Fritz, William H., O25620.
Fromme, Robert J., O39246.
Fry, Ernest M., O48666.
Fuller, Ellis LeR., O37366.
Fuller, Hiram G., O25936.
Fulmer, John M., O47846.
Fulton, William B., O25385.
Gardner, Ralph V., O39236.
Garten, Melvin, O48990.
Gean, Kirby A., O25588.
Geaney, Edward J., Jr., O26328.
Geelan, William R., O40963.
Gehring, Frederick R., O36462.
Gibbons, Murray F., Jr., O54398.
Gibson, James McK., O48730.
Giffin, Stewart S., Jr., O26342.
Gilbert, Harold N., Jr., O37307.
Gilbert, Stanley K., O47926.
Giles, Warren A., O37874.
Gingrich, Harold W., O26076.
Glasgow, William M., Jr., O25905.
Glendening, James K., O26176.
Glick, John R., O48877.
Glickson, Solomon P., O54079.
Glisson, Roy, Jr., O37078.
Glotzbach, Edgar N., O27011.
Goggans, Robert, O49051.
Gohmert, Roland L., Jr., O35402.
Goldenthal, Mitchel, O25482.
Goodlett, John G., Jr., O54600.
Goodman, Glenn W., O54171.
Goodman, Jess L., O47795.
Gordy, Stephen E., O26125.
Gorman, Vincent J., O41019.
Gossett, Henry M., O36941.
Gottliebsen, Richard E., O48309.
Gould, George H., O55058.
Grace, Arthur B., Jr., O25498.
Grady, Ronan C., Jr., O25985.
Gray, Thomas E., O47851.
Green, George E., O40983.
Greene, James F., Jr., O25900.
Greenlief, Dale R., O36476.
Greenwalt, William J., O25998.
Greiner, Robert J., O54034.
Grice, Thorpe C., O26326.
Griess, Thomas E., O25533.
Griffin, Bobbie A., O25938.
Grimm, Henry F., Jr., O25519.
Grissom, Thomas C., Jr., O46263.
Groom, Kenneth G., O54786.
Grunzweig, Nicholas J., O47845.
Hahn, William R., O25566.
Hakala, Robert W., O48852.
Haley, Norman R., O36911.
Hall, Alphus W., O54490.
Hall, Chester A., Jr., O48018.
Hall, Claude H., O47794.
Hall, Frederick W., O47574.
Hallock, Richard R., O37367.
Hamblen, Archelaus L., Jr., O26187.
Hanchey, Charles W., O36889.
Hand, Robert, O36415.
Handley, George E., Jr., O37294.
Hanifen, Thomas J., O40926.
Harding, Leslie B., O25512.
Hardy, Leslie B., O26003.
Harrigan, William F., O36438.
Harris, Elva, O36714.
Harth, John F., O36997.
Hash, William A., O36625.
Hastie, William L., O54089.
Hatch, Robert F., O54234.
Hawkins, Wallace E., O40969.
Hawthorne, Frank, O54194.
Hayes, Leo V., O26213.
Hayes, Robert L., O41016.
Hazel, Charles E., O39260.
Head, Harold S., O26272.
Healy, John D., Jr., O25715.
Hecker, Warren R., O26292.
Helms, Kenneth R., O37023.
Helsley, Llewellyn S., O36900.
Heltzel, Charles L., O25746.
Henderson, Chester T., O39274.
Henderson, Tony S., O39279.
Henry, Gregg, O25574.
Hensel, William E., O25531.
Henson, Ira C., Jr., O36423.
Herold, John W., O36548.
Herres, Fred W., Jr., O25996.
Herres, Harry L., O41049.
Hershey, Charles G., Jr., O37364.
Hevener, James W., O37121.
Hiatt, Charles R., O37099.
Hickman, Charles T., O47948.
Higgins, James L., O36306.
Higgins, Joseph P., O48665.
Hill, David A., Jr., O54124.
Hill, Ralph J., O26127.
Hochella, Michael F., O36480.

Hoffman, Ralph W., O36786.
Hofmann, Ralph M., O25495.
Hogan, James H., O37144.
Holder, Leonard D., O37267.
Holland, William E., Jr., O48873.
Holman, Jefferson T., O36987.
Holmes, Robert M., O26110.
Holt, John B., Jr., O48996.
Hood, Burton F., Jr., O25729.
Hoplin, Herman P., O36975.
Horton, Paul N., O36254.
Hubert, Enrique J., O36518.
Huck, Terence W., O36513.
Huddleston, James McC., O25554.
Huggins, Lloyd G., O36139.
Hughes, Algin J., O25630.
Hughes, Clyde E., O48881.
Hughes, John P. M., O47232.
Humphrey, Charles Van-B., O40945.
Hunnicut, John O., Jr., O36380.
Hunt, George T., O36777.
Hunt, Herman T., Jr., O26053.
Hunter, William L., O49016.
Hutchin, Walter J., O25916.
Hyde, John F., O36905.
Hyle, Archie R., O37271.
Hymers, Charles S., O48228.
Ingle, Paul T., O37329.
Ingwersen, Glenn P., O25993.
Inman, Lloyd J., O36274.
Ippolito, Charles J., O37208.
Ireland, Thornton E., O37325.
Irving, John H., Jr., O27004.
Isaacs, Alvin C., O48816.
Ivan, Gabriel A., O25865.
Jackson, Joseph J., O39265.
Jackson, Kenneth E., O36349.
Jalbert, Donald J., O26309.
James, Lee B., O25619.
James, Stanley L., Jr., O25833.
Jeffries, John H., O36427.
Jemmott, Arthur H., Jr., O37043.
Johnson, Earle A., Jr., O26211.
Johnson, James M., O54002.
Johnson, John F., O25538.
Johnston, Thomas M., O25942.
Johnston, William R., O47363.
Jones, Alan W., Jr., O25868.
Jones, Charles M., Jr., O25890.
Jones, Dearl F., O48423.
Jones, Harry L., Jr., O48397.
Jones, Ralph K., O26123.
Jones, Russell G., O37213.
Jones, William M., O37209.
Jordan, Edward E., O54028.
Joyner, Archie B., Jr., O54001.
Kajencki, Francis C., O25582.
Kapp, Ronald A., O37070.
Karnes, Howard L., O36515.
Karrick, Samuel N., Jr., O25446.
Kasserman, Harold W., O48070.
Katz, Sidney, O26327.
Kauffman, Eldeen H., O39257.
Kaufmann, Paul R., O36377.
Keating, William J., O36503.
Keene, Leonard L., Jr., O36529.
Kellogg, Dimitri A., O25433.
Kelly, John J., Jr., O25869.
Kelly, Randall, O47876.
Kemp, Herbert E., O25742.
Kendall, Maurice W., O27003.
Kengle, Lansford F., O25975.
Kennedy, Arthur H., O39300.
Kennedy, Richard T., O48390.
Kennedy, Stanley Y., Jr., O37179.
Kennedy, William M., O36640.
Keown, James LeR., O36528.
Kerr, Gerald L., Jr., O41033.
Key, Herbert L., Jr., O54858.
Kidd, William T., O48216.
Kidder, James D., O26227.
Kinnes, Ralph, O36800.
Kirchner, Alfred W., O36559.
Kissam, Richard V., Jr., O36339.
Kittrell, William S., O49082.
Klein, Donald A., O36668.
Klekas, Louis J., O54883.
Klie, Harry K., O47792.
Koch, Bruce C., O25947.
Koenig, William A., Jr., O40906.
Kolb, James T., O47708.
Kolesar, Armand M., O36783.
Kranc, Robert T., O36667.
Kreml, Edward A., O26283.
Krieger, Mervin, O49000.
Kruger, Richard O., O36575.
Kuffner, John E., O25602.
La Chaussee, Charles E., O37164.
Lacouture, Arthur J., Jr., O26240.
Ladner, Gerard J., O37143.
Landrum, Eugene M., Jr., O55032.
Lanen, William J., O36907.
Langland, Lawrence Q., O39238.
Langley, Warren G., O55029.
Langstaff, James D., O26314.
Langston, Alex T., Jr., O55069.
La Patka, Thomas M., O36646.
Larned, Royce P., O55108.
Larsen, Gerald E., O36893.
Laughlin, Virgil V., O41059.
Leach, James H., O48718.
Leach, Ross E., O54970.
Lee, Oscar W., Jr., O36670.
LeFebvre, Henry E., O36358.
Leister, Albert F., Jr., O36201.
Levasseur, Armand R., O47280.
Lewis, Herbert S., O25734.
Lewis, Norman F., O48701
Light, Morgan C., O36773.
Lindsey, Morris L., O40935.
Lingan, William J., O48851.
Lingner, Frederick A., O36387.
Linton, William C., Jr., O26140.
Lochrie, Wilmer R., O36936.
Lorck, Horace C., O36359.
Losten, Steven W., O48412.
Lothrop, James N., Jr., O26057.
Loughman, Jack P. O26282.
Loughran, Joseph P., O37167.
Lovell, Herbert R., O39253.
Lowe, Elward W., O54717.
Lowe, Horace A., Jr., O36857.
Lucas, John P., Jr., O26159.
Lueck, William J., Jr., O36716.
Lundberg, George B., O25679.
Lundelius, Maurice W., O54864.
Lundy, Irvin M., O41000.
Lutz, Edwin M., O36755.
Lutz, George A., O37296.
Lutz, William D., O26018.
Lytle, James R., O48021.
MacArthur, John E., O40885.
MacDonald, Augustine G., O36989.
MacFarlane, William G., O36948.
Magathan, Wallace C., Jr., O25861.
Maguire, Robert F., O37528.
Mahan, James J., Jr., O48988.
Mallory, Barton J., O25764.
Malone, William F., O26044.
Marks, Sidney M., O36977.
Marrero, John, O54297.
Martak, Clyde J., O54719.
Martin, L. D. Kirkwood, O37177.
Martin, Lawrence E., Jr., O47622.
Marts, Harry H., O37186.
Masenga, Robert C., O54101.
Mathe, Robert E., O25878.
Mattox, Robert H., Jr., O26316.
May, Marion H., O25576.
Mazzucchi, Reno A., O36208.
McArtor, William S., O47849.
McBane, Robert B., O48890.
McBride, Robert B., 3d, O37277.
McCabe, Edward F., O25926.
McCabe, John T., O37126.
McCall, Ray N., O37381.
McCanna, Robert L., O26047.
McCarthy, Max R., O36249.
McCauley, Robert H., O36756.
McClain, Ralph E., O36661.
McCoy, Richard L., O36950.
McCoy, Robert G., O41003.
McCrory, Raymond J., Jr. O37146.
McCutchen, Roy M., Jr., O54575.
McDermott, William J., Jr., O48180.
McDowell, Charles T., O37309.
McDowell, Robert B., O25980.
McElwee, Frank D., O25409.
McGee, Dale F., Jr., O26253.
McGinnis, Norris D., O37232.
McGowan, John D., O25759.
McGuigan, William J., O36993.
McGurk, Donald J., O48078.
McKenzie, William H., 3d, O25929.
McKinney, Hugh L., O36986.
Mc.Laughlin, Charles M., Jr., O37128.
McLendon, George P., O37133.
McLeod, Charles A., O27047.
McLeod, William E., O36374.
McMahan, Jack E., O37300.
McManus, Vincent J., O36334.
McMillan, William C., O54971.
McNary, Quentin L., O37212.
Mehrtens, Donald J., O25877.
Merrick, Thomas L., O37132.
Metts, Albert C., Jr., O26091.
Meyer, Richard H., O25872.
Michaelson, Franklyn J., O48532.
Milburn, Earl B., O48727.
Miley, William M., Jr., O37077.
Miller, James C., Jr., O25961.
Miller, Millard J., O47804.
Miller, Robert E., O54264.
Miller, Robert E., O37356.
Millhouse, Felix G., O36609.
Milligan, Jack A., O54586.
Milliken, William S., O41017.
Milmore, Charles W., O26045.
Milton, Ronald A., O54957.
Minckler, Rex D., O25581.
Mitchell, Arthur F., O36489.
Mitchell, John R., O25665.
Mitchell, Joseph W., Jr., O36351.
Mitchell, Joseph A., O48753.
Mitro, Michael P., O54862.
Moe, George R., O26022.
Moneyhun, Joseph A., O48065.
Moore, Clayton H., Jr., O48625.
Moore, Howard E., O25816.
Moore, Robert D., O36329.
Moore, Robert F., O36304.
Moore, Roy, Jr., O37063.
Moore, Thomas N., O37295.
Morgan, Henry G., Jr., O26305.
Morley, Harry C., O37341.
Morris, John W., O25992.
Moses, James R., O41035.
Moses, John G., Jr., O25528.
Moses, John W., O26170.
Mozingo, Roule C., O26274.
Mulheron, William, Jr., O47283.
Mulligan, Tracy E., Jr., O54309.
Murray, Charles P., Jr., O41057.
Murray, Edward H., O25730.
Murray, Paul, Jr., O36982.
Myers, Frederick W., O54959.
Myers, William R., O25513.
Nash, James H., O26153.
Neafus, Holady C., Jr., O54544.
Neale, William D., O25755.
Nechey, Walter F., O47231.
Neill, Harold A., O26271.
Nelson, Carlton, O47373.
Nelson, Oliver W., O37084.
Nethery, Donald M., O54988.
Nett, Joseph E., O25804.
Nett, Robert B., O41070.
Newberry, Robert H., O39232.
Newman, George E., O26015.
Nichols, George W., O54033.
Nixon, Victor M., O47617.
Nobles, Lloyd E., O36865.
Nolte, Marvin C. O., O36763.
Norris, John J., O25713.
Null, Jack G., O36202.
Nygard, Walter E., O25669.
O'Connor, Joseph F., O36411.
O'Connor, William S., O54316.
O'Donnell, James J., O47982.
O'Halloran, John T., O55106.
Oppenhimer, John S., O36490.
Orphan, Richard C., O26039.
Orsi, Francis J., O36238.
O'Sullivan, Michael N., O37162.
Ott, Edward S., Jr., O25860.
Page, Cecil W., Jr., O25723.
Pardue, Wallace D., O36413.
Parfitt, Harold R., O25914.
Parham, Douglas F., O26226.
Parker, Lester L., O36638.
Parker, Nicholson, O26193.
Pasta, Melvin J., O36713.
Patterson, James A., O36549.

Paul, Richard I., O36814.
Pavick, Pete D., O25699.
Pavy, Laurent D., O26088.
Payne, Otho C., O54764.
Peak, William O., 3d, O26025.
Peeples, Russell C., Jr., O36558.
Pehrson, Norman E., O25912.
Peixotto, James M., O47628.
Penuel, Victor B., Jr., O48015.
Perkins, Del S., O26016.
Perry, Benjamin E., O37328.
Peters, Emanuel P., O41006.
Peters, Kenneth A., O47220.
Peterson, Peter R., Jr., O47806.
Petrie, Glen E., O36827.
Peyer, Gustave A., Jr., O37207.
Pezdirtz, Joseph W., O36779.
Phillips, Henry G., O36383.
Phillips, James W., O26236.
Phillips, Steve F., Jr., O36624.
Pigg, Milton K., O26004.
Pinnell, Samuel W., O25880.
Plett, Robert E., O25924.
Plichta, Frank, O40884.
Plunkett, Hubbard T., Jr., O36991.
Powell, Donald F., O25762.
Prather, Herb D., O36258.
Prince, Altus E., O25714.
Pritchett, Harry H., Jr., O25705.
Proctor, Fred B., O25990.
Pruett, George J., O37054.
Pruett, Lloyd O., O39309.
Prugh, George S., Jr., O54092.
Puckett, Charles D., O26210.
Putnam, George D., O36328.
Quinn, Ray B., O36604.
Raaen, John C., Jr., O25486.
Rader, Robert J., O25676.
Ramsey, Thomas E., O25716.
Rasper, Arthur H., Jr., O26121.
Raub, Stanley C., O36209.
Raulin, Ernest C., Jr., O25793.
Ray, Roger, O26035.
Ray, William J., O26139.
Reberry, Gerald V., O37359.
Reed, Charles S., Jr., O25944.
Reeder, Harry L., Jr., O26214.
Rhea, Frank W., O25876.
Rhoads, Edwin M., O25956.
Riccio, Joseph A., O25737.
Richards, Robert H., O47545.
Richardson, Donald H., O37160.
Richardson, Howard B., O36934.
Richardson, James R., O25491.
Richardson, Warren L., O48271.
Riffe, James L., O54861.
Riles, William L., O36221.
Roach, Harold K., O25626.
Robinson, Reaford L., O36774.
Rockwood, Charles A., O37293.
Roe, Walter L., O26344.
Rogers, Bernard W., O25867.
Rogers, Charles I., O36778.
Rogers, Warren, O25913.
Romanek, Henry, O25911.
Romstedt, Gerhart O., O55056.
Rooker, Robert L., O26155.
Roop, William B., O54199.
Roos, William F., O25982.
Roquemore, Frank U., Jr., O36712.
Ross, James T., Jr., O36931.
Ross, John R., Jr., O25688.
Ross, Raymond H., O36412.
Rothbard, Leonard, O54051.
Rounsaville, Tom J., O36259.
Rowan, John V., Jr., O47374.
Rudziak, Nicholas D., O47988.
Rumpf, Edward J., O26180.
Runte, Walter G., O36525.
Rush, Roger S., O47718.
Russell, Cecil R., O36600.
Russell, John T., Jr., O25721.
Russell, Roger L., Jr., O24689.
Ruyffelaere, Raymond F., O25814.
Sadler, Robert E., O36522.
Saine, Harold J., O26291.
St. John, Adrian, 2d, O25583.
Salter, Max D., O37037.
Sanders, Roy A., O25612.
Sanders, Vernon K., O25476.
Sandlin, William B., Jr., O36406.
Sargent, Frank H., O48462.
Sawyer, Kenneth T., O25957.
Schatz, John P., O26224.
Schnebli, George A., O36639.
Schnelker, Gerald C., O36785.
Schoos, Robert B., O37375.
Schott, John L., Jr., O40901.
Schraeder, Gordon A., O25896.
Schroeder, Henry J., Jr., O26028.
Schumacher, Thomas C., O54290.
Schwalje, John M., O36430.
Scott, James M., O37201.
Scott, Russell F., Jr., O26325.
Scott, Samuel B., Jr., O36312.
Seabrook, George W., 3d, O48225.
Seaman, Harold D., O36616.
Sebesta, Arthur J., O25644.
Seibel, Paul, O36861.
Sembach, Leon, O26007.
Sexton, William E., O48110.
Shadle, William J., Jr., O37262.
Shanahan, James G., O36322.
Sharkey, Neil J., O37299.
Sharp, Hunter L., O36523.
Sharp, Sam H,, O54968.
Sharra, George F., O36891.
Shaw, Charles R., O47789.
Shaw, Franklin P., Jr., O25492.
Shenk, Frank L., O37193.
Sheviak, Frank G., O40878.
Shields, Harry H., Jr., O54994.
Shipstead, Alton M., O26345.
Shoemaker, John O., O54351.
Short, David S., O36603.
Short, James H., O26242.
Shortall, John L., Jr., O25544.
Shultz, John J., Jr., O25550.
Sickler, Robert L., O37231.
Sieber, Harry F., Jr., O54161.
Smiley, Robert F., O48683.
Smith, Chester M., O40993.
Smith, Dale L., O54616.
Smith, Daugherty M., O25717.
Smith, Ellsworth W., O48540.
Smith, Frank B., O25888.
Smith, Gordon L., O26029.
Smith, Horrell H., O36562.
Smith, James F., O37046.
Smith, Orvil T., O37353.
Smith, Vincent P., O36499.
Soler, Eduardo, M., O26020.
Sonstelie, Robert D., O26141.
Spahr, William J., O26177.
Spalding, Basil D., Jr., O26341.
Spann, Frederick C., O25561.
Spiece, Donald C., O25989.
Spiegelberg, Frank J., O54373.
Spiker, Robert C., O35972.
Spratt, James L., O39233.
Sprigg, William H., O36318.
Stabler, Joseph P., O25647.
Stanford, Leslie E., O54587.
Stanley, Felix W., O36428.
Starr, Norman B., O36922.
Staszak, Stanley M., O25960.
Steinbach, Alois L., O48109.
Steinbring, Milton E., O25946.
Stevens, Milton E., O25471.
Stevens, Wilmer B., O37079.
Stiles, Robert B., O27000.
Stockton, John B., O26152.
Stoeckert, George I., O36757.
Stone, Lloyd E., O37138.
Stone, Stephen G., Jr., O47960.
Stowbridge, Robert W., O36501.
Strantz, William R., O54512.
Stroede, Roger A., O49045.
Strong, LeRoy, O48417.
Sullivan, Alden P., O41069.
Sullivan, Leo J., O37027.
Summerall, Robert E., O39314.
Sumner, Robert S., O36867.
Surkamp, Arthur T., O25935.
Surum, Henry, O36478.
Synnott, Donald A., O48542.
Taber, Eugene D., O47959.
Talbot, Max V., Jr., O26322.
Tallerday, Jack, O36346.
Tansey, Hubert E., O26031.
Tauber, Bernard L., O36715.
Taylor, Cloyd V., O47850.
Taylor, Dale W., O36935.
Taylor, Noble E., O40924.
Taylor, Richard I., O36676.
Taylor, Warren L., O26068.
Teague, Jack, O26354.
Tenney, Duane P., O26000.
Therrell, John W., O40899.
Thomas, George, O37081.
Thomas, Jesse R., O36320.
Thomas, Lorres C., O25930.
Thompson, Howard M., O47399.
Thomsen, Frank L., O54615.
Thomson, Arington C., Jr., O54322.
Tillery, George G., O39267.
Tilson, Forrest B., O47769.
Tomlinson, William H., O26333.
Torgersen, Maxwell S., O37083.
Townsend, Delbert L., O41062.
Townsend, Robert T., O48913.
Truex, Ralph J., O25558.
Tucker, William O., Jr., O48880.
Tufts, Henry H., O54270.
Turrou, Edward A., O48222.
Umlauf, Louis B., Jr., O26338.
Underwood, Vernon W., O36204.
VanAuken, Wendell G., Jr., O26269.
Van Laethem, George, O36342.
VanSchoick, Arthur W., Jr., O26017.
Vaughn, Clarke S., O48868.
Veach, Fletcher R., Jr., O26301.
Venzke, Edgar L., O40979.
Vigen, Oscar C., O48256.
Vincent, Donato N., O36674.
Vognild, Alden E., O37080.
Vogt, Blaine O., O54699.
Volk, Karl W., Jr., O54596.
Vordermark, Jonathan S., O25917.
Voso, Edward J., O54117.
Wade, Arthur P., O25666.
Waid, Lewis C., O54314.
Walbridge, John H., O54767.
Waldie, James R., O36347.
Walker, Charles S., O48299.
Walker, J. LeRoy, O37248.
Walker, Mansell A., O54889.
Walker, William J., O36551.
Wallschleger, William L., O48250.
Walrath, Charles F., O36207.
Wardell, Patrick G., O25628.
Washcoe, Wilfred C., O36554.
Waters, Fred B., Jr., O25449.
Waters, James H., O37327.
Waters, William E., O25719.
Watson, George H., O25740.
Watson, Thomas R., O25718.
Watts, James H., O36348.
Webb, Hugh W., O47228.
Webb, Travis E., O36509.
Wechsler, Ben L., O54528.
Weems, Miner L., O40999.
Wehrle, Howard F., 3d, O25454.
Weller, Irwin Van A., O36764.
Wells, Jack D., O48257.
Wells, John A., O36205.
Wells, Sidney L., O36810.
Welsh, William J., Jr., O26339.
Wessmiller, John J., Jr., O54052.
Wesson, Thomas E., O37280.
Westbrook, Robert L., O37049.
Westfall, Clarence R., O26024.
Westmoreland, Raymond M., O36607.
Weyrick, Joseph W., O26294.
Wheeler, John P., Jr., O25824.
White, Arthur B., O54886.
White, John F., O25507.
White, Lee A., O41061.
Whitfield, Harold N., O41032.
Whitworth, Mancil R., O36563.
Wickert, Howard T., O26312.
Wiggins, Edward G., O36457.
Wikan, Walter W., O36512.
Wiley, Harlon R., O37082.
Wilhelm, Leland F., O48723.
Wilhelmy, John F., Jr., O37233.
Wilke, Robert G., O47408.
Wilkinson, Reading, Jr., O26257.
Willcox, Edwin J., O25594.
Williams, Harry O., O37184.
Williams, James E., O48104.
Williams, Louis A., O36161.
Williams, Norman L., O26173.

Williams, Paul R., O36707.
Williams, Richard W., Jr., O47344.
Willig, Lester G., O47419.
Willis, Jean P., O37283.
Wilson, Charles A., Jr., O25907.
Wilson, Gerald R., O36338.
Wilson, John M., O25556.
Wilson, Roy R., O25827.
Wilson, William M., O47016.
Wimert, Paul M., Jr., O48914.
Windsor, Thomas B., O25670.
Winfield, Richard M., Jr., O26117.
Winiarczyk, Andrew W., O47278.
Wolf, Karl E., O26202.
Wolfson, Morton, O48975.
Womer, Richard E., O36623.
Wood, Franklin, O26104.
Wood, John S., Jr., O25655.
Wright, David B., O54276.
Wright, Elam W., Jr., O37214.
Wright, Lucius F., Jr., O25966.
Wright, Raymond J., O36780.
Wuest, Charles H., O39280.
Yoder, Quentin E., O48994.
Young, Crawford, O25984.
Young, Curtis F., O37305.
Young, George H., Jr., O36242.
Young, James R., O37365.
Young, Maurice L., O36794.
Young, Ralph E., O26331.
Younger, Douglas G., O36945.
Yount, Harold W., O54875.
Zellefrow, Albert E., O40982.
Zuckerbrot, Irving, O36901.

To be majors, Chaplains

Hutchins, Gordon, Jr., O31291.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Bouton, Irma V., L195.
Brister, Jane G., L289.
Grant, Patricia E., L181.
Gray, Dorothy, L159.
Holsington, Elizabeth P., L164.
Martin, Ethel M., L182.
Mashidlausky, Agnes A., L171.
Metzger, Hope, L174.
Price, Lenore M., L177.
Robinson, Delia D., L278.
Root, Barbara E., L162.
Trulock, Sue B., L188.
Yoniack, Frances M., L157.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Allerton, William S., O59713.
Anderson, Clarence LeR., O61069.
Archer, Francis C., O66607.
Arnett, Norman L., O62928.
Arrington, Clifton W., O58032.
Austin, James A., O65571.
Badgley, Theodore McB., O62975.
Beck, Marcus R., O60043.
Beckwith, Richard R., O62953.
Beisel, William R., O59560.
Bellas, Joseph J., Jr., O65675.
Berke, Irving, O62918.
Berrey, Bedford H., O65949.
Biehusen, Frederick C., O58038.
Bindeman, William W., O58713.
Bitner, Leland M., O59570.
Blemly, Nelson, R., O62969.
Bolliger, Eugene F., O59717.
Bottiglieri, Nicholas G., O67791.
Boysen, Alexander M., O59612.
Brackebusch, Carl O., O59561.
Briggs, Gordon W., O62940.
Briske, John P., O62931.
Brittis, Anthony L., O60042.
Brody, Arnold J., O58099.
Brosius, Otto C., O59645.
Brune, Warren H., O66613.
Buchanan, David P., O59563.
Buescher, Edward L., O60050.
Butterworth, Charles E., Jr., O59617.
Canham, John E., O62925.
Canney, Philip C., O65573.
Carlton, Donald C., O67903.
Carstensen, Harold G., O60061.
Carter, Willis H., O58097.
Cavin, Elwyn, O62917.
Cenac, Mark T., O63220.
Champlin, Gerald A., O60046.
Chandler, Bruce F., O59613.
Chandler, Eugene F., O63672.
Chase, Robert A., O59719.
Child, Proctor L., O67905.
Cole, Norman J., O58028.
Collins, Warren J., O59564.
Conroy, Joseph V., Jr., O59707.
Conroy, William J., O59614.
Cook, Edgar L., O63167.
Crepps, William F., O59629.
Crow, John B., O59623.
Curtis, Hugh P., O58048.
Daniel, Crowell T., Jr., O59693.
Daniels, Roswell G., O60058.
Davis, Albert J., Jr., O59556.
Dillon, Robert F., O62943.
Downs, Charles R., O62970.
Draheim, John H., O60034.
Fisher, George W., O67569.
Forrester, Ralph H., O63165.
Froemming, William E., O64930.
Gaffney, John J., O65998.
Gamble, Robert D., O59694.
Garner, Robert C., O58733.
Garrett, Richard H., O62945.
Gibbs, James J., O62934.
Gibson, John R., O63454.
Gilpatrick, Cleston W., O59649.
Glew, Donald H., Jr., O59550.
Glock, Robert F., O62936.
Gonder, Maurice J., O62948.
Goplerud, Clifford P., O59700.
Gordon, John N., O59695.
Graybill, Leon D., O59567.
Green, Richard E., O62935.
Gregory, Lloyd J., Jr., O58100.
Griffin, Herschel E., O65676.
Hackett, Louis J., Jr., O66622.
Hall, Robert J., O59628.
Hall, Robert McC., O64929.
Hall, William H., O60133.
Hamilton, George B., O60143.
Hammill, James F., O59543.
Hannon, Joseph L., O59553.
Hansen, Herman R., O67926.
Hansen, James E., O62926.
Harman, Louis E., Jr., O62916.
Harrison, Ira B., O59603.
Hausman, William, O58273.
Hawe, Donald W., O70194.
Hedberg, Charles L., O59566.
Hood, Robert F., O62949.
Howie, Donald L., O60756.
Hoyt, Jay C., O59445.
Hume, Vincent H. S., O62921.
Hurd, Harry F., O59587.
Innes, Robert C., O68016.
Irvin, Robert W., Jr., O59555.
Isham, William H., O59610.
Jackson, Lawrence M., Jr., O59443.
Jahnke, Edward J., Jr., O59591.
Jeans, Park C., Jr., O59600.
Jeffords, Francis W., O57910.
Jensen, Robert T., O60761.
Jesseman, Winston C., O60060.
Johnson, Arnold W., Jr., O62920.
Johnson, David E., O63164.
Jones, Robert C., O62941.
Keim, Robert R., Jr., O62937.
Kelly, Thomas D., O65420.
Kempe, Ludwig G., O67586.
King, Robert J., O62973.
King, Samuel V., O65421.
Latteri, Joseph A., O61949.
Lauderdale, James M., O59552.
Lawson, John D., O65533.
Leddy, Donald V., O63721.
Leslie, William T., O69524.
Lienhard, Wendell F., Jr., O62933.
Lincoln, Arthur F., O60033.
Lindig, Edwin, Jr., O58776.
Lineback, Carl M., O66037.
Livingstone, Bruce L., O62944.
Lynch, Charles L., O57911.
Lyon, Donald R., O59634.
Mason, Roscoe E., O59618.
Masters, Joseph H., O62968.
McFaddin, James G., O65418.
McGonagle, Laurence C., O62938.
McGuire, John M., O65575.
Meriwether, William A., O65572.
Meyerdierks, John J., O58039.
Moncrief, John A., O59697.
Moore, Charles A., O59584.
Moore, Walter H., Jr., O67597.
Moser, Robert H., O59597.
Munger, Richard S., O67599.
Murphree, Harold C., O68389.
Nelson, Thomas G., O64933.
Newman, Stanley, O62965.
Nicholas, Theodore H., O58771.
O'Dell, Edward T., O57960.
Owens, Kenneth N., O59586.
Painter, John H., O59551.
Palmer, Paul W., O60097.
Parmenter, Robert E., O62960.
Passmore, Jack W., O60144.
Peisel, Francis J., O59621.
Phelps, Harvey W., O64935.
Phippen, William G., O59581.
Piper, Clinton A., O64934.
Pitts, Forrest W., O59747.
Pixley, Charles C., O57841.
Porter, Warren E., O58046.
Price, Douglas B., O62930.
Quinn, Robert H., O67605.
Reisner, John E., O62952.
Richert, Joel H., O60145.
Rigney, Francis J., O62923.
Rink, Richard A., O64927.
Rosenberger, Eugene A., O62951.
Roth, Joel L., O60139.
Rubini, Milton E., O62974.
Ruth, Charles J., O59646.
Schillhammer, William R., Jr., O63453.
Schmidt, Robert B., O62966.
Schwab, Gerald J., O62961.
Serfas, Lee S., O61184.
Sharp, John H., O59619.
Sherman, Jacques L., Jr., O59541.
Sherman, Robert L., O60062.
Sherwood, Robert W., O63476.
Sholk, Alvin, O59630.
Simenson, Robert A., O58101.
Singer, Ralph C., O66638.
Skeehan, Raymond A., Jr., O67959.
Smith, Dermott A. P., O65532.
Smith, Vernon M., O62964.
Stallones, Reuel A., O62929.
Steinborg, Robert J., O59635.
Stowens, Daniel, O65570.
Stutzman, Leon, O58266.
Terrill, Arthur A., O59594.
Teschan, Paul E., O59604.
Throne, Elias M., O62956.
Tiffany, William J., Jr., O65417.
Tomsovic, Edward J., O58217.
Tormey, David M., O59609.
Van Avery, Jasper L., Jr., O59703.
Vander Ploeg, Darl E., O62963.
Walsh, Richard A., O61187.
Ward, Richard A., O60070.
Wells, Charles H., O70126.
Westfall, Charles H. P., O62971.
White, David C., O60763.
Wikler, Irving, O67883.
Williams, Fred C., O57906.
Winn, Dean F., Jr., O57959.
Woodard, George S., Jr., O62924.
Woodward, Kent T., O58230.
Wright, William H., O59580.
Yourish, Norman B., O59764.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Bolbat, Walter J., O60735.
DiMatteo, Albert J., O60099.
Konze, Charlie F., O59448.
Rau, Martin H., O59447.
Rowan, Robert J., O61063.
Schreiber, Leonard K., O60734.
Stiesmeyer, Edward H., O60741.
Watkins, John A., Jr., O56259.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Chadwick, Ralph D., O31280.
Failing, Frank W., O31298.
Gleiser, Chester A., O31289.
Klett, Wilbert M., O52047.
Vacura, Gordon W., O31309.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Edward S., O56230.
Bates, Elvis E., O37577.
Blakeslee, Theodore E., O56970.
Brown, Charles T., O37506.

Burleson, Derwood E., O37566.
Chitwood, Douglas C., O56248.
Clark, Jack K., O37524.
Crosby, Leonard A., Jr., O49967.
DeVine, Joseph R., O37520.
DuMond, Paul A., O37607.
Evans, Robert D., O37568.
Fink, James L., O37604.
Gottry, Samuel M., O37544.
Graber, Charles D., O37555.
Graham, Harrold E., O37531.
Gwin, Jack W., O37598.
Hazelrigs, James A., O39345.
Holloman, Chester C., O41159.
Holt, John H., O37814.
Hoover, Thomas H., O37565.
Hrdlicka, Otto G., O37512.
Hughes, Robert L., Jr., O37591.
Julian, Russell E., O37590.
Kadrovach, Dan G., O37613.
Keating, Edward J., O37611.
Kerwin, Bernard F., O37567.
Kilmer, Joseph M., O37498.
Kistler, Grover C., O49958.
Klodniski, Stanley F., O56946.
Knickerbocker, Max E., O41151.
Knoblock, Edward C., O41158.
Kropp, Arthur J., O37561.
Lapiana, Joseph A., O56952.
Leary, John J., O56235.
Luehrs, William C., O37521.
Mathis, John E., O56251.
Munson, Jack W., O39349.
Newbold, William M., O37538.
Nichols, Maurice W., O37532.
Normington, Joseph M., O41157.
Parker, Elliott G., O37540.
Peters, George M., O37533.
Piercy, Clarence H., Jr., O37603.
Reich, Norman, O37516.
Rivas, Ernest G., O37543.
Ryan, Francis J., O56957.
Scarpitta, Anthony, O37519.
Schmahmann, Lionel H., O37583.
Shedivetz, Clayton L., O37514.
Shepler, Lloyd B., O37445.
Smiley, Frank H., O37582.
Smith, Charles R., O37608.
Smith, Robert L., O39350.
Specht, Murval F., O37558.
Spika, Howard J., O37593.
Stacey, Richard M., O41153.
Stock, William E., Jr., O37595.
Strobel, Edward M., O37584.
Thompson, Elmer L., O37513.
Torgerson, Fernando G., O37523.
Valentine, Robert G., O37585.
Walsh, Glen M., O41156.
Waters, John F., 2d, O37605.
Wells, Floyd B., O37575.
Whitaker, Harry T., O37539.
White, William F., O37597.
Williams, Alonzo R., O41140.
Wisser, Nathan R., O37522.
Wood, Norman E., Jr., O37596.
Wrigley, John H., O41161.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Blochberger, Irene C., N145.
Breitung, Elizabeth L., N1902.
Claussen, Esther, N2217.
Clifford, Louise M., N2114.
Cuppy, Mary K., N141.
Fitzgerald, Eileen, N575.
Hanna, Elizabeth T., N2026.
Harper, Margaret, N147.
Houston, Eva D., N1950.
Lessley, Georgia E., N1869.
Mettie, Elizabeth E., N156.
Pollard, Bertha E., N566.
Reeve, Agatha M., N120.
Sar, Cecelia M., N1876.
Schaupp, Miriam C., N144.
Shutt, Edith L., N112.
Snowden, Hazel I., N1895.
Tobin, Nora M., N1872.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Barrett, Ruth, N1884.
Benninger, Marion L., N1885.
Crain, Joy B., N1954.
Cullen, Mary B., N2367.
Eddins, Grace T., N2373.
Garrard, Delzena E., N1890.
Goodman, Thelma B., N1957.
Holland, Alice E., N2048.
Houston, Emma F., N1960.
Jennings, Catherine T., N2125.
Jensen, Wanda, N2123.
Kornfeind, Helen A., N105.
Lassiter, Janie L., N2041.
Mallette, Bernadette M. J., N1893.
Miller, Alberta J., N2132.
Oswald, Marie A., N2047.
Peck, Loucelle E., N2049.
Ross, Margaret C., N2129.
Steadman, Winnie, N1961.
Uftring, Celestia H., N2042.
Zirkle, Winifred R., N2370.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Andersland, Louise S., J61.
Boger, Martha M., M10062.
Buck, Kathryn V., R10130.
Davies, Elizabeth J., M10102.
Ehlers, Christine D., M10036.
Hobson, Edith M., R10042.
Ladd, Margaret P., M10115.
Lydon, Josephine C., R10123.
Marshall, Eleanor M., M10040.
Strain, Ruth G., R10070.
Summers, Evelyn G., R10122.
Swartz, Dorothy L., R10008.
Tremback, Helen, R10073.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

To be captain

Ivan, Gabriel A., O25865.

To be first lieutenants

Coy, Malcolm L., O70313.
Horton, Dan H., O69951.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 625, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

To be captain

Wakefield, Walter W., DC, O1186763.

To be first lieutenants

Baze, Wallace R., DC, O985332.
Bond, William R., Jr., DC, O2274489.
Canfield, Margaret E., ANC, N900487.
Capper, Robert S., MC, O1941999.
Chapin, Viola M., ANC, N799606.
Dolinski, Eleanor, ANC, N805636.
DuVal, Charles H., DC, O4055774.
Edmonson, George B., MSC, O4007125.
Edwards, Ian K., MC, O2267482.
Fisk, Mary L., AMSC, R2657.
Kishpaugh, Barbara F., ANC, N794839.
Mahoney, Bettijane, ANC, N901384.
Monahan, James L., DC, O938692.
Morgan, Betty F., ANC, N804710.
Murphy, Michael J., MC.
Rita, Mary, ANC, N773684.
Stearns, Barbara J., AMSC, M20004.
Taft, Hunter G., Jr., MSC, O957540.

To be second lieutenant

Giffin, Joan L., WAC, L1010768.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Beard, Hallard W.
Butler, Donald E., O1321150.
Creveling, Robert L.
Cummins, Leo H.
Dalbey, Charles G., O2275604.
Duncan, Theodore G. W.
Johannessen, John M., O2275423.
Kriebel, Richard H., O2275416.
Kwedar, Edward W.
Lazarus, Herbert R.
Mueller, Robert L.
Schultz, Thomas L., O2275457.
Scioscia, Eugene A.
St. Louis, Joseph A., Jr., O2275402.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Andrew, Dale H., O2211141.
Bird, William C., O2275905.
Fuller, Walter W., O2277419.
Karr, James H., O2276574.
Poprik, Michael, Jr., O2276966.
Prince, Jack P., O2275893.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Barnette, Bobby L.
Ficks, Filmore L., O4003776.
Gerasimon, Gerald G.
Luthultz, Gene H., O4030922.
McCool, James M., O4010589.
Olchovik, Stanley, O4010670.
Taylor, Richard F., O4031018.
Werner, Stanley A.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Barnes, Frederick.
Bradby, Harold N., Jr.
Corbett, Richard L., O4053035.
Coruthers, John M., Jr.
Denny, Davis M., Jr.
Donner, William O., Jr.
Fitzekam, Gordon L.
Hensley, William R., O4036566.
Johnson, Marion, Jr., O4048936.
Lamont, William, Jr.
Lanier, Jack D.
McPheeters, Leander B., Jr.
Metcalf, Jack A., O4048958.
Pistorius, Joseph H., Jr.
Plough, Ronald C.
Spinelli, Michael A., O4059373.
Terry, Robert L.
Thompson, Jackson D.
Walker, William C.
Worrell, Armond J.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1956, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Dacus, Lester H.
German, Norton I.
Muzzio, Robert J.
Pyles, Thomas E.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1956, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Abbott, Jerry M.
Aceto, Vincent R.
Adams, George B.
Adams, Jack L.
Adkins, John E.
Agnew, Jack S.
Aicken, Larry B.
Aldrich, David F.
Alexander, William E.
Allman, John W., Jr.
Amoneno, Ernest G.
Amos, Julian E.

Andersen, William A.
Anderson, Douglas F.
Anderson, Valjean C.
Angelo, Joseph S.
Archer, James H.
Arlotti, Mario G.
Armfield, Samuel L., III
Arnecke, Charles O., Jr.
Arnim, Cecil H., Jr.
Arnold, John M.
Ashworth, Don C.
Atkinson, Don R.
Axtell, Ralph R.
Baker, A. J.
Balboni, Louis A.
Balcerzak, Marion J.
Bales, Garry L.
Bannister, Edwin J.
Barber, Robert G.
Barker, Harold S., Jr.
Baxter, Arthur S., Jr.
Beavens, Arthur M.
Beck, Edmund S.
Bedard, Ronald L.
Bedford, Robert E.
Bell, Lawrence A.
Bell, Ronald K.
Bender, Robert
Bennett, James D.
Berkley, John L.
Berman, Myron B.
Bird, Max R.
Birdsong, Edward M., Jr.
Birkenholz, Richard M.
Blagg, Thomas E.
Blair, David A.
Blair, Jerral D.
Blaker, William J.
Blanton, Albert B., Jr.
Blecharczyk, Stephen S.
Boerner, Dennis H.
Boiani, Peter J.
Boldon, David L.
Boles, Bennie C.
Bonner, Benjamin J., III
Bonnett, William B.
Borland, Paul C., Jr.
Botts, Robert H.
Bourne, William G.
Boyd, James W., II
Braddock, David R.
Braithwaite, Garlan D.
Bramlett, Mead R.
Brashears, Bobby F.
Briggs, Joel L.
Britt, Henry M.
Bromley, Barton W., Jr.
Bronson, Russell A.
Brookhart, Edgar W.
Brooks, Thomas W.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Roy A.
Broyles, Alvin K., Jr.
Bryant, James W.
Brylla, Charles W.
Buccola, Victor A.
Buchanan, James R.
Burg, James H.
Burgess, Robert B., Jr.
Burns, Edwin A.
Burset, Miguel A.
Buswell, Arthur T.
Byrd, Hale H.
Byrne, Robert J.
Calderwood, Earl H.
Calhoun, Creighton L., Jr.
Calvert, Jack F.
Campbell, Donald A.
Camper, Kenyon L.
Cann, Donald C.
Carlsen, Gary H.
Carrasquillo, Humberto R.
Carter, Donald D.
Carter, Robert H., Jr.
Carter, Thomas E.
Carter, Woodward C., II
Charles, George H., Jr.
Chesley, Arthur P.
Codd, Nicholas J., Jr.
Coffee, Edwin F., Jr.
Coffman, Ronald L.
Cogswell, Richard J.
Coleman, Willis H.
Colson, John T.
Concilio, Richard V.
Cook, Richard A.
Cosimini, Gino N.
Cover, John P.
Cox, Randall S.
Craver, Douglas M.
Crawford, Cecil M.
Crewse, Leonard L.
Croft, John A.
Crosby, James C.
Crowe, James L.
Crowe, John M., Jr.
Cruff, Ronald A.
Cunningham, Clarence
Custard, Norman L.
Dal Corobbo, Bruno V.
Danehy, Franklyn T.
Danieli, Joseph A., Jr.
Dann, Herbert I., Jr.
Daugherty, John M., Jr.
deCamp, William S.
DeLorme, Wayne F.
Del Vecchio, John, Jr.
Demetropoulos, Andrew J.
Dempsey, John M. L.
DeThorne, Raymond J.
Detjens, John, III
Dinsmore, Wiley
Ditman, William D.
DiValentino, Leo E.
Dixon, Robert C.
Doke, Marshall J., Jr.
Donaldson, Thomas W.
Dove, Hoy D., Jr.
Dow, Richard A.
Dowling, Donald J.
Doyle, Charles T.
Draper, Ronald F.
Dross, David D.
Drury, Dan L.
Dubin, Leonard
DuBose, Perryman F.
DuBrule, Paul A., Jr.
Dudley, Gerald O.
Dunn, James E.
Dvorak, Philip J., O4017546
Eagle, John R.
Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr.
Eaton, Melville L.
Eccles, Spencer F.
Eckert, William N.
Edsall, Richard H.
Edwards, Eugene T.
Ellis, Don C.
Enloe, James A.
Ethridge, Wayne H.
Evans, Bobi R.
Evans, Gary B.
Farley, Andrew N.
Fee, Gordon G.
Fennell, George R., Jr.
Filler, Merl C., Jr.
Finehout, Robert E.
Finley, Jerry D.
Fisher, Anthony B.
Fisher, Robert L.
Fitzmorris, Lawrence B.
Florence, David L.
Floyd, Jerry M.
Foard, John B., III
Ford, Wilbur E., Jr.
Fraley, Harold J.
Frazier, James H.
Freeman, Charles G.
Freisem, Robert D.
Galligan, Robert A.
Garrett, Doyle B.
Garrett, Richard E.
Garside, Robert E.
Georges, Peter J.
Gibb, Robert B.
Gibbons, James H.
Giles, George E.
Gillie, Gerald R.
Gilmore, Joseph R.
Gilpatrick, Volney T., Jr.
Givhan, Walter H.
Glasker, Samuel J.
Glover, Richard R.
Godding, Donald R.
Gonzalez, Richard E., Jr.
Gooch, Robert G.
Gordon, Harold J.
Gordon, John V.
Gordon, Kenneth F.
Gothard, Donald L.
Gowell, Earle R., Jr.
Greene, Earl M.
Griffith, Franklin D.
Griminger, Charles O.
Grinnell, Leroy A.
Gross, Donald
Gross, Thomas R.
Groves, Billie R.
Guilfoyle, Francis M.
Habermann, Larry M.
Harbuck, Edwin C.
Hardin, James A.
Harding, Trewitt D.
Harmon, Marsden A.
Harris, Bruce R.
Harris, Kenneth A.
Harwig, Donald H.
Harwood, Michael S.
Hatch, Vernon L.
Haynes, Jesse L., Jr.
Hearn, Jerry L.
Heckman, Richard T.
Heggen, Larry E.
Hemminger, Girard L.
Hersey, Frederic T.
Hickerson, Arville L.
Hilgeman, Charles E., Jr.
Hilton, Jimmie L.
Hinkleman, Robert S.
Hinspeter, William L.
Hodges, Charles E.
Hodges, Harold E.
Hoffman, Jack E.
Hohmann, Jere W.
Hokansson, Nils C. I.
Holder, Bobby W.
Holland, Harold B.
Hollenbeck, Elmer W
Hollister, Myron P.
Hood, William P., Jr.
Hooker, Richard D.
Hopkins, Woodard B., Jr.
Hopp, Keith R.
Horn, Will H.
Horrigan, Lawrence B., Jr.
Horton, Floyd W.
Houlis, Harry S.
Houston, Joseph B., Jr.
Howerton, William B.
Hudson, Alfred H.
Hudspeth, Thomas J.
Huff, Donald W.
Humphrey, Jerry H.
Hunt, Byron W.
Hunt, J. Howard
Hutson, Leonard E.
Hutton, John D.
Imschweiler, David R.
Ingram, Duane C.
Ippolito, Charles P.
Irvin, Charles L.
Israel, Glenn A.
Jackson, George F., Jr.
Jakuc, Henry S.
James, William N.
Jarvies, Richard C.
Jefferson, Walter, Jr.
Jenkinson, Harlan H.
Jensen, Lynn R.
Jessup, William R.
Jetta, Norman W.
Johnson, William J.
Jones, Carleton H., Jr.
Jones, Teddy R.
Jordan, Arthur B., III
Jovan, George A.
Judd, Roger C.
Kalbaugh, Gary A.
Karlin, Philip J.
Katz, Charles M.
Kaufman, Richard C.
Keliher, John G.
Kelly, James O.
Kelly, Thomas A.
Kennedy, Irvin D.
Keppeler, John P., II
Kernan, Redmond F., III
Kilpe, Gunars
Kimpton, John E.
Kinder, Norman W.
King, John R.
Kirkmire, Nicholas J.
Kitchen, Kenneth S.
Kite, John C.
Klein, Rudolph F., III
Knapper, Aubrey L.
Kohlhoff, Karl F.
Kramer, Bryce R.
Kraus, John H.
Kripowicz, John P., Jr.
Krome, Alan
Kronenberger, Lawrence
Kronmiller, Lowell K., Jr.
Kuluz, Peter J.
Lackey, Lyman A., Jr.
Ladd, John P.
Lafayette, William P.
Lake, Howard K., Jr.
Landry, Bernard A.
Lane, Robert L.
Lang, George P.
Latturner, George J.
Laughbon, Richard W.
Law, Laurence J.
Lawhorn, Douglas A.
Lawrenson, Bruce E.
Leckinger, Paul A.
Lecocke, Frank J.
Lee, Ray H.
Lehner, William J., Jr.
Leonard, Ronald K.
Leoniak, John J.
Lester, Robert J.
Lindanger, Earl L.
Lingaitis, Francis V.
Littlejohn, Thomas W.
Lockridge, Robert W., Jr.
Lockwood, Willard E.
Logan, Rodney W.
Losik, Robert C.
Lowe, Jack W.
Lowe, Thomas L., Jr.
Lundberg, Ronald J.
Lunn, John G.
Lunsford, Earl M.
Lyons, Calvin G.
Maass, Charles G.
Maguire, James E.
Malsbary, James S.
Manhart, Richard A.
Mann, Robert L.
Mapes, Steven E.
Maphis, Samuel W.
Marguccio, Robert G.
Marinelli, Gino A.
Marquis, Donald A.
Marsh, Elgin R., Jr.
Marshall, John P.
Martin, Samuel
Marx, Thomas J.
Mason, John
Mason, Richard O., Jr.
Massey, Oran A.
Matthews, Kenneth F., Jr.
McCain, Arthur W., Jr.
McCarthy, John J.
McCarty, Douglas W.
McClain, Robert C.
McClain, Terrence W.
McCoy, Charles E., Jr.
McCready, David J.
McCreery, John L.
McCullough, James A.
McCurry, Spencer L., Jr.
McDowell, Robert C.
McFadden, James D.
McGinley, Frank L.
McGowan, Paul A.
McGraw, Van C.
McGregor, Donald V.
McKee, William S.
McKinney, Collin J., Jr.
McKinney, Horatio W.
McKown, Richard J.
McLaughlin, Charles H.
McLaughlin, James J.
McLeod, David S.
McMillan, Robert B.
McSpadden, Gilbert R., Jr.
Merchant, Frederic L., Jr.
Meyer, Allan E.
Meyers, Stewart E., Jr.
Mikuta, Joel J.
Milliron, Joseph F.
Mills, Lawrence L.
Mitcham, William G.
Mock, Thomas D.
Monahan, Edward J.
Morehead, Robert N.
Morey, William S.
Morris, Joseph L.
Mosure, Thomas F.
Mouring, Barron W.
Moxley, William M., Jr.
Munro, Robert D.
Murphy, Clifton M.
Murphy, George S., Jr.
Nelson, Marlin G.
Netterblad, John W.
Nichols, William B.
Nicholson, Donald E.
Nicoll, Carl R.
Nobriga, Gordon H.
Nock, Carleton C.
Norbo, Gary J.
Novotny, Richard A.
Nowick, Henry W.
O'Brien, Robert M.
O'Bryant, James E.
Oeck, Emil A.
O'Keefe, Timothy J., Jr., O4051990
Onley, John H.
O'Rourke, Lewis C.
O'Rourke, Peter J., Jr.
Osa, Nelson
O'Shaughnessy, Thomas E., Jr.
Owens, John H.
Padden, Edmund J., Jr.
Padgett, David H., Jr.
Painter, Charles F.
Pape, Richard J.
Parham, Byron A. P.
Parks, Donald
Parsons, Walter H., III
Patton, Edwin P., Jr.
Pearson, John R.
Pearson, Stanley R.
Pellegrinon, Ronald G.
Perryman, James D., Jr.
Perryman, William E.
Phillips, William F., Jr.
Pitman, Kenneth M.
Pitre, George L., Jr.
Polhemus, Richard E.
Pothin, Paul F.
Powell, Richard E.
Powers, Max L.
Pugmire, Robert M., Jr.
Raines, Fred B.
Rainey, Ellis C., Jr.
Ramey, Hubert D.
Ranger, David W.
Raudebaugh, James D.
Ray, Robert L.
Reason, Robert L.
Reed, Donald L.
Reedy, Henry J.
Reeves, Stanley J.
Reicker, Frederick A.
Rein, Richard H.
Rhoads, David E.
Rhodes, Chester J.
Rhone, Jimmy S.
Riggs, Joseph A., Jr.
Rivera-Sola, Fernando
Roberts, Charles W.
Robinson, Thonius, Jr.
Rod, Ronald F.
Roddy, Robert E.
Rogers, Richard S., Jr.
Romanski, James F.
Rose, Jerald L.
Rose, Walter N.
Ross, Charles A.
Roughley, David
Roush, William W.
Roy, Charles D.
Rubin, Franklin D.
Rush, Karl C.
Rusk, Edward E.
Russell, James F.
Ryan, Edmond M.
Sanches, Manuel L.
Santiesteban, Humberto T.
Santoro, David A.
Sawey, William J.
Schaubhut, Norman J.
Schessler, Donald R.
Schlee, Gerald J.
Schmidt, John L.
Schneider, Robert S.
Schofield, David G.
Schoonmaker, Paul D.
Schober, Frank J., Jr.
Schuler, James D.
Schwab, Bernard A., III
Sechrest, Noah S., Jr.
Seiser, William R.
Selch, Glenn C.
Senko, John M.
Sherby, Thomas A.
Sherrill, Ernest K.
Sherrill, Lawrence W., Jr.
Shoemaker, James P.
Shore, Lawrence B.
Short, Earl D., Jr.
Shuck, David L.
Shumate, John W.
Shumway, Dean L.
Sides, Jerry M.
Sigler, Jackson L., Jr.
Sikkenga, Donald P.
Simon, Frederic P.
Simpson, Charles E., Jr.
Sims, Paul D.
Sinagra, Robert L.
Sitkin, Charles P.
Skoronski, Frank M.
Smedley, Jimmy C.
Smith, Raymond G.
Smith, Raymond W.
Smith, William F.
Snowden, Edgar, IV
Snyder, Harold B., Jr.
Snyder, Ronald E.
Snyder, William H., III
Speth, Gerald L.
Squires, Myron E.
Staiger, Charles W.
Stark, Robert L.
Stern, Allan R.

Stevens, Philip J.	Tyler, Warren C.
Stevenson, Frederick N., Jr.	Vanbebber, Herman J.
Stewart, Charles F., Jr.	Van Cleave, Henry D., Jr.
Stewart, James A.	Van Poucke, Marcel L., Jr.
Stiles, Ronald E.	Vetterling, John M.
Stillions, Eugene L., Jr.	Victory, Antony M.
St. Jacques, Ernest O.	Von Urff, Charles A.
Stokes, Theodore K.	Wahl, Don D.
Stokes, William M., III	Wakefield, Donald Y.
Stone, Frank R., Jr.	Walker, George J.
Stork, Richard C.	Walker, Jimmy F.
Storms, Peter F.	Walker, Peter H.
Storrs, Norman B.	Walls, William H.
Stotser, George R.	Warlick, Joseph R., Jr.
Streisand, Sheldon J.	Watke, Frederic W.
Stringer, Paul G.	Watts, Ronald L.
Strohmayer, Alfred R.	Weber, Wayne G.
Strong, Daniel M.	Weinkauf, Donald E.
Stuart, James R.	Werning, John B.
Stuart, John C., Jr.	Wheatley, Robert R., III
Sturgeon, James M.	White, Jack A.
Sultenfuss, Gerard E.	Whitmer, Henry J.
Swann, John H.	Wiersema, Kenneth E.
Swenson, Arthur G.	Wilber, Donald E., O4058431
Swift, John B.	Wiljanen, Walter A.
Swoboda, Edward J.	Wilkerson, Arlie J.
Tapp, Richard L.	Williams, Donald G.
Tarby, Stephen K.	Williams, Richard L.
Tatum, James M.	Williford, Donald E.
Taurke, Erwin A.	Wilson, Robert W.
Taylor, Henry S., III	Wittekind, Wilfred H.
Taylor, Perry R., Jr.	Wojtal, Robert J.
Taylor, Richard C.	Wojtas, Jerry R.
Taylor, William H.	Wolfe, Robert A.
Thacker, Goebel R.	Wolfe, William M.
Theroux, Gilbert L.	Woodle, Kenneth J.
Thompson, Ronald A.	Woodmansee, Wayne E.
Tieken, Richard V.	Woods, Robert D.
Tippett, Laurence A.	Yoho, Robert O.
Todd, Ronald D.	Young, Charles D.
Tompkins, Raymond E.	Young, Daniel K., Jr.
Toner, Richard B.	Zabransky, Ronald
Torres, Marco, Jr.	Zanuck, Richard D.
Townsend, Merton L.	Zekanis, Henry A.
Treece, Ausby J.	Zickel, Raymond E., Jr.
Tripp, Joseph W.	Zoubandis, James
Trounday, Roger S.	
Turk, Roy M.	
Turley, James R.	

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, April 18 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

George Cochran Doub, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the source of the true, the splendor of the beautiful, and the strength of the good, we are again coming unto Thee through the old and familiar way of prayer, compelled by our needs and constrained by Thy love.

Grant that we may have a faith that is humble and courageous as we seek to minister and mediate unto all mankind the blessings of peace and prosperity.

Inspire us to give ourselves earnestly and eagerly to the leading of Thy spirit and may we make a more daring trial of the moral and spiritual resources which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

Fill us daily with a fervent desire and a strong determination to build a social order in which justice and righteousness, good will and brotherhood shall reign supremely.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE NECESSARY ARRANGEMENTS FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 21st day of January 1957, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. MCCORMACK, and Mr. MARTIN.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 26]

Ashley	Haley	Morgan
Boykin	Healey	O'Hara, Minn.
Dawson, Ill.	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Donovan	Holtzman	Powell
Eberharter	Hosmer	Scherer
Engle	Jackson	Tollefson
Gamble	Johnson, Calif.	Velde
Gary	Kilday	Williams, N. Y.
Green, Pa.	Mollohan	Wolcott

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 406 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit in executive session during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill H. R. 12, an act to provide an improved farm program.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much if it is possible for me to say anything about H. R. 12 which has not already been said, but I do feel justified in making some observations about this very controversial measure. I introduced H. R. 12 on January 5, 1955. Our committee conducted long hearings. Our committee room was open to all who wanted to be heard. The bill was reported to the House with nonpartisan or bipartisan support and, after a very long and hard fight, the bill passed this House and was sent on to the Senate. There it remained until the beginning of this year.

Members of Congress are being criticized, and very severely criticized, because of what is called a great delay in the passage of farm legislation. I do not think I need to defend the House Committee on Agriculture nor need I defend the membership of this House. I need only to put the facts in the RECORD, and the facts are that our committee and this House early last year recognized the seriousness of the farm situation and sought to do something about it. Yes, some of us are being accused of playing politics. I think all the Members of this House know me well enough to know, and they certainly know my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] well enough to know, that neither one of us has ever at any time been willing to play politics with the problems of the farmers of America. Partisan politics has been kept out of the deliberations of our committee. I repeat here that in the 22 years I have served on the committee, we have had only one partisan vote, and that was in the spring of 1949.

This conference report does not represent only the labors and views of members of my party. I said here the other day and I repeat that I do not know how it would be possible for 10 devoted Members of Congress to work more diligently and more faithfully on a piece of legislation than did the House and Senate conferees on H. R. 12. This conference report is not the handiwork of Democrats. It was not signed only by members of my party. Of the 4 very distinguished statesmen of the Republican Party who sat day in and day out and way into the night, through the Easter holiday, 3 of the 4 signed this report. That should be convincing evidence to everyone that there is no partisan politics involved in this measure. Why should anyone be so absurd as to suggest that any of us are prompted by partisan politics? I have believed through the years and I still believe that the problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems, even to the problems of peace; because until we can solve the paradox of plenty here in this Nation of ours and hunger in other lands, we cannot hope to live in a very peaceful world.

I have seen this week some great demonstrations of really true, sturdy statesmanship on this floor. I have seen men who have heretofore entertained views that they did not express here until last

Wednesday. They were prompted by the purest emotions and impulses in the hearts of statesmen. And I am talking about Republican statesmen, who had the nerve, the honesty, and the integrity to come into the well of the House and say, "I have studied this problem, I have talked with my farmers at home, and I and I alone have been authorized to represent them in the House of Representatives"—one after the other. Can you tell me that men like the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and his colleagues, are not good Republicans? They are good Republicans if there are any on this earth. Can you tell me that Mr. BELCHER, our beloved colleague, who has labored long and hard on our committee, is playing politics because he voted for this measure which he knows provides the only hope to help the farmers of America in their present plight and predicament?

I could go on and name many Republicans who supported this bill not because of partisan politics but because they believed in it. I indulge the hope that they believe in it now.

Unfortunately, and I think it is unfortunate, I believe that the great man in the White House has been too well protected and insulated. I honestly do not believe that he has been well advised concerning the provisions of this bill. A reading of his veto message would indicate that he actually does not even now understand the provisions of this bill.

What does the bill do? What did all of us want to do? All of us wanted to do something to help the farmers of America. This veto will take out of the pockets of farmers more than $3 billion that we were trying to put into their pockets.

The soil-bank provision does not increase farm income. It only replaces farm income. But one thing it definitely does, it definitely decreases farm purchasing power to exactly the same extent that the soil-bank fund is used.

I say that to appeal to the men from the industrial area. That soil bank will cut off $1,200,000,000 of the purchasing power of the farmer and he will buy that much less fertilizer, insecticides, farm machinery, and other things that are needed on the farm. So why should we bring here a bill restricted only to the soil bank? The price-support provisions of this bill would put into the farmer's pocket approximately $1,300,000,000, yes, income and purchasing power, and would not increase the surplus we now have in storage.

I hate to complain about the President's message. He says that this bill is full of contradictions. The fact is his message is full of inconsistencies. He seems to lose sight of the fact that before the producers of basic commodities are eligible to receive the 90-percent price support provided in the bill they must of necessity comply with the orders of Mr. Ezra Benson himself and reduce their acreage in keeping with his mandate. It is not a subsidy, it is not a handout.

Here we are, knowing as we sit here that farm income is going down and down and down, and that the impact is being felt in every industrial center in this country. Yes, in the country stores and out on the highways and the byways, you can see what has happened. We are inevitably going into another depression unless we can do something to check and change this tragic downward trend in farm income and purchasing power.

Now—what are we supposed to do about it? I voted here the other day, honestly believing as I do today, that this is a good bill. I frankly admitted that it was somewhat of a legislative monstrosity when it came out of the other body and was referred to conference. But, we took the bill apart. We carved it to pieces section by section and word by word and we rewrote the bill in conference. We presented it here to the House with bipartisan support. The President complains about surplus disposal. By vetoing this bill, he prevented the enactment of 14 provisions which would have strengthened his arm in disposing of these surplus commodities or preventing their accumulation. We sought to give him $500 million additional for section 32 operations and the power to pay the ocean freight to send surplus commodities to hungry people wherever they are in the world.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time to read but will insert for the RECORD a more detailed analysis of the President's veto message and the effects of his veto.

COMMENTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

First. The nine-point program referred to by the President in his message consisted largely of generalities and the blocking out of areas of the agricultural problem for study by Congress. No specific legislation was sent up to implement the program and it was not until February 28 that the Committee on Agriculture received specific legislative proposals embodying the recommendations of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. The legislation was not then submitted voluntarily but was made available only after a direct committee request on the Secretary for such a bill.

Second. It is difficult to understand how H. R. 12 would encourage more surpluses than the program endorsed by the President. No change is made or proposed in the basic legislation under which production is now regulated and will continue to be regulated whether H. R. 12 becomes law or not. The basic tools for adjusting production to demand and preventing surpluses are the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended. These would be fully as operative under the provisions of H. R. 12 as they will be under any other type of program. In fact, they would be more effective at a higher level of support because it has been clearly demonstrated that there is greater compliance with marketing quotas and acreage allotments at high support levels than at lower levels.

Even more important, however, is the fact that by vetoing H. R. 12, the President has deprived the Secretary of Agriculture of at least 14 new provisions of law to assist in dealing with the surplus problem—provisions providing authority which the Secretary does not now have and which he will not be able to exercise in the absence of new legislation. Following is a list of the new authority to prevent surpluses or to help dispose of them contained in H. R. 12 as approved by the House and Senate:

(a) Corn: In order to be eligible for price supports, corn producers would be required to reduce their acreage of crop-producing land by 15 percent.

(b) Feed grains: H. R. 12 offers, for the first time, some solution to the rapidly deteriorating feed-grain situation that is hurting not only grain producers but livestock producers as well. Under the provisions of H. R. 12 feed-grain producers would be eligible for price supports only if they curtailed their acreage of feed grains at least 15 percent below their previous 3-year average. Under the Secretary's program feed-grain producers receive supports on all the grain they want to produce, without any limitation whatever on their acreage.

(c) To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in the bill to process food commodities, such as grains, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the States and the Federal Government to donate food commodities to certain penal institutions.

(d) To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and the amount which can be used under title II of Public Law 480 is increased from $300 million to $500 million.

(e) The domestic parity plan for wheat would solve a number of the problems relating to overproduction and surpluses of that commodity. It would encourage the producers voluntarily to limit their production to a quantity more properly adjusted to current needs. It would put world trade in American wheat on a sound economic basis for the first time in many years by making it possible to offer that wheat for sale on the world market, at the world price, without Government subsidy.

(f) Use of wheat as feed on the farm where grown would be facilitated by the wheat program in H. R. 12 by permitting any farmer, anywhere to grow all the wheat he wants to grow, without penalty, for use on his own farm for feed or food.

(g) Rice: The rice two-price plan would substantially improve the position of United States rice in the world market. Like the wheat program in the bill, it would make possible the sale of United States rice on the world market, at world prices, without any Government subsidy whatever.

(h) H. R. 12 would attack the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by placing extra long staple cotton within the quota now set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

(i) Solution of our surplus problem, particularly in textiles, would be substantially assisted by new authority given the President in H. R. 12 to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of

competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

(j) H. R. 12 authorizes appropriation of an additional $500 million annually to section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities.

(k) The bill authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

(l) H. R. 12 authorizes and directs the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

(m) To make more effective our present production control laws, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

(n) In order to further encourage the underplanting of acreage allotments, the bill authorizes a producer, for the first time, to plant only part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This would eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem—authority which the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have—there were other directives in the bill designed also to substantially improve the surplus situation. The Secretary of Agriculture was directed to make a study of proposals for disposing of surplus food commodities domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan. He was directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter. He was directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency. He was directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long staple cotton specifically.

Third. The soil bank would not increase farm income—this year or any other. Because farmers would receive at the most only their anticipated net income from acres placed in the acreage reserve, their gross income would be substantially curtailed by participation in the soil bank. This would be reflected in sales of fertilizer, farm machinery, gasoline, and other supplies to farmers.

Fourth. The President refers to the problem created by the diversion into other crops of acreage removed from basic-commodity production by allotment programs. He has vetoed the bill which sought to do something about this serious problem by authorizing a program for feed grains and a more effective program for corn, but he has made no suggestion as to what he now proposes to do about this problem.

Fifth. The President says production would be stimulated by the support levels provided in H. R. 12. With the control programs in effect on all basic crops, it is difficult to follow his reasoning at this point. Production of the basic crops is regulated by acreage allotments—not by price levels. In this connection I must reiterate that H. R. 12 offers, for the first time, a program for actually reducing the production of feed grains—which is rapidly becoming one of our serious agricultural problems. In the absence of H. R. 12 there is no such program for feed grains and production will run rampant and uncontrolled.

Sixth. The President devotes four paragraphs to a condemnation of dual parity and says that its establishment in H. R. 12 could "destroy the parity concept itself". Strangely enough, dual parity has been in effect since enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949 without destroying the parity concept. Modernized parity was recognized when it was adopted as inequitable to the basic commodities and requiring such a sharp drop in support prices as to be economically impossible. Dual parity was, therefore, provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 and has been in operation every year since then except 1955.

Seventh. In condemning the provisions for feed grains in H. R. 12, the President says that these provisions would result in a shrinking market for feed grains—presumably because these grains would be supported at a somewhat higher price. It is difficult to follow the President's reasoning in this respect since the statistics of the Department of Agriculture show exactly to the contrary—that consumption of feed grains is at least as high and usually higher, when the price is higher. The reason for this is that the price of livestock is closely related to the price of feed and when livestock prices follow feed prices upward, livestock producers are more prosperous and can afford to buy more and better feed.

The following figures show the relationship I am talking about: In 1951 feed grains were 25 percent higher than they were in 1955, yet Department of Agriculture records show that livestock producers fed slightly more feed per animal unit in 1951 than they did in 1955. The same principle is exemplified in 1953. Then, feed grains were about 13 percent higher than 1955, yet consumption of feed was substantially above that estimated for 1955.

The price of livestock in those years also showed the relationship between feed grains and livestock. In 1951, with feed prices 25 percent above last year, hogs brought an average price for the year of $20 and beef cattle brought an average price of $28.70. Compare this with the livestock prices in 1955 with lower feed grain prices—the level of prices which the Secretary of Agriculture apparently finds desirable. In 1955—on an unweighted basis—hogs brought an average of $15.50, and cattle only $15.80.

Admittedly there is very little in H. R. 12 of direct benefit to livestock producers, but the vetoing of H. R. 12 and the carrying out of the kind of a program outlined by the President in his message will be one of the most serious blows the livestock industry has suffered for a long time. Every livestock producer knows that when feed prices are low and feed is in surplus livestock is plentiful and prices are cheap. With their heavy capital investment, it is far better for livestock producers to pay a reasonably high price for their feed with the assurance that they will receive a correspondingly higher price for their animals. The feed grain program espoused by the President, of low level supports on unlimited production, is the worst possible news the livestock industry could hear. By increasing the support level on feed grains and at the same time requiring a 15 percent reduction in acreage, H. R. 12 would go a long way toward solving not only the feed grain problem but the financial difficulties of livestock producers.

Eighth. After devoting four paragraphs to the evils of dual parity, the President dismissed, in less than three lines of his message, the programs for rice and wheat which would put both those commodities on a sound world price basis and which have been worked out most carefully by the producers of those commodities after years of study. The rice industry has formally and almost unanimously requested the kind of program provided in H. R. 12. An important segment of the wheat industry has requested the wheat program and all wheat producers would have an opportunity to vote on it with a two-thirds majority required to put it into effect. Yet, the President says that neither rice growers nor the wheat farmers are to have this opportunity they have asked for.

Ninth. The President finds "certain provisions found in the section dealing with the dairy industry" objectionable, but he has approved supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat at precisely the levels estimated by H. R. 12. Apparently it makes a substantial difference whether prices are established by act of Congress or by action of the executive branch of the Government.

Tenth. The price level announced by the President for wheat is only 3 cents per bushel above the March 15 price and amounts to about 83.7 percent of parity.

Eleventh. The price level announced for corn is about 30 cents above the March 15 price and equivalent to about 86.2 percent of parity.

Twelfth. The price level announced for rice is only 4 cents above the March 15 price and equivalent to about 82.7 percent of parity.

Thirteenth. A separate support program for corn "not under acreage control" to be announced at an early date would hardly seem to be the kind of action to substantially discourage production of corn or greatly reduce the surplus problem. By contrast H. R. 12 has a realistic program for corn outside the commercial area.

There is too much good in the bill for the President to have vetoed it. But, he did veto it. I am not going to be too optimistic about overriding his veto. I know that he was exercising his constitutional rights and responsibilities. He had a perfect right to do what he did. Every Member of the House of Representatives has a perfect right to do what he did last Wednesday and we have the perfect right today to exercise freely our own judgment. But, it would seem to me, it would be very, very difficult for

a man who represents farmers or consumers or the industrial centers to go back home and say, "I voted against the bill that would intensify and would increase the purchasing power of agriculture so that the farmers of the Nation could purchase the things that industry produces."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the administration make any major farm legislation recommendations last year?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad my friend mentions that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, will the gentleman give the history of the soil bank and what the attitude of the administration was last year.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, I will. I appreciate the suggestion.

Before this Congress adjourned last session, I asked the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates if they had any more recommendations to make, and if any more legislation was needed. The answer was "No," but the farm situation continued to deteriorate.

Mr. Benson returned from Europe. The newspaper reporters met him at the airport and he gave out a statement to the effect, "Yes, we have some programs we are working on and the details will soon be around." Later, he flew out to Denver, and after a conference with the President, he came back. Again, he was met by the newsmen and he said, "Yes, we have a program." On October 31, I wired him and called attention to the fact that the House of Representatives by an appropriate resolution had authorized me to call our committee together at any time and at any place, and I was ready, willing, and anxious to call the committee together to receive such recommendations as he might desire to make. I told him then that time was important. We could have worked through October and November, but we received no recommendations.

When he replied to my telegram he said that the recommendations of the administration would come up in traditional fashion and would be presented to the Congress in January. January 9 arrived. The President sent up his agricultural message, but we received no executive communication from Mr. Benson transmitting a bill for our committee to consider. So we waited.

The Senate had started hearings. We did our work last session. We had other hearings this session. But when the President's message came with a nine-point program, there was not a new thought or a new suggestion in any 1 of the 9 points. All of them had been considered many times by Members of Congress and by the appropriate committees of Congress.

When Mr. Benson, when he was freed from his appearances before the Senate committee, we asked him to come before our committee, and—after some delay—he appeared on February 21. But, even then, he had no bill. I said "Mr. Secretary, where is your bill?" He looked at his associates there with him, and they had no bill.

In the meantime two bills had been introduced. Neither of them contained his recommendations in full. So I asked him, "Will you please bring to this committee next Monday, the 27th, a bill embracing all of the recommendations you have to make?"

So late on the 27th of February—7 weeks to the day after the President's message—the Secretary finally sent up a bill. On the 28th of February I wrote him a letter, after having conferred with the 37-man Agriculture Committee, and extended an invitation to him to come before our committee to discuss his bill. His reply was to the effect that because of his heavy schedule it would be impossible for him to appear before our committee for 2 weeks.

Two weeks we waited. What else could we do? We had heard the testimony of all the farm leaders and all the farmers and all of the other people who wanted to be heard. So finally, at the end of the third week, almost 3 weeks later, I wrote him another letter, and he then indicated that he was ready to come before the committee, but at that very moment the bill was ready to go to conference. Then I was faced with the proposition, should I delay the conference in order to hear Mr. Benson or should we proceed with the conference and let him submit his recommendations in writing. I decided to do the latter.

I want to comment on this conference; I have been in many conferences but I have never attended any conference like this. We extended to Mr. Benson and all of his associates an opportunity to give us the full benefit of their views and their technical advice and assistance in drafting as good a bill as we could draft. We did not have a single meeting that was not attended by officials of the Department of Agriculture. We had from 7 to 9 people there—the legal branch and the administrative branch—and they participated in our discussion. If there ever has been an open conference that was it. After every meeting the public was fully advised about the progress that had been made. I do not like the idea of having Members of Congress blamed for delaying unduly this very important measure.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has not, I believe, discussed the history of this soil bank. Is it not a fact that a year ago this last February two bills were introduced in our committee, one by a Republican and one by a Democrat embracing a soil bank very similar to that the President now supports? That you as chairman of our committee asked the Secretary for suggestions in regard to those bills, and in July of last year he said the bills were unworkable?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right; the gentleman is entirely correct. I do not believe the farmers of this country have any doubt about the origin of the plan. The original bills were introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] on the Republican side and FRED MARSHALL, another distinguished Member of Congress, on the Democratic side.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] and I personally introduced this bill for a soil bank on February 2, 1954. A week prior to that Mr. Benson, as will be evidenced by our hearings, informed us that in his opinion the general principle was unworkable.

Mr. COOLEY. At the gentleman's request, I sent that bill, along with FRED MARSHALL'S bill, to the Department for an official report. They kept the two bills from February until July 27, and on July 27, after a committee in the Department had studied the proposition, they wrote me a letter rejecting the bill, and said this:

> The Department recommends against the enactment of this bill.

And the letter goes on with a long report telling me why the soil-bank bill could not be made to work.

But between July and January the soil-bank idea—which was born when Mr. ANDERSEN and Mr. MARSHALL introduced their bills—the soil-bank idea grew in popularity and became on January 9 the administration's farm program.

I said to begin with, and I want to repeat right now, that I believe the President now has all the authority he needs to deal with all of the problems of the soil of America. All he needs is money. I challenged the Department representatives in the committee room and I said:

> Mr. Benson, tell me what authority you want and need that you do not now have.

He looked at his associates, and at his attorney, and we had no answer.

He has broad and comprehensive authority to deal with all the problems of the soil. I would like to read them to you but time will not permit me to do so, so I will insert in the RECORD at this point the relevant parts of sections 1, 7 (a) and 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended:

SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT, AS AMENDED

An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby recognized that the wastage of soil and moisture resources on farm, grazing, and forest lands of the Nation, resulting from soil erosion, is a menace to the national welfare and that it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby to preserve natural resources, control floods, prevent impairment of reservoirs, and maintain the navigability of rivers and harbors, protect public health, public lands and relieve unemployment, and the Secretary of Agriculture, from now on, shall coordinate and direct all activities with relation to soil erosion and in order to effectuate this policy is hereby authorized, from time to time—

(1) To conduct surveys, investigations, and research relating to the character of soil erosion and the preventive measures needed, to publish the results of any such surveys, investigations, or research, to disseminate information concerning such methods, and to

conduct demonstrational projects in areas subject to erosion by wind or water;

(2) To carry out preventive measures, including, but not limited to, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, and changes in use of land;

(3) To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act; and

(4) To acquire lands, or rights or interests therein, by purchase, gift, condemnation, or otherwise, whenever necessary for the purposes of this act. (16 U. S. C. 590a.)

* * * * *

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION POLICY AND ENUMERATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 7. (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include, (1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; (4) the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio. The powers conferred under sections 7 to 14 inclusive, of this act shall be used to assist voluntary action calculated to effectuate the purposes specified in this section. Such powers shall not be used to discourage the production of supplies of foods and fibers sufficient to maintain normal domestic human consumption as determined by the Secretary from the records of domestic human consumption in the years 1920 to 1929, inclusive, taking into consideration increased population, quantities of any commodity that were forced into domestic consumption by decline in exports during such period, current trends in domestic consumption and exports of particular commodities, and the quantities of substitutes available for domestic consumption within any general class of food commodities.

* * * * *

BASIS FOR PAYMENTS AND GRANTS OF AID; LOCAL, COUNTY, AND STATE COMMITTEES; CONSERVATION MATERIALS AND SERVICES

(b) Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); or (5) any combination of the above. In arid or semiarid sections, (1) and (2) above shall be construed to cover water conservation and the beneficial use of water on individual farms, including measures to prevent runoff, the building of check dams and ponds, and providing facilities for applying water to the land. In determining the amount of any payment or grant measured by (1) or (2) the Secretary shall take into consideration the productivity of the land affected by the farming practices adopted during the year with respect to which such payment is made. In carrying out the provisions of this section in the continental United States, the Secretary is directed to utilize the services of local and State committees selected as hereinafter provided. The Secretary shall designate local administrative areas as units for administration of programs under this section. No such local area shall include more than one county or parts of different counties. * * * The Secretary shall make such regulations as are necessary relating to the selection and exercise of the functions of the respective committees, and to the administration, through such committees, of such programs. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary—shall, as far as practicable, protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers; is authorized to utilize the agricultural extension service and other approved agencies; shall accord such recognition and encouragement to producer-owned and producer-controlled cooperative associations as will be in harmony with the policy toward cooperative associations set forth in existing acts of Congress and as will tend to promote efficient methods of marketing and distribution; shall not have power to acquire any land or any right or interest therein; shall, in every practicable manner, protect the interests of small producers; and shall in every practical way encourage and provide for soil-conserving and soil-rebuilding practices rather than the growing of soil-depleting crops. Rules and regulations governing payments or grants under this subsection shall be as simple and direct as possible, and, wherever practicable, they shall be classified on two bases: (a) Soil-depleting crops and practices, (b) soil-building crops and practices.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in making available conservation materials consisting of seeds, seed inoculants, fertilizers, liming and other soil-conditioning materials, trees, or plants, or in making available soil-conserving or soil-building services, to agricultural producers under this subsection, the Secretary may make payments, in advance of determination of performance by the producers, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials or covering soil-conserving or soil-building services, furnished to producers, or who render services to the Secretary in delivering to producers approved conservation materials, for the carrying out, by the producers, of soil-building or soil-conserving practices approved by the Secretary. The price at which purchase orders for any conservation materials or services are filled may be limited to a fair price fixed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in programs under this act; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)).

There is the broad authority. We have had a soil bank, I know, since 1934. In 1934 we spent $637 million on a soil bank.

Under the authority of these provisions of law, the Department of Agriculture has carried out numerous programs of similar nature to the present soil-bank proposal. One of these was described by the Secretary to the House Agricultural Committee in the following words in March 1955:

Acreage allotment payments under the agricultural conservation program. These so-called class I or acreage allotment payments, under section 8 (b) of the act of February 29, 1936, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, were aimed at maintaining farm production in balance with demand. This was carried out by the establishment of individual farm acreage allotments of soil-depleting crops representing proportionate shares of national production goals. The acreage allotment payments compensated farmers, in part, for making their proportionate acreage adjustments. This item excludes the so-called class II payments for conservation practices which are shown on the statement under the function headed "Programs Primarily for Conservation of Resources." The cost of these acreage allotment payments, which were made in the period 1937 through 1944, amounted to $2,354.8 million.

Year after year this Congress, with votes on both sides of the aisle, has given to Mr. Benson tens of millions of dollars more than he has asked us to give him. He asked for $175 million for the ACP program and we gave him $250 million. All of a sudden he comes up and he wants $1,200,000,000. I am willing for him to have that. But I want the record to show that Congress has not only given Mr. Benson more money than he has requested for soil conservation programs but that he has not used all we did give him. In the past 4 years he has failed to use more than $100 million of the funds Congress has appropriated for this important purpose.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that a few years ago he was here with the recommendation and making an effort to cut down the very program from $250 million to $150 million?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, the gentleman is correct; but the Congress refused to do that because we have appreciated the value of the soil program.

I remember when I first came to Congress the great speech made by that distinguished statesman, Mr. Fred Vinson, the beloved Kentuckian. He talked about the value of the topsoil of America. We have year after year spent millions of dollars and I am willing now for Mr. Benson to improve the soil, to have a soil bank, but I am not inclined to go into the committee room and to write a bill to duplicate authority he now has. He does not have authority to make 10-

year contracts. There may be a few minor things that we need to do. But the basic law is there and I challenge any lawyer in this House to read the law and tell me that my statement is inaccurate.

Let us face up to the situation. Perhaps I am not going to persuade anybody to change his mind. But let us think about our own responsibilities. The President has exercised his responsibility. Every Member of this House was elected from a great congressional district and each of us must share and bear our own responsibility. We are facing a tragic situation in the constant decline of farm income.

The President recognized that, the President said that, and I want to quote one thing and then I think I will stop. In his message to Congress on January 9, he made a statement, and these are very significant words because Mr. Benson has never used them but once and that was in the city of Paris. He never made a speech like this here. Here is what Mr. Eisenhower said:

> Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperatively needed in wartime.

That we know to be the truth. Why are we so greatly disturbed that we have a surplus here which has been accumulated because of programs we had in operation at a time when the men of America were on the ramparts of freedom throughout this world and bleeding and dying in behalf of the institutions of freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Inasmuch as we are going to have an extended debate, I wonder if the gentleman is reserving any time for this side?

Mr. COOLEY. I conferred with the former chairman and ranking minority member of our committee and he indicated he would like to have some time. If the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to speak, of course, I shall yield him time.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] would like to have some time today.

Mr. COOLEY. I will be as generous as circumstances permit.

Mr. MARTIN. That is an old story. How much time is the gentleman going to give us?

Mr. COOLEY. How much time does the gentleman from Indiana want?

Mr. HALLECK. At least 10 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. We might take the other 20 minutes, too.

Mr. COOLEY. I cannot be that generous. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes and then see where we stand. I will yield him 10 minutes after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] speaks.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, certain questions have arisen in connection with this veto on which there seem to be considerable misunderstanding. In the first place, I think there is a complete misunderstanding on the part of the President as well as on the part of others as to just how we affect the production of agricultural commodities by price. The President seems to indicate that all of our troubles from an agricultural standpoint have come from what he calls "high, rigid" price supports. I think the fallacy of the President's position is perfectly clear. He simply does not understand just how a farmer must operate. The President says "Why would a farmer plant more if he knew the price were going down?" I think that is a fair question, and I think it deserves a fair answer. Farmers are just like other people. They do the best they can for their loved ones, just as city people do. Suppose you were a cotton farmer or a wheat farmer. Last year the price of cotton was 31 cents a pound or $160 a bale. Suppose you grew 10 bales of cotton. You would have a gross of $1,600 from your farm. Suppose you learned in some manner that the price next year was going to be just half that or $80 a bale. What would be your reaction? The President assumes that you would immediately cut your cotton production. Of course, he assumes you would go into something more profitable, and that would be fine except for two things. In the first place, the price of all crops is depressed. There is no profitable alternative you can go into. In the second place, as a cotton grower, you doubtless live in a one-crop area. So does the wheat grower, and so does the tobacco grower; so do all of those who grow these basic commodities. That is the reason we call them basic commodities, because they are basic to the community in which they are grown. The man who grows peanuts, although it does not amount to a great deal in the total of the Nation, is dependent upon that peanut crop, and to him peanuts are just as basic as the corn crop or the wheat crop or the cotton crop. So it is with the producers of all of these commodities. They are each basic where grown, and there is no opportunity for the farmer to turn to something else. His only recourse, to maintain the living standards of himself and family, is to grow more, not less, cotton or wheat. And, that is exactly what the farmers will do. It is what they have always done. We grew our largest cotton crop when we had a price support of 52 percent of parity.

According to General Eisenhower, we should have been importing cotton that year, but we grew over 19 million bales at 52 percent of parity. It is the failure to understand this simple economic fact which has caused so many of our people to be critical of 90 percent supports. It has been a misunderstanding that has caused so many people to make the mistake the President has made and to charge that the so-called high rigid supports have caused an accumulation of vast surpluses at a great loss to the Nation. Of course, 90 percent supports are not high and they are not rigid. They are only nine-tenths of a fair price. Would a labor union take nine-tenths of a fair wage? Would the Bell Telephone Co. accept a rate that returned only nine-tenths of a fair return? These support prices are not rigid because they are tied to parity and parity itself goes up and down; up, only if the farmer's costs have increased and down any time the farmer's costs come down.

But let us look at the record; I shall quote to you from Secretary Benson's own record, his printed record of January 31, 1956. That shows that on that date our total losses on all 6 of the basic commodities were only $522 million. This incidentally compares with a net profit on those 6 commodities of over $13 million the day General Eisenhower took office. Up until that same day we had lost about $120 million on milk and milk products in about 20 years. But as of last January our losses on milk and milk products alone stood at $958 million and the support on milk and milk products has been flexible every day of that time.

That is not a loss on high, rigid supports. That is a billion-dollar loss on a flexible commodity, more than $800 million of it occurring under President Eisenhower.

I want to take the few remaining moments that I have to call attention to what I think is an extremely important matter, in regard to the provision of this bill that the President vetoed. I refer to the control of production of feed grains. For the first time in history this Congress has given the country a bill that automatically provides for a reduction in the production of feed and feed grains. That bill, which he criticizes, has in it in plain language a provision—and it is the first time we have had it—that, in order to get supports, the growers of corn and of feed grains all over the United States must make a reduction in their production, and we offered to pay enough to encourage such a reduction.

Surely, corn has had acreage allotments for years, but never has it been subject to the marketing quotas imposed on cotton and wheat, and never has corn production been effectively controlled. In this bill we have said that if you are going to get 90 percent supports you have got to take a certain percentage of your land out and put it into the soil bank. We have said to the grain-sorghum man in Texas and in Kansas and in the Southwest area, if you are going to get the supports that we offer, you have got to reduce your acreage by 15 percent. But the President has vetoed that provision and comes back and proposes to pay those people a support price of 86 percent on corn with no effective control. He has also vetoed the requirement that the grower of feed grains must cut his acreage. He has reduced the income of the grain grower but he has, at the same time, greatly increased the flood of cheap feed which is about to drown us.

How are you going to save the great livestock industry? You cannot do it by simply going out and knocking calves in the head and chloroforming little pigs. I know and you know that we did not have 10-cent pork when we had high-priced feed grains. You have never had cheap pork, you have never had cheap beef when you had a fair price for feed. Cheap feed always brings cheap hogs.

Cheap feed brings cheap cattle. The only way you are going to help the livestock industry and raise it out of the doldrums in which it now flounders is to give us some kind of restrictions on the ever-increasing production of feed. And yet the President vetoes the only hope that this Nation has ever had to restrict in any way, in any orderly manner, our production of feed.

We came in here with a carefully worked out bill, one that kept the relationship between corn and the other feed grains fair and equitable; a bill which we had worked out in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, because we did not just sit there in conference and draw figures out of the air. In that conference committee we had the experts from the Department of Agriculture with us to see that we kept the proper ratios between corn and other grains. We provided that the acreages of these feed crops must be reduced. That is the only way you are going to solve this great problem of too much corn, this problem of too many hogs, this problem of too much lard, of too cheap pork, and help the bankrupt farmer in Iowa and the cowman in New Mexico.

We offered you and we offer you today an opportunity to put shoes on the children throughout that great area of the United States. We offer you an opportunity to put carpets on the floors of the homes throughout the great breadbasket of America. Are you over here on my left going to say that you are so carried away with the agricultural knowledge of a great general, who never farmed a day in his life, that you are going to substitute his judgment for the judgment that you yourselves passed here just 1 week ago today? I assume that you acted in good faith and in good conscience then. I assume that you were correct when you told your constituents, 45 of you told your constituents, that you believed that you were passing a good bill for them then. Let us see how you vote today.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague from North Carolina. Some of us had thought originally that, as he said at the outset, possibly about everything possible had been said on this matter, and there was some idea that possibly he would state the majority position and we would let it go at that. But since that route was not followed, then I think some of the things that have been said need to be clarified.

First of all, let me say this, and there is no one here to deny it: We have in Dwight D. Eisenhower a President of the United States who is respected and admired certainly as much if not more than any President in my time.

There is another thing that ought to be understood on both sides of the aisle, because I have heard many protestations since he took office that the right-hand, Democratic, side of the aisle supports the President better than we support him on our Republican side of the aisle. We are about to find out about that. So I am not at all sorry about this vote coming along on this issue or that there has been some debate.

Actually, as to any suggestion that the President does not know what is in this bill or the action that he took on the veto, I say to you people I have sat in conferences with him and he does know. I know what I am talking about, and I must say some of the rest of you do not know what you are talking about in that regard.

I have been here nearly 22 years. I will say again for President Eisenhower that he has shown more respect for constitutional processes, yes, more respect for legislative prerogatives and responsibilities, than any President we have had for a long time. We have seen evidences of that time and time again.

I listened as always with interest to the gentleman from North Carolina, and I must say if I ever heard him make a defensive speech that was it. He is trying to explain away the delay. It would seem as I listened to him that he waits upon the administration to write the legislation but then after the administration makes suggestions, why, such suggestions are not to be heeded or followed in connection with the legislation. I do not believe you can blow hot and cold on that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I will yield if the gentleman will give me a few more minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. I have only a minute, but I would like to make one statement.

The SPEAKER. Whether the gentleman from Indiana yields is in his hands, not in the hands of someone else. That is his business.

Mr. COOLEY. Even up to this hour Mr. Benson has not asked for the $1,200-000,000 that he wants.

Mr. HALLECK. I assume from that the gentleman means the appropriation?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. HALLECK. I disagree with the gentleman from North Carolina as to the statutory authority now existing in the law. I think that legislation is needed. May I say this. If you are the fathers of the soil bank plan, why did you disavow it Why do you not get busy and bring out a soil bank plan which we know will be legal and right. The country is going to watch to see what you do about that part of the program in which we are all so interested. As a matter of fact, the Republican 80th Congress did not get much help from downtown, but we wrote a farm bill, a tax bill, and the Taft-Hartley bill. We accepted our responsibility as legislators. We went ahead and wrote what we felt we should write. You passed a bobtailed farm bill last summer with 90 percent supports in it and the milk program and the brucellosis program. If you wanted a soil bank then, why did you not put it in your bill? If you wanted a two-price system on wheat, why did you not put it in the bill? If you wanted supports, why did you not put them in the bill? If you wanted dual parity, why did you not put it in the bill? It took you a long time to find out, apparently, what you wanted. Actually, that bill reposed in the other body all last fall. The President's proposal came here in January 9th. That was the nine point program. You knew then what the administration wanted, and you cannot explain the fact that more than 3 months elapsed from January 9 until the President got the bill on his desk. I know—I saw it quoted in the paper—my very dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] who is now so concerned about the farmer getting some money this summer—he was the one, if he was quoted correctly, who wanted to see to it that none of the money went to the farmers before November. I do not accuse anyone of playing politics, but I must say at times it looks to me as though there has been some pretty rank delay. Now, then, I do not know whether I understood the gentleman from North Carolina correctly or not, but if I did, I must say I have never been shocked by any statement as I was just a few moments ago when he said that the farm program is paramount to the program of peace and the problem of peace. I just do not believe that. I think the farmers of this country want this Nation kept at peace. I do not think they want their price problems solved by getting into another war. Certainly, this farm problem has been building up and all of us have been trying to do something about it. Certainly, we ought to do something about it. When you came in with this conference report, we pointed out to you that there were things in it which were completely unacceptable and which were objectionable, and we devised a motion to recommit not to take out all of the things that were objectionable, but to get them down to a bare minimum. You were told that if you did not vote for that motion to recommit, the bill would be vetoed. Then what did you do? You chose to charge headlong into a situation which you knew could not prevail. I predict right here and now that there will be a majority of Representatives who will vote to sustain the President's veto here in just a few minutes. May I say to my friends who voted for the conference report that at that time I said in debate that if the motion to recommit did not prevail, you would go back to existing law which was 75 percent, and wheat would be supported at $1.73 and likewise corn would be supported at a lesser figure. Now with reference to this matter of voting to sustain the veto. What happened? The President has moved administratively, if we had not abdicated our responsibility and authority in that regard. So the President has said that the support price on wheat will be $2 and that the support price on corn will be $1.50 and on rice $4.50. Tobacco will be supported as it is presently, and milk will be $3.25 a hundredweight and butterfat 58.6 cents. So now you have that part of it—the very thing we tried to do to clean up the bill when we had the motion to recommit. But, as I say, you would not pay any attention to our efforts then.

The President has moved administratively to improve the farm condition, and it is improving. I sold my corn the other day for $1.30. I should have held

on to it. I sold my soybeans for $2.23, and they hit $2.86. That is away above parity. Hogs came back to $16. We will work this thing out if you will just help.

Now, certainly for anyone who voted for the conference report there is no inconsistency in voting to sustain the veto today. I have here the editorial comment from daily papers in my own State of Indiana. All of them call this bill a monstrosity or something worse. The United Press took a poll of farmers in Indiana. Overwhelmingly they said the President ought to veto the bill.

I have a clipping from the newswire, quoting Governor Lausche, of Ohio:

Gov. Frank J. Lausche says it would have been shameful for President Eisenhower to have signed the farm bill.

Further:

The President would have compromised everything noble he has stood for all of his life if he had signed the bill, which was a bad bill—

The Democratic Governor said in an interview.

Lausche said if the President had signed the bill "he would have put himself in the role of just another common politician."

The Governor said that "the legislators in Congress put everything they could in that bill to get a few votes."

Lausche said that if he had been faced with the issue of signing the bill, "I would have vetoed it quicker than the President did."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. No. If the gentleman differs with his Governor, and that is entirely possible, perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina will give him some time, but I cannot yield.

Now, here we are. The question is, Are we going to stand by what we believe is right? I know that there are Members here whose standing with me has always been high however they voted, and it always will be high. Personally, I do not charge any single Member with any lack of courage or any playing of politics. I think there can be honest differences of opinion about what is best for the country, and I respect those differences. But I know from talking with the greatest farm leaders in the country and by conversations I have had with the dirt farmers who realize we have to make some adjustments in the transition from war to peace—I know that this bill as it went to the President was not good for the farmers, and if it was not good for the farmers it could not be good for the country, and the veto should be sustained overwhelmingly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone who has had anything to do with agriculture in the House knows that I have been a strong supporter of the soil bank plan for more than 3 years. I was a supporter of this measure long before the Department of Agriculture had ever given it any consideration.

Melvin Gehlbach of Lincoln, Ill., a constituent of mine, was the originator of the soil bank plan. Members of the House Committee on Agriculture will recall that Mr. Gehlbach was the first person ever to testify before that committee about the soil bank. That testimony was first rendered in June of 1953 before the subcommittee which was having grassroots hearings at Bloomington, Ill. Ever since that day, the soil bank has been growing in the estimation of the thinkers on agriculture in this body. Eight months later, early in 1954, two bills—one by Mr. MARSHALL and another by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, both of Minnesota—were introduced in the House. I supported both of those bills.

I supported the present bill under consideration when it was before the House on a conference report, a week ago. I supported this legislation because I believed that the soil bank plan was the heart of that bill. The soil bank is the only plan or suggestion in the 6 years I have been in this Congress which I felt would have a real impact on agricultural surpluses in the country. This plan is an incentive method to the farmer of reducing acreage. Reduction in acreage is the only solution I can see whereby we can get a reduction in overall supply.

For the last hour I have been hearing a great deal of discussion on both sides of this bill. It seems to me too much of what has been said is essentially destructive. In these 2 minutes, I hope I can lend something constructive to this discussion.

I do not believe there is a colleague sitting in this House now who believes that the President's veto will be overridden. I voted for the bill on last Wednesday. To be consistent, I shall vote for the bill today. However, I do believe now we should begin to think where we are when this vote is finished.

The soil-bank plan is supported by 9 out of each 10 Members on both sides of the aisle. This part of the farm bill has almost unanimous support. We should begin immediately to take the heart of the present bill, the soil-bank plan, and pass it as separate legislation.

I am not interested in credit. I will be perfectly willing to yield credit to anyone in either party who will help get this needed legislation passed.

I was somewhat disappointed when my colleague, the chairman of this great committee, a few minutes ago said he believed the Secretary of Agriculture had all of the authority he needed to put a soil-bank plan into operation. I believe I am somewhat familiar with most of the legislation on farm problems. In my opinion, no country lawyer after reading all of the legislation having to do with this problem would render a decision that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to put into effect the kind of a soil bank which is contained in the bill under discussion. The Secretary must have the additional legislation contained in this bill or similar legislation in order to get the soil bank started.

Therefore, I hope that partisan feelings will not enter too much into further consideration of this important problem. It is true it is too late to implement the soil-bank plan in 1956. However, unless we pass such a plan this year, we cannot have it ready in time to be of assistance in 1957. This surplus problem will be with us unless we put into operation this or similar legislation. And, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will use all of your influences with the great Committee on Agriculture to get out a bill covering the soil-bank plan only on which this House can vote in 1956. I am sure you know as well as I do that such a plan would pass this House overwhelmingly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made a few points in his speech to which I think some reply ought to be made.

He stated that the Democrats claim credit for giving the President better support than the Republicans do. I might say that on this issue Democrats have given the President better support than have Republicans, more especially if you gauge the support by our effort to help the President carry out his galloping campaign promises of 4 years ago.

In 1952, Candidate Eisenhower outbid the Democrats for the farm vote when he promised farmers 100 percent of parity. The 90-percent bid he made at Brookings, S. Dak., turned out to be not good enough for him. He upped it to 100 percent and took the farm issue right out of the campaign.

Here at least we have gone as far as we could to help the President carry out his campaign promises and at the same time stand by our own, but our good friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], along with most of his Republican colleagues, have done just to the contrary. They have ignored and forgotten those promises. Unfortunately, so has the President.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] indicated that the 80th Republican Congress did not get much help from the White House and the downtown departments. Well, they were not entitled to much. With Democrats not being responsible in the least for the results, the Republican 80th Congress wrote a record that immediately helped Republicans out of office at the next election. They committed suicide. Had Democrats downtown joined in, the coroner's verdict, instead of being "suicide," would have read "Murder at the hands of Democrats."

Our distinguished friend from Indiana also defended the President in his criticism of the Congress for failing to do legislatively what he, the President, is now doing administratively. Well, of all things. The President is a grown man; so is the gentleman from Indiana. Had it been possible to do these things administratively, why did he and Benson announce last early winter that they would have a new farm program ready for this session of the Congress? Why do they fuss about all of the so-called delay? Why didn't Mr. Eisenhower, who seemingly can do no wrong, make no mistakes and commit no error—why didn't he then and there take the administrative action? Why did he send a farm message to us on January 9? What

has he and Secretary Benson been waiting on all this time?

He referred also to a statement issued by Governor Lausche, of Ohio, in which Lausche supports the veto. He said Mr. Lausche is a Democrat. I do not know; I have never seen Mr. Lausche. I have heard of him, and the statement which is accredited to him is not the first Republican utterance the Governor is said to have made. May I also point out that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana very carefully avoided making reference to three distinguished Republican governors from Iowa, South Dakota, and Kansas, respectively, who made a flying night ride to Washington and appealed to the President to sign the bill. They thought it was all right. And they thought enough of it to come to Washington so as to make a personal appeal in support of it. If we are to measure the correctness and merits of the bill by governors who have crossed party lines, the score is 3 to 1 in favor of the bill.

One other point. The gentleman indicated that he should have held his corn. He certainly should have. And measured by the action announced in the President's veto message, he might have done well to have held it until just before election. The President may have had the urge, acting administratively, to give corn supports another raise. It would have vote appeal, you know.

In the veto message the President announced several increases in price supports—wheat, corn, rice, manufacturing milk, and butter.

Could it be that the administration is playing a little politics? Could it be that the raises, coming after the support prices were already announced, constitute just a little political bait for the November election? I am making no charges. But it is exceeding strange that Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Benson waited until this late date to raise these support prices. The timing seems to be unusually coincidental with the unpopular veto.

This administration had announced the support price on wheat at $1.81 per bushel, or 76 percent of parity. That was for this year, 1956; but when he sent the veto he sent along with it another bid for the wheat vote, or was it a bid? I just cannot help but feel that they became alarmed over their first announced support price of 76 percent of parity on wheat and decided the results might be fatal. Seeing the difficulty confronting them, they announced a new support price for wheat—$2 per bushel, or almost 84 percent of parity, a raise of 8 percent.

Could it be that the administration was concerned about the vote in the Wheat Belt? Why did they not stick by their guns, by their first announced support price of 76 percent of parity? Could it be that this was to temper the disappointment that would come to wheat farmers for knocking them out of 90 percent of parity and also burying the two-price program for which they and the National Grange have fought so long?

The administration had also previously set the price support on corn at 81 percent of parity. For 1956 corn. When the veto mesage came over, they tinkered with corn supports, too. I will not say absolutely they were playing politics with the Corn Belt, but it is rather strange they would fix the price, as they did some time ago, on 1956 corn at 81 percent of parity and then on vetoing the farm bill announce that corn support was going to be raised to 86.2 percent of parity. Why was this announcement tied in with the veto message? Could it be because the Republican Governor of Iowa had told Eisenhower what the political consequences would be if he vetoed the farm bill and failed to up the price support on corn? You know Iowa is a corn State. And you know there is talk of a political upheaval out there among the corn farmers. Why did not Eisenhower and Benson fix the price support on corn at 86.2 percent of parity in the beginning? Now I am not saying all of this is political, however, it looks mighty, mighty suspicious. But, of course, we are told Ike would not think of playing politics, oh, no, not at all. He is much too big for that.

Could it be that the administration after it had set the price support for 1956 on manufacturing milk became concerned about the political situation in the Dairy Belt? I am not making the charge, just throwing out the inquiry. Eisenhower and Benson had set the 1956 price support on manufacturing milk at 82 percent of parity, but when the veto message came over they raised it to 84 percent of parity. They had set the 1956 price support for butter at 78 percent of parity but when the veto message was sent over they announced that it would be raised to 81 percent of parity.

I just do not understand this sort of administrative action. Furthermore, the timing of the raises makes me rather suspicious. We all know that wheat, corn, manufacturing milk and butterfat are the substantial farm products of the Midwest and upper Midwest. We also know that some political primaries have just been held out there and that they indicate an upheaval among farmers against the administration's program. We also know that these farmers are unhappy with the original levels at which the administration set the price supports. We also know that many midwestern Republican Senators and Representatives voted for the farm bill and urged the President to sign it. We also know that 3 Republican governors from the Midwest flew into Washington and made a similar appeal to the President. Now, I ask in all seriousness, how does it happen that the increases in price supports for this particular section of the country are simultaneously announced along with and as a part of the veto message. Never before have I heard of support prices being announced by way of a veto message. They usually come directly from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Is all of this political? Be your own judge.

There were two notable exceptions to this sudden increase in price supports—cotton and peanuts. Where are they grown? They are grown down in the deep South, where there are very few Republicans, thank goodness. They did nothing for cotton. Cotton farmers were written off. They did nothing for peanuts. The peanut farmers were written off. But they did not write off the Wheat Belt, they gave them a raise. They did not write off the Corn Belt, they gave them a raise. They did not write off the Dairy Belt, they gave them a raise. And although Mr. Benson had sent a letter to a Member of the other body—in an effort, I must say, to persuade Cotton Belt Senators to support his policies in which he indicated to them he would support cotton at about 87 percent of parity, yesterday he announced the support price for cotton at only 82½ percent of parity. But this is in keeping with Republican failures to go through with their promises.

Also, it is very strange indeed that this administration has waited until such a late date—later than ever before—to announce the price support on cotton. Could it be that this was intended to put a squeeze on Senators and Representatives from the deep South?

Action of the administration is a bold, barefaced discrimination against cotton. They fix price supports on wheat, corn, manufacturing milk and butter. Then when the heat is on they raise the support levels. They withhold the announcement of price support on cotton but indicate that it may be around 87 percent. Then after the fight is over they beat us over the head with the lowest support of all—82½ percent. Such discrimination I have never seen.

And for the poor lowly peanut, another crop of the deep South, they have made no announcement at all.

I just wonder what cotton and peanuts would be supported at if they were produced in the Midwest, the center of the farm revolt.

We will let the people look at the record and determine for themselves who is playing politics and where it is being played. You may think you can appease farmers of the Midwest with this slight increase in support prices. Come November you will get the verdict. It will then be the turn of my Republican friends to weep.

The discrimination of which this administration is guilty against southern cotton and peanut farmers will be felt in every Southern farm home. It will be difficult for us to bear. Already the southern cotton farmer is living in a depression. His acreage has been cut back and back and back. Now his price is to be cut and the cut is even deeper than that administered to other major commodities such as wheat, corn and milk.

But southerners have lived through other discriminations practiced against them by the Republican Party. We will make it through this, too. The going will be tough but we will make it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say this about the great golfing Governor of Ohio who reputedly shoots a lower score than the President and who has through his opposition to adequate financing tried to ruin the school system of Ohio and who in his

tenure as Governor has permitted Ohio's highways to deteriorate until they are among the worst in the Nation. Knowing him as I do, perhaps I should say in my opinion, he would have kicked the farmers of the Nation in the teeth before he teed off on the first hole; he wouldn't have waited to have a conference in the golf shop on the ninth hole.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything further but the gentleman from Indiana made some reference to certain observations of mine and I did not desire to interrupt him at that time. I want to make perfectly clear what I said a moment ago when I stated that the problems of agriculture were paramount to the problem of peace. I meant by that, and I thought everyone understood, that we are living in a very hungry world. We are complaining here in this country about the problem of plenty. Regardless of what party is directing the destinies of this Nation, we must learn something about the art of distribution. We cannot hope to live long at peace in a world that is as hungry as are many parts of the world in which we live.

I want to conclude on this price support matter by saying that it seems to me the differences now involved are more or less inconsequential in view of the magnitude of the problem with which we are dealing. The fact remains that all of this talk about price supports has been going on for the last 3 years. Even now for last year's crop 3 of the 6 basic commodities are supported at 90 percent of parity.

With reference to sugar—and there is not a pound of sugar produced in North Carolina or in my district—it is being supported by this administration at more than 98 percent of parity. Wool is being supported at 106 percent of parity. Both of these commodities are raised in Utah, Colorado, and other places out there. I am not saying that Mr. Benson's views are governed or influenced by geography, but the fact is that sugar is used in the households of America and it does not have to be supported at 98 percent of parity, yet it is. He has not advocated lowering the sugar support price. He can lower it overnight just by administrative order.

So when we sum up all this talk about price supports, it seems to me that he has not been practicing what he has been preaching for the last 3 years.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 202, nays 211, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—202

Abbitt	Andersen, H. Carl	Aspinall
Abernethy	Andrews	Avery
Addonizio	Anfuso	Barden
Albert	Ashmore	Barrett
Alexander	Belcher	Bass, Tenn.
Bell	Bennett, Fla.	Berry
Blitch	Boggs	Bolling
Bonner	Bowler	Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.	Brown, Ga.	Buckley
Burdick	Burleson	Byrd
Byrne, Pa.	Cannon	Carlyle
Carnahan	Celler	Chatham
Chelf	Christopher	Chudoff
Colmer	Cooley	Cooper
Davidson	Davis, Ga.	Davis, Tenn.
Dawson, Ill.	Deane	Dempsey
Denton	Dies	Diggs
Dingell	Dollinger	Dolliver
Dorn, S. C.	Dowdy	Doyle
Durham	Eberharter	Edmondson
Elliott	Evins	Feighan
Fisher	Flood	Flynt
Forrester	Fountain	Frazier
Garmatz	Gathings	George
Gordon	Granahan	Grant
Gray	Green, Oreg.	Gregory
Griffiths	Gross	Hardy
Harris	Hays, Ark.	Hays, Ohio
Hayworth	Hoeven	Holifield
Holland	Hope	Huddleston
Hull	Ikard	Jarman
Jennings	Jensen	Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.	Jones, Mo.	Jones, N. C.
Karsten	Kee	Kelley, Pa.
Keogh	Kilgore	King, Calif.
Kirwan	Klein	Kluczynski
Knutson	Krueger	Landrum
Lanham	Lankford	LeCompte
Lesinski	Long	Lovre
McCarthy	McCormack	McDowell
McMillan	Machrowicz	Mack, Ill.
Madden	Magnuson	Mahon
Marshall	Matthews	Metcalf
Miller, Calif.	Mills	Morrison
Moss	Moulder	Multer
Murray, Ill.	Murray, Tenn.	Natcher
Norrell	O'Brien, Ill.	O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski	O'Neill	Passman
Patman	Perkins	Pfost
Pilcher	Poage	Polk
Preston	Price	Priest
Rabaut	Rains	Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.	Richards	Riley
Rivers	Roberts	Rodino
Rogers, Colo.	Rogers, Tex.	Rooney
Roosevelt	Rutherford	Selden
Shelley	Sheppard	Shuford
Sieminski	Sikes	Simpson, Ill.
Sisk	Smith, Kans.	Smith, Miss.
Spence	Springer	Steed
Sullivan	Talle	Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.	Thompson, N. J.	Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry	Trimble	Tuck
Tumulty	Vinson	Watts
Weaver	Whitten	Wickersham
Wier	Williams, Miss.	Willis
Winstead	Wright	Zablocki
Zelenko		

NAYS—211

Adair	Chenoweth	Gavin
Alger	Chiperfield	Gubser
Allen, Calif.	Church	Gwinn
Allen, Ill.	Clark	Hagen
Andresen, August H.	Clevenger	Hale
Arends	Cole	Halleck
Ashley	Coon	Hand
Auchincloss	Corbett	Harden
Ayres	Coudert	Harrison, Nebr.
Bailey	Cramer	Harrison, Va.
Baker	Cretella	Harvey
Baldwin	Crumpacker	Hébert
Bass, N. H.	Cunningham	Henderson
Bates	Curtis, Mass.	Herlong
Baumhart	Curtis, Mo.	Heselton
Beamer	Dague	Hess
Becker	Davis, Wis.	Hiestand
Bennett, Mich.	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Bentley	Delaney	Hillings
Betts	Derounian	Hinshaw
Boland	Devereux	Hoffman, Mich.
Bolton, Frances P.	Dixon	Holmes
Bolton, Oliver P.	Dodd	Holt
Bosch	Dondero	Holtzman
Bow	Donohue	Horan
Boyle	Dorn, N. Y.	Hyde
Bray	Ellsworth	James
Brown, Ohio	Engle	Jenkins
Brownson	Fallon	Johansen
Broyhill	Fascell	Jonas
Budge	Fenton	Judd
Burnside	Fernandez	Kean
Bush	Fino	Kearney
Byrnes, Wis.	Fjare	Kearns
Canfield	Fogarty	Keating
Carrigg	Forand	Kelly, N. Y.
Cederberg	Ford	Kilburn
Chase	Frelinghuysen	King, Pa.
Corbett	Friedel	Knox
Coudert	Fulton	Laird
Cramer	Gary	Lane
Latham	Pillion	Staggers
Lipscomb	Poff	Taber
McConnell	Powell	Taylor
McCulloch	Prouty	Teague, Calif.
McDonough	Quigley	Thomas
McGregor	Radwan	Thompson, Mich.
McIntire	Ray	Thomson, Wyo.
McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Tollefson
Macdonald	Reed, N. Y.	Udall
Mack, Wash.	Rees, Kans.	Utt
Mailliard	Rhodes, Ariz.	Vanik
Martin	Riehlman	Van Pelt
Mason	Robeson, Va.	Van Zandt
Meader	Robsion, Ky.	Velde
Merrow	Rogers, Fla.	Vorys
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Mass.	Vursell
Miller, Nebr.	Sadlak	Wainwright
Miller, N. Y.	St. George	Westland
Minshall	Saylor	Wharton
Morano	Schenck	Widnall
Mumma	Schwengel	Wigglesworth
Nelson	Scott	Williams, N. J.
Nicholson	Scrivner	Wilson, Calif.
Norblad	Scudder	Wilson, Ind.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Seely-Brown	Withrow
Osmers	Sheehan	Wolverton
Ostertag	Short	Yates
Patterson	Siler	Young
Pelly	Simpson, Pa.	Younger
Philbin	Smith, Va.	
Phillips	Smith, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—20

Blatnik	Healey	Morgan
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Hara, Minn.
Donovan	Hosmer	Scherer
Gamble	Jackson	Walter
Gentry	Johnson, Calif.	Williams, N. Y.
Green, Pa.	Kilday	Wolcott
Haley	Mollohan	

So (two-thirds not having voted in the affirmative) the bill was rejected, and the veto message and bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Healey and Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Mr. Morgan and Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Walter against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Haley with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Hosmers.

Mr. Gentry with Mr. Jackson.

The results of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. OSMERS, is recorded as answering to his name. I understand his name was called and he answered on the first call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. MARTIN. He was here on the first roll call and thinking his name was recorded he left. I understand the Chair cannot do anything about it.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as voting "No."

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman vote?

Mr. OSMERS. Yes, sir. I voted "Nay."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was present and listening and voted "Nay" when his name was called?

Mr. OSMERS. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be recorded as voting "Nay."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the House has voted to sustain the veto of the President, thereby reducing the income of the farmers of America by more than $2 billion in this year, 1956.

It is easy to understand how some Members may have been misled in believing that it will be possible to enact legislation which will supplant or be substituted for the relief which was carried in H. R. 12, but unfortunately that is not the case.

As was so clearly pointed out by our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, any money made available through a soil bank program is not new income for the farmer; it would merely replace a portion of that income taken away from and which will be denied to the farmers of America through the veto of the farm bill by President Eisenhower.

As I stated at the time of the veto, President Eisenhower has evidenced his willingness to assume the criticism that has been directed at Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and to accept the responsibility for reducing the income of the farmers of the United States by not less than $2 billion this year.

Likewise, the President's announcement of price supports on some of the basic commodities at not less than 82½ percent of parity will not have the effect of reducing production and will not have one iota of effect on reducing surpluses, but will only have the effect of reducing the income of farmers. This reduction of income to the farmers will likewise be felt throughout the economy of the entire Nation.

With all of this talk about integrity, principles and people, and if you please honesty, it reminds me of the "Honest John" character who was always going about bragging about his honesty and his principles in the hope that it would direct attention from his questionable reputation and his everyday activities.

With all of his platitudes about his concern for the farmers of America, President Eisenhower has never explained, to my satisfaction, how he squares his actions throughout the last 3 years with his pre-election statement made at Brookings, S. Dak., when he said:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100-percent parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90.

I have time and time again called attention to the promise made to members of our House Committee on Agriculture by Secretary Benson that politics would have no part in the administration of the ASC program, yet he has stubbornly and consistently refused to demand that the program in Missouri be administered honestly, fairly, and legally. He has condoned the rewriting of regulations to permit the payment of salaries to office managers who had been fired by farmer-elected county committees who have been stripped of any authority which they may have had for administering the programs at the county level.

While he concurred in the report of the Department of Agriculture which disapproved of the soil-bank program which was proposed more than a year ago, on the grounds that it was unworkable and that the estimated cost of $490 million annually was prohibitive, he now recommends a program that would admittedly cost more than a billion dollars to be distributed on an arbitrary basis, and in advance of proof of compliance. And still there are some who will contend that the President and his Secretary of Agriculture are not playing politics with the farm vote.

The arbitrary actions of the Secretary of Agriculture were further pointed up this week, when on April 17, he arbitrarily announced that the support price on the 1956 cotton crop would be 82½ percent of parity. I guess he thinks the cotton farmers of America should be most grateful to him for not setting the price at 75 percent of parity, and admittedly he could have done this. And of course the President will tell the voters in the cotton section this fall that he was good to them by asuring them support prices of 82½ percent of parity, rather than the 75 percent minimum which the collapsible price-support system would have permitted. But he may have a hard time explaining why he did not set the support at 90 percent of parity which he could just as easily have done. And do not forget this, my friends, the level of price support will not have one bit of effect on the production of cotton this year. The only effect will be on the income of the farmers who grow this crop.

And I wonder how the Secretary of Agriculture will explain his proposed deal offered in the Senate when the farm bill was up for consideration there. It is a well known fact that he was willing to guarantee price supports of no less than 87½ percent if the Senate would give him a flexible price-support bill. There is no question but what he was able to get some votes on this promise, but his promise of 87½ percent price supports for cotton in 1956 will amount to as much as the President's promise of 90 percent price supports made to the farmers of America back in the fall of 1952.

And, I wonder how the Secretary of Agriculture will try to explain his actions in waiting so long to announce the price supports for cotton in this year, 1956. He waited until a large portion of the crop was planted in the South; some has even been planted in the northernmost sections of the Cotton Belt; and plans had been completed for all planting before April 17 when this announcement was made, almost 2 months later than the announcement is ordinarily made. Will the Secretary of Agriculture have the audacity to say that politics did not enter into that announcement?

February 21, was the date that the announcement was made in 1952. In 1953 this announcement was made on February 26; March 3, 1954; and it was as early as February 23, that the announcement was made last year. Yet, during this election year the Secretary appears to have held this uncertainty over the heads of the Members of Congress as a whip to get his particular version of the farm bill passed. By his proposed "deal" he has admitted that he has the power to manipulate and to arbitarily fix the support prices, not only on cotton, but on all other basic commodities. With one stroke of the pen he has seen fit to knock $15 a bale from the price of cotton, which translated into the 14 million bale crop of this past year is well over $200 million. If he is still in the saddle I shudder to think what will happen to the cotton farmers in 1957.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Finance and Commerce of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 474) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the vice chairman and ranking House minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. And at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the reading of the resolution, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 10387.

This resolution came out of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously and the rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. It makes the resolution in order. It is an open rule. Debate is limited to 1

hour. The bill made in order, H. R. 10387, has to do with construction by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and no objection to the resolution.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10387, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in behalf of H. R. 10387, an original bill unanimously reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which authorizes the appropriation of $295,495,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission to be used for construction or expansion of existing facilities or acquisition or condemnation of any real property.

As you may recall, last year was the first time that the Atomic Energy Commission was required to seek such authorization. When the original Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was revised in late 1954, a new provision of law was included requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to seek authorization for moneys to be utilized for construction or acquisition purposes. This provision is identified as section 261 of Public Law 703 and reads as follows:

SEC. 261. Appropriation: There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

The first part of this section grants general authorization for the appropriation of money needed by the Atomic Energy Commission for operating purposes. The latter portion of the above cited section, however, specifically provides that each year authority must be sought for any moneys to be used for construction or acquisition purposes.

The initial authority last year—which became Public Law 141—established the format and general limitations upon the expenditure of such money. H. R. 10387, now before us, follows the identical pattern.

Section 101 contains a list of the projects identified by numbers. This section is broken down into general categories which relate to major programs being carried on by the Commission. It is further subdivided for purposes of setting specific limitations under which the various projects may be started when the deviation is at variance from the estimate originally prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In section 102 these deviations are detailed.

Section 103 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services it deems necessary but which are not otherwise authorized by law.

Section 104 of the bill authorizes the appropriations of funds necessary to restore or replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged. In addition the Commission is authorized to use such funds as may be currently or otherwise available to it under these emergency conditions.

Section 105 of the bill authorizes the Commission to utilize not only the moneys authorized to be appropriated in section 101 of this bill but also any other funds which may be currently available to it for accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Section 106 authorizes the Commission under certain specific procedures to substitute within the limits of money authorized by this bill a new project, the estimate for which is not contained in this bill.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on the projects identified in this bill and is satisfied that these items are essential to the national defense and to the furtherance of the civilian application of atomic energy.

Inasmuch as the gentleman from California who is chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on this matter is completely familiar with the details of these projects, I would therefore ask him to give a more detailed discussion of the bill and answer such questions as the Members may desire to ask.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today H. R. 10387, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

This bill was reported out by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in conformance with its statutory responsibility under section 261 of Public Law 703.

The Committee, through its duly appointed Subcommittee on Legislation, heard testimony from the Atomic Energy Commission in defense of each of the individual items set forth in this bill, the total of which amounts to $295,495,000.

You will note that this bill authorizes the appropriation of moneys to be used for construction and acquisition purposes only. The AEC request for operating expenses for fiscal year 1957 is now before the House Appropriations Committee for consideration. It is therefore a matter of some urgency that this bill, H. R. 10387, receive early floor action in order that both the Commission's operating budget and construction budget requests be considered by the House Appropriations Committee simultaneously.

The bill as reported out carried language under section 102 which strictly defines the latitude the agency has in expending this money. This is identical in every respect with the provisions of the similar bill reported out for the first time last year and which became Public Law 141.

The Committee is familiar with the programs for which this money is intended to be spent and based on its knowledge thereof concurs in such expenditures. It is the Committee's judgment that these programs are essential to the national defense and to the rapid exploitation of atomic energy for peaceful uses.

Perhaps a brief general description of what the AEC proposes to use the money for which this bill authorizes would be in order. Out of the overall $295,495,000, to be authorized, $113 million is to be used for the construction of new and urgently needed facilities to further reactor development. Aside from the weapons program, this is probably the most important responsibility the Commission has. It therefore proposes to continue at the present high rate the devlopment of specialized reactors for both military and peacetime uses. For example, research in nuclear propulsion of aircraft has advanced to the point where the Commission is in urgent need of new and more extensive facilities at its Arco testing station for the advanced testing of nuclear propulsion systems for aircraft. It will be unnecessary to acquire any more land for this construction program.

The next general category is authorization for $70.6 million to be utilized for the construction and additions to existing weapons fabricating facilities. This construction is urgently needed to meet not only the increasing rate at which weapons are being manufactured, but also to permit the production of new types of weapons as they are proven in.

The next largest item is $57 million which the Commission plans to expend for improvements to existing fissionable material production facilities. The committee deems this to be a proper expenditure since for a relatively small sum of money as related to the value of the existing facilities, the efficiency and production rate can be enhanced rapidly and significantly. These improvements in efficiency and production can be brought about sooner and at less cost than would be the case if the Commission undertook to construct completely new facilities.

The Commission plans to expend $28.6 million for construction purposes to further its physical research program. Into this category falls the construction of newer particle accelerators, a highly important research tool essential to more profound studies of the nature and behavior of the atom.

Three million two hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars will be expended in the Commission's raw materials program. Of this amount, $400,000 is for the construction of a new central analytical laboratory which will analyze the uranium ore bought by the Commission. This is an essential function to assure the proper payment for the uranium content of the ore. The balance in an amount of $2,800,000, is for the construction of approximately 200 miles of new access roads and improvements on 106 miles of old roads in the Colorado Plateau area. These roads are necessary for the continued development of highly productive mines which have been located at distances from main highways. This program of construction of access roads has been in effect for several years and is handled in behalf of the Commission by the United States Bureau of Public Roads.

Four hundred thousand dollars will be expended for miscellaneous small construction items necessary to the futherance of the AEC's program on medicine and biology.

Five hundred and fifty-four thousand dollars will be expended for community construction projects. This item consists of two projects: $359,000 to develop a new residential site at Los Alamos Laboratory where employees of that important research center may acquire home sites and construct their own homes; the other project is $195,000 for the construction of new elementary school rooms. These rooms will be added to existing school buildings at Los Alamos.

One million one hundred and seventeen thousand dollars, carried under the administrative construction program consist of $600,000 to convert barracks at the Sandia Base in New Mexico into office space, and $517,000 to renovate a building for the AEC's technical information service at Oak Ridge.

Finally, $21 million is carried as a miscellaneous construction fund. This money is generally divided among the various AEC operations offices. This amount of money is for miscellaneous small improvements, additions, and unanticipated small construction projects which might occur during the fiscal year.

You will note that, as in the past, the joint committee and its authorized subcommittee considered this bill primarily from a programatic basis. Although H. R. 10387 indicates specific sums of money, the final determination will, of course, be made by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. What we of the joint committee propose by means of this bill is to indicate that after a thorough review of the Commission's plan for the coming fiscal year, these items and these estimates of money appear to be reasonable and it is our considered opinion that the facilities are essential to a continuation of the Commission's program, both for national defense purposes and for peaceful applications.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the gentleman from California on his statement.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the report accompanying this bill and the statements just submitted to the House by the two distinguished gentlemen, members of the joint committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], very thoroughly cover the provisions of the bill with respect to its details, and I have no desire to be repetitious. I do think it might be of interest, however, to point out that the amount contained in this bill in comparison with a similar bill of last year is but slightly higher. That is occasioned principally I think by reason of a very sizable item in connection with the development of an airplane propelled by nuclear energy. So that for all practical purposes, the construction authorization, the plant construction and acquisition for the fiscal year 1957 is substantially the same as it was in 1956.

The question might be raised why it is, after a period of a decade of continuous expansion of the atomic-energy program, that we must expect each year that there will be further expansions in construction of various types of plants. It is inevitable in this program, I think, that as we learn more and more about the nonmilitary uses of atomic energy, we must expect a transition of construction requirements to occur by reason of the demand and the need for nonmilitary installations.

The amount contained in this bill for weapons, purely and exclusively weapons production is very, very slight, as the weapons production has continued apace. In recent years due to the very marked expansion of 3 or 4 years ago, of course, it was necessary to acquire additional land and build storage sites to accommodate the new weapons. But for the purpose of weapons production expansion there is little if any money in this program.

A large segment of the authorization in this bill is for the production of special nuclear materials. That does not necessarily mean that the special nuclear materials have for their purpose inclusion in the production or fabrication of weapons, because the same material that goes into a weapon may also be used to fuel an atomic furnace, an atomic reactor. Another large segment of the bill is for the development of reactors which have no military significance, no weapons significance whatever. So as we look to the future I think we should prepare to expect that as the years go along the Atomic Energy Commission will require additional funds for plant construction and plant expansion, but we can anticipate that the greater emphasis from here on out will be placed on meeting the needs to satisfy the nonmilitary program of the Atomic Energy Commission rather than the military program.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission the sum of $295,495,000 for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, as follows:

(a) Special nuclear materials:

1. Project 57–a–1, additional feed-materials plant, $22,200,000.

2. Project 57–a–2, improvements to reactor instrumentation, Hanford, Wash., $8 million.

3. Project 57–a–3, improved high level waste handling system, Savannah River, $5 million.

4. Project 57–a–4, reactor facility safety improvements, Hanford, Wash., $5 million.

5. Project 57–a–5, additional waste disposal system, Hanford, Wash., $5 million.

6. Project 57–a–6, charging and discharging system, Hanford, Wash., $3,450,000.

7. Project 57–a–7, modifications to existing production facilities for increased efficiency and safety, Hanford, Wash., $3 million.

8. Project 57–a–8, chemical processing facility, St. Louis, Mo., $1,600,000.

9. Project 57–a–9, barrier plant automation, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $1,400,000.

10. Project 57–a–10, reactor temperature test installation, Hanford, Wash., $900,000.

11. Project 57–a–11, improvements to reactor cooling water effluent system, Hanford, Wash., $550,000.

12. Project 57–a–12, fuel element heat-treating plant, Fernald, Ohio, $500,000.

13. Project 57–a–13, renovation of service plant, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $450,000.

(b) Atomic weapons:

1. Project 57–b–1, area 5 expansion $20,900,000.

2. Project 57–b–2, weapons assembly plant, $15 million.

3. Project 57–b–3, weapons production and development plant, $15 million.

4. Project 57–b–4, weapons development and engineering facilities, Livermore, Calif., $10 million.

5. Project 57–b–5, storage site modifications, $2 million.

(c) Reactor development:

1. Project 57–c–1, aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant, area No. 2, Idaho, $55 million.

2. Project 57–c–2, research and development test plant, $15,900,000.

3. Project 57–c–3, modifications and expansion of aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test facilities, area No. 1, Idaho, $15 million.

4. Project 57–c–4, small submarine reactor test facility, $10 million.

5. Project 57–c–5, expended core handling and service plant, National Reactor Testing Station, $4,750,000.

6. Project 57–c–6, food irradiation facility, $3 million.

7. Project 57–c–7, project Sherwood plant, $2 million.

8. Project 57–C–8, Argonne low power reactor facility, $1,225,000.

9. Project 57–C–9, materials testing reactor hot cell extension, National Reactor Testing Station, $310,000.

(d) Physical research:

1. Project 57–d–1, high energy accelerator, $15 million.

2. Project 57-d-2, bevatron research plant, University of California Radiation Laboratory, $1,084,000.

3. Project 57-d-3, 48-inch heavy particle cyclotron, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $459,000.

4. Project 57-d-4, conversion of accelerator design building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, $300,000.

(e) Raw materials:

1. Project 57-e-1, analytical laboratory addition, Grand Junction, Colo., $362,000.

(f) Atomic weapons:

1. Project 57-f-1, metallurgy laboratory, Livermore, Calif., $2,270,000.

2. Project 57-f-2, base construction, Pacific proving ground, $1,569,000.

3. Project 57-f-3, high explosive and weaponizing plant, Livermore, Calif., $1,100,000.

4. Project 57-f-4, installation of 115 kilovolt tie line, Los Alamos, N. Mex., $1 million.

5. Project 57-f-5, base construction, Nevada test site, $543,000.

6. Project 57-f-6, manufacturing support plant, Kansas City, Mo., $444,000.

7. Project 57-f-7, warehouse, Sandia, $308,000.

8. Project 57-f-8, mechanical shop additions, Livermore, Calif., $300,000.

9. Project 57-f-9, programing building, Livermore, Calif., $180,000.

(g) Reactor development:

1. Project 57-g-1, addition to electrical power system, National Reactor Testing Station, $3,800,000.

2. Project 57-g-2, chemistry cave for radioactive materials, Argonne National Laboratory, $800,000.

3. Project 57-g-3, transient housing, Argonne National Laboratory, $533,000.

4. Project 57-g-4, materials testing reactor maintenance shop, National Reactor Testing Station, $235,000.

(h) Physical research:

1. Project 57-h-1, permanent research buildings, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, $5,780,000.

2. Project 57-h-2, physics building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $2,140,000.

3. Project 57-h-3, engineering building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $1,879,000.

4. Project 57-h-4, engineering service building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, $1,080,000.

5. Project 57-h-5, cosmotron target area, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $350,000.

6. Project 57-h-6, 18-inch cyclotron building, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $300,000.

7. Project 57-h-7, addition to heavy ion accelerator building, University of California Radiation Laboratory, $200,000.

(i) Biology and medicine:

1. Project 57-i-1, reclamation plant and hot laundry, Brookhaven National Laboratory, $400,000.

(j) Community:

1. Project 57-j-1, real-estate development program, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $359,000.

2. Project 57-j-2, elementary-school classrooms, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $195,000.

(k) Administrative:

1. Project 57-k-1, conversion of barracks for Albuquerque Operations Office headquarters, Sandia Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex., $600,000.

2. Project 57-k-2, renovation of building for technical information services, Oak Ridge, Tenn., $517,000.

(l) Raw materials:

1. Project 57-L-1, off-site access roads, $2,873,000.

(m) Reactor development:

1. Project 57-m-1, purchase of Bettis Field property, $400,000.

(n) General plant projects: $21 million.

LIMITATIONS

SEC. 102. (a) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (a) through 101 (d) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 25 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(b) The Commission is authorized to start any project set forth in subsections 101 (e) through 101 (k) only if the currently estimated cost of that project does not exceed by more than 10 percent the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(c) The Commission is authorized to start the project set forth in subsection 101 (L) and (m) only if the currently estimated cost of the project does not exceed the estimated cost set forth for that project.

(d) The Commission is authorized to start a project under subsection 101 (n) only if it is in accordance with the following:

1. For community operations, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $100,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such project shall be $10,000.

2. For all other programs, the maximum currently estimated cost of any project shall be $500,000 and the maximum currently estimated cost of any building included in such a project shall be $100,000.

3. The total cost of all projects undertaken under subsection 101 (n) shall not exceed the estimated cost set forth in that subsection by more than 10 percent.

SEC. 103. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, in connection with projects which are not otherwise authorized by law, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 104. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated funds necessary to restore or to replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged, and the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes.

SEC. 105. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission by section 101 of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Atomic Energy Commission to accomplish the purposes of this act such sums of money as may be currently available to the Atomic Energy Commission.

SEC. 106. Funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this act may be used to start any other new project for which an estimate was not included in this act if it be a substitute for a project authorized in subsections 101 (a), 101 (b), or 101 (f), and the estimated cost thereof is within the limit of cost of the project for which substitution is to be made, and the Commission certifies that—

(a) the project is essential to the common defense and security; and

(b) the new project is required by changes in weapon characteristics or weapon logistic operations;

(c) it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, including a licensee, on terms satisfactory to the Commission to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided in the new project.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 1, line 3, strike out "That there" and insert "SEC. 101. There".

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 474, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill H. R. 10387.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 429) providing for the consideration of S. 1188, a bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I opposed this bill in the committee and I expect to oppose it on the floor, if I can get time from the committee chairman. I would like to have at least 10 minutes. I think surely that is a reasonable and modest request. Unless I can get that time, I would like

the gentleman to yield me time on the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman will be glad to yield the gentleman time on the rule, but I had understood the gentleman from Kentucky was prepared to yield the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman from Kentucky will do that, it will be all right.

Mr. SPENCE. I will yield the gentlemen 10 minutes, if other members of the committee do not need the time.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky says "if." Will the gentleman from Missouri yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. BOLLING. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to complete my statement first.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 429 makes in order consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

S. 1188 makes three changes in the present Federal law governing the examinations of national banks by the Comptroller of the Currency.

The first would permit the Comptroller to waive 1 of the 2 examinations required each year, but this waiver could not be exercised more often than once every 2 years. It is not proposed to waive one examination in all cases, but to adjust examination schedules to permit the examining staff to make more thorough examinations in banks that appear to require greater supervision.

The second change would permit the Comptroller to assess all national banks for examination services on a yearly basis regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. The assessments will continue to be based on the assets of the banks, but would be billed in installments.

The third change provides that the charges for the examinations of the trust departments of national and district banks shall be based on the cost of making the examinations rather than the amount of trust assets under administration since there is no standardization of practice in respect to carrying the value of trust assets.

The Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are in favor of these changes in the present law.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules reported out unanimously not only House Resolution 429 but two other rules, House Resolutions 430 and 431.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

TO AMEND SECTION 5146 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. At this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 430 makes in order consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

Present law requires that at least three-fourths of the directors of national banking associations must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the associations are located, or within 50 miles of the offices for at least 1 year immediately preceding their election as directors, and three-fourths of the directors must continue to maintain such residence during their terms in office.

S. 1736 would reduce the number of directors subject to the residence requirements from three-fourths to two-thirds. The number of directors of a national bank may not be less than 5 nor more than 25. Therefore, on most bank boards only 1 director position would be affected and on no board would more than 2 be affected.

The other change would increase the 50-mile residence limitation to 100 miles.

Federal law in these respects is more restrictive than that of many of the States and this bill will give national banks a wider range of selection of their directors.

The Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are in favor of this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Unless I can get time from the chairman of the committee, I would like to have some time on the rule.

Mr. SPENCE. I will give the gentleman 10 minutes on each bill.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very satisfactory.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Committee on Banking and Currency reported this bill unanimously. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. It was not reported unanimously. I opposed the bill and I expect to oppose it here.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Is the gentleman the only one opposing the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I understand there are others who will oppose it.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am glad the gentleman corrected me.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SECTION 14 (b) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 431 makes in order consideration of the bill, H. R. 9285. House Resolution 431 provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

H. R. 9285 will extend until June 30, 1958, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amount not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

This direct borrowing authority permits the Treasury to carry smaller cash balances than it would otherwise feel obliged to maintain in order to meet its day to day needs. It is useful in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in the Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly in-

come tax payments. It is also a safeguard that could be used in the event of any sudden nationwide emergency requiring heavy cash payments from the Treasury before securities could be sold.

The proposed extension is given for 2 years only as the Banking and Currency Committee feels that such a power should be brought before the Congress for periodic review.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and have no requests for time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the House Resolution 442, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5299) to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of debate on the bill.

The proposed park would be located on a portion of St. John and St. Thomas Islands, in the Virgin Islands, and would cover 9,500 acres. Mr. Laurence S. Rockefeller has already acquired over 5,000 acres for donation to the Government for the park, and the remainder of the park area would be acquired with funds to be donated. It is estimated that an initial investment of $120,000 by the Government would be needed and approximately $60,000 would be required annually for operation and maintenance.

The Virgin Islands Legislature adopted a resolution expressing its approval of the establishment of the park, stating in the resolution that the park would stimulate tourist trade and preserve historic sites and plant life.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 442 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 5299.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one opposed to the rule, although it is my understanding there is some opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1188, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a Senate bill that was passed by the Senate, as I understand it, without objection and without very much debate. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation asked that it be considered. We heard the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the American Bankers Association, all of whom were in favor of the bill. We considered the bill very carefully.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the bill should not be viewed with alarm. It merely provides that the law in regard to the examination of banks, which calls for 4 examinations every 2 years, shall be so amended that the Comptroller of the Currency may waive one of these examinations. The argument was put forth that some of the banks were in such condition that it is not necessary to examine them 4 times every 2 years and, therefore, it would give the examining body greater opportunity to discharge its duties more satisfactorily and that body would have time to apply its energies to matters where they were most needed. I cannot see anything fundamentally wrong, or anything to cause us any alarm.

The bill provides also that the banks will pay for the 4 examinations every 2 years whether they are made or not. So there will be no pressure to waive an examination in order to save the cost of the examination fee.

The bill also changes the method of determining the charge for examination of trust departments. Heretofore the examinations were charged for on the basis of assets. Under this bill the banks will pay the actual cost of the examinations.

Mr. Chairman, the changes, it seems to me, are not so fundamental or material that they should excite any alarm. As a matter of fact, I thought the bill would be placed on the Consent Calendar and be passed without much debate.

This is not my bill, but I feel that when the administration, whether it is my administration or an administration of a political party to which I do not belong, presents a matter, I should bring it before the Congress immediately for consideration. I ask for your consideration of this bill. I can see no harm in it. The people who are most vitally interested in the administration of the matter want it. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as well as the American Bankers Association are all in favor of it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], has correctly stated the facts relating to this legislation. I most assuredly agree with him that this is a simple bill. There is nothing in it that could be considered earthshaking. It might well have been put on the Consent Calendar, except for the fact that in committee a request was made that a rule be asked for, and that was done.

May I, Mr. Chairman, emphasize one point that is important in this bill. The Comptroller of the Currency has found that it is not easy to develop and to keep an efficient corps of examiners. In view of the fact that this bill proposes that over a 2-year period there may be 3 examinations of some banks instead of 4, the Comptroller will have some latitude and he will be able to make better use of his work force. That is a telling argument and a very strong one in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for my taking more time. I do, however, reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

LOOKS INNOCENT BUT VERY DANGEROUS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill seems to contain a very innocent proposal, something that you would normally not object to at all. I can see some serious objections to it myself.

No. 1: Under present law the banks are examined 4 times every 2 years. They must pay for those examinations. Under this proposal the Comptroller of the Currency may, in his discretion, reduce that number of certain banks to 3 every 2 years; in other words, it will be making first- and second-class banks out of the banks of the country. How will the bankers in your home town feel when the banks there are examined 4 times and the banks in the adjoining town, through a favor of the Comptroller of the Currency, are only examined 3 times, or 1 less? Some people will probably say, "Why? Does that mean that our bank is under suspicion? Why should our bank be a second-class bank? Why should we not have a first-class bank like the other town?" The truth is we should not change this law; we should keep it like it is and keep all the banks on the

same plane. Now, if you allow the Comptroller of the Currency to favor certain banks, that is a great advantage to these banks. What kind of supervision will the Congress have over them? The Congress will have no supervision over them. Congress will not even know the favors that are being granted.

NO AUDIT

May I invite your attention to this fact? And I especially ask the chairman of the committee to listen to this. The Comptroller of the Currency is not audited by the General Accounting Office or by the Comptroller General. Now, if the office of the Comptroller of the Currency was audited and investigated by the Comptroller General, then you would have a good argument for this bill, maybe. In the event of abuses, they would be pointed out by the Comptroller General. But the office of the Comptroller of the Currency is not audited by the General Accounting Office. Therefore it will be all in secret and any favors could be granted secretly; no supervision, no way to find it it out; exempt from the Comptroller General, exempt from the General Accounting Office. Secret deals could be made. I am not saying they will be made. I have confidence in the present Comptroller of the Currency. I think he is a fine, honest, honorable man. I do not anticipate anything wrong being done or attempted to be done by him. It is not that. It is the possibility.

One of the basic things first agreed upon in the writing of our Constitution was that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men. That was when the Articles of Confederation had failed and they had to write a new Constitution. And in writing that new Constitution they agreed upon certain basic principles. One of the first of those was that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men.

Now here you are changing that. Here you have a good law that applies to all banks alike, all of them first-class banks; none of them second-class banks. You are changing that law and giving a man the power—a man-made law—to make the law and the rules and the regulations. You are getting away from that basic principle that this shall be a government of laws and not a government of men.

So it is wrong. This bill should not pass. There is no reason for it except to discriminate against certain banks and allow gross favoritism to others. You hear it said every day that if there has ever been a time when there should be close supervision of banks it is now. Instead of having fewer examinations, we should have more examinations. Let me tell you the reason for my statement. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act is one of the finest laws ever passed. It helped the banks, it helped the depositors, it helped the entire country. We were all for it. At first we had an assessment larger than now which the banks paid. The object of that small assessment was to accumulate a fund sufficient to represent a good reserve, a reserve sufficient to justify insurance of all the deposits in all the banks in the country. After we established that assessment, the banks commenced to complain about it, saying that it was too much. In 1934 we had a fund in FDIC equal to $2.02 per $100 of liability which seems awfully small, $2.02 for each $100 of insurance liability. The banks complained about the assessments until we started to reduce it, and now it is only $1.41 for each $100 of liability. That seems pretty small. And if you include all deposits it comes to only 77 cents for each $100 of the banks deposit liability.

Who is behind the FDIC? The other day a special train came to Washington. Each one of the delegates had a big badge and when he came in contact with a Member of Congress he would say, "Repeal all these socialistic laws. Repeal every law under which the Government is in business. We want the Government to get out of business. We do not want the Government supporting any business. We are against that. Repeal them all. It is socialism."

Understand, I am for the FDIC. I think it is a great thing. I would not change it if it were within my power. I might make the assessment a little bit larger for awhile to build up a sufficient reserve, or it is possible I would conclude the present reserve is sufficient. But it is a wonderful thing. And what I am saying is not in criticism of it but in answer to these people who are always saying, "Repeal these socialistic laws." If you applied their standard of socialism to the FDIC, it would be one of the most socialistic laws upon our statute books because the Government is absolutely supporting it, backing it.

I asked each witness, Mr. Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve; Mr. Gidney, and the rest of them, "What is behind the guarantee of bank deposits?"

"The Government of the United States."

That is what is behind it. That little 77 cents or the $1.41 does not amount to anything. It is the Government behind it. So if you are going to repeal socialistic laws, according to the standards that are given to us of the Government's supporting some business, this law would be the first to be repealed. But nobody wants it repealed. I do not even claim it is socialistic. My statement is to warn certain people not to use the charge too loosely.

This is not a time to let your guard down, this is a time to put your guard up. This is not a time to have fewer examinations, this is a time to have all examinations required by law and maybe more.

We do not want the same thing to happen that happened in this country one time in 1932 and 1933. Contrary to reports that all banks did not close, every bank in the United States closed its doors March 3, 1933. Every bank in America was closed.

There were over 30,000 banks at that time, and a lot of them did not open. A lot of them were consolidated and merged. Today we have only 14,000 banks, that is all; 14,000 banks. We ought to have a lot more than that. I know good communities that ought to have a bank that do not have a bank. Now is not the time to let our guard down, now is the time to hold it up. Now is not the time to say that we do not need as many examinations, now is the time to say we need them all. Let us keep our eyes on these banks, not that they are dishonest, for they are not. The banks have done a wonderful job. I am for our capitalistic system, which is the finest and greatest system on earth. I am also for the private banking system which is allowed to operate at a satisfactory profit.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, I arise to the support of S. 1188, a bill relating to the examination of national banks. S. 1188 is being introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It has also been approved by the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The present method of examining national banks is sometimes a waste of effort and an unnecessary expense on the part of national banks, since regulations provide that all national banks will be examined twice each year.

S. 1188 will make 3 important changes regarding the examination of national banks. The first change would permit the Comptroller, in his discretion, to waive 1 of the 2 examinations required each year, but this waiving of 1 examination could not be done more often than once every 2 years. If an examination is waived by the Comptroller, the result will be 3 examinations in a 2-year period instead of the present 4 examinations. Such an arrangement enables the Comptroller to use his examining personnel to a greater advantage. One difficulty in the present arrangement rests with the fact that a national bank in sound condition, which has been favored with the best of management personnel over a period of years, may be subjected to a second examination soon after the first one has been completed. This second examination is a waste of time and money on the part of the Federal Government.

A second change would permit the Comptroller to assess all national banks for examination services on a yearly basis regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. These assessments will be based upon the assets of banks, and such institutions will be billed on an installment basis. At the present time assessments are made payable by the banks at the conclusion of an examination. It is to the advantage of the Comptroller to have the receipt of these funds spread over the year and payable on the installment basis. It is felt that in this way he will be in best position to meet the cost of examinations and other expenses as they occur.

The third change would permit the Comptroller to assess national banks for the cost of an examination for a fee adequate to cover the actual cost thereof. The present law provides that the expense of examining trust deposits shall be assessed against the banks examined in proportion to the total assets. There appears to be no standardization of the practice of banks in respect to carrying the value of the trust assets, and this situation has made the present method

of assessing institutions impractical. Under the proposed legislation, the fee would be based upon the actual cost to the Comptroller's Office of making the trust examination.

Since S. 1188 has been approved by the Treasury Department, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, it would seem that in the light of its merits and the approval of these agencies it should receive the support of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, S. 1188 was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It has passed the Senate and was reported from the House Banking and Currency Committee almost unanimously. It would amend certain provisions of the present law—Revised Statutes 5240, title 12 United States Code, page 881. Under that statute the Comptroller of the Currency is required to examine every national bank at least twice in each calendar year. Examination, of course, may be made oftener if considered necessary.

S. 1188 would provide elasticity to the present requirement by permitting the Comptroller, in his discretion, to waive one such examination in justified cases. However, examinations may not be waived with respect to a particular bank more frequently than once during any 2-year period. Thus, the minimum number of examinations during a 2-year period would be 3 rather than 4 as under the present law.

The experience gained by the Comptroller's Office over a long period of years clearly proves that two examinations is a desirable schedule for a large proportion of national banks. Nevertheless, it is apparent that the present statutory requirement is unnecessarily rigid and not conducive to the best utilization of the time and efforts of the bank examiners. It is not proposed to waive one examination in all possible cases, but rather to adjust examination schedules so as to obtain the maximum benefit from the examination work performed. A large portion of national banks would continue to be examined twice a year.

However, in the case of many adequately capitalized banks with sound asset structures and a long record of capable management of proven ability, it would be safe to omit 1 of the 4 examinations over a 2-year period. The time thus saved would permit the Comptroller's examining staff to be utilized to better advantage by making more thorough examinations generally and devoting additional time to those banks considered to require a somewhat greater than normal degree of supervision.

A change would also be made in the manner of fixing the date on which to have the assessment to cover the expense of the bank examinations. At the present time, the expense of examination of a national bank is assessed by the Comptroller upon the bank examined in proportion to its assets or resources at the date of examination. This bill would give the Comptroller discretion to make the assessment on any date he may select. In all probability, the assessments would be levied on a quarterly or semiannual basis. The annual rate of assessments would be the same for all national banks. However, banks which are examined more than twice in 1 year would also bear the expense of the special examinations in addition to their regular assessment.

The method of assessing the additional fee required for the examination of trust departments of national banks would be put on a more workable basis. The present law provides that the expense of examining trust departments shall be assessed against the banks examined in proportion to the total assets, and the total bonds or notes outstanding under corporate bond or note issues for which the banks are acting as trustees. Since there is no standardization of practice in respect to carrying the value of trust assets, this provision has proved to be impractical.

Under the proposed legislation, the fee would be based upon the actual cost to the Comptroller's Office of making the trust examination. Included in this cost would be a reasonable amount attributable to overhead expenses of the Comptroller's Office.

S. 1188 has been endorsed by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the bankers of this country speaking through their professional organization, the American Bankers Association. I believe the enactment of this measure is necessary to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the national bank examination program and I therefore, urge a favorable vote upon it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have always thought that when a Member is voting on a measure in which they might have an interest or some special interest, they should declare it in some way so that it might be a matter of public record. I do not know whether this particular measure will come to a record vote, but if it does, I want to state I happen to be on the boards of directors of two banks, and if there was a record vote, I would vote "present." I have never voted on any measure in which I had a special interest, either for or against, but I have always voted "present." I want to make the record clear in this case that I will not take a position on this legislation due to the fact that I have a modest interest in two small banking institutions, being on their board of directors.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of the Banking and Currency Committee it has been my practice to consult the judgment of the bankers of Chicago, from which city I come, on all pending legislation concerning the regulation of banks and other matters in which those responsible for the proper conduct of banking are interested. I have felt that this is a practice in prudence since it is conceivable that the thinking of bankers in one community might not be similar to the thinking of bankers in other communities because of local customs and conditions.

When S. 1188 and S. 1736 came before our committee 2 questions arose in my mind. First, there was the question as to whether the bankers in Chicago favored the extension from a 50-mile to a 100-mile limitation of the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank, as provided for in S. 1736. At the public hearings before our committee it was stated that the demand for this change largely came from cities in the East. There was no testimony as to the attitude of the bankers in the city from which I come.

Secondly, and more important, was the question of reducing for one classification of banks the number of national bank examinations from 4 to 3 every 2 years while in another classification of banks the inspections would continue to be 4 times in every 2 years. Under the proposal in S. 1188 an estimated 25 percent of the national banks would be examined 4 times in every 2 years and some 75 percent of the banks would be examined only 3 times every 2 years. This raised a question in my mind whether this apparent discrimination could operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25 percent category.

So I wrote to all the Chicago banks for an expression of their opinion. I stated that it might be that my concern was baseless but nevertheless I thought I should bring the question to the attention of the bankers in my home city and fortify my position with the recommendations emanating from their wide experience. I did state in my letter that Mr. Gibbs Lyons, President of the National Bank Division of the American Bankers Association, had appeared before our committee in support of both measures.

All of the replies that I received being favorable to both S. 1188 and S. 1736, I gave my support to the action of the Banking and Currency Committee in reporting the bills out.

I am including in my remarks letters from the executives of banks in Chicago, neighborhood banks as well as large banks in the Loop. If there were any danger from what on the surface had appeared to me as a possible discrimination I think it a certainty the bankers who are closest to the situation in the neighborhoods as well as in the downtown area would have discerned it. All who replied to my letter are agreed that beneficial results would attend the passage of these measures and that there would be no unfavorable repercussions.

It must be borne in mind that under existing law when it is believed necessary examinations in addition to those prescribed may be ordered. This is a sufficient safeguard of banking security and stability in unusual situations. I can see no harm in reducing the number of

compulsory examinations when experience has found that they are unnecessary. The letters from the Chicago bankers seem to answer the question of a possible discrimination operating to the disadvantage in the public mind of the banks more frequently investigated.

I am making this report to my colleagues of my correspondence with the bankers of my home city to show how conscientiously not only I but all the members of the Banking and Currency Committee proceeded in our consideration of this proposed legislation. I shall vote for both bills today, as I did in the committee, and I recommend their enactment into law.

Mr. Chairman, I have letters from the presidents of 17 or 18 of the larger and smaller banks in Chicago, all approving this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include these letters.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The letters from the Chicago bankers follow:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Upon returning to my desk I find your letter of February 16 which was acknowledged in my absence. I would favor the enactment of both S. 1188 and S. 1736. While I recognize your point about potential discrimination if S. 1188 should become law, I doubt very much that it would work to the disadvantage of the bank that had the full four examinations. Except perhaps in the smaller communities, the public at large is not even aware that an examination is taking place. In addition, the likelihood that the public at large would know that the law had been changed to permit 3 instead of 4 examinations every 2 years, is very remote.

It is encouraging to us in banking to have a Congressman give such careful study to legislative proposals having to do with our business.

With personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. J. LIVINGSTON,
President, the First National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am pleased to give you our thoughts on this pending legislation.

Senate bill 1181, pertaining to examination of national banks, is one which does not directly affect us as a State bank. However, it is our understanding that most banks are in favor of the American Bankers Association support of this bill. We concur in this position.

Senate bill 1736, extending a director's residence from within 50 to within 100 miles of the location of the bank, we believe is not objectionable and think you are justified in voting in favor of it.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our thoughts on this legislation. We believe this is a fine policy to pursue.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH V. ZWIENER,
President, Harris Trust and Savings Bank.

DEAR SIR: In the absence of our chairman of the board, Mr. Lawrence F. Stern, I am very pleased to respond to your letter of February 6, 1956, wherein you invite our comments on legislation for bills S. 1188 and S. 1736. The subjects contained in these two bills have been made a matter of discussion by the management of this bank. We believe that the passing of these bills will operate in the public interest. In the first instance, the Controller of Currency may exercise discretion and concentrate his examinations in areas which in his judgment require an added degree of supervision. Then, also, the provision to extend the limitations on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank is fully justified by the modern developments in the transportation industry.

We are very pleased to add our support in favor of passing this legislation.

Cordially yours,

E. W. STEVENS,
Comptroller, American National Bank & Trust Co.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Birdsall is away from the bank temporarily so it is my pleasure to reply to your letter of February 6. I know that Mr. Birdsall would appreciate, as I do, the opportunity to express views on pending legislation before the report of your committee is made.

As a member of the American Bankers Association, our views are expressed through them for the most part. However, we do not see any unfavorable public reaction arising from a greater number of examinations in one bank as against another because it is unlikely that a bank's customers are aware of the timing of examinations. We have always welcomed frequent examination of our bank, but we are sympathetic to the problems of the Comptroller of the Currency and we are happy to abide by the spirit of the proposed legislation.

With respect to an increase in the distance of the resident of an out-of-State director, we feel that the legislation is merited in view of the decentralization of industry and the increased speed of communication that has been achieved in the last 20 years. Undoubtedly, the problem is more acute in the larger cities of the East than it is here in the Midwest. However, the present 50-mile limit for out-of-State directors could very easily deprive Chicago banks of the services as director of very able men residing in nearby areas of either Indiana or Wisconsin.

Yours very truly,

FREDERIC A. CURTIS,
Comptroller, Continental Illinois National Bank.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: When I was on an extended business trip your letter of February 7 seeking my views on S. 1188 and S. 1736 reached my desk. I feel the objectives of both bills are in the public interest, and accordingly endorse them.

Cordially,

J. VINCENT O'NEILL,
President and Chairman of the Board, Mercantile National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In the absence of our president, Mr. Samuel F. Hillman, I am relying to your very kind letter of February 7, 1956. We are honored that you have taken the time to communicate with us as to our position on S. 1188 and S. 1736 and we wish to compliment you for your sincere efforts to get the viewpoint on these bills from members of the bank fraternity.

We have given the question of the provision of S. 1188 due consideration and we feel that it meets with our complete approval. It has been our experience with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency that he has consistently adopted a fair and impartial program for all national banks and we are certain that those banks which will be examined 4 times within each 2-year period will not feel any discrimination but realize that the necessity for such examination exists.

We feel that the provision providing for some banks to be examined only 3 times within a 2-year period will be of great help to the examining staff. We ourselves prefer for our own satisfaction and the protection of our customers as complete an examination as possible and we recently had the feeling that some examinations were unnecessarily brief and incomplete because of a large backlog of examinations required to be made by the examining staff in the current year. For these reasons we lend our support to this bill.

We are also in agreement with S. 1736. We have felt that the move from the large cities to suburban areas has a tendency to eliminate the selection of competent bank directors since many whom we might take under consideration have their residence beyond the 50-mile limit now provided by the law. In addition, even banks as small as ours, do business beyond our city limits and we might want to attract as a member of our directorate, a businessman living in some surrounding community who banks with us.

We therefore commend to you both of these bills and once more wish to thank you for your very kind consideration in polling our view on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

SEYMOUR BERMAN,
Executive Vice President, Peoples National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Regarding bills S. 1736 and S. 1188 now being discussed by the House Banking and Currency Committee, it is my judgment that they both have merit and are entitled to your favorable consideration.

With reference to the increasing latitude being granted the supervisory department of bank examinations, I am not apprehensive that there may be discrimination alleged by banks that may be subject to more frequent examinations. This could be a constructive factor where management of banks having an inclination to step out of bounds of good banking will be restrained from further speculative tendencies. The classification of assets reflected in the report of examinations should always be an indicator to banks as to what they may expect in the way of visits from the Department.

With reference to the bill regarding qualified directors, I see no objection to increasing the distance from which they may be drawn.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE A. BEUTEL,
President, the South East National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. Arthur T. Leonard has requested that I express to you his appreciation for your considerate communication of February 6 pertaining to Senate bills 1188 and 1736.

It is our considered judgment that the discretionary authority vested in the Comptroller of the Currency under S. 1188, whereunder one examination might be waived during a 2-year period, would not operate to an unjustified disadvantage to certain national banking associations. Inasmuch as all national banks will uniformly bear the expense of 2 examinations each year, although only 1 examination may be made, and the need of the Comptroller's examiners for a sufficiency of time to conduct a thorough examination, it is our opinion that the discretionary authority is both constructive and desirable.

With respect to S. 1736, it is our opinion that the decentralization of many large industries from metropolitan centers has necessitated capable and qualified bank directors to transfer their residences to localities beyond the 50-mile area embraced in section 5146 of the Revised Statutes. Accordingly, it is our opinion that Senate bill 1736 embraces progressive legislation.

We are grateful for the opportunity provided by you to express our views on these two important matters.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE MCMAHON,
Vice President, City National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you very much for writing me under date of February 7 with respect to the upcoming bills affecting banking. I am strongly in favor of both bills being passed. First, with respect to the number of examinations made yearly, the bank examiners are indeed in a better position than anyone to know what banks should be examined 1, 2, or 3 times yearly. Second, I think it would stimulate bankers to better banking to keep in the least examined class. Also, I do not think that the number of examinations is pertinent to the public for they never know whether we have 1, 2, 3 or more examinations a year. Therefore, it is my suggestion that you support this bill.

With respect to S. 1736, I would see no objection to extending the 50-mile limit to 100 miles. In this day of rapid transportation, distance is not too important, and I think some of the men who would be good material for directors have residence over 50 miles away.

Please be assured of my appreciation of your writing me in this connection.

Very truly yours,

ROSWELL O. BYERRUM,
President, University National Bank.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: This will acknowledge your letter of February 6 addressed to our chairman, John C. Wright, which has been referred to me for reply.

We would urge you to vote for S. 1188 reducing the number of national bank examinations from 4 to 3 in every 2 years. We do not believe the public would be mindful of the fact that some banks would be examined more frequently.

We are also in favor of S. 1736 extending the permissible distance of a director's residence from the location of his bank. We believe this tends to recognize the improved transportation facilities resulting from the growth of residential areas surrounding our metropolitan centers.

We appreciate your interest in writing us regarding these bills.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD MEIDELL,
President, The LaSalle National Bank.

My DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am pleased to reply to your letter of February 6, addressed to Frank C. Rathje at the Chicago City Bank & Trust Co.

Mr. Rathje is on a world cruise and his associates at the other bank thought that I should answer your letter because S. 1188 is a matter that national banks are particularly concerned with.

I am sure if Mr. Rathje were here, he would advise you that bankers generally favor this bill simply because it is so difficult for the Comptroller to hire enough competent men. He should be given some leeway in the number of examinations. I am also quite sure Mr. Rathje would feel as we do that it is unlikely that the public would ever know how many times any given bank is examined during any 1 year. Since in some years every bank will be examined twice, I doubt that the customers would be aware of any difference.

We have heard very little about extending the distance of the directors' residence from 50 miles to 100 miles from the location of the bank. In talking with Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., vice president of the First National Bank of Chicago, he expressed the opinion that the Chicago bankers would probably be in favor of this change.

We are grateful for your interest in calling this matter to Mr. Rathje's attention, but we are sorry he is unable to answer your letter personally.

Yours truly,

HARRY A. FISCHER,
President, the Mutual National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR BARRATT: Was glad to hear from you under date of February 6, with reference to Senate bills S. 1188 and S. 1736.

From your letter I can see that you have given quite a bit of thought to both these bills, especially with reference to S. 1188 with respect to the apparent discrimination that could operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25-percent category. I believe that under the law it is always possible for the Comptroller to examine the bank as many times as he sees fit, if in his judgment conditions so warrant, and if the public were alert, seeing examiners around, I can well imagine that it might operate to the disadvantage of the bank. However, from a personal standpoint, I do not believe this has too much effect, and if a bank is conducted along the lines subject to criticism by the Comptroller, there are certain penalties which must be suffered. Personally, I am in favor of S. 1188 and feel that in reducing the number of inspections from 4 to 3 every 2 years, it would permit the examiners to be even more thorough than they are now in the scope of their examinations.

In connection with S. 1736, I believe this is worthy of consideration also, and would certainly approve of the substitution of the words as set forth in the amendment to section 5146.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours.

GEORGE R. BOYLES,
President, Merchant's National Bank in Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I hope that you will be able to vote for Senate bill 1188, and it is not of great importance if it is amended to require the Comptroller to make examinations 3 times in each 2 years. If the Comptroller is given discretion, I doubt if there are many hardships that arise out of his discrimination.

Section 2455 now provides that the Comptroller of the Currency shall examine every member bank at least twice in each calendar year and oftener if considered necessary. It appears that the Comptroller should not be prohibited from examining a bank if he thought it necessary to do so for the protection of the depositors.

Senate bill 1736 should be approved since we are having more and more directors living at a greater distance than 50 miles from the banks.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. FREY,
President, Lake Shore National Bank.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of February 7 in which you have enclosed copies of S. 1188 and S. 1736 being proposed legislation relating to the examination of national banks and to the qualifications of directors, and distance of residence from the location of national banks.

I think both proposals are constructive and join in their endorsement with the committee of the American Bankers Association represented by Mr. Lyons, president of the national-bank division of that association.

Answering your specific question in the second paragraph of your letter, "Could this apparent discrimination operate to the unjustified disadvantage in the public mind of the banks in the 25-percent category?" I would say no. Certainly no more than those banks which can presently be placed on the so-called special lists of examiners. Categorically, the one way to avoid extra examinations is to run a good bank, and I think the proposed legislation is sound.

Your courtesy in writing me is greatly appreciated, and I am glad to see you lending your constructive interest.

With all good wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

D. H. REIMERS,
President, The Live Stock National Bank of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You are very kind in making available drafts of measures before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and, specifically, S. 1736. I am familiar with the intent thereof, and I appreciate very much indeed your letter soliciting my views thereon.

With respect to S. 1188, it is my judgment that this will be a very salutary thing for the banking industry. I do not feel that banks which will be examined 4 times within 2 years will be subjected to any unjustified disadvantage in the public mind. I should like to see passage of this legislation.

As to S. 1736, the extension from 50 to 100 mile limitation on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank is not a burning question with Chicago banks or bankers. I would be totally indifferent to the fate of this legislation.

Thanking you for affording me the opportunity of expressing my views, and with kind personal regards, I am

Cordially yours,

PETER I. BUKOWSKI,
President, The Cosmopolitan National Bank of Chicago.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just returned to my desk and found your letter of February 7. It is good to have a Congressman that works with his constituents.

I think the bill on examinations is good. The reason I feel that it is, is that management in all banks are not alike. Many banks need more examinations in order to make corrections and do away with manipulations, if there are any. I think the Department is the best judge of how banks are managed and in some banks if the examiners never come in they would still run a good bank, while others have to be continually prodded to get away from reckless loaning and the practices that are not sound.

The change on bill S. 1736 limiting the number of miles the majority of the directors can live to the location of the bank, I think is good. Personally, I don't see any difference between 50 and 100 miles as long as the request for three-fourths of the directors live within the 50 or 100 mile radius, they can then have their executive meetings more frequently and once a month that distance is not too far for the majority of directors, who in most instances are executives who can take the time to attend these meetings.

Thanks again for your thoughtfulness in writing the bankers and with best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

WM. V. MCKINZIE,
President, the Steel City National Bank.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of February 7, 1956, with regard to Senate bill No. 1188 has been received, and I am happy to have the opportunity to express my opinion as to the desirability of empowering the Comptroller of the Currency to waive one bank examination in each 2-year period as proposed in this bill.

As a State bank examiner in Illinois 25 and more years ago, I found that some bankers disliked to have their customers know that an examination was in progress and were very sensitive on the matter of frequency of examinations. This, of course, was prior to the great depression and at a

time when bank deposits were not federally insured. The insurance of deposits has done much to establish and maintain confidence in our banking system and about the only question ever raised today is as to whether or not a bank is a member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Moreover, rigid supervision by State and Federal banking authorities following the depression, supplemented by examinations made on behalf of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in the case of State nonmember banks, and the insistence of bank supervising authorities generally that periodic examinations be made by or in behalf of the boards of directors of all banks, have caused the public to become more accustomed to bank examiners and they are recognized as everyday citizens with a job to do and are the kind of people that we are happy to introduce to our customers during the course of an examination.

The fact that two examinations are made of our bank each year by national bank examiners and that an examination by certified public accountants in behalf of our board of directors may be made between the national examiners' visits, does not arouse any curiosity or apprehension on the part of our depositors.

In the final analysis, the examination of banks today can be looked upon as an almost continuous process and I do not believe that the waiving of 1 examination in each 2-year period by the Comptroller of the Currency would focus attention on those banks, which, for one reason or another, did not secure the benefit of the waiver.

With regard to the second question in your letter, concerning my reaction to Senate bill 1736 which proposes to extend the limit on the distance of a director's residence from the location of the bank to 100 miles (from the present limit of 50 miles), I feel that this change, at the present time, would benefit banks in metropolitan areas on the east coast more than banks in other sections of our country. However, decentralization of population in areas such as Chicago is continuing at such a fast pace that I feel it will not be too long before the provisions of this bill will be helpful in Chicago and other centers of population throughout the country.

I urge your support of both measures.

Very truly yours,

PAUL R. WILKINSON,
President, National Bank of Hyde Park.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has indicated some of the pitfalls that this bill presents. I would like to indicate why I think the bill should be recommitted or, if not recommitted, certainly amended.

We have a very unusual situation presented here. The Comptroller of the Currency came before our committee as did the Chairman of the FDIC and recommended the approval of this bill. Because of prior experience under similar circumstances, I asked the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation whether or not this matter had ever been considered by his Board. I refer now to the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. As you know that Board consists of 3 persons, 2 members, one of whom is the Chairman, and the Comptroller of the Currency. Under the law, not more than two members may be of the same party.

For some years now under this administration the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has consisted of the Comptroller of the Currency, an appointee of this administration; the Chairman, Mr. Earl Cook, a Republican appointed by this administration; and Mr. Maple T. Harl, a Democrat.

There should be no politics involved in this and I hope there is not. I had learned previously that matters that had been referred to our committee on the letterhead of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation bearing the signature of the Chairman, purporting to be the action of the Corporation and its Board were in fact not the action of the Board but the action of the Chairman acting alone and without having consulted the other members of the Board and without having consulted the Democratic member of the Board.

When these two gentlemen, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of this Board, were before our committee, I asked the Chairman of the Board while he was testifying and while the Comptroller of the Currency was present, whether this recommendation which he was making was his personal recommendation or that of the Corporation.

He replied that it was that of the Corporation. I then asked him if this had been considered by his Board at a Board meeting.

He answered that it had not been formally considered, and there had been no Board action as such, but that he had informally discussed it with the members of the Board.

I then wrote a letter to Mr. Harl, the other member of the Board. I have a copy of that letter before me. It is dated January 26, 1956—after our hearings had closed, unfortunately.

I quote from my letter:

I inquired specifically of Chairman Cook whether or not the recommendation was his personal recommendation or that of the Corporation. Mr. Cook responded that it was the expression of the Corporation. I then asked him whether or not the matter had been discussed in any Board meetings of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and he said it had not been formally discussed at Board meetings, but it had been informally discussed among the Board.

Will you please advise me as to what the facts are with reference to this bill, and any discussions thereof with you formally or informally and, at the same time, whether your views are in accord or contrary to those of Mr. Cook.

I received this significant reply from Mr. Harl dated February 20, 1956:

Replying to your recent letter in which you very thoughtfully enclosed Senate bill 1188 and asked for comments regarding same, please be advised that to the best of my knowledge the board of directors of this corporation has never taken a position regarding its merits. Likewise I have never discussed this proposed legislation with any of the other members of the board of directors.

It is my personal opinion, however, as a result of several years of experience in the supervisory field, that the better the supervision the better the bank; furthermore, vigilance is the price of bank stability and solvency.

I say to this Committee that under these circumstances this bill should be recommitted or be voted down; it should not be passed. Whether or not it will eventually be adopted I do not know, but I say until those men are called before our committee and explain this discrepancy in the operation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation we should not take action on this bill.

This has been the law now I believe since 1913. There is no immediacy about it; there is no economy involved here. The testimony before our committee is that there is no economy involved here.

Let us review this matter in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 481), is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following sentences: "The Comptroller of the Currency, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall appoint examiners who shall examine every national bank twice in each calendar year, but the Comptroller, in the exercise of his discretion, may waive one such examination or cause such examinations to be made more frequently if considered necessary. The waiver of one such examination as above provided shall not be exercised more frequently than once during each 2-year period beginning January 1, 1955."; and by deleting from the second sentence thereof the following: ", or of any other members bank,".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "each 2-year period beginning January 1, 1955" and insert "any 2-year period."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not have time a while ago to develop what I wanted to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I object to the extension of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's objection comes too late.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency does not want all the light on this he can get.

Mr. SPENCE. I will tell the gentleman if he wants to know.

NO DEBT—NO MONEY

Mr. PATMAN. I am not yielding to the gentleman now. I might yield later.

Mr. Chairman, the capitalistic system is a fine system. It is the greatest system on earth. I believe in it, although it is the debt system. In order for people to have money under the capitalistic system they must go in debt. No debts, no money. Many people argue about the national debt and about paying it off. If you paid off any substantial part of the national debt you would have the most devastating depression we have ever experienced in our history. You must

have debt under the capitalistic system in order to have money. Therefore, the banks perform a very fine, constructive service in creating debt, and I am for that.

I am for the private banking system privately operated. We want to keep it that way. We want to keep a system that is profitable, one that enables them to make money. If they do not make money, they will not be able to stay in business or serve the public well. Therefore, I believe in a profitable private banking system. That is all right. But the point that bothers me in this particular bill is the possibility of favoritism.

The favoritism that I am afraid of is making first- and second-class banks. I do not believe we should leave that power to anyone, particularly a person who is not supervised or audited. And, the Comptroller of the Currency is not under the General Accounting Office. The books, papers, records, policies, and administrative actions of the Comptroller of the Currency are not supervised by the Comptroller General. Therefore, we should not leave this power to a person to act in his own discretion, according to his own will, his likes or dislikes. It is too much power. It is a government of men and not a government of laws. Now, you take, for instance, in the last few months we have had a lot to say about the banking system; it was about trivial matters like this that do not amount to much, here at a time when our Government bonds are going down to 92. They are right now 92. They should not be allowed to sink below par. For 10 years and longer there was a policy in this country that the Open Market Committee would support Government bonds below par. That was a good policy. It saved everybody. It protected everybody who owned bonds. There was no objection to it except from a few banks in this country, and they kept working on it until they finally got that line broken, and Government bonds commenced to go down. They went down in 1953, and then they went up. Some banks bought them low and sold them high and made a profit over the preceding year on the sale of Government securities in 1954 over 1953 of 966 percent. Did you hear that? They made a profit in 1 year by pushing the bonds down, buying them low, and holding them until they went up and selling them. They made $275 million, a few banks did, and they made a profit of 966 percent over the preceding year. The same thing is taking place now. Bonds are being forced down. They will get into sound hands when they reach the bottom, but I do not know when they will reach the bottom. The people in charge, our money masters, know and the people connected with them know. You and I do not know. But they will buy them at the right time. They will hold them until they go up. Then they wil make 966 percent again.

It is the same old racket over and over and over. Now, instead of having fewer examinations it is time when we should have more examinations. And, remember this, that when this bill becomes law, you will find out that your bank is a second-class bank, because it is required to submit to 4 examinations every 2 years, and the big banks of your State only have to submit to 3 examinations every 2 years. Therefore, the big banks are first-class banks and your bank is a second-class bank. You will probably be asked the reason why. Of course, if we vote for this bill, we will have to say we are responsible for it; we take full responsibility, because we were told by certain people that it is a good thing for the country to allow the Comptroller of the Currency that power, and we granted him that power. Well, it is going to be a sad day for many of us when the banks in the First Congressional District of Texas that I have the honor to represent call me up and say, "Why is it that our banks are second-class banks and the banks in Dallas and Houston are first-class banks?" and when the banks down in Georgia call the distinguished gentleman, Representative BROWN, who is a member of this committee, one of the finest Members we have here, a great man, and say "Why is it that our banks down here in this country district are second-class banks? Why do you not make them first-class banks?" Only the Atlanta banks are first-class banks.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia. I know the gentleman would have a good explanation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. My reply to that would be that I was the author of the bill that required the FDIC to make examinations of national banks last year. We passed that amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope that satisfies the gentleman's banks, because I certainly do not want him to get into trouble. I want him to stay here as a Member of Congress. He is a fine Member of Congress. I hope they will not hold this against him. I know that the opposition against him would not be substantial anyway. But what is going to happen down in Kentucky when they begin to call up from Chairman SPENCE'S district and say, "What is the matter? Our banks are second-class banks. The banks in Louisville and other places are first-class banks. Why don't you keep our banks first-class? Why do we have to be in a second-class category while the banks in the big cities are first-class?"

That is the kind of thing that is hard to explain. But the chairman is good at explaining things and he will be able to explain it.

And over in Arkansas they will be calling up and asking, "Why is it that only the Little Rock banks are first-class?" Or in Tennessee, "Why is it that only the banks in Memphis and Nashville and Knoxville are first-class banks while other banks are second-class banks?"

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. The Comptroller of the Currency can have additional examinations and charge them to the bank. So it does not change his power at all.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is referring to additional examinations?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. But they are still in the same class.

Mr. SPENCE. These would be additional examinations. This is merely a waiver.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is making my argument. Keep them all in the same class. Keep them all first-class. Then if there are additional examinations required, as the chairman has suggested, they can be made. That is all right. That is well and good. Then we will not have second-class banks and first-class banks. Let us keep them all first-class banks. If you want to change it to 3 examinations every 2 years for all banks with the privilege of making—and they have it and they would have it anyway—of making additional examinations, that is all right if it is justified and I will not oppose it. But here you are giving the Comptroller the power to favor certain banks. And we know which ones he will favor, the big banks, because they can make a better case. But the big banks will be the first-class banks and the little banks will be the second-class banks. Let us keep them all on the same plane, 4 examinations every 2 years for all banks. And if they need additional examinations you can have them. Or if you can make a case for 3 examinations every 2 years, let us have it. I would be for it. But then all banks will be first-class banks. Then if you need additional examinations, you can get them, too. This bill should be recommitted. It should be defeated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when I had the floor during general debate, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], asked me to yield, but my time had expired. I am prepared now to yield to him if he desires to have me do so.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman wanted this bill recommitted to the committee. Just what reason does he have for recommitting it, just because he wanted another witness to testify?

Mr. MULTER. So that we could bring before us the members of the Board, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and have the Chairman explain to us why he said that he had discussed this matter with the members of the Board, when another member of the Board has put in writing the statement that this bill was never discussed with him formally or informally, and to get his opinion of it on the RECORD, that this is not a good bill. I think it is important for the committee to get the opinion of the member who was not consulted and who should have been.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The FDIC was summoned to appear and the Chairman did appear. All of the Board did not appear. If the gentleman wanted anybody else to appear, all he had to do was notify the chairman. Sending the bill back to the committee will not change anything. We had all the evidence. Nobody appeared against the bill.

Mr. MULTER. Our distinguished chairman very properly addressed his communication to the Chairman of the FDIC. He came before us. He misrepresented the fact to the committee, saying that he was talking for the Corporation when he was talking for himself. Since that time the other member of the Board has advised me in writing that he was never consulted about this bill. The Chairman of the FDIC owes our committee an explanation as to why this difference of opinion, as to whether this is his personal opinion or that of his Corporation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I think it is too late to ask for an explanation now. It should have been asked for while we were hearing the bill.

The Chairman of the Board came up, after the chairman of this committee had written to him, and testified. You certainly cannot attack evidence of that kind at this late date. If you did, there would be no orderly procedure in the House. Any time somebody could get up and say some man who might have been there was not there and was not consulted. The time to have made that charge was when we were holding hearings on the bill. No such charge was made then. The other member of the Board did not make any charge. It was not proper for him to make the charge to an individual. He ought to have made the charge to the committee that he was not invited to come. We never heard from him. He is a good friend of mine, too, and I think he would not have hesitated to tell me.

Mr. MULTER. The answer to my distinguished chairman, and I hate to differ with him, is that this is the kind of investigation our Committee on Banking and Currency is charged with making. When wrongdoing occurs in any agency the legislation concerning which comes within the jurisdiction of our committee, I say it is the duty of our committee to conduct a full and thorough investigation of the matter, no matter where the complaint comes from. When a respected Government official will put in writing the fact that important legislation was not discussed with him, and the Chairman of his Board says it was, that is enough reason for us to inquire fully into the matter.

I charge that it was reprehensible conduct on the part of the Chairman of the FDIC to misrepresent the facts to us. Responsibility for such misconduct also falls on the Comptroller of the Currency, who silently sat by when the misstatement of fact was made. He, too, knew that the Chairman of FDIC had no right to pretend to be talking for that Corporation at that time. He also knows that that was not the first time the Chairman of FDIC misspoke himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 1, line 9, strike out lines 9 and 10 on page 1 and lines 1 to 7 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the words "three times in every 2 years."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make one class of banks as against what may be first- and second-class banks if the bill is passed as reported.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] did not dream up this expression "first-class banks." If you will read the hearings you will find the person who first used that expression with reference to these banks was the Comptroller of the Currency in trying to describe what he was trying to do by this bill.

Under the law as it exists now, they are required to make 4 examinations in 2 years. If they said, "Let us make this 3 examinations in 2 years," as the distinguished gentleman from Texas says, he has no objection to that, and I think that might be all right. But when the Comptroller of the Currency says, "I am going to continue to charge the banks for 4 examinations every 2 years, but if you give me this bill I will have the right to waive 1 examination in every 2 years as I see fit, and still continue to make the complete charge for 4 examinations," there is not only discrimination by his classifying them as first- and second-class banks but he is also making the bank that gets only 3 examinations pay for 4 examinations every 2 years. One group will pay for 4 examinations and get only 3 examinations. To one group he says, "You are not as good a bank as the bank next door. We cannot waive an examination for you because you are not as good or as strong as the other bank." That is the vice in the bill now before us.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I stated I would favor three if justification were shown, but, of course, justification has not been shown for three examinations of all banks. Therefore, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his amendment. Let us do what he has said before should be done—recommit the bill. Then, we can have hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. If they can show a justification for three examinations a year, and keep all banks as first-class banks, I will favor it. But, I want the justification to be shown. As it is now, it shows the opposite.

Mr. MULTER. There is not any doubt but that the gentleman is right in saying that no justification has been shown. I spent considerable time in the hearings trying to get the Deputy Comptroller and the Comptroller and the Chairman of the FDIC to tell us what standard he will use in order to determine when he will waive an examination. We know what standards he uses when he decides to have an additional examination—he has reason to believe something is wrong in the practice of the bank; the bank may be unsound or it may be making bad loans. He uses indicia such as that in his scheme of standards to decide whether to make an additional examination. What standards will he use to determine when he will waive examinations? Now, there is page after page after page of hearings, but we could get nothing from any of these distinguished gentlemen who should know this subject, and know what they are doing, particularly, with reference to the examination of banks. We could not get a word from them to indicate what standards they would use. Under this bill they will arbitrarily say to bank No. 1 in city A, "You are all right—three examinations." To the bank next door they will say: "You are no good. We are going to give you four examinations."

That is the vice of this bill as it comes to us. If you want to pass the bill at all, then let us put all of these banks on the same plane. Let us keep them on the same plane and let us give them the same rights. If you only want 3 examinations in 2 years, give all of them 3 examinations. The right, of course, will still continue in the law permitting the Comptroller or the FDIC or the Federal Reserve Board or the State superintendent of banks, if he has the authority to go in, to conduct an additional examination when they want it. But let us not say: Every bank gets 4 examinations every 2 years except, when for some unknown reason and without any standards the Comptroller of the Currency says to his favorite or his friend, "You get only three." I hope you will adopt the amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the years the national banks have been examined 4 times every 2 years—that is in the law. Those who are charged with that duty believe that it will continue to be necessary to examine a large proportion of these banks twice a year. That is the way this bill was drawn. If that is their opinion and if that is their experience that 4 examinations are usually necessary and we only authorize 3 examinations, then there will be a great number of extra examinations, and if each one of those examinations is a reproach to the bank—if each extra examination will make people believe a certain bank is not as stable and as sound as the banks that have not had that examination, then this is the best amendment in the world to create a distinction between banks—a distinction which is not created by the bill as introduced, which is the result of the experience of those who have charge of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The third paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482), is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "The expense of the examinations herein provided for shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon national banks in proportion to their

assets or resources. The assessments may be made more frequently than annually at the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency. The annual rate of such assessment shall be the same for all national banks, except that banks examined more frequently than twice in 1 calendar year shall, in addition, be assessed the expense of these additional examinations."

TWO CLASSES OF BANKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to remind the Members that if they succeed in amending this law so that first-class banks will be examined only 3 times a year and second-class banks will be examined 4 times a year, assessments will be the same. There is no difference in the money that will be provided or the assessments. It is strictly a question of allowing one person, according to his likes or dislikes, his good reasons or no reasons, to grant a special favor, or to indulge in favoritism between banks. I am not claiming that the present Comptroller of the Currency will do that. I am sure he does not have that in mind, but I can see in a case like Covington, Ky., for instance, the town represented by the distinguished chairman of this committee, a great statesman and a great chairman of the committee, if he succeeds in getting this bill passed and it becomes law, the banker at Covington will call him up and say "Why don't you get us classified 1–A, just as good as a dairy out here in the country, or like the Cincinnati banks?" The Cincinnati banks and the Louisville banks are first-class. They will say "Why can't ours be first-class?"

The chairman will be powerless to do that, because the Comptroller of the Currency is not going to be pressured into doing something. He acts according to his own good judgment.

This is a dangerous bill. It does not save anybody a penny. It does not save the Government any money. It does not save the banks any money. It does only one thing, it permits one person who has no supervision of any kind whatsoever to grant favoritism between banks, and make first-class banks out of big banks and second-class banks out of the smaller ones.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

This matter of examination of national banks goes back to 1863. At that time it was agreed that some banks might need more examinations than two per year. So, if favoritism arises out of the number of examinations, the practice dates back to the origin of the National Bank Act because the provision was made then for special examinations. If there are classes of banks, they are classes which are made by the banks themselves because of the manner in which they manage their operations.

Years ago, a distinguished public servant who was Comptroller of the Currency or Deputy Comptroller for as long as 30 years wrote a book called "The Romance and Tragedy of Banking." Anyone who reads that book will find that the principal reason for the failure of banks is poor management. Human beings are not endowed with equal managerial talents. I doubt that those who oppose this bill would be able by law to guarantee the same class of management in every one of our banks. If they could do that, then there would be some point to the opposition argument. This bill does not establish any classification of banks whatever. What it does do is to conserve the time of the work force, the corps of examiners, so that they can be employed profitably where they should be employed, in the examination of some banks that need further examination because the management is less good than in other banks.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The seventh paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482) is deleted and there is substituted therefor the following: "In addition to the expense of examination to be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency as heretofore provided, all national banks exercising fiduciary powers and all banks or trust companies in the District of Columbia exercising fiduciary powers shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency for the examination of their fiduciary activities a fee adequate to cover the expense thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, pursuant to House Resolution 429, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PATMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to recommit the bill S. 1188 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 3, noes 15.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1736, with Mr. PRESTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Although this bill comes with a unanimous report from the Committee, I anticipate that there may be opposition to its passage. It has but one purpose, and that is to enlarge the territory of the residences from which directors of national banks may be drawn.

Under existing law 75 percent of the directors must live within the State or within 50 miles of the bank. The other 25 percent may live anywhere.

This bill would reduce the number of directors from three-fourths to two-thirds who must live within a prescribed distance of the bank and increase that distance from 50 to 100 miles. Under this provision banking associations might frequently be able to obtain directors who are desirable whom they otherwise could not obtain. A bank's reputation largely depends upon the character of its directors. A fine directorate gives strength and character to the bank. It is essential that banks should have directors in whom the people have confidence. Great advances in transportation and improvements in our roads have changed the character of the residence of our people. The great mansions of the rich men of generations ago have now gone into decay as these men establish their homes in the suburbs and at more distant places. It is not unusual in this age

for one to live 60 or 70 miles or more from his business.

The bill was passed by the Senate without objection and without much debate. The Comptroller of the Currency wants this provision enacted in the law. The Federal Reserve is in favor of it. The American Bankers Association wants it and the banks want it. The bill is asked for by those who have had experience, and we feel that it may give strength to the banks and confidence to the patrons.

I think it is desirable to pass the bill.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, like the preceding bill which was just passed by the House, is a good one. It is simple; nothing earth-shaking about it. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has stated the case correctly and well. It is an attempt to be realistic. A lot of improvement in communication and transportation has occurred since the National Bank Act was written near the middle of the last century. This bill is realistic in its outlook, and it will make for stronger bank boards of directors.

Mr. Chairman, there is great variation among the States as to residence requirements for directors of State bank boards. There are 18 States that do not have any residence requirements at all.

I think, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in my taking further time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

LOOPHOLE IN BANK ANTIHOLDING COMPANY ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is another innocent-appearing bill. When the distinguished chairman of our committee devoted so much time and effort to an antiholding company bill, I was working with him 100 percent. I thought he was right, and he was right. He did a wonderful service in getting the Committee on Banking and Currency to pass an antiholding company bill which was an antiabsentee ownership of banks. That is what it was, antiabsentee ownership. And, believing in local ownership as much as possible, I was one of his principal supporters; in fact, I had introduced a bill, in years gone by, myself. It is a fine bill. All right. That bill passed the House by a good vote. It went to the Senate, and it will soon be out of the Senate, I hope.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I just wanted to thank the gentleman for the kind sentiment he expressed about me in regard to the antiholding company bill. That is the first time he has been right today, I think.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I have been right a lot of times, and the gentleman is wrong as well as right a lot of times. This is the second time the gentleman has been wrong today. This holding company bill will be out pretty soon. Think about how ridiculous we are if we put a loophole in the law before it passes. This will be a loophole in the antiholding company bill big enough for a Cadillac car to go through. It will not destroy the antiholding company bill, but it will be a big loophole in it. It is going in the opposite direction. In the antiholding company bill we are saying we are for local ownership; we are against absentee ownership of banks. This bill says a director can live as far away as 100 miles. What does that mean? That means a person can live halfway between Philadelphia and New York and be a director of New York banks and Philadelphia banks and all the important cities on the eastern coast. Instead of this being for local ownership as against absentee ownership, it is in the direction of absentee ownership. It is going in the opposite direction.

Now, I will admit this is not an earth-shaking bill, as the gentleman from Iowa mentioned a while ago; it is not, and I shall not insist on any rollcall on it or make any point of no quorum. It is not a question that is so great as that. But, it seems to me just a little bit ridiculous for us to be taking up questions like this, making loopholes in laws before they are actually enacted into law, and so small in comparison to the big problems that are before us today that are not receiving any consideration at all.

MAJOR PROBLEMS

You take, for instance, the veterans are now being forced to take a 10 percent discount on many of their mortgages that are guaranteed 100 percent by the United States Government. If there ever was a shame and a disgrace, that is one, yet we will take up our time on bills like this and not say a word about these money sharks forcing the veterans to take a 10 percent discount on mortgages guaranteed by the United States Government; just as good as United States Government bonds; going on all the time, every day. We are not turning our hands on it. Another thing: Government bonds are going down. They will soon be down to 90. Why, that is terrible. And yet here we are taking up our time on things like this and paying no attention to the other at all, letting it go. We can support those Government bonds. This Congress can require the proper authorities to do it and it would not cost the Government one penny. It would not cost anybody a penny. We could keep them at 100 percent and keep our economy sound. Yet we do not do it; we do not pay any attention to it. That is not a problem we are concerned about. We take up our time with bills like this.

Another thing: Interest rates are being arbitrarily raised. If there was ever a scandal on earth, there was one the other day. That was the unnecessary increase in interest rates. It was said that it was needed on account of the danger of inflation. Where are the dangers of inflation? They are not on the farm, not among the small-business men, not among the home builders of America. There is no inflation there. Where is it? But let us assume for the sake of argument that there are dangers of inflation. Why do we have to raise interest rates in order to deal with them? They can raise reserve requirements of banks and do exactly the same thing. But that would not raise interest rates. Why do they not do that? That poses a serious question for Congress to answer. Why should we take up our time on little things like this that do not amount to a thing in the world in the overall economy of the country and let major things like that go on?

Down in Texas we used to have a bank robbery now and then. Of course, any bank robbery is bad, but when people ride in on horseback in the middle of the day and go in and rob a bank and get away with it, the people in other towns criticize them—the local residents and businessmen—and say, "Why in the world did you let them get by with it, come in there and rob your bank in broad daylight?"

ROB US IN BROAD DAYLIGHT

But that is what we are permitting them to do here. As Members of Congress we are letting them rob us in broad daylight. We are letting them rob the veterans of 10 percent of their guaranteed mortgages. We are letting them arbitrarily raise interest rates. We are letting them force Government Bonds to go down to 90. And here we are doing nothing about it. We are just letting them rob us in broad daylight and doing nothing about it.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman from Texas is a great student of money matters. I was wondering if he was going to make any comment on the raising of the discount rate by the Federal Reserve.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. I put a statement on that in the RECORD yesterday. I hope the gentleman will read it. That was cruel, absolutely unnecessary. Anyone who understands the problem at all knows that. Why should they raise interest rates? What excuse can they give? Inflation. Where is it? As I said a while ago, it is not on the farm, it is not among the small-business men; they are going broke. It is not among the home builders. Where is the inflation? That is the excuse they give. All right; let us say again, for the sake of argument, that their apprehensions and fears are justified. They do not have to raise interest rates to meet that threat of inflation. They can get the same results without raising interest rates by increasing the reserve requirements of banks.

What I deplore is the fact that we take up our time on bills like this when there are real earth-shaking problems, I will say to the gentleman, before our eyes here in broad daylight that we do not touch, say nothing about, and to which we give no consideration.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1736. This bill was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department to amend the residence requirement for directors of national banking associations. The present law—Revised Statute, section

5146; title 12, United States Code, section 72—requires that at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the association is located, or within 50 miles of the association's office, for at least 1 year immediately preceding their election as directors. Furthermore, three-fourths of the directors must continue to maintain such residence during their term in office.

The present law would be changed in two respects by S. 1736. The number of directors subject to the residence requirement would be reduced from three-fourths to two-thirds and the 50-mile limitation would be increased to a 100-mile limitation. Consequently, under this bill at least two-thirds of the directors would be required to maintain a residence within the State or within 100 miles of the bank's office.

The purpose of these amendments is to give national banks a wider range in the selection of their directors. The shareholders of national banks are desirous of electing strong boards of directors and, in some instances, the present law has proven unduly restrictive. The new 100-mile limitation gives recognition to the advances in transportation that have occurred since the 50-mile limitation was adopted in 1921. Today a director residing 100 miles from the bank would be as available to discharge his duties as would a director who resided 50 miles away at the time of enactment of the present law.

I have heard of no objections to the amendments and I believe that these minor changes will be beneficial to the national banking system.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, under the law, boards of directors of national banks must consist of not less than 5 members nor more than 25, so this proposed change in the residence requirement is genuinely minor; but it does mean something to some banks. If we will take into account the changes that have taken place here in the Washington area within the last 15 or 20 years and consider how much farther away from the Capital Members live now than formerly, we can visualize very easily why we should not restrict a bank director from living as far away from the bank as say 100 miles. This bill is realistic and should be passed.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 72), is amended by deleting therefrom the words "three-fourths," "fifty" and "fifty-mile," and substituting therefor the words "two-thirds," "one hundred" and "one-hundred-mile," respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRESTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations, pursuant to House Resolution 430, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file the 15th intermediate report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION ON GATT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution that provides for an investigation and study by the Committee on Ways and Means of certain aspects of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—and its relation to the proposed new Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD House Resolution 459.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 459

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of:

(1) The legislative authority for negotiations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), signed for the United States by the Department of State on October 30, 1947, in Geneva, Switzerland;

(2) The source of authority for each of the 35 articles of the same agreement (GATT), to determine—

(a) whether the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, was the sole authority for the negotiation of each article, and if so

(i) what doctrine of delegation of powers from the legislative to the executive was relied upon to justify negotiation of the so-called trade rules or the substantive provisions of the agreement; while if not

(ii) what other legislative or nonlegislative sources of authority were invoked to justify negotiation of each article authority for which was not found in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended;

(3) The power of self-amendment contained in article XXX of said agreement (GATT), in order to determine the extent to which the contracting parties thereof may themselves, independently of any restrictions on the powers of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation, amend the existing agreement toward the enlargement of its scope and jurisdiction without further reference to Congress;

(4) What barriers, if any, would approval of the articles of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation create against the recapture and retention by Congress of its power to regulate foreign commerce in view of—

(a) the renunciation of import quotas under article XI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which would be administered by said Organization;

(b) the power of self-amendment conferred upon the contracting parties of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) under article XXX, referred to in paragraph (3) hereof;

(c) the practice of the contracting parties of the said general agreement to agree to the binding of tariff rates at specified levels and the freezing of items on the free list;

(5) The status of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should the Organization for Trade Cooperation be established, to determine the extent to which the said general agreement could be carried out independently of any reservations attached to membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation by any member; and the extent to which any such reservations must be compensated by concessions to other member nations and the extent to which the necessary waivers by other members permitting such reservations might be merely temporary and subject to withdrawal;

(6) The extent to which the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade operate toward the binding of a future Congress against the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine the policies that are to govern our foreign trade and the level of our import duties, by action of a preceding Congress or by action of the President in exercising the powers delegated to him in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, or otherwise;

(7) The extent to which the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are in conflict with the provisions of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (that is, the so-called escape clause); with section 8 of the same act (that is, amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act); with the provisions of section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 (that is, the so-called national security provision); the American selling price and other valuation provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930; the Anti-Dumping Act; the Buy American Act; the cargo preference law (that is, the 50–50 preference for American merchant shipping); the mixing regulations of the Rubber Act of 1948; with export subsidies, and to what extent, if any, membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would deter or bar action by the United States Government toward the enforcement of these statutes;

(8) The source of the presumed or assumed power of the contracting parties of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade under which they have acted to grant a waiver to the United States to continue in effect import quotas on various agricultural products established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, including an examination of the doctrine of delegation of power by which the said contracting parties became possessed of sufficient authority to come into a position of granting such a waiver;

(9) The meaning of the stated objectives and purposes of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade insofar as they may conflict, upon implementation, with the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate

foreign commerce and to establish and adjust tariff rates; and the extent to which the Organization for Trade Cooperation, if established, would operate to carry into effect such objectives and purposes.

(10) The extent to which approval by the Congress of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would ratify the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and thus nullify the congressional caveat adopted in various Trade Agreements Extension Acts.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, the need for such a study became apparent during the hearings conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means during March on H. R. 5550, which is the bill that calls for United States membership in the OTC.

The question naturally arose what kind of an organization we are being asked to get into. This question could not be answered either by looking at the bill, H. R. 5550, nor by reading the articles of agreement of the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The bill itself proposed nothing more than membership in the OTC and something about appropriations to pay a part of its expenses. Obviously that told us nothing or very little of what we needed to know. The articles of agreement on the OTC, to be sure, gave more details, but only enough to leave a gaping hole in the information that is needed.

Obviously if the United States is about to enter another international organization we who are asked to approve the step owe it to ourselves and to the people we represent to know what will be the powers of that organization and just where Congress itself will stand if we do become a member.

The resolution accordingly asks for an investigation of the legislative authority under which the State Department negotiated the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, since that is what the OTC would administer. It asks further that the legislative authority for negotiation of each of the 35 articles of the general agreement—GATT—be ascertained.

This information is essential for any member who seeks to vote intelligently on H. R. 5550, for two reasons:

First. The source of authority for negotiation of the general agreement—GATT—is under dispute. The State Department itself has been inconsistent in explaining the source of its authority.

In one instance—that is, before the Senate Finance Committee in 1949—it said that the President's authority did not rest solely on the Trade Agreements Act but that the President had some undefined general authority to make international trade agreements. Fifteen of the 35 articles of the general agreement—GATT—were attributed to this general authority and the remainder to the authority contained in the Trade Agreements Act.

In other instances the State Department has held that the Trade Agreements Act itself delegated ample authority to the President to enable the State Department, acting for the President, to negotiate GATT, including the substantive provisions, such as the one against the establishment and maintenance of import quotas. This was the position the Department took before the Senate Finance Committee in 1955 and before the Ways and Means Committee in 1956.

Which is the correct interpretation, if, indeed, either one of the two explanations is correct?

Many of us, on the contrary, believe that the State Department greatly exceeded its authority when it negotiated the General Agreement in Geneva 8 years ago. We believe that the State Department representatives ran wild and paid little attention to the source of their authority. They began to explain only after they were challenged by Congress. Their first explanation, already mentioned, was that more than the Trade Agreements Act was drawn upon, namely, the general authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs.

This turned out later to be too vague an explanation and not a satisfactory source of power, particularly since a Supreme Court decision on the inherent authority of the President, and the State Department shifted to the more recent position, which, to repeat, was that the Trade Agreements Act itself gave the President adequate authority. The American Bar Association, among others, does not agree with such an interpretation. It says that the OTC would be unconstitutional.

What are Members of Congress to think of such varying interpretations of the power delegated to the President?

Such questions should be answered before we are asked to vote on the OTC.

This brings us to reason No. 2 why the legislative authority to negotiate GATT should be studied thoroughly before Congress is asked to approve the OTC:

Second. Approval of the OTC would also represent approval of the general agreement, for the simple reason that the OTC would administer GATT and would be set up to give full effect to the purposes and objectives of GATT. This is set forth clearly in articles 1 and 3 of the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

This is very important. If Congress is to approve GATT, even if only by the back door, we should know what kind of a house we are entering.

But this is not in accordance with the State Department design. If we took a good look at GATT we might not want to go into the house by either the back or the front door. That is why the State Department devised this roundabout way of getting congressional approval of GATT. It was afraid to submit GATT itself for approval.

Many of these objections came to light in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and that committee tried hard to meet the objections.

I am sorry to say that the amendments adopted by the committee, no matter how well-intentioned—and I believe that they were designed honestly to meet the most serious objections—nevertheless do not hit the spot. The fact is that they could not overcome the objections so long as GATT itself was not before the committee for approval or disapproval.

Paragraph 3 of the resolution calls for an investigation of the power of self-amendment contained in article XXX of GATT. There is very good reason for looking into that, as I hope you will see. That power, that is, GATT's power of self-amendment, has been exercised in the past; and in no case, let me emphasize, in no case have such amendments come to Congress for acceptance or rejection. And right here let me point out, let me make it clear beyond doubt, that nothing contained in the Ways and Means Committee amendments to the OTC bill would modify or restrict this power of GATT to amend itself.

It does no good, it does not go to the heart of the matter, to throw a halter on the OTC or to hobble its range here and there by amendments. The central reservoir of power lies in GATT, regardless of its source, and amendments to the OTC do not reach it. GATT can amend itself. Remember that. GATT can amend itself, and the OTC could not stop it. Should it do so, the OTC, once established, would simply administer the GATT in its amended form.

The committee amendments of the OTC bill do little or nothing to keep GATT itself in bounds; and we are well aware how free GATT has been in setting itself up as the supreme arbiter over our tariff and trade policies. Considering how far and how fast the State Department has moved with GATT never approved by Congress, we can only guess what notions it would put into effect if Congress approved the OTC and thus assured GATT that the reins guiding it had been relinquished into its own hands.

The ink of the President's signature approving OTC would hardly be dry before the State Department would begin to reinforce its already systematic method of ignoring Congress in matters of tariffs and trade. Congress would no longer have any hold over the regulation of our foreign commerce; only a shadow, a theory would remain, but nothing in reality. The so-called right to legislate left to us in this field would have no more substance than a cobweb; and that is exactly what would be spun around our authority and responsibility very soon after approval of the OTC.

These are some of the questions that the resolution seeks light on. These are some of the problems that loom before us in considering the OTC. There are more, many more, and still more would

soon come to light, particularly in dealing with the farm problem, if OTC were accepted. The question of disposal of farm surpluses runs squarely into our commitments under GATT. The question of establishing import quotas on farm products and keeping them in effect is also tangled up in GATT. Shall we confirm the powers of GATT without knowing what they are?

I say first let us find out how far down the river the State Department has already carried us before we extend another accession of power, much less virtually a blank check, such as OTC approval would amount to. As far as I am concerned the Department has not earned our confidence in this field. It has grabbed for power and then when challenged has turned around and claimed this power as a matter of right. Now it asks for still more power. I cannot consent to it.

This all calls for close examination. That is the purpose of the resolution. Let us stand firm in our purpose to get more information. If we fail to get the facts, we should, in the interest of our economic security and the safety of the Republic, defeat this un-American proposal.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in hearty accord with the resolution calling on the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct a full investigation and study of various aspects of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, usually referred to as GATT.

The purpose of this resolution is not to call into question the competence, industry, or integrity of the Committee on Ways and Means for which I have the highest regard.

It is for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the shortcomings of H. R. 5550 which is the bill on which the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings during the month just past and which proposes membership of the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC.

H. R. 5550 as introduced was a very simple bill and very short. It was amended in committee in what was no doubt an attempt to overcome some of the serious defects of the original bill as revealed in the hearings.

Unfortunately the amendments also fall short of curing the shortcomings of the bill.

For this there is a very good reason.

The bill, H. R. 5550, did not call for an examination of the long and complex and highly controversial articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; and the committee therefore was without benefit of having before it the substance of the very thing it was asked to act upon. The difficulty of reaching a conclusive judgment on the OTC under such circumstances is not difficult to understand.

What was before the committee was a proposal for membership of the United States in an international organization. That was about all there was to it. And that is what this House will no doubt soon have before it. The question will ostensibly be, "Do we wish to join an international organization that will administer and carry out the provisions of an international agreement?"

If this sounds odd, the blame must fall on H. R. 5550.

The question is indeed made to appear quite simple. Every member should be able to make up his mind whether he wishes the United States to take out membership in an organization dedicated to the implementation of an international agreement.

It would in fact be quite simple, unless a member should make so bold as to ask, "What's in this agreement that we are asked to vote for?"

The answer to that would also seem to be simple. Congress is not being asked to vote on an agreement. It is asked simply to give its O. K. to membership in an organization that would administer and carry out a certain agreement, namely, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). It is asked to vote only on the organizational features and not the substance; but in so doing would in reality be passing on the substance as well.

Unfortunately for the success of such a maneuver, some of us want to know what is in the agreement before we decide whether we want the United States to join an international body set up specifically to carry out that agreement. We do not relish giving our consent without knowing what it is that we are consenting to.

It is true that in the public hearings on H. R. 5550 many references were made to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, but the committee was under no obligation to inquire into it in detail. The hearings developed a great diversity of opinion on the meaning of the OTC in its relation to GATT. For example, the American Bar Association, among others, strongly opposed H. R. 5550 on the grounds that it would be unconstitutional. Other witnesses, on the other hand, said there could be no question about its constitutionality.

The hearing probably raised more questions than it settled; and the committee adopted a number of amendments that were apparently designed to meet at least some of the objections of the opponents; but as I have said previously these amendments could not reach the heart of the matter because the Ways and Means Committee obviously could not amend the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as distinguished from restrictions on our membership in the OTC itself. Nor was the committee in a position to lay down limitations to the conditions under which the United States participates in GATT as a contracting party. It could not do this, first, because the GATT was not before the committee; and, secondly, because GATT provides its own mechanism for its amendment and the Congress of the United States does not figure in that mechanism.

In other words, the Ways and Means Committee was all but acting in a vacuum, so far as doing anything to guide our participation in GATT was concerned. This was unfortunate if not deliberate because the Congress has not had an opportunity to vote approval or disapproval of GATT. This looked like a good opportunity but GATT was not brought before the Congress in H. R. 5550.

On the other hand, while the committee was thus helpless toward GATT, it was nevertheless in a position to give GATT a green light. This was the case because of the nature of the carefully designed wording of the bill. Without authorizing Congress to examine GATT, the bill, if passed, would nevertheless represent congressional approval of GATT.

This follows from the logic of the case. If we approve membership in an international organization that is set up specifically to administer and carry out a named agreement, only by tortured logic could it be held that we did not approve of the contents of the agreement. Such a course would be completely irrational and cannot be accepted as the intent of Congress.

The fact is that approval of the OTC would everywhere be construed, and properly so, as ratification of the GATT. And this would be accomplished without Congress necessarily knowing what GATT is.

That is why GATT itself should be brought before Congress; and that is what the present resolution proposes. It would give the Ways and Means Committee an opportunity to inquire, first, into the intended or probable relationship between OTC and GATT; second, into the position of Congress alongside of an approved GATT, in view of the extensive authority exercised by GATT over our tariff and trade policies; third, into the probable loss of its constitutional power to regulate foreign commerce by Congress under such circumstances and the gravitation of this authority into the hands of OTC-GATT; and fourth, into many other questions that were left dangling because of the limitations on the hearings on the OTC.

There is so much hidden in the operation of GATT, so much controversy over the powers it exercises and so much concern over its replacement of Congress as the regulator of our foreign commerce that it needs a thorough going over before we go ahead with the OTC. One of the greatest elements of danger in endorsing GATT, as we would be doing if we approved the OTC, lies in the weapon of coercion that this would place in the hands of the Executive by which a dissenting Congress could be driven into line.

Those who argue that the State Department could not coerce the Congress through the instrumentality of an international trade agreement have evidently not followed closely what has already been done under GATT. Import quotas, for example, have been renounced, except under circumstances that have only limited application to the United States.

This renunciation has given the executive a powerful weapon that can be used

effectively to thwart any effort in Congress to pass contrary legislation. It would be said, as it has been said already, that Congress in legislating contrary to a trade agreement would violate our international commitments and thus defame and besmirch the good name of Uncle Sam before the world. Moreover, our friends, the free nations of the world, would be dismayed and discouraged and would become embittered over what would appear to be the irresponsibility and instability of Congress.

Such arguments, made possible only because the State Department had gone beyond its power in binding the United States to a given course of action in tariff and trade matters, could intimidate Congress in a manner that would not be possible if the State Department were prevented from venturing out of bounds in the first place.

Only by studying the various aspects of the powers delegated to the President in the Trade Agreements Act, the manner in which these powers were used by the State Department in negotiating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the interrelation between the proposed OTC and GATT, can Congress hope to deal properly with the question of whether the United States should become a member of the OTC.

I strongly urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to that of the other Members who have preceded me in endorsing the resolution calling for a study and investigation of GATT before we are asked to vote on OTC membership as provided in H. R. 5550.

Mr. Speaker, my State, too, would be affected by our membership in the OTC. Maine has a textile industry that faces destructive import competition. It has paper mills, shoe factories, plants that make spring clothespins, sardine fisheries and canneries. It supplies lobsters and potatoes far beyond its own borders.

These are all products that experience import competition. The regulation of such competition so that these industries and their workers may carry on their operations with reasonable profits and scales of pay is of the utmost importance to them. Tariff and trade legislation affects them directly and substantially. My interest in such legislation therefore needs no further justification.

My interest in the resolution arises from its search for more information. The Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the OTC. I testified before the committee and no doubt the hearings produced much important evidence. But like many others, I do doubt whether because of the limitations on the hearings, they produced the kind of information that we need most in order to vote properly on H. R. 5550.

The defect of the hearings lay in the fact that they were addressed to the OTC and not to the core of the whole question that we must really decide, namely, the scope, the powers, the meaning and the status of GATT; but more particularly the relation of OTC-GATT to Congress, should OTC be adopted.

How far would approval of the OTC by Congress be interpreted as representing simultaneous approval of GATT? How far would approval of the OTC represent confirmation by Congress of GATT actions during the past 8 years?

How familiar is Congress with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT? How familiar are the Members of this body with the origin of GATT; its makeup, its trade rules, its manner of operation, its purposes and objectives, its assertion or assumption of jurisdiction over trade and tariff questions and its manner of amending itself? This could be an embarrassing question.

Since the State Department has never been under obligation to report to Congress on GATT operations and since the articles of agreement have never been submitted to Congress, it would not be surprising if the membership of this House were a little on the deficient side in their knowledge of this very important subject.

GATT has held 10 annual sessions. It has built up a somewhat voluminous record of decisions and a yet larger one on interpretations and protocols. Its tentacles of power have been extended into many areas and nooks that may not have been contemplated at the outset.

The OTC would give the members of GATT an assembly. This indicates the direction of GATT ambitions, for while the OTC is described as little more than an administrative agency to carry out the provisions of GATT, the creation of an assembly must contemplate rulemaking or amendment and modification of the present agreement. Assemblies are not usually set up as compliance machinery.

None of this is set forth in H. R. 5550, which is a very short bill.

There is so much at stake here, so much that needs to be brought out into the open and so much that needs interpretation that it seems odd that GATT was not submitted to the Ways and Means Committee for full examination along with the OTC itself. Failing this, the call for hearings on H. R. 5550 should have included an inquiry into the many highly significant questions about GATT that must have occurred to many Members since the negotiation of that agreement.

What powers did Congress really intend to place in the hands of the President when it passed the Trade Agreements Act and subsequently extended it? Does Congress now agree that the Department has wisely used these powers?

Or better yet, would Congress agree, if it knew all the facts, many facts that are not now before it, that the State Department has stayed within the grant of power contained in the Trade Agreements Acts?

It might be asked whether it is the fault of Congress itself that it knows so little about GATT. There may be some room for entertaining such a possibility. If so, that is all the more reason why we should now remedy any such failure. Keep in mind that Congress receives no reports on GATT and that the President was under no mandate to keep Congress informed.

That, however, is water under the bridge and in no sense would excuse any further complacency toward our responsibility in this field, expressly fixed by the Constitution. We are now at a most crucial point in the history of this delegation of power. Either Congress shoulders its responsibility and is true to its duty or it forfeits its authority and lets down its constituency, that is, the electorate and the citizens it represents.

Mr. Speaker, I am not blaming the Ways and Means Committee. I think if it had it to do over again it would call a hearing on GATT. Nor am I blaming Congress for knowing so little about GATT, for in doing so I would also be blaming myself. I do, however, feel that from here on we would fall far short of our responsibility if we did not make up for the lack of information on GATT from which we suffer.

There is no question in my mind that we would be committing an unpardonable omission, in fact an evasion of duty, if we undertook to act on OTC without first informing ourselves on some of the questions that I have raised. These questions need answering and we cannot be indifferent to them. There are other questions that need answering before we vote on this issue. Many of them have been raised by other speakers on the resolution. I join with them in their concern and ask that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the glass industry and the ceramic tile industry in the district which I have the privilege to represent—both employees and management—have expressed themselves in regard to the proposed organization for trade cooperation. These people are deeply concerned because they find themselves in increasing competition with cheap foreign imports.

For this reason, I would like to add my voice to those who are in favor of the complete study of GATT before final action is taken on the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation.

OTC, as that organization is called, has been billed as a powerless organization which would not affect the authority of Congress over the control of foreign commerce.

Nothing could be more misleading. OTC would be an international assembly whose power would be defined by two documents which give it its jurisdiction. One of these is the OTC agreement, and the other is GATT.

GATT is a solemn agreement which has been entered into by the United States and 34 other nations. Its provisions are concerned with defining the policies which its members will follow in the conduct of international trade.

If Congress authorizes the executive department to commit the United States to membership in OTC, its action can have only one meaning. This would be

that Congress is willing to give up part of the sovereign power of the United States to determine for itself what policies it will follow in the realm of international trade.

Let me explain how this could be the only meaning of congressional approval of OTC.

First, each of OTC's members, including the United States, would previously have signed GATT.

Second, GATT, as I have said, is nothing more and nothing less than an elaborate set of substantive rules which its members agree will govern their foreign commerce.

Third, OTC would administer those rules. In so doing it would have the power to hear complaints brought by one member against another for violating GATT's rules. It would also have the power to require the accused member, the United States, for example, to consult with it regarding the complaint. Then it would have the power to make a decision or a ruling on the merits of the complaint as the majority of its executive committee or its assembly see the matter. Finally, OTC would have the power to authorize its members to impose sanctions against the accused member if the member did not comply with OTC's ruling or decision on the complaint.

Fourth, the provisions of GATT, which—as I have said—are the rules that OTC enforces, can be changed by a two-thirds majority vote of GATT's members. Since the United States has only one vote in GATT, new obligations could be imposed on it against its will.

Fifth, as a matter of fact, the United States is now technically in violation of GATT's rules. Many of our laws are in conflict with GATT. We have been given permission to continue this conflict between our laws and GATT only in respect to those laws which Congress passed prior to October 1947. Domestic legislation passed since that time—like the escape clause and the national defense amendment in H. R. 1—is not covered by this permission.

Sixth, once we are in OTC any member can bring a complaint against us for not bringing the laws I have just referred to into conformity with GATT. As I have explained, OTC can hear the complaint and if it wants to can authorize other member nations to impose economic sanctions against us.

Seventh, GATT has a provision which describes when it will become finally effective. At that time the permission I referred to a few moments ago to deviate from GATT's rules so far as laws on our books as of October 1947 will come to an end. Many time-honored provisions of our tariff and customs laws which have been on our statute books since long before 1947 are contrary to GATT's rules. They would have to be changed or we would be in violation of our GATT obligations and subject to complaints and penalties under the OTC machinery.

Although the Ways and Means Committee amended H. R. 5550 to specify that the United States will not be obliged to pass any specific laws to conform to GATT if we join OTC, this really will not help much. The State Department claims full authority under the trade-agreements law to enter into GATT. If Congress bows to the State Department's wish in H. R. 5550, a simple proclamation could change our laws when pressure from GATT's members against our nonconformance with GATT becomes too great.

Among these laws which are threatened by our membership in GATT are the following:

First. American selling-price value provision for coal-tar chemicals.

Second. Existing customs valuation provisions of the Tariff Act.

Third. Antidumping law.

Fourth. Countervailing-duty law.

Fifth. The escape clause in United States trade-agreements legislation.

Sixth. Right to use import quotas.

Seventh. Right to use internal taxes on imports.

Eighth. Right to use mixing regulations which specify use of domestically produced raw materials.

Ninth. Right to correct customs classifications by judicial process without compensation to foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about an international arrangement which could have such far-reaching effects on the policies of the United States Congress and our future control over those policies.

I am even more alarmed about the way in which the real significance of OTC and GATT have been concealed by the State Department. OTC and GATT are one of the most far-reaching grabs of authority which the executive department of our Government has ever attempted to carry out. There is precious little understanding at the moment on the part of the Members of Congress of the implications of the OTC bill. The study called for by the resolution is badly needed if the Congress is to pay any attention to its responsibilities under the Constitution for the regulation of foreign commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have many misgivings in regard to H. R. 5550. This measure would authorize the United States to become a member in the Organization for Trade Cooperation—OTC. This is an international organization composed of 35 contracting countries to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into a discussion of all the ramifications of GATT and OTC, we run into a Pandora box of complications and contradictions. Even if it be granted that there is any merit to the proposal, there are so many unresolved issues involved that we cannot escape the fact that this legislation is untimely.

Let us take a brief look at just 1 or 2 phases of this thing. GATT is an executive agreement, entered into by our Government in 1947, under authority—or alleged authority—of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. That action has never been considered by the Congress. Nor has its validity been determined by the courts. I am informed a considerable amount of litigation has resulted and certain legal aspects, including questions of constitutionality, remain unresolved. The American Bar Association is reported to doubt the constitutionality of OTC.

When OTC was created, it was proclaimed "to further the achievement and objectives set forth in GATT." Then, in 1955 that objective was amended to include the objectives of "raising standards of living, insuring full employment, promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties."

Now those objectives are in themselves fine for individual countries to seek. But should our country become tied to global objectives, which those are? Should we, by becoming a member of OTC, undertake to insure full employment, not only in this country but likewise in all the other countries which become members of OTC?

We have never adopted that sort of a policy for our own country. Indeed when it was proposed at the end of the war back in 1946 that the Government virtually guarantee full employment in the United States, the legislation, endorsed as I recall by Henry Wallace, was soundly repudiated by the Congress. It was felt by the Congress that such a philosophy ran counter to the principle of free enterprise and as being too expensive to talk about.

Should we endorse a principle which would apply on an international basis that has been repudiated by the Congress as applied to our own country alone? While the two situations are not identical there is an analogy that must be recognized. This is just one of the facets of this thing that needs study and clarification before permanent legislation is enacted.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into the field of international trade, somewhere along the line the Congress must draw the line in respect to delegation of the powers and responsibilities assigned to it by the Constitution. We must be careful about frittering away the people's interests by giving tremendous powers to people who are not responsible to the American people, or even to the American Government. Let us approach this subject with care and caution.

It will be recalled that when the Trade Agreements Act was enacted it was intended primarily for the benefit of the United States, its economy and people. It was so stated in the act. But by a nibbling process, our own domestic interests seem to become secondary. I cannot find in the original act the authority for GATT and OTC. Their legitimacy remain in doubt.

The hearings held on H. R. 5550 suggest a multitude of questions on this subject going to both the propriety and legality of these various activities and proposals. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the time is not ripe for this legislation. It becomes more and more obvious that we should devote our energies to the clearing up of the more outstanding questions which bear on H. R. 5550 before the House passes on this bill. The House Ways and Means Committee should be

charged specifically to make a full review of these important problems.

I am pleased to join the able gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in calling for a fuller investigation of this subject.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding to me and commend him for the unrelenting fight that he has made on behalf of the people of this country in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, now pending in this Congress is a bill, H. R. 5550, which would authorize our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee have touched on many problems connected with this legislation. A review of the testimony before the committee quickly reveals that the issues involved are very complex. Despite this complexity, many have come to recognize the dangers inherent in the legislation.

One of the involved issues which H. R. 5550 throws open before this House is the conflict in the mechanisms and goals of the legislation and our domestic farm policy. In this instance the peril embodied by the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the accord which it would administer, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is very immediate and obvious. In fact, the Department of State which has already taken part in the so-called GATT accord for the past 9 years on what the Department has called a temporary or provisional basis, has laid this Nation's farm policy bare to the inroads of foreign influence.

As I see it, our farm policy should seek to afford the American farmer a fair, proportionate share of our national income. It should seek to enable him to obtain a standard of living comparable to the high national average which this Nation alone has achieved among the nations of the world. In so doing the Nation recognizes that this is a fair and just portion which the farmer can expect in return for the difficult labors in his fields.

We also strive to provide a workable farm program because the Nation recognizes that the prices of farm products must be stabilized for the good of the country as a whole. Economists point to the catastrophic drop in farm prices during the great depression in this country when they search for the reasons for our difficult recovery from that economic crisis. They also indicate that our farm population has served us admirably during the two world wars by a rapid increase in farm production. Unfortunately for the farmer, his activity is not the kind which adjust easily to the needs of a changing market. Our farm program has sought to secure for the farmers a fair share of our postwar prosperity in the face of these vagaries over which each of our farmers as an individual can have little control.

I hardly think that many will dispute the fact that our farm program is vital for our national well-being. How then do we safeguard the rights of our farmers?

A part of this program is the payment of subsidies to farmers. These subsidies often give rise to domestic farm prices considerably above world market prices. As a result, our domestic farm prices are constantly in danger of being undercut by cheaper imports. To meet this problem we have had to impose import quotas on certain farm products. Among products protected in this manner are wheat, cotton, butter, cheese, dried milk, peanuts, almonds and filberts. In addition, imports beyond a certain level of products such as potatoes, wool, and tobacco are subject to extra tariff charges.

There is an unmistakable conflict with these import quotas which protect our farm program and certain GATT provisions. Article XI of the GATT provides that—

> No * * * quotas * * * shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of * * * any other contracting party.

A conditioning clause in the GATT to this provision provides exceptions to this rule in GATT's article XI, section 2, and permits quotas on agricultural products provided domestic production is controlled and provided that such quotas will not reduce the share of the market normally held by imports. This would only tend to exempt some of our products such as wheat and tobacco from the GATT prohibition on import quotas. However, the question of whether or not the quotas fairly represent the share of the market normally held by imports is still open to question. It is highly significant that in cases of dispute, the question must be referred to the OTC, should OTC come into effect.

Our domestic production of butter, cheese, dried milk, rye, oats, barley, and linseed oil is not controlled. Therefore, the exception does not apply and under GATT rules we are not permitted to impose import quotas on these products.

Let me remind you at this point that the supporters of GATT and OTC have steadfastly maintained that these bodies have no power to influence our domestic legislation. In the event of conflicts, they say that domestic law is supreme or that Congress can act to declare them supreme. In this connection they point with pride to the waiver which has been granted to this Nation by GATT which permits us to maintain our existing quotas on farm products in the face of GATT prohibitions.

This is clearly a specious argument. It is obvious to me that if we must go to an international organization or conference arrangement to apply for a waiver, this action in itself implies that the organization in question has the power to grant or refuse. The action which granted the waiver in this instance, it seems to me, was a clear indication of authority.

Moreover, we made certain promises to obtain this waiver. The State Department promised that we would remove the existing quotas as soon as possible. I am sure that the primary producing countries that have been trying to export to this country will see that pressure is applied on us to carry out this promise. In any case we must report progress made to remove the quotas once a year and if the quotas remain in effect, we must explain why and outline the steps we have taken to remove them.

I am at a loss to resolve these considerations with section 22 of the Agricultural Act which gives the President freedom to impose import fees within certain specified limits when he finds that imports threaten our farm program. Section 22 also provides that no international agreement entered into by the United States may be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of section 22.

I think that we must finally injure our national integrity if we keep subscribing to international accords and then constantly provide for their nonobservance in domestic legislation. We are attempting to balance on a razor's edge if we pursue such a policy and rely on the actions of an international body in which we have only 1 vote in 35 to enable us to maintain our precarious balance.

Many hope that we will gradually be able to solve the problem of our farm surpluses by exporting some of these. Here GATT opposes us again. It asks its members to renounce the use of subsidies which encourage the export of primary products. Here GATT also requires consultation and implies that it will decide on apportioning equitable shares of the world market to member nations.

These are merely a few of the ways in which GATT has intruded on our domestic scene. It is startling to find that GATT has been allowed to do so through no conscious policy on the part of the Congress. In these matters, the State Department has assumed the initiative under some rather tenuous authority.

Though the House Ways and Means Committee has struggled with the problems brought up before it, we still lack a clear-cut answer to many problems. The cause lies not with any fault of the committee but rather it springs from the confusion sown by the supporters of H. R. 5550 who state that a consideration of GATT is not a proper study for the committee when it reviews H. R. 5550.

On the contrary, there is a crying need to investigate the connection between congressional action on the OTC and what this implies as to the opinion of Congress on GATT. We must also have an accurate appraisal of what our membership in the OTC presages for our domestic legislation. I believe a need for such a review is made clear by my outline of present conflicts between GATT and our domestic farm policy.

I therefore support the resolution that calls for a study and report by the Ways and Means Committee on the GATT and its meaning in the light of the OTC.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I wonder what the gentleman thinks will be the reaction of the American people when they find out that they, and even the Department of Agriculture, if they wanted to impose an import quota or set up a subsidy, would

have to go to Geneva and ask permission of 34 contracting nations to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades before they could set up that subsidy or impose that quota?

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid they would think the Congress had failed miserably in its duty to them.

Mr. BAILEY. I agree with the gentleman heartily.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I understand that this House is to be presented with another bill which deals with the foreign trade of this Nation. Foreign trade has become increasingly important in the modern world. Within our generation, totalitarian powers, both Communist and Fascist, have shown how well they recognize the strategic importance of international commerce.

Not so many years ago, Nazi Germany demonstrated how ruthless economic methods can be applied to upset completely the theoretical foundations of so-called free trade. In an utterly cynical fashion, the Nazis manipulated bilateral agreements and exchange controls to suit their purposes of economic domination. They introduced practices which required whole new textbooks for adequate explanation. By skillful application of their ruthless methods, they held scores of unwary nations at their mercy.

These same nations unwittingly aided the Nazis in completing their preparations for war. The commercial relations between Nazi Germany and the nations with which it traded became anything but free. Moreover, the Nazis used their trade missions to spy on their trading partners.

In their anxiety to export at any price, all too many fell into the traps set by the totalitarian states. Rather than pay for the goods they imported with convertible currencies or valued goods and services, the totalitarian states allowed their trading partners to run up credit balances, weighted their balance of payments accounts with blocked accounts or flooded their markets with unessential goods.

We are all too apt to feel that this chapter in commercial policy belongs to history. Yet the methods employed in this period are still with us. True, there is no evidence that they are being employed in the Western World for those goals which the Nazis sought to achieve. Nevertheless, they still radically distort the old theoretical notions of free trade which are still put forward in many a text on international economics, in fervent disregard of today's economic realities.

There are still many free nations in this world who find themselves compelled to utilize unorthodox trade restrictions and systems of preferences. It is well known that in so doing they seek to prop up artificially their strategic economic positions and protect the standard of living of their people.

Into this scene, those who espouse free-trade doctrines have interjected a proposal for a world organization whose aim is to remove trade restrictions. This House is soon to be confronted by a bill which would authorize United States membership in this new international agency which is to be called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The bill in question, of course, is H. R. 5550.

So far about 35 nations have subscribed tentatively to the OTC. Many of the candidates for membership are nations who have found it necessary to maintain trade restrictions to which I referred earlier. Many of the nations employing such restrictions hope to remove these in time in an orderly manner.

But there are others who seek to maintain these restrictions in order to encourage economic growth.

The OTC Charter and GATT, the instrument which it would implement, both provide for exceptions to provisions which prohibit the maintenance of trade restrictions such as import quotas and exchange controls, and other discriminatory trade practices.

It is hardly likely that our Nation will pursue policies which will qualify us to make use of such exceptions. On the other hand, certain nations within the western community have shown signs of consciously promoting such conditions so that they may qualify for the exceptions to the prohibitions by the OTC and GATT. Thus, they seek to force economic development. We are aware that the United States has favored the orderly development of national economies. However, I doubt whether we favor methods which would achieve economic development at all costs. There is evidence in the OTC Charter and the GATT documents that the establishment of the OTC would regularize such behavior.

So much for a dangerous feature of the OTC-GATT arrangement within our own sphere of influence. Though this is serious enough, there is much more cause for concern when we look toward the East.

It should be noted at this point that Communist Czechoslovakia is to be a member of the OTC. True, Czechoslovakia is only one nation among the satellite group. The Soviet Union has made no move to join the OTC though it expressed some interest in its forerunner, the ITO. Nevertheless, it is sufficient for Soviet purposes to have Czechoslovakia present as an observer among the 35 member nations.

It is well to keep in mind the recent appearance of Czechoslovakia on the international commercial scene. Let us remember that it was an action by Czechoslovakia which touched off the heightened tensions in the Middle East. It did so by shipping arms to Egypt.

Here it is well to ask whether we should enter an organization with this Communist nation after its recent transgression. Certainly there is a moral question involved. It should be asked how we can act in concert with a nation which has recenty undertaken an action in international trade running directly counter to our interests and the interests of world peace and security.

Even more portentous are the possible future consequences which Czechoslovakian membership in the OTC could have. Czechoslovakia will be able to sit in on negotiating sessions which heretofore under GATT have been closed to many interested parties in the United States. The hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 5550 have raised serious apprehensions over how our OTC membership—and our participation in GATT—affects our congressional responsibility to regulate our tariffs and foreign commerce. In view of some of the trade practices of some GATT member nations and in view of the threat posed by the membership of Czechoslovakia, it is vital that we have more exact information.

In recent months it has become painfully clear that the Communists intend to make greater use of international trade as a weapon in the cold war. This makes even more necessary the retention of our freedom of action in foreign trade matters. How much will our membership in the OTC infringe upon this freedom of action?

The House Ways and Means Committee has turned up a substantial amount of evidence that the powers of this Congress over foreign trade has been hobbled by GATT and may suffer a decided eclipse with the passage of H. R. 5550. However, since the committee's immediate aim was not concerned with this problem, I feel that a more searching inquiry on this subject is necessary before the House can act to authorize membership in the OTC.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia and the other Members on both sides of the aisle that have joined him in what I sincerely believe is an effort in behalf of the American people. This is a fight which should be near and dear to the heart of every American, because what the gentleman from West Virginia is endeavoring to do is defend this country against our actual enemy. I know that while sometimes we are disheartened at the response we get, in the long run those that come after us will be thankful that there have been such leaders as the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I have spent 10 years in this fight. It has been time donated willingly. I believe the very foundations of the Republic are involved in this matter. The Congress cannot surrender its constitutional rights to regulate our commerce, tariff, and trade.

Mr. SAYLOR. I agree heartily with the gentleman. I sincerely believe that what is involved in this matter is that it is up to Congress to determine whether the Founding Fathers actually meant that Congress should handle these matters, or whether the present Members of Congress are not willing to face up to their responsibility in this modern day

and age but instead are willing to delegate their constitutional rights to some other group.

The thing I think the gentleman from West Virginia should be congratulated for is that he has pointed out that he is not against trade—he is not against foreign trade—he is against the Congress abdicating to another agency of Government its given rights.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and have spoken on the floor of the House in opposition to such proposals as H. R. 5550. I object to this bill and to any and every project which I consider to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I appreciate that the Ways and Means Committee did adopt certain amendments to the original bill in a conscientious and sincere effort to make it as palatable as possible. Unfortunately, the amendments do not change the basic concept of the bill in any way. So far as I am able to ascertain, the activities of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade organization would remain unchanged, except that there would now be an international bureaucratic agency—that is, the Organization for Trade Cooperation—set up to devote full time to empire building and to devising ways of controlling foreign trade without the consent of Congress.

To me, GATT must go if America's international commerce is to be administered by the duly delegated legislative branch of our Government. To extend the assumed powers of the State Department and non-American delegates in the making of trade agreements for this Nation would be nothing short of tyrannical if it were to be arranged without consent that can come only through a constitutional amendment.

Let us examine for a moment what would happen if Congress were to give ear to the demands of the international groups behind H. R. 5550. The OTC would sit in Geneva, armed with an assembly, an executive committee, and a secretariat with the power to call international trade conferences of GATT members. The work of members of this group—responsive to no voters in the United States—would of a certainty be devoted to methods of expanding foreign trade without any thought whatsoever of the consequences to American industry and labor. State Department spokesmen who have testified in favor of H. R. 5550 have made it clear that their objective is to lower America's tariff barriers. Their intention is to strengthen diplomatic ties, not to enter into the field of foreign trade with the idea of helping this country improve economically.

What chance would any industry, any group of workers, or any farmers in this country stand to make themselves heard in Geneva under such circumstances? If trade concessions are to be made for the purpose of providing assistance to other countries, then those deals should be made in the name of international aid—not under the label of good business.

Through H. R. 5550, the State Department expects Congress to hand over to it the exercise of controls vested in this legislative body by the Constitution. Once cloaked with this authority the Department would immediately toss it into an international pool, as indicated by the record which the Department has made in postwar years. The transfer of power over tariffs and trade has already been carried so far by the State Department that—unless Congress checkmates the trend—our national policy on foreign trade will become bound to the whims of so-called diplomats wearing the colors of several score foreign insignia.

The blunderings of the State Department, as already exhibited since its usurpation of authority in the field of foreign commerce, should in themselves be sufficient warning to place Congress on guard against any further surrender of power. Who among us is willing to report to his constituents that he has participated in a movement to permit foreign traders to make the laws of our land in respect to what and how much we are going to export and import?

My own congressional district has suffered so much from the unwise tariff policies thrust upon this Nation by the State Department theorists that we have actually been placed at a disadvantage from which it will be a long time until we can recover. As an example, consider the case of foreign residual oil. Until this administration recognized the threat to our national economy and security contained in a policy which permitted unrestricted imports of residual oil to enter our markets, millions of tons of bituminous coal from western Pennsylvania were refused a market outlet. The situation has eased in the past year, but there is still ample room for further improvement.

Now look back to the coal which would have been mined and sold had it not been for the unfair competition of foreign residual oil. Month after month, year after year, more and more of our miners were relegated to the ranks of the unemployed. Railroaders, too, lost countless paychecks as a consequence of these inequitable policies, and the impact was felt throughout our coal and transportation centers. Hundreds of young boys and girls completing their high school courses were deprived of an opportunity to obtain a higher education. Some of them are still hopeful that their fathers will be able to catch up on back bills and eventually make it possible for them to enter college, but many found the situation at home so hopeless that they were forced to give up forever any idea of pursuing their scholastic training. These are among the unlisted tolls of an unrealistic foreign trade policy. Add to them the heartaches occasioned by the knowledge that many little children were undernourished through no fault of their parents and you will understand why I—for one—am receiving hundreds of communications objecting to the proposals contained in H. R. 5550.

Our coal and railroad workers are not the only groups who have had a practical lesson in the evils of uncontrolled foreign trade. The glass industry constitutes an important segment of the economy in my congressional district. Our families who depend upon the glass industry for a living have seen firsthand what can happen to an industry and to a community when the products of cheap labor in alien lands are admitted into this country without proper application of tariff provisions. The same situation is applicable in the case of pottery workers, machine tool manufacturers, and in any category of workers exposed to the effects of an unrealistic trade program. Our farmers would be placed in a most untenable position if H. R. 5550 were enacted. They now have some protection through the tariffs and quotas implicit in section 22 of the Agricultural Act, but—given the right to dispose of tariffs and quotas—the State Department and its foreign collaborators could quickly bring about the flooding of our food markets with the products of coolie wages, thus depriving our own great agricultural family from any opportunity of enjoying increased levels of income.

Mr. Speaker, in emphasizing my opposition to H. R. 5550, I should like to state at this time that I am in complete agreement with the resolution introduced by my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], calling for a thorough investigation of our membership in GATT. I feel that this inquiry should take place. Meanwhile, the proper course for the House to take at this time would be to recommit H. R. 5550 when it is called up, and await the outcome of the GATT investigation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD in support of this resolution the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means to make a complete investigation of certain background information necessary for a better understanding of the meaning of United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation as proposed in H. R. 5550.

I support the resolution because I feel that Congress has not gained sufficient understanding of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and its operations and ramifications, to give it the approval that immediate passage of the OTC bill would provide.

In my district, and in my State, there are a number of industries vitally affected by import competition. The welfare of tens of thousands of workers is at stake, and their future is bound up with the tariff and trade legislation we pass here.

Sometimes we feel it does not matter very much whether we pass or do not pass this bill or that bill. I assure you that it matters a great deal what we do in tariff legislation. Those engaged in industrial, or farming and fishing operations back home hold us responsible for what we do here and I am sure they want to keep a system under which they as constituents, and we as their elected

representatives, can exercise control over what is done to them, or for them, by Congress.

Many of us are aware that the whole question of who is to control our foreign trade and tariff policies is at stake in H. R. 5550. I have seen denials of this, but they either come to nothing, or are based on an acceptance of the controls already exercised by GATT over our foreign trade and tariff policies. It may be said the approval of the OTC would not add to the powers of GATT; that may be true. Therefore, we are asked, what is wrong with approving United States membership in the OTC?

The point at issue is not that OTC would add to the existing powers of either the President or GATT over the regulation of our foreign commerce. The question is whether by passing H. R. 5550 Congress will put its stamp of approval on its own divestment of authority and responsibility.

The State Department, drawing on power delegated in the Trade Agreements Act, has already delivered much of the previous congressional power over to GATT. Many of us have objected strenuously to such freehanded disposal of congressional control and certainly we do not wish today to do anything, either to confirm or encourage it. Approval of OTC now would confirm the objectionable past action of the State Department in this field and would encourage GATT to go even further in the future.

This is the first opportunity that Congress has had to express its opinion on what has appeared to many of us as the siphoning away of our constitutional obligations, and lodging them in an international organization where the voice of Congress does not penetrate.

GATT has never been before us. We have not been able to come to grips with it. We therefore could not register our sentiment.

It will be said that we could have done so when the Trade Agreements Act was up for renewal, from time to time. On those occasions there were other considerations and to avoid creating the impression that extension of the Trade Agreements Act meant approval of GATT, Congress, as is well known, successively adopted a caveat or caution saying that our action was not to be construed as approving or disapproving GATT.

GATT is not before us now; but we are confronted with a situation in which approval of something else that is before us, namely, the OTC, would also confirm GATT. It would confirm and approve all that the State Department has done in negotiating GATT and extending its own powers, and those of GATT, by operating through GATT as a member and disposing of many agenda items that bear directly on matters that fall properly into the zone of congressional control.

Therefore, while GATT is not officially before us, we are confronted with the meaning of GATT, with the history of GATT, including its inception, the character of its operations, the trend of its decisions, and much else of substantial significance. We should not let this opportunity, perhaps the only one that we will have, slip by without examining GATT.

The Congress should not be asked to take a step as crucial as that proposed in H. R. 5550—one that would settle a highly controversial issue of nearly 10 years' standing—without examining the background and weighing the consequences of our action, with full access to all the GATT documents, including its numerous protocols and interpretations.

I would feel that we were voting in the dark, and were being asked to vote in the dark, unless GATT is brought officially before us. That is why I endorse the resolution.

Consider for a moment what the situation might be if Russia should ask to be admitted to GATT, and therefore the OTC. This possibility is not the figment of a feverish imagination.

Russia knocked at the door of UNESCO and was admitted in April 1954. She knocked at the door of the ILO and was admitted. In 1955 she expressed an interest in joining the ITO—the International Trade Organization—unaware that the ITO never came into being or confusing it with GATT or the proposed OTC.

Clearly the question of Russian membership is one that must not be ignored. Who knows what it would mean?

In the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 Russia and all Communist-dominated countries were excluded from enjoyment of the concessions—tariff reductions—that we had given to other countries and which would have been extended automatically to Russia and other Communist countries under the most-favored-nation clause.

Could Russia, by coming into GATT, circumvent this congressional mandate? It is a nice question. The State Department and not Congress decides for the United States whether we will support the application for membership in GATT by a given country. We—that is the United States—supported the membership of Japan in GATT and Japan came in although 14 countries, among them some of the leading trading nations, refused to extend their concessions to that country.

Please note that it was the State Department and not Congress that determined our support of the Japanese application to join GATT. Should Russia apply for membership, the State Department and not Congress would decide for the United States whether we would support the application.

Should Russia come in, I ask again, what would happen to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, which directed the President to withdraw all our trade agreements concessions from Russia and other Communist-controlled countries? Would her admission upset this law, which was put into effect by the President? You may recall that in 1951 the President quickly complied with the mandate from Congress to withdraw our trade-agreements concessions from Communist countries, with one exception. That exception was Czechoslovakia. We had to apply to GATT for permission to drop that country from our most-favored-nation list. Why? It was because Czechoslovakia was a member of GATT; and GATT itself lays down the procedure to be followed in the withdrawal of concessions. As it turned out GATT supported our position but we had no assurance it would do so.

The upshot is that membership in GATT bestows privileges and obligations, about which Congress is not consulted. We may pass a law but GATT decides whether it will be carried out.

If Russia did come into GATT she could cause embarrassment to the State Department, and to the Congress. As a member of GATT and OTC she could challenge many of our commercial practices. The whole system of waivers and exceptions would be made to order for her genius at tying an organization into knots.

I raise these questions, not because I have the answers, but to show how little we know of the probable effects of approval of H. R. 5550. It seems to me imperative that we study GATT thoroughly before we give it our approval by a casual process of voting for OTC membership. I believe it would be a profound mistake if we proceed without this necessary information. The resolution would give us the needed opportunity. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the resolution on a GATT–OTC study by the Ways and Means Committee. I was not one of those who testified before the committee a few weeks ago when it held hearings on H. R. 5550; but it was not from lack of interest and deep concern.

Because I come from an area that has long been in the forefront of import competition, particularly in the case of pottery and glassware, I have had occasion to keep in touch with the developments in our international excursions in tariff and trade matters. While I am not an expert in the field, I do not hesitate to say that no member of this body should be asked to vote for United States membership in the OTC, as provided in H. R. 5550, without more information to go on than that contained in the proposal itself and in the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation, signed in March 1955 in Geneva, Switzerland.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee were confined to these documents. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the very agreement that this legislation is all about and without which the OTC would be wholly meaningless, was not sent in by the President for ratification or even for examination in connection with the OTC. The reason is very clear. The State Department did not care to have Congress examine into the GATT record.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a full exposure of the usurpations of power by GATT, not only abetted, but in some instances promoted

by, our own Department of State, would lead not only to a rejection of OTC membership by Congress but to a restraint on GATT itself. That explains why GATT was not sent over.

The State Department in coming before Congress with its own negotiated OTC is trying to execute a clever end run. It well knows and has good reason to know that Congress would not approve GATT if the general agreement that forms the basis of GATT were transmitted to Congress for scrutiny. Therefore, the Department sought a way of getting approval of GATT from Congress by indirection and without exposing the ill-favored and illegitimate whatever-it-is to Congress at all.

That is why we have H. R. 5550. It makes no mention of GATT. It only calls for membership in the OTC.

I say the maneuver is a fraud, a deception.

Approval of the OTC would be an approval of GATT for the simple reason that the OTC would undertake to carry out the provisions of GATT. We would not be so stupid as to approve an agency that would administer an agreement and seek to give it effect if we did not approve of the agreement itself.

Why then, in the name of honest procedure, was the general agreement not sent to Congress for examination in a public hearing? We are asked to put our stamp of approval on an agreement without knowing what is in it. How contemptuous can an executive department become in its treatment of Congress?

The agreement has been in effect since January 1, 1948. It has been a storm center of controversy since it was signed in Geneva. Its assumed powers have been sharply challenged on many occasions. Many who have kept watch on its operations have protested its encroachment on the powers of Congress. There has never been a satisfactory explanation of its source of power; no lines of demarcation and no specifications of its jurisdiction have ever been issued. It is a jungle of world economic planning and of uninhibited ambitions.

GATT has been operating as a going concern without approval by Congress. In 1949 the State Department said that authority for negotiation of GATT was not fully dependent upon the Trade Agreements Act. Nearly half of its 35 articles, the Department said, looked to the general authority of the President to conduct foreign affairs, for their justification. Later this position was abandoned. Now the Department claims that the Trade Agreements Act itself provided ample authority for State Department negotiation of GATT.

Was the Department right in 1949 or is it right in its later interpretation, or was it perhaps wrong on both occasions?

With the GATT agreement in hand, unratified as it was, the State Department was in a position to twist the arm of Congress and thus smother all opposition. The Department could and did make agreements that snatched the power of Congress right out of its hands. Congressional protests were answered by pointing to the delicate international situation.

"Don't rock the boat. Don't offend our friends. Don't disappoint them. Don't drive them into the hands of Russia."

With cautions of this kind the Department could intimidate Congress. It is a species of coercion, bordering even on blackmail.

We all know or should know that in 1951 Congress directed the President to cut off all trade agreement concessions from Russia and other Communist-controlled countries. In carrying out the mandate the President, however, ran into a snag. Czechoslovakia was both a Communist-controlled country as well as a member of GATT. The President notified Russia and all the other Communist countries that our trade-agreement concessions would be withdrawn; but in the case of Czechoslovakia even the President's own hands were tied.

They were tied by the fact that since Czechoslovakia was a member of GATT we could not withdraw our concessions from that country without first obtaining the "O. K." of GATT—unless, of course, we elected to withdraw from GATT entirely. This we were not likely to do since GATT was largely a creature of our own State Department.

But not only did the President find his own hands tied by an agreement that was made in his own name but he was unable to carry out the mandate of Congress.

The question is how, when, and in what manner did the Congress ever empower the State Department, directly or indirectly to enter into an international agreement that could be used effectively to block the execution of an act of Congress?

This is not the only example. At the ninth session of GATT in Geneva in 1954–55 the United States was granted a waiver permitting us to maintain in effect temporarily our import quotas on certain agricultural products. These import quotas on wheat, raw cotton, peanuts, dairy products, and some grains were established under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

They were found to be in violation of the GATT ban on import quotas. Yet these quotas were imposed in accordance with procedures established to carry out section 22, just mentioned.

Once more the question arises how GATT obtained the power to review the implementation of an act of Congress carried out under the constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce? Again, how, when, and by whom did GATT become vested with such power?

These questions and others like them have been asked before. They have remained without answer; at least, they have not been answered under circumstances that would permit a congressional response. GATT has been kept at more than arm's length from Congress. Many of us have waited a long time for the opportunity of an accounting.

We want to review the stewardship of the State Department over the powers delegated to the executive in the Trade Agreements Act. Many questions remain without a satisfactory answer.

If the State Department claims that the Trade Agreements Act gave the executive all these powers to do what has been done under GATT we want a citation of chapter and verse. I do not think we ever extended such power. I do not believe that Congress ever had in mind placing a weapon in the hands of the State Department that the Department could use to bar Congress from exercising its constitutional authority by throwing roadblocks of international moral commitments across its path.

If Congress did do so, and the State Department can establish it to our satisfaction, we want to know that too.

Whatever the situation, this end play by the State Department has been going on long enough, too long in fact. Now is both the time and the occasion for a review.

One would think that the State Department itself would come forward in view of the controversy stirred up by GATT operations, and offer its record for review; but no. Instead of that we are treated to the same kind of evasion and contemptible tactics that have been characteristic of the Department in this field in the past 10 years. Mark my words, if the Department continues in its stiffnecked attitude it will end before long with complete deprivation of the delegated authority entrusted to it.

Congress should not even think of passing on OTC membership without an accounting by the State Department—and a detailed one—on GATT and its operations and on the Department's stewardship. Naturally I support the resolution and give notice right now to the State Department that its tactics have fooled no one who has had occasion to observe the GATT operations over a period of years.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, finally I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the comments of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5550, which would authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, was recently reported out by the Ways and Means Committee. It presents this Congress with a very complex proposal. I see no precedent for the plan as it has been presented. This very simply worded bill, H. R. 5550, would commit the United States to a complex series of obligations.

If this Congress approves OTC, then it also acts affirmatively on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT. It is true that we were led into GATT by the State Department in 1947 and have been bound by its decisions ever since. Yet, from the point of view of normal legislative processes, this has occurred by most unorthodox methods. Congress has never been asked to approve or disapprove GATT until now, in this roundabout way. As a result the agreement itself was not sent to Congress for review.

The Congress has constantly been reassured that it need not concern itself with GATT. There is something indi-

rect in this. The Department of State asks Congress not to concern itself with substantive rules and regulations embodied by GATT but instead asks that Congress pass on this Nation's membership in an organization (i. e., the OTC) which would administer GATT.

The spotlight should therefore really be on GATT. Frankly, I am at a loss to characterize it briefly. It defies a brief description. It has sometimes been called an accord. We know it largely as a conference arrangement which has exercised far-reaching influence on the tariff and trade policy of the United States. In reaching decisions on its actions, it has made little reference to any organ of the Government of the United States. This Congress has certainly not been consulted by GATT on its actions. Indeed, as I have indicated, the Congress is constantly advised not to concern itself about GATT. In the press of the legislation coming before this Congress, there has been a compulsion to sidestep the issues which surround GATT. But now we can no longer sidestep the question without neglecting our duty. We have to look at GATT carefully if we are to know what we are asked to approve.

In the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, the supporters of H. R. 5550 presented us with a host of glittering generalities. These were generally unsupported by the documents in question or the facts of United States participation in international trade. For example, on March 1 the Secretary of State disposed of the substantive questions surrounding H. R. 5550 by stating:

> We found that American participation in GATT was serving the national interest of the United States by strengthening economic ties with our partners and allies.

Nowhere in the presentation of the Department of State before the House Ways and Means Committee was there a factual study in support of these generalizations. Evidently the Department regarded it neither necessary nor desirable to supply Congress with fuller information.

In the brief recitation of the functions of the OTC, the Department of State listed "Administering the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade." With this phrase, the Department of State disposed of GATT in connection with H. R. 5550.

Judging from the weight of supporting material given in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, the preponderance seems to be definitely on the side of the opponents to H. R. 5550. This fact has given rise to uneasiness about OTC membership in Congress. This uneasiness led the Ways and Means Committee itself to amend H. R. 5550 in an attempt to overcome the objections.

Another issue which the Department of State skirted in cavalier fashion is our influence within the club that would be set up by the members of GATT–OTC. We actually account for a little over 20 percent of the club's trade. The United States has been asked to cover 20 percent of the operating expenses of this club. I presume it was easy for the GATT negotiators to agree on a weighted share for the United States when it came to levying charges on members.

But what happened when it came to handing out votes? The United States is to have only one vote in 35. Thus, when it comes to decision-making, we are accorded a voice no more powerful than that of the smallest member of the OTC.

Our influence in the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank is based on a more realistic assessment of our importance in the sphere of international commerce and finance. In these bodies we account for nearly a third of the available vote. Thus the strength of our voice is roughly proportionate to our capital contribution to the fund and the bank.

I need not stress the fact that our interests are protected along similar lines in the United Nations through our standing membership in the Security Council and our veto power there.

Naturally the supporters of H. R. 5550 claim that the OTC is not comparable to the United Nations, the IMF or the World Bank. They find that the OTC is purely administrative. As I implied in the beginning of my remarks, I for one am not convinced by the generalizations of H. R. 5550 supporters.

Cognizant of these and other problems connected with H. R. 5550, the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, as already stated, reported out the bill with six amendments. The amendments reflect uneasiness caused by the manner in which the OTC was presented to the committee and the way in which it was supported before the committee. But, I am afraid the amendments have not removed the disturbing questions connected with H. R. 5550.

I believe that the American electorate would have this Congress take the initiative to investigate thoroughly matters which affect their vital interest. No one can question the importance of legislation affecting our foreign trade and tariff legislation for every inhabitant of this nation. Mere disclaimers or amendments to H. R. 5550, though they reflect concern over this Congressional responsibility, do not overcome the objections to H. R. 5550.

The heart of the issue is that in approving the OTC we would also be approving GATT which has not been brought before Congress; and that amendments to the OTC do not extend to GATT itself. We would be ratifying GATT as it is without having a look at it. Because of this circumstance I agree with the resolution presented here and urge its adoption.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate in this discussion and to say I think the gentleman has rendered a service in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Maine, I appreciate having his assistance and cooperation in this matter. My thanks also go to others of my colleagues who have participated in this panel discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman has yielded to me, I want to thank him again for the splendid address he is making on behalf of the people of the entire country. The gentleman's State and the State of Pennsylvania have already felt what some of the other States are going to experience under this GATT and OTC, if it is adopted.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have long had strong misgivings about the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and have for that reason voted against extension of the Trade Agreements Act itself.

It is not a question of being against the expansion of trade. I can appreciate as much as anyone the value of foreign trade. That is not the same as saying that we should expand trade regardless of the consequences, regardless of what increased imports would do to our own industries. In my State we have textile manufacturing, including lacemaking; costume jewelry, cutlery, toys, pens and pencils, scientific apparatus and other manufacturing industries that face unfair competition from low-wage countries.

In my opinion the best way to expand trade is to regulate its flow so that it will not do more damage than good. We buy more abroad when our own industry is in a prosperous condition and we buy less if our industry is weakened and depressed. Imports from low-wage countries, as we all know, can help weaken and depress our industries unless the conditions of importation are properly regulated.

It is not my purpose, however, to dwell on the question of freer trade or protection. There is more at stake in H. R. 5550, the OTC bill, than this question. That is why I support the resolution that calls for investigation and study of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—particularly that part of it that relates to the exercise of power over our tariff and trade policies.

I make no secret of it: I want Congress to keep and to exercise the power granted to it by the Constitution to regulate our foreign commerce. This is not only a power; it is a responsibility that we owe our constituents, the people who have a right to look to us for carrying out our constitutional functions. We have no right to shift this power to an international trade organization.

Now, I know that it is said that Congress would lose none of its authority in this field if we should join the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I do not agree. It is a disclaimer that cannot be substantiated by the facts and represents little more than an effort to lull Congress into complacency.

If the OTC were to exercise no power, if it would not push Congress farther to one side, why would the State Department suggest that we become a member? There is no point in joining an international organization for the sake of joining. If the OTC would be as weak and helpless as its proponents contend,

it would be a useless society for the waste of the taxpayer's money.

Judging from the past, the OTC is not intended as a club to serve as a rendezvous for international socialites. The State Department has a record of power accumulation under GATT that throws an entirely different light on the OTC.

Starting with the Trade Agreements Act and carrying through GATT, that Department has spun a thread of delegated power into a web of international authority so interwoven and complicated that Congress can hardly take a step today toward the regulation of foreign commerce, be it a tariff question, a matter of import quotas, or disposal of farm surpluses, without getting entangled in some provisions of GATT. And what GATT means nobody knows.

There are many opinions; but there is no authority except GATT itself. And what GATT was last year or the year before is not what GATT is today, and what GATT is today is not what it may be next year.

For one thing, most countries, or groups of countries of similar economic position, have accommodated themselves in GATT with an assortment of exceptions. This process in turn is so overlaid with cross-hatched waivers, compensatory claims, rights of withdrawal, preference systems, and retaliatory privileges that only a mathematician trained in calculus could find his way through the maze.

I repeat I support the resolution of my colleagues for a close scrutiny of the general agreement—GATT—and this new OTC proposal that would wed us permanently to GATT. At the same time I must record my strong doubt that a study of GATT will tell us very much. I am afraid we could study it for 6 months and come away more confused about it than now.

Nevertheless I go along with the idea that we ought at least to try to penetrate the mysteries of the Geneva document before we give it our sanction. An affirmative vote on the OTC would be exactly that. We have never had an opportunity in Congress to vote on GATT. We are not being given that opportunity now.

It is not difficult to understand why the State Department did not send GATT to Congress along with the OTC. If by obtaining approval of the OTC it could automatically by the same step get ratification of GATT, why ruin the chances by exposing GATT itself to public view?

There is something about GATT that is not generally known. It has more than once amended itself since its first appearance on October 30, 1947. This is not surprising. It was born of the ITO (International Trade Organization) and the ITO died on the operating table of the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1950. It never came out of the ether. Since the ITO was to absorb GATT but never came into being, GATT needed some going over.

Thus, while it is not surprising that the GATT amended itself, the fact that it has the power of self-amendment is not only very significant, it is crucial to an understanding of H. R. 5550. For one thing, it leaves Congress to one side. Yet some of the amendments to GATT, past, present, or future, may be of the greatest interest and concern to industries, farmers, and workers in this country—all of them represented in Congress and looking to Congress to speak for them in such matters.

By "leaving Congress to one side," I mean such amendments of GATT by GATT are not submitted to Congress for approval.

This power of self-amendment is significant for another reason. No doubt it troubled the Ways and Means Committee because I cannot believe that that great committee could abet the stripping away of its own power and responsibility by substituting GATT in Geneva for itself. The committee therefore sought to plug the hole. It adopted an amendment saying that only Congress can authorize amendments on behalf of the United States to the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Unfortunately an amendment to the OTC is something quite different from an amendment to GATT itself. Nothing in the OTC amendment can bind GATT nor does such amendment require that amendments to GATT itself can be accepted for the United States only by Congress. They are and have been offered and adopted by GATT members acting together in Geneva. OTC would not change that regardless of the Ways and Means Committee amendment.

In another amendment the committee provides that adoption of the OTC neither repeals nor "modifies by implication or otherwise any existing legislation of the United States."

If read carefully this simply means that the act of passing H. R. 5550 will not of itself repeal or modify any existing legislation. That is not the same as saying that the representative of the United States may not agree to provisions that call for modification or repeal of any of our existing laws. Nor is it the same as saying that by adopting this amendment Congress thereby cancels agreements already made by the State Department calling for modification or repeal of existing legislation. Nor, finally, will it restore laws that have already been altered by way of implementing provisions in GATT that conflicted with domestic law.

Evidently the amendments, which I understand were all approved by the State Department, were drawn too hastily in view of the very complicated situation that has grown up. They fall far short of accomplishing their apparent purpose. It is doubtful that amendments to the OTC bill itself could in any case, prevent self-amendment by GATT.

I concur certainly that the whole matter needs much more study.

Whether any study can straighten out this barbwire entanglement is doubtful, but I am convinced that we should not proceed without the investigation called for in the resolution. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DOYLE, for 5 days, on official business as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, now holding hearings in Los Angeles, under Public Law 601.

Mr. GREEN (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for today and the balance of the week, on account of death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY and to include a speech by the Honorable JAMES C. MURRAY, of Illinois.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial and other matter.

Mr. PELLY.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHUDOFF.

Mr. HESELTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. HENDERSON (at the request of Mr. COLE) in two instances and to include tabulations of figures.

Mr. POWELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK.

Mr. PATMAN to revise and extend remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. HYDE).

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. PRIEST.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6712. An act to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 19, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1755. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1955, made pursuant to the request of the Corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1756. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the United States in the interest of national security"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1757. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1758. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1759. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1760. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1761. A letter from the Commisioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1762. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 243); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5550. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; with amendments (Rept. No. 2007). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 2851. An act to transfer certain lands from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior for the benefit of the Yavapai Indians of Arizona; without amendment (Rept. No. 2008). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8385. A bill to transfer certain responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior to the Public Housing Commissioner and the Secretary of Agriculture; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2009). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9358. A bill to require the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue a deed to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., for certain land heretofore conveyed to such city, removing the conditions and reservations made a part of such prior conveyance; with amendment (Rept. No. 2010). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10251. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2011). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10441. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to restrict its application to insurance which has been in effect 6 months at the time benefits are sought under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. Fifteenth intermediate report of the Committee on Government Operations pertaining to a food and clothing report (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 10592. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 10593. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 10594. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 10595. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 10596. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10597. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 10598. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10599. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 10600. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 10601. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10602. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 10603. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 10604. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10605. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 10606. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 10607. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil,

water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 10608. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 10609. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 10610. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10611. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10612. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10613. A bill to reduce the individual income tax by 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10614. A bill to preserve permanently as a national park, an area of national significance in Colorado and Utah, such park to be known as the Dinosaur National Park, which shall supersede the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that moving expenses paid by an employer for a new employee shall not be included in the gross income of the employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10616. A bill to provide for the organization of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10617. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 3651, so as to permit confinement in jail-type institutions or treatment institutions for a period not exceeding 6 months in connection with the grant of probation on a 1-cent indictment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 10618. A bill to provide a temporary extension of certain special provisions relating to State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10619. A bill—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

To reaffirm the national public policy and the purpose of Congress in the laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, commonly designated "antitrust" laws, which, among other things prohibit price discrimination; to aid in intelligent, fair, and effective administration and enforcement thereof; and to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to independent business, the Congress hereby reaffirms that the purpose of the antitrust laws in prohibiting price discriminations is to secure equality of opportunity of all persons to compete in trade or business and to preserve competition where it exists, to restore it where it is destroyed, and to permit it to spring up in new fields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10620. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 10621. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 10622. A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10623. A bill to merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for retirement of Government capital in Federal intermediate credit banks; to provide for supervision of production credit associations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10624. A bill relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 10625. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands in fee between the United States of America and the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10626. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 10627. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 10628. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10629. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10630. A bill relating to the District Court of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10631. A bill to provide Federal assistance for the construction of school facilities in Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10632. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RADWAN (by request):

H. R. 10633. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that certain employees who terminate their railroad employment shall be entitled to a refund of the railroad retirement taxes which they have paid; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10634. A bill to provide for the formulation of a plan for control of the property of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10635. A bill to preserve permanently as a national park, an area of national significance in Colorado and Utah, such park to be known as the Dinosaur National Park, which shall supersede the Dinosaur National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 10636. A bill authorizing the construction of a project on the Eel River for local flood protection at Sandy Prairie in the vicinity of Fortuna, Humboldt County, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10637. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 10638. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 10639. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10640. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the America's New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10641. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:

H. R. 10642. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to exempt certain retired officers of the Armed Forces from the operation of section 216 thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to pay certain expenses incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from April 14, to April 27, 1957; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the house of representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond, in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of the general court of the Commonwealth memorializing Congress

to enact certain legislation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation establishing proper flood control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 10644. A bill for the relief of Hylin Golding; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 10645. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Sai Ip Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 10646. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sen Lai Wong and her daughter, Yu Kiang Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10648. A bill for the relief of Thomas Haggerty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 10649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Myrtle Reveley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 10650. A bill for the relief of Lillian Cummings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10651. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of 1st Lt. Nicholas Mainiero, United States Marine Corps Reserve (retired), to the grade of captain; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10652. A bill for the relief of Harry F. Lindall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 10653. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chu Buoy Ngow Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

920. By Mr. CEDERBERG: Petition of Mrs. Amanda Olson, Big Rapids, Mich., and 104 others expressing their appreciation to the Ways and Means Committee for extending alcoholic beverage taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

921. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of Ensign John R. Monaghan Post 51 and 150, Veterans of Spokane, Wash., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

922. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition of 45 veterans of Ironton, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

923. Also, petition of 45 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Basil, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

924. Also, petition of 79 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Wellston, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

925. Also, petition of 31 veterans of Baltimore, Ohio, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

926. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of California urging passage of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit interstate advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

927. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Erick Lund and 17 other citizens of the State of Oregon urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

928. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. George Paine and 117 other residents of Clarion and Shippenville, Pa., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

929. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of LeRoy W. Lewis, Vassar, Mich. and 300 others for separate pension program for World War I veterans, their widows and orphans and urging its immediate enactment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

930. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Federation of Economic Organizations, Marunouchi, Tokyo, relative to the discrimination against the sale of Japanese textiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 6 I delivered at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics, in Rochester, N. Y., an address entitled "Can We Halt the Race for Atomic Arms?" I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE HALT THE RACE FOR ATOMIC ARMS?

(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

A New England author reminded us many years ago that trouble is like hot weather: It sours milk and sweetens apples.

The power of the atom has its twin aspects: it can blow whole cities to bits; yet it might bind this frightened world together.

Somewhere between the blast of Hiroshima and the hoped-for dawn of such a milennium of perpetual peace lies the no-man's land we now so timidly explore—a narrow strip of neutral territory between the barbed-wire entanglements of the world's great armed camps. In it labor the men of science and religion and politics, the possessors of faith and hope, who believe that destruction need not be the destiny of our day and civilization, who know that it is possible to be secure as well by the majesty of what we do as by the might of what we have, and who trust that the intelligence which enables us to split the atom for a bomb will in time teach us to use the split atom for the advancement of man and the glory of his God.

My academic training gives me no right to speak at a meeting called to discuss problems of high energy physics. My purpose this evening is to ask if there is a role that you men of science may play in proposing an affirmative answer to the question: Can we halt the race for atomic arms?

Day by day in the Congress of the United States we are alerted to that question. It colors the debate on the size of our military establishment. It increases as our agricultural storehouses fill and overflow. It influences the volume of our foreign aid. It throws into sharp controversy the relative value of guided missiles and jet aircraft. It builds a nuclear Navy and equips an atomic Army. We know all about Nike batteries; we watch ground-to-air, air-to-ground and air-to-air encounters. But we find no peace.

And yet, through all our thinking runs the belief that the true significance and greater ultimate effect of atomic energy for the human race will come, not from its destructive capabilities but from its contributions to the betterment of man's lot upon this earth. The weapons of mass destruction are impressive, but so would be the fruits of peace. The difficulty has been that the power to destroy comes before and grows faster than the power to build.

Has that not been the story of mankind? Are not the destructive uses of power the simplest and those most likely first to occur when a new source is discovered?

Certainly man's first experience with chemical and electronic energy as released in an ordinary fire told him of its destructive character. When forests spanned this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our ancestors saw fires originate in lightning, which itself was a source of terror and disaster, and then saw the flames reach up to topple the mightiest trees. They ran for their lives from the fire, and the wild animals of the field and forest ran with them. It took generations to learn how to tame

the elemental force of fire, to bend it to their own purposes in the cooking of food, the refining of ores and the casting of metals. Likewise, even though our atomic age had its origin in the New Mexico desert, when a new ray, brighter than the New Mexico sun, lit up the landscape, even though the toll of human life that followed in Japan shocked the sensibilities of the warring world, we look forward to a new age of power and plenty with new servants to do man's work and to raise the standard of living throughout the world.

There is in this new atomic power one additional hopeful element. It took our aboriginal ancestors generation upon generation to learn to tame the energy of fire, but we in this great scientific era have a right to believe the acceleration which we see on all sides today in the growth of technology may be matched, at least to some extent, by an acceleration in the rate at which men of different national origins may learn to meet together in a common need to bring under control and put to beneficial use the immense forces of atomic energy.

This has been a harsh chapter in the history of our world. This new power which promises so much has thus far increased some of our problems and, if we look only at the surface, has made more difficult the eventual arrival of worldwide peace and the utilization throughout the earth of nuclear power.

The conviction is growing that disarmament, the sense in which it was proposed and may have been possible from 1945 to 1948, has now become impossible. There was once a day when a rigid system of inspection could have prevented the growth of dangerous stockpiles of fissionable materials for military use, but in the last decade the sizes of stockpiles held by the principal atomic powers have presumably grown large enough that substantional amounts could be secreted before any inspection system begins, and would be adequate for a devastating attack if one of the powers so chose. But wholly apart from this question of secreting materials before initiating inspection, it might be recognized that even if that did not occur and a rigid inspection system and control of materials were imposed, then still in the event of war, the facilities which have grown up for peacetime uses of atomic energy are of such productive capacity that it would not be long after the outbreak of war that adequate materials would have been produced for full scale atomic devastation.

Moreover, we should not restrict ourselves merely to consideration of hazards implicit in wars of annihilation with atomic weapons. In technology applied to military ends, novelty is ever a prime goal. Thus there is the probability that a war between major powers will lead to types of destruction of a nature and scope not yet conceived, much less demonstrated.

Modern war makes certain for all participants their near annihilation and makes military conquest utterly illogical and absurd. The great powers of today thus find themselves in a sort of uneasy stalemate. Each is concerned with maintaining heavy retaliatory forces to insure that the other dare not risk the gamble of military conquest; but in turn dares not risk it on his own save as a result of monstrous blunder.

While much time will pass before we work our way out of our current military stalemate, certainly it is a hazardous stalemate which no one likes, and it may have merit only if we use the time it provides to take advantage of the evident value of peaceful collaboration on projects of common concern. Says the editor of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, "Atomic deadlock can have positive value only if man uses the breathing spell it provides to develop a permanent foundation for peace without terror."

On the one hand we may strive to use this period for creating mutual respect for, and consent to use, the machinery of an expanded and strengthened United Nations to mediate international disputes, and to diminish tensions arising from international rivalries. On the other hand, we may move toward direct collaboration on technical projects for which the high level of modern technology makes such cooperation unusually productive and beneficial to all concerned.

Here I would like to mention several projects which seem especially appropriate for joint developments in world laboratories. But before doing so, let us look at some road blocks in that path.

Restrictions on free travel and free exchange of information have become increasingly irksome in recent years. These restrictions have fallen heavily on many scientists, on people in the arts, on businessmen, sometimes on religious leaders or other people whose interests and pursuits are not confined by national borders. The justification of these restrictions is the implicit argument that somehow they increase the national security and well-being of the Nation that applies them. But today with the rapid approach of the time when any country which launches atomic warfare can create untold damage at will, we need to examine whether we can remove many of our restrictions on free travel and exchange of information. We need to encourage, by whatever means we can, the spirit of international cooperation and openness which will minimize the chances of a misunderstanding—an accidental spark that would lead to disaster.

One step we can take in this direction is to remove our present restrictions on transmission of nonsecret scientific information between nations. The United States has helped to foster such restrictions but their contribution to our security is open to question. We know that such measures foster fear and suspicion rather than cooperation and understanding. They decrease the rate of gain of knowledge which is at the maximum only when free communication exists. Physical truths cannot be protected by such policies. They are everywhere the same—equally measurable in any laboratory.

We can break down barriers in communications still further by encouraging an expansion in our present system of exchange of teachers and students between nations. Most of our American universities do not have visiting professors from other lands on their facilities but would be happy to have them. Many of our own scientists go abroad to study and teach in foreign institutions. They come back with new ideas, a fresher outlook on their own problems which cannot help but be of benefit to science as a whole. An increase in opportunities for exchange of faculty and students between our great institutions of learning would be an important integrating factor in our pursuit of knowledge. We have plenty of disintegrating influences; we need men and women who are concerned with mutual problems and prepared to dedicate themselves to their solution.

The importance of the international meetings of the kind being held here in Rochester cannot be overemphasized. Information exchanged between participants will hasten the day when science will understand the secrets of the nucleus and of fundamental particles, and move man another step forward in his understanding of the universe about him.

A further measure we might well undertake now to promote a spirit of international cooperation would be the establishment of a world passport, which would be granted annually to a select list of nominess from all over the world. Such a passport would permit its holder to travel freely in lands of all member nations. A list of nominees for this honor would be prepared by a committee of participating nations, and the honor would be conferred only on those who received a unanimous vote of approval from all member nations. The list might include, for example, Nobel prize winners, outstanding artists, leaders in religion, in government, in science, in education, and in business. It could become a highly coveted award all over the world—a suitable mark of distinction for our public servants in every walk of life. Above all, it could promote a degree of mutual trust and understanding that might in the end help to halt the race for atomic arms and forestall a war that nobody wants.

A world in which restrictions on communication and on the travel of individuals has been minimized is one in which the combined intellectual and technical powers of many nations can be brought to bear in unison on common problems. We are aware of many problems which can be and should be attacked by an international effort. Even under the imperfect conditions of international communication which exist today, significant projects are under way and important beginnings have been made on others.

There is the superb example of regional cooperation illustrated by Cern, set up by the European Organization for Nuclear Research. Here men of many nations gather together for a joint assault on the experimental and theoretical problems of nuclear physics. There is likewise the inspiring scope of the International Geophysical Year. When it opens, a great network of observatories will embrace the entire earth. Chains of weather stations strung out on three meridian lines from the Arctic to the Antarctic will chart the circulation of the atmosphere during the intense period of activity spanned by the International Geophysical Year. All of the modern instruments of meteorology and geophysics will be mobilized in a global accumulation of data which should provide the basis for years of analysis, speculation, and debate. The final reduction to conclusive findings will mark a new step in man's understanding of his global home.

There is the World Health Organization which through its many laboratories and agencies is waging successful war against the diseases of mankind, and is promoting in the less fortunate areas of the world new understanding of medical care for infants, for the aged and for the handicapped.

In the atoms for peace program, there are more than 25 bilateral agreements between the United States and countries less advanced in nuclear technology.

There is a multitude of activities supported by UNESCO: its educational training centers, its support of travel for scientific and cultural reasons, its contribution to the European Organization for Nuclear Research mentioned above, the creation of the International Computation Center at Rome, the conferences in arid zone research, and the many less noticed activities of the Field Science Cooperation offices. The UNESCO 1954 participation in the U. N. technical assistance programs amounted to 56 projects in 36 countries.

These are but some of the most evident international cooperative efforts bringing the benefits of modern science and technology to peoples around the world.

We have reviewed briefly both the positive and the negative steps toward increased collaboration among scientists of different nations, as they have developed in recent years. Now let us glance at a few fields in which joint efforts may prove especially beneficial.

As a prime example of a project which involves a subject that clearly has no relevance to national boundaries, we may think of climate control or world-wide weather modification. Recent advances in meteorology suggest that efforts in this direction may pro-

duce useful results sometime in the future. Yet evidently the control of amounts of precipitation, directions of winds and like matters, are not properly planned by a single national power or even by 2 or 3 in regional collaboration. For instance, I believe that much of the weather of the United States is made along the coast of Alaska, in the Gulf of Mexico, or out in the Far Pacific, and my country has little or no control of the sea areas involved. Any regional effects on climate will have, perhaps, attenuated effects on climatic conditions in most distant areas. Moreover, such information as we now have strongly implies that the most effective weather control requires coordinated efforts over vast areas of the earth's surface, and the broader the cooperation, the greater might be the results.

Another example on a large scale which inevitably crosses national boundaries is the project to send a rocket into outer space. Purely from a geographical viewpoint, efforts to send missiles and ultimately passengers to the moon and the nearby planets are of worldwide interest. While the intensely nationalist feelings characterizing international relations on our planet at the present time suggest that we may even see, as a result of interplanetary travel, an extension of the competitive colonialism which the last century saw for the backward areas of this planet, the prospect of seeing different sections of Mars staked out by different national governments of this earth seems on the face of it ludicrous. Are we trying to play God and develop a new planet in our own image and likeness? A much more rational and probably more productive basis for the exploration and development of other worlds would be under an organization which properly reflects the common interests of all the peoples of this earth in such development. The Man in the Moon belongs to the children of every country, is a part of their dream world, and if reached by space ship, might better remain the property of all.

Returning now, however, from the fanciful and the future to the more immediate problems of initial efforts to get a space ship away from the earth, we recognize hazards of a rather severe sort which may arise as a result of the erroneous function of a space missile intended for the moon but which instead, through defective mechanism or planning, lands on the territory of another nation. If such a nation were at that time in an advanced state of tension in anticipation of a possible attack, this simple error might touch off the spark of world conflict.

Which brings me to the competitive race to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile. We in the American Congress have already learned that it would be a drain on all our budgets if that race should set a pattern in the whole field of space conquest. Russia and this country are working at high speed toward the attainment of an intercontinental ballistic missile, called by many "the ultimate weapon." Yet if the missile were to be attained almost simultaneously and prove to be as accurate as now forecast, if indeed it could carry atomic warheads with a striking power of several kilotons and place them within the area of a small circle, then no city in the world is safe, no jet interceptor can police the skies and no highway can promise egress from the affected area. In that day the people of the earth would banish the weapon as poison gas was outlawed in World War II, but only after the expenditure of fantastic sums of money, materials, and scientific skills.

Might it not be better to examine the chance to use space conquest as another project for an international laboratory? If we will never use this weapon once we achieve it, might it not be set aside as one segment of worldwide competition that could be surrendered to the effort to halt the race for a full arsenal of atomic arms in every land? Or must everyone carry his own six-shooter constantly strapped to his belt?

A third area might be research on the problem of controlling thermonuclear reactions in such a way as to produce useful power. Those of you in this audience know far better than I the great amount of energy which may be released in the fusion of the lightest elements to form helium. The great abundance of heavy hydrogen or deuterium the great quantities of this valuable isotope which are contained in the world's oceans, leads to a staggering picture of power availability to lift the yoke of labor from men's shoulders throughout all the world.

It has been estimated that the amount of heavy hydrogen in the oceans is sufficient to meet world power needs at 1,000 times the present consumption and for the next million years.

There seems to me to be no other field of technology today in which there is a more evident need for pooling all of the imagination and ingenuity which the world's scientists can bring together. The riches for mankind which must flow from the solution of these problems are without parallel. The history of science dramatizes again and again that problems of special difficulty are most usually solved by the cross-fertilization of ideas from diverse sources. The effort of any one country to develop controlled thermonuclear reactors in a unilateral manner under the secrecy required by an attitude of competitive nationalism must certainly have the effect of retarding the progress of such a country in this vital field.

As many of you have been saying again and again, science cannot flourish under secrecy. The essence of the scientific process is the exchange of ideas—the comparison of procedures and the development of new ideas and techniques in an active atmosphere of collaboration in which many people may contribute small parts of the solution to produce a whole far greater than the sum of the parts. No one can yet say that the immense problems associated with development of controlled thermonuclear power will be capable of solution. What we can say, certainly, is that if their solution is available to man, then it will be most readily available and perhaps only available in an atmosphere of vigorous collaboration built upon the genius of many people from many lands. It would seem that the enlightened self-interest of all technologically advanced nations would best be served by their contributing heavily to the creation of a joint world laboratory in which the solution of these problems is sought jointly by scientists from many nations.

Some secrecy-minded individuals may object that the technology associated with each of these fields I have mentioned has possible military applications. This claim is perfectly true; however, it does not necessarily follow that the security of different nations will be furthered by developing these fields under the military security system which our competitive nationalism has imposed upon science in recent years. In fact, it may be just because of the possible military applications from these new technologies that we shall wish to develop them jointly with all principal powers participating in world laboratories created for the purpose. Perhaps we can learn an important lesson from our experiences in the development of atomic energy. The unilateral development of the field of nuclear technology has created the following dilemma. Assuming the universal desire of all peoples to achieve some sort of workable disarmament, we have nevertheless in the development of nuclear technology greatly accentuated both the need for, and the difficulty of attaining disarmament. Whereas modern atomic weapons raise the destructive potential of war to a new level, the suitability of atomic weapons for concealment and surprise use has at this advanced stage in the competition made disarmament by mutual inspection very difficult, if not impossible.

This experience in the field of nuclear technology suggests that similar potentialities exist in as yet undeveloped technologies. Research into the killing diseases of man with the objective of eliminating these diseases may bring us instead new ideas as to how we may visit death on opposing populations by new species of bacteria. Or we may find a new type of rust that will destroy his feed grains, or a virus that will kill his livestock. Successful travel in outer space will suggest new, more effective and even less detectable means of attack on other nations. Unilateral success in the field of climate control will suggest important new schemes for military action against the unfriendly powers. Project Sherwood for the development of controlled thermonuclear reactors provides the greatest promise on the horizon today of immense, cheap power sources. Yet in the event of success for this project, it takes no advanced military technician to realize that such power sources would have great applications in the engines of war. Thus we are led to feel that in every area in which the scientific method has enabled the intelligence of man to gain new mastery over nature, we face the possibility of an added complication in future disarmament efforts.

It is to that problem that I have directed these words. If the great powers find themselves in an atomic stalemate today—and I think they do—it is a carryover of patterns of national security which modern science has rendered obsolete. The military techniques which might emerge from the new areas of technology that I have been discussing can make the stalemate no worse. Already it is at a level in which any major power can precipitate almost total destruction upon an adversary (and in return upon itself) if it should make so tragic an error in judgment. Yet there is the danger that if these new areas of technology are developed in secret, some nation which at some future time is led by reckless rulers, may feel that it has gained so great a lead in some field of science that it may dare to launch an attack for world conquest. While this error in judgment will almost certainly be answered by mutual annihilation approaching totality, every effort must be bent while still we have the chance to prevent such dreadful miscalculations from occurring. Scientists, it seems to me, might suggest to the statesmen that modern technology could make the greatest contribution to the security of great powers if statesmen would move as far as possible from the secret competitive development of technologies under which we have largely operated in recent years. The scientists might urge, indeed, that the race for atomic arms could best be halted by having new fields of science developed jointly by all nations.

The responsibility for carrying forward the proposals here made for cooperative studies of weather modification and for world laboratories of science, must be placed with some international organization. A natural agency for this purpose is the United Nations. Such responsibility, such new avenues for accomplishing good, will strengthen and expand the capacity of the United Nations for reaching its goal of creating a world at peace.

The procedure for implementing ideas of this nature must fit the pattern of life in each land, and therefore what we will first need will be suggestions as to possible courses of action. I hope they will be forthcoming. For my part, I intend to discuss the question with my colleagues in the United States Senate.

I hope that the United States citizens in this audience, and elsewhere, will give me their recommendations. I hope that those of you from other countries will raise the question with your associates back home, and possibly lead to official proposals from your governments to the U. N. on how best to proceed.

If we do succeed, then no nation can make the fatal error of assuming that it has an overwhelming technical lead over a possible adversary. The recent Geneva Atoms-for-Peace Conference illustrated how similar the achievements were in different nations even though each had pursued its program of research and development in careful secrecy. Such similarity of development will no doubt be the case in the future in arms as well as peaceful atoms.

My own experience at Geneva persuades me that many nations know a lot about the atom. When India's Dr. Bhabha opened the pie of thermonuclear power, the blackbirds from 4 and 20 lands began to sing! What was secret at breakfast was table talk at lunch. Nations rushed to hold press conferences and attend activities. Isn't it possible that there might be a similar pattern in weapons, and that no one nation holds all the cards?

Something new seems to be needed in this disarmament business. The nations make little headway in finding grounds for agreement on reducing the size of armies or destroying parts of atomic stockpiles. Very well; why not try to think constructively about disarmaments in potential weapons, in "ultimate weapons." The problems here are simpler because no one nation has so strong a vested interest in the new field that it will be contributing much more than valuable scientific help. It would be a new try at disarmament, this "disarming the future," and it would lack some of the defects of proposals for present disarmament.

This is not a suggestion that all nations pool their efforts in the field of present atomic technology, nor a hint that the testing of atomic weapons be stopped by any of the great powers, and surely not a proposal that Oak Ridge, Hanford, Livermore and Los Alamos be levelled to the ground. It springs rather from the feeling that the new technologies may displace the old, and that a war-weary world might achieve in time a form of disarmament by obsolescence.

If and when that day should dawn, each new technology would no longer be a source of dread power to be somehow kept from destroying us in the convulsion of global war. Rather it would become what men of science have always intended—a means for opening up a new dimension in human life for defining a greater destiny for the forward course of the human spirit.

You men of science labor in that vineyard. May God add strength to your endeavors.

Dissolution of Cominform Means Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Russia's announcement that the Cominform has been dissolved actually means very little. The Communist information bureau which was established in Warsaw 9 years ago actually has been inactive since 1949.

The significant point to keep in mind is that abolishing the Cominform has not changed in any way the complete and total loyalty of the Communist Parties in various countries throughout the world to the Soviet Union. The Red organizations in other countries blindly follow every twist and turn of the Soviet line and owe their first loyalty to Russia. The men in the Kremlin despite their change in tactics have not given up their hopes of world domination.

Recent events as well as observations made on my trip to the Soviet Union and five satellite countries last fall convince me that we are entering into one of the most dangerous and demanding periods in world history. It was much easier to keep our guard up when the Russian-led Communist movement was engaging in aggression and obvious subversion to destroy human freedom. The snarling Red tiger is often less dangerous than the smiling Red tiger.

It is imperative that we keep in mind that the Communist conspiracy continues to follow the Soviet objectives in all political problems and aids and abets Russian intelligence services throughout the world.

We must now recognize that the new Russian approach will be much more palatable to nations in the West, including our own, than previous Soviet policy. We must now prepare ourselves to accept a greater responsibility than ever in leading the free world in this more relaxed and at the same time more dangerous Russian approach. We must accept this new challenge by the Communists to compete with us more readily in diplomatic and economic fields.

Independence of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1956, by the Jewish calendar, Israel was 8 years old and its people can well take pride in that fact. I wish to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Israel, President Ben-Gurion, and His Excellency Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel, upon the occasion of the celebration of Independence Day.

The Republic of Israel emerged fully clothed with the problems and realities of political statehood on May 14, 1948. During these short years of independence the two main preoccupations of Israel have been economic development of the country and the establishment by diplomatic and military means of the security of the country within the boundaries set by the armistice agreement.

The State of Israel is a product of an ancient dream, of suffering, courage, faith, and sacrifice of a people striving to create a new democracy and to live in peace. There are few historic parallels for the present resurgence of faith in democratic values witnessed in Israel. Israel's faith is everywhere in evidence in the energy of its manifold activities and in a rapidly accumulating array of solid achievements along social, economic, political, and spiritual lines. The triumph of the human spirit in Israel over seemingly endless and overwhelming obstacles is a constant beacon light of faith to all men.

Because Israel is small and poor in natural resources it faces towering economic problems. The economy of Israel is still in the process of building healthy foundations for a normal existence. The economic policy of the government is characterized by the encouragement of healthy economic enterprise in all its beneficial forms. In economic matters Israel has steered a middle and nondoctrinaire course between the totalitarian economics of the slave states and the typical laissez faire of the 19th century. It is developing an indigenous blend of free enterprise and free government suited to its own particular problems.

The Middle East is the crossroads of the Old World, the bridge between Europe, Asia, and Africa, straddling global air and sea routes, the Dardenelles and the Suez Canal. Within the Middle East the State of Israel is clearly the heartland of the crossroads. The present masters of the Kremlin, following the lead of past military conquerors, covet this position. The deeply disputatious question of peace with the Arab States leaves the political future clouded. Yet within Israel there is energy and optimism, for here at last a dream of centuries for a homeland has become a political reality.

The avowed aim of the United States is to promote the political and economic stability of the entire region of the Middle East with a course of action based on neither favoritism nor on prejudice, but on the principle of safeguarding the best interests of the United States and the free world. The United States has given increasing attention to ways of reducing tension along the troubled frontiers of the Middle East. The most serious threat of this continued strife, from the free-world point of view, is the danger it presents to the Middle East as a whole. Seeking new directions for further Communist exploitation, the masters of the Kremlin already are looking upon the troubled waters of Palestine as a good spot for launching their next dangerous activities.

If our worldwide position is to be secure, we must recognize the potentialities of Israel as an outpost for western civilization. The whole Arab world is in a state of underdevelopment and extreme poverty. Its populations are restive and if practical solution to the miseries of millions of people do not come, Communists will certainly make the most of their opportunity.

If we in the Western World ignore the Middle East and its unsolved human problems, we shall not only have failed a large section of humanity, but we shall

have mortally weakened our own defenses of the West and its message of freedom. We can strike no more effective blow in defense of our way of life on a global basis than to do everything possible to make Israel a strong bastion of freedom in the Middle East and through it to reach the rest of the region in the true spirit of our freedom. And, further, we must cooperate in all wholesome economic endeavors of the entire Middle East.

Letter to the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday forenoon, April 16, about 2 hours before I learned the President had vetoed the farm bill, I delivered to him by special messenger, the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am quite certain you will remember all that took place during the fall of 1952, when at your request, the writer was called to Denver, Colo., to debate the 90 percent of parity question vs. flexible parity with a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation in your presence. I need not remind you of your decision and of the outcome of that debate, but will only say it was most gratifying to a great majority of our farmers, and was reflected in the election of 1952. Hence, as a humble Representative of the American people, I feel dutybound to again speak out on this subject which is of such great importance to every American, as well as to our farmers.

I sincerely hope you will sign the farm bill because:

1. The farmer's dollar is now worth only 80 cents at the counter, which our American economy cannot long endure.

2. The 90 percent of parity provision would immediately raise farmer income, hence their purchasing power and in turn would benefit industries and labor, now and over the long pull.

3. When the American farmer dollar buys 100 cents worth at the counter, he buys over twice as many dollars' worth of processed and manufactured goods on an average than do other Americans per capita.

4. Most everyone favors the soil bank provision, for obvious reasons.

5. The bill embodies about 90 percent of your own nine point farm program, both in principle and purpose.

6. The American people are today spending on an average of less than 24 percent of their income for food, which is less than at any time in our history, except when a number of foods were subsidized during World War II. We must weigh a slight price increase in finished goods against millions of jobs now in jeopardy.

7. When the threat of lower prices of raw products is eliminated, then the thousands of processors and manufacturers of raw products will know they can safely purchase a year's supply of their raw products needs (amounting to billions of dollars annually) without financial loss if the parity provisions now in the bill are maintained. For the past 3 years they have been buying from hand to mouth, either from the producer or from the Government surpluses, due to the threat of lower raw product prices under the flexible parity proposal, which is the primary cause for the piling up of surpluses in Government warehouses and grain bins, instead of being purchased and stored by private processors and manufacturers, as should be, and will be if the parity support provisions in the farm bill are made law by your signature.

Therefore, I plead with you to sign the farm bill.

Respectfully,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I yield to no man in the high regard and respect I hold for our great President, but I, too, have a duty to perform and a conscience to satisfy and live with by voting my honest convictions on every question which comes before Congress, including this veto message. For these reasons and for the reasons set out in my letter of April 16 to the President, I cannot find it in my heart to sustain the President's veto of the farm bill.

Hon. James C. Murray's Address at the Annual Dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Held at the Mayflower Hotel on March 17, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD the stirring address of the Honorable JAMES C. MURRAY, of Illinois, delivered at the annual dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians on March 17 at the Mayflower Hotel.

The dinner of the Ancient Order of Hibernians is one of the finest in the country. Congressman MURRAY held the audience spellbound with his eloquence. His speech was a personal triumph and a tribute to the district which sent him to Congress and which he so ably represents. Realizing the speech with its scholarship and its message would be enjoyed by others, I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD. The speech follows:

When I received your kind invitation to speak at your outstanding St. Patrick's Day dinner, I made up my mind to be completely objective. Since an Irishman can be objective about everything except Ireland, I attempted to avoid as my topic our Emerald Isle. I thought that I might talk about our own country. When I started my address as follows—From the rock-bound coast of Maine—I had to stop because I became instantly aware of the fact that Maine was a founder of my own family and of a great Irish king.

I knew that I could not talk about Scotland because I am certain I would get into an argument with my Scotch constituents when they learned that Scotland comes from the word "Scotia"—as Ireland was originally called—which was settled, in part, by St. Columba.

To avoid controversy, I skipped over England, although I paused briefly enough to observe that the only extant manuscript of the earliest English epic Beowulf was written in Gaelic lettering. If I were to talk upon France, I would have to dwell on St. Columbanus' monasteries at Luxeuil—and in Italy, at Bobbio, which were the principal centers of the reconversion in education made by Irish monks of a Europe lapsed in barbarism. If I were to dwell on Switzerland, or for that matter, in any country up to the Ukrainian, I would find evidence of Irish teachers and missionaries.

Being thus frustrated in my attempts to find something to speak about other than Ireland, I decided to make my oration an objective speech about the Irish from the Celtic viewpoint. One of the gifts that St. Patrick secured for our race prior to his death was the promise that no son of Erin would experience the horrors preceding the destruction of the world. It would seem from this prophecy that some time prior to the end of the world, the last Irishman would have passed away.

If an historian at that time were to attempt to write the history of the Irish and were to predicate his history upon the Irish as pictured by present-day columnists, radio announcers, and other such organs of public information, I am afraid we would have a very misconstrued picture of ourselves.

I sometimes wonder whether or not the picture painted of the Irish by present-day organs of propaganda is one founded on jealousy, or aimed at the destruction of the things that an Irishman stands for. Since our basic virtue is spiritual rather than material, I am convinced the reason is the latter.

Oftentimes I wonder whether we ourselves, in our attempts to enjoy God's world, realize what we stand for. For the purpose of setting the record straight, if not to advise you of your birthright, and the obligations it entails, I would like to relate our Irish inheritance.

Biblical scholars tell us that we sprang from 1 of the 10 lost sons of Jacob. I don't know whether this is correct, but I do recall a song my grandfather used to sing which indicated that the Irish made the passover from Egypt to Israel with Moses. It goes like this: "It must have been the Irish that swam the River Nile because only an Irishman would fight a crocodile."

Anthropologists relate that we came from the stone-age hunters and fishermen which might be the basis for our stone throwing and tall tale telling ability. Bronze-age scholars related that our ancestors' gold and copper gave Ireland a preeminent position in early commercial and artistic world.

Regardless of what the early pages of history might have disclosed of an Irishman, we know the principal reason for our existence finds its source in our Apostle—St. Patrick. It is the love of God in every Irishman instilled by our Apostle and nurtured by our martyrs that is the divine spring from which flows the greatness of our race. From this divine fountain flows the love of individual liberty which has dedicated Irish everywhere to its cause. From it springs our saints, our missionaries, clergy, teachers, patriots and mothers.

Our birthright has proven to be the most formidable armor against every attack—against godliness or individual liberty—regardless of its form. Greater than the atom, our heritage is an indestructible eternity.

That which makes us Irish has been subject to every conceivable assault since its

inspiration. Cromwell attempted to destroy it by military might but succeeded only in fostering it. Others attempted to suppress it by legislation but merely nurtured it. Today we face the most subtle attack ever hurled at our birthright. It is not hurled only at us as Irishmen—but as children of God. It is the assault of Satan's stepson who chose as his birthplace and growth the one place on the face of the earth not visited by our missionaries and patriots—Red Russia.

Its subtleness is most dangerous because it attempts to undermine our spiritualness by appealing to our worldliness. Our vices are encouraged, our virtues discouraged. Our humor stressed, our compassion depressed. Our intemperance glamorized, our estheticness criticized. Our vanity appeased, our meekness derided. Our pride fostered, our humility starved. Our earthliness praised, our love of God taunted.

To those of you who might feel that we as Irishmen have not the strength or wherewithal to meet this latest and greatest assault made against that which an Irishman stands for, I would like to recall some of the contributions that our ancestors, fathers, brothers, and even sons and daughters made to the liberty under God represented by our own great country.

Historians approximate that one-third of Washington's army were of Irish descent, so you see we were here a great many years prior to any "potato famine." The only reason that there are not more of our wives in the DAR is because we were too busy building railroads and developing our country to keep track of our ancestors.

The founder of our Navy was an Irishman, as you all know. The early builder of the present-day Democratic Party—Andrew Jackson—was an Irishman.

As a matter of fact, one of the Congressmen wrote me that St. Patrick must have been a Democrat.

The greatest award given by this country for individual contribution to its cause is the Congressional Medal of Honor. It is an award presented for acts of bravery actually performed and not inspired in the mind of a competent press agent. The very creation of the Medal of Honor was inspired by deeds of an Irishman in the Civil War—Maj. Gen. Phillip Karney.

The first deed for which a Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded was a deed performed by a native Irishman during Indian warfare in the settling of the West—the name of that distinguished son of Erin was Col. Bernard J. D. Irwin, an M. D.

Over two-thirds of the Congressional Medal of Honor winners who were born on foreign soil were born in Ireland—this despite the fact that Ireland is comparatively a small country.

In recent years the deeds of our brothers, sons, and daughters in behalf of our country occupy as prominent a place in our history as did the deeds of their forebears. The first American bombardier to sink a Japanese ship in World War II was an Irishman. The first American to kill a Jap in World War II was an Irish-American. The first American flier to bag five airplanes in World War II was an American of Irish descent by the name of Edward O'Hara.

The first American to be eulogized by the President for bravery in World War II was an American of Irish extraction. The first American Coastguardsman to catch a spy, had Erin's blood flowing in his veins. And the first American to make himself a human torpedo was another of our kinfolk.

Although our War Department does not classify data on the basis of nationality, the Irish War Veterans, United States of America, have estimated that during World War II, 3½ million persons of Irish or part-Irish descent served in our Armed Forces.

I did not intend to bring any message to you, but if there is any message contained in this address, it is merely to urge you to be more Irish—for being more Irish—you will be more American. And being better Americans, you will have successfully borne the obligations required of your emerald inheritance.

Tabulation of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year I prepared a questionnaire of public opinion on many issues and questions of national importance for circulation in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent. When I undertook the task, it was my desire to obtain a random sample of opinion which might demonstrate local feelings on these issues and questions. A total of 4,435 of the questionnaires were returned to me by April 1 and were tabulated.

The 15th Congressional District of Ohio is in many ways typical of America. Its interests are diverse. It has farms, large and small. There are located there many factories engaged in the production of a multitude of products. The area is a storehouse of natural resources. The people are thinking people, vitally interested in the affairs of the day. Since the people of these seven counties have such diversified interests, it is my feeling that the answers are those of typical Americans, free from the extremes of sectionalism and provincialism. I regard their answers as a source of valuable guidance on various issues as they are considered. Others in the Congress may also share my great interest in the results of this poll.

The tabulation is as follows:

	Total vote	Number favoring	Percentage favoring
1. Do you support the Bricker amendment to void treaties insofar as they would abridge the sovereignty of the United States?	3,692	2,916	79
2. Do you favor lowering the legal voting age from 21 to 18?	4,340	1,657	38.2
3. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prevent the Federal Government from spending more than it receives in revenues during peacetime?	4,237	3,132	73.9
4. Are you in agreement with the present foreign policy of the United States?	3,540	1,880	53.1
5. Do you favor the admission of Communist China to the United Nations?	4,222	340	8
6. Do you favor continuation of technical assistance to underdeveloped nations?	2,973	1,988	66.9
7. Do you favor continuation of military assistance to friendly nations?	3,875	2,847	73.5
8. If answers to questions 6 and 7 are "yes", where do you think aid should be concentrated? Increase (1,307—60.5 percent) or decrease (851—39.5 percent) aid to Asia. Increase (638—30.8 percent) or decrease (1,438—69.2 percent) aid to Europe.			
9. Should we continue the United States Information Agency which furnishes information about our Nation and its policies to other countries?	3,994	2,295	57.5
10. Do you favor the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service by our Government to train future diplomats?	3,797	2,341	61.6
11. Do you favor Federal aid to education for the construction of public school buildings to be supported by additional tax measures?	4,225	2,090	49.5
12. Do you favor Federal aid to assist in the payment of teachers' salaries and administrative costs of local schools to be supported by additional tax measures?	4,187	1,580	37.7
13. Do you favor increased Federal aid for new highways financed by increased taxes (on gasoline, tires, etc.) for highway users?	4,229	2,377	56.2
14. Do you believe the minimum wage laws should be extended to fields of employment not now covered?	3,986	2,474	62.1
15. Do you favor the administration's health reinsurance proposal whereby the Federal Government would encourage expansion of private health insurance by assuming exceptional risks?	3,891	1,542	39.6
16. Do you support increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	4,255	3,022	71
17. Do you favor the reduction from age 65 to 62 for women to receive benefits under the social security law?	4,314	3,132	72.6
18. Do you favor the construction of additional public housing units?	3,889	1,307	33.6
19. Which farm program do you favor:			
(a) Price support program based on 90 percent parity with acreage restrictions	----------	617	16.7
(b) Price support program based on flexible parity with acreage restrictions	----------	1,276	34.6
(c) No Federal price supports and no crop controls	----------	1,796	48.7
20. Do you support the elimination of Federal taxes on gasoline consumed by farmers in the operation of farm machinery?	4,215	2,495	59.2
21. Do you agree that we must abolish farm surpluses before the reduction in farm prices can be solved?	3,833	2,736	71.4
22. Do you support the President's proposal for a soil bank to transfer acreage from farm production to soil-improvement crops as a means to reduce surplus production?	3,909	2,647	67.7
23. Do you agree with the President's recommendation that family-size farms should receive greater consideration in crop price support payments than large commercial farms?	4,103	3,642	88.8
24. Do you favor legislation to remove acreage restrictions on wheat which is grown and used for feed or seed on a particular farm?	3,915	3,110	79.6
25. Do you favor increased postal rates on first-class mail as a means to decrease the deficit under which the Post Office Department has operated?	4,155	2,237	53.8
26. Do you favor statehood for Hawaii and Alaska? Alaska only, 212 (6.3 percent); Hawaii only, 122 (3.6 percent).	3,359	2,904	86.4
27. Do you favor a policy of lower tariffs even though it results in increased competition with domestic industry?	3,946	930	23.6
28. Do you favor a reduction in Federal income taxes without first balancing the budget and decreasing the national debt?	4,114	870	21.1
29. Do you favor a basic pension for all World War I veterans?	3,963	2,198	55.5
30. Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	3,738	3,246	86.8

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. AREND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956.

It precisely and concisely states the situation with respect to the farm bill. It points out how once again the Democrat Party has made the farm problem a political football at the expense of the farmers.

I am also inserting the statement I released to the press on the veto message:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1956]

THE FARM ISSUE REDEFINED

When the Democrats in Congress cooked up their vote buying monstrosity in place of the workable farm program that the President submitted early in January, they must have thought they were dealing with another Dewey. They expected that if Mr. Eisenhower did veto their bill, he would thereafter sit quietly while they told the farmers about all of the wealth that would have been poured on them if it had not been for a callous Republican President.

The Democrats miscalculated. In his speech to the Nation, explaining why he had to veto the farm bill, President Eisenhower demonstrated that the moral courage that prompted the veto is fighting courage as well. He brought forth a sound alternative program, salvaging what he could from Democratic sabotage and delay.

Now the burden of action has been shifted to the Democratic majority in Congress. If its members do not enact the President's recommendations, it is they who must accept responsibility for failure to provide relief for American farmers.

Mr. Eisenhower said he would call a special session of Congress to meet after the national conventions if an acceptable farm program is not enacted before that time. The proposals he put forward Monday evening have been thoroughly discussed. They were, in fact, embodied in the farm bill he vetoed, but were rendered unworkable by the discredited high price-support plan that the Democrats tacked onto that bill.

Twice on Monday, in his veto message and again in his address to the citizens, President Eisenhower exposed the fraud of the high price supports that the Democrats seek to perpetuate. They are the source of the unmanageable surpluses that are depressing farm prices and driving American agriculture toward socialism.

His soil-bank plan was designed to reduce these surpluses and still support farm income by paying farmers to rest and improve acres that are not needed for present production. Because the Democrats paltered so long with the farm bill in Congress, the time has passed when that plan can be put in effect this year, even though the vetoed bill provided for it.

The President proposed that he be authorized, nevertheless, to pay 50 percent of the soil-bank benefits to any farmer who signed to observe land conservation practices next year. These payments could be made any time after July 1, and as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out, would enable farmers to buy the seed, trees, fertilizers, and new machinery they might need to start preparing their land for soil-bank use.

All that is required is that Congress pass the soil-bank bill, unencumbered by the nostrums that evoked the veto on Monday. If the Democrats fail to do this, it is they who must answer to the farmers for the callous disregard that candidates Stevenson and Kefauver have been piping about.

This is by no means the best possible farm program. It will defer for a full year the job of cutting farm surpluses. But it is the best that can be achieved at this time after the Democrats have played politics with the problem for more than 3 months.

STATEMENT OF HON LESLIE C. ARENDS, REPUBLICAN WHIP, 17TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, ON FARM BILL VETO RECORD

It is obvious from the President's veto and his message that he is thinking solely in terms of what is best for the welfare of our farmers and the country as a whole.

The bill sent the President by the Democrat-controlled Congress, after long, costly delay, is purely a political measure, not a cure to the farm problem but a political narcotic to try to fool the farmers.

President Eisenhower recognized it as such. He will not play politics with the welfare of agriculture. Once again by vetoing this bill President Eisenhower demonstrated his statesmanlike greatness. I am sure his action has the overwhelming approval of the majority of our farmers.

If an attempt should be made to override the veto, I am sure it will fail. I, for one, will vote against any motion to override.

It is now the duty and the responsibility of the Congress to act immediately on the soil-bank proposal. As the President points out this can be done in a few days, if the Democrat leadership will permit, and stop all this political maneuvering.

War-Risk Insurance for Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Department of Commerce to provide war-risk insurance for aircraft.

The usual commercial insurance policy does not cover aircraft against war risk in the event of outbreak of hostilities. Air carriers are, therefore, reluctant to permit their aircraft to venture into potential danger areas.

Lack of adequate insurance protection would jeopardize mobilization of the country's air-transport facilities in case of an emergency. For these reasons, in 1951 the Congress enacted title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act to authorize the Department of Commerce to issue binders insuring United States aircraft against war risk in the event of an outbreak of hostilities. This authority will expire on June 14, 1956. The Department has informed me that, if legislation extending this authority for 5 years is approved, binder fees will more than cover expenses chargeable to the war-risk-insurance fund under peacetime operations. If the program should go into operation in time of war, it is anticipated that premiums would keep the insurance fund self-sustaining.

Enactment of the legislation therefore would insure our civil air fleet against loss from war risks with little likelihood of any need for significant appropriations to the war-risk-insurance fund. The Department of Commerce urges early enactment of this legislation to keep the civil air fleet covered by war-risk insurance without danger of lapse.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, rigid farm price supports in the 1956 farm bill vetoed by President Eisenhower would have kept the farmers' incomes high in an election year, it is true, but it encouraged costly overproduction for increased storage at the expense of all the people. As usual, the President did the right thing.

After all, the domestic parity plan for wheat alone would have cost consumers in increased grocery bills almost $350 million. All food products containing wheat would have gone up in price. Bread would have gone up about 2 cents a loaf. Also, under the two-price plan for rice, its retail price would have increased at least 2 cents a pound. Low income city families would be doubly subsidizing the farmer.

The results of rigid supports have been high food prices plus high taxes for payments and cost of loans and cost of storage of surpluses.

The farmer, like any other group, has a right to expect protection from all-out distress, but farmers should not expect their Government to return to a barren program which created and was responsible for the basic trouble.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the administration's soil-bank plan would cut surpluses and yet boost farm income. The delay in enacting this program into law in time for this year's planting is not the administration's fault. But the President's suggestion of advance payments to the farmers to alleviate their distress should help to overcome part of the effects of the delay of this Democrat-controlled Congress.

The farm bill as voted by Congress as President Eisenhower said was a bad bill for all the people of the country. In the interests of my constituents and consumers generally, that is why I voted against it.

By the same reasoning, I am voting to sustain the President's veto.

But I will vote to help the farmer because that is what the soil-bank plan will

do, but not by adding the cost to the consumer's food bill.

I urge immediate action on the soil-bank plan recommended by the President to reduce surpluses and prevent distress prices.

Syria Celebrates Evacuation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute the people of Syria, His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli, President of the Republic of Syria, and His Excellency Dr. Farid Zeineddine, the Ambassador of Syria, on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of Evacuation Day, April 17, 1956.

Before 1920 the Republic of Syria in its present boundaries had no separate history of its own. Despite centuries of subjugation to the Ottoman Empire, Syria, like other Arab countries, played a notable part in the shaping of modern Arab history. From the middle of the 19th century to the second decade of the 20th century—the period of the "Arab awakening" and the struggle against the Ottomans—Syria played a leading role in determining the aims and objects of the rise of nationalism in the Arab world.

Syrian proclamation of independence on March 18, 1920, announced to the whole world her determination to remain a free and independent country. This act, although short-lived, marked the climax of the Arab national movement and the farthest point of success reached in the partial realization of Arab national aims. The strangling of Syria's first period of independence was engendered by the conflicting interests of the so-called big powers of the era. High hopes of the period of independence dimmed and the fight against the two-fold foreign domination of the Arab countries initiated a struggle which is continued today in some parts of the Arab world.

Syrian history from 1920 to 1946 is that of a desperate and bitter national struggle. The changes in the international scene influenced the crisis in Syria. Making full use of the special circumstances of the Second World War, Syria succeeded in obtaining recognition of her complete independence and in achieving the evacuation of all foreign troops from the country. The increased pressure of the Syrian nationalists forced the mandate authorities to restore constitutional life to the country. In July 1943 elections were held and Syria's second nationalist regime was established. His Excellency Shukri al-Quwwatli became President of the Republic of Syria. During the period of this regime evacuation took place—one of the outstanding events in Syria's history after the achievement of independence. Force was met with force and the Army of the mandate power was expelled from the country. The death knell of imperialism in Syria was tolled when finally on April 17, 1946, the United Nations approved by a large majority of votes the evacuation of all foreign troops from Syria.

Other Syrian successes in this period included her participation in the field of international politics. The Syrian Government in 1945 joined the Allied cause. Following this, Syria was invited to participate in the San Francisco conference where she signed the charter of the United Nations as one of the first members of the organization, achieving thereby the status of a free and fully sovereign state.

Syria has made notable contributions to culture and civilization. In the course of many centuries, Arab Syria has produced eminent poets, men of letters, jurists, historians, scientists, and journalists who made great contributions to world culture. Syria has also transmitted to the West the philosophy and sciences of the ancient world, serving thereby as a bridge over which the cultures of the ancient Greeks, Persians, Romans, and Indians passed to Europe and America.

Syrians today are eager to keep step with the progress of modern civilization. Education is being fostered, books are being translated, and the ancient heritage of Arabic culture is being recovered. Syria's institutions of higher learning, for example Syrian University and the Arab Academy of Damascus, proceed along western patterns. Through these and other channels the learning of the West is being translated, digested, and introduced to the country. Valuable research projects and studies are being conducted on a scale that promises well for the cultural future of Syria.

The Syrian struggle for liberty served as a symbol to other oppressed peoples in the world. In the words of today's Syrian leaders:

> The people of Syria are content and gratified that their struggle for political independence has been accompanied by a parallel fight for the liberation of the country from feudal and reactionary forces and for the achievement of a social, economic, and cultural revival which, it is hoped, will ultimately bring great good to all Arabs, will strengthen the people's social consciousness and will secure for the country the benefits of a true democratic rule, based on the great principle of government by the people and for the interest of the people.

Some Aspects of Law in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 16, the northeastern regional meeting of the American Bar Association asked me to discuss some aspects of law in the atomic age.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ASPECTS OF LAW IN THE ATOMIC AGE

(Address of Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

I appreciate the opportunity to talk this morning to you members of the bar. It is hardly a unique experience for me as a layman to address a group of lawyers. Well over one-half of the Members of the United States Senate are members of the legal profession and I find occasion to talk with and to them at times. My task this morning, however, does present a novel opportunity, for I plan to discuss with you some of the problems which as lawyers you will face in the atomic age. I will be pleased if at the conclusion of my remarks you are convinced that a man cannot live for a lifetime as a business man, farmer, and public official without absorbing portions of the learned advice of his counsel.

Until the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the interest of the organized bar in the development of the Nation's atomic energy program was almost nonexistent. With a few notable exceptions the legal profession gave scant attention to this most important matter, and the contributions which lawyers customarily make to public affairs here lagged behind that which accompanied other current developments. That atomic energy prior to 1954 had a limited impact upon the law is understandable in the light of the conditions of the predominantly Government-financed operations which then existed. Only the patent bar to a limited extent and the lawyers for the Atomic Energy Commission and its principal contractors had a real professional interest in the subject.

This is not the situation today. The 1954 act opened the door to private initiative and set the framework for the development of a complex atomic energy industry. Lawyers can no longer remain detached or aloof, and it is not surprising to find the bar now playing an interested and substantial role in the growth of the country's program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Thus, the American Bar Association now has a special committee on atomic energy, and at its last annual meeting received some one-half dozen papers dealing with atomic-energy matters. The organized bar associations of the cities of New York and Chicago have have active committees on atomic energy law. The Federal Bar Association last fall conducted a 2-day briefing session in Washington on atomic energy, attended to capacity by lawyers from all sections of the country. Leading law schools now conduct seminars on legal problems in atomic energy. The Bar Journals and Law Reviews contain an increasing number of articles on the subject. The current issue of Duke University's Law and Contemporary Problems is devoted entirely to legal problems in the development of atomic power. I have been informed that a forthcoming issue of the Texas Law Journal will also be devoted entirely to the subject.

Various approaches have been taken toward the subject of atomic energy and its legal problems. One extreme has been that atomic energy has brought about a strange "brave new world" with an entirely different set of problems than exist in any other field, and given rise to a separate body of atomic energy law capable of being understood only by an esoteric group of specialists. The other extreme is that atomic energy problems are no different from any others and can be dealt with accordingly under traditional patterns.

I prefer a middle course which recognizes pragmatically that there are some unique aspects present, but also recognizes the feasi-

bility of applying and adapting traditional doctrine to these new situations. Thus, we may hope to approach the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the pattern of normal private enterprise, recognizing that there will be unique aspects in this field which give rise to an active role by the Government.

The uniqueness of atomic energy lies in its nature and in its sources in uranium and thorium metals. Here is a new natural resource of substantial proportions, capable of destruction in devastating proportions, but capable also of achieving the more abundant life for all mankind.

For reasons of national defense, the development of this resource became a national monopoly for bomb-production purposes. Federal ownership of fissionable material (or special nuclear material as it is now known) has been continued under the Atomic Energy Acts of 1946 and 1954 because of security and other considerations. Legally, therefore, we are dealing with a resource which is Government property. And I can assure you that the accountability for this material even transcends that to which normal Government-issued property is subject.

Seriously though, we are dealing with more problems than that of Government property in the narrow sense. We are dealing with a Government-owned, contractor-operated industry of very large proportions. We are also dealing with a parallel-growing, privately financed industry which will operate under Government regulation. At the present time we are in a transition stage with the Government acting as a proprietor, promoter, and regulator.

The legal problems of atomic energy stem from these Government roles. I want to emphasize this morning the newer problems under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, particularly in the privately financed development of atomic energy.

However, I would stress that a very substantial part of the atomic industry is still Government financed. The big money is still being expended here. From a legal standpoint, there are a number of unique problems in this neglected field of the law. We have a new institution called a "Government Prime Contractor" whose operations are a sort of hybrid between private industry and direct Government operations. We have rather unique types of contractual arrangements with these prime contractors and subcontractors that do not fit standard forms. But more of that some other time.

Of primary concern to the lawyer is the fact that privately financed atomic energy activity is a regulated business—necessarily so because of two principal characteristics: first, the potential hazard to public health and safety which is involved, and, second, the presence of a paramount concern for the interests of the common defense and security. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 provides the broad outline of a plan for the control of essential materials and facilities. In general, the control scheme adopted has two main features: (1) A system of licensing which permits a review of proposed activities and the imposition of such conditions as may be deemed necessary, and (2) continuing supervision of a licensee through the conditions and terms included in the license, through rules and regulations, through inspections, and through reports.

Under the broad statutory power which it has over materials and facilities, the Atomic Energy Commission has issued a series of regulations and standards dealing with the detailed health, safety, and security aspects of the atomic energy business and with the rules of practice and procedure for those who seek Commission action or who are subjected to Commission orders. Students of constitutional and administrative law are familiar with the legislative technique of delegating to an administrative agency the authority to prescribe the standards of a uniform regulatory scheme, when the field requires special knowledge, or the hand of an expert, but leaving that flexibility which is necessary or desirable.

There is nothing unique in this application of the general rules and principles of administrative law in the field of atomic energy. However, the atomic energy lawyer must be familiar, not only with the statute and the rules and regulations, but must also acquire, for complete understanding, knowledge of the technical implications which are involved. This, in turn, may require the acquisition of a new and somewhat strange vocabulary.

Another field of interest to the lawyer is that associated with international trade in atomic energy goods and services. American industry, with the lead given by the Manhattan project in the war years and by the Government's research and development program since then, should enjoy a competitive advantage in the world's atomic market place. This is particularly true with respect to the manufacturers of reactors, reactor components, high-level radiation sources, control devices, and instruments of all sorts. It is also true of architect-engineers and others who may be employed to perform consulting services for foreign countries or their nationals.

Here the lawyer will need more than an acquaintance with the rules of international trade generally. To serve his client well, he will need in addition a knowledge and understanding of the United States program for cooperative assistance with the free world in atomic energy matters. Among other things, this will involve knowledge of the bilateral agreements for cooperation which we have with other nations, the substance of their provisions, and the limitations which are imposed in the interest of the common defense and security. It will require an understanding of the important matter of supplying fuel for foreign reactors, the allocations which have been made, the policy and procedures which are applicable, and the type of private international arrangements permitted. Comprehension of these matters cannot be acquired through the traditional sources of law but must be derived through a selective use of nonlegal materials.

Particularly apt for discussion in the city of Hartford and of special interest to me as an insurance man are the problems of legal liability and insurance.

The basic device used in the production of atomic energy—a nuclear reactor—is potentially a dangerous instrument. The major hazard involved is not heat or blast, as commonly assumed, but radiation emanating from the highly radioactive fission products accumulated within the reactor as waste during periods of operation. These fission products are more toxic than any substance heretofore known, and more insidious. They can neither be seen nor felt. Exposure beyond tolerable limits may bring no sensual reaction, and it could be some time before the effects of exposure become apparent.

A major reactor accident could result in the release of large quantities of these fission products into the atmosphere, contaminating a wide geographic area.

Widely publicized statements describing the theoretical effects of a major reactor incident in graphic terms have contributed greatly to the fears and doubts of the public and of potential members of the atomic energy industry. It must be carefully noted that these statements are designed primarily to plead the cause of care and caution in atomic energy activities. Proper perspective must be given to the theoretical data presented and the conclusions reached. At the present time it seems reasonably certain that inherently safe reactors can be designed and constructed. Engineering data assures the essential integrity of containment, or the placing of reactors in protective, gas-tight envelopes. Constant and extensive research in reactor safety and radiation protection has provided a basis for increased understanding of the problems involved and for the development of standards and health-safety regulations. The published operating history of 25 reactors in the United States over a period in excess of 12 years shows no accidents involving radiation injury sufficiently serious to cause lost time of personnel during 606,686 operating hours and 17,799,000 man-hours.

Nevertheless, in spite of this remarkable safety record, the catastrophic incident remains a possibility. Regardless of design, location, or isolation, there is no such thing as an absolutely safe nuclear reactor—just as there is no such thing as an absolutely safe chemical plant or ore refinery. There is always present a finite possibility of the occurrence of an event, or series of events, the result of which would be the release of unsafe quantities of radioactive material to the surrounding area. What is frightening about this possibility, however remote it may be, is that the potential damage—the maximum conceivable damage—which can be caused by such an accident is far greater than that which can result from other industrial accidents.

Questions of legal liability and insurance thus are of immediate and significant interest to the growing atomic energy industry and its lawyers. The latter also foresee that it is inevitable that nuclear accidents will give rise to unique legal problems involving statutes of limitation, workmen's compensation procedures, techniques of proof and the introduction of evidence, the conflict of laws, Federal-State relations, and other conceivable technical questions.

The rules of legal liability are a matter of concern not only to the future owner and operator of a reactor but also to the manufacturer and supplier of component parts and to the architect-engineer who may be responsible for the design of a reactor and the supervision of its construction.

The owner and operator is faced with the possibility of being held liable for damages caused by a reactor accident without regard to the question of negligence because of the alleged ultrahazardous activity involved. The manufacturer of reactor parts and equipment, cognizant of Justice Cardozo's famous opinion in *MacPherson* v. *Buick Co.*, and faced with a likely application of the doctrine of strict liability, must assess his potential liability in terms of every project for which he has manufactured and supplied parts and equipment. Under recent cases, the same appears true of the architect or design engineer.

The only way in which all segments of the industry can protect themselves, in the absence of prohibitive indemnity clauses in commercial contracts, is through insurance. The availability of such insurance in adequate amounts remains a major problem in the effort to develop a private atomic energy industry, and is held by many to be a serious deterrent to large-scale nuclear enterprises.

Under the 1946 act, the atomic-energy program was financed almost wholly from public funds. Accordingly, the Government assumed directly all risk of loss under its general policy of self-insurance on Government property and through indemnity provisions in contracts covering third-party liability. As a result, the private insurors of the country had only a limited knowledge of the hazards involved in atomic-energy activities, no real basis upon which to evaluate those hazards, and no need to develop and make available private coverage in the field.

It is a great credit to the insurance industry that it has recognized a public responsibility in the premises and has indicated, in

the short time that has been available, its readiness to provide liability insurance covering nuclear activities in unprecedented amounts. I have no hesitation in saying that the work of the insurance study group has been one of the most encouraging indications of the willingness of private enterprise to be self-sufficient in atomic-energy affairs.

However, in spite of the $65 million, third-party-liability coverage which the private insurors have indicated they will offer, the atomic-energy industry—almost unanimously—has indicated a reluctance to proceed without assurance that they will be financially protected to the full extent of their potential liability. This may be beyond the combined capacity of the insurance industry. This poses a very serious problem. The unwillingness of the industry to get on with the job without open-ended coverage is a serious and immediate threat to the public interest in the rapid development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and raises a question concerning participation by the Federal Government in the insurance problem and in the reactor program generally.

No one is very happy over the prospect of the Government entering the atomic-energy insurance field. Yet the Government does have a basic responsibility to do everything possible to develop an atomic-energy industry as rapidly as possible and, at the same time, to make certain that in the course of such development a risk of unprecedented loss is not thrust upon the public without adequate provision for relief. It would seem, therefore, that if the reluctance of the atomic-energy industry is well-founded, this Nation may face this alternative: either some form of Government assistance must be provided in the insurance field, or the Congress may decide to proceed with Government-financed reactors under normal-indemnity provisions covering third-party liability in order to keep the program rolling. That problem now faces the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress, and insofar as it is the burden of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we intend to determine our policy as promptly as we can.

Several bills have been introduced in the present session of the Congress in an attempt to meet the problem, and recently the joint committe held an executive seminar to hear the views of both the atomic energy industry and the insurers. This proved to be a very valuable experience, and the committee is considering holding open hearings on the insurance problem in the near future.

I should point out at this point that the recent survey made by a committee of distinguished public citizens, known as the McKinney Panel on the Impact of Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, concluded that the time had not arrived to consider the need for a Federal atomic insurance program covering peaceful uses. Rather, the panel suggested that the efforts of private insurance companies to deal with the problem should be encouraged, and expressed the opinion that at least 2 and possibly 3 years remain in which to conduct research and accumulate knowledge and experience before any substantial private activity would be delayed or stopped because of the inability to obtain adequate insurance. The panel concluded that a Federal atomic insurance program constituted a threat to private atomic enterprise, not a benefit. It is, the report states, "a last resort not yet called for and one which may not be needed." I would hope that the forthcoming hearings will thoroughly explore the entire field of insurance and test the soundness of the panel's conclusions.

In addition to questions of liability and insurance, the nature of the hazards connected with atomic energy work suggest the possibility of other legal problems.

Consider the question of the statutes of limitation which require the commencement of an action for damages within a prescribed number of years after the cause of action occurs. In most jurisdictions, the period of limitation begins to run from the date of the alleged wrong—in the case of radiation injury, from the date of exposure. But, as I have pointed out, the insidious nature of radiation is such that the fact of overexposure and its effects may not be manifest for many years. By that time, the statutory period may have expired and the cause of action barred. This seems to me a legal problem which will require careful thought in the interest of preserving the rightful claims of the general public. Some modification of the statutes is indicated in order to extend the period of limitations in actions for damages caused by radiation, or to recognize that actions involving radiation injuries present a special case of public policy which outweighs the general desirability of requiring that lawsuits be brought to trial with a minimum of delay.

Similar problems are presented in the field of workmen's compensation in connection with the general requirement that notice of a compensable injury be given the employer within a short time after its occurrence and that claims for compensation be made within a limited period after the injury or disability becomes apparent. It seems certain that a reconsideration of local workmen's compensation laws by State legislatures will be necessary unless the atomic energy worker is to be severely penalized. Indeed, many of the legislatures and industrial commissions now have the problem under consideration.

I have previously referred to the wide geographic area which quite possibly could be affected in the event of a major nuclear accident. This may include at least two adjacent States. In such case, there will be a problem in what lawyers call the conflict of laws: What law will govern in the event of a so-called "interstate tort"—the law of the State where the radioactivity was released or the jurisdiction where the exposure took place? It is obvious that legal imagination and boldness will be required in solving unusual questions such as this.

Let me give you a few legal brain twisters:

1. How do you prove or disprove negligence in the atomic-energy industry if the operations are shrouded in secrecy?

2. If radiation damage appears, how do you prove which of several possible radiations caused the damage?

3. If radiation damage appears after a long period of time and you can prove where the damage came from, how do you collect if the organization responsible is not longer in business?

4. If radiation causes damage to the genes in a parent, to whom does the right of action belong—the parent or the deformed child?

5. If it takes an Einstein to understand the theory of relativity, how can a jury decide whether a reactor is run negligently or carefully.

In this brief time, I have tried to outline for you what I believe to be some of the legal problems which will exist in the transition period of the atomic age. That some of the problems will be unusual or unique is apparent, and their solution will require legal pioneering of a high order. This, however, is a common experience attending the growth of any new industry, particularly when it widely affects the activities and conduct of the general public and is dependent upon continuing technological advance. In addition to the unusual problems, there will be the everyday, run-of-the-mill questions of adaptation to these circumstances. This will require high standards of craftsmanship. The history of the legal profession has been a dynamic one, and I am confident that the lawyers of the Nation are capable of meeting any challenge which may be presented by this new scientific and industrial force—the energy of the atom.

Fresno County, Calif., Celebrates Its Centennial and 100 Years of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise on the floor of this House today as the Representative whose district includes Fresno County, Calif., to call the attention of the Members to a most significant event in the history of that county.

Tomorrow will mark the 100th anniversary of the enactment on April 19, 1856 by the Legislature of the State of California of an act creating Fresno County. All this week the people of the county are celebrating this event and are pausing to pay tribute to the pioneers whose vision and courage, hard work and sacrifice, have contributed to the county's foremost position in our country. I am most happy to add my word to theirs and to ask that the Members join with me in marking this hundredth anniversary and recognizing its importance to the San Joaquin Valley, the State of California, and the Nation.

The people of Fresno County are rightly proud that their industry, vision, and hard work have carved an agricultural empire out of semi-desert and have won for the county for at least the past seven years an official classification as the richest county of the Nation in value of agricultural production.

Land that once was arid and nonproductive today nurtures the roots of farm crops valued at more than $300 million annually and forms the foundation for the steel and concrete and homes of 15 thriving, growing cities. The bounty of this 5,985 square miles of area comes from its fertile farm lands, its beautiful and valuable forests and its mineral-producing formations.

The key that opened the door to this phenomenal growth was water—water in the hands of farmers willing to couple their toil with a farsighted realization of the possibilities for making Fresno County a modern Garden of Eden.

From a sparsely cultivated, dry farming economy, with limited cattle and sheep raising, these farmers have successfully progressed through one-crop dependency on grapes and raisins to today's versatile production of some 86 different species of field, horticultural and seed crops. The 1954 total crop value represents an increase of almost 10 times the value of crops raised in the county in 1935, while acreage planted has increased from 450,000 to 1,329,210 in 1954.

In addition to its agricultural production, Fresno County is noted for its beautiful forests which provide both valuable timber and recreation for thousands of people, including visitors from all parts of the world who enjoy with us the scenic grandeur of the Sierra Nevada and its great national parks.

Concentrated in the county's western area is some $116 million in annual pro-

duction of minerals such as natural gas, petroleum, and quicksilver, while the mountains to the east are mined for tungsten, gold, silver, and other minerals.

Its great attraction of climate and location have resulted in a constantly increasing industrial growth for Fresno County. Twenty years ago there were only 4,000 manufacturing employees in the county, while in 1954, 14,600 workers in industrial plants earned more than $94 million.

Fresno City, seat of the county, is the trading center and metropolis for the entire central section of the San Joaquin Valley, and is growing by leaps and bounds. A recent census disclosed more than 200,000 persons in this metropolitan area.

From its small beginnings as a sleepy frontier community a hundred years ago, Fresno County has achieved miracles of development and it can confidently look forward to equal miracles of progress in the future, which I know all of us want to see directed toward greater happiness, stability and finer achievements for all of the people of this great county. Tomorrow I am flying out to join with the people of my county in their centennial celebration and from the expressions of many of the Members here, I know that I can take with me the congratulations and best wishes of this House to the people of Fresno County.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL CHUDOFF
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a program of civil-rights legislation can and must be enacted in this session of Congress.

There is nothing before this Congress more vital to our national conscience and to our international self-respect than assuring all citizens of this great Nation freedom and security in the exercise of their constitutional civil and human rights.

We all know that the suppression of and infringement on those rights is still a threat. We cannot expect to continue to lead a strong free world successfully as long as our enemies can exploit this as a defect in our national character.

Our forefathers had the courage to recognize and declare the equality of men before God and the law. Can we do less than enforce this equality?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot, we must not, let down the people of the world now. We must not fail to do what we know is right, just, and necessary. We must wipe out every vestige of the suppression of the civil rights of millions of our fellow countrymen.

On April 9 the Attorney General sent to the Congress a so-called civil-rights program of the present administration. Unfortunately, this is a weak and inadequate program. Evidently strong leadership in this vital field does not grow on the golfing greens of Georgia.

The administration's program does not go nearly as far toward the protection of civil rights as do bills introduced by myself and by other Members of Congress. I am sure the administration's program does not go as far as Congress is ready to go right now.

Mr. Speaker, the great interests of the Nation and of the free world require that we in Congress take the lead and enact a good civil-rights program immediately. We must put an end to lynching; we must strengthen our election laws and abolish the poll tax; we must guarantee to all citizens full protection and enforcement of each and every constitutional right; we must wipe out discrimination in interstate travel. A vigorous commission with authority to study all types of economic, social, legal, and other developments affecting civil rights and with a duty to present its findings to the President, to Congress, and to the country must be established. A regular joint committee of Congress should be set up with the protection of civil rights as its main concern. The civil-rights activities of the Justice Department must be strengthened and made effective.

These measures will be a definite step in the right direction. They will do much to redeem our national conscience and to restore our place in the minds and hearts of oppressed and hopeful people everywhere.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week we debated one of the most important legislative proposals to come before the House in this session of Congress. The omnibus farm bill which was presented at that time was a genuine disappointment to me in view of the urgency with which I regard the problems of American agriculture today. It was my hope that the conference committee would present to the House a bill embodying the far-reaching and constructive recommendations which the President and his administration formulated in a sincere effort to assist the American farmer. My strongest disappointment sprang from the insistence that rigid price supports be reinstated on basic crops even for the 1-year period provided in the bill.

The appalling consequences of the rigid price support plan are felt by every farmer in the Nation today who is experiencing lower prices for his commodities because of the fantastic surpluses which have been created through 10 years of rigid price supports. I have opposed the further extension of rigid price supports in the past and my opposition has not diminished. I believe that any thinking individual who is sincere in his concern for American farm prices must conclude that we must abolish these surpluses and with them the rigid price support program which has fostered and stimulated them.

It is my belief that American agriculture must continue to be based upon the production of the small family farmer. While rigid price supports have offered only inconsequential direct benefits to this type of farm operation, the program has greatly benefited the large commercial type farm. This has stimulated these large commercial operators to grow more and more of the crops already in surplus. The result has been the piling up of more surpluses which have, in turn, depressed market prices and created a serious economic hardship for the small farmer in southeastern Ohio and throughout this country.

Last week when this bill came to a vote in the House, I hoped that it could be returned to the conference committee to remove the objectionable and somewhat contradictory provisions it contained. I favored the motion to recommit the bill for the purpose of removing those provisions. That motion failed. Returning to the conference report, I recognized the value of placing the soil bank proposal in operation this year so that American farmers could have its benefits without delay.

The bill also contained a provision whereby farmers might exercise greater freedom from acreage restrictions with respect to wheat grown and used on their farms. This provision is of particular importance to hundreds of small farmers in my congressional district who have experienced difficulty under past restrictions.

My bill, H. R. 4570, would allow farmers freedom from such controls and, although a similar measure has been passed by the Senate, there seems little or no likelihood that the House Committee on Agriculture will take affirmative action this year on my proposal and similar bills introduced by a number of my colleagues.

With these provisions in mind, I reluctantly supported the conference report when it was brought to a vote on the floor of the House a week ago. Admittedly, it was a difficult decision. The balance seemed nearly even.

Assuredly, it was a difficult decision for President Eisenhower when the bill came to his desk for study. He weighed those same factors in the balance and, based upon his information, the bad outweighed the good. Furthermore, he has shown a determination to fight this thing through. He has indicated that the forces of his administration will be employed in wresting a workable farm bill from a reluctant Democrat majority in the Congress.

The President's veto of this bill and his reasons for the action he has taken are, in my opinion, cogent and sound. They are based upon a concern for the problems of the American farmer which transcends any immediate partisan gain which his approval of the bill might have obtained. I support his action.

In his veto message, the President has urged the Congress to enact legislation authorizing the establishment of the soil

bank proposal. In this I heartily concur and wish to express my conviction that the Congress, if it is motivated by an honest concern for the American farmer, will act quickly on this measure. There are no acceptable reasons, in my opinion, why this cannot be done and done now without any more verbiage. Political intransigence will be understood by our people when they evaluate any failure of the Congress to enact the soil bank legislation. Election year politics is no substitute for positive and constructive action by the Congress this year.

I recognize that the soil bank proposal may not, in itself, bring great direct benefits to many small farmers. Its benefits, however, will be appreciable and real when we consider that this program will reduce the surpluses and cause a general rise in the price of farm commodities. The decline in farm income is our problem today. Since the soil bank proposal will contribute to the solution of this problem, its benefits will be felt by all farmers in the prices they receive for basic crops. We must meet this challenge by formulating our solutions directly and honestly.

I wish to urge that the Congress enact a soil bank proposal bill immediately.

Watsonville (Calif.) Register-Pajaronian Wins Sigma Delta Chi Public Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Sigma Delta Chi Professional Journalistic Fraternity yesterday announced that its 1956 award for public service in journalism would go to the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian which is published in Watsonville in the 10th Congressional District of California.

Only twice before in the history of the award has this honor, one of the very highest in American journalism, been bestowed upon a newspaper not published in a metropolitan city. Never before has it been awarded to a newspaper in the West. Neither has it ever been given to a more deserving recipient.

Under the leadership of its editor, Mr. Frank Fletcher Orr, the Register-Pajaronian has long been the conscience of its community. A rare combination of aggressive and meticulous reporting, imaginative editing, and judicious editorial comment have made this newspaper an outstanding example of sound, constructive American journalism with a reputation which far exceeds its immediate circulation area. I know that the community of Watsonville daily enjoys the expressed respect and admiration of great metropolitan newspapers of much larger circulation.

Mr. Speaker, the community of Watsonville is no different from hundreds of cities of comparable size throughout the length and breadth of the United States. Its newspaper, the Register-Pajaronian, faces similar problems with similar resources as do scores of newspapers of comparable circulation from coast to coast. What makes it outstanding, and what now has won for it the coveted honor of the Sigma Delta Chi award, is the intelligent approach, the refusal to compromise with truth, the fearless determination to learn and report all the facts, and let the chips fall where they may.

This week, when the American Society of Newspaper Editors will hold its meeting here in Washington, much will be said about Freedom of the Press. We all know that there are many forces working consciously or inadvertently to restrict this freedom. May I suggest that in the United States of America, freedom of the press will never be in danger so long as courageous, intelligent editors with capable staffs are doing their jobs the way Frank F. Orr and the staff of the Register-Pajaronian have been and are doing theirs in Watsonville, Calif.

The late great William Allen White proved to all America with his Emporia (Kans.) Gazette that a small-town newspaper can, through sheer enterprise and excellence, gain influence far beyond the confines of its own small circulation area. As the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of California, I am intensely proud that the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian is gaining national recognition for taking the same approach.

The Need for the Housing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be an effort in progress to make political capital of the fact that a group of women will gather in Washington next week to exercise the important force of public opinion about consumer preferences in homes.

Mr. Albert M. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, recently asked the women of the United States to tell him what type of home they as homemakers would like to live in. From some 3,000 replies, he chose about 100 that seemed to show the keenest interest, the most insight into this problem and the most fruitful ideas. With some regard to geographical location, 100 women were invited to attend the Housing Conference that will meet in the Nation's Capital on April 23, 24, and 25.

It is an example of truly representative government that the Housing and Home Finance Agency should draw upon the collective knowledge and wishes of women in the home to help the Agency in its necessary functions. Mr. Cole's Agency has, among other functions, supervision of the Federal Housing Administration. The statutes and regulations governing the FHA require that in the insurance of mortgages in its regular and most often used programs it should consider the economic soundness of the dwelling with relation to the housing market. Homes that do not meet modern standards and tastes are not economically sound. Who can be more helpful than a panel of 100 women who have demonstrated their interest in this matter, and who represent all segments of our diversified Nation?

As a Member of Congress who has sponsored and supported housing legislation in the past several years, I object to those who say it is silly and useless to ask for this very pertinent information from homemakers. I would remind those who question the need for women's opinions that the latest figures available to me show that women hold 40 percent of the titles of America's 30 million homes and that they pay 40 percent of all property taxes. It is generally agreed by those who have made studies of home buying habits of the American people that women are in the main the final arbiters about whether a home should be purchased and—once bought—what should go into it.

It has been contended also that the recent publication of a book entitled "What People Want When They Buy a House," makes this Housing Congress unnecessary. In checking the facts I learn that although this volume was published last year, it was based upon a sample survey made 6 years ago. The Agency tells me that there was no money available to provide for the publication of the book in the time intervening. The book, I am informed, is an excellent study, but reflects none of the modern developments in housing, nor does it give the woman's point of view which is so important to sound home building.

Those who have the greatest stake in adequate homes for America's families are strongly endorsing the aims of this Housing Conference. Supporters include the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Association of Home Builders and the American Institute of Architects.

I would like to add my congratulations to Mr. Cole for originating this project that will attempt to improve homes by going to the people most directly concerned: the women of America.

President Eisenhower's Restatement of His Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of listening to President Eisenhower last evening were fortunate.

His summary of the traditions and philosophy of the Republican Party rich-

ly merits the careful reading and most serious consideration of every voter in this country. The millions of Americans who shared in electing him our President in 1952 have the rare opportunity now of guaranteeing his reelection in November. We can all start now with an immediate and continued effort to make his full statement available to every possible friend and neighbor.

In my opinion, certain portions of that statement are of such striking importance and in such marked contrast to a great deal we all are reading and hearing from certain sources that I want to take this means of making these excerpts available now to as many of my friends and constituents as I can.

The President said:

The mission of our party is to help 167 million Americans build a Nation stronger spiritually and materially, a Nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secured.

The President also said:

As a Republican I share my party's deeplying trust in what free men can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

People are made in the image of God—

He stated.

They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their destiny reflects their divine origin. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern that comprehends every American; that sets up no walls of birth or creed or party; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will equal in their dignity.

Speaking of the difference between the Republican and the Democrat Parties, President Eisenhower said:

We are all Americans, but in the practical pursuit of national objectives we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of Government's responsibilities.

I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy:

1. Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans.

2. Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom.

3. Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared.

4. Best keeps economic decision-making in the hands of the people and out of the hands of government.

5. Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs.

6. Best assures our children, and their children's children the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

The President referred to the record established by this Republican administration and suggested that the Republican Party platform for 1956 should include the following basic principles:

1. The individual is of supreme importance * * *people everywhere—every American of every race and creed should enjoy equally the rights and privileges of free citizens in a free nation.

2. The spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation. The ultimate values of mankind are spiritual. These values include liberty, human dignity, opportunity, and equal rights and justice. These are our heritage and our birthright.

3. America does not prosper unless all Americans prosper. More jobs and better jobs, and happier living for every family * * * call for a strong, growing, private-enterprise economy.

4. Government must have a heart as well as a head * * * Government should increase and strengthen personal and family security without impairing the self-respect, initiative, and incentive of the individual.

5. Courage in principle, cooperation in practice make freedom positive * * * all parts of our American community deserve the concern and support of Government in making their contribution to our well-being.

6. The purpose of Government is to serve, never to dominate.

He quoted Abraham Lincoln, "In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

7. To stay free, we must stay strong. We must gird ourselves with sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war and protect our Nation's vital interests; we must help to strengthen the collective defense of free nations against those who would seek their ends through aggression. Our own and our allied strength must be spiritual, intellectual, scientific, material.

8. Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples. The peace we want will be the product of understanding and agreement and law among Nations * * *. It will foster the concentration of human energy for the advancement of human standards in all the areas of mankind's material, intellectual, and spiritual life.

Opposition to H. R. 7089

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, out of the 435 complement of the House of Representatives, 6 Members were appointed during the 83d and 84th Congresses to a special group known as the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. Under a special rule of the House which permitted no amendments except by the special committee, a significant piece of legislation, H. R. 7089, was introduced last year and passed the House of Representatives on July 13, 1955.

I concede the fact that some of the bill's provisions were good, however, the bad features far outweighed any merits. I, therefore, take this opportunity to indicate my reason for voting against this bill, because in all good conscience, I could not agree with the concept of basing death compensation on the attained rank and length of service of an individual as proposed in section 202 (a). This section contained one of the most radical changes in existing legislation and, in my opinion, has never been made in the history of our country.

I am convinced that a life given for one's country is a life, whether the individual be a general or a private. There is certainly a need to provide for the widow and children in either case, yet who is to say that a widow and children of a general should have more benefits than the widow and children of a private. Let us compare the pay of each. A general receives approximately $1,200 a month as opposed to $120 a month for a private. These figures alone immediately indicate that the chances of leaving a sizable estate are much better in the higher than in the lower ranks.

I do not object to increasing benefits to widows and children of men who make the supreme sacrifice, however, I strenuously object to any system that would create a wide disparity between benefits given families of high-ranking officers and next-of-kin of privates, airmen, and seamen.

The high military echelon voiced their approval of this bill, and well they should. This is an excellent proposal for the career military personnel, who in view of long service have a better opportunity to attain some degree in rank. But what of the civilian soldier called to serve his country for the duration of an emergency? The majority have little opportunity to rise above the E–3 to E–5 bracket where the great number of deaths occur. These individuals have been forced to leave their families, their homes and their jobs—in most instances, jobs which pay far more than the military.

For example, let us consider the case of a lieutenant colonel with a monthly income of approximately $525 and the newly inducted private, just out of basic training, who prior to induction was earning $125 a week either as a steelworker, glassworker, or coal miner. The wives of both men enjoyed similar standards of living prior to the private's entry into service. Both men lose their lives, side by side, by the same enemy shell. The private's widow receives as her death compensation $122, while the wife of the liuetenant colonel would receive between $169 and $193, depending upon the length of service. I can see no equity in such a proposal—both faced the same hazards, both subjected themselves to the same dangers—yet the widow of one receives far greater benefits than the other.

The Federal Government has a direct obligation to the widows of men killed in service of their country. However, this obligation should be discharged in the historic manner of equality and not based on rank and length of service. I have long advocated an increase in compensation based on a flat sum. In lieu of the formula contained in section 202 (a) of H. R. 7089, I suggested a flat monthly rate of compensation to all widows in the amount of $140, since this appeared to me to be equitable in view of the loss of the servicemen's indemnity.

Other provisions of the bill calls for expansion of social-security benefits—depending on rank and longevity of the deceased serviceman—and a lump-sum gratuity of between $800 to $3,000—again depending on the deceased husband's rank and longevity. I could not look upon these features in favor and I voted against its final passage and endeavored to persuade by colleagues to do likewise. Even though the bill passed the House of Representatives over negative objections by many conscientious Members of Congress, I have been

gravely concerned over its future, because of the injustice involved and the resulting effects upon the morale of a great majority of the men in service during an emergency.

I cannot endorse any proposal injecting the philosophy that rank, length of service or military pay should be considered as factors in discharging the Federal Government's obligation to the widows and children of our servicemen who died as a result of service connected disabilities.

H. R. 7089 is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and I hope the committee will strike this rank philosophy from the bill.

Federal Employees Need and Deserve Basic Guaranties Provided in Union Recognition and Arbitration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to H. R. 10237, a bill to provide for the recognition of Federal employee unions and the establishment of arbitration machinery for the settlement of grievances. I am pleased to note that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has scheduled hearings next month on an identical bill, S. 3593, introduced by Senator OLIN JOHNSTON. Because of the demonstrated need for this type of legislation, I am hopeful that hearings may also be scheduled by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following guest article on this subject, which appeared in the April 13, 1956, issue of the Government Standard, the newspaper of the American Federation of Government Employees:

ON CAPITOL HILL
(By GEORGE M. RHODES)

Employees of the Federal Government enjoy the unique distinction of having 166 million employers, since it is their duty to provide a necessary assortment of scientific, technical, clerical, and administrative services to all our citizens.

As our Government has grown, both in complexity and the scope of its activities, it has become clear that those Americans who serve their fellow citizens, need and have a right to expect basic guaranties affecting their conditions of employment. Tens of millions of employees in private industry have long since been granted certain well-defined rights in the field of labor-management relations. The labor-management-relations law, established by act of Congress, makes this significant statement in its findings and declaration of policy:

"Experience has proved that protection by law of the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively safeguards commerce from injury, impairment, or interruption, and promotes the flow of commerce by removing certain recognized sources of industrial strife and unrest, by encouraging practices fundamental to the friendly adjustment of industrial disputes arising out of differences as to wages, hours, or other working conditions, and by restoring equality of bargaining power between employers and employees."

But unfortunately, our Government has not chosen to legally apply a similar set of rules to dealings with its own employees. A beginning was made in 1912 with the passage of the Lloyd-La Follette Act, which guaranteed Federal employees the right to join unions of their choice—provided such unions did not impose an obligation to strike against the Government. However, there was no requirement that the executive branch of the Government recognize or deal with such unions as the spokesmen for Federal employees.

Thus, effective labor-management relations having any degree of bargaining rights binding upon executive branch "employees," are nonexistent in the Federal service. The injustices of this situation have long been recognized by many responsible authorities.

The 1955 report of the American Bar Association's Committee on Labor Relations of Governmental Employees said:

"A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law requires of private enterprise."

It is obvious that some practical machinery for dealing adequately and fairly with the labor-management problems arising between the Federal Government and its employees is badly needed. I have introduced such remedial legislation in the past several Congresses.

Recently I introduced H. R. 10237, a strengthened version of my previous bill, H. R. 697. The chief difference is that the new bill provides for arbitration of disputes as a final recourse. It would give Government employee unions official recognition in the Government and require executive agencies and departments to deal with them on personnel policy matters and employee grievances.

A similar bill, though without the arbitration feature, was favorably reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1952 by a vote of 14 to 1. Unfortunately, the action came too late in the session for floor debate to be scheduled. It was placed on the Consent Calendar but chances for enactment were killed by the objection of a single Member.

In the past, established unions representing Government employees have discussed personnel problems and presented grievances to various administrative officers of the Government; but this action is a matter of sufferance rather than a right. If the Government administrator or his subordinates should refuse to meet or discuss the problem with union representatives, or should fail to take the necessary remedial action, the aggrieved parties have no appeal short of Congress.

As the American Bar Association pointed out in its report:

"Government which denies to its employees the right to strike against the people, no matter how just might be the grievances, owes to its public servants an obligation to provide working conditions and standards of management-employee relationships which would make unnecessary and unwarranted any need for such employees to resort to stoppage of public business. * * *"

I regret that no action on my bills has been forthcoming in the present Congress, despite the clearly demonstrated need for some type of remedial legislation to provide basic rights for Federal employees. Not one of the executive agencies or Departments of the present administration has even submitted a report to the committee stating their views on the proposed legislation—in favor or in opposition. They have chosen to ignore the existence of the bills, which is to deny that any problem or need exists. This "head in the sand" policy of the administration is shortsighted and unfair to the millions of loyal and devoted public servants who are entitled to workable standards of conduct affecting their hours and conditions of employment, vacations, and sick leave, as well as the expeditious settling of grievances which necessarily arise.

This present administration policy is also unfair to the citizens of our Nation because the present adherence to outmoded employee-management practices is contrary to sound and enlightened public personnel administration. It is arbitrary, unjust, and undemocratic. It destroys the morale of efficient and hard-working Government employees through the pyramiding of resentment, misunderstandings, and irritation because of the failure to provide necessary grievance machinery and other sound principles of employee-management relations which have been in effect in private industry for many years.

I feel that the principles and objectives of this legislation are reasonable and just. I feel that the need for enactment of such legislation is urgent. It is the duty of both the administration and the Congress to recognize this need and act accordingly, without further delay.

"For Where Your Treasure Is, There Will Your Heart Be Also"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, those who would disregard the old just because it is old are reminded that the thought expressed in the above quotation from the Sermon on the Mount is still with us.

That pressure groups are still thinking in terms of temporary, material self-interest, rather than the permanent welfare of all, is demonstrated every time Congress is called upon to enact major legislation carrying appropriations.

Every thinking individual knows that paying a Government subsidy which increases a price for the production of anything, whether it be automobiles or farm products, above that fixed by supply and demand, will result in the creation of a surplus.

Because of farm subsidies which came to us with the war and which were then necessary, we now have on hand billions of dollars worth of agricultural products, the mere possession of which is costing us a million dollars a day. The fair, useful disposal of that surplus appears to be an unsolvable problem. We know that a continuation of the payment of subsidies will but increase our dilemma. The approximate overall cost value, as of April 4, 1956, of surplus commodities in storage was $5,165,395,000.

What I am trying to express is the idea that some of those who insist upon

the continuation of a high, rigid farm subsidy, who object to the President's veto of the farm bill, have a personal financial interest in that type of legislation.

Justifiably, they say that, having been enticed by the Government into overproduction, and having assumed obligations which they otherwise would not have incurred, supports should not be suddenly, wholly kicked out from under them. With that I can agree.

While a continuation of subsidies at a high level will but make our farm problem worse, the shock of a total, sudden withdrawal of benefit payments should be tempered by a gradual but ever-continuing lessening of such payments.

CHASING THE DOLLAR

But in seeking and applying the remedy, we should not forget that some of those who insist upon a rigid 90 percent of parity policy are personally financially interested. The Farmers' Union, ostensibly in behalf of the little fellow, has been putting the heat on Congressmen, but has not publicized the fact that some of its members are financially interested in and control the Farmers' Union Grain Terminal Association. That outfit, during the year ending December 22, 1955, in the Minneapolis area alone, collected fees for storing surplus wheat, corn, barley, oats, rye, flax, and soybeans, amounting to the not insignificant sum of $1,604,069.

The Farmers' Union has the right to establish for financial gain storage facilities. But when they write me stressing the need of the small farmer and his family, who profit but little if any from subsidy payments, I wish they would also advise whether the big boys of the Farmers' Union who are in the storage business are sharing their storage profits with the small farmer. How many small farmers have received a dividend check from the storage organizations of the Farmers' Union?

Why not, instead of laying up treasure for a few, enact legislation for the long-time, overall welfare of all the people?

We Must Protect American Labor and Industry From Unfair Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the OTC legislation, represented by H. R. 5550 and reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means, strikes me as extremely important. H. R. 5550 is not just another bill. It is one of those crucial proposals that would change radically the lines of our constitutional division of powers.

The State Department seeks through this legislation to obtain the consent of Congress to its own abject demotion to the sidelines in the matter of regulating foreign commerce. If this seems presumptuous it is in keeping with that Department's action in this field during the past 10 years. By one scheme or another it has aimed at obtaining and keeping control over our tariff and related aspects of trade. H. R. 5550, the OTC proposal, is only the last in a series of steps.

Why does this interest me as a Member of Congress?

It interests and concerns me for several reasons. In the first place, as a Member of Congress, I am bound to carry out my obligations and responsibilities as a Congressman; and this clearly does not involve resignation to the State Department or the abdication of powers that the Constitution has placed upon us, whether on the grounds of expediency, following the path of least resistance, or anything else.

Second, I have definite obligations to the people who elected me. It has become something of a stigma to acknowledge this fact. We hear of bowing to "local selfish interests" when we pay attention to the electorate back home.

In this particular instance I am speaking for such local selfish interests as the owners of and workers in various industries in my district. They have a real stake in this legislation. Their interests, that is, their economic welfare, the wage levels, the employment opportunities and the very value of investments in plants, mills, and manufacturing enterprises in my district are affected by and stand to benefit or lose by what Congress does or does not do in its action on this bill. We are not legislating in a vacuum.

If the employment opportunities of men and women in the manufacture of watches and clocks is a local, selfish concern then I am guilty of catering to local selfish interests in seeking to preserve and to promote such employment. If continuity or increase of employment at good wages in rubber-soled-footwear plants, or in factories producing bicycles and parts, or in those making wood screws and metal fasteners or in textile plants in my district is a matter of local selfish interest, then again I am guilty of upholding such narrow interests; and I may say that I am proud to do it.

At the same time I will challenge anyone to say that it is against the national interest for a Member of Congress to speak for those who elected him, to seek to preserve their jobs and their earnings against influences that might upset them or even take them away.

For these several reasons I support the resolution introduced on both sides of the aisle, by the gentleman from Maine and by the gentleman from West Virginia. The OTC bill leaves too much in the dark. It presents us with a handle to a pan but says nothing of what is to be cooked in the pan, or how. We are simply to agree to hand over the pan to cooks in Geneva, Switzerland, who will want to use it as they see fit, to cook what they please.

Looking back over the last 10 or 20 years of State Department activity, I am convinced that American industry, American producers, including some important parts of our agriculture, would be asked to supply the goose to be cooked, and if the past is any guide to the future that goose would be cooked in short order. I am afraid that Congress' own goose would be cooked at the same time. We are here, among many other things, to regulate foreign commerce. Evidently that means what it says.

I am not willing to give the pan and its handle away; and I do not believe that any reservations about the use of the pan will do us much good so long as we leave it to others to decide what is to be cooked in it.

To be plain about it, amendments to the OTC, such as those adopted by the Ways and Means Committee, can do little good so long as GATT itself remains free to operate under the power of self-amendment without reference to Congress.

In H. R. 5550 we are addressing ourselves only to the OTC, that is, to the pan and its handle. What goes into the pan and how it is to be cooked; that is, the real substance of the issue, corresponds to GATT and GATT is not brought before us in H. R. 5550. GATT would be left free to work out its own destiny beyond the reach of Congress. It could by a two-thirds vote extend its own powers without consultation of Congress in any way. GATT has amended itself in the past; and there is nothing in H. R. 5550 or in the OTC agreement or in the amendments adopted by the Ways and Means Committee that would prevent its doing so in the future.

What good could I do then in behalf of the many producers in my district who would be injured by action taken in Geneva? Neither I nor any other Member of Congress would be able to reach the decision-making spot in Geneva, or if we could the delegates from the 35 countries congregated there behind closed doors would be under no obligation either to see us or pay us the least attention.

Is that the goal to which we want to move? Is that the way we want to dispose of our responsibility to regulate the foreign commerce of this country?

There are those who deny that membership in the OTC would have that effect. I say the burden of proof is on them. We have observed for 10 years or more the direction of State Department activities in this field. It has moved ever farther away from congressional control directly toward international control of our foreign trade. The ban on import quotas written into GATT is only one example.

It would require a complete reversal of State Department policy to prevent loss by Congress of its authority to an international organization in this field if Congress should approve OTC membership on behalf of the United States. The burden of proof to the contrary is indeed upon those who deny this.

Let them bring GATT before us for a thorough examination. If they balk at this, they will demonstrate the duplicity of their position. If they have nothing to hide, if they are not bent on wresting powers from Congress and lodging them in Geneva, they will gladly come forward and place before Congress the full record of the State Department in its GATT

negotiations. Then Congress can determine for itself what is what.

In my opinion the resolution should be adopted forthwith.

Cotton Cannot Go It Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] at the annual meeting of the Western Cotton Shippers Association, in El Paso, Tex., on April 12, 1956. This is one of the greatest agricultural speeches which has ever been delivered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COTTON CANNOT GO IT ALONE

(Address by Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico)

This is a difficult time to be talking about farm problems and particularly about cotton. The Senate took weeks to pass a farm bill. About a year ago the House of Representatives passed a farm bill also. The two bills were far apart. Now the conferees have spent two weeks trying to bring them together into something that will receive Presidential action. You will notice I did not say will receive Presidential approval. I have not been able to determine accurately for myself whether the program was to produce a bill that the President would veto in the hope that some slight political value may result, or whether it was planned to work out a bill that the President could sign.

Today I want to review what the Senate tried to put into its farm bill and what has happened in the cotton picture which seems to make the action taken by the Senate the proper one for the industry as well as for the country.

We had long hearings on the new farm legislation. I commend the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, for traveling across this country trying to find out what the farmers wanted. After I studied the hearings I became convinced that farmers were not unanimous in what they wanted. In one part of the country there seemed to be quite a bit of approval for a program of flexible price supports. In other parts of the country the committee was assured that farmers would settle for nothing less than 90-percent rigid price supports. There was a good deal of testimony indicating that they would take 100 percent if pressed hard enough.

When the hearings were over, our committee tried to write a farm bill. We had before us all the suggestions that had been developed, boiled down to what the committee felt might be considered in a final bill.

When we came to our final votes, my first motion was to strike the price provisions from the bill on the theory that we should be seeking to shrink agricultural production, and that the soil bank which had been proposed by the President to do that, had a chance for early enactment, possibly as early as the middle of February. I thought we could then proceed to fight over the price question at our leisure. Further there was then in the bill a surplus disposal provision based upon a resolution which I had submitted the first day of the Congress, and I wanted to see it passed.

I have said repeatedly that there are two ways to help the American farmer. The first is to dispose of the burdensome surpluses which hang over the market and depress all agricultural prices—not only for cotton, corn, wheat, and rice, but for livestock as well. Therefore, I felt it necessary to make sure that the Secretary of Agriculture came back to the Congress within 30 days and reported what he was going to do to get rid of these surpluses. That resolution, in my opinion, could have been acted upon by the Senate Agriculture Committee in the first 2 weeks of the new session, and the Secretary would have been before us by the middle of February telling us how he proposed to get rid of surpluses. We could have either taken that medicine or we could have stirred up a new batch, but we could at least have been on our way. Now, 60 days later, we are in the process of trying to pass agricultural legislation which has, to be sure, a surplus disposal provision in it. It still requires the Secretary to report, but gives him 60 days from the date the bill is signed, if it is ever signed. In my opinion, that frees him from any responsibility whatever of coming before the Congress and telling us what he proposes to do.

That was important, because the very first thing that is going to be of interest to the cotton producers and the cotton shippers of this country is whether or not the Secretary intends to dispose of about five million bales of cotton per year in some sort of surplus-disposal program. If he does not, we will continue to accumulate oppressive stocks of cotton. If he does,, you will see cotton markets stiffen and cotton prices reflect the result of his program of stepped-up disposal.

The second problem is to bring our expanding agricultural production under control. Let me say to you that we now know enough about the production of cotton so that we have the technology to raise the average yield per acre across the United States on a harvested-acre basis to 700 pounds per acre. Do not cross off that figure too lightly. The average for 1950 and 1951 on a harvested-acre basis was a yield of 269 pounds; 1952 was 379 pounds; 1953 was 324 pounds; and 1955 was 416 pounds. We are on our way and 700 pounds per acre is not an impossible yield. Therefore, if we are to have high cotton production per acre we have to have some device to bring our expanding agriculture production under control. The soil bank, since it was first advocated by Henry Wallace in 1937 and as it was again advocated by President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson in 1956, is the best single device that can be used to bring about that result.

These then were the two things which I thought needed to be done first. Facing that situation, what did Senator EASTLAND, who was the leader in our cotton legislation this time, seek to do? In the first place, he wanted to see a large export program. He talked with the Secretary of Agriculture steadily and effectively, and the newspapers of February 29 carried a story that the Secretary of Agriculture would put all the Federal-owned surplus cotton on the world auction block effective August 1, and that in return for support of the administration's flexible price-support system he had offered Southern Senators a somewhat higher support price on cotton than they might otherwise have had in view of the large stocks we had on hand.

I was tremendously interested in the story, because I thought it was important to start moving cotton. The Secretary set the export goal as "somewhere in the neighborhood of 5 million bales a year as our share of the world market." That was a very big step in the right direction. We were able to do other things if he could have an export program that moved 5 million bales of cotton.

What were those other things? First of all we put into the bill a provision that we would price cotton on average grades and staples rather than on Middling ⅞-inch. That on the face of it would reduce cotton prices a couple of pennies a pound. We had a long discussion of that in the committee. I took hard work on the part of Senator EASTLAND and me to bring about the adoption of that proposal. We felt that cotton was losing markets at home and abroad and that a reduction of 2 or 3 cents would be desirable. Senator EASTLAND took the position that he would be willing to accept this reduction in price if the Secretary in turn would not reduce the acreage for 1957 and 1958.

I want to comment on that because it is of real importance. If the Secretary used a planted-yield-per-acre basis for the last 5 years, he had the authority, under the law, to reduce cotton acreage to a 1957 allotment of 15,841,000 acres as against the 1956 allotment of 17,400,000 acres. If, however, he used the harvested yield per acre, he would find the average for the last 5 years to be 326 pounds per acre and that would give a 1957 allotment of 14,724,000 acres. I think the Secretary can use either the harvested yield or the planted yield as his yardstick. I think in view of the enormous cotton surplus he would be well advised if he used the harvested-yield basis. Therefore, the cotton economy of this country faced a shrink from 17,400,000 acres to 14,724,000 acres, which was too large.

Furthermore, the Secretary, under the flexible price support program, if he had so desired, could reduce the price level to a figure in the seventies instead of a figure in the eighties. It was indicated by the Secretary that he would be willing to hold the price level at about 86 or 87 percent of parity if Congress would change the provision on grades and staples to average from Middling ⅞-inch and would also be willing to freeze cotton acreage for 1957 and 1958 at 17,400,000 acres.

The effect of that program would have been substantial. It would have said that America was going into the business of regaining a fair share of what historically had been its part of the world export market. That did not mean to go all the way because at one time we had 50 percent of the world's export market—yes, at one time we had 60 percent. Recently we have been down to as low as 20 percent. But 5 million bales would be a reasonable share for the United States to have, and the Secretary could slowly have begun whittling away at the surplus. Meanwhile the price would have dropped a little bit so that cotton would have stayed in competition domestically and worldwide. All of that, I think, would have made a fairly well-rounded program.

However, it didn't work out that way. We were able to get the bill through the Senate with the provisions for average grades and for freezing the acreage still in the bill. But when it went to conference, the conferees took the sweet and rejected the bitter. They kept the provision which would freeze the acreage at 17,400,000 acres, but added to it 90 percent price supports, which means that American cotton will not move domestically as rapidly as it should, will in fact continue to lose its domestic markets to the synthetics, and will not move in world trade without subsidy. It meant, to put it bluntly, that we were going to produce cotton for the Treasury of the United States and sell it to the Commodity Credit Corporation in exchange for drafts on Uncle Sam. No greater damage could be done to the cot-

ton farmer of America than to have that sort of philosophy prevail.

Therefore, my message today to you is that cotton can't go it alone. Cotton as it grows in the field in the United States is going to have to have some help from the Congress and from the trade if it does not face extinction. The supply in the United States for the current marketing season, 1955–56, has touched an all-time high of 25.7 million bales, higher than the previous record of 24.6 million bales in 1939–40. During the time that this huge stock was accumulating, cotton has had 90 percent price supports. As a matter of fact, due to the use of Middling ⅞-inch as the grade when the average growth was better than that, cotton has had about 94 or 95 percent price support and has enjoyed a more favorable position than most other crops. The result has been to price cotton out of the market at home and abroad.

The production of synthetic fibers has been increasing with great speed. It is only 15 years ago that 81 percent of the total fiber used in the United States was cotton, and only about 10 percent was rayon and other synthetics. In 1954 it had gone to 69 percent use of cotton and last year to 66 percent. Just how far do the so-called friends of the farmer want it to go? How far are the advocates of 90-percent price supports in the Congress of the United States willing to have rayon and other synthetics take over before we have a realistic approach to the cotton problem?

But we cannot consider only cotton at home. The production of cotton has been increasing all around the world. The only thing that has changed is that the United States has not been able to share in the new markets. Our exports have been gradually decreasing. They averaged 5.3 million bales from 1935 to 1939, but less than 4 million bales from 1950 to 1954, and dropped to 2.4 million bales in 1955. If we want to throw away our world markets, we can. But when we do we jeopardize cotton farming as an industry in the United States.

Cotton can't go it alone. It needs help from Congress, not only in its pricing but in its marketing. The Department of Agriculture, during the latter part of the year 1945 and early 1946, made a very intensive study of the need for research and marketing methods. Material that was accumulated filled a whole wall of filing cabinets in the Department of Agriculture. It took weeks to analyze the uses that were being made of cotton and the possibilities for research in cotton as well as other crops. After that long study, we sent to the Congress a research and marketing bill which was enacted into the Research and Marketing Act of 1946.

Just a few days ago, Senator CAPEHART proposed that we spend a hundred million dollars a year for agricultural research and facilities. I called his attention to the fact that the act of 1946 would have authorized $9½ million in 1947 but nothing was appropriated. It would have authorized $19 million in 1948 and $9 million was appropritaed. It would have authorized $48 million in 1950 and $19 million was appropriated. It would have authorized $61 million in 1951 and only a tiny fraction of that was appropriated. It would have authorized almost unlimited appropriations in every year since 1951 so that today under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 we could be spending $100 million on research for agricultural commodities.

We saw in 1946 the problem that has now arisen in 1956. We saw that cotton was going to face competition from synthetics at home and abroad. We were trying hard to provide the necessary basic research so that cotton could find new markets. Instead of that, the cotton producers of this country have been denied their chance for a fair share of trade in this country and in other parts of the world. The great producers of synthetics can afford to take from their treasury millions of dollars each year for research. But farmers of this country can't spend it individually and they can't spent it collectively very well.

To be sure, the Supima cotton producers have done a good job in marketing and are on their way to a very creditable demonstration but over the country, generally speaking, no one can sign up the man who has a mule and a few acres of cotton to a fund promotion. Therefore, we have felt that the combined force of the Government might be able to do for all the farmers what a great industrial organization like Du Pont might be able to do for its product. The very fact that these research and marketing appropriations have not been made shows that cotton and other commodities have not had the things to which they were entitled and I say to you that cotton can't go it alone. It needs help fighting through the right kind of research and marketing appropriations in the Bureau of the Budget and in appropriation bills before the Congress of the United States.

And now, some words more directly aimed at the western cotton shippers.

A most important factor in farming is what to do with the harvested products. In your membership, we assuredly have a trade group who are truly valuable in the marketing of harvested cotton. That great commodity of streaming white gold plays an important part in the commodity economy of the great Southwest and West.

I think that the cotton pricing structure of the merchandising system is the most sensitive merchandising operation of any I know. Price reactions or fluctuations occur, by reason of a multitude of variable circumstances. The recorded price changes, occurring by seconds during the market hours of your great cotton futures exchanges, are flashed in a matter of seconds to the four corners of the world—equaling the mechanism of a fine jeweled watch.

Members of your organization offer a complete worldwide marketing service. You buy the produced cotton right at the gin or warehouse and merchandise it out in quantities desired by the spinners worldwide. Your finance system is a marvel—your word is your bond—you make a verbal offer over the telephone for $10,000, or $100,000 worth of cotton, and many times no bilateral contract is ever signed, yet the seller never worries that there will be any hitch. Too, you phone the spinner and the same is true. Very few organizations have a record like that. I congratulate you for this.

Foreign consumption of synthetics today is equivalent to 8.9 million bales and domestic consumption is at the annual rate of 4.5 million bales. Those rates have grown rapidly and attention must be given to the vast inroads. The synthetic producers are a most aggressive group of people. The capacity for producing man-made fibers is increasing every year and new mills are scheduled to be built during this year that would permit the expanding of output to the equivalent of another 1 million bales of cotton.

I hope I can give you some good news. I think you as cotton handlers can make plans for a good business this coming season. I look for close to 9½ million bales, or better domestic consumption, and 4 million export, a total of 13½ million versus 11¼ million for this current season. You fellows should share in a greater percent of those increases than some of the other areas. Therefore, I would make plans for full steam ahead.

Some apprehension may exist that the present export plans would be unreasonable on the cotton trade in this area, but I would like to believe that you men have enough inventiveness to make up for some of the misgivings of the sales program. Surely the CCC, with its past experience in selling vast amounts of cotton to the trade, will be fair in its treatment, and not be so restrictive as required in the recent 1-million-bale program. I think that the quality of the cotton favors you manifestly—your area has improved its quality to such a high level that you now have cotton as fine as is grown anywhere, worldwide, and a good product never is at the bottom of the totem pole. You have the finest of qualities; therefore, I have faith your cotton will move to the spinners where you have established its reputation.

Now let us take a closer look at the export situation. The production of cotton in other countries has been climbing steadily since the war, and this year rose to an all-time high of 25.3 million bales—an increase of 7.5 million bales over the 1934–38 level and 12.3 million bales over the 1946 level.

There is no denying that our price policy has been the most important single factor in encouraging this competition. There is no denying either that if the price policies of the past are continued that the United States will be completely out of the cotton-export business in a few years' time. This is not to say that price is the only factor. Some of the foreign countries are following policies of economic nationalism designed to encourage production of both cotton and rayon for self-sufficiency and to provide a means of earning foreign exchange. In such countries price is a secondary consideration, but, fortunately, this situation is not general. It is also true that the shortage of dollars has been, and still is, a factor limiting our exports, but the purchasing power of the rest of the world is improving every year, and the ability to finance imports is less of a factor. Also, the United States is continuing to provide special financing to aid countries in balance of payments difficulties through direct economic aid, sales of local currencies, loans, and the like.

The most important effect of the new export program will be to set a price for cotton that will remove the incentive for expansion of production of both cotton and rayon abroad. Once the fibers are produced we can assume they are going to be sold because other countries simply aren't in a position to hold their stocks off the market for long.

It is necessary that this price be low enough to discourage competing production, if we are to be successful in rebuilding our exports. At the same time the United States cannot afford to engage in price wars to the extent that we break the economies of friendly countries and thus create new economic, political, and even military problems and impair our international security objectives. Our sales will have to be orderly. We must recognize that our surpluses will have to be liquidated over a period of years.

The policy will have to be essentially long range in its nature. Unless some confidence is reestablished in cotton prices the foreign mills may be frightened away from cotton and encouraged to go more and more to the man-made fibers, the prices of which are relatively stable. At the present time the increased use of man-made fibers is coming largely through blending a portion of these fibers with cotton primarily in an effort to reduce the raw material cost. If cotton prices are lowered to a realistic level, and if there is a reasonable assurance that these prices will be fairly stable, I am confident that the use of these blends can be discouraged and that cotton can regain many of these markets. On the other hand, the uncertainty of price and of supply will make this objective very difficult indeed.

While the foreign market is the most important aspect of the cotton marketing problem at the moment, and while it undoubtedly offers a large opportunity for expansion given a reasonable export price policy, we cannot afford to take the domestic market for granted either. Although the

cotton farmers of this country do not have to face the competition from foreign-grown cotton in the domestic market to any significant extent except in the field of extra long staples, the competition from man-made fibers in the domestic market is very real. At the present time the price advantage of rayon over cotton is from 5 to 9 cents per pound in the various end use markets. The quality improvements that have been made and are being made every day in the man-made fibers, tend to increase this competition. The uncertainty of the cotton prices is an additional factor that plays into the hands of our competitors in this market and encourages the mills to use the man-made fibers, prices of which are more stable.

Over the long range the price to which the cotton supports can be lowered must be geared to the cost of production. We must redouble our efforts in research and education to employ all of the resources which modern science can command to find new and improved ways of cultivating, harvesting, and merchandising cotton in order to cut these costs.

If we are successful in our efforts to reduce cost and if we develop a realistic long-range pricing policy, I have no doubt that cotton can and will be able to meet its competition and that our production can continue to expand.

At the same time, we cannot afford to neglect the opportunity for expanding consumption and stimulating the demand for cotton products on the part of the ultimate consumers. There is a real opportunity in this country and throughout the world to increase the use of cotton not only as a percentage of the total textile fibers consumed, but also by increasing the use of textiles by encouraging people to be better dressed and to make their homes more comfortable and more attractive. The programs in research and sales promotion that have been developed in this country have proved their effectiveness. These can and should be expanded. In the rest of the world the opportunity may be even greater. An addition of only 2 pounds of cotton per person per year—the equivalent of 1 pair of overalls or 1 bed sheet—in consumption in the free world would require an addition 6 million bales of cotton and would leave the average person in the free world consuming only one-fourth as much cotton as the average person in the United States. With the rapid increase in the standards of living around the world, the possibility of these objectives is improved. The increase in the population throughout the world is a further factor. I have no doubt that the demand for cotton can be increased, that the production of our farms can be increased, that the income of our cotton farmers and those who handle cotton can be protected and improved if we face the situation and have the courage and the imagination to adopt the policies that are necessary to maintain cotton in a strong competition position from the standpoint of price, quality, and sales effort.

Our Supima producers are setting a fine example of meeting the issues. They are matching the finer world-recognized qualities of the Egyptian cotton through research. They are setting aside $3 per bale for promotion. They have set their support levels at 75 percent of parity. That is what I call a forthright program designed to meet the situation head on. The Supima people who are our neighbors and friends have the cotton spotlight of the world on them. Washington was dazzled when they came forward not too long ago to sell their program. The spinners over the world, too, have taken special note, and the Egyptians are really watching.

The sales promotion of Supima, too, is moving with vigor. Just think, a small group of producers moving in breeding and developing in a few short years such an outstanding quality and now producing some 45,000 bales currently, with prospects of some 100,000 bales. Imagine what the results would be, if just half of the Cotton Belt would take on the same amount of vision, fire, and enthusiasm of the Supima growers. Let me tell you, we would be moving 15 million bales annually in a short 3 years. The cotton business would soon be out of the Government's hands and freedom of merchandising would be enjoyed to the fullest extent.

I want to close on that note of hope. God still helps those who help themselves. Cotton farmers, ginner and shippers will be in need of help unless all join to put King Cotton back on a throne by programs of courage and vision in which you may take the lead and in which, I hope, the Congress may give you effective support.

A Bill To Provide Financing of Needed Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of a number of builders, laborers, lumber and material suppliers, and veterans' groups in my district, I have introduced a bill to provide financing of needed housing.

This bill is similar to one introduced by Hon. ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama, and referred to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Here is a summary of provisions of the bill:

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Section 101 dealing with FHA title I home improvement loans provides—

(1) A 2-year extension.

(2) An increase in the maximum loan amount to $3,500 (present ceiling is $2,500) and from $10,000 to $15,000 for loans to improve multifamily structures.

(3) An increase in the maximum loan term to 5 years (present ceiling is 3 years).

(4) A sliding interest rate scale permitting a 5-percent discount on loans below $1,000, with a 4-percent discount permitted on that portion of the loan which exceeds $1,000. Presently a 5-percent discount is charged regardless of loan amount.

Section 102 would permit the FHA to become a self-insurer against, fire and hazard risks to properties acquired by FHA as a result of foreclosure.

Section 103 would liberalize rental housing insurance under FHA's section 207 by—

(1) Permitting a loan up to 90 percent of value (present ceiling is 80 percent of value).

(2) Increasing loan ceilings to $2,250 per room (present ceiling is $2,000) and up to $2,700 per room for elevator-type structures (present ceiling is $2,400). In high-cost geographic areas the Commissioner is authorized to increase the per room maximum by an additional $1,000. These liberalizations would establish loan ceilings for section 207 similar to those permitted for urban renewal insurance projects under section 220.

Section 104 would amend cooperative housing insurance under section 213 by providing—

(1) A new device to permit a cooperative sponsor to obtain a commitment for a loan up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. This would overcome the marketing difficulties involved in the present requirement that the cooperative be sold 100 percent before construction can begin. The sponsor would certify intent to sell to a cooperative upon completion. Should he fail to sell the project he would be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. Also, if the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he cannot use this special insurance feature again.

(2) Authority to the FHA Commissioner to permit in the high-cost geographic areas an additional $1,000 per room in computing the maximum permissible insured loan.

Section 105 would increase the FHA mortgage insurance authorization to make available $3 billion for the next fiscal year.

Section 106 would permit a profit and risk allowance of 10 percent for sponsors of urban renewal insurance projects under section 220, although the FHA Commissioner could prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10-percent allowance is unreasonable.

Section 107 would liberalize relocation housing insurance under section 221 by—

(1) Increasing the maximum permissible loan to $8,600 and to $9,600 in geographic high-cost areas. (Present ceilings are $7,600 and $8,600, respectively.)

(2) Permitting no downpayment financing by requiring only that the borrower pay at least $150 in cash to apply toward closing costs.

(3) Increasing the permissible loan maturity from the present 30 years' ceiling to 35 years and up to 40 years where the Commissioner finds such longer maturity necessary for low-income families.

Section 108 would amend the cost certification requirement by making such certifications incontestable after the Commissioner's approval of the certification, barring fraud or material misrepresentation. It would also permit an allocation of general overhead costs acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in the total certified cost.

TITLE II—SECONDARY MARKET LEGISLATION

Section 201 would liberalize the operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association by—

(1) Permitting advance commitments under the secondary market operations. Such commitments would be issued at a price high enough to provide production support to builders and yet sufficiently below the prices offered by the Association for immediate purchase to discourage excessive sales to FNMA pursuant to advance commitments.

(2) Reducing the stock purchase requirement to no more than 2 percent.

(3) Requiring FNMA until June 30, 1957, to pay par for special assistance mortgages.

(4) Increasing the advance commitment funds available for special assistance operations to $400 million (present ceiling is $200 million).

(5) Providing a $50 million revolving fund under the special assistance program to support FHA section 203 (i) loans. Section 203 (i) loans are designed to encourage low-cost housing in outlying and rural areas.

(6) Amending the present revolving fund for section 213 mortgages to make it clear that the $5 million limit per State is on outstanding commitments; in other words to make clear that the State suballocation can "revolve" exactly the same as does the $50 million nationwide revolving fund.

(7) Exempting from the $15,000 limit on loans eligible for purchase the following: (a) Military housing loans insured under section 803 and (b) FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans made in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii.

Section 202 would establish a new secondary market support program for GI loans.

Under its provisions the Secretary of the Treasury could invest up to 10 percent of the reserves of the national service life insurance fund by purchasing VA-guaranteed loans in geographic areas where discounts on GI loans are heaviest. Both current reserves and future premiums could be used. Since the fund's reserves are approximately $5½ billion, the program could supply approximately $550 million in funds to support the market.

Only loans guaranteed after enactment would be eligible for purchase. In case of serious default, provision is made for purchase of the defaulted loan from the fund by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

The program would expire on July 25, 1957, the present expiration date for the GI loan benefit of most World War II veterans.

The Federal National Mortgage Association would act as the Treasury's agent to purchase and service loans. Payment for such services is limited to a maximum of three-fourths of 1 percent. Since the GI loans purchased would yield at least 4½ percent, the fund would earn a minimum of 3¾ percent on its mortgage portfolio.

TITLE III—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Sections 301, 302, 303, and 304 would establish a new loan program for housing for the elderly, similar to the college housing loan program.

These sections would provide $250 million to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for loans to nonprofit corporations for the construction or rehabilitation of housing for the elderly.

The interest rate could not exceed 3½ percent per annum and the maximum loan term would be 50 years. The cost of funds to the Administrator from the Treasury could not exceed 3 percent.

The bill would permit loans only when private capital is not available upon the terms and conditions provided in the bill.

TITLE IV—SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

Section 401 would increase the funds available under present law for capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects by an additional $1 billion. The sum would be made available in $500 million increments on July 1, 1956, and July 1, 1957.

Section 402 the Housing Administrator would be authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community must have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, requirements of public hearings, and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas.

The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal housing programs would also be amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement, and urban planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

Section 403 the urban planning grant authorization would be increased from $5 million to $10 million.

Section 404 would extend to private nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning the same privilege with respect to Government construction planning advances, as that now enjoyed by tax-supported educational institutions of higher learning. Both such types of educational institutions receive equal consideration under provisions of the college housing loans program, and this change would place them on a parity with respect to planning advances.

TITLE V—PUBLIC HOUSING

Section 501 would provide 50,000 low-rent public-housing units annually for a 3-year period beginning August 1, 1956. Provision is made for carrying over to subsequent years any unused portion of the annual quota.

Section 502 would make low-rent public housing available to elderly persons (65 years or over)—

(1) By making elderly single persons eligible.

(2) By authorizing the construction of units specifically designed for elderly persons. The section provides 10,000 units annually for a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1956.

(3) By increasing the permissible per room cost for units for elderly persons to $2,250 (present ceiling, $1,750).

Section 503. The Public Housing Administration would be directed to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies in the areas of the camps if requested within 12 months after enactment of the bill and the local public housing agency certifies as to the low-rent need for the project and that preferences will be given, first, to low-income agricultural workers and, second, to other low-income persons and families.

Section 504 would authorize the sale under prescribed conditions of two Government-owned projects, the Chinquapin Village housing project in Alexandria, Va., and the Techwood Dormitory in Atlanta, Ga.

TITLE VI—FARM HOUSING

Section 601 amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide the following additional authorizations for loans and contributions to farm housing:

(1) $100 million in the amount of loan funds which can be obtained from the Treasury;

(2) $2 million per annum in the amount of annual contribution commitments for housing on potentially adequate farms; and

(3) $10 million in the amount of appropriations authorized for loans and grants for improvements and repairs of farm housing.

TITLE VII—COLLEGE HOUSING

Section 701 would increase loan funds for college housing by $250 million, bringing the total authorized for such purpose to $750 million.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY HOUSING

Section 801 would extend and liberalize the title VIII military housing program by—

(1) Extending the program until September 1959 (under present law the program would expire September 30, 1956).

(2) Permitting an average cost per dwelling unit of $15,000 (presently $13,500) and up to $16,500 in high-cost areas as determined by the Secretary of Defense. The aggregate total of mortgage insurance authorized would be increased correspondingly.

(3) Permitting the FHA Commissioner to waive or reduce the FHA insurance premium.

(4) Prescribing maximum floor area limitations for various ranks and grades with a special allowance for quarters outside the United States and for the quarters of commanding officers.

(5) Extending eligibility for military housing insurance to the Canal Zone.

Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27, 1956, I addressed the Conference of Organizations on the United Nations, called by the American Association for the United Nations, on the subject of disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have this speech inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA, AT THE SECTION MEETING ON DISARMAMENT AT THE CONFERENCE OF ORGANIZATIONS ON THE UNITED NATIONS, CALLED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, FEBRUARY 27, 1956, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Chairman Bolte, Mrs. Roosevelt, Governor Stassen, and friends, it is a particular pleasure to be here today with you and to share this platform both with the President's personal representative in the field of disarmament and with the leaders of the great organizations throughout this country that are dedicating their talents and energies to these problems of overriding international importance. I see many friends in this audience; representatives from every area of American life—labor, business, agriculture, the professions, and our great organizations of fraternal and religious faith. Regardless of your particular interests, you are here because you believe that our country and its freedoms would not survive without a citizenship that was well informed. You are here to inform yourselves through your own deliberations and then to take that information back to the groups you represent. I know that you do not have to be recommissioned for that assignment, but it seems to me tremendously important that the flow of information to your constituency be most certain and most comprehensive. The job of our Government would be far more difficult if it were not for people with a sense of community responsibility—people who are at work constantly alerting and informing the public. Just as you have helped to inform others, including Senators and appointees of the President, it is the obligation of your Government to provide accurate and detailed information on all matters of foreign policy, national security and disarmament.

I say this in connection with all the manifold problems of national and international policy which now confront us. During the past few days you have been canvassing the broad issues of economic development, collective security, atoms for peace, and colonialism. Today we are turning our attention to the opportunity and the challenge of disarmament, but in doing so, I know we will not forget how interrelated all of these problems are.

This interrelationship was frankly recognized 10 years ago at the birth of the United Nations in San Francisco. The new world organization was dedicated not only to a peaceful world, but to a better world. Everyone acknowledged that security alone was not enough, even though progress in the long run would be impossible without it. Thus article 1 of the United Nations Charter spelled out the two major goals of the United Nations as follows:

1. "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace."

2. "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character."

Thus, there was an early admission that security alone was too hollow an objective. The delegates to the founding conference at San Francisco in 1945 knew in their hearts that security has meaning primarily for those who have something to preserve.

Therefore, as we concentrate on this subject of disarmament, let us never forget that

there are other immediate everyday problems that are simultaneously stirring the hearts and hopes of men and women throughout the world. If disarmament itself is to make any headway, people everywhere must have a clear idea of the kind of world that a disarmed world might be. There must be a great incentive. If the net effect of disarmament would be to freeze the status quo, to stifle change, to prevent the correction of existing abuses, much of its attractiveness would fade away.

Actually the pathway to disarmament may very well involve utilizing the great international agencies such as WHO, UNESCO, FAO, the technical assistance programs, capital development programs—all of which have a way of firming up the economies of the nations of the world—so that our international mental health is more conducive to a sane, sensible discussion of the problems of disarmament.

We must always remember that we live and labor in a world of revolution. Protecting and enlarging the freedom of the two-thirds of the world which is still outside Communist control will take more than military alliances to which we seem to be unduly addicted. It will take more than a stockpile of bombs, and more than threats to use them. It is a false notion, though widely held, that today's tensions and torments are entirely caused by the Soviet drive for expansion and that military deterrents, therefore, are the chief answers.

Aggressive Communist designs are, to be sure, in the forefront of our current foreign policy predicament, but this Communist threat occurs in the midst of a world-wide revolution for freedom and for material progress. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and South America, forces are now at work which will rank among the great movements of history, as important as the Renaissance and the Industrial Revolution.

More than a billion people are on their way to political self-determination, economic development, and human dignity. They are the so-called "underdeveloped nations" and many of them happen to be uncommitted to either side in the cold war.

The Communists have now recognized this Twentieth Century revolution and have sought to turn it to communism's advantage. They have sought to preempt it, to claim it, to own it, and to direct it. We, on the other hand, are today running grave risks of failing to take it adequately into account, and of failing to identify this revolution with our own historic tradition and continuing ideals.

Many of us have been deeply disturbed over the inadequacies of public understanding and of official policy on this new challenge now facing us. I am convinced, for example, that if we are to match the new Soviet political and economic offensive, we must reexamine and liberalize our approach to the underdeveloped—the uncommitted—nations of the world. In those nations the demands for self-government, human dignity, and economic progress are now irrepressible. We had better face up to that. Our own national history symbolizes these self-same demands. We will be faithless to our tradition if we neglect this new opportunity to help other nations reassert our common principles.

I am sure that the uncommitted peoples of the world have been impressed during the last few days with the President's dramatic step forward in sharing "atoms for peace." Let us hope, however, that our approach to peaceful atomic assistance to other nations will proceed within the framework of the United Nations. The President himself, in his famous "atoms for peace" speech to the General Assembly in December 1953, said that he "would expect that (an international atomic energy agency) would be set up under the aegis of the United Nations." We all know that bilateral arrangements may be helpful and at times essential. But I think it would be a mistake to concentrate on these bilateral arrangements as an exclusive pattern for atomic assistance. Too much bilateralism can detract from, and ultimately erode, the multilateral concepts which are the foundation of the United Nations.

The atoms for peace proposals are important to disarmament, too, because they foreshadow the kind of life that a peaceful, disarmed world would allow to mankind.

In turning to a discussion of disarmament itself, therefore, let us remember that neither it, nor the other problems that we have just mentioned, can be pursued in a vacuum. That is what is meant too by the warning which we frequently hear, that large-scale political settlements are the prerequisite to progress on disarmament.

It is a legitimate question to ask whether it is possible to think seriously of disarmament so long as the great powers find no ground for agreement on the basic issues that divide them. It is tempting, of course, especially after the many disappointments that we have suffered, to answer "No" to this question at the outset and let it go at that. We have had ample disillusionment in the past when disarmament negotiations have had to be broken off during the tension-ridden periods of the Berlin blockade and the Korean war.

It is quite true, therefore, that chances for disarmament may depend in part on the climate of the world political situation. It may be true, as some say, that no disarmament agreement can possibly be negotiated without a political settlement of the German question or the Formosan Straits question.

But to this question, as to most important questions, there is no simple answer. Undoubtedly, the prospects for disarmament are curtailed by the presence of thorny, unanswered political problems. It is equally true, however, that there are crucial divergencies of interests, important diplomatic conflicts, that cannot be solved, either, as long as the armament race goes on. It can be argued that they in turn cannot be brought close to a solution until the framework of a disarmament agreement is firmly established. I know that every person in this room is acutely aware of the danger of war which continues to confront us. I think we know or sense that another war, if it comes, may well destroy our civilization. Is it any wonder that people in this country are united in a deep revulsion to war? This revulsion is shared by people in Europe and Asia and elsewhere. I believe that it is shared by the peoples of the Soviet Union. It may be that an awareness of this revulsion has even penetrated the walls of the Kremlin. Mr. Khrushchev's speech to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party indicates that he is beginning to appreciate the fact—one which was not, may I say, recognized by his predecessor, Mr. Stalin—that it will not be capitalist countries alone which will be blown up in an atomic war.

This universal abhorrence of war gives us a base to build on. It does not, however, guarantee that we shall avoid a tragic conflict. We must come to grips with the specific problems which lead us to war. One of these problems is the rapid increase of armaments and the incredible increase in their destructive capacity.

It was a concern with this aspect of the problem that led me to introduce Senate Resolution 93, which set up a special Subcommittee on Disarmament. The challenge of this undertaking is enormous. I do not have any simple answers any more than do Mr. Stassen and the dozens of other people in the executive branch of the Government who are working on this problem. The work of the subcommittee has just begun. Certain fundamental principles, however, have already started to emerge. They are the principles which I believe should govern our approach to the problem of disarmament.

First, any disarmament agreement or proposal must, of course, protect the national security of the United States and other nations. It cannot have loopholes which give a potential agressor the advantage he needs to start a war and to win it. Each proposal must be carefully examined before we can be sure that our national security will be preserved. And what we do ourselves we must expect others to do. Protection of the national security is a function of all governments. We can expect others to pursue it at least as zealously as we do ourselves. I do not question their right to do so. I simply stress that we must be equally aware not only of our right but of our duty in this respect.

The protection of national security leads us directly to the second principle which must operate in disarmament negotiations. It is this: No proposal, no matter how good it looks and regardless of who proposes it, should lead us to let down our guard. Until the agreement or agreements are signed by all the necessary parties, until they can go into effect—and prove their effectiveness—the United States and its allies throughout the free world must maintain their proportionate defensive strength.

We cannot let the lofty words, our own or anyone else's, tempt us to think that now is the time to reduce essential expenditures for national defense when there is no armament reduction agreement. The time to disarm is after the agreement to disarm, and not before. No matter how appealing a balanced budget, it must not be pursued, as it appears to me it is now being pursued, at the risk of jeopardizing our capacity for defense or weakening friendly nations abroad.

I might add here that the actions of the United States in all of these areas—economic, military, and political—tend to set the pace. If allied nations see us thinking and acting primarily in terms of economy, they are likely to follow suit. If we shirk our responsibilities, they will do the same. Leadership imposes responsibility to lead—to set the pace—to establish the standards and the guidelines by clear and unmistakable policies and performance. I have yet to see the clear outlines of American policy on many vital subjects.

The third principle has to do with perhaps the most vital element in the maintenance of a democratic and self-governing society. This is the principle of an informed public. I know and you know that the men who are conducting disarmament negotiations, and planning military, atomic, and foreign policy are loyal citizens who have the interests of their country at heart. But they are not omnipotent. They are men with all of the limitations and weaknesses of men. They are not the sole judges as to what facts we should have and what developments might disturb us and discourage us from thinking that all is not well in the world. I have never thought that I needed to be spoon-fed by public relations men and neither do the American people feel that they need to be spoon-fed. Possibly we can't know everything that is going on, but we do need to know a lot more than we know now. There is a tendency here in America today, not only on questions of disarmament, but in virtually every activity of our Government to clamp the secrecy label on far too many items, to keep facts bottled up even after they are revealed and known in many other parts of the world.

The special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, hopes to conduct virtually all of its work in full

public view. There are far too many executive sessions in this city, ladies and gentlemen. There needs to be more open discussion. As chairman of this subcommittee, I intend to do everything I can to see to it that the important facts, the legitimate information on all phases of this subject, are published and made available and understandable to all Members of the Senate, and through them to the American people.

The fourth principle which must guide our approach to disarmament is sincerity—sincerity of purpose. By its very nature, the Soviet system of communism produces men fanatically clever in the art of deception, hypocrisy, and duplicity. There is always a danger that as a result of our frustrating experience of trying to deal with them, some of those responsible for carrying out our policy may tend to take on some of these same characteristics. In our struggle against communism we must be careful not to ape the totalitarian. In our efforts to win this great struggle against forces of tyranny, let us not take on the manners and the habits of the tyrant. Psychological warriors are not going to win either a war or a peace. They may win skirmishes, but they do so at the risk of losing for us the great issues. I should not like to see the day when this country begins to use words in matters of life and death in the fashion of the advertisers. There is no brand name for peace; it can't be spelled backwards. The peace and disarmament proposals which this country makes must be supported by the full conviction that they are workable, plausible, and that they will genuinely contribute to a solution of the basic problem.

As I see it, therefore, the efforts for disarmament are being advanced on three fronts: In the United Nations, the executive branch of our Goverenment, and the Congress of the United States. All of these are essential, if our hopes for effective control and restriction of armaments are to be realized as a practical achievement. The details of what is going on within the first two fronts come to me, as to you, from published reports, statements of our official representatives, and through the newspapers. Many of you have also had reports from your own official observers at the United Nations and your legislative representatives here in Washington. So if I concentrate the rest of my remarks on the Senate work and my views of what we may do, I hope you will understand why, because you have possibly much more information about the first two fronts than I have myself. I would hope that my good friend, Governor Stassen, would see to it that the executive branch does a little more proposing for us and for the world in this field of disarmament. Because after all the executive branch conducts the foreign policy of the United States and the Senate would have little opportunity to dispose if the executive branch never proposed.

With respect to the role of the United Nations, I am saying nothing new to this group when I say that we would not know nearly as much as we do today about the problems of disarmament and the efforts required to attain it if it were not for the United Nations.

But I am here in my capacity as a member of the Senate. It is well to remember that even if the executive branch came forth with brilliant plans, unassailable in their logic, and even if they were accepted by all of the members of the United Nations, they could not come into effect without the participation of the Congress of the United States. Now this is not to try to overawe you with our importance. It is merely to point up an essential feature of our constitutional system. It is also to remind you that the Senate cannot act effectively unless it is fully informed and has sufficient information to render sound judgments. This is the principal reason why last June, I introduced Senate Resolution 93 setting up this special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

The Senate cannot do the negotiating with foreign powers on the subject of disarmament. But we are a vehicle to make certain that the agreements reached will fulfill the needs of the American people and meet the test of acceptability by them. Furthermore, we in the Congress are a means through which the American people have an opportunity to express their views, their hopes, yes, even, their doubts of disarmament, and through which they may learn how present disarmament proposals can affect their future lives.

Now, a few words about this special committee. It is bipartisan: 12 members, 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. It would be premature to speculate now on the conclusions we may reach. But at the present time the subcommittee has three lines of approach.

First, we intend to have members of the executive branch discuss at public hearings the Government's policy on disarmament and to give us their appraisal of the possibilities of reaching a solution. Governor Stassen led the witnesses with his opening presentation on January 25. He will be followed on Wednesday of this week, February 29, by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. On March 7, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the United States Information Agency, will appear. On that same day, one of my colleagues, Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, will testify before the subcommittee. He has, as you know, dedicated much of his life to the disarmament cause. On March 15, these gentlemen will be followed by Secretary of Defense Mr. Charles E. Wilson, who will bring to us the critically important views of the Defense Establishment.

Then the subcommittee's second line of approach will be to hold hearings both here and outside of Washington so that we may have the benefit of the views of experts and informed, interested private organizations and citizens. These hearings, I believe, will be somewhat unique. They will be in two parts. The first part of the hearing will consist of testimony from experts, largely men and women at our universities who have made a special study of disarmament. They will be asked to summarize the results of their research and study and pool their knowledge in an effort to assist us in our work. The second part of the hearings will be devoted to those individuals and groups who wish to present their views to the subcommittee. We need to have a good cross-section of the ideas of the people of the United States on this question in all parts of the country and we intend, if possible, to go out and get it.

The third approach of the subcommittee is to commission a series of staff studies. Each will present an aspect of the problem of control and reduction of armaments. We hope that these studies will assist us and other interested Americans to understand more clearly the dimensions of the disarmament problem and the issues which arise from it. The first of these studies has already been published. It deals with the organization of the executive branch to handle disarmament questions. That study itself revealed some of the problems.

For example, I came to sympathize with Governor Stassen in his responsibility. In addition to the Governor's office, 3 executive departments with numerous subbureaus, 2 agencies, 1 commission, 1 mission, 1 council, and 2 boards are involved in disarmament matters.[1]

I hope that while you follow the work of this subcommittee you will also help us. I hope you will make known to us the conclusions that you reach here at this meeting, and I solicit these conclusions and recommendations. As leaders of some of the most important organizations serving the public interest there are contributions you definitely can make to peace and security of the world.

First, you can help by continuing to keep informed. I want to emphasize again that there are no shortcuts. There is a good deal of homework that has to be done by the American people in these crucial areas of national security, foreign policy and disarmament.

Second, you can help bring a sense of realism to the consideration of disarmament by reminding your members of the real dilemma posed by this question. One horn of the dilemma is that we cannot hope to have real peace so long as we and the rest of the world race to build more deadly weapons. The other is that we must not be led or tricked into unilateral disarmament which leaves us and the other free nations defenseless against a potential aggressor.

A third contribution you can make is to caution patience. Disarmament is as hard a problem as we have in the entire field of foreign policy. We Americans have often tended to believe that each defined problem carriers with it a possible solution. In the disarmament field, that might not be true even if each nation would define the problems the same way. A difficulty with disarmament, however, seems to be that definitions are often as lacking as solutions.

Patience can be helpful in this process. Perhaps patience will help in connection with the President's aerial inspection plan. The Government first talked about this in 1946.[2] In 1952 our deputy representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, described the use of aerial survey in a working paper submitted to the Commission on "Proposals for Progressive and Continuing Disclosure and Verification of Armed Forces and Armaments." Now the idea has been brought back to life in a somewhat different context. Perhaps patience will gain acceptability for it. That remains to be seen.

But patience is not an excuse for inaction or indifference. You are going to be discussing disarmament later on in small groups. I'd like to pose some questions for you to consider. They won't necessarily be easily answered. Perhaps some cannot be answered at all at this time. But they are questions which I have been asking myself, which my mail reveals, and which I would like to share with you.

Take, for example, the President's aerial inspection plan.

Can aerial reconnaissance alone detect each and every military maneuver of another country? If it can't, are we in possible trouble by proposing it or our accepting it? Should aerial inspection include the entire area in which a potential enemy has control or has control or has bases or has alliances? Even if we reach agreement on the principle of aerial inspection, some commentators contend that it is not fool-proof since there is no ostensible difference between a flight or bombers taking off on a training mission and one taking off with a load of H-bombs in the bomb shafts.

It has been suggested that progress on an overall plan for the reduction and control of armaments must be suspended until a way can be found to detect nuclear weapons which have been previously manufactured and then hidden. Does this mean we have to give up on trying to reach agreement on armed forces and conventional weapons too?

[1] Departments of Defense, State, and Justice; Central Intelligence Agency; United States Information Agency; Atomic Energy Commission; United States Mission to the United Nations; National Security Council; Planning Board and Operations Coordinating Board of the National Security Council.

[2] Description of aerial inspection contained in the First Report of the U. N. Atomic Energy Commission, 1946.

The aerial inspection plan is called a beginning. I believe it was said to be a gateway. Is this the only beginning that can be made? Are we to stand with this one proposal committing ourselves almost entirely to this one to the exclusion of others? We are told some of the best brains in the Government are working on this problem, but we have no plan except a proposal which is said at best to prevent a surprise atomic attack between two countries. And I want you to ponder that for a moment. The plan that we have today, which seems to be the core of the American disarmament proposal, if you can call it disarmament, is one merely of being able to ascertain what the participants may do to apprehend an attack.

The world applauded the President's initiative in making the open-skies proposal at the summit conference. But there have been indications since that the world is somewhat worried about our sense of followthrough. For instance, the distinguished French representative on the United Nations Disarmament Commission, Mr. Jules Moch, has flatly stated: "Never have I believed that a formula for control without disarmament would receive the unanimous support of the governments—any more than a formula for disarmament without control."

Mr. Moch himself has proposed a three-point objective for further disarmament conversations: (1) no control without disarmament; (2) no disarmament without control; but (3) step by step, disarmament over all activities that can be controlled.

It is my personal conviction that the situation requires a reexamination at least on the part of the western representatives at the new London conference, of all of the major proposals put forward by President Eisenhower, Prime Minister Eden, and the then Premier of France—Premier Faure—at the summit conference last July.

If we ever expect disarmament to come, we need the world working with us. We do not seem to have the world working with us now, as hard as it might. In all humility, I do not think we are pushing ourselves on this issue as hard as we should.

The Picasso peace dove symbolizes the beguiling success which the Soviet peace campaign has had in many areas of the world. Strangely enough among many millions of non-Communist people, the popular impression today is that the Soviet Union, not the United States, has been most insistent on halting the arms race. No impression could be more damaging to America's prestige abroad. And, of course, no impression could be more false. But, as one who has been in politics, I have found much—sometimes to my sorrow—that what people believe is not always the truth.

Since 1947 when the Soviet threat of aggression and subversion became fully evident to us, American policymakers have assumed that its nature and dimensions were equally evident to others. This led us seriously to underrate the effectiveness of Russian propaganda on peace and disarmament. The fact that much of the world has forgotten our own early imaginative proposals for atomic energy control and disarmament—and we were the first nation to make these proposals—is indicative of a major failure of our information program in recent years. It may also be indicative of the fact that louder and more strident voices have talked about dropping bombs and using massive retaliation rather than constantly emphasizing the potentialities of peace.

Let us reassert our leadership on this matter all along the line. We need the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations with us on this great issue of disarmament. I don't think we can make real progress without their help.

We are reassured that other nations are with us because they voted overwhelmingly in the United Nations General Assembly for the United States resolution on aerial inspection. But what are they themselves doing on this question? Have we encouraged them to make as full a contribution to the solution of this problem as we might? These questions are not rhetorical. They are asked in a most earnest search for help on this key issue. I shall be interested to see what your discussions produce.

In military language defense is often spoken of in terms of the long pull ahead. Well, I want to close on the theme of the long pull ahead for peace.

It is a mistake, in my judgment, to say that we are going to get disarmament this year or next year or the year after. It is a mistake to paint a smilingly optimistic picture of the prospects for peace. The disarmament problem, much less the total problem of peace, is not going to be solved either by wishful thinking by advertising or by half-hearted attempts. It will require hard work—sacrificial labor—at many points. It will require some fresh bearings for our foreign policy. I am confident, however, that if all of us in all sincerity devote our efforts to this question—if the people whose stake in this matter is life itself, if you who represent so many groups who have devoted years to the problem of world peace, if Governor Stassen with the boards and agencies of the executive branch, if the Senate and last but not the least, the United Nations—if all of us pull together we can begin to frame our hopes for peace with the realities of peace. We can give substance to the words of a man with whom I have not always agreed, but with whose words I should like to close.

In his remarkable speech before an American Legion convention in Los Angeles a year ago, Gen. Douglas MacArthur forcefully stated the central challenge ahead. He said: "We are in a new era. Old methods no longer suffice. We must break out of the straitjacket of the past. There must always be one to lead, and we should be that one. We should now proclaim our readiness in concert with the great powers of the world to abolish war. The result might be magical."

Indeed, it might.

Address of Vice President Nixon Before Brand Names Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President NIXON today delivered a most interesting and inspiring address before the Brand Names Day dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. I urge all my colleagues to read the Vice President's excellent and careful analysis of the leadership of President Eisenhower and his administration.

The address follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE BRAND NAMES DAY DINNER, THE WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 18, 1956

May I first join with you in congratulating the Brand Name Retailer-of-the-Year Awards winners. Before the evening is over, I hope to have the opportunity to meet and congratulate each one of you personally for the achievement so justifiably recognized this evening.

I must admit at the outset that I have had some difficulty in selecting an appropriate subject for this gathering.

A speaker should usually direct his remarks to a subject of particular interest to the organization which he is addressing. Unfortunately, my knowledge of the businesses and other organizations represented at this dinner is limited to that of the millions of Americans to whom brand names are household words.

It is true that I have had experience on both sides of the counter in that respect, having grown up in a family which operated one of those old-fashioned general merchandise stores.

And, as one who has sold products, as well as purchased them, I know you can't sell something unless you know what you are talking about.

That's why well-advertised, brand-name products were easier to sell. I knew about them, my customers usually did also, and less sales talk was necessary.

That's why I have tonight selected a subject I know something about—the record and philosophy of the Eisenhower administration.

I want to admit at the outset that my views will necessarily be biased by the fact that I am a member of the administration.

But I don't believe I am being partisan or prejudiced when I say that most Americans, regardless of party affiliations, are grateful to the man whose leadership has brought peace and unparalleled prosperity to America, and honesty, dignity, and integrity to Government in Washington, D. C.

In fact, the problem I was confronted with tonight, as always, was to select which field of accomplishment to discuss in the limited time I have.

With your permission, I should like to direct my remarks to the economic policies of this administration in terms of what they are, what they have accomplished, and what we can expect for the future.

We immediately are confronted with a problem with which you are far more familiar than I—what to call this policy—its brand name if you please. Because the Eisenhower economic policies which have been in effect for the past 3 years have been called from time to time both conservative and liberal, both Republican and Democrat, both Old Deal and New Deal, both moderate and radical.

As you know, better than I, in the final analysis, it isn't the name but the product that counts.

No better proof of the application of this truth in the field of politics could be found than an event that occurred last week.

Thomas Jefferson's birthday was celebrated on Friday, April 13. Democratic orators all over the country hailed him as a member of their party. But a study of history reveals that Thomas Jefferson was elected President in 1800 as the candidate of the Republican Party.

And when we consider his devotion to the rights of individuals and of the States, and his opposition to too much power in the Federal Government, I do not believe I am overstepping the bounds of objectivity when I say that if Jefferson were alive today he would probably be an Eisenhower Republican.

Therefore, before we can brand this policy we must examine the programs which have been executed under it, the results of those programs, and the philosophies behind them.

In January 1953 the President and his Cabinet were confronted with a basic and difficult decision in the field of economic policy. Here is what we found when we came into office:

Taxes and spending were at record peacetime rates.

Controls shackled the economy and more were being advocated.

Various messages to Congress by the President's predecessor had urged the adoption of

new programs in the fields of education, health, housing, agriculture, and power which would have carried the national economy further down the road to nationalization, federalization, and, in some instances, socialization of basic American institutions.

The decision we had to make was this—should we drift with what seemed to be the wave of the future or should we turn to more conservative policies?

Purely apart from the principle involved, there were strong political arguments for allowing things to go on as they were. Because, whether we like it or not, we must recognize that millions of Americans lost faith in conservative economic policies as a result of the great depression of the thirties.

They were convinced that those policies had brought on the depression. And they feared that a return to those policies might bring on another depression.

The problem was thoroughly debated in the Cabinet, and, finally, a basic decision was made.

In essence, we decided to give the free American economic system a chance to work. We based that decision on our faith that conservative policies were right in principle, and that if they were right in principle they would, in the end, prove right politically.

To implement that decision—

We removed controls from the economy.

We got the Government out of business, rather than putting it in.

We cut spending.

We cut taxes.

We adopted fiscal policies designed to encourage the initiative, the dynamism, and the ingenuity of the American people.

It will be many years before an accurate and objective appraisal of the major accomplishments of this administration can be made.

But I submit that when the history of this administration is finally written, no accomplishment will have been more significant, or more in the interests of the great majority of the American people than this: The danger of America following some of our friends abroad down the road which leads inevitably to socialization or nationalization of our institutions has been averted and the faith of the American people in businesslike, conservative conduct of Government economic policies has been restored.

Statistics are invariably dull. But, just for a moment, let us look at the record in terms of what has been accomplished.

Gross national product, personal income, labor income, savings deposits, retail sales are at all time highs. For the first time in recent history, the United States has enjoyed over 3 consecutive years of high prosperity, and records are being broken almost as fast as they are made.

Furthermore, we are not using rubber dollars as our measuring rods. When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, the index of living costs compiled by the Department of Labor stood at the level of 113.4. Three years later, the level was 114.6, a rise of 1 percent. Compare this if you will with the record of the 4 years preceding this administration when the rise was over 11 percent.

This means that today when wages go up, the profits increase, there is a real gain, not merely a money rise that is canceled out by higher prices. The tremendous increase in almost every sector of economic life is sound and well grounded.

I realize that sometimes our political opponents charge that this is a business administration. If they mean by this that government is running efficiently and well, we plead guilty to the charge.

We have done our best to give the country a good example of economy, industry, and integrity in the handling of Government affairs.

But, if the charge means that we favor the interests of business to the exclusion of other groups of the economy, we suggest that all Americans look at the record.

In 1952, there were those who said, "You have never had it so good." But let us make some comparisons between 1952 and 1955, not in terms of the economy as a whole, but in terms of the 65 million American wage earners.

In 1952, the average gross weekly earnings of a factory worker was $67. At present, it is $78.

In 1952, the take-home pay of the average factory worker with three dependents was $56. Today it is $62.

In 1950, 20 million persons owned their home. Today, 24 million homes are owner-occupied—an increase from 53 percent in 1950 to 58 percent in 1955.

The average life insurance policy in force per family has increased from $5,300 in 1952 to $6,300 in 1955.

What these figures mean is that wage earners today are better off than at any time in the entire history of the Nation.

How did this unprecedented prosperity come about?

From a political standpoint I would like to be able to claim all the credit for my party and the Government policies this administration has instituted during the past 3 years.

But to do so would not only be historically inaccurate; it would miss the great secret of America's economic progress from the time of our foundation.

What we must recognize is that under our system governments do not create wealth—people do.

We know that, in all fairness, the credit for America's great prosperity today must be shared among Democrats and Republicans, labor leaders and business executives, farmers and city folk, alike. Together they have brought about the changes that have made our economic system the model that it is today. In a real sense the achieving of the American dream has been the combined work of all Americans.

Yet, without in any way detracting from the other factors I have mentioned, I think I can state without fear of contradiction that the philosophy of government that has prevailed in Washington for the last 3 years has been the most important single factor in producing the good times we enjoy today.

That philosophy is not easy to describe.

There are many who ask what the difference is between the Eisenhower economic policies and those of the administrations which preceded this one.

The difference is not in goals. All Americans, regardless of their political affiliations, want better schools, housing, jobs, medical care, and more progress for all our citizens.

The difference is in means—how we achieve these goals.

And, as far as the difference in means is concerned, the difference is in where we start.

The administrations which immediately preceded the Eisenhower administration in Washington assumed in virtually every instance that Federal Government action was the answer to all social and economic problems. If more jobs were needed, the Government should create them. If better medical care was desired, the Government should provide it, and so on down the line.

In other words, they believed that if there was a social or economic problem to meet, the way to meet it was to begin with the Federal Government and work down.

We, in this administration, have exactly the opposite point of view. We say that the most effective way to meet social and economic goals is to begin with the individual and work up. We believe the Federal Government should step in only where individual action or State and local action is inadequate to do the job.

We hold to this view not only because we believe that individual action should always be encouraged rather than repressed under our system of government, but for the very practical reason that we know that in the long run this is the best way to meet social and economic goals.

Because, though whenever something needs to be done it always sounds easy to suggest that the Federal Government will do it, the difficulty generally with such programs is that they won't work.

For example, over the next 10 years, it is estimated that to keep pace with our growing population and insure continued progress and prosperity, we shall have to spend approximately $180 billion for schools, hospitals, power installations, roads, and slum clearance.

To meet these goals we must tap all the resources of America. If the Federal Government were to step in and assume full responsibility, State, local, and individual action would shrivel up.

That is why the Eisenhower Federal partnership program, which encourages State and individual action, will succeed where a program of Federal paternalism would fail.

We now come to a problem which I am sure will intrigue those in attendance at this brand names dinner: What do we call the economic philosophy of this administration which I have been describing?

I have used the word "conservative" tonight in describing it, but I realize that "conservative" during the early days of the Republic referred to those who advocated more power in the Federal Government. Now it tends to mean almost the opposite.

"Capitalism" is another word which is often used to describe the economic philosophy of this administration, but certainly the capitalism we have in the United States today is very unlike the capitalism we knew 50 years ago, or that which still prevails in some other parts of the world.

If it is capitalism, the term "consumers' capitalism" or "people's capitalism" would be perhaps more appropriate.

Ours is a capitalism in which owners, management, workers, the general public, and consumers participate and share.

We have witnessed a dispersal of economic power in the United States on a truly democratic scale. Main Street has displaced Wall Street as the controlling and dynamic force behind American capitalism.

The terms "middle of the road" and "moderation" have often been used to describe the administration's philosophy.

Does this mean, as the extremists contend, lack of firm principles in dealing with economic and social problems?

Certainly not. Because when we speak of "moderation" and "middle of the road" we are not speaking merely of a compromise between the left and the right.

Ours is a new approach to political economy.

Extreme individualism has rendered a great service in developing the Nation, but, in the process, it has rendered itself obsolete.

On the other hand, exclusive emphasis on Government action to meet social and economic needs, we find, inevitably leads to loss of freedom.

What then is the alternative?

What we have sought and what we believe we have found is not a compromise, but a living and dynamic synthesis.

In the past, private initiative had been primarily confined to the economic field and selfish ends.

But the mistake of those who opposed it was that they tried to liquidate private initiative, rather than to redirect its ends.

Social goals are of utmost importance, but the individual must remain the agent of his own destiny.

The middle way is to expand private initiative for social goals. We believe that private initiative is the dominant social force in a free society.

That is why in finding solutions to social and economic problems we always begin by exploring whether the problem can be handled by private initiative.

The role of government is to help the individual—not to make decisions for him.

Russell Davenport in his penetrating analysis of the American economic scene, "The Dignity of Man," which he left unfinished at his death, summarized this philosophy in these words: "No solution of any problem in a free way of life should be provided by calling upon the State to undertake tasks which under proper circumstances of education and encouragement citizens themselves can do."

In summary, what this little excursion into philosophy means to me is simply this. America is a great Nation today because our Founding Fathers recognized the supreme importance of the individual dignity of men and women. And, any administration which bases its policies on that fundamental precept, whether it be Democrat or Republican, whether it be called liberal or conservative, will help to make the American dream come true.

Less than 2 years ago President Eisenhower predicted that within 10 years economic production would reach a level of $500 billion in dollars of constant value. Many persons thought he was too optimistic when he made that prediction. But now it appears that we may attain this goal several years sooner.

This is not a wild prediction. I am simply projecting the rate of growth that we have recently been enjoying.

For all this, I repeat, the Eisenhower economic program deserves an important share of the credit.

The idea that government is the servant of the people is not a new idea, but the way that it has been applied in the last 3 years is new, and we are all better for it.

We have seen something rare in American political history—a government that is really dedicated to helping all the people—a government that rises above political considerations and class interests, and judges all its programs by one, and only one, norm—does this benefit all Americans, does it recognize, conserve, and protect the inherent dignity of every man, woman, and child in America?

As long as this is our goal and our philosophy, we can look forward with confidence to a fuller, richer, and brighter future for all Americans.

First Anniversary of the African-Asian Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 18, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the African-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia. I was privileged to be present. I rise today to commemorate that occasion by addressing myself to the problem of how we can win the uncommitted nations.

The uncommitted nations are centralized in southeast Asia. Southeast Asia is important because of its geographical location athwart communication lines and its enormous wealth in natural resources. Its manpower is capable of contributing significantly to world peace and prosperity.

Today all shipping between Europe and the Orient via the Indian Ocean must pass through either the Strait of Malacca or the Strait of Sunda. Control of these two southeast Asian straits gives dominance over a sea route that is comparable in importance to the Panama Canal route.

Furthermore, all intercontinental airways in the Far East traverse the southeast Asian area.

The successful advance of communism through China and well into northern Vietnam threatens the remaining southeast Asian countries with a more deadly form of colonialism than any the world has ever known. Extension of Communist control over the remainder of Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Burma, which together form Asia's rice bowl, would place most of the independent Asian nations in mortal danger. India, Ceylon, Japan, and Malaya, which are dependent upon that rice bowl for life itself, would have access to it only on Communist terms.

It was because of this that despite the attempts of the Department of State to dissuade me that I went to the Bandung Conference, April 18, 1955.

Now, as regards the Bandung Conference, let me be very specific and point out that the United States of America per se did not come out on top. The idea of democracy most definitely did. For the first time in the history of the world the Asian and African countries had an opportunity to go on record as to whether they wanted democracy or communism and they voted overwhelmingly for democracy. Because the United States has been the foremost exponent of democracy through all the years we naturally basked in the reflected glory.

Now, democracy does not of necessity have to win again in Cairo in 1956. On a significant question such as the admission of Red China to the United Nations, I believe that the Bandung conferees would have voted 17 to 12 against Red China. On this basis, I would say that 17 out of the 29 nations were committed to the idea of democracy. The 17 nations will not of necessity continue on the side of democracy. Very definitely, at the Conference, Cambodia and Laos were wooed close to the neutralists' camp. The future of South Vietnam is in danger. It is just possible that when the Conference meets again the forces against democracy plus the forces that are uncommitted to democracy might be in the majority.

Never, therefore, has any nation in the history of the world been confronted with such a great problem and with so little time in which to solve it as ours. And yet the very suddenness of this impact upon our Western World might greatly assist us in making the idea of democracy globally triumphant. Forces in Asia are compelling us to accelerate the timetable of democracy. An outstanding American paper cabled one of their correspondents in the midst of the Bandung Conference asking this correspondent to find out what were the opinions of the delegates from Asia and Africa concerning the Supreme Court's implementation of the decree to bring about integration in the public school system. This would be equivalent of asking an eastern Asian journalist in the United States to find out what the United States reaction was to the abolition of the untouchables in India or the signing of the agreement on dual citizenship of the Chinese and Indonesians. We know that these two questions were not explored in the slightest by correspondents here in the United States, but Bandung was of such importance that the American press wanted to know what was the attitude of the Chiefs of State of Asia and Africa on our own problem of racialism within our borders.

And so we come to this breathtaking moment when the United States of America, a modern colossus, stands astride western civilization with one foot at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and the other foot at Fort Knox, Ky., holding in our hands more gold than any other nation owns and more atomic energy than any other nation controls. We feel that we are all powerful. We sense that we are invincible. The voice of conscience has died. Where is there the still small voice to tell us that no man has ever lived by bread alone?

Congressman WALTER JUDD, distinguished missionary to China for many years, told me this story when I came back from Bandung. A very great Chinese leader said to him one day, "Yes, we need gold from the United States but we also want the roses." We are not going to be able to buy friends even though we have all the gold at Fort Knox at our disposal. We are not going to be able to frighten people into being our friends even though we possess the A-bomb and the H-bomb.

What does gold mean to vast sections of Asia and Africa where for thousands of years hundreds of millions of people have never even seen a piece of silver?

The possession of nuclear weapons did not help us. The specter of the H-bomb haunted the halls of Bandung. No single thing has done more to destroy trust in us than the explosion of the A-bomb at Hiroshima and the continuing experiments in the South Pacific. In other words, the very things upon which we place all of our pride and all of our faith in the future—gold and atomic power—these are utterly meaningless in the Far East and when misused are actually Trojan horses within our camp.

The time is getting short. The caravan of democracy will succeed there only to the degree that it comes with roses; with complete equality and with complete dignity for all men.

Matthew Arnold stood on the beach of Dover one day when the hordes of nazism were poised on the other side of the English Channel ready to destroy that fair isle and penned these words:

> We stand between 2 worlds, 1 world is dead and the other world has not yet been born.

Bandung was the womb from which the other world sprang. The President of Indonesia in his opening address called his address, Let a New Asia and a New Africa Be Born. And they were born: A potential for peace was unleashed by the peoples of the Far East. Now we have suddenly thrust upon us

full and certain knowledge that the old world is unmistakably dead, irretrievably gone. The shaping of the New World and the giving of content to it will no longer be monopolized by Western powers.

More than anything else our Christianity is on trial, too. The Asian-African Conference was a great parliament of the world's religions. The concept of brotherhood was stressed repeatedly. One speaker said:

If our religion, whatever it may be, does not allow us to get along with our brothers, regardless of what his religion may be, then our religion cannot be of much value.

Here in the United States, the forces of organized religion are still operating in a 19th century fashion in a 20th century world.

The powers of Caesar—the Supreme Court of the United States—have contributed much more effectively to the cause of brotherhood and to the cause of the recognition of the individual's worth than has the Christian church. Where the Supreme Court on one hand has abolished segregation in the public-school system, the United States of America still continues to practice segregation in its churches. The eminent Dr. Wade McKinney, of Cleveland, Ohio, said one day:

There is more segregation practiced in the United States of America at 11 a. m. on Sundays in our Protestant churches than at any other time in our Nation.

This then is the time for a great positive moral witness on each of us. We have lost this individual personal witness. We gave it over to the politicians in the field of civil rights. We abdicated our responsibility as churchmen to the paid professionals. Even though we go to church in droves, contributing as never before, we say "that paid professionals will take care of our religious responsibilities during the week," and we return to our ancient ruts of intolerance and prejudice.

The hour has been struck at Bandung for us to recapture our individual witness. The mantle of world leadership cannot become sheep's clothing. We must rise up and accept the responsibility regardless of the agonizing soul searching that must precede it.

We are a privileged people, privileged to live at one of the great crossroads that every now and then the force of history thrusts upon an unwilling world. Which way we should take depends entirely upon the individual choices made by American people up and down the main streets of our villages and hamlets and in our towns and cities. Capitol Hill cannot do it for us. The Supreme Court cannot be our personal witness. Individual, personal, moral witness must be made. The faith of our forefathers is not enough but the ferment of our forefathers is a deadly necessity.

And so, in far-off Indonesia on April 18, 1955, maybe America was brought back to the kind of arena that our forefathers lived in and died in. The men who stood at the rude arching bridge at Lexington and Concord were men dedicated to the idea of an individual witness. Black Crispus Attucks, striding across Boston Commons, refusing to bow his head to British colonialism and dying—the first American to die for freedom—was a dedicated revolutionary.

Bandung sent us forth on our way to a new world. As we journey as pilgrims to these new meccas, we cannot journey blithely as tourists but we must walk with the full weight of destiny on our shoulders. We must walk with the awesome knowledge that we have become the appointed prophets of democracy, that if communism shall envelope the earth it will be because we failed in these testing years to give a bold and free and untrammeled witness to the idea and ideals of democracy.

Across the broad earth's surging breast there comes a cry of 1,400 million people, why cry, in the language of Donald Grant, for "admission to the front door of modern mankind." We are the guardians of that front door. The marks of the fraternity of modern mankind are decent clothes, minimum creature comforts, abolition of disease, no illiteracy and above all, no patronizing condescensions. This, the entire world, all humanity, is determined to have. If the United States of America, meaning you and I, do not let them in, they are going around to the back door where Soviet Russia with blandishments and enticements is urging them to come. They do not want to go in the back door unless we refuse to open the front door.

The weakest spots in our democratic offensive is the Department of State. Our Asian-African foreign policy is being given to us second-hand through the foreign offices of the English, French, Dutch and other colonial powers. In other words, we, the foremost exponent of democracy in the free world, are evaluating Asia and Africa through the eyes and ears of powers which are being pushed out of Asia and Africa as fast as the natives can do it. This is why we have been behind the eight ball in so many places such as Indochina and the same tragedy is being repeated in North Africa as we follow this 19th century policy.

On Monday, May 9, I met at a top level off-the-record meeting with the key people of our Department of State. I will not be breaking any security rule by saying that one of those present insisted that Bandung was an anti-white conference. I spent quite a little time disputing his point. When I saw the President of the United States, Dwight David Eisenhower, on Wednesday, May 11, I mentioned this to him. It is not permissible to quote the President of the United States; nevertheless, I can state that he pointed out that this State Department position could not be true because we had so many friends at Bandung standing up and fighting for the United States. This is an obvious fact to anyone.

How could Bandung be antiwhite when democracy came out on top and the majority of the delegates were praising the United Nations and the United States? And yet, after the Bandung Conference it was still the considered opinion of one of our top career men that Bandung was a conference against the white people. I do not discount the possibility that Bandung can develop through the years into an antiwhite conference. If it does it will be because we of the western Anglo-Saxon world refused to give them the equality and the dignity which they and God demand that all people should have.

Another great mistake in the operation of our Foreign Service is the steadfast refusal of the Department of State, under Democratic and Republican administrations, to utilize colored Americans in embassy posts. When Mr. Eisenhower first became President of the United States I got hold of a confidential analysis of the Negro in the Foreign Service from the Department of State files. This is not marked "classified" nor "security" and I am going to release portions of it for the first time because I hope that by doing so American public opinion will be goaded into action to do some good. Page 7 of that analysis is as follows:

The above report represents considerable progress after much diligent work by the Office of Personnel. However, it is admitted that there is much to be done before it can be said that the Department of State has hired nonwhites fully and fairly and has utilized them to best effect in various parts of the world. There are only 55 Negroes among the 8,231 persons employed abroad in the Foreign Service. There are only 15 Negroes with upper-grade classifications among the approximately 6,700 departmental employees grade 7 and above who are in Washington, D. C. Small progress has been made in the hiring of Americans of Asian descent. Only 7 are known to be employed both at home and abroad. Present outlook for employment opportunities in the Department of State is not good.

Now it is important to realize that I am quoting from a State Department document so there can be no arguments about any discussion later. I would like to continue now:

Some further idea of the importance of such employment (nonwhites) can be seen in the experience of United States delegations to the United Nations. The presence of Negro members in recent delegations to the General Assembly of the United Nations has been a source of good will and stimulated confidence in the United States. Moreover, the division of opinion on many issues in the United Nations Assembly, especially in relation to human rights has sometimes tended to follow a color line, white against non-white, with Russia seeking to be recognized as the champion of the nonwhites. In such situations, the assurance that Negro citizens of this country may be found among the employees and representatives of the Department is a source of strength to the United States in the presentation of its foreign policy and achievement of its objectives.

After almost a year and a half had gone by, Mr. George F. Wilson, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel, wrote me from the Department of State:

I have your letter of April 8, 1954, regarding the employment of Negroes by the Department of State. I cannot make any observation on the accuracy of your figures as to the number of our Negro employees.

I was unable up until then and I have been unable since to find out what the picture is in the Department of State but I do know that if an analysis could

have been made by the Department of State in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, there is no reason why such an analysis could not be made now. In my White House conference with the President on May 11, I brought up this issue and I am happy to say that immediately he saw the psychological value of colored people serving in our embassies. After President Eisenhower instructed Mr. Maxwell Rabb, Secretary of the United States Cabinet, to confer with the State Department, an appointment was arranged. Mr. Rabb and I met with Mr. Loy Henderson, Under Secretary of State in Charge of Personnel, and although a year has passed, absolutely nothing has been done. This, I consider, open defiance of the President's orders.

Bandung has placed a time limit on indecision. It is absolutely impossible for the United States to continue to hope for any more support from the people of Asia and Africa if we continue to abstain on the question of colonialism before the United Nations. Congress on June 6, 1955, by record vote in the House of Representatives and Senate, established the following as a part of our foreign policy:

[84th Cong., 1st sess. H. Con. Res. 153]

Whereas Communist imperialism and other forms of colonialism constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man; and

Whereas the people of the United States have traditionally supported other peoples in their aspirations to achieve self-government or independence and in their struggle against tyranny or domination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should administer its foreign policies and programs and exercise its influence through its membership in the United Nations and in other international organizations so as to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-government or independence under circumstances which will enable them to assume an equal station among the free nations of the world.

Despite the fact that the foregoing resolution on colonialism was passed by both Houses of the Congress and thus became the law of the land, our delegates to the United Nations completely ignored this as indicated by the following votes:

Issues	For	Against	Abstained	Vote of United States
Cyprus—U. N. Assembly consideration of self-determination, Sept. 23, 1955.	28	22	10	Against.
Algeria—Question of U. N. considering French administration, Sept. 30, 1955.	28	27	5	Do.
West New Guinea—Placing the question of West New Guinea on U. N. agenda, Oct. 3, 1955.	31	18	10	Abstained.
South Africa—On the question to continue a special commission on the racial situation in South Africa and proposal to continue consideration of the subject, Dec. 6, 1955.	41	6	8	Do.

I am, therefore, requesting the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate to sharply question the appropriate officials as to why.

I recognize that Britain and France and other Western powers have for centuries stood at our side and fought with us, even though the fighting has ofttimes been our men fighting with them to protect their national sovereignty and integrity. I do not believe that for 1 minute we should turn our back upon these ancient allies. We should very vigorously and emphatically state that in Europe they are our allies and we can always be counted upon to give them the fullest measure of every kind of support.

I do believe that a historic break must be made and that we must just emphatically tell them that we can no longer support either with aid or with arms any form of imperialism sponsored by these nations in Asia and Africa. The cold stark fact confronts us that whether we take this stand or not, imperialism is finished. The natives, country by country are going to drive out the colonial powers and if we continue to stand with these powers on the question of colonialism then we are going to suffer diplomatic defeats. The full force of freedom is now sweeping over the earth and there are no powers that can stop it—short of a complete war of annihilation. This I don't believe the most rabid isolationist or warmonger would dare to suggest. From here on in the Western powers can no longer decide the fate of Asians and Africans without their leaders being present. There is a new group of powers in the world; the Eastern powers, and this group of powers wants to work in complete cooperation with us.

It is true that the United States has no colonies in Africa; yet we have a great responsibility as a permanent member of the Trusteeship Council, for the Trust Territories of the United Nations in Africa. The total population of these territories, excluding southwest Africa, is 15,433,339. The land area of these territories would be roughly comparable to all of New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

Since the establishment of the trusteeship system and the recognition of international responsibility for the freedom of dependent peoples, the United Nations has become the center of a struggle between the colonial powers, principally England, France, and Belgium, and the ex-colonial countries, principally India, Iraq, Egypt, Pakistan, and Indonesia. The colonial powers constantly seek to limit the scope of international responsibility under the charter and the ex-colonial powers ceaselessly attempt to broaden it. Probably no other subject has consumed more time or claimed more items on the agenda in the various meetings of the United Nations. The ex-colonial countries are highly responsive to any evidence that the colonial powers are not expediting the maturation of self-government within their colonies and trust territories. They feel a natural kinship with those people still in bondage.

The United States is one of the six administering powers in the Trusteeship Council. However, its territories are not as extensive and it is not traditionally a colonial power. Thus, in this power struggle, the United States has officially sought to take a middle moderating position between the colonial and ex-colonial points of view.

On the surface this seems like a correct policy. However, in practice, the weight of the United States has been preponderantly behind the colonial powers. The result has been that the ex-colonial countries have come to the conclusion that since the United States is generally found to be supporting the colonial power position where it really counts, that it, too, is a colonial power. The Russians have never lost an opportunity to make this point, for they are only too happy to drive a wedge between Asian and African countries and the United States.

A very important issue that has come up several times in Trusteeship Council and the General Assembly is that of target dates for self-government for trust territories. In two cases of Italian territories, Libya and Italian Somaliland, the General Assembly set actual dates for independence. As Italy was a defeated nation, her opposition to this was not taken seriously.

The suggestion that target dates be set for the other trust territories has been strenuously resisted by the colonial powers. In 1952 the General Assembly invited the administering authorities to give reports on measures taken to lead their trusts toward self-government and the period of time regarded as necessary to reach this goal. This request was repeated again in 1953, over the opposition of the administering powers, who opposed the recommendation on the grounds that it was impossible to foretell the date of independence. The United States abstained from this particular debate.

The issue was raised again in the 1955 report of the U. N. mission to Tanganyika which recommended that assurances be given to the people of Tanganyika that they would have their freedom within 20 to 25 years. The United States was a member of this mission and the United States representative initially supported this highly controversial recommendation. Under great pressure from the colonial powers, however, the United States reversed its support for such a target date. Clearly United States officials in principle support this policy of establishing target dates but find themselves overruled by the State Department, which regards this as a secondary issue but is under strong pressures from the colonial powers who regard it as a primary issue.

The United Nations Charter provisions on trusteeship did not make provisions for visiting missions. These missions have often been criticized by the administering powers for their inability to make profound judgments on the basis of a 6- to 8-week tour of a territory. The Trusteeship Council should, therefore, establish advisory councils in each trust territory. This would enable the Trusteeship Council to

play a more direct role in the supervision of the trust territories.

If the United States were to support the establishment of such advisory councils, the other administering powers would be hard put to refuse. This would be a highly strategic step for the United States to take at this time in expediting the movement toward self-government.

In the second place, racialism everywhere in the world must be speedily eradicated. This means that we must clean up our own house in the United States everywhere. The hard core of resistance based in the South must be dissolved. All Americans must become law-abiding citizens living according to the edicts of the Supreme Court, the orders of the President and the laws of our land. No Federal funds should go to any defiant State. In other words, stop subversion in our hearts and homes.

We must consider immediately the problem of South Africa and in the consideration of that problem we cannot afford, directly or indirectly, to allow the people there to think that we are in any way condoning the policies of segregation. If the rule of reason and order does not prevail, we should consider economic sanctions against the Boers. If the whole force of the United Nations is unanimously dedicated to eradicating racialism in the Union of South Africa, it will go. We need to realize that the Union of South Africa does not intend to stay within the British Commonwealth of Nations. They are anti-British and already they have announced that by 1958 they will withdraw and set up their own separate nation.

Thirdly, a thoroughgoing drastic reorganization of our Department of State, its Foreign Service, and all related activities should immediately take place. This is the showcase of America. Regardless of what we do within our borders, regardless of how we think, regardless of what public opinion may be unless the Department of State is actively projecting these things into the full arena of international diplomacy, international relationships, and international propaganda and education, then all we do here is nothing but sounding brass. The full impact of the American way of life in all its vast and progressively advancing fields is not being sold to the people of Asia and Africa. It is not being sold because there is a roadblock at the highest peak—and that roadblock is in the Department of State. The men in the Department of State are undoubtedly able and dedicated, but they are operating under the archaic 19th century system of evaluations and they are letting minor matters of protocol stand in the way of America giving the leadership the world so desperately and hungrily is demanding.

Mr. Dulles is our greatest deterrent. I suggest Stassen, Nelson Rockefeller, or Chester Bowles.

Fourthly, the Madison Avenue technique of selling is one of the great innovations of American life. This is the kind of technique that we need in the international field—bold, daring, new, fresh, vigorous, bringing a new impact each day, using every channel, every resource, every bit of our strength. Being fully conscious of our weaknesses and fighting the idea of communism with our greatest strength: the greatest idea—the idea of democracy. The Western World should not condemn what it does not understand. India and Burma's neutralism should be approached by the West in a new light. These countries are primarily interested in economic development and secondarily in strong military defenses.

Russia has taken the initiative away from the United States in southeast Asia. They make every punch count. Russia has a propaganda policy. The United States has none. It is time for a change. We must keep up our good work in an area of economic aid, but we need to appropriate a certain amount of money to strategically placed things. For example, to use an extreme point of view, Billy Graham advocates giving a white Cadillac to Nehru for its sheer propaganda and news value.

In order for the United States to wage effective propaganda war in Asia we must have one on the home front. We must make our people ready to accept new concepts of neutralist nations. Instead of scorning Burma and India we should let the American people know that neutralism is not an enemy—it should not be regarded as an enemy, but friendly action. Home-front plans of propaganda should be followed by a plan of action which is well coordinated. We need a bipartisan foreign policy that really works to make it effective at home and abroad—we do not have this policy today. Dulles and his aides seem to have no understanding of those problems. Too often our foreign policy is geared for the home front and is totally unrealistic. We must prepare the United States before we can go to southeast Asia.

Whenever we give aid to southeast Asia, whenever possible it should be administered through Asians themselves because we must recognize the sensitivity of these peoples to colonialism. We must help them build themselves up to resist communism; we must find unobtrusive ways to get credit for what we do. We might give a million dollars in aid but we should appropriate a share for administration by Asians and some for show purposes. We must coordinate our aid to these countries with their own plans. There should be no strings to our help. Those not wanting aid could be given low interest loans if they want them.

We should contemplate long-range aid, not sporadic aid. We have failed to convey the idealism of America to these people. We have become satisfied. We, not Russia, were the revolutionaries which these countries hoped to model themselves after. Our callous feelings toward them have resulted in our failure to convey our idealism to them. We are a young country and have more anti-colonialism than any other power in the world. Russia is a colonial power—her satellites prove this. The United States holds the torch of liberty but we do not let these people see it. We do not sell our ideas properly.

Fifthly, we must recognize as we go out to fight communism in the East that it is not sufficient to have military alliances. Even if communism were completely destroyed the ancient problems of the East would still haunt them as fearsome specters—colonialism, disease, hunger, and illiteracy. What value the complete destruction of communism in Indonesia when the average income of an Indonesian for an entire year, in the year of our Lord and Bandung was only $25?

What does it matter if communism is completely destroyed when the life expectancy for a man or a woman in India is only 32 years?

A foreign policy founded upon defeating communism alone may be of great value in the West but it is of very little value in the East. Yes, we must continue our fight against communism but we must expand our fight against the ancient problems of the East on all fronts.

Sixth, Africa is the No. 1 problem of our world. That dark, vast continent stretching for 5,000 miles is shaped like a question mark and it is. For there in Africa will be won or lost the world battle for freedom. This our Foreign Office is not aware of or, if so, is doing nothing about it. Communism in the West under the leadership of Soviet Russia and in the East under Red China is supposedly waving the flag of peace even if it is a little dirty and blood-stained. While they are doing this, north Africa and south Africa represent soft spots to establish new beachheads of subversion by Communist agents. We went to Africa centuries ago carrying a cross. It is time to go back to Africa again carrying an offer of full equality, dignity, mutual respect and direct and adequate assistance for social change. This is the only way to stop the wave of communism in Africa.

We need to channel as much of the aid that we give in Asia and Africa through international organizations. We know that the United Nations has a limited role but we should seek to build its strength through concrete demonstrations of our belief in its principles.

And lastly, with the full facts that I have presented indicating that the United States has no Far Eastern foreign policy except one founded on military alliances, let us for the first time in the history of the world sit down with the leaders of the people of Asia and Africa and work out an adequate Far Eastern policy.

This the last thought that I left with President Eisenhower—why not be bold and daring and call an eight-power meeting in Manila in the Philippines. This would, in my own words to Mr. Eisenhower, "just about annihilate the propaganda of Red China." What a day it would be for the forces of democracy and of peace for the President of the United States to sit down with the leaders of Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines. This has never been done in all our history before. This alone proves the inadequacies of our foreign policy. The Presidents of the United States have

been holding historically for years Big Four, Big Five, and Big Six meetings all over Europe but never have they held a meeting with the leaders of Asia and Africa. Bandung was an invitation for this. I and members of the press talked to chiefs of these states and they indicated that they would be extremely well disposed to meet for a summit talk in the East. Gen. Carlos Romulo on Meet the Press on Sunday, May 8, said:

The President of the United States should come to the East and talk to the Asian leaders.

There is not much time left to do this. The world is moving with a startling rapidity that transcends not only the visual but even the imaginative. With our Yankee courage, our Madison Avenue know-how, our Christian heritage and the bulwark of the Bill of Rights, in back of us, using our 25 million colored citizens as a spearhead, we can launch a drive for peace and for full equality now in the Far East. Only through such a bold maneuver can we win. History will pass us by if we do not.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, guardian of these pilgrim days, the hurrying pace of our fleeting years frightens and awes us. Strained and tense with the pressures of our burdened lives we seek the shelter and strength that undergirds us, as Thy completeness flows round our incompleteness. As for this moment of quiet we look away from ourselves and our tasks to Thee, Thou judge of all men, strip us, we beseech Thee, of our disabling illusions, chasten us for our willful blindness. In the performance of this day's duties may we ascend the hill of the Lord with pure hearts and clean hands. In a tangled and tragic day lead us in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake.

As comrades of like passions as ourselves walk by our side, make us tolerant and charitable in our attitudes to those who may differ from us in conviction and opinion. As sometimes we may question their judgment, save us from impugning without cause their sincerity and integrity. We ask it in the name of that One who warns us: Judge not, that ye be not judged. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAYNE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 18, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 18, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 2438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; and

S. 3269. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Ryder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 1956.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10387) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, the Minerals, Materials, and Fuel Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the finances of the Federal Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON VETERANS CANTEEN SERVICE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Veterans Canteen Service, Veterans' Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (IN LIQUIDATION), ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF PENTAGON ROAD NETWORK

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize funds for the improvement by the Secretary of Commerce of the Pentagon Road Network and that portion of the Henry G. Shirley Memorial Highway in Arlington County, Va., and to provide for the transfer of such highways to the Commonwealth of Virginia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond in the city of Springfield

"Whereas on or about August 18, 1955 the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond, in the city of Springfield, was damaged and the top four courses of masonry show disalinement and permit passage of water at the joints, said condition making the dam unsatisfactory for its designed purpose; and

"Whereas in addition to the aforesaid damage the flashboards of said dam were washed away from the crown thereof; said boards having been a permanent wooden installation 2½ feet high permitting additional water retention above the designed top of the masonry dam; and

"Whereas, disruption of the flashboards permitted the water retained thereby to be immediately released into the brook channel causing damage along the lower extremities of the Mill River; and

"Whereas because of the damage to the masonry portion of said dam the water impounded thereby was released through the sluice gates which are a structural part of said dam; and

"Whereas the release of this water has created a condition where only the normal flow of the stream known as the Mill River passes through the brook bed above said dam and there is no appreciable impounding of water in said pond at this time; and

"Whereas the damage to said dam and the resulting lack of water in said pond causes an unsightly condition and results in loss of property value in the adjoining area and further results in the loss of recreational facilities formerly offered by said pond; and

"Whereas the properties surrounding said pond were developed, and the residences and other buildings thereon were erected in relation to the normal elevation of the surface of said pond, with the reasonable expectation that said elevation would be permanently maintained; and

"Whereas the said dam has been under the control of the United States Army for more than 100 years and the United States has a moral obligation to repair the same: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money for the repair and reconstruction of said dam to the height at which it was, including the height of flashboards, prior to said damage; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress from this Commonwealth, and to each member of the appropriate Committees on Appropriations."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of H. R. 7225, the social-security bill, and so forth; to the Committee on Finance:

(See resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) on April 18, 1956, p. 6452, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A statement, in the nature of a memorial, from the National Lawyers' Guild, New York, N. Y., relating to the appearance of Philip Wittenberg as a witness before the subcommittee of the Internal Security Committee of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the national society, Sons of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., reaffirming its faith in the McCarran-Walter Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A statement, in the nature of a petition, from the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, favoring the withdrawal of the United States as a member of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSTITUTION DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of trustees, national society of the Sons of the American Revolution, in Washington, D. C., relating to Constitution Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., ON FEBRUARY 25, 1956

Whereas the national society of the Sons of the American Revolution has for many years fostered and promoted throughout the Nation special observance of Constitution Day on September 17, with a resulting constantly increasing interest in and attention to the great fundamental principles of our Government emphasized by this immortal document; and

Whereas as a result of a joint resolution introduced in the Senate of the United States by our distinguished compatriot Senator KNOWLAND, of California, and unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress, and the proclamation issued in response thereto by the President of the United States designating the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1955 as Constitution Week, there was a largely increased interest and participation in this observance; and

Whereas Senator KNOWLAND on January 5, 1956, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 105 authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week, and to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of trustees of the national society of the Sons of the American Revolution, That we express to Senator KNOWLAND and to President Eisenhower our sincere appreciation of their patriotic actions relative to the celebration of Constitution Week in 1955; and that we further express to Senator KNOWLAND our deep appreciation of his action in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 105, looking to continued and annual emphasis on the meaning of our great fundamental document; be it further

Resolved, That we direct the sending of a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Senate with a personal letter from our president general expressing the deep interest of the society in the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 105; and that we request the officers of each State society and local chapter to express to their Senators and Representatives our interest in the passage of this resolution.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition signed by Harold Curtis and 23 other citizens of my State, expressing their opposition to S. 2, the so-called universal military training bill, and Senate Joint Resolution 19, relating to narcotics, and their support of S. 923, relating to the advertising of alcoholic beverages, and S. 2845 and S. 3039, which have to do with the sale or consumption of alcoholic beverages on planes.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned members and friends of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Ferndale, Wash., do wish to declare ourselves as opposing or favoring certain bills as follows and we do urge that you give us your support in these matters:

We oppose:

S. 2, the Legion draft-UMT bill.

Senate Joint Resolution 19, PAYNE, of Maine, to transfer Bureau of Narcotics.

We favor:

S. 923. LANGER, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce and over the air of alcoholic-beverage advertising.

S. 2845. Thurmond, to prohibit service or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military aircraft.

S. 3039. NEUBERGER, to prohibit sale, service, or consumption of alcoholic beverages on commercial or military planes.

Mrs. W. R. Sager, Ferndale, Wash.; Mrs. R. L. Brant, Bellingham, Wash.; Grace Sullivan, Bellingham, Wash.; Mabel D. Pearson, Mrs. Velma Widman, Mrs. Edith Pehrson, Mrs. Fannie McGuire, Mrs. Jennie Andersen, Minnie Norgaarden, Mrs. Edith M. Gunderson, Mrs. Lisa Andres, Mrs. Edith V. Larsen, Mrs. H. H. Lewis, Mrs. Bertha M. Burrows, Alice P. Lewis, Ferndale, Wash.; Thelma E. Nelson, Bellingham, Wash.; Bertha Amundson, R. H. Funkhouser, Mina Willand, Gertrude Hall, Mrs. Harold Curtis, Mrs. Audrey Owsley, Mary LeCocq, Harold Curtis, Ferndale, Wash.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 9078. An act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers and members; without amendment (Rept. No. 1789).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 7993. An act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1790).

REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FISCAL STATUS (S. REPT. NO. 1788)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, pursuant to Senate Resolution 57, submitted a report entitled "Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration Fiscal Status," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3682. A bill for the relief of Michael Wierzbicki; and

S. 3683. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Mary Hinder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3684. A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal penitentiary at Bismarck, N. Dak., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 3685. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the States or Territories relating to the confinement, care, or treatment of Indians who have been convicted of penal offenses, or who are juvenile delinquents or offenders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3686. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on or adjacent to Indian reservations in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 3687. A bill for the relief of Vera Wisner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3688. A bill for the relief of Paul Er (Ear) Chen and Lydia Chen, nee Shih Ming Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3689. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the national system of interstate highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 3690. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Finelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 3691. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to deed certain land to the city of Grand Junction, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 2, 1956, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduced the bill (S. 3119) to provide that certain survivor benefits received by a child under public retirement systems shall not be taken into account in determining whether the child is a dependent for income tax purposes. Our bill provides that for the purpose of determining dependency for tax purposes, up to $600 of social security or other public assistance benefits for children could be deducted by the taxpayer. Because the purpose of the bill is to protect social security benefits, which are themselves tax-exempt I now offer the bill as an amendment to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment be taken up and considered by the Committee on Finance with H. R. 7225.

Mr. President, it is a shocking fact that there are 2 million children in America whose fathers are dead. More than half of them receive social security benefits of between $288 and $624 a year. For each child the mother must show that she contributes more than half of the child's support, or more than $288 to $624 a year. The average income of families headed by women is $2293. Clearly, many widows find it impossible to show that they provide more than half a child's support if the child is receiving between $288 and $624 in social security benefits. The loss of the exemption is a very serious matter in these families, and I feel certain that this effect of the benefit for children was not intended by Congress, since we made the benefit itself tax-exempt.

I therefore ask that the amendment be favorably viewed by the Finance Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 203. (a) Section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of the term "dependent") is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Special Support Test in Case of Children Receiving Survivor Benefits Under Public Retirement Systems—For purposes of subsection (a), in the case of any individual who is—

"'(1) a son, stepson, daughter, or stepdaughter of the taxpayer (within the meaning of this section), and

"'(2) a surviving dependent child under a public retirement system, amounts received by such individual, or by any person in respect of such individual, under one or more such public retirement systems shall be taken into account in determining whether such individual received more than half of his support from the taxpayer only to the extent that the total of such amounts received during the calendar year exceeds $600. For purposes of this subsection, the term "public retirement system" has the meaning given to such term in section 37 (f).'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply in respect of amounts received after December 31, 1956."

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3243) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Act, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF NATIONAL SOIL, WATER, AND FOREST RESOURCES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3651) to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced on yesterday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], for himself and other Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the award dinner of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, in New York City, on April 17, 1956.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1188) to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks, which was, on page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "each two-year period beginning January 1, 1955" and insert "any two-year period."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, some weeks ago the Senate passed S. 1188, authorizing the Comptroller of the Currency to waive 1 of the 2 annual examinations of national banks as required by law, but not more frequently than once during each period of 2 years. The bill comes back from the House with a technical amendment, to make sure that what is meant is that the Comptroller of the Currency cannot waive an examination of national banks more than once in each 2 years.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has conferred with the distinguished minority leader and with the majority leader. We are in agreement that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF RED WILLOW DAM AND RESERVOIR AND WILSON DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1194) to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That administrative jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., an authorized unit of the Missouri River Basin project (act of Dec. 22, 1944, sec. 9, 58 Stat. 887, as amended and supplemented), is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior and jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., another authorized unit of the same project, is hereby transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of the Army. The principal purposes of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir shall be those of making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and of assisting in the control of floods, and the principal purposes of Wilson Dam and Reservoir those of flood control and of assisting in making available a regulated supply of water for irrigation and low-flow regulation: *Provided*, That no expenditure of funds shall be made for construction of such projects until the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and the Secretary of the Army, in the case of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., with the approval of the President, have submitted to the Congress completed reports demonstrating such projects to be economically justified, and the Congress has approved

SEC. 2. Both the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cause these units of the Missouri River Basin project to be coordinated and integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plans approved by section 9 of the act of December 22, 1944, aforesaid, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Army shall, in the case of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for flood-control regulation as provided in section 7 of the act of December 22, 1944, and the Secretary of the Interior shall, in the case of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, be responsible for the disposal of water for irrigation or space reserved for this purpose in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1194, to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

The bill was designed to transfer jurisdiction over the proposed Red Willow Dam, Nebr., to the Bureau of Reclamation and over the proposed Wilson Dam, Kans., to the Corps of Engineers, under the Secretary of the Army. The provision represents an exchange of jurisdiction betwen the two agencies for the construction and operation of the two dams, both of which are in the coordinated Missouri River Basin project, authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Red Willow Dam will be in an area in the Republican River Valley, where reclamation has the predominant interest because of the irrigation potentials. Wilson Dam will be in the Saline River Valley in Kansas, where the Corps of Engineers has predominant concern for flood-control problems.

The House approved the principle set forth in the Senate bill and, by amendment, requires that no construction expenditures shall be made on either dam until, with approval of the President, the agency shall have submitted to the Congress completed reports demonstrating the economic justification for each of the developments. Approval of the Congress of each report is required.

The committee understands that basic data in connection with the economic justification for the Red Willow Dam is in the hands of the Bureau of Reclamation, and that there should be no delay in submitting a report to the Congress. We are not advised as to the status of the Corps of Engineers' information on Wilson Dam, but understand both Reclamation and the Corps have considerable data available. Unless there is some sound reason for so doing, there would seem to be no reason for either agency to redo the work already done by the other.

The committee is advised by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], chief sponsor of S. 1194, after consultation with his colleague [Mr. HRUSKA], that they are agreeable to acceptance of the House amendments, but are anxious that a prompt report shall be made, so that construction of Red Willow Dam may proceed. The two Kansas Senators [Mr. SCHOEPPEL and Mr. CARLSON] likewise advise that they hope the Corps of Engineers will expedite its report on Wilson Dam to the same end.

The second amendment perfects the title of S. 1194 to conform to the bill, as amended.

I believe that both the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will agree with me that this is a desirable measure

to which the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously gave its approval.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As I understand the situation, if we agree to the amendments which have been adopted by the House, the Wilson Dam, which originally was authorized as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation program, will now be transferred to the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. And the reverse will be true of the Red Willow Dam, in Nebraska.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Is there any report by the Army engineers on the progress being made on the Wilson Dam?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, there is not. We know the Bureau of Reclamation has made progress, and we know that the Army engineers have been at work, but we do not have information regarding how far along the work has gotten. Part of the confusion has been due to the uncertainty as to jurisdiction.

If this measure is enacted, the work will proceed more rapidly; and we are anxious to have that done.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am thoroughly familiar with the Wilson Dam project, in Kansas; and I think the change now proposed is one which should be made in the interest of both agencies. So I am very happy that the Senator from New Mexico advocates our concurrence in the House amendments.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of all the premises, I favor our concurrence in the amendments which have been adopted by the House.

I have only one question to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico: Is it the intention that when the reports showing the feasibility are submitted to Congress, at that time these projects will be taken up separately? In other words, if one runs into considerable delay, that will not mean that the other will also be delayed, will it?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is the present proposal that they be considered as if they were entirely separate projects.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1194.

The motion was agreed to.

"MOTHBALL" ACRES URGED

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday several bills were introduced in the Congress providing for the establishment of a soil bank as a part of the farm program.

One of the early and original advocates of a program of this type was Dr. Raymond W. Miller, of Washington, D. C., and presently a lecturer at the Harvard Business School.

Dr. Miller's program is one that would compensate farmers for taking land out of production, and he states, "putting land in mothballs," and keeping it ready for future production by proper conservation methods.

Dr. Miller has been actively interested in and associated with agriculture for many years. An article he wrote, entitled "'Mothball' Acres Urged," appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Tuesday, July 20, 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MOTHBALL" ACRES URGED

EAST LANSING, MICH.—Retirement of cropland to fallow or nonproduction in a national program that will assure "acres for tomorrow" is the sanest and cheapest method for solving America's surplus-crops dilemma, Dr. Raymond W. Miller, visiting lecturer at the Harvard Business School, told the 280 editors assembled here for the 1954 convention of the American Association of Agricultural College Editors.

"Scientists, economists, and politicians have all tried to solve the American farmer's overproduction of grains, oil seeds, and fibers. We have failed, Dr. Miller alleged, because we haven't gone back to look at the faucet and see whether it can be turned off. While we have taken crops out of production through acreage controls, we often have planted the same acres to another crop, creating another surplus rather than keeping the land out of total commercial production.

As a result, we have developed extremely bad public relations both at home and abroad. The farmers of Europe and Asia conclude we are either very stupid, or are stockpiling for world war III.

Dr. Miller would have farmers compensated by the Federal Government for taking land out of production—"putting land in mothballs," he called it—and keeping it ready for future production by proper conservation methods. This kind of expense would cost, at a guess, perhaps less than half the present type of farm subsidy which has resulted in piling up surpluses. His project would be voluntary, Dr. Miller said. Farmers, many of whom have land they have bought as a hedge against inflation, would sign up for the mothballing payments.

The farmer would get a small return on his investment, not to exceed 3 percent, which must be spent for soil-improvement practice.

"This project would literally turn off the faucet," Dr. Miller said, "instead of trying to solve the problem with buckets and mops. We would be better off nationally to spend some money for this type of program rather than spending the millions of dollars we are allocating at the present time to warehousing crops we don't know what to do with."

Since counties and States need tax money for school and highway maintenance, he went on, the Federal Government should pay taxes on all land voluntarily retired from the production of surplus crops. This, he believes, could be worked out in an allocation program, State by State. He emphasized that it should be a voluntary act on the part of the owners and should result in taking out of production much land held by absentee owners for speculation, which now only adds to surpluses.

"Such a program might be called acres for tomorrow," he said. "That is precisely what it would be. Our population is growing and may go to 275 or 300 million during the next century. There will be an acute need then for more good cropland. Acres for tomorrow would also be a vital reserve during times of national emergency, such as the war we all pray won't come."

A California farmer for many years, Dr. Miller is an internationally recognized authority on farming and on agricultural relations. He was president of the American Institute of Cooperation from 1945 to 1947. He returned this spring from a six months' investigation of Asia's rural problems and leaves this week for similar duties in Newfoundland, Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland.

INVASION OF SCENIC REGIONS BY LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the RECORD a news article from the Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., of April 9, 1956, describing a speech by Mr. A. F. Hartung, president of the International Woodworkers of America, before the Northwest Wilderness Conference held in Portland.

In that speech Mr. Hartung expressed the opposition of himself and his membership to any policy which would invade such scenic regions as the Olympic National Park and the Three Sisters Wilderness Area in an effort to secure more timber for the production of lumber. By taking this fine stand, Mr. Hartung has placed the welfare of our scenic outdoor resources above a temporary payroll gain in dollars for his own members. This is an enlightened, unselfish and courageous stand which merits the support of us all.

There are those who would strip off our forests in order to gain a temporary financial advantage. Yet such a policy would be adverse to the welfare of future generations of Americans. For that reason I believe that Mr. Hartung's address and the very favorable reaction to it among the delegates to the Northwest Wilderness Conference should be called to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IWA HEAD HITS WILDERNESS EXPLOITATION

(By Bill Hulen)

Although recognizing the importance of temporary payrolls which would be created through industrial exploitation of wilderness areas, labor feels that in the long run these areas will be of much more importance in the field of recreation for the working man and woman.

This was the key remark of a talk Sunday by A. F. Hartung, president, International Woodworkers of America, at the concluding session of the 2-day Northwest Wilderness Conference at the Multnomah Hotel.

With the coming of automation and atomic development, laboring people will have more and more leisure time in which to seek outdoor recreation, and "it is our responsibility to see that we preserve and increase the areas where this is possible," Hartung declared.

Hartung hit at what he called "the greed of certain individual industrialists" who would exploit these areas for dollars instead of cooperating in attempts to preserve them. He said labor "is willing to work to protect what we now have, and to even increase these areas."

LABOR POSITION APPLAUDED

Several members of the audience of more than 200, including Rollin E. Bowles, State

president of the Izaak Walton league, got on their feet to commend Hartung's labor organization for its support in the Three Sisters and Olympic Park hearings, and for its work in behalf of the Save the Deschutes and Save the McKenzie programs.

While admitting there is some conflict between the forest-growing and harvesting interests with the wilderness concept, Ed Heacox, managing forester, Weyerhaeuser Timber Co., said that, perhaps, at some future date his company might concede that certain areas of virgin timber on public lands should be set aside as wilderness area, and so publicize that position.

Heacox took mild exception to a remark from the floor intimating that only the wilderness people were conservationists. He cited the timber industry's program of reforestation in order to perpetuate the forests.

The timber company executive said the industry takes a dim view of land dedicated to a special use, and asked: "What portions and types of public lands should be set aside for special use by a small minority of the people?" The question went unanswered.

John McKean, chief of the game division, Oregon game commission, said there was a better chance that game management and the wilderness concept could be compatible than conflicting, and declared that both groups were interested in high-quality recreation.

He said, however, that both the Oregon and Washington game departments undoubtedly would oppose any proposal to withdraw land on the Wenaha big game winter range for wilderness area purposes. He said an elk problem there made it necessary that these animals be adequately harvested.

W. H. Oberteuffer, Boy Scout leader, talked on the values of wilderness to American youth, and showed color slides of scenic areas taken in the high Cascades while on trips with Boy and Girl Scouts.

HUMAN VALUES STRESSED

Human values of wilderness were discussed by Fred M. Packard, executive secretary, National Parks Association, Washington, D. C., and scientific values by James Kezer, department of biology, University of Oregon. Kezer said the Three Sisters area offers a vast outdoor laboratory for the scientific study of plant and animal life. Packard declared the intangibles of wilderness were more important than the tangible assets.

David R. Brower, San Francisco, executive director, Sierra Club, received the National Parks Association award for distinguished service in behalf of the national parks and monuments. Brower took an active part in the Echo Park Dam controversy.

PATRIOT'S DAY—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who now occupies the chair as Acting President pro tempore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOT'S DAY STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

Today marks the 181st anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. This day is a public holiday in my State and in Massachusetts. I believe that it is a fitting time for this great body, and, indeed, for all Americans, to pause and reflect upon the early events in our Nation's struggle for independence. The actions of our forefathers nearly 2 centuries ago, in those little Massachusetts towns, have inspired and kindled in people everywhere down through the years the spirit to answer the call of freedom. The course which they followed, the ideals for which they died, and the ultimate victory which, with God's help, they achieved, leave us as a Nation and as a Republic a heritage far greater than that enjoyed by any other people in any other time in history.

Many times since 1775 we have stood by the "rude bridge that arched the flood" as indeed we do today. The Spirit of '76 can well be applied to Patriot's Day, 1956, for in this troubled and uneasy time, freedom-loving people everywhere are turning to America for the strength and guidance necessary to preserve their integrity and sovereignty as nations. We cannot, we must not, fail them.

I should like to conclude my remarks with the well-loved poem The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere, by Maine's great poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:

"PAUL REVERE'S RIDE

"(By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow)

"Listen, my children, and you shall hear
Of the midnight ride of Paul Revere,
On the eighteenth of April, in Seventy-five;
Hardly a man is now alive
Who remembers that famous day and year.

"He said to his friend, 'If the British march
By land or sea from the town tonight,
Hang a lantern aloft in the belfry arch
Of the North Church tower as a signal light,
One, if by land, and two, if by sea;
And I on the opposite shore will be,
Ready to ride and spread the alarm
Through every Middlesex village and farm,
For the country folk to be up and to arm.'

"Then he said, 'Good night!' and with muffled oar
Silently rowed to the Charlestown shore,
Just as the moon rose over the bay,
Where swinging wide at her moorings lay
The Somerset, British man-of-war;
A phantom ship, with each mast and spar
Across the moon like a prison bar,
And a huge black hulk, that was magnified
By its own reflection in the tide.

"Meanwhile, his friend, through alley and street,
Wanders and watches with eager ears,
Till in the silence around him he hears
The muster of men at the barrack door,
The sound of arms, and the tramp of feet,
And the measured tread of the grenadiers,
Marching down to their boats on the shore.

"Then he climbed the tower of the Old North Church,
By the wooden stairs, with stealthy tread,
To the belfry-chamber overhead,
And startled the pigeons from their perch
On the sombre rafters, that round him made
Masses and moving shapes of shade,
By the trembling ladder, steep and tall,
To the highest window in the wall,
Where he paused to listen and look down
A moment on the roofs of the town,
And the moonlight flowing over all.

"Beneath, in the churchyard, lay the dead,
In their night-encampment on the hill,
Wrapped in silence so deep and still
That he could hear, like a sentinel's tread,
The watchful night-wind, as it went
Creeping along from tent to tent,
And seeming to whisper, 'All is well!'
A moment only he feels the spell
Of the place and the hour, and the secret dread
Of the lonely belfry and the dead;
For suddenly all his thoughts are bent
On a shadowy something far away,
Where the river widens to meet the bay—
A line of black that bends and floats
On the rising tide, like a bridge of boats.

"Meanwhile, impatient to mount and ride,
Booted and spurred, with a heavy stride
On the opposite shore walked Paul Revere.
Now he patted his horse's side,
Now gazed at the landscape far and near,
Then, impetuous, stamped the earth,
And turned and tightened his saddle-girth;
But mostly he watched with eager search
The belfry tower of the Old North Church,
As it rose above the graves on the hill,
Lonely and spectral, and sombre and still.
And lo! as he looks, on the belfry's height
A glimmer, and then a gleam of light!
He springs to the saddle, the bridle he turns,
But lingers and gazes, till full on his sight
A second lamp in the belfry burns!

"A hurry of hoofs in a village street,
A shape in the moonlight, a bulk in the dark,
And beneath, from the pebbles, in passing, a spark
Struck out by a steed flying fearless and fleet:
That was all! And yet, through the gloom and the light,
The fate of a nation was riding that night;
And the spark struck out by that steed, in his flight,
Kindled the land into flame with its heat.

"He has left the village and mounted the steep,
And beneath him, tranquil and broad and deep,
Is the Mystic, meeting the ocean tides;
And under the alders that skirt its edge,
Now soft on the sand, now loud on the ledge,
Is heard the tramp of his steed as he rides.

"It was twelve by the village clock,
When he crossed the bridge into Medford town.
He heard the crowing of the cock,
And the barking of the farmer's dog,
And felt the damp of the river fog,
That rises after the sun goes down.

"It was one by the village clock,
When he galloped into Lexington.
He saw the gilded weathercock
Swim in the moonlight as he passed,
And the meeting-house windows, blank and bare,
Gaze at him with a spectral glare,
As if they already stood aghast
At the bloody work they would look upon.

"It was two by the village clock,
When he came to the bridge in Concord town.
He heard the bleating of the flock,
And the twitter of birds among the trees,
And felt the breath of the morning breeze
Blowing over the meadows brown.
And one was safe and asleep in his bed
Who at the bridge would be first to fall,
Who that day would be lying dead,
Pierced by a British musket-ball.

"You know the rest. In the books you have read,
How the British Regulars fired and fled—
How the farmers gave them ball for ball,
From behind each fence and farm-yard wall,
Chasing the red-coats down the lane,
Then crossing the fields to emerge again
Under the trees at the turn of the road,
And only pausing to fire and load.

"So through the night rode Paul Revere;
And so through the night went his cry of alarm
To every Middlesex village and farm—
A cry of defiance and not of fear,
A voice in the darkness, a knock at the door,
And a word that shall echo forevermore!
For, borne on the night-wind of the Past,
Through all our history, to the last,
In the hour of darkness and peril and need,
The people will waken and listen to hear
The hurrying hoof-beats of that steed,
And the midnight message of Paul Revere."

ADVANTAGES TO INDUSTRY OF LOCATING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my friend, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], may have 6 minutes to address the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, a recent issue of the New York Journal of Commerce contained a plant location survey, in which some 1,500 industrial sites suitable for chemical or allied industries were listed. On close inspection, officials of individual companies and industries seeking locations for expansion or new development will find comparatively few areas elsewhere in the country able to offer the many advantages inherent in the numerous projected locations in West Virginia.

For the further information of those executives responsible for choosing plant sites, let me list some of the data emphasizing West Virginia's natural and man-made advantages. In the first place, we are all aware of the fact that the new peaks of United States industrial activity envisioned for the coming years will be made possible because of this Nation's abundance of coal reserves. West Virginia is the Nation's leading producer of coal, the most economical and most abundant of our energy resources. Last year the total output from our mines amounted to 142 million tons, or 30.2 percent of America's total production. Our mines are modern. Our coal producers have made vast investments in order to reach the richest veins of coal and to get it out of the ground in the most efficient manner.

Modern equipment in modern mines includes electrically operated mobile machines with long blades that cut deep into the coal at the face of the seam; automatic drills that follow the cutting machines and bore uniform holes into which explosives may be tamped so that the charge will loosen the coal and make it ready for loading; electric loading machines capable of scooping up as much as 6 tons of coal a minute; and electrically drawn shuttle cars that can carry 10 tons of coal from the workingroom to the underground railroad or conveyor belt along the main haulageway. This equipment requires a great amount of capital, as do the extensive ventilation facilities and other safety devices.

About 25 percent of the total bituminous coal production in this country comes from surface mines. Here again there have been heavy investments in machinery on the part of the mining companies. Giant shovels or draglines—the monstrous machines which scoop soil and rock from atop the coal bed—may cost as much as a million dollars each. Efficient operation also requires the use of mechanical brooms and drills, electric shovels to remove the coal, and fleets of trucks.

No matter what type of mechanical mining equipment is selected, I believe more units will be found in operation in West Virginia than in any other State. There will be found the latest kinds of underground locomotives and trolley systems, the most modern lighting, the newest in belt conveyor systems.

Today a cleaning plant represents a sizable investment in the coal business. Coal preparation upgrades the product, gives maximum recovery of marketable coal from run-of-mine, and makes a salable product from low-grade seams. According to latest estimates, there are now more than 200 preparation plants in operation in West Virginia, some of them costing as much as $2 million each.

Added up, the West Virginia coal industry's determination to produce the best fuel, at as low a cost as possible, provides an attractive incentive for a diversity of industry. The men who extract this coal from the earth—that is, members of the United Mine Workers of America—have never objected in any way to management's laying the groundwork for the progress that has come through mechanization. On the contrary, they have eagerly accepted the new machinery and quickly set about absorbing the knowledge necessary to its operation and maintenance. Our coal miners are skilled technicians.

It is true that a number of short-sighted policies on the part of the incumbent administration tended to discourage our mining families from remaining in the coal districts. By inflicting upon the coal industry a number of unfavorable and inequitable policies which were detrimental to coal's markets, the Government in effect invited personnel of the coal industry to move into other fields in search of employment. Through the determined efforts of Members of Congress from coal-producing States, however, a number of remedial steps have been taken, and I am confident that a better adjustment will continue to develop. Given the chance to earn an income that will enable them to care properly for their families, our miners are going to remain within the State of West Virginia and participate in the advantages that will accrue from the overall industrial development of the State.

We have the men. We have the machines. We have the coal. By next spring, West Virginia will have contributed its six billionth ton of coal to supply heat and energy to the homes and industries of America and—to a lesser extent—for the peoples of other continents. I am inclined to believe that our State should publicize this milestone when it is reached. The people of our country should become more cognizant of West Virginia's contribution to the national economy.

Despite this enormous production over the years, there are still enough mineable coal reserves in West Virginia to last for more than three centuries at present rates of production. Scarcely more than 10 percent of all the recoverable coal in West Virginia has been extracted. The United States Geological Survey lists West Virginia's rich mineable deposits at more than 53 billion tons.

What about West Virginia's other natural advantages from the standpoint of new and expanded industries? West Virginia ranks first in production of natural gas east of the Mississippi. West Virginia has considerable reserves of petroleum, and production is expected to be increased as newer recovery techniques are utilized. All of the oil is of Pennsylvania grade, which yields a high percentage of best quality lubricants. Within our State are large deposits of limestone, clay and shale, sand and gravel. We have rich timberlands. Agriculture is a statewide activity, which means that ample foodstuffs are raised within short distances of our industrial centers. West Virginia produces corn, wheat, hay, tomatoes, and a variety of fruits. Our verdant pastures produce some of the country's best livestock and dairy products, and poultry and egg production has always been high within the borders of our State.

Perhaps one of the most important benefits of locating an industry in West Virginia comes from the fact that we are so close to the Nation's richest markets. The steelmaking center, Pittsburgh, is our next-door neighbor. The Atlantic Ocean and a number of Great Lakes ports are within 300 miles of the center of our State. Equally important, we have excellent transportation facilities, and are improving them by the day. Railroads with main lines traversing or leading into and out of our State include the Baltimore & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, the Chesapeake & Ohio, Western Maryland, and the Virginian, with trunkline service provided by the New York Central and the Pennsylvania. Our integrated highway system is being constantly expanded with turnpikes and road improvements.

As may have been noticed, Mr. President, many of the plant sites listed in the Journal of Commerce are on navigable waterways, thus offering perhaps the most economical method of transporting heavy commodities, such as coal, steel, and steel products. In addition, rivers are doubly attractive to industry, because normally a considerable amount of water is required in plant operation, particularly in the case of electric-power generation.

The history of West Virginia is replete with experiences of waterways transportation and development. As early as 1789, coal was moving down the Monongahela on keelboats, and before the dawn of a new century it was being shipped on the Ohio River to Fort Washington—now Cincinnati. In a few short years this service was extended to Louisville, then down the Mississippi to New Orleans. As new mines opened in the various coal-bearing regions and as demand for the product increased, coal was carried on barges, rafts, cargo ships, and an assortment of other craft on our waterways. The transfer of coal from mine to consumer has in recent years come to grow in popularity, especially since industry began to realize the advantages accruing from the establishment of plants on river sites. In one mine in our State a series of conveyor belts carries coal down one mountain, around another, and through a third—a 2½-mile ride to a river front for loading into barges.

We have the coal. We have the manpower. We have the transportation facilities. We have—in various parts of our State—the most desirable plant locations to be found anywhere in the world. We invite industry to come to West Virginia. We are a hospitable State; and those who come to it will like our people, as well as our beautiful mountains, our undulant fields, our fertile agricultural areas. Scores of new companies have come to West Virginia to set up shop in the years that have passed since the conclusion of World War II.

Under the leadership of Gov. William C. Marland, West Virginia is conducting an extensive industrial-development program, and it is reaping great benefits for our State. Governor Marland has traveled to all sections of the Nation to acquaint industrial leaders with the advantages inherent in our State, and every West Virginian is enthusiastic about welcoming new friends and new business to the mountaineer State. We welcome the opportunity to show visitors around the State, so they may see for themselves what excellent possibilities are available for industrial locations.

SYSTEM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter printed in today's RECORD, written by Wallace S. Wharton, an illustrious Navy veteran. Mr. Wharton's letter is short, but in a few lines he succeeds in making several significant observations that deserve the closest attention of all those charged with the responsibility of developing our civil-defense system.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARION COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,
Salem, Oreg., March 21, 1956.

Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: As director of Marion County civil defense I wish to bring to your attention the desirability and great need for such action on your part as may be required to get fire-fighting apparatus and equipment restored to the contributing program of the Federal Civil Defense Agency in the 1956–57 fiscal year.

Experience in the war clearly showed that loss of life and the destruction of resources from fire was far greater than the direct effect of the aerial bombing which caused the fires. This was especially true in metropolitan areas where great fire storms followed the attack and which got out of control because adequate fire-fighting facilities were not available.

In the case of nuclear weapons the fire problem increases manyfold in magnitude.

Since the 1952–53 contributing program, fire-fighting apparatus has not been included in the FCDA program, whereby the Federal Government aids local government in acquiring equipment for civil defense by sharing 50 percent of the cost. It is reported that abuses occurred in which some local agencies used the program to obtain apparatus and equipment that they should have purchased wholly on their own account. I submit that the need for such apparatus and equipment for national survival is so great as to offset the abuses, especially when it is possible to prevent any abuse by proper administrative action.

Therefore, I hope you will do all you can to make it possible to build our defense rampart in this vital salient.

Yours sincerely,

WALLACE S. WHARTON,
Director.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY ON ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 15, radio station WLIB, in New York, devoted an hour's program to Israel independence day. One of the features of the program was a brief address by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO. Mr. Meany spoke out clearly and vigorously for America's shipment of arms to Israel. These remarks, by the spokesman for 16 million Americans, are worthy of the most careful consideration by the Congress and by the State Department.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Meany's address be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

It is a privilege to participate in this program hailing the eighth anniversary of the creation of the State of Israel.

The American labor movement from the beginning strongly favored the establishment of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. At the conclusion of World War II, we urged our own country and our allies to make good their pledge to sanction the independence of Israel in the territory under the protectorate of Great Britain.

When this was finally accomplished 8 years ago, we were confident it would go down in history as a triumph for justice over brute force in international relations as well as the beginning of a new era of peace, freedom and progress in the Middle East.

Despite the stormy events of the ensuing years and the threatening crisis which hangs over Israel today, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations is still confident that the cause of decency will prevail and that the free world will rally to the defense of this new nation.

The accomplishments for its people have been almost miraculous. First, it opened its doors to the oppressed and terrorized Jewish refugees of Europe, the victims of Hitler's hate. To these unfortunates, Israel offered a new start in life in a new land. With their help, flourishing farms and modern towns were created out of the desert.

Then, when anti-Semitism became a fixed policy of the Communist dictatorship, thousands of additional refugees flocked to the haven of Israel. Even today, the exiled Jews of North Africa are being welcomed in this tiny new country.

The herculean task of resettling all these immigrants and providing homes, food, jobs, schools and hospitals required a great deal of money. Israel desperately needed help from the outside. I am proud of the generous way in which American trade unions responded to this call.

Of course, the American labor movement for many years had maintained friendly relations with the Histadrut. This Israeli Federation of Labor has done a remarkable job of organizing the workers in Israel and building up their standards and the national prosperity at the same time.

Today Israel faces its gravest threat from the surrounding Arab nations whose hostility has been emboldened by military aid and assistance from the aggressive forces of communism. In fact, the situation in the Middle East has reached an explosive stage that gravely imperils the peace of the entire world.

For her own sinister purposes Soviet Russia is now openly cementing a military machine, with the Egyptian Government in the forefront, with the clear purpose of waging a war of annihilation against the Republic of Israel.

The Communists already have ignited the fuse to the powder keg of war. The free world must act immediately and effectively to stamp out that sputtering fuse and safeguard peace. If we do not act now, Israel may become another Korea.

As a first step the AFL–CIO recommends that the United States provide arms for the defense of Israel. It is unrealistic to regard military aid to Israel as an instigation of an arms race. Actually the race is already on and Israel may soon be out of the running.

Our country, along with Britain and France, has a commitment to take immediate action against the use of force and aggression in the Middle East. President Eisenhower reiterated that commitment the other day. We believe he should ask Congress for advance authority to carry out the pledge to safeguard peace in the Middle East under the tripartite declaration of 1950.

Beyond this the free world should take the lead in promoting a permanently peaceful agreement between the Arab nations and Israel, supplemented by a program of technical, economic, and financial assistance which would permit all nations in that area to work for a brighter future for their people in peace.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am much concerned over the problem of narcotics, the narcotics traffic, and the impact of this traffic on the lives of our people, especially the young.

I do not profess to be an expert in this field, and I am not in a position to comment on the technical aspects of the problem. But as a layman and as a public official, I am very much aware of it and concerned with it.

I am a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 19, dealing with this problem. That joint resolution is now before the Senate Finance Committee. I joined in sponsoring this measure not because I thought it was a perfect solution to the narcotics and barbiturates problem—as a matter of fact, I reserved the right to object to several of its provisions—but because I felt it would help emphasize the urgent need for action in this area. I think the joint resolution does contain some excellent provisions; and I trust that the Finance Committee will, in its wisdom, improve and modify the resolution in such a way as to present to the Senate a measure which will effectively control the narcotic drug traffic and aid the unfortunate individuals who have become addicts.

While I have been deeply concerned about this problem for some time, I have become increasingly disturbed in recent months as a result of testimony presented in the course of the hearings held by the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman. I have been very much troubled by the evidence presented

before my subcommittee, relating juvenile delinquency and crime to the problem of narcotics.

I was particularly distressed by the number of young people arrested in New York in 1954 because of the use of narcotics. Of the total number of 3,647 persons arrested for this cause, 749—or roughly 20 percent—were under 21. I do not know how this compares with figures for previous years or for the country as a whole, but I do know that it is far too many. This is only one index of the seriousness of the problem. I know there are many other figures just as revealing.

Unfortunately, attempts to cope with the problem have been relatively unsuccessful, and the seriousness of the problem continues to increase. I think perhaps one of the chief reasons for our failure to find a solution has been the attitude society has taken toward this problem. Until recently, the general tendency has been to view the use of narcotics and barbiturates as a crime, and the users of these drugs as criminals. No one would deny that there are certain aspects of the problem which are, and should be, recognized as crimes, and treated as such. But we are beginning to realize that the problem is not as simple as all that. We are coming to recognize that addicts are suffering from an illness as serious in its way as cancer or tuberculosis. They must be treated for their sickness. The question of cure must come before the question of punishment.

In this connection, I consider the report on drug addiction by the New York Academy of Medicine a major step forward in dealing with the problem. I do not necessarily subscribe to all the recommendations contained in the report, but I feel that the attitude taken by the academy can do much to help change the attitude taken by society as a whole toward the unfortunate use of habit-forming drugs. Until legislation on this subject reflects this new point of view, I do not think we can ever hope to deal successfully with this situation.

I have not attempted to discuss this problem as an expert. All I have tried to do is indicate my deep interest and concern, and to express the hope that prompt and vigorous measures will be taken to deal with it. I look forward to supporting appropriate proposed legislation to this end and I hope that such a measure or measures will be brought before the Congress of the United States at an early date.

DEVELOPMENT OF LABOR UNIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this has been a good year for the American economy. To be sure, there are segments of it that have not benefited to the extent other segments have—such as some farmers and some industrial areas. But on the whole, it has been a good year; and the indications are that it will continue to be one. It has been a good year for unions, too. The U. S. News & World Report, in its April 20 edition, brings out some very interesting information about the increases in dues collections, and the extent to which union funds have benefited by this and by the general economic condition. For instance, the article shows that the UAW in 1945 reported $2.1 million in net worth. Compare that, Mr. President, with the current resources of that union, which include nearly $3.9 million in cash $28.4 million in securities, nearly $12,000 in stocks, some $4.5 million in land and buildings, and about $560,000 in furniture and equipment, for a total worth of more than $37 million. Other unions show similar gains.

One reaction to this, Mr. President, is that it is difficult to understand why, with this unprecedented gain in net worth—which means a corresponding increase in membership—the heads of some of those organizations can be so violently against the leadership of the President or the activities of the Republican Party. Another reaction is that this development places unions in the ranks of big business. Their membership alone would do that, but their assets surely do it.

This leads to a question often asked me today: When will the unions come under monopoly laws? My answer to that inquiry, Mr. President, has been to let the unions have time in which to place their house in order, have time in which to realize the responsibilities of bigness, and have time in which to assume for themselves the leadership that bigness demands. It may well be that if these things come about, big unions can so operate that they will not infringe on the rights of others, that they will show their type of leadership to be such that they recognize their total responsibilities to the American way of life, and that legal intervention to control their bigness might not be needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report on April 20, 1956, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S BEEN A GOOD YEAR FOR UNIONS, TOO

Labor unions, like business firms, now are making public their yearly financial statements. And, as in private industry, the reports show that most unions did well in 1955.

From these profit-and-loss statements, this picture emerges:

The net worth of big unions is growing. Most of them managed to bank more money than they spent. The United Auto Workers, for example, doubled its net worth in the past year, now has nearly $40 million.

Reserves of about $200 million are reported by the International Ladies Garment Workers, including welfare and insurance funds. The United Mine Workers can count about $146 million in its union and welfare funds.

The Teamsters Union is switching from Government bonds to first mortgages and loans to employers as a way of increasing investment income. Later, the Teamsters probably will start to buy corporate stocks. Investments last year added about $900,000 to the union's assets.

The cost of operating a large union is shown by the auto union's report which lists the year's receipts at more than $48 million and expenses at more than $31 million, excluding purchase and sale of investments.

Investments of unions for the most part are in Government bonds, although a few organizations are putting part of their reserves into industrial stocks. In general, unions tend to be conservative in their investments.

That is the situation as indicated by the reports now appearing. Most unions make public financial statements during the early months of the year. Reports are required each year, under the Taft-Hartley Act, if the unions want to use the National Labor Relations Board.

The auto union offers an example of a prosperous union that came up with a sharp gain in net worth, largely because of a temporary boost in the dues of its 1.3 million members. The increase had been voted to supplement the union's strike fund, which now contains nearly $26.9 million.

Net worth of the UAW, as reported by Emil Mazey, its secretary-treasurer, was $39.4 million as of December 31, 1955. A year earlier, the net worth amounted to $20 million.

Growth of the UAW's treasury shows up more clearly if a comparison is made with that union's 1945 report. Ten years ago, UAW reported $2.1 million in net worth.

Current resources of UAW include nearly $3.9 million in cash, about $28.4 million in securities, $11,825 in stocks, about $4.5 million in land and buildings, and about $560,000 in furniture and equipment.

The securities include nearly $26.5 million in United States Government bonds and certificates of indebtedness; $10,000 in Dominion of Canada bonds and nearly $1.9 million in bonds of General Motors Acceptance Corp.

One of UAW's buildings is its Solidarity House in Detroit, main office for the union. UAW last year paid a half million dollars for the old headquarters of the CIO, near the White House in Washington.

The clothing unions, however, are far wealthier than the auto union, if their insurance reserves and welfare funds are taken into consideration.

The Ladies Garment Workers, for example, headed by David Dubinsky, is about to publish new financial statements that are reported to show total assets of about $200 million.

In the men's clothing field, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers reports about $8 million dollars in union assets, but it has estimated that its total resources at about $250 million, including two banks, two insurance companies, various housing developments, and health centers. The total also covers the treasuries and property of local-union affiliates.

The United Mine Workers is another union with large assets. John L. Lewis heads an enterprise that controls a bank, owns various office buildings, and considerable real estate in the UMW's name. He also directs a welfare fund that, at last reports, had a surplus of $104 million.

UMW assets, exclusive of the welfare fund, are reported at about $42 million. UMW does not make public an annual report, although statements are sent to local unions.

The Teamsters Union is one of the labor groups that are revamping their investment programs to bring better returns. Several unions are doing this on advice of investment counselors who argue that labor has been too conservative in putting all of its reserves in Government bonds.

Dave Beck, Teamster president, explained his policy on investments in an interview last week. He reported that the union's income from investments was running about $400,000 a year when he became president in 1952, but came to about $900,000 in 1955.

"When I came into office," Mr. Beck said, "the union's money was largely frozen in Government bonds, paying 2.5 to 2.75 percent interest. Also, there was $6.5 to $7 million sitting in a commercial account in a bank, drawing no interest. And there were time deposits at 1.5 percent.

"As soon as I could, I began to work on an investment program for the union. We started into the field of veterans' first mortgages and convention loans to business firms. We now have invested $17 to $18 million in veterans' first mortgages at a net return of 4 percent.

"We have been selling Government bonds at the market discount and buying 'veterans' on the same basis. Temporarily, we sometimes take a loss by these sales until we pick up that loss through higher interest rates on the mortgages that are bought in place of the bonds. It means a big gain over the years."

Mr. Beck said that this process of switching from Government bonds explained an item appearing in the union's financial statement for 1955. The item was carried as "loss on sale of securities, $418,632.91."

"That is a bookkeeping matter," Mr. Beck said. "There was a paper loss at the time we made the report, but the higher interest rates will more than make up for it."

The financial statement shows the net worth of the teamsters was $35 million at the end of 1955. Securities held by the union at that time were valued at more than $28.4 million.

The teamster portfolio: Mr. Beck explained that the securities included $7,650,000 in United States Government savings bonds, $200,000 in United States Treasury notes and $1,675,000 in Treasury short-term securities.

The union, which also operates in Canada, had $160,000 in Canadian Government bonds, $225,000 in school-district bonds and $65,000 in corporate bonds of Canadian firms.

The portfolio, at year's end, included nearly $13.2 million in veterans' mortgages. Mr. Beck said this figure now is more than $17 million.

Loans to business firms amounted to nearly $3.9 million when the report was drawn up. None of the loans is with a company having a contract with the teamsters, Mr. Beck said. These loans are earning interest at 4.5 percent and up in most cases, he reported.

Mr. Beck said that he does not intend to invest teamster money in corporate stocks until the union's convention next year gets a chance to vote on the question. He indicated that he might propose a program, with purchases limited to stocks with high-dividend records.

Net worth of the teamsters increased about $400,000 in the past year. Its operating expenses, outside of investment costs, went up $2.4 million.

Other unions are in the big money, too.

Near the top of the list is the railroad trainmen, with nearly $54 million in assets. This includes $2.8 million in the general fund of the union, plus more than $50.8 million in insurance reserves. The union, headed by William P. Kennedy, operates an insurance program for its 204,000 members.

Assets of $48.2 million are shown by the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which also has an insurance program. Assets of the Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen total $34 million, including insurance reserves.

Nearly $19 million in net worth is reported by the Steelworkers as of mid-1955. The Machinists Union reports assets of about $15 million.

Those are some of the unions now reporting to their stockholders, the dues payers. For most of them, 1955 was a profitable year.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE TO ATTEND WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it always is a pleasure for me to invite my Senate colleagues to visit the State of Virginia, especially the valley area where I have made my home. There is no time when the physicial attractions of such a trip are greater than in the spring season when the apple and other fruit trees are in bloom.

It also is a privilege, which I have often asserted, to recall to the attention of Members of this body some of the contributions to our American philosophy of government which were made by a distinguished native of the valley of Virginia—Woodrow Wilson.

I need hardly remind you that the 83d Congress established a national commission, on which I am proud to serve, to develop and execute plans for the celebration during 1956 of the 100th anniversary of Woodrow Wilson's birth in Staunton, Va. One of the highlights of that celebration is the Woodrow Wilson Festival Week, celebrated in Staunton from April 22 through April 29 and the climax of that festival will be on Saturday, April 28, which is the 37th anniversary of the adoption of Wilson's covenant of the League of Nations.

Wilson's conception of an organization which would settle international disputes by peaceful means still represents an ideal which seems our only alternative to the blotting out of modern civilization by weapons of mass destruction. Recognition of this fact and of Wilson's general contribution to political science and to international peace will be evidenced by attendance at the Staunton exercises on April 28 of ambassadors and representatives of foreign nations as well as important representatives of our own Government and of the teaching profession.

It is with particular pleasure, therefore, that I invite Members of the Senate to join the motor cavalcade which will leave Washington under Virginia State police escort at 9 a. m. on Saturday, April 28 and arrive at Staunton in time for a luncheon at the Ingleside Hotel, where Senators will be guests of the Federal and Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commissions. You will be expected to furnish your own cars and should assemble by 8:45 a. m. at the entrance to the Arlington Cemetery.

During the day in Staunton you will have an opportunity to see a parade of Virginia military units with proud histories, to hear concerts by outstanding musical organizations including the National Symphony Orchestra and combined college choruses and to attend ceremonies at Wilson's birthplace where one of the guests will be Mrs. Woodrow Wilson.

The principal address of the occasion will be delivered by a distinguished Virginian, Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson, who has been designated as the personal representative of President Eisenhower and who will speak on today's significance of the ideals and achievements of Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the complete schedule of the April 28 observance. I hope that a large number of my colleagues will find it possible to make this trip with us.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM, WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE, STAUNTON, VA., APRIL 28, 1956

12 NOON

Luncheon for official guests, Ingleside Hotel.

2 P. M.

Military parade.

3 P. M.

Ceremonial on the east steps of the birthplace (if the weather is unsuitable, these exercises will be held in King Auditorium, Mary Baldwin College, nearby).

Band concert.

Invocation: The Reverend Richard R. Potter.

Opening remarks: Maj. Gen. E. Walton Opie (retired), Chairman, Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission.

Greetings from the Diplomatic Corps.

Introductions.

Introduction of the speaker by the Honorable George M. Cochran, chairman, Virginia Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission.

Address: Today's Significance of the Ideals and Achievements of Woodrow Wilson, the Honorable Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State, representing the President of the United States.

Benediction.

8 P. M.

Music for Young American concert, King Auditorium, National Symphony Orchestra, Howard Mitchell conducting.

College choral festival, auspices Virginia Federation of Music Clubs.

10 P. M.

Woodrow Wilson centennial ball, Staunton Military Academy Gymnasium.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join my distinguished colleague from Virginia in urging our colleagues, if possible, to attend the celebration at Staunton, Va., as the culmination of a series of events in connection with the Woodrow Wilson Centennial observance.

As a member of the Commission, and also as a personal friend of Woodrow Wilson during his life, I am very happy to join in the work of the Commission. This celebration is the climax of a good many weeks and months of effort. I hope the Senate will be well represented on that occasion.

RECOMMENDATION BY FRANK C. SPANGLER, OF GRESHAM, OREG., CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the unique aspects of American life is our tradition that any citizen, no matter what his employment, education or wealth, may freely express his views. In particular this is the case in regard to an American's participation in his Government. Suggestions from individual citizens play an important role in our Government. Recently I received a suggestion from a fellow Oregonian, and I believe it deserves to be brought to the attention of the Senate.

This suggestion is that the Foreign Relations Committee of this body should be renamed the International Relations Committee. The idea is that of Frank C. Spangler of Gresham, Oreg., and it

was given in brief in the January 1956, issue of the Rotarian, published by Rotary International. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point.

I think it significant that Mr. Spangler is a Rotarian and that his suggestion appeared first in print in the Rotary magazine. This organization emphasizes a worldwide outlook even in its name, Rotary International. Mr. Spangler's action is another example of the many ways in which Rotary International constantly aids the spread of understanding and friendship throughout the free world. Rotarians know that there are no foreigners, only friends with whom they are not acquainted yet.

In correspondence with me, Mr. Spangler has elaborated on his suggestion. He notes that when the Foreign Relations Committee was formed years ago, the name may have been fitting.

At that time—

He wrote—

the world was a vast little known Universe * * * transportation and communications were so slow that it took weeks and even months for the events of one part of the world to reach other parts of the world.

Mr. Spangler noted that recently this has changed; the farthest corners of the world are just around the corner, figuratively. Americans have found, he wrote, that "the foreigners they were meeting were not too different from themselves."

But the old committee title still remains in use. Mr. Spangler believes "as the name now stands, foreign relations to some means poor relatives, and in some languages suffers greatly in the process of translation until it is almost an insult to some people."

It seems to me that there is a parallel here with the recent switch in terms from "foreign aid" to "mutual security." I feel that this suggested change in name and title of the Foreign Relations Committee is a worthy one, and that Mr. Spangler should be commended for his interest in this subject.

I ask unanimous consent to have the brief article from Rotary magazine printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Suggestion: Frank Spangler, a Rotarian of Gresham, Oreg., is a man who believes in going right to the top when he thinks something should be changed. He got to thinking about the title "Foreign Relations Committee" as used in the United States Congress, and, being a good Rotarian, it didn't "rub him right." As he says, "A stranger is merely a friend I haven't met, so why should I call him a foreigner?" So to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, Rotarian Spangler suggested that the committee be renamed the "International Relations Committee." As he put it in his letter to President Eisenhower, "The term * * * always upsets me when I hear it, for in these modern times when transportation and communications have become so speedy, the world has shrunk until the farthest people are now practically next-door neighbors, and the only reason they are 'foreign' is because we have not taken the time or trouble to get acquainted with them and their problems.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. CHARLES PANNELL, MEMBER OF BRITISH PARLIAMENT

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to present to my colleagues in the Senate a distinguished member of the British House of Commons, Hon. Charles Pannell, representing Leeds West. I will ask him to take a bow. [Applause, Members rising.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is very happy indeed to welcome the distinguished visitor.

MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the treaties on the executive calendar be considered prior to the call of the legislative calendar. My request yesterday was that the treaties be considered following the call of the Legislative Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of a small group of flag and general officers relating to temporary appointment in the Army in the grades of major general and brigadier general and retirement and special assignment of vice admirals in the Navy, and ask that these be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Brig. Gen. Robert George Butler, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States; and

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, Rear Adm. John M. Will, and Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, designated for commands and other duties by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I also report favorably a total of 2,252 routine nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades from ensign to colonel; 456 of them are Naval Academy graduates, and 887 are NROTC graduates. All of these names have already appeared in the RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

PROTOCOL RELATING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION, CONVENTION CONCERNING CUSTOMS FACILITIES FOR TOURING, AND CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PRIVATE ROAD VEHICLES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed order, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed order will be stated.

The proposed order was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the question of advising and consenting to the ratification of Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, and that, with respect to Executive A, 84th Congress, and Executive B, 84th Congress, the advice and consent of the Senate shall be deemed to be given or refused (as the case may be) to their ratification by the vote on Executive F.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the proposed order? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider, en bloc, the following protocol and conventions:

Executive F (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A protocol dated at Montreal, June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.

Executive A (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A convention concerning customs facilities for touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Executive B (84th Cong., 2d sess.): A customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

The protocol and conventions were severally read the second time, as follows:

[Ex. F (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

PROTOCOL RELATING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

The Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization,

Having met in its Eighth Session, at Montreal, on the first day of June 1954, and

Having considered it desirable to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December 1944,

Approved, on the fourteenth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in accordance with the provisions of Article 94 (a) of the Convention afore-

said, the following proposed amendments to the said Convention:

In Article 48 (a), substitute for the word "annually" the expression "not less than once in three years";

In Article 49 (e), substitute for the expression "an annual budget" the expression "annual budgets"; and

In Article 61, substitute for the expressions "an annual budget" and "vote the budget" the expressions "annual budgets" and "vote the budgets",

Specified, pursuant to the provisions of the said Article 94 (a) of the said Convention, forty-two as the number of contracting States upon whose ratification the proposed amendments aforesaid shall come into force, and

Resolved, That the Secretary General of the International Civil Aviation Organization draw up a Protocol, in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, embodying the proposed amendments above mentioned and the matters hereinafter appearing.

Consequently, pursuant to the aforesaid action of the Assembly,

This Protocol shall be signed by the President of the Assembly and its Secretary General;

This Protocol shall be open to ratification by any State which has ratified or adhered to the said Convention on International Civil Aviation;

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization;

This Protocol shall come into force among the States which have ratified it on the date on which the forty-second instrument of ratification is so deposited;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all contracting States of the deposit of each ratification of this Protocol;

The Secretary General shall immediately notify all States parties or signatories to the said Convention of the date on which this Protocol comes into force;

With respect to any contracting State ratifying this Protocol after the date aforesaid, the Protocol shall come into force upon deposit of its instrument of ratification with the International Civil Aviation Organization.

In faith whereof, the President and the Secretary General of the Eighth Session of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization, being authorized thereto by the Assembly, sign this Protocol.

Done at Montreal on the fourteenth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four in a single document in the English, French and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity. This Protocol shall remain deposited in the archives of the International Civil Aviation Organization; and certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by the Secretary General of the Organization to all States parties or signatories to the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on the seventh day of December, 1944.

WALTER BINAGHI,
President of the Assembly.
CARL LJUNGBERG,
Secretary General of the Assembly.

Certified to be a true and complete textual copy of the Act deposited in the Archives of the Organization

P. A. ROY,
(*For Secretary General*).

[Ex. A (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

CONVENTION CONCERNING CUSTOMS FACILITIES FOR TOURING

The Contracting States,

Desiring to facilitate the development of international touring,

Having decided to conclude a Convention and have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(a) The term "import duties and import taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatever chargeable by reason of importation;

(b) The term "tourist" shall mean any person without distinction as to race, sex, language or religian, who enters the territory of a Contracting State other than that in which that person normally resides and remains there for not less than twenty-four hours and not more than six months in the course of any twelve-month period, for legitimate non-immigrant purposes, such as touring, recreation, sports, health, family reasons, study, religious pilgrimages or business;

(c) The term "temporary importation permit" shall mean the Customs document testifying to the guarantee or deposit of import duties and import taxes chargeable in the event of failure to re-export the article temporarily imported.

ARTICLE 2

1. Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention, each of the Contracting States shall admit temporarily free of import duties and import taxes the personal effects imported by a tourist, provided they are for the personal use of the tourist, that they are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist, that there is no reason to fear abuse, and that these personal effects will be re-exported by the tourist on leaving the country.

2. The term "personal effects" shall mean all clothing and other articles new or used which a tourist may personally and reasonably require, taking into consideration all the circumstances of his visit, but excluding all merchandise imported for commercial purposes.

3. Personal effects shall include among other articles the following, provided that they can be considered as being in use:

personal jewelry;
one camera with twelve plates or five rolls of film;
one miniature cinematograph camera with two reels of film;
one pair of binoculars;
one portable musical instrument;
one portable gramophone with ten records;
one portable sound-recording apparatus;
one portable wireless receiving set;
one portable typewriter;
one perambulator;
one tent and other camping equipment;
sports equipment (one fishing outfit, one sporting firearm with fifty cartridges, one nonpowered bicycle, one canoe or kayac less than 5½ metres long, one pair of skis, two tennis racquets, and other similar articles).

ARTICLE 3

Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention each of the Contracting States shall admit free of import duties and import taxes the following articles imported by a tourist for his personal use, provided that these articles are carried on the person of or in the hand luggage accompanying the tourist, and provided that there is no reason to fear abuse:

(a) 200 cigarettes or 50 cigars or 250 grammes of tobacco, or an assortment of these products, provided that the total weight does not exceed 250 grammes;

(b) one regular-size bottle of wine and one-quarter litre of spirits;

(c) one-quarter litre of toilet water and a small quantity of perfume.

ARTICLE 4

Subject to the other conditions laid down in this Convention each of the Contracting States shall grant to the tourist, provided that there is not reason to fear abuse:

(a) authorization to import in transit and without a temporary importation permit, travel souvenirs for a total value not exceeding 50 U. S. A. dollars, provided that such souvenirs are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist and that they are not intended for commercial purposes;

(b) authorization to export, without the formalities applying to currency controls and free of export duties, travel souvenirs which the tourist has bought in the country for a total value not exceeding 100 U. S. A. dollars, provided that they are carried on the person of or in the luggage accompanying the tourist and that such souvenirs are not intended for commercial purposes.

ARTICLE 5

Each of the Contracting States may require a temporary importation permit in respect of articles of a high value covered by article 2.

ARTICLE 6

The Contracting States shall endeavour not to introduce Customs procedures which might have the effect of impeding the development of international touring.

ARTICLE 7

In order to expedite Customs procedures, contiguous Contracting States shall endeavour to place their respective Customs posts close together and to keep them open during the same hours.

ARTICLE 8

The provisions of this Convention shall not prejudice in any way the application of police or other regulations concerning the importation, possession and carrying of arms and ammunition.

ARTICLE 9

Each of the Contracting States recognizes that any prohibitions which that State imposes on the importation or exportation of articles which benefit under this Convention shall apply only in so far as they are based on considerations other than economic in character, for example, of public morality, public security, public health, hygiene, veterinary or phyto-pathological considerations.

ARTICLE 10

The exemptions and facilities provided by this Convention shall not apply to frontier traffic.

Nor shall the applications of these exemptions and facilities be considered as automatic:

(a) when the total quantity of a commodity to be imported by a tourist exceeds substantially the limit laid down in this Convention;

(b) in case of a tourist who enters the country of import more than once a month;

(c) in case of a tourist under 17 years of age.

ARTICLE 11

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse the Contracting States shall be free to take proceedings for the recovery of the corresponding import duties and import taxes and also for the imposition of any penalties to which the persons who have been granted exemptions or other facilities may have rendered themselves liable.

ARTICLE 12

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or an article improperly to benefit from the system of importation laid down in this Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offense was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws of that country.

ARTICLE 13

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting States which form a Customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to residents of the States forming that union.

ARTICLE 14

1. The Convention shall be open for signature until 31 December 1954 on behalf of any State Member of the United Nations and any other State invited to attend the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism held in New York in May and June 1954, hereinafter referred to as the Conference.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 15

1. From 1 January 1955 this Convention shall be open for accession by any State referred to in paragraph 1 of article 14 and any other State so invited by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It shall also be open for accession on behalf of any Trust Territory of which the United Nations is the Administering Authority.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 16

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 20.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 20.

ARTICLE 17

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may denounce it by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

ARTICLE 18

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting States is less than eight.

ARTICLE 19

1. Any State may, at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General if the notification is not accompanied by a reservation, or from the ninetieth day after the notification has taken effect in accordance with article 20, or on the date on which the Convention enters into force for the State concerned, whichever is the later.

2. Any State which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article 17.

ARTICLE 20

1. Reservations to this Convention made before the signing of the Final Act shall be admissible if they have been accepted by a majority of the members of the Conference and recorded in the Final Act.

2. Reservations made after the signing of the Final Act shall not be admitted if objection is expressed by one-third of the Signatory States or of the Contracting States as hereinafter provided.

3. The text of any reservation submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by a State at the time of the signature, the deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession or of any notification under article 19 shall be circulated by the Secretary-General to all States which have at that time signed, ratified or acceded to the Convention. If one-third of these States expresses an objection within ninety days from the date of circulation, the reservation shall not be accepted. The Secretary-General shall notify all States referred to in this paragraph of any objection received by him as well as of the acceptance or rejection of the reservation.

4. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of nine months from the date of making its objection, the objecting State has not ratified the Convention. If, as the result of an objection ceasing to have effect, a reservation is accepted by application of the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall so inform the States referred to in that paragraph. The text of any reservation shall not be circulated to any signatory State under the preceding paragraph if that State has not ratified the Convention within three years following the date of signature on its behalf.

5. The State submitting the reservation may, within a period of twelve months from the date of the notification by the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 3 that a reservation has been rejected in accordance with the procedure provided for in that paragraph, withdraw the reservation, in which case the instrument of ratification or accession or the notification under article 19 as the case may be shall take effect with respect to such State as from the date of withdrawal. Pending such withdrawal, the instrument or the notification as the case may be, shall not have effect, unless, by application of the provisions of paragraph 4, the reservation is subsequently accepted.

6. Reservations accepted in accordance with this article may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General.

7. No Contracting State shall be required to extend to a State making a reservation the benefit of the provisions to which such reservation applies. Any State availing itself of this right shall notify the Secretary-General accordingly and the latter shall communicate this decision to all signatory and Contracting States.

ARTICLE 21

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting States in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the States in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the States in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those States may request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decision.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting States concerned.

ARTICLE 22

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if, within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one-half of the Contracting States notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States and invite them to submit within a period of three months such proposals as they may wish the conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting States the provisional agenda for the conference together with the texts of such proposals at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this article all Contracting States and all other States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies.

ARTICLE 23

1. Any Contracting State may propose one or more amendments to this Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall circulate it to all Contracting States.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting State expresses an objection within a period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall notify as soon as possible all Contracting States whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, and if no such objection has been expressed, the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting States three months after the expiration of the period of six months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

ARTICLE 24

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Member States of the United Nations and all other States invited to attend the Conference of the following:

(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions, received in accordance with articles 14 and 15;

(b) The date upon which this Convention shall enter into force in accordance with article 16;

(c) Denunciations received in accordance with article 17;

(d) The abrogation of this Convention in accordance with article 18;

(e) Notifications received under article 19;

(f) Entry into force of any amendment in accordance with article 23.

ARTICLE 25

The original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall transmit certified copies thereof to all Members of the United Nations and all other States invited to the Conference.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

Done at New York, this fourth day of June one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

The Secretary-General is requested to prepare an authoritative translation of this Convention in the Chinese and Russian languages and to add the Chinese and Russian texts to the English, French and Spanish texts when transmitting certified copies thereof to the States in accordance with article 25 of this Convention.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
For Argentina:
Ad Referendum.
LUIS J. ESTEVARENA.
For Australia:
For Austria:
Dr. J. STANGELBERGER.
For the Kingdom of Belgium:
Sous réserve de ratification.
CH. HOPCHET.
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
For Bulgaria:
For the Union of Burma:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For Cambodia:
IEM KADUL.
For Canada:
For Ceylon:
H. SHIRLEY AMERASINGHE.
For Chile:
For China:
For Colombia:
For Costa Rica:
ad-referendum.
J. F. CARBALLO.
July 20th, 1954.
For Cuba:
JOSÉ MIGUEL RIBAS.
For Czechoslovakia:
For Denmark:
For the Dominican Republic:
Ad Referendum.
R. O. GALVÁN.
For Ecuador:
B. OQUENDO.
For Egypt:
Subject to the reservation recorded in the final act.
RACHAD MOURAD.
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
For France:
PHILIPPE DE SEYNES.
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
RICHARD PAULIG.
WALTER WAGNER.
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
Con sujeción a las reservas consignadas en el Acta Final
E. CASTILLO ARRIOLA.
For Haiti:
Sous La réserve consignée dans l'Acte Final
ERNEST G. CHAUVET.
For Honduras:
TIBURCIO CARÍAS JR.
June 15, 1954.
For Hungary:
For Iceland:
For India:
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
UGO CALDERONI.
For Japan:
For the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
For Mexico:
JOSÉ A. BUFORT.
For Monaco:
MARCEL A. PALMARO.
For Nepal:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
PAYMANS.
For New Zealand:
For Nicaragua:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
ad referendum
ERNESTO DE LA OSSA.
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippine Republic:
MAURO MÉNDEZ.
For Poland:
For Portugal:
ad referendum
FREIRE DE ANDRADE.
For Romania:
For San Marino:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Spain:
ad referendum
R. DE LA PRESILLA.
For Sweden:
Sous la réserve consignée dans l'Acte final
G. DE SYDOW.
A. APPELTOFFT.
For Switzerland:
FR. LÜTHI.
For Syria:
For Thailand:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
CHARLES HENRY BLAKE.
For the United States of America:
JAMES J. WADSWORTH.
HENRY H. KELLY.
For Uruguay:
ad Referendum
E. RODRÍGUEZ FABREGAT.
For Vatican City:
Monseigneur THOMAS J. MCMAHON.
For Venezuela:
For Viet-Nam:
For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia.

[Ex. B (84th Cong., 2d sess.)]

CUSTOMS CONVENTION ON THE TEMPORARY IMPORTATION OF PRIVATE ROAD VEHICLES

The Contracting States,

Desiring to facilitate the development of international touring.

Having regard to the aims of the Convention on Road Traffic, adopted by the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport held at Geneva from 23 August to 19 September 1949 and opened for signature at Geneva on 19 September 1949,

Have decided to conclude a Convention and have agreed upon the following provisions:

CHAPTER 1—DEFINITIONS

Article 1

For the purpose of this Convention:

(a) The term "import duties and import taxes" shall mean not only Customs duties but also all duties and taxes whatever chargeable by reason of importation;

(b) The term "vehicles" shall, unless the context otherwise requires, mean all road motor vehicles (including cycles with engines) and trailers (whether imported with the vehicle or separately), together with their component parts, and normal accessories and equipment, when imported with the vehicle;

(c) The term "private use" shall exclude the transport of persons for remuneration, reward or other consideration and the industrial or commercial transport of goods with or without remuneration;

(d) The term "temporary importation papers" shall include the Customs document showing the guarantee or deposit of import duties and import taxes;

(e) The term "persons" shall mean both natural and legal persons unless the context otherwise requires.

CHAPTER II—IMPORTATION WITHOUT PAYMENT OF IMPORT DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES AND FREE OF IMPORT PROHIBITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

Article 2

1. Each of the Contracting States shall grant temporary admission without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, subject to re-exportation and to the other conditions laid down in this Convention, to vehicles owned by persons normally resident outside its territory which are imported and utilized, for their private use on the occasion of a temporary visit, either by the owners of the vehicles or by other persons normally resident outside its territory.

2. Such vehicles shall be covered by temporary importation papers guaranteeing payment of import duties and import taxes, and if the case should arise, of any Customs penalties incurred, subject to the special provision of paragraph 4 of article 27.

Article 3

The fuel contained in the ordinary supply tanks of vehicles temporarily imported shall be admitted without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions, it being understood that the ordinary tank is that designed by the maker for the type of vehicle concerned.

Article 4

1. Component parts imported for the repair of a particular vehicle already temporarily imported shall be admitted temporarily without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions. Contracting States may require these parts to be covered by temporary importation papers.

2. Replaced parts which are not re-exported shall be liable to import duties and import taxes except where, in conformity with regulations of the country concerned, they may be abandoned free of all expense to the Exchequer or destroyed, under official supervision, at the expense of the parties concerned.

Article 5

Temporary importation papers and international circulation papers intended to be issued to persons residing in the country into which the papers are imported who wish to enter other countries and which are sent to the authorized touring associations by the corresponding foreign associations, by international organizations or by the Customs authorities of the Contracting States shall be admitted without payment of import duties and import taxes and free of import prohibitions and restrictions.

CHAPTER III—ISSUE OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 6

1. Subject to such guarantees and under such conditions as it may determine, each Contracting State may authorize associations, such as those affiliated to an international organization, to issue either directly or through corresponding associations the temporary importation papers covered by this Convention.

2. Temporary importation papers may be valid for a single country or Customs territory, or for several countries or Customs territories.

3. The period of validity of these papers shall not exceed a year from the date of issue.

Article 7

1. Temporary importation papers valid for the territories of all or several of the Contracting States shall be known as carnets de passages en douane and shall conform to the standard form contained in Annex 1 of this Convention.

2. If a carnet de passages en douane is not valid for one or several territories, the issuing association shall indicate the fact on the cover and on the importation vouchers of the carnet.

3. Temporary importation papers valid only for the territory of a single Contracting State may conform to the standard form contained in Annex 2 or in Annex 3 of this Convention. Contracting States may also use other documents, in accordance with their legislation or regulations.

4. The period of validity of temporary importation papers, other than those issued by authorized associations as provided for in article 6, shall be laid down by each Contracting State in accordance with its legislation or regulations.

5. Each Contracting State shall, upon request, supply the other Contracting States with models of temporary importation papers valid for its territory, other than those appearing in the annexes to this Convention.

CHAPTER IV—PARTICULARS ON TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 8

Temporary importation papers issued by authorized associations shall be made out in the name of the person who own the vehicles temporarily imported or who have the possession or control of them provided that, if the vehicle has been hired, the papers shall be made out in the name of the hirer.

Article 9

1. The weight to be declared on temporary importation papers is the net weight of the vehicles. It shall be expressed in the metric system. In the case of papers valid for one country only, the Customs authorities of that country may prescribe the use of another system.

2. The value to be declared on temporary importation papers valid for one country only shall be expressed in the currency of that country. The value to be declared on a carnet de passages en douane shall be expressed in the currency of the country where the carnet is issued.

3. The articles and tool-kit which form the normal equipment of vehicles need not be specially declared on the temporary importation papers.

4. When the Customs authorities so require, parts (such as wheels, tyres, and innertubes) and accessories not considered as constituting the normal equipment of the vehicle (such as radio sets, trailers not declared on a separate document, or luggage carriers) shall be declared on the temporary importation papers with the necessary particulars (such as weight and value) and shall be produced on exit from the country visited.

Article 10

Any particulars inserted on temporary importation papers by the issuing association may be altered only with the approval of the issuing or guaranteeing association. No alteration to the papers may be made after they have been passed by the Customs authorities of the country of importation except with the consent of those authorities.

Article 11

1. Vehicles admitted under the cover of temporary importation papers may be used, for their private use, by third persons duly authorized by the holders of the papers, provided that those third persons normally reside outside the country of importation and also fulfil the other conditions laid down in this Convention. The Customs authorities of the Contracting States have the right to require evidence that such persons have been duly authorized by the holders of the papers and fulfil the aforesaid conditions. If this evidence does not appear sufficient, the Customs authorities may refuse use of the vehicle in their country under cover of the papers. In the case of vehicles which have been hired, each Contracting State may, in the case of fear of abuse, require that the holder of the temporary importation paper be present at the time of importation of the vehicle.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding paragraph, the Customs authorities of the Contracting States may permit, in special circumstances and under conditions of which they shall be sole judges, a vehicle circulating under cover of temporary importation papers to be driven by a person who is normally resident in the country of importation, in particular when the driver drives the vehicle on behalf of or under instructions from the holder of the temporary importation papers.

CHAPTER V—CONDITIONS OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION

Article 12

1. The vehicles mentioned in the temporary importation papers shall be re-exported in the same general state, except for wear and tear, within the period of validity of such papers. In the case of vehicles which have been hired, the Customs authorities of the Contracting States shall have the right to require the re-exportation of the vehicle as soon as the hirer has left the country of temporary importation.

2. Evidence of re-exportation shall be provided by the exit visa properly appended to the temporary importation papers by the Customs authorities of the country into which the vehicles were temporarily imported.

Article 13

1. Notwithstanding the requirement of re-exportation laid down in article 12, the re-exportation of badly damaged vehicles shall not be required, in the case of duly authenticated accidents, provided that the vehicles:

(a) are subjected to the import duties and import taxes to which they are liable; or

(b) are abandoned free of all expenses to the Exchequer of the country into which they were imported temporarily; or

(c) are destroyed, under official supervision, at the expense of the parties concerned

as the Customs authorities may require.

2. When a vehicle temporarily admitted cannot be re-exported as a result of a seizure, other than a seizure made at the suit of private persons, the requirement of re-exportation within the period of validity of the temporary importation papers shall be suspended for the duration of the seizure.

3. The Customs authorities shall notify, so far as possible, to the guaranteeing association, seizures made by or on behalf of these Customs authorities of vehicles admitted under cover of temporary importation papers guaranteed by that association and shall advise it of the measures they intend to take.

Article 14

Vehicles imported into the territory of one of the Contracting States under cover of temporary importation papers may not be used even incidentally for transport against payment, reward or other consideration between points within the frontiers of that territory.

Article 15

Persons entitled to temporary importation facilities may, during the period of validity of temporary importation papers, import the vehicles covered by those papers as often as necessary, on condition that they have each passage (entry and exit) established by a visa of the Customs officers concerned if the Customs authorities so require. Temporary importation papers may be made valid for a single journey only.

Article 16

When temporary importation papers without detachable vouchers for each passage are used, the visas given by the Customs officers between the first entry and the final exit are provisional. Nevertheless, when the last visa is a provisional exit visa, it will be admitted as proof of the re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts temporarily imported.

Article 17

When temporary importation papers with a detachable voucher for each passage are used, each entry implies the passing of the document by the Customs, and each subsequent exit constitutes its final discharge, except as provided in article 18.

Article 18

When the Customs authorities of a country have finally and unconditionally discharged temporary importation papers they can no longer claim from the guaranteeing association payment of import duties and import taxes, unless the certificate of discharge was obtained improperly or fraudulently.

Article 19

Visas on temporary importation papers used under the conditions laid down in this Convention shall not be subject to the payment of charges for Customs attendance during the authorized hours for Customs offices and posts.

CHAPTER VI—EXTENSION OF VALIDITY AND RENEWAL OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 20

The lack of proof of re-exportation within the time allowed of vehicles temporarily imported shall be disregarded when the vehicles are presented to the Customs authorities for re-exportation within fourteen days from the expiry of the papers and satisfactory explanations of the delay are given.

Article 21

Each of the Contracting States shall recognize as valid extensions of validity of carnets de passages en douane granted by another Contracting State in accordance with the procedure laid down in Annex 4 of this Convention.

Article 22

1. Requests for extension of validity of temporary importation papers shall be presented to the competent Customs authorities before the expiry of the period of validity of these papers, unless this is rendered impossible by force majeure. If the temporary importation paper has been issued by an authorized association, the request for extension shall be made by the association which guarantees the papers.

2. Extensions of time necessary for the re-exportation of vehicles or component parts imported temporarily shall be granted when the persons concerned can establish to the satisfaction of the Customs authorities that they are prevented by force majeure from re-exporting the said vehicles or component parts within the time allowed.

Article 23

Each of the Contracting States shall, unless the conditions of temporary admission are no longer satisfied, authorize, subject to whatever measures of control they may consider necessary, the renewal of temporary importation papers issued by the authorized associations and relating to vehicles or component parts temporarily imported into its territory. Requests for renewal shall be presented by the guaranteeing association.

CHAPTER VII—REGULARIZATION OF TEMPORARY IMPORTATION PAPERS

Article 24

1. If temporary importation papers have not been regularly discharged, the Customs authorities of the country of importation shall (whether the papers have expired or not) accept as evidence of re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts the presentation of a certificate based on the standard form shown in Annex 5 of this Convention issued by an official authority (consul, Customs, police, mayor, judicial officer, etc.), attesting the facts that the vehicle or component parts in question have been presented to it and are outside the country of importation. They may also accept any other documentary evidence that the vehicle or component parts are outside the country of importation. In the case of papers, other than the carnets de passages en douane, which have not expired, the papers shall be produced at the same time as the evidence referred to above. In the case of carnets account shall be taken, as evidence of re-exportation of the vehicles or component parts, of the visas entered thereon by the Customs authorities of countries subsequently visited.

2. In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of a temporary importation paper not regularly discharged but relating to a vehicle or component parts which have been re-exported, the Customs authorities of the country of importation shall accept as proof of re-exportation the presentation of a certificate based on the standard form shown in Annex 5 of this Convention issued by an official authority (consul, Customs, police, mayor, judicial official, etc.), attesting the facts that the vehicle or component parts in question have been presented to it and are outside the country of importation after the date of expiry of the paper. They may also accept any other documentary evidence that the vehicle or component parts are outside the country of importation.

3. In the case of the destruction, loss or theft of a carnet de passages en douane while the vehicle or component parts to which it refers are in the territory of one of the Contracting States, the Customs authorities of that State shall, at the request of the association concerned, accept a replacement document, the validity of which expires on the date of expiration of validity of the carnet which it replaces. This acceptance will annul the previous acceptance of the carnet destroyed, lost or stolen. If, instead of a replacement document, an export license or similar document is issued for the re-exportation of the vehicle or component parts, the exit visa on this license or document shall be considered as sufficient proof of re-exportation.

4. If the vehicle is stolen after having been re-exported from the country of temporary importation, without the exit having been regularly endorsed on the temporary importation papers and in the absence of entry visas on the papers entered thereon by the Customs authorities of countries subsequently visited, the papers may nevertheless be regularized provided that the guaranteeing association furnishes the papers together with such evidence of theft as may be considered sufficient. If the temporary importation papers have not expired, the Customs authorities may require their surrender.

Article 25

In the cases referred to in article 24, the Customs authorities shall have the right to charge a regularization fee.

Article 26

Customs authorities shall not have the right to require from the guaranteeing association payment of import duties and import taxes on vehicles or component parts temporarily imported when the nondischarge of the temporary importation papers has not been notified to the guaranteeing association within a year of the date of expiry of the validity of those papers.

Article 27

1. The guaranteeing associations shall have a period of one year from the date of notification of the non-discharge of temporary importation papers in which to furnish proof of the re-exportation of the vehicles or component parts in question under the conditions laid down in this Convention.

2. If such proof is not furnished within the time allowed, the guaranteeing association shall forthwith deposit or pay provisionally the import duties and import taxes payable. This deposit or payment shall become final after a period of one year from the date of the deposit or provisional payment. During the latter period, the guaranteeing association may still avail itself of the facilities provided by the preceding paragraph with a view to repayment of the sums deposited or paid.

3. For countries whose regulations do not provide for the deposit or provisional payment of import duties, payments made in conformity with the provisions of the preceding paragraph will be regarded as final, it being understood that the sums paid may be refunded when the conditions laid down in this article are fulfilled.

4. In the case of the non-discharge of temporary importation papers, the guaranteeing association shall not be required to pay a sum greater than the total of the import duties and import taxes applicable to the vehicles or component parts not re-exported, together with interest if applicable.

Article 28

In the event of fraud, contravention or abuse, the Contracting States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of this Convention, be free to take proceedings, against persons using temporary importation papers, for the recovery of the import duties and import taxes and also for the imposition of any penalties to which such persons have rendered themselves liable. In such cases, the guaranteeing associations shall lend their assistance to the Customs authorities.

CHAPTER VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 29

The Contracting States shall endeavor not to introduce Customs procedures which might have the effect of impeding the development of international touring.

Article 30

In order to expedite customs procedures contiguous Contracting States shall endeavor to place their respective Customs posts close together and to keep them open during the same hours.

Article 31

Any breach of the provisions of this Convention, any substitution, false declaration or act having the effect of causing a person or an article improperly to benefit from the system of importation laid down in this Convention, may render the offender liable in the country where the offence was committed to the penalties prescribed by the laws of that country.

Article 32

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent Contracting States which form a customs or economic union from enacting special provisions applicable to residents of the States forming that union.

CHAPTER IX—FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 33

1. This Convention shall be open for signature until 31 December 1954 on behalf of any State Member of the United Nations and any other State invited to attend the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism held in New York in May and June 1954, hereinafter referred to as the Conference.

2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 34

1. From 1 January 1955 this Convention shall be open for accession by any State referred to in paragraph 1 of article 33 and any other State so invited by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. It shall also be open for accession on behalf of any Trust Territory of which the United Nations is the Administering Authority.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 35

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 39.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the date of the deposit of the fifteenth instrument of ratification or accession in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession either without reservation or with reservations accepted in accordance with article 39.

Article 36

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may denounce it by so notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. Denunciation shall take effect fifteen months after the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the notification of denunciation.

Article 37

This Convention shall cease to have effect if, for any period of twelve consecutive months after its entry into force, the number of Contracting States is less than eight.

Article 38

1. Any State may, at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations that this Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible. The Convention shall extend to the territories named in the notification as from the ninetieth day after its receipt by the Secretary-General if the notification is not accompanied by a reservation, or from the ninetieth day after the notification has taken effect in accordance with article 39, or on the date on which the Convention enters into force for the State concerned, whichever is the later.

2. Any State which has made a declaration under the preceding paragraph extending this Convention to any territory for whose international relations it is responsible may denounce the Convention separately in respect of that territory in accordance with the provisions of article 36.

Article 39

1. Reservations to this Convention made before the signing of the Final Act shall be admissible if they have been accepted by a majority of the members of the Conference and recorded in the Final Act.

2. Reservations made after the signing of the Final Act shall not be admitted if objection is expressed by one-third of the Signatory States or of the Contracting States as hereinafter provided.

3. The text of any reservation submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by a State at the time of the signature, the deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession or of any notification under article 38 shall be circulated by the Secretary-General to all States which have at that time signed, ratified or acceded to the Convention. If one-third of these States expresses an objection within ninety days from the date of circulation, the reservation shall not be accepted. The Secretary-General shall notify all States referred to in this paragraph of any objection received by him as well as of the acceptance or rejection of the reservation.

4. An objection by a State which has signed but not ratified the Convention shall cease to have effect if, within a period of nine months from the date of making its objection, the objecting State has not ratified the Convention. If, as the result of an objection ceasing to have effect, a reservation is accepted by application of the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall so inform the States referred to in that paragraph. The text of any reservation shall not be circulated to any signatory State under the preceding paragraph if that State has not ratified the Convention within three years following the date of signature on its behalf.

5. The State submitting the reservation may, within a period of twelve months from the date of the notification by the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 3 that a reservation has been rejected in accordance with the procedure provided for in that paragraph, withdraw the reservation, in which case the instrument of ratification or accession or the notification under article 38 as the case may be shall take effect with respect to such State as from the date of the withdrawal. Pending such withdrawal, the instrument or the notification as the case may be, shall not have effect, unless, by application of the provisions of paragraph 4, the reservation is subsequently accepted.

6. Reservations accepted in accordance with this article may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General.

7. No Contracting State shall be required to extend to a State making a reservation the benefit of the provisions to which such reservation applies. Any State availing itself of this right shall notify the Secretary-General accordingly and the latter shall communicate this decision to all signatory and Contracting States.

Article 40

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall so far as possible be settled by negotiation between them.

2. Any dispute which is not settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration if any one of the Contracting States in dispute so requests and shall be referred accordingly to one or more arbitrators selected by agreement between the States in dispute. If within three months from the date of the request for arbitration the States in dispute are unable to agree on the selection of an arbitrator or arbitrators, any of those States may request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate a single arbitrator to whom the dispute shall be referred for decision.

3. The decision of the arbitrator or arbitrators appointed under the preceding paragraph shall be binding on the Contracting States concerned.

Article 41

1. After this Convention has been in force for three years, any Contracting State may, by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, request that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the Convention. The Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States of the request and a review conference shall be convened by the Secretary-General if, within a period of four months following the date of notification by the Secretary-General, not less than one-half of the Contracting States notify him of their concurrence with the request.

2. If a conference is convened in accordance with the preceding paragraph, the Secretary-General shall notify all Contracting States and invite them to submit within a period of three months such proposals as they may wish the conference to consider. The Secretary-General shall circulate to all Contracting States the provisional agenda for the conference together with the texts of such proposals at least three months before the date on which the conference is to meet.

3. The Secretary-General shall invite to any conference convened in accordance with this article all Contracting States and all other States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies.

Article 42

1. Any Contracting State may propose one or more amendments to this convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall circulate it to all Contracting States.

2. Any proposed amendment circulated in accordance with the preceding paragraph shall be deemed to be accepted if no Contracting State expresses an objection within a period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General.

3. The Secretary-General shall notify as soon as possible all Contracting States whether an objection to the proposed amendment has been expressed, and if no such objection has been expressed, the amendment shall enter into force for all Contracting States three months after the expiration of the period of six months referred to in the preceding paragraph.

Article 43

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify all Member States of the United Nations and all other States invited to attend the conference of the following:

(a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions, received in accordance with articles 33 and 34;

(b) The date upon which this convention shall enter into force in accordance with article 35;

(c) Denunciations received in accordance with article 36;

(d) The abrogation of this convention in accordance with article 37;

(e) Notifications received under article 38;

(f) Entry into force of any amendment in accordance with article 42.

Article 44

The original of this Convention shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations who shall transmit certified copies thereof to all Members of the United Nations and all other States invited to the Conference.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have signed this Convention.

Done at New York this fourth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four, in a single copy in the English, French and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic.

The Secretary-General is requested to prepare an authoritative translation of this Convention in the Chinese and Russian languages and to add the Chinese and Russian texts to the English, French and Spanish texts when transmitting certified copies thereof to the States in accordance with article 44 of this Convention.

For Afghanistan:
For Albania:
For Argentina:
Ad Referendum
LUIS J. ESTEVARENA.
For Australia:
For Austria:
Dr. J. STANGELBERGER.
For the Kingdom of Belgium:
Sous réserve de ratification
CH. HOPCHET.
For Bolivia:
For Brazil:
For Bulgaria:
For the Union of Burma:
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For Cambodia:
IEM KADUL.
For Canada:
For Ceylon:
Subject to the reservation recorded in the Final Act
H. SHIRLEY AMERASINGHE.
For Chile:
For China:
For Colombia:
For Costa Rica:
ad-referendum
J. F. CARBALLO.
July 20th, 1954.
For Cuba:
JOSÉ MIGUEL RIBAS.
For Czechoslovakia:
For Denmark:
For the Dominican Republic:
Ad Referendum
R. O. GALVÁN.
For Ecuador:
B. OQUENDO.
For Egypt:
RACHAD MOURAD.
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For Finland:
For France:
PHILIPPE DE SEYNES.
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
RICHARD PAULIG.
WALTER WAGNER.
For Greece:
For Guatemala:
Con sujeción a las reservas consignadas en el Acta Final.
E. CASTILLO ARRIOLA.
For Haiti:
ERNEST G. CHAUVET.
For Honduras:
TIBURCIO CARÍAS JR.
June 15, 1954.
For Hungary:
For Iceland:
For India:
Subject to the reservations recorded in the Final Act.
A. S. LALL.
For Indonesia:
For Iran:
For Iraq:
For Ireland:
For Israel:
For Italy:
UGO CALDERONI.
For Japan:
For the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan:
For the Republic of Korea:
For Laos:
For Lebanon:
For Liberia:
For Libya:
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
For Mexico:
Con subjeción a la reserva consignada en el Acta Final.
JOSÉ A. BUFORT.
For Monaco:
MARCEL A. PALMARO.

For Nepal:
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
PAYMANS.
For New Zealand:
For Nicaragua:
For the Kingdom of Norway:
For Pakistan:
For Panama:
Ad referendum
ERNESTO DE LA OSSA.
For Paraguay:
For Peru:
For the Philippine Republic:
MAURO MÉNDEZ.
For Poland:
For Portugal:
ad referendum
FREIRE DE ANDRADE.
For Romania:
For San Marino:
For Saudi Arabia:
For Spain:
ad referendum
R. DE LA PRESILLA.
For Sweden:
G. DE SYDOW.
A. APPELTOFFT.
For Switzerland:
FR. LÜTHI.
For Syria:
For Thailand:
For Turkey:
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
J. K. HULME.
For the United States of America:
JAMES J. WADSWORTH.
HENRY H. KELLY.
For Uruguay:
Ad Referendum
E. RODRÍGUEZ FABREGAT.
For Vatican City:
Monseigneur THOMAS J. MCMAHON.
For Venezuela:
For Viet-Nam:
For Yemen:
For Yugoslavia:
Certified true copy
For the Secretary-General:
C. A. STAVROPOULOS,
Principal Director in Charge of the Legal Department.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the protocol, Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, now before the Senate for advice and consent to ratification, has as its only purpose to change the requirement for an annual meeting of the assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization—ICAO—to a triennial meeting, that is, a meeting once every 3 years.

The Organization has found over the years of its operations that full meetings of the assembly every year are not necessary for its effective functioning. It believes that a meeting once every 3 years would suffice to deal with questions of major policy and organization.

This Civil International Aviation Organization handles technical problems related to international air traffic. Other organizations of this nature, like the Postal Union, the Telecommunications Union, the Meteorological Organization, meet about once every 4 or 5 years, which has proven to be entirely adequate. If an unforeseen problem of major importance should arise during the intervening years between sessions, the assembly could still be called together in an extraordinary meeting to deal with the situation.

The protocol itself amends the three provisions in the convention which require or make reference to annual meetings or the voting of annual budgets.

I believe the Senate will go along with me when I say that perhaps we have fallen into the habit of having too many international meetings in some fields and that it is refreshing to find an international body deciding that it could get along with fewer meetings. This should, moreover, result in a budgetary saving, both for the Organization, and for each member, who, after all, has to bear the costs for sending delegations to these meetings.

I hope that the Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of this protocol.

I do not know whether it is preferable that I proceed with my statement on the two conventions at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the fact that under the order previously entered a vote on the protocol will be considered a vote on the two conventions, I believe it would be more helpful if the Senator from Rhode Island were to explain all three matters before a vote is had.

Mr. GREEN. Then I shall proceed to explain the two conventions, which will be considered together, and to say a word of explanation and justification for them.

The purpose of the two conventions is to simplify and standardize customs procedures in connection with the international transportation of the personal belongings and automobiles of tourists. The essence of the touring convention is an agreement to allow tourists to bring into and take out of the country duty-free a limited amount of personal effects and souvenirs. The main point of the convention on private road vehicles is the agreement to admit the automobiles of tourists duty-free for visits of not more than 6 months' duration.

These conventions will be of great help to travelers. They will reduce substantially the complex and time-consuming formalities for crossing international borders. The conventions will cost the United States nothing. The 1956 travel season is about to begin and it would be a great help to Americans who plan to go abroad if the United States were to ratify the conventions and if they were to become effective soon. Also our ratification may hasten approval of the other nations that are parties to them.

The two conventions require no change in United States law and they will have no effect on State laws.

Citizens of the United States will be the chief beneficiaries of the conventions because more of our people travel abroad than do citizens of any other country and because United States Customs procedures are already more liberal than those which the conventions require. In addition, the spur to travel which these conventions will make will have an important and beneficial effect on the trade and cultural interchange of the free world.

The two conventions are endorsed by the Department of State and Department of Commerce and by the American Automobile Association. No objections to the conventions have been received.

I hope that the Senate will give its advice and consent to the ratification of these two conventions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolutions of ratification I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the protocol and conventions will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages, up to the point of consideration of the resolutions of ratification. The clerk will now read the resolutions of ratification.

The Chief Clerk read the resolutions of ratification, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, a protocol dated at Montreal June 14, 1954, relating to certain amendments to the convention on international civil aviation.

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session, a convention concerning customs facilities for touring, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session, a customs convention on the temporary importation of private road vehicles, signed at New York on June 4, 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate has under consideration Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, on the Executive Calendar. The yeas and nays have been ordered on Executive F, and, by order of the Senate previously agreed to, ratification of Executive F will automatically be deemed to include ratification of Executive A, 84th Congress, 2d session, and Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—81

Aiken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Millikin
Anderson	Goldwater	Morse
Barkley	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Murray
Beall	Hayden	Neely
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hruska	Pastore
Bricker	Humphrey	Payne
Bridges	Jackson	Potter
Bush	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Laird	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Dirksen	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thye
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Flanders	McClellan	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Butler	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Byrd	Hill	Monroney
Daniel	Ives	Scott
Eastland	Kefauver	Smathers
George	Mansfield	Wiley

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification to Executive F, 84th Congress, 2d session, is agreed to.

In accordance with the order previously entered, the advice and consent of the Senate is hereby deemed to have been given to the ratification of Executive A and Executive B, 84th Congress, 2d session, and the resolutions of ratification thereto are agreed to by the same vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the ratification of the protocol and the two customs conventions upon which a vote has just been taken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, following the consideration of the treaties on the Executive Calendar, the Senate will now proceed to the call of the calendar. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5566) to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that Calendar No. 1748, House bill 5566, is being called, and I do not believe the Senator's calendar committee is present. I have a notation that that bill should be held on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That bill should be held on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 3025) to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAYMON H. A. MASSEY

The bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Waymon H. A. Massey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF WOODROW WILSON

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 444) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in whose case deportation has been suspended for 6 months pursuant to section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (54 Stat. 671; 56 Stat. 1044; 62 Stat. 1206), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings and to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of each alien in accordance with the provisions of section 244 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 216–217), upon the payment to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of a fee of $18, which fee shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts:

A–2568385, Frett, Lilly M.
A–9605857, Frett, Rudyard D.
A–8014941, Todman, Edith Eileen.
A–3148643, Todman, William Isaac.
A–5978822, Turnbull, Joyce E.
A–8057169, Turnbull, Norwell Leon.

ISABEL TRE

The bill (S. 146) for the relief of Isabel Tre was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isabel Tre shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

ELLI YORGIYADIS

The bill (S. 1364) for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elli Yorgiyadis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARIO FARABULLINI AND ALLA FARABULLINI, HIS WIFE

The bill (S. 1885) for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States

for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

GIUSEPPE CULCASI

The bill (S. 2095) for the relief of Giuseppe Culcasi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Culcasi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

MARIA NOVAK

The bill (S. 2244) for the relief of Maria Novak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (b) (2) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the alien Maria Novak shall be held and considered to be the alien parent of Janvid John Staut, a citizen of the United States.

CECILE ANGELE CHAFFOO

The bill (S. 2563) for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cecile Angele Chaffoo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

THEODORE F. HARTUNG AND MRS. ELIZABETH HARTUNG

The bill (H. R. 1099) for the relief of Theodore F. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALIH HOUGI AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 1179) for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KHATOUN MALKEY SAMUEL

The bill (H. R. 2796) for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUGLIELMO JOSEPH PERRELLA

The bill (H. R. 2948) for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. BERGOS (FORMERLY ATHANASIOS KRITSELIS)

The bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOIS O. JENNINGS

The bill (H. R. 4466) for the relief of Lois O. Jennings was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO PENNA

The bill (H. R. 4588) for the relief of Antonio Penna was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPE LADDOMADA AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 586) for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, to strike out "their entries into the United States" and insert "the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Laddomada, Antonietta Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MELECIO ACOSTA-MORALES

The bill (S. 1013) for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill provides for cancellation of deportation proceedings in behalf of a 39-year-old native and citizen of Mexico, who last entered the United States on December 5, 1953, as a returning resident. He was first admitted to the United States in 1920. On December 16, 1953, the beneficiary was convicted of the crime of knowingly and fraudulently importing narcotic drugs into the United States, and was sentenced to imprisonment for 2 years and a fine. Upon payment of the fine, the prison sentence was suspended.

The beneficiary states that while visiting across the border in Mexico, narcotic drugs were placed in his car, and when he attempted to reenter the United States, the drugs were discovered. The beneficiary is married to a United States citizen, and the couple have four citizen children. The beneficiary is well thought of in the community in which he resides, and this is the only time he has been arrested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Melecio Acosta-Morales. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Melecio Acosta-Morales shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTINO PALMERI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1101) for the relief of Martino Palmeri, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Martino Palmeri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments: on page 2, line 5, after the name "Chamberis", to insert "Olga

P. Cheek"; in line 6, after the name "Corra", to insert "Nicola G. D'Armi"; in line 8, after the name "Falcone", to insert "Anna G. Favia"; in line 9, after the name "Gasparatos", to insert "Lilli Gerlinsky"; in line 10, after the name "Gibson", to insert "Lieselotte W. Grimmer"; in line 11, after the name "Israel", to insert "Efstathios Katsikis"; in line 12, after the name "Kikel", to insert "Hedwig B. Krause, Gertrud H. E. T. Kruger"; in line 13, after the name "Labellarte", to insert "Margaret W. Lampinen"; in line 14, after the name "Larson", to insert "Chieko S. Lee"; in line 16, after the name "Loukatos", to strike out "Elfriede Luker"; in the same line after the name "McGrath", to strike out "Maria McWalters" and insert "Marianne Putz McWalters"; in line 19, after the name "Mavromatis", to insert "Tatjana Meerman"; in line 25, after the name "Pantera", to insert "Armaranti N. Papanikitas, Maria M. Regina"; on page 3, line 1, after the name "Ruschak", to insert "Anna Sagan"; and in line 6, after the name "Wilson", to insert "Brian Woo."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN THE HUALAPAI INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 2822) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Hualapai Tribe of Indians is located in the northwestern part of Arizona. In their entire history they have not had adequate school buildings. Recently the tribe met and sent a resolution to the Department of the Interior authorizing and approving the transfer of 9 acres of Indian land to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.

I should like to relate to the Senate an amusing incident in this connection. Only 1 voter, 1 property owner, lives in school district No. 8. The other day the polls were opened for her. She went to the polls and voted "aye" on the school bonds.

Money will be expended in the sum of about $129,000 to construct this school. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that if the school is ever abandoned, the land will revert to the Department of the Interior in trusteeship for the Hualapai Tribe of Indians.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after the word "purposes", to insert "and are available to Indians and non-Indians on the same terms unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior"; in line 5, after the word "school", to strike out "purposes," and insert "purposes or is made available to Indians and non-Indians on different terms without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary may publish in the Federal Register a declaration to that effect and"; and, in line 10, after the word "Tribe", to insert a colon and "Provided also, That the Secretary of the Interior may not approve any terms or conditions which would discriminate against Indians", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by patent to school district No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz., all right, title, and interest of the United States and the Hualapai Tribe of Indians in and to a tract of approximately 9 acres of land within the Hualapai Indian Reservation described as part of the southwest quarter of section 23, township 25 north, range 11 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, as long as such lands are used for school purposes and are available to Indians and non-Indians on the same terms unless otherwise approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That if said tract no longer is used for school purposes or is made available to Indians and non-Indians on different terms without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary may publish in the Federal Register a declaration to that effect and all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to the United States in trust for the Hualapai Tribe: *Provided also*, That the Secretary of the Interior may not approve any terms or conditions which would discriminate against Indians: *And provided further*, That all mineral rights, including gas and oil, are reserved for the use and benefit of the Hualapai Tribe. The lands to be so transferred to said school district are described in detail as follows: Starting at the north quarter corner of section 23, township 25 north, range 11 west, Gila and Salt River meridian, Mohave County, Arizona, marked by a Government set brass capped iron pipe; thence, north 89 degrees 57 minutes east, along the north line of said section 23, a distance of 109.09 feet to a point; thence, south 2 degrees 48 minutes 30 seconds west, a distance of 2646.76 feet to a point; thence, north 84 degrees 20 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 109.04 feet to a point; thence, south 33 degrees 28 minutes 15 seconds west, a distance of 949.8 feet to the place of beginning, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 28 degrees 31 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 313.73 feet to a corner, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence south 61 degrees 48 minutes 15 seconds east, a distance of 167.08 feet to a corner and point along the northwesterly right-of-way boundary of an oil cake paved road, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 26 degrees 41 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 273.58 feet along the said northwesterly right-of way boundary of said paved road, marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 63 degrees 29 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 446.41 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 26 degrees 40 minutes 30 seconds west, a distance of 188.92 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 63 degrees 29 minutes 45 seconds west, a distance of 403.75 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 9 degrees 16 minutes 15 seconds east, 365.56 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 88 degrees 47 minutes 15 seconds east, a distance of 433.09 feet to a corner point marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, north 75 degrees 12 minutes 45 seconds east, a distance of 289.71 feet to a corner marked by a half-inch iron pipe; thence, south 79 degrees 28 minutes 45 seconds east, a distance of 202.51 feet to the place of beginning.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The bill (S. 3673) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I request the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to explain the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last year, for the first time, the Atomic Energy Commission was required to seek authorization for the construction or expansion of existing facilities, or the acquisition or condemnation of any real property. That situation arose because of the new Atomic Energy Act of 1954. For a long time, of course, there was extreme secrecy even as to where the installations were located. However, as the program has developed, it has seemed proper for those sponsoring the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to require that the Atomic Energy Commission, in its budget, set forth the installations it desired to build and the expansion it desired to make.

Section 261 of Public Law 703 provides as follows:

SEC. 261. Appropriation.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

The first part of this section grants general authorization for the appropriation of money needed by the Atomic Energy Commission for operating purposes. The latter portion of the above cited section, however, specifically provides that each year authority must be

sought for any moneys to be used for construction or acquisition purposes.

The initial authority last year—which became Public Law 141—established the format and general limitations upon the expenditure of such money. It will be noted that on page 2 of the pending bill there is a series of items for the Hanford, Wash., installation totaling about $30 million. Heretofore, when money was needed, the Atomic Energy Commission came forward and asked for one and a half or two billion dollars, and because of the generally secret nature of the work, as the distinguished majority leader well knows, we did not try to itemize the projects.

This time it is different. The first item calls for an authorization of $22,200,000; then there is an item of $55 million for an aircraft nuclear propulsion ground test plant, and so forth, throughout the bill. This time the items are all set forth as clearly as security will permit.

Section 101 contains a list of the projects identified by numbers. This section is broken down into general categories which relate to major programs being carried on by the Commission. It is further subdivided for purposes of setting specific limitations under which the various projects may be started when the deviation is at variance from the estimate originally prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission.

In section 102 these deviations are detailed.

Section 103 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to use funds currently or otherwise available to it for such purposes for advance planning, construction, design, and architectural services it deems necessary but which are not otherwise authorized by law.

Section 104 of the bill authorizes the appropriations of funds necessary to restore or replace plants or facilities destroyed or otherwise seriously damaged. In addition the Commission is authorized to use such funds as may be currently or otherwise available to it under these emergency conditions.

Section 105 of the bill authorizes the Commission to utilize not only the moneys authorized to be appropriated in section 101 of this bill but also any other funds which may be currently available to it for accomplishing the purposes of this bill.

Section 106 authorizes the Commission under certain specific procedures to substitute within the limits of money authorized by this bill a new project, the estimate for which is not contained in this bill.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through its Subcommittee on Legislation, has held detailed hearings on the projects identified in this bill and is satisfied that these items are essential to the national defense and to the furtherance of the civilian application of atomic energy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The Chair is advised that there is on the desk a House bill, H. R. 10387, which is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 10387.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 10387), to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 3673 is indefinitely postponed.

RATES CHARGED PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

The bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall object, in view of the fact that no report on the bill is available—I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have an explanation?

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The report may be available later in the day. I understand the bill was unanimously reported from the committee. An explanation could be made.

Mr. PURTELL. I welcome an explanation. However, I shall still object to the passage of the bill on the call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut withhold his objection pending an explanation?

Mr. PURTELL. I withhold my objection pending an explanation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, this bill was introduced as the result of action on the part of the Department of the Interior, which was taken to bring about an increase in the rates charged by the Southwestern Power Administration, an agency of the Interior Department, for power sold to the preference customers of the Government, namely, rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and Government installations.

The rate now in effect was put into effect, I believe, in 1946, for a period of a certain number of years, with the notice that the interim rate would then terminate, and the future rate would be as fixed by the Federal Power Commission, or as approved by the Federal Power Commission upon the application of the Southwestern Power Administration.

A number of actions have been taken since the expiration of the primary term of the rates, whereby the same rate was continued in effect, on the application of the Department of the Interior, and with the approval of the Federal Power Commission. Now the Department of the Interior seeks to increase the rate by about 40 percent.

Pursuant to action by the Public Works Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the corresponding committees in the House, whereby they requested the Department of the Interior to postpone its effort to bring about an increase in the rate, the Department of the Interior has three times postponed the action whereby it sought to bring about an immediate increase in the rate. Each of the postponements was for 30 days. The last one was made on April 7.

In the absence of a further request by the Department of the Interior, which we do not anticipate, or in the absence of a denial by the Federal Power Commission of the application of the Department of the Interior to increase the rate, it means that 30 days after April 7 the rate charged by the Southwest Power Administration for electric power furnished to the rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and the Government installations served will be increased by about 40 percent. That will result, in my judgment, and on the basis of testimony brought before the committee, either in the serious impairment of the financial structure of most rural electric cooperatives in the Southwest, or in their being forced into such a position that they will have to fail to meet their commitments for repayment of their loans to the Government.

It is the position of those who introduced the bill and of the sponsors of the bill—and they are on both sides of the aisle, and action on it was unanimous by the Public Works Committee—that if the bill is not passed, a crisis will confront the power consumers which will result in an impairment of their position. Such a result, in my judgment, would be contrary to the wishes of Congress and contrary to the spirit of the act under which the preference customers were created, and would cause to the farmers of the country hardship and a great burden, which would be added to the other burdens which we know about, and with which we are so well acquainted and familiar.

It is my hope, and the hope of the sponsors of the proposed legislation, that the bill will be passed by the Senate. It would freeze the rates as of this date until June 30, 1957. During the interim it would be the purpose of the sponsors of the proposed legislation to seek to

bring about, by further legislation, a declaration of policy by Congress which would control the Department of the Interior in the fixing of its rates to the REA's, the municipalities, and Government installations.

If it is not done, we will be confronted with the very amazing situation that the Reynolds Aluminum Co., under the terms of a contract made some three or four years ago, to run for 25 years, would be getting power from the Southwest Power Administration, through the Arkansas Light and Power Co. transmission facilities, at a rate less than 5 mills per kilowatt-hour, while at the same time every rural electric cooperative which is being served by the Southwest Power Administration would be paying a little more than 7¾ mills per kilowatt-hour.

We would be confronted by a situation whereby the REA's, municipalities, and Government installations themselves would not only be paying the Government a sufficient amount to reimburse the Government for the part of the power facilities which furnish power dedicated to these customers, but the REA's and the others would also be paying a deficit which the Interior Department says has been and is being created because they are selling power too cheap or at less than cost, first, to the utilities themselves and, second, to the Reynolds Aluminum Co.

I know it is not the purpose of Congress either to bring that about or to permit it. However, unless the bill is passed, that situation will develop.

Therefore, in view of the fact, first, that the action of the committee was unanimous and, second, that the bill was amended in a way which, in my judgment, meets the specific objections both of the Department of the Interior and of the Budget Bureau, it is my hope, Mr. President, that the objection will be withdrawn and the bill permitted to be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce, for the information of the Senate, that the Government Printing Office seems to be slow in sending to the Senate reports on some of the bills on the calendar. I do not know the extent of the hearings involved, or how voluminous is the report on the pending bill which makes it impossible for the Printing Office to have the report available when the bill is being considered. However, I assume that the Government Printing Office has its own justification. I have asked that the matter be looked into. I assume that the report on the bill will reach the Senate some time during the day. I would therefore like to inform the Senate that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bills on the calendar, if the report is available—so that Senators who prefer to read the report, may study it—it will be the purpose of the leadership to bring the bill up on motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Texas for handling the business of the Senate so rapidly that he even keeps ahead of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, if I may address an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to ask him whether a delay in the consideration of the bill until the report is received would in any way interfere with the objective of the bill. My objection is based entirely on the fact that no report on the bill is available to us.

Mr. KERR. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that it would not. However, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who sits with him, and who participated in the hearings on the bill and in the writing of the bill, is thoroughly familiar with it, and indeed helped to bring about the action which resulted in the bill being reported to the Senate. I would be glad to accept from him any amendment to the statement I made to the bill if I in any way failed to give a correct or adequate explanation of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is not the purpose of the majority leader that the Senate consider any measure unless and until each Senator can hear the report, feel the report, actually touch it, and even smell it, if he wants to do so, notwithstanding the fact that it may be an oral report. For that reason I will myself ask that the bill go over until the report on it is available.

The majority leader wishes to call attention to the fact that the Government Printing Office should have had the report available for us.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his attitude, and I thank the Senator from Texas for his kind remarks, and I shall be very glad to accede to their request.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said about the conditions which have arisen. It is very unfortunate that discrimination should exist in that area under the new formula of the Department of the Interior. I wish to associate myself with what the Senator from Oklahoma has said about it today.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I wish to say one further word. It is the purpose of the Department of the Interior to follow through on this policy wherever the Department of the Interior provides power.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I also wish to associate myself with the Senator from Oklahoma in supporting the bill, and to point out that if for any reason the parliamentary situation should be such that we cannot consider the bill on the call of the calendar, I hope the majority leader will schedule the bill for debate at a very early date.

It is obviously a very sound bill. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall that he offered it during the debate on the farm bill as an amendment to the farm bill. At that time it was ruled—and I believe erroneously ruled—that the amendment was not germane to the farm bill. In due time, I intend to file with the Senate a memorandum on that parliamentary ruling, because I believe it is a precedent which must be erased from the records of the Senate. The bill is actually a farm aid bill, in that it comes to the assistance of the REA's. In my judgment, it is just as germane to a farm bill as any aid provision in any farm bill could possibly be.

I hope the bill will be considered at a very early date, either on the call of the calendar or by way of its being scheduled for debate on motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On request of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] the bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 240) certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the judiciary concerning Mary Knowles was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that Calendar 1784, Senate Resolution 240, just announced, and Calendar 1785, Senate Resolution 241, certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Leveright, be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be passed over.

The bill (S. 924) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is requested of Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the committee reported the bill with the statement that the penalties imposed were not sufficient in cases of this kind. The bill raises the amount of the fine from not more than $5,000 to not more than $20,000 in cases of seditious conspiracy, and the term of imprisonment from not more than 6 years

to not more than 20 years. The bill increases the fine and the term of the sentence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that there is no report accompanying the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MEMORIAL TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN FOUNDATION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 71) to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Whereas it is fitting that there should be a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians, the original Americans;

Whereas there has been chartered by the State of Michigan a nonprofit corporation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for the purpose of establishing such a memorial, which will be located in the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas the establishment of such a memorial would acknowledge the contribution made to our Nation by the North American Indians: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby commends the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its noteworthy project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians, and extends to such Foundation its best wishes in carrying out such project.

EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS FROM ACADIA NATIONAL PARK, MAINE

The bill (S. 2305) to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the bill simply permits the Federal Government to dispose of 300 acres of certain surplus property for which the Federal Government finds no further use. It is referred to as a part of the Acadia National Park. However, it is located some 35 miles away from that park. There was formerly a fish hatchery located on the property which the Government closed some time ago.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose the transaction is in accordance with terms and conditions of the Surplus Property Act?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land in Acadia National Park, State of Maine, comprising approximately 300 acres and identified as the "Green Lake Fish Hatchery Tract" is hereby excluded from Acadia National Park, and the said tract is authorized to be disposed of in accordance with the laws relating to the disposition of Federal property.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY THE COUNTY OF CUSTER, MONT.

The bill (S. 3254) to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill relates to property conveyed originally for fairground purposes. The Federal Government would like to have back a small parcel of the land, and the State has no use for the particular property involved in the bill. Inasmuch as the law requires that the property must be disposed of in a block, the bill would permit the State to give back the desired portion of the property without affecting the status of the remainder.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the county of Custer, State of Montana, may, notwithstanding the provisions of the act of April 15, 1924 (43 Stat. 97), convey by quitclaim deed to the United States of America, for acceptance by the Secretary of the Interior under existing law, the following tract of land:

That portion of tract "C" as shown on the supplemental plat of townships 7 and 8 north, range 47 east, principal meridian, Montana, accepted by the assistant commissioner of the General Land Office on March 23, 1927, which is described as follows: Beginning at a point on the south boundary of tract "C", 669.23 feet north 73 degrees 10 minutes west of corner numbered 11 of tract "C", which point is 80 feet south 28 degrees 08 minutes west of the fair grounds boundary fence; thence north 61 degrees 52 minutes west, parallel with and 80 feet from the fair grounds boundary fence, a distance of 1,280.123 feet to the west boundary of tract "C"; thence south 16 degrees 50 minutes west along the west boundary of tract "C", a distance of 250.84 feet to a corner numbered 3 of tract "C"; thence south 73 degrees 10 minutes east along the south boundary of tract "C", a distance of 1,255.33 feet to the place of beginning, containing 3.614 acres, more or less.

TITLE AND POSSESSION TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY, PENSACOLA, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 5310) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this is a bill to quiet title to certain property in Pensacola, Fla. The title to this property runs back prior to the date when the United States took possession of Florida. The Federal Government has no objection to the proposed legislation. There might be some question as to whether a rather complicated lawsuit should be used to accomplish the objective, but there is no objection to quieting the title.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill involves a 39-foot lot in the city of Pensacola, title to which had passed from the Spanish Government 6 years prior to the acquisition of the Floridas. There is no objection by anyone to this bill, which, in effect, quiets title to that 39-foot lot. There is an explanation contained in the House Report No. 1772, a reading of which would, I think, prevent any question arising as to adjoining lands, because the point raised here does not apply to the adjoining lands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the House report, consisting of about one page, under the heading "Explanation," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the House Report No. 1772 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

Pensacola was an established town when the United States acquired Florida in 1819. Under the Spanish grant the United States succeeded to the rights of Spain in lands within the city of which disposition had not been made.

It appears from the records that the 39-foot lot described in the bill was disposed of 6 years before the United States acquired Florida from Spain. However, it appears that in order to perfect title it is necessary that the United States disclaim any interest whatsoever by quitclaim deed.

A photostatic copy of the abstract of title to the land, prepared by the Title Guarantee Co. of Florida, shows that on June 26, 1813, the parcel of land described in the bill was sold for the city, of Pensacola by Don Antonio Cabanas, minister of army and finance, to one Maria Louisa Gayarre. The deed is recorded in Spanish Archives A, page 321, and recites that it was sold by order of the Governor and Ayuntamento to provide for the purchase of provisions for the garrison. In 1817 the property was deeded to James Falconal. There followed a long succession of recorded deeds in the chain of title down to the present claimants to the property.

The Department of the Interior has no objection to the enactment of legislation which would accomplish the objective of this measure. However, the Department's report suggested an amendment to the act of January 12, 1925 (43 Stat. 738), so as to permit the claimant to have his claim adjudicated under the Color of Title Act of December 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 1069), as amended (43 U. S. C., secs. 1068–1068b). The departmental report and testimony before the Public Lands Subcommittee base support for the suggested amendment primarily on the declared belief, or on speculation, that there may be other property in the old city tract of Pensacola subject to the same title uncertainties here involved, i. e., other property which might require quitclaiming of title by the United States at some time in the future. The feeling of the Department, also acknowledged to be based on speculation, that the issuance of a quitclaim deed on the property might cloud the title of adjacent land patented (patent No. 996,407) in 1927, is not shared by the committee.

The committee notes and the Department witness so affirmed during the hearing on the bill, that the amendment proposed by the

Department would involve a complicated procedure requiring an adjudication by the Federal Government as to the ownership of the land, whereas nothing more than a simple action to quiet title, as provided by H. R. 5310, is all that is necessary in this instance. The author of H. R. 5310, the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes, suggests, and the committee agrees, that in the event that any other property in Pensacola is found to require similar treatment, it should be considered and disposed of on its merits.

The committee recommends the enactment of H. R. 5310.

No expenditure of Federal funds is required by this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES OF REMAINS OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 8728) to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN MONTANA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1053) to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion in order to authorize the renewal of such lease, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may dispose of the southwest quarter southeast quarter and the east half of southeast quarter southwest quarter of section 35, township 32 north, range 32 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising 60 acres, to Phillips County Post, No. 57, of the American Legion, Department of Montana, under the provisions of the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173).

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion."

CONVEYANCE BY QUITCLAIM DEED OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 2144) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quit claim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that we have no report accompanying this bill, I ask that it be passed over.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut withhold his request?

Mr. PURTELL. I shall be delighted to withhold it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this bill involves 20 acres of property in the State of North Dakota. The property would be sold in order that it could be used for burial plots. It would be sold at its appraised value. If there is good reason for delaying action on the bill, I shall not insist on explaining it, but I am sure the Senator from Connecticut would have no objection to it.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection to the bill being brought up later today, but by reason of the fact that we have no report accompanying the bill, I ask that it go over.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I see no objection to considering any bill passed over only because no report was available as, in effect, a new bill, and not as one included with those bills which are passed over for cause, because, as the Senator knows, we sometimes begin a calendar call with a new bill. If objection is raised only because of the report not being before us, I think it would be well to consider such a bill subsequently as being called up for the first time.

Mr. LONG. I think there are three other bills now on the calendar which do not happen to have reports.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if I might propound a question. Is that to be the attitude taken with reference to every bill on which no report is available? I am asking the question for the simple reason that there is another measure on the calendar in which I am interested, and I shall not wait for it to come up if this is to be the course followed.

Mr. PURTELL. I am sure the Senator agrees that bills might be considered even in a case where we have studied the report only half an hour ago, but where there is no report, it seems to me such a bill should be passed over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not object to that procedure. I think it is perfectly good. I was simply asking for information. But I hope that later in the day Calendar 1796, Senate bill 3515, to amend the National Housing Act, may be taken up in the event the report becomes available, because it is an urgent matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the majority leader will attempt to comply with the request of the Senator from Alabama. It may be that the influence of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, which is very great in this body and in many parts of the Nation, can be exercised on the Government Printing Office and cause it to send reports to the Senate a little more promptly. It sends reports without bills, and bills without reports.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, most of these bills were only reported on April 18. We are going to find a good many from now on. Would it not be better not to place on the calendar bills which have no reports accompanying them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Except that in some cases a bill will go on the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if there be no objection, I should like to ask that, starting at this point, at the next calendar call we begin with this bill, because there are several other bills from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on which reports have been sent to the Government Printing Office but have not yet been received by the Senate.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I subscribe to the suggestion of the minority leader as to the manner in which such bills should be treated. In every instance, of course, the explanation is given that the objection is raised only on the basis that no report is available.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the bills to which there has been objection and which have been passed over, and regarding which no report is available, shall be considered as new bills on the reprinting of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have all Senators on notice that when the reports arrive, the majority leader may move to take up any of those bills today or tomorrow, or whenever it is convenient. I had hoped that explanations could be given, so that all Senators could understand the bills. They were unanimously reported from committee and there were no objections to the bills.

I had hoped that the Senate might go over from Thursday until Monday. If the reports can be obtained later in the day, it may be that those bills can be considered then. So I want all Senators to be on notice of the possibility that the bills may be called up on motion.

Mr. PURTELL. I think the majority leader will agree that we have been trying to cooperate; but, as I said, up to the time of the quorum call the reports had not been received. I wanted that fact to be known.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on April 18, 32 bills were sent to the Government Printing Office, but some of them were not returned as it was expected they would be.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague on the committee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], I wish to say that we could not ask for finer cooperation than we have received from the members of the Calendar Committee on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from North Carolina.

ADVISABILITY OF ESTABLISHING FORT CLATSOP, OREG., AS A NATIONAL MONUMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2498) to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has not been called before. Is there objection to its present consideration?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, located in Clatsop County, Oreg., as a national monument.

SEC. 2. As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the results of such investigation and study made by him under the first section of this act, together with such recommendations as he deems appropriate. Such report shall contain specific findings with respect to (1) the national historical importance of the proposed memorial, (2) the size, present status, and condition of Fort Clatsop, and (3) the estimated total cost of establishing such memorial.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. In the absence of a report on the bill, and only because at the moment no report is available, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST, ALASKA—BILL PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk does not have a copy of Calendar No. 1797, Senate bill 2517, to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

LENGTHENING OF TERMS OF OFFICE FOR JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME AND CIRCUIT COURTS OF HAWAII—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6162) to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill merely provides that the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii shall have their terms increased from 4 to 7 years, and that the judges of the Circuit Courts of Hawaii shall have their terms increased from 4 to 6 years. The bill merely lengthens the judicial terms of the justices of those courts.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to look further into the bill. Because I am opposed to life tenure for Presidential appointees, I should like to study this extension of tenure for territorial courts. I therefore object to the consideration of the bill until I have had an opportunity to examine further into the matter.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7058) to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges was announced as next in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4047) relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, at the end of the bill to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 per year for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4781) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Since the clerk does not have a copy of the bill at the desk, the bill will go over.

RELIEF OF ALISON MacBRIDE

The bill (H. R. 6078) for the relief of Alison MacBride, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF A GRATUITY TO MARY MARGARET O'HARA

The resolution (S. Res. 242) to pay a gratuity to Mary Margaret O'Hara was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary Margaret O'Hara, widow of Robert E. O'Hara, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk does not have at the desk copies of Calendar No. 1804, Senate Resolution 243, and Calendar No. 1805, Senate Resolution 244. The resolutions will be passed over.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 97, 82D CONGRESS, ENTITLED "ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK"

The resolution (S. Res. 245) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook," was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the revised edition of Senate Document No. 97 of the 82d Congress, entitled "Election Law Guidebook" be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF 58TH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The resolution (S. Res. 246) to print the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, as a Senate document, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the 58th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended April 1, 1955, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Copies of Calendar No. 1808, Senate Resolution 239, and Calendar No. 1809, Senate Resolution 238 are not at the desk. The resolutions will be passed over.

ERECTION OF APPROPRIATE MARKERS IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The bill (S. 2512) to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces was considered, ordered to

be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of members of the Armed Forces missing in action," approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 880), is amended by striking out "missing in action" and inserting in lieu thereof "who died or were killed while serving in such forces, and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Copies of Calendar No. 1811, H. R. 1774, to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes; Calendar No. 1812, H. R. 8957, to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia; and Calendar No. 1813, S. 2875, to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act, are not at the desk. Therefore, all three bills will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the calendar committees on the minority side and the majority side, I wish to express the gratitude of the leadership for the fine work done thus far today, and for the cooperation of all Senators concerned, on both the minority and the majority legislative review committees. Theirs is not a pleasant task, and it requires much sacrifice on the part of the members of the committees involved. The majority leader wishes to commend the Senators involved for the most excellent work they have done.

I also wish to inform those Senators, and also the members of their staffs, that at the conclusion of the consideration of the unfinished business, if reports are available on the bills which have been passed over, the Senate may consider them, in the hope that we may go over until next Monday, and not meet tomorrow.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement, on the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 97, 2 hours will be allowed on any amendment or motion, and 1 hour on the passage of the joint resolution, the time to be equally divided. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before proceeding with the unfinished business, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes on a subject on which I could have spoken during call of the calendar. I withheld making my request at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon may be recognized for 6 minutes, without the time being charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBSERVANCE OF PAN AMERICAN DAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 14, last Saturday, there was held at the Pan American Union in Washington a ceremony of great interest for those of us in the Western Hemisphere. The Ambassadors of 21 American Republics representing 335 million Americans met at the headquarters of the Organization of American States. They were there to attend the unveiling of a bust of the late beloved Cordell Hull, American Secretary of State from 1933 to 1944, and one of the foremost advocates in his time of the doctrine of Pan-Americanism. The occasion marked the 66th anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union, or Pan American Day as it has come to be known in its annual observance throughout this hemisphere.

During his years as Secretary of State, Mr. Hull came to be regarded in many ways as the personification of the inter-American spirit of unity and common purpose which is symbolized in this annual observance. His active and continuing interest in the relationship of the United States with our sister republics is too well known here to require elaboration. It was during his tenure that the concept of the good-neighbor as applied to the free nations of the Americas became a practical reality.

Since Mr. Hull's day, the principles which he helped to establish as a basis for our relationships with the other countries have been tried and proved on many occasions.

To mention only a few instances during the past year, many will recall that when a difficult situation arose several months ago between two of our neighbor nations in this area, the peace machinery of the Organization of American States was successfully used in helping to bring about a settlement. This machinery has been forged slowly, and sometimes painfully, over the years, to give concrete expression to the desires of the 21 American Republics that disputes between them should be settled amicably, and without endangering the security or well-being of other nations in the community. It is a model that some of the governments of the Old World might well adopt. Indeed, in a sense they have done so, for many of the principles embodied in the United Nations Charter were based on concepts developed within the inter-American system.

In another field entirely, Members of the Senate will recall, I am sure, the quick and effective assistance which was rendered by our Government to Mexico and Honduras when parts of those countries were damaged by floods. More recently, during the past month in fact, we have helped to provide medication and equipment to Argentina, to help her people cope with a severe epidemic of polio.

It is perhaps not so well known, but should be equally recorded here, that when floods and hurricanes damaged parts of our own Northeast in 1955, contributions were made by us to several of the Latin American Republics.

Meanwhile, our own Government has continued to give expression to the policy of inter-American cooperation through its programs of technical assistance, and cultural exchanges, as well as through negotiations of specialized agreements in many fields, such as those providing for the joint development of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

All this of course does not mean that our relations with our sister republics are perfect. There are from time to time subjects on which we disagree heartily and emphatically. We realize, for example, that while great progress has been made in recent years in the development of representative government in Latin America, there is still room for improvement. However, it must also be said in justice that from the Latin point of view, some of our policies also often may seem less than ideal, perhaps including some in the field of economic affairs. But such disagreements are common among good neighbors, and quite possibly further help to lend strength and vitality to our friendship. After all, it would be a sterile partnership which did not occasionally have its disagreements.

While it is proper and constructive to acknowledge such areas of difference, I believe the important thing to bear in mind on Pan American Day is the spirit of unity and progress which makes the inter-American system work—and which was reflected so magnificently in the personality of Cordell Hull.

Consider for example the inspiration it must provide to the captive peoples of the Communist satellites to look across the ocean and observe the mutual respect and consideration with which our 21 Republics, the great and the small, conduct their business with each other. They should take hope for their own future freedom from the spectacle of so many nations, so different in language, background, economic development, and military strength, sitting at the common council table to resolve their differences in harmony and work out their individual destinies with due regard for the rights of their neighbors. It proves that such relations are possible among nations no less than among individuals. Therein lies the great hope and faith which we all express, knowingly or not, when we celebrate Pan American Day.

THE SOUTH—THE NATION'S NEW ECONOMIC FRONTIER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes, with the same understanding under which the Senator from Oregon addressed the Senate. I just spoke to the acting minority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], about the request I was about to make.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it is satisfactory to me, so long as we can, as soon as possible, get to the business at hand. There are some Senators who desire to leave as early as possible.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say it will save time if I make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, almost 18 years have passed since President Roosevelt referred to the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. Since then, the South has undergone deep and penetrating changes, as has the entire Nation. To take stock of the economic changes in the South, I instructed the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to study the economic and financial status of the southeastern region of the United States, including the area comprised of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. The study is being conducted with the cooperation of the Legislative Reference Service and is now entering its final stages. It will be presented to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency before the 18th anniversary of the famous Roosevelt speech on the South.

The preliminary findings of the study are becoming clear: the South is no longer the Nation's No. 1 economic problem; it is now the Nation's new economic frontier.

The level of economic development in the South is still considerably behind that of the rest of the Nation. However, we no longer view our difficulties as a national problem, but as a challenge to ourselves; a challenge to develop our potentials to reach the national level of economic development so that the people of the South may share fully in the American standard of living. That is the birthright of every American from every region of the country—on the farm and in the city.

LOW INCOME OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE SOUTH

The economic well-being of the people in the South has risen markedly in the past years, but it still falls below that enjoyed by the rest of the country. Possibly the best single measurement of the economic well-being of a region is its per capita income. Measured in these terms, the average income of persons outside the South is almost 50 percent higher than in the South—see table 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a number of tables relating to the substance of the remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, several factors, some of them rather complicated, account for these differences in income. Here are just a few of them.

First. Farming is relatively more important in the South than it is in the rest of the country. The proportion of persons engaged in agriculture is twice as great in the South as it is in the rest of the United States. In my own State of Arkansas, the comparable ratio is three times as high as in the rest of the country. This puts us at an economic disadvantage, since farmworkers earn less than half of that earned by workers in nonagricultural occupations.

Second. In the South, we have relatively less manufacturing than in the other sections of the country. More than 1 out of 4 workers in the United States is engaged in manufacturing, compared with less than 1 out of 5 in the South. Arkansas, unfortunately, in this respect lags behind most other States. In my State, manufacturing provides jobs for only about 1 out of 7 gainfully employed persons—see table 2.

Third. On the whole, the breadwinner in the South shares his lower income with more persons than does his counterpart in other sections of the country. The birth rate in the South is higher than in other regions, and, consequently, so is the proportion of dependent children. Many southerners migrate to other areas when they get to be of working age, and are a source of vitality to growing urban centers throughout the country. In recent years, the net outmigration from the South has exceeded inmigration by about 300,000 a year—see table 3.

Fourth. The growth of cities and schools has a direct bearing upon income, as has the type of industry and commerce. In all these aspects the South is below the national average. It has a higher percentage of rural population and a higher ratio of workers in the less-efficient forms of industry and commerce, while the level of educational achievements of the southern people is lower.

Fifth. Wages and salaries in the South are lower. As of 1954, hourly earnings of manufacturing production workers in the South averaged $1.36, or only about three-fourths of the national average. The South does not have its share of high-paying industries, such as automobiles, steel, and rubber. On this basis, the production worker outside the South had to work 9 months to get the same income as the southern worker earned in a whole year. Nevertheless, since the end of World War II, the progress of manufacturing wages in the South has kept pace with that in the rest of the country—see table 4.

Sixth. The financial and credit institutions are not developed as efficiently as similar institutions in the more industrialized parts of the country.

RECENT ECONOMIC GROWTH OF THE SOUTH

All these facts sound rather grim, but they hide the story of the remarkable growth and progress that the South has achieved during the past few decades. Per capita income in the South has risen to two and a half times the 1929 average, while for the whole country it rose only one and a half times. In the past 15 years alone the per capita income in my State almost quadrupled, while in the United States it tripled.

Another over-all measurement of economic progress is the rise in total nonagricultural employment. Here, too, the South's growth has been more rapid than in the rest of the Nation. Between 1939 and 1954 nonfarm employment in the 11 southern States rose by 72 percent. In the other 37 States, it rose 56 percent—see table 5.

Another excellent gage to measure the progress of a region is the development of electric energy—the lifeblood of industry. Between 1939 and 1954 electric energy output in the South grew more than one and a half times as fast as it did in the Nation as a whole. In this respect I am happy to point to Arkansas, whose electric output in the last 15 years increased twenty-eight-fold. A recent survey of southern electric utilities showed that total installed generating capacity doubled in the past 5 years, and it is expected that it will double again in the next 6 or 7 years. For the Nation as a whole it is anticipated that it will take 50 percent longer to double electric capacity.

Economic growth and expansion require investments, and the southern share of manufacturers' expenditures for new plants and equipment has increased over the years even more than has the phenomenal rise in industry nationwide. In 1939 the South accounted for 12.4 percent of the total; this share ran to 13.8 percent in 1947 and 15.5 percent in 1953, the latest year for which data are available. Here again, I am happy to note that manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment rose relatively more than 50 percent faster in Arkansas than in the Nation as a whole—see table 6.

Yes, the South is the Nation's new economic frontier, but its potential is still far from being a reality. The area is ideal both for work and play. Its recreational facilities are unexcelled, its climate delightful, and its investment opportunities abundant. The climate pays off not only in year-round recreation and sunshine, but also in dollars and cents. Investors in the South find that a dollar invested in southern plant goes further, because the mild climate precludes the necessity of winterized building. Similarly, available data indicate that a dollar invested in agricultural development—particularly raising livestock—in the South goes further than in the rest of the country.

But let me hasten to add that, as any frontier, our economic problems are still far from being solved, and we must not and do not intend to rest on the laurels of past achievements. Thus far, the per capita income of even the richest State in the South is still below the national average. So we must continue to strive to improve our economic conditions to reach the national level, and, I hope, even forge ahead of the national average.

The people of the South have made sacrifices to achieve economic progress. During the 15-year period between 1939 and 1954 State taxes in the South have increased threefold, while the comparable increase for the rest of the country was less than double—see table 7.

In this connection, the increased expenditures for education are particularly significant. We know that there is a direct relationship between levels of education achieved by persons and their income. Comparable data on educational attainment and income show that the differentials in income between the South and the rest of the country decrease with the increased level of education—see table 8. It can be expected, therefore, that increased expenditures for education in the South would be rewarded in cultural enrichment as well as in rising income.

The expenditures made for education is a good gage for measuring educational progress. In this respect, too, the South is also catching up with the rest of the Nation. Between 1939–40 and 1953–54 the South enlarged its expenditures per pupil in public elementary and secondary education by 306 percent. During the same period, the Nation as a whole increased its spending per pupil by 235 percent—see table 9.

THE NEED FOR INTENSIFIED INDUSTRIALIZATION

On the economic front we must concentrate our energies on accelerating the development of our industries. The South still does not have its appropriate share of manufacturing, and a considerable proportion of its limited manufacturing is concentrated in the relatively less efficient industries. The census of manufacturing divides American industries into 20 major groups. The value added per employee by those industries varied in 1953 between a high of $12,200 in the chemical industry to a low of $4,400 in apparel. More than half of the manufacturing employees in the South were employed in 1953 in the five industries which rank lowest according to the value added per employee. The same industries accounted for less than a fifth of the workers in the rest of the United States. These industries were apparel, leather, textiles, lumber, and furniture. The top five industries according to value added per employee—petroleum, chemicals, tobacco, primary metals, and paper—accounted for a fifth of the total employees in the South as well as in the other regions of the United States.

The value added by manufacturing per employee averaged $7,100 in 1953 in the country, as compared with $5,800 for the South. Moreover, between 1947 and 1953, the value added per employee rose more sharply in the rest of the United States than in the South. Apparently the higher concentration of lower ranking productive industries in the South accounted for the fact that its industry trailed behind the rest of the Nation in terms of value added—this despite the fact that the number of manufacturing employees had increased at about the same rate in the South as it had in the rest of the country—see table 10.

TO HIM THAT HATH

But again I am optimistic as to the future. The South is blessed with richness of resources, both human and natural, that are needed in the most rapidly growing United States industries, including petroleum, chemicals, and paper. And the old practice of shipping the raw materials for processing and manufacturing to other areas is slowly but surely disappearing.

This growth has in turn attracted the location of new industry, though not in sufficient quantity. The automobile industry serves as an excellent illustration. Motor vehicle registration in the Southern States has increased more rapidly than in the rest of the country. The automobile manufacturers have responded to this rise by building new assembly lines. Each new assembly plant, in turn, attracts associated industries: tire plants, producers of fabricated metal parts, chemicals, and others.

The experience of Arkansas, if I may turn again to my favorite State, illustrates this point. Barely 6 years ago lumber, which in terms of value added per employee is the least productive industry group in Arkansas, accounted for 40 percent of the production workers in manufacturing. Since then employment in lumber has declined by 25 percent, but the slack in employment has been taken up by relatively more productive industries, such as metals, chemicals, and petroleum.

POSITIVE POLICIES ACCOUNTING FOR GROWTH

I am also counting on the competitive factors to benefit the South. The southern advantages in resources will continue to spur the establishment and expansion of new industry. It is on this basis that I oppose the distortion of the Walsh-Healey Act which the Secretary of Labor has used as a basis for setting uniform nationwide minimum rates for establishments bidding on Government contracts. A realistic policy should take cognizance of the fact that labor costs, as well as other costs, may vary from market to market and region to region.

Now, lest I be misunderstood, I do not favor that industries move to the South solely because of its lower wages. I fully expect and hope that the wages and salaries of the working people in the South will rise to the national average with further increase of industrialization. But I am equally opposed to the Government favoring one region over the other in awarding contracts.

A positive Government policy to stimulate competition calls for Government recognition of the need to encourage small and new business. In this connection, I have introduced recently a bill on behalf of myself and a majority of the distinguished members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, representing both parties, which is designed to relieve the Federal income-tax burden on small business. I am convinced that this is the most practical way to help small business and stimulate competition, which is the lifeblood of American industry. Briefly, this bill will reduce taxes of corporations earning up to $25,000 per year by 26.7 percent; corporations earning $50,000 per year will pay approximately 10 percent less; corporations earning $100,000 per year will pay between 2.7 and 4.3 percent less, while the Federal income taxes of larger corporations will remain virtually unchanged or will be increased, if it is found necessary to make up the loss in revenue due to the reduction of taxes of smaller corporations.

I believe that this bill would be of material benefit to the smaller business of the Nation, and would encourage the growth of new business throughout the Nation.

I am also deeply concerned with the fact that not all the sections of our economy have been sharing in the rising income of recent years. Prosperity cannot last long when large sections of the population do not get their fair share of the total national pay. Such a situation is also manifestly unfair and unjust.

It is for these reasons that I am particularly disturbed about the present depression in agriculture. So far, my own State has not been hit as hard as others. But, as I have stressed earlier, the economic well-being of the South is still largely dependent upon agriculture, and a depression in agriculture threatens the very foundations of our economy.

Government responsibility in this area is paramount. The staff study to which I referred earlier points to the scarcity of long-term and intermediate-term credit that is now available to farmers. There is ample evidence that the judicious use of these types of credit can increase farm efficiency and income, particularly that of small and part-time farmers. The additional resources made possible by credit have increased productivity of farmers and have tended to reduce underemployment. The private credit institutions in the South have accomplished a great deal in recent years toward extending agricultural credit facilities in the South, but I believe that a more energetic and positive Federal Government policy in this area is highly desirable.

Expansion of credit facilities is, however, only one facet of a rounded Federal program to aid the farmer. But, since we have just spent a considerable amount of time on the Senate floor in discussing this question in great detail, I do not think that it is necessary to elaborate on this point.

I should also like to say a few words about the role of the South in the all-pervading problem—the present uneasy peace which is threatened by aggressive world communism.

The needs of our national defense require greater dispersal of our industrial capacity. Thus far little has been done in this direction. Industry has favored geographic concentration as a means to achieving greater efficiency and economy of operations. The Government has hardly intervened with industry's natural desire to achieve expansion at the lowest possible cost. This practice will have to be seriously revised. The threat of atomic warfare will force us to disperse our industrial capacity as a defense measure.

The geopolitics of this situation favors the South, which is located at the farthest point on the continental United States from likely sources of atomic attack. Naturally, regional interests are

secondary to the needs of national defense. But it is the very interests of national defense and survival that require greater dispersion of industry, and the South stands to benefit from these regrettable, but unfortunately compelling, circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, my remarks were addressed to the conditions which have accounted for the South's becoming the Nation's new economic frontier and the challenge that is before us to make this a reality.

But we must not forget for one moment that only what is good for the Nation is also good for the South. We cannot materialize the economic promise of the South unless we ascertain that conditions of full employment prevail throughout the Nation. A national policy of full employment is an essential ingredient for the economic growth of the South. The region's greatest gains in per capita income occurred during the years when full employment prevailed throughout the country. Only under conditions of full employment can all the regions and economic groups share in the blessings of plenty and the promise that is a free and prosperous United States.

The tables ordered to be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Senator FULBRIGHT's remarks are as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Per capita income, United States and South, 1954*

State	Per capita	Percent of United States	Rank among 48 States	State	Per capita	Percent of United States	Rank among 48 States
United States	$1,770	100.0		Kentucky	$1,216	68.7	41
South	1,233	69.7		Louisiana	1,302	73.6	38
Rest of United States	1,909	107.9		Mississippi	873	49.3	48
Alabama	1,091	61.6	45	North Carolina	1,190	67.2	43
Arkansas	979	55.3	47	South Carolina	1,063	60.1	46
Florida	1,610	91.0	27	Tennessee	1,212	68.5	42
Georgia	1,237	69.9	39	Virginia	1,480	83.6	33

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce. Survey of Current Business, September 1955.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of civilian labor force, 1950*

	South	Percent of total civilian labor force				South	Percent of total civilian labor force		
		United States	South	Rest of Nation			United States	South	Rest of Nation
	Thousands				Nonagricultural—Continued	*Thousands*			
Total	10,968	100	19.5	80.5	Transportation, communications, and basic utilities	690	7.8	6.3	8.1
Agriculture	2,526	12.2	23.0	9.6	Wholesale and retail trade	1,800	18.8	16.4	19.3
Forestry and fisheries	53	.2	.5	.1	Finance, insurance, and real estate	244	3.4	2.3	3.7
Nonagricultural, total	8,018	87.6	73.1	91.3	Services	1,795	18.0	16.4	20.6
Mining	189	1.7	1.7	1.6	Public administration	428	4.4	3.9	4.6
Construction	699	6.1	6.4	6.1	Industries not reported	177	1.5	1.6	1.5
Manufacturing	2,173	25.9	19.8	27.4					
Durable goods	817	13.8	7.4	15.3					
Nondurable goods	1,344	11.9	12.3	11.8					

Source: 1950 Census of Population, vol. II. Characteristics of the Population: United States Summary, tables 55 and 80, individual State volumes, table 30 in each.

TABLE 3.—*Net civilian migration, United States and South, April 1950 to July 1954, and percent natural growth, 1954*

Area	Net migration [1] (thousands)	Percent natural growth	Area	Net migration [1] (thousands)	Percent natural growth
United States	+1,233	1.6	Kentucky	−176	1.6
South	−1,191	1.9	Louisiana	−30	2.1
Rest of country	+2,424	1.5	Mississippi	−231	2.3
Alabama	−277	1.9	North Carolina	−170	2.0
Arkansas	−247	1.7	South Carolina	−67	2.2
Florida	+330	1.6	Tennessee	−128	1.7
Georgia	−147	2.0	Virginia	−48	1.8

[1] Net total migration comprises both net immigration from abroad and net interstate migration.

Source: Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 124.

TABLE 4.—*Average hourly earnings in manufacturing, United States and South, 1954*

	Hourly rate	Percent of United States		Hourly rate	Percent of United States
United States	$1.81	100	Kentucky	$1.66	92
South	1.36	75	Louisiana	1.58	87
Rest of United States	1.89	104	Mississippi	1.18	65
Alabama	1.43	79	North Carolina	1.25	69
Arkansas	1.25	69	South Carolina	1.26	70
Florida	1.36	75	Tennessee	1.45	80
Georgia	1.27	70	Virginia	1.42	78

Source: U. S. Department of Labor. Employment and Earnings, May 1955.

TABLE 5.—*Employment in nonagricultural establishments by major industry groups, United States and South, 1939 and 1954*

Industry	Employment 1954 (thousands)			1954 as percent of 1939			Industry	Employment 1954 (thousands)			1954 as percent of 1939		
	South	United States	Rest of Nation	South	United States	Rest of Nation		South	United States	Rest of Nation	South	United States	Rest of Nation
Total	7,541	48,285	40,744	172	159	157	Trade	1,726	10,498	8,772	197	159	153
Mining	141	770	629	96	91	90	Finance, insurance, and real estate	264	2,114	1,850	240	155	148
Contract construction	488	2,527	2,039	224	220	219	Service	788	5,629	4,841	174	169	168
Manufacturing	2,310	15,989	13,679	155	159	158	Government	1,219	6,751	5,532	184	169	166
Transportation and public utilities	612	4,008	3,396	146	138	136							

Source: U. S. Department of Labor. Employment and Earnings. Annual Supplement, May 1955.

TABLE 6.—*Percentage increase in electric energy output, 1939–47 and 1939–54, and in manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment, United States and South, 1939–47 and 1939–53*

State	Electric energy output		Manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment		State	Electric energy output		Manufacturers' expenditures for new plant and equipment	
	1939–47	1939–54	1939–47	1939–53		1939–47	1939–54	1939–47	1939–53
United States	135.9	318.0	381.9	505.3	Louisiana	163.2	542.1	515.2	1,307.0
South	198.9	570.2	434.2	651.0	Mississippi	500.0	3,600.0	312.7	447.3
Alabama	117.9	341.0	508.4	728.6	North Carolina	236.0	488.0	361.7	525.5
Arkansas	800.0	2,850.0	588.6	763.6	South Carolina	118.8	300.0	466.1	440.4
Florida	245.5	909.1	542.3	1,223.1	Tennessee	320.0	800.0	265.9	583.0
Georgia	150.0	406.3	368.3	421.7	Virginia	205.3	447.4	482.4	599.0
Kentucky	277.8	1,311.1	747.3	1,033.0					

Source: National Industrial Conference Board. The Conference Board Business Record, December 1955.

TABLE 7.—*State tax collections, United States and South, 1954, and 1954 increase over 1939*

	1954 (millions of dollars)	1954 percent increase over 1939		1954 (millions of dollars)	1954 percent increase over 1939
United States	11,088.9	207	Kentucky	138.1	167
South	2,153.3	288	Louisiana	294.7	291
Rest of United States	8,935.6	192	Mississippi	119.9	329
Alabama	159.9	231	North Carolina	294.8	272
Arkansas	105.7	244	South Carolina	157.0	423
Florida	267.8	320	Tennessee	194.7	302
Georgia	224.7	340	Virginia	196.0	258

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 8.—*Median income by level of highest formal education attained, United States and South, 1949*

Years of school completed	United States	South	Years of school completed	United States	South
No. years of school	$1,108	$777	High school, 1 to 3 years	$2,517	$2,498
Elementary school, 1 to 4 years	1,365	1,023	High school, 4 years	3,285	3,079
Elementary school, 5 to 7 years	2,035	1,591	College, 1 to 3 years	3,522	3,382
Elementary school, 8 years	2,533	2,032	College, 4 years or more	4,407	4,251

Source: Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 9.—*Expenditures for public education—total current expenditures and expenditures per pupil: United States and South, 1953–54, and increase over 1939–40*

	Total expenditures		Expenditures per pupil		Expenditures for public education as percent of personal income, 1954		Total expenditures		Expenditures per pupil		Expenditures for public education as percent of personal income, 1954
	1953–54 (millions of dollars)	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	1953–54	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40			1953–54 (millions of dollars)	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	1953–54	Percent increase 1953–54 over 1939–40	
United States	9,109.0	294	$355	235	3.19	Kentucky	81.7	204	$160	302	2.26
South	1,399.9	385	224	306	3.43	Louisiana	156.2	440	320	321	4.16
Rest of United States	7,709.1	281	398	232	3.15	Mississippi	57.2	260	127	273	3.08
Alabama	101.5	316	165	293	3.10	North Carolina	202.9	387	232	373	4.04
Arkansas	71.1	356	200	440	4.04	South Carolina	130.1	554	285	506	5.39
Florida	161.7	492	299	321	3.04	Tennessee	122.2	309	191	254	3.00
Georgia	139.8	478	198	340	3.13	Virginia	175.5	483	285	360	3.33

Source: Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Preliminary data.

TABLE 10.—*Value added by manufacturing per employee, United States and South, 1947 and 1953*

Industry	1947			1953			Industry	1947			1953		
	South	United States	South as percent of United States	South	United States	South as percent of United States		South	United States	South as percent of United States	South	United States	South as percent of United States
Total	$4,465	$5,207	85.8	$5,799	$7,117	81.5	Petroleum and coal products	$10,612	$9,506	111.6	$15,565	$12,191	127.6
Food and kindred products	5,613	6,259	89.7	7,244	8,204	88.2	Rubber products	6,154	5,028	122.4	10,049	7,492	134.1
Tobacco manufactures	6,589	5,737	114.9	12,612	10,342	121.9	Leather and leather products	3,600	4,000	90.0	4,747	4,558	104.1
Textile mill products	4,114	4,330	95.0	4,155	4,671	88.9	Stone, clay, and glass products	4,160	4,991	83.4	6,404	7,410	86.4
Apparel and related products	2,868	4,107	69.8	3,144	4,412	71.2	Primary metal industries	4,487	4,982	90.1	7,518	8,545	87.9
Lumber and products (except furniture)	2,804	3,928	71.4	3,340	4,862	68.6	Fabricated metal products	4,358	5,066	86.0	6,243	7,286	85.6
Furniture and fixtures	3,587	4,274	83.9	4,603	5,672	81.1	Machinery (except electrical)	4,049	5,055	80.1	6,553	7,911	82.8
Paper and allied products	7,099	6,391	111.1	9,620	8,368	114.9	Electrical machinery	4,500	4,859	92.6	6,378	7,187	88.7
Printing and publishing industries	5,057	5,967	84.7	6,852	7,781	88.0	Transportation equipment	4,491	4,966	90.4	6,411	7,602	84.3
Chemicals and allied products	6,619	8,484	78.0	10,362	12,129	85.4	Instruments and related products	3,564	4,656	76.5	4,858	7,599	63.9
							Miscellaneous manufacturers	3,071	4,500	68.2	4,844	6,249	77.5

Source: United States figures: Annual Survey of Manufactures, 1953, table 2. South: Special tabulation by Bureau of Census.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I intend to offer later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table.

The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Chair calls attention to the fact that the Senate now is operating under the provisions of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered on yesterday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call at this time, without charging to either side the time required therefor.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Will the Senator from Ohio indicate how much time he yields?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes. I may not require all of it. This record was largely made last week, when the joint resolution was brought up for consideration, but I wish briefly to supplement the record at this time.

Mr. President, the amount of money involved in the pending resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 97, is relatively small. However, a very great moral issue is presented for our decision. The question is: Shall the Congress of the United States, by raising the ceiling on United States contributions to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 to $3 million, condone by implication the action of the ILO in recognizing that Communist agents masquerading as employer and employee representatives from Soviet countries are entitled to participate and to vote in meetings of the International Labor Organization?

My amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 does not—

First. Call for United States withdrawal from ILO. My amendment to the pending resolution will not prevent United States employer, employee, and Government delegates to the ILO from fighting out the Communist issue within that organization.

Second. If my amendment to the pending resolution is adopted, it will not cause the United States to be delinquent in assessments made on the United States by the ILO. The present ceiling on United States contributions to the ILO will not be pierced prior to the time when the Congress considers the budget for fiscal 1958. If the next Congress—unwisely in my judgment—wants to give the ILO more money, even though the ILO recognizes that there are no free and independent business and labor organizations behind the Iron Curtain, the next Congress can do so.

My amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97 simply provides that no sums in excess of the present ceiling, $1,750,000, shall be contributed to the ILO for any calendar year after 1956 if during the preceding calendar year phony employer and employee delegates from the Soviet bloc countries are permitted to vote at ILO meetings. If the Senate does not adopt the pending amendment, we shall, in effect, have endorsed the ILO's action in seating and granting voting privileges to phoney employer and employee representatives from Communist countries.

The Communist delegates and their friends can then say, "Look at what the Congress of the United States has done." The argument can easily be made in ILO circles that the Congress, knowing that so-called Communist employer and employee delegates were granted voting privileges, nevertheless increased the statutory ceiling and, in fact, by the amendment adopted in the Senate last Monday, has permitted the United States percentage share of the ILO budget to rise from its present figure of 25 percent to 33⅓ percent. That is the great danger in passing Senate Joint Resolution 97 in its present form.

I should now like to clarify in several respects the record which was made in the Senate last Monday. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed out that no hearings had been held on the resolution but that "the reason why there were no public hearings is that there were no requests on the part of anyone to come before the committee at that time." I am confident that the reason no requests were made to be heard on this important matter is that interested parties outside of the executive branch were not advised that the matter was under consideration. Senate Joint Resolution 97 was not introduced in the Senate, but reported as an original resolution from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the request of executive agencies.

Some misunderstanding exists as to Communist voting strength in the International Labor Organization. The United States, of course, is outvoted by the Communist bloc 32 to 4. While there are 280 votes in the ILO, 4 for each of its 70 members, the average vote at the ILO Conference is about 175. There are some small countries which do not send delegations, some countries are in arrears on their dues, and there are always some abstentions in voting and some absentees. On most votes in the ILO, 87 is a majority. Accordingly, a solid Communist bloc of 32 votes can carry most measures with the support of so-called neutralist nations.

Passage of my amendment will maintain the status quo until the executive branch has completed its study on United States participation in the organization, until the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has had an opportunity to hear representatives of American labor and business organizations, and until the International Labor Organization itself has had an opportunity to reconsider its ill-advised action in seating as bona fide employer and employee representatives mere mouthpieces of the Kremlin. According to my information, the 1956 ILO Conference will discuss, but not decide, the Communist issue in ILO; the ILO governing body will consider the issue at its November 1956 meeting; and the 1957 ILO Conference may place the issue on its agenda for a final decision.

In my judgment, passage of the pending amendment will strengthen the bargaining position of United States delegates representing employers, employees and the Government of the United States. Our entire delegation strongly opposed the acceptance of employers and worker delegates from Communist countries by the ILO. They recognized that these delegates were completely controlled by the Soviet Government, and that their acceptance by the ILO violated the ILO constitution and the fundamental tripartite character of the organization. But whatever others may think, the Congress of the United States should not take any action which would even remotely imply that there exists free and independent labor and business organizations behind the Iron Curtain.

In this connection, I should like to read to the Senate two telegrams which I have received. The first is from Mr. Charles P. McCormick, president of McCormick & Co., of Baltimore, Md., which reads as follows:

> As United States employer delegate to the ILO during the years of 1949 to 1952, member of the governing body of the ILO from 1949 to 1952, president of the International Organization of Employers in 1951 and vice president of the ILO Conference in 1950, I am absolutely in favor of Senator Bricker's amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 97.
>
> When a communistic power sends a representative to the employers' meeting as an employer, he is definitely controlled in mind and action and ceases to become a free man. The spirit of the ILO is tripartite and each employer, worker, or government delegate should be free to act as an independent man and not have his vote controlled. Until such time as this is clarified, Senator BRICKER's

amendment should stand to stimulate only fair and tripartite work in the ILO.

As a citizen and employer, I believe that man should have freedom of choice and not be subject to pressure or coercion when voting as an employer or as a worker in any international gathering.

The second telegram is from Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and it reads as follows:

If the ILO budget and United States contributions to the ILO are to be increased, it is of even greater importance to support Senator BRICKER'S proposal that no additional funds from the United States may be used for this purpose as long as agents of the Communist Party, masquerading as representatives of free employers and free workers, are allowed to sit in ILO conferences.

As the United States employer-delegate to the ILO 1954 and 1955 conferences, I watched these men use the ILO as an international forum for denouncing the United States and promoting the cause of the Communist Party. They have 32 votes to our 4. As long as they are allowed to participate in ILO conferences, any increase in ILO contributions from the United States of America will, in fact, have the effect of helping to finance Communist anti-United States propaganda. Why should the United States taxpayers help the Communist spread international poison?

It is my belief that the participation of Communist so-called employer and worker delegates in the ILO is contrary to the ILO constitution on the ground that such delegates do not represent employers or workers but represent governments and are indistinguishable from government representatives. A debate on this subject is now going on in the ILO but it is my belief that no constructive action will be taken unless the ILO is jolted by action such as is proposed by Senator BRICKER.

For the purpose of the record, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech delivered by Mr. McGrath, who has had as extensive experience in this field as anyone else, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SURPRISING CASE OF THE ILO

(By William L. McGrath, president, the Williamson Heater Co., Cincinnati, Ohio,[1] before the 54th annual meeting of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, the Waldorf Astoria, New York, N. Y., October 25, 1955)

At its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the International Labor Organization from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year. This provision is contained in Senate Joint Resolution 97. If this is agreed to by the Congress, it will be just another example of $3 million of the taxpayers' money going for a purpose that few people know anything about and most Americans have never even heard of.

The total budget of the ILO is arrived at by multiplying by four the contribution of the United States. We pay 25 percent, and the other 69 member countries pay the remaining 75 percent. If we boost our contribution from $1,750,000 to $3 million, this boosts the total ILO budget from $7 million to $12 million, and will enable it to expand its activities accordingly.

How many of you men here today are familiar with the ILO, and what it does? Most of you know, I presume, that it is affiliated with the United Nations. But are you aware that the International Labor Organization has been in existence for some 36 years, considers itself an international parliament, and is drafting basic laws on social and economic matters which are having profound influence upon legislation all over the world?

As the years have gone by you have seen one Socialist proposal after another introduced into the House and the Senate of the United States. Haven't you ever wondered where these things came from? Well, I can give you the answer. Many of them have originated in the ILO, which has for years been the breeding ground of international socialistic legislation.

The ILO originated with the League of Nations, with the idea that an international organization devoted to consideration of the problems of labor the world over would be a useful adjunct to the league, and an instrument on behalf of world peace.

The League of Nations died, but the ILO kept right on going; and the United States joined it in 1934.

Then along came the United Nations, and the ILO hooked up with the United Nations in 1945. The ILO is, however, not under the direction of the United Nations. The United Nations gives the ILO an additional $2 million a year, of which we pay 33⅓ percent, for what it calls its technical-assistance program, but the ILO runs its own show and gets its own budget appropriations directly from member governments.

The ILO as originally conceived was supposed to concern itself purely with questions dealing with labor—but at a meeting in Philadelphia in 1944 they adopted a declaration which said, among other things, that "poverty everywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere," that people have a "right" to economic security, and which stated, "It is the responsibility of the International Labor Organization to examine and consider all international, economic, and financial policies in the light of this fundamental objective."

By this device the ILO arrogated unto itself the supposed right to draft basic laws, on social and economic questions, for adoption by member countries all over the world.

In 1954 Russia, which had long been absent from the ILO came back in a big way, bringing satellite countries also into the picture. The Communists gained a strong foothold in 1954 and strengthened their position in 1955.

That in the main brings you up to date on the origin and development of the ILO.

Now let's consider the functioning of the ILO. As I said before, although it is a United Nations affiliate, it isn't bossed by the United Nations, and furthermore it is unique among international agencies because it is not composed solely of representatives of government.

At its annual conference held each June in Geneva, Switzerland, each participating nation has 4 voting delegates; 2 representing government, 1 representing employers, and 1 representing workers. The delegates are accompanied by advisers. Total attendance is usually over 600, with over 60 nations represented.

At the annual conference, the ILO enacts proposals which are in effect skeleton drafts of legislation which it hopes will be enacted by member countries. These may be passed in the form of a resolution, a recommendation or a convention. A convention—and pay close attention to this—is a draft of a proposed international law which, when ratified by member nations, stands as a treaty among them. By this means the ILO seeks to introduce standardized basic laws into countries all over the world.

When the United States joined the ILO in 1934, it was with the reservation that our country would not be bound by such convention procedure, but would consider any ILO proposals as recommendations only. In 1944, however, when our Congress, by joint resolution, approved the Philadelphia declaration, we entered the ILO on the same basis as other member nations—so that today, if we ratify an ILO convention, it stands as an international treaty and we are bound by it accordingly.

The ILO has a governing body, composed of representatives of governments, workers, and employers, which serves, you might say, as its board of directors. I was elected 1 of the 10 employer members of the governing body.

It has a permanent office in Geneva headed by a Director General, and a staff of about 800 persons. This is known as the International Labor Office. It sends missions of technical assistance to countries all over the world, supposedly to help increase productivity, but I suspect largely to propagandize on behalf of socialism. It conducts research and makes investigations, the purposes and results of which are not too clear, and releases publications, the purpose of which is only too clear—namely, that of propagandizing all over the world on behalf of the ILO and the socialistic measures which it champions and promotes.

There is something unique about the Geneva ILO staff and personnel—they are all tax-exempt. Although they constantly recommend measures that will add to the taxes of everybody else, they themselves pay no income taxes to any country.

In its earlier years the ILO devoted itself to matters directly concerned with labor. It enacted conventions, for example, on living quarters of seamen in the international marine service, the employment of women in underground mines, the employment of children in factories, safety provisions, and so forth, and proposed a series of constructive practices which everybody in our country would agree should apply to employment conditions the world over.

But then the ideology of state socialism came into ascendancy in Europe and spread to other parts of the world. The ILO fell completely under the domination of a Socialist government-labor coalition. It decided that anything in industry, government, or social systems that in any way affected the workingman was a subject for consideration by the ILO. This was how the state Socialists moved in on the Organization, and used it as a means of promoting Socialist ideology.

The employer delegates to the ILO have consistently and eloquently objected to the proposed drafts of international Socialist laws fostered by the ILO; but they have been hopelessly in the minority, and outvoted on practically all issues.

Now, I have told you that the ILO is a breeding ground of Socialist ideas. So now I think I had better get down to cases and give you a few specific examples.

First of all, suppose I review the basic principles of socialism as I understand them from my ILO experience.

In the United States we believe, as was said in our Declaration of Independence, that men are born with certain inalienable rights, and that government derives its powers from the consent of the governed.

The principle of socialism is exactly the opposite. The premise of socialism is that all rights belong to government—and government then parcels them out to the people in line with its own divine judgment. I have sometimes said that the main purpose of the ILO is that of trying to substitute government for God.

The underlying theme of ILO proposals is always government regulation, government domination, government control, government

[1] Mr. McGrath was United States employer delegate, ILO Annual Conferences of 1954 and 1955; United States employer adviser, ILO Annual Conferences of 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952; member, ILO governing body.

direction, government supervision, and, of course, in the long run, government ownership of industry, government price control, and government dictation as to jobs and wages. There is no half-way stopping point on the road to collectivism.

Well, to start with specific cases, let's take the subject of collective bargaining.

It is certainly quite proper for the ILO to endeavor to protect the right of collective bargaining, but let me tell you how far the ILO is going in that direction.

The ILO has proposed that if most of the workers in an industry have signed a collective bargaining agreement, government should have the power to compel the rest of the workers in that industry to sign up likewise, regardless of whether or not they wished to do so. What they want is nationwide collective bargaining enforced by government decree.

But the Socialists go further than that. Some of them in the ILO suggested that one-half of the board of directors of a company should be chosen by management, and the other half should be chosen by the union, which would have an equal right with the management as to the course of action of the company. In case of a deadlock, the matter would be submitted to government. This would put government in the position of being the controlling factor in the future destiny of industrial enterprises.

Do you think this is farfetched?

It is nothing of the sort. This device is known as codetermination, and it is the law in Germany today.

Well, let's go on to another subject. Let's take social security.

It may interest you to know that the ILO brags that one of its earliest and most successful technical-assistance projects was when it sent two experts over to the United States to show us how to set up our social-security system. For social security was born and bred in the ILO.

And social security, according to the ILO, is still in its infancy. In 1952 the ILO enacted a convention entitled "Minimum Standards of Social Security." I want to emphasize that word "minimum," because it is the intent of the ILO at some time in the future to develop, God help us, what they are going to call advanced standards of social security.

Under the title "Minimum Standards of Social Security" the ILO drafted an international law providing government benefits for practically all the ills the flesh is heir to. It is a blueprint for the biggest giveaway program yet devised.

Under this proposal government would pay people money for the following:

Any condition requiring medical care of a preventive or corrective nature, including pregnancy, and any morbid condition, whatever its cause.

Loss of earnings due to sickness or unemployment.

Survival beyond a prescribed age.

Employment injuries.

Babies. The government pays you for having them; the more you have the more money you get.

Child birth, including medical care and hospitalization.

Invalidity—which is defined as "inability to engage in any gainful activity."

Death benefits—that is, life insurance.

Originally included in this proposal was a provision to the effect that all life insurance must be compulsory and subsidized by government, and any insurance would be illegal unless government paid at least 25 percent of the cost of the premiums. This effort at socializing insurance was aimed at putting out of business insurance companies such as we have in the United States.

This convention also contained provisions for socialized medicine, such as they have in England.

Well, now we are getting echoes in the United States.

Our House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 7225) which provides that if at any time after the age of 50 a man becomes totally disabled and is so certified by the government, he can immediately collect the same amount of social-security benefits that he otherwise would get after retirement at age 65. That bill will be up for consideration by the Senate at the next session of the Congress.

Think what that means. To be eligible for total disability, a man must be certified by Government doctors. This means doctors on the Government payroll. This puts doctors in Government, and is the opening step toward socialized medicine.

Now let's take it from the standpoint of insurance. Private insurance companies now protect people against total disability. But now Government comes along and enters that field.

So you have, therefore, in this bill, the opening wedge toward socialized medicine and socialized insurance; and these provisions are lifted out of the ILO Convention on Minimum Standards of Social Security.

For example, the ILO Convention proposes government payments for "invalidity," which it defines as the "inability to engage in any gainful activity." Our bill, H. R. 7225, defines "disability" as the "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity"—a change of only one word. Our bill states that a person may be ruled disabled as the result of "any medically determinable physical or mental impairment." The ILO uses the phrase "any morbid condition, whatever its cause." We will be hearing more, in this country, about a morbid condition and invalidity.

In 1952 the ILO passed a convention called the Maternity Protection Convention, which provides that:

An employed woman should be given at least 12 weeks off to have her baby, with free medical care and hospitalization.

During this period she would receive from the government, in cash, an amount equal to two-thirds of her pay.

A woman cannot be discharged while on maternity leave.

Interruptions for nursing the baby, and I quote: "In cases where the matter is governed by or in accordance with laws and regulations" are to be counted as working hours and paid for by the company.

I sat in the committee on maternity protection, and at times I couldn't believe my ears. In that committee, representatives from countries all over the world spent an entire half day debating as to whether or not an international law should contain a provision to the effect that a mother should nurse her baby for one hour, during the working day, or for two half hour nursing periods. As I recall it, France held out for two half hours, and Israel held out for one full hour. No conclusion was reached, for the reason, I imagine, that the men on the committee knew little about the subject, and the women on the committee seemed singularly unequipped for the purpose under discussion.

In that committee I got a clear-cut idea as to the relative positions of maternity and paternity in the socialistic utopia.

Apparently, in those golden days, practically all women are supposed to work. Their babies are financed by government benefits; and in due course they bring them to work with them, placing them in government-run nurseries and leaving their machines or typewriters to nurse them on company time. There is no distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy.

The place of the father in the scheme of things, married or unmarried, is reduced purely to the function of paternity. The state takes over, to a large extent, the functions of the family. It provides against a multitude of contingencies for which, in a free society, the husband and father is supposed to provide.

Under such circumstances, what becomes of the family? What becomes of the home? What is the object of the institution of marriage? What happens to the children, starting life in Government or industrial nurseries? What are the people, save wards of the State?

In 1955 the conference discussed what they termed "welfare facilities for workers." The proposal stated that "the competent authority" (meaning Government) should prepare suggestions for the operations of canteens, feeding equipment, types of meals, balanced diets, food service, and feeding costs. The implication was that Government should take over and supervise all phases of inplant feeding in industrial institutions.

At its 1955 conference the ILO enacted a resolution entitled "Vocational training in agriculture." Never have I seen a document more foreign to the philosophy of the United States.

It assumed, as a basic premise, that the agricultural worker is an employee. It assumed that wages in agriculture are determined on the basis of collective bargaining. And it proposed the setting up of an apprentice system for young farmworkers.

Well, in the United States most of our farmworkers are not employees, they are members of the farmer's family. They don't belong to unions, so the collective-bargaining idea has no application in our country. And as for apprenticeships, about the only way this could be worked out would be for farmers' sons to be apprenticed to their fathers.

Furthermore, embodied in this proposal is a definite pattern of Government domination and control. The general idea is that the Government should take over the vocational training of all youngsters on the farm, in what the ILO calls a systematic and coordinated program.

This program provides that government should provide school textbooks and other educational material, should pass on the qualifications of teacher and examination requirements, should subsidize educational facilities, and make sure that the education and training of young people on the farm should be done by the Government, and not by their parents.

I don't think I need go any further. I could cite many more examples. But I have given you enough to indicate the overall trend of the proposals which the ILO government-labor majority hopes to enact into basic laws which may be followed by other countries all over the world.

And if you think this is not the case, you are very much mistaken. Thus far the ILO has enacted 103 conventions. Of these, Great Britain has ratified 56, France has ratified 73, Belgium has ratified 55, Holland has ratified 42, Argentina has ratified 45.

You will ask, how many ILO conventions have been ratified by the United States? Here is the answer:

Seven conventions have been approved by the Senate and ratified by the President's signature. Most of these deal with conditions of maritime employment and are not socialistic.

Three conventions have been approved by the Senate but not signed by the President, and seven more were sent by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for action. Several of these involve the threat of the invasion of international laws into our domestic affairs.

Now—why has no further action been taken, with respect to these conventions? And why have the more recent and radical ILO conventions, for which our Government

voted in ILO Conferences, never been submitted to the Senate for consideration, which, under the ILO constitution, our President is supposed to do?

The answer is the Bricker amendment.

With the whole country aroused to the danger of having Socialist measures imposed upon us by the back door of convention ratification, the proponents of such measures have not dared to bring them out on the floor of the Senate.

But in the rest of the world things have gone the other way. A major share of the social, labor, and economic legislation enacted in Europe and in many other parts of the world during the last 20 years has been born in the ILO.

The South American countries and the underdeveloped countries of the Far East have been following the lead of the ILO. They have been told by Socialist Europeans that socialism is the hope of the world, and that the kind of civilization we have in the United States is outmoded and in some mysterious way still lingering along, operating under old-fashioned concepts that are holdovers from the last century.

The fact is that out of the entire world, the United States and Canada are practically the only countries left that are still operating in the main on the basis of the free-competitive system.

Well—so far I have given you the picture of the ILO previous to the time the Russians moved in on us. As I said before, Russia had been out of this picture for a long time, but in 1954 they moved back in in a big way, and brought their satellites along with them.

They precipitated a debate which is still going on in the ILO, a debate which is founded upon a fundamental premise.

From the very beginning the employer delegates to the ILO, who under its constitution are supposed to represent free associations of free employers, contended that the Communist so-called employer delegates could not possibly represent free associations of free employers, because there were no such associations in Communist countries.

Our claim was that the so-called employer delegates from Communist countries were simply government agents, and agents for the Communist Party.

At the 1954 conference the employer delegates from non-Communist nations made a determined effort to get these Communist so-called employer delegates thrown out. We were defeated. At the 1955 conference we tried to keep them off our employer committees, and once more we were defeated.

In 1954 the United States Government supported our position. But in 1955 our Government reversed its stand and supported the Communists. We wound up by having Communist agents placed on the employer groups of the ILO. Let me explain how this works out.

The working committees of the ILO are tripartite; that is, on each committee we are supposed to have representatives of government, employers, and workers. But what happens if we get Communists officially seated as members of employer groups. The result is as preposterous as if the National Association of Manufacturers, or the United States Chamber of Commerce, should accept Communist agents on their boards of directors.

I simply could not face up to this proposition. At the 1954 conference I protested as strongly as possible, but to no avail. At the 1955 conference I withdrew the United States employer delegation from participation in any ILO working committees upon which Communist so-called employers had been seated. I felt that a time had come to make a stand on principle.

Now I wonder whether you realize what the invasion of the ILO by the Russians actually means.

Russia has come back into the ILO as three countries—the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, and Byelorussia. That is the basis upon which Russia belongs to the United Nations. I do not know yet why Russia represents 3 nations in the United Nations whereas we represent only 1. But that is the situation.

In addition, Russia is now reinforced in the ILO, on a very active basis, by Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Albania. That makes 8 Iron Curtain countries that have a total of 32 votes in the ILO, as compared to 4 votes from the United States. Meanwhile we pay 25 percent of the cost, while the 8 Communist countries pay a total of 14½ percent.

The Communists have got their foot in the door in the ILO, and they are preparing to take it over. Their interminable tirades of oratory at the 1955 session were incredible.

Many nations of the rest of the world are much impressed, and are afraid of the Russians. It seems to me very probable, therefore, that from now on ILO proposals and findings will, without question, go more definitely to the left. The ILO is going to be swamped by Red propaganda.

We were told by a member of the Labor Department, in the last days of the Truman regime, that it was important that the United States pretend, in the ILO to go along with Socialist philosophy, because the Socialists would help us contain the Communists.

Did they? The answer is, they did not. The Communists now have a good chance of taking over not only the propaganda aspect of the ILO, but a good share of its overall operation.

And when you get right down to it—what is the difference between a Communist and a Socialist?

Socialism and communism are rival collectivist systems, competing for followers and for political power. In the ILO each strives for influence, as opposed to the other; but when it comes to matters of basic principle, both of them go right down the same line.

I think the distinction between communism and socialism has been excellently stated by Earl Bunting, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who said to me, one day, "Communism is the cruel force required to put socialism into effect."

So we have, in the ILO, a struggle between communism and socialism—and in between the two, our whole system of freedom, our whole system of competitive enterprise, is dropped in the middle, neglected and scorned as something old-fashioned, outmoded, and no longer suited to modern civilization.

So I, for one, am getting pretty sick and tired of a situation which is becoming progressively impossible.

Up until the time the Russians came back into the ILO, I felt that the United States employers were accomplishing something. We had definitely succeeded in having some of the most objectionable provisions of proposed ILO conventions thrown out. We had done far more than that. We had raised such a row against the very principle of conventions enacted as international laws that the ILO has passed only one convention in the last 3 years.

But when the Communists came back in, and were accepted, and we had Communist agents put on employers committees—well, that to me well-nigh spelled the end of the road.

There is one last stand still to be taken. The ILO has appointed a committee to determine whether employer and worker delegates from various countries represent associations of free employers and free workers, or whether they don't. The idea is that the report of this committee might be the basis for formulating a constitutional amendment under which so-called Communist employer and worker delegates could be thrown out. This committee is supposed to make its report at the November meeting of the government body, which I shall attend.

If this committee makes its report in all sincerity on the basis of actual facts, if the ILO governing body takes this proposal seriously and puts the matter on the agenda of the ILO Conference, I think that we in the United States should stick tight and use our utmost influence to further this objective.

But if, on the other hand, things go the other way—and I think they will—if no determined effort is made by the ILO to disqualify the Communist so-called employer and worker delegates—we will be faced with the prospect that the ILO will become just another Communist-dominated organization. And in that case I can say very frankly that I can see no further constructive purpose to be gained by continuing further United States participation in the ILO.

But no matter what we do about the ILO, remember that this is only one of the various arms of the United Nations that are enacting conventions, and seeking thereby to write laws governing internal domestic affairs and impose them upon us by the device of treaty ratification.

We need the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator BRICKER to protect us against this threat to the principle of self-government. I don't want the laws of the United States written for us by representatives of over 60 foreign countries. I say, let's write our own laws, in our own way.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point some comments which have been made by representatives of Communist countries to show that their participation is merely a propaganda ruse on the part of the Communist representatives. I might say that not only did our delegation oppose the entrance of the Communists into ILO conferences and committees, but that, likewise, Italy, France, New Zealand, The Netherlands, Ireland, and the United Kingdom, in expressions from their representatives, also opposed the seating of the so-called employer and employee delegations from Soviet Russia. I should like to give two or three examples of what has been stated at these conferences by delegates from Communist countries, to illustrate to Senators what the representatives of the United States are up against when they sit down with these delegates from Communist countries.

I rather agree with Mr. Meany of the American Federation of Labor–CIO, that he will not sit at a conference table with Communists on matters of this kind. He very expressly stated that in a recent speech.

I now should like to insert in the RECORD some excerpts from speeches made by Communist representatives after they had been seated. One of them, a delegate from the Ukraine, said:

> The trade union organizations of the Ukraine have over 1,800 clubs, 21,000 special meeting halls and aproximately 5,000 libraries, with tens of millions of volumes. The workers have every facility for rest in clubs, palaces, and cultural houses. Factories and workshops are equipped with rest rooms and sports grounds.

The Government delegate from the U. S. S. R. said:

> In the United States, as in other capitalist countries, various forms of forced labor are linked together in a remarkable way. The United States is the country where the capitalists most cruelly exploit their employees by means of the most subtle forms of sweat

labor. In the United States also there are still vestiges of slavery.

The Government delegate from Bulgaria said:

In the capitalist countries, legislation is such that employers can make tremendous profits and at the same time pay the workers—who are the real producers of goods—very low wages, thus condemning them to misery, unemployment and suffering. By contrast, in our country, as well as in the Soviet Union and in the People's Democracies, this problem has been happily solved.

These are all Communist countries from which representatives of labor, so-called, and representatives of business, so-called, have been seated, against the votes of the American representatives.

The next quotation is from the delegate from Czechoslovakia:

The proportion of our industrial production in the total national income increased from 56 percent in 1948 to 70 percent in 1953. During the same period, labor productivity increased 60 percent. On the other hand, the increasing number of strikes in capitalistic countries shows that the workers and their organizations are exhausting themselves in a continual struggle.

The delegate from Bulgaria said:

Political tension and economic instability are one consequence of the policy of preparing for a new war furthered in certain capitalist countries, by circles that are guided solely by their material and egotistical interests.

Mr. President, I could go on and read endlessly quotations from speeches made by delegates from Communist countries who have been seated against the votes of the American delegation.

If the Senate does not adopt the pending amendment, it will be, in effect, saying to our representatives: "There is no use continuing your fight. There is no use for you to stand adamant against these representatives of phony employers and phony employees, or in carrying on the fight you have been waging."

Mr. President, I believe it is essential that the Senate adopt the amendment, and in that way strengthen the hand of our representatives in the ILO, which has now passed from the phase of considering the interests and the welfare of employers and of labor all over the world, to a socialization program and to a consideration of all sorts of governmental functions, passing resolutions, and drafting treaties, and all sorts of contracts for the various countries to enter into, all of which affect not only labor, but the political interests of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted, to strengthen the hand of our country's representatives, in behalf of free labor and free business. I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing, before he yields to the Senator from Virginia, to answer some questions which I have in mind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes, so that I may answer the questions of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I understand the Senator from Ohio to say that the executive agencies of our Government were in favor of his amendment?

Mr. BRICKER. Agencies of our Government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know that any of them have been required to express their feelings on the matter. The State Department did, and I believe the Labor Department also did. I have a record here that Mr. Mitchell was opposed to the seating of the Communist delegates. A bill was introduced, but no hearings have been held on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether the administration has taken a stand on the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. I cannot say as to that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address an inquiry to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire of the distinguished minority leader whether the administration has taken a stand on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that a representative of the State Department, Mr. Francis Wilcox, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and testified in behalf of the measure which is before the Senate. I believe it is fair to say that he would not be in favor of an amendment of the type of that the Senator from Ohio has offered. It is fair to say that at least Mr. Wilcox, representing the State Department—and I have every reason to assume that he was speaking for the State Department—would be in opposition to the amendment.

I would say to the Senator, however, after having made that statement to the Senate, that, so far as the minority leader is concerned, he intends to support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, on the basis that it does not take the United States out of ILO and does not reduce the contributions we now make to ILO. It does hold in abeyance, until the matter can be thoroughly gone into by the Committee on Foreign Relations—and I hope the ILO itself—what I believe to be an untenable situation under which the Soviet Government and the other Communist governments purport to speak for both a free labor movement and free business in their respective countries, when the fact is that no such movement or business exists in those countries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the executive office taken any position on this amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If it has, I have not been contacted in regard to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has not informed the Senator?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It has not informed me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the attitude of the United States Department of Labor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Again, I have not been contacted, but I would assume——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield another minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would assume from the testimony of Mr. Wilcox that the views which he expressed when he appeared represented the views of the Department of State and the Department of Labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, therefore, of the administration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should think so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Secretary of Labor was represented.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, Mr. Wilcox is a representative of the State Department.

Mr. KNOWLAND. He used to be chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LEHMAN. And he appeared before the committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. He appeared before the committee. Mr. Wilkins from the Department of Labor appeared in support of the resolution which is now before the Senate without the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LEHMAN. That was my understanding, also.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My understanding is that a representative of the Department of Labor contacted my office and expressed his Department's opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the distinguished minority leader who said that in supporting the Bricker amendment we were merely giving the Foreign Relations Committee and the executive branch of the Government a further opportunity to look into the charges which have been made by the business representative of this group, that the Communist members of the ILO have been using that international organization as a front to promulgate ideas and principles which are to the detriment of the United States and of what we call the free world.

Mr. President, I am frankly discouraged over our participation in what might be called a world struggle for the mastery of men's minds, because, in my opinion, in recent years we have been losing both to socialism and to communism. I have seen that particularly illustrated in the work of the Interparliamentary Union of which I am proud to be at the present time the vice president

of the American group, and I am more familiar with how Communists have tried to use that old and honorable peace organization than any other international organization, as a sounding board for communistic propaganda.

The Interparliamentary Union was organized approximately 70 years ago in Geneva, Switzerland, and the United States was a charter member. At that time we were a young Nation, as nations go. We had a population of less than 58 million. While we were doing pretty well financially, we did not at every international gathering say, "Oh, let me pick up the check; I have so much more than you have."

So, Mr. President, when we went into the Interparliamentary Union 70 years ago we entered it on the same basis as did Great Britain, when Britannia was ruling the waves and the British boasted that the sun never set on the British Empire. We entered it on the same basis as did France which at that time had universal military service and far more military power than we had. For a number of years our contribution to that organization was only $10,000 a year. It was based on population. Finally, as we developed and grew, our contribution reached $18,000, and last year it reached $20,000.

The Interparliamentary Union is an organization with some 46 members. It meets every year in a general assembly, and every spring, in the executive council to prepare the agenda for the fall meeting. The charter of the organization provides that it shall be composed of members of free representative parliaments dedicated to the cause of peace and the extension of democratic principles. Of course, when the Interparliamentary Union was formed Russia, under the czars, did not ask to be admitted. It would not have been admitted, but it did not ask, because the czars were not dedicated to the promulgation of democratic principles.

Not until last year did representatives of the Soviet Union ask to be admitted to the Interparliamentary Union. Then, under the skillful leadership of Lord Stangate, the president of the Interparliamentary Union and a member of the Labor Party of Great Britain and a warm friend and admirer of both the Soviet Union and its satellites, and also of Red China, maneuvers were made to enable Soviet Russia and a number of its satellites to become members of the Interparliamentary Union. Later, at a meeting of the executive committee, which is composed of eight members—we have one member at the present time on that committee—in New Delhi last November a proposal was made by a representative of the Communist group that Red China be admitted to the Interparliamentary Union. We were not present, because we did not know the issue was coming up. There was another nation which was not represented and did not know the issue was coming up. There was a 3-to-3 tie vote, and the tie was broken by Lord Stangate in favor of the Communist group.

That is primarily why I accepted the assignment to go to Yugoslavia in the early part of this month as 1 of 2 delegates from the United States, to block, if we could, the motion which has been made in the executive committee that the executive council should vote to accept Red China as a member of a peace organization, mind you, when her hands were still dripping red with the blood of American boys, when she had been declared to be an aggressor in Korea and still maintains a tremendous army in Korea, to which she has no just and legal claim whatever. Our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], is the other delegate.

It may have been because of the secret vote—I am not too sure—but we succeeded at that meeting in defeating a motion made by a representative of Poland, on behalf of the Soviet Union, to admit Red China. But the issue undoubtedly will be brought up again when the Interparliamentary Union meets next fall in Bangkok, Thailand.

At that time I am not too certain that Red China will not be admitted; but I am sure that if Red China is admitted then the votes of the big communistic countries, like Russia and China, all having populations far greater than our own—although there is, under the charter, a limitation upon the total vote any nation may have on the basis of population—plus the votes of the so-called neutral countries, like India, which vote against us every time some proposal is made by a Red group against our interests, will cause the free nations of the world to lose complete control over what once was a very fine group of members of Parliament, who would annually meet in a friendly atmosphere, exchange views, and adopt resolutions and proposals designed to promote the peace of the world and the maintenance of democratic institutions.

As I say, Mr. President, I am more familiar with the debates which occur in that group than I am with those which are alleged to occur in an organization like the ILO.

I can say very definitely that the trend in Europe and in Asia is toward more socialism, which, of course, is a first cousin to communism. No nation has ever attempted pure socialism, which means government ownership and control of all instruments of production, excepting the private ownership of homes, farms, and things of that kind. No nation has ever attempted a full scale regime of communism. Communism has been modified even in the Soviet Union, a nation which has gone further, I believe, in that direction than has any other nation.

When the United States stands as a living example of how much more productive a Nation can be under a system of private enterprise than under socialism or communism, it is difficult for me to understand why we are losing the struggle for the minds of men and to influence them to stay free, and to try to convince them that they will be happier and more prosperous if they will not succumb to the lure of Communist propaganda. But I am convinced that we are losing the struggle, because that is the impression I get everytime I meet with a large group of delegates from 30, 40, or 50 nations at a foreign conference.

We made one so-called socialistic experiment in this country when we decided to follow the advice of the wise Benjamin Franklin, who maintained that the only way to obtain cheap postage was to give the Government a monopoly in the handling of first class mail. That was done; and in every year in which the Government has operated the Post Office Department, except two, the Government has gone in the hole. Last year, after having discontinued the twice-daily delivery of mail, to residential sections, thus saving $100 million, and transferring to the Civil Aeronautics Board the subsidy paid to the airlines for the carrying of mail, thus saving another $50 million, the Government went in the hole $450 million. In the next fiscal year, if a postal rate increase is not obtained, the Government will go in the hole about $500 million. There is not a private corporation in this Nation which, if it were given a monopoly on the handling of first-class mail, could not make a big profit, plus securing the additional advantages which would be gained from the handling of second, third, and fourth class mail.

Our Government conducted one other such experiment. During World War I, the leaders of the Nation decided that the Government could not get proper priority in the rail shipments of war materials or in the movement of troops unless the Government took over the railroads. So Congress voted to have the Government take over the railroads. Whom did the Government place in charge of that activity? A very distinguished man. He was no second-rate politician; oh, no. He was a great engineer. He was supposed to be a financial wizard, because later he was named Secretary of the Treasury. Still later, he was a candidate for the Presidency and made a very respectable showing. He was Mr. William G. McAdoo. He became the director general of the railroads. Certainly the Government could not have selected a man who had better qualifications to do a good job. But what happened? In a period when the railroads had unprecedented traffic, the Government went in the hole hand over fist for the 2 years in which it operated the railroads during the war.

All the nations in Europe own and operate their railroads. All of them lose money on their operations, with the possible exception of Switzerland, which is strategically located so as to benefit by the great amount of tourist traffic between Paris and Italy. But all the other nations lose money on their railroad operations. There is not a railroad in all Europe on which the wages paid the workers compare favorably with the wages paid the workers on American railroads. Yet the foreign governments lose money on all their railroad operations.

What were the earnings of our railroads last year? I have just received today some interesting figures on that subject. Last year the American railroads paid $1,081,000,000 in Federal, State franchise, and local property taxes. After paying those taxes, and after setting aside suitable amounts for depreciation, for new rolling stock, and for plant

expansion and improvements, the railroads distributed to their stockholders $421 million.

One would think that because in all the foreign countries, both in Europe and in Asia, the governments own and operate the railroads, they would draw the conclusion from the example of the American railroads alone that there must be some inherent value in our system of private enterprise, and that the Russian propaganda, to the effect that the United States and other capitalistic countries are decadent, and that our private-enterprise system is slavery for the workers, could not possibly be true.

Unfortunately, on the basis of my recent contacts in Yugoslavia with the representatives of 33 nations, I have to report that the definite trend is toward more socialism, where such countries are not actually on the verge of moving toward out-and-out communism. The leaders of the Politburo recognize the advantage they can gain today in stressing the increase of socialism in those countries where they do not want to start a revolution by force, and where the voters would not be willing at this time to install peaceably a Communistic regime.

In his now famous speech of February 14, 1956, the Communist leader, Khrushchev, now visiting in London and elsewhere in Great Britain, and paying tribute to a capitalistic country, made this statement:

> In this connection the question arises of whether it is possible to go over to socialism by using parliamentary means. No such course was open to the Russian Bolsheviks who were the first to effect this transition. Lenin showed us another road—that of the establishment of a republic of Soviets, the only correct road in those historical conditions. Following that course, we achieved a victory of worldwide historical significance.
>
> The right wing bourgeois parties and their governments are suffering bankruptcy with increasing frequency.

Make no mistake about it, Khrushchev is talking about the United States; and he is trying to say the same thing to the countries in Europe, some of which are faced with bankruptcy, but largely because they have already had too much socialism. Listen to this:

> In these circumstances, the working class, by rallying around itself the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces, and resolutely repulsing the opportunist elements who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the popular interest——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield me 10 additional minutes?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield 10 additional minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Who are the reactionary forces? Those who believe in private enterprise, and according to this speech, they are opposed to the popular interest. I continue to read:

> to capture a stable majority in parliament, and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will.
>
> In such an event this institution, traditional in many highly developed capitalist countries, may become an organ of genuine democracy—democracy for the working people.
>
> The winning of a stable parliamentary majority backed by a mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and of all the working people could create for the working class of a number of capitalist and former colonial countries, conditions needed to secure fundamental social changes.

I skip a part of the statement, and read the following:

> There are cases where certain Socialist parties have gained majorities in parliaments. In some countries there were, and still are, even Socialist governments. However, even then things are restricted to all the small concessions in favor of the workers no socialism is built. It is necessary for the state and the leadership of society to pass over to the working class; the working class must be prepared not only organizationally but also politically and theoretically for the struggle to socialism, so that it may not be satisfied with the crumbs from the capitalist table but will obtain majority, take power into its own hands, and liquidate private ownership of the basic means of production.

That is the current program of the Politburo of Russia and of all of their satellites in every international organization of which they are members, where they cannot infiltrate and build up strong Communist parties as they have in France and Italy. There were more Communists in those countries in 1956 than there were before we started spending in 1948 hundreds of millions of dollars to stem the tide of communism. Where larger Communist parties cannot be built up, they are told to take the next move and try to infiltrate with this program of socialism on the ground that it is the only answer for the working man. If we could get across to them the illustration of our railroads, it ought to tell the tale.

During the recent meeting in Dubrovnik on economic and social matters there was an attack made on our racial policies, and I told the Soviet delegate that there were 14- or 15-million colored people in the United States, most of whom were in Virginia and throughout the South, who had a standard of living higher than existed anywhere in Europe, and the standard of living in Europe is higher than anywhere in Russia or behind the Iron Curtain. I stated that those 14- or 15-million colored people owned more automobiles than did all the people of the Soviet Union combined. Yet they attacked us.

When we discussed foreign aid the Soviet representative in that group said, "You should beware of all foreign aid to which political strings are attached." He was talking about us. We are the only ones who have been giving any foreign aid.

I have no knowledge of what is happening in a propaganda way in other great peace organizations dedicated to the promulgation of democratic principles, but I am sure, from the statement I have read to my colleagues from the speech of Khrushchev at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on February 14, 1956, and from what I have heard happens in the United Nations and all the other organizations, the pattern is the same.

Now, in 1945, when we were in a generous mood and helped organize the United Nations, we said, "Let us pay 40 percent of the bill. We have plenty of money." Our share of the cost has since been decreased to some extent. When we went into ILO we said, "Let us have one-fourth of the bill." There are some 60 nations in it, and our share of the cost is $1,750,000. Since that time the assessments of 42 nations have been reduced, while it is proposed to nearly double our cost from $1,750,000 to $3 million.

I have checked the contributions of other nations to the cost of the organization.

Albania pays 0.12 of 1 percent. There are four votes against ours, and our four votes cost us $1,750,000.

Bulgaria pays 0.21 of 1 percent.

Byelorussia, 0.45 of 1 percent.

Czechoslovakia, 0.96 of 1 percent.

Hungary, 0.50 of 1 percent.

Poland, 0.124 percent.

The Ukraine, 1 percent.

The Soviet Union, 10 percent.

Those nations, which have 32 votes, contribute 14½ percent of the cost against our present 25 percent, and against the pending request that our share of the cost be increased to $3 million, which would probably put it close to 40 percent, but for the proposal adopted last Monday that, whatever the amount is now, our share of the cost cannot be more than 33⅓ percent.

I know the hour is growing late, and I know the Senate wants to act on the joint resolution. There are many matters connected with the foreign-aid program I wish I had an opportunity to discuss. I think the time has come for a very serious reappraisal of our foreign-aid program. I know from personal experience that some nations which have been large recipients of our aid are now openly hostile to us. I know there is general dissatisfaction with our foreign-aid, in most Southeastern Asia, with the exception of Pakistan.

So, Mr. President, this is just one phase of our international program where it has been shown that the Soviet Union is nullifying everything that the organization, the ILO, was intended to do for the protection of the workingman throughout the world. Therefore, I feel very strongly constrained to vote for the Bricker amendment, to let the matter stay in status quo, so to speak, until we can have a little better look and get more information as to whether or not we are spending the money of the taxpayers of America for purposes that are against their best interests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Six minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Bricker amendment, but in doing so I wish to make it clear that while every purpose which the Senator from Ohio [Mr.

BRICKER] has in offering the amendment has my hearty approval, it seems to me it would be wrong to adopt the approach he suggests to accomplish his purposes.

On Monday last I made a brief statement on this subject, and I emphasized the fact—and I think we are all agreed—that we are not trying to destroy the ILO. We are not trying to bring it to a conclusion. The Senator from Ohio himself has said he is for the ILO, and he simply wants to limit our contribution this year to $1,750,000, unless the condition which he has put in the amendment is complied with, namely, nonpermission for the representatives of industry and labor in Russia to vote, because they do not actually represent their respective groups.

I am entirely in sympathy with the position which the Senator from Ohio has taken, but, as I have some knowledge of the history of the ILO, know the importance of that organization, and recognize the fact that up to the present, at least, the United States and the Western Powers can be said to be "on top of the situation," I hesitate to put any restrictions on our representatives at the present time in the form of monetary limitation.

It seems to me that in voting for the pending joint resolution and in voting against the Bricker amendment, we shall really be giving a vote of confidence in our delegates to the ILO, based upon what they have done there, and what they are trying to do now.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, our delegates to the ILO have opposed the seating of some of the delegates from other countries, but have been overruled. The same is true in the case of the parent organization, the United Nations, where I once served as a delegate. In both the ILO and the United Nations, our delegates have sometimes been overruled; but that has not brought about a refusal on our part to contribute further to those organizations. Of course, the question of contributions has always been an important one.

On Monday, the Senate adopted the amendment providing that the payments by the United States to the FAO and to the ILO shall not exceed 33⅓ percent of the total assessed budgets of those organizations.

It is my understanding that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to reconsider that amendment. However, I am not now discussing that matter. Instead, I am discussing the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which, if adopted, would have the effect of saying to our delegates: "You are prohibited from negotiating a settlement as to what the United States' contribution will be this year, unless these Soviet delegates and satellite delegates are not seated."

Mr. President, as I stated on Monday last, in the course of my remarks in the Senate Chamber:

It has been said that we are outvoted in the ILO by the Communists. Eight Soviet bloc countries are members of the ILO, and they have 4 votes apiece, or a total of 32 votes. The United States also has 4 votes—2 for our Government delegates and 1 each for our employer and worker delegates. But besides the Soviet bloc and the United States, there are 62 other members of the ILO, also with 4 votes each. Of the 284 votes in the ILO, the Soviet bloc has 32, and the free world has 252.

In other words, today we and our allies are not outvoted by the Soviet bloc. I agree that we should oppose the seating of delegates who do not really represent the groups they are supposed to represent. On the other hand, in registering our disapproval of such delegates, I do not think we should go to the extent of saying, "We will not pay our contribution to the organization unless what we request is done." For us to take that position would, it seems to me, be of doubtful wisdom from a psychological viewpoint, for in that event we would practically be saying that we were determined to control the organization, whereas, of course, we desire to maintain our position of strength with our allies, particularly with the Asian countries, who work with us in this field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, because I think the approach it proposes is the wrong one for us to adopt.

Mr. President, let me say there could hardly be controversy within the United States over the objective of this amendment, which is to deny seats in the ILO Conference to delegates purporting to represent employers and workers in Soviet bloc countries. Because there are no free employers and free workers in those countries, these delegates are, in fact, government delegates. There is no doubt that that is correct.

This poses a very real problem for the ILO; but the amendment of the Senator from Ohio adopts, in my opinion, the wrong approach to solving the problem. The amendment provides that if these spurious Soviet employer and worker delegates are seated, the United States contribution to the ILO in the succeeding year cannot exceed the present ceiling of $1,750,000. Obviously, Mr. President, such a limitation would prevent our representatives or delegates from having any leeway for negotiation. Instead, they would be bound by that limitation.

It has already been established that the United States' assessment in the ILO—and I understand that our delegates participated in arriving at that assessment—probably will exceed this ceiling. Suppose that, notwithstanding the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, the ILO Conference this year does seat Soviet employer and worker delegates. The result, under the amendment, would be to embarrass the United States and to impair our position in the ILO, with corresponding benefit to the Soviets.

Mr. President, I am not sure whether the constitution of the ILO provides that the delegates of a country which does not pay its agreed-upon assessment will be barred from voting. I rather think there is such a rule, but I cannot state that dogmatically. However, if such a rule does exist, of course our delegates would be barred from voting if the United States' new assessment were not paid.

As was pointed out in the debate on Monday, the ILO is taking steps to deal with the problem of Soviet employer and worker representation. It is probably unrealistic, however, to expect a definitive solution this year.

What is really needed—as George P. Delaney, the United States worker delegate, has pointed out—is an amendment to the ILO constitution, so that employer and worker delegates may not be handpicked by totalitarian governments. That is a process which will require some time to carry out. But in the meantime, the United States position in the ILO should not be prejudiced by action such as that proposed in the pending amendment. Such action might well be interpreted by some of the non-Communist nations in the ILO as a unilateral attempt on the part of the United States to dictate to the organization. It might, therefore, produce results contrary to those intended, and might leave us without the moral strength we have at the present time.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the administration has brought to my attention their belief that the joint resolution now before us should be passed without the pending amendment, and because of the reasons I have just outlined, I feel compelled to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of those who look to the RECORD for guidance, the portion of the report of the committee on the pending measure commencing on page 3 with the heading "5. Executive Branch Comments," so it will be very clear that this proposal is sponsored by the State Department and by the administration—which certainly includes the President—and also by the Department of Labor. I think there is no question about their position in regard to the amendment itself.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No.1172) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

5. EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMENTS

It is anticipated that, due to a combination of circumstances, United States assessments for the regular budgets of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the International Labor Organization (ILO) will increase in the next year or two. The authorizing legislation, as amended for United States participation in each of these organizations sets the maximum amount which may be appropriated annually for the regular budgets of the organizations. The existing statutory limit in the case of the Food and Agriculture Organization is $2 million, and of the International Labor Organization, $1,750,000.

In neither of the two organizations does the United States assessment for calendar year 1955 (financed from fiscal year 1956 appropriations) exceed the respective statutory ceiling, and the ILO ceiling will not be breached in calendar 1956. However, it is the best estimate of the Department of State and

of the other United States agencies concerned that, due to anticipated decisions of the policy determining bodies of the two organizations in regard to their scales of assessment and the size of their regular budgets, the assessments on the United States for calendar year 1956 in the FAO, and for calendar 1957 in the ILO, will be very near to, or in excess of, the existing ceiling figures.

It is proposed, therefore, that Public Law 174, 79th Congress, and Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806, 81st Congress, be further amended to increase the authorization of the amounts which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the regular budgets of these 2 organizations to $3 million, respectively.

United States participation in the Food and Agriculture Organization was authorized by the above-cited Public Law 174 of the 79th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806 of the 81st Congress after review and approval by both Houses of Congress. As a part of the enabling legislation, the 79th Congress placed a ceiling of $1,250,000 on the amount which might be appropriated for the United States contribution to the Food and Agriculture Organization in any 1 year. When the FAO undertook larger responsibilities which called for a larger contribution from the United States in 1950, the Congress inquired into the Organization's program and development, and determined that an increase in the ceiling was justified and in the United States interest. In the light of the known circumstances at the time, a ceiling of $2 million was established.

Total FAO assessments on all members for calendar year 1955 amount to $5,890,000. The United States share for 1955 is 30 percent, or a gross assessment of $1,767,000. Because of a nonrecurring credit from the working capital fund, the net United States contribution for calendar 1955 is reduced to $1,527,624. There is every indication that at the next session of the FAO Conference in November 1955 both the United States percentage share and the total amount of the budget will be increased for 1956 and 1957. For some time, there has been increasing pressure from other members of the organization to conform the FAO scale of assessments to the United Nations scale, an action which would increase the United States share to 33⅓ percent as in the United Nations. At the FAO Conference in November 1953, the United States, after a major effort, succeeded in averting an increase for 1954 and 1955 above the existing 30 percent. At the same time, however, the conference directed that a study be made of all factors in the calculation of the scale with a view to revising the scale for 1956 and 1957. This study was conducted by a special FAO working group in March 1955. The position taken by the United States in this working group was the result of lengthy consultation among the various agencies of the executive branch. In line with this position, and in order to avoid a recommendation by the working group to conform the FAO scale to the United Nations scale in one step in 1956, the United States indicated to the group that this Government would not oppose an increase in the United States assessment to 31½ percent for calendar years 1956 and 1957, but that a further increase to 33⅓ percent would have to be delayed until 1958. These increases assume the continuance of FAO membership at substantially its present size. The United States emphasized that it would expect to share in any significant percentage reduction occasioned by the adherence of new members. The working group adopted a recommendation along these lines which was approved by the FAO Council in June for final action by the conference at its session in November.

Representatives of the United States have made it abundantly clear in the FAO that, under existing statutory authorization, United States annual contributions to the regular FAO budget are limited to $2 million and that, as a result, the United States cannot support a budget which will result in a United States assessment in excess of that figure.

However, it is the view of the Department of State and the Department of Agriculture that the activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization in helping to improve the methods of production and distribution of agricultural products and to increase the standard of living of rural people have been of great value in terms of United States policies, and that certain of these activities should be expanded. Attention is called, for example, to the work the FAO is carrying on to assist countries in analyzing their agricultural production programs in the interests of promoting selective expansion of products in areas of need to help meet nutritional deficiencies, and at the same time to help decrease the problems arising from surpluses of products already available in adequate supply. To this end, the FAO is helping individual governments to develop agricultural extension services, and has promoted regional consultations such as those recently held in Latin America and the Near East on problems of selective expansion. It is believed that the present statutory limitation of $2 million will be a handicap to the United States at the FAO Conference in November and in future years, and will weaken the influence of the United States in guiding the future development of this organization. The proposed increase in the ceiling to $3 million would avoid a possible situation in calendar 1956 in which the United States might be unable to meet its full assessment, and beyond that point it would provide for foreseeable future requirements.

In the case of the International Labor Organization, United States participation dates from 1934, first under authority of Public Resolution 43, of the 73d Congress, and since 1948 under authority of Public Law 843 of the 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 806 of the 81st Congress. As a part of the legislation in 1948, the 80th Congress placed a ceiling of $1,091,739 on the amount which may be appropriated for the United States contribution to the International Labor Organization for any one year. In 1950, at the same time that the statutory ceilings in regard to the Food and Agriculture Organization and certain other international organizations were reviewed, the Congress determined that an increase in the ILO ceiling was justified and in the United States interest. In the light of known circumstances at that time, the Congress increased the ceiling to $1,750,000.

Since 1950, there have been significant developments in the ILO program which have increased the costs of the Organization. Four ILO operational field offices have been established on a regional basis to permit more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, etc. In addition, the ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting, and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious, and unsubstantiated.

Total ILO assessments on all members for calendar year 1955 amounted to $6,990,913. The United States share for 1955 is 25 percent, or a gross assessment of $1,747,729. This amount is reduced by certain credits to $1,633,855. For calendar 1956, the Labor Conference in June 1955, approved total assessments of $7,395,729. The gross assessment on the United States (at 25 percent) will be $1,848,933. When available credits have been taken into account, the United States contribution for calendar 1956 will be $1,638,861. A contribution of this size, although close to the existing statutory ceiling of $1,750,000, will not breach the ceiling. However, the ILO governing body in November 1955 will consider a proposal put forward by Canada to revise the ILO scale of assessments and bring it into conformity with the United Nations scale in three steps in calendar years 1957, 1958, and 1959. Such an adjustment would increase the United States percentage share above the present 25-percent level, and would result in breaching the statutory ceiling, possibly by the calendar year 1957.

If the present ceiling of $1,750,000 remains, the United States will have little or no flexibility for negotiation, particularly as regards the assessment scale when this issue is considered by the Governing Body in November. The Department of State and the Department of Labor believe that the United States would be in a better position to obtain a reasonable solution on this issue, and on other financial and substantive issues, if this Government were not forced to take a completely negative stand on these matters. The proposed increase in the statutory ceiling to $3 million would provide the flexibility which is required.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should also like to call attention to the fact that in the basic law in the case of the ILO, I do not believe there is any mention of the so-called free labor movement or of participation in it—which seems to be the basis of the objection of the Senator from Ohio—or of participation in it by delegates from the Soviet Union.

I may say that I am very sympathetic to many of the expressions and views of the Senator from Ohio; but I think it would be impractical for us to attempt to proceed by means of his amendment, especially in view of the attitude of the administration, which has the responsibility for carrying on this program and for the participation of our delegates in the deliberations of these groups.

In this connection, let me call attention to article III, paragraph 5, of the constitution of the ILO, which reads as follows:

> The Members undertake to nominate nongovernment delegates and advisers chosen in agreement with the industrial organizations, if such organizations exist, which are most representative of employers or work people, as the case may be, in their respective countries.

That language would indicate that it was anticipated that perhaps in some countries such organizations would not exist, and there would not be any real organizations of either laborers or industrial groups.

However, in any case I think that on the floor of the Senate we should not undertake to deal with the characteristics of the Government of every participant in either this organization or any other organization. If we were to attempt to

do so, we would be undertaking an impossible job. Many other governments which participate in the ILO have more or less a degree of socialism or statism or more or less democracy, in the sense in which we understand that term. If we attempt to evaluate the purity of the democracy of each of them, I think we shall be undertaking an impossible task.

If we are to participate at all in this organization, we must not do anything which would render our membership in it ineffective. I, myself, do not believe we should leave the organization; but that is neither here nor there. The administration thinks our membership in this organization is valuable, and I do not quarrel with that position. If, on the other hand, the administration were to recommend that the United States withdraw, I am not sure that I would object to such action.

However, the point is that, in my opinion, the pending amendment is not a practical one; and therefore, I intend to oppose it. So long as we are in the organization, I do not think this is a workable provision. Therefore, I must oppose it.

I intend to offer an amendment which, if adopted, would restrict moneywise our participation to the present percentage, which is 25 percent. I do not believe—and I so stated in the committee—in increasing our percentage of the payment for the support of the ILO in the future. Regardless of the amount its members may be willing to pay for it, inasmuch as our share is and has been 25 percent, I believe it should not be increased. I object to increasing it to 33⅓ percent, which is what will occur if we do not adopt such an amendment.

The same is true of the FAO. I believe that the effect of not adopting the amendment which I shall offer would be that, in principle, we would be accepting the responsibility for paying a third of the cost of all the international organizations. I object to that. I think we should very reasonably look forward to the time when we can reduce our percentage, even in the United Nations, below what it is now. It is now a third. I think it could well be reduced to 25 percent.

We joined these organizations when most of the world, other than ourselves, was in a very bad financial condition. There has been a great improvement with respect to most of the other members, and I think we should properly look toward a gradual reduction in the amount we pay for the support of these organizations. So in that sense my own amendment is, to a degree, in accord with the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, at least so far as the amount of money involved is concerned. It would restrict it to 25 percent.

From an administrative standpoint, if we are to be in the organization at all, I do not think we can undertake to evaluate to exactly what degree the various members are free from Government domination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, are there any further calls for time on this side of the aisle?

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like about 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator for or against the pending amendment?

Mr. POTTER. I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, last year I was selected as a delegate to represent the Senate at the ILO Conference. I am thoroughly in accord with the objectives set forth in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] with respect to the percentage of our contribution to the ILO.

The ILO was established on a tripartite basis, 1 portion representing government, 1 representing management, and 1 representing labor. We recognize the fact that with respect to the Communist countries, there is no free representation from management and there is no free representation from labor. Management, labor, and government operate in unison, primarily to foster the philosophy and ideology of the Communist government.

It is my position that the Congress, in dealing with an issue of this kind, should deal with it on the basis of whether or not we are to continue our membership in the ILO. That should be the decision of the Congress. If it should be our national policy to cease our membership in the ILO, that is one problem. But if we are to continue as a member of the International Labor Organization, our hands should not be tied, and we should take full advantage of our membership to sell the American way of life, to sell free enterprise, to sell our American system of government.

The question before us now is neither black nor white. We should stick to the main issue involved. It is my feeling that if we are to continue our membership the adoption of the Bricker amendment would put us in the position of saying to the rest of the world: "We are reluctant partners. We are members, but we are not happy about it. We are going to cut down our efforts in this field, and we are not going to utilize this forum to the best advantage."

There may be serious question as to the desirability of continuing our membership in the ILO; but that should be the main issue. We should not adopt such an amendment as the one which is pending, which would continue our membership but would say to the other members of the International Labor Organization: "We are doing it most reluctantly." We would lose our influence within the international organization.

There are other countries which are members of the ILO, with respect to which very serious questions could be raised as to whether their delegates represent either free labor or free management. For example, consider our good friend, the country of West Germany. There is serious question as to whether the labor representatives from West Germany, or the management representatives from West Germany represent free labor or free management.

Consider the case of our good friend, Great Britain. It was interesting to note at the conference that the Government, management, and labor representatives from the great country of Great Britain acted in unison. We know that there are basic differences of opinion between management, government, and labor in various countries; but at the ILO their national interest was made paramount to the interest of either labor or management.

What disturbed me at the conference which I observed was the fact that we had no national policy, represented by the three parts of our tripartite group. Our Government representatives assumed one posture. Many times our labor representatives would assume another posture, and our management representatives would assume a third.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is that not exactly the reason for the tripartite arrangement?

Mr. POTTER. So far as technical matters under discussion are concerned, I would say yes, that we certainly expect to have individual expressions from the representatives of management, labor, and Government. However, when it comes to national policy, we find that the United States has constantly been put into an embarrassing position, and that the leadership of the Western World has been assumed by the British Empire, because its delegation has worked in unison to promote the national interest of the British Empire.

That does not mean that in technical matters there must be agreement. However, on questions of national policy, there is no difference between them. That is not true of our own delegation to the ILO. I hope that in the future the United States, as it participates in this program, will either assume its responsibility and utilize to full advantage this forum, or withdraw entirely from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The amendment does not take the United States out of the ILO. It does not reduce the amount which we contribute to ILO. On the arguments which have been made, I submit a very strong case has been made that Congress should maintain the status quo so far as this country is concerned. Congress, through the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, should have an opportunity to go into the subject and to take testimony from those who have been closely observing the situation and the recent developments.

Mr. President, had it not been for the fact that some Senators on the Committee on Appropriations and on other committees, and Representatives on

committees of the House had insisted on a maximum amount of 33⅓ percent as the contribution of this country for the United Nations Organization itself, we would today be paying an amount greatly in excess of that.

I believe that Congress, under our constitutional system, must always keep control of the purse strings. It is entirely proper that the amount of the contribution be maintained as it is until Congress can be satisfied as to what the facts are in the case.

The Senator from Ohio has pointed out that this is the first time the Congress has had an opportunity to pass upon the very fundamental question whether its intent in participating in an organization created presumably to represent, on a tripartite basis, government, free employers, and free labor, has been abused by the seating of Communist delegates, who not only vote the government vote but also vote what are supposed to be the votes of free labor and of free business.

Under those circumstances it would be putting the stamp of approval of Congress on such an abuse of intent in establishing an international labor organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the circumstances I do not believe that the amendment in any way handicaps the Government of the United States. It serves notice on the entire world that we are still operating under our constitutional system, under which Congress functions as a coordinate, not as a subordinate, branch of the Government. It demonstrates to the world that under our constitutional system no group, be it the executive branch of our Government or a delegation to an international organization—the United Nations itself or any other organization—has a right, in effect, to appropriate funds out of the Treasury without the affirmative approval of Congress.

It is very important that that be demonstrated in a world in which so many people have lost their freedom and in which representative governments have been destroyed.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, has what is called a supreme Soviet, a parliamentary system. However, does any Member of the Senate or anyone else in the United States believe that it is a free, representative parliamentary body? Of course not. Russia does not have such a system any more than the Nazis had it in Nazi Germany. The mere use of the term does not prove the facts. Under those circumstances it would be a violation of the basic moral principles upon which the ILO was supposed to rest for us now to say, merely because the Soviet Union has won a temporary victory, that the Soviet Union in fact does have free labor and free business.

For those reasons I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have just had an opportunity to read the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I sympathize with the argument just made by the minority leader. However, as I read the amendment, it seems to me it would be wholly unenforceable. Let me read the amendment:

Provided, however, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly—

Not actually, but allegedly—

allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement were permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization.

What authority will say that delegates allegedly represent employers and employees in a country which is dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement? What authority will determine that to be a fact? If a satellite country is to be found as being dominated by another country, who is to find that to be the fact? The resolution does not find it.

Where is that fact to be proven? The resolution does not prove it. Who is to enforce it? What court will do it? Will the United Nations do it? Will we do it? Will the State Department do it? How could anyone enforce a resolution of this kind?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe I understand the objective of the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. However, I should like to go a little further than the Senator from Wyoming has gone. I should like to ask what comprises domination of a foreign government, and who determines whether such country is dominated? Does it mean economic domination? Does it mean political domination? What does it mean?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield an additional minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Government of Ceylon be considered to be under Communist domination? Would the Government of Egypt be considered to be under Communist domination? Would the Government of East Germany be considered to be under the Communist domination? What countries can be considered to be under Communist domination? Would Canada be considered under Communist domination because she is dependent upon Communist countries to take a big share of her wheat surplus?

In other words, what constitutes domination, and who determines whether a nation is being dominated?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The wording is the exact wording contained in the Immigration Law. It was copied from that law; and there has been no difficulty interpreting that law.

The Soviet bloc in the International Labor Organization has been assessed for the following percentage contributions:

Together, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine, and the Soviet Union contribute approximately 14½ percent, as compared with 25 percent for the United States, at this time, and 33⅓ percent under the amendment adopted last week. They have 32 votes. We have 4 votes.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any certainty that the directive would be followed?

Mr. BRICKER. It is not a directive to the International Labor Organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the objective of the Senator from Ohio has merit, since it is recognized by Members of the Senate that worker delegates and so-called industrial delegates from Soviet bloc countries are undoubtedly to be spokesmen for the Soviet bloc governments, but I think the amendment indicates a kind of a sense of insecurity and fear on our part. Are we saying that a delegate from a free trade union in the United States or a free delegate from an industrial establishment in the United States is incapable of dealing with or arguing with delegates from the Soviet bloc? Are we willing to testify by resolution to that effect?

Furthermore, I think it may be very advantageous to the United States of America to come into the open and argue with Soviet bloc delegates, particularly as the argument may affect representatives from industry, labor, and government, from so-called neutral countries and from our friends around the world in the other free countries. Very frankly, Mr. President, I should hate to think that we in America were less confident of our position than, let us say, is Great Britain or any one of the other 60 countries. I personally feel that any time we have an opportunity to join issue on any matter of politics, economics, culture, or social welfare with delegates from the Soviet bloc countries, we should accept it not only as a challenge but as an opportunity. We have never lost an argument in the United Nations. When it came to arguing with the Soviet bloc we won the argument by vote.

This seems to me to be an opportunity. I, for one, am tired of ducking these fellows. I would rather engage the enemy——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it still permissible to offer an amendment to the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What is the rule as to time if an amendment is offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There may be an hour's debate on the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like a little more time in which to offer an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to address my statement to the author of the amendment, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. President, of course, as a lawyer, the Senator from Ohio knows that the mere allegation that a person has done a certain thing is not proof that he has done it. I assume the intent of the amendment is to place a limitation upon the amount to be expended if persons who are actually Communists and who are representing employers or employees, are permitted to vote by the Soviet Union or by a satellite nation. But that is not what the amendment provides. It refers only to those who are alleged to represent such employers and employees. It refers to countries dominated by the Communist government. As the Senator from Vermont has said, nothing in the amendment states by whom the fact of domination shall be found.

I may say to the Senator from Ohio that his amendment could be amended so as to avoid this lack of clarity if, on page 2, the word "were" were stricken out and the following language substituted: "are found by the State Department to have been."

Then we would have an agency of the United States Government making a finding, and there could be no doubt about it.

As the amendment now stands, it is utterly unenforceable and would not attain the objective which the Senator seeks.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I would not agree that it is unenforceable any more than are the immigration laws.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is like saying, "I copied an unenforceable law and I am presenting another unenforceable law."

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment is a directive to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How is the committee to find out who are involved?

Mr. BRICKER. Everyone knows who they are. I read them into the RECORD a few moments ago. They never came in until last year. They had never been members of the ILO until 1954. The Government representatives were willing to accept them; but to say they represent free labor and free business in those countries is a most absurd allegation, because we know that free labor and free business do not exist there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes from the time on the resolution itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from California.

I ask the Senator from Ohio if he will explain to the Senate by whom he intends the allegation to be made. The language used in lines 7 and 8, on page 1, is as follows:

> If during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees—

And so forth. How is the allegation to be set forth?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator read his amendment again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 2, line 2, strike out the word "were" and insert thereafter "are found by the State Department to have been", so that the sentence will read, beginning with the word "if" in line 7 on page 1:

> If during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by foreign governments controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote.

And so forth. I think that would accomplish what the Senator seeks to do.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, as the author of the amendment I accept the amendment suggested by the Senator from Wyoming. I think he has a good point, and I appreciate the fact that it does clear up the meaning of my amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if there is no request for time on this side of the aisle I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on condition that those in favor of the amendment yield back their time.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield back our time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I understand correctly that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the Bricker amendment, as modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. And has all time for debate expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, before the time expires, I should like——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, all time for debate has expired, but I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. MURRAY. I was promised by the majority leader——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am about to make a unanimous-consent request that the distinguished Senator from Montana be granted 1 minute in which to make a statement. Would that be sufficient?

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to have 2 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana may have 2 minutes in which to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "A Catholic Attitude Toward the ILO," which was published in the magazine America, a Catholic review of the week. The article discusses the problem of the ILO. Before having it appear in its entirety, I should like to read a part of the article:

> Now that the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated an employer delegation to the 1956 convention of the International Labor Organization, the controversy over continued United States membership in that U. N. agency loses some of its urgency. Nevertheless, the statement issued on April 5 by the Catholic Association for International Peace is still a timely as well as an enlightening, document.

Further, the article continues:

> In addition to the ordinary vexations which seem to spring up wherever Communists offer their collaboration, the Soviet request for membership in ILO created a very special problem not found in any other U. N. agency. The ILO happens to be organized on tripartite lines. In addition to government representatives, each nation's delegation includes representatives of free organizations of workers and employers. In all ILO decision making, these worker and employer spokesmen enjoy complete independence. Their votes are not controlled in any way by government representatives.

The article goes on further to say:

> Noting that the Communist bloc controls no more than 32 of the potential 280 votes in an ILO conference, and therefore is in no position to dominate that organization, the CAIP contends that to withdraw from it "would play directly into the hands of the Communists." If the United States delegation were absent from Geneva, it says, the Kremlin and its satellites "could more easily use the ILO as a sounding board for their own propaganda." The CAIP also calls attention to the possibility that the Kremlin may have joined the ILO solely in order to wreck it.
>
> Before Catholics take a stand on this issue, they ought to be aware that last January a French Jesuit, Rev. Joseph M. Joblin, was appointed to the ILO staff. This appoint-

ment was made, the CAIP observed, "with the advice and consent of the holy see." Evidently the holy father, who only 2 years ago spoke of the ILO in highly laudatory terms, is persuaded that, despite Communist obstructionism, this U. N. agency can still add to its rich accomplishments for social justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CATHOLIC ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ILO

Now that the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce have nominated an employer delegation to the 1956 convention of the International Labor Organization, the controversy over continued United States membership in that U. N. agency loses some of its urgency. Nevertheless, the statement issued on April 5 by the Catholic Association for International Peace is still a timely, as well as an enlightening, document.

The dispute with which it deals was touched off nearly 2 years ago when the Soviet Union finally decided to participate in ILO affairs. This meant, of course, that not only the Soviet Union but also Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, Albania, and Czechoslovakia, along with Byelorussia and the Ukraine, would henceforth be present at ILO gatherings in Geneva.

In addition to the ordinary vexations which seem to spring up wherever Communists offer their collaboration, the Soviet request for membership in ILO created a very special problem not found in any other U. N. agency. The ILO happens to be organized on tripartite lines. In addition to Government representatives, each nation's delegation includes representatives of free organizations of workers and employers. In all ILO decision-making, these worker and employer spokesmen enjoy complete independence. Their votes are not controlled in any way by Government representatives. It goes without saying that the worker and employer delegates are understandably very jealous of their independence.

It was only to be expected, then, that many of them would oppose granting membership to Communist countries. How, except by a sort of legal fraud, could Communist employer and worker representatives be fitted into the ILO tripartite framework? They obviously would not be able to speak for free organizations of labor and industry, since such organizations are unknown in their countries. They would be in fact, whatever their name, merely additional members of official government delegations. Though this argument was strongly urged 2 years ago at Geneva, the ILO voted to seat the Communist employer and worker delegates.

QUIT OR FIGHT?

Since that time some American employers have been arguing that the United States ought to show its disapproval of this development by quitting the ILO and withdrawing its substantial financial support. The CAIP disagrees. Noting that the Communist bloc controls no more than 32 of the potential 280 votes in an ILO conference, and therefore is in no position to dominate that organization, the CAIP contends that to withdraw from it "would play directly into the hands of the Communists." If the United States delegation were absent from Geneva, it says, the Kremlin and its satellites "could the more easily use the ILO as a sounding board for their own propaganda." The CAIP also calls attention to the possibility that the Kremlin may have joined the ILO solely in order to wreck it.

Before Catholics take a stand on this issue, they ought to be aware that last January a French Jesuit, Rev. Joseph M. Joblin, was appointed to the ILO staff. This appointment was made, the CAIP observes, "with the advice and consent of the Holy See." Evidently the holy father, who only 2 years ago spoke of the ILO in highly laudatory terms, is persuaded that, despite Communist obstructionism, this U. N. agency can still add to its rich accomplishments for social justice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and insert the following: "and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *'Provided, however*, That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization'."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is absent because of a death in his family.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting the Senator from Virgina would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—43

Barrett	Ellender	Purtell
Beall	Flanders	Robertson
Bender	Frear	Russell
Bennett	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bridges	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Capehart	Knowland	Thye
Carlson	Malone	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Iowa	Welker
Cotton	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Curtis	McClellan	Wofford
Dirksen	Millikin	Young
Duff	Mundt	
Dworshak	Payne	

NAYS—40

Aiken	Hayden	Mansfield
Allott	Hennings	McNamara
Anderson	Holland	Morse
Barkley	Humphrey	Murray
Bible	Jackson	Neely
Bush	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kerr	Pastore
Clements	Kuchel	Potter
Douglas	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Ervin	Langer	Sparkman
Fulbright	Lehman	Symington
Gore	Long	
Green	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—13

Byrd	Hill	Scott
Daniel	Ives	Smathers
Eastland	Kefauver	Wiley
George	McCarthy	
Hickenlooper	Monroney	

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire how I was recorded on the vote just taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois was recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may proceed for approximately 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, ample time is available for debate on the joint resolution itself. So I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, the vote just taken was an extraordinary one. The administration has requested the passage of the pending joint resolution; and, as the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], very honorably stated, the administration is definitely opposed to the amendment on which the Senate voted a moment ago.

I desire to commend the Senator from California for the characteristic frankness and honesty he displayed in this matter and in stating that the amendment was opposed by the administration. He did not attempt, as is so often done, to cover up.

I have made a tentative tabulation of the votes cast on the amendment, and it shows that all Members on the Republican side of the aisle, with the exception of six, voted for the amendment and

against the position of the administration; and that all Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, with the exception of a few, voted against the amendment, and for the program of the administration. So it has been a Republican victory but an administration defeat.

The vote raises some very real points. It shows the fact that in the case of vital questions dealing with foreign policy, the President finds his chief support on this side of the aisle, rather than on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. President, we on the Democratic side of the aisle know what will happen to us. We know perfectly well that when we return to our constituencies, we shall be attacked by the various Republican committees, including probably the Republican National Committee, for the vote we have cast just now. If the experience of the past is any guide, the administration will denounce us in a few days (when they think people have forgotten) as being noncooperative; and high officials of the administration will take the stump and will denounce us in our States for the vote we have cast, and which they will say shows we are "soft" on communism. I hope the speeches made by leading Republicans during the last 2 days indicate a change in tactics and possibly a change of heart, but I am not certain that is the case.

In any event, Mr. President, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I think the administration acted in accordance with what it believed to be in the best interests of the United States; and I cast my vote as I did because I felt the administration knew more about the situation than we in the Senate do, in view of the somewhat clouded condition. I think they are afraid that we may be expelled from the ILO for nonpayment of dues, and that the Bricker amendment will create in the ILO a vacuum which the Communist countries will exploit.

Mr. President, it is very interesting to observe that a majority of the Members on the other side of the aisle do not believe in the foreign policy of this administration, and will take advantage of every opportunity to defeat it. That is what I have been saying for a long time, Mr. President. I think the country should know what the facts are and what the vote was.

Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 2 minutes to me? I must leave in a short time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well, Mr. President; I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Monday the Senate adopted an amendment which was submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. At this time I desire to offer an amendment. However, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that before my amendment can be considered, it will be necessary for the Senate to reconsider its action in adopting, on Monday, the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action or vote of the Senate, taken on Monday, whereby the amendment of the Senator from Montana was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator send to the desk, and have read, the amendment he desires to submit? I think that should be done for the information of the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a moment I shall request that the amendment be read by the clerk. In the meantime, I can explain my amendment. All my amendment will do is retain the United States contribution at 25 percent in the case of the ILO, and at 31½ percent in the case of the FAO—in other words, the present percentages of our contributions.

I have a very simple reason for submitting this amendment: I see no reason for establishing more or less permanently a 33⅓ percent contribution by the United States to all international organizations. At the present time we are contributing 25 percent of the budget of the ILO, and I see no reason for increasing it; I refer to the percentage, as distinguished from the number of ballots. That is my position. The Senator from California will remember that I took the same position in the committee. In other words, it is my position that the fact that we are contributing 33⅓ percent of the budget of the United Nations does not mean that we should contribute in the same percentage to the budgets of all other international organizations. My position is that in a case in which our contribution now is 25 percent, it should remain at that percentage, rather than be increased to 33⅓. In short, I do not believe that all the contributions we make to international organizations should be on the basis of 33⅓ percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, I understand that the Senator from Arkansas desires to offer a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment of the Senator from Montana provided for a maximum ceiling of 33⅓ percent, which is in general conformity with our other contributions to the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I was going to point out that not all our contributions are on the basis of 33⅓ percent, and I object to having all of them increased to 33⅓ percent.

I believe that if my amendment is adopted, it will be possible for us to take the position that gradually our contributions to these organizations should be decreased.

At the time when we first contributed to these organizations, many other countries were in difficult financial circumstances. But as other countries are better able to contribute to the organizations, I think our contributions should be decreased. For instance, only recently 17 new members, I believe, were admitted. Under these circumstances, why should not our contribution be decreased?

I am perfectly willing to have the United States contribute its fair share. However, if in connection with the pending joint resolution we adopt an amendment calling for a 33⅓ percent contribution on the part of the United States, it seems to me we shall be indicating that, as a policy, we intend to have the United States contribute 33⅓ percent to the budgets of all international organizations.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield to me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. BUSH. Did the Senator from Arkansas submit his amendment to the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did, but I was outvoted.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Arkansas was outvoted in the committee, was he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

My position is that I object to having the percentage of the contribution of the United States increased. If the work of the ILO is so important—and our representatives agree that it is—and if the overall budget of the ILO should be increased, I have no objection to having that done, provided our contribution is not increased.

My amendment will merely prevent increasing the ceiling on our contribution to 33⅓ percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas does not object, and inasmuch as certain Members are not now on the floor, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, before we proceed further in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have just discussed the question with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who was temporarily absent from the Chamber. We have no objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for reconsideration of the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], which was agreed to on Monday, which established a limitation of 33⅓ percent, in order that the Senator from Arkansas may offer his amendment to that section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and agreed to on Monday as section 2 of the bill is reconsidered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the percentage contribution of the United States to the total annual budget of the Food and Agriculture Organization shall not exceed 31.5 percent and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 25 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. Really, I have already explained the amendment. I do not know that I need to repeat the explanation.

All my amendment would do would be to retain the present percentage. One of the principal objections I have to the amendment agreed to on Monday is that I am sure it would create the impression that we were accepting, as a principle, responsibility for payment of 33⅓ percent of the cost of every international organization.

At the present time there is a considerable variation in percentages of contribution by the United States to international organizations. I read the percentages for the major international organizations:

United Nations, 33⅓ percent; the Food and Agriculture Organization contribution will be 31½ percent, under my amendment; International Civil Aviation Organization, 32.60 percent; International Labor Organization, 25 percent; International Telecommunications Union, 8.99 percent; UNESCO, 33⅓ percent; Universal Postal Union, 4.36 percent; World Health Organization, 33⅓ percent; World Meteorological Organization, 11.45 percent.

There is a considerable variation. I think the inevitable result of leaving in the joint resolution the amendment adopted on Monday would be to indicate acceptance of the principle that we should pay a third of the cost of all such organizations.

I think the proper objective of our Government should be gradually to decrease our participation, at least down to approximately 25 percent. Considering the great number of nations which are members of these organizations, I think 33⅓ percent is an unduly large amount as a permanent percentage for us to contribute to all such organizations. I think the adoption of my amendment would have the effect of at least preserving the present situation and allowing freedom of negotiation in the future, to try to decrease the percentage we now bear in the United Nations, for example. On the other hand, to the opposite effect would be acceptance by our Government of a permanent 33⅓ percent contribution. That is the issue which is involved.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I compliment the Senator for his objective. We have been trying, through appropriations, to reach this objective for some time. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has the courage, good sense, and judgment to submit a proposal of this kind, because that is certainly the direction in which we should go, instead of building up greater expense to the American taxpayers and the American Government, which has been the trend for many years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. As the Senator from Arkansas understands the situation respecting our commitments, I take it he does not believe that his amendment would involve any embarrassment to our Government, or cause us to go back on any commitments we may have made heretofore in this connection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is my present belief that it would not require the violation of any commitments we have made. We were told in the committee by representatives of the Department that they were embarrassed because other members of the ILO made the argument that "you pay one-third of the cost of the United Nations. Why should you not pay one-third of the cost of the ILO?"

I can see no persuasive argument why we should do so. There have been changes in the economic condition of other members. They should bear a larger percentage. It is my definite belief that during the past several years there has been relative improvement in the capacity of other members to pay. Going back 10 years, we were the only ones who were well off. At that time we paid a larger percentage than a third. We started paying nearly 50 percent in connection with the United Nations. We gradually worked that down to a third.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The argument was advanced to our representatives, "You pay a third of the cost of the United Nations. Why should you not pay a third of the cost of the ILO and the FAO?" To me, that is not a persuasive argument. Broadly speaking, it is a valid argument to base distribution of the burden upon capacity to pay; but I do not think that argument was sustained before the committee.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for answering my question so fully. I intend to support his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to mislead the Senator. My amendment would place no dollar limitation on the amount. I do not wish to limit the dollar amount, if this activity is so important that all the other members are willing to pay a part.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say, in connection with what the Senator from Arkansas said to the Senator from Connecticut, that we on the Appropriations Committee—and I have been on the subcommittee with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for a number of years—have been trying to cut back these appropriations. It has been our clear understanding, particularly with the State Department, that in the case of the United Nations Organization the Department will make no firm commitments until Congress makes the appropriations. That has been one of our difficulties in years gone by, that they would make a commitment in December and then come to us in May and try to get us to confirm their commitment. I believe it is clear that they will now not make any firm commitment, and that any limitations we place in the bill will not make us break any agreement.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not on the floor during all the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. I am not quite sure what his amendment would do. Yesterday a substitute amendment offered, I believe, by the Senator from Louisiana [ELLENDER] was agreed to by the Senate. How is that amendment affected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The amendment is offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on Monday. I believe it was adopted on Monday afternoon. I was not on the floor of the Senate that day. I was not a party to it. I understand it was in the nature of an agreement between the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators, and that it provided for a ceiling of 33⅓ percent on our contribution.

Before the Senator from New York came into the chamber I said that I believe if we let that amendment of the Senator from Louisiana stand, it will be interpreted as an acceptance by the Government of a 33⅓-percent contribution by the United States to all international organizations.

I do not wish to accept such a principle. I believe we have been contributing 25 percent of the ILO funds for many years. I have heard no persuasive argument made to increase our percentage contribution. The other members have not become worse off, certainly, and we have not become relatively so much better off that we ought to increase our contribution. In other words, I object to the acceptance of the principle that we are going to contribute a third of all the funds of all the international organizations. That is what I believe we would be doing under the Ellender amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana had two parts; that one part increased the percentage of the total amount of the budget of the ILO, to be paid by the United States, and the other decreased the amount that was authorized in resolution 97, which proposed to strike out the figure of $1,750,000 and to insert in lieu thereof the figure of $3 million? I believe the two provisions were contained in the same amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been told that it was the Mansfield amendment, not the Ellender amendment which was adopted. I will say this to the Senator from New York. The only effect of my amendment is to put a ceiling on the percentage. It contains no dollar amount.

If the other members of the ILO or of the FOA are willing to increase their total contributions of dollars, our contribution would go up also. This is not any assurance that the dollar amount would be set at any particular level. But it is an assurance that the percentage would not be greater than 25 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe for the RECORD I should also state, as the Senator from Arkansas has stated, that it was not the Ellender amendment which was voted on Monday. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana had an amendment pending at the desk. When the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] indicated that he had an amendment to offer, the Senator from Louisiana, as I recall it, withdrew his amendment, and agreed to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, which I believe was adopted without any opposition at that point. That amendment was offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], not the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. I say to the Senator from New York that the only difference between the two is that the amendment of the Senator from Montana provided a ceiling of 33⅓ percent, which is an increased ceiling. The present ceiling of the ILO is 25 percent. The ceiling which has been tentatively agreed to for FOA is 31½ percent.

My amendment would place a ceiling on the percentage, not on the dollar amount. That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for explaining his amendment. However, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas will not prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Does a Senator in control of time yield some time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we are dealing with an organization which I consider to be one of the great international organizations of the world today. We have before us a report from the State Department, which I have no doubt reflects the point of view of the United States. It describes some of the very important work that has been done by the ILO. It is almost fulsome in its praise of the organization.

We have done enough harm to the ILO already. The other day we refused to increase the authorized amount as recommended by the State Department and, I assume, by the President of the United States. Today, in the face of the position taken by the President and by the State Department—and I admit I do not always agree with them, but in this particular case I believe they are absolutely right—we have placed a further handicap in the way of the success of this great organization by adopting the Bricker amendment.

Either we will wholeheartedly seek to hold up our end of the very important work being done by the ILO, or we will handicap it and make it impotent. I am not willing to do that. I am convinced that this organization is not only worthwhile, but is extremely important.

I repeat what I have said before. A part of the report of the State Department describing the activities of the ILO states that, in addition to permitting more effective assistance to governments in meeting problems in such fields as manpower utilization, industrial safety, administration of labor standards, social security, and so forth, the "ILO has been instrumental in exposing violations of basic rights of labor, particularly in Iron Curtain countries, and in promoting and strengthening democratic institutions among workers. Jointly with the United Nations, the ILO has carried on a worldwide investigation of the use of forced labor for purposes of political coercion or for the fulfillment of the economic plans of a State. This investigation has done much to dispel the Soviet fiction of the "workers paradise" in the minds of those whom the Soviets are most anxious to influence. In regard to freedom of association, the ILO has brought to public attention specific, documented cases of governmental control or domination of worker organizations in a number of countries for political purposes. At the same time, careful screening procedures are employed to weed out allegations which are propagandistic, malicious, and unsubstantiated."

I realize, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], that it is a myth to consider the Soviet representatives of employers and employees as freemen. They are not. They do not represent labor. They do not represent industry. They represent the Soviet Government. I realize that to be a fact. I decry that fact. I hope the time will come when that situation will be cured.

However, in the meantime, the ILO has functioned effectively and very usefully in spite of that fact. The organization has functioned for the benefit of labor and industry in this country. It has functioned, in my opinion, for the benefit of all the free nations of the world.

Today in the ILO the number of votes to which the Soviet countries are entitled is 32, as against the total number of member nations in ILO of more than 250. Certainly in view of that great disparity we have nothing to fear. But if we fail strongly to support ILO we have a great deal to lose.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am anxious to have nothing done that will further weaken the ILO. I am afraid we may give the impression that this country is not wholeheartedly behind the ILO, and I am afraid that by our action today we have again indicated that we are willing to take unilateral rather than collective action. Because of those things I very much hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will not prevail.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. It was offered in the committee and was rejected. I appreciate the persistence of the Senator from Arkansas in the matter, but I do not quite understand it. Outside the United Nations itself, I regard the International Labor Organization as one of the most important and effective international organizations now in existence. Theoretically, the organization itself has the power to allocate the percentage of contributions from the different nations which are members of it. Here we propose unilaterally to reduce our contribution for the sake of saving a few dollars.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator misunderstands my amendment. The amendment which was adopted on Monday set a new ceiling which was not adopted by the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that, but the Senator is offering an amendment which would reduce the amount carried in the resolution which is now before the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would reduce as a matter of principle the amount carried in the amendment which was adopted on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that was on a different basis. What I am talking about is the unwisdom of the Senate of the United States acting unilaterally to reduce the amount recommended by the administration in the resolution as it was offered to the committee and which was reported by the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Kentucky is correct. The amendment adopted last Monday reduced the dollar amount requested by the administration and was considered to be a reasonable compromise. It was stated in the amendment which was adopted by the Senate that contributions by this country should not exceed 33⅓ percent, and it was specifically stated during the course of debate that it was up to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so far as might be possible, and especially the Committee on Appropriations, to see that appropriations were kept down.

If the Fulbright amendment is adopted—and I wish to say that the junior Senator from Arkansas has been very consistent over the years—it will mean, in my opinion, although I do not think it is the Senator's intent, by any means, that the amount will be reduced still further and the objectives which the administration has in mind insofar as the ILO is concerned will not be met.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Montana for his observation.

The Soviet Union and other members of the Soviet bloc are in full membership in the ILO, and employer and em-

ployee representation is now admitted. In the face of that we propose to whittle down our contribution to this great international organization which I think has done and is doing a great work in the international field in regard to labor. So I hope, Mr. President, that the amendment will be rejected. I shall vote against it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has stated that the amendment would whittle down our contribution. It is not intended to whittle it down at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would whittle it down from what the administration has asked for and what is contained in the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. Not necessarily. It provides for $3 million.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the amendment offered is adopted, the top limit will not be $3 million.

Mr. BUSH. The amendment seeks only to establish a limit of 25 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the top limit will be 25 percent, and not $3 million as asked for by the administration.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as amended, is agreed to.

The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time on the joint resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield back our time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back, and the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following laws of the United States are hereby amended in the following particulars:

(a) Public Law 174, 79th Congress, as amended by section 1 (b) of Public Law 806, 81st Congress, is hereby further amended by striking out the figure "$2 million" in section 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$3 million";

(b) Public Law 843, 80th Congress, as amended by section 1 (e) of Public Law 806, 81st Congress, is hereby further amended by striking out the figure "$1,750,000" in subsection (a) of section 2 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$3 million," and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such subsection a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That no sums in excess of $1,750,000 shall be appropriated to defray the expenses of the International Labor Organization for any calendar year after the calendar year 1956, if during the preceding calendar year delegates allegedly representing employers and employees in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or in any nation dominated by the foreign government controlling the world Communist movement are found by the State Department to have been permitted to vote in the International Labor Conference or in other meetings held under the auspices of the International Labor Organization."

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the percentage contribution of the United States to the total annual budget of the Food and Agriculture Organization shall not exceed 31.5 percent and to the International Labor Organization shall not exceed 25 percent.

RATES CHARGED TO PUBLIC BODIES AND COOPERATIVES FOR FEDERALLY GENERATED ELECTRIC POWER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas withhold his suggestion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on the call of the calender earlier today, Order No. 1783, Senate bill 3338, a bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects, was postponed until later in the day. I ask unanimous consent that that bill may now be considered by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I respectfully suggest to the distinguished Senator that a number of bills were passed over solely because the reports on them were not available. The bill in which the Senator is interested happened to be in that category.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand there will be some discussion of the Senator's bill. The majority leader is not present at this time. I had hoped that we might call the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, and then bring up by motion the bill in which the Senator from Oklahoma has an interest. I think there are some bills which will go through without any discussion at all. I hope the Senator will permit us to proceed in that order. If we can, I think we can save time.

Mr. KERR. I understood there would not be any discussion on Senate bill 3338.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been informed that there will be some discussion on that bill, although I do not know how much.

Mr. KERR. I have no objection to the bill going over until the other measures have been called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall cooperate with the Senator. I thought we might dispose of some measures which have been held on the calendar for the reason stated by me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the Senator from Oklahoma willing to have a quorum call, so that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] may be present?

Mr. KERR. I join in the request that there be a quorum call.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so order.

INCREASE IN PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854, until the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] can be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1787, H. R. 2854, will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspriacy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "shall," to strike out "be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction" and insert "be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with reference to the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Existing law provides maximum penalties for the following crimes: Seditious conspiracy, $5,000 fine or 6 years imprisonment or both; advocating overthrow of the Government, $10,000 fine or 10 years imprisonment, or both; conspiracy to commit offenses relating to advocating overthrow of the Government, $10,000 or imprisonment for 5 years, or both.

Government criminal records disclose that a prisoner with a record of good conduct need serve but two-thirds of his total sentence. Such short servitude—a little over 3 years in this case—is entirely inadequate to deter activities of persons conspiring to overthrow the Government of the United States.

The purpose of this bill is to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to make all penalties for the above crimes more uniform, more deterrent to subversive activities of

any nature and also to add to existing law a conspiracy provision with increased penalties pertaining to the offense of advocating overthrow of the United States Government. The penalties would be $20,000 fine or 20 years imprisonment, or both.

The committee has amended the bill in one particular: namely, on page 2, in line 6, immediately after the word "shall," strike the remainder of the sentence through line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be disqualified from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States."

The purpose of this amendment is to bring this provision into closer accord with the gravity of the offense. Such crimes as bribery, graft, multilation of records, etc., also disqualify a convicted person from holding any office of honor, trust or profit under the United States (18 U. S. C. 202, 1901, 2071).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE BY QUITCLAIM DEED OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE FAIRVIEW CEMETERY ASSOCIATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1794, Senate bill 2144.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2144) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", to strike out "without consideration" and insert "at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., Wahpeton, N. Dak., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land, together with all improvements thereon, situated in the county of Richland, State of North Dakota: North half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 6, township 132 north, range 47 west, fifth principal meridian, comprising 20 acres.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The lands involved in the bill comprise a 20-acre tract of acquired lands in Richland County, N. Dak., presently administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Government has no present need for the land and does not object to its conveyance to the association.

In view of the fact that the association is a private organization and would utilize the lands, if acquired, for private purposes, or would sell the lands as cemetery lots to private individuals, the committee agrees with the Department of the Interior that the conveyance to the association should not be without consideration.

The report from the Department of the Interior states, in part, as follows:

S. 2144 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a 20-acre tract of acquired lands in Richland County, N. Dak., to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc., of Wahpeton, N. Dak. These lands are at present being administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of this Department. We have no need for the tract at this time, and would have no objection to the conveyance of the tract to the cemetery association. However, we do not, on general princples, favor the outright donation of federally owned land to a private organization, and, in this case, it is assumed that the cemetery association will sell cemetery lots to other parties. We, therefore, recommend that the conveyance be made upon the payment of the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. To accomplish this end, the words "without consideration" at line 4 should be deleted and the words "at its fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Interior" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The present occupant of the chair wishes to explain that the committee amendment requires that the cemetery pay the fair market value of the property, in order to purchase it from the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the present occupant of the chair will permit me to say so, I wish to extend to him, as the floor leader of the bill, my sincere compliments for making certain that, once again, a bill which comes to the floor of the Senate will obtain for the taxpayers of the United States the fair market value for the taxpayers' property which is being conveyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Oregon.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, S. 3338; and I call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 18 months after January 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior shall not, in the disposion of electric power and energy generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof), make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956, for electric power and energy furnished by him to such public body or cooperative.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President jointly with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who prepared the bill in committee and reported it, I offer an amendment as disclosed on a copy of the bill which I send to the desk, and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to any public body or cooperative charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, before discussing the tenor and the exact phraseology of the amendment, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the entire subject was discussed very thoroughly in connection with the proposed increase of rates for the Southwestern Power Administration. The revision of rates which was discussed this morning by the Senator from Oklahoma was, in reality, pursuant to an order entered by the Federal Power Commission

in 1947, at which time interim rates were fixed for the Southwestern Power Administration. In part the order reads as follows:

an interim rate schedule to remain in effect only until such time as further study and experience indicate the desirability for revision, but for not more than 6 years.

The date of the Federal Power Commission order was February 1947. Six years have long since come and gone, and several attempts have been made to get the necessary increase in rates, as has been indicated. In each instance, there were several extensions of the period. No order has been entered to supplement the interim rates. The action on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, as he testified, was pursuant to the law as it now exists. He had no other alternative than to do what he did.

The further fact is that there has always been in the consciousness and in the knowledge of all the contracting parties the idea that there would be a revision of the rates. It was clearly indicated that there should be, because the cost at the time of the authorization to which I have referred, which occurred in 1947, was estimated at about $200 million in connection with 7 of the integrated projects of the SPA, whereas the total construction cost estimated by the Corps of Engineers in 1954 was $357 million, an increase of approximately $157 million. Obviously, there was experience during the intervening years which showed that an increase in rates was necessary.

So the principal subject and the principal point to be considered by the SPA lay in two areas: One, the formula by which the cost would be increased, and, secondly, the amount of the increase which would be computed.

It is fair to point out that the report on the bill which came to us only about 2 hours ago, includes a letter from Assistant Secretary of the Interior Fred G. Aandahl, and the letter is dated only yesterday. In the letter the position is taken that the administration and the Department of the Interior oppose the bill. However, they say, before the bill is passed they would like to call attention to the fact that the phraseology therein is inadequate, is very unclear, and would be difficult to construe.

They point out, for example, that the phraseology of the original bill refers to a single rate which was in effect on February 27, 1956, and that that rate should be frozen. In his letter, Secretary Aandahl points out that electric power and energy is not sold pursuant to a single rate, but is sold pursuant to a schedule of rates.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since the Senator has been discussing the letter of Assistant Secretary Aandahl, I wonder if it would not be advisable to have printed in the RECORD at this point in his remarks the entire letter.

Mr. HRUSKA. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: You have requested the views of this Department on S. 3338, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

While the effect of S. 3338 in certain particulars is not clear, the bill generally would operate to freeze at their present levels and until July 1, 1957, the rates charged public bodies and cooperatives for federally generated power marketed by the Department of the Interior.

This Department cannot recommend that S. 3338 be enacted.

In marketing electric power and energy from its own installations and from projects of the Corps of Engineers, this Department acts through a variety of constituent agencies and pursuant to a number of statutes. The Bonneville, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administrations and the Bureaus of Reclamation and Indian Affairs all exercise power marketing responsibilities. Governing statutes include those specifically applicable to the marketing of power from the Bonneville, Fort Peck, Boulder Canyon, Eklutna, and Falcon projects, the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, statutes relating to Indian irrigation projects, and section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. As to the Bonneville, Fort Peck, Eklutna, and Falcon projects and projects governed by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, power rates promulgated by this Department are subject to confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission.

While there are, of course, variations in detail among the statutes above referred to, there is under them a common responsibility to secure the return to the United States of an appropriate share of project costs through revenues from the sale of power. If adequate levels of power rates are not maintained, that responsibility cannot be met.

For the period during which it would be effective, S. 3338 would deprive the United States of an essential means of properly administering the Federal power projects to which it would be applicable. With the exception of power marketed through the Southwestern Power Administration, hereinafter discussed, this Department does not now foresee for an extended period including that covered by S. 3338 a necessity for a general rise in rate levels. Nevertheless, the principle contained in S. 3338 is so inconsistent with concepts of sound administration that its enactment cannot be regarded as desirable public policy. And especially is this so since S. 3338 would not only preclude timely action in the event circumstances not now foreseen were to require it but would also preclude technical improvements and adjustments in rate schedules having the incidental effect of raising particular charges even though overall rate levels were to remain unaffected.

S. 3338 is undoubtedly prompted by the increase in rates now being considered by this Department for the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA) power marketing area. It has long been apparent that a general rise in SPA rates is inevitable if the Federal investment in power producing and transmitting facilities is to be returned on the basis generally applicable to other Federal power developments administered by this Department. The generally accepted basis for the establishment of power rates except where the Congress otherwise provides, is the return, in addition to operation, maintenance, and replacement costs, of the power investment over a period of 50 years at an interest rate approximating 2½ percent.

The existing SPA rates (rate schedule A) have from their inception been intended only for temporary and interim application, a fact known to all purchasers of SPA energy. The rate schedule was confirmed and approved by the Federal Power Commission on February 13, 1947 (docket IT-5971), as "an interim rate schedule to remain in effect only until such time as further study and experience indicate the desirability for revision, but for not more than 6 years * * *." From February 13, 1953, the expiration of the original 6-year period of approval, until December 31, 1954, successive short extensions were granted, and on January 5, 1955, the Federal Power Commission extended schedule A until new rate schedules are approved by the Commission.

That existing rates are not sufficient to accomplish an adequate return is due to a combination of factors among them being rising construction costs, the revision of cost allocations, increases in annual operation and maintenance costs, and the increase in costs resulting from the operation of the so-called lease-option contracts with several generation and transmission cooperatives in the Oklahoma and Missouri areas.

After several years of study, the Federal Power Commission was requested, on December 29, 1954, to confirm and approve an increase in schedule A to the level then considered necessary in order to accomplish return of the Government's investment under the generally accepted standards. However, the reactivation of the lease contracts with the G and T cooperatives, provided for in the Departmental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1956, further increased costs necessitating restudy and revision of the December 1954 proposals. The Commission accordingly was requested to withhold action on the submittal then before it. Studies had progressed to the point where this Department was prepared to propose specific revisions in the 1954 submittal for approval and confirmation by the Federal Power Commission when the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works instituted a series of hearings upon the proposed rate increase.

A summary comparison of original and current estimates of cost and other data for the projects for which SPA is the marketing agent clearly demonstrates the necessity for an increase in power rates.

For the seven integrated projects in the system (Denison, Norfolk, Bull Shoals, Fort Gibson, Tenkiller Ferry, Blakely Mountains, Table Rock) total cost at time of authorization was estimated at $199.8 million, of which $109.2 million was allocated to power according to the SPA estimate. At the time of filing of rate schodule A in 1946, total estimated cost had risen to $234.8 million, with $111.2 million allocated to power according to the SPA estimate. In 1953 the Corps of Engineers and SPA each made allocation studies. The corps estimated total cost at $42.4 million, with $216.4 million allocated to power, and SPA used a total cost of $337.9 million, with $160.3 million allocated to power. In 1954, following the agreement among FPC, the Department of the Army, and this Department as to cost allocation methods for application to all water development projects, the corps estimated total construction cost at $357.6 million, with $200.2 million allocated to power.

Several significant points are to be noted. First, the estimated total construction cost has risen 79 percent above the original estimate. Second, while dollarwise the allocation to power has increased 83.3 percent over the original SPA estimate, the percentage of

total cost allocated to power under the current estimate (56 percent) is approximately the same as the percentage prevailing at the time of authorization (54.7 percent) and it is only slightly higher than the percentage prevailing at the time of the filing of rate schedule A (47.4 percent). Third, the substantial increase in construction costs has not been accompanied by any significant increase in the estimate of annual available primary energy, this having been 1,362 million kilowatt-hours at the time of filing of rate schedule A in 1946 and currently stands at 1,376 million kilowatt-hours. Fourth, although the estimate of installed capacity has increased from 426,000 kilowatts at the time of authorization to 674,000 kilowatts under current estimates, with a rise in the estimate of average annual energy from 1,430 million kilowatt-hours at the time of authorization to 1,970 million kilowatt-hours, the contribution to the revenue picture of this increase is minor since the increase represents almost entirely nonfirm energy.

Except for the Denison and Norfork projects for which the allocations to power are based upon incremental costs by virtue of the provisions of authorizing documents, current cost allocations for the integrated projects are arrived at by the separable costs-remaining benefits method. This is the method recommended for general application by the interagency agreement on cost allocation methods and it was also recommended by the Subcommittee to Study Civil Works of the House Committee on Public Works (the so-called Jones committee) in its report to the 82d Congress. This method entails an allocation of joint costs among the several purposes served in such a way that each purpose shares equitably in the savings resulting from the combining of the purposes in the multiple-purpose development.

As above indicated the current allocation of costs by that method is $200.2 million. If only separable costs were to be allocated to power, that is if there were to be allocated to power only the difference between the cost of constructing the projects with and without power as a purpose, the cost allocation would be reduced by less than $19 million to a total of $181.4 million. This would decrease revenue requirements by only $0.00032 (three-tenths of a mill) per kilowatt-hour on all primary energy sales. It is apparent, therefore, that the adoption of the separable costs-remaining benefits method of allocations is not a substantial factor contributing to the need for increased revenue. The principal factor contributing to the need for increased revenue is the substantial increase that has come about in construction on operating costs unaccompanied by a comparable increase in available primary energy.

The rate increase proposed by this Department is the minimum considered necessary to accomplish return of the Government's investment allocated to power in 50 years at 2½ percent interest, the generally accepted standard for the establishment of power rates.

We are firmly of the view that it would be unwise to defer further the application of the rate-establishing procedures of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944. Extended deferment of consideration of a revision in rates can only result in the end, if the standards of ratemaking applicable generally to Federal projects are to apply, in a necessity for an increase above the level that would be sufficient were action to be taken at this time. Further delay would, therefore, in our view constitute a disservice to the very public bodies and cooperatives S. 3338 is intended to aid.

At the outset of this report it was stated that operation of S. 3338 in certain particulars is not clear. The bill refers to the rate charged on February 27, 1956, to a public body or cooperative for electric service furnished that public body or cooperative.

Charges for electric power and energy are commonly computed not upon the basis of a single rate but upon the basis of rate schedules applicable to particular classes of service. Thus, ordinarily there will be one rate schedule for firm power service and others for other classes such as dump or secondary service and irrigation pumping. Particularly in the case of firm power service the rate schedule will consist of a number of rates, the applicability of each of which will depend upon such factors as the amount of energy taken by the customer in a given month, the customer's load factor, his highest monthly demand, etc.

From the use in S. 3338 of the singular rate, the reference to the rate charged rather than to the rate schedule applicable, and the absence of a reference to classes of service it is not clear whether in the event of its enactment charges could be computed, during its effective period, on the basis of the schedule of rates applicable on February 27, 1956, to the particular class, quantity and character of service received by the customer during each monthly billing period. If the bill is not to be so read it would preclude proper charges based upon variations in such factors as the customer's load factor and upon changes in the class of service being taken. It would also, in that event, continue in effect certain rate schedules or rate schedule provisions that would otherwise by their terms have expired within that period, for example, rate ceilings applicable temporarily in new service areas and experimental rates all of which would otherwise expire by their own terms within the period of the bill's applicability. Other examples of the uncertainty that S. 3338 would bring about in the computation of charges may be found in those cases where the monthly charge is dependent in whole or part upon some factor of actual monthly variable cost as in the case of certain dump energy rates which are established at a specified percentage of fuel costs and in other instances in which the customer's charges are in part premised upon actual, monthly operating expenses.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask him if the amendment which has just been offered clarifies at least that part of the objection which was raised by the Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes; it does clarify that part of the situation.

Continuing with the reason for the criticism in the first place, it is pointed out in the Secretary's letter that the applicability of any portion of a rate schedule as of any particular day or as of any particular month would depend upon the amount of energy taken by the customer in a given month, the load factor, the highest monthly demand, the class of power, and so on.

The purpose of the amendment which was proposed and read into the RECORD is to accommodate that thought and make clear the construction of the bill, so that it will apply to the schedule of rates and the particular rate which will flow therefrom, rather than to a single rate, which is, of course, not a practical application of the term.

HOUSING FOR ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed there are other Senators who would like to be present when the bill now under discussion is considered. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1796, S. 3515. One Senator wants a quorum call. Another Senator has asked for time to get here. Meanwhile, the Senate can proceed to consider bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3515) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 809. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title and in addition to mortgages insured under section 803, the Commissioner may insure any mortgage under this section which meets the eligibility requirements set forth in section 203 (b) of this act: *Provided,* That a mortgage insured under this section shall have been executed by a mortgagor who at the time of insurance is the owner of the property and either occupies the property or certifies that his failure to do so is the result of a change in his employment by the Armed Forces or a contractor thereof and to whom the Secretary or his designee has issued a certificate indicating that such person requires housing and is at the date of the certificate a civilian employee at a research and development installation of one of the Armed Forces of the United States or a contractor thereof and is considered by the Armed Forces to be an essential, nontemporary employee at such date. Such certificate shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the employment status of the mortgagor and of the mortgagor's need for housing.

"(b) No mortgage shall be insured under this section unless the Secretary or his designee shall have certified to the Commissioner that the housing is necessary to provide adequate housing for such civilians employed in connection with such a research and development installation and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installation. Such certification shall be conclusive evidence to the Commissioner of the need for such housing but if the Commissioner determines that insurance of mortgages on such housing is not an acceptable risk, he may require the Secretary to guarantee the Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund from loss with respect to mortgages insured pursuant to this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to provide for payment to meet losses arising from such guaranty.

"(c) The Commissioner may accept any mortgage for insurance under this section

without regard to any requirement in any other section of this act that the project or property be economically sound or an acceptable risk.

"(d) Any mortgagee under a mortgage insured under this section is entitled to the benefits of insurance as provided in section 204 (a) with respect to mortgages insured under section 203.

"(e) The provisions of subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (j) of section 204 shall apply to mortgages insured under this section except that as applicable to those mortgages: (1) all references to the 'Fund' or 'Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund' shall refer to the 'Armed Services Housing Mortgage Insurance Fund' and (2) all references to section 203 shall refer to this section.

"(f) The provisions of sections 801, 802, 803 (c), 803 (i), 803 (j), 804 (a), 804 (b), and 807 and the provisions of section 803 (a) relating to the aggregate amount of all mortgages insured and the expiration date of the Commissioner's authority to insure under this title, shall be applicable to mortgages insured under this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a part of the general statement contained in the report on the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This bill would add a new section 809 to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance on homes to be owned by private individuals who are essential civilian employees of the armed services, or employees of contractors of the armed services, at research and development installations. Mortgage terms available under the bill are the same as those available under section 203 of the National Housing Act, the FHA's regular program of mortgage insurance for sales housing.

In order to qualify for insurance under the proposed new section, an individual would be required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that (1) he requires housing, (2) he is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research and development installation of one of the armed services of the United States, or an employee of a contractor of the armed services, and (3) he is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary, employee at such date.

SALE OF TIMBER WITHIN THE TONGASS NATIONAL FOREST, ALASKA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1797, S. 2517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2517) to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the act approved August 8, 1947 (61 Stat. 920), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of said subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That all receipts heretofore and hereafter received from the sale of such timber shall be subject to the provisions of the act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260), as amended, and the act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 843), as amended. If any claims of possessory rights to lands or timber within the exterior boundaries of the Tongass National Forest are determined to be valid, the Territory of Alaska shall pay to the United States 25 percent of the moneys required to satisfy such claims: *Provided*, That the Territory shall not be required to pay to the United States any amount in excess of the total amount received by the Territory from the United States pursuant to the act of March 23, 1908: *Provided further*, That such payments by the Territory to the United States shall, to the extent possible, be effected by deductions from the amounts otherwise payable to the Territory pursuant to such act."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a brief statement with reference to the bill as contained in the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2517 would authorize payment of 25 percent of the revenues from the Tongass National Forest in Alaska to the Territorial government of Alaska for gravely needed schools and roads in the Territory. The Department of Agriculture would receive 10 percent of the revenues for roads and trails in the national forest.

Such payments would be made under Federal laws of long standing that are applicable to all States and Alaska in which national forests have been established. Alaska would not receive any benefits that the States do not now enjoy. In fact, the Territorial schools are now being deprived of benefits they would now be enjoying were it not for the specific provision of the Tongass National Forest Act which requires that all revenues be held in escrow.

COMPENSATION OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES AND CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1799, H. R. 7058.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7058) to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997) in respect to the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in explanation of the bill contained in the report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 7058 would increase the part paid by the Federal Government of the total annual salaries of the supreme and circuit court judges of the Territory of Hawaii by amendment to the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997).

All of the judges that would be affected by the bill, 15 in number, are appointed by the President and are confirmed by the Senate. Under the Organic Act of Hawaii, all must be residents of Hawaii.

The present annual salaries were established by act of Congress in 1928. By act of the Territorial Legislature of May 22, 1945—1945 Session Laws of Hawaii, page 357—the salaries payable to these justices by the United States were supplemented from funds of the Territory to the extent of $3,000 per annum. In 1951 the Territorial Legislature increased the supplemental compensation to $4,500 per annum—1951 Session Laws of Hawaii, page 637. Thus, the total annual compensation now received by the chief justice of the supreme court is $15,000; for the associate justices, $14,500; $12,000 for the justices of the first circuit; and $11,500 for the justices of the remaining circuits.

The changes in the salary scales that enactment of H. R. 7058 would bring about are: chief justice, Supreme Court of Hawaii, $17,500; associate justices, Supreme Court of Hawaii, $17,000; circuit judges, all circuits, $15,000.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1801, H. R. 4781.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4781) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$20,000,000"; and on page 5, after line 17, to insert:

SEC. 7. The Territory of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary, to guarantee payment of bonds issued by municipalities, school districts, and public-utility districts in Alaska for constructing, altering, equipping, or acquiring public improvements of the nature for which the Territory may issue bonds in an aggregate amount which shall not at any one time exceed the sum by which the principal amount of Territorial bonds and certificates of indebtedness then outstanding under this act is less than $20,000,000. The authority to guarantee bonds of such subdivisions shall be exercised in a manner prescribed in section 2 of this act.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a House bill, and its purpose is to authorize the Territory of Alaska to issue bonds and other instruments of indebtedness to obtain funds for public purposes. Under the committee amendments, the Territory is authorized also to guarantee bonds issued by municipalities, and school and public utility districts for specified purposes.

All borrowing authorized by the bill would be on the responsibility of the Territory of Alaska, and under laws to be enacted by the Territorial legislature, the members of which are elected by the people of Alaska. The credit of the Federal Government is in no way involved.

Maximum indebtedness under the authorization of H. R. 4781 may not exceed $20 million at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO RENA V. PELLEGRINI

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1804, Senate Resolution 243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 243) to pay a gratuity to Rena V. Pellegrini.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the United States Senate lost a valued and trusted servant in the untimely passing on January 14, 1956, of Frank Pellegrini, chief counsel of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Today, through adoption of Senate Resolution 243, we have the opportunity, in small measure, to give a belated "thank you," perhaps not to Frank, but to Mrs. Pellegrini, and the two sons who survive him. We wish them well, and undoubtedly this resolution will express in more tangible terms our sentiment.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which was adopted by unanimous vote of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at an executive session on January 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has learned with profound sorrow of the death of its chief counsel, Frank Pellegrini; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini had been outstanding in organizing and handling the affairs of this committee, conducting its hearings with impartiality, so that despite the press of business, all had a fair and equal chance to be heard; and

Whereas the instantaneous nationwide expression of deep sympathy from the transportation, communications, maritime, fisheries, and other industries with which he worked are indications of the regard in which he was held; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini was a man of the greatest integrity, brilliant intellect, and devoted himself with a whole heart to the public interest in the discharge of the duties of this committee; and

Whereas Frank Pellegrini, the individual, was of such a caliber as to command the deepest respect and at the same time the greatest personal loyalty of staff members as well as Senators, of comparable staff in the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as well as Representatives with whom he worked; and

Whereas there developed between Frank Pellegrini and the individual members of this committee, of both parties, a close personal bond of friendship which transcended the day-to-day business of the committee: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That individually and as a committee we express to his widow and two children our sincere sympathy in their bereavement, in partial consolement and assure them of our great respect for their husband and father who has been our wonderful friend and sympathetic fellow worker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 243.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Rena V. Pellegrini, widow of Frank Pellegrini, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 11½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYMENT OF GRATUITY TO RUTH M. HAEFNER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1805, Senate Resolution 244.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 244) to pay a gratuity to Ruth M. Haefner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Ruth M. Haefner, daughter of Florence R. McKeever, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AMONG INDIANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1808, Senate Resolution 239.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 239) to print for the use of the Judiciary Committee additional copies of the subcommittee report on juvenile delinquency among the Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary not more than 2,000 additional copies of the report No. 1483, 84th Congress, of the Committee on the Judiciary to the Senate on its study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1734 ON WELFARE AND PENSION FUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1809, Senate Resolution 238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 238) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Senate Report 1734 on welfare and pension funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 1, after the word "printed", to strike out "3,500" and insert "3,230," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there be printed 3,230 additional copies of Senate Report 1734, a report on welfare and pension funds, for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE VERENDRYE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1811, House bill 1774.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued

public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereon", to strike out "subject to existing permits" and insert "subject to the reservation to the United States of the right to flood such lands in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the bill, because I think we can quickly reach agreement on it.

As I understand, the committee wishes to have the property disposed of in accordance with provisions of the Surplus Property Act. I have no objection to having that done. However, the bill in its present form will not do that.

I should like to suggest that the amendment which I understand the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], is willing to accept be submitted; and as a matter of courtesy I shall offer it for him, if he will permit me to do so. If the amendment is adopted by the Senate, I shall not have any objection to the bill; I never object to having property disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Surplus Property Act.

However, in its present form the bill does not provide for that. Therefore, I would have to object to the bill, unless the amendment were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Oregon has the amendment before him now. The Chair is not certain that the amendment has yet been prepared.

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President; I do not have the amendment before me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then let the Chair suggest that the bill be passed over temporarily.

Mr. MORSE. Very well, Mr. President; I ask that the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be passed over temporarily.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1812, House bill 8957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8957) to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the bill merely extends the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, which is made up of some very fine persons, may submit its report and recommendations with repect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to—

First. Extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations to the President and to the Congress with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957.

Second. To change the designation from "civic auditorium" to "national civic auditorium."

Third. To authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of July 1, 1955—Public Law 128, 84th Congress—in addition to the $25,000 authorized by that act.

Public Law 128, approved July 1, 1955, established a commission known as the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission for the purpose of formulating plans for the design, location, financing, and construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center.

Mr. President, I think we are unusually fortunate in having some very prominent persons of very high caliber serve on the Commission. They believe they need additional time in which to submit their report and recommendations. So I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8957) to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8957) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1780, House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. My purpose is to have this bill made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire as to the situation in the case of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATED AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1783, Senate bill 3338.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for clarifying the language of the bill by what he has had to say about the amendment which he and I jointly submitted.

I call attention to the fact that the purpose of the amendment is to make the bill effective to carry out its general purpose, namely, to prevent the changing of any rates or schedule of rates to the rural electric cooperatives and other public bodies for the period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3338) relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 1, in line 7, after the word "thereof" and the parentheses, to strike out ", make any charge for any such power and energy furnished to any public body or cooperative at any rate in excess of the rate charged on February 27, 1956," and insert: "to any public body or cooperative, charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3338) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for a period of 18 months after January 1, 1956, the Secretary of the Interior shall not, in the disposition of

electric power and energy generated at projects under the control of the Federal Government (or any department or agency thereof) to any public body or cooperative, charge any rates applicable to any class of service in excess of the rates in effect for such class of service on February 27, 1956; for electric power and energy furnished by him to such public body or cooperative.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this act shall not apply to any charge made at a rate established specifically by any contract entered into by the Federal Government prior to February 28, 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today the Senate has completed action on 3 treaties, 2 conference reports, and 48 bills. We convened at an early hour, and we shall conclude our session today earlier than we had anticipated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the request of the Senator from Texas to have the Senate proceed to consider the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior was not agreed to, because before the request was acted upon, request was made to have the Senate consider another bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I requested unanimous consent, and I thought my request was granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question in regard to that matter.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request—which I thought had been agreed to—that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1780, House bill 9390, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. It is my intention to have this measure made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object; certainly I would not object to consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill—I wish to ask the Senator from Texas 1 or 2 questions in regard to this matter.

I think the RECORD should show whether it is true that when the Senator from Texas requests consideration of the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill, he requests consideration of a bill involving a considerable number of appropriation matters which affect projects in the States of a number of Senators. Is not that true?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly it is true, and it is particularly true in the case of the Senator's State of Oregon and in the case of the entire section of the country in which the Senator from Oregon is so vitally interested, namely, the Pacific Northwest. The bill contains appropriations in the amount of approximately half a billion dollars—to be exact, $433,851,000—for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I am correct in understanding that not only does the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, propose to have the Interior Department appropriation bill taken up by the Senate on Monday—and of course I would not suggest that, in order to meet the personal convenience of any Member of the Senate, the bill not be considered then—but that the probability is that next week the so-called bank holding company bill will be brought up on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that on yesterday the majority leader announced that the Interior Department appropriation bill could be brought up this week. However, in order to give ample time, so that all Members could thoroughly study the report on the bill, and since some Members insisted that the full 3 days provided by the rule be allowed, we thought we would allow an extra day, and not have the Senate take up the bill before Monday. We expect to have the Interior Department appropriation bill followed by the bank holding company bill sometime during next week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I wish the RECORD to show that I have a whole series of amendments to offer to the bank holding company bill. I am in favor of the passage of a bank holding company bill, but I am also in favor of the passage of a nondiscriminatory bank holding company bill. I do not wish to have the Senate pass a bank holding company bill which will single out certain holding companies and will act in a discriminatory fashion in regard to them, and will exempt other holding companies. I shall have more to say about that matter when the bill comes before the Senate.

I make this comment at this time, for the RECORD: Unwittingly and unintentionally, and certainly not by design, the majority leader, in arranging the work of the Senate, has placed me in a position in which other Senators frequently find themselves—namely, a position in which a Senator has to make a choice between remaining in Washington, in attendance on the Senate, and protecting, according to his sights, the best interests of his constituents, or keeping some previous engagements. I wish to state for the RECORD that although I was planning to leave the city on a 6 o'clock plane, for Oregon, the announcement that the Interior Department appropriation bill will be before the Senate on Monday, leaves me no choice but to remain and perform my senatorial duties here on Monday. Furthermore, the announcement that the bank holding company bill will in all probability be brought before the Senate next week likewise leaves me with no choice but to remain here and present my arguments and my amendments on that bill.

Because it is very easy for all of us to be subject to unfair criticism, I make this statement for the RECORD, under my reservation of the right to object, because I think my remaining in Washington will cause some comment in my own State and will cause great inconvenience to various organizations and persons who expected me to be there next week, either to make speeches of introduction or to make the major speeches at various meetings.

I have made my statement. I assure the majority leader that now, as always, I will cooperate with him in expediting the business of the Senate, without any delay to meet the personal convenience of any Member of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator, and his understanding of the situation confronting the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9390, the Interior Department appropriation bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees be authorized to file reports during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDITION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, today the Senate has disposed of 3 treaties, 2 conference reports, and 48 bills. Only 19 bills remain on the calendar. Some of them are awaiting the drafting of amendments, such as the one in which the distinguished occupant of the chair [Mr. LONG] is interested.

I hope that the recess of the Senate until Monday will allow full opportunity for us to utilize the next few days in an attempt to get from the committees any proposed legislation they now have under consideration which might be reported.

I do not know of any period of time since I have been a Member of the Senate when there have been so few bills on the calendar. I intend to address a letter—which is already in preparation—to each chairman of a committee, urging him to make every effort to have reported to the Senate from his committee at as early a date as possible, every bill which has received consideration by the committee.

The Senate staff and its employees have made a very fine record during the first 3 months of the session. If the committees can report to the Senate proposed legislation we can arrange to have it handled on the floor of the Senate. It is difficult for us to consider measures in the form of amendments which have not been considered in committee, so I hope committees will give thorough consideration to the bills which are pending be-

fore them, and report as many of them as they feel justified in reporting, based upon the merits of the bills.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DELEGATION OF DELAWARE WOMEN

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, today is an important day in the history of the District of Columbia. One hundred and fifty fine women from the State of Delaware are visiting the Nation's Capital. I am very sorry that more Senators are not present in the Chamber. In addition, there was some difficulty in transportation within the city limits. However, with the permission of the Chair, I should like to present to the Senate and to the other visitors in the galleries a small but very important segment of the group of 150 ladies from Delaware.

Included in the group is our one lady member of the Delaware Legislature.

[The visitors rose and were greeted with hearty applause.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish the distinguished group of visitors from the State of Delaware to feel certain that they have both a bipartisan welcome and a welcome from the other side of the continent. I join with the Senator from Delaware in extending the welcome of the Senate.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the distinguished minority leader. This group is a bipartisan group.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to associate myself with this most harmonious presentation of and welcome to the charming ladies from Delaware. They are every bit as charming as the ladies from Minnesota; and when they are that charming, they are at the top of the charm ladder.

Mr. FREAR. I am obliged to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his statement.

THE NEW SOVIET CHALLENGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the lesser known features of the new Soviet challenge is the intensified "redefection" campaign which the Kremlin is now sponsoring. According to an official of the International Rescue Committee the Soviet Government is now paying close to $100,000 per person to persuade escapees from the Iron Curtain to return to the Communist fold. According to a nine-man emergency Commission headed by William J. Donovan, no lure has been overlooked by the new Soviet leadership in their intensified drive to recapture refugees from Communist tyranny: the promise of better jobs, schooling for young people, guaranteed amnesty, and sentimental letters from families behind the Iron Curtain urging the escapee to return.

I point out that Mr. William J. Donovan is indeed a man of great competence and expert knowledge in these matters of counterintelligence. His record of information, knowledge, and experience with respect to the Soviet Union and its programs is second to none.

Mr. President, within the last 2 weeks an interesting article has appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, written by Claiborne Pell, entitled "Redefection Drive Uses Honey or Steel." Mr. Pell is a former State Department officer who is presently Director of the International Rescue Committee and a member of the Donovan Emergency Commission. I ask unanimous consent that his article be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Communist nations, led by Russia, are spreading a new Red dragnet throughout the free world in an intensified campaign to repossess refugees who have fled Iron Curtain countries.

Amnesty decrees, appeals by radio and special newspapers, personal interviews and letters which find their way even to refugees in the United States are being used.

The aim of this latest Soviet weapon: "Redefection."

Threats, bribery, thefts, kidnapings and even murders have been employed in some European areas of high refugee concentration.

So far, the campaign has resulted in the return home of hardly 1,000 refugees a year. A rough estimate of the cost to the Communists would be in the neighborhood of $100,000 a head.

The effect of the increasing tempo of the redefection campaign on the anti-Communist refugees has been profound, however. Suspicion and distrust have been sown in refugee communities everywhere.

Headquarters for this Red roundup is in an office building at 65 Behrenstrasse, East Berlin, just around the corner from the gleaming new Soviet Embassy. There Gen. Nikolai F. Mihailov conducts the campaign. It is there that the propaganda newspaper, For Return to the Homeland, receives its editorial direction.

Munich, Frankfurt and various refugee camps in Germany are particular targets of the costly For Return to the Homeland, with its liberal use of color and eye-catching photographs, and of regular radio broadcasts from East Germany. The Communists play upon the emotions of the refugee with tape recordings of appeals by one member of a family still behind the Iron Curtain to another who has escaped.

Since names are frequently mentioned, these radio appeals get a wide audience in refugee camps. The apprehension of the refugee for his loved ones often is increased by the fact that the announcer usually knows the exact address of his listeners and cites such intimate facts as the color of a particular refugee's suit.

The Reds have resorted to violence in many places. Dr. A. R. Trushnovich, who was head of the Russian Rescue Committee in West Berlin, was abducted. Dr. Abdurakhman Fatalibeyli, section editor of Radio Liberation in Munich, was murdered. In the past year eight thefts of list of names and addresses of refugees were reported in Frankfurt.

In certain camps, Communist agents bring pressure on refugees not to continue with their application for American visas.

It was found that individuals were being beaten up in one camp for Bulgarian refugees in Greece for contacting the United States consulate. Others were being bribed to ignore summonses from the American consulate in connection with processing of visa applications.

Still, refugees are redefecting at a rate of only about three a day throughout the world, but the effects of the campaign can't be measured in those terms. Its real danger is the fear and suspicion it spreads among all refugees.

If one refugee redefects, his fellows know that he will be grilled for the name of everyone he met and about everything he did in the West.

The tentacles of the Communist campaign have now spread to the United States. Refugees in this country are being wooed with letters directed personally to them at their new American homes.

If the refugee moves, say from New York to Washington, often within 2 or 3 days his change of address will be known to the Communist embassy or legation which claims him. So far, however, violence has not been employed in this country.

In general, the campaign is most effective in the European sanctuaries where the refugee first alights after crossing the curtain. In such camps the Soviet or satellite agents use a gentler method of persuasion, the personal interview.

At the Zirndorf camp outside Nuernberg, a former Russian circus bear trainer I met was interviewed by a Soviet official flown from Moscow to bring pressure upon him. The interview, at which the Germans insisted that a representative of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees be present, was fruitless. The refugee had only agreed to it to head off Russian charges that he was being prevented from seeing officials of his onetime homeland.

One of the many difficulties refugees face in West Germany is that legal status and working papers are given only to those who can establish that they would have been persecuted or imprisoned for political reasons if they had remained under Communist rule.

This policy stems from the widely held opinion in West Germany that if all individuals opposing the Communist puppet regime in East Germany were given sanctuary, there would be a mass exodus; East Germany would be emptied of its anti-Communists and the reunification of Germany would be further postponed.

Despite all obstacles, however, 500 to 1,000 East Germans stream into Berlin's Marienfelde Refugee Emergency Reception Camp every day. They escape simply by walking across the sector border in Berlin and surrendering themselves.

If a refugee passes the West Berlin screening he spends a couple of months in a camp being processed. Then, if finally accepted, he is efficiently resettled in some part of West Germany.

If the refugee is not accepted as having fled for bona fide political reasons, however, he is condemned to a sort of shadow life, since papers permitting freedom of movement are withheld. These so-called unrecognized refugees usually end up working at cut-rate wages. Some enter the black market or other illegal activities and some return to East Germany.

Non-German refugees from Russia and the satellite countries also turn up in Austria or West Germany. They may apply for emigration visas, but after a year or two in a refugee camp, awaiting processing, they may decide to settle down in Germany, whose language they have learned by that time.

The most pathetic refugees in Europe today are the so-called hard-core ones, of whom there are some 70,000 in West Germany. Usually for reasons of health or age these are not eligible for emigration to the Western Hemisphere. Often they have also been rejected for integration into the German economy. Some have been in camps or dependent upon public assistance for 10 years. This group provides a particularly fertile ground for Communist redefection propaganda.

But the eligible refugee desiring to go to the United States faces a hard row of his own. First, he must fulfill requirements of the United States Refugee Relief Act, which requires detailed evidence of good conduct for the past 2 years.

If the refugee has just crossed the border, obviously such evidence is almost unobtainable. And by the time he establishes a 2-year good behavior record in camp, he may have developed a spot on his lungs or some other health defect.

The Scandinavian countries are helping to solve the problem of "hard core" refugees by accepting some who are in bad physical condition. Denmark, for instance, recently took 100 persons with active tuberculosis and placed them in Danish sanitariums. Their families were given employment, food, and lodging nearby.

Fortunately, there are ways of combating the Communist redefection campaign. The most important would be to speed up processing of the refugee on his way to the United States.

The 2-year individual history requirement could be loosened administratively along the lines of President Eisenhower's recent recommendations to Congress. The tuberculosis ban could be limited to refugees with active, contagious cases rather than cover everyone with a spot on the lungs.

(Representative WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, last week introduced a bill to allow tubercular refugees to enter the United States under certain conditions. Sometimes refugee families with one tubercular member elect to stay abroad rather than be separated, it was explained. Walter's bill would authorize the Public Health Service to determine the extent of the individual's illness and, when necessary, send him to a sanitarium.)

Civic and church organizations in the Free World could adopt individual refugees. National and local governments could issue proclamations assuring refugees of a warm welcome.

A general campaign by the Government, the pulpit, the editorial page, and the radio station could raise the refugee from his present status of second-class citizen to that of a temporarily immobilized soldier of democracy in the cold war against communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past few days it has also become clear, Mr. President, that when the more persuasive "lures" fail, the Soviet leadership does not hesitate to use the old Communist trademarks of threats, reprisals against relatives, blackmail, terrorism, and even abduction on American soil. An astounding lead article appears in the April 23, 1956, issue of Newsweek magazine on pages 21–23. Apparently the administration is not as alert as it might be in hamstringing the operation of Soviet agents right here in our own midst. The Newsweek article recounts the shocking story of how five refugee Russian seamen were forced to return to the Soviet Union with the connivance of Soviet diplomats and under the direction of the head of Russia's United Nations delegation. I ask unanimous consent that the article I have just referred to be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS: A DIPLOMATIC KIDNAPPING ON UNITED STATES SOIL

The five refugee Soviet sailors who took off for Finland from Idlewild Airport in New York early this month en route to the U. S. S. R. were, in effect, kidnapped by Soviet secret police.

No United States Government or local law agency did anything to prevent the kidnapping even though two, the Central Intelligence Agency and the Immigration Bureau, knew something of what was going on. The CIA did give protection to a sixth sailor when he asked for it and he escaped abduction.

The Immigration Service seemed almost to put itself out to make things easy for the abductors.

The Service authorized the sailors' departure after a routine 7-minute hearing to which no American, other than an inspector stationed at Idlewild and an interpreter, was admitted.

Among those excluded from the hearing were representatives of the Church World Service, an agency of the National Council of Churches, which sponsored the sailors.

The evidence indicates that the Soviet agents worked with or under Arkady A. Sobolev, chief of the Soviet delegation at the United Nations.

During the 4 days immediately preceding the arrival of the sailors at Idlewild, they were lured by a combination of persuasion and threats to the headquarters of the Soviet U. N. delegation on Park Avenue. when they finally cracked and agreed to return to Russia, they were whisked off to the Immigration hearing in a cavalcade of eight Soviet-owned automobiles, filled with agents. After the hearing, as they waited for their plane, they were surrounded by 20 agents, who kept them from speaking to their American friends.

The friends of the five young men said they had no intention of returning to the Soviet Union up to the time Soviet agents started closing in on them. Indeed, two of them told friends only a few days before they disappeared that it would be suicide for them to go back. One of them had planned to be married the Sunday after he vanished.

The extent to which they were subjected to physical pressure was suggested by a bloody shirt left behind in the quarters of one of the sailors.

All the sailors were shown letters and photographs from friends and relatives in the U. S. S. R. to back up the arguments for their repatriation made to them by Soviet agents. The threat was implied, if not openly made, that these hostages in the Soviet Union would be punished unless the boys cooperated with their abductors.

The boys did cooperate, at least to the extent of saying at the Idlewild hearing that they wanted to go home. According to the Immigration Service, the inspector who conducted the hearing failed to see anything unusual about their behavior. The Immigration Service declined to identify either this inspector or his interpreter. The Service's spokesman added that the inspector could have done nothing in any case because there is no law authorizing the Government to interfere with the exist of aliens from this country.

FRACAS

An Immigration Service spokesman said: "There was no way of detaining the defectors without provoking an international fracas. If there was any possibility of a kidnapping taking place, Church World Service, the defectors, or their friends should have notified the FBI, the proper police authority. Based on what we knew, there was nothing we could do."

The Immigration Service, like the FBI, is a part of the Justice Department.

Exactly how the five were lured to the Park Avenue headquarters of the Soviet U. N. delegation is not entirely clear. Their former neighbors are afraid to talk freely because they dread the power of the MVD. One witness claims he was told by Government agents not to discuss the case. The Russian communities in and around New York City are terrorized.

"But this is America," a Newsweek reporter told one of the witnesses. "You are safe enough here."

"Were those boys safe enough here?" he asked. "What good did it do them to be in America?"

The 5 sailors with 2 Soviet police escorts were flown to Finland aboard a Scandinavian Airlines plane. (This line has recently been authorized by the Soviet Union to fly a regular service from Helsinki to Moscow.) Officials of the line decline to say who paid for the tickets, but it was learned that the tickets had been ordered by Soviet officials through a travel agency.

The whole operation of rounding up the refugees and spiriting them out of the country was conducted with military precision and obviously was carefully organized. A small army of agents was used.

The victims were Valentin Lukashkov, 25; Alexander Shirin, 26; Michael Shishin, 25; Viktor Ryabenko, 23; and Nikolai Vaganov, 23. They were part of the crew of the Soviet tanker, *Tuapse*, which was captured by the Nationalist Chinese in June 1954, while en route to Shanghai carrying a cargo of kerosene for the Chinese Reds. The crew was temporarily interned on Formosa and then given the choice of returning to the Soviet Union or remaining in the free world. Of the 20 crewmen who asked for asylum in the United States, 9 got it.

TAILED

From the time they arrived in New York in October 1955, the nine were hounded by Soviet agents trying to persuade them to go back home (Newsweek, December 26, 1955). They were bombarded with letters from home but refused to be impressed with these communications because they all seemed spurious. The sailors said their families weren't literate enough to write such persuasive and well-composed letters.

Of 6 who were in New York when the Soviet secret police went to work on them in earnest, only 1 escaped them. The other three are living outside the New York area and their addresses are being kept secret.

The refugee who planned to get married is Lukashkov. His fiancee, Nina Somons, a pretty, 24-year-old Russian girl who arrived in this country 5 years ago and now is a part-time teacher of English, said the ceremony was to have taken place in the same Russian Orthodox Church where he recently had been baptized. Nina was brokenhearted. She said she was sure Lukashkov never left this country of his own free will.

Olga and Tania Sirovatko, sisters who had double-dated Shirin and Shishin a week before they enplaned, were equally sure that their friends had no thought of returning to the Soviet Union. The girls said these two sailors had made plans for their future in America and were happy about their prospects.

Return: Ryabenko and Vaganov, who lived together in Paterson, N. J., had discussed with their landlords changes in Soviet Russia brought about by the anti-Stalinist line the Kremlin is now pursuing. They had both made it clear that they had no idea of going home.

The sailors had recently told the Church World Service that four of the crewmen of the *Tuapse*, left behind in Formosa, now wanted to come to the United States. They had expressed the hope that their four comrades might join them.

Shirin, who worked in a New York factory, complained to his employers on Wednesday, three days before he departed for Russia, that a Soviet agent had bothered him at the factory.

Tass reported the departure of the five seamen from New York. It was the first time the Soviet press had admitted that any of the *Tuapse* crewmen were in the United States. It explained that some of them had

been "sent" to America when their mates chose repatriation. The Tass report blandly added:

"The five men requested the Soviet Embassy in the United States to help them return home. On April 7, the Russian colony in New York gave them a warm send-off."

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY FATEFUL HOURS FOR FIVE

Here, chronologically, is what happened to the five who are now back in Russia during the few days it took Soviet agents to herd them aboard a Europe-bound plane:

Tuesday, April 3: Shishin communicated somehow with Soviet officials and volunteered to go back to Russia or was persuaded to consent. From then on he was used as bait to catch the other four. Shishin was the only one of the refugee sailors with a wife in the Soviet Union.

Wednesday, April 4: Shishin tried to persuade Shirin and Lukashkov, who had been living with him at 500 Riverside Drive, to go back with him. They refused. That night Soviet agents also tried to persuade them but without success.

Meanwhile, two Soviet agents called on Viktor Soloviev, 20, who lived at the George Washington Hotel and who had talked with Lukashkov and Shirin and knew they still were determined not to return. Soloviev's callers woke him up at 11:30 p. m., and made a strong argument for his return. He was jostled but wasn't taken by force when he made it clear that he'd call for help.

Thursday, April 5: That morning Shishin, Lukashkov, and Shirin left International House for Columbia University, where they were to take the final examination in an English course they had just completed. When it was over Shishin disappeared. He went or was taken to the Soviet delegation's building on Park Avenue.

Two agents called on Ryabenko and Vaganov at their boarding house in Paterson, N. J. They carried bottles of liquor into the house. At 7 a. m. the two sailors got into the agents' car. Later, the landlady found Ryabenko's shirt, which she said was blood-stained. Frightened, she washed it.

Friday, April 6: At 1 o'clock that morning, Lukashkov, Shirin, and Soloviev met at International House and talked about their plight until 5 a. m. They decided to defy the Soviet agents. Soloviev then returned to the hotel.

At 6:30 a. m. he tried to reach his two friends at International House by telephone but was told by the operator: "Something has happened . . . I don't know."

Later that day Soloviev reported what had happened to the Church World Service and asked for protection. The service in turn reported to the CIA. Soloviev told Newsweek days later that he still lived in terror of abduction.

The Immigration Service was notified by the Russians that they intended to fly the refugees out of Idlewild the following day. They said they had a document signed by all five of the sailors stating their willingness to return home.

Jan Van Hoogstratten, the Church World Service worker who had been in effect the guardian of the sailors since they arrived in this country, asked the Immigration Service to conduct a hearing.

Saturday, April 7: The 8-car Russian parade arrived at Idlewild at 3:30 p. m. The 20 agents looked like a mob with the five sailors at its core. The hearing started at 3:45 p. m. It was over in less than 10 minutes. The five sailors and their guards took off on schedule at 4 p. m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the appropriate officials of our Government owe an explanation to the Senate and to the country if the account contained in Newsweek magazine of this diplomatic kidnaping is accurate.

It would be all to the good for American public opinion if this article were verified by the State Department or our intelligence agencies, or appropriately refuted, if it contains any misstatements of fact or any allegations which may be proved untrue.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

ATOMIC POWER PROJECT IN MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just been informed that the Atomic Energy Commission has authorized negotiations with the Rural Electric Cooperative Power Association at Elk River, Minn., for a contract to design and develop an atomic power reactor developing 22,000 kilowatts of electric power. This is an historic occasion, and I am proud, as every Minnesotan is, that Minnesota has been chosen among the first peacetime power projects. This is a historic event—not only for Minnesota, and for the great cooperative movement, but also for the whole Nation.

Minnesota has scored a tremendous first. But far more important are the implications for cheaper electric power for the entire Nation. At long last, we seem to be moving into the long-promised era of peaceful atomic energy. Nothing demonstrates this to me so vividly as this decision, belated as it is, and after long delay, to support the development of an atomic power reactor in a small Midwestern community. We are at last on the threshold of the new era—the era of the peaceful use of the atom, or nuclear energy.

I want the RECORD to show that from time to time representatives of the Rural Electric Cooperative Power Association have met with the officials of the Atomic Energy Commission in regard to this very project. Also from time to time the Minnesota congressional delegation—both my senior colleague [Mr. THYE] and myself, and Members of the House of Representatives—have met with the Atomic Energy Commission, urging that this action be taken. About a month ago I had reason to believe that this action was in the offing, and I am delighted now to have my expectation confirmed within the past hour or so. Negotiations have been authorized, and it is now quite evident that the power project will soon be underway.

Mr. President, 3 years ago in the Senate, at the time the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was handling the bill containing the appropriation for the Rural Electric Administration, I asked whether under that appropriation it would be possible for an atomic reactor to be built under the auspices of the REA. We discussed the subject for some time on the floor of the Senate. It was the view of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from North Dakota, that such an atomic reactor could be constructed under the appropriations provided to the Rural Electric Administration.

Subsequently, the matter was clarified in some detail in the next year's appropriation bill and in the discussion of the REA authorizations.

Now the Atomic Energy Commission, in cooperation with REA, has made possible the first peacetime atomic reactor plant for a rural electric cooperative. I am singularly delighted and happy that this has taken place in the State of Minnesota. It bodes well for the future.

Mr. President, I desire now to turn my attention to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota still has the floor.

THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today something very important happened in the House of Representatives on another subject. I have in my hand a number of news items from the news ticker, both from the United Press and from the Associated Press, relating to an action which was taken in the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives. The first item reads as follows:

The House Appropriations Committee, moving speedily on the heels of the farm bill veto, today voted $1.2 billion to President Eisenhower to put the soil-bank farm plan into effect immediately.

Another item reads:

Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, said the money would enable Agriculture Secretary Benson to put into effect under existing laws exactly the same soil-bank plan that had been contemplated in the farm bill vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of a subcommittee that drafted the money bill at an unannounced session this morning, said there was one exception to this.

WHITTEN said as far as he knows, Benson will not be able to make advance payments to farmers this year, for soil-bank commitments for the next year.

Democrats had bitterly assailed this feature of the administration's plans as an effort to buy the votes of farmers in the 1956 presidential and congressional elections.

I should like to read from the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, as reported by the Associated Press and the United Press:

CANNON said he hopes to call up the money bill in the House next week.

The Democratic-controlled committee took advantage of the opportunity to renew its frequent criticism of the Agriculture Department. In its report to the House the committee said:

"The committee doubts that the soil bank plan will do all that the President claims for it, so far as reducing surpluses is concerned. In its opinion, present surpluses are the result of the failure of the Department of Agriculture to sell commodities in world trade for the present charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. To support this view, the committee need only point to the fact that in recent months practically all commodities which have been offered for sale competitively in world trade through normal channels have been sold for dollars.

"Neither does the committee believe that such program can ever be a substitute for price or income which farmers must have if they are to share fully in national prosperity. The committee does believe that such a program, if properly administered, can be of some help to American farmers under present conditions. * * *

"Since the President has vetoed H. R. 12, which would have restored the historical relationship between the farmer's price and the cost of what he must buy, and would have fixed price supports at 90 percent of the farmer's comparative purchasing power during the period 1909–14, some alternative action must be taken by Congress. The action proposed herein appears to be the most feasible way of providing some immediate relief for the farm problem."

Furthermore, I should like to have it noted in the RECORD that Democratic leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK announced later that the soil-bank appropriation would be called up in the House next week, possibly as early as Wednesday.

The reason I mention this is that, as the ticker items reveal, the committee has stated that the provisions of the existing soil-conservation law authorize a soil-bank program.

Another news item states:

The committee cited provisions of the existing soil-conservation law as authority for the soil-bank program It said it was surprised to find President Eisenhower asking for a soil-bank law since this authority had existed since 1935 and since the President, during 3 years of declining farm income, had made no request for funds to implement it.

"Notwithstanding the failure of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture to use such existing authority, and despite the fact that they have not seen fit to request the necessary funds, the committee feels that the appropriation proposed in the accompanying bill should be given immediate consideration by Congress," the committee said in its report to the House.

Yesterday, Mr. President, in the Senate I referred—at pages 6493 and 6494 of the RECORD of April 18—to the act of 1935, known as the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. I called the attention of the Senate to sections 1 through 6, and to sections 7 and 8. At that time I said:

Sections 1 to 6 have been on the statute books since April 27, 1935.

They give the Secretary of Agriculture sweeping powers to carry out intensive conservation efforts, including specific provisions for changes in the use of land.

Then I went on to point out:

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary." Not even a limitation. Yet, has Secretary Benson or President Eisenhower ever asked for such appropriations?

I was summarizing this law in laymen's language, and I said:

In layman's language, what does that law provide? It specifically authorizes payments to farmers for changes in land use, so as to avoid the exploitation or wasteful use of land resources for production unneeded for domestic consumption. That is what the soil-bank program will do. That is its whole purpose.

Note, however, that the language is permissive, not mandatory. I say that anyone who reads the language of the Conservation Act and the Domestic Allotment Act, with amendments up to date, going back to as early as 1935, will find in them all the authority which is necessary for effective soil conservation or a soil-conservation reserve program.

When my own soil-bank bill was introduced, my purpose was to direct the Secretary to carry out such a program, in view of his failure to take such action on his own initiative. If the Secretary wanted such a program, if the President wanted such a program, why was it not included in this year's budget under authority which now exists?

The Committee on Appropriations of the House has gone into this matter very meticulously. The members of that committee, by an overwhelming vote of 36 to 7, went on record as saying that the authority already exists. Appropriations have now been voted by the committee.

I merely bring this point up because 2 weeks ago today, when Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams was making comment in the press about the delay on the soil bank, namely, to the effect that if the soil bank provisions were not written into law now they would possibly be inoperative, due to the fact that farmers were engaged in planting, the junior Senator from Minnesota issued a statement to the press and said there was ample authority under existing law, and called it to the attention of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to say quite frankly that my statement has been ignored. There has been no effort made on the part of the administration to look into that authority and to come to grips with the problem and to present a program.

This morning in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Secretary of Agriculture was asked about this subject by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and in colloquy between the Senator and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture apparently took exception to the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana, and said he did not believe that he could inaugurate such a program.

Benson insisted, "We have looked into it, and we cannot put the soil bank into operation without legislation."

Benson's statement came in testimony today before the Senate Agriculture Committee. He said Agriculture Department attorneys had studied existing law thoroughly and concluded it does not contain authority for the soil-bank plan the administration sponsors.

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, the committee chairman, disagreed.

"All you need is funds * * * you could get it next week," he said.

ELLENDER warned the Secretary he would open the way for another bitter farm-policy battle if he insisted on a new farm bill including only the soil-bank provisions.

"You can't ask for what you want and not expect others to ask for what they want," the Senator said.

"If we put any farm bill through this year, you can depend on this—a lot of the provisions will be distasteful to you," ELLENDER added.

ELLENDER said he was "too busy" to order immediate hearings on the GOP soil-bank bill introduced yesterday. He told reporters he might call hearings later this year.

Mr. President, I have read the full story as reported. I wish to say that I happen to know that a study of this legislation, the act of 1935, has been made in the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, any who have been associated with the Department in the past know that the authority is inclusive, and is sufficiently broad to permit the Secretary to enter upon a program known as the soil bank, in all its features. The only limitation has been upon farmers. The House is about to appropriate $1,200,000,000, which is exactly the amount of money provided in the Senate and House conference report for both the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve programs.

I wish to commend the members of the House committee for this quick and positive action. If we in the Senate will move with the same dispatch we can make the money available to the Department within a few days, and the soil-bank program can go into operation, because a good deal of planting has not been done. Furthermore, some of the planting could not be touched, anyway, this year—winter wheat, for example. Some of the wheat is planted in the fall, and, obviously, could not have been affected by any soil-bank bill which could have been passed in either January, February, or March of 1956.

I think, Mr. President, my colleagues understood that advance payments are usually open to all kinds of abuses and criticism by the public——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I think it is desirable that the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses should give consideration—and I hope they will give favorable consideration—to an appropriation to support the soil bank program. I think that is necessary, whether the procedure be followed of merely having an appropriation item, or, perhaps, the more sound procedure of also having specific legislative authority.

People may differ as to whether the present authority is ample; certainly there are some differences of opinion in that regard. But apparently earlier this year the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, as he has pointed out in the Senate on several occasions, introduced a soil bank proposal. It may have been last year that he introduced it. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] yesterday pointed out that as a Member of the House 2 years ago he had introduced a soil bank bill. The distinguished group of Senators who serve on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at least felt there was considerable merit to providing legislative authority in the so-called agricultural bill which was recently passed by both Houses and vetoed by the President.

So it seems that there was a considerable body of thought that if not absolutely essential, certainly it would be desirable to have some specific legislation in this regard. In any event, the legislative authority of the Senate and the House, if, in their judgment, they determine to proceed in that way, will of course have to be supported subse-

quently by appropriations in support of the authorization legislation.

I hope that rather than possibly getting into a situation involving the General Accounting Office, or some legal action being taken questioning the Secretary's authority, those who are interested in solving the problem and in having a soil bank will not only support the appropriation which may be necessary, but will also support authorization legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the minority leader's words are both clear-cut and constructive. I think, however, that if my colleague will examine the RECORD as I have done, he will note that on the day of the introduction of the so-called soil-bank bill, the conservation and acreage reserve bill, it had one express purpose, namely, to make soil bank and conservation and acreage reserve mandatory, to direct the Secretary rather than leaving it permissive.

Furthermore, if we examine the RECORD in relation to the objections of the Department to soil-bank bills both in the Senate and the House, it will be noted that from time to time the Department recognized that it already had great authority in this particular area.

I think it is always right and proper to admit one's own limitations and lack of knowledge. The truth is that many of us had not studied the act of 1935 as carefully as we should have done. I came to the study of that act after the Assistant to the President, Mr. Adams, had made a rather personal attack, stating that some us, including the junior Senator from Minnesota, had been responsible for delay in the passage of the farm bill. Under necessity one is able to do considerable work. So, looking through the law and going back through the whole conservation legislation, I came across the sections in the act of 1935 to which I have referred. I have discussed these sections with lawyers of competence in the field of agriculture.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I might say that neither the Senator from Minnesota nor the minority leader is an attorney, and my observation over several years has been that even eminent attorneys can sometimes disagree. I even find that in the Supreme Court of the United States, which is our greatest tribunal, every once in a while a 5-to-4 decision is handed down, which must indicate that even able lawyers disagree as to the exact meaning of the law.

So, while the Senator from Minnesota may have been advised, and the persons with whom he advised may have had the finest legal ability, that is no assurance that some other legal counsel might advise someone else that there is no statutory authority. All I am saying is that if there is a will to enact legislation, and to button it down so that there can be no valid question, it would seem to me that the constructive way of proceeding would be to have both authorization legislation and an appropriation.

It is true, and I think the Senator has made it very clear in his remarks, that even those who placed the appropriation in the bill in the committee pointed out that it did not cover the point of advance payments. It may be that a valid argument can be made by those who think that is not a sound procedure, but it would seem to me that that feature could very well be debated and discussed on the floor of the House and the Senate as a matter of national policy.

Nevertheless, I would not want to rest merely on the advice of a limited number of lawyers and then find after Congress had acted that some legal action was taken or some opinion rendered which would throw the whole thing in doubt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California. He is one of the most able proponents of the administration's point of view on many matters, and is one of its most able and conscientious defenders.

However, I should like to note again for the RECORD sections 1 to 6 and sections 7 and 8 as I have cited them on pages 6493 and 6494 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The language appears to me to be rather explicit. It says:

To cooperate or enter into agreements with, or to furnish financial or other aid to, any agency, governmental or otherwise, or any person, subject to such conditions as he (the Secretary) may deem necessary, for the purposes of this act.

Section 6 authorizes to be appropriated for the purposes of this act "such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary."

Section 7 provides:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act also to secure, and the purposes of this act shall also include—

(1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility:

(2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land;

(3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources;

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the text, to the bottom of the page, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"(5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909-July 1914, inclusive, as determined from statistics available in the United States Department of Agriculture, and the maintenance of such ratio."

Section 8 (a) of the act makes clear this authority exists in force until the end of this year.

Section 8 (b) says:

"Subject to the limitations provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall have power to carry out the purposes specified in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 7 (a) by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable in connection with the effectuation of such purposes during the year with respect to which such payments or grants are made, and measured by (1) their treatment or use of their land, or a part thereof, for soil restoration, soil conservation, or the prevention of erosion; (2) changes in the use of their land; (3) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, or the normal national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption; or (4) their equitable share, as determined by the Secretary, of the national production of any commodity or commodities required for domestic consumption and exports adjusted to reflect the extent to which their utilization of cropland on the farm conforms to farming practices which the Secretary determines will best effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a); of (5) any combination of the above."

A NEW START IN ARMAMENTS CONTROL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Armament Control: A New Start?" published in the Nation magazine for March 17, 1956.

The editorial discusses the progress which had been made up to that time by the Senate Special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within the past few weeks there have been two important moves toward the international control of armaments. One, President Eisenhower's letter of March 1 to Marshal Bulganin hit the front pages all over the world. The other, the start of a serious study of disarmament by a special Senate subcommittee headed by HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota, has been noted on the back pages when it has been noted at all.

The President's letter is an encouraging sign of a new interest and flexibility on the part of our own Government in his central problem of the contemporary world. Yet of the two, the Senate study may well have the greater and more lasting effect. Much prominence has been given to the President's new proposal to consider excluding the future production of fissionable materials from weapons stockpiles. But when Admiral Strauss appeared before the Senate disarmament subcommittee on March 7, he took pains to point out that this proposal was conditional upon the prior adoption and satisfactory operation of the Eisenhower "open skies" inspection plan. A good many of our free-world allies have indicated privately, and a few publicly, their belief that the Soviets will never accept inspection in advance of agreement on substantive measures of arms control.

The Senate disarmament subcommittee, authorized last July, began its public hearings on January 25 with Harold Stassen, the President's Special Assistant on Disarmament. The Senate caucus room was largely vacant and the Nation's press carried hardly a line about it. Somewhat more notice was given to Secretary Dulles' appearance for 2 hours on February 29; but the press coverage was based primarily on a routine State Department release rather than upon the Secretary's more revealing and significant answers to extensive questioning. Chairman Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Senator FLANDERS, accompanied by Col. Richard S. Leghorn, testified on March 7; but the admiral, unlike Secretary Dulles, ducked many of the most penetrating questions or put them off to a secret session.

Although technically only a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations

Committee, this is no ordinary subcommittee. By deliberate design its membership includes, in addition to Chairman HUMPHREY, 5 other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, 4 members of the Armed Services Committee, and 2 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Such membership insures that all important aspects of the subject will be covered—international relations, military, and atomic energy. It is already apparent from the first two hearings that the subcommittee, and particularly Chairman HUMPHREY, are not looking for headlines, but neither are they shying from an examination of the important central problems in this area.

As a Nation we have been drifting along since the U. N.'s "majority plan" for atomic-energy control was evolved in September 1947, distracted by day-to-day developments in the international field and unconsciously hoping that if the problem of atomic control were ignored it might go away. But far from disappearing, this problem has become more and more unmanageable as stocks of fissionable materials for bombs have grown in this country, the U. S. S. R., and Great Britain. The destructive power of these stocks of fissionables has been multiplied by a factor of at least 100 and probably closer to 1,000 by the development of the fission-fusion-fission bomb. The scientific correspondent of the Manchester Guardian has estimated within the past month that the accumulated stockpiles are now sufficient in Great Britain for 2,000 to 4,000 bombs, in Russia for 10,000, and in the United States for 35,000. That these estimates are not unreasonable is suggested by the recent United States announcement that 40,000 kilograms of U-235 would be made available over a period of time for atomic-power development. That is enough for 8,000 bombs at the 5-kilograms-per-bomb figure used by the Guardian.

In their testimony Mr. Stassen and Mr. Dulles both stressed the point that all previous United States positions on armaments control were formally "reserved"—in other words withdrawn—at the U. N. discussions last September, when it was shown that no effective technical method is now known for accounting fully for all past production of fissionable materials. Thus at the moment the United States has no arms-control plan of any kind before the U. N. President Eisenhower's "open skies" proposal of last July is only a scheme for a warning device; it includes no plan for reduction of armaments, atomic or otherwise. The present administration deserves some credit for bringing this question of accounting for past production into the open, even though, as Senator HUMPHREY pointed out on March 7, it was done 2½ years after the administration came into office and the problem has been known to exist at least since the Soviets tested their first atomic bomb in September 1949. The problem has been present in its crucial form ever since this country exploded the first hydrogen bomb in November 1952, since it was then demonstrated that the destructive power of fissionable stocks must be recalculated by a factor of at least 100.

Senator HUMPHREY urged Secretary Dulles to develop and present a complete new arms-control plan adapted to the present situation, and the Secretary admitted that this finally might be done. Indeed he went further to indicate—as Mr. Stassen has also done on other occasions—the form that such a plan would have to take: The limitation and control of carriers of fission and fusion weapons, primarily planes and missiles. The Secretary gave no indication, however, that any such proposal was in the immediate offing, and the realistic prospect—despite the President's March 1 letter to Marshal Bulganin—is another more-or-less futile session of the five-power disarmament subcommittee of the U. N., which is to resume its meetings in London on March 19.

The Senate Disarmament Subcommittee has announced that, after hearing Secretary of Defense Wilson, it will hear nongovernmental witnesses in Washington and subsequently in the field. Various university scientists and technicians have been invited to submit their views. The country will certainly benefit from these hearings—at the very least by bringing the essential facts on the subject out from behind the foggy curtains of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Pentagon, and perhaps by prodding officialdom into doing what Mr. Stassen was appointed to do a year ago—develop a comprehensive United States plan for arms control.

GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY IN MINNESOTA BY ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was indeed most happy this afternoon to receive from the Atomic Energy Commission, in an official news release, a notice that the AEC had authorized nuclear powerplant negotiations with two electric cooperatives in Minnesota and Michigan. The Elk River Rural Power Cooperative of Elk River, Minn., submitted one of the two proposals which were accepted.

I live in a rural community not having electricity at the time the REA Act was passed. I hailed the coming of rural electrification, and was instrumental in helping our local county associations to create and develop a rural electrification association. I have watched the development of the REA over the years, and have found that the farmers' REA associations in the States have enjoyed the many benefits of rural electrification.

I watched the development of the plant at Elk River, Minn., to generate electricity by steam power and to serve the REA's in the Northwest. With that background, I could fully understand and appreciate what electricity meant to the rural communities of the Nation, especially since I have watched the development of the power unit at Elk River.

Then atomic energy, with its great source of heat, was made known to man. Heat, of course, will generate or create steam, and I realized that the new type of energy promised much to us who were landlocked, so to speak, in the central part of the United States, especially in a State such as Minnesota, which does not have rapid water or a source of hydroelectric power. We realized that the heat source of atomic energy afforded us the means to obtain the power which was needed to create electricity within the State.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I worked on this matter with my colleagues on the committee, and we were successful in getting an appropriation which would permit the Atomic Energy Commission to do research and to enter into such a project as the Commission has now approved or authorized for Elk River. Only in that manner could we have speeded the day when atomic energy would be used commercially; only by authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with such projects could we have been certain that atomic power would be used in the commercial field.

As early as June 14, 1955, the Elk River Cooperative Association submitted a proposal. I broke the story to the Minnesota newspapers on June 25, 1955, and I also arranged with the AEC to have the Elk River Cooperative officials come to Washington to present their proposal.

On September 21, 1955, I arranged a second meeting in Washington for the Elk River officials to discuss with the Atomic Energy Commission and its technicians the possibility of developing such a project at Elk River.

On September 21, 1955, we experienced the disappointment of having the proposal rejected.

I felt that the Atomic Energy Commission should make a complete restudy of the Elk River plant. I explained to the Commission that the REA association managed that plant, and stated that Mr. Ed Wolters, of Elk River, was not only an excellent business manager of the plant, but also was an expert in the field of rural electrification. I wanted the Atomic Energy Commission to become acquainted with the facilities which existed in Minnesota. So I invited the Commission to come to Minnesota. I said that only in that manner could the Commission become acquainted with what our State had to offer. I said further that I could not conceive of a proposal which had more merit than the proposal which the Elk River plant had submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission, namely, to offer their facilities and also to offer the statewide REA association of farmers as a body or a nucleus through which they could work in the establishment of a pilot plant in the commercial field or for the commercial use of atomic energy.

Fortunately, we were able to impress the Atomic Energy Commission to such an extent that on October 18 and 19, 1955, technicians and administrative experts from the Atomic Energy Commission visited Minnesota. Comdr. Lewis H. Roddis, of the AEC, and his assistants visited the Elk River plant, where they met with the REA officials.

Then they came to my senatorial office in St. Paul, where we had a full session with the REA officials and the technicians and administrative experts of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The proposal which had been filed by the Elk River cooperative was reexamined by the Atomic Energy Commission.

I found it necessary to arrange for a conference in Washington on January 11, 1956, of representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and REA officials of Minnesota. The conference proved to be most profitable and fruitful. At that meeting we began negotiations with the Atomic Energy Commission, and the negotiations have been continued from day to day over the months, in an endeavor to have the Atomic Energy Commission officials make a complete study of the proposal made by the Elk River cooperative.

The receipt this afternoon of an official notice from the Atomic Energy Commission that the Commission has approved

the Elk River proposal makes this one of the most gratifying days of my service in the Senate.

If atomic energy will accomplish what we all hope and can expect of it, it will mean a source of power—cheap power—in the areas of the United States which are too far distant from either the natural gas fields or the coal fields or possible hydroelectric projects really to have a source of cheap power which could be used by heavy industries. Here is a new source of power which promises to make it possible for the central areas of the United States to have heavy industry and large industrial plant development.

I am absolutely confident that the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington will move quickly to approve the loan application for the Elk River power plant, so construction can move forward. This will require an estimated loan of $6 million. Two million nine hundred thousand dollars would be used for transmission lines and substations and planning facilities. Three million one hundred thousand dollars would be used for generating purposes.

Mr. President, there were those who did not believe this was going to become a reality. There were those who last fall had a tendency, more or less, to say, "It is only a political gesture. They keep saying we are going to get it, all for the purpose of trying to break into the news headlines."

Even when such attempts were made to minimize my efforts and endeavors, I never lost sight of what it would mean to commerce and the United States generally if a pilot plant could be developed for the purpose of investigating the generation of electricity by the use of atomic energy.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the official release by the United States Atomic Energy Commission which was made public today.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AEC AUTHORIZES NUCLEAR POWERPLANT NEGOTIATIONS WITH MINNESOTA AND MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Willard F. Libby, acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, today announced that the Commission has approved in principle, as a basis for negotiations, the nuclear powerplant proposals of the Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River, Minn., and the Wolverine Electric Cooperative of Big Rapids, Mich. The proposals were among seven made in response to the second invitation of the Commission under its power demonstration-reactor program, calling for development, design, construction, and operation of plants with capacities within the 5,000 to 40,000 kilowatt range.

The Commission action opens the way for negotiations which will determine the kind of assistance to be given the cooperatives and will establish the cost limits of this assistance. Contracts for the assistance will be contingent on approval of Rural Electrification Administration loans requested by the cooperatives.

In accepting the proposals as basis for negotiation the Commission determined that the types of plants contemplated are technically feasible, that they represent desirable extensions of development work now underway or planned, and would make important contributions to the power reactor art.

Both cooperatives proposed that the Commission finance and retain title to the reactor portion of the plant. The Rural Cooperative Power Association proposed a closed cycle boiling water reactor plant with an electrical capacity of 22,000 kilowatts. The cooperative would assume capital costs totaling $2,450,000, including the value of the site. The Commission is asked to contribute a maximum of $6,860,000 for the development, design, and construction of the reactor and postconstruction research and development work. The Commission is also asked to waive the use charge for the fissionable material which will fuel the reactor.

The Wolverine Electric Cooperative proposed an aqueous homogeneous reactor plant with an electrical capacity of 5,000 to 10,000 kilowatts. This group would assume capital costs totaling $1,088,000, including the value of the site. The Commission is requested to contribute a maximum of $3,788,000 for development, design, and construction of the reactor.

The five other proposals which were made in response to the Commission's invitation are still being evaluated by the Commission staff. They are:

1. Chugach Electric Association, Anchorage, Alaska, and Nuclear Development Corporation of America, White Plains, N. Y.: a sodium-cooled, heavy water moderated plant of 10,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

2. City of Holyoke Gas and Electric Department, Holyoke, Mass.: a gas-cooled reactor with closed-cycle gas turbine of 15,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

3. City of Orlando, Fla.: a liquid metal fuel reactor of 25,000 to 40,000 electrical kilowatts capacity;

4. City of Piqua, Ohio: an organic moderated reactor plant of 12,500 electrical kilowatts capacity;

5. University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.: a pressurized light water reactor plant of 2,000 electrical kilowatts capacity.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand some newspaper articles. I have one which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of October 20, 1955. The headline reads "THYE Vows To Help Elk River Get A-Plant."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, said Wednesday he is "confident and determined" that an atomic powerplant will be built at Elk River, Minn.

He used the word "determined," he emphasized, as a member of the United States Senate Appropriations Committee which has a great deal to say about funds for the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC).

THYE made the statement following a closed-door conference with top representatives and technicians of the AEC, and Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River and seven municipalities.

"Minnesota has iron ore and skilled workmen. It will have the St. Lawrence Seaway. But it is at a competitive disadvantage with States which have fast waters and coalfields for cheap power," THYE said.

"Maybe power generated by atomic energy is the answer. I shall never rest until we have solved the problems of putting this energy to commercial use.

"I am confident the Elk River plant will be a possibility in the very near future—say, 1½ years—and I am confident this will give us the energy to make industrial expansion possible in this State."

Four AEC representatives came out of the conference with a carefully worded statement which deplored the unfortunate impression that the first Elk River Co-op proposal had been rejected. This was incorrect, they said, and so was the inference from it that the whole project was dead.

They said the co-op, which serves a dozen Minnesota counties, had merely been asked to resubmit its proposal with minor modifications.

This would qualify it as a small-scale experimental nuclear powerplant for which an application deadline had been set by the AEC for February 1, 1956.

The four will take their recommendations—which they did not reveal—back to the AEC.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have another article from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Friday, September 16, 1955. The headline reads, "Strauss Asked To Visit State, Discuss Plant." The article was written by Charles Bailey. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), was invited to come to Minnesota Thursday after he sent Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, a letter listing reasons why the AEC might not approve an atomic-powered electric plant in the State.

THYE extended a telegraphic invitation to Strauss to come to Minnesota in October to visit the site of the proposed plant and discuss it with local groups.

Strauss pointed out two major questions which he said had to be answered before AEC could decide whether to provide funds for building a pilot atom generator for Elk River Rural Electric Cooperative.

"1. Is it in the national interest for the AEC to assume all the financial risk involved in building a reactor for the sole use of any single rural cooperative power association?

"Subsidiary to this question would be the further question that since available funds do not suffice for the construction of reactors for every municipality and cooperative desiring one, how can the Commission select one without discriminating against all the others?

"2. Could and should the criteria for loans by REA to rural electric cooperative associations be modified to permit REA to make loans for construction and operation of experimental atomic reactors * * *?"

Strauss said these questions "will be answered in due course."

Strauss offered to meet with some of the Elk River representatives who came to Washington earlier this year and met with AEC officials and the Minnesota congressional delegation.

THYE said he thought "we could not expect a more encouraging report at this time" from the AEC head.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the Minenapolis Tribune of October 13, 1955, there appeared an article the headline of which reads "AEC Official To Study Elk River As A-Plant Site." I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A top official of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) will visit Minnesota next

week to look into the possibility of an atomic powerplant at Elk River, Minn., Senator THYE, Republican, Minnesota, announced Wednesday.

Comdr. Louis Roddis, manager and acting director of the AEC's reaction division, will spend 2 days in the State.

Tuesday he will survey the Elk River cooperative facility and Wednesday he will confer in St. Paul with THYE and officials of the Elk River Rural Power Association.

"This latest development makes me extremely optimistic about the possibilities of establishing an atomic power pilot plant at Elk River," THYE said.

The site had been dropped from consideration as the first Rural Electrification Administration (REA) atomic pilot plant when it was found the REA could not legally assume the financial risk involved in the conversion to atomic energy.

THYE said the AEC has agreed to reconsider this action. He expressed hope the rural power agency would be willing to assume the risk.

The alternative to REA financing is private development, but THYE said he believes a cooperative should handle the program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, recently, on April 17, there appaeared in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune an article by Jack Wilson, Minneapolis Tribune staff correspondent, the heading of which reads "THYE Says AEC To Approve State A-Power Plant." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Senator THYE, Republican, Minnesota, said Monday he had been assured that the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) will approve construction of the Nation's first small atomic-power plant at Elk River, Minn.

The Rural Cooperative Power Association of Elk River has proposed building a 22,000-kilowatt station to be financed jointly by the co-op, the AEC and the Rural Electrification Administration (REA).

AEC's acceptance of the co-op's proposal is expected to be announced officially within 48 hours.

The REA loan for construction of the conventional generating facilities depends on AEC approval of the proposal for the nuclear reactor which would furnish steam for the plant.

The Elk River Co-op applied last summer for a $2,985,000 AEC advance to finance the atomic-steam section of the plant and $1,785,000 REA loan for the electric generating equipment.

Total cost of the plant was estimated then at about $5,410,000. That proposal was rejected by the AEC with a suggestion that it be revised and resubmitted.

The new proposal, filed in January, asks for about the same amounts but was modified in some technical details.

REA Administrator Ancher Nelsen said approval of the REA loan could be expected as soon as AEC accepts the Elk River plan.

Under the cooperative's proposal, it would operate the nuclear reactor and buy steam from it to run electric generators for a period of 5 years, after which the coop would negotiate with the AEC for purchase of the reactor.

Six other proposals for construction of similar small powereplants have been received by the AEC.

It is understood that only two, including the Elk River project, will be approved by the Commission.

One reason the AEC is reported to be favorable to the Elk River plant is that the project represents a new development in this field and would be the first of its type ever attempted.

This is one of the requirements set up by the Commission for the use of Federal funds in such projects—the development of general knoweldge in the field.

The Elk River co-op's proposal is based on the contention that power costs in the Elk River area are unusually high because of the cost of shipping fuel for conventional plants.

The atomic powerplant could produce electricity approximately as cheaply as it can be produced by conventional means and possibly more cheaply.

The engineers who designed the Elk River plant represent American Machine and Foundry Co.

THE AMERICAN BICYCLE INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, over a period of years I did some work in behalf of the bicycle industry, because of the large bicycle plants in my State. We did secure some relief through the escape clause in the Trade Agreements Act. In connection with what is happening in the industry today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report by the bicycle industry relating to bicycle imports and their volume.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BIKE INDUSTRY'S REPORT TO UNITED STATES CONGRESS

BIKE IMPORT PATTERN IS DISQUIETING

Seven months have passed since the President applied the "escape clause" and raised the bike tariff to protect the American bicycle industry. While domestic producers hesitate to assess the results with any degree of finality at this stage, foreign bike makers seem not to be as hesitant.

Admittedly, the continuing record flow of bicycle imports, despite the President's intention to diminish them, is disturbing. Equally disquieting is the emergence of other patterns, highlighted briefly below, which tend to thwart the relief that was supposed to have been granted the American Industry.

British imports sets new records

The Wall Street Journal in a special dispatch from Nottingham, England on March 21, 1956, flatly states that foreign-made bicycles are rolling into the United States at an accelerated rate, despite last year's tariff increase. As proof, it quotes the head of the British Cycle Manufacturers Union as follows:

"Hugh Palin, head of the British Cycle and Motor Cycle Manufacturers Union, has finished counting up 1955 exports and found that more British bicycles were shipped to the United States last year than ever before. This record was set despite the 50 percent boost in United States bike tariffs last August."

After reporting a gain of almost 20 percent in the number of British bikes shipped in January 1956, compared to the same month in 1955, the pattern of expansion was further confirmed by a spokesman for one of the "big four" British manufacturers. He said: "We are so well established that the increase in the American duty will not have an adverse effect on our sales."

Germany and France score new gains

The ability of foreign bike makers to hurdle the Government's decision to slowdown imports has not been limited to the British. After showing how other European countries increased their exports here, the Journal (March 21) said:

"You can get an idea of what's happening by glancing at figures from Germany. They are not complete for all of 1955, but in the three post-tariff-hike months of September, October, and November the producers of Germany sold 179,544 bicycles to the States, up more than 50 percent from the similar months of 1954."

Foreign plants boost profits and employment

In contrast to the plight of the American industry, foreign bike producers are enjoying ever increasing profits and expanded employment. The Journal article makes this clear:

"To handle heavy foreign demand—in large part from the United States—Raleigh is constructing a 20-acre plant expansion, costing $11.2 million."

The same article continues: "The prosperity of British bicycle makers, Raleigh's profits, for instance, jumped nearly half a million dollars in 1955 * * * should perhaps calm the excitement of Europeans who have been agitated by escape clause hikes in American tariffs."

Foreign makers copy new United States styles

Like President Eisenhower, the American bike makers hoped that the introduction of the new style middleweight bicycle might help us meet the price competition of imports. A story in the catalog of the Sixth International Toy Exhibit reports a leading German bike importer as saying:

"With the introduction in 1955 by American manufacturers of the new middleweight type of bicycle, a number of German manufacturers are already making plans to include this new model in their 1956 production. This new addition to the bicycle field has much to recommend it, including eye and sales appeal, lighter weight and ease in riding comfort. It is much more durable from a construction angle than the present lightweight model."

It is quite apparent that there is no salvation for the domestic bike industry in such ingenuity.

Unfair continental prices irk British

The March 21 Journal reports:

"The main British worry nowadays seems to be unfair competition in the American market from other European producers in Germany, France, Austria, Belgium and Holland. English companies claim their price is being undercut by 2 or 3 dollars."

What, it may now be asked, has happened to the oft-repeated propaganda line of the so-called irresistible appeal of British style and quality? Faced with lower priced competition in the United States (as American producers have been) the British admit that when the shoe is on the other foot it pinches.

The importance of price is borne out in the Journal article which quotes the buyer of a leading mail order house as admitting:

"His company is taking most of its imported bikes from the Continent (rather than Britain) because prices are 10 percent cheaper."

What is a 50-percent bike tariff increase?

At first glance a 50 percent tariff increase appears to be a substantial one. In the case of bicycles it is negligible because it only added 3¾ percent to the former 7½ percent duty on lightweight bikes. "This particular increase," said the Journal story, "raised the price of the typical British-made lightweight by only $1.25 to $1.50." The increase was even lower for other countries.

Foreign nations to get compensation

At the request of the British in accordance with the GATT program, our Government has instructed United States trade experts to work out compensatory concessions to foreign governments to offset the assumed hardships resulting from higher bike tariffs.

This is in shocking contrast to the British boast that they are currently selling more bikes in the United States than ever before—as is the case with Germany, France, Austria, and others.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the veto by President Eisenhower of the unpalatable agricultural bill—H. R. 12—once again demonstrates the quality of our national leader. The action once again reveals his political courage, his statesmanship, his continuing high resolve to do what is best for the whole country, for all of the people.

Thoughtful farmers, and all who value sound long-range planning over short-term expediency, will, I am sure, hail and approve his action.

In fact, approving statements are coming forth immediately, in quality and in quantity. Particularly I wish to point to two statements in the New York Times on the editorial page of Tuesday, April 17: First, the lead editorial, called No Retreat, and second, the Arthur Krock column on "the Factors in the Farm Bill Veto."

Mr. President, there is still time to get the soil-bank program through Congress before adjournment. There are other legislative steps we may yet take to tackle this program affirmatively.

Secretary Benson found the amended-to-death and unfortunate H. R. 12 a measure with which he could not effectively work. I am very glad to observe that once again the President has backed the Secretary of Agriculture to the hilt.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have previously referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 17, 1956]

NO RETREAT

President Eisenhower has accepted the challenge of those cynically minded leaders in Congress who had handed him what can only be described as a travesty on farm legislation, relying with serene confidence on the impudent assumption that no President in an election year would dare to withhold his signature from any bill that bore the label "farm relief," even though the label was counterfeit and the contents of the package a spurious and dangerous imitation of what they purported to be.

Yesterday Mr. Eisenhower brought the mounting speculation of the politicians and the public to an end by vetoing H. R. 12, designated as "The Agricultural Act of 1956." But this veto was neither a hasty action, an arbitrary one nor a negative one. Few persons, we think, will question the fact that, as the President declared in a compact, but devastatingly clear, message to Congress, justifying his action, that he was acting "only after thorough consideration" and "after searching my mind and conscience." Nowhere does Mr. Eisenhower's message reflect any tendency to minimize the economic difficulties of the farm population or to question the need of an accelerated and generous program of constructive aid. On the contrary, the President notes: "It is with intense disappointment and regret that I take this action. Our farm families are suffering reduced incomes. They had a right to expect workable and beneficial legislation to help solve their problems." And he leaves no doubt where responsibility lies for failure up to now to provide such legislation.

The heart of the farm problem, the President points out (as he has done time and again over the last 3 years), is "price-depressing surpluses." Any forward-looking sound program to meet the needs of the farm people "must remove the burden of these accumulations." But, he notes, H. R. 12 would not correct this situation. On the contrary, "It would encourage more surpluses. It would do harm to every agricultural region of the country and also to the interests of consumers. Thus it fails to meet the test of being good for farmers and fair to all our people."

The President's objections to H. R. 12 are best summarized in his observation that "to sign it would be to retreat, rather than advance toward a brighter future for the farm families."

But what is likely to impress most people reading the President's message is the fact that it isn't merely an exercise in dialectics, nor is it simply an effort to put the onus on Congress for not providing the aid to which the farmer is entitled. That, after all, would be of little comfort to the farmer.

The President is convinced that despite the long and unnecessary delay in framing this measure, and despite the fact that it is completely unacceptable as it stands, there is still much that can be done if Congress is prepared to cooperate with the Administration. He proposes that, acting under authority that it possesses under the legislation of 1954, the Administration undertake a three-part program for temporarily alleviating the farmer's plight by voluntary increases in the support levels for crops and dairy products. He calls upon Congress, for its part, to "pass a straight soil bank bill as quickly as possible." He concludes:

"It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound soil bank act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task. The combined program of administrative action and legislative enactment will begin now to improve the income and welfare of all our farm families. Here is a challenge for both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

[From the New York Times of April 17, 1956]

IN THE NATION

(By Arthur Krock)

THE FACTORS IN THE FARM BILL VETO

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Suppose the President had signed the farm bill, as a number of Republicans in the farm States, including governors, and most Democrats, urged him to do:

He would have sacrificed to a cynical concept of political expediency an economic principle he repeatedly said was basic to the first steps toward improvement of the income of agriculture and to its ultimate stability on a prosperity level.

He would have discredited his Secretary of Agriculture, whose unwavering opposition to the continuation of rigid price supports the President steadfastly encouraged and emulated. If Secretary Benson had not resigned, he would have been set down as a man whose desire to stay in office rose above his deep conviction of what the fundamental public contribution of that office should be.

The President would, by signing the bill, have also rejected the views of another counselor on whose judgment in agriculture he greatly relies and with whom he has the closest personal bond: his younger brother, Milton Eisenhower.

In the ranks of the repudiated would also have been (a) the administration spokesmen in Congress, who warned their colleagues of a veto if the conference form of the bill was passed; and (b) the Members of Congress who voted against the legislation as an expression of confidence in the administration's farm policy, some at great political risk.

These are among the calculable debits the President would have contracted by signing the conference report. And to them would have been added a debit as much greater than the sum of them all as it is incalculable. This would have been the inevitable and sharp downward revision of an overwhelming public impression the President has created—that he lives by a set of principles, personal and political. By signing the bill he would have compromised both, and in a sector where they are mutually inclusive.

What many politicians urged the President to do, and Senator KEFAUVER confidently predicted he would do, was to sign legislation that further embedded in the farm economy the component which, above all others, he charged with responsibility for the depressed state of that economy. "It only extends rigid 90 percent parity for another year," was again the argument which, accepted annually by the President's predecessors, has piled higher and higher the agricultural surpluses that are largely responsible for the steady slump in farm income while the income of nearly all other groups has constantly been rising.

THE LOST MAGIC

On this argument Congress from year to year has deferred the institution of the flexible price support system it legislated some time ago. And on this argument the economic condition that is frightening the officeholders in the farming areas has been more and more deeply entrenched by those same politicians. Though what the President referred to in his veto message as "the insatiable markets associated with war" shrank with the shrinking postwar demand, the 90 percent price system was constantly extended in changing circumstances where it lost whatever magic it may have had. This was demonstrated when, in every year but one between 1947 and 1954, farm income declined despite the Congressional mandate for 90 percent parity.

In standing by his principle the President, however, recognized and served certain economic considerations with which political factors are plainly linked. By setting price supports on five basic crops at 82½ percent of parity he fixed national averages for a number of farm products that would also have resulted from the bill he vetoed. This undoubtedly will be as welcome politically to the beleaguered farm-belt Republicans as it will be economically to their constituents. The Democrats, and those Republicans who supported the bill the President vetoed, can claim credit for this move by the Administration, contending that the passage of the farm bill forced the President to fix these averages. But the hand that feeds will be the President's. And it was evident today that this thought greatly comforted the Republican Governors who went to the White House to advocate signing and left with the news of the new levels.

The economic interest of farmers in the United States is not the same in all areas. What helps one group does not help all. Moreover, despite the drive in Congress to pass the bill the President vetoed, and the activity of some farmers' organizations in its behalf, other organizations as actively opposed it. A large body of political, economic, consumer, and agricultural opinion stands with the President against those aspects of the bill that evoked his veto. It was not a case of General Eisenhower and Secretary Benson alone on the burning deck.

Congress may decline to rescue the soil bank from the veto, as the President requested in his message today, but that request, plus the new minimum support levels he fixed, puts him on the affirmative and Congress on the negative side of the equation. And on the moral test of standing by a principle he has all the best of it.

FISCAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, one of the surest signs of an election year is the lush growth of wild charges that spring up like rank weeds in the field of politics. This is one crop that needs no encouragement of price supports or foreign aid. It is distinctly a domestic crop of the "fibbus politicandidatus," a quadrennial variety of shrinking violets.

The crop grows like skunk cabbage in spring, and dies away just as quickly when the spring peepers have had their short day in the sun.

These political weeds take the form of flagrant personal attacks on a good President, whose statesmanship and integrity is the envy of his political enemies. They also take the form of vicious distortions of the good record of the Republican administration.

Certain members of the party which has burdened our people with deficits in 17 out of their 20 years in office are now trying to rewrite the record in such a way as to turn public censure on the Eisenhower administration. They are trying to mislead the people into the false belief that ours is the party of spendthrift and deficit.

Here is what one of the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination had to say on the subject of Fiscal Integrity, which he called an advertising slogan:

> Which arrested inflation most—the Truman administration which reduced the national debt $12 billion in 6 years, or the Eisenhower administration which has increased it $12 billion in 3 years?

That statement was made by Candidate Stevenson at Kennewick, Wash., as reported in the New York Times of February 16, 1956.

A man who can make a statement like that is either ignorant of plain facts, readily available in Government reports, or he is deliberately misrepresenting the facts. Fortunately, this is one rank weed in the political garden easy to spot and easy to eradicate with simple truth as a weed killer.

Harry Truman has been making the same false statement as he goes about the country trying to cover his tattered political record with a new Sunday suit. "Give-em Hell Harry" is counting on the people either to have short memories or to lap up political elixir from the same old sideshow faker.

What are the facts and what is the truth?

Let us first look at the presidential budgets, because this is a direct test of presidential intentions. Then we shall look at the exact results of Government finances.

THE DEMOCRAT SPENDING RECORD

Mr. President, Mr. Truman was President from April 12, 1945, to January 20, 1953. In that time he presented eight budgets to Congress, as follows:

Year	For fiscal year	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)
		Billions
1946 (January)	1946–47	−$4.3
1947	1947–48	+.2
1948	1948–49	+4.8
1949	1949–50	−.873
1950	1950–51	−5.1
1951	1951–52	−16.5
1952	1952–53	−14.4
1953	1953–54	−9.9

With the exception of 2 years, Mr. Truman's plans for Government finances ended in deficits. The 2 years in which surpluses occurred were the years of the Republican 80th Congress, noted for its demand for economy.

Even though he had from Democratic Congresses three tax increases totaling $16 billion in a year and one-half, Truman could not come anywhere near to making income cover outgo.

What were the actual results of Truman's 6 years, as written in the official record of the Treasury? Let us be charitable and exclude the $20 billion deficit of 1946, which cannot be fairly charged to Mr. Truman, since it was a legacy of World War II financing. After excluding that item, here are the actual deficits and surpluses—stated in billions of dollars—during his administration:

Fiscal year ending—	Deficit	Surplus
1947		[1] 0.754
1948		[1] 8.419
1949	1.811	
1950	3.122	
1951		3.150
1952	4.017	
1953	9.449	
Totals	18.399	12.683
Net deficit	5.716	

[1] Republicans were in control of Congress during these 2 years (the Republican 80th Cong.); all other years were Democratic Congresses.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States 1955, p. 348.

If we look at this table, we can readily see where Truman and Stevenson get their claims of a $12 billion surplus. Both focus on the surplus column, and conviently ignore the $18.4 billion deficit. Subtracting the surplus from the deficit—as every schoolchild learns to do—we have a net deficit of $5.716 billions for the years of the Truman administration.

Before we leave that revealing table, suppose we ask one more question. Where did that $12 billion surplus come from?

Here, again, the answer is plain. Some $9 billion of that surplus came in the 2 years of the 80th Republican Congress which climaxed the vigorous Republican fight for economy in government. We waged this fight ever since the party of "spend and elect" had taken office. Incidentally, it was the same 80th Congress that gave the American people a tax reduction over Truman's veto.

DEEPER IN DEBT WITH DEMOCRATS

Mr. President, how did the Truman deficit record show up in the national debt? Let us turn again to official reports of the Treasury. The following figures are stated in billions of dollars:

Fiscal year:	*Public debt*
1945–46	$269.4
1946–47 (Truman's first full year and Republican 80th Congress in action in the latter half)	258.2
1947–48	252.2
1948–49 (Truman and Democrats in control of Congress in 1949)	252.7
1949–50 Democrats in control	257.3
1950–51 Democrats in control	255.2
1951–52 Democrats in control	259.1
1952–53 the last Democrat fiscal year	266.0

From this table it may be seen at a glance that it was the Republican 80th Congress, with its insistence on Government economy, that enabled Truman to make some reduction in public debt. It came about through rescission of war contracts and other economies directed by the Republican Congress. The drop in the public debt continued as long as a Republican Congress had some influence on the public purse strings.

But once a Democratic Congress got back into the saddle, in 1949, the public debt began to mount again, as it had every year for the 16 years of the Roosevelt administration. When President Eisenhower came into office in 1953, he inherited an insolvent Treasury and a mountain of public debt.

The 1953 budget deficit over which President Eisenhower had no control was $9.4 billion. The public debt stood at $266.1 billion. And the Treasury was faced with $81 billion in Government promises to pay for goods contracted for under the Truman administration. Three-fourths of the public debt at the time of the changeover from the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration came due within 5 years. All these items were delayed-action financial bombs bequeathed by the Truman administration to the Eisenhower administration.

REPUBLICANS MOVE TOWARD A BALANCED BUDGET

One of the issues on which President Eisenhower and Republicans waged the 1952 campaign was the promise to cut Government spending and the pledge to move toward a balanced budget. What effort have we made to redeem these pledges? Let us again turn to official sources—and I now refer to the budget report for the fiscal year 1957:

[Billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt
1953 (last Truman year)	−9.4	266.1
1954 (first Eisenhower year)	−3.1	271.3
1955	−4.2	274.4
1956 (estimated)	+.2	274.3
1957 (estimated)	+.4	273.8

There are several things to observe about this table.

First, even though the Eisenhower administration inherited $81 billion of the Truman administration's unpaid debts, the Republican administration cut Mr. Truman's estimated deficit for 1954 from $9.9 billion down to $3.1 billion.

Second, in 1954, the Republican administration gave the American people a $7.4 billion tax reduction, the largest

in the Nation's history. Sixty-two cents of every dollar in the tax cuts went to individuals—almost 25 cents to taxpayers with incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

Third, it can be seen that the Republican administration has actually kept below the old debt ceiling of $275 billion, although it had been given authority to go up to $281 billion.

Fourth, it can also be seen that the Republican administration will actually balance the budget at the close of the 1956 fiscal year.

After a quarter of a century of Government deficits and constantly rising public debt—mostly under Democratic administrations—the country can at last look forward to balancing income with outgo.

Few people realize how inflation robs the average family. A recent survey made by the National Committee on Monetary Policy, a private organization of economists and financial researchers, shows that, because of inflation, between 1938 and 1952, Americans lost $158 billion in purchasing power. The organization found that at the end of 1952, the dollar was worth 52.4 cents, based on the 1938 yardstick. The resulting losses in purchasing power included $97 billion lost by holders of life-insurance policies, $31 billion lost by holders of bank deposits, $21.5 billion lost by owners of Government savings bonds, and $8.5 billion lost in other channels.

A balanced budget, an economical Government, and a stable but balanced rise in the economy, such as have now been achieved by the Eisenhower administration, means that those tragic losses to our people will be stopped. The fall in the value of the dollar has already stopped. Every indication points to some recovery of the value previously lost. This means that the farmers' dollar and the workers' dollar will bring home more in the market basket and more of the other good things of life. Sound finance, coupled with prosperity, means that there will be more dollars for everyone and that each dollar will buy more.

REPUBLICANS PRACTICE ECONOMY

Mr. President, let me say a few words about how the Eisenhower administration accomplished this healthy improvement in Government finances and economy.

Compared with the last year of the Truman budget operations—1953—the Republicans reduced actual spending by $6.5 billion in the first full year—1954—of Republican control, by almost $10 billion in 1955, and by almost $11 billion—estimated—in 1956.

The Republicans reduced requests for new spending authority from $72.2 billion in the last Truman budget—1954—to $58.6 billion in the 1956 Eisenhower budget.

Every department of Government was instructed by President Eisenhower to comb its budget in the search for savings. Waste and inefficiency were eliminated wherever found. Thousands of detailed examples of these savings can be found in departmental reports. Hoover Commission recommendations were adopted wherever that was administratively possible. Government agencies disposed of commercial-type plants and operations, ending the competition of Government with its own citizens. Tax loopholes were closed. By eliminating waste and extravagance, the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress teamed together to save the taxpayers more than $16 billion.

In looking over the full 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz declared:

> During the first 3 years of the present administration, the Government will spend $36 billion less than it would have, had the spending policies of the preceding administration been continued. That represents a saving of nearly $1,000 for every farm and city family of 4 in the United States.

At the same time, not a single element of security in national defense or social welfare of our people has been sacrificed.

Mr. President, this is exactly what President Eisenhower meant by a program which is liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals.

Here is a record of economy to cite everywhere with pride. It meets the Democrats' wild charges—the rank weeds raised in the Democratic political hothouse—with the cool, refreshing facts of official reports. It shows that a Republican President abides by his promises and keeps his pledges. It shows that waste and extravagant spending of other people's money can be stopped if there is the will to do it. It shows that prosperity need not depend upon Government handouts or war. It reaffirms our hope that there can be such a thing as good government.

IS FOREIGN AID UNCONSTITUTIONAL?

Another rank weed in the current political crop is the wild charge that the President and Congress are violating the Constitution by enacting the so-called foreign-aid programs. A charge like this is 100 percent pure nonsense, Mr. President. People who make such a charge know next to nothing about the Constitution.

THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT A SEARS, ROEBUCK CATALOG OF DETAILED ITEMS

These people thumb the Constitution the way they flip the pages of a Sears, Roebuck catalog. If they do not see a precise listing of grass skirts in the Sears, Roebuck catalog, then they are sure the mail-order house cannot sell a grass skirt.

In the same way, they expect the Constitution to offer a specific listing for every item dealing with national affairs. If in the Constitution they do not see a statement that "Congress shall have power to provide economic aid to Japan" or "military aid to Turkey," they rush to the conclusion that the President and Congress have no power to do those things. If the aid is given, then Congress, they conclude, is acting unconstitutionally.

REAL DESIGN OF THE CONSTITUTION: BROAD POWERS AND PRINCIPLES

Mr. President, the Founding Fathers did better by the Constitution than such people appreciate. The Founding Fathers were well aware that times and circumstances change. They knew that if they laid down a broad charter of government, setting forth the principles to govern a free people, they could safely entrust the day-to-day interpretation of powers to a Congress and a President freely elected by the people.

They looked upon the Constitution as a living document with principles broad enough to enable each generation to meet the circumstances and needs of that generation. How well they wrought is proved by the flexibility of the Constitution in meeting a constantly changing America for more than 160 years. Few democracies in world history have so successfully met the challenge of time.

If the designers of the Constitution had been so unwise as to spell out each right and power in detail, the Constitution would have burst its seams and left our people in chaos with no compass points of government to guide us at all.

People honestly may differ about the wisdom of a foreign aid program, economic or military. Logic and reason may make a plausible case either way—for or against foreign aid as a matter of national policy. I do not question the sincerity of those who incline either way.

But it is sheer ignorance of the law to say that Congress and the President have violated the Constitution by adopting such a program.

BASIS FOR THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FOREIGN AID

The Constitution specifically grants exclusive power to Congress and the President to act in national affairs. This is the prime purpose of the Constitution—to unify the Nation and give it a single voice in matters affecting the Nation as a whole.

The legal case for the constitutionality of foreign-aid programs is unassailable.

By article I, section 1, all legislative powers are vested in the Congress of the United States. More specifically, in section 8 it is provided:

Clause 1:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States (including income taxes by the 16th amendment).

Clause 3:

> To regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Clause 10:

> To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations.

Clause 11:

> To make war.

Clause 14:

> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Clause 18:

> To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

These powers cover both economic and military aid to foreign nations. They vest exclusively in the Congress in order that the United States may speak and act with a single voice in matters touching the defense of our country, the governance of our military, and in dealing with foreign nations. The individual States of the Union are expressly forbidden to deal with such matters.

CONGRESS HAS POWER TO DISPOSE OF UNITED STATES PROPERTY

The Constitution then takes one step further in defining the powers of Congress. In article IV, section 3, it declares:

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belong to the United States.

POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

Turning now to the Presidency, the Constitution vests the Executive power in the President of the United States. It makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

I gives him the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers, and to make treaties which the Constitution expressly declares shall be the supreme law of the land. All laws enacted by Congress must have the concurrence of both Houses and approval by the President.

FOREIGN-AID PROGRAMS FOLLOW CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Our foreign-aid programs rest upon the solid foundation of treaties and laws enacted by Congress, both of which when properly executed are the law of the land. All our treaties with our Western allies and with those in Asia providing for mutual aid and defense have been made within these provisions of the Constitution. All laws authorizing foreign aid and appropriating funds for that purpose have scrupulously followed the constitutional requirements.

FINDINGS IN THE LEND-LEASE ACT

One of the most extensive programs for foreign aid was the Lend-Lease Act of 1941. It is significant that Congress expressly entitled it "An act to promote the defense of the United States" and the law was used for that purpose. By that law the President was empowered to authorize the manufacture, sale, transfer, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of "any defense article for the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States." And the term "defense article" was given the broadest possible interpretation—55 Statute 31.

Do our critics today hold this law to be unconstitutional? Had they done so back in 1941, these critics would not be here today and free to voice their criticisms.

FINDINGS IN THE MARSHALL PLAN

Few people will deny that amid the chaos and devastation of a war-torn Europe, the people there would have turned to another form of totalitarian tyranny—communism—if they received no help in reestablishing their lives and economic enterprise. Had they been abandoned to this fate, the Iron Curtain would have stretched from the Bering Sea to the European shores of the Atlantic Ocean.

How long, then, could the United States have remained an island of freedom in a totalitarian, Communist world?

It was therefore in the highest interest of the defense and welfare of the United States for us to come to the aid of our European friends and allies. And we did come to their aid with a program that has won the admiration of the free world. This was the Marshall plan which did much for the security of the United States.

In the statement of policy contained in that legislation, the Congress declared:

Recognizing the intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe, and recognizing that disruption following in the wake of war is not contained by national frontiers, the Congress finds that the existing situation in Europe endangers the establishment of a lasting peace, the general welfare and national interest of the United States—62 Statute 137.

Subsequent foreign-aid programs rest upon full knowledge of the worldwide nature of the Communist conspiracy and the great need of the United States to lead and help in preventing the red tide from engulfing the free world.

We cannot exist smug, complacent, and free, if the world around us sinks into communism out of frustration and despair. To prevent this, we have been acting both individually and in concert with other nations of the United Nations and thus far we have been successful in checking the spread of communism by aggression.

No one, of course, can prevent the people of a foreign nation from accepting Communist enslavement if that is their wish, but we can point out the superior values of freedom and we can help such nations to attain and preserve freedom if they desire to do so. That is what our foreign-aid programs aim to do. Our efforts are just as much for the security, freedom, and national interest of the United States as they may be to aid our friends abroad.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I wish to call attention to a memorandum prepared by the legal section of the Library of Congress and submitted to me. I quote from page 2 of that memorandum:

Accordingly, the validity of an expenditure of public moneys derived from tax receipts will depend largely upon whether the expenditures in fact will advance the national welfare or contribute effectively to the national defense. The determination of the latter questions, as the Supreme Court has acknowledged, rests almost entirely with Congress; and unless the decision of Congress is clearly wrong or involves a display of arbitrary power rather than an exercise of judgment, judicial condemnation thereof is not likely to occur. As a practical matter, moreover, the courts, on grounds of lack of substantial interest on the part of the individual taxpayer, have made it almost impossible for the latter to obtain a judicial review of the constitutionality of a specific expenditure of public funds; and as a consequence, Congress, from the very beginning of the Federal Union, has been virtually unobstructed, legally speaking, in its spending ostensibly to promote the general welfare. Thus, grants for the relief of human suffering, the validity of which has been challenged on the ground that no noticeable improvement of the general welfare can be effected thereby, have been made at intervals since 1794, when relief was voted for the refugees of Santo Domingo (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*).

Mr. President, the entire memorandum is of great interest, and I am sure it will be helpful to a general understanding of this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the entire memorandum be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S SCRUPULOUS CONCERN FOR CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Mr. WATKINS. The charge of unconstitutionality in foreign operations falls flat when we consider how seriously and scrupulously President Eisenhower has regarded the mandates of the Constitution. It is absolutely inconceivable that he would commit the country to any foreign transaction, much less a foreign war, without taking full council with Congress and the country.

Under President Eisenhower there will not be such actions as will be remembered of a former President who "by his own unaided, unheralded act in affecting the 'Fifty-Destroyer Deal' converted, as it were at a blast of the trumpet, the international status of the United States as a neutral to that of a quasi-belligerent in the war then raging in Europe"—Edward S. Corwin, the President: Office and Powers, New York, New York University Press, third revised edition, page 246.

President Eisenhower has shown his reverence for the Constitution on several recent occasions. Barely 2 weeks ago, the President was asked at his press conference—April 15—if he would order our marines in the Mediterranean to war "without asking the Congress first?"

I have announced time and time and time again—

President Eisenhower replied—

I will never be guilty of any kind of action that can be interpreted as war until the Congress, which has the constitutional authority, say so.

Again, on April 12 when the crisis in the Middle East became serious, the President and Secretary Dulles issued a statement that the United States will not shrink its responsibilities under its United Nations commitments. But in the very next accompanying paragraph, they declared they would act "within constitutional means."

The President's fidelity to the Constitution is not a matter of words. He practices what he preaches which is the best proof of integrity. In January 1955, when a real crisis had arisen concerning Formosa, President Eisenhower laid the facts before Congress asking authority to use troops if necessary in the interests of peace and for the security of the United States. Congress readily granted the

authority requested because it recognized the sincerity of the President and the nonpartisan nature of his request.

Commenting on this January 25, the New York Times observed that short of a declaration of war, the special message was undoubtedly one of the most important any President has ever sent to Congress.

His action was important for three good reasons. He united the country. He united Congress. And he served notice on the Red enemy that America was united and determined to stop aggression and preserve peace. The threatened invasion of Formosa never took place and peace was preserved.

One other reason accounting for the unusual character of the message lies in the scrupulous regard the President showed for the provisions of the Constitution and for the prerogatives of Congress as representatives of the people. By no act of his alone did he intend to take this country into operations likely to mean war.

When another crisis threatened in Indochina, President Eisenhower refused to be drawn into warlike operations there.

His careful regard for the Constitution contrasts sharply with the conduct of a former President who engaged American forces in the Korean war in 1950 without asking specific approval of Congress. It contrasts also with the acts of another President in our history who maneuvered the country into warlike actions in complete disregard of the sole right of Congress to declare war.

President Eisenhower's action in the Formosa case will stand as one of the great landmarks in history because it proves conclusively that a President can act constitutionally if he respects that great charter of government.

To say that President Eisenhower and Congress have acted unconstitutionally in foreign aid or in any matter, domestic or foreign, over the last 3 years is to be grossly ignorant of history and lacking in plain reason and logic.

President Eisenhower takes very seriously his solemn oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. He has honored that oath time and time again in the last 3 years when others would have had him act without authority. This is one of the chief reasons for the people's confidence in his honesty and integrity.

He has scrupulously refrained from infringing upon the sphere of Congress in many matters of domestic legislation. He has respected the independence and prerogatives of the Supreme Court.

Where other Presidents before him engaged in open war with Congress and even tried to pack the Supreme Court as did President Roosevelt when he disliked its decisions, President Eisenhower respected the rights of each branch of government exactly as the framers of the Constitution intended. So long as we have a man like that in office, with a strong and responsible political party to back him up, our democracy and the freedoms of our people will be secure.

EXHIBIT 1

VALIDITY OF FEDERAL TAXATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FOREIGN COUNTRY

The provisions of the Constitution that can be invoked to sustain the validity of the expenditure of Federal tax revenues for the benefit of a foreign government are:

1. Article I, section 8, clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes, duties, imports, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

2. Article I, section 8, clause 3: "The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

3. Article I, section 8, clause 17: (The Congress shall have power) "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

4. Article II, section 2, clause 2: (The President) "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Although a determination to raise public moneys through the levy of Federal taxes obviously is governed, if not actually preceeded, by decisions as to the purposes for which the moneys thus collected are to be spent, the exercises of the power to tax and the power to spend, generally, are distinguishable as the utilization of two separate grants of authority. As long as the proceeds from the levy of any specific tax are not segregated and employed exclusively to finance any particular activity of the Federal Government, the validity of any Federal tax will not be impaired by the character of any particular one of the purposes for which Federal tax revenues in the aggregate are to be spent. In short, as long as Congress has the power to impose a given tax, the constitutionality of that tax or its collection will not be jeopardized by the fact that a controversy subsequently arises as to the authority of the National Government to spend Federal funds in support of a debatable purpose (*Halvering* v. *Davis* (1937) 301 U. S. 619).

Accordingly, the validity of an expenditure of public moneys derived from tax receipts will depend largely upon whether the expenditure in fact will advance the national welfare or contribute effectively to the national defense. The determination of the latter questions, as the Supreme Court has acknowledged, rests almost entirely with Congress; and unless the decision of Congress is clearly wrong or involves a display of arbitrary power rather than an exercise of judgment, judicial condemnation thereof is not likely to occur. As a practical matter, moreover, the courts, on grounds of lack of substantial interest on the part of the individual taxpayer, have made it almost impossible for the latter to obtain a judicial review of the constitutionality of a specific expenditure of public funds; and as a consequence, Congress, from the very beginning of the Federal Union, has been virtually unobstructed, legally speaking, in its spending ostensibly to promote the general welfare. Thus, grants for the relief of human suffering, the validity of which has been challenged on the ground that no noticeable improvement of the general welfare can be effected thereby, have been made at intervals since 1794, when relief was voted for the refugees of Santo Domingo (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (1923) 262 U. S. 447).

Similarly, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations has been construed to embrace the power to promote such commerce; that is, to increase the volume of trade in both directions between the United States and foreign nations. Consequently, if there is a reasonable basis in fact for the conclusion by Congress that financial aid to a foreign nation ultimately will be productive of mutually expanded trade between the two countries, a justification would exist sufficient to sustain the proposed assistance as a valid exercise of this power. Moreover, there can be no doubt that Congress is competent, under the necessary and proper clause (art. I, sec. 18, clause 17), to appropriate moneys to carry into effect otherwise permissible measures designed to extend our foreign trade.

Finally, mention should be made of the treatymaking power. Deducible in part from this grant of authority is the power of the United States, as a sovereign nation, to conduct foreign relations, and in conjunction therewith to formulate and apply foreign policies. To carry out foreign commercial and defensive policy, the United States is competent to effect agreements with specific nations, in the form of treaties, by the terms of which it agrees to extend financial aid to the other signatory powers. In the absence of any explicit limitations on the treatymaking power, it cannot be contended that an agreement to extend financial assistance is not, by international usage, an appropriate subject of treaty negotiations, and as a consequence, Congress clearly is empowered, under the necessary and proper clause, to appropriate the sums required to carry such an agreement into effect.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

PATENT OFFICE

Arthur Wilbur Crocker, of Maryland, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

FOR APPOINTMENT, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

John E. Munzer	George F. Mallison
Richard Moore	John L. S. Hickey
Eugene J. Nesselson	Thad Patrick

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John E. McLean	Ernest D. Harward, Jr
Herbert A. Bevis	Charles A. Froman, Jr.
Richard D. Vaughan	Jack F. Neal

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Charles S. Oulman	Robert J. Kleffmann
Harry C. Vollrath III	Joseph L. Gerit
Joseph H. Norman, Jr.	Jack L. Witherow
Morton D. Sinkoff	John C. McMahon
Jules B. Cohen	Lynn D. Wilder
James G. Gardner	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Very Reverend Harold W. Rigney, rector, Fu Jen Catholic University, Peking, China, offered the following prayer:

We beg of Thee, Almighty God, to bless the Members of this august body, and to enlighten and guide them in their deliberations and decisions so that they may continue to preserve and safeguard our American way of life, which recognizes Thee, O Lord God, for which we sincerely thank Thee.

We also implore Thee, Almighty God, to comfort our fellow Americans, who are suffering unjustly in the cruel prisons of Communist China, and we beseech Thee to hasten the day of their deliverance so that they again may worship Thee in freedom, and enjoy the blessings of this great land through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2091. An act authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement, and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.;

S. 2092. An act transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal;

S. 2424. An act to provide that lock and dam numbered 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam;

S. 2712. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.;

S. 2854. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended;

S. 2855. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Housing to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for housing to provide shelter for disaster victims, and for other purposes;

S. 2859. An act to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes;

S. 3272. An act to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1287) entitled "An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES, as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Arrangements for the Inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 21, 1957, authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 of the 84th Congress.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1955—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, *April 19, 1956.*

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE BLIND: BAND CONCERT ON CAPITOL STEPS BY BLIND ORCHESTRA

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, over the years Congress has demonstrated a sympathetic interest in vocational-rehabilitation problems for the blind. I believe, therefore, the Members who may have an opportunity to do so will be interested in a rather unusual band concert upon the steps of the United States Capitol about 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, when 45 members of a band from the Tennessee School of the Blind, located in my own district, under the direction of a blind director, will give a concert on the steps of the Capitol at that time. I am sure if you have no other appointment you will be inspired by the performance of this very fine musical group under the direction of a very sensitive and capable director.

LEO R. SACK

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, to many of whom he was well known, will be grieved, I am sure, to learn of the passing of Leo R. Sack, a native son of my district in Mississippi.

Mr. Sack's distinguished career as a journalist, a soldier of World War I, and an American diplomat carried him far and wide across the country and to many parts of the world.

He was perhaps best known to his friends in Washington as a member for many years of the Capitol Press Galleries, where he represented the Scripps-Howard newspapers, and later as a public-relations consultant.

After attending the University of Missouri School of Journalism, of which he was one of the student founders, he worked on newspapers in Springfield, Mo., and San Antonio, Tex., before coming to Washington for Scripps-Howard newspapers, from 1919 to 1933.

In the latter year he was appointed by President Roosevelt as United States Minister to Costa Rica, with which country he successfully negotiated our 1936 trade agreement.

Meantime, he played a part in the 1936 presidential campaign as special assistant to James A. Farley, then Democratic national chairman.

Mr. Sack was a veteran of World War I, serving in France in the pioneer Army Air Corps of that conflict, and emerged with the rank of major. He was appointed an honorary colonel on the staff of the Governor of Mississippi. He was a member of the National Press Club here and of the Overseas Writers in New York.

Retiring about 5 years ago because of his health, Mr. Sack moved to Los Angeles, where he is survived by his wife, Regina Rogers Sack; a daughter, Mrs. Sarita Jones; and four grandchildren. To them I extend my sympathy and condolences.

CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was very good news to those of us de-

termined that this Congress must vote on a civil-rights program that the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee has reported a civil-rights program back to the full committee for action. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE], the chairman of the subcommittee, and its members have done their country a splendid service. It is now up to the full committee to complete the job.

The dominant fact of our American life is the importance of the individual person. From the beginning of our Nation, we have striven to give to every human being an essential dignity and integrity which must be respected and safeguarded. The welfare of the individual must be the final goal of group life.

History has taught me that for man to be secure in the rights he wishes for himself, he must be willing to respect the rights of other men. I believe that this is the conscious recognition of the basic moral principle that all men are created equal as well as free. Flowing from this principle is the obligation to build social institutions that will guarantee equality of opportunity to all men. Without this equality, freedom becomes a mockery.

Freedom can only exist where each citizen, no matter what his color, is assured that his person is secure against lawless violence, economic intimidation, and arbitrary arrest and punishment. To be free, men must be subject to discipline by society only for violations of law clearly defined and only after trial by due process of law. Where the administration of justice is discriminatory, no man can be sure of security. History has taught us that where the threat of violence by private persons or mobs exist, the freedom of activity and security of the person is absent. Where a society permits private and arbitrary violence to be done to its members, no matter what their color or station of life, its own integrity is inevitably corrupted. We cannot permit human beings to be imprisoned or killed in the absence of due process of law, no matter in what section of our country they reside, without degrading our whole society.

Today, freedom from fear, and the democratic institution which sustains it, are again under attack. In some places, local enforcement of law and order has broken down, and individuals have been killed, maimed, or intimidated.

Freedom from fear is the handmaiden to equality of opportunity. Without freedom from fear, equality of opportunity can never be realized. We have been blessed in America; freedom from fear has been more fully realized in our country than in any other land. Yet, some groups in our population are not equally free from fear, nor do they enjoy equality of opportunity.

The preservation of civil rights is the prime duty of every government, whether it be Federal, State, or local. Wherever law-enforcement measures and the authority of Federal, State, or local governments are inadequate to discharge this primary function of government, these measures and this authority should be strengthened and improved. The constitutional guaranties of equal protection under the laws clearly place on the Federal Government the duty to act when State or local authorities abridge or fail to protect these constitutional rights.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who believe in giving the normal procedures of the House full respect and effect have waited patiently and respectfully. We know the many problems involved in such legislation. But time is running out and it is for just such emergencies and unusual situations that the House rules provided for discharge petitions and a discharge calendar. The latter can only be considered on the second and fourth Mondays of the month, except during the last 6 days of the session. Realistically then, only May and June remain for such action. I am sure that the Members of the House will realize that, if a vote is to be assured on a civil-rights program, all committee action, including the Rules Committee, must be concluded shortly.

The protection of civil rights is a national problem which affects everyone. We need to guarantee the same rights to every person, regardless of who he is, where he lives, or what his racial, religious, or national origin is. That is the obligation of our Government. The Congress must vote on civil rights.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, civil defense is the greatest challenge and the greatest failure in our national effort today.

In an attempt to start a constructive move toward a more effective and realistic civil defense program, I am introducing a concurrent resolution to set up a Joint Committee on Civil Defense. The purpose of this committee is to give nonmilitary defense the continuing and constant attention of the Congress that it so urgently requires.

Mr. Speaker, as I traveled from Toledo to Washington recently, I noticed some 57 large, green and white signs informing me that in case of enemy attack the road on which I was traveling would be closed. I wonder if this road will be closed, Mr. Speaker; and, if so, whether the decision to close it will be an intelligent one. These signs are a further means of confusing the public. It gives them the impression that our civil-defense efforts are completely apart from them as individuals. They are not to use this road. What are they to do? No one has told them. This certainly does not inspire the self-help philosophy upon which our civil defense is supposedly based.

A revealing article appeared in the Washington Post on February 21 underlining the confusion concerning these signs that harks back to the total lack of coordination and adequate control over the civil defense program. The article said that new signs will soon be added to the old ones stating "This is a civil defense escape route." Apparently two opposing statements are considered better than one incorrect one. The States put up the signs and Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson cannot remove them even though he feels they should come down. They cost about $65 each and were paid for with Federal-State matching funds. They were put up during the duck-for-cover age of blockbusters and early atomic bombs to prevent mass flights from cities, according to Administrator Peterson.

> In those days production won wars. The philosophy was to absorb bombing and then get back to work. Now, for instance, one megaton bomb can destroy 11 counties and 39 cities in the Philadelphia area. All efforts of civil defense are now directed to getting people out of town—

Says Mr. Peterson.

Yet, at the time of that statement, authorities on all sides were speculating on whether we would have time to get the people out of town. Earlier in February 200 mayors from cities of over 50,000 population all over the country gathered here in Washington. They were told the shocking news that with the intercontinental ballistic missiles which is rumored to be 1 year from actuality in Russian military research, the present 2-hour warnings before attack could be cut down to 15 minutes. This left the mayors, as it must leave any one who absorbs the implications, numb with the feeling of hopelessness and what can we do?

At this point in the nuclear age we find ourselves beyond the atomic, through the hydrogen, and entering into the mysterious and fearful era of the so-called ultimate weapon. This is known in military circles as the ICBM—the intercontinental ballistics missile. According to leading columnists and national magazines, the Soviet tests on the IRBM, or intermediate-range ballistic missile, are rather final and decisive proof that our country has lagged far behind in missile development. Until a few months ago, the American missile program altogether neglected the intermediate ranges, and this was the subject of a bitter interservice quarrel finally resulting in the crash program recently announced by the Defense Department to perfect the IRBM in the shortest possible time. Unfortunately, we have to quote magazines and journalists in this vital field because of the lack of a comprehensive policy statement by the Defense Department on where we stand in this life and death race. It is time the administration made a frank statement giving an honest estimate of the situation. The value of secrecy must be carefully weighed against the value of giving such information to the public and the civil defense workers, and creating public incentive for the necessary protective measures.

If the civil defense authorities do not know what the threat is, as I have reason to suspect that they do not, the situation is of tragic proportions. I have a letter from a former civil defense official stating that no policy statement had reached him regarding the new menace or a possible revision of the old evacuation plans. He felt he was way out in left field—excluded from vital information and advice that civil defense workers must have.

I am unhappy to inform him that we are all out in left field, and apparently nobody has been informed or is seeking to get the information necessary for a new, meaningful approach to our civil-defense problems.

As Congressman HOLIFIELD pointed out on last June 15, the day of the mock evacuation of Washington, a new approach has been in order since it was proven that bombs can be made and delivered with power release measured in multiple-million-ton TNT equivalent. This date was November 1952. Almost 4 years have passed. The hydrogen weapon has been improved in power, decreased in size, and methods of delivery have been improved and are now reaching the ballistics stage. The administration has failed to accept these facts in terms of proposing legislation to replace the obsolete Civil Defense Act of 1950.

Perhaps the best approach to the problem at this point is to look into the origins of civil defense, discover what its inherent weaknesses are, and where we are today in the evolution of the program.

The present civil defense program was first established by Executive Order No. 10186, issued December 1, 1950. It provided for the establishment of a Federal Civil Defense Administration—originally a part of the Office of Emergency Management—which became an independent agency under the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, Public Law 920, 81st Congress.

This law specifically declared it to be the policy and intent of Congress that the responsibility for civil defense shall be vested primarily in the States and their political subdivisions. There is complete lack of acceptance of responsibility by the Federal Government. Under the Constitution, article I, section 8, it is provided that "the Congress shall have power to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Yet, in this legislation for nonmilitary defense, the Congress has abdicated its responsibility at the outset. Since then, Federal, State, and local statutes have provided for a national civil-defense structure in three superposed levels. It resembles a command structure but no level has statutory authority to control the one below, even in an emergency, but only to coordinate it. That means persuading equals to work together. We all know how extremely difficult and unworkable that can be. The only forces the Federal Civil Defense Administrator controls, even under attack, are the employees of the Federal Government other than military. The only forces a governor controls are generally the mobile support groups which he is authorized by statute to organize directly, to supplement the civil defense of the subdivisions. Generally, local volunteers commit themselves to serve only in their own political subdivisions and in neighboring subdivisions with which there is a mutual-aid agreement—each to pick the other up. The civil defense of the Nation is a voluntary system in which a citizen does only what he chooses to do.

When the emergency powers of FCDA came up for congressional renewal in June 1954, the mayors of critical target cities and the civil-defense directors of States having a number of those cities, pointed out that they would need emergency aid from the outside that would probably not be forthcoming. They argued that the civil defense of the Nation could be built up to effectiveness only in the same command pattern as the military defense.

The proposal was again rejected. The majority opinion of the States through the Council of State Governments, called for the preservation of the independence of the States in civil defense. The Federal Civil Defense Administration is to continue to offer plans and to coordinate the outcome, but it is not to assume command over State or local operations during emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, here we are practically in the ultimate weapon era using the tactics of Davy Crockett in defending ourselves. I am all for self-help and initiative on the State level. But how can we help ourselves against the devastation of a hydrogen bomb? We must have a strong overall leadership with skilled guidance and aid from the Federal level. Through this leadership the proper information and means of self-help can then reach down into the smallest political subdivision. But the proper defenses against devastating hydrogen attack cannot possibly start on the local level and work up to a strong national program. We are not fighting the Indians, remember. And there are very few forts left in our country to which we can repair to defend ourselves.

A review of the financial requests of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and what Congress has given them is an indictment of the lack of Federal interest and responsibility in this crucial field:

	Requested	Approved
1952	$403,000,000	$33,581,000
1952	535,000,000	75,310,000
1953	600,000,000	43,000,000
1954	125,200,000	46,525,000
1955	85,750,000	49,325,000
1956	59,300,000	56,350,000
Supplemental		12,325,000
Total		68,675,000
1957	123,200,000	

Mr. Speaker, these figures tell a shocking story. Why do you suppose the FCDA request for appropriations dropped from $600 million in 1953 to $59.3 million in 1956 when the need has multiplied tremendously and not diminished as the request would indicate?

It is because they have discovered over the 6 years of their life that it is useless to ask for more. Both the Bureau of the Budget and the FCDA have realized that Congress is in no mood to grant more than a relative pittance for civil defense. The public apathy is so great, the Congress is deaf to their needs. This apathy seems to be based on three assumptions:

First, the feeling that it is useless to build effective defenses, and, indeed, financially impossible to do so. Secondly, that Russia does not have the ability to deliver the bomb. Grounds for this belief are fast disappearing. And, thirdly, lack of confidence in the administrators of the program. Those who have studied and worked with the leaders of this program have great respect for them, but point out that the administrators' hands are tied by the weak law and lack of funds.

Altogether, Federal, State, and local governments spent a total for the civil defense of the Nation of $95,242,000 during fiscal 1954. In contrast, the annual expenditures of all citizens for fire insurance premiums are more than $1.5 billions. For casualty insurance of all kinds, the annual premiums are $4.5 billions additional. Together for protection against the normal occurrence of either fire and casualty, all the citizens paid an annual insurance premium of some $6 billions. Civil defense is a national insurance policy. Like any insurance policy, it is valuable not because we are sure something will happen but because we want real protection if it does. How much then should the Nation pay for civil defense? The Federal budget for fiscal 1954 gave military defense $34.5 billions. The military function is to cut down an attack to manageable size. The civil defense function is to survive it. They supplement each other. The next war could be won by the military defense and lost by the civil defense.

One of our major hopes is that we can develop defensive weapons in time to meet the threat of the ultimate weapon. But we cannot bank on this in our civil defense planning. Yet, we must balance our expenditures for scientific development, military defense and civil defense to get the most effective results from the final overall program.

A second hope is that through the United Nations and international agreements we can work out a really effective system for armaments control and inspection. The United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament now meeting in London seems to be making some progress, a small but significant beginning, in this field. We must never give up our efforts for averting war in every conceivable way. At the same time, one of the surest deterrents is strength—strength in defensive weapons, strength in civil defense planning, and strength in a citizenry alerted to the potential dangers. This is why I feel we must give due recognition to the importance of civil defense.

The only general publication designed to inform the public which I have seen come out of the Civil Defense Administration is a little pamphlet, done in a humorous but effective vein, called Facts About Fallout. This can be of some use to those citizens not directly affected by a bombing—that is, those who are outside the critical areas but who might be exposed to radioactivity by upper winds carrying the particles long distances. This seems typical of the whole program as conceived in the law—to deal with the fringe issues and avoid the vital question: what is our overall national plan in the event of atomic attack to care for the actual target areas? This question is still unanswered. It is vital to our national survival that it be dealt with immediately. I believe a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Defense is the best direct method of dealing with

this problem and finding a solution. I hope my bill, which was introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY, will receive serious consideration and favorable action by the House.

CORRECTION OF EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct an extension of my remarks on March 28, 1956, by including an additional paragraph which was inadvertently omitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DAMAGE TO ALFALFA CROPS BY THE SPOTTED ALFALFA APHID

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has had widespread reports of extensive damage being caused to alfalfa crops of the Far West, South, West, and Middle West by the spotted alfalfa aphid.

Taking cognizance of these disturbing reports, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], the vice chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, has today appointed a subcommittee, the purpose of which is to investigate this problem. The members are the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Bass], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER], and myself as chairman.

The committee will open a hearing on this matter at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, April 24.

Preliminary to the appointment of this subcommittee to determine the extent of this infestation, its cost to farmers and what remedies now are being considered, I made inquiry to the Agricultural Research Service, and today I am in receipt of this information from Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of the Research Service:

The spotted alfalfa aphid was first discovered in New Mexico in 1954 and later in the same year it was found in Arizona and California. At first it was confused with the yellow clover aphid which had been in this country for some time, and at that time no one was certain that we were dealing with a new form. In 1955 the aphid had spread to 11 more States, all west of the Mississippi River. Information at hand now indicates that it has spread into additional States, and there is a feeling that it will eventually cover the entire alfalfa area. Severe damage has been reported from California, Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

The eradication or control of this aphid is extremely difficult. Nearly all of the aphids are females and a large proportion is winged and can be blown for many miles. They give birth to living young and fertilization is unnecessary. The life cycle varies from 15 to 20 days, which means that there can be from 12 to 20 generations produced a year. While the aphid is especially bad on alfalfa, it has also been found on burr clover, sweet clover, and sour clover.

The aphids can be controlled on alfalfa by the use of organic phosphates such as malathion and parathion, also by the use of chlorinated hydrocarbons such as DDT and toxaphene. Usually when chemicals are used they last for only a short time and from 1 to 7 treatments may be needed for a single hay crop. Recent reports indicate that the effectiveness of some of these chemicals varies with location and climatic conditions.

There are natural enemies of the aphid, one of which is the ladybird beetle. At the present time the Department of Agriculture and the California Agricultural Experiment Station are releasing additional natural enemies in the hope that this method of control will have some effect. It should be pointed out that when dusts or sprays are used on the fields they not only kill the aphids but also the natural enemies.

The Agricultural Research Service is very much concerned over this insect and has speeded up its research program. An attempt is being made to find cheaper and better chemicals which may be used for the immediate control. Also, it would be desirable to find chemicals which would kill the aphids and not the natural enemies, but as yet no such chemicals are available.

The second line of attack is a search for insect parasites which might attack the aphid. The Department is searching for such parasites in France and India and the California Agricultural Experiment Station is making a similar search in Egypt, Israel, and Italy. So far we have introduced about 4,000 samples of parasites, some of which have been released in California and Arizona. This approach has been so recent that as yet we have no definite information to prove the buildup in the field of these natural enemies.

The third approach has to do with the question of resistant varieties. It so happens that the Agricultural Research Service, in cooperation with the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station, has developed a variety of alfalfa named Lahontan which is resistant to the aphid. So far as we know, this variety is of rather limited adaptation, but it is being tested in a number of States. By this fall there will be a supply of approximately 2 million pounds of seed of this variety available for planting. It is quite possible that while Lahontan will not be the answer for many years it will give temporary relief. At the same time we have speeded up our breeding program so as to transfer this resistance of Lahontan to varieties of alfalfa adapted to different areas of the country. This program is going to be pushed just as rapidly as is possible.

All of our research program is in cooperation with the various State agricultural experiment stations. When we realized that this situation was becoming quite serious some additional funds were made available in the current fiscal year. In our 1957 budget we have included additional requests for funds to step up the work on the entomological phases as well as the development of resistant varieties.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the vote was taken yesterday on the Presidential veto of the recent farm bill, I introduced a separate farm bill which includes only the provisions of the soil bank plan contained in the old bill.

In my opinion it would be a serious mistake for us to do nothing further on some kind of a farm bill this year. The soil bank plan has the almost unanimous support of every Member on both sides of the aisle. Everyone realizes that if we had been voting on the soil bank plan alone recently it would have passed overwhelmingly.

The soil bank plan is badly needed to reduce the surpluses on hand. It is simply an incentive method of inducing farmers to reduce acreage. By reduction in acreage we get a reduction in supply.

If it were possible to reduce the corn acreage by 15 percent in the commercial areas of this country, our present corn surplus would almost disappear in 1 year's time. The result would be a corresponding increase in prices for the farmer in the market place. The same would be true of other basic products, as supply came more into balance with demand.

I have repeatedly said I would back any reasonable plan which had a chance of success that would make an impact in our surplus situation. Frankly, this is the only plan in the 6 years I have been in Congress which I think has a chance to reduce surpluses. By that I mean it is the only plan which has been suggested which will reduce the yearly supply.

I was 1 of the 5 authors of Public Law 480, the Surplus Agricultural Disposal Act. I predicted 3 years ago that bill would do a good job in helping to sell our surpluses overseas. The bill has succeeded better than I expected at that time—but that bill cannot carry the load alone. We simply have to find some method of reducing the yearly output. The soil bank plan does this.

These are very real reasons as to why the House Committee on Agriculture should start hearings immediately on the soil bank plan. I know the chairman of that great committee is a patriotic American and a true friend of agriculture. He can demonstrate again his great statesmanship by putting aside all differences over the recently vetoed bill and come forward with the soil bank plan which, in my estimation, could prove a monument to his integrity and far-sightedness.

If the Secretary of Agriculture follows out the President's radio speech of a few days ago, he will support corn at about $1.50 and wheat at $2. This would give strength to farm income in 1956. But we do need to pass the soil bank plan in order to be ready for the planting season of 1957. If Congress had passed the soil bank plan in 1955, we would have been in the position to implement it this year. In my opinion, it would be serious for this Congress to adjourn without having passed a soil bank plan for the growing year 1957.

DOMESTIC PARITY PLAN FOR WHEAT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation to provide for putting into effect the domestic parity plan for wheat. The bill which I have introduced is identical with subtitle D of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1956 recently vetoed by the President.

This legislation, which has wide support among wheat farmers as well as such organizations as the National Grange and the National Association of Wheat Growers, provides, in my opinion, the best and most effective solution to the great problems which confront the wheatgrowers of this Nation today. These problems of course are not the problems alone of wheatgrowers, they concern all of agriculture as well as our national economy as a whole.

This legislation has already passed both the House of Representatives and the Senate and its objectives and principles are well enough known that I do not believe it is necessary for me to make any extended explanation of the same at this time. I would, however, like to take this opportunity to point out a few of the more obvious advantages of this legislation, as follows:

First. Returns to the farmer will be somewhat greater than under the present program and there is a good prospect that expanded outlets will further increase these returns in the future.

Second. Marketing quotas and penalties will be eliminated and acreage controls greatly minimized and possibly entirely eliminated in the course of time.

Third. Relief to taxpayers will be afforded through an immediate substantial reduction and eventual elimination of practically all the costs of the present program under which export subsidies and storage costs amount in the aggregate to over $400 million per year.

Fourth. To a large extent it will take the Government out of the warehousing and merchandising of wheat and in the end probably do away with such activities altogether.

Fifth. Wheat would be produced for market instead of for sale to the Government and would be sold on the basis of quality, thus encouraging good farming and the production of superior varieties.

Sixth. Producers of livestock and poultry wherever situated would be able to produce wheat for feed or buy wheat at feed prices.

Seventh. There would be some expansion of wheat exports through the elimination of redtape, delays, and other obstacles existing at present.

Eighth. It would result in moving wheat into its natural outlets and market channels.

Ninth. It will fit in perfectly with the soil-bank proposals proposed by the President.

Tenth. It will return to the farmer greater freedom and control over the operation of his own farm.

WOMEN'S CONGRESS ON HOUSING

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, Albert Cole, Housing Administrator, announced a plan to have women from the various parts of the country meet here in Washington for a Women's Congress on Housing.

Because of the similarity of names, I have received a number of letters addressed to "Mr. Cole, Washington, D. C.," which, upon being opened and read, I found were intended for Albert Cole. Not only were the letters generous in their praise of the idea soliciting home building plans from the housewife, but many of them contained what I thought to be sincere suggestions.

A noted woman columnist, Sylvia Porter, states that the idea of such a women's congress is "such a commonsense approach that, in an era when commonsense often seems on a permanent holiday, it appears nothing short of brilliant."

Another prominent woman, Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in referring to the Women's Congress on Housing, says that "if women have the opportunity to make known their time- and step-saving ideas, as well as other observations as to safety and efficiency, that all America would benefit by housing that produces more for the money, and meets today's housing needs more adequately."

I congratulate our former colleague and distinguished citizen, Albert Cole, for the women's congress plan, and my best wishes to the able ladies who will soon gather here in Washington to advise the Government on their choices in homes.

NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIP CORP.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the National Merit Scholarship Corp, recently announced the selection of 4,300 young Americans as the top high-school seniors in the United States. Among this outstanding group are 13 students from the Fourth District of Oregon which I represent in Congress.

This group was selected by means of competitive examinations from the top 5 percent of the graduating seniors in 10,338 high schools throughout the Nation, approximately 60,000 students.

The National Merit Scholarship Corp. estimates that these 4,300 students comprise the top one-half of 1 percent of our Nation's high-school seniors.

Certificates of merit will be awarded to each of the 4,300 who will compete in a final examination for 520 4-year college scholarships valued at $6,000 each.

All of the 4,300 certificate winners are deserving of scholarships and the corporation reports that all would get them if the money was available. A list of these talented students is being sent to colleges, universities, and other scholarship granting agencies.

The 13 seniors from southwestern Oregon reaching the final round of competition are: Jerry Miller and Peter Windt, of Ashland; Judith W. Finell, of Coos Bay; LaSells Stewart, of Cottage Grove; David Harrington, of Eugene; Kathryn Compton, of Florence; William Burroughs, Thomas H. Denny, Jr., and Edgar Stout, of Grants Pass; Thomas McDonough, of North Bend; Larry D. Jones, of Springfield; and Keith D. Ryder, of Winston.

It is a great honor and privilege for me to pay tribute to these outstanding young people and to represent in Congress an area which consistently produces such fine examples of American youth.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE COUNSEL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 160) to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from New York briefly explain what this bill does?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. Briefly, it would appear that by unanimous vote the so-called Lobby Committee of the Senate, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, has selected Mr. Fay, a former United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to be general counsel for that committee. The appointment is for a brief period of time, and, following precedents, this bill would exempt Mr. Fay from the operation of the so-called conflict-of-interest statute.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I feel that we ought to go slow about granting such exemptions and consider them carefully. I am quite sure my colleague agrees with me on that. I have conferred with Senator BRIDGES, who is the ranking Republican member of this committee, and he agrees that there is need for this legislation. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of the person first duly appointed as counsel for the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress, 2d session, agreed to February 22, 1956, shall not constitute service or employment subjecting such person to the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, United States Code, or to the provisions of any other law of the United States imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LET US GIVE OUR OWN TAXPAYERS A BREAK

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 10613, a bill to cut individual income taxes by a flat 10 percent, straight across the board. This will mean a reduction in the tax take of the Treasury of about $3 billion.

If Congress would adopt the recent Hoover Commission recommendations, it would mean an annual saving of over $7 billion in our Federal expenditures. That in itself would take care of my proposed tax cut; would insure a balanced budget; and would also allow a substantial payment each year on the national debt.

If Congress would stop the $5 billion yearly foreign-aid giveaway program, it would also take care of my proposed tax cut and insure a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that neither Congress nor the administration will ever reduce Federal expenditures, stop the foreign-aid giveaway program, or adopt the efficiency and economy program recommended by the Hoover Commission until the present heavy tax take is reduced drastically. Because I am firmly convinced of this—after 20 years' experience in this House—I have introduced H. R. 10613.

Mr. Speaker, most European countries now have balanced budgets. Some of them that we are giving aid—Great Britain, France, and Western Germany—not only have balanced budgets, but they have reduced their national debts and have also reduced the heavy wartime tax loads upon their people, partly with the money collected from American taxpayers and handed out in the form of foreign aid.

Is it not about time Congress gave our own taxpayers a break?

SOIL BANK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced H. R. 10603, one of 21 similar bills introduced on yesterday to provide for a soil bank with authorization for payments in advance, of 50 percent of the total payments as soon as a farm was signed up for withdrawing acreage for production.

I do not think there are many members who are against the soil-bank proposal. That was indicated in the vote on the farm bill during the past week. No hearings are necessary on the soil-bank provision of the proposed legislation, although short hearings may be necessary on the provision for advance payments. I am sure a bill can be reported out of the Committee on Agriculture in a matter of hours or certainly a few days.

I respectfully request that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the majority leadership in the House get back of this legislation and see to it that it is presented to the House at the earliest opportunity. The President has said that he will sign a separate soil-bank bill. The proposal has wide support and is needed to help alleviate our agricultural surplus problem. Let us get the legislation on the books without delay.

VERY REV. HAROLD W. RIGNEY, RECTOR, FU JEN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, PEKING, CHINA

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, althought it is not a custom in this House to make any remarks about the Chaplain who delivers the prayer at the opening of the session, we have with us this afternoon a man who has served over 4 years in a Communist Red China prison camp. I am very happy that Father Harold Rigney is again a free man. He comes from my district, the "back of the yards" district. Over 15,000 schoolchildren in my district sent letters to the State Department asking for his release. We are very happy to have Father Rigney with us. I hope that more of the clergy will be released in the near future.

POLITICS AND STATESMANSHIP

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the statement by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that for a Republican to suggest at a Republican meeting that politics and statesmanship went hand in hand was a history-making event. It may be history making as far as the Republican Party is concerned, but good politics being good statesmanship has been the preachment and the practice of the Democratic Party from the very first day of its foundation.

POLITICAL CRUSADES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker has referred to the fact that a second crusade is often less effective than a first crusade. I must assume that he was speaking of the decreasing and depreciating efforts of the former Governor of Illinois, Mr. Stevenson, who started out on what he announced was a crusade, an attempt to talk sense to the American people. While there is some question as to how much of his soliloquizing was vapor and how much was sense, I agree that in the second crusade there is more evasion, less sense, and even less persuasiveness. So we have no arugument.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 83D AND 84TH CONGRESSES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the press recently we read of some intemperate and incorrect statements of an extremely partisan nature made by some of our Republican friends. As a matter of curiosity and to get the record straight, I asked the Congressional Library to prepare for me a comparison of what was accomplished in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, Republican controlled, compared with the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the present session, Democratic controlled. The information is as follows:

As of April 1, 1954, there were 36 public bills enacted into law.

As of April 1, 1956, there were 59 public bills enacted into law.

As of April 1, 1954, there were 7 bills in conference.

As of April 1, 1956, there were 5 bills in conference.

As of April 1, 1954, there were 7 bills through conference.

As of April 1, 1956, there were 6 bills through conference.

As of April 1, 1954, the Senate had passed 222 measures.

As of April 1, 1956, the Senate had passed 426 measures.

As of April 1, 1954, the House had passed 269 measures.

As of April 1, 1956, the House had passed 308 measures.

As of April 1, 1954, the Senate committees had reported 328 bills.

As of April 1, 1956, the Senate committees had reported 455 bills.

As of April 1, 1954, the House committees had reported 337 bills.

As of April 1, 1956, the House committees had reported 318 bills.

In addition to that, my own comment is that the 84th Congress stopped the "giveaways" of the 83d Republican Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman has compiled a lot of statistics. I wonder if he would go a little further and compile some statistics explaining just what is the type of resolutions and bills. Just how important are the bills passed. That would be interesting for the people to know.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have passed more appropriation bills than your party did in the 2d session of the 83d Congress. We passed more important legislation.

Mr. MARTIN. I mean would the gentleman describe the character of all these miscellaneous and personal bills that have been passed. He will prove these bills have been for the general benefit of the people.

Mr. McCORMACK. The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. MARTIN. That is what I want. I would like to have the facts published and they will speak for themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. The facts speak for themselves. The 2d session of the 84th Congress is far ahead of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, which was under Republican control.

Mr. MARTIN. I hold in my hand the official calendar of the Congress. You can read for yourself what the calendar shows. The calendar shows what you passed and they are few.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, and I have the record here and it shows what has been done, and it cannot be disputed.

Mr. MARTIN. And neither can this calendar be disputed, and it actually shows your record and what you have actually accomplished insofar as passing major bills is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Four years ago the Republican Party made a promise of 100 percent parity at the market place for the farmers of the country.

Mr. MARTIN. Let us forget history and come back to today and let us talk about what you are doing today.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do not want to remember. You forget what you promised.

Mr. MARTIN. You have not held sessions over 4 days in any week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; go ahead and get excited and lose your head. Four years ago you forgot the farmers and now in an election year you remember the farmers. But, they are not going to forget that for 3 years you forgot them, and now in an election year you are undertaking to remember them.

Mr. MARTIN. When election day comes, we will find out whether the chances—do not worry about that.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will take our chances—do not worry about that.

Mr. MARTIN. And so will we.

AMENDING SECTION 14 (B) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9285, with Mr. IKARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It provides for an extension of the power that now exists of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase direct from the Treasury obligations of the United States Government. This power is given to the Federal Reserve to purchase short-term certificates in order to make up cash shortages in the Treasury which would otherwise have to be made up by the sale of Government bonds on the market. In a sense, it is a right of the Treasury to overdraw in the Federal Reserve banks to make up temporary shortages in cash.

The Federal Government has necessarily kept on deposit in the banks of the country at all times great sums of money required to meet the cost of its various activities. It may be asked, "Why does not the Federal Government withdraw the money from the banks instead of asking the Federal Reserve banks to purchase these securities?"

Of course, it would be disruptive to the orderly financing of the Government to periodically draw out great funds that are deposited in the banks. So this plan has been devised by which the Treasury may at all times have adequate funds to meet its requirements.

The authority to purchase direct from the Treasury by the Federal Reserve banks existed prior to October 1935. The Banking Act of 1935 took away that power, but in 1942 an amendment was enacted under the Roosevelt administration restoring that authority to the Federal Reserve banks. That amendment was identical with the amendment that is offered to you today. The amendment at that time extended the authority for 4 years, during the period of the war, but it was reenacted in the very words in which it is presented to you today, during the Truman administration. It was again passed in this administration, and now it comes up for reconsideration today.

Three administrations have approved it in the exact words in which it is submitted to you. The agencies most interested, the Federal Reserve and the Treasury, both desire its enactment. It is a bill that should have been put on the Consent Calendar. I think it would be a very foolish and ill-considered thing to refuse to extend this power.

I think I have said enough. I ask for its adoption because it is essential for the orderly conduct of the business of the Treasury. It will provide a means to meet the shortages in funds that often come during lax periods of collection. The power provided for in the bill has been used very infrequently. Since 1942 there have been 6 years in which this power was not use. It has not been used since March of 1954 to the present time, but it should be on the statute books as a protection to the Treasury. Its enactment will be an assurance to the Treasury that it will get the funds it needs most expeditiously and most economically.

I ask for your support of the amendment.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I agree fully with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], that this bill should have been on the Consent Calendar; likewise, the two bills enacted yesterday afternoon should have been on the Consent Calendar, but rules were asked for in committee and, therefore, we have to proceed as we are proceeding today.

The gentleman from Kentucky has stated the case correctly. May I review the history of this legislation briefly? Members will remember that the Federal Reserve Act was passed in December of 1913, 43 years ago. It was put into effect the following year. One of the provisions in that act permitted the Federal Reserve to make direct purchases of United States obligations as is proposed in this bill today, and the pending bill seeks to extend existing law for 2 years beyond June 30, 1956. As the law was written in 1913, the Federal Reserve could purchase securities either directly from the Treasury or in the open market; and as the gentleman from Kentucky said, that authority prevailed until 1935 when the law was changed and for a period of 7 years the Federal Reserve could buy the securities only in the open market.

In 1942 the Congress reenacted the earlier provision and that provision has prevailed down to now. The only difference between the legislation of 1913 and that which was enacted in 1942 was that in 1942 a limitation was put on the amount that could be bought directly from the Treasury and an expiration date was set. The latter is the reason why the bill is before the House today. Extension of time for 2 years is proposed. The limitation as to amount was $5 billion.

What is asked for today is an extension of authority that has been in prac-

tice for 36 of the 43 years of the existence of the Federal Reserve System. It has worked very well. There are times when the income of the Treasury is low. It has obligations which must be met continuously. Therefore, in order to avoid undue strain in the money market, this authority is necessary, and it is used only when necessary.

As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has said, this authority is not used except when conditions require it. The report which accompanies the bill shows on page 2 that the authority was not used in 1944, it was not used in 1946, 1947, and 1948, it was not used in 1955, and it was not used up to March 1 of this year—the latest date for which data are available. It is clear, therefore, that the Treasury uses this authority only when necessary. No one knows when some emergency may arise which will require that this authority be employed.

It is a quick, convenient and economical method for the Treasury to use. It is a necessary authority in an emergency. The Under Secretary of the Treasury, W. Randolph Burgess, who is to a large degree in charge of the management of the Federal debt, is in favor of the extension. He was most careful and forthright in his testimony before the committee. He said:

I have always taken the position that it is well to have a time limit on it. * * * It is a good thing for us to have to come and justify our operations to you from time to time. This is one of those operations between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve where there could be an abuse, and where a review of it from time to time is a good thing. (Hearings, p. 4.)

The Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is also very much in favor of the extension.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I expect to propose an amendment, but whether the amendment is adopted or not I will still vote for the bill. I think this is a good bill. I do not agree with everything that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency said. I do not agree that it is an overdraft bill. Instead, it is a bill to prevent an overdraft, it is a bill that permits the Treasury to borrow up to $5 billion in short-term securities direct from the Federal Reserve banking system. It is a fine provision.

Mr. Chairman, if you will go back and read the history of the legislation you will discover, as I did, that the real intent of the legislation as originally proposed was for the purpose of making it unnecessary to keep such enormous balances in private banks, without interest incidentally. That is one of the main objects and purposes of the bill.

NEED FOR LARGER TREASURY BALANCES IN ABSENCE OF AUTHORITY FOR RESERVE BANKS TO PURCHASE SECURITIES DIRECTLY FROM TREASURY

A question has been raised as to the legislative history of the provision in section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act which authorizes Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury. The question is whether the legislative history indicates an expectation that the Treasury would have to maintain larger balances if the authority for direct purchases were not available.

A review of the legislative history indicates that this consideration has been mentioned from time to time, along with others, as one reason for continuing this authority.

It was not mentioned in the committee reports when the provision was added to the Federal Reserve Act in 1942. However, it has been referred to from time to time, along with other considerations, in the committee reports on various extensions of the authority. For example, the Senate committee report on the 1954 extension stated in part:

If the Treasury did not have this authority it would have to maintain larger cash balances in order to meet its disbursement requirements just before heavy tax receipts. In addition, it provides flexibility to meet possible emergency situations.

Similarly, the House committee report in 1952 stated:

Under both the existing law and that prior to 1935, the direct-purchase authority has been used only infrequently and for a short period, as a useful mechanism for helping to smooth out the effect of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, so that the disturbing effect of their flow through the banking system may be held to a minimum. It also makes it possible for the Treasury to operate with a smaller cash balance than might otherwise be needed, since it provides a means by which the Treasury, if necessary, may temporarily meet large cash outlays, of which it has not had previous notice. Typically prior to heavy tax payment dates the Treasury permits its cash balances to run down to a minimum in anticipation of the receipt of heavy tax payments that will be processed and collected in the days immediately following. It is on these occasions that the Treasury has utilized the authority to borrow directly from the Federal Reserve banks.

In connection with the 1950 extension, Secretary of the Treasury Snyder wrote in part to the House Banking and Currency Committee:

As I have emphasized, the Treasury Department is urging that this authority be extended, not because it is vital to the conduct of the Nation's financial affairs, but because the authority enables the Treasury to get along with a very much smaller cash balance and, at the same time, minimizes the danger of sudden, sharp strains on the commercial banks and in the money market generally.

In connection with the 1947 extension, Chairman Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, stated in part before the House committee:

The direct-purchase authority is, in effect, merely an overdraft privilege with the Reserve banks—a line of available credit for use if needed. Without it, the Treasury would feel obliged to carry much larger cash balances, which means that it would have to borrow more and thereby increase the amount and cost of the public debt. In other words, having the overdraft authority, even though there may be no need to use it, enables the Treasury to carry smaller balances than otherwise would be possible and thus reduces interest charges.

As indicated above, the fact that it was felt that lack of the provision would make it necessary for the Treasury to maintain larger balances has been only a part of the reasons advanced for the authority. The statements in the legislative history also have not indicated how much larger the Treasury balance would need to be in the absence of such authority, or what would be considered a proper level for that balance either with or without the authority.

DIRECT PURCHASES OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES BY FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS—HEARINGS, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON H. R. 2233, MARCH 2, 1947

STATEMENT OF MARRINER S. ECCLES, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The purpose for which the direct-purchase authority has always been used in the past and would be used in the future is simply one of meeting temporary needs of the Treasury which, if met in other ways, would entail either needless additional costs in managing the public debt or equally needless fluctuations in the securities and money markets for brief periods. What is involved in the proposed bill is not a question of monetary theory or policy, but simply a question of efficient, economical, and businesslike management of the public debt.

The direct-purchase authority is, in effect, merely an overdraft privilege with the Reserve banks—a line of available credit for use if needed. Without it, the Treasury would feel obliged to carry much larger cash balances, which means that it would have to borrow more and thereby increase the amount and cost of the public debt. In other words, having the overdraft authority, even though there may be no need to use it, enables the Treasury to carry smaller balances than otherwise would be possible and thus reduces interest charges. For every billion dollars of Treasury balance that can be saved in this way, interest costs would be reduced by at least $4 million. That would be figuring a rate of three-eighths the bill rate.

At a 3-percent rate now prevailing, the saving would be $30 million.

EXAMPLE

Five banks in New York City had $624,589,000 in Government funds on deposit April 11, 1956. Two of these banks, the First National City and Chase National had $364,341,000 of these funds. They pay no interest on money that is costing the taxpayers 3 percent and more. With this law permitting $5 billion to be borrowed direct at any time these large balances will not be required.

AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—HEARINGS, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JUNE 14, 1950, H. R. 7894

STATEMENT OF EDWARD S. BARTELT, FISCAL ASSISTANT TO SECRETARY OF TREASURY

It is the considered opinion of the Treasury Department that the authority of H. R. 7894 would be in the public interest; and, therefore, we strongly recommend the enactment of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill was initiated by the Treasury; was it not?

Mr. BARTELT. It was; yes sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a Treasury bill?

Mr. BARTELT. It is primarily a Treasury bill. It is to facilitate Treasury operations.

The CHAIRMAN. And it simplifies the Treasury operations and prevents you from floating issues that you otherwise would have to do; is that not true?

Mr. BARTELT. It makes it possible, Mr. Chairman, to do two things: maintain a

smaller balance than otherwise would be required, and, secondly, it enables us to maintain a better distribution of our balances between the Reserve banks and special depositaries than otherwise would be possible.

STATEMENT OF RALPH YOUNG, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND STATISTICS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, HEARINGS, FEDERAL RESERVE ACT AMENDMENTS, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 21, 1952

Mr. YOUNG. I am here, Mr. Chairman, to testify on behalf of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and I would like to say at the outset that the Board appreciates very much this opportunity to have its views expressed at this hearing.

The proposed legislation, H. R. 6909, would make permanent the present temporary authority of the Federal Reserve banks, to purchase Government obligations directly from the United States.

Except between the years 1935 and 1942, the Federal Reserve banks have always had authority to purchase Government obligations directly from the Treasury. Since 1942, this authority has been limited by section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act to an aggregate maximum amount of $5 billion at any one time, and the provision has been temporary in nature.

While the time limit has been extended from time to time, the authority under present law will terminate on June 30 of this year. The Board of Governors believes that the direct purchase authority of the Federal Reserve banks is desirable.

This authority provides a useful mechanism for helping to smooth out the effect of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, so that the disturbing effect of their flow through the banking system may be held to a minimum.

It also makes possible for the Treasury to operate with a smaller cash balance than might otherwise be needed, since it provides a means by which the Treasury, if necessary, may temporarily meet large cash outlays, of which it has not had previous notice.

This happens to be the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson was the father of the Federal Reserve Act. Without his guidance and leadership, we would not have any Federal Reserve System. I think the Federal Reserve System is a great system.

Contrary to what people usually say, it is not owned by the private banks. The 12 Federal Reserve banks are owned by the Government of the United States. They are not owned by private banks. As a matter of convenience, private banks are required to make a certain investment which is so insignificant in value that it could not be construed as ownership and not intended to be ownership. It is not voting privileges. They have no voting rights by reason of this involuntary assessment upon the banks. They do not own stock as the word "stock" is generally known. It is an involuntary investment; very small. So, remember this, the Federal Reserve banks are not owned by the member banks. The Federal Reserve banks are owned by the Government of the United States.

Now, when this bill was before the Congress in 1913, there was an effort made to put private bankers on the boards determining policy; in other words, to determine whether or not money will be tight or whether it will be easy; whether interest rates will be high or whether or not they will be low. President Woodrow Wilson's leadership prevented the private bankers from being on these boards, and his argument was that it would be just as reasonable to put railroad owners on the Interstate Commerce Commission and let them fix railroad rates as to put bankers on the Federal Reserve boards or on a policymaking board where they could influence the cost of money or interest rates. There was a terrific battle going on between the big banks of the country and the Congress on that one issue, and when it came down to the question of actually getting it done, Mr. Carter Glass, who was chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency at that time, went to the White House with a delegation to see President Wilson, and here is what he said in his book, Adventure in Constructive Finance, commencing on page 115. He said:

The President was courteous and contained. These great bankers, arbiters for years of the country's credits, were grouped about the President's desk in the Executive office adjoining the Cabinet room. I sat outside the circle, having already voiced my own dissent from the President's attitude.

Now, it will be noticed that Senator Glass was really for the bankers being on the board. Notice that.

President Wilson faced the group across the desk, and as these men drove home what seemed to me good reason after good reason for banker representation on the central board, I actually experienced a sense of regret that I had a part in subjecting Mr. Wilson to such an ordeal. When they had ended their arguments Mr. Wilson, turning more particularly to Forgan and Wade, said quietly: "Will one of you gentlemen tell me in what civilized country of the earth there are important boards of control on which private interests are represented?" There was painful silence for the longest single moment I ever spent; and before it was broken Mr. Wilson further inquired: "Which of you gentlemen thinks the railroads should select members of the Interstate Commerce Commission?" There could be no convincing reply to either question, so the discussion turned to other points of the currency bill; and notwithstanding a desperate effort was made in the Senate to give the banks minority representation on the Reserve Board, the proposition did not prevail.

Now, by reason of President Woodrow Wilson's leadership for 20 years there was no private banker representation upon any board that had policymaking power, and President Wilson was right. But long after President Wilson was gone and during a great depression when we were grasping at everything for the purpose of helping our economy and our currency and credit systems, Senator Glass yielded—of course, he was formerly for it—and permitted the banker representation. Today on the Open Market Committee of 12 members, the most powerful men on earth, who absolutely control our money and credit, 5 are selected by the private banks. That is just like having five railroad owners on the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix freight rates or passenger rates.

That is the situation. Here is the way it applies to this bill. Here is a transaction of $5 billion, the Treasury being able to borrow that amount from the Federal Reserve Board, just across the street. Unless my amendment is adopted they will have to go to New York and get private bankers to agree to that before they can consummate a transaction here in Washington, D. C., involving Government credit, the Government's own money, in a transaction between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. They should not be required to do that. Why should we have to ask private bankers to use our own money? So I expect to offer an amendment providing that it will be a matter between the Federal Reserve Board, seven public members charged with performing a public service and public duty and the Treasury only, and they will not have to go through Mr. Sproul who was selected by the private bankers of the New York area to represent them. That is very reasonable. I think the amendment should be adopted and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, at the moment, I have no further request for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 9285 as reported by your Committee on Banking and Currency. This bill would extend until June 30, 1958, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Prior to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5-billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since. The present authority was granted for 2 years and expires June 30, 1956.

The primary purpose of this direct borrowing authority is to help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System work together in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly income-tax payments. These short-run movements of funds are large and precise estimates of their day-to-day patterns are often difficult. This direct borrowing authority in effect gives the Treasury an overdraft privilege with the Federal Reserve banks, thus permitting the Treasury to carry smaller cash balances than it would otherwise feel obliged to maintain in

order to meet its day-to-day needs. It represents a useful fiscal mechanism for the Treasury and the Federal Reserve and its use has avoided unnecessary financial strains on the money market on a number of occasions.

Treasury borrowing from the Federal Reserve banks under this authority has been used infrequently and then only for short periods. The last time it was used was on March 17, 1954. Borrowing has exceeded $1 billion only rarely.

The Treasury and the Federal Reserve have used the direct borrowing authority only to meet temporary requirements of the nature previously discussed. The authority is also, however, a safeguard that could be used in the event of any sudden nationwide emergency requiring heavy cash payments from the Treasury before securities could be sold.

While admittedly this is a broad power, properly used it is a very useful one. It is a power which your committee believes automatically should be brought before the Congress for periodic review and hence the proposed extension of the authority for only a 2-year period. When the authority is utilized a record of its use is included in the weekly statement of condition of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, which is published in newspapers on Thursdays of each week. Further, existing law requires that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System include detailed information with respect to use of this authority in its annual report to Congress.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have opposed this bill each time it has been before the House since I have been a Member of the House. I recall that back in 1948 or 1949 the late distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, called this an outright and unadulterated printing-press-money bill, and that is exactly what it is. It does not make any difference how thick or how thin you slice it, this is a printing-press-money bill.

The thing I have never been able to understand is why those who believe in printing-press money, those who believe that the Government should have $5 billion in obligations outstanding at any one time through this process of kiting checks, do not advocate that the Government simply print money, pay it out for services rendered to the Government during the period the Government deems it necessary to use the money; just print money and pay it out for services rendered to the Government, and save the interest, the taxpayers' money, which you are going to pay on Treasury notes or certificates that will be issued under this legislation. Why not? When you print Treasury certificates or notes and make them available to the banks of this country, which in turn make a line of credit available to the Government, you pay them interest. That is the only difference. If there is any other difference, I wish some member of the Committee on Banking and Currency would rise and tell me. I would like to know. Does your silence lend acquiescence to the fact that this is a printing-press-money bill?

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. The Treasury can operate without the use of this authority. If the Treasury did not have this authority and it found itself short of funds, which has happened occasionally in the past, it would sell 90-day notes, and, of course, interest would be paid on those notes. When those Treasury notes are sold, reserves in the banks are reduced because the money is used for buying the notes. What, then, would the Federal Reserve do? The Federal Reserve would buy Government securities in order to release money and restore the reserves of the banks. That is a long, roundabout way to do it, and a costly way. It is like one man digging a hole and another man filling it up. The direct purchase method saves money and is a convenience to the Treasury in its day-to-day operations whenever the money market is strained. Perhaps one day's borrowing would be enough in some instances. Rather than employ the costly operation of printing the notes and selling them, and all else I have mentioned, this direct, quick, and economical method is preferable.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman still has not answered my question. You still have to have some form of transaction under the terms of this bill between the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the member banks thereof. Is that not correct?

Mr. TALLE. The Treasury does pay interest on the loans for the short period of time that it has the money.

Mr. GROSS. Exactly, but why not issue money and pay it out for services rendered to the Government and when the need for it is over, recall the money and destroy it.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman is advocating something with which I am not familiar and do not endorse.

Mr. GROSS. This method provides that you pay interest on it whereas if the Federal Government issued the money and paid it out, as I say again, for services rendered to the Government, it would be saving the taxpayers of this country the interest on the money. I do not think the gentleman can deny that.

Mr. TALLE. As a matter of fact, the direct purchase method saves the taxpayers money because the 90-day notes would be costlier.

Mr. GROSS. I am not speaking in terms of the 90-day notes, I am speaking in terms of currency now since it is a printing-press-money bill no matter what process you use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I will say again it does not make any difference how thick or how thin you slice it, it is a printing-press-money bill and so designated by the late Senator Taft in debate on the floor of the Senate along about 1948 or 1949.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. I have a great deal of respect for the distinguished gentleman from Iowa and his views generally are views with which I am usually in accord, but I cannot see this idea of printing-press money as a replacement for this procedure. We have peaks and valleys in the receipt of taxes, and if we do not have some provision whereby the Government can get money together in the low points in tax collection, we must carry in the Treasury at all times a sufficient amount of money to meet all the bills of the Government. We cannot do that for nothing, because we have to take taxpayers' money. Therefore I just cannot see the kind of reasoning that the gentleman has expressed on the floor.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman is on his feet, may I ask him this question: What happens if, under the provisions of this bill, you have $5 billion outstanding at the termination of this law? What then happens? How are you going to get the $5 billion out of circulation?

Mr. McVEY. At the termination of this law?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; under this law, the Treasury is permitted to obtain $5 billion; is that not correct?

Mr. McVEY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. How would you retire the $5 billion at the expiration of this law if it is extended another 2 years? How are you going to get the $5 billion out of circulation?

Mr. McVEY. That has to come from the Treasury of the United States and the taxpayers of this country. That is why I think we should have a procedure of this kind so that we can continue to serve during the valleys in tax collections instead of maintaining in the Treasury at all times the total amount of money sufficient to meet the bills of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does agree that there could be $5 billion outstanding at the termination of this law under certain provisions for which there is no other authority than this law; and it could only be removed through tax levies; is that not correct?

Mr. McVEY. The Treasury would have to meet that either with notes or with funds in the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, we are hearing a great deal of talk about $5 billion and it is all meaningless. There is in the pending bill an authorization not to exceed $5 billion. But what are the facts? In 14 years the borrowings exceeded, and then only slightly the $1-billion figure in but 2 years, 1943 and 1953. In the last Roosevelt administration, only on a total of 8 days in 1945 were there borrowings, which totaled less than half a billion. In 1946–48 the authority was not used at all. In those 3 years there was absolutely no borrowing under the authority, even though the authorization was up to $5 billion figure.

In the Truman administration, it was used a total of 8 days in the first 3 years,

and when the Korean matter came on—an emergency—it was used for 30 days.

In the Eisenhower administration the borrowings in 1953 slightly exceeded $1 billion. In 1954 they totaled, and then only for a period of 15 days, less than half a billion. In 1955 and up to March 1, 1956 there were no borrowings at all.

Then, when it is not used, why is there the authority to borrow up to $5 billion? We might have a vast economic situation descend upon us. There might be an international situation descend upon us. This authorization of $5 billion is a cushion which might operate to save our entire economy. It is that simple. I think it would be very foolish at this time to refuse to extend this authority for another 2 years. I do not know of any period where there was greater potential danger than in the 2 years ahead. We have a bad situation in the farming areas just as we had in the late twenties. The situation now is closely comparable to the situation then. Now, I am an optimist. I think everything will work out all right, but we should not prematurely throw away our cushions. In Illinois we do not unhinge the storm shutters on a sunny day in January. We wait to make sure winter really has passed on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time. So I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the bill, but I am taking this time to direct the attention of the membership to the fact that it was not so long ago when the Republican Party and its spokesmen and the newspapers that were telling the Republican story were attacking the Secretary of the Treasury because he was consulting with the Federal Reserve Board about this very important work covered by this bill, and the Federal Reserve Board was consulting the Secretary of the Treasury, and together they were making the monetary policy of our Nation. At that time our Republican politicians particularly said this is the wrong way to manage the monetary affairs of the United States. They clamored that the Secretary of the Treasury is supposed to be independent of the Federal Reserve Board and vice versa. They should not talk to each other.

During the course of the hearings on this bill we had before us the Under Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Both agreed that the only way you can properly manage the money affairs of our country, the only way you can properly manage the debt of this country, the only way you can finance our Government properly is by having the Secretary of the Treasury consult with the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Board consult with the Secretary of the Treasury, and together map out a program and move forward.

In that connection it is interesting to note that never, during a Democratic administration after a conference between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board did we run into a situation like that of last December 1955. Despite the consultations and conferences of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, and after they had agreed we should raise the reserve requirements in order to restrict credit, 2 weeks later the Federal Reserve Board had to go into the market and buy $6 billion of Government bonds in order to have the opposite effect. Instead of restricting credit as they did 2 weeks before, they had to operate against the restrictions and loosen credit. Six billion dollars worth of bonds is not very much to this administration. As a matter of fact, the gentleman who appeared before our committee, when asked whether they had to go into the market and buy some of these bonds, $12 billion worth of bonds, said "Yes, the situation changed, and the Federal Reserve Board had to go in and buy a few bonds." Then we find that the few bonds was more than $6 billion worth of bonds.

This is a good program, this is a necessary law. We must extend the law by passing this bill, but let us alert our officials downtown to the fact that they can do a better job than they have been doing.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. ARENDS].

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 23

Mr. ARENDS. I take this time, Mr. Chairman, to ask the majority leader to acquaint us with the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to.

Monday is District day and there is one bill out of the District Committee, H. R. 7228, the Potomac River Bridge. Then there will be H. R. 9824, Veterans' War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, and H. R. 9260, Veterans' Servicemen's Readjustment Act, second purchaser.

On Tuesday, of course, there are primaries in Alaska, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. Should there be any rollcalls that day they will go over until Wednesday but on Tuesday we will call H. R. 8750, the Watershed Projection and Flood Prevention Act.

Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday: There is a bill, H. R. 10654, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture to initiate an Agricultural Reserve Act soil-conservation program and to assist in raising farm income.

There will be the State, Justice, Judiciary appropriation bill for 1957.

There will be the highway construction bill if the rule is granted for its consideration. Also—

House Joint Resolution 501, to authorize participation in the NATO conference.

S. 2972, making it a criminal offense to damage or destroy aircraft.

H. R. 7500, Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, and

House Resolution 353, to authorize the Committee on House Administration to conduct an investigation of campaign expenditures.

There is the usual reservation, of course, that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. The other bills are important, but I understand it is somewhat problematical whether the highway bill will actually come up next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has stated it correctly. I have scheduled it just in case we can get to it but I think it problematical as to whether it can be brought up.

Mr. ARENDS. I understand it is the desire to go over from today until Monday if we complete the program this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDING SECTION 14 (B) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., supp. II, title 12, sec. 355), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1958" and by striking out "June 30, 1956" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1958".

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: After line 7 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'Notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding sentence, direct purchases under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the direction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; the Federal Open Market Committee shall make available such of its facilities as the Board may request in order to assist the Board and the Federal Reserve banks in carrying out such purchases.' "

AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely provides that this will be a transaction between the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who are the seven public members charged with the duty of representing the public, and the Secretary of the Treasury, concerning the issuance of this credit on these short-term securities or the sale of these short-term securities by the Treasury direct to the Federal Reserve banks. In other words, in practice here is what it means: If the bill passes in its present form, in order to get any amount of this money to be used, it would have to be done through Mr. Sproul and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He would have to do it. He is in charge of the Open Market Account of the Federal Reserve System and he is 1 of the 5 members who are representatives of the private banks on the Open Market Committee. I do not think those five interested representatives should have anything to do with these transactions up to $5 billion between the Treasury and the Federal

Reserve Board. In other words, leave the private bankers out of this. It does not concern them. It is not a matter that they should be allowed to veto. It is not a matter that they should be given the privilege of approving. It is none of their business. It is the Government's business. It will be transacted here in Washington between the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board, located a very few blocks apart right here in Washington. So why should not the Treasury be allowed to deal with the Federal Reserve Board just a few blocks away?

They can do this in the people's interest, in the Government's interest. Unless we adopt this amendment we will have to go to New York and get the approval of the representatives of the private banks. That is wrong. It is unnecessary, it is unduly crippling or retarding or impeding the progress of the people's business at a time when these transactions must be performed quickly, hurriedly. The money is needed right away. That is the reason the power is given.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything in the gentleman's amendment that would make this strictly a short-term proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. The law itself makes it that way. I am not afraid of that.

Mr. GROSS. What is the maximum time?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know what it is, but I am not afraid of that. Over the years it has operated satisfactorily, and I am not afraid of it going too long that way because the private bankers do not want it to go too long and they have a lot of power in the Federal Reserve System.

The fact of the matter is that the other day I had occasion to deal with some REA people and they were telling me that back in Texas they had to borrow $242 million at 2 percent interest. They are being criticized for that, charged with getting a subsidy in the rate of interest. Of course, they paid 2 percent when the going rate was much below 2 percent. It is a little above 2 now. At that time, April 11, 1956, I received a statement from the New York banks which showed that two banks up there had $364,341,000 in Government deposits for which the Government received no interest at all. Five New York banks, including these 2, had $624,599,000 and 13, including these 5, had $885 million. That is an illustration of on the one hand no interest at all, while on the other 2 percent being criticized. It is not unusual for the banks to have from three to seven billion dollars in Government deposits which is without interest.

This bill will permit of smaller Government deposits in the banks. You must have some deposits, of course. I would not be in favor of pulling all of the Government money out of the banks. It is necessary to keep some Government money there, but it is not necessary to keep a billion dollars in a few banks in New York upon which the Government is paying about 3 percent interest or more. That is absolutely unnecessary.

This bill if properly administered in the interest of saving the people's money could result in pulling out all except perhaps a few million dollars from those few New York banks. It is unnecessary to keep that amount of money there and there is no reason for keeping it there.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope my amendment will be adopted. It will allow the Treasury right here in Washington, D. C., to deal with the Board of Governors of the Federal System right here in Washington, D. C., and do everything that the bill proposes to do—nothing more, nothing less. In other words, it will be in the hands of the people charged with protecting the Government's interest and they will not be required to go through representatives of the private banks who, incidentally, usually have their own axes to grind.

I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment is wise. The program in its present form has been operating in a satisfactory manner ever since its adoption in 1942. It has gone on under two administrations. There has been no complaint from any quarter.

Mr. Chairman, I think we better let good enough alone, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment may seem to be a very simple one, but there is a lot more in it than meets the eye on first reading. The net effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to close up shop as far as the Open Market Committee is concerned; in other words, the Open Market Committee would cease to operate. The amendment is equivalent to an eviction notice. Now, the Federal Reserve does not want this proposed change. The Federal Reserve testified through its chairman that it wanted a continuation of present law. It is well known among the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and to everyone who has been present in this Chamber for the past 13 years that the gentleman from Texas has carried on a sort of running fight with the Open Market Committee. But, he has not been successful in knocking it out. This amendment is another attempt to destroy the Open Market Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat what I have said on a number of occasions, that the management of the Federal debt of the United States is the most difficult financial task that has ever been assigned to any man. An excellent job is being done. This is certainly not the time to disturb or rock the boat. We are doing very well. We learn from newspaper reports, that the chances are good that there will be a surplus in the Treasury at the end of this fiscal year. Let us not now disturb an arrangement that is working very well.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a deceptive one, and it should be voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] has just made a significant statement with respect to a Treasury surplus. I wonder why, in view of the publicity in the papers yesterday and today telling us that we are going to have an estimated $2 billion surplus, we need this legislation. It seems that with a $2 billion surplus coming up on July 1 of this year, we might dispense with this.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. TALLE. The reason is the one I stated at the outset. The obligations of the Federal Government are continuous. The receipts in the Treasury are received in a rather fitful fashion, and therefore there are times when the cash balance is low. But, of course, the outgo is continuous, because the Government must pay its bills, and this legislation merely seeks permission to have a day-to-day arrangement whereby, when necessary, the Treasury, with the cooperation of the Federal Reserve, can continue to pay the bills of the Government without using the cumbersome method of selling, say, 90-day notes and so on.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me that if we are now going into such lush times for everybody but the farmer, if we are going to run Treasury surpluses from now on, I might well ask when you expect to get rid of this kind of legislation if you cannot do it now? When are we going to get rid of this kind of financing over which the Congress certainly delegates tremendous financial authority to the Treasury and indirectly to the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I would not be too sure that we are going to have surpluses until after Congress has decided how much money it is going to vote in supplemental appropriation bills that are coming up.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman could mention the foreign giveaway bill, but he and I happen to differ on that.

I want to respond very briefly to the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. He said that simply because the Treasury has not used the full authority under this law that we should here today accept the fact that they may not at some time use that authority. I think that is the most specious kind of argument. If that is true, if in the past they have not borrowed more than $100 million or $1 billion at any one time, why $5 billion under this bill? Why not reduce the amount? To me that is the most specious argument that could be advanced in support of this bill.

I say again that the late Senator Taft of Ohio, who had forgotten more about financial matters than I will ever know,

well described this bill as nothing more or less than a printing press money bill. I have been opposed to it and I am still opposed to it on that basis.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the strongest argument that could be made for the amendment has been made by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], with the exception, of course, of his utterly uncalled-for statement that the amendment is deceptive. There is nothing deceptive about the amendment at all. The amendment very simply provides that the Federal Reserve Board shall be in charge of this operation and shall direct the Open Market Committee as to how it shall operate.

There is no reason why if this operation is so very important, as it is—as was explained to you by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE]—if it is so important, as it is, then the Federal Reserve Board should do this job. That is all this amendment seeks to do. Instead of letting the Open Market Committee do the job alone then I say the Board should at least supervise the job.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. And it is restricted to this $5 billion only.

Mr. MULTER. That is correct, just to this $5 billion. I am not one bit flattered by the fact that this Open Market Committee is operating out of the city of New York which is my home town. I say that the big bankers are doing this job just as big business today is doing a job. They are doing it on the little fellow. One reason why we have had the tremendous increase in the number of bankruptcies of small business, which have occurred during the last 2 years is because big business and big banks are crushing the little fellow. One way of helping stop that kind of operation is to adopt this amendment and see to it that the Federal Reserve Board under this law, which is a good law and a necessary law, performs this important task.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to answer my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. He asked me to yield to him, when I had the floor a little while ago. I started to yield to him and then suddenly realized that I had only 3 minutes and I had to withdraw my gesture of generosity. Now I am talking on my own time in order to answer his remarks.

When Mr. Martin appeared before our committee I asked him the question why, when they had never used the $5 billion authorization to anywhere near the full limitation, it was desired to retain the $5-billion limit and not reduce the figure as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa. He gave the answer, which seemed to me to make commonsense. In essence it was that we do not know when an emergency may come upon us, when people are unable promptly to meet their tax payments because of frozen assets, holdings that cannot quickly be liquidated and other reasons. Meanwhile the expenses of Government go on and must be met. While there is little probability that the $5-billion limitation will be reached, nevertheless it does provide a cushion for an emergency. We cannot be criticized for exercising a proper sense of caution and prudence. As a matter of fact, as I pointed out earlier, very little use has been made of this authority. Most of the years since 1942 it has not been used at all, and in the years when it has been used it has been only for a limited number of days, the largest number being 30 days. Generally it is for 2, 3, 4, or 5 days a year.

We may have coming upon us, I do not know, very uncomfortable conditions. Our consumer credit is expanding. That means that the individual debtload is growing, making it difficult to continue instalment payments should deflation hit family incomes to say nothing of sustaining buying power for new purchases. There is unrest in the farm districts. I read in the Wall Street Journal that in a survey in Iowa it was found that in one typical town of 1,000 population there were 10 closed stores and others on their way out. That would indicate that already in the farm areas there is a serious curtailment of buying power. If the economy should develop downward as it developed in the late twenties this $5-billion authorization might be a very fine cushion to have in getting money to pay the Government's bills.

My friend from Iowa, that is my answer to you.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, who is one of the hardest workers and most conscientious Members of the Congress, and for whom I hold a warm affection.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman not think if we are moving into a position where the people cannot pay taxes in this country the Treasury can come to Congress for authority to do certain things, and does the gentleman not think that when we get into the position of having any appreciable number of people who cannot pay their taxes we had better be cutting down on expenditures rather than giving somebody the opportunity and the authority to go out and borrow money, with little or no responsibility to Congress?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman comes from Iowa and of course I know he is very sympathetic with the owners of the 10 vacant stores in the little town of What Cheer that are mentioned in the Wall Street Journal of April 11, 1956.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly am.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The Wall Street Journal also says that one of the main grocery stores in What Cheer closed up last month and one of the farm implement dealers is about ready to fold up. If the Wall Street Journal's account of conditions in rural Iowa is correct, perhaps the gentleman will agree with me that a few cushions would not be out of order.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion on the subject of money brought back to my memory something that happened here on the floor over 20 years ago. The State of Indiana had a Member in this House whose special subject was money. Several times during each session he rose on this floor, came down here to the well, and delivered an address on the subject of money.

I can see him now. His right arm extended upward. His right foot extended forward. He wore his hair long. He also wore a long type of Prince Albert coat.

One day he took this floor and said, "There are not more than a dozen Members of this House who know anything about money." Upon that statement a Member rose in the rear of the Chamber and said, "Will the gentleman from Indiana tell the House who the 12 men are who know all about money?" His response was, "No, sir, but I can tell the gentleman he is not one of them." His keen sense of humor and native wit appealed to the membership.

I am here to confess I am not one of them, either. I am interested in the bill under discussion about money. I am satisfied that the committee has devoted a great deal of time in considering this question. They say it is necessary to pass this bill, and I propose to stand by the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] mentioned something that I think needs correction. He used the word "deceitful" in referring to this amendment. This amendment is not deceitful. It is anything but deceitful. It is open and aboveboard.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. I used the word "deceptive." I want to tell the gentleman why. On reading this amendment, which was not available to me until the moment we began consideration of the bill, I could see that the purpose was to terminate the authority of the Open Market Committee. It is deceptive in this sense that, unless Members other than myself—I am quite familiar with the gentleman's viewpoints—were aware of the gentleman's views, they might think this was a very innocent little amendment and fail to realize that the effect would be to terminate the authority of the Open Market Committee. That would be a major change indeed and, certainly, we should have hearings on such a proposition before taking legislative action on it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman used the word "deceptive," and I think it is the same as the word "deceitful." I think the meanings are the same. I do not know of any difference myself; possibly I am wrong. But there is nothing deceitful or deceptive about it. It does deny private banks the opportunity of being in on a deal between the Treasury here in Washington and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System involving up to $5 billion only, which is allowed under this bill. That is the only

way in the world it will affect the Open Market Committee. Otherwise, the Open Market Committee will go ahead. I would like any Member of the House to give me one reason why representatives of private bankers should be conferred with and consulted concerning a transaction between the Treasury of the United States and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. No one will ask me to yield because no one can give a reason for it; there is no reason. So I am just asking that the Government's business be done by people who are charged with the duty of performing their duties for the people—for the Government and no WOC's and no representatives of private banks should be involved in this. That is all it does. These transactions only shall be performed by the Board of Governors and the United States Treasury. We are just saying it is unnecessary to go to New York and get the consent of private bankers up there to do a little Government business down here in Washington. It is simple; it is easy; it is not deceptive; it is in the interest of the people; and it is in the interest of the taxpayers. I hope this simple little amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone far afield, it seems to me, in the discussion of whether or not we shall pass this bill. The experience of mankind has always had great weight. If anything is tested and retested and found to be good and accepted by the people, it is an evidence of its worth and goodness. The common law is based on experience of mankind. The rules of this Congress are based upon its experience through the years. Here is a simple amendment. I feel it my duty as the chairman of this committee, which adopted this report unanimously, to say that the amendment as reported in the bill has been tested for 14 years. Three administrations have asked for it and it has been repeatedly reported by the committees and passed by the Congress. Most of the discussion today has not been relevant to the bill. The amendment provided in the bill has worked well for the purposes for which it was enacted. It has been satisfactory to the Treasury. I has been satisfactory to the Federal Reserve. Experience has shown that they can work well under it. If you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and it should pass, you do not know what the result will be. No hearings have been held on it. I ask that the Committee of the Whole ratify what the Committee on Banking and Currency has done and vote for the amendment contained in the bill as we reported it.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to interrogate my chairman and ask for a correction in his statement.

Mr. SPENCE. I was referring to the amendment that we have reported and not the amendment which has just been offered.

Mr. TALLE. Yes, that is the point I would make.

Mr. SPENCE. The amendment that we have reported is the amendment that I have asked to be adopted.

Mr. TALLE. I was certain the chairman was for the bill because he has been for the bill all the time and explained it very well.

Mr. SPENCE. We have reported an amendment to the existing law, to extend it. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. TALLE. Yes. As I understood your comment, the gentleman is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. SPENCE. Necessarily I am opposed to that amendment.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman and I are in complete agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9285) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury, pursuant to House Resolution 431, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question was on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 10654, passed out of the Committee on Appropriations this morning, makes an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. I ask unanimous consent at this time that members of the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight to file a minority report or reports, and that such report or reports be printed along with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the bill H. R. 10660.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 477, Rept. No. 2018), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7500) to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5299) to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5299, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 5299 is to authorize the Department of the Interior to establish the Virgin Islands National Park on a portion of St. John and St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands.

The United States Virgin Islands, consisting of three principal islands, St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John and a number of surrounding smaller islands, rocks and cays, are located in the Caribbean Sea about 1,400 and 900 miles southeast of New York and Miami, respectively. These islands were purchased from Denmark in 1917 and are administered as an unincorporated Territory of the United States. The total population of the Virgin Islands is about 27,000, of whom 746 were living on St. John in 1950.

H. R. 5299 would establish a national park on an area not to exceed 9,500 acres in extent. It would permit the Secretary of the Interior to accept land and funds donated for developmental purposes. Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller has already acquired over 5,000 acres of land on St. John for donation for the park. Additional land area will be acquired with funds to be donated. The proposed park will conserve for public benefit a portion of St. John which has outstanding scenic, recreational, and historical beauty and significance. It is believed that tourism in the Virgin Islands which is a substantial part of the economy of the islands will be greatly enhanced by the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park.

The effort behind the establishment of this public park is the desire of Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, who has devoted himself in the past to many public enterprises, to acquire a major portion of St. John's Island, some 9,450 acres, when it is finally complete, 5,000 of which have now been acquired, and turn it all over to the United States Government to be administered by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior as a park.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. It is my understanding from the gentleman's statement that approximately 5,000 acres of this land has now been acquired and that Mr. Rockefeller plans to buy the additional 4,000 acres. Why would it not be better for the Congress to wait until all the land is acquired before passing the act?

Mr. ENGLE. It is not necessary to acquire all the land before the park is set up. Five thousand acres is sufficient for park purposes. The balance will be acquired from the Rockefellers or by the Department of the Interior through donations.

Mr. Rockefeller not only proposes to donate the land to the United States Government for park purposes, but also in addition to that he has set up in the past nonprofit organizations such as the one at the Jackson Hole Monument and other recreational and park areas throughout the United States to handle the concession activities on a nonprofit basis. In order to carry out that enterprise he will build the necessary facilities on the island; that is, a hotel, the cabanas and the necessary recreational facilities and they will be operated for the benefit of the public by this nonprofit corporation, in which Mr. Rockefeller himself will have no financial interest.

With reference to the scenic area itself, the Advisory Committee of the National Parks Service made a study of this matter and came to the conclusion that this particular island is one that adapts itself to creation as a national park. It is very different, of course, from any of the national park areas we have in existence at this time. It is an area with historical significance because it is an area which was first sighted by Columbus when he came across the ocean; the Danes had a settlement there, the ancient Indians lived there and some of their works still exist on this island. It is unique, too, with reference to the scenery and the weather. The National Park Service, the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service Advisory Committee have all recommended that the area be taken over and established as a national park area.

I may say that the legislation which is before you today was introduced by me as the result of an executive communication requesting that the legislation be introduced.

The visitations touristwise to the Virgin Islands surprised me. The record shows that in 1954 103,867 people visited the Virgin Islands. Some of those, of course, were people who came across from Puerto Rico, which is only 40 miles away, and, presumably they are included in this figure. But even then that is a startling number of people visiting the Virgin Islands. As an illustration with reference to other park areas in Territorial and Commonwealth national parks, the Hawaii National Park had 444,551 visitors, somewhat over 100,000 more than visited the Virgin Islands. Of course, Hawaii has been known as a recreational area for some time and their facilities are well developed. The Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska had 4,999 visitors, the San Juan National Historic Site, San Juan, P. R., only had 39,983. So I think it may be correctly said that from the standpoint of visitation in the area the establishment of this park would have sufficient interest to warrant the Federal Government providing of some facilities there to accommodate the people.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to deal with some of the cost figures. The bill as introduced does not have any figures with reference to the authorized appropriation, which has caused some discussion in the committee. I asked for submission by the Park Service of what they contemplated to be necessary. Those figures appear on page 19 of the hearings on the bill in the Senate, S. 1604. The breakdown of the figures shows that they have asked for $60,000 for administrative costs. That is the annual operating cost. They asked for $120,000 for capital investment. In looking over their requirements it seemed to me that they were asking for more than they had any need for, in light of the fact that the major portions of this area—in fact all of it except those areas immediately on the coastline—will be maintained in their natural state. The island will be continued and maintained in its natural state. There will be a great deal of improvement as far as the service to the public is concerned. That service to the public will be rendered by the concessionaire who will render it through the operation of a nonprofit corporation. So, at a little later point in these proceedings I intend to offer an amendment, which I have discussed with the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, and some of the others, who protested the open ended nature of the authorization, limiting the capital investment for improvement purposes to $60,000 and the annual operating or administrative expenses to $30,000. I will discuss the justification for that amendment and those figures in a little more detail when it is appropriate to offer the amendment and discuss it under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman agree with the views of the minority that it would cost a man and wife, traveling from the eastern seaboard to this national park, approximately $500 to get there?

Mr. ENGLE. I think that is the cost of the round trip. I am not sure.

Mr. GROSS. Well, $500 round trip. Then it would cost them, as I understand, $15 to $17 per day after they got there. Is that about correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That would be correct in the facilities to be established at the hotel. Now, of course, the Park Service has in mind establishing some facilities out there that will not be as expensive as that, so the people who do not want to spend that kind of money and who do not come as far, either, as the Atlantic seaboard, will be able to get down there and spend a little time.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you cannot get much closer than the eastern seaboard, can you, and still be in the continental United States?

Mr. ENGLE. Well, it depends where you are leaving from. If you start from New York, it is quite a bit farther.

Mr. GROSS. You are not by any chance creating a rich man's playground down there, are you?

Mr. ENGLE. That is exactly what we are trying not to do. And, I will say to the gentleman that if there is any major criticism of the facilities existing in many of the parks of our Nation, it is the fact that there is not enough area for the poor people, the people of moderate incomes, to get out into the scenic areas of the country and enjoy themselves. As a mater of fact, the situation has gotten to the point where out in my State they are going into the national forests rather than into the national parks, such as Yosemite, where the costs are high. Not all the costs are high, but there simply are not enough facilities there, and they are going out into the national forests. There is not very much area for a poor man any more, and it sems to me it is good sense to set aside an area in this scenic situation in the Caribbean where people from the southern part of the United States, who are fairly close, or on the peninsula of Florida can get down into that area, or from Puerto Rico, and not have to spend $15 or $18 a day to stay there. That is the situation at present.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman 1,000 percent as to the facilities provided in many of our national parks in this country. I had a little experience last summer, and I think I know some-

thing about it now. I did not have until that time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Did the gentleman explain to the committee just what this island will be used for in the future if it is not set aside for some such use as this?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. I think what the gentleman is alluding to is certainly what I was talking about, namely, that if we do not set aside the area so that the common people can get their hands on it, the people who are not so rich, eventually it will be set up into tremendous resort areas that the little fellow, the white-collar worker, a man with moderate income, will not be able to afford.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is exactly what I was going to say. I was down there last autumn, and the wealthy people from the East are just trying to build homes in that salubrious climate, and if we do not do something about setting aside that park for the people, it is going to be built up with expensive homes very quickly. Another point I wanted to make with reference to what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] said is that St. John is only 1 hour away from St. Thomas by boat; and that if there are no places where they can live right now on St. John, they perfectly well can live on St. Thomas and come over and spend the whole day on that beautiful unspoiled island.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution; he is perfectly right. Not only are they seeking to build very expensive homes down there, but I can visualize that a few years hence, if we do not set aside an area now, there simply will be none available, because the better areas will be taken over by very expensive resort operations. All of them will carry the kind of prices mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], and they will probably not be as inexpensive as that. The price mentioned in connection with the installation down there that will be managed by the Rockefellers on a nonprofit basis would be from $15 to $18 I believe. But they could go up to $25 or $30; and so on.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee on his presentation. After the minority had filed their views, I made it a point to check with the airlines, and I find that their figures represent perhaps the most luxurious manner in which one could travel. That I shall not dispute. But today a husband and wife can leave New York by Clipper plane, go to the Virgin Islands and return for $288.40; or they can leave from Miami and take a round trip for $204.40. Also, for $10 for a husband and wife over there, you can pay taxi fare from the present airport at St. Thomas over to the airport at St. John. These figures compare very favorably with what it would cost people in the eastern part of the United States to travel, if they wanted to go out to Yellowstone or Yosemite or Glacier National Park or any one of the other great national parks in our country.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] that if they wish to go by boat, they could go for even less money?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right. The rates of transportation by water are less than the rates I have quoted.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to join those who are proposing this measure. I think it is a most meritorious bill and it should not provoke any controversy in the House today. I think we could well afford to pass such a bill on the Consent Calendar. The cost of this proposal is negligible. It does not amount to anything in comparison with the benefits that it will provide. We should never fail to take advantage of every opportunity to create State parks when the land is contributed to the Government. They always serve a most useful purpose and in this particular area I believe it would serve an even greater purpose.

I congratulate the chairman of this committee on bringing this bill before the House.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of this committee, has given a very excellent dissertation I think not only on this particular bill but on the Park Service in general. However, I believe there are a few things this committee ought to learn about this particular situation before they are asked to vote on it.

I have opposed this bill in committee and I am opposing it here for reasons which I think are substantial.

First of all, let us talk about these Virgin Islands for just a minute. There are about 22,000 to 25,000 people who live there. It was interesting to me to find out that over 100 years ago there were over 40,000 people living there. In other words, the population has been decreasing. So there is plenty of room for people in that area.

Our Federal Government has contributed and is contributing substantially to the economy of the Virgin Islands today. For example, all of the income taxes collected in the Virgin Islands are returned to them, plus at the present time, or after this fiscal year 1955–56, $1 million a year which shall go into the Virgin Islands. The citizens of the Virgin Islands are contributing practically nothing financially to the Federal economy.

A couple of years ago we wrote an organic act for the Virgin Islands and tried to set them up on a basis where they could become self-sustaining. We made them a free port so that tourists going to this area could buy commodities at prices less than they could buy them elsewhere. We tried to increase the tourist travel to this area, and I believe to some extent that has been successful.

The chairman mentioned that over 100,000 people had visited the Virgin Islands last year. It is interesting to me, however, that they all come by boat, practically all of them come by tourist boats. They spend about 1 day there in the Island of St. Thomas and perhaps St. Croix, and then they get away. They spend their money in that place. I doubt that there would be more than 100 people who would ever get over to the Island of St. John, which has a population of some 700 people.

Now it is proposed to take 9,500 acres out of this island of St. John, which has a total acreage of 12,000, and make a national park out of it. In my opinion, this would defeat the very purpose for which we amended the organic act. In other words, you would completely stop any further private enterprise from going into that area and doing anything. You would prevent any person from ever building a home in that area. You would put this thing in the icebox.

I do not believe that is good for the economy of the Virgin Islands, and I do not believe it is good for this Federal Government to step in and take over that area. I think our Park Service department might well take a look at the some 400,000 acres which are presently privately owned within the exterior boundaries of our national parks, and be more concerned with acquiring those areas rather than grabbing more, rather than taking on new areas.

This Committee and this Congress are going to be asked to vote pretty soon on the so-called mission 66. That is a program of the National Park Service. You will be asked to appropriate some $785 million over a 10-year period for the modernization of our national parks. I believe I will favor that sort of thing after we have taken a look at what they intend to do. I think the Park Service should be more concerned with modernizing our present facilities and bringing them up to par, bringing them up to a condition where our people can go into our national parks and enjoy themselves. Even the chairman of the committee has said that out in his State they have to go into the national forests because the facilities in our national parks are not being maintained properly. Yet here we are taking on more areas, some 9,500 acres, in a place that is some 2,000 miles from here.

There is one other thing I should like to mention particularly, and that is this: Here we have a bill where the Director of the Park Service has said that under its terms he will spend $120,000 for capital improvement and he will spend $60,000 annually for maintenance. The chairman of the committee has indicated that he is going to cut that in half and make it $60,000, and $30,000 for maintenance. I am sorry more Members of this House have not been down there to see what that area is like, but it is mountainous, it is really hilly, believe me. When you go

on a road for a ride, you ride in a jeep and you hang onto the sides just as tight as you can, because it is almost straight up and down.

If you are going to cut these funds from $60,000 to $30,000, what are you going to do with it?

How are you going to improve this place so that these so-called poor people that the gentleman mentions can enjoy these facilities? Let me tell you this. There is no fresh water there. The only water you get comes from the rain. You can catch it on the roofs of the houses, or you can do as Mr. Rockefeller is doing at Caneel Bay and cover up one side of these mountains and plaster it with concrete. That is exactly what they are doing. At the bottom of that place, water runs down, and they store it. Caneel Bay is a very delightful place. Mr. Rockefeller is spending some $2 or $3 million there, and they are also building one of these catchments on the side of the mountain, and it is costing $200,000 to do that. How ridiculous can you be? Are you going to build campgrounds for the people who are going to go down there from this country and not give them any water; what are they going to camp on? Are they going to carry that water over there on their shoulders? The gentleman from Pennsylvania has mentioned the cost of getting there. I do not know what airlines he checked, but I, too, checked the airlines and the tourist round-trip figure that I was given was $182.04, and first-class fare is $215.82. Maybe he has a cheaper airline than I have. I do not know, but I would think they would all be the same. When you add up a few incidentals, it would come, I think, reasonably close to the $500 figure which was mentioned in the minority report. I believe for these reasons that this bill is a bad bill and that the Park Service department should be more concerned with the present park area of some 23 million acres, which is presently under their control. I imagine most of you gentlemen are receiving letters occasionally from your constituents complaining about the conditions of the Park Service in your home areas. I know I am. I imagine many others are having the same experience. I think our Park Service department would be well advised to stay within what they already have. They are going to spend $785 million on it, and they should not take on any more.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BATES. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington for the very splendid statement he has made. I did want to listen to his remarks, because I realize how fully he goes into all subjects that he undertakes to study. I was particularly impressed with the fact that the gentleman mentioned that this is no time for the Federal Park Service to expand itself. Last summer the gentleman from Washington went to Salem, Mass., and looked at the park there which is only about 200 yards by 50 yards in size.

Mr. WESTLAND. I might say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it was in an entirely disreputable condition and some funds could well be spent in that area.

Mr. BATES. When we inquired into the reason why money was not spent, they said that the money was not available.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is right.

Mr. BATES. That is why I say the gentleman's point is well taken that this is no time to expand into other park areas.

Mr. WESTLAND. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. Pursuing further the colloquy between the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Washington; does the gentleman from Washington know of any national park or parkway in this country where the people in the area think that the funds have been sufficient for the proper maintenance of that park or parkway?

Mr. WESTLAND. If there is, I am not acquainted with it. I might say in my own district I have the Olympic National Park of 900,000 acres and certainly they could use a great deal of funds to modernize some of the facilities they now have.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that most of the national park areas to which the gentleman referred are in the Far West, and that there is no comparison between the area to which the gentleman from Massachusetts drew our attention and the area which comes under discussion at the present time? Although the gentleman is right in asking for an improvement in that particular historic site, they do not serve the same purpose; is that not correct?

Mr. WESTLAND. They may not serve the same purpose I will say to the gentleman from Colorado, but both would be under the National Park Service, and this is merely an indication that the present facilities are not being maintained in the way they should be.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman not feel that all parts of the United States should have some of these facilities?

Mr. WESTLAND. I surely agree, and they should not expand their present facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Let me make one more point. It has been stated that Mr. Rockefeller is the owner of these 9,500 acres, and that he has already acquired 5,000 acres. They have told me they have spent between two and one-half and three million dollars at this delightful spot at Caneel Bay. It is generally conceded that Mr. Laurance Rockefeller is an outstanding conservationist; that he is a man who wants to preserve something of this kind. I think the best thing we could do would be to let Mr. Rockefeller preserve these areas himself. Let some of that money which he is spending be spent right there, and let him have full control of it. I am sure Mr. Rockefeller, who is an outstanding conservationist in this country, would see to it that these horrible things which have been mentioned today would not be built in that area; and let the Federal Government stay out of this altogether.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. As I understand the gentleman's argument, he says that this is a bad bill because we cannot afford it. I believe the gentleman will agree that we should have a good park system, and he knows too that a 10-year program has been recommended to bring our parks to a respectable level. I would assume that the gentleman would probably be willing to support that. I would like to say to him that in all probability we will have a bill coming before this Congress to appropriate some three or four billion dollars for overseas aid, of one kind or another, to add to the $40 billion we have already put in there. It seems to me it is little enough to pay for our own people when all we are asking for in this bill, if they get everything they request—and I am proposing to cut it in half—the sum of $60,000 for capital investment and some $30,000 annually to keep a park ranger down there.

Mr. WESTLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's great thoughts on economy, and I concur with him heartily in economy, but economy should come in the proper place. If we are going to create a park of 9,500 acres, and spend $30,000 a year on it, what have you got? You might just as well take the $30,000 and throw it away.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman from California had been voting as I have on this foreign giveaway program, we would have some money to take care of our own people.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I would like to ask if there was any testimony as to the ownership of the other 3,000 acres on the island. I read in the minority report that this proposed park will concern itself with the scenic, recreational, and historical beauty and significance, and at the same time I read that the property concerned is exceedingly mountainous and hilly.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Presumably it does have some area down next to the water which would have a certain amount of recreational bases. But the scenic benefit of the mountains must go to the property owners adjacent. I wonder whether there was any testimony regarding the ownership of other parts of the island.

Mr. WESTLAND. There was some testimony from people who lived there,

and they were very concerned over the possibility of being thrown out of this 9,500-acre area. I notice in the report that although they will be able to live there to the extent of their lives, as soon as they have passed on, their property will revert to the Federal Government. I am sure they never had that idea. Certainly I never heard any testimony along those lines while we were in the Virgin Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I ask the gentleman to return to the thought he just expressed and I would ask a question. I see on page 2 of the report the statement is made that the present tenants within the taking area would be guaranteed a lifetime interest in their holdings, but said interests would not be inheritable or transferable. Who is to guarantee this lifetime interest to the present tenants?

Mr. WESTLAND. There is nothing in the bill so far as I could find, I would say to the gentleman, that would guarantee that right. I am sure that if the people who own homes within this area anticipated that they were going to be able to keep their homes that would be one thing, but for example, if they were taken over at the present time and later one had a child, that child would not be able to inherit.

Mr. JONAS. That is right as I understand it. I understand also the Government does not propose to acquire property by purchase, condemnation, or anything of the sort, but it is to be acquired by outside interests and conveyed to the Government.

Mr. WESTLAND. As I said earlier, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, in whom we had a great deal of faith, has bought this property. I am sure he would see to it that if somebody had a home there he would not be kicked out during his tenure.

Mr. JONAS. He owns only 5,000 acres of the 9,450.

Mr. WESTLAND. But I understand he has an option on the other 4,400.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WESTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the National Park Service does not use any right of condemnation to take over areas within parks, and that if this area were purchased by Mr. Rockefeller for the park he could very easily put a lifetime estate into the deed of transfer and thereby continue the right of the person in possession to occupy the property?

Mr. WESTLAND. I would say to the gentleman that I frankly consider from the language of the report that they would have a life estate only.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman knows they could not take the property if the person in possession did not care to sell.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is correct, but by some legal gimmick or something you are going to say that when the present tenant has died that property will then go over to the Government. That is what it states in the report.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. It is true that there are some people in the United States who feel that there is already too much land within the confines of our national parks. With that I do not agree. At the rate our population is growing, however, it is incumbent upon the Members of Congress today to take a long-range view of our national parks, so that not just for today but also for the generations which are to come there will be areas within the United States that can be visited by our citizens.

Up until the present time practically all of the large areas that are in our national parks are in the West and Far West. In the eastern part of the United States there are very, very few areas of any size at all that can be visited as a national park, yet in the East we have our largest concentration of population.

It has been proposed in this bill that a large part of the island of St. John in the Virgin Islands be set aside as a national park. The man who had the vision and foresight to make these plans is Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

It is true that he is one of the outstanding conservationists in the United States. It is because of men such as him that other people have had cause to really appreciate some of the things that exist in the United States and some of the things which he wants to preserve not only for the present but for the future.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the only national park in the New England area is at Bar Harbor, Maine, the Acadia National Park, which was given to the Federal Government by Laurance Rockefeller's father, John D. Rockefeller; otherwise there would not be a national park in that area?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. If it were not for John D. Rockefeller there would not be an Acadia National Park in Maine. Also if it were not for the Rockefellers we would not have the Grand Teton National Park to the extent it is there now. This family has been one of those that have used their substance in this world not just for their own good but for the benefit of mankind, present and future. In those respects I sincerely believe they are to be commended.

There has been some comment that certain people who live on this land within the confines of the proposed Virgin Island National Park will only have a life interest. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington that there is absolutely nothing new in acquiring real estate and allowing the present owner to have a life interest in his property and at the death of the present life tenant the property will revert to some other person. It makes a difference in the amount that is paid for the property and that is just what is proposed to be done down there in the Virgin Islands. They intend to allow these people who are natives to live in their homes, to stay there until the present tenants have passed on, knowing that they can make a place for their children. The money they will receive for their reversionary interest will be paid at once and they can use the money to allow their children to go out, get an education and find some other place in which to live.

I sincerely hope that the Members of this House will see to it that the bill is passed. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], our chairman, for having seen to it that some of the provisions and askings of the Park Service are cut down so that it is not a financially infeasible proposition. I shall go along with his recommendation, even though I feel that as far as capital outlay is concerned, it should remain as it is in the present bill.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, we all appreciate Mr. Rockefeller's generosity with regard to the preservation of the scenic areas in this Nation. But I recall at the time a similar proposal was entered into in connection with the Grand Teton National Park where Mr. Rockefeller donated land that he did not make the donation to the Interior Department until after the Congress had appropriated some $5 million to build the water system. Does the gentleman have any information as to how the water system and the other utilities are to be provided in this area, and, if so, what the cost will be and who is to put them in?

Mr. SAYLOR. The facilities that are necessary at the present time for Caneel Bay have already been put in by Mr. Rockefeller and also included in the donation. For the further expanse that will be necessary in this area, it will be up to the Members of Congress to face up to their responsibility and provide for the people in the East just as we are going to provide for the people in the West whatever is necessary for the proper maintenance of our national parks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Nebraska. I would simply like to correct the inference made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. In the current National Park Service budget and in all of the Park Service budgets for the last several years, by far the larger part of the appropriations have not gone to the parks in the West. They have gone to the parkways in the East, and I think an examination of the Park Servive budgets will very clearly show that fact.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this minute in order to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], a question. It was stated that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands had approved this legislation. I notice on page 3 of the report, the second proviso in the resolution that was adopted by the legislature, it says this:

> All efforts be made by the Congress of the United States and the United States National Park Service to protect and maintain the vested interests of the residents of the island of St. John.

Am I to understand that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands approves the method of acquiring the land and reserving to the present tenants only a life estate, in view of that provision in the resolution?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to answer the question?

Mr. JONAS. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. The legislation only calls for about three-fourths of the area of St. John to be taken over for a national park facility. The other one-fourth will remain in private ownership. This provides that the part that remains shall not be trespassed upon by the National Park Service or the National Government. It also provides that any of the taxing base that there is on the island of St. John shall be left as nearly as it is at the present time. The bill before us permits that very thing to take place.

Mr. JONAS. You mean that the proviso I read relates only to the owners of the remaining part of the island which is not to be taken over.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right. There are only about 3 or 4 owners of property within the area concerned, and they would not be dispossessed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL.].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a clear idea of just what we are trying to do in this legislation. First, we are trying to firm up a national park area for a part of the United States of America that has no national park facility at the present time. Second, we are trying to preserve for use by the ordinary citizen an area which is of very low value for other than recreational and home purposes. This would take from the island the center of it mostly, with some of the shoreline, and set it aside as a national park, but would permit a sufficient amount of the shoreline to remain for private enterprise to develop and use as it sees fit.

It so happens that these islands were among the first of the Carribean Islands that were taken possession of by the Spanish Government. Later on they came under the jurisdiction of England, then the Danes, and, then came our own jurisdiction over them in 1916. We did not buy these islands because of any economic value that they had to the United States. We purchased this outpost of the Carribean because the harbor at Charlotte Amalie, the main city on St. Thomas, was the most perfect harbor we could have for our defense purposes in the First World War.

The island of St. John has been used for agricultural production for a long time, as the gentleman preceding me has suggested. The particular island of St. John is an area of a few thousand acres which presently is covered almost entirely with a secondary growth of timber, an island which once, when slaves were being used, was extensively cultivated for sugarcane production. I think that it is a very sound idea to take over control of the area before it can be put to use by only a select group of our citizens. I would remind the committee that a similar development took place near Bar Harbor, where John D. Rockefeller II gained control of the area, developed it as an area to be set aside for the use of the public, which presently uses it as a national park under the jurisdiction and control of the National Park Service. Last August I saw hundreds of families camping out, as it were, in Acadia National Park. There were no plush hotels for the users but rather, just well-kept and orderly camping facilities. It does not have any expensive improvements. The area at Acadia National Park is used for public camping grounds more than anything else. That is what will take place on St. John if it is developed into a national park. There will be a modest headquarters for the Park Service; the development of one road perhaps 5 miles long, a few trails, and 2 or 3 camp grounds.

Quite a fuss has been made in this debate about the water supply. The only need for water within the interior of this small island is for drinking and cooking purposes. These people go from the top of the island down to the bays to swim. They do not have to worry about a large quantity of water.

Some water and sewage facilities will be necessary, of course. But these need not be extensive.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Does the gentleman honestly believe that that catchment that the Rockefellers are building there now would provide sufficient water for camping facilities up at the top of the mountain?

Mr. ASPINALL. I believe that there will be enough water provided by using that water and other water that can be secured. The gentleman knows—he was with us when we were on top of the mountain and found one family living up there—that they got all of their water from just the roof.

Mr. WESTLAND. If the gentleman will yield further, is not that exactly what this bill would prevent, another family from building a home within these 9,500 acres? We talked to that person. He had a home he had built himself and on which he said he had spent perhaps $8,000, and which was worth perhaps $15,000 because he used his own labor on it. Putting all of this acreage in a park area would preclude any further such construction.

Mr. ASPINALL. I would admit that, but it would provide for the public the opportunity to use this area for their recreational and vacation needs.

Mr. WESTLAND. If the gentleman will yield further, is the public precluded from using the area now or has the public ever been precluded from using it?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman knows very well that if it comes under private control that the common people, the ordinary citizen, will not be allowed to use it.

Mr. WESTLAND. Does the gentleman believe that if this were left in the hands of Mr. Laurance Rockefeller he would keep the public out of that 5,000-acre area that he already owns?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado believes that if Mr. Laurance Rockefeller's dream is not allowed to develop, then he will not continue his ownership of this property for very long. The gentleman understands why Mr. Rockefeller bought this property. He did not buy it for the purpose of developing any profitmaking enterprise on his own part. He bought it so that he could set it aside as an area to be used by the public; is not that correct?

Mr. WESTLAND. The gentleman surely does not believe that Mr. Rockefeller is running short of money so that he would not continue with his plan?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman knows that Mr. Rockefeller has already put more money into this development than he contemplated putting into it in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who have made their presentation in opposition to this bill. I do so even though I am strongly supporting the proposed legislation. I happen to come from a part of the country where a big proportion of the national parks and monuments are located. I have 16 national parks and monuments in my own district, including the Grand Canyon, perhaps the greatest of them all.

I know the great need for this mission 66 program. I think the opponents today have made out a very good case for mission 66; I wish we were voting on it now. But I do not think they have made out a good case against this particular bill today.

As the chairman of our committee stated earlier, this proposed legislation initiated—I think that point should be reiterated here—in a request by the Department downtown.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], perhaps one of the leading conservationists in Congress, has indicated, this is a conservation issue. It is perhaps one of the most important conservation issues this Congress will have an opportunity to vote on. The idea for this bill originated with the Department of the Interior, and they propose to preserve this great natural resource.

The picture we see here at the moment then is the gentlemen on this side of the aisle rescuing a conservation measure proposed by the administration. That is not, perhaps, an unusual situation, but that is precisely the picture we have here this afternoon.

So I say this is a sound conservation measure. It is needed. I think we will look back in the years to come and say that in enacting this legislation today we acted wisely to conserve one of the last great areas that will qualify for national park status.

I say to all Members of the House, let us back up and support this request by Dr. Wirth, the National Parks Director, and by the administration, and let us set aside this area and add it to our great national park system.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an administration request. It is a gift to the United States by a farsighted citizen looking to the good of our children and our children's children. If the people had been so narrow-minded 50 years ago as some of the statements I have heard here today, we would never have had Yellowstone Park, we would never have had the Grand Canyon National Park, we would never have any of our great national parks.

This is a unique area. It is different from any other area in the United States where there is a park. If we turn down this request today, as I said when I questioned the chairman from the floor, it is practically sure that the area will be immediately grabbed up by wealthy people and by hotel people who were down there last fall in flocks in St. Croix, and I am sure would be in flocks down there in St. John, and the area would be completely spoiled.

It is a wild area. I went around the proposed park by boat, all around the entire island. I do not think there were a dozen houses you could see in the area which is to be taken over. On the north side of the island there are wonderful white beaches without a person there. It is a unique area, an area which for the good of the people of the United States in future generations should be made into a park. If we do not do it now we are apt to lose it forever. I think for the sake of our children and our grandchildren we should vote to accept this wonderful gift from Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I believe the opposition to this bill is very sincere and possibly right, although I disagree with the opposition.

I should like to touch very briefly on three of the points which have been made here. No one's land will be taken away from him. It will be donated or sold. I think that when a person donates or sells a piece of property it is rather generous to give him a life interest in that property thereafter, so there would be no injustice in that field.

I was impressed with the dispute over the cost of going to the Virgin Islands. Some say $204 and some say $500 for a couple. But may I say for a resident of my community in New York State contemplating a vacation either to the Virgin Islands or to the Yellowstone National Park, I would think either sum would be about equal, especially if in the Virgin Islands you were not going to be burdened very heavily for living costs after you arrived. Finally, and I think this is an important point, we are very much concerned here with the economy of the Virgin Islands. We know it has cost the United States a considerable amount of money in an effort to keep their economy high. In this case, $5,000 approximately in taxes would be lost on this property taken over, but we would permit the Virgin Islands to continue to tax the concessions in the national park and that, I would think, would balance out or more than balance out the $5,000 lost plus the rich flow of tourists which would help the economy of the Virgin Islands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a portion of the Virgin Islands of the United States, containing outstanding scenic and other features of national significance, shall be established, as prescribed in section 2 hereof, as the "Virgin Islands National Park."

The national park shall be administered and preserved by the Secretary of the Interior in its natural condition for the public benefit and inspiration, in accordance with the laws governing the administration of the national parks (16 U. S. C. 1, and the following).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, subject to the following conditions and limitations, to proceed in such manner as he shall find to be necessary in the public interest to consummate the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park:

(a) The acreage of the national park shall be limited to a total of not more than 9,500 acres of land area, such total to be comprised of not more than 50 acres on the island of St. Thomas, and not more than 9,450 additional acres to be comprised of portions of the island of St. John and such small islands, rocks, and cays not in excess of 1,000 acres in the general vicinity thereof as may be desirable for inclusion within the park;

(b) Tentative exterior boundary lines, to include land not in excess of the aforesaid acreage limitations, may be selected for the park in order to establish the particular areas in which land may be acquired pursuant to this act, such tentative boundaries to be selected and adjusted as may be necessary by the Secretary of the Interior;

(c) The Secretary, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to accept donations of real and personal property within the areas selected for the park until such time as the aforesaid total of 9,500 acres shall have been acquired for the park by the United States, and he may also accept donations of funds for the purposes of this act;

(d) Funds made available for purposes of this act may be used by the Secretary in such manner as he shall find to be in the public interest, in order to procure by purchase or otherwise, land or interests therein for the park;

(e) Any Federal properties situated within the areas selected for the park, upon agreement by the particular agency administering such properties that such properties should be made available for the park, may be transferred without further authorization to the Secretary by such agency for purposes of this act;

(f) Establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, in its initial phase, shall be and is hereby declared to be accomplished and effective for purposes of administration when a minimum acreage of not less than 5,000 acres in Federal ownership for purposes of this act shall have been acquired by the United States in specific areas containing such acquired lands to be designated by the Secretary; and

(g) Notice of the establishment of the park as authorized and prescribed by this act shall be published in the Federal Register.

Mr. ENGLE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 3, line 3, strike out subsection (d) of section 2 and reletter the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and I have discussed this amendment. It strikes out the words:

Funds made available for purposes of this act may be used by the Secretary in such manner as he shall find to be in the public interest, in order to procure by purchase or otherwise, land or interests therein for the park.

It seems a rather wide authority for the Secretary to have.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. I concur in the amendment. We want to make it clear that we do not authorize the purchase of land. That can be made more abundantly clear by the amendment which I propose to offer, but I agree with this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE: On page 3, line 24, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from Federal funds a sum not in excess of $60,000 for capital improvements for said Virgin Islands National Park, and a sum of not in excess of $30,000 annually for the administration of the Virgin Islands National Park."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which was previously discussed. The major objection to this legislation comes from those who think that we should not be setting up too elaborate a scheme in the Virgin Islands to take over and manage the park area

being provided by the generosity of Mr. Rockefeller. So I asked the Park Service to supply me with a breakdown of what they had in mind. I previously referred to where it can be found for those who may hereafter or now want to look at it in the RECORD. It is on page 19 of the Senate hearings on the bill S. 1604, the companion bill in the other body. Here is what they ask for. They want a superintendent, a chief ranger, a naturalist, a ranger, an administrative aid, and two clerk-stenographers. Those are seven permanent positions which is more people than I have running the professional staff of my committee. I told Mr. Worth I thought he ought to be able to get along on a good deal less than that. Those salaries, taking into account the Territorial differential of 25 percent, run to about $38,000. The balance of $60,000 includes some $9,000 for travel and some $6,000 for temporary and seasonal labor and general expenses making up $6,987 or a total of $60,000. So I told Mr. Worth we ought to be able to get along with a superintendent and a couple of people to help him out. Nine thousand five hundred acres is not a big layout, and we do not want to set up a large administrative agency.

Therefore this amendment places a limitation of $30,000 for annual administrative expenses. The amount requested for capital investment is $120,000: $10,000 for trails, $50,000 for roads, $25,000 for buildings, $20,000 for sewerage, light, water, and communications; $15,000 for archeological surveys. My amendment would cut that in half. It would leave the $10,000 for trails, $10,000 for roads, $20,000 for building structures. All that we need is a little ranger station there, and the total amount requested for sewerage and water and communications is left in. The $15,000 for archeological surveys is cut out entirely, because I think those fellows down there can do that themselves. The purpose is to limit these amounts so that we are not setting up a large administrative agency. The service rendered to the visiting public will be taken care of largely by the concessionaire, who will operate his concessions on a nonprofit basis. If at some later time these amounts appear to be inadequate, it is always possible to come back and amend this authorization bill and change it in the light of changing circumstances.

I have offered this amendment after consultation with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], who appeared on the minority report, to make the bill more acceptable to him.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]. The amendment should be adopted as presented by the gentleman from California. It overcomes some of my objections because I thought they were starting out in a much too grandiose manner. They can always come back to Congress and the Congress will listen to their plea.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, lines 8 and 9, after "more," strike out "than 50 acres" and insert "than 15 acres."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the bill on page 2, lines 8 and 9, calls for 50 acres of land on St. Thomas. That is the other island, some 40 miles away. All they need acreage for is a dock and perhaps a storage warehouse in which to store some of their materials. It did seem to me that acquiring 50 acres on another island might be taking land needed by the island in the days ahead. I am sure they can get along with 15 acres of land for a dock and the necessary road, and for a building sufficiently large to store any materials they may have to store in order to get over to the island of St. John. I am a little fearful that some people in the park service might want to build a nice large house down there on the island of St. Thomas, which is a very beautiful place, and have a very plush yacht that they could use to go back and forth to and from the island of St. Thomas, but 50 acres seem a little large for even a nice house or another building. So I am offering the amendment to cut down the size of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Arizona indicated we ought to accept this proposal because it is asked for by the administration and specifically by Mr. Wirth, who, I believe, is Director of the National Park Service. Now, I will say to you that it is my belief in the light of some recent developments that Mr. Wirth is completely uninhibited when it comes to asking for things, so that statement makes little or no impression upon me.

We have pending before the House now a bill to build, at the expense of your taxpayers and mine, a six-lane traffic bridge across the Potomac between the States of Maryland and Virginia, down at Alexandria, Va. Also pending is a bill to provide that Mr. Wirth get out of the bridge-building business, and turn it over to the Department of Commerce. Yet in spite of that bill to take Mr. Wirth and the Department of the Interior out of the bridge-building business at Alexandria, he is still coming before Congress and asking for authority to build bridges in the District area. So he is apparently uninhibited when it comes to asking for legislation.

I wonder if this bill is a proposition to bail Rockefeller out with his already heavy investment on St. Johns Island? I have not been able to determine from the arguments that have been made around here whether this is a bill to bail Rockefeller out of his $3 or $3½ million investment down there. I just cannot see it from the standpoint of the citizens of this country, and particularly the average garden variety of American citizen taking a trip to St. John and down in the Caribbean; I cannot see it at all. Maybe there is going to be a great exodus of tourists at $500 per man and wife for transportation alone, but I doubt it.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. One hundred and three thousand visitors went down to the Virgin Islands in 1954. I explained that I thought a good many of those came from Puerto Rico; nevertheless, there is a tremendous number of people going to the Virgin Islands.

With reference to Mr. Rockefeller, he hardly needs any bailing out. In this case he is going to donate the land, and in addition to that he is setting up a hotel and other accommodiations that will cost two or three million dollars to be operated on a nonprofit basis.

Mr. GROSS. Some one suggested here a little bit ago that if this bill was not passed he might pull out.

Mr. ENGLE. I do not understand he is going to pull out, but if they do not use it as a national park it may be used for something else.

The gentleman remarked a little while ago that if I had voted as he did on foreign aid we would have had more money for things like this. I would like to go something like 50–50 on this foreign-aid business—a dollar for them and a dollar for the home folks. I do not ask the gentleman to go that far even on this one. It seems to me appropriate to do something for Americans once in a while, and that is what this bill will do.

Mr. GROSS. Of course we have had no such 50–50 foreign aid proposition before the House. I would like to make it about 10–90, wherein foreigners put up 90 cents on every American handout dollar. I might vote for that one, but we have had no such proposition as that offered to us.

You talk about tourists. Those who will travel to St. Johns Island will be people of considerable means. There are quite a lot of them in "Mon-ah-co" or "Mon-ay-co," however you pronounce it, right now, but I do not believe you will find every-day Americans able to go to Monaco, and understandably so. Incidentally, I think that Prince and Princess business has become very disgusting, if not nauseating.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment more or less in the nature of a perfecting amendment in view of the adoption of the last one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, line 10, strike out "50" and insert "85."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, that merely corrects the amount of acreage and keeps it in line with the rest of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 3, after line 23, insert:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 hereof the authority to accept, acquire or receive by exchange lands for park purposes under this act shall terminate 3 years after the effective date of this act and no land shall thereafter be added to the Virgin Islands National Park except by act of Congress."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this briefly with the chairman of the committee. The difficulty we have had in some of our national parks in the past seems to be that we set up a national park, then someone comes along without coming to Congress and enlarges that park. We have had that situation down in the Everglades Park, we have had it in a half dozen areas of the United States where great enlargements have been made without their coming to Congress for permission to have such enlargement.

My amendment would place some restriction upon the Secretary and limit him. If they want to go beyond the amount in this bill then it will be necessary to come back to Congress and state their reasons for the enlargement. That, I think, will avoid some problems like we have in connection with the Everglades National Park and some other parks. We have had before us from time to time the situation where they are trying to enlarge parks that sometimes seem to be large enough already.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the section be numbered 4, because we now have 2 sections 3 in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 2, line 12, after "excess of", strike out "1,000" and insert "500."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this goes to the question of how many acres beyond the island may be acquired. The bill reads this way: "and such small islands, rocks, and cays not in excess of 1,000 acres in the general vicinity thereof as may be desirable for inclusion within the park."

One thousand acres takes in a lot of those islands. It stretches clear over to St. Johns, and clear over to St. Thomas. I think there again we ought to simply cut down on the amount of money in the bill. Possibly we ought to limit how many of these islands they may take in. This will make the bill a little more palatable to me and I think to other Members who signed the minority report. In other words, the Secretary here is reaching out and taking in, in addition to what he has here, another 1,000 acres of the islands around him. As I remember the area, that could include a rather large number of islands, going clear over to St. Thomas and probably to St. Croix.

I offer this as an amendment. It will make the bill more acceptable to those of us who signed the minority report. If they find they need more islands and need more help, they should come back to the Congress and state their reasons.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Under this bill is all of the waterfront at Caneel Bay reserved for use of the public?

Mr. ENGLE. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. When the distinguished and beloved gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE], and I visited the Virgin Islands a few months ago we found that they were erecting near the waterfront a number of cottages to rent. However, at that time all of the waterfront apparently was open to public use. That will be continued?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is not exactly right. The area around Cruz Bay, which is just to the south of Caneel Bay, is all privately owned, and from there on around for a considerable distance, as well as over to Coral Bay on the other side, it will still be open to private ownership. It starts someplace between Cruz Bay and Caneel Bay area, and Rockefeller is building, as the gentleman knows, on his own property, and that will be turned over to the Federal Government.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I do not know whether the gentleman quite understands me. I am one who believes that Caneel Bay is perhaps the most beautiful bathing spot in the world, and I believe the gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Colorado agrees with the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Under this bill will the beach at Caneel Bay be under private control?

Mr. ASPINALL. It will be part of the concession.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. What part of it?

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, it will be part of the concession that goes with the Rockefeller interests there, the cabanas, the motels, and the small houses up on the hill. But, they will be open to use by the public.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. As well as the title?

Mr. ASPINALL. And the title.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. When I was down there a few months ago part of Caneel Bay, that people talk about all over the world who have been there, seemed to me to be just in front of these expensive cottages that rent, as I understand, during the season at $100 a day.

Mr. ASPINALL. No; $17 a day.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Well, that is what they told us. The cottages were not open. But the beaches in front of these cottages will be open to the public?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I wanted to make certain that it is the purpose of the authors of this bill to conserve for public use the entire beach and waterfront at Caneel Bay and similar place where the land meets the water. In Chicago we had a long fight to redeem our beautiful lakefront for use and benefit of all the people. It would be a tragedy if the entire Caneel Beach were not open to public use.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to make available to the gentleman the map which has been published by the Park Service which clearly shows that that bay which he describes as Caneel is shown on the map as Solomon Bay, and that will be part of the Federal property.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. That is as I understood, but I wanted to make it clear that this bill does not give authority to enter into any arrangement that closes the beaches to the public. I am most enthused over this project, having viewed firsthand the work that Mr. Rockefeller has done in building a road system where there were only dangerous trails and in restoring some of those old sugar mills that were operating at the time Jamestown was settled, as I understand it.

Mr. ENGLE. In commenting on the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, I think it is unnecessary, but I do not believe it does any harm, and I have no opposition to it.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. My only thought is that if this property were continued in the ownership of Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, it could always be open to the public as it is today; that with the Federal Government entering into this arrangement, the picture will not be any improvement whatsoever. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It is my understanding that Mr. Rockefeller, who put all this money into building roads and making restorations—and the cost was very heavy, especially as all materials and most of the labor had to be brought in from Puerto Rico and elsewhere—is now making a donation of the land and property to the Government for use as a national park.

Mr. WESTLAND. My only comment is that Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, as well known a conservationist as he is, would maintain that facility in the way it is today.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Yes, but it is possible that Mr. Rockefeller might do someday as I am going to do someday—die.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5299) to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 442, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WESTLAND) there were ayes 50, noes 17.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LIBRARY SERVICES—NATIONAL NEED

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent statement on the subject of the library services bills, S. 205 and H. R. 2840, which has been prepared for delivery in connection with her appearance before the Senate committee hearings by my valued friend and distinguished constituent, Mrs. George R. Wallace, of Fitchburg, Mass.

Let me state that I am most desirous of associating myself with the sincerity and enthusiasm of Mrs. Wallace's comments and remarks concerning these important bills. Her statement is very ably written and forcefully presents the strong and, to my mind, unanswerable argument for these measures.

We should keep in mind that libraries are a truly indispensable part of American life and American culture. They are part indeed of our way of life, because they originated in some of our communities in the very early days of the settlement of this country. In my own State of Massachusetts, for example, historians have pointed time and time again to the fact that the Founding Fathers and the early settlers first put up their meeting houses and places of worship, then their schools, then their public libraries. These were the first public buildings or facilities provided in early New England and I believe that this pattern spread over much of the country.

We will never be able, of course, adequately to appraise the important role which libraries have played in the education and training, the development of our people and the growth of our great Nation. But we know that libraries, as much perhaps as any other institution, save our churches, were responsible for opening the doors of wisdom and enlightenment to our young people and giving then the inspiration and knowledge to forge ahead and undertake the great tasks of building the power, might, and strength of the Nation we live in today. Though sometimes I think we are not so conscious or aware of it, as we should be, it is an undeniable fact that these tasks still remain with us these days, which the early settlers superbly and willingly accepted and must still be carried out with energy, devotion, and untiring attention, if this Nation is to retain its vigor, its economic health, its spiritual power. If our way of life is to be sustained in this perilous world, if we are to conquer the great problems of the present and adapt our democracy dynamically to the needs of the hour, of unbelievable growth, of fabulous progress and of miraculous advancement.

Libraries are playing a greater role in America than ever before, not only in our communities, but in our great universities, colleges and schools, where research and development projects are pursued with fiery zeal by thousands of dedicated American men and women, in the precincts of our great cities where libraries are the indispensable hand maiden of American culture, in our Government, which prizes and prides itself with the great Library of Congress, probably the greatest institution of its kind in the world, and in the myriads of libraries which serve our armed services, not only in the United States, but virtually all over the world wherever the farflung forces of our Nation are deployed to check and deter the savage barbarians seeking the destruction of freedom.

Yes, my friends, libraries are esssential, necessary, indispensable to American life. If because of rising costs, mounting prices and, I fear, also perhaps because of lack of the same vigilance and meticulous devotion exhibited by our forbearers they are suffering from handicaps, from insufficient income, from lack of attention from government, local, State, and National, it is all the more imperative that Congress should act to hold out the supporting hand to bolster up and to properly develop our library system in the Nation.

Some will whine and complain, I know, about subsidies and bounties for functions that essentially belong to the States and local communities and shed their crocodile tears. But if this Government can pour out millions for oftentimes nondescript and futile purposes overseas, frequently controversial, libraries for foreign nations, I think we can afford a few million dollars out of our tax money to make sure that the libraries of America are kept intact, well-stocked, well-supplied and flourishing, their services up-to-date and efficient, that their doors are open to the old and to the young, and especially to those who seek the opportunities that come from the acquisition of knowledge and wisdom, because it is upon these young men and women that this Nation must rely to cope with and solve its future problems and to provide the leadership, which will, not only sustain, but strengthen and advance the democratic cause and the blessings of free government for our posterity. It is indeed the next generation that will settle the fate of mankind for centuries to come.

Thus, my friends, while the amounts sought by these bills are not great, seemingly picayune, the purposes to be gained are unquestionably unanswerable and of inestimable benefit to the Nation. Let us not languish in our efforts. Let us not permit these measures to die because of indifference or inattention. Let us not overlook them because they do not involve an appropriation for a billion dollars. On the other hand, remembering our own origins as almost each and every one of us can, remembering the values of libraries to us as individuals in our early lives when we were in school and college and seeking to secure our education, remembering the great historic and contemporary use and utility of libraries to unnumbered Americans through the Nation, remembering and marking well the tremendous influence for good which libraries serve in engendering intellectual curiosity in the young, in fostering learning, in promoting wisdom, in building the tolerance we need if America is to be kept as a haven for those who seek freedom, remembering all these things which have so benefited us in the past, in the present, and are so vital to our welfare now and in the time to come, let us insist upon the early passage of these salutary beneficial measures.

Mr. Chairman, in asking unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein Mrs. Wallace's fine statement, I most respectfully urge the chairman and members of our great Rules Committee to report H. R. 2840, which is now pending before that distinguished committee, to the full membership so we can debate it and pass it at the earliest possible time. This bill is a modest, but imperative, investment by our Government in the mental strength, educational growth, scientific, social, cultural, and ethical development of the Nation. It truly deserves our wholehearted, earnest support.

STATEMENT PREPARED BY MRS. G. R. WALLACE FOR APPEARANCE BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE HEARING ON LIBRARY SERVICES BILLS S. 205, H. R. 2840

I am Mrs. George Rodney Wallace, of Fitchburg, Mass. I am serving my 27th year as trustee of the Fitchburg Public Library. For the past 3 years I was president of the Massachusetts Library Trustees Association. I am a member of a five-member Massachusetts Library Commission, appointed by Gov. Christian A. Herter, to make a study and to report on the financial situation and general condition of public libraries in Massachusetts. I am also serving as first vice president of the American Association of Library Trustees, a national organization working within the American Library Association and its public library division. My associations with libraries are enjoyed on a strictly voluntary basis.

I appear before you in favor of the Federal library services bills, speaking from the result of my own experience, from what I have seen with my own eyes, and from what I feel in my heart.

I favor this bill because it would focus the need for better library service within the 48 States and thousands of communities where 27 million people have no library service of any kind. The bill is designed to stimulate State and community thinking as to the ways and means to meet the need of one of the Nation's most vital services.

This library services bill is, I believe, a good, sound, modest bill. It recognizes what every tax expert knows, that a rural community, because of its limited tax capacity, cannot maintain adequate public library services for its people. The tax base in rural communities has long been recognized as inadequate for schools, public health, welfare services, and public highways; State and Federal funds supplement local resources for these purposes, and similar action must be taken on behalf of public libraries.

Librarians, library trustees, and friends of libraries in Massachusetts who are interested in equalizing library opportunities in our commonwealth are eager to see favorable action on this bill. We look to it as a way to finance projects which will demonstrate how, through federation, cooperative and contractual agreements, and regional service centers, our small libraries in our rural communities, without sacrificing local autonomy, may improve their overall library services; and how such services may be extended to areas which are now totally deprived of them.

May I say here that although I appear before you as a citizen of Massachusetts my interest in the bill derives from my concern for the people not only in the rural areas of my own Commonwealth, but in every State of the Union. They are all American wherever they live, hungry with the same hunger for good book services. And I will add at once that Massachusetts needs this bill as urgently as other States do.

Ninety-four percent of our public libraries in Massachusetts are substandard on the basis of the American Library Association standard of annual operating expenses of $1.50 per capita; and 250 of the 357 libraries of the Commonwealth are in communities with a population of less than 5,000 souls. It has long been apparent that financial assistance was needed in the rural communities. It is equally apparent that in this challenging mid-20th century world, the day is past when a public library, be it in the largest or smallest community, can remain a mausoleum of stuffed bluejays, rusty muskets, and shelves filled with old Harper's and Youth's Companion. The good public library today, wherever it may be—located on a hustling, bustling thoroughfare or a bookmobile traveling over the snowy or dusty lanes of a rural district, is an information and cultural center; and part of a great bulwark of national security and progress.

I envision the public libraries in our great Republic as a network of information and cultural centers, of vital importance to our survival and advancement. America's well-supported public libraries, most of which are in our large metropolitan areas, have long been among the most admired symbols of democracy in a world torn by fundamentally opposite concepts of how to achieve human progress. The opportunity of the individual to have access to the accumulated knowledge of mankind by way of the public library is one of the greatest tributes to democracy yet conceived. Yet today we are excluding 27 million Americans from this opportunity.

In 1950 a grant of $36,500 was made by Marshall Field 3d to the Massachusetts division of library extension to conduct a 2-year demonstration of regional library service in 12 western rural communities. In 1952, when the funds for this highly successful demonstration terminated, a citizen group known as the Franklin-Hampshire Rural Library Association, was formed; and through their concerted efforts and working through their local representatives, the general court appropriated funds to extend this western regional library center which today includes 38 rural communities.

I give you this picture of Massachusetts State participation in library services in order to show that the stimulation from Federal funds is urgently needed and further to show that we have a division in our department of education already set up to handle the much-needed funds and to implement the legislation proposed in this bill.

If I and others who favor this bill were to come before you and produce statistics to show that 27 million people—men, women, and children—were physically starving, were hungry for food—16 out of every 100 persons in America—we would need not more elaborate pleas. You, I assume, would make prompt recommendations for speedy legislation to alleviate the hunger.

Yet I have seen with my own eyes breadlines, as it were, men, women, and children standing in line awaiting their turn to enter the bookmobile and there choose their mental sustenance for the next 11 weeks. Lines of children eager for the chance to satisfy a profound hunger for books, and for all the sustenance and inner satisfaction that good books bring as they open the door to a new world of understanding. We must meet this hunger for food for the minds if we are to make America secure and strong in this mid-twentieth century world of harsh realities.

The $7½ million a year for 5 years which this bill proposes in the way of Federal funds is 5 cents a year for each person in the United States. It is the cost of one jet bomber. It is less than one-twelfth of what America, in a strange and rather sad manifestation of a deep hunger, spends annually on comic books.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, $109,044,000 of Federal funds was allocated for school lunches. The funds assisted in providing food for 9,362,000 pupils in the peak month—a most worthy area of Federal aid to fulfill a demonstrated need. This library services bill would allocate a modest $7½ million annually for 5 years—something like 28 cents each for the 27 million children and adults in our rural areas who need mental sustenance.

If we are convinced that good books of information and fiction and poetry and all the adventuring of man are a major part of the foundation of this Republic, and of the universal republic of mankind—

If in this conviction we so liberally use books in our United States Information Services abroad—

Would it not be strange were we to delay overlong in providing access to books for Americans in the rural areas, whence has traditionally come leadership for our urban centers?

If we translate this question of Federal aid into human terms, each dollar means a something in the way of providing for the people in our rural areas that which is their rightful inheritance as Americans, as individuals of human dignity and worth. Each dollar means that in some of the loneliest areas there shall be new and great and good companionship; that in some of the fairest sections of our land—and yet perhaps most economically retarded—there shall be planted new orchards of knowledge.

Gentlemen, public libraries today are facing a great challenge. They are being called upon to sell a vital product, and they need funds to set up the sample. The purpose of this library services bill is to set up the sample—to demonstrate, through consideration of certian specific examples, the immense power wielded by books. The aim is to see that books, which have the most profound influence on our history, our economics, our cultural, and our civilization, be made accessible to the children and adults living throughout our rural areas.

I thank you for the opportunity and the honor of appearing before you, and I most fervently appeal for your support of this bill.

AMENDING TITLE III OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. O'NEILL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 478, Rept. No. 2019), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 479, Rept. No. 2020), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2840) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and

amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POLITICS AND STATESMANSHIP CAN GO HAND IN HAND

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech of the President delivered on April 17, 1956.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the evening of April 17, 1956, it was my privilege to attend an important meeting of my political party and where I think I saw some significant things happening that will go down in history and pointed to as a desirable trend in political activity.

This meeting began, Mr. Speaker, as a purely but respectable partisan affair, and it was reasonable to expect in this atmosphere that all speakers and participants in the program should appeal to the normal prejudices of party activity and the normal appeals were made with one notable exception. That was when President Eisenhower made his history-making presentation in which he demonstrated that the title of politician and statesmanship in their finest sense can go hand in hand.

Mr. Speaker, as I reflect back in history it seems that not since Lincoln's second inaugural address and Cooper's Union speech have we heard remarks so nonpartisan and yet so American at a purely political meeting.

Mr. Speaker, when in history have we heard the following at a political meeting:

Now, no party has a monopoly on brains or idealism or statesmanship. We—Republicans and Democrats alike—are motivated by the same loyalty to the flag; by the same devotion to freedom and human dignity; by the same high purposes for the Nation's security and its people's welfare. Within our hearts and minds, in all things that are vital to the Republic, we cannot be partisans. We are all Americans. But in the practical pursuit of national objectives we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of government's responsibilities.

What could be a better objective of both our political parties than the following?

The campaign is concerned with people, for the mission of our party is to help 167 million Americans build a nation stronger spiritually and materially. To describe the Nation I mean, permit me to quote myself: "A nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secure."

People are made in the image of God. They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their political organizations must reflect this truth. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern for the rights of every citizen regardless of his station; that sets up no walls of birth or creed; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will as equal in their dignity.

There is much merit in what this humble American, our President, said about self-discipline. Let me quote:

A great Frenchman defined liberty as the right of self-discipline. In a nation such as ours, indeed in any social order, there is a great need for performance of certain jobs in which people must work together. In other forms of government this group work is produced under the orders of a dictator, or of a central government that is all-powerful. Free government gives us the right to do it by spontaneous cooperation. When that readiness to cooperate with others in the performance of these great problems disappears, then it will not be America. I deem it one of the great missions of the Republican Party to keep alive, to help to grow, to enrich the idea that every citizen must forever be eager to perform his obligations to the country when it is needed. Farmers, laborers, businessmen, veterans, all parts of our American community deserve the concern and support of government in making their contribution to our national well-being.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I make the observation that the history and story that we are pleased to call American is probably the most fascinating and challenging of any system ever given to mankind. This, in my opinion, is so because from the very beginning our people, through its government and its many and varied undergirding influences, have been conscious of a peculiar destiny; this is so because our people have seemed to sense that upon them has been focused, as if by divine appointment, the hopes and aspirations of a large part of the human race; and, Mr. Speaker, it has not failed, because throughout history we have had great men who set up signposts pointing the way for the people of their time—many of them here in the Halls of Congress—they are reflected in the lives of the men whose pictures we see on our left and on our right. The Father of Our County must remind us each day of his Farewell Address, and when we see Lafayette's picture we must be reminded of his great contribution toward making this Government of the people a reality.

We are reminded, too, of all the rich history of our country and that it is with virtuous contributions made by people that are remembered and become a part of our rich traditions, and since I feel that the type of thing exemplified by our President the evening of April 16 is a desirable trend in politics that should be encouraged by all who are in political life, and because I sincerely believe that historians will note this as one of the great documents in the history of our country, I am asking that his remarks be published.

My fellow Republicans, it is a grand feeling to know that I am among friends. As you may be aware, following any Presidential address, a flood of messages pour in at the White House. Among a very large group today, I am glad to say preponderantly, overwhelmingly favorable, there were a few sturdy souls who expressed themselves differently.

One man from California started out, "I am disgusted." And he said, "Never again will I vote for this party. To think that such a party would allow itself to be led by a weakling, persuaded by his business friends, his rich business friends, to crucify the farmers of the United States." He ended up by saying, "What you should do is kick out Secretary Benson and follow him yourself as fast as you can."

I really felt I would like to have answered that man, for this one reason: He was right; I have many, many business friends, and some of them sent me messages. But every message I had from the businessmen—and some of them old and dear friends—said, "Please sign the bill." So I think, just in defense of "terrible" businessmen, I should answer that one man.

Now tonight, even this early in 1956, we seem to find ourselves in the midst of a presidential campaign, though neither party has yet nominated its candidate for the office.

At stake in the contest will be more than public office, more than the elation of success or the gloom of defeat, more even than the fortunes of a great political party.

Next November, America will decide the course our Republic shall take through a 4-year span of inescapable problems and mighty challenges; of many dangers for the timid and the weak; of rewarding opportunities for the courageous and wise.

On that 4-year course—on the policies that guide it, on the character and attitudes of those chosen to direct it, on the spirit which animates the Republic during it—depends the continuance of our advance in prosperity, the strengthening of our security, the progress we shall make toward a just peace among the nations.

My fellow Republicans, the campaign before us is concerned with those things which count most—people and principles.

The campaign is concerned with people, for the mission of our party is to help 167 million Americans build a nation stronger spiritually and materially. To describe the nation I mean, permit me to quote myself: "a nation whose every citizen has reason for bold hope, where effort is rewarded and prosperity shared, where freedom expands and peace is secure."

People are made in the image of God. They are divinely endowed with aspirations and talents. Their political organizations must reflect this truth. Therefore, the Republican Party must be inspired by a concern for the rights of every citizen regardless of his station; that sets up no walls of birth or creed; that ranks all men and women of decency and good will as equal in their dignity.

The campaign is concerned with principles because they provide the only sound base for policies and practices. Policies not based on principle retreat to expediency. They become—as we have seen them become in the past—surrenders to pressure, bribes for support, escapes from responsibility. Because expediency is a betrayal of America's trust, the Republican Party in this campaign will be, as always, dedicated and inspired by principles, by political integrity.

But an evident concern for people and an incontestable concern for principles are not of themselves automatic guaranties of success in an election campaign.

These two elements must be demonstrated in a consistent program, understood by all our people.

Our party must be an organized crusade of men and women who preach and exemplify our concern and dedication. Republican men and women must be tireless in winning new friends to the party. They must be sustained by a high morale that is rooted in personal conviction.

To such a party any American could be proud to belong.

I am. I think none of us can be a member of a meeting of this kind without sensing, at least subconsciously, something of our traditions and the spirit of our first and greatest leader, Abraham Lincoln. One of the simplest and greatest facts of his life was that

long before he became President, he espoused a principle. He expressed it first publicly in his speech of the divided house. He said, "I do not expect a house to fall, but it will become all one or all the other." And from that moment on, he became dedicated to one ideal, one principle: to serve this country with all his might, to preserve it. To preserve the dream and the vision of our founding fathers, well knowing that a cut-up divided national existence on this continent would be ruin for us all.

Everything he did from then on, the insults he took from his own Cabinet, the sarcasm he endured, the way he was almost abused by a general, to the great horror of his aides. And he refused to resent it, saying merely, "If the man will win a battle, I will hold his horse." He dedicated himself heart and soul, and completely, to one thing: the good of the United States of America, which was its unity.

Even at that day, as he pondered the great Emancipation Proclamation, it was done as a war measure, for its influence on keeping this Nation one.

A party which in all its gatherings senses, hovering in a room such as this, that spirit, that history, that tradition, can never go far from the beaten path. Dedication to service, not to self-glorification.

I am often asked why I entered political life as a Republican.

Now no party has a monopoly on brains or idealism or statesmanship. We—Republicans and Democrats alike—are motivated by the same loyalty to the flag; by the same devotion to freedom and human dignity; by the same high purposes for the Nation's security and its people's welfare. Within our hearts and minds, in all things that are vital to the Republic, we cannot be partisans. We are all Americans. But in the practical pursuit of national objectives, we differ in our methods, in our traditions, in our philosophy of government's responsibilities.

I am a Republican, because I share our party's deep-lying trust in what freemen can do—a fundamental trust in the nature and capability of individual human beings.

I believe the Republican Party, in its methods and traditions and broad philosophy:

Offers the best hope of preserving the self-reliance and vigorous independence of individual Americans;

Best serves the Nation in the search for peace with justice and freedom;

Best fosters a competitive enterprise economy whose purpose is a wider prosperity fairly shared;

Best keeps economic decision-making in the hands of the people and out of the hands of Government;

Best answers the concerns of people for the meeting of their human needs;

Best assures our children, and their children's children, the heritage of an America rich in all the resources of nature, dynamic in great traditions and ideals and purposes.

I so believe because the Republican Party remains true to its heritage.

Our party was born to vindicate the equal dignity of all men, their equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The dedication of its earliest days still animates our party in this age when worldwide corrosion eats away at freedom, and justice and opportunity for men.

The Republican Party has fostered the development of an economy, dynamic in its power to release men's energies. Vast, unfettered production for vast, unfettered consumption is the economic expression of our political belief: All who work to produce should share equitably in the fruits of their labor.

Today, under the policies of the Republican Party, our economy is more immense than ever before in its productivity, more bountiful in its widespread benefits, more dependable and more creative.

The Republican Party, by all its traditions, is committed to support men's aspirations and convictions as individual citizens. We reject any attempt to treat them merely as members of pressure groups or as serial numbers in the files of a Government office. The individual—in his God-given talents, in his limitless potential—is the source of every advance in the material and intellectual good of humanity.

That fundamental principle in the Republican credo has a corollary—every American is equal before the law and the conscience of Government.

In the philosophy of the Republican Party, the role of Government requires a faithful stewardship of the heritage received from our forebears, that heritage is to be transmitted—enriched and enlarged—to our descendants. Heedful to the wishes and the needs of the day, the Republican Party will not be false to itself by despoiling our children for a present, transitory advantage.

So believing, all of us must work to have the American people more clearly know the principles of the Republican program for America tomorrow, next year—a generation hence.

Now these principles, to my thinking, are several in number. They are implicit in the personal testament I have just made to you. But I should like to present some of them to you explicitly—for your examination, or correction, or amplification.

The first is this: The individual is of supreme importance. You, your family, your neighbors, the people down the street—people everywhere—every American of every race and creed should enjoy equally the rights and privileges of free citizens in a free nation.

And the second: The spirit of our people is the strength of our Nation. The ultimate values of mankind are spiritual. These values include liberty, human dignity, opportunity, and equal rights and justice. These are our heritage and birthright. Our common efforts to preserve and strengthen them must be inspired by things of the spirit—by national pride, by self-respect, by an eagerness to meet our responsibilities as freemen, by humility in our recognition of the debt we owe generations of men and women who built this Nation.

The third, in my opinion, is: No section or group in America can permanently prosper unless all groups and sections so prosper. More jobs and better jobs, a flourishing agriculture, happier living for every family, peace and plenty for all people—these call for a strong, growing, private-enterprise economy in which there are ever-increasing opportunities.

The fourth principle is surely this: Government must have a heart as well as a head. We must concern ourselves with basic human problems. Americans are committed to the alleviation of misfortune and distress among their fellow citizens. Government should increase and strengthen personal and family security without impairing the self-respect, the initiative, and the incentive of the individual to provide for his own.

The fifth: Courage in principle, cooperation in practice makes freedom positive. Our people's eagerness to compete is matched only by their willingness to cooperate in a common cause.

A great Frenchman defined liberty as the right of self-discipline. In a nation such as ours, indeed in any social order, there is a great need for performance of certain jobs in which people must work together. In other forms of government this group work is produced under the orders of a dictator, or of a central government that is all-powerful. Free government gives us the right to do it by spontaneous cooperation. When that readiness to cooperate with others in the performance of these great problems disappears, then it will not be America. I deem it one of the great missions of the Republican Party, to keep alive, to help to grow, to enrich the idea that every citizen must forever be eager to perform his obligations to the country when it is needed. Farmers, laborers, businessmen, veterans, all parts of our American community deserve the concern and support of government in making their contribution to our national well-being.

The sixth principle, as I see it, is: The purpose of government is to serve, never to dominate. There has never been a better, clearer explanation of this principle than one I have often quoted from Abraham Lincoln. "The legitimate object of government," he said, "is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do, at all, or cannot, so well do, for themselves—in their separate, and individual capacities. But in all that people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And here is the seventh principle I suggest: To stay free we must stay strong. Though we must recognize that peace cannot be gained by arms alone, yet we must gird ourselves with sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war and to protect our Nation's vital interests; moreover, we must help to strengthen the collective defense of free nations against those who would seek their ends through aggression. Our own and our allied strength must be spiritual, intellectual, scientific, material.

The eighth, and in this day requiring special emphasis, is: Under God, we espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples. The peace we want will be the product of understanding and agreement and law among nations. It will reflect enlightened self-interest. It will foster the concentration of human energy for the advancement of human standards in all the areas of mankind's material and spiritual life.

I believe that the Republican platform, presented to America at the national convention in August, will in substance be the expression of these principles applied to the human problems of today and tomorrow. It will therefore be a program for the good of all Americans, whether they work in field or factory or office. Faith in America and in God will be its inspiration. Courage and optimism will hearten it. Integrity will characterize it. The welfare of all the people, the security of the Republic, the peace of the world will be its objectives.

It is our conviction that, for Americans who cherish eternal principle and high purpose, that document will chart the path to a better America, a Nation ever growing in material and in spiritual strength. The Republican platform will be a program of principle around which all Americans—Republicans, Independents, and sound-thinking Democrats—can rally. We welcome them all.

Tomorrow you return to your homes in every State and Territory of the Republic, and on the islands of the Caribbean. You go as leaders, chosen to lead by those who know best your fitness for the responsibilities of leadership. To help prepare yourselves for the campaign ahead, you have, during the past 2 days, talked over the problems and the anxieties of our time, the strategy and the tactics of the campaign, the priorities of your various tasks and missions.

Permit me a word of counsel to you on the eve of your departure. I offer my observations with real temerity, because I want to talk a moment about leadership and organization, and I realize that every individual in this room has had real experience in these fields.

You have already entered a vigorous campaign, and the first point to remember is: There is no such thing as an easy battle. The purpose of the present battle is to win the hearts and minds of men and women—Republican recruits to assure the party's right to carry on the business and functions of government.

Above all, it is our hope to appeal to youth because, once won to our side, the young citizen will, each year throughout a life much longer than most of us will have, attract other men and women to the party.

The good fighter takes nothing for granted. It is not enough that you march under the Republican banner—a banner of which we are so proud because of the ideals and the principles for which it stands. You must look well to your organization and to the leaders you will assemble to direct its efforts.

Many long years in the service of our country brought me into contact with men whose qualities as leaders were unsurpassed. From them I learned many valuable lessons in organization. Among their immediate associates—that is, among the generals and the high-ranking staff officers—the great leaders surrounded themselves with the wisdom that comes from long study, from work, and experience. But they made certain, those great leaders did, that each lower echelon of leadership would in its composition, respond to the need for youth, for the idealism, the vigor, the enthusiasm of youth—in carrying out the hard and detailed work always necessary to victory.

As long as I am back in my military life for a second, I should like to observe one thing about leadership that one of the great has said—Napoleon. He said, the great leader, the genius in leadership, is the man who can do the average thing when everybody else is going crazy.

I think this is important in a political campaign, because I recall the incident one night when a great many people on my train, and certainly half of California, were suddenly upset, and they saw the election lost in California, therefore the Nation, and things were going to the bad place in a hand basket.

One man walked into the room and he said to this group of very excited people, "You might as well go on home, not even your worries and your fears and your trepidations can lose California." And, he said, "I know because I am going to speak for the Republican ticket, and I have asked the committee to send me into 17 other States, not here, I am not needed." And he was right.

So if you can just keep your head when the pressures are on, that is one of the marks of the real leader.

Moreover, the best leaders never lost an opportunity to visit their own front-line men—to see, to learn, but above all to establish that spirit of comradeship that would withstand any temporary reverse.

So it must be with any organization that strives to influence millions of people into a particular line of action. The wisdom of experience is necessary, and this you provide, each for your own organization. But it is not alone sufficient.

To weld your organization into an effective instrument for a political campaign, each of you must visit and must intimately know those who, under your direction, are carrying the daily burdens of the fight.

Moreover, to attract the young recruit, the mechanism of leadership that you set up must itself search out and employ the young. Our aim must be to convince every American newly arrived at voting age, that the Republican Party, by its principles and by the quality and appeal of its personnel, is the party through which young citizens' aspirations for their country can be achieved.

Moreover, we must convince them that it is the party in which their own qualities of leadership will be recognized and employed.

So shall we go before the country with a program that is concerned with those things which count most—peoples and principles.

Let us stand on a record that reflects only desire of the Republican Party to serve America honestly and earnestly, a record that is unempeachable in its concern for people and principles.

We will win if, from the moment of your arrival home, you work to build a crusading organization of inspired morale, determined to interpret Republican principles, and the Republican program to all the people.

Victory will be the product.

Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you for your kind attention.

OPERATION FANTASTIC

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have recently observed a remarkable spectacle. The Republican Party is suddenly trying to picture itself as a great and good friend of labor. Gentlemen from the Republican Party are complaining that we Democrats have not done enough for working people, and that working people are going to punish us terribly at the polls.

This election-year maneuver might be termed "Operation Fantastic." But it is being spearheaded by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Mitchell, a personally amiable man in an exceedingly tough spot in a Republican administration. It has the full cooperation of the Republican National Committee, which in its publicity pictures Mr. Mitchell as an excessively diligent and effective Cabinet officer. It is echoed in this House from the other side of the aisle.

Just before the Easter recess the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] took the floor for a speech on what he blandly labeled the "President's program" for the benefit of workers. He ran down the list of nine little bills and complained that we Democrats had not moved fast enough. He piously expressed a political hope that what he called the "reluctant Democratic leadership" would "encourage" hearings on some of these bills. He promised menacingly that unless we got these precise little bills passed "American wage earners will judge this Democratic Congress as the foot-dragging, do-nothing Congress."

The next day another volley was fired by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. This gentleman gave some statistics on an increase in industrial accidents and demanded action on the President's program including a piddling $2 million for grants to the States for industrial safety programs.

I assume it was not a coincidence that the gentleman from New Jersey put his statistics into the RECORD at almost the exact time Secretary of Labor Mitchell was releasing them at a press conference downtown. And once again we Democrats were menaced with the threat of labor's retaliation unless we approved the piddling $2 million; once again we were exhorted to act in behalf of the President's program.

It is understandable that in a political year the Republican Party wants to pretend to be a friend of labor—no matter how many things it does to workers in other years. Let us examine the pose.

Why is it up to us, in the second session of the 84th Congress, to "do something" swiftly about legislation for the benefit of workers. Mr. Speaker, the principal reason is that Secretary Mitchell, for all his soft soap now, did not have any comprehensive program of his own until less than a year ago.

He has been in office since the autumn of 1953, but it wasn't until May of 1955 that some of the bills in what he now calls the President's program were recommended. It was not until this year that others were recommended. Some of his reports, needed before sensible action can be taken on the basis of facts, arrived only recently. Some of them have not arrived yet.

There is something a little laughable about a solemn listing of 9 specific bills as Mr. Eisenhower's labor program. These bills, fundamentally, are nothing more than housekeeping measures. The purpose of most is laudable, but they are not measures to arouse the unbounded enthusiasm of working people. They are measures to make slight if desirable improvements in programs long ago put into effect by Democratic administrations. They blaze no new trails. They pioneer no new ground.

Let us take a look at some of the things the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] did not mention in running down his list of measures to define Mr. Eisenhower's labor program.

He did not mention amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. Why not? Because the belated Eisenhower proposals on Taft-Hartley amendment were muddled and inadequate and were emphatically rejected by the Congress, and Secretary Mitchell has not had a new idea on the subject since.

Mr. Mitchell, indeed, appears not to be allowed to have any independent ideas on this subject. Secretary of Commerce Weeks has more influence in this administration on the subject of Taft-Hartley than Mr. Mitchell has. So in a fulsome declamation on Mr. Eisenhower's so-called labor program, our Republican friends find it too embarrassing to mention Taft-Hartley.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not mention expansion of minimum wage coverage, to protect more than 20 million workers now left unprotected by the $1 an hour minimum wage we established last year in amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The President talks about expansion and Secretary Mitchell says he favors it. But there is not any administration bill on the subject.

Last year, indeed, Mr. Mitchell came up here and recommended that the Congress study the desirability of expanding minimum-wage coverage to those now left unprotected. He did not recommend anything. He did not ask us to do anything specific. He did not throw the weight of the White House behind a measure.

This year he has not even asked us to study expansion of coverage. He will not say in press conferences what he would like to see done.

So the Republicans in muttering about Mr. Eisenhower's so-called labor program have to leave out minimum wages and expansion of coverage as well as Taft-Hartley.

There is a third subject the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not mention—amendment of the unemployment compensation law to set minimum Federal standards below which no State could fall.

Such Federal standards have been requested repeatedly by labor leaders and expert witnesses from unions testifying on the deficiencies of some State systems. But a program for minimum Federal standards would be a pioneering thing—it would plow fresh ground. And, despite election-year oratory, we get no plowing of unbroken ground from President Eisenhower and Secretary Mitchell in the field of labor legislation.

Let us look at a couple of other factors that might reasonably be included in a genuine labor program or a genuine program for the general welfare.

This House last year passed a bill amending the social-security laws to provide pensions for disabled workers at the age of 50, to lower the retirement age of women workers and the eligibility of widows for pensions. That bill is now pending in Senate committee. And what is the Eisenhower administration's attitude? The administration is against it. Secretary Folsom testified against it.

Secretary Folsom has to reverse, as an Eisenhower official, certain attitudes he had expressed years ago as a private citizen. As a private citizen he favored lowering the retirement age for women workers and favored disability benefits. But now that he has joined what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] wants us to consider the pro-labor Eisenhower administration, he is against them.

In discussing the so-called administration labor program, the gentleman obviously felt, also, that it would not be discreet to mention the Eisenhower anti-labor packing of the National Labor Relations Board by spokesman of big business. This packing and its results were authoritatively documented just before the recess by the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE. When the Eisenhower apologists speak in this House, the subject simply is not mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the nine little bills conjured up in a package as the alleged Eisenhower labor program are not a labor program at all.

We are told that one would benefit maybe 650,000 workers, another 1 million workers.

But realistic amendment of Taft-Hartley would benefit all 18 million union members and 18 million other workers who would have a better chance for collective bargaining—and on that subject the administration is silent.

Expansion of minimum wage coverage could benefit more than 20 million workers—and on that subject the administration is silent.

Decent Federal standards of unemployment compensation would benefit almost all workers in interstate commerce, perhaps thirty or thirty-five million—and on this subject the Eisenhower administration is silent.

Unpacking the NLRB would benefit workers both organized and unorganized—but nothing is being done.

Amendment of the social-security laws to liberalize them would benefit millions of women workers, their retired husbands, and the totally and permanently disabled—and on this subject the Eisenhower administration opposes liberalization.

The nine little bills are not a labor program. They are simply housekeeping bills advanced to cover up the fact that all the big things, the important things, have been left out.

Are the Republicans trying to kid us or kid themselves? Are they hoping to silence us about the fact that Secretary of Commerce Weeks has more to say about labor policy under President Eisenhower than Secretary Mitchell? They are obviously trying to befuddle the voters. It is a good trick if you can get away with it. I do not think they can.

ALGER HISS AND PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, rise today to speak again on the subject on which I addressed the House a few days ago. That is on the invitation which the American Whig-Cliosophic Debating Society of Princeton University extended to Alger Hiss. He is being invited by that debating society to address the students on the Meaning of Geneva.

I am not going to repeat what I said last week, but I did think the House would be interested in some of the information which has developed since that talk. I have before me the Daily Princetonian, which is a newspaper, published at Princeton, under date of Thursday, April 12. In this editorial we are told that:

Whig-Clio—

Which is the name of the debating society—

was not obligated by any consideration of free speech to invite Hiss to come here. But once the invitation had been extended and accepted, a policy reversal would imply Princeton's acceptance of the opinion that Hiss was indeed different. He may be a symbol, but he is still entitled to his rights. No matter how strong the criticism, we must not forsake this ideal, both for our personal integrity and for Princeton's reputation.

Alger Hiss has had many invitations to speak, throughout the country. He is not at a loss for a place to air his views. Thus far, he has accepted only two of these invitations—Whig-Clio's and Swarthmore's. When the Students for Democratic Action at Swarthmore—

I might suggest there that the name had better be changed to Students for Detrimental Action—

retracted their bid under the prompting of the parent organization, Americans for Democratic Action—

Here again I would change that name to Americans for Detrimental Action—

another organization on the Pennsylvania campus invited Hiss to speak there. But because this was a group which caters to unpopular radicals, Hiss declined. Quite obviously he—

Meaning Hiss—

wishes to regain the respectability he lost when he was convicted for perjury. In this sense he is "using" Princeton. But so did ESTES KEFAUVER and Billy Graham. We have no reason to condemn a man's desire to further his own interests.

I read that to the House because it indicates the type of thinking that is going on in one of our outstanding universities. I daresay this type of thinking is not isolated, either. But to begin with, we note that Hiss was invited to speak elsewhere but Hiss would not go because he did not want to speak where "unpopular radicals" spoke. Apparently he conceives himself to be a popular radical.

This is the first time I have ever known, I think, in the history of man where a person who has betrayed his country can attract a crowd in that country, a crowd of admirers, a crowd of people who seem to feel that betrayal is the art of the day. So because Mr. Hiss was too particular where he would go, the students had to offer him the great Princeton University as a forum where the Continental Congress met hundreds of years ago.

I referred to this editorial, which is generally written in that stuffy university style so prevalent these days among the so-called eggheads, and I read from it again:

Whig-Clio's motives for inviting Hiss may be open to question. It is well known that the organization does not invite speakers unless it feels they will draw crowds. Usually, these speakers have vital viewpoints to express. If Whig-Clio invited Hiss to speak here simply for sensationalism, we would have to censure them—

This is important—

but since Hiss is a man with opinions of great interest on international affairs, we cannot legitimately condemn them.

So that we now have the picture of Hiss coming before the university as a man who has "great interest in international affairs," and whose "opinions cannot be condemned." In other words, we are now being led to believe this man was just guilty of some little peccadillo. Could it be that the student who wrote this editorial has so little regard for his country that he can still think of Hiss as someone whose opinion is of great importance and which cannot be legitimately condemned?

I can recall when I went to school I remember reading something from Sir Walter Scott. I just thought I would read it again. That is not so long ago, either, and I can recall reading it.

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said, "This is my own, my native land!"
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim,
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung.
Unwept, unhonour'd, and unsung.

Hiss is a man like that.

That used to be the attitude toward men who were faithless to their country. That was the way I thought any young man should be trained because all of us, certainly, owe it to this great Nation to love it. Let us go a step further and read in the Newark News of today where someone in Princeton is doing something about it. Father Hugh Halton, head of the Princeton Aquinas Foundation, has invited Willard Edwards of the Washington staff of the Chicago Daily News to speak April 25. He is going to speak on the meaning of Alger Hiss. And what happens? Immediately there is organized "the veterans in Princeton," an organization of some 80 students, who are veterans of all branches of the service. They are presenting a petition to the Daily Princetonian, the campus newspaper in which they defend the Hiss invitation and attack the legion and the VFW for interference with freedom of speech. This petition would censure both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion "for contradicting themselves by their interference with an American citizen being allowed to express his views in public before an audience." "We"—so the petitioner says—"feel we are mature enough to judge any argument on its own merits."

This American citizen—meaning Hiss—how he clings to citizenship when it serves his purpose. But how disloyal he was to it when he had the opportunity to serve his country. Now the proposition is simply this. Are we getting in our universities the type of teachers that we have a right to expect? Are the universities of our country somewhat responsible for this situation? How can you explain that young American citizens who will some day grow up to be Members of this House or, perhaps, Members of the other body, or hold some important governmental post, how to explain their desire to preserve the 'right" of this man to address them. I say if he wanted to go before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and there recant and there tell us the truth and there tell us to whom he gave our secrets, then I could understand that there might be some merit to it. But why should American students go out of their way to hurt our country? I suppose it is old-fashioned and somewhat of a cliche to say, "I love the country—I love it dearly and devotedly." I cannot understand why anyone would voluntarily and intentionally try to aid and assist Mr. Hiss. The impression seems to be that he has paid his debt. What they forget is that he was an articulate, conscious, active, and important member of the Soviet conspiracy. He betrayed all those who reposed trust in him. He is still part of that conspiracy so far as we know, and this attempt to rehabilitate him, as the editorial points out, is a deliberate attempt. In my opinion, it is a start for him to make a comeback so that he can still advance the cause of atheistic communism by using the university as a backdrop of respectability.

You know we have the Congressional Medal of Honor and we give it to men who have performed conspicuous and gallant service for our country. I think it is about time we had a new "decoration." We ought to have a congressional medal of dishonor and give it publicly to the Americans in this country who were so willing to betray us into the bonds of slavery. Today we had a prayer offered by Father Rigney who came back after 4½ years of "academic freedom" in a Red dungeon where he was tortured in such a fashion that your hair would stand on end if you heard him tell what they did to him. Yet, these kids, these Katzenjammer striplings, as I call them, are going out of their way to bring Hiss, who is determined to destroy everything that their university stands for, to their campus and there knowingly permit him to use the Ivy Towers and the great tradition and culture of Princeton University so that he might slowly but surely advance the cause of this country's destruction. It is not just a childish prank. It is not one of those goldfish-swallowing stunts that these students indulge in. Someone else is behind it. I do not know who, but someone else is putting this idea across, because you can see the beginning of the old technique. That is the old Communist technique starting again. Now, who in the university? As Father Rigney said the other day, one Communist in the country is one too many, because the moment one is there they organize; stealthily. They organize in such fashion that before you know it the country is gone; and this country can be taken. I am surprised at the men in our university circles who seem to be unconscious of what is going on.

It might be a good idea to declare a moratorium on some types of education for a while, so that some of our students can recover from the type of training they are getting. Is it unreasonable for me to ask that the university not aid this man Hiss in his plan? Is there something peculiar about an American saying, "Please do not advance the destruction of this country"? Who only have praise, only have pats on the back, only have compliments for those who are cowardly betrayers? A betrayer is the worst conceivable type of animal. If he were a gunman you would have a chance if you could draw first, but the man who gets up and takes advantage of all that is good in your nature to impress you and then turns you over to those who would destroy you is the worst I can think of.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is the subject on which he is addressing these eggheads, as you call them?

Mr. TUMULTY. He is addressing them on the meaning of Geneva; the meaning of the conference held between President Eisenhower and Bulganin.

Mr. GROSS. I guess he was out of the penitentiary at that time, but he was not at Geneva, was he?

Mr. TUMULTY. He was not at Geneva. He was perhaps out of the penitentiary on conditional release at the time. Incidentally, while he was on conditional release he could not have done this. He only waited until after he is free from any Federal supervision that he is now going around the country trying to advance this cause.

Mr. GROSS. Since he was the chief architect of this outfit known as the United Nations, since he does know something about that and was responsible for that farce, why does he not speak to these eggheads at Princeton and tell them about the United Nations? He knows all about that. He was the architect who put the Russians in control of the United Nations and thereby assured that organization that it would be a failure before it ever got into operation.

Mr. TUMULTY. I cannot guess on the devious twisted mind of a traitor, but if it would support and advance the cause of the Soviet Union I am sure he would advocate it.

Mr. WITHROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. WITHROW. I was under the impression that Alger Hiss had lost his citizenship.

Mr. TUMULTY. I would assume he has lost his privileges of citizenship. I honestly do not know. The inference gathered from this news article is to make him to appear to be a normal citizen like you and me. If he has not lost his citizenship it should be taken away from him, because unless we learn to get rid of that kind of man who would destroy us, we will be destroyed.

Mr. WITHROW. I agree with you.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Was he not convicted of a felony?

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then that automatically deprives him of his citizenship.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes; its privileges.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman know whether any steps have been taken to restore his citizenship?

Mr. TUMULTY. No; but I am convinced that is what they would like to do. Hiss is more concerned for his reputation than the students are for the university's. He will not talk where the soapbox orators hold forth. He wants to pick out the nice places.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that not a buildup to apply for restoration of full citizenship?

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes; I think it is. He wants, I think, to ultimately be pardoned.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TUMULTY was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. TUMULTY. The reason I presume on your patience—I realize this has been a long day—is the importance of the matter.

You can say, as some do, that Hiss can go any place in the country. What a sad commentary on the judgment of our people. In ancient times the person who betrayed his country or who was even a party at some infamous trial would be ostracized, but in this instance we have the students going out of their way and being brash about it. If their purpose were to see whether or not Hiss would be willing to reveal who his associates were and make a clean breast of things, that would be one thing, but there is no possibility of that. He has always denied what he did, in spite of the testimony being uncontroverted to the contrary.

Now you can see where he has selected his sites. It is interesting to note in these stories that in each one of these places he tries to pick one of the traditional colleges, he tries to pick the conservative colleges. The original news story said "Conservative Princeton has invited him." Actually, it is not the university; the university has not invited him, or the trustees. I telegraphed the Governor of our State who happens to be a trustee and I urged him to ask the board to revoke this action of a group of students. I think the trustees ought to do something about it because if you are going to run a school it should be run by the trustees and not by the boys. If the trustees are not going to live up to their responsibility why not let the boys take over and the president of the student body be the president of the university, if the president of the college cannot exercise some supervision over these young men? If this cannot be done, some day some bright students will say, "Let us have an H-bomb test on the campus of the university, let us explode an H-bomb here in the interest of science and see if we cannot blow up New York and New Jersey" in the name of academic freedom.

I say it is time that the heads of the college lived up to their responsibility. I say it is time that the faculty acted like men; I say it is time they started trying to prevent young men making mistakes of this sort. I know when I went to college I thought I knew a lot, but I listened to the voice of authority and was willing to be guided.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I believe that the warden of the penitentiary in which he served would not even permit him to lecture to the prisoners. Is not that so?

Mr. TUMULTY. I do not know; I have no information on that. But I do know we are dealing with an intelligence which has a satanic comprehension. The organized Soviet conspiracy is working night and day, and Mr. Hiss was an integral part of it and he has so far not evidenced any desire to recant his activities. Therefore when he appears at Princeton he is advancing the cause of the Soviet Union and these boys are practically saying: "Come up here and propagandize us." They want to be "Brain-washed," I guess.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I just want to say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that he has made a very interesting speech and taken a very patriotic stand here today. The people where I come from and whom I represent agree with you about 99 percent in what you are saying here today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not a hundred?

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes, what about that 1 percent? Seriously however I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

What about Princeton? Now explain it? A teacher takes the place of a boy's parents and assumes a responsibility for molding the minds and thoughts of those in his charge. I think Princeton should investigate the incident thoroughly to find out whether or not there may be something subversive about this; unquestionably they should investigate it.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to commend my friend and colleague from New Jersey on what he has said on this matter. When Alger Hiss was released from Lewisburg Penitentiary there was published an article by a pocket magazine entitled "Yalta, Modern American Myth." I am told he received $300 for that article. And one of the things he said in that article is this:

> Yalta was a magnificent step forward for the free nations of the world.

I wonder if he would dare go to old Poland and preach that kind of philosophy before the freedom-loving people over there. I want to say to my friend from New Jersey that I have faith in Princeton, I have faith in our Governor and the board of directors of Princeton University. I do not believe they are going to go along with Mr. Hiss' appearance before that society.

Mr. TUMULTY. I hope the gentleman is right. I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include in the RECORD two articles from the Daily Princetonian.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, one of these editorials is headed "TUMULTY'S Invective: Cynical Demagoguery."

Although it is stated that some of these implications are senseless demagoguery, the interesting thing to me is that so far the students have abused only me. I do not mind that as long as they spell the name "Tumulty" right. There is another Tumulty up there, but he is a skinny one. So far they have abused the Senator from New Jersey because he will not reply to my remarks. But nowhere do we find any abuse of Hiss. He is treated as if he had accomplished something instead of being a man who deserves the harshest criticism, the man who is still in this country because we are free and he is allowed to go around and carry out his master plan to help destroy us.

Again I repeat, I hope the university will give him the Jersey bounce, then put him off the campus. If somebody in Princeton is foolish enough to want to learn the truth from a liar, let him go visit him wherever he lives. But he should not be allowed to use the stage prop of Princeton University and put that institution in an embarrassing position because the faculty is afraid to put the boys over their knees and paddle their red aspirations.

I would hope we could get a congressional medal of dishonor and hang it on men of this type publicly so that they may be shamed into loving their country.

The editorials to which I previously referred are as follows:

TUMULTY'S INVECTIVE: CYNICAL DEMAGOGUERY

The snowballing criticism of the Whig-Clio officers and the university for Alger Hiss' April 26 appearance on campus forces us to admit that the officers lacked a certain discretion when they invited the convicted perjurer to Princeton. Still, we must realize that public hatred of Hiss has exceeded most estimates, and we should not be too hasty to reprimand Whig-Clio, when we are relying upon our privilege of hindsight.

And we resent the venomous and malicious knives that are flying in the direction of everything and everyone stamped with "Princeton."

T. JAMES TUMULTY, Democratic Representative from New Jersey, unleashed a stream of invectives across the floor of the United States House of Representatives Wednesday that not only taints the name of Princeton but also reflects upon the dignity and intelligence of the Lower Chamber. TUMULTY cynically suggests that we give Benedict Arnold a posthumous LLD, an insult to Princeton's intellectual reputation. He opines that we may as well set up a Department of Treachery in a statement that smacks of Neanderthal emotionalism. And he has another timely witticism: invite murderers down to tell how they killed their grandmothers—this would simplify Whig-Clio's task of lining up speakers, because there are certainly more murderers around than perjurers.

We also deplore the refusal of Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH '01 to make a public statement clarifying the issues which have been so outrageously perverted by Mr. TUMULTY'S ravings. While we do not expect him to back Whig-Clio's stand, we feel that he is in a position to protect his university's name from serious damage. Although TUMULTY'S implications are senseless demagoguery, nevertheless people will believe what he says unless a firm stand is taken by a well-respected source.

Apparently, criticism is spreading. Michigan's Representative CLARE HOFFMAN has backed TUMULTY, and alumni groups throughout the country are deeply concerned over the possible damage that Princeton faces. However, what is needed now is not continued alumni tongue lashing, but

a general clarification by the Princeton family of the incident, whether one agrees with Whig-Clio's original judgment or not.

J. W. M.

AN EDITORIAL

Alger Hiss is a symbol.

So Princeton has learned from newspapers, radio commentators, and the swelling flood of letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from alumni and friends of the university. We hear that by permitting Hiss to speak here on April 26, we are condoning a convicted perjurer or worse.

Princeton is not condoning, defending, or giving sanction to the actions of Alger Hiss. We are a university, not a supreme court. We will hear his views on international affairs and weigh them as such.

The nature of the criticism pouring into the administration has surprised many people. Not only crackpots and emotionalists, but also responsible and level-headed men have repeatedly warned us of the potentially damaging effect that Hiss' appearance here could have on Princeton's reputation. This is certainly a consideration. Since President Dodd's statement has been universally misinterpreted by the press and radio, everyone believes that Princeton, not Whig-Clio, invited Hiss here to speak. No amount of denial will change this prevailing opinion. Princeton, including faculty members, administration, and everyone from the youngest freshman to the oldest alumnus, is implicated.

In our opinion, Princeton's reputation will suffer far more if the bid is rescinded than if Hiss comes here as scheduled. No matter what the means, if Whig-Clio retracts its invitation the public will feel that it was forced to do so by the university. It would imply that Princeton is an institution which can be browbeaten by outside pressure groups. We believe that this stigma would be too great a price to pay merely to pacify people who object to Alger Hiss.

The critics protest that Hiss is far more than a controversial radical. He is a perjurer. And though many do not state it in so many words, they think he is a traitor. They declare themselves in favor of free speech, but announce that Hiss is different. The logical extreme of this attitude implies that anyone with an unsavory background could be classed as "different," and denied his rights as a citizen.

Whig-Clio was not obligated by any consideration of free speech to invite Hiss to come here. But once the invitation had been extended and accepted, a policy reversal would imply Princeton's acceptance of the opinion that Hiss was indeed different. He may be a symbol, but he is still entitled to his rights. No matter how strong the criticism, we must not forsake this ideal, both for our personal integrity and for Princeton's reputation.

Alger Hiss has had many invitations to speak, throughout the country. He is not at a loss for a place to air his views. Thus far, he has accepted only two of these invitations—Whig-Clio's and Swarthmore's. When the Students for Democratic Action at Swarthmore retracted their bid under the prompting of the parent organization, Americans for Democratic Action, another organization on the Pennsylvania campus invited Hiss to speak there. But because this was a group which caters to unpopular radicals, Hiss declined. Quite obviously he wishes to regain the respectability he lost when he was convicted for perjury. In this sense he is "using" Princeton. But so did ESTES KEFAUVER and Billy Graham. We have no reason to condemn a man's desire to further his own interests.

Whig-Clio's motives for inviting Hiss may be open to question. It is well known that the organization does not invite speakers unless it feels they will draw crowds. Usually, these speakers have vital viewpoints to express. If Whig-Clio invited Hiss to speak here simply for sensationalism, we would have to censure them. But since Hiss is a man with opinions of great interest on international affairs, we cannot legitimately condemn them.

A majority of the more level-headed critics proclaim that they have no objection to anything that Hiss may write. (The first published statement of his views on the Yalta Conference is now on sale at the university store.) It is his connection with Princeton which they deplore. We repeat that, despite public misinterpretation, Alger Hiss has no connection with Princeton. We are not a haven for soiled public figures. We are sincerely interested in what the man has to say.

NO CONNECTION WITH PRINCETON

In its persistent refusal to deprive Whig-Clio of its responsibility by overruling the invitation, the university administration has shown faith in both its undergraduates and its own convictions. If outside sources have a distorted opinion of the Hiss speech, there is no reason why Princeton should succumb to the pressures of that distortion. We owe a debt of gratitude to our administration for its courage in an explosive situation where any alternative means damage.

Princeton already has the stigma of being powerfully influenced by its alumni body. It is true that we have one of the most loyal and active alumni bodies in the Nation. But if the invitation to Alger Hiss is retracted due to outside pressures, the more unattractive aspects of the stigma will become even more ingrained than ever in the public mind. It would be a long time before this conception of Princeton as an institution could be erased.

MOTIVES OPEN TO QUESTION

There is no reason why we should compromise ourselves. Polls taken on campus yesterday show that undergraduates here favor Hiss' appearance here by a 10-to-1 ratio. We feel mature enough to be able to hear and judge his views on their own merits. That the man in question is a symbol of treason to some people is unfortunate, since it calls our sincerity into question. This should not be powerful enough to destroy our self-confidence.

Whatever happens now, there will be damage. If Hiss appears here, many will feel that Princeton is defending a perjurer at least, a traitor at worst. If the bid is retracted, even more will feel that Princeton is a university without the courage of her convictions. We must choose the lesser of two evils.

THE MARKING OF IMPORTED GOODS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the press the other day that the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was a little bit shocked and expressed his regrets to Japan because the State of South Carolina and the State of Alabama had passed State laws requiring that some of these goods which are being imported from Japan to be labeled "made in Japan" or a sign had to be placed in the stores, stating that we sell Japanese goods, where these goods were being sold, putting the people on notice that they were coming in from Japan and were being offered for sale. I see nothing shocking about that. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alabama and South Carolina have a right to know when they are buying Japanese textile goods.

I just wanted to rise here today in defense of my State and the State of Alabama for trying to protect one of their basic industries. I say again it is absolutely ridiculous for any country, under any kind of a trade agreement, to import products that are in surplus there. I ask Mr. Dulles today if he would insist on Brazil importing raw coffee from some other South American country? Of course, he would not. Then, why should he insist on the United States of America importing textiles or glassware or some of the other things that injure the economy of West Virginia and Pennsylvania when we have those things in surplus already? It is just simply ridiculous.

I have raised that point before and the State Department has not answered it, nor have the membership here who favor importation of Japanese textile goods, GATT and OTC. They do not insist on India importing tea; they do not insist on the Malay States importing raw rubber. Yet they insist on bringing Japanese textile goods into South Carolina, where our textile mills have been forced to curtail production throwing many people out of work. We produce more textiles than all the rest of the world combined and I say that to import Japanese textiles into our country is ridiculous and absurb. I believe in reciprocal trade, yes, I believe in trade. We have always had trade. But never before in the history of the world has a country been forced to import goods they do not need and which they already have a surplus. The next thing Mr. Dulles will be asking us to import raw cotton, or maybe oil and canned beef into Texas, Mr. Speaker.

Again, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am in favor of more trade but I disagree with the administration of our Reciprocal Trade Act. I do think, however, we ought to protect our basic, fundamental industries, particularly those which have products in surplus. Let us have real reciprocity by selling in foreign countries our vast amounts of textiles and by continuing to import such products as rubber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read something here which appeared in the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal and was carried by the Lancaster Livestock Bulletin of Lancaster, Pa., the largest cattle market east of Chicago, where many of my farmers sell their cattle. This article proves how utterly ridiculous the administration of reciprocal trade is becoming. Now listen to this:

Those canned hams from Poland now appearing in Corn Belt grocery stores represent the height of irony. It is meat snatched away from the Polish people—who love pork and beef, but must satisfy themselves with canned fish instead—and exported to the United States, which needs more pork like a drowning man needs a drink of water.

The reason for this nonsensical procedure, which dismays almost everybody but the Government of Poland, is that the Poles need dollars. With them they can buy more machines to help speed the conversion of their economy from agriculture to industry, which has been decreed the thing to do by their Soviet overlords.

They want to get over into industry so that they can conquer the world. And we are helping them to do it.

So Poland deprives its people of the pork they dearly love and sends it off to pork-rich America, where hog raisers are being forced to cut production in order to revive a market floundering in the heavy seas of overproduction. In the first 2 months of this year, 34 percent more canned pork than in the same 2 months last year came to this country from Poland. February canned-pork imports from Poland were 94 percent greater than in February a year ago. During all of 1955, Poland sent us 13 percent more canned hams than during 1954. So it seems evident that the program of exporting pork to the United States is being stepped up by Poland.

I want to emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, Communist Poland. Attention, Mr. Dulles, under your reciprocal trade, now you want the Iowa pork farmer to buy Communist hams.

We can understand Poland's desire to improve its economic status. But we join American hog raisers in deploring its efforts to do it at the expense of the domestic swine industry, which is already wallowing in trouble. The last thing the hog business here needs is a flood of foreign pork to contribute further to its depression.

I agree with the sentiment expressed in this article from Chicago. I sympathize with the farmers of Iowa and Illinois and the pork-producing Midwest, also my distinguished colleagues [Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. GROSS], who are against this program and are trying to help the farmer. Secretary Dulles and you Members who favor this kind of reciprocal trade are ruining the cotton farmers of South Carolina, Mississippi, Texas, California, Tennessee, and other cotton-producing States. Do not forget when we are forced to import Japanese textiles the American textile industry uses 76 percent of the cotton grown in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of trade. I refute these reciprocal traders who say we are against trade. The world has had trade ever since the Roman days and before, but we have never had any such trade as is being forced upon this country today. Under Mr. Dulles' free-trade program we have to take Communist hams from Poland where ham and pork is needed so badly and injure the farmers of this country. We have to take textiles from Japan and injure the cotton farmers and textile workers of this country. The State Department should be helping the textile people and cotton farmers of South Carolina and Alabama to find markets for their cotton and textiles abroad. These farmers and textile workers, Mr. Dulles, have been reciprocating for years by buying coffee, cocoa, silk, tea, tin, rubber, nuts, and many other products from abroad. It is time for this Congress to reassert its constitutional right to regulate tariff and foreign trade. It is the duty of Congress to protect our own patriotic American people from foreign textiles, Communist hams, Argentine beef, foreign chemicals, oil, and such other products that we already have in surplus.

THE FARM PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 months we have had the great debate on the farm bill. In January President Eisenhower made a plea for a strong effective, and workable farm program that would give farmers an opportunity to profit and prosper with the rest of the economy.

The heart of this program was a dynamic forward-looking soil bank which was the foundation for farm prosperity not only for this year but for years to come. It was designed to help all farmers—dairymen, beef raisers, fruit growers, as well as growers of cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, corn, and tobacco. What happened to that bill? It was brutally mutilated by the House and Senate spokesmen for the owners of cotton plantations, big wheat ranches, peanut plantations, huge rice plantations, and the commercial corngrowers in the Corn Belt.

The family farmer of Michigan and other northern livestock States has not forgotten—not at all. He was promised a modest milk price increase until after election. Then the architects of the farm bill carefully set the stage for the roof to fall in. This planned sabotage of the livestock farmer has not been widely publicized, but the record is there.

President Eisenhower tackled the farm problem at its source. He asked to restore fertility in the soil and not deplete it to produce more surpluses. To make certain that cotton, corn, and wheat acres would not be planted to grass—only to produce more milk and beef—he asked that these soil-bank acres not be grazed. But the Congress majority nullified that safeguard. The farm bill would have permitted the grazing. Thirty to forty million acres would have been released to produce milk and beef. This is an area equal to the State of Iowa in size. Dairymen would have been buried under mountains of surpluses which could have wrecked the dairy farming business.

The original farm bill approved by the Senate would have helped dairy farming through a new method of calculating parity. It was a good provision. It provided permanent benefits. But what did the conferees do? They wiped it out and tossed a bone of 10 cents per hundredweight—but only until after election. Then beginning April 1 next year, prices would drop at least 20 cents per hundredweight. Eventually prices could skid to an all-time low. But then the votes they thought about would be in.

Those of us interested in the family farmer voted for a limit on how much price support money could be paid to big producers. Let me give you some background. One wheat farmer has drawn a check for $1,300,000. Sixty-two bigtime farmers received more than $100,000 from the Government on their 1954 crops. A rice grower received $486,000. Are these the men, the so-called farmers, our support program is designed to serve? Not in my opinion. But what did the House-Senate conferees do? They wiped out a proposed $25,000 ceiling on price support loans and payments. Here again, was the bill in the interest of the family farm? Certainly not.

Obviously for these and other reasons I could not support such a bill—one which promised to do untold harm to the farmers of my district.

Let me emphasize, however, that I am not rubberstamping everything that has been said by leaders of my party. After all, I have actively farmed most of my life. I have a mind of my own; personal convictions born of a lifetime of firsthand farm experience.

I believe for example that the domestic parity program for wheat and rice should be approved. It was in the farm bill but opposed by the administration. I believe too that the present dairy program has not been nearly as successful as it should be. I believe dairy farmers should be given an opportunity to vote on a two-price program—a new approach to a workable, effective peacetime dairy program. I am working with my friends from other dairy States on such a program.

In the meantime, however, I am relieved that President Eisenhower had the wisdom to recognize that the farm bill was designed to do great damage to the livestock farmers of our district and America. I am pleased that he boosted dairy price supports to approximately 85 percent of parity. Now it is up to the Congress to buckle down and pass a good soil-bank bill with safeguards against the dumping of diverted acres.

Our family farmer expects House and Senate leadership to serve them as citizens entitled to the same consideration they have previously expressed to the big plantation and ranch owners. The President has demonstrated his fairness. Now it is up to the opposition to rise to the same level of statesmanship.

THE REVEREND FATHER DOMINIC J. DEL MONTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I had intended originally to rise and pay my respects, and very sincere respects, to a very distinguished constituent of mine of Bayonne, N. J., who has been very kind to me and whose parishioners have been most kind to my political fortunes. I had intended to pay a eulogy at this time to the Reverend Father Dominic J. Del Monte, citizen, as well as pastor, and a member of the Roman Catholic clergy, the archdiocese of Newark. But when I came on the floor of the House and I heard the name of my alma mater taken, Princeton University, I am afraid I had to throw my eulogy into neutral gear for the moment. So I shall ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks on this subject at the proper point in the RECORD. Such point being, if time allows, at the end of my remarks on Princeton University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that Father Del Monte has been voted the outstanding Catholic of the year, and I congratulate him on the honor.

I, who was christened an Episcopalian, and reared as a Baptist, attended Presbyterian chapel services at Princeton; last Sunday, I attended chapel services at Immanuel-Church-on-the-Hill, on the grounds of the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria, where my stepdaughter was married last May. Hoping that that qualifies me in some measure to speak as a Christian, I now want to say something about what I think has given me much of the happiness that I have had in life, and that is the inspiration of my alma mater, Princeton University, under attack for the past week on the floor of this House; heard by me for the first time just now.

Let me say that at the age of 18 I made my own decision, in my freshman year at Princeton, to go abroad. I studied at Hamburg University, Germany, in the summer of 1930, thinking that that would help me in my efforts to become a doctor. So at 18 I made a decision to go overseas and study. It was my own decision, inspired by Princeton. I had intended to go to Heidelberg so I could row on the Neckar but there was no rowing so I went to Hamburg.

As I recall Princeton, it asks students inferentially to come there only if they want to further develop their minds, to think and interpret things for themselves, using what talents God gave them in the best light possible, and only as they saw the light, and to have the manliness to take their medicine in any mistakes made therefrom.

My beloved colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY], has referred to the distinguished role that Princeton has played in the history of this Nation. A commemorative stamp will be issued honoring Nassau Hall's 200th anniversary, next September, by the Post Office Department.

As Mr. TUMULTY has related, the First Continental Congress, if memory of my history is correct, was held at Princeton. In every war—as their names, chiseled on the 4 sides of the marble walls of the Hall of Remembrance, located just outside the board of trustees' room reveals—Princeton men have given their lives for this Nation, just as students and other young men have all over this country in and out of universities given their lives. For what?

This is a great country. We have a great flag. It is a great freedom that we enjoy, enjoy at the price of lives given and blood spilled.

The American Legion was founded by a Princeton man in Paris just around the end of the First World War. It might seem a bit immodest to roll off some of the accomplishments of Princeton's sons and I do not want to impose upon the good graces of this House to do that. Currently, before the Senate, there is a bill asking the Senate to award, shall I say, a Medal of Honor, to Col. John Page, building up the 12 incredible days in combat of this distinguished son of Princeton in the Korean war. The April issue of the Reader's Digest tells the story of Johnny Page. Egghead, eh? I have hopes that that bill on Johnny Page will pass and will come to the attention of the President favorably.

My dad just passed away less than 3 weeks ago, and it was rather a shock not only to the family—though he was 78, he was hale and hearty—but to the doctors who attended him down in Dunedin, Fla. The RECORD shows that I asked unanimous consent for leave of absence for 3 or 4 days because of critical illness in the family.

Father suffered a heart attack, and he rallied, and on the fourth day, the critical day, as we know, of such an attack, he passed on. But the doctors, as shocked as we, thought he would come through. When he passed on, they gave mother a certificate or a piece of paper asking her if she would sign a release so that they could cut into his chest and see what it was that hastened his death. I remember she said, "Doctor, if it will save someone else in the future from going through what my husband went through these past 3 days, I will sign." And she did.

No Princeton man who calls himself a Princeton man at heart, who knows the traditions of the founding of this Republic in the days when the British thought that the men around Princeton were traitors, when the British shot cannonball through Nassau Hall, when they burned the area around Princeton as it was burned here later in the Capital by men who, had they had their way, would have strung us up—I say, no man worthy of the name is going to run from any charge of treason or any catcalls any more than Christ did, and remember Princeton was founded by men of the cloth; they knew the lesson of Christ and its inspiration, and that of the apostles and their inspiration. Sinners, the apostles were forgiven and forgave. A second chance is the root of Christendom; is it not?

I say this: If 165 million Americans were against a Princeton man, who in his heart felt that he was right, those Americans would not frighten that Princeton man, because, though he loves life, he loves more the eternal, and he would not flinch. Johnny Page did not. If I know the Princeton spirit, the board of directors tomorrow and the student body are not going to flinch if they think that by cutting into the chest of what slaughtered Americans abroad, what slaughtered them in Korea, and what might yet slaughter them tomorrow, they can yet, while he lives, find out from Hiss how that blood, in his view, can be stopped. Power to them. I hope that the board of trustees of Princeton tomorrow, and its governor, the Governor of New Jersey, can conclude that Mr. Hiss' presence at Princeton can slash the chest of the past on international affairs and give us a post mortem worthy of thought.

As my name indicates, I am of Polish forebears. My wife lost everything in World War II, as wives of Members of this House, those who have spoken with her, might know. She was in Warsaw in 1939 when both the bombs of Hitler fell, and the subsequent perfidy of Stalin ensued. The ravages of war tore her family asunder. I met her in Vienna when I was with General Clark's allied government. He headed up the allied commission, as you know. That is obiter dicta to this story except that I put myself on record as saying that there are many tears being shed in people's hearts today as there have been through history for the loss of Poland and the loss of over 100 million Christians, in Central Europe, if you please, of their right to worship and live as they would want to worship today, free from the ravages of tyranny and fear. But the Poles are not afraid. Neither is Central Europe. They never were. Karl Marx feared the Poles and their spirit. So did Stalin.

It is a funny thing about the Polish people, from Kosciusko, Pulaski, and others, on, but, like the men at Princeton, they like to fight their own battles. My wife's daughter, my stepdaughter, broke out of the Iron Curtain just a few years ago. In all her tribulations and trials there was no weeping, there was no saying that anyone sold them down the river except the perfidy of Stalin and the Reds and the evil of Hitler. Today we talk only of communism, but let us remember that when the guns went off, it was Hitler that pulled the trigger. Then followed the doublecross of Molotov and Stalin. So here, like the Irish, through the years, the Poles have been flanked by difficult neighbors. But you do not see the Poles crying about anything any more than you do the Irish. They are willing to stand up and fight for what they want if they feel it is right.

Let us get back to this one issue. I have said what I have to say about the background of Princeton, about the "Tigers" being often on the one-yard line, short of a touchback, about their being able to retrieve a seemingly hopeless situation and scoring—I have talked about Princeton and the boys down there who decided to come to Princeton because at Princeton they could dare to think and act for themselves. If they did not think they could, they would not be there. They are going to make that decision tomorrow, and what I say here will not influence them one iota. They know their own minds. I am sure if I know the Princeton spirit that what they are going to do tomorrow at the meeting of the board of trustees, or what is going to happen in off-campus debate if the board of trustees turns them down—and, incidentally, there was no boxing team allowed at Princeton when I was first there. It was against the rules of the university to engage in boxing bouts, but, in 1932, competitive boxing was allowed. I know. On December 19, 1931, under the name of Al Simmins, in my junior year, I fought two off-campus fights in one night at the Newark Athletic Club and won a gold watch. Those were great days. I was never in the ring before. Princeton allowed its students to think and act on their own. With all modesty, I trust, I was the first, I am told, president of any officially sanctioned boxing club organized on the university campus.

Yet, the rule on this said, "Thou shalt not." But, we did—only because the desire was healthy and strong enough.

Again, I salute the position of the president, the professors and the spirit of the Princeton student council in allowing to take place an honest inspiration to learn more about world affairs and not to kill it.

There is a show in New York today called The Lark. Joan of Arc was once tried and burned as a traitor. Today, she is a saint and a martyr. Many people who have seen The Lark want to reach out as I did, I am sure, on that stage before she is burned and say, "Stop, fools, stop." The British were in on that Joan of Arc deal, too. But there was no Bill of Rights then. And hindsight is always 20–20 anyway, as someone said. Today, Joan of Arc is a saint. But the moment and the times and the opinion was such then that she was considered a heretic—"Burn her"—but you do not say that today. Today, she is respected. You just wonder how the spirit of Christ could ever have been so perverted at that time that men would dare lay that kind of a hand on mortal man. That to me is the lesson of Christ's crucifixion. I say before you lay a hand on another mortal, or his mind, you had better be careful because you may yet have to be the judge of your own act and, like Judas, dash your 30 pieces of silver to the ground and walk the plank.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. And so, again, Christendom might have been different if perhaps they had allowed Martin Luther to lay his protestations at the Vatican door and act on them instead of letting him nail them on some church door, and then have him go back to found another movement in Christendom.

If that and many other things had been allowed to be said about God and His will, this great globe of ours might today be united in joint and fervent faith for the good of mankind while it strove to prepare itself for the disclosure of His endless mysteries. Certainly, it must be painful to the Lord, as it is to His people here, to behold these fierce schisms that have rent man against man through time in every activity of life all over the world.

We have got to unite under God, too, in that belief in Him. But let us not tremble as did the crusaders for the mere sake of getting hold of some parcel of distant land if it means the loss of millions of lives needlessly. The spirit of God must first be within us. Let us be careful. I say that to me the lesson of Christendom is that you shall not crucify. How can we dare to lay hands—not on just a body, that is one thing, but, on the spirit of man, that is another thing. And, as the Hudson Dispatch in my own district said, Mr. Hiss was not convicted for subversion or treason. He was convicted because the court said he lied. That is one thing. And he lied about activities in a period before World War II. You cannot get me to say that I was not grateful that the Russian soldiers slaughtered the enemy of the United States. No, no, no, no. That happened between 1942 and 1945. I would not say that I did not want Russian bullets to kill the enemy of the United States from 1942 to 1945. Nor likewise do I say I am for what they stood for in the Kremlin—no, no. It was the perfidy of Stalin after Yalta that turned the trick against us. Like Christians in good faith, we laid it on the line—we put it in black and white, and the way we talk today you would think it was the United States who was the doublecrosser at Yalta. There were situations. The Russians had the battlefields. Their men were in the possession of territories. So we asked them to honor certain sacred commitments, and the records show that perfidy in peace came from Stalin and his Kremlin gang. Why brand our country as liars and blackguards? Why must we say America was guilty? Remember, once we were hemmed in on the Atlantic and the Pacific. They say we gave Poland away. They say we gave China away. No; we were here, not there. We fought back. We landed on Normandy. We landed in Japan. We broke the chains in which we were encased on our own shores. Let us not, as Christians, say that we are afraid to let Hiss come on the campus. Are we, in this, like Christ? No; He was not that way. He was not afraid. Why should we be afraid of Hiss? Why can we not let him talk and then have the television and the press and the radio pick him apart? Let us give Hiss the chance to plunge the knife, as I said at the start, into the chest of world affairs. If he, like we, is interested in a post mortem, and, if he is the idealist and the Quaker that we are told that he was, and might still be, that he fell in love with an ideal, and was consumed by it, if Hiss is ever to have that second chance, let it be said that no one in America was afraid to let that man speak on a college campus; and, under the principles for which we stand in this Republic—let him have a chance to tell us, if he can, how we can, in honor, stop bloodshed. How we can, in honor, avoid depressions, and how we can, in honor, avoid the exploitations of man against man, now and for all time.

If those are the principles that Hiss fell in love with, if those are the principles he wanted mankind to talk about just as the President of the United States did in his speech, printed in the newspaper yesterday, about placing the individual first, then let us give him a chance. In that one sense I want to revise these remarks so that they are not slanted as favoring any one man but as favoring a principle. We here are sworn to uphold the law. Hiss served his time. He is a free man. If there is something wrong with the law, change it.

What are the implications behind this invitation? Maybe it is to embarrass Adlai Stevenson, a Princeton man, if he wins the Democratic nomination. If that is the case, let us know it right now. Whether Hiss is given permission to talk tomorrow or Monday or on the 28th does not matter. The damage is done. On the other hand, if the Democrats want to fight back, they can say, "Maybe the Republicans would not want this talk of Hiss to happen." Why? How different was Geneva from Yalta? In both instances officials of the United States Government sat around the table with Communists. But the difference is that at Yalta things were reduced to writing. There was not any talk of spirit. It was, that if such and such things happen, such and such things will be done. Contracts were written at Yalta. There were secret agreements; perfidy set in; but at Geneva you had the same thing you had at Yalta. The chiefs of America sat around the table with the Reds. But how have we balanced out? Now, since Geneva, instead of the West going to the Soviet-dominated territories as it did at Yalta, you have two men from the Kremlin in London tonight. Maybe they can come clean. Maybe the Bible will work for us, if we let it. Maybe the people of Russia can get finally what they have hoped for, and certainly through the sacrifices of war, deserve to hope for, a better today and a better tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I yield to my beloved colleague, Mr. TUMULTY, who has fought this battle to the fullest, and I wish I could agree with him and he knows that I wish I could. But I don't and with all my heart, I cannot.

Mr. TUMULTY. The only thing I am interested in at this point is my understanding, and I wish you would clarify it for me. I gathered when you spoke of Joan of Arc and her ultimate sainthood, you are not suggesting that Hiss would ultimately be a saint.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I am not a debater. The gentleman has humbled teams from Oxford and Cambridge in debate. He is a very astute and brilliant man. I do not intend to tangle with him. He knows that by referring to the record, as I shall leave my remarks, any and all implications are clear. Joan of Arc—I saw the play. I felt as if I could reach down and grab those clergymen and say "Let us apply the things we have learned from the crucifixion of Christ. Why can't you take His spirit and let that girl live?" But they did not. Today I know she is a saint. As you see that play, you would wish that they had a foresight as sharply developed as is our hindsight today. But centuries separated the stage from where I sat in the box when I saw the play.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to get into an argument with my colleague. You know, as he suggested, the Irish do not run away from a fight. As far as I could gather, and I hope I am incorrect, the parallel that he drew between this play, The Lark, that he saw and the various incidents in church history to which he alluded could only make sense if it related to Hiss. I gathered the impression that he thought if we let Mr. Hiss go around to all the universities and talk and advance the cause of Soviet conspiracy, that ultimately Hiss might reach sainthood some day. I can understand his defending his alma mater, and I think he should. I think it is about time some Princeton man spoke up, but I point out that Hiss would bring slavery to us. Hiss is a man who would bring to us the very thing that the Russians have brought to everyone; the absence of free speech; the destruction of the Bill of Rights, the end of American freedom. Hiss has betrayed our country to the Reds and now he is using the students, using the historic background of Princeton, using the gentleman's own courageous career as a soldier in World War II and in Korea, cloaking them around himself so that he might vicariously wear the mantle of Princeton.

I have no quarrel with Princeton at all, but it just does seem to be muddle-headed foolishness to go out and invite men in who are going to destroy it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. First, let me state categorically I did not mean to imply any transfer of religious or secular sainthood one way or the other.

Mr. TUMULTY. You do not think Hiss should be allowed to go around and talk to such university groups, do you? Remember what he is.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I am a Princeton man and I feel that my life is mine to plan with as I wish, but because I may choose to risk my life on or off the battlefield I do not have the right to force other Princeton students to do the same.

Mr. TUMULTY. My life is involved, too, and I would like to keep hold of it for a while.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further to the gentleman at this time. There is too much colloquy. I would like to hear the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. TUMULTY. This cannot be considered as some have suggested, just a student prank. There is something far deeper to it than that. As I pointed out Hiss was invited other places. He would not go to the University of Pennsylvania because he would not speak from the same platform with unpopular radical speakers; he wants only to speak in proper places.

Where was Hiss when the cold war was going on? He was in a place where he was slipping information to the enemy when the gentleman was fighting. You do not have to have a hot war to get killed. Men get killed in the cold war, too. And to suggest that Mr. Hiss should be on the verge of sainthood and wear a halo is incredible; a halo of flame where he is going if he does not repent.

Mr. GROSS. As did Benedict Arnold.

Mr. TUMULTY. Yes. I am beginning to reconsider Benedict Arnold. He betrayed us to the British. God forbid that anybody should have been betrayed to them, but at least the British had some concept of honor even if it is English, and some concept of religion. Arnold did not betray us to an atheistic government such as communism.

Are we to turn such men loose after they have served their prison terms? Is it to be treated no more seriously than switching from one brand of whisky to another? Should we honor the man we should excoriate? He would not last 5 minutes in Soviet Russia.

Are we going to maintain the proposition that he is a proper person to talk to students on our foreign policy?

When a man has done what this man did is he to be allowed to go around and poison the judgment of our students? Is Princeton going to allow this in the name of academic freedom? Is she going to contribute to her own destruction? I do not know; maybe Princeton wants to commit hara-kiri.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield, but not for a speech.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Does not the gentleman feel that there is still a little courage and ability at Princeton to preserve that institution? Does not the gentleman believe its men have the intelligence to weigh what they hear? Does it mean that because this man should speak there that he has the endorsement in his views of Princeton men?

Mr. TUMULTY. All I am asking Princeton to do is to protect the Princeton boys.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think Princeton students well qualified to protect themselves. I think they are just as courageous as you think they are. They should let him speak.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SISK (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) on April 19 and April 20, on account of official business.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have permission to sit during general debate in the House all of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. TUMULTY, for 15 minutes today.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. CHUDOFF, for 15 minutes on Thursday, April 26.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. METCALF), for 30 minutes on Tuesday, April 24, 1956.

Mr. KNOX, for 10 minutes today, following any other special orders.

Mr. SIEMINSKI, for 10 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF).

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MUMMA.

Mr. LOVRE.

Mr. SADLAK and to include a speech by Mr. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

Mr. BALDWIN.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATMAN, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2091. An act authorizing the reconstruction, enlargement and extension of the bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Rock Island, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2092. An act transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2424. An act to provide that lock and dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., shall hereafter be known and designated as the John Hollis Bankhead lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2712. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for transit over the Manette Bridge in Bremerton, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 2854. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2855. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Housing to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for housing to provide shelter for disaster victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2859. An act to provide rent-free accommodations in certain federally aided housing for needy victims of major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 3272. An act to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1287. An act to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national bank associations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 23, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1763. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to certifying that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Santa Maria Water Conservation District which are to be benefited by the Santa Maria project, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1764. A letter from the Acting Commissioner General Services Administration, relative to a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 3,302 ounces of emetine hydrochloride now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597, 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1765. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Veterans Canteen Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1946 (38 U. S. C. 13f) (H. Doc. No. 384); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1766. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation (in liquidation) and Defense Lending Division, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 385); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1767. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Facilities Corporation, Office of Production and Defense Lending, Department of the Treasury, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 386); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1768. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed revisions of the 1957 budget for the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, involving a total increase of $29,415,000 (H. Doc. No. 383); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1769. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved August 17, 1937, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1770. A letter from the Director, District Unemployment Compensation Board, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the calendar year 1955, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9314. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 9593. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10654. A bill making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2017). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 477. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7500, a bill to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; without amendment (Rept. No. 2018). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 478. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 9260, a bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2019). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 479. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2840, a bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2020). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 10654. A bill making an additional appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 10655. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the admission of single persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 10656. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 10657. A bill to establish a soil bank; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 10658. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that annuitants may elect to have their annuities taxed in the manner provided by the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10659. A bill to protect the public in the operation of, and in performance under warranties on, delicate, complicated, sensitive or inherently dangerous machinery, mechanisms, or apparatus sold in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 10660. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 10661. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 10662. A bill creating the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 10663. A bill to provide for the establishment of a regional water laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 10664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 10665. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by civilian agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 10666. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 10667. A bill to amend the act of August 26, 1950, relating to the suspension of employment of civilian personnel of the

United States in the interest of national security; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 10668. A bill to readjust postal classification on certain educational materials, and for other purposes; to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 10669. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10670. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal Government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 10671. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10672. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Housing to enter into contracts on a standby or emergency basis for housing to provide shelter for disaster victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10673. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10674. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10675. A bill to authorize an increase of emergency relief highway funds from $10 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 10676. A bill to increase and make certain revisions in the general authorization for small flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act of 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 10677. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, relating to war risk insurance for an additional 5 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 10678. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 10679. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bi-State commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 10680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income-tax deductions for depreciation and repair of the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10681. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of nonferrous chrysotile asbestos in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 10682. A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10683. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, so as to provide punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10684. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands at the United States Naval Station, San Juan, P. R., between the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (by request):

H. R. 10685. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission to regulate the number of vehicles to be used as taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10686. A bill to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U. S. C. 35); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10687. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of mercury in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 10688. A bill to assist in maintaining sound domestic mining industries for the production of certain strategic metals; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 10689. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 10690. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 10691. A bill o amend with Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 10692. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 10693. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 10694. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 10695. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 10696. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 10697. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PILCHER:

H. R. 10698. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 10699. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. R. 10700. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 10701. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 10702. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BASS of Tennessee:

H. R. 10703. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 10704. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10705. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10706. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 10707. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 10708. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H. R. 10709. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 10710. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 10711. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to cotton-acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. Res. 480. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate and study the downgrading of positions in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to appropriate money for the repair of the dam at Massasoit Lake, better known as Watershops Pond in the city of Springfield; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to enact certain legislation, such as necessary for establishing proper flood-control measures in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; reduc-

ing the age of eligibility for women for social-security benefits; providing for the establishment of a national health insurance plan; repealing the Immigration and Nationality Act in which there shall be no quota system based on national origins; granting aid in the form of arms to the Government of Israel; incorporating the Franco-American War Veterans; and repeal of a treaty relative to the prosecution of members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries for alleged violation of the law of such countries; and that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to insure that the Postmaster General issue a postage stamp in memory of the late Herman Melville; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10712. A bill for the relief of Moshe Davidovitz and Frieda Davidovitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10713. A bill for the relief of Wei-Kuan Chang and Su Chun Wei Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 10714. A bill for the relief of Ivo Bukvic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 10715. A bill for the relief of Ornella Buratto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 10716. A bill for the relief of Baleriano Alvarez-Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10717. A bill for the relief of Ciro (Jerry) Barile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 10718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cleopatra Vasiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 10719. A bill for the relief of Silvio Dario Durante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 10720. A bill for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

931. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Kellenbach-Mead Barracks No. 163, Veterans of World War I of the U. S. A., bearing the signatures of 1,258 residents of Willamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

932. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of L. H. Bowman and 46 other residents of Grants Pass, Oreg., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

933. Also, petition of Percy Edwards and 46 other residents of Sutherlin, Roseburg, Oakland, Wilbur, Myrtle Creek and Camas Valley, Oreg., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

934. Also, petition of R. H. Woodbury and 45 other residents of Grants Pass, Oreg., and vicinity, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

935. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of employees of the Burlington freight office in Ottumwa, Iowa, urging the passage of H. R. 9065; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

936. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. Hellen M. Bilderbeck and 363 other residents of Los Angeles, Long Beach, Pasadena, and Glendale, Calif., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

937. Also, petition of Mrs. Maggie Plemons and 102 other residents of Fort Payne and Rainsville, Ala., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

938. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miss W. S. Pratt, secretary, Townsend Clubs of Fourth District of Florida, Miami, Fla., requesting Members of the House of Representatives to sign petition No. 4 to have H. R. 4471 brought out of committee for debate and a vote; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

939. Also, petition of K. V. Swalley and others, Valliant, Okla., requesting passage of legislation that will bring about a good national old-age-pension plan during this session of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Horace Seely-Brown, Jr., Tells Hi-Y Youth Legislators More Politicians Mean Better Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and wish to do so by inserting in the RECORD an address which was delivered during the recent recess of the Congress by my colleague from Connecticut, the Representative of the Second Congressional District, and as such my own Congressman, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

The Members of this House know that Mr. SEELY-BROWN does not take up much of the time of the House with speeches, but when he does speak, we have observed that invariably it is briefly and to the point, and his remarks always are a cogent contribution to the business before the House.

The address which I am about to place in the RECORD was delivered at the Hotel Bond, in Hartford, Conn., where Mr. SEELY-BROWN was asked to be the guest of honor at a dinner which marked the close of a 2-day session of the general assembly of the Hi-Y youth in government project. There were about 175 young men present, all juniors and seniors in high school, who had been elected by their Hi-Y Clubs at the Young Men's Christian Associations in their home communities, to serve as senators or as representatives in the youth general assembly. They performed all of the steps involved in carrying into effect a law of the State of Connecticut.

As always, my colleague was brief in his remarks, but the advice which he gave to the youth legislators and the other guests present was so well thought out, and it is of so much interest, not only to parents, but to all citizens of all ages, that I am inserting at this point in the RECORD the text of his address:

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., TELLS HI-Y YOUTH LEGISLATORS MORE POLITICIANS MEAN BETTER GOVERNMENT

Mr. Chairman, I consider it an honor and a privilege to be given the opportunity of sharing in this program with you. The invitation so graciously tendered by your chairman to address this closing session of the Youth General Assembly was one which I was pleased indeed at being able to accept.

During these past 2 days, you as members of the Youth and Government Assembly have completed an arduous program. I am sure that in your "stand in" capacity you have had a real look at some of the problems faced by the duly elected executive and legislative officers of our State government. I trust that you have passed all the bills that needed to be "passed," and perhaps repealed a few acts that needed repealing. At any rate when you finished, it was unnecessary for the Secretary of State to proclaim, "God save the State of Connecticut." I wonder if any of you are already making plans for calling a special session.

I have been pleased to examine the Handbook of Instructions so carefully prepared by the Youth and Government Committee of the Connecticut State YMCA. I congratulate those who worked in its preparation. This manual could well serve as an effective "do it yourself" manual for your prototypes, the elected Senators and Representatives, especially those coming to Hartford for their first term of service in the General Assembly.

I have not yet received any specific report as to the "laws" which you have enacted during this session of the Youth and Government Assembly. I am sure there are many which rightly can be counted as an index to your alert civic responsibility and sound thinking.

I would not be at all surprised, nor would I blame you, if there were no bills passed under the general entitlement of "juvenile delinquency." I am sure that many of you are sick of the term and for much of the loose talk for which this term must serve as a label.

I promise not to belabor the point, but it does seem to me that even those of us who are adults have become quite confused about juvenile delinquency, including alike what it is, and what to do about it.

"Juvenile delinquency" is a term which we do not find in the annals of the past. It does not appear as such in our literature of other centuries, or in the jurisprudence of distant times. No doubt, mother's knee and father's knee were important administratively as well as anatomically in preventing the need for such a term.

The Scriptures, the lawgivers, the ancient and modern philosophers, the poets of the Golden Age do not give us anything about "juvenile delinquency." Instead, they have handed down to us much that is well worth remembering about youth and its qualities and virtues.

Fame Is the Thirst of Youth. Youth is on the march to fame and will not be stopped. It has been so in every generation. Age could not stop this, nor would it. In our present day, there would be perhaps less confusion if we elders, we parents, spent more effort in undertaking to understand youth, and more time and energy in working with youth.

Young people are not the only ones who seem to be confused. One State, Georgia, already says that persons are mature enough to vote when they reach the age of 18. In fact, a proposal is presently before the Congress for the same voting age in all States in electing Federal officials. On the other hand, all States but 6 say a man cannot get married without his parents' permission until he is 21 years of age. At 18½ you are old enough to be drafted into the military service, and, if necessary, to fight for your country; but you are not old enough to buy anything on the installment plan, except by your parents' authority, until you are 21.

Here in the State of Connecticut we hope that willful damage and acts of vandalism will be reduced, as the result of a law which was passed last year, making parents responsible, up to $250, for any willful damage to property by their children up to the age of 21 years. In New York, however, Governor Harriman has just vetoed a similar bill, I am informed, saying that young people would use the threat of causing damage, for which their parents would be liable to pay, as a club over the heads of their parents to make them give them the things they wanted. And so I say, who is confused?

Whether or not the legislation you have adopted at your youth-government assembly deals with any of these matters, I am sure that you can help, by your studies, by your interests, and by your influence and example, to clear up much of the confusion that prevails on these and many other important subjects.

I have been examining the list of the members of the youth and government committee of the Connecticut State YMCA, the committee responsible for this program. It is an impressive list.

Do you know that the chairman, Judge Maltbie, served as chief justice of Connecticut for 20 years—a longer period than any other man in that office since our State's present constitution was adopted in 1818? I believe that he was the youngest man to be appointed to the superior court bench, either before or since, when he was nominated to that high judicial office by Gov. Marcus Holcomb. And already, at that early age, he had served his town of Granby as representative in the general assembly, he had served Hartford County as assistant State's attorney, and he had served as executive secretary to Governor Holcomb. His distinguished career has comprehended public service in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our government.

The honorary chairman of your committee, Justice Raymond E. Baldwin, of the supreme court of errors, was one of our State's most beloved governors, and a member of the United States Senate from Connecticut; and, before he was elected governor, he sat in one of the very seats that you youth legislators sat in, in the House of Representatives at the Capitol, where he represented the town of Stratford for 2 terms, during 1 of which he was the majority leader of the House.

I would like to point out to you that both Judge Maltbie and Justice Baldwin were politicians. I look over the names of the other members of the distinguished committee, and I find among them many personal friends of mine from my own congressional district of eastern Connecticut. They are politicians, too.

"Politician," according to the distorted usage of today's world, has become an ignominious word. There is no reason why this should be so. One of the things of greatest value that you could carry back home from this session is that there is nothing wrong with being a politician; in fact, that you should aspire to be one, to the extent that your time and talents permit.

Politicians are an essential part of our system of government. The dictionary says that politics is the science or art of government. Politicians are men and women who have had sufficient interest in public service, sufficient care about the kind of government we have, to take the time and trouble to become experts, to a greater or lesser degree, in the science or art of government.

Most politicians do not conform at all to the cartoon conception of what a politician is, and what he does, and how he operates.

You who have just served in the general assembly of the youth and government program no doubt are aware that in our official general assembly there are 36 Senators and 279 Representatives, and all they receive by way of compensation for their services to the State, at home and in Hartford, for their entire term of 2 years, is $600. They are barred by law from accepting appointment to a public-service job with a salary while they are members of the General Assembly.

There are about 750 men and women, serving on more than 100 boards, commissions, and committees that constitute part of the government of the State of Connecticut, who are responsible for important decisions of policy, and the direction of thousands of employees, and the spending of millions of dollars in State appropriations. They receive nothing for their services—not a penny! They are politicians.

In your own community back home, and in every community, there are other citizens, men and women by the dozens, by the scores, in the larger cities even by the hundreds, who are serving as aldermen, councilmen, commissioners, and as members of boards of education, boards of finance, etc. They are paid nothing for their services. They are politicians.

Also, in your own community, and in every other community in Connecticut, there are men and women who serve on the town committee of the political party of their choice, or they serve on the State central committee, or they serve on a ward or precinct or district committee. They do not receive anything for their services, and they do not expect to; but they care enough about the principles and about the candidates of their party to devote much energy, many hours, and, yes, a lot of their own money, to working for the attainment of their objectives. They are politicians.

In the assembly sessions which you have attended I am sure that you have learned much. As true representatives of your respective clubs, it will now be your responsibility to report back to those whom you represent. You have had an opportunity to see our government from the inside actually.

Take back home the message that the government of Connecticut is well conducted, and that it is conducted as the people want it to be, as expressed in their mandate to parties and to candidates every election.

Take back the message that the science and art of government demand skilled and talented practitioners, just as every other science, art, or craft demands, and that these are politicians. Groom yourself, and influence your fellow club members at home, to take an eager interest in government—local, State, and Federal—even at your present age, and continue and develop it when you are able to become voters.

Do not be afraid or ashamed to be a politician. Being a politician is also being a patriot; and the more politicians we have—the more sincere, interested, and experienced men and women in politics—the better our politics will be, which is just another way of saying the better our government will be.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman Before the Albert Einstein College of Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered at the award dinner of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, in New York City, on April 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT AWARD DINNER OF THE ALBERT EINSTEIN COLLEGE OF MEDICINE, APRIL 17, 1956, WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK

I am grateful for your award. I am honored, greatly honored, to be included in the company of Carl Sandburg, Dr. Stanley Cobb, and Dr. John von Neumann in receiving this recognition from the Albert Einstein College of Medicine.

Carl Sandburg and these two brilliant scientists have enriched mankind's heritage in a way and degree that no political figure possibly can. The contributions of these men will be remembered and utilized long after the political chronicles of these times have been relegated to the archives of oblivion.

To be honored in the name and in the memory of that towering figure of the ages, Albert Einstein, makes me feel humble, and thankful, indeed.

There is a man who lent luster not only to his adopted country, America, but to all humanity. Our entire epoch will one day cite Albert Einstein as one of its chief claims to immortality. There was a mind—and a soul—which soars above our time, like an eagle over the distant terrain below.

This College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, under whose auspices we meet tonight, is richly endowed with Albert Einstein's name alone. The finest hope I can express for this college is that it will never cease to be animated by the spirit and ideals of Albert Einstein. If that hope be realized—and I am confident it will—this college will repay in full measure all the efforts and sacrifices that have gone, and must continue to go, into its creation and growth.

What nobler enterprise is there, what finer way to carry on in the spirit of Albert Einstein, than to provide this facility, this college, for the training of young men and women in the twin pursuits of medical research and medical practice. And here, I am proud to note, under the aegis of the Jewish tradition, the scientific spirit is to

be given free rein and scope, "on the principle," in Albert Einstein's words, "that the desire for truth must take precedence over all other desires."

In these words Albert Einstein wrote what could be the inscription on the foundation stone of this college.

The search for truth is a sacred quest whose inviolability must be recognized by any society which aspires to the ways of freedom. It is the hallmark of a mature society which has a true faith in freedom.

I accept your citizenship award, hoping that I have indeed contributed in some small measure to the struggle for freedom in our beloved country, against the encroachments of those men, to be found in every time, who view every unorthodoxy as heresy, and whose answer to heresy is repression.

Against these forces I have fought in these recent years, as during all the years of my life, with such strength as I have had. And if my efforts have served any purpose, it has been to help sound the alarm for the mobilization of those legions of Americans who, loving freedom, have been aroused to defend it.

We have had some measure of success. The worst assaults have been beaten off. The chief vigilante of them all, Senator McCarthy, has been, at least temporarily, unhorsed. The hobgoblins of fear with which he frightened the people and made America the object of ridicule throughout the world have been exposed for the penny-show effigies that they were.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin, for the moment, preaching to unhearing ears the doctrines of fear, danger, and hate which, only 2 years ago, commanded the breathless attention of the Nation and the world.

I have emphasized the phrase "for the moment." I have done so because I do not share the confidence of some that the danger of McCarthyism is past.

Indeed, I think it still hovers over us. It may take another form and pass under another name; while the sickness in our national soul which permitted McCarthyism to rage so violently has apparently been arrested, I doubt whether it has been completely cured.

I am reminded of the prophetic words of the late Huey Long, when asked whether the United States could be swept by fascism. He was an intellectual cynic: he said it could happen, but in America it would be called antifascism. He was wrong only in terminology. In fact, when it came, it was falsely called anticommunism. Next time, if and when it comes, it will probably be called something else again.

No, the danger is not over and the damage has not yet been undone.

The stigmata of the basic illness remain with us. The climate of apprehension is much milder now but it still can be felt in the schools, in the Government service, and in the general body politic. The teacher, the public figure, or the Government servant must still think twice before he makes an appointment, writes a letter, buys a book, discusses an idea, or makes a speech or statement. He must weigh and consider how this activity could be made to look in its worst light, how it could be made to sound in the mouth of a McCarthy, or before a congressional investigating committee.

Public men must still take frequent public oaths of hatred for communism, as though such hatred required public affirmation in order to give assurance of loyalty to America.

And we still have the unedifying spectacle of congressional committees touring the country inquiring into the individual beliefs and long-past associations of private citizens.

It was only a few months ago that a most unfortunate attempt to intimidate a great newspaper, the New York Times, was to be discerned in one of the investigations conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security.

The stage and screen have continued to be exposed to sporadic attacks, and the blacklist is still a reality in the entertainment world.

Finally, the Government security program, perhaps at a somewhat slower pace than before, continues to claim its innocent victims, although the numbers game, which Attorney General Brownell enjoyed so much at one time, is no longer as popular as it was.

No; freedom's banners can scarcely be said to fly at full mast in our country yet. We have much to do, much wreckage to repair, and many battles still to win, before we can claim that we are even at the point from which we came a scant few years ago.

Nor must we forget that the struggle for human freedom is one which must be continuously pressed forward to new victories and new advances. To do otherwise is to lose ground in a world which is in irresistible motion, where standing still results, in effect, in moving backward.

Albert Einstein said: "Laws alone cannot secure freedom of expression; in order that every man may present his views without penalty, there must be a spirit of toleration in the entire population. Such an ideal of external liberty can never be fully attained but must be sought unremittingly if scientific thought, and philosophical and creative thinking in general are to be advanced as far as possible."

Today, while facing the imperative duty of pressing onward to regain lost ground in the field of civil liberties we are presented with a fresh challenge in the field of civil rights.

I am proud and glad to take note that in this college, students are selected entirely on the basis of individual need and merit, without regard to race, creed or color.

The application of this rule to our entire society is the problem with which we must now grapple with all our might.

This problem weighs upon us today with the accumulated force of generations of injustice. Today we are being asked—no, we are directed—to eradicate the evil practices of the past and to make a prompt start upon this heavy task.

The immediate problem is legally enforced segregation in the public schools, but looming behind this one are others—the denial of the right to vote, the denial of equal opportunity in employment, and the denial of the equal protection of law against physical violence. And finally there is the overall, the basic, problem—the eradication of the assumption that race, creed, color, or place of national origin is per se a warrant of superiority for some and a badge of inferiority for others.

These problems demand, in one degree or another, our immediate concern, attention and action.

The denial of basic human rights to some, based on race, can no longer be tolerated. It will no longer be tolerated. The victims of discrimination, disenfranchisement and unequal justice are no longer content to wait for the gradual rusting away of their chains. And the conscience of America, in this respect, can no longer withstand the pitiless inspection of mankind two-thirds of which consists of peoples of colored races.

While the denial of basic rights and the repression of people on the basis of their race is concentrated in its most acute forms in some parts of the South, the larger problem is common to every part of our country.

We, in the North, while urging and requiring a forward movement on these fronts in the South, have our own movement to make, to eradicate the practices of discrimination in our own part of the country—and the existence of prejudice in our own hearts and minds, whether the victims of such discrimination and prejudice are Negroes or Puerto Ricans or Jews or Catholics or just foreigners.

We have our own backyards to clean up, even as we continue, as we must, to lend our force to the tide which is sweeping back the barriers of legal discrimination in the South.

Nor should we forget in this cleanup of discriminatory practices and prejudicial actions and attitudes, the McCarran-Walter Act. There is an area which falsely reflects and distorts the spirit of America. We cannot rest until the national origins quota system—that shameful codification of the mythology of Nordic superiority—is expunged completely from the laws of our land.

The tasks confronting us are difficult, weighted with practical problems of the greatest complexity.

In every direction there is a new challenge, a tangled array of almost insuperable difficulties.

We must not seek to escape from this troubled prospect by passing the responsibility to others, or by contenting ourselves with the pious hope that time will bring easy solutions. There are no easy solutions.

This is the responsibility of every man. Each one of us shares in that responsibility. Each one of us has a part to play in the drama of these critical days.

We must catch up, in our human relationships, with the seven-league advances of science in the field of communication, movement and destruction.

We must do battle for freedom and justice now for everybody, or we will awake to find them gone for everybody.

I have faith. I have hope. I believe that the purposes we serve will prevail. God willing, we will not fail.

The Late Leo R. Sack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad coincidence that Mr. Leo R. Sack, the distinguished soldier and diplomat and former member of the Capitol Press Galleries, died on Sunday in Los Angeles, Calif., on the eve of the observance of the eighth anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel, in the creation of which he played such a significant role.

As public relations counselor to Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, then president of the Zionist Organization of America, Leo Sack rendered an incalculable service that will be long remembered by those who have the cause of democracy at heart.

As a patriotic American he saw the wisdom of the establishment of a bastion of the free world in the Middle East where communism had long sought, and still seeks, a foothold. As a member of the Jewish faith whose brethren survivors of the Nazi holocaust sought a refuge in their traditional homeland he labored for the justice of their cause.

And as an experienced journalist and diplomat of wide experience and friendships he directed his efforts in the crucial

days of the partition fight and the birth of the fledgling nation to the success of that cause.

I am sure I speak the sentiments of many other Americans, Jew and non-Jew alike, who knew and loved Leo Sack when I extend our sympathies to his wife, his daughter and grandchildren and other members of his family and add: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Public Housing at Its Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, on April 22, 1953, when public-housing legislation was under consideration in the House, I asked this question: "How long is it reasonable to allow a tenant to stay in this low-cost, subsidized, less-than-cost housing?" I think my remarks then are worthwhile repeating in part at this time. I quote:

I think this approach to the public-housing situation is very important. Some plan should be adopted whereby tenancy is limited to a certain period of time. This would help get out of these units some of the people who expect to make this a permanent thing and allow others to have a chance. It is reliably estimated that public housing can at best take care of only one-tenth of our people who are in the low-income group and need this help.

Another angle that should be studied, when the whole housing situation is reviewed, is the matter of incentive. It is claimed that Federal housing rehabilitates. If it is a matter of rehabilitation, there ought to be a period of so many years or months of occupancy provided to permit tenants to acquire a stake to be used in the purchase of homes of their own. I realize it is a much easier proposition for a veteran to get out of these low-cost housing units and have a little garden for his kids to run around in than for a widow with 2 or 3 children to support. This should be taken into consideration when this public-housing item is reviewed again next year by the Banking and Currency Committee.

In my community of Pennsylvania we have a very good housing authority. We have a very good manager in charge. We have 1,100 units and, in my opinion, those 1,100 units should form the basis for a turnover so that people who run into a streak of hard luck may be taken care of and perhaps save a little money. In my experience, it is not always the fellow who makes the most money who lives in the nicest or has the best home. I can show you cases of people, living more or less on a low-income wage, who get in there and pitch and own their own homes. They look nice; they have a nice garden. It is mainly a matter of their will to lift themselves up rather than continuing to accept this subsidized housing.

Now read these interesting figures from an article in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of February 16, 1956:

MODERN UNITS FOR FAMILIES WITH LOW INCOME LAUDED

M. W. Smith, executive director of the Harrisburg Housing Authority, today released figures indicating the modern facilities of local public housing projects are encouraging thrift among low-income occupants.

Harrisburg has 1,080 modern housekeeping units in four public housing projects; George A. Hoverter Homes, William Howard Day Homes, John A. F. Hall Manor and Hillside Village.

In the last 3 years, Smith said 633 families moved out voluntarily, 169 of them, or 26.7 percent, going into homes they are buying.

"We are of the opinion," said Smith, "that if these 633 families had not enjoyed the benefits of modern public housing they would still be 'existing' in substandard dwellings."

The Housing Authority, the Harrisburg Redevelopment Authority and City Council are currently striving to obtain 330 more units of public housing to replace substandard dwellings.

Smith also disclosed figures of a recent housing survey showing that although 1,893 units of public and private housing were erected since April 1, 1950, the city, on February 1, still had 7,662 units of substandard dwellings. Of those, he said 6,337 are occupied by white families, 1,325 by Negroes. Dwellings demolished in extended Capitol Park since April 1, 1950, he said numbered 452.

I have always felt that we have a good Housing Authority in Harrisburg, with efficient, honest management. I believe you will agree with me, after noting the authority's approach to this housing problem as carried in the friendly, helpful and constructive news article mentioned above. It speaks well for public housing as it has been managed and developed in our community.

Opposition to Utility Provision in Federal Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the utility reimbursement section which has been approved by the House Public Works Committee for incorporation in the Federal highway bill, is an undesirable section. This section would allow reimbursement by the Federal Government of 90 percent of the cost of relocating utility lines on Federal interstate highways. In my opinion, the action is too liberal and should contain restrictions.

The Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee had previously established restrictions limiting such reimbursement to 50 percent of the cost of relocation, and providing that such reimbursement could not exceed 2 percent of the cost of the highway construction project. However, the full Public Works Committee, on a split vote, struck out these limitations and inserted the more liberal 90 percent provision in the bill. I voted against this provision for 90-percent reimbursement, and desire to point out that the provision contains no limitation whatsoever on the portion of the cost of a highway construction project which can be used for utility reimbursement, whereas the Roads Subcommittee had previously set a limitation of 2 percent of this cost.

I am concerned about the effect of this provision upon the States. As an example, the State of California now is authorized under State law to enter into agreements with the utilities for partial reimbursement of relocation costs, but these agreements normally limit reimbursement to 50 percent of these relocation costs. The insertion of a more liberal 90 percent reimbursement provision in the Federal highway bill will, in my opinion, be likely to cause pressure by the utilities on the California State Highway Department to increase utility relocation reimbursement payments on all State highway construction projects from 50 percent to 90 percent. The California State Highway Department is opposed to this 90 percent utility reimbursement provision.

Regional Water Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, land utilization is affected by many economic, physical and social conditions. However, the main factors which determine the suitability of land for crop production are the extent of rainfall and the supply of water.

As Dr. H. H. Wooten pointed out in his excellent study Major Uses of Land for the United States, published by the USDA in October 1953, as Technical Bulletin 1082:

Several significant interrelationships exist between use of cropland and water. These include limits on lands used for crops in moisture-deficient areas; problems of excess water in wetland areas and those subject to overflow; condition of land in relation to general water; relationship of ground water to supplemental irrigation and domestic water; and drainage and soils in relation to salinity (p. 62).

Water is becoming a more scarce, and, at the same time, valuable resource. Competition for its control and use is becoming more intensified as the various demands for water—agricultural, municipal and industrial—multiply in number. In light of this intensive competition, it becomes exceedingly important that the most efficient use is made of this valuable but diminishing resource. For example, we need to know more about:

First. Water sources and their development, both surface and underground.

Second. Storage, control, measurement, and conveyance of water.

Third. Water requirements and uses.

Fourth. Application of water—alternative methods and their relative efficiencies.

Fifth. Removal of excess water from surface and subsurface areas.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the climate of the eastern part of the United States

is generally characterized as humid or subhumid; while the western part, except the Pacific Northwest, is generally referred to as an arid or semiarid area. While the former area during parts of the year has an overabundance of water, giving rise to problems of drainage and flood protection; the latter is a moisture-deficient area, giving rise to the need for collecting and storaging of water during wet periods for use by irrigation during the dry seasons. It is evident, therefore, that the relationships between cropland and water I outlined a moment ago and the need for more basic information relative thereto are not sectional or regional but rather national in both their nature and scope.

Although nearly 95 percent of our irrigated cropland is in the 17 Western States, the expansion of irrigation in Eastern and Southern States has been rapid. For example, whereas in 1939 only 39,862 acres of cropland were irrigated in 28 States designated as either Northeastern, Corn Belt, Lake States, Appalachian, Southeastern; the number of irrigated acres increased to 61,902 by 1944; and 152,586 by 1949.

On the other hand, the number of acres in organized drainage enterprises declined during the decade 1940–50, by 119,000 acres in the Mountain and Pacific Coast States; whereas the number of acres in such enterprises in the North and Southeastern States increased by 15,840,000 acres. This is not to say that some western and Pacific-coast irrigation areas do not have drainage problems, they do, but the major concern of people in these areas is the acquisition and more efficient use of water.

Although we have regional laboratories which are studying basic soils and plant relationship and water hydraulics, and so forth, there are inadequate facilities in existence today whose basic concern is the more intelligent development and use of water. Because of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a regional water laboratory. The bill also authorizes an initial appropriation of $1 million for this purpose.

A Tribute to a Great Hungarian-American—Michael de Kováts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, 177 years ago, a great patriot of our country was killed in a battle waged in the fight for freedom and independence of the infant United States. Of foreign birth, Col. Michael de Kováts typified the many great European leaders who fought so valiantly for a cause they believed to be right and just.

Born in Karcag, Hungary, in 1724, little of his youth is known. His name does not appear in history until 1744 when he joined the Jasz-Nagy-Kun Huszar Regiment as a junior officer at the age of 20. He fought in the Second Silesian War as a member of Empress Maria Theresa's army. A document dated December 14, 1761, shows that he distinguished himself in this war and by the time of his discharge he had decided to enter upon a military career.

He took a very active part in the Seven Years' War in the service of Frederick the Great as a Prussian officer. His commander, Col. Michael Székely, led the First Prussian Hussar Regiment which took part in the battles of Pirna, Gotha, Lobosits, Prague, Torgau, and Leitmeritz. Kováts received very serious wounds in the battle of Gotha but recovered to become, in 1760, captain and commander of the so-called Gersdorf—free Hussars.

On March 12, 1761, he resigned his army commission, probably because he did not like his military assignment, which forced him to be the tax collector and oppressor of certain territories occupied by the armies of Frederick the Great.

In 1762 he returned to Hungary and Empress Maria Theresa appointed him a major in the Hussar Regiment. But with no major conflicts to claim his attention, he was restless for military action. In the new world the Colonists had signed the Declaration of Independence and, having followed with keen interest the activities in America, it was not surprising that Major Kováts decided to help the great cause of George Washington and the revolutionists.

Kováts was 53 years old when he wrote an historic letter to Benjamin Franklin, American Ambassador to France. He had been in military service for 33 years. This letter of application, written in classical Latin, is in Philadelphia at the Library of the American Philosophical Society among the papers of Benjamin Franklin. The letter, speaking for Kováts and his cultural standing, reads:

> Golden freedom cannot be purchased with yellow gold. I who have the honor to present this letter to Your Excellency, am also following the call of the Fathers of the Land, as the pioneers of freedom always did. I am a free man and a Hungarian. I was trained in the Royal Prussian Army and raised from the lowest rank to the dignity of a captain of the hussars, not so much by luck and the mercy of chance, than by the most diligent self-discipline and the virtues of my arms. The dangers of the bloodshed of a great many campaigns taught me how to mold a soldier and, when made, how to arm him and let him defend the dearest of the lands with his best ability under any conditions and developments of the war.
>
> I now am here of my own free will, having taken all the horrible hardships and bothers of this journey (referring to his trip from Budapest to Bordeaux, France). I beg Your Excellency to grant me a passport and a letter of recommendation to the most benevolent Congress.
>
> At last, awaiting your gracious answer, I have no wish greater than to leave soon, to be there where I am needed most, to serve and die in everlasting obedience.

When he received no reply from Franklin, he became impatient and set sail for the colonies without a letter of recommendation, probably sometime in the summer of 1777. Kováts was a professional soldier, a specialist in the branch of light cavalry and he had one purpose in coming to America: to organize hussars—cavalrymen—for Washington.

He knew that Washington had no cavalry in the professional sense. The four so-called mounted regiments, commanded by Colonels Moylan, Bland, Baylor, and Sheldon were mere mounted infantry without the least elementary training or organization in the true cavalry sense.

Kováts and his commanding officer, Count Casimir Pulaski, of Poland, faced an uphill fight to establish a true cavalry unit in the Revolutionary forces. And, in the strict sense of military history, they failed. Cavalry never became of any importance in the Revolutionary War. Washington's English military background included the scepticism of the value of cavalry in combat. With only a pitifully small army of men at his command, Washington felt he could ill afford to allocate the 400 to 500 men that Kováts and Pulaski requested. Forced to undertake their own recruitment program among a people already stripped of most of their eligible men, they were forced to accept into the ranks of the newly created Pulaski Legion many former prisoners and deserters. With food and supplies in short supply, Kováts, as master of exercise, had great difficulty in keeping his troops disciplined and defections were an ever-pressing problem.

These conditions resulted in several clashes with some of the townspeople where Kováts' troops were billeted. Although he was careful not to resort to the classic custom of commandeering the supplies and housing needed for his troops, both he and Pulaski could not understand why disloyal tories should retain their wealth while soldiers and horses went hungry. In June 1778 matters came to a head. One of Kováts' men was arrested by a civil officer for confiscating some tory-owned supplies. The civilian officer was then abused by other members of the regiment and Congress, hearing of the incident, became aroused. Kováts strongly supported the actions of his men and Pulaski was obliged to explain the matter to Congress. This was something of a dilemma for Congress, but it finally solved the problem by supporting Pulaski while reminding him that civilian authorities must be obeyed in situations of this nature.

The legion was fully trained and ready for action by the summer of 1779. Congress delayed approving the new unit and the men, including Kováts, spent 6 idle weeks in Philadelphia. Orders finally arrived on September 29. The legion was to help counter a British offensive in south Jersey. As had been feared, some of the men proved unreliable. Treachery and desertion led to severe reverses in the first engagement. Again the legion's critics became active and Pulaski had to defend himself to Congress. Eager to redeem his reputation, Pulaski and Kováts hurried to their next assignment on the frontier in New York State. Disappointments followed again. Cavalry was ineffective in this wooded wilderness and Pulaski obtained permission to bring his legion back to Philadelphia.

Months passed with no action other than bickering with Congress over the finances and abuse of local citizens. Then, toward the end of 1778 the British invaded Georgia and threatened Charleston. Pulaski's Legion was among the forces ordered south to meet this new attack. Reaching Charleston on May 8, Pulaski and Kováts found the city on the point of surrender. The arrival of the Legion fired the spirits of the defenders and it was decided to resist. On May 12 the Legion swung into action against a much superior British force, and although it fought well, it was completely overwhelmed. Colonel Kováts, with most of his men, died in this battle.

Though hardly an American victory, the dash and bravery of Pulaski's force buoyed up the defending forces and strengthened the resistance immeasurably. It is impossible to assess the true importance of so small an engagement, but the sacrifice of the gallant Hungarian Michael de Kováts equals that of any hero of our Revolution and shines as a true example for all patriotic Americans today.

Big Bend Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental flood-control programs ever attempted in the United States is currently underway in the Missouri River Basin. Involved are 10 States and a sixth of the land area of the United States. The program has been progressing on schedule and overall is about 60 percent completed.

The last major structure involved is the Big Bend Dam in central South Dakota. No funds were provided for this project in the budget. Recently I wrote to all members of the House Appropriations Committee, making a recommendation in regard to this dam. I would like to insert the letter I wrote in regard to this project as I believe it provides a feasible solution:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Reference is made to the development program in the Missouri River Basin, which was authorized in 1944, and which is made up of a series of large dams plus subsidiary structures to assist in controlling floods and to provide other benefits throughout a 10-State area. The program is getting along exceptionally well and has reached a high degree of completion with the exception of the last major structure; namely, Big Bend Dam.

In this regard I should like to call your attention to my testimony before the Public Works Subcommittee of your committee on March 28, relative to this dam. I was notified earlier this year that the Corps of Engineers has sufficient funds currently available to complete a structure known as the Gavins Point Dam. The budget request which was submitted to the Congress contains a provision for $1,700,000 for the Gavins Point Dam. The budget provided no funds for the Big Bend Dam, although it has been authorized. My suggestion to the subcommittee was that whatever funds are necessary for the preliminary engineering and survey work on Big Bend be allocated from the $1,700,000 budgeted for Gavins Point. Such action would in no way increase the budget request of the executive department and would provide the first step in the last major phase of the river program.

Various estimates have been made as to what the initial engineering and surveying would cost, and the most recent figure available to me is $650,000. This would leave a balance of well over a million dollars in the budget, which could be used for other river purposes, such as surveys on some of the tributary streams and channel stabilization from Yankton, S. Dak., south. I think there is considerable merit to this suggestion, because (1) it would assist in bringing the Missouri River Basin development program into its final stages, (2) it would not increase the budget estimate, and (3) it would hasten the day that the interrelated structures on the Missouri River can work in conjunction with one another more efficiently than they can operate individually.

I would appreciate it very much if you would give this suggestion your consideration during your deliberations.

Thank you kindly.

Cordially,

HAROLD O. LOVRE.

Israel's Vital Importance to America and the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago, it was my privilege here to be among the first to applaud the United States recognition of the new State of Israel and extend, with a great majority of fellow Americans, my prayers for her continuing peace, progress, and prosperity.

I believe that most Americans were heartfully glad about the initiation of this new State by courageous people because they realized the fundamental bond of democratic principles and aspirations connecting our two countries even in a certain similarity of birth conditions.

Because we here offered the first and strongest encouragement to Israel, and because of the related cultures of our two democratic peoples, we had at their origin and should maintain now a very particular interest in her survival and advancement as the democratic bulwark against Communist intrusion and control of the Middle East.

In the midst of the present tension surrounding her, I think we should try to more clearly and more forcefully understand that Israel has only one desire, and that is to live peacefully among her neighbors. Israel's record of progress during the past 8 years is ample evidence of her objective for a peaceful existence to carry on her programs of modern agricultural and industrial improvements. In this short time, this new state has become perhaps the most progressive and energetic state in the Middle East. In the last 8 years, more than 400 new agricultural settlements have been created in a small area, compared to less than 300 in the 70 years prior to Israel's birth. Every type of industry has developed. Transportation and housing have greatly progressed, but beyond this mere material success, Israel is today the symbol of courage for the rest of the free world, sharply reminding us of the hardships and trials and challenges surrounding the beginning years of our own Nation.

It is fitting, then, that on this occasion we earnestly beseech this administration, particularly the State Department, to intensify their efforts to promote the cause of peace in the Middle East, while at the same time taking appropriate steps to insure the survival of this courageous State of Israel by granting them at least sufficient assistance to adequately protect themselves by maintaining a balance of arms, during negotiations for peace. Such a course might well serve to eliminate much of the tension now threatening war erruption in that whole area and would tend to permit Israel and her neighbors to concentrate their attention and energies to the peaceful needs of their peoples. In any case, so long as the threatening situation remains as it is, this Nation can hardly consider any other course than a forceful policy to prevent the destruction of this democratic state and the loss of a vital and reliable ally, where needed most, to the free world.

Let us, then, continue our prayers while we reemphasize our appeals to the State Department to perseveringly work for the preservation of Israel and the establishment of peace in the Middle East for the security of ourselves and the rest of the free world.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, please permit me to insert in the RECORD the following two paragraphs from a news story dated Geneva, Switzerland, April 12:

The secret 26-nation negotiations to reduce tariffs, which began in January, now have entered a critical stage, it was learned today.

The 500 delegates are trying to finish the discussions by the end of this month. The negotiations are being carried out under auspices of GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Every Member of Congress should give serious thought to the implications contained in this report. I find it extremely disturbing that policies which can have a heavy impact upon the working people of our country are being made in secret session by a conference in which America

has a very small voice. To me, what is taking place in Geneva should serve as a warning against this country's committing tariff and trade policies to the quicksand of an international pool capable of submerging entirely the interests of United States citizens. This warning comes at a most appropriate time, in view of the fact that H. R. 5550, the bill to provide for the inextricable involvement of this country in these important matters, is soon to be considered by the House.

I ask my colleagues to think back to the constitutionally delegated functions of this legislative body as regards foreign commerce. Under normal procedure, Congress decides how much of a foreign commodity is to be admitted into our markets, and what the assessed tariffs should be. These decisions are not made in secret meetings. The people of our land would not permit any such malpractice to take place in our Capitol. Our faithful corps of newspapermen assigned to relaying to the reading public news of what takes place in the House and Senate would justifiably assail any attempt of Members of Congress to conduct secret meetings on any such important issue.

How then, Mr. Speaker, are the actions of the GATT delegates to be explained? In view of the fact that what is taking place in Geneva is the outcome of the magnanimity—or should I say the neglect?—of Congress in permitting the executive department to assume powers that are not constitutionally assigned to it, Members of Congress should be vitally concerned about those secret meetings in Geneva. Who, may I ask, has consented to a program whereby tariff concessions are to be effected to the exclusion of public information? What course does Congress assume if agreements inimical to the best interest of our country are negotiated at Geneva? So far as can be determined, Congress would be forced to take ex post facto action in an attempt to negate the effects of a pact made under the auspices of—presumably—an official body of the executive department.

In order to preclude the necessity for any such unpleasant duties—with their subsequent diplomatic complications—Congress must forbid those delegates, who travel around the world concocting unauthorized trade tables with those nations who are looking for a place to unload products manufactured by underpaid workers, from further participation in such conferences. The first step to bring about such an objective is to refuse to allow the United States to enter into the OTC. From there, Congress can and must prepare and enact suitable legislation to undo the damaging consequences of action already committed by the unauthorized agents of the executive department in foreign commerce.

Mr. Speaker, representatives of coal-producing areas are often accused of being concerned about the foreign trade situation because of its impact on the coal industry and its workers. We do not resent such accusation. I, for one, have seen and talked with members of scores of mining families whose very subsistence has been threatened by excessive imports of residual oil.

Residents of mining communities—though for the most part they may be many miles distant from ports of entry to this Nation's markets—are fully cognizant of the reasons for the many mine shutdowns that occurred in postwar years. They know full well that customers who had been buying the product of their efforts shifted to foreign oil because it could be obtaind on a comparatively cheaper basis than an American-produced fuel. When we protested this situation to responsible officials in Washington, members of the State Department, who now want to assume complete responsibility for trade negotiations through the medium of the OTC, were the first witnesses to appear before Congress in an effort to dispute the legitimate claims of our people. We do not wish to be subjected to the further whims of this group which has shown time after time that conditions in mining communities should not be taken into consideration when international trade pacts are being negotiated.

Yes, it is because of what might happen to my congressional district that I ask Congress today to turn down those lofty executive department appeals for United States membership in OTC. But, to you Members outside the coal-producing States, let me remind you once again of that news story from Switzerland. Arrangements to reduce tariffs are being made in secret session. Can any Member of Congress consent to this procedure?

It Will Cost $50,000 To Move the Old Enginehouse—Step Held Wholly Unnecessary

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a solution of the dilemma faced by the International Monetary Fund, arising from the proposal to move the Old Union Enginehouse occupied by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, can be reached by leaving the historic old structure where it is. This is the considered opinion of Homer Joseph Dodge, a distinguished member of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, as he outlined it in the Evening Star of April 18, 1956.

Mr. Dodge points out in his important statement that—

> The plans for the addition to the IMF Building provide for a spacious parked entrance on the Old Enginehouse site. It is wholly unnecessary to remove the firehouse from this park.

Fifty-eight countries contribute to the International Monetary Fund. The United States quota, which is 31.43 percent of the total fund, amounts to $8,750,000,000. If my figures are correct it will cost the United States $15,715 to move the Old Union Enginehouse, a move which is wholly unnecessary, according to Mr. Dodge. This would seem to me to be a matter of interest to the many associations of taxpayers throughout the country. Conceivably it may be of interest to the members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

My own interest in this matter springs from a bill, H. R. 9719, I have introduced—"to amend the act of March 2, 1891, as amended, to insure that the Association of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia will continue to have the exclusive right to occupy and use the Old Union Engine House in the District of Columbia."

At a meeting of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the House District Committee on March 5, 1956, the members of the subcommittee determined that a hearing would be held on H. R. 9719 at an early date. In the meantime the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have been officially requested that any order to the Association of Oldest Inhabitants to vacate the premises of the old Union Engine House be withheld until such time as the members of the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives have had an opportunity to hold hearings on my measure.

I would like to take this occasion to commend Mr. Dodge for his fine statement regarding the old Union Engine House. I was particularly moved by that part of his statement in which he says:

> Just as Trinity Church stands in the shadow of towering structures in New York's financial district as a symbol of grace and antiquity, so should the Old Engine House remain against the background of the wholly commonplace and undistinguished IMF Building.

A number of years ago when the new General Accounting Office at Fifth and G Streets NW., Washington, D. C., was being planned, the Federal Government proposed to buy the land on which St. Mary's Church is located. The issues that confronted the congregation of this fine church and its doughty pastor at that time, were remarkably similar to the problems faced by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants. I am very pleased to be able to say that St. Mary's Church was not destroyed, nor was it moved. It continues to serve its historic and important mission, and, I should add, the General Accounting Office is unquestionably better off for that mission. Certainly the thousands of Federal employees who work in the General Accounting Office and the other Federal buildings in the area feel safer because of the church and the beneficent influence it exerts in what is surely one of the less desirable neighborhoods in the District of Columbia.

I include here for the information of my colleagues the splendid statement by Homer Joseph Dodge, in the Washington Evening Star, of April 18, 1956:

OLD ENGINE HOUSE

A solution of the dilemma faced by the International Monetary Fund, arising from the location of the Old Engine House occupied by the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, can be reached by leaving the old building where it is. The plans for the addition to the IMF Building provide for a spacious parked entrance on the Old Engine

House site. It is wholly unnecessary to remove the firehouse from this park.

The National Capital, more than most cities, has a special interest in historic structures. The present IMF Building, with the planned addition, constitutes a structural mass similar to a thousand, yes, 10,000, other office buildings. The Old Engine House is well-nigh unique.

Just as Trinity Church stands in the shadow of towering structures in New York's financial district as a symbol of grace and antiquity, so should the Old Engine House remain against the background of the wholly commonplace and undistinguished IMF Building. This is especially compelling as the life expectancy of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants is far greater than that of the International Monetary Fund. The purpose of the fund is to stabilize currencies of civilizations built upon our economic system. The fund has an unexampled opportunity to achieve its stabilizing function by preserving the Old Engine House where it is.

HOMER JOSEPH DODGE.

Message to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 19, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article prepared by me for insertion in Town and Village, a newspaper circulated in the Stuyvesant Town area of New York City which is in my district:

In one of my recent columns for Town and Village in which I tried to give my constituents a picture of the working day of a Congressman, I told of how he must take time off to ask himself questions about national problems and policies.

It must not be supposed though that questions are enough. They have to be pursued until the right answers are found.

By this time, of course, I have arrived at a number of conclusions and I want to deal with one in particular which seems to be particularly important; and that is the administration's foreign policy.

I judge from the letters that I get from my district that nobody is fooled by the bluster and braggadocio that substitute so very often for genuine diplomacy. Nor I think, is there any failure to recognize that in the basic goals, the present administration has added nothing to the fundamentals laid down by the prior administrations. We seek peace and in order to help achieve that goal, we want to be strong, we want to have friends, and exert an influence on world opinion. Along those broad lines the administration has the support of the Democratic legislators far more than it has the support of its own party members. Across my desk there come many leaflets, pamphlets and documents of all sorts. Quite a number of them are from "die-hard" Republicans and isolationists and they make it pretty clear that they are outraged by the administration's foreign policy.

My criticism of it is of another character. It stems from the fact that they inherited a good idea from the past administration and have fouled it up in its application. As a result we are now losing friends and alienating people because the methods vary from dull to Dulles, and often with sheer incompetence.

A particular defect of the administration's foreign policy efforts is in its inflexibility. Another is that it substitutes advertising slogans which, though they may tickle partisan supporters in this country, give offense to thoughtful national leaders the world over. Still another is that the administration is halfhearted about its policy, doing things too late and floundering in a spate of words rather than action. Still another is in its ambiguity.

Look, for example, at the bluster and big talk as to China and the unleasing of Chiang Kai-shek or at the gaffe of Goa that so deeply and unnecessarily came out with its tremendous offense to hundreds of millions of the people of India. Consider the gap between the solid support of United States policies 5 and 6 years ago and the wavering, the neutralism, and the open opposition today. Consider how little and late the administration is when it now tries to revive the essence of a point 4 program, 1 of the greatest concepts developed in America's foreign policy, which was shamefully left to wither on the vine. And consider what passes for smartness in the ambiguities about our support of the anticolonial movement and our unbelievable confusion in regard to Israel.

One does not have to have any particular sympathies for the State of Israel and the heroic struggle which it is undergoing, to recognize one simple truth, that Israel wants peace and that in this basic drive, Israel completely synchronizes with the stated United States policy as to maintenance of peace. You may have difference of opinions on this or that aspect of the Near East problem, but you cannot blind yourself to the fact that the United States wants peace and that alone of all the nations in that area, Israel wants peace and that its neighbors do not, as is clear from the fact that they will not even sit down to discuss peace with Israel.

Yet this basic and, one would suppose, elementary truth is obscured by all kinds of double talk that evades this central common interest of the United States and the State of Israel.

Recently I had occasion to say a few words in Congress about the eighth year of independence of Israel as follows:

"This occasion, however, must not be noted without regard for the threats of and actual aggression that hover like a calamitous cloud over the State of Israel. The cry of the victims reaches out to us and calls upon us to reassert vigorously our national policy to prevent aggression and to warn and, if need be, punish aggressors.

"The security of the State of Israel is vital to the stability of the entire area of the Middle East and this in turn is basic to America's own defense and the defense of the free world. This calls for an administrative policy of action rather than of inaction; and of direct, friendly, and timely intervention rather than by a nod to our allies. It calls for prompt and sympathetic action as to the defense needs of the State of Israel, out of the same considerations that justify our provision for our own defense needs and for those of the Western World.

"It calls for an ample and timely couhterweight to the armaments furnished by the Communist and satellite governments.

"Above all, it calls for a clear unambiguous assertion on the highest level that the United States is committed to the proposition that peace is indivisible and that peace and the safeguards of peace for the State of Israel are basic in our national policy."

Can anything be more unrealistic than to drift along in our present policy of lack of policy?

Perhaps there is no more flaming example of the folly of this course than the recent announcement that while the United States will not itself supply the defensive arms asked for by Israel, it will not object if its allies, largely armed by the United States, will supply such weapons. This, in Mr. Dulles' book, may seem smart; and may appeal to the men in the gray flannel suits on Madison Avenue on which the administration leans so heavily. Yet it is still a diplomatic blunder of the first magnitude. For here is action, or rather inaction, that is certainly calculated to alienate everybody. The Israelis must certainly continue with their sense of injustice when they cannot get defensive arms from the United States. The Arabs are annoyed because of this "go-ahead" signal to allies of the United States.

This is perhaps the most glaring example of the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy. In reviewing the world situation, however, it seems to be only typical.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, April 9, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of lights, in whom is no shadow caused by turning: In a world that lieth in darkness, swept by fitful winds of doubt and despair, blighted by suspicion and intrigue, at the week's beginning we pause in this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that Thy light is not shuttered from our inner lives. We lift our soiled and shadowed faces to the one true light, knowing that if we keep our hearts with Thee there is no darkness from without which can dim the light that is within.

In this desperate hour, when the world's hope of a bright tomorrow is so largely committed to our frail hands, strengthen us in Thy name to challenge all evil forces which seek to bemean and degrade human personality. Join us to the great company of unconquered spirits who in other troubled times have stood their ground, preserving the heritage of man's best, and whose flaming faith has made their lives as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1956, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of April 19, 1956,

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MCNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 3073. A bill to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs; to create and

establish a public body corporate with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1791).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9285. An act to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, so as to extend for 2 additional years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase United States obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Farm Credit Administration of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. ROBERTSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Territories of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to a 2-minute limitation on statements.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

J. Edgar Murdock, of Pennsylvania, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Stephen E. Rice, of Florida, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States;

Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States; and

John Edward Mulroney, of Iowa, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama, vice Percy C. Fountain, deceased;

William S. Spire, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska, vice Donald R. Rose, resigned; and

James Crawford, Jr., of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas, vice Peyton McKnight, Jr., resigned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FAVORABLY AND PLACED ON THE VICE PRESIDENT'S DESK, WITHOUT PRINTING

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, in the Air Force, and in the Navy, which had been reported favorably and placed on the Vice President's desk, without printing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 115)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Department of Labor, in the sum of $237,000, for the fiscal year 1957 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT TO STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement to the stockpile report, covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT FOR WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed

plans for works of improvement for watershed protection and flood prevention (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 3295. A bill to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1792).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2705. A bill to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE., in the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1793).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 8334. A bill to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic Games (Rept. No. 1794);

H. R. 8942. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theatre Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1795); and

H. R. 8959. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1796).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2202. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association with respect to payment of construction charges on the valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1798); and

S. 2206. A bill to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project (Rept. No. 1799).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 8535. A bill to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution system (Rept. No. 1800).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1812. A bill for the relief of Athanase G. Politis (Rept. No. 1802);

S. 2064. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Spiros Ferentinos (Rept. No. 1803); and

H. R. 907. A bill for the relief of Justin G. Maile and Theodore R. Hilbig (Rept. No. 1804).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Arthur K. Jefferson (Rept. No. 1805);

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson (Rept. No. 1806);

S. 2240. A bill for the relief of James Richard Hogan (Rept. No. 1807);

S. 2271. A bill for the relief of Salomon Benveniste (Rept. No. 1808);

H.R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton (Rept. No. 1809); and

H. R. 5787. A bill to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La. (Rept. No. 1810).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2169. A bill for the relief of M. B. Huggins, Jr. (Rept. No. 1811); and

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 1812).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 2008. A bill for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter (Rept. No. 1814);

H. R. 2068. A bill for the relief of William F. Friedman (Rept. No. 1815); and

S. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution favoring appropriate observance of National Hospital Week (Rept. No. 1813).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 3639. A bill for the relief of Ralph Bennett and certain other employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Rept. No. 1816).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 977. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims (Rept. No. 1817).

REPORT ENTITLED "REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER" (S. REPT. NO. 1797)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 126, 83d Congress, as amended, the Chair submits herewith the final report of the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter. This subcommittee was created in 1953 when the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 126, submitted by former Senator Guy Gillette, of Iowa.

The subcommittee undertook extensive studies during the 83d Congress under the chairmanship of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY. Its work has been continued and brought to a conclusion during this session under my chairmanship.

The Chair takes this occasion to thank his colleagues on the subcommittee on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself. They have worked hard. During the course of the study, the subcommittee held hearings in some 10 different cities to receive the views of American citizens on the United Nations Charter. Those citizens who gave the subcommittee their carefully considered views deserve our special thanks.

The Chair should also like to express appreciation to former Senator Guy Gillette for his initiative in encouraging this study and to Francis O. Wilcox, former chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for his fine work in directing the staff activities of the subcommittee during most of the period of its work.

Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

TOM HOLLANDER CO., SUPERIOR, NEBR.—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 282 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original resolution, referring S. 282 to the United States Court of Claims, and I submit a report (No. 1801) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 282) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Tom Hollander Co., Superior, Nebr.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such finding of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3692. A bill relating to the import tax on sugar used after June 30, 1955, as livestock feed or in the production of livestock feed; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 3693. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil-defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 3694. A bill to reorganize the Department of the Interior by establishing the Fish and Wildlife Service of such Department as a division under an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3695. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia employed in District of Columbia institutions located in Maryland and Virginia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to compensate retail dealers of gasoline for taxes paid on gasoline which is lost due to spillage, evaporation, and other causes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 3697. A bill to extend the educational provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) (by request):

S. 3698. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1920, as amended, providing for allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3699. A bill to amend section 5 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, as amended, so as to permit an officer or an employee of the Farm Credit Administration, or any officers or employee of any corporation operating under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, to be elected to membership on a farm credit board; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 3700. A bill authorizing the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain property to the District of Columbia and to the Department of the Interior to be available for park and recreational purposes, including the construction of a national athletic stadium; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 3701. A bill for the relief of Maria LaSala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3702. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on alumina, on crude bauxite and on certain calcined bauxite; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3703. A bill for the relief of Frieda Herrmann, Genesee, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 3704. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HAYDEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3705. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3706. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3707. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 3708. A bill for the relief of Noemi Maria Vida Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3709. A bill to provide for payment of certain defaulted joint-stock land bank bonds, receiver's certificates, receiver's receipts for certificates given in lieu of such bonds, or receiver's receipts given for such bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

RESOLUTION

The following original resolution was reported, and placed on the calendar:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 247. Resolution referring S. 282 to the United States Court of Claims.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he reported the above resolution, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR CIVIL DEFENSE PURPOSES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by authorizing the transfer of surplus Government property to State and local civil defense organizations when it is determined by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator that such property is usable and needed for civil defense use. The bill is proposed in lieu of H. R. 7227, which passed the House of Representatives in the closing days of the last session of Congress.

Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have supervisory jurisdiction over the allocation of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, as he does now for health and education purposes. In addition, the bill provides that distribution of these surplus items shall be through a single State agency designated by the State to insure that there will be no overlapping or waste and that the goods are channeled into the uses for which they were intended.

H. R. 7227 was objected to rather vigorously by the executive branch, and thus it was deemed desirable to modify that bill. Accordingly, the provisions of this bill have been perfected by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations and the legislative counsel of the Senate, in cooperation with representatives of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, General Services Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of the Budget. The committee has been advised that all these Departments and agencies support the revised bill and are in complete accord that it can be administered without disrupting the existing surplus donable property program as applied to health and educational institutions.

I should like to point out that this bill is in keeping with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, in its Report on the Utilization of Surplus Property, that Congress reexamine the program relating to the donation of Federal surplus property, with respect to broadening the program.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on this bill next Wednesday, April 25, at which time representatives of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, Bureau of the Budget, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration will be present to submit their views.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3693) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil-defense purposes, to provide that certain Federal surplus property be disposed of to State and local civil defense organizations which are established by or pursuant to State law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U. S. C. 484 (j)) is amended to read as follows:

"(j) (1) Under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Administrator is authorized in his discretion to donate without cost (except for costs of care and handling) for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, any equipment, materials, books, or other supplies (including those capitalized in a working capital or similar fund) under the control of any executive agency which shall have been determined to be surplus property and which shall have been determined under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection to be usable and necessary for any such purpose. In determining whether property is to be donated under this subsection, no distinction shall be made between property capitalized in a working capital fund established under section 405 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, or any similar fund, and any other property. No such property shall be transferred for use within any State except to the State agency designated under State law for the purpose of distributing, in conformity with the provisions of this subsection, all property allocated under this subsection for use within such State.

"(2) In the case of surplus property under the control of the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense shall determine whether such property is usable and necessary for educational activities which are of special interest to the armed services, such as maritime academies or military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard preparatory schools. If such Secretary shall determine that such property is usable and necessary for such purposes, he shall allocate it for transfer by the Administrator to the appropriate State agency for distribution to such educational activities. If he shall determine that such property is not usable and necessary for such purposes, it may be disposed of in accordance with paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of this subsection.

"(3) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this

subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of education or public health, or for research for any such purpose, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who shall allocate such property on the basis of needs and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to (A) tax-supported medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, school systems, schools, colleges, and universities, and (B) other nonprofit medical institutions, hospitals, clinics, health centers, schools, colleges, and universities which are exempt from taxation under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received, from such State agency, a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property.

"(4) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for civil-defense purposes, including research, in any State shall be made by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to such State agency for distribution to civil defense organizations of such State, or political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, which are established pursuant to State law. No such property shall be transferred until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for civil-defense purposes in the State, and until the Federal Civil Defense Administrator has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator for the disposal of surplus property. The provisions of sections 201 (b), 401 (c), 401 (e), and 405 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, shall apply to the performance by the Federal Civil Defense Administrator of his responsibilities under this section.

"(5) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Federal Civil Defense Administrator may impose reasonable terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions upon the use of any single item of personal property donated under paragraph (3) or paragraph (4), respectively, of this subsection which has an acquisition cost of $2,500 or more.

"(6) The term 'State,' as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 2. (a) Clause (C) of paragraph (2) of subsection 203 (k) of such act is amended by striking out the word "or" at the end thereof.

(b) Clause (D) of paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by striking out the comma at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or."

(c) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting, immediately after clause (D) thereof, as amended by this section, the following new clause:

"(E) the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in the case of property transferred pursuant to this act to civil defense organizations of the States or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which are established by or pursuant to State law,".

SEC. 3. Subsection 203 (n) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(n) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of subsections (j) and (k), the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, and the head of any Federal agency designated by either such officer, are authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State surplus property distribution agencies designated in conformity with paragraph (1) of subsection (j). Such cooperative agreements may provide for utilization by such Federal agency, without payment or reimbursement, of the property, facilities, personnel, and services of the State agency in carrying out any such program, and for making available to such State agency, without payment or reimbursement, property, facilities, personnel, or services of such Federal agency in connection with such utilization."

SEC. 4. Subsection (h) of section 507 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, as added by clause (3) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the acceptance and maintenance of Presidential libraries, and for other purposes," approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 697), is redesignated as subsection (i) of such section.

SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b), the amendments made by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) In the case of any State which on the date of enactment of this act has not designated a single State agency for the purpose of distributing surplus property pursuant to subsection 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, transfers of such property may be made by the Administrator of General Services under such subsection, as amended by this act, to any State agency or official authorized under State law to receive and distribute such property until 90 calendar days have passed after the close of the first regular session of the legislature of such State beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

DIVISION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to reorganize the Department of the Interior by establishing within the Department a Division of Fisheries. This would be accomplished by removing the functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service relating to fishing and fisheries activities from the Service and assigning them to the newly created Division. In addition, the bill would provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior to head the Division of Fisheries.

Those of us who are specially interested in the fishing industry in the United States have become alarmed at the recent decline and the difficulties experienced by our domestic fishing industry. As the Senate will remember, the 83d Congress enacted the Saltonstall-Kennedy Fisheries Act, with the hope that the research into the production, marketing, and distribution of fish in the United States would assist the industry in its own efforts to appraise its own operations and to regain its lost position of prominence in our American economy. I am happy to report that many worthwhile experiments and projects have been and are being undertaken as a result of that program. Yet it is obvious that additional measures are necessary to expedite the recovery of our fishing industry.

It has been suggested that it would be well to have the fishery functions of the Federal Government entrusted to an independent commission under the control of commissioners appointed by, and responsible to, the President. However, the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee, of which I have the privilege of serving as chairman, has spent considerable time considering the problems created by independent agencies, commissions, and boards which report directly to the President; and it is my personal belief that, from an organizational point of view, very little would be gained, and perhaps something would be lost, to the fishing industry if its problems were to be the problems of an independent commission. It seems to me that, at least at this particular time, a more desirable approach would be to assign responsibility for the Government's participation in the development of our national fishing industry to a separate division within the Department of the Interior, headed by an Assistant Secretary. With such an organization, I am sure that the problems of the fishing industry would receive the appropriate attention of the administration, and that its voice in the Department of the Interior would be considerably louder and more effective than under the present arrangement. Normally, I am reluctant to force the hand of the administration in the internal organization of its major departments and agencies. I feel, however, and I am sure that other Senators who are familiar with the desperate situation facing the fishermen of this country will agree, that some action is absolutely necessary, and that it is needed immediately. It should also be noted that the first Hoover Commission recognized the need for emphasizing the importance of the fishing problems of the Nation by recommending a separation of the fishery and wildlife functions.

This bill would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to appoint an advisory committee of the American fisheries industry to assist him in formulating national fisheries policy. Although the fishing industry has had access to the Fish and Wildlife Service, a formal commission would offer the advantages of continuity, a comprehensive view of the fishing industry, and an established process by which the problems and attitudes of the fishing industry would be brought to the attention of the Federal Government.

I do not mean to suggest by what I have said that an organizational change will instantly revive the fishing industry of this country. I regard such a move only as an initial or further step in the right direction. The Commerce Committee is currently considering legislation to provide a new personnel training program to enable the benefits of fisheries research—including that federally financed under the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act, that of the various States, counties, and local governmental units, as well as that of private industry—to be trans-

lated into practical and useful improvements in techniques of harvesting, processing, marketing, and distributing fish.

Additional legislation pending before the Congress would provide for financing improvements in fishing equipment and physical plants, and other possible forms of legislative assistance to the industry are being considered for introduction to the Congress in the very near future.

Fishing, which is the oldest industry in the United States, is in dire need of assistance. The Federal Government has a continuing responsibility to do everything within its ability to assist the industry in its own efforts to effect an economic recovery. Congress has been aware of these difficulties, and has been willing to assist, as evidenced by its acceptance of all reasonable legislative proposals to aid the fishing industry; and the executive branch is also aware of the serious problems facing the fishing industry, and is equally anxious to assist in resolving these difficulties.

I am sure, therefore, that there will be agreement that action of the sort proposed in this bill will emphasize the importance of the problems of our fishermen, and will result in prompter and more effective attention to these serious problems.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3694) to reorganize the Department of the Interior by establishing the Fish and Wildlife Service of such Department as a division under an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSION OF EDUCATIONAL PROVISIONS OF VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 5 minutes, in order to make some remarks in connection with the introduction of a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 so as to extend the educational provisions of that act to all persons entering the Armed Forces of the United States from January 31, 1955, until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective. I should like to explain briefly the reasons that motivate me in introducing this proposed legislation.

After World War II, a grateful Congress passed what has come to be known as the GI bill of rights. Under this act, Public Law 346, 78th Congress, the veterans of World War II became entitled to benefits such as certain medical services, disability compensation, guaranteed loans, unemployment compensation, mustering-out pay, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and educational training. Again, after the thousands of our young American citizens had served in the Korean conflict, Congress passed a similar bill which became law. This law is known as Public Law 550, the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. It extended to the Korean veterans the same benefits which had been extended to the World War II veterans, and included a provision for a cut-off date of these entitlements.

The provision relative to the cut-off date is found in section 911 of title 38, of the United States Code. There it is provided that a veteran who had served in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and a date to be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress would be entitled to certain benefits, including medical services, disability compensation, guaranteed loans, unemployment compensation, mustering-out pay, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and education and training opportunities. These benefits were curtailed by the President of the United States on January 5, 1955, by proclamation 3080. In this Presidential proclamation, January 31, 1955, was set as the terminal date for the computation of such veterans' benefits under the 1952 act.

All persons who entered the service since the terminal date of January 31, 1955, whether voluntarily or under the Selective Service Act, have not been entitled to any of the benefits I have enumerated.

It is not my purpose to challenge the reasons behind the Presidential proclamation, for there can be no question that the cost to the Nation in furnishing all the benefits provided by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 would be enormous, and it is perfectly obvious that there must be a terminal date for such benefits, especially when the service in the Armed Forces has been designated as not of "wartime character." The purpose of my bill is to reestablish only one of the benefits authorized by the 1952 act; namely, the educational training benefits that heretofore existed under the 1952 act.

Several cogent reasons exist for the reestablishment of educational or training benefits:

First. It appears to me that, as a matter of equity, so long as we continue to induct into our military services young Americans, thus denying to many of them an opportunity for a complete education, the least we as a grateful Nation can do is to offer these young Americans a quid pro quo; that is, in return for their sacrifice of 2 or more years of their life at a most crucial time in their education cycle, give to them some assistance in pursuing their education.

Second. Still in the field of equity, I fail to see any good reason to differentiate between the service rendered subsequent to January 31, 1955, and that rendered prior to that date. The inductee or volunteer prior to that date received all the benefits of Public Law 550. I am asking only that the inductee or volunteer since that date receive the educational or training benefits of that law. I think this provision will go a long way toward alleviating the strong feelings which must exist in the minds of those that have served and will serve since the cutoff date of January 31, 1955.

Third. From all sides we hear of the difficulties the Armed Forces have in maintaining the strength of the several services of volunteers. It is my considered opinion that with the reestablishment of the educational benefits, the Armed Forces will be rewarded by an increased number of volunteers and reenlistments. There can be no question that many of our young citizens who are desirous of receiving additional education but who do not have the financial resources to provide such for themselves would welcome the opportunity to receive such training in consideration for serving their country for several years in the military service.

This provision also cannot fail to lift the general tone of the morale in the Armed Forces. All of us are familiar with the many bills that we have been asked to consider that would increase fringe benefits, such as hospitalization for dependents, increased pay, and so forth. Passage of this bill would have as much or more effect on the morale of the serviceman as any bill I have seen to date.

Fourth. There can be no question that the need to increase our general educational level is of paramount importance. This need is dual in nature, in that not only is it of prime interest to increase our general standard of living but it is vital to our national security. Daily we read in the press statements by persons high in the military departments, educators, and persons holding high office in the executive branch of the Government that we are falling behind in the output of trained scientists and engineers. Russia today is reported to far exceed us in the number of persons under training in these fields. Obviously this situation is of grave concern to us, for today our race to preserve our way of life is not limited to manpower, but rather is limited by our know-how in regard to making further strides into the realms of guided missiles and other nuclear weapons. The cost to the Nation in offering an opportunity to further their education to the thousands of young men and women who will put on their country's uniform is nil compared to the enormous benefits to be derived by the Nation as a whole from these educational entitlements.

So long as the cold war continues and we are compelled to maintain a ready defense force of the size we now have considerations other than cost must be weighed in adopting policies applying to the personnel in uniform.

It is a matter of interest to note that, under the World War II GI bill of rights, some 7,815,000 veterans received educational training benefits. Under the Korean GI bill, Public Law 550, 1,362,000 veterans have received educational training benefits. Since the cut-off date of January 31, 1955, approximately 167,003 individuals have been inducted into the Armed Forces under the Selective Service Act. As I see it, this group of young Americans should be entitled to the same

consideration, insofar as educational training entitlements are concerned, as were their predecessors of World War II and the Korean war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3697) to extend the educational provisions of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 until such time as existing laws authorizing compulsory military service cease to be effective, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES — AMENDMENTS

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2577, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2577, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FISHERIES ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], I submit an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3275) to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may lie on the desk until next Monday, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and be printed; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment deals with the subject of the Nation's fisheries. We have worked a long time in trying to have enacted legislation which would be agreeable to all concerned.

For several years the fisheries of the Nation have not prospered. Little attention has been granted to them by the Congress or by the executive branch of our Government. The situation of several of our major fisheries has become particularly critical in the past 2 or 3 years. At a time when the general economy of the country has been prospering, our fisheries have been going downhill.

On February 23, I introduced S. 3275, for myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. This bill sought to reverse this downward trend of the fisheries by reorganizing the administration of the fisheries in the Federal Government. The Subcommittee on Fisheries of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held public hearings on S. 3275 between March 19 and 24, at which representatives of various branches of the fishing and fish-processing industries from every section of the Nation were heard, as well as governmental witnesses.

Immediately after the hearings I had prepared a substitute bill which incorporated various suggestions and recommendations offered by witnesses testifying at our hearings. This was printed for the use of the committee on March 30. It was circulated for comment to every fisheries association, fisheries cooperative, and fisheries union in the fishing and fish-processing industries in the country, as well as to upward of 600 individual firms in the industry. Strong letters and wires in support of this substitute measure have been coming in from every segment of the domestic industry in every section of the country. No adverse comment has been received from anyone in the domestic fish producing and processing industries.

Accordingly, I am today introducing this substitute for S. 3275. It will be left open for cosponsorship by other interested Senators until Monday, April 30.

The substitute bill provides these things:

First. It enunciates a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries.

Second. It creates a semi-independent United States Fisheries Commission within the Department of the Interior to carry out the policy.

Third. It prescribes the functions of the Commission, which will have all of the fisheries functions now carried out by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as some others.

Fourth. It defines the status of the Commission within the Department of the Interior, much along the lines of the Maritime Board and the Civil Aviation Board. Essentially, the Commission will be independent of the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to the framing of conservation regulations, investigations, and reports and recommendations based upon those investigations, and it will be guided by the general policies of the Secretary of the Interior in its other functions.

In other words, it would be responsible to the Secretary of the Interior only for its housekeeping.

Mr. President, the Congress has never, so far as I know, enunciated a national policy for the fisheries. The indefinite manner set forth by the Government to regulate this important phase of our national economy has never been set forth as a unified statement. Certainly this is a basic reason for the disturbed economic conditions that affect most of our major domestic fisheries. We hope to remedy that lack by stating a clear and comprehensive, rational policy for the fisheries in this bill.

Also there has been little or no consistency in the administration of the fisheries by the Government. Every time the administrator of the fishery agency changes, there has been a longer or shorter period of unrest in the fisheries. For this reason we have provided for a bipartisan commission of five men to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each of the Commissioners will have a term of 6 years and they will be appointed for staggered terms. Thus we hope to provide stabilization of policy and its administration for the fisheries.

In the postwar years the international problems of our major sea fisheries have grown apace. We now have seven international fisheries commissions upon which the Federal fishery agency, by law, has a member. Additionally there are numerous international conferences and negotiations treating with the fisheries whose representation by the Federal fishery agency is necessary. In these meetings and in these international commissions, the American representative often deals with Ministers of Government and nearly always with representatives on the policymaking level in the foreign governments. To meet these foreign representatives on an equal level, and effectively, our representatives require more prestige than they now have. This is one of the reasons why we have provided for five commissioners, directly under the Secretary. On the one hand, this will provide enough manpower for these manifold international activities and, on the other, it will provide our representatives with sufficient prestige to meet with their foreign colleagues on a basis of closer equality. Additionally, we have provided for closer liaison between the Commission and the Department of State than exists at present.

Mr. President, the cosponsors of this amendment and I do not expect its passage to solve all of the economic and international problems of our fisheries. We do look upon it, however, as an essential step forward in that direction and as laying a solid foundation for gradually improving the status of the fisheries in the international field, in the Federal Government, and in the economy of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a brief summary of what is sought to be accomplished by the amendment.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY

S. 3275, to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes.

The bill, as revised after the hearings, would establish a semi-independent Fisheries Commission under the Secretary of the Interior, appointed by the President by and

with the advice and consent of the Senate, to administer and promote domestic fisheries on a national level in the United States and Territories.

The United States Fisheries Commission would be composed of 5 members, at least 3 of whom would be required to have practical knowledge of domestic fisheries. Each member would serve for a term of 6 years, except the ones first appointed who would have staggered terms, and not more than 3 such members would be from the same political party.

The policy level of Federal fisheries management would thus be raised. The Commission would exercise a degree of independence in formulating conservation regulations to advance the fisheries, and it would have authority to investigate conditions, conduct research programs, to publish reports, and to make recommendations directly to the Congress, the President, and to the public relating to fisheries.

With a general national program for administering Federal fisheries under a five-man Commission, it will be possible for the first time in our Nation's history to employ practical trained men from the industry to assist in the management of this valuable resource and important segment of the national economy.

It is contemplated that greater security in American international fisheries relations will result from this program, administered by the Commission working in cooperation with the Secretary of State.

Under the Commission authority greater cooperation can be maintained between the Federal and State interests for the advancement and protection of domestic fisheries, and with the agencies established under international treaties and conventions.

Compensation provided for Commission members will probably not require any additional outlay of funds due to the fact that nontechnical responsibilities now carried out under the Fish and Wildlife Service may be divided to a great extent among the Commission members.

In answer to the pleas of representatives of all segments of our domestic fisheries, S. 3275 was drafted and introduced by Senator MAGNUSON and Senator KUCHEL.

Hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the past month. At these hearings witnesses from every section of the United States appeared and testified. All the representatives who appeared in the interest of domestic fish producers and fish marketing concerns voiced their support of the legislation and urged the adoption of the bill as amended in the Committee Print of March 30, 1956.

The bill, S. 3275 as amended, comprises a program for Federal administration of fisheries most favorably advocated by representatives of the fisheries industry and other interests. The revised bill should overcome the most sincere objections of the governmental agencies affected, and should provide a method by which they can perform a better service to the American public.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BENNETT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3407) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 11, 1956,

The names of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 3616) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, special disability determinations for railroad employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators) on April 11, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that beginning at 2 p. m. Tuesday, April 24, 1956, there will be a hearing on proposed civil-rights legislation in the committee room, 424 Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SIMON E. SOBELOFF TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE, FOURTH CIRCUIT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, May 3, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Morris A. Soper, retired.

Prior to the above-mentioned date all persons interested in the above nomination should file with the committee such representatives as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and myself, chairman.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make for the information of the Senate. Today we shall take up the Interior Department appropriation bill, which is in charge of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. During the noon hour the majority policy committee will meet and will consider the approximately 19 or 20 bills now on the calendar. I hope during the day we shall be able to announce which bill will follow action on the Interior Department appropriation bill. It is expected that the next appropriation bill to be considered will be the District of Columbia appropriation bill. That will be some time during the week of April 30. I rather expect that the bill which will follow the Interior Department appropriation bill will be the bank holding company bill, but I have not reached a definite decision. As soon as the policy committee acts, I shall notify my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, so that they may be prepared.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF WALTER REUTHER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the merger of the two great unions of the United States occurred, fears were expressed that this might result in a third party in this country, or might result in the Democratic Party being taken over by this new combine. The president of the new organization, Mr. George Meany, made it plain to the people of America that these fears were groundless and that the labor group would operate within the framework of the existing two-party system. I have great faith in Mr. Meany, and I inclined my thoughts toward his announcement with confidence that such would be the case.

Now, however, I am a bit disturbed. Mr. Walter Reuther, whose efforts encompass not only the field of labor, but the fields of economics, social work, world affairs, civil rights, public power, reclamation, schools, hospitals, and all the other myriad affairs of government, has been to India. There he expressed himself both for and against the United States military role in Asian affairs. He spoke out against Secretary Dulles for not backing India against Portugal. He spoke for more billions to be given to Asia, not caring, or not remembering, that the very people he is supposed to be working for, the union men, pays those billions.

In short, Mr. Reuther sounded to me like a man who either represented a political party or was anxious to do so. He did not sound to me like a representative of American labor who might rightly concern himself with working conditions as they are in India. If Mr. Meany meant what he said about labor and politics, then I suggest that in the future he himself represent American labor abroad or that he ask his colleague to confine his observations to those things that would be of vital interest to working people everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Reuther Abroad," from the Chicago Daily Tribune.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REUTHER ABROAD

Walter Reuther, the labor czar, is making a show of himself in India, abusing this country's Government and perplexing the audiences assembled to hear him.

In one breath, Reuther criticized the Eisenhower administration for placing too much emphasis on military power, and in the next he defended America's military alliances, but argued for less emphasis on Asian pacts. Like Chester Bowles and Henry Morgenthau, the New Dealers who preceded him in India, Reuther said he wants more American money tossed around abroad, in the name of bolstering the economy.

Reporters were handed a prepared text in advance of Reuther's talk in New Delhi, in which he assailed State Secretary Dulles for not backing India against Portugal in the dispute over Goa. But when he spoke, he omitted any reference to Dulles, or to American policy in the matter, and one of his agents confused newsmen by saying that Reuther stood on the text as well as his spoken words.

The Socialist barnstormer then undertook to speak on race relations in the United States to a country whose people still practice the cruel caste system outlawed by their constitution. All in all, Reuther contrived to make most Americans look bad, including himself.

POLITICAL USE OF DUES COLLECTED BY UNIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for many months I have directed remarks against the political use by unions of dues moneys collected by compulsion. I am happy that the Republican Party, through its leader, the President, has recognized the threats to individual freedom posed by this unmoral practice. Of course, the people in the union movement who have been responsible for this action have denied such practices exist, in spite of repeated proof offered that they do. Now, Mr. President, comes an additional voice, and a strong one, directed not only against this antifreedom practice, but also directed toward further proof of its being.

On April 13 Mr. George Hinkle, commissioner of labor for the State of Indiana, addressed the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, and his remarks are so to the point and of such general interest to the subject that I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with an editorial from the Indianapolis Star and a story from the same newspaper that urges corrective legislation aimed at this threat to political freedom.

There being no objection, the address, editorial, and news story were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION BOSSES AND POLITICAL ACTION

(Address by George F. Hinkle, commissioner of labor, State of Indiana, before the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, April 13, 1956)

Gentlemen, not only is it a distinct privilege to be here this afternoon to address you, but it is also an opportunity for me to publicly express my opinion and the opinion of many others as to a growing national political problem in this country, a problem which involves a violation of the individual rights and freedoms of citizens of these United States.

President Eisenhower recently made the following statement to the first convention of the AFL–CIO: "The rights of minorities holding differing social, economic, and political views must be scrupulously protected and their views accurately reflected." The principle involved is individual rights and freedoms, and I emphasize the word "individual."

First, I shall briefly touch on the highlights of the American labor movement and its participation in politics up to the year 1943. After that I shall delve more thoroughly into the political action of certain union leaders from 1943 up to this present date.

From its inception, around 1790 up to 1882, the American labor movement was rather closely alined with political parties and functioned a great deal as a supplement to political organizations. Most of labor's political goals in those days pertained to issues concerning voting rights, shorter working days, abolishment of child labor, etc. All of these were problems directly concerning labor.

When issues other than those directly affecting labor were championed by labor, these organizations split up. During this span of time, most of the organizations emanating from this movement were unsuccessful in maintaining membership and influence because of politics. Most of them died on the vine.

In 1882 the American Federation of Labor was born, the organization of which was accredited to Samuel Gompers, Peter McGuire (the founder of Labor Day), Peter Strasser, and others.

The AFL was not the first federation of international unions, but it was the first to weather wars and depressions, and as you well know, it is still with us today.

There are some very good reasons for the ability of the AFL to stay alive and to continue to expand up to this present day.

Initially Gompers, McGuire, and the other founders were active members of the Socialist Party, but as they built the AFL, from 1882 to 1886, they became aware of the incompatibility of the philosophy of socialism as opposed to the American capitalistic type of government in which they believed.

When they recognized the fallacies of socialism they discarded it completely and developed the first American business-type union philosophy. They believed in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay and also to stay out of organized politics.

Along with this avoidance of politics, these leaders avoided intellectuals who attempted to foist abstract programs on the workers and they avoided the left-wing Socialists and other radical groups.

Here is a statement by Gompers from the proceedings of the 1903 AFL convention: "I want to tell you Socialists that I have studied your philosophy, read your works upon economics. * * * I have heard your orators and watched the work of your movement the world over. * * * I have kept close watch upon your doctrines for 30 years; have been closely associated with many of you and know what you think and what you propose. * * * I know, too, what you have up your sleeve. And I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. * * * Economically you are unsound, socially you are wrong, and industrially you are an impossibility."

Gompers was president of the AFL until he died in the twenties and it is my opinion that the AFL remained strong because of its belief in individual rights, its belief in capitalism, and its belief that it was best to stay out of organized politics.

Financial support is the true test of organized labor's strength in political action.

The CIO was organized in 1935. In 1936 John L. Lewis made no bones about the fact that the United Mine Workers and the CIO paid cash on the barrelhead for a piece of legislation—$500,000 for the right to organize.

Under Lewis, the CIO formed Labor's Nonpartisan League. Lewis as the leader, of course, did not endorse Roosevelt in 1940, so as a result the left-wing Socialist element had to find some other way to bore into one of the two national political parties.

Maybe someone will question my use of the term "left-wing Socialist element," so let us go to 1942 and see if it may be applicable.

The CIO-PAC was born in 1943 because of what some labor leaders called brazen victories of reactionary forces in the 1942 elections.

Now, where do the left-wing Socialists come into the picture? The following is from a publication by Joseph Gaer entitled "The First Round":

"In all its activities PAC followed the simple precept: Do nothing illegal; do nothing unethical. Every move PAC made, every statement released, every activity initiated, every publication issued was approved by legal counsel. PAC was fortunate in having the advice of the distinguished CIO general counsel, Lee Pressman. It was even most fortunate in its own legal adviser, John Abt. John Abt gave more than legal advice. He participated in the planning of every one of the PAC's activities. He helped from the start to shape its publication policies. And he edited with meticulous scrutiny every bit of copy PAC prepared for publication. His criticism at times drove some of the writers nearly to distraction, but John Abt always remained calm, willing to reason, but never willing to argue.

Today John Abt represents the Communist Daily Worker in its present difficulties with the Treasury Department. Pressman has admitted being a Communist at one time. Abt has used the fifth amendment many times in congressional hearings. If men such as Pressman and Abt were in such an advisory capacity, someone was responsible for their being there and the policies they first inaugurated are still being followed by the PAC to this day. I think the term left-wing socialism is very mild when applied to men such as Pressman and Abt.

Now, what about individual rights and freedoms? Today, there are millions of union members in this country who are being forced to contribute to the campaign funds of political candidates, candidates these very same union members are opposed to at the polls. These candidates are the choice of, and are many times owned by, unscrupulous labor leaders. This is being done through the use of union dues money by labor leaders and the individual union members are being forced to make political contributions to candidates and parties as a condition of employment.

I say union members are being forced to do this as individuals. In this day of the American labor movement, we have the union shop throughout most of organized labor. These individual union members, as a condition of employment, pay dues in order to hold their jobs. In other words, the labor leader says that in order for you to work here you have to be a member of this union and pay dues, and I don't care what political party or candidate you are in favor of, I am going to use your dues money to help elect candidates I want. I know what is best for you politically and I do not care what or how you believe individually.

There very same labor leaders will turn around and tell you or anybody else that they believe in individual political freedom, individual rights, the Bill of Rights, protection of minorities against discrimination, etc. They will also state that all political campaign donations come from voluntary contributions by union members, but when it is proved, as it has been time and time again, that union dues money is being used, they will admit the fact.

Since Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and John Feikens, of Michigan, have been protesting this outrageous discrimination against a minority in our country, the union leaders have become quite confused in answering the charge. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, recently made the statement that future political

campaign donations would come from voluntary contributions and union treasuries. Dues money is the sole support of union treasuries. The COPE leaflet claims that all political campaign donations come from voluntary contributions. Gus Scholle, director of the Michigan CIO–PAC says political donations came from, and will come from, voluntary contributions and union dues money. Scholle also says that the PAC will never support a Republican in Michigan, regardless of how liberal he is.

The recent dismissal by Federal Judge Frank A. Picard of a Federal grand jury indictment against the UAW–CIO in Michigan is a case one should take note of. In this particular case, the union leaders at no time denied the use of dues money for political action and were brazen enough to claim that the charge against them by the Government was an assault on the basic constitutional rights of working people. In dismissing the charge, Judge Picard stated that, "The expenditures charged in this indictment are not prohibited by the act," and he said the union was "exercising the right of free speech."

Free speech? In other words, the individual union member must supply the labor leader with money so that he, the labor leader, can speak freely for the political candidate endorsed by the labor leader. The right of individual political freedom and endorsement is completely ignored by the labor leader and the judge.

Let us see how insidious and outrageous this problem is. At its start, PAC was faced with the problem of raising finances for its political activities. It had the grandiose idea of soliciting each of its 5 million members for a $1 contribution per year. They felt that enough would contribute to give them a nice fat political war chest along with the use of union-dues money.

At first, the dollar contribution was sufficient, but as the country pulled out of the war years and rolled into the 1950's the politically inspired labor leaders found that they would have to try something else as a fund-raising gimmick. The rank-and-file worker was beginning to realize that the money he was contributing to PAC was being used in a great many instances to help promote and elect candidates that he as an individual was opposed to. The rank-and-file worker began to quit contributing to the PAC. The PAC was slipping.

There was only one thing the labor leaders could do. Go to the union treasuries and really dig in. That they did.

In 1951, at the UAW–CIO convention, Walter Reuther's administration managed to pass a dues increase which incorporated a so-called citizenship fund. A great many flowery words were used by this eloquent UAW–CIO president to explain the intended use of this citizenship, but Reuther, when questioned from the floor, had to admit that it was his intent that it be used for political action.

This citizenship fund is maintained in the following manner. Out of each individual member's monthly dues, 5 cents goes into the local union citizenship fund and 5 goes into the international citizenship fund. This is a case where it is actually spelled out in a union constitution and bylaws that dues money will be used for political action; 1,250,000 nickels is a lot of nickels to have coming in each month to an international union for political action.

University surveys have revealed that more than 40 percent of the union members of this country voted for a Republican President in 1952. The union dues of most of this 40 percent were being used to finance the campaigns of candidates which these same union members, as individuals, were opposing at the polls.

A recent survey by Chicago University, in association with Cornell and Columbia Universities, revealed that 43 percent of union workers believe unions should take no part in politics. A survey conducted by Wayne University among UAW–CIO workers revealed that 63 percent of Democrat union members opposed political action by their union.

One hundred percent of Republican UAW–CIO workers oppose any political action by their union.

I use these figures to further bring out the point that these minorities are being discriminated against. A basic individual freedom is being violated.

I would like to mention at this time that this is not a partisan problem, but it is one with which both political parties are faced. There are areas of this country where a Republican is never elected to office. In these areas, the PAC uses the money of union members to help elect candidates in the primary elections. It does not make any difference which candidate an individual union member is supporting in a Democratic primary; the union leaders will select one which they are in favor of and spend the individual member's dues money to get that candidate nominated.

I know of union members who have run for political office in the Democrat primaries and their own dues money was used by certain union leaders to defeat them at the polls.

About this time someone will undoubtedly start thinking of Senator Robert Taft and his reelection in Ohio in 1950. If this uncontrolled special interest group is so dangerous and insidious, how did Taft win in Ohio? Labor leaders poured hundreds of thousands of dollars into his opponent's campaign and still Taft soundly thumped them.

Aside from being well liked by the Ohio voters and having a Democrat Governor voting for him, Taft benefited from a mistake the PAC made, a mistake they do not intend to make again. PAC in that campaign identified itself as PAC, a special-interest supplement to the Democrat Party. The people of Ohio, like most Americans, felt that they did not want a Senator who was owned by a special-interest group. This is one of the reasons Taft won by such a resounding majority that year.

In Michigan, the PAC, having learned its lesson in Ohio, ceased to operate openly as a separate organization supporting one political party. It became an actual functioning part of the Democrat machine. In fact, they took control of the Democrat Party in Michigan. In a coalition of so-called liberal Democrats and PAC workers, who got elected to offices in precincts, wards, and districts, the PAC was successful in taking control of the Michigan Democrat Party away from the old guard.

It is reported by Fay Calkins, a former CIO worker and author of the book, the CIO and the Democratic Party, that when the Wayne County conventions in Michigan were taken over, the coalition equipped the districts with bouncers. These bouncers were equipped with clubs and pistols.

George Fitzgerald, at that time Democrat national committeeman from Michigan and a leader in the AFL, said, "I have just watched socialism take over the Democrat Party by the communistic processes."

Here is this left-wing socialism idea again. Have any of you ever heard Walter Reuther refer to our Government as a republic or as a capitalistic form of government? I never have. He always refers to it as a free democracy.

I question this term "free democracy." We have a republic, not a democracy. Not long ago, Adm. Ben Moreell, in a speech, put it this way:

"This seemingly elaborate mechanism was designed primarily for one purpose, to protect the smallest possible minority, one person, against oppression by the largest possible majority, all other persons combined. This is the very antithesis of political democracy."

I am inclined to believe that Walter Reuther could very easily be classified as one of the intellectual radicals Samuel Gompers spoke of and it would seem that he has been trying to foster a new concept of government on the American people since he and his brother returned from their trip to Russia some 25 years ago.

A friend of mine once told me that one may criticize, but criticism without a constructive alternate proposal for correction is only half the job done. Before I go into the possibility of a proposal to combat this great injustice to a minority in this country, I shall make a few statements in anticipation of those labor leaders who are guilty of promoting this great wrong.

All labor leaders are not in favor of this compulsory political activity by all union members. It is only those who have the desire to promote and foster their absolute control over all the citizens of our country and those who wish to promote their own socialistic ideals and are using the labor movement as a vehicle to be used toward attaining these ideals.

Many labor leaders of this day will immediately brand a person as antilabor the moment a person disagrees with them on any one thing. I was just recently branded as antilabor by a high officer of the CIO because I would not criticize Gov. George Craig when he sent the National Guard into New Castle, Ind. This man has criticized the action of using the National Guard; so have some political leaders who would also make capital out of the nonsensical identity of the Governor with strikebreaking. But these men offer no alternative; they are typical negativists; we know what he is against, but he will never tell us what he is for. For any part, a governor who protects the lives of little children and the property of American citizens, whether the violence is on the part of labor or management, I submit to you, here is a moral governor, with the guts to do his duty.

This labor officer went on to say that the use of the guard to prevent violence and bloodshed in this strike was a violation of the Golden Rule. I say this kind of thinking is anti-American and a violation of Christian principles. If this is the way his free democracy is supposed to operate, I want no part of it.

I am positive that I will again be branded as antilabor by certain labor leaders as an aftermath of this speech, but these labor leaders can rest asured that I shall be very happy to debate this issue with them at anytime.

It amuses me the way Walter Reuther switches around at times when he is branding someone with a smear campaign. If someone is opposed to him on a major issue such as this, he immediately brands them antilabor, at other times, however, he will not.

When LYNDON JOHNSON and SAM RAYBURN led the fight for the passage of the natural gas bill in Congress recently, Walter Reuther promoted a campaign in an effort to defeat the bill and was emphatically opposed to its passage. Reuther did not, however, brand JOHNSON and RAYBURN as anti-American when they fought for something he was opposed to. He merely said that there were more Republicans for the bill than Democrats.

There is reason for Reuther not attacking JOHNSON and RAYBURN. He has to coo and ooze sweetness to these gentlemen, or they are apt to take what power he does have in the national Democrat Party away from him and Reuther does not want to lose that. The man is very ambitious politically. He is merely waiting his day and biding his time. This is the reason he is not consistent with his smear tactics.

Gentlemen, I have been a member of the UAW–CIO in good standing for 15 years and my dues money has been used time and time again to help elect political candidates not of my choice. This is my alternate proposal in line with my criticism of what is being done.

As an American citizen, as a union member, and as Commissioner of Labor for the State of Indiana, I am of the opinion that legislation should be passed on a State level and a national level prohibiting this discrimination and violation of political freedom.

I want to make it clear that I am not in favor of any "right-to-work" legislation and that I truly believe in the union shop because of what I consider to be several good reasons. I do say, however, that the right to have a union shop is a privilege granted by statute and that the privilege is being abused.

I would like to make the point at this time that when Senator Taft helped write the present Labor-Management Relations Act, he left the union shop up to the people, the unions, and the employers. I think it should be left as such.

I also want to make the point that I am not opposed to unions participating in politics, as long as they finance their candidates with money which is solicited on a noncompulsory, voluntary basis from the membership. I say that in a political campaign the individual American citizen should be permitted to decide whom he shall labor for and for whom to spend money.

I say the State of Indiana should pass legislation prohibiting the use of union dues money by union leaders in political campaigns. I say that the penalty for violation of this legislation and principle should be the denial of the right of that particular union or local union to have a union shop. I say that this proposal is not a so-called "right-to-wreck" proposal and it is not an antilabor proposal. It is an antipolitical labor boss proposal.

In closing with this proposal, I ask all Americans to consider the proposition that those labor leaders who are insistent on continuing this practice are desirous of eliminating the American way of government.

Take heed of the recent happenings in Michigan, where over two-thirds of the campaign expenses for the Democrat Party are being paid for by those labor union leaders.

Scrutinize the recent arbitrary decision of the Governor of Pennsylvania to subsidize strikers with taxpayers' money by paying the strikers unemployment compensation while out on strike.

It is time we took cognizance of the fact that our individual rights and freedoms are in jeopardy and that our children will not enjoy the freedoms we enjoy today if proponents of this philosophy are permitted to thrive and grow in power and control.

You and I have to face this thing head on. We can't gossip about it over cocktails in the cloistered, smoke-filled rooms of French Lick and expect to solve the problem. The problem needs to be faced with foresight, courage, and faith in the free enterprise system, a system that has worked so well that it seems sometimes to be the architecture of God. But it's the same today as in the time of Samuel Gompers. If we want to keep America as the land of the free, we have to make sure it is also the home of the brave.

[From the Indianapolis Star of April 15, 1956]

PROTECT THE WORKER'S RIGHTS

A hard hitting and important speech was made in Indiana on Friday on the subject of labor boss denial of the political rights of the workers. George F. Hinkle, Indiana Commissioner of Labor, charged bluntly that "Millions of union members in this country are being forced to contribute to campaign funds of political candidates these very same union members oppose at the polls." And he added that "This is being done through the use of union dues money by labor leaders. Individual union members are being forced to make political contributions to candidates and parties as a condition of employment." Where a union shop is in force, where a worker has to pay dues to hold his job, where part of those dues are spent in political campaigns to defeat candidates the worker favors, you have a condition that is little better than slave labor. Why should any free man be forced to help support candidates and policies he is against?

Hinkle dramatically produced evidence of his charges. He noted that George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO stated flatly that all political contributions would come "from voluntary donations and union treasuries." But union dues money is the sole support of union treasuries. It is not volunteered. It is simply seized.

Not long ago Federal Judge Frank A. Picard, in a remarkably tortured opinion, dismissed the indictment against the UAW-CIO for violating the prohibition against using union dues for political purposes. He said the union was "exercising the right of free speech." That is a good one. The union leaders admitted they were using union dues for politics. That is supposed to violate the law. But the judge upheld the union view that the Government case was "an assault on the working people."

That's like saying "Down is up." As Hinkle put it, "The individual union member must supply the labor leader with money so that he, the labor leader, can speak freely for the political candidates endorsed by the labor leader."

Only labor bosses have the right of "free speech." The individual workingman "the real working people" has no right to decide how his political donation is going to be spent. That is freedom, democracy, and "human rights" about which these labor bosses prate so loudly?

The usual gimmick for siphoning off union dues money for political campaigns is the citizenship fund. The UAW–CIO, of which Hinkle has been a member for 15 years, collects 10 cents each month out of union shop dues from every member and sets it aside for "citizenship." It takes in about $65,000 a month that way. This money is used lavishly and ruthlessly to build a political machine inside the Democratic Party and to support candidates who toe the labor bosses' line.

Labor bosses who use union dues for political purposes—and they are not by any means all or even most labor leaders—are simply usurping the individual political rights of their "subjects." They do it in the name of democracy or free speech or human rights. But the only "democracy" is boss rule. The only "free speech" is for them. The only "rights" are their "rights" to seize the workers' money for their own purposes.

Hinkle quotes surveys to show that 40 percent of union dues paying members voted Republican in the 1952 election. Two independent surveys by universities show that 43 percent of all union members oppose political action by their unions. In the UAW–CIO that percentage is 63 percent. Think of that. Here a majority of union members is forced to pay money into a political campaign fund they disagree with. That is "democracy"?

To stop this political dishonesty Hinkle proposes State and Federal laws prohibiting the use of any union dues for political purposes. He suggests that a penalty for violation be the denial of the right of the union to have a closed or union shop. This is not, as Hinkle put it, a "right to wreck" proposal. It is an "antipolitical labor boss proposal."

It is a sound and courageous idea for defending the individual worker's political rights. It should be adopted in Indiana and in the National Capitol.

[From the Indianapolis Star of April 14, 1956]

LAW URGED TO BLOCK USE OF UNION DUES ON POLITICS

(By Don G. Campbell)

FRENCH LICK, IND.—Legislation prohibiting the use of union dues money in political campaigns, with forfeiture of union shop privileges as punishment for violation of the statute, was recommended strongly here yesterday by Indiana's commissioner of labor.

In a blistering attack on union officials who channel union dues into massive political machines, State Commissioner of Labor George F. Hinkle urged the board of directors of the Indiana State Chamber of Commerce to support legislation on a State and national level prohibiting this discrimination and violation of political freedom.

Hinkle's charges of outrageous discrimination against a minority, came yesterday as the State chamber's governing body opened its 3-day spring meeting here in the French Lick-Sheraton Hotel.

Today, Hinkle told the State's most influential business group, "there are millions of union members in this country who are being forced to contribute to the campaign funds of political candidates these very same union members are opposed to at the polls. These candidates are the choice of, and are many times owned by, unscrupulous labor leaders."

Although declaring himself "not in favor of any 'right-to-work' legislation"—such as was urged in an earlier address here yesterday by Stephen C. Noland, president of the Indiana Right-to-Work Committee—Hinkle acknowledged that the union shop privilege "is being abused."

Noland earlier had characterized his committee's proposed legislation as a move to restore the unions "to the voluntary basis which Samuel Gompers declared to be the only basis on which a union can build permanent strength and solidarity.

"It compels union organizers," Noland said, "to sell union benefits. It protects the employees' security."

Hinkle, however, recommended that the union shop question be left up to "the people, the unions, and the employers," as was intended, he said, when the late Senator Robert Taft helped write the present Labor-Management Relations Act.

In tracing the background of labor's political history, Hinkle cited the hands-off policy that characterized organized labor's growth under the guidance of such men as Gompers, Peter McGuire, Peter Strasser, and others. Politically, he said, the unions remained relatively inactive except in issues directly involving labor until the formation of Labor's Nonpartisan League under John L. Lewis.

The culmination of this movement, Hinkle said, was the formation of the CIO–PAC in 1943 because of what some labor leaders called brazen victories of reactionary forces in the 1942 elections.

Labor's power today, he said, needs no better illustration than the present situation in Michigan where over two-thirds of the campaign expenses for the Democratic Party are borne by labor union leaders and in Pennsylvania where the governor of that State subsidized strikers with taxpayers' money by paying the strikers unemployment compensation while out on strike.

This exists, Hinkle charged, in spite of the fact that recent university studies have revealed that: More than 40 percent of the union members in the country voted for a Republican President in 1952 although their labor leaders were using their funds to finance the campaigns of candidates to whom they were opposed; 43 percent of union

workers believe unions should take no part in politics; 63 percent of the Democratic members of the UAW–CIO are opposed to political action by their union and 100 percent of Republican UAW-CIO workers oppose any political action by their union.

In proposing his antipolitical labor boss legislation, Hinkle said: "I ask all Americans to consider the proposition that those labor leaders who are insistent on continuing this practice are desirous of eliminating the American way of government."

At its dinner meeting last night, the board of directors of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce heard Boyd Campbell, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, attack the gloomy gremlins of disaster, who read the stock market report as though it were a fever chart, and their negative attitude toward their own country.

"We have to tell about America," Campbell said, "and it should be told in a positive manner."

"In our attempts to improve our country," he added, "it should be remembered that the American Revolution is one without end."

VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the veto by the President of the farm bill I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a statement issued by the New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation which appeared in the April 17, 1956, issue of the Manchester Union Leader, of Manchester, N. H. The New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation is in full agreement with the veto by President Eisenhower of the farm bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE FARM BUREAU SEES VETO SAVING FREE ENTERPRISE

(By D. Frank O'Neil)

CONCORD.—The New Hampshire Farm Bureau Federation yesterday applauded President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill as a necessary step in maintaining the free-enterprise system for agriculture.

Stacy W. Cole, president of the NHFBF, said that "those who would socialize agriculture have suffered a real setback" by the President's action.

He added:

"If it had become law (the farm bill approved by Congress) it would have increased our present difficulties in agriculture in the way of tremendous surpluses which even now are hanging over the markets and depressing prices.

"It would have been bad for our New Hampshire poultry and dairy farmers by lifting feed grain prices beyond a reasonable point. Fortunately, the veto nullified an effort to run agriculture by politics rather than by commonsense."

Mr. Cole expressed the opinon that Congress can still pass a good bill with flexible support prices and a good soil-bank plan and pave the way for improved agricultural prices.

DECLINE OF AMERICAN PRESTIGE IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, some days ago, there was an observance of Bataan Day, the day which marked the end of the heroic resistance of Filipino and American troops on the last peninsula stronghold in the Philippines in the cheerless days of early 1942.

On Bataan Day, we spoke of the special and unbreakable ties between America and the Philippines.

Mr. President, I have just had occasion to read a speech delivered on the floor of the Philippine Congress on the evening of March 12 by Representative Pedro Lopez, who has always been a warm supporter, advocate, and friend of the United States. His speech traces an alarming decline of American prestige in the Philippines in recent months, and discusses some of the reasons therefor.

Mr. President, I do not know whether all the facts set forth by Representative Lopez are true; but if only half of them are true, it is occasion for concern and for a careful revaluation of the actions and attitudes on the part of some American interests which have led to the present situation.

Mr. President, among other things, Representative Lopez strongly recommends that President Magsaysay, of the Philippines, pay a good-will trip to the United States in order to straighten out some of the misunderstandings which have arisen between our two countries. I cannot, of course, speak for the United States Government; but speaking as only one Member of the Senate, I would warmly welcome President Magsaysay here. I hope the trip suggested by Representative Lopez is indeed arranged.

Because of the importance of his speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

Mr. President, I also ask that there be inserted into the RECORD two editorials bearing on this general subject, which appeared in two Filipino newspapers.

There being no objection, the speech and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(The text of the privilege speech delivered by the Honorable Pedro Lopez, Independent Congressman of the Second District of Cebu, on the floor of the House of Representatives, Congress of the Philippines, in the evening of March 12, 1956, on Philippine-American relations. Congressman Lopez was a member of the Philippine-American Rehabilitation Commission in Washington, member of the Philippine delegation to the UNO Conference in San Francisco which drafted the United Nations Charter and a signatory to that charter, chairman of the Philippine delegation to the first assembly of the U. N. in London, and associate prosecutor of the Philippines at the International Military Tribunal of the Far East:)

Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentleman of the house; only a year ago, this august hall resounded to unanimous professions of Filipino affection and support of America, as members of the House of Congress vied with one another in voicing with pride their approval of the concurrent resolution filed by your humble servant, together with the gentleman from Manila, the Honorable Joaquin R. Roces and the gentleman from Pamanga, the Honorable Diosdad Macapagal, which unequivocally backed the announced stand of President Eisenhower to defend by force, if necessary, Formosa and the Pescadores from an imminent Communist invasion. Dire threats of suicidal involvement in another struggle between titans, and conjured pictures of horrible devastation of our cities and mass annihilation of our helpless population in swift raids by fleets of Red modern jet bombers, were poised upon us, but all these we ignored and cast aside in our fervor to prove once again to America that although she was abandoned by her western blood brothers, who evinced more concern for the preservation of their commercial outposts than for the defense of their ideological concepts of living, we, puny in stature but indomitable in spirit, were at her side, a true and loyal friend in her critical moment of need.

How we, the members of this house, faithfully and accurately mirrored the inner thoughts and feelings of our 20 million people toward our American friends was best documented by the sweeping victory scored by Nacionalista candidates led by President Magsaysay in the last November elections. The President and his party staked their leadership and fortune on the main electoral issue of their close collaboration with the United States, a posture which was masterfully assailed by its archcritic, Mr. Recto in a province-to-province campaign throughout the nation. In this land where partisan politics is a major daily preoccupation and political partisans cannot bring themselves to agree with their adversaries on anything under the sun unless death, acting as a magnanimous ink remover of earthly blemishes, supervenes, it was quite unique that, after Senator Recto failed to garner, specially in the cities, the recognized citadels of supranationalists and oppositionists, as many votes as were generally expected he would, there was a consensus that the Magsaysay-Nacionalista triumph at the polls was a clear-cut confirmation by the people of the pro-American policies pursued by the present administration.

Hardly a year passed by since the approval of the Formosa resolution and 4 months since the November elections, and yet it is almost unbelievable that we, who have kept our ears close to the pulse-beat of this house, should have noticed a sudden changing of heart, a quick transformation of this attitude toward America. The transformation, as seen from an intimate distance with eyes that reflect objectively the unbellished and undisguised truth, consisted in a swing from the former extreme of admiration, hero worship, and idolatry to the new extreme of disenchantment, disillusionment, and even hostility. In the beginning there were only guarded whispers and discreet remarks in off-the-record conversations, later the grumblings became louder and bolder, and finally they erupted on this floor in torrents of violent and sarcastic statements hurled, in the course of interpellations, upon the gentleman from Zambales, the Honorable Enrique Corpus, who despite his own modest protestations, is regarded as the eye, ear, nose, and throat of President Magsaysay in this chamber. It was bad enough that the gentleman from Zambales, who was defending high American officials from what he termed as unwarranted and inordinate attacks, was himself grilled and roasted in scroaching interpellations for four solid hours; but what made it worse was that there was general approbation of the anti-American trend of the questioning from many of the seated members of this house, who were goading the interpellators to belabor further the gentleman from Zambales. As early as 3 weeks ago I had occasion, in a press interview in Cebu, to express alarm at the rising tide of anti-Americanism in this house, and I suggested then that the President do something immediately to nip it in bud by having the iniquitous sources of discontent removed.

Who would ever dream and expect that the very able, patriotic gentleman from Manila, the Honorable Joaquin R. Roces, who was precisely my coauthor in the Formosa resolution, would file, all of a sudden, a proposal now pending consideration before us, which would reexamine our present foreign policy, and adopt a new one which would veer us away from America and closer to Asia, which certainly does not exclude Red China? In his interpellation of the gentleman from

Zambales the other day, Congressman Roces, who is one of the most widely read and respected newspaper columnists of the country, heatedly contended that expediency, rather than friendship, guides American policy, as shown, according to him, by the fact that America's enormous aid to Japan, a former enemy though expected to be a highly useful ally in a war against Soviet Russia, has totaled $9 billion, beside which the one given to us appears miserably insignificant in comparison. In this connection, I should like to bring out an instance which depicts a head-on collision between the mobile and adjustable American concept of expediency and the immovable and rigid oriental concept of principle. When South Korea was bleeding to near death under the heels of the Communist invaders, the Americans offered to President Rhee the use of Japanese troops to assist repel the Red enemy. At that dark hour when the salvation of his country depended so much upon more troop reinforcements, President Rhee declined to have Japanese soldiers set foot on Korean soil, unforgetful of the unfortunate experience they had had with the Japanese in the past. To the grand old man of Korea, it was a question of moral principle, and he stood by his guns regardless of the consequences; to the Americans, who must have smiled the knowing smile of practical men, it was a simple matter of realism and, of course, expediency. In P. T. Barnum's book, President Rhee would be one of those suckers born every minute.

We have with us in this house two war heroes, the gentlemen from Bohol, the Honorable Bartolome Cabangbang and Esteban Bernido, both of whom demonstrated their love and loyalty to America not by lip-service but by helping lead the resistance movement in the last war; Congressman Cabangbang had a valiant record with the Allied Intelligence Bureau, while Congressman Bernido was our chief of staff in the MacArthur-recognized Bohol area command. Should you hear them talk of America now, you can sense a feeling of some creeping disappointment over what they consider the shabby treatment our country has received. We also have with us our well-known Foreign Affairs Committee chairman, the Honorable Miguel Cuenco, who went through long privations in the hills rather than cooperate with and serve under the Japanese conquerors; of all people, he is now urging a reexamination of the bases agreement with America and, notwithstanding that he is a devout Catholic, he has formally advocated for a coexistence with the Reds. We can also cite the case of the distinguished gentleman from Iloilo, the Honorable Jose Aldeguer, and the brilliant gentleman from Oriental Negros, the Honorable Lamberto Macias, both of whom were tutored and brought up under the wings of American educators, the latter having become the judge advocate of the Negros Oriental guerrilla; and of many others just as distinguished but too numerous to mention within the brief space of time allotted to me—of real, honest-to-goodness pro-Americans who have suffered varying degrees of disappointment with Uncle Sam.

Among our people who are anxious to see the continuance of the present close amity and ties between the Philippines and America, not because they love any other country but their own, but because they see in that relationship the only sure protection to our free and democratic institutions, and the only foolproof guarantee against being gobbled up by an aggressive totalitarian neighbor, there is serious concern as to what could have been the cause why this wave of anti-Americanism is sweeping across our House. As best as I could gather, it all started when American vested interests launched an all-out campaign to dump and ram their huge excess Virginia leaf tobacco worth millions into Filipino throats, irrespective of whether we need it or not, or whether we can afford it or not.

With a powerhouse lobby in Washington, these interests convinced an influential group of legislators in the United States Congress that the tobacco industry was the victim of a doublecross from Philippine Government representatives who had welshed on a gentleman's agreement which would allow the entry, without need of license, of vast quantities of Virginia leaf tobacco valued at millions of pesos into our ports before the effectivity of the tariff under the Laurel-Langley trade agreement and the 17-percent import tax. It seems that American tobacco interests have been utterly dissatisfied that during the last few months they were only able to get into our country 6 million pounds of Virginia leaf tobacco, without payment of tariff, and an additional 3 million pounds, with tariff. They have been moving heaven and earth to have us absorb 7 million pounds more. What makes it very difficult for us to accommodate the tobacco interests is the fact that the Philippines is expected to produce this year about 32 million pounds of Virginia leaf, which is 2 million in excess of our yearly normal needs.

Evidently, the tobacco lobby did not acquaint the United States Congress with certain unpalatable facts in Philippine economic life which would have relieved the Philippines from fulfilling its commitment in the event it had made any. The dollar reserves of the Philippines has tobogganed down from a high of $400 million to a record dangerous low of $209 million; that in this sad state of our financial affairs, the dollar allocations of long established importers had to be drastically cut; that the raw material requirements of new and necessary industries, for which, before their operations, the Central Bank had made definite assurances to provide, had to be substantially reduced just the same; that unnecessary travels and studies abroad had to be banned; that serious consideration is being given to rationing gasoline consumption, all in a desperate effort to prevent the further dwindling of our dollar reserves; that finally, Governor Cuaderno, of the Central Bank, had to be sent posthaste by the President to Washington to negotiate for more loans with which to stabilize our precarious dollar reserve position. In other words, this vaunted American show-window of democracy in the Orient is going broke, with not enough funds to finance its import needs.

Instead of understanding and sympathizing with our predicament, the tobacco lobbyists accelerated their campaign of retaliation against all Philippine interests before the United States Congress. The first target of their attack was Philippine sugar. In the pending bill which would provide for the allocation, out of the yearly increase in sugar consumption in America, the Philippines was singled out as one of the countries not given any increased quota at all. During the hearing on the sugar bill, attempts were made to graft into the measure some penalty clauses detrimental to Philippine sugar quota as fixed in the Laurel-Langley Trade Agreement. The next target of discrimination is Philippine labor. There is now a bill which would exclude thousands of Filipino workers in air, naval and military installations in Guam from enjoying the benefits of the minimum wage law of the United States Federal Government. The other day a radiographic report was received from reliable sources in Washington that it is idle to expect any legislation out of the United States Congress favorable to the Philippines, unless we relent in our stand not to import more Virginia tobacco. One thing led to another, and, before we knew it, we began acting like a hurt lover, magnifying Uncle Sam's faults but minimizing his virtues, recalling real or fancied grievances, such as the deficient war damage payments which were conditioned upon our granting them a one-sided pairty. We have now gone as far as flirting with his rivals, and wrestling with the idea of a parting of ways.

Evaluated from the viewpoint of public relations accomplishments in the East-West cold war, we can positively state that the United States tobacco clique, by undermining the faith of Filipinos and other Asiatics in the loftiness of American motivations, has done more to advance in so short a time the aggressive program of subversion and conversion undertaken by the Communist Internationale the world over, than all the combined Communist propaganda tactics resorted to by Moscow, like charging the Americans with engaging in germ warfare in China and Korea, and with discriminating racially against the Negroes and lynching them; of brandishing around in state visits the captivating smiles of that peripatetic, back-slapping, hard-drinking, vaudeville-like team of Khrushchev and Bulganin; and of showering some trade concessions and aids in few underdeveloped countries. Where Communist and Hukbalahap propaganda have thoroughly failed through these years to dent the armor of Filipino conviction in the sincerity of the Americans, the tobacco clique has succeeded overnight in engendering mistrust in the minds of our leaders that after all at the end of the rope of an American assistance there is always tied a business booby trap. Unquestionably, Moscow and Peking owe the tobacco boys a medal for invaluable services rendered to the Communist cause.

If the United States Government and people permit vested interests, like the tobacco coterie, to carry the ball, so to speak, and daub a paint of crude mercenariness on the American mission of humanity and security in this part of the world, then they might just as well forget about their darling favorite, President Magsaysay, for under such adverse climate he will have become completely impotent to render effective help in protecting, much less advancing, American-Filipino security interests; they might just as well have the Voice of America and the USIS pack lock, stock, barrel, radio towers and printing presses, and order them home, and have the carrier U. S. S. *Shangri-la* and all other units of the Seventh Fleet sent back to Pearl Harbor, for what need do we have of the thundering jet planes, the smooth, silky radio voice of persuasion and the beautiful brochures of self-praises, if Filipino hearts no longer belong to Daddy? During the Japanese occupation we learned the lesson that what matters most is the conquest of the mind and heart, and these simply could not and never will be won by bayonets, but only by good deeds that shine without need of ballyhoo.

With tempers rising to what might yet become hysteria, I wonder if at this moment it is treasonable for me to point out a fundamental fact: that there is a world of difference that distinguishes the mass of the American people from a mere group of predatory interests. With all their share of human shortcomings and imperfections, the Americans have proved themselves the most generous on earth throughout the history of mankind. They have proved themselves in more ways than one the best friends that we ever have had. Mostly because of the loyalty demonstrated and the sacrifices made by our people in the last war, more particularly the gallantry and bravery of our heroes at Baatan, Corregidor, and during the resistance movement, the Americans have by actual deeds shown they have a special soft spot for us in their hearts. Those of us who have had the occasion to travel around the United States and visit the Americans at their homes can personally testify as to the

warmth and sincerity of their affection and regard for us. You see showered all over their country the fabulously rich bounties of nature, the vast fertile lands, the endless mountains laden with minerals, the forests of factories, their tremendous wealth and their almost incredible self-sufficiency. We can very well understand that they cannot be the kind who go out into foreign lands to exploit other people; they have more than enough at home. But as in other countries, the Americans have their small quota for frustrated imperialists and carpetbaggers. As in our country, American official representatives can also be duped by shrewd and sleek lobbyists of special interests, but reflective of the instinctive ability of the Americans to dig into the truth and thereafter separate the genuine from the fake, we have Lincoln's saying that some can fool some of the people some of the time but never all the people all the time. I feel certain that given the facts and the justification of our stand, the Government of the United States will immediately right any wrong and correct any injustice.

Mr. Speaker, before this thing goes out of hand, before the beautiful friendship that has long existed between our country and the United States breaks to pieces beyond repair, I should like to see the highest representatives of the two nations sit down at a conference table, and in a heart-to-heart talk, explain misunderstandings, iron out differences, and remove irritants that have caused suspicion and frictions in our relationships. About the most opportune time, it looks to me, for taking this matter up on highest level would be the long awaited and overdue visit of President Magsaysay with President Eisenhower in Washington. We understand that for sometime now an official invitation has been extended by President Eisenhower to President Magsaysay to visit with him at the Capitol of the American Nation, and that the American people themselves, are eagerly awaiting word that our President, whom they greatly admire, can make it. I believe that the time has come that President Magsaysay ought to leave behind for a moment his homework, and fly to Washington at the earliest opportunity to take up at the summit the more pressing and critical problem of saving Philippine-American amity from disintegrating.

With the background of a half century of friendship, fully forged and tested in the crucible of the last war, and nurtured by the blood of their heroes shed in common sacrifice on the altar of freedom, there is no reason on earth why two old friends who speak the same language and share the same common way of life, which alone can give meaning and fulfillment to the aspirations of all freemen, cannot continue to get along splendidly together, and settle amicably whatever differences they may have to their mutual satisfaction.

[From the Evening News of March 13, 1956]

FAIRNESS AND SOBRIETY

As advocates of the continuation and improvement of Filipino-American friendship and collaboration, we are disturbed by the recent outbursts of anti-American verbiage on the floor of Congress. That the hostility was sparked by members whose background and accomplishments have served to strengthen the feeling of amity between our people and those of the United States merely intensifies the puzzlement, but does not explain or justify the sudden demonstration of unfriendliness.

Because we believe, as we have previously announced, that friendship and collaboration with America is "not only essential to our well-being, but is elemental and inevitable because they have been established by the force and determination of historical events," we find encouraging, inspiring, the speech delivered yesterday in Congress by Representative Pedro Lopez, of Cebu. It was a gallant and forthright rejointed to the rash of passionate reaction and narrow-mindedness on Philippine-American relations that was recently shown on the floor of the lower house.

Representative Lopez' appeal for a statesmanly approach to matters of foreign policy is a solid pleading for great sobriety and less bitterness and prejudice in the consideration of issues that vitally affect the future of this country, and the very foundations of freedom and democracy on which it rests. He expressed alarm over the rising tide of anti-Americanism in the lower house and, in a sense, reflected the thinking of the vast majority of our people who have constantly demonstrated their abiding friendship and trust in the goodness of the American people.

In tracing the causes of the flareup of anti-American feeling in the lower house, Representative Lopez mentioned, among other things, the fact that certain vested interests in the United States are advocating reprisals against Philippine products and even against Philippine labor, because their own products had been adversely affected by certain measures taken by our Congress to protect Philippine interests. This does not, however, blind him to the basic reality that those who believe in close amity and ties with America are so inclined "not because they love any other country but their own, but because they see in that relationship the only sure protection to our free and democratic institutions, and the only foolproof guaranty against being gobbled up by an aggressive totalitarian neighbor. * * *"

The Cebu Representative also pointed out wisely, we believe, and without risk of arousing doubts as to his patriotism, one fundamental fact that, he believes sincerely, underlies the entire situation. "There is," he declared, "a world of difference that distinguishes the mass of the American people from a mere group of predatory interests. With all their share in human shortcomings and imperfections, the Americans have proved themselves the most generous on earth throughout the history of mankind. They have proved themselves in more ways than one the best friends that we ever have had."

We believe with Representative Pedro Lopez, that the broad base upon which we must work our destiny as a people is in friendship and collaboration with America.

[From the Daily Mirror of March 13, 1956]

NEW VOICES IN CONGRESS

Tracing the cause of the apparent anti-Americanism in Congress, Representative Pedro Lopez in a privileged speech last night called for the early acceptance by President Magsaysay of a standing invitation to the United States to bolster the sagging good will between the two countries.

There is no doubt that Philippine-American relations have become strained although this will never be admitted by administration leaders. The move to deal Filipino labor in the Marianas Islands out of the United States minimum wage law, the exclusion of the Philippines from any benefits to be derived from increased sugar quotas, and the insistence of the American tobacco lobby on dumping Virginia leaf over the heads of Filipino tobacco producers—these have presented to our people a very unflattering picture of Uncle Sam. And as Congressman Lopez points out, many colleagues of his who in the past had lauded the United States on the floor of the house are now disillusioned and are advocating measures which they formerly would have denounced as heretical.

It must not be supposed, however, that the fresh stock of good will which would be generated by President Magsaysay's visit to Washington would completely undo the effects of the present agitation in Congress for reexamination of our official attitude toward the United States. As world conditions improve it is only natural to expect the more independent minded of our public officials to voice less and less orthodox views of our foreign relations. This in itself would be a healthy sign for it must be admitted that in times of severe East-West tension, when loyalty lines have to be drawn sharply, our leaders refrain from being too critical toward American acts and policies for obvious reasons. The present temper of Congress is probably due to the lessening of world tension as much as to injustices committed or threatened by the less worthy representatives and spokesmen of the American people.

Another thing which will militate against politicians retracting what they have said in recent weeks on foreign policy is the effect on the public of their own speeches and statements. For the first time the people have heard their representatives speaking out boldly; overtones of neutralism sound attractive to ears long used to extravagant paeans to "brother Americans" from "little brown brothers."

Our relations with the United States will never be so strained that they should cause serious worry on either side. But the two countries may emerge from current misunderstandings with increased respect for each other, thanks to the outspokenness of some of our lawmakers. There has been in the past too much groveling in the direction of Washington by supposedly responsible leaders. Whatever strain exists may be due to the growing pains of a foreign policy which has had difficulty in reconciling its special relations with the former mother country with its professed adherence to the anti-colonial bloc of Arab and Asian nations forged at the Bandung Conference.

ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS TO AMERICANS TRAVELING ABROAD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized to address the Senate for a total of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is the time of the year when Members of the Senate begin to consider the annual appropriations for the Department of State. It is my privilege to sit with the Committee on Appropriations during consideration of these appropriations, and I will make my views known to the committee at that time. Now, however, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to one aspect of the Department's work abroad which costs money, which benefits especially Members of the Congress, but which we often forget when it comes time to appropriate funds.

I refer to the heavy burden carried by American Foreign Service officers in providing assistance to so-called VIP's. Members of the Congress, high-ranking Government officials, and certain private individuals are given the VIP treatment when they travel abroad.

Normally this involves meeting the traveler at the airport or the dock, escorting him to his hotel where reservations have been made, assisting him in meeting local officials and members of the Embassy, helping him obtain the information he seeks, and in due course

putting him aboard transportation facilities for travel to his next stop.

While I am sure that my colleagues do not especially relish the reference to their travel abroad as VIP's, I do believe they are assisted immensely in accomplishing their work by the special help they receive. There have been instances in which the privileges which go along with VIP travel has been abused. For the most part, however, the help given has been well used and I believe most Members of Congress who travel abroad come home better able to participate in the formulation of our foreign policy.

In order that we may have before us an idea of the burden carried by our Foreign Service in connection with visits of this kind, last fall I asked the Department of State to obtain information on the extent of the services which it has supplied during the past 4 years at certain European posts. In summary, the information I received is contined in the table I hold in my hands, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressional visits

	1955	1954	1953	1952
Rome	223	101	109	70
Bonn [1]	84			
Paris [2]	707	452	501	242
Madrid	393	209	194	132
Geneva [3]				

Visits by Government officials

	1955	1954	1953	1952
Rome	123	140	115	108
Bonn [1]	129			
Paris [2]	1,360	612	630	641
Madrid	228	297	99	174
Geneva [3]				

Visits by private individuals

	1955	1954	1953	1952
Rome	177	248	176	163
Bonn [1]				
Paris [2]	911	510	535	612
Madrid	279	453	297	387
Geneva [3]				

[1] Bonn figures on congressional visits and visits by Government officials available only for period since establishment of combined Reception Bureau and Travel Section; May–December 1955. No records kept on number of private individuals assisted.

[2] American Embassy, Paris, indicates that figures on congressional visits include congressional staff members, and families.

[3] American consulate general, Geneva, reports that for period, 1952–55, the number of congressional visitors ranged from 100 to 150 each year, and that estimated total numbers important visitors, including congressional groups, other official Government groups, and delegations to conference, are as follows: 1955, 1,600; 1954, 900; 1953, 900; 1952, 600.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These figures show that for the one year 1955, no less than 1,400 congressional and 1,840 Government official visitors received special treatment at four posts. Many of these, of course, were repeaters—that is, they visited Paris, then Rome, then Bonn, Madrid, and so on. But so far as concerns the help they received at each post, it means that officers from the Embassies had to be detailed for special jobs—special jobs oftentimes on Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays. It frequently meant that they had to spend evening hours catching up on the day's work interrupted by visits. These figures also show a gradual increase in the number of individuals receiving special assistance.

Most embassies appoint so-called control officers responsible for seeing that VIP's are assisted in completing their assignments. In Germany last year, an incomplete report indicates that at least 40 officers were assigned during 1955 to take care of visiting groups and individuals in the VIP category. In Madrid no less than 21 control officers were appointed to take care of 393 congressional visitors and 228 Government visitors. These officers had salaries ranging from some $5,000 to $14,000 per year. In Paris, it has been necessary to establish a full-time office to assist the large number of VIP's traveling through Paris.

Mr. President, when representatives of the Department of State appear before the Committee on Appropriations this year, I shall ask them to give us an estimate of the total official man-hours devoted to helping VIP's as they travel all over the world. I suspect that the figure will be startling. My survey has covered only four posts in Europe. If one were to add to the totals the number of Congressmen and high ranking Government officials visiting such spots as Tokyo, Formosa, the Middle East, southeast Asia, and Latin America, and consider the time given to help them in their studies, I suspect one might well wonder how the men and women at those Embassies have time enough left to carry on their regular duties. It is my hope that when we consider the appropriations for the Department of State, we will keep closely in mind this aspect of the work of the Department which we often overlook.

Let me say in conclusion that, as a recipient of some of this assistance, I have appreciated it deeply. I do not think I could have done my work properly as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations without the help of many able men and women in the Foreign Service of the United States. Although they serve primarily to represent the United States abroad and to report to the Secretary of State on foreign policy problems, it is important that they help members of the legislative and the executive branches of the Government as they undertake official duties abroad. It is as important that they help us to understand our neighbors as that they interpret our neighbors to us.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that we will have the facts I have presented clearly before us when we consider the State Department appropriations this year.

ADMINISTRATION'S POWER POLICIES THREATEN FUTURE OF ALUMINUM INDUSTRY IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great and burgeoning aluminum industry was getting started in the Pacific Northwest under the previous national administration. It brought 85,000 new jobs to a region which confronted an economic crisis, in the loss of much of its old virgin-growth timber.

Today, under the present administration, this aluminum development in the Northwest has been halted. A few weeks ago, the Kaiser Metals Co. announced that it would expand in the Ohio Valley, using steam-generated power, rather than near hydroelectric sites in the Northwest.

Now, the great proposed Taiya aluminum project of the Aluminum Company of America, near Skagway, Alaska, has been shelved. Instead, Alcoa has plans for a project in the Ohio Valley, likewise burning bituminous coal to generate power from steam.

Ironically, the one future aluminum undertaking assured to the Northwest is the projected Harvey Metals plant at The Dalles, Oreg., under a power contract negotiated during the Truman administration by Bonneville Power Administrator Paul J. Raver, a contract, incidentally, which my predecessor in the Senate has attacked as a major mistake.

Between 1940 and 1952, the Northwest went from a region which did not produce an ounce of aluminum to an area responsible for nearly half of all the aluminum production in the United States. The sole reason, of course, was abundant low-cost power from such dams as Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and McNary.

Now, the aluminum expansion—with its payrolls, property taxes, local buying of supplies and general community betterment—is stopped, perhaps permanently.

What are the reasons? They are amply clear. This administration has put a halt to new Federal power projects. The great Hells Canyon site, for example, has been surrendered to Idaho Power Co. for piecemeal and less-than-full development. Compare the Idaho Power industrial rate with that of the Bonneville Federal system. Bonneville's industrial rate averages 2.12 mills per kilowatt-hour, that of Idaho Power averages approximately 8 mills.

Furthermore, our relations with Canada have so bogged down under the chairmanship of ex-Governor Jordan, of Idaho, on the International Joint Commission that all hope of projects like Taiya, which require mutual pacts with Canada, are fast evaporating. Ex-Governor Jordan, as Idaho's Governor and still today, has been an outspoken foe of Federal power developments in the Northwest.

Mr. President, my home region will suffer for decades from the fact that this administration has throttled and choked off the power program that had made possible vast expansion of aluminum plants in the Northwest. Now, this expansion is stopped in the Northwest and, instead, is occurring in the Ohio Valley and elsewhere. Even should a new national administration finally get our power program back on the trolley, it is possible that aluminum production will have been rooted to Ohio and elsewhere for a good many years to come. Can we ever get back to where we were?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD with my remarks an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 16, 1956, comparing administration power policy in the Colorado Basin with that in the Columbia Basin, and a news item from the Juneau, Alaska, Independent of April 1, 1956, describing the abandonment of the Taiya project by the Aluminum Company of America.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 16, 1956]

YES AND NO

President Eisenhower spoke some words of excellent wisdom in signing the upper Colorado River development act. He said it represented "something I believe in" because it treated river valleys as a whole thing.

The puzzle is that Mr. Eisenhower, while enunciating this fine principle for the Colorado, does not apply it elsewhere.

One of the President's appointees, General Vogel, Chairman of the TVA board, is busily engaged in an effort to weaken the first application of the unified-development principle to an American river valley.

Another of President Eisenhower's appointees, Secretary McKay, who has just resigned to run for the Senate from Oregon, has been throwing the unified-development principle to the wolves in the Columbia River Valley.

How can these contradictions between the Colorado, Tennessee, and Columbia Valleys—between words and actions—be explained? Thomas L. Stokes discusses this apparent enigma in an illuminating column on the opposite page.

The $33 million Federal project at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia at the Idaho-Oregon line, was defaulted by Mr. McKay to the Idaho Power Co. 3 years ago. One of the principal reasons he gave was that "the cost * * * is not small and bears examination in the light of present efforts to balance the national budget."

Yet the cost of the upper Colorado project is twice as great—$760 million—and President Eisenhower was advocating its adoption even before the announcement of a balanced budget.

Why this double standard for different areas?

The partial and piecemeal development on the Columbia which President Eisenhower has so far viewed with complacency is wasteful of natural resources. It wastes an electric-power potential estimated to be as large as the entire prime-power output of Bonneville Dam, on the Columbia. It wastes this power potential in a power-hungry region whose development will be retarded by anything less than full realization of its waterpower.

Private design, construction, and operation of three small dams at this site of a key project of the overall Federal development program will break up the very unification which Mr. Eisenhower finds so essential on the upper Colorado.

This obstructionism has been the objective of bitterly antipublic-power private utilities toward unified river valley developments generally. It has been pursued persistently in the Central Valley of California. If the Federal Government gives in to it elsewhere as at Hells Canyon, TVA will become the last unified development in this country as well as having been the first.

Nobody actually opposes unified development, as such, any longer; it makes too much sense. When are we going to start practicing what we preach in the Columbia and other river valleys?

[From the Juneau (Alaska) Independent of April 1, 1956]

ALASKA PROJECT SHELVED

The Aluminum Company of America has shelved plans for the $400 million power and manufacturing establishment which it announced in 1952 it planned to build near Skagway, the New York Times said last week.

The Times said Alcoa officials, who remained optimistic for several years after Canadian authorities refused permission to divert Yukon River waters for the so-called Taiya Project, now acknowledge that the project is dead.

"If the Canadians changed their minds now," an Alcoa official was quoted by the Times, "we'd have to restudy the whole situation in the light of other developments." He said these included technological improvements in the use of coal and rising transportation costs.

The Times said the clincher in the Alcoa's decision to drop Taiya seemed to be its announcement in the company's annual report that plans were well advanced for a smelter in the Ohio Valley which would be powered by bituminous and lower-grade coals.

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my good friend from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the fact that on April 16 the Senate considered Joint Resolution 97, which sought to increase the amount of United States contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization.

On that date I offered an amendment the effect of which would have been to limit the amount of United States contributions to those organizations to the same percentage of their total budgets as this Nation had contributed during the present year. It will be remembered that this percentagewise contribution, in the case of the FAO, was 31.5 percent of the total budget, and, in the case of the ILO, 25 percent. The purpose of my amendment was to freeze American contributions at those percentages. During the course of the debate, my good friend from Montana suggested a maximum of 33⅓ percent instead. I asked my friend from Montana whether or not the Committee on Foreign Relations had been unanimous in agreeing upon 33⅓ percent as the maximum. I was informed that it had been. Because of that fact, and because I understood the Senate was anxious to conclude consideration of the bill on the day on which we discussed the amendment, I readily consented to a compromise whereby the amounts fixed in the resolution remained at $3 million for FAO and $3 million for the ILO, with the proviso that if those increased amounts were used they would not represent more than 33⅓ percent of the total budgets of those two agencies.

It was only upon the representations made to me by my good friend from Montana to the effect that the Committee on Foreign Relations was overwhelmingly opposed to any lower limitations that I agreed to the compromise. Later I found that I had been unintentionally misinformed. Subsequently the Fulbright amendment was adopted, which had the same effect as the amendment which I had offered on April 16.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Every word the Senator from Louisiana has said is correct, and I am glad the statement is in the RECORD.

I did give the Senator from Louisiana certain assurances, because it was my strong belief that the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Montana as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana had met with the approval of the full committee when we discussed the measure.

At this time I wish the RECORD to be clear that what was done originally was done in good faith, and that what was done finally in agreeing to the Fulbright amendment was, in fact and effect, the same as contemplated by the amendment offered earlier by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM FOR THE NATION'S HEALTH

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Congress has before it a comprehensive program for improving the Nation's health. This program has been recommended by President Eisenhower. in the April 19 issue of Roll Call, the Capitol Hill newspaper, there appears an article, prepared by me, which describes the various proposals of the President in the field of health which are now before the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN PROGRAM FOR THE NATION'S HEALTH

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, New Jersey)

Since the beginning of his administration, President Eisenhower has persistently emphasized the necessity for positive action in facing the health problems of the Nation. The President has recommended to the Congress a forward-looking, constructive, and well-balanced program for improving and expanding health facilities, research, training, and services for the benefit of all our people.

The following par[illegible] of the President's program have been approved by one or both Houses of Congress:

The Polio Vaccine Assistance Act was passed during the current session of Congress to insure that no child or expectant mother will miss the necessary vaccine shots due to inability to pay.

A bill implementing the President's recommendation for periodic surveys on the incidence, duration, and effects of illness and disability throughout the country has passed the Senate and is before the House.

Revision and permanent extension of the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, as requested by the President, has also passed the Senate and is pending before the House. Its passage will insure that the Public Health Service will continue to assist the States in connection with the problems of pollution control.

RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEES

The following major recommendations of the President's health program are still before congressional committees.

An increase of at least 28 percent over present appropriations for medical research, with the major share of the additional funds devoted to increased research grants to medical schools, hospitals, and private laboratories.

A $250 million 5-year program for matching grants to assist in the construction of research and teaching facilities for schools of medicine, public health, osteopathy, dentistry, and various types of medical research.

Extension of the hospital survey and construction program to provide for the continued construction of chronic-disease hospitals, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic and treatment centers, with an increase of $19 million in the funds devoted to such purposes.

Mortgage insurance by the Federal Government on loans made by private lending institutions for the construction of health facilities.

A program to increase the training capacity of our nursing schools and to provide traineeships for graduate nurses in order to prepare them for positions as administrators, supervisors, and instructors and facilitate better utilization of our professional nurse supply.

Additional vocational-education grants to the States which could be utilized for practical nurse training as well as traineeships in other public-health specialties.

Matching Federal funds to assist the States and localities in medical care for the indigent aged, the blind, the totally and permanently disabled, and dependent children.

Special project grants to the States for demonstrations and new techniques for the care and treatment of mental patients, designed to reduce the duration of necessary treatment in mental hospitals.

Special grants for the extension and improvement of existing public-health programs and for special public-health projects, as well as consolidation of the present separate grant programs for general health and the control of venereal disease, tuberculosis, cancer, and heart disease, for greater flexibility.

Authorization for the Public Health Service to construct and maintain the necessary health facilities for our Indian population.

A PRACTICAL PROGRAM

I believe that the President's comprehensive program for meeting the problems of the Nation's health is a practical program designed to combine the expansion of necessary medical research, training, facilities, and services. In addition it preserves the traditional role of the Federal Government, as a partner, rather than a dominating authority.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am hopeful that considerable progress can be made by Congress in the current session to implement and enact the President's recommendations in the health field.

Certainly there can be little disagreement over the need for such legislation and its approval by the Congress will redound to the benefit of the whole country.

PAYING FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, this week has been designated Medical Education Week. It is a time for all Americans to give special thought to the problems we face in improving medical training and medical research facilities.

In connection with this important week I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 21 entitled "Paying for Medical Education."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYING FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

The National Fund for Medical Education, which campaigns for support for the 81 accredited medical schools in the country, has been promised $10 million in grants by the Ford Foundation. Since its establishment in 1949 the fund has tried to raise $10 million annually from industry, a sum that has proved beyond its reach and would in any case be insufficient to keep up with the growth of medical education in the United States. The Ford Foundation's generous gift, which is made on a matching basis and is to extend over no less than 5 and no more than 10 years, should stimulate the flow of private support to the medical schools and go far to realize the fund's endeavors.

Next week, from April 22 to April 28, is Medical Education Week. During that period the country will be asked to give thought to the high cost of medical training and the plight of those engaged in furnishing it. Recent figures show that more than 21,000 out of 28,000-odd medical teachers in the Nation are serving without pay. Generous contributions from the Ford Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, the Mellon family foundation, and other sources have helped greatly, but even these are not enough to pay the bill. Meanwhile, the drain of medical schools on university budgets has put a severe burden on the entire system of American higher education.

When the National Fund for Medical Education was organized, President Eisenhower (then president of Columbia University) declared: "It falls upon American business to assume a greater share of the responsibility for maintaining the institutions essential to our national health." The urgency of this appeal has not diminished in the years between. Medical Education Week will be an appropriate time to give it full and sympathetic consideration.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION'S EDITORS

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, as printed in the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 22, 1956, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago, when I last talked to you, stories from battlefields and fighting fronts crowded the front pages of our press. Human freedom was under direct assault in important sectors by the disciples of communistic dictatorship. Violence and aggression were brutal daily facts for millions of human beings. Fear of global war, of a nuclear holocaust, darkened the future. To many, the chance for a just and enduring peace seemed hopeless.

Today, only 3 years later, we have reason for cautious hope that a new, fruitful, a peaceful era for mankind can emerge from a haunted decade. The world breathes a little more easily today.

A PROMISE OF PEACE

The prudent man will not delude himself that his hope for peace guarantees the realization of peace. Even with genuine good will, time and effort will be needed to correct the injustices, to cure the dangerous sores that plague the earth today. And the future alone can show whether the Communists really want to move toward a just and stable peace.

Yet not for many years has there been such promise that patient, imaginative, enterprising effort could gradually be rewarded in steady decrease in the dread of war; in an economic surge that will raise the living standards of all the world; in growing confidence that liberty and justice will one day overcome statism; in the better understanding among all peoples that is the essential prelude to true peace.

This week marks the anniversary of one of the most important events in freedom's progress. One hundred and eighty-one years ago, on April 19, our forefathers started a revolution that still goes on. The shots at Concord, as Emerson wrote, were heard "round the world."

The echoes of Concord still stir men's minds.

The Bandung meeting, last year, of Asian and African leaders bears witness to Emerson's vision. There, almost two centuries after Concord, and halfway around the earth, President Sukarno of Indonesia opened the conference with an eloquent tribute to Paul Revere and to the spirit of the American Revolution.

Why do the musket shots of a few embattled farmers at the Concord Bridge still ring out in far-off lands?

The reason is clear.

IDEAS FOR MANKIND

Concord was far more than a local uprising to redress immediate grievances. The enduring meaning of Concord lies in the ideas that inspired the historic stand there. Concord is the symbol of certain basic convictions about the relationship of man to the state.

Those convictions were found in a firm belief in the spiritual worth of the individual. He must be free to think, to speak, and to worship according to conscience. He must enjoy equality before the law. He must have a fair chance to develop and use his talents. The purpose of government is to serve its citizens in freedom.

Our forefathers did not claim to have discovered novel principles. They looked on their findings as universal values, the common property of all mankind.

These deep convictions have always guided us as a Nation. They have taken deep root elsewhere in the Western World. In the 19th century they inspired a great surge of freedom throughout Western Europe and in our own hemisphere.

These ideas of freedom are still the truly revolutionary political principles abroad in the world. They appeal to the timeless aspirations of mankind. In some regions they flourish; in some they are officially outlawed. But everywhere, to some degree, they stir and inspire humanity.

The affairs of men do not stand still. The ideas of freedom will grow in vigor and influence—or they will gradually wither and die. If the area of freedom shrinks, the results for us will be tragic. Only if freedom continues to flourish will man realize the prosperity, the happiness, the enduring peace he seeks.

II

The appeal of the ideas of freedom has been shown dramatically during the past decade. In that time, 18 nations, totaling some 650 million people—a quarter of the human race—have gained independence.

In manifold ways these nations differ widely from each other and from us. They are the heirs of many ancient cultures and national traditions. All of the great religions of the world are found among them. Their peoples speak a hundred tongues.

Yet they share in common with all free countries the basic and universal values that inspired our Nation's founders.

They believe deeply in the right of self-government.

They believe deeply in the dignity of man.

They aspire to improve the welfare of the individual, as a basic aim of organized society.

The new nations have many of the sensitivities that marked our own early years as a free Nation. They are proud of their independence and quick to resent any slight to their sovereignty. Some of them are concerned to avoid involvement with other nations, as we were for many years.

Certainly we Americans should understand and respect these points of view. We must accept the right of each nation to choose its own path to the future.

IMMENSE DIFFICULTIES

All of these countries are faced with immense obstacles and difficulties. Freedom and human dignity must rest upon a satisfactory economic base. Yet in many of these nations, incomes average less than $100 per year. Abject poverty blinds men's eyes to the beauty of freedom's ideals. Hopelessness makes men prey to any promise of better existence, even the most false and spurious.

Ofttimes the peoples of these countries expected independence itself to produce rapid material progress. Their political leaders are therefore under heavy pressure to find shortcuts and quick answers to the problems facing them.

Under these conditions, we cannot expect that the vision of a free society will go unchallenged. The Communists, aware of unsatisfied desires for better conditions of life, falsely pretend they can rapidly solve the problems of economic development and industrialization. They hold the Soviet Union as a model and a guide. But the Communists conceal the terrible human costs that characterize their ruthless system of dictatorship and forced labor.

We have a vital interest in assuring that newly independent nations preserve and consolidate the free institutions of their choice.

The prospects for peace are brightest when enlightened self-governing peoples control the policy of nations. Peoples do not want war. Rulers beyond the reach of popular control are more likely to engage in reckless adventures and to raise the grim threat of war. The spread of freedom enhances the prospect for durable peace.

THE RETREAT TO CHAOS

That prospect would be dimmed or destroyed should freedom be forced into steady retreat. Then the remaining free societies, our own among them, would one day find themselves beleaguered and imperiled. We would face once again the dread prospect of paying dearly in blood for our own survival.

In every corner of the globe, it is far less costly to sustain freedom than to recover it when lost.

Moreover, our own well-being is bound up in the well-being of other free nations. We cannot prosper in peace if we are isolated from the rest of the world. If our economy is to continue to flourish and grow, our Nation will need more trade, not less. The steady growth of other nations, especially the less-developed countries, will create new and growing demands for goods and services. It will produce an environment which will benefit both them and us.

Indeed, Atlanta, Pittsburgh, Seattle—every American town and farm—has a stake in the success or failure of these new nations—a stake almost impossible to exaggerate.

If these new nations are to achieve economic progress with freedom, they will have to provide many of the necessary ingredients for themselves.

Only these peoples and their leaders can supply the initiative and determination essential for success. And they must mobilize the larger part of the resources they require.

LAC TRAINED MEN

But these nations are gravely lacking in trained men for management, production, education, and the professions. Their institutions for such training are limited. Hence they are handicapped in trying to extend modern techniques to agriculture, industry, and other fields.

They also face shortages of capital and foreign exchange, even though they strain to mobilize their own resources. Private foreign investment should be utilized as much as feasible; but for many areas it will clearly fall short of the requirements. Moreover, their task of improving conditions of life is made the more difficult by their large and steadily increasing populations.

Inevitably these nations must look abroad for assistance, as ours did for so many years. They want help, first of all, in real and enduring friendship. They want help in training skilled people and in securing investment capital to supplement their own resources. For such help they will look to us as the most prosperous and advanced economy of the world.

Foresight will compel an understanding response from us. In our own enlightened interest we can and must do much to help others in pursuit of their legitimate aspirations.

Further, we must recognize that economic and technical assistance cannot be a transitory policy. The problems of economic progress are not to be solved in a single spurt. Our efforts must be sustained over a number of years.

LONG-TERM ASSISTANCE

To do the most good, some part of our material help will have to be furnished on a long-term basis which these nations can plan on. For some purposes, commitments on a strictly annual basis are not sufficient. It takes time to complete major projects like hydroelectric and reclamation developments. If the new nations can plan on some part of our help for several years, they will be better able to mobilize resources of their own and assistance from others.

Furthermore our assistance must be used flexibly to fit needs and plans as they develop. We must be ready to adapt our help promptly to meet changing conditions.

The development program for mutual security now before the Congress is based on these considerations. It seeks from the Congress the additional authority that would add essential flexibility and continuity to a part—a modest part—of the program. The amounts requested are the practicable minimum. In its entirety it is not, I assure you, an excessive program. It is in our national interest, in the fullest sense of that term.

III

The ideas of freedom are at work, even where they are officially rejected. As we know, Lenin and his successors, true to Communist doctrine, based the Soviet state on the denial of these ideas. Yet the new Soviet rulers who took over 3 years ago have had to reckon with the force of these ideas, both at home and abroad.

The situation the new regime inherited from the dead Stalin apparently caused it to reappraise many of his mistakes.

Having lived under his one-man rule, they have espoused the concept of "collective" dictatorship. But dictatorship it still remains. They have denounced Stalin for some of the more flagrant excesses of his brutal rule. But the individual citizen still lacks the most elementary safeguards of a free society. The desire for a better life is still being sacrificed to the insatiable demands of the state.

In foreign affairs, the new regime has seemingly moderated the policy of violence and hostility which has caused the free nations to band together to defend their independence and liberties. For the present, at least, it relies more on political and economic means to spread its influence abroad. In the last year, it has embarked upon a campaign of lending and trade agreements directed especially toward the newly developing countries.

It is still too early to assess in any final way whether the Soviet regime wishes to provide a real basis for stable and enduring relations.

Despite the changes so far, much of Stalin's foreign policy remains unchanged. The major international issues which have troubled the postwar world are still unsolved. More basic changes in Soviet policy will have to take place before the free nations can afford to relax their vigilance.

IV

At Concord, our forebears undertook the struggle for freedom in this country. History has now called us to special tasks for sustaining and advancing this great cause in the world.

As we take stock of our position and of the problems that lie ahead, we must chart our course by three main guidelines:

First, we must maintain a collective shield against aggression to allow the free peoples to seek their valued goals in safety.

We can take some cautious comfort in the signs that the Soviet rulers may have relegated military aggression to the background and adopted less violent methods to promote their aims. Nevertheless, Soviet military power continues to grow. Their forces are being rapidly modernized and equipped with nuclear weapons and long-range delivery systems.

So long as freedom is threatened and armaments are not controlled, it is essential for us to keep a strong military establishment ourselves and strengthen the bonds of collective security.

Without help from us, many of our allies could not afford to equip and maintain the forces needed for self-defense. Assistance to them is part of our proper contribution to the systems of common defense. If those systems did not exist, we would have to bear much greater costs ourselves. Thus in aiding our allies, the mutual security program also advances our own security interests.

We hold our military strength only to guard against aggression, and to insure that the world remains at peace. War in our time has become an anachronism. Whatever the case in the past, war in the future can serve no useful purpose. A war which became general, as any limited action might, could only result in the virtual destruction of mankind.

MUST REDUCE ARMAMENTS

Hence our search must be unceasing for a system to regulate and reduce armaments under reliable safeguards. So far, the Soviet Union has refused to accept such safeguards. But even now we are earnestly negotiating toward this end. The problems involved are difficult and complex. We cannot afford to underestimate them. But we cannot slacken our efforts to lift the burden of armaments and to remove their threat.

If effective measures of disarmament could be agreed upon, think how the world could be transformed. Atomic energy used for peace—not war—could bring about the development of a new industrial age. Far more human energy and output could be devoted to reducing poverty and need. To that end, as I said to you 3 years ago, we would "join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved from disarmament to a fund for world aid and construction."

Of even more importance, the pall of mutual suspicions, fear and hatred that covers the earth would be swept away in favor of confidence, prosperity, and human happiness.

Our second guideline: Within the free community, we must be a helpful and considerate partner in creating conditions where freedom will flourish.

ARMS HOLD WORLD BACK

Beyond defense, the crucial task of the free nations is to work together in constructive ways to advance the welfare of their peoples. Arms alone can give the world no permanent peace, no confident security. Arms are solely for defense—to protect from violent assault what we already have. They are only a costly insurance. They cannot add to human progress. Indeed, no matter how massive, arms by themselves would not prevent vital sections of the world from falling prey to Communist blandishment or subversion.

If we are to preserve freedom here—it must likewise thrive in other important areas of the earth. For the welfare of ourselves and others, we must therefore help the rest of the free world achieve its aspirations. For our mutual benefit, we must join in building for greater future prosperity, for more human liberty and for lasting peace.

Within the Atlantic community, our aim must be to strengthen the close bonds which have steadily developed since the war. On Monday next, the Secretary of State will speak on this topic.

In the less developed nations, the urgent need is for economic and social progress for their peoples. Tonight I have spoken particularly about the new nations of Asia and Africa, which face such urgent problems. Of equal importance is continuing progress in other areas, especially by our neighbors in Latin America who are our fast friends. These developing nations need the full measure of our help in understanding and resources.

PROGRESS AND TRADE

The steady progress of the free world also depends on the healthy flow of peaceful trade. Our example will be of crucial importance in freeing the channels of such trade from wasteful restraints. We can take an important step to that end by joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Our national interest will be served by passage of the legislation for that purpose now pending in the Congress.

Another important task is in helping to resolve disputes between friends we value highly. Such disputes impair the unity of the free nations and impede their advance. In these situations, each side would like the United States to back its point of view without reservation. But for us to do so could seldom contribute to the settling of the disputes. It would only sharpen the bitter enmities between the opposing sides and impair our value in helping to reach a fair solution.

Our aim and effort must be to assist in tempering the fears and antagonisms which lead to such disputes.

My words apply with special force to the troubled area of the Middle East. We will do all in our power—through the United Nations whenever possible—to prevent resort to violence there. We are determined to support and assist any nation in that area which might be subject to aggression. We will strive untiringly to build the foundations for stable peace in the whole region.

In these and many other constructive ways, our Nation must help to build an environment congenial to freedom.

THE THIRD GUIDE LINE

Our third guide line is this: We must seek, by every peaceful means, to induce the Soviet bloc to correct existing injustices and genuinely to pursue peaceful purposes in its relations with other nations.

As I have said, many of the wrongs of Stalin against other nations still prevail under his successors. Despite the efforts of the West at Berlin and Geneva, Germany is still divided by the Soviet veto of free all-German elections. The satellite nations of Eastern Europe are still ruled by Soviet puppets. In Asia, Korea remains divided, and stable peace has not yet been achieved.

We must be tireless in our efforts to remedy these injustices and to resolve the disputes that divide the world. These knotty problems will yield to patient and sincere effort. We stand ready to explore all avenues for their just settlement. We will not grow weary in our quest for peaceful remedies for the enslavement or wrongful division of once-free nations.

The interests and purposes of the United States and of the free world do not conflict with the legitimate interests of the Russian nation or the aspirations of its people. A Soviet Government genuinely devoted to these purposes can have friendly relations with the United States and the free world for the asking. We will welcome that day.

V

We cannot doubt that the current of world history flows toward freedom. In the long run dictatorship and despotism must give way. We can take courage from that sure knowledge.

But as a wise American, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said: "The inevitable comes to pass through effort." We should take these words to heart in our quest for peace and freedom. These great aspirations of humanity will be brought about—but only by devoted human effort.

Concord is a symbol of the faith, courage, and sacrifice on which the victory of freedom depends. We in our day must strive with the same dedication that brought the militiamen to the Concord Bridge. If we do so, freedom will surely prevail.

SOVIET LEADER'S BOASTS ON GUIDED MISSILE AND HYDROGEN BOMB DEVELOPMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all the people of the United States look forward hopefully and prayerfully to peace, and so indeed do all the peoples of the free world.

By the same token, the American people and the Government of the United States intend to keep their Military Establishment strong and to prepare their defenses to constitute a powerful deterrent to aggression, and a sure means to protect our freedom.

Earlier today, in Birmingham, England, Mr. Khrushchev made a speech, and I wish to refer very briefly to a paragraph or two of that speech as reported by the wire services:

Soviet Communist Party Boss Nikita Khrushchev boasted that the Soviet Union is building a guided missile with a hydrogen warhead.

The Soviet Communist leader told British businessmen that the western embargo on strategic goods is not preventing Soviet arms progress.

"Do you really think you are ahead of us?" he asked.

"If you want to discuss the hydrogen bomb, it remains a fact that we were the first to explode the H-bomb from a plane. The Americans are only intending to."

Later in a speech to civil leaders and businessmen at the British industries fair:

"Great stress is being laid on guided missiles. We can compete there, too. I am quite sure we shall have a guided missile with a hydrogen bomb warhead quickly. And, in spite of that, you do not want to trade with us."

Mr. President, some persons in our country desire and publicly advocate that our thermonuclear tests be abandoned. Some of those persons are good but mistaken; others are neither good nor mistaken.

The President of the United States has demonstrated to all the world that this country devoutly prays for peace and desires to work in conjunction with all other free peoples, indeed, with all the world, in achieving an enduring peace, a peace with justice. But it is wrong for people to advocate that now we junk our program of research and tests in the thermonuclear field.

In my judgment, the tests should go on. I am sure the American people agree with the President of the United States in his philosophy that our defenses must continue to be strengthened, not upon the basis of warmongering, but upon the basis of the needs of defense of freedom both in the United States and around the world.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to commend the Senator from California for his forthright statement on the subject of the defense of our country. Those people who are being taken in by some of the phony olive branches which from time to time are extended really need to have their heads examined in the light of the speech referred to by the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. While the distinguished Senator from California was delivering his very pertinent and important remarks, I could not help wondering, although the Senator did not refer to anyone by name, if one of the individuals he had in mind was shown in a photograph about 4 years ago with a hole in his shoes. Would I be correct in making my assumption?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not know to whom the Senator refers. I make my comments today as a United States Senator who desires to give his unstinting support to our President, in exactly the same fashion that the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the President pro tempore, who now presides over the Senate, has done in the field of defense and foreign relations.

In this field the Senate has spoken, not upon a partisan basis, but upon the American basis. I make my comments today as an American.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to finish my comment. I did not mean to infer by my remarks that the Senator from California was not adhering closely to a nonpartisan approach to this subject. I am sorry that he construed

my remarks as such. All I desired to say was that possibly the gentleman I have in mind, who was pictured as having a hole in his shoes, might now be having the experience of having had that hole move up to the other extremity. [Laughter.]

THE PROBLEM OF SURPLUSES AND A SOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to pay my respects to a group of farmers of the Delmarva Peninsula. As is true with many other segments of American agriculture who face the problem of surpluses the poultry industry on the Delmarva Peninsula has likewise recently been faced with the problem of too many broilers and low prices.

Instead of coming to Washington and asking the Government to bail them out last Friday evening a group of poultrymen held a promotional affair at Salisbury, Md., in an effort to solve their own problems.

Farmers from the three States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia joined together as a Delmarva group and purchased $100 tickets, thus raising a fund for the purpose of advertising their product and moving it into domestic channels of trade. The success of the affair is best shown by the fact that 862 farmers made contributions, and that the total amount raised was $86,200, all of this to be used for the promotion of sales of poultry.

At that meeting the farmers emphasized the fact that they were not asking the United States Government to support or subsidize their product. Although they may have too much poultry on hand at the moment, they said they are confident that with the grade of poultry they are producing they will be able to dispose of it with the help of some additional advertising. They are determined to store the surplus poultry in the stomachs of consumers instead of in Government warehouses.

Mr. President, in this day when so many segments of our agriculture are looking to the Government to solve their problems, it is gratifying to find a group with enough American initiative to sell their own products.

It is well to note that as a result of close industry cooperation the Delmarva farmers are now sending to the markets the highest grade of poultry produced, under the most rigid inspections of any area in the country.

They approach their problem on the basis that if they give the American consumer a reasonably priced product of exceptionally good quality there will be no surplus.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Delaware has had to say about this matter. When a group of poultry farmers, who have suffered as a result of low prices and the conditions involving their industry, join together at a $100-a-plate dinner to help finance their own promotional plan and exclude any help from the Government, it is certainly commendable. I am glad the Senator from Delaware has brought it to our attention.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I am very happy to have heard the remarks made by the Senator from Delaware. I remember the days when the poultry industry was really up against it, so to speak, and they did not come to the Federal Government for any assistance. They have never come to the Federal Government for any assistance. I think that is a very shining point about which to rally in these days when so many persons are willing to come rushing to Washington for aid. I think it is an excellent demonstration of Americanism and free enterprise in action.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Maryland. Many of his own constituents and also many poultrymen in Virginia are members of the association. Working together they are doing a marvelous job.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; and may I say to the Senator, they are all persons who are of the old school who believe in taking care of themselves and not in running to Washington all the time with their hats in their hands.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, and I think other segments of our agriculture could well study this record.

All that the poultrymen ask the Government to do is not subsidize their competitors and destroy their markets. If beef and pork are distributed freely throughout the country under some other program it cannot help but eliminate some of their sales and disrupt normal channels of trade. It would be unfair to the poultry industry, which asks no subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very glad that the poultrymen of the Delmarva Peninsula have taken the action which they have taken. I think they will find it to be one of the best investments they have ever made. I think we may look at what the dairy people of this country have done since they stopped looking to the Government to supply a market for all their production. Last year they spent approximately $2 million to promote the increased use of dairy products, and, largely as a result of this action, the income of the dairy people of the United States increased $200 million in 1955 over the year 1954.

I understand that this year they are planning to raise about $6 million to $6,500,000 to be used for the same purpose. I shall be very much surprised if the money invested does not return them a hundredfold. I am willing to predict now that the income of the dairy people of the United States this year will be $500 million or $600 million more than it was last year; and it will be almost wholly due to their own efforts and to the fact that they are willing to promote their own products.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it emphasizes the fact that the eastern farmers recognize that the solution of their problems does not lie in the Congress of the United States but largely through the cooperation of their own membership.

The poultry growers of the three States of the Delmarva Peninsula are to be commended. The money was raised not by two or three large groups. It was raised by all segments of the industry, all of the poultrymen admitting that they are at the moment having to sell their poultry a little below cost of production, but they feel that by properly advertising their product and maintaining its quality they can move it. They know they cannot solve their problem by storing their product in Government storehouses, but they have enough confidence in the quality of their broilers being produced on the Delmarva Peninsula to believe that if properly called to the attention of the American consumers there will be a shortage rather than a surplus.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING THE LATE AMELIA EARHART

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there is much interest in our Nation in the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring the late Amelia Earhart.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I introduced a resolution to this effect a year ago, and I have just read a very splendid editorial from the Kansas City Star, issue of April 7, entitled "Tomboy on a Stamp?"

This editorial mentions many of the achievements of Amelia Earhart. For instance, she was the first woman to fly the Atlantic, the first woman to fly the Pacific, the winner of the Distinguished Flying Cross, the first woman to pierce 14,000 feet. There is no doubt but what she was trying to make another record by being the first woman to fly around the world. It was on this trip that Amelia Earhart and her plane disappeared in the far-off South Pacific and nothing has been heard of it since.

The issuance of this stamp would meet with great favor in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOMBOY ON A STAMP?

First woman to fly the Atlantic; first woman to fly the Pacific; winner of the Distinguished Flying Cross; first woman to pierce 14,000 feet. And so the headlines read year after year until the early hours of July 2, 1937. Amelia Earhart disappeared that morning in the far-off South Pacific and a legend, born a decade before, swept on to new heights.

Amelia Earhart apparently died in her effort to be the first woman to fly around the earth. An armada of rescue ships and planes went to her rescue, but no trace was ever found, giving rise to two theories: Her plane crashed into the sea or the Japanese killed her to protect island military rearmaments. Now almost two decades later, the debate persists.

In any list of attractive American heroines, Miss Earhart would surely have a place. So naturally her name comes up with a discussion of women on postage stamps. A short while ago an editorial in these columns pointed to a foreign trend to grace stamps with the likes of Grace Kelly and Elizabeth

of England. And why not Amelia Earhart, quickly replied the Topeka Stamp Club? Well, why not? If America is to follow suit, the tousled-haired Kansas tomboy would certainly be a likely candidate.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRAINAGE WORKS AND OTHER ITEMS ON FEDERAL RECLAMATION AND LIKE PROJECTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6268) to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on March 18, the Senate passed H. R. 6268, relating to drainage construction and completion of minor work on reclamation projects, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. On April 10, the House disagreed to the Senate amendment and asked for a conference. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House has insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2286) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BONNER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. ROBESON of Virginia, Mr. TOLLEFSON, and Mr. ALLEN of California were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) to print as a document a pamphlet entitled "A Handbook for Americans."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4909) relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks;

S. 1194. An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 2796. An act for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel;

H. R. 2948. An act for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrelia;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis);

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Lois O. Jennings;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Antonio Penna;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges;

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 23, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks;

S. 1194. An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

DEPARTMENT ON INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed; and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9390) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Office of the Solicitor", on page 2, at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$2,800,000" and insert "$2,835,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Minerals Mobilization," on page 3, line 6, after the word "fuels", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Land Management—Management of Lands and Resources," on page 3, line 17, after the word "lands", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$18,738,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 4, line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "thirty-one."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Indian Affairs—Education and Welfare Services," on page 6, line 12, after the word "museums", to strike out "$50,700,000" and insert "$50,720,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Resources Management," on page 6, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$16,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 7, at

the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$7,740,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 8, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "two hundred and seventy passenger motor vehicles (of which two hundred and fifty shall be for replacement only)" and insert "two hundred and ninety passenger motor vehicles (of which two hundred and seventy shall be for replacement only)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Geological Survey—Surveys, Investigations, and Research," on page 11, line 1, after the word "activities," to strike out "and the preparation of plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.;" and insert "and for the Geological Survey or the General Services Administration to acquire a site and to prepare plans and specifications for a building or buildings to meet the special needs of the Geological Survey in the metropolitan area of Washington, District of Columbia, without regard to Revised Statutes, page 3709, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5), and section 302 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U. S. C. 252 (c))."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 11, line 21, after the word "hundred", to insert "and twenty-six."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources," on page 13, line 1, after the word "deposits", strike out "$15,363,000" and insert "$17,363,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Park Service—Management and Protection," on page 14, line 24, after the word "Basin", to strike out "$11,480,000" and insert "$11,537,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 14, line 24, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon, for himself and on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 24, in lieu of the amount proposed by the committee, it is proposed to insert "$11,631,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to discuss the amendment to the committee amendment, I desire to make a general statement on the bill.

I shall discuss the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation for 1957, and in particular the provisions covering our public lands, national forests, and parks, because these programs are so vital to the West.

I think the administration has performed a gross disservice toward the Congress by sending budget estimates which do not reflect accurately what the budget and receipts picture will be, and I further think that it has failed to make a request for funds which are vitally needed. Few better examples exist than the budget for the Forest Service.

Our western national forests do more than supply timber for sawmills and recreation for campers. One of the most important functions the forests perform is to furnish the West with the water upon which our urban and rural populations are equally dependent. The national forests are 21 percent of the land area of the West, and they provide 53 percent of the average water production. In Oregon 29 percent of the land is in national forests, but 44 percent of the water production comes from these lands. The way we manage these Federal holdings, and the protection which we in Congress can help supply through adequate funds, will decide whether these lands will provide the people with the right amount of water of good quality when they need it. As I talk of timber and access roads, I do not ever want to have anyone forget that I consider sound management for watershed values the primary goal of the Forest Service. Access roads are a tool of timber management, and the proper conduct of timber management is a tool of watershed development and protection. They are all closely linked, and one program cannot be properly carried out without the other.

In the Pacific Northwest our national forests deposit $2 in the Treasury for every dollar expended, and I emphasize that this computation is not arrived at by any juggling of the books. It includes all the expenditures made by the Forest Service in the Northwest, for fire protection and all other activities which are connected with the administration of these Federal properties.

PUBLIC CAMPGROUNDS

The committee recommends an increase of $4,395,500 over the budget estimate. It has increased the funds for the care of public campgrounds by $1,805,500 over the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. When I testified before the Appropriations Committee I pointed out that the budget provided only 1.3 cents for each person in the United States. The committee increase is a good one; it means an expenditure of about 3 cents per person. I think the committee has done good work, when we consider the type of information the administration made available. The committee has told the Bureau of the Budget to send up a realistic program next year, and I shall continue to support heartily this request.

REFORESTATION, REVEGETATION, AND REHABILITATION

The committee recommends an increase of $620,000 for the reforestation of national forest lands, of $500,000 for range revegetation, and of $250,000 for the rehabilitation of badly eroded areas in the national forests. These increases are slightly greater than those I urged, and I think that fact illustrates the conservativeness of my proposal. There are also increases for wildlife and range management which are long overdue. I requested that a small amount be allowed in the budget for acquisition of scattered tracts in the national forest to enable the Forest Service to improve its management, and I am glad to see that the committee made this allowance.

I am particularly pleased with the increases in the State and private forestry programs, although they will be of greater benefit to the East than to the West.

My service on the Commission of International Governmental Relations reinforced my conviction of the need to promote sound forestry and the protection of forest lands all over the country. The Commission recommended that forest tree-planting support be withdrawn by the Federal Government. I dissented from that recommendation. I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations upon its wisdom in increasing the money available for fire protection by almost $3 million, by increasing the money for tree planting by $500,000, and the funds available for forest management advice by $300,000. I testified in behalf of these increases, particularly with respect to tree planting, and I state again that I think the committee's action was wise.

The budget request for a vital item known as timber resource management was $9,807,000. That is the heart of the Forest Service operating program, because it is these funds which are used for timber sale work. This amount represented an increase of $1.6 million over last year's budget, and I point out that last year's actual budget was not the administration's proposed budget but the Senate budget, because the Senate provided substantial increases in this item last year. Now the administration proposes a $1.6 million increase, and the committee has allowed every cent of it, I myself think it would have been good business to increase this item by another $200,000, because every dollar appropriated will bring back $10 more than the actual cost of administering the timber sale program. It is this timber sale money which has enabled the national forests in the Northwest to develop a record of $2 in income for every $1 spent on all the national forest programs.

I requested that the committee make special provision to furnish more money for timber access roads in the national forests, even though the amount being requested was the full authorization. Mr. President, I intend to keep hammering on this subject and to make a record on it, because the access roads are the backbone of a system of sound forestry. In the almost 4 years the present administration has been in office, the access roads authorization has risen from $22½ million to $24 million a year, but it did not reach that point because of anything the administration did. I was a member of the Committee on Public Works in the 83d Congress and led the fight in the committee which resulted in the increased authorization. There is an increasing recognition of the value of access roads, and the bill I have introduced, if enacted, or if kept in the road bill, as I urged before the House committee, will enable the Government to go forward with the sort of program which should be undertaken.

I think also the committee should be supported by the Senate in every action taken with respect to the Bureau of Land Management budget and providing for the full amount requested. Last fall both the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I called upon the Secretary of the Interior to submit a realistic budget for this money-making agency. I suggested some amounts for his guidance. We got a budget which represents a step toward providing the money needed, and I believe that the full allowance is completely justified.

I emphasize to my colleagues from those sections of the country which do not have extensive Federal lands that the importance of these programs reaches to them. Fifty-seven percent of the timber in the West is in Federal ownership, but only 7 percent of the timber in the East is in Federal ownership. The western Federal forest lands are capable of making a tremendous contribution to our economy, far beyond that which they are now making. They supply revenues greatly in excess of the money which is spent on them. If they are developed as they should be, the entire Nation will benefit.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has proved once again that he is a great and effective champion, not only of the West, but of the entire Nation, when it comes to the matter of natural resource practices and development. For that matter, he has repeatedly demonstrated his understanding and sympathy for the needs of Oregon and their relationship to a sound national economy.

Now I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arizona in regard to the pending amendment. It involves only a slight amount of money; and here again I am not fighting alone for the interests of my State in connection with this particular item, but I am fighting for the Nation in an effort to preserve and conserve and protect some of the great cultural values which will be lost unless the increase I am proposing in the appropriation shall be made.

To use an illustration, I speak, for example, of the petroglyph problem that exists in connection with the dams which may be constructed. The information on which I make my argument is information which comes from great anthropologists in America, the chief spokesman for whom in regard to this particular amendment happens to be Dr. L. S. Cressman, chairman of the anthropology department of the University of Oregon, who is recognized as one of our greatest living anthropologists in the field of research activities which are conducted in an effort to get out of the ground the record of lost generations of mankind.

The Interior Department appropriation bill as passed by the House provided $50,000 for archeological investigation in Federal reservoir sites outside the Missouri Basin. It was testified that an additional $119,000—which is what my amendment provides—would be necessary to do the work with any adequacy, including $30,000 for research in the Dalles area. The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends an increase of only $25,000 with no allocation to any specific project.

I am informed that in the committee meeting, a member of the staff pointed out that an additional $119,000 was needed for this work throughout the country, and the committee does have the list of the names of the projects where the money is needed.

I understand the committee decided upon $25,000, leaving it to the discretion of the National Park Service to spend it where most needed. I think that is a mistake, because I do not believe the National Park Service should be placed in that position. In particular, directing my attention to the problem which is involved in the Dalles Dam situation, this is the last year in which we can possibly get the historic record of civilizations that we know lived in the great Columbia Basin long before this country was discovered.

On February 27, 1956, I submitted to the committee a letter on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], which I shall read, because it sets forth the problem which confronts us. The letter reads as follows:

Many residents of Oregon who are interested in archeological remains in the reservoir area behind the Dalles Dam have communicated with our offices strongly urging that appropriations be made for the fiscal year 1957 in order to salvage materials of tremendous historic significance, particularly petroglyphs and Indian mounds which will be inundated and lost for all time if they are not salvaged prior to the time at which the Dalles Reservoir is filled.

We note that the bill H. R. 9390 which passed the House of Representatives several days ago contains no specific item in the appropriations for the National Park Service which would make possible the carrying on of this particular archeological salvage work. We are advised by members of the professional staff of the Senate Appropriations Committee that the budget request of the National Park Service includes an item of $50,000 for archeological investigations but that investigations at the Dalles Dam area are not included.

We are sincerely of the opinion that the archeological remains at the Dallas Dam Reservoir area are not only of historical but also of scientific interest. The material appears to be unique and there is an indication that some sites in this specific area may date back as much as 10,000 years. Thus, it is possible that a long range of prehistory may be explored through materials to be salvaged from the reservoir area.

We have been reliably informed from a number of sources that the sum of $30,000 is a minimum amount which could be devoted to urgently needed work on petroglyph removals and the recovery of other archeological remains. The last mentioned sum would, by no means, enable a complete recovery job to be performed but it would enable the salvage of sufficent material to give students and experts in the subject sufficient information to piece together the entire historical situation.

Many organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce of The Dalles, Oreg., the Wasco County-Dalles County Museum Commission, members of the faculties of the University of Oregon and the University of Washington, and numerous public-spirited citizens who have a deep interest in the preservation of these historical materials have urged that funds be appropriated for this extremely worthwhile project, and have indicated their willingness to cooperate in every way possible.

The matter is urgent because if the funds are not appropriated for the fiscal year 1957, the historical materials will be inundated and will be lost to our generation and to posterity.

For the foregoing reasons, we respectfully urge the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to give serious consideration to this request in connection with its studies of the appropriation bill H. R. 9390.

The letter is signed by the two Senators from Oregon.

Mr. President, I also wish to read into the RECORD the essence of the testimony which I gave before the committee, because I think this testimony, along with the letter to the committee and the remarks which I have made, pretty well cover the point. Before the committee I said:

Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee to give serious consideration to increasing the amount allowed by the House on an item designated as "Salvage Archeology" for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

As the situation now stands, only $50,000 was recommended by the House to cover the salvage of historical and scientific materials in the vicinity of multipurpose dam projects now being constructed outside the Missouri River Basin. This amount is wholly inadequate, as will be noted in a moment. Unless it can be increased by this committee, I fear that these irreplaceable materials will be lost for all time.

At present, there is an inter-agency archeological salvage program designed to salvage, preserve, and interpret a minimum amount of the varied historical and archeological remains located in areas threatened with flooding by large Government-sponsored multipurpose dams and related projects. The program is sponsored and coordinated by the National Park Service. It is conducted in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Smithsonian Institution, and numerous local and State agencies.

Funds appropriated by the Congress are utilized by the National Park Service through cooperative agreements with the Smithsonian Institution and numerous State agencies for carrying out the actual salvage projects. During the earlier years of the program, modest sums averaging about $56,000 a year were appropriated but during fiscal year 1954 and fiscal year 1955, except for a small amount in the Table Rock area of Missouri, no such Federal funds were available. During this time, however, construction on Federal projects continued and there is, therefore, a large backlog of urgently needed salvage work and very little time left in which to accomplish it. It is a great credit to the many State agencies which have participated in this program that they did so with such willingness, often to the detriment of their own research programs.

Final reports are prepared on all phases of this work and published either by the Government or the local agency cooperating in the program. Materials recovered from the excavations are stored by the Smithsonian Institution and other agencies for exhibit and study purposes, and are available for display purposes in museums which may be built in connection with the completed water-control projects.

The material recovered by these excavations and surveys indicates how man lived in many areas of the United States over long periods of time.

One of the largest and most important river basins in the United States is that of the mighty Columbia River. In this basin, the Dalles Reservoir area, which will be

flooded by the waters of the Columbia River next year when the gates of the dam are closed, contains an archeological record of man's continuous use and habitation of this area which goes backward into the realms of prehistory as much as, and maybe more than, 10,000 years. Such a continuous occupation by mankind of one locality for such a long period of time is almost unparalleled in the Americas.

The earliest man of whom we know arrived in the Columbia Basin area at a time when the river flowed much higher than today, and the climate was much cooler. Evidence of his living there has been found in what was then a gully near the river, not far from the present city of The Dalles.

In excavating at this site, Dr. Cressman, of the University of Oregon, has found many materials of great research value.

Some of the finest carved and ornamented stone work recovered in America comes from the area around The Dalles. Family groups of Indians clustered along the banks of the Columbia. Some lived in semisubterranean pit houses, others in fancier plank houses much like the ones seen by Lewis and Clark in 1805 when they made their famous portage over Celilo Falls and the Long Narrows.

Among the many artistic achievements of these people are the unique and spectacular petroglyphs, or carved drawings, and the pictographs, or paintings, which they made on many of the large boulders and on the faces of the basalt cliffs along the river's edge. Many of these drawings are fanciful and imaginary, and their exact meaning is now unknown, but others are representations of the Indian's way of life, or portray the animals upon which the Indian depended for their livelihood.

Several days ago Senator NEUBERGER and I asked this committee to recommend $30,000 for archeological salvage work in river basin area above the Dalles Dam. However, since that time the Director of the National Park Service appeared before the committee and in answer to a question put by a member of the committee, indicated that it would take $169,000 to do the archeological salvage job during fiscal 1957 if we are to save a minimum of the historical and scientific materials and information presently available in a number of multipurpose dam areas outside the Missouri River Basin. In view of this testimony I feel that the amount recommended by the House should be increased to a total of $170,000. These priceless objects and sources of information will be lost through inundation if we do not act quickly.

Mr. President, I digress from reading my testimony before the committee, to make clear to the Senate that I am not requesting the appropriation of funds for such work at the Dalles Dam alone. Instead, I am requesting the appropriation of funds for the conduct of such work in every State in the Union where such multipurpose dams are in process of construction, because, as the National Park Service has made clear in its report, in the environment of all these dams there are great, historic relics which should be saved.

I continue to read from my testimony before the committee:

PRESERVING PRICELESS ARCHEOLOGICAL RECORDS OF THE PAST

My attention has been directed to the very worthwhile suggestion that a museum be developed near the city of The Dalles.

Mr. President, at that point in my presentation before the committee, I discussed a museum project which is not before us today.

At this point I should like to refer to one other item, and then I shall conclude.

Mr. President, since the testimony was given and since the problem in regard to the inadequate amount of money contained in this appropriation bill developed, Dr. L. S. Cressman, of the University of Oregon, came to Washington and had a conference in my office. At the conference there were present two representatives of the National Park Service. We discussed the seriousness of this situation. Mr. President, I paraphrase accurately what was said by Dr. Cressman when I say that we must make clear to the Senate that unless the amendment I am submitting be adopted, these relics will be lost forever.

I wish to say that I have known Dr. Cressman for a quarter of a century. I served with him for a great many years as a fellow faculty member at the University of Oregon. Not only do I know of his high standing as a great scholar and researcher in the field of anthropology, but I also know how he can pinch a dollar. I wish to say—and I speak advisedly—that I have never known a researcher who obtains more out of a dollar that is assigned to him for research than does Dr. Cressman.

In this instance, with time running against us, a simple issue is involved, namely, are we going to adopt this amendment, or at least take it to conference, so that the conferees can review the facts? I wish to say that I am so confident about the merits and soundness of the amendment I am submitting today, Mr. President, that all I plead for is an opportunity to have the conferees consider it. The amendment calls for what really is a piddling amount, when we consider the great symbolism of the amendment and when we think of the great encouragement it will give to the cultural forces who are working in the laboratories of America in an attempt to save the great historic relics which will mean so much to future generations of American boys and girls as they come to study the origins of mankind on this continent.

So, Mr. President, I plead with the Senator from Arizona to take to conference my amendment, which calls for the increase I request in the amount to be appropriated for this purpose.

Let me add, Mr. President, that I believe it very important, in connection with the legislative history we are making, that the National Park Service understand that in order to have the research work done in The Dalles area in the months ahead, it is essential that a minimum of $30,000 be earmarked for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague. I shall not duplicate what he has said, because his remarks cover very thoroughly the urgent need to protect the archeological remains which will be covered by the waters rising back of the Dalles Dam.

I think it sufficient for me to emphasize that perhaps the last lingering remnants of the historic civilization which existed in the Northwest long before the coming of Lewis and Clark, the first Americans to visit that region, are to be found in the gorges and canyons and riverbed which will be inundated by the reservoir behind the Dalles Dam.

As my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] has pointed out so cogently, we have very little time to waste. The waters soon will rise.

I wish to say that not only do I join in what the senior Senator from Oregon said about the appropriation in general, but I desire to make a brief statement, in addition: I have been a Member of the Senate for a little over 1 year, and my particular field of interest has been conservation of natural resources. I do not think anyone has done more than has the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in helping us move toward the attainment of that goal. Last year, when I went to him and talked to him about the deterioration of the national parks and about the need for the appropriation of additional funds, in order to provide for sufficient recreation and campgrounds in the national forests, I found him to be a very willing and very patient listener. There has been a great deal of publicity, Mr. President, about the so-called Mission 66 of the National Parks Service to improve our national parks, and much of that propaganda has given credit to the recently resigned Secretary of the Interior. However, I wish to say that, in my opinion, the one who has done most for the national parks, to help save them from deterioration and decay, is the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I think it is significant to point out that in the 83d Congress the National Park Service received some 40 percent less in funds than later was voted by the 1st session of the 84th Congress, when the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona was chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I believe that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] deserves a great deal of the credit and a great deal of the praise for the effort which is being made—and which I hope will continue to be made—to save our national parks and make them more available and more pleasant for the millions of Americans—I think about 50 million—who visit them each summer.

I concur in what my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] has said about our appreciation of the efforts of the Senator from Arizona to conserve our priceless natural resources, and to make our national parks and national forests better, more comfortable, and safer playgrounds for the millions of people who go West each year to visit them.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Our Parks and Forests Are in Trouble," which I wrote for Chrysler Events for January 1956. In that article I give credit to the Senator from Arizona for his leadership in this field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PARKS AND FORESTS ARE IN TROUBLE

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

America's outdoor playgrounds are tumbling down. The mountains still tower skyward, the fir and pine trees still grow, the graciers continue to creep over their pebbly moraines, the foaming rivers surge eternally to the sea. But the accommodations installed in the National Parks and National Forests of the United States, for the safety and convenience of nearly 100 million vacationing pilgrims annually, are in the worst state of disrepair and deterioration in history.

Although 50 million people tour the national parks each year, facilities for sheltering and feeding these visitors have not been substantially enlarged since 1932, when the number of tourists totaled only 4 million. Our national forests have been equally neglected. In 1954 the funds available for improving recreation areas visited by 40,304,000 Americans were $187,000 less than in 1947, at a time that the number of sightseers was barely more than half this total—21,331,000.

It is a tribute to the scenic grandeur of these magnificent realms that the traveling public persists in visiting places where preparations for taking care of people have so lagged behind prevailing needs. The typical tourist is a hardy chap, indeed.

Trails in national parks and national forests have reverted to the encroaching wilderness. Guard rails along perilous highways have crumbled into splinters. Picnic tables at public campgrounds often amount to little more than kindling—victims of vandalism as well as the elements. Neglect has made outdoor comfort stations a menace to public health. Stone fireplaces for cooking and warmth are mere mounds of rock. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, even has referred to some of the camps under his management as rural slums. Dilapidated tourists cabins are virtual huts.

Yet, these eyesores lurk among the grandest sights on the North American Continent. Nomads look up from filthy overnight shacks to see the white domes of glacial peaks dotting the heavens. We are failing to honor the pact made with nature four decades ago when the National Park Act first provided for the conservation of "scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same * * *." Is it possible to enjoy the terraced depths of the Grand Canyon or the spouting geysers of the Yellowstone while living in a campground which is overcrowded, dustry, rundown and perhaps a possible breeding spot for communicable disease?

Director Wirth admits that the Park Service has fallen "far behind in its attempt to provide adequate facilities for visitors." Back of this official language looms the fact that Wirth is trying to handle twice the number of people who visited the parks in 1940 with 20 percent fewer rangers. Some Government bureaus have swollen in size, but the Park Service has shrunk. Such a situation takes its toll in many ways—in climbing mishaps by novices, in women and children lost in the woods, in automobile accidents on mountain roads, in mutilation of trees and shrubbery, in illegal killing of wild animals, even in increased thefts and pickpocketing at park hotels and campgrounds.

For example, Mr. Wirth declares that $187 million is needed for the highways and trails alone in the national parks, if they are to be fully developed. In the absence of these appropriations, roads are pocked with chuckholes the size of volley balls and some of the neglected trails would frighten a Canadian mountie, much less a timid tourist on horseback for the first time in his life. Maps are not accurate because many roads and paths are virtually impassable.

Although the national forests exist for timber management and watershed control, as well as for recreation, they are the most popular of all outdoor attractions in the 11 vast States stretching westward from the Continental Divide. When the Civilian Conservation Corps was organized in 1933, these brawny young men trudged into the solitudes and gave the 180 million acres in national forests the finest sprucing-up they ever experienced. Over 4,000 separate recreation areas came into first-class existence.

Unfortunately, after the CCC was disbanded, these improvements ceased. The visitors, however, did not. They kept right on coming. Today, the sum of $1,070,966 is spent by the Forest Service every year just to police, clean up, and supervise the recreation spots which the CCC helped to develop—nor is this considered sufficient for the purpose.

Consider merely the item of garbage. What connection is there between disposal of garbage and a vacation in the vast open spaces? Yet, tourists leave behind them a litter of bottles, tin cans, paper, and the residue of many meals and snacks. Discarded fish heads can contaminate a campground for months to come. If this refuse is not buried or burned, filth and disease inevitably result. Listen to the stern warning issued in the spring of 1955 by the Forest Service itself:

"Inspections made by the United States Public Health Service on many national forests confirm our fears that there is a serious danger to public health and safety unless sanitation and clean-up at forest recreation areas can be brought to acceptable standards."

This is why I was glad to participate on the floor of the Senate recently in increasing by $1 million the funds which will be appropriated by the Government during the 1956 fiscal year for sanitation and care at campgrounds in the national forests. Senator CARL HAYDEN, of Arizona, who represents a Western State with far-flung scenic domains, took the lead in bringing this about. The new total of $2,170,000 will provide some advance in disposing of the debris that invariably marks the path of 40 million adventure-loving Americans.

But is it enough to simply hold our own on the 153 national forests of the Nation? Additional roads, trails, docks, ranger stations and even directional signs are urgently needed. Further campgrounds may seem unnecessary, but they will more than pay for themselves if they prevent indiscriminate camping by thousands of people who dump refuse into upland rivers and thus destroy valuable runs of Chinook salmon and steelhead trout. It is ironical, in my opinion, that the national forests should be short of funds to provide for the welfare of tourists when, actually, these forests are a reliable source of profit to the Government.

Last year $64 million was collected from grazing fees and the sale of merchantable timber on the national forests. Some Members of the Senate, among whom the writer is included, believe that at least 10 percent of national forest revenues should be especially set aside for recreation, with a ceiling of $5,500,000. This would more than double the present allotment for that purpose.

Adequate appropriations are the principal immediate need of both the National Park Service and the United States Forest Service to serve the ever-increasing number of citizens who gain both spiritual inspiration and physical restoration from visiting the evergreen-stockaded fastnesses which these agencies manage. But a long-range policy also is required. The automobile has brought most of the parks and forests within reach of the average family. Somewhere, beyond everybody's radiator cap, lie the plumed waterfalls of the Yosemite and the dizzy pinnacles of the Grand Tetons. The Forest Service frankly admits, for example, that the widespread use of the forests is a byproduct of the motor age.

Recreational values cannot always be calculated in dollars and cents to the Treasury. Yet, Bernard Frank, an assistant chief of the Forest Service, estimates in his recent book, Our National Forests (Oklahoma University Press), that pleasure for people on the forests is worth a minimum of $25 million annually to the United States. Is this not a modest estimate for 40 million separate visits—about 60 cents apiece? Once the value of this recreation could be accepted as national policy, conservationists might not have to struggle each year to keep campgrounds and tourist areas at even low standards of maintenance.

National parks call for the establishment of still more fundamental principles, because their borders fence off the most extraordinary scenic majesty in our country. Commercial interests constantly try to invade the parks—some to build dams, others to log off the trees, still others to mine for ore, a few to divert tranquil lakes for irrigation or drinking water.

I believe all such encroachments should be resisted. Canadian authorities have just turned down uranium prospectors seeking to quarry fissionable rock inside Banff National Park, Alberta. Our own great Nation ought to do no less in defense of the 28 parks and 48 monuments under the supervision of the National Park Service. After all, we have far fewer acres of scenery left per capita than has Canada.

Public opinion has helped to prod the National Park Service into setting up "Mission 66," a program to complete rehabilitation of our parks a decade from now—by the year 1966. The plan calls for more and better roads and highways within the National parks, for new lodges and inns and campgrounds, for safer trails and for additional safeguarding of fish, birds, and wild animals. "Many people now leave the parks," admits Park Director Wirth, "wondering why their Government is content to display American treasures in a manner not in keeping with their greatness."

As at least a start toward correcting this situation, Congress has appropriated a total of $45,029,300 for operating our national parks during fiscal 1956, an increase of 41 percent over the previous year. Furthermore, appropriations for Forest Service recreational areas have been boosted by 47 percent, in an effort to restore our national forests as the outdoor playgrounds of the American people.

Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, told me that few acts gave him greater personal satisfaction than the substantial advances allowed for the parks and forests of our vast scenic regions.

I shall never forget riding with my wife through the thrilling Lochsa River wilderness of Idaho, along the last part of the Lewis and Clark trail which still remains as it was originally when the first westbound white men came with the American flag. I recall that some individuals hoped to flood a wide portion of these forested solitudes with two dams. When that occurred, I thought, every American would lose a little bit of his heritage.

Our legacy ought to be expressed in the untouched outdoors as well as in the bustling metropolis. In America the Beautiful, Katheryn Lee Bates wrote not only of "alabaster cities undimmed by human tears" but also of "purple mountain majesty above the fruited plain."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument of the distin-

guished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for an increase of $119,000 above the budget, or $94,000 above the figure reported by the committee.

The Senator from New Hampshire is interested in the same general objectives which the Senator from Oregon seeks. However, he feels that the Committee on Appropriations, when it went 50 percent higher than the budget, was really proceeding in a very generous manner in the consideration of this subject.

The Senator from New Hampshire understands that the Senator from Oregon is concerned about a particluar project which needs immediate attention. I believe that the addition of some $25,000 which we made to the budget request will certainly enable the Department to proceed with that project.

The point the Senator from New Hampshire wishes to make is that there was a budget estimate of $50,000. We understand that there is a problem. We increased the amount by $25,000, or 50 percent, which was a very substantial increase, percentagewise, for the committee to make.

I think that is certainly all we could hold in conference with the House. I should like to see at least a part of the money used on the project which will require action immediately, as the Senator from Oregon has said. I do not know whether there is any way to insure that course of action or not, but that is the feeling of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the hearings will show that when we considered this budget estimate for this purpose I asked the representative of the National Park Service this question:

> Is the estimate of $50,000 adequate to do the work that has to be done in the coming fiscal year on those reservoirs that will be flooded? We would like to have a list of all those sites.

He replied:

> We have such a list.

He supplied the list, making up the total of $169,000, which the amendment of the Senator from Oregon would cover.

An examination of the list discloses that reservoirs constructed and now being flooded involve work of this nature requiring about $100,000. The remaining reservoirs in the list have not been completed. The water has not backed up this year, and probably will not back up in some of them for 2 or 3 years. In the case of others, where construction is going on this year, it will certainly be another year before they are flooded.

I believe that $100,000 would be ample adequately to take care of all the projects where there is to be flooding, according to the list supplied by the National Park Service. I would be willing to go along with the Senator from Oregon to the extent of an additional $25,000, making the total $100,000. That would cover every reservoir which is being flooded this year. We can take that amount to conference. If we provide a larger appropriation than that, I am quite sure the House will not agree to it. I think the Senator from Oregon would be well off if we increased the committee recommendation by $25,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like also to have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I want both Senators to understand that there are two objectives which I am seeking to attain and two needed protections which I am seeking to provide.

I am familiar with the testimony before the committee. It is my understanding that as the bill now stands it does not provide sufficient money to take care of the excavations which will be needed in connection with the areas which will be flooded in the year ahead. Second, there is nothing in the language of the bill which places upon the National Park Service the clear duty of spending the money on the sites which are to be flooded. Instead, we give the Park Service broad discretion so that the money can be used anywhere the Park Service desires to use it.

I take it for granted that an efficient National Park Service would, of course, spend the money on the sites which would otherwise be flooded. However, I have learned from my experience in the Senate that there should be some language which would make perfectly clear the intention of the Senate in this connection.

Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Arizona that I shall not stand here and try to climb a wall when I have no ladder with which to get over it. I know that in the past we have put into effect good-faith gentlemen's understandings and compromises. There ought to be taken to conference at least the minimum which the Senator from Arizona has proposed, $100,000; but I think we ought to go beyond that. It should be made clear in the legislative record—I think this colloquy will help in the legislative history; that is why I am engaging in it—that it is the intention of the Senate that the National Park Service shall look first to the sites which are to be flooded. There is only one in my State. These projects cover other States as well.

What I am doing is urging protection of American historical research. Think of the great number of American dollars which have been spent for excavations in Greece and in other areas of the world in connection with historical research.

I close this legislative reference by accepting the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon that the figure $100,000 be taken to conference, with the understanding that clear notice will be served on the National Park Service that the money is to be used, in the first instance, to save sites which will otherwise be flooded this year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the distinct understanding with which I am undertaking to make the agreement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly feel that when the Committee on Appropriations increased the amount by $25,000 it made a substantial increase. If the amendment is to be taken to conference with an additional increase of $25,000, certainly as a result of this discussion on the floor of the Senate it should be clear to the National Park Service that preference or priority should be given to the projects which are to be immediately flooded. Having made such a record, I believe we can attain the objective we seek.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Oregon will modify his amendment, I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I intend to do. Mr. President, I modify my amendment so as to increase by $25,000 the amount recommended by the committee. That would change the figure on line 24, page 14, to $11,562,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 14, line 24, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 15, line 15, after the word "expended," to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$15,250,000, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for the construction of additional school facilities at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, since my days as Governor of Minnesota, and even before, I have always had a deep interest in the welfare of the Indian, and on every occasion I have sought to achieve not only economic security for him, but measures which will assure him all of the rights and privileges enjoyed by citizens of this Nation.

Particular problems confront our Minnesota Indians who reside in northern Minnesota. In this area, industrial development has not reached the point where employment opportunities are always good, and long, severe winters frequently impose additional hardships due to further restricted employment opportunities during these months.

Seeking ways in which to alleviate these difficulties and economic problems, I consider a program with a two-fold purpose. Accordingly, I recommended to my colleagues on the Senate Appropriations Committee that funds be appropriated for reforestation and conservation work in the Superior and Chippewa National Forests and that Indians wherever possible do such work. I am gratified with the action of our committee in recommending an appropriation of $100,000 for reforestation work and with the committee's recommendation that Indians be employed on work of this character.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I wrote on February 29, 1956, to members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, be incorporated in the RECORD, together with the tabulation furnished me by the Forest Service indicating the most worthwhile projects which might be undertaken, employing Indian labor.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 29, 1956.*

DEAR SENATOR: One of the recurring problems confronting the Indian community in Minnesota, specifically the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, has been the limited employment opportunities and the resultant economic difficulties experienced by them which, at times, became so severe as to prevent them from obtaining even the necessities of life. Congress has, in the past, recognized the plight of these Indians through the approval of a per capita payment from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

This session, I introduced a bill proposing an additional $75 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians which I hope Congress will promptly approve in view of the dire straits of the Chippewa Indians. At the same time, I have sought to determine just what long-range program might be undertaken to give the Indians year-round economic security and at the same time foster their further integration into our economic and social life.

In view of the fact that the Red Lake Indian Reservation is located in an area recognized for its forestry resources, I have been investigating the possibility of employing Indian labor on expanded reforestation programs which would have a twofold result—desirable in my opinion—of giving the Indian a greater degree of financial security and at the same time of promoting the valuable forestry resource of northern Minnesota. In this connection, I have inquired of the Chief of the Forest Service as to the probable employment of Indians on reforestation programs, and I have received a report which indicates that it would be highly productive in terms of increased forest resource values to undertake programs of this nature.

Specifically, 2,400 man-days of Indian labor could be used in planting 1,650 acres on the Chippewa and Superior National Forest at an estimated cost of $48,370. In addition, 7,926 man-days of Indian labor could be used on 6,150 acres for thinnings, weedings, and other improvement work in natural stands at an estimated cost of $57,720. Therefore, at a cost of $151,272 planting and stand-improvement work could be undertaken on 7,800 acres of land utilizing 10,326 man-days of Indian labor.

There are numerous other conservation projects which would contribute greatly to increased resources productivity in this area, and the enclosed tabulation indicates the most worthwhile projects which might be undertaken with the employment of Indian labor.

I am sure you will agree with me that the development and protection of our timber stands, as well as the promotion of good land management, represents an important long-range objective in the national interest.

Therefore, I wanted to bring this proposal to your attention now as I sincerely believe that it is a meritorious one and that Congress could make a lasting contribution to the future preservation of our forest resources by approving funds for fiscal year 1957 to enable the Forest Service to undertake reforestation and conservation programs of this character. I am informed that no substantive legislation is necessary and that the Forest Service presently has sufficient authority to expand such programs if adequate funds are provided. Therefore, I lay the matter before you, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in the hope that it may receive favorable consideration.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

Productive conservation projects on national forests of Minnesota suitable for employment of Indian labor

[Data taken from project work inventory]

	Number of units	Man-days	Cost
Fire control:			
Hazard reduction, slash disposal ---------- acres	7,080	70,800	$849,600
Lookouts and observatory structures ---------- each	15	1,155	99,000
Timber management:			
Blister-rust control:			
Initial working ---------- acres	18,397	607,101	81,867
Reworking ---------- do	18,216	4,554	61,934
Erosion control ---------- do	200	12,000	360,000
Wildlife: Habitat development and restoration ---------- acres	1,600	2,400	28,800
Recreation:			
Trails ---------- miles	468	18,720	365,040
Water systems ----------	55	1,375	66,000
Sanitary systems ----------	35	525	17,500
Camp and picnic units ----------	840	33,600	672,000
Boat landings, docks, piers, etc ----------	9	1,800	21,600
Lands:			
Road-side cleanup ---------- acres	820	4,120	4,920
Large signs and portals ----------	8	80	1,600
General administrative improvements ----------	202	30,590	1,038,900

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it is with pleasure and satisfaction that I refer to the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in recommending an increase of $1 million in funds for forest-research work. We in Minnesota, with our vast and important forest resources, are vitally interested in not only the preservation of them but in the development of sound measures for expanding these resources.

It is of particular satisfaction to me that the Senate Appropriations Committee accepted the recommendation I made for increasing forest-research funds, out of which the Forest Service will be able to use funds for the establishment of a forest hydrologic laboratory in Minnesota. There is a great deal of interest in the establishment of such a laboratory to do essential research on watershed problems of the forest areas. As representative of this interest, I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by the Minnesota Emergency Conservation Committee be incorporated at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMAZING TELEGRAM ARRIVES IN A CLOUD OF DUST

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 20, 1956.*

A few days ago we received a very important telegram from Senator EDWARD J. THYE, informing us that the Senate Appropriations Committee, in reporting out the Interior Department appropriations bill, recommended a million-dollar increase for forest research work. "I have every assurance," said the Senator, "that out of recommended increase, funds will be made available for the establishment of a hydrologic laboratory in Minnesota."

The telegram carried, perhaps, the most important soil and water conservation news this committee has ever received, and the timing of its arrival bordered on the sensational, for on this day the winds were again high and soil fertility in the form of dust was tending to becloud an otherwise sunny day.

The agricultural areas in the breadbasket region of Minnesota are tinder dry. The same situation prevails in the Dakotas and the States to the south and southwest. Newspaper headlines in the Central United States have been screaming for many days that the duststorms this spring are "the worst ever." Several mornings in some places the visibility has been less than a quarter of a mile, so reports a news release of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

The situation is the worst since 1934, the year of the terrible drought. It can become worse, for we have been busy during the last 20 years laying a foundation to make it worse than in the early thirties. We have been busy trying to farm every acre of land: wet land, steep or sloping land and submarginal land. We have stupidly doled out public funds to encourage landowners to try and convert every type of land to row-crop and clean-tilled agriculture. Except for a few meager appropriations for soil conservation, we have not spent $1 for encouraging landowners to keep critical lands out of cultivation. It has been a vicious land-use pattern.

So the fertile dust is again on the move and in many farm sections of Minnesota wells continue to dry up and towns and farms are lacking water for domestic use. In spite of the seriousness of the situation, some people, including many Members of Congress, are still bent on an agricultural program that can only assure a greater loss of soil fertility and water resources.

Amazing, then, to get such a telegram as the one we received from Senator THYE, for this is what the proposed hydrologic laboratory implies:

1. We must acquire fundamental hydrologic data, if we are to develop and maintain a lasting soil and water policy.

2. A new and greater value is placed on forest research, namely, that trees and vegetation generally have as much value, perhaps a greater value, in retarding runoff and checking erosion than what we have accorded vegetation in the past when the value has been limited to board-feet measurements and unwise grazing practices.

3. It gives due recognition to the importance of watersheds, treating the land where the raindrop falls.

4. It acknowledges that conservation must be treated as a completed job. It must be a program of cooperation, not individualism, for all resources are each an integral part of an ecological whole.

We hope Congress will approve the establishment of a hydrologic laboratory in Minnesota. It is a proper beginning for a land-use management program that seeks a favorable and well-balanced relation to its environment.

It will mark the beginning of a farm-subsidy program that all of our citizens can and must support, if the United States is to be a permanent country.

The agricultural regions in the Plains States are sick with dust, other regions of the country, especially along the Columbia River, have fears for worst-ever floods. These conditions are principally manmade. They are the terrible results of improper land use.

We ask you to write to your Senators and your Congressmen, urging them to support this type legislation, the only kind of legislation that has promise of permanent farm relief.

One thing is clear. Successful human occupation has in the past depended upon a stabilized landscape. When erosion began,

cultural activities were interrupted. The lesson to us is self-evident.

We have the knowledge; we do not have the unity.

MINNESOTA EMERGENCY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE,
O. L. KAUPANGER, *Secretary.*

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] in his comment on the action of the Appropriations Committee with reference to forest research. Because of the very large use of forest products in this country, more and more attention must be given to forest research. I was one of those who, in connection with previous appropriation bills in former years, emphasized the need for forest research in my section of the country, as well as in other sections, particularly with reference to hardwoods. In recent years, some types of hardwoods have suffered severely because of diseases and the ravages of insects.

Also, Mr. President, as a result of research, there is developing gradually a greater use of hardwoods than ever before. The bill this year provides more than one million dollars for additional research, and I think that is wise.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] could not be present today. He is particularly interested in the subject of hardwood research. He submitted to the Appropriations Committee a statement, which will be found on page 754 of the hearings, in which he made certain statements and requests. For instance, he says in his statement:

It appears substantially impossible to uncover practical means of developing the present inferior hardwood natural growth. The approach must be based on planted hardwoods. Therefore, this amendment proposes appropriations for the following four fields of hardwood research:

I. Site research which should include studies of soil conditions, elevation, and exposure to determine precisely the appropriate location for hardwood planting.

II. Procedures for growing good nursery stock and cheaper, more successful planting methods should be worked out.

III. Development of practical techniques for repelling elements of natural destruction, which should include exploring the effectiveness and economic feasibility of means for discouraging animals such as deer and mice from feeding on young hardwoods.

IV. The speeding up of equality hardwood growth for early maturity which should include the application of the latest work in genetics and environment.

For this purpose, Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has requested an appropriation of $250,000. The committee granted an overall increase of substantially more than a million dollars for forest research.

But the point of my discussion today with reference to this particular item—and I address myself to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee—is to inquire, if it is the intention to develop legislative history to that end, whether a certain amount will be used for hardwood research as indicated by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the distinct understanding I have. There is no question about the need for hardwood research, and some of the increase should be used for that purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from New Hampshire, to a statement in the report.

Mr. BRIDGES. What page?

Mr. CARLSON. On page 12. It is in regard to the Fish and Wildlife Service and reads as follows:

Propagation and distribution of food fishes, $100,000. The committee recommends the allowance of $100,000 for expanded operation at existing fish hatcheries.

The question which I should like to ask the chairman is this: Does the sum of $100,000 provide only for expanding existing fish hatcheries? Is there any appropriation in the bill for giving the agency sufficient money to explore the possibility of building new fish hatcheries?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will turn to the next page of the report he will see that we provide for the construction of new hatcheries and the rehabilitation of existing hatcheries.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much having that part of the report brought to my attention by the chairman.

Last week I received a letter from Ross Beech, who is chairman of the Kansas Fish and Wildlife Service, who stated that there had been some conferences with representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Federal Government in regard to the possibility of establishing a warm-water fish hatchery at Cedar Bluff Reservoir, which is a Bureau of Reclamation project. What would be the procedure in case the Department should decide that it wanted a fish hatchery at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. What should be done, of course, would be to get an agreement with the State. We are trying to develop the principle, wherever the United States builds a dam, of taking into consideration to start with, the duty of the Bureau of Reclamation to help to stock the lake created back of the dam, because they are taking away a natural resource and substituting one of another kind.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Bureau should decide that the point to which I have referred is a logical place at which to establish a fish hatchery, would we need to come before Congress in the future and get additional funds for the purpose, or would funds be available for that purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. There would have to be the authority of law. In the first instance those interested in the matter would not come directly to the Appropriations Committee. There must be a bill passed authorizing the construction of the hatchery, just as any other construction is provided for, military or otherwise. Then an appropriation would be in order.

Mr. CARLSON. If I understand the Senator correctly, he is suggesting that the Senator from Kansas introduce an authorization bill; and if it is passed, the Senator from Arizona will look with favor upon an appropriation. But at present he can do nothing about the item because it is not authorized.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's first question, there is nothing in the bill which would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from exploring the need for the hatchery suggested by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest that the Senator from Kansas confer with the folks back home, and have them get together with the Fish and Wildlife Service and agree on a program. Then let the Senator introduce a bill to carry out the program, and we will see if action cannot be taken.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Kansas could start operations now by asking the Fish and Wildlife Service, with funds which they already have, to explore the situation as a basis for legislation.

Mr. CARLSON. I sincerely hope I can make some progress. Next year when I seek funds, I shall call the attention of the Senators to the fact that we discussed the matter as we have today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 7 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Page 7 contains an item of $240,000 for the building of a schoolhouse on an Indian reservation in my State. The amendment I shall submit is intended to make that money available for the purpose for which it was placed in the bill. I offer the amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be read now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that his amendment be stated out of order? Hearing none, the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, after "$7,740,000", it is proposed to insert ", of which not to exceed $240,000 may be paid to the Municipal School District No. 1, Sandoval County, N. Mex., to supplement an allocation of funds from the Office of Education for the construction of elementary public-school facilities which shall be available to Pueblo Indian children."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico can be considered the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, line 7, striking out "$4,000,000" and inserting "$7,740,000" will have to be reconsidered. Is there objection to reconsidering the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to? The Chair hears none; and

the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment to the amendment adds no money to the bill, but is to carry out the purpose which the committee had in mind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall not object to taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico to the committee amendment is agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to concur in the observations made about the extra funds allotted to forestry research. I think it was very generous on the part of the subcommittee to include an extra million dollars. Incidentally, I think it is the wise course to let the Forest Service have a large degree of flexibility and latitude in the apportionment of this money.

I have been discussing with the Director of the Forest Service the situation in the lower end of Illinois. That section happens to be, in some measure, a distressed area. It is an area having basic resources, such as coal and timber. I have always proceeded on the theory that the best way in which to rehabilitate any area is to make use of the resources which the Almighty put there.

On that basis, a pilot plant was established some years ago at the University of Southern Illinois. The university made great progress in increasing the uses of timber in that area. With that in mind, I appeared before the subcommittee and sought to refresh them on the importance of the work, and also the need for some additional funds, so that the work could move forward.

From my discussions with the Director of the Forest Service, I am encouraged in the belief that some additional funds will be made available there.

Not only do I congratulate the committee, but I concur in all the statements which have been made about the item of forestry research and the utilization of forest resources in the most economic and efficient way.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the committee on submitting the item for forest research. Also, I wish to take a moment or two to commend the committee for providing additional funds for reforestation and for range revegetation. I am very much pleased to see that the committee has added $620,000 for reforestation and an additional $500,000 for range revegetation.

The committee points out very aptly that there are 3,500,000 acres af rangelands in the national forests which need revegetation. I think it is high time Congress took into consideration the fact that this great domain, belonging to the public, has need of some attention by Congress.

I desire to compliment the committee upon its splendid work in both these fields.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 15, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I desire to offer two amendments and ask that they be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming are not in order at this time; they will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. BARRETT. Was the committee amendment agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Wyoming will withhold his amendments, we shall be finished with the committee amendments in a moment.

Mr. BARRETT. Very well. I withdraw my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions", on page 16, line 15, after "(69 Stat. 242)", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That all receipts from the operation of the McKinley Park Hotel in Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska, may be applied to, or offset against, costs of managing, operating, and maintaining the hotel and related facilities and any receipts or other revenues in excess of such costs shall be deposited at least annually into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Management of Resources", on page 17, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "$9,696,000" and insert "$10,373,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Investigations of Resources", on page 18, line 1, after the word "law", to strike out "$5,065,000" and insert "$5,105,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction", on page 18, line 7, after the word "therein", to strike out "$2,200,000" and insert "$2,471,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the chairman of the committee with reference to funds for road construction improvements under the National Park Service.

In looking through the comparative statement on appropriations at the back of the report, I find an item for road construction under the Bureau of Indian Affairs and one under the Forest Service. I do not find a heading covering the highways under the National Park Service, unless the line which reads, "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)," covers highways.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does. The item appears on page 10 of the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 29 of the report, the item reads "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)."

Mr. HAYDEN. The item "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)" covers the entire amount of money authorized to be expended and contracts to be made under the Federal Aid Highway Act for the construction of roads and trails, and parkways.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the distinguished Senator from Arizona knows, I have been very much interested in establishing authority for contract authorization for the three services which are covered in the bill. For many years, the appropriation of funds for the forest roads and trails and for the National Park Service, and for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, never came up to the authorizations.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In 1954, when hearings were held on the bill which became the Highway Act of 1954, I asked Mr. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service; the representatives who spoke for the Forest Service; and the representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Mr. J. Maughs Brown, for tables showing the amounts of authorizations over a period of years, and the corresponding appropriations.

I had been aware of the fact that there was some lag, but I had not realized it was so great as was demonstrated. Over a period of years, I think the lag in appropriations was from $40 million to $50 million below the amount authorized.

So there was written into the Highway Act of 1954 a provision for contract authorization, in the belief that Uncle Sam should treat his own roads as well as he treated the roads of the States.

As the able Senator from Arizona knows, the Hayden-Cartwright Act, and its successors, in the biennial acts for highways, the States have been assured that when an apportionment was made, they should proceed to contract for highways and that funds would be provided for making mature commitments. But there never was such assurance for the Forest Service and its forest roads, nor for the Park Service, nor for the Indian Bureau, until the Highway Act of 1954. My reason for drawing attention to this matter is that, as nearly as I can examine the figures, the committee has provided in full the amount of the contract authorization.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which is very, very different from the situation which used to prevail.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the committee for pursuing what we intended to approve as a contract for the Government, because now, or the first time, the Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Indian Bureau can plan their roads and get their roadbuilding on a modern basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at the conclusion of the remarks I have just made, and following the colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee, excerpts from the hearings on the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954, including the tables to which I referred in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Excerpts from the hearings of the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Roads, dealing with the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954]

THE STORY OF THE FOREST SERVICE

(From the hearings of Monday, March 1, 1954, from the testimony of Leo V. Bodine, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association)

Senator KERR. Mr. Chairman, I take it that is the second item in this lower group on this tabulation sheet that has been given us by the staff.

Senator CASE. There is authority in the present law for access roads to be built under two funds: One, the second paragraph under the section dealing with the Forest Service; and the other under the access roads as such, and the provision for the advisory hearing occurs in both places under the present law.

Senator KERR. You are familiar with this summary of amounts that we have before us, Mr. Chairman?

Senator CASE. I think so.

Senator KERR. What I would like to be certain about is that the unused authorizations, to which he refers, are those which are identical to those which are identified here as forest highways.

Senator CASE. Forest trails. It is the second one of the forest provisions.

Senator KERR. I thought that was the one he was asking for, the 22½ million a year, for forest roads and trails.

Senator CASE. I think he is.

Mr. BODINE. That's correct.

Senator KERR. And that the 27 million unused authorizations now outstanding would be identical in character to what he has referred to here as forest highways, or the second item on the summary?

Senator CASE. I don't know whether that is true or not. The present law, in section 3, has a subparagraph for forest highways in the sum of $22.5 million for the 2 fiscal years, and (2) for forest development roads and trails in the sum of 27 million. That is, there is the same authorization for both purposes.

Senator KERR. The amounts total $45 million a year?

Senator CASE. That would be correct.

Senator KERR. I am trying to get straight in my mind which one of them still has 27 million unusued authorizations.

Mr. BODINE. It is the forest roads and trails, Senator, that has the unusued 27 million authorization, not the forest highways.

Senator KERR. That isn't what your statement says.

Senator CASE. Mr. Cliff is present, isn't he?

Mr. EDWARD P. CLIFF. Yes.

Senator CASE. Mr. Cliff is representing the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. I wonder if we won't save a little time if you would just answer that question, if you can.

Mr. CLIFF. Section 3 of these 2 bills deals with 2 different things: One, the forest highways, which are parts of the State and county highway systems which go through the national forest, and there is a separate authorization for those roads.

Senator KERR. May I have a copy of the public law to which he refers?

Mr. CLIFF. The second item is for forest development roads and trails, which are facilities within the national forests, not a part of the State and county road systems. They are roads and trails needed for the administration and the management of the national forests, themselves, and that has a separate authorization.

Senator CASE. Under which one of those would you say the timber access roads come?

Mr. CLIFF. Both of them serve for timber hauling, but the principal need for timber access roads is under the forest development roads and trails.

Senator CASE. That would be the second one?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Senator CASE. Then the existing law also authorizes timber access roads under section 10, which authorizes access roads and provides for the hearing also in case of them being timber access roads?

Mr. CLIFF. That's correct. Section 10 provides for access roads to sources of raw materials, and it also covers the military access roads.

So far the Department of Agriculture has not received appropriations under section 10 for access roads.

Senator KERR. For access roads to forests?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct.

Senator CASE. The allocation is there for that money to be used under access roads, is it not?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, but none of this money authorized by the 1952 act has been used for that purpose.

Senator KERR. None of it has been appropriated, has it?

Mr. CLIFF. Not to the Department of Agriculture.

Senator CASE. To be correct, I don't know that money would be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture. That money is appropriated generally through the Bureau of Public Roads or is available to the Bureau of Public Roads for projects approved by the Atomic Energy Commission in case of uranium-bearing ores and allocated for roads that might be on the Federal primary system, or could be on a timber access road if they approved a project proposed by the Department of Agriculture; is that correct?

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, and it is my understanding the funds authorized under that section were used for military and atomic energy roads and, therefore, none is available for timber access roads.

Senator CASE. Do you know to what extent the authorization of $22.5 million for the forest development roads and trails was exhausted in the appropriations made last year? How close did you come?

Mr. CLIFF. Mr. Chairman, there is an available authorization for forest development roads and trails of $49,612,000, not 27 million as cited by Mr. Bodine.

Senator CASE. Over what period of time?

Mr. CLIFF. That is an accumulation of unused authorization over about 8 years.

Senator KERR. Which identity do you refer to?

Mr. CLIFF. Forest development roads and trails.

In 1954, fiscal year 1954, the appropriation is for $14,500,000, and the authorization was 22½ million.

Senator CASE. What about the forest highways, in the first subparagraph?

Mr. CLIFF. The forest highways—there is an available authorization of $53,400,000.

Senator CASE. What was the appropriation?

Mr. CLIFF. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 was $15 million as against an authorization of 22½ million.

Senator CASE. Do you have a table there which shows the appropriations year by year in the two categories over a period of time?

Mr. CLIFF. I can get that for you.

Senator CASE. Of course, you are really scheduled to appear on the program for the Forest Service a little later on; but since this question has arisen it seemed to me it would be well to have the facts before us in order that our questions might be more intelligent and save a good deal of time.

It occurs to the Chair also that a table showing the authorization and appropriation over the period of the last 10 years might be useful for reference, and if you will supply that it may appear in the record.

Mr. CLIFF. We will be glad to do so.

* * * * *

Senator CASE. Mr. Cliff, this morning when you were attending the hearing I asked if you could get for us the table which would show the appropriations over the period of the last 10 years. You have handed me a table. Is that the table in response to that request?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CASE. That will be inserted in the record at this point.

(Table showing authorization and appropriations for fiscal years 1945 through 1953 is as follows:)

Appropriations and authorizations for forest highways and forest development roads, fiscal years 1945 through 1954

	Forest highways		Forest development roads and trails	
	Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Appropriation
1945				$4,161,498
1946	$25,000,000	$3,500,000	$12,500,000	6,898,778
1947	25,000,000	13,714,222	12,500,000	12,500,000
1948		5,300,000	12,500,000	11,000,000
1949		12,800,000		9,892,000
1950	20,000,000	22,500,000	17,500,000	10,348,000
1951	20,000,000	22,500,000	17,500,000	13,648,000
1952	20,000,000	21,000,000	17,500,000	13,000,000
1953	20,000,000	18,000,000	17,500,000	16,000,000
1954	22,500,000	15,000,000	22,500,000	14,500,000
1955	22,500,000		22,500,000	

Senator CASE. Directing your attention to that, it would appear that one story applies to the forest highways, and a different story to the forest development roads and trails. In many years the appropriations under forest highways has come up pretty close to the authorization and I take it that that is due to the provisions of Public Law 769 of the 81st Congress which, in section 3, relating to forests came up with this language with respect to the highways:

"*Provided further,* That the Commissioner of Public Roads may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorization and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractural obligation on the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof."

Is that correct?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, I am sure that is correct.

Senator CASE. That language appeared and applied to the forest highways in subparagraph 1, and made it possible to regard the authorization as in effect an appropriation.

That is, he gave you authority or gave the Commissioner of Public Roads authority to approve projects and incur obligations so that the maximum amount of authorization could actually be contracted for and then Congress would have to meet the cost thereof.

Mr. CLIFF. I think that is correct and that that is the way the law was interpreted in the past.

Senator CASE. In the bill S. 2982, the Martin bill, I note on page 6, lines 4, 5, and 6, which read as follows:

"*Provided,* That any sums heretofore authorized unobligated on June 30, 1955, shall be canceled as of June 30, 1955."

In that connection I want to call to your attention the testimony that was given by some of the witnesses this morning in which they said that the reason for supporting a lower figure for these highway funds was that they understood that there was some unused authorization, and consequently there was no need for increasing the authorization at this time. Do you recall that testimony?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, I think in the testimony they were referring to the forest development roads and trails and not the forest highway funds. The forest development roads and trail funds has never been subject to entering into contractual obligations in advance of appropriation.

There is an available authorization for forest highways of $53.4 million, which includes the 1955 authorization.

Senator CASE. What was that figure again?

Mr. CLIFF. $53.4 million.

Senator CASE. Of that $22.5 million would be the authorization for the new year?

Mr. CLIFF. For 1955.

Senator CASE. So there is an accumulated backlog of about $32 million of authorizations with contract authority under the forest highway section.

Mr. CLIFF. I think that is correct.

Senator CASE. But if you do not get it obligated by the 30th of June 1955, that will be canceled?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes. You will notice in the table which I have just given you there were authorizations in 1953 for $20 million, with an accumulated backlog, with the amount appropriated being $18 million.

Again in 1954 the amount of $15 million was appropriated. Now, I am not sure whether that means that the Bureau of Public Roads failed to take advantage of the advance contract authority, or whether the Congress failed to appropriate the full amount authorized.

Senator CASE. Of course, if you go back immediately before that, you will find by this table in 1950, although the authorization was $20 million in new funds, the appropriation was $22.5 million, and the same thing in 1951.

In 1952 the appropriation was for $21 million. In other words, in those 3 years there was used up about $6 million of the prime—prior contractual authorization.

Looking at the figures for 1953 and 1954, it would appear there that what happened was the the Bureau of Public Roads refrained from entering into contractual obligations and consequently the prospective maturing bills were such that all that Congress needed to appropriate was $18 million for the fiscal year, and $15 million for the second year. Because, under the language of the existing law, his action, that is the Commissioner of Public Roads, in incurring obligations shall be the contractual obligation for the payment of the cost thereof.

Mr. CLIFF. Perhaps Mr. Dean can throw some light on that. He has been working with the forest highway program for a number of years. Is that deduction correct?

Mr. DEAN. I am not sure about that. I think that that would depend upon the agreement between the Commissioner and the committee for different years.

Senator CASE. For a number of years in the House I served on the Appropriations Committee, both on some of the subcommittees that handled appropriations for public roads when it was an independent agency and in the Committee on Independent Offices, and on the Deficiency Committee for the various categories of public highways.

The amount of authorization is always made on the basis of expedience of the bills that would mature during the year. The first three categories are Federal-aid items, and primary, secondary, urban, they make allocations to the States and the States can go head on the basis of those allocations and proposed projects, but the actual cash appropriations are made in subsequent periods, and they never correspond identically with the authorizations. They were recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and the Commissioner of Public Roads, according to the rate of progress on contracts, and the amounts of bills that would be matured, that would be maturing for which money would be necessary.

An identical situation seemed to exist here.

Mr. CLIFF. These funds for forest highways are administered by the Bureau of Public Roads, and they should be answering these questions rather than I.

My understanding of the way they have handled these advance contractual arrangements is as you have explained it.

Senator CASE. Senator Morse, do you have any questions?

Senator MORSE. From your explanation, Mr. Chairman, is there any basis to conclude that the Government agencies involved have not contracted for the building of roads in an amount of the appropriations in any year or period of years?

Senator CASE. I think there is no question about it.

Senator MORSE. That is the conclusion I would draw from the facts you have pointed out here.

Senator CASE. Did you use the word "appropriation" or "authorization"?

Senator MORSE. Authorization.

Senator CASE. No; in this particular category of forest highways, it is not the appropriation that controls how much they might contract. It is the authorization.

Senator MORSE. Well, let me ask two questions, then; certainly there is no doubt about the fact that they have not contracted for the amount of road contracts for which funds have been authorized. They have to make these contracts first and get a commitment that a contract will be entered into if the appropriation is forthcoming. Those contracts have been less in amount than the authorizations and the departments were perfectly free to go ahead and enter into the contracts, were they not?

Senator CASE. They were.

Senator MORSE. Now, is there any evidence that they have not used up all the appropriations that have been made for the construction of roads in any year or period of years?

Senator CASE. I don't know as to that. I think we will have to ask the Bureau of Public Roads, but the only purpose in making appropriations in the case of forest highways and of the three categories of Federal aid is to provide cash to meet maturing contracts.

It is the one exception to the general rule in authorizing appropriating legislation as to highway acts. Normally authorizations are merely licenses to the Appropriations Committee to make an appropriation.

Senator MORSE. I did not know that. That is a point I have never recognized before.

Senator CASE. The reason for that with respect to the three categories of Federal primary roads and Federal secondary roads and urban roads is that legislatures meet once in 2 years, and in order that a legislature might make their plans to develop revenues sufficient to provide matching funds, the first part of the biennial Highway Act provides appropriation money on the basis of the past year and those allotments become, in fact, contracts with the States.

In this first class of forest highways, the same thing exists with respect to the Federal Government itself and that is in this language to which I have called attention in the act, Public Law 769.

Mr. CLIFF. It should be pointed out that the same thing does not apply to the forest development roads and trails.

Senator CASE. That is correct. I want to discuss those a little separately. The clerk suggests to me that the reason for making that contractual authority for forest highways is that frequently the forest highways are themselves portions of the Federal primary roads and in order to keep pace with the development of the primary road system with the States, this contractual authority was established.

Senator MORSE. I think we ought to take up with the Public Roads group when they come before us because if it is true, and I think obviously it is, that we have less miles of access roads today simply because the Public Roads Commissioner has not entered into the contracts to give us the maximum amount that we could have under the authorization granted, that is a pretty sad reflection on the Public Roads Commissioner.

Senator CASE. The Chair might suggest that there might be some moral suasion and the Appropriations Committee might have suggested that they wanted him to drag his feet a little in making contracts, and the Bureau of the Budget might have made the same demand on him to reduce the requests on the Federal Treasury.

The testimony has already been placed in the record with respect to the forest development roads and trails, and that the Chair would invite your attention to the relationship between the appropriations and the authorizations there.

Here we have a different situation from the normal rule on authorization applications. I note that up to 1950 the authorizations did not exceed $12.5 million, and of course up to that time the appropriation never exceeded that amount.

However, in 1950, or in the act for 1950 or 1951, apparently the authorization went up to $17.5 million the first year. The appropriation did come to that amount, but in the second year the appropriation while not coming up to $17.5 million did go to $13,648,000, and again in 1952 and then in 1953 it went to $16 million. In 1954 it was $14.5 million.

Obviously, Mr. Cliff, the Forest Service could never have had an appropriation of $16 million, or $14.5 million for forest development roads and trails, had the authorization remained at $12 million.

Mr. CLIFF. Not exactly.

Senator CASE. Unless you had an accumulated authorization.

Mr. CLIFF. There was an accumulated authorization at that time which would have enabled the Congress to appropriate more than it did.

Senator CASE. But historically, prior to the raising of the appropriation to $17.5 million, the fact is that under the figure you have submitted that the appropriations never, prior to that time, exceeded the amount of 1 year's authorization, $12.5 million.

Mr. CLIFF. That is correct, and they have never equaled it since that time.

Senator CASE. They have never equaled it since then, but they have exceeded $12.5 million.

Mr. CLIFF. Yes.

Senator CASE. That is the same thing we found in the Indian Road picture to which I alluded this morning, that the making of a case for more roads and that the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate, which resulted in an increase in the authorizations, was reflected later in an increase in the appropriations, even though they did not come up with the authorization. The pattern of larger appropriations followed the larger authorizations.

Senator MORSE. Could I ask this question, Mr. Chairman?

Senator CASE. Certainly.

Senator MORSE. Have you people in the Forestry Department always spent all the money that was appropriated?

Mr. CLIFF. Yes, we do. Occasionally there is a carryover from 1 fiscal year to another of unexpended funds which are obligated for expenditure on contracts or projects which may carry over from 1 fiscal year to another, but generally the need for forest development roads and trails work has been in excess of our ability to finance them, and we have been able to spend up all the money available.

Senator CASE. You stated:

"Because of the lack of timber access roads, the timber cut from the national

forests in fiscal year 1953 was about 1.5 billion feet below the sustained allowable cut."

And then you make this rather striking statement:

"The financial loss to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber was about $20 million in gross revenue in that 1 year."

Mr. CLIFF. That is a true statement.

Senator CASE. Why haven't you used arguments like that previously during the time you have been before the Congress, and the time that I have been in Congress, to try to get the appropriations for forest development roads and trails increased, and if my memory is correct, along about in 1948 or 1949 we did make a supplemental appropriation available for some forest development roads and trails and then a year or two later the Forest Service told me that because those roads were built they had sold several millions of dollars worth of timber which otherwise they would not have sold.

Mr. CLIFF. That is true. In 1953 we had a supplemental of $5 million, which is included in the $16 million appropriation in 1953, which enabled us to build roads in the insect-infested area of northern Idaho and northern Montana.

Senator CASE. What did the timber sales there amount to?

Mr. CLIFF. We have not fully realized on the benefits of those roads, because some of them are still under construction and they will not be in full use until the next logging season, but they will more than pay for themselves within the period of several years.

Senator CASE. How many years?

Mr. CLIFF. Within a period of 4 or 5 years.

Senator CASE. It is difficult for me to reconcile the logic which calls for a smaller authorization for forest-development roads and trails with that kind of a statement. Any time that the Federal Government can recover in 4 or 5 years a capital investment for roads and then have the benefit of the roads from then on, it seems to me that is a good deal.

THE STORY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

(From the testimony of Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service)

Senator CASE. Mr. Wirth, could you give us a table that would show the authorizations over a period of years and the corresponding appropriations?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, sir; I could.

I could brief them right here, and put it in the record, if you wish.

Senator CASE. If you can tell us a little bit about it, it might be helpful for questioning now.

Mr. WIRTH. Well, I have prepared a very short statement here.

Total authorization for the 8 postwar years for roads and trails and for parkways amounted to $137,610,000 and against this authorization there was appropriated $66,958,200, or 49 percent of the authorization. However, $18,010,300 of the funds appropriated were spent in the National Capital Park System, which means 27 percent of our available funds went into the National Capital Parks, leaving 73 percent for the National Park System, or $48,947,900, which is 36 percent of the authorized appropriations.

Breaking this down we find that $61,610,000 was authorized for roads and trails and $25,983,200, or 42 percent was appropriated and that $1,558,600 of this amount, or 6 percent, went into the National Capital Parks. Under parkways $76 million was authorized and $40,975,000, or 54 percent, was appropriated and that $16,451,700 of this amount, or 40 percent, went into the National Capital Parks.

* * * * *

Senator CASE. You have given us the totals on the authorizations and the appropriations against them.

It will be helpful to the committee if you could give us a table that would show that by years.

Mr. WIRTH. By years?

Senator CASE. Yes.

Mr. WIRTH. All right; I will get the table and submit that.

(The table referred to is as follows:)

Statement of authorizations and appropriations or allocations for construction of roads and trails and parkways, 1947–54 fiscal years

Fiscal year—	Roads and trails		Parkways	
	Authorization	Appropriation	Authorization	Appropriation
1947	$4,250,000	$3,700,000	$10,000,000	$11,000,000
1948	4,250,000		10,000,000	
1949	3,110,000	610,000		
1950	10,000,000	3,942,500	10,000,000	7,500,000
1951	10,000,000	6,546,000	10,000,000	4,729,000
1952	10,000,000	2,500,000	13,000,000	5,825,000
1953	10,000,000	4,674,700	13,000,000	8,104,700
1954	10,000,000	4,010,000	10,000,000	3,816,300
Total	61,610,000	25,983,200	76,000,000	40,975,000

May I submit that, Mr. Chairman?

Senator CASE. Yes, we will be glad to have it.

Both in connection with the forest highways and forest roads and trails, and some other information that came to the attention of the chairman, it has appeared the tendency of the appropriations is to trail the authorizations, but to reflect the increasing amounts, and I was wondering if that was true in your case, too.

You have had a fairly constant authorization of $10 million over a period of years, haven't you?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes, sir.

If I may add, we would be in much better shape if we could use the whole authorization.

THE STORY OF THE INDIAN SERVICE ROADS

(From the testimony of J. Maughs Brown, Chief, Roads Branch, Bureau of Indian Affairs)

Mr. BROWN. Yes, sir.

As you stated, I think, in one of the previous hearings, while we have never received in appropriations the amounts authorized, yet the more that is authorized the more we seem to receive.

Senator CASE. Could you give us a little table showing the authorizations by years?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Senator CASE. And the appropriations against them?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Senator CASE. We would like to have that for the record.

(The information requested is as follows:)

List of authorizations and appropriations for Bureau of Indian Affairs roads

	Amount authorized	Amount appropriated
Fiscal year—		
1947	$6,000,000	$3,700,000
1948	6,000,000	3,000,000
1949	6,000,000	2,784,000
1950	6,000,000	3,300,000
1951	6,000,000	5,627,130
1952	6,000,000	3,582,730
1953	6,000,000	6,516,000
1954	10,000,000	6,020,000
1955	10,000,000	

Mr. BROWN. The chairman is very familiar with the situation on these Indian reservations throughout the Dakotas and other parts of the country, and I believe you are familiar with the fact that at the present time we are engaged in our most substantial road program on the Navaho Reservation as a result of the action of Congress in passing a general rehabilitation bill concerning the Navahos.

Senator CASE. Yes. I think we passed an authorization act which ran in rather large figures, but the appropriations haven't been so large.

Mr. BROWN. No.

Senator CASE. How much have you been getting on that program a year in appropriations?

Mr. BROWN. Well, we don't receive funds separately for that program, or the Congress or Appropriations Committee hasn't separately earmarked the fund; but in order to make any headway at all we have allocated a substantial amount of our small construction funds to that program, and it has been going on there at the rate, in the last 3 years, of a little over a million dollars a year; and that has been a very substantial part of the amount appropriated and about 25 percent of the total money available for all the reservations of the United States, some 200 of them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the basis of the foregoing testimony, the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Roads reported S. 3184 with a new proposal in section 6 which read:

SEC. 6. Any funds heretofore, herein, or hereafter authorized for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be immediately available for contract: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

The language was modified in the conference with the House to limit the contract authorization to funds available for the fiscal years of 1955, 1956, and 1957, thereby not picking up all of the previous authorizations but with an increase in each category, launching a new program for the bringing of Forest Service, Park Service, and Indian Service roads up to an annual level of construction never before attained.

The language was continued in the highway bill passed by the Senate in 1955, and is understood to be incorporated in the highway bill now pending in the House of Representatives, and thus seems to have been accepted as a permanent part of our national highway legislation. Under this, the authorization for roads on Uncle Sam's own lands will be accorded the same treatment that has been given the road programs of the several States by the annual apportionments of the authorized programs in the Federal primary, secondary, and urban systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, line 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Provisions," on page 19, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "ninety-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only" and insert "one hundred and thirty-one passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-seven shall be for replacement only."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General Provisions, Department of the Interior," on page 26, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 106. (a) Not to exceed $200,000 of the funds appropriated to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1957, shall be available to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1957 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) function performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating or disseminating public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion picture and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

(b) This section shall not apply to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or publications of the National Park Service, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Related Agencies—Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Salaries and Expenses," on page 32, line 4, after "(7 U. S. C. 1010–1012)", to strike out "$41,668,000" and insert "$46,063,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 21, after the word "economics", to strike out "$9,350,000" and insert "$10,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 10, to insert:

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Weeks Act

For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $100,000, to be available only for payment of the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 35, to insert:

Special acts

For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forest, in accordance with the provisions of the following act authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amount from such receipts: Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "State and Private Forestry Cooperation," on page 36, line 7, after the word "industries", to strike out "$11,385,000" and insert "$15,165,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Capital Planning Commission," on page 38, line 17, after the word "compensation", to strike out "$185,000" and insert "$210,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 24, after the word "expended", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,500,000"; in the same line, after "(a)", to strike out "$438,000" and insert "$526,000"; on page 39, line 1, after "(b)", to strike out "$287,000" and insert "$344,000"; and in line 3, after "(c)", to strike out "$525,000" and insert "$630,000".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the item appearing on page 34 of the bill, under the heading "Forest Roads and Trails," for which there is provided the sum of $24 million. I should like to have the RECORD show the answer of the Senator from Arizona to this question: Am I correct in my understanding that in the expenditure, for example, of the $24 million by the Forest Service, the Forest Service is in no way limited to any specific roads or trails which it may have discussed in the hearings of the committees by way of illustrations and examples?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The item covers the entire field and covers both, money used for construction of roads and the maintenance of existing roads. No specific sum is tied down to any particular project.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator advise me if $24 million is the amount the Forest Service thought would be adequate for expenditure during the next fiscal year in view of the present personnel and facilities?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the full amount authorized by the last Federal Highway Act, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has stated. In prior years there have been authorizations for appropriations, and then the amount appropriated for the Forest Service has been cut in half. This time the authorization was substantially $24 million, and the appropriation is $24 million.

Mr. MORSE. That was the point I wanted to bring out in the RECORD. I wish to say to the chairman and the members of his committee that I think they are to be highly commended for the action they have taken in making available every dollar which has been authorized for the forest roads.

Mr. HAYDEN. We had testimony which fully justified the use of that sum of money.

Mr. MORSE. As I said earlier in my remarks today, this expenditure of money is very sound economy, because it is going to return to the Treasury of the United States a good many dollars for every dollar which is spent on the roads. This is the way to make money for the American taxpayer. I am exceedingly happy the committee has made the recommendation which it has submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 38, line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 25, after "(66 Stat. 781)", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That the employment of not more than one person by contract or otherwise, pursuant to the third sentence of section 2 (c) of the act of June 6, 1924, as amended by the act of July 19, 1952 (66 Stat. 783), may be extended for an additional year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Smithsonian Institution," on page 41, line 8, after the word "publications", to strike out "$4,400,000" and insert "$4,425,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$1,495,000" and insert "$1,505,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 17, to insert:

WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 964, 965), $48,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The amendment of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] will now be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 15, after the words "water rights" and the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the words "to be immediately available and."

On page 16, in line 1, after the numeral "$29,800,000" and the comma, it is proposed to insert the words "to be immediately available and."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, as everyone knows, Yellowstone is our first national park. It was created in 1872, long before Wyoming became a State. It is one of the most popular of our national parks, but it seems to me that it is in worse shape than any of our parks. Last year 1,368,515 people visited Yel-

lowstone. Since 1945 the visitors to Yellowstone have averaged 1,154,411 each year. Because of the deplorable conditions presently existing in Yellowstone National Park, many of the people have been obliged to sleep in their cars at night.

The Yellowstone Park Co. is the largest concessionaire now operating in the park, and its contract was extended the forepart of this year. My colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself held several conferences with the Yellowstone Park Co. and with Conrad Wirth, the Director of the National Park Service. It is estimated that the visitors to Yellowstone will reach the 2 million mark by 1965. In its new contract the Yellowstone Park Co. agrees to improve its facilities in the park by expending $13½ million in a construction program over the next 10 years. It will spend $3½ million during the next year.

There is an item in the pending bill for $1½ million to provide utilities, campgrounds, trailer parks, and other public buildings during the next fiscal year. Most of the money made available to the Park Service for work in Yellowstone will tie in with the improvement program of the Yellowstone Park Co. Unless that money is made available immediately upon the approval of this bill by the President, then it is highly improbable that we can get any of the work done before next year. On the other hand, if the contracts can be let and the money expended in June, it is entirely possible that both the program of the concessionaire and the program of the Park Service can be completed before next winter sets in. I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I would be willing to take the amendment to conference, but I must be frank with the Senator and say I hope he can persuade the House conferees, if he knows any of them, to look upon this amendment with favor, because ordinarily they are not favorably inclined toward such amendments. The same proposal was up before in connection with work in Alaska, and we were unable to persuade the House that such an amendment should be agreed to. The Senator is obviously correct. If work can be done only in the summer season, and it could be started in late May and early June, it would be that much ahead. For that reason I shall accept the amendment, but I cannot assure the Senator that it will become a part of the law. We shall have to argue it out with the House conferees.

Mr. BARRETT. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee. I recognize that the House Appropriations Committee has taken such a position in years gone by. I may say the snow is on the ground in Yellowstone Park until the end of June, and snow comes again in September. If any work is to be done, it must be done in the summer months. I appreciate the chairman's kindness in taking the amendment to conference. I shall be glad to confer with my friends on the House side and ask them to accept this amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to say a word on the Senator's amendment and the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think there is good reason and good, sound sense in what the Senator from Wyoming proposes, because it is necessary to consider the seasonal situation. Certainly, money can be expended more economically if the work for which it provides can be done in good season.

I concur in what the Senator from Arizona has said. I have sat in conference before. Perhaps this time we can get the House conferees to take a little different position from that of the past. At any rate, I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct and sound in his proposal.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I may say to the Senator that the people of Wyoming have been alarmed at the rapid deterioration of the facilities in Yellowstone. The situation in Yellowstone was so bad that last year our State legislature ordered a study made of Yellowstone Park with the idea in mind that the State might acquire the concessions in the park so that they could be brought up to standard. That indicates very clearly that the people of our State recognize that prompt and effective measures must be taken to remedy the situation at an early date.

As I indicated earlier, I am sure that we need additional facilities in all of the national parks of the country, but I believe that Yellowstone is in the worst shape of all. Accordingly, I joined with my colleague [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the introduction of a bill calling for the authorization of $16 million each year for the next 10 years for improvements in our national parks. That is known as Mission 66, and it is anticipated that the program will be completed during the year 1966.

The Park Service officials estimate that it will cost $17 million to construct the improvements necessary to complete that program in Yellowstone Park. As I stated a while ago, the concessionaire intends to spend $3½ million in the next 12 months in constructing new improvements in Yellowstone. The Park Service will have available about one-third of that amount to make improvements in public facilities such as sewer, water, lights, and public buildings in order to round out the improvement program to be carried out by the Yellowstone Park Co.

I hope that the Senate conferees will make it abundantly clear to the House conferees that the work to be done by the Yellowstone Park Co. and by the Park Service should be carried on at the same time. In other words, the Yellowstone Park Co. cannot use the facilities it will build, costing $3½ million, unless the Park Service is in a position to provide the utilities such as sewer, water, lights, and the like, when the buildings are completed. Unless my amendment shall be accepted in conference, the Park Service will be unable to let a contract until it is too late this summer to get the work completed this year. So I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAYDEN] can prevail upon the House conferees to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] on pages 15 and 16.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in examining the bill, it occurs to me that it is constructed somewhat differently than previous appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior, in that in this instance we find included in the bill appropriations for the Forest Service, a part of the Department of Agriculture, but we do not find included in the bill appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, the appropriations for which historically have been included in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill. I realize that it is possible that heretofore the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has made a statement regarding this matter, for I have not been in the Chamber all the time.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, Mr. President, I have not made a statement about it. However, the fact is that we must take the appropriation bills in the way they are sent to us by the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has framed this bill in this way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not at all critical, and I recognize that all appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives. But I wish to observe that Members of the Senate who do not know about this matter would normally have expected to find included in this appropriation bill the appropriations for the various projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. Conversely, perhaps, it was a surprise to some Members who were not aware of the fact that the House had formulated this bill on a somewhat different principle, to find in the bill appropriations for the Forest Service, an agency of the Department of Agriculture. It seems to me that Members of the Senate who have not had this matter brought to their attention might be somewhat surprised and perhaps chagrined if by this means something they did not expect to have done were done, or to find, for example, that appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are not included in this appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. No. Appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission and for civil works by the Corps of Engineers are carried in the Public Works appropriation bill. All those appropriations were transferred to the Public Works appropriation bill last year.

On the other hand, the appropriations for a number of independent agencies, in addition to those for the Forest Service, have been added as a part of this bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. One of the points made by the Senator from South Dakota is, it seems to me, to the effect that there is a fear among some persons that certain agencies of the Government will be shifted from one executive department to another, and that, for instance, by means of shifting from the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill the appropriations for the Forest Service, eventually that Service will be moved into the Department of the Interior. That possibility is viewed with fear by some persons.

Let me say that I, for one—and I think probably the chairman of the committee will agree with me—believe that by accepting the arrangements in the pending bill on the part of the House of Representatives, by no means shall we be indicating that we give any approval to the eventual shifting of various of the executive agencies.

Mr. HAYDEN. We are not called upon to give any such approval; and we do not give any approval. We simply take things as we find them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the point the able Senator from New Hampshire has brought out should not be passed by without notice. I can remember when a reorganization bill was submitted to the Congress, some years ago, and there was considerable excitement on Capitol Hill when it was feared that the bill was sufficiently broad to permit the shifting of the Forest Service from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior, without any specific consideration of that move by the Congress. There was trouble in securing the enactment of some of those reorganization bills until assurances were given that such a change would not be made, at least not without consultation with the Congress or without some opportunity for Congress either to approve or to disapprove.

At this time I am not interested in debating the merits of the question of whether the Forest Service should remain in the Department of Agriculture or should be transferred to the Department of the Interior. However, this matter is of interest, and I believe it should be duly noted—as has now been done by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and by the ranking minority member of the committee—that the present inclusion in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill of appropriations for the Forest Service is not a commitment in one way or the other as to the status of the Forest Service or as to its eventual transfer or nontransfer to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be printed in the body of the RECORD prior to the passage of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

On March 16, I appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which was then conducting hearings on this bill, H. R. 9390, the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. At that time, I presented a statement urging the committee to favorably consider a request for additional funds for forest research. I am highly pleased that the subcommittee has recommended an increase of $1 million for 1957 to strengthen forestry research throughout the country. The subcommittee, I think, should be congratulated for realizing the importance of this activity.

Timber resources are of tremendous importance to the economy of my State. In Arkansas we have about 20 million acres of forest land, almost one-third of which is owned by farmers. Nearly half of the industrial employment in the State stems directly from forest industries, and we have over 1,600 small wood-using plants from which approximately 40 percent of the State's industrial wages are derived. The maintenance and growth of these forest industries require the application of sound forest management on the land to insure the production of the necessary wood products, and the guidance of this management depends on information obtained through the findings of research.

I am greatly concerned that we view too lightly the importance of our future wood supply in the State of Arkansas. Timber is a basic commodity; without a sustained supply, our employment opportunities will diminish and our population, which has been declining while the rest of the country has been growing, will probably continue to decline rather than grow. The future of my State is closely bound to the productiveness of our forest lands.

I have discussed this problem at some length with people in the wood-products industry and with others who are in a position to know the present status of the forest situation in the State of Arkansas. I was pleased to learn of the progress being made by the 4-man staff at the field research center at Crossett, Ark., and by the 2 men working at Harrison in the Ozarks region. This program is fine as far as it goes, but it is quite inadequate for our needs. I was astonished to learn of the great gaps which exist in our knowledge of forest soil productivity and in the knowledge of the best management for our forests. A case in point is the Ouachita Mountain Belt which extends over 6 million acres through the center of Arkansas and into southeastern Oklahoma. Most of this land is utterly worthless for anything other than the growth of trees. This area includes 1½ million acres of the Ouachita National Forest, and from the Ouachita National Forest alone the United States Treasury profited to the extent of more than $2 million last year from the sale of timber to private wood-products manufacturers. I was therefore disturbed to learn that no research is being conducted in this Ouachita Mountain area. I have been told that this area represents a veritable wood basket which could grow 2 or 3 times as much timber if certain facts on management were available. Unfortunately, these facts are not obtainable because not a single cent is currently available for research work in this area.

A similar situation exists for a sizable portion of the Ozark National Forest which embraces nonagricultural land of the roughest sort, from which we derive much valuable hardwood growth. The 1955 cut of timber in the Ozark National Forest amounted to 33 million feet, the sale of which brought into the United States Treasury over $519,000.

10-year record of income received from timber cut on Ouachita and Ozark National Forests

Year	Ouachita National Forest		Ozark Nationa Forest	
	Volume cut (M bd. ft.)	Value	Volume cut (M bd. ft.)	Value
1946	38,683	$450,624	16,017	$227,903
1947	38,801	406,537	19,423	274,113
1948	39,416	770,466	28,566	367,645
1949	43,538	1,316,129	25,421	308,690
1950	62,951	1,792,256	18,328	292,669
1951	58,284	2,055,788	18,675	443,593
1952	44,739	1,438,406	19,609	451,234
1953	45,273	1,834,551	17,899	296,965
1954	55,578	1,942,759	28,128	612,348
1955	69,716	1,728,650	33,193	519,460
Total	496,979	13,736,157	225,259	3,794,620

10-year State summary

National forest	Volume (M bd. ft.)	Value
Ouachita	496,979	$13,736,157
Ozark	225,259	3,794,620
Total	722,238	17,530,777

This table is a 10-year record of the income derived from the sale of timber cut from the Ouachita and Ozark National Forests. For the 10-year period from 1946 through 1955, the value of the timber cut from these forests amounted to $17,530,777.

Federal forest research expenditures in Arkansas 1947–56

Year	Crossett Research Center	Harrison Research Center	Tota
1947	$24,813	$21,537	$46,350
1948	20,111	21,641	41,752
1949	29,924	24,350	54,274
1950	37,606	23,224	60,830
1951	37,665	21,247	58,912
1952	36,925	27,099	64,024
1953	38,960	29,975	68,935
1954	40,461	25,519	65,980
1955	63,042	32,971	96,013
1956	48,932	33,366	82,298
Total	378,439	260,929	639,368

This table shows the amount of Federal forest research expenditures in Arkansas during the 10-year period from 1947 to 1956. Since 1947, as reflected by the table, the Federal Government has spent a total of $639,368, $378,439 of which was expended at the Crossett Research Center and $260,929 of which was expended at the Harrison Research Center.

In view of the benefits presently derived from timber sales from these forests, I feel that it would be wise to continue a program of research which would insure that the vast timber-producing potentialities of this area can be realized.

I am assured by the Forest Service that the increase in funds recommended by the Subcommittee for Forest Research Activities, if approved by the Congress, will insure that additional moneys will be available for expanding forest research activities in my State.

I again wish to commend the subcommittee for recommending an increase in funds for forestry research. I support wholeheartedly their recommendation, and I urge my colleagues of the Senate to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of

the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 9390) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL PROPERTY AS AN EXTENSION OF THE NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING SITE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is joining with me in introducing a bill authorizing the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, to acquire the east half of the square on which the New Senate Office Building is now being erected, known as square 725, and all of the square located immediately north of the New Senate Office Building site, known as square 724. These property acquisitions are proposed as an extension of the New Senate Office Building site and as additions to the Capitol Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3704) to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of addition to the United States Capitol Grounds, introduced by Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

GROWTH OF CONGRESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the history of the continuous growth of the national population—of the continuous growth of the population of the city of Washington and its environs—and the history of the continuous growth of congressional requirements, make it imperative for the Congress to provide itself with adequate space in the vicinity of the Capitol to permit its own inevitable future growth.

The facts supporting such need cannot be escaped, when it is considered that the national population increased from 122 million in 1930 to 162 million in 1954, with the latest census prediction of a national population of 206 million by 1975; that the population of the District of Columbia increased from 486 thousand in 1930 to 853 thousand in 1955; that the population of the Washington metropolitan area increased from 1,464,000 in 1950 to 1,840,000 in 1955, and is predicted to rise to nearly 4 million by 1975; that Senate personnel totaled 575 in 1909, 1,092 in 1949, 1,948 in 1954, and more than 2,200 in 1956.

DEVELOPMENT AROUND THE CAPITOL

All these facts have an essential bearing on the availability, need, and use of property in the District of Columbia for housing and office purposes, including the needs of the Senate. In recent years the trend of business and labor organizations of national scope to establish their headquarters buildings in the District of Columbia has also had its effect on property utilization and property values.

Since World War II, the effect of these conditions has been noticeable in the vicinity of the Capitol. During this period there has been underway in the southeast section of the city, in areas close to the Capitol, the restoration and improvement of old homes—in much the same manner as has been done in Georgetown. Improvements made have more than doubled property values. Removal of slums and obsolete dwellings from the southwest section of the city, close to the Capitol, under the District of Columbia redevelopment program—with a resulting shift of population—has already resulted in increased activity in the real estate market in the Capitol Hill area.

INCREASE IN PROPERTY VALUES

Only 25 years ago 2 squares were acquired as a site for the New House Office Building for $1 million; 2 squares as a site for the Botanic Garden for $981,000; 2 squares as a site for the annex to the Library of Congress for $921,000. In 1949—less than 20 years after these 3 building sites were acquired—the cost of acquiring only one-half of square 725 as a site for the New Senate Office Building amounted to $1 million.

Even though allowance be made for any differences which may have existed in the areas and uses of these several squares at the time of their acquisition, the tremendous increase in property-acquisition costs within the past 25 years remains fully evident.

Following World War II, monumental and other costly structures, affecting Capitol Hill property values, have been erected in areas in the vicinity of the Capitol. A continuation of this trend could, within the next 5 to 10 years, readily result in prohibitive acquisition costs for purchasing property close to the Capitol for purposes of expanding the facilities needed to carry on the work of the Congress.

PRIVATE BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

The National Association of Letter Carriers, the Milk Drivers Union, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the Acacia Life Insurance Co. have all erected costly structures in the vicinity of the Capitol; alley dwellings in Schott's Court have been rehabilitated and converted into deluxe living quarters; a seven-story brick building has been completely renovated for use as a modern office building; the Congressional Hotel and the Coronet Apartments have been erected. A large parcel of land fronting the Capitol Grounds is now, reportedly, being offered for sale at $35 a square foot.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING EXPANSION

These conditions have already been recognized by the House of Representatives, with respect to properties in the neighborhood of its office buildings. As a result of such recognition, there was included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, authority for the Architect of the Capitol to acquire, as a site for an additional House Office Building and for additions to the Capitol Grounds, any real property located south of Independence Avenue in the vicinity of the Capitol Grounds, as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission for such purposes. In this act, sufficient funds were provided to insure the immediate acquisition of four squares in the immediate vicinity of the House Office Buildings, in which present and future expansion would normally occur.

SAVINGS UNDER THE HOUSE PROGRAM

This action on the part of the House has already resulted in the saving of more than $1½ million in the acquisition of the triangular square bounded by Delaware Avenue, C Street, and Canal Street SW. This square was acquired by the Architect of the Capitol in September 1955 under authority of the Additional House Office Building Act. At the time of acquisition of the square by the Government, a private corporation which had purchased this square in 1954 had completed plans for erection thereon of an 8-story and basement air-conditioned apartment building. The building, as planned, was to contain 198 apartment units, and was to be erected at a cost of more than $1,500,000. This square was acquired by the Government at a cost of less than $200,000. Had this square not been purchased by the Government before erection of the proposed apartment building, the acquisition cost would have, undoubtedly, been in the neighborhood of $2 million.

At no time has the Senate ever been extravagant or even liberal in providing accommodations for itself or its needs.

SENATE OFFICE SPACE REQUIREMENTS

The New Senate Office Building, expected to be completed early in 1958, constitutes the only additional building accommodations provided the Senate during the past 25 years, even though Senate personnel has doubled in the past 6 years and is, today, nearly 4 times the total personnel in 1909, and even though there has developed an ever-increasing demand by the public for space in committee rooms to attend hearings. Some further relief is expected to be provided through the projected extension of the east front of the Capitol, but the working space which will be gained must be divided between the Senate and the House of Representatives. Failure to erect the New Senate Office Building 7 years ago has forced the Senate to operate under overcrowded, congested, inadequate, and inefficient conditions. Entirely too much time has elapsed before doing anything about these conditions.

The history of House needs has followed much the same pattern as those of

the Senate. The original House Office Building was completed and occupied in 1908. Twenty-five years later, the New House Office Building was completed and occupied in 1933. And now, 25 years later, an additional House Office Building has been authorized and is in the planning stage.

If past history may be used as a criterion for future congressional needs, then there remains no doubt that the Senate will require additional space for further expansion in the not too distant future.

DELAY WILL PROVE COSTLY

If the Senate does not see fit to acquire the east half of square 725 and all of square 724 at this time and to have and hold these two squares for future expansion, then there is no effective means of preventing organizational headquarters buildings, office buildings, apartment houses, and other modern structures from being erected on these squares, or the purchase and improvement of properties by speculators—resulting in a soaring of property values.

If arrangements for acquisition of the properties in these squares are not made now, there is every indication that within the next 4 or 5 years the acquisition of these squares will cost an additional $5 or $6 million.

Undue delay can often prove very costly, as in the case of the New Senate Office Building now under construction. Building costs have been steadily on the rise for the past 8 years, with no indication of levelling off.

AUTOMOBILE PARKING SPACE

Effective utilization presently can be made of the proposed acquisition. At this time, there are available in the Old and New areas of the Capitol Grounds a total of 861 automobile parking spaces for Senate employees housed in both the Capitol and Senate Office Buildings. All of these spaces have been assigned by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate to Senate employees. The Sergeant at Arms has, however, actually had filed with him more than 2,000 applications for these 861 spaces. There are approximately 2,200 officers and employees presently carried on Senate payrolls and this number is augmented to a total of more than 2,600 when there are added Senate Office Building employees under the Architect of the Capitol and other miscellaneous employees. The Sergeant at Arms now has on hand nearly 1,200 unfilled applications for parking spaces and the actual shortage in relation to total personnel is undoubtedly close to 1,500 parking spaces.

When construction was started on the New Senate Office Building, it was imperative to find space for the 420 automobiles which had been parked on the west half of the block. Congress last year authorized the temporary use of 171,200 square feet of the open space southeast of the Union Station and 320 automobiles owned by employees of the Senate are now parked there. This area should be restored to its former beauty as a part of the symmetry and design of the Capitol grounds.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Arizona has introduced Senate bill 3704 and has outlined the need for it. I think we must look to the future. If we had gone ahead in the past, as some of us suggested, perhaps we would not be in the predicament in which we find ourselves today. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from New Hampshire will not be around when all these facilities are needed. However, certainly no one can find fault with our making plans today for the future. The Nation is growing; its Capital, of necessity, is growing; and unless we who have in our hands the planning of facilities today take the necessary steps we shall be derelict in our duty.

I commend the Senator for his approach to the problem.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am very happy to have the Senator from New Hampshire join me in introducing the bill. I am sure that if the Committee on Public Works, to which it has been referred, will give it the careful attention which it deserves it will be reported to the Senate.

NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING EXPANSION

The New Senate Office Building will contain approximately 200 automobile parking spaces. Another 1,000 parking spaces can readily be provided by construction of a 2-tier underground garage in the east half of square 725, and the use of the surface above the garage, also, for parking purposes. Such construction would accommodate the very minimum needs of the Senate for automobile parking facilities at the present time. Eventually, this half of square 725, if acquired, would also be available for the construction of an underground security vault and for future additions to the New Senate Office Building.

HISTORIC SITE

It might be well to add at this point that there is only one building in the entire area proposed to be acquired for the use of the Senate that is of a historical character which suggests that it should not be demolished. It occupies 15,017 square feet in square 725, in the southeast corner at Constitution Avenue and Second Street, and is believed by some historians to be the oldest house in the District proper.

Title to the property now rests in the National Women's Party of the United States, whose objective is to raise the status of women. During the course of the hearings on the bill now being introduced, the Senate Committee on Public Works, to which it will be referred, could very properly give consideration to the desirability of exempting that particular part of square 725.

PARKING CONGESTION

Square 724 also is of immediate value to the Senate. This square, directly north of the New Senate Office Building, could in the near future offer a solution to the increasingly congested parking situation on Capitol Hill. In addition to those employed there, the Senate Office Building is daily frequented by hundreds of witnesses called or appearing before Senate committees and by other so-called customers, such as the large numbers of tourists and other visitors to Senators' offices. Large numbers of those driving their cars to the Hill are in competition for parking spaces with those residents of the District attempting to use the facilities of the city post office and Union Station. This square could ultimately provide 1,000 or more off-street parking spaces.

A word should be said about parking congestion. I believe the United States Senate must eventually face, if it does not act with foresight now, an acute parking problem which will choke up traffic conditions in the vicinity of the Capitol.

HIGHWAY RESEARCH BOARD SURVEY

The Highway Research Board of the National Research Council of the American Academy of Sciences has made a survey and study of the automobile parking situation on a national basis. They find that more and more local governments are finding it sound administration to establish ordinance provisions, through zoning regulations, governing off-street parking in connection with public buildings. Their report indicates that more than 300 municipalities now have ordinance provisions relating to the provision of parking space; also, that it is the consensus of expert opinion that the proper dimension of a parking space is 180 square feet, net, exclusive of access or maneuvering area, ramps, or columns.

The Highway Research Board, organized in 1920, is an agency of the National Research Council established in 1916 as a branch of the National Academy of Sciences established in 1863. The Academy is a private, nonprofit organization of scientists, dedicated to the furtherance of science and to its use for the general welfare. It is a recognized body whose findings merit consideration.

OFF-STREET PARKING

In its report, the Council further points out that more than 41 million public, private, and commercial motor vehicles now operate in the United States, and the great majority of these seek places to park in connection with most of their travel; that the vast registration of motor vehicles is well distributed among the thousands of local units in the United States, and most of these units have parking problems of varying magnitude. The Council finds that commendable progress is now being made in the recognition of the merits of land-use control in requiring the provision of off-street automobile parking facilities. The report states:

> It is sheer extravagance to create a new use or build a new structure without making adequate provision for the parking space that will be needed inevitably in connection therewith.

The same theme is stressed in an article entitled "How To Solve the Parking Problem," printed in the U. S. News & World Report for April 13, 1956. The statement is made that in 88 major cities off-street spaces are now available for 2.4 million cars. About 50 cities require some parking facilities to be constructed as a part of all new office buildings, hotels, apartment houses, department stores and other like construction. The Senate should recognize the existence of the problem and act accordingly.

INEVITABLE FUTURE EXPANSION AND COST

Aside from the parking problem which I feel will eventually confront the Senate in a most acute form and the uses to which I have suggested the proposed property acquisitions might be put in the near future, there remains the paramount purpose and justification for acquisition now—inevitable future expansion and cost.

The index of building costs shows that building costs advanced more than 30 percent between 1949—the year in which the construction of the New Senate Office Building was mistakenly and most unfortunately stopped—and 1955—the year in which the contract for construction of the building was actually let. On a $20 million project, such as the New Senate Office Building, such a cost rise represents an increase of more than $5 million—whether or not such additional cost is met through additional appropriations, or through curtailment of the extent of construction.

If the Senate agrees that the properties, proposed to be acquired in the bill which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have introduced, are necessary for future expansion, then past experience and other facts of record certainly indicate that this is the opportune time to proceed with their acquisition. These poperties should certainly be put under Senate control at the present time, in order that the Senate may not be penalized by undue real-estate speculation and may be provided with additional ground for future expansion.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, and I express the hope that the Senate Committee on Public Works will give it prompt and favorable consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3704) introduced by Mr. HAYDEN, for himself and Mr. BRIDGES, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3704

A bill to authorize the acquisition of the remaining property in square 725 and the property in square 724 in the District of Columbia for the purpose of extension of the site of the additional office building for the United States Senate or for the purpose of adddition to the United States Capitol Grounds

Be it enacted, etc., That in addition to the real property contained in square 725 in the District of Columbia heretofore acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028), the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is hereby authorized to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, for purposes of extension of such site or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds, all other publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets) contained in said square 725 and all publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets) contained in square 724 in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act and of such act of June 25, 1948, squares 725 and 724 shall be deemed to extend to the outer face of the curbs of sidewalks surrounding such squares.

SEC. 3. Any proceeding for condemnation brought under this act shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–644).

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States and contained in squares 725 and 724 shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be tarnsferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol, and any alley, or part thereof, contained in such squares, shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of such Commmission.

SEC. 5. Upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this act, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized to provide for the demolition and removal of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property.

SEC. 6. The jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this act.

SEC. 7. The Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personal and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES AT ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of an address delivered by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, at the annual meeting of members of the Associated Press, at New York on Monday, April 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I

I feel honored to speak before this important gathering of our free press. We share a great responsibility. I believe that the public should be as fully informed as possible about what we are doing in the State Department and what our foreign policy is. Under our form of government the effectiveness of our Nation's foreign policy depends in large measure upon public understanding and support of it. And our free society would indeed be in trouble without the diligent reporting and alert appraisal of world events that you make possible.

We are at a point in time when important events, occurring in rapid succession, change the scene in Europe, in the Near East, in Asia, and in Russia. It seems that this second postwar decade upon which we have entered will mark a new phase in the struggle between the forces of despotism and the forces of freedom.

The first postwar decade was marked by two sharply contrasting trends. In those parts of the world where the West had been politically dominant, freedom flourished and independence spread. Since 1945 over 650 million people, who were non-self-governing, have become 18 independent and sovereign nations.

On the other hand, during that decade, the Soviet type of Communist despotism, which ruled only 200 million people up to 1945, aggressively extended its rule to nearly 700 million more people belonging to what had been 13 independent nations.

Inevitably, these opposing trends to freedom and to despotism led to a sharp cleavage of the world. In response to the Soviet policies of violent expansion, the free nations drew close together. They submerged any differences of their own in the face of the threat of open aggression. Since they could not depend on the United Nations Security Council, because of Soviet veto power, they created their own collective security associations. Forty-five free world nations joined with others for collective defense.

These arrangements, backed by United States mobile striking power, have constituted a great deterrent to the open use of violence.

Also, the free peoples built moral bulwarks. They unitedly condemned the violent and intolerant practices of Soviet communism and made manifest their repugnance of Soviet despotism and its tactics. They subjected the Soviet and Chinese Communists to a kind of moral, social, and to some extent, economic ostracism.

By such measures, the free world found the ways to halt the Soviets in their hot pursuit of the free nations 1 by 1.

But the policies of the free world were never designed to be purely defensive. Freedom is inherently dynamic and expansive. We renounce the use of force and violence to promote freedom, but we have sought in manifold other ways that Russia should be governed in accordance with civilized standards.

We are not dedicated to perpetual hatred of Russia. What we hate is the evil that Russia's rulers do. The arbitrary despotism of a police state, governmental intolerance, and enforced conformity, the enslavement of people for the magnification of the state, the use of violence and the threat of violence in international relations, the use of fraud and trickery to corrupt and overthrow free governments—these are all things which we abhor and against which we stand. But United States foreign policy is not merely negative. We seek, above all, to advance the inevitable day when the historic friendship between the Russian and American peoples can again be fully manifested. Therefore, we take deep satisfaction from the fact that we can today see within Rusia some signs of light which could mark the dawning of that new day.

II

The Soviet rulers who have replaced Stalin seem to have concluded that the time had come to present a new look at home and abroad.

In foreign affairs, the Soviet rulers now seek, in much of the world, to present an aspect of conciliation. They talk softly of peaceful coexistence, and often gear their diplomatic activity to economic aid rather than to threats of violence.

Within the Soviet Union there is a change which is even more significant because, while its foreign policy is readily reversible, it is not easy to erase the consequences of internal liberalization.

Stalin, the demigod, has been dethroned, Collective leadership now replaces one-man despotism. Violence is no longer preached as the only way. The sway of the secret police has, it seems, been curtailed. There is greater tolerance of independent thinking and even the heresy of Titoism has been made respectable. There is an obvious effort to give individuals a sense of greater

freedom and security and to respect the demands inherent in the higher and broader education of many of the Russian people.

Vicious doctrinal works such as Stalin's Short History of the Communist Party have been withdrawn from circulation, and the fate of Stalin's Problems of Leninism remains in doubt. Those are the two works which for the last 20 years have been the Bible of Soviet and world communism. Soviet doctrine and history are currently being rewritten.

Meanwhile the Russian schoolchildren are excused from taking examinations in history. No one yet knows the correct answers.

III

It is important to appraise what these changes mean and also what they do not mean.

They mean, I think, that unity and strength of the free nations have shown the Soviet rulers the futility of their policies of violence.

Also they must mean that forces for liberalization are at work within the Soviet bloc, and are powerful enough to require some response, or at least the appearance of response.

All of this is immensely important. It is more than we dared hope for a few years ago.

But our satisfaction must be restrained.

Stalin has been demoted. But we do not yet see, in the Soviet bloc, the reality of representative government or respect for the basic aspirations of the peoples.

The Soviet rulers profess to have renounced violence. But they press feverishly to develop their military establishment, particularly nuclear weapons and the means for their delivery.

The countries of Eastern Europe, including East Germany, are still under the iron heel of Soviet force.

In Asia and the Near East the Soviet rulers have become merchants of hatred and fomenters of violence.

In relation to Japan, Soviet foreign policy is still ugly in its aspect.

In some places Soviet foreign policy is baited with economic lures which may superficially seem attractive. But close scrutiny shows that the bait is attached to a hook and that the hook is attached to a line, the other end of which is purposefully held by Moscow.

And, if they have admitted some of the lies and false testimony which marked political trials of the Stalin era, they have failed to repudiate two of the most outrageous lies ever perpetrated by any government, and both perpetrated by Stalin—the lie that South Korea was the aggressor in the Korean war, and the lie that the United Nations forces in that war used germ warfare against the Chinese Communists.

Khrushchev said last December, "We never renounced and we never will renounce our ideas, our struggle for the victory of communism." So long as that victory is the Soviet goal; so long as it is backed by a vast military establishment and the underground apparatus of international communism; so long as these instruments are at the absolute disposal of despots who repudiate moral principles as restraint upon their conduct—so long as this combination exists, it would be folly for the free nations to consider that they can safely lower their guard and fall apart.

I have often said in relation to the Soviet Communist problem that the moment of greatest danger would be the moment when we relaxed. Never was that statement more relevant than it is today. If we treat the prospect of success as being itself a complete success, that could turn into an ultimate disaster.

IV

To say that is not to say that we should act as though nothing had happened. We cannot and would not set the clock back. There is no longer the mood of fear that gripped the free world when in quick succession there occurred the Communist guerrilla war against Greece, the seizure of Czechoslovakia, the blockade of Berlin, and the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea. We would not, if we could, smother the hope that a benign transformation may have begun.

Our new task is to build more on hope and less on fear.

That is, of course, a more difficult task.

Fear makes easy the tasks of diplomats. For then the fearful draw together and seek the protection of collective strength.

Soviet rulers and their agents, in their new garb, have somewhat greater acceptability, and therefore more chance for mischief.

Allies no longer feel the same compulsion to submerge differences as when they faced together a clear and present danger.

Collective security arrangements, which were born primarily out of fear of armed aggression, seem to some less important now than 5 years ago.

Neutralism can now be plausibly portrayed as a safe and even profitable course.

Under these conditions our tasks are harder—so much so that some people regret the recent developments because they confuse what, until then, had been a rather simple scene.

That is not our view. Of course war, and danger of war, is a simplifier. When the issue is "who dies and who lives?" all other issues seem unimportant. But we do not want simplicity at that price. Nor do we intend to invoke needless fears and a sense of emergency because that would make our tasks more simple.

We cannot undo the changes that have come upon the world. And we do not want to reverse what holds so much of promise, merely because it also holds some risk of loss. Our task is not to seek to reverse change, but to build constructively upon all the changes that hold a possibility of good. In that way we may make our hopes come true.

Because Soviet military capabilities remain so vast and because their intentions are subject to rapid change, we must maintain our vigilance and our strength. But also we must increase the unity and dynamism of the free world by greater emphasis on cooperation for something rather than merely against something. Let us exalt freedom by showing better what freedom can do.

President Eisenhower, speaking day before yesterday, outlined the task which lies before the free nations of the world. He emphasized that task as it relates to the newly independent and newly developing nations of the world.

There is also need to maintain and develop the strength and vitality of the older free world nations. Here, too, there is vast opportunity. Our peoples have many common aspirations and interests that go far beyond the instinct of self-preservation, and which we can more surely achieve if we work together than if we work apart. We can, in association, form major steppingstones along the path to universal peace and justice and human welfare.

We had all hoped that the United Nations would establish order on a universal basis. It has indeed done much in this respect and certainly we should do nothing to detract from the United Nations. It remains the cornerstone of United States foreign policy.

But the United Nations was never expected to be an exclusive means for developing world order. The charter itself looks to regional and collective defense organizations to play a major role in this great task.

V

The Organization of American States illustrates the possibilities of a regional organization. It takes account of external perils. But it concentrates primarily upon its own positive accomplishments.

That Organization traces its origin back 66 years to when the Pan American Union was founded. It is held together by considerations which long preceded, and which will long succeed, the fear of Soviet armed attack.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is another organization which, in its own distinctive way, contains the possibilities of great development. It was, to be sure, conceived primarily as a military alliance, and that aspect of the Organization remains vitally important. But the Organization can and should be more.

The Canadian Government has notably espoused this point of view and at last December's ministerial meeting of the Council, both the French and Italian delegations introduced resolutions along this line. I expect that this matter will be dealt with further at next week's ministerial meeting to be held in Paris.

We basically have so much in common that we should be able to do more in common.

All of our peoples embrace a religious faith which makes atheistic materialism abhorrent to them. We have a common sense of moral values.

Our political institutions predominantly reflect democratic conceptions which had their origin in Greece, and legal institutions which had their origin in Rome.

Our economies are similar. We all believe in and encourage the private ownership of property, and there is a large and flourishing private trade between our countries.

Our educational systems are much the same and provide a broad basis for the free exchange of views and the gaining of common understanding.

Not only do we have this firm and broad foundation, but also we hold in common many guiding principles of action which should enable us to develop practically our fellowship.

We all believe that the days are past when any part of the world, or any particular civilization, should dominate others. Several of the members of NATO are more than Atlantic countries. The United Kingdom, for example, is a member of the British Commonwealth. The United States is a nation of the Americas and a Pacific nation. We are today members not only of NATO but of the Organization of American States, of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and several other collective defense treaties in the Pacific. We are associated with the Baghdad Pact. All NATO members would, I think, agree that NATO should not attempt to represent the totality of their policies.

We all believe that no government has just powers except as it derives them from the consent of the governed. At the same time, we all recognize that political independence is illusory unless those who obtain it are able to sustain it and carry its responsibilities. Also, we reject the conception which would prevent different races from freely uniting in one political system. Under these conditions, we all strive to advance the historic evolution of non-self-governing peoples to self-government or independence.

We believe that the spirit which in the last decade has provided so many non-self-governing peoples with political independence ought also to operate peacefully to stimulate independence for those subject to the ruthless colonialism of Soviet Russia. Peace and welfare in Europe require that East Germany

should be allowed to unite in freedom with the Federal Republic and that the nations of Eastern Europe should once again be independent.

We believe in the closer integration of some Western European countries, such as is represented by the Coal and Steel Community, by the Western European Union created by the Brussels Treaty, and by the prospective development of "Euratom" whereby the members of the Coal and Steel Community would apply like community principles to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Such European integration and the development of NATO are complementary and not mutually exclusive processes.

The NATO members believe in the principle of political consultation between allies and are increasingly practicing it in the NATO Council. Every NATO country, of course, has certain vital national interests, that may sometimes require independent judgment. Some of us have grave worldwide responsibilities that cannot be effectively discharged unless there is a capability of prompt decision and corresponding action. Our consultations must be designed to assure essential harmony in our viewpoints on fundamentals. But the processes of consultation should never enmesh us in a procedural web so that we fall victim to the ability of despotisms to act suddenly and with all their might.

None of our governments is predatory. We want military power to be used as a community force to prevent aggression and not as a national force for aggrandizement. Indeed, the amended Brussels Treaty for Western European Union already sets an example in armament limitation which we can ask the whole world to follow.

No NATO member, I suppose, wishes to drift into some new and ill-defined relationship which could be provocative of future misunderstandings. But the unanimity of our thinking upon the great basic issues makes it apparent that the time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning.

VI

Western civilization has made an immense contribution to the welfare of the whole world. It has been a dynamic force which, like everything human, has made its mistakes. But on the whole it has reflected an enlightened view of the nature of man and of his God-given right to enjoy life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Furthermore, the Western view of the nature of man has made it inevitable that its influence should on the whole be a liberalizing influence. Some nations take pride in the size of their domain and the number of people under their rule. But the Western nations can feel that their greatest success was to have brought to much of the world a knowledge, a political freedom, and an economic opportunity which it had never enjoyed before.

But the mission of the West is not completed. More independence needs to be perfected. More economic development needs to be planned and supported throughout the world. More sense of equality and human brotherhood needs to be developed. Also, the West needs to appreciate better how rich are the gifts other civilizations have to offer.

The historic weakness of the West has been its disunity. Out of this disunity came wars which have taken the lifeblood of its finest youth and weakened its economies. A major task of postwar statesmanship was to find ways whereby the West can maintain its solidarity. Much has been done. But more can still be done to make sure that the good in Western civilization is not again negated by differences.

The peoples who make up the Atlantic community ought, in increased unity, to resume their greatness; and true greatness is not to be measured by ability to impose on others what they do not want, but by ability to find new ways whereby all men can better realize their aspirations.

The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable and vital instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has, I believe, come to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed, if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring the possibilities which now beckon us forward.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is Calendar No. 1107, S. 2577 the order of business before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending business before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Pesident, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request for the moment, so that I may first suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall withhold my request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 1107, S. 2577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am writing to the chairmen of all standing committees urging them to report any proposed legislation pending before the committees which they are in a position to report to the Senate.

In the meantime, the Senate will consider S. 2577.

The majority policy committee met at noon. It has cleared certain bills, which will be taken up by the Senate. They will not be taken up necessarily in the order in which I shall list them, but at some convenient date in the future. I do not mean to say that the Senate will proceed immediately to consider any of these bills. I shall consult with the minority leader and, if possible, find a date satisfactory to him for the consideration of these bills. However, the majority policy committee has given clearance to these following bills and resolutions:

Calendar No. 1428, S. 1823, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes;

Calendar No. 1511, H. R. 3653, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930;

Calendar No. 1755, S. 3025, to amend the Bankruptcy Act;

The Interior Department appropriation bill has been passed by the Senate;

Order No. 1784, Senate Resolution 240, a resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Mary Knowles;

Order No. 1785, Senate Resolution 241, a resolution certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Liveright;

Order No. 1786, S. 924, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law;

Order No. 1798, H. R. 6162, an act to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii;

Order No. 1811, H. R. 1774, an act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1814, H. R. 9078, an act to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 2,500 officers and members; and

Order No. 1815, H. R. 7993, an act to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, those bills and resolutions have been cleared by the majority policy committee, and, after I have a chance to discuss them with the minority leader and he has a chance to check with the minority policy committee, we shall inform the Senate of the exact date on which they will be brought up. As I have indicated they may not be brought up in the order in which I have stated them.

Mr. President, we expect the Senate to sit until a reasonable hour today for the consideration of the bank holding company amendment, and to discuss it tomorrow and consider amendments which may be offered to it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when I became a Member of the Senate one of my first requests was to be made a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on which my illustrious predecessor in this body, the late Carter Glass, of Virginia, served in so distinguished a manner.

Among the enduring monuments to Carter Glass is the Federal Reserve System, founded on an act which he sponsored as a Member of the House of Representatives, and without which it is doubtful whether our Nation could have met the financial demands of two world wars.

Later, drawing on his experience both as a Member of the Congress and as Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, Carter Glass became author of the National Banking Act of 1933.

That act contains regulations which are now applicable to a small number of bank-holding companies, but as early as 1938 Glass realized that the restrictions provided were not adequate to protect independent bankers from possible monopolistic situations and he sought to have them strengthened. After failing in an effort to amend the Banking Act in 1938, Glass tried again in 1941 but he was not able even to get his bill out of the Banking and Currency Committee.

My own efforts to pick up and carry on the attempts of my predecessor to regulate bank holding companies more effectively began in 1949. In that year and again in 1950 and in 1953 I sponsored bank holding company bills, but none of these was reported from the Banking and Currency Committee.

Last year, however, the House passed a bank holding company bill and after the Senate committee had conducted hearings on this bill and other proposals for bank holding company regulation I proposed as a compromise solution of the problem S. 2577 which was reported to the Senate on July 25, 1955, but which was not considered before the Congress adjourned last year.

To complete the record of the background of that bill without consuming an undue amount of the Senate's time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement on S. 2577 which appeared in the November 1955 issue of the magazine Banking, published by the American Bankers Association, in which I outlined the history and the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE BANK HOLDING COMPANY BILL—A SPONSOR OF THE BILL OUTLINES ITS AIMS

(By Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, is a member of both the Banking and Currency and the Appropriations Committees of the Upper House. First elected to Congress in 1932, he remained in the House until his election in 1946 to fill the unexpired term of the late Senator Carter Glass.)

S. 2577, the bank holding company bill, which will be on the Senate Calendar when Congress convenes in January, represents the culmination of 18 years of effort to control expansion of bank holding companies and to require such companies to divest themselves of nonbanking investments.

The Banking Act of 1933, sponsored by my predecessor in the Senate, Carter Glass, of Virginia, dealt with bank holding companies only from the standpoint of their financial soundness and that of their affiliates. Their impact on banking and the Nation's economy was not covered. As early as 1938, however, the deficiencies of this law were recognized by some bankers, and since that time there have been efforts to obtain some measure of Federal regulation of the expansion of bank holding companies.

The chief reason that no legislation has been passed so far has been the inability of a majority of State and Federal bank supervisory authorities, independent bankers and the bank holding companies to reach any agreement on the basic principles involved. I am convinced that those who want bank holding companies regulated have outnumbered, in recent years, those who opposed any legislation, but the opposing minority always has held the balance of power by being able to join forces with one or another of the groups which differed as to the form regulation should take.

Those engaged in the banking business are aware, of course, that in addition to independent unity banking we have today three types of multiple-office banking. There are branch banks with a single board of directors and one capital structure operating through more than one banking office. There are chain banks in which one individual owns or controls a number of indepently incorporated banks. And, finally, there are groups of independently incorporated banks owned or controlled by a single corporation, business trust, association or similar organization to which the general term "bank holding company" has been applied.

LIMITED APPLICATION

Some of the difficulties connected with past efforts to enact bank holding company legislation have resulted from disagreement as to whether more than 1 of the 3 forms of multiple-office banking I have mentioned should be covered. It is important to remember, therefore, that S. 2577 applies only to bank holding company groups. It does not deal with branch banking or chain banking because I, and other Senators sponsoring it, believe those fields should be dealt with separately.

The existing law, as I have indicated, is concerned primarily with the financial soundness and internal operations of bank holding companies. It has very limited application because it applies only (1) if one bank in the holding company group is a member of the Federal Reserve System and (2) if the holding company wishes to vote the stock it owns in such a bank. Consequently, as of December 31, 1954, only 18 bank holding company groups with assets of $10.8 billion were subject to regulation by the Federal Reserve Board.

Inadequacies of the present law of which independent bankers have complained are, principally, that: (1) only a limited number of bank holding companies are covered; (2) there is no control of future expansion; and (3) there is no limitation on the acquisition of nonbanking investments.

S. 2577 is designed to remedy these three deficiencies. As to method, it represents a compromise based on three bills considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at hearings earlier this year. These were: H. R. 6227, which was passed by the House; S. 880, the companion bill to H. R. 6227; and my original bill, S. 2350. After the committee hearings, S. 2577 was worked out on the basis of testimony we had heard, and I had as joint sponsors the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. This bill was reported to the Senate by the full Banking and Currency Committee with only one vote recorded against it. (In contrast, I might add that every Republican member of the House Banking and Currency Committee voted against the House bill.)

The philosophy of S. 2577 is in line with preferences expressed in testimony of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and the American Bankers Association, and differs markedly from that of the House bill.

Our bill recognizes that bank holding companies are legitimate business organizations entitled to fair and equitable treatment, but that they should be subject to proper regulation by the Federal Reserve Board to prevent unfair competition and undue concentration of banking activities. The approach of the House bill suggests that bank holding companies are evil per se and that any further growth should be prohibited.

Of course, any business that cannot expand to meet the needs of its customers is destined to die. It is natural, therefore, that many of the bank holding companies, which want no legislation at all, would prefer S. 2577 to the House bill, because, while the Senate Banking and Currency Committee made many concessions in an effort to reach an agreement with the House bill, we could not compromise on the principle that a legitimate type of business might be regulated in the public interest but ought not to be eliminated.

The way in which S. 2577 would deal with the regulatory problem may best be indicated by a review of its main provisions, which are as follows:

DEFINITION

One of the fundamental questions involved in framing this legislation is the definition of a bank holding company. The definition in the existing law of a "holding company affiliate" is based on ownership by a company of a majority of the shares of a member bank of the Federal Reserve System. I advocated that this definition be carried over in this bill to the extent that a company owning a majority of shares in any bank would be included under the regulations. My definition would have covered 116 bank holding companies having deposits of $22.9 billion.

However, the House bill based the definition on the ownership of 25 percent or more of the stock of two or more banks. The Independent Bankers Association strongly urged the adoption of the House definition. In the spirit of compromise, our committee agreed to the House definition, even though it limits the maximum coverage of the bill to 47 bank holding companies with deposits of $14.2 billion.

EXEMPTIONS

The effect of several provisions in H. R. 6227 would be to provide specific exemption from regulation for a number of bank holding companies. The committee felt that all the companies covered by the bill which occupy the same basic position should be treated equally. Therefore, the specific exemptions made by the House were omitted from the Senate bill.

The general exemptions contained in the Senate bill are limited to cases where the committee believed regulation was unnecessary. Thus, investment companies registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 are exempted because they are adequately supervised by the Securities and Exchange

Commission. Religious and charitable organizations are exempted because the very nature of these organizations precludes the possibility of violating the spirit of this bill. Proxy soliciting companies and companies engaged in underwriting securities are exempted because such companies could acquire ownership of 25 percent or more of the shares of 2 or more banks during the ordinary course of their business and thus technically qualify as a bank holding company, even though their operations were not intended to be covered by the bill. I believe that these exemptions are justified and will insure fair and equal treatment for all the companies involved.

CONTROL OF EXPANSION

Both the Senate and House bills require bank-holding companies to obtain prior approval before acquiring additional bank shares or assets. One of the chief differences between the two bills on this subject is the procedure in obtaining approval. The House bill grants to the bank supervisory authorities (State authority or the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case might be) the power to veto any acquisition without a hearing and regardless of the opinion of the Federal Reserve Board. The House bill permits the Federal Reserve Board to participate in the decision only if the State authorities or the Comptroller approve the acquisition.

Some members of the committee believed that the power of decision should be placed solely in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, with the bank supervisory authorities playing only an informal consulting role. S. 2577 represents a compromise between the two views. It affords the bank supervisory authorities an opportunity to file with the Federal Reserve Board a formal recommendation that an acquisition be disapproved. But it also provides that if such a recommendation is made, the Federal Reserve Board must provide a hearing of record after due notice at which the testimony of all interested parties may be received. After the hearing has been held, the Federal Reserve Board is required to approve or disapprove the acquisition by formal order. The bill then affords any party aggrieved by the order the right to a judicial review of the order by an appropriate Federal court of appeals. This procedure should afford an opportunity for developing the true merits of each case and also assures adequate recourse to court review for the aggrieved party.

ACQUISITION ACROSS STATE LINES

The procedure which I have outlined will apply to all acquisitions of bank stocks or assets either within a State or across State lines. In view of the adequate opportunity for expression of opinion by the bank supervisory authorities, the committee did not deem it necessary or advisable to insert in the bill an absolute prohibition against the expansion of bank holding companies across State lines as contained in the House bill and urged by the Independent Bankers Association. An absolute prohibition of this nature would constitute a Federal freeze on future expansion without regard to the merits of each individual case. The committee received testimony indicating the public benefits which have flowed from the interstate structure of some bank holding companies. Like bank holding companies in general, interstate holding companies are not evil of themselves.

It should be noted that another provision of the Senate bill expressly preserves to the States their present authority over bank holding companies within their respective borders. * * * Therefore, each State may, within the limits of its proper jurisdictional authority, be more severe on bank holding companies as a class than this bill empowers the Federal authorities to be. In the opinion of the committee, this provision adequately safeguards States rights concerning bank holding companies.

BRANCH BANKING

The committee decided against the inclusion of a provision in the bill that would automatically apply State laws concerning branch banking to bank holding company operations. This provision was contained in the House bill and was advocated by the Independent Bankers Association. A bank branch is, by form, ownership, and functions vastly different from a bank holding company affiliate. The provision in the House bill is an attempt to regulate two dissimilar types of organizations by laws designed specifically for branch banking alone. The effect of the House provision would be to say to the States: "When you enacted your branch banking laws you really meant to regulate bank holding companies." The committee did not feel it was within the province of Congress to interfere arbitrarily with the interpretation of State statutes.

DIVESTMENT OF NONBANKING ASSETS

Another main feature of S. 2577 prohibits a bank holding company from acquiring ownership of voting shares in any company which is not a bank. Moreover, bank holding companies are required within 2 years after the date of this act to divest themselves of voting shares of any company which is not related to banking. The 2-year deadline may be extended up to a maximum of 5 years with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board.

Exemption is provided from the divestment requirements in cases such as the safe-deposit business, the holding of bank premises, bank-servicing organizations, the collection of debts, the acquisition of shares in a fiduciary capacity, the involuntary acquisition of shares, and investments permissible for national banks. Also bank-holding companies may retain investments of no more than 5 percent of the voting shares of any company, since that amount of stock would not be sufficient for effective control of a company. These provisions are generally the same in both the Senate and House bills.

S. 2577 grants to the Federal Reserve Board the discretion to exempt the ownership of shares of other companies of a financial, fiduciary or insurance nature that are determined to be so closely related to the banking business as to constitute a proper incident thereto. The committee felt that certain activities of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature are obviously so closely related to modern banking as to require no divestment by a bank-holding company. This provision gives the Federal Reserve Board authority to determine this relationship in each case on its merits.

The Senate bill also exempts labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations from the divestment requirement. This differs from the House bill in that the House bill had exempted such organizations completely from regulation. The committee felt that labor, agricultural, and horticultural organizations should be required to be registered and regulated under other provisions of this bill, but that their nonprofit character mitigated any possible danger in their retention of legitimate investments.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

S. 2577 contains the provision of the House bill prohibiting the borrowing of subsidiary bank funds by a bank holding company or by another subsidiary bank. Other provisions of the bill provide for the administration of the act, reports to Congress by the Federal Reserve Board, and criminal penalties for violation of the act. The committee adopted the tax provisions contained in the House bill with certain technical changes suggested by the Internal Revenue Service. These provisions insure favorable Federal income-tax treatment for property distributed to shareholders of bank holding companies because of the requirements of the bill.

As a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee since 1947, I have personally participated in the drafting and consideration of several bank holding company bills and I have made a careful study of earlier efforts in this field. I am convinced that, while S. 2577 is not perfect, it offers a fair and equitable solution of the problem of bank holding company regulation. It is not as strong a bill as some of the independent bankers would like to have, and it contains some features which are regarded with disfavor by the holding companies subject to its proposed regulations. I believe, however, that S. 2577 comes closer to satisfying more people than any previous legislation on the subject, and, if the Senate rejects this bill next year, we are likely to go on for some time under the admittedly inadequate provisions of the 1933 law.

I hope, therefore, that a majority of my Senate colleagues will agree it is better to pass this bill, with an opportunity to amend it if future experience indicates changes are needed, rather than to leave the subject once more in the field of fruitless debate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when the committee reported S. 2577 in the closing days of the first session of this Congress, I felt we were closer to the enactment of legislation than at any time during the past 18 years, but I realized there still were hurdles to surmount, and it was understood that the bill would not be acted upon until this session.

The interim period provided an opportunity for Members of the Senate, representatives of the bank holding companies and banking organizations generally to study the bill and determine whether any perfecting amendments were necessary. As a result of this study, several executive meetings of the committee and some limited hearings held this year, the committee has agreed upon a number of technical and clarifying amendments and some substantive changes in the tax provisions which, we believe, strengthen the bill without altering its philosophy. I shall discuss those amendments at a later point in my remarks.

I am convinced that over the years a majority of the Members of Congress have favored legislation to regulate bank holding companies, but such legislation has not been enacted due to the failure of proponents to agree on the form of regulation. I should like to quote from a speech the late Senator Maybank, former chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, made before a meeting of the Independent Bankers Association on September 29, 1952, on the subject of bank holding company legislation. Senator Maybank said:

Unfortunately, our legislative processes are not fully understood or appreciated by those whose interests are directly affected. Getting a bill through Congress is far more of a give-and-take process than most people realize. Where, as here, the legislative objective is vital to the public interest and at the

same time involves conflicting private interest, my experience leads me to conclude that it is far more effective in the long run to set for ourselves a minimum rather than a maximum goal; to seek a basic rather than an all inclusive objective; to settle for half a loaf of real sustenance rather than no bread at all.

What, then, is the minimum objective of any bank holding legislation?

First. To prevent unlimited expansion of holding companies over banks and by so doing preserve the independent unit banking system.

Second. To prevent the combining under the same management of both banking and nonbanking interests. The public trust inherent in private banking operations makes it imperative to eliminate any possibility of the abuse of this relationship by using banking resources for the furtherance of nonbanking enterprises of the same parent company.

Both the Senate and House bills cover the minimum objectives outlined by Senator Maybank, and in regard to the divestment of nonbanking assets, are primarily the same.

The principal controversy revolves around the method of controlling the future expansion of bank holding companies. The differences between the two bills on this point fall into 3 segments:

First. The procedure for obtaining approval of future acquisitions of bank shares as assets;

Second. The prohibition of acquisition across State lines; and

Third. The relation of branch banking laws to bank holding company operations.

Since criticisms of the Senate bill have centered on these 3 points, I should like to discuss them in some detail.

APPROVAL OF ACQUISITIONS

Both the Senate and House bills require bank holding companies to obtain prior approval before acquiring additional bank shares or assets.

The House bill grants to the bank supervisory authorities—State authority or the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case may be—the power to veto any acquisition without a hearing and regardless of the opinion of the Federal Reserve Board. The House bill permits the Federal Reserve Board to participate in the decision only if the State authorities or the Comptroller approve the acquisition. The Federal Reserve Board is opposed to the House procedure because, as Chairman MARTIN said at our Senate committee hearings:

> This requirement would result in an undesirable diffusion of responsibility and give rise to duplication of effort and administrative difficulties.

The Comptroller of the Currency also is opposed to the House provision.

Some members of the committee believed that the power of decision should be placed solely in the hands of the Federal Reserve Board, with the bank supervisory authorities playing only an informal consulting role.

S. 2577 represents a compromise between the two views. It affords the bank supervisory authorities an opportunity to file with the Federal Reserve Board a formal recommendation that an acquisition be disapproved. But it also provides that if such a recommendation is made, the Federal Reserve Board must provide a hearing of record after due notice at which the testimony of all interested parties may be received. After the hearing has been held, the Federal Reserve Board is required to approve or disapprove the acquisition by formal order. The bill then permits any party aggrieved by the order the right to a judicial review of the order by an appropriate Federal court of appeals. This procedure should afford an opportunity for developing the true merits of each case and also assures adequate recourse to court review for the aggrieved party.

ACQUISITION ACROSS STATE LINES

The procedure which I have outlined will apply to all acquisitions of bank stocks or assets either within a State or across State lines. In view of the adequate opportunity for expression of opinion by the bank supervisory authorities, the committee did not deem it necessary or advisable to insert in the bill an absolute prohibition against the expansion of bank holding companies across State lines as contained in the House bill and urged by the Independent Bankers Association. An absolute prohibition of that nature would constitute a Federal freeze on future expansion without regard to the merits of each individual case.

The American Bankers Association, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Comptroller of the Currency testified in opposition to any absolute prohibition against acquisition across State lines.

The statement made by Senator Maybank in 1952 is very pertinent on the question of States' rights. Senator Maybank said:

> In the name of States' rights the position is taken that no bank holding company should be permitted to acquire bank stocks or assets across State lines or in any State in which branch banking is not allowed.
>
> Now, to me, States' rights means the right of a State to choose its own course of action on a matter within its own jurisdiction and not have the Federal Government make up its mind for it. This is the positive approach. A State should have the right to permit or prohibit branch banking, and at the same time, it should have the right to permit or prohibit the operation of bank holding companies within its borders. Any Federal legislation which forces a State to change its policies with respect either to branch banking or holding companies would be an unwarranted interference with States' rights. It is conceivable, for instance, that a State might seek for its banks financial assistance which an out-of-State holding company might be able to render. Yet a State would be powerless to do so if proposals for a flat prohibition by Federal law against expansion of bank holding companies across State lines existed.

It should be noted that another provision of the Senate bill expressly preserves to the States their present authority over bank holding companies within their respective borders. Therefore, each State may, within the limits of its proper jurisdictional authority, enact legislation to regulate bank holding companies. Mr. President, as an example of the type of legislation the States may enact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a bill recently passed by the Georgia Legislature.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Bill No. 30, Legislature, State of Georgia, by Senator Lambert, of the 28th

A bill to be entitled "An act to provide for the prohibition of the owning, controlling or holding by certain companies of more than 15 percent of voting stock of banks as defined therein and of bank holding companies as defined therein; to define company as included in said prohibition to include any bank, corporation, partnership, joint stock company, business trust, voting trust, association, or similarly organized group of persons and the shareholders and those persons who otherwise own the company or are officers thereof; to provide that stock held by the immediate family of a shareholder, owner, or officer of a company as defined in the act shall be construed to be owned, controlled, or held by the company; to provide for restriction of certain foreign companies in voting stock or said bank or holding company; and to provide for certain exceptions to said prohibition and restriction and for other purposes"

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia as follows:

SECTION 1. The maintenance of competitive services between banks has been found to be the best method of serving the public. There are dangers in the concentration of economic power through centralized control of banks. It is, therefore, held to be in the public interest to curtail such concentration of economic power by preventing the expansion of bank holding companies and similar organizations.

SEC. 2. Unless the context requires otherwise: (a) "Bank" means any national bank or State bank, banking association, savings bank or trust company, whether organized under the laws of Georgia, the laws of another State, or the laws of the United States, doing business in the State of Georgia.

(b) "Company" means any bank, corporation, partnership, joint stock company, business trust, voting trust, association, or similarly organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not, and includes the shareholders and those persons who otherwise own the company and including any foreign corporation or other organization or association doing business in Georgia, but shall not include any corporation or community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation.

(c) "Bank holding company" means any company incorporated or organized under the laws of the State of Georgia or doing business in Georgia, which directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds, with power to vote, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of 2 or more banks.

(d) A company will be construed to own, control, or hold, with power to vote, stock indirectly whenever any officer or shareholder of such company or any natural person included within the definition of "company" in section (b) of this act or any member of the immediate family of such officer or shareholder or of such natural person, shall own, control or hold, with power to vote, such stock. Immediate family includes a spouse, children, mother, father, brother, and sister.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any company directly or indirectly to own, control, vote, or hold, with power to vote the same, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of

each of 2 or more banks, except that it shall not be unlawful for a company to continue to own, control, vote, or hold, with power to vote, such voting stock as it owns, controls, or holds, on the effective date of this act. Also, in municipalities now having branches of a bank with a holding-company relation, such banks may make branches of existing holding-company banks; and in the future in cities of over 80,000 population, according to the 1950 or subsequent census, now having branches of a bank, present branches will have the same privilege of additional branches as permitted to other banks.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any company directly or indirectly to own, control, vote, or hold, with power to vote the same, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of a bank holding company, except that it shall not be unlawful for a company to continue to own, control, vote, or hold, with power to vote, that stock of a bank holding company which it owns, controls, or holds on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any company hereafter to acquire, with power to vote the same, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of 2 or more banks, except that it shall not be unlawful for any company to acquire, with power to vote the same, any stock in banks, a majority of whose voting stock such company owns, holds, or controls, on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 6. It shall be unlawful for any company to acquire, with power to vote the same, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of a bank holding company.

SEC. 7. It shall be unlawful for any foreign company owning, controlling, or holding, with power to vote the same, 15 percent or more of the voting stock of each of 2 or more banks, to vote more than 15 percent of the stock of more than 1 such bank in any 1 year, except that it shall not be unlawful for a company to vote that voting stock which it owns, controls, or holds on the effective date of this act.

SEC. 8. This act shall not apply to the holding by a company in respect of its owning, controlling, or holding, with power to vote, stock in a bank or banks or bank holding company or companies in a fiduciary capacity, unless such stock is held for the benefit of another company or for the benefit of a majority of the stockholders of such bank.

SEC. 9. Any company which violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction, be fined not less than $500 nor more than $1,500. Each day on which such violation occurs will constitute a separate offense.

SEC. 10. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 11. All laws and parts of law in conflict with this act hereby are repealed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in the opinion of the committee, this provision of the Senate bill, which is the same as one in the House bill, adequately safeguards States rights concerning bank-holding companies.

BRANCH BANKING

The committee also decided against the inclusion of a provision in the bill which would automatically apply State laws concerning branch banking to bank-holding company operations. This provision was contained in the House bill and was advocated by the Independent Bankers Association. A bank branch is, by form, ownership, and functions, vastly different from a bank-holding company affiliate.

A chart has been prepared by the American Bankers Association showing clearly the many differences between branch banking and holding company operations. I ask unanimous consent that the chart be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF BRANCH BANKING AND HOLDING COMPANY OPERATIONS

BRANCH BANKING	HOLDING COMPANY OPERATION
Corporate organization	*Corporation organization*
One legal entity created under a single charter covering the main office of bank and all its branches.	Two or more separate legal entities each created under a separate charter, one for each bank affiliate.
Stockholders	*Stockholders*
Possess the same stockholders.	Possess different set of stockholders for each affiliate.
Supervision	*Supervision*
Main office of bank and all branches are under supervision of the identical authority as provided by the laws under which organized. Could be either Federal or State laws. Main office and all branches also would be subject to supervision of Federal Reserve System if a member or FDIC, if insured.	Each affiliate individually is subject to supervision under the laws under which it was separately organized. Some affiliates could be organized under State laws and others under Federal laws. Each affiliate may or may not be subject to supervision of Federal Reserve System or FDIC, depending if such affiliate is a member of the Federal Reserve System or if insured in the FDIC. If a holding company controls both national and State member banks and procures a voting permit, then the holding company, as well as all of its affiliated nonmember State banks are subject to examination by and reporting of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board.
Board of directors	*Board of directors*
One board of directors.	A separate Board for each affiliate. Statutes commonly impose residence requirement. For example, national banking laws require that every director, during his whole term of service must be a citizen of the United States, and at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the association is located, or within 50 miles of the location of the office of the association for at least 1 year immediately preceding their election, and must be residents of such State or reside within a 50-mile territory of the location of the association during their continuance in office. Each director must own stock in the association, the aggregate par value of which shall be at least $1,000, unless the capital of the bank does not exceed $25,000, in which case he shall own not less than $500. Any director ceasing to own the required number of shares, shall vacate his place.
Management	*Management*
Amounts to absentee management by officers of main office and board of directors. Officers in charge usually have limited powers.	Affiliates are local institutions managed by local board of directors and officers. May have some supervision and assistance on loan and investment overall policies from holding company.
Capital structure	*Capital structure*
Single capital structure for main office and all its branches.	Separate capital structure for each affiliate. Changes in capital are subject to the supervisory authority having jurisdiction over each affiliate.
Deposits	*Deposits*
All deposits pooled as deposit liability of and available for investment or loans by the bank through main office or any of its branches.	Each affiliate has its own deposits which are its sole liability, and which such affiliate alone can invest or loan from its own office and to its own customers.
Loan limit	*Loan limit*
Loan limit based upon capital and surplus applies to the aggregate of all loans made at main office and at all branches. (In case of National Banks the limit is 10 percent of capital and surplus). As a result a small branch in an industrial section can handle the loan require-	Each affiliate has its own loan limit based upon its own capital and surplus. This limit has no relation to capital and surplus of any or all of the other affiliate banks and the holding company. An affiliate has a special restriction imposed by section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act with respect to loans to other affiliates. An affiliate in an industrial section can only handle the loan requirements of a

COMPARISON OF BRANCH BANKING AND HOLDING COMPANY OPERATIONS—Continued

BRANCH BANKING	HOLDING COMPANY OPERATION
ments of large customers up to the total limit permitted of the whole branch banking operation. Consequently the branch usually carries the deposit accounts of such customers.	customer up to its individual limits. Consequently substantial deposits of the customer usually go to a larger bank or branch banking operation with larger loan limits.
Loanable funds	*Loanable funds*
Each branch has access to entire capital funds and deposits of the bank (main office) and all branches. Consequently a branch might lend more than the total deposits of that particular branch.	Each affiliate has available for loans only its own capital funds and deposits. This parallels the situation of independent banks. An affiliate therefore is dependent upon correspondent banks to share excess loans.
Termination	*Termination*
Branch can be closed at any time if unprofitable. All that is required to close a national bank branch is a resolution of the board of directors or of the stockholders, if branch is described in articles of association, and the transmittal to the comptroller of such resolution together with certificate authorizing the branch.	Requires voluntary liquidation of affiliate according to provisions of the State or Federal laws under which it was chartered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the representatives of the American Bankers Association in opposing the branch banking provision stated:

> The prohibition in H. R. 6227 against expansion of a bank holding company within a State based upon geographic limitations applying to the establishment of branches of banks will result in inevitable confusion and conflict of laws and should be deleted. It is an attempt to regulate two dissimilar types of organization by laws designed specifically to apply only to one; that is, branch banking.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency also were emphatically opposed to the House provision.

I have purposely stressed the testimony of the American Bankers Association because the association's position has been misrepresented in editorials appearing in a newspaper called the American Banker. This newspaper is not affiliated with the American Bankers Association and seems to take great pleasure in misinforming its readers as to the ABA's position on this legislation. I am afraid that the newspaper violated its own motto which appeared under the masthead on the December 6, 1955, editorial page. The motto reads:

> Preference becomes prejudice when we refuse to see the good of anything we happen to dislike.

For example, the first of these American Banker editorials asserted that the Boston convention of the American Bankers Association went on record unequivocally against holding company banking expansion across State lines and that the ABA resolution "definitely brackets holding company banking with branch banking." It charged that nowhere in my article in Banking Magazine was any respect for the ABA's views shown.

The second editorial again charged me with omitting mention of the Boston resolution and of improperly assuming that the American Bankers Association was ready to accept my bill.

One thing these editorials did not mention was that the ABA resolution to which they referred was adopted not last year or the year before but in 1937 and that this Boston resolution made absolutely no mention of bank holding companies but dealt exclusively with branch banking.

To clarify the record, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the pertinent section of the Boston resolution.

There being no objection, the section of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM BOSTON RESOLUTION, 1937, ON BRANCH BANKING

We favor the preservation and continuation of the dual banking system by which banks are free to operate under either State or national charter. We also believe that the system of unit banks has been peculiarly adapted to the highly diversified community life of the United States. However, many of the States now authorize by law the operation of branch banks. We believe that national banks should, as they do now, continue to enjoy an equality with State banks of branch banking privileges within those States. The association supports in every respect the autonomy of the laws of the separate States with respect to banking. We reiterate our belief that no class of banks in any State should enjoy a greater right in respect to the establishment of branches than banks chartered under State laws. We are definitely opposed to any proposal or device looking to the establishment of branch banking privileges across State lines, directly or indirectly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I also ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, following the resolution, excerpts from testimony given before our committee last year by the representative of the American Bankers Association, Mr. George R. Boyles, indicating the latest position taken by that organization on bank holding company legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY OF GEORGE R. BOYLES ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKING, SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, JULY 11, 1955

Mr. BOYLES. My name is George R. Boyles and I am president of the Merchants National Bank in Chicago, Chicago, Ill., and chairman of the committee on Federal legislation of the American Bankers Association.

For many years the regulation of bank holding companies has received the thoughtful study of the association and as a result there has been crystallization of certain overall policies. For your information, I would like to explain that all policy matters of the association are arrived at only after careful deliberation by the various divisions, commission, committees, and sections of the association and then approved by the membership in general convention.

The policies of the association on bank holding company regulation, after due processing through its committee on Federal legislation, the administrative committee, and the executive council, were approved by the general convention of the American Bankers Association on September 22, 1953, at its convention assembled in Washington, D. C.

The membership in the American Bankers Association consists of approximately 15,000 member banks, both National and State banks, large banks and small banks, independent banks, banks with branches, banks affiliated with holding companies, chain groups, and mutual savings banks. About 98 percent of the banks in this country are members of the association.

In order to simplify and save this committee's time, I have prepared a supplemental statement attached hereto outlining the position of the ABA in relation to H. R. 6227.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF GEORGE R. BOYLES ON H. R. 6227

* * * * *

2. ACQUISITION OF BANK SHARES OR BANK ASSETS

The provisions of section 5 of H. R. 6227 in reality constitute a Federal freeze on any future expansion across States lines and within a State unless such State affirmatively authorizes the same by statute. This attempt to regulate by Federal authority in such drastic fashion seems inequitable and impractical. It should be remembered that during the past 25 years bank holding companies served a useful purpose in supplying many communities with services, especially during the trying depression period of the early thirties. Not only that, but this country in recent years has been undergoing a rapid expansion of production and population. The demands of the Nation's dynamic economy requires the further development of bank services, the increase of banking resources and the assurance of the continuity of sound bank managment. In their operations bank holding companies have made their contributions in this respect.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is believed that the expansion limitations of H. R. 6227 could be improved as follows:

1. The complete Federal freeze of any expansion of a bank holding company outside of the State in which located, as provided for in H. R. 6227, is an invasion of the rights of the outside State. It should be modified so as not to deprive such outside State of the right to determine whether such expansion is to be prohibited or permitted.

2. The prohibition in H. R. 6227 against expansion of a bank holding company within a State based upon geographic limitations applying to the establishment of branches of banks will result in inevitable confusion and conflict of laws and should be deleted. It is an attempt to regulate two dissimilar types of organizations by laws designed specifically to apply only to one, that is, branch banking. A bank branch is for form, ownership, and functions vastly different from a bank holding company affiliate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to mention also a so-called survey which was conducted by the American Banker, and which was pub-

lished in the November 30, 1955, issue of that newspaper.

This survey purported to reveal that the small town bankers of our country are overwhelmingly in favor of the House bill. According to the newspaper, 9,955 of the approximately 14,392 banks in this country were asked 9 questions. One of these questions was, "Do you favor the Spence bill to regulate holding companies?" One thousand six hundred and ninety, or 16.97 percent of the surveyed bankers, answered the question, with 83.72 percent of these voting "yes."

This survey is misleading in several respects. First of all, only about 12 percent of the bankers in the country answered the question, and these were mostly from small towns. Secondly, the bankers were given no alternative in the question. The bankers were not given an opportunity to express an opinion on the Senate bill, or even made aware by the question that such a bill existed.

It also is interesting that the newspaper states:

> While the bankers answering our survey were free with commentary on most other questions asked, there were no comments whatsoever on this question.

I believe the reason for this is that the majority of bankers do not understand all the complex features of the proposed legislation.

I am sure that the small-town bankers would agree with me that it is better to pass the Senate bill and put its safeguarding provisions into effect rather than leave the subject once more in the field of fruitless debate.

Finally, Mr. President, I desire to discuss briefly the committee amendments to S. 2577.

I emphasize that these amendments in no way change the fundamental principles or objectives of this bill. The amendments to the nontax sections of the bill are designed to correct technical and typographical errors, and to clarify the language of several provisions so that any possible misinterpretation of the committee's intent can be avoided. The nontax amendments were in part based on recommendations of the Treasury Department, and all were approved by the Federal Reserve Board. No one objected to any of these amendments. I am sure they are completely satisfactory to the Independent Bankers' Association, Transamerica Corporation, other bank-holding companies, and other segments of the banking industry.

The amendments to the tax provisions of the bill were recommended by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the Treasury Department. The tax amendments have also been cleared by the Senate Finance Committee. The purpose of these amendments is to prevent abuse and to make the provisions more flexible to meet legitimate business needs by aligning them closer to similar provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. As in the case of the nontax amendments, the changes in the tax provisions are supported by all elements of the banking industry.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to remind my colleagues that when the present law on bank-holding companies was enacted in 1933 there were only a few bank-holding companies in existence, they had only limited assets, and did not furnish serious competition to independent banks.

Today there are 163 companies controlling one or more banks, and they have deposits of more than $25 billion. Only 18 of these are classified as bank-holding companies under the existing law. The bill which I first introduced would have applied to all of them. S. 2577, which applies only to companies controlling two or more banks, but with a stricter definition of control than was proposed in my original bill, would fully cover 42 of these companies.

The committee hearings which Senators now have before them show that 1 bank holding company, Transamerica Corp., controls the operation of 8 banks, with more than 200 branch offices, and with assets of around $2½ billion. In addition, Transamerica, according to the testimony of Mr. Belgrano, its president, has nonbanking investments worth about $1 billion.

Nothing is more fundamental in the Banking Act of 1933 than the principle that banks should be restricted to banking activities and not engage in other types of business. Since 1933 both State and national banks have been so limited, but this limitation has been evaded by the bank holding company device, as indicated in the example of Transamerica. The divestment requirements of S. 2577 would correct that situation, but still would make liberal allowance for holding companies to continue to carry on functions closely related to banking which are essential for their efficient operation.

Recently there has been much discussion, in and out of Congress, of bank mergers. I believe there is substantially greater danger of abuse through the bank holding company device than through the process of bank mergers. Imagine what a New York City bank with deposits of $7 billion could do in the way of competition with other banks if it also controlled a vast industrial empire worth $1 billion, and had unlimited ability to establish banks throughout New York State and in any other State.

It is inconceivable to me that any Member of this distinguished body would say that the time has not come to put a curb on such possible expansion. The pending bill not only would divorce the bank holding companies from their industrial empires, but also would put any future expansion under the control of the Federal Reserve Board, which would have the advice and assistance of the Comptroller of the Currency and State bank regulating agencies—the agencies which are charged with responsibility for maintaining the strength and the integrity of our monetary system.

I can understand why some Members of the Senate, like some Members of the House, would advocate a more stringent bill which would place bank holding companies in a straitjacket by prohibiting any expansion across State lines, even when such expansion was welcomed by the State involved. We must be realistic, however, and remember the futile efforts which have been made in the past to enact legislation on this subject. One such effort, which failed, was backed not only by Carter Glass, but by his Banking and Currency Committee colleague, Senator McAdoo, of California. Both of those Senators had been Secretaries of the Treasury, and both had been candidates for the presidential nomination. Never in the history of the Congress have two such distinguished experts on banking requested Congress to enact legislation regulating bank holding companies, but they never got their bill out of the committee.

It was in consideration of this history that the members of our present committee agreed on a compromise bill which presents a more moderate approach. We do not contend that it is perfect. We do believe that it meets the minimum requirements referred to by the late Senator Maybank for bank holding company legislation, and that it is fair to the holding companies, though not so generous as they might have desired.

I feel confident that when the time comes to vote on this bill an overwhelming number of Senators will favor it. However, if the bill should be voted down, no Member of the Senate and no independent banker should expect any member of the Banking and Currency Committee again to spend many weeks preparing for consideration another bill of this type. If the bill cannot be passed at this session, we might as well conclude—as the late Senator Glass did, after 1941—that such an attempt would be wasted effort.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to which I have previously referred be considered and agreed to en bloc; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee's report, giving a detailed explanation of the amendments. I then desire to call up the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, let me say that I understand the request of the Senator from Virginia to be that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, with the result that the bill with the amendments shall appear as if it were original text; and that if that is done, it will not prevent any Member from submitting additional amendments to any part of the bill, including the committee amendments to which the Senator from Virginia has referred.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Exactly. I emphasize that my request, if agreed to, will not preclude action by means of other amendments. Furthermore, let me state that when we dispose of the committee amendments in the way I have proposed, I shall then move that the Senate adjourn. Then—inasmuch as I have requested that the explanation of the amendments be printed in the RECORD—all Members who are interested will be able to read the explanation. Then on tomorrow we shall be able to proceed with any additional amendments that any Senator may desire to

submit; and at that time a full record on the committee amendments will be available to all Members.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia indicate where the printed amendments appear in the bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They will be read by the clerk. There are 11 of them, but most of them are technical; in other words, where the date "1955" appears, we propose that it be changed to "1956."

In addition, we completely rewrote the tax amendment which appears in the latter part of the bill so as to bring it in line with the provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in respect to a spin-off which was not made for the purpose of tax evasion.

But these amendments are largely technical. The substantive amendment is, primarily, the one in regard to the tax provision. There are several minor changes for the benefit of bank-holding companies. However, as I have said, all agencies connected with the Government have approved the amendments, and our committee was unanimous in regard to them; and the amendments improve the bill without in any way changing its fundamental philosophy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Virginia state whether he wishes to have the amendments considered in the regular way?

Mr. ROBERTSON. No, Mr. President; I am requesting unanimous consent that, without prejudice, the committee amendments may now be considered and agreed to en bloc. If such consent is given, and if the committee amendments are thus agreed to, I shall then—at the instance of the majority leader—move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia be willing to make some explanation of the committee amendments as he proceeds? Is it necessary that the Senate adjourn at once?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; I can make the explanations. However, to save time, I have requested that the explanations be printed in the RECORD, inasmuch as not many Members are present at this time. So, by having the explanations printed in the RECORD, they can be read by all Members.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the Senator from Virginia wishes to have the committee amendments acted upon in what has become a rather customary manner, namely, to have the committee amendments considered and agreed to en bloc, so that the bill, including the committee amendments, will then be before us as original text, and then will be subject to amendment, without any question as to whether further amendments will be in the second degree or in the third degree.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Exactly; of course, I assume there will not be any contest regarding the committee amendments.

Mr. ANDERSON. However, I wish to be sure that we do not get into such a parliamentary situation that it will be impossible for Senators to submit amendments to the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have made clear that the action I propose will not, if agreed to, prejudice further amendment of the bill. Instead, the entire bill will become, as the Senator from Minnesota has indicated, practically a new bill or new text, subject to amendment to any part of it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Virginia intend to have each amendment read?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Of course each amendment shows on its face where it will appear in the bill. If any Member wishes to have a further explanation made, I shall be glad to give it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? If not, the first amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make it crystal clear that I have requested unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that if that is done, any Senator may thereafter have the privilege of submitting, and having considered, any amendment he may wish to submit to any part of the bill, including the committee amendments. In other words, the action I request on the committee amendments will not, if taken, prejudice the right of any Member to submit further amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? Without objection——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the request of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, will it be possible for amendments to be offered to the committee amendments which now are before us?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, the bill will then be open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Do I correctly understand that both the original text of the bill and the committee amendments will then be open to amendment ?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. If the committee amendments are now agreed to en bloc, will they be open to amendment in the second degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will then be considered as original text of the bill, and will be open to amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, let me state that it is my understanding that if my request is agreed to, the committee amendments, after being agreed to en bloc, will be open to amendment in the same way that they would be if the committee amendments were considered one by one; and then any Senator will be in a position to offer to them any amendment he may please. If my request is agreed to, we shall thereafter be able to act on the committee amendments; and there will be no change in their status, in the case of subsequent amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not the purpose of the Senator from Virginia to perfect the bill, so that the text of the original bill, together with the committee amendments, will be considered as new text, just as if the amendments had been incorporated in the bill beforehand?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Exactly. Let me say that after the hearings last July, it was suggested that by means of certain amendments the bill could be improved. But by that time the bill had been reported to the Senate, and was on the calendar; and we did not wish to remove it from the calendar. So we unanimously approved these amendments.

The purpose of my request is to have the committee amendments included in the bill as original text, so that the text will then read in the way it would have read if we had had the privilege of writing the amendments in extenso into the original bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the request of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to, it seems to me that a Member who then desires to ascertain what is included in the bill and what changes have been made by means of the committee amendments will have to compare the new text with the old text.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not customary for the committee to submit to the Senate, for its examination, a finished bill?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committee did furnish a finished bill, as is generally done; but after the bill was reported to the Senate and was placed on the calendar, the commmittee agreed to some additional amendments, which were printed, together with a report on each one.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I understand that the Senator from Virginia has reference to the fact that certain printed amendments appear in the copy of the bill which now is before us, and that the Senator from Virginia is requesting that these committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes, with a slight addition; I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to the fact that the additional amendments are in the print I have before me, which is not the same as the committee print.

Mr. THYE. What is the date of the print to which the Senator from Virginia refers?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me say that I now have the correct form for the request from the Parliamentarian. I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the amendments, as agreed to, be

considered as original text of the bill for the purpose of further amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make certain that we understand the request. After all, the procedure in the case of this bill has been rather unusual, in that the bill was reported to the Senate and was placed on the calendar last fall; and since that time the committee has held hearings, and has agreed to additional amendments, even though the bill was already on the calendar, ready for consideration and passage. Therefore, the situation is a rather strange one, and I wish to make certain that nothing is done to prevent any Member from submitting any amendment which normally he would be entitled to submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the request made by the Senator from Virginia would not take away any of the rights of Senators with respect to amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the document which I hold in my hand entitled "Calendar No. 1107—Additional Amendments" represents amendments which were agreed to by the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. They were unanimously agreed to. The distinguished Senator from Indiana was one of us.

Mr. CAPEHART. As I understand, the request is that the Senate approve the amendments which I hold in my hand, which were agreed to by the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. And with the understanding that any Senator shall have the right to make a motion to strike any of those amendments, or to amend them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under those circumstances, I have no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. Would it be proper, if these amendments should be agreed to en bloc today, to make a motion that the Senate be furnished tomorrow with a print of the bill as amended, containing the corrections, so that we shall have before us tomorrow a clean copy?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that such a motion or unanimous consent request would be in order.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I make such request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is already one unanimous-consent request pending before the Senate.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I asked for approval of the committee amendments with the understanding that the Senator from Utah would then make his request that the bill, as amended, be printed.

Mr. BENNETT. The request of the Senator from Virginia has been agreed to.

I now renew my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether or not the request of the Senator from Virginia has been agreed to. The Senator from Virginia asked unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc. That request must be disposed of before the amendments are considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that that has been done. The Chair put the request, and asked if there was objection. The Chair heard none.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not wish to make a point of it, but I think there were two requests to come before the Senate, and not one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair leaves that up to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. ANDERSON. Of course, the RECORD can be doctored.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that the request of the Senator from Virginia has been disposed of.

The explanations submitted by Mr. ROBERTSON are as follows:

NONTAX AMENDMENTS

The committee wishes to emphasize that these amendments do not in any way change the principal objectives of this proposed legislation. These objectives are: (1) To regulate the future expansion of bank holding companies, and (2) to require bank holding companies to divest their nonbanking investments. The amendments are designed to correct technical errors in the bill and to clarify the language of several provisions so that any possible misinterpretation of the committee's intent can be avoided.

CHANGE OF DATE

The bill as reported by the committee bears the short title of "Bank Holding Company Act of 1955." Since the bill will be scheduled for enactment during 1956, it is necessary to change "1955" to "1956" in the short title wherever it appears in the bill. This is accomplished by striking "1955" and inserting "1956" on page 1, line 4, and page 14, line 23, in the substantive sections of the bill. The tax amendments make the necessary date changes in the tax provisions.

SHAREHOLDERS OR MEMBERS

On page 5, line 9, of the bill as reported by the committee, a reference is made to shares held by trustees for the benefit of the "shareholders and members" of a bank holding company. The "and" is a typographical error and should read "or." This change makes the provision conform to the language on page 2, line 3, where reference is also made to "shareholders or members."

ACQUISITION SHARES IN A FIDUCIARY CAPACITY

Section 3 (a) of the bill requires prior approval by the Federal Reserve Board before any action may be taken which results in a company (including a bank) becoming a bank holding company. The bill as reported provided an exemption from this requirement for a bank which is a bank holding company in cases where the shares were acquired (i) in good faith in a fiduciary capacity or (ii) in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt. This language would seem to preclude a bank which is not a bank holding company from acquiring such shares in other banks or in bank holding companies without prior approval by the Board. It was not the intent of the committee to require approval by the Board where a bank acquired shares in a fiduciary capacity or in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt. In order to clarify the language of the exemption, the committee struck the words "which is a bank holding company" on lines 4 and 5 of page 6. Thus, the amendment exempts from the prohibition of section 3 (a) "shares acquired by a bank (i) in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank, or (ii) in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith but any shares acquired after the date of enactment of this act in securing or collecting any such previously contracted debt shall be disposed of within a period of 2 years from the date on which they were acquired."

SHARES IN A BANK HOLDING COMPANY

Section 4 (a) (2) of the bill as reported provides in part that no bank holding company shall, after the date of enactment of the act, "retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank." This language would prohibit a bank holding company from holding shares in a subsidiary bank holding company. This result was not intended, since it is a common practice for bank holding companies to hold a part or all of their banking investments in a subsidiary corporation. In order to remedy this situation, line 17 on page 8 was amended by adding after the word "bank" the words "or a bank holding company." Thus, this section as amended provides that no bank holding company shall after the date of enactment of the act "retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank or a bank holding company."

SUBSIDIARY SERVICE COMPANIES

Section 4 (c) provides certain exemptions from the divestment requirements of the bill. Subparagraph (1) of section 4 (c), as reported by the committee, exempts companies engaged in serving the bank holding company and its subsidiary banks in "auditing, appraising, investment counseling." Your committee has found this provision too restrictive as there are many other legitimate types of servicing which should be permitted. Other services rendered by subsidiary companies are in the fields of advertising, public relations, developing new business, organization, operations, preparing tax returns, personnel, and many others.

In order to properly encompass this wide range of activities, your committee amended subparagraph (1) to exempt such companies solely engaged in "furnishing services to or performing services for" the bank holding company and its banking subsidiaries. Thus, the bill, as amended, would permit a bank holding company to furnish these services to its subsidiaries through a subsidiary company as well as directly by the holding company itself as provided in section 4 (a) (2).

This provision is not intended to supplant the exemption contained under section 4 (c) (6), where the Federal Reserve Board is given discretion to exempt activities of a "financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature" which are so closely related to banking as to be a proper incident thereto. Such financial, fiduciary, or insurance activities do not come within the scope of the meaning of the phrase "furnishing services to or performing services for a bank holding company." The

servicing exemption should not be interpreted to include activities beyond the ordinary category of such services.

SHARES ACQUIRED IN SATISFACTION OF A DEBT

Section 4 (c) (2) of the bill as reported provides an exemption from the divestment requirements for shares acquired by a bank holding company which is a bank or "any of its banking subsidiaries" in satisfaction of a debt previously contracted in good faith. A literal reading of this language would seem to provide an exemption only for banking subsidiaries of a bank holding company which is a bank. It was intended that the exemption would apply to banking subsidiaries of any bank holding company. This provision was clarified by amending line 4 on page 10 by striking the words "any of its banking subsidiaries" and inserting in lieu thereof "by any banking subsidiary of a bank holding company." Thus, a banking subsidiary of any bank holding company could qualify under this exemption.

SHARES ACQUIRED IN A FIDUCIARY CAPACITY

Section 4 (c) (4) of the bill as reported provides an exemption from the divestment requirements of the bill for shares which are held or acquired by a bank which is a bank holding company in a fiduciary capacity. This language would not permit a banking subsidiary of a bank holding company to qualify under this exemption. Lines 19 and 20 on page 10 were amended by striking the words "which is a bank holding company in a fiduciary capacity" and inserting in lieu thereof "holding company which is a bank or by any banking subsidiary of a bank holding company, in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of the shareholders such bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries."

Thus the exemption applies both to a bank holding company which is a bank and to a banking subsidiary of any bank holding company with the limitation that such shares cannot be held for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries.

OWNERSHIP AND ACQUISITION OF SHARES

Section 4 (c) (5) of the bill as reported provides an exemption from the divestment requirements for the ownership by a bank holding company of up to 5 percent of the shares of any company. This section does not refer to the acquisition of shares as is set forth in other exemptions under section 4 (c). Because of the shift in language, it could be argued that this exemption does not apply to the acquisition of shares but only to the retention of shares already owned. To clarify the situation, lines 24 and 25 on page 10 were amended by striking the words "to the ownership by a bank holding company of shares of any company" and by inserting in lieu thereof "to shares of any company which are held or acquired by a bank holding company." This amendment makes it clear that the exemption applies to both the acquisition and ownership of such shares.

LABOR, AGRICULTURAL OR HORTICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS

Section 4 (c) (7) of the bill as reported contains an exemption from the divestment requirements for any bank holding company which is a labor, agricultural, or horticultural organization. Although the committee report points out that in order to be entitled to this exemption no net income derived by any such organization can inure to the benefit of any individual, this limitation is not set forth in the language of the subsection. The intention of the committee is made explicit by inserting at the end of the subsection on line 15, page 11, the words "and which is exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

FOREIGN BANKING SUBSIDIARIES

Section 2 (c) of the bill as reported defines "bank" so as to exclude any organization which does not do business within the United States. Thus, technically, any foreign banking subsidiary of a bank holding company would be a nonbanking investment and would be required to be divested pursuant to section 4 (a) of the bill. The Federal Reserve Board would probably exempt such foreign banking subsidiaries from divestment by applying the provisions of section 4 (c) (6), which authorizes the Board to exempt companies of a financial nature which are so closely related to the business of banking as to be a proper incident thereto.

However, in order to make it unmistakably clear that foreign banking subsidiaries are not subject to divestment, the committee added a new subparagraph (8) to section 4 (c) specifically exempting such subsidiaries. The amendment provides that the divestment requirements shall not apply "to shares held or acquired by a bank holding company in any company which is organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged principally in the banking business outside the United States."

ADMINISTRATION

The committee agreed in reporting out the bill that section 5 (a) contain the same language as set forth in section 4 (a) of H. R. 6227 in regard to the information required by a bank holding company in registering with the Federal Reserve Board. However, through inadvertence, improper language was inserted on lines 22 through 25 on page 11. This was corrected by striking the words beginning with "history" on line 22 through to the word "organizations" on line 25 and inserting in lieu thereof "condition and operations, management, and intercompany relationships of the bank holding company and its subsidiaries."

RESERVATION OF STATES RIGHTS

A great deal of concern has been expressed that section 7 of the bill as reported by the committee granted new authority and powers to States over national banks in general, and respecting the stocks of national banks in particular. This concern apparently has arisen as a result of the language added to this section by the committee and certain statements which appeared in the committee report. The language added by the committee in the bill as reported provided that States in the exercise of their jurisdiction and powers over banks and bank holding companies could impose "no less onerous" restrictions than were provided in the bill. The intent of the committee was to make it clear that a State could not enact legislation inconsistent with the bill and therefore nullify its effect. In view of the fact that the meaning of the no less onerous clause has apparently been misconstrued by some persons, the committee agreed to strike the clause and thus return to the language of the comparable section of H. R. 6227. However, your committee reiterates its view that section 7 in no way permits States to exercise such powers and jurisdiction in a manner inconsistent with this proposed legislation.

In order to clarify the legislative history of section 7, the committee wishes to emphasize that this section does not grant any new authority to States over national banks. The purpose of the section is to preserve to the States those powers which they now have in our dual banking system. It is always of uppermost importance in legislation of this nature to preserve the dual system of National and State banks, and section 7 must be viewed in that light.

TIME LIMIT ON JUDICIAL REVIEW

Section 9 of the bill as reported by the committee contained no limit on the time within which an aggrieved party must seek judicial review of an order of the Federal Reserve Board. A time limit is necessary so that persons or companies affected by the Board's orders may know when they may act in reliance thereon without fear of the orders being subsequently set aside or modified by court decree. The committee amended this section by providing that any aggrieved party seeking judicial review must do so within "60 days after entry of the Board's order."

TAX AMENDMENTS

GENERAL EXPLANATION

H. R. 6227, passed by the House of Representatives, would add a new part VIII to subchapter O of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under this new part, several tax-free paths are provided for the divestment of property which this bill imposes on a bank holding company. S. 2577, as originally reported, adopted the tax provisions of the House bill with certain technical changes. Your committee's additional amendments modify these tax provisions so as to prevent abuse and to make them more flexible to meet legitimate business needs by aliining them closer to similar provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

In general, a corporation which comes within the terms of the bill as a bank holding company can choose between remaining a bank holding company or disposing of its interests in banks. The tax provisions of the bill apply only to a corporation which would have been a bank holding company on May 15, 1955, and which on that date held prohibited property.

If a corporation decides to remain a bank holding company, subject to the supervision of the Federal Reserve Board, it may distribute any prohibited property, which the Board certifies is necessary or appropriate to comply with the bill, to its shareholders without the recognition of gain by the shareholders. For this purpose prohibited property, in general, means stock or assets of nonbanking businesses to the extent the bank holding company is required to divest itself of such assets under section 4 of the bill. The term does not include cash, Government bonds, or certain short-term obligations. It is believed desirable to expressly exclude cash, etc., from the definition of prohibited property, since a similar exclusion is contained in the comparable provision of part VI of subchapter O, relating to exchanges in obedience to SEC orders.

With respect to the distributing corporation, the usual provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 apply. Under these provisions, gain generally is not recognized to the distributing corporation except under unusual circumstances such as the distribution of LIFO inventory, the distribution of property subject to a liability in excess of the adjusted basis, or the distribution of certain installment obligations.

The distribution of prohibited property may be made either directly to the shareholders of the corporation which is a bank holding company or may be transferred to a wholly owned subsidiary expressly created for purposes of receiving the prohibited property, in which case all of the shares in the new corporation must be distributed directly to shareholders. Under the bill prohibited property may be placed in one or more such new corporations. Your committee's amendments differ from S. 2577, as originally reported, by providing that other assets may also be transferred to a new corporation without making the transaction taxable. This would include cash and bonds, for working capital purposes, as well as prohibited property acquired after May 15, 1955, but not controlling shares of bank stock or similar property.

Your committee's amendments also differ from S. 2577, as originally reported, by providing that the tax exemption for any particular distribution may be denied if that

distribution is part of a plan with a principal purpose of avoiding dividend tax on a distribution of earnings and profits.

Your committee's amendments also differ from S. 2577, as originally reported, by making provisions for certain exchanges of stocks and bonds as part of the divestment program. Under S. 2577, as originally reported, bank holding companies having outstanding preferred stocks and bonds might encounter serious obstacles in making use of the tax provisions of the bill. The divestments required under the general provisions of the bill would remove from the corporation property that provides security for its preferred stocks or bonds. Your committee's amendments would permit the exchange of preferred stocks and bonds in the old corporation for comparable securities in the new corporations or direct distribution of prohibited property in exchange for the outstanding preferred stocks or bonds.

The bill provides that in exchanges involving the creation of a subsidiary a common shareholder may only receive common stock, a preferred shareholder may only receive preferred stock issued on substantially the same terms or common stock, and, finally, a bondholder may receive only bonds issued on substantially the same terms, or preferred or common stock. It is also provided that a bondholder in such an exchange may be taxable on any greater face value of bonds received over those given up.

If a corporation which is a qualified bank holding company under the bill chooses to divest itself of all or part of any stock or property which causes it to be a bank holding company, it may distribute directly to its shareholders or bondholders such stock or property, or it may form a subsidiary to effectuate such distribution. Your committee has made the same revisions for divestments of this type as are made in the case of divestments of prohibited property.

The Board must certify that the divestment of the bank stock or similiar property is necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policies of the bill. In the case of direct distributions, for example, the corporation may distribute to its shareholders without the recognition of gain all the shares of bank stock in a bank in which it was deemed to have control within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the bill. Thus, if a corporation owned 40 percent of the voting stock of each of 2 banks, it could distribute all of its shares in those banks even though it ceased to be a bank holding company by distributing only 16 percent of the voting shares in 1 bank. If the same corporation had in addition 15 percent of the voting shares of a third bank, it would not be able to distribute tax free, under this bill, those voting shares unless the Federal Reserve Board deemed that by virtue of those shares the corporation exercised an effective control over the election of a majority of the board of directors of the particular bank.

Your committee contemplates that the Federal Reserve Board, in the discharge of its functions in making certifications that exchanges and distributions are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the bill, will examine these from the point of view of their desirability from a banking standpoint. However, a certification by the Board that a particular divestment is necessary or appropriate is not to be considered as permitting any method of carrying out this divestment if it is part of a plan having a principal purpose of avoiding dividend tax on a distrbution of earnings and profits.

In case direct distribution to stockholders and bondholders of either prohibited property or property which causes the distributing corporation to be a bank holding company, your committee has restricted the nonrecognition treatment to property which was owned on May 15, 1955. This restriction is deemed necessary to prevent corporations from purchasing highly marketable shares and other property as a means of transferring cash from the corporation to its shareholders. The restriction would not apply, however, if the property were received in a transaction in which gain was not recognized because of either the general rules described above or in certain types of corporate reorganizations or liquidations. For example, if prohibited property originally acquired prior to May 15, 1955, were distributed by a subsidiary to its parent in a corporate chain without recognition of gain to the parent by reason of provisions in this bill, the parent, in turn, may distribute the property to its own shareholders without recognition of gain under a certification by the Board, even thought the property was acquired by the parent after May 15, 1955. Similarly, the May 15, 1955, cutoff date is not applicable where the prohibited property or controlling bank interests certified by the Board are retained at the corporate level by the transfer to a wholly owned subsidiary created for that purpose if stock of the subsidiary is distributed by the qualified bank holding company, and such distribution meets the tax avoidance test discussed previously. In the case of the creation of a subsidiary, prohibited property or controlling bank stock acquired after May 15, 1955, may be transferred to it along with prohibited property or controlling bank stock acquired prior to May 15, 1955.

In the case of a contribution to capital of any corporation made by a bank holding company after the date of enactment of this bill, the general test of a principal purpose of tax avoidance will be applied. Where a contribution has been made after May 15, 1955, and before the date of enactment under the terms described in the bill, the treatment provided in S. 2577, as originally reported, will be retained. If any part of the contribution made in this period is part of a plan for the avoidance of taxes, only a portion of the shares of the corporation to which the contribution is made will be taxable on distribution. This portion will correspond to the portion of the value of those shares attributable to the contribution.

Where the nonrecognition treatment has been extended to prohibited property which has been distributed by the corporation which is a bank-holding company, a final certification must be obtained from the Board that the corporation has divested itself of all property necessary or appropriate to comply with the bill within the statutory period permitted for divestment. If this final certification is not obtained, the transactions previously permitted to be made without recognition of gain are reopened and tax may be imposed in such cases. For this purpose the statute of limitations on assessment of deficiency resulting solely from the distribution of prohibited property which has been certified by the Board does not expire until 5 years after the corporation gives notification that the period prescribed in section 4 (a) of the bill has expired.

A similar final certification is required where nonrecognition treatment has been originally accorded to the distribution of bank stock or similar property which the Board has certified that the corporation must divest in order to cease being a bank-holding company. In this case the tax provisions of the bill provide that the Board must give a final certification that the corporation has ceased to be a bank-holding company within 2 years after the date of enactment of the bill or within 2 years after the date on which the corporation becomes a bank-holding company, whichever is later, unless the time has been extended by the Board for 1-year renewals not to exceed 5 years from the date of enactment of the bill or the date on which the corporation becomes a bank-holding company, whichever is later. The statutory period for the assessment of a deficiency resulting solely from such distribution is extended in the same manner as in the case of the distribution of prohibited property.

The basis of stock or other property received by a distributee without recognition of gain under the provisions of the bill is determined by allocating the adjusted basis of the stock with respect to which the distribution is made between such stock and the property so distributed. In the case of any recognition of gain upon the receipt of stock or property, such gain will be taken into account in determining the adjusted basis of the stock with respect to which the distribution was made and the property which was received. These rules are similar to the general rules for allocation of basis in the case of stock dividends and corporate reorganizations. The bill provides that the allocation of basis shall be made under regulations provided by the Secretary or his delegate.

Where a bank holding company distributes stock of a subsidiary formed to receive either prohibited property or controlling bank interests which causes it to be a bank holding company, proper allocation of the earnings and profits of the bank holding company is made to the subsidiary. Your committee has extended such treatment to direct distributions of stock of a corporation where the bank holding company owns at least 80 percent of such corporation.

Except in the case of a distribution permitted to be made tax free under this part, nothing in this bill is intended to limit the applicability of other provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. For example, in a program of divestments under this bill a bank holding company could make distributions permitted under the tax provisions of this bill or under subchapter C of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to corporate distributions and adjustments).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I renew my previous request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate do now adjourn——

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill? Can we be informed, for example, whether or not the bill would prevent such an organization as the Northwest Bank Corp. from operating?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would not prevent it from operating, but it could not operate on the same scale on which it is now operating. It could not acquire new banks without the consent of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the bill now designed only to hit the Transamerica Corp., or does it hit the Northwest Bank Corp. in the same fashion it hits Transamerica?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It hits every bank holding company with two or more banks in exactly the same way. The only difference between the corporation the Senator mentions and Transamerica is that Transamerica happens to be the largest; and when it has to get rid of nonbanking assets, it must get rid of $1 billion worth of assets, which none of the others have, so far as the Senator from Virginia can ascertain. It gets rid of them without one red cent of tax liability, provided the proceeds of the sale of such assets are distributed to the stockholders.

Mr. ANDERSON. What about W. R. Grace & Co.?

Mr. ROBERTSON. W. R. Grace & Co. has only one bank.

Mr. ANDERSON. Therefore it can engage in other activities.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As the Senator from Virginia has said, when he introduced the bill he included all of them. The independent bankers said "No, we want a bill covering corporations with two or more banks." So when we reached the compromise bill the Senate committee said, "Let us take the House provision, because it will be difficult enough to get a bill through over the opposition of 42 companies. If we have opposition from 163, the task will be immeasurably increased."

From all practical standpoints, this bill would freeze the corporations which have only one bank. If they acquire an additional bank, they become bank holding companies. Then they must get rid of both banks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They do not get rid of both banks, but they get rid of nonbanking assets.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no corporation I have been able to find anything about which has great nonbanking assets and only one bank, which would not get rid of the small bank rather than give up all the other holdings. Therefore I say that the one-bank corporation is frozen by the bill rather automatically, because if it acquires another bank it becomes a bank-holding company. It must then choose between banking assets and nonbanking assets; and under those circumstances it would keep its banking assets. Therefore there would be no point in acquiring another bank, and having to give up the bank it really wishes to keep. The bill does not apply to corporations with only one bank.

Certain amendments may be offered on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Virginia refused to accept them in committee, and he will vote against them on the floor of the Senate because he thinks the proper approach to this bill is to treat all alike.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Has the question of the committee amendments been submitted to the American Bankers Association? Is it familiar with the amendments to the committee bill which have been approved here this afternoon?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendments have been submitted to the American Bankers Association unofficially. There has been no general meeting of that association since their adoption, because they were adopted this year, and the general meeting does not take place until September. However, the legislative representative of the American Bankers Association approved them, and the Federal Reserve Board approved them. All the bank-holding companies approved them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Are the independent bankers of America acquainted with the amendments which were made a part of the bill by the unanimous-consent agreement this afternoon?

Mr. ROBERTSON. They are thoroughly acquainted with them, and have raised no objection whatever to them. As a matter of fact, unofficially the information came to me that if we would adopt the Douglas amendment—which is not quite so stringent as the House provision, but which prohibits crossing State lines unless they are invited by the State to come in—the Independent Bankers Association would be very much pleased with the bill. It would be very much pleased if we added that much to the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator tell me the difference between the House bill and the Senate committee version? Is the House bill considerably different in character? I ask that question only because there is a pretty substantial block of testimony to read.

The banks which have had correspondence with me have indicated that they like the House bill. However, they say that they would be glad to see the Robertson bill passed, so that the House bill can get into conference.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There are many differences between the House bill and the Senate committee version. Naturally our committee thinks it has a much better bill.

I mentioned in my discussion—and they are also discussed at greater length in the material which I inserted in the RECORD—the various points of difference. I stressed three of them.

One related to control. Under the House bill there is absolute control by the State banking agency, in the case of a State bank, or the Federal Comptroller of the Currency in the case of a Federal bank. But we think the control has been and should be in the Federal Reserve Board, leaving the other agencies to make recommendations, but permitting court review if the parties feel aggrieved.

There are a number of minor differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. We had the advantage of additional hearings after the House bill was passed, and we had the advice of all those who might be called experts in this field.

We took advantage of all the help we could get in formulating a compromise bill. It is quite different from the bill which the Senator from Virginia introduced on various occasions. It was the result of the contributions of a great number of persons. It came first from our subcommittee, and then from the full committee as a compromise bill. There are many differences. Most of them are minor. So far as possible, in the compromise bill we accepted the exact language of the House bill wherever it was possible to do so without violently changing the philosophy we were aiming to incorporate in the measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am trying to find out from the Senator what we might use for guidance. Most independent bankers have said that they favor the House bill. Also they have said that they favored a considerable portion of the Senate bill. Would it be a fair conclusion that this is probably the best bill which can be obtained, from the standpoint of the position of independent bankers? Is it the Senator's opinion that probably the best we can do is to pass the bill as it has been amended?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly this will be the best that can be obtained on the floor of the Senate. However, I frankly admit that the independent bankers would like to have the Douglas amendment adopted. If the Douglas amendment were adopted, the bill would be very acceptable to the independent bankers. That amendment will be offered in due time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. However, it would not be at all acceptable to the bank-holding companies. Since we are dealing with $15 billion in assets, under the terms of the bill, and possibly as much as $25 billion, all told, we should not run roughshod over that much invested interest all over the Nation. For that reason, the late Senator Maybank always said, "You never did get legislation because you went for the maximum, and you could not reach it."

In this instance we did not go for the maximum. We went for what we thought would be adequate controls, without having the bank-holding companies say to us, "You are definitely unfair to us. We have been in existence for many years, and many stockholders have invested their money in our stocks, and, therefore, we have some legal as well as moral rights in this matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Did the committee consider the Douglas amendment, or the question embodied in that amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is a member of our committee. He offered an amendment. He took as much time as he felt was necessary before the committee to debate his amendment. The committee voted on the amendment. The amendment received 4 favorable votes in committee. It was not reported by the committee as a committee amendment.

Mr. THYE. What does the Douglas amendment propose to do which the bill now before the Senate would not do? It would be helpful if the Senator from Virginia would tell the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committee bill places jurisdiction in the Federal Reserve Board over the question of future expansion. The Board can deny or grant requests for expansion. The Douglas amendment does not confer upon the Board any discretion whatever. The Douglas amendment specifically says that no bank holding company in the future may cross a State line unless the laws of the State involved permit it to do so.

With respect to the operations of some of the bank holding companies in the Northwest, the Douglas amendment would freeze them into a favored posi-

tion. Trans-America, I believe, operates in 10 States, and if the Douglas amendment were agreed to, no other bank could enter that field. The Northwest Bank operates in 4 States, I believe, and no other bank could enter that territory if the Douglas amendment were adopted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. That was the question I had in mind with respect to holding companies, particularly so far as the Douglas amendment is concerned. Under the amendment, the Federal Reserve Board would be foreclosed in the future from giving any consideration to the merits of a proposal by a bank that it be permitted to go into another State and establish a bank there. The amendment would give a virtual monopoly to the bank holding companies that are now established in that State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was the principal reason why the committee did not adopt the amendment. There were other reasons. The reason the Senator has stated was the one that was very strongly urged before the committee by the Federal Reserve Board. They said that the amendment would create tremendous monopolies and freeze the big banks into favored positions. They said it was not fair for us to do so, because perhaps in some instances other banks would wish to go into an area to give the big banks some competition.

Mr. THYE. In the opinion of the Federal Reserve Board, then, the Douglas amendment would give unfair advantages to existing bank holding companies which had branches operating in a particular State or States. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Federal Reserve Board also took the position that there was an unfair restriction on the dual system on the one hand, of national banks, and, on the other hand, State banks.

In the third place, the Federal Reserve Board took the position that President Eisenhower, when he sent his economic message to the Congress, had said that we must have, or should have, bank holding-company legislation enacted which would put the holding companies under the control of a Federal agency. That agency should be the Federal Reserve Board. That is the position of the President. That is the position of the Federal Reserve Board, unanimously, so far as I know. That is the position of the Comptroller and of the FDIC.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia that my mail from independent bankers in Minnesota is predominantly in favor of the Douglas amendment. They so state in their letters to me.

Of course, I am particularly concerned because I do not wish to have independent banks destroyed by competition which they cannot meet, particularly because of the ability of the holding companies and larger banks to finance almost any kind of loan application. At the same time, I realize that there are times when a community would be foreclosed from having a bank established within it if a bank holding company did not enter the community. It frequently happens that minority stockholders become affiliated with a holding company, and in that manner a community is served with a bank.

Because of the expressions made to me by independent bankers, I have gone into the subject as carefully as I have been able to in an effort to acquaint myself with the question so that I would be fair and just in my decision and would safeguard the interests of the independent bankers, many of whom are my friends. For that reason, I have asked the questions I have propounded. I hope that as a result of my questions we may be in a better position to give proper consideration to the amendments as they come before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can assure my distinguished friend from Minnesota that that is the fact. There are no holding companies in Virginia. There are none in Virginia because the banks of Virginia are pretty well off, and are able to take care of the situation in my State. But if the pending bill did not give the bankers of Virginia adequate protection against future unfair competition from bank holding companies, I would not be on the floor advocating its passage.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to assure my good friend from Virginia that in the State of Minnesota we have both holding companies and independent banks. I am sure the Senator from Virginia will not deny that we in Minnesota have as good independent bankers as are to be found anywhere in the United States, and that they are as good as any in Virginia. Nevertheless, we do have holding companies in our State, and I know from personal knowledge that in one or two instances holding companies have made it possible for a community to have a bank, and to have it continue in operation when there was a possibility that the bank would be closed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Federal Reserve Board testified on that subject. Its representatives said that in numerous instances a bank holding company had furnished needed capital which could not have been obtained anywhere else. To that extent, a bank holding company served a useful purpose. Hence our committee would not adopt the philosophy of the report of the House committee, which in effect held that the bank holding company was an unmitigated evil. We do not believe that to be the fact. We believe bank holding companies serve a useful purpose in some instances. However, some of them have grown so powerful, we felt that the time may have come to put them under suitable regulation.

I happen to know of an instance in Florida which will come out in debate when the Senator from Florida offers an amendment. There is a large naval stores corporation in an area in Florida involving about 80 percent of agricultural work of one kind and another. There was one bank in the area, which failed during the depression. The naval stores corporation relieved the bank of all liability. No depositor lost a nickel. The bank was reorganized and is now doing a very flourishing and substantial business. But that made the naval stores company a holding company. There are two banks there instead of one.

Mr. THYE. Will the bill which we shall have before us tomorrow, with the committee amendments which were adopted en bloc this afternoon, provide that a holding company must divest itself of nonbanking business?

Mr. ROBERTSON. With this minor exception. Certain operations are mentioned in the committee amendment which are held to be so closely related to the banking industry as to make it neither necessary nor desirable to force a bank holding company to give them up, although technically they are not banking operations.

Mr. THYE. Could the Senator from Virginia describe the nature of the business?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Credit life insurance is one; the operation of safety deposit boxes——

Mr. THYE. Of course, that has been a customer's privilege in all the banks of which I have any knowledge. We certainly would not wish a bank to divest itself of that sort of business.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. One is the credit life insurance program in connection with bank loans; another is the operation of insurance programs in cases where the bank holds the mortgage. And there are many other activities of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature which cannot be determined to be closely related to banking without a careful examination of the activities.

So, we spell out a few exemptions and leave out the others. A bank holding company can go before the Federal Reserve Board and say, "Here is an activity which is not technically banking, but it is so closely related to it that we think it should not be held to be a nonbanking asset," and the Board can act upon it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for asking the questions he has propounded to me.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Had the Senator concluded his statement?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; but I am at the moment acting majority leader, and I shall have to remain.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wanted to speak on another subject, and then, it is my understanding, the Senate will adjourn.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is the understanding.

NEW USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I had intended to make quite a lengthy speech with reference to a bill which I introduced on March 21, together with 35 other Senators, for finding new uses for farm products, but I shall not do

that today. I have a large number of editorials and letters which I had intended to place in the RECORD, but I shall put them in later, not today, as I have had a very fine talk with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who states that my bill has been referred to a subcommittee headed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and he feels certain that the Senator from Kentucky will have a meeting and will hold a hearing in the very near future.

I think that will make millions of farmers very, very happy, because farmers are expecting this Congress to start a program of finding new uses and new markets for farm products as a permanent solution of their problems, because they realize that there is no permanent solution in cutting back production. They can be helped only by increasing production rather than cutting it back.

I appreciate very much, as I know the farmers do and as I know other Senators do, the fact that hearings will be held on this proposed legislation in the near future. I am sure that no Senator will be opposed to it. I am confident that before Congress adjourns—sometime, I hope, in the early part of July—we shall have passed the bill in a form and with sufficient appropriations at least to get the job started, if not completed, of increasing the farmer's income on a permanent basis by permitting him to grow more rather than requiring him to reduce production.

I am very grateful to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] for his intention to take up this proposed legislation.

GRANTING TERMS OF LEAVE IN THE UNITED STATES TO PERMANENT MEMBERS OF FULBRIGHT COMMISSION STAFFS ABROAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from a citizen of Minnesota who is at the moment studying on a Fulbright scholarship at Newcastle-on-Tyne in England. He has had an opportunity to judge the personnel of the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, the administrators of this Fulbright program, and he has nothing but praise for their capability. He suggests an appropriate reward for their work might be to establish a program granting terms of leave in the United States to these permanent members of Fulbright Commission staffs abroad.

This idea, Mr. President, strikes me as an excellent method to obtain a two-way benefit from the Fulbright program. I am sure that the cost involved in bringing some of these foreign Fulbright staffs to the United States would be more than compensated for by the benefits which this exchange of persons would provide. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from my constituent be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE 2, *March 22, 1956.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In spite of the above address I am a resident of St. Paul and therefore, I believe, one of your constituents. At present I am spending a year of study in England on a Fulbright scholarship, and I would like to take this opportunity to praise without reservation the personnel of the United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, who administer the Fulbright program on this side of the Atlantic. All members of the small staff are extremely capable and work earnestly to make the transition from United States to United Kingdom as smooth and as efficient as possible. As well as being good workers they are good friends, and I don't believe there is a one of the grantees who is not in their debt for something, from major items like finding housing to minor ones like finding a good place to eat.

In this connection, I wondered whether it might not be feasible and advisable to establish a program to grant terms of leave in the United States to the permanent members of Fulbright Commission staffs. There is no doubt that considerable benefits to the program would arise from such a plan. It would increase the already high degree of interest the staff have in their work and deepen their understanding of the vagaries of the American character. They could maintain the many contacts they have made with the people they have already met as grantees, and in so doing contribute to one of the objects of the program. No one could deny that such leave would be in just recognition of work well done, and it would not be inconsistent with the leave programs presently operating in the Foreign Service and numerous international organizations. Few of them, because of currency restrictions and local salaries could afford to make the trip themselves, and it would be only fitting for our Government to bring them across.

As for the arguments against it, a minimum limit of employment could be set before leave was granted, say 2 years, to exclude the opportunists. If necessary it could be operated in connection with normal vacation periods to save loss of time from work. The Commission's work is seasonal, with a crushing peak in the spring and summer and a slack season in the autumn and winter, during which time leaves could probably be taken without necessitating relief employees. As for cost, the travel funds could come from the same pool as the grantees' while it would take only a small appropriation to provide a reasonable allowance in dollars for the time actually spent in the United States. The London office, which administers the largest program, doesn't amount to more than a dozen or so staff members.

It cannot be denied that these people render our Government a great service by their willing and hard work. They deserve some compensation for their efforts, and further such compensation would facilitate the execution of their duties in the future.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. MAEHL, Jr.

FAIR TRADE LAWS AND CUT-PRICE SELLING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks three articles on "cut-price selling" which appeared in the Retailing Daily. These articles were written by Mr. Jerry Lansky who based them on his own research which included interviews with discounters.

Mr. Lansky's articles point up the nefarious merchandising techniques discounters are practicing today. In many parts of the country such activities are rife and as a result numerous consumers are being hoodwinked by such practices as switching substandard or inferior merchandise to the purchaser through deceptive advertising or merchandising techniques.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Lansky has afforded an insight into the tactics employed by the discount traders and in so doing has performed a valuable service to retailers and consumers alike. In the following article Mr. Lansky discusses the methods used by the price racketeers in arriving at their prices:

[From Retailing Daily of February 7, 1956]

CUT-PRICE SELLING

(By Jerry Lansky)

PRICING IMPORTANT APPLIANCE QUESTION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The retailing of major appliances at discount prices has grown to a point where it is no longer the exception, but the rule. Retailing Daily has interviewed New York appliance specialty dealers of varying sizes who sell at discount in order to determine their methods and the reasons for them. This, the first of three articles, discusses the problems of pricing appliances and keeping the salesman informed.)

One of the most important questions facing an appliance dealer who turns to discount selling is how to establish the prices for the merchandise he sells.

The dealer who sells at list, of course, has no such problem, as his price is set for him by the manufacturer or, in some cases, the local distributor.

But the discount operator doesn't have it that easy. He must be able to sit down with pencil in hand to determine at what point he can afford to sell his merchandise and where he must refuse a sale if he is to make a profit.

Actually, many retailers do not draw the line that thinly. It is felt that rather than establishing a minimum price, a retailer should be guided by his competition and price his appliances accordingly. However, most retailers do have a method for establishing a selling price.

The most common pricing system in use today is the cost-plus method. Here, a retailer figures out how much it costs him to deliver, warehouse, and handle any given appliance. This amount, plus his fixed overhead costs and a desired net profit in dollars, is added to his net cost for his low selling price. It doesn't necessarily hold that all sales are to be made at that price, but at least a price is established below which no salesman can go.

Since the market is so highly competitive, most New York specialty dealers have set this low at a figure ranging between $20 and $30 above net cost. Deducting the costs of pickup, delivery, commissions, fixed costs, etc., a dealer probably can realize a net profit of about $10 when he is forced to sell at low.

Another pricing method, used by the early discount operators years ago but not too prevalent now, is the percentage-from-list method. There a dealer sets his price by

taking a constant percentage from the established list price. For example, if a discount dealer decides to sell everything at 25 percent below list, a $299.95 refrigerator would sell for about $225.

This system is effective in an area where discounting is not too common and consumers are impressed by big percentage cuts. However, in large markets like New York, where the cost-plus method is widely used, shoppers quickly get the feel that cost-plus means cheaper prices.

Two other pricing systems, although not widely practiced, are in use. Both are keyed to operations where most of the selling is done by the owners and maybe 1 or 2 salesmen.

Make expenses

In the first place, the store owner must decide how much it costs him to turn the key in the front door each morning. In other words, what will his day's total expenses be for rent, insurance, utilities, salaries, etc. Then, the profit made from each sale is subtracted from this figure until the day's expenses are met. After that, "no one walks." The dealer is then willing to sell merchandise even at cost, if necessary, in order to get the benefits of cooperative advertising funds, bulk buying, dealer trips, etc.

The other system is really no system at all, but just a haphazard way of doing business. Here, the owner gets whatever he can for a piece of merchandise, depending on how much the consumer presses him; how near it is to bill-paying time; how much he desires to make that dealer trip to the Belgian Congo, and, simply, how he feels. This method is found where growth of the business is of little concern.

If the pricing method established by the retailer allows for wheeling and dealing, such as with the cost-plus method, there is often some concern as to how much a salesman should be told about such things as dealer net cost, inventory, general business, etc.

Most retailers feel that if a salesman is to sell intelligently, he must know as much about the business as possible. For instance, if a salesman has the opportunity of selling a certain model washer, it would be to the dealer's advantage to have the salesman know that the inventory on that model was high and that it should be sold even below the low price.

Salesman and cost

Salesmen generally should be told the dealer's cost on merchandise also, so that they can "bend" a little in certain cases and yet be able to make a sale on an economical basis.

Some dealers permit their salesmen to go down only to the low price and no further. If there is a chance the customer will walk, he should be turned over to the manager. Such a policy would eliminate the necessity of keeping the salesmen informed, since the manager then would be responsible for all walks.

Regardless of how a dealer prices, it is always necessary for him to know what price his competition is getting for a piece of merchandise. Most often the consumers will keep a dealer informed of his competitors's prices by quoting "what the man down the block just offered."

Sometimes, however, dealers who are interested in certain models will hire a neighborhood woman to do their shopping. One dealer sends his shopper to a certain store to bargain for the best price she can. She gives a $5 deposit, and a phony name and address. The dealer gets the information he wants, gives the shopper $5 for her trouble, and charges the $5 deposit off as a business expense.

As might be expected, the selling techniques of the discounters vary greatly in their cutthroat operations. Mr. Lansky deals with some of the procedures employed in the following article:

[From Retailing Daily of February 8, 1956]

CUT-PRICE SELLING

(By Jerry Lansky)

(Second of three articles)

SIZING UP SHOPPER AN ART IN ITSELF

The appliance dealer who chooses to sell at discount must be a genius in the art of sizing up a customer in 30 seconds.

He must be able to predict what the customer knows and wants and must be ready with an answer if one of his predictions proves inaccurate.

For instance, it is important to know what price to give a consumer when she first asks: "How much?" If he quotes too high, he might lose the confidence of a customer who came in thinking he had the lowest price in the neighborhood. Then again, if he quotes too low, he will never be able to bring the price higher if he finds that the person would have paid more.

Most discount dealers try to "feel" the consumer out. If in the first few minutes of conversation the salesman judges that the person has shopped in other stores, there is little sense in starting with a list price because the consumer already has some knowledge of relative prices.

It is best, in these cases, to start at a "reasonable price" but somewhat above the "low" so that a salesman can come down if necessary.

Where there is some assurance that the consumer has not shopped competition, many dealers will start with list price. It is necessary to watch a person's face in order to see whether or not this price shocked or offended her. If it is obvious that it did, it is recommended that the salesman kid along with her saying that a deal could be worked out.

But it is sometimes surprising that a consumer will not flinch and will eventually buy at list, although some dealers feel this is not good policy and that it can only bounce back as bad will.

MANY HOURS ON PHONE

Discount dealers find that many hours of their working day are spent on the telephone. Consumers, trying to save a trip to the store, attempt to get a dealer's price on the phone.

Dealers generally refuse to give their low prices over the telephone because if it did not beat a previous price the consumer may have gotten there is no chance at constructive selling or switching.

Since if is impossible to get a deposit on the phone, it should be the dealer's aim to talk the caller into coming to the store. He should explain to the caller that he can't give prices over the phone because she might be calling to get information for another dealer. Make it clear, however, that when she does come in, she will get a "good deal."

If the caller gives the price she has been offered by a competitor and wants to know if she can beat it, dodge the issue. If necessary, infer that the price can be beaten and that she should come in. When she does come in and the price can't be beaten, switch.

The tactic of "switch," or trying to sell the customer something other than what she asked for, is of extreme importance to a discount dealer. If a customer comes in armed with knowledge gained through an accumulation of visits to other stores, it is best to switch her because a salesman will have trouble winning her confidence. She probably knows more than he and will try to catch him at a mistake.

SWITCH USED

The switch also has been used when a consumer has been given a bona fide price which a dealer can't beat. Then try to sell her something for which she doesn't have a comparison price.

Most dealers find the switch desirable in pushing merchandise they were able to get for a good price or for which they have been given promotional money.

"Burn-up" prices, or below-cost prices which are quoted by a competitor knowing that the consumer will unsuccessfully try and beat it elsewhere, plague the discount dealer. Since the dealer generally knows the cost of any appliance to his competitor, as they probably buy through the same distributor, he can usually spot a burn-up.

The best policy is to try to explain to the consumer that the other dealer would not sell the appliance at that price since there would be additional charges of installation, delivery, service, etc., if she forced him to sell. It is important that the dealer should not challenge the consumer's ability to buy the appliance at that price because by sending her back to the competitor, he is doing exactly what the competitor wanted him to do.

The best thing to do is what the competitor would do if the same customer were to return—switch.

Pencil-and-pad shoppers are another problem. These are the people who come into a dealer's store interested in comparing model numbers and prices with information they received in other stores. Dealers agree that these people have to be treated with kid gloves. Joke with them. Find out when they will want delivery and if you feel they are ready to buy, switch them to something they haven't shopped.

FAVOR BURN-UP

Some dealers are in favor of using burn-ups on these shoppers.

When a dealer receives a cancellation of an order, it is a good policy to find out why the order has been canceled. If it is a matter of price, try to meet the price of the competitor. If the customer still refuses, most dealers mail back the deposit without an argument.

Retailers agree that whenever a consumer comes into the store, she is in the market for an appliance. It is up to the dealer to take her out of the market by getting a deposit regardless of delivery date.

Mr. President, as in the cases of pricing and selling, discounters differ appreciably also in their advertising campaigns from the traditional advertising techniques. The duplicity of the discounters is covered succinctly in Mr. Lansky's article, "Discounter Urged Be Cautious in Ads," which follows:

[From Retailing Daily of February 9, 1956]

DISCOUNTER URGED BE CAUTIOUS IN ADS

(By Jerry Lansky)

The major advertising aim of a discount appliance dealer is to let the public know that he is a discounter without giving too much other information.

The dealer should advertise often and say loudly that he is a discounter. Once he is able to establish himself as such, consumers generally think of him in terms of appliances and discounts.

However, retailers are advised to be cautious in their appliance advertising by not giving too much information other than the usual name and location and plenty of brand identification. If too much is made known about the products the dealer is selling, the consumer is being given the opportunity of finding out what she wants to know without coming into the store.

REGARDED AS TABOO

For instance, listing prices in an ad, whether list or discount, is regarded as taboo. If a list price is noted there is a danger that the reader won't look at the whole ad and assume the advertiser is selling the appliance for that price. If a discount price is given, a consumer may try to beat that price elsewhere, only to be switched.

Model numbers are likewise frowned upon since it is felt that this would be giving the consumer an education.

Retailers are also warned that their advertising should be such as not to permit competition to use the ads to their own advantage.

A floor display can be effectively set up to tie in with a current advertising campaign. For instance, if a dealer happens to be advertising a price leader which he is not particularly desirous of selling, that model should not be highlighted on the display floor. The unit can be made comparatively unappealing by having it scuffed up, possibly discolored and with a broken handle.

Nearby, however, the dealer can show his step-up merchandise in an attractive setting with shining lights and appealing colors. This piece should be well polished and in working order.

ARE NOT AGREED

Appliance dealers are not agreed on how a floor model of an appliance should be marked. Some feel that each model should carry a coded notation of the low price so that the salesman can talk price without leaving the customer or referring to catalogs.

However, others state that when a salesman refers to a catalog with a pencil in hand, the consumer feels that a special deal is being worked out for her.

There is similar disagreement as to whether appliances should carry list prices and model numbers. Some dealers say that if a shopper wants any information she should have to ask a salesman, giving the salesman the opportunity to make a pitch. Others feel that the notation of list and model number on each piece eliminates the possibility of a salesman making a mistake since there might be as many as 50 appliances on the floor.

A discount dealer should handle as many lines as possible although this might present some problems. By carrying a large assortment of merchandise, a dealer is limiting his buying power on a given line so that he would probably be paying more than a competitor who is specializing in the line. Also, he is not getting the highest rate of cooperative advertising money that this other competitor might be getting.

Neither of these circumstances leaves a dealer in a good competitive position.

MAINTAIN FORCES

Therefore, many dealers join forces with other dealers in 1 or 2 ways: They may buy carload lots on a cooperative basis and then share the merchandise; or they may have a reciprocal agreement with other dealers to buy merchandise that is needed.

In the latter case, the dealer would probably have only the spec sheets of these other lines and resort to this arrangement only when he was unable to switch the consumer.

Most salesmen for New York appliance specialty stores work for a base salary ranging from $50 to $65 a week plus commissions and promotional money. These men average about $125 a week with some getting over $200 in heavily trafficked stores.

There are some dealers, however, who do not believe in the commission incentive and pay instead, a straight salary of about $85 a week plus promotional money and a yearly bonus.

Commission rates vary. One store pays a 5 percent commission for a sale made at list price and descending rates to 1 percent for a sale at the low. Another store gives 1 percent for a certain amount of dollars above the low and an extra 15 percent for everything beyond that. Still another pays 1 percent for a sale at low and 2 percent for a sale made above low.

However, since the salesmen's salaries are proportionate with the amount of business a dealer is doing, there are few complaints about paying them.

Mr. President, these articles are effective rebuttals to those opponents of fair trade who have argued that the discounter brings quality merchandise to the consumer at reduced prices. Apart from guaranteeing the recognized right of a manufacturer to protect his product, fair trade protects the consumer through assuring him that he receives the merchandise he intended to buy, at a fair price. Fair trade insures a fair profit and consequently there is no need for misrepresentation.

Discounters frequently offer certain branded products as loss-leaders and sell substandard and discontinued models as high grade merchandise. This procedure is nothing new. It is well settled that no one operates at a loss and stays in business. Fair trade insures healthy competition. A manufacturer must market his product at a reasonable price or else lose out to a more efficient manufacturer. From the foregoing articles it is evident that discounters are not able to offer lower prices through more efficient merchandising techniques but rather because they operate on the cut-throat basis described by Mr. Lansky.

The broad implications that flow from these articles have caused me to refer them to the Federal Trade Commission in order that such practices as those described might be given careful scrutiny by the Commission.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

LETTER OF BERTRAND RUSSELL CONCERNING EXECUTION OF JULIUS AND ETHEL ROSENBERG

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg went to their death in the electric chair at Sing Sing in June of 1953 convicted of conspiracy to engage in espionage on behalf of the Soviet Union. Morton Sobell is now serving a 30-year prison term in Alcatraz as a result of his conviction for participating in the conspiracy. These people were found guilty by an American jury after a long trial, in accordance with judicial principles. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and the United States Supreme Court have had these cases before them on a number of occasions and have found no merit whatsoever in the contentions advanced on behalf of these conspirators.

I am convinced, and I believe most thoughtful Americans are convinced, that justice has been fully done in these cases. Nevertheless, some groups in this country have persisted in making the most irresponsible charges that these cases represented a hoax and that innocent persons were deliberately framed by our Government. Undoubtedly this stream of poisonous propaganda has been harmful to American prestige in other countries, but I am confident that most people abroad have considered the source of these charges and have discounted them accordingly.

Now, however, a more reputable person has picked up and is parroting these accusations. I regret to make this reference, but I feel compelled to do so. I refer to Bertrand Russell—Lord Russell. Lord Russell claims that he has looked into the evidence regarding the Rosenbergs and Sobell, and is certain of their innocence. They were convicted, he says, through perjured testimony which our Federal Bureau of Investigation elicited by use of Nazi-like atrocities and blackmail. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Lord Russell's letter printed in the Manchester Guardian of March 26 be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN:

I am writing to enlist your support in the case of Morton Sobell, an innocent man condemned as a result of political hysteria to 30 years in jail and at present incarcerated in Alcatraz the worst prison in the United States. He was sentenced as an accomplice of the Rosenbergs in espionage. I am ashamed to say that at the time of the Rosenberg's trial, I did not look into the evidence. I have now done so. I am almost certain that the Rosenbergs were innocent and quite certain that the evidence against them would not have been considered adequate if prejudice had not been involved. But the Rosenbergs are dead and nothing can be done for them now except to hold up their official murderers to obloquy. Sobell, however, is alive and it not too late for the United States Government to make some reparation now.

The facts in this case are briefly as follows: He had a friend named Elitcher who had been his best man. Elitcher had stated under oath that he had never been a Communist and the FBI discovered that in making this statement he had committed perjury. They let him know that he could escape punishment if he would denounce other people as accomplices in his treasonable activities. He decided to save his own skin by denouncing his best friend, Sobell. While negotiations in this sense were going on between him and the FBI, Sobell and his wife and their two small children went to Mexico. Sobell toyed with the idea of not returning to the United States, but rejected it. His decision to return became known to the FBI, which had determined to present him as a fugitive from justice. In order to be still able to present him in this light, they hired thugs who beat him into unconsciousness, hustled him and his wife and their two children into fast cars, and drove them without stopping from Mexico City to the United States border. There they were handed their card of entry with the words "Deported From Mexico," although the Mexican Government had not been privy to the kidnapping and had expressed no intention of deporting them.

When Sobell was brought to trial these facts were not released as his counsel considered any criticism of the FBI, however justified, would only increase the severity of his sentence, his condemnation being regarded by his counsel as certain in spite of lack of evidence. The judge instructed the jury that they could not find Sobell guilty unless they believed Elitcher. Elitcher, because he was useful in this trial, has never been indicted for his acknowledged perjury

and, in spite of his being known to be a perjurer, every word that he said against Sobell was believed.

People express scepticism when it is said that most Germans did not know of Nazi atrocities, but I am sure that the immense majority of Americans are quite ignorant of the atrocities committed by the FBI. They do not know of the standard techniques of these defenders of what, with cynical effrontery, they still call "the free world." The technique is one with which we have been made familiar in other police states such as Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia. The police find a man whom they can prove to be guilty of some offense and they promise him immunity if he will manufacture evidence against people who could not otherwise be indicted. Perjury is especially useful as a lever because many people who have been Communist in their student days rashly hope that this can be concealed and swear that they were never Communists. After a sufficient number of secret interviews the FBI descends upon innocent people with a posse of terrified perjurors and in the general hysteria every word uttered by the perjurors is accepted as gospel truth.

I do not suppose for a moment that President Eisenhower is aware of this well-established technique. If he knew of it, he would not only feel the revulsion which all decent people must feel, but would realize that every such case which becomes known outside the United States turns hundreds of thousands of people, if not into Communists, at least toward neutralism and away from the policy of NATO. For this large reason of public policy, as well as from motives of humanity and justice, it is to be hoped that something will be done to curb the FBI. A beginning might be made by the release of Morton Sobell, or, at least, by ordering a new trial in his case.

Yours very truly,

BERTRAND RUSSELL.

RICHMOND, SURREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am dismayed by the reckless liberties which Lord Russell has taken with the facts and with our Nation's great legal and judicial traditions. What is more important, I am deeply concerned that, because Lord Russell has in the past been an anti-Communist and an independent thinker, the outside world may take his allegations seriously.

There is no necessity for me to defend the Federal Bureau of Investigation against this attack. It can stand with honor and distinction upon its own customarily excellent record. I believe, however, that something should be said to demonstrate to our British friends that Lord Russell's comments are irresponsible and false.

In this connection I am gratified that two knowledgeable Washington attorneys have seen fit to write to the Manchester Guardian in reply to Lord Russell's letter. Mr. Irving Ferman and Mr. Harold P. Green wrote to the Manchester Guardian on April 2, 1956, to set the record straight. Both of these gentlemen are well qualified to speak on this matter, since both have had extensive experience in internal security and civil liberty problems, and considerable familiarity with the Rosenberg-Sobell case itself, as well. Mr. Ferman is the assistant director of the American Civil Liberties Union. Our friends abroad may rest assured that if there were the slightest tinge of validity to Lord Russell's charges, Mr. Ferman and his organization would be in the vanguard of the attempt to expose and correct the injustice. Mr. Green, who is now engaged in the private practice of law in Washington, formerly served for a number of years in the General Counsel's office of the Atomic Energy Commission, where he handled the complex legal questions involved in the atomic-energy security program. More recently, he served as counsel to the subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, which it was my provilege to serve as acting chairman, and which held extensive hearings last year on the overall Government security mechanism in connection with the resolution to create the Commission on Government Security. Since I served as acting chairman of this subcommittee, I can testify personally as to Mr. Green's knowledge of internal-security matters, as well as his complete dedication to civil-liberties principles and to the cause of justice.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter addressed to the editor of the Manchester Guardian by Mr. Green and Mr. Ferman be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN:

We feel impelled to reply to Mr. Bertrand Russell's letter which appeared in your columns on March 26.

One of us is Harold P. Green, who participated for several years in the security program of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and subsequently served as counsel to the Senate Subcommittee chaired by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY which undertook the comprehensive study of the overall security mechanism resulting in creation of the Commission of Government Security. The other is Irving Ferman, Washington Director of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Bertrand Russell has accepted and advanced as fact the self-serving concoctions of alibis and defenses offered by individuals who have been charged with and convicted of grave offenses. He has arrogated unto himself the rendering of a judgment on their guilt or innocence which is contrary to the judgment reached by those who administer our judicial system and who have carefully and objectively reviewed the allegations in accordance with established procedures. Let no one be deceived into believing that the "facts" recently learned by Russell have not been thoroughly reviewed by the Courts of the United States in accordance with the long standing Anglo-American traditions of due process. The cases of the Rosenbergs and Sobell have been before the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit (generally recognized by American lawyers to be one of the best courts in the country) and before the Supreme Court of the United States on several occasions. These courts have been singularly unimpressed and unmoved by these "facts" which now so deeply stir Mr. Russell. But this is not all. Even our reputable private organizations which exist only to further and strengthen our civil liberties have seen no substance to the propaganda barrages in these cases. Thus, the American Civil Liberties Union has said that "there are no civil liberties issues involved" in the Rosenberg-Sobell cases.

Mr. Russell builds his belief in the innocence of the Rosenbergs and Sobell, and his condemnation of the FBI, upon the completely unproved and unjustified assumption that the FBI blackmails perjurers into testimony which will frame innocent persons. But this theory overlooks the mass of evidence corrobating beyond any doubt the existence of a Soviet espionage network of which these people were a part. This was a web which included Fuchs in England; Gold in Philadelphia; the Rosenbergs, Sobell, Elitcher in New York City; the Greenglasses in Albuquerque; Alfred Dean Slack in Tennessee; Soviet diplomats in New York; and others. These people were not strangers to each other. Events which transpired in London; Cambridge, Mass.; New York City; Sante Fe and Albuquerque, N. Mex.; and Kingsport, Tenn., tie these individuals to each other and to the conspiratorial network.

Mr. Russell forgets, apparently, that it was the confession of Fuchs in England which led almost directly to the Rosenbergs and Sobell in New York. In addition, Fuchs, Gold, Slack, Elitcher, and the Greenglasses have all confessed to their own roles in the conspiracy. Such confessions are, in Anglo-American jurisprudence, fully admissible in evidence, and none of them has been repudiated by any confessor or rejected by any court.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD P. GREEN.
IRVING FERMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, although Lord Russell freely criticizes our Federal Bureau of Investigation because it obtained the confessions of a number of spies who implicated others in the conspiracy, he ignores the fact that it was Scotland Yard which obtained the confession of Fuchs. This confession led immediately to the American participants in the conspiracy, including the Rosenbergs and Sobell.

I do not know on what information Lord Russell has based his fantastic charges. He says he has looked into the evidence. I wonder whether he has actually done so, or whether he has merely accepted as truth some of the "tripe" which has been written in this country purporting to analyze the facts in these cases.

The leading example of this is a book entitled "The Atom Spy Hoax," written by Mr. William A. Reuben, and published by Action Press. Some of Lord Russell's charges mirror the charges developed in this book. Unfortunately, this book, and others similar to it, give the impression of being based upon massive and painstaking research, and have apparently impressed many Americans. I think it would be useful to call to the attention of the members of this body and to the American public a review of The Atom Spy Hoax by Mr. Harold P. Green, which was published in the October, 1955, issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this review be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATOM SPY HOAX, BY WILLIAM REUBEN, NEW YORK: ACTION BOOKS, 1955

It is unfortunate that much of the public discussion of problems of internal security proceeds from extreme assumptions. On the one hand, it is frequently assumed and argued that our governmental and industrial institutions are honeycombed with Communist spies. On the other hand, extremists at the opposite pole assume and argue that there is really no problem of subversion or espionage. Neither extremity advances the cause of public understanding or the establishment of sound national policy.

The Atom Spy Hoax, by William A. Reuben, is an extreme example of the latter extremity. Mr. Reuben undertakes an "analysis" of the Canadian espionage cases, the cases of Hiss, Coplon, Fuchs, Gold, Slack, Greenglass, the Rosenbergs, Sobell, and the other spy cases of the past decade, and brings these cases together in a neat package supporting his theme that our national security obsession is based entirely upon a hoax. Mr. Reuben paints his picture on a canvas of cosmic proportions with a whitewasher's brush and lividly colored paint. All of these cases are part of a vast conspiratorial hoax to which the Canadian, United States, and British governments are party. The accusations of espionage were authorized and masterminded to further the cold war and the atomic arms race, which, of course, were initiated by the United States and its allies. Officials of these countries have lied, concocted myths, committed perjury, and conspired in fraudulent activities to accomplish their purpose. The accused spies who have confessed their crimes have all confessed falsely under duress, lack of mental balance, brainwashing, or promises of leniency. The accused spies who have asserted their innocence have all been "framed," and all of their self-serving statements, explanations, and alibis are to be accepted at face value.

Mr. Reuben does not paint a pretty picture. It would be a simple task to demolish his treatment of any of these espionage cases by straightforward recital of the facts. The temptation not to do so is great, for it would only lend unwarranted dignity to the author's allegations. In the interest of objectivity, however, we may consider his treatment of one case, that of Alfred Dean Slack, which can be discussed adequately in brief form.

Slack had been named by Harry Gold as one of the persons who had furnished him with secret information to relay to the Russians. Slack was arrested on June 15, 1950, and indicted on September 1, 1950, for conspiring with Harry Gold and "Richard Roe" to violate the Espionage Act, the indictment charging specifically that on two occasions Slack met Gold and delivered to him information relating to the national defense. Slack admitted that he had turned over to Gold certain reports as to a new explosive being produced at the Government plant where he was employed as well as a sample of the explosive, and he entered an unqualified plea of guilty pursuant to which he was sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Subsequently, Slack moved to vacate the sentence on the grounds that his constitutional rights had been infringed, but the trial court denied the motion. The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, however, reversed the order of the trial court and remanded the case to the trial court for a hearing on whether Slack's constitutional rights had been denied. The trial court, after a lengthy hearing, denied the motion to vacate the sentence, finding that Slack had not been deprived of his constitutional rights. The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit upheld the lower court on appeal, and the Supreme Court of the United States denied certiorari.

Mr. Reuben proclaims that this case provides a full and complete answer to the bedeviling question as to why alleged spies confess and accept lengthy prison terms although they are actually innocent. He states that the incredible developments in this case may be more sensational than any other revelation made in connection with the series of espionage cases.

Mr. Reuben finds insidious significance in the fact that the decision of the court of appeals remanding the case to the trial court for a hearing on Slack's motion to vacate the sentence was only three paragraphs in length, and that the style, terseness, and wording of the decision practically made it unrecognizable. The proceeding on which this decision was rendered is characterized as one of the most remarkable court actions ever undertaken in the United States. But few lawyers would regard the case as remarkable or would find the decision in any way unusual. It was a brief per curiam decision in a case which involved no contested issue. The United States attorney himself had asked that the order of the district court denying the motion to vacate the sentence be reversed and that the case be sent back to the district court for a full hearing. There was, therefore, no issue and no reason why anything other than the most perfunctory decision by the court of appeals was in order. As a matter of fact, the court's use of three paragraphs under the circumstances appears to be quite extravagant.

On the rehearing before the district court, Slack sought to establish principally that the attorneys whom the court had appointed to represent him prior to and during the trial did not properly advise and represent him. His main complaint was that his attorneys did not advise him of an interpretation which had been placed upon the Espionage Act in judicials decisions, and that had he been aware of this interpretation he would not have pleaded guilty. The interpretation of which he was not aware when he pleaded guilty was that of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *United States* v. *Heine*, 151 F. 2d 813, to the effect that the espionage laws are not violated by furnishing information known or available to the recipient from public sources. He contended that all the information contained in reports which he gave Gold was derived from public sources. Slack argued that not only did his court-appointed attorneys not advise him of this interpretation, but also that they urged him to plead guilty in order to obtain a lenient sentence.

Mr. Reuben makes much of this. He quotes copiously from Slack's testimony and accepts it at face value; he pulls out of context testimony by Slack's attorneys, and fails to reflect their side of the story. He plays to the hilt the contention that Slack passed no information which was secret, and the Government's failure to produce evidence that unauthorized information was involved.

But the trial court, after the hearing on these questions, denied the motion, and its decision was affirmed by the court of appeals. Mr. Reuben quotes a brief paragraph from the decision of the court of appeals as the basis for suggesting that the court regarded Slack's contention as based upon a "legal technicality, an impression enhanced by the appellate court's ruling finding it without merit and by its declaration that Slack's appeal 'evinces the ingratitude which might be expected of a traitor to his country—a man obviously without principle or honor.'"

The fact of the matter is that the appellate court did not treat the matter as a legal technicality. Its decision consumes 5 pages of print in the official reporter. The court believed, and with good cause, that Slack's contention was manifestly a concocted afterthought.

Mr. Reuben espouses the cause of Slack's innocence even though Slack did not deny that he passed information to Gold for transmission to the Russians. He is satisfied that Slack is innocent merely because Slack contended that all the information in the reports was available to the public. He does not report that the appellate court regarded the interpretation of the Espionage Act relied upon by Slack as "open to serious challenge," and that the court went to great pains to point out that even if this interpretation were correct, it would not help Slack. As the court pointed out, since Slack was employed in a closely guarded munitions plant, information furnished to the Russians about the explosive being produced there, even if drawn from public sources, acquired authenticity and value to the Russians as information about what was going on in this plant. Nor does Mr. Reuben mention the court's observation that Slack, in furnishing samples of the explosive, provided the Russians with the means by which, through chemical analysis, they could determine what in fact was being manufactured in the plant. The court held unequivocally that such information falls within the scope of the espionage laws.

Moreover, Mr. Reuben does not report the appellate court's eloquent defense of the integrity, ability, and counsel of Slack's attorneys and its detailed summary of their efforts in Slack's behalf. Similarly, he does not report that Slack wrote his lawyers at the end of the trial court proceedings before sentencing that, "your help, your counsel, and your representation were far more than I had expected; your efforts today were magnificent. For now I must sincerely thank you," and that these facts were the basis for the court's remarks concerning his ingratitude and lack of principle or honor.

One must weigh the careful judicial pronouncement that Slack "is clearly guilty beyond a reasonable doubt" against Mr. Reuben's pronouncement that an innocent man has been framed. Mr. Reuben employs much the same pattern of analysis in discussing every espionage case portrayed in his book.

Mr. Reuben's central thesis is based in large part upon the contention that atomic espionage is a hoax because there was no secret of the atom bomb to be stolen. In support of this he relies heavily upon the assumption that the Government's publication of the Smyth report in 1945 "in itself indicates that there were no longer any essential secrets regarding the bomb." But General Groves, in his preface to the Smyth report, states:

"Obviously, military security prevents this story from being told in full at this time. * * * All pertinent scientific information which can be released to the public at this time without violating the needs of national security is contained in this volume."

And Dr. Smyth himself, in his preface, points out that "secrecy requirements have affected both the detailed content and general emphasis so that many interesting developments have been omitted."

The biographical sketch of Mr. Reuben on the jacket of his book does not indicate that he has had any legal training or experience. This is, perhaps, his major difficulty, since in the 500 pages of the book he takes a number of weird excursions into the field of criminal law. He is thoroughly confused about the nature of and relationship among complaints on which arrests are made, arraignments, indictments, trials, verdicts, and sentencing, and he compounds the confusion by vesting scare headlines, newspaper stories, Government press releases, and political utterances with quasi-evidentiary significance. He finds his hoax in discrepancies among the charges reflected in the successive procedures from arrest to sentencing. He assumes that the Government's official announcement of the arrest of a spy must reflect all pertinent information known to the Government about the offense, and that each and every statement in the announcement stands as disproved unless reflected in the indictment and proved in court; that the complaint on which the arrest is based must be the equivalent of an indictment; that the initial statements of the alleged spy, and his plea on arraignment, are absolutely truthful if they profess his innocence, but made of whole cloth if they confess his guilt; that the Government is obliged to indict and prosecute the alleged spy for, and to prove in court, each and every offense and offense or circumstance which it has referred to publicly; and that any enlargement of the scope of the offense which occurs after the

arrest and preliminary statements and procedures necessarily is based upon insidious concoction. Anyone with the slightest sophistication about criminal law and procedures will recognize the absurdity of these assumptions.

The author also takes a flier into the law of evidence. He cites the unquestionable authority of Wigmore as to the evidentiary value of a confession in a criminal proceeding, and proceeds from this to the astounding judgment that on the basis of available facts it is clear that under "ordinary Anglo-American standards" the confession of Klaus Fuchs "would almost certainly not be admissible (sic) as evidence."

Mr. Reuben would have us believe that many of the alleged spies were convicted on the basis of confessions alone, unsupported by corroborative evidence. While it is true that in some of these cases the Government was not required to, and did not, submit corroborative evidence because the defendant confessed and pleaded guilty, there was an abundance of corroborative evidence available in each of these cases.

But the most striking instance in which Mr. Reuben is caught off base is to be found in his preface. He argues that for the Rosenbergs and Sobell to be believed "guilty as charged," it must be assumed "that there is an atom bomb 'secret' which can be stolen and transmitted by individuals; that without the aid of 'atom spies' the Soviet Union could not have produced an atom bomb so soon as 1949; that Russia's possession of the bomb was in some way related to the outbreak of the war in Korea and leads to the expectation that she will use the bomb for aggressive warfare; that there is an innate relationship between communism and Russian espionage; and that all 'Communists' are primarily loyal to Russia and can therefore be presumed to be actual or potential spies," and that no such evidence was produced at the trial. In saying this, Mr. Reuben insists upon discussing the Rosenbergs-Sobell trial in political terms; he ignores the basic fact that as a matter of law all the Government had to prove was that the defendants engaged in a conspiracy to violate the espionage laws and that overt acts within the scope of these laws were in fact committed in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Mr. Reuben attempts to prove too much. Thoughtful Americans will recognize that the national obsession with espionage and subversion has been blown up beyond any valid proportion to the actual facts. They will also recognize, unless they are unable or unwilling to open their minds to the facts, that the United States has been the victim of large-scale espionage efforts which have been highly detrimental to our national security, and that this espionage has been directly related to the Communist conspiracy. The Atom Spy Hoax contributes nothing to our understanding of the events of the past decade.—Harold Green.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that all of us should welcome constructive criticism from sources either at home or abroad on any or all of the major issues now confronting this Nation and the free world. But the very seriousness of these issues should place upon all of us a commensurate obligation to deal with them soberly and intelligently. I am deeply disturbed that a man of worldwide reputation should have contributed such a damaging and ill-informed attack on American justice as Lord Russell has done on this occasion.

It is even more serious when so many persons have long recognized the many fine contributions to literature and to the social sciences which Lord Russell has made. I say, in a most forgiving and understanding manner, that the purpose of my comments today is merely to correct the record and not to chastise or unduly to criticize. Nevertheless I feel that in matters of such gravity as this it is important for Members of Congress and other persons to speak out and to defend what we know to be true, namely, that due process of law was followed; that these cases were appealed not only to the highest courts of the land but also to two Presidents of the United States. I know of no President who would in any way have permitted a violation of the rules of justice in the name of security if he had any evidence to indicate that a person was innocent.

The evidence is replete as to the guilt of the persons concerned, and the courts of the United States, as well as two Chief Executives, have made it crystal clear that justice was done. Therefore I have brought the matter to the attention of my colleagues only for the purpose of stating what I believe to be the position of our Government, of our courts, and of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the texts of two broadcasts by Dean Clarence E. Manion, sponsor of the Manion Forum of Opinion, South Bend, Ind. The broadcasts are entitled "The Next President Will Be Elected by the States" and "Will the House of Representatives Elect Our Next President?"

There being no objection, the text of the broadcasts was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEXT PRESIDENT WILL BE ELECTED BY THE STATES

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

My distinguished friend, George Sokolsky, says that "on the whole, the American people are bored with politics and with all the intricate maneuvers that need to be reported if the complete (political) story is to be told." (Washington (D. C.) Post, February 24, 1956.)

Nevertheless, while friend George was writing this sentence, more than 4,000 of his neighbors in New York City were being turned away from Carnegie Hall, where 3,800 people had already purchased all available seats for a patriotic rally to stimulate political action "for America."

For 3½ hours on that night of February 22, the jam-packed auditorium resounded with cheers for George Washington's warnings against the "insidious wiles of foreign influence." Every demand for the Bricker amendment brought forth a ringing roar of approval. The unequivocal recommendations of all speakers to put the interests of the United States first in the consideration of every foreign and domestic policy drew repeated and prolonged applause.

All this, if you please, inside the senatorial bailiwick of New York's internationalist Senators LEHMAN and IVES, and well within the frowning shadow of the United Nations Headquarters Building.

As speakers urged the cheering audience to give long-overdue priority to the American interest, the inevitable chanted response was, "How? Tell us how."

The final recommendation for popular action was so simple and so practical that it startled the assembled patriots, who, like millions of others, have become accustomed to the expenditure of their patriotic indignation in hopeless and fruitless frustration. As I told you last week, the immediate practical remedy for this paralysis of patriotic action is found in the constitutional provisions for the election of the President of the United States. (United States Constitution, art. II, as modified by amendments XII and XX.)

The Constitution makes it clear that the election of our President is the right and duty of the people in each of the several States of the Union. This right and duty is not legally controlled by Congress, nor by the national conventions of national political parties.

Legally and actually, the election of a President is not national in any sense. It is a State-by-State process from start to finish.

The nationwide popular vote that is apparently cast for a presidential candidate in the November election has nothing whatsoever to do with his victory or defeat. It is entirely possible for 1 of 2 such candidates to win the presidency in spite of the fact that the nationwide popular vote goes against the winner by a ratio of 2 or even 3 to 1.

When Lincoln was elected President in 1860, he received less than 40 percent of the total popular vote cast in the entire Nation. Nevertheless, in the State-by-State tabulation, he received more than 59 percent of what was then the 303 total electoral votes.

Lincoln's chief opponent in that election, Steven A. Douglas, accumulated approximately 30 percent of the nationwide popular vote, but fewer than 4 percent of the total available electoral votes.

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson received less than 45 percent of the total nationwide popular vote, but more than 80 percent of the total electoral vote in the State-by-State tabulation which determined the election.

STATES CONTROL ELECTION MACHINERY

In facing up to this somewhat startling reality, we must remember that our country was designed as a Federal Republic of individual States, each of which is separately and severally sovereign, except to the extent that certain described powers are surrendered by each of these States in the Federal Constitution.

One of the powers not granted to the Federal Government and consequently reserved to each State is the machinery for popular elections, along with the power to qualify voters and to control the polling places.

The Federal Government is without authority to call or conduct a national popular election of any kind for any purpose. All of our popular elections are therefore local. They are not national affairs. Every American voter is qualified under State statutes, rather than by national laws.

Under the Constitution, each State is entitled to as many presidential electors as it has Representatives and Senators in Congress. Each State may select these electors in any manner that the State legislature desires.

In the beginning of our national history, the State legislatures themselves chose the States' presidential electors. Then, for a time, in some States, electors were chosen by congressional districts, with only two electors, representing the Senators, being chosen in the statewide vote. Now, all State laws require the presidential electors to be elected in a statewide popular election on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

From the flood of inquiries that have reached me since this subject was mentioned at the New York rally, I am more than ever convinced that not 1 American voter in 10,000 completely understands the constitutional power of the 531 presidential electors,

all told, who will be chosen in the State-by-State election returns next November 6.

Between now and November, professional managers of the 2 national political parties will select these presidential electors and qualify them for the ballot in each of the 48 States. Every one selected as a candidate for elector will be morally pledged to vote for the Presidential candidate of the party which puts such elector candidate in its ballot.

If our politically organized nature is allowed to take its course, there will be only two rival sets of electors on the ballot in your State and in mine next November 6. That was what Vice President NIXON anticipated when he recently said that our choice in November would be between the Eisenhower program and something even "more radical."

If you and I wish to vote for something more conservative of the Constitution and preservative of American national independence than this bipartisan distinction without a difference will present, then we can get our wish by qualifying a slate of American presidential elector candidates in our respective States. We can do this simply by complying with the laws of the individual States, all of which, in one way or another, now provide us with such an opportunity.

In some jurisdictions, the process is more difficult than in others. Everywhere petitions must be circulated according to prescribed specifications and filed before stipulated dates. In a number of States, patriots are already far advanced on these necessary prerequisites. In others, work must start from scratch.

Just remember that, like the ultimate tabulation of the electoral vote, the qualification of electors for the November ballot is a State-by-State process. Is it not something that can be provided for you in finished form by a centrally directed national headquarters. The procedure must be motivated and powered on the local level, in full view of local laws and local political conditions.

Some of my wise and trusted friends in certain States of the Union are confident that their existing local political organizations can be trusted to protect the voters of those States against the dreaded possibility of two one-world, Socialist tickets in November.

These patriots still have hopes that one or the other of the two national party conventions can somehow be made to break loose from the one-world. Socialist bipartisan combine and come forth with an American candidate on a platform calling for the restoration of constitutional government.

I sincerely hope that their faith in the politicians is justified. I likewise hope and believe that my house will not be destroyed by fire between now and November. Nevertheless, I shall keep my fire-insurance policy, just in case. I shall be particularly concerned about the currency of that fire-insurance policy, if there is an obvious sign and smell of smoke in the neighborhood.

In view of the persisting signs of smoke and the prevailing political winds, I likewise advise you to insure yourself against the dreaded November distinction without a difference that Vice President NIXON tells us to expect.

THE CASE OF LINCOLN'S ELECTION

Meanwhile, I suggest that you review your American history, to see if by any chance it is now to be caught in the act of repeating itself. One year less than 100 years ago, the whole country was trembling from the impact of a certain Supreme Court decision, the famous Dred Scott case. (*Dred Scott* v. *Sanford*, U. S. Supreme Court, 19 Howard 393.)

In the case of Dred Scott, the United States Supreme Court ruled that Congress could not prevent the extension of slavery into the unorganized Territories of the United States. For the new Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln declared: "We offer no resistance to the Dred Scott decision; but we think it is erroneous and we shall do what we can to have it overruled."

One of the most important results of Lincoln's determined opposition to this Supreme Court ruling was his nomination and election to the Presidency of the United States in a bitter contest which divided the popular and electoral vote between 4 candidates of 4 separate political parties. That was in 1860.

In 1956 Democrat Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, calls for massive resistance to the Supreme Court's desegregation decision through what he calls the "interposition" of State legislative resolutions to shield the affected areas and affected citizens of the individual States from the execution and enforcement of the Supreme Court's decree. At the same time, Democrat Adlai Stevenson condemns such interposition as "incompatible with the existence of the Union." Stevenson praises the desegregation decision and declares that it does not "recognize or permit repudiation or rejection." (Chicago Tribune, February 26, 1956.)

Governor Allan Shivers, of Texas, has already called for a Texas referendum on the question of "interposition" and the possibility of another constitutional amendment to strengthen the protection of States' rights. (Press release, February 23, 1956.) In turn, Democrat Congressman ADAM POWELL, of New York, urged a nationwide protest against disturbances in Alabama.

Between these contending viewpoints lies a long stick of political dynamite with fuses now burning at both ends. Remember that 4 separate slates of presidential electors contended with each other in 1860. In anticipation of the explosion and in defense of conservative constitutional government, get busy now on your political insurance policy. With all due respect to my friend Sokolsky, 1956 will not be a boring political year. Fix things now so that you may enjoy and profit by the fireworks.

WILL THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECT OUR NEXT PRESIDENT?

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

The Republican Party is dead. As an actual or potential channel of opposition to the Democrat welfare state, the GOP has ceased to exist.

Officially, the Republican Party lived a ripe 100 years, but the mourning members of the immediate family know in their hearts that the breath of life left the pain-wracked GOP boy several years ago.

Whether President Eisenhower made over the Republican Party or was himself taken over as a part of the Republican death design is now an academic question.

Some contend that an anonymous third force captured General Eisenhower in 1952 in a plot to kill the Republican Party and reanimate its corpse with the general's beloved image and likeness.

If that is true, then the third force certainly suffered severe shock last fall when President Eisenhower's heart accident threatened to remove him from the political scene before the plotted death and fraudulent resurrection of the GOP could be accomplished.

That frightful possibility has now been officially dissolved. Those who are at present in possession of the deceased GOP's estate have long known that its mechanical assets are exceedingly valuable. The political machinery which the dead party left behind is geared into every precinct of the country. It amounts to a vast arterial system into which alien blood has now been deliberately transfused.

The Republican corpse is already warm again. Political doctors expect it to be up and walking long before the official San Francisco resurrection day.

One of the deceased GOP's honorary pallbearers puts it this way: The San Francisco convention will insure the long-term remaking of the Republican Party in the image of Eisenhower policies and purposes. (Roscoe Drummond, South Bend Tribune, March 5.)

Where does that leave the millions who are convinced that the Eisenhower policies and purposes are undermining the conservation of our national solvency and national independence? Those millions of American conservationists are now political orphans. The Democratic Party offers no comfort to these orphaned voters. As Vice President NIXON has observed, the policies and purposes of the Democrat Party are even more radical than those of President Eisenhower.

Furthermore, the health of the Democrat Party itself is gravely questioned. For years the Democrat organization has endured a chronic case of split personality. Now, this illness has suddenly become acute. The Democrats are not expecting a glorious resurrection at Chicago this summer. On the contrary, all signs point to a destructive explosion there.

Some of the most distinguished adherents of the Democrat Party have already written off the Chicago convention as a total loss. For instance, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, a former United States Senator, Governor, and United States Supreme Court Justice, told the United Press on March 2 that neither the Democrats nor the Republican Party could be expected to give support or sympathy to southern views as to the rights of the States.

Consequently, Mr. Byrnes will pass up the Chicago convention. He indicated the possibility of a new party, pledged to preserve the Constitution of the United States and the rights of the States. (United Press, March 2, Columbia, S. C.)

Apparently, Mr. Byrnes envisons a new political orphans' home for southern voters who expect to be blown out of their old Democrat homestead by the force of the explosion at the Chicago convention.

The southerners are not without experience for such an emergency. In 1948, southern Democrats, who were dissatisfied with the results of the regular Democrat Party convention, formed a States Rights Party, which nominated Gov. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, and Gov. Fielding Wright, of Mississippi, for President and Vice President, respectively.

THE ELECTOR IS CONSTITUTIONALLY FREE

This party was terribly handicapped by lack of time and money. Nevertheless, the States Righters carried four States and rolled up a total of 39 electoral votes. One Tennessee presidential elector, elected on a ticket pledged to President Truman, deserted the President and voted for Governor Thurmond.

Remember that any presidential elector who is elected in November has the legal right to vote for whomsoever he pleases, regardless of the party or person to whom he has been pledged in the November election.

This is the master key to any plan for pro-American electors in 1956. In the 1948 election, President Truman won the race for California and Illinois electors in a neck and neck photo finish with Governor Dewey. In the case of Illinois, the Democrat margin of victory was less than 34,000 votes in a total vote of nearly 4 million. If, instead of this narrow victory, President Truman had lost California and Illinois in 1948, Dewey would then have had 242 electoral votes, Truman 250, and Thurmond 39. None would have had the required electoral vote majority, which is 266.

When no candidate has such a majority, the Constitution requires that the House of Representatives shall choose the President from the 3 highest persons on the list of those receiving electoral votes. However, when the House of Representatives thus

chooses a President, the Constitution provides that the vote shall be taken in the House of Representatives by States, and that each State shall have one vote. A majority of all States in the Union, or 25 of the present 48 States, shall be necessary for a choice.

In such a Presidential election by the House of Representatives, Nevada, which has but one Representative in Congress, would have the same voting strength as New York, which has 43 Representatives in the House. In like manner, Delaware, with one Representative, would have the same voting strength as California, which has 30 Representatives in Congress.

In a Presidential election by the House of Representatives, 25 States with a total House membership of less than 100, could elect a President over the opposition of 24 States with a total House membership of more than 335.

In such an election, the populous States with their big-city voting blocks would be outmaneuvered, and the President would be chosen by Representatives of rural districts and the wide open spaces.

These are the areas which have long been victimized by big city control of our foreign policies, immigration regulations and Federal labor laws. Once the election of a President goes into the House of Representatives, the less populous States can be expected to coordinate their forces with a vengeance.

The millions of pro-American voters in the North, South, East, and West who will be orphaned in the Democrat explosion and in the Republican resurrection next August must act at once if they are to have a political haven in November.

To provide ample insurance against the threatened destruction of our solvency, our sovereignty, and our constitutional government, this pro-American project must embody all of the great flexibility which the Constitution permits it to employ.

The State-by-State qualification of outstanding pro-American electors for the November ballot is all that is presently necessary or desirable.

This is not the time to pick our all-American candidate for President. Some State laws require elector candidates to state their choice for President and Vice President. Where this is the case, let the pro-American electors in that State name a favorite son as a patriotic stand-in, to satisfy this technical requirement.

In every such case, the stand-in will be a self-acknowledged martyr to the cause. He will announce, in advance, that once the November elections are over, he will expect his electors to vote for whomsoever they please, but with the single purpose of making sure that the House of Representatives will have at least 1 distinguished pro-American States' Righter on the list of 3 candidates submitted to it for election.

There are many Governors, Senators, and Representatives in Congress who are American to the core. Any one of these all-American statesmen could be safely depended upon to restore national independence and constitutional government to our troubled country. However, each of these men is now frozen into an existing political party organization. The "old pros" would drive any one of them from public life if he dared to endorse the independent pro-American elector project in his State or permitted his name to be used in connection with it.

THIRD GROUP OF ELECTORS IN THE OFFING

After the prospective explosion and resurrection, and particularly after the November election, things will be different. On November 6, the people will choose 531 electors. Some of these will have been filed, pledged, and supported by the New Deal Democratic Party. Others will have been filed, pledged, and supported by the fraudulently resurrected Republican Party.

If presently conceived patriotic plans do not miscarry, a third group of pro-American electors will then have been elected in many States of the Union. The future of America will depend upon the aggregate number of these successful pro-American electors whose devotion to our national independence, States' rights, and constitutional government will transcend their preference for any particular presidential candidate, announced or unannounced.

Between November 6 and the following December 17, when the electors will meet and actually vote for a President and a Vice President, much can be accomplished by soul-searching analysis and negotiation.

The best qualified American, regardless of his political party, official position or geographical location, will then be available and willing. Under the anticipated circumstances, no person will command a majority of the elected electoral votes.

In that case, after December 17, when the electors make their choices, the United States Senate will choose the Vice President from the 2 persons receiving the highest and next highest number of electoral votes for Vice President. At the same time, the House of Representatives will select the President from the 3 highest on the list of those selected by the electors for President.

If at that time the all-American patriotic cause will have fared as well as we hope and pray that it will, political party discipline will have been proportionately relaxed. That being so, many regular Democrat and Republican electors may do what the Tennessee elector did in 1948, namely, jump the political traces and vote for principle.

Long overdue political realignment will then be malleable for the making. But, meanwhile, a combination of intelligence, patriotism, and personal sacrifice will have saved our Constitution and insured the continued independence of our glorious American Republic.

For this historic dramatization of freedom in action, the whole country is the stage, and every citizen is a potential star. You will get the role that you deserve.

HOW FOREIGN TO AMERICAN INTERESTS IS OUR FOREIGN AID?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of a broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion entitled "Foreign Aid for the Communist Conquest."

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID TO THE COMMUNIST CONQUEST

(By Dean Clarence E. Manion)

Exactly how foreign to American interests is our foreign aid? Aside from the maintenance of our Military Establishment, foreign aid is the most expensive program ever undertaken by the United States Government.

Apparently, no one knows the exact amount of money that foreign aid has cost the American taxpayers. A year ago, the Hoover Commission found that we had given more than $141 billion to foreign governments since the beginning of World War II.

Published estimates of the total amount that American taxpayers have contributed to foreign countries since the end of the war range all the way from $51 billion to $67 billion. (Manion Forum Broadcast No. 24.) More than $3 billion of this incredibly huge foreign giveaway was used to reduce the public debt of the receiving nations. (Chicago Daily News, July 13, 1955.)

In this phase of the giveaway operation, the United States increased its own national debt by $3 billion, so that foreign governments could reduce their national debts by the same amount. This single $3 billion item is now costing the American taxpayers $90 million a year in interest charges.

If we accept the very lowest published amount of our total postwar foreign aid bill—$51 billion—then, on that basis, the American taxpayers must henceforth dig up more than $1½ billion every year just for the annual interest on the amount that foreign aid handouts have added to our Federal debt in the past 10 years.

Back in the ways before we quit minding our own business and started out to "make the world safe for democracy" (1916), $1,500,000,000 was enough to pay all the expenses of all departments of the United States Government for 2 full years.

What have we received in return for the handout of all of these foreign aid billions? Has the handout program produced good will for the United States and strengthened the defenses of the free world against communism?

Is there now any place on earth where affection and respect for the United States is greater and where the prestige of our Government is higher than it was 10 years ago?

Where in the free world are those protective bastions against the spread of communism that our multibillion dollar giveaways were supposed to construct?

Right in the face of our continued worldwide generosity, the Kremlin gangsters have quadrupled the population of their slave empire and extended the Iron Curtain to include more than a third of the earth.

More than a half-billion dollars worth of our foreign aid went to India. Nevertheless, that country turned the visit of the Soviet dictators, Khrushchev and Bulganin, into a triumphal tour. Some weeks ago, on this program, Senator MCCARTHY pointed up the irony of the fact that the most enthusiastic reception of those visiting Communist gangsters was staged in an Indian town built with American money.

The weapons we gave to France for her defenses against communism are now being used by the French Government to suppress revolutions for national independence by the native Moslems in France's North African colonies. Because we paid all expenses incurred by France in her futile war to hold French Indochina, France will now ask us to provide additional billions for the suppression of the North Africans.

Meanwhile, France apologizes for the "unpardonable act" of a French mob that wrecked the United States Consulate in Tunis last March 9. Ironically, France offers to pay for the property damages. If these violent foreign outbursts of love and affection for the United States become general throughout the world, still more foreign aid will probably be requested to enable the various governments to reimburse us for incidental destruction of American lives and property.

BRITAIN'S BULLDOG-LIKE LOVE FOR US

Just before the last general election in England, we tossed a cool $200 million to Mr. Eden's government so that Mr. Eden could reduce British taxes and thus win the election. Naturally, there was no suggestion of American self-interest in this item of our giveaway program. The English people already loved us $10½ billion worth, that being the amount of our postwar aid to Britain before Mr. Eden's tax-cut bonus.

The British Prime Minister has already reciprocated generously with a plan for settling the crisis between Israel and the Arab States. He observes, of course, what Mr. Dulles has declared, but which few Americans know, namely, that "the foreign policy of the United States embraces the preservation of the State of Israel."

To help carry out this policy, Britain proposed that the United States give Israel the money to pay compensatory damages to 1 million destitute Arab refugees who were driven from their homes by the Israelis. But Israel has little interest in this project and has countered with a demand for American weapons and ammunition.

However, Egypt has intimated that if we grant Israel's request for arms, Egypt may refuse to let us give the Egyptian Government the $300 million, more or less, that our State Department has allocated for the construction of the great Egyptian dam on the upper Nile River.

Our foreign-aid experts tell us that we must be carefully considerate of the attitudes of these foreign governments; otherwise, these governments may refuse to take our money. Mr. Harold Stassen said as much to the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee a few days ago.

The Senators wanted to know why we are giving our foreign-aid money to nations which are selling vital strategic war materials to Soviet Russia and to Red China.

Senator McCARTHY raised and repeated that question over and over again when he was chairman of this same subcommittee 2 years ago.

The question was revived recently on the floor of the Senate by the present chairman, Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Senator McCLELLAN told the Senate that subcommittee hearings revealed "astounding secret concessions * * * made by our Government to Allies whose governments and merchants want to do business as usual with the Communist bloc countries."

Senator McCLELLAN revealed that, with the official but top-secret consent of the United States Government, our allies have been shipping 200 separate items of strategic machines and machine tools to Communist governments for the past 2 years. Of these items, the Senator listed four types of mills and machines, some of which sell for half a million dollars each.

All of these are indispensably necessary to the manufacture of jet engines, guided missiles, aircraft, artillery weapons, and heavy ordnance. Said Senator McCLELLAN: (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 23, 1956, p. 3183.)

"By permitting the newest machine tools to be sent to the Soviet bloc, we allowed them to save from 3 to 5 years in engineering research and development."

The Senator then quoted expert subcommittee witnesses as saying that it would be better for the United States to permit shells, guns or guided missiles to be disembargoed and sent direct from the United States to the Soviet Union, because these could be used against us only once. However, machine tools can and will be used to make armaments which may be used against us many times.

OUR LEFT HAND DOES WHAT RIGHT HAND WON'T

Of course, the Communists know exactly what materials they are getting, but Senator McCLELLAN'S information had to come from unofficial sources.

Mr. Stassen said that if he gave the list of these strategic materials to the United States Senate, he would be "serving the enemy" and "maligning our allies."

Please remember that, in many instances, the foreign factories in which these strategic materials are now made were built with American foreign aid money. Our own American industries are prevented by law from shipping such materials directly to Communist countries.

On the other hand, we are giving the taxpayers' money to foreigners who use that money to produce the prohibited items and then proceed to sell them to our enemies at a profit.

Nevertheless, at his press conference on March 7, President Eisenhower insisted that this procedure is desirable. He said that our allies now have an excess productive capacity; that they must continue to export to the Soviet Communists, unless we are to continue to give economic assistance to Western Europe indefinitely. But with or without this Communist trade, indefinite foreign aid is precisely what the President recommended to Congress last January 16. At that time, he urged that our current foreign aid spending be doubled for what he called a "long term" program for building and maintaining the economic strength of the free world.

At that time, the President admitted that our foreign spending department had a backlog of 7 billion unspent dollars, but this, he said, would be rapidly reduced.

So it looks as if the Communists will continue to get their guided missile machines, and the bankruptcy of the United States to boot.

Just who has been designing this program for American self-destruction since the end of World War II? Congressman LAWRENCE SMITH of Wisconsin came up with an answer to this question on the floor of the House of Representatives on March 6. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 6, 1956, p. 4053.) Said Congressman SMITH: "Less than 95 days ago, the national conference of the Communist Party in Chicago advised its members and fellow travelers to 'press for all-out foreign aid.' "

The Congressman then quoted from Political Affairs, the Communist propaganda magazine, which singled out the following major Communist fighting objectives, as follows:

1. A fight for disarmament.

2. A fight to restore normal trade relations between America and the Communist world.

3. The fight for a policy of large-scale economic aid, without strings, to the so-called underdeveloped countries.

Continued the Communist magazine: "The Communist Party has a vital and decisive role to play in helping these movements unfold and reach their objectives."

Congressman SMITH explained why the Soviets press for all-out foreign aid without strings, limitations or conditions. They do so, he says, because "it fits the Soviet pattern of bleeding capitalism to death. It conforms to the Kremlin scheme of undermining the economy of the free world. When that is achieved, there will be choas, anarchy, and turmoil. Communism will then step in like a political vulture and devour the world."

Will the Congressman please tell that to Harold Stassen, who has been officially and guilelessly working on Communist projects 2 and 3, and is now in charge of project No. 4, namely, disarmament?

Perhaps Mr. Stassen is right after all about the unimportance of unrestricted international trade in guided-missile machines. Given enough unlimited, unrestricted American foreign aid, the Communist conquest can be achieved without firing a shot.

The path from Moscow to Washington will be paved by the bankruptcy of the United States, overlaid with plenty of chaos, anarchy and turmoil. Louder, Congressman SMITH. Louder and louder, please. Eventually, you may be heard in the White House.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

Walter Bedell Smith, general, United States Army, retired, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1961. (Reappointment.)

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be Members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1962:

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota.
Glenn A. Boger, of Pennsylvania.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, O14905, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 23 (legislative day of April 9), 1956:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert George Butler, O17191.
Brig. Gen. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069.
Brig. Gen. David Haytor Buchanan, O17746.
Brig. Gen. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662.
Brig. Gen. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060.

To be brigadier generals

Col. David William Heiman, O17094.
Col. Eric Hilmer Frithiof Svensson, O17630.
Col. Thad Adolphus Broom, O18246.
Col. William Frederick Cassidy, O18354.
Col. Milton Leonard Ogden, O18687.
Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress:

To be major

Mordecai, Lindley R., MC, O1718112.

To be captain

Bridge, Carl J., MC, O1861678.

To be first lieutenant

Belleville, Helen E., ANC, N901757.
Caldwell, William L., MC, O4050745.
Clarke, Robert B., JAGC, O4017173.
Fenstermacher, James M., MC, O2268939.
Laubham, James J., Jr., DC, O2275651.
Mansfield, John O., MC, O4016515.
McCaffrey, Joseph P., MSC, O2049015.
Montgomery, Roena, ANC, N794859.
Staples, Jack E. MSC, O2205819.
York, Germaine, ANC, N758821.

To be second lieutenant

Wilson, Shannon D., ANC, N901478.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate

General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

To be captain

Rouillard, Irving G., O28177.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship:

Brandt, Fred A., O2275375.
Collie, Lamar P., Jr., O2275374.
Davies, Olwyn K., O2275572.
Fagerstrom, Charles D., O2275393.
Groth, Robert C., O2275559.
Haller, Yoel I.
Hartenstein, Paul E., O2275420.
Jacobs, Robert D.
Kuxhausen, Donald L., O2275415.
Lagace, Maurice N.
Lopiano, Michael A., O2275372.
Miale, August, Jr.
Plaut, Samuel M., O2275597.
Sample, Donald W.
Smith, Neilson A., O2275352.
Walker, Donald D., O2275456.
Weissbein, A. Sigmund.

The following-named person for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), upon receipt of doctor of dental surgery degree:

Kelly, James J., O2276573.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Gwaltney, Robert L.
Kuhns, Craig S., O2210734.
Maurer, William W., O2268174.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Edwards, Charles A.
Hanson, Gene
Hawkins, Charles C., III
Pinson, David L.
Rosecrans, James E.
Sawyer, Frank N., Jr.
Schvaneveldt, Noel S.
Sentell, Joseph W.
Wolf, Walter E.

IN THE AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502, 508, 509, AND 510 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED, AND SECTION 107 OF THE ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

The nominations of Donald Sears Dundas and 190 other officers, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 9, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Donald Sears Dundas, which is shown on page 5946, and ending with the name of Patricia Ann Thomas, which appears on the same page.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers, designated by the President for commands and other duties, in accordance with the provisions of section 413 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, were nominated to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. Roscoe H. Hillenkoetter, United States Navy.

Rear Adm. John M. Will, United States Navy.

RETIRED LIST

The nomination of Vice Adm. Francis O. Denebrink, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Frederick G. Adams and 2,019 other persons for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps (1,676 in the Navy and 344 in the Marine Corps), which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on April 9, 1956, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Frederick G. Adams, which is shown on page 5946, and ending with the name of Norman H. Bryant, which occurs on page 5951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Very Rev. J. Bernard Moore, pastor, Holy Comforter Catholic Church, Charlottesville, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty and Eternal God, ruler of the universe and of the world, direct all our actions by Thy holy inspiration and carry them on with Thy gracious assistance.

Endow those who rule our people with the knowledge of the truth that all men are created after Thine own image and likeness and that they are, thereby, precious in Thy sight.

Infuse in the minds and hearts of those who make our laws Thy divine wisdom so that our legislators may ever strive to regulate the affairs of men in such fashion that citizens may find laws conducive to their civil and also their eternal destiny.

Permeate the peoples of our blessed country with respect for divine law and rightful constituted authority in order that peace might prevail in our land.

Where there is strife and conflict between rulers and subjects, sustain us with Thy patient understanding.

Guide us all in the way of Thy justice and may we all, one day, attain our salvation and reign together forever enraptured in the glories of Thy beatific vision. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 2796. An act for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel;

H. R. 2948. An act for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis);

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Lois O. Jennings;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Antonio Penna;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges;

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10387. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2854. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government;

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 146. An act for the relief of Isabel Tre;

S. 586. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antoniette Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada;

S. 1013. An act for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales;

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion;

S. 1101. An act for the relief of Martino Palmeri;

S. 1364. An act for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis;

S. 1885. An act for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife;

S. 2095. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Culcasi;

S. 2144. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc.;

S. 2244. An act for the relief of Maria Novak;

S. 2305. An act to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to

authorize their disposal as surplus Federal property;

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument;

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces;

S. 2517. An act to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska;

S. 2563. An act for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo;

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.;

S. 3254. An act to authorize the county of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects;

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefore; and

S. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; and

S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2286) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to provide for the utilization of privately owned shipping services in connection with the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of certain personnel of the Department of Defense, insist upon the amendments of the House, and agree to a conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BONNER, GARMATZ, ROBESON of Virginia, TOLLEFSON, and ALLEN of California.

AMORTIZATION OF GRAIN-STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9083) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 169 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the amortization of grain-storage facilities) is amended by striking out in subsection (d) of that section "December 31, 1956," wherever it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1958."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9083 amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain storage facilities from December 31, 1956, to December 31, 1958.

Members of Congress will recall the critical shortage of facilities for storing grain which had developed throughout the Nation in years prior to 1953. This shortage had caused a great deal of damage to farmers, particularly among producers of wheat and corn. To alleviate this situation Congress added a new section to the Internal Revenue Code by the provisions of section 206 of the Technical Changes Act of 1953, which by its terms provided an inducement for taxpayers to construct new grain storage facilities, to increase the capacity of those already in existence, or to adapt then existing construction to the storage of grain. Prior to this amendment taxpayers could recover their costs only through a deduction for depreciation over the useful life of new or adapted facilities. The amendment permitted taxpayers, at their election, to recover their costs over a period of 60 months.

This relief covered construction or adaption from the period December 31, 1952, through December 31, 1956. The Committee on Ways and Means in its report stated:

> In the event that the shortage of facilities for storing grain remains in a critical state through 1956, your committee would consider it appropriate to extend the date within which a taxpayer may construct such facilities and receive the benefits of this provision.

The need for grain storage facilities continues to be acute, and it is the belief of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means that it is necessary to extend the period within which the benefits of amortization will extend to taxpayers who supply the facilities to alleviate the pressing need of the farmer for a place in which to store his grain. Farmers who themselves construct or adapt grain storage facilities are eligible for these benefits. Accordingly, H. R. 9083 will extend the period to December 31, 1958.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. I urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in urging the favorable consideration of H. R. 9083. This bill, which was reported unanimously by our committee, extends from December 31, 1956 to December 31, 1958 the period for amortization of grain storage facilities.

This provision was originally enacted in 1953 by the 83d Congress in an effort to encourage the construction of new grain storage facilities and to increase existing capacity. As we all know, the shortage of such facilities for storing grain created considerable hardship among our Nation's farmers. It has been a source of pride to me that the present tax treatment, which has been of such significant help in solving this critical problem, was developed by the Committee on Ways and Means when I was chairman. Nevertheless, while the shortage of these facilities is less acute today, there is still a need for the provision of existing law. The present provision expires at the end of this year, and H. R. 9083 provides for a temporary extension until the end of 1958.

I should also like to call to the attention of the House that an identical bill, H. R. 9178, was introduced by my distinguished Republican colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, Representative HOLMES of the State of Washington, one of the great grain producing areas in our Nation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TARIFF ON PLASTIC CLOTHESPINS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as it affects plastic clothespins. It appears that this industry of only recent years has developed quite a bit abroad and they are shipping plastic clothespins into this country under the schedule provided for wooden—steel clothespins that we make in this country.

I find that all other plastic articles under the Tariff Act have an ad valorem rate of 30 cents. They are shipping these plastic pins in here under the rate provided for ordinary wooden-steel pins which is 10 cents a gross.

I am offering this proposed legislation for the purpose of clarifying the 1930 act and definitely fixing the rate on plastic clothespins.

HEARINGS OF AMENDMENTS TO WAR CLAIMS ACT AND TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a considerable number of Members of the House have introduced bills proposing to amend the War Claims Act, and perhaps an equal number have introduced blls proposing to amend Trading With the Enemy Act. All these bills have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As a preliminary to more detailed hearings by a subcommittee, I have scheduled next Monday, April 30, before the whole committee for Members of the House who have introduced bills and who may desire to appear in support of their own bills. Announcements will be mailed to Members later in the week, but I wanted to make this announcement today in order that Members may know that this particular day has been set aside to hear them on this proposed legislation.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LEXINGTON AND CONCORD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by President Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, President Eisenhower made a very important speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Although I know this speech of the President's was widely printed in the important newspapers throughout the country in their Sunday and Monday issues, I believe it is extremely important from the viewpoint of the history of our times to have this speech published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Whether or not we are Republican or Democrat, whether or not we agree or are inclined to disagree, everyone who heard President Eisenhower Saturday night either in person at the American Society of Newspaper Editors dinner or over the television must have been deeply impressed with his great sincerity, his commanding desire to do what is best for the United States of America and for the cause of freedom all over the world, the strength of his determination and the completeness of his faith in mankind and in man's ability to reach the shining goal of peace and freedom throughout the world.

In this speech in which the President outlined some of the obstacles to freedom and what must be done about them, he referred to the time 181 years ago on the 19th of April 1775 when the cause of freedom not only was born but was first established. The President mentioned the heroic fight at Concord Bridge and how Ralph Waldo Emerson years later described it as "the shot heard round the world."

Only a few miles away there was taking place almost at the same time the first great battle for freedom, the battle of Lexington Common. It was here that Capt. John Parker organized his men and said to them, "If they mean to have war, let it begin here." In other words, it was on Lexington Common where Capt. John Parker let it be known that freedom had been pushed as far as it was going to be. It was here that he intended to make his stand and that freedom was to either live or die. The fight at Concord Bridge was a part of this decision to stand our ground for freedom. Capt. John Parker fell at Lexington Common and no man ever gave his life for a greater cause.

The towns of Lexington and Concord, where freedom was born and where the first stand was made to establish it, are in my congressional district. I cannot tell you, my colleagues, of the depth of pride I possess in having the honor to represent this hallowed ground and the descendants of those brave men who made the decision to make their stand 181 years ago. As I pass by Concord Bridge and the Minuteman standing at Lexington Common, which I do on so many occasions, I never cease to have a thrill and a feeling of great inspiration. I am grateful to those people and many others who send me here to Congress to represent them, for no one could represent a finer people or a more inspiring district.

Last Thursday, on April 19, I went to Concord and Lexington for the exercises in celebration of these memorable moments in our history and in the history of freedom. For many years now, and I am so proud of the opportunity, I have been attending and taking part in these celebrations on April 19, known as Patriots' Day in Massachusetts. On every occasion, one can almost visualize the battle lines formed, one can almost hear the crack of the muskets, one can almost see lying on that hallowed soil Capt. John Parker and others, and the great confusion of the moment that is present in the fury of any battle.

There is something, however, one cannot see but one feels and knows, experiences, and breathes. It lives in the hearts of men and we call it freedom. How thrilling it is and, oh, so inspiring, to go back to this hallowed ground every year and capture anew this great force in the lives of mankind and so greatly reached for throughout the world.

Although I know all of my colleagues in the Congress are by this time familiar with the text of President Eisenhower's address to the editors, I am confident many of you regardless of your political party will want to send it home to your people in order that they might read it and study it and know it completely. No other man in the world knows any more about the value of the free way of life and the overwhelming cost of sustaining it than does President Eisenhower. In his great address, which I herewith commend to everyone everywhere, President Eisenhower has hewn the path which must be followed if freedom is to be sustained in America and eventually brought to mankind everywhere in the world.

Following is the text of the speech of President Eisenhower before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, April 21, 1956:

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, HOTEL STATLER, SATURDAY EVENING, APRIL 21, 1956

Three years ago, when I last talked to you, stories from battlefields and fighting fronts crowded the front pages of our press. Human freedom was under direct assault in important sectors by the disciples of Communistic dictatorship. Violence and aggression were brutal daily facts for millions of human beings. Fear of global war, of a nuclear holocaust, darkened the future. To many, the chance for a just and enduring peace seemed hopeless.

Today, only 3 years later, we have reason for cautious hope that a new, a fruitful, a peaceful era for mankind can emerge from a haunted decade. The world breathes a little more easily today.

The prudent man will not delude himself that his hope for peace guarantees the realization of peace. Even with genuine good will, time and effort will be needed to correct the injustices, to cure the dangerous sores that plague the earth today. And the future alone can show whether the Communists really want to move toward a just and stable peace.

Yet not for many years has there been such promise that patient imaginative, enterprising effort could gradually be rewarded in steady decrease in the dread of war; in an economic surge that will raise the living standards of all the world; in growing confidence that liberty and justice will one day overcome statism; in the better understanding among all peoples that is the essential prelude to true peace.

This week marks the anniversary of one of the most important events in freedom's progress. One hundred and eighty-one years ago on April 19th, our forefathers started a revolution that still goes on. The shots at Concord, as Emerson wrote, were heard "round the world."

The echoes of Concord still stir men's minds.

The Bandung meeting, last year, of Asian and African leaders bears witness to Emerson's vision. There, almost two centuries after Concord, and halfway round the earth, President Sukarno, of Indonesia, opened the conference with an eloquent tribute to Paul Revere and to the spirit of the American Revolution.

Why do the musket shots of a few embattled farmers at the Concord Bridge still ring out in far-off lands?

The reason is clear.

Concord was far more than a local uprising to redress immediate grievances. The enduring meaning of Concord lies in the ideas that inspired the historic stand there. Concord is the symbol of certain basic convictions about the relationship of man to the state.

Those convictions were founded in a firm belief in the spiritual worth of the individual. He must be free to think, to speak, and to worship according to his conscience.

He must enjoy equality before the law. He must have a fair chance to develop and use his talents. The purpose of government is to serve its citizens in freedom.

Our forefathers did not claim to have discovered novel principles. They looked on their findings as universal values, the common property of all mankind.

These deep convictions have always guided us as a Nation. They have taken deep roots elsewhere in the Western World. In the 19th century they inspired a great surge of freedom throughout Western Europe and in our own hemisphere.

These ideas of freedom are still the truly revolutionary political principles abroad in the world. They appeal to the timeless aspirations of mankind. In some regions they flourish; in some they are officially outlawed. But everywhere, to some degree, they stir and inspire humanity.

The affairs of men do not stand still. The ideas of freedom will grow in vigor and influence—or they will gradually wither and die. If the area of freedom shrinks, the results for us will be tragic. Only if freedom continues to flourish will man realize the prosperity, the happiness, the enduring peace he seeks.

II

The appeal of the ideas of freedom has been shown dramatically during the past decade. In that time, 18 nations, totaling some 650 million people—a quarter of the human race—have gained independence.

In manifold ways these nations differ widely from each other and from us. They are the heirs of many ancient cultures and national traditions. All of the great religions of the world are found among them. Their peoples speak in a hundred tongues.

Yet they share in common with all free countries the basic and universal values that inspired our Nation's founders.

They believe deeply in the right of self-government.

They believe deeply in the dignity of man.

They aspire to improve the welfare of the individual, as a basic aim of organized society.

The new nations have many of the sensitivities that marked our own early years as a free Nation. They are proud of their independence and quick to resent any slight to their sovereignty. Some of them are concerned to avoid involvements with other nations, as we were for many years.

Certainly, we Americans should understand and respect these points of view. We must accept the right of each nation to choose its own path to the future.

All of these countries are faced with immense obstacles and difficulties. Freedom and human dignity must rest upon a satisfactory economic base. Yet in many of these new nations, incomes average less than $100 per year. Abject poverty blinds men's eyes to the beauty of freedom's ideals. Hopelessness makes men prey to any promise of a better existence, even the most false and spurious.

Ofttimes the peoples of these countries expected independence itself to produce rapid material progress. Their political leaders are therefore under heavy pressure to find shortcuts and quick answers to the problems facing them.

Under these conditions, we cannot expect that the vision of a free society will go unchallenged. The Communists, aware of unsatisfied desires for better conditions of life, falsely pretend they can rapidly solve the problems of economic development and industrialization. They hold up the Soviet Union as a model and a guide. But the Communists conceal the terrible human costs that characterize their ruthless system of dictatorship and forced labor.

We have a vital interest in assuring that newly independent nations preserve and consolidate the free institutions of their choice.

The prospects for peace are brightest when enlightened self-governing peoples control the policy of nations. Peoples do not want war. Rulers beyond the reach of popular control are more likely to engage in reckless adventures and to raise the grim threat of war. The spread of freedom enhances the prospect for durable peace.

That prospect would be dimmed or destroyed should freedom be forced into steady retreat. Then the remaining free societies, our own among them, would one day find themselves beleaguered and imperiled. We would face once again the dread prospect of paying dearly in blood for our own survival.

In every corner of the globe it is far less costly to sustain freedom than to recover it when lost.

Moreover, our own well-being is bound up in the well-being of other free nations. We cannot prosper in peace if we are isolated from the rest of the world. If our economy is to continue to flourish and grow, our Nation will need more trade, not less. The steady growth of other nations, especially the less-developed countries, will create new and growing demands for goods and services. It will produce an environment which will benefit both them and us.

Indeed, Atlanta, Pittsburgh, Seattle—every American town and farm—has a stake in the success or failure of these new nations, a stake almost impossible to exaggerate.

If these new nations are to achieve economic progress with freedom, they will have to provide many of the necessary ingredients for themselves.

Only these peoples and their leaders can supply the initiative and determination essential for success. And they must mobilize the larger part of the resources they require.

But these nations are gravely lacking in trained men for management, production, education, and the professions. Their institutions for such training are limited. Hence they are handicapped in trying to extend modern techniques to agriculture, industry, and other fields.

They also face shortages of capital and foreign exchange, even though they strain to mobilize their own resources. Private foreign investment should be utilized as much as feasible; but for many areas, it will clearly fall far short of the requirements. Moreover, their task of improving conditions of life is made the more difficult by their large and steadily increasing populations.

Inevitably these nations must look abroad for assistance, as ours did for so many years. They want help, first of all, in real and enduring friendship. They want help in training skilled people and in securing investment capital to supplement their own resources. For such help they will look to us as the most prosperous and advanced economy of the world.

Foresight will compel an understanding response from us. In our own enlightened interest we can and must do much to help others in pursuit of their legitimate aspirations.

Further, we must recognize that economic and technical assistance cannot be a transitory policy. The problems of economic progress are not to be solved in a single spurt. Our efforts must be sustained over a number of years.

To do the most good, some part of our material help will have to be furnished on a long-term basis which these nations can plan on. For some purposes, commitments on a strictly annual basis are not sufficient. It takes time to complete major projects like hydroelectric and reclamation developments. If the new nations can plan on some part of our help for several years, they will be better able to mobilize resources of their own and assistance from others.

Furthermore, our assistance must be used flexibly to fit needs and plans as they develop. We must be ready to adapt our help promptly to meet changing conditions.

The development program for mutual security now before the Congress is based on these considerations. It seeks from the Congress the additional authority that would add essential flexibility and continuity to a part—a modest part—of the program. The amounts requested are the practicable minimum. In its entirety it is not, I assure you, an excessive program. It is in our national interest, in the fullest sense of that term.

III

The ideas of freedom are at work, even where they are officially rejected. As we know, Lenin and his successors, true to Communist doctrine, based the Soviet State on the denial of these ideas. Yet the new Soviet rulers who took over 3 years ago have had to reckon with the force of these ideas, both at home and abroad.

The situation the new regime inherited from the dead Stalin apparently caused it to reappraise many of his mistakes.

Having lived under his one-man rule, they have espoused the concept of collective dictatorship. But dictatorship it still remains. They have denounced Stalin for some of the more flagrant excesses of his brutal rule. But the individual citizen still lacks the most elementary safeguards of a free society. The desire for a better life is still being sacrificed to the insatiable demands of the state.

In foreign affairs, the new regime has seemingly moderated the policy of violence and hostility which has caused the free nations to band together to defend their independence and liberties. For the present, at least, it relies more on political and economic means to spread its influence abroad. In the last year, it has embarked upon a campaign of lending and trade agreements directed especially toward the newly developed countries.

It is still too early to assess in any final way whether the Soviet regime wishes to provide a real basis for stable and enduring relations.

Despite the changes so far, much of Stalin's foreign policy remains unchanged. The major international issues which have troubled the postwar world are still unsolved. More basic changes in Soviet policy will have to take place before the free nations can afford to relax their vigilance.

IV

At Concord, our forebears undertook the struggle for freedom in this country. History has now called us to special tasks for sustaining and advancing this great cause in the world.

As we take stock of our position and of the problems that lie ahead, we must chart our course by three main guide lines:

First. We must maintain a collective shield against aggression to allow the free peoples to seek their valued goals in safety.

We can take some cautious comfort in the signs that the Soviet rulers may have relegated military aggression to the background and adopted less violent methods to promote their aims. Nevertheless, Soviet military power continues to grow. Their forces are being rapidly modernized and equipped with nuclear weapons and long-range delivery systems.

So long as freedom is threatened and armaments are not controlled, it is essential for us to keep a strong military establishment ourselves and strengthen the bonds of collective security.

Without help from us, many of our allies could not afford to equip and maintain the forces needed for self-defense. Assistance to them is part of our proper contribution to the systems of common defense. If those

systems did not exist, we would have to bear much greater costs ourselves. Thus in aiding our allies, the mutual security program also advances our own security interests.

We hold our military strength only to guard against aggression, and to ensure that the world remains at peace. War in our time has become an anachronism. Whatever the case in the past, war in the future can serve no useful purpose. A war which became general, as any limited action might, could only result in the virtual destruction of mankind.

Hence our search must be unceasing for a system to regulate and reduce armaments under reliable safeguards. So far, the Soviet Union has refused to accept such safeguards. But even now we are earnestly negotiating toward this end. The problems involved are difficult and complex. We cannot afford to underestimate them. But we cannot slacken our efforts to lift the burden of armaments and to remove their threat.

If effective measures of disarmament could be agreed upon, think how the world could be transformed. Atomic energy used for peace—not war—could bring about the development of a new industrial age. Far more human energy and output could be devoted to reducing poverty and need. To that end, as I said to you three years ago, we would "join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved from disarmament to a fund for world aid and construction."

Of even more importance, the pall of mutual suspicions, fear and hatred that covers the earth would be swept away in favor of confidence, prosperity and human happiness.

Our second guideline: Within the free community, we must be a helpful and considerate partner in creating conditions where freedom will flourish.

Beyond defense, the crucial task of the free nations is to work together in constructive ways to advance the welfare of their peoples. Arms alone can give the world no permanent peace, no confident security. Arms are solely for defense—to protect from violent assault what we already have. They are only a costly insurance. They cannot add to human progress. Indeed, no matter how massive, arms by themselves would not prevent vital sections of the world from falling prey to Communist blandishment or subversion.

If we are to preserve freedom here—it must likewise thrive in other important areas of the earth. For the welfare of ourselves and others, we must, therefore, help the rest of the free world achieve its aspirations. For our mutual benefit, we must join in building for greater future prosperity, for more human liberty and for lasting peace.

Within the Atlantic Community, our aim must be to strengthen the close bonds which have steadily developed since the war. On Monday next, the Secretary of State will speak on this topic.

In the less developed nations, the urgent need is for economic and social progress for their peoples. Tonight I have spoken particularly about the newer nations of Asia and Africa, which face such urgent problems. Of equal importance is continuing progress in other areas, especially by our neighbors in Latin America who are our fast friends. These developing nations need the full measure of our help in understanding and resources.

The steady progress of the free world also depends on the healthy flow of peaceful trade. Our example will be of crucial importance in freeing the channels of such trade from wasteful restraints. We can take an important step to that end by joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Our national interest will be served by passage of the legislation for that purpose now pending in the Congress.

Another important task is in helping to resolve disputes between friends we value highly. Such disputes impair the unity of the free nations and impede their advance. In these situations, each side would like the United States to back its point of view without reservation. But for us to do so could seldom contribute to the settling of the disputes. It would only sharpen the bitter enmities between the opposing sides and impair our value in helping to reach a fair solution.

Our aim and effort must be to assist in tempering the fears and antagonisms which lead to such disputes.

My words apply with special force to the troubled area of the Middle East. We will do all in our power—through the United Nations whenever possible—to prevent resort to violence there. We are determined to support and assist any nation in that area which might be subjected to aggression. We will strive untiringly to build the foundations for stable peace in the whole region.

In these and many other constructive ways, our Nation must help to build an environment congenial to freedom.

Our third guideline is this: We must seek, by every peaceful means, to induce the Soviet bloc to correct existing injustices and genuinely to pursue peaceful purposes in its relations with other nations.

As I have said, many of the wrongs of Stalin against other nations still prevail under his successors. Despite the efforts of the West at Berlin and Geneva, Germany is still divided by the Soviet veto of free all-German elections. The satellite nations of Eastern Europe are still ruled by Soviet puppets. In Asia, Korea remains divided, and stable peace has not yet been achieved.

We must be tireless in our efforts to remedy these injustices and to resolve the disputes that divide the world. These knotty problemts will yield to patient and sincere effort. We stand ready to explore all avenues for their just settlement. We will not grow weary in our quest for peaceful remedies for the enslavement or wrongful division of once-free nations.

The interests and purposes of the United States and of the free world do not conflict with the legitimate interests of the Russian nation or the aspirations of its people. A Soviet Government genuinely devoted to these purposes can have friendly relations with the United States and the free world for the asking. We will welcome that day.

v

We cannot doubt that the current of world history flows toward freedom. In the long run dictatorship and despotism must give way. We can take courage from that sure knowledge.

But as a wise American, Mr. Justice Holmes, once said: "The inevitable comes to pass through effort." We should take these words to heart in our quest for peace and freedom. These great aspirations of humanity will be brought about—but only by devoted human effort.

Concord is a symbol of the faith, courage and sacrifice on which the victory of freedom depends. We in our day must strive with the same dedication that brought the militia men to the Concord Bridge. If we do so, freedom will surely prevail.

THE "DO-NOTHING" LABEL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing plenty these days about a "do-nothing" Congress and a "do-nothing" President, but we do not go behind these labels and find out upon what the label is based.

Certainly if this Congress deserves the label, the Ways and Means Committee cannot be a part of the Congress, because in the 20 years I have been in Congress there never was a time when our committee had so many things on the fire as we have now.

An editorial from the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of April 15, 1956—one of the outstanding Democratic newspapers of the Nation—bearing on the subject of a "do-nothing" President is so timely and pertinent to the present-day political situation, that I include it as a part of these remarks:

EISENHOWER: "DO-NOTHING" PRESIDENT

Former President Truman says Dwight Eisenhower has been a "do-nothing" President.

He's partly right.

Mr. Eisenhower has done nothing to surround himself with 5-percenters, influence peddlers, John Maragon, or aides like Gen. Harry Vaughan.

He's done nothing to discourage the ferreting out of Communists in government by any cry of "red herring."

He's done nothing, such as by the ridiculing charge of "asinine," to belittle efforts to uncover corruption in governmental agencies.

He's done nothing to lower the dignity of the high office of President by publicly calling anyone an "S. O. B." or by threatening to kick a music critic in the groin.

He's done nothing to make a mockery of justice by pardoning such notorious criminals as former Representatives Andrew May and J. Parnell Thomas, and Chicago gangster William (Big Bill) Johnson.

He's done nothing to put politics into the muck by vulgar and abusive language publicly directed at a political opponent.

He's done nothing to imply approval of a ruthless political machine, such as by paying public tribute to a Pendergast in Kansas City.

Truly, Mr. Eisenhower in many ways, has been a "do-nothing" President.

Thank God.

SOIL-BANK PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was much interested in listening to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] a few minutes ago when he said he was placing in the RECORD, as I understood it, the law and his interpretation of what he thought was meant insofar as the Secretary of Agriculture has authority at this time to put in effect a soil-bank plan.

I am reserving my opinion upon this matter until such time as I have a legal opinion as to whether or not this can be done. If I become convinced that this can be done through the plan outlined by the gentleman from Mississippi, I will back it. I have said repeatedly this is a nonpartisan matter. Putting into effect

the soil-bank plan ought to be nonpartisan.

If the legal opinion, which I think is coming forth in the next few days, indicates that it cannot be done in the manner in which the gentleman from Mississippi has indicated, but that it will need separate legislation, I do think the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture ought to call his committee together and start immediately to initiate a bill on the soil-bank plan this year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman what I have put in the RECORD today is primarily and almost altogether quotations from the law itself and I have not tried to interpret those sections believing that they speak for themselves. It is my understanding that in connection with a case in the circuit court of appeals a number of years ago, I think these particular sections were approved by the court. Certainly, I know they have been acted on in years past. However, at the present moment, in view of the atmosphere in which we are working, I am restricting myself entirely to the law itself with the thought that it might speak for itself.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE POULTRY SITUATION

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, positive action must be taken to assist poultry raisers in overcoming the problems with which they are faced.

I represent one of the major poultry-producing areas of the United States. While it is largely centered at Petaluma, Calif., it does constitute a large segment of the agricultural economy of the First Congressional District.

These people are not looking for handouts or subsidies. All they want is a chance to operate freely on an open and competitive market, without the interference of Government controls and price supports.

They are caught in a squeeze. They receive no help under the price-support theory, but are harassed by supports which keep the prices of feed grains at a high level.

They are a class of farmers who must purchase supported grains to produce a food that is not supported, nor controlled. Production has increased in excess to consumption, and finds the market glutted with unsaleable surplus.

I have interviewed and have met with producers and thoroughly understand their problem. Some solution of this dilemma must be found. Large investments are involved and a large segment of our people are in jeopardy.

I am calling a meeting in my office for Tuesday, April 24, at 1: 15 p. m., to which I have invited Representatives from States which have similar problems to mine. I have invited officials from the Department of Agriculture to meet with us and hope we can find some relief for this stricken industry.

I feel certain that the results of this meeting will prove to be constructive in arriving at a realistic solution to the poultry problem.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSION REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain related material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from a meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs at which I heard General Omar N. Bradley make his presentation of the President's Commission on Veterans' Pensions report. I want to just make this statement. This is the most fantastic and the most heartless program I have ever heard presented to the people of America.

General Bradley and his cohorts have found nothing new. Experienced Members of Congress and those familiar with veterans affairs knew all along just what the report would contain. This Commission, you will find, was appointed for the sole purpose of rubber-stamping an old idea cooked up by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget back in 1951, and since that time the Veterans' Administration has been trying to palm off on Congress the proposition of removing all service pensioners from the VA rolls. President Eisenhower, therefore, has taken up where the Bureau of the Budget and the VA left off, and other than waste $300,000 of the peoples' money, this Commission has accomplished but one thing. It has served as a device to stall off much needed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership in Congress, however, will never implement the report's major suggestions or recommendations. From within 60 days after the signing of the Declaration of Independence the Congress—and the Congress alone—has determined our national policy toward veterans and their survivors. In several major instances, these policies were legislated over the vigorous opposition of Presidents. So today, regardless of Presidential Commissions, one-worlders, and college professors, the Congress will not relinquish its 180-year-old prerogative.

If the President wants to do the country a real service, let him follow our colleague's—Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN—suggestion and appoint a commission to investigate our foreign aid programs, and for chairman of that commission I would take the liberty to nominate a great Republican—Gov. G. Bracken Lee, of Utah.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the President should undertake to upset congressional prerogatives and to throw our veteran population into a state of utter confusion.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am proud to be a member, will conduct extensive hearings on this report so as to give our veterans' organizations and veteran spokesmen an opportunity to be heard.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] if he can tell us about the legislative program.

Mr. ALBERT. I can say to the gentleman that the program remains as previously stated. It is my understanding that the Committee on Rules will consider the highway-construction bill tomorrow and, if a rule is granted, it is planned to call up that bill on Thursday. But, otherwise, the program remains the same.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that the appropriations bill voted out by the committee last week will come ahead of the highway bill so far as floor action is concerned?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that that bill will come up on Wednesday and will be ahead of the other one.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand that the Committee on Appropriations is presently set to have Secretary Benson before it in connection with this appropriation of $1,200,000,000 on tomorrow morning. He will be there all day. It would be a little unusual to have that measure before the House before the hearings are available.

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Appropriations has already reported the bill.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; but without any hearings.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the first place, we had weeks and weeks of hearings before the appropriate legislative committee and they were available to all Members. The appearance of Secretary Benson tomorrow has to do with the regular appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the current year. Also we are scheduled to go before the Rules Committee at 10 o'clock and in the afternoon we have a conference with the Senate on the regular appropriation bill. On account of that we have to postpone the

appearance of Mr. Benson until Thursday or some day later to be agreed upon.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us when the State, Justice Department, and judiciary appropriation bill will be called up?

Mr. ALBERT. At the present time that is programed to follow immediately after the acreage and soil conservation appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if I might ask the gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. WHITTEN] a question. There is a great deal of argument as to the existing authority for the expenditure of the $1,200 million. As I understand it we are all for the soil bank proposal. I wonder if the gentleman from Mississippi would go along with a rule which is to be obtained tomorrow that would provide that the soil bank proposal be in order as an amendment, so that we could have the law along with the money and have a program that would have some reasonable chance of success.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. To amend the bill which would incorporate everything in the recent soil-bank bill, H. R. 12, would be going far afield. It is my contention that the appropriation bill implementing existing legislation does what the gentleman would like to do by amendment. In view of that I think it would be superfluous to ask that we write in a new soil-bank program where authority already exists. Earlier today I have inserted in the RECORD quotations from existing law. I am also releasing that this afternoon. I have tried to steer clear of any interpretation of the act, but simply to quote the act as it now exists. If the gentleman will read that I think he will realize that making the soil-bank provisions of H. R. 12 in order is necessary. I will go along with such changes as might become necessary but not on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that there are many of us who believe, and I think rightly, that the existing law is woefully inadequate for the accomplishment of the job that needs to be done. It expires at the end of this year, for one thing. Likewise, there are dollar limitations. I would like to suggest to the gentleman, as far as I am concerned, that the Rules Committee ought to grant a rule that would provide for consideration of an amendment dealing with the soil-bank proposal. That would be subject to amendment, so that it could be perfected. Likewise, I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, if we do not get that kind of a rule, then I will be here doing what I can to vote down the previous question on the rule so that we can amend the rule to make the soil bank in order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Further addressing myself to the gentleman from Mississippi, if that action is taken and the question comes on the previous question on the rule then everybody in this country will understand that if you vote for the previous question you are shutting off consideration of the soil bank plan; if you vote against the previous question then you make it possible for the Congress of the United States to work its will on the soil bank plan and have that in the legislation.

I do not know how the other Members would be inclined to vote, but as far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for an arrangement here that will make it possible for us to enact the soil bank plan, something we started out to do a long time ago and something, may I say, we are all for.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

PUBLICATION OF SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Joint Resolution 150 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the Senate 1,500 copies of Senate Procedure, to be prepared by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian, to be printed under the supervision of the authors and to be distributed to the Members of the Senate.

SEC. 2. That notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such edition of Senate Procedure shall be subject to copyright by the authors thereof.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 55 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary the amounts stated after each item of the following hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the above committee during the sessions listed: Institute of Pacific Relations (S. R. 2050), 82d Congress, 2d session, 5,000; Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations (Rept. No. 2), 83d Congress, 2d session, 5,000; Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments (report), 83d Congress, 1st session, 20,000; Korean War and Related Matters (report), 84th Congress, 1st session, 20,000; Report of the Internal Security Subcommittee for 1954, 84th Congress, 1st session, 20,000; Documentary Proof that the Communist Party United States of America, Teaches and Advocates the Overthrow of the United States Government by Force and Violence (hearing), 82d Congress, 2d session, 8,000; Communism in Labor Unions (hearing), 83d Congress, 2d session, 8,000; Communist Propaganda (pt. 1), 83d Congress, 2d session, 5,000; Communist Propaganda (pt. 2), 83d Congress, 2d session, 5,000; Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations (pt. 1), 82d Congress, 2d session, 5,000; Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations, (pt. 2), 83d Congress, 1st session, 5,000; and Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations (pt. 5), 83d Congress, 1st session, 5,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "84th" and insert "83d."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "1st" and insert "2d."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "(hearing)" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Document."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is true, is it not, that this resolution provides some material to the Senate, no part of which is to be distributed to the House?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true of this resolution, but I think the resolution in which the gentleman is really interested is the one I propose to call up next, if he cares to defer his inquiry until then.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think it would be correct to say that they were all voted unanimously, were they not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 62 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the pamphlet entitled "A Handbook for Americans," prepared for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed 75,000 additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Subcommittee on Internal

Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I was only going to make the same inquiry I made a minute ago in the interest of comity between the two Houses. It is very important that this resolution be adopted. It applies only to the other House.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman that he knows that this resolution is a Senate resolution and there was quite a good deal of discussion in the committee about it. The House Administration Committee took the position that we had no authority to go behind the Senate resolution and verify the contents of the document. If the other body certified it, it was our belief that we could not go behind the resolution and I would like to read to you just two lines. When the resolution was reported out a motion was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK], seconded by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and in the motion this language was included:

This committee takes no responsibility for the contents of this pamphlet, Handbook for Americans. The responsibility rests entirely on the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, with that written into the record, it was voted unanimously?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is true.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Senate resolution.

The Senate resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4909) relative to the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "Code" insert "of."

Page 4, line 8, after "Association" insert "or in any proceeding for the enforcement of the rights, if any, of any member of the National Tax Association."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] for the purpose of calling up H. R. 7228.

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES OVER THE POTOMAC RIVER

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up H. R. 7228, to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact this bill involves the expenditure of some $14 million, I must object.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7228) to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7228, with Mr. JONES of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the 83d Congress Public Law 704 was enacted for the construction of a bridge at or near Jones Point, Va., across the Potomac River. That act provided that the Secretary of the Interior shall have jurisdiction and was athorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia. Since that bill was passed and became a public law, some changes have become necessary both as to the construction of this bridge and as to certain other features which I will briefly refer to here.

In the first place, this bill now under consideration would change it from a bridge which the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction over and was authorized to construct and maintain to the Department of Commerce which is the Department under which the Bureau of Public Roads operates.

Secondly, the height of the bridge in the original bill was to be 70 feet above the waterline, and in this bill it will be reduced and the height above the waterline will be only 40 feet.

In the first bill the opening for traffic to come up and go down the river was to be one of the swing-span type, and under the present bill it is provided that the opening will be of the type known as the bascule type, which opens up and down. Also in the original bill it was provided that the Federal Government should maintain the bridge or be responsible for the cost of maintaining the bridge, and this bill provides that the States of Virginia and Maryland shall be responsible for the cost of maintenance of the bridge. The amendment in that respect provides that such bridge will be maintained and operated by the said States, which are the States of Virginia and Maryland.

I would like to point out that the cost of the approaches to this bridge are to be borne respectively by the States of Virginia and Maryland. The cost of the bridge itself would be paid for by the Federal Government, and the best estimate which I have as to the cost of this bridge is $13.8 million. That, briefly, constitutes the changes provided for in this bill.

There is one other provision as to the construction of the approaches to which I wish to call your attention. In the original plan the approaches to this bridge would involve certain streets over in the older section of the city of Alexandria: Potomac Street, South Lee Street, South Fairfax Street, South Royal Street, South Pitt Street, South St. Asaph Street, Green Street, and Jefferson Street. Now, we intend to offer an amendment to this bill a provision that the Secretary shall not construct any ingress or egress approaches to the bridge which will directly connect with or empty into those streets within the corporate limits of the city of Alexandria, Va., which are east of Mount Vernon Boulevard, now known as Washington Street, and those streets are those I have already named.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I gladly yield.

Mr. GROSS. Now let me see if I have this proposal straight. This would make in order, in effect, the authorizing of construction of a $13.8-million bridge, in other words, a $14-million bridge, across

the Potomac River from Virginia to Maryland?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The construction of a bridge at that point has already been authorized. It was authorized by Public Law 704 of the 83d Congress. This bill merely amends that authorization.

Mr. GROSS. But without this particular bill there is not very much chance of a bridge being built. Is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Yes So that, as a matter of fact, this is authorizing legislation. Without the passage of this bill, the taxpayers all over the country will not build a bridge across the Potomac River.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, it could be built under Public Law 704 of the 83d Congress, but these amendments will make a much more desirable and better bridge.

Mr. GROSS. If the report on this bill is accurate I doubt very much that the President would approve the building of this bridge under the previous legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman of course, may come to his own conclusion on that.

Mr. GROSS. But what is happening here is that the taxpayers of the country are being called upon to build a $14-million bridge across the Potomac River connecting the States of Virginia and Maryland; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It will connect the States of Virginia and Maryland. But it is a part of a national highway system. We in the committee think that it is very properly a bridge which should be paid for as the bill provides.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all I should like to express my thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] for his time and efforts in behalf of this proposed legislation. The fact of the matter is I feel that all of the citizens of the Nation's Capital and of the metropolitan area of Washington owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Georgia for his interest and concern over these problems affecting the Nation's Capital and the metropolitan area.

This bill which we are considering here today I thought was supposed to be a simple, routine piece of legislation. But the gentleman from Georgia did not pass over it as such. He conducted extensive hearings in order to determine whether or not the proposed legislation was necessary and whether it would improve the original legislation. Then he did a very unusual thing. After we had concluded hearings and were ready to report the bill favorably, some citizens living in Alexandria, in the area of the Virginia approach, felt that there was some danger that some of the approaches, or some of the ramps which might be constructed might affect the old, historic section of Alexandria which is known as the Old Town section. They asked that hearings be reopened so that they could appear before the committee and express their fears and concern over what some of the approaches might do. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] very graciously consented to reopen the hearings to give everyone who had anything to say about this particular proposed legislation or the effects of it an opportunity to be heard. Again I want to express the thanks on behalf of those people of Alexandria for the gentleman's generosity.

As I said before, I think this bill should be a noncontroversial bill. I realize that there are 1 or 2 objections to it, but, as has been pointed out here, this measure does not authorize the construction of this bridge nor does it appropriate any funds. It is merely corrective legislation to improve the original act that was passed in the 83d Congress.

What does this bill do? It simply changes the authority for construction of the bridge from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Public Roads, where it should have been to start with. That was just an error on the part of the 83d Congress. When we originally authorized the construction of that bridge, in the House, we authorized the District Commissioners to construct the bridge, because the bridge does pass over part of the District of Columbia. But when the bill was passed by the Senate, they amended it to authorize the Department of the Interior to construct the bridge; and I imagine they did that because the George Washington Memorial Parkway was involved. But I think everyone agrees that authority for construction of it should rest with the Bureau of Public Roads. That is one of the major things this bill does. Secondly, it makes a slight change in the original design. As has been pointed out, it lowers the vertical clearance by 30 feet and changes the type of draw span from a swing span to a vertical type span, which will save in the cost of construction approximately half a million dollars.

The necessity for the bridge has been pretty well debated and the bridge was approved, of course, in the original construction legislation in the 83d Congress. That should not be a matter for debate here today.

However, it has been stated that this is a "taxpayers' delight" for the people of Maryland and Virginia. I assure the Members of this body that the bridge is not constructed there just for the benefit of the taxpayers of the States of Maryland and Virginia. This is a part of an overall metropolitan area road and highway program. It is to improve the traffic situation in the Nation's Capital, the Capital of all the people in the country.

It is estimated by the engineers that when this bridge is constructed over 14,000 vehicles would use the bridge immediately. Where are those 14,000 vehicles going now? A large part of them are coming right up Independence Avenue here, route 50, for east-west traffic, which is helping to congest the bridges and streets of the Nation's Capital. The purpose of this bill is to divert some of this traffic into a bypass area.

It is part of the responsibility of the Federal Government to help improve the traffic situation in the Nation's Capital. Be that as it may, Virginia and Maryland are having to spend several million dollars to make the bridge usable.

In the original legislation we provided that $7 million be authorized for approach roads in the State of Virginia. It is going to cost much more than $7 million on the part of Virginia to provide the necessary approach roads. In the legislation the States of Virginia and Maryland are required to assure the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce that they have constructed adequate approach roads to justify the construction of the bridge before any money is paid on the bridge itself. So it is a joint venture on the part of Virginia and Maryland and the people of the country. All the people of the country will benefit as the result of the construction of this bridge.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much money are the taxpayers of Virginia and Maryland spending on the bridge itself?

Mr. BROYHILL. On the bridge itself they are not spending anything, but they are spending over $7 million on the approach roads, as I just pointed out.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I point out to the gentleman, and he knows it as well as I do, that the maintenance and operation of the bridge will be paid by the taxpayers of Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is in the legislation we have. Originally the maintenance was left under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Originally as the proposal came to the committee there was no cost at all to go against the States of Virginia and Maryland and we in the committee made that change in the original bill in the last Congress.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman know of any other cities in the United States where the Federal Government is building bridges to relieve traffic congestion?

Mr. BROYHILL. I know this, that this is the Nation's Capital, and there is only one Nation's Capital in the United States. We will have, of course, a multibillion-dollar Federal interstate highway program on which the Federal Government will spend 90 percent of the cost. We have only one Nation's Capital, and it is just as much the responsibility of the people of Iowa to help maintain and beautify the Capital as it is the responsibility of the people of Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a District of Columbia bridge.

Mr. BROYHILL. It is a District of Columbia bridge. It is part of the overall District of Columbia Metropolitan

Washington area highway program. It is to divert much of the traffic which is now coming through the Nation's Capital.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield further, a portion of this bridge goes over a portion of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct. It does cross over a portion of the District of Columbia.

If this bill is not passed it will not necessarily prevent the construction of the bridge. The bridge can be constructed by the Department of the Interior. We have already appropriated $600,000 for the Department of the Interior to proceed with the plans and specifications, but they are holding them up hoping that we will improve and correct the legislation.

As I said before, we also have a slight change of design which will lower the cost of the bridge, but if we do not pass the legislation the executive branch can go on as originally authorized to build the bridge under the present design at a cost of $500,000 more. However, I am quite certain the Members of this body would want to improve and perfect this legislation, and I do urge careful consideration of the bill here today.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bridge is truly the Virginia and Maryland taxpayers' delight. Here Congress is being called upon today to spend almost $14 million for the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River from Alexandria, Va. to some point in the State of Maryland. As I have said before on the floor of the House, there is no way that I can drive back to my home city in Iowa without paying a bridge toll. I know no reason why a toll bridge cannot be constructed across the Potomac River between Alexandria, Va., and the State of Maryland, and let the people who use the bridge pay for it. Let the people who are going to use this six-lane bridge, which is proposed to be built down there, pay for it. Automatic toll collection devices are coming available and traffic would not be seriously impeded by the collection of tolls. I am opposed to this business of all of the taxpayers of the United States building a bridge across the Potomac River for the benefit of the States of Virginia and Maryland. Oh, sure, they are going to be charitable enough to build the approaches to the bridge. We could use a few bridges across the Mississippi River. In fact, a toll bridge is now being constructed at Clinton, Iowa. I am sure the States of Illinois and Iowa would have been happy to build the approaches if the Federal Government would have built a toll-free bridge across the Mississippi River. In my opinion, this is another steal. The gentleman says they already have the authorizing legislation. Here is what the Secretary of Commerce says in his letter to the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN. He says:

> The President at the time of his approval of the act of August 30, 1954, title II of which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to construct and maintain and operate a bridge over the Potomac River at or near Jones Point, Va., issued the statement that title II improperly vests responsibility in the Department of the Interior, which is not a construction agency.

The President says that in the previous legislation, improper authority was vested in the Department of the Interior. In the light of this letter, I cannot conceive of the President signing any legislation or any appropriation bill which would further the construction of this bridge. In other words, if this bill is killed here today and unless other legislation is passed by the Congress, in my opinion, this bridge is dead as it ought to be when financed solely out of Federal funds. I have figures here of what the Federal Government has spent upon bridges across the Potomac River directly connecting the District of Columbia with the States of Virginia and Maryland. Congress has already spent many millions on these Potomac bridges. I can go along with some of that, but why do you not make it a three-way proposition with this bridge, if it is designed to relieve traffic in the District of Columbia? Let the States of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia build this bridge. Why saddle the whole thing upon the taxpayers of the country. Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say on this bill at this time. If you want to give the States of Virginia and Maryland a nice free bridge across the Potomac River, then vote for this thing. For my part, I am not going to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I join with my friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] in expressing my opposition to this allocation of $14 million for this interstate bridge. I have seen times during my membership in this House when a $14-million item had pretty hard sledding. I have seen this Congress very economy minded in days prior to this, in which $14 million was given a lot of study and a rather rough time. I can only express about the same view that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] expressed, and that is that this is a favored bridge. I have in my district the necessity for bridges, spanning from Minnesota to Wisconsin on both the St. Croix and the Mississippi Rivers. So, we have need for a lot of these interstate bridges. This is an interstate bridge if there ever was such a thing. Whether it is on the Ohio or the Columbia or the Snake River or the Mississippi River or any other river, it most assuredly is an interstate bridge. It is my opinion that the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia have the same program of financing bridges that all other States have. That is, by the help of the two States who will be the beneficiaries of the bridge, as well as the participation of the Federal Government's road allocation of funds to those States. I do not know why Maryland and Virginia have to build this bridge any more than the people of Minnesota have to build a bridge across the St. Croix or the Mississippi River. Again I say this is an interstate bridge. No interstate bridges have been built with Federal funds, where they were considered interstate bridges. That is the responsibility of the two States.

That is the position I am taking on the passage of this bill, that the two States are no different than the States in the Midwest that have to build bridges across the Mississippi, the Missouri or the rest of the rivers. They go into the same category as those States. You simply ought to have to do what they have to do. This should not be any Santa Clause bridge by any stretch of the imagination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, the subject of this bridge has already been debated and decided by this body and the other body. The bill was passed, and it was passed with very little objection, if any, as I recall it.

What we have here this morning is merely a proposal to change the design of the bridge in order to have a half a million dollars and to place it in the hands of the Department of Commerce where the road-building function of the Government is conducted. That is all there is to this bill. The question of whether the bridge ought to be built was long ago decided by both the House and the Senate, and the President signed the bill. But a great deal of misapprehension has been raised as to this bridge, as to whether it was a national bridge or a bridge for the States of Virginia and Maryland. Let me say to you that if the National Capital was not here there would be no necessity for the bridge. They say it is being built in Virginia and Maryland. The fact of the matter is that it was designed as a bridge to run from one portion of the District of Columbia to another portion of the District of Columbia. For convenience of location it became desirable to push the bridge just a few feet down the river. It is a matter of feet, whether it is in Virginia or Maryland, because it was a better spot for the bridge. There is only a short distance between the District of Columbia and the Virginia boundary. Placing it in Virginia or landing it in Maryland is purely a matter for the Government's convenience.

Why is this bridge neecssary? One reason why it is necessary is that you have the War Department, the Pentagon, on the Virginia side, with thousands and thousands of employees. You have your Navy Department over on that side. You have military installations at Fort Belvoir and Fort Myer, and you have numerous other smaller installations on the Virginia side. They were not put there to accommodate Virginia. They were put through for the necessities of your Government. What happens to all these employees? What happens to them when they get out of work in the afternoon or when they go to work in the morning?

I use the 14th Street Bridge morning and evening, and when you cross that bridge between 4:30 and 6 in the eve-

ning you will find traffic four-lanes wide on both sides and half a mile long standing and waiting. You find that condition in the afternoon; you find it in the morning.

This is to take care of an emergency; it is not a Virginia emergency, it is not a Maryland emergency; it is an emergency of the Government of the United States to get these people backward and forward across that river.

This business of talking about its being a Virginia bridge or a Maryland bridge is all tommyrot. That bridge is being built for the benefit of the Federal Government, and we ought not to hesitate about it, and we ought not to have all this debate about something that has already been settled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is the traffic on this bridge going to be limited to Government workers by any chance?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. GROSS. I think it will not be, but the gentleman is trying to make a case here on the basis of its taking care of Government workers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think I will attempt to answer a question like that. Is there anything else the gentleman wishes to ask?

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. The position the gentleman takes with regard to the emergency and the fact that the Federal Government is responsible for that bridge, if that is so we might amend the Federal impacted school bill to include this bridge as an emergency made necessary by the Federal impact here.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think I will consume the time of the House in answering that question. Is there any other question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I would like to ask a question. It has nothing to do with the bridge, but I want to tell the gentleman that every time I take a drink of milk in the morning it almost gags me that I have to pay 2 cents a quart more for your milk from Virginia and Maryland than we have to pay back home. That is what gripes me.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, we are trying to take care of our farmers just like you do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I appreciate very much the interest of the gentlemen from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER] from an economy standpoint. So far as their objections are concerned, I would like to say that I have fought with these gentlemen on many occasions for economy in various measures in this body, and I certainly would not find fault with anybody for opposing any bill on the ground of economy. Let me conclude by pointing out that this bridge has already been authorized and we are saving a half million dollars by this very bill. It will cost that much less than the bridge provided in the original bill in the 83rd Congress.

The bill did not originate from any need brought to our attention by the State of Virginia or the State of Maryland; this entire legislation originated because of the need of the District of Columbia for an additional bridge to relieve traffic conditions here across the Potomac River. That is the principal reason the legislation ever came before the Congress at all. In passing this bill, which is an amendment to the original bill, we will be saving half a million dollars over the cost of the bridge provided for in the original bill.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I feel I would be very hesitant, and many more in the House would be very hesitant—and I do not know of any river that bears more traffic than the Mississippi from the Canadian boundary to New Orleans—but the House would be hesitant and I think it would be a very difficult task to get the Federal Government to build a bridge across the Mississippi River at any of the so-called key traffic centers of the Nation. It is quite obvious, I think, that such a bridge across the Mississippi River would carry as much traffic east and west as any bridge in the country except the Potomac bridges, of course, because of the Federal impact here. I am talking about bridges being constructed on the national level. I do not think the gentleman himself would even support a bridge across the Mississippi River at the Government's expense.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As was so ably pointed out by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] this is the capital city of the Nation. There is only one capital city of the Nation. Therefore it is not a fair comparison to compare the situation here with that which exists in any other city in the Nation. Certainly we need to provide whatever the capital city needs in the way of transportation and we should eliminate these conditions which have been described by everyone who has spoken, including the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. There is very great need for this additional bridge, and as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] pointed out, it is just a matter of feet here. A part of this bridge does go over a part of the District of Columbia.

This has all been thrashed out in very detailed and complete hearings in the subcommittee and in the full committee. This bill comes here with the unanimous approval of both of those committees. In my opinion, it is a bill that is very much needed, it is a very meritorious one and I think the bill should pass without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes" (68 Stat. 963), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Commerce (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to construct a six-lane bridge over the Potomac River from a point at or near Jones Point, Va., across a certain portion of the District of Columbia, to a point in Maryland, together with bridge approaches on property owned by the United States in the State of Virginia.

"(b) The bridge shall be of deck girder construction, with a movable span of the double-leaf bascule type over the navigable channel having horizontal clearance of approximately 150 feet and vertical clearance above mean low water of approximately 40 feet, and shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 502 of the "General Bridge Act of 1946," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 847), as amended, and subject to the conditions and limitations in this title.

"(c) The Secretary shall request the recommendations and suggestions of the National Capital Planning Commission relative to the design of such bridge and approaches and shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior with respect to all plans for overpasses, approaches, interchanges, and connecting roads at both ends of the bridge which affect lands and facilities administered or authorized to be administered by the Department of the Interior.

"(d) Upon the completion of the bridge project all lands acquired pursuant to this act that are located within the authorized boundaries of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, with the exception of such portions thereof that shall be actually occupied by the bridge structure and main approaches leading thereto and the bridge itself, shall be under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for purposes of the Parkway."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: "On page 2, at the end of line 3, insert "The Secretary shall not construct any ingress or egress approaches to the bridge which will directly connect with or empty into those streets within the corporate limits of the city of Alexandra, Va., which are east of Mount Vernon Boulevard (now known as Washington Street) and are now known as Potomac Street, South Lee Street, South Fairfax Street, South Royal treet, South Pitt Street, South St. Asaph Street, Green Street, and Jefferson Street."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if we adopt the theory suggested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that simply because you have traffic congestion the Federal Government ought to build you a bridge regardless of where it is, then the time has come for New York, Chicago, Seattle, Wash., Portland, Oreg., and other municipalities and States to get their hands in the Federal till.

The gentleman from Georgia tells us that this bill will save, I think he said $500,000. Well, I was never a horse trader myself, but I know I am not going to trade $14 million for $500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest something else. We are going to be confronted here one of these days with a bill to construct a bridge across the Potomac River as an extension of Constitution Avenue, again into Virginia. According to figures compiled by the Library of Congress that bridge will cost the taxpayers of the country at least $9 million. There has been some suggestion on the part of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] that a traffic tunnel be built. I do not know what that would cost, or whether the estimate is for a tunnel or bridge. You will also probably be confronted in the not too distant future with another bill involving $4½ million for a bridge to replace the old highway bridge, wherever that is. These bridges directly connect the District of Columbia, or at least one of them does, with the State of Virginia. It might make a little sense to make a contribution of Federal funds for a bridge that directly connects the District of Columbia with one of these States, but I see no reason why the Congress should vote a single dime for the building of a bridge across the Potomac River from Alexandria to some spot in the State of Maryland. Incidentally, I do not know whether there is a move on to locate the Central Intelligence Agency's new building over in Maryland as the result of the building of this bridge, if it is built.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. The CIA building will be constructed in Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. It will be?

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I did not know whether it was going over into Maryland as the result of the building of this bridge or what was going to happen.

Mr. BROYHILL. The State of Virginia made that sacrifice.

Mr. GROSS. Just as they are making a great sacrifice in building the approaches to this $14 million bridge. The milk of charity really pours out of their hearts, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 204 of the said title II is hereby amended by inserting, immediately before the period at the end thereof, the words "and that such bridge will be maintained and operated by the said States."

SEC. 3. There shall be transferred to the Department of Commerce so much of the records, property, and funds of the Department of the Interior as may be appropriate by reason of the enactment of the foregoing provisions of this act. Such measures and dispositions as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall deem to be necessary to effectuate the said transfers shall be carried out in such manner as he shall direct and by such agencies as he shall designate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7228) to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes," had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 9, not voting 143, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—284

Abbitt	Bolton, Oliver P.	Dempsey
Abernethy	Bonner	Denton
Adair	Bosch	Derounian
Albert	Bow	Devereux
Alexander	Boyle	Dies
Alger	Bray	Dingell
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Dixon
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Dodd
Andersen, H. Carl	Brownson	Dolliver
Andresen, August H.	Broyhill	Dondero
Andrews	Burdick	Dorn, N. Y.
Arends	Burleson	Edmondson
Ashley	Burnside	Elliott
Ashmore	Byrd	Ellsworth
Aspinall	Byrnes, Wis.	Engle
Auchincloss	Canfield	Evins
Avery	Cannon	Fascell
Ayres	Cederberg	Feighan
Bailey	Chase	Fernandez
Baker	Chelf	Fisher
Baldwin	Chenoweth	Fjare
Bass, Tenn.	Chiperfield	Ford
Bates	Christopher	Forrester
Beamer	Church	Fountain
Becker	Clevenger	Frazier
Bell	Colmer	Friedel
Bennett, Fla.	Coon	Gary
Bennett, Mich.	Cooper	Gathings
Bentley	Crumpacker	Gentry
Berry	Cunningham	George
Blatnik	Curtis, Mo.	Gordon
Boggs	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Boland	Davis, Wis.	Gregory
Bolling	Dawson, Ill.	Griffiths
Bolton, Frances P.	Dawson, Utah	Gubser
	Deane	Hagen
	Delaney	Hale
	Denton	Halleck
	Derounian	Harden
	Devereux	Harris
	Dies	Harrison, Nebr.
	Dingell	Harrison, Va.
	Dixon	Harvey
	Dodd	Hays, Ohio
	Dolliver	Hayworth
	Dondero	Henderson
	Dorn, N. Y.	Herlong
	Edmondson	Hill
	Elliott	Hinshaw
	Ellsworth	Hoeven
	Engle	Hoffman, Mich.
	Evins	Holifield
	Fascell	Holmes
	Feighan	Holt
	Fernandez	Holtzman
	Fisher	Horan
	Fjare	Hosmer
	Ford	Huddleston
	Forrester	Hull
	Fountain	Hyde
	Frazier	Ikard
	Friedel	Jarman
	Gary	Jennings
	Gathings	Jensen
	Gentry	Johansen
	George	Johnson, Wis.
	Gordon	Jonas
	Gray	Jones, Ala.
	Gregory	Jones, Mo.
	Griffiths	Jones, N. C.
	Gubser	Karsten
	Hagen	Kean
	Hale	Kearney
	Halleck	Keating
	Madden	Kilday
	Magnuson	Kilgore
	Mahon	Kirwan
	Mailliard	Kluczynski
	Marshall	Krueger
	Martin	Laird
	Meader	Landrum
	Miller, Md.	Lanham
	Miller, Nebr.	Latham
	Mills	LeCompte
	Minshall	Lesinski
	Moss	Lipscomb
	Murray, Ill.	Long
	Murray, Tenn.	Lovre
	Natcher	McCarthy
	Nelson	McDonough
	Nicholson	McGregor
	Norrell	McIntire
	O'Brien, Ill.	McMillan
	O'Brien, N. Y.	McVey
	O'Hara, Ill.	Machrowicz
	Ostertag	Mack, Ill.
	Passman	Mack, Wash.
	Patman	Schwengel
	Pelly	Scrivner
	Pfost	Scudder
	Poage	Seely-Brown
	Poff	Selden
	Polk	Sheppard
	Preston	Short
	Price	Shuford
	Priest	Sikes
	Prouty	Siler
	Quigley	Simpson, Ill.
	Rabaut	Smith, Kans.
	Radwan	Smith, Miss.
	Rains	Smith, Va.
	Ray	Smith, Wis.
	Reece, Tenn.	Spence
	Reed, N. Y.	Springer
	Rees, Kans.	Staggers
	Reuss	Steed
	Rhodes, Ariz.	Sullivan
	Richards	Talle
	Riehlman	Teague, Calif.
	Riley	Teague, Tex.
	Rivers	Thomas
	Roberts	Thompson, La.
	Robeson, Va.	Thompson, Mich.
	Robsion, Ky.	Thompson, Tex.
	Rogers, Colo.	Thomson, Wyo.
	Rogers, Fla.	Thornberry
	Rogers, Mass.	Tollefson
	Rogers, Tex.	Trimble
	Rooney	Tumulty
	Rutherford	Udall
	Sadlak	Vanik
	St. George	Van Pelt
	Schenck	Van Zandt
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Weaver
		Westland
		Wharton
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Wigglesworth
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N. J.
		Willis
		Wilson, Calif.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wolverton
		Wright
		Yates
		Young
		Younger
		Zablocki

NAYS—9

Budge	Mason	Taber
Gross	Norblad	Utt
Heselton	O'Konski	Wier

NOT VOTING—143

Addonizio	Doyle	Kelley, Pa.
Anfuso	Durham	Kelly, N. Y.
Barden	Eberharter	Keogh
Barrett	Fallon	Kilburn
Bass, N. H.	Fenton	King, Calif.
Baumhart	Fino	King, Pa.
Belcher	Flood	Klein
Betts	Flynt	Knox
Blitch	Fogarty	Knutson
Bowler	Forand	Lane
Boykin	Frelinghuysen	Lankford
Brooks, La.	Fulton	McConnell
Brooks, Tex.	Gamble	MrCormack
Buckley	Garmatz	McCulloch
Bush	Gavin	McDowell
Byrne, Pa.	Granahan	Macdonald
Carlyle	Grant	Matthews
Carnahan	Green, Oreg.	Merrow
Carrigg	Green, Pa.	Metcalf
Celler	Gwinn	Miller, Calif.
Chatham	Haley	Miller, N. Y.
Chudoff	Hand	Mollohan
Clark	Hardy	Morano
Cole	Hays, Ark.	Morgan
Cooley	Healey	Morrison
Corbett	Hébert	Moulder
Coudert	Hess	Multer
Cramer	Hiestand	Mumma
Cretella	Hillings	O'Hara, Minn.
Curtis, Mass.	Hoffman, Ill.	O'Neill
Dague	Holland	Osmers
Davidson	Hope	Patterson
Davis, Tenn.	Jackson	Perkins
Diggs	James	Philbin
Dollinger	Jenkins	Phillips
Donohue	Johnson, Calif.	Pilcher
Donovan	Judd	Pillion
Dorn, S. C.	Kearns	Powell
Dowdy	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.

Rodino	Simpson, Pa.	Walter
Roosevelt	Sisk	Watts
Saylor	Taylor	Wickersham
Scherer	Thompson, N. J.	Williams, N. Y.
Scott	Tuck	Wilson, Ind.
Sheehan	Velde	Wolcott
Shelley	Vursell	Zelenko
Sieminski	Wainwright	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Hiestand.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Powell with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Carrigg.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Hess.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. James.
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Williams of New York.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Cretella.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Bowler with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Cole.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Johnson of California.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Patterson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 470 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9824) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, House resolution 470 makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 9824, the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956. The resolution makes in order consideration, without intervention of any point of order, the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs now in the bill. Such substitute, for the purpose of amendment, shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. Two hours of general debate.

The purpose of H. R. 9824 is to aid children of servicemen to attain the education deprived them because of the death of a parent as a result of a disability incurred in combat or from an instrumentality of war during either World War II or the Korean conflict.

The educational assistance program includes schooling leading to an educational, vocational, or professional objective and also provides special restorative training for children with physical or mental disabilities.

In general, benefits would be available after graduation from high school or the attainment of age 18, whichever is earlier, and before age 23. Exceptions to both the minimum and maximum age limits are outlined in the bill. A maximum of 36 months of full-time training or its equivalent in part-time training would be afforded each child.

The program would be administered by the Veterans' Administration. The legislation is patterned closely after the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952. However, the bill does not permit on-the-job training, institutional or on-farm training, correspondence courses or courses at foreign schools.

The educational assistance would consist of monetary benefits paid monthly to the parent or guardian of the eligible person in the amount of $110 a month if pursuing a full-time course, $80 a month if on a three-quarter time basis and $50 a month on a half-time basis. The total benefit for each eligible person is $3,960.

It is estimated that if two-thirds of the proposed beneficiaries train for an average of 24 months, the direct-benefit cost of this bill would be approximately $150 million, plus administration expenses of about $6 million. And in any one year is not expected to exceed $15 million.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 470 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 9824.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a soil-bank bill specifying that some soil-bank land may be used for public recreational purposes, and placing an upper limit on soil-bank payments, so as to favor the family-sized farm.

I am taking this action in order to keep faith with the farmers of my district. At a series of public farmer meetings I held last fall, they almost unanimously favored the soil-bank proposal. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture already has authority to establish a soil-bank program, and it is apparent that Congress will provide him the necessary appropriation. But to avoid any possible delay I would like to have specific legislation passed—and I feel sure the farmers of my district would like to have it passed—so that there will be no question about it.

The bill I am introducing does not provide for the advance payments advocated by the President. I regard the advance payments proposal as unbusinesslike and a mere election-year bribe.

I should like to discuss briefly the two additional points which I believe make the bill I am introducing superior to those introduced last week by a number of Members. Those two points are the placing of an upper limit on the amount of soil-bank payments, and authorization of the use for public recreation purposes of soil-bank land which is suitable for such use.

I believe we should protect the family sized farm by limiting soil-bank payments to $25,000 a year per farmer on the 1-year acreage reserve and $7,500 a year per farmer on the long-range, 3- to 15-year conservation reserve program. These limits were adopted by the Senate as part of its soil-bank plan, but were eliminated by the conference committee and were not included in the Republican-sponsored bills introduced last week. The limits are restored in my bill.

It has been pointed out that 1 farmer, in this country, has a 340,000 wheat-acre allotment. If there were no

limits to soil bank payments, he might collect a Government check for some $3,400,000 for merely allowing half his land to lie idle for a year. The soil bank program should aim at increased income for small- and medium-sized farms, and not at making millionaires richer. I am convinced that we can achieve the necessary participation in the soil bank without opening it up to the huge corporation-type farms.

Now, on the subject of recreational uses for some of the soil bank land, I want to say that I believe those who live in the cities are also entitled to some direct benefits from this $1,200,000,000 Government program. They would receive such benefits if the soil bank plan provides for using some of the more desirable land in the long-range conservation reserve for parks and recreation areas, to be maintained by Federal, State or local park authorities.

I need not call the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that throughout the country there is a great and growing need for additional park space. This is true in my State of Michigan, among many others. Last year's Michigan Natural Resources Conference recommended that "State parks should be greatly increased in number and area, with an improved distribution relative to metropolitan centers, even at a sacrifice of quality standards as to scenery, wilderness, etc."

Even those States with sizeable park acreage or with substantial Federal lands within their borders may nevertheless be inadequately served. To again use the State of Michigan as an example, many of the State parks are in the northern part of the State. The great majority of the State's people live in the southern part of the Lower Peninsula. Population growth has been extremely rapid and much of the population increase has been in the highly industrialized southern section of the State.

Though a real effort has been made by the State and by some local governmental units to increase the facilities, almost all of the parks are woefully inadequate in size and facilities to meet the present needs of our own people and our hundreds of thousands of vacationists. That inadequacy is particularly acute in the more heavily populated, industrialized southern part of the State.

We can easily agree that recreation in many forms is due for a rapid growth. As automation offers our people more leisure time, there will be an ever-mounting pressure on existing public recreational facilities.

I am convinced, therefore, that at least some small portion of the millions of acres to be taken out of production under the conservation reserve program should be utilized for public recreational purposes—for roadside parks and picnic areas, for wildlife preserves and wilderness areas suitable for Boy Scout camping and other such activities.

Under the provisions of my bill a farmer signing a 3- to 15-year conservation reserve contract with the Government would agree to permit such of his soil bank land as the Secretary of Agriculture deemed suitable to be used for public recreational purposes. The Secretary would then make arrangements with Federal, State or local park authorities to equip and maintain the best-suited available areas for the duration of the farmer's contract with the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we may this year see the inauguration of a soil bank program to protect the family-size farm and with an investment in recreational facilities.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDING TITLE III OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 478 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois Mr. [ALLEN], and at this time yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 478 provides for the consideration of H. R. 9260, to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate on the bill.

The bill contains several amendments to title III of the GI bill. First, the bill provides that World War II veterans who lose their homes through no fault on their part, such as public condemnation or natural hazards, may have their entitlement reinstated. The committee amendment to the bill provides that an eligible veteran still in service, upon receipt of orders for transfer, may dispose of his home, pay off his guaranteed loan and have his entitlement reinstated.

There have been some questions raised by lenders concerning appraisals of property and this bill clarifies the fact that final determination of reasonable value is vested in the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration.

There have been abuses of the certification of occupancy made at the time of an application for a home loan and for this reason a further amendment requires that in addition to the certification made at the time a veteran makes application for a loan, he shall again certify that he intends to occupy the property as his home at the time of the closing of the loan.

At the present time if a veteran sells his home and the second purchaser defaults on the loan, the veteran is liable to the Veterans' Administration for the amount of the guaranty by the government in connection with the mortgage. The bill proposes to release veterans from this liability upon application of a veteran and the prospective buyer to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator determines that the buyer is acceptable under the same credit requirements as the original veteran purchaser and that the loan is current.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 478.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

WAR ORPHANS' EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9824) to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9824, with Mr. RAINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of policy of H. R. 9824 states in concise terms the basic purpose of this legislation. I would like to read the statement of policy:

The Congress hereby declares that the educational program established by this act is for the purpose of providing opportunities for education to children whose education would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of the death of a parent from a disability incurred in line of duty while in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict, and for the purpose of aiding such children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of such parent.

I am of the opinion that it is the obligation of the Federal Government to give first consideration to the surviving dependents of servicemen who lost their lives in the service of their country, and next to veterans with service-connected disabilities. We have spent almost $20 billion on the education of servicemen who were fortunate enough to return from World War II and Korea. I am not critical of these expenditures, since I believe, for the most part, they have accomplished the purpose of readjusting the returning serviceman—the purpose for which the expenditure was made—and I believe that the Nation as a whole has gained great benefits from the veterans' education and training program. I am mentioning these tremendous expenditures made to veterans who, for the most part, suffered no service-connected disability in order to emphasize the great need for a program to assist the surviving children of those servicemen who lost their lives in the war.

I regret that this legislation has not been enacted sooner. There are a few surviving children of servicemen who died in these wars who have already passed the age of eligibility, and some who have attained their educational goals without Government aid. Fortunately the bill is timely for the large group. The biggest group of children eligible under the act are in the age group from 10 to 14 years and, of course, the children of some of the men who lost their lives in Korea are much younger.

The children who are eligible are those children of veterans who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty while in the Armed Forces during World War II or in the Korean conflict in combat or from an instrumentality of war. Since this bill was presented, the Veterans' Administration has pointed out that it will be difficult to determine deaths from an instrumentality of war. I intend to offer later an amendment to make eligible children of men who died of a service-connected disability during World War II or the Korean conflict.

There are about 100,000 orphans involved in this bill. The average age of the orphans today is from 10 to 14 years. Each orphan will be entitled to receive 36 months of education and training in an approved educational institution. The orphans will receive $110 per month for full-time training and proportionately lesser amounts for part-time training—half time and above.

Each persons eligible may begin training upon the completion or termination of high school education or at the age 18. The training period will terminate at age 23. Any time lost in military service will be restored.

The types of training available would be courses offered by colleges, public and private vocational schools, business schools, and other approved educational institutions. There is no provision in this bill for farm training, on-the-job training, or avocational courses. There will be no training in foreign countries.

The administration of the program will be by the Veterans' Administration and is patterned after the education and training program for Korean veterans. The State approval agencies which now approve schools for the training of Korean veterans will be utilized for the approval of schools under this bill. Approval of a school for Korean veterans automatically covers approval under the orphans'-scholarship program.

Title IV of the bill gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs broad discretionary authority in using the monetary benefits of the bill to obtain special restorative training to improve the individual's ability with respect to physical or mental functions in which he is handicapped and which are essential to the normal pursuit of education.

It would include courses of training such as language retraining, speech or voice correction, lipreading, auditory training, Braille training, one-handed typewriting, left-hand or nondominant-hand writing, and so forth. In defining special restorative training we have made it clear that we do not mean medical care and treatment. It was recognized by the committee that there would be a few persons among those eligible who would not be able to participate in regular training. We did not wish to deny these children because of their unfortunate circumstances. We have, therefore, made it possible to deal with them on an individual basis and use the benefits provided by the bill in a way that will be most advantageous to the handicapped individual.

We have made applicable the general penal and punitive provisions which apply under Public Law 550, 82d Congress, and we have made the General Accounting Office responsible for reviewing the regulations promulgated by the Veterans' Administration under this bill to assure that they are consistent with its basic provisions.

The bill is supported by all the veterans' groups and was reported out of our committee unanimously.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I know something of the deep personal interest and the long-standing concern which the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has had in this legislation. This is a bill which I think will mean a very great deal to thousands of orphan children across the country. There is no more tragic aftermath of war than the family which is left with children and without a father to assume responsibility for the education of those children. This bill undertakes, on behalf of the Government, to see that the children of our men who fought in battle, who died in the service of their country, have the opportunity which they would have had had their fathers lived, to send them on through school.

I personally want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for the role he has played in drafting this bill and bringing it to the floor. I think it is a fine bill. I believe, Mr. Chairman, there will not be a vote cast against it in the House today.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am heartily in favor of the bill, which would provide educational assistance to the children of persons who died as the result of a disability incurred during World War II or the Korean conflict in combat or from an instrumentality of war. I have long felt that we should do more for the children of such persons and during the last session, I introduced a somewhat similar bill. My bill was somewhat broader and would have provided a scholarship to aid the children of all persons who died from service-connected disabilities due to World War II or the Korean conflict.

I should like to ask the chairman of my committee if an amendment to that effect is not to be introduced today? Am I correct in that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is an amendment to be introduced which will cover service-connected cases, either of disease or injury.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would be extremely helpful.

The instant bill has received a great deal of work. It is a good bill and I can give it my wholehearted support.

H. R. 9824 resembles, in many respects, the educational and vocational assistance program established for veterans of the Korean conflict by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. Basically, it would give a monetary allowance to each eligible child to assist him in attaining postsecondary schooling leading to an educational, vocational, or professional objective. However, since there will, undoubtedly, be some children, who, because of physical or mental handicaps are unable to pursue a normal educational program, provision for such persons to receive special restorative training.

The benefits of the bill will, in general, be available after the child's graduation from high school or the attainment of 18 years, whichever is earlier, and before his 23d birthday. Not more than 36 months of full-time training, or its equivalent in part-time training, can be afforded; and the rates of the monetary allowance are such as to result in a maximum Federal benefit of $3,960.

The present bill recognizes a Federal obligation to these "war orphans" and would provide generous, but by no means lavish, assistance. It should be a long way toward helping them to receive the education which they might have normally expected to have received if their father had not lost his life in the service of his country.

The Veterans' Administration estimated the cost of the bill over its entire existence, as $150 million. However, it further stated that it was not anticipated that in any one year the cost would exceed $15 million. This certainly is a small amount when compared to the worthy purpose of the measure.

In closing, I want to emphasize that this is a meritorious bill. It has been endorsed by all of the major veterans' organizations. I want to express my pleasure that it is now before this House

for action and I hope that it will speedily become law.

I believe the chairman of our committee told me that the first bill that he introduced in the Congress was a bill for orphans of combat veterans. Am I correct in that, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I congratulate the gentleman and ask for the immediate passage of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have no further requests for time on this side, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some questions. I am trying to go over the bill very hurriedly. I notice that the Veterans' Administration report is opposed to this. I am trying to figure out why. I certainly do not think we ought to pass this bill without having some explanation given to the Members as to what the opposition is to this bill. I think everyone is in favor of these fine objectives, but I think sometimes our emotions can lead us beyond the point of good reason. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would paraphrase why the Veterans' Administration is opposed to this bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. May I say to the gentleman that out of some 375 bills in our committee the Veterans' Administration have been in favor of only a very few bills other than a few land-transfer bills that did not cost a dime.

Their basic objection to this is that it is a departure from a proper concept of veterans' benefits, with which I disagree, because we today give orphans certain recognition while in school. In other words, a widow with a child draws compensation for that child until he is 18, but if he continues in school we continue those benefits until he is 21.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I can see without getting into it too far that this is going to be a very serious problem of administration. I can see that they are pointing that out among other things they are required to determine a very indefinite group. The gentleman said there would be 100,000 orphans, but this class is still not a closed class, is it?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The bill as introduced was restrictive and applied only to men that were actually killed in combat or from an instrumentality of war. During the hearings it was pointed out that certain men who died of disease in the Pacific islands or in many other places should be considered in the bill. The amendment prepared removes any doubt as to who are eligible. In other words, the bill would then cover all men who died from any service-connected cause and are given a rating of service connection, so there will be no question as to who is eligible for the training.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point I am getting at is that the number that would be contained in it is not limited, because you can still have a child born 2 years from now who could become qualified if the father died of a disability which was the result of service connection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is very true.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. So we have an indefinite group. I am just trying to understand this thing. It is an indefinite thing.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If you take the maximum group, it could not reach more than 156,000, according to the Veterans' Administration's own figures.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of the veterans with service-connected disabilities, what is the ratio of those who died from their service-connected disability? I imagine it is a small portion, is it not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is very small now, of course.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They usually die of some other cause than that which is their disability. One might be disabled in the leg or arm but die from some other cause.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman understand that this is only concerned with the orphans of veterans during the war period?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand that. What I am trying to get at is this. Suppose we have a veteran who has a service-connected disability from which he may die. He may die this year from that disability. He may die 10 or 15 years later. He is covered, is he not?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If he dies from the service-connected disability; not with the service connection, but of the service connection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Of the service connection; that is right. I am willing to abide by the studies of this committee because I know you have gone into it, but I am very disturbed about the fact that the administrative problems involved in here can be exceedingly complicated. The Veterans' Administration, as far as I can see, is opposed to it because of that.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Does the gentleman understand the time limit the committee has placed on this training?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. You can even go on up to the age of 31, as I read this bill. Am I not right? There is one place where he can be 31 years old.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Provided he went into the service and served a number of years.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. We think that would be a very small group, if any at all.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. To comment further on this premise of recognizing the offspring or child of a deceased veteran, I point out to the gentleman from Missouri that that is not a new principle because in our present rate of compensation, there is attention given to that very thing. For instance, the present rate of compensation to the widow ends when the child reaches 18 years of age unless he continues in school; and she then gets $34 for the first child, $29 for the second child and so on. So, really, we are not injecting a new formula into compensation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, what you are saying is that you know who the orphans are.

Mr. AVERY. They are pretty well identified under the present compensation-for-widows bill which is now in operation.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I see. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman see the estimated cost by the Veterans' Administration? The total cost is estimated at $150 million, but it is not expected to exceed $15 million in any 1 year. I would like to point out that I think this is an extremely valuable service because they need trained men and women too to go into the highly scientific courses. Today, there are not nearly enough of scientifically trained people. This is performing a patriotic service.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There are many ways of getting education. This is certainly only an incidental way. I might state from the committee's report itself the cost of this bill could be as much as $600 million—multiplying the $4,000 average which is contained in here plus the 150,000 potential. I agree that that is the maximum that might never be attained, and probably the estimate of around $200 or $300 million would be more accurate. But, your top is around $600 million on the basis of your own figures.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment as follows:

That this act may be cited as the "War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956."

TITLE I—STATEMENT OF POLICY; DEFINITIONS

Statement of policy

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby declares that the educational program established by this act is for the purpose of providing opportunities for education to children whose education would otherwise be impeded or interrupted by reason of the death of a parent from a disability incurred in line of duty while in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict in combat or from an instrumentality of war, and for the purpose of aiding such children in attaining the educational status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained but for the death of such parent.

Definitions

SEC. 102. (a) For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "World War II" means the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946.

(2) The term "Korean conflict" means the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on January 31, 1955.

(3) The term "eligible person" means the child of a person who died as the result of a disability incurred in line of duty while in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict—

(A) in combat, or

(B) from an instrumentality of war.

(4) The term "child" means a legitimate or legally adopted child, a stepchild if he was a member of the household of the parent from whom eligibility is derived, or an illegitimate child if it is shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator that the person from whom eligibility is derived was the parent.

(5) The term "Armed Forces" means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States.

(6) The term "duty with the Armed Forces" as used in section 203 means (A) full-time duty in the active military or naval service, other than for training purposes, (B) full-time active duty for training for a period of 6 or more consecutive months by a member of a reserve component (including the National Guard), or (C) active duty for training required by section 262 (c) (1) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

(7) The term "parent or guardian" means a father, a mother, a father through adoption, a mother through adoption, a fiduciary legally appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction, or any person who is determined by the Administrator in accordance with section 21 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 450), to be otherwise legally vested with the care of the eligible person.

(8) The term "program of education" means any curriculum or any combination of unit courses or subjects pursued at an educational institution which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill the requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective.

(9) The term "educational institution" means any public or private secondary school, vocational school, business school, junior college, teachers' college, college, normal school, professional school, university, or scientific or technical institution, or any other institution if it furnishes education at the secondary school level or above.

(10) The term "State" means each of the several States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(11) The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

(12) The term "special restorative training" means training furnished under title IV.

(b) If an eligible person has attained his majority and is under no known legal disability, all references in this act to "parent or guardian" shall refer to the eligible person himself.

(c) Any provision of this act which requires any action to be taken by or with respect to the parent or guardian of an eligible person who has not attained his majority, or who, having attained his majority, is under a legal disability, shall not apply when the Administrator determines that its application would not be in the best interest of the eligible person, would result in undue delay, or would not be administratively feasible. In such a case the Administrator, where necessary to protect the interest of the eligible person, may designate some other person (who may be the eligible person himself) as the person by or with respect to whom the action so required should be taken.

TITLE II—ELIGIBILITY AND ENTITLEMENT

Eligibility and entitlement generally

SEC. 201. Each eligible person shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be entitled to receive educational assistance.

Duration of educational assistance

SEC. 202. (a) Each eligible person shall be entitled to educational assistance under this act for a period not in excess of 36 months (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training).

(b) The period of entitlement of an eligible person under this act shall be reduced by a period equivalent to any period of education or training received by him under title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 or of vocational rehabilitation training received by him under Public Law 894, 81st Congress.

(c) The period of entitlement of an eligible veteran under title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to any period of educational assistance received by him under this act.

(d) If an eligible person is entitled to educational assistance under this act and also to vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 894, 81st Congress, he must elect whether he will receive educational assistance or vocational rehabilitation. If an eligible person is entitled to educational assistance under this act and is not entitled to such vocational rehabilitation, but after beginning his program of education or special restorative training becomes entitled (as determined by the Administrator) to such vocational rehabilitation, he must elect whether to continue to receive educational assistance or whether to receive such vocational rehabilitation. If he elects to receive vocational rehabilitation, the program of education or special restorative training pursued under this act shall be utilized to the fullest extent practicable in determining the character and duration of vocational rehabilitation to be furnished him.

Periods of eligibility

SEC. 203. (a) The educational assistance to which an eligible person is entitled under section 202 may be afforded him during the period beginning on his 18th birthday, or on the successful completion of his secondary schooling, whichever first occurs, and ending on his 23d birthday, except that—

(1) if he is above the age of compulsory school attendance under applicable State law, and the Administrator determines that his best interests will be served thereby, such period may begin before his 18th birthday;

(2) if he has not reached his 23d birthday on the effective date of this act and—

(A) he has reached his 18th birthday on such effective date, or

(B) he serves on duty with the Armed Forces as an eligible person before his 23d birthday and on or after such effective date, or

(C) the death of the parent from whom eligibility was derived occurs after such effective date and after his 18th birthday but before his 23d birthday—

then such period shall end 5 years after such effective date, his first discharge or release after such effective date from duty with the Armed Forces if such duty began before his 23d birthday, or the death of such parent, whichever occurs last, except that in no event shall such period be extended beyond his 31st birthday by reason of this paragraph; and

(3) (A) if he is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on a quarter or semester system and such period ends during the last half of a quarter or semester, such period shall be extended to the end of the quarter or semester; or

(B) if he is enrolled in an educational institution operated other than on a quarter or semester basis and such period ends during the last half of the course, such period shall be extended to the end of the course, or until 9 weeks have expired, whichever first occurs.

(b) No eligible person may be afforded educational assistance under this act unless he was discharged or released after each period he was on duty with the Armed Forces under conditions other than dishonorable, or while he is on duty with the Armed Forces.

Application

SEC. 204. The parent or guardian of a person for whom educational assistance is sought under this act shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form and contain such information as the Administrator shall prescribe. If the Administrator finds that the person on whose behalf the application is submitted is an eligible person, he shall approve the application provisionally. The Administrator shall notify the parent or guardian of his provisional approval or of his disapproval of the application.

Processing of applications

SEC. 205. (a) Further processing of an application for educational assistance and the award of such assistance shall be pursuant to the requirements of title III, unless the parent or guardian requests special restorative training for the eligible person, in which case the application will be processed under title IV.

(b) If the request for special restorative training is approved, educational assistance will be afforded pursuant to the terms of title IV. If the request for special restorative training is disapproved, or if approved the restorative training is completed or discontinued, any educational assistance subsequently afforded will be in accordance with title III.

TITLE III—PROGRAM OF EDUCATION

Development of educational plan

SEC. 301. Upon provisional approval of an application for educational assistance, the Administrator shall arrange for, and the eligible person shall take advantage of, educational or vocational counseling to assist the parent or guardian and the eligible person in selecting his educational, vocational, or professional objective and in developing his program of education. During, or subsequent to, such counseling, the parent or guardian shall prepare for the eligible person an educational plan which shall set forth the selected objective, the proposed program of education, a list of the educational institutions at which such program would be pursued, an estimate of the sum which would be required for tuition and fees in completion of such program, and such other information as the Administrator shall require. This educational plan shall be signed by the parent or guardian and shall become an integral part of the application for educational assistance under this act.

Final approval of application

SEC. 302. The Administrator shall finally approve an application if he finds (1) that section 301 has been complied with, (2) that the proposed program of education constitutes a "program of education" as that term is defined in this act, (3) that the eligible person is not already qualified, by reason of previous education or training, for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education are offered, and (4) that it does not appear that the pursuit of such program would violate any provision of this act.

Change of program

SEC. 303. An eligible person, with the concurrence of his parent or guardian, may request changes in his program. The Administrator shall approve an initial change of program, and may approve not more than one additional change, if he finds that—

(1) the program of education which the eligible person proposes to pursue is suitable to his aptitudes, intests, and abilities; and

(2) in any instance where the eligible person has interrupted, or failed to progress in, his program due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, there exists a reasonable likelihood with respect to the program which the eligible person proposes to pursue that there will not be a recurrence of such an interruption or failure to progress.

Disapproval of enrollment in certain courses

SEC. 304. (a) (1) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible

person in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality-development course.

(2) The Administrator, shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person—

(1) in any photography course or entertainment course, or

(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public speaking course, or course in sports or athletics such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic courses, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective, or

(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible person submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any course of flight training other than one given by an educational institution of higher learning for credit toward a standard college degree the eligible person is seeking.

(c) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any course of apprentice or other training on the job, any course of institutional on-farm training, any course to be pursued by correspondence, television, or radio, or any course to be pursued at an educational institution not located in a State.

(d) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any course which is to be pursued as a part of his regular secondary school education, but this subsection shall not prevent the enrollment of an eligible person in a course to be pursued below the college level if the Administrator finds that such person has ended his secondary school education (by completion or otherwise) and that such course is a specialized vocational course pursued for the purpose of qualifying in a bona fide vocational objective.

Discontinuance for unsatisfactory progress

SEC. 305. The Administrator shall discontinue the educational assistance allowance on behalf of an eligible person if, at any time, the Administrator finds that according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution he is attending, his conduct or progress is unsatisfactory. The Administrator may renew the payment of the educational assistance allowance only if he finds that—

(1) the cause of the unsatisfactory conduct or progress of the eligible person has been removed, and

(2) The program which the eligible person now proposes to pursue (whether the same or revised) is suitable to his aptitudes, interests, and abilities.

Period of operation for approval

SEC. 306. (a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible person in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than 2 years.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than 2 years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution; or

(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than 2 years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality.

Institutions listed by Attorney General

SEC. 307. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an educational assistance allowance to, any eligible person in any course in an educational institution while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

Educational assistance allowance

SEC. 308. (a) The Administrator shall pay to the parent or guardian of each eligible person who is pursuing a program of education under this Act, and who applies therefor on behalf of such eligible person, an educational assistance allowance to meet, in part, the expenses of the eligible person's subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, equipment, and other educational costs.

(b) The educational assistance allowance on behalf of an eligible person shall be paid, as provided in section 309, only for the period of his enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

(1) on behalf of any person enrolled in a course which leads to a standard college degree for any period when such person is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the educational institution and the requirements of this act, or

(2) on behalf of any person enrolled in a course which does not lead to a standard college degree for any day of absence in excess of 30 days in a 12-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution is not regularly in session.

(c) No educational assistance allowance shall be paid on behalf of an eligible person for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

(1) from the eligible person (A) in the case of an eligible person enrolled in a course which leads to a standard college degree, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible person enrolled in a course which does not lead to a standard college degree, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, and

(2) from the educational institution a certification, or an endorsement on the eligible person's certificate, that he was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education during such period.

Educational assistance allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within 20 days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

Computation of educational assistance allowance

SEC. 309. (a) The educational assistance allowance on behalf of an eligible person who is pursuing a program of education consisting of institutional courses shall be computed at the rate of (1) $110 per month if pursued on a full-time basis, (2) $80 per month if pursued on a three-quarters time basis, and (3) $50 per month if pursued on a half-time basis.

(b) The educational assistance allowance to be paid on behalf of an eligible person who is pursuing a full-time program of education which consists of institutional courses and alternate phases of training in a business or industrial establishment with the training in the business or industrial establishment being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of $90 per month.

(c) No educational assistance allowance shall be paid on behalf of an eligible person for any period during which he is enrolled in and pursuing an institutional course on a less than half-time basis, or any course described in subsection (b) on a less than full-time basis.

Measurement of courses

SEC. 310. (a) For the purposes of this act, (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 30 hours per week of attendance is required with no more than 2½ hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 25 hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of 14 semester hours or its equivalent is required.

(b) The Administrator shall define part-time training in the case of the types of courses referred to in subsection (a), and shall define full-time and part-time training in the causes of all other types of courses pursued under this act.

Overcharges by educational institutions

SEC. 311. (a) If the Administrator finds that an educational institution has charged or received from any eligible person any amount in excess of the charges for tuition and fees which such institution requires similarly circumstanced students, not receiving educational assistance under this act, who are enrolled in the same course to pay, he may disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any eligible person not already enrolled therein under this act and any eligible veteran not already enrolled therein under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

(b) Any educational institution which has been disapproved under section 234 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 shall be deemed to be disapproved for the enrollment under this act of any eligible person not already enrolled therein.

Approval of courses

SEC. 312. (a) An eligible person shall receive the benefits of this title while enrolled in a course of education offered by an educational institution only if such course is approved in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any course offered by an educational institution (as defined in this act) shall be considered approved for the purposes of this title if it is approved under either section 253 or section 254 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prior to the date for the expiration of all education and training thereunder, and has not been disapproved under the provisions of section 256 of that act.

(c) Subsequent to the date for the expiration of all education and training under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, the Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of any additional courses for the purposes of this title. In approving such a course, the criteria of section 253 and section 254 of that act, as now or as hereafter amended, shall be applicable to approvals under this subsection and the Administrator may utilize the services of State educational agencies in connection therewith.

Discontinuance of allowances

SEC. 313. The Administrator may discontinue the educational assistance allowance of any eligible person if he finds that the course of education in which the eligible person is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this act or any of the standards and criteria of section 253 or 254 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance

Act of 1952 or if he finds that the educational institution offering such course has violated any provision of this act or fails to meet any of its requirements.

TITLE IV—SPECIAL RESTORATIVE TRAINING

Purpose

SEC. 401. The purpose of special restorative training is to overcome, or lessen, the effects of a manifest physical or mental disability which would handicap an eligible person in the pursuit of a program of education.

Entitlement to special restorative training

SEC. 402. (a) The Administrator at the request of the parent or guardian of an eligible person is authorized—

(1) to determine whether such person is in need of special restorative training; and

(2) where need is found to exist, to prescribe a course which is suitable to accomplish the purposes of this title.

Such a course, at the discretion of the Administrator, may contain elements that would contribute toward an ultimate objective of a program of education.

(b) In no event shall the total period of educational assistance under this title and other titles of this act exceed the amount of entitlement as established in section 202, and the provisions of section 203 shall be applicable.

Special training allowance

SEC. 403. (a) While the eligible person is enrolled in and pursuing a full-time course of special restorative training, the parent or guardian shall be entitled to receive on his behalf a special training allowance computed at the basic rate of $110 per month. If the charges for tuition and fees applicable to any such course are in excess of $35 per calendar month the basic monthly allowance may be increased by the amount that such charges exceed $35 a month, upon election by the parent or guardian of the eligible person to have such person's period of entitlement reduced by 1 day for each $3.60 that the special training allowance paid exceeds the basic monthly allowance.

(b) No payments of a special training allowance shall be made for the same period for which the payment of an educational assistance allowance is made or for any period during which the training is pursued on less than a full-time basis.

(c) Full-time training for the purpose of this section shall be determined by the Administrator with respect to the capacities of the individual trainee.

Special administrative provisions

SEC. 404. (a) In carrying out his responsibilities under this title the Administrator may by agreement arrange with public or private educational institutions or others to provide training arrangements as may be suitable and necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title. In any instance where the Administrator finds that a customary tuition charge is not applicable, he may agree on the fair and reasonable amounts which may be charged the parent or guardian for the training provided to an eligible person.

(b) The Administrator shall make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary in order to promote good conduct on the part of the persons who are following courses of special restorative training and to otherwise carrry out the purpose of this act.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Authority and duties of Administrator.

SEC. 501. (a) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, promulgate, and publish such rules and regulations as are consistent with the provisions of this act and necessary to carry out its purposes. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the act of October 17, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1193), payments under this act shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office, as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to accept uncompensated services and to enter into contracts or agreements with private or public agencies, or persons, for necessary services, incident to the administration of this act, including personal services, as he may deem practicable.

(c) The Administrator is authorized to provide the educational and vocational counseling required under section 301, and may provide or require additional counseling if he deems it to be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act. Where educational or vocational counseling is required pursuant to this act, the Administrator is authorized, in his discretion, to defray or reimburse the parent or guardian for the necessary traveling expenses of the eligible person to and from the place of counseling.

(d) The Administrator may advise and consult with the advisory committee established pursuant to section 262 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, with respect to the administration of this act.

(e) In carrying out his functions under this act, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall be made either in advince or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement.

Nonduplication of benefits

SEC. 502. (a) The commencement of a program of education or special restorative training under this act shall be a bar to subsequent payments by reason of the proviso to paragraph VI, Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended, or the proviso to section 3 (c), Public No. 484, 73d Congress, as amended, of compensation or pension to an eligible person over the age of 18, or of increased rates, or additional amounts, of compensation or pension because of such a person.

(b) No educational assistance allowance or special training allowance shall be paid on behalf of any eligible person under this act for any period during which such person is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this act, where the payment of an allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid from the Federal Treasury to the eligible person or to his parent or guardian in his behalf.

Control by agencies of United States

SEC. 503. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this act, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State-approving agency, or State educational agency, or any educational institution; however, nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized, by existing provisions of law, to exercise over any Federal educational institution or to prevent the furnishing of education under this act in any institution over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

Conflicting interests

SEC. 504. (a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or service from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible person was pursuing a course of education under this act shall be immediately dismissed from his office of employment.

(b) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible persons by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

Reports by institutions

SEC. 505. (a) Educational institutions shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education of each eligible person enrolled therein under this act.

(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this act, an allowance at the rate of $1 per month for each eligible person enrolled in and attending each institution under the provisions of this act to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that in the event any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this act, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

Overpayments to eligible persons

SEC. 506. If the Administrator finds that an overpayment has been made to an eligible person as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of an educational institution to report, as required by this act and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course by the eligible person or (2) false certification by an educational institution, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States. Any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the eligible person. This section shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under this or any other act.

Examination of records

SEC. 507. The records and accounts of educational institutions pertaining to eligible persons who received education under this act shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

False or misleading statements

SEC. 508. The Administrator shall not make any payments under this act to any person found by him to have willfully submitted any false or misleading claims. Whenever the Administrator finds that an educational institution has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or that a person with the complicity of an educational institution, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

Criminal penalties

SEC. 509. Whoever knowingly and willfully—

(1) makes or presents any false, fictitious, or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, voucher, endorsement, or paper or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for payment under this act, or pertaining to any matter arising under this act,

(2) makes or presents any paper required under this act on which paper a date other than the date upon which it was actually signed or acknowledged by the claimant has been willfully inserted,

(3) certifies falsely that the declarant, affiant, or witness named in such affidavit, declaration, voucher, endorsement, or other paper or writing personally appeared before him and was sworn thereto, or acknowledged the execution thereof, or

(4) accepts and converts to his own use payments for any period during which he was not actually pursuing a course of education under this act for which period payment was made,

shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Application of other laws

SEC. 510. The provisions of Public Law No. 262, 74th Congress, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), as amended, the provisions of section 15 of Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended, the provisions of paragraph V, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, and the provisions of titles II and III of Public Law No. 844, 74th Congress, approved June 29, 1936, as amended, shall be for application under this act.

Waiver of recovery of overpayments

SEC. 511. There shall be no recovery of payments of educational assistance allowance made under this act from any person who, in the judgment of the Administrator, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer or certifying officer shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

Effective date

SEC. 512. This act shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but no educational assistance allowance shall be paid for any period before the first day of the first month which begins more than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (interrupting the reading of the committee amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with, that the amendment be considered as read, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this bill. It seems to be going very quickly without proper discussion. I have great respect for the gentleman's committee, but I would like to know a little bit more in connection with these illegitimate children who, I understand, come within the purview of this act: Whether they shall be required to be citizens of the United States in order to receive the benefits?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Any illegitimate child who can qualify for compensation through legal means or under the law would be entitled to the benefits of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has not quite answered my question. I asked whether or not they would be required to be citizens of the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They would not necessarily be citizens of the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, may I point out to my dear friend that in World War II and in the Korean War, the GI was all over the map.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HINSHAW. Just a moment. I want to mention a few of the countries.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman realizes that they may not draw benefits under the terms of this bill in a foreign country.

Mr. HINSHAW. No, I do not realize that—they are eligible for benefits.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But, it is prohibited to draw benefits in any foreign country.

Mr. HINSHAW. They can come into the United States under other laws and obtain a college education, I believe, as students. I do not believe the gentleman's provision would quite hold—it might hold, but I doubt it. I would want to find out from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTERS] or from his committee whether or not such a child might not have rights to come in as a student and hence receive their training in the United States at the expense of the United States.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If, under the legal interpretation or the veteran admitting that he was his child or if the veteran is dead and he is drawing compensation as a result, he would certainly be entitled to come into the country and receive educational training—otherwise, he would not.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I am talking about because the GI was all over—all over England, all over Germany and France and Italy and, in fact, all over almost the entire world. Whether or not legitimacy or illegitimacy can be proven in cases of that sort is going to be an almost indeterminable administrative problem. I have no doubt but what the gentleman and other members of his committee will be sought after a great deal to find out whether a child may be proven to be illegitimate or legitimate. I think this bill takes a great deal of consideration, and it is being offered to us very hastily, without reading. I have not objected to passing over without reading because it would take a great deal of time, and I think it should take some time, if a bill that may cost us anywhere from 150 to 600 million or more dollars and which conceivably would operate, according to the budget in the next to the last paragraph of their report, for at least a quarter of a century from now.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There has been no bill from the Veterans' Affairs Committee since I have been a member of it that has received more careful consideration than this bill. There are no gimmicks or new interpretations of the immigration laws in this bill. We have used the precedents establishing the legitimacy of any child, but the bill has been very, very carefully considered over a period of more than a year. There have been a number of roundtable discussions by representatives of the Government who will be concerned with this bill, and there were very careful hearings held on the bill. There is no intent on the part of the chairman to try to pass this bill hurriedly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman inform me that this bill has the approval of the various veteran organizations, such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so on?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It has the unanimous approval of every organization.

Mr. HINSHAW. That beats me. I do not see how they did it. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

On page 30, strike out lines 9, 10, and 11, and insert "from a disease or injury incurred or aggravated in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict, and for,".

On page 30, strike out line 22 and all that follows down through line 2 on page 31, and insert:

"(3) The term 'eligible person' means a child of a person who died of a disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty in the active service in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict, but only if such service did not terminate under dishonorable conditions. The standards and criteria for determining incurrence or aggravation of a disease or injury in line of duty shall be those applicable under disability compensation laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment changes the definition of an eligible person. In the original bill, trying to make this bill apply to men only killed in combat, the language required that his death be the result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict in combat or from an instrumentality of war. The term "instrumentality of war" as officials of the Veterans' Administration have noted would be difficult to interpret, and for that reason the amendment is offered which includes children of all men who died of a disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty; who died in World War II or the Korean conflict, but only if such service did not terminate under dishonorable conditions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9824, pursuant to House Resolution 470, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordercd.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas moves to amend the title of the bill to read: "A bill to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 9824, the War Orphans' Education Assistance Act of 1956, now before the House for consideration, is the kind of legislation that makes me glad I am a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which is unanimously recommending passage. I believe it merits and will win unanimous passage by the House.

In brief, this bill provides financial assistance for the college education of children orphaned by the death of a parent as the result of a disability incurred in line of duty while in the Armed Forces during World War II or the Korean conflict. It seems to me that we may understandably have differences of opinion regarding a great many legislative proposals concerning veterans' benefits, but who can disagree with the obligation of our people to help educate the orphaned children of those who have given their lives in defense of our country?

We properly appreciate and pay homage to those who have died to help us, but we must also realize that they have sacrificed not only their lives, but also their opportunity to provide for their children and to give them the educational opportunities every mother and father seek for them. This bill recognizes that the educational opportunities of a great many war orphans will be impeded, interrupted or made impossible by reason of the war-caused death of a parent, and it sets up an educational program and allowances to give them the opportunities the veteran would want for his children and which he would try to give them.

The amount of death compensation which the widow and child now receive is barely sufficient to meet minimum living costs. There is no possible way the average mother can provide an education opportunity for the child unless she has other income. This legislation proposes that the people of the United States recognize this obligation and step in and provide that supplementary income over a 4-year period. It is good legislation, already too long delayed. I earnestly hope it will have unanimous passage.

AMENDING TITLE III OF THE SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9260, with Mr. ALBERT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is identical with five other bills that were considered by the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in an effort to correct five conditions which had been brought to the attention of the subcommittee in the course of investigating the housing program across the country.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is the author of the pending bill. Similar bills were introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SHUFORD], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and by myself.

Hearings were held on these bills on March 13 and 14 and H. R. 9260 was favorably reported by the subcommittee unanimously, subsequently amended in the full committee and, thereafter, reported unanimously by the full committee.

The five conditions which are dealt with by this omnibus bill may be summarized as follows:

In the first place, in the course of the hearings and investigations of the subcommittee across the country we discovered there was a condition known as the sale of entitlements which was taking place throughout the United States in which veterans were more or less being a party to a transaction whereby they would contract to purchase a home with a VA-guaranty loan for that home, then dispose of the home without ever occupying it, very often under conditions where there was serious doubt as to whether they ever had any intention to occupy it as a home.

One of the provisions of this bill, H. R. 9260, which the committee felt would help to correct this situation, requires that a veteran has to certify as to his intent to occupy the home which is the subject of a GI loan, at the time of the loan's closing. Under the existing situation he merely has to state when he applies for the loan that he intends to occupy it as a home. Thereafter he may say he has had a change in his intention in that regard and dispose of his entitlement under this sale of entitlements procedure and the Government is really without any recourse in the situation to stop the loan from going through.

This new provision would require that he must certify as to intent to occupy the home at the time of the loan's closing, which we feel will help greatly to reduce this particular abuse of the GI bill.

Another provision deals with the situation which has come to exist with regard to appraisals. The law as it presently reads requires that the CRV, the certificate of reasonable value, which is issued on the house must be based on the appraisal reported by the appraiser. It cannot exceed that figure. In the course of a great deal of experience with the program the VA has determined it is necessary to revise that particular appraisal figure to make it coincide with other property values in a given development or make it coincide with changes in cost which may be present in connection with the house. For some time it has been the practice for the VA itself to review this question of appraisal and to set finally the figure that is to be the basis for the certificate of reasonable value. That procedure has been going on for some time with something of a question or a cloud over it because of the wording of the present law.

This bill would correct that situation and make it clear that the responsibility for review and of final determination of reasonable value does rest with the Administrator.

Another situation which we feel has created some injustice insofar as some veterans are concerned in the country has to do with the entitlements which they have to homes which are lost as the result of condemnations or of natural disasters of one kind or another. Under existing law when a piece of property is condemned on which a World War II veteran has a GI loan subject to an entitlement, under the law he can have his entitlement reinstated until July 25,

1957, the date the present program expires. This bill provides he can have his entitlement reinstated until January 25, 1965. By an act of the Government in many cases, or perhaps of a municipality or a State, he is deprived of his GI home through condemnation. The same result could follow an earthquake or tornado of some kind that wiped out his home.

This bill would make it possible to renew or to revive his GI entitlement until January 25, 1965, when without any cause or fault of his own he is deprived of it through such a thing as a condemnation proceeding or a natural disaster of some kind.

This was the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] offered in view of conditions in his area where there are a large number of these condemnations.

Another situation has to do with a condition that prevails in the GI loan field whereby literally thousands of veterans today are still held liable on loans which have been made to them some years back where the property has passed into the hands of a subsequent purchaser. It was felt that the interest of the veteran would be better served and certainly the interest of the Government would be better served if we made it possible in future transactions that a GI, who has obtained a loan and thereafter sells the home for one reason or another to someone else, may apply to have the subsequent purchaser assume his liability, whereupon the Government will have the right to determine whether or not this subsequent purchaser is a good credit risk. If he is found to be a good credit risk, then the Government may accept his liability in lieu of the liability of the veteran. There is a feeling that this would provide a greater justice to the veteran himself and would also insure the Government of a solvent person in possession of the property to look to for the loan, because under the existing situation the Government does not have any right to go to this subsequent purchaser and collect from him on the Government's share which is guaranteed under this loan program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I just want to know whether that would apply to this situation: Can they reevaluate the amount of the loan under such a transaction where the veteran sells, let us say, to a nonveteran?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not think that there could be any increase in the liability of the Government under those circumstances at all, but the portion of the liability which still remains in the veteran could be assumed by the new purchaser if he was found by the Government to be a satisfactory credit risk.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Whether he was a veteran or not—the subsequent purchaser?

Mr. EDMONDSON. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me give a specific case. We have this situation in St. Louis, and I imagine it exists elsewhere, where some veterans' homes were built around the airport, and they extended the airport and put jets on there, and the new regulation under the Veterans' Administration would not permit those homes to be guaranteed. So, when the veteran goes to sell his home, the subsequent purchaser cannot get the benefit of the veteran's loan, and that, of course, hurts the veteran who may have to sell his property due to being changed from one city to another to follow his job. Now, I was wondering if the gentleman's amendment would correct that problem that the veteran has.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my personal belief and, I believe, the belief of the staff present that it would take care of that situation and that it would make it possible for the subsequent purchaser, if he is a good credit risk, to assume that liability.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, they could not throw up this regulation that has come in since about being within a mile of the airport?

Mr. EDMONDSON. However, in that instance, the new purchaser would not be using his own entitlement but, rather, would be assuming the liability of the previous purchaser.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I rise to ask questions about this release and assumption agreement. As I understand, that is to operate much along the same line as present release and assumption agreement made by the Federal Housing Administration on FHA loans. Is that true?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am informed that it is similar to the procedure which the FHA uses.

Mr. SCHENCK. Now, do I understand, also, that the person purchasing the property and getting the release and assumption agreement, assuming he is eligible under the standards set up by the Veterans' Administration, need not be a veteran?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct, yes.

Mr. SCHENCK. But that the purchaser will have full advantage of whatever lower interest rates apply to the present guaranteed loan under the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Well, as it presently stands, he would have that right. If he took over the loan, he would be paying on the loan at the same rate of interest that the veteran had. The only difference is that now the Government's position is protected because we say, "You, under this agreement, have bought the home from the veteran and may also be held liable to the Government," which under existing conditions may not be the case, for the Government's share of the loan.

Mr. SCHENCK. But the veteran under present legislation is responsible, is he not, in the event of a deficiency judgment?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes, he is. We have thousands of veterans who are discovering that they are liable, who thought when someone came in and assumed their loan and took over their house and occupied it that they were no longer responsible for the loan. This would not correct that situation that has existed under previous law, but it would prevent it from coming up in the future when a veteran does find a good credit risk to purchase his home and he has some reason to sell it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Because he would then be released of further responsibility on that mortgage?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHENCK. My friend and colleague from Missouri, [Mr. CURTIS], asked a question about a home on which there is an insured loan, which home is within an area adjaccnt to a runway and therefore under the VA rules and under the FHA rules is no longer eligible for an insured mortgage. I did not quite understand the gentleman's answer to that. It was my impression that under this release and assumption agreement it would be possible for a purchaser to take over the unpaid balance of that loan and the veteran to be released; but I am sure that it is not intended that the property shall be regarded as eligible for an insured loan after the airport has come into being.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I answer the gentleman in this way. There is not intended any enlargement of the liability of the Government in any way if the property has been made less desirable or a riskier type of property by some development such as a jet runway in the immediate vicinity. And it has been determined that the Government does not want to enlarge and extend its liability by making new loans in that area. That is well and good. We do not propose to change that. But if a veteran sells his house or has the loan assumed by someone who takes it over, the Government's liability is not enlarged in any way by permitting this new purchaser to become liable for the loan which the Government already is guaranteeing on that property. We are not increasing or enlarging the liability of the Government in any way. We are simply finding a new party to whom we can look for repayment if we have to pay off on the guaranty.

Mr. SCHENCK. I understand that. It is my understanding that this proposed legislation does not renew the eligibility of a property which otherwise would be ineligible because of, say, this airport encroachment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the sense of making it eligible for a new loan?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Under the new GI entitlement it would not. But in the sense of making it possible for a transfer to occur under which a new purchaser came in and assumed the liability of the veteran on the existing loan, there is that change in the situation as we interpret this proposal.

Mr. SCHENCK. If I may ask one more question: Is there anything in this legislation that would in any way clarify or change the appraisal methods used by the VA appraisers?

Mr. EDMONDSON. There is nothing to change the appraisal methods. The

only change with respect to appraisal is that we are legalizing the present procedure, the procedure that has been followed for some years, whereby the Administrator himself makes the final determination on a certificate of reasonable value, and he is not bound by the appraiser's figures at the time of the appraisal.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I should like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that in the last 2 or 3 weeks, Mr. Higley has put into effect some regulations which I believe will help the appraisal system considerably; and much more will be done to take care of the appraisal system in the next year than has been done in the past.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for that comment, because I understood that had been done. May I also express my deep appreciation to this great Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their bringing in this legislation, which is very necessary and should be supported.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman will recall that I appeared before his committee and conferred with the subcommittee in reference to a situation in my district where there was failure in a whole subdivision of veterans' housing construction to carry out the contract and specifications. I had suggested that the problem was not so much with the appraisal as with the inspection system used by the Veterans' Administration. I further suggested that I felt that the remedy needed was to put in the hands of the Veterans' Administration under appropriate safeguards the right to bring a civil action for specific performance of the contract in the case of a veterans' subdivision or to bring an action for breach of the contract, rather than have each one of a whole group of veterans similarly situated bring a lawsuit. At least in the Columbus case, the fact that there were similar breaches of contract on many of the houses made it a subject that could have been taken care of in a group action. This was not necessary because corrections were made by agreement. In my investigations, however, I felt that veterans' housing needed more effective administration, first in making sure that the inspection would result in building the houses according to specifications and the appraisal, and second, in taking additional steps in case the contract was not carried out. I do not believe the second is taken care of in this legislation. What does the chairman of the subcommittee have to say on this?

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I say to the gentleman first of all that we appreciate his coming before the subcommittee to report the failures in the subdivision of Columbus. We have had assurances from the Veterans' Administration there that they are following up carefully on the contractors' delinquencies with regard to construction in that particular subdivision.

As to the problem of the inspections, the Administrator has recently announced the intention to appoint approximately 67 new supervising inspectors throughout the country, construction analysts, I believe they are actually called, who will have the responsibility of seeing that these inspections do occur systematically in each of the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

There has actually been, and I believe that the Veterans' Administration has sustained this point to some extent on this, a problem of skilled and trained personnel in this inspection field on the payroll of the Veterans' Administration to take care of this problem of continuous inspections in these large developments, large subdivisions, where sometimes hundreds of houses are under construction at the same time.

Mr. VORYS. Did the gentleman's committee come to the conclusion that the correction needed was administrative rather than legislative? Maybe we have all the laws that are needed, but it was my hope that his able committee would make sure that the Veterans' Administration would take some such action as the gentleman has just described. It seems to me like a step in the right direction.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In all honesty, I believe there is some joint responsibility there. I think that the Veterans' Administration should have a more competent and a better staff inspection service at work with more careful and more extensive directions on the subject of inspection from the Veterans' Administration's central office. On the other hand, I think we in the Congress have failed to provide the funds and the mandate in the field of inspections that really were required to do the job and to do it adequately. I am hoping that there has been some progress in both directions of responsibility in the last few months.

Mr. VORYS. Perhaps I am overestimating the importance of the amendments here with reference to appraisals, but it seems to me that in this proposed bill you make very clear that not merely does the Veterans' Administration have to get somebody to go out and make an appraisal but the Administrator has to back up the appraisal. I think you are going to get by that action a little closer connection between the appraisal, the inspection, and the actual value of the house that is built.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would hope that would be the result of the measure.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is it not true that in the event a veteran cannot have recourse to the builder by reason of bankruptcy on the part of the builder that there is an administrative relief to the veteran for contingent liability and that the veteran may apply to the Veterans' Administration to be relieved of his contingent liability and that he be reinstated so far as obtaining a new GI loan?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is in a field with which I do not have a great deal of personal familiarity. I am informed that the Administrator has the discretion in circumstances like that to modify or to change the liability of the veteran. However, I have no personal knowledge of cases where that has been done.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I wonder if the chairman has any information on that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is my understanding that the Administrator does have that discretion, but he does not act in cases such as that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In other words, he does have discretion. It was my understanding that in many instances similar to the one I have pointed out where there is no recourse of the veteran to the builder by reason of bankruptcy, and if it has been demonstrated, perhaps, that the Veterans' Administration through lack of inspections, perhaps, and in not forcing the builder to live up to the recognized code, then the Veterans' Administration must assume or take care of the responsibility and can, in turn, relieve the veteran of any contingent liability.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I understand that legally he has the authority to do it, but it has been the policy not to act in cases such as that.

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me in a situation where a veteran made a contract for a house and has been making payments on it, and where the house was appraised at a certain value, and due to defects the house is not worth the money, it is a pretty poor remedy merely to relieve him from part of his liability. What is needed is to make sure that he gets the sort of house that he contracted for. I realize that the veteran and his contractor have the primary responsibility, but it seems to me the Veterans' Administration should be more helpful than they have been in certain instances in making sure that he does not have that sort of loss, due to poor inspection, and irresponsible contractors.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is aware of the severe criticisms that have come to this committee concerning the Veterans' Administration housing section, I would like to compliment the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on taking the action which he has recently taken. I think next year you are going to see the situation improved considerably. The entire committee and the subcommittee—Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. AYRES, Mr. WEAVER, Judge SHUFORD, and Mr. CHRISTOPHER did a fine job last year going all over the country and holding hearings. In most of the cases, they have been able to obtain many corrections so far as the veteran is concerned. I do believe the veterans of the country have failed to meet their responsibilities in buying a home in many cases, but there is no question in my mind that the Veterans' Administration has not in the past few years done what they should have done. But from the action recently taken, I certainly believe there will be some improvement next year.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, there is one additional provision which

is sought to be remedied by this bill. Men who have served in World War II or in Korea and have left the service and have received a GI entitlement and have bought a home, and thereafter have gone back into the service, or have used this entitlement after going back into the service and have then been transferred to another station and are forced to leave the home which they have acquired under the GI bill, under existing provisions of law they cannot sell their home pay off the GI loan, and have their entitlement reinstated so that they can purchase a home at a new station or any new place where they might be sent by the Government under military orders. That is an inequity to the veteran who has gone back into the service, which does not exist as to other veterans in other lines of endeavor. Veterans not reentering the service have a right to have their entitlement reinstated when they are transferred by their company to some other place or when, by reasons over which they do not have control they are forced to some other climate.

The fifth provision of this bill would give to those veterans who have reentered the service the same rights with regard to reinstatement of entitlement, that other veterans have under existing law.

This was the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, offered during committee consideration, in order to correct a long-standing inequity.

That seems to be the five principal conditions with which we have been concerned in connection with the GI ill on home-loan guaranty, and the five proposals which we have advanced in an effort to meet with them and to improve existing conditions.

I want to express my thanks to the staff of the subcommittee, Mr. Jenkins, housing consultant to the committee, and to the Administrator, Mr. Higley, and the Veterans' Affairs personnel who have assisted us in preparing these amendments to existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire, but I shall take very little time now. I am going to vote for the bill.

H. R. 9260 would amend the loan provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in order to provide certain additional benefits to veterans and to insure more effective operation of the loan guaranty program.

In the first place section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act would be amended to provide that veterans of World War II who have property securing a VA loan taken from them by public condemnation, natural hazard or other reasons beyond their control and without fault on their part may have the entitlement which they had used to obtain a loan to secure such property reinstated for use at any time in the future until January 31, 1965. This section would also permit a veteran who is in active service to get a restoration of any entitlement used to purchase a home when he disposes of such home as the result of being transferred under orders of the service department.

A number of sections of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act would be amended by the bill to clarify the fact that determinations as to the appraisal of reasonable value are made by the Administrator. Some uncertainty as to the legal authority of the Administrator to adjust the appraisals of designated appraisers would be resolved by this amendment which would serve to bring the provisions of the law into conformity with existing administrative practice.

Section 504 of the act would be amended to require that a veteran certify, both at the time he applies for a loan to be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration and also at the time such loan is closed, that he occupies or intends to occupy the dwelling to be purchased with the proceeds of the loan as his home. The purpose of this amendment is to emphasize to veterans the requirements of the law with respect to occupancy as experience has shown that many of them were either unaware of, or disregarded, this requirement.

H. R. 9260 would also amend section 509 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to require the Veterans' Administration, on receipt of proper application, to release a veteran from liability to the Government on account of a guaranteed loan when he disposes of residential property to a subsequent purchaser if (1) the loan is current, (2) the subsequent transferee has obligated himself to assume liability for the payment of the balance of the loan, and (3) the transferee qualifies from a credit standpoint to the same extent as if he were a veteran obtaining the loan in the first instance.

The bill would not increase the administrative costs of operation, nor would additional benefit appropriations be required.

At this time I would like to say I sincerely hope that the whittling away of the services of the Veterans' Administration, the taking away of the department is a very reprehensible thing, to my mind, and does not help the veterans in any way. I sincerely hope that everyone present will help to continue the veteran activities as they are now.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank my chairman and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for the masterful way in which they have handled this legislation.

The only thing I would like to add is that this bill does not make it mandatory on the Veterans' Housing Administration to release a veteran when he sells his home, and accept as security the party that buys the home. It just gives them the privilege to do that. If they think the purchaser of this home is a better credit risk, or for any other reason they release the veteran and accept the other one, they have that privilege. It just gives them the privilege to do that if, in their wisdom, they think that is the right thing to do.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I am urging passage of H. R. 9260 because I believe it will help to give us a more practical and workable veterans' home loan program, will prevent certain abuses of that program and will correct inequities which are preventing veterans from receiving the benefits to which they are entitled.

I would like to direct my remarks particularly to the committee amendment, which I proposed during consideration of the bill as the result of information reaching me that quite a number of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict, who are remaining in military service as a career, are now denied the veterans' home loan guarantees they would receive if they were in civilian life.

This amendment deals with restoration of loan guarantee entitlements when a veteran must sell his home and move to another city or area because of a business transfer. This is necessary to provide his family a home in the new area, provided the original loan has been paid off and the guaranty terminated. Under present law the Administrator has the discretion to restore the entitlement. Under current policy a civilian veteran's entitlement is restored if an employer transfers him, but the veteran still in military service is denied reinstatement when the Armed Forces transfers his duty station. This policy has prevented many veterans in military service from using loan guarantee rights, because a military transfer would destroy the entitlement.

The committee has joined in my feeling that this present policy is unfair and inequitable. It penalizes the veteran who continues to serve his country. It is an added reason for trained personnel to leave the military service, weakening our armed strength and increasing costs of training. I can find no reason for such a discriminatory rule.

The amendment would operate to provide the same right to veterans in military service which is now applied as a matter of policy in the cases of civilian veterans. It would not increase the Government's obligation, because original loans would have to be retired before the entitlement would be restored. I believe the Members will want to join in this merited correction of this program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TEAGUE. I have no further requests.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(1) Section 500 (a) is amended by deleting the colon immediately preceding the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and, notwithstanding any other provision of this section to the contrary, an entitlement may be so excluded and restored to the use of any veteran at any time prior to January 31, 1965, for the purpose of obtaining a loan which will be guaranteed or

insured in accordance with the provisions of this title;".

(2) Section 500 (c) is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "Upon making a loan as provided herein, the lender shall forthwith transmit to the Administrator a report thereof in such detail as the Administrator may, from time to time, prescribe."

(3) Section 501 (a) is amended by striking subsection (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the Administrator."

(4) Section 502 (a) is amended by striking out subsection (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(4) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the Administrator."

(5) Section 503 is amended by striking out subsection (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(4) That the price paid or to be paid by the veteran for such property, or for the cost of construction, repairs, or alterations, does not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the Administrator."

(6) Section 503A is amended by striking out the first paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Whoever knowingly makes, effects, or participates in a sale of any property to a veteran for a consideration in excess of the reasonable value of such property as determined by the Administrator shall, if the veterans pay for such property in whole or in part with the proceeds of a loan guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under section 501, 502, or 503 of this title, be liable for three times the amount of such excess consideration irrespective of whether such person has received any part thereof."

(7) Section 504 is amended by adding a new subsection (d) to read as follows: "(d) No loan for the purchase or construction of residential property shall be financed through the assistance of the provisions of this title unless the veteran applicant, at the time that he applies for the loan, and also at the time that the loan is closed, certifies, in such form as may be required by the Administrator, that he intends to occupy the property as his home. No loan for the repair, alteration, or improvement of residential property shall be financed through the assistance of the provisions of this title unless the veteran applicant, at the time that he applies to the lender for the loan, and also at the time that the loan is closed, certifies, in such form as may be required by the Administrator, that he occupies the property as his home. For the purpose of this title the requirement that the veteran recipient of a guaranteed or direct home loan must occupy or intend to occupy the property as his home shall be construed to mean that the veteran as of the date of his certification actually lives in the property personally as his residence or actually intends upon completion of the loan and acquisition of the dwelling unit to move into the property personally within a reasonable time and to utilize such property as his residence."

(8) Section 506 is amended by designating the existing provisions therein as subsection (a) and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows: "(b) Whenever any veteran disposes of residential property securing a guaranteed, insured, or direct loan obtained by him under this title, the Administrator, upon application made by such veteran and by the transferee incident to such disposal, shall issue to such veteran in connection with such disposal a release relieving him of all further liability to the Administrator on account of such loan (including liability for any loss resulting from any default of the transferee or any subsequent purchaser of such property) if the Administrator has determined, after such investigation as he may deem appropriate, that (1) the loan is current, and (2) the purchaser of such property from such veteran (a) has obligated himself by contract to purchase such property and to assume full liability for the repayment of the balance of the loan remaining unpaid, and (b) qualifies from a credit standpoint, to the same extent as if he were a veteran eligible under section 501 (a) for a guaranteed or insured or direct loan in an amount equal to the unpaid balance of the obligation for which he has assumed liability."

(9) Section 507 is amended by striking out subsection (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) The amount of the guaranteed loan does not exceed the reasonable value of the property or business, as determined by the Administrator."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "title;" and insert "title:", and such section 500 (a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'In computing the aggregate amount of guaranty or insurance entitlement available to a veteran under this title, the Administrator shall exclude the amount of guaranty or insurance entitlement previously used for any loan guaranteed or insured under section 501 which has been repaid in full, and with respect to which the real property which served as security for the loan has been disposed of because the veteran, while in the active service, was transferred by the military department with which he was serving.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Page 3, line 18, strike out the word "veterans" and insert the word "veteran."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: On page 5, immediately after line 23, insert:

"(10) Section 501 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, where a contract for the purchase of residential property has been entered into before July 25, 1957, and on that date approval of a loan for the purchase of such property is being processed by the Administrator, then such loan may be guaranteed pursuant to the provisions of this title if such approval is granted and the loan is closed on or before July 25, 1958.'"

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give a year's extension in the event that the loan is actually in process, but all of the details have not been completed. I am quite certain most of the Members know that under existing law the housing program for World War II veterans will expire on July 25, 1957. There is no assurance that it will be continued. I know the chairman of our committee is considering the possibility of holding hearings in regard to the continuation, but until something is definite in that regard I think it is advisable that we should protect ourselves against this rush at the end of the program by giving this extension to the loan applications on file that are supported by a contract to purchase that are in process, but not completed in all details. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The present law reads:

Any loan made by such veteran within 10 years after the termination of the war—

The termination of the war was considered as being July 25, 1947.

It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration interpreted that to mean that veterans' loans must be completed by July 25, 1957.

If this amendment is adopted it means that so long as the application supported by a contract to purchase was filed before July 25, 1957, although the details are not entirely completed, it could still be processed within the following year, but the cutoff date for such applications would be July 25 of next year.

Mr. AYRES. It would provide that so long as his application and contract to purchase was filed before July 25, 1957, he would be entitled to the loan.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. But this amendment would fix an absolute date for filing the application with a sales contract which would be July 25, 1957; and that is the date most veterans believe today is the final date for a loan to be closed.

Mr. AYRES. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think that the amendment can serve a very worthwhile purpose.

I do, however, want to call upon the Committee at this time to give its consideration to the fact that this program is about to expire for millions of American veterans of World War II, and that we do face definitely the problem and the challenge of whether or not we are going to exend the program. My own opinion and my own plan, I know, is to introduce legislation that would provide for an extension; but until such time as that legislation has been acted upon there certainly is none, and I would thank the gentleman from Ohio for a clarification as to how long the Veterans' Administration will continue to process Korean loans under the existing law. I certainly have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. AYRES. I hope when the gentleman introduces legislation, as I understand he contemplates doing, that it will extend the housing provision of the GI bill. We should hold hearings. In my judgment we should decide this year and not next year whether the program is to be continued. If plans are to be made in the housing field we should make that decision before we adjourn this session of Congress.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would certainly agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly and I know I can count on his cooperation in trying to bring that matter to an issue in this session.

Mr. AYRES. The gentleman can count on my cooperation in bringing it to an issue in this session and he can probably count on my cooperation in seeing that the program goes ahead according to schedule.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is at least being helpful in the matter of how long we have to decide that question but we must have some additional leeway and some additional time to decide the question. I appreciate that.

Mr. AYRES. We are going to be confronted with many problems regardless of when the program ends. We ought to face up to our responsibility in this session.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I heartily endorse the gentleman's amendment and I hope very much that the loans will be continued. As I have stated previously, it is a horrible thing to me to watch the attempt to scrap and to quibble away the benefits now administered by the Veterans' Administration. Other departments do not begin to do the job as well and the veterans are not protected. I heartily endorse the gentleman's amendment and I commend the committee for the wonderful work they have done.

Mr. AYRES. I thank the gentlewoman for her endorsement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Veterans' Adminstration, its central office, its regional and district offices, for the splendid job they are doing in connection with loans on real estate for veterans. At the same time, I would like to see this Congress somehow or other emphasize to the Veterans' Administration the need for prompt and proper consideration of applications that have been filed for loans. Oftentimes the veteran himself finds that he must have prompt consideration of his loan in order to do the thing that he must do in finding proper housing for himself and family. Also owners of houses who are selling their homes to veterans oftentimes have to wait an unconscionable length of time for approval by the Veterans' Administration of the various portions of the insured mortage. Owners upon signing an agreement to sell their home to a veteran must take their home off the market and can do nothing about moving themselves until the deal is closed. This delays occupancy by the veteran and complicates many situations still further. Then, too, builders of new homes which are sold to veterans are finding themselves having to pay an excessive amount of interest on construction loans, waiting a very long time to get these various approvals through. This additional cost is passed on to the veteran and results in greater housing costs to be borne by the veteran and his family.

So I hope that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will take all the steps at its disposal to encourage the Veterans' Administration to speed their service and at the same time to guard all of the rights and prerogatives of the veterans and all of the sound mortgage writing principles which must be guarded. I certainly would never advocate speeding mortgage methods at the expense of getting bad mortgages, but I certainly think there are plenty of opportunities where improvement in this service can be made. Perhaps this means that better qualified, more experienced, and increased numbers of personnel should be hired by Veterans' Administration offices throughout the Nation. Veterans and others pay substantial fees for appraisements, inspections, and other services. I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that these fees will more than pay these necessary additional costs and veterans are entitled to better service. Perhaps this also means that better administrative procedures through which many lost motions, unnecessary redtape, and other delays can be eliminated. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that everyone connected with the consideration of home mortgage loans for veterans is trying hard to do a good job and really wants to do a good job, but, I am certain, Mr. Chairman, that a great deal of time and money can be saved and real improvement can be obtained both in the quality and quantity of VA loans by the installation of more business like methods. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Veterans' Administration will continue to improve its operations and that every effort will be made to reach new and higher goals of efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALBERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9260) to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 478, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an analysis of House Resolution 459.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked that House Resolution 459, relating to the General Agreement and Tariffs and Trade and the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation be analyzed by the executive department and questions raised by the resolution answered.

Such an analysis has been prepared within the Departments and transmitted to me by Mr. Robert C. Hill, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, and is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 18, 1956.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MILLS: In accordance with your request, I enclose a memorandum prepared by the Department of State analyzing the provisions of H. Res. 459, relating to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure: Memorandum on provisions of H. Res. 459, relating to GATT and OTC.)

ANALYSIS OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 459, 84TH CONGRESS

The resolution (H. Res. 459) introduced by Representative BAILEY with respect to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation, raises a number of questions with respect to the legal basis for American participation in the general agreement and the effect of congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The present memorandum analyzes and answers these questions.

1. The resolution first raises the question as to the legislative authority for the participation by the United States in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Such legislative authority is contained in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, which specifically authorizes the President to enter into foreign trade agreements for the purpose of expanding American exports. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is such a trade agreement.

2. More specifically, the resolution inquires regarding the source of authority for each article of the general agreement, and whether there are any articles of the agreement which are not based on the authority of the Trade Agreements Act. The Trade Agreements Act authorizes the President to make and secure the commitments contained in each article of the general agreement. The act recites the broad purpose of expanding markets for products of the United States and authorizes action by the President if he finds that measures are burdening and restricting the for-

eign trade of the United States, and that this broad purpose will be promoted thereby. Accordingly, the act specifically authorizes the President to enter into foreign trade agreements without any qualification on the content of such agreements other than that they shall relate to foreign trade. Moreover, the act authorizes the conclusion of such agreements when duties or other import restrictions of the United States or a foreign country are adversely affecting our foreign trade, and authorizes the President to proclaim modifications of duties and other import restrictions, additional restrictions, and the continuance of customs or excise treatment in order to carry out such agreements.

The report of the Ways and Means Committee on the original trade-agreements legislation, which was made a part of the Senate Finance Committee report on the same bill, stated that it was noteworthy that in negotiating with respect to a complex situation relating to trade the President could deal not merely with customs duties but with other import restrictions. The report also emphasized that the authority covered various types of measures for the retardation of trade (73d Cong. 2d sess., H. Rept. 1000, 15 and 16; ibid., S. Rept. 871, 18 and 19).

Secretary of State Hull in appearing before the Ways and Means Committee had emphasized the need for "broad authority to face other countries with their network of ever-increasing devices of every kind and description and name." He submitted for the record a list of devices to which he had referred, including import quotas, license restrictions, exchange controls, clearing agreements, mixing regulations, consular and other administrative fees, marks of origin, and sanitary measures. (Ways and Means Committee (House), reciprocal trade agreements: Hearings on H. R. 8430, pp. 8, 9, 13, and 19 to 21).

The report of the Ways and Means Committee also throws light on the scope of the trade agreements which it was intended the President would enter into under the new legislation. In two places, when discussing the constitutionality of the legislation and when referring to the existing most-favored-nation commitments of the United States, the committee recognized that many agreements relating to trade had been entered into by the President in the past (73d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 1000, pp. 10 and 55; ibid. S. Rept. No. 871, pp. 13 and 18). Various of these earlier agreements had contained provisions relating to the reasonableness of restrictions and fees affecting imports, to export taxes (1891 agreement with Brazil), to sanitary restrictions and statutory rights to retaliate against them (1891 agreement with Germany), to customs and consular regulations, valuation for customs purpose, the review of customs rulings, and import documentation (1907 agreement with Germany), and to most-favored-nation treatment with respect of import and export duties and other charges, of transit, warehousing, and other facilities, and of licensing and import and prohibitions (1924 agreement with Greece). Thus by 1934 the term "trade agreement" had come to mean an agreement covering a wide range of trade controls relating to importation and exportation.

The specific term "duties and other import restrictions" is defined by the Trade Agreements Act itself to include, in addition to rates of duty, the "form of import duties and classification of articles" and "limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importation or imposed for the regulation of imports" (sec. 350 (c) (1)).

The substantive trade undertakings provided for in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade consist of (1) those relating to nondiscriminatory trade treatment (arts. II, XIII, XVII); (2) those relating to national treatment with respect to internal measures affecting imports (art. IV); (3) those relating to tariff concessions (arts. III and XXVIII); (4) those relating to customs administrative matters (arts. V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, and X); (5) those relating to elimination or administration of quantitative and exchange restrictions on trade (arts. XII, XIII, XIV, and XV); (6) those relating to subsidies upon the exportation of goods (art. XVI); and (7) exceptions from these various undertakings (arts. XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXIV, and portions of other articles already cited).

Each of the articles of the General Agreement falls within one or more of the authorizations under the Trade Agreement Act described above. Each is authorized by the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as amended and extended.

3. The resolution inquires as to the extent to which the powers of the proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation can be enlarged, without the approval of Congress, through the exercise of the so-called self-amending power of the General Agreement under Article XXX of that agreement.

There is no self-amending power in the General Agreement. Amendments enter into force only by virtue of acceptance by individual governments. Moreover, no amendment to the General Agreement can have any effect on any country which does not accept the amendment. In other words, it would not be possible for other governments to adopt an amendment and then force that amendment upon the United States.

The participation of the United States in the General Agreement rests upon the authority of the President under the Trade agreements Act. The authority of the President under the Trade Agreements Act does not enable him to accept amendments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which would have the effect of broadening the scope of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, without the approval of the Congress, to include matters other than those which relate to governmental barriers to trade. Specifically, the President could not, under the Trade Agreements Act, accept amendments to the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade on behalf of the United States which would broaden it to include international codes relating to such matters as full employment, private restrictive business practices, economic aid to underdeveloped countries, or commodity control schemes closely regulating international trade and prices of commodities. Agreements such as the International Wheat Agreements of 1949 and 1953, the International Sugar Agreement of 1953, and the Coffee Agreement of 1940 have been approved by the Senate as treaties.

4. The resolution inquires concerning what barriers, if any, would approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation create against the recapture and retention by Congress of its power to regulate foreign commerce. The resolution suggests that this question is asked because of the inclusion in the general agreement of a provision aimed at eliminating import quotas, of a provision for self-amendment, and of provisions incorporating tariff concessions which the parties to that agreement have negotiated.

The answer to this is that the Congress is constitutionally free now, and would remain constitutionally free after approval of H. R. 5550, to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States. It has chosen to exercise a portion of this power by delegating limited authority to the President to enter into trade agreements, one of which is the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. That agreement, like the 29 bilateral trade agreements entered into pursuant to the authority of the Trade Agreements Act, record tariff concessions and limit the use of import quotas on foreign trade. The provisions of the general agreement realting to quotas are of special importance to American export trade. Without them our agriculture, industry, and labor occupied in the production of goods for export would not be adequately safeguarded. Nevertheless, the Congress is free at any time, if it so chooses, to enact legislation affecting imports into or exports from the United States and any such legislation would have the force of law in this country, notwithstanding the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This freedom would remain unaffected by enactment of H. R. 5550 and subsequent United States participation in the OTC.

5. The question is raised as to the extent to which the general agreement could be carried out "independently of" any reservations attached to membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, the extent to which such reservations must be compensated for by concessions to other countries, and the extent to which waivers permitting reservations may be withdrawn.

The concept of a reservation to an international agreement is that of a counteroffer, which must be agreed to by the other party or parties before any agreement is reached with such party or parties. Once it has been agreed to, the reservation becomes a part of the contract between the country making it and the countries which have agreed to it. Of course we cannot, by ourselves, modify the general agreement pursuant to a reservation, but we could make agreement by other countries to a reservation affecting our obligations under the general agreement a condition of our acceptance of the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation. By its terms, the OTC Agreement cannot enter into force without its acceptance by the United States, and consequently the United States could make agreement to such a reservation a condition for the establishment of the organization.

If the United States should attach to its acceptance of the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation a reservation which would reduce our obligations under the general agreement, it would be quite natural for other countries to attach comparable reservations, with the result that the price for obtaining agreement to our reservation might be that we would have to accept, as a condition to the acceptance of our reservation by others, reservations of other countries adversely affecting our benefits under the general agreement. Such a situation is basic to international bargaining.

There has never been any attempt to withdraw a waiver granted under the general agreement. Many waivers contain a time limitation or a statement of circumstances under which they might be reexamined. It would be the position of this Government, if the question should ever arise, that no waiver may be withdrawn, without the consent of the country to which it was granted, except in accordance with the terms of the waiver itself. The waiver accorded to the United States with respect to import restrictions and fees on agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, contains no time limitation.

6. The resolution inquires as to the extent to which the provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade bind a future Congress against the exercise of its constitutional authority to determine the policies that are to govern our foreign trade and the level of our import duties.

The Congress has exercised its constitutional authority, through the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act, authorizing the President to enter into trade agreements containing provisions relating to duties and other import restrictions. The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is such an agreement. Neverthless, the Congress is constitutionally free to adopt legislation which would nullify the effect of any international agreements entered into by the United States. The constitutional power of the Congress has not been, and cannot be, taken away.

Consequently there is no basis for concluding that the general agreement deprives Congress, whether the present Congress or a future Congress, from exercising its constitutional authority to determine our trade policies.

7. The resolution lists many provisions of our law, such as the escape clause of sections 6 and 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, the national security provisions of our trade agreements legislation, valuation on the basis of American selling price, the Antidumping Act, and the Buy American Act (all of which are discussed below), and asks to what extent the general agreement is in conflict with them, and to what extent, if any, membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would deter or bar action by the United States toward the enforcement of these statutes.

The following are the domestic laws referred to in the resolution together with a statement as to whether the general agreement is in conflict with them:

(a) Escape-clause provisions of Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. The escape clause in article XIX of the general agreement would permit any action required or appropriate under the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

(b) Action imposing fees or quotas to protect agricultural programs under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. Action taken under this section would come within either the exception for agricultural quotas in article XI, paragraph 2 (c) of the general agreement or under the section 22 waiver granted to the United States.

(c) National security provision in section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. Depending on the circumstances, either the escape clause in article XIX, the conservation exception in article XX (g), or the security exception in article XXI, would enable action to be taken under this legislation without involving conflict with United States obligations under the general agreement.

(d) American selling price and other valuation provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. There is no conflict between the American selling price and other valuation provisions which do not conform with article VII of the general agreement, since they come within the exception in the protocol of provisional application for legislation existing on October 30, 1947.

(e) Antidumping Act. The antidumping provisions of article VI of the general agreement are consistent with the Antidumping Act.

(f) Buy American Act. There is nothing in the general agreement inconsistent with the Buy American Act. Article IV, paragraph 8 (a) excepts from the national treatment provisions of that article procurement by Government agencies.

(g) Fifty-fifty shipping provisions of cargo preference law. The general agreement contains no provisions relating to shipping.

(h) Mixing regulations of the Rubber Act of 1948. Article IV paragraph 6 permits mixing regulations no more restrictive of imports than those existing on a date shortly after the close of the war. A note to this article permits the imposition of comparable restrictions on imports to implement such a mixing requirement. Article XXI would prevent the general agreement from conflicting with the imposition of more stringent mixing regulations in case of war or international emergency, and article XX (j) would similarly apply to such regulations imposed in short supply situations. Consequently, there is no inconsistency between this legislation and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

(i) Export subsidies legislation. The provisions of article XVI relating to export subsidies on agricultural products reflect the policy applied by the United States in carrying out legislation for the subsidization of exports of such products. The provisions relating to export subsidy on other products do not prevent the imposition of subsidies existing in 1955.

Consequently, there is no conflict between the general agreement and any of the legislation referred to in the resolution.

Membership of the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would have no effect on any of these legislative measures relating to foreign trade, or on any other trade legislation of the United States, or on the relationship of the general agreement to any such legislation.

8. The resolution asks, how did the contracting parties of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade acquire the power to grant to the United States a waiver in order that we might continue in effect our import quotas on agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Agricultural import quotas established by the United States are made effective pursuant to American law, and the contracting parties to the general agreement have no power to set aside or modify the application or enforcement of such quotas.

The waiver was granted not in order to empower the United States to apply these quotas but in order to remove an inconsistency between the quotas and obligations which the United States had, by voluntary action, earlier assumed under the general agreement. The authority of the contracting parties to the general agreement to waive obligations is not presumed or assumed, as implied in the House Resolution 459. It is explicitly provided for in article XXV of the general agreement and would be transferred to the OTC in accordance with article 13 of the OTC agreement.

The waiver provisions of the general agreement and of the OTC were included on the initiative and insistence of the United States and are a valuable safeguard to American industry, labor, and agriculture. To suggest that these waiver provisions should not be in the general agreement or in the OTC is like suggesting that our trade agreements should not contain an escape clause comparable to the escape clause in our trade agreements legislation.

9. The resolution asks two questions about the stated objectives and purposes of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

It is asked first, how may these objectives conflict, upon implementation, with the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate foreign commerce and to establish and adjust tariff rates.

The stated purposes and objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Organization for Trade Cooperation do not conflict with the Trade Agreements Act. Furthermore, these stated purposes and objectives neither are nor can be a source of authority in the President with respect to matters going beyond the authority explicitly given to him by the Congress in the Trade Agreements Act.

The second part of this question is, to what extent would the Organization for Trade Cooperation, if established, operate to carry into effect these objectives and purposes? The Organization for Trade Cooperation could not carry into effect, insofar as the United States is concerned, any measures affecting the regulation of the foreign commerce of the United States without the express consent and approval of the United States. As has been explained above, the authority of the President in this field is based upon the authority granted to him by Congress under the Trade Agreements Act. Congress, therefore, is ultimately in control. Moreover, no amendment to the Organization for Trade Cooperation could apply to the United States unless it were accepted by the United States.

10. Finally, the resolution inquires, to what extent would approval by the Congress of the United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation ratify the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade? Congressional approval of the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation would not ratify or enact the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is not before the Congress for approval. It is a trade agreement, like the 29 bilateral trade agreements, entered into by the President pursuant to the authority granted to him by the Congress and within limits established by the Congress. Such trade agreements are not submitted to Congress for its approval or ratification. To do so would be to nullify the whole purpose of the Trade Agreements Act. Accordingly, enactment of H. R. 5550 cannot have the effect of enacting or ratifying the trade provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

APRIL 18, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the Department of State at my request has supplied a reply to the suggestion that the functions of OTC may be broadened through amendment of GATT, which follows:

REPLY TO SUGGESTION THAT FUNCTIONS OF OTC MAY BE BROADENED THROUGH AMENDMENT OF GATT

H. R. 5550 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means provides that "Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment to the Agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation."

OTC is intended to be an organization whose functions will be limited solely to international trade, its major responsibility being the administration of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The purpose of the provisions of H. R. 5550 quoted above is to make sure that this limited responsibility of the OTC will not be broadened, without the approval of the Congress, to cover wide responsibilities in the international economic field, such as codes relating to full employment, investment and various types of direct assistance for economic development, private restrictive business practices and commodity control schemes regulating international trade and prices. In short, the purpose of this provision is to assure that the OTC will not become an organization such as the International Trade Organization, which was once proposed, unless the Congress approves such action.

Now it is being suggested in some quarters that this limitation in H. R. 5550 could be circumvented by the President through the simple expedient of amending the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In other words, it is being suggested that the President could literally change the nature of the proposed OTC by amending the General Agreement so as to give to the OTC these broad functions not now contemplated.

This is a groundless fear.

First, no amendment to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade can have any application to the United States unless the United States accepts that amendment. It would not be possible, therefore, for other governments to broaden the OTC by an amendment to the GATT and then force that amendment on the United States against its will.

Secondly, United States participation in the General Agreement is based upon the authority contained in the Trade Agreements Act. That act relates solely to governmental barriers to trade. It does not authorize the President to accept amendments to the General Agreement with respect to matters relat-

ing to codes on full employment, investment, private restrictive business practices, commodity control schemes and the other broad provisions of the old ITO charter.

There is no basis for the fear, therefore, that in approving OTC we shall be setting in motion a project to recreate the old ITO without the approval of the Congress.

EXISTING AUTHORITY FOR A SOIL BANK

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in January of this year, right after the President's farm message I pointed out to the departmental officials that authority for the soil bank and other soil-conservation measures already existed under present law. On February 2, 1956, in a speech to the Congress I pointed out once again that this authority already existed. The President's veto message called on the leadership of the Congress to act expeditiously to give him a soil bank. Our committee met and reported out an appropriation bill which I trust will come up in the next 2 or 3 days.

As soon as that action was taken, there was much discussion about what is the existing law. Therefore I am putting in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the existing law which will show the broad authority which the present Secretary of Agriculture has to carry out such a program.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman cite legal authority for his position—decisions of a Federal court which indicates that this is the law?

Mr. WHITTEN. I quote the law itself which I think is the best way to do it. I shall put in the RECORD the law itself which, after all, is the best evidence of what the law is.

I. SOIL-BANK AUTHORIZATION, APPROPRIATION NOT LIMITED

Under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized until January 1, 1957, and I quote:

Section 1, subsection (2): To carry out preventative measures including, but not limited to * * * methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation and changes in the use of land;

Section 2 subsection (b): On any land upon obtaining proper consent or the necessary rights or interests in such land;

Subsection 3: To cooperate or enter into agreements with or to furnish financial aid to * * * any person, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary;

Section 3: As a condition to extending of any benefits under this act * * * the Secretary of Agriculture may insofar as he may deem necessary for the purpose of this act require:

Subsection (2): Agreements or covenants as to the permanent use of such lands. * * *

Section 6: There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

II. CONSERVATION PAYMENT PROGRAM APPROPRIATION FOR ANY FISCAL YEAR LIMITED TO $500,000,000

The Secretary of Agriculture, on such terms and conditions as he may require, is authorized to secure:

(1) preservation and improvement of soil fertility; (2) promotion of the economic use and conservation of land; (3) diminution of exploitation and wasteful and unscientific use of national soil resources; (4) the protection of rivers and harbors against the results of soil erosion in aid of maintaining the navigability of waters and water courses and in aid of flood control; and (5) reestablishment, at as rapid a rate as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be practicable and in the general public interest, of the ratio between the purchasing power of the net income per person on farms and that of the income per person not on farms that prevailed during the 5-year period August 1909–July 1914. * * *

by making payments or grants of other aid to agricultural producers, including tenants and sharecroppers, in amounts determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable. * * *

The Secretary may make payments in advance of determination of performance, to persons who fill purchase orders covering approved conservation materials.

Section 8, subsection (b):

Appropriations are authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials or any soil terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary.

The Secretary "shall in every practical manner protect the interest of small producers." Section 8, subsection (b).

(d) Any payment or grant of aid made under subsection (b) shall be conditioned upon the utilization of the land, with respect to which such payment is made, in conformity with farming practices which the Secretary finds tend to effectuate any one or more of the purposes specified in clause (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of section 7 (a).

Any payment made under subsection (b) with respect to any farm (except for lands which the Secretary determines should not be utilized for the harvesting of crops but should be permanently used for grazing purposes only) shall, if the number of cows kept on such farm, and in the county in which such farm is located, for the production of milk or products thereof (for market), exceeds the normal number of such cows, be further conditioned upon the utilization of the land, with respect to which such payment is made, so that soil-building and soil-conserving crops planted or produced on an acreage equal to the land normally used for the production of soil-depleting crops, but, as a condition of such payment, not permitted to be so used, shall be used for the purpose of building and conserving the fertility of the soil, or for the production of agricultural commodities to be consumed on the farm, and not for market.

A payment which may be made to a farmer under this section, may be assigned, without discount, by him in writing as security for cash or advances to finance making a crop.

Subsection (g):

Section 12 (a): Whenever the Secretary finds that the exercise of the powers conferred in this section will tend to carry out the purpose specified in clause (5) of section 7 (a), or will tend to provide for and maintain a continuous and stable supply of agricultural commodities adequate to meet consumer demand at prices fair to both producers and consumers, or both, he shall use such part as he deems necessary of the sums appropriated to carry out this act for the expansion of domestic and foreign markets or for seeking new or additional markets for agricultural commodities or the products thereof or for the removal or disposition of surpluses of such commodities or the products thereof (16 USC 590 (a)).

Section 15:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of sections 7 and 8 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year not exceeding $500 million.

Under such limitation this bill would provide $250 million for the remainder of this fiscal year, which together with amount authorized for the next fiscal year would make a total available of $750 million for the remainder of this calendar year. If funds are obligated within this year, payments could be made into calendar year 1957. The balance of the $1.2 billion would be available for use under the unlimited authority carried in sections 1–5 of the act, part I hereof.

I pointed these statutes out to officials of the Department of Agriculture in January, this year, immediately after the President's farm message to the Congress on January 9, 1956, when he asked for a soil bank.

On February 2, 1956, in a speech in the House of Representatives, appearing at pages 1914–1918 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out again that such authority already existed.

The President, in his veto message, said the following:

I now request Congress to pass a straight soil-bank bill as promptly as possible. It should be in operation before fall seeding for next year's crops. It is vital that we get the soil bank authorized in this session of the Congress. There is general agreement on it. I am ready to sign a sound Soil Bank Act as soon as Congress sends it to me. That can be accomplished in a very few days if the leadership in Congress will undertake the task.

In our report we replied:

Such a statement is surprising since the President has had such authority throughout the period of his administration.

Now we will find out who is for the soil bank and for conservaiton as well as who is not.

SURVIVAL FOOD

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide a nationwide network of survival food depots.

This bill, by establishing food depots for possible evacuees from target areas, would not only solve a serious problem in civil defense, but would also put to

use substantial quantities of surplus farm foods.

The Civil Defense Administration has already designated 70 cities as critical target areas in the United States where enemy attacks might be centered. No provisions, however, have been made to assure that there will be sufficient supplies of food and water in the dispersal areas to which these evacuees would be sent. Since nearly 68 million people are concentrated in the 70 target cities, this is a problem of some magnitude.

The merits of survival food depots were first called to my attention by the editors of the Minnesota Farmer, an independent publication which serves the area I represent, and as ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, I must confess that the possibility of the use of substantial quantities of our surplus farm foods in this program is also of great interest to me.

The bill which I have introduced today recognizes the importance of preserving the lives of large numbers of the civilian population in case of an enemy attack, and provides for the location in strategic areas of survival food depots. First, for the feeding of evacuees who would be required to leave heavily populated target areas and disperse into areas where food supplies would be inadequate; and, second, for the feeding of those already living in such dispersal areas whose normal food supply channels might be cut off by the attack.

To administrate this program, this bill provides for an Emergency Food Board to be composed of the Federal Civil Defense Administrator as Chairman, and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Agriculture.

This Board would direct such studies as necessary to determine which cities should be designated as target areas; the fallout area for each of the designated cities; the probable number of evacuees from each city; and the dispersal areas which would best serve each city.

The bill calls for survival food depots in each dispersal area to be equipped with suitable warehouses, refrigeration, and other necessary facilities, and to be stocked with food. Adequate water supplies shall be provided, and arrangements shall be made for the use of existing facilities for the preparation of the food.

The food stocks would be sufficient in quantity and type to meet the nutritional requirements of the anticipated number of evacuees, and would be purchased wherever possible from surplus stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation or from any other support program authorized by law.

Under this bill, food would be stored in conditions which would readily permit its conversion into food for human consumption. Each depot would contain flour milled from surplus wheat, butter from surplus milk, powdered milk, canned meats, fruit juices, fruits, vegetables, and other foods canned or processed in a suitable form for storage. The bill also provides for the transfer of stocks to prevent spoilage.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend careful consideration of this proposed legislation. I believe such a program would not only be vital to the civil-defense program, but would also put to a useful purpose the agricultural surpluses now depressing farm prices.

I am including in these remarks an editorial from the Minnesota Farmer, of Minneapolis, Minn. The editors of this farm publication were the originators of the survival-food plan which has been used as the basis for the legislation which I am introducing today.

SURVIVAL FOOD: A PLACE FOR FARM SURPLUS

Emergency food banks or food kits for use by civil defense could help solve the farm-surplus problem.

Surplus farm commodities could be processed into food and located in relief areas for use by evacuees of a target city. Specially processed survival kits could be distributed as part of civil defense preparations for the families who would be evacuated from target areas in an emergency. Such advance preparations would ease the problem of feeding a population displaced by real or threatened enemy attack.

Would feeding emergency evacuees be a problem? Suppose the metropolitan Minneapolis-St. Paul area were evacuated in the face of enemy attack? Evacuation would displace some 1 million persons into relief areas in the State. Food stocks of these rural communities would soon evaporate. Hope it never happens, but if the Twin City area were actually destroyed, with the cities would go a major food processing center and large stocks of basic food. Other great commercial food warehouses and processing plants of America are in critical target areas.

The unpleasant truth is that today's farm surplus in its present form, is not today's emergency food. If war comes to the world again, the fact must be faced that American cities will be subject to attack with weapons of obliteration. The stocks of farm commodities, the raw material of food, which served well in other wars, cannot be counted on as long as it is possible in an instant to wipe out food-processing centers.

America has great stocks of farm commodities which are being blamed for low-farm prices. But much of this large surplus is not food that can be readily eaten. Some surplus could never be made into food. Some stored grain for example, has deteriorated in storage to the point where it is not fit to make into food. The storage bill for farm surplus is running a good $1 million a day.

THERE IS A NEED

True, even specially packaged survival food might in time, become unfit, but the cost of maintaining usable supplies could be split between civil defense and the farm program. Providing survival kits to families in designated target areas would ease the necessity for large food warehouses.

Based on appeals by American leaders, providing survival food stocks or kits would not be overemphasizing the threat of war or surprise attack. In his appeal to Congress for a stepped up civil defense program, Administrator Val Peterson charged that some of his work "has been starved," and that the "small amount of money we have spent for research to save the lives of American people is shameful to contemplate."

The Civil Defense Administration has named 70 critical target areas in the United States and there are nearly 68 million people in those areas. If they become evacuees they will be moved to relief areas where they must be sheltered and fed under emergency conditions.

President Eisenhower has said that this is an age of peril. There is a constant threat of death and destruction because of the rapid development of atomic and hydrogen bombs and of planes and missiles to deliver them. Defense leaders have asked the Nation to prepare for emergencies. A ground observer warning net is being set up to supplement radar in watching the skies.

"Peace" statements by Russia's leaders cannot be taken seriously because of the basic conflict between democracy and communism.

IT CAN BE DONE

Complete plans for emergency food can and should be part of overall civil defense plans. The redtape can be cut. The administrative machinery exists to distribute surplus food to distressed areas. This country stands ready to make surplus supplies available to peoples of Western Europe, suffering from the worst winter in decades. The United States Department of Agriculture has been delegated authority to provide food for civil defense. Under Secretary of Agriculture, True Morse, represents his Department on the Civil Defense Board. Farm surpluses can be released for processing into survival food stocks or food kits if the agencies act.

Because of their experience in packaging emergency foods during World War II, this publication asked executives of Doughboy Industries, New Richmond, Wis., about the possibilities of food preparation for civil defense use.

E. J. Cashman, Doughboy president, confirmed that such a plan was feasible. His firm set up processing, packaging, and shipping procedures for rations and emergency food during World War II. Dehydrated soups and other foods packaged by Doughboy were distributed to Allies of the United States through the United Relief Administration. The firm also packaged survival kits for men in the Air Force. Today, Doughboy engineers and manufacturers heat sealing units and packaging equipment used by the Government. Mr. Cashman believes that a survival food plan would be frankly facing facts. "The farm surplus problem is a serious one and so is the question of emergency food supplies for our defense programs," he said. "This plan could ease pressure for both civil defense and the farm surplus problem."

The Minnesota Farmer also asked Val Peterson, Federal Civil Defense Administrator, to comment on the idea of converting some farm surplus commodities into emergency food. He believes a year's supply of basic foods, stored properly as a wartime emergency measure, makes sense from a civil defense standpoint. "The need is more apparent," he said, "when one considers that the great commercial food warehouses and processing plants of America are generally in critical target areas. These warehouses would be gone if an attack should occur and then it would not be long before the shelves of all the grocery stores would be completely bare. Bulk food supplies that are on hand now represent a valuable asset, but it would be ideal to store processed foods or something in the nature of Armed Forces C or K rations."

What about costs of preparing emergency food and storing it properly or distributing it as family survival kits? First, if civil defense plans are to be complete in face of what is known about atomic war, some processed food must be stored in relief areas as insurance. Second, processing farm commodities would reduce costs of storing them. Third, it could be even more costly to try and transport large supplies of emergency food through the terrible confusion of evacuation. Moving the population from designated target areas will be probably the biggest mass transportation job ever undertaken in America. It may have to be done with facilities crippled by destruction of transportation centers.

Because turning farm surplus into survival food would help solve two major economic and social problems faced by America today, the long-range cost could very well be small.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?

The Minnesota Farmer is presenting the survival food idea in the belief that free discussion leads to more correct solution of problems. Readers are invited to comment for publication on all aspects of this proposal. Address your letters to the editor, Minnesota Farmer, Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis 1, Minn. A selection of letters received by March 20 will be published in the April issue.

INVESTIGATION OF GROWTH OF COMMUNISM IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's edition of the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger contained the following forceful and important statement which merits attention and action by the House:

IT'S TIME SOMETHING WAS DONE

Two witnesses have put the finger on the chief of the Soviet U. N. delegation as the mastermind behind the virtual kidnaping of five Russian seamen from their sanctuary here by Soviet secret agents 2 weeks ago.

This testimony, shocking as it is, only adds to the great body of evidence showing the flagrant abuses of their privileged position which can be charged to Communist diplomats in this country. Ever since the late President Roosevelt officially recognized the Soviet Union more than 20 years ago, the Embassies and consular offices of Russia and its satellites have been known headquarters for Communist espionage and other subversive activities.

The mysterious and strangely unchallenged kidnaping of the five Russian sailors is not a unique activity. It has been done before. Perhaps the most publicized case was the attempt to kidnap Soviet schoolteacher Oksana Kasenkina in 1948. This brazen act was foiled only because that brave woman preferred possible death to return to Communist Russia and hurled herself out a third-story window of the Russian consulate in New York to escape her captors.

Now, once again, the sinister activities of Soviet diplomats here has been brought to light. It is an old, but still shocking story.

The only really surprising thing about it is the fact that nothing has ever been done about it.

In the 2d session of the 83d Congress, I introduced House Resolution 574 and in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I reintroduced that resolution as House Resolution 59. My colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. DORN, New York, introduced identical resolutions. Each resolution called for the appointment of a special committee to investigate, first, the ways in which and the extent to which actions of the Government of the United States, including its recognition of the Soviet Government, have contributed or may contribute to the growth of communism or the spread of communistic influence in this country; and, second, whether or not, and if so, to what extent the Charter of the United Nations and the privileges and immunities extended to its members and employees have contributed or may contribute to the growth of communism or the spread of communistic influence in this country. House Resolution 574 was heard by the Rules Committee in July 1954 and House Resolution 59 was heard by the Rules Committee in January 1955. There was no action by the committee in either case.

I did not understand then and I do not understand now why the committees refused to permit the House to vote upon the resolution. The virtual kidnaping discussed in the editorial above presents a new and startling reason why there should be an immediate investigation of the sort contemplated by the resolution.

There are still more than 22,000 active Communist workers known to be in this country. The various intelligence officers know about them but must keep their information secret. The public should have that knowledge and the way to bring that about is to pass House Resolution 59. I am informed that no other committee is investigating in this field.

I am writing today to the chairman of the Rules Committee urging that the resolution be brought to the floor.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in considering the tremendous responsibilities of the Federal Government in providing for the defense of our Nation, there is a tendency to limit our thinking to the armed services almost to the exclusion of what was aptly described in wartime as our fourth arm of defense, the American merchant marine. If we remember the vital and sometimes decisive role played time and again by the merchant marine in times of war, we are forced to realize that the Nation cannot risk this defense planning weakness.

Last week I introduced H. R. 10560, a bill which I believe will help meet this situation. It is designed to require a yearly survey by the chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of our national shipbuilding and repair capabilities and capacities. Due to a lack of work, this industry has been made to retrench during most of the postwar period to a critical level. Facilities are decaying where they cannot be diverted to allied fields of production and the absolutely vital nucleus of skilled shipyard personnel is being lost to more active industries. These are losses which cannot be recouped overnight in the event of an emergency. Time—an increasingly precious commodity in defense planning—will be all that can make up for any present lack of foresight we display.

In order to meet the preparedness standards which maritime history indicates are necessary, we need the periodic and comprehensive information on our existing shipyard capability which the Chairman of the Maritime Board would provide under the terms of my legislation. By amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to require surveys on a yearly basis, the Federal Government will be assured of a regular flow of shipyard information. Based on this data, the Congress and the Maritime Administration can administer the merchant ship replacement program, now being undertaken, in such a manner as to produce maximum defense value for the dollars expended.

Immediate support for this legislation was demonstrated by 17 Congressmen who have introduced companion bills. These Members represent Atlantic, Gulf, and Great Lakes States, as well as my own Pacific coast. Such a broad basis of support gives me real hope that action can be taken on this matter by this Congress, and I should like to invite others of our colleagues who are interested in the problem to join in this undertaking. I sincerely hope that this or similar legislation will be enacted before this Congress adjourns.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 8, section 1106 (a), United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Member on the part of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mr. KEATING.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill aimed at helping a portion of the American economy which is in desperate straits despite the apparent prosperity enjoyed by others of our Nation. That is the small business which is worse off now than at any time since 1929.

Since 1952 General Motors Corp.'s profits are up 136 percent and United States Steel's profits are up 178 percent. But while big business profits generally are up about 46 percent, small business profits have dropped about 66 percent.

Small businesses face little chance of surviving even in these relatively prosperous times. I shudder to think what would happen to them in the event of a depression. Of 9 million firms which have been established or purchased between 1944 and 1955, 7.8 million have since been sold, reorganized, or liquidated.

Statistics released by the Department of Commerce show that if a citizen starts or purchases a small business today he has only a 50–50 chance of lasting 2 years. Chances that such a new business will last 4 years drop to 1 out of 3; and chances of the business surviving 10 years drop to 1 in 10. In spite of a huge population increase of on the order of 4 million people since 1952, the number

of firms engaged in business has remained static at about 4.2 million, which means that the birth rate and death rate of new businesses is almost exactly equal, a fact which is the cause of much justifiable concern.

No matter how you put these statistics they show clearly the very huge difficulty faced by small business under the administration's favoritism toward industrial giants.

The rate of business failures is 42 out of every 10,000 firms in existence under this administration. The rate of business failures over the 10 years previous to the present administration was only 20 per 10,000 firms, a rate of less than half that under this administration. This is in excess of the business failure rate for the 20-year period from 1932 to 1952 which included much of the great depression. Almost without exception these failures were small-business failures. Substantially over 90 percent of the failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet involved total liabilities under $100,000.

In 1954 and 1955 about 11,000 businesses failed per year. In 1947, for comparison, only 3,500 went under. An even more appalling statistic released by the Administrator of the Federal courts is that there were approximately 65,000 bankruptcies in 1955 and that 75,000 bankruptcies are anticipated in 1956. According to him, "This would be the highest number of bankruptcies recorded in the history of the country."

Another criterion which demonstrates the need for relief to small business is given in the chart below which shows earnings for two classes of corporations, small ones whose assets were below $250,000, and large ones whose assets were above $100 million. For comparison, I start with the last year of the Democratic administration, 1952. The chart shows the percentage rate of return on investment.

	Small corporations, assets less than $250,000	Large corporations, assets over $100 million
	Percent	*Percent*
1952	9.3	11.8
1953	6.8	12.1
1954	3.2	12.1
1955 (1st 3 quarters only)	6.4	14.1

These figures clearly show that the economic climate is such that it favors giantism in business and industry. Business recognizes this fact by many mergers to bigger and bigger corporation.

For example, Studebaker and Packard, once great in the automobile industry had to unite to remain in business under the fierce competition of the larger firms. In like manner the original components of American Motors, Nash-Kelvinator and Hudson had to combine to protect themselves. For further proof, in 1952 corporations with assets over $100 million had 52 percent of all manufacturing assets, by the middle of 1955 such corporations had 57 percent of all manufacturing assets. It is not inconceivable that if unchecked for 20 years this trend will result in complete domination of business by corporations.

Sound legal opinion has held that bigness alone is not sufficient basis for Federal antitrust action. This bill will result in substantial benefits to the economy by giving strong inducement against further mergers by the giants of industry and stimulation of small business by tax relief. One can hope that the effect might even be to induce giants of industry to voluntarily split up into businesses more compatible with the traditional concept of free American competition, and less like the alien concept of massive cartels and trusts which control the whole economy of a country or continent.

It is particularly of concern to the smaller businessman that there have been no tax incentives to small business of note since the present administration took office in 1952. Big business on the other hand received such favorable tax treatment in the Republican 83d Congress, that it amounted to tax favoritism. This favoritism has been perpetuated by the way the tax laws are administered by the present officers of the Treasury Department. The laws passed under that Congress included the accelerated depreciation allowance which saved large firms $1.6 billion per year and the repeal of the excess-profits tax which saved big business $2 billion per year. Curiously, both of these big business benefits were supported by small business, which got only the leavings.

Carry-forward and carry-back provisions of the current law are used to further foster giantism. Often one of the large corporations will take over one of the sick, smaller industries only for the purposes of using the losses of the other corporation to offset past or future income.

One particularly interesting feature of my bill is that it offers another substantial advantage to the small corporations with less than $50,000 per year income. In the past, such corporations have found it advantageous to use the lower 22 percent regular rate earings, a thing which larger corporations may not do.

My bill will help small business in its present straits. It reduces the normal corporate tax rate from 30 percent of income to 22 percent, and raises the breaking point for the application of the surtax to $50,000 from the present $25,000. The surtax on income above the $50,000 breaking point is raised to 32 percent.

Revenue estimates based on the level of profits before taxes for the first half of 1955 indicate that there could be a loss to the Treasury on the order of $150 million according to the Department of Commerce.

It would now appear that any revenue estimate based upon such figures would be very low according to the Council of Economic Advisors, and according to recent glowing pronouncements by the Secretary of Commerce. Probably the actual loss to the Federal Government will be small or nonexistent. It is not inconceivable that there might be a profit to the Treasury under present conditions. This is a matter which the Ways and Means Committee will consider in its scrutiny of this bill. If the committee should find the loss would actually exist, in spite of recent changes in the corporate earnings picture, then it could revise upward the figure of 32 percent to 32½ percent or 33 percent to prevent any weakening of the Treasury's economic position.

Comparison of proposed corporate rates with those under present law

Income subject to both normal tax and surtax	Tax under proposal	Tax under present law	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$1,100	$1,500	−$400	−26.7
$10,000	2,200	3,000	−800	−26.7
$15,000	3,300	4,500	−1,200	−26.7
$20,000	4,400	6,000	−1,600	−26.7
$25,000	5,500	7,500	−2,000	−26.7
$35,000	7,700	12,700	−5,000	−39.4
$50,000	11,000	20,500	−9,500	−46.3
$60,000	16,400	25,700	−9,300	−36.2
$75,000	24,500	33,500	−9,000	−26.9
$100,000	38,000	46,500	−8,500	−18.3
$250,000	119,000	124,500	−5,500	−4.4
$500,000	254,000	254,500	−500	−.2
$525,000	267,500	267,500		
$1,000,000	524,000	514,500	+9,500	+1.8
$5,000,000	2,684,000	2,594,500	+89,500	+3.4
$10,000,000	5,384,000	5,194,500	+189,500	+3.6
$100,000,000	53,984,000	51,994,500	+1,989,500	+3.8

According to the above table, it can be seen that corporations earning less than $525,000 will receive a tax cut of increasingly large proportions. And businesses earning less than $75,000 per year will not receive less than 26.7 percent cut in taxes. To accomplish this, businesses earning above $525,000 will pay slightly increased taxes on a graduated scale.

I have attempted to discover whether this bill would encourage a fictional splitting of a large corporation into a number of smaller corporations for tax purposes only.

Experience indicates there are strong inducements present for filing a consolidated return under present law which would remain unchanged under my bill. It is my feeling that the Ways and Means Committee should and would study that aspect of the matter, and an amendment to limit this aspect of the problem should be a simple matter if the committee deemed it necessary.

I am well satisfied that this is a good bill, which will serve the people and business of this country. I urge early and favorable consideration of it.

THIS IS THE AGE OF POLITICAL, NOT MILITARY, CONFLICT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I shall speak on a subject of vital concern to all of us in the present world situation. By this I mean our capability for fighting to a successful finish the present struggle between two competing systems of government, the contest between democracy and communism, between the free world and the vast areas controlled directly or indirectly by the Soviet Union. In the last few months it has become increasingly clear that this contest between competing systems very likely will be won in the mind of men by means of political warfare and not by actual military conflict.

What does the term political warfare mean? It has been applied to a wide

range of essentially nonmilitary instruments of foreign policy. For practical purposes these include political and economic pressure, forceful action through such agencies as the United Nations and other international organizations, and, on the part of the Soviet Union, the manipulation and control of the Communist Party and front-organizations in a number of countries. In practice, the use of all these components has been accompanied by a broad range of informational or propaganda activities, ranging from straight news services and cultural relations programs to the most scurrilous forms of propaganda and rumor-mongering. In time of war, military establishments enter the political warfare field with elaborate organizations which produce and deliver messages for both the enemy soldier and civilians aimed at lowering morale, inducting desertion and defection, and, if possible, mutiny and revolution. This activity is called military or combat psychological warfare. In a word, such psychological operations are an ally of diplomacy in peacetime, a valuable auxiliary to military force in time of war, and a useful weapon or instrument of policy in both situations.

Now what does all this mean in the present international situation? Before that question can be answered, we must first take a look at the outstanding facts of the situation.

The end of World War II, when the German armies were defeated and the United States forces were hastily brought home and demobilized, left an enormous power vacuum in Central and Western Europe. The story of how the Soviet Union, in cynical violation of its solemn treaty pledges moved into these areas, and one by one seized the satellite countries, is too familiar to need repeating here. It was this Soviet threat, first to Greece and Turkey, then to Western Europe, with the seizure of Czechoslovakia, that called into being the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan and finally NATO, the alliance of our free world partners to defend themselves against Soviet encroachment. In Asia the same pattern repeated itself with the Chinese Communist victory in China, and the unwarranted attack on South Korea, except that this last brazen act of aggression rallied the United Nations to meet this attempted conquest with armed force on the field of battle. Our defensive alliances in this area, with Japan, with Formosa and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, were created as a shield against further acts of aggression in this part of the world. During this decade of mounting tension and limited warfare, only the clearly demonstrated United States will to resist further Communist military aggression and the threat of atomic retaliation prevented a Soviet attempt to overrun Western Europe and the outbreak of a third World War.

Then something happened at the center of Soviet power which may have far-reaching circumstances. Stalin died, and a new team took over, first under Malenkov, and presently under an uneasy collective leadership, which for the first time includes such military figures as Marshals Zhukov and Konev. At the same time that the Soviet Union was eagerly striving for atomic parity and approaching a delivery capability comparable to that of the United States, the unprecedentedly destructive powers of the hydrogen bomb were demonstrated in the Pacific explosions and the aftermath of their radioactive fallout.

Under these circumstances, although we may never know the whole truth, it seems clear that the Soviet leaders took a long, second look at where their postwar policy of aggressive expansion had led them, and decided to adopt a new tactic. If the threat of Soviet aggression had cemented the Free World into defensive alliances, perhaps the best way to dissolve these alliances would be to hide the threat behind a mask of smiles and cultural blandishments. Thus, at the first Geneva Conference, the world was presented with what we may call the open-mouth policy of smiling inflexibility. Without giving an inch on such major issues as the unification of Germany and European security, the Russian bear burst out into gay smiles, and began the joyous task of killing with kindness and amiability. Let us examine how deadly effective these tactics could have been. Without materially reducing their actual capability to attack Europe, the Soviet and satellite armies made certain token reductions in troop strengths, which were highly publicized as proof of Soviet peaceful intentions. At the same time, the Soviets almost convinced our western allies that the threat of atomic war is minimal. Together, these moves threatened to take the heart out of the NATO armies, which would have to defend against a Soviet attack launched with conventional arms at a time when the military forces of NATO have not yet reached their effective treaty strength. The cement which bound the NATO forces together came dangerously close to being dissolved in a flood of vodka, visiting Soviet firemen, and general affability. This was political warfare of a very effective kind. However, the Soviet bloc conventional military forces have in fact greater capabilities through modernization than before, and the Communist Parties in Western Europe, especially in France and Italy, have their same potential threat, however masked, as an arm of Soviet diplomatic policy abroad.

Fortunately, Molotov's pessimistic and intransigent performance at the second Geneva Conference has dispelled at least temporarily the growing delusion among the Western nations that the Soviet Union had indeed altered its ultimate objectives. The uncompromising Soviet attitude proved conclusively that the New Look following the first Geneva Conference was nothing more than a tactical expedient. Much of the credit for causing Soviet policy and objectives to emerge in their true light must be given to the refusal of our Western allies to be taken in by this and other Communist maneuvers. Even more of the credit for exposing their true objectives must be given to Soviet leaders themselves. The offer of satellite arms to Egypt and other Moslem countries was widely recognized as a reversion to the familiar Stalinist tactics of fishing in troubled waters.

It is still too early to predict whether the Soviet Union will ultimately retrench its expansion abroad and concentrate principally on its internal problems, not the least of which is the job of running its vast empire, which now includes the captive states of Eastern Europe and the Balkans. On the basis of the historical record we may certainly expect additional shifts in the political wind from Moscow. Karl Marx, who was one of the first to sound a clear warning of the Russian menace to Europe, tells an illustrative story—and I quote—of "two Persian naturalists who were examining a bear; the one who had never seen such an animal before, inquired whether that animal dropped its cubs alive or laid eggs; to which the other, who was better informed, replied: 'That animal is capable of anything.' The Russian bear is certainly capable of anything, so long as he knows the other animals he has to deal with to be capable of nothing."

For the foreseeable future only Russian deeds, not empty words and blandishments, will demonstrate the real lines of Soviet policy behind whatever facade of smiles or scowls the Kremlin may present to the world. But one thing is certain: Any further reduction of the conventional forces of the United States and our allies would require a far greater numerical reduction in Soviet forces to maintain the present relative strengths of the two blocs. Force reductions which adversely affected this relative strength position would clearly indicate a need for building up, strengthening, and sharpening our other means of implementing policy. In this I include political warfare, our nonmilitary instruments of policy, the combination of political, economic, and diplomatic pressure, combined with their skillful exploitation through our information program abroad. We have seen how seriously Soviet political warfare threatened the cement of our NATO alliance system, and created the illusion that the Russian bear no longer has teeth or claws, simply because it has now gone into a grinning dance routine, an admittedly novel spectacle, but one which has drawn worldwide applause and acclaim.

What can the United States do to strengthen its political warfare capability during the prolonged period of competition with the Soviet system which is apparently opening before us? To answer this question intelligently we need to survey our present organization, to inventory the means and agencies with which we are now equipped.

Let us start at the top, putting first things first, with—

THE PRESIDENT

Probably the single most important instrument of political warfare in the world today is the Presidency of the United States. Whatever the President says echoes around the world. It is front page news, and experience has shown that paradoxically, straight news is frequently the best form of political warfare, particularly when issues are deliberately clouded by the Soviets for propaganda purposes. A dramatic illustration of the President's role in this regard was his announcement of the atoms for peace

plan, and later, his call for mutual arms inspection at Geneva. In both cases these were responsible statements of national policy made without any propagandistic overtones. Before the first Geneva Conference mounting international tension had produced a situation which the U. S. S. R. had successfully exploited to portray the United States as a belligerent, bomb-swinging menace to world peace. Continued testing of nuclear weapons with much fanfare has not helped our standing. To offset this the dramatic arms inspection proposal has materially assisted the United States in regaining the initiative in the field of disarmament. This proposal has done more to decrease international tension and to correct a distorted image of the United States abroad than any single action since the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan. Unfortunately it has not been followed through with vigor.

Of course, the broad guidelines for our political warfare effort are provided by the National Security Council, which formulates national objectives in a number of foreign and domestic fields. Under NSC direction, the Operations Coordinating Board is responsible for integrating the actions of executive agencies into cohesive, overall operations. The OCB itself does not implement decisions, but distributes tasks among executive agencies, and monitors the results of political warfare operations.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The State Department formulates our official foreign policy, which provides guidance for our foreign information program. Through its day-to-day contacts with other governments throughout the world and at the United Nations, State Department actions have an enormous psychological impact abroad. Under the direction of the Department of State, the International Cooperation Administration, the successor to the FOA, has a similar impact.

It is axiomatic in political warfare that the best propaganda is deeds, not words. The concrete programs directed by the State Department and administered by ICA are, and will continue to be, a tremendous political warfare asset in themselves. However, deeds that go unheralded, or for which someone else takes the credit, are of little value in the struggle for men's minds. Fortunately, the United States has a means of making our deeds known far and wide, namely:

THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The mission of the USIA is to submit evidence to the peoples of other nations that the objectives and policy of the United States are in harmony with, and will advance, their legitimate aspirations for freedom, progress, and peace. It does this through the use of all types of communications media: Radio, the Voice of America, news releases, films, television, cultural exchanges, and extensive libraries abroad. The USIA is an official spokesman for the Government of the United States abroad. What it says and does is viewed as an authoritative and responsible reflection of United States policy and views. This agency operates United States information posts in 79 foreign countries, and through the VOA beams programs to most of the globe. We have seen how in a period of general disarmament and smiling coexistence, the United States must rely on its nonmilitary or political warfare instruments. Among those instruments, certainly the USIA, by means of which our political, economic, and diplomatic moves are made known, is of vital importance, if the United States is to hold its own in world affairs.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In taking inventory of our political warfare instruments we have thus far looked only at our peacetime capabilities. During periods of open hostilities our Military Establishment conducts military or combat psychological warfare as a supporting weapon on the field of battle. Naturally, the planning for such contingencies is carried on in the Department of Defense, under the Deputy Secretary, Mr. Robertson, who is a member of the Operations Coordinating Board. Within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of Special Operations monitors psychological warfare planning and the international information activities connected with the Military Establishment.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff coordinate the psychological warfare efforts of the Army, Navy, and Air Force insofar as such activities pertain to joint commands and affect strategic planning. Of the three services, neither the Air Force nor the Navy maintain organized psychological units at present, but the Army does. Within the Department of the Army, the Office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare formulates plans, monitors the training of personnel, sets up requirements for research and development, and monitors worldwide psychological warfare operations of the Army, presently conducted only under the Far East Command.

The overall mission of a military commander in the field is to destroy the enemy's capacity to resist. He may accomplish this mission in two ways: Either by the physical destruction of the enemy armed forces or by reducing or destroying the enemy's morale, or will to resist, without which his forces cannot be effectively employed. Combat psychological warfare aids materially in destroying the enemy's will to fight. Under certain circumstances the so-called paper bullets, the leaflets, radio messages, or direct broadcast appeals may be as effective in reducing enemy morale as the other weapons at the military commander's disposal. It is a widely recognized fact that in the French defeat of 1940, psychological factors, including the softening-up effect of Nazi propaganda, played an important part. The devastating effects of German political warfare were not fully appreciated until after the invasion began; until then they had been greatly underestimated by both the French and German military staffs. This extension of political warfare to the battlefield, where there is a direct contact with both the enemy's military and civilian elements, offers the United States a tremendous advantage which is denied to the U. S. S. R. and its bloc of captive states. Let me illustrate what this means. No American commander need worry greatly over the disaffection of his men, either individually or collectively, but this same problem has the Soviet bloc commanders seriously concerned. This well-grounded fear stems from their losses through defection to the Germans in World War II and Chinese losses during the Korean war. In the first year of the Russian campaign, the Germans captured nearly 4 million prisoners. This was more than the total allied strength at its peak in Western Europe. Of course, large numbers of these prisoners were taken as a result of direct military action; however, hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers laid down their arms and welcomed the Wehrmacht as liberators from the oppressive Soviet regime.

While the Department of Defense clearly realizes that combat psychological warfare by itself cannot win battles, it can contribute immeasurably to victory. Under optimum conditions it may decisively affect the course of events at critical turning points in national morale, when, after tremendous military losses on either or both sides, the will to resist hangs by a tenuous but many-stranded thread of political and psychological intangibles. Such an exceptional opportunity developed in the course of the German campaign against the U. S. S. R. but Nazi policy, brutality, and blunders, excluded its exploitation by political means. In contrast, in the final stages of World War I, President Wilson's 14 points contributed immeasurably to the collapse of German morale, both on the home front and on the battlefield.

The wealth of experience from two World Wars and the Korean conflict has been drawn upon to shape the concept, organization, and planning of the Department of the Army in the psychological warfare field. In addition, a positive research program continues to refine the lessons to be drawn from the past, and to improve equipment and techniques. The Office of the Chief of Psychological Warfare, thinks of its tasks in terms of target audiences, and has therefore organized its combat units to conduct what are called strategic, tactical, and consolidation operations. Obviously, it is impossible to separate the target exactly into these three categories since in time of war it includes not only the forces on the battlefield, but civilians on the enemy home front as well. Tactical psywar is waged against troops in actual combat. It reduces the enemy's will to resist by lowering his morale, by creating dissension, and by urging dissatisfied soldiers into desertion or surrender.

Strategic psywar is conducted primarily against the civilian population behind the troops, or what is usually called the home front. World War II proved that skillful political warfare can soften up an entire nation before an attack, can divide the enemy population against itself, and may even modify its ideological outlook. Effective strategic psychological warfare should bring about dissident actions, ranging from passive noncooperation to outright acts of sabo-

tage, and the formation of partisan or guerrilla groups.

Consolidation propaganda is aimed at the people in an area which has been liberated or is occupied and attempts to persuade the population to assist our military effort, or at least not to interfere with it. Consolidation propaganda can be extremely useful in smoothing the rough path of a military occupation and speeding the return to normal civil life after hostilities have ceased. The United States occupation of Germany was one of the most successful in modern history, and the contribution of both the military and later USIA, to the rehabilitation of Germany is an outstanding achievement of constructive political warfare.

With consolidation propaganda, which provides a transition from war to peace, we have come full circle in our survey of the political warfare instruments available to the United States. I recognize that the word "propaganda" has a bad connotation, because of the sinister purposes to which it was put by the Nazi propaganda machine under the direction of its evil genius Mr. Goebbels. For this reason, many good Americans believe that there is something essentially un-American about political warfare, or the use of propaganda. However, no less an American than General Washington, in the dark days of Valley Forge, enjoined his men to save the wornout socks and the rags wrapped around their frozen feet for use in the production of propaganda leaflets which were spread in the camp of the enemy. In those days there was no such thing as cheap newsprint, and these leaflets had to be printed on rag paper. This situation stands in vivid contrast to the Korean conflict, when Army psychological warfare units in the field were able to produce quantities of leaflets, if called upon to do so, and the Air Force was able to deliver them.

George Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, and other historic American figures made skillful use of political warfare in times of both war and peace. Moreover, in the conduct of business affairs, the United States as a country has developed the comparable arts of public relations and advertising to a very high degree. Thus it is an unfortunate paradox that our public information program and activities abroad, have at times been the object of misleading and misguided attacks. Our information activities, ranging from the VOA to our library programs, have in the past served as something of a political football. Such attacks have, of course, played directly into Soviet hands by confusing and paralyzing our own political warfare effort, while the flood of Soviet propaganda continues unabated.

The United States has been in the organized foreign information business only since World War II, whereas, for over 35 years agitation and propaganda have been major instruments of the Soviet regime both at home and abroad. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has literally poured billions of dollars into its political warfare activities—including Communist Parties and a vast network of front organizations abroad—whereas the United States budget for our Information Service is microscopic by comparison.

One or two homely examples will serve to illustrate the point. In the present cultural offensive the Soviet Union has financed a continuous flow of visiting delegations and dignitaries from abroad, ranging from the United States farm delegation last summer to literally thousands of individual government leaders, legislators, and public officials from all over the world. It looks as if the Soviets were trying to change the old adage that "all roads lead to Rome" to "all roads lead to Moscow." This Soviet program is excellent political warfare, because, even though such officials know they are being given a special Cook's tour, they cannot fail to be, and are impressed. All this costs a lot of money, and requires a major back-stopping effort to receive and guide these visitors. The United States Cultural Exchange Program, which is administered by the State Department and coordinated with USIA, is severely limited by comparison. Another example: In addition to financing an incoming flood of visiting firemen and vodka, the U. S. S. R. underwrites an enormous tidal wave of outgoing propaganda materials, ranging from scientific, technical, and political works to magazines and news sheets.

As early as 1937—the only year for which the Soviets released official figures—the U. S. S. R. distributed abroad 3½ million books, 11 million newspapers and a million magazines. With the stepped-up cultural offensive of the last 2 years, the volume of such Soviet publications has increased at least severalfold. By contrast, the USIA's ideological book program has of necessity been severely limited. Nevertheless, its achievement, considering its built-in budgetary restrictions, has been a very real one: In the period 1951–54, nearly 2 million copies of books in the general field of ideological subjects were distributed through USIA channels abroad. These books, which were translated into 38 languages, have been carefully selected, and fall into two main categories: Those which provide a critical analysis of communism and those which expound and illustrate American democratic concepts. Of the 107 books in this program issued in English, 17 have been translated into 33 languages and over 700,000 copies of them have been distributed through USIA channels. This official Government program has been greatly reinforced by private business and professional groups. Through the CARE organization, which has sent millions of food packages overseas, it is now possible for private individuals to send abroad a package of 99 volumes for $30. The very existence of this privately sponsored program is proof that, as America comes of cultural age, it realizes the true significance of the Biblical injunction that "man does not live by bread alone."

It is encouraging that realization of this basic truth is spreading, for beneath whatever blandishments and scowls the Soviets may offer, the hard facts of life continue. The central fact of today's life is the existence of two competing systems of government. As the President recently summed it up:

> They are in contest for the friendship, loyalty, and support of the world's people.

This contest may be won, not by force of arms, but by political warfare. The stakes are high; nearly a third of the world's people, literally hundreds of millions, are still uncommitted to either of the two competing systems, democracy and communism of which the President spoke.

As we have seen, the present Soviet campaign of relentless amicability is much more menacing than the outmoded tactics of revolutionary violence and open military aggression. The battleground in the struggle between the free world and international communism has switched to the area of political warfare, to the area of ideas and international persuasion. With more than 30 years' experience in agitation and propaganda at home and abroad, the present Soviet leaders have expressed confidence in their ability to win this contest hands down. The threat is a real one, and we cannot afford to be complacent about it. Now, as never before, the United States must develop the strongest, the most hard-hitting political warfare program of which it is capable. Half measures will not do. We must recruit our best talent and devote our best thinking to the job ahead, and we must have the financial resources to do whatever a successful program demands. And above all, we must believe in the power of democratic ideas and what we have to say. We must meet today's challenge with the same determination that Washington showed at Valley Forge. In this contest we can—and must—win.

WISCONSIN FEED COSTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on two different occasions last week several Wisconsin Republican House Members gave this Chamber statistical information on possible increased feed costs in Wisconsin. As I shall explain later, I believe the information was and is erroneous. The information purported to show that under the now vetoed H. R. 12 the price support increases for basic commodities would have adversely affected feed costs and farm income in Wisconsin.

I have no desire to enter into a controversy with my Wisconsin Republican colleagues on this question. I have more than a nodding and academic knowledge of feeding practices in Wisconsin. My late father operated a retail feed business, and as a young man I worked in various capacities in this business. Also, I did own and operate a dairy farm for a time.

I was amazed then at the ease and simple method by which my Wisconsin Republican colleagues arrived at their conclusion on possible feed cost increases in our State. Perhaps if they were more familiar with total feeding practices and programs in Wisconsin they would not

have fallen into the error of using such a simple and completely inadequate computation formula to derive their estimate.

In the interests of accuracy—or at least partial accuracy—I wish to explain why I believe their information and conclusions on increasing feed costs are wrong. I realize some of my Wisconsin Republican colleagues have used this old feed-cost chestnut as an excuse for explaining their past votes on a general farm bill. I presume it will be used again this summer and fall.

The information on Wisconsin feed costs was first given to the House in the form of a letter inserted in the RECORD on April 16. The letter, which was signed by 6 of the 7 Wisconsin Republican House Members, was dated April 15. The letter urged President Eisenhower to veto H. R. 12. The letter was not signed by the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSKI of the 10th District in Wisconsin.

Some of the same information was given again on April 17 during the discussion of a House floor discussion on the farm bill.

According to contentions of my Wisconsin Republican colleagues the increase in support prices for basic commodities—particularly feed grains—would have raised the farm-feed bill in Wisconsin by $26 million for the next year. My Wisconsin Republican colleagues also contended that because of the difference in increased supports for basics as compared to dairy price supports that Wisconsin farmers would be the losers by an estimated $12 million next year.

My principal reason for questioning the validity of this conclusion on increased feed costs is because of the overly simplified method of computation. There are too many unknown facts and factors to permit the use of my Republican colleagues' computation.

As I understand it, here is how my Republican colleagues derived their figure of $26 million: They took the 1955 cost of feed purchased by Wisconsin farmers and multiplied this figure by 20 percent. The 20-percent figure is the highest estimate for increased price supports of basic commodities.

The total cost of feed purchased by Wisconsin farmers in 1955 for feeding dairy cattle, beef livestock, calves, hogs, and poultry was $130 million. According to United States Department of Agriculture surveys, 87.6 percent of Wisconsin farmers' cash receipts in 1954 came from dairying and livestock operations. Therefore, it is logical to assume that most of the feed was purchased by dairy and livestock farmers. Poultry farmers purchased the remainder of the feed.

Before I comment on some of the fallacies in the computation used by my Wisconsin Republican colleagues, I should like to present some information on feeding practices of Wisconsin farmers. Our farmers raise most of their grain feeds.

From page 21 of a bulletin—Wisconsin Dairying in Midcentury—published in 1955 by the Wisconsin Crop and Livestock Reporting Service, I quote as follows:

> Roughly nine-tenths of the corn, oats, and barley fed to the dairy cattle are grown on farms where used, according to the Wisconsin dairy reporters. They indicate that for 1954 a little more than a third of the wheat was homegrown.

Actually, as grain and concentrate statistics prove, our farmers do not use too much wheat in their dairy and livestock rations. The chief grains used by our farmers are corn, oats, and barley.

The homegrown grains—and this is very important—are mixed with commercial concentrates. As I shall show later, there are few, if any, price-supported ingredients in the commercial-concentrate preparations.

In 1955, according to information I received from the United States Department of Agriculture sources, Wisconsin farmers raised 90 percent of their own corn, 94 percent of their oats, and 91 percent of their own barley.

During the summer months our dairy and livestock farmers rely heavily on pastures for feeding purposes. Of course, dairy cattle are fed grain and concentrates to supplement pasture feed. The 10-year averages—1944–53—on percent of feed secured from our pastures is as follows for the months of: June, 77.3 percent; July, 90 percent; August, 81.9 percent; September, 74.9 percent; and October, 63.1 percent.

In the months when pasturing is out of the question Wisconsin dairy and livestock farmers use corn and grass silage, about 80 percent corn silage and 16 percent grass silage. During these months the cattle are also fed grain and concentrate supplements. Incidentally, in 1950 20 percent of all the silos in the United States were located in Wisconsin.

I almost omitted the fact that Wisconsin farmers raise about 96 percent of their own hay for feeding purposes.

With this background information out of the way, I shall turn again to the fallacies and inadequacy of the formula used by my Wisconsin Republican colleagues. My Wisconsin Republican colleagues forgot to consider that the $130-million feed bill for Wisconsin includes the cost of many items and commodities that cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered as price supported. All of these items and commodities should be subtracted from the $130-million feed bill.

For example, the $130-million figure includes the cost of hay purchased. Hay, as we know, is not a price-supported commodity.

The $130-million feed bill includes the cost of commercially manufactured concentrates that our farmers mix with their homegrown feeds.

Apparently my Wisconsin Republican colleagues forgot about commercial concentrates and assumed that Wisconsin farmers feed only grains to their cattle and poultry. I do not have the 1955 statistics on commercial feed mixes, but in 1954, when the total purchased feed bill was about the same as in 1955, the cost of commercial feed mixes was $75 million. This is nearly 58 percent of the total feed bill.

Every farmer and feed dealer knows there is little in the way of price supported ingredients in commercial mixes sold in Wisconsin—and I speak only of commercial concentrate mixes used in our State. The commercial mixes sold in Wisconsin contain vegetable proteins, animal proteins—derived from meat scraps, tankage and fish meal—dried skim milk, dried buttermilk, dried whey, minerals, vitamins, and numerous other chemicals deemed necessary for balanced diets of animals and poultry.

The content of the commercial mix is determined by its usage for dairy cows, calves, hogs, beef livestock and poultry. I am not going to burden my colleagues with a detailed analysis of every commercial mix formula. I shall list the contents of only one nationally known mix so that you can check the items and ascertain how many price supported items are in this mix.

Here are the ingredients in this well-known commercial concentrate for dairy cows: It contains the following—calcium, phosphorous, iodine, salt, soybean oil meal, corn gluten feeds, cottonseed meal, linseed oil meal, corn distillers' dried grains, wheat standard middlings, cane molasses, urea, D activated plant sterol, defluorinated phosphate, iodized salt, calcium carbonate, and traces of iron oxide, manganese, sulfate, copper carbonate, cobalt carbonate and basic zinc sulfate.

This, gentlemen, is but one of the many types of concentrate preparations mixed by Wisconsin farmers with their homegrown feeds—90 percent of which are grown in Wisconsin.

The subject of homegrown feeds brings to mind another fallacy in my Wisconsin Republican colleagues' computation. The $130 million feed bill also includes the cost of grains sold and bought in Wisconsin. Most of our feed grain is not price supported.

Whenever our feed dealers run short of grain they usually are able to buy some grain from local farmers who have a slight surplus above their own needs. I called one large private feed dealer last week to find out how much out-of-State grain he was buying. He informed me that he has not bought any feed grains from out of Wisconsin for the last 5 years. He is able to buy his grain from local farmers.

Thus, after we subtract all of these factors from the total feed bill figure used by my Republican colleagues we discover that their conclusion evaporates and it has no substance or validity. If President Eisenhower relied on this information about Wisconsin feed cost increases he was misled and misinformed. Not only was the President misinformed but so were thousands of Wisconsin citizens who read the newspaper stories containing this conclusion.

Frankly, after considering all of the factors mentioned above, I cannot give you an estimate as to how much the real cost increase—if any—would have been under H. R. 12. I have tried to get figures on all of the factors I cited, but some of them are unavailable. I am convinced that the increased cost would have been very slight. I do not know that it would

not have been $26 million. Perhaps it might have been only 2, 3, 4, or 5 percent of $26 million.

Incidentally, if President Eisenhower and the administration—for reasons best known to themselves—had not announced the same price support levels for butterfat and manufactured milk as contained in H. R. 12, all of my Wisconsin Republican colleagues except ALVIN O'KONSKI would be hard pressed to explain their vote against H. R. 12.

They are fortunate that President Eisenhower followed out the recommendations contained in H. R. 12. However, the administration did nothing about dairy price supports until Congress passed H. R. 12—or at least not too much was done. I am sure that Wisconsin farmers will take note of this fact.

There is another aspect of Wisconsin dairy farmers' position in the total industry that I believe my Wisconsin Republican colleagues have ignored whenever we consider a general farm bill. That aspect is this: If feed-producing farmers are constantly faced with depressed prices, what is to prevent large numbers of these farmers from turning to dairy farming?

I note that in the last 10 to 20 years dairy farming has grown in some of the grain producing regions adjacent to Wisconsin. These farmers have to make a living, and if they cannot make a living from livestock and grain they will feed the grain through dairy cows to earn their livelihood.

Wisconsin's own economic history proves that this is possible. Our State was not always a dairy State. Fifty years ago Wisconsin ranked fourth among the dairy States. Our farmers turned from grain to dairy farming.

Whenever I consider the broad aspects of a farm bill I vote to keep our dairy farmers in the business of dairy farming under the most favorable industry and competitive conditions. Wisconsin farmers, by tradition and experience, are best qualified for dairy farming. Likewise, I want feed grain farmers to stay in the business of producing feed grains. I do not like to see them switch to other types of farming when they find that they cannot make a living from the farming they know best.

The same reasoning goes for all other farmers. I want to see poultry farmers stay in poultry farming; cotton farmers in cotton; tobacco farmers in tobacco; livestock farmers in livestock; cash crop farmers in cash crops; fruit farmers in fruit.

I have no intention of presenting the case for basic commodity farmers as to why they should have certain support programs. I am not qualified to speak for or against them—and neither is any other Member from Wisconsin. The congressional Representatives from the basic commodity regions must present the case for their farmer constituents on support programs. I, for one, will always consider their case with an open mind; and I hope the Representatives from the basic commodity areas will do the same with respect to dairy farmers.

I also know that farmers producing a single agricultural commodity do not have enough representatives in Congress to pass legislation solely for their own benefit. There are not enough Congressmen from the dairy farming, cotton, grain, livestock, poultry, and other types of farming to pass a bill on a single commodity program. That is why we need unity among representatives from the farm regions. In addition, we also need the votes of Congressmen from city areas to pass a farm bill.

In view of this, then, Congressmen from one area cannot continuously walk out on farmer representatives from other regions. If they do, in the long run they will injure prospects for legislation pertaining to their own farmer constituents at some future date.

When I voted for H. R. 12 I had this philosophy in mind. I also had in mind at all times the fact that farm income dropped more than $3 billion in the last 3 years. The drop in farm income has hurt every segment of our economy.

Wisconsin produces some farm machinery—and it is not sold exclusively to farmers in our State. Grain and livestock farmers buy some of the machinery produced in Wisconsin; but they cannot buy our machinery when their income is down I note that some Wisconsin farm implement manufacturers have already curtailed production. Curtailed production means unemployed workers, and unemployed workers cut down on their purchases of dairy products when the pinch grows tighter.

There are, then, many factors besides a narrow view that must be taken into account on consideration of a general farm bill. I believe that I studied the general farm bill just as thoroughly as did the President and his advisers. I came up with a different conclusion than he reached.

These are some of the factors that an erroneous feed cost estimate cannot explain away to Wisconsin farmers, business, and industry.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VINSON, for 1 hour, on April 24.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, for 20 minutes, on today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today, and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. HUDDLESTON) and to include a speech.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALBERT and include an address delivered by the Speaker at the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Dinner on Saturday evening, April 21st.

Mr. MCGREGOR and include a brief summary relative to the bill H. R. 10660, the highway bill.

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. UTT) and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 146. An act for the relief of Isabel Tre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 586. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Laddomada, Antoniette Laddomada, and children, Concetta and Paolo Laddomada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1013. An act for the relief of Melecio Acosta-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands in the State of Montana to the Phillips County Post of the American Legion; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1101. An act for the relief of Martino Palmeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1364. An act for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1385. An act for the relief of Mario Farabullini and Alla Farabullini, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2095. An act for the relief of Guiseppe Culcasi; to the Committee on the Judiicary.

S. 2144. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey by quitclaim deed certain real property of the United States to the Fairview Cemetery Association, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2244. An act for the relief of Maria Novak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2305. An act to exclude certain lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and to authorize their disposal as surplus Federal Property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2498. An act to provide that the Secretory of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior on Insular Affairs.

S. 2512. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954, so as to provide for the erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries to honor the memory of certain members of the Armed Forces who died or were killed while serving in such forces; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2517. An act to amend subsection 3 (a) of the act approved August 8, 1947, to authorize the sale of timber within the Tongass National Forest, Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2563. An act for the relief of Cecile Angele Chaffoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2822. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer approximately 9 acres of land in the Hualapai Indian Reservation, Ariz., to School District No. 8, Mohave County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3515. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, to assist in the provision of housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to amend certain laws providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Labor Organization and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution granting the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozelle Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 2796. An act for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel;

H. R. 2948. An act for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis);

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Lois O. Jennings;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Antonio Penna;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of Supreme Court Justices and circuit court judges;

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks;

S. 1194. An act to provide for transfer of administrative jurisdiction over Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., to the Secretary of the Interior and over Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., to the Secretary of the Army; and

S. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain laws of the United States with respect to counsel employed by the special committee of the Senate established by Senate Resolution 219, 84th Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1771. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting certain plans for works of improvement which have been prepared, pursuant to the authority vested in the President by section 5 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 667) and delegated to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1772. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the statistical supplement, stockpile report, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress, and in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1773. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Benjamin Buchanan, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Coulee Dam National Recreational Area, Wash., will authorize him to provide a marina service for the public at Coulee Dam National Recreational Area, during a 1-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1774. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Geoorge T. Moore and Carl D. Berry"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1775. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Charlie Toy also known as Kwan Fat (file A–8932746), involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1776. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 18, 1956 the following bill was reported on April 20, 1956:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 10721. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2021). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 19, 1956 the following bill was reported on April 21, 1956:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 10660. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2022). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted April 23, 1956*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 150. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; without amendment (Rept. No. 2023). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 55. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate; with amendment (Rept. No. 2024). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 62. Concurrent resolution to print as a document a pamphlet entitled "A Handbook for Americans"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2025). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 18, 1956, the following bill was introduced on April 20, 1956:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 10721. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[*Introduced and referred April 23, 1956*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 10722. A bill to reclassify plastic clothespins in the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10723. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 10724. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Klamath County, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 10725. A bill to provide that withdrawals or reservations of more than 5,000 acres of public lands of the United States for certain purposes shall not become effective until approved by act of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 10726. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Buford Dam and Reservoir, Ga., by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 10727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish corporate tax rates of 22 percent normal tax and 32 percent surtax, and to increase the amount of the exemption from such surtax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 10728. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 10729. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10730. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 10731. A bill to establish a plan and appropriate procedures for the promotion of employees of the Government on the basis of merit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 10732. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, forest, and wildlife resources, to provide additional public recreation areas, and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 10733. A bill to amend section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to place certain restrictions upon ownership or control of broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 10734. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 10735. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10736. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide increased payments, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 10737. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 10738. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10739. A bill relating to the method of allocating tax liability of an affiliated group of corporations for purposes of computing earnings and profits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 10740. A bill authorizing the Adminstrator of General Services to transfer certain property to the District of Columbia and to the Department of the Interior to be available for park and recreational purposes, including the construction of a National Memorial Stadium; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 10741. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuted from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 10742. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10743. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to permit the renewal of certain policies of insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 10744. A bill to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10745. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 to change the position of order filler from level 2 to level 3 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 10746. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission, to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H. R. 10747. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the reversionary interest of the United States in certain lands to the Clint Independent School District and the Fabens Independent School District in the State of Texas, or to either of them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10748. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act (50 U. S. C. 98–98h), with respect to transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing and spending powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution to create a Joint Committee on Civil Defense; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 481. Resolution to continue in effect House Resolution 190 and House Resolution 386, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. Res. 482. Resolution to express House disapproval of anti-Christian terror and persecution by Communists of the Ukrainian Christians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 483. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to withdrawal of land in Saline Valley in Inyo County from the public domain for use as an aerial gunnery range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10749. A bill to validate a patent issued to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, for certain land in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 10750. A bill for the relief of Dr. Franklin Fu-Yen Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 10751. A bill for the relief of Valeriana O. Albisua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10752. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 10753. A bill for the relief of Wha Dee Loo, his wife, Margaret Chan Loo, and their three minor children, Mary, Josephine, and John Loo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

940. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Ralph H. Oehlke and 45 other residents of Enderlin and Sheldon, N. Dak., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension

program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

941. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Edward L. Snyder and 44 other veterans and citizens of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

942. Also, petition of Ralph Paternostro and other veterans and citizens of Williamsport, Pa., urging the immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

943. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Henry B. Williams, of Anchorville, Mich., and 44 others, urging enactment of legislation providing for a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the committee on Veterans' Affairs.

944. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretariat, the council of State governments, the National Association of Attorneys General, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of two resolutions adopted April 11 by the subversive activities committee and the executive committee of the association concerning a proposed amendment of section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code, having to do with concurrent jurisdiction of the States in the field of sedition and subversive activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

945. Also, petition of Leodegario M. Radaza, LaPaz, Leyte, Philippines, requesting reexamination and consideration of his claim for compensation pertaining to the death of his father, the late Leoncio A. Radaza, a veteran of World I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Results of the Questionnaire Mailed to Northern Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of the votes I have received from the 10th Congressional District of Virginia in response to a questionnaire.

During February and March of this year I mailed 107,200 questionnaires to all legal residents of my district distributed as follows: Alexandria, 25,000; Arlington, 40,000; Fairfax, 40,000; Falls Church, 2,200.

The following letter accompanied the questionnaire:

DEAR NEIGHBOR: In accordance with my established policy, I am again consulting with you on major legislative proposals which may be considered by Congress in this session. Your advice through past questionnaires has proven extremely valuable to me as your Representative and I would be grateful if you would again take the time to let me have the benefit of your views on the 10 questions listed on the reverse of this letter.

As you well know, there are far more than 10 major issues to be decided upon by Congress. However, these are important ones on which I would particularly like to have your opinion. I believe these are questions which vitally affect us as individuals, as citizens of northern Virginia, and as citizens of the United States.

With knowledge of your thinking on these questions, I am confident I will be better able to represent you not only on these issues but also on the many other decisions which will be made in the House of Representatives.

Please indicate your vote by checking the proper space on the opposite side and return it to me at Post Office Box 1300, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C., at your earliest convenience. Your cooperation and assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Approximately 15,000 replies have been received and I am very grateful at this fine indication of the interest taken by the residents of northern Virginia in their Government. I have congratulated them on their unusual awareness of the acute problems facing the Nation and their community. The low percentage of "no opinion" ballots and the high percentage of total returned are both tributes to the civil responsibility and participation of citizens in this area.

In addition, thousands of those who responded took the additional time and effort to enlarge on their views by letter and comment written on the questionnaire blank. These have indeed been of value to me as their Representative and are being considered along with the tabulations.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1. A reduction in Federal taxes this year even though it might mean an operating deficit and an increase in the National debt	16.6	79.5	3.9
2. Continued foreign economic aid	57.2	33.2	9.6
3. Federal financial assistance to the States for school construction	65.2	27.9	6.9
4. President Eisenhower's Soil Bank Program and continuation of flexible farm price supports, in an effort to reduce the $8 billion surplus and increase farm income, rather than the high rigid support program	76.7	9.6	13.7
5. Proposed Federal super interstate highway construction program	76.9	13.9	9.2
6. Federal Government participation in a nationwide health insurance program	42.0	45.7	12.3
7. Liberalization of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act	31.9	45.9	22.2
8. Postal rate increase as recommended by President Eisenhower to assist in cutting down postal deficit (now over $1 million per day) and improve the service and facilities	77.7	17.0	5.3
9. Creation of a Metropolitan Washington Authority to operate and improve transportation, airport, and harbor facilities in this area	72.3	12.5	15.3

The following question applies only to Federal employees:

10. There are two principal proposals to increase annuities of Federal employees. These are listed briefly below. Please check the one you prefer:
   (*a*) Inclusion of old age and survivors insurance (social security) coverage with the civil service retirement plan as proposed in the Kaplan report — 17.0
   (*b*) Change the method of computation within the framework of the present civil service retirement system in order to increase the benefits — 83.0

Croatian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 22, I took part in ceremonies in Cleveland, commemorating the 15th anniversary of the national independence of Crotia, at which Msgr. Tomislav Firis was chairman.

We Americans will never forget that during World War II our airmen who were shot down over Croatia found the Croatian legions true friends and protectors from the enemy. The same Croatians legions under the leadership of General Mikhailovich established and maintained an underground railway through which our airmen escaped from Croatia to the free world. It will also be recalled that when the Communist occupiers of Yugoslavia captured General Mikhailovich and were preparing to execute him, American veterans of that theater of war protested these actions and sought to prevent the murder of General Mikhailovich. All freedom-loving people were sad upon hearing the news of the murder of General Mikhailovich by the Tito Communists. These are some of the reasons, in addition to our basic political beliefs, which compel us to support the cause of the Croatian people in their aspirations for national independence.

Under leave granted, I include my address delivered at the Croatian Independence Day celebration:

I am very happy to be here with you today and to join with you in commemorating the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the independence day of Croatia.

As most of you know, I have, throughout my entire public life, stood for and advanced the policy of equality for people and for nations. In more recent years, I have led the fight in Congress against all forms of colonialism which today enslave nations and people.

Communism is, by its very nature, imperialistic, predatory, and inhuman. The two outstanding examples of imperialism and colonialism at work in the world today are found in the Russian Communist Empire and Tito's Communist Empire. The Soviet Union has long been called the graveyard of na-

tions. The nations of central Europe were added to this graveyard of nations during and following World War II, but Yugoslavia is also a graveyard of nations. Tito's Yugoslavia enslaves 4 distinct nations and 1 of them is the Croatian nation whose independence day we honor today.

Croatia has every right to be independent and free of the Communist chains applied to it by Tito. We Americans believe in the principle of national self-determination for all people. We, therefore, believe the Croatians are entitled to national self-determination. It is a certainty that if the Croatian people were allowed to express their views today, they would be solidly against Tito's empire and in favor of a free and independent State of Croatia. Even Tito is aware of this fact, and accordingly, he will do everything in his power to prevent the world from knowing about the heroic struggles of the Croatian nation to regain its national independence.

I again assure you that I shall continue to support, with all the vigor at my command, the right of all nations to self-determination, independence, and self-government. I shall also continue to fight against all forces that deny any people these natural rights. I shall continue to do what I can to expose Tito for the Communist stooge and Russian agent that he really is. The only loyalty Tito has is to the Russian Empire and the world domain of communism. He and the conspirators who surround him are no different than the evil men who live in the Moscow Kremlin. Both are equal evils and threats to the cause of peace.

Excerpts From the Remarks of Speaker Sam Rayburn, of Texas, at the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Dinner, Saturday, April 21, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the remarks of Speaker SAM RAYBURN, at the Woodrow Wilson centennial dinner, Saturday, April 21, 1956:

Tonight we honor Woodrow Wilson, the first effective great liberal to occupy the White House in the 20th century. Woodrow Wilson should be with us again at this hour. We need again his great soul and his stern voice and prophetic insight into the troubled hearts of men and the tremendous affairs of nations. In his first inaugural, I was a freshman Congressman, and the words he spoke then come back to me again in this hour and are applicable to much that is happening among us today. He said:

"The great Government we love has too often been made use of for profit and selfish purposes, and those who used it have forgotten the people."

Under Wilson's leadership we Democrats determined that this should not be a nation of giant machines overshadowing men. We decided that machines were made for men, and not men for machines. He said, "We must believe the things we tell the children."

Once the Republicans had a liberal in the White House—Theodore Roosevelt—but he was not effective. He had his troubles with the old guard Congress.

The Republicans now have in the White House a man who has indicated liberal tendencies, but the old guard Republicans in Congress have done little but thwart them. As always, when they are in control of the executive branch of the Government, the Republicans are content with the status quo, nullification, and negation.

I am speaking from a position of personal knowledge. We Democrats in Congress have had a difficult time in getting the Republicans to go along with a modicum of President Eisenhower's legislative program when he advocates Democratic measures in the interest of the people.

The Republicans are boasting privately to their big-business friends that they are responsible for defeating their President's proposals while at the same time they are proclaiming to the public that we Democrats are doing nothing to put through his program.

The truth will out sooner or later. Meantime, it appears to me that the Republican President has little discipline in the rank and file of his forces.

The Republicans are not even in step with their Commander in Chief.

The Republicans have not changed in a hundred years. They still have the old Hamiltonian theory that the way to make the country prosperous is to make the rich very rich and that prosperity will trickle down to millions of workers and farmers.

Many of us have been around here for a long time and we have been waiting for the Republican trickle-down theory to trickle down to us.

Our Democratic theory is, and always has been, that the way to keep the country prosperous is to assure the working man, the working woman, and the farmer the earning power and the purchasing power to produce prosperity for all.

Our theory proved right in 20 years of Democratic administrations. We raised the national income from $39 billions in 1933, when we took over, to $290 billions in 1952.

The tremendous prosperity that the Republicans are now boasting of could not have come about if we Democrats had not laid the sound foundation for it during the 20 years we were responsible for the destiny of our people.

Certainly there has been nothing in the Eisenhower program that could have laid the basis for this prosperity. The Eisenhower administration has not originated any major change. About the only think it can claim is that it asked for and has been granted extension of programs instituted originally in the Wilson, Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

But the Republican brand of prosperity, and the Republican policies of administration, have developed certain weaknesses. The major one, of course, is the plight of the farmers. Every depression has been preceded by a drop in farm income.

And there are other indicators: The growing number of failures of small-business enterprises and the current drop in home construction, to mention only two.

Now everyone remembers that during the 1952 campaign, the Republicans went all over this country talking about Democratic programs being socialistic. They implied, at least led the people to believe, that they were going to rip our programs out of the Government by the roots.

I challenge any Republican, in any position of responsibility from the President down, to point to a single major law that we passed in 20 years, that they have even proposed to repeal.

So, I say, if the Democratic enactments were socialistic in 1952, then they are socialistic today, and that if the Democratic Party was socialistic in bringing them into effect, then the Republican Party is equally socialistic in keeping them on the statute books.

No, the Republicans have not had the temerity to attack our programs directly. But I'll grant this—they have through negation and nullification, prevented our programs from protecting small business and the farmers.

In contrast, they have done much for big business, as all Republican administrations have done in the past.

They have encouraged mergers of businesses.

They have fostered concentration of wealth into a few huge corporations, and have permitted the big ones to gobble up the little ones. This occurred not only in business but in farming. Under the Eisenhower administration we have seen millions of small farmers leave the soil. The family farm, in contrast to the corporation-owned farm, is one of the bedrock foundations of our social system and the American way of life. The Republicans are making its survival more and more difficult. We have seen many small businesses sell out to octopuses that stretch their tentacles into the lives of communities far afield.

The Eisenhower administration has turned its back on the farmers in the face of conditions that forecast the loss of prosperity to many. It seems to ignore the fact that the net income of farmers declined from more that $14 billion in 1952 to around $11 billion last year. Furthermore, the Eisenhower administration, through Secretary Benson, has made the city populations believe that the farmer is responsible for his cost of living. That is just not so. The price spread between producers and consumers is growing under policies of this administration.

That Republican policies are bad for this country has been proven time and again. It was proved before Woodrow Wilson was elected President in 1912. I was here when that great liberal and genius of democratic government was inaugurated. The country, after many years of Republican big business, including a panic, was in dire straits. Millions were idle. Farmers were broke. Our foreign trade had fallen. Businesses were closing.

In 10 minutes, I cannot even list briefly the many peacetime accomplishments of the Wilson administration. But the Congress passed Mr. Wilson's Underwood Tariff Act, that restored export markets for our farm and industrial products. It approved the Clayton Antitrust Act, to set standards for enforcement of the Sherman Act; and took the management of the Nation's money from private individuals by establishing the Federal Reserve System, a financial agency that has stood the test of our times.

In Mr. Wilson's own words: "The control of the system of banking and of issue which our new laws are to set up, must be public and not private; must be vested in the Government itself, so that the banks may be the instruments, not the masters, of business and of individual enterprise and initiative."

Through the great wisdom and vision of Woodrow Wilson, this Nation made a transition from a primarily agricultural nation to the industrial age. He saw the need for a national highway system, of a merchant marine, aid to farmers, protection of workers through shorter hours and higher wages. These accomplishments were coupled with the 16th amendment to the Constitution, which made possible the graduated income tax based on the "ability to pay," and the 17th amendment, which made the Senate, as well as Members of the House, subject to the democratic process of direct elections.

The Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Tariff Commission, and the Federal Power Commission were instruments of good government created in the Wilson era to protect trade and the natural resources of the Nation.

Woodrow Wilson led us through World War I, and upon its successful conclusion,

he went to Europe with his great conception of a league of peace.

Isolationism, emerging from Republican spawning grounds, arose to defeat this high aim of a man who gave his life for his cause.

Wilson's dream of world peace—theretofore unparalleled in the concept of man, died with his prediction that if the United States did not join with the Allied Powers, the world would again be plunged into conflagration within 25 years.

The Wilson concept resulted in the United Nations after the second great war. Our Presidents Roosevelt and Truman cemented this organization in the scheme of the world's peace plans.

No one can say that in the 20 years that our party governed this Nation, that we did not bring prosperity out of chaos; that we did not give this Nation the strength to make it the most powerful on earth.

When the Republicans took over in 1953, our foreign policy was respected throughout the world. We had prevented the Communists from taking over Europe and the Middle East, and we stopped them in Korea.

Our foreign policy was condemned in the 1952 campaign by the Republicans. Now it is not known here or abroad exactly what our foreign policy is. Under the Eisenhower administration, there is the utmost confusion, and it is evident, despite all the State Department propaganda and conflicting statements, that we are losing ground and losing friends in world affairs to a nation that harbors only ill will toward us.

I regret to say that in my opinion, the way this administration has handled our foreign affairs, the free world stands in the direst danger it has ever faced.

We Democrats must unite for the forthcoming campaign for control of our Government. In the words of Woodrow Wilson, the people will not give a divided political party the responsibility of running the Government. If among us there are different views, let us compose them among ourselves and not let our political opponents use our intraparty differences to defeat us.

I believe the Democratic Party is the best party to govern this Nation in the days ahead. Woodrow Wilson believed, as did Roosevelt and Truman, that our party was the best equipped in philosophy and character to do so, because our party has the ability and vision to see into the future and find solutions to meet the needs of our people.

The Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief summary of contents of H. R. 10660, new highway bill.

The highway bill, to be reported on the floor of the House shortly is H. R. 10660. This is a combination of H. R. 8836, the Fallon bill, which is the highway authorization bill reported by the Public Works Committee, and H. R. 9075, the revenue raising bill, the Boggs bill which was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. The first title of H. R. 10660 relates to the authorization as contained in the Fallon bill as amended.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, URBAN

Sections 101 through 107 of the bill are approximately the same as the 1954 Highway Act which deals with the primary, secondary, and urban systems of roads as now in effect, with the exception that the funds involved are increased in the new legislation. The amount authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, in addition to the $700 million already authorized for 1957 by the 1954 act is increased by $25 million.

It is established as the intent of Congress that starting in 1957 and continuing through 1969 the total amounts intended for the primary, secondary, and urban systems be progressively increased in the amount of $25 million per year. Thus the total Federal funds involved for these systems during this period is $11,375,000,000.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

It was the opinion of the committee that the Congress should review every 2 years the authorization on the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Included in the sections up to 107 are increases for forest highway roads, trails, national parks, and so forth, and also some clarifying amendments relative to Indian land and other Federal domain roads. These sections also include a $30 million authorization for an emergency fund for highway repairs in disaster areas.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Section 108 to section 201 deals with the interstate system as set forth in H. R. 8836, the Fallon measure as amended. The authorizations of this section establishes a Federal expenditure, over the 13-year period 1957 up to and including 1969, for the Interstate system of $24,825,000,000. The matching as it deals with the interstate system is 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent State funds. In reality the total expenditure of the two programs as far as Federal funds are concerned is approximately $36,500,000,000.

MAXIMUM AXLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

In the bill will be found new subject matter relating to Federal axle weight limitations on vehicles using the highways. From available information, and taking into consideration the sponsor of the amendment, it would be my opinion that it was submitted upon the recommendation, and with the approval of, the trucking industry. This section would deny Federal funds to the interstate system in any State which permits single axle loads in excess of 18,000 pounds or tandem-axle loads in excess of 32,000, or which exceeds present State statutory regulations in effect July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. The enactment of this provision will not deprive any vehicle of any legal right it presently enjoys. It is an effort on the part of the Federal Government to insure that the highway facilities to be constructed with this large sum of Federal money shall serve out their economic life and not be prematurely destroyed by excessive loads and the question of safety for the traveling public shall be properly recognized. The bill takes into consideration the research that is now going on, the results of which will be known to Congress not later than March 1, 1959, and instructs the Secretary of Commerce to make recommendations to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959, with respect to maximum desirable dimensions and weights of vehicles using the public highways.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

The bill contains a section instructing the Secretary of Commerce to do necessary research regarding reimbursement of funds by the Federal Government to those States that have completed sections of the interstate system whether toll or free, subsequent to August 2, 1947, and meeting standards required on the interstate system and to report to the Congress his findings not later than January 2, 1958. It was recognized by the committee that possibly there was equity in the reimbursement feature but sufficient factual data was not available to permit the establishment of a fair formula either in dollars or miles credited.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

The bill contains a provision for bringing under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act contract work performed on the interstate system. This provision requires that the Secretary of Labor determine the prevailing wages to be paid on all contracts involving interstate sections of the program.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

The bill as written sets forth that whenever a State shall pay for the relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project in the Federal-aid primary or secondary system, or on a national system, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such costs in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project. The term utility includes, publicly, privately, cooperatively owned utilities, which, of course, includes sewer systems, water systems, gas, telephone including REA, light and power. This leaves the determining power entirely in the hands of the States.

FREE COMPETITION

Other provisions relate to the filing of periodic reports on the progress of the interstate system; the use of rights-of-way incident to the interstate system and provisions which will insure that the users of the interstate system will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at, or adjacent to, highways in such system;

CHECK BY CONGRESS

The bill provides that departments and agencies of any State and the executive branch of the Government shall furnish to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House, or a subcommittee of each, such information as may be requested relating to the construction of the new interstate system.

TITLE II—REVENUE FEATURES

It corporates the recommendations of the House Ways and Means Committee as contained in H. R. 9075 by Congressman BOGGS. This revenue section, which in all probability will come to the floor of the House under a closed rule, contains provision for a 1-cent gas tax increase; a 1-cent diesel and special fuels increase; a 3-cent increase on all rubber used by highway vehicles; 2-percent

ad valorem tax increase on trucks, buses, and trailers—which makes a total of 10 percent as now being paid by automobiles.

The bill places a new tax of 3 cents a pound on camelback or retreading material and a new permit fee of $1.50 per thousand pounds on vehicles in excess of 26,000 pounds.

The total yield anticipated from the revenue measure over a 15 year period is approximately $38 billion. It is to be noted that nonhighway users on all of the above taxes are exempt.

This revenue section recognizes the withdrawal from general revenues after July 1, 1957, of one-half of the total yield of the 10 percent ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and trailers and the total yield of the rubber tax on tires and the assignment of these revenues to the highway program. Prior to July 1, 1957, the revenue measure recognizes the dedication of only the 2 percent increase in ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and trailers and the 3 percent increase in rubber taxes.

This means, in a general statement, that a large amount of money that is now going to the general revenue fund will be designated to the highway trust fund after 1957.

PAY AS YOU GO

After study and attempting to analyze whether or not the revenue raising feature will meet the authorization, it is the considered judgment that in the overall program we will be short about $3.5 billion. However, it is the belief that possibly this amount can be collected by increased sales and use of the highways so I think, in all fairness, it should be said that the revenue bill as submitted by the Ways and Means Committee and incorporated in title II of this bill will meet the authorization and expenditures as set forth in title I.

In summary, the proposed legislation has the merit of providing for review by the Congress and the correction of any inequities that may develop as the program progresses. The bill is not perfect but I think the general public wants a highway bill and, in my opinion, the controversial features contained in this legislation are the results of various segments of our society compromising to obtain that which the people are asking, namely, better roads.

Pulaski League of Nassau County, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, due to previous commitments, I was unable to speak before the Pulaski League of Nassau County at New Hyde Park, on April 22, 1956. My friend, Mr. Louis S. Backiel, an outstanding American of Polish ancestry, appeared in my stead and delivered my address, which is as follows:

As you know, this is the first annual banquet of the Pulaski League of Nassau County. I want to welcome you to it in the hope that this banquet is the first of a long series of get-togethers.

This social and fraternal organization is performing a very much needed service. It is helping and encouraging Americans of Polish descent to get acquainted with their local and State leaders. To know their local and State leaders is the duty of every voter, because it is at the local level that political campaigns are won and American Presidents elected.

Your State and local leaders are as important to you as the national representatives that you send to Washington. I congratulate Americans of Polish descent for supporting so strongly such an organization as the Pulaski League of Nassau County.

Many, perhaps all of you people here tonight, have relatives and friends in Poland. And I know that you will want to hear how President Eisenhower and his supporters feel about that unhappy country, especially now that the Soviet leaders are trying to sell their "new look" to the free world.

In the first place, no matter what you read in the papers, or hear from opposition sources, President Eisenhower is not fooled by the smiling faces which Khrushchev and Bulganin are now showing the world.

And he is not going to believe that they have had a change of heart until they free all the satellite nations, and most especially Poland.

You know, of course, under whose administration Poland was first sold to the slavery of the Iron Curtain.

But one thing is certain, if Polish history—a history of incredible heroism and fortitude—means anything, it means that Poland will be free again.

The Polish will to be free surpasses any love of liberty shown by any other European nation in world history.

Those famous words, "liberty or death," well might have been spoken by the combined voice of the Polish people.

And I say this to Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev, "As long as the Polish nation is kept in slavery behind the Iron Curtain, you are holding to your bosoms a dagger that will eventually destroy you. You cannot enslave the unconquerable Polish spirit. You cannot make henchmen of souls whose longing for freedom transcends their passion for life itself."

President Eisenhower and his administration inherited the present Polish tragedy. They cannot undo this dreadful wrong overnight. But, they are not fooled by the honeyed words now coming out of Russia. They are not fooled by the current destruction of the myth of Stalin. They have known all along that Stalin was the bloody murderer he is now proclaimed to be.

They know that the present leaders of Russia were his followers while he lived and so are as guilty as he was.

They will not weaken in their stand against Russia until the Iron Curtain is destroyed and Poland a free nation once again.

President Eisenhower is the first President in over 20 years to face Russia boldly. His Cabinet members reflect in their speeches and actions that strong bold policy.

Secretary of State Dulles proclaimed that for aggressors, we had up our sleeve the ace card of massive retaliation. He proclaimed for all the world to hear, that in the event of aggression anywhere in the world, we meant to use massive retaliation.

As a result, the Korean war was ended and Russian aggression brought to a halt. For the first time in over 20 years, communism was stopped dead in its tracks. History has shown that all dictatorships hold the seeds of their destruction. The moment they stop growing, they start to decay. We are determined to stop the growth of the Communist evil—we are determined that bit by bit, the Iron Curtain shall be rolled back. We are determined that 1 day Poland shall be free. To that end I pledge my labors in your behalf.

Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I delivered before a Conference on Management and Taxes held by the American Management Association at the Plaza Hotel, in New York, on April 20, 1956:

Last year a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report conducted a study of our Federal tax policies as these policies relate to economic growth and development. There were two things unique about this study. First, the venture of a congressional committee into an area of what might be termed philosophical political science. Second, the method of conducting the study. I have used the word "study" to describe the procedure adopted by the subcommittee. It was not an "investigation" nor a "hearing" as these congressional committee procedures have come to be known. Yet it contained elements of both. In April 1955 in preparation of the studies the staff of the subcommittee prepared a list of names of some hundred students of taxation and economics, men in the academic world, in the business world, in labor and in agriculture. The subcommittee agreed upon the names of around a hundred persons chosen from this list and from additional suggestions received. Invitations were extended to these experts to come to Washington in May to go over with the subcommittee the project in mind. Around 70 of the persons did appear for a briefing with the subcommittee.

The broad topic was divided up into subtopics and each person was assigned to a subtopic within a subtopic. A great deal of attention was paid to the individual person's suggestion of proper subtopics and to his choice of subtopic he would like to develop.

Each person was asked to prepare a paper on his subtopic to be ready for printing by the first part of October. The purpose was to have all of the papers printed together and circulated among all of the 84 persons who participated in preparing papers and the members of the subcommittee. This was done, and I might say this thousand-page volume of prepared papers has become a best seller in the Government Printing Office.

In early December panel hearings open to the public were conducted on the papers by the subcommittee. The subtopics were grouped under chapter headings as appears in the printed document containing the papers. Those persons having papers covered by a subtopic heading appeared together on the same panel. Each person was given introductory time to point out the highlights of his paper and to comment upon the highlights of his fellow panelist's paper. The

subcommittee members then began interrogating the panel upon their papers and invited further participation by the panel in questioning their fellow panelists.

The fact that the written papers had been available sufficiently ahead of time so that the subcommittee members and the panelists had a chance to read and to study the papers made these panel hearings vigorous and meaningful. These printed hearings, of course, are also available to the public and students of this subject.

The subcommittee reached some conclusions in a brief report it made on these studies. One of these conclusions, in my opinion, had more to do with keeping the subject of tax reduction out of the political arena this second session of the 84th Congress than any other single thing. The subcommittee concluded unanimously, as did most of the panelists who discussed the subject, that during an expanding economy, with times good and the Federal debt at the height it is, any excess of revenues over expenditures should be used to reduce the Federal debt rather than to reduce taxes.

However, it was not the conclusions that the subcommittee reached that appears to me to be the most important or the most significant thing about the subcommittee's work. The most significant thing is that a decision was made to study this area objectively through the procedures of a congressional committee. That decision proved to be practical and of tremendous value to our knowledge of this important subject. I think it is very important that this work be continued by the subcommittee and that other areas of economic-political operations be subjected to a similar technique of study. A study of international trade or of the economics of our domestic agriculture industry along these lines would be of inestimable advantage to coming up with intelligent solutions to the problems that exist in these areas.

There is ample room for drawing up sides along political lines after an objective study has been made. In fact, after an objective study has been made the areas of proper disagreement are sharpened. But above all, the loose demagoguery that exists where ignorance exists will be lessened considerably. The demagoguery that presently exists in the nationwide public discussion of the agricultural industry and the political programs in relation to it has its roots in ignorance. Playing upon ignorance through the emotions certainly will harm, not help, our society in solving the farm problems or any other problems.

So it could have been with tax cutting in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. We could easily have picked up where we left off in the 1st session of the 84th Congress by appealing to this group or that group in suggesting tax cuts here or tax cuts there. There is ample room for real political differences on the subject of our tax laws; I am satisfied with the studies of the subcommittee available to the Congress and the people, intelligent political lines can be drawn on the subject of the kind of tax laws we should have. It is interesting to note that the preconceived lines of political differences in this area have been to a large degree dissipated simply by casting knowledge on the subject. It will take a little time, I suggest, before we do draw up political differences.

I hope the time will be soon because I believe that through the two political parties taking positions which differ on important issues the matters best can be discussed publicly and resolved intelligently.

With this lengthy introduction I want to discuss some of the basic things that were brought out in our studies of the economic effects of Federal taxation. Neither the staff of the subcommittee nor my colleagues quite agree with the conclusions I am going to express.

I want to start the discussion by referring to the title adopted by the committee for its study, "Federal tax policy of economic stability and growth," This was not the title I suggested at the time I was urging these studies to be made and a subcommittee established to make them. The title I used and still like to use to refer to these studies is: "The economic effects of Federal taxation."

The difference in these two titles reflect a basic difference in political philosophy. The overtones in the title "Federal tax policy for economic stability and growth" imply that the Federal tax policy can be used deliberately by the political government to promote economic stability and growth in our society. Many of the papers presented by the panelists assumed without posing the question that the Federal Government deliberately should use its taxing power to promote economic stability and growth. There is another political philosophy however which says, granted that any tax or any system of taxation has economic effects and so affects economic stability and growth, nonetheless the purpose of taxation should remain solely that of raising revenue, therefore the tax or tax system which has the minimum effect on the economy is the better, to that extent.

It can be argued in these days of high Federal expenditures brought on primarily by the carried over costs of World War II and the present high cost of military preparedness in the cold war era, that the difference in approach does not affect the results. In other words, our tax take being as high as it is has a very great impact on our society whether we regard the taxing power as solely a method of collecting revenues or whether we regard it as also a proper tool for intentionally producing economic results. Granting that the tax take has this impact, under either theory it would be the proper objective to set up the tax structure to produce the maximum amount of stability and growth in our economy.

The difference lies, perhaps, in the frame of mind one has toward the amount of governmental expenditures. The person who looks upon the taxing power as an affirmative means for affecting the economy recognizes that the larger the tax take, and the higher the tax rate the stronger is the taxing power as a device for affecting the economy. Accordingly, he views the amount of governmental expenditures with equanimity. If he is a Fabian Socialist he actually pursues the course of bringing about greater governmental expenditures because he pursues two concurrent courses. The more Government spends, whatever the purpose, the greater control the Government has over the economy through the control of expenditures; likewise the more it spends the greater the taxes and so the more effective is this other powerful weapon of governmental control. This is not just two courses moving in the same direction; it has a built-in spiraling effect. The more functions the Government assumes, which is synonomous with the Government spending more money, the less functions private enterprise assumes. Private enterprise is the tax base, so as Government expands in ratio to the overall economy, private enterprise or the tax base ratio declines. As the tax base declines, the tax rate must increase in order to maintain the same high tax take. It is essentially the tax rate which provides the energy for the control the taxing power exerts over the economy.

Let me illustrate. What would be the effect of a certificate of necessity if the corporate tax rate were 20 percent instead of 52 percent or what would its effect be if all corporations were permitted to set up their own depreciation schedules for tax purposes? The certificate of necessity is a neat, effective way of producing a direct economic result, i. e., the building of a new plant for a specified purpose. The advocates of private enterprise have not been alarmed at the use of the tax power here because they see in it a less dangerous procedure, to their way of thinking, than direct subsidies or even more dangerous of direct participation by the Government.

I used the illustration of the certificate of necessity out of the many illustrations I could have used, for a specific reason. I wanted it to be quite clear that the use of the tax power to produce economic effects has about it a great attractiveness. It is neat, quiet, easy to administer, and effective It is a constant temptation for Government officials to resort to it. Let me illustrate further. Farmers ought to build more ponds on their farms. The Government, instead of persuading through education or ordering through police powers, simply presents an attractive offer—if you do build ponds you can take a tax deduction. The attractiveness of the offer is directly in proportion to the rate of the tax from which exemption is granted.

By referring to many of the beneficial uses of the taxing power to produce economic effects we easily could come to the conclusion that the taxing power should be used deliberately to produce certain economic results including providing for more stability and growth in our economy. Of course, we could look at other economic results the taxing power has produced and begin to wonder. For example, I believe that the excess-profits tax did more to hurt and stunt the growth of small and new industries than any single economic or political thing. I believe the double taxation of the corporate form of doing business has done more to hurt the growth and stability of corporations than any single thing, by placing, as it does, a premium on financing expansion through debt or retained earnings instead of through floating new equity issues.

Much of the economic effects of our tax structure has not been planned. In fact, our subcommittee studies revealed that not only had the effects not been planned, in most instances the effects were unknown, and even with our studies the effects remain unknown and only give rise to dispute as to what they really are. However, everyone agreed that the effects are considerable and that the proportionately great tax take of today lies at the bottom of the effectiveness of the tax structure on our economy.

However, there are certainly those who would like to engage in economic planning. and for their purposes the Federal political government is the best place to do the planning. The dispute that arose over the use of a single word in the Employment Act of 1946 which created the President's Board of Economic Advisers and this Joint Committee on the Economic Report brings out this fact forcefully. The word in dispute was the adjective "full" used to modify the noun "employment." The word finally adopted in the Employment Act was "maximum." Now what is the difference between saying that the Federal Government shall do all in its power to produce full employment instead of maximum employment. The use of the word "full" imposes upon the Federal Government the responsibility for employment of its citizens rather than upon private enterprise. The adjective "maximum" means "fullest attainable" and, therefore, raises the question of what is attainable. Raising this question throws into discussion the question, How do we maintain employment of our citizens? Through the private economy regulated by the political government or through the political government? Persons like myself, who believe that the only way to continuing growth is through the trial-and-error methods, which I regard in economics as synonymous with private enterprise, maintain that private enterprise is the only

way to maintain maximum employment over a period of years, and that at best all the Federal Government can do is to assist from time to time on short-term programs and help on long-range programs by preserving a system of free and true competition.

The argument over the responsibilities of private enterprise and political government for the employment of its citizens was brought out to some degree at the time the ILO set out its bill of rights among which was the so-called right to work. This is certainly a brave new world, if we have decided that we know enough about sociology, economics and psychology that we can have political governments guarantee "the right to work." Our constitutional forebears were more humble in their day when discussing the right to happiness, they limited the Government guaranty to the right to pursue happiness. So I would suggest that we are only at the stage of human knowledge and development that we can talk about granting the right to pursue full employment. That means that Government's role is ancillary. That Government can set up rules of procedure for its citizenry in the economic fields which if followed would permit every one to receive his just dues from the sweat of his brow.

But to get back specifically to taxes. Aside from the implications brought to light about the use of the taxing power there were two other basic matters about taxes brought to light. Like the first factor which I have been discussing the other two require considerably more thought and study than have been given them.

The first matter is inflation. Our panelists who discussed what inflation is, under my questioning agreed that in essence inflation is a form of taxation. It takes purchasing power from the individual and transfers it to the political government. Of course, if the Government is essentially a creditor and not a debtor this would not be the effect, but this is certainly an academic point in modern times. Perhaps in any times because political government by its nature will be always a debtor to its citizens.

But inflation also transfers purchasing power from one citizen to another. Now what has this to do with a discussion of our overall Federal tax structure and its economic effect? There are two basic things I want to point up. First, though inflation is a way of federally financing projects, it is a good way? Second, after reviewing the thousands of requests for changes in our present tax laws to bring about what is always referred to as equity and fairness I have concluded that 90 percent of these present-day inequities arise from the tax of inflation. For example, the cry about "locked in" investments stems largely from the effects of inflation on our other tax laws. The change made in our tax laws to permit homeowners to sell an old house to buy a new one to escape the tax on the capital gain from the sale, the extra exemption given to people over 65 because after all those on retirement and other fixed incomes were the ones hit the hardest by the inflation tax, the problems of business inventories and the use of LIFO, the present problems of tax treatment of replacement of capital equipment, the general problems involved in capital depreciation are all examples of inequities brought about by the tax of inflation.

I am satisfied that if we would trace through most of the recent requests for tax relief we would find that they have their origin in the economic effects resulting from our Government's resorting to the tax of inflation to finance World War II.

When all is said and done I believe one of the most important principles that any Federal tax policy must follow is to preserve the integrity of the dollar. Just as the standards of our weights and measures used in evaluating physical lengths, widths, thickness, quantities, and bulk must be kept exact and constant so must our standards for evaluating economic events and economic trends be kept exact and constant. The dollar is the most important of all the measuring standards in the field of economics. A tax system that fails to protect the exactness and constancy of economic standards cannot promote real growth and stability in an economy.

The third matter is as basic as the question of the use of the tax power and the question of the use of inflation as a method of taxation. The third matter has to do with the taxation of two different dollars, the consumer dollar and the investment dollar. This was a matter consciously posed by many of the committee's panelists. Organized labor's panelists expressed the view that our present tax structure was hitting the consumer dollar too heavily and that it was the plentitude of the consumer dollar that lay at the base of any expanding economy. That given the consumer dollar the investment dollar would always appear. In other words, given the demand for production the capital formation necessary to provide the production would be forthcoming. Organized labor's panelists expressed the thought that obviously the tax on the investment dollar was not excessive, because we were doing all right, but that to continue to do all right we had to continue to relieve the consumer dollar from the burden of taxation.

However, labor's spokesmen failed to appreciate, it seems to me, that when consumer demand outstrips production inflationary forces are created which can become strong enough to break through any governmental system of brakes and controls to produce full-fledged inflation which is, of course, essentially a consumer's tax. The investment dollar, unfortunately, does not always flow to areas where there is a consumer demand. Even if there are plenty of investment dollars the channels may be clogged by governmental action. Furthermore, there is such a thing as clogging up the source itself. Right at the present time we have been experiencing a demand for cement, glass, steel, nickel and other metals and basic materials which is greater than the production facilities. This could be the result of tax deterrents on the investment dollar. I'm not sure that it is, but I emphasize, it could be.

Industry's spokesmen argued that the investment dollar was being too heavily hit now and that there was not sufficient capital formation to bring about the continued growth and stability we should be able to look forward to in our economy. It was pointed out that around $14,000 capital investment is needed to keep one man employed in our American society of today, and that multiplying out the increasing labor force in America from population increases the necessary capital formation to keep labor employed did not seem to be in the offing.

One factor in this discussion was not fully touched upon in my opinion. After all, what is a consumer dollar can be shifted readily to an investment dollar, and likewise what is an investment dollar can readily be shifted to a consumer dollar. The determination of what is to be a consumer dollar or an investment dollar lies in the psychological makeup of our 165 million people. Obviously as long as basic living needs must be fulfilled for a person, that person is not going to convert his dollar into an investment dollar. Equally obviously, if the Federal Government taxes the investment dollar too heavily there will be considerable incentive to convert it into "living it up" as my kids now term it.

I want to mention another factor which seems to me is basic but was only touched upon in the hearings by my line of questioning of the panel witnesses. I was disturbed to conclude from the answers I received to these questions that not very many people had been thinking about the position Government capital formation has been playing in our present-day economy. A discussion of this factor will bring me right back to the beginning of my talk. The labor economists said there was adequate investment capital available because we were doing all right. The industry economists said maybe so, but if we need $14,000 capital investment to provide a job for each person coming into the labor market in the future we had best take heed now.

Now I pose the question, has there been sufficient private capital formation in the immediate past to carry forward our economy and to build solid growth? The housing industry has grown to a large extent on the basis of Government capital formation, not private capital formation. Certainly FHA and VA guaranties and Fanny Mae and most of the other Government housing programs are indirect financing. But what industry can operate without the economic function of insurance being performed by some capital formation? In my panel questioning to bring out my point, I referred to an insurance function being performed in the private economy which is a type that Government today is constantly performing in other economic areas without much comment. This particular operation, I might add, is one of high speculation and not of conservatism as we in this country have come to view the insurance field. I referred to the commodity exchange. To illustrate, Purina Mills, located in my district, is a big buyer of grain, but Purina in its operation wants to minimize the speculation involved in the cost of the grain it must buy * * * the grain futures market, private speculators, performs this economic function—this insurance function for it.

In other words, the question is: How much capital formation required to support our present day economy in all its varied ramifications has been supplied by the Federal Government? Until we know this we are hardly in a position of commenting with any intelligence on whether or not the investment dollar has been affected adversely by our Federal tax policies.

The argument for 20 years in the congressional committees and on the floor of the House has been, private enterprise isn't doing the job, the performance of the job is a social necessity, therefore Government must move in to do the job. Whether you talk about rural electrification, housing, medical attention, building municipal food markets in Philadelphia, the pleas are all this way.

Now there can be two basic reasons why private enterprise is not doing the job: (1) Because private enterprise lacks the initiative to do it, or (2) because Government through its own policies has hampered private enterprise from doing the job. Shut off speculative capital and you can cut off private endeavor most effectively. Again, this is part of the Fabian Socialists plan. Emphasize the social need for the service (and this can be built up emotionally by the demagogues to a point where it gets beyond all control), hamper private enterprise from doing it, then cry Government must do it.

To a degree, I am a liberal Republican but I have had little chance to demonstrate it since I have been in Congress. I am perfectly willing to have the Federal Government perform certain economic needs for our society provided (1) the need is clear, (2) private enterprise is not fulfilling the need, and (the point always overlooked in these discussions) a study reveals that private enterprise cannot fill the need, (3) that Government's entry is on an emergency basis and that plans simultaneously are set up to eliminate the reasons which have prevented and do prevent private enterprise from doing the job.

I am regarded as a conservative because with my small and to date ineffective voice I continue to harp on the last point. I shall close upon it. The question is: How does our Federal tax system hamper the economic growth and stability of our economy? And how can we reduce such hampering to the minimum? The question is not how does our Federal tax policy promote economic growth and stability and how can we increase that promotion. In my judgment, herein lies the solution to our problems of providing maximum employment and maximum happiness for our people, for the answers to the attainment of both our economic and spiritual values lie in providing the maximum amount of freedom for the individual person in his society.

Plans Completed for 1956 Congressional Tour of New York City and West Point, May 11, 12, and 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, plans have been completed for the annual congressional tour of New York City and West Point for May 11, 12, and 13 for Members of both branches of Congress and their families. The annual tour provides for 3 glorious days in New York at a cost of $37.50 for adults and $32.50 each for children between the ages of 5 and 12 years.

So that the membership may have some idea of the schedule of events for the tour, the following itinerary will be of interest:

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday, May 11: 9:45 a. m. daylight time we leave Washington via Pennsylvania Railroad (please note change in leaving time). Luncheon will be served in dining car. We arrive New York Penn Station at 1:45 p. m. daylight time and immediately board motor coach for tour of lower New York, including a stop at city hall for reception by the mayor, Hon. Robert F. Wagner. We also stop at the United Nations for a 1-hour tour. We arrive at the Paramount Hotel at about 5:30 p. m. daylight time. At 6 p. m., cocktails and buffet dinner will be served in the Oceanic Room off the lobby to the left of the elevator. The evening will be open for Members to attend the theater or enjoy the bright lights of Broadway.

Saturday, May 12: 8 a. m., motor coaches will leave for La Guardia Airport where the American Airlines will serve us breakfast in the air—plus an enjoyable air trip over the city of New York, the Hudson River Valley, the State of Connecticut, Long Island Sound, and other points of interest. Eleven a. m., motor coach will take us to the Brooklyn Navy Yard where we will see the largest aircraft carrier in the world—U. S. S. *Saratoga*. Then we step aboard the New York Port Authority steamer for trip around Manhattan with a descriptive tour of New York Harbor docks and facilities. Luncheon and refreshments will be served aboard ship. Four p. m., motor coaches will transfer our party from dock to the Paramount Hotel. At 6 p. m. cocktails and buffet dinner will be served at Hotel Pierre, overlooking Central Park. Motor coaches will transfer our party from the Paramount to the Hotel Pierre. The evening will be open for members of our party to attend the theater and other places of amusement.

Sunday, May 13: Don't forget it's Mother's Day. Nine a. m., motor coaches will take us for our visit to United States Military Academy, West Point on the Hudson. We visit the information center, the museum, Washington Hall, tour kitchens, meet cadet escorts, luncheon, USMA Library, dress parade on the Plain (weather permitting), tour of post, Trophy Point, Cullum Hall, and cadet chapel, including brief organ recital. Motor coaches to Penn Station where we meet at east gate No. 13 to await train departure at 5:30 p. m. daylight time.

I should like to emphasize that this tour is for Members of the Senate and House and their families, and reservations should be made immediately by calling Miss Patricia Bryan, extension 366 or 1830.

Outline of Thoughts on the 165th Anniversary of Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, freemen everywhere will salute the Polish people on the 165th anniversary of their constitution day. They do so in honor of Poland's early recognition and adherence to the principle of the equality of man.

Since that day in 1791, constitution day has been commemorated by the Polish people. It has unified the people into a nation dedicated to freedom and democracy.

It is no surprise therefore, that when the Kremlin's puppets came to power in Poland, they abolished constitution day. Moscow's puppets felt they had to destroy this proud memory so that they could trample underfoot everything it stood for.

Today, there are no constitution day celebrations in captive Poland. The equality proclaimed by the constitution in 1791, has been replaced by a police state, where Communist terror divides the people into the rulers and the ruled.

Fat Communist functionaries live in luxury, while the oppressed population lives in squalor.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by slave labor camps run by the Bezpieka knows only blind obedience to the party and its functionaries.

Nowhere in the world is there less equality, greater class distinction, than in the Communist-controlled countries.

Maybe the Communist have a point when they call for a relentless class struggle. People everywhere sooner or later will join in the struggle against the most oppressive class in the world, the Communist bosses, who represent the climax of reaction.

One hundred and sixty-five years ago, the Polish Constitution called for the transformation of tenant farmers into peasants owning their own land. Today, Communist reactionaries dispossess the peasants by forcing them into collective farms.

The 1791 constitution abolished the peasant's obligation to work for his landlord. Today, the Communist state is a worse landlord, imposing compulsory delivery quotas.

This is what the Communist call progress, when they deny the people the very freedom, those rights, which they won over a century ago.

Although the Communists suppressed the celebration of constitution day, they can never suppress its spirit which lives on in the hearts and minds of the people.

Poles never bowed to foreign rule or oppression. They always stood in the front ranks of those who fight for freedom and the right of man. They fought Hitler hordes, while the Communist Red Army twice stabbed them in the back; first by invading their country, and later during the Warsaw uprising. Today, they are engaged in an equally uncompromising struggle against communism. Their resistance to the regime takes many forms and is adjusted to the ability of the individual to do his best under most difficult circumstances.

This resistance is manifest in a few overcrowded churches; in those brave escapees who cross the minefield and barbed-wire fences to reach freedom; in the parents who will not let their children forget the proud history of their country; in the millions who withstand Communist pressure and coercion in their daily life.

To all of them we here pledge that we shall support them to the best of our ability in their unceasing struggle to retain that freedom, that equality, which their own constitution proclaimed so long ago.

Bipartisanship of Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I heard our distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, address the National Housing Conference at the recent meeting in Washington. It was a great speech. I commend it to your attention:

BIPARTISANSHIP OF SLUMS

You have heard from the experts this morning on the subject of urban renewal and low-rent public housing. I wish it had been possible for me to share the meeting with you.

I have been given a subject that intrigues me—Bipartisanship of Slums. It is a subject on which I feel strongly.

I have long been proud of the leadership that my city of Cleveland has brought to our State and to the Nation in the long, tough attack on slums, and in behalf of better housing authority, and Ohio was the first State that put a public housing law on its books. We have been blessed with the dedicated leadership of my old friend Ernest J. Bohn, who by the way, is a former Cleveland

Republican councilman. Ernie Bohn has dealt always in human terms. This has given him the backing of community interests and leaders, businessmen and labor, Republicans and Democrats. Our accomplishments in Cleveland have been team victories. They must continue that way.

It hasn't all been easy going. We have met powerful opposition, but step by step we are winning this fight. We are winning it because we have a positive approach. We waste no time attacking those who attack us. We try to understand the needs and desires of our people, and we do our utmost to meet them. We have no faith in miracles. We know that our job is long and difficult, but so long as we unite our forces, and in our planning for each new day we rise above greed and the pettiness of partisan advantage, we know that our progress will one day bring us to our goal of an adequate home for every family in Cleveland and in America.

In the House of Representatives, where I have served since 1940, I have listened to some bitter debates on the subject of low-rent public housing. We have won some ringing victories and suffered some stinging defeats. But always we shall do well to remember that there is wide bipartisanship among both the proponents and opponents of public housing. Whenever we get into wrangles over public housing, I find myself wishing that I could take my colleagues by the hand and lead them through the jungles of the slums of our cities and let them feel and smell what it is we are talking about. Will you forgive me if I say that it always seems to me that you people who are today within the reach of my voice haven't done all that you could do back home, to bring understanding to Members of the Congress of the humanitarian programs to which you devote your lives.

You can bring a real knowledge and so a better understanding to the House of Representatives, if you will make it your No. 1 job this summer to see to it that your Representatives in the Congress know and understand the job that you are doing. Don't bother about the political affiliation of your Congressman, or how he has voted in the past. Think of him as just another good American who wants more than anything, to represent honestly and well all the people of his (or her) district. We Congressmen are just ordinary folk! We are your next-door neighbors. If we fail to seek your counsel, provide it freely anyway, and do it when we are at home where we can see and feel what it is of which you speak. No Member of Congress is too busy to find out how his constituents live.

I was impressed with President Eisenhower's forthright message to this, your 25th annual meeting. Let us repeat what he said: "Our Nation's progress in the housing field must continue. To renew our cities and towns, to prevent and clear slums, and to raise the living standards of all our families, the individual citizen, the community, the State, private industry, and the Federal Government must work together. Such cooperation is exemplified in communitywide programs for urban renewal that have been generated by the Housing Act of 1954.

"I am confident that in the years ahead your Conference will continue to give strong support and encouragement to this common effort."

You are called upon by our President, for continuing support and encouragement. I have read the administration's housing proposals for 1956, as introduced by SENATOR CAPEHART in the Senate, in which he was joined by request by SENATOR SPARKMAN, and by REPRESENTATIVE WIDNALL in the House. I am aware that the National Housing Conference has taken the position that the administration's recommendation of 70,000 units of low-rent public housing to be contracted for over the next 2 years, is inadequate as weighed against the housing needs of families of low income. It is not my wish to discuss statistics or housing needs, but I must say one thing with all of the force at my command:

All of us know that the task of slum elimination and the rebuilding of our cities is staggering beyond belief. Our administration has shown a willingness to attack this problem in a practical way. One cannot wave away the fact that a majority of the House of Representatives has shown itself many times to be opposed to the low-rent public housing program as it presently operates. That is an unfortunate fact with which we have to deal. Yet the administration makes it perfectly clear that it will move ahead with the gigantic task of slum clearance and urban renewal. The administration also says frankly that this job cannot be accomplished unless there is some public housing to rehouse low-income families that are displaced through slum clearance. It asks for a program that it believes it can persuade the House of Representatives to approve. That means progress, not stagnation. It means that we are headed forward, not backward, and it takes us to the place where the future rests with you.

If you are right in saying that the recommended program is too small to meet existing needs, then I feel that it is your duty to prove your point with local facts and figures. I know that the National Housing Conference prepared and presented a study of housing needs, using facts from the 1950 census and other data. That was fine as far as it went. It was an excellent statistical document presented by a national organization. It was helpful to those of us who are on your team anyway, but far more than that is required if we expect to achieve any kind of a balance between authorized programs and need.

National figures are interesting, but before I can do anything about it, I have to know Cleveland's situation from the mayor, the housing officials, and from civic leaders. I need to see the actual conditions under which some of our citizens have to live. My colleagues from Georgia, Texas, California, Massachusetts, and New York need to know the same thing. How can those of us who are on the Hill really know the situation except through you? We in Congress should not be called upon to ask you, and somebody in Washington shouldn't have to do the job for you.

If what the administration is asking is too small; if the cities of our Nation demand more in order to do a job that is essential to the welfare of our people, then tell us the facts and do it quickly, because time moves ahead relentlessly. That is my message for you.

I am almost envious of the opportunity that is yours to help destroy slums, and to help create communities in which millions of American families can find a new way of life and prepare themselves to graduate as full-fledged members of our proud, self-supporting, economically free body politic. It was my great privilege to spend many years in the field of social service and education, specifically in public health nursing and in nursing education. I began right in the districts where life is hard and the light of hope is often very dim. I speak from personal experience, and from a full heart. I believe I understand your objectives and your problems. It is this that brings me here.

To me, the so-called housing problem is a composite of many things. It is complicated, because it is so personal. It is related to a vast range of intensely human problems that confront not only slum dwellers, the aging, veterans, minority groups, but all of us, every day that we live.

The housing problem cannot be explained away with easy clichés: the greedy landlord, the maniac tenant who destroys property for the fun of it, the slum dweller who would put coal in the bathtub if he had one; or the slick mortgage-foreclosing banker versus the poor widow, nor the Communist agitator versus the strong, sturdy, upright private enterpriser.

Housing is so much more than just the fact that you can't find a place to live; it is all tied up with the problem that when you do find a proper house, you may have to cut down on food to pay for it—and then lose it anyway when you are unemployed for a few months. Or it may be quite simply that you can't afford a house with a back yard when the children are young and need the space and the sun, but must wait till you get that raise and the doctor's bills are paid * * * and by that time the children have grown up. No matter how dearly you love your parents, living together in a crowded flat often stretches your patience and theirs beyond the breaking point.

Housing is doubling up and sharing the bath and cooking over a hotplate. It is why so many young people, who got married in a romantic rush during war years, couldn't turn their marriage into something solid and enduring and so took the only way out that they knew: separation-divorce. It is why colored and whites throw rocks at each other in some overcrowded cities where otherwise there seems to be a general and sincere desire to get rid of discrimination and live peaceably with your neighbors whoever they may be.

Housing is the fire that trapped a sick woman in the old three-decker, the bowed legs and pale face of the little girl in the tenement, the epidemic that started in the shacktown with no sewerage connection, the boy gang in the alley aping the older gang in the pool room * * * and it is the cost of all of these things to taxpayers and society as a whole, against which we all rebel.

Housing is the fact that, even if there were no shortage and you had plenty of money, you would have to choose between renting a noisy apartment in a crowded neighborhood, or buying a suburban house that is pleasant and open, and an hour from your work where you can't find a place to park.

Housing is the fact that the house and the neighborhood you used to take pride in are now run down, undesirable for anything but cheap boardinghouses, funeral emporiums and quack doctors; it is finding a place with a nursery school nearby, a place where older children won't have to cross dangerous highways or pass filthy dives. It is the fact that dirt and noise and danger, dreariness and high tax rates made you move to the suburbs, but that did not improve the conditions you left behind. Housing is the fact that your child in the suburb and the child in the slum or low-rent housing project tend more and more to see only their own class and kind, in a country whose historic strength is a lack of built-in class barriers. It is one reason why the farmer's wife grows old before her time and his children go to the city, where they won't have to thaw out the pump on zero mornings. It is why the big producer cannot get enough men to pick his crop before it rots. Housing is people, and all of their problems and frustrations. Housing is also their dreams, their hopes, their prayers which all too often end in anguish and despair.

You are brave people indeed to devote your lives to an effort to help solve our housing problem. You have become dedicated people. You know as few do that human problems are common problems which cannot be solved except as a completely bi-partisan task. You are dealing with all kinds of people, and with all of the emotions of the human race. May Heaven grant you ever-increasing understanding and wisdom as you continue with patience and determination toward our common goal.

It is thrilling to know that you are making progress, for you are. We, on Capitol Hill want to help. We need your guidance, your advice and the facts that only you can give. Where Federal aid is required to find the answer to this complicated problem it must and will be forthcoming. Keep your courage high. I suggest that the people are on your side.

Perhaps the Housing Act that will pass in 1956 will not be all that you desire, but I predict that one will pass and that it will mark progress toward the goal that we mutually seek. I express the hope that the National Housing Conference will continue its long fight for slum clearance and better housing. When you meet 25 years from now to celebrate not 25 but 50 years of public service, I feel certain that you will be able to look back and say: "It has been a long, steep road, but we have never ceased to climb."

Once more I venture to predict: That when most of America is properly housed because of the work that has been done by Republicans and Democrats together in true bipartisanship the deeper meaning of freedom will be brought home to all who can call themselves Americans, and our wonderful representative Republic will be the symbol of men's understanding of those basic human needs which mean growth and happiness and peace.

Russian Communism Versus Human Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address I delivered in Cleveland, Saturday evening, April 21, at the State of Ohio Catholic War Veterans' 11th Annual Convention, held at the Hotel Carter, on "Russian Communism Versus Human Freedom":

It is a great pleasure for me to be with you this evening. I know how each one of you is guided by an unswerving love of God and country. By the very nature of your organization, it is immediately apparent that you are concerned with the preservation of Christian civilization and the American way of life.

I know too that the hardships of life which so many of you have endured in support of those noble ends have taught you the necessity of understanding the forces of evil at work in the world and the folly of looking at the world arena through rose-colored glasses. All of this, of course, gives me assurance that you expect me to talk right from the shoulder and put before you the facts as I know them with respect to the status of Christian civilization and the American way of life, together with an estimate of the prospects for the future.

As a starting point, we might ask ourselves—what is the greatest, the fundamental issue facing all mankind today, and then we should ask ourselves—is this issue the greatest one which confronts all the American people? The need to maintain a healthy and prosperous agricultural economy is certainly an important issue. So also is it important to have an adequate housing and health program throughout the country. No one can deny that we must assure a strong and healthy climate for the growth of organized labor and the free-enterprise system. Most people recognize the need for us to forge ahead in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy in order that our people may fully benefit from the great scientific advances and the bounties of nature of our generation. Important as each and every one of these issues are, I believe that none of them is the basic or fundamental issue facing our civilization. I believe that the gravest issue of our times is summed up in the case of Russian communism versus human freedom. This issue is all the more fundamental to the American people because the ominous threat of further Communist aggression has caused us to drain from our national resources each year, upwards of $40 billion to keep us in a state of preparedness and to provide our allies the wherewithall to defend themselves against the predatory Russians. If this issue could be resolved beyond any doubt and human freedom would emerge as the sturdy victor, much of these public funds which now go to national defense could be directed at the happy resolution of the other important issues which I have cited. Moreover, the taxpayer could be given a long overdue relief because it is a fact that over 60 percent of the tax dollar must now go for national defense.

I believe on the basis of this logic, that the central issue of our times is the case of Russian communism versus human freedom.

We Americans have been hoping and praying that communism with all its evils and threats to the peace could be banished from the face of the earth. Communism carries with it the seeds of its own destruction, but it appears that the small, tightly organized regime which controls the lives of the people who inhabit one-third of the earth's surface, is well cemented in the Kremlin. Moreover, that group of criminals is now embarking upon a new type of warfare against all civilization. I speak of the Communist claims to "peaceful coexistence" with free nations and people of the world.

On the one hand the Kremlin, through its vast network of propaganda organs, is seeking to convince people everywhere that it seeks peaceful coexistence as a means of relieving world tensions. The Russians hint that they believe in a policy of live and let live. The late Communist Dictator Stalin is now being defamed and undeified by the very men who, for several decades, were his eyes, ears, and willing accessories in carrying out a long list of crimes against humanity. It seems there is no extreme to which the present directorate of world communism will not go to gain acceptance of their proposal of peaceful coexistence.

There are people in our midst today who unfortunately are willing to accept the Communist overtures for peaceful coexistence. Such people attempt to deceive us into believing that the conspiracy of world communism has undergone fundamental changes since the death of Stain. They say that the day of the one-man dictator has ended and that a new day has dawned over the empire of communism in which collective rule will reduce the outrageous inhumanities of the past. These people hold the unfounded conviction that changes can be effected in the basic nature of communism by the process of evolution. Some are so imbued with this false notion that they predict that within 25 years communism and human freedom will fuse and then evolve into a utopia here on earth.

There are others who hold that so fundamental are the changes now taking place within the Russian Communist empire, as to give hope that the tyrannical rule of communism may be superseded by some new type of government. This new type of government might be similar to the court of the czars, and the likelihood is presented that the so-called military career men will occupy the throne. It is in these circumstances that Marshal Zhukov is now being presented to the American people as the hope for the future, the key to peace, or the balance wheel against those elements in the Communist conspiracy which have been responsible for armed aggression and open war.

We must also recognize that the Russian leaders are quick to take advantage of any opening in the armor of the free world to advance their nefarious cause just as we must be willing to recognize that certain Western leaders have been made unwitting helpers in the present Kremlin offensive of peaceful coexistence.

You will recall the story that was prevalent immediately before the so-called Geneva Conference to the effect that Anthony Eden had to commit himself to such a meeting in order to assure victory at the polls in the British elections. As a result of that Geneva Conference the Russian leaders, Krushchev and Bulganin, are now in Great Britain where they are certain to do great harm to the free world alliances and to further delude the unsuspecting into believing that they are not the arch criminals who were in fact associated with Stalin in his reign of terror over the preceding 20-odd years. I cannot constrain myself from saying that there are some politicians and pseudo statesmen who consider no price too great to pay, either by them or by their native land, in order to win an election.

The evidence as to whether or not the Russian Communists have undergone any fundamental changes following the death of the Dictator Stalin is overwhelmingly conclusive that no change whatever has taken place as to policy or worldwide objectives. The goal to communize the world and to make abject Russian colonies out of every nation of the world remains unchanged.

The Communist determination to use any and all means to destroy civilization and to replace it with the rule of the jungle remains unchanged. There has been a slight shift in Communist tactics calling for louder talk about peace, disarmament, coexistence, and open competition with free governments. The noisy little Russians have proven themselves experts in this field.

The Communist doctrine of peaceful coexistence was originated by the first Communist dictator, Lenin. Twenty-five years ago the official line on peaceful coexistence was laid down by a disciple of Lenin, Dimetry A. Manuilsky. Here is what he said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

That Communist doctrine has not been altered one iota since the day it was uttered. Communist Party boss, Khrushchev, in a speech before the so-called 20th Congress of the Communist Party during February of this year, restated and confirmed that basic doctrine when he called for a greatly stepped up propaganda, economic, political, and cultural offensive against the free world. He clearly stated

that the usual methods of violence would be used only in those countries where the resistance to communism is strong and that the Communist take-over of the neutralist nations could be easily accomplished by what he described as "parliamentary methods" and the deception of the popular-front type of government. For countries well informed on the truth about communism, he ordered an increase in internal subversion through the Communist Party Cadres already organized for that purpose, in order to bring about conditions of extreme violence and lawlessness. It is apparent, therefore, that the United States is marked for violent treatment by the conspiracy of communism rather than the conciliatory and friendly approach the Kremlin leaders have been claiming so loudly of late. Khrushchev, speaking for world communism, removed any hopes there may have been for an end to the cold war and made it clear beyond any reasonable doubt that the Communists are convinced they are movng into an advanced stage of their blueprint for world conquest. To accomplish these objectives all Communist organizations, agents, and fronts have been ordered by Communist Party boss, Khrushchev, to "intensify our efforts in Communist education of the masses and in eliminating the survival of capitalism in the minds of men, make fuller and more active use, to this end, of all the ideological media—propaganda, agitation, the press, radio, cultural and educational organizations and institutions, science, literature, and art."

Amidst the high degree of organized confusion which has descended upon our Nation and other free nations as a result of the campaign for so-called peaceful coexistence being carried on by the noisy little Russians, and the subterranean efforts on the part of some American to secure peace at any price, the true nature and the hideous record of communism seems almost obliterated. The public mind is diverted from the cruel facts and directed toward an illusion of peace. The outstanding accomplishment of the Geneva Conference in my opinion was to humanize the evil little despots who reside in the Moscow Kremlin. Through the Geneva Conference the blood of millions of martyrs was wiped from the guilty hands of Khrushchev, Bulganin and company. The vast benefits which derived from the campaign of truth in which the United States engaged for so many years were brushed aside in one sweep of a hand, grasping a martini cocktail and raised up in a display of comradeship with communism. Bulganin has since reminded the world that the spirit of Geneva gave birth to the martini road—the road to a life worse than death.

I should like to make it clear that I believe President Eisenhower sought the opposite results in Geneva. I am reasonably certain he is as unhappy about the results of the so-called summit as you and I are. But the fact remains that the advisers around him, who should have known better than to lead him into an impossible situation with the Russians, cannot escape responsibility for the terrible setback to the free world and the cause of a just and lasting peace.

Despite the Russian camouflage and the barrage of words supporting the allusion of peace, the record of communism stands as an indelible mark on the conscience of all mankind. This record cannot be brushed aside by pleas for peaceful coexistence or by the clinking of martini glasses, even if those martini glasses are held by the chiefs of state of the western powers.

The evil record of communism must be righted else all mankind will pay a frightening price.

The ugly earmarks of communism are many, and the record of its inhumanities over these past 38 years, if put side by side, would overflow the largest archives in this country.

I believe it will be useful to discuss what I consider to be the outstanding characteristics of communism in practice.

The first is that communism, in order to survive, must destroy whatever civilization it occupies. Communism cannot afford honest and open competition of any type.

Communism still holds to the goal of a utopia on earth, and that utopia is the graveyard of nations. To the communists, all sense of nation and nationhood must disappear and be replaced with a faceless society in which the Russians will be the elite and all else will be hapless slaves.

Man is considered nothing more than an animal, to be used by the state as the state alone sees fit. To the Communist, man has neither dignity, destiny, nor a hereafter.

Man-made famines in which millions of people are caused to die are considered a necessary step toward communization of the world. This accounts for the man-made famine in the Ukraine in 1932–1933 and in Turkestan in 1934, which brought about the death of over 5 million human beings.

The crime of genocide was born and perfected under communism. This is the crime of liquidating an entire nation by the process of forced deportation and dissemination to the four winds. This accounts for the destruction of the Crimean Tatars, the Chechen-Inguish, and the Kalmuk nations, in the course of 24 hours by the cruel process of forced deportation of these people to the barren reaches of Russian Siberia.

Mass murder is a standard practice of communism. In cases where towns, villages, or large areas openly resist communism, mass murder generally follows. For example, the Vinnitzia massacre in Ukraine in which the leaders of a whole region were all executed and buried in mass graves.

The deportation and murder of leadership elements in the nations occupied by communism is standard practice. It is a known fact that whenever Russian communism occupies a country, the first step undertaken by the tyrants is to round up the leaders in all walks of life. These leaders are then deported to slave labor camps in Russia under circumstances in which husband is separated from wife, and children are separated from parents. Specific evidence to this point is provided in captured secret Russian MVD Order No. 001223, signed by General Serov, and carried out in 1941, which sets forth detailed instructions on who was to be rounded up in the Baltic States and how their cruel deportation was to be carried out in the darkness of the night. This is the same General Serov who only several weeks ago was sent by Khrushchev and Bulganin as their trusted friend, to make advance security arrangements for their visit to Great Britain. Another case in point is the infamous Katyn Forest massacre, in which over 10,000 Polish officers, the cream of Polish manhood, were murdered by the Russians and buried in mass graves. These are only two examples of Russian methods used to destroy leadership elements of the nations they occupy or intend to occupy. There are hundreds of others. As a member of a congressional investigating committee, I heard, here and abroad, sworn testimony by eyewitnesses to the inhumanities of communism.

Brainwashing is a new and evil science developed by the Russian Communists as a means of advancing their objective of world empire. This technique has been applied both to individuals and to entire nations. It is standard operating procedure with Communists everywhere. The Russians taught it to their stooges in China, who then applied it to American prisoners of war, missionaries, and other American civilians living in Red China. The Russians also taught this evil technique to their stooges in Hungary, and other captive nations as evidenced by the farcical trial of the beloved Hungarian patriot, Cardinal Mindzenty.

Still another example of brainwashing on a mass scale is evidenced by the techniques of the Russian Communists of calling for peace one day and engaging in threats of armed aggression the next day. By the constant pounding of the slogans of peace and war, peace and war, and peace and war, they hope to break down the resistance of the free people and utterly confuse the nations of the free world.

To me, the standard symbols of communism are, on the one hand, a murder victim with a bullet hole in the back of his head, hands tied by wire behind his back, dumped into a mass grave; and the other is the statue which stands in Moscow of a Russian teen-age boy, who was made a Soviet hero because he betrayed his father to the secret police for withholding grain from the farm collective and for attempting to interest his son in religion.

For the next several weeks our press will likely carry feature stories about the visit of Communist Party boss Khrushchev and "Charlie McCarthy" Bulganin in their tour of the British Isles. No doubt considerable space will be given to the statements made by both these jolly conspirators as they make pleas for a lessening of international tensions, the need for immediate disarmament, and devious pleas for peace—Russian style. We may be certain that the two Russian circus performers will get their deceptive message across to vast numbers of the people of Great Britain and other countries of the free world despite efforts of the British Government to prevent this tour from becoming an overt propaganda campaign.

That is the way the free press works and that is the calculated plan of the Kremlin leaders to use the free press to carry their false message to unsuspecting millions throughout the world.

The British once proudly claimed that the sun never sets on the British Empire. I believe it would be most appropriate at this time for the British to point out that the only real colonial empire left in the world is that of the Russian Communists and the sun never rises over any part of it.

An effort has been under way for some time here in the United States to smooth the way for a visit by Marshal Zhukov. The Red Army has been described as a new force emerging within the power struggle in Moscow. The false notion has been advanced that somehow the Red army is to be distinguished from the criminal conspirators in the Kremlin, and that the Red army leaders are free from the many sins of the elite class of communism. Zhukov himself has been built up in this country as the one likely to emerge as the strong man of the Soviet Union. By a strange process of reasoning, he has also been built up as a hoped for guardian of the peace. Neither one of these assumptions can be supported by facts. To begin with, the Red army and its commanders are as integral a part of the international Communist conspiracy as is the MVD, the MGB, the Russian diplomatic corps, and the Communist Party in the United States. All of them are dedicated to the singular goal of communizing the world. None of them have differences as to how this goal shall be accomplished. They all subscribe to the belief that any and all means must be used to attain the goal of world empire. Zhukov has no more freedom of individual action than Molotov, Molotov has no more freedom of action than Mikoyan, and so it is with any and all of the Communist oligarchy.

Yet, with all of this, there are disturbing signs that Zhukov may be invited to visit our beloved country sometime in the late summer or early fall to be given the welcome of a comrade in arms. His visit may even be scheduled as a personal one, and the fulfillment of a hope that he expressed in the flush days of victory shortly after the fall of Berlin. Whatever the reason or the climate engineered for this visit, in the background will be draped the illusion of peace.

I am sure the American people do not want peace at any price. I am certain that the building of false illusions of peace can lead us nowhere except to a cruel and devastating war. I remain convinced that we can only prevent war and find the way to just peace by adopting a course of action which excludes the use of rose-colored glasses in charting that course.

I believe that we must maintain a completely adequate and battle-ready national-defense force. That force must be buttressed by the maximum utilization of all the scientific advances which will give us assurance that we can quickly and completely defeat any enemy who attempts aggression or, indeed, the destruction of the United States. I believe that it is imperative that we stand by our proven allies, that we extend to them necessary military and economic assistance so that they will be strong allies when needed. I believe equally that we must not squander our great natural resources upon nations whose reliability is questionable and who have yet to prove their friendship for the United States springs from allegiance to those great moral and political truths which have inspired mankind down through the ages. I believe it is flirting with disaster to engage in any trade whatever with the Russian Communist Empire, which, in my judgment, includes Communist occupied China. I also believe that the United States Government must undertake an all-out campaign to accomplish these two objectives on a worldwide basis—

1. To inform all the people of the world concerning United States hopes and aspirations for them and our desire to bring about a genuine world peace and to restore the family of nations into which every nation, large and small, has en equal sovereignty.

2. To reawaken the conscience of all civilization to the cruel record of inhumanities which stand as the earmarks of communism everywhere it has festered and taken root. It it our moral duty as good neighbors and brothers to other people of the world to alert them to the true facts of communism and what it does to all religions, all cultures, all languages, all traditions, and every nation.

It has long been my belief that we are losing the worldwide struggle for the minds of men. This has not been the fault of any administration or any individual. It has, in my judgment, resulted from the fact that we, as a Nation, have not yet come to realize the full power of ideals and ideas when they are applied to the many medias of mass communication. We should make an honest evaluation of what the Russian Communists have done in this regard. I believe it is fair to say, in the case of communism, that never have so many people been fooled and misled by an appeal which has so little to claim or hold adherents.

For these reasons I introduced in the last session of Congress a resolution calling for the establishment of a joint committee of Congress on United States international information programs. That resolution makes clear that the time has come for us to make maximum use of an international information program in the struggle for the minds of men. I believe that Congress, through such a joint committee, can make an ever increasing contribution in the direction of a just and lasting peace and the prevention of war. I am hopeful that Congress will establish such a joint committee and that we can go forward with a winning program against the latest Communist propaganda offensive which they are carrying out under the slogan of "Peaceful coexistence."

This is a cause in which we must not hesitate. The survival of Christian civilization and the American way of life hangs in the balance. The hour is already late. I am confident that despite the organized confusion which has descended upon us, we will soon awaken to the grave danger of the latest Russian propaganda offensive and go on to win victory in this worldwide struggle of ideals and ideas.

Wheat Farmers Want the Domestic Parity Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would incorporate in our farm program one of the desirable features of the conference report on H. R. 12 which, among others, prompted me to vote for that measure. In so doing, I am joining with our distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, who was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress. This bill has the support of the National Grange, and the National Wheat Growers' Association. I am confident that it would meet with the approval of our administration.

Wheat is one of the basic crops grown in western Nebraska, and it is the only crop readily and profitably adaptable to the soil and climate of large areas of my State. If other crops could be grown economically, I can assure you they would be grown because the farmers in my district would like nothing better than to rid themselves of Government controls.

Existing wheat programs are unrealistic and unacceptable to the farmers in western Nebraska. Their land is highly susceptible to wind erosion, and moisture is scant. It is absolutely necessary to maintain a cover on the land to prevent blowing and to catch and hold every bit of snow and rainfall; as a result, nearly every farmer follows summer-fallowing practices whereby one-half of his land must lie idle each year. The prudent farmer is severely penalized by the present wheat program because his acreage allotment has been established on the basis of the number of acres he plants, and the 2 or 3 acreage cuts decreed in past years have reduced his wheat base to such an extent that he is able to use scarcely more than 30 percent of his farmland. In the case of the small farmer this has been disastrous. This is his dilemma: If he stays in the program, his wheat base is too small to permit him to operate profitably; if he chooses to overplant, he cannot afford to pay the penalty imposed.

The domestic parity bill I have today introduced is a desirable improvement.

First, it will eventually remove the hand of the Federal Government from control of the wheat farm. The farmer would not be penalized if he plants more than the Government permits, because the Government will not be able to tell him how much he can plant.

Second, since the support program applies only to the wheat used for domestic food purposes and marketing quotas are based on annual consumption of wheat as food, the multifarious problems and the $350 million annual expense connected with storage will be sharply reduced and eventually wiped out.

Third, the supported wheat will be produced primarily for the domestic market, and not for sale to the Government. The Government will be eliminated in due time as the world's largest wheat warehousing and marketing establishment.

Fourth, the cost of operating this program will be considerably lower than the present catchall operation.

The mechanics of the domestic parity program are quite simple. On the basis of the information available to him, the Secretary of Agriculture determines the number of bushels of wheat that will be consumed in the domestic food markets in this country during the coming year. Using this figure as the base, he then establishes bushel quotas for each of the wheat-producing States in terms of their history in the preceding 10 years. County and farm unit quotas are then established by appropriate State and local organizations, using as criteria the past wheat acreages, the normal yield, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. The wheat farmer subsequently receives a marketing certificate which will assure him 100 percent of parity for this bushel quota. If he chooses to produce more wheat, it is his privilege to do so but the wheat must be sold at the market price, consumed, or fed on the farm, or stored back against future crops.

The cost of this program to the consumer of wheat products would be negligible. Prices now paid for good milling wheat traditionally exceed parity, and the wheat content of many of our staple foods contributes little to its retail cost. For example, the cost of the wheat in a loaf of bread is about 10 percent of the total. Wheat produced for sale in excess of the domestic quotas would receive no support and would have to seek their own level on the market.

This plan for wheat would dovetail nicely with the administration's soil bank; it would work exceedingly well with the bill I have introduced emphasizing the industrial use of agricultural commodities. It would serve the best interests of the wheat farmer and the general public. Surplus crops can be converted into alcohol, rubber, and other industrial items. This legislation should be adopted this year.

Speech of Hon. James C. Davis, of Georgia, in Defense of Constitutional Government, State Sovereignty, and Commonsense, Delivered at West Memphis, Ark., March 31, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 23, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional crisis forced on us by the Supreme Court's Black Monday decisions, and subsequent attacks upon States rights is the most serious threat to our form of government since the War Between the States. Almost equally important is the irreconcilable social problem created by these decisions, which threatens to destroy completely the peaceful relationships that have existed between the races for the last hundred years.

It has been virtually impossible for the South to present its side of the controversy to other parts of the country because of a biased press which deliberately suppresses the arguments of southern leaders.

Recently, in a speech at West Memphis, Ark., our distinguished colleague from Georgia, Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, presented what I consider to be an irrefutable argument for the preservation of segregation, and the need for protecting the rights of the States against the unconstitutional usurpation of power by the Federal establishment. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of Mr. DAVIS' address and commend it to Americans everywhere. Its thought-provoking contents should serve to open the eyes of those who have been blinded by the misleading arguments of South-hating propagandists:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. DAVIS DELIVERED AT WEST MEMPHIS, ARK., MARCH 31, 1956

I am glad to come from Washington to talk to you tonight. We have a common interest. The bold and brazen attack now being made upon constitutional government calls for organization, for unity of purpose and for unity of action.

Every Member of the House and Senate from Arkansas signed the Manifesto in Washington on March 12. It is necessary—it is imperative that you people back home be unanimous in your action. This fight has 2 fronts—the one in Washington and the one at home. On each front there must be organization, unity, and work.

The theme of the message which I want to bring to you tonight is this: The time has come for action.

We have been a tolerant people, tolerant to the point of gullibility. The average American, if given a choice between peace on the one hand, and strife on the other, will choose peace. He is long suffering. He will endure with patience an unbelievable amount of injustice and mistreatment.

In his spirit of tolerance your people and my people in the last 25 years have seen our constitutional rights whittled away little by little, and the whittling has been done by those whom we had a right to trust.

In our upbringing we were taught to respect our Government—to believe in the integrity of public officials.

Ingrained in us was the faith and confidence that the United States Supreme Court was a bulwark for the preservation of constitutional government; that it would always stand, as it had stood in the past, a fortress of strength, against which anyone would dash himself to destruction who sought to weaken or destroy the instrument of our liberties, the Constitution of the United States.

For nearly a century and a half the Court deserved the respect which it received. It justified the confidence of the people that it would uphold the Constitution and would proclaim its provisions as written, knowing that it was not in the province of the Court to change the Constitution by one jot or title, that the Court could not add anything to the Constitution or take anything from it; recognizing that if changing and modern times call for a revision of the Constitution, either great or small, then the Constitution itself declared how the change must be made.

In the structure of our Government there is no fact more certain than this; the nine justices of the Supreme Court cannot change our Constitution.

The Congress with its 531 Members of the House and Senate, cannot change it.

The President of the United States, with all his power, cannot change it.

Neither one of these alone can amend the Constitution. All three together cannot amend it.

It can be changed only by an amendment voted for by two-thirds of the House and Senate and by three-fourths of the sovereign States of the Union.

Any attempt to change our Constitution in any other manner is a gross fraud—a fraud which it is the duty of all patriotic citizens to expose and to prevent.

It was to restate, reaffirm, and support this well-known doctrine that the congressional "Declaration of Constitutional Principles" also called a manifesto, was written and signed by 101 Representatives and Senators in Washington on March 12.

We prepared and signed this document in Washington because we realize that the time is here when we must, as free men, defend the constitutional Government which is ours, or, as unworthy descendants of those who fought at Bunker Hill and Yorktown, sit by in silence and in cowardice while our hard won rights of State and local self-government are struck down illegally by the would-be social reformers on the Supreme Court.

We signed it because the time is here to defend free government, or to surrender to judicial dictatorship.

The principle involved here goes far beyond our right to operate our schools, although that in itself is a valued right, and a right we do not intend to surrender because the Supreme Court undertakes to usurp power it does not possess.

But the real issue is: Shall we permit the Supreme Court, one department of Government, whose powers are defined and limited by the Constitution, to successfully assert the power to change that precious document, by reading into it language it does not contain, and which those who wrote the Constitution and its amendments, never intended it should contain.

The question is, if changing conditions require a change in the Constitution, shall it be changed as the Constitution says, by drawing an amendment with definite and specific language, which shall receive the people's stamp of approval through a vote of two-thirds of the Congress, plus three-fourth of the States? This is the legal way.

Or, shall it be amended by the arbitrary act of nine men, to whom this authority has not been given, who are not elected, and who can in no sense of the word be said to represent the will and wishes of the people regarding amendments to the Constitution. We have amended the Constitution 22 times in the past by following legal and regular procedure. The 22d amendment was proposed in 1947 and certified in 1951. What has happened that we no longer must submit amendments to the Congress for a two-thirds vote and to the States for a three-fourths vote?

We have not yet lost this right to have a voice in adopting amendments to the Constitution, or in rejecting them. But this Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, is a brazen effort to destroy this right.

COURT CANNOT STRIKE DOWN CONSTITUTION

If the Court can today strike down the accepted and declared meaning of the Constitution; if it can nullify a construction on the exact point involved, which has been followed and approved in dozen of instances, by the Supreme Court itself and courts of many other jurisdictions, and in doing so rely upon nothing but its own arbitrary will, to support the decision, then it can tomorrow or next month strike down any other provision which does not conform to its sociological beliefs. While it may be Georgia or Arkansas which suffers today from such wrongful usurpation of authority, next year it may be Oregon, Maine, or Illinois.

While the subject today is schools, its next usurpation may involve taxes, or criminal law, or the right to own property. Once the precedent is established—once we have acknowledged the right of the Supreme Court to trifle with the Constitution, there is no limit to its possibilities.

Those of us who support local self-government and States rights have been slow to believe that we could lose these precious rights. We know now that we must fight for them.

There are many conditions which must get worse before they can get better. This is true because so many of us are apathetic to danger until we come face to face with it. To most of us a condition must become an emergency before we make even the first move to meet it. It is human nature not to take medicine until we get sick, although the sickness might be avoided by following some simple precautions in advance.

The segregation problem is one of those things that had to get worse before it could get better. It has now reached the emergency stage. The problem is so urgent that even the most indifferent can no longer ignore it. We can no longer shrug this problem off with the thought that it is the problem of the Federal Government, or the State government, or the school officials. It has come much closer home than that. It is my problem. It is your problem. I must do something about it. You must do something about it.

What is it that you and I must do, and do now, to save our schools, our States rights, and our constitutional Government? We must organize. We must organize with our neighbors. We must organize on the local level. We must organize on the county level and on the State level. We must present a massive, united front against the fraudulent attempt to take away from the people and the States our constitutional rights to conduct our own affairs in the way we choose to conduct them. You will find, if you have not already found it, that your neighbors are ready to organize with you, and we will have this massive, united front, if we organize with like-minded people.

Those of us who signed the Washington manifesto represent States having a population of nearly 40 million people. Do not let any loose-tongued, radical promoter of social equality tell you that this great segment of the American people, nearly one-fourth of the total, is helpless and powerless as we demand that which rightfully belongs to us. Do not let any mealy-mouthed traitor, whatever may be his motive, tell you that we must meekly accept this brazen usurpation of power as a legal exercise of its powers by the judicial department.

We are supporting a position which is sound and correct. We are supporting a position acknowledged by one and all to be sound and correct throughout the 178 years of our country's existence from 1776 to 1954—namely that the control and operation of schools belongs to the States and not to the Federal Government. Our position on local self government has been supported by decisions of all the courts during that entire period. It has been supported by the statesmen of all the periods of our history, by Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, their predecessors and their successors.

Franklin D. Roosevelt recognized the soundness of segregation when he, in 1928, provided in a deed to land at Warm Springs, Ga., that the land conveyed should not be sold, rented, or disposed of to any Negro or other persons of African decent, or to a corporation owned or controlled by Negroes. After he became President he executed a deed containing the same provision.

The right to be segregated goes back for thousands of years before our Government was established. That right was never challenged until this present Supreme Court decided to make new law on the subject. Yet the Court is not a law-making body. Congress alone has the right to legislate and introduce new matter into the body of our law. Congress, in the proper exercise of its function, has time and time again refused to make new law on this subject. There is no question about the fact that Congress alone can change the law and that the Court cannot.

The 101 Members of Congress in the House and Senate who signed the Washington manifesto have united in this declaration which challenges the right of the Court to change our Constitution. We are unified in this matter, and are standing solidly together. If you people at home will organize and do likewise, together we will defeat this attempted usurpation of power—this attempted judicial dictatorship.

But let me warn you that the strength of the resistance in Washington will depend upon the strength of your organization at home. You cannot expect to have a unified strong front in Washington unless you have a unified, strong front at home. The vigor and enthusiasm with which this fight is carried on in Washington will depend in great measure upon the vigor and enthusiasm which you show back home.

The separate States of this Union have not been operating their State governments under any hazy misconception of powers. State and Federal officials alike have known from the beginning their respective powers, their duties and their limitations, and have governed themselves accordingly. The right of self-government belongs to you and to me under the Constitution. The 10th amendment reads:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Without this saving clause in the Constitution, it is doubtful that the States would have ratified the Constitution at all.

This is an all-inclusive, express reservation to the States and to the people of all the powers not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution or amendments to it.

There is nothing in the Constitution, or any amendment, which authorizes the Supreme Court to say that segregation is unconstitutional. When the Constitution was written in 1787, segregation was universally practiced. Its practice continued to be universal. The thought that the Constitution might prohibit segregation never occurred to those who wrote it or adopted it.

When the 14th amendment was adopted in 1868, segregation was universally practiced. It continued to be universally practiced. No one contended that the 14th amendment would make segregation unconstitutional. In Washington, D. C., the seat of the Federal Government, there were schools in operation, and they were segregated before, during, and after the adoption of all the amendments to the Constitution. The very Congress which voted the 14th amendment enacted legislation dealing with segregated schools in the Nation's Capital. Segregated schools continued in Washington down to the year 1954, as the Supreme Court and courts of other jurisdictions in decision after decision declared them to be constitutional. It was only in 1954 that the Supreme Court, wholly without authority, arrogated unto itself the right to change the law of the land, which only the Congress has the power to do, and to amend the Constitution, which can only be legally be amended when the amendment is proposed by two-thirds of the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

For the nine men who sit upon the Supreme Court to usurp these powers which do not belong to them, but which belong exclusively to Congress and to States, is a monumental fraud which is shocking, outrageous, and reprehensible.

Such fraudulent conduct imposes no obligation upon the States to acquiesce, or upon the people to bow the neck to this new form of tyranny.

Let me say to you, as we counsel together, do not be concerned about what is said by the Communists, the pinkos, the radicals, the NAACP, the ADA, the one-worlders, and all that motley group of crackpots who are clamoring for desegregation and mongrelization. These groups of organized minorities are chanting a chorus that opposition to the fraudulent order of the Supreme Court is defiance of law. Of course that is not true. The decision of May 17, 1954, is not law. It is an attempt to make law where none existed before, by a non-law-making body. The defiance of law comes from the other side of this dispute. It is an arrogant defiance of law for the Supreme Court to usurp authority which it does not possess.

This claim that opposition to, and criticism of, the fraudulent Supreme Court decision is "defiance of law" is a sham. It is intended to draw attention away from the truth in this matter. That truth is that the Supreme Court is boldly and brazenly attempting to change the form of our Government.

The left-wing press, left-wing columnists and writers, the left-wing commentators on television, and radio, together with all of the left-wing organizations in the country beginning with the Communists and ending with organizations that are merely crackpot, are staging a massive campaign of super-brain-washing propaganda having a twofold purpose. These purposes are, first, to sell law-abiding American people the false idea that no one has the right to question a pronouncement of the Supreme Court, and second, that those who have any pride of race are bigoted, prejudiced, narrow-minded, racists, and hate-mongers. It is almost an understatement to say that this is a massive campaign of super-brain-washing propaganda. Radical newspapers and magazines from every section of the North and East have been sending writers, photographers and columnists to bring back slanted and derogatory tales Northern white people. Some of these are false; many are half-truths; most of them are slanted. The left-wing Washington newspaper, the Post and Times Herald sent such a writer named Jim Bishop on a tour through the South to write a series of articles supporting the Supreme Court's constitutional amendment. His venom and prejudice was so ill-concealed that he was unable to do the white people of Mississippi the courtesy of referring to them as white people. He consistently and repeatedly called them "red-necks." He did, for what reason I do know, capitalize the words "red-necks." To this left-winger the Citizens Councils are cruel and brutal; the National Association for the Advancement for Colored People is a splendid organization doing a fine work. To the left-wingers who write the slush for Look magazine, organized efforts to lawfully resist a wrongful Court decision make a "pattern of definance" and bring a prediction that "the back of the rebellion will be broken." Look magazine's writer of slanted material named Joe Morschauser who went to Albany, Ga. to sympathize with a Negro soldier named Joe Foster, was dumbfounded and couldn't believe his ears when Joe Foster told him he liked Albany. Morschauser, in total disregard of truth, theatrically describes the enterprising city of Albany, which would be a credit to any section of the United States as "a pretty little town cut in half by fear, ignorance, and the remains of a dead civilization." Joe Foster, Negro, said "It's my hometown, and I'm proud of it."

Morschauser expressed surprise that Joe Foster, having lived on terms of forced equality with white people in the Army, could be so dumb as to go back to segregated Albany, Ga., and enjoy living with Negroes. Undoubtedly, Morschauser in his ignorance of human relations in the South was amazed. After reading Morschauser's article, I am convinced that Joe Foster has more sense than Morschauser. And incidentally, racial integration in the Armed Forces is forced; it is not voluntary.

A lot of this slanted drivel and doctored propaganda which is being poured out upon us now has about as much sense to it as Gertrude Stein's famous masterpiece: "A rose is a rose is a rose is a rose."

A stock contention of the integrationists and mongrelizers is that a Court decision is the last word in the law, and must be accepted; that the Court's function is to expound the law.

As long as the Court sticks to the law its decisions will be accepted. When it flies in the face of the law, as the Court has done in this instance, it commits a wrong and perpetrates a fraud upon the people. It commits as grievous a wrong as a tax collector commits when he demands more than just taxes from a taxpayer. It commits a wrong as grievous as a warden of a penitentiary commits who would seek to imprison a convict beyond the limits of his legal term. It commits as grievous a wrong as any other public official who seeks to assert and use authority which he does not possess or to exceed the authority which he does possess. No right-thinking citizen can acquiesce in brazen usurpation of authority by any public official.

Free Americans are under no obligation whatever to permit any public official to take from them that which is theirs merely because that public official occupies a seat of authority, and attempts either through ignorance or malfeasance to go beyond the bounds of that authority.

We owe allegiance to the Constitution of the United States. That instrument is the bedrock upon which our structure of government is built. It is our guaranty of

liberty. But the allegiance we owe is to the Constitution which was drafted by the Constitutional Convention, and ratified by the sovereign States and to such amendments thereto as have been legally proposed by two-thirds of the Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States.

There are some who say that the Constitution means what the judges say it means. But that is not true. The Constitution itself proclaims its meaning. No court or judge possesses any authority to change the language or meaning of any phrase or word of the Constitution in the slightest degree. It is only when the wording of the Constitution is ambiguous or needs interpretation that the judicial department of the Government has authority to go into the question of what it means. And the judicial department never has had, and never will have, authority to add anything new or take anything old from the instrument. That can only be done by amendment.

So the Constitution is not, as some would have us believe, "what the judges say it is." It has no such unstable or uncertain meaning. The Constitution, and all of its amendments, is the compact of the sovereign States who consented to its operation. It is the document under which we live—which we understand, and which the courts have understood for years and generations. Its meaning has been proclaimed again and again. It is the document which every public official is sworn to uphold, and to which the loyalty of every public official is due. And let us never lose sight of this fact—that our loyalty is to the Constitution itself—not to a perverted opinion of nine men who happen for the moment to be occupying seats in the Supreme Court, and who seek because of that fact to change the true meaning, the established and accepted meaning, of our Constitution. That authority does not belong to these nine men. It belongs to two-thirds of the membership of Congress and to three-fourths of the States, joining in concurrent action.

The members of the Supreme Court have also sworn to uphold the Constitution. They owe the same loyalty to the Constitution that every other citizen does. The Constitution does not mean one thing yesterday, another thing today and something else tomorrow, and they have no right to so hold.

If the logic or reasoning employed by the Supreme Court in order to reach this decision is allowed to become standard practice; if the Constitution means one thing today and something entirely different tomorrow, then actually we have no Constitution at all.

And when anyone, whether he be President, legislator, or judge, deals with the Constitution unlawfully, it is the part of patriotism, and in keeping with loyalty to the Constitution, to protest and oppose such unwarranted action. The preservation of our Government depends upon it. Our Government cannot survive in any different climate.

George Washington, the greatest American of all time, in his wisdom and experience, anticipated that the time would come when the judicial department of the Government would chafe at its restrictions, and would become ambitious to exceed its authority.

In his Farewell Address on September 17, 1796, he warned us to be on guard against attempts to wrongfully change the Constitution by usurpation of authority. In that Farewell Address he said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotisim. * * *

"The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be, in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment, in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by unsurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil and partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield."

The advice and counsel of George Washington is as sound today as it was then. The time has come when the encroachment which Washington feared is being attempted.

The Supreme Court and the NAACP have created strife and turmoil where no strife and turmoil existed before. Their joint action has increased tension between the races, and has caused hatred and hostility where before there was good will and harmony. This strife is chargeable to, and responsibility for it, must rest with the Court and the radical NAACP, which has been encouraged by the Court's action to stir up hostility between the races.

A good example of the destruction of good relations between the races is the irresponsible talk of a Negro NAACP official quoted in the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal of January 30, 1956. A Negro attorney, said to be a leader in the Memphis chapter of the NAACP is quoted as having said at a meeting of that radical organization, "rock more boats and create more storms in the fight for equal citizenship. * * * If it's necessary for us to stir up more tension and more unrest to win our fight, I'm willing to do it."

I have been talking to you about the Constitution and the legal phase of this question. I want to say something now about the human side, and the moral justification we have for insisting upon segregation. The average southern white person does not intentionally say things to hurt the feelings of Negroes. White people do not ordinarily talk of the differences between the races. But this is a time to bring out the facts.

Much false propaganda has been spread within recent years, and much effort has been made to brainwash the public with the utterly false doctrine that there is no difference between whites and blacks. It is time to look behind this brainwashing propaganda, and have a straight look at the facts.

There are obvious and well-known differences between whites and blacks which no amount of glossing over and covering up by subversive so-called "anthropologists" and pseudo scientists can hide.

Let's have a look at some facts from the record which have a direct bearing upon the question of desirability or undesirability of integrated schools, aside from the legal aspect of the problem.

Among the many other reasons why the white people object to their children having this close association with Negro children are health, the Negroes' high crime rate and disrespect for law, the lower mentality level, and the high rate of illegitimacy among Negroes.

It is well known that the crime rate among Negroes far exceeds that of whites. In Washington D. C. Negroes have every advantage they could ask for. The schools and colleges are open to them; also hotels, restaurants, theaters, parks, swimming pools, tennis courts. They buy property and live in any section they choose. The President and his appointed city commissioners apparently want to make a second Harlem out of Washington, and they boast that Washington is a model example of a nonsegregated city.

But Washington is noted for the great number of serious crimes committed in its limits. Its crimes of violence are more than twice the number of those committed in Boston, a city of comparable size, more than twice those of Milwaukee, and nearly twice as many as New Orleans, La.

HIGH CRIME RATE IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Negroes are responsible for this high crime rate. Crime statistics show that throughout the years the Negroes in Washington have committed the bulk of the crimes of violence, although they have constituted about one-third of the population. In 1955 out of 11,072 crimes of violence, or part I offenses, 9,056 were by Negroes. This is 82 percent of the total, and the precentage for the last 3 months of 1955 was 88 percent of the total.

Let's look at the District of Columbia health records. A report for the year 1955 made by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health of venereal diseases, in children of school age and under, showed 834 Negro children 17 years and under treated for gonorrhea, as compared with 20 white children. Of the 834 Negro children, 10 were under 6 years of age. The total cases of gonorrhea of all ages, children and adults, for 1955 were Negro 10,243, or 97.5 percent of the total; white 271, or 2.5 percent.

These are repulsive statistics, but they show some of the impelling reasons for segregated schools, and what a tragedy it is for white children to have integration forced upon them.

From the standpoint of mentality, the Negroes have not been able to keep pace with the white children of the District of Columbia. This has resulted in lowering of educational standards.

Achievement tests were recently conducted in the Washington public schools, and revealed that this forced integration has downgraded scholastic standards below the national average.

The retarded learning ability of Negro pupils in a given class is holding the entire class back. White children are being denied the education they are capable of receiving.

One of the loud claims of the promixers has been that integrated schools would reduce costs of operation. They claimed the taxpayers would benefit from the combined schools. Experience shows exactly the opposite to be true They claimed there would be no friction, and that pupils would learn as well as in segregated schools.

In Washington experience has proven that nonsegregated schools cost more to operate; that the Negro children cannot meet the educational schedule or keep pace with the white children, and that friction exists to a greater degree than ever before.

Conditions have reached such a deplorable state in Washington that the superintendent of schools has recently requested an additional 229 "special teachers" for next year. The mentally slow learners—predominately Negroes—would fall within the province of these "special teachers." This would cause an extra burden on the taxpayers, most of whom are white.

The Washington integrated school system is asking for next year $33,740,000, plus $9,178,900 capital outlay, as against $28,130,000, plus $4,473,300 capital outlay, the appropriation for this year. This ten and a half million dollar requested increase knocks the props out from under the integrationists economy argument.

School Superintendent Hobart Corning has repeatedly denied that integration has forced

scholastic standards down. But the records tell a different story. Integration has produced lower standards and poorer instruction for the white children.

And it becomes more and more evident that the integration experiment in Washington public schools is a dismal failure, its proponents, looking for something to excuse the failure, come up with the claim that segregated schools in the past have deprived Negro children of an equal opportunity. This claim will not hold water. This is the second year of nonsegregated schools in Washington.

For years Negro teachers and white teachers have been paid according to the same salary schedule. The same rules have applied to both systems. The failure of Negro children to learn under these conditions proves one of two things; either Negro teachers cannot teach as well as white teachers, or Negro children cannot learn as well as white children. No place in America offered a better opportunity than Washington, D. C., to determine whether white and Negro children could be taught successfully in the same classes.

Repeated warnings were made that Negro children could not meet the competition. The Negroes loudly denied this and claimed that Negro children only needed a chance. The white social-equality do-gooders and radicals supported them in this claim.

They were mixed in all the schools in Washington in September 1954. To such lengths was the integration craze carried out that a Negro woman was made Superintendent of the elementary schools and a white woman was made her assistant.

Thaddeus Stevens in the darkest days of reconstruction never exhibited a more cruel and vengeful spirit than those now in charge of integration in the Washington public school system. They do not intend to have one school all white or one school all colored. They have therefore placed one white girl pupil with 711 Negroes in Carver school, one white boy with 326 Negroes in Langston school, one white boy with 815 Negroes in Grimke School, one white boy with 712 Negroes in Burville school. To carry out this infamous plan of mixing the races in all schools, this is the pupil arrangement in 23 other Washington schools:

HIGH SCHOOLS

Cardozo: 4 white boys, 2 white girls, 1,698 Negroes.

Dunbar: 1 white boy, 964 Negroes.

Spingarn: 1 white boy, 1,592 Negroes.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Randall: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 771 Negroes.

Elliott: 1 white boy, 84 Negroes.

Langley: 1 white boy, 33 Negroes.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Bell: 3 white boys, 2 white girls, 378 Negroes.

Birney: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 990 Negroes.

Blow: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 337 Negroes.

Bruce: 6 white boys, 3 white girls, 614 Negroes.

Cleveland: 1 white boy, 1 white girl, 535 Negroes.

Cook: 1 white girl; 657 Negroes.

Garfield: 1 white boy, 489 Negroes.

Harrison: 9 white boys, 1 white girl, 714 Negroes.

Hayes: 2 white boys, 1 white girl, 290 Negroes.

Kenilworth: 1 white boy, 235 Negroes.

Ludlow: 3 white boys, 2 white girls, 237 Negroes.

Monroe: 1 white boy, 2 white girls, 503 Negroes.

Morgan: 1 white boy, 1 white girl, 691 Negroes.

Mott: 2 white boys, 1 white girl, 956 Negroes.

Parkview: 2 white boys, 3 white girls, 1,001 Negroes.

Perry: 2 white boys, 2 white girls, 346 Negroes.

Taylor: 3 white boys, 293 Negroes.

May Almighty God pity the poor white children who are being made the guinea pigs for this rotten experiment. I do not think Hades has a spot hot enough for those responsible for this outrageous treatment.

The integration bug bit the Baltimore officials and they abolished segregated schools about the same time Washington did. But the authorities in Baltimore at least had some consideration for the wishes of the people and permitted the children both colored and white to attend the schools of their choice. Under that plan, only 1,576 colored pupils entered formerly all white schools, while 55,488 colored entered or remained in colored schools. Sixty-one schools remained all white and 80 schools remained all colored. Forty-eight schools, formerly all white, received some colored pupils, but in most instances the number of colored was very small. The proportion of colored pupils went above 10 percent in only five schools, all of them on the elementary level. In the high schools, the largest number of Negroes in predominately white high schools was at Southern High School, which had 39 Negroes in a student body of 1,788. These figures are given in the official reports dated July 1955.

As a result of the bull-headed policy followed in Washington, the Washington public schools are now in a state of complete chaos.

Now after nearly 2 years, the governing authorities are realizing that Negroes and whites cannot be educated in the same classes on the same basis, with the same results.

Because of the confusion in Washington's public schools on March 10, General Thomas A. Lane, one of Washington's three city Commissioners, issued a statement proposing a mass demotion next September of Washington school children who are showing "educational lags." He suggested testing all the city's 106,000 public school pupils, and reassigning them next September according to the achievement level shown by each child's tests.

Regarding the proposal to hire more teachers Commissioner Lane said that would be "only applying a poultice to a cancerous condition." He said drastic action is required by the achievement problems.

He also said that "it appears that our problem has reached unmanageable proportions," and that to hire more teachers would be "lulling our parents into an illusion that bringing in more teachers would cure our ills, when, in fact, it is not even addressed to the heart of the problem."

Apologists for the Negroes will claim that this achievement lag is the result of a segregated system in past years. But again that claim will not hold water. The lag is the result of Negro mentality.

This is substantiated by the report of the Selective Service System regarding soldiers drafted in World War II. The report showed that of the draftees inducted during World War II the number of Negroes rejected for educational and mental reasons ran in a smaller proportion in Georgia, where segregated schools were operated, than in New Jersey and New York City where nonsegregated schools were operated. In Georgia Negro rejections on these grounds, educational and mental, ran about 2½ to 1 over white draftees; in New Jersey about 4 to 1, and in New York City about 3 to 1. This disproves the absurd claim that Negroes learn better in nonsegregated schools.

Venereal disease showed up again unfavorably for Negroes in the selective service records. Rejections on this ground for Negroes were about 8 to 1 over whites in New York City, 4 to 1 in New Jersey and 7 to 1 in Georgia.

So far as illegitimate children are concerned, the regard which Negroes have for the sacred bonds of matrimony is indicated by the fact that of 11,905 nonwhite births in Washington 3,128, or 26 percent were illegitimate, as compared with 617 of 20,441 or 3 percent of white births. Official reports show that the relative percentage runs pretty much the same in Georgia.

These are some of the many valid reasons why white people are justified in the position taken regarding segregation.

I have given you these facts about the situation in Washington because in the wake of the Supreme Court decision to integrate schools, the President declared that Washington would be an example of how good integration would be. The present sickening conditions of the Washington schools are mute testimony to this example.

In spite of every effort to deny it—and in spite of the censorship and suppression of the facts surrounding the Washington school situation—the truth is that integration has been a complete failure.

Not only have mixed schools been a scholastic failure but as an experiment in human relations it has been a nightmare.

Last December, principals in high schools and junior high schools found it necessary to hold "shake-down" inspections of their students, in compliance with numerous complaints that students were carrying knives.

Two cases of attempted assault by Negro boys on white girls were reported in 1 day at 1 junior high school. These cases involved language and actions so vile and so sordid that it staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to subject our children to such a malignant experiment. The same integrationists and mongrelizers have stated that they only want equal rights and opportunities for the Negro. Yet the radical NAACP, has repeatedly declared that their ultimate goal is intermarriage and complete mongrelization of the American people. The fact that this is also the identical aim of the Communist Party of the United States is more than just coincidental. If they are successful in cramming this school decision down our throats, they will follow it with a decision invalidating our marriage laws, and that will be the end.

With full knowledge of the irreconcilable harm they are doing to the people of Washington, and are trying to do to the rest of the country, the Executive Department and the Supreme Court persist in their efforts to integrate the races in our schools here in the South.

They continue to pander to and knuckle under to radical left-wing organizations like the NAACP, completely disregarding the majority of the people in this country who are white.

In a step-by-step process the Supreme Court in collusion with the Executive Department has bypassed the Legislative Department and distorted the Constitution to mean what it was never intended to mean.

Through a series of Executive orders and so-called judicial decrees they have denied the people the voice in the Government through their elected representatives, which the Constitution provides. These orders and decisions are part of a pattern.

In two Supreme Court cases in the early 1940's (*U. S.* v. *Classic*, 1941; *Smith* v. *Allwright*, 1944) the Court struck down white primaries. Suddenly private political associations were classified as agents of the State. No longer could men of common political belief band together as a political party and set the rules for its own membership. The Supreme Court had decided that only the Court could determine the rules.

Throughout this Nation, for generations, property owners have protected themselves and the value of their property by restrictive clauses in their deeds prohibiting the sale

to Negroes of the real estate conveyed in the deed. In 1948 (*Hurd* v. *Hodge*) the Supreme Court struck down these protective clauses and jeopardized the value of every man's property.

DECISIONS COME FROM PACKED SUPREME COURT

In 1951 the Supreme Court, having been fully packed with New Deal politicians, handed down the absurd decision that associations were an integral part of education, and consequently Negroes were being discriminated against when not allowed to associate with white people in the professional schools. Everyone should ponder the philosophy of that decision for one moment. On the one hand Negroes zealously demanded full social equality, and on the other hand maintained that association with their own people is degrading and discriminatory. This was the case of McKissick against Carmichael and it opened the door for the University of North Carolina to be invaded by Negroes.

When the United States Supreme Court rendered its opinion in the school segregation case of May 17, 1954, it departed from 86 years of judicial precedent. It absolved itself of any affiliation with legal authority, and chose instead to quote so-called modern scientific authorities as the basis on which to render its opinion. One of these so-called modern scientific authorities quoted by the Supreme Court was a book by a Swedish sociologist named Gunnar Mydral entitled "An American Dilemma." This is the book in which Mydral stated, and I quote, "the Constitution of the United States was impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people."

Sixteen of the contributors to this book have lengthy records of pro-Communist activity in the files of the un-American Activities Committee. One of the chief contributors to this book, one W. E. B. DuBois, a Negro educator, has 72 such citations against his name in the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In Virginia the law prohibits interracial marriages which is the case in 28 of the States of this Union. The Virginia Supreme Court pursuant to that law, declared invalid a marriage between a Chinese seaman and a white woman, and annulled the marriage. The Chinaman appealed the case to the Supreme Court, and asked that Virginia's marriage laws be declared in violation of the 14th amendment.

I do not think the Federal Supreme Court would hesitate to strike down the marriage laws of Virginia and 27 other States if these experts in sociology felt that public opinion would accept such a shocking decision. They know that public opinion would not accept it, and they want to kick the case back and forth for a while between Washington and Richmond to give the Communist Daily Worker, the NAACP and other integrationists and mongrelizers some time in which to condition the public mind for a "judicial decision" striking down the last legal barrier which stands in the part of mongrelization. The Supreme Court entered an order vacating the judgment, and sending the case back to the State court, for further action, saying that it wanted additional evidence as to whether Virginia's courts had jurisdiction in the case.

In a bold and courageous stand, the Virginia Supreme Court on January 18, of this year notified the Federal Supreme Court that it refused to take further action on the case, and wound that case up. But another will come along.

The Federal Supreme Court with both ears attuned to the political drum beating of the NAACP and other radical left-wing organizations has engaged in a program of deliberate usurpation of legislation functions. This usurpation in effect is designed to dissolve the separate States and foster an all-powerful central Government under the joint-exclusive dictatorship of the Supreme Court and the executive department. It would destroy our State governments. It would destroy our county governments, city governments, and school district governments. These local officials would become powerless puppets, and all our directions and instructions would come from bureaucrats in Washington.

The actions of these two agencies of the Federal Government constitute not only a threat to the laws and traditions of the South but also to the foundations of our republican form of Government, and to State and local governments in all sections of the country.

The time to end this judicial usurpation is now. The time to restore the Constitution to the people is now.

Otherwise, no longer will our sacred rights and institutions and our honored way of life be protected according to commonsense, custom, and tradition. If our children are to have the same freedom we inherited from our fathers, then now is the time for every man to stand up and be counted. Now is the time for aggressive organization; organization that is wise, and unalterably determined to preserve our States rights, our individual freedom, and our personal liberty.

The only way our leadership can effectively voice our determination to resist is through organization. We must organize into one strong, unified, and determined group.

We must organize on the county level, on the State level, and on the National level.

We must prepare to carry our message to every section of the country. It is imperative that we mobilize our strength and take the offensive.

The fight we wage must at all times be legal and honorable. There is no place for violence or lawless acts. They will do irreparable harm to our cause and turn public opinion against us.

I have given you tonight, in brief, a picture of the deplorable situation in Washington. I have seen there the tragic results which come from the breakdown of segregation and substitution of an integrated public-school system.

This same thing can happen, and will happen here, if the people meekly accept wrongful usurpation of power, and a Supreme Court dictatorship, as they did in Washington.

It need not happen, and it will not happen, if we as free, liberty-loving Americans band together to retain our constitutional rights.

By organization at home you can give inspiration to your public officials who must lead in this fight—to your Governor, legislators, public-school officials, all those who must lead in this fight here at home, and to your Senators and Representatives in Washington. They have all signified their determination to fight this battle to a successful conclusion. But you have a most important part to play. It is your individual struggle, and your neighbor's individual struggle. Let me urge you to accept your responsibility, and to do your part. Urge you neighbor to do his part. This is a time when it is true as never before, that "united we stand, divided we fall." This is a fight which can be won, and I pray that it is the will of Almighty God that it will be won. But it will not be won by default.

Plato said many years ago:

"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Let us not lose sight of this truth in these critical times. Let us remember that the fight is ahead of us—not behind us.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all, who art above all and through all and in all, without whom life has no spiritual source, no divine meaning or destiny, but with whom there is power for the present and hope for the future, we seek Thee as our fathers before us have sought Thee in every generation, when the difficulties they faced were as frowning heights before their climbing feet. Yet by faith they were led over the peaks to the pleasant valleys and still waters beyond. So lead us on, for Thou only art our guide and deliverer.

Strengthen us with Thy might, that the strain of these days may not break our spirits, and that no denials of human freedom by those who would enslave mankind may intimidate our souls. When the problems which front us seem insoluble, when the very principles for which brave men have died are betrayed, when the seamless robe of world unity is rent in twain, when even the shining river of our dreams seems to sink into the sands of futility, still may we labor on, serene and confident, knowing that while the weeping of hopes deferred may endure for a night the joy of Thy sure victory cometh in the morning.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 23, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7228. An act to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes";

H. R. 9083. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities;

H. R. 9260. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict.

The message informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of title 8, section 1106 (a), United States Code, the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed Mr. KEATING, of New York, as a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, on the part of the House, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7228. An act to amend title II of the act of August 30, 1954, entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 9083. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for amortization of grain-storage facilities; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 9260. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9824. An act to establish an educational assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability or disease incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Farm Credit Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today. I have cleared the request with the acting minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Edgar Murdock to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stephen E. Rice to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Morton P. Fisher to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Edward Mulroney to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ralph Kennamer to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William C. Spire to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James Crawford, Jr., to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations today confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour statements be subject to a 2-minute limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, that there have been no significant developments to report relating to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of March 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4 OF ACT OF AUGUST 5, 1953

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 5, 1953 (ch. 321, 67 Stat. 363) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NUMBER OF AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that at the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 1956 there was an aggregate of 2,699 officers of the Air Force assigned to duty at the seat of government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON MILITARY PRIME CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States, for the period July 1, 1955, through February 29, 1956 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INCLUSION OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE IN SECTION 158 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN EMETINE HYDROCHLORIDE

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 3,302 ounces of emetine hydrochloride now held in the national stockpile (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, COULEE DAM NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a

proposed concession permit at Coulee Dam National Recreation Area, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit at Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CERTIFICATION OF SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, SANTA MARIA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Santa Maria Water Conservation District which are to be benefited by the Santa Maria project, California, and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

GEORGE T. MOORE AND CARL D. BERRY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Charlie Toyaka Wwan Fat from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the construction of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on the Chowchilla River and Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River

"Whereas it is currently estimated that over $2 million in damage to property was done in Madera County, Calif., by floodwaters in December 1955; and

"Whereas such floodwaters came from the Chowchilla and Fresno Rivers and their tributaries which rivers drain relatively low elevation watersheds of approximately 500 square miles of the Sierra Nevada Mountains between the Merced and San Joaquin Rivers basins of the Central Valley of California; and

"Whereas prior to 1955 these rivers repeatedly caused extensive and increasing flood damage in Madera County; and

"Whereas therefore, during the past 25 years the State of California, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation of the United States Department of the Interior have independently recommended the construction of the Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on the Chowchilla River and of the Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River to control the floodwaters of these rivers and to conserve such waters for irrigation use to the extent consistent with effective flood control; and

"Whereas approximately 10 years ago the State of California recommended that the construction of these dual-purpose facilities be deferred because they were not justified on the basis of flood control alone and the local need for additional irrigation water had not then been sufficiently demonstrated; and

"Whereas after further study over the intervening years the State of California in February 1956, through its State water resources board, did formally recommend to the Congress of the United States the immediate authorization of the construction of these two dams and reservoirs on the basis of the great damage resulting from the December 1955 floods and in order to meet the irrigation water requirements of the rapidly expanding agricultural economy of the area; and

"Whereas more specifically, the State of California through its State water resources board recommended that the Congress authorize immediately the construction of these two dams and reservoirs substantially, as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in 1948 in House Resolution No. 367, 81st Congress, 1st session, but with such modifications as may be necessary to coordinate them with the federally authorized and approved flood control works now proposed to be constructed by the State of California along the San Joaquin River and tributaries between Merced River and Friant Dam and with such further modifications as may be necessary to conform the water conservation feature of these two facilities to the proposed California water plan: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take steps forthwith to authorize and otherwise implement the immediate construction of Buchanan Dam and Reservoir on the Chowchilla River and Hidden Dam and Reservoir on the Fresno River by the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army for the control and conservation of the floodwaters of these rivers; and be it further

"Resolved, That these two dams and reservoirs be constructed in accordance with the aforestated recommendations of the State of California through its State water resources board; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 18

"Resolution relating to withdrawal of land in Saline Valley in Inyo County from the public domain for use as an aerial gunnery range

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has strongly disapproved of further withdrawals of lands from the public domain unless such action is absolutely necessary for vital Federal purposes which disapproval was evidenced by Senate Joint Resolution No. 16 in the 1955 regular session of the legislature (Res. Ch. 92, Stats. 1955); and

"Whereas there are plans for the acquisition of 879,360 acres of land in Saline Valley in the county of Inyo for all-aerial gunnery range for use by the Marine Corps pilots at the Navy Air Base at Mojave, Calif., which acquisition will most seriously affect the county of Inyo which already has 96 percent of the area in the county not subject to county taxation by taking still more lands off the tax rolls and by closing highways on which Inyo County has expended considerable public money; and

"Whereas after long and considerable study of this problem of removal of lands from the public domain, the Senate Interim Committee on Public Lands adopted a resolution requesting the Legislature of the State of California to memorialize the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy to defer any further action with reference to sale and exclusive acquisition of lands by the United States Navy until such time as the citizens of the affected area and the owners and operators of mining interests and other development be considered with reference to their being allowed to continue the enjoyment of their rights and privileges as they currently exist; and

"Whereas this resolution of the Senate Interim Committee on Public Lands was based on extensive public hearings during which considerable evidence was presented as to the disastrous effect of the withdrawal of lands of the Saline Valley: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy are respectfully memorialized to defer any further action whatsoever with reference to acquiring any additional lands, and especially any lands in Saline Valley, in the county of Inyo for the purpose of exclusive control by the United States Navy or any of its subdivisions to the detriment and hardship of the citizens of the area and persons owning property or operating commercial enterprises therein; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy.

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Women's Grand Lodge, B'nai B'rith, at Philadelphia, Pa., relating to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., protesting against the recently granted increases in freight rates and refrigeration charges by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by a convention of the Women's Grand Lodge, B'nai B'rith, at Philadelphia, Pa., relating to immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, T. H., favoring the enactment of House bill 5265 relating to exemptions of certain areas from the Federal travel tax; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, one of a series of petitions, signed by 228 citizens of the States of Pennsylvania and Virginia, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to exercise the proper discretion vested in you by passing legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air, a practice which nullifies the rights of the States under the 21st amendment to control the sale of such beverages. At a time when 1 out 10 drinkers is becoming an alcoholic there should be no encouragement to increasing the use of such beverages. Children and youth are being misled to consider them harmless, especially by the powerful audio and visual suggestions of radio and television.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 6573. A bill to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States (Rept. No. 1818); and

H. R. 6703. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska (Rept. No. 1819).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

H. R. 7513. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska (Rept. No. 1821).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H. R. 7186. A bill to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry (Rept. No. 1820).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3498. A bill to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1822).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of Joseph Righetti and Marjorie Righetti (Rept. No. 1834);

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Brickell (Rept. No. 1835);

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse (Rept. No. 1824);

H. R. 2465. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Denn (Rept. No. 1836);

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi (Rept. No. 1837);

H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa (Rept. No. 1838);

H. R. 5626. A bill for the relief of Fred Mazan (Rept. No. 1839);

H. R. 5634. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney (Rept. No. 1840); and

H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner (Rept. No. 1841).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2984. A bill for the relief of Col. John A. O'Keefe (Rept. No. 1833);

H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of George D. Hopper (Rept. No. 1825);

H. R. 2338. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Bullette (Rept. No. 1842);

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Giles P. Fredell and wife (Rept. No. 1843);

H. R. 2924. A bill for the relief of David J. Daze (Rept. No. 1844);

H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn (Rept. No. 1845);

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr. (Rept. No. 1826);

H. R. 4902. A bill for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan (Rept. No. 1846);

H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of William H. Foley (Rept. No. 1847); and

H. R. 7583. A bill for the relief of Mary Viola Jones (Rept. No. 1848).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of James Edward Robinson (Rept. No. 1823); and

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Butcher (Rept. No. 1849).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 4791. A bill to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees (Rept. No. 1828).

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 584. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, relating to the customs court (Rept. No. 1827).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution relative to the fight against mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week (Rept. No. 1832).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 7678. A bill to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1831).

AUTHORIZATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WASHOE PROJECT, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement in connection with a report I am submitting on the bill (S. 497) to authorize construction of the Washoe project located in Nevada and in the State of California. The bill was sponsored by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] and myself. Hearings were held in Nevada in October and the measure was thoroughly considered by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and the parent Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which favored the bill unanimously.

The report describes the Washoe project, sets forth the views of the committee with respect to the major points in the bill, and discusses the few controversial features. Representatives of the States of Nevada and California are in agreement on the interstate features of the project.

It is our hope that early favorable action may be taken on authorization of the Washoe project so that a supplemental appropriation may be acted on at this session of the Congress and construction, particularly of the flood-control features gotten underway promptly. The disastrous floods in Douglas, Washoe, and Lyon Counties last December fully justify starting construction of the project at the earliest possible date.

Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 497) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California, and I submit a report (No. 1829) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE HEARINGS ON THE NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 206, authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206), which was read, as follows:

That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held by said committee during the 84th Congress, first session, on the national highway program.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Charles A. Buckley, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, urging that we take prompt action, because that committee is going to proceed with the hearings this week, and needs additional copies of the hearings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished chairman of the committee has cleared the matter with both the majority and minority leaders, and I hope the Senate will agree to the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 206) was agreed to.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—UNEXPENDED BALANCES, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (S. REPT. NO. 1830)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), as chairman of the Joint

Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report entitled "Unexpended Balances, Department of Defense," which I ask to have printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Virginia.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 3710. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; and

S. 3711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 3712. A bill for the relief of Anna Purker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3713. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Cacavas (Elisavet Ioannou Kakava); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3714. A bill for the relief of William Tassie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3715. A bill for the relief of Muh Po Fu (also known as Yu-Lin-Fu) and his wife, Nancy L. Fu (also known as Tsing Ing Li Fu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3716. A bill for the relief of Aston H. Savage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. IVES, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. THYE):

S. 3717. A bill to strengthen the civil-rights statutes, and for other purposes; and

S. 3718. A bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 3719. A bill to provide for the transfer of strategic materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products to the supplementl stockpile created under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3720. A bill for the relief of L. Foster Udell; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 3721. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 3722. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3723. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain land in the county of Alameda, Calif., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 75) favoring United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas forced labor for political or economic purposes is abhorrent to all civilized nations and is repugnant to the constitutional and statutory concepts of the republican form of government on which life in the United States is based; and

Whereas the people of some nations are subjected to forced labor for political or economic purposes; and

Whereas the existence of forced labor in any nation is inimical to the interests of the United States and other free nations morally, politically, and economically and constitutes a threat to the security, well-being, and even the existence of democratic institutions and free economic systems; and

Whereas to meet this threat and to promote the welfare and dignity of human beings throughout the world, the United Nations and the International Labor Organization, at the initiative of the American Federation of Labor, appointed an ad hoc committee to study the nature and extent of forced labor for political or economic purposes throughout the world; and

Whereas the ad hoc committee on forced labor issued a carefully considered and well documented report detailing the existence of forced labor for these purposes in a number of nations of the world; and

Whereas the International Labor Organization is now considering the adoption of an international instrument designed to abolish forced labor for political or economic purposes wherever it may exist; and

Whereas the United States Government has exercised leadership in the United Nations to mobilize world opinion for the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Government of the United States exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR CERTAIN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to allow an additional income tax exemption for a full-time student in an educational institution above the secondary level. The exemption may be claimed by the taxpayer himself, or on account of a spouse or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is in attendance at the educational institution.

Since I have been in the Senate, I have supported many measures designed to assist students and to improve our educational institutions. This bill is but another measure designed to assist the people of our country in their efforts to obtain an education.

Primarily, the bill, if enacted, will benefit parents who are paying for the education of their children, and young people who are working their own way through college.

The cost of a college education varies, but I believe it is reasonable to estimate the cost of $1,500 per year, or $6,000 for a 4-year college education. The cost of some specialized courses in science and medicine may run much more than this, and yet the parent, or the individual himself, gets only a $600 a year tax exemption.

There has been, for decades, a serious and continual deterioration in the quality of our education generally. More recently, there is a mounting shortage of trained scientists and engineers. This situation is all the more critical because of the demands, not only of industry, but of national security. We should, of course, do our utmost to educate our children for their own sake, and for the sake of the society in which we live. But in addition to this, the competition with the Communist world demands that we do much more in this field if we expect to preserve our traditional way of life.

Assuming that the objective of this bill is a proper one, it seems to me much more efficient in the long run to encourage and to enable a parent to pay for his children's education than it is for the Government eventually to assume directly the burden of educating its citizens.

In addition to these reasons, such an exemption will, I believe, add to the income of the Government, as well as the income of its citizens. Dr. Paul Glick, of the Census Bureau, estimates that the male college graduates will receive an average of $100,000 more in lifetime income than the average high school student. We must remember, also, that the increased income arising from this investment in education will be taxed in full. If one pays $1,000 for an acre of ground and sells it for $2,000, he pays a tax only on the increment of $1,000, at reduced capital gain rates. If he pays $1,000 for a truck to be used in his business, and takes in $2,000 in drayage fees, the cost of the truck amortized over its useful life is deductible from the $2,000 income as earned. But, if he spends $1,000 for education and his income is later increased to $2,000, the Government will not recognize that he should be allowed to get his seed back. He receives no deduction for the $1,000 and the $2,000 is taxed in full as ordinary income.

As I said a moment ago, I feel strongly that it is in the national interest to encourage the education of young people. Not only will education contribute to the material well-being of our citizens, but in this period of competitive coexistence with the Soviets, the intelligence and training of our population may well be the key to our survival. The great emphasis which the Soviets have placed on the training of technicians, engineers, and scientists is a challenge which cannot be ignored by the Western World.

This minor adjustment in the tax laws can provide an incentive to our families who have children of college age.

Mr. President, this bill will provide a much needed relief for our students who work their own way through college and the parents who have dependents in college. It merely provides an additional exemption for these classes.

In addition to these considerations, public and private educational institutions face a precarious future. They are essential to the preservation of our traditions and our way of life. This bill if enacted would give them some help. Many universities can today accept additional students, especially students who can pay their way. So this bill would have a further beneficial effect upon the finances of many of our good private colleges.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3710) to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HOLLAND proposed amendments to the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests, which were ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

Editorial written by him for the National Sunday School Association, and published during National Family Week.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FOREIGN TRAVEL FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, RELATING TO TREATMENT OF GAIN IN CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BYRD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECENT TRENDS IN ASIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while our main concern at the moment seems to be the Middle East, I respectfully suggest that we keep a sharp eye on the dangerous course of events in southeast Asia. The Communists are on the march in that area. In Singapore there is the distinct possibility that, due to the efforts of young Chinese activities, especially in the high schools, that British Crown Colony may well be approaching the end of its democratic days. With the unexpected setback for the West in the recent Ceylon elections and with the demand—as a result of these elections—that Britain withdraw from its naval and air bases there, it appears that the danger has increased for Britain and the West, leaving only the Crown Colony of Hong Kong at the one end and the protectorate of Aden at the tip of the Arabian peninsula as the two major strategic defensive outposts in Asia. Even there, we find elements of danger with Hong Kong existing precariously at the whim of Communist China, and Aden being pressured by Yemen—a country which has just concluded a tripartite military pact with Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

The situations in Singapore and Ceylon, plus the neutralism of Cambodia, the economic and possible diplomatic penetration of that country by Communist China and certain of the Soviet satellites, plus the increased trade relationship between Burma, India, and the Soviet Union, should give us reason to pause. It is incumbent upon us to come up with new ideas and to modify old concepts if we are to counter the ever-advancing Communist aggression in that area. We should recognize that economically, diplomatically, and perhaps politically, Communist penetration into this vital area of the world is advancing at a pace which calls for a reevaluation of our foreign policies—and soon.

VETO OF THE FARM BILL—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last evening the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the majority leader, delivered a masterful address over the television and radio networks, in answering the veto message on the farm bill recently passed by the Congress and the radio and television message to the people by President Eisenhower. The address by the Senator from Texas completely exposes the inconsistencies and fallacies of the President's position, as outlined in his veto message and in his radio and television appearance. The Senator from Texas has pointed out in words that all can understand the very great danger to the total economy which is posed by the wait, drift, and drop policy of the Eisenhower administration, as applied to farm matters.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to dwell upon the able presentation of facts or the irrefutable logic of the statement made by the Senator from Texas. I merely say that it was addressed primarily to those who are not farmers, who do not have first-hand knowledge of the problems of the farmer, and who in many instances have been misled by the deceptive statements of those in power, followed by the erroneous editorials and the slanted news columns of so much of our great metropolitan press. The Senator from Texas brought home to the people the realities of the farm problem and its effect upon our total economy.

Mr. President, every farmer and rancher of the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Texas for the clarity of his statement and for telling the American people the truth about the farm problem and for placing this issue in its proper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that this outstanding address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS ON FARM BILL VETO BY SENATE DEMOCRATIC LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON

My fellow citizens, a week ago today President Eisenhower vetoed the farm bill.

I want to talk to you tonight about that bill and about the farm problem. The President may veto one farm bill, but he can't veto the farm problem. It is still there. It won't just go away.

I know that most of the newspapers have told you that this farm bill was bad and that President Eisenhower was right to veto it. Because of what you have read and heard on the radio and seen on TV, I suspect you have decided this is a black and white issue—all the white on the President's side and all the black on the side of the Democrats.

That is why I want to tell you our side.

Many of you do not farm for a living. You live in the big cities and the large towns. You have probably been saying to yourselves that the farm problem really doesn't touch you. Too many of us think about the farmer only when we go to the supermarket and leave most of our paycheck for groceries. And then we think harsh thoughts. Most of us do not know that the farmer gets very few—in fact, less and less each year—of the dollars we pay for food.

The farm issue reaches into the daily lives of each and every one of you.

I thought we had learned this lesson once before. Our great American economy is all tied together. What hurts the small-business man in Los Angeles eventually is bound to hurt the farmer in Iowa. And when the farmer in Iowa begins to hurt, sooner or later the rest of us will be in trouble too.

Since 1952, wages have gone up; corporate dividends have gone up; the entire national income has gone up. But all this time, the income of the farmer has gone down 26 percent. The economists know that when one part of our country is in a depression, it will ultimately fan out into the other parts and end their prosperity, too. The worker who is making refrigerators and television sets will sooner or later be out of work if there is no one to buy refrigerators and television sets. But if the farmer can't make a living, the farmer can't buy these things. If he can't buy them, that cuts the market down. And that means workers will be thrown out of jobs. Then they can't buy and other workers are thrown out with them.

Those of us who are over 40 know this from hard experience. There was a nationwide depression in 1929. All industry was prostrate until the Democrats came into power in 1933 and put the country back on its feet. But those of us who are old enough, remember that the farm depression started long before 1929. It started in 1921 and it stayed bad for the next 8 years when the rest of the country was basking in prosperity—a prosperity that in many ways resembles the prosperity we have today. This same thing has been happening for the past several years. The farmer's income has been declining. The cost of the things the farmer must buy to farm and to live has remained the same or has gone up. He is caught in a squeeze between costs and prices.

That is why the Democratic Congress has worked so hard to help the farmer. The farmer's income must be bolstered, not only for the farmer's sake, but for your sake. Otherwise, we may spin into another depression. Under the leadership of Senator ELLENDER, the Senate Agriculture Committee went all over the United States. The House Agriculture Committee, under Congressman COOLEY, took testimony from top farm advisers. Both committees held hearings to find out what the farmers and farm experts thought must be done. The farm bill, which we passed and which President Eisenhower vetoed, was the product of years of hard work and hard thought. Many of the members of the Republican Party, those Senators and Congressmen who live in the farm areas, supported the bill. Fifteen Republican Senators voted with the Democratic leadership, as did 48 Republican Congressmen. Three Republican governors from farm States flew into Washington last Monday to persuade President Eisenhower that our bill was good for the farmer and good for the country. The governor of my own State, who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952, wired a strong plea to the President to sign the measure.

These officials knew something had to be done. They knew that per capita income of farm people has fallen to $860 a year. The average for city and town dwellers is almost $2,000 a year. Last year the farmers in Iowa earned only 50 percent of the income that they got the year before. How would you like to support your family on half of last year's paycheck? Wouldn't you worry about feeding them and clothing them and paying their medical bills—and wouldn't you be feeling a little desperate?

To put it as simply as I can—the farm bill was designed to bolster the farmer's income. The experts said that only 90 percent of parity will halt the slide of farm prices.

Sometimes I think the city man has trouble with the farm problem because of words like "parity." I confess that words like that scare me, too.

But let's look at this word "parity." All it means is this: If a farmer 20 years ago could buy a shirt for a bushel of wheat, the farmer ought to be able to buy a shirt today for a bushel of wheat. All parity really means is a fair price.

Now, Congress does not say the farmer must get a fair price for his crops. All it says is that the farmer should get 90 percent of that fair price. Is this unreasonable? Would you settle for only 90 percent of a fair wage? Do you think your telephone company would be happy with 90 percent of a fair rate? Of course not—they feel they are entitled to 100 percent.

All Congress is trying to do is to put a floor under the farmer's prices. This is not unusual. It is just an insurance policy. The Government has been issuing similar insurance to us for decades. Your social-security payments are something like this. Your unemployment compensation is, too. The tariffs for business, the subsidies to airlines and the shipping industry, the land grants which made our railroads great, the minimum wage for the worker—all these are a floor to protect you and keep our economy healthy. And 90 percent of parity does the same thing.

Do you remember when Congress last year—with the approval of President Eisenhower—raised the minimum wage to $1 an hour? What would happen if this year it should be cut to 82½ cents an hour?

General Eisenhower himself campaigned for 90 percent of parity as the best thing for the farmer. During the campaign of 1952, the General favored this. When he was running for the presidency, he went up into the farm country to Kasson, Minn., and made a farm speech on September 6, 1952. He said he was a 90 percent parity man with no "ifs or buts." Now—I don't want to tell you what General Eisenhower said at Kasson. I want you to listen to his own voice.

Mr. Cameraman—will you turn on your projector and carry us back to that fall day in 1952 in Kasson, Minn., and let General Eisenhower speak for himself.

"And here, and now, without any 'ifs' or 'buts,' I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the Basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity * * *. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout. And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity."

In that election year of 1952, General Eisenhower's pledge to the Democratic principle did not waver. On October 4, 1952, he spoke in the farm country once more. This time, at Brookings, S. Dak., General Eisenhower said and I quote:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90."

But once the Republicans came into office, this promise was forgotten. Despite all efforts of Democrats to stop it, President Eisenhower's administration did away with 90 percent supports for the farmer. In its place went something called the sliding scale. Well—farmers have slid down that scale ever since. The Republicans claimed this would do away with surpluses. They said it was the way to get the farmers' income up and do away with surpluses at the same time.

Well, where are we now under this Republican theory? The crop surpluses we have today were largely built up under the Eisenhower administration. The Republicans won't deny this; they can't. Take the example of wheat. The day before the Eisenhower administration took office, we had surplus wheat on hand to last us less than 6 months. On the last day of 1955, we had enough to last us more than 13 months. We have three times as much surplus corn as we had when this administration took office. We have 12 times as much cotton as we had when this administration took office.

Prices dropped—even where there were no Government surpluses. Beef cattle fell 40 percent and hogs 30 percent. In 1952, the average hog sold for $42.18. On March 15, 1956, the average hog sold for $29.21. In 1952, beef cattle sold for an average of $228.42; on March 15, 1956, the price was $135.36 a head. The farmer has lost $12.97 on a hog and $93.06 on a head of beef. Hogs and cattle are not supported at 90 percent of parity, but they, too, shared in the farm decline.

Do you wonder that the farmer had had enough and the Congress had had enough, too? That is why the Congress went back to 90 percent of parity which had worked in the past and would work again.

Now, I'll tell you a secret which you did not read in the newspapers. President Eisenhower has had enough of his system, too. He has completely abandoned his flexible supports. The day he vetoed our farm bill for 90 percent of parity, he dumped the sliding scale, and gave the farmer 82½ percent for cotton, 83 percent for rice, 84 percent for wheat, and 86 percent for corn.

President Eisenhower even put into effect the same price supports on milk and butterfat which he had criticized Congress for passing.

So it is not just partisanship when I say there is only one consistency in the Eisenhower farm program. In 1952 and in 1956 the Republicans favor high supports. In 1953 and 1954 and 1955 the Republicans favor low supports. They favor high supports in

election years and low supports in nonelection years. The farmer and Congress know that next year is not an election year. If the past is a guide to the future, General Eisenhower's Republican administration will go back to 75 percent next year, if it is still around at that time.

We Democrats feel the price-support program should be consistent. It should enable the farmer to plan his operations in election and nonelection years alike.

President Eisenhower's veto has cost the farmers $2 billion for this year. The farmer knows that his income in the last 3 years of the Republican administration has dropped from $14 billion to $11 billion.

The farmer reads that corporate profits increased 34 percent since 1952.

Dividends have gone up 24 percent.

Landlords get 19 percent more.

Wages and salaries are up 13 percent.

The farmer is not opposed to such splendid economic gains. He just wants to share them. But the farmer's share has not gone up. It has gone down 26 percent.

The country prospers—the farmer goes deeper into debt. Farm mortgage debt has increased a billion dollars each year for the past 3 years. In the first 6 months of last year, farm mortgage debt was the largest for any 6-month period recorded in the history of this Nation.

Now this farm bill and this Presidential veto are only one chapter in the fight of the Democratic Party for the farmer. We will fight. We will fight again. We will fight for credit for the farmer; we will fight to keep his interest rates low; for his protection against disaster; for disposal of the surpluses to people in need—something which President Eisenhower's administration has done little about in the last 3 years.

And we will, I promise you, fight again for 90 percent of parity, fight to stop this decline of farm income. And I promise you also that we will win—sooner than some people think.

I know your food bills are usually a shock. But it's not the farmer who gets the lion's share. In 1946, farmers got $3 a bushel for wheat. You paid 14 cents for a loaf of bread. Today the farmer gets only $2 a bushel, but you pay not 14 cents but 18 cents for a loaf of bread. The price of wheat has dropped one-third but the price of bread has gone up one-third.

If the shirt you are wearing cost $4, the farmer got only 25 cents for the cotton. The middleman takes more of your dollar and the farmer gets less.

The Republicans say the farmer is going broke because of surpluses. When the President vetoed our farm bill last week, he asked for a soil bank. The administration has been a long time coming around. But I'm glad it finally got there, just as I hoped it would come around to 90 percent of parity.

The soil bank was a simple idea. We have known for a long time that the cure for surpluses was to cut crop acreage. If the farmer lets acres lie idle he does not get any income from those acres. Under the soil bank the Government would pay the farmer part of the income he would have received by planting those acres. The farm bill had this proposal. The Democratic Congress has favored it for years.

Since 1954, however, the President's own Secretary of Agriculture has been calling the idea "unworkable." It seems lots of things are "workable" in an election year that don't work in other years. But if he wants to do it, the President has had the power all along under the Soil Conservation Act of 1935. I think President Eisenhower can rest assured that the Congress will give him $1,200,000,000 to set up the soil bank.

It often seems to me that it is the Republicans who worry about surpluses and the Democrats who worry about the farmers. I sometimes suspect that the Republicans feel there wouldn't be any farm problem if farmers would just go away. That is why they always move half-heartedly and too late.

A farm depression came to the United States under President Harding. A second farm depression came under President Hoover. The Republican Party is now pushing us into a third farm depression. This happens because of a basic difference between the two parties. The Democrats worry first about the individual. The Republicans forget about the individual and worry only about the economic problem.

The administration deals only in cold, statistical terms. The vital figures are not the percentage points or the dollar symbols. The all-important numbers are men, women, and children—people like you and me. People worrying about how to make ends meet. Fathers and mothers concerned about their children's schooling—how to clothe them and pay for medical care.

Since 1952 the farmers have been on the economic downgrade. The harder farmers have worked, the deeper farmers have gone into debt. The Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" has failed to work for millions of them.

If it fails to work for the farmers it will fail to work for you. The problems of the farmer touch directly on your own life. If the farmer does not prosper, eventually you will not. If he cannot make a living today on the land you cannot make a living tomorrow in your business or your factory or your trade.

The Democratic Party is the party of many interests. Under its great tent gather people from different regions and people with different ways of life. No one interest can dominate but all must have their rightful day in court. Today the farmer, faced with a constantly declining income, needs his day in court—not only for the farmer's good but for all our good. I hope that those of you who live in our big cities and in our large towns, on our broad prairies and our fertile fields, on our farms and ranches will think about the farmer tonight and in the days ahead.

This is LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas saying: Thank you and good night and God bless you.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and to express my approval of the address delivered by the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I also wish to remind the country and the Senate that a year ago the Banking and Currency Committee was very greatly concerned about the same problem, namely, the gradual and really very drastic decline of agriculture during the past several years.

The statement made last evening by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas was certainly on all fours with, and was borne out and supported by the hearings the Banking and Currency Committee held last year, showing that we are treading on very dangerous ground when we permit the economy to become so unbalanced, as it is now becoming, by the decline in agriculture and the great boom in industry.

I, too, think the Senator from Texas rendered a very great service in bringing home in so dramatic and irrefutable a manner the facts and the true situation in this field.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arkansas. Last evening I had the great pleasure, in company with a party of 14 or 15 other persons, of listening to the splendid address delivered by the majority leader. Each one of the persons in the party was deeply impressed by the irrefutable arguments and by facts which were brought to the attention of the American people in the course of the speech by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I sincerely congratulate the majority leader by making the speech in the manner in which he did, and by reason of the accurate informative data he presented, the Senator from Texas has rendered a very real contribution to all the American people, who for the first time, in my opinion, have learned the true story of the farm bill which recently was passed by this body and which unfortunately was vetoed by the President.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for having printed in the RECORD the very able speech delivered last evening by the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. Mrs. Neuberger and I were privileged to hear and to view that presentation.

I, in part, represent a State which has been hard hit by the present farm situation. Although many of them do not have access to television, I only hope that most of the people who live on the farms and in the rural areas of my State were able to hear on the radio the words of the outstanding Senator from Texas.

I am particularly pleased that he called to the attention of the people of the Nation some of the speeches made in 1952 by the then Republican candidate for President of the United States, so they can be made to realize that President Eisenhower is not now making his deeds square with his words.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for the very able presentation he made; and I also wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for having the speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] for the address which he delivered last evening on television. In my opinion, that farm address will go down in history as one of the greatest speeches ever delivered on television. I was very much pleased with it, because it removed from

the minds of a great many people any doubt as to whether or not President Eisenhower said certain things and then did not stand up for them after he became President.

I wish I could have given to the majority leader one further statement which the President made. It was made in South Carolina. Standing on the State House steps in South Carolina, the President, as a candidate, made a statement similar to the ones to which reference has been made. However, I believe his statement in South Carolina pinpointed the subject a little more clearly. He said there, without any ifs or ands, that "I am for the present 90-percent parity."

He was for the 90-percent parity which was in effect at that particular time.

I wish to commend the great Senator from Texas for having given to the people of the Nation the words of the President when he went before the people and told them what he stood for. I do not need to tell Senators that after he was elected he refused to sign a bill to carry out the program which he said he favored when he was a candidate.

As was brought out by the Senator from Texas, it was very clearly shown that the President vetoed the bill because it contained a provision for 90 percent of parity, although there were a great many other things in the bill which the President said he favored. For example, his soil-bank program was in the bill. He vetoed that, along with the other provisions, in order to get rid of the 90-percent parity for which he campaigned in 1952.

Let the people of the United States, after hearing what the President said, and knowing what was done, be the judges. Let them cast their ballots in the November election for the man who can best serve the farmers of the Nation.

ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FRANCIS O. WILCOX BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will soon be considering legislation dealing, among other things, with appropriations for the coming fiscal year for economic development and technical assistance.

I have had called to my attention a very informative address delivered by Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox, formerly chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The address was delivered before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Development, in Washington, D. C., on April 10, 1956. The address deals with the very important subject of multilateral programs for economic development and technical assistance, working through the United Nations. I think the address is so pertinent at this time that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, those of us in the Government who have anything to do with economic development and technical assistance are well aware of the active role played by the many American private organizations concerned with this subject. In the Government, we have come to recognize the understanding and skill which you bring to this important problem. I regard it as a great pleasure and privilege to be able to address you this morning.

First of all, let me pay a word of tribute to the United Nations for its work in the economic and social fields. To be sure, a few people criticize it either for doing too little or for attempting to do too much, but that is the kind of criticism any worthwhile enterprise can expect. There are a handful of critics, too, who urge that the United Nations be stripped of its economic and social work and be limited strictly to the maintenance of peace and security.

This is, of course, a wholly unrealistic attitude which would result in emasculating the United Nations and negating some of the main purposes of the charter. It is precisely in this field that the Organization has achieved some of its most solid successes. Whatever the transient follies of man in the political field, the United Nations social and economic program has been doing much, without a great deal of fanfare, to build good will among the nations and lay the basis for a lasting peace.

PROBLEMS OF TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

International technical and economic development programs raise very pointed questions. How long are we going to continue to make this kind of assistance available? Is it contributing significantly to the development of other countries? Are we getting benefits commensurate with our financial expenditures? How can we answer those who say we could use this money better at home, or of those who contend that we are developing foreign industry and agriculture to the point where they can better compete with our own production? These are important questions, many of which will be covered in your discussions today.

Knowing the record of the organizations here represented, I assume that there will be little disagreement among you on one basic issue. I am sure that there will be agreement that we cannot weaken our support for soundly conceived foreign-aid programs designed to help the underdeveloped countries to help themselves. It is not merely that we are confronted with a determined effort on the part of the Communist forces in the world to achieve through economic and ideological penetration what they are not able to achieve through military might. It is also that the demands of the great majority of the individuals in the world for development and for improved standards of living are undeniable and require a positive response.

BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS

Furthermore, there should be little divergence of views regarding our support both for bilateral and multilateral programs which, far from competing with each other, are complementary.

Few people here would seriously argue that we could or should dispense with either one. I may, however, be forgiven if I emphasize what seems to me the special importance of carrying out some of these programs increasingly through the United Nations. As the United Nations agencies grow in strength and attract resources from member nations which match our resources, we shall wish to place upon them a gradually increasing load of responsibilities. The United Nations system is the international society of which we are necessarily and vitally a part. We will, I believe, find it increasingly in our interest to take an increasing part in its work. From those whom we can help, and who also can help us, we must not isolate ourselves.

The executive branch is not alone in this opinion. Congressman BROOKS HAYS and Congressman CHESTER MERROW were distinguished members of the United States delegation to the 10th General Assembly. In their excellent report on the session, they have this to say:

"It is urgently necessary that in the future we make far greater use of the United Nations system for foreign aid than we have in the past. This would not mean an increased amount of money appropriated for foreign aid but rather the channeling of a part of existing appropriations through United Nations machinery.

"Some will say that such sponsorship does not give us the advertising and good will that bilateral programs provide. However, we would point out that the basic reason for our program of economic assistance is not to purchase affection but rather to strengthen the free world, eliminating the vacuums of weakness into which the Soviet power is trying to move."

STATUS OF UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION

The request of the executive branch for contributions to the United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program is now before Congress. The request we are making is for funds for 1957. This contribution will be pledged by our representative next fall at the so-called "pledging conference" in New York. We are asking Congress for $15,500,000, which is the same amount we pledged last year.

Last summer Congress granted the full amount which we sought—an 18-month appropriation totaling $24 million. The United States was thus enabled, at long last, to go to the United Nations in November and make our pledge for the whole of calendar year 1956. While this represented a fuller understanding on the part of Congress for the problem which this program has faced, we also recognize that we cannot be too scrupulous in presenting solid evidence to the Congress of the facts concerning the program—its effectiveness, its importance to the American people, and their interest in it.

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

In considering the request for funds this year, I think we can foresee certain questions that will be raised. First, has the Soviet participation in the program become a threat to its proper functioning or to our own national interests? Second, is there any validity to the argument that the organizational developments of the Expanded Technical Assistance Program have become such as to threaten the integrity of the specialized agencies? Third, what can we see for the future of this fund and other programs to assist in development of the underdeveloped countries? I propose to deal with each of these questions in order.

SOVIET BLOC ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

The recent attempts of the Soviet bloc at worldwide economic and social penetration deserve your very careful attention. May I at this point suggest some aspects of the broader problem as it is related to the United Nations?

In the early days of the United Nations, Soviet support of economic and social work was something less than lukewarm. At the very beginning, the Soviets conceived of

the United Nations as primarily a political and security organization. They resisted efforts to give vitality to the economic and social chapters of the Charter. Soviet membership in the specialized agencies was scattered, being chiefly confined to such older agencies as the Universal Postal Union, which had existed before World War I. In 1949 and 1950, when the Technical Assistance Program was established, the Russians used the debates in the United Nations as a forum for propaganda against the program. They denounced the whole plan as a device for Western imperialistic control of the underdeveloped countries. In this connection, it is interesting to observe the increasing desire of the rapidly developing countries to receive aid through multilateral agencies.

The striking reversal of the Soviet position in recent years is a tribute to the effectiveness of the programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. Since the Soviets were able neither to destroy nor to ignore these programs, they apparently have decided on a policy of "if you can't lick 'em, join 'em." Moreover, outside the United Nations, the Soviet Union has launched a rather impressive program of bilateral loan or barter agreements with other countries.

I would be the first to admit that when a totalitarian government embarks on a program of foreign economic aid, it does have certain temporary advantages over representative governments. A monolithic state such as the Soviet Union does not have to answer directly or promptly to the people on a particular foreign policy. It does not have to act in accordance with an accepted set of moral principles but only in accordance with what appears expedient at a given moment. It is not accountable to the taxpayer, irate or otherwise, since the state controls all wealth and all expenditures. In short, in foreign policy matters, the totalitarian state has maximum flexibility coupled with minimum accountability. These facts we must take into account in assessing the threat of the new Soviet economic policies.

Despite these temporary disadvantages, we in the democracies have the advantage in the long pull. It may be inconvenient, at times, to have to be concerned about public opinion or moral principles, or to have to convince Congress and the American people of the wisdom of a particular course of action. But these requirements, which are based upon an enlightened public reaction, give our policy the stability and the dependability it needs in an uncertain world.

We in the democracies may be somewhat slower and less dramatic than totalitarian states in entering into agreements. But once arrived at, our agreements are the considered policies not only of governments but of the people they represent. They are not lightly entered into nor are they lightly discarded.

Moreover, we in the United States have something of an advantage in that we initiated the practice of technical aid to foreign countries long before there was such a program in the United Nations. We were, so to speak, "first in the field" and this fact is well known to peoples and governments throughout the world.

In the United Nations, again, the United States has been a leader both in supporting the establishment of the specialized agencies and in consistently providing a large share of their financial support. This, too, is not new information to the members of the United Nations. It underscores the fact that we believe in technical aid for the benefit it will bring to other peoples and not alone for the good will and political prestige which are involved in bilateral aid.

I am not suggesting that the democracies should have a monopoly on technical assistance. We do have, however, a record of experience and integrity, of good faith and fair dealing, which are assets of incalculable value. In any long-term contest with totalitarian states in international technical and social cooperation, these should stand us in good stead.

In view of all this we would be shortsighted indeed to be frightened into a position of outpromising the Russians on offers many of which they would not or could not keep.

In theory at least, it would be beneficial to the United Nations and to the underdeveloped countries if the Soviets would commence a consistent and sincere program of technical assistance. Their record on this score to date has not, however, been impressive.

In the summer of 1953, the Soviets made their first pledge to the technical-assistance program. Successive pledges and contributions have been made since then. However, the nonusability of the rubles which were paid in, coupled with the reluctance of recipient countries to accept Russian experts or training grants within the Soviet Union, resulted in a considerable accumulation of rubles on the books of the United Nations.

There are indications that greater use will be made of these funds in 1956. However, in the face of continued reluctance on the part of many countries to receive Soviet experts, most of the projects financed out of Soviet and satellite funds must be in the form of supplies and equipment.

What this all means in practical terms is still very much an unknown factor. To obtain the equipment has required extensive negotiations between the international agencies and the Soviet Government. Specifications do not always conform to western standards. Even where specifications can be met, the quality and durability of Soviet equipment is open to question. Servicing of the equipment and obtaining spare parts may present a real problem, as the years go by. To the extent that there is competition in this area between the East and the West, there would seem to be no doubt that in the technical field western countries, including the United States, can meet any challenge the Soviets put up. Clearly, American machinery, tools, and equipment can make their way in the world. In a sense, we have here a first-rate opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of the American industrial system, as compared to the Soviet.

One further development deserves attention. A few countries in dire need of help found it difficult to resist the lure of the unused rubles. They have recently shown a willingness to develop projects designed to use primarily or almost exclusively Russian experts, Russian training grants, and Russian equipment. For practical purposes, these have the appearance of bilateral projects financed out of Soviet funds contributed to the United Nations. This tends to pervert the truly multilateral character of technical assistance.

You may rest assured, however, that your representatives in the United Nations and the specialized agencies are not oblivious to this danger. Both in the Technical Assistance Committee, and in other United Nations organs, our representatives have drawn attention to this threat and we have every reason to believe that a stop will be put to any attempts of this nature to endanger the United Nations program of technical assistance.

ORGANIZATION OF EXPANDED PROGRAM

The organization of the Expanded Technical Assistance Program has raised very real apprehensions in certain quarters. It is contended by some that the mechanisms established at the beginning of the expanded program, which has been somewhat strengthened since that time, have now become a threat to the specialized agencies—and to such a degree as to seriously hamper them in the proper performance of their functions. Now, it is important to establish at once the fact that there is nothing fixed or sacrosanct about the procedures under which the expanded program operates at the present time. The administrative arrangements are undoubtedly complex. Of its complicated arrangement of checks and balances even students of the United States Federal Government may well stand in awe. It is a system which has grown up in response to very definite conditions and needs. But this does not mean that it cannot be made better and that we cannot steadily work to simplify and improve it.

What I think is important to recognize is the fact that conscientious and sincere people have discussed this question on both sides of the fence. There are some, for example, who believe that the concept of a single fund and the mechanism of the expanded program have become so elaborate and so dangerous to the integrity of the specialized agencies, that the expanded program itself should be scrapped and contributions made to each of the specialized agencies separately.

On the other hand, there is a wealth of evidence—from the recipient countries, from our missions overseas, and even from most of the participating agencies—which supports the other view. From these sources it is pointed out that confusion, lack of coordination, and diminished impact are bound to result unless each specialized agency is provided with convenient machinery for cooperation and coordination with others and for gearing its activities to agreed country needs and programs.

The central problem is to find precisely the right place to draw the line. Few people advocate placing the program under centralized administrative direction. On the other hand, the United States Government believes it is unwise to advocate complete separation. We believe that the expanded program in its present form has established itself as an effective and important force in international affairs.

For one thing, it assures the several participating agencies the essential freedom which they must have for their technical programs, while providing necessary coordination. If the program were broken up and financial contributions made separately to the various agencies, such coordination would be extremely difficult to accomplish.

Furthermore—and this is highly important—the agencies would risk losing a large part of the funds they are now receiving through the expanded program of technical assistance. Some 70 countries, non-United Nations members among them, would be compelled to make separate contributions to 7 or 8 different agencies, all of them competing for funds. It can be taken for granted that this process would become exceedingly cumbersome and inefficient and the machinery might even collapse of its own weight. The agencies themselves would be the chief losers. Instead of receiving technical-assistance funds on their present scale, their income would rapidly diminish. What this would mean can easily be seen when it is realized that the FAO spent in 1955 $7,650,128 out of the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund, as against $6 million received under its regular budget. The corresponding figures for the WHO are $4,335,981 as against $9,500,000; and for UNESCO $3,081,748 as against $10,299,618. The 1956 figures are even higher for FAO and other agencies.

In summary, let me reemphasize that no one intends to weaken the specialized agencies or to interfere with matters within their technical competence. In the expanded program we believe the United Nations is fundamentally on the right track. As this program continues to develop in size and influence—and I believe it will—separatism among the participating agencies will more and more become an impossible proposition to sustain.

THE FORWARD LOOK

The technical assistance program of the United Nations has turned out to be an international instrument of major significance. From all I have said, it is clear that we must move steadily ahead with it. The Technical Assistance Board is now developing what, perhaps following your good example here, they call their forward look. This is a study of what 5 years' experience has shown and in what directions the program might go from here.

The program is still extraordinarily small relative to the needs which it aims to meet. We should begin to recognize that, in a modest way, some change in the nature of the program may be desirable as it expands. The paucity of supplies and equipment has been one of the factors which has hampered its work. We would not wish to see the nature of the program altered into a means of supplying financial aid. But it may very well be, although this is, of course, a matter for careful study, that some augmentation of supplies and equipment, for teaching and demonstration purposes, would represent a very desirable emphasis. This might mean an increase in required funds from the present total of $30 million a year.

In the area of financial aid we encounter a much more difficult and intricate problem. The needs of the underdeveloped countries for development capital are large and urgent if they are to win the race between sound economic development, on the one hand, and unrest and political and economic disaster, on the other. It is axiomatic that the bulk of these funds have to be found internally through taxation and encouragement of local capital formation. At the same time, it is evident that if these countries are to be freed from the threat of subversion and revolution they also require outside help.

In this context we think, of course, first of all of private capital. Our own early development benefited greatly from British and other investments made in this country. Private capital is also moving today into underdeveloped countries and is doing much for them, but the flow is discouragingly slow and limited. It can be increased if the underdeveloped countries themselves do everything possible to create a better investment climate, and many of them are doing just that.

Beyond this we need a more imaginative approach to discover opportunities for private investment which will be of benefit to the countries concerned. Ways and means ought to be found, for instance, to use the best knowledge available in a determined move to explore the natural resources which await development throughout the world. As the opportunities for such development become clearer, the flow of private capital will increase and help speed economic development in countries where it is most urgently needed.

Second, public loan capital is available both through bilateral instruments such as our own Export-Import Bank and through multilateral channels such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The loans made by these institutions are bankable loans and must by necessity be restricted to the repayment ability of individual countries.

Third, along with [or prior to] investments of interest to banks or private individuals, there is a need for development projects which are not bankable for a variety of reasons. Irrigation schemes, roads, schools, and hospitals illustrate the point. Without these, further agricultural or industrial development is severely handicapped or impossible. These projects constitute what is commonly known as infrastructure. Although the word is a dreadful one, the things for which it stands represent the foundations for economic development. It is on the basis of such foundations that there will be infinitely greater scope for private investment and public lending.

How such funds, whether they be local or external funds, can be made available is a matter of grave concern to all those interested in the development of sound economies which will not be vulnerable to subversion. Our own Government, along with other governments, is continuously exploring this problem in the hope of finding an adequate answer. Our international system is not a stagnant one. Like other systems and institutions, it must continue to grow and meet ever-changing conditions.

In conclusion, I would like to enter a word of general caution to those who would go too far and too fast with the United Nations. The United Nations has great potentialities. Prudently used, it can continue to be an important means for the development of the kind of world we want to live in. But impetuosity and over-reaching have their dangers here as elsewhere. Common horsesense and a recognition of what is practical will in the end carry us further than attempting too much at once. We do disservice to something we all believe in by running forward and stumbling, instead of walking certainly and surely to our goal.

It has been a pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to meet here this morning with this group. I am confident that your discussions (now that I have finished) will prove to be fruitful and constructive. We in the State Department shall watch with interest the outcome of your labors.

MRS. FRANKLIN PEABODY—A SOLITARY VOICE IN THE DAR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, last week, on April 12, there took place at one of the sessions of the convention of the Daughters of the American Revolution an episode which impressed me so deeply that I cannot refrain from reciting it here on the floor of the Senate.

A constituent of mine—a constituent I am very proud of, although I do not know her—Mrs. Franklin Peabody, of Glens Falls, N. Y., arose on the floor of the DAR convention to oppose a resolution indicating the support of the DAR for the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mrs. Peabody's was a solitary voice in opposition to the resolution and in advocacy of a more liberal and forward-looking attitude on the part of the DAR, on this question. No other members of the DAR arose in support of Mrs. Peabody's position, although I am sure that there are thousands of members of the DAR who agree with what Mrs. Peabody said on the floor of the convention. I do not know how many of the delegates who were present listened to what Mrs. Peabody had to say, but she caught the ear of the Nation, and many thousands have now read of her views.

I was so deeply impressed with Mrs. Peabody's action, that I wrote a letter to her, congratulating her on her display of courage.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the Evening Star reporting on this incident, the letter I wrote to her on the basis of this article, and a speech I delivered before the educational conference sponsored by the United Automobile Workers—a speech which is referred to in my letter to Mrs. Peabody—be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article, letter, and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONE OBJECTOR PROTESTS DAR IMMIGRATION STAND

Over the protest of a lone objector from the floor, the Daughters of the American Revolution today reiterated their support of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

In addition to attending the business sessions of the 65th DAR Continental Congress in Constitution Hall, delegates were lining up at the polls to vote for national officers in the triennial election. The polls closed at 2:30 p. m., with results to be announced at tonight's session.

The three candidates for the top DAR post—president general—are Mrs. Charles Carroll Haig, of Washington; Mrs. Thomas Henry Lee, of Philadelphia; and Mrs. Frederic A. Groves, of Cape Girardeau, Mo.

Each of the top candidates has a slate of 11 running mates. The large number of names on the ballot makes it anybody's guess when the tellers will be able to complete the count but it is likely to be early tomorrow morning before the results are known.

During today's session, Mrs. Franklin Peabody, 29-year-old housewife from the Chepontuc chapter at Glens Falls, N. Y., took the convention floor to protest the organization's going on record "year after year, in blind support of a highly complex law."

She declared that the Immigration and Nationality Act contains, among its many restrictive features the illogical national origins quota system. She said this system is laughable when it is recognized that the tiny principality of Monaco has the same allowance for quota immigrants to the United States as the world power, India; the quota for each is 100."

Mrs. Peabody told the Daughters, "I do not intend to dwell on the truism that we are all descendants of immigrants."

Calling the national origins system absurd, Mrs. Peabody said it assigns priorities on the basis of geographical area of birth rather than of individual worth and merit. She added the total of quota immigrants of about 154,000 a year is entirely unrealistic.

She expressed the view that a reassessment of today's needs and resources should prove the United States capacity to afford immigrants far greater than this mean, parsimonious amount.

DELEGATE PROTESTS LACK OF TIME ON DAR RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. Franklin Peabody, of Glens Falls, N. Y., who took the floor today to explain her lone vote against the DAR's resolution supporting the present immigration law, said her chapter is concerned about the short length of time given delegates to study resolutions.

She is the wife of a Glens Falls lawyer. A part-time teacher in the nursery school at the Presbyterian Church there, she is 29 and a delegate from Chepontuc Chapter.

She and Mrs. William Montgomery, her alternate, told reporters their chapter had tried for the past 5 or 6 years to have the resolutions sent out for study at least a month prior to the congress.

"We did succeed in accomplishing this in the New York State Society," Mrs. Peabody said. Delegates to the National Society Congress here received copies of the resolutions a day before they were to be voted upon.

"We have no way of knowing how many chapters have sent in similar requests for a change in resolution proceedings because a minority report is never given," Mrs. Montgomery said.

APRIL 23, 1956.

Mrs. FRANKLIN PEABODY,
Glens Falls, N. Y.

DEAR MRS. PEABODY: A member of my staff has reported to me that you called at our office to discuss the subject of immigration policy. I later read in the Washington Evening Star the very exciting story of your courageous stand at the DAR Convention in opposing the resolution proposed to uphold the McCarran-Walter Act. As I read this account, I was deeply moved. This is the kind of courage of which heroism is made.

As you probably know, I have been working for the amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act since the act was passed 4 years ago. In the past, I have often felt myself to be standing almost alone on this issue, but as time goes by more and more people have come to see the inequities and injustices in the present law.

I want not only to congratulate you, but to thank you. Just yesterday I delivered a speech at a convocation sponsored by the United Auto Workers. I spoke on the subject of freedom, with particular emphasis on freedom of expression. While I was writing this speech, I thought of you and the courage you showed in standing up, a lone voice, on the floor of the DAR Convention. I am enclosing a copy of that speech so that you may see what I mean. I do not know whether you will agree with all the things I have to say in my speech, but I think you will appreciate, from your own experience, what I was talking about.

I wish I had been in my office when you called so that I might have been able to greet you. I have a very warm feeling for Glens Falls. I have been there on several occasions and in recent years I have stayed in touch with it through my friend, the Honorable Nathaniel P. Davis, a former distinguished member of the Foreign Service now living in retirement in Glens Falls.

I hope that on your next visit to Washington you will find occasion to call at my office again, and that I will be able to meet you and thank you in person.

Yours very sincerely,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

P. S.—I know you will not mind the fact that I am planning to put the article which appeared in the Evening Star into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my letter to you. When this is printed, I will be happy to send you a copy.

REMARKS OF HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, OF NEW YORK, UPON ACCEPTING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY FREEDOM AWARD OF UNITED AUTO WORKERS (AFL–CIO) AT THE SYLVAN THEATER, WASHINGTON, D. C., 11 A. M., SUNDAY, APRIL 22, 1956

Thank you for your award. It means as much to me as any honor I have ever received. This award, coming from this union, is an accolade I will always treasure.

It is almost unnecessary for me to tell you in what esteem I hold the United Automobile Workers Union, and how pleased I am to be able, on this occasion, to congratulate the UAW on this 20th anniversary of its founding.

My admiration for your leadership is deep and abiding. I count it a privilege to number among my true friends that man of thought and action, that dreamer and realist, that American ambassador to world labor at large, Walter Reuther.

Historians will one day measure what the UAW has done for its members and for the automobile industry, for the American labor movement as a whole, for the national welfare and for the strength and prestige of the United States in world affairs.

But speaking for myself, I know of no single organization, of whatever nature or size, which has had a greater or more constructive impact on the entire history of these times than the United Automobile Workers of America.

It is not only the size and extent of its contribution, but even more, its quality. When other organizations have wavered or held back in doubt or fear, the UAW has pressed boldly forward, an elite guard in the forces of courage and progress.

Today on this occasion, on this 20th anniversary of the founding of the UAW, I give this union my own award of deep respect, admiration, and gratitude.

You have given me your freedom award. I am especially proud of that.

I have always sought to resist on every possible front the encroachments of those men and forces who have striven to narrow and restrict the practices of freedom. I have tried to help sound the alarm for the mobilization of those legions of Americans who, loving freedom, have been aroused to defend it. The UAW was one of the first to respond to that alarm, to help spread it throughout the land, and to help mobilize the forces to resist the assault.

The most recent assault on our Bill of Rights and on our practices of freedom is too fresh in our memory to need recital today. The effects of it are still very much with us.

One of the worst of those effects is a widespread reluctance, both in official circles and among the public at large, to cope with the grave and vital issues which confront us at home and abroad today. There is a strong inclination to turn away from these issues, to refuse to recognize some of them and to defer others, into the future.

This current inclination is, in part at least, one of the after effects of McCarthyism. There are, of course, other factors in this current tendency to avoid controversy and to refuse to face the necessity of struggle. But I am going to confine myself today to a discussion of what has happened to our practice of freedom and the consequences thereof.

I shall talk today about the first freedom—the freedom of thought and expression. What is the heart of that freedom?

Freedom of thought and expression is freedom of conscience, and the freedom to communicate opinions and conclusions, without restriction or penalty. It is not only the right to think freely and to express oneself freely, but the use of that right.

Today while the right of this freedom is plainly written in the Constitution and generally supported by the Supreme Court, its actual use is, in fact, greatly restricted in vital areas of thought and conduct.

There has developed a widespread recognition of a set of taboos, armed with almost irresistible powers of sanction and enforcement. These taboos are against the advocacy or even the discussion of subjects labeled "controversial." The power of enforcement of these taboos consists of the power to dismiss people from jobs and positions, the power of the blacklist, and for public men, the threat of defeat at the polls.

The subject matter of these taboos differs somewhat in different areas of the country. Communism, of course, or anything which can be called communism, or even socialism falls everywhere under the taboo. In some areas and localities any position which resembles liberalism is subject to these sanctions.

Worst of all, these taboos have come to be, in significant part, self-executing and self-enforcing. Many people recognizing these taboos, have come to abide by them.

All of this may be an inevitable consequence of the period we have just gone through, and I am sure that under ordinary conditions we could look forward with good cheer to the prospect of a steady improvement in the situation I have described.

But today we confront the most extraordinary of conditions. Our problems, both at home and abroad, are as critical as any we have ever had in the history of our Nation. I need refer to only one problem, the problem of segregation and of equal rights for all our citizens. Today that problem threatens our national unity and tranquillity to a degree unprecedented in this country.

But in many parts of the South, at least, there is no such thing as free discussion and debate of the course to be followed. The taboo against free expression of opinion on this subject has forced an almost complete acceptance, among the white population, of the sorry doctrine of white supremacy. In some places it is dangerous even to voice acceptance of the rule of constitutional law. To speak of the Supreme Court save with contempt is to violate the taboo. To question the morality of segregation is, of course, to invite swift and certain retribution. Those few brave souls who have expressed opinions or even posed questions within this range have suffered not only social ostracism but have been stripped of jobs, honors, titles, and positions.

Freedom of expression on this issue has suffered an almost total eclipse in many places in the South. The effect of this, in turn, has been to deprive these areas of an effective liberal opposition to the extreme racists and advocates of the status quo. This has placed the total burden of vocal opposition and struggle upon those of the Southern Negro leaders who can withstand the economic and other pressures directed against them. This is not only an unhealthy situation; it is one fraught with danger.

I said a few moments ago that one of the worst things that has happened is that in general the taboos on freedom of expression have become, to some extent, self-executing and self-enforcing. All of us think twice before we voice opinions on certain subjects; we refrain from expressing the indignation of our feelings at certain injustices; we avoid contact with certain organizations and individuals; we keep our bookshelves free of certain books and magazines. To do otherwise we fear might be misunderstood.

This, we tell ourselves, is prudence. And, in fact, it is. But why should it be prudent? And where does prudence in ourselves end, and cowardice, in others, begin?

The trouble is that we have lost the passion for the full right of freedom of expression, and we have thus lost the full use of the standard by which conduct, on the part of others, can be judged.

I am primarily concerned of course with the decrease in the right of freedom. I believe that every free human soul requires a constant exercise of his right of self-expression. When his conscience decides, his voice must speak. Once he begins to be prudent in the exercise of his voice, he will find prudence affecting his conscience.

Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that

good men remain silent." And I say today that if good men remain silent in the face of evil, they have already compromised with evil.

I know this is easy to preach and hard to practice. But my friends, on this Sunday morning, I am preaching to myself as well as to you. And if the ideal is impossible to attain in this real and practical world, it must never cease to be striven for. It must never cease to be the goal.

What is the meaning of all this in terms of contemporary events and issues? I think that the present national mood of acceptance of the myth of "peace and prosperity"—that peace which is threatened at every hand, and that prosperity which all too many of our people do not share—is due in part to the erosion of true freedom in our country.

A great propaganda machine, utilizing all the new media of communication—has merchandised the myth that all is well in Eisenhower's America. The insidious techniques of mass market salesmanship have been employed to cultivate an acceptance of slogans instead of facts, and a greater interest in the packaging or presentation of ideas than in their merit or substance.

This administration proposes and expects to go to the people next November without a record of achievement, without a program for future accomplishment, and without advocacy of any recognizable set of principles—on a platform built simply on the Tin Pan Alley slogan of "I Like Ike."

Yet the issues of the present day are as I have already tried to indicate among the most serious of our history. We are gripped in a domestic crisis of the gravest possible consequence; in world affairs we are shuffling along from brink to brink of war.

Let me list just a few of our current problems:

Vast numbers of our people are inadequately housed—slums creep ever forward in our cities.

Our school systems are overburdened and tragically substandard in many areas.

The problem of our aged population grows by the month.

Our natural resources are being stolen and dissipated.

The shortage of scientists and technologists grows increasingly intense.

The shortage of doctors becomes ever more critical and adequate health care, ever more difficult to obtain for most of our people.

Scandalous discrimination characterizes our immigration policy.

Injustice is rife in our treatment of aliens.

And last, but by no means least, our family-sized farms and small farmers are being subjected to greater and greater pressures of economic adversity.

And even with this long list, I have only begun. I have not touched on the problems of economic concentration and monopoly, and of automation, which are of such pressing concern to you—and the problem of the Taft-Hartley Act.

And in the face of this, all we are hearing about today is peace and prosperity.

Few are the voices which are seriously raised to dispel or dispute the myth that all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds.

Oh, my friends, we have much to do in our beloved land to bring justice and equality to all our inhabitants and citizens, to build a true prosperity and to advance toward a lasting peace. But first of all, we must work to restore freedom to her hallowed place in our hearts and in the practices of our country.

We must cut away the hedges which now hem in the areas of freedom. We must dedicate ourselves to the advancement of the sacred cause of liberty, not just in words, but by hard and difficult deeds.

We must free the conscience of every man to express itself as it will.

We must restore the public faith, and our own faith, the power of truth to prevail over error, and the necessity of free search and inquiry to establish that truth.

If these be our guides and our standards, we will advance to the inevitable victory.

ANNIVERSARY OF MASSACRE OF ARMENIANS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today in many places in America, Americans of Armenian descent observe the tragic date of April 24 on which, in 1915, more than 1 million Armenians were massacred.

The people of Armenia, in their long history, have suffered the oppression of many conquerors. They have had only brief interludes of freedom. But their love of freedom has never ceased to burn brightly, and they have given many patriots to the cause of freedom in many parts of the world. Those Armenians behind the Iron Curtain who endure the tyranny of Communist rule today will one day, I am sure, achieve again the blessings of liberty.

We must show our sympathy for these people on this memorial day, which is the anniversary of one of the greatest tragedies of Armenia's tragic history, by expressing our warm sympathy for the enslaved people of Armenia, and by continuing to work for the liberalization of our immigration laws so that we may give asylum to qualified freedom-loving people of Armenian birth and descent. We must also continue to press for the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

DISPOSITION OF FORMER ENEMY-SEIZED PROPERTIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last Friday the Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on Trading With the Enemy Act, of which I am chairman, completed public hearings on several major bills pending before it. These bills relates to the disposition of former enemy-seized properties, now being administered by the Office of Alien Property.

We heard many witnesses. A large number of individuals, companies, and groups submitted briefs and statements.

No one questions the wisdom and necessity in time of war of seizing the properties of enemy aliens. All means to stay the enemy and overcome him are necessary.

The problem now of the first magnitude is "What shall we do with the private property of individual owners with whose governments we were at war when the seizures took place?"

There are many statutes on alien property. One is superimposed on another. Executive orders and legislation by the adoption of reorganization plans are added to these statutes. The administration of them has resulted in some harsh results. The turn in part of the law seems contrary to our traditional American policy of free enterprise and the exemption of an individual's private personal property from his government's obligations.

The subcommittee will study the complex questions involved. The answers to them are not easy. Domestic law, constitutional law, as well as international law and custom, are involved. Many disputed questions of fact arise. We are greatly concerned with how and in what manner we make provision to pay the claims of Americans for personal injuries, wrongful deaths, and property losses. I do not refer to token payments—partial payments—or a piecemeal approach to await further legislation. I refer to an immediate overall program that will do substantial and complete justice to American claimants as their claims relate to the subject matter of alien property.

The major problems in the handling of alien property revolve around questions like these:

How shall we provide for the full payment of all American losses—such as those for personal injuries, wrongful deaths, and property damage claims?

What existing agency of the Government is best suited and qualified to complete the payment of claims within a reasonable time?

Should appeals be allowed from the final decision of the agency making the award of payments?

Are we to adopt the Communists' method of confiscating private property—even partially as proposed in one bill?

Will partial confiscation harm our foreign policy?

How will a program of partial confiscation affect the security of our vast private and governmental investments abroad?

Shall we foster, uphold, and maintain the American principle that an individual's private property is sacred and entitled to the protection afforded by our Constitution?

Shall we sustain the principle that an individual's property is exempt from any obligation by his Government?

Shall we penalize aliens because of their faith and confidence in our institutions when they invested here in time of peace?

These and their related problems have far reaching consequences.

We have much evidence in the record to review. We have diverse contentions to weigh.

On Friday there was one outstanding item or a series of items of evidence introduced which because they are so important, so timely and because they so vitally affect other measures now under consideration by the House of Representatives and will shortly reach the Senate that I feel it imperative that the Senate, and the American people at large should be alerted to them now.

Mr. Paul O. Peters, an able research consultant, submitted a statistical analysis of all of the American loans, gifts and grants to foreign governments and their amounts for the periods of (a) World War I, (b) under the lend-lease program, and (c) in the various foreign-aid programs since the close of World War II.

I send the analysis to the desk and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN LOANS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, POST WORLD WAR I; INDEBTEDNESS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES ARISING FROM WORLD WAR I LOANS, INCLUDING DEFAULTS; LEND-LEASE AID RENDERED BY THE UNITED STATES, WORLD WAR II; FOREIGN AID GRANTS AND CREDITS FROM THE UNITED STATES TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES, JULY 1, 1945, TO JUNE 30, 1955; AMERICAN PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES FOR THE YEARS 1928 AND 1954

(Compiled by Paul O. Peters, research consultant)

AMERICAN LOANS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, POST WORLD WAR I

Under the acts of Congress of April 24, 1917, September 24, 1917, April 4, 1918, and July 9, 1918, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to establish credits in favor of foreign governments engaged in war with enemies of the United States and to the extent of credits so established to make advances to such governments through the purchase at par of their respective obligations. The total appropriations provided by Congress for loans to foreign governments was $10 billion. The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year 1919, summarizes the situation as of June 30, 1919, as follows:

Country	Credits established	Cash advances	Other advances	Total loaned
Belgium	$343,445,000	$338,745,000		$338,745,000
Cuba	10,000,000	10,000,000		10,000,000
Czechoslovakia	55,330,000	52,690,000		52,690,000
France	3,047,974,777	2,887,477,800	$110,000,000	2,997,477,800
Great Britain	4,277,000,000	4,277,000,000		4,277,000,000
Greece	48,236,629		48,236,629	48,236,629
Italy	1,629,922,872	1,610,922,872		1,610,922,872
Liberia	5,000,000	26,000		26,000
Russia	187,729,465	187,729,465		187,729,750
Serbia	26,780,465	26,780,465		26,780,465
Rumania	25,000,000	25,000,000		25,000,000
Total	9,647,419,493			
Cash advanced		9,416,370,888		
Other charges against credits			158,236,629	
Total loaned (to June 30, 1919)				9,574,608,517

Recorded repayments and balances, June 30, 1919

Country	Total loaned	Repayments	Balances
Belgium	$338,745,000	$10,000	$338,735,000
Cuba	10,000,000		10,000,000
Czechoslovakia	52,690,000		52,690,000
France	2,997,477,000	12,147,000	2,985,330,000
Great Britain	4,277,000,000	57,164,008	4,219,835,992
Greece	48,236,629		48,236,629
Italy	1,610,922,872		1,610,922,872
Liberia	26,000		26,000
Rumania	25,000,000		25,000,000
Russia	187,729,750		187,729,750
Serbia	26,780,465		26,780,465
Total	9,574,608,517	69,321,008	9,505,287,509

The indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States, June 30, 1954 (arising from World War I advances)

Country	Principal in default	Interest in default	Total in default	Unmatured principal	Total indebtedness
Armenia	$11,959,917.49	$20,813,124.67	$32,773,042.16		$32,773,042.16
Austria	13,623,712.32	44,058.93	13,667,771.25	$12,356,768.34	26,024,539.59
Belgium	114,900,000.00	177,743,077.60	292,643,077.60	285,780,000.00	578,423,077.60
Czechoslovakia	51,181,108.90	51,118,599.51	102,299,708.41	114,060,000.00	216,359,708.41
Estonia	3,674,112.87	13,178,678.94	26,852,791.81	12,792,000.00	39,644,791.81
Finland		345,097.00	345,097.00	6,780,678.82	7,125,775.82
France	1,293,841,430.30	1,513,442,964.36	2,807,284,394.66	2,569,808,569.70	5,377,092,964.36
Britain	951,000,000.00	3,414,759,301.93	4,365,759,301.93	3,417,000,000.00	7,782,759,301.93
Greece	19,091,000.00	9,280,095.10	28,371,095.10	12,425,000.00	40,786,095.10
Hungary	397,060.00	1,429,709.53	1,826,769.53	1,511,500.00	3,338,269.53
Italy	411,900,000.00	112,076,159.34	523,976,159.34	1,593,000,000.00	2,116,976,159.34
Latvia	1,509,264.20	5,388,477.84	6,897,742.04	5,370,200.00	12,267,942.04
Lithuania	1,335,680.00	4,806,565.03	6,142,245.03	4,862,002.00	11,004,247.03
Poland	43,312,000.00	164,931,404.20	208,243,404.20	162,745,000.00	370,988,404.20
Rumania	20,310,560.43	27,372,734.44	47,683,294.87	43,550,000.00	91,233,294.87
Russia	192,601,297.37	342,371,797.63	534,973,095.00		534,973,095.00
Yugoslavia	13,153,000.00	4,575,631.28	17,728,631.28	48,472,000.00	66,200,631.28
Total	3,143,790,043.88				
Interest in default		5,863,677,256.33			
Total in default, June 30, 1954			9,007,467,300.21		
Unmatured principal				8,290,513,718.86	
Grand total, indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States					17,297,981,019.07

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1954.

Lend-lease aid rendered by the United States, World War II

[By major countries and country groups, Mar. 11, 1941, through June 30, 1945]

Country or group:	Total expenditure by country
British Commonwealth including Canada	$29,280,184,735
China	338,287,842
France	645,459,595
Russia	10,074,691,047
Belgium	31,585,058
Czechoslovakia	16,758
Egypt	10,621
Ethiopia	5,081,371
Geece	72,854,831
Iceland	3,786,437
Iran	19,780
Iraq	4,144

Lend-lease aid rendered by the United States, World War II—Continued

Country or group—Con.	Total expenditure by country
Liberia	$1,981,104
Netherlands	146,633,122
Norway	31,244,707
Poland	15,982,251
Saudi Arabia	11,046,553
Turkey	21,154,577
Yugoslavia	18,369,421
Unassigned areas	56,982,542
American Republics (16)	346,356,443
Production facilities: special projects and administrative expense	[1] 869,018,422
Total lend-lease to to June 30, 1945	[2] 42,020,779,261

Explanatory notes:

[1] Production facilities in the United States provided with lend-lease funds accounted for $634,209,771. Special projects, servicing of foreign vessels, ocean freight and administrative expenses cost $234,808,651, making a total of $869,018,422.

[2] In addition to lend-lease aid furnished during the period to June 30, 1945, the United States expended $2,413,193,669 for installations owned or controlled in foreign countries or their dependencies. In all there were 3,013 of these installations all but 66 of which were military in character. As examples of the nonmilitary expenditures are such items as expenditure of $104,101 in India for production of mica and an additional $4,141 for extraction of beryllium ores.

Foreign-aid grants and credits from the United States to foreign countries and areas

[Postwar period; July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1955, excluding payments to capital of International Bank ($635 million) and International Monetary Fund ($2,750 million) which were both measures to promote foreign economic recovery following World War II. This compilation includes interim aid under United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration; GARIOA; the Marshall plan (ECA); Mutual Security Administration and International Cooperation Administration (grants and credits by principal countries)]

Country or area	Net grants	Net credits	Total
Western Europe:			
Austria	$1,003,000,000	$8,000,000	$1,011,000,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	579,000,000	151,000,000	730,000,000
United Kingdom	2,658,000,000	4,294,000,000	6,952,000,000
Denmark	233,000,000	49,000,000	282,000,000
Finland	3,000,000	77,000,000	80,000,000
France	3,561,000,000	1,842,000,000	5,403,000,000
Germany (Federal Republic)	2,676,000,000	1,192,000,000	3,868,000,000
Iceland	28,000,000	6,000,000	34,000,000
Ireland (Eire)	17,000,000	128,000,000	145,000,000
Italy, including Trieste	2,466,000,000	277,000,000	2,743,000,000
Netherlands	791,000,000	268,000,000	1,059,000,000
Norway	207,000,000	102,000,000	309,000,000
Portugal	15,000,000	50,000,000	65,000,000
Spain	35,000,000	56,000,000	91,000,000
Sweden	87,000,000	21,000,000	108,000,000
Yugoslavia	666,000,000	53,000,000	719,000,000
Unspecified aid in Western Europe	681,000,000	101,000,000	782,000,000
Eastern Europe:			
Czechoslovakia	186,000,000	5,000,000	191,000,000
Eastern Germany	17,000,000	----------	17,000,000
Poland	365,000,000	63,000,000	428,000,000
U. S. S. R. (Russia)	204,000,000	222,000,000	426,000,000
Other Eastern Europe	26,000,000	13,000,000	39,000,000
Near East-Africa:			
Egypt	22,000,000	4,000,000	26,000,000
Rhodesia and Nyassaland	----------	40,000,000	40,000,000
Greece	1,200,000,000	75,000,000	1,275,000,000
Iran	141,000,000	55,000,000	196,000,000
Iraq	----------	142,000	142,000
Israel	231,000,000	128,000,000	359,000,000
Near East-Africa—Con.			
Jordan	$21,000,000	----------	$21,000,000
Liberia	6,000,000	$18,000,000	24,000,000
Turkey	219,000,000	93,000,000	312,000,000
Union of South Africa	−92,000,000	104,000,000	12,000,000
Unspecified areas	176,000,000	−6,000,000	170,000,000
South Asia:			
Afghanistan	3,000,000	24,000,000	27,000,000
India	101,000,000	227,000,000	328,000,000
Pakistan	118,000,000	15,000,000	133,000,000
Burma	20,000,000	2,000,000	22,000,000
Indo China	303,000,000	----------	303,000,000
Indonesia	104,000,000	137,000,000	241,000,000
Thailand	25,000,000	1,000,000	26,000,000
Unspecified South Asia	17,000,000	----------	17,000,000
Asia and Pacific:			
Australia	−9,000,000	12,000,000	3,000,000
China (Formosa)	1,074,000,000	106,000,000	1,180,000,000
Japan	2,410,000,000	60,000,000	2,470,000,000
Korea	1,158,000,000	21,000,000	1,179,000,000
New Zealand	2,000,000	3,000,000	5,000,000
Philippines	743,000,000	77,000,000	820,000,000
Other Asia-Pacific	24,000,000	----------	24,000,000
Canada	----------	6,000,000	6,000,000
American Republics	256,000,000	752,000,000	1,008,000,000
International organizations	907,000,000	60,000,000	967,000,000
Total	25,684,000,000	10,992,142,000	36,676,142,000
Military grants	14,663,000,000	----------	14,663,000,000
Grand total grants and credits	----------	----------	51,339,142,000

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Foreign aid in the postwar period to June 30, 1955, including military grants of $14,663 million were distributed in general areas as follows:

(1) Western Europe (excluding Greece and Turkey)	$39,409,000,000
(2) Eastern Europe	1,101,000,000
(3) Near East (including Greece and Turkey)	4,316,000,000
(4) South Asia, other Asia and Pacific	10,153,000,000
(5) American Republics	1,233,000,000
(6) Canada	6,000,000
(7) International organizations and unspecified areas	$1,118,000,000
(8) Adjustment due to rounding to thousands	3,142,000
Distributive totals	51,339,142,000

Source: Foreign Grants and Credits by the U. S. Government, a report prepared in the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce for the use of Congress and Government agencies, issued October 1955.

Compiled by Paul O. Peters, research consultant, Washington, D. C.

American private investments in selected foreign countries, calendar years 1928 and 1954, on a net basis

Country	Investment, 1928	Investment, 1954
England	$485,355,000	$1,245,000,000
France	145,009,000	362,000,000
Germany	216,514,000	280,000,000
Italy	113,216,000	148,000,000
Belgium	64,246,000	126,000,000
Netherlands	43,244,000	155,000,000
Brazil	193,606,000	1,082,000,000
Argentina	331,819,000	444,000,000
Uruguay	27,904,000	73,000,000
Bolivia	61,619,000	11,000,000
Chile	422,593,000	609,000,000
Peru	123,742,000	242,000,000
Venezuela	232,538,000	1,413,000,000
Ecuador	11,777,000	18,000,000
Colombia	123,994	230,000,000
Total	2,485,780,994	6,438,000,000
Other direct	4,991,954,006	11,386,000,000
Total	7,477,735,000	17,824,000,000
Plus foreign dollar bonds	----------	2,377,000,000
Plus securities payable in local moneys	----------	2,048,000,000
Plus short-term loans	----------	1,516,000,000
Other evidences of debt	----------	1,499,000,000
Total private investment abroad	----------	25,264,000,000

Source: Files of the Office of Business Economics, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Summary

Indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States arising from World War I loans	$17,297,981,019.07
Lend-lease aid rendered by United States—World War II	42,020,779,261.00

Summary—Continued

Foreign aid grants and credits rendered by the United States to foreign countries (July 1, 1945–June 30, 1955)	$51,339,142,000.00
United States advances to International Monetary Fund	2,750,000,000.00
United States advances to International Bank	635,000,000.00
Total	114,042,902,280.07

American private investments in foreign countries, $25,264,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall deal for the moment only with the totals. The breakdown will appear in the RECORD.

Our Allies in World War I are indebted to us, and in many instances are in default, in the sum of $17,297,981,019.07.

Our lend-lease aid cost us the sum of $42,020,779,261.

Foreign aids in grants and loans to June 30, 1955, aggregate $51,339,142,000.

We have advanced to the International Monetary Fund the sum of $2,750,000,000.

We have advanced to the International Bank the sum of $635 million.

These items aggregate the astounding total of over $114 billion—to be exact, $114,042,902,280.07. They alarm me. They should alarm every thinking American. They should be of great concern to the banker, the businessman—large and small—the worker, the housewife and to every average American. These totals press everyone of us for we carry on our shoulders the backbreaking load of taxes which have made such gifts possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we are being presented with a request for over $4½ billion more a year and, if you please, on a 10-year plan of like expenditures. The idea is to first get the program launched, get the foot in the door and then there will be easy sailing thereafter. Not with me, Mr. President, for I have consistently opposed wasting our material substance abroad. Our people here are being crushed under an unbearable burden of taxation with foreign governments now owing us over $114 billion. When will the administration—when will the Congress—when will the American people see the red-danger signals these indisputable figures flash in our faces?

There is just one other item of costs to us to which I wish at this time to make brief reference. The United States was forced in maintaining our principles and a free way of life to conduct the Berlin airlift. That was an achievement which confounded the world. It will be written in history as one of America's most glorious pages. It was carried on from June of 1948 to September of 1949. Its exact costs may never be known. A

few figures however are available. First, it cost us 31 American lives. For gasoline and repairs alone to our aircraft, the cost amounted to $228,808,000. We flew in 2,325,509.6 tons of our supplies. No record was kept of what those supplies cost us. Their cost could well run into billions of dollars.

I refer to these 2 sets of figures (a) loans, grants, and gifts aggregating over $114 billion, and (b) the billions expended in the Berlin airlift because according to the estimates we have received we are holding about a half billion dollars worth of properties belonging to about 34,000 individual German and Japanese owners. Just think how insignificant this one-half billion dollars worth of property we are holding amounts to as compared to the $114 billion, we have given to friends and former enemies alike.

Besides the totals of loans, gifts and grants to which I have referred, the American people are further entangled in foreign countries. We have private investments abroad aggregating over 25 billions of dollars. We have Government properties abroad such as housing units, warehouses, storage depots, plant facilities, air fields, harbor installations and numerous other defense projects. Their cost exceeds 20 billions of dollars. In the handling of alien property we must consider how it affects our private investments and also the vast holdings of our Government in foreign countries.

To resolve these questions in the American way in the light of high principles of justice and in furtherance of a better and freer way of life shall be our purpose.

From the large record of all views and contentions before us the Subcommittee will dedicate itself to a solution of the problems involved in our seizure and administration of former enemy assets—former enemies, German and Japanese—whom we are now glad to count among our staunchest friends and allies.

The Subcommittee will continue to give careful consideration to this very important subject in the hope that we will be able to come up with a proper solution to the complex and varied problems involved.

THE VETO OF THE FARM BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Williston Plains Reporter, of Williston, N. Dak., entitled "Area Farmers Claim Ike Wrong With Veto."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA FARMERS CLAIM IKE WRONG WITH VETO—BROKE PROMISE GENERAL TERM USED IN ANSWERING—SAY WILL SUFFER IN ELECTION

Williston area farmers expressed mixed opinions today to the Monday veto of the farm bill by President Eisenhower, although the greater percentage of those queried by the Plains Reporter said they felt he should have signed the bill. Many of those who were asked for an opinion said they didn't wish to be quoted by name, but added their comments to the others saying Eisenhower made a mistake by not signing the bill.

There were others who refused to express an opinion because they said "every time I think of the veto, I get mad."

Woodrow Ritter and several others said the bill was too complicated for the average person to understand. Another type opinion was expressed by Mrs. Laura Kirk, the lone such opinion of all those queried, that Eisenhower vetoed the bill because of his conscience dictating it.

Representative opinions of a few of those queried are listed:

T. C. Walstad of Marmon: "I had expected the veto and wasn't surprised. Eisenhower said he signed the veto 'regretfully,' but he didn't—he lied. If he had said he signed it 'gleefully,' then he would have been telling the truth. To heck with the veto—I want some rain."

Mrs. Laura Kirk whose farm is 22 miles northwest of Williston, had this to say: "Eisenhower, in my opinion, had a great deal of courage in the face of the coming election and other political aspects to veto a bill so important to the Nation and to agricultural interests." She stated, "The bill seemed to be incomplete and inadequate and was introduced more or less as a political football during the election year. The benefits that would have been derived would have offered very little in the way of aid to the small farmers."

Eugene Iverson of Buford had this comment: "I don't approve of the veto; it means all wheat farmers will receive about 45 cents a bushel less for their wheat this year." He said undoubtedly the veto had cost the President a lot of farm votes. Discussing the proposed soil-bank plan, Mr. Iverson said, "I don't see much help in that either."

Woodrow Ritter, who farms 5 miles south of Wheelock said: "I've got mixed opinions about the bill and can't honestly say whether I approve or disapprove of the veto." He said if he had understood it more, possibly he could give a firm answer one way or the other. "I never understood the bill," he commented, and said, "nobody knew what kind of a bill it was," not even the administration and the sponsors. He continued, it was as complicated as the Taft-Hartley bill, saying, we need legislation the average person can understand.

Swan Anderson, a farmer 15 miles west of Williston on highway 2: Eisenhower was absolutely wrong in killing the bill. "He's forgotten his election promises and those of the Republicans when they promised 90 percent of parity. They've forgotten that promise. This veto will make it even tougher for the farmer. The price of seed is going up and the price of wheat down; it will break a lot of farmers."

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS—FORECAST OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to commend the distinguished majority leader for his outstanding address on the farm question and, in particular, President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill. The Senator from Texas, in his television and radio address of last night, succinctly and concisely stated issues revolving around the difficult and complicated problem of farm economics and farm production. I wish particularly to commend him for stating the issues in language which could be readily understood by both the farm population and the residents of our large metropolitan areas. I also wish to commend him for a speech which was directed toward a better understanding between all groups in our society, rather than toward cleavage between city dwellers and farm producers.

Mr. President, it should be of interest to my colleagues to note that as of yesterday afternoon the Department of Agriculture made another forecast for the American farmer for the year 1956.

That forecast reads, in part, as follows:

The Agriculture Department said that farm income during 1956 likely will average about 5 percent below last year's receipts.

And then, Mr. President, it goes on further and says:

Farm production expenses so far this year are slightly less than in 1955, reflecting lower costs for feed and replacement livestock.

In other words, Mr. President, the only break the farmer is getting in reduced costs is due to sacrifices of his fellow farmers in cheap feed and cheap livestock for replacement purposes.

I ask my colleagues to note this particular statement of the Department of Agriculture:

Farm wage rates are much the same but there are slightly fewer hired hands. Interest and tax charges are larger.

Those factors, Mr. President, are not within the control of the farmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire release be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Agriculture Department said that farm income during 1956 likely will average about 5 percent below last year's receipts.

The Department made this prediction in two publications, The Demand and Price Situation and The Agricultural Outlook Digest.

Total cash receipts from farm marketings in the first quarter of 1956 were estimated at $5.9 billion, down 5 percent from last year. This level, the Department said, likely will continue for the rest of the year.

The volume of products marketed in January, February, and March was a little larger than for the same period a year ago.

Prices averaged 7 percent lower than a year ago. Receipts from livestock and livestock products in the first 3 months were about $3.6 billion, 5 percent below the corresponding period of 1955. Crop receipts were $2.3 billion, down 4 percent from a year ago.

Farmers received about $1.8 billion from marketings in March, the same as in February, but 5 percent below March 1955. Prices were up slightly from February, but averaged 5 percent less than a year earlier. Receipts from livestock and products were about $1.2 billion in March and crop receipts were about $600 million.

Department economists said that while the price drop noted in the first quarter likely will diminish as the year progresses, cash receipts the remainder of the year may be somewhat under 1955.

This would reflect smaller acreage allotments and marketing quotas for tobacco, rice, and cotton, a lower support level for cotton and the possibility that production will fall below record yields in 1955.

Farm production expenses so far this year are slightly less than in 1955, reflecting lower costs for feed and replacement livestock. Farm wage rates are much the same, but there are slightly fewer hired hands. Interest and tax charges are larger.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the morning newspapers there is an announcement by the Secretary of Agricul-

ture which, to me, reveals that principle in connection with agricultural matters has been tossed out the window by the Department of Agriculture. The headline of the story in the New York Times is as follows:

All Corn Raisers To Get Price Aid.
Benson Ends Need To Meet Acreage Curbs, But Makes Support Level Lower.

The story goes on—and I am reading from the New York Times in this instance:

The administration cut corn farmers loose from Federal controls today, ending the need to comply with the controls to be eligible to share in the price supports program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 minutes additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read further from the New York Times article:

It gave to noncompliers a price subsidy of $1.25 a bushel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL CORN RAISERS TO GET PRICE AID—BENSON ENDS NEED TO MEET ACREAGE CURBS, BUT MAKES SUPPORT LEVEL LOWER

WASHINGTON, April 23.—The administration cut corn farmers loose from Federal controls today, ending the need to comply with the controls to be eligible to share in the price-supports program. It gave to noncompliers a price subsidy of $1.25 a bushel.

Price support had been denied to farmers who failed to comply with Federal acreage allotments. The $1.25 compares with the $1.50 subsidy for producers who comply with acreage restrictions.

A majority of farmers do not comply because they feed corn to livestock on the farm. These can now grow as much corn as they wish and be assured of Government aid on a lower price level.

Today's new program for corn was announced by Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture. It was the first time that a Secretary of Agriculture had granted a price support for farmers who do not comply with acreage restrictions in a commercial area. The action was taken under an obscure section of the farm law that permits the Secretary to give such a subsidy "to facilitate the program."

The commercial corn area covers 840 counties in 23 States. The big production is centered in the politically important livestock States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and the Dakotas.

Mr. Benson told a news conference he did not believe that the new program would result in a greater surplus. Rather, he said, he expected the program to bolster corn prices because it would give to farmers the benefit of Federal storage programs to hold excess corn for "orderly marketing."

The Secretary acted in pursuance of the announcement of President Eisenhower, when he vetoed the farm bill, that he would increase flexible price supports this year on corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and peanuts and initiate a new corn plan.

Mr. Benson also carried out today the President's announcement as it pertained to minimum supports for wheat and rice.

Wheat will be supported at $2 a bushel, or 83.7 percent of parity, an increase of 19 cents over the prevailing $1.81 a bushel, or 76 percent of parity. The price support was increased from $4.04 per 100 pounds, or 75 percent of parity, to $4.50, or 82.7 percent of parity.

Under the vetoed bill all these crops would have been supported at 90 percent of parity with higher dollar and cents subsidies.

The $1.50 a bushel corn support for producers who comply with Federal acreage restrictions reflects 86.2 percent of parity.

Outside the commercial area there are no acreage limitations and corn grown in this outside area receives a support of 75 percent of the commercial rate of $1.50. The $1.25 a bushel prop for noncompliers in the commercial area is slightly above 70 percent of parity, a floor below which, Mr. Benson said, the price of commercial area corn would not be permitted to fall this marketing year.

Mr. Benson declared today that he could not spend the $1,200,000,000 approved by the House Appropriations Committee for a soil bank, unless Congress voted "more authorization."

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, told the House today that his party would attempt an unusual parliamentary maneuver to force a House vote on the administration's soil-bank bill.

This would be an effort, he declared, to make the soil-bank bill an amendment to the appropriation bill that is to reach floor action Wednesday.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Minnesota and I were very much interested in amendments which had to do with corn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Senator have any idea about how much corn will be produced in the corn areas with a guaranty of $1.50 a bushel?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish I had that knowledge. It is going to have a tremendous impact on corn production.

Mr. ANDERSON. How about sorghum prices?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is going to open up a Pandora's box of trouble.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was there not an announcement by the Department of Agriculture that the proper corn acreage allotment for 1956 should be 43 million acres in the commercial corn area?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. But across the country the acreage might run more than that. The action on the floor with reference to the Hickenlooper amendment raised it to 51 million acres, but the amendment originally proposed to raise it to 56 million acres.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it likely that the figure in the commercial corn area will finally be less, with a price of $1.25 to those who do not comply?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be the miracle of the world if the acreage were less than the amount stated. I point out that this is the first time any basic crop—and corn is a basic crop under the law of 1954, as amended—has been given a guaranteed price support where there was no compliance with either marketing quotas or acreage allotments.

That is throwing out the window the principle underlying price supports for basic crops. I do not want to hear any more talk from this administration about principle.

If the administration wishes to talk about a fixed price support for corn, that is all right; but do not embellish it with fine terms, such as "principle," because I do not think there is a Senator on the floor who can defend what has been done from the standpoint of principle.

Coming from a State in which a great deal of corn is produced, I say that $1.25 will be the ultimate price, or less than that, for corn in the cash market. The $1.50 is the carrot before the rabbit, so to speak. Feed grains will be in serious trouble, particularly grain sorghums.

Furthermore, we found out in testimony from cattle raisers and hog raisers that when there is an excess supply of corn and feed grains there is an excess supply of livestock, and particularly pork products. The administration may get by in this election year, but next year there will really be some trouble.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Minnesota is familiar, I believe, with the corn-hog ratio.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the corn-hog ratio goes above 12.7 in Chicago and about 13.6 in the Corn Belt—I may have the figures reversed——

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is about 13 to 1.

Mr. ANDERSON. We will get a very sharp and sudden increase in production. The Senator knows, I am sure, that $1.50 a bushel for corn results in a very favorable corn-hog ratio and tends to encourage the production of extremely large amounts of pork. We shall feel the effects of it in January and February of next year. Is not that of some interest to the farmers generally?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the farmers will fully understand it. Our farm people are very well versed in these matters. They understand the relationship between price and production. I am sure that as they go into it they will see what it means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true also that when those who do not comply in the commercial area get $1.25, the price will come down to that level?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is generally the situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When that happens, there will be another step up to $1.50 for those in the commercial area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On 43 million acres.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Those persons are going to sell their corn to the Government, and the Government will lose a lot of money on account of the pegging at $1.25 in the commercial area for farmers who do not comply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator can well rest assured that the Government is going to have rather substantial holdings of corn, holdings which will make what it presently has look rather insignificant at the end of the years—present crop year. The administration constantly talks about surpluses, but it is simply creating surpluses by what I call frenzied action in a political year. But the farmers will not be deluded by such action.

Finally, I continue to be shocked by the fiscal irresponsibility and financial recklessness of the Department of Agriculture, which is talking about advance payments on soil-bank provisions before anything has been done in terms of the soil bank or of conservation principles. This is but another desperate effort on the part of the administration to write Government checks for farmers ahead of the deed, before the fact of accomplishment is available.

But the farmers are not going to ask for this. I have not yet had a letter from a farmer who asked to receive a Government check for something he did not do. But Mr. Benson yesterday proposed an advance payment program on a soil bank, the sending out of money this year for soil-conservation practices to be completed next year.

I cannot imagine an administration which worships at the altar of principle and fiscal responsibility and integrity indulging in such open, blatant, political shenanigans—that is all it is—at the expense of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the closing hours of the debate on the farm bill the junior Senator from Minnesota proposed an amendment having to do with the increase in the size of the set-asides, thinking thereby to raise a few prices. If the Senator from Minnesota will indulge me, may I ask him whether or not, on careful calculation, the amendment would not have raised the support price of cotton to about 87 or 88 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was approximately the figure.

Mr. ANDERSON. But there was a provision in the bill at that time which related to a change of grades in staples from Middling seven-eighths to average grades.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. That would have effectively reduced what is now the support price on cotton to about 83 percent. Did not the Secretary of Agriculture, only a day or two ago, announce a support price of 82½ percent on cotton?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did not the Senator's amendment provide for a support price of about 85 percent on wheat and of about 84 percent on corn?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think on wheat it was 84 percent, and on corn about 86 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think——

Mr. HUMPHREY. There was some dispute between the Senator from New Mexico and myself over that figure.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will not say my figures are infallible, but they are based on some calculation. I believe the Senator from Minnesota and I were not far apart in our figures. On wheat, the support price was about 85 percent; on corn it was 84 percent. So our prices were within the range of what the Secretary of Agriculture is now proposing.

Does the Senator from Minnesota recall what was said about the amendment at the time it was proposed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, my; I recall it; but in polite company I should not mention it again.

Mr. ANDERSON. I supported the Senator from Minnesota. I think he——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If my colleagues will bear with me, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes, to accommodate Senators who wish to engage in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I point out that at the time the amendment was proposed I supported the Senator from Minnesota, even though I had moved to strike the 90-percent provision from the bill, contrary to his point of view. I was against dual parity, and against all such provisions of the bill. But I thought the amount of the surpluses was placing an undue burden on the American farmer, a burden which was not of his own making. He had nothing to do with the rice problem; he had very little to do with the cotton situation. As a result of that condition, I supported the junior Senator from Minnesota in favoring a slight change in those levels.

As I understand, the suggestions were considered in certain quarters to be horrible when they were made by the Senator from Minnesota, so much so that I was almost ashamed to associate myself with him on the floor for a few minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad we are together again.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator's proposal became sanctified a few days later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When such proposals get the beneficent blessing of the Eisenhower administration, all political sins are wiped away. It is absolution the like of which few people are ever permitted to have.

Mr. President, I repeat, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] last night set forth clearly and unmistakably who is responsible for the surpluses. As he said, the Republicans are always concerned about surpluses, but they never seem to get around to being concerned about the farmers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that although he has heard many radio and television presentations, he has never heard a finer, clearer, abler presentation than that by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas last night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Texas made it positive and clear that the problem of the farmer is not alone the farmer's problem, but is the problem of all the American people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. HILL. And that the situation which today confronts American agriculture is one which confronts all the American people. Certainly, the speech of the Senator from Texas last night was a ringing challenge to every man, woman, and child in the country. I should like to think that all of them heard that masterful address. I hope that those who did not have the privilege of hearing it will read it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. The able junior Senator from Minnesota is usually a model of accuracy. But unintentionally he has stated a colossal error.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will stand corrected.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me assure my very dear friend that my interruption is for a friendly purpose. The Senator said, in effect, that the Eisenhower administration, by its recent action relative to corn, had, like Pandora, opened a box containing a multitude of human afflictions. Let me remind the Senator that no one can open that which is not closed. On the day General Eisenhower was inaugurated President, without a single moment's qualifying experience as an administrator of civilian affairs, he, like Pandora, opened the mythological box. It was filled with inexperience, confusion, and chaos. They all escaped. They have ever since sorely bedeviled the American people. The box remains wide open. It will continue wide open until we, in November 1956, elect a Democratic President of the United States to close it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I accept that correction from the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I regret that my analysis of the situation was not so comprehensive and learned as that of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He is right, and the junior Senator from Minnesota recognizes his own limitations, both of judgment and of perception, in these political matters.

I conclude by suggesting that every Senator make it his business to study the message given last night by Senator JOHNSON and go before the people of America and talk about it, and recite it, because in those few short pages is to be found a great lesson of political and economic truth. We owe it to ourselves and to the people to make it avalable to the public.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE ADDRESS TO THE NATION BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I listened last night to the address delivered by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in reply to the speech by the President last week explaining his veto of the farm bill.

I do not think I have heard in a long time a clearer and more precise analysis, not only of a veto message, but of the situation which faces not only the American farmer, but the American people as a whole, by reason of that veto, than the speech which was delivered by the Senator from Texas last night. The speech was couched in language and was delivered in a manner which could be easily understood by everybody in the United States. The Senator from Texas was calm, deliberate, and logical; and in no instance did he exaggerate or overplay the situation which he was discussing. I was very glad that he appealed not only to the farmer, but to everyone else in the country who has any interest whatsoever in a well developed, symmetrical economy, in which all our people share.

We know that the farm population of the Nation comprises only about 15 percent of the total. But we know also that in normal times, when the farmer is sharing his portion of prosperity, the farmers of the Nation and their families buy 25 percent of the production of the United States.

Whenever farm income goes down, farm purchasing power falls, production is reduced, factories close, and persons are thrown out of employment. Last year, in the city of Louisville, the Minneapolis-Moline Co., which manufactures agricultural implements, closed its factory and left the State of Kentucky, because of the decline in the purchasing power of the farmers of the United States.

There has never been in the Nation prosperity of any sort which endured very long which did not include the farmers; and there has never been a depression, so far as I recall, when the farmer was not the first to suffer and the last to recover when the economy started back up the hill.

The Senator from Texas, in his address last evening, drew a clear distinction between the consistent policy of the party which is in control of the Senate and the House and that which is in control of the executive department.

We tried to make it clear in the debate on the farm bill that farm surpluses are not created by high rigid supports about which the farmer knows in advance. Most of the farmers have to reach a particular, definite financial goal in the production of crops and in receipt of money for them. They have obligations which are known long in advance. If a farmer does not know in advance, as he has not known in the past 3 years, under the so-called flexible system, what he is going to receive in the way of supports, the chances are he will raise a larger crop, in order to be sure to reach a certain financial goal at the end of the year.

It is untrue that high rigid supports of 90 percent have created the surpluses of which we hear so much complaint. They have been created under the flexible system, notwithstanding the statements to the farmers in 1952 which were so effectively quoted last night by the Senator from Texas in the language of the President himself when he was a candidate. I do not recall that there has even been any explanation of those statements. Certainly, I do not recall that the President himself has explained why he changed his mind after 1952. He may have a good reason for it, but I do not know what it is. I do not think the farmers know yet what it is.

Mr. President, I wanted simply to congratulate the Senator from Texas on the plain and simple analysis of the President's veto and the consequences of it, and the agricultural situation. I thought it particularly pertinent that he laid this picture baldly before the people of the Nation, in cities, towns, and everywhere, so that they might be able to tie in the agricultural situation with every other economic problem which faces the American people.

I think the people of Texas, without regard to party, occupation, or economics, ought to be proud that they have a man in the United States Senate as majority leader who can do that sort of job in pointing out the number of inconsistencies of those who are responsible for the farmer's plight, and who are now responsible for the failure of Congress to enact appropriate and proper legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and all my other Democratic colleagues in commending the majority leader of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for the fine job he did last night in behalf of the people of the country. It was a pleasure to watch and hear him relate the facts and lay before the American people the true story, plain and unvarnished as it was and is. I am delighted he tore away the veil which has been created during the past several years, so far as this Republican administration is concerned.

I am delighted also that the majority leader of the Senate, acting in this particular instance as the leader of the Democratic Party, went before the people and told the American people the truth about the farm problem. He rendered an outstanding public service. He showed the people of the United States just where the Democratic Party stands on the farm issue, and demonstrated, furthermore, that we need to offer no apologies because we did not make promises in 1952 which we as a party failed to fulfill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Montana, and I think I might, with great propriety, suggest a quotation from the Bible which says that the truth will make one free. The truth will make the American people free, if they are in need of it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate this opportunity to join with my colleagues in expressing pleasure at the very fine presentation which was made by the majority leader, not only of the particular farm legislation under discussion, but of the farm problem which confronts the country. I listened to the speech of the majority leader last night—every word of it. I think I can say I never heard a clearer, more succinct statement, or one which covered the many points which were made so well and in such an understandable fashion.

The able Senator from Kentucky has referred to a Biblical quotation. At another place in the Bible it is stated that none are so blind as those who, having eyes, see not, and none so deaf as those who, having ears, hear not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I welcome the Senator from Alabama into the fraternity of Bible students. I am sure he is a charter member.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator very much. I wish some of our Republican colleagues were present, in order that they might hear some of the remarks being made. I trust they listened last night. I know it would have done a great deal of good for them to have had ears and to have heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Maybe by their absence they have demonstrated that, having ears, they hear not, and having eyes, they see not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is the trouble with a great many of those who try to carry along the administration's farm program. I take delight in saying that the able Senator from Texas last night certainly gave a presentation which anyone having ears could hear, and anyone having eyes could see, from which he could learn a great deal.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, one has to have an open mind as well as open ears and open eyes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is largely the implication which would be given to that Biblical quotation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to add my word in commendation of the able majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas, for the way in which he handled his subject during the broadcast last night. I need not remind the Senate of the United States that the able Senator from Texas and I do not at all times vote the same way on farm problems. We were on opposite sides on 90-percent supports, on dual parity, on a two-price system for wheat, on milling quality of wheat, and about everything one could imagine which was controversial in the bill. Yet I recognize that the farmer of this country was entitled to the considered exposition which the Senator from Texas made last night.

In that connection I wish to relate to my colleagues the story that once some members of a board of directors were not able to follow the argument of one member, but he succeeded in persuading us that we were wrong, so we joined in

his viewpoint. Then he started arguing on the other side of the question, and tried again to persuade us to go along with him. I asked him on which side of the question he was, whether he was for it or against it, whether he was favoring it or opposing it. He looked at me and he said, "I am neither proposing nor opposing; I am exposing."

So far as I am concerned, the Senator from Texas did a splendid job of exposing the fact that surpluses had a definite influence on agricultural prices. Surpluses of corn and other commodities not only have an effect on the cash price of corn, but on livestock prices, all the way up and down the line.

I pointed out a moment ago to the Senator from Minnesota that we had a problem now in connection with the support price on corn. It may have a very definite relationship to the price of pork in the coming year, and it will also influence livestock prices.

Since I see in the Chamber at this time some very distinguished Senators who represent the cotton-growing area, let me say that I am also wondering what the cotton farmer thinks about the privilege which has been given to corn and the producers of corn, by means of which the corn producers can obtain $1.50 a bushel if they are in compliance, and can obtain $1.25 a bushel, which is nearly that much if they are not in compliance.

I happen to come from an area which is ready, willing, and able to increase its cotton production by 35 percent in the next year. If the Secretary of Agriculture will only announce that cotton producers can obtain 30 cents if they are in compliance and 27½ cents if they are out of compliance, I know what will happen in the Cotton Belt.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me say that I had occasion to check back, the other day, on the acreage devoted to the production of various commodities during the last 25 or 26 years. I found that in 1930 or 1931 in the United States approximately 42 million acres were planted to cotton; about 65 million acres were planted to wheat. There was no commercial corn area at that time. Therefore, I have some very definite feelings on this subject, inasmuch as I represent a consistituency which has taken the greatest reduction—a reduction amounting to 40 percent, last year—in their acreage. I think that cotton producers who are not extinct will recognize the political implications in the offer to the corn growers of the country to release them from all controls and yet to guarantee them $1.25 a bushel for corn placed under loan. That proposal is shot through and through with politics; it cannot be attributed to anything else. If it had been designed to correct an injustice, if it had been brought out in honesty of purpose to aid the most distressed of the American farmers, it would have been accompanied by an order lifting the acreage controls from cotton, or guaranteeing the producers of cotton on land over and beyond the allotted acres a slightly lower price, amounting to approximately 24 or 25 cents, instead of the 28 cents, to which they have been reduced from a support of 33½ cents by this pre-election manipulation by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to point out that it was not something which came to us as a complete surprise, for Members of the Senate will recall that the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] submitted his amendment, which would have raised the corn acreage in the commercial corn areas to 56 million, and would have allowed the corn growers to come into compliance at that acreage. The Department of Agriculture had said 43 million acres was a proper amount for next year, in view of the supply situation. Persons in the Department of Agriculture had recommended 49 million acres, and an attempt was made to reduce the 56 million acres to a figure somewhat less than that but over 50 million acres. But somehow that did not happen.

It will be recalled that I then submitted an amendment which proposed that the same treatment be given to wheat and to various other commodities; but the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] announced that if that were done his amendment would really be killed. Therefore, he modified his amendment so as to provide for 51 million acres. I thought that represented a substantial improvement. But the action now announced will again leave the matter wide open.

Mr. RUSSELL. It makes the sky the limit; and the only advantage will accrue to the States in which acreage can be planted to corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

I wonder what the effect on the storage situation will be. For several years, large quantities of corn have been placed in storage or sealed. When the Humphrey amendment to increase the set-asides was submitted, it was pointed out that there was in storage ample corn from the 1954 crop and previous crops to take care of the proposed set-aside. That corn is still under seal.

What would a farmer who was in compliance naturally do? He would place his corn under seal, and would get $1.50 a bushel for it, and then would go into the open market and would buy the corn he needed for $1.12 or $1.15. As a result, large amounts of corn would continue to be placed in storage. So it is that I say that the storehouses, which already are full, will simply be filled to overflowing, and again we shall have too much corn. Therefore, I wonder whether we are not in serious trouble as regards the production of corn.

Let us consider the situation in the case of some of the other commodities. I know it is not very nice to reduce cotton acreage. As the Senator from Georgia may remember, I was the author of the cotton-acreage-reduction bill. I had fought the problem of cotton-acreage reduction when I was in the Department of Agriculture, and I had realized that in my opinion we never would be able to maintain a high level of price supports unless there was some control of cotton acreage. So the cotton-acreage-control bill was introduced, and the acreage of cotton was to be reduced to 21 million acres the first year, and dropped to a lesser figure in the following years. We modified the bill in conference to allow a minimum acreage of 22½ million acres for 1 year. Now we have decreased the acreage to 17 million acres. If the amendment of the Senator from Mississipppi [Mr. EASTLAND] was not to become effective—and it was included in the bill which was vetoed—the acreage would have had to shrink to 15 million; and I believe it would be reduced to fourteen million, seven hundred and some thousand acres, if the law were applied very strictly.

I should like to know why it is proper to reduce cotton acreage from 20 million to 17 million or perhaps 14 million acres, and yet permit corn acreage, which was set at 43 million, to expand to 55 million or 56 million, and permit the corn growers to receive $1.25 a bushel. In my opinion, that does not make sense, and I do not believe it can be sustained.

So I wish to say that I think the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] rendered a real service in bringing the problems in the case of these surpluses to the attention of the American farmers. He understands, and I understand, that we have differed, and may continue to differ, in regard to what a proper agricultural bill should be. But I must say that the attempt to deal with these problems by throwing wide open the control of corn acreage and permitting corn to come into the market in unprecedentedly large amounts, and placing on corn a support price of $1.25 for corn producers who are not in compliance, can only mean trouble to those who produce oats, barley, rye, and grain sorghums; and I think it will result in an inequitable and unjust situation. So I am happy that the Senator from Texas pointed out the facts he did last night.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to express my commendation of the most able and excellent address delivered last evening by the majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. I do not think the speech was needed insofar as the American farmers are concerned. The farmers understand the situation, and they listened to the President's veto message with, of course, great regret. But, at the same time, they understand.

What the Senator from Texas did was not so much to give to the farmers a message or an understanding of what the Congress had attempted to do by means of the farm bill the President saw fit to veto, but the Senator from Texas undertook—and did so successfully, I think—to present the broader issue to those who live in the cities and the large towns and the small towns throughout the Nation. He gave them a better understanding of what was involved in the farm bill, which would have been very helpful to the farmers themselves, and in the absence of which their economy will continue to sag.

Mr. President, last week I was away when the veto message was taken up in

the House of Representatives and, indeed, when the President vetoed the farm bill. I had occasion to talk with many farmers and to speak to a great many farmers. Without exception, those farmers understood the issue very clearly. The farmers generally understand it. But the city dweller does not understand it, and in many instances the ordinary American citizen does not know how vitally the general economic condition is linked with some prosperity on the American farm, or, at least, a hope for prosperity which will keep our farmers active.

I am quite sure that those in charge of our political affairs would do well to consider the able address of the Senator from Texas. It is clear, plain, simple, direct, and easy to understand. No partisan view or attitude was injected in presenting the facts in the present situation. It would be well if this address were printed and universally distributed, because in my judgment the speech would do more good than anything that has been said on an issue which is easily understandable by the people of the United States.

I repeat that the speech was not so much needed for the information of the farmers as for the information of the American people as a whole. I have often said that in the final analysis a prosperous, capable agriculture, an agriculture capable of responding to the needs of the country under any and all conditions, is just as essential for the defense of America as all the Armed Forces we can put into the field.

The address of the Senator from Texas last night made that point very clear to the American people, without saying it in those words. He made the issue easily understandable by all the people of the country who heard him. I commend him most heartily. He has performed a great public service, not merely for his party, but for the American people and in behalf of our general economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know that I can add much to what has been said about the fine address delivered by my good friend from Texas last night. Suffice it to say that it was masterful. However, LYNDON JOHNSON needs no praise from any of us. We all know him, and we are all aware of his ability, his convictions, and his determination to do what will result in the most good for the most people. I have been a Member of the Senate for 20 years. I do not know of any majority leader who has been more devoted to his work than is LYNDON JOHNSON, or who has more capacity and ability for that work. I say, "Amen," to all that has been said about him, especially with respect to the wonderful presentation which he made last night to the American people.

The approach he demonstrated was somewhat different from that which would ordinarily be expected on the floor of the Senate. He made an outstanding presentation of the farm issue, of the plight of our farmers, as it affects the great number of Americans who are not actually farmers.

He demonstrated, for example, that the farmer is the single, most important segment in our economy and our society. The farmer provides food and fiber, the very lifeblood of our country. Without a healthy agriculture, the great industrial units of our economy, the businesses, the tradesmen—in fact all Americans—would soon be rendered helpless. Yet, as the Senator from Texas pointed out, today the average city dweller is receiving an income which is approximately 2½ times the income of our farmers, whose well-being is so vital to our economy.

Much has been said recently by some of my good Republican friends and others to the effect that the Congress should immediately take action to enact into law a soil bank such as the President has requested; they urge that we enact a soil bank, nothing but a soil bank, and that it be enacted forthwith. Frankly, Mr. President, I would hesitate to bring before the Senate another soil bank bill and incorporate in it only the provisions which have been suggested by the administration. I think it would be dangerous to do so, for it is my judgment that, judging from their most recent utterances, neither Mr. Benson nor the President knows the philosophy of, or is well acquainted at all with, the working of the soil bank, as provided in the bill which we considered only a few weeks ago, and as outlined to Congress in broad, general terms on January 9.

When the President speaks of new money being provided, when he talks of an immediate $500 million increase in farm income, through the soil bank, he is in error.

Under the soil bank, farmers would be paid not to produce.

Soil bank payments would represent, at best, about what a farmer would have received in net income had he planted his land instead of placing it in the soil bank. Soil bank payments would not mean new money, or more money, for farmers. Soil bank payments would substitute a Government payment for any net profit which farmers otherwise would realize by harvesting the acres, which they put in the soil bank. These payments would not be extra money—or added income. Farmers could make approximately the same amount if they did not participate in the soil bank, and harvested their lands instead. As for making soil bank payments in 1956 for participation in a 1957 soil bank, farmers should know that any amounts they were so paid would be that much less cash they would have in 1957.

One outstanding reason why I would not now vote for a straight soil bank and nothing more—one compelling reason why I do not think we should immediately give the administration carte blanche authority and thus permit payments-in-advance for soil bank participation, as has been proposed by the administration—is that I do not trust some members of the administration—and I mean just that.

The Congress made an earnest effort 2 weeks ago to increase 1956 farm income by legitimate means, and on a legal basis. That was the sole purpose, the only purpose, of providing 90 percent of parity price supports for the basic commodities for 1 year. But the President turned thumbs down on our bill. In order to take the sting out of his veto, the President saw fit to provide a system of rigid administrative price supports in lieu of rigid legislative price supports, as contained in our bill. He tossed out a political sop to the farm-belt voters in the coming election by casting aside his theory of flexible price supports, even as he cited it as a reason for vetoing the farm bill.

As was pointed out in the speech of the able Senator from Texas, and by many other Senators on and off the floor of the Senate, if he had been acting in good conscience, if he had been following the spirit of the law instead of creeping through the loopholes, the Secretary of Agriculture would have had to admit that he was without justification, under existing law, to increase the support price of wheat from 76 to 84 percent of parity, or to similarly raise the support levels of other commodities. This is especially true with respect to those commodities for which the support level has been long announced. Today wheat, for example, is running out of our ears, so to speak. For the Secretary of Agriculture now to do administratively what we sought to do in the bill, and then to declare that the bill was "unworkable," to my way of thinking borders on administrative dishonesty.

The Secretary has not done as much for cotton as he did for wheat, or for corn, which has now become the most favored of commodities. For cotton, the Secretary of Agriculture has raised the support level by only 7½ percent—from 75 percent, the lowest level which could be established under the law, to 82½ percent of parity.

However, the commodity which fared best under the Secretary's new administrative sleight-of-hand is corn; that is, insofar as offering a political sop to the voters of this Nation is concerned, the preferred treatment given corn stands head and shoulders above all others. I know that the voters will not be fooled, however, Mr. President.

Let us see what happened in the case of corn. The Secretary found a little gadget in the law—one which had never before been used—which permitted him to support corn prices in the commercial corn area, even though there was no compliance with acreage allotments on the part of the corn growers in the commercial area.

As I understand what the Secretary has done, he has told those corn farmers who comply with their allotments, which have already been fixed at a national total of 43.7 million acres: "We will support all the corn you produce on all those acres at $1.50 per bushel. However, if you, or your next-door neighbor, should choose instead to not comply, that is, to plant more than the acreage you have been allotted, you can still get price support on your crop at $1.25."

As was pointed out by my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators, this means that the lid is off; corn can, and will, be planted in unlimited quantities. The sky will be the limit so far as corn acreage and corn

production are concerned—and the Government, via Mr. Benson, will support it all.

This is bound to affect the producers of the small grains, whom we have tried to assist. All-out corn production means low feed prices—and as feed prices fall, the small grain producers will be hard hit.

Mr. President, no other basic commodity has been given the kid-glove treatment accorded to corn. The producers of all other basic commodities must comply with their acreage allotments in order to get price support. Only the corn producer is able to engage in a coin-tossing match with the Government and have the benefit of Mr. Benson's heads you win, tails you win, too, approach.

I wish to make it known now, so that there will not be any misunderstanding about a future farm bill, that, first of all, I would prefer to await action on farm legislation on the House side before the Senate takes any step in that direction. I say that because we in the Senate are now prepared to bring up a bill. We have held hearings and, as a result, we have much information. The House has not done so.

Therefore, it would be an idle gesture on my part, or on the part of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to proceed to report out another farm bill without knowing what the House will do on the subject.

Mr. President, I frankly do not have time to waste on working long hours on another farm bill without some assurance that my work will not be in vain. I spent almost 12 months working on the last farm bill. I have other work to do. I do not propose to keep working on that subject until doomsday, without first finding out what is in the offing at the other end of the Capitol. I wish to make this plain, Mr. President. So far as I am concerned, there will not be any soil-bank provision this year if it is to be incorporated in a bill to which other features may not be added. For my own part, I am not going to turn into a walking rubberstamp for Secretary Benson or anyone else. I do not intend to sit down and write farm legislation with a shotgun pointed at my head and I do not believe the people want me to.

Another point I wish to make is that I do not intend to add to such a bill any advance payment provision. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may so vote, but, for my own part, I shall insist that firm, valid contracts be signed and at least a start made toward compliance in conformity with our original soil-bank provision, before payments are made. I do not wish to see a farmer paid this year for performing something next year. I do not want to see farmers given something by way of an "advance" this year and then have it taken away from them next year—and that is what would happen under this pay-in-advance scheme. The farmers might as well go to the bank and borrow money. I think they would prefer to do so. At least they would know where they stand—that the money they got was a loan on next year's crop, and not a Government handout.

I would not vote for a soil-bank bill that provides for advance payments for another reason. As a Senator, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and as one who farmed for many years, I resent this approach of attempting to buy the farm vote on the installment plan, and using Government money to do so.

There is another point I wish to make. It strikes me that there ought to be equality among the producers of the basic crops when it comes to price supports. Why should compliance corn be supported at 86.2 percent, noncompliance corn at 79 percent, wheat at 84 percent, rice at 83 percent, and cotton at 82.5 percent, when the surpluses of all of them are far in excess of normal supply?

The theory of the sliding scale, as I understood Mr. Benson's original proposal, was that by dropping support levels as the surplus increased, the Government would discourage farmers from further production. Yet we have huge surpluses on hand; Mr. Benson and President Eisenhower have so stated. They have also said that we do not know how to dispose of, or what to do with, these surpluses. Yet the Secretary is raising price supports for these surplus crops. He has raised them and made them rigid, all at the same time—even as he tells the people about how terrible rigid price supports are—how they stimulate production. Let us be frank, Mr. President. There is only one real difference between our bill and these newly announced administrative price supports. That difference is that we made the support level 90 percent in order to bring our farmers better returns—more returns than the Secretary now proposes for them.

There is one other point I wish to make in connection with the vetoed bill.

We have been talking about two-price systems in Congress for many years. I made an earnest effort—and I was supported by the majority of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—to provide a two-price plan on rice, on a trial basis. We wanted to use rice as a guinea pig, so to speak, to determine how a two-price system would work under normal, practical conditions. Why did we choose rice for a trial run? The reason was very simple. Rice is produced in large quantities in only four States; the industry is composed of only a comparatively few farmers. I thought, and the Department of Agriculture agreed, that since there has been a great desire in recent years for two-price plans for farm commodities, something ought to be done to find out how the two-price system worked.

Of course, on the floor of the Senate the two-price system for wheat was added. However, that program was not mandatory; it did not go into effect automatically. First, it had to be voted on and approved by the wheatgrowers themselves.

So far as I am concerned, I think any new farm legislation considered this year should contain a two-price system for rice. If that fails, then we should place a floor under the number of acres of rice which can be planted next year and the year following. This minimum should be no lower than the National, State, county, and farm allotments in effect this year. I should like to see the same kind of provision with respect to corn. However, I believe that the national corn-acreage allotment is a little too low. I believe it is much too low to have any effect in persuading corn producers to embrace the soil-bank idea. Therefore I should like to see a provision in the bill fixing a minimum national acreage allotment for corn at 51 million acres, with price support available in the commercial corn area on the production from that 51 million acres and that acreage alone. A similar provision was contained in the bill that the President vetoed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that the 51-million-acre figure seemed to be a reasonable figure, as the 43-million-acre figure was unreasonable.

By the same token, I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that in committee I supported the two-price system for rice, not because I felt it was the final answer, but because if we were to experiment with the two-price system, rice was the best guinea pig that I had ever seen, because rice production is centralized and because we could dispose of a surplus rather quickly, as we had demonstrated.

Therefore, I felt that the request of the chairman of the committee was a reasonable one. The bill was modified, because I objected to the maximum-acreage provision. The producers of rice tried to bring it in line with what seemed to be reasonable and sensible, and I thought it was a good proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. I thought the two-price plan for rice should be tried because the entire production in the United States is a little less than 1½ percent of world production. Our production amounts to only a drop in the bucket, so to speak, as compared with cotton or wheat, where great amounts are involved and where great quantities are grown in this country.

Mr. President, it strikes me that something should be done to curtail any further increase in the production of small grains. I may be in error, but it is my considered judgment that had the President signed the bill which we sent to the White House, he would have found that our approach to the small-grain problem was sound. It would have been a good avenue upon which small-grain producers could travel toward participating in the soil bank.

The Secretary has now decided to support feed grain prices at 70 percent of parity, with the sky the limit as far as production is concerned. It is my belief that most of the feed-grain producers would gladly have followed the law we proposed—and that they actually preferred it to the present scheme. What did the conference bill provide? It

authorized the Secretary to support feed grains at 85 percent of parity, on the condition that producers seeking price support plant only 85 percent of the average of their 1953, 1954, and 1955 plantings. There was a further requirement that the equivalent of 15 percent of this base acreage be placed in the soil bank. It is my judgment that if that course had been pursued, we would have found that our losses and feed-grain surplus would have been much less than they will be a year from now under the Eisenhower program, as he has announced it.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude what I want to say, but I wish to reiterate that in the event a soil-bank bill is reported with my approval, it will contain no authority for advance payments without some assurance that at least a start toward compliance will be made a prerequisite. There must be a national acreage allotment for corn, similar to that which was established in the bill which the President vetoed. If the bill should fail to contain a two-price plan for rice, I would expect a floor to be placed on rice acreage—a floor of not less than the 1956 planting. The same should be done for cotton, Mr. President.

As the RECORD will show, the vetoed bill provided for a minimum national cotton acreage allottment for 1957 and 1958; it also provided a minimum of 100,000 acre sover and above the national acreage to relieve hardships among small farmers, to make a start toward assuring them of not less than 4 acres of cotton to plant each year.

Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Texas has stated, the bill which was vetoed had been thoroughly studied by the Congress. It had been the subject of intense study over many, many months. I made a complete circuit of the United States in order to get the views of farmers as to what they thought should be done for them this year. The RECORD is plain; it shows that the majority of our farmers desired, I believe, a bill along the lines which we sent to the President, and which he then vetoed.

My good friend from Texas did not have to argue the farmers' cause, but the exposition made by him of the necessity for teamwork between the city dweller and the farmer was one of the great highlights of his fine address, to my way of thinking.

He has made it very plain to the American people, to the urban consumer, and to the city dweller—that the farmers are not getting what they should receive, and that the high cost of living, if it can be termed such, is not chargeable to the farmer. He has made it clear that the farmer constitutes the single most important segment of our society, and that Congress must do something to improve the economic condition of the farmer by increasing his income from the low level which now prevails.

It strikes me that industry and labor ought to march down the same aisle with the farmer, linked arm in arm. It does not make sense for the income of the laboring man to have increased from $137 billion in 1948 to $222 billion today, for the earnings of industry to have increased from $37 billion in 1948 to $45 billion today, while the income of the farmer has dropped from $17 billion in 1948 to a little more than $10 billion now. That is not fair; it is not right. It is economically unsound.

Unless the Nation has farmers to produce an abundance of our life blood—food and fiber—all of us will surely die on the vine. It strikes me there is still time for us to be able to do something for the farmer. Let us do it in the democratic way.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, April is one of the most important months in the history of the Nation. It is of particular significance to our farmers. On the 19th day of April 1775—a hundred eighty-one years and four days ago—by a rude bridge that arched a Massachusetts flood the embattled New England farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world. That shot marked the beginning of the Revolutionary War, by means of which the American Colonists gloriously won their independence from Great Britain. This notable shot was heard only by those who were in the vicinity in which it was fired. It is not probable that more than a hundred people could have seen the deathless heroes of this exploit while they were performing their priceless service. But nevertheless their achievement will live in recollection, song and story forever.

Last night, in the Nation's capital, there was fired for America's farmers by their distinguished, tireless, faithful friend, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, a shot second in importance only to that New England one to which we have referred. As a result of ocean-to ocean radio and television facilities, Senator JOHNSON, while firing his shot which consisted of an address masterful in its commonsense, logic, and eloquence, was seen by an estimated audience of more than 30 million. What he most impressively said was heard by tens of millions more. As the New England shot signalized the beginning of the deliverance of the American Colonists from the oppression of the British empire, so the shot fired by Senator JOHNSON last night signalizes the beginning of the deliverance of the American farmers from the indifference, discrimination and distress which they have suffered for more than 3 devastating years under the Eisenhower administration.

Soon after the renowned Montesquieu had completed his great philosophical work entitled "The Spirit of Laws" the celebrated Voltaire said:

> The human family had lost its title deeds—Montesquieu found them and restored them to their owner.

The American farmers, during the Eisenhower administration, have lost their title deeds to prosperity, to a fair share of the comforts of life and to the pursuit of happiness. Senator JOHNSON, last night by means of your never-to-be-forgotten address, you, to the limit of argumentative possibility, brought forth and restored to the farmers these title deeds of which the Eisenhower administration had stripped them. For this great service the men, women, and children of agricultural America will love you and sing your praises—

> Till the sun grows cold,
> And the stars are old,
> And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the address which the distinguished majority leader made last night on the present farm situation was a masterful job of drawing the lines plain and clear in the forthcoming political campaigns.

Without any ifs, ands, or buts, Senator JOHNSON laid the cards on the table, where everybody could see them for what they are worth.

There is one issue that stands out above all others in this election-year campaign, and that is the indisputable fact that President Eisenhower himself made promises in the campaign of 1952 that he has not made one iota of effort to keep. The President said he was going to do one thing and he did something else. It is just that simple.

I think I speak for many millions of farm people when I say thanks to the majority leader for hitting the nail squarely on the head.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to say that Mrs. Morse and I listened with great delight last night to the radio broadcast by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and, with equal delight an hour and a half later, to the television broadcast of his reply to the President's farm veto message. I should say that the speech of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] was a reply to the President's rationalizations for his veto of the farm bill.

There are several things about the speech of the Senator from Texas that particularly commended themselves to us.

First, the speech was characterized by understatement, which I happen to believe is always the most effective technique of rebuttal. In his speech by way of understatement it seems to me the Senator from Texas pointed up very clearly the gross limitations and inadequacies of the President's veto message.

Second, when in the speech the Senator from Texas pointed out the position the President took in 1952, when he was a candidate, I think that was a long overdue pointing out of a failure to keep a campaign pledge.

Mr. President, I wish to make two comments on the Republican alibi, these days, about the Kasson speech and about the speeches in the Dakotas, particularly the one at Brookings, S. Dak. The Republicans say that what the President said there during the campaign was that the Republicans stood behind the farm legislation then on the statute books, but that in his Minnesota and Dakota speeches he did not say he might not advocate a change.

Mr. President, that kind of word juggling is just as deceptive in politics as in any other phase of human relations. If Mr. Eisenhower had, at the time when he made the speeches in Minnesota and in the Dakotas, any reservation in regard to an intention to make a change in the future, then ethically he owed it to the people to say so in 1952. When one reads

either the Minnesota or the Dakota speeches, it is perfectly clear that Mr. Eisenhower definitely sought to give the farmers of the United States the clear impression that he favored 90 percent of parity and more. I think the country is greatly indebted to the Senator from Texas for using the President's own words, and letting the American people hear through the President's own lips—as was done last night by the Senator from Texas—the pledges made to the farmers by Dwight Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign. As a result of the failure of the President to keep those pledges the people can see and understand for themselves what political deception means, even when it comes from the lips of the President of the United States.

The second Republican alibi regarding those speeches by Mr. Eisenhower in the 1952 campaign is that in one of the speeches he referred to full parity in the market place, and that is supposed to open some exit door for the President through which to escape his pledge on 90-percent parity. Again I say, Mr. President, that in view of the political setting of those speeches by the Republican candidate in 1952, they add up to only one conclusion, namely, that in 1952 he sought farmer votes on the basis of a clear pledge of 90 percent of parity, or more.

The third point I wish to make regarding the position of the Republican Party on the farm issue is that the impression the Republicans seek to give is that, after all, the surpluses have not been the result of any flexible-support program, but have been the result of a rigid-support program. Here, again, Mr. President, the record is clear that almost immediately after he took office, the Secretary of Agriculture used his discretionary power over agricultural products, by proceeding over a 2-year period to cut prices and supports in the case of every product over which he had jurisdiction, save and except wool. In the case of wool, the Secretary of Agriculture could not "get by" with a reduction in supports and prices on his part, because the Congress had passed a special bill in regard to wool.

Mr. President, let me say that the parity cuts by the Secretary of Agriculture is the responsibility of the President of the United States. I happen to be one Member of this body who from the beginning of this administration has placed the responsibility for its sorry record on one man, and that one man is Dwight D. Eisenhower. He should be required to assume full responsibility for the record of this administration in the field of agriculture as well as in regards every other issue.

So I am glad that again the American people are being told—as they must be told time and time again in the months ahead—that the responsibility for the great cut in the prices of agricultural commodities rests upon the President of the United States, acting through his Secretary of Agriculture, who, immediately after he took office, proceeded to cut the parity percentages on agricultural commodities which, under his discretionary powers, he had the power to cut.

So, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] for the speech he made last night, a speech which in my judgment places the agricultural issue again in the perspective of truth, as to the record—and a sorry record it is—of the Dwight D. Eisenhower administration in the field of agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first of all I would not be human if I did not deeply appreciate the sentiments expressed by my colleagues this morning with reference to the speech I delivered last night. I, perhaps more than anyone else in the Chamber, realize how little worthy I am of those generous statements.

I particularly appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] has said. He spent much time and effort in the preparation of the bill which was passed, and more of his energy went into the bill than that of any other Member of Congress.

I think the propaganda effort made by the administration to discredit the farm bill, and to brand it as a bad bill, even before it was passed by Congress, will be looked upon as a dark event in the administration's history.

The only way in which I can interpret the acts of the administration at this time is that they are political. For 3 years the administration has been talking about surpluses. Yet now, in an election year, it has given a support price for corn without any acreage allotments whatever. I think this is a last minute, desperate, frantic effort by the Secretary of Agriculture to attempt to buy back the votes of the farm-producing States; but I am sure the people of those States and the people of America as a whole will recognize his action for what it is.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 55) to print for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary copies of certain hearings and reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, which were, on page 2, line 2, strike out "Eighty-fourth" and insert "Eighty-third"; on page 2, line 2 strike out "first" and insert "second"; and on page 2, line 5, strike out "(hearing)" and insert "(document)."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 55, came to the Committee on Rules and Administration from the Committee on the Judiciary with a recommendation of approval. The Committee on Rules and Administration reported the concurrent resolution favorably, and it was agreed to by the Senate.

When the concurrent resolution went to the House, it was found that by some mistake a few clerical errors had occurred. The corrections which should be made are set forth in the House amendments. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to comment briefly on the announcement, which appeared in the newspapers this morning, that the President has stated that he is in support of home rule for the District of Columbia. That statement is another example of an inclination on the part of the President to use slogans and labels without substance, because the home rule which the newspapers inform us the President of the United States favors is not home rule in substance, but only by way of a token label or title.

Mr. President, I speak as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I yield to no other Member of the Senate for the fight I have made in this body for 11½ years now, for true home rule for the people of the District of Columbia, so they can enjoy first-class citizenship, rather than be subjected to second-class citizenship.

However, the newspaper articles state that the President favors home rule for the District of Columbia, subject to certain conditions. However, the conditions deny first-class citizenship to the residents of the District of Columbia. The President is reported as saying that he believes the people of the District of Columbia should have home rule, but that under the President's conception of home rule, the President must appoint the mayor of the District of Columbia. In that event, Mr. President, the citizens of the District of Columbia will not be allowed to enjoy the right of the full franchise of free men and women in the election of a mayor. What kind of home rule will that be?

Mr. President, the very essence of home rule is the right to exercise the greatest freedom the American people have, namely, the right to elect the officials who govern them. In this instance the quest of the people of the District of Columbia is for true home rule by way of the freedom of the free ballot box in electing the head of their city government. But the President does not propose to give the people of the District of Columbia that right. Yet in the same release he refers to home rule. Mr. President, the proposals of President Eisenhower are irreconcilable with true home rule. True home rule cannot be reconciled with the appointment of a mayor by the President. The alibi that is given by the White House as to why

the President does not want the people of the District of Columbia to elect their own mayor is that because of Federal interests in the District of Columbia, the President must retain authority over the selection of a mayor.

I say to the President of the United States, "Apparently you have little faith in the democratic processes, if you are not willing to trust a free ballot box in the District of Columbia in the election of a mayor."

Mr. President, I speak advisedly when I say it is an insult to the people of the District of Columbia to say to them, in effect, "I will give you what I call home rule, provided you do not have the right to enjoy the freedom of a free ballot box in the election of a mayor."

Of course, Mr. President, I speak as a Member of the Senate who fought for the Morse amendment to the original home-rule bill which came to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I offered the Morse amendment for the election of a mayor in the District of Columbia. Other Members of the Senate know what some of the objections in the cloakrooms were to my amendment. Some feared my amendment because they felt that it might eventually result in the election of a colored mayor. I hope so. I hope someday we shall have reached such a high plateau of equality in America that a qualified, able, competent colored person may become mayor of the District of Columbia if, in the judgment of free men and women expressed through the ballot box, he or she is the one who ought to sit in the mayor's seat.

I was urged not to offer my amendment. I offered it. I offered it first in the District of Columbia Committee. When it was said that it could not be adopted in the District of Columbia Committee, I asked for public hearings on the amendment, which were granted. When the public hearings were completed, and when we thrashed out the issue of the election of a mayor of the District of Columbia, how many members of the Committee on the District of Columbia voted against my amendment? Only three. I have always said that there were only 2½ votes cast against it in committee, because one of the committee members who voted against my amendment in committee made it very clear that he thought it was a good amendment and that he would vote for it on the floor of the Senate, but he had already committed himself to vote against it in committee. So, although 3 votes were recorded against it in the committee, in effect, speaking figuratively, the opposition amounted to only 2½ votes.

Then the bill with my amendment in it came to the floor of the Senate. The record is perfectly clear. The bill went through the Senate of the United States, to its everlasting credit, with the Morse amendment in it relating to the election of a mayor. Now a President of the United States says he would favor a bill which did not include the election of a mayor. I am proud that I have made my record on this issue in contrast, again, to another sorry compromise with principle on the part of the President of the United States. A compromise with principle in regard to another matter which, in my judgment, is fundamental to the democratic process in America, namely, an untrammeled freedom to vote for officials to govern us in a true home-rule system.

According to the press this morning, the President would favor a home-rule bill, provided he were allowed to retain the power to overrule the city council in case it, in turn, should overrule a veto by the mayor. That shows how far removed the President of the United States is from an understanding of what home rule means. Congress established the city government in the District of Columbia. The President now says that if the city council should override a veto by the mayor, he, the President, must have the power to override the overriding of the mayor's veto by the city council.

There is no home rule to that proposal, Mr. President. All the President is doing, again, is trying politically to capitalize on a slogan in the hope that the average citizen will not take the time to analyze the emptyness of the slogan as he uses it. So I say, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that I am shocked at the President's proposal, because it is not home rule. His proposal is a sham which he labels "home rule." There is no home rule to it. It would continue the complete domination of the municipal government in this District by the White House. A President of the United States ought to be too busy with the problems of the Nation to be functioning in connection with municipal politics and controlling municipal politics.

One last word. What is this fear about a municipal government following a course of action in the Nation's Capital which it is alleged might in some way endanger Federal interests? Congress would continue to exercise its power to protect Federal interests, just as Congress would exercise the power to protect any encroachment upon Federal interests by the States. The situation is no different. It is a phony argument which the White House is using when it seeks to clothe again the long-standing scarecrow about Federal interests being jeopardized by the exercise of true home rule in the District of Columbia.

There are a great many State capitals in which great functions of State government are localized. But on the State level we do not hear that the Governor should have the power of appointment of the mayor of a capital city in a State because the State may have important activities and interests in the capital city of the State.

Look across the water and see what some of the democracies abroad do in regard to the question of home rule. I say again, as I have said before, that here again is another opportunity for us, in the great fight for freedom in the world which lies ahead, to demonstrate that in America we practice political freedom at home as we urge its adoption abroad. At least we ought to demonstrate to the world that we are not afraid of the full and complete exercise of the democratic processes in the capital of the Nation.

That is why I rise today to protest what I consider to be another clear example of the President of the United States talking in terms of form and not of substance—in this instance, in connection with his political offering of the label of home rule for the District of Columbia, with no substance of home rule in his proposal.

MILITARY RESERVE WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this week of April 22–28 has been designated and is being observed as Military Reserve Week.

Recognition of the ever-increasing needs of the Nation for an adequate reserve force is, of course, the motivation for this period of observance, but recognition of what is currently being accomplished demands attention as well.

The Senator of Illinois is delighted to report today one tangible facet of that effort.

We have as our guests in the gallery 16 Organized Marine Reserves, drawn from the 4 corners of the Nation, to compete in the finals of a technique of instruction competition.

Winners of the preliminary tests in their respective local units, and later their regions, these young Americans epitomize the devotion, the thoroughness, and the self-sacrifice so typical of their colleagues.

For the balance of the week they will be subjected to the very stiffest of competitive testing, and whether final winner or not, it is a foregone conclusion all will return to their units with an accumulation of new abilities they will in turn impart to others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in my remarks a list of these Organized Marine Reserves who are the guests of the Senate today.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTESTANTS

FIRST DISTRICT

Sgt. Richard M. Welsh, 2d Engr. Co., Boston; 109 Grove Street, Lynn, Mass.

Cpl. Marie K. Driscoll, WM Co., 2d Inf. Bn.; 15 Cramer Road, Watertown, Mass.

FOURTH DISTRICT

Cpl. Paul T. Kirsch, 12th Inf. Bn., Pittsburgh; 12914 Middletown Rd., Pittsburgh, Pa.

S. Sgt. Robert S. Seriff, 78th Sp. Inf. Co., Williamsport, Pa.; 816 Woodland Avenue, Williamsport.

FIFTH DISTRICT

Sgt. Steven R. Benford, 13th Inf. Bn., Washington, D. C.; 7403 Hopkins Avenue, College Park, Md.

Sgt. Richard N. Stultz, 5th Engr. Co., Roanoke, Va.; 2119 Avenel Avenue SW., Roanoke, Va.

SIXTH DISTRICT

S. Sgt. Lewis H. Wilson, I. & I., 38th Sp. Inf. Co., Montgomery, Ala.; 704 W. Edgemont Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

S. Sgt. Paul H. Ilyinsky, 99th Sp. Inf. Co., Riviera Beach, Fla.; 279 Queens Lane, Palm Beach, Fla.

EIGHTH DISTRICT

S. Sgt. William V. Cheek, 57th Sp. Inf. Co., Albuquerque, N. Mex.; 513 Spruce Street, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Pfc. W. J. Fletcher, 6th Inf. Bn., Houston, Tex.; 7126 Conley Street, Houston, Tex.

NINTH DISTRICT

M. Sgt. Miles M. Vondra, Jr., 18th Sp. Inf. Co., Illinois; 1536 Meadow Lane, Glenview, Ill.

Sgt. Martin C. Kelly, 1st Shore Party, South Bend, Ind.; 525 North Street, St. Louis Boulevard, South Bend, Ind.

TWELFTH DISTRICT

Sgt. Bernard Hyman, 2d Armored Amph. So., San Francisco, Calif.; 1228 De Bolo Drive, Pedro Valley, Calif.

Cpl. Ernest M. Vollmer, 6th Auto. Wpns. Btry., Spokane, Wash.; East 2720 Samson Avenue, Spokane, Wash.

COMMANDER, MARINE AIR RESERVE TRAINING

M. Sgt. Robert W. Deicke, VMF–142, MARTD, MCAS, Miami, Fla.; 102 East 49th Street, Hialeah, Fla.

Cpl. Walter E. Simonson, MarFitron 234, NARTD, NAS, Minneapolis, Minn.; 5104 26th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4047) relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4909. An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York;

H. R. 10387. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 24, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 150) to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment to the pending bill, on which I ask to be heard. The amendment is offered on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Kentucky for himself and the senior Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, line 4, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following: "or to the ownership by a bank holding company of shares, securities, or obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company and which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this proposed amendment in no way changes the intent of the pending bill. As I understand, one of the purposes of the bill is to prevent bank holding companies from owning and controlling unrelated businesses. The bill recognizes, however, that bank holding companies should not be prevented from making investments in other businesses when such investments would not violate the purposes of the bill.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, in its report on page 12, has this to say:

> Appropriate exceptions are made in the bill in order to enable bank holding companies to retain ownership and control of nonbanking assets in cases where such retention will not violate the purposes of the bill.

The amendment which I have offered does not violate the purposes of the bill, but, as a matter of fact, is in harmony with the bill. One of the exceptions of the bill is that a bank holding company may hold shares of any company if they do not represent more than 5 percent of the company's outstanding voting securities, and if they do not have a value greater than 5 percent of the total assets of the holding company itself.

The sole purpose of my amendment is to assure the equitable application of this provision to all bank holding companies, recognizing that there are differences throughout the country in bank holding companies and in their structure.

Under my amendment, a bank holding company can own stock of an investment company whose sole business is investing in the securities of other companies, provided the investment company does not own more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting stock of any one company, and provided further, that the investment company does not own in any one company stock which has a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company.

In other words, my amendment simply provides that a bank holding company can invest in the securities of other companies through the agency of an investment company to the same degree as, but no greater than, the bill now provides a bank holding company may do directly.

This is not a new provision. A similar provision to this was contained in Senate bill 1118, introduced in the Senate in the 83d Congress. It was also in H. R. 6304, introduced in the House of Representatives in the 83d Congress. The same language is in section 6 (c), paragraph 6, of H. R. 6627, which passed the House of Representatives in the first session of the present Congress.

In other words, this amendment of mine merely does what the bank holding company bill, which was introduced in the Senate in the 83d Congress, did. It is the same as was provided in the House bill, introduced in the 83d Congress, and it is the same as the provision now contained in the House bill which has passed the House and has come to the Senate. It is not only not out of harmony with the bill, but it is in harmony with it, and merely allows bank holding companies to invest in some of the investment companies that are not bank holding companies in the same manner as if they were doing it directly.

I hope the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee will agree to this amendment. I appreciate very much the courtesy the committee has extended to me in the matter by allowing me to appear before the committee. However, I may say that was done after the bill had been reported to the Senate.

I do not believe the amendment, if adopted, would in any way impinge upon the purposes of the bill, but would be in harmony with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia, as one of the cosponsors of the bill, and as floor manager for the committee, regrets very much that he has no authority from the committee to accept the amendment offered by his distinguished colleague.

It is true that that amendment is in the House bill. The effect of it would be to relieve the trustees of the First National Bank of Louisville, Ky., of the necessity of divesting themselves of the First Kentucky Co.

That issue was considered last summer by the committee, before Senate bill 2577 was framed as a compromise measure and reported; and the amendment was rejected. The committee, in order to be sure that no injustice was being done to the First National Bank trustees, permitted a representative of that fine organization to be heard on February 8.

The committee voted again, and again rejected the amendment, but not because the committee felt that there was involved any great threat to private bankers. As a matter of fact, so far as I recall, the committee had no protest from any private banker in Kentucky on this subject; but the committee adopted a policy of not writing into the bill specific exemptions for anyone.

It is with regret, therefore, that the manager for the committee finds himself unable to accept this amendment, although he can give assurance that if the Senate does not adopt it, it will have full consideration in conference, because it is in the House bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate further than merely to say that, as I indicated a while ago, when the bank holding company bill was introduced in the two Houses in the 83d Congress, this provision was in both bills.

All the amendment would do would be to permit a bank holding company to invest not more than 5 percent of its assets in the securities of an investment company which is not a bank holding company, provided it does not invest in more than 5 percent of the value of the assets.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. When the Senator refers to both bills, I wish to remind him that there were more than two bills. There was a House bill, which had been introduced by Chairman SPENCE. Then there was a Senate bill, which had been introduced by the former chairman of the committee and now the ranking minority member, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Therefore when the Senator refers to both bills, I am sure he is referring to the Spence bill and to the Capehart bill. That provision was not contained in any of the bills introduced by the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not assuming that it was. I did not mean to say that. None of those bills was passed by the 83d Congress. However, the provision was contained in the bill introduced in the House and the bill introduced in the Senate. It is now contained in the House bill, which has been sent to the Senate, and I assume that ultimately the Senate will substitute the language of its own bill for that of the House bill, pass the House bill, and send it to conference.

Inasmuch as my amendment does not in any way offer any inconsistency with the provisions and purposes of the pending bill, and merely allows a bank holding company to invest not more than 5 percent of its own assets in not more than 5 percent of the assets of an investment company, which is not itself a bank holding company, it seems to me that the amendment I have offered ought to be adopted. We all know that many bankers, through investment companies, invest in securities of one kind or another not only their own assets, but, to a certain degree, the assets of their clients and their friends, and their customers.

I hope the Senate will be willing to adopt the provision I am suggesting in my amendment. It has already been adopted in the House bill. It does not in any way affect the purposes and objectives of the bill now under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume that what the Senator's amendment does is to permit a bank holding company to continue to invest money in other than banking assets; is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. In other than bank assets; but the amendment is limited to investment companies that are not themselves holding companies. In other words, it cannot invest its assets in another bank holding company.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other than bank holding companies? Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. It cannot invest more than 5 percent in any one company and not more than 5 percent of its own assets.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it could invest up to 5 percent in many different companies. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume it could. However, it so happens that the situation which my amendment intends to cover does not involve a promiscuous use of assets in such a manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am eager to have some legislation adopted on the subject of bank holding companies. Two or 3 years ago I introduced a bill to that effect. I have prepared—and it is lying on the desk—an amendment which would do exactly what the Senator from Kentucky wishes to do in this respect, except that my amendment would treat all bank holding companies exactly alike. It would permit bank holding companies to retain their nonbanking assets, but deny them the right to acquire any more.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment goes further than mine. My amendment applies to all banks and bank holding companies that come within the purview of the definition of a bank holding company. Such a company may not invest more than 5 percent in an investment company which itself is not a bank holding company. The Senator's amendment, I would say, is broader than the one I have offered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to point out the situation in which we will find ourselves. We will find ourselves that the amendment of the able Senator from Kentucky will be before the Senate, as will also the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], to permit a bank holding company to retain certain nonbanking assets, and I understand that other amendments will be offered. I shall offer an amendment which will permit all of them to retain their nonbank holding interests, on the theory that I believe all of them should be treated alike. The bank holding companies acquired these properties legally, and they ought to be permitted to retain them.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's amendment would permit them to retain what they have already bought.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. My amendment merely applies to bank holding companies in the future, so that in the future they would not be permitted to invest more than 5 percent in an investment company which is not itself a holding company. Therefore, there is some difference between the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana and my amendment. I may vote for his amendment, but I should like to urge the adoption of my amendment as well.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is possibly some difference between the two amendments. The able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] also submitted an amendment to permit a bank holding company to own other than banking assets. The bill now before the Senate exempts charitable institutions and churches and labor organizations. Now, we are talking about exempting a given situation under the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, and another given situation under the amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia. I suspect there will be other amendments offered. All of that leads me to believe that what we ought to do is to permit bank holding companies to hold what they now have and deny them the right to have any of their banks loan money to any of their subsidiary nonbanking institutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. That question may arise. Of course, it can probably be worked out in conference whether an omnium-gatherum amendment of that kind should be adopted, or whether an individual amendment which covers a certain situation should be adopted, particularly when Senators are familiar with the particular situation involved.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, there is a difference. However, my purpose in rising was, primarily, to find out how we could possibly treat all alike in this situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not believe there is any inconsistency so far as my amendment is concerned.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course my amendment does treat all alike.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's amendment would permit any bank holding company to invest up to 5 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. In a nonbanking investment company which, as the Senator knows, is a familiar form of financial institution in our country.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would not permit every banking company to invest up to 5 percent in an investment company. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it would. That situation does not apply in very many cases, of course.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the manager and author of the bill if the statement I made is correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. So far as the manager of the bill is concerned, the amendment applies to only one company. It may be possible that other

companies of this kind could be organized. At the present time I know of only one.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is only one company to which the amendment would apply. It would not give a bank holding company the right to organize or to buy up to 5 percent of the assets of an investment company which it might organize or which was previously organized. Is that correct? I believe it is important that we understand whether the amendment applies to only one company.

Mr. ROBERTSON. All the testimony was to the effect that it would apply to only one company. We never went into the legal phase of whether it could possibly apply to another company if such a company were to be organized. All the testimony was to the effect that there is only one company in this situation. The House saw fit to make that exemption.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the language of the amendment had to be drawn in general terms, even though it has application to only one situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, if more than one company were in the same situation, the amendment would apply. It would apply if, after the bill is passed, a bank holding company wished to invest up to 5 percent of its assets in a security company. It would be permitted to do so. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. If there were in existence another company which would be in the same situation as the one we are talking about, the language of the amendment would apply.

Mr. CAPEHART. It seems to me that the language might well permit a bank holding company to invest up to 5 percent of its assets in a securities company even though it may not have any interest in the security company at the moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. If up to this time in the financial history of our country only one company has had this kind of a connection, it is not likely that others will be organized.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the bill becomes law, and the bank holding company cannot expand, it might wish to invest up to 5 percent in an investment company.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There has been a little confusion because of the two different provisions. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has evidently been discussing subsection 5 on page 10 of the bill, which provides:

(5) to shares of any company which are held or acquired by a bank holding company which do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of such company, and do not have a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank-holding company.

That applies to all of them. But the provision we were asked to put into the bill reads as follows:

Or to obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company, which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, and which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company.

That last language would exclude one specific company operating in Louisville, Ky. But, in my opinion, it is in general terms, and if there should be organized in the future a similar type of company, no doubt it could do the same thing.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If it had the same authorization, and it were in the law.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, a bank holding company, if this bill should become law, could invest up to 5 percent of its funds in an investment company?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It could invest in any company.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, why is it necessary to have this amendment?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment goes further than that.

Mr. CAPEHART. How far does it go?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It goes so far that if a bank holding company has a nonbanking asset——

Mr. CAPEHART. A nonbanking asset being 5 percent interest in the investment company?

Mr. ROBERTSON. More than 5 percent.

Mr. BARKLEY. The company could not invest more than 5 percent of its assets in the securities in which it wished to invest.

It would be limited to 5 percent.

Mr. CAPEHART. What I am trying to find out is this: If this amendment becomes law, can a bank holding company, under the new law, do exactly what the amendment will permit the Louisville company to do?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose, if the bill becomes law, an organization similar to the bank holding company could invest 5 percent of its assets in it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The difference between what is in the Senate bill and what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky wants to do is that the Senate bill prohibits a bank holding company from investing more than 5 percent in securities of an investment company.

Mr. CAPEHART. A bank holding company could invest all its funds, provided they were less than 5 percent of the investment company's funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no. A bank holding company could not invest more than 5 percent of its funds, nor could it invest in more than 5 percent of the securities of the investment company.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The witness said:

As near as I can determine from a study of Webster and the International Dictionary, it really comes under the head of a technical amendment.

I think I agree with him. I think every Senator on the floor wil agree, because we are having some difficulty in understanding what it means, and, therefore, it must be a technical amendment.

Let me read it again:

or to obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company, which is not engaged in any business other than in investing in securities, and which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company.

That is what the witness called a technical amendment. He said he did not know of any other language with which to describe the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill which is before the Senate does not dissolve or eliminate bank holding companies. It only estops them from going any further.

I am trying to find out whether in the future all bank holding companies will be able to invest up to 5 percent of their assets in an investment company if they care to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would suppose that if in the future an investment company were organized and did business only in investments in securities, with no other business, and a bank holding company wanted to invest 5 percent of its assets in 5 percent of the investment company's assets, it might do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. But there are 146 so-called holding companies, and the Senator feels that under this amendment, 146 holding companies could invest up to 5 percent of their assets in an investment company which was strictly engaged in the business of buying and selling investments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Theoretically, any bank holding company in this country could invest not to exceed 5 percent of its assets in a company not a holding company but whose only business was that of dealing in securities.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I correctly understand the amendment, the bank holding company would not necessarily have to organize an investment company.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. CAPEHART. It could be organized by other people.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not have to organize such a company, and I suppose it would not do so, if a completely independent investment company were organized whose only business were investments in securities. A bank holding company might invest in the securities of such a company, provided it did not invest more than 5 percent of its own assets in more than 5 percent of the assets of the investment company itself.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am not too sure that I can throw any further light on this question, but I shall give my interpretation of it.

An investment company buys here, there, and yonder——

Mr. CAPEHART. And it sells here, there, and yonder.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. Provided it is an investment company which does not have invested in any one particular enterprise more than 5 percent of the assets of the bank holding company, under this amendment, a bank holding company can invest in such an investment company. The amendment is tailored to fit this one case.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand the Senator—or if I do understand him, I do not agree with him.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The witness said that he had looked at Webster's International Dictionary and that the amendment comes under the head of a techni-

cal amendment. There is no doubt that it is very cleverly drawn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I served on the Banking and Currency Committee for many years, and was at one time chairman of it, and I think the whole banking business is technical.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to read, very slowly, the words of the amendment:

> Or to obligations of an investment company which is not a bank-holding company, which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, and which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company.

In contradistinction to that, the Senate bill provides that any bank holding company can buy 5 percent of the securities of any investment company, but cannot invest more than 5 percent of the assets of the bank holding company in securities of the investment company. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky apparently makes the limitation the same, except that it does not apply to the 5 percent of the assets of the bank holding company when it makes the investment.

Mr. BARKLEY. That really encourages diversification of investment, because the bank holding company cannot buy more than 5 percent of the assets of the investment company, and they cannot invest more than 5 percent of their own funds.

Mr. CAPEHART. I presume it is the opinion of the able Senator from Virginia that the amendment applies only to the one company, and would not apply to the other 145 holding companies.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I beg the Senator's pardon; I did not say that. The amendment was tailormade for the one company. Another company might be tailormade to this formula; then the amendment might apply.

But the difference between the amendment and the provision in the Senate bill is that the 5 percent limitation in the amendment does not apply to the bank holding company. This change was needed to take care of a particular situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the object of the bill not to make certain that bank holding companies do not expand, and that bank holding companies shall not be permitted to do that which banks cannot do? Broadly speaking, is that not what is sought to be done?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct, and it is the reason why I am so much opposed to the amendment which the Senator from Indiana proposes to offer, namely, to let all bank holding companies retain all their assets, even though they amount to millions of dollars, because the main reason for the bill is to get rid of those assets.

Mr. CAPEHART. How will a bank holding company be able to get rid of its assets if we write into the bill a provision that any bank owned by a bank holding company cannot lend money to any of its subsidiaries, or that it cannot acquire or merge with other companies? How will a single, independent bank be harmed under that formula?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The theory of the 1933 Banking Act is that a bank must be limited to banking, and not be a conglomeration of banks so as to constitute a banking empire. That is the theory of the Senate bill.

The amendment is a very mild one. No objection has been heard from any banker in Kentucky. It relates to a small operation. The committee turned the amendment down because it provided for a specific exemption, and we did not want to include a specific exemption in the bill. But it is contained in the House bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. The object of the bill is to divorce banks and bank holding companies from the ownership and control of businesses other than banking, and to take their hands out of the treasuries and the management of industrial corporations.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment I have offered not only confirms that theory and is in harmony with it, but it simply provides that a company which is a bank holding company may invest not more than 5 percent of its assets in not more than 5 percent of an investment company which is not a bank holding company.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator from Kentucky be willing to amend his amendment so as to provide that any bank holding company in the future may do likewise?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not want to do that; because that would encourage the very thing we are seeking to prevent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why does the able Senator from Kentucky want one bank holding company to have a right to do something which all other bank holding companies do not have?

Mr. BARKLEY. As I have already tried to explain, there is only one bank holding company which the amendment fits; but if there were another, not an investment company, organized in the future which complied with the terminology of the amendment, I certainly would not deny that they should have the right to do what the amendment permits.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would be no trouble for an investment company to comply with the terminology of the amendment. I may be wrong, but I believe any bank holding company——

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be very unwise to broaden the language so as to encourage situations which do not now exist and may never exist.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Kentucky said he thought he might be in favor of permitting all present bank holding companies to hold other assets.

Mr. BARKLEY. I look with an open mind upon that proposal. I am not attempting to commit myself to it. I have not considered carefully the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Indiana. I shall consider it carefully when he offers it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator from Kentucky be willing to withdraw his amendment, so that we might discuss the subject as a whole, rather than piecemeal?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I would not, because I think the amendment intended to be offered by the Senator from Indiana is much broader than mine. Whether the Senator's amendment be adopted or not—and that will be a matter for the Senate to determine—my amendment, in my opinion, is very fair. It does not interfere with the purpose of the bill, but it takes care of a condition which may never exist in any other situation, but does exist in one situation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the bill is to make certain that bank holding companies do not expand, and that bank holding companies established in the future will be unable to do that which a bank cannot do at the moment. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing in my amendment which is in any way inconsistent with that theory.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's amendment permits a bank holding company to invest in outside companies and to have outside interests.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; only to the extent that it is an investment company engaged only in the purchase of securities as investments, and is not engaged in the operation of industrial plants.

Mr. CAPEHART. But a bank holding company might own a business which was engaged only in the manufacture and sale of tires, just as the able Senator says there are companies which only buy and sell securities.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is any investment company which is engaged in the manufacture of tires, it would not be subject to the amendment, because it would have to be an investment company which is engaged only in the purchase and sale of securities.

Mr. CAPEHART. I myself have no objection to the amendment, although I think all bank holding companies ought to be treated exactly alike. I do not know why one bank holding company should be permitted to do that which hundreds of others will not be permitted to do, anymore than I do not see why bank holding companies should be permitted to do that which banks are not permitted to do.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I can give a little information about the local situation. The First National Bank trustees control the First National Bank of Louisville and the Kentucky Trust Co.—two banks. That makes the First National Bank trustees a bank holding company.

They control also the First Fire Insurance Co., which they will have to dispose of under the bill. Also, they control the First Kentucky Co., which is an investment company. This they can continue to hold—not merely 5 percent of it, but all of it, under the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. They can control all of the investment company?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not merely 5 percent of it, but all of it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. It is my information that they own all of it now, and they will continue to hold it. But the amendment does not permit them to hold the fire insurance company; they will have to dispose of that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why will they have to dispose of the fire insurance company but not the investment company?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator will have to ask the Managers on the Part of the House why that is. That provision was in the bill when it came to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is still in the bill, and I am not seeking to change it.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are being asked to legislate for the benefit of a specific firm. I have no objection to legislating for that firm in this respect, but I think we ought to treat all other holding companies on the same basis. We should permit them to keep what they have, with the understanding or with the provision in the law that they cannot expand in any way, because that is what is sought to be done, that is what the amendment offered by the able Senator from Georgia would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. PAYNE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Millikin
Anderson	Green	Monroney
Barkley	Hayden	Morse
Barrett	Hennings	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Neely
Bible	Hruska	Neuberger
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jackson	Pastore
Butler	Jenner	Payne
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Carlson	Kefauver	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kuchel	Scott
Cotton	Laird	Smathers
Curtis	Langer	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Long	Sparkman
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Welker
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	McCarthy	Wofford
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	McNamara	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], which will be followed by an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Presumably debate has ended on the Barkley amendment. Debate on the George amendment will probably require only a few minutes.

Then the main amendment to the bill will be offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. In view of the fact that Senators will wish to go on record one way or the other on the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Illinois to prohibit crossing State lines, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Douglas amendment, which has been on the desk for several days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that it is impossible to order the yeas and nays at this time, because the Douglas amendment is not before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the manager of the bill, the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has just informed the Senate that it will soon vote upon the Barkley amendment, to be followed by an amendment to be offered by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

I have no objection to the amendment of the able Senator from Kentucky or the amendment of the able Senator from Georgia. However, I invite attention to the fact that both those amendments are tailormade to take care of one holding company ear—one in Louisville, Ky., and one in Atlanta, Ga. I have no objection to either amendment, because later I shall offer an amendment which will permit all bank holding companies to retain their nonbanking assets under specific rules—first, that neither the bank holding company nor any of its affiliates may lend any money to nonbanking subsidiaries; second, that the nonbanking subsidiaries may not acquire or merge with any other company.

I invite attention to the fact that if we vote for those two amendments, the amendment of the able Senator from Georgia and the amendment of the able Senator from Kentucky—and I am for them—we shall be voting to favor two companies. Later I shall offer an amendment which will treat all bank holding companies exactly alike so far as nonbanking assets are concerned. I cannot quite make up my mind that we ought to treat one company differently from another.

I favor 100 percent the purpose of the proposed legislation. I introduced proposed legislation on this subject about 3 years ago. The purpose of it is to prevent bank holding companies from expanding, except under controlled conditions. I think that is the best way to put it. Also it is the purpose to make certain that a bank holding company may not do something that a bank may not do. In other words, what we are trying to do it is to bring bank holding companies, so far as banking is concerned, under the same rules and regulations that govern banks.

As I recall, there are 146 bank holding companies. Many of them have acquired nonbanking assets. Under the provisions of the pending bill they would be required to dispose of such nonbanking assets, except in cases in which we might grant tailormade exemptions, such as the one proposed with respect to the bank holding company in Louisville, Ky., and the one proposed with respect to the bank holding company in Atlanta, Ga. The bank holding companies would be required to dispose of nonbanking assets. That would not help the independent bankers particularly, because the bank holding companies would merely siphon the businesses off and issue stock to the present bank holding company stockholders, in proportion to the stock in the subsidiary.

The same people would continue to own the assets, and we would not have helped the independent bankers, because from a banking standpoint the situation would not be changed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the bill was reported from the committee with a provision which would require the liquidation of all nonbanking assets in a period of 2 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And bank holding companies would be prohibited from holding nonbanking assets.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I take it that the amendment now before the Senate is diametrically opposed to that provision in the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; yet I am in favor of the amendment, for the reason that I do not agree that we ought to force bank holding companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets. I think we ought to deny them the right to lend money to them. I think we ought to deny them the right to take one of them and make another holding company out of it. I think we ought to deny them the right to merge with any other company, or any part of any other company. But I think we ought to give them the option either of disposing of such assets, or of operating them as separate, individual companies, and prohibit them from even borrowing money from any of the banks which they control.

I would not be in favor of such legislation if I thought it would interfere with or harm the small banks of America. It

could not possibly hurt an independent bank. There is no way it could do so. The fact of the matter is that if we do not do what I am proposing, and these independent companies are siphoned off to the existing stockholders, the bank holding company can continue to lend money to them and do business with them. There will be the same stockholders and the same officers. So I do not see how anything would be gained.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What puzzles the Senator from North Dakota is this: If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, it will help a bank holding company in Kentucky.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], it will help a bank holding company in Atlanta, Ga.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. What is to prevent a Senator who wishes to favor the Transamerica Corporation from offering a similar amendment in its behalf?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is nothing to prevent it. I am in favor of allowing all bank holding companies to continue to hold their present nonbanking assets, on the theory that they acquired them legally, but I think they should be denied the right to acquire any more.

Mr. LANGER. What is the use of passing the bill, if we are to make exemptions?

Mr. CAPEHART. It would be better to pass my bill, exempting all of them.

I am wondering if we should amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to include the acquisition by one bank of the assets of a competing bank. The House passed such a measure last week. I am not so certain that we should not adopt an amendment to accomplish that purpose, and I may offer an amendment to do exactly what the House has already approved doing, that is, to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act so as to include the acquisition by one bank of the assets of a competing bank.

I invite attention to some further features of the bill. I am not complaining about them particularly, but I invite attention to certain features of the bill which I consider to be inequitable.

For example, the pending bill exempts charitable organizations, regardless of the number of banks they may own. It exempts banks owned by charitable institutions, and it exempts banks owned by churches. It exempts banks owned by labor organizations.

I am not particularly finding fault with that situation. I am trying to point out, however, that we are not being very consistent and very fair in the situation. I know of one church which owns a number of banks. It also owns department stores and many different businesses. They are all exempt. Yet they are very much a part of the business of the country. Why do we exempt labor organizations and charitable organizations and churches?

The bill also exempts a situation in Florida. I refer to the fact that a member of the Du Pont family sets up a trust, and the trust owns a series of banks. Those banks are exempt on the basis that the trust is a charitable trust. Yet the widow has had the use of the business and has received income from the trust for 20 years. She will continue to receive the income for as long as she lives. I hope she will live another 50 years. I do not know how long she will live, of course. However, why are there so many exemptions in the bill? Why do we say to a concern which acquired money legally under the law, "Now you have to get rid it?"

I am in favor of controls, and my amendment would call for controls. However, why do we practice that sort of thing? It has been done in the past, and there are examples of it, of course. However, I do not know of any great hue and cry in America that the nonbanking assets of the holding companies have in any way done any harm or that the holding companies have had any monopoly. The nonbanking assets are not what the small, independent bankers are complaining about. They complain about the fact that the bank holding companies are establishing branches and are establishing banks all over the country. They complain that bank holding companies are able to do things they themselves are unable to do.

Of course, one of the things bank holding companies will be unable to do will be to hold onto their nonbanking assets. That is provided in the bill. The bill takes away from them the nonbanking assets they acquired in the past.

I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Possibly I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. I am not too certain about that. I wish to talk about it a little.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Florida is in a little different category. I shall vote for the other amendments because I believe the banks ought to be permitted to keep their nonbanking assets, though I believe they ought to be controlled. I think that we should be fair and equitable to everyone. If we are, we will have a better bill.

I cannot for the life of me understand why that should not be our attitude. I wish someone would give me some facts to show how a small banker, or any banker, can be hurt by permitting the holding companies to keep their nonbanking assets if they cannot lend money and if they cannot merge with another company. Why is the ownership of a bank holding company, under those circumstances, any worse than the ownership by any other group of stockholders or by any other men? Wherein does the small bank get hurt? How is it affected? I do not see how it is at all affected. Perhaps it is, but if so, I wish someone would give me some facts setting forth how it is.

I can well understand that if we permit a bank holding company to lend money, we would be denying other banks the right to lend money. I could see new holding company. I am not sure subsidiary to become the nest egg for a now holding company. I am not sure that that is not permitted now, as the law is written. There is some question whether the companies are not permitted to do that under the present law. Under the Robertson bill, if it shall be enacted, I am not certain that a subsidiary could not set up a whole new series of holding companies. That is particularly true if the amendment of the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] shall be agreed to. I am sure that would be the result. It opens the door for such action.

As I said a moment ago, I shall support the two amendments, because they accord with my philosophy of the way the whole subject should be handled. I shall likewise offer an amendment to treat all holding companies in exactly the same way.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose there is a big holding company in Chicago and a tiny little bank in Indiana across the State line. How would the passage of the Robertson bill and the amendments affect the little bank in Indiana?

Mr. CAPEHART. How would it affect the bank?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would deny the holding company the right to establish a bank in Indiana, if the law in Indiana prohibited it from doing so, or, if the law permitted it, then only if the Federal Reserve Board agreed to it. I believe that is the correct answer. I ask the manager of the bill to correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It could not move into the State if the State law prohibited it, or, if the State law permitted it, it could not move into Indiana in opposition to a little bank unless the Federal Reserve Board permitted it to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is with respect to bank holdings. We are talking about their divesting themselves of their nonbanking assets. The adoption of the Louisville amendment or the Atlanta amendment or my amendment, to permit the companies to keep all of their nonbanking assets, has nothing whatever to do with the law that will govern the bank holding companies and their future expansion. That is a part of the Robertson bill, and will remain a part of the bill.

There are two parts to the bill. One refers to the bank holding companies and the banks themselves. The other has to do with nonbanking assets which the bank holding companies now own and which they legally acquired under the law. No one objected to their acquiring those assets. The question is, What are we going to do with them? Are we going to make the companies divest themselves and sell the assets to someone else? By so doing, I do not see how we will help a small bank or any kind of bank, particularly if the bank holding company which owns stocks of subsidiaries cannot lend them any money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How would the passage of the bill affect Transamerica?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know. That is one of the largest companies in America. They have many nonbanking assets. It would affect them no differently than it would any other bank-holding company. There is an exception or exemption of labor organizations, charitable institutions, and churches, and there are pending amendments tailored to affect other institutions. I am not quarreling with that situation. I do not quarrel with those amendments at all.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield further.

Mr. LANGER. I am not a member of the committee, and I know very little about the bill. Under the Robertson bill, will labor organizations and charitable institutions be allowed to establish banks all over the country?

Mr. CAPEHART. They are exempt under the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Will they be permitted to go into any State of the Union and operate banks?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. Of course, they will be subject to certain State laws, and they will be subject to getting FDIC insurance, and that sort of thing; but they are exempted from the provisions of the bill. In other words, a labor organization can open up as many banks as it desires and it does not come under the purview of this proposed legislation. Neither do churches or charitable organizations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give me any reason why those organizations should be allowed to buy a bank and private individuals should not be allowed to do so?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any particular reason, except that we have always gone on the premise that a charitable organization is a nonprofit organization. But there is no good reason for it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. If there is no good reason for it, I wonder if some Member of the Senate can inform those of us who are not members of the committee why the committee exempted them.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator will have to talk to the manager of the bill. Maybe I should not have said "good reason." Certainly there is no equitable reason.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Did the Senator ask me a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I told the Senator from California that the distinguished Senator from Virginia might answer his question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. They were not exempted in the bill, but an amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with reference to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 4, after the semicolon, it is proposed to add the following:

or to obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company, which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, and which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 23, at the end of section 4 (c) (4), it is proposed to strike out the semicolon and insert, "or to shares lawfully acquired and owned prior to the date of enactment of this act by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I shall occupy only a few minutes. This is a rather unique situation. It is the case of a bank owning, in turn, a bank holding company which is not a bank, but both own assets legally acquired and held, for investment only, over thirty-odd years. Now, Mr. President, I call attention specifically to the facts. Under the pending bill, both the bank and the bank holding company are bank holding companies within the meaning of the law as written into this bill. They own and have owned for thirty-odd years shares of stocks mainly of Coca-Cola, and other minor stocks as well. The shares have been owned directly and indirectly by the bank itself for over 30 years, as I have stated.

None of the shares has ever been sold or traded in since 1933. The shares were legally acquired in the normal course of business and have been held solely for investment purposes. The shares represent only 1.96 of 1 percent of the more than 4¼ million shares of the parent company. The shares have no value assigned to them on the books of the bank or the books of the bank holding company. They are carried at zero. But the aggregate value of these shares which the bank, under the terms of the bill, would be required to sell, is in excess of $9 million. To put those shares on the market would create a bad effect. It would weaken the banking institutions which they support and which they have supported through the years.

The House bill contains specifically the amendment which I have offered, but the Senate bill does not. With my colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] I am offering this amendment, which strikes out the semicolon at the end of section 4 (c) (4) and inserts the language which has been read. The language is identical with the language in the Spence bill of the House. It is eminently fair and just. It would work a very great hardship upon one of the important banking institutions in Georgia if it were compelled to dispose of these stocks.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will approve the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that the language relates to shares lawfully acquired and owned "prior to the date of enactment of this act by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries."

We could say exactly the same thing about every nonbanking asset owned by any bank holding company that comes within the purview of this bill. There are 146 of them. That is a perfect description of what has happened to them.

I am not opposed to the amendment, because I think we ought to do this. An amendment which I shall propose later will permit all bank holding companies to do exactly what this amendment will permit. If we do it for one, I do not know why we should not do it for all. This amendment is already in the House bill. I have no objection to it. The language applies just as truly to every other bank holding company as it does to this particular situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have no authority to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. It was considered very fully by the committee last summer, because, as I have stated, it is in the House bill. The committee reported the bill without that amendment in it, because we thought it was not good legislative practice to write specific exemptions into a bill which would have general application.

On the 8th of February we heard some further testimony. We again voted on the amendment and we again rejected it. Therefore, as manager of the bill for the committee, I regret that I have no authority to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up amendment designated 4–16–56–A, offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Wyo-

ming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois for himself and other Senators will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, between lines 6 and 7, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which such bank holding company maintains its principal office and place of business or in which it conducts its principal operations unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the pending bill, and the amendment which has just been read, are in the true American tradition, for what the sponsors of the amendment are seeking to do is to prevent an undue concentration of banking and financial power, and instead to keep the private control of credit diffused as much as possible. For we know that when the credit resources of a country become concentrated and fall into a few hands, then the industry and trade of that country also become concentrated.

Big banks commonly find it much easier and more to their liking to do business with big business rather than with little business.

JACKSON FOUGHT CENTRALIZATION OF BANKING AND CREDIT

Andrew Jackson realized all this when he faced Nicholas Biddle and the Second Bank of the United States. Biddle, building on the traditions of Hamilton, and supported by the Whigs under Webster and Clay, was attempting to make his bank the dominant financial institution of the whole country. He was fast succeeding in this attempt when Andrew Jackson took him on. Jackson not only opposed the private creation of monetary purchasing power by the bank, but also its tendency toward monopolizing credit by driving out the small banks. He wanted credit and banking to be decentralized and diffused so that men might be free.

In that terrific struggle, lasting over a decade, Jackson, aided by Thomas H. Benton, saved economic democracy in this country for a time by denying a new charter to Biddle's bank. And although the Whigs tried hard to revive Biddle's power, they were turned back by the Democrats and by John Tyler at a later date.

Similarly, when Salmon P. Chase created the national banking system during the Civil War, he not only desired to create a market for Government bonds by building up a supplementary currency built upon them, but he also wanted to have so many national banks created by the lure of double interest that the new banking system would also be diffused like that of the various State systems.

In short, we who are struggling to prevent the concentration of financial power from becoming greater are carrying on the fighting tradition of Andrew Jackson who wanted a competitive and a free America, and not one dominated by a relatively small group of financiers and industrialists.

DANGERS OF CONCENTRATED BANKING POWER SHOWN IN EXPERIENCE OF BRITAIN

If we look abroad we see plenty of corroboration for our fears about the concentration of banking powers. A century and a quarter ago, England had large numbers of provincial bankers who helped to finance the relatively small industries of their localities. But gradually these private bankers were bought up by and merged with the bigger houses, so that for many years now there have been virtually only five banks which have mattered in England and Wales, namely, Barclays, Lloyds, Midland, Westminster, and National Provincial. These firms do more than three-quarters of the banking business of the entire United Kingdom, including Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Along with this concentration in banking, and partially caused by it, there has developed a concentration in manufacturing and in industry. There is but 1 chemical company in Great Britain, 2 flour concerns, 2 chocolate and cocoa companies, only a handful of breweries and distilleries, not more than 2 tobacco companies, and tight cartels in steel, tin, machinery, and textiles. Professor Ben Lewis has shown how widespread this stifling of competition is in Great Britain. The Big Five have been important factors in promoting this concentration and in reducing competition.

BANKING CONCENTRATION IN CANADA AND GERMANY ALSO LEAD TO INDUSTRIAL MONOPOLY AND CARTELS

Canada, our neighbor to the north, is going through a similar experience. There are only 11 banks in all of Canada to serve 16 million people. The Bank of Montreal, for example, has absorbed at least 10 other banks and has 603 branches. The Royal Bank of Canada, a consolidation of another 10 banks, has 793 branches. Ten more banks have been arbsorbed into the Canadian Bank of Commerce, which now has 651 branches, while still another score of banks have been swallowed up in the Canadian Bank of Commerce. The Bank of Nova Scotia, a consolidation of half a dozen banks, has 415 branches, while 2 banks designed to serve primarily the French-Canadian population have 560 and 349 branches, respectively.

The two biggest banks in Canada, namely, the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Bank of Canada, have almost precisely half of the total bank deposits in the entire country. If we add the third largest bank, 67 percent or two-thirds of the countrywide total will be included. The top four have well over three-quarters of the total deposits.

As in Great Britain, monopoly and quasi-monopoly in industry have accompanied this concentration of banking. There is, I believe, only one tobacco company, for example, in all of Canada, and one private railroad; and a similar situation exists in a very large number of industries. Moreover, industry and banking are so intertwined in directing personnel and in financing as to prove how the concentration of banking power has helped to promote industrial monopoly and quasi-monopoly.

Incidentally, the power of the private monopolies led to the movement for nationalization which was carried out for about one-fifth of the British industry by the Labor Party from 1945 to 1951.

The example of Germany is notorious. Prior to Hitler there were only three banks in Germany, namely, the Deutsche, the Dresdner, and the Commerz Banks. These played ball with and helped the cartels and monopolies. As all students of nazism know, it was the cartels and the big banks which financed Hitler's final drive to power. Thus, concentration of financial power helped on the concentration of economic power, and then the two forces joined hands to aid in creating a dictatorship of political power with all of the terrible consequences which ensued.

CONCENTRATIONS IN BANKING AND CREDIT ARE ALSO SERIOUS DANGERS IN THIS COUNTRY

All these examples paint an image of what is likely to happen in this country if we permit the concentration of banking and credit, which has already gone far, to go farther. For here, as elsewhere, the control over credit is moving into fewer and fewer hands.

At the same time, industry has been moving out of competition into closer and closer concentration—monopoly and quasi-monopoly. This has been helped by the big banks. If we do not wish to travel the path of Canada, Great Britain, and Germany, we should do something effective to check and, if possible, to roll back the concentration of banking and credit. For he who controls the credit of a country controls the industry of that country and, ultimately, the political life of the Nation as well.

Unfortunately, we have already traveled very far down the way of the concentration of credit and banking. This has been done by the growth of the original home offices of the big banks, such as the Continental and First National Banks of Chicago and the Chase and National City Banks of New York, but also by three other forms of accretion, namely, mergers, branch banking, and bank holding companies.

BANK MERGERS HAVE INCREASED RAPIDLY

During the past 9 years, bank mergers have been growing apace. The following number of banks have been merged since 1947:

Year:	*Number of mergers*
1947	82
1948	77
1949	76
1950	89
1951	79
1952	99
1953	115
1954	207
1955	231
Total	1,076

Source: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Thus, nearly 1,100 banks merged during these 9 years, with the numbers greatly increasing during the last 3 years. This, moreover, was during a period when the total number of banks in the country was decreasing by 475, from 14,759 to 14,284. This was a decrease of 3.2 percent.

Among the big mergers were those in New York City of the Chase National Bank and the Bank of Manhattan, of the National City and the First National, the Chemical Bank & Trust and the Corn Exchange, and the Bankers Trust and Public National. These mergers alone involved $19½ billion of assets and over 57 percent of the banking facilities of New York City. There have been a great many other mergers in other portions of the country.

BANK BRANCHES HAVE ALSO MULTIPLIED

The second way control over credit becomes concentrated is through the opening of branches. The organization of branch banks proceeded very rapidly in the 1920's, and to check their growth various States passed laws limiting, and in some cases preventing it, as in the case of Illinois. National banks had previously been implicitly prohibited from opening branches, and there was a strong movement to remove this prohibition and completely open up the field for the national banks. This, however, was not done. Instead, by the McFadden Act and other measures, national banks have been permitted to open branches only to the degree permitted by State laws and State authorities.

I may say that what our amendment aims to do is to carry over into the field of holding companies the same provisions which already apply for branch banking under the McFadden Act—namely, our amendment will permit out-of-State holding companies to acquire banks in other States only to the degree that State laws expressly permit them; and that is the provision of the McFadden Act.

Despite these restrictions on branch banking there has been a great expansion of branches during the last 9 years. At the end of 1946 there were 4,220 branches. This number had increased by the end of last year to 7,391. This was a growth of 3,171 branches, or 75 percent. Among the banks with many branches is the Bank of America, which is now the largest bank in the world, and which dominates banking in California.

HOLDING COMPANIES HAVE ALSO EXPANDED RAPIDLY

The third way in which credit is becoming concentrated is through the device of holding companies. Holding companies have been developed in part—I would say largely—in order to get around restrictions on branch banking. A State will prohibit branch banking, and so a holding company will be organized, which will buy up individual banks and operate them, in effect, within the State, and which sometimes buy up banks in other States and also operate them, in effect, as branches. Even though local officers and directors are used, the direction rests in the holding company. Two out-of-State holding companies have invaded Illinois in just this way, and each company controls three banks in Illinois, despite our Illinois laws prohibiting branch banking.

Now, the two holding companies which operate out of Minneapolis—namely, the First Bank Stock Corporation of Minneapolis, which had 75 banks and 6 branches, and which operated in 4 States, with total deposits of $1,352,000,000 as of the end of 1954, and the Northwest Bancorporation of Minneapolis, which had 72 banks and 22 branches in 7 States with deposits of $1,583,000,000—have been developed and formed largely because of restrictions on branch banking in Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. Since branch banking was prohibited or restricted, at least originally, these holding companies buy up the controlling interests in the banks and operate them as branches.

I see the eminent senior Senator from North Dakota present, and if he wishes, he may make whatever comment he wishes to make.

Mr. LANGER. I have no comment except to say that what the distinguished Senator has said is absolutely true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

In New York the State is divided into 10 zones. Branch banking is permitted within each of the zones, but a bank cannot have branches in another zone. What happened there? The Marine Midland Co., of Jersey City, was organized, and it bought banks in each of the 10 zones and established 125 branches. As of the end of 1954, it had total deposits of $1,635,000,000. Now, the letter of the law is complied with, but, in effect, each of those 10 banks—each one within a given zone—is operated as a unit of a centralized banking system.

TRANSAMERICA CORP. IS LARGEST HOLDING COMPANY AND GROWING RAPIDLY

The biggest holding company is, of course, Transamerica, which was originally closely affiliated with the Giannini banking interests and the Bank of America, but which has attained greater independence in recent years.

As the eminent junior Senator from Virginia stated yesterday, that holding company not only had banks in 5 States, with 167 branches, and banking deposits of $2,021,000,000 as of the end of 1954, but it is somewhat unique in that it has a large number of nonbanking corporations which it controls and directs.

I wish to make a correction for the RECORD. I said that at the end of 1954 Transamerica had banks in five States. As I shall show in a few minutes, it now has banks in 10 States, because it has been expanding, in recent months and weeks, at a very rapid rate.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia, who seems to want to make a statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I was going to suggest what the Senator has just stated, that Transamerica now has banks in 10 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Perhaps we should say that "Eastward the course of banking empire takes its way."

In addition, Transamerica owns one of the largest insurance companies in the United States—the Occidental Life Insurance Co.—and other insurance companies and a variety of other industrial enterprises, including a salmon packing company which packs some of the good Columbia River salmon, which I am sorry to say have displaced Maine salmon from the table, and so forth. As everyone should know, the present bill requires the divestiture of those nonbanking assets.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I regret that the Senator from Illinois has said he is sorry that Columbia salmon have displaced Maine salmon. I will see that he gets a Columbia salmon again, to refresh his taste and enable him better to understand why Columbia salmon have replaced Maine salmon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was permitting his boyhood fondness for landlocked Maine salmon to express itself, in contrast with the sockeye salmon which goes through such an amazing odyssey from the inland lakes to the sea, and back again.

Mr. President, not only does Transamerica have branches in California, but it also has greatly expanded its operations elsewhere. It has purchased a bank in Oregon—the First National Bank, I believe—and has expanded its holdings there until they totaled 68 branches and had 45 percent of the bank deposits in that State at the end of 1954. It controls most of the banking resources in Nevada. The two banks it controls in Nevada had 77 percent of the bank deposits in that State at the end of 1954. At the end of 1954, the 1 bank it owned in Arizona had 17 branches and 21 percent of the bank deposits in that State; and since that time there has been further expansion. So, Mr. President, the Transamerica Corporation is a most powerful group.

OTHER HOLDING COMPANIES CONTROL LARGE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL DEPOSITS IN VARIOUS STATES

Now let us consider the two holding companies which operate out of Minneapolis: The First Bank Stock Corp., with deposits at the end of 1954 of $1,352,000,000; and the Northwest Bancorporation, with deposits of $1,502,000,000. If we add them together, we find that those 2 holding companies then controlled 55 percent of the bank deposits in Minnesota, 44 percent of the bank deposits in Montana, 29 percent of the bank deposits in North Dakota, and 32½ percent of the bank deposits in South Dakota; and these figures are correct only as of the end of 1954.

In a minute I shall speak of the extraordinary expansion which has occurred in more recent years. The figures I have given are taken from pages 51 and 52 of the printed hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee which are on the desks of all Senators. In addition, there are minor holdings of the Northwest Bancorporation in Iowa, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

Then there is the First Security Corp., which is based primarily upon Utah, where in 1954 it controlled almost 24.6 percent of the bank deposits in that State; and 32.5 percent of the bank deposits in Idaho. In recent years this corporation has also been expanded.

As is well known, the corporation is controlled by the Eccles family. Mr. Eccles was for many years a member of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, and for many years was chairman of the board. In my opinion he was one of the most distinguished public servants we have had in the United States for many years. Mr. Eccles made war on holding companies when he was a public servant, and I know he was absolutely sincere in doing so, because he thought they were against the public interest. Then he resigned from the Federal Reserve Board, and went into private banking; and now as a private banker he is naturally seeking to expand his banking interests to the fullest degree possible. There is nothing in the slightest degree unethical in what Mr. Eccles is doing. He happens to be a close personal friend of mine. But since I believe that the expansion of bank holding companies is not in the public interest, I shall oppose the future expansion of the First Security Corp., across State lines, just as I am opposing expansion of other bank holding corporations.

Mr. President, in addition to those instances, there are also a considerable number of bank holding companies which at present operate only within State lines, whereas the ones to which I have previously referred operate across State lines. However, there are some which operate only within a single State. As I have previously mentioned, one of them is the Marine Midland Corp., operating in New York, with deposits at the end of 1954 of $1,636,000,000. Another is the Wisconsin Bankshares Corp., which had 6 banks and 14 branches, and at the end of 1954 had deposits of $780,000,000.

Still another is the BancOhio Corp., with 21 banks and 17 branches, and deposits of $556,000,000 at the end of 1954. In Massachusetts there are 2, namely, the Baystate Corp., with 9 banks and 66 branches and with deposits of $399,000,000; and the Shawmut group, with 14 banks, 37 branches, and deposits of $523,000,000.

Then there are two, which have just been given special exemption, namely, the Trust Company of Georgia Associates and the Trustees of the First National Bank of Louisville, of Louisville, Ky.

Then there are minor holding companies as well.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, let me ask the Senator from Illinois whether he is now arguing, or laying a foundation, for the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that my inclination is to support his amendment. But I wish to ask a question. I think the Senator from Illinois said a few moments ago that in his judgment the theory of holding companies was contrary to the public interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I said that further expansion of holding companies in the field of banking would be contrary to the public interest.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then do I correctly understand that it is the position of the Senator from Illinois that the situation existing today with respect to bank holding companies in his judgment is not against the public interest?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If any other Senator wishes to make a motion to require bank holding companies to divest themselves of their bank stock as well as of their nonbanking assets, the Senator from Illinois will support such a motion.

But all that the Senator from Illinois is at present trying to do is to prevent bank holding companies from expanding across State lines, unless the States give them explicit permission to do so.

Mr. KUCHEL. As I say, my inclination is to support my friend from Illinois in that venture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The inclinations of the Senator from California are always very helpful and generous.

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate that statement.

If the pending bill is designed to prohibit holding companies in the public interest, my question of the Senator is this—and I asked the same question earlier of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]—Why does the bill make certain specific exemptions, on the basis of policy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is not too happy about the exemptions which we have granted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is his unhappiness of sufficient strength to cause him to oppose the bill on that basis?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it is not, because I think, on the whole, the bill is a step forward. I am not too happy about these exemptions. They came about in the play of stresses and strains of banking and political life. I think I voted against most of them in committee. But if my amendment is approved, I think, on the whole, the bill will be a big step forward. If it is not approved, it will be a little step forward.

Mr. KUCHEL. As I understand, the Senator cannot find justification for eliminating some holding companies, while at the same time permitting and protecting others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has been very unhappy about that situation.

HOLDING COMPANIES HAVE EXPANDED MORE RAPIDLY IN RECENT MONTHS

Mr. President, the figures which I have been giving apply as of the end of 1954. Since then the process of acquisition of banks by holding companies has proceeded apace.

The First Security Corporation has been "getting into the act." It bought up the Commercial Bank of Utah, with $18 million in deposits, and 8 banking offices, in January of this year, and the Uinta State Bank, of Vernal, Utah, according to a report in the American Banker for March 12, 1956.

Transamerica has been extending its empire. It acquired the Southern Arizona Bank & Trust Co., with 7 banking offices and $77 million in deposits, in November of 1955. I believe that is the old group of banks formerly headed by Lewis W. Douglas.

It acquired the Bank of New Mexico, with $23 million in deposits and 4 banking offices, in January 1956.

It took over the First National Bank of Caldwell, Idaho, the Continental State Bank at Boise, Idaho, and the Bank of Eastern Idaho, at Idaho Falls, with $41 million in total deposits and 7 banking offices, in January 1956. It took over the Walker Bank & Trust Co. of Salt Lake City, with $117 million in deposits and 5 banking offices, in February 1956.

It took over the Sandy City Bank of Sandy, Utah, with $7 million deposits and 2 banking offices, in March 1956.

I hold in my hand an article from the Salt Lake Tribune of April 13, 1956, which describes the purchase by Transamerica of the Casper, Wyo., First National Bank and the Riverton National Bank, which were old-time Wyoming financial institutions. The Waddell family of Casper were the principal shareholders in those institutions.

According to my information, Transamerica has also purchased in March 1956 the Cache Valley Banking Co., of Logan, Utah, with $9 million in deposits. These three Utah acquisitions by Transamerica give it and the First Security Corp. together 49½ percent of the bank deposits in that State, according to data furnished to me today by the Federal Reserve Board.

If my information is correct, Transamerica also purchased the Montana Bank, of Great Falls, Mont. Since we held the hearings last year, it has gone into New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Montana, and Wyoming for the first time. The financial information which I am able to obtain is that in the case of many of these banks Transamerica has paid far more than the book value of the stock.

As Transamerica has been expanding, the Minneapolis bank holding companies have been expanding as well. The First Bank Stock Corp of Minneapolis, Minn., has purchased the Worthington National Bank of that town in Minnesota, with $7 million in deposits; the Northern Minnesota National Bank, of Duluth, with $57 million in deposits; the Duluth National Bank, of that city, with $9 million in deposits; the First National Bank of Hibbing, Minn., with $13 million in deposits; the First National Bank of Virginia, Minn., with $12 million in deposits; and the Batavia National Bank, of LaCrosse, Wis., with $12 million in deposits. This LaCrosse acquisition moves their Minneapolis holding company into Wisconsin for the first time.

Marine Midland of New York has also purchased two banks, namely, the First National Bank of Herkimer, with $9 million in deposits, and the Bank of Towanda, also with $9 million in deposits.

So the bank holding companies have been expanding very rapidly in recent months, possibly because of a desire to "beat the gun" so that they would have a

foothold in new States and not be required to divest themselves of these banks when the new law went into effect—and possibly in fear that if my amendment were approved they would be shut off from future expansion across State lines.

Mr. President, I have said all this to lay the background for our amendment. It is not merely my amendment. It is also sponsored by a very eminent group of Senators. It has been advocated, as we all know, by the Independent Bankers Association of America. It has been endorsed by the American Bankers Association, although I suspect that some of the big banks are not too happy with it. Nevertheless, the official action of the American Bankers Association is in its favor.

COMMITTEE BILL MAKES NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS

I wish to speak very briefly about the changes which our amendment would make in the bill as it has been reported. I think the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] deserves to be congratulated for the work he has done in getting this bank holding bill out on the floor of the Senate. It makes two fundamental changes. In the first place, it requires the divestment by bank holding companies of nonbanking assets, and hence removes the possibility of future abuse.

The second feature is that any future expansion of bank holding companies, including the purchase of additional banks, will be permitted only if the Federal Reserve Board gives its permission.

The bill lays down a number of standards to be followed by the Board, including standards relating to financial history, condition of the company, prospects of the company, character of management, needs of the community, whether the acquisition would expand the size of the bank holding company beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking, and so forth.

PENDING AMENDMENT PREVENTS BANK ACQUISITION BY OUT-OF-STATE HOLDING COMPANY UNLESS STATE LAW EXPRESSLY PERMITS

Our amendment would prohibit bank holding companies from purchasing banks in other States unless such purchases by out-of-State holding companies were specifically permitted by law in such States. At present no State specifically grants such permission. Therefore the immediate practical effect would be to bar the expansion of bank holding companies across State lines. But the amendment would leave the way open for States to make explicit provision for such purchases and acquisitions if they so decided. If they were to do so, then such expansion would be subject to the rules and judgment of the Federal Reserve Board.

Even with my amendment, the Federal Reserve Board would still have final jurisdiction over the acquisition of banks or bank holding companies within a given State, that is, intrastate acquisitions. If and when individual States permitted a bank holding company from another State to acquire assets across State lines, then the Federal Reserve Board would have final jurisdiction in those cases as well.

I wish to repeat that, so far as interstate acquisition of banks is concerned, namely, purchase by bank holding companies of banks in other States, the provision in my amendment is in principle almost identical with the present provision which governs branch banking.

Therefore, it is a logical continuation of the principles of the McFadden Act, which tried to prevent the Federal power from being used to permit national banks to expand across State lines in a way contrary to State policy and, of course, under the McFadden Act, even to expand within a State.

Anyone who favors States rights, it seems to me should support my amendment. I am not urging it on that ground, however. I believe in a somewhat unified banking system. However, so far as the bank holding companies are concerned, I want to check their expansion. This seems to me to be about the best way of doing so.

AMENDMENT DOES NOT AID BUT RATHER IMPEDES FURTHER MONOPOLISTIC EXPANSION ACROSS STATE LINES

My good friend the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] yesterday, in his speech presenting the bill, criticized my amendment on the ground that, by making further interstate expansion more difficult, it would freeze the present situation and would aid monopoly.

In the first place, it does not freeze the situation, as the analysis of the powers left to the Board makes clear. It is still possible to have an expansion of a bank-holding company within its home State, if it musters the approval of the Federal Reserve Board. Moreover, if State law permits, and if approved by the Board, interstate acquisitions are possible. Therefore the amendment does not freeze the situation.

If the amendment aided the existing holding companies, as the Senator's argument implies, they would favor it. They do not favor it. They are a very able group of men. I am informed that Transamerica and the two Minneapolis holding companies, and the First Security Corporation of Utah, are very much opposed to my amendment. I believe they know their own self-interest, and pursue it, as is quite proper. I am not blaming them for that. Therefore it must be news to them that the amendment would aid and protect them in their existing position.

Basically, the argument of the Senator from Virginia seems to be that the way to check monopoly is not to check it, and that by permitting other competing banking concentrations the same right to expand and take over independent banks, which is enjoyed by present holding companies, we would bring about a more competitive situation.

Surely the existence of monopolistic conditions in some areas is no justification for true opponents of monopoly to urge that their growth be permitted in all areas, on the principle of "justice among monopolies." The present degree of concentration of control does not give everyone else a vested right to equivalent expansion. Furthermore, the big holding companies, freed from the restraint of my amendment, would undoubtedly keep far ahead of the rest of the pack. These are unequal races, in which the strong usually outdistance the weak.

I am not interested in having a bank situation in which there are only two banks in a State competing with each other. I am interested in a bank situation in which there are a large number of banks with no monopoly and with a dispersion of power.

If the Senate really desires to reverse the trend toward the concentration of banking, it could write legislation requiring the divestiture not merely of nonbanking assets, but of banking properties themselves, beyond certain limits. If anyone proposes an amendment such as that, I again wish to assure him in advance that I shall support it. However, no one suggests such a proposal in the bill, and it should not be argued against my amendment that it does not require it.

What the bill with my amendment does is to check a rising trend to monopoly without undoing it completely.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion for the present?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will withhold it for the moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have grave doubt about the wisdom of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the form in which it is presented. I recognize that it is less severe than the House language which contains a flat, unequivocal prohibition against bank holding companies crossing State lines. But it is only slightly less severe in that it makes a blanket prohibition which can only be lifted by specific affirmative action by the States and in its present form creates an evil which I must oppose.

The net effect of the amendment is to require every State that does not now have legislation prohibiting bank holding companies to discriminate in favor of such corporations that may be resident in their State and against bank holding companies resident in any other State and requires affirmative legislation to remove the discrimination.

So far as I can learn, no State has of its own volition, and by action of its own legislature, set up such a discrimination. There are some States, including the State of Illinois, which prohibit all bank holding companies, domestic as well as foreign. This is not discriminatory. But I know of no State that permits domestic bank holding companies to operate within its borders and shuts out their counterparts residents in other States. That would be the effect of this amendment.

For Congress to require discrimination in interstate commerce, and then leave it to the several States to correct it, is a strange approach, out of harmony with the basic American concept of fairness and fair play. It smacks a little of the concept that a man is guilty until proved innocent.

It will have two other interesting consequences. It will preserve and protect the status quo in those States in which foreign or domestic bank holding companies are now operating, and will serve to intensify their expansion within these narrowed ranges. This would tend to set up some areas of bank holding company concentration and others that will be free.

I think I can look at this problem objectively. In my State we have two big bank holding companies represented, one foreign and one domestic, and a number of smaller local banking groups. At last count we had 97 banks in the State, 58 in holding companies and 46 operating as independents. So I am in the middle, and can afford to look at the principles involved. Since I want to eliminate rather than create discrimination, and since I want the States left free to act on this subject affirmatively for themselves, and not first be burdened with discrimination by our action, I am forced to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], not particularly as it affects the rights of the States, although I did serve for many years in my State in a capacity which afforded me opportunity to consider attempts to prevent discrimination by one State against another, the tendency, manifested again 2 years ago, to Balkanize State jurisdictions, and matters related to constitutionality, and so forth, and I believe constructive service was rendered in that field. However, I consider a constitutional question to be involved in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois was considered by the Banking and Currency Committee and was rejected by the committee. In fact, only four votes were recorded in favor of the proposal. The Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are all opposed to this amendment, because, in effect, it constitutes an absolute prohibition against future expansion by bank holding companies. I am sure it is obvious that every bank holding company in the country is opposed to this punitive proposal.

I stated earlier the procedure under S. 2577 for the Federal Reserve to consider every proposed acquisition of additional banks whether within the State or across State lines. Both types of acquisitions are treated the same. Under the bill, a bank holding company must obtain prior approval from the Federal Reserve Board before it can acquire a bank. The Federal Reserve Board in considering an application for an acquisiiton must take into consideration five factors. These factors are, first, the financial history and condition of the company or companies in the banks concerned; second, their prospects; third, character of their management; fourth, convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities in the area concerned; and, fifth, whether or not the effect of such acquisition would be to expand the size or extent of the bank holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking.

The last factor I named is the most important and requires the Federal Reserve Board to consider the question of the public interest and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. This provision gives the Federal Reserve Board power to prevent undue concentrations of banking activities and at the same time permits the strengthening and expansion of banking facilities when needed.

The Douglas amendment prohibits the acquisition of a bank outside the home State of a bank holding company unless the laws of the State to be entered specifically authorize such acquisition. I submit, Mr. President, that no State in this country has enacted laws along this line. So the effect of the Douglas amendment is to absolutely prohibit a bank from crossing State lines. This proposal suggests that bank holding companies are evil per se and that any further growth should be prohibited. The amendment is another attempt to force bank holding companies out of business. This is contrary to the theory of the Senate bill which seeks to regulate bank holding companies and not to punish them.

Some statements have been made to the effect that this amendment protects States' rights. I believe that I am as strong a States rights advocate as any Member of this body. However, this amendment forces States to take legislative action to protect themselves and thus is clearly a derogation of States' rights.

Section 7 of S. 2577 preserves the true States' rights in regard to this question. The bill reserves to the States their present authority to regulate bank holding company operations within their borders and does not force the States to take any action. The committee believes that this provision is an adequate preservation of the rights of our States.

I should also like to point out that the Douglas amendment runs counter to the policy of the National Bank Act and our dual system of National and State banks. The National Bank Act recognizes the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government over national banks just as the States have exclusive jurisdiction over State banks. The branch banking law is cited as a precedent for giving powers to States over national banks. The branch-banking law is the only major exception to the general rule that the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction over national banks.

However, it must be remembered that prior to the McFadden Act of 1927, national banks did not have statutory authority to establish branches. The purpose of the McFadden Act and the Banking Act of 1933 was to permit national banks to compete with State banks in States which authorized State banks to have branches. Congress merely gave national banks equal powers with State banks in respect to branch offices. These acts enlarged the powers of national banks rather than restricted them. Certainly it cannot be argued successfully that the branch-banking law is a precedent for permitting States to place restrictions on national banks and take away privileges they now enjoy.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to reiterate that the committee rejected this amendment. The Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and all the bank holding companies are absolutely opposed to it, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment in the interest of sound banking and the preservation of the competitive system of banking in our country as between the various States and as between the Federal Government and the States.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement concerning the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, for himself and other Senators, and concerning the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The junior Senator from Maine would like to speak briefly today in support of bank holding company bill S. 2577, now under debate by the Senate. At the very outset, I would like to emphasize my firm faith in the independent banking system which has been the foundation of economic growth in the United States, the traditional source of capital investment, and the holder of the savings of millions of individual Americans. It is my firm belief that S. 2577 with the amendments approved by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and with the additional amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will halt the trend toward the destruction of the independent banking system and will preserve independent banking as the financial base of the United States economy.

During the hearings held last summer on various bank holding bills before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, witnesses representing bank holding companies repeatedly questioned the need for regulation or limitation of their operations. These witnesses stated that there had been no abuse of either the letter or the spirit of the law in their operations. And they were right, because there is now no law that effectively regulates the conduct of the bank holding company. The bank holding company is structurally beyond the reach of present statutory laws. Separate segments of its operations are subject to careful regulation, such as its subsidiary banks which are subject to the national banking laws and to the banking laws of the States in which they operate. The nonbanking subsidiaries of bank holding companies are regulated in the same way as other completely independent corporations. However, the totality of the bank holding company operation is in many respects, because of its unique structure, beyond the law. Through its ability to cross State lines, the bank holding company can operate in a way closed to the independent bank. The competition presented by a single bank which is a subsidiary of a bank holding company may not in any legal sense be unfair competition, but the fact that it is backed by the powerful assets of a vast bank holding company gives it a competitive advantage that is undeniable. And this competitive advantage springs from the fact that the bank holding company can operate in a manner closed to the independent bank.

I have heard it said that the independent banker is afraid of competition. I do not believe that it is necessary to give any extended argument to disprove this assertion. The independent banker is naturally afraid of competition which is going to put him out of business. And he has every right to resent the competition of the bank holding company subsidiary which has capital resources behind it of a vastness not available to the independent banker by the very nature of his operation as an independent bank. Some would say that this kind of competition is good for the independent banks. It is not good for them if it is going to eliminate them as independent banking units. And it is not good for the economic stability of the country if independent banks are no longer able to compete successfully.

It is important to establish in any dicussion of bank holding company legislation the value of the independent banking system. The independent banking system has been the traditional banking system in the United States. The independent banks financed the economic growth of this country through some of its most expansive periods. Methods and regulations governing the methods of independent banking have evolved with the development of our economy. Mistakes which were made have been corrected so that we now have a carefully regulated and safe independent banking system, privately owned and operated, working for the benefit of the communities the independent banks serve.

The independent bank is a local operation, owned and managed by citizens of the community in which it operates. The particular financial needs and problems of the community are well-known and thoroughly understood by the directors and officers of the local independent bank who in no small measure contributes to the economic growth and financial well-being of that community. What is important to the community is important to the financial leaders of that community. And in the independent bank those financial leaders are in a position to act in the interests of the community.

In the bank whose control is in the hands of the bank holding company's shareholders, the policy of the bank must necessarily be concerned with insuring a profit to the controlling shareholders who are not in all likelihood, local people. What is most profitable for the shareholders may also be in the interest of the community in which the bank is operating, but this does not necessarily follow. Where there is a conflict between community interest and the profit interest of the shareholders who are not members of that community, it would seem likely that the policy of the bank might well be directed toward serving its shareholders. In the independent bank serving a community this situation will not arise in the same way. True the directors and officers of the independent bank must also serve their shareholders. But in most cases those shareholders are also local people, residents of the community. No one would pretend that every action taken by every board of directors of every independent bank is inevitably in the interests of the community which these banks are serving. But the incidence rate of a correaltion between the interest of local shareholders and the community itself could naturally be expected to be higher in the case of the independent bank than in the case of a bank which is owned by a bank holding company whose shareholders are spread throughout a far wider area than the town or city.

The bank is a semipublic institution. The bank may be privately owned, but in serving its owners, its activities must be in accord with the public interest, both to justify its existence and to comply with the laws which regulate banking. By insuring the preservation of the independent banking system through the passage of S. 2577, we can insure the preservation of the public character of banking.

The divestment provisions of S. 2577 have been described by some as unduly harsh, unnecessary, and unjust. If we accept the fundamental argument, and I think we must accept it, that it is neither wise nor safe nor in the public interest to combine banking assets with nonbanking assets in the same financial structure, then the divestment provisions of S. 2577 are neither unduly harsh, unnecessary, nor unjust. Special tax exemptions in the act will enable bank holding companies to preserve their nonbanking assets after divestment in the form of banking assets, or the bank holding company may distribute them to the holding company shareholders as the directors see fit.

Although I approve of S. 2577 as a definite step in the right direction, it is my feeling that more can be done to insure the preservation of the independent banking system at this time. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has introduced an amendment to S. 2577 which I have cosponsored. This amendment would require that State legislatures pass specific legislation authorizing bank holding companies from another State to acquire interests in State banks located within its borders. The purpose of this amendment is to return to the States their traditional control over the activities of the State banks now nominally under the State's authority.

S. 2577 leaves the control of the future expansion of bank holding companies to the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board. It is not my intention to question the capacity of the Federal Reserve Board to carry out the will of the Congress, but it seems to me that the control of expansion of bank holding companies across State lines into State banks is a matter of primary concern to the State governments and is an area best left to their discretion rather than to have it solely under the jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. President, in this brief statement, I have not attempted to go into the complexities of S. 2577. I have spoken in very broad terms, and have tried only to outline some of the reasons why I am in favor of S. 2577 with the amendment proposed by Senator DOUGLAS. We now have before us a bill which is just and reasonable. It does not pretend to rectify all the problems involved in bank holding companies. But it will, if enacted, go a long way toward halting the trend toward overconcentration of financial interests in the United States. The Douglas amendment would reestablish State authority over State banks. I am convinced that it will be in the interests of our banking system and in the interests of all the people of this Nation to enact S. 2577 with the Douglas amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia withhold his suggestion?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I have been advised that his amendment is favored by independent bankers across the country. I know of no group which is more identified with free enterprise than are the independent bankers; and I know of no group more in favor of States rights, so far as concerns protecting the economic interests at the lower level of private business institutions. What they have in effect pointed out is that the breadth of the extension of great banking empires across State lines as having a very detrimental effect upon the continuation of the American competitive system in the banking industry. It seems to me that if we are in favor of the competitive enterprise system we will support the Douglas amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McNamara
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Barkley	Hennings	Morse
Beall	Hill	Mundt
Bennett	Holland	Murray
Bible	Hruska	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bridges	Jackson	Pastore
Butler	Jenner	Payne
Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Carlson	Kefauver	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Kerr	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kuchel	Scott
Curtis	Laird	Smathers
Daniel	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Mansfield	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Frear	Martin, Pa.	Young
Fulbright	McCarthy	
George	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Douglas amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate will the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is handling the bill on the floor, indicate what position the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC took, if they took any position on the matter, when the amendment was presented in committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the amendment was first considered last summer, before the bill was reported. At that time there were no votes for the amendment. It was considered again in February. At that time there were four votes for the amendment. The testimony before the committee was that the President was in favor of the proposed legislation without the amendment. The amendment was opposed by the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the FDIC.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a supplementary question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that while there were only 4 votes for the amendment, there were only 6 votes against it?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The others were not recorded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for himself and other Senators. On this

question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

Also on this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Holland	McNamara
Anderson	Hruska	Millikin
Barkley	Humphrey	Morse
Bridges	Jackson	Murray
Byrd	Jenner	Neely
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Cotton	Kefauver	Payne
Curtis	Kerr	Potter
Daniel	Kuchel	Purtell
Dirksen	Laird	Russell
Douglas	Langer	Scott
Duff	Lehman	Smathers
Eastland	Long	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ervin	Mansfield	Symington
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Welker
George	Martin, Pa.	Wofford
Hennings	McCarthy	
Hill	McClellan	

NAYS—18

Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Mundt
Bennett	Frear	Robertson
Bible	Green	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hayden	Thye
Butler	Knowland	Williams
Carlson	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—20

Allott	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Barrett	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bender	Gore	Sparkman
Bush	Hickenlooper	Stennis
Chavez	Ives	Watkins
Clements	Kennedy	Wiley
Dworshak	Monroney	

So the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS, for himself and other Senators, was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF REPORT OF ALLEGED ATTACK UPON THE VICE PRESIDENT BY SENATOR McCARTHY

Mr. KERR obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oklahoma begins his speech will he yield to me for 1 minute? I should like to correct the record with respect to an event which occurred today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield for that purpose, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall not consume more than 1 minute.

Mr. KERR. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Today I heard over the radio a report to the effect that Senator McCARTHY had exposed the fact that the Vice President's campaign manager had taken $5,000 from certain people who were appearing before our committee today.

If anyone searches the record he will find I did not say a single word when the auditor was testifying.

I will state further that so far as I can see, there is nothing improper about the $5,000 fee referred to. It was a legal fee. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I had nothing whatsoever to do with any so-called exposure of Vice President NIXON. Mr. Kennedy was questioning the auditor, and the auditor mentioned the name of a certain individual, whose name I cannot even remember now. I know that Mr. Kennedy did not bring it up purposely, either. It was simply a routine question.

However I wish the record to be clear that I was not making any attack upon our Vice President.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma very much for yielding to me in order that I might make the record clear.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the chairman of the Republican National Committee has just released a statement in which he accuses the distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], of "using false figures and a cropped version of President Eisenhower's 1952 farm speeches in an attempt to distort what Mr. Eisenhower said and meant."

Further, the chairman of the Republican National Committee says:

> By lifting out of context a few sentences from the Kasson speech and by cutting from the tape entire paragraphs that came before, after and in between, Senator JOHNSON presented to a nationwide audience a tortured, twisted picture.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the chairman of the Republican National Committee finally got around to telling a part of the truth. Last night, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] told the American people the unadulterated, stark, and naked truth about the betrayal of the American farmer by Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States. The Senator from Texas told it from the record which Dwight D. Eisenhower, the candidate, and Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President himself had made. Mr. Leonard Hall is accurate when he says that record presents to the Nation "a tortured, twisted picture." Mr. President, the American farmer is the one who has been tortured, and the President of the United States is the one who has been twisted.

The words of the senior Senator from Texas were not the ones which went out over the air last night, Mr. President, in saying:

> And here, and now, without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books.

And, further, wherein it was said:

> All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout. And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity.

Those were the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, the candidate; and it was Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President, who twisted. I think he squirmed, Mr. President. The Republican national chairman is squirming because the truth has been presented to the American public. The truth has been presented to the American farmer. There is not a farmer in this Nation who does not know that he and his agricultural industry have been betrayed.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, the income of the American farmer has not been reduced a mere 20 or 25 percent. As was shown to a convention of Oklahoma bankers a few weeks ago, the average family income of Oklahoma farmers in 1955 was $1,200 per family. That was $1,000 per family less than it had been 3 years before. Any eighth grade student can figure out the degree of decrease which has been inflicted upon the farmers; and it has been inflicted upon them by the hand of Eisenhower. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas for going on television and telling the stark, naked truth. He presented the record which showed the tortured event whereby the President of the United States has twisted his own commitments, and his own promises to the American farmer. The Senator from Texas has laid bare the record. I congratulate him. I can understand the tortured and twisted features of the Republican national chairman as he views with dismay the sorry record, and learns of the repercussions which have come and will continue to come until the mighty tide of disappointment and retribution has

rolled against the White House and rolled out its present occupant.

Quoting further from Candidate Eisenhower, whom the Republican national chairman himself quotes in his release, I find these words:

> I certainly don't believe farming is going to stand still. I see an expanding future for American agriculture, and I'm sure you folks do too. With our growing population, our expanding industry, and our leadership in the free world, our farms will have a tremendous job to do. And to serve that future, working together as friends and neighbors, we can do much to improve and strengthen our farm programs.
>
> First, they must be cleansed of politics.

What a lofty sentiment. Yet I saw in today's press a story of the politics being played by the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. I see that he has fixed a support price for corn from allotted acres in commercial corn States at $1.50 a bushel.

I see that he has held out an inducement to the farmers in the so-called commercial corn States—23 in number, I believe—for them to disregard the allotments of acres. He has said to them, "Plant every acre you wish to plant, and I will support it at the price of $1.25 a bushel."

There are 48 States in the American Union. The other 25 States can look forward to a situation in which the corn which their farmers will produce will be supported at the level of $1.125 a bushel; and that policy comes from the Secretary of Agriculture, whose President made the pledge, first, that farm programs must be cleansed of politics.

What is it that impels an administration first to say that, "We shall have an allotted acreage for corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, wheat, and tobacco," and then to say to the wheat farmer, "If you produce a single fraction of an acre over and above your allotted acres, you cannot sell your wheat; it will not be supported at any price," and to the cotton farmer, with an acreage which has been reduced by more than 50 percent in 25 years, "If you produce one fraction of an acre over and above that allotted to you, you cannot get the support price, or any advantageous price for your product," to make the same statement to the peanut farmer and the rice farmer, and then, in the same breath, to say to the corn farmers in 23 States, "You have an allotment, and if you live by it, your corn will be supported at $1.50 a bushel. If you throw it out the window and plant twice that much, every bushel you sell will be supported at the price of $1.25 a bushel"?

The administration then says to corn farmers in the other 25 States of this great Union—and there are some in every such State, and many in some States—"Whatever corn you produce, you must sell at $1.125 a bushel."

That is from the Secretary of Agriculture, who is so pure that he puts purity above parity. He is working for a chief who has pledged, above all else, to cleanse farm programs of politics.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that the Department of Agriculture increased the parity on wheat and lowered the parity on cotton?

Mr. KERR. It did.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that when the Department of Agriculture was asked how this could be justified said the dollar value on all crops had been lowered? However, it turns out that the percentage of the lowering on cotton is far more than the percentage the other products in question were lowered.

Mr. KERR. Yes; but who knows whether they understand that the cotton farmer who sells for a dollar gets the same kind of dollar that the wheat farmer gets. Maybe they do not know that. Let us be charitable.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that this is the fourth year in which the Secretary of Agriculture has had the entire program under his control, subject only to the approval of the President?

Mr. KERR. Very largely.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma know the year in which the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will finally say that the farm problem is their problem, not the problem of previous administrations?

Mr. KERR. I hope that, so far as the present Secretary of Agriculture and the present President of the United States are concerned, that this will be the last year in which they will have that opportunity. [Laughter.]

Mr. SYMINGTON. So do I. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, farmers in my State of Missouri are very grateful to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas for the fine, truthful, and well-portrayed presentation he made to the American people last evening with respect to the farm problem.

I congratulate the distinguished majority leader for one of the finest presentations of its kind ever made, particularly as many of us are so anxious to start getting the truth on many subjects to the American people. Through the distinguished senior Senator from Texas the truth about the farm problem is now before the American farmer and the American people as a whole.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First I wish to thank my good friend from Missouri for his very generous remarks.

It is rather significant that the first Republican reply to my speech came from the head of the political party, the Republican National Committee. Obviously, the facts have stung Mr. Hall. The charge that I took General Eisenhower's statement out of context is absolutely absurd, and no one knows that better than does Mr. Hall.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, there be printed in the RECORD the speech made by President Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952, as issued by Mr. Hall and by the Republican National Committee. I make this request so that every Member of the Senate and every American who cares to see or hear, will realize that the Hall statement is nothing but pure political bunkum, and that Mr. Hall proves it by the statement he himself has issued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield in a moment. First I wish to make an observation. I appreciate what the majority leader has just said. I must say to him, however, that I disagree with him. I have not found anything in it that is pure. It is filled with bunkum, but I must say to my good friend from Texas I do not find any purity in it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I accept the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to those who may be interested in the veracity or authenticity of the statement made by the Senator from Texas in his radio and television broadcast may examine the speeches of Candidate Eisenhower at Fargo, N. Dak.; Brookings, S. Dak.; Omaha, Nebr.; Columbia, S. C.; and at all points in between.

I further suggest that when some of us in 1952 said, "You cannot believe him. He does not mean it. This is a Republican trick. This is one of those election-year promises," a whole battery of Republican Senators and Representatives and spokesmen rose up in a mighty chorus and said, "Oh, no. It is true. We testify that it is true." I submit as evidence the daily newspapers published on the day following the Kasson speech.

I have previously inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the issue of the Minneapolis Star on that point. That is a newspaper which has repeatedly supported the present administration. At times it has not carried the news about the truth some of us have been attempting to tell of the agricultural problems. That newspaper carried the headline, Eisenhower Pledges 100 Percent of Parity. It carried editorials along that same line. The Minneapolis Star claimed to be one of the more objective newspapers. It was trying to be fair, it said.

If anyone will examine Candidate Eisenhower's statements, he will come to one conclusion, namely, that he promised 90 percent of parity as a minimum. He said he was really for 100 percent of parity, and he was going to deliver it.

There is no Republican alive—and I do not believe the Republicans can resurrect anyone—who will say that in 1952 any member of the Republican Party denied that Candidate Eisenhower said he was for 90 percent of parity.

Let us remember that the Republicans did not have that in their platform. Let us remember that they endorsed in their platform something other than 90 percent of parity. They made quite a to-do about it. They said the President himself had come boldly forth—and I put the word "boldly" in quotation marks—with this new farm program.

I was present at Kasson. I say that in the bright sunlight of God's universe Candidate Eisenhower outbid Adlai Stevenson by 10 percent in front of 70,000 people. [Laughter.]

Let us make no mistake about what he said. It comes with ill grace from Mr. Hall, the Republican campaign director and chairman, who has never been in favor of an effective farm program—and let his record be examined also—to say now, after the votes have been garnered, "Well, really, you misunderstood what the President said. You misinterpreted what Candidate Eisenhower said."

I ask anyone who is interested in fair play to examine the speeches made by Candidate Eisenhower in September and October of 1952. They are very clear indeed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Inasmuch as we are talking about purity and honesty——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thought it was parity we were talking about.

Mr. CAPEHART. Or parity. If that is what we want to talk about, let us keep the record straight. Let us be honest about what Candidate Eisenhower said.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator sure that Mr. Hall can survive it?

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Texas has inserted in the RECORD the speech of Candidate Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn. Let us read it. The President said on that occasion:

> And here and now, without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic farm act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. President, that is exactly what was done, notwithstanding what Senators on the other side of the aisle are saying. The 90-percent support was continued through 1954, as Mr. Eisenhower said it would. Let us have a little honesty. Let me read a little further:

> These price supports are only fair to the farmer to underwrite the exceptional risk he is now taking. They are a moral and a legal commitment which must be upheld.
>
> We now have at least 2 years in which to plan ahead. We must use this valuable time to figure out sound means and methods of maintaining and expanding both securities and opportunities in agriculture. We must mobilize all of the brains in agriculture—farmers, farm organizations—

And so forth. Then he said:

> All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout.

That is exactly the position of every Senator on the other side of the aisle.

> And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity.

He was talking about the market place. He was talking about farmers having 90 or 100 percent without Government supports. He was absolutely 100 percent honest. He has lived up to his statement when he said that 90 percent would carry through 1954. It did carry it through 1954.

So if we want to have a little purity and a little honesty and take a good look at the record, let us do so.

I saw the President this morning, and he did not——

Mr. KERR. I did not yield to the Senator to make a speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me tell the Senator how the President looked. He was not very much worried about what Senators are saying about him. He looked very pleasant; he had a big smile on his face. He was not concerned about the misinformation which is being spread and the misstatements which are being made about him.

Why do we take things out of context? Why, when the Senator made his statement a few minutes ago, did he not say that the administration continued the law with reference to parity through 1954? Why did the Senator not include the words of the President that every farmer would prefer to get 90 or 100 percent in the free market?

Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Indiana said the President looked urbane, happy, and carefree; and I think he is.

Mr. CAPEHART. He was not worried about what the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators have been saying about him.

Mr. KERR. He is not worried about anything. He is a perfect example of the ancient adage that they who know nothing fear nothing.

The Senator from Indiana calls upon us to be honest. I must say that is the principle the Republicans have always wanted applied to the Democratic Party. There may come a time when they will even submit to it themselves; and that would not be a bad thing.

But the Senator from Indiana read the clincher from this statement himself, where the President said:

"All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have a Government handout," or words to that effect. He also stated that a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity, but full parity.

If he had been honest and had meant 90 percent of parity in the market place in one sentence, and 90 percent of parity, under the law, in another sentence, he should have said so. But he used the same terms in each sentence, and the last one was to the effect that the farmers' fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity but full parity.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement preliminarily to asking the Senator from Oklahoma a question.

Some years ago in North Carolina, in one of the counties the Republicans conducted a campaign for the election of their candidate to the legislature. When Mose got to the legislature he took a position which was directly opposite to the position taken by the Republican Party in its State platform. Some Democrats asked him how he reconciled his position with his party's platform, and Mose said he did not undertake to reconcile it. He said, "My friends all know that a platform is writ to get in on."

My question is, Is it possible that Republican speeches are made for the same purpose for which Republican platforms are written; namely, to get in on?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. But the Senator from Texas hit the nail on the head a while ago when he said the national Republican chairman is hollering so loudly because he is hurt. He would not be squealing and screaming if the pinch was not getting tighter and tighter. That is why he tries to lead the people's mind away from the real picture, so that they will think of something else instead of the broken promises and betrayals of the American farmer by this administration.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, after I read a brief sentence, how he interprets it. Here are the exact words of the President in Columbia, S. C., on October 3, 1952, when he was seeking the farmers' votes. I read:

> For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any ifs or buts in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What was the present program?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The program he was speaking about, in regard to parity.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Which carried through the year 1954, and the President of the United States lived up to its terms.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No, no.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I think it might be noteworthy that the President of the United States lived up to the law which he had taken his solemn oath to uphold and defend. That may be a justification for our giving him a medallion of merit because he lived up to his oath of office in that regard.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I wish to answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina.

The interpretation of that language can be but one thing, and that is that President Eisenhower said, "I approve of

this program of 90 percent of parity on the basics."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If he had taken the position suggested by the minority leader, would he not have said to the people, "I am for anything that is on the statute books at any time"?

Mr. KERR. If he had lived up to the implications of what has been said to us by the Senator from Indiana, if he had been for something less than honest, he would have said so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have here a photostatic copy of the speech of General Eisenhower at Columbia, S. C., on September 30, 1952, printed at page 29 of the New York Times for October 1, 1952. The quotation is precisely as the Senator from South Carolina has read it, and which I repeat:

> For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

In the subsequent sentence dealing with the farm question, there is no mention of the law terminating in 1954, and the impression which was given was that he was in favor of it as a principle.

Mr. President, I ask the pages to give copies of this full and complete text to the Senator from California and the Senator from Indiana. If they can find any "escape hatch" with reference to 1954, I shall be grateful and ask them to come forward and read it to Members of the Senate.

I also have a quotation taken from the New York Times, and a release issued on the train of the speech of Candidate Eisenhower at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4 which reads as follows:

> The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity with the guarantee in the price supports of 90 percent.

Note, Mr. President, that Candidate Eisenhower said "with the guarantee in the price supports of 90 percent."

I believe at least one of the distinguished Senators from South Dakota stood on the platform with General Eisenhower when he made that statement, and I am sure that as honorable men, those who were there will verify it as correct.

On that afternoon, Candidate Eisenhower journeyed to Fargo, N. Dak., and made the following statement:

> I went to Kasson, Minn., and on behalf of Republican leaders, and with the concurrence of the great men of the party, at least all that could be reached in time, I stated exactly what we want to do, and the present 90 percent of parity price in the farm program was sustained and supported completely.

I think these quotations at Columbia, S. C., at Brookings, S. Dak., and at Fargo, N. Dak., when added to the Kasson speech, are pretty clear that General Eisenhower certainly gave the impression to the country that he was in favor of 90 percent of parity. In fact, some of the wording is precisely 90 percent, without any qualifications. And, certainly, the impression given to midwestern farmers and to the newspapers was that it was 90 percent, because we can assemble and put into the RECORD the newspaper headlines showing that 90 percent had been pledged, but no mention of a possible hedge was included.

I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me for bringing out this additional evidence to support the quotation from the Kasson speech.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for adding further to the documentation of the record, clearly proving that the President repudiated the program he had pledged himself to strive for and betrayed the American farm family, for instead of giving them 90 percent of parity they are now receiving less than 70 percent of parity on their agricultural products.

Now I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While the Senator from Oklahoma is placing material in the RECORD, he might be interested in the Democratic platform of 1948, which said specifically:

> We favor a permanent system of flexible price supports for agricultural products to maintain farm income on a parity with farm operating costs.

The word "permanent" is particularly called to the Senator's attention.

Mr. KERR. Let me say about the principle which the Senator has enunciated that I am glad the Democrats have got to the point where they do not support it. I am sorry the time has come when a Republican President embraces it and refuses to budge from it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma, with the greatest respect, that I think the President's position was clear, as can be seen if the entire speech and the series of speeches are taken in their proper context. He was speaking about an extension to and through the year 1954, which was a platform pledge, and which was carried out, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows.

There is ample room for a difference of opinion as to what the basic policies of the country should be apropos either fixed or flexible price supports. Men may honestly differ on that issue. But I say most respectfully to the Senator from Oklahoma that if he is attempting to demonstrate to the country that the President of the United States has willfully misled or attempted to mislead the American people, I do not think he will sell the people that bill of goods.

I submit that in this kind of situation we are prepared to go to a solemn referendum of the American people, who have confidence in the integrity of President Eisenhower. I do not think anything which the Senator from Oklahoma may say here will change the judgment of the American people in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wonder if the minority leader would include the chairman of the Republican National Committee, who has made a charge of distortion and of falsely presenting a statement by the President of the United States. I have placed in the RECORD everything the President said. I placed last night on the television screen the President's own picture and his own words at Kasson, Minn., including everything he had to say about the 90 percent price supports.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I heard the 11:30 o'clock program. I saw the presentation which the Senator from Texas made on television. I heard the words of the President of the United States. I will say in all fairness that the Senator from Texas included in the script the statement of the President that it was through the year 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from California agree with the chairman of the Republican National Committee that the Senator from Texas presented a tortured, twisted, clipped, mutilated version of the speech?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not defending the statement of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, because I have not had a chance to read it. I am defending the integrity of the President of the United States and stating that I do not believe he knowingly or willfully misrepresented his position to the American people. I say that if the President's speeches during the campaign are taken in their context, the President's position was clear in that regard.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the President has changed his position. That is what I said last night.

I know the Senator from California would not defend the chairman of the Republican National Committee in his charge that the Senator from Texas presented a tortured, twisted, clipped, mutilated picture, when that is not so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. No; not just now. I will yield later.

I have the highest regard for the integrity and intelligence of the distinguished Senator from California. There is this difference between him and the President of the United States—the Senator from California knows what he believes in. He is unafraid to say so. If he announces a position today, Senators on both sides of the aisle may have complete confidence that when the sun rises tomorrow, the Senator from California will take the same position. I think that when the session opens in January 1957, the Senator from California will remember what he said and understand what it meant, and will be both intelligent enough and honest enough to stay with the position and be able to defend it.

In answer to his inquiry whether I challenge the integrity of the President of the United States, I do not say that the President of the United States willfully falsified. I say the President of the United States in 1952 said he would do a certain thing. I say that the President has not done it. I do not know whether he is aware of it or not.

I do not believe my good friend from California knows whether the President of the United States knows whether he has willfully or unwillfully produced an

official record diametrically opposed to his campaign promises. But I say to my good friend from California that every farm family in the country knows that President Eisenhower has repudiated Candidate Eisenhower's campaign promises. That is the record.

I say further to my good friend from California that not only are we willing to go to the people in a referendum in November; we cannot avoid it. The inexorable march of time will bring to an end this term of the President of the United States. He of necessity, if he carries the standard of the party of the Senator from California into the political battlefield this fall, must meet that issue.

The aurora, or aura, or diadem, or halo of superb knowledge and of supernal spiritual attitude which Eisenhower wore in 1954 has become so dim and disarranged that he had better get something else at which to point when he subjects himself to the result of that referendum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma find it rather peculiar that at the very same time a statement comes from the chairman of the Republican National Committee, we are reminded repeatedly and repeatedly by the President of the United States and his Secretary of Agriculture that the surpluses are due to 90 percent of parity and the Democratic farm program?

If Eisenhower and if Benson are going to say that, then why did they not have the courage in 1952 to say that the program ought to come to an end? Mark my words, every complaint against the Democratic farm program has been that it produced surpluses, and the reason it produced surpluses was 90 percent of parity, and there was 90 percent of parity in 1952, which Eisenhower pledged his party to sustain and continue. He repudiated that pledge once he came into office, but at the same time continues to beat a dead cat as to 90 percent of parity producing surpluses.

He cannot have it both ways. He cannot, on the one hand, say, "We are for the 90-percent program; we want to sustain the 90-percent program; we would like to have the farmers get 100 percent of parity"; then move into the other vacant lot of political activity and say, "The 90-percent program is what produces surpluses, and it is surpluses which produce farm misery"; and then go over to the other side again and say, "We are for 90 percent, but not for misery."

Mr. President, this administration has played both sides of the street. The administration has no consistency whatsoever in its agricultural philosophy. In 1954, set-asides were legitimate. Eisenhower said they were right, noble, pure, and honorable. But in 1956, when the set-aside principle is used in the Senate, it becomes politics, delay, and obstruction, and is unworkable.

The administration has played politics with agriculture. I shall undertake in a colloquy later with the Senator from Oklahoma to show that Chairman Hall does not know what he is talking about, not only on this subject, but on another. He has not only refused to know the facts, but, I may say most candidly, he is immune from them.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I think Mr. Hall is allergic to the facts.

The Senator from Minnesota asked me if I thought President Eisenhower could work both sides of the street. I answer the Senator by saying that the President will do it if he can. I never saw a man try to do that any harder than the President is trying.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to know whether the President of the United States has actually denied that he promised to support 90 percent of parity on basic commodities. I have seen that statement denied for him. I would be curious to know whether he has personally denied it. I would like to know if the President has even been confronted with the quotations and has undertaken to say there were some "ifs" and "buts" and that he had some weasel words in there to protect himself, so he would not have to go along with 90 percent.

Mr. KERR. Let me say at that point that I would have more diligence than I am capable of to ascertain whether the President knows what is going on. Not only has he made no effort to answer the charges I shall make here, and which the Senator from Texas documented last night; I am not even sure that tonight President Eisenhower knows that his record has been documented and proved to be in direct contradiction of his campaign pledges.

Mr. LONG. Let me suggest the course of events which might very well shed some light on the situation.

The President was quoted, at the time he was seeking the nomination, as having said to farm leaders that he really did not know what parity was, and that he had to rely on others to inform him. Then, after he was nominated, he went to the farm areas and he subjected himself to the distinguished leaders of that area, like the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota, who believed in high support prices. Certainly he was in an area where Republicans believe in high support prices. In that area he proceeded to promise 90 percent of parity, which farm leaders in that area seemed to support.

Subsequently, after his election, he appointed Ezra Taft Benson to be Secretary of Agriculture, who said he was against the whole idea. The President surrounded himself with a Cabinet of millionaires, who were all against the idea.

Did it ever occur to the Senator from Oklahoma that the persons by whom the President was surrounded tried to persuade the President that he had not promised what the rest of us thought he had promised?

Mr. KERR. I do not know whether they tried to persuade him, or prepared instruments for him to sign and he was not aware of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Let us divide the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KERR. I shall yield to my delightful friend from Indiana, because I am waiting for him to tell us how he feels about the veto of the conference report for which he voted.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us be fair and keep the record straight.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator want to do both? Had we better not take them up one at a time?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not too certain, the way the Senator has been talking recently, he would understand both of them; but here is the record. The law which established price supports at from 52 to 75 percent was passed in 1938. Then the law was changed during the war to make the support 90 percent. The law provided that 2 years after the war the supports were to go back from 52 to 75 percent. Then the Korean war broke out, and price supports were continued at 90 percent.

President Eisenhower made the statement—and I hold it in my hand, and it was understood by everyone—that he was talking about 90-percent supports to remain through 1954.

So the parity established by the party of the Senator from Oklahoma in 1938 was 52 to 75 percent. When the war started, parity was increased to 90 percent, and there was written into the law the provision that 2 years after the war ended parity would go back to from 52 to 75 percent. It would have gone back to that except that the Korean war broke out and parity was continued at 90 percent. President Eisenhower in the statement which has been quoted, and many other statements he made—he may have forgotten it in his Columbia speech; I do not know——

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean he may have forgotten what he said when he made the speech, or that he forgot he made the speech?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is nobody quite equal to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. KERR. I know my friend is confused, but I am still from Oklahoma.

Mr. CAPEHART. I mean Oklahoma. The Senator becomes terribly confused about a lot of these matters. For example, the able Senator from Oklahoma a moment ago made a statement which he knew was untrue, when he said parity was 70 percent. The Senator knows it is not 70 percent. He knows parity on corn is 86 percent. He knows——

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator make the statement again?

Mr. KERR. I do not yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator make the statement again?

Mr. KERR. I do not yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Oklahoma made the statement, and he knew when he made it that he was not telling the truth, because parity is not 70 percent.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from Indiana take his seat, and that he observe the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. What about sticking to the facts on both sides?

The Senator knows parity supports are not 70 percent.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the distinguished Senator from Indiana lost control of himself. I knew that he was wandering in a field where he either was unable to see or was unwilling to see. I knew that he was confused, as he proved when he referred to me as the Senator from Colorado. I deeply regret that he made the charge that what the Senator from Oklahoma said was untrue and that the Senator from Oklahoma knew it was untrue.

I now repeat that the average price received by the farm families in this country for their overall production is at less than 70 percent of parity; and I say to the Senator from Indiana, if he will get his nose out of the unsupported statistics issued by the Department of Agriculture and will look at the cash receipts of the American farm family for farm products they are selling, he, too, will know that statement is true.

He knows, as well as I do, that the price of hogs today is less than 65 percent of parity. He knows, as well as I do, that the price of cattle today is less than 60 percent of parity. And if he will examine the parity figures and then find out what the farmers are actually receiving for what they sell, he will know what they know, and that is that their overall receipts——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I do not yield to the Senator unless he is willing to say that he was mistaken when he said the Senator from Oklahoma knew he was stating an untruth.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator permit me to make a statement?

Mr. KERR. I do not permit the Senator to make a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma does not yield to the Senator from Indiana; therefore, the Senator from Indiana has no right to the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Well, I am standing on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is sitting on it now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. In a moment I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Senator from Indiana for becoming angry. If I, in the exercise of my best judgment on the basis of my responsibility to my people had spoken on this floor as he did, and had voted for the conference report, and then had been slapped in the face by the President of the United States by an ill-founded and unwarranted veto, I would resent it, too; and as I contemplated the burdens upon me, as I had to go back to my constituents and, on the one hand, justify my decision and my act in voting for a decent farm program, and then on the other hand tell them, "I want you at the same time to vote for and support the man who struck it down," I would be under a lot of emotional strain and stress, and I would be vexed and bedeviled, too.

The Senator from Indiana often is very genial. He is vigorous in his partisanship, yes; sometimes, like a bull in a china shop, if he cannot break it, he will mess it up. [Laughter.] But on the whole, Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is a lovable fellow. So I am surprised and astounded that by reason of the twisting duress upon him to live not only with his own vote, but also with the ill-warranted veto of the President, the Senator from Indiana would permit himself to get into such an emotional storm, that he would reach a point where he would call honorable men speakers of deliberate untruth. I am shocked and surprised. If and when the Senator from Indiana wishes to return to the fray on the basis of mutual esteem, I shall welcome him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. Yes, Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will apologize for what he said—but not otherwise.

Mr. CAPEHART. I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that I shall apologize, standing in the front of this Chamber, if the statement the Senator from Oklahoma made, namely, that at the moment the prices the farmers receive is, on an average, 70 percent, is shown to be correct. I am saying that on March 15, the average was 82½ percent. We shall be in session tomorrow, and by then we shall be able to verify the facts. If the facts show that in making that statement, the Senator from Oklahoma made a true statement, I shall apologize, standing in the front of the Senate Chamber, and I shall be delighted to do so.

Let me say that I voted for the conference report on the farm bill. I have never been particularly opposed to 90-percent supports, and do not feel they have anything to do with the problem.

The only reason I have been speaking here is that I simply do not like the attack the Senator from Oklahoma made on the President of the United States. I do not like it because the innuendoes and round-about statements which have been made are rather cruel, when made against a President of the United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Indiana that I did not accuse the President of the United States of deliberately lying. However, that is what the misguided Senator from Indiana accused the Senator from Oklahoma of doing.

Mr. CAPEHART. A moment ago I said that if the facts are as the Senator from Oklahoma stated, I shall apologize while standing in the front of the Senate Chamber; and I referred to the Senator's statement that today the average farm-commodity price is 70 percent of parity.

Mr. KERR. I say that the Senator did not dispute that the average price received by the farmers was 70 percent. The Senator from Indiana got so carried away with self-hypnosis that he said the Senator from Oklahoma willfully and deliberately made a statement that he knew to be false. That is what I resented, and that is what I resent; and I do not yield further to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. No; I refuse to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield further.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me for a second?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not yield further, unless the Senator from Indiana is ready to withdraw the statement he made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will never withdraw it, if what the Senator from Oklahoma said is not true.

Mr. KERR. Then, Mr. President, I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oklahoma proves to me that the statement he made was a true one, I will apologize to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma declines to yield. A Senator who has the floor has a right to decline to yield, and no other Senator has a right to interrupt him if he declines to yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I shall write to my friend, Claude Wickard, in Indiana, and tell him to take a little pressure off my friend, the Republican Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I knew Claude Wickard was on the tail of the Senator from Indiana and was giving him a lot of worry; but I did not think he had the Senator from Indiana in such mental turmoil as is now evident.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is not imputing bad motives to anyone, but would like to have the record kept straight, and would like to have the privilege of having printed at this point in the RECORD the five paragraphs in which General Eisenhower, then Candidate Eisenhower, dealt with the farm problem, in the speech he made at Columbia, S. C., on September 30, 1952. I have read these paragraphs with care, over and over again. They are the only paragraphs in that speech dealing with the farmer. There can be no charge that the words have been torn from their context. I submitted them to the Senator from Indiana. He has very graciously given them back to me. But I can say they do not contain a single reference to the 90-percent program stopping in 1954. The only impression we can get is that they constitute a pledge to continue 90 percent; and those who try to say that pledge was to last only to 1954 are just torturing and twisting the words.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is eminently correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For example, I believe wholeheartedly and without any "ifs" or "buts" in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities. I believe that the farmers should obtain their full share of the national income.

I am for programs to put a firm foundation under farm prosperity and to strengthen the family farm as the mainstay of our agricultural production, including soil conservation, research, rural electrification, rural telephones, farm credit, farmer cooperatives, farm-to-market roads.

But I am for ending this era in which, increasingly, the American farmers have been looked upon by the Department of Agriculture as Washington's stepchild. The independent American farmer is nobody's ward. And management and direction of the farm program—federally financed though it will be—must be turned over to farmers. It must be made, not only for them, but of and by them.

And I am sure of one thing: The Brannan plan for the regimentation of American agriculture was not cooked up among the farmers of South Carolina or of any other State in the Union.

You cannot fasten the blame on our farmers for Washington's increasing controls over farming and for the increasing arrogance of those sent out by Washington to enforce them. Every American farmer knows better than that. He knows so much better that he, too, is ready to vote for a change.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is eminently correct; and, in my judgment, that is the reason why the Senator from Indiana took the photostatic copy and looked at it, and then held it under the desk until he could return it to the Senator from Illinois, without referring to it in his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some time ago the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] brought to our attention the 1948 platform of the Democratic Party in regard to agriculture. He read it accurately and correctly.

However, I think it would be well to note that Mr. Harry S. Truman, then the Democratic candidate for President of the United States, and Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, then the Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States, made it crystal clear to the American people where they stood as regards agriculture, and made their voices heard throughout the land. Furthermore, the records reveal that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], cast the deciding vote, when he was Vice President of the United States, in order to keep his campaign promise; he did that as Vice President of the United States when, in the 81st Congress, the Senate voted to extend the 90-percent-of-parity act. That is what I mean by following through and keeping one's promise and assuring the public of the responsibility of one's position.

Furthermore, I note that the able Senator from California did not read the Democratic platform of 1952. That platform reads in part that "under the present farm program, our farmers have performed magnificently and have achieved unprecedented production. We applaud the recent congressional action in setting aside the sliding scale for price support through 1954, and we will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural commodities under the terms of a mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity."

That was the Democratic platform.

The Republican platform is about as clear as mud on this issue; and I should like to read what the Republicans had to say about parity:

We favor a farm program aimed at full parity prices for all farm products in the market place. Our program includes commodity loans on nonperishable products, on-the-farm storage, sufficient farm credit, and voluntary self-supporting crop insurance.

It was because of the ambiguity and the indefiniteness and the uncertainty of the meaning of that particular language in the Republican platform that in 1952 Candidate Eisenhower, after consultation with Republican farm leaders—and such consultations were noted in the press and were heralded as a new day—said, "We shall make it explicit; we shall make it clear"; and in a series of speeches, without any "ifs" or "buts" or "ands" or "ors" he read it out; and in Brookings, S. Dak., it was explicit, beyond any shadow of a doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I finish what I was saying?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to comment at this point, if the Senator from Minnesota will permit, and if the Senator from Oklahoma will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. I shall yield for that purpose, Mr. President, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to comment that Mr. Hall is completely silent in his attack upon me with respect to the quotation from General Eisenhower's Brookings, S. Dak., speech. I think Hall's silence is very conspicuous. I assume that he has no complaints in that connection. He has not been able to conjure up an answer as to the Brookings, S. Dak., speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If Mr. Hall could conjure up an answer for this one, he would provide an escape hatch or loophole which would make Houdini look as though he were tonguetied and a victim of cramps and rheumatism.

Mr. KERR. And arthritis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. This is what the candidate Eisenhower said at Brookings, S. Dak.

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent price support; and it is pledged, even more than that, to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent of parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90.

There was no dateline on that statement. This was after Kasson. This was after we had been saying that the Republican candidate was trying to give only a half-commitment, or a partial commitment, to agriculture. I know, because I was on the stump in my part of the country. It was carried in the press that the agricultural policy committee of the Democratic Party challenged the sincerity of the pledge at Kasson. This was on the 4th day of October, rather than on the 6th day of September. I ought to remember that sad day. On the 6th of September, at Kasson, some idea was inculcated that perhaps the promise applied only until 1954. That was for the lawyers, and the fine print experts, not for the editors, publishers, and politicians. They had it going on into eternity.

But when we got to Brookings, the pressure was on. The critics had been after the candidate of the Republican Party. In one speech after another we questioned whether the pledge at Kasson was a real and true one. What did Eisenhower say? He did not give any dateline. He said:

The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support; and it is pledged, even more than that, to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent of parity, with the guarantee in the price supports of 90.

It is possible we are unkind. Possibly the President was confused in the appointment of his Cabinet officers. What the President wanted was a flexible foreign policy, apparently, and a firm agricultural policy. What he should have done was to appoint Benson Secretary of State and Dulles Secretary of Agriculture. Then he would have had it.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I close with this observation: There may be an honest difference of opinion here as to what the President meant by what he said. I do not believe there is any room for doubt, or any form of misjudgment. I do not believe there is any possibility of avoiding the conclusion, from an inspection of the record, that he promised one thing, and, in his official record, has done another. But this I do say: The American farmer knows that he is the victim of the betrayal. He is the victim of the failure to live up to the campaign pledges made by Dwight D. Eisenhower; and after the November election Dwight D. Eisenhower will know that the American farmer knew of the betrayal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator aware of the charge that Mr. Hall

brought against our colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], with respect to the distortion of figures relating to Iowa farm income?

Mr. KERR. I read that statement in the release.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator will note that the chairman of the Republican Party stated:

As a further illustration of Senator JOHNSON'S recklessness with statistics, I would point to his assertion that "last year the farmers in Iowa earned only 50 percent of the income that they got the year before."

I cite for the RECORD a New York Times story of April 15. The headline is "Farm Income Off 50 Percent in Iowa in 1955—College Study Shows Decline in Cash for Crops and Livestock on Good Land."

The dispatch is dated Ames, Iowa, April 14. This is from the Iowa State College of Agriculture, one of the truly great agricultural schools in America.

Mr. KERR. At one time I believe it was presided over by the brother of the President of the United States; is that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not sure. I believe not.

Mr. KERR. I am mistaken. That was a university in Kansas. I am becoming as confused as was the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who thought I was from Colorado.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The item from the New York Times reads, in part, as follows:

A special economic survey, made available this week by Iowa State College, offered a new explanation as to why so many Midwestern farmers are now in a general state of unrest.

Detailed records, kept by Iowa farmers in cooperation with the college, showed that even on above-average property the average net cash income in 1955 had dropped in every type of farm operation.

The average profit per acre was down more than 50 percent from that of 1954, and the return on livestock for each $100 worth of feed dropped as much as 32 percent in some sections of the State.

These findings were not based on scattered interviews with Iowa farmers. They were compiled from a standard record system devised by the college and kept in all parts of the State by farmers who volunteered to participate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article, by Seth S. King, a special correspondent of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME OFF 50 PERCENT IN IOWA IN 1956—COLLEGE STUDY SHOWS DECLINE IN CASH FOR CROPS AND LIVESTOCK ON GOOD LAND

(By Seth S. King)

AMES, IOWA, April 14.—A special economic survey, made available this week by Iowa State College, offered a new explanation as to why so many Midwestern farmers are now in a general state of unrest.

Detailed records, kept by Iowa farmers in cooperation with the college, showed that even on above-average property the average net cash income in 1955 had dropped in every type of farm operation.

The average profit per acre was down more than 50 percent from that of 1954, and the return on livestock for each $100 worth of feed dropped as much as 32 percent in some sections of the State.

These findings were not based on scattered interviews with Iowa farmers. They were compiled from a standard record system devised by the college and kept in all parts of the State by farmers who volunteered to participate.

On the basis of records from 148 Iowa farms, all modern and above average in soil quality and equipment, the study showed that net cash income averaged $7,051 in 1955. In 1954 it was $8,269. In 1953 it was $10,247.

CROP VALUES DOWN

The gross value of crops per acre dropped to $57 in 1955, compared with $68 in 1954, and $64 in 1953. The returns in livestock sales for each $100 of feed fed to the animals dropped to $109 in 1955, compared with $141 in 1954 and $143 in 1953.

The sharpest drop was shown in the net income per acre on all types of farm operations. This declined to $15 in 1955, compared with $39 in 1954 and $56 in 1953. This was caused by a lowering of gross profits per acre from $81 in 1954 to $56 in 1955. During that time expenses per acre declined only $1, from $42 in 1954 to $41 in 1955.

The percentage of Iowa farms that either made no money or lost money showed a pronounced increase.

In north central Iowa, a highly productive part of the State, 17.9 percent were in this category in 1955, compared with only 1.9 percent in 1954. In western Iowa, where the drought was particularly severe last year, 32 percent showed no profit or a loss. Only 0.7 percent were classed this way in 1954.

The study of net farm income, compared with net cash income, showed even greater losses in 1955 than in 1954. This comparison took into consideration the total cash sales plus or minus the amount of feed, livestock, and operating expenses involved.

Under this study, net farm income dropped 59 percent on farms in north central Iowa and 61 percent on those in western Iowa. It indicated that farmers had been forced to sell much greater numbers of cattle and much more feed to produce the income they did get and that the cost of replacing the cattle would be greater in 1956.

EXHIBIT 1

The following passage is from President Eisenhower's address at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952:

"I pledge you that the Republican Party is going forward with positive, aggressive, farmer-run farm programs.

"The first thing we intend to do is to take the emphasis off Washington. The American farmer has had enough of government by long distance.

"Next, there's going to be a spring house cleaning of the unscrupulous leadership that would use farm programs for political purposes. There will be no more of this business of using Federal power to export the farmers' vote.

"And here and now, without any ifs or buts, I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

"These price supports are only fair to the farmer to underwrite the exceptional risk he is now taking. They are a moral and legal commitment which must be upheld.

"We now have at least 2 years in which to plan ahead. We must use this valuable time to figure out sound means and methods of maintaining and expanding both security and opportunities in agriculture. We must mobilize all of the brains in agriculture—farmers, your farm organization leaders, your farm-wise legislators, your agricultural specialists and research workers—to join with us to build and improve our long-range farm policies and programs.

"Our goal will be sound, farmer-run programs that safeguard agriculture—but do not regiment you, do not put the Federal Government in charge of your farms. We must, by using good old-fashioned horse sense, figure out sound methods of maintaining agriculture's freedom to shift patterns of production without losing the basic protections to which agriculture is entitled. We must realize that no formula developed at any particular time is infallible. Conditions change. What counts is being prepared to do the right thing at the right time.

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal in ways that minimize Government control and protect farmers' independence. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout.

"And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

"But it takes more than price supports to build a farm program. The administration, tired and incompetent, is trying to distract your attention from its many fumbles, failures, and deceptions. The administration wants you to forget its neglect of research and education at the expense of political monstrosities such as the Brannan plan; its great potato fiasco which cost hundreds of millions; the grain-storage scandals; and the immorality of using Federal resources to influence your vote.

"The future of an independent, dynamic agriculture depends on cleaning up the mess in Washington and getting farm programs back on a nonpolitical, cooperative basis. We must not let programs devised for farmers be turned against farmers.

"I certainly don't believe farming is going to stand still. I see an expanding future for American agriculture and I'm sure you folks do too. With our growing population, our expanding industry, and our leadership in the free world, our farms will have a tremendous job to do. And to serve that future, working together as friends and neighbors, we can do much to improve and strengthen our farm programs.

"First, they must be cleansed of politics. An effective way to do this is found in the Republican platform: 'The establishment of a bipartisan agricultural commission with power to review the policies and administration of our farm programs.' The Republicans will establish such a commission, and will see that it is made up of bona fide farmers and farm leaders. That is a pledge."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the point in the RECORD where the discussion on the farm bill took place, before we got into a discussion of the pending bank holding bill, the full text of the address delivered by President Eisenhower at Kasson, Minn.

It was from that text that the distinguished majority leader had selected excerpts for his speech last evening and also for his remarks today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am sure the Senator from California is aware of the fact that the Senator from Texas in his statement last night quoted everything from General Eisenhower's Kasson speech which referred to 90 percent of parity. The Senator from Texas

has already asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a portion of the Kasson speech as issued by the chairman of the National Republican Committee, along with the chairman's press release. I know the Senator from California is aware of that fact.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not criticized the Senator from Texas that the excerpts were taken out of context, or that they misrepresented what the President had said. Inasmuch as the speech dealt with agriculture, I merely wished to have the entire speech published in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not have any objection, and the Senator from Texas wishes the Senator from California to know that the Senator from Texas knew the Senator from California did not criticize him. It was Mr. Hall who said that the Kasson speech had been distorted. The Senator from Texas has already inserted in the RECORD the portions of the Kasson speech which were sent along with Mr. Hall's press release.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that, but——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. I note that in the text——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have the floor. I have yielded to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY EISENHOWER PLEDGING AID FOR AGRICULTURE

Governor Anderson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, what I have prepared to say for you today is not so important that I cannot take the time to express something very, very close to my heart. It is that I should like to pay my tribute to every single person who is interested or is taking a part in this land-conservation program we see here exemplified today.

If there is anything that America must value in all her material assets and resources, it is first of all her land. Everybody who does his part in preserving it has my deepest admiration and unwavering support.

Now I am grateful for this opportunity of meeting with you in this great farming region. I am grateful because of the clear knowledge, gained in my early years and confirmed many times over by what I have seen in the world, that man draws his essential strength from the land. There man lives close to the Creator's handiwork and there spiritual values in full measure enrich life.

I have come to this heart-warming grassroots scene to outline one major part of a sound farm program. But I come here with no idea that the farmer is interested solely in his own affairs. I come to you as one citizen to another—each of us equally concerned with the future of our United States.

The supreme question before us all today is that of peace. It is the question that grips the hearts of parents in every home. It is the question: What is going to happen to our boys? Will our boys be here to help us carry on? Or, will they be called to fight on some distant battlefield?

PLEDGES WORK FOR PEACE

I know how haunting is the thought of war to every father, mother, and young person in America. But none of us must ever abandon the hope, indeed the conviction that we can lift from our country the threat of war. We owe it to ourselves and to our children to give them the chance to remain here on these fertile, peaceful lands, to establish families of their own and not to be sacrificed to stupid blunders in world politics.

For myself, no matter what my future private or official status, I shall never cease working for a real and lasting peace.

But to achieve that peace we first must have sound plans for it. We must have leadership which inspires confidence. There is one sure essential for that peace, a strong, secure, solvent, United States that can and will cooperate effectively with every other friendly nation to establish and maintain peace and freedom.

Now, building that kind of a United States is our first job. And a productive, prosperous agriculture is a foundation stone of that structure.

In discussing one phase of a farm program with you. I am not going to pretend to be a farmer. My farm activties belonged to the day of the percheron and the mule; the walking plow and the wheat binder; the traveling thresher and husking corn by hand. Things have changed.

But I still get up with the chickens.

From those early experiences I gained an enduring belief that independence is something to be prized fiercely as man's most precious possession * * * and that cooperation between free men is the force that solves problems too great for the individual.

I know that since those simple, self-sufficient days farming has undergone an amazing revolution. In the fields where I once shocked wheat behind a horse-drawn binder, the harvest is now a one-man job with a self-propelled combine.

But to me, the most significant fact of the revolution on the land is that the essential character of our agriculture has not changed. The family farm is still the mainstay. The farmer still wants to be his own boss.

And I'm for that.

PROBLEMS IN MODERN FARMING

We all know that this huge modern agriculture of ours has problems. One of them is the hard economic fact that we sometimes produce more than we can sell at fair prices on the domestic and foreign markets. And I don't have to tell you that unprofitable prices not only threaten the security of our farms but also sap the prosperity and strength of our whole Nation.

It's a fact, too, that our farm economy is especially vulnerable to the forces of changing world conditions and to inflation and deflation. You know what it means to have your hold on your land and your home threatened by these forces.

These problems can be solved only by people who are independent, people who carry on in the spirit of cooperation.

As a foundation for the security of our agriculture and the Nation, we much achieve a prosperity that is not based on expenditures for war.

Now, during the past 30 years, we have fashioned special plans for the protection of agriculture. Many sincere men—dirt farmers, farm organization leaders, and legislators—put much thought into programs to assure farmers of reasonable stability of prices. These programs were brought into being by Congress on a nonpartisan basis. They have been improved from time to time on a nonpartisan basis. Now most of these agricultural laws are based on the sound principle that the Government should aid farmers to aid themselves. Farmers themselves were supposed to have much to say about the management of those programs.

But what happened? Do you have a voice that carries weight with the Washington agricultural autocrats?

Or should I call them agricrats?

Do they listen to you? Do they welcome your farm organization leaders in their councils?

You know they don't.

You've seen them grow cynical and arrogant. They've just been in power too long—far too long. Systematically they have tried to use the vast powers of the Federal Government to make the farmer a political captive.

NOTES GRAIN STORAGE HOAX

You don't have to look far for evidence. The case is now perfectly clear in the grain storage hoax of 1948. It is a story of perversion of Government responsibilities and powers—a story of a giant Federal farm agency, backed by the people's dollars, deliberately driving down the price of grain to instill fear in the minds of farmers.

It is a story of Government agencies spreading panic—using press, radio, and speeches to paint a picture—a false picture—of the lack of storage space for grain.

You were told at Dexter, Iowa, in 1948, that the 80th Congress had prevented the administration from providing storage bins for farmers. You were further told that this would make it impossible for many of you to get price-support loans.

The facts are now well known—and here they are:

The 80th Congress did not prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from furnishing storage to farmers for their grain.

There was no shortage of storage space.

Contrary to the implication, the Commodity Credit Corporation never has furnished storage to farmers. It hadn't before and it has not since.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was selling its own grain bins as surplus at the very moment the Democratic candidate accused the Republicans of having "stuck a pitchfork in the farmer's back."

Now, who actually stuck that pitchfork in your back? It was none other than the Democrat administration itself.

And now the agricrats are trying to set the stage for a repeat. Fear is being broadcast by the administration and its front organizations. They are trying to scare you into voting, not as your conscience dictates, but as they want you to vote. They are telling you, "the Republicans will pull the rug out from under you."

I have an answer to the false propaganda now gushing out of Washington and Chicago.

That answer is—bunk. Pure bunk.

PROMISES HOUSECLEANING

Now, my friends, if you want to know where I stand on this question, I will tell you right now.

I pledge you that the Republican Party is going forward with positive, aggressive, farmer-run farm programs.

The first thing we intend to do is to take the emphasis off of Washington. The American farmer has had enough of government by long distance.

Next, there's going to be a spring housecleaning of the unscrupulous leadership that would use farm programs for political purposes. There will be no more of this business of using Federal power to extort the farmers' vote.

And here, and now, without any "ifs" or "buts," I say to you that I stand behind—and the Republican Party stands behind—the price support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the Basic Farm Act, passed by votes of both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

These price supports are only fair to the farmer to underwrite the exceptional risk

he is now taking. They are a moral and legal commitment which must be upheld.

We have now at least 2 years in which to plan ahead. We must use this valuable time to develop sound means and methods of maintaining and expanding both security and opportunities in agriculture. We must mobilize all of the brains in agriculture—farmers, your farm organization leaders, your farmwise legislators, your agricultural specialists and research workers—all of them to join us in building and improving our long-range farm policies and programs.

WOULD USE FARMERS' KNOWLEDGE

Our goal will be sound, farmer-run programs that safeguard agriculture—but do not regiment you, do not put the Federal Government in charge of your farms. We must, by using good old-fashioned horse-sense, figure out sound methods of maintaining agriculture's freedom to shift patterns of production without losing the basic protections to which agriculture is entitled.

We must realize that no formula developed at any particular time is infallible. Conditions change. What counts is being prepared to do the right thing at the right time. To do this the Republicans will use the wisdom of farmers.

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal in ways that minimize Government control and protect the farmers' independence. All I know of farmers convinces me that they would rather earn their fair share than to have it as a Government handout.

And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—it is full parity.

But it takes more than price supports to build a farm program. The administration, tired and incompetent, is trying to distract your attention from its many fumbles, failures and deceptions. The administration wants you to forget its neglect of research and education at the expense of political monstrosities such as the Brannan plan; its great potato fiasco which cost hundreds of millions; the grain-storage scandals; and the immorality of using Federal resources to influence your vote.

FORESEES EXPANDING FUTURE

The future of an independent, dynamic agriculture depends on cleaning up the mess in Washington and getting farm programs back on a nonpolitical, cooperative basis. We must not let programs designed for farmers be turned against farmers.

I certainly do not believe that farming is going to stand still. I see an expanding future for American agriculture—and I'm sure you folks do too. With our growing population, our expanding industry, and our leadership in the free world, our farms will have a tremendous job to do. And to serve that future, working together as friends and neighbors, we can do much to improve and strengthen our farm programs.

First, they must be cleansed of politics. An effective way to do this is found in the Republican platform: The establishment of a bipartisan agricultural commission with power to review the policies and administration of our farm programs. Now the Republicans will establish such a commission, and we will see that it is made up of bona fide farmers and farm leaders. Ladies and gentlemen, that is a personal pledge from me.

Second, the programs must be transformed into genuinely farmer-run operations, with maximum responsibility decentralized to States, counties, and districts.

Third, these programs must be better adapted to regional, State, and local conditions.

Fourth, we must find methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milks, eggs, fruits and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." We can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

WOULD AID COOPERATIVES

We must realize, too, that the economic programs I have discussed are but one part of our farm program. We will be equally concerned with conservation and wise use of our soil, water, and forest resources. We must give high priority to the expansion of farm research—particularly research that is the key to wider markets—better packaging, preservation, and more efficient distribution of farm products.

We must be always concerned with strengthening farmer cooperatives, which have done so much to build this progressive farming area; with up-to-date farm-to-market roads; with developing rural electrification and telephone service. We also must be concerned with our human resources. We must see to it that every farm child has the best educational opportunities. We must be concerned with all the things that aid in building a sound America by building a sound American agriculture. These matters I shall discuss in later talks.

Now I give you this positive assurance. The Republican Party will use every legitimate means to see that American farmers obtain their full share of the income produced by a stable, prosperous country. We will do it in cooperation with farm people themselves, without seeking to make them fearful and without seeking to make them the tools of a political party.

We will set about this great task in faith, not fear, faith in America and our agricultural community, faith that we can meet the challenge of changing times, faith that nothing is impossible for a determined united people.

It is that faith, rooted in deep religious convictions, which in every generation has moved America boldly forward. It is by that faith that today's Americans will build a more just, a more humane and a more securely prosperous land. It is by that same faith that America will work unceasingly in the service of peace and freedom throughout this world.

Ladies and gentlemen for the very great honor you have done me in gathering to listen to me today, I thank each of you warmly and from my heart. I sincerely trust that I shall get to see each of you again, closer to your own farms. Goodby.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from California, then I shall yield to the Senator from Indiana; then I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, immediately following the printing of the speech of President Eisenhower, which I have asked to have inserted in the RECORD, there be printed the text of the speech delivered by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Memphis, Tenn., on October 16, 1952. Just before that is done, I should like to read a few paragraphs from the speech. I am quoting the President:

Here and now let me say to you what I have said to farmers elsewhere. I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic farm act, approved by both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

Present price supports apply to four of the great crops of the South—cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. All of these, as you know, are directly affected by world events and world conditions.

The mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity will expire at the end of 1954. This means we have just 2 years, beginning next January, to plan ahead. In those 2 years we must mobilize the best brains of agriculture—farmers, farm organization leaders, legislators, agricultural specialists—to join us in building and improving our long-range farm policies and programs.

I ask that the entire speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER FARM POLICY

Following is the text of the address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered at Memphis, Tenn., October 16, 1952:

"I deeply appreciate the introduction by Ed O'Neal, a great leader of American agriculture. He has given a lifetime of honorable service to the farmers of this country. The farm programs which exist today are a monument to him and to other farsighted men, men from both parties.

"Ed O'Neal helped bring farm leaders from the West and South together. Out of those meetings grew many of the basic ideas that today are embodied in agricultural programs. These programs were nonpartisan in character and should so remain.

"I am sorry to say that the existing administration has tried to make them partisan; to use them for political ends. I know southern farmers and farmers all over this country resent this fact and will make their resentment known at the opportune time.

"I come here today with a feeling of kinship for the South—a feeling which goes back to my family ties to the South and to experience outside the United States. By tradition and by training, the South realizes clearly the trade ties which link us with the rest of the world. You realize clearly our interdependence with the rest of the world.

"There are no isolationists in the South.

"Memphis is one of the great cotton markets of the world. It lies in the heart of an agricultural empire. You have industry and lots of it. But your economic welfare depends directly upon agriculture, and my talk today is devoted primarily to agriculture.

"Here and now let me say to you what I have said to farmers elsewhere. I stand behind the price-support laws now on the books. This includes the amendment to the basic farm act, approved by both parties in Congress, to continue through 1954 the price supports on basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

"Present price supports apply to four of the great crops of the South—cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. All of these, as you know, are directly affected by world events and world conditions.

"The mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity will expire at the end of 1954. This means we have just 2 years, beginning next January, to plan ahead. In those 2 years we must mobilize the best brains of agriculture—farmers, farm organization leaders, legislators, agricultural specialists to join us in building and improving our long-range farm policies and programs.

"With single-minded purpose we must move toward sound farmer-run programs which assure farmers their full share of the national income and we will do this without putting farmers in a Government straitjacket."

URGES SOUND AGRICULTURE

"Then we will take our farm programs out of the grasping hands of politicians who have to use those programs to corral the farmers' vote. A sound agriculture is to everybody's advantage. We will take these programs out of partisan politics. We will then move forward to strengthen them.

"We will find a sound way for the farmers to shift patterns of production without losing the basic protection to which agriculture is entitled.

"Conditions affecting agriculture are constantly changing. We must therefore, realize that a formula which works today may not work tomorrow. Most important, we must be prepared to do the right thing at the right time. At all times, southern farmers must have their say as to what is right.

"We will establish a bipartisan farm commission to review existing farm programs and to help plan for the future. And when I say bipartisan, I mean bipartisan. On this commission will be outstanding farm leaders of the South.

"But I don't believe any more than you do, that price supports alone make a complete farm program. Price-support programs—many other Federal programs—should be regarded as floors. They give the farmers protection.

"To work toward this goal, our main reliance must be on the initiative, energy and ability of our citizens as they are expressed through our private-enterprise system. The Government can and should help farmers, as a partner—not a dictator. It will help to develop new opportunities, new markets, and new efficiency. Then the farmer will move forward toward this rightful income goal.

"Today the initiative of our citizens is being hampered by unnecessary and unwanted bureaucratic control. It is being choked by a dangerous policy that deliberately fosters inflation. Our future is being mortgaged by a national debt—a debt which will be a heavy burden on our children and their children.

"Today prices for most farm products, although there are notable exceptions, appear on the surface to be good. But farmers know that they are caught in a squeeze that is flattening their pocketbooks. Their costs are rising alarmingly, while their prices are weakening and their taxes soaring.

"Farm production costs in the United States have more than tripled since 1940. Every time you turn around it cost you more to keep going. It cost 24 percent more to operate a cotton farm in 1951 than it did the year before. It is costing a lot more in 1952, and costs are still rising."

ASSERTS INCOME IS DROPPING

"The plain fact is that the income of farmers, after expenses and taxes, is going down.

"This squeeze hurts in many ways. For example, farmers are having to borrow more money to meet their costs. Short-term borrowings have been forced up 20 percent so far this year—the largest rise since 1921. This hits all farmers. But it is particularly hard on small farmers and young farmers, especially young veterans who are trying to buy farms. They find that production costs take all their cash and strain their credit.

"Farmers are tired of the wasteful spending, higher costs, and ever-mounting taxes which are the inevitable partners of inflation in the hands of an irresponsible administration.

"Southern farmers, like anyone else, want to call a halt to all this. They want a change. They can help get that change on November 4.

"Southern farmers are concerned with the future for still other reasons. They greatly need an expanded research program.

"The South must have the answers to literally hundreds of questions as its farming moves toward greater mechanization. In particular, we need bold, imaginative research to bring mechanization to smaller farms.

"Here I pay tribute to all segments of the cotton industry for their foresight in finding ways to increase the uses of cotton. The cotton industry needs help with this tremendous job.

"The fact is, we are spending on research for agriculture only one-ninth as much per unit of income as American industry is spending on research. This is shortsighted. We must greatly enlarge our system of research and education and extension in the land-grant colleges. This would be a real investment in the future.

"In this region, you are deeply interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority, and in the part it has played in the improvement of the agriculture and commerce on this area. TVA has served rural areas well and has created many new industries in this section. It has helped conserve natural resources, control floods, and promote national defense.

"Certainly there would be no disposition on my part to impair the effective working out of TVA. It is a great experiment in resource development and flood control for this particular area.

"We should not, however, look upon the TVA as a rigid pattern for such development in other regions. In the Missouri Valley, for example, many officials and other thoughtful citizens are considering the possibility of a legal arrangement which would make State and Federal agencies true partners in developing the resources of that great region. We should give all such suggestions serious consideration. This is the system I favor in general for new projects."

BARS POLITICAL PRICE TAG

"Our goal should be to work out river basin development the way the people in the region want it done.

"A constructive job can be done with the cooperation of an administration in Washington that is devoted to the principle of decentralized government and to the principle of States rights, as well as to the full development of our resources.

"No region of our Nation has greater soil problems, or benefits more from a sound conservation program, than the South. We must strengthen all conservation activities. But these activities should not carry a political price tag.

"The agricultural conservation program, administered by PMA, is now permeated with partisan politics. At this very moment, in certain areas, Federal employees paid with your tax dollars are meeting with the farmer-committeemen and other farmers, misrepresenting by views about farm programs. They are urging farmers to vote to perpetuate all the mistakes and fumbling of the present administration. I am glad to say that thousands of PMA committeemen deeply resent the pollution of these programs with politics. And so do I.

"Recently my two opponents—the President and his handpicked candidate—have said that on July 21, 1949, Republicans voted 40 to 1 against the plan to help the producer of perishables. The plain truth is that the vote in Congress that day was on the Brannan plan—nothing else. I am proud that on that day members of my party joined with Democrats to defeat that monstrous proposal.

"I pledge you an administration that will cleanse all farm programs of partisan politics, that will decentralize their administration, that will increase farmer-participation in their own programs.

"And I pledge you now: There will be no Brannan plans.

"No section of the country will benefit more than the South from healthy trade with the rest of the world. We have built in the United States an agriculture which, for continuing prosperity, must sell much of its cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat, and other farm commodities on the world market.

"We also have built an industrial empire which, for its successful operation, must draw many raw commodities and some processed goods from the Far East, Middle East, Europe, South Africa, South America, and elsewhere.

"If we were suddenly cut off from the rest of the world, our agriculture and industrial economy would collapse."

PEACE OUR SUPREME GOAL

"But sound trade relations with the world are far more than an essential part of our economic system. They are also a means toward peace and they are a fruitful product of peace.

"Peace is our supreme goal. The present administration has not ended war or the fear of war. You and I have a right to hope—not fear—for the future of our country. We have a right to a steady, clear-headed leadership by able and devoted men and women who will work unceasingly and effectively toward a true and lasting peace.

"These are harrowing times and our hearts are troubled by the thoughts of our boys—yours and mine—now in Korea. We have a right to be deeply worried by the terrifying possibility that the same leadership that let us drift into the Korean war, might bungle us into still greater conflict.

"We have a right to be distrustful of a leadership which has allowed the godless Red tide of communism to engulf hundreds of millions of people who were once our friends and allies. We have a right to be suspicious of the leadership which failed to see the Red stain seeping into the most vital offices of our own Government.

"We must now work—all of us—to regain our lost peace. As a start we must establish a leadership of our ablest men and women in Washington that we can trust—we must have an administration which inspires the confidence of our allies and the respect of the world. We must build a strong, secure, solvent United States that can and will cooperate intelligently, consistently, and effectively with other friendly nations in the cause of peace.

"And we must approach this all-important task with faith in Almighty God, the faith that is rooted deep in both our religious convictions and our concepts of freedom. It must be the same intense faith which gave vision and strength to our Founding Fathers.

"That is the faith which, throughout our history, has made the United States the symbol of freedom for the world. With the renewal of our faith, we will not falter in the task."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I regret that I may have been too severe with the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I thought it was well understood that the average parity price the farmers received for everything they sold was at least more than 80 percent, both in February and March. I could not resist the temptation, therefore, of calling the Senator's attention to that fact.

I find now—which I was certain of before—that the average parity price on February 15 was 81 percent; on March 15, 82 percent; and that the

April 15 report will soon be issued, and that it will be a little higher.

I felt confident that the able Senator from Oklahoma knew it. However, I can well understand that he did not know it. However, with these figures being available, and being published in the newspapers, I was astonished that anyone should want to make the statement that it was 70 percent, when the facts show that it was not. I did not intend to take any undue advantage of the Senator from Oklahoma. I merely wished to keep the record straight in this greatest of all debating bodies in the world. Certainly we should correct the record when we find it to be wrong.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I noted that on the copy of the President's Kasson speech which the Senator from California asked to have printed in the RECORD there were indicated the lines which the Senator from Texas used in his broadcast last night. Does the Senator from Texas object to having those indicated in the reprint in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has objected to nothing. The Senator from Texas has merely pointed out that he has already put in the RECORD what the Senator from California asked permission to put in.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from Texas that the question was raised some time ago that no one seemed to get up on this side of the aisle to talk about the Senator's broadcast last evening. I should like to say to the Senator that I heard quite a good part of his broadcast. As I listened I realized that some of the statements might be quite misleading to people who were not fully familiar with the facts of our agricultural program.

However I also realized that in the busy life of the Senator from Texas he could hardly find time to do all the research and preparation which were necessary to get together a 30-minute broadcast. Therefore I felt that if the Senator——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say at this point that if my research work was sufficient to have caused the political head of the Republican National Committee to become so concerned as apparently he was, and to throw out wild charges of the type that he has thrown out without any research whatever, then it served a good purpose.

Before the debate is over I shall outline two of the charges Mr. Hall made, and I shall give sufficient answer to each of them for the purpose of the RECORD.

The Senator from Texas makes no apology for anything he said. He attempted to mislead no one, and, so far as he is aware, no one charged him with such an attempt except the head of the Republican National Committee, who by his own statement indicates his own ignorance of what the Senator from Texas said.

Mr. AIKEN. As I listened to the Senator's speech last evening, I realized that it would be very easy for listeners to misinterpret some of the statements of the Senator from Texas. But, as I said——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is exactly what Mr. Hall has done.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not think it was deliberate. I think he misunderstood what the Senator from Texas has said.

Mr. AIKEN. I also realize that the Senator would not wish his statement to be misinterpreted, and that if he had had the time to make all his own research——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did make my own research. I did not have the National Committee do it. That is more than some Senators can say. I had some difficulty in getting the film which was run last night. For several days I made attempts to get it, realizing the great pleasure which would be brought to many people in seeing and hearing the President make these statements again, and in the interest of truth I thought the American people should have that opportunity. I attempted to be fair in presenting my statement and attempted to be reasonably calm about the whole matter. So much so that until the chairman of the Republican National Committee issued his blast, every Republican Senator who talked to me indicated that he thought I had done a good job from my point of view.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator indicates that the Republican National Committee may have been doing some agricultural research for Republican Members of the Senate. To the best of my knowledge they have not been doing agricultural research, but I think it is high time they did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator had in his hand a release containing a picture of the elephant, in which release Mr. Hall makes three charges. I should like to take up those three charges. The first charge he makes is that I took quotations from the Kasson speech out of context.

I have read Mr. Hall's excerpts from the Kasson speech. There is nothing in them that contradicts the quotation I used. I have asked that his excerpts from the speech be inserted in the RECORD and that request has been granted.

Mr. Hall's silence about the quotation from the Brookings, S. Dak., speech is conspicuous. I assume he has no complaints about that one, because he does not mention it.

While we are at it, I wonder how Mr. Hall feels about this quotation from the Columbia, S. C., speech of September 30, 1952:

> I believe wholeheartedly and without ifs or buts in Federal programs to stabilize farm prices, including the present program insuring 90 percent of parity on all basic commodities.

Charge No. 2: Mr. Hall claims my figures about a 50-percent decline in the income of Iowa farmers were incorrect. He uses some figures from Secretary Benson. Mr. Hall apparently has no quarrel with the Iowa State College and the New York Times.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Sunday, April 15, 1956, which is headed "Farm Income Off 50 Percent in Iowa in '55." The first paragraph of the article reads as follows:

> A special economic survey, made available this week by Iowa State College, offered a new explanation as to why so many midwestern farmers are now in a general state of unrest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME OFF 50 PERCENT IN IOWA IN 1955—COLLEGE STUDY SHOWS DECLINE IN CASH FOR CROPS AND LIVESTOCK ON GOOD LAND

(By Seth S. King)

AMES, IOWA, April 14.—A special economic survey, made available this week by Iowa State College, offered a new explanation as to why so many Midwestern farmers are now in a general state of unrest.

Detailed records, kept by Iowa farmers in cooperation with the college, showed that even on above-average property the average net cash income in 1955 had dropped in every type of farm operation.

The average profit per acre was down more than 50 percent from that of 1954, and the return on livestock for each $100 worth of feed dropped as much as 32 percent in some sections of the State.

These findings were not based on scattered interviews with Iowa farmers. They were compiled from a standard record system devised by the college and kept in all parts of the State by farmers who volunteered to participate.

On the basis of records from 148 Iowa farms, all modern and above average in soil quality and equipment, the study showed that net cash income averaged $7,051 in 1955. In 1954 it was $8,269. In 1953 it was $10,247.

CROP VALUES DOWN

The gross value of crops per acre dropped to $57 in 1955, compared with $68 in 1954, and $64 in 1953. The returns in livestock sales for each $100 of feed fed to the animals dropped to $109 in 1955, compared with $141 in 1954 and $143 in 1953.

The sharpest drop was shown in the net income per acre on all types of farm operations. This declined to $15 in 1955, compared with $39 in 1954 and $56 in 1953. This was caused by a lowering of gross profits per acre from $81 in 1954 to $56 in 1955. During that time expenses per acre declined only $1, from $42 in 1954 to $41 in 1955.

The percentage of Iowa farms that either made no money or lost money showed a pronounced increase.

In north central Iowa, a highly productive part of the State, 17.9 percent were in this category in 1955, compared with only 1.9 percent in 1954. In western Iowa, where the drought was particularly severe last year, 32 percent showed no profit or a loss. Only 0.7 percent were classed this way in 1954.

The study of net farm income, compared with net cash income, showed even greater losses in 1955 than in 1954. This comparison took into consideration the total cash sales plus or minus the amount of feed, livestock, and operating expenses involved.

Under this study, net farm income dropped 59 percent on farms in north central Iowa and 61 percent on those in western Iowa. It indicated that farmers had been forced to sell much greater numbers of cattle and much more feed to produce the income they did get and that the cost of replacing the cattle would be greater in 1956.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Hall's next charge, No. 3, has reference to the price of hogs. He does not charge that the figures I used in my speech are incorrect. I wish to call that to the at-

tention of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. He carefully walks away from those figures used in my speech and gets another series of figures on different dates from the Republican Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson's statisticians can prove almost anything. However, for the record I will have Mr. Hall's figures analyzed, and as soon as that is done, we will prove that those figures are fantastic. Note that there is no challenge by Mr. Hall of the figures I used last night, and I assume that Mr. Hall is not arguing that the price of hogs has not gone down out of sight. If he does, I should love to be present when he starts telling that one to the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator realizes that there was no record or recording of the President's speech at Brookings?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not sure of that. I was told that a recording was available. A recording was sent to me, which was branded "Brookings, S. Dak.," but when I had it played for me with the text of the Kasson speech in front of me, it developed that the film was not the Brookings speech at all, but the Kasson speech. I was informed that there was a record of the Brookings speech, but it was not available at the time I delivered my address last evening.

Mr. AIKEN. It was my understanding that there was no recording made of the Brookings speech or of other extemporaneous speeches made by the President in the fall of 1952.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I cannot speak with true authority on that matter. I was informed that there was a recording. I was not able to get it.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from Texas has no objection to my refreshing his memory by saying that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, pages 9138 to 9140, will be found the warning that the Farmers Union repeatedly sent out over the country to the effect that Eisenhower's Kasson speech and his other speeches were not in favor of 90 percent of parity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I realize that. Mr. Hall made reference to the same item to which the Senator from Vermont now makes reference. I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont has done Mr. Hall's research or Mr. Hall has done the Senator's research, or whether it is an instance of both minds running in the same channel.

I do not take any responsibility for what the Farmers Union may have said. In fact, that organization took me to task when I said that the veto of the farm bill would cost the farmers $2 billion. The Farmers Union said it would cost the farmers $3½ billion. But whether the farmers are going to lose $2 billion or $3½ billion, I am convinced that the veto of the farm bill will cost the farmers a large amount of income, and other Members of the Senate are of the same opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will go back over the RECORD he will find that in early February I made the statement that if the soil bank bill should be held up until after April 1st it would cost the farmers about $2 billion this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Texas are closer together than are the Senator from Vermont and the Farmers Union. I am glad to hear the Senator admit that the veto will cost the farmers approximately $2 billion this year. The Farmers Union contends it will cost them $3½ billion.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Texas and I are closer together in our philosophies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Two billion dollars is a lot of money, even to a Texan. But if the farmers are going to lose $2 billion this year, it is time that Congress stopped, looked, and listened, and tried to do something to rectify the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is already lost.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the word "and".

On page 3, line 22, before the period, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and (E) no company shall be a bank holding company if at least 80 percent of its total assets are composed of holdings in the field of agriculture."

On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

(g) "Agriculture", as used in section 2 (a), includes farming in all its branches, including fruit growing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, forestry or lumbering operations, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the intention of the Senator from Florida that these amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if it would be agreeable to the Senator from Florida to allow his amendments to go over until tomorrow for consideration the first thing after the morning hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. If that is necessary, of course, I will accede to the request. However, I was absent on business of the Senate, conducting a hearing by myself in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when three amendments of this nature were brought up. The other two were adopted by voice votes. They both relate to much larger institutions than the institution affected by my amendments.

Again tomorrow I shall be in attendance upon hearings. Unless there is very decided objection by some Senator, I should like to have the amendment disposed of this evening. Of course I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote, but I believe that a brief explanation of the amendments wil lead to their adoption by a voice vote. If such proves not to be the case, I shall be glad to let them go over until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should be glad to accommodate the Senator, except that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROBERTSON], who is in charge of the bill, is not present in the Chamber. There is no Senator present to speak for the committee and accept the amendments. I would have to suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the Senator from Virginia, and probably other Senators, return to the Chamber. After conferring with the distinguished minority leader and in view of the fact that it is already 6:30, I believe it would be the better part of wisdom to take up these amendments after the morning hour tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say to the distinguished leader that I advised the distinguished Senator from Virginia that I intended to call up the amendments, and he was expecting me to call them up. I cannot understand why he is absent. I understand that another member of the committee is present to make brief remarks with respect to the amendments.

Of course, I shall be glad to cooperate with the distinguished majority leader. However, I believe that when a Senator is absent on necessitous business, attending a hearing at which witnesses who have come from as far away as California are appearing, he should receive some consideration. I was obliged to leave the Chamber. I was carrying on the business of the Senate. I was not called, when I thought I had made arrangements to be called back to the Chamber. I think I should have the right to have the amendments considered at the same session of the Senate which has already approved the other two amendments, both of which, as I have said, affect much larger institutions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. If the Senator wishes to exercise it, he has that right. If the Senator from Florida will yield to me so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, I shall attempt to have the Senator from Virginia return to the Chamber.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from Florida will be agreeable to his amendments going over until tomorrow. I realize he was absent on official business. The hour is late. It is now 6:30. A number of the Members of the Senate had made inquiries of the minority leader as to the matter, and I said to them, in view of the discussion which was going on in connection with the farm bill, that I did not anticipate there would be any further amendments considered this evening. Under the circumstances, if the majority leader had not indicated

that he was going to suggest the absence of a quorum, I would have to suggest it. I am afraid some Members have gone home. I respectfully suggest that we consider the amendments tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I accede to the request of the two leaders, although I regret the fact that I was not recognized, as I had been promised I would be recognized, prior to the time that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] obtained the floor.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to address the Senate, then, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 24, 1956:

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1956:

J. Edgar Murdock, of Pennsylvania.
Stephen E. Rice, of Florida.
Morton P. Fisher, of Maryland.
John Edward Mulroney, of Iowa.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Ralph Kennamer, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama for a term of 4 years.

William C. Spire, of Nebraska, to be United States attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

James Crawford, Jr., of Texas, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Texas for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the supreme source of wisdom and strength, of truth and righteousness, may we daily surrender ourselves completely and confidently unto Thy divine guidance as we strive to find our way through darkness to light, through despair to hope, and through defeat to victory.

Give us a clear and comprehensive understanding of the needs of humanity and may the moral and spiritual principles and powers which Thou hast ordained soon become gloriously triumphant.

Inspire us to dedicate ourselves as devotedly to the high calling of preserving and perpetuating our freedoms as the founders of our Republic gave themselves to the task of establishing them.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who went about doing good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9390. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 6268) entitled "An act to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PROCUREMENT OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9428) to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "original."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date."

Page 3, line 6, after "the" insert "effective."

Page 3, line 17, after "the" where it appears the second time, insert "effective."

Page 3, line 18, strike out "of enactment."

Page 4, line 13, strike out "enactment" and insert "effective date."

Page 5, line 21, after "such", insert "medical."

Page 6, line 3, strike out all after "internship;" down to and including "law" in line 6 and insert "and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the service credit authorized by this clause shall not—

"(A) be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from the service, under any provision of law;

"(B) increase the retired or retirement pay of a person who became entitled to such pay prior to May 1, 1956; or

"(C) increase the retired pay of a person who becomes entitled to such pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1087), on or after May 1, 1956, but who does not perform active duty after May 1, 1956'."

Page 6, strike out lines 7 and 8 and insert:

"SEC. 3. Title II of the Public Health Service Act (act of July 1, 1944, 58 Stat. 683), as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'PROMOTION CREDIT—ASSISTANT GRADE

"'SEC. 220. Any medical officer of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service who—'".

Page 6, line 9, strike out "(1)" and insert "'(1)."

Page 6, line 14, strike out "(2)" and insert "'(2)."

Page 6, line 23, strike out "date." and insert "date'."

Page 7, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3, and insert:

"(1) By inserting in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 211 (e) and in the first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 311 (d), after the words 'a staff corps', the words 'other than the Medical and Dental Corps', and deleting in those sentences the words 'if of other than the Medical Corps, and in the preceding calendar year if of the Medical Corps,'."

Page 7, line 12, after "SEC. 5.", insert "(a)."

Page 7, line 19, strike out "three" and insert "two."

Page 7, line 22, after "those", insert "veterinary."

Page 7, line 25, strike out "three" and insert "two."

Page 8, after line 12, insert:

"(b) Section 203 (b) of such act is further amended by striking out the following words in the third proviso: 'of $100 per month as is'."

Page 8, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 6. Any person who, on the day before the effective date of this act, has not completed 18 years of service creditable in the computation of active duty pay in the uniform service of which he is a member and who, as a result of the enactment of this act, is upon the effective date of this act credited with more than 17 years of such service shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be allowed 12 months from the effective date of this act within which to make the election provided for in section 3 (a) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 502)."

Page 8, line 13, strike out "6" and insert "7."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Texas kindly explain the meaning of these amendments?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the bill increasing special incentive pay for physicians and dentists in the armed services.

As it passed the House, the bill provided for an increase to $150 a month from the $100 a month in existing law at the termination of 3 years of service. The Senate bill reduced that period of service to 2 years from 3 years.

There is much merit to the Senate provision because at the present time many physicians and dentists are serving an obligated tour of 2 years, although on duty voluntarily as Reserve officers, under the compulsion of the Doctors' Draft Act, so that under the Senate provision of the bill they would make their first election as to remaining on duty at the termination of their obligated tour of duty. That is the principal and a very substantial change made by the Senate amendments.

There are clarifying amendments to make it clear that the same will not apply to medical and dental officers retired prior to May 1, 1956. That was the intention of the House bill, and this provision makes it clear.

The other one that is of substance is a provision granting an additional year in which these officers may make their election as to whether or not they will come within the provisions of the Contingency Option Act. Under that act an officer must make his election within the first 18 years of his service. Inasmuch as this bill grants additional constructive service, there could be officers on duty who had already exceeded 18 years of service. So this grants an additional year in which to make the election.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Texas tell us how much more this is going to cost than the bill passed by the House?

Mr. KILDAY. The Department estimates that it will cost an additional approximately $572,000.

Mr. BOW. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman feel this will be helpful in securing more doctors for the hospitals?

Mr. KILDAY. We are very hopeful that it will, and feel that it will attract and retain physicians and dentists on a career basis in the armed services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit for the remainder of the week during general debate while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports as it sees fit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday the President and the former Governor of Illinois stated their respective positions on the matter of foreign policy. In yesterday's Washington News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, appeared an editorial in which an appraisement was made of the positions taken by the President and the probable nominee of the Democratic Party to oppose him in the November presidential election.

I read from the editorial:

> The contrast between the Eisenhower and the Stevenson speeches makes it appropriate to examine the broad picture of foreign policy. * * * We do not hesitate to say—as we have been saying in effect for a long time—that Mr. Stevenson's appraisal of the state of the world makes a lot more sense than President Eisenhower's. The time has come for the Eisenhower administration to get out of its complacent mood, to throw away its rose-tinted glasses, to tell the American people the real facts, however unpleasant. Stop all this nonsense about the Soviets failing. We are failing. * * * The United States needs new policies to fit the new facts. President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State need to get in step with these facts.

It would appear from this and editorials much along the same line in newspapers throughout the Nation that Governor Stevenson's address in Washington on foreign policy has made a profound impression upon the country.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman intend to make the point of order before the conclusion of the unanimous consent requests?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a reason and I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Addonizio	Cretella	Hiestand
Bailey	Dague	Hinshaw
Barden	Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.
Barrett	Dingell	Holland
Bass, N. H.	Donovan	Jackson
Bass, Tenn.	Doyle	James
Baumhart	Durham	Jenkins
Betts	Eberharter	Jensen
Blatnik	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
Bonner	Flood	Kearns
Bowler	Fogarty	Kee
Boykin	Forand	Kelley, Pa.
Bush	Fulton	Kelly, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Gamble	Kilburn
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	King, Pa.
Carlyle	Gary	Knox
Carrigg	Gavin	Knutson
Chatham	Granahan	Lankford
Chiperfield	Grant	McConnell
Chudoff	Green, Oreg.	McCulloch
Clark	Haley	McDowell
Cole	Hand	Macdonald
Cooley	Healey	Matthews
Corbett	Hébert	Merrow
Coudert	Hess	Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.	Powell	Vanik
Mollohan	Prouty	Van Zandt
Morano	Quigley	Vursell
Morgan	Rhodes, Pa.	Walter
Morrison	Riehlman	Watts
Moulder	Saylor	Wier
Mumma	Scherer	Williams, N. J.
O'Hara, Minn.	Scott	Williams, N. Y.
O'Neill	Sheehan	Wilson, Ind.
Osmers	Shelley	Wolcott
Philbin	Sieminski	Zelenko
Phillips	Sikes	
Pilcher	Simpson, Pa.	
Pillion	Staggers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon while the House is in session, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 8901, the Capital Transit Authority bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION NO. 1746

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of Executive Communication No. 1746, concerning the late Honorable Chauncey W. Reed and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ATROCIOUS MURDER OF ISRAELI SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a day or so ago I received the following telegram from the Congregation Ohel Abraham, Rabbi N. Horowitz, M. Blinder, president; the Congregation Anshei, Rabbi M. Pinsky; the Congregation Kehal Yesob Hatorah, Rabbi M. Stern; the Congregation Machzikai Torah Bneiaaron, Rabbi H. Horowitz; the Congregation Beer Shemuel, Rabbi Horowitz; the Congregation Kehal Yereim Chust of Borough Park, Rabbi J. Grunwald; the Congregation Merkaz Amshinov, Rabbi M. Kalish; the Congregation Shomrei Habas, S. Greenberg, president; the Eretz Israel Committee National Council of Young Israel, Elijah Stein, chairman; and the National Council of Young Israel, Meyer Wiener, president; all from Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting the recent atrocious murder of Israeli schoolchildren:

Hon. Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY,
Washington, D. C.:

The children slain in cold blood while at prayer in Habad Village Israel last Wednesday belong with numerous congregations and schools in America to the same family of Habad Lubavitch followers of purely religious and philanthropic Hassidic movement headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, American citizen, with headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y. We are our brothers' keeper grieved and heartbroken at cold-blooded murder of our young brothers in Holy Land. We demand our Government take energetic effective steps to prevent similar massacre and assure indemnification of bereaved families.

CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that a short time ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised a point of no quorum, because at the very time this issue was raised, a meeting was in progress, I understand, in the House Judiciary Subcommittee considering civil-rights legislation. I think it is very important that there be no further delay in consideration of civil-rights legislation. I am informed that at the very moment the quorum call came the administration's three-point program was about to be considered by the subcommittee. I certainly hope that later today there will be no further interruptions of this kind because if there is to be any action on President Eisenhower's recommended program, time is of the essence.

PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES IN ALASKA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4047) relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000 per year for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, June 30, 1958, June 30, 1959, June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1961."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to get an explanation of the amendment. The bill passed the House and was amended in the other body. Can the gentleman from California tell us what the amendment does?

Mr. ENGLE. This bill passed the House on the Consent Calendar. It is a bill relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska. We did not have a limitation on the amount of money authorized. The bill as it passed the House on the Consent Calendar was an open-end authorization. The Senate limited it to $100,000 a year for 5 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4781) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$20,000,000."

Page 5, after line 16, insert:

"SEC. 7. The Territory of Alaska is authorized and empowered notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary, to guarantee payment of bonds issued by municipalities, school districts, and public utility districts in Alaska for constructing, altering, equipping, or acquiring public improvements of the nature for which the Territory may issue bonds in an aggregate amount which shall not at any one time exceed the sum by which the principal amount of Territorial bonds and certificates of indebtedness then outstanding under this act is less than $20 million. The authority to guarantee bonds of such subdivisions shall be exercised in a manner prescribed in section 2 of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], does this take off the limitation as to the amount of bonded indebtedness permitted?

Mr. ENGLE. No, it does not. The bill as it passed the House authorized the Territory of Alaska to incur certain indebtedness, the Territory being under restrictions of its organic act. The amount provided in the bill was $12,500,000. The Senate amendment raises that to $20 million.

The second amendment permits the Territory to guarantee bonds issued by school districts, municipalities, and other public agencies. In other words, it raises the amount $7,500,000 and permits the Territory to use its financial resources to underwrite the bonds of the school districts and other public agencies.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish to issue a warning to the people in Alaska to use this permission to incur bonded indebtedness rather carefully, because I think there is a good deal of inherent danger involved. I do not like the Senate amendment. I think it is too liberal and gives entirely too much leeway to the Territory in their bonding and guaranteeing the bonds of the school districts, and so forth. It goes much further than the Congress has ever gone before. However, if that is the desire of the Delegate from Alaska I will concur in it.

Mr. ENGLE. It is also the desire of the Governor of Alaska, who requested it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I still think it is far too liberal, but I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF SIKATUNA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10754) to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized to accept the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to

the contrary, the named recipient may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 443) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8750, a bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and thereafter yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution indicates, this is an open rule providing for 2 hours of debate on the bill H. R. 8750 which provides certain amendments to the present Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. In my opinion, it is a very important measure and one of the most important that we may consider at this session. I know of no opposition to the rule on this side of the aisle.

The purpose of the bill is to broaden the scope of the present act. It would authorize the inclusion of municipal and industrial water supplies as a part of a watershed program and would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to assist local organizations in carrying out a multiple-purpose water- and land-management program rather than a program limited to flood prevention and agricultural water management as presently provided in the act.

The act is further amended to permit the inclusion of flood-prevention storage at sites which local organizations wish to utilize for other purposes by allowing the construction of structures providing more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity, provided the construction costs of the capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet is borne by the local organizations.

Another amendment provides that local organizations shall not be required to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention. This would allow some degree of Federal aid in the storage of water for such purposes as irrigation and streamflow regulations.

The bill also provides that projects involving a Federal contribution of less than $250,000 need not be submitted separately to Congress through the President.

Two new sections are added to the present act. One provides for long-term loans at the Government rate of interest to local organizations for the purpose of financing their share of the cost of the programs. The other extends the provisions of the act to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The committee report complies with the Ramseyer rule and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 443 so the House may proceed to the consideration of H. R. 8750.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8750, with Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for a great many years it has been the policy of the Federal Government to try to assist communities which have suffered from floods. That development has moved along throughout the years. I believe at first it involved only the Mississippi River and involved nothing but the erection of levees. As the years went by, we found that more and more areas of the country were involved in disastrous floods and we called upon the Army engineers to carry out a more comprehensive program of flood control to try to protect our great urban areas and our agricultural areas as well as our industrial and transportation facilities from losses by these disastrous floods. Gradually it became apparent that it was not sufficient to straighten out the channels or build levees to protect against floods, but it was also necessary to build great storage reservoirs. The Engineers went further and further up the stream and built larger and larger reservoirs, and they did a great job of flood control. Our system of flood control is probably the greatest in the world involving the control of waters that have become concentrated in our streams. The Federal Government has always paid the entire cost of flood control, because we felt it was a matter that involved a wide number of our citizenship and it was not something you could assess against any one individual; that it was something the burden of which should fall on all of our people. The Government has paid a tremendous amount of money to control floodwaters, and I think properly. We have spent probably half a billion dollars a year for a good many years in carrying on flood-control works, to control waters that come down our rivers in such volume that the river channels could not carry the water.

In recent years we have begun to recognize more and more that in addition to this work we need something more in the way of trying to prevent the occurrence of as many floods as we can. So we passed what was known as the Flood Prevention Act, whereby the Federal Government assumed at least partial responsibility for carrying out the upstream works with the idea of preventing as many of the floods as we could. The more floods you can prevent, the less you have to control. Obviously you cannot prevent all floods, so you still need flood control, but to the extent you can prevent floods you save that much money on flood control.

Flood prevention must occur somewhere close to the head of the stream, where the water falls. Flood prevention is primarily a matter of causing the water to sink into the ground where it falls. Failing in that, it involves temporary detention of the water until such time as the channels below will carry it without overflowing and thereby resulting in floods. So we first look to the uses of water on the land. That means on the farms and on the ranches. We try to make as much water as possible sink into the ground where it falls. Then we look to the detention of the water close to where it falls. For that detention we have built detention dams. That is a dam that would be a storage dam if you left the water there. But you do not leave the water there. So you estimate the size of the spillway so that at no time will more water run out than the stream below may carry. If you put enough of those dams upstream you do not have your streams overflowing. Perhaps it would take 2 weeks for the water to run out, whereas if there was no detention it would cause disaster to the people below as it ran out all at once.

So in the original Flood Prevention Act we provided the Federal Government might contribute to a share of the cost of the flood prevention projects, but not all of the cost. We left the major share of the burden on the farmer who owns the land. He is not the man who is primarily interested in the protection that is afforded by this flood prevention, because that protection is somewhere down the stream. That farmer is not the man who is overflowed, because it is water coming off of his land that hurts somebody else. So we thought that we would make a partnership arrangement, but we found that would put too large a part of the cost on the man who owns the land. So we come to you today with a bill that leaves all of the burden of

handling the water on the farm, the cost of making it sink into the ground, the cost of such practice as stripcropping and terracing, on the owner of the land. These costs are paid by the farmer because they add to the productivity of his farm. But we provide in this bill today a change in the policy of the cost; we say that the Federal Government will pay all of the cost of all structures to the extent that flood control is involved, but that the farmer will continue to pay all of the cost for his land treatment which leaves him with a cost in most cases equal to and in many cases in excess of the cost that will be borne by the Federal Government. We leave to the farmer or to his local association all the cost of rights-of-way and of operation of the project. We are simply applying to the flood-prevention program the same criteria that we have long applied to the flood control and the reclamation programs. Where we have built dams for other purposes in the United States we have always said that to the extent that they contributed to flood control the Federal Government would pay the cost of such control.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In looking over the report on the flood-control amendments I find no report from the Agriculture Department. I do find, however, comments taken out of some text and I call attention to the one applying to the fourth amendment where it states:

> A fourth amendment would provide "That the Secretary shall not require local organizations to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention." We feel that this amendment defeats the concept of cost sharing presently embodied in the act which provides that, "local organizations shall assume such proportionate share of the cost of any works of improvement involving Federal assistance as may be determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of the anticipated benefits from such improvements."

I do not understand that the bill conforms in that respect with the thinking of the Department relative to sharing of local costs with the Federal Government. The Federal Government does all the work and pays all the cost—or where it is a local project do the local people who receive the benefits make some contribution?

The gentleman spoke about soil stripping and conservation practices where the farmer gets paid for it as a conservation measure, soil stripping, summer fallowing, and things of that kind. The Congress has presently dealt with 3 or 4 phases of it. I wish the gentleman would comment on the suggestion given to the Government by the Department of Agriculture and whether there was a report by the Bureau of the Budget and what is the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget on this measure.

Mr. POAGE. I have been doing just that. I must apologize to the House if I have expressed myself so ineptly as not to get that point across, because that is exactly what I have been trying to do the last 5 minute, commenting upon the whole philosophy in which there is a disagreement between the viewpoint that the Federal Government should pay for flood control if it is a part of a reclamation project but should not pay for flood control if it is a part of an agriculture program. There are those who feel that the Federal Government should pay all of the cost of flood control if it is carried on by any other agency of the Government than the engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. It is my feeling and was the feeling of the committee that the Federal Government should pay for flood control regardless of the agency that carries it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes and now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the amendments proposed in this bill do not bring the Department of Agriculture quite into line with the other Federal agencies on the cost of flood-control projects to the Federal Government. For instance, the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation provide the cost of the site and also of the maintenance. Under the terms of this bill those costs are borne by the local interests.

Even though it does not bring it up to the level of other agencies those most interested in conservation are willing to take it as it is.

Mr. POAGE. That is exactly right, this bill still leaves the local people assuming a greater part of the cost than they would under any other program which involves any flood control.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman, and I quote from page 2 of the report:

> In general, the amended act will provide three different levels of Federal cost sharing—

And I refer to (c):

> (c) And those purposes where the Federal Government will bear no part of the structural cost (municipal and industrial water supplies).

My question is: What is the change in the cost sharing under section (c) as outlined on page 2?

Mr. POAGE. Under the present bill there is not any way whereby you can put municipal water supplies into one of these reservoirs. I do not want to preclude anyone from going into that question but maybe if I could proceed a moment and outline the changes in the bill I could save some questions. There is no provision in the present law whereby you can have municipal water storage. We do provide for municipal water storage in this bill but the local people pay the costs.

Mr. SPRINGER. The reason I asked that is because I happen to have one city in my area where this is under consideration and it is my understanding there was a cost sharing and the city paid a part of it. Is there any change in that?

Mr. POAGE. There is no change because there is now no way in which your city can share in the use of such a reservoir and there is no way you can put municipal water storage into one of these projects under the present law. In this bill, we specifically provide that the local interest, which would be your city, which needs municipal water, shall bear all of the extra costs that are incident to providing that municipal water.

As I pointed out before I started yielding, the first thing this bill does is to provide that the Federal Government shall bear all of the cost of flood control just as we do for any other program. In the reclamation program the Federal Government bears the cost of flood control. When we build any multipurpose dam in the West, largely for power, the Federal Government bears all of the costs allocable to flood control. When we build a flood-control dam, the Federal Government bears all of the cost of flood control. We provide here that the Federal Government shall bear all of the cost of flood control.

Let us assume that there are needed 4,000 acre-feet of detention capacity for flood control. The Government would pay that cost. Then let us assume your city wants to put on an addition of say 5,000 acre-feet, for city storage. The city could do that under this bill provided the city would come in and pay all the additional cost, not the basic cost but the additional cost, which will reduce the overall cost per acre-foot. Suppose in that same area you wanted to organize a little reclamation project downstream and you wanted 4,000 acre-feet for that. That would give you a total of 13,000 acre-feet. Your reclamation project would have to pay for the 4,000 acre feet that it uses. Your city would have to pay for the 5,000 acre-feet it proposed to use. Each one of the local projects would have to pay for the additional storage that is provided for its own purpose. The Federal Government would pay only for the flood-control part of the reservoir. In no event could that storage for flood purposes exceed 5,000 acre-feet in any structure.

Mr. SPRINGER. That answers the question.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. It should be pointed out that under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, the cost of the right-of-way, easements, and all other expenses, with the exception of the structure itself, is borne by the local organization.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. LOVRE. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Under the programs sponsored by the Corps of Engineers as well as under the Bureau of Reclamation, is it not true that the projects are considered Federal, while under this act the projects are considered local?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. LOVRE. We ask that the Federal Government contribute in part as much for the local projects as it does for Federal projects where it bears the entire expense.

Mr. POAGE. Yes. The local people have to pay the expense of operating these projects after we get them in operation, whereas if you build them as a Federal project the Government will pay it.

Mr. LOVRE. That is in addition to furnishing the right-of-way and easements?

Mr. POAGE. Yes, and doing all other land treatment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. In reference to the question just asked by the gentleman, is it true this reservoir which provides for 5,000 acre-feet of flood control is still considered as a local project?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. BOLAND. This is only a flood control project embracing 5,000 acre-feet of storage. Is that a local project under the terms of the bill?

Mr. POAGE. Let me explain it this way. The only way under this bill you can build any kind of a project is as part of a watershed project. This bill does not provide for the erection of an isolated structure without regard to the other flood prevention needs of the watershed.

This bill only provides for the complete control of a given watershed which must be less than 250,000 acres, because you cannot have a watershed larger than that under the basic law. If, as one part of the control of that watershed, you need a reservoir, a detention reservoir, that reservoir cannot exceed, even under the basic law or under this proposal, 5,000 acre-feet of detention capacity. But, this bill would amend the basic law so that other local interests may come in and join with the watershed project which is itself a local project organized under State law. This bill then would allow other local interests to cooperate with this local interest that is doing the watershed development and to put storage for specific purposes, additional storage, in these reservoirs, but there could be no reservoir constructed simply for municipal purposes or simply for irrigation under this bill. It would have to be incident to a complete watershed development. That is one of the places that this bill so completely differs with some of those we had before, in that this bill affects only those areas where you are trying to develop a watershed as an integrated unit.

Now, I have called your attention to the fact that this bill changes the basis of sharing the cost of the flood-control features. I have called your attention to the fact that it allows the use of these structures for multiple purposes. I should call your attention to the further fact that the bill provides a financing for those multiple purposes that is not in the present law. Under the present general law, if you are building a reclamation project, the Government will finance it for 50 years without interest. Our committee felt that we did not want to go into the interest-free money for this purpose, so we have provided that the local interest can borrow the needed funds from the Federal Government. That will mean your city can borrow if it wanted to put municipal water into one of these reservoirs. It would mean your reclamation project, if you had a little reclamation project down below the dam which wanted to put in 5,000 acre-feet of storage for irrigation. These local groups, cities, or districts could come to the Federal Government to borrow the money necessary to install their part of the dam and could borrow at the going rate of public money, which is roughly 2.5 percent interest. This provision is inserted in order that the Federal Government would lose no money on these projects. Of course, in a direct reclamation project, the Government actually loses interest for 50 years. In this bill we are not providing that kind of subsidy but only providing what we think is a very effective method of enabling the local interests to participate in a needed program without cost to the Federal Government. We think that is highly desirable and highly necessary to provide a source of credit for the local cities and districts.

There is one technical provision in the bill which I think is important. The original basic law has a proviso that all projects must be reviewed by the governor, by the local State interests, by each of the departments up here: Agriculture, Reclamation, Army, and so forth, and then come down to the Congress and wait here 45 days. We provide in those particular projects where the total cost involved is less than $250,000 that we waive that long period of review and waiting and let the Secretary of Agriculture pass on the application. The review period is still required on all larger projects, but we think that on those smaller projects, some of them for less than $10,000, it is rather ridiculous to spend so much time for review.

There is another thing. This bill extends the provisions of the Flood Prevention Act to Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. I believe that covers the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 8750, amending the Flood Prevention Act of 1954, is an extremely important measure. It seems to me that anyone who really understands the vital necessity of caring for the land and conserving water would wholeheartedly support this improvement in the original bill, which concept was different from anything yet conceived.

At this point I wish to pay the highest tribute to my colleague, W. R. POAGE of the 11th District of Texas, who had the foresight to devise a plan which has already proved itself in practical operation.

As I have said on numerous occasions, it is the application of a theory of closing the barn door before the horse has fled. It is truly a flood prevention program. It is important to control floods, but it is tremendously more important to prevent those floods before they have swept the living land down to the sea.

Arguments are advanced by some that it is either big dams or small dams. They do not concede that each has its purpose and that one compliments the other.

One of the greatest problems connected with large downstream dams is sedimentation. Smaller dams on the tributaries of the larger streams are, of course, a protection for these very expensive projects. Likewise, the development of the small streams and creeks feeding the larger tributaries of the main stream is a protection for these middle-size dams.

So one is certainly complimentary to the other and all three types are needed if proper conservation is to be accomplished.

In the great southwestern area of this country, if the flow of water can be slowed down, we will be succeeding to a great extent in preventing erosion.

The 1954 flood-prevention measure was a tremendously important step in the right direction. The pilot projects which have been built under this act are today paying dividends in conservation. Those which are accomplished facts provide a demonstration for all to see what can really be done in an organized effort with assistance from the Federal Government.

However, after the pilot projects had been selected, the present Secretary of Agriculture raised the ante considerably on the landowners. It was thought wise at the time of the passage of the original act in 1954 to leave wide latitude for the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, in the beginning of this program, I think everyone agrees it was necessary that such be done. The requirement later placed on the landowners that they pay approximately 50 percent of the cost, and giving them no credit for previous conservation practices, no credit for easements and rights-of-way, maintenance, and other contributions, has prevented the program from going forward. In the State of Texas we have approximately 100 applications for such projects. About half of them have been approved by the proper State agency, but very few—I believe only 3 or 4—have been finally approved, because local people simply cannot meet the requirements imposed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is extremely important and highly desirable that the provisions of this amendment be adopted in order that the intents of this program may be effective. I would not especially call this amendment to the original act a liberalization of its provisions. It simply recognizes the responsibility of the Federal Government in matters of flood control, in the same manner that it has heretofore done with reference to larger dams. I think it will make it possible for local communities to meet that part of the responsibility which is justly theirs, and that it will pay dividends to the entire country by reason of the soil- and water-conservation features.

Let me say here, Mr. Chairman, that I have never seen greater devotion, energy, and enthusiasm on the part of anyone in a public position than those men of the conservation service, whose duty it is to carry out the intents of this program. I have had occasion to see all of them in my particular area, and I am sure

that they are no different from those in other localities. They are wholly cooperative and practical in every approach. All those whom I know are highly qualified and dedicated to accomplishing those things intended in this important feature of soil and water conservation. I know that if we can broaden this concept to make possible the purposes intended much good will come of it because it will be in the hands of soil conservation people and soil conservation-minded local citizens who will make the most of every dollar invested by the Federal Government. I use the word "invested" because, my friends, it is one of the best possible investments which can be made.

I trust this measure will pass without a dissenting vote, and I believe those of you who are not directly affected, and who may never have such a development in your district, can still take pride in the fact that you exercise sound judgment in preserving not only soil and water, but in preserving the people on the land, and that they might live better.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has been well said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], this is a logical extension of the original Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act. There are really just two principal changes made in this bill. There are others of a more minor nature. I am going to refer to those two and perhaps discuss some of the minor changes if time permits.

One of these principal changes is that this bill sets up a multipurpose program. The other one is the change with reference to payment of the cost of the structures in flood-control projects.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and I had two important objectives in mind when we developed the pilot watershed program, which was the forerunner of the legislation you seek to amend today.

Our first objective, of course, was the treatment of small watersheds for the benefit of local farmers and the people living on the lower reaches of the streams to be treated. Probably no other conservation program in recent years has been so universally accepted by farmers, municipalities, and others as has this pilot program.

The other important objective was to provide, as the name implies, a pilot operation from which we could gain the necessary experience to successfully develop an overall program for the entire Nation.

As I interpret your amendment, you proposed to bring the cost-sharing provisions of the Public Law 566 program into line with the provisions of the pilot program. You are drawing upon our experience under the pilot program in revising this cost-sharing provision, are you not?

Mr. HOPE. That is true in a large part. In addition to that, we are doing what I mentioned a moment ago; we are authorizing multipurpose projects rather than purely flood-control projects.

I am glad the gentleman mentioned the pilot plant projects which have been so successful. Everyone in this country who is interested in water conservation owes him a debt of gratitude for the great part he had in making this program possible.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly; the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has been a leader in behalf of agriculture all the years he has served in Congress. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has for a good many years been interested in watershed protection legislation and has been one of the leaders in Congress with respect to it. He has suggested that after all, if it is fair for the Federal Government to assume the entire cost of the flood control in the program of the Army engineers and the reclamation program, why is it not fair to accord to the watershed protection program, which means so much to the rural communities of America, the same degree of protection? I think the gentleman from Texas was absolutely correct and I wish to compliment him and Mr. HOPE at this time upon bringing this bill before the House.

Mr. HOPE. As the gentleman has well said, this brings the program as far as construction costs of the structure are concerned into line with other flood control programs, whether by the Army engineers or under the reclamation service. Under this bill the cost of that part of the structure that goes to flood control is paid by the Federal Government. This is the only type of project where local people have been asked to share the cost of flood control structures.

This bill is a logical extension of the original Watershed Act which became a law in 1954. The fact that we are back here so soon, you might say, with an extension of that act, shows how rapidly we are moving in the field of water development in this country.

It has been only during the past 4 or 5 years, let me say, that the American people have come to realize the great extent to which we have depleted our water resources. And they are beginning to see the great demands that will be made upon our water resources in the years ahead by our increase in population, by our expanding industrial uses for water, as well as increased household uses. We are consuming tremendously increased quantities of water for all these purposes to say nothing of the expanding use of water for irrigation even in the more humid sections.

I believe anyone who has studied the water question at all must agree and admit that it is one of the most serious problems confronting the country at this time. Many of us who have been working on this legislation believe the only way we are going to solve this great problem of making the wisest and best use of our water is by storing that water in the soil or in small reservoirs near the place where it fell. Of course, some of it will get away and we will have to have larger dams down the streams. Some of it we will want for reclamation. That will be taken care of under reclamation projects large and small. But the nearer we can come to holding this water near the place where it falls the better job we are going to do in conserving our water resources.

That is the purpose of this legislation. It provides for multiple uses of water. There is a general realization that the original act was too limited in providing only for flood control.

It was very apparent soon after the act was passed that people regarded it as being too limited, because we immediately began to get inquiries as to why a small city, for instance, which wanted to put in some water storage could not combine its project with a flood-control project and thus get municipal water. People were interested in getting water for irrigation and industrial purposes or any of the other multitudinous uses to which we put water in our complex economy of today. So that is one of the important changes we have made in this bill. We have made it a multiple-purpose piece of water legislation.

The the second change is the one that was mentioned particularly and dwelt upon by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], that is, that we are now putting this legislation in the same category as all other flood control legislation in that we are requiring that the Federal Government pay the cost of flood control structures. I said we are putting it in the same category. We are not, however, because if you have a flood control project built by the Army engineers the Federal Government not only pays for the construction, it pays for the site and it pays for the maintenance thereafter of the project. Here the site will be furnished locally, and after the structure is completed the local people must assume the cost of maintaining it. So we have not gone in this legislation as far as the participation of the Federal Government in the cost is concerned as we have in flood control projects of the Army engineers and that reclamation projects which deal in part with flood control. In view of what is being done by other agencies we feel that in all fairness to the people who have to pay the cost of these small flood control projects the Federal Government should at least bear the cost of the structures. That is all we are asking the Federal Government to do.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. May I ask my able colleague from Kansas, who is familiar with the Washita project, this question. The Sandstone and other segments of the Washita River Basin was initially a pilot soil conservation district project wherein the Government paid the entire cost and the local people furnished the right-of-way and land. This was an excellent program. Will this new measure be similar to the 11 pilot projects? One phase of this new program will be similar to that, will it not?

Mr. HOPE. It will be similar to the 11 projects of which the Washita is one. As the gentleman from Minnesota pointed out, it will also be more nearly like the original Pilot Plant Act that we passed a few years ago.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In Oklahoma many worthwhile soil-conservation projects have been approved by our able Soil Conservation Service and soil conservation district officials. Though there are not sufficient funds under existing programs to put them all on a priority basis, would this permit a number of projects to be approved without limiting the number of needy projects?

Mr. HOPE. There would be no limitation on the number of projects. The only limitation is the amount of money which might be made available.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to thank the gentleman and compliment him and members of the House Agricultural Committee in pressing for passage of this legislation.

Mr. HOPE. There are, of course, many, many projects which are now going through the mill, both in the States and in the Department of Agriculture. We do not know how large this program may finally become, but the interest in it is tremendous.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Again permit me to commend the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I am sure the program will expand, and rapidly, especially if we pass this legislation.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. May I say to the gentleman I am very much interested in this legislation. It will go far toward helping our farmers and our local State governments to preserve our water supply and our soil as well. I see something here I would like to have the distinguished gentleman clarify for me. The bill reads:

> Such loans shall be repaid in not more than 50 years from the date when principal benefits of the project first become available with interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury—

Suppose you have a Secretary of the Treasury at some future time who is unfriendly. One who is not interested in this program. A Secretary who would like to see an honest and a practical application of the law fail. Suppose he makes the interest rate so high that the local water districts cannot make these loans. What happens in that case? Who determines the interest rate?

Mr. HOPE. The rate is that rate at which the Federal Government is borrowing money. That is what determines the interest rate. It is the interest rate on long-term borrowings by the Federal Government.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Kentucky did not read the entire sentence. It says:

> At the average rate of interest, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan is made.

It becomes simply a ministerial act on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to make the calculation—that is all he can do—and it is about 2½ percent.

Mr. CHELF. You mean that Congress has no control over the interest rate on this type of loan?

Mr. POAGE. The Congress has the control. We have said it shall be whatever the United States Government is paying for money. In other words, the purpose of it is to see that the United States does not lose money as a result of financing this—yet, we give the money to these localities at the least cost that we can to the Federal Government.

Mr. HOPE. As the gentleman from Texas has so well said, it is a purely ministerial act on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. The interest which is paid depends on the rate that the United States Government has to pay.

Mr. CHELF. I hope the interest rate is kept low so as to encourage these loans and thereby insure the success of this program. Our farmers and our country need this legislation badly. It will succeed if it is administered fairly and properly.

Mr. HOPE. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman and want to take this occasion to express my appreciation of the great interest he has always taken in watershed problems.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any limitation in the bill on the size of the loan? I notice the Department of Agriculture recommends an upper limit of $5 million on any one project. Does the bill carry any limitation?

Mr. HOPE. We did not put any limitation in the bill as to the amount of the loan, but, of course, the nature of these projects of itself puts a limitation on them. You cannot have a very large loan when it is limited to this type of project. I do not know whether there will be any loans of more than $5 million or not—there possibly might. The great majority of them will be considerably less than that, in my opinion.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. A question has been brought to my attention and I am asking this question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] for the purposes of clarification. The provisions of this amendatory act in addition to the original act itself in no way imposes any unwanted project upon any community. In other words, the initiative and the solicitation for the project must originate in the local community.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. That is the purpose of the original act and it remains the purpose of this amendment. These are local projects and they are initiated locally and under the control of local people at all times.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that the hearings have brought out that under the original law, Public Law 566, the Department of Agriculture found out that the farmers could not determine what the cost was going to be and, as a result, the projects have been slowed up so they are not going ahead the way we expected them to. We expect now that by the Government sharing the full cost of the dams, they will be able to give the participating people in the watershed more of an idea what their cost is going to be. Thus there will be more watersheds come under the act.

I believe the hearings brought out also the fact that they are unable to determine what the cost sharing would be until the project was ready for final O. K. by the Department.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The points which the gentleman makes were all brought out in the course of the hearings. I think each one of us who has been interested in the matter have had situations of that kind called to our attention many times. That is, the local people have some hesitation in going ahead without pretty good knowledge of what their share of the cost will be. To a considerable extent this legislation will help that situation in that it will lessen the burden on the local communities.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. In the last session of Congress we considered a small-projects bill with regard to the reclamation law. That was amended to provide for a program under the Department of Agriculture. It has been tied up in conference, I understand, because of the difficulty of working out a bill for providing for 2 programs in 1 bill. In the opinion of the gentleman this bill tends to specify the program in the Department of Agriculture so that that bill might be considered from the standpoint of the local participating program which will result in substantial savings to the Government.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is referring to the small-projects bill passed last year.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. It has been a disturbing thing to the Department of Agriculture to find that they would be compelled to administer two programs, each authorized by a separate piece of legislation, which in a sense, would be competing with each other. This legislation will clarify that matter and I assume in the conference between the two Houses on the small-projects bill the conflicting matter will be eliminated.

I am sorry I have not had time to discuss all phases of this legislation, but those of you who are interested will find them fully and clearly set out in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 8750 is important legislation, especially for us of the West. The seven amendments in

this bill will make the present Watershed Protection and Flood Control Act more usable and workable. It will provide a program for Federal assistance for conservation, utilization, and control of water.

Of the 7 changes offered, the first 2 are the most important:

1. The general scope of the act is broadened to include all aspects of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water—not just the "agricultural phases" of these activities as provided in the present act. This means that such things as municipal and industrial water supplies may be included as part of a watershed program.

2. Permits the building of dams with a capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet if the capacity in excess of that figure is for purposes other than flood prevention and the construction cost of such excess capacity is borne entirely by the local cooperating organizations.

When Assistant Secretary of Agriculture E. L. Peterson testified before our subcommittee—of the Committee on Agriculture—he stated:

A distinguishing feature of watershed projects is that land treatment becomes an early consideration in the management and use of water. It is the objective of these projects to develop and increase the usable water supplies and to begin the controls and management of water on the fields and forests where it first falls as rain or snow.

Developing and making best use of the water supply for irrigation and other productive uses, as well as for flood prevention and drainage, requires a combination of both engineering and land management practices. Water management must be compatible with the management of farms and the needs of urban communities that make up the watershed if we are to meet the increasing demands on water supplies. A dominant consideration in watershed planning is the interrelationship of land and water.

We view the work in small watersheds to be a needed complement to other necessary work on the larger rivers. Where there are direct relationships between upstream and downstream developments they are being taken into account in the planning of watershed projects and in reviews of the work plans by all State and Federal agencies who may have water-resource responsibilities.

We have been encouraged by the acceptance of the provision of the act that watershed projects are to be local projects with assistance from the Federal Government rather than projects planned and built by the Federal Government. We have been pleased with the willingness of watershed communities to assume development and management responsibility, and with the action of State governments to provide enabling legislation that permits local communities to take on these responsibilities.

All of the 48 States have designated State agencies or made other appropriate arrangements to handle the review and approval of applications for assistance under the act. As a part of the process of tooling up to provide for State and local participation in watershed projects, the legislatures of 20 States enacted 37 separate pieces of legislation during the calendar year 1955 to strengthen State and local participation with the Federal Government in carrying out projects under this legislation.

State legislative action since January 1 indicates that additional State legislation, including State financial assistance, is under consideration.

In the past 18 months the Soil Conservation Service has received 438 State-approved applications for assistance under the act. Information from the field indicates that the rate of applications is continuing to increase.

The Soil Conservation Service has to date approved planning in 135 watersheds of those for which applications have been received. All of these approvals have been based on priority recommendations of the State agencies which have the approval responsibility.

A planning organization has been built up, including 38 planning parties in the States. Some 27 plans have been completed in the field and are being reviewed in Washington. Of these, 16 have been transmitted to other Federal agencies and the governors for review in accordance with the provisions of the act, and 8 of the plans have been transmitted to the Bureau of the Budget for consideration in connection with their transmission to the Congress.

Water is our most important natural resource. We should develop our watersheds, cultivate and expand them, as well as protect our soil from constant erosion by damaging floodwater. This legislation points in that direction.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Addonizio	Gamble	Mollohan
Allen, Calif.	Garmatz	Morano
Allen, Ill.	Gary	Morgan
Ayres	Gavin	Moulder
Bailey	Granahan	Mumma
Barden	Grant	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Osmers
Baumhart	Gubser	Philbin
Betts	Haley	Phillips
Blatnik	Healey	Pilcher
Bowler	Hébert	Pillion
Boykin	Hess	Powell
Bush	Hiestand	Quigley
Byrne, Pa.	Hillings	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.
Carlyle	Holland	Riehlman
Carrigg	Jackson	Saylor
Chatham	James	Scherer
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Scott
Clark	Jensen	Sheehan
Cole	Johnson, Calif.	Shelley
Cooley	Kearns	Sieminski
Corbett	Kee	Sikes
Coudert	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cretella	Kelly, N. Y.	Spence
Dague	Keogh	Staggers
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Taylor
Davis, Wis.	King, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Knox	Vanik
Donovan	Lankford	Van Zandt
Doyle	McConnell	Walter
Durham	McCulloch	Watts
Eberharter	McDowell	Widnall
Fenton	Macdonald	Wier
Flood	Machrowicz	Williams, N. J.
Fogarty	Matthews	Williams, N. Y.
Forand	Merrow	Wilson, Ind.
Fountain	Miller, Calif.	Wolcott
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8750, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 300 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my deep interest in H. R. 8750, which is the result of legislation our Committee on Agriculture began working on this past year.

I believe this legislation will help our farmers get irrigation, which they so badly need. In several of the counties in my Eighth District of Florida, drought conditions have been fought by many of our farmers for the past few years, and I am hopeful that H. R. 8750 will offer them the assistance they need to cope with this problem.

I certainly hope this important legislation, H. R. 8750, as reported by our Committee on Agriculture, will pass.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, the problems of water, ranging from lack of it to sudden excess, has had a major influence on the life of man from the very beginning of his life on this globe.

In our time, we have been inclined to take this element for granted, thinking that our nature had become our docile servant.

The storms and droughts and floods of recent years have cured us of this superiority, for the cost has been enormous.

As we now come to grips with the problem, we become aware of contradictions in such Federal laws as we have that deal with the overall question of water. Unfortunately, we have approached the problem in piecemeal fashion, without having a complete and unified policy.

H. R. 8750, helps to correct some of these shortcomings.

Most people associate water control with agriculture, the Mississippi and the West, big dams and large projects.

Yet, in recent years, the East and the Far West have suffered the most disastrous floods.

Somehow, people do not think of municipal and industrial water supplies as part of a watershed program.

When they should be, for you very well cannot have one without the other.

At this time, I want to pay tribute to the Army engineers for the fine work they have done on flood control, extending back into the last century. The engineers have had to cope with big problems. Perhaps they have not had the time nor the means to take care of the smaller ones. At any rate, as we in New England have learned, floods seem to come out of nowhere. And preventive measures seem to bog down in endless red tape.

We in New England need the smaller dams to give us protection.

We need a tie-in that would enable municipalities to increase the size of their water supply reservoirs to provide at the same time a measure of flood control. This has been restricted by the

limitation on the size of authorized impoundments.

The committee considers that the Secretary should not provide for any part of the construction costs allocated to municipal and industrial water supply or other similar purposes. Municipalities will, however, benefit in many instances through cheaper storage resulting from a combination of flood prevention and water supply capacity in the same structure. Moreover, municipalities would be eligible for a loan under the new loan provisions of the bill.

Furthermore, the amendment to section 4 provides:

That the Secretary shall not require local organizations to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention.

The amendments would also permit planning of a structure providing more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity but only if the structure is, first, an integral part of the watershed plan; second, the capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet is for other than flood-prevention purposes; and, third, the construction cost of the excess capacity is to be borne by the local organization.

The emphasis, rightly, is toward a total watershed plan.

We cannot isolate and deal with one factor of the water problem, and ignore the rest.

We must have a multiple-purpose water and land-management program instead of one that is limited to flood-prevention and agricultural water management.

This is the final objective.

H. R. 8750 will help us to make further progress toward that end.

I may have certain misgivings that this bill does not go far enough, and in time, but I am going to support it because it is a step forward.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H. R. 8750. It is only logical that I shall vote for H. R. 8750 because it is identical to my bill H. R. 8738.

Before I discuss a few of the specific merits and provisions of the bill, I should like to make a general observation with respect to soil and water conservation programs. The general observation sums up my philosophy on this matter.

It is my belief that every citizen—regardless of whether he lives in a city, a village, a suburban area or on the farm—has a vital stake in the conservation of our soil and water resources. If we did not have enough fertile soil, adequate water supplies, efficient farmers and a good system of distribution the majority of people—living in cities, villages, and suburban areas—would not have enough food to meet their daily living requirements.

For this reason, then, I believe every citizen-taxpayer must share—through Federal aid programs—in the cost of conserving our soil and water resources. Farmers, alone, cannot pay for the costs of maintaining the soil; and we should not expect farmers to do so.

The bill now before the House recognizes this principle, and there are provisions in the bill to correct certain inequities that have held back programs extending and promoting soil and water conservation practices designed to improve the general welfare of all people.

I know that there are a number of watershed associations in the Ninth Wisconsin Congressional District whose members—as individuals—have gone as far as they can financially go in water and soil conservation programs. The members of these watershed associations are willing to do conservation work on their farms; but they cannot afford to pay for the cost of flood control dams. I am sure that there are many, many other regions in the country where the same situation prevails.

Under provisions of the present law the cost of flood prevention dams is shared equitably by the Federal, State, and local agencies in proportion to benefits received. H. R. 8750 amends the law so that the cost of flood prevention dams is borne by the Federal Government.

The bill also eliminates from the present law the necessity of submitting to Congress and to the President detailed plans and justification for smaller projects—that is projects involving a Federal expenditure of less than $250,000.

H. R. 8750 permits the building of dams in excess of 5,000-acre feet if the capacity in excess of this figure is for purposes other than flood prevention. The construction cost of such excess capacity is borne entirely by local cooperating agencies. This provision makes it possible for communities, villages, and cities to participate with the Federal Government in planning and constructing multiple purpose projects.

The bill also provides for long-term loans at the Federal Government rate of interest to local organizations for the purpose of financing their share of the cost of programs.

In closing, I wish to say that the bill provides three different levels of cost sharing of projects. In the first level the Federal Government will bear the full cost of flood prevention. This feature will be of particular benefit to farmers who belong to watershed associations.

Under the second level the Federal Government and local agencies will share the cost of storage of water for irrigation, streamflow regulation, drainage and other similar purposes.

Finally, there are projects where the Federal Government will bear no part of the structural costs. These projects include structures for the storage and supply of municipal and industrial water.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in support of this bill that is before us. The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was signed into law about a year and a half ago. The fundamental principle of that law is very simple and very American. It provides for Federal aid to local organizations in carrying out their own locally initiated and executed programs of watershed protection and flood prevention.

The amendments that we are considering are essential to make this principle fully operative. This watershed work is a program through which the Government gives a helping hand to local communities. It is a partnership operation, so to speak, with the local community playing the role of senior partner. And that is the way I think it should be. That is the way the people of South Dakota think it should be.

Experience gained in watershed work during the past year and a half has demonstrated the need for these proposed changes. The local organizations should be able to obtain help for, and to include in their watershed plans all types of improvement for better soil and water management.

These amendments, too, will make for more equitable cost-sharing arrangements. When the local people pay for applying the necessary soil and water conservation measures on their farms; when they supply the land, easements, and rights-of-way for structures; when they contract for all structures and guarantee their operation and maintenance; they have certainly done their share. The least the Federal Government should do is pay the cost of construction for the flood-prevention structural measures that provide community benefits. The truth is that the national benefit resulting from the work that farmers are doing to conserve and improve the lands of this Nation for our children and grandchildren more than offset such Federal contribution to construction costs.

We are all fully aware that the farmers of this Nation are today the least able of all its citizens to take on additional financial burdens.

Another fact that we should keep constantly before us is that water is becoming more and more the basic limiting factor in agriculture and our entire national economy. Water is the key to future progress. Water conservation is growing in importance by leaps and bounds. Here is a program that offers vast opportunities for actually doing something about the water situation in local communities. It brings the water element into balance with the soil element in our going soil- and water-conservation program in America.

I should like to point out, too, that watershed work that will be made possible by these amendments will be especially helpful in advancing the conservation programs of soil-conservation districts throughout the country.

In South Dakota farmers have organized 66 soil-conservation districts. These districts are managed by locally elected, dedicated people. Through these districts farmers are moving forward in putting sound soil and water conservation into practice on their land. These amendments will make help in watershed protection and flood prevention more readily available to the districts for tackling water management problems that involve a number of farms or whole communities. In the applications received so far over at the Department of Agriculture, I think it is highly significant that in practically every instance a soil-conservation district is one of the local sponsoring organizations of watershed projects.

These proposed amendments to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act can make a substantial and significant contribution to speeding up soil and water work in South Dakota and all of the United States.

Our soil and water conservation is good and effective. What we need is to get on faster with the work. This bill will help in that respect. I urge that the House go on record as passing H. R. 8750 by a unanimous vote.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, in 1954 when the full force of the worst drought within the past 30 or 40 years struck Georgia, we in the Southeast who normally enjoy such a generous annual rainfall, came to realize the urgent need for small watershed projects. At that time, there was pending in the Congress an act which came to be known as Public Law 566. Press notices from the Nation's Capital to the effect that this bill had passed met with a great deal of jubilation among the farmers, sportsmen, and municipal officials of the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia.

The Satilla Soil Conservation Agency, which covers several counties in my district, sponsored a meeting which led to the formation of the Satilla Watershed Corp. This became the parent organization of many prospective small watershed groups. It was not long before these groups had a rude awakening. They found out that under the provisions of Public Law 566, there was little which would benefit them. Coming from a large rural district that is blessed with many streams, most of which have been running almost dry during the past several years, and being a farmer myself, I, too, was greatly disappointed and distressed over the futility of trying to obtain watershed help from the Federal Government under the provisions of Public Law 566. Therefore, when I came to Congress the first order of business with me was to attempt to get something done which would relieve this terrible situation. I introduced, last year, an amendment to Public Law 566. It was a simple amendment, but it called for the removal of the limitation of all other projects except flood control which was the crux of the problem of Public Law 566. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who is chairman of the Commodity and Credit Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, very generously granted my request for public hearings on my amendment. I had not realized, Mr. Chairman, the tremendous fight that those who have been on the Agriculture Committee for a long time had been making to provide a really beneficial watershed program for the people of this country until I attended all the public hearings on my bill, participated in them, heard all the testimony and read all the committee hearings which had been held on Public Law 566 during 1954.

Right now, Mr. Chairman, I want to pay high tribute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and many others of the Agriculture Committee for the fight they have been making on this program for a long time, and I want to thank them for their generosity in giving me such a sympathetic reception to the problem that faced not only all my particular district, but the entire United States. While these hearings were going on, I learned, too, that there were others intensely interested in this problem. Congressman JONES of Alabama introduced a small watershed bill; Congressman ENGLE, of California, introduced a small water projects bill. The problems of the reclamation States and the rest of the Nation are somewhat different. Neverless the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] with great generosity I thought, accepted the provisions of Mr. JONES' bill in his own small water projects bill, and while the result—because the bill would have had to be administered partially by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture—was rather confusing. Nevertheless, the Members of this House felt the need for such legislation and I joined with them in passing it.

The bill went to the Senate and was rewritten into two parts; title 1 dealt with Mr. ENGLE's bill and was to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and title 2 of the Senate bill dealt with Mr. JONES' bill and was to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. However, that bill has lain in conference committee since last year, and it has been impossible to get it out. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if the House passes the small watershed bill we have before us today, the impasse in the conference committee will be resolved. It is certainly my hope that the small watershed bill will pass this House today, and the Senate will pass it, and I certainly hope that Mr. ENGLE's bill then can come out of the conference committee free of the provisions that were put in to relieve all the other States outside the reclamation States.

Within the past 25 years our country has made amazing strides in the conservation of its soil. It has taken us some time to realize that water is our most precious asset, and that it, too, must be conserved to the very best of the ability of our citizens. With the great increases in population and the giant increase in industry, the need for water has outgrown by far the expectations anyone could have had even just a few years ago, and so it becomes extremely pertinent that the enactment of Federal legislation for this purpose take place as quickly as possible.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, the hearings on the bill I offered were not concluded until close to the end of the session. By that time the Agriculture Committee members and I, myself, realized that the bill I had offered was not comprehensive enough. While it opened up in a general way the possibilities for all types of water conservation within the small watershed projects, these were not spelled out. Upon consultation with experts from the Department of Agriculture and the members of the Agriculture Committee, we all agreed that a new bill should be written and that we did not have time in the remaining days of the session to do this. We agreed that the committee and the staff acting with the advice of others very close to the problems faced by the country on water conservation should then draw a bill that would be offered at the beginning of the present session. The bill we are considering today is the result of a year's work. It goes far beyond my highest expectations in providing a really workable small watershed program. In the first place, the Federal Government will, under this bill as it has heretofore done in all other legislation relating to the subject, bear the full costs of each project insofar as it relates to flood control. I submit that this is the only fair thing that could have been done.

The bill goes further than helping the farmer. It brings in municipal groups, wildlife organizations, recreation groups, and industry. It is really, Mr. Chairman, a multipurpose small watershed projects bill. For the first time to my knowledge, the Congress has an opportunity to consider legislation that is truly comprehensive in this field. We include in this bill a lending program. While the flood-control project, which is to be paid for in full by the Federal Government, is limited to 5,000 acre-feet there is no limit up to the sum of $5 million as to what each project can include. The various groups participating in this project can obtain loans at a low interest rate for a period of 50 years to carry out the purposes of the bill. Because so many projects will amount to comparatively small sums, any amount up to $250,000 can be borrowed from the Government without congressional approval. This is a most important aspect of the bill, because it makes it extremely workable.

Farmers and all groups must practice soil-conservation measures under this bill. It is going to be possible now, after this bill has been enacted into law, for all farmers participating in these small watershed projects to have irrigation, a need that is more poignantly recognized each year by our farmers. We now know that it is highly foolish to practice water conservation without accompanying soil-conservation measures. Water, insofar as it is possible, should be held on the ground where it falls.

I think this is extremely important, and even in sections of the country that are blessed with abundant rainfall there is no control over when the rain will fall, and oftentimes there may be weeks or even months of drought, when irrigation could save a crop. The farmers need not only rainfall. They need water at the proper time to get the most out of crops that they raise. Cities can participate in these projects, for municipal water supply and for water-purification purposes. Recreation groups can use the pools or reservoirs that are created by the backing up of water, and they can become marvelous community projects for young and old by providing all water sports and fishing facilities. All of us know that there is need for conserving water as never before, and that we should put it to as many uses as we possibly can.

One thing I would like particularly to point out is the fact that drainage is defined as a part of the flood-control project. This makes sense to the flatland regions of our Nation because while we do not have floods in the same drastic manner as come in some of the hilly sections of the Nation, we do have the problem of water overflowing the banks of streams and standing there for long periods of time. This tends to make the lowest part of our croplands, which are incidentally usually the most fertile, al-

most impossible to cultivate. In my section of the country softwood trees grow in prolific abundance. The constant settling of water in many areas kills off the seedlings of the softwoods which are of great economic value to us, and leaves the land barren.

I want to point out another thing which has happened since the adjournment of the Congress last year. We have had some of the most disastrous floods in the history of the country, in New England, California, and other places. If this bill had been in operation and small-watershed projects had been in existence, millions and millions of dollars would have been saved, not to mention the lives that were lost in those floods. I know of no real opposition to this bill, Mr. Chairman. I firmly believe that the House will pass it.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first bill I have ever introduced to reach the floor of the House. I am grateful for the sympathetic consideration it has received from the membership at large. I am grateful that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and others thought so much of this bill that they introduced it, too. I am proud that the nature of the bill is such that the great majority of the membership sees and believes in its need.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as favoring this bill very much. Again I wish to compliment the committee on bringing into line with the Army engineers' great work and with that of Reclamation the same rights for our small watersheds throughout the Nation relative to the Federal Government's assuming the cost of the actual flood control features.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and others who have introduced these amendments to Public Law 566 are to be commended for their alertness to the need for further refining this basic legislation.

We have, as we had hoped, learned many things from the Andersen-Hope pilot watershed program. In starting that program we were responding to a prime agricultural need, and experience has already shown that benefits to agriculture alone far exceed the actual costs of the projects going forward under the pilot operation. As an intentional by-product of this program, we have gained priceless knowledge of the collateral benefits to the people living in the cities and villages downstream.

On other farm legislation we have had the unfortunate situation in which unthinking people or those motivated by selfish desires to see their individual views prevail have attempted to divide farm and nonfarm people. It is no credit to them that they have been highly successful in their efforts, and as a result we find the metropolitan press raising a great outcry against farm legislation in general.

Under the pilot watershed program, however, we have an agricultural undertaking which has been warmly endorsed and, in some instances, actually fostered by nonfarm people. My own Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota is an excellent example.

In southwestern Minnesota we have a relatively flat terrain in which water disposal is about as serious a problem as water retention. The pilot program takes into consideration the basic understanding that flood prevention is as much a part of watershed treatment as the effective utilization of rainfall on crop and rangeland.

We have already seen dramatic results from the pilot projects in our area. Beginning on the land where the water first falls, our farmers, with the guidance and technical assistance provided by the soil-conservation districts, have applied land treatment and conservation practices which porvide maximum retention and utilization of the rainfall. A significant part of the water which formerly rushed downstream to flood farmland and villages alike is now kept right where it falls.

In seasonal periods of heavy precipitation, however, we find more water falling than could possibly or desirably be kept in the soil itself. This brings us to the second important phase of the pilot operation in our area. With local cooperation in the form of easements, reservoir sites, and so forth, the Soil Conservation Service steps in and constructs dams and water-retarding structures to either hold the water indefinitely or restritc it temporarily and then release it at a controlled rate which will avoid costly flooding below. With the exception of flood prevention on downstream farmland, these structures are for the primary benefit of city dwellers and municipalities.

The third important phase of the pilot watershed treatment applies to the ditches and streams themselves. These are cleaned out, channelized, and otherwise physically treated so that they can carry away the determined amount of water during peak seasons without flooding the lower reaches. This work is also of great benefit to the nonfarm people downstream.

In the watershed areas our municipalities have three major problems involving water. First, they have the problem of seasonal floods which do great damage to private and public property, risk lives, and depress commerce. Second, they have the physical and sanitation problem of sewage disposal when their sewage plants are inundated by flood waters. Third, they have the ever-increasing problem of maintaining adequate water supplies for public use.

Personally, I believe the pilot program has exceeded expectations in meeting all three of these nonfarm problems. On this matter of floods, we find that upstream treatments have been highly successful in preventing downstream floods. City residents who had come to look upon seasonal floods as almost a way of life now see the ending of this menace to life and property. It is not at all remarkable that they have become so enthusiastic about the watershed program. They, too, share in very large measure in its benefits.

During flood seasons, I have made on-the-spot inspections of municipal sewage systems which have been inundated by floodwaters. The effects of such inundation were shocking, to say the least. With sewage disposal plants knocked out and raw sewage entering the streams, a serious threat to health was presented. You can well imagine the difficulties facing householders with their disposal system shut down. Prevention of such conditions by the flood-control measures of the watershed program naturally merits its high approval from city residents and municipal officials.

Municipal and individual water supply problems are mounting rapidly throughout most of the Nation. Here, again, we see material benefits for nonfarm people in this program. Communities depending upon wells for their water supplies have had them shut down and all but destroyed by ravaging floods and sewage contamination. Additionally, as the water tables have fallen they have had to drill new wells and deepen the old. Today, we are eliminating the flood threats and raising the water tables in many areas of short supply.

The amendments before us will do even more to meet this problem of short municipal and industrial water supplies. The bill provides that municipalities may develop primary or supplementary water supplies by merely paying the additional costs on reservoirs above 5,000 acre-feet of flood-prevention capacity. This additional feature of the watershed program will be of tremendous benefit to water-starved communities in many areas. Again, we have an excellent example of the immediate benefit of a vital farm program to nonfarm people.

The Anderson-Hope pilot watershed program, which had its inception in my Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture while I was chairman, has opened up a new era of mutual helpfulness and cooperation between farm and nonfarm people. It has given us invaluable experience and technical know-how for application on other watersheds throughout the Nation. It has borne the burden of pioneering and has advanced the cause of conservation and flood control immeasurably.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has well stated, we have here a program which has been enthusiastically received by the Nation. The Anderson-Hope pilot-plant program and the Watershed Protection Act which followed have already done much good for conservation in America.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (act of August 4, 1954, 68 Stat. 666) is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out the third sentence of section 2 and amend the second sentence of said section to read: " 'Works of improvement'—any undertaking for—

"(1) flood prevention (including structural and land treatment measures); or

"(2) the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water in watershed or subwatershed areas not exceeding 250,000 acres and not including any single structure which provides more than 5,000 acre-feet of total capacity except structures proposed to be constructed by a local organization as an integral part of a watershed plan in which any capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet is for purposes other than flood prevention and the construction cost of such excess capacity is to be borne entirely by the local organization."

(b) Section 4 of the act is amended by striking out of the proviso in paragraph (2) the words "That no part of the construction cost for providing any capacity in structures for purposes other than flood prevention and features related thereto shall be borne by the Federal Government under the provisions of this act;" and inserting "That the Secretary shall not require local organizations to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention."

(c) Section 5 of the act is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first proviso ", and in no event after July 1, 1956";

(2) by inserting after the word "That" in the third proviso ", whenever the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement in any watershed or subwatershed area shall exceed $250,000,"; and

(3) by inserting in the fourth proviso after the words "That any such plan" the words "involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of $250,000."

(d) Said act is further amended by inserting after section 7 the following two new sections and renumbering subsequent sections of the act to conform:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make loans to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement provided for in this act. Such loans shall be repaid in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the project first become available with interest, at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid on the long-term interest-bearing marketable securities of the United States outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan is made.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

With the following committee amend-amendments:

Page 2, line 19, strike out the period and insert a semicolon.

Page 3, line 2, strike out the comma.

Page 3, line 6, after the sum, insert "and after the words 'public or other lands' the words 'or wildlife'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EDMONDSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, pursuant to House Resolution 443, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATES RIGHTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of America can be directly attributed to the wisdom and foresight of those brilliant men who guided the formation of the Union during the Revolutionary War and shortly thereafter.

Farsighted men gave us a Constitution in order to form a more perfect union, but the Thirteen Sovereign States ceded to the Federal Government only those powers that are necessary and desirable for the good of all of the States. They carefully preserved to the several States all the powers not specifically granted to the Federal Government. Those farsighted men were wise beyond their generation. Their wisdom was born of the hard experiences of colonists revolting finally against a foreign master.

They had tested the bitter lesson of a central government arrogating to itself the liberties of free men. And by force of arms they threw off that yoke, declaring that these colonies were, and of right ought to be, free, and independent. They did not intend that another sovereign alien power nor an all-powerful Federal entity should take over from these independent and sovereign States the victory which they had so dearly purchased.

That is why they measured out with such care and safeguards the only powers which they would cede to the Federal Union; they reserved all others to the States and to the people.

Why was our Constitution written in such a manner as to delegate specific powers to the Federal Government? And why did the 10th amendment specifically state that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"?

To quote the Supreme Court of the United States, of a bygone day:

This amendment * * * disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted. With equal determination, the framers intended that no such assumption should ever find justification in the organic act, and that if in the future further powers seemed necessary they should be granted by the people in the manner they had provided for amending that act.[1]

Some outstanding Americans have expressed considerable concern over the assumption of powers reserved to the States. For example, I quote from a great American who stated on October 14, 1952, in New Orleans:

First, I deplore and I will always resist Federal encroachment upon rights and affairs of the States.

Second, I am gravely concerned over the threats to the States inherent in the growth of this power-hungry movement.

This same eminent gentleman, on October 14, 1952, at Houston, Tex., stated:

America was built by a robust and vigorous people. They operated first through the original States and then through a balance of State and Federal powers. That balance was designed to keep as much of the Government as close to the people as possible—no nation of free men was ever built from the top down—that system of government has served us well for 160 years—that system is one in which States have a vital part. The preservation of local order, elbow room to produce and build, protection of our titles to land, the sacredness of our homes from intrusion, our right to get the best schooling for our children—we were secured these basic freedoms in the first instance by our State, our country and our own home town. These are primarily affairs for logical (local) administration. We must keep them so. Otherwise an all-powerful Washington bureaucracy will rob us one by one of the whole bundle of our liberties—We must preserve and protect this matchless system of States united.

And, at another time, this same gentleman said:

I want to see maintained the constitutional relationships between the Federal and State Governments. * * * For, if the States lose their meaning, our entire system of Government loses its meaning. And the next step is the rise of the centralized, national state in which the seeds of autocracy can take root and grow. * * * We will see that the legitimate rights of the States and local communities are respected. * * * We will not reach into the States and take from them their powers and responsibilities to serve their citizens.

Now lest I be accused of being partisan in my approach, let me say that the very famous American whom I have just quoted is the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

And let me quote from another source. Let me read from the Republican platform of 1860:

The maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depends.

On July 16, 1929, another famous American, then speaking as Governor of a great State, said:

Our Nation has been a successful experiment in democratic government, because the individual States have waived in only a few instances their sovereign rights. * * * But there is a tendency, and to my mind a dangerous tendency, on the part of our national Government, to encroach, on one excuse or

[1] *Kansas* v. *Colorado* (2-6 U. S. 46 (1907)).

another, more and more upon State supremacy.

And again in 1930, this same outstanding American stated:

> The proper relations between the Government of the United States and the governments of the separate States thereof depend entirely, in their legal aspects, on what powers have been voluntarily ceded to the central government by the States themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman I have just quoted was, of course, one of our greatest Presidents, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I have quoted Eisenhower, Roosevelt, and the Republican platform of 1860 merely to establish the fact that what I say here today is not new. It is something that has been recognized for many, many years.

James Madison, during the debate on the Constitution, wrote as follows:

> The powers delegated * * * to the Federal Government are few and defined. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce. * * * The powers which are reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.

The concept of a federal union as created under the Constitution, defined by its authors, and interpreted and analyzed by great American Presidents, together with an unbroken line of decisions of the Supreme Court, left no doubt in anyone's mind as to what was meant by the powers preserved to the States by the Constitution.

But on May 17, 1954, 168 years of precedent was shattered and abandoned to the sociological ideas of an alien who mislead nine members of the United States Supreme Court into an attempt to set aside the principles of constitutional government so dearly bought, and so carefully preserved—principles which made us a great and federal union—principles which had protected us against the creation of an all-consuming, all-powerful, Federal Government.

For we know that the Federal Government, like any other uncontrollable growth, has an insatiable appetite, and will continue to expand at the slightest provocation until it has gnawed away at the very fibers which sustain it—namely, the States which gave this Nation its very name—the United States of America. And, when that day happens, and we are fast approaching it, we will have lost the initiative and the greatness of America.

The power to make laws is vested in the Congress; the power to execute the laws is vested in the President; the power to interpret the laws is vested in the judiciary. No power is vested in the judiciary by the Constitution to make the laws—and any power so assumed is in direct violation of the separation of powers that constitute the very heart of our form of government. The Supreme Court may say what the law is; they may not say what the law should be. Only the Congress may write our Federal laws.

But Congress has enacted no law with respect to the manner in which the States will conduct their public-school system because it has no constitutional authority to legislate in this field, but the Supreme Court has not hesitated to inject itself in the affairs of the States.

The Constitution of the United States does not specify how the school systems of the States will operate—nor does it specify how the States will administer the law of domestic relations, or the law of probate proceedings.

The Constitution does not refer to the laws of inheritance; nor does the Constitution provide for the police systems of the various States. But, if the States of this Union sit idly by; if the Congress sits idly by, and permits the Supreme Court to make the laws for the several States, then we will deserve the judgment which will extinguish our representative form of government as we know it.

And, Mr. Speaker, I refer specifically to the decision of the Supreme Court rendered on May 17, 1954.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The gentleman from Georgia is making a speech that the rest of the Members should hear.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman from Georgia withdraw his point and permit me to finish my speech?

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman is making a great speech and I think it should be heard by the entire membership. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Addonizio	Garmatz	Mumma
Bailey	Gary	Nelson
Barden	Gathings	O'Hara, Minn.
Barrett	Gavin	O'Neill
Bass, Tenn.	Granahan	Osmers
Baumhart	Grant	Philbin
Betts	Green, Oreg.	Phillips
Blatnik	Gubser	Pilcher
Bonner	Haley	Pillion
Bowler	Healey	Powell
Boykin	Hébert	Prouty
Burdick	Hess	Quigley
Bush	Hiestand	Reed, N. Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Riehlman
Carlyle	Holland	Rogers, Mass.
Carrigg	Jackson	Rutherford
Celler	James	Saylor
Chatham	Jenkins	Scherer
Chudoff	Jensen	Scott
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Sheehan
Cole	Kearns	Shelley
Cooley	Kee	Sieminski
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Coudert	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Cretella	Kilburn	Staggers
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Sullivan
Dague	Knox	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Thompson, N. J.
Davis, Wis.	Krueger	Vanik
Dawson, Ill.	Lankford	Van Zandt
Diggs	McConnell	Vursell
Dingell	McCulloch	Walter
Donovan	McDowell	Watts
Doyle	Macdonald	Wharton
Durham	Matthews	Widnall
Eberharter	Merrow	Wier
Engle	Miller, Calif.	Williams, N. J.
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Flood	Mollohan	Wilson, Calif.
Fogarty	Morano	Wilson, Ind.
Forand	Morgan	Wolcott
Fulton	Morrison	Wolverton
Gamble	Moulder	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and ninety-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT BILL

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have 2 days to file minority views with respect to H. R. 8901, the District of Columbia transit bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as I said just before the quorum call, I refer specifically to the decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954.

The Congress of the United States has not spoken with respect to the matter of operating integrated schools in the States. And the Congress has not acted because it has no constitutional authority to act. No responsible person ever really thought there was constitutional authority for this unwarranted invasion of the reserved powers of the States until the May 17, 1954, decision, when the Supreme Court abandoned all the judicial decisions of its predecessors and took it upon itself to change the Constitution in their own name.

Now let us analyze a few portions of that unfortunate decision of May 17, 1954.

What happened on that day was that nine men of the Supreme Court unwittingly, perhaps, arrogated to themselves the whole constitutional Federal system of government.

While sitting nominally as a court they actually took upon themselves the powers of a constitutional convention, as well as the powers of the 531 Representatives of the States sitting in the Congress, and of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, when they amended and ratified, in one judgment, the whole of the Constitution and all of the decisions of their predecessors.

This is what they said:

> In approaching this problem
>
> Of segregation—
>
> we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or even to 1896, when *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* was written. We must consider public education in the lights of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way, can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Now let me repeat the first part of this portion of the decision:

> In approaching this problem—
>
> Said the Supreme Court—
>
> we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted.

In one fell swoop this new, self-created legislative body, under the guise of the

Supreme Court, abandoned and destroyed a cardinal rule of construction and interpretation that had been in existence since the beginning of judicial systems.

Every student of law knows that in the construction and interpretation of every document, the date, together with the conditions and circumstances surrounding the date, must necessarily be considered in fixing the intention of the parties at the time the instrument was executed. As a matter of fact, the true intention of the parties at the specific period in question, is the very purpose of a judicial inquiry. And where it is a legislative enactment, even the journals and minutes and records of the speeches, pro and con, are referred to in the ascertainment of this intention.

Another great cardinal principle of law that was violated by the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, was the abandonment of the doctrine of stare decisis as a result of the decision of Plessy against Ferguson rendered in 1896, which had confirmed the early and proper meaning of the 14th amendment. On the basis of this 1896 interpretation, billions of dollars have been invested by the various States of the Union and their agencies, and by private investors, in segregated schools, as well as recreational and social facilities in various parts of the United States.

Thus the action of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954, amounted to an expropriation, and a confiscation, of public and private property.

In addition, this same Supreme Court which rendered its decision on May 17, 1954, completely overlooked, or refused to acknowledge, the legislative history of the 14th amendment.

At the very time that the proposed 14th amendment was under debate in the Congress, the Congress enacted legislation dedicating certain real estate in the city of Washington to the establishment of Negro schools in the District, and simultaneously amended an earlier law to insure that the trustees of colored schools in the cities of Washington and Georgetown should receive a proportionate share of the school fund.

In 1868, just after the 14th amendment had been ratified by the requisite number of States, Congress passed a law transferring the duties of Negro trustees of Negro schools to white trustees of public schools.

Thus we find that the same Congress which, in proposing the 14th amendment to protect the Negro in his civil rights within his State, did not consider attendance at nonsegregated schools one of those civil rights to which the Negro was entitled in the District of Columbia.

How anyone can possibly argue that the 14th amendment was ever intended to prohibit segregated schools is beyond comprehension.

As a matter of fact, of the 37 States to which the 14th amendment was submitted, only 5 abolished or prohibited segregation when they ratified the amendment and there is no indication whatsoever that this action was based upon the 14th amendment. And of these 5, 3 later established segregated school systems after the 14th amendment had become a part of the Constitution of the United States.

Nine States did not have racially segregated public schools at the time the 14th amendment was submitted to them for ratification, so they were not involved.

Four States with segregated schools refused to ratify the 14th amendment: California, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware. But their failure to ratify the amendment at the time it was submitted to them was not based upon the fact that they had segregated schools.

Missouri and West Virginia ratified the 14th amendment at a time when they had segregated public-school systems and they continued to operate segregated school systems after ratification of the 14th amendment. But perhaps the most persuasive evidence of the meaning and intent of the 14th amendment will be found in the fact that nine Northern States continued to operate or immediately established segregated schools after ratifying the 14th amendment. These States are Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

School segregation was not completely outlawed in New York State until 1938, and it is very obvious that the New York Legislature which ratified the 14th amendment did not believe that it would require abolition of school segregation at the time of ratification. And the New York courts in decisions rendered from 1869 to 1900, all agreed that this was not the effect of the amendment.

Ohio continued to segregate school systems for almost 20 years after the 14th amendment had been adopted and did not outlaw segregation until 1887—again ample proof that the 14th amendment was not understood by the State of Ohio as prohibiting or requiring the abolition of segregation in the public schools in that State.

Pennsylvania established separate schools for Negroes in 1854, and such school segregation was upheld by the Pennsylvania courts when the system was attacked on constitutional grounds in 1873. The system was not abolished in Pennsylvania until 1881.

And finally, eight States continued to operate, or immediately established, segregated schools after ratifying the 14th amendment. These are the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Tennessee.

The indisputable evidence based upon the history of the amendment and the actions of the State legislatures following the ratification of the 14th amendment, overwhelmingly establishes the fact that the States of the Union when the 14th amendment was adopted, did not construe that amendment as compelling the abolition of segregated schools.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States, contrary to the basic principles upon which constitutional law is based, said:

> In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted.

But what did another Supreme Court say about this theory of judicial construction? In 1887 the Supreme Court said in *Ex parte Bain* (121 U. S. 1):

> It is never to be forgotten that, in the construction of the language of the Constitution here relied on, as indeed in all other instances where construction becomes necessary, we are to place ourselves as nearly as possible in the condition of the men who framed that instrument.

And what has the present Supreme Court done?

Based upon its own wishful thinking, based solely on its own views as to what they think the Constitution of the Nation should be, they have decided that they cannot turn back the clock to 1868, but instead they must view the Constitution of the United States on the basis of the sociological studies that are available to them.

It mattered little to the Supreme Court of the United States that neither the Congress nor the States, through the consitutional process, have acted upon the question. It mattered little to the Supreme Court of the United States that the 14th amendment was never intended to prohibit segregated schools. It mattered little to the nine members of the Supreme Court that the entire legislative history of the 14th amendment justifies the maintenance of separate but equal schools among the States, if that is the will of the State.

No, the only thing that apparently mattered to these misguided nine men was that some writers of sociology had concluded that segregated schools were bad for the personality development of certain individuals, and on that basis the Constitution should be interpreted without regard to its legislative history, and in complete disregard of what the framers of the amendment intended.

If ever there has been an unwarranted assault upon the rights of the people, the sovereignty of the States, the dignity and prestige of the Congress, it was this unlawful invasion by the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954.

Who knows but what the Supreme Court may next decide that all minerals in the ground belong to the Federal Government; or that the fish in the Great Lakes, and the streams of Pennsylvania, must bow to Federal domination?

There is no end to the dangerous results of this decision. If it goes unchallenged, our entire judicial system, our entire legislative process, indeed, our whole doctrine of government—the theory of the separation of powers—will be in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the American people and the States of these United States to reassert and reaffirm the principles by which they became the United States.

It is time for the States of the Union to reassume their responsibility to their citizens.

I am not willing to admit that a decision of the Supreme Court, so obviously based upon sociological studies, takes precedence over the Constitution of the United States.

Nor am I willing to concede that a misguided decision, based upon socio-

logical studies, can by judicial fiat, give to the Federal Government a power reserved to the States.

If we fail to put a stop to this seemingly limitless seizure of power, the Federal Government, like an all-enveloping octopus, will continue to reach out its tentacles until there will be nothing else to strangle—and then the very foundation of our Federal Government—the very cornerstone of our United States—will crumble.

When that happens, our whole system of checks and balances—our whole system of representation, our whole philosophy of reserved powers, will disappear. And after that will come complete regimentation—with a Federal bureaucracy telling you where to work, when to work, who to work with, what to wear, when to wear it, how much you are going to be paid, and where to spend what you earn.

Never forget that it was the fear of an all-powerful national government that brought about the Constitution as we know it.

Unless we return to the principles upon which this Nation was based; unless the States reassert themselves, we are on the brink of disaster.

I am not speaking from a sectional viewpoint—I am not talking about segregated schools alone—I am not talking about tidal waters. I am talking about property rights in the State of Maine, the divorce laws of the State of Minnesota, the laws of inheritance of the State of Kansas, motor vehicle license laws in the State of Oklahoma, hunting and fishing laws in the State of Montana, the probate court procedures of the State of New York, the laws of civil procedure in the State of Texas, the right to hold elective office in the State of Michigan, the laws with regard to the qualification of a doctor in the State of Delaware, the right to sell potatoes in the State of Idaho.

These are just some of the things that we are concerned with here—not just segregation. We are dealing with fundamental principles upon which this Nation is based.

We are dealing with the way we live. We are dealing with the manner in which we associate with our fellow citizens.

We are dealing with a method of life that has existed in this Nation since the founding of the Republic.

Unless we take positive action now to put a stop to this insidious whittling away of the responsibilities of the States, then the foundations of this Nation will be so undermined that the weight of the Federal bureaus alone will bring about our collapse.

We must challenge this assumption of power that has been seized, mistakenly I hope, by the Supreme Court. We must insist upon the sovereignty of the 48 States. We must resist all efforts to amend the Constitution of the United States by judicial decree. We must demand a return to the principles which made America great.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we have reached a most critical stage in our history as a Republic.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the point of order.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman not withhold that? I have only about 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I deny with all the power of my being the naive presumption that the Constitution of the United States is nothing more than what the Supreme Court says it is. The Supreme Court is made up of human beings. Its history is inseparable from the greatness of America. It cannot divorce itself from this history.

It has no right to laugh at precedent and the intentions of those men who wrote the Constitution and the amendments to the Constitution.

How ridiculous it is for anyone to contend that any nine men can completely disregard the intentions of not less than three-fourths of the legislatures of the sovereign States of this Union who ratified the 14th amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making a very sound statement here and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The point of order that a quorum is not present is not debatable.

Mr. YATES. Since the last point of order on a quorum there has been no further transaction of business, and it is obvious that the points of order being made are dilatory.

The SPEAKER. There were various unanimous-consent requests granted since the last call of the House. The Chair has been up against this question of whether there was a filibuster or whether there was not a great many times. This occupant of the Chair is very liberal with Members who want a quorum present or to have business transacted in the regular way. The Chair is not going to hold that this point of order is dilatory.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Georgia retains the floor, that motion is not in order.

Mr. VINSON. I retain it, Mr. Speaker. I am just moving around to get a little exercise.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist upon his point of no quorum?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I insist upon the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn is a privileged motion. The question is on the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Ashley	Fulton	Morano
Ayres	Gamble	Morgan
Barden	Garmatz	Moulder
Barrett	Gary	Mumma
Bass, Tenn.	Gavin	Nelson
Baumhart	Granahan	O'Hara, Minn.
Beamer	Grant	O'Neill
Belcher	Green, Oreg.	Osmers
Betts	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Blatnik	Haley	Phillips
Bowler	Healey	Pilcher
Boykin	Hébert	Pillion
Burdick	Hess	Powell
Bush	Hiestand	Quigley
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Carlyle	Holifield	Saylor
Carrigg	Holland	Scherer
Celler	Jackson	Scott
Chatham	James	Sheehan
Chudoff	Jenkins	Shelley
Clark	Jensen	Sieminski
Cole	Johnson, Calif.	Sikes
Cooley	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Kearns	Spence
Coudert	Kee	Staggers
Cretella	Kelley, Pa.	Sullivan
Curtis, Mass.	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Dague	Kilburn	Thomas
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Vanik
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Van Zandt
Dawson, Ill.	Knox	Vursell
Diggs	Knutson	Walter
Dingell	Krueger	Watts
Donovan	Lankford	Widnall
Doyle	McConnell	Williams, N. J.
Durham	McCulloch	Williams, N. Y.
Eberharter	McDowell	Willis
Engle	Magnuson	Wilson, Calif.
Fenton	Matthews	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Merrow	Wolcott
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Wolverton
Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.	Zelenko
Forand	Mollohan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 298 Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, as I stated just before the quorum call, how ridiculous it is for anyone to contend that only nine men can completely disregard the intentions of not less than three-fourths of the legislatures of the sovereign States.

We have gone a long way in the direction of concentrated power in the National Government. It may now be too late to stop this avalanche, but we must make the effort if we are to remain a United States of America.

It is for this Congress, and the 48 States of the Union, and above all, the people of this Nation, to decide their destiny now.

We will either have a United States of America, made up of 48 sovereign States and the people, with limited powers vested in the Federal Government or we will have a supreme National Government with unlimited powers, and a Supreme Court unhesitatingly stating, as the law, what they think the law should be.

The entire foundation of our freedom; the cornerstone of democracy; the backbone of this Nation, is embodied in the doctrine of separation of powers, and the delegation of limited powers to the

National Government, with the States and the people reserving all other powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

The challenge now before the people is whether our form of government will continue, or a supreme National Government will supersede the 48 States of this Union in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, with all the sincerity that I possess, I say now is the time to plug the dike that holds the tidal wave of national destruction. On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court breached that dike and the trickle that started is fast becoming a torrent. It can be repaired now. But if we dally, if we delay, it may be too late.

If this Congress and the States of the Union are willing to surrender their responsibilities to the Supreme Court of the United States then all they have to do is sit back and let the dike be destroyed.

But if the elected representatives of the United States and the sovereign States of this Union are convinced, as I am, that only those powers specifically granted to the Federal Government by the Constitution are vested in the Federal Government, the dike can be repaired.

If the elected representatives of the people and the sovereign States are convinced, as I am, that the Supreme Court has one function, and only one function, and that is to interpret the Constitution as the framers intended it to be interpreted, then we can still prevent the deluge.

I say now is the time to act.

I say to you again that we face today one of the most critical decisions since this Nation was founded.

We either return to constitutional government or we surrender our liberties to a new third house of the Congress, the Supreme Court and a Federal bureaucracy, that will exercise complete and dominating control over every State, every city, every town, every hamlet, and every person in this Nation.

Concentration of power in a few inevitably brings about the elimination of personal liberty.

This is not a sectional problem; this is not a problem limited to the case of whether or not we should have segregated schools in the South; this is a fundamental problem which deals with our future existence as a Nation.

The State of New York has just as much interest in this matter as the State of Georgia. The State of Illinois is just as much concerned about this matter as the State of Mississippi.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the time for action is now.

If we delay, the future generations of this Nation may sadly reflect upon this Congress and this year as the fateful year in which the disintegration of the American Republic began.

On Wednesday, March 14, 1956, the President of the United States stated at a press conference, when asked to comment on the implementation of the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954:

> Now, let us remember this one thing, and it is very important: The people who have this deep emotional reaction on the other side were not acting over these past three generations in defiance of the law. They were acting in compliance with the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States under the decision of 1896.
>
> Now, that has been completely reversed.

Since 1896 to 1954 the law of this Nation recognized that separate but equal school facilities completely satisfied the 14th amendment. Suddenly the precedent of 58 years was wiped out by one decision.

During these past 58 years many States of the Union had invested millions and millions of dollars in building school facilities for colored children equally as good, and in many instances more modern and up to date than those provided white children. And suddenly these same States find that the tremendous investment will not satisfy nine men who, with the stroke of their pens, wiped out the tradition and customs of a large portion of America.

It is this precipitous action on the part of the Supreme Court that worries so many of us. It is this disregard for precedent—this tendency to create law instead of interpreting law that worries us, not only in the South, but in other parts of the Nation.

The American people are beginning to lose confidence in the Supreme Court.

We don't know what the law is going to be tomorrow on any subject.

Long-standing decisions that have guided us in every walk of life can be reversed tomorrow, for that seems to be the tendency of the Court.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing that would disrupt the peace and harmony of this Nation more than for the people to look upon the Supreme Court as a court of philosophy rather than as a court of law.

The people are disturbed, for they realize that their way of life, the deeds to their land, their local systems of government, their zoning ordinances, their long-accepted beliefs as to what the law is and always has been may well be completely altered by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States tomorrow.

Up until recently the people of this Nation looked upon the Supreme Court as the purveyors of justice, as distinguished men who devoted themselves entirely to the interpretation of the Constitution and the laws of the Nation based upon precedent and the intentions of those who wrote the law. But now all that has gone by the wayside, and we are living in an era of grave concern, for no one knows what may be the next decision.

I cannot help but recall to your minds the famous statement of Justice Roberts in *Smith* v. *Allwright et al.* (321 U. S. 649), who said:

> The reason for my concern is that the instant decision overruling one announced about 9 years ago tends to bring adjudication of this tribunal into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket marked "Good for this day and train only."

Mr. Speaker, we are a nation of laws, and not of men. If the American people lose their confidence in the Supreme Court of the United States, then we have endangered the security of our Nation. If one of the three branches of our Federal Government assumes powers unto itself that are contrary to the fundamental principles of this Republic, then we are on the threshold of national calamity.

The Supreme Court does not, and cannot, have the power to overthrow the traditions, the customs, and the way of life of almost one-third of the Nation. It cannot, and must not, disregard precedent. It must not assume powers that are reserved to the people and to the States of the United States.

The Supreme Court has made a mistake. They have been wrong in upsetting the traditions of a large segment of the population—and more than 100 Members of Congress have so stated.

Let us hope and pray that it is not too late for the Supreme Court to see the error of their ways.

Wise and courageous men do not hesitate to correct their mistakes; wise and courageous men do not hesitate to call attention to those mistakes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Florida), for this day, on account of personal illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VINSON and to include a speech by Mr. KILDAY.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. RADWAN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4909. An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York;

H. R. 10387. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real

property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relative to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 8, 80th Congress (21 U. S. C. 114d); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1778. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, relative to the number of officers that shall be assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government as of the end of the third quarter of fiscal year 1956, pursuant to Public Law 150, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1779. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics), transmitting the monthly report on military prime contracts with business firms for work in the United States for the first 8 months of the current fiscal year, from July 1, 1955 through February 29, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 268, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1780. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Messrs. Paul Petzoldt and Glenn Exum which, when executed by the superintendent, Grand Teton National Park, will authorize them to act as guides on mountain-climbing trips, to operate a mountain-climbing school, and to furnish equipment and shelter facilities to climbers in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo., for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2026. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2028. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2028. Report on the disopsition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2029). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 7144. A bill to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; without amendment (Rept. No. 2030). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8837. A bill to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 2031). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 10542. A bill to liberalize certain criteria for determining eligibility of widows for benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2032). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 8458. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 10 to provide that the widow of a veteran of the Spanish-American War (including the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion) who married the veteran before January 1, 1938, may be eligible for death compensation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2033). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8901. A bill to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs; to create and establish a public body corporate with powers to carry out the provisions of this act; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2034). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9841. A bill to provide that in determining eligibility of a widow or child of a deceased veteran for a pension the income limitations applicable to such widow or child shall be increased by $600 for the year in which the veteran's death occurs; with amendment (Rept. No. 2035). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 9922. A bill to provide that certain veterans suffering from active pulmonary tuberculosis shall be deemed to be permanently and totally disabled for pension purposes while they are hospitalized; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 484. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10721, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2037). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 485. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 10660, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2038). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10754. A bill to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines; passed House.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 10755. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 10756. A bill to amend section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to place certain restrictions upon ownership or control of broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 10757. A bill to establish a program of survival food depots in order to provide subsistence for the large numbers of the civilian population of the United States who would be evacuated from the devastated areas in the event of attack on the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10758. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 10759. A bill to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 10760. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 10761. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 10762. A bill to extend the time limit within which recommendations for and awards of certain military decorations may be made; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 10763. A bill to provide for an increase in the wage basis for computation of compensation for disability or death under the Federal Employes' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 10764. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 10765. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10766. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 10767. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for certain losses and damages caused by United States Armed Forces during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 10768. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled, "An act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 10769. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10770. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 10771. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bistate commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 10772. A bill to amend section 93 (b) (2) of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 10773. A bill to authorize retroactive payments in lieu of taxes by the Housing Authority of the city of Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 10774. A bill for the relief of the village of Wauneta, Nebr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 10775. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. J. Res. 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judicary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10776. A bill for the relief of Erdne Cucukow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 10777. A bill for the relief of Rosa Grunbaum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 10778. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Customs Brokerage Co., of Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10779. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Maria Elizabeth Rambo (Mrs. Charles B. Rambo); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10780. A bill for the relief of the Little Lake Misere Land Co., Inc., and the North American Land Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 10781. A bill for the relief of Mario Colombo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 10782. A bill for the relief of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

946. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Branch 50, National Association of Letter Carriers, Williamsport, Pa., protesting the continuance of the 20 percent amusement tax imposed upon the entertainment industry, and urging its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

947. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of Gustav Bratteig, Marshalltown, Iowa, and 45 Iowa residents urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

948. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Matthews Milner, Jr., Danville, Ark., and others urging a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

949. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of members of VFW Post 580, Sioux City, Iowa, urging the enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

950. By Mr. MULTER: Petition of Abraham Meyer, Brooklyn, N. Y., and 21 other citizens, urging enactment of legislation providing for a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I, their widows, and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

951. By Mr. SILER: Petition of Mrs. Hallie Nicholson and 38 other residents of Pasadena, Calif., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

952. Also, petition of Mrs. Gladys Barr and 106 other residents of Evansville, Ind., Philadelphia, Pa., Arlington, Va., and Alexandria, Va., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

953. Also, petition of Mrs. Florence Rice and 49 other residents of Silver Spring, Md., urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

954. Also, petition of Mrs. Mae Copeland and 37 other residents of Rockford and Ashtabula, Ohio, urging enactment of the Siler bill, H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Air Pollution Control Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to the Congress that the annual meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association will be held in Buffalo, May 20–24. Buffalo looks forward with eager anticipation to being host to over 700 scientists, engineers, and other representatives of industry and of the Federal, State, and local governments who will participate in the important meetings scheduled during the convention. Buffalo also invites the visitors to bring their wives and other members of their families, for there is no finer vacation spot in all the land—particularly in the spring of the year.

Members of the Air Pollution Control Association are largely responsible for the monumental progress that has been made in cleaning up the air in and around industrial communities. They have worked with industry, with government, and with individual citizens in an effort to obtain the closest cooperation in dealing with the air pollution problem. While there is still a long way to go, particularly because of the constantly increasing industrial activity in our country, the efforts of this association are reflected in improved conditions in scores of American communities.

Members of the APCA have helped to develop new and improved methods of checking air pollution. They have worked closely with public-spirited business leaders who were willing to invest millions upon millions of dollars in new equipment in the job of combating the air pollution nuisance. The APCA has taught the public that, regardless of what type of fuel is used, unnecessary pollution can be eliminated when proper combustion methods are employed in the right kind of equipment. Among the many accomplishments of the air purification engineers is their successful attack on fly ash. Modern design and combustion methods provide for capturing these minute particles before they get out of the stacks. Furthermore, the fly ash itself is now being put to good use, particularly as a reinforcing agent in cement. In all, the APCA has made remarkable progress through the years and is determined to continue its outstanding work toward eliminating so far as possible the man-made pollutants in our atmosphere.

The Buffalo convention will attract representatives of industry and government from every section of our Nation and from Canada, for air pollution is not confined to any single area. The convention will feature papers by outstanding engineers and scientists, displays by manufacturers of air pollution control equipment, and plant tours in Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Lackawanna, and Tonawanda. As a lake front city with a population of 600,000 persons, Buffalo itself will offer an interesting study for the APCA visitors. We are an important railroad center and a lumber market, and we produce flour and grain mill products, plastics, steel, and chemicals. We also have manufacturers of buses, electrical equipment, and rubber products. Buffalo has foundries, machine shops, meat-packing houses, refineries, and a variety of other manufacturers.

A local committee, whose honorary chairmen are the mayors of Buffalo and Niagara Falls, has been set up to provide the necessary arrangements for the 1956 APCA convention. Buffalo is proud to be the site of this event, and I am certain that the association will be happy that it has chosen this city for this convention.

Against Serving Alcoholic Beverages to Passengers Aloft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my address before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Friday, April 20, 1956, in connection with my bill, H. R. 7922, which would prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers in flight.

The address follows:

AIRLINES JOB IS TO FLY, NOT TO MAKE PASSENGERS SKY "HIGH"

Mr. Chairman, the practice of selling alcoholic beverages, in addition to the complimentary cocktails offered to passengers aboard commercial airliners, has aroused much public opposition.

On August 21, 1955, I asked the airlines to discontinue this dangerous custom by voluntary actions, serving notice that I would introduce a bill in Congress "to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight" if they failed to cooperate.

Previously the people whose immediate responsibility is to insure the safety and comfort of airborne passengers, namely, the members of the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses' Association and the Airline Pilots' Association, had called for an end to the risky policy of serving alcoholic beverages aboard commercial airliners.

Subsequent to my request the Civil Aeronautics Board failed to issue an administrative order that would correct this situation.

And the airline officials refused to adopt the minimum code of regulation that was recommended by the Air Transport Association.

In defiance of the mounting evidence, of which the following quote from an editorial in the Air Line Employee of September 1955 is a sample:

"To illustrate our point, we quote one recent incident experienced by a major carrier involved in this liquor problem. At the original station the captain canceled the flight because he felt that 18 of the passengers were so drunk as to constitute a menace to safe operation of the flight. Twenty minutes later the flight was reoriginated and 10 of the 18 were taken off. Two hours later it was necessary to make an unscheduled stop to put off the other 8. No passenger need to fear that he will be refused passage if he can crawl aboard. Once in the air, he can get refueled, either on the house or for a dollar a shot. The airlines are not stingy with their liquor, either. Every drink is a double shot, which has a potent punch at high altitude. A $5 bill will produce a proper jet-age wingding in the average air traveler."

Again, as one pilot reported concerning a December 18, 1955, flight:

"This flight could have had a disastrous ending. I feel that it is time to keep drunks and alcohol off from all aircraft. This practice should be stopped immediately."

Or must we wait for the inevitable, and avoidable, tragedy to happen before thinking of protecting passengers from the irresponsible and belligerent actions of those who become intoxicated as a result of "flying saloon" service that is more interested in profits than in safety?

One company tries to lure this type of patronage by advertising "champagne flights."

Seven American commercial airlines serve alcoholic beverages in flight on domestic routes. They are:

	Flights
Eastern Airlines	61
Northwest Airlines	38
Trans-World Airlines	18
National Airlines	16
American Airlines	11
Western Airlines	2
United Airlines	12

These airlines make the feeble defense that they try to observe State liquor laws. But who knows, at 25,000 feet where 1 State ends, and the other begins? And what authority is there to enforce compliance?

The commercial airliner, as a public carrier, is faced with unique responsibilities, that do not pertain to ships or trains.

Passengers must travel in close and confined accommodations, with no support but the thin air, where one wandering and drunken passenger can jeopardize all.

Is it necessary for the airlines to defer to the wishes of the few who insist on getting alcoholic beverages to drink while the plane is in flight, in complete disregard for the many women, children, and men who should not have to endure the profanity, molestation, and scatterbrained conduct of the drunks?

I believe that the sober majority are entitled to protection.

The fact that one airline is reluctant to discontinue the practice for fear that its competitors won't, means that few of them will.

The answer to this is Federal legislation (constitutional under the powers to regulate interstate commerce) providing that: "No air carrier shall sell or otherwise furnish to its passengers any alcoholic beverage (including beer and wine) for consumption while in flight within the United States."

Polls of public opinion registered overwhelming opposition to the serving of liquor on commercial airliners, up to 1950, when such sampling of public opinion was discontinued because it ran so strongly against the policy of the airlines.

However, the unsolicited response my Washington office has received since I served notice last August that I would seek corrective legislation, has been almost unanimous in favor of such a bill.

The score:

Thousands of letters for my bill.

One letter and one telephone call against.

The lives of millions of passengers on our domestic airlines must be protected from the dizzy, disgusting, and dangerous conduct of those who become a public nuisance as long as the airlines run flying saloons.

The airlines have been given the opportunity to clean up their planes and have refused to do so.

The only solution is to enact H. R. 7922 into a nationwide law that will eliminate the menace of flying saloons.

Our Home and God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which I was requested to write earlier this year for the National Sunday School Association for National Family Week.

The editorial has been printed in a number of church and Sunday school publications.

There are three institutions that are basic in the fundamental growth and strength of our great Nation, namely, the home, the church, and the school. It is essential that we protect and preserve the family life in order that we may have strong churches that will care for the spiritual needs of our people and good schools that will continue to provide for us an intelligent citizenry.

The family life is also most important in the upbringing of our youth, who will be not only the future citizens of this Nation but in the immediate future will take over the preservation and protection of this great Nation of ours.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Blessed are they who build families
For they are the builders of the world."
—*Leland Foster Wood.*

The home is the basic unit of our society and someone has truly said, "as goes the home, so goes the Nation."

Far too often parents have left the responsibility of the early training of their children to the church, the public school, and the community.

While the above-mentioned institutions and agencies are important in the life of our children, the childhood training in a home determines largely the adult life of the individual.

The fundamental responsibility of every father and mother is the nurture of the religious life in the home. Fortunate indeed is the child that is nurtured in a home where the family altar is preserved in the worship of their Heavenly Father. As these children grow and reach adolescent age, they

will have a knowledge of their Creator and an abiding faith in their Lord and Saviour. These will serve as an anchor and be of inestimable value when trials and temptations beset them—as they most certainly will.

Some years ago a very prominent man told me how important he felt the early home training and Sunday school had been in helping his own son through the age period of 14 to 18 years. This man stated if our young people have the background to get through this period, we can feel that their future is secure. This has been my personal observation.

Not only that, I am deeply indebted to my parents, who have gone to their heavenly reward, for the early training in a Christian home—for the hours my mother spent in giving me instruction in the Scriptures—for their parental prayers and for a home where the atmosphere was conducive to the development of Christian character.

While it is true that there have been many changes in our home life within the last 50 years, the fact remains that the stability of our economic, social, and religious life still depends on the family affections and a devotion to spiritual ideals.

If we are to continue to enjoy the heritage left us by those who have given us this great Nation, we must again restore the family altars in the home and give our children and their children the same sound, fundamental Christian training for which we are indebted to those who have gone before. We break faith with them and with God if we do less.

Automobile Marketing Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the current congressional hearings on automobile marketing practices, automobile manufacturers have consistently opposed any legislation on factory-dealer relationships. One manufacturer alleged in his testimony that such legislation would only "weaken dangerously an industry fundamental to the Nation's economic growth."

Over the weekend I was pleased to learn that this sham plea has not deterred the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman. On April 20, 1956, Governor Harriman signed a bill amending the New York general business law, for the purpose of prohibiting automobile manufacturers from arbitrarily revoking the franchises of dealers in New York State. Under the law effective October 1, 1956, auto manufacturers are required to register with the Secretary of State. Manufacturers are prohibited by the law from terminating a dealer contract except for cause. A maximum penalty of $1,000 fine is imposed for each violation.

In his statement upon approving the bill, Governor Harriman called attention to the growing difficulties of small- and medium-sized independent businesses, and pointed out that the giant corporations have the economic power to decide the life or death of thousands of smaller businesses—not only their competitors, but their own suppliers and distributors. Governor Harriman further stated that, contrary to the claim of manufacturers that "the public interest is not sufficiently affected," it is his firm conviction that "it is very much in the interest of the people that small- and medium-sized business should be protected against unfair exercise of economic power."

I sincerely hope that the Congress will also heed the public interest and take the necessary action to correct the abusive practices in the automobile industry which have been uncovered in the current hearings before the Senate and House committees.

Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make a plea that this Congress shall really do something to aid some of the economically depressed areas of the Nation, including my own depressed section in southeastern Kentucky.

The President himself has recommended that something be done. Many people are concerned. Time is running out and we should act to extend a helping hand to our needful areas right now.

I have offered a good bill that would help, H. R. 8283, by bringing about a three-way cooperative effort (a) by the communities involved, (b) by our Government through Employment Restoration Authority created by my bill, (c) by industries that would come and settle in our depressed areas under the plan of this bill.

Other good bills have also been offered and I hope the best ideas of all of these proposals will be chosen and welded into a good legislative instrument that would provide a bright star of good hope to some of our discouraged people in depressed areas over the country. I have sent out about 90 copies of my own bill to Members of the House and Senate and have suggested and urged that we all act collectively and promptly on this serious problem that confronts many of our districts.

An official report that has recently come out of Kentucky says that the eastern part of my State is in "far worse shape in 1955 than 5 years earlier."

The same report says:

First. The average income in the area is 40 percent lower than that of the State as a whole;

Second. Employment in the area fell 18,322 since 1950, while employment in the State as a whole increased 33,591 in the same period;

Third. Earned wages in eastern Kentucky dropped to $51,400,000 last year, a decrease of $8,000,000 since 1950, yet statewide payrolls gained 40 percent during the same period;

Fourth. Harlan County alone, which is the most populous county of my district, lost $5,900,000 in annual wages during the past 5 years;

Fifth. Coal production furnished 25,152 jobs for men in eastern Kentucky last year compared to the 47,108 jobs it furnished in 1950 in the same area;

Sixth. Even last year, when the coal business increased to some extent, there was still a small decline in jobs for our people in eastern Kentucky;

Seven. Population losses in the past 5 years are 15,043 for Bell County and 12,327 for Harlan County and 8,197 for Pulaski County and 7,648 for Whitley County, to mention a few in my own district; and

Eighth. In some of these eastern Kentucky counties the per capita incomes are now among the lowest in the whole United States, the average being $749 in the year 1953 compared to a statewide average of $1,187 for the same year.

Now if a scourge should strike some part of the world or even some part of our own country, we would all be concerned and would gladly send our dollars and our aid to the affected areas without delay. Yet there is a great scourge of unemployment that has right now come over some of our own districts. So, it is time to become concerned about them. We should immediately stop importation of cheap, foreign residual oil into this country to compete with American workmen. And we should certainly converge our attention and our efforts upon early passage of a suitable bill to help the people in some of our districts "trace the rainbow through the rain" with clear assurance that their lands are not the forgotten spots of America.

A $1.50 Calf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department has announced that the farm income for the first quarter of 1956 dropped 5 percent from the postwar low of the first quarter in 1955. The Kentucky farmers who depend on income from livestock feel that the drop has been much greater. I have here a check to Mr. Sam Litton, Jr., route 1, Morehead, Ky., dated February 21, 1956, for one brown, white-faced calf. The gross price received at the Morehead Stockyards, Morehead, Ky., was $2.50. The net check, less 75 cents commission and 25 cents for insurance, was $1.50 for one veal calf. This is the price received by a farmer under the Eisenhower farm program of flexible price supports. The talk of continued prosperity com-

bined with the Benson farm program does not help the Kentucky farmer to meet his bills when the price of a calf is scarcely equal to the truck charge for the hauling to market. The day of the $15 calf is long gone, it is now the $1.50 calf.

No. 1451

MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.

MOUNT STERLING, KY., *February 21, 1956.*

To Montgomery National Bank, Mount Sterling, Ky.

Pay the sum of $1.50 to Sam Litton, Jr., on order, Morehead, route 1.

MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.,
DONALD E. IRON.

Void if not cashed in 60 days from day of issue.

SALE BILL NO. 1451—MOREHEAD STOCKYARDS, INC.

Kind, brown calf.
Pen, 57.
Head, 1.
Mark, brown, white face.
Amount, $2.50.
Commission, 75 cents.
Net, $1.75.
Deductions, insurance, 25 cents.
Amount received, $1.50.

Address by Hon. Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland, Before the Government Employees' Council, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am particularly pleased to include therein an excellent address made on April 18, 1956, by our distinguished colleague from Maryland, Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, before the Government Employees' Council, in Washington, D. C. Congressman LANKFORD very ably and effectively addresses himself to H. R. 10237, introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES. Convincingly, he presents reasons why H. R. 10237 should be enacted into law. The presentation made by our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] is one of the ablest I have ever heard presented in support of any legislation. It is consistent with the clear thinking evidenced by him on all legislation; it is consistent with the splendid manner in which he represents the people of his district.

I am sure that the employees of the Federal Government will deeply appreciate the position taken by our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] on this bill, as well as all other legislation, such as relating to wages, hours of employment, sick benefits, and retirement, as well as conditions of employment; also, that they are indebted to him for his vigorous advocacy of legislation relating to their best interests.

The speech follows:

I am delighted to have this opportunity of meeting with the Government Employees' Council. My remarks will not be lengthy, because I know your program is heavy.

As a matter of fact, I would much prefer to sit back and let you gentlemen conclude your deliberations. It is on the basis of your decisions and advice that I take my cue in matters affecting postal and other Federal employees in my district. And may I say that some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives might well follow the same pattern.

Take the case of pending legislation affecting your retirement benefits. I took a poll on what the employees thought of this legislation. It was not the same kind of poll some of my colleagues announced nor the kind proposed by others on the Senate side of the Capitol. I simply directed my inquiry to the headquarters of the employee groups and to the employees with whom I am in almost daily contact. There was no rhyme or reason to suggest a referendum or worldwide poll in order to learn something that could be ascertained by merely placing a telephone call right here in Washington and through daily conversations.

The answer I got from your council headquarters was to the effect that you gentlemen—speaking for your respective organizations—approved Senator JOHNSTON'S bill, S. 2875. That was the extent of my poll. All the facts were in as far as I was concerned. Anything beyond that was little more than politicking or "gamemanship" to use a more sophisticated term.

Of course, I am not opposed to consultation between Members of Congress and Federal workers or between the heads of departments and employees or representatives designated by them. I consult with Federal workers practically every day. But a poll is hardly consultation. Questions can be loaded and often produce not facts or opinions, but just about what the poll taker wants the answer to be.

I recall that no poll was taken a few years ago when the distinguished gentleman who heads up the Post Office Department attempted to put over his Fry report. There is no record of the White House polling the farmers of our Nation prior to President Eisenhower's veto of the farm bill.

As I said, I am not opposed to open channels of discussion. However, the way to make certain that employees are given an opportunity to express themselves is not through polls, but through a bona fide labor-management procedure.

I sincerely hope we will be given an opportunity before this session of Congress adjourns to vote on the union recognition legislation your council is supporting. The bill introduced by Congressman GEORGE RHODES, of Pennsylvania, known as H. R. 10237, is fair and equitable to everyone. It does not suggest that the executive branch must forfeit or abandon its responsibilities to Congress or the employees. Nor does it intimate in the slightest degree that Government workers want to determine policy. As I understand the Rhodes bill, all you people ask is the right to sit down with the heads of departments to discuss working conditions, safety, in-service training, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, promotions, demotions, and any other facet of your employment affecting the day-to-day lives of the people you represent. Following these discussions, you further request assurance that in the event of a serious disagreement both sides will accept the decisions of an impartial board of arbitration.

Frankly, it is difficult for me to understand how anyone can seriously oppose this legislation. Our Federal Government guarantees these same rights under one form or another to workers in private industry. Why should there be a distinction, indeed discrimination against Federal employees?

I am not going to attempt a résumé of all the bills in which your council is interested. It was simply my intention to drop in and visit for a few minutes. However, I would not want to yield the floor without giving you my pledge to support your drive for better wages. The decision of your council announced early in March hit the nail right on the head. It is time Congrss started to legislate in terms of standard-of-living wages for Government workers. The old method of chasing prices and attempting to peg wages to living costs might have worked out, but it had no chance. It was always a case of too little and too late. By the time a wage settlement was made prices had spurted ahead and the gap between living costs and salaries was as wide as ever. I want to encourage the new approach you have adopted and again assure you that you have my full support. You need not worry that I will be inclined to take a poll of the Federal employees in the Fifth District of Maryland on that decision on my part.

No Public Official or Employee Can Serve Two Masters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I made on WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, April 21, 1956:

They call it "conflict of interest" when a person goes to work for the Federal Government "with an ax to grind." To use his inside position to serve an outside interest.

We have laws to prevent such activities, but continuing vigilance is required to make sure that people in key positions do not direct Government policies for the benefit of any individuals, groups, or corporations.

An employee of the United States Government is expected to put the public interest above any and every private interest.

Ninety-nine percent of them do.

The 1 percent used their position in Government for the financial advantage of private enterprise.

Oftentimes this is difficult to pin down.

It is not easy to trace the tipoff to one corporation, for instance, and concerning some change in Government policy, or the way in which contracts are awarded to a preferred company that has access to influential friends inside Government.

As to full-time Government employees, the majority observe the code of ethics, similar to the one promulgated by the General Services Administration. This requires that all employees of the Agency so conduct themselves as to permit no possible basis for suspicion of unethical business practices. It prohibits employees from engaging in any outside business unless the approval of competent authority is first obtained. And it prohibits employees from taking any final action with respect to any matter in which the employee has any personal or financial relationships.

As to WOC's, meaning those who serve without compensation, such standards are difficult to enforce. The Government must avail itself of the best skills and talents, particularly on Government advisory groups and in the employment of WOC personnel by administrative agencies.

Certain advisory groups are composed of the principal executives of some of the most important business firms in the country. WOC's serving as Government officials in charge of divisions dealing with the particular industry often are important but subordinate officials of these same firms.

The Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary is concerned about this problem.

It wants to know whether this relationship leads to special influence on Government policy by industry through its control of advisory groups.

Unfortunately, many of the practices that are considered to be legitimate in the give-and-take world of keen competition become abuses when done in the name of Government that is supposed to be the impartial umpire.

Businessmen, by force of long habit, are inclined to favor the interests of their own business or industry when they serve as advisers to Government.

During the past year the Government felt it necessary to disengage itself from the services of four high officials. If they had been rank-and-file employees, they would have been fired. But this is too harsh a term to apply to influential people. To save face, they are permitted to resign.

You see, it began to appear that these four officials were using their Government positions to favor firms in which they had a political or financial interest. Although no corruption was chargeable, there was much doubletalk in evidence. Their two-faced roles, as Government advisers and as possible financial beneficiaries, did not appeal to the public.

Their behind-the-scenes activities did not pay off—because the public is determined that no official shall try to serve two masters.

It can't be done in a well-informed democracy.

But how and where are we going to draw the line?

I recall the hue and cry that was raised when Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors Corp., was appointed Secretary of Defense. He sold all his holdings in GM so that there would be no possible suspicion that his decisions as Secretary of Defense would in no way favor GM.

In view of the fact that the stock of GM has gone up considerably since then, Mr. Wilson made a very real personal sacrifice in accepting a Cabinet post.

This raises the serious question as to whether anyone coming into the service of the Federal Government should divorce himself completely from a business to which he has given most of his life.

The United States Government, which is the biggest organization in the world, must not be deprived of the best talent it can get.

But how can we be sure of attracting and holding this talent and, at the same time, make certain of its devotion to the public interest above all else? Especially those who serve without compensation.

Must we insist that a person sell all stock holdings in a business concern for which he worked to remove any temptation of furthering the interests of that business as against the interests of Government?

This is a hard question to answer.

Such drastic action would discourage many high-type men who might otherwise regard it as an honor and a duty to serve their Government.

At the same time, we must protect ourselves against the few who would exploit their Government positions to favor private interests.

Perhaps we need a stronger and more detailed code of ethics regarding such activities, supported by a wide-awake press that will keep the public informed as to whether standards are being maintained * * * to protect us against "conflict of interest."

As to present laws there are statutory provisions of the United States Code which affect Federal employees, or former Federal employees, in their conduct of private business activities. These statutes, better known as the conflict-of-interest statutes, are aimed at protecting the public interest by prohibiting Federal officers and employees from engaging in private activities which are incompatible with the duties and responsibilities of public office. Penalties for violation include both fine and imprisonment. Except as provided by these statutes, there is no legal prohibition against the conduct of private business activities for compensation by an officer or employee of the United States.

As to political activity, all employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including persons employed as experts or consultants, even on a part-time or intermittent basis, are subject to the political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act. This covers the full 24 hours of any day that the individual performs some services for the Government, rather than just the actual hours of employment. The Hatch Act prohibits the use of official authority or influence to interfere with or affect the results of an election, and active participation in political management or in political campaigns.

Supplementing the laws, we have directives such as the following one titled: "Steps Followed by the Business and Defense Services Administration To Avoid Conflicts of Interest."

One. The incoming WOC is advised during negotiations in connection with his hiring, that he will be expected to devote his full time and energies to Government work without the influence of any prejudicial interest.

Two. Upon entrance, he is required to take the usual oath of faithful performance to the United States Government.

Three. On taking the oath he is handed a document which sets forth his exemptions from the "conflict-of-interest" statutes and the limitations to such exemptions as set out in Executive Order 10182.

Four. Shortly after reporting for duty the WOC is given a face-to-face indoctrination which includes a caution against acting upon any individual matter in which he or his company has any direct or indirect interest. He is told that he should withdraw from any matter which, if he acted upon it, would embarrass himself, his company, or the Government. In such cases, he is instructed to refer the matter to the chief career employee of the division, who is specified, and who is usually the deputy director. He is advised that, if there is any question in the application of this rule, he is to consult with the legal staff or chief administrative officer.

So far so good.

But laws and directives in and of themselves do not always guarantee compliance.

Human nature being what it is, partiality is apt to affect decisions.

As the chairman drily observed, however, "I am not so much interested in directives. It is a question of whether the directives are followed."

Congress has added one new safeguard for the public by providing that private interests of WOC employees appointed under the Defense Production Act must be published in the Federal Register.

We have the feeling that much more can be done to separate conflicting interests.

John Lord O'Brian, whose experience and integrity command respectful attention, advises that heads of divisions should not come from industries in which they have an interest. In other words, if the Government wants an industrialist to head the Iron and Steel Division, it should not seek a man from that industry. In this way it will remove temptation from an official who heads a division in which his employer has a special interest—the temptation for him to serve the master who pays him rather than the master to whom he owes primary allegiance under these circumstances, namely, the Government of the United States.

There are several bills being considered by the Judiciary Committee designed to curb those who leave the Government and then use this previous Government experience improperly. These bills implement the rule of conduct as expressed in Canon 36 of the Canon Ethics of the American Bar Association.

Perhaps the cure for this whole problem would be to develop a genuine career service in Government. With adequate salaries to attract and hold the best talent, and with special leave provided each year for key employees to freshen up on current developments in those fields outside the Government, but related to its problems.

In this way we would avoid the alarming turnover in Government employment, and would not have to call in experts or advisers for temporary service.

This would eliminate the "in and outers" and their divided loyalties.

In the meantime we can help to reduce conflict of interest in Government service by keeping the bright spotlight of public opinion trained on those areas where temptation might occur.

There Was No Defeat at the Alamo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I includ a brilliant and most appropriate speech delivered by the Hon. PAUL J. KILDAY at San Antonio, Tex., on April 16, 1956, in celebration of the great victory of the Texans at the Battle of San Jacinto. It is entitled "There Was No Defeat at the Alamo." I think every Member will benefit by reading this outstanding résumé of our struggle for constitutional rights and the preservation of liberty:

THERE WAS NO DEFEAT AT THE ALAMO

(Address by PAUL J. KILDAY, Member of Congress, at the pilgrimage to the Alamo, April 16, 1956)

We stand on hallowed ground. Ground hallowed by the life blood of 187 patriots. One hundred and twenty years, one month, and ten days ago the last of that valiant band died within the walls of this chapel of the Mission San Antonio.

"Texians" they were called and Texians they were, but they came from many States and originally from many nations. To place

the time in perspective, remember that this occurred but 61 years, almost to the month, after the minutemen drawn up on the village green at Lexington, Mass., had heard the British command: "Disburse ye rebels" and the countermanding order of their own commander: "Stand your ground. Don't fire unless fired upon. If they mean to have war, let it start here."

And then at Old North Bridge at Concord, Mass., and:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled.
Here the embattled farmers stood
And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

Like their fellow Americans of but sixty odd years before they loved liberty. They loved liberty to the extent that they would give up their own lives to establish and maintain it for others. Those earlier Americans began their resistance as loyal British subjects to maintain the rights and liberties enjoyed by all British subjects since the barons met on the Plains of Runnymede in 1215 and wrung from the reluctant King John the Great Charter, Magna Carta, which established for the first time that rights existed in men above and beyond those granted by the sovereign king. That was the first idea of the concept so dear to Americans—constitutional government.

In the course of events the shots fired at Lexington and at Concord resulted in that meeting of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia which declared on July 4, 1776:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,".

The issue being formed, the bitter and long drawn out American Revolution ensued. Many lives were lost, much suffering and privation were endured.

Through many defeats and the long winter at Valley Forge they persevered. Shortly before the battle of Trenton, Thomas Paine, the great pamphleteer of the Revolution, sat by the flickering camp fire and, using a drum head to write upon, wrote the inspiring words of the "American Crisis." Words so inspiring and typical of the times, that George Washington directed that his troops be paraded and the "American Crisis" read to them. It included:

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly: It is dearness only that gives every thing its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price upon its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as freedom should not be highly rated."

Those words were true before the Battle of Trenton. Those words were true before the Battle of the Alamo. They were true before the massacre at Goliad. They were true before the Battle of San Jacinto; and they are true today.

Their efforts triumphed, victory was achieved. There followed what a great Englishman has called "the greatest document ever struck off, at a given time by the mind and purpose of man." Again from Philadelphia, this time in 1787, comes the pronouncement:

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Peace survived only until 1812, when Americans again fought to maintain the Nation so newly established. In 1814, just 22 years before the battle of the Alamo, Americans saw their Capital sacked by the British invader, their Capitol Building, the official residence of the President, and other public buildings burned. But their Nation and their Constitution endured. They endured because Americans who had been willing to fight and to die to establish them were willing to fight and to die to maintain them.

The Texans had come here relying upon the protection guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United Mexican States proclaimed on October 4, 1824. It guaranteed to each of the Mexican States, of which Texas was one, that each State be divided as to the exercise of its powers into a legislative, executive, and judicial department; and that two or more of those powers could never be vested in the same persons. Most important, that legislative power be never confided to a single individual, but be entrusted to a Congress of each particular State. It guaranteed that executive and judicial power be exercised in accordance with the constitution of the respective States.

A free legislative system has always been, and still is, the one effective deterrent to dictatorship. Hitler and Mussolini as the first step to dictatorship assaulted and subjugated the legislative bodies of Germany and Italy. Communist Russia has never tolerated a free legislative system.

As Americans these Texans had come to the Mexican State of Texas believing that Mexico's Constitution was as sacred and inviolate as that of the United States.

In 1835 there arose in Mexico a dictator named Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. True to the pattern of all dictators before and since, Santa Anna abolished the Constitution of the United Mexican States with its restrictions on the powers of government and seized all power for himself. As the self-proclaimed "Napoleon of the West," he proceeded to establish his one-man rule. In violation of the Mexican Constitution, he abolished the separate State of Texas and combined it with the State of Coahuila.

Let us here and now remember that Santa Anna's oppression was against all of the people in all of the States of Mexico, not only the former citizens of the United States now Mexican citizens settled in Texas. Long devoted to constitutional government, these Americans fought against dictatorship, proclaimed a provisional government, declared in favor of a union with Constitutionalists of all of the Mexican States, and dedicated themselves to the restoration of the Mexican Federal Constitution.

No patriots ever fought for higher purpose than these Texans—the protection of constitutional rights—as dear to us here today as it was to them. Did these men, under siege in the Alamo, know the high purpose of their resolve to remain in the Alamo and die with their leaders, Travis, Bonham, Bowie, and Crockett? There can be no doubt. In the last message from the Alamo, in which he pleaded for reenforcements and pledged never to surrender, Travis said, "Our flag still flies proudly from the walls." It was not our beloved Lone Star Flag of Texas nor was it the Stars and Stripes of the United States. Rather, it was the red, white, and green flag of Mexico, their adopted country. However, the Mexican eagle had been removed from that proud banner, and substituted for it was the date 1824, which symbolized for these besieged all of their rights, their freedoms, their protections—1824, the sacred date of the constitution of the United Mexican States. To Santa Anna's observers at the Church of San Fernando, that date, 1824, on the Mexican flag was a galling reminder of his perfidy.

Their defense of basic rights, to the very last drop of the blood of each of the 187, has long thrilled the hearts of freedom-loving men wherever the story has been told, and the story has been told wherever men love liberty. Here is the Cradle of Texas Liberty. Not a combatant remained alive on March 6, 1836; only three noncombatants remained alive.

Today we begin a week of observance of the gallant deeds of our forebears. It is meet and proper that our first thoughts be of the Alamo and its immortal dead. We celebrate with pageantry and with pomp, not that the Alamo was conquered and its defenders slain, not that here some 3,000 annihilated 187. No; we celebrate the victory of the Battle of San Jacinto and its triumph of right over might—the vindication of constitutional government over dictatorship and oppression.

We here pay honor to the memory of the immortals who died here, but we celebrate the victory of San Jacinto some 6 weeks later. Herein lies the basic difference between our New World and the Old World with its constant wars. Even today in Europe, nations observe and celebrate defeats of the 18th century. They are determined that each succeeding generation shall remember that the neighboring nation is its traditional enemy and shall remain so. Hence, the interminable wars between them.

How different in our own beloved America. Nowhere in our calendar of holidays and observances is there one dedicated to the remembrance of a defeat or a wrong. Those reverses belong to the dead past. Not forgetting those who were the victims of defeats, keeping them fresh in our memories, we celebrate our victories. The victor can be magnanimous. The vanquished can only be embittered.

In our country, unlike the old world, we have no tradi'ional enemies. We have many traditional friends. The descendants of the British redcoats at Lexington and Concord are now the traditional friends of the descendants of the minutemen they faced. You and I, as the successors to the men of the Alamo, are the traditional friends of the descendants of the men who fought here and at San Jacinto under Santa Anna. It will ever be so.

An orator has said most eloquently: "Thermopylae had her messenger of defeat, but the Alamo had none." There may have been defeat at Thermopylae. But was there defeat at the Alamo? True every combatant was slain. Their bodies were placed on a funeral pyre interlaid with mesquite wood and the torch applied. They were reduced to ashes. But from their own ashes they rose in youthful freshness like the Phoenix. In that pristine beauty they formed the inspiration of the gallant army of Sam Houston in its decisive victory at the Battle of San Jacinto. They provided the battle cry, "Remember the Alamo." There followed the Republic of Texas, its admission to the United States as the 28th bright star of the galaxy of 48. Their devotion to constitutional rights, their defense thereof, rendered it possible for us to stand on this hallowed ground surrounded by the marvels of modern progress and stable government. The wild frontier conquered, the blessing of liberty maintained for you and for me and for generation after generation which shall follow us as did every generation which has followed them. No; there was no defeat at the Alamo.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1956

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 24, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. E. E. Parker, pastor, Claypool Methodist Church, Davin, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, the everlasting Lord and Father, who art with us in all our ways, we beseech Thee, as we bow our hearts in prayer, to fill us with the strengthening peace of Thy conscious presence and with the knowledge that love is at the root of everything that is good. It alone can bring us back from the solitude which is haunted with perplexity into our true relationship with our fellow man.

Give to us faith, courage, and wisdom, that we may be able to march in rhythmic majesty with life's procession and in proud submission to Thy will toward the goal of our glorious destiny among the nations of the world.

Lord, may Thy countenance shine on this great lawmaking body in all of its endeavors for our Nation and the peoples of the world. All of which we ask in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 24, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 23, 1956, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1834) to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; and

H. R. 10754. An act to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of routine business, and that statements in connection therewith be limited to the usual 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in Muir Woods National Monument, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MANAGEMENT OF RED LAKE INDIAN FOREST AND SAWMILL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and Sawmill (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Jui-Chang Hsieh from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 18, 1955, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC., FINLEY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc., Finley, N. Dak., relating to Federal development of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River in Idaho.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE HELLS CANYON DAM ON THE SNAKE RIVER IN IDAHO

Whereas in order that full development of this national resource be attained, the development must be done by our Federal Government; and

Whereas adjacent to this power resource there are also large deposits of phosphate and potash, which should be developed to the maximum but only can be by an abundance of cheap electricity; and

Whereas an abundance of cheap electricity has revolutionized the development of our Nation, without which progress and present standards would be retarded; and

Whereas posterity is dependent upon soil fertility and cheap energy for a higher and better standard of living: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative respectfully urge the 2 Senators and the 2 Representatives from the State of North Dakota to support the full development of the Hells Canyon resource by supporting Federal development; and be it further

Resolved, That in order to achieve Federal development of this resource, we urge our 2 Senators and 2 Representatives to use their influence among their colleagues in order to obtain their support for this very necessary and important piece of legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

SHEYENNE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
JULIUS ANDERSON, *President*.
FINLEY, N. DAK.

ELIMINATION OF TAX ON ADMISSIONS—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from A. J. Gilman, manager, Bijou Theater, Beach, N. Dak., transmitting an excerpt from the North Central Allied Bulletin, relating to the elimination of the tax on admissions. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and excerpt may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIJOU THEATER,
Beach, N. Dak., April 16, 1956.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Received your letter in regard to the the 10 percent admission

tax. I certainly would like to see it eliminated.

The farm economy being what it is the theaters in this area are having a hard time. The theater is the only entertainment many rural people have or can afford to indulge in. Due to the admission tax and confiscatory methods of the film producers and distributors many small theaters are losing money or are forced to close. I believe the film industry should be controlled the same as any public utility.

With kindest regards and thanking you for your interest in the small theaters, I am,

Sincerely,

A. J. GILMAN,
Manager, Bijou Theater.

EXCERPT FROM NORTH CENTRAL ALLIED BULLETIN

Most exhibitors are presently in bad financial straits and are fearful of the future. According to Sindlinger, theaters are losing an average of $700 per year. If exhibitors were to eliminate the sale of confections in their theaters, just about 75 percent of the theaters would be forced to close—automatically. This is the situation in which exhibitors find themselves at a time when producers and distributors are making more money than at any other time in the history of the motion-picture business—and the country as a whole is enjoying the greatest prosperity of all time.

The fault is primarily ours because we do not stand up to be counted. The average exhibitor stays home, broads, cries and curses the distributors instead of doing what he should be doing: Supporting the organization financially, and writing to his Congressmen and Senators, advising them of what the distributors are doing, particularly to the small grossing theaters. And, unless you get in the battle and use this type of ammunition, you and the rest of us are doomed.

EXILE OF ARCHBISHOP MAKARIOS, OF CYPRUS — RESOLUTION OF PHILADELPHIA CITY COUNCIL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the chairman of the Philadelphia Justice for Cyprus Committee, Gregory G. Lagakos, has sent me a copy of a resolution adopted unanimously by the City Council of Philadelphia, on March 22, 1956. This resolution expresses the sympathy and indignation of the city council over the exile of Archbishop Makarios, of Cyprus, by the British Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 39

Resolution expressing sympathy and indignation on the occasion of the exiling of Archbishop Makarios, of Cyprus, by the British Government

Whereas the people of Philadelphia cherish the democratic form of government under which we live and particularly the guaranties of individual freedom from arbitrary police action and the guaranties to a fair and just trial under both the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas we acknowledge that to exile a man from his country is cruel and harsh treatment in the extreme; particularly a prelate whose life has been dedicated to the service of God, and who by exile is separated not only from his home, family and friends, but from his spiritual children and his work in the service of his Maker; and

Whereas we are thankful to Almighty God for the guaranties in our form of government against such acts in wanton disregard of the most basic constitutional rights; and

Whereas on or about March 9, 1956, on the isle of Cyprus, His Eminence, Bishop Makarios, archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus, was seized by the British Government and, without the substantiation of any charge against him and without the opportunity to refute or even to hear his accusers, was exiled from his home, his country, and his archbishopric of over 400,000 souls: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby express our vigorous indignation at the highhandedness of the action taken by the British Government, as aforesaid; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby express our sincere feelings to the members of the Greek Orthodox faith in terms of our deepest sympathy for the grievous wrong which they and their spiritual leader, Archbishop Makarios, have suffered by reason of the aforesaid acts; be it further

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm the sentiments of the city of Philadelphia in behalf of freedom and liberty-loving Greece and the embattled and valiant people of Cyprus, who are fighting for the freedoms for which we fought in 1776; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Royal Greek Embassy, the United States Senators from Pennsylvana, and the Members of the House of Representatives from Philadelphia.

This is a true and correct copy of the original resolution passed by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the 22d day of March 1956.

JAMES H. J. TATE,
President of City Council.

SIZE AND WEIGHT OF PARCEL-POST MAIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Gardner, Mass., relating to the size and weight of parcel-post mail.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF H. R. 9566

Whereas the exstence of an efficient, economical parcel-post system is essential to the pattern of life of our citizens and businesses in both rural and urban areas; and

Whereas the present discriminatory parcel-post size and weight limitations seriously disrupt the service once enjoyed by all at great and unnecessary cost and inconvenience; and

Whereas there is no nationwide substitute for parcel post that can and will serve all citizens regardless of address; and

Whereas the present size and weight limitations have been both a financial and an administrative burden to the Post Office Department: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Gardner Chamber of Commerce, comprised of 330 members and representing 203 businesses in Gardner, favors immediate enactment of H. R. 9566 and restoration thereby of uniform parcel-post size and weight limits.

It is respectfully requested that Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that he request the chairman of the Post Office Committee to schedule hearings now on parcel-post size and weight so that the citizens of Gardner may have relief from the present law before the current legislative session is concluded.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of the F. Delizia Co., Inc. (Rept. No. 1851);

H. R. 3054. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs, or personal representatives (Rept. No. 1852); and

H. R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson (Rept. No. 1853).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 1835. A bill for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans. (Rept. No. 1854); and

H. R. 3975. A bill for the relief of the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B. (Rept. No. 1855).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H. R. 1603. A bill to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects (Rept. No. 1857).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1622. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1856).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 4118. A bill to amend section 606 (5) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to the computation of the 10-year recapture period (Rept. No. 1859).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3266. A bill to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska (Rept. No. 1860).

By Mr. POTTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3524. A bill to give effect to the Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries signed at Washington, September 10, 1954, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1858).

REPORT ON TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS (S. REPT. NO. 1850)

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit a report on the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. The report was made by unanimous vote of the subcommittee which investigated the narcotics traffic, and also by unanimous vote of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

In connection with our nationwide investigation of the narcotics traffic, pursuant to Senate Resolution 67, adopted on March 18, 1955, we received the direction that "special attention be given to the extent, cause, and effect of unlawful uses of narcotics and marihuana and to the additions and changes in the laws necessary to combat the increasing narcotic addiction in the United States."

Mr. President, we spent most of a week in hearing the experts on the subject of narcotic addiction and treatment. One of the special findings we make in the report is that "the so-called clinic plan" for free distribution of narcotics is totally unworkable, is completely contrary to accepted medical practice and theory, and would aggravate, rather than solve, the problem of drug addiction."

In the report we face that fact that although much improvement has been made since passage of the Harrison Narcotic Act, and although at this time there are fewer narcotic addicts than there were then—and especially is that true since the Federal Bureau of Narcotics was established—there are today in the United States at least 60,000 narcotic addicts, and they are responsible for approximately 50 percent of the total number of crimes committed in the large metropolitan areas, and 25 percent of all reported crimes in the Nation. So it is high time that active steps be taken toward the cure and rehabilitation of the 60,000 drug addicts in this country, and toward removal of the incurables from public contacts where they spread both their addiction and the traffic to other people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that our committee's conclusion concerning the free drugs clinics, as set forth in the report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSION

The subcommittee is unalterably opposed to and rejects the clinic-plan proposal for supplying narcotic addicts with free or low-cost narcotic drugs. We are opposed to all types of so-called ambulatory treatment. We believe that initial treatment must take place within a special institution, and that rehabilitation of a drug addict should not begin until he is off of narcotic drugs and has undergone extensive physical and psychiatric treatment within an institution. We believe that attempts to reduce narcotic addiction and to destroy the illicit narcotics traffic by giving free drugs to narcotic addicts would be an abject failure and, more important, that it would maintain and tend to increase the present problem of drug addiction in the United States. Finally, we believe the thought of permanently maintaining drug addiction with sustaining doses of narcotic drugs to the addict to be utterly repugnant to the moral principles inherent in our laws and the character of our people.

The subcommittee is supported in its conclusions and policy by other groups which have given intensive study to this particular problem. Among them are:

(a) The Canadian Senate's Special Narcotics Investigating Committee, which reported on June 20, 1955, as follows:

"The committee heard considerable evidence with respect to narcotic clinics and ambulatory treatment. The vast preponderance of responsible evidence on this subject, both oral and written, leads the committee to conclude that the establishment of such clinics or the provision of any other legalized supply of drugs for the purpose merely of supporting addiction would be a retrograde step. The committee is therefore strongly of the opinion that the narcotic-drug problem cannot be solved by the creation of Government clinics where addicts could obtain their supplies.

"The committee unanimously rejects any proposal designed to provide legal supplies of drugs to criminal addicts."

(b) The Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations, which reported at its 10th session:

"In the treatment of drug addiction methods of ambulatory treatment and open clinics are not advisable."

(c) The Committee on Drug Addiction and Narcotics of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, which adopted the following policy at its 14th meeting, October 1–2, 1954:

"The committee disapproves a policy of legalization of administration of narcotics to addicts by established clinics or suitably designated physicians because:

"1. It is impossible to maintain addicts on a uniform level of dosage;

"2. Ambulatory treatment of addiction is impossible and has been so judged by the American Medical Association and other informed groups;

"3. The clinics would facilitate the production of new addicts by increasing drug availability; and

"4. The policy is contrary to international conventions and national legislation."

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in the report we make affirmative recommendations for improvements in the present treatment of drug addicts, and regarding the indeterminate commitment of habitual addicts—those who have gone to Federal hospitals three times, but still relapse to the use of drugs. We recommend that there be some kind of commitment to narcotics farms, so as to keep such drug addicts off the streets and out of public places.

We have made other specific recommendations for improvement of our procedures for treating and rehabilitating narcotics addicts. I ask unanimous consent that our recommendations, as summarized on pages 20 and 21 of the report, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That voluntary commitments to the Federal narcotics hospitals be abolished and that all admissions be processed through the appropriate district court of the United States for civil type commitment requiring a mandatory period of treatment, or by State court commitments under the conditions hereinafter outlined.

2. That the Surgeon General be authorized to accept addicts commited by a State on a reimbursable basis under State court orders requiring a mandatory period of treatment.

3. That each State be assigned a quota of addict-patients which may be committed to Federal narcotics hospitals at any one time, therefore assuring that each State has fair and equal opportunity to avail itself of the limited facilities. In those few States where the number of addicts requiring treatment exceeds the established quota of patients at Lexington and Fort Worth, such States should assume the responsibility of establishing their own special hospital facilities for the treatment of drug addiction.

4. That States desiring to participate in the commitment program, in order to become eligible, must have satisfied the Surgeon General that suitable follow-through, or posthospitalization facilities have been established to aid and assist the drug addict upon his discharge from the Federal narcotics hospital and to determine any relapse to addiction. That the USPHS continue to provide technical and advisory assistance to States and local communities in developing followup programs.

5. That, for a successful follow-through program, commitment orders for drug addicts should provide for at least a 3-year probation status upon release from Federal hospitals, including mandatory provisions for regular reporting, and physical examinations and for recommitment upon relapse without the institution of new procedings.

6. That no drug addict be treated at Federal narcotics hospitals on more than three occasions, after which, if found to have relapsed again to the use of drugs, he should be subject to State or Federal proceedings designating him as an habitual narcotic addict and committing him to an indeterminate quarantine-type of confinement at a suitable narcotics farm which, it is recommended, be established with joint Federal-State planning and financing, such arrangement to include either:

(a) individual States, or

(b) a group of States entering into a compact for such purpose.

7. That the Public Health Service Act be amended to authorize the divulgence of information relating to narcotic addicts to appropriate Federal and State authorities in charge of treatment and rehabilitation programs and to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

8. That the Surgeon General continue and expand, where needed, the existing Federal research program into the causes, treatment, and rehabilitation of drug addicts, and that annual reports on the progress of such research be made to the appropriate committee of the Congress.

It should be noted that these recommendations for treatment and rehabilitation are not intended as a substitute for criminal confinement and punishment of those addicts who are convicted of law violations. They should pay their debt to society the same as nonaddicts, and proper law enforcement and confinement in such instances will do much toward minimizing the narcotics traffic and addiction in the United States.

PRICE DANIEL, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.
JAMES O. EASTLAND.
HERMAN WELKER.
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to report, as in executive session, 750 nominations of persons for promotions in the Coast Guard.

These promotions are routine in character, and, in order to avoid the expense of printing the nominations on the calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be kept on the Secretary's desk without being printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3724. A bill creating the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3725. A bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3726. A bill to amend section 48 of title 28 of the United States Code in order to authorize holding terms of the United States Court of Appeals for the fifth circuit at Miami, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3727. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 3728. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 3729. A bill creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing the Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boon County, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 3730. A bill to provide for protecting Soap Lake, Wash., in connection with the Columbia Basin project, Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. JENNER, and Mr. MARTIN of Iowa):

S. 3731. A bill to provide certain increases in annuity for retired employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishment of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

The following concurrent resolution was submitted and agreed to:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67 favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he submitted the above concurrent resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS TO ABOLISH FORCED LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 248) favoring United States cooperation with other nations through the International Labor Organization to abolish forced labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas forced labor for political or economic purposes is abhorrent to all civilized nations and is repugnant to the constitutional and statutory concepts of the republican form of government on which life in the United States is based; and

Whereas the people of some nations are subjected to forced labor for political or economic purposes; and

Whereas the existence of forced labor in any nation is inimical to the interests of the United States and other free nations morally, politically, and economically and constitutes a threat to the security, well-being, and even the existence of democratic institutions and free economic systems; and

Whereas to meet this threat and to promote the welfare and dignity of human beings through the world, the United Nations and the International Labor Organization, at the initiative of the American Federation of Labor, appointed an ad hoc committee to study the nature and extent of forced labor for political or economic purposes throughout the world; and

Whereas the ad hoc committee on forced labor issued a carefully considered and well documented report detailing the existence of forced labor for these purposes in a number of nations of the world; and

Whereas the International Labor Organization is now considering the adoption of an international instrument designed to abolish forced labor for political or economic purposes wherever it may exist; and

Whereas the United States Government has exercised leadership in the United Nations to mobilize world opinion for the abolition of forced labor for political and economic purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Government of the United States exercise leadership in the International Labor Organization to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the 84th Congress, for the purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, $10,000 in addition to the amount authorized in such section.

PROHIBITION OF COSPONSORS ON BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 250) prohibiting the introduction of bills or joint resolutions by two or more Senators jointly, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARKLEY when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED BENEFITS TO PERSONS PRESENTLY ON CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ROLLS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2875) to liberalize and improve retirement, disability, and survivorship benefits for present and future employees of the Government, was reported favorably a few days ago by unanimous vote of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and is now on the calendar. Among other things, that bill provides that present and future Federal employees, who will share its benefits, must also share a portion of the added cost of such benefits. This, and the other financial provisions of S. 2875 will, for the first time, establish the civil service retirement fund on a fully financed "pay-as-you-go" basis with respect to benefits based on future service.

Enactment of Senate bill 2875 will provide reasonable benefits to our long-time and loyal Federal employees who reach retirement age in the foreseeable future.

However, the plight of many of our former employees now on the retirement rolls is of great personal concern to me and other members of the committee. Because of our genuine regard for their welfare, we propose to introduce a bill that will increase the annuities of these senior citizens of ours, who devoted their earlier years to the Government service. The bill provides:

A. An increase of not to exceed $300 in the annuity of former employees now retired.

B. An increase of $80 in the annuity of survivors of former employees—except children.

C. An increase of $50 in the annuity of surviving children.

Additionally, since Senate bill 2875 proposes to place the fund on a pay-as-you-go basis with respect to future service costs, the bill presently being introduced provides that the cost of increased annuities to persons now retired shall be met out of appropriations made specifically for such purposes.

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is also chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3725) to provide for increases in the anuities of annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any employee who, before the date of enactment of this act, was retired and is receiving or entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall be increased by $100 plus $10 for each two full months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not in any case exceed $300.

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any survivor, except a child covered by subsection (c), who, on the date of enactment of this act is receiving or is entitled to receive an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of a former employee, shall be increased by $30.

(c) Subject to the provisions of section 2, the annuity of any child who, on the date of enactment of this act, is receiving or is entitled to receive an auunity under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, based on the service of his parent, shall be increased by $50.

SEC. 2. No increases in annuities shall be payable under section 1 of this act until, and except to the extent that, an appropriation made for the specific purpose of paying such increases is available for such purpose. Any such increase shall become effective on the first day of the first month for which such appropriation is available, and shall terminate on the last day for which such appropriation is available.

SEC. 3. Section 8 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out the next to the last sentence in paragraph (1) thereof.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, TO ENCOURAGE SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS TO ENGAGE IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on April 18, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] introduced for himself, and the junior Senator from Delaware, the bill (S. 3672) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to encourage small-business concerns to engage in foreign trade, which has been referred to the Finance Committee.

I intended to be present on the floor at the time and deliver a brief statement in support of the measure. Unfortunately, I was delayed by a committee meeting; but I now ask that a brief statement, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

I join with my colleague, Senator CAPEHART, in his contention that a study of the administration of the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation Act reveals that the smaller manufacturer in the United States is not being given equal opportunity with our largest manufacturers to compete with foreign exporters on the Western Hemisphere markets.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee to which this bill will be assigned, I wish to make it clear here that I will ask the committee act at the earliest opportunity to eliminate the existing inequality.

I am sure that Senators will not wish to continue the requirement—by the Treasury Department interpretation—that title to goods sold to Western Hemisphere countries must change hands outside the continental United States in order to qualify for Western Hemisphere competitive benefits.

This requirement denies a competitive position to the smaller manufacturer who cannot afford to maintain agencies and warehouses in all Western Hemisphere countries, but permits benefits to the largest manufacturers who do maintain such title-changing facilities in their normal business operations.

That item is of grave importance, but, as Senator CAPEHART has said, there is more evidence which needs to be placed before the committee to reveal the complete picture of the position in which the smaller manufacturers have been placed.

I do not believe it was not the intent of the Congress and the Senate Committee which acted on the original amendment that only one segment of our industry was to be placed in a position to compete with foreign manufacturers for Western Hemisphere trade.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BEALL, Mr. IVES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. KUCHEL) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3407) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3371) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. PAYNE:

Statement prepared by him on the anniversary of the birth of John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal, and poetic tribute by Maurice H. Thatcher.

By Mr. POTTER:

Statement prepared by him regarding the 11th anniversary of the meeting of American and Russian soldiers on the Elbe River.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Homer Ferguson;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina, vice Albert F. Nufer; and

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile, vice Willard L. Beaulac.

Notice is given that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days.

FUTURE ROLE OF NATO

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Monday before the annual meeting of members of the Associated Press in New York, Secretary of State Dulles said that the time had come to consider expanding the role of NATO.

Yesterday, at his press conference, he expanded somewhat on his proposal, and suggested that there be an exchange of thoughts at the coming NATO Council meeting with regard to the possible development—economically and politically—of NATO.

Mr. President, I believe such an expansion would be desirable.

It may be that NATO could, in the future, play a role in assisting the less developed nations of North Africa and the Middle East in their efforts to build themselves economically.

I am hopeful that some such development will be agreed to in the near future.

Mr. President, in response to a question concerning recent criticism of United States policy as being overmilitarized, the Secretary made it clear, as did the President last Saturday, that we must give more emphasis to the economic and political approach without sacrificing our military preparedness.

The thoughts that Mr. Dulles has expressed with regard to expanding the role of NATO constitute further evidence that United States policies are continuing to be adapted to meet more effectively both recently revised Communist tactics and the changing demands of the times.

As President Eisenhower said on Saturday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

Our assistance must be used flexibly to fit needs and plans as they develop. We must be ready to adapt our help promptly to meet changing conditions.

Mr. President, in connection with the NATO proposal, I desire to call attention

to editorials in two of our leading New Jersey papers.

The first is an editorial from the Newark Star Ledger of April 24 entitled "It's Time To Expand NATO." The other is an editorial from the Newark Evening News of April 24 entitled "Foreign Policy Changes."

Mr. President, from the latter editorial I shall quote a portion of the last paragraph, which refers to Mr. Dulles' NATO speech:

Thus the speech contained at once hope and skepticism, an implicit willingness to accept criticisms of past performances and to lead the way toward meeting demands that in the economic field we counter the new Russian policy. In the light of this it cannot be said that the administration is stubbornly persisting in a course that needs redirection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both of these editorials be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Star Ledger of April 24, 1956]

IT'S TIME TO EXPAND NATO

Secretary Dulles' foreign-policy speech before an Associated Press luncheon yesterday in New York will be welcomed heartily by our allies, particularly those in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Secretary, following the broad principles laid down by President Eisenhower in his Washington speech Saturday, proposed expanding this successful, though essentially military alliance of 12 North Atlantic nations to include the economic phases of their foreign relations.

This, of course, is not new. Italian President Gronchi, in an address to a joint session of Congress during his recent visit here, and French Premier Guy Mollet, in a later blast at United States policy toward Europe, both called for a similar change in emphasis within NATO and other western alliances to economic, rather than military cooperation.

The details of this expansion, of course, have not been revealed, either by Dulles or by Messrs. Gronchi or Mollet. Perhaps they will now be formulated at the upcoming May 4 meeting in Paris of NATO ministers.

But the basic idea of making NATO more effective, particularly in light of the New Look of Soviet foreign policy, seems certain to strengthen our ties with our allies and put the West in a sounder position to counter any and all Soviet policy shifts.

[From the Newark News of April 24, 1956]

FOREIGN POLICY CHANGES

Reorienting of United States foreign policy is under way. Important decisions have been taken in Washington. Their first fruits will become apparent at the NATO Council at Paris next week.

This was made clear in the speech by Secretary of State Dulles before the Associated Press in New York. It fitted together with the address by President Eisenhower to the editors in Washington, to spell out a new phase of our foreign relations.

Our attitude toward Russia is changing, though we will not let down our guard. Both the President and his Secretary of State are encouraged by the changes in Soviet policy and tactics, which they attribute to a conviction in Moscow that the policy of force was not getting the Communists anywhere. They are hopeful that forces for liberalization are effectively at work in the Soviet Union, which they still do not trust and whose methods Mr. Dulles saw fit to attack anew. In reorienting we are not taking anything back. But said Mr. Dulles:

"Our new task is to build more on hope and less on fear."

Accordingly, there will be less emphasis on militarism in our foreign relations, though we will continue to build strength into our alliances, as well as to maintain our national strength. Mr. Dulles forecast that next week in NATO the United States will yield to those nations which are anxious to develop the North Atlantic Treaty Organization along other than military lines.

The Secretary pointed out that unity among allies is hard to maintain when fear of attack is lessened, but he is convinced that cooperation for constructive purposes can serve usefully as a unifying influence. He foresees NATO nations cooperating closely "for something, rather than merely against something."

"We seek, above all, to advance the inevitable day," he declared, "when the historic friendship between the Russian and American peoples can again be fully manifested. Therefore, we take deep satisfaction from the fact that we can today see within Russia some signs of light which could mark the dawning of that new day."

Thus the speech contained at once hope and skepticism, an implicit willingness to accept criticisms of past performances and to lead the way toward meeting demands that in the economic field we counter the new Russian policy. In the light of this it cannot be said that the administration is stubbornly persisting in a course that needs redirection. We shall see at NATO how readily our allies respond to our approaches.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of S. 669, a bill to grant home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia, I am pleased to note from a letter written by the Director of the Budget, Mr. Brundage, to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, that the President has recently endorsed this particular proposed legislation with certain modifications.

The President has suggested that instead of an elected mayor, the city should have a mayor appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Also, he has suggested that the President should have veto power over legislation passed by the city council over the mayor's veto but he should have no veto power over legislation which his appointed mayor approved. These powers are not granted in the present bill.

There have been objections that this is not complete home rule and therefore the changes should not be accepted. Though I voted for S. 669 when it passed the Senate on June 29, 1955, I agree that these changes are wise and that they would provide a proper balance between the Federal and city governments. They permit the Federal Government to retain some control over the city and at the same time allow the city to govern itself with a minimum of outside interference.

The President's suggestions provide a feasible compromise. The crux of home rule lies in granting the city of Washington the lawmaking power through an elected city council. The President's suggestions do not necessarily inhibit this power, but leave it as granted in the bill already passed by the Senate.

That there should be some degree of control over the Nation's Capital by the Federal Government is understood and appreciated by many of those in the city advocating and working to obtain home rule. This is taken care of in the President's suggestions and also in section 324 D of the bill approved and passed by the Senate, wherein the Congress of the United States reserves its right to continue to legislate also for the District of Columbia.

On January 22, 1952, the Senate passed S. 1976, a bill granting an elected city council and an elected board of education and a mayor to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

On May 31, 1949, the Senate passed S. 1527, also a bill granting home rule. This bill provided for an 11-member city council—9 members to be elected and 2 to be appointed by the President, the mayor to be chosen by the city council. These last proposals were incorporated at the request of the late Senator Taft, who was a coauthor of that bill and interested in obtaining home rule for the city.

I mention these things, Mr. President, for the history of this legislation shows the concept that Congress has held consistently about the relationship between the Federal Government and the city of Washington. I regret that both bills passed by the Senate were not accepted by the House and therefore never became law. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to grant unrestricted home rule to Washington, considering the circumstance of having the Nation's Capital located within the city of Washington itself.

I hope, Mr. President, that the changes suggested by the President will be incorporated in S. 669.

VERRAZZANO DAY AND ADMISSION OF ITALIANS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am greatly pleased that Mayor Wagner, of New York City, has designated April 17 as Verrazzano Day.

This great Italian explorer was in the tradition of, and followed in the footsteps of, Christopher Columbus. He helped plot the way to the exploration and development of the New World. He deserves a place of high honor in our hearts and an expression of gratitude from America, as from all the other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

It is strange and paradoxical that men of Italian blood, whose forebears did so much to make the New World possible, are now discriminated against, so far as entry into this country is concerned. The list of the great explorers of Italian birth who blazed the trails across the unknown seas is a long one, and includes not only Columbus and Verrazzano, but also Cabot, Vespucci, and many, many others. That should be warrant enough for the elimination from our immigration laws of all traces of discrimination against Italians. Indeed, if any people

has a historical right to a preference, it is the Italians.

But today we believe there should be no preferences or discrimination for or against any people, and that all immigrants should be admitted into our country on the basis of individual worth.

I hope that from the observance of Verrazzano Day, there will be a renewed dedication to the broadening of our welcome to peoples of Italian birth and descent who desire to emigrate to America.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to inform the distinguished Senator from New York that today the Immigration Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is meeting to consider this very problem, and to deal with immigration. This matter has been very close to the hearts of a great many members of the Judiciary Committee, and I think it is receiving prompt attention.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

FARM COMMODITY PRICES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, toward the end of the session on yesterday, we got into quite a heated debate—although purely on a friendly basis—over the farm situation and President Eisenhower's position regarding it, and, in particular, the address recently made by President Eisenhower and the address recently made by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. In a colloquy with the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the debate became quite heated in regard to the prices the farmers are receiving at the moment, in relation to parity.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to notify the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and to ascertain whether he cares to discuss this matter, in which case he may have an opportunity to come to the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe that will be necessary, because all I intend to do is place in the RECORD the parity figures which have been given to me by the Department of Agriculture.

As I said, Mr. President, the debate became quite heated—although in a friendly way. Perhaps our feelings became slightly strained in the course of the colloquy; but one can well understand how that might occur during heated debate on a problem so controversial at the moment as the farm problem.

At this point I wish to place in the RECORD—because I am sure that someone gave the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma some very unreliable information—certain figures which I have received from the Department of Agriculture. I am sure that if the Senator from Oklahoma had been given the correct facts, he would not have used the figures he did.

I now find from the Department of Agriculture the following in regard to the prices farmers are receiving in relation to parity:

Eggs, 97 percent.

Wholesale milk prices—the prices the farmer receives—87 percent. That means 87 percent of parity.

Barley, 75 percent of parity.

Oats, 78 percent of parity.

Flaxseed, 80 percent of parity.

Grain sorghums, 77 percent of parity.

Peanuts, 90 percent of parity.

Cotton, 90 percent of parity.

Butterfat, 81 percent of parity.

Soybeans, 97 percent of parity. Soybeans are almost up to 100 percent of parity at the moment; and I repeat that these are the percentages of parity the farmer is receiving at the present time.

Corn, 82 percent of parity.

Wheat, 85 percent of parity.

Cattle, 74 percent of parity. The figure for cattle includes the prices paid for all grades of cattle, including the utility grade, the commercial grade, and all the other grades. They are averaging about $14.40 a hundredweight, for all grades, including the utility grade, the grade for the old cows.

Hogs, 74 percent of parity. That is based on the price of hogs as of yesterday.

Of course, Mr. President, the trouble with these figures is that no two markets in the United States pay exactly the same price on the same day. Instead, prices vary as between different markets. However, these figures are the best judgment of the Department of Agriculture, taken on the average, as a whole, throughout the United States.

These figures will be officially published soon. They are the figures as of April 15. They are approximately correct. As I say, some markets may be lower and some may be a little higher.

Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show the facts. As I stated a moment ago, I am certain that the able Senator from Oklahoma would not have used the figures he used if these figures had been available to him. Someone handed him some figures which were wrong with respect to the prices farmers are receiving at the moment in relation to parity. I believe it to be a true statement that even during the depression in the 1930's, at no time did the overall average of farm prices go below 70 percent. I do not believe it has ever gone below 70 percent. Some items have, but I am talking about the overall average.

These are the facts, as best we can obtain them. Naturally the figures are approximate. They will vary in different sections of the United States. I wish to say, in all fairness to the Senator from Oklahoma, that I am sure, had he been handed these figures instead of the ones he had, he would not have used the figures which he used.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are these parity prices after Mr. Benson announced increases a few days ago?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. These are the prices which farmers are receiving in the free market today. They have nothing to do with the support prices. These are the prices which the farmer is receiving in the open market for that which he sells.

For example, in my State at the moment corn is selling for $1.43 a bushel, I believe. That is about 87 percent of parity. The Department gives me a figure of only 82 percent. That is because the corn is not selling quite that high in other parts of the country. I wish to be fair. Markets vary, even from elevator to elevator within any given State.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken when he says that during the drought wheat, for example, did not go below 70 percent.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I did not say that. I say that the general average of all farm products, even during the depression days of the 1930's, never went below 70 percent. I believe that to be a true statement. If it is not, I shall find out.

Mr. LANGER. I do not believe it is correct. For example, rye was selling in North Dakota for 7 cents a bushel. Wheat was sold for prices ranging between 19 and 24 cents a bushel.

Mr. CAPEHART. Parity at that time may have been only 90 cents a bushel for rye. We are talking about the parity prices. When we say 70 percent of parity, we mean 70 percent of parity as established by law, under a formula written by the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator is interested, I can obtain the figures. The figure was not 70 percent of parity during the drought.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator may well be correct. As I say, these figures vary from State to State. They vary from market to market. They vary from elevator to elevator, in the case of grains, as much as 3 or 4 cents a bushel in my State on corn and other grains. However, generally speaking the figures are approximately correct. I think the RECORD should show the facts. As I stated a moment ago, I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma would not have used the figures he used had he been handed the correct figures.

AUTHORIZATION TO SPEAKER RAYBURN TO WEAR A DECORATION AWARDED HIM BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of House bill 10754, a bill just passed by the House of Representatives. The bill would authorize Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear a decoration awarded him by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines. I have discussed this proposed legislation with the distinguished minority leader, and we are in agreement that it should be considered by unanimous consent at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 10754) to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the

House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, was read the first time by its title and a second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, is authorized to accept the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipient may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to say a word in regard to the bill just passed. The bill authorizes Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to wear a decoration which was awarded him by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, with which we have had long and historic ties of friendship over the years, and with which we are now mutually associated in defense treaties. We have a keen interest in the economic, political, and military stability of that great new country in the far Pacific.

I think all of us, regardless of our partisanship, and regardless of the House in which we serve, are pleased that this tribute has been paid to Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. Many of us have had occasion to know Speaker RAYBURN for a number of years. Some of the Members of this body served in the House with him ever since he came to Congress, in about the year 1913. While I did not have that privilege, my father served in the House of Representatives with him.

I think we all recognize that Speaker RAYBURN has had a long and distinguished career. While it is true that he occupies the position of Speaker of the House of Representatives as the leader of the Democratic majority in the House, regardless of that fact, both Democrats and Republicans in the House, and I am sure both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, join in congratulating Speaker RAYBURN on the very well-deserved tribute he has received from our good neighbor, the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation of the very generous remarks of the distinguished minority leader. All of us who have served with Speaker RAYBURN are devoted to him. When the Philippine Government honors him, it honors us. I know of no man in this Nation who is more worthy of this recognition than SAM RAYBURN. I am particularly grateful that the distinguished minority leader should see fit to pay him such a very generous tribute. It is not only a tribute to SAM RAYBURN that the senior Senator from California has paid him, but it is also a tribute to the senior Senator from California.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND SHIPBUILDING

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the latter part of last week, the Senate Armed Services Committee reported a bill already passed by the House authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels.

This is a subject of vital interest and of the utmost importance to the shipbuilding industry in my State.

During the period immediately before World War II private shipbuilding in California employed 100,000 people. The descent has been breathtakingly fast falling to a low figure of less than 2,000 as of 1955. This fact alone is one to cause great concern. Not only because it signifies the crisis the shipbuilding industry is facing in terms of production, but a shipyard is more than just a physical plant or workshop. It is a composite of equipment, management, and working skills, all of which must be geared in very delicate fashion to produce the technical and highly complicated modern vessel. Such facilities cannot be maintained in adequate condition unless they are used. Highly trained specialists essential in the construction and development of current technological advances in this field cannot be expected to remain at jobs where there is no work. The depletion of these skills is as much of a loss to the Nation as it is to the industry.

It has been substantiated that a major portion of Government contracts is being awarded to naval shipyards although often the cost of construction exceeds that in private yards. The situation is so obvious and unfair that a Hoover Commission task force report made this comment:

> Due to the distressed condition of the private shipbuilding industry and the serious competition engendered by Government shipyards, the private industry is weakened as a war reserve * * * the Navy's operation of all these shipyards represents a destructive intrusion into the private shipbuilding of this country.

In 1954 I urged the Congress to initiate a program of emergency ship repairs which was designed to cover 205 ships and which amounted to $45 million. A bill was enacted authorizing $25 million, which was estimated to cover 100 ships. Eighty-one ships were laid up on the west coast, and I was assured by the Maritime Commission that at least one-third of the work awarded under the program would be at California shipyards. We are grateful. Bit by bit, morsel by morsel, the industry manages to keep alive.

Throughout the report made by the House Committee on this bill, the importance of a modern Navy and the United States maintaining command of the seas is emphasized to the extreme that victory or defeat in a hot or cold war might very well be decided by our naval position. Recommendations have been made proposing an expanded shipbuilding program. Congress must take a farsighted look into the probabilities and potentialities of such a program and give the proper consideration to these proposals.

That same farsighted consideration should be given to greater utilization of private shipbuilding. Every effort should be made now while we have the opportunity to see to it that private shipbuilding does not deteriorate to the extent that it would not be possible to utilize it during a time of emergency. The appropriate executive departments must see to it that substantial allocation of contracts be made to California yards when the time comes to implement the legislation Congress has been called upon to enact, so that empty docks and ways will stop rusting and the sounds of men working and the clamor of steel will again fill the vast silence of our now almost inactive shipyards.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to the following timely and appropriate editorial pointing up this acute situation which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on April 21. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND SHIPBUILDING

One of the chief recommendations carried in the Hoover Commission reports is the elimination of Government competition in enterprises and services which can be performed adequately and well by private industry. This is a commendable goal, but it is still a long way from achievement, and particularly so when the case of the west coast's private shipbuilding industry is considered.

EMACIATED INDUSTRY

The fact is that our shipbuilding industry which played such an important part in the Nation's defense during the critically anxious days of World War II is now only a thin shadow of its former self. Just how thin can be seen in survey figures that show private shipbuilding employment in this area plummeted from a height of more than 100,000 in 1943 to less than 2,000 as of last year.

Meanwhile Navy shipyard employment in the Southland was listed at 9,000 men, employed, of course, on Navy work. Private yards had a scant 540 men employed on naval projects, or 5.7 percent of the total naval work employment. Yet they have the facilities and equipment in most cases to take over some of the naval work, not on the order of that handled by the Navy's shipyards but enough to restore them as a working, operational part of this country's auxiliary defense system.

GLARING DISCREPANCY

Joseph Fellows, president of the Fellows & Stewart Yard on Terminal Island, was quoted in the Times recently as saying: "Certainly we would like to see the Navy yard (the Long Beach Naval Shipyard) at operational level for an emergency, but we all know that there is a lot of work done by the Navy that could be turned out much more economically in a private yard * * * our area yards could be put on a sound basis if there was enough Navy work spread around the private yards for 2,500 to 3,000 additional men."

On a regional basis the glaring discrepancy between naval and private shipyard employment is most marked on the west coast.

Actually there isn't much disparity in the percentages for the North Atlantic coast: 54 percent for Navy yards as against 46 percent for private yards. In the South Atlantic the division is 57 percent for Navy yards and 43 percent for private yards. But on the Pacific coast the gap widens to 75 percent for Navy yards and 25 percent for private yards.

It is scarcely to be wondered that a Hoover Commission task force reported: "Due to the distressed condition of the private shipbuilding industry and the serious competition engendered by Government shipyards, the private industry is weakened as a war reserve * * * the Navy's operation of all these shipyards represents a destructive intrusion into the private shipbuilding of this country."

The Commission has recommended that Congress provide for the appointment of a commission to study the effect on the private shipbuilding industry of the construction and repair of naval vessels in Government shipyards "to make recommendations for the transfer, where advisable, of such construction, and repair to private facilities."

PROPOSAL ENDORSED

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, which, through its maritime committee, has long fought for the preservation of our private shipbuilding industry, has endorsed the Hoover recommendation.

As to the vital role our west coast private shipbuilding industry plays, or should play, in national defense, that has been gone over before. But it is no less imperative to repeat that now, more than ever, we need an active, vitalized private shipbuilding industry ready and able to expand to meet the tremendous demands that would be made upon it in case of a national emergency.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have said that out of 77 strategic materials needed to successfully prosecute a war only 11 are to be found within the continental limits of the United States. Our ocean commerce must be preserved. Private shipbuilding can help, but it cannot help without a backlog of trained, experienced men, skilled in all the diverse tasks required of them. And these men have largely disappeared because private shipyards could not furnish them with work.

The problem is a grave one, made graver still by the exigencies of time which, unlike Congress, cannot, and does not, wait.

PROPOSED NORTHEAST AIRLINES EXTENSION TO WASHINGTON AND FLORIDA

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on April 3, 1956, Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn issued his decision in the New York-Florida proceeding—Document No. 3051, et al. The denial of Northeast Airlines' application to extend its routes to Washington and Florida has caused a great deal of consternation throughout the New England area. As examples of how deeply disturbed New Englanders are about this matter, I should like to quote briefly from a few of the many editorials which have appeared in our New England newspapers since this decision was made public.

The Portland Press Herald of April 10, 1956, stated editorially:

Northeast Airlines' petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board for extension of its route pattern from New York to Florida is of concern to others besides Northeast executives. The New England economy has a stake in Northeast's future. Thus a CAB examiner's recommendation against the route expansion is disturbing to the area capably served by the airline and deeply interested in improving its transportation system.

The Boston Herald of April 5, 1956, stated:

We have been struggling to make sense out of the report of the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner in the New York-Florida proceedings. Maybe what is veiled to us will later be made clear somehow, but the report now looks like an odd scramble. Northeast Airlines asked to be certificated for the rich and growing Boston-Miami route now serviced alone by Eastern Airlines. Northeast appeared to have a very good case. It now serves a stack of minor New England communities from Nantucket to Presque Isle and New York, at a heavy loss made up by a Government subsidy. Its big operation is in the summer, and the Florida route would give it a chance to use its planes and personnel the year round, and either eliminate or reduce the subsidy. Such a certificate would also bring New England communities into direct air touch with something outside of New England besides LaGuardia Field. Today only Boston, Providence, and Hartford have reasonably direct access to the rest of the Nation. But the examiner has recommended the rejection of Northeast's application.

The Pawtucket Times of April 6, 1956, in an editorial entitled "An Affront to New England Aviation" stated:

Should the examiner's recommendations prevail the many small communities which have been served by Northeast will continue to note that only Boston, Providence, and Hartford have direct air access to other parts of the Nation. The program suggested by the CAB examiner which would permit two more airlines to take business from the existing New England airlines, including Northeast, is a slap at the airline which pioneered broad air service throughout this area.

The Waterville Morning Sentinel of April 11, 1956, commented:

New England's economy would be struck a serious blow if the recommendation of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner turning down a bid by Northeast Airlines for route to Florida should stand. All of New England is concerned with the health of its airline and the need for that airline to improve its position by the requested route extension.

The Boston Traveler of April 6, 1956, stated:

The decision of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner to deny a bid by Northeast Airlines to extend its routes to Florida should be resented deeply throughout New England.

Mr. President, I have quoted briefly from 5 editorials. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of these editorials and 7 other representative editorials, which are indicative of the alarm caused in New England by the CAB hearing examiner's decision, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Press Herald of April 10, 1956]

NEW ENGLAND'S STAKE IN NORTHEAST'S FUTURE

Northeast Airlines' petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board for extension of its route pattern from New York to Florida is of concern to others besides Northeast executives. The New England economy has a stake in Northeast's future.

Thus a CAB examiner's recommendation against the route expansion is disturbing to the area capably served by the airline and deeply interested in improving its transportation system.

The Northeast operation presently carries two burdens, one geographical, the other financial. The line picks up passengers in Maine's central population artery running from Presque Isle to Portland, and covers the other New England States equally as well, but is not certified to go beyond New York. Other lines take the load—and the revenue—from there. And because of the nature of the New England climate and economy the biggest business is in the summer months, creating a heavy loss and forcing Northeast to accept a Government subsidy.

A route to Florida would permit Northeast to keep planes and personnel busy during the winter, and reduce if not entirely eliminate the need for a subsidy. It would, for instance, give Portland the same kind of access to the outerworld now enjoyed by Boston, Providence, and Hartford.

The argument for Northeast's request is not based on sentiment. Cold logic supports it. The community of New England wants to see its regional airline given the tools it needs to make good service even better and the aid necessary to improve its financial picture. An additional factor is that Delta Airlines, the firm given the nod for the New York Florida run by the CAB examiner, is not in a weak position and does not need the coastal run as much as Northeast does.

The examiner's recommendation is not final. It is to be hoped the Civil Aeronautics Board will study the matter further and will decide that in the interest of New England's general aviation health Northeast Airlines should be certified to fly to Florida. The ultimate decision cannot be easily or wisely divorced from New England's economic future.

[From the Boston Herald of April 5, 1956]

OUR AIRLINE SCRAMBLE

We have been struggling to make sense out of the report of the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner in the New York-Florida proceedings. Maybe what is veiled to us will later be made clear somehow, but the report now looks like an odd scramble.

Northeast Airlines asked to be certificated for the rich and growing Boston-Miami route now serviced alone by Eastern Airlines. Northeast appeared to have a very good case. It now serves a stack of minor New England communities from Nantucket to Presque Isle and New York, at a heavy loss made up by a Government subsidy. Its big operation is in the summer, and the Florida route would give it a chance to use its planes and personnel the year round, and either eliminate or reduce other subsidy.

Such a certificate would also bring the New England communities into direct air touch with something outside of New England besides LaGuardia field. Today only Boston, Providence, and Hartford have reasonably direct access to the rest of the Nation.

But the examiner has recommended the rejection of Northeast's application. The reason appears to be that Floyd B. Odlum's Atlas Corp., which owns the bulk of Northeast's stock, may have violated CAB regulations and ought not to profit. The fact that Atlas offered the chance for Northeast to finance the expansion evidently failed to move the examiner. Nor did the examiner seem moved by the plight of the New England communities.

Pan American also put in for the Boston-Florida route, with the reasonable argument that since its foreign service was largely seasonal (summer) it could service the seasonal (winter) traffic to Florida, not to mention giving direct Boston service to Central and South America. But the examiner also ruled out Pan American, either because he did not want to give it its first domestic

route or because Pan American competition might be fatal to National Airlines. (National would get an extension of its present Florida-New York run to Boston).

Instead of these possibilities, what did the examiner do? He gave the nod to Delta Airlines for the Florida route. Delta is a strong carrier, which does not need the route to survive financially. It does not need the route to balance any substantial seasonal demand. It does not need the route to bring New England communities into the national air grid. Counsel for the CAB's Bureau of Air Operations opposed the Delta application. Yet the examiner singled it out.

The examiner's report is subject to overturn by the board, and Northeast has said it will protest the report. Massachusetts, Boston, the New England Council and the Chamber of Commerce may also object to it. It calls for some deep study.

[From the Pawtucket Times, Pawtucket-Central Falls, R. I., of April 6, 1956]

AN AFFRONT TO NORTHEAST AVIATION

New England is deserving of extended airplane service, one which will link the northeast area directly with the South as far as Florida. But Northeast Airlines, on which many New England communities depend, is not entitled to participate in that expansion. Those are the surprising conclusions of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner. They run against the best interests of the airline which has been serving the Pawtucket area through North Central Airport.

Northeast Airlines intends to appeal the recommended denial of its application to operate south of New York. There is sound reason for challenging the impressions and the conclusions of the examiner.

Northeast's heaviest traffic comes in the summer when New England resort business is at its peak. Revenue from the summer business does not underwrite operations during the winter when business declines. Thus Northeast receives a Government subsidy. To obtain a share of the heavy passenger-cargo traffic to the South and Florida when northern business falls off Northeast Airlines asked CAB for permission to operate to points south of New York, with Florida as a terminal. With increased income from such extended service dependence on subsidy would decline.

An element in the recommended rejection of the Northeast application is the Atlas Corp., a holding company with a large investment in Northeast. The CAB examiner says the Atlas-Northeast relation is not in the public interest. He believes if Northeast is allowed to extend its service southward into Florida the holding company would be in the way to profit by selling its interests in the airline made more valuable by being able to expand its area of operations.

Concern with the assumped purpose of Atlas rather than with the security of air service to many New England communities is inferred from the examiner's adverse position on Northeast's application.

While the examiner recommends rejection of the petition of Northeast he recognizes the need for additional New England-Florida air service. He proposes the Delta Airlines and the National Airlines, both of which successfully operate southward from New York, be permitted to extend their operations north into New England. On one hand the CAB is advised to allow two airlines to expand to the north, into New England and to deny an active New England airline the right to expand southward.

It is difficult to reconcile the examiner's recommendations when it is recalled that counsel for the CAB Bureau of Air Operations officially opposed Delta's application to enter New England and officially recommended Northeast's application to add middle Atlantic and southern seaboard airlines to its New England pattern.

Should the examiner's recommendations prevail the many small communities which have been served by Northeast will continue to note that only Boston, Providence, and Hartford have direct air access to other parts of the Nation. The program suggested by the CAB examiner which would permit two more airlines to take business from the existing New England airlines, including Northeast, is a slap at the airline which pioneered broad air service throughout this area.

The Pawtucket Business Chamber was among the New England organizations which supported Northeast Airlines petition at the CAB hearings. A close study of the examiner's recommendations may lead the business chamber to join the protest being prepared by Northeast.

[From the Waterville Morning Sentinel of April 1, 1956]

CAB SHOULD CONSIDER NEW ENGLAND'S FUTURE

New England's economy would be struck a serious blow if the recommendation of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner turning down a bid by Northeast Airlines for route to Florida should stand.

All of New England is concerned with the health of its airline and the need for that airline to improve its position by the requested route extension.

Northeast is burdened by the geography of the region it serves which causes its biggest business to come in the summer months, thus creating a heavy loss in its year-round operation. Because of this it is forced to accept a Government subsidy.

Should Northeast be successful in its fight for a Florida route it could keep its planes and personnel busy during the winter. This would certainly reduce, and possibly eliminate, the Government aid.

At present it handles the traffic through Maine from Presque Isle to Portland and serves other parts of New England. But it is not authorized to go beyond New York. The load, and the fares, are taken from there by other lines.

If Northeast were to get its requested Florida certification, Waterville and other Maine cities would have greatly improved services.

The problem is not exclusively one that concerns the operators of Northeast. It concerns all who are interested in the future prosperity of Maine and New England since the role of air travel in modern economy is unquestioned.

Northeast needs the coastal run to operate efficiently. Improved efficiency of Northeast helps all who earn their living in New England. Some are helped more directly than others, but all benefit.

The CAB examiner gave the nod for the New York-Miami run to Delta Airlines, a line which doesn't need it. His recommendation isn't final, of course, and it is to be hoped that the CAB will give further study to the arguments in favor of the New England position.

As the matter stands the financial situation of Northeast, as such, is not the important thing. It is the economic future of New England that matters. In this interest it is to be hoped that the Board will reverse the examiner's decision.

[From the Boston Traveler of April 6, 1956]

FOILED AGAIN

The decision of a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner to deny a bid by Northeast Airlines to extend its routes to Florida should be resented deeply throughout New England.

Fortunately, this was the recommendation of but one examiner. The whole thing will now be taken up by the full Board. There are many good reasons why the examiner's recommendation should be ignored.

First of all, the recommendation went against the policy of the CAB. That policy is to strengthen smaller trunklines to insure that they will be able to operate without subsidy even during periods of economic adversity, and so they will be able to compete effectively with larger carriers.

Well, Northeast Airlines, a New England carrier, certainly falls into the category of a smaller trunkline. It operates with a subsidy, and unless it is allowed to expand it will never be able to compete effectively with larger carriers.

Northeast Airlines performs a valuable service to New England air passengers, shuttling them back and forth from New York and to points throughout New England. It also runs to Montreal.

But when it comes to bidding for the more profitable long runs, such as that to Florida, Northeast is stymied and ignored.

Northeast's inability to carry New England passengers through to Florida is already of major interest to this area. Any passenger who is forced to change planes or terminals in New York knows why. But the possibility that Northeast will not be allowed to extend its lines is of even greater interest. If the line finds that it is unable to keep up its New England service, who would take over that service? Certainly none of the larger carriers now enjoying the cream of the routes.

Finally, the examiner's recommendation is in direct conflict with the recommendation of the CAB's counsel, V. Rock Grundman.

Grundman pointed out during a CAB hearing in December that Northeast needs to extend its routes in order to enlarge its competitive opportunities in line with the Board's objective of developing a sound national route structure.

"The grant of its (Florida) application will accomplish this result," he said.

What all this means is that the CAB examiner, against all the weight of testimony, policy, and evidence, would let Northeast strangle and let New England air travelers go hang.

Northeast President George E. Gardner says he'll fight the recommendation. He deserves the support of our congressional delegation, our chambers of commerce, and anyone else who wants New England to stay on the aviation map.

[From the Bangor Daily News of April 13, 1956]

LEAVING NEW ENGLAND OUT IN COLD

The Civil Aeronautics Board on several occasions has reversed the findings of an examiner. They should do so in the case of the recent ruling against Northeast Airlines' petition for direct New England-Florida service. Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn, instead, favored a New York-Florida route for Delta Airlines, of Atlanta, Ga. His reasons don't stand up to critical examination.

Regional airlines such as Northeast need a profitable long-haul route to balance their budget. Short hauls are money losers and the Federal Government is paying out $1,800,000 annually to subsidize Northeast's service to 32 New England communities. Letting Northeast share in the Atlantic seaboard "gravy" run would, according to the airline, cut out the Federal subsidy and provide money as well as improve regional service.

In contrast, Delta already has a well-paying Chicago-Miami haul and operates without a subsidy.

Awarding of a seaboard route to Northeast would tie in this region with the South, thus adding to the national network of air service. Awarding the route to Delta simply adds more planes to the seaboard service. New England is left out in the cold.

Northeast is preparing a rebuttal. Not the least of its arguments is the fact that CAB counsel had recommended, before the examiner's report but on the same evidence,

that Northeast get the Florida route. Reason and fairness to New England call for reversal of Examiner Wrenn's recommendations.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Sun of April 21, 1956]

NEW ENGLAND PLANE SERVICE

Lewiston and Auburn, although thus far they are not interveners in the dispute, are very much interested in the flood of protests pouring in to the Civil Aeronautics Bureau against a decision by one of its examiners that involves Northeast Airlines.

For some time Northeast has been seeking an extension of its service from New England to Florida, arguing that many passages to the winter vacation area originate in this region, while it cited the need of more revenue in order to maintain adequate service in the six-State area.

But the CAB examiner heard the Northeast application along with 20 others by a dozen airlines, and came up with a package that no one likes. The result is that virtually every interested party has filed exceptions to the examiner's findings, including the cities of Portland, Augusta, Bangor, and Presque Isle, in Maine.

To the layman, it makes little sense that the examiner would allow Delta Airlines to fly the Florida route, that National shall be allowed to tap the New England market when the line didn't even apply for entry here, while ending the restriction on the right of Eastern Airlines to make long-haul flights into New England.

With so many protests, added to those of all 12 New England Senators, at least we have the consolation of a promised full CAB hearing. Airline service today is an indispensable, and Northeast's good record of safety and service entitles it to more consideration than the CAB examiner granted.

[From the Burlington Free Press of April 7, 1956]

SCRAMBLE FOR AIR TRAFFIC TO FLORIDA

Airlines operating in this part of the Nation have been seeking to extend their operations southward, particularly on New York-Florida and Boston-Florida routes.

Northeast Airlines asked to be allowed to operate the New York-Miami route, one of the most traveled in the Nation, and now serviced only by Eastern Airlines, which is now preparing to merge with Colonial Airlines.

Northeast presented a good case for getting approval to operate New York-to-Miami, says the Boston Herald. Northeast now serves several smaller New England communities (including Burlington) and New York City, at a heavy loss which is made up by Government subsidy. Its summer business is good, but winter operations are seriously "in the red." The New York-Miami route seemed to be a logical operation to get the line on a paying basis.

But the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner recommended the rejection of Northeast's application, and also the application of Pan American Airways for the Boston-Florida run. Instead the examiner approved Delta Airlines for the additional carrier for New York-to-Florida.

The Boston Herald points out that Delta is a strong carrier and does not need the route in order to survive financially, while Northeast does need it. If and when the Federal Government ceases subsidies to airlines, Northeast would have to find additional revenue from somewhere or cease operations.

It appears that the reason why the CAB examiner rejected Northeast's application was because Floyd B. Odlum's Atlas Corp., which owns the bulk of Northeast's stock, was claimed to have violated CAB regulations. That may be a sound technical reason for the CAB examiner's decision, but it appears from this vantage point on Northeast's route in northern New England that the decision is not in the general public interest.

The examiner's report is subject to review by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and that is undoubtedly the next step. The fact that counsel for the CAB's Bureau of Air Operations opposed the Delta application may have some bearing on the final decision.

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune of April 6, 1956]

LOCAL AIRLINE THWARTED

Greater Lawrence has an interest in the prosperity of Northeast Airlines, for the obvious reason that Northeast services this area out of the Lawrence airport. If Northeast doesn't prosper, it is entirely conceivable that greater Lawrence might be deprived of airline service. A Federal examiner has turned down Northeast's bid to extend its Boston-New York run to Florida, which would make it eligible for a share of the rich rewards other airlines are enjoying on that run.

In fact, the extension is necessary to the fulfillment of the pattern of Northeast's development. It is now operating under subsidy, and the extension would, it claims, make subsidy unnecessary and thus result in a saving of $1,800,000 a year. Such a deficit clearly endangers its operation and the special interest that greater Lawrence has in having an efficient airline link with the rest of New England.

It would seem that the very fact that Northeast has tenaciously stayed in the competition, awaiting a chance to expand its service, entitles it to consideration. It proves, at least, that Northeast was willing to accept the handicap of a limited operation in order to qualify finally for something bigger. To be thwarted by what seems to be a pretty arbitrary decision is in frustration of the principle that good performance should be encouraged by enlarged opportunities.

[From the Worcester Telegram of April 5, 1956]

WORCESTER AIR SERVICE

An examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board has rejected the petition by Northeast Airlines to fly from Worcester Airport to key Florida cities. This comes as a surprise to Worcester. Thomas L. Wrenn, the examiner, apparently based his decision wholly on his opinion of Northeast's financial structure. He disregarded the line's good service to the public.

The CAB's own bureau of counsel had strongly recommended that Northeast be allowed flights from Worcester to Washington, Jacksonville, Tampa and Miami. Worcester airport officials, in impressive exhibits, had shown the CAB examiner the importance of Worcester-Washington-Miami air service.

In 1955, more than 25,000 passengers flew back and forth from Worcester and points south of New York City. But they were forced to change planes at New York. By 1959, it is estimated that at least 125,000 air travelers will be using the Worcester Airport. The figure is now 80,000 passengers annually.

Fortunately, the examiner's opinion is not the final decision. Exceptions to it can, and will, be made within 15 days. The full CAB has previously reversed recommendations by its examiners, and there is hope that it will in the Northeast case.

Wrenn agreed that New England needs more air service direct to Florida. But, for some unknown reasons, he deliberately circumvented Worcester's appeal for such service.

It was strange that Wrenn recommended that Delta Airlines be granted a Florida-Boston route, that additional service be granted to Providence and Hartford by other airlines, and that Northeast be excluded from a Worcester-Florida service.

True enough, a CAB examiner is properly concerned with an airline's finances, and possible need for public subsidy. But he should also be concerned with the public interest. In this case, Wrenn emphasized a possible need by Northeast of a subsidy. But Northeast itself says the expanded service would be so profitable, it wouldn't need more subsidy. The truth should easily be obtainable by the full board. Worcester needs direct air service to Washington and to Florida if its airport is to meet its full future potential.

[From the Worcester Evening Gazette of April 5, 1956]

WORCESTER NEEDS EXTENDED AIR SERVICE

One fact emerges from Civil Aeronautics Board Examiner Thomas L. Wrenn's rejection of Northeast Airline's petition to run flights from Worcester to Washington, Jacksonville, Tampa, and Miami: The interests of central Massachusetts were practically ignored.

Wrenn grounded his case upon the alleged financial structure of the Atlas Corp., which he said controls Northeast. He accused it of irregular practices, and said that any permit issued for the new flight routes would most likely become a pawn of speculative capital.

Wrenn also remarked that, even though the Massachusetts to Miami flights were the real moneymakers for other airlines, such flights would only lose money for Northeast, which would have to buy new equipment, including DC-6B aircraft.

We are not intimately acquainted with the activities of the Atlas Corp., nor do we hold any brief for any particular airline. But it is disappointing that none of the proposals made by Wrenn would alleviate Worcester's situation in any way. One of his recommendations would give Providence a second competitive service to Florida and another of his suggestions would substantially improve air service out of the Hartford-Springfield area. Yet Worcester would remain boxed in on the south. Worcester passengers who wish to fly to Washington or Miami will still have to go first to Boston or New York and change planes.

Worcester Airport is an important and growing operation. By 1959, estimates show that more than 125,000 air travelers will use it—if it can provide the service wanted.

It is hard to believe that this service cannot be arranged—somehow, some way. Fortunately, the CAB examiner's decision is not final. Exceptions can and will be filed which will result in consideration by the full CAB.

[From the Pawtucket Times, Pawtucket-Central Falls, R. I., of April 14, 1956]

NEW ENGLAND UNITES FOR AIR SERVICE FIGHT

New England does not take kindly to the recommended denial of expanded service to Northeast Airlines and intends to do something about it. The fight to help the airline and assure its growth will go forward on three fronts.

Most important is the attitude of the 12 New England Senators in Washington. In concert they will carry their argument in behalf of Northeast to the Civil Aeronautics Board. In the event CAB upholds the examiner's recommendation to deny Northeast the right to extend its route from New York southward to Florida, another avenue of protest is open. The second avenue leads to legislation, official censure of the CAB and an official CAB explanation before a Senate committee.

Bolstering the New England bloc in the Senate are two civilian organizations, the New England Council and the New England Conference of State Aviation Officials. They too will protest the decision of the examiner who recommends that National Airlines be permitted to add the New England route to

its Florida-New York operations. It is difficult to reconcile the CAB examiner's opposition to Northeast service with his support of National Airlines.

The aviation requirements of New England get short shrift in the turn to National Airlines. Northeast services the six New England States, the majority of the centers of population, including the Pawtucket-Providence area at North Central Airport. Almost axiomatic is the fact that if Northeast Airlines is not permitted to expand it will be forced to retrench and widespread air service in New England will become a skeleton.

The combined New England effort in behalf of Northeast Airlines is enlightened self-interest. It is reassuring to have the six States mustered against a threat to the continuity of a regional transport essential.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, as a member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have found this decision an amazing document. I trust that the Civil Aeronautics Board will reverse it on the appeal proceeding now in progress. I am concerned about only one thing in connection with this matter, namely, adequate air service for the New England area. I believe the hearing examiner's decision would deny adequate service to many areas of New England. Our region is an air-minded area. New Englanders are relying increasingly on air transportation. If other airlines are allowed to come into the area and skim off the cream of the traffic, Northeast will wither on the vine; and the outlying areas will be denied adequate air service.

In the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 the Congress set forth the following declaration of policy:

In the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this act, the Authority shall consider the following, among other things, as being in the public interest, and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity—

(a) The encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense;

(b) The regulation of air transportation in such manner as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of, assure the highest degree of safety in, and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation, and to improve the relations between, and coordinate transportation by, air carriers;

(c) The promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices;

(d) Competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense;

(e) The regulation of air commerce in such manner as to best promote its development and safety; and

(f) The encouragement and development of civil aeronautics.

These criteria which the Congress established in 1938 are still valid and binding today. When the Civil Aeronautics Board itself applies these criteria to the New York-Florida proceeding I feel certain the Board will approve Northeast Airline's application to service this route. To do otherwise would jeopardize adequate air service for the entire New England area.

In the last analysis the purpose of regulating transportation, be it sea, surface, or air, is to insure the existence of a system that is in the public interest. Therefore, any decision in a case such as the one in question must be based on the merits and not on extraneous side issues. The merits of the particular case at issue involve a determination as to which airline can best meet the air transportation needs of the entire New England community. The initial decision by the hearing examiner does not appear to have been based on the merits, but it is hoped that the CAB, in its consideration of the case, will see the real question at stake and render a decision which will be to the best interest of all concerned.

WILSON, THE STATESMAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by a distinguished American, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], on the subject "Wilson, the Statesman," in Washington, D. C., last Saturday night.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON, THE STATESMAN

(Address by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, at the Woodrow Wilson centennial dinner, National Guard Armory, Washington, D. C., April 21, 1956)

Ladies and gentlemen, we are often asked whether a man may be a statesman without holding public office.

A statesman has been facetiously described as a dead politician.

The terms "statesman" and "politician" are not interchangeable, although in principle they ought to be.

Politics is defined as the science of government and, therefore, the politician should be a man who is grounded in the science of government. If this were the true meaning of the term, then politician and statesman would be synonymous.

In the real sense of the word Woodrow Wilson was both statesman and politician.

He was a statesman long before he held public office.

Though most of his adult years were spent in scholastic research in the cloistered atmosphere of the classroom and library, his active and restless mind dwelled upon the problems of government and its relationship to the people. When, therefore, he became the Governor of New Jersey, he brought to the State House a fresh new atmosphere of courage, frankness, and determination, which routed the forces of plunder and reaction, which stamped him at once as the logical leader of the American people in the critical period just ahead.

His advent on the national scene brought to its end the period of stagnant laissez-faire, and ushered in the beginning of a new era of modern concepts within the inspiration of a new freedom, which was in truth the successor of the square deal of Theodore Roosevelt and the predecessor of the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is not my function here to detail the great legislative accomplishments of the Wilson administration.

The Federal Reserve System, the Clayton antitrust enactments, the Federal Trade Commission, the curbing and reduction of child labor, the inauguration of the farm credit system, Federal highway legislation, an honest tariff system, civil-service improvement, and many other great strides on the road to better government for the American people were inaugurated under Mr. Wilson.

He was the first President in almost half a century who conceived government as the servant, and not the master, of the people. It was to him largely that we changed our conception of Uncle Sam from a congenial old gentleman sitting astride the dome of the Capitol complacently viewing the attractive scenery, drawing his salary and doing nothing. He made him the symbol of service and the true representative of the people. He removed the financial and political control of American institutions back to Washington from which it had long been absent.

Woodrow Wilson in 1912 made the statement that "the Republican Party had not had a new idea in 40 years."

That was 44 years ago. This makes 84 years in all—nearly a century of intellectual and political sterility not relieved by recent efforts to create the illusion of originality by continuing but renaming the agencies and policies of four Democratic administrations under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

Let me turn for a moment from domestic to international affairs.

For a generation Republican politicians, for lack of either a domestic or foreign program, have sought to beguile and deceive the American people by referring to the Democratic Party as the "war party" and Democratic administrations as "war administrations."

I am old enough to remember the campaign of 1916, in which Charles E. Hughes, a great lawyer, a great Governor, a great Secretary of State, and a great Chief Justice, then the Republican nominee for President of the United States, bitterly criticized President Wilson for not pursuing a more aggressive and belligerent attitude toward German submarine warfare against American commerce, the American flag, and the American people.

I recall with what solemnity President Wilson asked Congress in April, 1917, to accept the status of war forced upon us by the central powers of Europe, and I could never forget what he said—"It is a fearful thing to lead a great peace-loving nation into war," but he and the American people recognized that sometimes a righteous war is better than an unstable and humiliating peace.

Who was the peacemaker and the peace-lover of those days?

Woodrow Wilson made the first real effort since the Congress of Vienna in 1815 to organize the world for peace. It was he who, better than any other man, conceived the horrors of war and the blessings of peace.

Who defeated that effort, and laid the foundation for the rise of Hitler and the inauguration of the world's greatest war against an innocent and unoffending world?

It was the Republican Party in the Senate of the United States.

If that Party had been in power in 1917, would it have accepted supinely the ruthless warfare against America, or would it have accepted the challenge as Woodrow Wilson accepted it?

This question has often been asked before, but it has not been answered.

If the Republican Party had been in power on December 7, 1941, would it have accepted the cowardly attack upon Pearl Harbor, or would it have done what every Senator except one did on that occasion—vote to accept the state of war forced upon us by the war lords of Japan?

Let them answer.

Long before the end of World War II, the Democratic Party and a Democratic Administration again attempted to organize the world for peace. Mr. Wilson's League of Nations had failed. Who knows but that if it had succeeded and we had played our part in its organization and its operations, the advance of the Japanese into China in 1931, the movement of Mussolini into Ethiopia in 1935, and the brutal attacks by Hitler upon a self-governing and liberty-loving people in Europe might have been stopped and World War II might have been avoided?

We did not make a political issue of the second effort to organize the world for peace. We asked the Republicans in equal numbers to sit with us and draw the framework of the charter of the United Nations and when at San Francisco that charter was adopted and the United Nations launched upon the tossing water of the international seas as the successor of Mr. Wilson's League of Nations, President Truman appointed a great Republican, Warren Austen, to head the American delegation to this world's organization to preserve peace.

Has there been any such act of non-partisanship exhibited in the last 3 years? I have not observed it. Have you?

When the Communists of Russia, China, and North Korea in 1950 attacked and overran the Republic of Korea and were denounced by the United Nations as aggressors against a peaceful people and the United Nations itself, would the Republican Party, had they been in power, have allowed the United Nations to have been discredited in its very first test, or would it have pursued the righteous and courageous course taken by President Truman and the United Nations?

Let the shallow critics answer. Let them answer to the American people or accept as men the obligations and responsibilities that go with statesmanship and leadership.

So much for the past.

What of the present and the future. We are tormented by profound and difficult problems at home and abroad. Except for agriculture and small business and some other segments of our economy, we are supposed to be enjoying a period of great prosperity.

I do not wish to detract from any effort that the Republican Party has made or is making to foster prosperity among any of our people, but it is the simple truth to say that, following the unequaled depression of the Hoover administration and the great constructive programs of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, the foundation was laid by the comprehensive policies adopted by the Democratic Party for whatever prosperity we are now enjoying, and if those policies with regard to agriculture and small business and other unhappy portions of our people today had been followed by the present administration, our so-called prosperity would not be spotted or hectic, irregular or uneven.

No such program of far-sighted advancement and true vision has ever been inaugurated in the history of this Nation as that which was inaugurated from 1933 to 1953.

While denouncing them at the time of their enactment—and since—the Republican Party has not had the courage to repeal outright the great program enacted in behalf of the whole of the American people, and the preservation and development of our natural resources, but they have changed the names of some of them.

The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan for foreign aid, are now encompassed under the alphabetical description of ECA. Soil conservation is now known as something else. It seems that our present Government is not willing that anything should be called by the name that became familiar to it under Democratic sponsorship.

A week ago a bust of Cordell Hull was unveiled at the Pan American Union. He inaugurated the good neighbor policy among the Republics of America, and that is the name Cordell Hull gave it and by which it is known. But it has been changed to the good partner policy. I do not suppose it makes much difference what it is called so long as the policy is preserved, but it seems to me that the good neighbor policy adopted by the Democratic Party more fittingly describes the change from dollar diplomacy than any other designation. I am quite sure that it will still be known and appreciated among the people of both hemispheres as the good neighbor policy.

I have always believed that partisan politics should end at the water's edge. I believe so now. But long before the end of Democratic control of our Government, Republican snipers began to shoot from ambush at our foreign policy and began to play partisan politics with it as they did with Wilson's foreign policy in 1919–20.

The Democratic Party and its leadership have not only believed in this policy but have followed it. Most of the program attempted to be carried out by the present administration would have fallen by the wayside in the 83d Congress and in the present Congress had it not been for the support of the Democrats.

We were not playing politics. We were, and are, trying to follow the path of rectitude in recognizing that our Nation can no longer avoid its responsibility in the family of nations.

Before and since the outbreak of World War I, and even in more recent years, many members of the opposition of both Houses of Congress and throughout the country sought to hide their entire anatomies by concealing their heads in the sands, by pretending to believe that the two great oceans still acted as moats around our castle. Only their heads were concealed. The rest of them was in plain and painful view.

It would be very interesting some day in the Congress for Democrats to abstain from voting on some great plan of foreign policy under the present administration and see what the vote would look like on the other side of the aisle.

I, of course, have great personal respect for the President of the United States and for his Secretary of State. They are men of good will and of good intentions, but I would be happier if I could be assured, and I think the country would be happier if it could be assured, that the good will and the good intentions are being translated into a firm understandable dynamic foreign policy in dealing with the nations of the world—both friend and enemy—in such a way as we and they could understand really what our foreign policy is.

A few days ago, as a member of the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Senate, I heard a member of the Atomic Energy Commission make the public statement that if the present administration had any policy in regard to nuclear power and nuclear weapons, he was unaware of it.

If members of the Atomic Energy Commission do not know what our policy is how can even the Congress know and how can the people know.

We were told that under certain circumstances massive retaliation would be our program and our policy. Instead of massive retaliation we seem to have produced massive confusion.

Under certain circumstances an agonized reappraisal was to be made of our commitments and our policy in the world at large.

Has there been any reappraisal? Or has it been all agony?

More recently we have been entertained by the graphic description of certain international calisthenics in which the attempt was made to see how close to the brink a set of diplomatic roller skaters could be projected without going overboard.

We know that Russian dictators are attempting to put on a new face. But we know, and we have it from the President himself and the Secretary of State, that they have not changed their ultimate objective of control and domination of the world.

We know that the Soviet Union are awarding scholarships to the students of Asia and Africa to be trained and educated in Moscow and go back to their countries as apostles of the Communistic ideology.

We know that Red China is violating every pledge it made 3 years ago in the truce that stopped the shooting in Korea.

We know that they have refused to discharge American prisoners as they promised.

We know that they are building up military strength in North Korea in violation of their pledge at the truce table.

We know they are a threat to the peace of Asia and the world.

We know that through every crack and crevasse in the under-developed world Russia is offering aid—like the famous wolf offered to help Little Red Riding Hood, only for the purpose of consuming her later.

We know that in 10 years Russia has multiplied armed forces, is catching up with and overtaking us in submarines, aircraft, and nuclear weapons.

We ourselves for the sake of a little economy are lowering our comparative strength, while they increase theirs.

I applaud all efforts to bring about reduction in arms among all the nations in the world, and I devoutly wish that success may crown our efforts in that field, but we disarmed following World War I. We sank some of our ships and tore up our blueprints and reduced our armed forces to a mere fragment.

Within less than two decades we were forced to rearm again and were drawn into the world's greatest conflict.

Following that war we again disarmed by ourselves.

We did not ask the same of any other nation. We simply disarmed and now within less than a decade we are forced again to rearm against the threat of another great military power in Eastern Europe that seeks to destroy all liberty, all human dignity, all self-government, and bring all nations under the power of its might and of its will.

Let us hope that we shall not again disarm by ourselves. Let us hope that out of present efforts real relief may come to the overburdened people of the world and that we may divert our resources from destructive agencies to those that will lift the human family to a higher standard of life and happier cooperation among all the peoples of the world without regard to race, creed, or color.

It was for things like these that Woodrow Wilson fought and gave his life.

It has been for things like these that the Democratic Party has fought from the days of Thomas Jefferson until this present hour.

It was for things like these that Woodrow Wilson projected his great mind and his great heart.

It was for things like these that he exhibited that intellectual precision and that courageous foresight which places his name and his character among the immortals of our age and of our country.

As Lincoln hoped and prayed that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people might not perish from the earth," let us hope and pray that under no political party and under no political administration shall that immortal shibboleth be transformed into a government of the dollar, by the dollar, and for the dollar.

If this be true, then I respectfully suggest that the Republican Party change its emblem from the elephant to the golden calf, which many of them worship in fact and in their hearts.

It is but an assertion of the simple truth to say that almost every great reform inaugu-

rated for the benefit of the masses of our people in the last half century has been brought forward by the Democratic Party and its leadership, whether for agriculture, for labor, for the sick, for the aged, for the unemployed; whether in behalf of international trade, of international cooperation to preserve the very fabrics of our moral and political raiment. It has been the Democratic voice crying in the wilderness.

We have welcomed, and will welcome sympathy and assistance from all segments of our population in behalf of these great causes; but the story of our institutions and the history of our people would constitute a dismal chapter in the life of man if it had not been for these great concepts and these great struggles in behalf of the people.

In this struggle Woodrow Wilson takes his stand alongside Jefferson and Jackson and all the great names which have embellished not only the Democratic annals but American annals.

As we stand today a generation from the year of his death and a century from the year of his birth, let us paraphrase an immortal sentence uttered about the father of his country, "To add beauty to the rose or luster to the name of Woodrow Wilson are alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce the name and leave it shining on."

The principles upon which Woodrow Wilson fought for peace and sought to relieve mankind from the burdens of war are such as can be endorsed by all our people regardless of politics. Let us hope that under the guidance and direction of God, whom he worshiped and upon whom he leaned, all nations may some day gather to acknowledge the superiority of the moral law over the law of force. Let us hope that day may come in our day and generation. When it comes all peoples of every tongue may join in the hosanna—"Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace and good will to men."

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, in my State of Michigan, dairy farmers form a very important part of our agricultural industry. In recognition of their work, the period of April 16 through April 29 of this year has been proclaimed as Pure Bred Dairy Cattle Week. All citizens of the State of Michigan are called upon to recognize the good work that is done by the pure bred dairy cattle industry. In recognition of this, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the words of this proclamation which form a fitting commendation to our dairy industry:

Our Nation's health and prosperity depends upon the farmers of this great land. Among all of our farmers, one-third of their income is derived from the dairy industry. In Michigan, in particular, is the raising of dairy cattle and the production of dairy products of special importance.

No branch of the dairy industry has been more actively engaged in research, experimentation, breed improvement, and promotional work than the purebred dairy breed associations in cooperation with our colleges and universities. With an even smaller percentage of our population living on farms and hence being called upon to furnish nourishing, healthful agriculture products to an ever-growing number of Americans, no activity could be more important than this.

DRAFT STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to introduce into the RECORD and to have printed following these remarks, the draft statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency for the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy which has just been made public.

This draft statute is the result of negotiations which have been held in Washington by the 12 powers designated in the resolution approved by the United Nations last fall to be the drafting group of this statute. The 12 nations are Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. This draft statute is to be the subject of an international conference which is planned to be held at the United Nations in New York late in September of this year. Thereafter, if there is agreement at that time on the statute by those of the 84 nations who, as members of the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies, are entitled to attend the conference, the statute will be ratified in accordance with the constitutional process of each nation. This means that this draft statute, in its present form or as it is finally agreed to at the international conference in September, will have to come back to the Congress to be ratified. It can be so ratified either as a treaty or as a joint resolution approved by both Houses of the Congress—section 124 of act. I believe that this is an important step looking toward the formation of a very important international agency. I ask unanimous permission to have the draft statute inserted into the RECORD following these remarks so that all Members of the Congress will know of the status of this agency and will be advised of the latest published draft of the statute. I want to make it clear that this statute has not yet been formally presented to the Congress and that this is merely so that all may be advised as to the latest steps taken in the formation of the international agency.

With this draft, one more step has been taken on the way to establishment of that international agency to encourage the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy which President Eisenhower suggested in his monumental speech before the United Nations on December 8, 1953.

There being no objection, the draft statute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY ADOPTED BY THE WORKING-LEVEL MEETING AT WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 18, 1956

ARTICLE I

Establishment of the Agency

The Parties hereto establish an International Atomic Energy Agency (hereinafter referred to as "the Agency") upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE II

Objectives

The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to the peace, health, and prosperity of the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose.

ARTICLE III

Functions

A. The Agency shall be authorized:

1. To encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world; and, if requested to do so, to act as an intermediary for the purposes of securing the performance of services or the supplying of materials, equipment, or facilities by one Member of the Agency for another; and to perform any operation or service useful in the practical application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

2. To make provision, in accordance with this Statute, for materials, services, equipment, and facilities to meet the needs of research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power, with due consideration for the needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

3. To foster the exchange of scientific and technical information on peaceful uses of atomic energy.

4. To encourage the exchange of scientists and experts in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

5. To establish and administer safeguards designed to ensure that special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its supervision or control are not used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and, at the request of the parties to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement not otherwise under the Agency's supervision or control, to apply these safeguards to such arrangement.

6. To establish or adopt standards of safety for protection of health and minimization of danger to life and property (including standards for labor conditions), and to provide for the application of these standards to its own operations as well as to the operations making use of materials, services, equipment, facilities, and information made available by the Agency or at its request or under its control or supervision; and, at the request of parties to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement not otherwise under the Agency's supervision or control, to provide for the application of these standards to operations under the arrangement.

7. To acquire or establish any facilities, plant, and equipment useful in carrying out its authorized functions, whenever such facilities, plant, and equipment otherwise available to it in the area concerned are inadequate or available on terms it deems unsatisfactory.

B. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall:

1. Conduct its activities in conformity with policies of the United Nations furthering the establishment of safeguarded world-wide disarmament and in conformity with any international agreements entered into pursuant to such policies.

2. Establish control over the use of special fissionable materials received by the Agency, in order to ensure that these materials are used only for peaceful purposes.

3. Allocate its resources in such a manner as to secure efficient utilization and the greatest possible general benefit in all areas of the world, bearing in mind the special needs of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

4. Submit reports on its activities to the General Assembly of the United Nations and, when appropriate, to the Security Council: if, in connection with the activities of the Agency there should arise questions that are within the competence of the Security Council, the Agency shall notify the Security

Council, as the organ bearing the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and may also take the measures open to it under this Statute, including those provided in paragraph C of Article XII.

5. Submit reports to the Economic and Social Council and other organs of the United Nations on matters within the competence of these organs.

C. In carrying out its functions, the Agency shall not make assistance to members subject to any political, economic, military, or other conditions incompatible with the provisions of this Statute.

D. Subject to the provisions of this Statute and to the terms of agreements concluded between a State or group of States and the Agency, the activities of the Agency shall be carried out with due observance of of the sovereign rights of States.

ARTICLE IV

Membership

A. The initial Members of the International Atomic Energy Agency shall be those States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies which shall have signed this Statute within ninety days after it is opened for signature and shall have deposited an instrument of ratification.

B. Other Members of the Agency shall be those States, whether or not Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies, which deposit an instrument of acceptance of this Statute after their membership has been approved by the General Conference upon the recommendation of the Board of Governors. In recommending and approving a State for membership, the Board of Governors and the General Conference shall determine that the State is able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership in the Agency, giving due consideration to its ability and willingness to act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

C. The Agency is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members, and all Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with this Statute.

ARTICLE V

General Conference

A. A General Conference consisting of representatives of all Members shall meet in regular annual session and in such special sessions as may be convened by the Director General at the request of the Board of Governors or of a majority of Members.

B. At such sessions, each Member shall be represented by one delegate who may be accompanied by alternates and by advisers. The cost of attendance of any delegation shall be borne by the Member concerned.

C. The General Conference shall elect a President and such other officers as may be required at the beginning of each session. They shall hold office for the duration of the session. The General Conference, subject to the provisions of this Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure. Each Member shall have one vote and, except as otherwise provided in this Statute, decisions shall be adopted by a majority of those present and voting. A majority of Members shall constitute a quorum.

D. The functions of the General Conference shall be:

1. To elect Members of the Board of Governors in accordance with Article VI.

2. To admit new Members in accordance with Article IV.

3. To suspend a Member from the privileges and rights of membership in accordance with Article XIX.

4. To consider the annual report of the Board.

5. In accordance with Article XIV, to approve the budget of the Agency recommended by the Board or return it with recommendations as to its entirety or parts to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference.

6. To approve reports to be submitted to the United Nations as required by the relationship agreement between the Agency and the United Nations, except with respect to the reports referred to in paragraph C of Article XII, or return them to the Board with its recommendations.

7. To approve any agreement or agreements between the Agency and the United Nations and other organizations as provided in Article XVI or return such agreements with its recommendations to the Board, for resubmission to the General Conference.

8. To approve rules and limitations regarding the exercise of borrowing powers by the Board, in accordance with paragraph G of Article XIV.

9. To approve amendments to this Statute in accordance with paragraph B of Article XVIII.

E. The General Conference shall have the authority:

1. To make recommendations to the Board of Governors on any matter relating to the functions of the Agency.

2. To make recommendations to the Board on any matter brought to the attention of the General Conference by the Board.

3. To propose matters for consideration by the Board and request from the Board reports on any matter relating to the functions of the Agency.

ARTICLE VI

Board of Governors

A. The Board of Governors shall be composed as follows:

1. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the First Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in Annex I) shall designate for membership on the Board the five Members most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials and the Member most advanced in the technology of atomic energy including the production of source materials in each of the following areas not represented by the aforesaid five:

(1) North America.
(2) Latin America.
(3) Western Europe.
(4) Eastern Europe.
(5) Africa and the Middle East.
(6) South Asia.
(7) Southeast Asia and the Pacific.
(8) Far East.

2. The outgoing Board of Governors (or in the case of the First Board, the Preparatory Commission referred to in Annex I) shall designate for membership on the Board two Members from among the following other producers of source materials: Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Portugal; and shall also designate for membership on the Board one other Member as a supplier of technical assistance. No Member in this category in any one year will be eligible for redesignation in the same category for the following year.

3. The General Conference shall elect ten Members to membership on the Board of Governors, with due regard to equitable representation on the Board as a whole of the Members in the areas listed in subparagraph A–1 of this Article, so that the Board shall at all times include in this category a representative of each of those areas except North America. Except for the five Members chosen for a term of one year in accordance with paragraph D of this Article, no Member in this category in any one term of office will be eligible for re-election in the same category for the following term of office.

B. The designations provided for in subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 of this Article shall take place not less than sixty days before each regular annual session of the General Conference. The elections provided for in subparagraph A–3 of this Article shall take place at regular annual sessions of the General Conference.

C. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 of this Article shall hold office from the end of the next regular annual session of the General Conference after their designation until the end of the following regular annual session of the General Conference.

D. Members represented on the Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraph A–3 of this Article shall hold office from the end of the regular annual session of the General Conference at which they are elected until the end of the second regular annual session of the General Conference thereafter. In the first election following that of the First Board, however, five shall be chosen for a term of one year.

E. Each Member of the Board of Governors shall have one vote and decisions shall be made by a majority of those present and voting, except as otherwise provided in this Statute. Two-thirds of all Members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

F. The Board of Governors shall have authority to carry out the functions of the Agency in accordance with this Statute, subject to its responsibilities to the General Conference as provided in this Statute.

G. The Board of Governors shall meet at such times as it may determine. The meetings shall take place at the headquarters of the Agency unless otherwise determined by the Board.

H. The Board of Governors shall elect a Chairman and other officers from among its Members and, subject to the provisions of this Statute, shall adopt its own rules of procedure.

I. The Board of Governors may establish such committees as it deems advisable. The Board may appoint persons to represent it in its relations with other organizations.

J. The Board of Governors shall prepare an annual report to the General Conference concerning the affairs of the Agency and any projects approved by the Agency. The Board shall also prepare for submission to the General Conference such reports as the Agency is or may be required to make to the United Nations or to any other organization the work of which is related to that of the Agency. These reports, along with the annual report, shall be submitted to Members of the Agency at least one month before the regular annual session of the General Conference.

ARTICLE VII

Staff

A. The staff of the Agency shall be headed by a Director General, who shall be appointed by the Board of Governors for a term of four years. The Director General shall be the chief administrative officer of the Agency.

B. The Director General shall be responsible for the appointment, organization, and functioning of the staff and shall be under the authority of and subject to the control of the Board of Governors. He shall perform his duties in accordance with regulations adopted by the Board.

C. The staff shall include such qualified scientific and technical and other personnel as may be required to fulfill the objectives and functions of the Agency. The Agency shall be guided by the principle that its permanent staff shall be kept to a minimum.

D. The paramount consideration in the recruitment and employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be to secure employees of the

highest standards of efficiency, technical competence, and integrity. Subject to this consideration, due regard shall be paid to the contributions of Members to the Agency and to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

E. The terms and conditions on which the staff shall be appointed, remunerated, and dismissed shall be in accordance with regulations made by the Board of Governors, subject to the provisions of this Statute and to general rules approved by the General Conference on the recommendation of the Board.

F. In the performance of their duties, the Director General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any source external to the Agency. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as officials of the Agency. Each Member undertakes to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the Director General and the staff and shall not seek to influence them in the discharge of their duties.

G. In this Article the term "staff" includes guards.

ARTICLE VIII

Exchange of information

A. Each Member should make available such information as would, in the judgment of the Member, be helpful to the Agency.

B. Each Member shall make available to the Agency all scientific information developed as a result of assistance extended by the Agency pursuant to Article XI.

C. The Agency shall assemble and make available in an accessible form the information made available to it under paragraphs A and B of this Article. It shall take positive steps to encourage the exchange among its Members of information relating to the nature and peaceful uses of atomic energy and shall serve as an intermediary among its Members for this purpose.

ARTICLE IX

Supplying of materials

A. Members may make available to the Agency such quantities of special fissionable materials as they deem advisable and on such terms as shall be agreed with the Agency. The materials made available to the Agency may, at the discretion of the Member making them available, be stored either by the Member concerned or, with the agreement of the Agency, in the Agency's depots.

B. Members may also make available to the Agency source materials as defined in Article XX and other materials. The Board of Governors shall determine the quantities of such materials which the Agency will accept under agreements provided for in Article XIII.

C. Each Member shall notify the Agency of the quantities, form, and composition of special fissionable materials, source materials, and other materials which that Member is prepared, in conformity with its laws, to make available immediately or during a period specified by the Board of Governors.

D. On request of the Agency a Member shall, from the materials which it has made available, without delay deliver to another Member or group of Members such quantities of such materials as the Agency may specify, and shall without delay deliver to the Agency itself such quantities of such materials as are really necessary for operations and scientific research in the facilities of the Agency.

E. The quantities, form and composition of materials made available by any Member may be changed at any time by the Member with the approval of the Board of Governors.

F. An initial notification in accordance with paragraph C of this Article shall be made within three months of the entry into force of this Statute with respect to the Member concerned. In the absence of a contrary decision of the Board of Governors, the materials initially made available shall be for the period of the calendar year succeeding the year when this Statute takes effect with respect to the Member concerned. Subsequent notifications shall likewise, in the absence of a contrary action by the Board, relate to the period of the calendar year following the notification and shall be made no later than the first day of November of each year.

G. The Agency shall specify the place and method of delivery and, where appropriate, the form and composition, of materials which it has requested a Member to deliver from the amounts which that Member has notified the Agency it is prepared to make available. The Agency shall also verify the quantities of materials delivered and shall report those quantities periodically to the Members.

H. The Agency shall be responsible for storing and protecting materials in its possession. The Agency shall ensure that these materials shall be safeguarded against (1) hazards of the weather, (2) unauthorized removal or diversion, (3) damage or destruction, including sabotage, and (4) forcible seizure. In storing special fissionable materials in its possession, the Agency shall ensure the geographical distribution of these materials in such a way as not to allow concentration of large amounts of such materials in any one country or region of the world.

I. The Agency shall as soon as practicable establish or acquire such of the following as may be necessary:

1. Plant, equipment, and facilities for the receipt, storage, and issue of materials.
2. Physical safeguards.
3. Adequate health and safety measures.
4. Control laboratories for the analysis and verification of materials received.
5. Housing and administrative facilities for any staff required for the foregoing.

J. The materials made available pursuant to this article shall be used as determined by the board of governors in accordance with the provisions of this statute. No member shall have the right to require that the materials it makes available to the Agency be kept separately by the Agency or to designate the specific project in which they must be used.

ARTICLE X

Services, equipment, and facilities

Members may make available to the Agency services, equipment, and facilities which may be of assistance in fulfilling the Agency's objectives and functions.

ARTICLE XI

Agency projects

A. Any member or group of members of the Agency desiring to set up any project for research on, or development or practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes may request the assistance of the Agency in security special fissionable and other materials, services, equipment, and facilities necessary for this purpose.

B. Any such request, shall be accompanied by an explanation of the purpose and extent of the project and shall be considered by the board of governors.

C. The Agency may arrange for the supplying of any materials, services, equipment, and facilities necessary for the project by one or more Members or may itself undertake to provide any or all of these directly.

D. For the purpose of considering the request, the Agency may send into the territory of the Member or group of Members making the request a person or persons qualified to examine the project. For this purpose the Agency may, with the approval of the Member or group of Members making the request, use members of its own staff or employ suitably qualified nationals of any Member.

E. Before approving a project under this Article, the Board of Governors shall give due consideration to:

1. The usefulness of the project, including its scientific and technical feasibility;
2. The adequacy of plans, funds, and technical personnel to assure the effective execution of the project;
3. The adequacy of proposed health and safety standards for handling and storing materials and for operating facilities;
4. The inability of the Member or group of Members making the request to secure the necessary finances, materials, facilities, equipment, and services;
5. The equitable distribution of materials and other resources available to the Agency; and
6. Such other matters as may be relevant.

F. Upon approving a project, the Agency shall enter into an agreement with the Member or group of Members submitting the project, which agreement shall:

1. Provide for allocation to the project of any required special fissionable or other materials.
2. Provide for transfer of special fissionable materials from their then place of custody, whether the materials be in the custody of the Agency or of the Member making them available for use in Agency projects, to the Member or group of Members submitting the project, under conditions which ensure the safety of any shipment required and meet applicable health and safety standards.
3. Set forth the terms and conditions, including charges, on which any materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by the Agency itself, and, if any such materials, services, equipment, and facilities are to be provided by a Member, the terms and conditions as arranged for by the Member or group of Members submitting the project and the supplying Member.
4. Include undertakings by the Member or group of Members submitting the project (a) that the assistance provided shall not be used in such a way as to further any military purpose; and (b) that the project shall be subject to the safeguards provided for in Article XII, the relevant safeguards being specified in the agreement.
5. Make appropriate provision regarding the rights and interests of the Agency and the Member or Members concerned in any inventions or discoveries, or any patents therein, arising from the project.
6. Include such other provisions as may be appropriate.

G. The provisions of this Article shall also apply where appropriate to a request for materials, services, facilities, or equipment in connection with an existing project.

ARTICLE XII

Agency safeguards

A. With respect to any Agency project or other arrangement where the Agency is requested by the parties concerned to apply safeguards, the Agency shall have the following rights and responsibilities to the extent relevant to the project or arrangement:

1. To approve the design of any specialized equipment and facilities, including nuclear reactors.
2. To require the observance of any health and safety measures prescribed by the Agency.
3. To require the maintenance and production of operating records to assist in ensuring accountability for source and special fissionable materials.
4. To call for and receive progress reports.
5. To approve the means to be used for chemical processing of irradiated materials and to specify disposition of any special fissionable materials recovered or produced as a by-product, and to require that such special fissionable materials be deposited with the Agency except for quantities authorized by the Agency to be retained for specified

non-military use under continuing Agency safeguards.

6. To send into the territory of the recipient State or States inspectors, designated by the Agency after consultation with the State or States concerned, who shall have access at all times to all places, persons, and data necessary to account for source and special fissionable materials supplied and fissionable products and to determine whether there is compliance with the undertaking against use in furtherance of any military purpose referred to in subparagraph F–4 of Article XI, with the health and safety measures referred to in subparagraph A–2 of this Article, and with any other conditions prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and the State or States concerned.

7. In the event of non-compliance and failure by the recipient State or States to take requested corrective steps within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate assistance and withdraw any materials and equipment made available by the Agency or a member in furtherance of the project.

B. The Agency shall, as necessary, establish a staff of inspectors. The staff of inspectors shall have the responsibility of examining all operations conducted by the Agency itself to determine whether the Agency is complying with the health and safety measures prescribed by it for application to projects subject to its approval, supervision or control, and whether the Agency is taking adequate measures to prevent the source and special fissionable materials in its custody or used or produced in its own operations from being used in furtherance of any military purpose. The Agency shall take remedial action forthwith to correct any non-compliance or failure to take adequate measures.

C. The staff of inspectors shall also have the responsibility of obtaining and verifying the accounting referred to in subparagraph A–6 of this Article and of determining whether there is compliance with the undertaking referred to in subparagraph F–4 of Article XI, with the measures referred to in subparagraph A–2 of this Article, and with all other conditions of the project prescribed in the agreement between the Agency and that State or States concerned. The inspectors shall report any non-compliance to the Director General who shall thereupon transmit the report to the Board of Governors. The Board shall call upon the recipient State or States to remedy forthwith any non-compliance which it finds to have occurred. The Board shall report the non-compliance to all Members and to the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations. In the event of failure of the recipient State or States to take fully corrective action within a reasonable time, the Board may take one or both of the following measures: direct curtailment or suspension of assistance being provided by the Agency or by a Member, and call for the return of materials and equipment made available to the recipient Member or group of Members. The Agency may also, in accordance with Article XIX, suspend any non-complying Member from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership.

ARTICLE XIII

Reimbursement of Members

Unless otherwise agreed upon between the Board of Governors and the Member furnishing to the Agency materials, services, equipment, or facilities, the Board shall enter into an agreement with such Member providing for reimbursement for the items furnished.

ARTICLE XIV

Finance

A. The Board of Governors shall submit to the General Conference the annual budget estimates for the expenses of the Agency. To facilitate the work of the Board in this regard, the Director General shall initially prepare the budget estimates. If the General Conference does not approve the estimates, it shall return them together with its recommendations to the Board. The Board shall then submit further estimates to the General Conference for its approval.

B. Expenditures of the Agency shall be classified under the following categories:

1. administratives expenses: these shall include—

(a) Costs of the staff of the Agency other than the staff employed in connection with materials, services, equipment, and facilities referred to in subparagraph B–2 below; costs of meetings; and expenditures required for the preparation of Agency projects and for the distribution of information.

(b) Costs of implementing the safeguards referred to in Article XII in relation to agency projects or, under subparagraph A–5 of Article III, in relation to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, together with the costs of handling and storage of special fissionable material by the Agency other than the storage and handling charges referred to in paragraph E below.

2. expenses, other than those included in subparagraph 1 of this paragraph, in connection with any materials, facilities, plant, and equipment acquired or established by the Agency in carrying out its authorized functions, and the costs of materials, services, equipment, and facilities provided by it under agreements with one or more Members.

C. In fixing the expenditures under subparagraph B–1 (b) above, the Board of Governors shall deduct such amounts as are recoverable under agreements regarding the application of safeguards between the Agency and parties to bilateral or multilateral arrangements.

D. The Board of Governors shall apportion the expenses referred to in subparagraph B–1 above, among Members in accordance with a scale to be fixed by the General Conference.

E. The Board of Governors shall establish periodically a scale of charges, including reasonable uniform storage and handling charges, for materials, services, equipment, and facilities furnished to Members by the Agency. The scale shall be designed to produce revenues for the Agency adequate to meet the expenses and costs referred to in subparagraph B–2 above. The proceeds of such charges shall be placed in a separate fund which shall be used to pay Members for any materials, services, equipment, or facilities furnished by them and to meet other expenses referred to in subparagraph B–2 above which may be incurred by the Agency itself.

F. Any excess of revenues referred to in paragraph E over the expenses and costs there referred to and any voluntary contributions to the Agency, shall be placed in a general fund which may be used as the Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference, may determine.

G. Subject to rules and limitations approved by the General Conference, the Board of Governors shall have the authority to exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the Agency.

H. Decisions of the General Conference on financial questions and of the Board of Governors on the amount of the Agency's budget shall require a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

ARTICLE XV

Privileges and immunities

A. The Agency shall enjoy in the territory of each Member such legal capacity and such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of its functions .

B. Delegates of Members together with their alternates and advisers, Governors appointed to the Board together with their alternates and advisers, and the director general and the staff of the Agency, shall enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary in the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Agency.

C. The legal capacity, privileges, and immunities referred to in this article shall be defined in a separate agreement between the Agency, represented for this purpose by the director general acting under instructions of the Board of Governors, and the Members.

ARTICLE XVI

Relationship with other organizations

A. The Board of Governors, with the approval of the General Conference, is authorized to enter into an agreement or agreements establishing an appropriate relationship between the Agency and the United Nations and any other organizations the work of which is related to that of the Agency.

B. The agreement or agreements establishing the relationship of the Agency and the United Nations shall provide for:

1. Submission by the Agency of reports as provided for in subparagraphs B–4 and B–5 of Article III.

2. Consideration by the Agency of resolutions relating to it adopted by the General Assembly or any of the Councils of the United Nations and the submission of reports, when requested, to the appropriate organ of the United Nations on the action taken by the Agency or by its Members in accordance with this Statute as a result of such consideration.

ARTICLE XVII

Settlement of disputes

A. Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Statute which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the Statute of the Court, unless the parties concerned agree on another mode of settlement.

B. The Board of Governors is empowered, subject to authorization from the General Assembly of the United Nations, to request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question arising within the scope of the Agency's activities.

ARTICLE XVIII

Amendments and withdrawals

A. Amendments to this Statute may be proposed by any Member. Certified copies of the text of any amendment proposed shall be prepared by the Director General and communicated by him to all Members.

B. Amendments shall come into force for all Members when (i) approved by the Board of Governors, (ii) approved by the General Conference by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting, and (iii) accepted by two-thirds of all the Members in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. Acceptance by a Member shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the depositary Government.

C. At any time after five years from the date when this Statute shall initially take effect in accordance with paragraph E of Article XXI or whenever a Member is unwilling to accept an amendment to this Statute, it may withdraw from the Agency by notice in writing to that effect given to the depositary Government, which shall promptly inform the Board of Governors and all Members.

D. Withdrawal by a Member from the Agency shall not affect its contractual obligations entered into pursuant to Article XI or its budgetary obligations for the year in which it withdraws.

ARTICLE XIX

Suspension of privileges

A. A Member of the Agency which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Agency shall have no vote in the Agency if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contri-

butions due from it for the preceding two years. The General Conference may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member.

B. A Member which has persistently violated the provisions of this Statute or of any agreement entered into by it may be suspended from the exercise of the privileges and rights of membership by the General Conference acting by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting upon recommendation by the Board of Governors.

ARTICLE XX

Definitions

As used in this Statute:

1. The term "special fissionable material" means plutonium–239; uranium–233; uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233; any material containing one or more of the foregoing; and such other fissionable material as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; but the term "special fissionable material" does not include source material.

2. The term "uranium enriched in the isotopes 235 or 233" means uranium containing the isotopes 235 or 233 or both in an amount such that the abundance ratio of the sum of these isotopes to the isotope 238 is greater than the ratio of the isotope 235 to the isotope 238 occurring in nature.

3. The term "source material" means uranium containing the mixture of isotopes occurring in nature; uranium depleted in the isotope 235; thorium; any of the foregoing in the form of metal, alloy, chemical compound, or concentrate; any other material containing one or more of the foregoing in such concentration as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine; and such other material as the Board of Governors shall from time to time determine.

ARTICLE XXI

Signature, acceptance, and entry into force

A. This Statute shall be open for signature on ————, 1956, by all States Members of the United Nations or any of the specialized agencies and shall remain open for signature by those States for a period of ninety days.

B. The signatory States shall become parties to this Statute by deposit of an instrument of ratification.

C. Instruments of ratification by signatory States and instruments of acceptance by States whose membership has been approved under paragraph B of Article IV of this Statute shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, hereby designated as depositary Government.

D. Ratification or acceptance of this Statute shall be effected by States in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

E. This Statute shall come into force when eighteen States have deposited instruments of ratification in accordance with paragraph B of this Article, provided that such eighteen States shall include at least three of the following States: Canada, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America. Instruments of ratification and instruments of acceptance deposited thereafter shall take effect on the date of their receipt.

F. The depositary Government shall promptly inform all States signatory to this Statute of the date of each deposit of ratification and the date of entry into force of the Statute. The depositary Government shall promptly inform all signatories and Members of the dates on which States subsequently become parties thereto.

ARTICLE XXII

Registration with the United Nations

A. This Statute shall be registered by the depositary Government pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

B. Agreements between the Agency and any Member or Members, and agreements between Members subject to approval of the Agency, shall be registered with the Agency. Such agreements shall be registered with the United Nations if registration is required under Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XXIII

Authentic texts and certified copies

This Statute, done in the ——— and ——— languages, each being equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the depositary Government. Duly certified copies of this Statute will be transmitted by the depositary Government to the Governments of the other signatory States and to the Governments of States admitted to membership under paragraph B of Article IV.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Statute.

Done at ———, this ——— day of ———, one thousand nine hundred fifty-six.

ANNEX I

Preparatory Commission

A. A preparatory Commission shall come into existence on the first day this Statute is open for signature. It shall be composed of one representative each of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Portugal, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America, and one representative each of six other States to be chosen by the International Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Preparatory Commission shall remain in existence until this Statute comes into force and thereafter until the General Conference has convened and a Board of Governors has been selected in accordance with Article VI.

B. The Preparatory Commission shall—

1. Make arrangements for the first session of the General Conference; and

2. Make designations for membership on the First Board of Governors in accordance with subparagraphs A–1 and A–2 and paragraph B of Article VI.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 2577.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with reference to the pending amendment, I can state its contents very briefly. I shall be very plain about it, and say that, so far as I know, the amendment affects only one company, the Consolidated Naval Stores Company of Florida. It is one of our old and highly respected agricultural companies in Florida. It has done much in helping to develop the State. More than 80 percent of its assets are in citrus groves, in naval stores, and in cattle and other farming activities.

In the years following the collapse of the Florida boom the Consolidated Land Co. either had to take over a little county bank, called the Tropical State Bank, then located at Lake Placid, Fla., or else see that last bank in the county collapse. The several other small banks in the county had already failed.

I happened to be one of the stockholders of that litle bank. Like everyone else in Florida at the time, I was without funds. When the Consolidated Land Co. offered to relieve all of us who were stockholders of our assessment liability and agreed to keep that little bank open, which would be the only bank left in operation in that section of the State, we all gladly turned our stock in that small $25,000 county bank. The Consolidated Naval Stores Co. not only carried the bank through the years of collapse which we sustained in Florida, but they have continued to keep it open, and they own the majority of the stock of that bank. The bank, now at Sebring, is prosperous and is a real asset to the community.

That taking over of the Tropical State Bank took place 25 years ago. That small bank is one of several now located in that same county. It is located in the county in which the major assets of this fine company are located, and where it now operates its citrus groves and citrus packinghouse and its cattle ranch.

The other holding of this agricultural company, obtained even earlier, is a block of stock of the Barnett National Bank of Jacksonville, which was its principal source of financial assistance. It has maintained that holding during all these years. It has made a contribution, as I see it, not only to the community where the small bank is located, but also to the Barnett National Bank, because, by having a director on its board all these years it has supplied liaison which was helpful and constructive between a large city bank and the agricultural interests of the State.

How any greater injustice could be done than to force this company, which has operated to the very great advantage of our State and of agriculture in our State, to divest itself of the interests which it has held for over 25 years, I do not see, Mr. President. It seems to me it would be a gross injustice, and, therefore, I have prepared this amendment which contains the same definition of agriculture as that which is carried in other Federal laws now on the statute books, and provides that a company which has more than 80 percent of its assets in active agricultural enterprises shall not be considered within the purview of the pending bill.

It seems to me to be so wholly true that such a company should not be considered to be a manipulator of banks or as seeking any control over banking institutions, taking into consideration the long and useful years of its operation, that this amendment should be speedily adopted. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate today.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to ask a few questions which I think should go into the RECORD. I wish to say, in prefacing

my remarks, that I was on the Senate floor during a part of the discussion in reference to the pending measure.

The Senate, in its wisdom, accepted an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

In examining the situations which have been referred to in the discussion, I note that the Senator from Florida has been speaking about the Consolidated Naval Stores Company of Florida. In checking over some of these matters I have wondered how many of these particular groups or institutions which have holdings we can exempt from the provisions of the bill and not prejudice the right of certain other areas and banking interests which might have some corresponding interests in a certain related way with other institutions which are covered by the proposed legislation.

According to Standard & Poor's Record, the Consolidated Naval Stores, of Sebring, Fla., has a 90-percent interest in the Tropical State Bank; a 34.45 percent interest in the Barnett National Securities Corp., which controls banks in St. Augustine, Cocoa, Deland, and Avon Park; a 34.45 percent interest in the Barnett National Bank, of Jacksonville, Fla.; Herman Sausage Co., 100 percent; Tomoka Land Co., 79.2 percent; and the citrus department, which has groves at Lake Placid, 1,245 acres of trees, packing plants; 301,177 acres of land in Florida of which 1,307 acres are used by the citrus department, and 42,-181 acres are used by its Kicco Ranch, in Polk County, as a breeding ranch with over 4,000 acres of cleared and improved pasturage; 233,951 acres leased for pasturage, turpentining, lumber, and agriculture.

Mineral interests are reserved in deeds of conveyance on 510,581 acres.

Oil leases cover 677,753 acres of free lands and mineral reservations; and there are other investments in lumber, forest products, and paper companies.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator means that leases are granted on the acreage mentioned?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes. That is reported in Standard & Poor's corporation records for 1955, page 7474.

The question which I should like to ask the Senator from Florida is this: The question arises in my mind as to whether there are any like and similar institutions in certain sections of the country which would still be included in the bill unless they were specifically exempted. What is the difference between the institution to which the Senator has referred and any other bank which has nonbanking assets? Does the Senator put it on the basis that the Florida situation covers and is related to an agricultural matter?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the city of Jacksonville, Fla., is located about 220 miles from the area where the bulk of the property of this concern is located. The little bank at Lake Placid was about to close its doors during the collapse of the Florida boom; and it was the last institution remaining open in a large area.

The Consolidated, in order to have an institution open in that area, offered to take over the stock of some people who had been the original subscribers. They wanted to continue the operation there of a small bank which could furnish necessary financing services. The stock was turned in to the Consolidated because it was the only local concern which had money enough to keep the bank open. It rendered a very great service to the entire community by so doing. It still wishes to retain that small bank because of its interests there, and it wants to have that small institution continue to exist on a stable basis. I think that is a justifiable ambition. I think it has rendered a very fine service.

As to the 34 percent of the stock of the Barnett National Bank mentioned by the Senator from Kansas, the Barnett National Bank is the third in size of three large institutions in Jacksonville. By no means does it control the financial market there; quite to the contrary. By no means has the Consolidated Naval Stores Co. sought to exercise any domination over the banking field. It has supplied generally 1 or 2 directors on a directorate of twenty-odd comprising the board of directors of the Barnett National Bank. I have never heard of any complaint against the company because of those interests, one in the place where its principal financing is done and the other where much of its property is located. It has rendered efficient service in both places.

Any law which would hold that this company is operating against the public interest by continuing in these two capacities could not be a sound law. It seems to me that an agricultural institution acquiring, as this company has, facilities in the two places mentioned and having made those investments more than 25 years ago, in the case of the Jacksonville bank, and 25 years ago in the case of the Tropical State Bank, should not be made to readjust its structure because of the laudable effort to prevent, in general, undue domination of banks by nonbanking interests. There is no domination in this instance; there is, instead, service rendered by both of these institutions.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I raised the point because the question arose in the minds of some of us as to how far we are going. I think we should have the record absolutely clear as to the institutions, and why they are included, because, unless that is done, there will be a misunderstanding in our approach to the question.

I appreciate the explanation which the Senator from Florida has placed in the RECORD with reference to the tie-in with the agricultural situation.

Therefore, I rather take it that the Senator from Florida, in offering the amendment to provide an exemption in this case and would certainly have no personal objection to exempting from the investment provisions of the bill all other bank holding companies which have some kind of common interest, such as the Senator has said existed in the Florida institutional situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly would be ready to consider them upon their own facts and their own merits.

The Senator from Kansas and I have been, for 2 days prior to this, sitting together, conducting hearings with reference to agricultural financial institutions. He knows perfectly well that the Nation has supplied very strong machinery for cooperative effort in the Farm Credit Administration and its various units. We heard testimony in that field in two rather long hearings, yesterday and the day before.

I have called attention to an agricultural institution which, instead of relying on Federal financing, has tried to supply financial facilities for the people who are dealing with it, and to supply strong financial institutions in the two places where its chief business is carried on.

It seems to me that instead of visiting a penalty upon such an effort, we should say that such a company is entitled to commendation, particularly when we realize that, as a Federal Government, we have been called upon to supply to many interests in agriculture very large sums of money to assist them in their financing operations.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I certainly share the Senator's views. I have great misgivings about how far the entire measure goes, as against banks in certain other sections of the country, which by pooling their interests could be most helpful in making credit available to the new and expanding areas, which is something which, under the provisions of many of the State banking laws, they would not be able to do.

It appears to me that the point the Senator from Florida is making is very well taken, but I think the distinction should be pointed out and made clear for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. It seems to me that any company which would be held, under this exemption, to apply not merely 50 percent of its business to agricultural activities, as required of some institutions under Federal law, but instead to place 80 percent of its business into direct agricultural channels, is certainly operating upon sound principles in applying less than 20 percent of its assets to the partial financing of two institutions which are of great and necessary importance to it in its business.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought I had the floor in my own right, but I shall be glad to speak in the time of the Senator from Florida.

Here we have another case of a small company. If an exception is made in one case it can be made in another. This is an instance in which we are asked to make an exception in the bill so as to permit a holding company to retain nonbank assets. That was done yesterday in the case of companies in Atlanta, Ga., and Louisville, Ky. Now we are being asked to act in behalf of a company in Florida.

I do not object to it. But my point is that we ought to treat all companies alike. What we should do is to permit all bank holding companies to retain their nonbanking assets under certain rules and regulations, and I propose to offer an amendment to achieve that purpose.

I simply cannot make up my mind that we ought to treat one set of circumstances differently from another set of circumstances which are practically the same.

We talk about what is proposed being helpful to agriculture. Will we permit other bank holding companies which deal in produce or foodstuffs, or which are interested in agricultural projects, do what the amendment permits one institution to do?

Mr. HOLLAND. I drew my amendment so that it would apply equally to anyone who was in the same type of business. I would not say to the Senate there is no one else in that position. I simply say that I do not know of any other concern in the part of the country I have referred to which is in the situation of the institution I have cited.

Mr. CAPEHART. But why should we treat one individual different from another? I had no objection to the amendment concerning the company in Georgia or the amendment relating to the company in Louisville; and I have no particular objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida. But it may well be that we are piling so many exceptions in the bill that there will be many Senators who will not vote for it.

We are exempting labor organizations, churches, and charitable institutions. Now it is sought to exempt a number of bank-holding companies. The bill relates to "two or more banks." I do not know why it should have reference to two or more banks.

I do not believe the Senator's amendment was considered by the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. The facts were stated in the committee. I did not submit any particular amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I remember a colloquy participated in by the able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], when we discussed the amendments which would be offered, and he assured me then that he would fight each and every one of them. I do not know how strongly he intended to fight them, but my impression was that when the bill was reported to the Senate, it was intended that every company would be treated alike.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not know whether the amendment was considered by the committee, because I am not a member of the committee; but the distinguished Senator will find on pages 252 to 256, inclusive, of the committee hearings, that Mr. F. Elgin Bayless, one of the officials of the company I have mentioned disclosed to the committee the same facts I have already stated; and I have been just as frank in stating them as I could be.

Mr. CAPEHART. How large is the bank-holding company to which the Senator's amendment relates? Do not its assets run into millions of dollars?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is stated in the testimony that the total valuation of all its assets is now approximately $9 million.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator from Florida feel that a bank-holding company which owned, let us say, a nonbanking asset which was producing a foodstuff in the form of fish should have the same exemption?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be perfectly willing to extend to it the same treatment, although I should want to know the entire facts about it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why would the Senator want to know all the facts about it? Why does the Senator qualify his statement by saying he would want to know all the facts?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the concern I am referring to, and any other which is engaged in the agricultural field, serving and helping the development of the great agricultural industry of our Nation, and trying to serve itself to the extent that less than 20 percent of its assets are invested in two banks which are serving it, is entitled not to be considered as principally a financial institution, not to be considered as trespassing upon other banks or depositors in other banks anywhere else, but simply as serving its own business. I should like to see that principle applied to anyone who is in the same position.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would not the Senator say the same thing for every other bank-holding company? The company with which the Senator is concerned is interested in making a profit, I am certain, just as are other bank-holding companies.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana wishes to take the position that those engaged in bona fide agriculture have not been given equal treatment by Congress over many years in an effort to enable them to finance themselves soundly through the assistance of Federal money, he would, of course, have to fly in the face of facts which he knows full well to exist.

Mr. CAPEHART. The same thing has been true of business. The RFC lent hundreds of millions, yes, billions, of dollars to banks and railroads. Think of the large sums which are being received at this moment from the small business agencies. Think of the guaranties through the FHA which the Federal Government is giving to the home-building industry, and which have helped the home-building industry. Congress and the Government have not helped agriculture any more than they have helped business or home building.

I am not opposed to the Senator's amendment; I shall vote for it. I merely wanted to make a record, and to make certain that when the time comes to treat all bank holding companies in the same way as the able Senator asks us to treat the one in Florida, he and other Senators will be equally as solicitous of other bank holding companies as they are of the ones they particularly happen to know something about.

I simply wanted to make a record, so that it will be shown that we are doing in this instance for a bank holding company what I think every other bank holding company has a perfect right to expect from 96 Senators who were elected to represent all the people and to treat everyone alike. They have a right to expect Senators to do for other bank holding companies that which is being done for this particular one.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida had no objection at all to the other amendments of this same sort which were adopted. He is strongly for the amendment he offers. He is willing to give equal consideration, on the facts, to any amendment offered by any Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has said "equal consideration," but I am not going to object to the amendment. I am sure the able manager of the bill is going to object very strenuously to it, and possibly insist on a yea and nay vote, because the committee did not accept the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the manager of the bill, on behalf of the committee, takes the same position on this amendment that he took with respect to the one exempting a bank holding company in Kentucky and one in Georgia. All three of these matters were considered by the committee. As the distinguished Senator from Florida pointed out, there was testimony last summer in the main hearings on the bill. Another reference will be found on page 21 of the supplemental hearings of last February. The committee considered all these amendments, and on all occasions turned them down.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Virginia remember the colloquy which he and I had as to what would happen on the floor of the Senate with respect to these special amendments?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We had so many colloquies that the Senator from Virginia cannot specifically remember that particular one, at least; but the Senator from Virginia specifically stated to the committee, both last summer and again in February, that he was going to oppose and vote against every amendment offered from the floor except the committee amendments, which have already been adopted, and he has consistently maintained that position.

Mr. President, it is quite important that we bear three things in mind concerning the policy of the committee in reporting Senate bill 577. One is that we wanted absolutely to divorce banking from all other types of business. The Senator from Indiana has been suggesting, and I believe he has offered an amendment to that effect, that bank-holding companies be allowed to continue to hold all of their nonbanking assets.

If such an amendment should be adopted, the bill would become worse than a futility, because, for instance, one holding company, Transamerica, which is now operating in 9 or 10 States, and which has 200 or more branches, as

well as a great number of banks, in those 9 or 10 States, with a billion dollars of outside assets, would be frozen in its position, because, under the Douglas amendment, nobody else could come into the State where it does business. The very object of the independent bankers would be defeated, which is to break up the combination between banking assets, on the one hand, and a vast industrial expansion on the other, where the overlord, the holding company, can pump assets into one branch or bank to stifle competition, against the interests of the local people.

So if the Capehart amendment is adopted, we can say to every independent banker in the United States, "We have turned our backs on you in favor of the bank holding companies," because the amendment would make an utter futility of the bank holding act, and it would be worse than no act at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Virginia knows that the amendment which I shall offer, and which I have not offered yet, denies bank holding companies or any of their banks the right to lend any money to their nonbanking subsidiaries. We ought to keep the record straight. I have stated exactly what the effect of the amendment would be. The able Senator from Virginia said a bank holding company would be able to pour billions into its nonbanking assets.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is nothing in the Senator's amendment which would keep Mr. Belgrano from swapping stocks in his company for those of some other company. That is what he wants to do. He wants to swap the stock, just as he did when he went to Tucson to take over the bank established there by the Douglas family years ago. He made such an attractive offer for the stock of that bank in exchange for his own stock, which was more valuable and which was paying higher dividends, that the owners of the bank sold out to him. If finally approved by the Federal authorities, he will have acquired this additional bank in Arizona.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The divesting of nonbanking assets has no effect whatsoever on the operations of the bank holding companies. Their operations will be unhampered after the able Senator's bill passes. The companies will come within the law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is just as wrong as he can possibly be. He is fighting the very essence of the proposed legislation under the pleasing guise of improving it. He will not get a single independent banker in the United States to support his position, and he need not think for a minute that he will. He is going against the interests of the independent bankers of the United States. I put the Senate on notice that if the Senate adopts the amendment, it will throw the bill in the ashcan, because it will be worse than no bill at all, since these vast industrial empires will then be frozen in their position, where there can be no competition, and the independent bankers will be wrecked.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why did the Senator sit here so nonchalantly and complacently, then, and see two amendments put into the bill to permit bank holding companies to hold their nonbanking assets, if it is such a terrible thing for the independent bankers? Where is the consistency in the Senator's position?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely lacking in facts, and he is not supported by the RECORD.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall read a portion of the RECORD to show the colloquy we had——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me complete my statement. The Senator has made a statement that is not supported by the facts. The Senator from Virginia expressed his opposition on behalf of himself and the committee to all amendments offered to the bill, and will continue to do so. The Senator from Indiana voted for both amendments which constitute exceptions, and has just announced he is going to vote for another exception to the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am going to vote to exempt all of them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then he lays the foundation to let Transamerica hold $1 billion of its nonbanking assets, and Transamerican is the largest institution of this kind. If there were only that one bank holding company in the entire United States, we would need this legislation; but there are a great many more.

In our committee we did treat everybody alike. We wrote no specific exemptions into the bill which would let anybody get by with operating a lot of nonrelated businesses in connection with the banking business.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I saw in the newspaper a day or two ago that W. R. Grace was acquiring Cosden Petroleum Co. W. R. Grace has a bank. Is it the holding of other assets that is dangerous, or is it the holding of two banks and holding the assets that is dangerous?

Mr. ROBERTSON. W. R. Grace probably has an empire of $300 million or more. It has large shipping and manufacturing interests. It is building chemical plants and other manufacturing plants in South America. It has one bank.

When the Senator from Virginia introduced the bill, the definition was 50 percent of one bank or more. The independent bankers framed a bill, and the distinguished Senator from Indiana introduced it on the Senate side, with a definition of two banks or more. The chairman of the House committee introduced a bill on the House side, with a definition of two banks or more. The House passed the bill containing a definition of two banks or more. The definition of two banks or more would cover 63 bank holding companies. The definition of one bank would cover 100 more.

In the first place, those who advocated the definition of two banks or more took the position that if a man had only one bank, he was not furnishing too much competition to the independent bankers, because most of those who have only one bank are large industrial empires that are not concerned primarily in banking, and they are not concerned with providing competition—especially unfair competition—to other bankers.

In the second place, they took the position that if we now pass this bill in such form as to have it apply to two banks or more, we shall more or less freeze the corporations which have only one bank, because the minute they got two banks, they would come under the definition included in the bill, and then they would have to get rid of either their banking assets or their nonbanking assets. Of course, being primarily industrial organizations, they would have to get rid of their banks or banking assets. That is the explanation of the definition as regards 25 percent of two banks or more.

Mr. ANDERSON. What I was concerned about was whether the bill is primarily for the purpose of protecting the independent banker against competition, or whether it is designed to require banks which have industrial holdings to divest themselves of such holdings.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill has two or perhaps three primary purposes. One is to protect banks from unfair competition from a unique corporate device which enables a corporation to do what no private bank can do, namely, to have a bank branch in another State. Under the Banking Act of 1933, national banks are limited to the State in which they are incorporated, and cannot operate outside that State. They can have branches only in accordance with the State laws and as permitted by the Federal agencies. The same rule now applies to all State banks; they cannot spread into other States. State banks and national banks are thus limited. That was the real reason why so much pressure was behind the Douglas amendment, because it was said, "The private banker cannot cross State lines. Therefore, do not let the bank holding companies do what the private bankers cannot do."

Our answer—although it was not very effective, because only 18 Senators took that view—was that such groups have always had this privilege, although now the plan seems to be to put the large investments of capital into a straitjacket and, in addition, to freeze the large bank holding companies into a very favored position. But the Senate voted overwhelmingly; there were only 18 votes in opposition. All the remaining votes were based on the view, "Not only are we in favor of the Senate committee's bank-holding-company bill, but we want a stronger bill than the one now before the Senate."

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that was the position which was taken.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] voted for the Douglas amendment, and indicated that he, too, wanted a stronger bill than the one the committee had proposed.

I am saying that if the Senator from Indiana offers an amendment to exempt

all bank holding companies from having to divest themselves of either their banking assets, on the one hand, or their nonbanking assets, on the other, he will have turned a complete somersault as regards this provision, because such an amendment would really nullify this provision of the bill.

Again I wish to say—particularly for the benefit of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who asked the question—that, first, the committee was consistent in attempting to treat everyone alike and in attempting to avoid writing any specific exemptions into the bill. In the second place, the committee wished to control future expansion of bank holding companies, so they would not go into areas where new facilities were not needed, and where the only purpose would be to give competition—and perhaps unfair competition—to the independent bankers who already serve the area. We propose leaving that matter to the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board, with the privilege on the part of State authorities, in the case of State banks, to make recommendations in that connection, or with the privilege on the part of the Comptroller of the Currency, in the case of Federal banks, to make recommendations.

Third—and this is very important—the committee took the position that since the Banking Act of 1933 absolutely prohibited any private banker from doing any kind of business except banking, the bank holding companies, if they wish to remain in the banking business, must of necesssity get down to the same level and get rid of their nonbanking assets.

All of those were essential objectives of the bill. I repeat that enactment of the bill is urgently needed.

I commend the statement made on the floor on yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], who supported the Douglas amendment, and who said that, with that amendment, the bill is a good one, and is long overdue, and that we need such legislation; and he also said that with the addition of that amendment, he planned to support the bill actively.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has referred to remarks I made in regard to the Holland amendment, I wish to say to him that I see very, very much that is most commendable and needed in the original bill, as reported by the committee.

However, let me say that I have checked on the George amendment, and I have ascertained certain facts in that connection. As I stated earlier today, I think it is good to have such matters set forth in the RECORD, along with a basic background regarding why—as the Senator from Florida has indicated—certain exemptions are sought to be made.

In the case of the George amendment, I found—and I think it well for the RECORD to show this—that the Trust Company of Georgia owns 100 percent of the Trust Company of Georgia Associates, which owns a controlling interest in 6 national banks, 10 percent of the Trusco Finance Co., and 4,968 shares of the Coca-Cola International Corp.; and the Trust Company of Georgia also owns 100 percent of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., of Lincoln, Nebr.; and 5,500 shares of the Coca-Cola International Corp.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, without reading any further figures, will the Senator from Kansas admit that inasmuch as only 18 votes were cast in support of my position on the Douglas amendment, I cannot control the Senate? If I cannot control the Senate, why does he attempt to hold me responsible for what the Senate did, inasmuch as I did not vote in favor of the Douglas amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I say most earnestly that I supported the position taken by the Banking and Currency Committee and by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I did not support the Douglas amendment.

Mr. ROBERSTON. I am very glad of that.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If I could not support the Douglas amendment then, I would not support it now, if it came up in exactly the same way.

I am not criticizing the Senator from Virginia; neither am I holding him responsible for the action taken by the Senate in its wisdom and best judgment. But I am pointing out that at the present time there are two amendments, and in all likelihood a third one, which depart drastically from the concept the Senator from Virginia sought to have the bill embrace.

I wish to state for the RECORD some of the circumstances and some of the actions taken which I think are discriminatory. I believe the Senate should consider very carefully the approach the Banking and Currency Committee has made to the bill.

If the bill is loaded down with exceptions, they will work inequities.

So I desire to point out these things. If the bill is thus to be loaded down, I fear that in good conscience I shall not be able to support it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the sentiment expressed by my distinguished colleague, but I should like to remind him of what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said yesterday. The bill introduced in the House carried exemptions for Kentucky and Georgia. That bill was introduced by Chairman SPENCE. The bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Indiana carried the same exemptions. But the bill introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from Virginia never contained any of them. He has consistently taken the position that it is not proper procedure for us to bring forward a bill and talk about only a few bank holding companies because they are very big and stand out like sore thumbs, without making the rule apply to all similarly situated.

We had a situation in which the House started with a bill carrying two exemptions. The Senate started with a bill carrying no exemptions. Yesterday the Senate voted to exempt two of the bank holding companies. With all due deference, I think the Senator from Florida has shown that the company covered by his amendment is even more entitled to exemption, if we are to make exemptions, than the two with respect to which we have already acted.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I hope the Senator from Virginia does not feel that I am critical at all. I merely wish to point out some of the things which I think should be in the RECORD. As I told the distinguished Senator from Florida a while ago when I was asking him questions, I think it should be definitely shown that his amendment is grounded in the agricultural industry, which puts it in an entirely different light than some of the other exceptions. I think we ought to have the facts in the RECORD and before the public.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia, with all due deference to the bill his committee requested him to present to the Senate, thinks that the most inconsistent position in respect to the bill is that we did not place all bank holding companies under the provisions of the bill. But we took the position that we have been trying to obtain some legislation for 18 years. The Glass bill, twice aided by the able Senator MacAdoo, of California, applied the one-bank definition. That bill never got out of committee. Everyone who took a look at it said, "If those two distinguished statesmen could not get a bill out of committee, how can those of us who do not claim such prominence and ability hope to have enacted a bill based upon the one-bank definition?" So they did not consider it. It was not tried on the House side. The Senator from Indiana, when he introduced his bill, did not try it on this side. I did try it, and I did not get my bill out of committee. The committee said, "We want the two-bank definition," and that is the one which is before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I should like to say, first, that I am sure the distinguished Senator from Virginia knows that there is no "overlord" concepts in the case of the Consolidated Naval Stores Company of Florida. It has had this relatively small interest in 2 banks for more than 25 years, without seeking to enlarge them or to enter into other fields.

I am sure the Tropical State Bank is as much regarded as an independent bank in my State as any other independent bank in the State. The activity involved in this case is an agricultural activity, an agricultural business, which has tried to protect itself, and in one instance to protect the community in which it is doing business. I do not think it should be handicapped in any way under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I take it the distinguished Senator from

Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is merely pointing out certain facts in connection with the situation which should be in the RECORD.

As I understand, yesterday the camel got his nose under the tent by way of the Barkley amendment. It got its neck under the tent by means of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. It is now about to get its first hump under the tent, and pretty soon the whole camel will get in. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That was what the Senator from Kansas was trying to point out. However, I did see much more merit in the position taken by the Senator from Florida in connection with his amendment, which is tied strictly to the agricultural side, than I could see otherwise. However, I am afraid we have too much of the animal under the tent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McClellan
Allott	Frear	McNamara
Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Barkley	George	Monroney
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Beall	Green	Mundt
Bender	Hayden	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hruska	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Byrd	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Clements	Knowland	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smathers
Curtis	Laird	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lehman	Sparkman
Douglas	Long	Symington
Duff	Magnuson	Thye
Dworshak	Malone	Welker
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Young
Ervin	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of a death in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of government; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KEATING, and Miss THOMPSON of Michigan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the followig enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for a few moments on the subject of American foreign policy, a subject which I deem to be of considerable importance.

Mr. President, two major events within the last 48 hours have put us all on notice that the challenge facing us in foreign policy is unrelenting and that our response must be more imaginative and constructive than it has been hitherto.

I refer first to the frightening indication from Mr. Khrushchev in Birmingham, England, Monday that his displeasure over the coolness of his reception in England has now taken the form of threats bursting through the smiles. Khrushchev is quoted as telling his British audience: "I am quite sure that we will have a guided missile with a hydrogen bomb that can fall anywhere in the world. In spite of that, you do not want to trade with us."

Mr. President, I think we can thank our British allies not only for showing the world that they are fully capable of evaluating the blandishments of their Soviet visitors, but for providing the Kremlin leaders with an opportunity to divulge in public that terror is still an instrument of Soviet diplomacy despite all the cocktail conversation about peace and friendship.

This combination of terror and smiles, Mr. President, is designed to break up the free world coalition. There are ample indications that it has been successful in helping to erode the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Hence I was delighted to read that the Secretary of State has at last taken notice of this challenge to NATO, and Monday in his important speech before the Associated Press luncheon in New York, he proposed what some of us have been proposing for a long time: Namely, that NATO must now go beyond its original status as primarily a defensive military alliance, in order to become an agency of cooperation for political, economic, and social progress.

Mr. Dulles said in part:

NATO contains the possibilities of great development. * * * The Canadian Government has notably espoused this point of view and at last December's meeting of the council, both the French and Italian delegations introduced resolutions along this line. I expect that the matter will be further dealt with at next week's ministerial meeting which will be held in Paris. Our nations basically have so much in common that we should be able to do more in common. * * * The peoples who make up the Atlantic community ought, in increased unity, to resume their greatness; and true greatness is not to be measured by ability to impose on others what they do not want, but ability to find new ways whereby all men can better realize their aspirations.

The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable vital instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has come, I believe, to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed, if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Secretary of State for that statement. I think it opens up before us a very important opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that pertinent excerpts from Mr. Dulles' speech be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is another organization which, in its own distinctive way, contains the possibilities of great development. It was, to be sure, conceived primarily as a military alliance, and that aspect of the organization remains vitally important. But the organization can and should be more.

The Canadian Government has notably espoused this point of view and at last December's meeting of the council, both the French and Italian delegations introduced resolutions along this line. I expect that the matter will be further dealt with at next week's ministerial meeting which will be held in Paris. Our nations basically have so much in common that we should be able to do more in common.

All of our peoples embrace a religious faith which makes atheistic materialism seem abhorrent to them. We have a common sense of moral values.

Our political institutions predominantly reflect democratic conceptions which had their origin in Greece, and legal institutions which had their origins in Rome.

Our economies are similar. We believe in and encourage the private ownership of property, and there is a large and flourishing trade between our countries.

DOMINATION IS SCORED

Our educational systems are much the same and provide a broad basis for the free exchange of views and the gaining of common understanding. And not only do we

have this firm foundation but also we hold in common many guiding principles of action which should enable us to develop practically our fellowship.

All of us believe that the days are past when any part of the world, or any particular civilization should dominate others. Several of the members of NATO are more than Atlantic countries. The United Kingdom, for example, is a member of the British Commonwealth. The United States is an American and a Pacific nation as well as an Atlantic nation. We are today members not only of NATO but of the Organization of American States, of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and of several other collective defense pacts. And we are associated with the Baghdad Pact. All NATO members would, I think, agree that NATO should not represent the totality of our policies.

And also, all believe that no government has just powers except as it derives them from the consent of the governed. At the same time we recognize that political independence is illusory unless those who obtain it are able to sustain it and carry its responsibilities.

Also, we reject the conception which would prevent different races from freely uniting in one political system. Under these conditions all of us, I am sure, want to strive to advance the historic evolution of the non-self-governing peoples to self-government and independence.

And we believe that the spirit, which in the last decade has provided so many non-self-governing peoples with political independence, ought also to operate peacefully to stimulate independence for those subject to the ruthless colonialism of Soviet Russia. Peace and welfare in Europe require that East Germany should be allowed to unite in freedom with the Federal Republic, and that the nations of eastern Europe should once again be independent.

INTEGRATION MOVES CITED

We believe in the closer integration of some Western European countries, such as is represented by the coal and steel community, by the Western European Union, which is created by the new Brussels Treaty, and by the prospective development of what is called "Eupratom," the proposed organization whereby the same countries that are members of the coal and steel community would apply community principles to the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Such European integration, and the development of NATO, are complementary and not mutually exclusive processes.

The NATO members believe in the principle of consultation between allies and at our council meetings we are increasingly practicing that consultation. But every NATO country has, of course, certain vital national interests, that may sometimes require independent judgment. Some of us have grave worldwide responsibilities that cannot be effectively discharged unless there is a capability of prompt decision and corresponding action.

Our consultations must be designed to assure essential harmony in our viewpoints on fundamentals. But the processes of consultation should never enmesh us in a procedural web so that we fall victim to the ability of despotisms to act suddenly and with all their might.

None of our governments is predatory. We want military power to be used as a community force to prevent aggression and not as a national force for aggrandizement. And, indeed, the amended Brussels Treaty for Western European Union already sets a historic example that we can well ask the whole world to follow.

No NATO member, I suppose, wants to drift into some new and ill-defined relationship which could be provocative of future misunderstandings. But the unanimity of our thinking upon the great basic issues makes it apparent that the time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning.

Western civilization has made an immense contribution to the welfare of the whole world. It has been a dynamic force which, like everything human, has made its mistakes. But on the whole it has reflected an enlightened view of the nature of man and of his God-given right to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Furthermore, the Western view of the nature of man has made it inevitable that its influence should be, on the whole, a liberalizing influence. Some nations take pride in the size of their dominion and the number of people under their rule. But the western nations can feel that their greatest success was to have brought to much of the world a knowledge, a political freedom, and an economic opportunity which it had never enjoyed before.

But the mission of the West is not completed. More independence needs to be perfected. More economic development needs to be planned and supported throughout the world. More sense of equality and human brotherhood needs to be developed. And also, the West needs to appreciate better how rich are the gifts that other civilizations have to offer.

The historic weakness of the West has been its disunity. Out of this disunity came wars which have taken the lifeblood of its finest youth and weakened its economies. A major task of postwar statesmanship was to find the ways whereby the West can maintain its solidarity. Much, indeed very much, has been done in this respect. But more can still be done to make sure that the good in western civilization is not again negated by differences.

The peoples who make up the Atlantic community ought, in increased unity, to resume their greatness; and true greatness is not to be measured by ability to imposed on others what they do not want, but ability to find new ways whereby all men can better realize their aspirations.

The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable vital instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has come, I believe, to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed, if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generation. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring those possibilities which now beckon us forward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the chronology leading up to Mr. Dulles' statement has been interesting to watch during recent weeks. It is a chronology of specific warnings that NATO is in danger of disintegration, and that positive new measures must be taken to give it life and vigor.

On February 3, the Christian Science Monitor in a special dispatch from Edmund Stevens in Rome reported that Italian President Gronchi said that on his forthcoming visit to Washington he would "tell Washington policy planners that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will atrophy and disintegrate unless the scope of the Atlantic Alliance is broadened by implementing the neglected economic and political clauses of the treaty."

NATO, he contends, suffers from the fact that it was conceived in the narrow image of the American view which considers resistance to communism solely in military terms. Consequently, as the apparent war threat waned, NATO member states lost interest commensurately. And when Moscow concentrated its efforts in other fields, such as economic and technical aid to backward areas, the West lacked the organizational framework to meet the challenge, he said.

When President Gronchi came to Washington later that month, Mr. President, he told the joint session of Congress on February 29:

The reorganization of the Western World is the central problem of the day which should be faced without delay. * * * Military cooperation continues to be very important today, but it should be supplemented with new and imaginative forms of cooperation. This is necessary not only to move away from a climate of emergency measures and to enter into a phase characterized by more complex and permanent arrangements, but chiefly because we all realize that no person, nation, or group of nations can consider without anxiety and anguish the prospects of a world where peace is based solely on military strength or on limited political alinements. * * * The new methods of a more organic cooperation should range from the political to the social and economic areas.

One might consider with more attention a better integrated functioning of NATO involving a wider and more frequent use of the Atlantic Council.

On March 5, President Gronchi went to Canada where he devoted most of his speech before the Parliament in Ottawa to pleading for an extension of the NATO alliance into an economic as well as a military grouping. He said:

Unification of the western viewpoint is the indispensable premise for any action in order to confer upon joint policies a dynamic and flexible character to counteract the forces which lately have so ably demonstrated their flexibility.

A few days earlier, the French Foreign Minister Christian Pineau had addressed a British-American correspondents association in Paris and warned that the West must try "a new unified approach to the East-West dispute or be engulfed eventually by a tide of Communist propaganda."

As the month of March rolled on, Mr. President, indications continued that NATO was deteriorating. The Parliament of Iceland asked for the withdrawal of all NATO armed forces from their country and the State Department expressed shock and surprise. I ask unanimous consent that two paragraphs from a column by Joseph C. Harsch which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on April 3 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—On March 28 members of Iceland's Althing passed a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all NATO armed forces from their country. * * * When the members of the Althing passed the resolution, they gave the most specific expression to date of a point of view which has been stated with increasing frequency in countries which participate in the North Atlantic Alliance.

The Foreign Minister of France and the President of Italy are two other recent sources of the opinion that the NATO alliance as it stands today is becoming obsolete, and that the first need of the West in the post-Geneva world is not for a military alliance, but for a much-improved economic and political association of the Western nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, events have become so serious that the seventh anniversary of NATO on April 4, 1956, became an occasion of special significance. Speaking at the SHAPE ceremonies in Paris on that day, Lord Ismay, Premier Guy Mollett, and Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther all emphasized that NATO was more than a military organization, and that the time had come to develop its political, economic, and social possibilities in building a genuine Atlantic community. As Volney Hurd cabled the Christian Science Monitor from Paris the next day:

When SHAPE's purely military chief takes this line, it shows strong forces at work on a long-neglected policy change.

Four days later there were intimations that Lord Ismay might resign, and an article entitled "NATO Could Fold if Ismay Quits," written by Edmund Taylor, was published in the Washington Post of April 8. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO COULD FOLD IF ISMAY QUITS

PARIS.—With Iceland's request for withdrawal of United States Armed Forces seeming to presage the collapse of NATO's northern flank, and with Cyprus a timebomb that may blow the southern flank to smithereens at any moment, there is a danger that United States policymakers may overlook quite a different, yet grave, threat to what is left of the western alliance.

There is the distinct possibility that Lord Ismay, NATO's Gibraltar-like British Secretary General, may hand in his resignation, perhaps at the ministerial meeting of the council in May. * * * Ismay's resignation, in view of observers here, might well be a fatal blow to NATO.

NATO's situation has gone from bad to worse. Although Washington seems to have been making strenuous efforts to play down the request of the Icelandic parliament, Paris observers have no illusions about its gravity. Above all, they fear an early spread of the same neutralist infection to the Scandinavian members of NATO—Norway and Denmark—where several signs of dissatisfaction have appeared in recent months. * * *

What depresses Ismay and his staff even more than the decay on the northern flank and the crisis on the southern flank, is the failure of NATO's leading members to supply—or even tolerate—any imaginative leadership in converting NATO from a simple military alliance into a real Atlantic community.

This concept has met with a notable lack of enthusiasm from the British and from Secretary of State Dulles, who has been more interested in promoting the integration of Western Europe within NATO.

Ismay tactically avoids any direct criticism of this policy. But he leaves one with the impression that he is seriously worried lest United States efforts to promote European unity, while neglecting the political and economic aspects of the broader Atlantic alliance, might end by undermining the latter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 14, in Pensacola, Fla., Adlai Stevenson asked for "swift action to restore the vitality and strength of the NATO alliance." Disputing President Eisenhower's statement made in a news conference on April 4 that NATO was "just as strong as ever," Mr. Stevenson said that if he were elected President he would "follow up the admirable suggestion made by President Gronchi, of Italy, in his recent address to Congress, and build NATO into something approaching a social and economic community."

The announcement that General Gruenther would retire from his SHAPE post has added to the growing uncertainty of the future of NATO, and evoked further demands by responsible commentators that we take steps to bolster the Atlantic community. On April 16 the Christian Science Monitor published a column by Erwin D. Canham entitled "Something Better With Our NATO Allies." I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this column be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOMETHING BETTER WITH OUR NATO ALLIES

(By Erwin D. Canham, April 16, 1956)

NATO, as a political and economic start toward integration, may turn out to be more important than NATO as a military force. The retirement of General Gruenther, the pulling away of French forces for use in north Africa, the breach between Greece and Turkey and Britain over Cyprus, the demand of Iceland for withdrawal of United States NATO troops—all these things reveal the changes in NATO.

If the alliance is weakening militarily, let us make it stronger politically and economically if we possibly can. We might well sell the Soviet a military easement if we ourselves could obtain something better with our NATO allies—closer economic and political cooperation.

Similarly, West German restiveness can perhaps be met in the political area. A Germany spiritually allied with the West is more valuable than a few more divisions of German troops.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago it was discovered that early in March Chancellor Adenauer had made an extremely important statement which, for some curious reason, was never picked up by the American press. An article appeared in the Bonn General-Anzeiger on March 2. The article begins:

The expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into a political instrument of the West in the cold war with the East was demanded yesterday by Federal Chancellor Dr. Adenauer in Bonn.

This statement by the German Chancellor is so important, Mr. President, that I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to it with particular emphasis. So far it has had no publicity in this country whatever. I ask unanimous consent that the translation of this article be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the translation of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CHANCELLOR DEMANDS POLITICAL NATO AS POLITICAL INSTRUMENT OF THE WEST IN THE COLD WAR WITH THE EAST

BONN.—The expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into a political instrument of the West in the cold war with the East was demanded yesterday by Federal Chancellor Dr. Adenauer in Bonn. This political NATO should guarantee a coordination of the political attitude and initiative of the West vis-a-vis the East and provide that Soviet Russian cold-war measures either be answered by a united front of the West or, through preventive political behavior, be precluded or made difficult from the start. The Chancellor stated that, in the same way in which years ago NATO was created as a military defense instrument in order to be a match for a possible hot war of the Soviets, NATO should now be expanded into a political instrument in the cold war. Article 2 of the NATO statutes not only permits this expansion but actually provides for it.

The Federal Chancellor hinted that in certain leading NATO countries the attitude toward the expansion of NATO into a political coordination and defense instrument is not particularly favorable. "Nevertheless, I believe the expansion of NATO to be the right way," he added.

As early as December of last year, preparatory talks in this direction took place in Paris, the Chancellor stated. It was true, however, that some thought had also been given at one time to the idea of effecting a coordination of the Western policies with respect to Russia through the expansion of other pact systems. In Dr. Adenauer's opinion, however, NATO presents the largest number of favorable prerequisites for such a coordination; first, because in NATO the smooth cooperation of a large number of powers in other fields already exists; second, because a well functioning apparatus is available; and third, because within NATO the most intimate knowledge of an economic policy nature is available and therefore political measures can be combined with economic policy measures.

The expansion of NATO into a political instrument is especially appropriate at the moment and also especially practicable, he added, because on one hand Soviet Russia is doubtlessly increasing the cold war measures while on the other hand the immediate danger of a shooting war does not exist. "For the time being we shall not have to fear a hot war, provided that the defense front created in NATO remains in existence."

Last but not least, the Russian policy of the three big powers makes a coordination of the political attitude and of the political steps vis-a-vis the East appear necessary in the opinion of the Federal Chancellor. While President Eisenhower was rejecting certain diplomatic initiatives of the Soviets with prompt reply letters, Soviet Russian statesmen were being invited to a state visit by Great Britain, and, finally, the new French Government had declared that the French-Soviet friendship continued to be binding for France. "This is definitely no joint policy." Also, in the Near East each country proceeded separately. In this way, the cold war of the East could not be counteracted in the "endangered areas," the Chancellor stated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week in Washington two other important voices were raised in concern over NATO. In his excellent review, on April 18, of our foreign policy in the Middle East, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] emphasized that he was disturbed about the "erosion of NATO." He said:

The organization has not changed very much outwardly, but I believe it has nevertheless changed in the sense that it has lost its spirit, its drive, its leadership.

The next day the president of the AFL-CIO, Mr. George Meany, wrote to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] regarding Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which proposes a conference of representatives of

the democracies supporting the North Atlantic Treaty. Mr. Meany stated:

This resolution was considered by the appropriate executive body of the AFL-CIO, together with a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 216. * * * I am glad to be able to inform you that the AFL-CIO is entirely in accord with the principle underlying the proposals of these resolutions. * * * Because your exploratory convention is not committed to any definite formula, the AFL-CIO can express agreement with the objectives which your group seeks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Meany's letter to Senator MURRAY be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1956.

The Honorable JAMES MURRAY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I thank you for sending me a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 dealing with a proposed conference of representatives of the democracies supporting the North Atlantic Treaty.

This resolution was considered by the appropriate executive body of the AFL-CIO, together with a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 216, which was sent me by Congressman HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., dealing with somewhat the same subject.

I am glad to be able to inform you that the AFL-CIO is entirely in accord with the principle underlying the proposals of these resolutions.

From the time that the North Atlantic Treaty was initiated, the American labor movement has been on record in support of the necessary military defense of Western democracies against the possibility of aggression. We have, however, at the same time insisted that the nonmilitary parts of the treaty should receive more consideration than has hitherto been accorded to them. On a number of occasions the representatives of the AFL-CIO have called for the implementation particularly of article 2 of the treaty, which deals with these matters.

The most recent example of this is the following quotation from the resolution on foreign policy, adopted by the AFL-CIO convention held in New York City, December 5–9, 1955:

"This implementation of the London-Paris accords should be combined with a program to enable NATO to fulfill not only its primary purpose as a military defense body but, in addition, as an organ for greater economic and political cooperation in advancing peace, human rights and improved living standards."

In the spirit of this position and because your exploratory convention is not committed to any definite formula, the AFL-CIO can express agreement with the objectives which your group seeks.

Best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY,
President.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, enough has surely been said to prove that all is not well in the NATO alliance. It is obvious today that many of the French forces, upon which we rely for defensive strength in Western Europe, are already committed in North Africa.

The major bulwark of democracy is Germany. A man upon whom we have placed great reliance, and who has committed West Germany to participation in NATO—Chancellor Adenauer—is deeply concerned, and has openly said so, over the gradual weakening and deterioration in this greatest free alliance which the world has ever known.

I am not speaking in a spirit of criticism; I am speaking only in a spirit of genuine, serious concern. I feel that the message which Secretary Dulles gave earlier this week is one which should challenge Congress. It appears to me that now, as in other days, Congress, particularly the Senate, should examine what is happening in the NATO alliance. We might very well examine what has been done and not done under the economic and political clauses of the NATO treaty. We might very well consider what more could be done in the light of the recent pronouncements by some of the great leaders of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Germay.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Minnesota upon his speech. I think it is very timely. Is it not true, in his opinion, that the relations between the United States and West Germany are not quite so strong and cordial as they were, say, even a year ago?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is correct to say that the people of West Germany are becoming more concerned over our relations with them. I must say that Chancellor Adenauer has been as stanch a friend of the United States as has any leader of any Western European democracy.

But I feel there is evidence that the West Germans are becoming somewhat impatient over the problem of German reunification. I noticed that the German Foreign Minister, Mr. Brentano, is contemplating another visit to Moscow to see whether or not something can be worked out on the unification question.

It is factors such as these that cause me deep concern over whether or not we are doing all that should be done in terms of strengthening NATO and utilizing it more effectively on the political, economic, and diplomatic fronts.

It is obvious, for instance, that there is little or no coordination of policy among the NATO nations as to how the constant intrusions of the Soviet leaders should be treated. For example, our country apparently would not welcome a visit from Bulganin and Khrushchev. The British are permitting them to visit Great Britain. Representatives of the French Government go to Moscow. The French Prime Minister and the French Foreign Minister make statements, as allies of ours, which occasionally seem to contradict the official policy of our country. I recognize the right of those persons to do those things. I do not criticize. I simply say that if NATO is to be effective, then we must have a policy in concert. We must work together. We must have common political and economic aims as well as military aims, because today it is perfectly obvious that the Soviet Union is moving on the political and economical offensive. Significantly enough, the newspaper editors who were in Washington last week attending the convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors voted 2 to 1—54 to 27—that the United States of America was losing the cold war.

Mr. President, they are editors who, in the main, are sympathetic to the present administration. I want to make it quite clear, whether it is this administration or any other, that all political forces in this country must work unitedly toward a common program, to recapture the diplomatic initiative for us and our allies. Political considerations, which could be taken advantage of for partisan purposes, must be put aside. But I think it is disturbing when the Secretary of State can come back from a trip around the world and indicate that everything is well and good, while the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, can come back from practically the same trip and from the same countries and report to the committees of the Congress that things are in a precarious condition, that our allies are not so strong as they should be, and that our policies are not succeeding.

Somewhere along the line there must be a reconciliation of those diverse views. We cannot have it from the Secretary of State that the world picture is better, that the Russians are in retreat, that they are demonstrating signs of weakness, and then have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff publicly report to the committee in the House that international developments are critical, that we are losing in the cold war, and that our military alliances are not adequate to meet the situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator have the figures indicating how other persons present at that newspaper editor's meeting voted? There were also present Cabinet officers and Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I think it will be found that they voted in the same ratio as the editors did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not have those figures.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Members of the Senate and the House and Cabinet officers were present at that meeting, and they also cast their votes. I think it will be found that the vote was in the same ratio as the vote cast by the newspaper editors.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say most respectfully to my colleague from South Carolina that I shall supplement the RECORD with those figures.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it would be well to put those figures in the RECORD at this point, along with the others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a breakfast meeting of editors attending the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 21, 1956, guests, including members of the Supreme Court, Congress, the Cabinet and the White House staff and

other Government officials, voted 43 to 26 that this country was losing the cold war.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is a matter of the utmost concern and of the highest import that we clearly understand the power which is arrayed against us in the world today. The visit of Mr. Bulganin and Khrushchev to Great Britain is an indication of what we are up against. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the British people, and particularly to the representatives of the British Labor Party who held a reception at which the Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Bulganin, and the Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Khrushchev, were in attendance. It was hoped by the Soviet visitors that they would be able to implement their current political line through what they call the Popular Front, by trying to get closer cooperation between the Communist political forces and the free democratic political forces. This effort was making some headway in Europe on the Continent. There have been overtures made to the Socialists of France, the Socialists of Italy, the Socialists of West Germany, and the Socialists of every other Western European country. There was evidence to indicate that the new look of the Soviet Union was making inroads among some members of the free political parties in Western Europe. But in London the new leader of the British Labor Party, Hugh Gaitskill, posed the question to Mr. Khrushchev as to what the Soviet Union was going to do about 200 Social Democrats who have disappeared in the Eastern European countries in the Soviet bloc.

According to the press reports, it was at that point that Khrushchev "blew his top," and it was at that point that the British character of steadfastness and of courage was demonstrated so completely. Gaitskill did not retreat. The members who were in attendance at that meeting did not try to act as though they had committed a social error. They stood their ground. Khrushchev demonstrated, once and for all, that behind the social smile, behind the cocktail-hour conversation, behind all the various ramifications of the new look, was the constant threat of Soviet oppression, tyranny, and terror.

I should also like to call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony of Prof. Walter Rostow, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as he testified recently before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament in hearings at Cambridge, Mass. In that testimony, which, by the way, was published in the Washington Post last Sunday, and which is available to every Member of the Senate, Professor Restow pointed out that bolstering the effectiveness of the new Soviet line of the happy look, the pleasantries, the smiles, is the continuing presence of Soviet military power.

I remind the Senate that in the Soviet budget of last year there was provided an increase of 12 percent in funds, in new money, for Soviet arms.

Khrushchev has now made it crystal clear that the Soviet Union does possess powerful, frightening weapons, and, what is more, that he is willing to threaten to use them in the appalling event of nuclear war.

I want to say again that those brave men on the British Isles, as in the days of nazism, have stood their ground, and Khrushchev and company have thereby been exposed.

Under these circumstances I hope our Government will press ahead. I hope our Government will cease to say on political occasions that all is well, and to paint a rosy picture. It would be nothing short of national disaster to have the American people believe that the world is more peaceful, simply because the bad men of our times, the villians, have started acting like charitable souls for the moment.

The facade of kindliness has now been exposed. Stalin can be purged, but Khrushchev lives on; and the reports we have received indicate not one single thing to relieve us from our concern, or from our obligation to keep this country strong or from our obligation to recognize that we shall need our allies, or from the necessity of developing NATO into a political and economic community.

Mr. President, just as in the days of the Marshall plan, when congressional participation was an essential element in a bold, new policy, so today, I think, it is essential that Congress participate actively in resolving the issues now confronting us in NATO. I am certain that the present challenge cannot be met without a dramatic, new response. Indeed, we have the words of General Eisenhower's own report to NATO on April 2, 1952, to bolster us in this conclusion:

> The enormity of the present threat will never be met by halfhearted measures. * * * This pattern of events, which points so surely to disaster, can be changed if only the peoples of the West have the wisdom to make a complete break with many things of the past. * * *
>
> Peacetime coalitions throughout history have been weak and notoriously inefficient. * * * Nevertheless, we were expecting NATO members * * * to work and sacrifice together over an indefinite period. * * *
>
> There is power in our union. * * * Visible and within grasp, we have the capability of building such military, economic, and moral strength as the Communist world would never dare to challenge. * * *
>
> Then the Atlantic Community will have proved worthy of its history and its God-given endowments. We shall have proved our union the world's most potent influence toward peace.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself in spirit, word, and deed with that expression by General Eisenhower in 1952.

I call upon President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, the members of both political parties, and the Congress of the United States to implement these words with action.

Is it not time for the executive branch of our Government and for the Congress to take to heart the admonitions given us by General Gruenther, by Lord Ismay, by Chancellor Adenauer, by President Gronchi, by Foreign Minister Pineau, and by others?

Let me say that the speech given on Monday by Mr. Dulles should be regarded as a call for action on the part of our Government at both the executive and legislative levels.

The Congress needs to participate effectively before it is too late. We need to remind the administration of what has been said, and we need to ask for deeds. Our country must exercise the leadership that a great nation is expected to take.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAPEHART in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for the great statement he has just made, and for the very deserved tribute he has paid to the British leaders for their strength of character—typical of Anglo-Saxons in all history—in resisting what in my opinion amounted to blackmail in the form of an economic threat by the Russian leaders in their recent conferences with the British leaders in England.

Let those of us in America never forget that the Russians' design is two-pronged—military and economic. They intend to use both economic and military weapons to reduce all the world, if they can succeed, into a slave state.

The questions which were put to the Russian leaders in the English conference to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred, strip bare, in my judgment, the designs of the Russians. When the English questioners touched upon the matter of slavery behind the Iron Curtain, then Khrushchev, and Bulganin, too, showed their true colors.

Let those of us in the free world remember that behind the Iron Curtain, men and women are not free, but by the millions are held in slave-labor camps.

So far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, in his judgment there can be no peaceful relations with Russia until Russia turns free the millions of slaves in her own country and the satellite countries which she controls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I sincerely believe, Mr. President, that the hour is very late and that unless we are able to strengthen and unify the forces we have, the Soviet Union may very well realize its objective to split us apart and to make NATO ineffective. If that happens, America will literally stand alone, facing a terrible future.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the recent visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin to Great Britain and the remarks attributed to Khrushchev at the meeting with the members of the British Labor Party have again put the free world on notice that the Communist leopard has not changed its spots. I think it was as clear an indication as free men will ever have that in building up the vast power the Soviets have and the vast power which they intend to continue to develop, they will be prepared to use it for the purpose of international extortion, if they cannot gain their objectives in any other manner.

Mr. President, we in this country and the people of the rest of the free world

will stand in great peril if we fail to recognize this basic fact.

It was not very long ago when, before the Supreme Soviet, speeches were made—prior to the downgrading of Stalin—to the effect that if any persons expected that the Russian leaders' smiles meant a change in the basic, long-term strategy of the Soviet Union, such persons would be making a great mistake. That would no more happen, said the spokesmen for the Kremlin hierarchy, than Easter Sunday would fall on a Monday. Mr. President, the last remarks attributed to Mr. Khrushchev enforce the same idea.

Recently there have been some observations to the effect that a Titoist movement in the satellite states would be a helpful development. To the extent that it may be helpful to a prisoner to get out of leg irons, while still being restrained in solitary confinement, that may be true. However, to the enslaved peoples of Poland, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, and Bulgaria, that is small satisfaction. Godless Communist tyranny—whether local or international—is unacceptable to the free spirit of the people in the enslaved satellite states of Eastern Europe.

As a government of free people, Mr. President, we must not put our stamp of approval on either local or international Communist tyranny over the satellite peoples, or consider anything as a substitute for the policy of liberation upon which this administration came into power in 1953. We must not give either our moral or our legal sanction to any agreement which would destroy the hope of the satellite peoples that someday, at some point in the not too distant future, they may again be free and independent.

CRITICISMS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I know of nothing more healthy under a representative form of government than good, constructive criticism. I have always felt, and feel today, that it is the duty of a minority party to criticize the majority party. In this instance I consider it the duty and responsibility of the Democrats to criticize the President of the United States and the Secretary of State if they feel that their criticism is constructive.

For many days I have been sitting here listening to and reading statements which have been made, to the effect that the Secretary of State is too optimistic, and that our country is possibly not so well armed as it might be. I have been listening to much criticism of the President of the United States in respect to national defense.

It seems to me that if there is one man in the United States in whom we ought to have the utmost confidence in respect to national defense, if there is one man in the United States who ought to know what we need and what we do not need in respect to national defense, it is President Eisenhower. If President Eisenhower does not know what the situation is, and is not capable, as President, of handling our national defense, I do not know where we could go to get a man with experience enough to do it.

I do not believe anyone has ever accused President Eisenhower of being disloyal in respect to national defense. I am a little confused as to just what the critics are talking about. In our President we have possibly the most experienced military man in the world. He ought to know what is needed. No potential enemy ought to be able to fool Mr. Eisenhower. He has had forty-odd years' military experience, and the experience of being the head of the greatest, most potent army in the world. Yet we hear much criticism to the effect that he does not know what he is doing, that evidently he has not had any experience, that he is letting down, that somehow, somewhere, in some concealed way, something has happened, so that he no longer knows anything about the military situation; no longer does he know what the Nation needs in order to defend and protect itself and the American people.

I should like to know whom we could elect who would be any better qualified from the standpoint of national defense. I do not believe that the gentlemen about whom I have been reading in the newspapers, and who wish to head the Democratic ticket, are better qualified. I know of no military experience that they have had. Perhaps they have had such experience, but I have not read about it. I do not believe that they know very much about the military situation, and what might be needed or what might not be needed. So I do not quite understand the argument from that viewpoint. Perhaps it is legitimate, but I do not quite understand it.

There is a second argument which I have heard frequently. I have just listened to the same argument made by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I refer to the argument that Secretary Dulles, and perhaps President Eisenhower and the administration, are too optimistic. What is meant by that? What are the critics complaining about? Are they complaining because we are not at war somewhere? Is it their idea of maintaining peace and stability in this country and the world that we must be fighting somewhere? Are they disappointed that there is no war in Korea or Formosa or that there is not a great deal of shooting going on? Are they disappointed because the administration has been able to settle by negotiation, not all the problems which confront it, but many of them?

What is it that they are frightened about? What is it that frightens them about optimistic statements to the effect that we do have friends throughout the world, and that our allies are fairly strong, even though, as we all know, there is an admission that there are some bad spots in the world, such as Egypt and Israel.

I presume there always have been such conditions and situations throughout the world, and that there will always be. But what is it that exists today that did not exist a few years ago? Up until 1952, when President Eisenhower became President, the world had been almost continuously at war over a long period of time, except for a few years between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean war.

In order to be optimistic, must we have a great degree of tension? Must there be a great amount of fighting, and many wars? I wish someone would enlighten me.

I am certain that the critics are not getting anywhere with the people of America by this line of talk, to the effect that we are too optimistic. We all know that the Russians have certainly changed their policies. They are tearing down all the statues of their former hero, Dictator Stalin. They are now trying to divest themselves of anything that he ever had anything to do with. Evidently they have failed in their military policy, or they would not be tearing down Joe Stalin.

We hear complaints to the effect that the Russians are now going all over the world talking economics, with big smiles on their faces. I think that is true. I think there is no question that they are traveling around with big smiles on their faces. But why condemn the President of the United States and the Secretary of State because the Russians have seen fit to change their policies, have seen fit to tear down the statues of Stalin, and are now traveling around the world with big smiles on their faces and talking about economics?

Our friends seem to want to blame the President of the United States for that circumstance. I am reminded of the situation which exists sometimes when criminals are brought before a judge. Certain critics undertake to condemn and complain about the judge, rather than about the criminals who are brought before him.

I do not think the President of the United States is responsible for the fact that the Russians are doing certain things. I should say that our policies, as a Nation, have forced them to change their policies, because if their policies were working, if they were accomplishing what they wanted to accomplish, they would not change their position almost overnight and condemn their former leader. If his policies were successful, and if he had achieved that which they wanted, why should they now condemn him? Evidently they feel that he failed.

As we all know, over the years the Russians have been operating under a military policy. My best judgment is that they are still capable of striking militarily. I would not for a minute want to see this Nation drop its guard, because I think they might well strike. But they are now operating in an economic offensive. At least, they tell us that. They are traveling from country to country. I do not gather from the position of the gentlemen who are continually discussing the situation, whether they are happy or disappointed over it. I cannot make up my own mind, after listening to the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] a minute ago, whether he is happy about it or disappointed about it, or whether he thinks it is a good thing or a bad thing. After listening to other Senators I could not

make up my mind, either, as to what their policy is, or as to what they would do about the foreign situation. Would they go to war? Would they have the two gentlemen who are now traveling in England arrested? What would they do? What is their policy? What are they thinking about? I do not understand whether they are happy or disappointed about conditions, or whether they feel that we ought to do something that we are not doing.

I myself am very happy—and I think 167 million Americans are happy, too—that we are not at war today. I am very happy that 167 million Americans believe that we have today in the White House a President who understands better than any other man in America—certainly as well as any other man—although we have other great generals—how to handle a military situation.

If there is some danger, which the American people do not quite understand, but about which some gentlemen seem always to be talking, then I say that the American people are saying, "Thank God we have a President in the White House who is an experienced military man."

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not quite understand it.

Mr. President, I like constructive criticism, and I am not objecting to it. Perhaps the result of what the critics are doing may well be helpful in alerting our people. It may make our people think twice, perhaps, on matters about which they should think twice. I am not objecting to it at all. I am trying to analyze it and to understand it from the viewpoint of what they would recommend, and from the basis of what they are thinking about.

I cannot quite determine whether they are happy or disappointed—or what. I cannot quite understand whether they are disappointed that there is not a war somewhere in the world, or that there is no fighting going on. I cannot quite understand whether they think we ought to declare war or get into a war. I cannot quite understand it.

Mr. President, I repeat that it seems to me as though they are sort of condemning the judge—in this instance the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the administration—instead of the culprits who are being brought before the judge. They do not seem to become angry with what the other fellows—the Russians and the other Communists—are doing, but are always saying that the United States is weak, and that the United States is making mistakes, and that the other fellows are a little better than we are. They are always saying that the others are farther advanced along atomic energy lines, are better in a military way, and that now they are meeting with success in meeting with other nations and discussing economics. According to some of the critics, the other fellows are always better, better, better.

Mr. President, I suggest we start educating American boys and girls and the American people generally that we are pretty good ourselves; that we have done pretty well in 176 years. I believe we have done pretty well in meeting the Communist threat. We have done pretty well in a few wars, much as we dislike wars.

I believe the President and the Secretary of State have done well in 3½ years in helping to stop wars. The fact that there is no war going on anywhere in the world should make us happy. I, for one, am very happy to have an administration in office which settles matters by negotiation. We are remaining strong, Mr. President. I am one who does not like to sell the American military short. I believe we are stronger than any other nation in the world, or any combination of nations. I am proud of that fact.

I am becoming a little tired of listening to people constantly say that the other fellow is better than we are; that he is bigger than we are; that he has more than we have. I do not believe it. I do not believe the American people are such children that we must always scare them. That technique was used for years and years by our New Deal friends. They always had to be frightening the people. There was always, or generally, a war going on somewhere around the corner. There was always a great emergency of one kind or another.

The present administration does not deal in emergencies. It deals in stability. It deals in getting things done by negotiation and in a normal way, not in an emergency way.

I have been in the Senate for 12 years. During the first 9½ years I served under President Roosevelt and President Truman. Then there was one emergency after another. Perhaps some of the opposition now, particularly those who talk about these things, do not feel quite comfortable because there is no emergency somewhere or other. Apparently they cannot understand a situation in which there is not some great emergency somewhere.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. McCARTHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is talking about our opposition. Although I have never been a defender of very many members of the Democratic Party, I believe we should give some credit to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the work he has done in connection with national defense, especially air defense. I know it may come as a surprise to the Senator from Indiana for me to commend the Senator from Missouri, in view of the difficulties I had with him in the Army-McCarthy hearings. However, I think that when we talk about the defense of the country, we should give him some credit for what he has done.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not surprised to hear the Senator from Wisconsin make that statement. I said a moment ago that constructive criticism is good. I think some good will come of all this, because it will alert our people. I do not say that the administration is not subject to criticism or that it has not made some mistakes in some areas. However, where, particularly from a military standpoint, could we get a man of more experience and with greater ability to lead our country than President Eisenhower? We would not know where to go to get him. Certainly I would not know. Honestly, I would not know where to get that kind of individual.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator recall that last week or the first of this week, when the newspaper editors gathered in Washington from all over the United States, the vast majority of whom had supported the Eisenhower administration, they voted 2 to 1 that in their opinion we were losing the cold war?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am aware of that fact. However, I do not believe they were correct. I do not think it is true. I spoke about that a moment ago. I am aware of the fact that they did that, but I still do not believe they were correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will permit me to ask one more question I should appreciate it, because I must leave the Chamber to keep an appointment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator talks a great deal about being scared. It is not a question of being scared. It is a question of being concerned. I believe the Senator will agree with me that at all times we ought to seek to be realistic about the conditions our country may confront.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think I said that in my remarks. I know I said it was a good thing to have constructive criticism. I said it might well alert the administration and the people. I am aware of that fact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the able Senator from Indiana read in the Scripps-Howard newspapers, specifically in the Washington Daily News of Monday, April 23, an editorial entitled "Who's Out of Step?"

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not read it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish I had time to read it. Of course I do not want to impose on the Senator's time to read it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the substance of the editorial that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles and the administration are out of step?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; if the Senator wishes to boil it down to that. What the editorial says in the last paragraph is:

President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State need to get in step with these facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. What are the facts?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The reason why I think the editorial——

Mr. CAPEHART. What are the facts?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator wishes me to read an excerpt from the editorial, I shall be glad to do so. If it is agreeable to him——

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe we should have the facts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it is agreeable to the Senator, I should be glad to place

the entire editorial in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, without the Senator from Indiana losing his right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the editorial to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 23, 1956]

WHO'S OUT OF STEP?

President Eisenhower talks about cold war victories. He insists the new Soviet economic and political challenge in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia is a Kremlin confession of failure of old policies.

But Adlai Stevenson says we are losing the cold war. He insists the administration is bankrupt of ideas in foreign policy and is misleading the public with claims that everything is dandy.

If such a black-and-white difference were widespread, the remarks of these two candidates for the Presidency could be dismissed as campaign oratory. But it is not. Most expressions of informed opinion, unhappily, more nearly agree with the grimmer appraisal of Mr. Stevenson.

Our allies, our own Ambassadors abroad, American correspondents in foreign countries, returning businessmen—these and many others irrespective of political labels, warn daily that the United States has lost the initiative to the Kremlin's traveling clowns. The members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, before whom the President and Mr. Stevenson spoke, thought, by a 2-to-1 vote, that the United States was losing the cold war.

The contrast between the Eisenhower and the Stevenson speeches makes it appropriate to examine the broad picture of foreign policy.

Without agreeing with all the proposals Mr. Stevenson made, we do not hesitate to say—as we have been saying in effect for a long time—that Mr. Stevenson's appraisal of the state of the world makes a lot more sense than President Eisenhower's.

Any cursory study of foreign affairs shows that the Soviet Union has made vast gains in the last year or so.

The Soviets have leapfrogged into the Middle East—fulfilling a 350-year-old czarist-Communist dream. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviets are successfully stirring up trouble all the way from Morocco to Indonesia, embarrassing us with the challenge to our colonial allies. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviet New Look is more and more appealing to neutralists and uncommitted countries. Ceylon and Cambodia have jumped in that direction. Is that a victory for us?

All the time the Soviet dictatorship—collective but still dictating—maintains an economy geared to war products * * * increases its armaments * * * woos friends by buying their surpluses and promising aid * * * prods and subverts * * * challenges even the United States in the scientific, technological and industrial fields. Are those our victories?

The exact score in the cold war may be debatable—and not necessarily important in itself. What is important, however, is the basis of our foreign policy.

If American foreign policy is being conducted upon the belief—as the President says—that the recent successful Soviet actions are the result of past Soviet policies failing, a rude awakening is due.

The time has come for the Eisenhower administration to get out of its complacent mood * * * to throw away its rose-tinted glasses * * * to tell the American people the real facts, however unpleasant * * * to warn the world that the new men and the new policies of the Kremlin are far more subtle and dangerous than the bluster of Uncle Joe.

Stop all this nonsense about the Soviets failing. We are failing.

Enough of patching up old programs and rejuggling old, obsolete policies.

The United States needs new policies to fit the new facts.

President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State need to get in step with these facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the editorial or with the Washington Daily News. I assume one man wrote the editorial, or possibly 2 men, and it is 1 man's opinion or 2 men's opinion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers is a great chain, and it was one of the most ardent supporters of President Eisenhower as candidate Eisenhower, and has been an ardent supporter of his administration.

I wonder if the Senator would permit me to read from the editorial——

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the floor. That great newspaper chain supported the President in his veto of the farm bill, did it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. And the able Senator from Alabama was against the veto.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As was the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator has his opinion and I have mine.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was not citing the editorial for the purpose of saying that we should agree with everything said in it. But this is not the Democratic Party or Democrats in Congress speaking. It comes from proven friends of the Eisenhower administration.

If the Senator will give me time, I should like to read 2 or 3 of the principal statements contained in the editorial:

Any cursory study of foreign affairs shows that the Soviet Union has made vast gains in the last year or so.

The Soviets have leapfrogged into the Middle East—fulfilling a 350-year-old Czarist-Communist dream. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviets are successfully stirring up trouble all the way from Morocco to Indonesia, embarrassing us with the challenge to our colonial allies. Is that a victory for us?

The Soviet new look is more and more appealing to neutralists and uncommitted countries. Ceylon and Cambodia have jumped in that direction. Is that a victory for us?

Let me read only one more paragraph, because this is the heart of the editorial:

All the time the Soviet dictatorship—collective but still dictating—maintains an economy geared to war production, increases its armaments—woos friends by buying their surpluses and promising aid—prods and subverts—challenges even the United States in the scientific, technological, and industrial fields. Are those our victories?

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator advocate that we go to war to stop that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would the Scripps-Howard newspapers advocate, and what would the Senator from Alabama advocate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would advocate that a definite, strong, and pronounced policy so that the whole world would know what it was.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would the Senator do to stop the Soviets from going into the Middle East?

Mr. SPARKMAN. They are going in because we left a vacuum there, and they will move anywhere where there is a vacuum.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where did we leave a vacuum?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the Middle East. We allowed the situation to drift and drift, and then when Russia proposed a plan for the stabilization of the Middle East we accepted, and she was there with her influence—something which she has been wanting for two and a half centuries. We need a strong, definite policy that the whole world can understand and for which we will firmly stand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator put an army there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all; and it would not be necessary to transfer our Marines into that section of the world today had we acted 12 months ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would the Senator have done 12 months ago?

Mr. SPARKMAN. First of all, I think the United States should have adopted a positive policy——

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me go on.

Mr. CAPEHART. Specifically, what would the Senator do?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We should have announced that we were going to stand by the tripartite agreement of 1950 and let all the countries know that we would carry out the terms of that agreement. I think we should have exercised the very best leadership of which we were capable by bringing those nations around the conference table. Twelve months ago we should have brought them together around the conference table and prevented the development of the mess which now exists in the Middle East.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who are the countries which should have been brought to the conference table?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Arab States, on one side, and Israel, on the other.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is being handled at the moment. There is a cease-fire order there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There has been a cease-fire order since 1949, but it has not prevented all the present trouble developing. There was a United Nations armistice in 1949, under which nations involved are supposed to be living today.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator know that we are members of the United Nations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. That is what I am talking about. In spite of that, all these things have happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. Tell me one specific thing which the Senator would have the President do which has not been done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Two things: Twelve months ago we should have announced that we were going to stand by the terms of the tripartite agreement of 1950. Second, the Government should have

done its utmost to get the conflicting sides around the conference table to compose the difficulties.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator know that is the obligation of the United Nations, and that they have been doing that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am talking about the tripartite agreement of 1950, which was between the United States, England, and France, and not within the United Nations.

Mr. CAPEHART. What the Senator is recommending has nothing specific about it. He is condemning the President of the United States because he is said to have violated some law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I am pointing out some of the things which should be done that we do not do.

I appreciate the Senator's kindness in yielding to me. I wish I could remain to discuss the subject further with the Senator, but I must leave the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very, very fond of the Senator from Alabama, as he knows, but he has not given the Senate or the world any concrete suggestion on how to handle the existing situation.

DR. LINCOLN ROY MANSON-HING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, which were, in line 4, strike out all after "act," down through line 6, inclusive, and insert "sections 201 (a) and 202 (b) shall be held not to be applicable in the cases of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, Collin James Manson-Hing, and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing.", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing, Mrs. Joyce Louise Manson-Hing, Collin James Manson-Hing, and Jennifer Lynn Manson-Hing."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 22, 1955, the Senate passed Senate bill 1212, which would exempt the beneficiary from the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act relating to aliens indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. On February 21, 1956, the House of Representatives passed Senate bill 1212 with amendments to include the wife and children of the beneficiary within the exemption.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move, Mr. President, that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate bill 1212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens, which were, on page 6, line 18, strike out "Stavroula," and insert "Stavroula" and on page 8, after line 7, insert:

A–7439286 Alth, Laura (nee Gallegra).
A–6929633 Alth, Aurel Joseph.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on February 3, 1956, the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, approving the granting of suspension of deportation to certain deportable aliens. On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, with amendments to correct an error in printing and to include the names of 2 aliens whose cases were submitted to Congress on January 16, 1956.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an original concurrent resolution deleting an additional name from the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) which was withdrawn by the Attorney General subsequent to action by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and recommended that the concurrent resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens be, and it is hereby, amended by striking out "A–7250943, Tsou, Tang.", as shown on page 8, line 4, of the engrossed concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) was agreed to.

WINSTON BROS. COMPANY AND THE UTAH CONSTRUCTION COMPANY AND THE J. A. TERTELING & SONS, INCORPORATED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1905) for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Company and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Incorporated, which were on page 1, line 5, strike out "Brothers" and insert "Bros."; on page 1, line 7, strike out "and", where it appears the second time, and insert "&"; on page 1, line 7, strike out "Incorporated" and insert "Inc."; on page 2, line 16, after "act", insert "in excess of 10 percent thereof", and to amend the title so as to read :"An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Company and the Utah Construction Company and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 28, 1955, S. 1905, for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc., passed the Senate.

On March 6, 1956, the House of Representatives passed the bill with certain perfecting amendments to the names of the claimants, and a provision for the payment of attorneys' fees not to exceed 10 percent of the claim.

Examination discloses that actual services were rendered by the attorneys in handling this claim before the court of claims.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1905.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

BRIGITTA POBERETSKI

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1255) for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski, which were, after line 7, insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nickolas Menis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio N. Panopoulos, citizens of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski and Nickolas Menis."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on July 30, 1955, the Senate passed S. 1255, to provide for the admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant, a minor child to be adopted by United States citizens. On April 9, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1255, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar individual Senate bill.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes, but merely group 2 cases into 1 bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1255.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

SHIH MING WANG

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 31) for the relief of Shih Ming Wang, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Shih Ming Wang, Chih Shing Hwa, Erich Anton Helfert, Eugene Alexander Figueirdo, Rose Hu Chen, Felisa Ho (nee Chang-Kuon), Balbino Acusin Ariasa, and Adel Kamal, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kathleen Schrater shall be held and considered to have been

lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, the Senate passed S. 31, to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to the beneficiary. On April 9, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 31, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of eight similar individual Senate bills.

Inasmuch as the House amendments make no substantive changes, but merely group several cases into one bill, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

OTTILIE HITZLBERGER LACHELT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 83) for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt and Maria Michela Federico may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorin Ursulesku Baron may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act, and the said Dorin Ursulesku Baron shall be classified as a nonquota alien under the provision of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of three aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, the Senate passed S. 83, to waive the grounds of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On April 9, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 83, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of two individual Senate bills. One case included in S. 83 passed the Senate to grant permanent residence, but has been amended to grant a waiver of the excludable grounds and provide for the beneficiary's readmission as a returning resident alien, inasmuch as recent information is to the effect that this beneficiary departed from the United States.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 83.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3996) to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed H. R. 3996, a bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, with an amendment. The House has disagreed to the Senate amendment and has requested a conference.

I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. WELKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION UPON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS TO ADJUDICATE CERTAIN CLAIMS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5862) to confer jurisdiction upon United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 29, 1956, the Senate passed H. R. 5862, a bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The House disagreed to the Senate amendment and has requested a conference.

I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. NEELY, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

SOVIET ADVANCES IN THE GUIDED-MISSILE FIELD

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the day before yesterday Nikita Khrushchev announced that the Communists will very soon have a hydrogen-bomb guided missile "which can hit any point in the world." I, for one, do not believe this was braggadocio on the part of Khrushchev. Our own intelligence sources have been reporting, for a number of months, that the Soviet Union has made startling advances in the guided-missile field.

Last October, in Boston, I warned that the Soviets had nearly perfected the middle-range ballistic missile, which could be launched by submarine or aircraft far outside of effective radar-detection range. I also said that the United States was lagging far behind in the guided-missile race; and that unless this situation were corrected, the United States would soon be at the mercy of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev's statement about a long-range missile "which can hit any point in the world" indicates that the danger is even graver than I had supposed. It is about time, Mr. President, that we wake up to the fact that a nation determined to destroy or enslave us may, within a matter of months, have the means to do so.

What are we doing about it? Despite all the warnings about Communist guided-missile developments, we have still received no assurance from our own Government that the United States is going all out in an effort to catch up with the Soviet Union. On the contrary, we know that the chief proponent of a "crash" guided-missile program, Mr. Trevor Gardner, lost his job 2 months ago because he advocated that we go all out in the program. Mr. Gardner wanted the United States to spend an additional $200 million in order to accelerate our program; but he was overruled by his superiors, and shortly thereafter, resigned. Recently Mr. Eger Murphree was appointed as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Guided Missiles. Mr. Murphree has made a number of statements about giving the guided-missile program top priority. But this phrase—"top priority"—is bureaucratic gobbledegook, and really does not tell us a thing. At the very most, "top priority" may mean that we are giving guided missiles more attention than any other weapon. However, it does not mean that we are putting the program on an all-out "crash" basis such as was employed in the Manhattan project for the atom bomb. And since neither Mr. Murphree, nor his superiors, have said that the program is on a "crash" basis, we can only conclude that we are going somewhat less than all out.

It is conceivable, of course, that the Executive has recently put the guided-missile program on a "crash" basis and has not told us about it. I sincerely hope this is the case. But the life or death of our country is in the balance, Mr. President; we cannot afford to stake our country's life on a mere hope that the executive branch is doing what must be done to save it. Congress must know the facts. If the facts reveal that the guided-missile program is moving at a snail's pace—which I have strong reason to suspect—then Congress must move in, and order the program to be put on a "crash" basis. This is our duty. The Constitution of the United States explicitly directs the Congress "to provide for the common defense." This is a responsibility from which Congress cannot abdicate. We Senators cannot discharge our obligation to protect our country by getting up every so often and making a speech on the subject.

Therefore, Mr. President, I suggest that we set up a special joint congressional committee, with full subpena powers, to investigate the guided-missile

program, and to keep a vigilant eye on its progress. If the committee finds that the program is not on an all-out basis, then it must go into the further question of why it is not on an all-out basis. If we are falling behind the Soviet Union in the development of a weapon that may permit communism to conquer us, then we must find out who is responsible and what has motivated those who are responsible.

And, Mr. President, we must find out whether it is a question of Mr. Alger Hiss' being still in the Government or merely incompetence. If executive officials refuse to cooperate with the committee, then the Congress should, by joint resolution, direct the Executive to give Congress the information it needs to provide for the common defense.

Should this special committee be satisfied that we have already adopted a crash program, then its function would be to watch the program's progress in the future, and to see to it that we continue at full steam ahead.

This investigation must be intensive and exhaustive—and conducted with all possible haste because of the immediacy of the Communist threat. I propose a special committee because I believe that existing committees have neither time nor the resources to do a thorough job.

I realize, of course, that this subject is highly sensitive. Therefore, it would be necessary for all of its staff members to have "Q" security clearance. While the committee could not report all of the details of the program publicly to the Congress, it could tell Congress, in a general way, how fast we are moving and whether we could move faster still.

Now, Mr. President, let me move on to another aspect of this guided missile situation. Only 2 days before Khrushchev announced that the Soviet Union had nearly perfected a hydrogen bomb guided missile, Adlai Stevenson solemnly proposed that the United States stop its hydrogen bomb tests. Stevenson also urged that we stop concentrating on multiplying and enlarging our arsenal of unconventional weapons.

I hope, Mr. President, that my Democrat friends—for many of whom I have great respect—on the other side of the aisle will not take what I am about to say as evidence of partisanship. I assure them no one believes more strongly than I that the defense of our country must be put above politics. But I cannot, and I will not, blind my eyes and close my ears to the fact that the titular leader of the Democrat Party proposed that the United States call a halt to testing and improving its own weapons—when he knew, as he must have known, that the Communists have nearly perfected a weapon that would blow us off the face of the earth. I ask my Democrat friends to consider what it would mean if Adlai Stevenson were elected President. May I say that I do not say this in a partisan sense. I realize that the millions of American Democrats love their country just as much and hate communism just as much as do the Republicans. But has not Mr. Stevenson told us that we must expect from him an attempt to emasculate our Military Establishment?

Khrushchev said that the Russians had dropped a hydrogen bomb from an airplane. This is a test which the United States has never made. Yet, Adlai Stevenson tells us that we should stop all further tests—an inconceivable statement, Mr. President, made only 2 days ago. On this one point alone it is frighteningly clear that a Stevenson administration would leave us at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

I know that a number of my Democratic friends on the other side of the aisle—such as the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Washington—have been vigorous proponents of increasing our military strength. I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that they will see fit to repudiate Mr. Stevenson's views, to repudiate Mr. Stevenson as their party leader, and to repudiate Mr. Stevenson's presidential candidacy.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that both political parties will nominate presidential candidates who are determined that America's military strength shall be second to none. Adlai Stevenson, on this score, and on a hundred others I can think of, is clearly disqualified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a two and one-half page statement which I now send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

In this connection, let me tell the Senators about some amazing testimony heard this morning by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. The committee, as you know, is investigating the scandalous case of the Soviet seamen who were apparently forcibly deported from the United States by Soviet agents. I assure the Senate that I shall have more to say in the future on this outrageous violation of American sovereignty. One of the committee's witnesses was a Colonel Rudolph, a Russian expatriate, who came to this country in 1951. Colonel Rudolph had been an officer in the Soviet military occupation forces in Germany prior to his escape to the United States. Colonel Rudolph revealed that at the end of the war the American Army took over a German guided missile installation with a large stockpile of German V1 and V2 missiles. Colonel Rudolph revealed that the Communists, under the occupational agreement, were allowed to take over the territory in which this missile installation was located. When the Soviets arrived they found that the United States forces had left the entire installation intact including the stockpile of guided missiles. We had known, of course, that the Soviets had found a number of guided missile installations in the areas taken over by the Red army, and these installations had been used for research and development of the Communist guided missile program. But now we learn that one of these very important missile installations was originally taken over by the United States, and that the United States handed it over intact to the Soviet Union. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that we are now lagging behind the Soviets in guided missile development when we deliberately gave them the benefit of German experience and research? I might add that Colonel Rudolph also testified that in the reverse situation—where the Americans took over areas under the occupation agreement which had been originally occupied by the Russians—that the Communists, before we got there, took away everything of any importance.

Colonel Rudolph also testified that a Mr. Grunther, who had been a leading figure in the development of the German guided missile was originally in American custody after the war, but that Soviet agents eventually took him behind the Iron Curtain. The head of the Russian Secret Police had given orders to his agents to bring this man to Russia, and American authorities did nothing to prevent this from happening. Mr. Grunther thereafter, according to Colonel Rudolph, played a major role in developing the Russian jet MIG fighter. I just bring these facts to the Senators' attention in order to show that the present Soviet threat in the guided missile field stems in large part from the criminal negligence of American authorities after the Second World War.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce to the Members of the Senate that tomorrow, assuming the Senate has completed action on the pending bill, it is our intention to consider the following measures:

Order No. 1784, Senate Resolution 240, certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Mary Knowles;

Order No. 1785, Senate Resolution 241, certifying the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning Herman Liveright;

Order No. 1798, H. R. 6162, to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii;

Order No. 1811, H. R. 1774, to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1814, H. R. 9078, to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 2,500 officers and members;

Order No. 1815, H. R. 7993, to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1817, S. 3295, to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia;

Order No. 1818, S. 2705, to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE., in the District of Columbia;

Order No. 1819, H. R. 8334, to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic Games;

Order No. 1820, H. R. 8942, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1821, H. R. 8959, to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to

be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1822, S. 2202, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users Association, with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley Division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1823, S. 2206, to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project;

Order No. 1842, H. R. 6573, to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States;

Order No. 1843, H. R. 6703, to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska;

Order No. 1844, H. R. 7186, to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry;

Order No. 1845, H. R. 7513, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blockard, within which to apply for a patent to certain lands in Alaska;

Order No. 1846, S. 3498, to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes;

Order No. 1853, S. 497, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; and

Order No. 1854, H. R. 7678, an act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I should like also to announce that on next Monday, at the conclusion of the morning hour, there will be a call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, beginning at the point where we left off at the last call of the calendar.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is designated "4–23–56–B."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert the following: "(1) to shares of any company lawfully acquired and owned by a bank holding company or by any of its subsidiaries prior to the date of enactment of this act."

It is proposed to redesignate subsection 4 (c) (1) as 4 (c) (2) and the following subsections accordingly.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am 100 percent in accord with the purpose of the pending bill. Two or three years ago, at the request of the Independent Bankers Association, I introduced a bill on this subject; and I would do so again, because I feel that this question should be handled by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and that it should be finally determined by Congress which had it under consideration for many years.

As I understand, the purpose of the bill, or at least what I am trying to do, or would like to be a party to doing, is to make certain that a bank holding company cannot lawfully do something that a bank cannot do. I think that is what the small bankers of America desire, and that it is a desirable objective. I never could see any particular reason why a bank holding company should be permitted to do something which a bank could not do.

I think the proposed legislation would accomplish the purpose which I have stated, under certain rules and regulations and within certain limits. I am sure that the author of the bill, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], will agree with me that that was his purpose in introducing the measure, and working so hard to get it through the Congress. The purpose is to make certain that bank holding companies have no advantage over banks, or vice versa.

I believe there are 42 bank holding companies which own 2 or more banks, and 147 bank holding companies which own no more than 1 bank. Over many years bank holding companies have legally acquired what are called nonbanking assets, meaning that they have bought 100 percent ownership in a manufacturing business, a wholesale business, a retail business, an agricultural business, or any one of a thousand and one different lines of businesses. Or they may have purchased a stock interest in such businesses.

The bill we are considering would require bank holding companies either to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets or their banking assets. The bill would say to them, "You can be either a bank holding company under the new rules and regulations, as spelled out in the bill, or you must be a bank holding company owning nonbanking assets."

Such assets have been acquired legally over many years. Earlier in the day I listened to the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] discuss a bank holding company in Florida. He offered an amendment, which was adopted by a vote of the Senate, to exempt that bank holding company from the terms of the bill we are considering. One of his arguments was that that particular bank holding company had been conducted in the same manner for 25 years. Many bank holding companies involved in this discussion have been buying nonbanking assets for much more than 25 years.

The bill would exempt many bank holding institutions from the necessity of divesting themselves of nonbanking assets. For example, labor organizations are exempted. Churches are exempted. Certain types of trusts are exempted. The biggest exemption of all—and I wish Senators would pay particularly close attention to this—lies in the fact that a holding company which has 1 bank is 100 percent exempt from the requirement that it get rid of its nonbanking assets.

There might be a situation in which a bank holding company might own one bank with $1 billion in assets. It would be big enough to buy and own a great many nonbanking assets. It would be exempt under the terms of the bill. But if a bank holding company should be so unfortunate as to own 2 or 3 small banks, with perhaps only $1 million of assets in each, it would have to divest itself of its nonbanking assets.

In my opinion, there are in the bill many unfair features having to do with the divestment of assets. My amendment would do for all the bank holding companies exactly what the three amendments which have already been approved by the Senate by a vote would do for three companies. I voted for those amendments, because I think those companies should retain their nonbanking assets. One of the companies is in Florida, 1 in Georgia, and 1 in Kentucky. This body has already voted that they shall be permitted to retain their nonbanking assets. Yet I know Senators who, at least up to this time, have frowned upon the idea of letting the other forty-odd bank holding companies retain their assets.

Under the terms of the amendment which I have offered, Congress would permit such companies to retain their nonbanking assets. In addition, we would say to them, "But neither the bank holding company nor any of its banks may lend any money to the nonbanking subsidiaries." That would mean that some other bank would have to lend money if they were to borrow money, or if they needed additional capital.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Under the terms of my amendment Congress would say that the subsidiaries of nonbanking asset companies may not acquire any other company; they may

not merge with any other company; they may not use any one of the subsidiary nonbanking asset companies to start a new holding company. All they may do is to continue to own them. They may not lend any money to them. They may not use them to start a new holding company. The separate individual companies may not acquire another company. They may not merge with another company.

I do not understand how any bank in the country could possibly be harmed, or possibly be opposed to what I am trying to do. Perhaps they could be, but as a businessman I cannot see any reason for such a position.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana a question. As I understand, there were extended hearings on the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Did the Senator's amendment come before the committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. It did.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What was the position taken by the independent bankers of the Nation?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know that the independent bankers ever testified on this particular subject. I believe I know what the independent bankers want; and I am for it. They want to prevent bank holding companies from expanding, and they want to bring bank holding companies within the same law and under the same rules and regulations under which the independent bankers must live. In all fairness and honesty, I presume they might take the position that if such bank holding companies were permitted to retain their nonbanking asset companies, that would make them a little stronger, because it is a fact that the bank holding company would receive any dividends which might be declared.

On the other hand, this is what would happen. If the bill as written should become law, the holding companies would dispose of their nonbanking assets and another group would acquire them. Either that, or they would siphon them off and give them to their present stockholders. The nonbanking asset companies would not be eliminated. They would not go out of business. They would stay in business. Some bank would handle their banking affairs. Under the bill it will not be the bank holding companies that will own them; and an independent bank somewhere will lend them money.

I cannot make up my mind that we should do for a few what we would not do for all. I cannot quite understand that sort of legislation.

The argument is made that we will freeze the bank holding companies if they do not want to dispose of their nonbanking assets. Of course, that is true. However, under the proposed legislation we are pretty much freezing the banking system of America, in order to get at the evil which has developed and to which the small banks object—and I think rightfully so. In other words, we will be freezing the American banking system. We will practically freeze the banking business and deny any new banks the opportunity of entering the field and competing with the established banks.

I believe the Senate ought to know that before it votes on the bill. It ought to know that it will be freezing the situation.

I suppose I could talk for some time on this amendment, but I do not know that I could cover the ground any better than I already have done. The question involved is very simple. It is whether we wish to treat all the way we are now treating a few. I wish someone would tell me, without becoming emotionally upset, in what way a small banker or independent banker will gain anything by our not permitting bank holding companies to retain their holding if they cannot lend them any money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. With the hope that the distinguished Senator from Indiana will not become emotionally upset, may I ask him why it was that in the 83d Congress he introduced a bank holding company bill which required divestment, and in the 1st session of the 84th Congress he also introduced a bill which required divestment, and why he now insists that divestment is a very bad thing?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I said a moment ago that I introduced proposed legislation when I was chairman of the committee. I did so by request, because I felt the independent bankers were entitled to bring the matter before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that they were entitled to have it brought before Congress. So I introduced it. I said a moment ago that I would do so again. However, I was never in favor of the provision which required the bank holding companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets. I see nothing inconsistent in what I have done. I would do it again. I believe it is the duty and responsibility of chairmen of committees, when an organization or a group so requests, to introduce proposed legislation, so that people may be heard. I would do it for any group in the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia was under the impression that last year the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CAPEHART. He was chairman of the committee. However, when the proposed legislation was originally introduced, I was chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But the Senator from Indiana introduced it again last year.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. I did bring it before the committee. I make no apologies for it. I would do it again. I would do it for any organization that is honest and sincere, as are the Independent Bankers of America, in trying to correct what they think is wrong. I believe it is the duty of Senators to do that. That is one of the cardinal principles of our American system of government; namely, the right of the people to petition Congress for a hearing.

However, I should like to have someone tell me wherein a single independent banker would in any way be hurt by permitting the bank holding companies to retain their nonbanking assets as long as they, the holding companies, could not lend them any money, and so long as they could not acquire other companies or merge with other companies. I should like someone to tell me how they could possibly be hurt.

Why should anyone be opposed to my amendment, particularly when the Senate has already broken the line in three different instances by a vote on the floor of the Senate? Are we to say that a concern in Florida, a concern in Georgia, or a concern in Kentucky is different from a concern in Minneapolis or in Milwaukee or in New York or in California?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana to look at the list of bank holding companies on his desk, then to look at the map of the United States, and then to ask himself the question: How many bank holding companies will be affected by the proposed legislation south of the Mason-Dixon line?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have a list of 173 bank holding companies. I read that the list shows 163 bank holding companies which would be covered by the "one-bank" definition. It says that the companies marked in red are the 47 companies that would be covered by the "two-bank" definition. The 116 unmarked companies would not be covered by the "two-bank" definition.

I find listed Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, and California. The Senator is inquiring about the South. There are listed Florida and Georgia. Minnesota has many of them. I find Tennessee and Missouri. Missouri has a number of bank holding companies. Kansas, Montana. New Hampshire has a number of them. New Jersey, New York, North Carolina. North Carolina has a number of them. North Dakota has a number of them. Ohio has a number of them. Oklahoma.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the bank holding companies the Senator has named south of the Mason and Dixon line are one-bank holding companies, not two-bank holding companies?

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that is generally true. I believe it is generally true that those in the South are one-bank holding companies.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator satisfied himself that it is true, generally speaking, that the bill in its present form would not be effective south of the Mason and Dixon line as to existing bank holding companies?

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean that it would not be effective?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; because south of the Mason-Dixon line they are practically all one-bank holding companies. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would say that with the three exceptions we have made, covering the situations in Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky, the bank holding companies in the South are one-bank holding companies.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator know of any other two-bank holding companies south of the Mason and Dixon line?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know of any others.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I believe the Senator will find that there are 6 such companies in Texas that will be affected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean that those companies own two banks or more?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not know that I have anything further to say at the moment concerning the amendment. I wish more Senators were present so that more of them might understand the significance and the consequences of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana withhold his suggestion?

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have very little to say. I have only 1 or 2 observations concerning the amendment. I do not think those of us who oppose it are opposing it because we think any specific injury would be done by the holding of nonbanking assets by any particular bank holding company. Roughly 20 years ago, the idea of the combination of banking activity with nonbanking activity was considered to be unsound. I think the late Senator Glass was one of the original sponsors of a bill intended to divorce nonbanking activities and banking activities of banks. It arose initially out of the difficulties which occurred in the 1920's with the combination of investment companies and banks and the abuses growing out of those relationships.

I am making no allegation, Mr. President. I do not oppose the amendment of the Senator from Indiana on any such ground. I oppose it on the very broad ground that the banking function is a very special one. Banking is not an ordinary business. It involves a fiduciary relationship between a bank and its depositors. Banks handle large amounts of money belonging to individual citizens, and we tried to protect their interests by the establishment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I think that Corporation has done a very fine job, and there has been created a great deal of confidence in our banks. I am glad to say that that confidence still prevails and that no one is worried about our banking system. It involves the very simple proposition that banks should not engage in nonbanking activities.

It is no secret that the company specifically involved is the Transamerica Co. Our purpose is not to criticize the way in which the company conducts its business. The principle of divestiture came up long before Transamerica was the outstanding holding company which had nonbanking assets. Its great nonbanking assets, of course, are pretty well known. The most outstanding one is the Occidental Insurance Co. It is an activity around which there is especial concern because of the trust relationship which exists between the company and the policyholders. Both banks and insurance companies have the respect and the support of every Member of this body, I think. No one wants to injure either insurance companies as an industry or this particular insurance company. That is not the point at all. We are standing on the very broad principle that year in and year out it is better policy not to mix nonbanking activities with banking activities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have been listening to the Senator from Indiana for 2 or 3 days, and I wish to make just one point.

I do not think anyone opposing the Senator's amendment has any thought of alleging that these companies are doing anything wrong. I do not think we should always be considered as passing punitive legislation. We are simply trying to pass a bill the principle of which has been before this body for 20 years, but, for one reason or another, such legislation has not been enacted.

Mr. President, it is not a matter of great importance in my State. There is not a single company that I know of which would be affected one way or the other, nor do I know of anyone who is even intending to form such a company. So it is not a matter which affects me as a representative of Arkansas. But I have been impressed by the arguments made with regard to the separation of the banking function from the nonbanking function.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think anyone could quarrel with the statement which the able Senator from Arkansas has made. At least, I do not quarrel with it.

But the problem involved here is that we do not do what he describes. He said a principle was adopted years ago that banks ought to stick to banking, and that nonbanking assets ought to——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from Indiana for a question. I do not yield to him for another speech. He may make another speech if he wishes to do so in his own time; but I have only a few minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is going to have longer than that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have not been speaking more than 5 minutes. If the Senator wishes to have me yield for a question, I will yield for that purpose. In his time he can express his own views as to what the bill will do.

Because it is not absolute and does not actually divest every single nonbanking asset from every bank, the bill is still not contradictory of or inconsistent with what I am saying with respect to one of its major purposes.

The Senator from Indiana well knows, as does everyone else, that the principal objector to or the principal opponent of the bill is the president of the Transamerica Corp. He is perfectly within his rights to object to it. Transamerica is the largest bank, and it will be affected more, I suppose, than any other bank.

The subcommittee, under the leadership of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], has gone as far as anyone could go to make the bill easy on Transamerica. Special tax provisions have been made, and everything possible has been done to enable the making of divestiture payments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to remind my distinguished chairman that of all the bank holding companies affected by the bill and required to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets or banking assets, only one has raised this issue, namely, Transamerica. It is the only one which has "kicked" from start to finish about doing anything at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the contribution made by the Senator from Virginia. The only other thought I wish to leave with the Senate is that some action should be taken on the bill. The Senator from Virginia has already related, in more detail than I shall, the history of the proposed legislation. But since the bill has been under consideration, there has been a headlong rush by some of the holding companies, particularly Transamerica Corporation, to purchase more banks.

Since November of last year, Transamerica Corp. has acquired 11 banks in 6 States. In 5 of those States, Transamerica never before owned any bank. The list of new bank acquisitions is an impressive one. I should like to have the RECORD show the names of the banks which Transamerica has purchased in that period, in anticipation, apparently, of some kind of restrictive legislation being enacted.

They are as follows:

1. Southern Arizona Bank & Trust Co.
2. The Bank of New Mexico.
3. The First National Bank of Caldwell, Idaho.
4. The Continental State Bank of Boise, Idaho.
5. The Bank of Eastern Idaho at Idaho Falls.
6. The Walker Bank & Trust Company of Salt Lake City, Utah.
7. The Sandy City Bank of Sandy, Utah.
8. The Cache Valley Banking Company of Logan, Utah.
9. The Montana Bank of Great Falls, Mont.

10. The First National Bank of Casper, Wyo.
11. The First National Bank of Riverton, Wyo.

These 11 banks have total deposits of over $315 million, and this brings the total deposits of all Transamerica-owned banks to over $2½ billion. It must be remembered that all of these banks were acquired without the necessity of receiving approval by any governmental agency—neither Federal or State. For future acquisitions, the bill requires the approval of Federal agencies.

Transamerica is the most outstanding example, but is not alone among the bank holding companies in the desire to obtain as many banks as possible before the pending bill is enacted.

The First Bank Stock Corp., of Minneapolis, Minn., acquired 6 banks in Minnesota and Wisconsin, with total deposits of $110 million, during February of this year. The First Security Corp., of Salt Lake City, Utah, acquired the Commercial Bank of Utah, with $18 million in deposits, in January, and, in March, the Marine Midland Corp., of New York, acquired the First National Bank, of Herkimer, N. Y., with $9 million in deposits.

The examples I have given should make abundantly clear to every Member of this body the necessity for prompt enactment of the proposed legislation. Every moment we delay we are aiding the growth of potential banking monopolies.

The point I wish to make is that I hope we can come to a decision. I can survive whichever way the bill goes. I think it is a good bill and ought to be passed. It is a step in the right direction.

If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana should be adopted I think that would destroy one of the principal reasons for the bill, namely, that it is a step toward the separation of nonbanking assets from banking assets. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and will proceed to pass the bill, so that we can get on with the business of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the amendment of the Senator from Indiana should, by some mischance, be adopted, would there be a freeze of investments? Could not the nonbanking subsidiaries owned by the holding companies expand their activities in one form or another? Instead of keeping things in status quo, would they not be provided with an opportunity for the growth of the industrial subsidiaries of the bank holding companies?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understand the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, it certainly would not freeze the activities of the subsidiary nonbank assets of the holding companies. In fact, if it had that effect, I feel certain those companies would not like it. They do not want those assets frozen.

Certainly it would not be desirable to freeze the Occidental Life Insurance Co. to what it may have now; to do so would ruin the company. It has to go on and expand. It is a fine company. I know it will carry on. I think the Senator is quite right when he suggests that there will not be a freeze in that sense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not one of the great abuses in banking in the 1920's the fact that banks and trust companies were frequently also issuing houses, and that they loaded off upon their customers, and upon the estates which they handled, funds of which they were really the trustees, and put these funds into securities which they were sponsoring?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not this confusion of function between business activity and banking one of the things we should guard against?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct. While I was not here then, it is my impression that the initial proposal was the outgrowth of the same condition which led to the separation of investment banks from commercial banks, and the breakdown of the holding companies in the utility field.

The bill is simply one aspect of the attempt to separate big banks from nonbanking activities which are so closely held by the same hands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even though Transamerica may now follow a policy of not making loans to its own subsidiaries, is there anything which would prohibit it from doing so? Would not the subsidiaries under their direction always offer the temptation of taking their depositors' money to support the bank's enterprises, even though that might not be sound procedure?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to make it clear that I do not allege, and I do not think anyone else has ever alleged in my hearing, that Transamerica or any other bank is presently doing anything wrong.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois has made that clear.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it is true that in an emergency, sometime, when it may be difficult to get money, or when times may be hard, it would be a great temptation, if a bank could not get money anywhere else, to get it from its own banks.

At present, conditions are good, although we do not know what will happen. Nevertheless, the principle of the proposed law may be justified on the assumption that it is in times of great hardship, when money is scarce, that people are tempted to do the things which the bill seeks to prevent.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question. I will yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to make a speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. Does not the Senator know that my amendment estops a holding company or any of its banks from lending money to its nonbanking asset subsidiaries? That is what the able Senator from Illinois has just said could not possibly happen under the amendment I am offering. But we want, 100 percent, to divorce nonbanking asset subsidiaries from bank holding companies. That is part of the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We do not want 100 percent divorcement; that is not what the bill does.

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment prevents absolutely the holding company lending any money to the subsidiaries. It also denies a subsidiary the right to acquire another company or to merge with another company, and denies a company the right to have one of its subsidiaries start a new holding company.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I may be permitted to yield the floor if the Senator wishes to explain his own amendment, I shall do so. If he does not wish to ask me questions, I yield the floor. Does he wish to ask me questions?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not particularly care what the Senator does. He can sit down if he cares to. It is perfectly all right with me. All I was trying to do was make certain that the RECORD showed exactly what the amendment did. If I have said something or have done something to which the able Senator from Arkansas objects, I apologize to him, because all in the world I was trying to do was to make certain that the RECORD showed exactly what the effect of the amendment would be.

Now, I desire to repeat what the amendment would do. The amendment would permit a bank holding company to retain its nonbanking assets. It would deny to it, however, and to any banks it controls, the right to lend any money or advance any money its nonbanking subsidiaries. It likewise would deny the subsidiary the right to acquire another business or to merge with another business. Under the terms of the amendment, the holding companies could dispose of or keep their nonbanking assets if they wished to do so.

I agree with the able Senator from Arkansas that many, many years ago Congress adopted the philosophy that banks ought not to engage in outside business. In fact, that is the purpose of the bill, and that is why I am for the bill generally, because what we are trying to do is bring bank holding companies within the same rules and regulations that apply to ordinary banks. But there exists the situation that bank holding companies have acquired nonbanking assets over the years. We have already decided it was good business to exempt three of them.

Let me show my colleagues again how inconsistent we are. We limit the provisions of the bill to a bank holding company which owns two or more banks. But if a holding company owns only one bank, it can own all the nonbanking assets it cares to, which is directly opposed to the position the able Senator from Arkansas took a moment ago, and I agreed with him.

We are being inconsistent. We are saying that if a bank holding company has only one bank, it is perfectly all right for it to own all the nonbanking assets it cares to own. But if a bank holding company owns two or more banks, then it cannot do so.

As I said a moment ago, a bank holding company may have one big bank which is worth $100 million, and it may hold its nonbanking assets. But if a bank holding company happens to own two banks in North Dakota, where banks are smaller, then it would have

to divest itself of any nonbanking assets it may own in any State.

Let me give my colleagues the best example of exemption. I refer to the equity corporation which owns the Morris Plan banks. I am not objecting to it; I am merely calling attention to how inconsistent we are. The Morris Plan banks all over the United States are exempt. They may own as many nonbanking assets as they wish. They are exempted from the terms of the bill. Why do we exempt them? If we stand on the principle that banks ought to be banks and ought not to deal in other matters, why do we say to the Morris Plan banks that they can invest in nonbanking assets? I have no objection to that. I am not complaining about it. I am trying to point out we ought to treat everybody alike and not discriminate against some.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking only theoretically and hypothetically, does the Senator believe that as a result of the exemption of the Morris Plan banks, they could, over the course of years, expand their subsidiary holdings to such a point that they could be as large as Transamerica is today?

Mr. CAPEHART. They could be larger. I refer not only to them, but to every one of the other companies that come under the investment act.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true, therefore, that the underlying principle and policy of the bill at best only postpones to a future day of reckoning the application to others of the principle being applied in the bill to Transamerica?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. Transamerica happens to be the largest of the 146 bank holding companies, but there is hardly a State in the Union which does not have some. My State of Indiana has only 1 holding company, the Riley Company of Chicago, and it has 2 banks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that a few minutes ago he and I had a colloquy as to where the exempted bank holding companies are going to be under the bill, on a geographical, comparative basis. I called the attention of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that, generally speaking, one of the results of the bill, if it should be passed in its present form without certain amendments I shall offer subsequently, would be to discriminate against banking interests in the North as compared to banking interests in the South. There are some exceptions; the Senator from Virginia mentioned a few in Texas, but I am speaking generally.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure Senators from the South are going to vote to exempt all nonbanking interests. In all fairness, I think they should. But I wish to get back again to the question of the Morris Plan banks. I am not complaining about the fact that they are exempted from the provisions of the bill. I am not bringing the question up for that purpose at all, but I am bringing it up to show that there exists this great Morris Plan chain, which operates all over the United States, and which does not come under the proposed legislation at all. Then there are many big corporations which own one bank and which do not come under the bill. That was ably explained by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Nobody quarrels with the fact that bankers ought to be banks, and that businessmen ought to be businessmen. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As I said before, I agree with the analysis of the chairman of our subcommittee that there were two main objectives of the bill, at least so far as the original design was concerned. One was to protect the independent bankers from unfair competition.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I am in favor of that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am, too.

Mr. MORSE. That is why, as a liberal, I find myself in a position where I cannot take my eye off the ultimate objective of bank holding company legislation. There should be bank holding company legislation. I have said that consistently, although I do not like certain discriminatory features of the pending bill, which I shall discuss subsequently, after we dispose of the Senator's amendment.

The second objective of the bill is to give proper protection to the interests of depositors. Bank holding company legislation has been discussed in the Congress for years, because, ever since the Insull fiasco, we have recognized the importance of the Government's performing its duty to see to it that provision for the protection of depositors is written into the law. But taking the second objective—and I think it is a legitimate one, and is an objective the Senator from Virginia has mentioned as 1 of the 2 major objectives of this measure—does the Senator from Indiana wish to contend that the second objective is in any way carried out by exemption of the Morris Plan banks? If we think it is bad public policy and is likely to lead to jeopardizing the best interests of depositors, if certain economic trends develop, is it not true that we should protect the depositors in the Morris Plan banks, as well as the depositors in other banks, from the possibility that subsidiary activities on the part of the banks may result in such bad investments that ultimately the depositors in the banks may suffer thereby?

Mr. CAPEHART. There is no question about that; and if that principle applies to one, it should apply to the others. That is the unfortunate part about this measure. I would not be speaking here today if all bank holding companies were being treated exactly alike by the bill. If that were proposed, I would not be objecting at all to the bill.

When, under my amendment, we deny a bank holding company or any of its banks the right to loan money to any of its nonbanking subsidiaries, we are going rather far, because that would mean that the subsidiary would have to borrow money from an independent bank or at least from another bank. When we say the bank holding company cannot acquire any other company or cannot merge with any other company, we are also going rather far, it seems to me. In that event, we are simply saying to the bank holding companies that, under the provisions of the bill, they will have the right to sell their businesses.

Furthermore, one example which has not yet been called to the attention of the Senate is that under the provision of the bill which directs these companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets, we give the companies the right to sell their nonbanking assets without paying any taxes in connection with the sale. Such a provision is included in the bill. In other words, in that event, the companies can dispose of their nonbanking assets without paying any taxes on them.

My amendment does not in any way affect the Robertson bill as it applies to the rules and regulations governing holding companies. My amendment has to do only with the divesting of the holding companies of their nonbanking holdings or assets. Even if my amendment prevails—as it should—the bank holding companies will still come under the regulations provided by the bill, including those provided by the Douglas amendment, which has been adopted. They will still come under all the provisions of the bill, which does the best it can to make certain that a bank holding company cannot do something a bank itself cannot do—which is what we are trying to provide.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Was the amendment of the Senator from Indiana considered in committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. Oh, yes.

Mr. THYE. Was it voted on in committee?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not sure. I may say that the bill was reported to the Senate last year, at the tail end of the session. We were asked by the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]—and I am not quarreling about it; I wish him to understand that—to report the bill to the Senate; and then, if we found during the interim, when the Congress was not in session, that the bill should be considered further by the committee and should be further amended, that that be done in the committee. We did so; in the committee we even held hearings on the bill after it had been reported to the Senate and was on the calendar. In my opinion, that shows how bad the bill was.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. On the point stated by the Senator from Minnesota, let me say that I know the Senator from Indiana has related his recollection of what occurred.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. But I wish the record to show my recollection of what happened.

Mr. CAPEHART. If I am in error, I wish to be corrected.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the Senator from Indiana is in error, insofar as my recollection is concerned. I think the record will show that last year we agreed we would report the bill to the Senate. The Senator from Indiana will recall that at the time when that vote was taken in the committee, I took the position that apparently a good many amendments were proposed by persons in the industry who should be heard.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; we both did.

Mr. MORSE. But it was understood that the bill would be reported to the Senate, and that the banking institutions involved would be given an opportunity, between the end of that session and the beginning of the next, in January, to study the bill and to submit to the committee their suggestions regarding amendments, and would be given an opportunity to be heard regarding any amendments they might wish to offer. The Senator from Virginia cooperated completely in that connection. That is exactly what we did.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. As to the specific amendment of the Senator from Indiana, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that the Senator from Indiana made very clear, when we had our discussion in the committee, that he would offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. The bill was reported to the Senate with the understanding that further hearings could be held if any persons wished to appear before the committee. And certain persons did wish to appear before the committee; and the committee heard them, and passed upon many amendments which are now a part of the bill; and that was done after the bill had been reported to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. To supplement that statement by the Senator from Indiana, let me say that that included all the tax amendments.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. And we had before us members of the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. In fact, I think the record should show that they wrote the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the original bill, which was reported to the Senate last year, and was placed on the calendar, did not include the tax amendments or the tax features.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Indiana is inadvertently in error on that point. We held additional hearings. Although the Senator from Virginia did not agree that after the bill had been reported, additional hearings would be held, yet there was so much demand for additional hearings, that we did hold them.

The present tax provision is a better one, but it is exactly in line with the spin-off provision in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. CAPEHART. But it goes beyond that. Even if the holding companies sell their nonbanking subsidiaries to outside interests, they will be able to sell them tax free; they will have the benefit of that provision, in addition to the spin-off provision. Is that not correct?

In other words, under the Internal Revenue Code, one can have the advantage of the spin-off provisions, without paying taxes, if he obtains like stock in a new company. But in this case, if the company sold to a third party, it could do so without paying the taxes; is not that correct?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Under the tax provisions, when a bank holding company must divest itself of such nonbanking assets, it can divest itself of all its nonbanking assets; and then, if it distributes the proceeds to the stockholders, it will not be necessary to pay the capital gains tax.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. For future reference, let me say that I think we shall not be through with this piece of legislation after we take action on it today; in other words, it will return to us in the future, at least for amendment.

I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana whether it is true that after the Congress convened last January, we had in the Banking and Currency Committee considerable discussion as to whether we should request that the bill be returned to the committee, although it had been reported and was on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; we had much discussion along that line.

Mr. MORSE. Or whether we should announce on the floor of the Senate that within the committee we would hold additional hearings on proposed amendments to the bill, including amendments regarding the tax-writeoff features. Was it not agreed that we would follow the latter course? I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that such an announcement was made on the floor of the Senate, and the banking industry was notified, and certain representatives of the independent bankers and certain representatives of the exempted companies—including the Kentucky company, the Georgia company, and, I believe, also the Florida company—attended our hearings, a few months ago, and testified. Over a period of 2 or 3 days, as I recall, we held committee hearings at which were present representatives of the Federal Reserve Board, representatives of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and, as I recall, tax experts of that Bureau, plus our own staff members, including the very able assistant who today is sitting on the floor of the Senate—Mr. Rogers.

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me take a moment to pay Mr. Rogers a very much deserved compliment. I have worked with many staff members in my 11½ years in the Senate. This staff member, recognizing the points of view of members of the committee who differed with respect to certain aspects of the bill, has been able to supply us with impartial expert service, giving us the facts as to each particular point of view as they developed within the committee discussions. I think he is entitled to this public acknowledgment of service which upon many occasions has been far beyond the line of duty.

Mr. CAPEHART. I concur 100 percent in the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. Coming back now to a discussion of the sessions of the committee, the tax provisions of the bill were written into the bill by agreement on the part of the committee, since January 1 of this year.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. It was a very unusual situation to have the bill reported to the Senate, and then have the committee hold further hearings and adopt many amendments. It was so agreed by the committee when the bill was reported to the Senate last year. I know that many Senators feel, as I do, that generally it is a good principle to follow the recommendations of the committee. In this instance the committee reported the bill, knowing that there was further work to be done upon it. Although the bill was on the calendar, many hearings were held after the bill was reported, many witnesses were heard, and many committee amendments were adopted.

The result is what I think is a fairly good bill, except that I cannot make up my mind that we ought to treat one company in one way and another company in another way, under equal circumstances. That is what we are doing. We are not helping the independent bankers or the banking system of America by permitting certain companies to continue to own their nonbanking assets if they cannot lend them any money or do any financial business with them. We are not helping the small bankers.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Have the independent bankers expressed themselves with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CAPEHART. They have not expressed themselves to me. I have not heard from a single one of them. I do not quite understand how they could take the position that they would be injured as a result of my amendment, or that it would in any way interfere with them.

Together with the late Senator Maybank of South Carolina, I originally introduced a bill in the Senate at the request of the independent bankers. The entire purpose of the legislation proposed then—as it should be today—to put it very frankly and plainly, was to deny to a bank holding company the right to do that which a bank could not do. Or,

to put it the other way around, the purpose was to place them on an equal basis.

Mr. THYE. Would the bill as it now stands permit a bank holding company to operate differently from an independent banker?

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator referring to the bill we are now considering?

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. There are certain limited aspects in which possibly that might be true, but generally speaking the answer is no. From that standpoint, I think it is a good bill.

Under the terms of my amendment bank holding companies would not be permitted to acquire any new nonbanking assets. They would merely be permitted to retain those which they now own.

The Senate passed upon 3 individual cases within the past 24 hours. I voted for each of those amendments.

Mr. THYE. Then what the Senator proposes in his amendment is to make it possible for a banking corporation to continue to hold other businesses than banking businesses. However, the Senator's amendment would foreclose any others from coming in at a future time and acquiring businesses other than banking businesses.

Mr. CAPEHART. The bill itself would do that. In general, the purpose of the bill is to make certain that a bank holding company cannot lawfully do something that a bank cannot do. The purpose is to try to place them both on a par. Generally speaking, that is the purpose. The bank may not own nonbanking assets. That has been the law for many years; but we found that bank holding companies owned a great many nonbanking assets. The question is what to do with them.

I think the fair thing to do is to say to them, as my amendment would do, "You may keep them, but you may not lend them any money. You may not use them to start any new holding companies. You may not permit them to acquire another company or merge with another company. Or you can sell them." If they decide to sell rather than keep them, they can do so without paying any taxes on the sale. I think we ought to give them that choice.

As I stated a few moments ago, the great Morris system would be exempt. It would be able to do whatever it wished. There are many other exemptions. There are 146 bank holding companies. There are some in practically every State. I think Minnesota has possibly the second largest number of any State in the Union. Almost every State has some.

Mr. THYE. The second largest number of what?

Mr. CAPEHART. Bank holding companies.

Mr. THYE. Unfortunately I have not been present in the Chamber during all of the Senator's explanation of his amendment. The question is, What does the Senator's amendment specifically propose to do?

Mr. CAPEHART. It does not change the law one iota in respect to bank holding companies, except that it provides that any existing bank holding company which has nonbanking assets may retain them if it wishes, but if it does retain them, neither the bank holding company nor any of its individual banks may lend them any money. It may not merge with another company one of the subsidiary companies which it retains, or acquire another company. It may merely operate it and have the ownership of it. It can expand its business, as was stated a moment ago with respect to an insurance company. However, the holding company which owns the insurance company may not lend it any money.

Mr. THYE. However, it need not divest itself of that company. There is no restriction as to the growth of the company. The only restriction is that the parent bank may not lend it any money, but that does not foreclose it from borrowing from another source.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would have to borrow from some independent bank.

Mr. THYE. It could borrow from any other source. It could borrow from an insurance company or a private investor.

Mr. CAPEHART. Anyone could lend it money except the holding company which owned it.

Mr. THYE. Could it float stock and acquire finances through the issuance of stocks and bonds?

Mr. CAPEHART. As an individual corporation, without any help from the holding company, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very much in the same position as my senior colleague. I have not had the privilege of hearing the entire argument of the Senator from Indiana. However, I appreciate the information he has just given us. I want the Senator from Indiana to know that my questions are not directed toward opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a matter of seeking information.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator speaks of permitting all bank holding companies to continue to operate all the nonbanking businesses which they now control. Does the Senator mean that they could expand or enlarge those companies, or increase their investment in such companies through additional resources?

Mr. CAPEHART. The bank holding company which owns them may not lend them any money or increase its investment in any way whatsoever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator's amendment, for example, permit a bank to sell, let us say, $100 million or $200 million worth of stock to the public and allow that money to be invested in one or more nonbanking businesses which it controlled?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator state that question again?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator's amendment permit a bank holding company, through one of its subsidiaries, to issue, let us say, for public sale, $100 million worth of stock and to invest the proceeds of that stock in one or more nonbanking businesses which it controlled?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; it would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That could be done under the Senator's amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; but its bank could not do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the holding company could. Is that correct?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; but it could not lend them any money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With reference to the limitation the Senator's amendment proposes, or the freeze, as the Senator calls it, how would the Senator's amendment prevent a nonbanking business, controlled by a bank holding company, from expanding its operations, as it might do by acquiring control of a subsidiary, or in other ways entering new fields?

Mr. CAPEHART. It could not acquire another business or merge with it. However, I am sure the Senator would not want to deny it the right of doing $2 million worth of business if it were already doing $1 million worth of business. However, it could not merge with another company.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or expand and have several branches or subsidiaries.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would a bank holding company, for example, which owned a large life insurance establishment, which could invest its funds in stocks and bonds to a large extent, have any competitive advantages over a bank that had no such affiliations?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know whether that would be true or not. A bank holding company which held stock, would, of course, receive any dividends the subsidiary paid. I presume to that extent it might have more assets. However, likewise, under the Robertson bill it could dispose of the insurance company the Senator has reference to and take the proceeds, and it could do that without paying taxes; whereupon it could invest the proceeds somewhere else and use the dividends to add to the assets of the corporation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under such an arrangement as I have referred to, by which a bank holding company might own a large insurance company, and at the same time, of course, conduct its regular banking operations, could the bank say to a prospective borrower, in effect, "You cannot get a loan from us unless you insure through our insurance company?" In that way its competitive advantage would be greater.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps it could do it if it wanted to do it. Likewise, any bank in the United States can now say, "We will not lend you money unless you buy insurance from X insurance company."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is that not a little different situation, in the sense that in the instance cited by me the insurance and banking operations are under the same control, whereas in the Senator's example, the insurance company is under different control?

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that is true to some extent. However, the same situation would exist if the Senate should

not adopt my amendment. Under the bill, if it is passed, the insurance company could be siphoned off by the bank holding company and the stockholders would be in exactly the same situation. Therefore, the same situation would exist. However, I do not believe we can guard against every kind of situation like that. It is a quite universal practice for banks to say, "We will make the loan to you if you will take out insurance from X agent."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that under our antitrust laws, some of the large institutions of business, like the old Standard Oil Co., for example, were broken up into separate segments, entirely unrelated so far as economic control is concerned, without great detriment to the business enterprise as such? In other words, they were broken up, but not denied an opportunity to operate economically in the American market. One purpose of the proposed legislation is to sever from banking institutions nonbanking business.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is true, of course. The Senator is pointing out situations that may well come to pass. However, my point is that we would permit the Morris Plan bank to do it and we would permit the three individual companies that we exempted yesterday and today to do it. We are now permitting a bank holding company which has only one bank to continue to own nonbanking assets. There are not too many bank holding companies which own nonbanking assets which own two banks or more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator has studied this subject very closely, and I should therefore like to ask these questions so that the information may be in the RECORD. I should like to ask him, for example, how many bank holding companies engage in nonbanking business to any great extent.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know what the exact number is. I believe it is 163. I do not know that anyone can answer that question. Of course in the Senator's State of Minnesota there is the Otto Bremer Co., of St. Paul. Then there is the First Bank Stock Corp., of Minneapolis. I believe that owns other nonbanking assets. I cannot answer the question of the Senator, I am sorry to say.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have in my hand the annual report for 1955 of Transamerica Corp., which I understand is one of the largest companies in that field.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is the largest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand it is one of the largest bank holding companies in the country.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is the largest; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It shows an investment in nonbanking business of approximately $50 million. Its investments have a net value of $161½ million, as against an investment of $92 million in banks. Does the Senator know of any other bank holding company which owns nonbanking assets to that extent?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I believe that is the largest company. I believe in the Senator's State there may be the second largest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the First Trust, as I understand?

Mr. CAPEHART. The First Trust; yes. However, there are some others that are quite large. Of course a number of them are smaller. The First Bank Stock Corp. is the one I had reference to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then there is the Northwest Bank Corp. of Minneapolis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it has very limited nonbanking business, as I understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. It has nearly a billion dollars in deposits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is in banks, of course.

Mr. CAPEHART. In banks; yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Its nonbanking activities are rather limited, as I understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not have that information. The record does not show its nonbanking businesses. Of course the fewer they are, the less harm my amendment would do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Except to this extent, I may say, that if there were a freeze of nonbanking activities, but a freeze in name only, and it did not prevent a bank holding company which has nonbanking functions or activities to grow and expand, it might very well be that under the Senator's amendment—and I am now think out loud—there would be a mushrooming growth by a very limited number of bank holding companies, which would augment their relative monopoly position in those activities.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should think that the holding companies in the Senator's State and in my State ought to be permitted to do what we have permitted the holding companies in Georgia and Kentucky and Florida to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Can the Senator from Indiana enlighten me as to whether his amendment freezes the investments of a bank holding company in nonbanking businesses?

Mr. CAPEHART. Does it freeze the investment on the part of a bank holding company?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; but it denies any one of its banks the right to lend money to such nonbanking businesses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that. But it does not freeze the investment. In other words, a holding company can expand its investment capital as such, which, in turn, can be utilized for the expansion of nonbanking functions and activities.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the bill, it can siphon them off to the present stockholders of the bank holding company and they can do the same thing. So the same people would be owning both.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator for his information. I felt that these questions were worthy of the comment of the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana is not, I think, in the public interest. For 18 years we have been trying to pass a bank holding company bill. Every bill which has been introduced has required banks to divest themselves of their nonbanking assets. In fact, a bill introduced over a year ago by the eminent Senator from Indiana himself, in which several of us joined, and which is found on page 2 of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, required such divestment. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board have always advocated divestment. The Independent Bankers Association has always urged divestment, and urges it now. The same thing is true of the American Bankers Association.

If one desires to torpedo this bill or make its passage difficult, I would suggest that he vote for the Capehart amendment. But if we really want a bill dealing with one of the central issues involved in the question, I hope the Senate will vote against this amendment by a very decisive margin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wisconsin

[Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 68, as follows:

YEAS—13

Beall	George	Malone
Bender	Goldwater	Russell
Bible	Jenner	Schoeppel
Bricker	Knowland	
Capehart	Kuchel	

NAYS—68

Aiken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Mundt
Barkley	Hennings	Neely
Barrett	Hill	Neuberger
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bush	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kerr	Scott
Curtis	Laird	Smathers
Daniel	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Long	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Magnuson	Symington
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Dworshak	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Wofford
Frear	McNamara	Young
Fulbright	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler	Ives	Sparkman
Chavez	Kefauver	Stennis
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ervin	Mansfield	Wiley

So Mr. CAPEHART's amendment was rejected.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ARMED FORCES OF FREE CHINA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have with us this afternoon, in the diplomatic gallery, a distinguished group of visitors, who are in this country by invitation of the Defense Department and our own Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is a delegation representing all arms of the service—the army, navy, air force, and marines—of the Republic of China, which is now in control of the island of Formosa, and which offshore islands, represents the people of Free China, with whom we have had long and friendly relationships as one of the free nations of Asia. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from California for calling to the attention of the Senate the presence of this group of distinguished visitors. The Chair wishes to assure them that they are most welcome guests.

PROHIBITION OF JOINT SPONSORSHIP OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may submit a resolution and make a brief statement on it, without his losing the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have observed with some regret, as I am sure many other Senators have, the growing practice in the Senate of multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions. It is a practice which has developed in the past few years, and it seems to me to be a very bad one; indeed, in a sense, multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions seems to be assuming the aspects of a vicious practice.

During the entire history of the United States Senate, until very recently, it has been customary for a single Senator to introduce a bill or joint resolution. That is the practice which should have been followed, and, in my judgment, it is the one which should be observed now. The habit of introducing bills and having them lie on the table, in order that Senators may walk down the sawdust trail and attach their names to the bill, seems to me to be undignified in the highest sense of the word.

Furthermore, for a Senator who works out a bill to canvass around among his colleagues to obtain signatures to his bill, in order that it may carry the prestige of many of the Senators and their names, frequently creates a situation in the Senate which is utterly indefensible.

If a Senator is able to peddle his bill around among other Senators, either by mail or in person, until he obtains a majority of the Senate, and they become committed to the bill by joint introduction, of what value is it to have committees? What function can a committee perform, if a majority of the Senators have already committed themselves to a bill before its introduction?

It is embarrassing to Senators to deny to their colleagues sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions they contemplate introducing. I myself have adopted the uniform custom of not joining in the introduction of bills or joint resolutions, no matter how much I might favor them in principle. I have recently received letters from constituents asking why I did not join in a bill which had been jointly sponsored.

We have all seen Senators vote against bills which they had cosponsored. Very recently a very able, distinguished, and honorable Senator, one respected by all of us, cosponsored a measure. Then he was compelled not only to vote against it, but to speak against it in the Senate.

In the House of Representatives there is a rule against multiple sponsorship of bills, and only one Member may introduce a bill. That is a dignified practice. That is a proper way to proceed. Such a rule in the Senate would be the only way to keep Members of the Senate from being embarrassed by requests of colleagues to join in cosponsoring a bill. It seems to me it is the practice which should be followed, although there is no rule prohibiting multiple sponsorship of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a resolution to amend the rule of the Senate so as to provide that only one Senator may introduce a bill or joint resolution, and that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope the Committee on Rules and Administration will give it earnest and prompt consideration, and hope I may be permitted, if necessary, to appear before the committee. [Applause.]

I believe every Senator present, in his heart, would like to see the rule amended, because we have all been embarrassed by importunities on the part of our colleagues. We all have received letters with a copy of a bill about to be introduced. We must either sign the bill, remain silent, or give some reason for not cosponsoring the bill. It is an undignified procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object to receiving the resolution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 250), as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph numbered 1 of Rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding after the word "day", after the end of said paragraph, a semicolon and the following: "and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of two or more Senators"; so that as amended the paragraph will read as follows:

"1. Whenever a bill or joint resolution shall be offered, its introduction shall, if objected to, be postponed for 1 day; and no bill or joint resolution shall be introduced jointly by or on behalf of 2 or more Senators."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in believing that the resolution does not bear multiple sponsorship? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that assumption; and if he does not wish to take my word for it, he can go to the desk and examine the resolution. He will see that it has only one name on it.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to state that action similar to that proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] had been proposed in the committee and had been approved by the committee; and such a resolution is now in process of being drafted. I make that statement for the information of the Senate, and, in particular, for the information of the Senator who submitted the resolution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say that a similar resolution has already been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. GREEN. No, Mr. President; I did not say that. I said such a resolution is under consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and is being drafted or redrafted, or a restatement of it is being drafted, by the staff of the committee.

DEFINITION AND CONTROL OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2577) to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding an amendment which I intend to offer to the bill; it is the so-called one-bank amendment, and is based upon a recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board. The amendment seems to be agreed upon, let me say, by those who have studied the bill generally, as the ideal. However, the amendment is not now in the bill, because—to be perfectly frank about it—some persons feel that as a practical matter it would not be possible to get the amendment through the House of Representatives. Mr. President, I am at a complete loss to understand why we should send to conference a bill less than what we consider to be the ideal.

Mr. President, I shall discuss the amendment only briefly. However, while a number of Members are present, I desire to request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to my amendment. I make that request at this time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "each of two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 2, line 2, strike out "each of two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 2, line 4, strike out "each of two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 3, line 14, strike out "each of two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As I understand, the first amendment of the Senator from Oregon is the so-called one-bank amendment; is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. After that amendment has been rejected, how many additional amendments will the Senator from Oregon have?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I never like to see my good friend, the Senator from Virginia, indulge knowingly, wittingly, and intentionally in false assumptions. Perhaps he can read correctly the minds of the individual Members of the Senate as to how they will vote on the amendment, but I very much doubt it. However, let us wait until debate on the amendment has concluded.

In answer to the question the Senator from Virginia has asked, let me say that I believe I have a total of six amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will there be five amendments following the one now before the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. That is my present expectation, but I may decide to offer one or two more.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The other five are the so-called Belgrano procedural amendments, which he offered; are they?

Mr. MORSE. Some of them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Some of them?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On how many of them does the Senator from Oregon intend to request a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. MORSE. Only on the second one. I am a very accommodating fellow, so I shall request yea-and-nay votes on only my first two amendments, and then Senators can go to dinner.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In other words, a yea-and-nay vote has already been ordered on the so-called one-bank amendment; and it is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon intends to ask that a yea-and-nay vote be had on the first procedural amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I think the yea-and-nay vote on the one-bank amendment will test the sentiment of the Senate and therefore I may decide at a later time to limit my requests for a yea-and-nay vote to just that one amendment.

Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and my other colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee that legislation is needed to regulate bank holding companies. I also realize that efforts over 20 years to obtain such legislation have been in vain because of the disagreement among the proponents as to the terms of the legislation. However, I must state that Senate bill 2577 is deficient, in my opinion, in two important respects:

First. The bill is discriminatory because of exemptions and exceptions. It covers only 42 of the 163 bank holding companies in this country. In fact, I think even that figure must be changed slightly at this time, in view of the fact that certain exceptions have been made by the Senate since I prepared these remarks; I believe the Senate has added three more exemptions or exceptions.

Second. The bill lacks procedural safeguards, and thus it is unfair and unworkable.

I should first like to discuss the discriminatory aspects of the bill, whereby 70 percent of the bank holding companies of the country are entirely exempted from regulation. The discrimination resulted from the failure of the committee to follow the recommendations of the Federal Reserve Board. My first amendment seeks to carry out only the recommendations of the Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve Board recommended that all 163 bank holding companies be covered by the bill, and that there be no specific exemption for any company. However, I must add that the House committee also failed to follow the Board's recommendation. In fact, the House bill is even worse than the Senate bill in this regard, because it covers only 27 companies, as compared to the 42 under the Senate bill.

The fundamental defect of the bill is contained in the section defining a bank holding company. A bank holding company is defined to be any company which owns or controls 25 percent or more of the shares of two or more banks. This definition automatically excludes from the bill 116 companies that own only 1 bank. No logical argument can be presented for not having a one-bank definition; and, in fact, the original bill by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] contained a one-bank definition. This is particularly important because of the divestment provisions of the bill. If it is in the public interest to require companies owning two or more banks to divest their nonbanking investments, then it is equally in the public interest to require companies owning one bank to do the same. The same abuses can occur whether a company has one bank or two banks. Some of the one-bank companies that are exempted have great industrial empires. A few examples are W. R. Grace & Co., with assets of $375 million; Deere & Co., with assets of $430 million; Corn Products Refining Co., with assets of $181 million; and Gimbel Bros., Inc., with assets of $161 million. I could mention many others in this category. The list reads like a Who's Who in American industry. However, Mr. President, I submit that all 116 of these companies should be regulated in the same manner as those covered by the bill.

The exemption of the 116 companies owning 1 bank is an example of what I call exemption by definition. The bill contains many other exemptions by definition. For instance, the Du Pont Trust in Florida is exempted from the bill because it does not fall within the definition of a company. The trust controls 24 banks and many industrial companies in Florida. Yet the Du Pont Trust is exempt from regulation under the bill. The definitions in the bill also fail to include savings and loan association holding companies, personal-finance companies, and chain banks controlled by a single individual.

Equally unjustifiable are the specific exemptions contained in the bill. The most flagrant of these is the exemption for the Equity Corporation of New York on the premise that it is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940. The Equity Corp. is the holding company controlling the Morris Plan Corp. which, in turn, controls 12 banks in 6 States. In addition, the Equity Corp. has vast industrial holdings, including control of the Bell Aircraft Corp., four other industrial corporations, a real-estate company, and an oil company. The effect of the language of the bill is to permit Equity Corp. to retain all of its industrial holdings even though the Morris Plan Corp. would be subject to regulation. There can be no justification for permitting this company to evade the restrictions of the bill.

The bill also provides specific exemptions for educational, charitable, religious associations, partnerships, and labor, agricultural, and horticultural

organizations. I will reiterate the fact that the Federal Reserve Board is opposed to all the discriminatory exemptions I have mentioned.

Let me say, in regard to the Morris Plan Co. and the other exempted companies, that if we let them hold their subsidiary industrial holdings, there will be nothing in the future, under the terms of the bill, to prevent them from expanding and expanding until they become as big as the bank holding company against which this bill is primarily aimed, namely, Transamerica—and I shall have something to say about Transamerica momentarily.

First, let me say that by way of exemptions and exceptions included in this bill we are running away from the problem, and we are running away, in part, from the public policy which we are pretending to the American people today we are seeking to protect.

Let me reiterate that it is alleged that there are two main objectives of the bill. The first is to protect the independent bankers of America from unfair competition. It is alleged that one of the sound public-policy reasons for supporting a bank holding company bill—and I think it is a sound reason—is to see to it that independent banks in this country are not squeezed out of existence as the result of unfair competition on the part of bank holding companies.

Spokesmen for the bank holding companies came to me last year to ascertain my position in regard to bank holding company legislation. As one liberal who, in the Senate, has consistently opposed the trend toward the development of great economic empires on the part of a few great industrial companies, I said that I would support fair bank holding company legislation, and that I would work for the best type of bank holding company legislation I could obtain.

Today liberals—at least this liberal—are placed in a position in which we must make a choice between protecting or not protecting what we think is a sound ideal of good public policy, namely, the protection of the independent bankers and the bank depositors of the country from what we think is always a potential abuse, the development of bank holding companies which invest the depositors' money without the depositors having a voice in the investment in subsidiary industrial organizations, companies, and developments which, in time of economic or financial panic might fall, as the Insull empire fell, to the net economic loss and detriment of the depositors.

Liberals have taken a position over the years against the development of such economic giants in the American economy, and I do not intend to retreat from that sound liberal position. But as a liberal I do not believe in unfair discrimination against banking institutions in this country, of which I submit this bill is notoriously guilty.

All we have to do is to look at the exemptions and exceptions in the bill to see what I mean. In the last analysis, it can be said that the label an anti-Transamerica bill can be pinned on this bill, because, by and large, that is what the bill is. It is a bill primarily aimed at Transamerica.

Today, no abuses on the part of Transamerica in respect to the depositors and the investors have been brought forth in the RECORD, but there is the danger, in my judgment—speaking hypothetically, now—that conditions might change sometime in the future, and this great economic empire, or another bank holding empire, might find itself in a position where, because of our failure to enact, in due course of time, a bank holding company bill, the depositors might suffer.

It has been said to me by representatives of the bank holding companies—and I think there is a great deal of merit in the position—that a loss to the depositors is an impossibility, or at least a remote possibility, at most. Nevertheless, as Senators we are confronted with this question: Does sound public policy call for bank holding company legislation?

My answer to that question has always been in the affirmative. However, I feel, as a Senator from my State, that I should work and fight for fair, nondiscriminatory legislation in this field, and at least raise my voice in protest, and do what I can to eliminate the discriminatory features of the bill.

I know what will be said by some with respect to my speech on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. It will be said that it is a Transamerica speech, because Transamerica is a great economic institution in my State.

Let me say this of Transamerica in my State: It has brought great economic benefits and great economic advancement to the State of Oregon. Its subsidiary holdings, such as Columbia River Packers, are among the outstanding economic institutions in my State. When I stand on the floor of the Senate today and fight for bank holding company legislation, I think the record is perfectly clear that I yield to no financial institution in my State, whether it be Transamerica or any other economic institution, so far as my independence of judgment is concerned. I intend to fight for the best bank holding company bill we can get at this session of Congress. However, it is my duty to the people of my State to try to improve the bill; and the amendments which I shall offer later would improve it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Far be it from the Senator from Virginia to challenge the view of his distinguished colleague that Transamerica has brought many benefits to Oregon.

In view of the position of the independent bankers of Oregon, of which I have heard, I should like to ask my distinguished colleague if they think the 68 branches which a California bank has opened in Oregon have been to their advantage?

Mr. MORSE. I was interrupted. May I have the question again?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I ask the Senator whether or not the 68 branches which a California banker, Belgrano, has opened in Oregon are to the advantage of the independent bankers of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the independent bankers of my State are opposed to the expansion of Transamerica. But I do not believe that the independent bankers in the State of Oregon have been hurt, as they think they have been hurt, by the development of Transamerica. Nevertheless, I know the position of the independent bankers. When I conclude this speech, I probably shall have the support of none of them or of Transamerica either. But that is no new position for the Senator from Oregon. When a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and fights for what he thinks is a sound ideal, he loses partisan support of all special interest factions involved in such legislation as this. I would rather not have such support than to sacrifice the ideal of fair, uniform, nondiscriminating bank holding legislation. So I intend to fight for what I think is a sound ideal as to what ought to go into the bill, namely, a nondiscriminatory definition. That means defining a bank holding company as one bank or more, not two banks or more.

That is the recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board, and it is sound. I see no reason why I should yield to any argument of political expediency on the floor of the Senate, that we ought to have a two-bank definition because the House will not accept a one-bank definition. Take it to conference and see. The question will have to be ironed out in conference. Why should we not take to conference a bill containing what authorities practically unanimously agree is the definition which we ought to adopt, namely, a one-bank definition? I am not going to compromise on an issue such as this. I do not care whether the independent bankers like it, or whether Transamerica likes it.

The question is, What is best in the public interest? If we start out with the major premise that bank holding legislation is in the public interest, then let us write the soundest bill we can write, without compromising with political factors. That is the plea of the Senator from Oregon this afternoon, and he will stand on it and take whatever political consequences may come.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to amend the definition of a bank holding company as is set forth in S. 2577. The bill defines a bank holding company to be any company which owns or controls 25 percent or more of the voting shares of each of 2 or more banks or of a company which is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of this act.

My amendment would extend the coverage of the bill to include all 163 bank holding companies in this country. The 2-bank definition contained in the bill before us covers only about 40 companies, and thus exempts 116 companies from regulation.

I submit that no logical argument can be presented in opposition to a one-bank definition. As I said before, the original bill, as sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], contained a one-bank definition. The Federal Reserve Board has testified before both the House and Senate committees in favor of this provision. My amendment merely carries forward the

present law which bases the definition of a bank holding company on the control of one or more banks.

I wish to reiterate that my amendment is supported by the testimony of the Federal Reserve Board and will make certain that there will be no discrimination under the bill. I am sure that members of the Banking and Currency Committee will agree with the logic of my statement. I hope they will join me in supporting the amendment.

One final word about the position of the independent bankers. I cannot speak for the independent bankers, but I can speak today as to what individuals among them have told me as they have lobbied me, and as they have lobbied most other Members of the Senate, in regard to the proposed legislation, namely, that, of course, if they could get final legislation passed with a one-bank definition, they would prefer it.

They are in the position of many other lobbyists. They are playing politics, too. They are in Washington counting noses. They are not standing up for what they know is a sound ideal and principle in this matter, because in private conversations they have said to me, "Wayne, you are right about it. That is what we ought to have. However, we cannot get the votes."

Mr. President, I do not ever take that position about the Senate until it has had an opportunity to vote. Therefore, I have said to the representatives of the independent bankers, "I will give the Senate a chance to vote on an amendment which in your opinion would be an ideal and sound amendment and which you would like to have; but, because you are so anxious to get some legislation you would rather support an amendment which, in your judgment, would harness Transamerica and are willing to go along with a two-bank definition, against the recommendation of the Federal Reserve Board."

Mr. President, I say they are welcome to do that. I will not do it. This afternoon we have an opportunity to strike a blow in support of the public interest for a type of bank holding act, by way of a one-bank definition, that I am satisfied in my mind most of my colleagues in the Senate think we ought to adopt. I want to give them a chance to stand up and be counted on the question of whether they want to send to conference a bill which they believe is a sound and ideal bill, or whether they will yield to the argument that has been made throughout the sessions of the Committee on Banking and Currency. "We cannot get it through the House."

Is that any reason why we should not put it through the Senate? Is that any reason why we should not make our record in the Senate in support of legislation that we believe is sound? Let us see what we can do in conference. That is my position. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I understand that the Federal Reserve Board felt that the wisest course would be to use a one-bank definition?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. That is the definite testimony, clearly in our record. They have never varied from that testimony. They testified before the House and Senate committees in support of a one-bank definition.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not come into this discussion with my mind made up. I have tried to find out what was behind the two-bank definition. I asked the question the other day, and I now ask it of the Senator from Oregon: What is the situation with respect to a firm like W. R. Grace & Co.? In reading the financial sections of newspapers during the last few days, I have noticed that W. R. Grace & Co. have made a proposal to take over the Cosden Petroleum Co. by the exchange of shares between the two companies, of 1.025 shares of one company for 1 share of the other company, and that they already own $300 million worth of nonbanking assets.

Do I understand that it is the position of the Committee on Banking and Currency, or at least of a majority of its members, that as long as a company owns $400 million in nonbanking assets in only one bank, it is all right, but that if it owns $200 million in assets in two or more banks it is all wrong?

Mr. MORSE. That is the whole policy and theory of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the justification for it?

Mr. MORSE. Politics—getting that one vote more than the other side that is needed in order to get a bill passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. What good is a bill if it merely freezes the pattern? I think if we are going to say that a one-bank organization can be unlimited, we have then established a pattern which will permit all sorts of holding company activities.

Mr. MORSE. As I pointed out earlier this afternoon in a colloquy with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], so far as excepted and exempted companies are concerned, they can continue to expand their subsidiary holdings, and there is nothing in the bill which would prevent it. So far as subsidiary holdings are concerned, the Senator from Indiana was correct in his answer, when I said, "Will the Senator agree with me that, at least hypothetically, any one of these one-bank holding companies can continue to expand their holdings so they can be as large or larger than the subsidiary holdings of Transamerica?" And he said that was true. And it is true.

Mr. ANDERSON. I mentioned the case of W. R. Grace because that company has expanded into many parts of the world. It has gone into aviation and even into the cotton business. If W. R. Grace can exchange stock with an oil company and take it over, what is to prevent it from taking over a refinery?

Mr. MORSE. Nothing in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Or a farm machinery company?

Mr. MORSE. Nothing in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. So long as it is one bank, it can have flour mills, yardgoods, shops, and anything of that sort?

Mr. MORSE. It could become bigger than General Motors; and that is some size.

Mr. ANDERSON. And that would be all right?

Mr. MORSE. Under the bill it would be allowed. Of course, it is not all right. It is bad public policy. But if we are going to stand for bank holding company legislation, we should stand for legislation which applies to all bank holding companies without favoritism.

Mr. ANDERSON. If there are two banks involved, it is all wrong?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. How about the John Deere Co.?

Mr. MORSE. They have a bank.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the Morris Plan bank get a special exemption?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. What is the nature of it?

Mr. MORSE. It comes under the 1940 act, and, therefore, is exempted.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does anyone think the Morris Plan bank is not a bank?

Mr. MORSE. No one questions its being a bank holding company, either.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why is it omitted?

Mr. MORSE. It seems to have some influence.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have found that a good many of them have influence. I am hoping to find out why a Senator should vote to apply the Holding Company Act against two banks, but not against one bank. If it is right in theory, for the protection of the public, why is the two-bank limitation in the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I have expressed myself on that. There is a feeling that we will not get any legislation at all if we have the one-bank definition which the Federal Reserve Board recommends. I will not say more. I do not think I need to say more.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to find out what possible reason there is for saying there should be a two-bank definition. I can understand a one-bank definition, and I can understand how it might fail in the House and that the proposed legislation might be lost.

The only reason I have been interested is that Transamerica has recently gone into several Western States, my own State included, and I am not able to determine in the 2 or 3 weeks they have been in my State that they are going to be harmful to the independent bankers. They have taken control of the Valley Bank, of Phoenix, Ariz., which is headed by some very fine people, whom I have enjoyed knowing for a quarter of a century. But I am wondering why it is bad to have two banks and it is all right to have one. I have heard no statement from the sponsors of the bill as to why it is bad to have two and all right to have one with several hundred million dollars of bank assets.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want anything I have said today to be considered as any criticism of the Senator from Virginia. He has stated many times that he would prefer a one-bank holding company definition. He said, very frankly, that we were confronted with the fact that if we wanted to kill this proposed legislation, then insist on the one-bank holding company definition. But my answer is, take it to conference. The one bank definition is a sound definition, and we ought

to put the House on the spot and let the House come to grips with what the Federal Reserve Board says is a sound definition that should be in the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me, I think I can give the Senator from New Mexico the testimony of a representative of the American Bankers Association, which is not a group of politicians. They make some concessions to the opposition in the hope that they can get some measure through.

Here is the testimony of a witness of the American Bankers Association:

For these reasons—

I shall not repeat them—

the definition contained in H. R. 6227, based upon ownership of 25 percent or more of each of two or more banks or of a company which is or becomes a bank holding company would appear preferable.

That was the testimony of the American Bankers Association, and that is the attitude which the committee took.

The committee also took the position that the more we load the bill down—and this is one of the things which some of my bank holding company friends, who were going along but could not go along with the Senator's amendment, hoped we would do—the more distasteful it would become, and that a motion to recommit would be agreed to, and the bill would never get to conference. It would be recommitted, and there it would die.

Mr. ANDERSON. I likewise do not question the good intentions of the Senator from Virginia. As I heard him a minute ago, the reason given was that it would be "preferable." I should like to know why. It is my information that the American Bankers Association has been against it. I think the Senator from Oregon has correctly stated the situation that if one bank is the right figure, and the Federal Reserve Board so recommends, we should give Congress an opportunity to pass it. If we cannot pass it, we cannot pass it; but we have a right to try.

Mr. MORSE. I always listen with great interest to representations and arguments of special-interest groups who come here in connection with special legislation. In this particular field the American Bankers Association is, of course, a special-interest group. But I have also talked with some of the members of that association, and there is no unanimity of opinion among them. They, too, like the independent bankers, find themselves in a position where they have to consider what they think is the best legislation they can get through, not what they consider to be the ideal.

But we as Senators do not sit here representing the American Bankers Association; we do not sit here representing Transamerica Corp.; we do not sit here representing the Independent Bankers Association. We sit here representing the public interest; that is all. We ought to ask ourselves the simple question, What is the definition of a bank holding company that would be "in the public interest"?

When we examine the record, we find that the one-bank definition is the definition which is in the public interest; and that is the definition we should send to conference. I do not agree with my friend, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], that the adoption of my amendment would mean that nothing will go to conference. If my amendment be adopted, and if the bill be passed this afternoon, the bill will go to conference. What the Senator from Virginia is trying to use, I say most respectfully, is a fear argument, that the adoption of my amendment will cause some Senator to move to recommit, and that a motion to recommit will be agreed to in the Senate. I do not accept that assumption, either.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] raised a question about W. R. Grace & Co., and John Deere. Before he came into the Chamber, I used figures in regard to the present holdings of those companies.

W. R. Grace & Co. has assets of $375 million. That is not chicken feed.

Deere has assets of $430 million. That is not chicken feed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I was present, and I heard the Senator from Oregon state those figures. I thought they were impressive figures. That is why I referred to W. R. Grace & Co. I know something about the operations of that organization. I thought, when he said its assets were $375 million, it was a fair-sized firm.

Mr. MORSE. It can get much larger, as the Senator from New Mexico has pointed out. Under the bill, it can keep right on growing.

Mr. President, I close by reading into the record a letter which was received from the Federal Reserve Board, addressed to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], our acting chairman, under date of July 12, 1955, as follows:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, July 12, 1955.

The Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Banking Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FREAR: When Governor Robertson and I were testifying before the Banking Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on July 5, 1955, with respect to the bank holding company bills pending before the subcommittee, Senator DOUGLAS requested that information be submitted regarding the cases which would be covered by a definition of "bank holding company" based on control of one bank under a 25-percent measure of control. The request was for a list which would identify the companies and the banks included in the various cases.

The Board is submitting to the committee's staff several statistical tables for inclusion in the record of the hearings, but these tables do not identify the companies or banks, with the exception of a table regarding the 18 holding company affiliate groups which are subject to the limited regulation provided by existing law.

For the confidential information of the committee, however, we are submitting herewith a detailed list showing the names of the companies and banks included in the 163 known cases which would be covered by a definition of "bank holding company" based upon control of one or more banks by corporations, business trusts, associations, or similar organizations under a 25-percent measure of control. The 116 known cases which would be covered by a definition based upon a 50-percent measure of control are, of course, included in the list. It will be observed from the note at the beginning of the list that it is based in large part on information obtained from confidential sources. Such a list has not been published by the Board of Governors, and the Board feels that, in the circumstances, a number of the individual names appearing in the list should not be published. It is for this reason that the Board respectfully requests that the information as to individual cases contained in the enclosed list be treated as confidential.

Very truly yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

I say to the Senator from New Mexico that the committee had before it, submitted by the Federal Reserve Board itself, a long list of bank holding companies which would not be affected by the bill. When the Federal Reserve Board made its research study of what the effect of the bill would be, it had the high sense of public duty to come before our committee and testify against the two-bank definition, and to recommend the one-bank definition.

I say that in fairness to all concerned, and particularly with regard for the public interest, the Senate should adopt this afternoon the one-bank definition; and with that in mind, I submit my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McNamara
Anderson	Goldwater	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Bender	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hennings	Neely
Bricker	Hill	Neuberger
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bush	Hruska	Pastore
Byrd	Humphrey	Payne
Capehart	Jackson	Potter
Carlson	Jenner	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cotton	Kerr	Scott
Curtis	Knowland	Smathers
Daniel	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Malone	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Wofford
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Young
Frear	McCarthy	
Fulbright	McClellan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I understand no Senator has answered to his name. I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. May I make a brief explanation to the Senate, so we shall know what we are voting on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Vermont if he voted.

Mr. AIKEN. I voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Virginia to ask unanimous consent that the vote of the Senator from Vermont be canceled and that the Senator from Virginia be permitted to make a brief explanation of the amendment. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I shall not detain the Senate long, but I think, since very few Senators were present when the amendment was presented, those now in the Chamber should know what they are voting on. We are voting on an amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to change the definition in the bill from 25 percent of 2 banks or more to 25 percent of 1 bank or more.

Several years ago the Senator from Virginia introduced a bill which contained a 1-bank definition, but which provided for 50 percent. There have been no hearings on the proposal relating to 25 percent of 1 bank or more. This amendment, if adopted, would affect 116 corporations that have 1 bank, and they have had no opportunity to testify on the subject. The American Bankers Association have adopted the 2-bank definition. The independent bankers included, in all the bills they suggested, the 2-bank definition. Therefore, the Senator from Virginia yielded to the opinion of his committee that we should follow the definition in the House bill of 2 banks or more.

If the Senate agrees to this amendment, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Virginia, it will imperil final action on the bill, because then many Senators will not know how the bill will affect some splendid corporations in their home States, and thus they will be unwilling even to have the bill sent to conference. Instead, undoubtedly such Senators will vote to recommit the bill, and that will mean the death of the bill.

So the Senator from Virginia hopes the Senate will stick by the committee, and will vote down the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may speak for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to the statement made by my good friend, the junior Senator from Virginia, I wish to say, first, that members of the Federal Reserve Board testified, both before the House committee and before the Senate committee, in support of the one-bank definition; and in that testimony they pointed out that if there is going to be bank-holding company legislation which will be uniform in application, a one-bank amendment should be adopted.

Second, the Banking and Currency Committee has threshed out this matter in its discussions time and time again during the long months of its consideration of the bill. Many witnesses before the committee, although not there to testify on this particular matter, were drawn out, however, regarding their position on it.

The committee knows very well the position of the American Bankers Association and the position of the Independent Bankers Association. In my remarks I said that the independent bankers—at least, many of those who have talked to me—felt that if it were possible to have the one-bank amendment put through, they would favor it; but they feared that legislation on this subject could not be enacted unless they agreed to the two-bank definition.

I say that we should take the one-bank amendment to conference, and thresh it out there.

Even the junior Senator from Virginia agrees with the principle of my amendment, as is shown by his previous introduction of a bill including the amendment.

So let us pass on what we believe to be a sound ideal, send it to conference, and have it fought out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Senators who favor the amendment will vote "yea." Senators who oppose the amendment will vote "nay."

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is absent because of a death in his family.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—28

Anderson	Humphrey	Morse
Barkley	Jackson	Neely
Bible	Jenner	Neuberger
Capehart	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Clements	Knowland	Potter
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Goldwater	Laird	Wofford
Gore	Langer	Young
Hayden	Magnuson	
Hill	McNamara	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Ervin	McClellan
Barrett	Flanders	Millikin
Bender	Frear	Monroney
Bricker	Fulbright	Mundt
Bridges	George	Pastore
Bush	Green	Payne
Byrd	Hennings	Purtell
Carlson	Holland	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cotton	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Long	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Malone	Symington
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Pa.	Welker
Ellender	McCarthy	Williams

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Hickenlooper	Russell
Beall	Ives	Sparkman
Bennett	Kefauver	Stennis
Butler	Lehman	Watkins
Chavez	Mansfield	Wiley
Duff	Murray	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a statement?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope Senators will not leave the Chamber. I understand that the Senator from Oregon has several amendments which he does not intend to discuss at length and that they will be disposed of by a voice vote. It is not contemplated that there will be any further yea-and-nay votes. It may be that it will be possible to dispose of the bill tonight—and I am sure Senators will be glad to do so—without further yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall make a statement in that connection in just a moment.

In the meantime, in order that there may be an amendment pending, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

(g) The filing in good faith by any company of an application for exemption from bank holding company status on the ground it is not a bank holding company within the meaning of this act shall exempt the applicant from any obligation, duty, or liability imposed in this act upon the applicant as a bank holding company until the Board has acted upon such application. Within a reasonable time after receipt of any application hereunder, the Board shall enter an order granting or, after notice and opportunity for hearing, denying or otherwise disposing of such application.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to discuss the amendment, I wish to make a brief comment on the suggestion just made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

I, too, hope that Members of the Senate who can remain for the disposition of the procedural amendments to which I now turn my attention will do so. I have talked with the leadership on this side. Certain of our colleagues cannot remain. We are satisfied that we shall receive the same fair consideration of the amendments without a yea-and-nay vote as with one. I am also a realist. I know when I can get a rollcall vote and when I cannot. Therefore, I shall proceed to discuss these amendments briefly and submit them to a series of voice votes.

I should now like to turn to the procedural deficiencies in the bill. The bill provides that when a bank holding company makes an application to acquire additional banks, a public hearing will be held by the Federal Reserve Board only if the Comptroller of the Currency, in the case of a national bank, or the State supervisory authority, in the case of a State bank, object to the acquisition. Thus, if the Comptroller or the State authorities do not object to an acquisition, then the Federal Reserve could disapprove the application without any hearing. This is contrary to the spirit of the Administrative Procedures Act and the usual procedures of Government regulatory agencies.

The most serious consequence of this lack of formal hearings by the Board is in regard to judicial review of the Board's decision. The bill provides for judicial review by an appellate court for any party aggrieved by the Board's order. In the event of such a review, the Board is required to file with the court its certified transcript of the record in the case. What kind of record would there be if there were no hearing, no evidence, and no proceedings before the Board? What would there be for the court to review? It is obvious that the procedure set forth in the bill is unfair to the bank holding companies and permits the Board to run roughshod over the applicant's rights.

The bill is further deficient in that the Federal Reserve Board is not given the power to compel the attendance of witnesses or the power to subpena documents. The Board does not have such power under existing law, and such power is necessary in order to produce all the evidence necessary for a decision. Almost every other Federal regulatory agency has such powers, and it is difficult to see how the Federal Reserve Board can conduct a genuine hearing without this authority.

Another important procedural defect is the use of criminal penalties to enforce its provisions. The bill completely fails to give the Board any authority to issue specific enforcement orders or to initiate civil proceedings to insure compliance. The purpose of such proceedings would be to obtain affirmative action to carry out the purpose of the bill rather than to punish. Any questions concerning administration of this law as it now stands can only be tested in criminal proceedings. The whole regulatory pattern of the bill is to be made effective solely by action of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

It is highly questionable whether this theory of self-enforcing legislation is a reasonable or efficient means of accomplishing the bill's objectives. Other Government regulatory agencies are given power to initiate civil proceedings to obtain compliance with their orders. This is another instance where the bill departs from the usual procedural safeguards contained in similar regulatory legislation.

The pending amendment would establish procedures for formal administrative determinations as to whether a company is or is not a bank holding company under the act. Since the bill defines a bank holding company in a manner which may leave doubt in some instances, this amendment is essential to avoid hardship to those companies whose status is uncertain.

For example, a company is a bank holding company if it "controls in any manner" the election of a majority of the directors of two or more banks. A company uncertain as to whether it meets this definition will be in a dilemma. Failure to conform to the provisions of the act may make the company liable to criminal penalties if the board should ultimately rule that it is a bank holding company. On the other hand, if the board of a court should ultimately rule that the company is not a bank holding company, the reorganization of its business in attempted compliance with the act may turn out to be not only legally unnecessary, but disastrous in a tax sense. A reasonable procedure for determining the applicability of the bill in doubtful cases is therefore highly desirable.

I wish to say a word about the source of this amendment and certain other procedural amendments which I shall offer. They are referred to as the Belgrano amendments. Each Senator has received in recent days a document from the Transamerica Corp. It is the statement of F. N. Belgrano, Jr., before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, together with proposed amendments to S. 2577, and supporting argument.

Mr. President, some of the amendments I am offering are amendments contained in the brochure that was sent out by Transamerica to all Senators. This is the representation of a special interest group. When I use the representations of a special interest group I am always willing to say so on the floor of the Senate and to say what I have done with them.

In this instance I have gone through Mr. Belgrano's statement with a fine-tooth comb, figuratively speaking. As a lawyer I have studied the proposed procedural amendments offered by Transamerica, in regard to which Mr. Belgrano frankly testified before our committee—and, may I say, exceedingly ably testified before our committee—and I believe that the procedural amendments which I have selected are sound and just. I am very proud to associate myself with the amendments, because they are sound amendments.

However, I wish the RECORD to show not only what I have said in support of the amendments, but what Mr. Belgrano himself has said in support of the amendments. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in my remarks, so that the students of this problem can read the source on which I based my amendments, although it is not the only source on which I based my amendments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF F. N. BELGRANO, JR., PRESIDENT, TRANSAMERICA CORP., BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 24, 1956, CONCERNING S. 2577

I am here at the invitation of the committee to discuss certain amendments to S. 2577 proposed by Transamerica Corp. These hearings were adjourned on February 8 before my testimony could be heard. At the conclusion of the hearings on that day, Senator ROBERTSON referred to the fact that I had appeared in the past and testified at length in opposition to bank holding company legislation. This, of course, is true.

This committee and the committee of the House have patiently and courteously taken my testimony in the past. I have never claimed and never will claim that I have not been given a fair hearing. My testimony has made it clear that Transamerica is opposed to this legislation. Although my views were not accepted by the committee, I continue to hold them and will continue to present them vigorously to Members of the Senate, because I believe them to be right and just.

You all understand that this is not a personal matter with me. Whether this legislation passes in one form or another, I will still have useful work to do. My own personal interest is not involved here except that, like many others, I am a stockholder in Transamerica. I oppose this legislation and propose certain amendments today as the elected representative of 120,000 stockholders, all of whom have a vital interest in this matter. They are my constituency, and I have an obligation of trust imposed upon me to speak for them. I am trying to carry out that job as best I know how. These stockholders are located in more than 5,000 different communities in every State of this Union. None of them owns as much as 1 percent of Transamerica's outstanding stock. It is my duty and obligation as head of Transamerica to bring to the attention of this committee, whenever given the opportunity, the discriminatory, unfair, and unsound provisions of this proposed legislation.

These hearings concern specific amendments. The committee has already accepted important tax amendments which substantially meet objections which Transamerica had to the tax provisions of the bill. I appreciate that this has been done. Today, I shall discuss the nontax amendments which we have proposed. I do this in a sincere effort to be helpful to the committee, and I trust that our comments on this phase of the legislation will also be found to have merit.

Transamerica's nontax amendments fall into three basic categories:

First, amendments designed to eliminate discrimination by removing from the bill its special exemptions and exclusions;

Second, amendments designed to eliminate all or some of the divestiture provisions and thereby to eliminate or at least lessen the impact of the bill's most discriminatory features; and

Third, procedural and other amendments designed to make the operation of the bill administratively fair and workable.

I would like to submit for the record a memorandum which presents the text of all of these amendments and a short statement of their purpose and effect. It shows precisely how the matters with which we are concerned can be dealt with in the bill, and will supplement what I shall have to say.

DISCRIMINATION

First, let us look at the problem of discrimination and at some of the suggestions we have made to take care of it. One of the assumptions underlying the divestiture provisions of the bill is that it is not in the public interest for an enterprise to control a banking business and at the same time to control nonbanking activities which are not closely related to banking. While we do not, of course, accept this premise, we think that at least you ought to treat everybody alike.

Transamerica Corp. would be required to divest assets which represent in value approximately 50 percent of its entire business. These businesses were all lawfully acquired and have been owned by us for many years. Nonetheless, divestiture would be required of us while many bank holding companies, as well as holding companies owning savings and loan associations and personal finance companies, would not be required to divest. This seems to me not only discriminatory but unsound and self-defeating.

If divestiture is necessary in the public interest, it ought to apply equally to all, not merely to some. In my opinion, this committee has no choice but either to eliminate the special exclusions and exemptions so that divestiture in fact applies equally to all, or to eliminate the unsound divestiture requirement altogether, so that it applies equally to none.

DISCRIMINATORY EXCLUSIONS AND EXEMPTIONS

Our first group of amendments would make the bill apply, as it should, to all companies and enterprises which are bank holding companies in fact. Let me go down the bill in its present form with you and show you how far it departs from this principle—how first one company and then another is taken care of until Transamerica is left almost alone to be broken apart.

If you turn to section 2 (a) defining a bank holding company, you will see that companies which own only one bank, regardless of its size, and various nonbanking businesses, are not defined as bank holding companies. Accordingly, they will not become subject to the provisions of the bill requiring divestiture. Representatives of the Federal Reserve Board have testified that this exclusion is logically indefensible. The reason is obvious. If it is presumed to be against public policy for a corporation to own banks and nonbanking businesses, it is just as much against public policy for a company to own one large bank and nonbanking businesses as it is for it to own 2 banks—perhaps small banks—and nonbanking businesses. I doubt whether there is any potentiality for abuse in either instance, but if there is, it is present just as much in the case of one-bank companies as it is in the case of two-bank companies.

One-bank companies are numerous. There are more than 100 of them. They represent about 70 percent of all bank holding companies in the country. Every one of them is excluded from this bill. A number are powerful and important and could be classified as so-called "concentrations of economic power." Many are more significant than companies which are covered by the bill. I understand that the Federal Reserve Board has given a confidential list of "one-bank" companies to this committee, which I have not seen. From data included in Moody's Industrial Manual and in the financial press, however, several of them have come to my attention.

W. R. Grace & Co., in New York is an example in point. As of December 31, 1954, its assets exceeded $375 million. In my judgment, this is a fine, well-managed concern, but the fact remains that it owns a bank in New York City, and that it also owns extensive interests in airlines, steamship companies, chemical and fertilizer plants, and other nonbank enterprises. The Financial World of February 1, 1956 (p. 6) stated that:

"The Grace empire is composed today of some 60 subsidiaries and affiliates whose activities reach into 16 key industries in both North and South America."

Grace has shipping, advertising, and other interests in the Far West, where we do business. It and others like it go scot-free from divestiture, or indeed from any regulation whatever under this bill.

Other one-bank companies with very substantial assets which have come to my attention are Deere & Co. ($430 million); Corn Products Refining Co. ($181 million); Gimbel Bros., Inc. ($161 million); and Peabody Coal Co. ($44 million). Why should these companies, which combine banking with various types of nonbanking businesses, be exempt from divestiture? I call any bill that has this result discriminatory. Transamerica thoroughly agrees with the Federal Reserve Board that one-bank companies should be included, and we have proposed a simple amendment to the definition of "bank holding company" in the bill which will include them.

Also in section 2 (a) there is a special provision tailormade to exempt 1 company and 1 company alone. That provision, which does not appear in the House bill, exempts the Equity Corporation-Morris Plan group from divestiture. I understand that this is the only bank holding company which was registered under the Investment Company Act prior to May 15, 1955. This company has banks and various nonbanking businesses, including insurance, finance and industrial concerns of different types. It is not subject to supervision and examination by the Federal Reserve Board under the Banking Act of 1933. The explanation given in your committee report of this special exemption for registered investment companies states that such companies are "adequately supervised by the Securities and Exchange Commission," and that "SEC regulation in such cases is closely akin to the purposes of the bill" (Senate report, p. 5). This justification, however, is obviously not sound. One requires divestiture, and the other doesn't.

In any event, there is no conceivable reason to limit the exemption to those investment companies registered before May 15, 1955, or any other cutoff date. Why should the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate give a special reward to a company which over the years has not subjected itself to Federal Reserve Board regulation and control under the banking acts, and penalize a company that has? This again is plain discrimination. We have proposed that this provision be made available to all companies, and not to just one company.

The practical effect of this provision, as we propose to amend it, would be to eliminate divestiture by permitting any corporation which is or becomes subject to regulation under the Investment Company Act to own a bank holding company as well as nonbanking subsidiaries. If this has merit in the case of Equity Corp., it is equally justified with respect to Transamerica or any other company which might desire to organize or reorganize so as to be subject to the Investment Company Act.

Later, in section 2 (b) of the bill, you find another discriminatory provision in the definition of "company." In the State of Florida, a large conglomeration of banks, a paper and pulp mill, a telephone company, railroads, and real estate and other nonbanking business, are held in a trust. This du Pont-Ball group is just as much a bank holding company as a practical matter as is Transamerica. It recently advertised its "Florida National Group" in the American Banker as the "largest banking organization south of Philadelphia and east of the Mississippi," showing ownership of some 24 banks with assets of over $550,000,000. This figure does not include any of its extensive nonbank interests. Yet the exclusion of enterprises taking the form of a testamentary trust lets the Florida group out and saves it from divestiture as well as from control of expansion of its banking interests.

Other types of bank holding companies are also exempt from divestiture, and some from all regulation as well. Parnerships, religious and charitable organizations, educational corporations, funds and foundations, labor unions, agricultural and horticultural organizations, are all specifically mentioned. We completely fail to see any reason in the public interest why these types of bank holding companies should be treated differently than Transamerica. If a labor union runs a business, shouldn't it be treated like other businessmen in the operation of that business? If a church enters into the bank holding company business, shouldn't it in this respect also come under the same regulation as the rest of the public? Certainly if these organizations invested their funds in an electric or gas utility or a bus company, they could not expect to operate it free of regulation. They are running a business and ought to be subject to the same rules as anyone else doing this.

None of these special exemptions makes any sense to me as a businessman. I can find no justification for them in the record. Many of them were specifically opposed by the Federal Reserve Board, the agency which will administer this proposed law.

Further amendments of a discriminatory character were presented to your Committee on February 8. These amendments have been proposed with a view to carrying into the Senate bill certain special exemptions already included in the House bill. An amendment has been suggested which will exempt from divestiture a Georgia bank holding company which also owns a finance company, bottling works and other investments, as well as another amendment which will exempt a Kentucky bank holding company from divesting its separate investment company. Transamerica is in full agreement with both of these companies that divestiture of their properties would inflict an unnecessary hardship and would substantially weaken the capital position of their banks. In this respect, however, their position is no different from that of Transamerica or of other diversified bank holding companies. The solution for this problem is not to be found in additional discriminatory special exemptions, but in a more fundamental amendment to eliminate for everyone the unwarranted requirement of divestiture.

It is the rankest kind of discrimination to pass a bill which takes our property away, and lets practically all others in the same line of business continue to hold comparable investments. If there is to be divestiture, it should operate across the board. I must protest against making compromise upon compromise in this bill until practically everyone escapes divestiture except Transamerica.

DIVESTITURE

This brings me to the other—and I think the better—way to get rid of most of the discrimination. Divestiture itself is an unnecessary and punitive measure. You recognize this in effect when you give so many special exemptions. If there were any genuine problem involved in the common ownership of bank and of nonbank businesses, these various exceptions would not and could

not be made. If you eliminate the divestiture provisions you will do away with the worst of the discrimination now in the bill. This is what I respectfully urge you to do.

We urge that the divestiture provisions be removed from the bill by striking Section 4 for the reason that no factual basis has been established upon which Congress, in the public interest, may justify divestiture of lawfully acquired private property. If compulsory divestiture is wrong, or if no need for it has been shown, it ought not to be in the bill. There are no alternatives to this.

Section 6 of the bill now contains prohibitions against certain intercompany dealings. These afford adequate protection against the only possible way that bank depositors could be injured by the fact that a stockholder of the bank is also a stockholder of some other corporation. Keep in mind, also, that the activities of all banks are subject to strict regulation and examination by Federal and State authorities.

Should some control over future acquisitions of nonbanking properties be considered essential—which I do not believe to be the case—this could easily be accomplished by requiring the approval of the Federal Reserve Board for acquisitions of nonbanking companies as well as of banks under the provisions of section 3 (a).

If the committee is not willing to eliminate the divestiture provision, there are at least some less drastic and more sensible ways to approach the problem. First would be an amendment which, in lieu of divestiture, freezes existing nonbank holdings and prevents any bank holding company from acquiring voting shares of any additional nonbanking businesses. It would permit Transamerica to hold what it now has, but it would subject its future nonbank acquisitions to the prohibitions contained in the bill.

If neither of these two approaches be taken, we urge the committee to rewrite the divestiture provisions so that bank holding companies will at least not be required to divest insurance, fiduciary, and financial institutions which they now own. Thus, divestiture would operate only with respect to the ownership and control of industrial concerns and other nonbanking businesses which are not fiduciary, financial, or insurance in character. While this suggestion is not really a satisfactory solution of either the divestiture or the discrimination problem, there is a sound and logical basis for this distinction, and it would at least have the effect of minimizing the very serious disintegration which, under the present bill, would be imposed almost alone on Transamerica. Insurance companies, for example, are all subject to the most careful type of regulation and examination by State insurance officials. Extensive regulation is also generally imposed on financial and fiduciary companies. Furthermore, the management of all of these businesses requires much of the know-how and skill that is needed for the sound and efficient direction of banks.

Section 4 (c) (6) of the present bill, as interpreted in the committee report, contemplates that the Federal Reserve Board will permit a bank holding company to continue to hold a credit life insurance company, at least if its operations are wholly or largely confined to writing insurance in connection with loans made by subsidiary banks. This is on the theory that the activities of such a company are sufficiently closely related to banking "to be a proper incident thereto." Thus, it appears to be contemplated that a bank holding company under the bill as now drawn can own and operate a credit life insurance company, and, as part of its bank lending activities, can require borrowers to insure with its own insurance company. If this is in the public interest, what is there contrary to the public interest in the operation of a straight life insurance or fire and casualty company which is fully segregated and operated independently in competition with other insurance companies?

It seems to me desirable that legislation should take into account the paramount need for maintaining the strength of our banking institutions, whether owned by bank holding companies or otherwise. Any step which will rock the boat or undermine the safety and security of the banks in times of stress should be avoided. By our ownership of Occidental Life Insurance Co., for example, we have funds available in the form of dividends from that company which we can use, and have used in the past, to increase and strengthen the capital of our banks. This may prove to be a very important source of capital in times of economic difficulty. This source of added strength should not be taken away from us—and from our banks—by divestiture. I do not believe that any of us is wise enough to know what may be the effect on our economy of dislocating, disrupting, and tearing apart existing business structures. It does not seem to me a good idea to wade into this matter at this time with a meat ax cutting our company all to pieces. All of you know we are playing a vital part in the strength, soundness, and growth of our western economy. This is no time to weaken us by the unnatural harsh penalty of divestiture. Remember it is very easy to break an egg but almost impossible to put in back in the shell again.

Before leaving the question of divestiture, I should point out an apparently unintended but nevertheless extremely serious consequence of the divestiture provisions as they are now drafted. "Bank" is defined so as to exclude any company not doing business within the United States. Section 4 forbids ownership of or control of any company "which is not a bank." Consequently, Transamerica, if it remains a bank holding company, would be required to divest itself of its Italian banking subsidiary, Banca d'America e d'Italia. This is the only American owned bank in Italy. It is playing a prominent role in the development of the country to which our Government has granted almost $2 billion in various forms of economic aid. We have suggested a simple amendment to the divestiture provisions to exempt the shares of any company which is organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged primarily in the banking business outside the United States.

PROCEDURE AND ADMINISTRATION

Finally, I would like to direct the committee's attention to some serious procedural deficiencies in the bill as it is now drafted.

First, the regulatory setup of the bill is defective in one obvious respect. It vests in the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System responsibility for all phases of its administration, but it does not give to the Board any of the necessary powers to conduct formal investigations, to make determinations of whether a company is or is not a bank holding company, or to enforce compliance by a company that is proceeding in ignorance or even in open violation of its provisions. It is apparently contemplated that the act will be self-executing. It can be enforced, if at all, only by the Department of Justice bringing criminal proceedings against any company which does not comply with its provisions. As a matter of commonsense, this hardly seems a wise way in which to exercise regulatory functions. Because this criticism goes to the basic design of the bill, however, we have not attempted to draft any amendments along this line. I raise the question for the committee's consideration only because I believe it presents a problem which should be dealt with if this is to be a workable piece of legislation.

Apart from this, probably the most serious procedural defect is found in the provisions of section 3 (b) of the bill. These deal with the procedure to be followed by the Board of Governors in granting or denying applications for approval of bank acquisitions. As this provision is now drawn, the Board must give notice of any such application to the appropriate State supervisory authority or to the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case may be. A formal hearing on the application is required to be held if the Comptroller or the State authority files an objection to the application. If no such objection is filed, however, the Board may deny the application for any reason or no reason, without holding any hearing whatever.

Why should a formal hearing be limited to instances when the Comptroller of the Currency or a State supervisory authority objects to an application? If an opportunity for hearing is to be provided at all, it certainly should be made available to an applicant in all instances. There is no justification whatever for allowing the Board to deny an application out of hand without any hearing whatever, if it chooses to do so, merely because it has received no formal objection to the acquisition from some other regulatory authority.

Under section 9 of the bill, judicial review by an appellate court is expressly given to "any party aggrieved by an order of the Board under this act." On such review, the Board is required to file with the court the certified transcript of the record made before the Board. What kind of judicial review could this be if there has been no hearing, no evidence, and no record of proceedings before the Board? What would there be for the appellate court to review? Unless you provide for a hearing, it will at least be necessary to adopt the provisions of the House bill which grant a completely new hearing to an aggrieved party in the Federal court.

This is not just an omission; it is a genuine conflict between two different provisions of the bill which can only result in litigation and delay. We have suggested a simple amendment which would take care of this problem. Our amendment would require the Board to give the applicant an opportunity for a hearing before it denies any application. It would, at the same time, preserve the advantages of flexibility by permitting the Board to grant such an application without a hearing if there is no objection.

Another obvious defect is the failure of this bill to give the Federal Reserve Board any power to compel the production of documents or the appearance of witnesses. The Board has no such power at the present time. Accordingly, anyone requested by the Board or a bank holding company to appear who does not desire to produce documents or to give testimony at a hearing held by the Board under this bill need not do so. It is hard for me to see how a genuine hearing could be held without this power, which I understand is given by law to almost every other Federal agency exercising regulatory functions of this sort.

Our suggested amendments include several other important but subsidiary procedural suggestions, which are explained in some detail at pages 34 through 45 of the memorandum I have submitted for the record. I hope that the committee will give them serious consideration. If we are to nave the additional regulation of bank holding companies proposed by this bill, that regulation ought to be exercised in accordance with the traditional principles of administrative law. These principles have been proved by experience in other fields to be necessary not only to safeguard the rights of those of us who are to be regulated, but also to permit the regulation to be accomplished with reasonable efficiency and without a lot of unnecessary lawsuits about how it is to be done.

You must remember that this bill is another step toward a fundamental change in the nature of the Federal Reserve Board's function. It is becoming less and less an agency concerned with credit and monetary matters. The entire function of the Board as conceived by Senator Glass and others is changing. You are gradually turning it into a cop on the beat. It is becoming a regulatory agency more like the CAB, the FTC, or the SEC. The change is fundamental. You must therefore be sure, in taking this additional step, that it has the necessary authority. It should be set up along lines which the experience of these other agencies has shown to be necessary for efficient accomplishment of the regulatory objectives. Due process and fair treatment of citizens require this.

Finally, we have included in our memorandum three miscellaneous amendments. These are described at pages 46 to 49 of our memorandum. One of the problems dealt with in these amendments is of particular importance to Transamerica. It seems to us that once we own 25 percent of a bank, which is the standard you have adopted for determining control and ownership for purposes of the bill, we should be free to increase our holdings in that bank, or to receive stock in the form of dividends, without going through unnecessary regulatory hearings and redtape.

I appreciate your hearing me again. Naturally, I shall be glad to answer any of your questions. This matter is one of major consequence to my company and its stockholders, who are affected far more than any others by this legislation. There has never been any bill like this enacted by Congress before in its history. Compulsory divestiture without proof of wrong doing or damage to the public interest is quite a new departure. At the very least any such bill should treat all citizens the same. May I respectfully urge that you take another hard look at this legislation, which has no sound basis in the public interest, and which so harshly and unnecessarily punishes Transamerica and its stockholders.

AMENDMENTS SUGGESTED BY TRANSAMERICA CORPORATION

On January 26, 1956, Transamerica Corporation circulated to all members of the Banking and Currency Committee a memorandum containing drafts of a number of substantive, procedural and tax amendments proposed to be made to S. 2577, together with a suggestion of additional amendments which it considered necessary to correct certain unfair and discriminatory features. Since the committee has adopted tax amendments which meet the major objections raised by Transamerica, no further changes in the tax-relief provisions are now being urged. Except for the tax amendments, however, the Committee has not yet accepted any of the important suggestions advanced by Transamerica.[1] This memorandum has been prepared for the purpose of presenting these proposals to the committee for its further consideration.

The first and most important group of Transamerica's proposed amendments is designed to eliminate or at least alleviate the bill's discriminatory features. As the bill is now drawn its divestiture provisions have their principal and almost sole impact on Transamerica Corp. The second group of proposed amendments included herein has to do with certain procedural and other changes which are considered to be necessary if the bill is to be administratively fair and workable.

[1] Two or three minor nontax amendments previously suggested by Transamerica were adopted by the committee. These have accordingly been eliminated from this memorandum.

I. AMENDMENTS DESIGNED TO REMOVE DISCRIMINATION

As noted above, S. 2577 is especially discriminatory against Transamerica in its divestiture provisions. These will effectively require the break-up of this company, but because of restrictive definitions or outright special exemptions few if any of the other great enterprises of the country which combine banking and nonbanking businesses will be so affected. This unfair discrimination can be cured only by eliminating from the bill these exclusions and exemptions, or by eliminating the harsh and unnecessary requirement of divestiture itself. Transamerica has accordingly proposed for the committee's consideration both types of amendments.

A. Amendments eliminating discriminatory exemptions and exclusions

The simple and straightforward way to avoid discrimination, of course, is to make the bill applicable to all organizations or associations which have a common ownership of banking and nonbanking businesses, with no exclusions by way of limited definition or special exception. Attached as Appendix 1 (p. 51) to this memorandum is a list of some 10 groups of enterprises which may own both banking and nonbanking businesses without being obligated to divest under the bill, together with two more such enterprises which are now seeking to be specially exempt at least in part. The amendments and suggestions set out below are designed to eliminate all of these special exclusions and exemptions so as to make the bill applicable to all alike.

1. "One-Bank" Companies

Proposed amendment: In section 2 (a), on page 1, line 9; on page 2, lines 2 and 4; and on page 3, line 14; strike out "each of two" in each instance and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

Purpose and effect: The definition of "bank holding company" in Section 2 (a) is now limited to any company which owns 25 percent or more of, or which controls, "each of 2 or more" banks. The proposed amendment would make the test ownership or control of the requisite percentage of the voting shares of any 1 bank. If it is improper (which we think it is not) to combine the ownership of nonbanking property with ownership of 2 or more banks, it is equally wrong and improper to combine this ownership with that of a single bank, especially when this bank may itself be far larger and more powerful than a considerable number of smaller but separately incorporated banks.

There are a minimum of 163 holding companies which own 25 percent of 1 or more banks, as compared to only 46 which own this percentage of 2 or more banks. (Senate hearings, pp. 54, 60.) Moreover, there are at least 116 bank-holding companies which have absolute control through ownership of more than 50 percent of the outstanding stock of 1 or more banking subsidiaries. (Senate hearings, p. 59.) In short, the bill by its definition of "bank holding company" excludes most of these companies which own or control banks.

Included among these exempt companies, for example, are such large industrial, transportation, mining and mercantile enterprises as W. R. Grace & Co., and Deere & Co., Corn Products Refining Co., Peabody Coal Co., and Gimbel Bros., Inc. The bank and nonbank holdings of these representative "1-bank" companies, as reported in the 1955 Moody's Manuals, are summarized in detail in Appendix 2 (p. 51) to this memorandum. All but 1 of them have assets of over $150 million. The full list of "1-bank" companies has never been made public, but it is available to the members of this committee. (Senate hearings, pp. 336–37.)

Both the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency favor an amendment to include "1-bank" companies.

Chairman Martin stated:

"Yet, it seems clear that the potential abuses resulting from combination under single control of both banking and nonbanking interests could easily exist in a case in which only 1 bank is involved. In fact, if the 1 controlled bank were a large bank, the holding company's interests in extensive nonbanking businesses might very well lead to abuses even more serious than if the company controlled two or more very small banks. For these reasons, the Board would continue to urge that, whatever the percentage test may be, the definition should be related to control of a single bank." (Senate hearings, p. 76.)

This view was reiterated throughout the testimony of Chairman MARTIN and Governor Robertson (Senate hearings, pp. 44, 45, 46, 58 and 66). In like fashion, the Comptroller urged the elimination of this disciplinary exclusion (Senate hearings, p. 84).

The committee report makes no effort to justify the exclusion of "1-bank" companies from all provisions of the bill. In short, at least 2 purported purposes of this legislation—to control "upstream" financing and to force divestiture of nonbank assets—plainly have equal application to both categories of holding companies. To force "2-bank" companies to divest their nonbanking interests while permitting "1-bank" companies to remain wholly unaffected by the legislation is logically and economically indefensible.

This becomes especially obvious when it is realized that the banks owned by these "one-bank" holding companies could be expanded at will by merger or otherwise without coming under the divestiture or other provisions of the bill. W. R. Grace & Co., for example, while it could not itself acquire a second bank without becoming subject to the regulation provided by the bill, could expand its Grace National Bank by merger or acquisition of assets until it equalled in side the aggregate of all the separate banks now owned or controlled by Transamerica Corp. Several New York banks are presently considerably larger than this. Yet W. R. Grace & Co. and its banking subsidiary would still remain free of any regulation of "upstream borrowing", and of any obligation to divest.

2. Grandfather Clause Exemption for One Company Registered Under Investment Company Act Prior to May 15, 1955

Proposed amendment: In section 2 (a) (B), page 3, line 9, strike out the comma at the end of the word "1940" and strike out the phrase "and was so registered prior to May 15, 1955".

Purpose and effect: The exemption for registered investment companies was included in S. 2577 because "any such company is adequately supervised by the Securities and Exchange Commission", and because "SEC regulation in such cases is closely akin to the purposes of this bill." (Senate report, p. 5.) If this justification is valid there is no reason to limit the exemption to investment companies registered before May 15, 1955, and consequently the cut-off date should be eliminated to permit exemption for future registrants under the Investment Company Act. If this is not done, the provision will be a bald special exemption permitting a single bank holding company to continue to hold both banks and nonbanking businesses. This company—the Equity Corp., together with its subsidiary, the Morris Plan Corp. of America—is one of the Nation's largest bank holding companies owning multiple banks; it has aggregate assets of some $43 million. (Senate hearings, p. 151.) In addition to banks, it owns directly or in-

directly controlling interests in industrial, real estate, mineral, insurance, finance and service companies. (Senate hearings, pp. 159, 162.)

3. Trusts and Partnerships

Proposed amendment: Amend section 2 (b) by inserting a period after the word "legislation", on page 4, line 8, and striking the remainder of that line, and on page 3, lines 23–24, by striking out all of those two lines and substituting the following: "(b) 'Company' means any corporation, partnership, testamentary, business or other trust, association, or similar organization, but shall not include".

Purpose and effect: There is no reason for eliminating from the provisions of the bill any business enterprise merely because it is in the form of a general or limited partnership or an intervivos or testamentary trust. It is still a unitary business enterprise exercising its ownership in a way similar to that of a corporation, and there is no reason for not treating it as corporate bank holding companies are treated if the enterprise otherwise meets the requirements of the definition contained in section 2 (a).

It is not known just how many important organizations are excluded by the limited definition of company now contained in the bill, but at least one of these is believed to be the Alfred I. du Pont testamentary trust in Florida. This trust owns or controls the Florida National Group of Banks, consisting of more than 20 separate banks in Florida (Senate hearings, p. 73), with aggregate deposits of over $550 million; it was recently advertised as the "largest banking organization south of Philadelphia and east of the Mississippi." See Appendix 3 (p. 55). In addition this trust, often referred to as the Ball-du Pont group, owns or controls directly or indirectly the St. Joe Paper Co. (with plants in Florida, Texas, and New Jersey), the Apalachicola Northern R. R. (some 96 miles long), a telephone company, some 750,000 acres of west Florida timberlands, and other important holdings. See Appendix 3 (p. 56). In spite of this it is relieved by the very restrictive definition of company contained in the bill not only from the obligation of divestiture but also from control over expansion of its bank holdings. There is no real basis in the record or elsewhere for any such exemption.

4. Religious, Charitable, and Educational Corporations, Funds, and Foundations

Proposed amendment: In section 2 (b), strike out "(1)" on page 3, line 24; place a period after the word "State" and strike out "or (2) any" on page 4, line 1; strike out all of line 2 through 8 on page 4.

Purpose and effect: The proposed amendment would eliminate a specific exemption in the definition of company of religious, charitable, and educational corporations. If such a corporation chooses to engage in the business of being a bank holding company, there is no legitimate reason for not subjecting it to the same regulation with respect to expansion or "upstream borrowing" to which any other bank holding company is subject, as Chairman MARTIN recommended. (Senate hearings, pp. 69, 76.) The same reasoning should also apply to divestiture. If regulation or separation is needed in the public interest, it is needed whether the profits of the enterprise go to support a worthy religious or charitable cause or whether they inure to the benefit of private individuals. It would be ridiculous to exempt a public utility from regulation, for example, because it happens to be owned and operated as an investment by a religious or charitbale foundation.

The Mormon Church is a case in point. In addition to controlling several banks in Salt Lake City, it owns 100 percent of the stock of a large life insurance company and is believed to hold substantial interests in a number of other nonbanking businesses. See Appendix 4 (p. 57). All of these are sound and well-managed enterprises, and Transamerica agrees that there is no good reason for requiring that any of them be disposed of. There is certainly no justification, however, for applying the regulatory and divestment provisions of the bill to Transamerica and excluding entirely such comprehensive and diversified business investments as these.

5. Tax Exempt Labor, Agricultural, and Horticultural Organizations

Proposed amendment: Strike out all of subdivision (7) of section 4 (c), as amended, page 11, lines 14–15.

Purpose and effect: Subsection 4 (c) (7), as amended by the committee, exempts from divestiture any bank holding company which is a labor, agricultural, or horticultural organization and which is exempt from Federal taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code. This is plainly another "special exemption" for which no sound reason can be advanced.

The policy of the bill as plainly expressed in section 4 is that banking and nonbanking businesses are not to be mixed: No organization which is engaged in any business "other than that of banking or of managing or controlling banks" or which owns or controls more than 5 percent of any nonbanking business shall be permitted to own or control 25 percent of 2 or more banks. The fact that an organization which owns and operates banks for profit may itself be a tax-free labor union (or an agricultural or horticultural organization) is no reason for giving it different regulatory treatment. If divestiture is in the public interest for an organization that is owned by thousands of small investors, it should also be in the public interest for an organization that is owned by thousands of labor union members.

At least one labor union, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, owns a controlling interest in 2 separate banks as well as other investments, and so would be subject to the divestiture provisions of the bill but for this special exception. These are both substantial banks, the Amalgamated Bank of New York having deposits as of December 31, 1954, of $57,824,277 and the Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank in Chicago having deposits as of that date of $36,819,140 (Senate hearings, pp. 427–431).

6. Additional Special Exemptions Which Have Been Proposed

In addition to the foregoing, the Trust Company of Georgia and the First National Bank Trustees of Louisville formally proposed to this committee on February 8, 1956, that additional exemptions be added to section 4 of the bill to enable them to retain various nonbank holdings.[2] Transamerica fully agrees with them that divestiture of these properties would inflict an unnecessary hardship and would weaken the capital position of their banks. In this respect, however, their position does not differ from Transamerica's or that of other diversified bank holding companies. The solution for this problem does not lie in another discriminatory special exemption, but in a more basic amendment to eliminate for everyone the unwarranted requirement of divestiture. This possible solution of the problem of discrimination is discussed further below.

B. Amendments to divestiture provisions

As already noted, the bill is most discriminatory in the applicability of its divestiture provisions. Accordingly, another way in which discrimination can be largely eliminated is to adopt the position which Transamerica has consistently urged, that compulsory divestiture of lawfully acquired investments is not in the public interest and should not be required of anyone. The amendments proposed below are designed to accomplish this objective.

1. Outright Elimination of Requirement of Divestiture of Nonbank Holdings

Proposed amendment: Strike out all of section 4 (p. 8, line 7, through p. 11, line 15); strike out all of section 10 (p. 16, line 12, through p. 28, line 9); renumber sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 to be sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively.

Purpose and effect: This amendment would eliminate entirely the compulsory divestiture provisions of the bill, leaving the regulatory features unchanged. It would also eliminate the amendments to the Internal Revenue Code now contained in section 10, since tax relief provisions will not be needed if divestiture is not to be required.

Divestiture is harsh and rare legislative surgery. Never before has Congress resorted to divestiture similar to that in the pending bill without a showing of extraordinary abuses or outright fraud. The hearings on bank holding company legislation have disclosed no comparable practices by bank holding companies, nor, indeed, any improper practices whatever.

The arguments put forward in support of the divestiture requirement have been demonstrated to be without substance. A bank holding company is not a bank. It does not invest in nonbanking companies with money obtained from depositors. It invests risk capital supplied by shareholders who wish to obtain the advantages of diversified investment. The prohibitions of State and Federal laws restricting the ownership of nonbanking properties by banks are based on a concern with the uses to which the money of depositors is put. To require bank holding companies to divest their nonbanking properties on this ground is to ignore entirely the different corporate and public functions of the two types of organizations.

No case for divestiture has been made out on the theory that this is necessary to prevent unsound financial transactions among holding companies, their subsidiary banks and their affiliate corporations. Not only is the hearing record totally lacking in evidence of abuses of this nature by any established bank holding company, but such practices are absolutely prohibited by section 6 of the present bill. Similarly there is no evidence of unfair competitive advantages resulting from investment ownership of banking and nonbanking companies, or any evidence to indicate that under present competitive conditions, pressures on customers or practices of this nature are commercially feasible. In fact, all testimony of Transamerica's customers with respect to its policies and practices is squarely to the contrary.

Divestiture therefore is no more than a punitive measure directed principally against Transamerica. The lack of realistic concern with the problem of combined banking and nonbanking ownership is demonstrated by the extensive exclusions and exemptions discussed above. If divestiture is to be required of any, it ought to be required of all; but if it is not genuinely needed it ought not to be required of anyone. Transamerica believes that this drastic remedy has plainly not been shown to be necessary in the public interest.

2. Elimination of Divestiture of Present Holdings, With Requirement of Board Approval of Future Acquisitions of Controlling Stocks or Assets of Nonbank Companies

Proposed amendment: Strike out all of section 4 (p. 8, line 7, through p. 11, line 15); strike out all of section 10 (p. 16, line 12, through p. 28, line 9); renumber sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 12 to be sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, respectively. On page 5,

[2] In appendix 5 (p. 58) are listed the principal holdings of these two companies which are now sought to be exempt from divestiture.

line 21, insert the word "bank", the following: "or of any company which is not a bank." On page 5, line 23, insert after the word "bank", the following: "or of such company which is not a bank." On page 6, line 1, after the word "bank" and before the semicolon, insert the following: "or of a company which is not a bank." On page 6, line 14, before the word "in", insert the following: "or in a company which is not a bank."

Purpose and effect: If it is considered desirable to provide some regulatory control over future acquisitions of nonbanking businesses by bank holding companies, this could easily be accomplished without imposing the harsh requirement of divestiture. By simple amendments to the acquisition provisions of the bill (section 3) the Federal Reserve Board could be given jurisdiction to approve or disapprove future acquisitions of stock or assets of nonbank companies.

The amendment now proposed is designed to accomplish this. Like the previous proposal it would permit bank holding companies to retain their present nonbank holdings, but would require Board approval of future acquisitions of stock or assets of nonbank companies. Ownership and acquisition by bank holding companies of interests in nonbank companies would thereby be placed on substantially the same footing as is their ownership and acquisition of banks.

3. "Freezing" of Existing Lawfully Acquired Holdings

Proposed amendment: On page 9, line 16, insert the following new subsection: "(1) to shares of any company lawfully acquired and owned by a bank holding company or by any of its subsidiaries prior to the date of enactment of this act." Renumber subsection 4 (c) (1) to become 4 (c) (2) and the following subsections accordingly.

Purpose and effect: If the above recommendations are not adopted, it at least remains possible to avoid the disintegration resulting from divestiture of lawfully acquired assets by making the provisions of section 4 of the bill applicable only to future acquisitions. While such drastic prohibitions are not believed necessary even with respect to the future, this solution is clearly preferable to the punitive effects of the present bill and would eliminate its most serious discriminatory features.

The investments of Transamerica in nonbank companies have been made for legitimate investment purposes and in full compliance with our Federal and State laws. They have served as a source of strength and stability for Transamerica's underlying banks and have provided Transamerica stockholders with the advantages of diversified investment. In the absence of a showing that Transamerica or other bank holding companies have employed their nonbank ownership in a manner contrary to the public interest, there can be no justification for the extreme measure of divestiture.

Section 6 (c) (4) of H. R. 6227 would permit those bank holding companies which are themselves banks to retain their presently held nonbanking properties. A similar amendment to S. 2577 has been proposed on behalf of the Trust Company of Georgia. See appendix 5 (p. 58). Transamerica agrees with the proponents of this amendment that divestiture of existing and lawfully acquired nonbanking assets ought not to be required. There is no logical reason, however, why a holding company which, under the peculiarities of local law, happens to be also a bank should stand on a different footing with respect to the ownership of nonbank properties than a bank holding company which is not a bank. The proposed amendment would accordingly extend the privilege of retaining lawfully acquired nonbank assets to bank holding companies which are not banks as well as to those which are.

4. "Freezing" of Lawfully Acquired Present Holdings of Financial, Fiduciary, and Insurance Companies

Proposed amendment: On page 11, line 7, strike out the word "which" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "either (1) a majority of the voting shares of which company were owned directly or indirectly by such bank holding company on the date of enactment of this act, or (2) the business of which company."

Purpose and effect: The harsh and discriminatory impact of the divestiture provisions of the bill cannot be avoided by measures short of adoption of the amendments discussed above. It is at least possible, however, to alleviate their most objectionable consequences by the addition of a simple provision permitting retention by a bank holding company of any company of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature which was majority owned, directly or indirectly, on the date of enactment of this bill. This would mean that bank holding companies could retain without question their financial, fiduciary, and insurance subsidiaries owned on the effective date of the bill, but could not acquire other such companies without the requisite order of the Board to the effect that such other companies are sufficiently closely related to the business of banking.

It is believed that this is an entirely reasonable exception to the divestiture provisions, and does no violence to the overall purposes of the bill. Section 4 (c) (6) of the bill in its present form recognizes that there is a real relationship between the operation of banks and of financial, fiduciary, and insurance companies. All of these companies present similar problems of management and the investment of funds, and all of them are subject to extensive regulation. If the divestiture principle is to be retained at all, at least it should not be applied to companies of this type which have been lawfully acquired in the past.

It should be noted that the language of section 4 (c) (6) in both the present bill and the proposed amendments specifies that all of the activities of any financial, fiduciary, or insurance company which can be retained must be devoted to these purposes. This prevents any possibility of changing the nature of the business of a retained nonbanking subsidiary so that it can enter into nonbanking businesses which would otherwise be prohibited.

5. Exemption of Foreign Banking Subsidiaries

Proposed amendment: Insert the following new subsection immediately following subsection 7, page 11: "(8) To shares of any company which is organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged primarily in the banking business outside the United States."

Purpose and effect: The proposed amendment is necessary to correct an obviously unintended effect of the present bill. Section 2 (c) defines "bank" so as to exclude any company which does not do business within the United States. Section 4 (a) prohibits, with certain limited exceptions, the ownership or control by a bank holding company of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank. Consequently, under the bill as it is now drawn, a foreign banking subsidiary, such as Transamerica's Banca d'America e d'Italia, would have to be divested.

The proposed simple amendment to the divestiture provisions would exempt the shares of any company which is organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged primarily in the banking business outside the United States. This amendment would appear to be in accord with the basic intent of the bill and there can be no rational basis on which its conclusion could be opposed.

II. OTHER PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

In addition to the amendments discussed above, which will eliminate or at least alleviate the principal discriminatory features of the bill, Transamerica has proposed a number of amendments which it believes are needed in order to make the administration of the law fair and workable. The bulk of these amendments have to do with the procedure to be followed by the Board in performing its functions under the act. The others are designed to correct what Transamerica believes are errors or omissions in the bill.

A. Procedural amendments

This bill is a step toward a fundamental change in the nature of the Federal Reserve Board's function. It vests in the Board new regulatory functions analogous to some of those now performed by such agencies as the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Federal Trade Commission. This in itself presents a serious problem, for the Board lacks a history of such functioning and does not now have the staff to enable it to perform such tasks. The bill, therefore, should at least give it the authority and prescribe the procedures which the experience of other agencies has demonstrated to be needed for the efficient accomplishment of such regulatory objectives. In its present form the bill is seriously defective in failing to do this.

In spite of the regulatory function so assigned, the Board is given no power to conduct formal investigations or to enter orders determining whether or not a company is a bank holding company under the act. The Board is not even given the power to issue subpenas and compel the attendance of witnesses in the proceedings it does hold. It is not empowered to enforce divestiture of specified subsidiaries, or other forms of compliance. It is given no power to do anything about a company which, through ignorance or intent, disregards the act. In such a case it may ask the Department of Justice for an indictment, but it may not itself issue or enforce anything in the nature of a compliance or cease-and-desist order.

Transamerica Corp. of course has not attempted to draft a code of procedure for the Board's regulatory functions, or to work out any kind of enforcement or compliance system. This would require a substantial redrafting of the entire bill, which certainly is warranted. In the absence of this, however, Transamerica has suggested certain relatively simple procedural amendments which can be included within the framework of the bill as it now stands and which, it is believed, will at least make administration of the act more workable, as well as fairer to those who are subjected to its impact.

1. Provision for Administrative Determination, Application, of Whether a Company Is a Bank Holding Company

Proposed amendment: On page 5, immediately following line 14, insert the following new subsection (g): "(g) the filing in good faith by any company of an application for exemption from bank holding company status on the ground it is not a bank holding company within the meaning of this act, shall exempt the applicant from any obligation, duty or liability imposed in this act upon the applicant as a bank holding company until the Board has acted upon such application. Within a reasonable time after receipt of any application hereunder, the Board shall enter an order granting or, after notice and opportunity for hearing, denying or otherwise disposing of such application."

Purpose and effect: The purpose of this proposed new subsection is to provide a procedure by which a company may obtain a determination as to whether or not it is a bank holding company subject to the act.

Although this provision is not of importance to Transamerica itself, it is essential to avoid hardship to those companies whose status is uncertain.

Section 2 (a) defines a bank holding company so as to leave doubt in some instances as to whether or not a company falls within the definition and is subject to the provisions of the act. For example, a company is a bank holding company if it "controls in any manner" the election of a majority of the directors of two or more banks. The quoted words are not susceptible of adequate definition short of a ruling by the Board.

Thus a company uncertain as to whether it falls within the definition will be in a dilemma. Failure to conform to the provisions of the act may make the company liable to criminal penalties if the Board should ultimately rule that it is a bank holding company. Furthermore, enforcement action by the Board to test the question might well be postponed or delayed beyond the mandatory time limitation within which divestiture must be accomplished, thus depriving the company of the benefit of the tax relief provisions of the bill. On the other hand, if the Board or a court should ultimately rule that the company is not a bank holding company, the reorganization of its business in presumed compliance with the act may turn out to be not only legally unnecessary but disastrous in a tax sense. Consequently, it would appear highly desirable to have some provision, like the one suggested here, which will provide a reasonable procedure by which to determine the applicability of the bill.

2. Provision for Notice and Opportunity for Hearing to Bank Holding Companies on All Applications for Approval of Bank Acquisitions

Proposed amendment: In section 3 (b), on page 7, strike out all of line 2 following the period and all of lines 3–14 and line 15 to the end of the sentence. Insert in place of the material so stricken the following: "If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority so notified by the Board does not request a hearing thereon in writing within said 30 days, the Board may without further notice or proceedings enter an order granting the application. If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority requests a hearing thereon in writing within said 30 days, or if the Board itself is unwilling to grant the application without a hearing even in the absence of such request, it shall forthwith given written notice of that fact to the applicant. If within 10 days after receipt of such notice from the Board the applicant does not either withdraw such application or request in writing a hearing thereon, the Board may enter an order forthwith denying the application. On receipt from the applicant of such request for hearing, however, the Board shall promptly give written notice to the applicant and to the Comptroller of the Currency or State supervisory authority, as the case may be, of the date for commencement of a hearing by it on such application. Such hearing shall be commenced not less than 10 nor more than 30 days after such notice."

Purpose and effect: In its present form, section 3 (b) plainly contemplates that a bank holding company shall initiate the action by filing an application for approval of a proposed acquisition or merger. It further provides that a hearing must be held and decision had on the basis of such hearing in the event that the Comptroller or appropriate State authority files an objection with the Board. The provision is silent, however, with respect to what happens if these authorities fail to object to the proposed acquisition and the Board itself determines for some reason not to grant it. If no hearing is to be had in this instance, there would appear to be no record on which judicial review could be had, thus raising a serious question as to the scope of the judicial review provided for in section 9 of the bill.

The proposed amendment avoids the cumbersome procedure resulting from a mandatory requirement that a hearing be held even if not requested by the parties, but at the same time insures that no application can be denied without affording to the applicant the right to a hearing, and to a decision on evidence advanced at such hearing, with judicial review by a court. Precedent for such treatment can be found in many regulatory statutes. See, e. g., section 309 of the Federal Communications Act with respect to applications for certain radio station licenses (47 U. S. C., sec. 309). Similarly, it is provided that no application can be granted over the objection of the Comptroller or appropriate State regulatory authority without an equal right in such authority to have a hearing if it so requests. In the latter case, the applicant must either agree to the holding of such a hearing or withdraw his application.

The procedural requirements for a hearing, if one is held, are those prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, which is specifically made applicable by a new suggested subsection (e) to section 5, discussed below. Accordingly, it appears superfluous to include in section 3 (b) such provisions as those to the effect that the length of the hearing shall be determined by the Board, that the parties shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity to testify, etc.

3. Clarification of Procedure on Exemption of Subsidiaries Closely Related to Banking

Proposed amendment: In section 4 (c) (6), on page 11, lines 7 and 8, strike the words "after due notice and hearing, and on the basis of the record made at such hearing," and in line 13, page 11, immediately after the semicolon, insert the following: *"Provided,* That the Board shall not deny any application for exemption under this subsection except after due notice to the applicant and an opportunity for hearing thereon."

Purpose and effect: The procedural provisions now contained in this subsection are not clear as to whether a notice and hearing are to be had on specific applications for exemption by a holding company, or as to whether the Board is authorized to grant such an exemption without a formal hearing where there is no objection or controversy. The procedural change suggested in this provision is designed to conform the procedure here to that suggested in section 3 (b) above. In other words, it is contemplated that a bank holding company which desires to avail itself of the exemption provided in this subsection shall first apply to the Board for an order granting such exemption. The Board may without hearing or other formal proceedings grant this application if it so determines, but it may not deny it without giving the applicant an opportunity for a hearing (and subsequent judicial review) in accordance with the procedure prescribed for such adjudications by the Administrative Procedure Act. This combines the advantages of informal procedure where no controversy is involved with the safeguards of full hearing and review when a bank holding company is not satisfied with the Board's preliminary determination.

4. Provision Granting Notice and Opportunity for Hearing on Application for Tax Certificates, and Generally Incorporating Provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act

Proposed amendment: On page 13 immediately following line 2, insert the following new subsection (e) to section 5: "(e) An application to the Board for a certification or extension of time provided for in section 10 of this act may be granted without notice, hearing or other formal proceedings. No such application shall be denied by the Board, however, except after due notice to the applicant and an opportunity for hearing thereon. The granting or denial of any such application on which the applicant has requested a hearing, as well as the granting or denial of any application under sections 2, 3, or 4 of this act on which the applicant has requested a hearing, shall be deemed to be an adjudication required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing within the meaning of section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 1004)."

Purpose and effect: The bill in its present form is seriously deficient in that it contains no provision whatever for the procedure to be followed by a bank holding company in obtaining from the Board of Governors the tax certificates provided for in section 10. Without these certificates, of course, it would be financially disastrous for any company to attempt to spin off or distribute either the companies required to be divested under section 4 (if it remains a bank holding company), or its bank holdings (if it chooses to terminate its bank holding company status). Whether a company is entitled to a certificate will often turn on complex questions of both fact and law, and clearly some procedure for a hearing on these questions should be provided, with the usual judicial review. Section 5 (e) has accordingly been drafted to meet this problem in as simple and practicable a way as possible.

Section 5 (e) contemplates that a bank holding company, or a company which has decided to dispose of its banks and to cease to be a bank holding company, will apply to the Board for the certifications provided for by the tax provisions included in section 10. If the Board is willing to grant the application without formal proceedings, it is authorized to do so, as with other applications. It may not deny an application for a tax certificate, however, without granting the applicant company an opportunity for a hearing, with subsequent judicial review.

The last sentence of this section 5 (e) is also designed to make it clear that the procedure provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all these hearings. As noted above, none of these hearings is to be held unless the applicant in fact requests it, so that these provisions do not in any way limit the Board's power to grant or otherwise dispose of an application without objection in entirely informal proceedings.

5. Provision Granting Subpena Power to Board

Proposed amendment: On page 13, immediately following new subsection (e) to section 5 [suggested above], insert the following new subsections (f) and (g) to section 5:

"(f) For the purpose of any hearing pursuant to the provisions of this act, the Board, or any officer thereof designated by it, is authorized to administer oaths and affirmations, and by subpena to require any person to appear and testify, or to appear and produce relevant books, records, or other papers. In case of failure or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person pursuant to such authority, the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce relevant books, records, or other papers, or both, in accordance with the subpena; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(g) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the Board may invoke the aid of any court

of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memorandums, contracts, agreements, and other records. Such court may issue an order requiring such persons to appear before the Board or member or officer designated by the Board, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found or may be doing business. Any person who willfully shall fail or refuse to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memorandums, contracts, agreements, or other records, if in his or its power so to do, in obedience to the subpena of the Board, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be subject to a fine or not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or both."

Purpose and effect: Subsections 5 (f) and (g) are suggested because the General Statutes creating the Federal Reserve Board and giving it powers in other fields such as enforcement of the Clayton Act do not, as is the case with other administrative agencies, grant to the Board general powers to subpena witnesses, compel the production of documents, etc. Thus, subpena power must be specifically granted if it is to be available to the Board or to the parties to proceedings before the Board in the administration of the bank holding company legislation. Unless documents can be required to be produced and witnesses compelled to attend hearings, the hearings may well be abortive. Accordingly, these two subsections are designed to give the Board this necessary power in connection with hearings held under the act. The provisions are modeled upon the corresponding provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. sec. 825f (b) (c)). Comparable powers are given to a number of other agencies, such as the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission. The subpena power so granted to the Board may also be availed of by any party to the hearing in accordance with section 6 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. sec. 1005 (c)).

6. Provision for Extension of Time Pending Final Administrative or Legal Decision on Divestiture Questions

Proposed amendment: On page 9, line 5, at the end of subsection 4 (a), insert a semicolon in place of a period and add the following new clause: *"Provided, however,* That the filing in good faith of an application with the Board under section 2 or 4 of this act, or of an application for certification provided for in section 10 of this act, shall extend this period in any event until 1 year after the date of entry of the Board's final order on such application, or 1 year after the date of entry of the final judgment terminating proceedings resulting from judicial review of such order under section 9 of this act, whichever is later."

Purpose and effect: Section 4 (a) as drafted provides that no extension of time for divestiture shall be granted beyond 5 years from the date of enactment of the act. This same time limitation is incorporated by reference in the tax relief provisions of section 10 of the bill (proposed as sec. 1101 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code) which require a bank holding company, if it is to receive the benefit of any of these tax relief provisions, to obtain a certificate from the Board that it has fully compiled with section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act within the stated period of time.

Since the time required for administrative or judicial proceedings is necessarily uncertain, it is essential to have a provision which automatically extends this time for a reasonable period after any necessary determinations affecting the obligation to divest have been finally resolved. It is quite possible that at the expiration of the stated period of time, proceedings may still be pending in court on whether or not a certain subsidiary is exempt, for example, as a closely related business under section 4 (c) (6), or whether a company is entitled to a tax certificate with respect to certain proposed divestiture transactions. Until these questions are finally settled, it is, of course, impossible to effect the divestiture and a company should not be exposed to the criminal penalties of the act, or, even more seriously, be denied entirely the benefit of the tax relief provisions, merely because the inevitable delays of litigation or administrative action have made it impossible to meet fixed deadlines. Accordingly, the amendment to section 4 (a) has been suggested to give any company an extension of time to 1 year after the date of entry of a final order or judgment on any issue on which divestiture might turn.

7. Clarifying and Correcting Amendments to Judicial Review Provisions

Proposed amendment: In section 9, page 15, line 23, insert after the word "act", the following: "including any denial of an application for certification under section 10 hereof", and in line 24, change the word "within" to "for." In the same section in line 25, page 15, and line 1, page 16, change "Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia," to "United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit."

Purpose and effect: The wording of the first sentence of the judicial review provisions of the act (section 9) has been revised to make it clear that these provisions are intended to apply to denials by the Board of applications for tax certificates as well as to other orders entered by the Board. Since millions of dollars of tax liability may depend upon receipt of such certificates, this clarification is important.

The other suggestion made is largely to correct obvious clerical errors, such as the proper name of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. There is no such court as the "Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia."

The committee has already adopted another of the suggestions submitted by Transamerica, that a clause be added providing a 60-day time limit within which a petition for review must be filed.

B. Miscellaneous amendments

In addition to the essential procedural amendments proposed above, certain further changes in the bill are necessary if hardships and unwarranted administrative red-tape are to be avoided. It is believed that all of these amendments are entirely consistent with the purported purposes and policies of the bill.

1. Provision To Allow Initial Creation of Small Holding Company Without Necessity for Board Approval

Proposed amendment: On page 5, line 19, after the word "act" and before the semicolon insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That a company may take action which results in its becoming a bank holding company without such prior approval, but subject to all other provisions of this act, if such company after taking such action owns, controls, or holds the power to vote shares in banks located only in a single State, and if all such banks in the aggregate then do not account for more than 5 percent of the total deposits of all banks located in such State."

Purpose and effect: Time is usually of the essence in the formation and financing of a new holding company. The necessity under the present bill for prior approval of the Board before any such company can be formed makes its organization almost impossible as a practical matter. Negotiations cannot normally be held in abeyance for the months necessary to process and hold hearings on an application, particularly when favorable action by the Board is necessarily not certain.

Inability to organize a new holding company may have serious long-run competitive effects. In particular, it will mean that a big bank or a big bank holding company presently in a dominating position in a given State or area will be immune from one of the remaining sources of future competition.

As a result, it would appear desirable to add a proviso to section 3 (a) permitting the organization of a new bank holding company without prior approval, but subject to certain limitations. To prevent this provision from being used by the new holding company to achieve a dominant position through the act of organization itself, the privilege should be limited to a company owning banks in a single State and not having banks controlling more than 5 percent of the deposits of all banks in such State. Once a company is formed, any future acquisitions by it would be governed, of course, by the limitations applicable to all bank holding companies under the bill.

Although Transamerica itself would not be affected by this proposed amendment, it has suggested it as a means of lessening the likelihood that the acquisition provisions of the bill will serve to perpetuate banking monopolies. This is of particular importance in those States in which statewide branch banking is not permitted by local law and in which a bank holding company is already well entrenched.

2. Provision Exempting From Requirement of Board Approval Acquisition of Additional Shares of 25-Percent Owned Bank

Proposed amendment: On page 6, line 15, strike out "a majority" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "25 percent or more."

Purpose and effect: The major test of bank holding-company status, as that term is defined in section 2 (a) of the bill, is the ownership or control of 25 percent or more of the voting shares of two or more banks. If ownership to such extent is deemed sufficient control for purposes of subjecting the holding company and its subsidiaries to regulation under the act, it should be sufficient to permit such company to expand its existing ownership by further acquisitions of stock as occasion warrants, without the necessity for undergoing each time the complex application procedures designed to regulate acquisitions of additional banks. The proposed amendment would simply permit a bank holding company to acquire further shares in a bank already defined as a subsidiary without the requirement of Board approval.

3. Provision Exempting From Requirement of Board Approval Additional Shares Acquired as Stock Dividend, Etc.

Proposed amendment: On page 6, line 15, strike out the period after the word "acquisition" and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the word "or"; insert thereafter the following new subsections: "(C) additional shares acquired by a bank holding company as a stock dividend or through the exercise of rights received with respect to shares previously owned by it as a result of a pro rata distribution of such rights to all owners of such shares, or (D) a change of indirect to direct or direct to indirect ownership of shares already owned, or (E) assets of a bank acquired by a bank holding company upon any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of such bank, or in connection with any other proceeding involving the distribution, in whole or in part,

of the assets of such bank to its stockholders."

Purpose and effect: The purpose of these amendments is largely self-evident. They are designed to free involuntary acquisitions of various types from the necessity of prior approval. No Board approval would be required for bank shares acquired as stock dividends, through the exercise of stock rights, when transfers take place within the holding company organization, or when the holding company acquires bank assets upon liquidation of a banking subsidiary.

None of the types of approval-free acquisitions authorized by this amendment involves expansion of a company's banking enterprises or a change in its percentage of ownership. The requirement of prior approval by the Federal Reserve Board therefore imposes a needless burden both on the Board and on the holding company. In the case of a rights offering, the inevitable delay involved in obtaining such approval might well extend beyond the expiration of the offer.

CONCLUSION

In proposing the amendments discussed above, Transamerica Corp. does not mean to indicate any change in the position it has heretofore taken, that additional bank holding company legislation such as that embodied in S. 2577 is not needed and should not be enacted. Particularly Transamerica wishes to reiterate its view that prohibitions of or limitations on the ownership of nonbanking interests by bank holding companies are unnecessary, undesirable and contrary to the best interests of sound banking. Transamerica's strong nonbanking assets provide an important source of additional capital for its banks, assuring that they will be able to serve adequately the growing needs of their customers in good times and reinforcing their financial stability in times of crisis. These factors are of particular importance in the rapidly expanding western area where all of Transamerica's banking subsidiaries are located.

If legislation is nevertheless to be enacted, it should as a minimum be as fair, as nondiscriminatory and as administratively workable as possible. Transamerica accordingly urges the adoption of the amendments proposed in this memorandum in a genuine effort to assist this committee in accomplishing this objective.

Respectfully submitted.

F. N. BELGRANO, Jr.,
President, Transamerica Corp.

APPENDIX 1

LIST OF SPECIAL EXEMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS—S. 2577

(Bill reference)

Complete or partial exemption for—

1. "One-bank" holding companies, page 1, line 9.

2. A company registered under Investment Company Act prior to May 15, 1955, i. e., Equity Corporation-Morris Plan, page 3, lines 7–9.

3. Testamentary trust, e. g., Florida National (du Pont-Ball) Group, page 3, lines 23–24.

4. Religious organizations, e. g., Mormon Church, page 4, lines 1–4.

5. Charitable organizations, page 4, lines 1–4.

6. Educational institutions and foundations, page 4, lines 1–4.

7. Partnerships, page 4, line 8.

8. Labor unions, e. g., Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, page 11, lines 14–15.

9. Agricultural organizations, page 1, lines 14–15.

10. Horticultural organizations, page 11, lines 14–15.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSED EXEMPTIONS

11. A bank holding company which is itself a bank, i. e., Trust Company of Georgia, page 10, line 23.

12. An investment company subsidiary of a bank holding company, i. e., First National Bank Trustees of Louisville, page 11, line 4.

APPENDIX 2

SUMMARY OF HOLDINGS OF SAMPLE COMPANIES OWNING ONE BANK

(From Moody's Industrial Manual, 1955)

The following are a few of the large industrial, mining, transportation and mercantile companies known to own a controlling interest in one bank. These companies, as well as others included in the compilation in Senate hearings, pages 59–60, which are named in a confidential list available to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee (hearings, pp. 336–337), would be included as one-bank companies and subject to divestiture of their banking or nonbanking businesses if the "one-bank" amendment is adopted.

1. W. R. Grace & Co. (p. 2789):

(a) Total assets as at December 31, 1954 were $375,693,744.

(b) At December 31, 1954, W. R. Grace & Co. owned 79.30 percent of the capital stock of Grace National Bank, New York City. As at that date this bank had deposits of $125,983,000 (Moody's Bank & Finance Manual, 1955, p. 266).

(c) W. R. Grace & Co.'s nonbanking activities include ownership and operation of some 35 chemical plants located throughout the United States and in several foreign countries; subsidiary Grace Line, Inc., operating an extensive fleet of steamships; Pan-American Grace Airways, Inc., a large international airline jointly owned by W. R. Grace & Co. and Pan-American World Airways, Inc.; and Grace Chemical Co., which owns a $20 million fertilizer and industrial chemical plant at Woodstock, Tenn. W. R. Grace & Co. also owns an advertising subsidiary, extensive foreign agricultural, mining and manufacturing subsidiaries, and other miscellaneous business enterprises.

2. Deere & Co. (p. 292):

(a) Total assets as at December 31, 1954 were $430,378,654.

(b) At December 31, 1954 Deere & Co. owned 94.5 percent of the capital stock of Moline National Bank, Moline, Ill. As at that date this bank had deposits of $36,990,000 (Moody's Bank & Finance Manual, 1955, p. 137).

(c) Deere & Co. owns and operates directly and through subsidiaries 13 principal plants in the United States and Canada which manufacture a full line of agricultural machinery, implements, and chemicals.

3. Corn Products Refining Co. (p. 2437):

(a) Total assets at December 31, 1954, were $181,781,031.

(b) At December 31, 1954, Corn Products Refining Co. owned 92 percent of the capital stock of Argo State Bank, Argo, Ill. As at that date this bank had deposits of $8,394,104 (Moody's Bank & Finance Manual, 1955, p. 1,176).

(c) Corn Products Refining Co. is the leading factor in domestic and world markets in the refining of corn products. It operates plants in a number of States as well as in Europe, South America, Canada, and Mexico.

4. Peabody Coal Co. (p. 164):

(a) Total assets as at December 31, 1954, were $44,426,969.

(b) At December 31, 1954, Peabody Coal Co. owned 59.78 percent of the capital stock of First Trust & Savings Bank of Taylorville, Ill. As at that date this bank had deposits of $12,171,000 (Moody's Bank & Finance Manual, 1955, p. 352).

(c) Peabody Coal Co. is primarily in the business of mining, jobbing, and selling bituminous coal. Through subsidiaries it also engages in the retail coal business.

5. Gimbel Bros., Inc. (p. 2748):

(a) Total assets as at December 31, 1954, were $161,094,112.

(b) At December 31, 1954, Gimbel Bros., Inc., owned 98.8 percent of Gimbel Bros. Bank & Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa. As at that date this bank had deposits of $14,992,000 (Moody's Bank & Finance Manual, 1955, p. 452).

(c) Gimbel Bros., Inc., is in the business of owning and operating department stores under the names of "Gimbel's" or "Saks." It has large stores in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, and other cities.

APPENDIX 3

[From the American Banker of January 31, 1956]

FLORIDA NATIONAL GROUP OF BANKS

Florida National Bank of Jacksonville, Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at Miami, Florida National Bank at St. Petersburg, Florida National Bank at Orlando, Florida National Bank at Pensacola, Florida National Bank & Trust Co. at West Palm Beach, Florida National Bank at Coral Gables, Florida Bank & Trust Co. at Daytona Beach, Florida National Bank at Lakeland, Florida National Bank at Key West, Florida National Bank at Bartow, Florida National Bank at Gainesville, Florida National Bank at Ocala, Florida National Bank at Fernandina Beach, Florida Bank at Fort Pierce, Florida National Bank at Perry, Florida Bank at Deland, Florida Bank at Starke, Florida National Bank at Belle Glade, Florida Bank at Madison, Florida Bank at Port St. Joe, Florida Bank at Chipley, Florida National Bank at Arlington (Jacksonville), Florida Bank at Bushnell.

Combined statement of condition, Dec. 31, 1955

RESOURCES

Loans and discounts	$142,595,834.45
Banking houses, furniture, and fixtures (including office buildings)	5,568,748.86
Other real estate owned	54,897.13
Prepaid expenses	70,024.06
Other resources	12,675.56
Customers liability A/C letters of credit	219,215.60
Accrued interest and income receivable	1,532,362.98
U. S. Government securities	207,081,379.42
Florida county and municipal bonds	21,725,232.87
Federal Reserve bank stock	906,150.00
Other securities	652,501.10
Cash on hand and due from banks	174,750,941.34
Total	406,648,567.71
Total	555,169,963.37

LIABILITIES

Capital stock	$13,000,000.00
Surplus	20,005,000.00
Undivided profits	1,885,953.53
Total	34,890,953.53
Reserve for contingencies	7,013,716.78
Reserve for taxes, interest, etc	2,876,348.22
Interest and income collected, not earned	1,856,488.07
Bills payable	200,000.00
Letters of credit	393,336.60
Other liabilities	18,122.78
Deposits	507,920,997.39
Total	555,169,963.37

NONBANK HOLDINGS OF ALFRED I. DU PONT TESTAMENTARY TRUST

Comprehensive information as to the extent of the nonbank holdings of the Alfred I. du Pont Testamentary Trust, frequently referred to as the Ball-Du Pont interests, is

not readily available. According to information which has been published in Interstate Commerce Commission reports and elsewhere, this trust owns a controlling interest in a number of very substantial nonbank enterprises, in addition to the banks included in the Florida National Group described in the aforegoing advertisement. (Senate hearings, p. 73.) Among the more important of these nonbank enterprises are:

St. Joe Paper Co., with extensive facilities at Port St. Joe, Fla., as well as plants in Houston, Tex., and Hackensack, N. J. (252 I. C. C. 151, 152; Fortune magazine, Nov. 1952, pp. 143, 150–55).

Apalachicola Northern R. R., extending some 96 miles from Chattahoochee, Fla., to Port St. Joe, Fla., 100 percent owned by St. Joe Paper Co. (Moody's Transportation Manual, 1955, p. 366).

In addition to the foregoing, St. Joe Paper Co. or its subsidiary or affiliated companies have been reported to own a majority of the bonds of the Florida East Coast Railway, now in the hands of receivers (282 I. C. C. 84), a telephone company and most of the real estate in the town of Port St. Joe, and some 750,000 acres of west Florida timberland (Fortune magazine, Nov. 1952, pp. 143, 155, 162). See also Mr. Ball of Florida in Investor's Reader, March 22, 1954, pages 17–20.

APPENDIX 4

SUMMARY OF CERTAIN REPORTED HOLDINGS OF MORMON CHURCH

While no published information is available, it is understood that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church—directly or indirectly owns substantial and in many instances controlling interests in a number of banks and nonbanking businesses. It is believed that the following are included among these holdings:

BANKS

Utah Savings & Trust Co.
Zion's Savings Bank & Trust Co.
First National Bank, Salt Lake City.

NONBANK COMPANIES

Beneficial Life Insurance Co. (100 percent owned by Mormon Church, see Moody's Bank and Finance Manual, 1955).
Utah Home Fire Insurance Co.
Deseret News Publishing Co.
Radio and Television Station KSL.
Utah Idaho Sugar Co.
Hotel Utah.
Temple Square Hotel.
Zion's Securities Corp.
Z. C. M. I. Department Store.

APPENDIX 5

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL HOLDINGS OF TRUST COMPANY OF GEORGIA AND OF FIRST NATIONAL BANK TRUSTEES OF LOUISVILLE

(a) Trust Company of Georgia is a bank which by local law is permitted to be also a bank holding company. In all respects, it meets the definition of bank holding company provided in section 2 (a) of S. 2577. It owns the entire capital stock of Trust Company of Georgia Associates (also a bank holding company under the bill) and of the Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Lincoln, Nebr. In addition, it directly owns 5,500 shares of Coca-Cola International Corp. (Senate hearing, Feb. 8, 1956, typed transcript, 911, 912, 934.)

The Trust Company of Georgia Associates, its wholly owned subsidiary, in turn owns a controlling interest in six national banks and all of the capital stock of Trusco Finance Co., which makes loans on automobiles, household appliances, farm equipment, etc. An additional 4,968 shares of Coca-Cola International Corp. are directly owned by the Trust Company of Georgia Associates. (Senate hearing, Feb. 8, 1956, typed transcript. p. 913.)

Representatives of this company have formally proposed that the bill be amended by the addition of the following language to section 4 (c) (4) of the bill (p. 10, line 23) (Senate hearing, Feb. 8, 1956, typed transcript, p. 909): "or to shares lawfully acquired and owned prior to the date of enactment of this act by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries."

The effect of this additional language, which is already contained in the House bill, is to relieve the Trust Company of Georgia and each of its subsidiaries of all divestiture obligations under the bill.

(b) First National Bank Trustees of Louisville is a widely held business trust owning the entire capital stock (directors qualifying shares excepted) of four separate corporations. Its wholly owned subsidiaries include the First National Bank of Louisville, a large commercial bank with deposits of $166 million, the Kentucky Trust Co., the First Kentucky Co., an investment company with extensive diversified holdings, and the First Kentucky Fire Insurance Co. (Senate hearings, pp. 201–202.)

Representatives of the First National Bank Trustees of Louisville proposed on February 8, 1956, an amendment to section 4 (c) (5) of the bill (p. 11, line 4) which would render the divestiture provisions inapplicable (Senate hearing, typed transcript, p. 919): "to obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company, which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, and which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company."

The effect of this amendment, which would conform S. 2577 to the provisions of section 6 (c) (6) of H. R. 6227, would be to exempt the First National Bank Trustees of Louisville from divestiture of their investment company.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say also that Mr. Belgrano has received some unfair kicking around in the course of the many months the bill has been under consideration. As I said earlier this afternoon, I do not agree with him that there should be no bank holding legislation passed, and he knows it. Nevertheless, I do not know of a witness who has appeared before any committee since I have been in the Senate who has been more frank and fair and objective with the committee than he has been, or who has laid his cards on the table and backed up his statement with documentation as has Mr. Belgrano. In fairness to him I have asked that his full statement appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will stand on my own arguments so far as the particular procedural amendments that I have selected for offering by way of additions to the bill are concerned.

I close by saying again what I said so many times in the 11 years of my service in the Senate, that no legislation is any better than the procedure that we enact into that legislation. The bill, in my judgment, in its present form does not contain the procedural safeguards that I believe the bank holding companies are entitled to have. They are certainly entitled to a hearing of record before the Federal Reserve Board if they are to have an appeal from a rejection by the Federal Reserve Board. How can an appeal be passed upon if no record is made which can be taken to the upper court?

What my amendment does, in effect, is to assure, not Transamerica alone, but every bank holding company that may be subject to the terms of the act, the right to have a record made before the Federal Reserve Board, on the basis of which an appeal can be brought.

I submit the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that the Senator's amendment would make it possible for any bank which would normally come under the provisions of the act to exempt itself from the act by a mere filing of an application?

Mr. MORSE. No. An appeal could be taken from the action of the Federal Reserve Board either by the Government or by the bank. Of course the act would not go into final effect until the courts had passed upon any appeal taken by a company under the act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I read the amendment, the only thing that a bank would have to do to exempt itself under the operation of the act would be to file an application, and that would serve as an exemption until the application was acted on.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, an order would not be applied until the appeal had been gone through. That is basic to just procedure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would be the reverse of normal procedure. Normally, under the Wage and Hour Act, for example, a person is under the act until he is exempted. The Senator's amendment would suspend the application of the act until the application was acted on.

Mr. MORSE. Let me point out to the Senator what the effect of the appeal procedure would be. We are dealing with vested property rights. We are dealing with property rights, which in my opinion certainly ought not to be taken away without due process of law. We are dealing with the right, in this instance, of a corporation, which is a person under the law, to its right to appeal. Certainly I hope we have not reached a point in American jurisprudence where a person must get rid of his property before he can have the right of appeal. Of course, it means a stay of proceedings until the appeal procedure has been exhausted. That is very basic to a fair trial in America. It does not do any good to hang a man, and then give him a chance to appeal after he is dead.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate, except that I wish to say that the Senator from South Dakota is absolutely right. Mr. Belgrano said that the filing of a good-faith statement would exempt an applicant and would permit him to go through the procedure of an appeal, which in some cases could take as long as 3 or 4 years.

Mr. Belgrano testified before our committee for 258 pages. He never mentioned the amendments to anyone else, and he never mentioned them on the House side, and he never mentioned

them last year, or when he offered additional amendments last December. It was only in February that he came forward with these so-called procedural amendments. At that time I criticized them as a delaying tactic and in the nature of an attempt to throw dust in the eyes. That is all the amendments are. No other bank holding company has endorsed them. This is a Belgrano proposal, pure and simple.

The committee did not vote on the amendments. I am sure if it had voted on them, there would have been an overwhelming vote against them. I note that the distinguished majority leader is asking us to vote. If he will vote "no," I will say "Let us vote."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have two very brief comments to make. I was very cooperative in committee with regard to letting the amendments come to the floor of the Senate. We were having a great deal of difficulty in getting a committee quorum in those days. We finally did get a quorum. The committee did not want to wait until the next day to consider the amendments, and I said, "Very well, I will take the amendments to the floor of the Senate." I want to say to my good friend from Virginia that he is quite wrong if he believes that I stood alone without any support in the committee for these amendments. I do not know what the vote would have been, but in the committee several Senators assured me they would vote with me on some of them, particularly on this one. It is shocking to me, as a lawyer, to hear anyone take the position in the Senate that, when we are dealing with economic interests which will have to be divested in connection with the bill, we should adopt a procedure that would require a bank holding company to divest itself first before an appeal can be taken.

This is a complete reversal of my conception of justice by way of fair appeal procedure in this country. We are dealing with millions of dollars of property rights. It would not take very long to go through the appeal procedure. The Senator from Virginia suggested 3 or 4 years. In my judgment, even if it took 4 years—and I do not believe it will take anywhere near that time—but even if it took that long, I say we had better cling very fast to the proposition in this country that American citizens, even though they be only legal persons in the form of a corporation, will have their day in court by way of fair appeal procedure.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a number of loan and investment companies in my State, which are concerned about the application of the provisions of S. 2577 to their business, have addressed inquiries to me.

Am I correct in understanding that S. 2577 will apply only to commercial banks in the strict sense of the word, and that there is no intention of bringing under the bill loan companies and companies sometimes known as industrial banks, whose prime function is making loans?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is absolutely correct in saying it is the intention of the commitee in reporting the bill to apply it to commercial banks only.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In defining the word "bank" in S. 2577, is it the intention to include loan and investment companies, which are called in some States, industrial banks? These institutions are basically lending institutions and may in some instances sell certificates as collateral for loans.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia could not pass judgment on a hypothetical case. The test is whether it is a commerical bank or is not. I would assume from what the Senator has said that they would not be called commercial banks from their name. But that is a matter to be determined by the Federal Reserve Board. From the information we received in committee I do not know of any situation in Pennsylvania which has not been already covered. After all, we cannot tell by a name exactly what business is being conducted, and it is a question of whether it is a commercial bank or is not.

Mr. MARTIN of Pensylvania. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 2, beginning with the word "If," it is proposed to strike out down through the word "hearing" in line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

If the Comptroller of the Currency or State supervisory authority so notified by the Board does not request a hearing thereon in writing within said 30 days, the Board may, without further notice or proceedings, enter an order granting the application. If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority requests a hearing thereon in writing within 30 days, or if the Board itself is unwilling to grant the application without a hearing, even in the absence of such request, it shall forthwith give written notice of that fact to the applicant. If within 10 days after receipt of such notice from the Board the applicant does not either withdraw such application or request in writing for hearing thereon, the Board may enter an order forthwith denying the application. On receipt from the applicant of such request for hearing, however, the Board shall promptly give written notice to the applicant and to the Comptroller of the Currency or State supervisory authority, as the case may be, of the date for commencement of the hearing by it on such application. Such hearing shall be commenced not less than 10 nor more than 30 days after said notice.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the bill as reported contains a number of serious procedural deficiencies. The most serious of these—which this amendment is designed to correct—is not just an omission; it is a genuine conflict between two different provisions of the bill which can only result in litigation and delay.

This defect is found in the provisions of section 3 (b) dealing with the procedure to be followed by the board of governors in granting or denying applications for approval of bank acquisitions. As this provision is now drawn, the Board must give notice of any such application to the appropriate State supervisory authority or to the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case may be. A formal hearing on the application is required to be held if the Comptroller or the State authority files an objection to the application. If no such objection is filed, however, the Board may deny the application for any reason or no reason, without holding any hearing whatever.

There is no reason to limit the formal hearing to instances when the Comptroller of the Currency or a State supervisory authority objects to an application. If an opportunity for hearing is to be provided at all, it should be made available to an applicant in all instances. There is no justification whatever for allowing the Board to deny an application out of hand without any hearing whatever, if it chooses to do so, merely because it has received no formal objection to the acquisition from some other regulatory authority.

Under section 9 of the bill, judicial review by an appellate court is expressly given to "any party aggrieved by an order of the Board under this act." On such review, the Board is required to file with the court the certified transcript of the record made before the Board. If there has been no hearing, no evidence, and no record of proceedings before the Board, what would there be for the appellate court to review? Unless provision is made for a hearing in instances where the Board on its own initiative and without objection by the Comptroller or the State supervisory authority determines that an application should be denied, it will at least be necessary to adopt the provisions of the House bill which grant a completely new hearing to an aggrieved party in the Federal court.

The proposed amendment is designed to remedy this defect. It avoids the cumbersome procedure resulting from a mandatory requirement that a hearing be held even if not requested by the parties, but at the same time insures that no application can be denied without affording to the applicant the right to a hearing, and to a decision on evidence advanced at such hearing, wtih judicial review by a court. Precedent for such treatment can be found in many regulatory statutes. See section 309 of the Federal Communications Act with respect to applications for certain radio station licenses—title 47, United States Code, section 309. Similarly, it is provided that no application can be granted over the objection of the Comptroller or appropriate State regulatory authority without an equal right in such authority to have a hearing if it so requests. In the latter case, the applicant must either agree to the holding of such a hearing or withdraw his application.

This amendment would also eliminate those provisions of section 3 (b) pertaining to the length of the hearing, the

opportunity to testify, and so forth. Other amendments to be offered render them superfluous.

Mr. President, we have a problem in conference with the House on the basis of the language, so far as the procedure is concerned. I wish to say that it would be good judgment to take this amendment to conference and there iron out any differences which ought to be ironed out.

I submit the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of why the Federal Reserve Board is opposed to this and the other amendments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR ROBERTSON'S STATEMENT ON MORSE PROCEDURAL AMENDMENTS

I assume the procedural amendments proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are similar to those proposed by the Transamerica Corporation in testimony before our committee. It is perhaps needless to say that the committee considered these amendments fully and rejected them. The committee believes that the procedure established in the bill as a fair and reasonable one which will protect all parties concerned. We felt that the real purpose of these procedural amendments was to delay action on the enforcement of this bill and drag the disputes to the courts for many years to come.

Many of these suggested procedural amendments appear to have as their objective the necessity for more formalized proceedings in connection with actions by the Federal Reserve Board under the bill. The bill already contains two provisions requiring the holding of formal hearings by the Board. First, if the appropriate State supervisory authority or the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case may be, should express its disapproval of any applications submitted to the Board by a bank holding company with respect to the acquisition of a bank, the Board would be required to hold a formal hearing. In the second place, S. 2577 provides for the holding of a formal hearing in order to determine whether any company is of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature and so closely related to banking as to be exempted from the divestment requirements in the bill. These two provisions guarantee a hearing in those cases where they are really necessary. We did not provide for hearings just for the sake of having the hearings but only where it was necessary to insure fairness in the application of this bill.

It must be remembered that for nearly 100 years Federal bank supervisory agencies have acted upon applications for charters and branches of banks without formal hearings. This practice has worked satisfactory not only for the banking agencies but for all parties affected.

Under my bill the parties in any event would be afforded an opportunity to submit with their applications whatever written briefs or arguments they might desire. They would also be afforded, if desired, an opportunity to discussion of the matter with the Federal Reserve Board and its staff. In any case in which the Board might deny an application, the reason for the denial would be stated by the Board. In fact, this would be required by the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

I believe I may best conclude by quoting from the statement submitted by the Federal Reserve Board on this question. The Board said: "It is believed that the proposed extension of the provisions of the bill with respect to formal hearings would inevitably impede and hamper administration of the law. Furthermore, such additional provisions are unnecessary for the adequate protection of the rights of bank holding companies under the bill."

I believe that the members of this body should follow the position taken by the Federal Reserve Board, the American Bankers Association, and the Independent Bankers Association and reject the Morse amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out the words "after due notice and hearing, and on the basis of the record made at such hearing."

On page 11, line 13, immediately after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That the Board shall not deny any application for exemption under this subsection except after due notice to the applicant and an opportunity for hearing thereon."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I speak with great confidence in the belief that students of this problem will come to approve the procedural position which I am taking tonight on this matter. If the matter should be submitted to any administrative law classroom in any first-class law school in America it would be found that on the basis of the authorities, this is the kind of procedure which the Senate of the United States should be fighting for. But we are confronted with a situation where minds are made up and Senators are determined to send the bill to conference without any amendments attached to it. Someone has to make a record for fair procedure, and I am proud to make that record. I speak with a very heavy heart, however, because I think it is regrettable that we should take the position that one agency, the Federal Reserve Board, which does not want to trust itself to have the kind of hearings for which I am asking, has objections to any change in their bewhiskered procedure.

Mr. President, section 4 (c) (6) of the bill exempts from the divestiture requirement companies "of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature" which the Board after hearing has determined to be so closely related to banking as to justify their exemption. The procedural provisions contained in this subsection, however, are not clear as to whether a notice and hearing are to be had on specific applications for exemption by a holding company, or as to whether the Board is authorized to grant such an exemption without a formal hearing where there is no objection or controversy. The proposed amendment would conform the procedure applicable here to that suggested for applications for approval of bank stock acquisitions.

Under the proposed amendment, a bank holding company seeking to obtain an exemption for companies "of a financial, fiduciary, and insurance nature" would apply to the Board for an order granting such exemption. The Board may grant this application without formal proceedings, but it may not deny it without giving the applicant an opportunity for a hearing and the establishment of a record for subsequent judicial review. This combines the advantages of informal procedure where no controversy is involved with full procedural safeguards to the applicant when the applicant is dissatisfied with the Board's preliminary determination.

I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(e) An application to the Board for a certification or extension of time provided for in section 10 of this act may be granted without notice, hearing or other formal proceedings. No such application shall be denied by the Board, however, except after due notice to the applicant and an opportunity for hearing thereon. The granting or denial of any such application on which the applicant has requested a hearing, as well as the granting or denial of any application under sections 2, 3, or 4 of this act on which the applicant has requested a hearing, shall be deemed to be an adjudication required by statute to be determined on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing within the meaning of section 5 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 1004).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment under the heading "Amendment to provide for the granting of notice and opportunity for hearing on applications for tax certificates and generally incorporating provisions of the Administration Procedure Act."

Under the bill, a bank holding company which has nonbank interests as well may choose either to remain a bank holding company and to divest itself of its prohibited nonbank properties or to terminate its bank holding company status by divesting itself of its bank holdings. In either case, the tax relief provided in section 10 of the bill for such distributions or spinoffs is dependent upon the holding company obtaining from the Board a certificate that it has fully complied with the divestiture requirements of the act within the stated period of time.

Whether a company is entitled to a certificate will often turn on complex questions of both fact and law, and clearly some procedure for a hearing on these questions should be provided, with the usual provision for judicial review. Nevertheless, the bill in its present form is seriously deficient in that it contains

no provision whatever for the procedure to be followed by a bank holding company in obtaining from the Board the tax certificates provided for in section 10.

The proposed amendment contemplates that a bank holding company, or a company which has decided to dispose of its banks and to cease to be a bank holding company, will apply to the Board for the certifications provided for by the tax provisions included in section 10. If the Board is willing to grant the application without formal proceedings, it is authorized to do so, as with other applications. It may not deny an application for a tax certificate, however, without granting the applicant company an opportunity for a hearing, with subsequent judicial review.

The last sentence of the new section 5 (e) proposed by this amendment is also designed to make it clear that the procedure provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to all these hearings. None of these hearings is to be held unless the applicant in fact requests it, so that these provisions do not in any way limit the Board's power to grant or otherwise dispose of an application without objection in entirely informal proceedings.

I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert the following new subsections (f) and (g):

(f) For the purpose of any hearing pursuant to the provisions of this act, the Board, or any officer thereof designated by it, is authorized to administer oaths and affirmations, and by subpena to require any person to appear and testify, or to appear and produce relevant books, records, or other papers. In case of failure or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person pursuant to such authority, the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Board, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce relevant books, records, or other papers, or both, in accordance with the subpena; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(g) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any person, the Board may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or proceeding is carried on, or where such person resides or carries on business, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, and other records. Such court may issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Board or member or officer designated by the Board, there to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such person is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found or may be doing business. Any person who willfully shall fail or refuse to attend and testify or to answer any lawful inquiry or to produce books, papers, correspondence, memoranda, contracts, agreements, or other records, if in his or its power so to do, in obedience to the subpena of the Board, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to grant subpena power to the Board.

A major defect of the bill is its failure to give the Federal Reserve Board any power to compel the production of documents or the appearance of witnesses. The Board has no such power at the present time. The general statutes creating the Federal Reserve Board and giving it powers in other fields such as enforcement of the Clayton Act do not, as is the case with other administrative agencies, grant to the Board general powers to subpena witnesses, compel the production of documents, and so forth. Accordingly, anyone requested by the Board or a bank holding company to appear who does not desire to produce documents or to give testimony at a hearing held by the Board under this bill need not do so.

No genuine hearing could be held without this power, which is given by law to almost every other Federal agency exercising regulatory functions comparable to those assigned to the Board by this bill. Unless documents can be required to be produced and witnesses compelled to attend hearings, the hearings may well be abortive.

The amendment proposed is designed to give the Board this necessary power in connection with hearings held under the act. The provisions are modeled upon corresponding provisions of the Federal Power Act (16 U. S. C. 825 (b)-(c)).

I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, line 5, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter insert the following: *"Provided, however,* That the filing in good faith of an application with the Board under sections 2 or 4 of this act, or of an application for certification provided for in section 10 of this act, shall extend this period in any event until 1 year after the date of entry of the Board's final order on such application, or 1 year after the date of entry of the final judgment terminating proceedings resulting from judicial review of such order under section 9 of this act, whichever is later."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment under the heading "Amendment to provide for extension of time pending final administrative or legal decision on divestiture questions."

The divestiture provisions of the bill require that all prohibited property be divested within a period of 5 years. No extensions of time for divestiture may be granted by the Board beyond 5 years from the date of enactment of the act. In like fashion, the tax relief provided in section 10 of the bill is available only if the Board certifies that the company has fully complied with the divestiture requirements of the act within the 5-year period.

This absolute prohibition on retention of prohibited property beyond the 5-year period presents serious difficulties. It is quite possible that at the expiration of the stated period of time proceedings may still be pending in court on whether or not a certain subsidiary is exempt, for example, as a closely related business under section 4 (c) (6), or whether a company is entitled to a tax certificate with respect to certain proposed divestiture transactions. Until these questions are finally settled, it is, of course, impossible to effect the divestiture, and a company should not be exposed to the criminal penalties of the act, or, even more seriously, be denied entirely the benefit of the tax-relief provisions, merely because the inevitable delays of litigation or administrative action have made it impossible to meet fixed deadlines.

The proposed amendment gives recognition to the fact that the time required for administrative or judicial proceedings is necessarily uncertain. The amendment would provide for an automatic extension of the time within which divestiture must be effected until 1 year after the date of entry of a final order or judgment, in all cases where the issue of required divestiture is being tested in formal administrative or judicial proceedings.

We are dealing with millions of dollars worth of property belonging to fellow Americans. Certainly they ought to have time, after the court has handed down a final decree, to dispose of their property without great economic loss and sacrifice.

The amendment proposes a 1-year extension after the final order of the court, if the 5-year period as provided within the bill does not comply with the time limitation in the final court order.

I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair.) The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 23, after the word "act", it is proposed to add a comma, and immediately thereafter the following: "including any denial of an application for certification under section 10 hereof."

On page 15, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the word "within" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

On page 15, line 25, beginning with the word "Court", it is proposed to strike out through the word "Columbia" on page 16, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit."

AMENDMENT TO CLARIFY AND CORRECT JUDICIAL REVIEW PROVISIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment under the heading "Amendment To Clarify and Correct Judicial Review Provisions."

This amendment would revise the language of the judicial review provisions of the act (section 9) to make it clear that a denial by the board of an application for a tax certificate is an action subject to judicial review in the same manner as other orders entered by the board. It would also designate the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit by its proper name. There is no such court as the "Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia."

Since millions of dollars of tax liability may depend upon a granting of the certificate by the board, it is essential that judicial review be equally available to determinations of this nature.

Mr. President, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say I have completed submitting the procedural amendments. They were procedural amendments which I thought, on the representations of Mr. Belgrano, in his testimony before our committee, and in my very careful study of his objections to the procedure of the bill, were sound amendments.

Let the RECORD show I have tried this afternoon to do two things. I have tried to offer amendments which seek to send to conference a true bank holding company bill, not a hybrid which we are sending, which is not a bank holding company bill at all. It is primarily an anti-Transamerica bill. I think Transamerica, along with other bank holding companies in this country, ought to be brought under divestiture legislation. I have said so many times. Therefore, the position I have taken is not going to please any group in financial circles in America, including the American Bankers Association or Transamerica.

But I am proud of the record I have made this afternoon, because I have made a record to accomplish two things: Namely, to keep faith with what the Federal Reserve Board said was the definition of a bank holding company which ought to be included in any legislation—namely, one bank or more. I have tried to protect the public interest in supporting legislation that would subject, in a nondiscriminatory fashion, all bank holding companies to fair regulation.

If it is true, as a matter of public policy, that bank holding companies ought to be checked in their having subsidiaries in addition to their banking operations, that is equally as applicable to the depositors of a bank holding company of one bank as it is applicable to the depositors of a bank holding company of two or more banks.

Lastly, I have sought to offer procedural amendments in keeping with sound legal procedure in this country.

I am willing to let time and future events be the judges of the course I have taken. I forewarn the Senate the time is coming when we shall have to propose additional legislation which will seek to carry out the proposals made by the Senator from Oregon this afternoon but which were steam rolled to defeat not because many of my colleagues disagree with me but because of the politics of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as we approach a vote on the final passage of the bank holding bill, which I hope and believe will be favorably voted on, I do not want to let the occasion pass without paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the eminent junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has guided the bill through committee and through the discussion on the floor.

The junior Senator from Virginia has displayed great patience, great ability, and great devotion to duty, and I wish to congratulate him on what will be, I hope, a successful termination of 18 years of work. In this, the Senator from Virginia continues to operate in the tradition of his eminent predecessor, Carter Glass.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia gratefully appreciates the kind words of the Senator from Illinois. We all know it is a physical impossibility to frame a bank holding company bill which will please everyone. We at least have two satisfactions tonight. One is that we are closer to a bank holding company law than we have been in the past 18 years.

Secondly, wet have now framed a bank holding company bill that is pleasing an acceptable to all the independent bankers. They were the ones who for 18 years were asking Congress to enact legislation on this subject. So I hope there will not be a single vote against the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to take a half minute to pay my compliments to the Senator from Virginia. I have opposed him on a great many features of the bill, and still oppose him on a great many features of the bill. Nevertheless, I have a high respect for the work he has done in behalf of a bill which he thinks is the best bill we have any chance of passing. Nevertheless, I want him to know I have a very deep appreciation for the many courtesies which he has extended to me over the months, as we have held different views on particular sections of the bill. I congratulate him on the great victory that is his tonight.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have always thought bank holding companies should be within the same jurisdiction and subject to the same provisions applying to banks. I still am of that opinion. But in my 11½ years in the Senate, this is the worst piece of class legislation I have seen passed. I look on it as class legislation. I believe we have been very, very unfair to many people, and that is unfortunate. I think we could have made a good piece of legislation out of the bill, and have protected the independent bankers, which I want to see done. We could have been fair. Instead of that, we have played favorites. We have exempted some companies from the terms of the bill. We have placed others under the terms of the bill. We have said that a bank holding company is one which has two banks or more, when we know a bank holding company should be limited to one bank.

I wish to go on record as repeating that this is the worst piece of legislation I have seen passed in the 11½ years I have been in Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared with respect to a situation in Florida, and also a summary of exclusions and exemptions in Senate bill 2577, showing the justification for a "freeze" amendment.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

At the hearing on February 24, 1956, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, there was discussion with reference to the fact that the Du Pont trust estate in Florida, owning banks and nonbanking enterprises, was excluded from provisions of S. 2577. In that connection, Senator ROBERTSON took issue with the contention made that the Du Pont testamentary trust should not be excluded. In that regard, he stated that the Du Pont trust was quite different from Transamerica's type of operation; that "there is a lot of difference between those who are working for Mr. Belgrano and his stockholders, and those who are working for crippled children or other charities," and that the "Du Pont trust (1) is working for the trust dollar, (2) it has never mingled its assets of a nonbanking character with its nonbanking assets, and (3) it has never gotten any upstream, downstream, or parallel loans from its banks."

It appears that Senator ROBERTSON was quite unrestrained in attempting to make a record based on his opinions without any supporting facts in the record.

Since the hearings we have secured access to a copy of the will of Alfred I. du Pont which establishes the testamentary trust in question and otherwise acquired information as to the Du Pont trust. Before setting forth information thus acquired, however, it appears to the writer that if there is danger to the public interest arising from concentration of capital by bank holding companies, and in having a bank holding company control both banking and nonbanking assets, the danger is present regardless of the type or character of the bank holding company. The disposition of the ultimate net income by the entity which controls multiple banks and banking and nonbanking assets, is not and cannot be a determinative factor in appraising the alleged damage to the public interest in the two instances comprehended by S. 2577.

The facts and record hereinafter set forth demonstrate clearly that, in considering the objectives of the bank holding company legislation protection of the public interest against dangers from concentration of eco-

nomic power and from control of banking and nonbanking enterprises—that it is unsound and unwarranted to exclude a testamentary trust and, in particular the du Pont trust estate in Florida.

1. THE DU PONT TRUST ESTATE—THE WILL

Alfred I. du Pont died on April 29, 1935, leaving a will, with two codicils, which was admitted to probate in Duval County, Fla., on May 24, 1935, and letters testamentary issued, accordingly, on the same date. The will provides, among other things, the following:

1. Makes 8 specific bequests of shares of common capital stock of Almours Securities, Inc., to persons named—5 of 5,000 shares each, 3 of 1,000 shares each (item 2).

2. Makes a specific bequest of $1,000 to each and every one of the employees who was in his employ, the employ of Almours Securities Inc., and the employ of any of its subsidiaries, at the time of testator's death and who had been so continuously employed for a period of 1 year or more preceding his death, whether in Jacksonville, Fla. or Wilmington, Del., etc. (item 2).

3. Bequeathed all of his personal belongings to his wife Jessie Ball du Pont in addition to the contents of the mansion house and other buildings and structures known as Nemours, which he had theretofore given to her (item 3).

4. Stated that Epping Forest, his home in Duval County, Fla., is vested in an estate by the entireties in his wife and himself, which upon his death would pass to her by operation of law, but provided that should his wife predecease him, he devised it to Almour Securities in fee simple, forever (item 4).

5. Subject to the legacies and bequests hereinabove set forth, gave, devised, and bequeathed the entire rest, residue, and remainder of his property and estate to 4 trustees named (1 corporate and 3 individual) to have and to hold the same forever in trust, for the following uses and purposes (item 5).

(Item 5 of the will makes provision for the perpetual continuation of the trusteeship, by vesting in surviving trustees the power and authority to select a trustee to replace one who dies or ceases to act.)

(a) Trustees to take possession and have entire management and control of corpus of estate, and set forth their powers. They are very comprehensive and broad, and include power:

1. To invest and reinvest assets.

2. To borrow money, make and renew loans and to execute, deliver, assign, such assignments, transfers, notes, bonds, mortgages and so forth, as they deem necessary.

3. To sell at public or private sale, mortgages pledged, leased—any or all assets of the estate.

4. To take over property in foreclosure, and enter into agreements to liquidate, conserve, better or save any assets of the estate.

5. To carry on any business enterprise, either individually or as a copartner: to enter into incorporation of same and accept stock in lieu of individual interest or to sell out testators' interest.

6. To take such contributions and pay such assessments upon any assets of the estate—which they are called upon to meet and deem wise and expedient.

7. To do every and all things they deem best for the preservation, conservation and betterment of the estate.

8. To pay all expenses incurred in the administration, conservation, or protection of the estate.

9. To replace and rebuild, out of insurance carried, any property destroyed by fire or other destructive elements.

10. To remodel and rebuild any improved property, or to build upon or improve unimproved property.

11. To exercise same powers in dealing with and disposing of real estate, securities and other property which shall at any time constitute a part of the principal of the estate, that an individual, owning the same absolutely, would have.

12. To subscribe and pay for stock in corporations, and hold same as part of the estate and vote said stock.

13. To compromise and settle all claims in favor of or against the estate.

14. Provides for compensation to trustee (item 6).

(b) Trustees shall pay out of the net income of the Trust Estate, annuities as follows, "payable monthly commencing at time of testator's death" (item 7).

1. Twenty-nine annuities each during the term of the natural life of the persons named.

2. One annuity for 10 years after death of testator or the natural life of legatee, whichever is shorter.

Comment on annuities: The total annual amount is $99,580 consisting of 1 for $30,000, 1 for $15,000, 6 for $5,000 each, 1 for $2,400, 1 for $1,800, 12 for $1,200, 1 for $900, 2 for $800, 3 for $600, 1 for $240, 1 for $1,440.

In several instances the bequest is payable to the legatee during his life; on his death to his child or children, during the terms of their natural lives or 21 years whichever is shorter; or upon legatee's death, to his wife and/or issue, during their respective lives, etc.

Another legatee, in addition to a cash annuity is given right to live in a house and to use the farm building free of charge, and, his wife, after his death to be accorded the same privilege.

(c) Trustees to pay from the income of the trust estate, to testator's wife, Jessie Ball du Pont (item 8).

1. $200,000 per annum, or such part thereof as is available out of net income derived during the current year—commencing at testator's death for and during the term of her natural life.

The annuities payable under item 7 (par. (b) above) are conditioned on their being available funds after paying this $200,000 annuity—as such annuities shall be second, subject and subordinate to this annuity to testator's wife.

2. The remainder, if any, of the net income from the trust estate—after payment of the annuities in items 7 and 8 (par. (b) and (c) (1) above) to Jessie Ball du Pont, for and during the term of her natural life.

3. Upon the death of Jessie Ball du Pont, trustees, after any of above annuities accruing, shall proceed as follows:

(d) Trustees are to incorporate a corporation for charitable purposes to be designated "the Nemours Foundation," to which:

(1) Trustees are to convey in fee simple the entire property known as "Nemours" in Delaware, if the title is in testators' name at his death—and if the title is in a corporation, then the stock of that corporation to be transferred to the foundation.

(2) Trustees are to pay over the net income of the estate (subject to the annuities and legacies mentioned) for the purpose of maintaining the estate of "Nemours" as a charitable institution for the care and treatment of crippled children, or the care of old men or old women, and particularly old couples, first consideration being given to residents of Delaware.

The Nemours Foundation is created and to be maintained as a memorial to the testator's father and great, great grandfather; the rooms of the "Mansion House" on the estate of Nemours, shall not be used for housing or hospital purposes, but shall be used for the reception and entertainment of visitors, and executive and administrative purposes, but mainly for the purpose of providing a library and exhibiting to the public interesting and valuable literature, works of art, and any articles of historic and artistic interest for the advancement of education.

Trustees are specifically instructed that their first duty is to care for the mansion, the grounds, and gardens surrounding "Nemours" in order that they be maintained for the benefit and pleasure of the public in their present condition and the grounds improved from time to time as the funds warrant; testator expressing his particular desire that this memorial be not permitted to deteriorate, but that it shall consistently become more beautiful and attractive to those who view it as time passes. "Only after faithfully carrying out the above instructions shall my trustees be warranted in using any portion of the capital or income of my estate for additional charitable purposes."

(e) Trustees are empowered to use not to exceed $1 million of the principal of the estate for the erection and equipping of buildings for the purposes of the Foundation—any additional buildings to be paid for out of estate income, bequests, or gifts.

(f) If after death of testator, his wife, Jessie Ball du Pont, shall desire to create a charitable corporation or institution for the purposes and objects given for the creation of the Nemours Foundation, then the trustees are directed to pay over to the Nemours Foundation out of the principal of the estate any sum or sums not exceeding $1 million which testator's wife during her lifetime may direct, and transfer to said corporation the Nemours estate or any portion thereof, for the use of said corporation as testator's wife shall direct provided, however, that the principal of the estate transferred under the direction of testators' wife to the Nemours Foundation, or used for the purposes of the foundation during her lifetime, taken together with the amounts of principal transferred the Nemours Foundation or used for the purposes of said foundation by my trustees after her death, shall not exceed the aggregate maximum of $1 million plus the said property known as Nemours.

"If after the death of testator's wife, the net income from the estate in any year should exceed the sums required to properly provide for the conduct and operation of the Nemours Foundation, and the care and maintenance of 'Nemours,' and for reserves of extensions, repairs, replacements, alterations, additional equipment, additional buildings, additions to buildings or other necessary improvements, and any and all future needs of the foundation—such surplus income may be used in contributions to other worthy charitable institutions as may be conducted for care of, or the care and treatment of, or the care and education of crippled children, or the care of old men or old women, or of old couples—the people of Delaware needing such care to be taken care of before any contributions are made to insitutions of any other State."

From the terms of the will set forth above, the following are clearly established:

1. That the trustees of the Du Pont estate—in perpetual succession—have possession of, and full power to manage and control all of the properties of the Du Pont estate, regardless of the form or nature of ownership, or of the form or entity which the property assumes or under which any business enterprise is or may be conducted.

2. That none of the income of the trust estate is to be paid over to or used to maintain the charitable institution directed to be created as the "The Nemours Foundation," until after the death of Du Pont's widow, Jessie Ball du Pont. (See item 8 of the will, pars. (c) and (d) above.)

Consequently, until after the death of Jessie Ball du Pont, the expressed charitable purpose of Mr. du Pont does not begin to have realization.

We are advised that, as of the week of March 11, 1956, Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont was still living.

Therefore, during the period of 21 years since the death of Alfred I. du Pont, the trustees of his estate have been managing, controlling, and operating the estate properties, without any devotion of the income therefrom to charitable purposes, insofar as the directions of the Du Pont will are concerned. Nor has such income been accumulated for such purposes, under the testator's direction. On the contrary, under the terms of the will, the time has not yet arrived for the creation of the charitable foundation for crippled children and old men and women. In the meantime, the income of the trust estate, under the directions of the testator, has been used to pay (a) the executors and trustees, for their services; (b) the annuities directed to be paid; and (c) the balance to the wife, Jessie Ball du Pont, and will continue to be paid to her during the term of her natural life.

2. THE DU PONT TRUST ESTATE AS A MONOPOLY

By Senate Resolution 35, 79th Congress, the Senate authorized and directed the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, to determine whether the activities of these Federal agencies, through their representatives, have (a) crippled, hampered, or rendered ineffective the Federal Municipal Bankrutpcy Act, as amended; and (b) unfairly resulted in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida.

Pursuant to that resolution, the Honorable Senator Pat McCarran, on July 24, 1947, as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, addressed the Senate of the United States and presented to it his proposed report. (The references indicated herein after are to the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 93, pt. 8, 80th Cong., 1st sess., July 21, 1947 to November 17, 1947.)

In his address to the Senate, Senator McCarran said:

"Alfred I. du Pont established his residence in Florida in 1926. During the same year he formed the Almour Securities Co., and it was through this company that he began the acquisition of substantial Florida holdings. Afred I. du Pont died, as a citizen of Florida, in 1935, and since then his vast fortune has continued to acquire diversified holdings in Florida through the trustees of his trust estate. These holdings include Florida taxing unit bonds, 20 banks, real estate, timberlands, docks, warehouses, 1 railroad, public utilities, office buildings, a paper mill, and so forth, and are held largely by the ownership of controlling shares of several companies. The St. Joe Paper Co. is the principal company in the group. About 76 percent of its stock is owned by the Du Pont trust" (9953).

* * * * *

"The Du Pont interests are the interests set up by the trust of Alfred I. du Pont (9953).

* * * * *

"But I say without fear of successful contradiction that the record made by the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will show the existence in the State of Florida of a monopoly that transcends anything that I ever heard of that exists in any other State in the Union—a monopoly that reaches out into the private life of individuals and into the public life of communities. When the existence of such a monopoly is shown, it certainly behooves the Senate Judiciary Committee to go at length into the matter" (9955).

In his report, which was ordered printed in the RECORD, Senator McCarran, under a special subheading entitled, "Does a Monopoly Exist in Florida?" stated the following:

"The avenues necessarily traveled by the committee * * * were found to be crowded with so-called Alfred I. du Pont or Ed Ball (brother-in-law of Du Pont; and he and his sister, Jessie Ball du Pont, are 2 of the 3 executors and 2 of the 3 individual trustees of his will) companies. Millions of dollars were and are invested by their companies, and in some cases by their principals, in municipal bonds of Florida taxing units, banks, real estate, timberlands, docks, warehouses, railroads, public utilities, hotels, office buildings, paper mills, and other commercial businesses or properties located in Florida. In fact, the very lifeblood of the economic structure of numerous cities and in counties of Florida depends upon the Du Pont-Ball interests for nourishment and strength" (9964).

"These companies, through their management, are a most prominent, if not a deciding factor in the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth of nearly all Florida key centers, in the management of their affairs, and in their efforts to satisfy human desires" (9964).

"Mr. Edward Ball became the harbinger for the late Alfred I. du Pont when he determined to leave Delaware and move to Florida. He is the late Alfred I. du Pont's brother-in-law, his sister, Jessie Ball, being Du Pont's wife. * * * Mr. Ball was actively identified with the establishment and expansion of the Du Pont fortune in Florida, and upon the death of Alfred I. du Pont, in April 1935, assumed complete control of all the Du Pont enterprises" (9964).

"Almours Securities, Inc. (the initial Du Pont Florida company), was incorporated as a Florida corporation in November 1926 by Alfred I. du Pont, his wife, Jessie Ball du Pont, and Edward Ball. Approximately $35 million of stock of E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Inc., was transferred to the company in exchange for the company's authorized capital stock. In addition to the acquisition of vast real estate holdings, the Du Pont fortune, through Almours Securities, Inc., by December 1932 has invested nearly $3 million in stock of banking institutions located in promient Florida cities.[1]

"An interesting statement revealing the early intentions of the Florida Du Pont interests is found in the case of petitioner, (Almours Securities, Inc.) further contends that it was the plan to build up a surplus of approximately $55 million to carry out its banking program and an additional $70 million to carry out its real estate developments" (9964).

"Dealing in municipal securities in Florida taxing units may have been a mere sideline of the Du Pont millions, when measured in dollars, in 1941. * * * Shortly prior to 1941, the Du Pont interests apparently decided to assume a larger measure of control in the field of municipal finance, as evithe 15 years preceding 1941, the Du Pont banks had acquired only about $4 million of Florida taxing unit bonds, during the 4 years from 1941 to 1944, the Du Pont banks alone acquired more than $22 million per value of such bonds (9965): (The report then set forth the action which the Du Pont interests took to drive their competitor, R. C. Crummer Co., out of business.)

"The result of driving Crummer and most of his 15,000 customers from the field of municipal finance in Florida has enabled the Du Pont interests, with the two Florida bond houses with whom these interests operate, to regulate to a high degree the issuance of bonds by Florida taxing units and to restrict the sale thereof" (9965).

"To report the apparent existence of a near monopoly in the field of municipal finance in Florida is to discuss only a part of the discovery made by the committee during its study and investigation. The exclusive control of the Du Pont interests extends to other fields of trade, commerce, and industry as well" (9965).

"The activities of the Du Pont interests revolve around the Du Pont-controlled group of banks. The extent of any particular company's operations is indeterminable from the record. But close intercorporate relationships exist between the companies, as disclosed by Mr. Ball's testimony on pages 742 and 743 of the record, in reference to the purchase and expansion of a telephone company located in west Florida. This company had about 99 miles of lines when the Du Pont interests purchased it. Within a short space of time nearly 13,000 miles of additional lines were added. Funds for the expansion were loaned to the company by another Du Pont-controlled company. Mr. Ball said that the Du Pont banks do not extend credit accommodations to other Du Pont concerns. Of course, with their other interests possessing a fat treasury, it would hardly be necessary. But it must not be understood that these various banks do not do business with each other, for they do. The Du Pont-controlled banks engage extensively with each other in trading in municipal securities. Practically all municipal securities of Florida's taxing units owned by the banks of the Florida national group were purchased initially by the Du Pont Jacksonville bank, and * * * subsequently distributed to the other members of the group at cost regardless of the market value at the time of distribution" (9965).

"The widespread and strategically located chain or group of banks throughout Florida enables the Du Pont interests to exercise a major influence in the economic life of the State and its citizens. An example is shown by quoting from a lease between the Du Pont Florida National Bank & Trust Co., at Miami and one of its tenants, as follows:

" 'As a further consideration for the execution of this lease, the lessee herein agrees that it will do all of its banking business in Miami with the lessor bank, the Florida National Bank & Trust Co., at Miami, during the term of this lease or any extension or renewal of the same.'

"This provision of the lease affords the management of the Du Pont interests confidential access to the financial affairs of its tenants in the bank building which, incidentally, is the largest office building in Florida and regarded by many as the most modern in the South" (9965).

"The ability of the Du Pont interests to grant or withhold credit sought by established individuals and concerns, or by individuals and concerns who seek to begin new enterprises, in Florida, also affords the Du Pont interests the opportunity of determining the extent of commercial growth in the areas served by them.

"It is not unreasonable to state that in many areas it would be difficult for Florida citizens to buy a home or operate a business without turning to the Du Pont interests; and if their desires are not looked on with favor by the Du Pont interests, such citizens may well find themselves without a source of credit.

"While * * * the Du Pont interests revolve around the group of banks, at the same time, all of their interests, being as they are, under the active supervision of one man—Mr. Edward Ball—are closely intermeshed. It seems reasonable to assume that the other interests, such as the St. Joe Paper Co., the land companies, the insurance and finance companies, the railroad and utility companies, are used to increase the power and influence and business of the banks, and that the banks are used to promote and

[1] The banking institutions in which these investments had been made were the: Florida National Bank, St. Petersburg; Florida National Associates, Florida National Bank, Bartow; Florida National Bank & Trust Co., Daytona Beach; Florida National Bank, Jacksonville; Florida National Bank, Lakeland; Florida Bank, Orlando; Florida National Bank & Trust Co., Miami; Florida National Group Ins.

extend the Du Pont industrial and other commercial objectives, present and future.

"The St. Joe Paper Co., a key Du Pont company, which owns extensive pine and hardwood forests, a pulp mill, a railroad, and many subsidiary companies is seeking to obtain control of the Florida East Coast Railway Co., one of Florida's three major railway systems. At an estimated cost of some $4,000,000, the St. Joe Paper Co., purchased approximately $25,000,000 par value of bonds of the railway company.

"It has about 15 percent of the entire trackage in the State of Florida and serves about 46 percent of the population of the State * * *. Moreover it operates the only tracks on the coast of Florida between Jacksonville and West Palm Beach. (9965).

"Thus the record established that the Du Pont fortune has obtained such vast power in the State of Florida, through its diversification of interests in the most favored parts of the State, that it can with some measure of success determine who shall enter business or who shall be permitted to remain in business in a large part of the State.

"The successful ouster of the Crummer companies from the field of municipal finance in Florida * * * is a glaring object lesson to all those who dare oppose the Du Pont juggernaut, that opposition is a hazardous thing and that acquiescence to the Du Pont wishes in all respects may well be the price of being permitted to begin, or to continue to do business in Florida.

"An organized group of banks, numerous companies with extensive and diversified holdings under corporate structures filled with the same individuals occupying prominent positions in many of them * * * and all undertakings being headed by one man (Mr. Edward Ball), vests such concentration of power in the hands of private individuals, and under the supervision of one, that the economic life of the State and the well-being of its people may be affected more by such power than by the power of the government of the State itself.

"Further augmentation of this vast accumulation of private power, now in prospect by control of a central artery of commerce, the Florida East Coast Railway, certainly will not lessen the appearance of a private monopoly over the economic life of the State.

"The committee views the concentration of economic power in the State of Florida * * * as a most unhappy condition, which, if not curtailed, ultimately may block the free functioning of the economy of the State.

"Within the last few weeks, a legal document bearing the seal of the clerk of the Supreme Court of Florida was brought to the attention of counsel for the committee. The document apparently was filed with the Supreme Court of Florida in the case of Edward Ball, appellant, versus James A. Yates, appellee, pending in that court on petition for rehearing. Extensive commercial transactions are alleged to have taken place between Edward Ball and two justices of the State supreme court. The nature of these transactions seems to have involved the granting of oil and mineral rights by the St. Joe Paper Co., to one justice, and the advancement of $110,000 by the Du Pont controlled banks to the other justice. These business transactions apparently took place while the case of Yates versus Ball was either pending before the court or had recently been ruled upon by it, both justices having ruled in favor of Mr. Ball.

"The document requests, among other things, that the justices refuse themselves or in the alternative, that the court hold that they are disqualified to participate in these proceedings. The committee quotes from the body of the sworn petition, as follows:

"The appellee does not question the legal right of Justice Buford to make oral leases with Mr. Ball, the St. Joe Paper Co., or anyone else. He only questions his right, having done so, to sit in judgment on his case. He does not question the right of Justice Adams to borrow money from Mr. Ball's banks in any amounts and on any terms that he sees fit but, having done so or expecting to do so, he questions his right to sit in judgment on his case."

"Although the two justices admitted their dealings as complained of, the court, in ruling on the petition, declined to hold them disqualified" (9965).

"The committee has endeavored to portray, in this report, a true picture and conservative estimate of the Du Pont interests extensive influence and control of the vital elements of the economic life of a sovereign State * * * that the dominant head of the Du Pont interests has seen fit to extend his influence beyond the recognized fields of finance, business, or politics by becoming a party to large commercial transactions with members of Florida's judicial system, while he was a litigant, the committee is more than ever convinced of the monopolistic designs of the Du Pont interest and the evident necessity of curtailing them."

From the foregoing findings and report made by Senator McCARRAN, chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, these conclusions are compelling:

1. There is no basis for Senator ROBERTSON's attempt to justify the exclusion of the "Du Pont trust" from the provisions of S. 2577, on the ground that it is "working for crippled children and other charities," and, as such, "for the trust dollar," for the reason that since its creation, and over a period of 21 years, and now, its net income has not been paid, and is not being paid, to any charitable institution, nor has it been used, nor is it being used, for any charitable purpose. On the contrary, the net income has been used, and is being used (insofar as current income makes possible), to pay the annuities specified in the will, including the annuity of $200,000 for life to Jessie Ball du Pont, and also to pay the remainder of the net income of the trust estate to Jessie Ball du Pont, for and during the term of her natural life.

2. Senator McCarran has found and reported to the Senate that the Du Pont trust is "a monopoly that transcends anything I ever heard of that exists in any other State in the Union—a monopoly that reaches out into the private lives of individuals and into the public life of communities." That finding demonstrates beyond any doubt that, in determining whether an enterprise may be endangering the public interest by concentration of capital or through control of banking and nonbanking businesses, (1) the use to which the net income is put is not a determinative factor; (2) there is no sound basis for concluding that an enterprise presents no such danger to the public interest because it is a charitable institution; and (3) the attempt of Senator ROBERTSON to justify the exclusion of the Du Pont trust, on that basis or for that reason, is completely fallacious.

SUMMARY OF EXCLUSIONS AND EXEMPTIONS IN S. 2577 SHOWING THE JUSTIFICATION FOR A FREEZE AMENDMENT

It is argued that there are serious questions of the public interest involved in the ownership by a bank holding company of both banking and nonbanking interests. As a consequence, the Senate is asked to enact a bill which would require bank holding companies to dispose of either their banking or their nonbanking assets. Yet the bill we are asked to enact clearly demonstrates that there is no realistic concern with this supposed problem of combined ownership of both banks and nonbanking interests.

(a) There are a minimum of 163 holding companies which own 25 percent of 1 or more banks (Senate hearings, pp. 54–60). By limiting the application of this bill to holding companies owning or controlling 2 or more banks, approximately 117 bank holding companies are immediately relieved of all obligation to divest their nonbank holdings. Included among these exempt companies, for example, are such large industrial, transportation, mining, and mercantitle enterprises as W. R. Grace & Co., Deere & Co., Corn Products Refining Co., Peabody Coal Co., and Gimbel Bros., Inc. All of these companies are to be permitted to continue to own both banks and nonbanking assets.

(b) This bill would also exempt companies registered under the Investment Company Act prior to May 15, 1955 (sec. 2 (a) (B)). The effect of this provision is to relieve the Equity Corp., which owns the Morris Plan chain of banks as well as controlling interests in industrial, real estate, mineral, insurance, financial and service companies (Senate hearings, pp. 159–162) of any obligation to dispose of these nonbanking interests. This company is therefore to continue to operate with combined ownership of both banks and other business enterprises.

(c) By the definition of "company" provided in section 2 (b), this bill would exempt bank holding companies taking the form of partnerships or testamentary trusts. It is not known just how many important organizations are excluded by this definition, but at least one is the Alfred I. du Pont testamentary trust in Florida, which owns more than 20 separate banks in Florida, advertises itself as the "largest banking organization south of Philadelphia and east of the Mississippi," and has controlling interests in a paper company, a telephone company, a railroad, and vast areas of Florida timberland (Senate hearings, pt. 2, pp. 113–114). This business enterprise will be permitted to retain its banking and nonbanking interests.

(d) The Senate also proposes to exempt from the prohibitions on ownership of both banking and nonbanking assets all religious, charitable and educational corporations. I have been told that the Mormon Church, in addition to controlling several banks in Salt Lake City, owns 100 percent of the stock of a large life insurance company and has substantial interests in hotels and industrial enterprises (Senate hearings, pt. 2, p. 141). Yet, this organization is to be permitted to retain both its banking and nonbanking holdings.

(e) This bill would also relieve all bank holding companies which are labor unions or agricultural or horticultural organizations of any obligation to divest their nonbank holdings. I understand that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, for exemple, owns a controlling interest in two separate banks as well as other investments (Senate hearings, pp. 427–431). Yet this organization is to be permitted to maintain its mixed ownership of banking and nonbanking assets.

(f) Yesterday the Senate adopted an amendment which would relieve the Trust Company of Georgia of any obligation to dispose of its nonbank holdings. This company is to be permitted to continue to operate its six banks while retaining ownership of a finance company, the Coca-Cola Bottling Company of Lincoln, Nebr., and over $9 million of Coca-Cola stock (Senate hearings, pt. 2, pp. 33, 35).

(g) The Senate also adopted yesterday an amendment which would relieve the First National Bank Trustees of Louisville, Ky., a business trust, of the requirement that it dispose of its wholly owned investment company which has widely diversified investments.

(h) Today by special amendment we propose to exempt from the obligation of divestiture a bank holding company in Florida identified as the Consolidated Naval Stores Co., which has what this bill defines as a

controlling interest in two banks as well as extensive agricultural interests.

In the face of these numerous exemptions, exclusions, and special provisions, how can it be argued that there is a serious public interest question involved in the mixed ownership of both banking and nonbanking assets? Taken together these exemptions relieve all but a very few bank holding companies of the prohibitions on combined ownership of both banking and nonbanking assets. If there were a realistic need for this punitive divestiture requirement there could be no justification for these numerous exclusions and exemptions. If there is not, we should treat all bank holding companies alike by permitting them to retain their lawfully acquired and presently owned nonbanking holdings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6227, and that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that all after the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out; and that there be inserted, in lieu thereof, the text of Senate bill 2577, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 6227) was passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the title of House bill 6227 be amended so as to make it conform to the title of Senate bill 2577.

The motion was agreed to; and the title was amended so as to read: "A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2577 is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1755, Senate bill 3025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3025) to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, following completion of the morning business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of the measures to which there is no objection, beginning at the point where the last call of the calendar was concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM THURSDAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business on tomorrow, it stand in recess until Monday noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM— ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have made the request for the Senate to take a recess from the conclusion of its business on tomorrow until Monday next, so that all my colleagues may be on notice.

On tomorrow we shall take up the measures which were announced earlier in the day; and we hope we may be able to complete action on all of them. Then we shall go over until Monday.

On Monday, we shall have a call of the calendar.

After conferring with the distinguished minority leader, I shall announce the program for later in that week. I hope the committees will report additional measures to the Senate.

Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 25 (legislative day of April 24), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines, vice Homer Ferguson.

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina, vice Albert F. Nufer.

Cecil B. Lyon, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Chile, vice Willard L. Beaulac.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years. (Reappointment.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made us for Thyself, grant that during the hours of this day we may be guided by Thy Holy Spirit in the ways of truth and strengthened for every task.

Thou knowest how frequently we are beset by fears and doubts which rob us of peace and assailed by worries and weaknesses which undermine our character and corrupt the spirit within.

Enable us by Thy grace to cultivate a faith that is calm and may we never waver when tempted to any unworthy action.

Deepen and increase among mankind the spirit of neighborliness and helpfulness that in times of peril we may uphold one another, in calamity serve one another, in sorrow comfort one another, and in suffering and distress encourage one another.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on the national highway program for the use of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5265) entitled "An act to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7247) entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganiza-

tions," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. KERR, Mr. FREAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–12.

THE CHELSEA (MASS.) RECORD WINS NATIONAL GUARD AWARD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, alert and public-spirited newspapers form the backbone of our democracy. Our Nation could not function without them. They not only keep our people well informed with their objective coverage of the news; their editorial comment which helps to clarify the issues on local, State, National, and worldwide levels; and their advertising service which links consumers and producers in the dynamic progress of our society; but give freely of their space to many worthy causes.

In fact, Government itself is dependent upon them to spread information concerning its needs and services. In time of war or national emergency, this cooperation is vital.

This voluntary and patriotic service on the part of our newspapers deserves special recognition.

It is with pride that I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a noteworthy instance of this public service on the part of the Chelsea Record, the daily newspaper of the city of Chelsea in Massachusetts.

A photograph in its issue of April 10, 1956, pictures Fred L. Gillis, military editor of the Chelsea Record, accepting the National Guard meritorious plaque from Capt. Samuel J. Leavis, Jr., of the 772d AAA Gun Battalion, Massachusetts National Guard, during the recent National Guard show put on by the local guard unit. The principal figure in the citation shows an emblazoned eagle with a shield on which are the words:

The National Guard Bureau meritorious service plaque awarded in recognition of your patriotic service and meritorious support of the National Guard.

The citation states the plaque is in recognition of outstanding service to the defense efforts of the Army and Air National Guard Bureau. Captain Leavis recommended the citation because of the support given the National Guard by the Chelsea Record in its news coverage and editorial especially during the unit's annual tour of duty and more recently in the move to have a new armory erected.

To which we add our special accolade for distinguished service, to the Chelsea Record.

SOIL-BANK PLAN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, April 19, I said on the floor of the House that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture "can demonstrate again his great statesmanship by putting aside all differences over the recently vetoed bill and come forward with the soil-bank plan."

I was happy to learn that yesterday the chairman had introduced a soil-bank plan and intends to proceed with this bill as soon as possible. This is a wonderful gesture on his part. I am sure he realized that it was not possible for either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a comprehensive or overall soil-bank plan without more legislation than presently exists.

I know we all have the highest regard for the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who on Monday this week placed in the RECORD existing legislation by which he felt the Secretary could put into effect the soil-bank plan.

I have reviewed carefully the gentleman's excerpts from existing law. I believe I have given careful scrutiny to all of it. I have talked with two legal experts on legislation. They advise me that there are some minor things which the President could do with the existing legislation, but that by no stretch of the imagination could the President institute the kind of soil-bank plan which was contained in the recently vetoed farm bill. In my opinion the soil-bank provisions of that bill were comprehensive enough that the good of the soil-bank plan could have been accomplished.

If my understanding is correct, much of the bill introduced by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee will follow the provisions of that bill which I am sure the great majority of the House would be willing to accept.

There are some provisions not in the chairman's bill which I hope he will be willing to add. One of these would include the prepayment idea outlined in the President's radio speech of some time ago. I am sure the chairman is just as anxious to bring forward legislation to help the farmer as he is the President. Their approach is slightly different. However, I do believe that the prepaid plan has considerable merit and of course would have the additional benefit of aiding the farmer early in the growing season.

Last night in the forepart of the Evening Star I was somewhat disappointed to read the following about the distinguished majority leader in the other body. I quote:

The Texan obliquely served notice that the Democratic-controlled Congress does not intend to comply with President Eisenhower's request for soil-bank legislation.

However, when I turned to page 6 of the Evening Star and read in detail the speech made by the majority leader in the other body, I did not find that he said anything to that effect. What he did say is as follows and I quote him:

I think President Eisenhower can rest assured that the Congress will give him $1,200,000,000 to set up the soil bank.

If I understand the majority leader of the other body correctly, he has inferred that he is in favor of granting the President the necessary money to institute a soil-bank plan. The majority leader was under the same impression as our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—that the President already had authority to set up the soil-bank plan.

I believe that within the next few days both of these gentlemen will become convinced by legal opinion impartially rendered that the President cannot institute a soil-bank plan with only existing legislation.

In that case I think that the majority leader in the other body will come to the same viewpoint as our distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee—that legislation for a comprehensive and overall soil-bank plan should be passed by this Congress and put into effect as soon as possible. If that is done there will be no question about the authority of either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture to proceed legally with the soil-bank idea.

There has been a lot said about politics in farm legislation. I do not know that I am any seer in this matter. However, it does appear to me that the soil-bank plan has been studied thoroughly by almost every agricultural expert and economist of any consequence and it has received almost unanimous approval.

From this I believe that anyone who attempted to block or to hinder the institution of this important and needed farm legislation would certainly receive deserved censure from the farm population.

I voted for the vetoed farm bill and voted to override the President's veto, because I believed that the real heart of that farm bill was the soil-bank plan. The soil-bank plan is the only measure that has been introduced or suggested since I have been in Congress by which we can hope to reduce agricultural surpluses to somewhat balanced demand without lowering the farmers' income. More than that, it is a democratically operated plan which provides an incentive method to the farmer to reduce his acreage without loss of income. It does not impose any fiat or Government control upon him to comply—only voluntary compliance is provided by this legislation.

I hope that the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture will start hearings on this bill as soon as possible and that a bill will be forthcoming without too much delay.

It appears to me that cooperation on this measure in the interests of the farm population generally should be nonpartisan and when it comes to a vote it is

my prediction that any reasonable soil-bank plan will carry overwhelmingly. I am sure that political credit, if any is needed, will be spread equally among those who are responsible for the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we do badly need this legislation now.

ACCIDENTS ON PUBLIC HIGHWAYS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the next several days, Congress will in all likelihood pass out a $51 billion highway bill to bring about needed improvements in the interstate system of highways. I am in hearty accord with this legislation.

However, it is my sincere hope that this improved highway system will not become an interstate escape route for valuable American life.

During 1955 there were 37,800 highway deaths, 2,300 more than in 1954, with excessive speed as the principal cause. In addition, there were 2,158,000 injuries—198,000 more than in 1954. Seven hundred fifteen thousand two hundred sixty of the casualties were the result of speeding.

The current trend in automobile promotion is horsepower and speed. The development of high torque and fuel injection engines, pushbutton driving, and increased horsepower has not contributed one iota to the brainpower behind the wheel. Kamikaze driving has become a fashionable American pastime.

I wish to call the attention to the following advertisement on a DeSoto Adventurer automobile which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on April 18, 1956:

On display now—320 horsepower DeSoto Adventurer. You've never seen or driven the likes of the new 320 horsepower DeSoto Adventurer. See this beautiful package of golden dynamite.

In a large block this ad states further:

Electronically clocked at the scorching speed of 137 miles per hour.

The following ad is appearing currently for Pontiac:

Meet the new boss—all-new stratoflight hydramatic especially for Pontiac's high-stepping Strato-Streak powerplant. The blazing action of 227 horses is yours in a flash.

Right here is the team that puts you in a performance class all by yourself. You're driving the one that's been clocked from 9 to 60 in 10 seconds flat.

Chrysler recently announced a model with 340 horsepower which is labeled the fastest commercial automobile with a clocked speed of 147 miles per hour.

What kind of a fool would want to drive an automobile on our public highways at 147 miles per hour or accelerate from 0 to 60 miles per hour in 10 seconds flat? These advertisements are designed to appeal to the highway idiot.

J. Edgar Hoover recently stated that parents should be held accountable and legally responsible for the crimes of their children. By the same principle, the automobile manufacturers might well be held equally responsible for the attractive and destructive toys they are willing to place in the hands of anyone who has a down payment and knows how to make his mark for perpetual indebtedness on a cognovit note.

I recommend the appointment of a congressional committee to conduct hearings and make recommendations on highway design and construction, highway use including the safety and power specifications of the modern automobile as well as ways and means of abating the loss of life on our public highways. This is a vital Federal problem in every sense of the word and should be considered now as we vote upon improving our highway system.

CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "Chamberis", insert "Olga P. Cheek."

Page 2, line 6, after "Corra", insert "Nicola G. D'Armi."

Page 2, line 7, after "Falcone", insert "Anna G. Favia."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, after "Gasparatos", insert "Lilli Gerlisky."

Page 2, line 9, after "Gibson", insert "Lieselotte W. Grimmer."

Page 2, line 10, after "Israel", insert "Efstathios Katsikis."

Page 2, line 10, after "Kikel", insert "Hedwig B. Krause."

Page 2, line 10, after "Kikel", insert "Gertrud H. E. T. Kruger."

Page 2, line 10, after "Labellarte", insert "Margaret W. Lampinen."

Page 2, line 11, after "Larson", insert "Chieko S. Lee."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Elfriede Luker."

Page 2, line 13, strike out "Maria McWalters", and insert "Marianne Putz McWalters."

Page 2, line 15, after "Mavromatis", insert "Tatjana Meerman."

Page 2, line 21, after "Pantera", insert "Armaranti N. Papanikitas."

Page 2, line 21, after "Pantera", insert "Maria M. Regina."

Page 2, line 21, after "Ruschak", insert "Anna Sagan."

Page 3, line 1, after "Wilson", insert "Brian Woo."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2854) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KEATING, and Miss THOMPSON of Michigan.

ELECTED OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 486) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved That, effective May 1, 1956, (1) the annual gross compensation of the elected officers of the House shall be as follows: Clerk of the House, $17,500 per annum; Sergeant at Arms, $17,500 per annum; Doorkeeper, $16,500 per annum; and Postmaster, $14,500 per annum; and (2) the annual gross compensation of the minority employees of the House holding positions now held by Lyle O. Snader, William R. Bonsell, Tom J. Kennamer, and Beecher Hess shall be respectively $15,000 per annum, $15,000 per annum, $12,500 per annum, and $11,000 per annum.

The additional amounts necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1957

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 484 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Bell	Davis, Tenn.	Haley
Bowler	Dawson, Ill.	Harris
Boykin	Diggs	Hays, Ohio
Brooks, La.	Donovan	Hébert
Byrnes, Wis.	Eberharter	Hess
Chatham	Fulton	Hiestand
Chudoff	Gamble	Hoffman, Ill.
Clark	Grant	Holifield
Cole	Green, Oreg.	Jarman

Johnson, Calif.	Machrowicz	Phillips
Kelley, Pa.	Martin	Pillion
Kelly, N. Y.	Matthews	Powell
Kilburn	Metcalf	Shelley
Knox	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Knutson	Mollohan	Staggers
McConnell	Morgan	Williams, N. Y.
McCulloch	O'Hara, Minn.	Willis
McDowell	Patman	Wolverton

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NEVER A SOUND REASON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at every opportunity during the Easter recess, an effort was made by repeated inquiries of individuals and at public meetings, to find a reason for the opposition to NIXON as the Republican Vice Presidential candidate.

The only answer was given by a young man at a public meeting who, when pressed, said: "NIXON cried." When asked when and where, he said "when NIXON appeared on television and answered the charge that he had been dishonest when he accepted and used for the dissemination of information contributions sent in by some of his constituents."

Personally, I do not recall that NIXON cried or wept on that occasion. But if he did, see St. John 11:35. I do remember that he had been most unfairly criticized by a large segment of the press because some of his constituents, approving of his thinking and actions as a Member of Congress, furnished funds to assist him in publicizing some of his views. At least I think that was the purpose.

If NIXON did do any crying or weeping on that occasion, it is not difficult to understand, to realize that any normal individual viciously and without reason assailed as was he, would either shed a tear or do a little cursing. If he let his emotions get the better of him, the exhibition was nothing more nor less than a demonstration that, like the rest of us, he was human; that he resented, as would every normal individual, such a vicious, unreasonable charge as was then made.

I should have suggested to NIXON's critic that if he could sometime watch NIXON at breakfast he might discover that the Vice President had spilled a drop or two of his coffee in the saucer.

All of which brings me to the following editorial in the April 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and to the firm conviction that DICK NIXON is not only suitable Vice Presidential but Presidential timber.

Perhaps it is gilding the lily to add that the character of his opposition but further proves that the country needs him.

THE CRUSADE AGAINST NIXON SEEMS TO HAVE RUN INTO SOMETHING OF A ROADBLOCK

First off, let us explain that we are not shilling for Mr. RICHARD NIXON. We are content to leave the choice of a Republican vice presidential candidate to the San Francisco convention.

However, the whispering, not to mention shouting, campaign against the Vice President persists, although the Vice President's startling strength in the New Hampshire primary last month and his virtual endorsement by President Eisenhower and many prominent Republicans, including a few who had been falsely identified with the "Dump Dick" movement, have put a serious crimp in it.

Men more or less like NIXON have often appeared in American politics, and although they have usually been involved in plenty of political infighting, and have often made blobs as startling as NIXON's reference to a "great Republican, Chief Justice Warren," few have been subjected to as much high-toned smearing as has been heaped upon NIXON. Why has all this happened to NIXON and not to other public officials of similar backgrounds and ambitions?

The "liberals" who don't like Mr. NIXON give all sorts of reasons why: his "brashness," his partisan attacks on the Democrats and so on. They usually ignore the Alger Hiss case, and NIXON's insistence on pressing it when the columnists, the Park Avenue set and members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities itself believed that Hiss was a maligned man.

In a frankly laudatory biography of NIXON (Henry Holt Co.) Ralph de Toledano recalls the atmosphere which prevailed on August 5, 1948, after Hiss had completed his rebuttal to testimony by Whittaker Chambers that Hiss had been a member of a Communist cell in the United States Government.

"When Hiss stepped off the stand," writes Mr. de Toledano, "there was a general rush of newspapermen and committee members to shake his hand." NIXON smelled a rat.

But the disclosures of Communist espionage have put the whammy on any Member of Congress courageous enough to tackle the problem. That is what happened to NIXON.

Undoubtedly there are people who wouldn't like NIXON if he were as "liberal" as Robert Maynard Hutchins—just as others, who don't like him very much, are for NIXON on account of his anti-Communist record. But the smear campaign against NIXON is kept alive by those who demand the heads of all who fight communism effectively. One thing we can be sure of is that the stockpile of dead cats for Mr. NIXON has not been exhausted.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1957

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 484 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 10721, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year 1957.

The resolution provides that all points of order against the bill shall be waived.

The total recommended in the bill is $541,367,372. Of this amount $171,506,737 is provided for the Department of State. This is a reduction of $9,700,548 in the amount of the budget estimates. Ninety million is for Foreign Service administration, including expenses and salaries for "government in occupied areas," which heretofore has been appropriated for separately. Approximately $22 million is appropriated for representation allowances for officers of the Foreign Service, acquisition of buildings abroad, funds to cover emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund. The amount for contributions to international organizations is $33,830,875 which includes the contribution to NATO for $1,150,000. Sixteen million one hundred and eight thousand three hundred and eighty-nine dollars is for the United Nations. The appropriation also covers funds for Missions to International Organizations, the International Boundary and Water Commission, and the International Fisheries Commission.

The amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is $215,965,000—a reduction of $19,915,000 in the amount of the budget estimates. This covers legal activities and general administration, the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System.

The appropriation for the operation of the Federal courts, including salaries of judges, judicial officials and employees, and other expenses of the Federal judiciary amounts to $35,395,635—$2,186,900 below the total amount requested; $1,527,785 of this amount is for the Supreme Court.

The bill also provides funds for the United States Information Agency in the amount of $110 million; $8,500,000 for the operation of the refugee relief program from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956, as requested by the President, and $950,000 for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

I urge the adoption of this resolution so the House may proceed to the consideration of this appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. While the gentleman told us how much these estimates have been cut, I should like to ask how much this bill has been cut compared with the spending of last year.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. ROONEY] to answer that question.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to the Department of State, there is an increase to the extent of $24,258,042. With regard to the Department of Justice there is an increase to the extent of $4,893,000. With regard to the Judiciary, there is an increase to the extent of $1,479,725. With regard to the Information Agency, there is an increase of $22,663,730. With regard to refugee relief, there is a decrease from the amount for this purpose last year in the amount of $6.5 million. So that in the four principal items in the bill I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, frankly, there have been increases. However, the committee made reductions in the amount of the budget estimates, which deductions amount to $56,802,448.

There was presented a requested substantial increase in funds for the information agency. They wanted the sum of $135 million. While the committee in unanimous agreement cut the amount to $110 million, a cut of $25 million, nevertheless there was an allowed increase to the extent of over $22 million.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from the Committee on Rules tell me why points of order are waived on this bill?

Mr. DELANEY. Yes. I will again ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to explain that.

Mr. ROONEY. There are a number of items in this bill that have been carried over a number of years. They never have been objected to. It is sought to protect them by waiving points of order.

However, there are three new items that would be covered by the waiver of points of order.

The first is in connection with the State Department, with regard to the payment of tort claims in the manner authorized by the first paragraph of section 2672 as amended by title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries. This provision would merely permit the Department of State in the event of an automobile accident or some other tort claim abroad to have the same authority which the United States Information Agency and the International Cooperation Administration now have, giving the Secretary of State or his designee overseas the right to settle such claims up to the amount of $1,000 without a great deal of redtape.

The second item concerns a confidential fund, an unvouchered fund, for the Attorney General, in the amount of $5,000, to be used in connection with getting information and the usual purposes of such a fund in the hands of a law-enforcement officer in the Territory of Alaska. There the United States Marshals comprise a great part of the law-enforcement system. Because of the fact that they have not been successful in instances because of their failure to have unvouchered funds, the committee thought it proper to allow the insertion of this language, "including not to exceed $5,000 for emergencies to be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Attornel General."

The third item concerns three positions, raising them to the grade of GS–16. At the present time and for some time there have been five assistant commissioners of immigration. Three of these commissioners for at least the past year have been in grade GS–16. About a month ago the Congress saw fit to permit two retired generals, Generals Howard and Partridge, to accept the positions of assistant commissioners of immigration. This inserted language would put them on the same basis as the other three commissioners, so that all five assistant commissioners would receive the uniform salary of GS–16. In their case the salary increase would amount to less than $2,600 for both.

There is one other position included, that of the district director of immigration in New York, Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy. For many, many years Ed Shaughnessy has been a very faithful servant of the Federal Government. In his case the increase would amount to not more than $1,000 and would give him a GS–16 grade.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the proper legislative committees are incompetent to handle these matters?

Mr. ROONEY. I am not saying that at all, but in the three specific instances to which I referred I think something should be done and done promptly. There is no telling when it might be done otherwise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the inclusion of these amounts over and above what was appropriated before the committee did not have in mind any thought that that might make it impossible to balance the budget or get a reduction in the income tax?

Mr. DELANEY. Again I will refer that question to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that that is not so. I have spent a number of years here now trying to save some money for the taxpayers. But it appears that in 1953 when the new administration came into office they cut the State Department and Foreign Service too drastically. I protested it at that time. We must have proper and adequate representation all over the world to protect the interests of this Government and its security.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am happy to know that that side of the aisle is supporting the President again.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Following the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], I also want to comment and express my opposition to this rule waiving all points of order. To me, this is a sneaker here.

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, then, through you.

Mr. DELANEY. Then I yield to the chairman for that purpose.

Mr. WIER. This provision written in this bill on page 22 dealing with these five new positions which are created is not in compliance with the position of the Committee on Armed Services which was taken a couple of weeks ago when these were presumed to be temporary positions and not in competition with career employees. But here you have frozen them in competition with career employees.

Mr. ROONEY. No. May I say the gentleman is in error. The increase to grade 16 refers to only 3 positions and not 5, or 6, as the language says, for the reason that 3 of the 6 are already by law grade 16. This language would make the 5 assistant commissioners uniform as to grades and amount of compensation.

Mr. WIER. The fact remains that the 2 generals will undoubtedly be included in these 5. I think that is what the bill is passed for. Let us call a spade a spade. You are making provision in this bill for these 2 generals on a permanent basis.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought I very frankly pointed that out. The committee was unanimous in feeling that there was no reason that 3 assistant commissioners should be grade 16 and 2 should be grade 15. This makes them uniform. That is all it does, and the amount involved is in the neighborhood of $2,600.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the Members of the House that tomorrow the highway-construction bill will come up. It will be voted on Friday. We will probably meet early on Friday. I am making this announcement so the Members can govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has explained the bill which this resolution will make in order. I can only add that this resolution is somewhat different from such resolutions as have been brought to the floor by the Committee on Rules on ordinary legislative bills in that the time is not specified in the rule. The time, as I understand it, is to be agreed to by the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, with the unanimous consent of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is shocking and almost beyond belief that the Rules Committee should approve a rule on this appropriations bill waiving all points of order.

Let it be remembered that it was only a few short weeks ago that the Rules Committee waived points of order on the independent offices appropriation bill and by so doing started a controversy to which I desire to direct your attention because it bears on exactly the same kind of legislation as is contained in this measure.

First, let me reemphasize that there can be only one reason for a rule waiving points of order on an appropriation bill and that is for the purpose of nullifying the prohibition against legislation on an appropriation measure. There would be no necessity for this rule if that were not the case. The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill and the leadership of this House, Democrats and Republicans alike, know this to be the truth.

And let me say this to the members of the Rules Committee—by the increasing frequency with which you are granting these waivers, you are making a mockery of the standing legislative committees and stultifying the prestige of your own committee. You are becoming parties to an expediency that will, if persisted in, break down the legislative process.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of which I am a member, and a subcommittee of which I am also a member, has been attempting to keep some balance of super grade employees in the Federal Government. This subcommittee is headed by one of the most distinguished and hard working Members of Congress, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

When the Independent Offices appropriation bill was before the House on March 6 of this year, it provided 11

supergrade employees for the General Services Administration. In order to slip through this legislation on that appropriation bill, the Rules Committee waived points of order. Now comes the Appropriations Committee with 5 more supergrade employees through the process of legislation in the pending State and Justice Department appropriations bill.

The provisions of the Classification Act, under which 1,200 supergrade positions under control of the Civil Service Commission are allocated, requires that each of these positions be analyzed in detail as to responsibilities and duties, and that they be completely justified as individual positions and in their relationship to all other positions in the Federal Government. The final authority for the allocation of these positions is a majority of the three Commissioners of the Civil Service Commission.

In the debate on the independent offices appropriation bill on Tuesday, March 6, 1956, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the subcommittee handling that legislation, stated, and I quote:

> The Civil Service Commission has 74 of those jobs over there unallocated, but they, frankly, told us at 10:30 this morning that there are 600 applicants throughout the Government for the 74.

I further quote from the remarks of the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS:

> All I can say is that this is a reasonable and an honest and a deserving attempt on the part of this subcommittee to adjust the supergrades among 18 agencies that come before us, to see that one man who is doing a more responsible job than are the men in the other agencies holding comparable jobs, is entitled to the same salary that other people get who are doing a less responsible job.

Did these gentlemen consider in any way the other 600 applicants for the 74 available positions when they allocated the 11 supergrades to the General Services Administration? I also ask them did they take the time necessary to thoroughly analyze the duties and responsibilities of each of the 11 jobs they so casually allocated? Did they review the job sheet of a single one of them? I further ask if they feel that if their committee, or any committee of Congress, should usurp the authorities and responsibilities not only of other House committees but the executive branch of Government as well, and attempt to classify and allocate the individual positions in the Federal Government?

I further quote from the RECORD of Tuesday, March 6, to show that the Committee on Appropriations did give some consideration to the allocation of these supergrade jobs. On page 4077 I quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]:

> What we are doing is the sensible business like thing. Here is a group of men who spend from two hundred to four or five hundred millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money of this country. We think it is good business to pay men with such responsibility a sufficient amount so that there is not going to be any question of defalcation.

I further quote from the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Texas as they appear on page 4090 of the RECORD:

> These people spend millions and millions of dollars. Is it right to have a man given authority to spend $50 million of $100 million and put him on a little bit of a salary? You want to keep him honest, do you not?

It seems to me that the only consideration given to justifying the allocation of 11 supergrade positions to the General Services Administration was that of keeping the employees honest. If the pay and classification schedules of the Federal Government are to be based on the relative honesty of the incumbents, I say that this Congress should no longer be concerned with any law establishing rules and regulations for the placing of positions in their relative order of importance and with the pay of the employees for duties performed, but should allow the departments and agencies to pay their employees only that amount which will guarantee their honesty. In such a scheme of things, of course, the man hardest to keep honest would get the highest pay. If I were one of the individuals concerned, I would highly resent the implication of the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, let us examine that "little bit of a salary" the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] told you is being paid the 11 people to whom he has so magnanimously proposed to give the 11 new supergrades in the independent offices appropriation bill.

The Comptroller of the General Services Administration is now getting $14,190; the other 10 employees are now being paid at least $11,610 and possibly $12,690, depending on length of service in the grade. I ask you, are these "little bittie salaries"? The proposed salaries are $14,800 and $12,900; increases ranging from $210 to $1,290 per year. Again I say, "What price honesty?"

Now, let us look at the comparable positions of Comptroller in other agencies under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. There are 18 of them. Only one has a grade equal to that proposed for the General Services Administration—that is the Chief of Audit of the General Accounting Office—responsible for the expenditure of all Federal moneys, not just a few hundred million.

The Comptroller of the Veterans' Administration, with a budget some 22 times as large as that of the General Services Administration, is being paid $13,545. Compare that with the $14,190 now being paid the Comptroller of the General Services Administration. With this condition existing in the 18 agencies considered by the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I ask you, how could they possibly have given thought to all of the comparable positions in the other departments and agencies of government? For instance, the top civilian Comptroller of the Army is paid $14,190 with a budget of over $8 billion, that of the Navy $14,405 with a budget of some $9 billion, and the Air Force pays theirs $14,620 with a responsibility for over $16 billion. Were these given consideration in setting a salary of $14,800 for the General Services Administration with a budget of considerably less than $1 billion?

I find absolutely nothing in the hearings on the State and Justice appropriation bill that would justify in any way the supergrade jobs that would be created. There is no evidence that anyone was called to testify from the Civil Service Commission concerning this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, this rule ought to be defeated. Notice should be served not only upon the Appropriations Committee, and the subcommittees thereof, as well as the Rules Committee that the rules of the House were never designed to satisfy the desires of a few Members of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations cut this bill to the extent of $56,802,000, or about 9.5 percent of the amount requested by President Eisenhower through his Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am perfectly aware of that. You cut the budget askings, did you not? In other words, you cut a calculated gamble.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman that if he had read the printed testimony he would not make that statement; this was not done that way. Each item was taken separately. In that regard he might inquire of the members of the Committee on Appropriations on his side of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. What I am saying to the gentleman is that the various departments of the Government come in and ask for far more than they expect to get; in other words, they take a calculated gamble when they come down here.

Mr. ROONEY. I have suspected that ever since the first part of 1953. Originally these agencies proceeded to cut appropriations, but this year they came back for increases in every area. If that is what is behind President Eisenhower's request in this particular instance for $598,169,820 I am willing to take the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. GROSS. That is the way I feel about it. You have not cut the spending, you have increased the spending over last year; you are not cutting the spending.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial immediately following the last quorum call.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of the House who over the years has not at one time or another been grateful to the Rules Committee for making it easier for him to vote on a particular bill. We

all realize the wonderful service performed by the Rules Committee, but sometimes notwithstanding that very helpful service which I received on more than one occassion, it will include some waiver or provision in a resolution or put out a particular rule which causes me to wonder, therefore, whether they are trying to follow in the footsteps of the Supreme Court which appears to have assumed legislative functions by taking over jurisdiction that properly belongs to legislative committees.

If the Rules Committee in its wisdom, and it has plenty of that, is to follow a practice of bringing in a resolution waiving all points of order on appropriation bills first at the suggestion of one individual then another, permit the writing of legislation in appropriation bills, or if the Appropriations Committee is to assume the duty of writing legislation and the Rules Committee continues to permit that to go on, I, for one, if I desired to shirk my duty might be thankful and happy because I can then go fishing more afternoons and more mornings. Neither I nor any other Member will need to serve on the legislative committees. Eventually, if they follow along on that, and I refer to these two committees, we will not need any legislative committees at all. In my judgment they are now overburdened with their regular authorized duties.

Do you get the point? This is the apparent procedure proposed. We will let the Appropriations Committee write the legislation for all of us, then we will let the Rules Committee report it out waiving all points of order and the rest of us who are not on either committee will not have anything to do. Then, if that procedure is to prevail, may I ask—"Why are we here."

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman poses a rather tough question for the Rules Committee because last year we did what the gentleman has just suggested. An appropriation bill was brought in after the Rules Committee had refused to report a rule waiving points of order. Then the Rules Committee received heaps and heaps of criticism for doing that. Now the gentleman is criticizing the Rules Committee for bringing in a rule waiving points of order. I do not see how the poor Rules Committee can survive no matter what it does.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps you will not. But the Rules Committee does a fine job, it is trying to do too much. It is trying to be too helpful, if that is possible. I have not felt capable of serving on either the Rules Committee, the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Ways and Means, those are tough ones. I would not want to get on either, even if I were a young fellow and this was my first term. True, I am critical, but who is not? It is apparent the Rules Committee can go too far on the practice of waiving points of order. As was just suggested, ultimately, if we keep on permitting the Committee on Appropriations to write legislation, we will not need the legislative committees. That has been said before. That is the only point I am making. If you want to do away with the legislative committees, do it by amending the Rules. No one believes that Appropriations can take over the duties of legislative committees and properly adequately perform them. The job is too big.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DELANEY. The Rules Committee as a practice does not present rules waiving points of order, but in most of these appropriation bills there are minor items included, and when the Appropriations Committee asks in good faith for a rule waiving those minor points of order the Rules Committee sometimes go along. And so in this case that is exactly what did happen.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do not misunderstand me. On various occasions I have been happy with the action that was taken, and which was helpful to me. But I was thinking of the overall situation and where we were drifting in our legislative procedure, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would not think the Appropriations Committee or any subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee would ever come before the Rules Committee except in good faith.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I realize that when the Rules Committee comes in with a proposal, the House usually accepts it. That would be all right if it occurred only occasionally, it is not good all over practice. If I was the gentleman's attorney that is what I would say.

Mr. DELANEY. And I would have a very good attorney if the gentleman were my attorney.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Rules Committee has gained the respect and support of the House to such an extent that almost everything it brings in we accept. Therefore this action today seems to be taking an unfair advantage of us.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is not the gentleman sometimes disturbed about the substantive content of these bills? We had a GSA bill up for consideration under the same kind of a rule, and although they admitted that my local post office is dirty and cannot be maintained adequately, they fired 5 charwomen this last year to fill 1 or 2 supergrade positions. Is it not possible that we will ultimately have all generals and nobody to clean floors by the time this is concluded?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That situation exists to a certain extent all over. I have similar trouble. They say to me, "Who are you recommending for a rural carrier or who are you recommending for this $3,000 post office job which they import somebody to take because nobody in the community wants it?" Then I make a recommendation and then I learn that somebody in the Department has control of the job, anyway, and all I have to do is to get the file and register the complaints that flood me after the appointment is made. I am not too happy about it. It would be helpful to me personally and aid me in doing my job if I had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to call attention to a provision in this bill on page 22 which is legislation on an appropriation bill. I realize this matter has been discussed to some extent, but I am here to protect, if I may, the rights and prerogatives of a legislative committee that is being circumvented by reason of a rule granted on this appropriation bill.

I agree the Rules Committee generally renders a great service. I know the members of the Appropriation Committee have worked diligently in their efforts to bring proper legislation to the floor dealing with appropriations for the agencies included in this measure. I do not say that the persons whose salaries would be increased because of this legislation may or may not be entitled to these increases. I do say that this is not the proper way to handle the situation.

There is not a thing in the hearings here with respect to these supergrades you are asking for that I know of. I would be glad to have the chairman point it out if there is. The chairman of the subcommittee is a great man, a great public servant, but it seems to me that the thing ought to be justified in the regular way.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York. I want to pay tribute to him, because he has kept these appropriations down.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the gentleman that these are not ideas that arose in the Committee on Appropriations. The language contained in the bill with regard to this subject was suggested by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization of the Department of Justice. The language I read awhile ago in regard to tort claims originated in the Department of State. The language in regard to the unvouchered funds for use of the Attorney General in Alaska arose in the Attorney General's Office. The committee was asked to write in a number of things, and I will give you an example of one. It was due as the result of a recent decision, a case lost by the Attorney General before the Indian Claims Commission under which we might very well have to buy the United States back from the Indians. The result of the decision says the Attorney General, may cost the taxpayers of the United States as much as $5 billion in Indian claims. We were presented with and asked to insert certain legislative

language in the bill. The committee said, "No. This is a matter for the proper legislative committee." And we did not insert the rider. We were asked for any number of other items of legislation.

Now, in regard to the 3 inconsequential increases in grade, the gentleman well knows that if this matter of these 3 men's salaries is not now straightened out, it is not going to be done in this Congress because the gentleman's committee is not going to do anything about it. Let me conclude by saying that the gentleman appeared before the Committee on Rules only yesterday and objected to this rule, but the Rules Committee saw fit to grant it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to pay tribute to the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for standing here and telling us that they could not put those things in this bill. As I understand your statement, you resisted those various agencies and said, "No, we are not going to put that in the appropriation bill; it does not belong there," and I compliment you for it all the way down the line. But, here you come to this one point and you give in. You said on this one, "We will give in and put it in."

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman finds fault with us for a little matter of $3,600 increase in salaries of these men. Is that not true?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just one thing. Tell us this. The committee has recently reported a bill that would take care of the situation described provided, of course, the jobs justify the salaries included in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman, with his years of experience in this House—and parenthetically, may I say that I have always respected him and we have always been good friends——

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is true. I also respect the distinguished gentleman from New York, one of the hard working and diligent Members of this House.

Mr. ROONEY. With his years of experience, the gentleman well knows that if the House does not insert this provision, when the bill goes over to the other body, the other body will put this language in the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I understand what he means. But that does not justify our doing it. Whatever the other body would do is something else. Let us stand up on our own hind legs and take care of our own business, so far as we can. We cannot do things just to excuse the other body for what it may do, because if we did that, we would be here all day. I still think the committee was wrong by including legislation in an appropriation bill.

I do want to compliment the gentleman for the manner in which he has dealt with a number of the appropriation requests. He has seen fit to approve reductions where it would have been more popular to have increased them. I know he has a difficult task. I think, however, there are a number of places where there should be further reductions, but the thing to which I direct attention now is that we should not include legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, chairman of the subcommittee, has twice made observations in the course of colloquy under the rule on a subject on which I should like to touch upon while we are on the rule, so that it will appear in the same area of the RECORD. He has remarked about the allegedly excessive cuts in the Department of State budget in 1953. I merely want to point out for the RECORD at this time, because I am sure we will have occasion to debate it later, that 1953, if anyone has forgotten it, marked the transition from an administration that had been in power for 20 years and through 2 wars, to a brand-new administration. The brand-new administration certainly was entitled by any standard, to have a new look at the existing agencies of Government, and that new look necessarily entailed some reductions of force so a fresh start could be made.

The cut in appropriations in the fiscal year 1953 resulted in and was part of a much-needed new look in Government operations in general and operations overseas in particular. The reductions in the appropriations to the Department of State led to a streamlining in the administration and a basic look at the machinery with which we conduct our foreign affairs. This was important and useful and from this the Department has established a new, strong basis from which it is now essential to expand.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10721, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I should like to express my grateful appreciation, as the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, to all my colleagues on that subcommittee.

I am indeed appreciative of the great help and courtesy extended to me by the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the very distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the ranking minority Member, my good friend, and fellow New Yorker, the very distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], and the likewise very distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER]. I very much appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended me by every one of them.

I would remiss if I did not express my thanks for his great help to the executive secretary of this committee, Mr. Jay B. Howe. Mr. Howe came to the Committee on Appropriations just a year before I first became chairman of this subcommittee. That was in the year 1949. Ever since then Mr. Howe, and I am sure I bespeak the thoughts of every member of the Committee on Appropriations, has been a trusted, valued, and competent public servant and of invaluable aid to all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, regardless of which side of the aisle happened to be in the majority at the time.

As I pointed out a while ago during the course of the debate on the rule waiving points of order against this bill, the total requests for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Judiciary, the United States Information Agency, and Refugee Relief, amounted to $598,169,820. The committee saw fit to cut these appropriation estimates submitted by President Eisenhower to the extent of $56,802,448. In doing so, the committee allowed the amount of $46,794,137 above the current level; $24,258,042 of this money is with regard to the Department of State. The Department of State came to the committee and said:

> We need a substantial buildup in employees at our Foreign Service posts. We need to increase the number in the Foreign Service. We need to increase the local employees abroad at our embassies and consulates.

The committee, and I am not now speaking for my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] because he expressed on the floor here a while ago an opinion to the contrary—the committee, having in mind that there was too drastic a cut in 1953 which at that time practically decimated the Foreign Service, agreed in part with the request of the Department of State this year. I have been connected with appropriations for the Department of State for almost the past dozen years and I have always been critical of the Department of State and the Foreign Service when I thought I should have been critical. On the other hand, I am one who has always thought that we must have a strong Foreign Service and the proper and best representation we can get

abroad. With that in mind, your committee saw fit to increase the State Department to the extent of $24,258,042.

As to the Department of Justice, the increase allowed was in the amount of $4,893,000. Included in this bill is an appropriation pursuant to a request in the amount of $4,265,000 for the anti-trust division. This amount is $801,000 over the amount appropriated for this division in the current fiscal year, and will provide for the continuation on a full year basis of the additional personnel which had been approved in the second supplemental appropriation act of 1956. I might say that in allowing this full amount of the budget estimate, the committee expects that the Department will commence a vigorous program of enforcement of the anti-trust laws.

The Judiciary request for the coming fiscal year is in the amount of $37,582,535. There was not much that could be cut with regard to this request—the amount allowed is $2,186,900 below the amount requested, which would be an increase of $1,479,725 above the amount allowed for the current fiscal year.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Solely to keep the record straight because I think both of us have used the wrong year—the year in which you allege excessive cuts were made was fiscal 1954.

Mr. ROONEY. No; I was speaking of calendar 1953. The gentleman knows when the cuts were made. President Eisenhower had only been in office a few months when with his great wisdom and the wisdom of his Secretary of State, he cut the Foreign Service to the bone.

Mr. COUDERT. But the fact remains nevertheless that the term fiscal 1953, I think, was used when we really mean calendar 1953 and fiscal 1954. I am not engaging in a discussion at this point with the gentleman, but I merely want the record to show that.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman and I understand each other—we know when the too-drastic cut was made.

With regard to the Federal judiciary, I regret that I again must discuss a subject which so annoyed the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] when we discussed this bill under general debate a year ago; to wit, the subject of bankruptcies. I made certain claims at that time that the number of bankruptcies were greatly increasing throughout the United States. I pointed out that those bankruptcies were bankruptcies which affected small people, and some exceptions were made to my remarks.

Well, let us see if we have the record straight at this time.

On the 8th of March last I wrote the following letter to the Chief of Bankruptcy, Administrative Office of United States Courts, Mr. Covey:

DEAR MR. COVEY: On yesterday I came across the following statement:

"According to Dun & Bradstreet figures, the rate of business failures during 1954—42 per 10,000—was 63 percent higher than the average for the postwar years 1946–53. Reports for the first 7 months of 1955 indicate that the number of failures last year, despite all the prosperity, will not differ much from the 1954 total. The number for 7 months was 6,487. Since the average liability of these failures was $40,000, it's a safe conclusion that most of the bankruptcies were small businesses."

I would appreciate your advice as to whether the above is correct.

With cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely.

Under date of the 15th of March I received a letter in reply from the Chief of Bankruptcy, Mr. Covey, in which he says:

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: This letter is in response to your letter of March 8, 1956, wherein you quote a statement relating to Dun & Bradstreet's figures on the rate of business failures during 1954 and 1955, and making certain comparisons with the period from 1946 to 1953. You ask whether they are correct. I believe they are substantially so, although there are a number of differences in the manner in which Dun & Bradstreet's statistics on this subject are compiled as compared with ours.

First of all, their statistics are compiled on a calendar year basis while ours are on a fiscal year basis. This should not make too much difference over a long period but it might make some for a single year.

Second, Dun & Bradstreet compile only "business failures" as I understand it, whereas we compile statistics on all bankruptcy cases including "employees" and "others not in business."

Third, they cover all types of business failures which would include common law, statutory and contract assignments for the benefit of creditors, out of court settlements, extensions and compositions, State and Federal court receiverships not under the Bankruptcy Act and bankruptcy cases including ordinary bankruptcy, arrangement and reorganization proceedings under the so-called relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act. Our statistics deal only with cases that are administered under the Bankruptcy Act.

Fourth, their data on the amount of liabilities involved are compiled as of the date a business goes into some sort of liquidation or administration, whereas our statistics show the actual amount realized and the amount of liabilities filed and allowed in the proceeding. In other words, their statistics as to liabilities are compiled as of the date a case is filed whereas ours are compiled after a case is fully administered and closed.

Furthermore our data on ordinary bankruptcy cases as distinguished from cases under the relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act is broken down into three categories, namely, asset cases, nominal asset cases and no-asset cases. These are defined for purposes of our statistics as follows:

1. An asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding (as distinguished from a proceeding under one of the relief chapters of the Bankruptcy Act) in which there was some distribution to some class of creditors over and above exemptions and costs of administration.

2. A nominal asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding in which there were some assets coming into the estate above exemptions but these were all consumed in payment of costs of administration.

3. A no-asset case is an ordinary bankruptcy proceeding in which there were no assets coming into the estate above exemptions.

With regard to the statement quoted in your letter to the effect that the rate of business failures during 1954 was 63 percent higher than the average for the postwar years 1946 to 1953, our statistics indicate that this is substantially correct. I attach as exhibit A, a compilation taken from table III of our annual statistics for the years mentioned. It shows that in 1954, cases filed by merchants, manufacturers, and others in business, was 57.6 percent greater than the average number of such cases from 1946 to 1953. Also in 1955, the number of such cases filed was 60.8 percent greater than the average from 1946 to 1953. It seems to me our statistics in this regard support one another.

I also attach for your information the following exhibits with comments:

Exhibit B, number of bankruptcy cases filed by types of business in the fiscal years 1940 through 1955: From it you will observe that we show only merchants, manufacturers, and others in business.

Exhibit C, total assets realized and liabilities filed and allowed in asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955: These are the only figures we have available showing the amount of liabilities involved in asset cases. They relate to all asset cases without regard as to whether the bankrupts were or were not engaged in businses.

Recently we have made a special study of the asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955, breaking them down into 12 groups with actual assets ranging from $500 and under to cases with actual assets over $50,000 each. The two lowest groups contain cases with assets of $500 and under and with assets from $501 to $1,000 each. It is believed that the great majority of the cases in the two lowest groups include many bankrupts not in business (employees) as distinguished from those in business. The following compilations relate to the two lowest groups:

Asset cases closed in the years indicated

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
1954			
$500 and under	1,686	$363,297	$215
$501 to $1,000	702	519,340	740
1955			
$500 and under	2,293	469,158	205
$501 to $1,000	847	629,282	743

The following compilations relate to the next 9 groups (groups 3 to 11 both inclusive). It is believed that most of these would involve small business.

Asset cases closed in the years indicated

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
1954			
$1,001 to $2,000	706	$1,031,357	$1,461
$2,001 to $3,000	407	999,873	2,457
$3,001 to $4,000	276	956,136	3,464
$4,001 to $5,000	204	907,798	4,450
$5,001 to $7,000	231	1,371,759	5,938
$7,001 to $10,000	221	1,850,648	8,374
$10,001 to $15,000	213	2,599,223	12,203
$15,001 to $25,000	173	3,320,525	19,194
$25,001 to $50,000	131	4,477,869	34,182
Total	2,562	17,215,188	6,719
1955			
$1,001 to $2,000	865	1,254,667	1,450
$2,001 to $3,000	478	1,178,279	2,465
$3,001 to $4,000	325	1,129,986	3,477

Asset cases closed in the years indicated—Continued

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
1955			
$4,001 to $5,000	234	$1,144,819	$4,465
$5,001 to $7,000	310	1,876,450	5,901
$7,001 to $10,000	250	2,080,933	8,324
$10,001 to $15,000	229	2,781,393	12,146
$15,001 to $25,000	203	3,915,457	19,288
$25,001 to $50,000	154	5,348,584	34,731
Total	3,048	20,710,568	6,794

The following compilation relates to group 12 which it is believed would include cases that could be classified as large businesses:

Asset cases closed in the years indicated

Size of estates	Number of cases	Total realization	Average realization per case
1954			
$50,000 and over	112	$16,225,921	$144,874
1955			
$50,000 and over	124	16,671,816	134,450

Assuming groups 3 to 12, inclusive, would consist almost entirely of business failures, and assuming groups 3 to 11 represent small-business failures, the percentage of the total number of failures involved would be—

Small business, approximately 96 percent.

Large business, approximately 4 percent.

I trust this will give you the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN L. COVEY,
Chief of Bankruptcy.

EXHIBIT A

Number of bankruptcy cases filed, by occupation of the bankrupt, in the years indicated:

Fiscal year	Merchants	Manufacturers	Others in business	Total
1946	236	201	821	1,258
1947	631	596	1,416	2,643
1948	1,338	808	2,546	4,692
1949	1,969	853	3,664	6,486
1950	2,565	803	4,568	7,936
1951	2,360	522	4,173	7,055
1952	2,319	532	3,358	6,209
1953	2,402	518	3,498	6,418
Total	13,820	4,833	24,044	42,697
Average	1,728	604	3,005	5,337

Fiscal year	Merchants	Manufacturers	Others in business	Total
1954	3,191	745	4,476	8,412
1955	3,317	750	4,515	8,582
Total	6,508	1,495	8,991	16,994
Average	3,254	747	4,495	8,497
Percent increase in 1954 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive	84.66	23.34	48.95	57.61
Percent increase in 1955 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive	91.95	24.17	50.24	60.80
Percent of average increase in 1954 and 1955 over average from 1946 to 1953, both inclusive	88.31	23.67	49.58	59.2

EXHIBIT B

Number of bankruptcy cases filed by types of business in the fiscal years 1940 through 1955

Fiscal year	Farmer	Employee	Professional	Others not in business	Merchants	Manufacturer	Others in business	Total	National population
1940	2,678	36,846	801	2,230	4,651	92	4,194	[1] 52,577	132,122,000
Percent of total	5.1	70.4	1.5	4.3	8.9	1.8	8.0	100.0	
1941	2,367	42,348	744	2,365	4,278	766	3,464	56,332	133,402,000
Percent of total	4.2	75.2	1.3	4.2	7.6	1.4	6.1	100.0	
1942	2,048	40,180	581	2,071	3,386	507	3,336	52,109	134,860,000
Percent of total	3.9	77.1	1.1	4.0	6.5	1.0	6.4	100.0	
1943	1,151	27,020	395	1,762	1,775	286	2,322	34,711	136,739,000
Percent of total	3.3	77.8	1.1	5.1	5.1	0.8	6.7	100.0	
1944	512	15,460	211	1,292	554	181	1,323	19,533	138,397,000
Percent of total	2.6	79.1	1.1	6.6	2.8	0.9	6.8	100.0	
1945	305	10,010	152	1,041	287	153	914	12,862	139,928,000
Percent of total	2.4	77.8	1.2	8.1	2.2	1.2	7.1	100.0	
1946	260	7,618	112	948	236	201	821	10,196	141,389,000
Percent of total	2.6	74.7	1.1	9.3	2.3	2.0	8.1	100.0	
1947	183	9,396	111	838	631	596	1,415	13,170	144,126,000
Percent of total	1.4	71.3	0.8	6.4	4.8	4.5	10.7	100.0	
1948	167	12,546	114	991	1,338	808	2,546	18,510	146,631,000
Percent of total	0.9	67.8	0.6	5.3	7.2	4.4	13.8	100.0	
1949	232	17,772	159	1,372	1,969	853	3,664	26,021	149,188,000
Percent of total	0.9	68.3	0.6	5.3	7.6	3.3	14.1	100.0	
1950	290	22,933	126	2,107	2,565	803	4,568	33,392	151,677,000
Percent of total	0.9	68.7	0.4	6.3	7.7	2.4	13.7	100.0	
1951	205	25,984	127	1,822	2,360	522	4,173	35,193	154,360,000
Percent of total	0.6	73.8	0.4	5.2	6.7	1.5	11.9	100.0	
1952	196	26,527	137	1,804	2,319	532	3,358	34,873	156,981,000
Percent of total	0.6	76.1	0.4	5.2	6.6	1.5	9.6	100.0	
1953	214	31,253	140	2,062	2,402	518	3,498	40,087	159,696,000
Percent of total	0.5	78.0	0.3	5.1	6.0	1.3	8.7	100.0	
1954	322	40,889	154	3,359	3,191	745	4,476	53,136	162,409,000
Percent of total	0.6	77.0	0.3	6.3	6.0	1.4	8.4	100.0	
1955	386	46,163	217	4,056	3,317	750	4,515	59,404	165,248,000
Percent of total	0.6	77.7	0.4	6.8	5.6	1.3	7.6	100.0	

[1] This figure includes 256 amended petitions and adjudications for which occupation is not shown. The percent figures for 1940 are based on 52,321 cases which excludes these 256 amended petitions.

EXHIBIT C

Total assets realized and liabilities filed and allowed in asset cases closed in 1954 and 1955:

	1954	1955
Number of cases	5,062	6,320
Total realization	$34,623,745	$38,380,830
Average realization	$6,839.93	$6,072.92
Total liabilities filed and allowed	$125,370,233	$156,601,254
Average liabilities filed and allowed	$24,767	$24,779

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has given us some very illuminating facts about business failures.

It seems that most of these failures pertain to small-business units. While we had this avalanche of business failures, I find that most of the Government procurement is directed to the large corporations; and I am told that 100 big corporations got 62.6 percent of the procurement totaling $123 billion in the last 5 years.

The share of the 100 corporations, with General Motors Corp. holding the first place, was $77,167,400,000 for the period from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1955.

Does not the gentleman feel that if some of this procurement were directed to some of these smaller corporations we might have had a different result, one other than the horrendous factors the gentleman adverted to?

Mr. ROONEY. I most certainly agree. The gentleman well knows that every effort made by this administration since it took office has been directed to making big business bigger and has done

nothing, in my estimation, to help the small-business man. The fact that 96 percent of business failures were small business indicates that.

Now, let us refer to the Department of State.

We used to hear about homosexuals in the State Department; we used to read about it in the press. How many homosexuals do you think they found during the past year and this after this administration has been in office for 3 years? How many homosexuals do you think they found in the State Department during the past year? I refer you to page 352 of the testimony and the following colloquy:

Mr. ROONEY. How many morals cases have you had in the Department in the past year?

Mr. FLINN. We have had 42 individuals who have resigned in lieu of charges after admission. We have had 15 individuals who resigned after being confronted with the nature of the investigations, but before final processing of their cases.

Mr. ROONEY. That includes women as well as the men?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Mr. ROONEY. These 57 cases were alleged homosexuals?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

A few years back if they had found 57 foul balls in the Department of State it would have made the front pages. But the press has had this story for a month or two now and I have not seen any mention anywhere, that they had 57 homosexuals in the Department.

Now, let us see how good the Department of Justice has done with regard to all the espionage cases and treason cases they have been talking about in the press for so long.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Not just now. When I have finished I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, I assure him.

Let us see what the situation is with regard to espionage cases. Four hundred and eighty-one cases were turned over to the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice under Attorney General Brownell. How many indictments do you think were obtained in these 481 cases? Two. How many convictions? Two. And were not these cases instituted back in the other administration? How many espionage cases did they close and find nothing in? Four hundred and thirteen.

Now they have almost as good a record as that in the number of sabotage cases. They claim they had 411 sabotage cases. How many pending? None. How many closed? Four hundred and eleven. How many indictments? None. How many convictions? None.

Treason cases: 273. They claim these are pending, but no convictions appear in their statistics. This will be found on page 115 of the hearings with regard to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about Communists in Government. There has been a very peculiar situation uncovered in connection with certain funds appropriated to the President. In the supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year there was appropriated directly to President Eisenhower the sum of $5 million, an emergency fund in connection with cultural affairs and international fairs. That fund was used to send a certain symphony orchestra to the Orient at a cost of $267,000. This symphony orchestra was away, as I recall it, for about 5 or 6 weeks at a cost of over a quarter of a million dollars. According to the latest figures received from the Department of State there were 103 people in this orchestral contingent sent to the Orient. It now develops that of those who went to the Orient 1 out of 10 of them have been characterized by responsible law enforcement officials of the Government as either present or former members of the Communist Party. This discovery came about when certain decent American members of the aggregation reported that when the orchestra people were in Okinawa and were told that in so many minutes an American bombing plane could be over Soviet Russian territory great consternation was expressed by several members. It was said that we Americans were barbarians and always thought of war. When this same aggregation went to Hiroshima in Japan, there was a discussion amongst certain of them, in not too quiet tones, about what butchers we Americans were to have ever dropped the atom bomb on Japan.

So when they returned home some of these decent American citizens had something to say about it. Information came to this committee, which was turned over to the Office of Security of the State Department and to the FBI. The FBI made an investigation. Now, the background of these 10 people is not a background supplied by their fellow musicians. This is not background reported as hearsay from somebody on the outside. This is the background of these people as given by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and if you will bear with me a minute I will see if I can find the details as to the first of these foul balls.

Let us see about the background of the first member of this aggregation. The FBI says, not what any fellow musician said, not what I say, or what anyone else says:

Information has been reported by an informant of known reliability—

An informant of whom? Of the FBI. Who decides reliability? The FBI—

that in 1943 he was a member of the Communist Party. A similar reliable source said in 1944 that he held Communist Political Association Membership Book No. such-and-such.

The number of the book was reported by the FBI. He held that book, which had that number, on September 30, 1944.

Another informant of known reliability to the FBI said that he was a Communist in 1946, and an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past advised that this particular gentleman was a member of the International Workers Order, Lodge No. 607, in 1952, and had been a member for the past 5 years. It was further reported by the FBI that he was observed in 1952 on certain premises alleged as a secret training school of Communist Party members.

Now let us see about the next gentleman. According to a source that furnished the FBI reliable information in the past, this gentleman was transferred from the New York City Communist Party to the Communist Party of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1942; that in 1942 he sold an automobile to Earl Browder. It was further alleged in the FBI report, reliably, that he was also registered in the Workers School in 1943. That school is now the Jefferson School of Social Science and has been cited by the Attorney General. From a source of unknown reliability it was learned that this individual had been a soloist for the record Rondo, issued by the Young Peoples Records. This organization, Young Peoples Records, was cited as a Communist front, which has been advertised by Communist bookstores and had been cited in the 1948 report from the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Now, then, let us see another one of these people. In 1940, 1941, 1942, and 1945 this individual and his wife signed nominating petitions for Communist Party candidates for the New York State elections. A list of the members of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party, Manhattan, submitted by a confidential informant of the FBI in the early part of 1944, contained the names of this man and his wife.

Now, I do not have time to read all this testimony. I am going to insert all the pages in regard thereto at this point in the RECORD:

WEDNESDAY, *March 14, 1956.*

EMERGENCY FUND FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CULTURAL PROGRAM

Witnesses: Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration; I. W. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, Controller; Scott McLeod, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs; Robinson McIlvaine, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs; Edward C. Crouch, Acting Budget Officer; Dennis A. Flinn, Director, Office of Security; Russell Riley, Director, Educational Exchange Program; Douglas N. Batson, Bureau of Public Affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, is one of your duties to handle the program under the appropriation entitled "Funds appropriated to the President" in connection with the sending of cultural and trade-fair groups and other such people to foreign countries?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And last summer did you send an organization known as the Symphony of the Air to the Orient?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I believe it was last summer.

Mr. BATSON. Last summer, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the date?

Mr. BATSON. May and June 1955.

Mr. ROONEY. This past May and June?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And where did they go?

Mr. MCILVAINE. They went to Japan, to the Philippines—is it all right if I ask Mr. Batson to supplement my answer?

Mr. ROONEY. Certainly.

Mr. BATSON. Korea, Okinawa, Thailand, Formosa, and Ceylon.

Mr. ROONEY. That is seven countries, I believe, you have given us.

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir, but I would add Malaya.

Mr. ROONEY. How many people did you send?

Mr. BATSON. There were 101.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a list of them?

Mr. BATSON. I have a list of them here, yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. May I see the list?

Mr. BATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. They were approximately 2 months in these foreign countries?

Mr. BATSON. About 6 weeks.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the cost to the taxpayers?

Mr. BATSON. $267,005.09.

Mr. ROONEY. How many performances did they give?

Mr. BATSON. I do not have the record of that with me; I do not know exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you insert that information at this point in the record?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir. There were 35.

Mr. ROONEY. Before you sent these people, Mr. McIlvaine, at a cost of $267,000 to the taxpayers, did you have their names checked for security?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, we did.

Mr. ROONEY. Who did you have check them?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We had the management and the conductors checked by the Department's Security Office.

Mr. ROONEY. I think from here on, we should use numbers in referring to them.

You have now given us 4 names which we have designated 1, 2, 3, and 4. Did you check anyone else of this group for security, beyond numbers 1 through 4, just mentioned?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No, Mr. Chairman, we did not.

Mr. ROONEY. By that do you mean there was not even a check made of the name files of the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, or anywhere else as to all other than the four mentioned?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That is correct. I would like to be able to elaborate on that, if I may.

Mr. ROONEY. You may go right ahead.

Mr. MCILVAINE. Well, as you know, the responsibility for operating this program is in the State Department. I want to clear up, right away, that it is a separate one from the regular exchange program.

Mr. ROONEY. But it is handled by the exchange program?

Mr. MCILVAINE. It was handled by 1 branch, 4 or 5 people in 1 branch of the exchange program.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; and it worked under the director of the exchange program?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That is right. But they report directly to the Interagency Committee of which I am chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. And is the United States Information Agency also in this program?

Mr. MCILVAINE. They are represented on this Interagency Committee, that is right. However, we have not appeared before this committee yet, this year, for our funds, although Mr. Riley and I have testified before you previously on the regular exchange request.

Mr. ROONEY. But you did get funds from the Congress last year including the $267,000, which was used to send this aggregation to the Orient?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That is correct. Now in setting up this program, I just want to point out, that we never had any experience in this kind of operation before. Therefore, we had to make our plans as intelligently as we could on the basis of our experience. As you already know, every recipient of a United States grant for travel or study abroad under the Smith-Mundt and Fullbright programs is subject first to a name check, even though such grantees are not Government employees, nor are they entitled to have access to classified information.

In formulating our operating plans for this program we are guided by the same criteria. The chief aim of this program is to demonstrate United States capabilities in the arts of music, drama, dance, and sports, and of course, an important byproduct of this program is the impact of the performers themselves for good will in their off hours. So naturally we determined that every effort must be made to insure that performers or groups be of the top artistic quality, and insofar as it could be determined, good representatives of the United States as well.

Mr. ROONEY. And by that do you mean dependable Americans without Communist connections?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That is correct. The first of these two criteria was relatively easy to handle, that is the artistic excellence. The American National Theater and Academy of New York, a nonprofit organization, which was chartered by Congress, and which has a very fine reputation, became our technical agent for making the technical arrangements, and in the selection of people from the artistic point of view. They have enlisted the help of prominent citizens, who are expert in the fields of music, dance, and so on to see that they have the artistic qualifications, and this procedure has worked very well. I can report to you that none of the groups that have gone abroad under this program have been anything but an artistic success.

Mr. ROONEY. In this group that you sent to the Orient, known as the Symphony of the Air, were they all dependable Americans without Communist connections?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I am not saying that; no, sir. However, the Symphony of the Air was a great success, from the point of view of everything that we have heard of it.

Now the second criteria, in which you are interested, and in which I am interested, that all participants be good representatives of the United States, is much less susceptible to precise determination. Clearly participants should not be persons who are Communists, or who might otherwise act against the interest of the United States. That includes various types, people who have nothing to do with communism, but who would be just plain poor representatives of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. How about Communist sympathizers?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That could include those too.

Mr. ROONEY. It should, should it not?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes. Making a determination in the case of an individual is a very difficult thing. It is relatively easy with respect to stars and top performers, because they are frequently well known by reputation and otherwise. And, of course, as you already know, we do submit their names for a name check.

The problem becomes much more difficult when you are dealing with a large group that operates as a team. Now a symphony is a good example of this. We are dealing with their reputation as an entity; and the top ones have international reputations as orchestras, because of the conductors and managers, and so on, who have been able to produce a team that produces music. The spotlight does not often get down to the third violin player, or other routine performers. Nevertheless I think we do have to consider what kind of a person that third player of the violin is, and it is not very easy to determine. For example, we might get unverified information, concerning a hypothetical violin player, describing him as a left winger or that he belongs to a do-good organization that was infiltrated with Communists in the past.

Our security people tell me that you often will find quite a proportion of such people who have had such associations, in this field, and I believe that the people themselves admit that people in this area are somewhat naive about such political things as the Communist conspiracy. So we had to make an operating decision in this program. And our decision was that since the President and the Congress had determined that this program was in the national interest we must try to make it work. In doing so we recognized that we must take all practical precautions to insure the proper type of performers; that in the case of large groups it was impractical to scrutinize each individual performer and that, therefore, our trust must be put in the management and the principals with whom we constantly stress the role that they and all their group play as unofficial ambassadors.

Thus, as a practical matter our assumption was if the hypothetical third violin player is a good one the overall effect of his participation in a great orchestra will far outweigh any mischief he might be able to do in the relatively few hours he is left alone on one of these tours.

Mr. ROONEY. Suppose it was said, as was written to me in a letter, that during the visit of the above-named band last year to the Orient, a good number of the members were spreading Red propaganda in the nations and islands they visited; would you then say that the third violinist's ability would outweigh the mischief he might be able to do?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I would say that was bad; except for this one member that we know about, and I have no evidence that they did. However I agree that it certainly would be bad if they did. On the other hand we have had very, very heavy evidence that the overall impact of the tour was highly successful.

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps the music was better than the third violin player?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Undoubtedly it was. Most of the reports we have had in have specifically mentioned the favorable impression made by the individual performers.

I am not so naive as to believe, or to state to you that in no instance did a single American performer make a fool of himself in any of these countries, or for that matter did not talk against the interest of the United States. But I do believe that the evidence in our files show that the overall impact of this program far outweighed any possible bad effect that was given by any individual.

Now, let us go into the details of this particular orchestra. This tour was organized over a year ago, and we used the Symphony of the Air, first of all because it has a reputation of being among the top in the country, and second because at the time it was thought best to send it, a number of the city name orchestras could not go; and in accordance with the policy we had adopted, we checked the president of the orchestra and the two conductors. All of them appeared to be——

Mr. ROONEY. And the booker; don't forget him.

Mr. MCILVANE. I included him.

Mr. ROONEY. But you just said the president and the two conductors.

Mr. MCILVANE. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. But you said you checked 4 people, not just 3 of them.

Mr. MCILVANE. Four people, yes. At the very beginning, there was trouble getting the group organized. Unlike the New York Philharmonic, the Philadelphia, Boston, Indianapolis, and other symphonies, the Symphony of the Air has become a "free lance" organization, since Toscanini left and NBC ceased to sponsor it. It does not play a regular season. Many of the musicians hold other jobs on the side. Not all of them could or wanted to get away for such a long trip on such short notice. As a result quite a few substitutions were made, I am told.

One of the great Japanese newspapers put up a $74,000 guaranty for their appearance in Tokyo, and arrangements were made with

the Defense Department for them to play for the troops in Okinawa, Korea, and Japan; and other arrangements were made for them to play throughout the Orient. The tour was not without its problems. We were really pioneering. This is the first time a symphony has ever gone to the Far East, and there were a great many problems involving such things as booking arrangements, transportation and so forth.

The report from Japan was extravagant, but typical of what we received from all the stops. It was described as the greatest cultural event that has happened in Japan since the opening of that country to the Western World.

Just last month the leading Philippine university cited the visit of the Symphony of the Air as the outstanding cultural event of the year, and presented Ambassador Ferguson with a citation to this effect for transmittal to the orchestra.

The Manila Chronicle which, by its own admission is generally critical of everything United States, had this to say:

"Once in a long time, America contrives to muster enough of her native genius to present to the rest of the world the best that she can give. When this happens, the bitterest critics of America and the American way of life restrain themselves * * * we wouldn't care if the State Department bombarded us with invasions by other symphony orchestras and with exhibitions of other American artists * * * this is the propaganda we would go out of our way to welcome. It is propaganda that will really sell the United States anywhere, be it Europe or Asia and should the United States Government adopt this propaganda as seriously and in as large a scale as it has adopted the program of military aid, all the evils with which America has been identified might be forgotten."

At one stage of the tour the orchestra was traveling in planes chartered from General Chennault's CAT airline. So pleased were the members of the orchestra with the friendly and efficient manner the pilots and crew handled the operation that they took up a collection for them. The pilots said they could not accept such a gift but would turn it over to the Formosa Symphony which was having a difficult time.

A recent letter from Taipei informs that this contribution has given the Formosa Symphony a new lease on life and that they look on the Symphony of the Air as their cultural godparents.

The comments from the other places were in the same vein. Everywhere they went tribute was paid to the excellence of the performance and the impressions of the performers as individuals.

On the basis of their record we considered the Symphony of the Air for another tour next year, but something happened.

Mr. ROONEY. Did you not consider them for a tour this year?

Mr. MCILVAINE. It was this calendar year; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. In the time already past?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No; the consideration was for a tour next fall.

Mr. ROONEY. For 1956?

Mr. MCILVAINE. 1956; yes, sir. Now something happened to this orchestra on its return. The management that we have mentioned moved out, and there were elections and new management came in. Soon thereafter we began to hear reports of dissension, and when we made our routine check on the new management it was clear that we did not have the kind of leadership that could be counted on to be good representatives abroad.

Mr. ROONEY. When did you make that routine check with respect to management?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I am not sure of the date.

Mr. BATSON. In January.

Mr. ROONEY. What did you do in making the check; who made the check?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We sent a memorandum over to the security officer and asked him for a check on the names.

Mr. ROONEY. It is my understanding that the security officer knew nothing about this until sometime about the 18th of January, when we took it up with him. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No; I do not. Maybe Mr. Flinn can tell you.

Mr. ROONEY. Wait a minute. Is that correct, Mr. Flinn, that you were handed certain information by me, on or about the 18th of January?

Mr. FLINN. That is right; the other requests were in process, when I received this information from you.

Mr. ROONEY. What request?

Mr. FLINN. The request from IES to check the new management; so that this thing happened simultaneously.

Mr. ROONEY. This is very strange. I have not heard that until this day, although we have discussed this situation to quite some extent. Do you have a copy of this request?

Mr. FLINN. I can get it.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I think possibly Mr. Flinn personally did not know I had called for that.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a copy of that request here? We should like to see it.

Mr. MCILVAINE. Very well.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you file it, please.

Mr. BATSON. We may have it in the files.

(The following information was subsequently supplied:)

"During first week of January 1956, 7 name checks were initiated incident to consideration of the orchestra for 1956 tour, including Nos. 22, 7, 16, 31, 6, and 2 unnumbered individuals."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Flinn, did he check all members of that orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir; only the names listed by request for him.

Mr. MCILVAINE. The management, again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Have you since checked all others in addition to the 30 names that the informant gave the FBI?

Mr. FLINN. That was handled by the FBI at that time.

Mr. ROONEY. There were 2 separate lists investigated; 2 separate investigations?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir. As a part of this investigation I submitted the entire list with a request that the FBI make a thorough check; investigate the allegations made against this orchestra as a whole, in addition to the names mentioned by the original informant.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have a copy of that with you?

Mr. FLINN. A copy——

Mr. ROONEY. A copy of the report with regard to the entire aggregation.

Mr. FLINN. I have the report, yes; it came back, a copy covering the entire group.

Mr. ROONEY. And you have that here with you?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead, Mr. McIlvaine.

Mr. MCILVAINE. Accordingly when we got this information which we have been discussing, which came almost simultaneously to your committee, we canceled the project. In doing so we had to be careful so as not to jeopardize the investment we already had in the Orient both in dollars and good will. Accordingly, we merely informed them that we were canceling the project and gave no reasons why we were doing so.

Mr. ROONEY. Who was the conductor of the orchestra at that time?

Mr. MCILVAINE. There was no conductor as yet.

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. MCILVAINE. This orchestra does not have a regular conductor; they get people to be guest conductors. I feel that——

Mr. ROONEY. Is No. 5 one of the conductors of this orchestra?

Mr. MCILVAINE. He has been a guest at various times. At the present time he would not be on any of our programs.

Mr. ROONEY. Has he been associated with the orchestra within the past year?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I believe he has, when it plays in the United States.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, Mr. McIlvaine, you may proceed.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I felt very strongly that in canceling this project we had 2 problems; 1 is the impact of a hassle over this question abroad, after the orchestra was so successful. And for this reason, because I think all here are trying to do what is best for the country, I would hope that this particular phase of the discussion in this session would not be made public. I am raising this point——

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, do you not think the public is entitled to know the type of people that make up an orchestra that goes abroad at a cost to the taxpayers of this country of a quarter million dollars?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I do, sir, if we know exactly what we are saying about them. Off the record I would prefer——

Mr. ROONEY. No; stay on the record, please.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I would agree with you, and I think it would be better if that phase of this could be handled separately from this program so that there would be no possibility of jeopardizing the undeniably good job they did and the good effect the orchestra had on the last trip.

Mr. ROONEY. Well don't associate me with that, though—because that is not my information at all. That does not reflect my thought on the subject at all.

Mr. MCILVAINE. We have approached this whole program, as I hope you appreciate, in addition to opposing communism, to put on a program that is as constructive as possible in this particular stage of the world situation.

Mr. ROONEY. May I ask you a question, Mr. McIlvaine?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Is not the very purpose of the program to combat and to contain communism abroad?

Mr. MCILVAINE. The purpose of the program is to show the cultural development in the United States, and in that context to put the lie to Communist propaganda that all the interest we have in the United States is to——

Mr. ROONEY. Are we to understand that it is not the underlying reason for a program such as this, where some $5 million was appropriated to President Eisenhower for use in connection therewith, to combat and contain communism?

Mr. MCILVAINE. It is to combat Communist propaganda, which is in itself to combat communism.

Mr. ROONEY. It was nice of you to stretch it that far. Go ahead.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I believe very strongly that this kind of a program is in the national interest; in fact we can no longer afford not to take steps to show that we have in this country something besides a strong defense and some of the best gadgets for comfortable living. I wish I could be able to tell that we have been able to find a workable system whereby we could guarantee to you and the American people that no one could go abroad under this program about whom there is not some taint. If we tried to make such a guaranty we would be dishonest, because I do not believe we could deliver. We can and do assure you that we regard this matter with the utmost seriousness; we have since the very inception of the program. Yet we have always known that lacking the kind of criteria that exists for Government employment and access to classified information, risks are involved.

Now I have never been one to contend that any particular administrative program is perfect or not susceptible to change. As I have already indicated we have kept this one under constant scrutiny. As a result of this study I believe we have taken steps to lessen the kind of risks that are involved in such a program.

Specifically we have taken steps to get the same check on rank and file performers that we have been getting on the leaders. We are continuing to stress the importance of this phase of the program to impresarios and union leaders.

Despite these efforts I am sure that our headaches will continue. However, nothing worth while is easy to accomplish. We believe in this program and believe with you that the interest of our country should be foremost in every phase of its operation. That is our sole aim in this operation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, you are familiar with the fact, are you not, that I turned certain information over to the security officer of the State Department on or about the 18th of January; are you familiar with that fact?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No; I am familiar with the fact that you did; I do not recall the date.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you familiar with the fact that thereafter the FBI made certain investigations?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now, have you seen the results of that investigation?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. If you had had that investigation before you spent $267,000 of the taxpayers' money in sending this aggregation to the Orient, would you have permitted them to go?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I would have first seen what possibilities there were to eliminate certain members of the orchestra and if that had not been possible I think probably I would not have let them go.

Mr. ROONEY. How many members of the orchestra?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I just cannot say. This is in this great gray area I referred to in my earlier testimony, as to where you draw the line in these things; where people are a part of the overall effect and not involved in security of the United States, as such. I am not an expert on that kind of thing, but I do know how difficult it is to draw the line.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you not think that before they went you should have had their names checked with the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee and other agencies, all the names of the persons in this program on whom you spent this $267,000?

Mr. MCILVAINE. As I have already told you, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ROONEY. Please let me have, once in a while, a categorical answer.

Mr. MCILVAINE. What was your question?

Mr. ROONEY. The question was: Do you not think that before you sent any of them on whom a part of this $267,000 of the taxpayers' money was spent that you should have first checked at least their names with the FBI and the Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We did not consider this practical up until now.

Mr. ROONEY. You have not answered my question, unless I misunderstand your answer. By that answer you mean you do not think you should have had the names checked before you sent them out at a cost of $267,000?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Mr. Chairman, that was the procedure under which we were operating.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not asking what procedure you were following; I am asking you a very simple question. Before you spent $267,000 of the taxpayers' money and sent this group abroad last summer, do you not think that you should at least have had their names checked with the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Well, yes.

Mr. ROONEY. To whom was this money appropriated that we are talking about here, this $267,000; to whom was it appropriated?

Mr. MCILVAINE. That comes out of the President's emergency fund for participation in international affairs.

Mr. ROONEY. And is there coordination of this program between the USIA, the Department of State, and the exchange program with the White House?

Mr. MCILVAINE. There is no direct contact with the White House. The Information Agency is assigned as the coordinator of the two arms of the program, one the trade fairs, and the other the cultural presentation program.

Mr. ROONEY. This was not money that was appropriated directly to the Department of State, was it?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was it money that was appropriated to the United States Information Agency?

Mr. MCILVAINE. It is my understanding—and I do not know exactly, but it is my understanding——

Mr. BATSON. The answer is "No."

Mr. ROONEY. These were moneys appropriated to the President for his emergency fund; is that right?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now, do you have the report with regard to the people who were on this trip? Do you have such a report? Who has it?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I would not have that.

Mr. FLINN. The report of the investigation?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. I have that.

Mr. ROONEY. On or about the 18th of January 1956, were you in touch with me, Mr. Flinn?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. At that time I told you that I had the name of a certain person in the city of New York which had been sent to me by a retired detective of the police department of that city?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. And did I give you a copy of that letter?

Mr. FLINN. You gave me a copy of the portion of the letter without the signature of your correspondent.

Mr. ROONEY. But including the name and address and telephone number of the informant?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. And what did you then do?

Mr. FLINN. I referred this—since the information contained in the letter appeared to come within the internal security jurisdiction of the FBI, I referred it to the FBI.

Mr. ROONEY. What did you then find?

Mr. FLINN. The FBI made the investigation and submitted the results to the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. And what did it report?

Mr. FLINN. They reported the interview with the original informant named in the letter to you, sir, and the results of the names-check of those persons he named including others in this orchestra who had gone on this Far East tour.

Mr. ROONEY. Let us stay with the original informant—the first person they interviewed.

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. We will call him No. 6.

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did No. 6 say?

Mr. FLINN. He identified himself as associated with this orchestra in the past, and stated that since the last election of officers of the orchestra, when the leftist group took control, he has not played with the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. Excuse me a moment.

Mr. FLINN. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, proceed. We were inquiring with reference to what No. 6 said.

Mr. FLINN. He attributed his lack of further employment with the orchestra to an incident that took place in 1955 when the arrangements were made for the trip to the Orient, which the orchestra made. He had made a comment to one of the members of the orchestra that some of the fellows were going to have difficulty——

Mr. ROONEY. He made the comment to No. 7; and who was No. 7?

Mr. FLINN. I do not have that—he is a member of the symphony.

Mr. ROONEY. The manager of the orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. Apparently that has certain information better than I have on this paper.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you looking at the report of February 15?

Mr. FLINN. No, I am looking at the raw material which I received, and I have identified the man there, but I did not identify him here, you see.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well.

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had made this comment to No. 7, that some of the fellows were going to have difficulty in making the tour because they would have difficulty in getting a passport.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say, because of their background?

Mr. FLINN. Because of their background. No. 7 replied that if he continued to talk in this manner that he would never play with the orchestra again.

Since that statement No. 6 said that he was constantly watched by the "leftist," while in the Far East. He also described an incident which occurred while on the tour, where he was given a "trial," when he was charged by other members of the orchestra with using vile language in the presence of an Army officer's wife. This trial resulted in proof that No. 6 did not make these comments in front of—in the presence of ladies, and it seems as though—and I am interpolating now, that in some of the comments made by No. 6, there is a showing of spite. However, he did name approximately 30 people associated with the orchestra, which he identified as the "leftist" group. He referred to certain other incidents which occurred in the Far East.

Mr. ROONEY. Before you get away from that, and concerning the vile language: What else did he say, if anything, with regard to that officer and his wife?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he was later invited by the officer and his wife to visit their home which apparently disproved the false charges made by the other member of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. What objection is there to just reading this matter, to save time?

Mr. FLINN. I would prefer that this did not go in verbatim.

Mr. ROONEY. Was No. 6 asked to elaborate on his allegation that some of the Symphony of the Air members spread "Red" propaganda while on the tour of the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that No.——

Mr. ROONEY. That is No. 8?

Mr. FLINN. I will leave out the designation, because that identifies him. That No. 8 had highly praised and agreed with the book which contained——

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a change in the officials so that it would not be possible to now tell exactly who was the chairman of the board.

Mr. FLINN. This was not the name of the chairman of the board.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, proceed. What did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He said this, that No. 8 highly praised and agreed with a book which condemned the atom bombing of Hiroshima.

Another example of propaganda given by the informant was that fact that number——

Mr. ROONEY. That is what number?

Mr. FLINN. No. 9, associated with the orchestra, constantly praised Russian music and stated that its culture was superior to ours. He added that while at Army installations in the Far East, the musicians with the orchestra took photographs. He admitted that he could not be specific as to the allegations of the Red propaganda, nor cite specific instances as to the spread of that progaganda. He did furnish, however, a list of 30 individuals suspected by him of being "leftists."

This informant was also not quite articulate when asked to define the term "leftist."

Mr. ROONEY. Did he not say that he believed there were certain people who were un-American?

Mr. FLINN. Un-American; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did No. 6 say about No. 4?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that he suspected No. 4 of black-market activities while on this trip to Thailand, because the musicians were paid in local currency rather than in American dollars.

Mr. ROONEY. What else, if anything, did he point out?

Mr. FLINN. He pointed out also that No. 18, No. 32, and No. 11, although not members of the orchestra, were planning to be included in the 1956 tour. He described these individuals as violent Communists, and stated that the musicians union had identified them as such. He could not furnish first-hand information in so describing these individuals.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a source interviewed who requested that his name be kept confidential?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was he interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Was he in a position, or did he say he was in a position to furnish information concerning the activities of the Symphony of the Air?

Mr. FLINN. He said he was in a position.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He described the background of the orchestra; in fact, he was formerly associated with the National Broadcasting Co.—formerly known as the National Broadcasting Co. orchestra, and conducted by Arturo Toscanini.

Mr. ROONEY. How long had he been with that orchestra; did he say?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had been with the orchestra for a good many years, and that he made this tour of the Far East under the auspices of the State Department, from April to July in 1955. He added that he knew no basis for the assertion that the orchestra was out to spread Red propaganda on the tour. He advised that he and No. 1 would not have permitted such use of the orchestra.

Do you want me to go into this internal struggle within the orchestra?

Mr. ROONEY. I think the safest and fairest thing is to have the whole thing right on the record. Does anybody disagree?

Mr. PRESTON. If we are going into it we had better do it thoroughly.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he name certain people, that is, this informant?

Mr. FLINN. Yes; he named certain people in the orchestra, and he described a rift that had existed internally in the orchestra for some time in the past; an internal rift.

Mr. ROONEY. What, if anything, did he say about No. 6?

Mr. FLINN. He stated that, in his opinion, No. 6 talked too much, and added that No. 6 had been warned in the past to wait until he had the facts to support him before making a statement. He continued—that is, No. 6—to accuse some members of the orchestra of being Communists, and thereupon became the subject of controversy within the orchestra itself.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say anything with reference to a scheduled tour of the orchestra?

Mr. FLINN. He added that the orchestra was scheduled for a tour—there was consideration in the State Department of a tour of Europe and the Near East during 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. In February 1956—did he say?

Mr. FLINN. In February 1956.

Mr. MCILVAINE. Mr. Chairman, that looks like what I stated was not accurate.

Mr. ROONEY. No; I am not trying to show that you were inaccurate; I am merely trying to show what this informant said at this point. What, if anything, was said to him——

Mr. FLINN. About tours?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. He said the schedule had been deferred until October of 1956. And that it might be further postponed.

Mr. ROONEY. Did the FBI interview a party whom we shall call No. 36?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What did No. 36 say?

Mr. FLINN. He described his position in the orchestra during the tour made of the Far East.

Mr. ROONEY. When was he interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. He was interviewed in January 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say he had no special information?

Mr. FLINN. He said that he had on special information regarding the spread of Red propaganda, but he felt and had heard that several members of the orchestra were Communists, and he had been told by one member of the orchestra that No. 7, No. 31——

Mr. ROONEY. No. 31.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; No. 21 and No. 24 were card-carrying members of the Communist Party; and that No. 37, not a member of the orchestra, but who is himself an orchestra conductor might be communistically inclined. He continued that although he had no factual data, he felt that a certain local union is controlled by the Communist faction. He stated the feeling that because of his own rightist tendencies that he had been held back in his career in the music profession; he felt—he believed that people who contract for orchestras might be communistically inclined. That is all under that one.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a further source interviewed?

Mr. FLINN. Yes; there was one interviewed with the request that his name be kept confidential.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the date of his interview?

Mr. FLINN. January 1956.

Mr. ROONEY. Did he say he toured the Far East with the Symphony of the Air last year?

Mr. FLINN. That does not show in my report—may I look at that list? Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. And what else, if anything, did he say with regard to that trip?

Mr. FLINN. He described the background of the orchestra. He said that the orchestra was attempting to obtain grants from the United States Government and Ford Foundation. He advised that during the fall of 1955 that the left-wing faction of the orchestra gained control of the organization; and at that time the anti-Communist faction had for all practical purposes been ostracized. He claimed that the anti-Communist group in the orchestra consisted of 10 to 15 musicians; that he received very few engagements——

Mr. ROONEY. Did he name anybody?

Mr. FLINN. He named the following persons as Communists, although he was unable to offer proof other than stating that he and the other members of the orchestra were loyal Americans and have the feeling that these are Communists: No. 13, No. 16, No. 21, No. 24.

Mr. ROONEY. No 8?

Mr FLINN. 7, 29, 31, and 8.

Mr. ROONEY. Well we had better call him No. 38.

What if anything did he say about the trip to the Far East?

Mr. FLINN. He said that during the trip that the left-wing group constantly praised the Soviet Union as to cultural and economic achievements. While in Seoul, Korea, this group was unanimous in describing the devastation as having been caused by American imperialists; and also they referred to Americans as butchers when they viewed the ruins of Hiroshima.

Mr. ROONEY. When you say "they," do you mean those whom he referred to as the left-wing group?

Mr. FLINN. As the left-wing group; yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Very good; and he added what, if anything?

Mr. FLINN. He added that No. 7 became irritated in Japan when members of the orchestra were informed that within 27 minutes the United States could bomb the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did he say they then were?

Mr. FLINN. At Sandai, Japan. He described No. 7 as a vicious Communist who loathed anything American. He added that he had heard from unrecalled sources that No. 7 was able to arrange his last tour of the Far East through contact in the State Department. He was unable, however, to be specific when he classified a person as a Communist, and defined "leftist" as a "cover for one who is a pro-Communist." In closing this person stated that he hated to see the United States foot the bill for a bunch of pinks.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the background of No. 7? Incidentally before you give me that, he was the manager of this tour; was he not?

Mr. FLINN. I can't answer that.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that right; was No. 7 the manager of the tour?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Who was that?

Mr. ROONEY. Suppose you take a look at the list.

Mr. BATSON. According to that list at the time the trip was made—we did not know who was; it may be that he was designated as that; he did not have that title when he worked with the organization.

Mr. ROONEY. You did not check him at all?

Mr. BATSON. No, we did not. He did not have that title at the time. We would have checked him; yes, if he had we did not know until after they started on the trip.

Mr. ROONEY. According to this list, he is designated as the tour manager?

Mr. BATSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the report say?

Mr. FLINN. No. 7, according to the information which became available from various sources, was registered with the American Labor Party, 1937 and 1938; 1940–44; and 1946, 1948–52.

In addition there is reference to the fact that he was a sponsor of the Artists Front To Win the War, cited by the House committee as a Communist organization, which grew out of a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall in 1942.

Mr. ROONEY. No. 7.

Mr. FLINN. No. 7 was listed as the sponsor of this meeting. Considerable information was obtained relating to his wife. Do you want me to give that?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. There is information to the effect that she was a signer of the 1943 Communist Party nomination petition and information of unknown reliability alleges that she contributed to the Jefferson School of Social Science in 1944. As you know, this school has been cited by the Attorney General. She was associated with the National Council of Artists, Scientists, and Professors, which was cited as a Communist-front organization by the HCUA, and has been in

contact with several persons identified as members of the Communist Party. She also registered a preference for the American Labor Party in the years 1937, 1946, 1950, and 1951.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there something in there about his wife being questioned by the FBI, or about the signing of a Communist nominating petition?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, she was; sources of known reliability; in 1943 she signed a Communist Party nominating petition. I read that at the end.

Mr. ROONEY. Was there a request of her at one time for an interview by the FBI?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What happened to that?

Mr. FLINN. But that was not in connection with this inquiry?

Mr. ROONEY. That was at some other time?

Mr. FLINN. At some other time and on circumstances unknown to me.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well. Now with regard to No. 8, what has been reported with regard to his background?

Mr. FLINN. Information has been reported to the effect, by an informant of known reliability in 1943, that he was a member of the Communist Party. A similar source in 1944 said that he——

Mr. ROONEY. Reliable source?

Mr. FLINN. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead.

Mr. FLINN. Said that he held a Communist Political Association membership book, number (number deleted).

Mr. ROONEY. On what date?

Mr. FLINN. On September 30, 1944. Another informant of known reliability said that he was a Communist in 1946; and an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past advised that No. 8 was a member of the International Workers Order, Lodge No. 607, in 1952, and had been a member for the past 5 years.

Mr. ROONEY. What about that next statement?

Mr. FLINN. I think that ought to be left out; that is a matter that is under continuous investigation. It was reported that he was observed in 1952, on certain premises, alleged as a secret training school of Communist Party members.

Mr. ROONEY. All right; you spoke of an informant; you are speaking of the FBI informant are you?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Now with regard to No. 13, do you have his background?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is it?

Mr. FLINN. There is information from a source that has furnished reliable information in the past that No. 13 was transferred from the New York City Communist Party to the Communist Party of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1942.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the result of your investigation show with regard to an automobile?

Mr. FLINN. With reference to what number?

Mr. ROONEY. With reference to No. 13.

Mr. FLINN. It shows that he sold an automobile in 1942 to Earl Browder.

Mr. ROONEY. Now what further, if anything, was disclosed with regard to No. 13?

Mr. FLINN. It is further alleged by—reliably—that he was also registered in the "workers school" in 1943. That school is now the Jefferson School of Social Science and has been cited by the Attorney General.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did the information with regard to No. 13 having been registered for the fall term of the workers school in 1943 come from?

Mr. FLINN. It was from reliable sources—I am sorry, I would like to correct that. It is from a source considered reliable in the past.

Mr. ROONEY. What was disclosed as to his background?

Mr. FLINN. From a source of unknown reliability it was learned that this individual had been a soloist for the record Rondo, issued by the Young Peoples Records. This organization, Young Peoples Records, was cited as a Communist front, which has been advertised by Communist bookstores, and had been cited in the 1948 report from the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. ROONEY. What further were you advised?

Mr. FLINN. In 1945, a source which furnished reliable information in the past indicated that No. 13 was in contact——

Mr. ROONEY. With whom?

Mr. FLINN. With No. 39, and discussed No. 40, a Soviet espionage agent, with No. 39. This source added that No. 13 was a good friend of No. 39; was acquainted with No. 40. No. 40 and No. 39 were associated in the Keystone Recording——

Mr. ROONEY. The Keynote.

Mr. FLINN. The Keynote Recording, Inc., which organization was cited by HCUA as a Communist Party front. That is the sum total on that number.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have the background of a person who is shown on this list as No. 14?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. Investigation reflected No. 14 indicated as party preference the American Labor Party for the years 1941, 1948, 1949, and that his wife had shown the same preference in 1949. No. 14's brother was reportedly employed by the Artkino Pictures, Inc., New York City, in 1945, and in charge of preparation for the American release of pictures imported from the Soviet Union. This brother was reported in 1951 to have been employed by a motion-picture servicing firm, outside of Artkino Pictures, but continued to use facilities of this organization. Artkino——

Mr. ROONEY. No. 14 registered in 1952 as agent of a foreign principal in Moscow?

Mr. FLINN. No, sir; but Artkino Pictures, Inc.

Mr. ROONEY. The firm was registered as a foreign agent?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir; had registered with the Department of Justice in 1952 as agent of a foreign principal, an organization in Moscow, Russia.

Mr. ROONEY. Known as Soyusintorgkino?

Mr. FLINN. The registration statement sets forth that the purpose of this organization, Artkino Pictures, was to import motion-picture films from the Soviet Union, and was the sole distributor of such films in the Western Hemisphere. This organization also exported American films to the U. S. S. R. and distributed Soviet film matters to the United States Government agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. Had No. 14 previously been investigated?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. In 1952 in connection with application for employment with the Government which was subsequently turned down?

Mr. FLINN. I do not know whether it was turned down.

Mr. ROONEY. I believe that was in August of 1952.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; he was investigated but he did not meet the employment standards of the Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 21 go on the trip to the Orient last summer?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. In 1940, 1941, and 1942, and 1945, this individual and his wife signed nominating petitions for Communist Party candidates for the New York State election. A list of the members of the 11th Assembly District Club of the Communist Party, Manhattan, submitted by a confidential informant in the early part of 1944, contained the names of No. 21 and his wife.

Mr. ROONEY. They were listed——

Mr. FLINN. They were registered for the American Labor Party from 1944 through 1951; and his wife for the same party in 1952, while No. 21 registered for one of the major political parties.

Mr. ROONEY. Was No. 21 previously investigated before that year, and if so in what years?

Mr. FLINN. He was previously investigated in 1945 and 1953. One other matter shows that No. 21 and his wife reportedly also entered the International Workers Order in 1943.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 31 go on this trip to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. The only information of a derogatory nature on this individual is from an informant who has furnished reliable information in the past, which advises that No. 31 was a member of the International Workers Order in December 1947. This organization has been designated by the Attorney General, as you know.

Mr. ROONEY. Did No. 4 go on this tour to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. During 1955 information was received concerning proposed tour of——

Mr. ROONEY. Of a certain well-known performer?

Mr. FLINN. Of a certain well-known performer, to the Near and Far East during the spring of that year. The concert agent for this individual was apparently No. 4, Mr. Louis S. Budenz, former party functionary reportedly described as——

Mr. ROONEY. Reportedly described this well-known entertainer?

Mr. FLINN. Described this well-known entertainer as a Communist entertainer, by reputation, as well as a former member of the Communist Party. House Committee on Un-American Activities records also reflect No. 4 sent greetings to the U. S. S. R. on the 10th anniversary of the Russian revolution, according to the Daily Worker of November 27, 1927.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the record indicate with regard to No. 5?

Mr. FLINN. He did not go on this tour.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, but we should have his background in view of the fact that he has been the conductor of this orchestra at various times.

Mr. FLINN. It is very lengthy.

Mr. ROONEY. Very well, please proceed.

Mr. FLINN. There is considerable information available on No. 5. He has been described by the former research director for the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a "confirmed fellow traveler, whose sympathies are definitely pro-Soviet." It is further stated that some of the organizations which No. 5 has sponsored and lent his name to are considered definitely dangerous because of their close control by the Communist element.

In 1948 two individuals associated with the World Telegram described No. 5 as a habitual joiner of fellow traveler Communist-front organizations, most of which they considered fairly dangerous organizations and very closely connected with the Communist Party. These individuals did not know No. 5 as an actual member of the party but stated his political leanings are "away over for the Soviet Government." An informant of known reliability stated that in 1945 when the Committee To Aid Ben Davis was being considered, both Ben Davis and Jack Stachel described No. 5 as an adherent to the Communist Party.

Alexander Trachtenberg and V. J. Jerome reportedly also described No. 5 as a Communist. According to Stachel, No. 5 allegedly agreed to submit to Communist discipline.

Davis, Trachtenberg, and Stachel were high officials of the Communist Party and were tried and convicted under the Smith Act.

It will be noted that the informant in this regard stated he had no direct personal knowledge of the facts set forth immediately above.

In 1948 a confidential source of known reliability advised that No. 5 was one of the individuals listed to be developed as a contact by a foreign government.

Mr. ROONEY. Of the Soviet bloc?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Instead of government, let's make it the consulate general of a Soviet satellite country.

Mr. FLINN. Another confidential source of known reliability advised that in 1948 in a certain labor union No. 5 was regarded as one of a group who were leftwing in their thinking and possibly sympathetic to the Communist line. Various records reflect that No. 5 was an official of the following organizations in the late 1940's, as indicated—and may I supply the list?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. FLINN. I will supply also those he sponsored, and the petitions, letters, and statements which he signed, and the organizations for which he was the speaker. The above record is not all inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. You will please furnish the report with regard to his affiliations.

Mr. FLINN. Yes; I will file this statement; there are 2 pages of it.

(The material above referred to follows:)

"Various records reflect that No. 5 was an official of the following organizations in the late 1940's, as indicated:

"Vice Chairman, the American-Soviet Music Society (an affiliate of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship).[1]

"Member, board of directors, Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.[2]

"Council member of Council on African Affairs.[1]

"Member, board of sponsors, People's Songs, Inc.[2]

"Member, board of directors, American Council for a Democratic Greece.[1]

"Member, executive board, New York committee, Southern Conference for Human Welfare.[2]

"Board of directors, New York State chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America.[2]

"These records reflect that No. 5 was a sponsor of the following:

"National sponsor, Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee for the years 1946, 1948, 1949, and 1951.[1]

"National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions,[2] Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, New York City, March 25–27, 1949.

"Young Progressive Citizens of America (youth lobby to Washington), June 15–16, 1947.

"Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy,[1] 1946 through 1948.

"Civil Rights Congress,[1] national conference, Chicago, November 21–23, 1947.

"Sponsor of and received award at Salute to Young America dinner on first anniversary of American Youth for Democracy, October 10, 1944.

"Hans Eisler concert, February 28, 1948.

"World Youth Conference,[2] July 1947.

"The records further reflect the following petitions, letters, and statements which had been signed by No. 5:

"Open letter to Congress by the Civil Rights Congress[1] for defeat of the Mundt bill, 1948.

"Letter from Civil Rights Congress[1] scoring Subversive Control Act of 1948.

"Statement attacking American policy in Germany, January 1948.

"Petition to Attorney General Clark in behalf of Hans Eisler, December 1947.

"Protest against deportation of Hans Eisler, December 1947.

"Statement by American Committee for Spanish Freedom,[1] artists' and scientists' division, asking for severance of diplomatic relations with Franco Spain, February 1945.

"In addition, No. 5 was engaged as a speaker for the following organizations:

"Committee for the First Amendment,[2] on a radio broadcast attacking the Committee on Un-American Activities, November 1947.

"Committee for the First Amendment[2] on the Hollywood Fights Back broadcast, November 2, 1947.

"American Youth for Democracy,[1] July 1947."

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to No. 7, did he go on this trip to the Orient?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is his background?

Mr. FLINN. The background of No. 7 reflects that he——

Mr. ROONEY. I believe we already have that. What is the background of No. 24?

Mr. FLINN. As you are aware, No. 24 did not go on the tour.

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FLINN. We do, however, possess the following information concerning him. A source, whose identity is unknown, advised in 1944 that a mass meeting was held in Jamaica, Long Island, to celebrate the Queens County Communist Party recruiting drive. Earl Browder was the principal speaker and it states that among the ace recruiters were included a party bearing the same name as the last named individual—No. 24. They may be identical; there is no proof that they are identical.

In 1944, a source which has furnished reliable information in the past, advised that No. 24 formerly——

Mr. ROONEY. No. 24 and his wife?

Mr. FLINN. And his wife, yes, formerly belonged to the North Jamaica Communist Political Association group, but were to form with others the nucleus of a new unit. This individual may be identical with No. 24.

Another source furnishing reliable information in the past advised that No. 24 and his wife attended Queens County Communist Political Association council meeting held at county committee headquarters to represent another unit of the Communist Political Association. There again in this instance is no proof they are the same individuals. Identical in name only.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard No. 32, who did not go on this trip but who was previously mentioned as being one of this group, or of this orchestra, do you have the background with regard to him?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. What is it?

Mr. FLINN. In 1950, information of known reliability advised that No. 32 was known to him as a member of the Communist Party and had revealed that the Communist Party was demanding that he hire other members of the party to play in the orchestra with which he was then associated even if they were not found to be capable musicians.

In 1953, another informer of known reliability advised that to the best of his knowledge No. 32 continued to be associated with the Communist Party.

An informant of known reliability also indicated that No. 32 had actively supported the Jerome defense committee, a committee organized for the defense of Victor J. Jerome a member of the Communist Party, who at that time was among the defendants being tried for violation of the Smith Act.

No. 32 registered in 1948 and 1950 as having preference for the American Labor Party.

In 1949 he did not indicate his party affiliation. His wife registered for the same party during the years 1948, 1949, and 1950.

When questioned by the investigator in 1953, when queried as to whether he is now or has been a member of the Communist Party, he said he objected to the idea of people being asked concerning their personal feelings and convictions, and he added that he thinks the Communist Party should be allowed to function even though it is a radical, leftist, Marxist Party; that he did not believe that the Communist Party, as it is conducted throughout the United States, was dangerous to the internal security of the United States; believed also that the Communist Party in the United States adhered strictly to the policy of the Soviet Government, but was not directly controlled by the Comintern. He expressed the view that a member is not a potential spy, and added that the Communist Party members should be permitted to hold office with the United States Government.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to Nos. 16, 18, 24, and 25, did a certain source of reliable information in the past, in 1951 furnish a certain list, and was there included in this list the names of Nos. 16, 18, 24, and 25, whom the informant believed to be Communists or Communist sympathizers?

Mr. FLINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Since January has there been an investigation as to all of those who went on the trip to the Orient last summer?

Mr. FLINN. There was a name check incident to the FBI inquiry of all members of the orchestra. As a part of their investigation——

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, are we assured that of the entire group that went to the Orient we now have all those with a questionable background?

Mr. FLINN. I must assume that.

Mr. ROONEY. For the reason that the available files do not disclose anything to the contrary?

Mr. FLINN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Any questions, Mr. Preston?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I think you have covered the subject very thoroughly, and I have no questions at this point.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Sikes.

Mr. SIKES. I would like to have Mr. McIlvaine state if he knows of any attempt that has been made, of any concerted effort by the Communist-front organizations to have their personnel participate in these programs which you have discussed today.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I do not know of any effort other than what has been revealed at this session.

Mr. SIKES. Have you made any effort to determine whether such effort is taking place?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No. As I previously testified, we have now taken up the matter of the name check procedure.

Mr. SIKES. When did you begin that proceeding?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Several weeks ago.

Mr. SIKES. Do you know anything specific that you could give us today? This is a very important question.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I have this, concerning the matters that have come to us in these reports.

Mr. SIKES. Are you speaking of the good reports that have reached you about the work of this particular orchestra?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIKES. Do you not feel that the good impressions that may have been left in some quarters could have been more than offset by the subversive activities of some of the members of this particular orchestra?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We have had no reports of any subversive activities other than the al-

[1] Organizations which have been designated by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 10450.

[2] Cited as Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

legations that have been brought forward today. We have had a great many reports to the effect that the impact over there was most successful.

Mr. SIKES. I assume that you are concerned about the allegations that have been made?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes; very much.

Mr. SIKES. About certain ones in this group.

Mr. MCILVAINE. Yes; very much.

Mr. SIKES. And if those allegations are correct then there would be good reason to believe that the work done by the members of this group against the interests of the United States and the democracies, done in behalf of the Communist Party, could have more than offset the good that would have resulted from the results as far as music lovers are concerned?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I do not want you to think that I believe that we should have any Communists in this program. However, the evidence that we had from the report on the trip was all favorable as far as the impact of the orchestra, as an orchestra, and we have not received any report about any deleterious activity of any individual member.

Mr. SIKES. That is perhaps true, although Mr. McIlvaine, you have not made any thorough or persistent check to determine what activities might have been engaged in by individual members of the orchestra while on the tour?

Mr. MCILVAINE. No, but I received the reports from abroad, and know that they were reported on.

Mr. SIKES. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. McIlvaine, who made the arrangements for this tour?

Mr. MCILVAINE. The procedure in this——

Mr. ROONEY. No; I am speaking of this particular case. Who made the arrangements to send this organization to the Orient?

Mr. MCILVAINE. You mean the actual booking?

Mr. ROONEY. Who in behalf of the Government had to do with the sending of this aggregation to the Orient that cost $267,000; who approved it?

Mr. MCILVAINE. The Interagency Committee, of which I am chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else are members of that committee?

Mr. MCILVAINE. There is on this a representative of the Information Agency.

Mr. ROONEY. Who is that?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Mr. Seebach.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. Who else?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I would like to furnish the names of the Department of Labor and the Department of Defense members of this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, the Department of Defense is on this, too?

Mr. MCILVAINE. They are in it as observer.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else is in it?

Mr. MCILVAINE. USIA and State are the only voting members.

Mr. ROONEY. Who finally approved this program, and how was it done?

Mr. MCILVAINE. After we had received the estimate of the costs, and the gate receipts and evaluated the loss we looked over the booking arrangements in the light of recommendations from our Embassies. The funds requested were then approved by this committee.

Mr. ROONEY. When you say "we"——

Mr. MCILVAINE. The committee.

Mr. ROONEY. You mean the committee?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I mean the committee; yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Who are the other members of that committee that joined in approving this quarter-of-a-million-dollar trip?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Frankly I shall have to furnish them to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Can you not remember them at the moment?

Mr. MCILVAINE. Not offhand. Do you have it, Mr. Batson?

Mr. BATSON. I do not have the members at that time.

Mr. MCILVAINE. I do not have it before me. Mr. Chairman, I should point out that as far as the deliberations of this committee are concerned, it does not get into the security aspect. Until we get a report back on the principles of the attraction we do not give final approval. Frequently, it is decided not to go further——

Mr. ROONEY. But in this case you did not have any check, you had no report, but decided to send this aggregation to the Orient at a cost of a quarter million dollars?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We had a name check——

Mr. ROONEY. Now who made the decision is the question I am asking.

Mr. MCILVAINE. In addition to myself, Jules Seebach; Ralph Busick, OCB staff; he is secretary of the committee, takes the notes or minutes of the meetings.

Mr. ROONEY. Is there a coordinating board?

Mr. MCILVAINE. The Operations Coordinating Board. To continue—Mr. J. L. Winfield, of the International Cooperation Administration, Lieutenant Colonel Coray, from Defense, and Mr. James Taylor from the Department of Labor.

Mr. ROONEY. Who furnished the estimate to which you referred a moment ago?

Mr. MCILVAINE. As to the costs?

Mr. ROONEY. As to the details.

Mr. MCILVAINE. The management of the orchestra furnished it to the American National Theater and Academy, our agent. That information is checked with travel agencies to make sure we are getting the best kind of travel arrangements.

Mr. ROONEY. Who in the orchestra furnished that?

Mr. MCIVAINE. I cannot be quite sure, but I think, I believe No. 1, of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. How about that, Mr. Flinn?

Mr. FLINN. We have referred to him as No. 1.

Mr. MCILVAINE. We have identified him as the president of the orchestra.

Mr. ROONEY. How about No. 7?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I have never heard of No. 7 before this came up. I do not know anything about him.

Mr. ROONEY. You say he was not down here in Washington on this?

Mr. MCILVAINE. I know he never saw me, and Mr. Batson knows he never saw him.

Mr. ROONEY. Who else would you say, besides the party you mentioned awhile ago?

Mr. MCILVAINE. We have not seen anybody, Mr. Chairman. All of these arrangements are done in New York, through the manager, with the American National Theater and Academy in this case; No. 1 I would suppose was in New York, and the individuals in the orchestra have never come to the Department, and so far as I know they did not even go to the ANTA office.

Mr. ROONEY. That is all, gentlemen, and I thank you very much for your cooperation.

You may inquire what has been done about this. At the meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations on Friday of last week, the committee unanimously directed me to turn over to the Attorney General of the United States and the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities the testimony which I have just inserted in the RECORD.

I expect that these agencies will take some action, because I am naive encugh to expect that if President Eisenhower is going to spend $267,000 of the taxpayers' money and needs 100 musicians to play a symphony, he can get a 100-percent American complement for any symphony orchestra.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. COUDERT. I should like to make it perfectly clear for the RECORD by a question what the facts are. These musicians of whom the gentleman makes so much were not high-ranking, responsible officials in the Department of State or the Department of the Treasury, were they?

Mr. ROONEY. They were musicians. The gentleman very well knows that. They were musicians who were sent abroad at the taxpayers' expense, musicians who were given a passport by the Passport Division of the Department of State without a word of protest. I was under the impression that anyone with a record and background such as these 10 people would be unable to get a passport from the Passport Division.

Mr. COUDERT. But the gentleman does not suggest that they were policymaking officials such as was the case during the period of the prior administration.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know how high they were in policymaking positions. Maybe they had something to do with the selection of the symphony they were going to play on a particular day; I do not know. All I know is that we are informed they sent 10 people who are either presently or formerly members of the Communist Party, at Government expense, on a propaganda tour to the Orient.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been interested in the gentleman's statement. It indicates to me that the Department of State has an ample supply of fiddlers.

Mr. ROONEY. I guess they have have some pretty good fiddlers and some pretty good oboe players, too. If we are going to send 90 decent American musicians, I do not want those 90 decent people, to use the vernacular, loused up with the kind of people whom it is reported they sent on this tour as a symphony orchestra.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for having put the material he has referred to in the hearings concerning this Symphony of the Air. I think he did a good job in bringing out the facts concerning that. But in view of the fact that the Department of State failed in its responsibility to screen these people, it is a little difficult for me to understand why he now turns around and recommends giving them $24 million more to spend.

Mr. ROONEY. The Congress appropriated the money which was used to send these 10 Commies to the Orient, directly to President Eisenhower. The money requested before us today is to be appropriated to the Department of State.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of State certainly had some responsibility in this matter, did it not?

Mr. ROONEY. It should have.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, recently the newspapers were quite full of the fact that President Eisenhower had sent up a special request for legislation on civil rights, to strengthen the civil rights law. It is my understanding that the Attorney General, whose office is part of the Department of Justice, for which we are now about to appropriate, has always had authority to set up a Civil Rights Division and, in fact, has always had such a division.

Mr. ROONEY. There has been a Civil Rights Division down there for years. It was part of the Criminal Division, as I recall.

Mr. MULTER. And we do not need any special legislation for that?

Mr. ROONEY. Of course not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understand there has been a section down there devoted to civil rights, but that this request provides for an Assistant Attorney General who shall devote his full time to civil rights matters. The proposal results from numerous requests to that effect from people in both political parties.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman that he well knows my stand on civil rights. There has been no action taken by this subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations which would interfere in the slightest with any plans moneywise or otherwise of the Attorney General in seeking to enforce civil rights.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that. I know that he joins with me in expressing enthusiasm over the action of the House Committee on the Judiciary today in reporting out the administration civil-rights bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman for a justification for the language contained on page 22, lines 7 to 10:

> That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS–16.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me this language was subject to a point of order, but you secured from the Committee on Rules a rule waiving points of order on that question. I have read the report of the gentleman's committee and I cannot find any justification for this language.

Mr. ROONEY. The exact language contained in lines 7 to 10 on page 22 was furnished the committee by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization with the request that it be inserted in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. This language provides that the district director shall have the grade of GS–16. There are four regional commissioners. Is it not a fact that the district director is under one of the regional commissioners?

Mr. ROONEY. The district director who is intended to be given an increase in one grade which would amount to only about $1,000 is Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, the district director in New York. I think that more than 50 percent of the Members on this floor on both sides of the aisle know Mr. Shaughnessy. They know him and his long and faithful service.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. My question is, he is under a regional commissioner, the regional commissioner's pay is only GS–16, yet you are placing an inferior at the same salary and the same grade as his superior.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman well knows that the position of district director in New York is the most strenuous position in the entire Immigration Service and that his position and responsibility in New York far exceeds that of, I would even venture to say, some of the assistant commissioners.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Shaughnessy is a former assistant commissioner of immigration?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is one of the finest public officials one could ever meet. As the gentleman says, 50 percent of the Members know him. I daresay more than 50 percent of the Members in both parties know him and deeply respect him.

Mr. ROONEY. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, may I say that everyone here knows that he is going to get this raise. So let us be practical about these things once in a while. The total amount involved in the amendment insofar as Mr. Shaughnessy is concerned is only about $1,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have no question about the honesty, integrity, and efficiency of Mr. Shaughnessy. What I am objecting to is the usurpation of the rights and privileges of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service being taken over by the gentleman's committee. The gentleman will admit that he is infringing upon the rights and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. ROONEY. I telephoned the gentleman, did I not, and I telephoned the ranking minority member and said, "Look, I have been asked by the Commissioner of Immigration to do thus and so. It amounts to only so much." I tried to be fair about it. I never expected we would have such a hassle as this over it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman did call me, and I want to cooperate with him.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman could cooperate fully if he would not make any remarks here on the floor with regard to this matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. However, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I must protect the rights and authority of my own committee. As the gentleman knows, this is clearly an infringement and usurpation of the rights of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. ROONEY. I think it is an infringement, yes. I could not say that it was not. However, it is so slight it is hardly worth while talking about.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I will yield to the gentleman but I am now going to conclude in 2 more minutes. I have made certain allotments of time and I find that I am using up most of the hour myself. I am going to be in trouble, as I was a year ago, with some of my good friends. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration are now authorized to purchase uniforms for certain foreign nationals overseas?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, they are.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is that same authority applicable to the United States Information Agency?

Mr. ROONEY. No; it is not. The committee feels that the Information Agency people ought to slip around quietly and do a good job—they do not need any uniforms.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the case of drivers of trucks and library employees and so on, I should think that a uniform might play a very important part for the personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. We provided previously that they could wear a cap. We think that is sufficient.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would the gentleman object to an amendment authorizing the payment for uniforms for certain foreign nationals overseas?

Mr. ROONEY. We certainly would—I assure the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I would like, if I could, to get a brief answer to this question. I notice on page 10 of the report the request for a close custody reformatory at a cost of $7,500,000 and a maximum custody institution at a cost of $9,500,000 is being denied. I ask this question for this reason: A number of bills are being offered to authorize those types of prisons on the ground that there has been overcrowding in our present prison facilities. I am curious to know why the request was not granted.

Mr. ROONEY. The committee did not feel that way at all. If the present number of available maximum security places were to be used, we would not need these new prisons.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am interested to see on page 3 of the bill where you provide for ice and drinking water for use abroad. How are you doing these days with the booze bill?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, they have to have some booze, you know.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes or such part thereof as I may require.

Let me say at the outset that I fully reciprocate as do my colleagues on the minority side the kind and flattering words of my good friend and neighbor from New York, the chairman of this subcommittee. Our hearings and our meetings have been singularly amicable. We have come to complete agreement. We have presented a bill which presents a concensus of opinion. The chairman himself has displayed his usual ability, energy, and consideration for the other members. All of the members have worked diligently and faithfully at this operation. And with all their diligence and all their ability, they still could not have done the job without the able, genial, and considerate gentleman who is the committee clerk, Jay B. Howe. It has been my privilege to serve as a member of a number of these subcommittees, and I have learned to have the highest respect for the staff of this committee. It is very fortunate in its staff, and it is particularly fortunate in the member of its staff who is the executive secretary of this subcommittee. I want to congratulate the subcommittee and the full committee for having the services of Mr. Howe, and I want to thank him for all that he has done to help me in my part of the work, and I am sure all the members feel alike.

Mr. Chairman, so far as the bill itself is concerned, and the appropriations for the various agencies covered, the chairman of the subcommittee has left very little for me to say, because he has said it all. If he has left anything unsaid it is in the subcommittee report. We batted around the various items. There were differences of opinion as there always are when a group of men gather around the table to discuss the various items in an appropriation bill. But we finally achieved a consensus which represents the best judgment of the group as to what funds will be required to adequately operate these many agencies during the fiscal year beginning on July 1. For my part I think it is a good bill. We have provided not all that was asked for but a very substantial part of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that we all think it is a good bill. It does not represent the exact thoughts of everybody. It is a compromise, but when we did arrive at the various amounts we did find ourselves finally in thorough agreement.

Mr. COUDERT. And we hope that the House will agree with us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much did the committee cut the appropriation to the United Nations, in view of the added nations that will have joined in the last year?

Mr. COUDERT. I think actually that appropriation was increased in technical respects. The exact figures are in the report. I think there was some increase in that item. However, that was routine. The committee had absolutely no discretion in the matter. It was following obligations otherwise established by agreement.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I was afraid of—the more nations we have in there the more we spend on it. I have thought that would be considered as routine.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to answer the gentleman from Iowa that when the 16 new member nations were added they were added at a time which would not cause their dues to be reflected in the instant budget, but there will come a time, I believe within the next year, when there will be a reimbursement made to the United States on their account.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa, who has been concerned about the rule on this bill and the subcommittee usurping the rights of the legislative committees, that the legislative committees of this House have set up the formula by which the appropriation is made, and if there is objection to the amount or to the membership, it should then go to the legislative committee for correction, and not expect the Appropriations Committee to flaunt the will of the legislative committee, which has already acted.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and I think he well knows that I have supported every amendment to cut that percentage of contribution to the United Nations.

Mr. BOW. I realize that, but the legislative committee set the amount.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe that is a valid argument for bringing this bill in under a rule waiving points of order.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I would be happy to know at what point the legislative committee of the State Department had any opportunity to consider this matter.

Mr. COUDERT. That is a question that I cannot answer. Perhaps it is addressed to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am sorry if I misunderstood the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BOW. The legislative committee has set the percentage of the amount which will be paid to these agencies. We have nothing to do but appropriate the amount which this Government has pledged.

Mr. COUDERT. The committee was impressed and satisfied to a very large degree, with the showing made by the witnesses representing the Department; the distinguished Secretary of State and the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, both of whom happen to be constituents of mine, and I am happy to say friends of mine, and the gentleman who is the head of the USIA, Mr. Streibert, who is also a neighbor and friend. The committee was also favorably impressed with departmental witnesses who came in support of the justifications. At the end of the trail we are satisfied that a very substantial part of the appropriations requested should be recommended to the House for action and have so recommended.

It is significant that only two criticisms my good friend from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, undertook is to make against the State Department—often a controversial subject—and he made no criticism at all of the operations of USIA. Of the two criticisms of the State Department one was technically irrelevant, to-wit, that an orchestra sent abroad under the cultural exchange operation was found to have some Communists or near-Communists among its membership. This is very unfortunate and nobody deplores it any more than I, except as far as I personally am concerned if they would take all the people who vote Communist in the 17th Congressional District of New York and send them abroad at election I would be very much gratified, because they vote for the Democratic candidates.

The fact is that the gentleman made something of a mountain out of a molehill in dealing with this matter. If one had not listened to him with the greatest care one would have thought that these oboe players and trombone players were the ones who set policy in high places of Government.

His second criticism related to an alleged overreduction in force and appropriations in the first year of this administration in the State Department. That is a very interesting point and one to which I shall address myself. In the first place, this was the first year of a new administration after 20 uninterrupted years of the prior administration. Can anyone doubt the right of that new administration to take a new look at all of the great agencies? In the course of such new look there were changes and some reduction of force here and there based upon merit or not filling vacancies.

The fact of the matter is, and the gentleman from New York who is chairman of the subcommittee did not point this out, in the first Eisenhower fiscal year the State Department personnel was reduced from 12,000 to 9,991. But the administration did not stop at that point; it continued the same reduction in fiscal 1955 and again in fiscal 1956. Now in fiscal 1957, with a somewhat new situation developing all over the world imposing greater burdens upon our State Department, our first line of defense, that Department comes up with a request approved by the budget for some 12,800 personnel which is still some 2,000 less than in 1950.

If ever a state department or a foreign office was the front line, the first line, of defense of a great nation, the State Department is that today. Despite criticism from some sources there is general agreement that as a net result of the Geneva Conference and of developments over the last few months, world

war, shooting world war, has been definitely made more remote, and the conflict with the Soviet bloc has taken a different shape, imposing a far greater burden upon our diplomatic and other nonmilitary representatives abroad and those responsible for their operations here at home.

I would like to close that subject by pointing out that the cut in 1953 was a part of that much needed new look at Government operations in general by a new administration. That, starting from a new and strong base, is essential for several reasons. There is now facing the free world powers a shift in the international situation which requiries that we, the free world, and particularly the United States, meet head-on a full-fledged Communist diplomatic offensive in all parts of the world. This offensive involves political, economic, labor, cultural, social, and many other approaches accompanied by a marked Soviet advance in military, economic, and technical fields. I think we of this subcommittee are all agreed, as we have been generally in the past, that it is of vital importance to have a strong State Department. I think we have done what is necessary to keep and improve a strong State Department.

I would like to say one more word about the USIA, always a controversial subject in some places. The recommendation is some $22 million greater than least year, something like a 25 percent increase. The same argument goes for that, that justifies the increase in the State Department appropriations. The need for an Information Service, the need of an adequate Propaganda Service abroad, was never greater than now. Of course, they make mistakes, of course, nobody is perfect, of course, nobody has all the answers. But I think we are all agreed that we have got to make an effort to sell American policy all over the world, including the free world itself. Failing to do so, failure to have an adequate Information Service, threatens to leave parts of the world wide open to Communist diplomatic, economic, and other nonmilitary attacks.

In that connection, Mr. Chairman, let me call the attention of the House to one of a series of articles by the British general, Glubb Pasha, who was thrown out of Jordan after many years in command of the Arab Legion. I shall only read the first paragraph:

> The principal weapon of the "cold war," in the Middle East, at least, is words. British is being driven from the Middle East by words—words to which, with British impassivity, she refuses to reply.

Words we must have, an Information Service we must have, and every effort is being made to improve it.

A gentleman by the name of Eugene Castle, a distinguished resident of my district, has written a book criticizing the operations of the Information Service. He has written articles, he has made speeches, criticizing that Service. While the committee cannot agree with his conclusions, I have no doubt that his criticisms have led to productive self-examination by the Agency. They have alerted this committee and other Government agencies to the possible defects in the operation of that agency and in the end have contributed to improvement in its operation.

Any kind of thoughtful criticism by well meaning persons is bound to have attention and bound to lead to some kind of self-examination.

Then there is one other small point I should like to make for the RECORD. Last year a request was originally made for funds for a book called "Profile of America." No funds were appropriated. Since that time the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, has been subject to violent pressure and some criticism on the ground that the book was banned. Let me make it clear at this point that the book, Profile of America, which a constituent and friend of mine edited, Miss Davis has never at any time been banned by this committee or any other committee. What happened was, in the committee hearings last year, there was some criticism of the use of the book as solely a propaganda instrument. Before the committee had occasion to take any action, the agency itself withdrew the request for funds.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like not only to point out to the distinguished gentleman that last year the director of the agency in writing withdraw the request that had been pending before the committee, but also that there is nothing in the instant budget in connection with the giveaway of that book as is shown at page 254 of the committee hearings, which I should like to insert, when I get permission, at this point in the RECORD.

The following is the testimony:

> Mr. ROONEY. Are there any funds in here for the book you requested in the presentation program last year?
>
> Mr. STREIBERT. No specific funds. There would be funds expended for replacements requested.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. In the libraries overseas?
>
> Mr. STREIBERT. In the libraries overseas.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. But not under the presentation program?
>
> Mr. STREIBERT. No.

There are to be no copies of that book to be given away under the presentation program.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the authoress of that book, who, I believe, is a constituent of the gentleman from New York, got out a press release last March 27 in which she spoke of my trying "to embarrass an agency" I "do not like." Why, I have been fighting for and on occasion defending the information program since its inception many years ago. She also said in her prepared press release that "Mr. ROONEY had the Senate amendment thrown out at conference." That would make me more important than I am. And, when she appeared before the committee this year, she said in her press release, "Mr. ROONEY again attacked the USIA." Well, all this is a tissue of lies, and I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD what Mr. Streibert, the director of the Agency, had to say at the conclusion of many days of hearings on the appropriation request for the USIA.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> Mr. ROONEY. The House has again made its historical investigation of your appropriations.
>
> Mr. STREIBERT. Mr. Chairman, may I say this on the record.
>
> This is the third time I have appeared before this subcommittee. The first time you, Mr. Chairman, I think, were the ranking minority member and twice you have been chairman, and I want to say that as a result of all this experience I think that the searching inquiry you conduct and the ability to get everything out on the record, to call to account those in the Agency that are administering these funds, is of great benefit to the Agency and is not only a salutary process but a necessary process in Government operation, and while at some points in the records in the past—and I hope not too often—there may have been some contention on my part, I want to apologize for any such contentious attitude now——
>
> Mr. ROONEY. That is utterly unnecessary, Mr. Streibert. If I were seated in your place on the other side of the table, I would probably be more contentious than you could ever be. We thoroughly understand your position on these things. We try to probe into them, understanding your zealousness and interest in the program. There is not a question of doubt that you are trying to do a good job. So your interest is easily understood.
>
> On this side of the table we try to look at it from the viewpoint of the taxpayer and try to ascertain whether or not he is getting his money's worth.
>
> Mr. STREIBERT. Quite properly. You have been very fair and if I may be permitted, if it is not presumptuous, I would say you have shown extraordinary ability in that respect.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say as far as I am concerned I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Secretary of State. I believe that he is doing a magnificent job under the most difficult conditions, I am very happy that this committee has decided to follow his recommendations with respect to strengthening and enlarging the Department which is his instrument of action. The Attorney General continues to maintain a great department, and I think is entitled to all the support we can give him. Mr. Streibert has an exceedingly difficult job. I think he is doing it well. I think it may be improved. I think the additional funds will result in better representation of the United States, its policies and its interests, abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have read the hearings rather carefully, but nowhere could I find where the committee gave any consideration as to the amount of current funds for UNESCO to be redeemed in American dollars. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. COUDERT. I do not think I know what the gentleman has reference to.

Mr. GROSS. Well, they are issuing what are called coupons redeemable in American dollars, carrying on transactions as between foreigners and purchasable goods in this country. The coupons are issued in denominations of 1, 3, 10, 30, and 100 dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. You mean like PX coupons?

Mr. GROSS. No. I mean that a Scotsman can buy a book in this country and give UNESCO coupons in payment for it, and it will be redeemed in American dollars.

Mr. COUDERT. I should be happy to yield to any other member of the committee who can answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the committee will give some consideration to this new form of world currency for this one-world organization.

Mr. COUDERT. If that is so, unless there is some other answer, the obvious answer is that that is part of the U. N. arrangement, to which we are parties by contract; and there is nothing that this committee could do about it, anyway.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. CANNON, such time as he may require.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in this connection I would like to endorse the low-priced books program of the United States Information Agency. This is one activity where the Information Agency will actually compete with the Soviets. What has been a complete vacuum in the availability of American books at prices people can afford overseas will be filled under the present program. The Agency requested funds for mass editions of some 500 separate titles, which will put into commercial circulation 22 million books, worldwide. Certainly with the threat that confronts us on all sides, this number would hardly begin to scratch the surface. I am assuming this is only a beginning and that an expanded program will be developed. I urge that we make certain that this beginning be pushed to the extent that capabilities will allow and that the Agency be encouraged to expand this low-priced books program to its full potentialities.

According to testimony by United States Information Agency officials before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, Soviet Russia alone turns out more than 50,000 titles a year and more than a billion books in all. This means that 200 million books are available from the Soviet Union alone for free or low-cost distribution worldwide. To meet this, we are asked to support a program, which will yield 22 million books. The figures speak for themselves. Even with this low-priced books program, the Soviet Union will still be distributing almost 10 times as many books as we do.

In my opinion, this threat must be met, and, further, we must reach the point quickly where the Soviet saturation of worldwide markets is neutralized and overcome by our program of making our best books available at 10 cents per copy to foreign readers.

It is interesting to note the warm endorsement of this activity by the Washington Post and Times Herald. I include excerpts from the editorial in this morning's edition:

STRENGTHENING USIA

The House of Representatives is scheduled to take up today the budget request for the United States Information Agency. The Appropriations Committee was neither ungenerous nor undiscriminating in its treatment of the Agency.

* * * * *

We hope that the House will give USIA enough money to insure an expansion of its tremendously valuable program of distributing inexpensive editions of significant books. The House needs to think of the whole USIA program as an important element in the contest going on today for men's minds.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman and members of the subcommittee and with particular reference to the hearings on the budget of the United States Information Agency for a job well done. I know the chairman and the committee members took into account the new and most serious international situation which has been created by the latest shift in tactics by the Kremlin in arriving at a budget figure of $110 million for the United States Information Agency. I speak about the intensified Communist campaign for peaceful coexistence and the startling success which has already attended their efforts to confuse, divide, and weaken the free world.

I believe it is worth noting in connection with the consideration of the budget of the United States Information Agency the performance by the two Kremlin top peddlers of veiled tyranny now visiting Great Britain. The tour of Great Britain by Khrushchev and Bulganin is a calculated part of the Kremlin propaganda offensive against the United States and all other free people. Only yesterday, thinking people were shocked to hear Communist Party boss Khrushchev openly threaten the good people of Great Britain with the prospect of the Russians soon having at their command an intercontinental guided missile bearing a hydrogen warhead. Khrushchev obviously believes that by this device he can frighten the British people and their leaders into a position of peaceful surrender. Undoubtedly he feels that since the British people underwent the horrors, the trials, and the heartbreaks of air bombings and attacks by the V–1 and V–2 rockets of the Hitler period that they would be willing to pay any price in order to escape even greater devastation caused by A-bombs or H-bombs. Khrushchev cleverly points out to the British people that they must either accept coexistence, the tyranny of communism, or plunge themselves into the horrors of atomic warfare. He excluded any possible third course of action. This is a brutal demonstration of the Russian tactic of diplomacy by ultimatum.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that Members of this House recall the Russian diplomacy by ultimatum which brought the enslavement of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. That same Russian diplomacy by ultimatum brought about the enslavement and communization of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, and the other nations of the Russian Communist empire. That is the final prospect behind Communist Party Boss Khrushchev's bold and defiant statement made in England.

Mr. Chairman, I joined with five of my colleagues in presenting a statement before the subcommittee of which the distinguished gentleman [Mr. ROONEY], is chairman, advocating support for the United States Information Agency in order that it could carry out the all important task of winning the struggle for the minds and hearts of men everywhere in the world. I feel the amount granted should permit the Information Agency the opportunity to expand its activities in the most critical areas so as to expose the latest Communist propaganda offensive for the cruel fake that it is. Moreover, I believe that the committee should be complimented for its action in granting elasticity for the Director of United States Information Agency in determining how cuts made in the budget request are to be applied to the program he has set forth for the next fiscal year, together with elasticity in the use of authorized funds to meet any contingency that may come up during the next year. I have one additional observation. The United States Information Agency requested $250,000 for representation purposes in the next fiscal year and the committee approved only $50,000, the same as that approved for the present fiscal year. In view of the fact that the committee approved an increase of $125,000 for representation funds for the Department of State, and I heartily approve and commend them for this action, I regret the committee did not increase the necessary representation funds for the United States Information Agency. I say this because of my own personal experiences of last fall while on an official inspection trip of southeast Asia and north Asia. I observed the work of the United States Information Agency in all these countries. To cite one example, upon questioning the public affairs officer in Bangkok I was advised that for a period of 1 year he had a total sum of $1,200 to cover all representation costs in Thailand, which you and I know is of the greatest strategic value and importance to the freedom of all of Asia. With this small fund he explained how he divided it among the four regional public affairs offices and among the principal officers in charge of the central operation including the office responsible for cooperation with the armed forces of Thailand. I also took the opportunity while in Thailand to visit the most distant outpost of the United States Information Agency located in the heart of the jungle. I made this trip in a United States Army plane; otherwise, it would have taken days of travel by jeep and riverboat. The regional public affairs officer was a young and vigorous American who had won the respect and admiration of all the people I talked to at the provincial headquarters office. He and

his family stood out as symbols of America to all the people in that region. Upon questioning him I learned that he had an annual allotment of $12.00 for representation. Yet the principal means by which he carried on his important mission was by contact with the provincial authorities, the local military authorities, and a teachers' training college. Anyone can see that he could not carry on the functions required of him on $1 a month for representation and that he had to use his own personal funds to get the job done. I could cite other examples of the need for an increased representation fund in order for the United States Information Agency officers to do their job properly.

In Japan I observed the work of one of the principal officers who was responsible for the development and distribution of publications in the Japanese language explaining the United States position on critical questions. He had other functions which were of great importance. Upon questioning, he told me that in his efforts to help the non-Marxist professors in the Japanese colleges and universities, his best approach was informal gatherings and sessions to which the Communists could not attach suspicion. He stated bluntly there were no funds available for him to arrange and carry out these informal gatherings and that consequently these expenses came out of his own pocket.

It is for these reasons that I had hoped that the United States Information Agency officials in the field would not be required to take up so much slack.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point up a situation which I am quite sure the committee has taken cognizance of in the deliberations which led to this appropriation bill. It is a situation which is important for all of us to think about as we consider this legislation, as I have the feeling that we are going to be concerned with this particular problem for some time.

I refer to page 103 of the printed hearings before the subcommittee, and particularly to the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Merchant, now Ambassador Designate to Canada. On page 103 in his testimony he discusses the living conditions in Moscow, and this is what he says:

> We have a very bad housing situation in Moscow, Mr. Chairman. This refers to a building known as America House, which is about 3 miles from the chancery. It houses male American clerks, 11 or 12 of them, and 21 marine guards.
>
> They are huddled into 18 single rooms for the combined total. They are away from the Embassy community, and they are living, really, under unbearable conditions.
>
> There is a security problem there and a morale problem. We don't think any amount of renovation can improve the basic deficiencies of America House.
>
> The Embassy now is trying to lease a six-story building adjoining the Chaikovsky Building where we have most of our other staff. This includes alterations and proper furnishing of the quarters in that new building to be leased.
>
> Then in addition there is a critical officer housing situation in Moscow. We have had to limit assignment to Moscow to officers who are either unmarried or had no more than two children due to the lack of proper available quarters.
>
> As you know, we are working on and I believe it important to develop an intensified language and area training course for officers specializing in the Soviet Union. That requires their being assigned to Moscow during part of their training.
>
> We don't want to be in a position where we have to limit the selection of such officers by reason of their having more than two children.
>
> There are going to be problems, I think, in building there. This is designed to provide the funds to correct what is really a very bad situation.

Mr. Merchant asked for $153,000 for improvements in the living conditions in Moscow of single male clerks. I understand that the appropriation is included in this legislation and will be allocated for that purpose when the legislation becomes law and the budget officer in the Department of State considers the allocation. Along with many of my colleagues, I had an opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and five of the satellite countries last fall. I had an opportunity, as did many of you, to study the living conditions of our people who represent us in this most hostile area.

Anyone who has studied the job being done by the Foreign Service personnel behind the Iron Curtain cannot help but come back with two conclusions—one is the outstanding job that is really being done. It is not at all uncommon for our people there to work 24 hours a day for days at a time. Second, they are working under extremely difficult conditions. For example, consider the living conditions in Moscow. I just touched on the American House in reporting the testimony of Mr. Merchant. We found also that at the Embassy itself there are a number of our people who live and work under the same roof. They must contend with the fact that Soviet listening devices are being used to record their every conversation. We found also that the condition of the building is such that they go without elevator service for weeks at a time. Sometimes in the coldest part of the winter, there is no such thing as hot water. We rent the Embassy at Moscow from the Russians for about $1 million a year. Nevertheless, we found that the Russians have not been very cooperative in making necessary improvements.

We also found at the time I was in Russia, last fall, that there were only two members of our Embassy staff who had licenses to drive automobiles which means that when most of our people want to go anywhere they must have a Russian driver. This further limits what they can see and do and what they can say. All in all, the people who represent us in Moscow are today living as virtual prisoners and operating under extremely difficult conditions.

The same is true in the satellite countries. We found there at one of the legations that Foreign Service officers after they have finished a 10- or 14-hour day often have to strap on a gun, put down an army cot in the building and pull guard duty for the rest of the night because the housing conditions are so short (or at least the Communist officials in this satellite country say they are so short) that we are not allowed housing for a Marine Guard. Therefore, we cannot bring our Marine Guard in and the Foreign Service personnel do guard duty as well as the rest of the work at the Embassy or legation.

Despite the fact that some people might misunderstand, I suggest that we send the very latest of our American inventions, particularly in the case of automobiles, to the people who represent us behind the Iron Curtain. We must remember that the Communists have a completely materialistic society and when they see a modern American day automobile or a modern American television set; in fact, when they see a well-dressed American walk through the streets, they begin to wonder about what life must really be like in this land so far from Russia where they have been told that the people live like slaves under a capitalistic system. I was amazed and shocked to find that our personnel behind the Curtain have been driving old dilapidated vehicles that cannot possibly match vehicles also American made which are used by some of the other foreign countries that are represented there.

In one case, we found that a station wagon—a moderately priced station wagon which had been brought to one of the countries behind the Iron Curtain and purchased at his own expense by an American warrant officer — caused crowds of some several hundred to gather and look at it and ask us if it was true that in America working men could have station wagons like that. We found that sometimes a modern American car created good will for us in telling what life is like in this capitalistic system than some of the other things we have done and are doing.

This suggestion to give to better provide for the people who represent us in a difficult area behind the Iron Curtain is not for their comfort alone but because it helps us advertise the fact that here in this country we have the highest standard of living in the world. It will show the people in Communist areas that this is the sort of thing that they could have if they would abandon their totalitarian form of government and seek a better life under a system of individual freedom.

I congratulate the American Foreign Service for the fine job it is doing.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the gentleman for that suggestion which seems to me to be a very sound one. I have noted with great admiration the recommendations which the gentleman from California made after his recent trip to Russia. My hope and wish is that every Member of the Congress would take as seriously as the gentleman from California did the investigation made on his recent trip and the excellent suggestions which the gentleman made on his return.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman from New York very much.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have seen but few bills come to this floor on which there has been more complete accord within the committee. We have been most fortunate in having a chairman who was able to exercise great skill and great tact. This naturally has helped to smooth out differences of opinion so that we could come here in agreement on this very important measure.

I do not think there is anyone who will deny that the State Department is the first line of America's defense in time of peace. Consequently, it must be a strong organization—strong in ideas, strong in personnel, strong in purpose, and strong in policy. Otherwise America and the world can suffer materially from the failure of America's objectives for the peace and welfare of mankind.

Three years ago we saw drastic reductions imposed in funds and in personnel in the State Department. To many of us it appeared at the time that these cuts were dangerously deep, and that in some important areas of activity they were crippling cuts. Now, in contrast for the second year, we are seeing a step-up in funds and personnel in the State Department. That damage that many people saw then is now being repaired. But also, Mr. Chairman, during these last 2 years we have seen a great step-up in the scope of Communist intrigue—in area, in intensity, and, unfortunately, in effectiveness. Who knows; perhaps by our own actions we helped to encourage and to invite that buildup of Communist activity and effectiveness and the accompanying buildup of our own troubles abroad—and certainly there has been a buildup in our own troubles abroad.

But that is all water over the dam. We will do well to recognize from this point henceforth that our State Department can make us or break us in this complex modern age. It should have our support, and that support should include adequate funds. By the same token the State Department must, by its own actions and accomplishments, justify the support that it needs. Obviously, this can never be accomplished except on a plane that is above politics.

May I now take this opportunity to compliment the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has, I believe, contributed substantially to national security by developing the fact that there is gross carelessness or negligence in the manner in which people are selected to go abroad as the representatives of the culture and the civilization which America has developed. When Communists are sent abroad by our Government, and when they preach their wares abroad under the auspices of our Government, eyebrows undoubtedly go up as people speculate on what is taking place and what we are countenancing, to say the very least. Quite obviously, then, this administration is subject to the same weaknesses in the conduct of policy that it had claimed to find so shocking in previous administrations. But I find no indication of any effort to clean up this situation whose existence has been so effectively portrayed by our subcommittee. That failure to step in and drastically go to work to clean up this situation is to me as disturbing as the fact that it was found to exist.

Again let me say that we have, I think, a good bill. It is a bill on which we are all in complete accord. We have saved money, we have prescribed a slower buildup than was requested by the administration, but I believe that we shall have a stronger and a more effective organization in the State Department as the result of the action of our committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with the greatest joy that I find the committee and also the State Department itself planning broader ways, deeper ways, and higher ways of helping build the Foreign Service that we must have. At this moment we should be extending ourselves and expending our energies and imaginations and good sense in building the greatest Foreign Service the world has ever seen.

I was particularly delighted that my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HILLINGS] gave us the facts he did about the Moscow situation. That is a particularly dramatic situation but there are many difficult posts to which we need to give our best attention.

I spent 3½ months in Africa during the recess. While there I went to all our consulates, embassies, and liaison offices with the exception of Alexandria and Somaliland. I was impressed with what we are asking of our representatives in the Foreign Service, and very proud of the much that is being given. May I give you a picture or two? At one post we were somewhat understaffed. Conditions could perhaps have been improved a little by better administration, but one questions it in that climate. Staff houses were prefabricated houses with iron window frames, and they were far from new. In that wet climate the iron had rusted badly so that it rained through the windows. Young mothers could not dry their children's diapers, and the only way they could put a dry diaper on a child was to put it in the oven or iron it with a hot iron. That is something you men have not had to contend with, babies or diapers, but most of the rest of us have, and these conditions are not easy to take smilingly.

Then in another area the only house available for one of the members of the staff who had a young wife was opposite the public latrines. That entire city works on a bucket system, and at 4:30 in the afternoon all those buckets are emptied. It was quite impossible to invite anyone to visit after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. I took my hat off to those young people who were taking it right on their chins.

I found upon later inquiry that certain restrictions we here on the Hill put on expenditures are at the root of what seemed to me as poor economy as I had ever seen. A new man often spends months looking for a house when very often the man who preceded him had one which under better methods of procedure could have been held for the newcomer.

It is a relief to know that we are going to increase the number of our consulates in Africa. Unless we move into Africa more rapidly than we are doing we are going to be in a very bad way in this rapidly changing world.

We face a new Embassy in the new nation of the Sudan—the possibility of one in the Gold Coast and a third in the soon to be free Nigeria.

I believe that there is intention on the part of the State Department to open four new consulates right across the middle of Africa, a rapidly growing harbor of the French Ivory Coast, 1 at Abidjan, 1 at Douala in the French Cameroons, 1 at Uganda, and 1 in the new nation which will come into being in 1960 out of the Italian Somaliland. All this is excellent, and gives rise to great hopes. I trust that we are going to make it possible for people who have some training in the kind of work they will have to do, to have a capacity to be human beings to the people with whom they deal. I trust we will choose our people with as much conscience and as much intelligence as it is humanly possible to do, because I am convinced that in Africa particularly—and this is true all over the world—if we go there with our hearts, with understanding, and show these people that we are interested in them as individuals because, like ourselves, they are part of the essence of the Being of Almighty God. If we prove to them by what we do that we want to know them, want to work with them, we will create a climate and an atmosphere that will make it absolutely impossible for any Communist to come between us.

May I commend the committee for the results they have achieved in this bill. I do not agree with all of it—but it seems to me that the bill as a whole is forward looking and constructive. We shall all of us watch with interest the use the Departments make of the funds so appropriated.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of clearing up a misconception regarding one item of the State Department budget which has existed in our Foreign Affairs Committee. I refer to the item with regard to a contribution to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.

At the bottom of page 6 of the bill that we have under consideration appears an item of $1,304,000. I understand that there was in a supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House recently an item of $1,200,000. I further understand that is the first appropriation that has been made for payment to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund since 1950.

Just recently on the floor of the House we passed a conference report to increase slightly the annuities for some of the older retired Foreign Service officers. At that time we were under the impression in the committee that the

Foreign Service retirement and disability fund was more or less self-supporting. We find apparently that is not so, that even though the payments into the fund greatly exceed the payments out of the fund—that is, the benefits to the members—the fund itself is apparently not self-supporting. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York, if that is correct and if under present circumstances it is anticipated that we will have to ask for an annual appropriation to keep this fund bolstered up, to keep it moving, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is correct in both parts of his statement. The fund is not self-supporting. The requested appropriation this year is to place the fund on a sound year-to-year basis. It would seem that during the past year a number of things happened which were quite unusual with regard to the fund and, if I may use the expression, it was thrown out of kilter. It is expected that in the future there would be further contributions.

Mr. BENTLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that before our Foreign Affairs Committee at the present time there is pending a bill, S. 3481, to amend the Foreign Service Act, which includes among many other provisions, further liberalization and an increase in benefits from the fund itself. In view of the fact that the payments by members, by participants in the fund, are only at the rate of 5 percent, I am wondering if the gentleman thinks this system should be allowed to go on or if we should not look into the possibility of raising the rate of contribution with the idea of putting the fund on a self-sustaining basis so that we will not have to make these annual contributions.

Mr. ROONEY. We are certainly now in a very peculiar situation. The committee saw fit a while ago to write some unimportant legislation, the consequence of which was an expenditure of about $3,600 for 3 grade 16 employees, and now a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asks the Committee on Appropriations such a question. It seems to me that this is entirely a matter for the gentleman's committee, and if the gentleman and his committee passes the bill to which the gentleman has referred and also passes bills such as any number of others pending which would increase our share in the United Nations Organizations, why, the Committee on Appropriations has no alternative but to pay the dues of our uncle, Uncle Sam. We have no alternative.

Mr. BENTLEY. This gentleman would like to disassociate himself with respect to some of those United Nations bills which the gentleman has mentioned. Did the State Department mention anything in connection with this annuity whether this might be an annual appropriation?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; the State Department did.

Mr. BENTLEY. And approximately in the same amount in the future?

Mr. ROONEY. It would vary. It might become larger and it might decrease. It would all depend in the particular year what the circumstances were.

Mr. BENTLEY. But under the present setup the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund is definitely not self-supporting?

Mr. ROONEY. It is not.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for that information, because that is distinctly contrary to the impression that our committee had, an impression which we received from the State Department, which was premised on the fact that for a period of approximately 6 years there were no appropriations for the fund, and this supplemental appropriation which contains this $1,200,000 was the first appropriation in the past 6 years. Is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for the information developed during the hearings. I do regret, however, that the chairman of the subcommittee and the members thereof saw fit to go off the record on about every other page. I found, in reading the hearings, I got to some important information, and then suddenly the subcommittee would go off the record, and certainly in most instances it was not classified information.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested to read in the hearings that we are now buying $27 wastepaper baskets for the State Department that is, $27 apiece; and $60 each for telephone stands for the State Department. It seems to me that a $27 wastepaper basket must be gold plated or have some platinum or something on it. I cannot understand why the taxpayers should be supplying the State Department with $27 wastepaper baskets. I get along pretty well in my office with some of those dollar and a half steel numbers. They do a pretty good job of catching the debris. So, just remember that you have been buying $27 wastepaper baskets for the State Department along with $60 telephone stands. And, I expect that when we build a new State Department building there will be plenty of them. The only reason given as to why they need these super-dooper baskets and telephone stands is that they match their desks. I leave to your imagination the kind of desks they have.

In studying the hearings, I was surprised to note the scant attention accorded the activities of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

I was particularly surprised that no mention is made at any place in the printed hearings to the matter of UNESCO paying off during the past year several American employees of UNESCO who had been fired for refusing to appear before a loyalty board of the United States Civil Service Commission.

I would be interested to hear from the chairman of the subcommittee as to why this was not discussed during the hearings. Surely the Congress has some interest in the matter with American taxpayers contributing 30 percent of UNESCO's budget; funds from which were used to pay off these individuals.

Since the committee did not question State Department witnesses concerning these payoffs, I want to call attention to the facts as I have been able to piece them together.

On April 26, 1955, a three-man administrative tribunal of the International Labor Organization handed down a ruling that UNESCO must reinstate three dismissed American employees or pay them damages totaling $43,800. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that three foreigners—a Belgian, a Frenchman, and a Dutchman—made up that three-man tribunal.

Immediately upon learning of the ruling, I wrote to Dr. Luther Evans, Director General of UNESCO, in an effort to obtain full particulars.

In reply, he said among other things that:

> I would not be in a position to execute judgment of the tribunal until UNESCO's executive board has had an opportunity to decide whether it wishes to appeal to the International Court of Justice, and whether I may draw from the working capital fund to pay any necessary amounts to individuals concerned.

The so-called International Court of Justice, by the way, is the one on which sit judges from Communist Poland, Communist Russia, and Communist Yugoslavia, and which in 1954 ruled in a similar case that 11 dismissed American employees of the United Nations must be paid $180,000 in back salaries and damages.

Dr. Evans also advised me that the State Department was fully informed concerning the case, so I then wrote to David McKendrew Key, at that time Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, in an effort to find out what the State Department was doing or planned to do in regard to the ruling.

Mr. Key replied that—

> The Department of State disagrees strongly with these decisions. We plan to do everything possible, within the terms of Article 12 of the Tribunal Statute to obtain redress.

On November 10, 1955, I again wrote to Dr. Evans for a report on the status of the case, as well as on information I had received that the ILO Tribunal had handed down another ruling involving more dismissed American employees of UNESCO.

Dr. Evans replied under date of November 30, 1955, and I quote from his letter:

> I would like to mention, first of all, that, on October 29, 1955, the tribunal rendered an identical decision in the case of a fourth staff member.

Remember, this is No. 4. In his case, the ILO tribunal ruled that he must be paid $12,800 damages, $300 costs, 4 percent interest from January 1, 1955, and children's allowance for 2 years, totaling $800. All of this, of course, is added to the total of $43,800 awarded the other three dismissed employees.

In his letter, Dr. Evans goes on to say that—

The executive board, on November 18, 1955, adopted the following resolution:

"That the executive board, acting under article XII of the Statute of the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labour Organization, challenge the judgments rendered by the administrative tribunal in the cases of Leff, Duberg, Wilcox, and Bernstein, and submit the question of their validity to the International Court of Justice."

From past performance by the so-called Court of Justice in the case of dismissed American employees of the United Nations, it is pretty obvious what the decision of the Court will be, and I do not hesitate to predict that it will not be favorable to the United States.

In fact, even Dr. Evans apparently knows what the decision will be, because in his November 30, 1955, letter, he says:

The executive board, on November 25, 1955, approved the advance payment of one-third of the amount of compensation ordered by the administrative tribunal in these four cases, on the condition that the persons concerned undertake to pay back to the Organization the amount, if any, by which these payments exceed any sum to which they will be entitled on final settlement of these cases in accordance with the advisory opinion to be rendered by the International Court of Justice.

How do you like that? These four individuals were paid off one-third of the amount of compensation ordered, even though the executive board of UNESCO challenged the judgments.

And note that Dr. Evans does not say that they will be made to pay back the money if the International Court rules against them. He says they should undertake to pay it back.

But that is not all. On October 29, 1955, the administrative tribunal of the International Labor Organization rendered a judgment in three additional cases involving American staff members of UNESCO who had refused to testify before a United States Loyalty Board. Dr. Evans or UNESCO's executive board did not challenge this decision, and on November 26, 1955, these individuals were paid off as follows:

Miss R. Froma, $11,289.37 in settlement of the judgments made by the ILO Tribunal, and in addition 3 months' base salary plus cost-of-living adjustment, in lieu of notice, $1,431.56; 5 months' termination indemnity at rate of pensionable remuneration, $2,250; 70½ days' accumulated annual leave at rate of pensionable remuneration, $1,464.23; 6 weeks' repatriation grant at rate of pensionable remuneration, $623.07.

Miss H. Van Gelder, $6,870.36, in settlement of the judgments, plus $998.45, $2028.57, $546.15, and $39.11.

Mrs. K. Pankey, $5,062.06 in settlement of the judgments, plus $585, $390, and $292.50.

That all adds up to a total of $34,-221.43 received by the three individuals.

From where did the money come to pay off these American employees of UNESCO, fired for refusing to appear before a United States loyalty board?

From UNESCO's working capital fund, Dr. Evans informs me. And what are the sources of revenue of the working capital fund of UNESCO? I quote article 6.2 of UNESCO's financial regulations:

There shall be established a working capital fund in an amount and for purposes to be determined from time to time by the general conference. The source of moneys of the working capital fund shall be advances from member states, and these advances made in accordance with the scale of assessments as determined by the General Conference for the apportionment of the expenses of UNESCO shall be carried to the credit of the member states which have made such advances.

Get that: "and these advances made in accordance with the scale of assessments as determined by the General Conference." This is the scale of assessments in which the United States is listed as contributing 30 percent of UNESCO's budget.

In other words, American taxpayers' money was used to pay off these individuals, despite the clear intent of Congress in unanimously approving House Concurrent Resolution 262 during the 2d session of the 83d Congress. That resolution stated:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States delegation to the United Nations should take all possible steps to prevent the General Assembly of the United Nations from authorizing or approving the payment to the 11 American employees in the United Nations who were dismissed because of their refusal under the fifth amendment to answer proper questions before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, of the awards of damages (in a total amount of $179,420) made by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal and recently upheld by the International Court of Justice, and that no part of the funds heretofore appropriated, or hereafter appropriated by the Congress for the United Nations shall be used for the payment of such awards.

Surely it was not the intent of this Congress for the resolution to apply only to the matter of 11 dismissed American employees of the U. N.

But now we have similar cases involving employees of UNESCO, a specialized agency of the United Nations, but to my knowledge, and from Dr. Evans' letters to me, nothing was done on the part of American representatives at the U. N. or UNESCO, or by the State Department, to prevent the use of American taxpayers' money to pay off the 4 individuals in full and one-third of the amounts set by the ILO tribunal to 3 others.

On the record, it is apparent that the dirt is still being swept under the rug at UNESCO. And that phrase in connection with UNESCO is not original with me, I assure you. In fact, I borrow it from no less than the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, United States Ambassador to the United Nations, who, in testifying last year on UNESCO before the same subcommittee handling this bill today, had this to say:

The thing to do is to improve it and not sweep the dirt under the rug, which is what was being done. I am being frank.

I repeat: On the record, it is apparent that the dirt is still being swept under the rug at UNESCO.

Apparently there is only one solution to this whole sorry mess, and that is to cut off all United States funds for UNESCO, for the UNESCO propaganda machine at the State Department—the so-called UNESCO Relations Staff—and for the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am very much concerned about the matter to which the gentleman has referred as well as with regard to the resolution adopted by the American Legion at its convention in Miami.

Mr. GROSS. I applaud the resolution adopted by the American Legion at Miami.

Mr. ROONEY. I took this matter up with the Department of State and was advised over the signature of Loy W. Henderson, Under Secretary of State, as follows:

The Secretary has authorized me to inform you that it is our conviction that our national interest will best be served by continued participation in this specialized agency of the United Nations, and by maintaining a strong advisory body, such as the United States National Commission, to help the Government in its effort to strengthen and improve the program and operations of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Mr. GROSS. Who pays his salary?

Mr. ROONEY. The salary of Mr. Dulles?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. The taxpayers pay his salary the same as the taxpayers pay the salary of the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, who presented the budget requesting these funds.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and Dulles needs this UNESCO propaganda machine to keep him going; does he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I get it, at the hearings when the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] was asking one of these gentlemen who represents us about how many men were in the department, he said something like 1,200 and then when you go through the hearings you find there were 2,900; is that not right?

Mr. ROONEY. I think your figures are way off. Probably the gentleman is referring to the highly misleading recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune. If that is so, he is now as inaccurate as were the contents of that editorial. The figures in that editorial were utterly incorrect.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean the figures are all wrong? I thought you were asking how many employees there were and finally it shows up different.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I do not ask—we have the correct figures here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How many have they—are they not paying 2,900?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know where the gentleman took the figure 2,900 from.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You seem to think it was from the Chicago

Tribune editorial. Maybe it was. I will look it up.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman might have just misread a decimal point—I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in conclusion that what Secretary Dulles has to say about UNESCO does not impress me for one-half of one second. He has one of the best little propaganda machines going for UNESCO that he could have anywhere. I do not care what he says about it pro or con.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, peace will come to this old troubled world of ours and victory will light on the banners of democracy only when we have won the war for the hearts and minds of men.

Until now we have been losing that war. Today is the turning point. What we are doing this day will have profound repercussions all over the world. I think it is safe to say that, measured in the future by the result of the action we now are taking, today will go down as a day of great historical significance. It marks the beginning of the frontal decisive attack in the war for the minds and hearts of men that up to this day of decision has been going steadily against us.

It was the force of reason that gave strength in vision and in deed to those who built for the dignity of man a fortress of democracy on American shores. There is no difference among men of various races and nationalities in common physical needs and in their basic desires and aspirations. The force of reason will be generated in any country and in any clime, in relatively equal measure, when the sources for reasoning are available and in a form of presentment to make them understandable. This I believe.

What we are doing today is to make available to mankind in every clime and translated into every tongue the classics of American democracy that are the sources of the eternal truths of government by, of, and for the people, government that upholds the dignity of all men and respects the purposes of the Creator of both men and nations.

CLASSICS FOR ALL THE WORLD

My colleagues will recall that a year ago when the appropriations of 1956 were under consideration I offered an amendment to provide for funds for a Classics of American Democracy program. While the amendment was ruled out on a point of order, the suggestion embodied in the amendment, I am happy to say, was sympathetically received by the House. That was a year ago. Much has happened in the intervening time. Later in my remarks I shall sketch briefly the events that marked the progress of an idea and its growth in the brief period of about a year into reality.

The important point is that with the increased appropriation for USIA in the bill now under consideration, and with the endorsement and cooperation of the commission on books of which the distinguished Dr. Mark May is chairman, and under the able guidance and experienced direction of USIA, the Classics of Democracy that inspired our forefathers are to be made available to peoples everywhere in inexpensive editions and translated into many tongues.

Heretofore these works were available only in the larger libraries and in editions priced beyond ordinary reach. There were few translations, none at all of some of our most precious national documents. Now they are to go on sale in the book stalls of the world, selling at prices comparable to those for which the literature of the Soviet is sold, and translated by outstanding scholars.

ON SALE IN ORIENT MAY 1

I am happy to be able to report that on May 1, now only a few days away, the following books in paper back editions will go on sale in the Far East at the prices given:

John Adams, Political Writings, 223 pages, 15 cents.

John C. Calhoun, Disquisition on Government, 104 pages, 10 cents.

Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography, Other Writings, 218 pages, 15 cents.

Thomas Jefferson, Representative Selections, 15 cents.

Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, Selections from the Federalist, 231 pages, 15 cents.

Henry D. Thoreau, Selected Writings on Nature and Liberty, 10 cents.

Thomas Paine, Common Sense, 184 pages, 15 cents.

From the Declaration of Independence to the Constitution: Roots of American Constitutionalism, 71 pages, 10 cents.

Lord Charnwood's Abraham Lincoln, 501 pages, 10 cents.

WILL MEET SOVIET PRICES

This is the first time that American classics have been sold at prices comparable to those at which communistic books have been sold. With no publicity, the advance orders ran over 5,000 copies in a week. This is an index of the interest at grassroots level. It is in a field that heretofore we have not touched, leaving it to be monopolized by the Soviet. Now we are moving in, and I can assure my colleagues that what we are doing today in supplying the funds for the expansion of the present USIA pilot program will have tremendous results in our war to win the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

Within a matter of months our American classics will be translated into 25 languages, printed and distributed by local dealers in the respective countries, and sold in all the bookstalls of the foreign world at 10 and 15 cents a copy. Too much credit cannot be given American book publishers for their fine cooperation in developing a program from which their only return will be the satisfaction of rendering a patriotic service.

GRATITUDE DUE SUBCOMMITTEE

The distinguished and most able chairman [Mr. ROONEY] and members of the subcommittee are to be congratulated on the manner in which they have handled the appropriation request of the USIA. While the sum granted is $25 million less than the amount requested by the agency it nevertheless is a considerable increase and provides funds for the agency to carry on the classics of democracy program and to increase its overall work in several critical areas of the world. Some of us believed the full amount requested should have been granted because of the many new and difficult duties which have fallen upon USIA as a consequence of the latest Russian propaganda offensive. Nevertheless, the chairman and members of the subcommittee have done a great and patriotic job and deserve the gratitude of the Nation.

It is next to impossible to speculate with accuracy as to what the Russians might do next in their drive to conquer the world. In the past they have not hesitated to engage in armed aggression to accomplish their objectives. They have long depended upon internal subversion to aid them in destroying the independent action of nations and men. They have demonstrated a capacity to stop at nothing in their fanatical drive to eliminate competition of every sort in the countries occupied by communism.

HOW SOVIET SPREADS DOCTRINE

We also know that the Communists have made tremendous gains in deceiving large numbers of people in many lands as to the true facts about communism in practice. One of their principal weapons to misguide public opinion has always been books carrying the theories and doctrines of communism.

In every country of the world the Russians have put out inexpensive books in the native language in order to get their propaganda story across. By inexpensive books I mean books within the easy reach of students, laboring people and youth. In instances where important groups are made a special target of the Communists thousands of doctrinal books are spread among them at no monetary cost to the victim whatever. In the case of colleges, universities, and outstanding intellectuals the Communists have deluxe, leatherbound editions of the basic works of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and so forth, which are presented as gifts. All in all they make certain that anyone who can read will not find it difficult to come by one of their doctrinal books.

Moreover the Communists have developed the know-how for distributing great volumes of their books. For example, in India the Communists have a virtual monopoly of the inexpensive book market. This accounts in large measure for the confusion among the people of India on the true nature of communism and their so-called neutralism on the question of communism. A captive audience in any country cannot make fair judgments on world issues when they only get one side of the issue. That is one of the major problems of the Indian people.

TWENTY MILLION TRANSLATIONS

The increase in budget granted the USIA will permit the Agency to carry through with its book program planned to counteract the damage done by Com-

munist books and to present the truth about the United States, including our political and social institutions. The Agency has planned to make available over 20 million books in 25 languages to the people of key countries in the free world. These will be inexpensive editions costing between 5 cents and 15 cents per copy. Thus students, laboring people and all interested will be able to get reliable books about the United States at a cost they can afford. This program will be concentrated on those areas where the Communists have flooded the bookshops, colleges, and libraries with their cheap books carrying Communist ideology.

BIRTH OF A PROJECT

In this connection it was my privilege and my pleasure to play a part in launching the project called Classics of Democracy. This project is now known to practically every Member of the Congress and has gained the support of important national organizations and prominent individuals in every part of the country. The Committee on Books Abroad of the USIA has given long and careful study to the project. Recently on the suggestion of the group backing the Classics of Democracy program a pilot project was launched to bring about the production of inexpensive books in some 10 different languages. A number had been recommended by our group as the type best expressing our American political and social philosophy. This project already has blazed the trail for a winning-books program and maximum utilization of the many fine suggestions which have developed from the original project and campaign for the Classics of Democracy.

I hope the USIA will not find it necessary to cut any funds from the book program. I have been assured that it will not. That program is the best weapon we have to help us win a just peace by making the political and social ideals which have made America the leading peace-loving nation of the world, known to millions of people who are hungry for knowledge and the true facts about the American people and the philosophies of democratic government by which we abide.

Again, I congratulate the subcommittee on a job well done.

HOW PROGRAM DEVELOPED

Mr. Chairman, I have stated that I was privileged to have a part in the Classics of Democracy program. It was a part which I shared with the distinguished statesman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]. The concept was born in, and the dynamic drive in its development came from, the discussions and activities of a small group in Chicago composed of:

Dr. Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century, probably the most widely read Protestant periodical in the country.

Dr. Jerome G. Kerwin, chairman of the Charles R. Walgreen Foundation, University of Chicago. He is nationally known as an educator in the field of political science and a prominent Catholic layman.

Dr. Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy, University of Chicago, a State Department visitor to universities in India, and a former member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

Dr. Emery T. Filbey, vice-president emeritus of the University of Chicago.

Thomas B. Stauffer, Humanities instructor, Wilson Junior College. He has a rich background in foreign service and was at one time aid to the Honorable Jefferson Caffery.

John McGinnis, President, Pennsylvania Railroad Lodge, No. 225, of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. T. Burch, executive editor, Chicago Daily News.

Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Chicago Daily News.

It began with informal discussions in Chicago motivated by observations made by members of the group during world travel both in an official and unofficial capacity. Their spadework brought them a letter of approval from the Committee on Books Abroad for the United States Advisory Commission on Information. Dr. Mark A. May, chairman of the committee, called upon the Chicagoans to supply a list of books to be considered.

OUTSTANDING JOURNALISTIC ACHIEVEMENT

In February of 1955 the Chicago Daily News called upon its foreign correspondents in different parts of the world to investigate the extent of the Communist book campaign and what the United States was doing to meet it. The reports from Paris, London, Bonn, Rome, as well as uncommitted parts of Asia and Africa all pointed to the fact that in the words of Van Allen Bradley, the literary editor of the News, 'The United States is losing the Battle of the Books." In an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily News and in all the Knight newspapers on June 6, 1955, Mr. Bradley pointed out:

> Russia is turning out in many languages millions of volumes of inexpensive editions of the classic Communist statements of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other writers, whereas we have nothing to compare with the Communist cheap book distribution plan.

The illuminating and revealing survey of the foreign book situation by the Chicago Daily News was one of the year's outstanding American journalistic achievements. The report will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 6, pages 7930 and 7931 of June 8, 1955.

QUESTIONNAIRE SHOWS APPROVAL

The public response was instant and widespread. Further evidence of the depth of the popular interest in the Classics of Democracy program was furnished by the response to the questionnaire mailed in December of 1955 to 3,500 outstanding industrialists, editors, educators and recognized leaders in labor, veteran and women's organizations to sound public reaction to the proposed program. Another purpose of the questionnaire was to ascertain what books in the judgment of a jury of American enlightened public opinion were entitled to inclusion in the list of books Americans as a whole would agree constitute the imperishable classics of our democracy.

Many of the letters received in response to the questionnaire were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The reading of these letters, I can safely say, furnishes a liberal education in the subject. Most of my colleagues, I am sure, are familiar with them. As one colleague remarked, "Once one starts reading, he cannot stop until the last word of the last letter, they are that interesting, inspiring and patriotically thrilling." Moreover, the letters reflected the thinking of the highest scholarship of the country. If you have not read these letters, you really have missed the substance of a most enriching hour or two of reading time.

CONFERENCES WITH USIA CHIEFS

Meanwhile conferences had been going on with Theodore C. Streibert, the able director of USIA, Dr. Franklin L. Burdette, Edward O'Connor, Dr. Claude E. Hawley, and others of USIA in which Congressman FEIGHAN and I participated. On January 27, 1956, Director Streibert gave the glad announcement of the launching of the pilot project in the following letter:

> DEAR MR. O'HARA: May I extend to you my appreciation for your leadership in highlighting the necessity for creating and distributing overseas inexpensive editions of American classics of democracy as one of the principal means for furthering United States information objectives.
>
> In accordance with our conversation and with discussions you have held with members of the Agency staff, I should like to recapitulate certain related activities the Agency is now pursuing. Inexpensive editions of 25 United States titles in English are being prepared and will be distributed commercially in Asia beginning February 1. Of these, 10 express our basic American social and political philosophy. In February a pilot project will be undertaken to publish 10 titles in foreign languages to be made available in the most inexpensive form possible. Through this project we expect to develop the necessary channels to permit the launching of a large-scale program which will accelerate the overseas distribution of books about the United States. Several of the titles used in this project are planned to be of the type advocated in your proposals.
>
> Looking to the future, we are requesting funds from Congress to permit expansion of the program for the distribution of inexpensive books in English to a level of 80 titles, plus some 440 editions of inexpensive translations, encompassing publication in more than 20 languages. For the most part, these will be available in foreign markets for the equivalent of 10 cents retail, although in some instances individual titles may be priced at the equivalent of 15 or 20 cents, depending upon the requirements of the program in different parts of the world. In all cases, commercial facilities will be used in order that the books may be accessible through normal means.
>
> It is hardly necessary for me to tell you how much all of us in the Agency appreciate the interest you have shown and the work you have done. It is certainly gratifying to learn of the response you have received from hundreds of outstanding citizens and organizations throughout the country. Please extend our thanks to the group of Chicagoans who assisted in promoting the idea of worldwide distribution of the Classics of Democracy and particularly to the Chicago Daily News for its pioneering efforts. We hope they

will all continue their interest in this work and that we will have the benefit of their continuing advice.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE C. STREIBERT.

CONGRESSMAN HAUNTS BOOK STALLS

It would be impossible to overstress the importance of Congressman FEIGHAN'S trip to the Orient after the adjournment of the first session for first-hand information. For days and weeks he haunted the book stalls. Perhaps no American with the single exception of Dr. Richard P. McKeon ever before made such a thorough inspection of what people in the Orient at grassroots were buying and reading. The American people are greatly indebted to Congressman FEIGHAN for the weeks of grinding, fatiguing work he gave to this work. What he found verified in every detail the reports from the foreign correspondents of the Chicago Daily News that we were losing the battle for the minds and hearts of men because the classics of our political philosophy, the classics that inspired our own forefathers, just were not available in translated and inexpensive editions.

On December 9, 1955, Congressman FEIGHAN reported to the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad on his trip to the Far East where he observed the distribution of Communist and other books through commercial channels. His report made a profound impression.

On February 21, 1956, I reported to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations chaired by Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY on the findings of the Chicago group and the results of the nationwide questionnaire among leaders in American public opinion. The testimony will be found on pages 377 to 383 of the public hearings on USIA. I am deeply grateful to Chairman ROONEY and the members of the subcommittee for the lengthy and sympathetic hearing they accorded the presentment of the views of the Chicago group and the larger group nationwide that had responded to the questionnaire. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of all those interested in the Classics of Democracy program to Chairman ROONEY and Congressmen PRINCE H. PRESTON, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, DON MAGNUSON, FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR., FRANK T. BOW, and CLIFF CLEVENGER.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BOOKS

In February of 1956 the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad of the United States Advisory Commission on Information gave a much appreciated and significant recognition by devoting one of its sessions to a discussion of the project. Congressman FEIGHAN and I were honored by an invitation to appear before this most distinguished body. We were accompanied by Mr. Stauffer, representing and presenting the views of the Chicago group.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information was created by Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress. The members of this Commission serve without pay and represent a cross section of professional and business experience in the communications field. The chairman of the commission is Dr. Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations of Yale University. Other members of the commission are Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Sigurd S. Larmon, president of the advertising firm of Young & Rubican, Inc., and Philip D. Reed, chairman of General Electric Co. Assisting the commission in formulating policies there are advisory committees, each chairmanned by a member of the commission.

Dr. May is the chairman of the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad. Its members are George P. Brett, Jr., president of the Macmillan Co., Robert L. Crowell, president of Thomas Y. Crowell Co., Robert B. Downs, director of libraries at the University of Illinois, Charles W. Ferguson, Sr., editor of the Readers Digest, Freeman Lewis, executive vice president of Pocket Books, Inc., Keyes D. Metcalf, former director of libraries at Harvard University, and Charles E. Odegaard, dean of the Colleges of Literature, Science, and the Arts of the University of Michigan.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDS PROJECT

In its 11th semiannual report to Congress, made on March 30, 1956, the Commission approved the recommendation of its advisory committee that "in view of the present world situation resulting from the Geneva 'summit' meeting it is imperative that large quantities of books be translated and widely distributed in certain areas." The Commission stated:

In view of these facts we agree with the Advisory Committee on Books Abroad that it is in the public interest for the Congress of the United States to increase its appropriations for the translation and distribution abroad of selected American books at prices which will compete with those of subsidized Communist books.

In recent months, a group of citizens in Chicago has expressed interest in the translation and distribution abroad in low-priced editions of the Classics of Democracy. We agree thoroughly that a substantial number of the books to be included in the Agency's program of low-cost translations should be of this nature. Some should be complete volumes in original form, others could be collections of basic documents, assembled and described by eminent scholars.

We are glad to note that Congressmen BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, and MICHAEL FEIGHAN from Cleveland have been working with this group of citizens on this matter and are taking an active interest in the need for a greater distribution abroad of American books and particularly translations of the Classics of Democracy.

VICTORY NOW IN SIGHT

Mr. Chairman, we now are on our way to victory in the war for the hearts and minds of men. That is why, as I have said, this is a day of historical significance. Again I commend and congratulate the distinguished chairman and all the members of a great and far-visioned subcommittee.

In closing, permit me to cite one recent illustration of how all the world is hungering for the classics of our democracy that heretofore for the most part have been unavailable in translated editions. At long last an edition of the Federalist Papers in Italian has been placed before the people of Italy. The University of Rome recently undertook the translation and publication. The volume is more pretentious than the 10- and 15-cent editions to which I have referred. It is selling for $2.60 per copy. Already it is second on the list of best sellers in Italy.

What, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, may we expect to come to our country and to the cause of democracy as dividends on what we are doing today when all over the world are classics of democracy, translated into all tongues and selling for 10 and 15 cents a volume, within the reach of everybody?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

THE IRISH REVOLUTION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, today we pay our tribute to those men of Ireland, who 40 years ago on April 24, 1916, first proclaimed publicly the existence of the Republic of Ireland and through armed revolution attempted to throw off the yoke of British usurpation. Through divided authority and the lack of a single command the long and carefully planned revolution failed to achieve the complete success and military victory which it sought. Nevertheless it did produce the declaration of independence for all of Ireland and prepared the way for the ultimate creation of the present Republic of Ireland, whose Government so ably and efficiently directs the affairs of the people residing in that part of Ireland, which is entrusted to its present care and jurisdiction.

Throughout the entire period of British domination the Irish people carried on an unceasing struggle to win ultimately their full freedom and independence. No nation has ever been called upon to wage so long and tireless a battle to regain one by one the inherent rights of freemen and even the inalienable rights of human beings, which had been so callously denied by the British and so grudgingly conceded through the centuries. The discolored pages of history relating the abuses of British rule in Ireland cannot be repainted even by the oratory of a Churchill or his voluminous writings on British historical achievements. No nation has suffered more or endured greater outrages than have the Irish people. All the crimes being committed today against the rights and freedoms of peoples scattered throughout this troubled world, had their foreshadowing on the soil of Ireland and in the homes of Irish people.

Although the uprising in the city of Dublin was short lived and its success doomed by the early arrival of British reinforcements, nevertheless the Irish revolutionaries conducted themselves with honor and waged their warfare in strict accordance with military codes. This revolt against the British army of occupation in Ireland might have ended in the most dismal failure, since it was limited to the confines of the city of Dublin almost exclusively. The confusion in orders and the delay of a day in starting the revolt occasioned a failure of similar insurrections, which had been planned, in other parts of the nation.

Failure, however, was not to be the historical estimate of the Easter Rising in Ireland. The vicious retaliation of the British commanding officer, Gen. Sir John Maxwell, made certain that all who gave their lives in the cause of Irish freedom were true martyrs for the sake of liberty. On April 25, three prominent citizens of Dublin, who played no part in the warfare, were arrested and on the following morning shot in the Portobello Barracks and secretly buried, under orders of Captain Bowen-Colthurst, the British officer in charge. With noncombatants treated in this manner, it was not surprising that all leaders in the revolt should expect a like fate. Thus all signers of the Independence Proclamation were speedily tried and shot, as well as most of the military leaders of the Irish forces.

The public reaction in Ireland was instantaneous. On May 3, three of the signatories of the proclamation, Clarke, MacDonagh, and Pearse, were shot following a secret field court-martial. The next 5 days were marked with the announcemnt of like shootings, until the clamor in Ireland was echoed in America and reechoed throughout the British Colonies. Even the Manchester Guardian cried out that the executions were becoming an atrocity.

George Bernard Shaw wrote in protest:

> My own view is that the men who were shot in cold blood, after their capture or surrender, were prisoners of war, and that it was, therefore, entirely incorrect to slaughter them. The relation of Ireland to Dublin Castle is, in this respect, precisely that of the Balkan States to Turkey, of Belgium or the city of Lille to the Kaiser, and of the United States to Great Britain.
>
> Until Dublin Castle is superseded by a National Parliament and Ireland voluntarily incorporated with the British Empire, as Canada, Australasia, and South Africa have been incorporated, an Irishman resorting to arms to achieve the independence of his country is doing only what Englishmen will do, if it be their misfortune to be invaded and conquered by the Germans in the course of the present war. Further, such an Irishman is as much in order morally in accepting assistance from the Germans, in her struggle with England, as England is in accepting the assistance of Russia in her struggle with Germany. The fact that he knows that his enemies will not respect his rights if they catch him, and that he must, therefore, fight with a rope around his neck, increases his risk, but adds in the same measure to his glory in the eyes of his compatriots and of the disinterested admirers of patriotism through the world. It is absolutely impossible to slaughter a man in this position without making him a martyr and a hero, even though the day before the rising he may have been only a minor poet. The shot Irishmen will now take their places beside Emmett and the Manchester martyrs in Ireland, and beside the heroes of Poland and Serbia and Belgium in Europe; and nothing in heaven or earth can prevent it. * * *
>
> I remain an Irishman, and am bound to contradict any implication that I can regard as a traitor any Irishman taken in a fight for Irish independence against the British Government, which was a fair fight in everything except the enormous odds my countrymen had to face.

The reaction in America was expressed in the New York World, which declared:

> The hurried vengence of the military authorities, for which the Government is responsible, has written a chapter that will forever stand to Great Britain's credit.

The celebrated poet, Joyce Kilmer, organized a mammoth memorial service in Central Park, New York, for those who died for Ireland in the rising.

At the very time President Wilson was enunciating his principles of international justice, so applicable to Ireland, which declared our belief in these fundamental things:

> First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live. * * * Second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon.

English statesmen realized that their hope of bringing America into the war was now a forlorn one. The British Ambassador in Washington wrote:

> I do not think we can count on American sympathy * * * the attitude towards England has been changed for the worse by recent events in Ireland. * * * If we are able to settle the Home Rule question at once, the announcement will have a beneficial effect here, although I do not think that anything we can do would conciliate the Irish here.

Fearing the outcome of the future elections in the United States an effort was made to get something done provisionally to settle the Irish Home Rule question and thereby appease American feelings. So Lloyd George inaugurated the nefarious conferences in which Home Rule was proposed but also in which partition was presented. The Home Rule Act of 1914 was to apply only to 26 counties, but the 6 counties in the Northeast were to be left out. Moreover Lloyd George wrote to Sir Edward Carson:

> MY DEAR CARSON: I enclose Greer's draft propositions. We must make it clear that at the end of the provisional period Ulster does not, whether she wills it or not, merge in the rest of Ireland.

This secret letter was accepted by Carson as "a precious possession, guaranteeing me that the six counties would be left out, and that they never could be put back again without an act of Parliament." This behind-the-scenes written guaranty made acceptance of partition palatable to the pro-British Unionists in the northeast; and the temporary nature of the partition made this poisonous proposal potable for the freedom-seeking people of the rest of Ireland. Yet 40 years after, the temporary partition remains, and today the English statesmen attempt to assert that it remains a question to be settled between the two divisions of Ireland, and that the London Parliament has nothing to do with it. This criminal expedient was engineered by the English, enacted by their Parliament and should be righted today by that same Parliament without further ado.

It is often said that the evil that men do lives after them. So it is with the creators of partition in Ireland. The evils of the situation remain. The evils of that example are copied in various countries throughout the world, and are in a large measure the cause of world unrest today. It is late in the day to remedy the evil that has been done, but that the glory of the Irish martyrs of Easter week may not be dimmed, I pray that the days of partition are numbered and that a unified Ireland may arise to take her rightful place among the nations of the world. Then the Irish declaration of independence, issued on that fateful Easter Monday, 40 years ago, may take its place among the cherished documents of the world, in which the peoples of the different nations have expressed their demand for freedom.

That the text of the Irish declaration may be known to you and be cherished as a sacred document, I desire to read its text at this time:

The Provisional Government of the Irish Republic to the People of Ireland:

Irishmen and Irishwomen, in the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

Having organized and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organization, the Irish republican brotherhood, and through her open military organizations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army; having patiently perfected her discipline; having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seizes that moment and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty; 6 times during the past 300 years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a sovereign independent state, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades in arms to the cause of freedom, of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations.

The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights, and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and oblivious of the differences, carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent national government, representative of the whole people of Ireland, and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the provisional government, hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people. We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most

High God, whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonor it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valor and discipline, and by the readiness of her children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

Signed on behalf of the provisional government:

THOMAS J. CLARKE.
SEAN MACDIARMADA.
P. H. PEARSE.
JAMES CONNOLLY.
THOMAS MACDONAGH.
EAMONN CEANNT.
JOSEPH PLUNKETT.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York for graciously yielding me this time. The gentleman from New York and his committee have done a wonderful job on this appropriation bill as they have done on appropriation bills over the years. It does remain, however, that a very important appropriation has been omitted from this legislation, and, therefore, I am planning to offer an amendment to restore at least a portion of this appropriation which was denied by the committee.

I plan to offer an amendment to restore a portion of the funds for new construction for the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I do not claim to be an authority on this subject, but I have taken an active interest in our prison setup and have recently had an occasion to make a detailed study during a tour of one of the Federal institutions. Therefore, I feel I am somewhat familiar with their problems. I, for one, am proud of the prison system in the United States. I am not proud of the fact that it is necessary to have prisons, but I am extremely proud of the prisons we have since it is necessary to have them.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hearings held by this committee clearly show the critical situation existing in Federal types of prisons in our country. And if this appropriation is not accepted, I can foresee a general deterioration of our complete system. I hope my amendment is accepted by this Congress as our prisons are overcrowded today, and it will take 3 additional years to construct a new prison. There will be 3,400 more prisoners at that time than we have today. We have enough hardened criminals today committed to other institutions and overcrowding their normal capacity to completely fill this new-type prison if it were available today.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because I believe my country has the best prison system in the world, and I want to keep it that way. I have the utmost confidence in Mr. James Bennett, the director of the prison system, as I feel he has held the system on a high level and has done a job comparable with that done by the FBI. Both Mr. Bennett and Mr. Hoover are career men dedicated to their service and their country. I respect their judgment and know, as you know, that their decisions are far beyond the realm of political or bureaucratic influence.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, I shall offer an amendment to increase the appropriation by $9,500,000 for the purpose of constructing a maximum security type prison. I have no information as to where this prison will be located, but I feel that this is not the question to be determined. The decision must be made coldly and realistically on the basis of need or justification for such a prison and if it is approved an appropriate site could be selected at a later date.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I feel very much as does the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA]. I take this time simply to congratulate the committee on what I think was a very wise decision in the reasonable increase it provided in funds for the work of the United States Information Agency. This Agency represents us in the most crucial struggle of our time, a struggle which transcends party lines.

In every far corner of the earth, in the ancient Middle Eastern desert, in the teeming, smouldering cities of the Orient, in the war-smitten villages of southern Europe, men and women are choosing sides between two diametrically opposed ways of life. How they choose may well determine the fate of our children.

Our competitor in this struggle for men's minds is making a supreme effort to capture the imagination and the allegiance of the world's peoples.

By the most conservative estimate, Russia has been spending more than $3 billion every year on propaganda aimed at depicting this Nation of ours as a land presided over by warmongers and Wall Street imperialists who exploit the great majority of our people. To combat this monstrous falsehood, the United States Information Agency has had only a minute fraction of this amount with which to spread abroad the truth about American democracy and matters of American policy.

Thomas Jefferson said that truth is the sufficient adversary of falsehood. But that truth must be told. It must be told often and convincingly.

Our Nation has the most dynamic, the most appealing, and the most practical political idea ever conceived by the mind of man, and we have throughout the world a vast yawning market simply crying for this product which we alone as a nation can supply. With all of our inventive genius as advertisers and as exponents of the written and spoken word, with our uncanny ability to make the taste buds cry out for Lucky Strikes and Coca-Cola, it seems nothing short of suicide to allow ourselves to lose this competition of ideas by default. And this is the only way we could lose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. I thank my distinguished friend, Chairman ROONEY, and wish to commend the members of the committee for the excellent work accomplished on this important appropriation bill. I certainly do not wish to be expressing negative thoughts upon the constructive work which the committee has done, but our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and also the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], have spoken of the Department of State as being our first line of defense, adopting wide and broad policies and winning the cold war.

I have been concerned and alarmed, Mr. Chairman, regarding the resolution adopted by the Parliament of Iceland to expel from that little island, our American forces. This expulsion resolution was adopted by the Icelandic Parliament by a vote of 31 to 16.

Certainly this expression is evidence that we are losing the cold war. It appears that our present State Department policies are not leading us in the right direction—that we are losing rather than gaining friends. We are losing our allies.

I was so concerned about this matter, Mr. Chairman—a most distressing incident—that I addressed a letter to the Secretary of State, asking for an explanation of the motivating reasons behind the adoption of this resolution. I received an extended letter from Mr. Robert C. Bell, the Assistant Secretary of State, outlining the history of our forces being in Iceland and of the action which resulted in the adoption of the resolution expelling our forces from that country.

It is certainly significant to me that we are losing our allies, we are losing our friends. This is evidenced by this resolution which has been adopted demanding that our forces be expelled from Iceland. The resolution adopted goes on to state that immediate action should be taken to effectuate the policy of the adopted resolution to the end that the American forces be removed from Iceland, and that the Icelanders take over the manning of the military installations and that the American military forces leave the country; that if agreement concerning the above is not reached the matter should be followed up by renouncing the existing defense agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I think that resolution and the decisive vote by which it was adopted is indicative of what is happening to us in several parts of the world, losing out with our neighbors and former allies. The matter is deserving of the thoughtful consideration and action of the Committees on Foreign Affairs of the House and Senate.

The letter from the Assistant Secretary of State follows:

APRIL 23, 1956.

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. EVINS: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated April 13, 1956, inquiring as to what is behind the resolution adopted on March 28 by the Icelandic Parliament. The resolution (copy attached) states that Icelandic policy concerning the Icelandic-United States Defense Agreement should be revised immediately "with the aim in mind that Icelanders take over the guarding and maintenance of military installa-

tions—but not military activities—and that the defense forces leave the country."

As your letter indicates, the conduct of American troops now stationed in Iceland is not a factor motivating the passage of the resolution; there have been no incidents involving American troops for some time.

The passage of the resolution must be considered in the light of Icelandic history and of the current political situation in Iceland. Prior to World War II Iceland remained largely isolated from the current of world events. Since 1918 Iceland had been a sovereign state united with Denmark under a common king with Denmark conducting Iceland's foreign policy and foreign representation. After Denmark was occupied by German forces on April 9, 1940, communication between Iceland and King Christian was severed. In May 1940 Iceland was occupied by British forces. In July 1941, an agreement was made with the Icelandic authorities for United States forces to replace the British in Iceland. On June 17, 1944, after a plebiscite in Iceland, Iceland was formally established as a republic. The United States and Icelandic Governments agreed to terminate United States responsibility for the defense of Iceland on October 7, 1946.

In 1949 when Iceland joined NATO, Iceland stated to the United States and to NATO that it was out of the question for a foreign army or for foreign military bases to be located in Iceland in time of peace, although in case of war, allied nations might request privileges similar to those enjoyed in World War II. In 1951, in view of the Korean War and the fear of a new world war, Iceland signed an agreement with the United States permitting the stationing of United States troops in Iceland. There is, however, an understandable desire on the part of Icelanders to reduce to a minimum the presence of foreign troops there. It is probably partly in deference to this feeling and partly because some Icelandic leaders now consider the international outlook to be more favorable than it was in 1951 that the above-mentioned resolution calling for the withdrawal from Iceland of United States forces was passed by the Icelandic Parliament.

Current developments in Iceland should be viewed against the above background. The present caretaker government in Iceland, as its predecessor, is a coalition of the Conservative Party (21 seats out of 52 in Parliament) and the Progressive Party (16 seats). Opposition parties were the Social Democrat (6 seats); National Defense (2 seats); and Communist (7 seats). The Progressive Party decided to join forces with the Social Democratic Party and withdraw from its restive coalition with the Conservative Party, thus precipitating special elections in Iceland on June 24, 1956. Before Parliament was dissolved it passed the resolution of March 28, sponsored by the Progressive and Social Democrat Parties. The National Defense and Communist Parties supported it in lieu of a more drastic resolution which they had proposed. The final vote was 31 to 18 (Conservative, with 3 Conservatives absent).

No action thus far has been taken by the present caretaker government of Iceland to implement the resolution and there are no indications whether any such action will be taken prior to the June 24 elections. It is possible that, before any irrevocable decision is made by the Icelandic Government, Icelandic authorities will become aware of the serious danger which such action would cause to their own nation as well as to other members of NATO.

I believe you will find the foregoing helpful in assessing the significance of the resolution adopted by the Icelandic Parliament.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosure: Resolution.)

ALTHING RESOLUTION ON ICELAND'S FOREIGN POLICY IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEFENSE AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES

The Althing resolves to declare:

The foreign policy of Iceland, hereafter as it has up to the present, should be aimed at protecting the independence and security of the country; friendly relations with other nations; and a joint stand of the Icelanders with their neighboring nations in security matters—such as their participation in NATO.

In view of the changed situation since the Defense Agreement was reached in 1951, and the declarations that a foreign army shall not be stationed in Iceland in time of peace, a revision of the conduct of affairs adopted in that connection should immediately be carried out with the aim in mind that the Icelanders take over the guarding and maintenance of military installations—but not military activities—and that the military forces leave the country. If agreement concerning the above is not reached, the matter shall be followed up by renouncing the Defense Agreement, in accordance with the provision for this in article VII.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of $1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards; not to exceed $35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed $5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 251 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed 2 for replacement only) and maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files and for rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General; $47,550,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS–16: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed $50,000 may be used for the emergency replacement of aircraft upon certificate of the Attorney General.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: On page 22, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, strike out *"Provided*, That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade CS–16: *Provided further,"* and insert in lieu thereof *"Provided,"*.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I feel it is incumbent upon me, in fact it is my duty, to offer this amendment which provides that the compensation of 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the grade of GS–16 be stricken from the bill.

This language in the bill is clearly and unquestionably legislation in an appropriation bill and is a direct usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. I regret that the great Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to include this provision in the bill. As the Members know, there are 3 supergrades at the present time, grades 16, 17, and 18. These supergrades were provided first by the Classification Act of 1949 which originated in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Last year our committee initiated legislation which raised the number of these 3 supergrades to 1,200 with 125 in grade 18, 375 in grade 17, and 700 in grade 16.

Now the Congress, through its Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, has the power and the authority and the duty to authorize these supergrades. After these supergrades are authorized by the Congress, it is provided that the Civil Service Commission shall then allocate the respective positions to the various departments and agencies. Now this provision which I am seeking to strike out would put these 6 men in grade 16 or at a salary of grade 16. I do not know anything about the qualifications of them. You are disrupting the orderly process and procedure in connection with the authorization and allocation of these supergrades by taking away from the Civil Service Commission and the two Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of Congress the right to have control over these supergrades in this instance. I wish the powerful Committee on Appropriations would quit stepping on the toes of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If this practice is continued, you are going to have chaos and confusion and inequities arising among the Federal personnel. What does the committee know about the qualifications of these men and about the requirements for these different positions? There are 6 men involved. I understand they are very fine gentlemen, but why not go through the regular legislative procedure and let the Civil Service Commission allocate these positions to these 6 men provided their positions can qualify for grade 16? If they are entitled to grade 16, then I am sure the Civil Service Commission will put them in there. At the present time there are 71 supergrades still that have not been filled by the Civil Service Commission, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has reported out a bill to the House just recently which authorizes 236 more supergrades.

This bill is now on the calendar of the House for action.

Let us not have confusion about these super grades. The members of the Appropiations Committee are not the ones to pass on the qualifications of each individual as to whether he should be in grade 16 or grade 17 or grade 18. These are super grades that need experts like the three members of the Civil Service Commission to pass upon the requirements and qualifications for the position in each one of these grades. I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will agree to my amendment. You are establishing here a dangerous precedent by taking away the authority and prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission to authorize and allocate these particular grades if you do not adopt my amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If this provision goes through, it will mean that the Committee on Appropriations has put through 17 super grades in 2 bills within a matter of less than 2 months; is that not true?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. I appeal to the committee to support this amendment. It is sound. It is in the interest of good, orderly, efficient Government. How can the Committee on Appropriations, without any investigation or study, put employees and officials in grade 16, 17, or 18? I say we are treading upon dangerous ground, and I hope you will leave this matter of super grades to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. This provision which I am seeking to eliminate will be bad for employee morale and will disrupt the orderly and proper alinement of top-level positions in these super grades. It is preferential legislation for the benefit of a few specific individuals. The report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill is strangely silent on the explanation or justification for the provision placing the five Assistant Commissioners and one District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in grade 16. This is another effort to legislate salaries for specific positions in the executive branch which unquestionably should be left to the usual procedures and processes which are provided by Congress in the Classification Act. The Congress, through its Post Office and Civil Service Committees of the Senate and the House, should be responsible for reviewing the need for and the use of top-level positions on an overall governmentwide basis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I realize this item does not seem to be of great importance to the Members as compared to some of the other portions of this legislation, but it is extremely important because of the principle involved.

The question before this committee now is, do you want to sustain the legislative committee of this House, or do you want to circumvent the legislative committee of this House, and, do you also want to circumvent the Civil Service Commission of these United States? That is really the question involved here. Our committee only recently approved a bill, which is now on the calendar that provides for some 236 supergrades that would be allocated by the Civil Service Commission in their regular order for people qualified under Civil Service in the regular way of doing business, but if you are going to follow this procedure and let certain people in these agencies go to the Committee on Appropriations and get that committee to allocate grades for certain individuals, then to that extent you just weaken your legislative committee of the House. This is a more important matter than most of the Members realize. I hope that they will see fit to support the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. It is important that they do that. I find no fault at all to the qualifications of these individuals who are being taken care of here. I am sure they are good men. That is not the point.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is acquainted with Mr. Shaughnessy, the district director in New York, is he not?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, Mr. Shaughnessy is a great man; he is a distinguished public servant; certainly he is. But I do not go along with the method of handling this matter in this fashion, because there is not a word that I know of, not a line of testimony in the hearings in support of this portion of the bill—nothing at all. You agree with me on that.

If the House is going to support legislation on which there have been no hearings, on which there has been no testimony before the committee, I do not think it is right. I do not believe there is a member of this committee, aside from the chairman, who has talked to these people involved in this legislation at all about wanting these super grades. I doubt it. I doubt whether any one of heads of the agency has even called the Civil Service Commission to find out whether these people were even considered by the Commission. If they have, I wish they would tell us about it right here on the floor of the House. I should like to have your further explanation. I know they are all good men; of course they are. They are employed in the Government. They are career men. Some of them have been in the Government for years. But here you go out and pick out 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 men. You did it in this case and your committee did it a few weeks ago in another bill from another subcommittee. If that is the way these things are going to be handled, and the House wants to approve that method of handling them, then we should know it. I feel the Members here should know the situation so that they would understand what they are doing if they do not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. There is no question that the amendment should be approved.

This is not a matter of personalities. The gentlemen affected by this proposed legislation, surely, understand that. There is, however, a matter of policy and principle involved.

If it is to be the policy of this House to approve the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House to permit legislation to be included in such manner that it is not subject to a point of order, we should know it. If the Appropriations Committee wants to increase salaries for certain employees without following regular procedure, and without hearings of any kind, we should know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I should like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. Does not the provision in the bill to which the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] was offered create new grades by increasing the salaries of those who are in those positions now? Is not that what it does?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, the issue is a great deal broader than appears on the surface. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who is the ranking minority Member was right when he suggested that the Committee on Appropriations is continuing as it has started on this line of permitting someone who is already in the Government service getting a provision in an appropriation bill raising his grade by increasing his compensation. If that is the case, what is the use of having one committee of which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] is chairman? What good then is the gentleman's committee on this phase of our business, I ask the gentleman from Tennessee? What is the use of being around when Appropriations writes legislation which should be written by Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I would say that we would soon be out of business if this method were followed. I will say to the gentleman that the amendment which I have offered, if it is approved, would save an increase of $1,290 for each one of these 6 positions. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations, without any justification that I can see, is increasing the compensation of these 6 jobs by $1,290 per year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Appropriations by its action put them in another grade, did they not? After the legislative committee having jurisdiction had refused to do so?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct. That is how the increase in salary comes about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why do we need the gentleman's committee? What does his committee do? What business do they have to transact if the Committee on Appropriations is encouraged to bring in this sort of legislation and get it approved?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say that the committee

of which I have the honor to be chairman has spent many days and long hours setting up these supergrades and outlining the qualifications for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And how much time has the Committee on Appropriations spent on the subject before it overruled the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I can find nothing in the hearings about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the point. It is just as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] said, and as was stated earlier in the debate today. There is no need for a legislative committee if the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Rules can come in and jockey through this kind of a provision in an appropriation bill. Is not that right?

If we are to have legislative committees, why is it we do not just vote down one of these bills and let the beneficiaries seeking a higher grade, more pay, go back in the regular way to the proper committee? It is the only remedy, as I see the situation. As was said earlier in the day, if we do not want the legislative committees to function, if the Appropriations Committee is to be a sort of city of refuge to which every fellow who thinks he finds himself in a situation where he wants something he cannot get through the action of the proper legislative committee can run to and get what he wants, from Appropriations, let the legislative committee just disband, and we can all go campaigning. The issue is a matter of legislative procedure, of adherence to long-established customs, and this new procedure is not fair to the legislative committees. It is not sound legislative procedure.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I have heard the argument made that we ought to approve this irregular procedure because Mr. Shaughnessy is a nice man.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who is he?

Mr. MEADER. Does that establish a precedent so that all nice men in the Government ought to go to the Appropriations Committee and get their salaries raised?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If this amendment is rejected and if that action is hereafter considered a precedent, that is just what it does do. I too think I am a nice man, and I think if I could go to the Appropriations Committee and get the salaries of Congressmen and all Federal employees reduced, while I might not be popular, we might slow down this threatened inflation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must disagree with my two delightful friends, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. They surely have been persistent about this little thing which would cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of $3,600. They were advised beforehand by me by telephone that the committee had unanimously agreed to take this action and insert this language in the bill because it originated in the mind of whom? In the mind of the Commissioner of Immigration, General Swing. The language was handed to the subcommittee and inserted in the bill.

On yesterday when a rule was sought both these distinguished gentlemen appeared before the Rules Committee in writing in the morning and in person in the afternoon, and opposed the granting of the rule. The rule was then granted by the Rules Committee. They opposed the adoption of the rule earlier today, and the rule was adopted by the House. Now they have their third bite at the cherry.

I want to point out first that this language which I shall read is presently the law because it was in this same appropriation bill at this time a year ago, the 1956 supply bill for the Department of Justice. It is the law of the land today. The gentleman from Tennessee well knows that this does not apply to any six employees, although six are mentioned in this language, because without any objection on the part of either of these gentlemen a year ago there was included in the bill this language:

> That the compensation of the five assistant commissioners shall be at the rate of grade GS–16 as long as the positions are filled by the present incumbents.

So that a year ago the scale of GS–16 was set up for five assistant commissioners of immigration and naturalization.

Some six weeks ago the Congress saw fit to pass and the President to sign a bill permitting retired Generals Howard and Partridge to become assistant commissioners of immigration. Is it not common sense that they should be at the same level as the other assistant commissioners, making five at grade GS–16?

With regard to Mr. Shaughnessy, as was pointed out earlier by the distinguished majority leader, he was previously an assistant commissioner of immigration himself and went to New York to take the district directorship because it is one of the most important jobs in the Immigration Service.

The committee has been fair about this thing. The new language is set forth in the report. The whole business amounts to something in the neighborhood of $3,600—a $1,000 in the case of Mr. Shaughnessy and about $1,290 each in the other two cases.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, it is not a question of how many dollars will be saved or spent. The question is do you think now, just between you and me and leaving the rest of them out of it—do you think this kind of procedure is fair to the other legislative committees?

Mr. ROONEY. I think so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, then.

Mr. ROONEY. I think they were given notice. I think it is the right thing to do under these circumstances because these men might not get GS 16 for the next 9 months or even years. Now is the time to do something which should be done. This is approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, General Swing, and supported by the entire committee and approved by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. About a month ago, we had these two bills here pertaining to Brigadier Generals Howard and Partridge. When the bill was debated on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in their arguments on behalf of these bills made much of the fact that General Partridge's retired salary was $9,688 and his salary in the civilian position would be $11,610 and the retired salary of General Howard was $8,875 and the salary in the civilian position that he was to occupy would be $11,610. They indicated that to employ General Partridge on a full-time basis would cost the Government only $1,922 a year and that to employ General Howard would cost only $2,907. Now, just after understanding what was given to us, it is proposed to increase the salaries of these two retired generals by another $1,290.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot find fault with that statement. That is exactly what you would be doing. That is exactly what the committee is in agreement on. That is exactly the reason the Committee on Rules gave us the rule waiving points of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will not impose overlong on the time of the Members. Perhaps, I should have been content having asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] whether he thought this was fair or not—perhaps, I should have been content with his answer. But, then, on going to the back of the Chamber my ever-alert colleague from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] called by attention to something.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I tried to be fair. The gentleman can recall when I was but one of a few around here who supported him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not saying that you were not fair. I do not recall the support, but assume the gentleman is correct as to that and am grateful. I am trying to accept your judgment, but my natural contrariness prevents. As I was saying, I went to the back part of the Chamber and my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan

[Mr. BENTLEY], who is always on the job, aware of what is doing, called my attention to another paragraph in this bill.

I am wondering now just how far the Committee on Appropriations wants to go in attempting to legislate and to determine policy.

As was stated before, action on this amendment is not an issue of how many dollars will be saved or how many will be wasted. The issue is as to legislative procedure. Listen to this language and read it yourself because it seems almost unbelievable to me that Appropriations should go out of its way to fix foreign policy without authorization from Foreign Affairs Committee. On page 16, line 16, section 110, reads:

It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

What has that to do with appropriations? How many dollars does that language provide for anyone or any agency to spend?

Mr. ROONEY. What is wrong with that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What business is it of those on the Committee on Appropriations to say who should be admitted to the United Nations?

Mr. ROONEY. What is wrong with that language? Surely the gentleman does not want Red China in the United Nations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now wait a minute. Let me talk—no, of course, I do not want Red China in the United Nations. I do not want any part of the United Nations at all, if you want to discuss that point. The Congress can and should vote legislation for the United States of America. U. N. has no legal right to write laws casting burdens imposing obligations on citizens of the United States of America. I do not want any part of U. N. or any other one world organization. But what law, or rule, or policy gives the Committee on Appropriations authority to advise the House on foreign policy? How do they get over into the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and tread on their toes? Does Appropriations want Foreign Affairs abolished or its authority just reduced?

I see our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] here as usual. The first thing Veterans Administration knows this Committee on Appropriations will be legislating for your veterans. Then you will hear some squawks—pardon me, not squawks but then you will hear some ladylike language that will really burn your ears and the back of your neck, down your back to your waistline, and it will be effective.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. PRESTON. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this language to which he referred on page 16 was put in this bill some years ago as the result of an amendment being offered on the floor of the House during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not care how it got in there. The point is that Appropriations has been invading the jurisdiction of 2 or 3 other legislative committees and now it is after the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Civil Service and Post Office, which are by this provision directly overruled.

Mr. GROSS. And on page 16 there is another provision which says that "rates may be fixed without regard to any provision of law in limitation."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The argument I am trying to make is to prove the point that the Committee on Appropriations is stepping over by or through one provision or another into the jurisdiction of other legislative committees. If the House wants to go across the board, let us do it not by invading one committee, then another. Just abolish the legislative committees and let it go at that. The legislative job is just too big for Appropriations or any other single committee; but if that be the decision of the House, let us do it by one clean, bold beheading, not piece by piece—degrading, humiliating, first one committee, then one by one all others.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not correct, because there was inserted in this bill on a rollcall vote the language which I pointed out at page 16. The gentleman sat here this afternoon and heard the Clerk read the bill for amendment. No one objected to the language, and it is now in the bill.

With regard to this great matter that concerns just three people and about $3,600 of the taxpayers' money, I venture to say that you have used ten or twelve thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money in opposing it this afternoon. The time has come to have a vote. The committee is willing to abide by the judgment of the Members of the House.

I ask for a vote Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 79, noes 58.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 90, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings and facilities

For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, $1,425,000: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Illinois:

On page 23, line 16, after the word "facilities", strike out "existing" and insert in lieu thereof the word "for."

And in line 18, strike out "$1,425,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,925,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to correct an injustice being done to the Bureau of Prisons. My amendment is to provide for the construction of a maximum-custody institution to relieve the present strain on our prison system.

Mr. Bennett, the Director of Prisons, has said the situation existing at these institutions is critical. There are only 4 maximum-security type prisons in the country. These are Alcatraz, Atlanta, Leavenworth, and McNeil Island.

On page 314 of the hearings a statement as of the end of fiscal year 1955 shows that we had approximately 1,700 prisoners over capacity in these institutions. Atlanta exceeds its capacity by 500; Leavenworth by 600. These figures change from day to day varying by institutions. But the totals remain approximately the same. It is impossible for the prisons to handle any additional prisoners at any of the maximum-security type prisons.

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of the Federal Prison System have we ever had a riot or major disturbance. This can only be maintained by adequate facilities. We have had riots and disturbances in other types of jails and prisons throughout the various States, but we have never had a riot at a Federal institution. I hope that the Members will recognize the urgent need for this institution and vote for this amendment so that we can maintain the good record which has been maintained by our Bureau of Prisons. Construction should be started now when there are no riots to cope with. It should be done in an orderly fashion.

There are more men today coming to prison than 10 years ago, and they are staying longer. The parole rate is also down. During the past 5 years, the number of prisoners serving sentence of 5 years or more has increased 26 percent. It is conservatively estimated that the Federal prison population will reach 23,400 by 1960 an increase over the 1955 average of 3,400.

This appropriation, if approved, will provide facilities for an additional 600 prisoners. Our offenders have increased by 4,000 since the last medium-security prison was constructed. The most recent maximum-custody Federal institution was built in 1902. That was Atlanta and that is 54 years ago. Alcatraz was built 87 years ago. The Director of the Bureau of Prisons has made a detailed study of the needs and has endeavored to develop a program of orderly institutional construction.

Four years ago, Mr. Bennett first requested clearance for this project. Since that time the Department of Justice and

the Bureau of the Budget opposed this construction with the argument that this would raise Government expenditures and prevent a balanced budget.

This year, they are unable to make such an argument. This appropriation was approved by the Bureau of the Budget for a supplemental appropriation bill 1 year ago, but the Committee on Appropriations failed to include this project in the general appropriation bill. However, the Senate included money for the purpose for acquisition of a site and planning for construction of this institution. In conference, this provision was stricken.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it is our responsibility to include this appropriation this year, and although I am confident it will be included by the other body, I feel that such a good argument has been made by the Bureau of Prisons that this should be included by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this is the 25th anniversary of the Bureau of Prisons. I do not believe that we should celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Bureau of Prisons which has provided the best prison system in the world by denying this appropriation which would have the effect of throwing a bomb into the center of our prison system.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. The gentleman in his very forceful talk in support of this amendment mentioned the numerous riots which occurred in local prisons and penitentiaries and the fact that there were none in Federal penitentiaries. Is it not true that one of the principal reasons for those riots was the overcrowded conditions of local penitentiaries?

Mr. MACK of Illinois. That was certainly true in Illinois and, I think, was also true in other penitentiaries where they had riots in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. There is a question in my mind whether we might be usurping a legislative prerogative.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, was going to offer this very important amendment, but out of respect for my senior colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] I decided to support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment just offered would allow the Department of Justice an appropriation of $9½ million to build a much-needed maximum security penitentiary somewhere in the United States.

Under the 5-minute rule, I, of course, will not have time to give all of the many reasons why this amendment should be adopted today; however, the need is imperative. The request comes from President Eisenhower, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Prisons, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget in their request to the Appropriations Committee. A maximum security penitentiary is needed to relieve the dangerous overcrowding of penitentiaries that house prisoners convicted of serious offenses. Maximum security penitentiaries are now located at Alcatraz, Calif., Atlanta, Ga., Leavenworth, Kans., and the main institution at McNeil Island, in Washington State. The total capacity of these institutions is 5,175. As of April 12 of this year, they were housing 6,304 prisoners, an overcrowding of 1,129 prisoners convicted of serious offenses and who cannot safely be housed in other than maximum security institutions because of their bad records. This proposed maximum security institution would help relieve this situation. In addition to the present need, the Federal courts are imposing longer sentences and increasing numbers of offenders are being committed for more serious crimes. This excess population of over 1,000 prisoners in the maximum security penitentiaries cannot be taken care of at the medium security penitentiaries.

It has been admitted by the Bureau of Prisons that some of their medium security penitentiaries throughout the United States are not at capacity. However, these institutions are definitely not suitable for housing the hardened criminal and, above all, subject him to living with some person who has been convicted of a less serious crime. The hardened criminal definitely must be separated. I am sure no one would propose that we subject some young American boy who has been convicted of stealing an automobile to living in a cell with some cold-blooded murderer such as the one who shot and killed the innocent service-station attendant last week here in Washington.

Overcrowding institutions housing the more serious type of prisoners is one of the major factors for riots and other disturbances. It is folly to wait until the need for this type institution is brought home to us by some major disturbance such as has happened in a number of institutions.

If this amendment is adopted and the money is allowed, it will take 3 years to build this proposed prison. With the already overcrowded facilities and the increase in the number of hardened criminals, we are late in building this institution as the matter now stands.

Mr. Chairman, there has not been a maximum Federal penitentiary built since 1902. Think of that—54 years with the same crowded and outmoded facilities.

The Bureau of Prisons had requested the Appropriations Committee for $17 million which would have allowed the maximum security penitentiary, plus $7½ million for a close custody reformatory for youthful offenders. This institution is also very badly needed; however, as a compromise we have only offered an amendment for the maximum security penitentiary because I believe of the two it is the more important.

I want to be perfectly frank and honest with the Committee in saying that if this appropriation is allowed, I propose to try to have the penitentiary built somewhere in my congressional district of southern Illinois, which is near the center of population. However, I want further to be frank with the Committee and say that a committee will be appointed to select the best location that can be found. I only feel that we should be in the running when a selection is ready to be made.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Let me say that I am in support of the amendment. I think the gentleman would have a logical reason to suggest its being built in southern Illinois because I understand that one of the requirements is that it will be on Government-owned land.

Mr. GRAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. PRICE. And there is an ample quantity of Government-owned land available in southern Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. That is a good point and I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. We have 180,000 acres of Government-owned land in my district. In addition, we have scores of cities that are willing to put up funds to buy a site and donate it free of charge to the Government, on which to build this proposed institution.

I want to say this very, very sincerely, in closing. In the interest of security and to insure adequate facilities to house the hardened criminals and in order to prevent the mixing of these hardened criminals with those who are convicted of less serious offenses and in an effort to assist the good, deserving people of southern Illinois or some other locality, I beg of you to support the Department of Justice and vote in the affirmative on this amendment.

Let me say further in closing that we have in southern Illinois 51,000 people receiving Government surplus food. We are spending a million dollars a month for public-aid assistance. This is only a $9½ million institution. It would employ approximately 500 persons and we could pay for the institution by a saving of expenditures now being paid to relief recipients. I beg of you to support the amendment. Thank you.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendment.

In support of this amendment I would like to say that in the last session of the Congress the Department of Justice asked for an appropriation of $9,500,000 in a supplemental appropriation bill. Even though this request had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Committee did not see fit to approve the amount requested.

Now, again, in this session of the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget approved $9,500,000 for a maximum security prison, to take care of the most hardened and vicious criminals, which the committee again failed to approve.

After going into this matter with the superintendent of the Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Bennett and his assistant, Mr. Alexander, I have secured the following information:

They tell me that they are badly overcrowded in the Federal prison at Atlanta, Ga., are also overcrowded in the Federal prison at Leavenworth, Kans., and at McNeil Island, Washington State. They say that because of this overcrowding

that they have had to put major criminals in camps and other institutions which was very bad prison practice; that if funds were provided in the amount of $9,500,000, they would expect to build a 600 man maximum security prison somewhere in the central Mississippi Valley—probably in south central Illinois, or probably in Missouri.

When I made some inquiry of the members of the subcommittee handling this matter, they raised the objection that the Department of Justice had not told them where they wanted to build the prison; that they saw no reason for appropriating before they had found a spot where they wanted to build it.

They also gave another reason that considering the prison population they were not convinced that a new prison was necessary.

In answer to the first question as to location, it is the policy of the Department of Justice to have a commission appointed, which, under the direction of the Department of Justice, will go out into the area referred to and after conferring with the officials of local cities who are interested in securing the location of the prison in their areas, and after considering what the various cities that are interested in securing the location have to offer in the way of transportation, housing, and other requirements, this committee, or commission, will decide where the prison can best be located to serve its purpose at the least expense to the Government.

This is a policy that the administration has followed before, as the Congress well knows, in locating Federal institutions, and it is a wise one in the interest of the Government.

The facts are that Mr. Bennett told me a year ago that his Department, cooperating with the Justice Department, would make no effort to decide on the location of such a prison until the Congress had showed sufficient interest in it by making a very substantial appropriation, if not the entire amount requested.

I think we can all agree that the Department's position with reference to such a location is tenable, and is just good business. We are confronted with this condition. The Department of Justice tells us that they are overcrowded by 1,100 in the major maximum security penitentiaries now, and it is possible, even though we hope crime will not increase, that by the time this prison could be constructed and readied for occupancy, we may be overcrowded by 1,500.

I do not think it is good economy to delay and put off the building of this institution because I think we must concede labor will not get cheaper, and there is little prospect that material will get cheaper. There is every prospect that if the building of this institution is delayed for another year or two, it will cost probably $1 million or $2 million more than it will cost if the Congress approves the appropriation in this session—so that a site could then be determined, and contracts for its construction let.

By delaying it we will lose money because the costs will go higher. By delaying it we will continue the overcrowding of present prison institutions, which is not good prison practice.

I hope the Members of the House will respect the wishes of these three executive departments to which I refer, and do the necessary thing we should do in voting for this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. This is an appropriation bill. As I understand, this is a move to establish a new prison in the State of Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. No, not in the State of Illinois. They said when they announced it, somewhere near the center of population. The center of population does happen to be in my district.

Mr. DONDERO. Has this building ever been authorized by a legislative committee?

Mr. VURSELL. The purpose is to get this thing authorized and get it on the way now. That is why we have it here before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield, it is authorized.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, a maximum custody institution was designed to meet in part the overcrowding at the existing maximum security penitentiaries. These maximum security penitentiaries are at Alcatraz, Calif.; Atlanta, Ga.; Leavenworth, Kans.; and the main institution at McNeil Island, Wash. The total capacity of these institutions is 5,175. As of April 12 this year, they were housing 6,304 prisoners, an overloading of 1,129 prisoners convicted of serious offenses and who cannot safely be housed in other than maximum security institutions, because of their records and the fact that approximately 25 percent of them are wanted by other jurisdictions as escapees, parole violators for other charges. Obviously the opening of a woman's section at the Terminal Island institution will not in any way relieve this dangerous overcrowding, neither will the establishment of a new youth camp or a farm dormitory at the institution at Terre Haute, Ind.

The proposed maximum security institution would help relieve this critical situation. The Federal courts are imposing longer sentences, and increasing numbers of offenders are being committed for more serious crimes. This excess population of over 1,100 prisoners in the maximum security penitentiaries can not be taken care of at the medium security penitentiaries at Lewisburg, Pa., and Terre Haute, Ind., because those institutions are already at capacity and have a limited cell capacity, most of the inmates being housed in dormitories. Nor can these dangerous security risks be housed at the minimum custody correctional institutions, which incidentally are also overpopulated, nor at the reformatories or institutions for juveniles.

Overcrowding in institutions housing the more serious type of prisoner is one of the major factors resulting in riots and other serious disturbances. It is folly to wait until the need for this type institution is brought home to us by some major disturbances such as have happened in a number of State institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to oppose the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I agree with a good many things that have been said by the proponents of the amendment. I think a basis for compromise is very feasible here. It has been mentioned that these facilities are very badly needed and that our prisons are overcrowded. Some reference has been made that one of the four maximum security penitentiaries be located in Leavenworth, Kans. That is very true. I know the situation at Leavenworth and am very familiar with it since it is in my district. It has been mentioned that this new prison should be located in the center of population. Leavenworth would qualify on that basis. Objections have been raised on the basis that this has never been authorized. If these expanded facilities were permitted to be built at Leavenworth, no authorization would be needed. It would just be an expansion of the existing facilities. The record at Leavenworth administrativewise is infallible. There have been very few escapes and no riots over the past fifty-and-some-odd years. So, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment should be voted down and then immediately an amendment should be offered to expand the existing facility in Leavenworth, Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that there is no decision as yet as to the definite location of this institution. There is, however, testimony before the Committee on Appropriations that this new facility is necessary. It has been recommended by the Bureau of Prisons. Authority exists under the law to construct it. We are not debating today where it should be located.

The question of location arises from the previous testimony to the effect that it would probably be built near the center of population. Statistics show that an area in Illinois is regarded as the center of population, but that does not pinpoint this institution in any particular State.

The Bureau of Prisons has indicated the proposed new prison should be near the center of population. It could be built in Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, or any one of a number of Midwest States and still be near the center of population.

I urge approval of the amendment to provide necessary funds for the construction of the institution, the need for which has been established after thorough study. The location is to be de-

termined by a commission. Personally, I recommend southern Illinois, where there is adequate Federal land available and which will meet all the other requirements set forth by the Bureau of Prisons.

May I emphasize the point that the Budget has approved the project. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK]. Naturally, as I have said, I hope the new prison will be located in Illinois.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. I just wanted to call to the attention of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], the fact that at the present time they have 508 hardened criminals in Leavenworth over their normal capacity. So it is a good possibility that your constituents may have some of them for dinner one of these days.

Mr. PRICE. Yes. Location at Leavenworth would not solve the problem. There is already a Federal prison there. Neither would expansion at Leavenworth meet the need as explained to the Appropriations Committee by the Bureau of Prisons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee has unanimously seen fit to delete the requested appropriation for this institution, as well as the other institution included in the budget estimate, for practically the same reasons as it did a year ago. We now find the additional facts that the prison population has gone down in the past year, and has thus proved the good judgment of the committee a year ago, and that criminal filings, according to the judiciary, have likewise fallen off in the past year.

Why anyone would want a Federal penitentiary in his district is beyond me. But there is no assurance, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, or anyone else who may like to have a prison in his district, that it will be located in southern Illinois or any definite place. I think that until such time as the Department of Justice advises the Congress as to where it proposes to locate the institution and on what terms, whether there will be donated local land without cost to the Federal taxpayers—what sort of an institution it will be in detail, that we should not approve this request.

A year ago when they estimated the present prison population they overstated it by 800 prisoners, as is shown at page 308 of the testimony in the volume entitled "Department of Justice." Mr. Bennett, at page 235 said:

> We are not going to reach our population estimate of 21,400.
>
> Mr. ROONEY. You missed it by about 800?
>
> Mr. BENNETT. Yes, sir.

Now if you will turn to the hearings at page 318 of the Department of Justice volume, wherein they show the total number of maximum-custody-type prisoners confined at the three maximum-custody institutions outside of Alcatraz, namely, Atlanta, Leavenworth, and McNeil Island, you will find there are 1,335 places for maximum-custody inmates not now being occupied by such inmates. This institution, at a cost of over $9 million, would provide for 600 inmates, whereas you presently have 1,335 places for maximum-custody prisoners. In addition, you have the institution at Sandstone, Minn., which has a capacity, as I recall, of about 600 inmates. It is a prison presently owned by the Federal Government, and under its agreement with the State of Minnesota it could be retaken just for the asking; still we have this request for $9 million.

I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the chairman in opposition to the amendment.

This is a matter to which the subcommittee gave very prayerful consideration. The membership was not unmindful of the problem of prisoners. It gave this the closest consideration, and, after long deliberation, reached the conclusion that there was no necessity for an additional appropriation at this time beyond the funds providing for a new youth camp, opening of the women's section at Terminal Island, and increase of the dormitory at Terre Haute. The result is that the total new capacity has been increased in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. So there may be no misunderstanding of that let me repeat that in the instant bill are provisions, as the gentleman has stated, for a new youth camp, a new women's section at Terminal Island, and a new dormitory at Terre Haute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACK of Illinois) there were—ayes 26, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 206. Appropriations for the current fiscal year for "Salaries and expenses, general administration," "Salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation," "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service," and "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," shall be available for uniforms and allowances therefor as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1114), as amended.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: On page 26, line 7, following the words "as amended", add a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 207. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the prosecution of any violation of section 335 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, when the entire crop of wheat grown on a farm was used for seed, feed, or food on such farm."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, for more than a year the Secretary of Agriculture and many Members of Congress have been urging an amendment to the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt from marketing quota penalties excess wheat that is grown solely for use as seed, feed, or food on the farm.

The other body, in response to the Secretary's request, adopted such a bill in March 1955. The House Agriculture Committee has refused to report this bill, or any House bill, on the subject. The problem is growing more acute and something must be done.

I feel that many Members have had experience with this unfair and unnecessary restriction on our farmers.

The case of Miss Elsie Mumma, of Hummelstown, Pa., has been reported in papers all over the Nation, because Miss Mumma has armed herself and defied the Federal Government to penalize her for raising 24 acres of wheat for her own use.

A monastery and an orphanage in Georgia have run afoul of the law, even though all of the wheat they grow is used for food in those institutions. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUIGLEY] pointed out in House committee hearings, public institutions of the State of Pennsylvania, accustomed to growing wheat for use as flour in hospitals, sanitariums, and penal institutions, are handicapped.

Countless cases can be cited of individual farmers who for years have followed a practice of crop rotation, including wheat, using all of the grain produced for feed and seed on their own farms. A man who customarily devoted 20 acres to wheat each year, and whose allotment is cut to 14 acres, finds his rotation is thrown out of balance, he is short of feed and straw, and he cannot understand why the Federal Government should interfere with his operation so long as he never has, and never will, sell even a kernel of the wheat produced.

This is the situation that needs correction. In view of the attitude of the committee, it appears that the only possible solution is the adoption of my amendment.

When a farmer is found to be growing in excess of 15 acres of wheat, and in excess of his acreage allotment, the law imposes a penalty which can be satisfied in several ways. He can plow under the excess acreage before a stated deadline. He can harvest it and store it under bond until such time as marketing quotas no longer are in effect. He can pay a cash penalty, which varies according to the parity price of wheat. If he refuses to do any of these, the Secretary of Agriculture has no alternative under the law but to refer the case to the Department of Justice.

The constitutionality of the law was upheld in 1942 by the Supreme Court decision in the case of Wickard against Filburn.

Secretary Benson, as I have indicated, does not wish to prosecute farmers whose violation consists of growing a few acres of wheat for their own use.

Department of Agriculture officials have pointed out that this penalty on such farmers is bad publicity for the Department, for our Government, and for the agricultural program itself. In a recent case, decided in favor of the Government, the Federal judge himself referred to the "embattled farmer." It is

natural to have sympathy with a man who is minding his own business and suffering from Government interference. It is natural for a farmer to want to be king of his own quarter section and to expect freedom so long as nothing he does interferes with the rights of others.

Lest anyone think that large amounts of wheat are involved, let me point out that the most recent figures show that in 65.2 percent of the cases processed the acreage involved was less than 30 acres. In only 19.2 percent did it exceed 40 acres. This excess production, fed on the farm, is not going to throw the whole wheat program out of kilter. The restriction and the penalty, however, are a serious blow to the farmer who is trying to operate his small acreage on a self-sustaining basis.

At this point in my remarks, I wish to read the list showing the number of cases reported in 1954 and 1955, all involving excess wheat used solely for feed, food and seed on the producing farm:

CASES IN WHICH MARKETING QUOTA PENALTIES WERE INCURRED WHERE ALL OF THE WHEAT PRODUCED ON THE FARM WAS USED SOLELY AS FOOD, FEED, OR SEED

During the 1954 and 1955 crop years the number of cases in which marketing quota penalties were incurred, where all of the wheat produced on the farm was used solely as food, feed, or seed, is estimated by the State agricultural stabilization and conservation committee State offices to be 1,899. These cases, by States, are as follows:

State	1954	1955
New York	120	56
New Jersey	16	10
Pennsylvania	185	52
Ohio	100	60
Indiana	51	15
Illinois	28	17
Michigan	75	25
Wisconsin	9	7
Minnesota	2	2
Iowa	16	6
Missouri	133	108
South Dakota	1	0
Nebraska	24	16
Kansas	27	31
Maryland	7	17
Virginia	43	25
West Virginia	10	6
North Carolina	29	11
South Carolina	40	5
Georgia	8	3
Kentucky	63	26
Tennessee	14	3
Arkansas	1	3
Oklahoma	15	5
Texas	11	2
Montana	39	46
Idaho	24	19
Wyoming	2	7
Colorado	5	7
New Mexico	2	4
Utah	90	65
Washington	12	9
Oregon	8	3
California	9	9
Total, United States	1,219	680

Members will note that 34 States are involved.

As of March 1, 1956, 193 of these cases had been referred to the United States attorneys for court action.

There is a related problem which could also be solved by this amendment. The law requires the Agriculture Department to measure fields, and the courts have upheld the Department's right to do so. Many farmers, however, consider this an invasion of their property and of their freedom. Their objection is most frequently stated on the grounds that they do not sell wheat. They use it on their own farms for their poultry, dairy herd, or hogs. We are going to have more bad publicity for the Federal farm program as the Department is forced to act against more farmers on this score. Last year there were 57 such cases in Ohio alone. I feel certain, and the Department shares my view, that this resistance to measurement and the consequent conflict between citizen and the Government will fade if no penalty is attached to excess wheat for farm use.

I have read the many arguments of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and his colleagues on the committee who fear that this action would lead to a considerable increase in the production of wheat. The best information and advice I can get leads me to believe the contrary. The complaints come not from people who want to go into large-scale wheat production but from farmers whose historic operations require 3, 4, or 5 additional acres of wheat to balance their rotation and feeding scheme.

It seems to me that it is a shame that any man can face fine and imprisonment for growing something for his own use. I am certain the general public reaction is similar to my own. Insofar as this situation reflects unfavorably upon the entire wheat program, it is in the interest of the constituents of the gentleman from Kansas, and all others who favor the farm program, to correct the injustice.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not particularly like this method of approaching a problem of this kind, because it does set an undesirable precedent in saying that funds shall not be used to prosecute a particular offender. This is an unusual situation, however, where these small farmers are being brought into court and assessed a penalty for growing wheat and using it on their own farms. Those of us who are interested in this problem have not been able to get any relief in any other way. I shall, therefore, support the gentleman's amendment because it does accomplish the purpose of relieving the small farmers from this obligation which was never intended, in my judgment, when this law was passed.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his observation. May I say to the gentleman that we have cases in the State of Georgia, for instance, involving an institution down there where they attempted to grow wheat for food for the inmates of the institution, the Monastery, I think it is called. They have been caught in this web. This was grown for their own institution on their own farm. We have many cases of similar nature. We have them in the State of Pennsylvania, we have them in Ohio, where the small farmers are being caught up in this web and brought into Federal court.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I understood the gentleman to say that these people were charged with a crime. The gentleman does not mean they are charged with a crime. The gentleman understands that these are civil cases to collect penalties, does he not?

Mr. BOW. I understand there is also a criminal penalty.

Mr. KEATING. While it is true it is a civil claim involving a penalty, yet if they do not pay up they might later go to jail.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOPE. They do not go to jail.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They go to jail for contempt. Did you ever hear of that? If you do not obey a court order, you go to jail.

Mr. HOPE. These are civil suits.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So is a divorce suit; but if you do not pay alimony, you go to jail.

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I was merely going to ask for the regular order. The gentleman from Michigan was getting a little bit involved down there.

Mr. BOW. It seems everyone was getting involved, and that is unfortunate for these small farmers when they find themselves a bit involved. They are greatly involved by the Federal Government coming in and enforcing an order against their free use of the land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from New York is completely mistaken. I was not speaking for myself. I was not sympathetic toward those folks who do not support their wives and their children. That is all I was thinking of.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do feel that this is one way in which we can protect the small farmer who has been faced with this serious problem, and by the limitation of the use of the fund we now can. We have done it before. We did it for some years in the State of California in the Santa Margarita case. We have a precedent for it. There is ample authority and precedent for it, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment. I have had a great deal of trouble in my State about this very problem. We have people who raise chickens, who feed a few cattle or cows on their place; they raise a little wheat, and, by George, the first thing you know, they are hauled into court because they have raised wheat to feed their own livestock; people who never made a habit of selling wheat; they never sold a bushel of wheat; they planted their own wheat; they harvested their own wheat. They feed it to their own chickens and never a pound of it goes on the market. It never comes off the farm, and the only way they get off the farm is when they haul them up and threaten them with a jail sentence or a fine for raising the food to feed their own family and their own chickens. Is that not absurd? I want to say that I have talked to a num-

ber of members of the Committee on Agriculture who have been sympathetic to this suggestion, and I am informed that in the bill which passed the House, in the conference report, in the late bill that was vetoed, that that provision was in there taking care of these small farmers. I was told by a member of the Committee on Agriculture who was for the proposal that it was contained in that conference report.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Those people will not be brought into court or be haled up unless they are violating the law; is that not correct; a law passed by this Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We want to make an exception to the law to say a fellow can raise at least enough wheat on the farm to feed himself and his family and his chickens.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You are only making an exception for one item, that is all, by this amendment. I am surprised that the gentleman from Virginia would want to evade a law passed by this Congress, by holding up the funds necessary to enforce the law.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, as I understand the amendment, all I want to do is to let this fellow feed his chickens, his cattle, and his family. If this amendment does that, I am for it. If it does not, I want one that does.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman should become acquainted with what the amendment does, because it does not do what I think the gentleman thinks it does. It only applies to one item.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, I have great confidence in the gentleman from Missouri, and I hope he will offer an amendment to the amendment which will straighten that out.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. This amendment simply says that none of the funds appropriated for the Department of Justice shall be used to prosecute these little fellows that feed wheat to their own stock and their own poultry and the result of it is that, if we adopt this amendment, Congress has spoken and has in effect amended the congressional intent which now, as it reads, would cause these people to be subject to a penalty.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I would like to read the exact language:

> When the entire crop of wheat grown on the farm is to be used for seed, feed or food on such farm.

That does just what the gentleman said he wanted done.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That sounds like plain language to me.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wrong way to amend legislation. I think every one of us will agree to that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], a distinguished lawyer, has said that he did not like this way of approaching the matter, and I do not believe any lawyer or any Member of the House for that matter would believe that this back-door method is the right approach.

But I am not going to talk any more about that. I want to go to the merits of the question which is basically involved here. It is charged that there are a lot of small farmers who are being criminally prosecuted and fined because they grew more than 15 acres of wheat.

That is not the fact. These are civil cases to collect penalties from farmers who have exceeded their marketing quotas. The law, as a matter of fact, is very generous. It provides that any farmer who has never grown a bushel of wheat on his land before may grow 15 acres of wheat without paying any penalty whatever. Members know that with the use of fertilizer this means from 400 to 500 bushels of wheat that may be grown even with moderate yields. This provision was placed in the law to protect the noncommercial wheat growers. It does protect him adequately. Do not tell me that a man who grows more than four or five hundred bushels of wheat is a small farmer who is not engaged in commercial operations.

In addition to that, he may grow all the corn, and all the rye, and all the barley, and all the oats that he wants for food and livestock feed, because there are no marketing quotas on any of these crops. So no one is suffering; no one is being persecuted. No criminal offense is being charged, nor can there be. These are simply civil suits and you would be surprised, perhaps, if I told you, in view of all the furor that we have had here today, that there were only 1,219 of these cases in 1954 and only 680 cases in 1955 out of over a million and half wheat growers in the United States. By this I mean that, according to figures furnished the Committee on Agriculture by the Department, there were only this number of cases in each of these years in which marketing quota penalties were incurred where all the wheat produced on the farms was used solely for food, seed, and feed. In most of these cases the penalties have been or will be collected by administrative action. As of March 1, 1956, only 143 suits had been filed. In all probability most of these cases will be settled without trial since the law is clear.

Now, in order to prevent the United States district attorneys from doing their duty under the law, this amendment is suggested to save a few farmers from paying a civil penalty because they grow more than the 15 acres of wheat which the law permits them to grow without any penalty when marketing quotas are in effect. Why adopt this method which everybody agrees is the wrong way of approaching this matter in order to save a few farmers from paying the penalty which they have incurred. Is this fair to the more than a million and a half farmers who grew wheat and stayed within the provisions of the law? In my opinion, if you adopt this amendment, it will mean an entire breakdown of the wheat program.

Let me call attention to the fact that we do not have such a provision in the case of any other commodity under marketing quotas. Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts cannot exceed their allotments in the slightest degree without paying a penalty, but a farmer may grow 15 acres of wheat where he has no allotment at all.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Under this proposal, what would keep a grower of 10,000 acres of wheat from qualifying?

Mr. HOPE. Nothing in the world. It would break down the program.

Mr. ALBERT. This is not a little-farmer's amendment. It is a big-farmer's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. These 3 million farmers to whom the gentleman has referred, and those referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] would be subject to this amendment if they fed all of that wheat on their own farm. This amendment is limited to those who use all of that feed on their own farm, and that, in general, would be only the relatively small farmer.

Mr. HOPE. It would have the effect of breaking down the entire wheat program and I think you might be surprised at how many large growers might take advantage of it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that anybody who is going to feed four or five hundred bushels of wheat in his farm as feed must be in the commercial feeding business? He has probably a flock of 40,000 chickens. He is not feeding simply the old lady's hens with 500 bushels of wheat. And he is not grinding up 500 bushels of wheat to feed the kids flour, either; because there are not any such mills in this country. People buy their flour from commercial mills. You will not find flour being ground in this country to make biscuits and light bread any more. It is a commercial proposition if a man is selling more than the product of 15 acres of wheat.

Mr. HOPE. This in the main is a proposal to bail out a few large poultry growers. That is where most of the support for this proposal comes from. This amendment should be voted down, not only because it is the wrong approach to the matter but because the basic proposition itself has no intrinsic merit.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know I am not immoderately modest when I say that it is pretty well known here in the House of Representatives that I am not a farmer. Being from the sidewalks of New York,

I thought it best to sit back and listen to the highly intelligent and convincing words of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. I could never discuss the subject with the ability of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I can only add that this is not the right way to attack any problem. The law is on the statute books. It is the duty of the Attorney General to enforce it. This is an around-the-back-door method of trying to upset law enforcement. I do not think this House will approve the pending amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Kansas and for my distinguished colleague from New York. I, too, have no farmers in my district. We do not raise any wheat, so I am something of a lay observer. However, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I have talked with him, and I am personally in favor of his amendment. I hope the Committee will support it.

Mr. ROONEY. I was under the impression that the Attorney General, whose duty it is to enforce this law which is now on the statute books, was a constituent of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. In the first place, that is quite true, and I am proud of it. In the second place, it is irrelevant. In the third place, I am sure he would be delighted to be relieved of some of his duties.

Mr. KEATING. If the gentleman will yield, along that same line, the Attorney General is a great friend of mine and doing a magnificent job, as the gentleman from New York realizes.

Mr. ROONEY. Which gentleman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]?

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman who is acting as Attorney General, of course. But if we adopt this amendment he will no longer have the duty to enforce this particular phase of the law in this narrow area.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask my good friend from Kansas how many farmers were involved in this setup nationally? Just give me the figures.

Mr. HOPE. Twelve hundred in 1954 and 600 in 1955, as I get the figures from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GAVIN. Evidently most of them must be in my State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How could this amendment break down this whole picture if it is not affective?

Mr. GAVIN. I am unable to answer my very good, able friend from New York State, but I do know this that the gentleman from Kansas states that the Committee on Agriculture is going to take care of this matter which is so objectionable to many small farmers. Why do you not take care of it and do something about it? You have had plenty of time to work something out. Why do they make it necessary to come out on the floor of the House with this kind of amendment with which they seemingly are not too pleased.

Let us take a look at the record: 82,000 wheat allotments were established in the State of Pennsylvania. Out of this number there were 737—1954—excess-wheat cases. Of this number 675 satisfied their penalty either by storage or by payment of the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled, 47 of which are in the hands of the Attorney General.

Now, up in my district I have a farmer, a good farmer and a good citizen. This farmer who took his case up with me said, "I cannot understand what kind of a Government we have. I am not a big wheat farmer. All I want to do is grow wheat to take care of my family and on my farm to feed my livestock, and so forth. He does not know, with all the regulations heaped upon him, whether he is in the United States or Russia. He said, "I do not ask for any subsidy. I do not ask for any gratuities. I do not ask anything from the Government. Why does not the Government just leave me alone to run my own farm in my own way?" He does not want any restrictions. He does not want any regulations. He does not want any regimentation. He just wants Uncle Sam to mind his own business and let him do what he wants to do on his farm. But the Attorney General says, "No, we have a penalty against you and this must be satisfied either by storage or by payment of the penalty."

He was allocated 15 acres. But he evidently grew more wheat than the law allowed, and the law said that he shall pay the penalty. Some 675 Pennsylvania farmers did pay the penalty. There are 62 cases still unsettled and there are 47 more that are in the hands of the Attornew General at the time this letter from Comodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, was written in November of 1955. Therefore, the member of the Committee on Agriculture here today says you are going to upset the equilibrium of the whole agricultural program. So what? This farmer is a good American citizen. He says he does not want anything from Uncle Sam except to mind his own business. He wants to be left alone to take care of his family and his farm. I think he has a good point. It's a matter of principle with him. I too want the Government to cease interfering with the small farmers, with their restrictions, regulations and regimentation that strangulate the whole agricultural life of the Nation. I just want to say to the gentleman from Ohio who introduced a very timely amendment that it might cause the Committee on Agriculture to do something about it. Give some relief to the average small farmer, who is a small farmer. The average small farmer wants to do his part. He does not want to violate the law. He does not want to pay any penalty. He just wants to be left alone, to run his farm in his own way. The small farmer has just as much right as the big commercial farmer or any other farmer in this agricultural picture. If he accepts no subsidies or gratuities from the Government he should be permitted to grow at least that which he uses on his own farm and for his own family but if he were allowed to do that it would interfere with the big production of the big commercial farmer and would cut down his market.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. I think it should be pointed out that while there are only 1,200 cases of violations of this provision, there are probably 12,000 farmers in the United States who would like to grow extra wheat strictly for their own feed.

Mr. GAVIN. For their own use on their own farms.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. The importance of this measure is not restricted to just 1,200 farmers.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the small farmer is entitled to be considered if he is not violating the law and going out and selling his wheat in the open market. Here is the chance to help the little farmer who does not ask anything from anybody except to be left alone and be permitted to sow enough for his own farm and family. He asked me, "What kind of legislator are you? Can't you do something about it?" I Said, "You do not fully understand the agricultural situation of the Nation. When you get down here, brother, you are in a big agricultural ring and you cannot get very far pleading the case of the small independent farmer." But here comes my friend, the gentleman from Ohio—he offers an amendment that will give some relief to this little farmer. The average small farmer is a good American citizen with a family and he looks after his farm and his family and I am proud of him. He is not asking for any consideration other than that to which he believes he is entitled. He just wants to be left alone and not be restricted and regulated by the Government. We should leave him alone. I say let us support this ammendment and possibly the Committee on Agriculture may get busy and do something about changing this law which is working a hardship on the small farmer. Now I ask the Committee on Agriculture, "Why have you not been doing something about it? Now is your chance to show that we can do something about it." Let me say to the Members the day will come when you will regret having passed regulatory laws of restrictions and regimentation on agriculture. If you continue you will have a system and bureaucracy that will tell you what to do, when to do it, and how to do it by the Government. As for me I want no part of it. We did not build America on these kind of programs.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to take any time after the membership quite clearly is ready to vote, but I would point out in spite of all the pleas that have been made in the name of the small farmers if this action becomes the law, or if we set a precedent by adopting this amendment, what is to keep a man from buying a

6,000-acre farm and going in the cattle business and feeding his own wheat to his own cattle? He would be protected under this provision, as I read it. It would mean the complete destruction of the farm program and be an open invitation for a man to have a complete operation. I do not believe the House means to do that.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out that all these people wanted was to be left alone. Just a few moments ago we voted on some amendment about establishing new penal institutions in the United States. As far as I can figure it out not an inmate in any of those penal institutions in the whole United States wanted anything other than to be let alone. He just wanted to be let alone—that is all.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are you classing the farmers with the inmates of these institutions?

Mr. POAGE. I did not classify anybody.

Mr. WHITTEN. Those who are opposed to a farm program want to make it unworkable.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. What would be the reason for having the soil bank or a farm program bill if the farmers might grow all the corn he wanted to feed to his hogs?

Mr. WHITTEN. There would be none.

Mr. GAVIN. If he wants to grow, all right, but what I hear you boys pleading for the small farmers, but under the farm program you are getting into big business. Here is a little small farmer, there are six or seven hundred of them and they have been hailed into court by the Attorney General and they will either have to pay up or go to jail. Sixty-two cases are unsettled and fifty-seven have been settled. They have been threatened if they do not pay.

Mr. WHITTEN. Such enforcement is essential if you are going to keep any farm program. Not only that, but under the amendment here you are inviting all the big farmers to come under it too, because instead of growing corn and selling it they would still grow corn and feed it to their livestock. Then you have no farm program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, I have only spoken 3 or 4 times today. Can I not have 2 or 3 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]? [After a pause]. The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I make objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late.

The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been introduced by Congressman Bow, which would provide that the funds appropriated to the Justice Department would not be used in the prosecution of farmers who have exceeded the acreage restrictions for the planting of wheat so long as the grain harvested therefrom is used for seed or feed on the premises of the farmer.

I have the honor to represent the 15th District of Ohio and it has been brought to my attention many times that the farmers of that area look with considerable consternation upon a Federal Government which would restrict the activities conducted wholly upon the farm. It is not a question of marketing and adding to the commercial surplus by the Ohio farmer. This unnecessary intervention into their lives and activities is one resembling a dictator nation in saying how the farming process shall be conducted.

On March 2, 1955, I introduced H. R. 4570, a bill which would permit the farmers to raise as much wheat as they could use for seed or feed, notwithstanding acreage restrictions. My reason in offering it was to return to the farmers, freedom of operation which had been taken away from them. Following the introduction of that bill, I received volumes of mail expressing approval at the action I had taken and the hope that the Committee on Agriculture would consider such legislation favorably.

On June 1, 1955, the Committee on Agriculture held a hearing on my bill and other similar bills. Many members of this body have joined in this strike for agricultural freedom by introducing similar bills. The Secretary of Agriculture has expressed approval. The President of the United States as one of his nine points for an agricultural program, advocated the enactment of such legislation.

Nothing came of the hearing in 1955—the committee failed to act. Early in 1956, advocates of similar legislation were again given the opportunity to appear before the Agriculture Committee but no serious action has followed.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], in offering this amendment, has recognized the problem which exists in his district and in mine, in our State of Ohio, and the other general farming States of our country. Its adoption would mark a step forward in the direction of the bill which I have introduced and I trust that other members of the Committee and the House will agree that they will support this measure. I hope they will also conclude that the time will not be far distant when the Committee on Agriculture will realize the desires of the people and of the Congress and will conduct further hearings on the so-called wheat bills and will grant the relief requested and return to the farmers of America, freedom of operation which, to them, is entirely just and deserving.

May I point out that the people of the 15th District have recently given expression of their opinion on this particular question and asked by me in a questionnaire; 3,915 replies were received to this question—3,110 favorably or 79.6 percent of the poll sample favoring this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the Chair rule that my objection came too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so ruled.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would a preferential motion be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be if it is a preferential motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Would a motion to strike the enacting clause be a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. If in proper form.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 68, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Before the curtain goes down on this bill I think the Members ought to be made aware of the fact that there is provided in this bill $800,000—I repeat, $800,000—for representation allowance, and I think most of you know what that means; it is largely for whiskey, cocktail parties, entertainment.

On page 3 of the bill, line 17, it is provided that out of the millions of dollars here appropriated to the State Department and the various agencies connected with it, ice and drinking water for use abroad will be furnished. Apparently with $800,000 for "entertainment" the water is going to have something added.

On page 5, if you care to see where this money is provided in the bill, line 20, there is a $700,000 representation allowance and on page 9, under International Organizations and Conferences, there is provided another $100,000. I was very much interested in reading the hearings on this bill to find out that $44,857 will go for liquor for United States nationals who are loaned to NATO. Who they are, I do not know, but they are going to get $44,857.

Then on page 628 of the hearings we find "hospitality expenses of the United Nations" which means there is another $50,000 for entertainment, including liquor, for the "poobahs" of the U. N.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Would it be possible that the hundred thousand or fifty thousand the gentleman is talking about

is going to be used for making these tariff arrangements over there in Geneva?

Mr. GROSS. I would not be surprised if some of it would be used for that purpose.

During the hearings, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] questioned Mr. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary of State, concerning these cocktail parties and Mr. Henderson replied to him that "we do not call them cocktail parties, we call them afternoon receptions."

Then reading on page 460 of the hearings we find under answers elicited by questions of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that in the European area gin costs from $1 to $1.50 a bottle, and scotch whisky about $2 a bottle. With $800,000 plus—I do not know how much more of that money is distributed throughout the bill—they can buy a lot of liquor at those prices. Yes; at the prices they pay overseas the striped pants boys are going to get an awful lot of liquor because it was also developed in the testimony that they have been spending only about $5,000 out of this fund for ceremonial wreaths. In other words, about $5,000 out of $800,000 will go for ceremonial wreaths. The rest of it will go for cocktail parties and what will you have.

I do not know whether the junketing delegations last summer left any counterpart funds in foreign countries, but if they did the committee should have directed them to buy some of this booze out of counterpart funds, instead of the taxpayers putting up $800,000 in brand-new money, and that is a minimum, for these cocktail parties.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, one of the outstanding young Members of the House.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the statement he has made and I want to associate myself with his remarks. On the basis of my own observations, made while traveling in other countries, I am of the opinion that our people in those countries spend altogether too much money on entertainment and especially with regard to the whisky and cocktails referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. If my memory serves me correctly, it seems that when Khrushchev and Bulganin went to Burma, India, and Afghanistan last fall, these smiling despots made it clear that there would be no whisky served at official functions. The two buffoons were, of course, hypocritical in observing fundamental tenets of the religions in countries they visited, but perhaps they showed some good sense, after all, and it might be well if we would start showing greater respect for the peoples of other lands whose religions militate against the drinking of alcoholic beverages. Islamism, for example, strictly forbids the use of alcoholic beverages, but does our Government instruct its people in the Foreign Service to observe this basic religious principle in Moslem countries? No, and one cannot blame these people for wondering if we Americans really have any religious principles to which we faithfully adhere. Furthermore, our actions contribute to the growing impression abroad that we are just a bunch of Epicureans, out for a good time and with plenty of money to burn. Let the State Department instruct its people to serve orange juice and ice water and cut out the cocktails. This would constitute a saving of several hundred thousands of dollars to the American taxpayers, and it would cause our enemies and friends alike to have a greater respect for us, and perhaps we would start gaining ground instead of losing it everywhere in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. I would just like to say this: Last year there was appropriated $575,000 for the State Department for exactly this same purpose. This year we can readily find $800,000 . That is stepping up the liquor bill pretty fast, in my opinion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Gladly.

Mr. BYRD. If I am not greatly mistaken, I feel that some of the people in the embassies would like very much to get along with less spending of money for cocktails themselves, and I hope that if the people in the State Department read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will pass the word on down to some of these individuals. I had hoped to be on the floor in time to offer an amendment to strike this figure, but inasmuch as I was unable to be on the floor at that time because of a subcommittee meeting, if there is a roll call I intend to vote against the bill as a protest against such an unnecessary item of expense.

Mr. GROSS. And I want the RECORD to show my vote against the bill for the reason of this unthinkable spending of the taxpayer's money for fun, sport, and amusement, and for a number of other reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to announce that it is my intention to ask for a separate vote on the so-called Murray amendment adopted at page 22. I want to point out at this time that in opposing that amendment and bringing this bill before you with the language contained therein, which was stricken by the adoption of this amendment, I was merely carrying to the floor of the House what was given to me by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and the administration, and I intend to ask that we have another vote on it so as to see how many are going to stand up and support the administration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman talks about the administration approving this bill and then he is talking about a member of one of the commissions and not the administration as such.

Mr. ROONEY. He is one of the administrators, and he was a classmate of General Eisenhower at West Point.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The Bureau of the Budget did not pass on the problem and the Civil Service Commission has not passed on it; not even the committee on the floor of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed $6,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $1,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; purchase of space in publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in title 44, United States Code, section 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; purchase of caps for personnel employed abroad; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding 5 years of offices, building, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State; and purchase of objects

for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; $110 million, of which not less than $9 million shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personnel effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That funds may be exchanged for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of information establishments abroad without regard to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543): *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (40 U. S. C. 481 (c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed $1,350: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized in making contracts for the use of international shortwave radion stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of 1 year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Information Agency asked the Appropriations Committee for funds to convert an obsolete Navy aircraft carrier into a floating exhibit ship. The committee has placed a sentence in its report stating that it disapproves this item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that he favors this floating Cinerama?

Mr. JUDD. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. At a cost of $9 a head?

Is the gentleman serious about that?

Mr. JUDD. I am perfectly serious about it. I think this is one of the means by which we can perhaps win a few friends around the world instead of losing them as we have done too frequently. We spend millions of dollars at big fixed installations to reach relatively few people. This ship could reach far more and at less total cost.

But in any case I protest this method of legislating. If the committee had put language in the bill providing that none of the funds appropriated therein shall be used for this particular purpose, then we could offer an amendment to strike out that provision. But I do not like legislation in committee reports. I have protested this procedure on previous occasions, and I protest it today.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should not even attempt to explain the parliamentary situation to the gentleman. But all the gentleman need do, if he thinks that we should pay $9 a head to show Cinerama to the Cambodians on this flat-top, is to offer an amendment providing the amount deleted in the report. That will put it right before the House for its decision one way or the other.

Mr. JUDD. Putting language in the report is what you might call legislation by intimidation. It is not legally binding, but no administrator who wants to save his skin, I am sure, would defy the gentleman and his subcommittee.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the language of the report is binding.

Mr. JUDD. I think it could not be held so, legally. But doubtless it is just as effective as if it were in the bill, because no director of USIA who wanted to survive would dare ignore that language in the report.

Mr. Chairman, because this proposal has real merit, I believe, I want to describe it here and express the hope the Senate committee will consider it more favorably.

In the first place, it is not a boondoggle intended to bring fun and games to the Hottentots. It is a bold and imaginative idea to carry the American story to the people of Asia and Africa. Visually and dramatically we could portray American purposes and policies to large audiences in 104 ports of the Far East, Near East, and Africa.

The proposed carrier would be a converted Liberty ship from the mothball fleet with space on the flight deck for a Cinerama theater, seating 2,000 persons. In addition—and this is very important—there would be space for the showing of regular films, for industrial, educational, and cultural exhibits, and closed circuit television.

Among the exhibits would be the basic documents of the American system, such as replicas of the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. There would be graphic portrayals of many of the basic policies which guide this Nation. The atoms for peace idea and the President's proposal for open skies inspection would be presented. This would be truly an idea ship, not just a showboat. It would be a powerful instrument for telling America's story, for demonstrating our firm desire for peace in the world.

It would be a telling thrust at the international Communist conspiracy which uses any means, any device, to try to convince the world that we are the imperialists, bent on taking over the world. This idea represents communications and technique which the Soviets could not match.

All of us are familiar with Cinerama and the impression it gives the viewer of being in the middle of a panoramic action. Cinerama stole the show at the trade fairs in Damascus and Bangkok. At Bangkok, the Soviet Union had 242 crates on the fairgrounds. At the last minute, when they saw our exhibit plans, including Cinerama, they did not bother to unpack the crates. They withdrew from the fair.

The United States has always been a Nation successful in selling both commodities and ideas. But we must admit that somehow or other, we have not done so well in the last decade in selling our very greatest ideas—our beliefs in human freedom and the dignity of man. It would be shortsighted in my opinion to deny ourselves the benefit of any imaginative device for selling our fundamental ideas to the world.

President Eisenhower said in a speech recently:

> Let us not forget for one instant that when we are putting $36 or $37 billion of expenditures every year into arms and armaments, those arms and armaments alone, remember, can never take us forward—they will merely defend what we have got.
>
> But when you talk about something that promotes a business arrangement—trade; when you can talk about something that proposes a better understanding between us and the people of the Mideast or the people of Africa, or anybody else, then you are talking about something constructive, something that yields results over the years to come.

The committee took exception to this ship idea because it might cost as high as $9 for each person who saw the Cinerama show. This was based on 1 showing a day for 200 days with a maximum audience of 2,000 per showing. However, the Agency estimated that it would be possible to have 2 showings a day of Cinerama for as many as 275 days a year. In addition to the seated audience, many more thousands would unquestionably line the harbor sides and view the showing of Cinerama from neighboring buildings, trees, boats, and so forth. So that the cost would probably be as low as a dollar or two per person who saw Cinerama.

The gentleman from New York derides the proposal because of the per capita cost to each of the viewers. He ignores all the relatives and friends to whom they talk, and how much does he think it costs per capita to kill those who may be arrayed against us as enemies if we do not win their confidence by showing them what we are really like and what we believe in and stand for? One expert on war has estimated that it cost an average of $50,000 to kill 1 soldier in World War II. Even if $9 were an accurate figure, how does $9 per person for selling our ideas via Cinerama and related films compare with the cost of killing at $50,000 per person? Does anyone here prefer the latter?

I should also point out that the committee in figuring the $9 cost per person to see Cinerama entirely disregarded the fact that many more thousands of persons would be visting the ship all day long to view the exhibits, closed-circuit

television, regular motion-picture showings, and the like which will also be housed on the ship—and which will also tell America's story in forceful fashion. And the newstories regarding the ship, and the reports to their neighbors of persons who do see the exhibits and the Cinerama, would reach countless millions.

The operation of this ship would be contracted to a private nonprofit organization. Freedoms Foundation, an organization of dedicated Americans who have done so much to make the world aware of the American heritage, has agreed to sponsor the project.

These Americans believe such a mobile instrument of peace and good will would be effective and worthwhile. It would carry around the world the same significance as the Freedom Trains did several years ago to our own people.

I might close with the following quotation from Roscoe Drummond's column in the New York Herald Tribune of March 5:

> It has long been fashionable to badger the USIA for trying to do too much too grandly or for attempting too little too cautiously. If it is arresting and original, the USIA is criticized as being too brassy. If it is muted and prosaic, it is criticized as being timid and unimaginative . But most of its critics have little to propose themselves.

In this instance, I believe USIA has been soundly imaginative and I regret the committee has not seen fit to approve the proposal. I hope the omission will be corrected in the other body.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to change the subject a bit and make reference to another program.

I have been much impressed by the extensive testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee in connection with the United States Information Agency's low-priced books program. According to this testimony, we are confronted with a mammoth Soviet machine which turns out a billion books a year promoting Communist doctrine in all languages at little or no cost to the readers. The Information Agency plan to publish significant American books to sell at prices these readers can afford strikes me as one of the most sensible methods to offset the Kremlin's propaganda. According to the testimony, the Agency also has developed the techniques for putting the plan into action. We cannot afford to wait. I strongly urge that we provide the funds to carry out these proposals and make certain that American books are available all over the world to readers of all languages at prices they can afford.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, although I expect to vote in support of this legislation, I am in hearty disagreement with the provisions of this bill which provides for an increase in the compensation for 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director at the rate of grade GS–16.

There is one gentleman involved who is deserving of an increase in compensation, Mr. Edward J. Shaughnessy, who is a competent public servant in every respect. However, Mr. Shaughnessy was included for the specific purpose of sweetening up a salary increase for Generals Partridge and Howard whose appointment was given legislative license by this House on March 21. At that time, I directed the following question to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and received the indicated reply:

> Mr. VANIK. In the gentleman's statement he points out this employment of the general will not cost the Government any more than $2,900 per year inasmuch as the general will have to give up his pension.
>
> Mr. VINSON. No. Of course, he gives up his retired pay and we have to pay his salary.
>
> Mr. VANIK. My question is this: Are his retirement rights permanently lost when he gives up the pension?
>
> Mr. VINSON. No—just suspended.
>
> Mr. VANIK. Or does it accrue to him?
>
> Mr. VINSON. No. He loses it during the time he is holding this position for 6 months or 6 years, when the job is over, then his retired pay starts again. Let me say that we had the Commissioner of Immigration before us and we asked him, "How come you cannot go out and employ civil-service people?" He said, "There are two men in my office who are qualified to do this work, but these men will not take this position because they will lose their civil-service status." That is the reason we are forced to do this.

With the understanding that the appointment of the Generals Partridge and Howard would not cost the Government more than $2,900 per annum in salary, this House passed out this legislation.

It is regrettable that the appointment of these two distinguished gentlemen Generals Partridge and Howard should again become the subject of Congressional debate—but their initial appointment in a civilian governmental department headed by a general followed by this proposal for salary increase constitutes a breach of faith.

I stated on March 21 that the inability of General Swing to find suitable civilian personnel to fill the high offices of Assistant Commissioners of Immigration appears a little like cronyism at its very worst. My opinion of March 21 has been confirmed by the provisions in this bill which grants the generals a pay increase.

The appointment of retired military officials to high offices in the civilian administration of the Government has the effect of discouraging qualified civilian officers from remaining with Government service. If these devoted servants of the Government must serve throughout the years only to have the top positions filled by others, the effect on morale in the Civil Service is depressing. The Immigration Service cannot afford to become a sanctuary for retired generals with special dispensations granted by the authority of Congress. It is the solemn obligation of this Congress through its established committees to further inquire and investigate the obvious futility of General Swing's effort to obtain adequate civilian personnel to fill these important posts. It is indeed strange that a general in charge of a civil function of Government is unable to find anyone else but another general to fill an important office of confidence and trust. It is also strange that of all the people in Government service, these few should be singled out for a prompt pay raise. If the generals have confidence in only themselves, can we safely repose in them the responsibility of executing broad civilian functions of Government.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the United States and its people have made heavy contributions of their resources to the free nations of the world. This marks a truly historic episode in our foreign relations since the end of World War II. I think it is only proper that the American people should ask themselves what their assistance to other nations has achieved. I know of no program of United States support that has given us a greater return for the money and effort expended than the United Nations system, including its specialized agencies.

Recently I had the privilege, with the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. MERROW, to serve on the United States delegation to the 10th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. On March 29, a report of our activity at the United Nations and our conclusions on what may well be considered the crucial session of the General Assembly was filed. That report contains this statement:

> It is urgently necessary that in the future we make far greater use of the United Nations system for foreign aid than we have in the past. This would not mean an increased amount of money appropriated for foreign aid but rather the channeling of a part of existing appropriations through United Nations machinery.
>
> Some will say that such sponsorship does not give us the advertising and good will that bilateral programs provide. However, we would point out that the basic reason for our program of economic assistance is not to purchase affection but rather to strengthen the free world, eliminating the vacuums of weakness into which the Soviet power is trying to move.
>
> We do not, of course, overlook the factor of good will, but the leaders of the nations, even the so-called underdeveloped ones, know where help is coming from, and even though the goods are not clearly identified as of American origin, we believe the people of those countries discern and appreciate our help.

Now what are these multilateral specialized agencies all about, and what have been the results of their labors? My statement of October 18, 1955, to the Economic and Financia' Committee of the General Assembly, is a partial answer:

> For example, rinderpest, the sourge of the world's cattle population in the Middle and Far East, has in recent years claimed 2 million cattle victims annually. The beginning of the conquest of this disease has been one of the significant achievements of the Food and Agriculture Organization under the technical assistance program. Something important has happened when vaccines which insure immunity against this disease for 2 years are now available at 2 cents an injection instead of, as previously, at $1 an injection. It does not take much imagination to translate this achievement into terms of human nutrition and a larger income for the farmers concerned.
>
> The war against malaria has produced one of the great victories of the World Health

Organization. It has been frequently described, yet each new step in this struggle is the most important news in the world to the families which no longer have a malaria sufferer in their homes. In some countries the rate of infant infection has been cut almost to zero. In several countries it is now estimated that all the people in malarious areas will be under the protection of DDT within the next few years. Starting from demonstrations by the World Health Organization, governments have been shown how simple the basic technique is and by what means a continuous organization can be maintained for surveillance against further outbreaks.

It is also news that in one Latin American country, where teacher training had been almost nonexistent, there are now more than 2,000 teachers who have attended vacation courses for teachers organized by UNESCO. Another Latin American country can also claim an impressive achievement. In that country, 18,000 farmers and 2,500 women are listening daily in more than 6,000 radio schools, which the government has organized. These people hear broadcasts on such subjects as reading, writing, hygiene, crop cultivation, and care of livestock. After the broadcasts are concluded, each village group discusses the lessons learned with the help of illustrated material which the government has distributed.

It is important and newsworthy that the productivity demonstrations which the ILO has arranged have in certain cases increased factory output by as much as 20 percent, and sometimes by several hundred percent. In a far eastern country, at a training center established by the International Civil Aviation Organization, there are now 300 students attending classes. Under the plan established by the center, 50 licensed copilots will be graduated each year and as many radiomen and mechanics. This is a form of investment—investment in people—and there is no richer source of wealth available to a country.

Mr. Chairman, it is not always easy to see the tangible returns of the contributions which the American people have made in our foreign affairs, but in the multilateral system the raising of standards of living through economic and social developments, the feeding of the hungry, the fight against disease, ignorance and poverty, and the facilitation of communications and the enhancement of man's enjoyment of work and life are all objectives with which I am sure the American people concur wholeheartedly. The multilateral system has played an important part in helping to achieve these objectives and deserves the full support of the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there an amendment or a motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Only pro forma amendments.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like simply to say that whereas the committee was unanimous on the bill and unanimous on everything else in the report I did reserve on the cinerama point that the gentleman has just discussed in the well of the House. I have no opinion upon it, but I rather regret that a limitation was imposed.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 22, lines 7 to 10, inclusive, strike out "*Provided,* That the compensation of the 5 assistant commissioners and 1 district director shall be at the rate of grade GS–16" and insert in lieu thereof "*Provided.*"

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 75, noes 84.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 184, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Brown, Ga.	Elliott
Abernethy	Brownson	Ellsworth
Adair	Broyhill	Engle
Alexander	Burdick	Fascell
Alger	Burleson	Fisher
Andresen, August H.	Burnside	Flynt
	Byrd	Forrester
Ashley	Cederberg	Fountain
Ashmore	Chase	Frazier
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Gary
Avery	Chiperfield	Gathings
Ayres	Church	Gentry
Bailey	Clark	George
Bass, Tenn.	Colmer	Gregory
Bates	Cooper	Griffiths
Beamer	Corbett	Gross
Bennett, Fla.	Cunningham	Gubser
Bennett, Mich.	Curtis, Mo.	Hale
Bentley	Davis, Ga.	Harden
Berry	Dies	Hardy
Blatnik	Dingell	Harrison, Nebr.
Blitch	Dolliver	Harrison, Va.
Bolton, Frances P.	Dorn, S. C.	Harvey
	Dowdy	Hayworth
Bonner	Doyle	Henderson
Bray	Durham	Heselton
Hoeven	Merrow	Schwengel
Hoffman, Mich.	Metcalf	Scott
Holifield	Miller, Nebr.	Selden
Holt	Morrison	Short
Hope	Moss	Shuford
Huddleston	Mumma	Siler
Jennings	Murray, Tenn.	Sisk
Jensen	Nelson	Smith, Kans.
Johansen	Nicholson	Smith, Miss.
Johnson, Wis.	Norrell	Smith, Va.
Jonas	O'Konski	Talle
Jones, Ala.	Pelly	Thompson, Mich.
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	
Jones, N. C.	Pfost	Thompson, N. J.
Judd	Pilcher	Thompson, Tex.
Kearns	Poage	Thomson, Wyo.
Kee	Poff	Tollefson
Kilgore	Priest	Tuck
King, Calif.	Rains	Udall
King, Pa.	Rees, Kans.	Utt
Knox	Reuss	Vanik
Knutson	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Pelt
Krueger	Rhodes, Pa.	Vinson
Landrum	Richards	Vorys
Lanham	Rivers	Watts
Lankford	Roberts	Weaver
LeCompte	Robeson, Va.	Westland
Lesinski	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
Lovre	Rogers, Fla.	Wier
McDowell	Rogers, Mass.	Williams, Miss.
McIntire	Roosevelt	Winstead
McMillan	Rutherford	Wright
Macdonald	Sadlak	Younger
Mack, Wash.	St. George	Zablocki
Meader	Saylor	

NAYS—184

Addonizio	Fino	Multer
Albert	Fjare	Murray, Ill.
Allen, Calif.	Flood	Natcher
Andersen, H. Carl	Fogarty	Norblad
	Forand	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Ford	O'Brien, N. Y.
Anfuso	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara, Ill.
Arends	Gavin	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Gordon	Osmers
Baker	Granahan	Ostertag
Baldwin	Gray	Passman
Bass, N. H.	Green, Pa.	Patman
Baumhart	Hagen	Patterson
Becker	Hand	Philbin
Belcher	Harris	Polk
Betts	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Boggs	Healey	Preston
Boland	Hill	Price
Bolling	Hillings	Prouty
Bosch	Hinshaw	Quigley
Bow	Holland	Rabaut
Boyle	Holmes	Radwan
Brooks, Tex.	Holtzman	Ray
Brown, Ohio	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Bush	Hosmer	Riehlman
Byrne, Pa.	Hull	Riley
Canfield	Hyde	Robsion, Ky.
Cannon	Ikard	Rodino
Carnahan	Jackson	Rooney
Carrigg	James	Schenck
Celler	Jarman	Scherer
Chelf	Jenkins	Scudder
Christopher	Karsten	Seely-Brown
Clevenger	Kearney	Sheehan
Cooley	Keating	Sikes
Coon	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
Coudert	Kilday	Spence
Cramer	Kirwan	Springer
Cretella	Klein	Steed
Crumpacker	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Curtis, Mass.	Lane	Taber
Dague	Latham	Taylor
Davidson	Lipscomb	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Long	Thomas
Dawson, Utah	McConnell	Thompson, La.
Delaney	McCormack	Thornberry
Denton	McDonough	Trimble
Derounian	McGregor	Van Zandt
Devereux	McVey	Velde
Diggs	Mack, Ill.	Wainwright
Dixon	Madden	Wharton
Dodd	Magnuson	Wickersham
Dollinger	Mahon	Widnall
Donohue	Mailliard	Wigglesworth
Donovan	Marshall	Williams, N. J.
Dorn, N. Y.	Martin	Wilson, Calif.
Edmonson	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Wolcott
Fallon	Mills	Yates
Feighan	Minshall	Young
Fenton	Morano	Zelenko
Fernandez	Moulder	

NOT VOTING—70

Allen, Ill.	Bolton, Oliver P.	Brooks, La.
Barden		Buckley
Barrett	Bowler	Budge
Bell	Boykin	Byrnes, Wis.

Carlyle	Hébert	Phillips
Chatham	Herlong	Pillion
Chudoff	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Cole	Hiestand	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Dawson, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Shelley
Deane	Kean	Sheppard
Dempsey	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Dondero	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Eberharter	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Friedel	Laird	Staggers
Fulton	McCarthy	Teague, Tex.
Gamble	McCulloch	Tumulty
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Vursell
Grant	Mason	Walter
Green, Oreg.	Matthews	Williams, N. Y.
Gwinn	Miller, Calif.	Willis
Haley	Mollohan	Withrow
Halleck	Morgan	Wolverton
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Green of Oregon for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mrs. Kelly of New York against.

Mr. Bell for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Mollohan for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Hays of Ohio for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Tumulty against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Bowler against.

Mr. Carlyle for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. Deane with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Budge.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Brooks of Louisiana with Mr. Hess.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. Johnson of California.

Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sieminski with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. PHILBIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LOCATION OF JET AIRBASE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all the clamor, hasty conclusions, and erroneous editorial comment, an examination of the facts justified the location of the jet base at Manistee rather than at Kalkaska, in the same State.

As an example of how editors can misjudge a situation, attempt to reflect discredit upon the people's representatives, read the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Press, captioned "Shameful Decision," then take a glance at my very brief answer to the editor, which might well have been amplified.

The editorial reads as follows:

SHAMEFUL DECISION

The House has decided to put the much-debated jet airbase in Manistee County for the poorest of all possible reasons—to save a Member's prestige. The Member is Representative RUTH THOMPSON. Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Allegan, gave the whole show away when he referred to her as a "lady in distress."

And Miss THOMPSON has been in distress. The base originally was to be located in Benzie County, which is in her district. Then, because the base seemed likely to interfere with the National Music Camp at Interlochen, the Air Force decided it should be in Wexford County. Wexford also is in Miss THOMPSON'S district, but she charged that she had been betrayed and demanded that the base be built in Benzie. Possibly tired of these political maneuvers, the Air Force switched to Kalkaska County, which is not in Miss THOMPSON'S district. But the Armed Services Committee—none of whose 37 members is from Michigan—decided the base should be transferred to Manistee, which is in Miss THOMPSON'S district.

Now the House—or, at any rate, 85 Members of it—has approved the committee's choice. Before going any further we should point out that only 137 Members voted on the move. The 85 who voted for it constitute only 18 percent of the House's total membership—and obviously it isn't the best-informed 18 percent of the House.

The Fifth District's own Representative, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., produced evidence showing that it will be more costly to place the base at Manistee than at Kalkaska. But his colleagues—85 of them, anyway—weren't interested. The Press' Washington correspondent, William F. Pyper, writes that "there could be no doubt, despite conflicting statistics, that the weight of the argument was in favor of Kalkaska." But, he goes on to say, sympathy was with Miss THOMPSON.

It seems incredible that any Member of Congress would interfere even for a moment in defense matters merely for the sake of saving another Member's feelings. But there it is. Actually 85 Members, speaking for the entire House, have done just that.

The only real argument the 85 raised in defense of their position, and it first was broached by Miss THOMPSON, was that the base should be located in her district because the executive branch of the Government had promised to put it there.

That is completely ridiculous. The only consideration in deciding where an airbase is located should be this: Where will it best serve the purposes of national defense at the least cost?

The Air Force finally decided in this case that the answer was Kalkaska. So far as we can see, the answer still is Kalkaska.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1956.

EDITOR, THE GRAND RAPIDS PRESS,
Grand Rapids, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Attention was just called to the editorial "Shameful Decision" in the Grand Rapids Press, in which, among other things, you state that I "gave the whole show away when he (I) referred to her (RUTH THOMPSON) as a 'lady in distress.'"

You add that your reporter, William F. Pyper—who I greatly respect—wrote that "there could be no doubt, despite conflicting statistics, that the weight of the argument was in favor of Kalkaska." Well, Bill was not called upon to vote on the proposition and the responsibility of deciding which was the better location for the base is but a matter of opinion. Certainly none of us who know him underestimate his ability to express an opinion even though he is a reporter, not an editorial writer nor a commentator.

Then you add "It seems incredible that any Member of Congress would interfere even for a moment in defense matters merely for the sake of saving another Member's feelings. But there it is. Actually, 85 Members, speaking for the entire House, have done just that." That charge is a most unworthy one and it is unfair, for neither you nor Mr. Pyper have any way of actually knowing what influenced the vote of each individual Member. Unless all Members of the Congress are to be discredited, why should you assume that the 85 who voted against the amendment had an unworthy personal motive—that the 52 who were present and voted for it were right.

I can understand your desire to support your local Congressman, who is a very fine, conscientious, hard-working Member, but there is no certainty that he is always right on every proposition which he advocates.

During the debate I did state "But here is a lady in distress because of the action of the Secretary of the Air Force. There is merit in her claim." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 6234.) I did state (p. 6254), that the real issue was whether, when the departments gave us their word, based upon their investigation and their judgment, the Department was to be held to its decision, or whether willy-nilly, for any reason or no reason at all, the Department was to be permitted to switch from one base to another.

During the debate, I said (p. 6234) that I had expected to go along with FORD because from his statement to me, I had understood that there would be a saving if the base was kept at Kalkaska. Subsequent investigation and a reading of the testimony taken before the members of the Armed Services Committee where 23 members voted for, but 5 (and I think 4 of them by proxy) voted against locating the base at Manistee,

indicated that the figures furnished by the Air Force were not accurate.

The Air Force in the first instance came up after a full and complete investigation with a decision that the base should be located in Benzie County. Then it switched to Kalkaska and the Armed Services Committee, which has jurisdiction over all three branches of the armed services and which is a legislative committee and which investigated every phase of the project, decided that it should be moved to Manistee.

Mr. FORD is on the Appropriations Committee, not on a legislative committee. A rule of the House forbids the writing of legislation in an appropriation bill. Any other rule would tend to utter confusion in House procedure because it would permit the Appropriations Committee to come up with legislation which had not by that committee received proper consideration but it had received consideration in a public hearing by a legislative committee, such as the Armed Services Committee.

In the judgment of the Armed Services Committee, in my own judgment, there would be neither delay nor impairment of our national defense by the location of the base at Manistee nor would there be a waste of public funds.

Just why is it that some editors, some columnists, some commentators, some publishers have formed the habit of so often attributing to members of the State legislature or Congress an unworthy or improper motive when the legislator's action is not in accord with the opinion of the publisher or writer? Twenty years' experience here causes me to wonder why it is that publishers and commentators who so frequently insist, sometimes habitually, that the individuals selected by the people to represent them either in Lansing or in Washington, know so little, are so dumb, that they themselves do not stand for public office.

Most of us at least make an effort to ascertain the facts, the merits of any and every proposition that comes up, and then just support the measures which we think are for the best interests of all the people.

Undoubtedly much of the money that is appropriated for the armed services is wasted due to the magnitude of their operations, the necessity of being always prepared, the desirability of experimentation with improvement in mind. It cannot be otherwise. So it is that many of us who do not possess an overall, accurate knowledge of everything which comes under the jurisdiction of the armed services go along, unless our own investigation dictates to the contrary, with the legislative committee charged with making an exhaustive study, an accurate report.

For your convenience I am enclosing a marked copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing just exactly what I did say. Of course, I assume no responsibility for the remarks of other Members or as to the reasons given by them for their action.

Sincerely yours.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been some time since I have called the attention of this body to my bill, House Joint Resolution 485, for the establishment of a National Commission on Nursing Services.

During the interval I have been in touch with hundreds of people, all over the country, people qualified by position and by experience to judge the merits of this proposal. They are hospital administrators, nurses, doctors, educators, and people in public life.

I include as a part of my remarks a few pertinent excerpts from letters which they have written on this subject:

REASONS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON NURSING SERVICES—EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED ON THIS SUBJECT BY HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO

Certainly your Commission could do a great deal to produce greater public understanding and stimulation of important measures to benefit nurses and nursing and increase nurse recruitment. (The executive secretary of a hospital board.)

I feel very strongly that such a Commission as you have recommended is a must if we are to correct or solve the serious situation in the nursing profession. (A hospital administrator.)

It would appear that a Commission established to make a study of the problems, could bring about some uniformity of thinking on the education, utilization of talent, and financing of nursing and its many other facets as related to service needed. I would heartily endorse the establishment of such a Commission. (A hospital administrator.)

I feel such a Commission as you propose would be of great help in getting to the foundation of the nursing problem today. (The executive secretary of a district nurses' association.)

I want to express my appreciation for your leadership in developing such a constructive measure. I feel that the nursing profession needs that interest and support which your bill receives from many groups. (The director of a school of nursing.)

We find it to be the only key offered, up to now, to open new channels to some very serious problems in the hospitals and nursing, particularly bedside nursing. I feel that if this Commission is established, it will in reality serve a great need. (A registered nurse.)

The strength of your resolution, it seems to me, is not so much that it calls for another study but the hope that it gives that nurse practitioners and educators and members of the legislative and executive branches of Government may sit down together to find solutions to these problems. (A university professor of nursing.)

Your recent efforts to establish a Commission to study nursing service needs is a logical and indirect approach to nursing education problems where all the troubles lie—maybe not at the present time, but certainly in the future. (A hospital coordinator of nursing education.)

I am in approval with your proposal for a National Commission on Nursing Services. For the Commission to have representation as you suggest is excellent. I find nurses alone, in an attempt to cope with the problems, are not seeing the overall picture of today. (A hospital administrator.)

When I reviewed the bill, some weeks ago, I felt that here was a splendid opportunity to deepen and broaden the scope of nursing research, and perhaps, to infuse new viewpoints into the solution of long-standing problems. Most of the nurses with whom I have discussed the project concur on the desirability of establishing a National Commission for Nursing Services. (A director of a State university.)

It is the opinion of this group that a study of nursing should be made by qualified and unbiased people, since it is obvious that nurses themselves seem to have difficulty in arriving at any definite agreement or recommendation. (A registered nurse.)

As a hospital administrator, I realize daily the growing shortage of nurses and the need for something to be done on a national level in such a concrete form as this proposed Commission to meet the national shortage of nurses. It has been brought very forcibly to my attention in my own institution where we were forced last June to close one floor of the hospital because of lack of nurses. This situation exists in hundreds of rural and urban hospitals throughout the country and with needed hospital expansion programs the condition will become worse unless steps are taken to remedy them. (A hospital administrator.)

The hospitals of this country have been faced with a shortage of nurses in all categories during or since World World II. There have been many efforts by affected organizations and agencies to meet this shortage and the success of these efforts has been in many cases temporary and inconclusive. I feel that this is a problem of national significance and, therefore, the answer should be sought on a nationwide basis. The commission as provided under Representative BOLTON'S bill would apparently accomplish this much needed study and possibly provide the answer for our problem. (A hospital administrator.)

This is an increasing national problem, and it would seem from the magnitude of the study that must be performed, and the necessity that such research be detached from any particular organization or association, that it can be competently performed by the Commission that is suggested in the bill. (A hospital administrator.)

Past studies of the situation have been made without offering relief, and it is our thought that a Commission on Nursing Service would produce a report of the situation free from the divergent views which have been common in the past. (A hospital administrator.)

I believe a Commission would definitely accomplish much more than any professional or lay organization could accomplish. (A doctor.)

I am in complete accord with Congressman BOLTON'S estimate of the situation as being urgent and requiring the services of a Capitol Commission to determine what steps are needed to correct this sad situation. I should like to stress that I am not in the habit of writing letters to Congressmen but this matter is so urgent that I would like to have you know that I and a good many of my medical colleagues are very much in favor of the proposed commission on nursing services. (A doctor.)

There is an urgent need for a National Commission on Nursing Services to study nursing problems by the scientific methods and to recommend constructive courses of action in legislature, education, and in hospital administration. This resolution is of paramount importance to the health and welfare of the American people whom we serve. (A registered nurse, director of nursing service.)

The proposed Commission on Nursing Services would be representative of the executive and legislative branches of Government, of the medical and nursing professions, and of the general public and would, through its composite interests and aims, concentrate its efforts in endeavors to alleviate the current nursing shortages; insure equities of opportunities and advancement in the nursing fields; and assure a comprehensive educational program for adequate national nurse coverage in succeeding years. (A doctor.)

The official nursing organizations have apparently not been able to secure the support from, or representation to the public of their services or their needs. Nursing services that are competent and in sufficient quantity to meet the need of society are of the greatest importance today. Since pressures within the group and outside groups

who have vested interests in this field make constructive and farseeing, realistic measures almost impossible, a Commission whose members can see needs as well as resources objectively and can present their finding to the public can best serve in opening avenues designed to meet the needs of the country as well as its nurse citizens. (A registered nurse, assistant professor of nursing education in a university.)

The health and welfare of the American people is a concern of all the people. Whenever a condition exists that materially affects all the people it becomes the duty of our National Government to do all within its power to correct such a situation. We are concerned about our natural resources in every other respect and the health of our people is a great natural resource. The nursing situation—number needed, salaries, and skills is cause for a study such as proposed in Mrs. BOLTON'S bill. (A school superintendent.)

The public questions factfinding by organizational groups whom they feel may have vested interests in outcomes. A broadly representative commission can avoid such reaction and give more effective consideration to the problems of nursing services for the public. (The dean of a school of nursing.)

Through the mechanism of a commission some centralized thinking from interested groups can be crystallized. To me, it is the old story of getting people together around the green table to talk over common problems. (A director of a university clinic.)

The advances in medical sciences have revolutionized the care and treatment of the sick and suggested methods of further preventing illness. Therefore, there needs to be a reevaluation of the amount and kind of nursing services needed in line with these developments. (A director of public health.)

There are so many facets to the total nursing problems of today that I feel it is to our (nursing) advantage as well as that of the patient, that these problems be thought out and worked out in cooperation with the representatives from all groups concerned. This is the goal of the proposed Commission on Nursing Service. After all is said and done, isn't the patient the real reason for the nursing profession being in existence at all? Shouldn't he have a voice in the matter of his care? Of how his money is spent? I feel that the patient should have this representation on the Nursing Commission. (A registered nurse, director of nursing service.)

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit while the House is in session tomorrow, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SHIP-SUBSIDY PROGRAM AND NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during my service as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have come to several very definite convictions. First, it is impossible for vessels flying the American flag to compete on an equal basis with foreign competitors without Government assistance. The officers and crews aboard our ships receive four times as much in wages as the officers and crews of foreign ships. These wage scales are entirely justified and are only sufficient to permit these men to maintain the standard of living enjoyed by the American workingmen in other forms of industry.

Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 we do provide for subsidy assistance in the operation of American-flag vessels, but only in connection with service on essential trade routes. Today there are 31 of these routes and some 16 American companies receiving subsidy aid under title VI of the 1936 act. But in the foreign commerce of the United States an American-flag vessel is at just as much disadvantage in competition with foreign-flag vessels whether the voyage takes place over an essential trade route, or whether it is in the nature of a tramp-type operation, or pursuant to a specific contract of affreightment.

During the hearings by the Merchant Marine Committee recently held on the cargo preference law, under which 50 percent of aid cargoes must be transported in United States-flag vessels, it was forcefully brought out that our tramp fleet, which today is composed of some 70 vessels, would immediately disappear from the seas if they are not assured of at least 50 percent of the bulk cargoes financed with United States Government moneys. This, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me, is not the proper way to subsidize any portion of our American merchant marine. We should call a spade a spade; and if the tramp segment and other contract carriers are essential to a strong American merchant marine, we should provide direct and open subsidy assistance.

The shipbuilding facilities of this country are equally as essential to the national defense as the existence of a fleet of fast, modern merchant vessels. The 70 vessels in the tramp fleet today are slow, 10-knot Liberty ships. The foreign tramp owners are building new, modern and much faster vessels. During a trip which I took to Europe last summer as a member of a subcommittee of the Merchant Marine Committee, I saw new building in all the yards of Western Europe, many of the vessels designed for the tramp trades. Under existing conditions, even though business today is at peak levels for the tramp owners, there is not the slightest prospect for any of our tramp vessels to be replaced and they are doomed to wither on the vine, so to speak. When they reach the age when they no longer can be operated economically, our tramp fleet will disappear unless some direct Government assistance is provided.

In view of these circumstances, I am about to introduce a bill which would provide the type of assistance which I believe not only justified from a national economy standpoint, but imperative from the standpoint of national defense. The bill would provide for an operating-differential subsidy only for new vessels to be constructed for the bulk cargo trades. It would provide, however, for subsidy being paid on any old vessels during the period of construction of the newer, modern, and more suitable types. I feel that only when we face up to the problem in the manner reflected by this bill will we be approaching the type of American merchant marine which this country so richly deserves.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KELLY of New York (at the request of Mr. KLEIN), for Wednesday, April 25, 1956, on account of illness.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), April 24 to April 27, 1956, on account of illness in the immediate family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HILL, for 45 minutes, on Wednesday, May 2, 1956.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE.

Mr. FERNANDEZ.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SPENCE.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS, his remarks today, and to include a letter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. HARDY and to include an address by Mr. BONNER.

Mr. VELDE.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the

following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes.

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Forces, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 24, 1956:

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung;

H. R. 1179. An act for the relief of Salih Hougi, Bertha Catherine, Noor Elias, Isaac, and Mozele Rose Hardoon;

H. R. 2796. An act for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel;

H. R. 2948. An act for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of Waymon H. Massey;

H. R. 3276. An act for the relief of George S. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis);

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Lois O. Jennings;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Antonio Penna;

H. R. 4909. An act to authorize the consolidation of the National Tax Association, a corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, with the Tax Institute, Inc., a corporation organized under the membership corporations law of the State of New York, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the membership corporations law of the State of New York;

H. R. 5310. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla.;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Alison MacBride;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 997), in respect of the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges;

H. R. 8728. An act to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of the remains of certain commissioned officers of the Public Health Service;

H. R. 8957. An act to extend the time within which the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission may submit its report and recommendations with respect to the civic auditorium to be constructed in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 10387. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 444. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation in connection with the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson.

On April 25, 1956:

H. R. 4047. An act relating to the establishment of public recreation facilities in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4781. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incure indebtedness, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 26, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1781. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

1782. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed consession permit with Mrs. Viola H. Montgomery, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Muir Woods National Monument, will authorize her to operate a lunchroom, soft-drink counter, souvenir, stationery, and photographic shop for the public at Muir Woods National Monument, Calif., during a 2-year period beginning January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1783. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Jui-Chang Hsieh, A-7247342, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1784. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Crooked River project, Oreg., pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1785. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 15, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of a channel from Port Lavaca and Palacios, and the Colorado River, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. This report is submitted in final response to the authority of the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, for a preliminary examination and survey for a channel from Port Lavaca and Palacios, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. It is also submitted in partial response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate adopted September 16, 1948, for a review of reports on the Colorado River, Tex., for a suitable outlet channel to the Gulf of Mexico (H. Doc. No. 388); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Financial position of the White County Bridge Commission. Report on investigation of the White County Bridge Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOLTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 210. Concurrent resolution to extend greetings to the Sudan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 232. Concurrent resolution extending greetings to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 10643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8228. A bill to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude bauxite and on certain calcined bauxite; with amendment (Rept. No. 2064). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8615. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before July 1, 1959 (the termination date for inductions into the Armed Forces), and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before such date; with amendment (Rept. No. 2065). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 415. An act for the relief of Ernest B. Sanders; with amendment (Rept. No. 2039). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 419. An act for the relief of Eli E. Hood; without amendment (Rept. No. 2040). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 438. Resolution providing that the bill H. R. 6893, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3532. A bill for the relief of Seymour Robertson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2042). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5591. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2043). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5691. A bill for the relief of P. R. Markley, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2044). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7835. A bill for the relief of Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; without amendment (Rept. No. 2045). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8041. A bill for the relief of Clyde R. Stevens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2046). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8867. A bill for the relief of the estate of F. M. Bryson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2047). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10006. A bill for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2048). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10013. A bill for the relief of Sfc. Henry F. Ferry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2049). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 2050). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 10191. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Cook Cleland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2051). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Shenekji; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 228. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 767. An act for the relief of Andrew Rosner; with amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 885. An act for the relief of Alice Elizabeth Marjoribanks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1111. An act for the relief of Eric A. Cummings; with amendment (Rept. No. 2060). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1883. An act for the relief of Pietro Rodolfo Walter Stulin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1970. An act for the relief of Kim Boksoon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 606. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2063). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of Vivencio Fernando Raymundo; with amendment (Rept. No. 2066). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 10783. A bill to amend section 314 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 10784. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 10785. A bill to provide for the protection and conservation of national soil, water, and forest resources and to provide an adequate, balanced, and orderly flow of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 10786. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 10787. A bill to establish a program of production controls for hogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 10788. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Federal Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 10789. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean or air freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 10790. A bill to provide for the rank of certain officers of the Army, Navy and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 10791. A bill to provide that the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission shall rotate among the Commissioners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 10792. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 10793. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H. R. 10794. A bill to provide for an annual report by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to certain timber resources of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 10795. A bill to provide a library of captioned films for the deaf and hard of hearing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 10796. A bill providing for payment by the United States of ocean- or air-freight charges on certain relief packages shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 10797. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 10798. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10799. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10800. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize payment of operating-differential subsidy to contract carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10801. A bill relative to processing of donated food commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 10802. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of streams at and in the vicinity of Gulfport, Fla., for present and prospective commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 10803. A bill to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 10804. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 10805. A bill authorizing and directing the construction by the Atomic Energy Commission of six nuclear power facilities for the production of electric power; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10806. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 10807. A bill to provide for the compulsory inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture of poultry and poultry products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 10808. A bill to adjust an inequity that exists with respect to certain technical, scientific, industrial, professional, merchandising and marketing periodicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 10809. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 10810. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 10811. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 10812. A bill to require periodic survey by the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board of national shipbuilding capability; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 10813. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 10814. A bill for the relief of Willem Fransen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 10815. A bill for the relief of Maria Ragusa Chiapetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 10816. A bill for the relief of Lillian Ida Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10817. A bill for the relief of Dr. Thomas B. Meade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 10818. A bill for the relief of George T. Moore and Carl D. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 10819. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to the descendants of James H. Haney, Bledsoe, Tex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 10820. A bill for the relief of Alexandra Vasilievna Ghermanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10821. A bill for the relief of Ezra Dweck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 10822. A bill for the relief of Maria G. Connolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 10823. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive Zaudie Makuria, a citizen and subject of Ethiopia, for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10824. A bill for the relief of Sonja Spieker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 10825. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 10826. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles O. Fairbank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 10827. For the relief of Melvin Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10828 A bill for the relief of Maitland McKinley Joseph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

955. By Mr. BOW: Petition of Mildred Carter and others, of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

956. Also, petition of Fred L. Ickes and others of Stark County, Ohio, for a separate pension program for World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

957. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 22 members of Post No. 172, the American Legion, Jasonville, Ind., in support of H. R. 7886, a bill to increase pensions to World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

958. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of the department of Pennsylvania executive committee, the American Legion, urging enactment of necessary legislation to declare November 11, now known as Veterans Day a national holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

959. By Mrs. CHURCH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Waukegan, Ill., urging that the Congress include in any Federal highway construction legislation the requirement that in every highway project where Federal funds are used, to make it possible for municipal governments to be reimbursed for all changes to its water and sewer facilities required by such projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

960. By Mrs. KEE: Petition of Mrs. Carolyn Barosky, president, Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kimball, W. Va., and 9 other members of Wood-Venable Auxiliary 8519, urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

961. Also, petition of John F. Boyd, of Alderson, W. Va., and 43 other residents of Monroe and Summers Counties, W. Va., urging immediate enactment of a separate and liberal pension program for veterans of World War I and their widows and orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Criticism of TV and Radio Commercials Is Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received a letter from Mr. Ted Rand, general manager of radio station KDRS, Paragould, Ark., regarding recent attacks made against the radio and television industry in the House of Representatives. Mr. Rand is an outstanding business and civic leader. The principal complaint against these media was that both television and radio stations increased the sound volume when commercials were being presented. According to Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, "these excessively loud commercials" applied to networks as well as local programs. Mr. HOSMER asked the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to look into the matter and advise him of the Commission's findings.

Mr. Rand's letter, giving views and observations of an owner and operator of a radio station, is good reading indeed. His letter portrays the value of radio to a community. I highly recommend that you read it. The full text of Mr. Rand's letter is as follows:

KDRS,

Paragould, Ark., March 31, 1956.

The Honorable E. C. GATHINGS,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GATHINGS: The assaults upon radio by Representative CRAIG HOSMER and others, in my opinion, accent the negative. It seems to me that radio needs something of a champion among Congressmen who will accent the positive.

I feel sure that you appreciate the services which the radio industry has rendered to the Nation. Moreover, I am confident that you have intimate knowledge of the manner in which many Arkansas radio stations relate themselves to their communities.

In our community, we do not merely give lip service to the goals, dreams, problems, and purposes of our people. We roll up our sleeves and pitch in. We devote time, talent, and energy to the building of our community. We try to do our best in support of those groups which are creating happiness within our community—from a home demonstration club's bake sale to a citywide campaign to raise $100,000 for a new industry.

We have time for our churches, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Red Cross, cancer, nursing home, schools, civic clubs, service clubs, farm groups, and every other similar organization. We rarely receive any direct remuneration from our work on behalf of these groups, although we do feel that our community service policies are directly responsible for our overall successful business operation.

We are typically American in the business sense, and I firmly believe that our industry is suffering unnecessary abuse from some of its critics. While criticisms of specific abuses by a few stations may be completely valid, the tendency to smear them across the entire industry is unfair to many of us.

I sincerely hope that you will find an opportunity to speak up for the great majority of the Nation's radio stations and in defense of the typical small city Arkansas station which builds its entire service around its people and their needs.

If the emphasis remains upon the negative aspects, may I then recommend that someone be equally unfair in appraising other aspects of the American scene which might be loud, noisy, and obnoxious in their own way:

Used car dealers illuminate their lots in a manner which is bright, glaring, and disagreeable to me.

Service stations fly masses of distracting pennants and twirling silver devices. They display huge day-glo signs. They distort the natural beauty of my town.

Magazines cluttered with attention-getters continually force me to turn to page one-hundred-and-something for a continuation of the article I am reading.

Full pages of my newspaper contain nothing but advertising. I find this annoying.

Billboards put to shame the loudest radio commercial I have ever heard. These billboards obliterate the landscape, and they divert my attention from the somewhat important function of operating my automobile.

I pay to see commercials at my neighborhood theater.

Times Square is simply a disgrace.

Anyone who will acknowledge the futility of these observations may then wonder with me why radio and television are such prime targets.

After all, radio and television offer two great compensating factors: a dial for the selection of various stations and a switch for turning the entire receiver off.

May I urge you to caution critics of the broadcasting industry to temper their observations with an appraisal of the services performed for the Nation, and to properly relate radio and television to the age in which they live.

Frankly, I am proud to be part of an industry which is vitally important in the everyday lives of the Nation's people. Because we are, we should not be shielded from valid criticism. However, there surely must be room for the presentation of radio's positive side in the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

TED RAND,
General Manager.

Many people accept fine programs of both radio and television as a matter of course and apparently do not appreciate fully that the station or network that is making such program available to them is performing a distinct and outstanding public service. Numerous viewers and listeners over their television and radio receiving sets do not stop to think that these programs are offered to them gratis; that if they do not like one particular station they have but to turn the knob. So many are prone to be unappreciative and ungrateful for the entertainment and educational value of the programs which come into our homes, and criticize the time consumed in advertising the product or firm or company that makes the program possible. Without advertising there would be no radio and TV industry; the public could not have and receive the entertaining, news, and educational programs that are a part of the daily lives of the American people.

I am of the opinion that those who criticize commercial advertising are in reality in the great minority, and that such is not the attitude of the majority of our populace.

The radio industry has consistently grown bigger and stronger from year to year. I set forth a table showing the growth of commercial radio stations:

Growth of commercial radio stations

Year:	Commercial stations
1922	30
1923	556
1924	530
1925	571
1926	528
1927	681
1928	677
1929	606
1930	618
1931	612
1932	604
1933	598
1934	593
1935	623
1936	616
1937	646
1938	689
1939	722
1940	765
1941	897
1942	925
1943	948
1944	957
1945	977
1946	1,009
1947	1,346
1948	1,835
1949	2,340
1950	2,611
1951	2,782
1952	2,915
1953	2,990
1954	3,094
1955	3,244

Source: Years 1922–1926 from Federal records; 1927 onward from Federal Communications Commission.

The broadcasting industry has become and is one of our most significant fields of endeavor. The following economic analysis of the total radio and television industry, as published by Caldwell-Clements, Inc., in Mart magazine, reflects the general importance of this industry:

Year 1955

Sale of time by broadcasters	$1,000,000,000
Talent costs	200,000,000
Electricity, batteries to operate 176,900,000 radio and TV receivers	750,000,000
12,500,000 radio receivers, retail value	485,000,000
7,500,000 television receivers, retail value	1,215,000,000
250,000,000 phonograph records	310,000,000
Radio repairs and supplies, 95,000,000 replacement tubes	237,000,000
Parts, accessories	425,000,000
Labor	850,000,000
Total	5,472,000,000

This data covers both the radio and television industry.

The following table clearly illustrates the phenomenal growth of the radio manufacturing industry.

Radio receivers—Selected data, 1922–55

Year	Sets produced	Retail value	Homes with radio sets	Total sets in use
1922	100,000	$5,000,000	260,000	400,000
1923	550,000	30,000,000	1,000,000	1,100,000
1924	1,500,000	100,000,000	2,500,000	3,000,000
1925	2,000,000	165,000,000	3,500,000	4,000,000
1926	1,750,000	200,000,000	5,000,000	5,700,000
1927	1,350,000	168,000,000	6,500,000	7,000,000
1928	3,281,000	400,000,000	7,500,000	8,500,000
1929	4,428,000	600,000,000	9,000,000	10,500,000
1930	3,827,800	300,000,000	12,048,762	13,000,000
1931	3,420,000	225,000,000	14,000,000	15,000,000
1932	3,000,000	140,000,000	16,809,562	18,000,000
1933	3,806,000	180,500,000	20,402,369	22,000,000
1934	4,084,000	214,500,000	21,456,000	26,000,000
1935	6,026,800	330,192,480	22,869,000	30,500,000
1936	8,248,000	450,000,000	24,600,000	33,000,000
1937	8,064,780	450,000,000	26,666,500	37,600,000
1938	6,000,000	210,000,000	28,000,000	40,800,000
1939	10,500,000	354,000,000	28,700,000	45,300,000
1940	11,800,000	450,000,000	29,200,000	51,000,000
1941	13,000,000	460,000,000	29,700,000	56,000,000
1942	4,400,000	154,000,000	30,800,000	59,340,000
1943			32,000,000	58,000,000
1944			33,000,000	57,000,000
1945	500,000	20,000,000	34,000,000	56,000,000
1946	14,000,000	700,000,000	35,000,000	60,000,000
1947	17,000,000	800,000,000	37,000,000	66,000,000
1948	16,000,000	700,000,000	40,000,000	74,000,000
1949	10,000,000	500,000,000	42,000,000	81,000,000
1950	14,600,000	721,000,000	45,000,000	90,000,000
1951	13,000,000	605,000,000	45,850,000	100,000,000
1952	10,000,000	500,000,000	46,000,000	114,500,000
1953	13,400,000	536,000,000	48,000,000	120,500,000
1954	11,200,000	470,000,000	50,000,000	127,000,000
1955	12,500,000	850,400,000	52,000,000	135,000,000

Source: *Broadcasting Telecasting*—Broadcasting Yearbook, 1956.

We Do Not Want Vigilantes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the throwing of sulfuric acid into the face and eyes of Victor Riesel, who has exposed many a labor racketeer, was not an isolated act. It was characteristic of the methods of the vicious gangsters who so frequently, by beatings, bombings, sometimes by murder, have sought to silence those who exposed their lawlessness, their stealing of welfare funds, the misuses of union dues.

Ever since the gangsters attained nationwide power in organizations like the Chicago Capone crime syndicate, they have frequently, without punishment, made good their boast that those who exposed them would be silenced.

Many a gangster, turned informant, has been executed by the gang. The recent attempt to silence Riesel obviously came from the same source.

Nor have police officers been exempt from the decrees of the gangsters. Well do I recall that, when a legislative committee held hearings in Chicago in an attempt to ascertain from whence came the pressure back of the paroling of the four Capone gangsters, two testifying police officers were threatened with physical violence. Not long thereafter, one, Captain Drury, when on his way to furnish another committee with information about the gang, was cooly and deliberately slain.

Others, sometimes officers charged with enforcement of the law, sometimes reporters or newspaper publishers or editors, have met a similar fate.

Time and time again have legislative committees, State investigatory bodies, called to the attention of the public this lawlessness which apparently has known no limits. If we continue to permit gangsters to ignore the law, to beat and to kill not only their own associates who inform against them, but innocent individuals whose only fault is that they speak or publish the truth about crime—if men like Victor Riesel are to be murderously assaulted—how long will it be before men like Pegler, Clark Mollenhoff, and others who publish or speak the truth about these gangsters will be likewise permanently injured or removed from the scene?

If those charged with the enforcement of the law fail in their duty because of lack of public support—if that situation worsens, will not otherwise law-abiding citizens attempt to retaliate by lawless punitive acts? Will not a situation develop similar to that which existed in the West when outraged citizens acting in defense of their rights organized and without legal procedure hung or shot those who over-long willfully disregarded all law? Drifting into such a situation is unthinkable. The cowardly assault on Victor Riesel—a courageous fearless writer—should be another warning to

law enforcement officials to fully perform their sworn duty.

One remedy for the threat to our freedom is to elect to law-enforcing offices only those who, regardless of threats of physical violence or political execution, have the will, the ability, the courage, the determination to see that all laws are enforced without fear or favor.

That remedy has worked in Berrien County, in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, where two prosecutors, Joe Killian and Jack Spelman, with the assistance of Sheriff Kubath and fearless judges, have successfully demonstrated that the unlawful activities of gangsters will not be tolerated and that the civil rights of citizens will be protected.

What we need is not more civil rights legislation, but a better enforcement of what we have.

Tribute to the Memory of the Honorable Vera Buchanan, Late a Representative From Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I rise to add my small tribute to the memory of my friend and colleague, the Honorable Vera Buchanan, late a Representative from the 30th District of Pennsylvania. I know that this feeling is shared by all of us here, for her courageous spirit, her patience and understanding were an inspiration to all who knew her.

Mrs. Buchanan was elected to the 82d Congress on July 24, 1951, to succeed her husband, the late Frank Buchanan. Like her husband, she worked hard for the people of her district, and they returned her to the 83d and 84th Congress. After having previously served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Public Works, she was elected to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the 84th Congress. As you know, the Banking and Currency Committee deals with housing matters. We are constantly concerned with the statistics of housing, and their effect on the Nation's economy. Being a successful homemaker herself, Mrs. Buchanan brought to the committee a special insight in housing matters, and a warm understanding of the problems and needs of homemakers and the importance of the home in American family life.

A severe case of pneumonia overtook Mrs. Buchanan last year when she had devoted her energies to the point of exhaustion in support of housing and flood-control legislation for her constituents. Her death on November 26 deprived the people of her district of a devoted and courageous representative. The House has lost a sincere and capable Member who will be sadly missed by those of us who knew her and valued her friendship.

My deep feeling of sympathy goes out to her two daughters and other relatives in their great loss.

Anniversary of the Birth of John F. Stevens, Chief Engineer of the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the decision of the Congress and the President in 1906 to approve the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal. Today is the 103d anniversary of the birth at West Gardiner, Maine, of John F. Stevens, who was the chief engineer of the Panama Canal. I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a poem on Mr. Stevens may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE

The State of Maine has produced many leaders on the national scene but few have attained the stature of John F. Stevens, who was born at West Gardiner, Maine, on April 25, 1853.

In a career packed with hard work and adventure he built a record of constructive achievement that stands as an inspiration to the youth of our land.

After graduating from the State Normal School at Farmington, Maine, and an attempt at teaching, Stevens decided upon an engineering career. In 1874, at the age of 21, and without technical engineering training, he went to Minneapolis where his uncle, Jesse Stevens, was an engineer. There he began as an assistant engineer—a rodman—for the city.

Attracted by greater opportunities that would be afforded on the railroads, then at peak construction, he went to Texas in 1876, and secured employment as a railway section hand. Rising step by step, he worked as rodman, instrument man, surveyor, and location and construction engineer—all of which served as a great school of experience.

Attracting the attention of the great railroad empire builder, James J. Hill, he was sent by the latter to locate a route for the Great Northern Railway over the Rocky Mountains. This led to his dramatic discovery on December 11, 1889, of Marias Pass in Montana, through which the railroad was constructed.

This notable achievement is commemorated by a bronze statue of the engineer-explorer near the track at Summit, Mont., showing Stevens as he appeared at the time of his discovery. Replicas of this statue are in the Maine State Library and in the national headquarters in New York of the American Society of Civil Engineering, of which society he later became national president.

In the course of his rise in the railroad work, Stevens was well prepared for a still greater assignment in taking over the building of the Panama Canal. For appointment as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the combination of his ability and extraordinary background of experience made him a "natural."

Assuming charge in the Canal Zone on July 25, 1905, at a time when chaos and hysteria incident to yellow fever was coupled with the resignation of its previous Chief Engineer, by the adoption of wise policies, Stevens promptly brought matters under control. One of the outstanding instances of his broad outlook was his sympathetic and timely support of the health and sanitation plan that had been proposed by Colonel Gorgas—adequate health and sanitation being an absolute prerequisite for constructing the canal.

Considering the problem of constructing the Panama Canal from every significant viewpoint, functional as well as economic and engineering, Stevens strongly recommended to President Theodore Roosevelt what is known as the lake and lock type canal as offering the best solution, and vigorously opposed the so-called sea-level proposal.

When this celebrated issue as to the choice of type was before the Nation in 1906, he was the greatest single influence in bringing about the decision of the Congress and the President for the high-level lake and lock plan. This contribution, which has been justified by more than 40 years' successful operation, establishes him in history as the basic architect of the Panama Canal. He was rewarded by the President with the first appointment to the combined positions of Chairman and Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission (1907).

Having organized the forces for construction, acquired the necessary equipment, designed the key features of the waterway, launched the project and brought it to a point where its success was a certainty, Stevens resigned in April 1907 and returned to railroad work. The Panama Canal was completed by others under the Stevens plans.

Though separated from the project his interest never ceased. At times of crises during the remaining years of construction, he always gave his support in the best interest of the project. In later years, he wrote extensively of his Isthmian experiences. Special reference is made to his collaboration with Col. William L. Sibert, a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission in charge of Atlantic construction, in a book entitled "The Construction of the Panama Canal," published in New York by D. Appleton & Co. in 1915. This volume is probably the best engineering historical treatise produced by the construction era.

Just after the declaration of war by the United States in 1917, Mr. Stevens went to see President Wilson and requested an active assignment in the war. The President expressed his interest, as Russia was then an ally and badly in need of a competent railroad man, in connection with its war transportation problems. Appointed as Minister Plenipotentiary and head of the United States Railway Mission to Russia in 1917, he undertook the difficult tasks involved in operating its railroad system. Later, from 1919 to 1923, he was president of the Inter-Allied Technical Board supervising the Siberian railways.

In these positions he observed the start and early years of the Communist Revolution. Accurately foreseeing the vast scope of that work conspiracy, he was among the first to alert responsible leaders of the United States to its dangers.

It is thus historically fitting that in 1956, which marks the 50th anniversary of the decision in 1906 by the Congress and the President for the lake-lock plan for building the Panama Canal, that the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, formerly Civil

Governor of the Canal Zone, and the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, serving during peak years of canal construction, and later a Member of Congress, should write for the occasion of Mr. Stevens' birthday an inspiring poem that epitomizes the vision and work of this eminent leader for the Panama Canal.

The poem follows:

"JOHN F. STEVENS: A TRIBUTE

"Amongst all those whose labors cleft the land
To blend, as one, the seas at Panama—
There was none greater than John Stevens; and
The passing years bear witness. He foresaw—
More clearly than the others had foreseen—
The value of the plan for lock and lake,
And led Authority—in doubt between
Diverse designs—the wiser choice to make.
Possessed of genius rare, with skills supreme
And ripen'd knowledge gained from ventures vasts—
He shaped the moulds to vitalize the Dream
Which had so long persisted in the past.
His all he gave to serve the Isthmian Task:
What more could men demand, or duty ask?"

—*Maurice H. Thatcher.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 25, 1956.

Eleventh Anniversary of Meeting of American and Russian Soldiers on the Elbe River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement prepared by me about the 11th anniversary of the meeting of American and Russian soldiers on the Elbe River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR POTTER

Today is a significant day for a great many American veterans. It is a day which is well worth remembrance and thoughtful consideration of the American people. Today marks the 11th anniversary reunion of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up. I would like to quote now from a letter by Joseph Polowsky, the secretary of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, sent to the fellow veterans of that occasion:

"Eleven years ago, at noon on Elbe day 1945, a patrol of American riflemen thrust through the no-man's land between the forward American and Russian lines and linked up with a patrol of Russian soldiers on the east bank of the Elbe River. On that blood-soaked river bank, we met the Russian soldiers with high resolve and as friends. All of us on both sides swore never to forget the scene, the day or each other, swore to do what we could to make a freer and more peaceful world for our children, and to meet again in peace. Two days later, when the link-up was more fully secured and American and Russian military units were joyously greeting each other, our patrol mission was completed, and we returned to the American lines; General Eisenhower said the American people were proud of us for our initiative and devotion to duty. The confidence and optimism, the spirit of comradeship and hospitality all of us had 11 years ago, from General Eisenhower to the privates in the field, lives on in us as American veterans. We'll make the American people proud of us once again when we shake hands again with the Soviet Elbe veterans at our reunion this month in Washington."

I should like to quote also from a letter from Mr. Polowsky addressed to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up:

"Last spring, the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union cooperated in bringing together the American and Soviet Elbe veterans for an inspiring and successful 10th anniversary reunion in Moscow. On May 11, 1955, at a formal meeting at which military and civilian representatives of the United States Government and the Soviet Government were present, the Elbe veterans read the following unanimously approved joint declaration: 'We Soviet and American veterans of the Elbe River link-up of the Allied Armies in 1945, gathered together in Moscow on the 10th anniversary of that historic event, affirm that we have not forgotten the friendly alliance formed during the war years. The link-up of our soldiers at the Elbe will live on in history of mankind as an enduring symbol of friendship, good will and mutual respect between our peoples. Today, as 10 years ago, we declare our determination to work for friendship between the American and Soviet peoples and the establishment of a peaceful world. We hope this first reunion will establish a tradition. We hope that on future anniversaries of the Elbe River link-up, American and Soviet war veterans will exchange friendly greetings and hold reunions as friends.'

"We American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up will hold our 11th anniversary reunion in Washington, D. C., on Elbe Day—April 25, 1956. We extend to the Soviet Veterans of the Elbe River link-up a cordial invitation for a group of Soviet World War II veterans to visit us at our reunion. We are sure that the visit of the Soviet veterans to the United States this spring will contribute to the establishment of the free and friendly world we all fought for during the years of the Second World War."

And now, may I read the words of acceptance from the chairman of the Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe. He says:

"Permit me, on behalf of the Soviet veterans of the Elbe meeting, to sincerely thank you for the invitation extended to the Soviet participants in this unforgettable, historic meeting to visit the United States of America to participate in the meeting of the American Veterans of the Elbe River link-up, which is being held on April 25, 1956, in Washington, D. C.; and thank you also for your good wishes and your efforts toward supporting and strengthening the ties between the American and Soviet veterans of the Second World War.

"The Soviet committee of the participants of the meeting at the Elbe, with a deep feeling of gratitude, accepts your kind invitation and is ready to send to the United States a group of Soviet participants of 5 to 7 people to take part in the meeting of April 25th of this year in Washington, D. C.

"We trust that the meeting of the Soviet and American veterans of the Second World War will further mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, and other freedom loving peoples who carried on so great a battle against a common enemy in the years of the Second World War."

It is interesting to note that some 11 years ago the armies of the United States and of the Soviet Union were fighting a common cause. The meeting at the Elbe demonstrated that the peoples of these two countries deeply cherish the common goals of freedom and peace. This should serve as a reminder to all of those in positions of responsibility in all countries that these are the goals of the peoples. We all sincerely hope that these meetings on a man to man basis at the various levels of our society will continue to deepen the mutual understandings and to strengthen the bonds of common interest all over the world.

Results of Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted I would like to include in the RECORD the result of my annual questionnaire. About 12,700 of these questionnaires went out to the persons who are on my mailing list to receive my semimonthly newsletter. In addition, I sent my questionnaire to every newspaper which is published in Maricopa County and asked that it be printed in such a manner that it could be cut and mailed to me. I received many questionnaires from this source. A total of 1,868 questionnaires were returned to my office; 95 percent of the answers came from persons residing in Maricopa County, Ariz. I do not claim that my poll is a scientific sampling of the opinion of voters in Maricopa County. It does reflect, however, as broad a cross section of the voters as it was possible for me to obtain.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's foreign policy?	75	15	10
2. Should we continue military aid to friendly foreign nations?	71	18	11
3. Do you favor amending the Walter-McCarran Act to allow a greater number of immigrants to enter the United States?	24	64	12
4. Do you favor Secretary Benson's farm program?	68	15	17
5. Should defense spending continue at the present level?	68	17	15
6. Do you favor a tax reduction prior to the attainment of a balanced budget?	20	75	5
7. Do you believe that the Eisenhower administration has done a good job in governing the country in the past 3 years?	89	8	3
8. Do you favor Federal aid to school construction?	53	38	9
9. Should the United States postal service be self-supporting	79	14	7
10. Do you favor a national right-to-work law, outlawing compulsory membership in any labor organization?	86	11	3

The Parris Island Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I was shocked to read of the death of some fine young Americans at the Marine training base on Parris Island.

My first reaction was one of horror. It seemed completely inconceivable that this tragedy could have happened in this country. Even more amazing, the incident occurred in the United States Marines.

Everyone knows that the Marine Corps has a reputation for toughness. It is an important part of the great spirit of a great fighting organization. Each former marine I know takes particular pride in his service. Without exception, every young man I have met who served with the corps wears his former service with a certain air, a knowledge that he was one of the finest outfits in world military history.

On every battlefield the United States Marines have acquitted themselves well. Every volume that tells of the growth of this great Nation has an important place for the leathernecks. It is true now as it was 170 years ago, the marine has no superior as a fighting man. An important part of the secret of his success has always been the training he receives. In a word, it is rough; it's meant to be. Yet for all its roughness there is intelligence, planning and direction to it.

Still in the final analysis any system is only as good as the men who administer it. In the Marine Corps, as indeed everywhere else where man is involved there are instances of abuse and flagrant violation. A review of the record of any criminal court will show that man has a habit of violating his conscience and the best laid plans of God and his fellow creatures. So it is with the Marines.

In every instance the corps tries to find and correct any inequalities or injustices in the system. Their only interest is in maintaining the quality of their organization. Humiliation of the individual and stupidity are not a part of their plan. If those two undesirable qualities crop up occasionally they are committed by individuals and not by the system, nor the men who direct the Marine Corps.

This is a most difficult matter to consider rationally or objectively. The fact is that young Americans have died while taking training under the rules and regulations of a United States Armed Force.

Still, it seems to me that there has been some hysteria toward this tragedy. The papers have been filled with stories about other abuses or alleged abuses in boot camp. Everyone has an opinion and it is usually a very violent one.

However, I firmly believe that this is a matter which the Marines can handle. They have been dealing with the weakness and the strength in men for a great many years. Their discipline and training have always been tough. Their courts-martial records show that there have been abuses before. In every instance they have handled their problems with the same dispatch and efficiency which characterizes every combat action in which they have participated.

Commandant Pate's reaction to the news of the tragedy was instant and commendable. He flew down to the scene to take charge, to make sure that an investigation was launched with the maximum of authority to get the job done; he called for a board of inquiry. At no point can I find reason to criticize the action of the general or any of his officers since the entire incident came to light. They know the full story of what happened and will act accordingly.

Whatever the decision rendered by the board of inquiry, I have every reason to believe that it will be a fair one—fair to the American people, just to the parties involved, and in the finest tradition of the United States Marines.

As to the future of the training programs, I think they are in the best hands right now. If modifications are called for, they will be modified. If the system is right and some individuals are wrong, the individuals will be changed.

We have trusted the United States Marine Corps in war. Now let us have confidence in them in peace. And more, let us pray to God that they might always receive His help and guidance.

The Right To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an interesting and provocative book, The Right To Know, by an old friend, Kent Cooper, executive director and former general manager of the Associated Press. At any time and under any circumstances, anything from Mr. Cooper on the subject of news gathering and dissemination would be worth while. At this time, when the United States is struggling painfully with the difficult dilemma of reconciling the necessity of keeping news of strategic value from potential enemies with the guaranties of the Bill of Rights and the necessity of having an informed and intelligent electorate, this book is most timely.

It is of vital importance that all responsible Government officials should continue to actively concern themselves with the problem of releasing legitimate news of the Government business to the greatest extent possible to the people by press and radio. As Cooper so dramatically points out, the surest way to destroy free government is by suppression and tainting of news sources.

While I do not agree with all of the conclusions and comments contained in this interesting and readable book, I do commend it wholeheartedly to readers interested in this vital subject.

Statement of Hon. Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, in Support of H. R. 10344

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid statement made by our colleague and my very good friend from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE, in support of H. R. 10344, introduced by Mr. LANE—

To establish the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the States and Territories with respect to sedition against the Government of the United States, States, Territories, and their political subdivisions.

Which statement was made April 20, 1956, before Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee.

There is no Member better versed on the subject matter of H. R. 10344 than our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. LANE. I might also say there is no Member of the House more devoted in the performance of his duties to his people than my distinguished friend, Mr. LANE, of Massachusetts.

The bill which he introduced, and the statement he made in support of it are evidence of the fine character of service which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] renders.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. LANE, DEMOCRAT, MASSACHUSETTS, SUPPORTING H. R. 10344, "TO ESTABLISH THE CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STATES AND TERRITORIES WITH RESPECT TO SEDITION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, STATES, TERRITORIES, AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS," SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, APRIL 20, 1956

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have witnessed a gradual erosion of States rights.

It goes without saying, that only the Federal Government can carry out certain functions, but the growing tendency to take over more and more authority, denying to the States even the right of cooperation, will lead to a topheavy centralization of power.

Amendment 10 to the Constitution provides that "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Under the Smith Act, passed by the Congress, the Federal Government is empowered to try and punish those who are accused and are found guilty of sedition.

The law does not specifically prohibit the States from taking such action under their own laws.

The Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided, but with a strong dissenting opinion by the minority, that only the Federal courts have jurisdiction in cases involving sedition.

This has paralyzed the initiative of those States which, under their own laws, have been most active in prosecuting sedition within their own borders.

In turn, this has weakened our total efforts to protect ourselves from the Communist conspiracy, and has had the effect of giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

The Communists are expert in exploiting every legal loophole to their advantage, and will continue to do so as long as we permit them to claim a conflict between Federal and State laws of this issue. Any division plays into their hands.

Obviously, State officials are more familiar with certain aspects of the problem, as well as having the additional facilities to prosecute sedition.

Furthermore, there is a precedent for joint Federal-State action.

Under the Volstead Act, both authorities moved in on violators of the prohibition laws.

Unfortunately, the Smith Act was loosely written.

This fact is generally recognized as a result of the Supreme Court's interpretation.

To compensate for this omission, several bills are up for consideration by the subcommittee.

One of them is H. R. 3 "to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws."

I submit that is language altogether too general.

It states "that no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect."

This covers all legislation.

It could have far-reaching applications, establishing the principle of precedence and priority on the part of the Federal Government "to occupy the field" if Congress so states, without delegation of that power to the Federal Government by the States through amendment of the Constitution.

Secondly, H. R. 3 provides that, in cases of irreconcilable conflict between acts of Congress and State laws, the Federal law shall invalidate those contradictory provisions of the State laws.

We are primarily concerned here with the problem of sedition alone, and not dealing with possible legislation in which there might be an honest difference of opinion among our people, or progressive legislation which the several States might enact without fear of being subordinated in all cases to the will of Congress.

Again there is no conflict on the issue of sedition.

We need and want the most effective employment of our courts to try and punish sedition.

Acting in concert, we shall make sure that no Communist conspirators will escape.

Speaking in support of my bill, H. R. 10344, I want to emphasize that it is specifically limited to sedition.

And that it will establish a concurrent jurisdiction as among the Federal Government, the States, the Territories, and their political subdivisions, to make certain that the laws and the courts give us full protection against those who conspire to overthrow the Government by force and violence.

To ferret out the Communist intriguers, there must be specific authority under both Federal and State laws for this purpose.

H. R. 10344, by establishing concurrent jurisdiction with respect to sedition keeps us well on the target.

It avoids the suggestion that Congress might expressly provide for the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject matter.

It clearly removes any possibility of judicial conflict of authority in dealing with the Communist danger and without establishing rules of interpretation that might be used in similar circumstances, and regarding other issues as a subterfuge for weakening our cherished institutions.

I submit that H. R. 10344 is strictly to the point.

Southbridge DAV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the text, in part, of an address I delivered on Sunday, April 22, 1956, at the annual banquet of the Southbridge, Mass., chapter, Disabled American Veterans.

The material follows:

REMARKS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN BEFORE THE DAV, SOUTHBRIDGE, MASS., APRIL 22, 1956

Distinguished commander, distinguished State commander, Judge Williams, my able and distinguished friends of the general court, Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, distinguished town officials, Gold Star Mothers, officers, members, and friends, it is always with a great sense of privilege that I attend the installations of this outstanding veterans' organization because I am conscious of the fact, as the American people are, that this Nation owes to you and to all our gallant veterans a deep debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Moreover, you have not been satisfied to serve in time of war alone and to offer your all on the altar of patriotic devotion. You have also made, and are making, tremendous contributions to the Nation in time of peace.

Your service to this beautiful community in various phases of its civic, economic, and political life, your unselfish service to the State and particularly your untiring efforts for the disabled veterans and their dependents are so well known, so memorable and distinguished, so praiseworthy, that they scarcely need comment from me or anyone else.

However, I gladly embrace this opportunity once again to tell you how deeply and sincerely your fine work is appreciated, and I am sure that it will be continued with the same zeal with which it has been conducted in the past.

I propose this afternoon to discuss with you very briefly some matters relating to veterans' affairs which are presently pending in the Congress and before the country, but before I do that I would like to make some reference to the progress we are making regarding flood-control and flood-rehabilitation work because I know how close to your hearts this subject is, and you know how close it is to mine.

When the great flood disaster struck us last summer and fall, it came like most disasters of this kind without particular warning. Not even our weather services, which usually endeavors to the best of its ability to give us timely reports, was able to present an accurate forecast of the approach and course of the terrible storm which caused such great loss of life and heavy damage in our area.

Most unfortunately and most unhappily this lovely community was afflicted with a sorrowful blow almost without precedent in the history of our State, in fact, I doubt that any similar disaster has ever beset any area in our State as the result of floods and turbulent waters as that which was visited upon us last August and which was augmented during the fall season.

The damage was great and the losses and suffering that followed almost unbelievable but, as I stated in your town hall a few days after this frightful disaster, I am proud and filled with unbounded admiration for this stirring manner in which all the people of your community faced up to this great disaster and the way in which you set to work both in your public and private facilities, to bring order so speedily out of the chaos and confusion and restore vital public services and set into motion the machinery of rehabilitation. Let me emphasize that you are all entitled to great credit, all of your town officials, your able, diligent, effective representatives in the general court, your various civic and business organizations and, indeed, all the people of Southbridge, for the spirit of determination and fortitude which you exhibited in the midst of adversity.

As you know, Government at every level has been participating in the efforts to repair the damage that was wrought and to bring the community back to normal in every respect. In this work your town government has made tremendous contributions and all your town officials to a man, have given their cooperation and assistance.

The State government, which has primary responsibility for the rivers and waterways of the Commonwealth, due in large measure to the unceasing, vigorous, persistent labors of Senator Benoit and Representative Cournoyer, and State agencies, is endeavoring to play its part, and the Red Cross and Federal Government, pursuant to its mandate under the laws, to cope with emergency situations is working and cooperating to the fullest extent possible. For all these efforts we can be thankful, to the Army engineers, civilian defense, Small Business Administration, and all the rest, and we can be thankful most of all for the indomitable spirit and never-say-die attitude of the good people of Southbridge who have made sure that their community will rise up from this disaster stronger, more prosperous, and finer than ever.

I may say that in Washington we are making splendid progress to date with the efforts which I commenced right after the floods and have continued since that time as chairman of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Prevention and Rehabilitation.

So urgently have we pressed the matter of flood protection in this area in our determination to see to it in every way we can that such a disaster will never be visited upon the people again, that almost within a month from the convening of Congress this year, we were able to secure legislation inaugurating several major flood projects in our area including the major dam at East Brimfield, which is considered by the Army engineers to be the key to adequate protection at Southbridge. That project has been authorized and planning money has been appropriated and we expect that before long construction will be underway. I am also pressing for planning money for the project at Westville which is another important part of the overall protective plan and, in time, I expect that that will also be accomplished although the engineers advise me that from an operational standpoint it would be necessary substantially to complete East Brimfield first.

The point I desire to make, my friends, is that we are moving as rapidly as humanly possible toward the desirable goal of full and adequate flood protection for this community and other areas in our State against the ravages and cruel afflictions of periodic floods. And we have been also moving with all possible dispatch with activities designed to effect stream clearance and stream im-

provement by the removal of rubbish, debris, and other obstructions and to provide for unimpeded flow of the river and the other streams involved.

In this work, among other features, we must understand two things, first, that it is a cooperative undertaking which involves the concurrence and participation of the local governments, and the State government as well as the Federal Government.

Secondly, we must realize that the major projects in mind are of considerable magnitude and require careful planning and construction activities over a period of time and that they cannot be completed over night.

The main thing to remember is that we are making progress, great progress. We are on the right road, moving in the right direction, and if we continue to cooperate with each other as we have been doing up to this point, I venture the prediction that it will not be very long before we will realize our objectives and the people of this community will be able to feel assured that, insofar as anything that can be done to insure them protection against terrible floods, it will have been done and accomplished by the patience, persistency, ability, and zeal of all those to whom responsibility for this work may be committed.

Then there is the question also of disaster insurance which will enable people and businessmen generally to be insured against floods and other disasters. To those of us in this area the arguments for this proposal are unanswerable. Admittedly there are practical difficulties to be worked out concerning the program, and the committees of the Congress are now considering them with vigor and careful attention, and I am hopeful that we will be able in due course to provide a system of insurance that will go a long way toward indemnifying our people against losses from these great disturbances of nature.

This great organization may feel well pleased and well satisfied with the response its membership has made in time of stress and danger. Dedicated as you are to the welfare, interest and defense of the Nation, determined as you are by reason of your own past service to protect it, I know that it is not necessary for me to urge upon you the continuance of your splendid work.

By all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against floods so vitally needed.

And by all means, let us continue to build adequate protection against the dreadful world conspiracy of communism which threatens our liberties at this hour. That is a particular job for patriotic Americans to see to it that the insidious influences of subversive elements is checked.

And let us see to it also that the cause of the veteran and their dependents of the people who have done so much to sustain this country is protected and advanced in the legislative bodies of the Nation and in every other place necessary. Let us make special efforts to assist our disabled veteran and his dear ones and, indeed, all the veterans with reference to the rights and privileges which the Congress has so fittingly extended to them—the GI Bill of Rights—education, homes, hospitalization and medical care and pensions which must be assured and provided at standards commensurate with the higher price levels and the higher cost of living which obtain in the country. In short, let us keep America strong, militarily, economically, socially and, above all, spiritually, since spiritual strength, belief in our Creator and in the great liberties we enjoy is the greatest weapon we have in combating the evil enemies that would destroy us. Let us stand by our ideals, by the principles of the Constitution and the Nation, the rights of the individual, the rights of our people to advance to a more dynamic way of life and we will not only thus protect and secure our liberties but we will be making the greatest contribution possible to a better, more prosperous and happier America and the cause of lasting world peace.

One Hundred Thirty-fifth Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence this year, I arranged, at the suggestion of Mr. Peter Chumbris, formerly assistant attorney general of my State of New Mexico, to have Father George P. Gallos, of the Greek Orthodox Church of the Annunciation in Baltimore, invited to offer the prayer at the opening session in the House on Monday, March 26. Father Gallos offered the following beautiful and inspiring prayer:

God of our Father, to Thee, author of liberty, to Thee we pray. On this occasion of the 135th anniversary of Greek independence, we ask Thee, Lord, to bless the Greek people. Keep alive in them the love of liberty for which they bravely fought and sacrificed. Grant that the Greek Nation ever may be on the side of justice, democracy, and freedom.

Lord God of Hosts, we pray for America, this land of ours, on which Thou hast bestowed so many rich blessings. Make us worthy of our inheritance. Let not Thy wrath descend upon us. Save us from new ordeals and tribulations, for wars and rumors of wars are shaking the equilibrium of the earth and heavy clouds are invading the tranquil heavens of peace.

O Ruler of the Universe, preserve in harmony those who govern us. Make them vigilant and keep them from falling into the spirit of sloth, faintheartedness, lust for power, and idle talk. Grant them, rather strength to do Thy will, wisdom to govern well, and make them worthy laborers of Thy kingdom, a kingdom of love, goodness, justice, mercy, and peace.

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us. Enlighten us, through the light of Thy truth, O Lord, and guide us in the paths of Thy precepts. Amen.

Mr. Speaker, the sons and daughters of Greece who, like Mr. Chumbris, are devoted to the democratic ideals steadfastly followed by the Greek Nation and our own, have contributed to the greatness of America. They, like all other Americans who believe in and adhere to those democratic ideals, are saddened today at the steadfast refusal of the British Government to grant the people of Cyprus the right to democratic self-determination, so that they may govern themselves or may join with Greece, their mother country, in a common government under a common heritage and culture.

And yet from Father Gallos' mouth we in the House heard these words sincerely offered in prayer:

Lord of Love, who didst command the disciples to pray for their enemies and who didst pray for those who crucified Thee, grant that we, too, may forgive those who hate us and show brotherly love to those who maltreat us.

In our hearts we all pray that the injustices occurring in Cyprus may be righted, and that the British Government and the people of Cyprus may reach a mutual understanding with our Lord's help, guidance and divine light, that will lead to peace and justice for all.

Public Policy Aspects of Automation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago it was my pleasure to address a Conference on Automation in Pittsburgh, Pa., cosponsored by the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council and Labor Education Service, Pennsylvania State University. My remarks were directed toward the public policy aspects of automation. Mr. Bruno A. Moski, Director of Industrial Engineering, Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co. presented the management viewpoint while Mr. Nat Goldfinger, economist from the Department of Research, AFL-CIO, presented the labor viewpoint. Delegates from AFL and CIO local unions and from lodges of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen from the western Pennsylvania area attended the conference and participated in the discussion which followed the formal presentation of the various viewpoints on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, this Conference on Automation was an inspirational example of democracy in action, citizens meeting together to discuss the various aspects of a mutual problem which is of immediate concern to the working people of our country. The conference in Pittsburgh made an outstanding contribution toward the more widespread understanding of the impact which automation will have on our social and economic systems. I congratulate the Labor Extension Service of Penn State University and the Pittsburgh Labor Education Council for their outstanding leadership in making the conference an outstanding success and hope that this type of meeting may serve as a model of similar discussions in other parts of the United States.

The text of my address follows:

Congressional concern over the impact of automation on our citizens, our living habits, and our economy has many different aspects. I would like to discuss some of the more important of them in the brief time allotted me for this initial presentation. Others may come into our discussion as the result of questions following your buzz sessions.

I would like to devote my remarks here today to these major points in regard to automation: (1) Automation in the Federal Government; (2) the broad public policy aspects of automation; (3) the role of the Federal Government in meeting the challenge of automation; and (4) positive steps which should be taken now.

I. AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In our general consideration of automation, we have tended to direct our attention to the application of automation in industrial situations. We have learned of dramatic changes in the production-line uses of automation, whereby hundreds of workers have been replaced by a handful, because of the installation of awe-inspiring machines and electronically controlled operations.

Less has been heard about the impact of automation on various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal reported that machines to streamline paper work in the Bureau of Public Debt of the Treasury Department have reduced the number of employees in that office by two-thirds over the past 10 years. Records divisions of the Veterans' Administration and the Social Security Administration are drastically reducing their number of employees through the use of electronic machinery. The Weather Bureau now has a machine which automatically reproduces the weather maps appearing in our daily papers. Weather data is fed into the machine, and in 8 minutes it performs mathematical computations that would take one man 64 years to complete.

The Post Office Department will perhaps have the greatest use for electronic machinery in the years ahead. Already there are various machines in use which sort mail, and perform other similar mechanical functions. The Wall Street Journal reports that encouraging results have been obtained on tests of a new machine which can read typewritten addresses on letters and sort these letters by city of destination.

The Post Office has also installed a new stamp-vending machine for use in post offices. You drop in coins, dial the number of stamps you desire, and they are automatically dispensed. A recorded voice even says "thank you" to the stamp purchaser.

Thus, you see that all of the applications of automation are not confined to the field of industrial production, but affect workers in the Federal Government as well.

II. BROAD PUBLIC POLICY

In view of the broad social and economic ramifications of automation, what should be the role of the Federal Government? Or to phrase it another way, what are the public policy considerations in the impact of automation on our modern civilization? At the outset I feel that the advent of automation on our modern industrial scene requires us to carefully reexamine our basic philosophy of government, since the concern over the changes automation will bring to our daily lives in the years ahead intimately affects this concept of democratic government.

Our democratic system of government in America is unique because it places primary concern on the individual human being, his wants, his needs, his welfare. All power of government reposes in the hands of the individual citizens. Government is successful in terms of its ability to formulate and carry out policies which fulfill the needs and promote the welfare of the people who delegate certain powers to their government. Government which ignores the needs and welfare of all the people, in order to pursue courses of action beneficial to particular groups of its citizens, is violating our fundamental precepts of democratic government. Good government is responsive to the needs of its people and within its constitutional limitations, acts to meet problems or innovations which conceivably could affect the well-being of its citizens. Such response of government to individual situations may be called public policy. Sound public policy, like good government, must be tailormade to meet the needs of our people and must always keep foremost as its objective the promotion of human welfare and human values. Material progress at the expense of human suffering cannot be defended. This is the way of the totalitarian dictatorships and has no place in our democracy.

These are fundamental statements of fact which we must be aware of in the discussion of automation as it affects public policy. I am sure that most Americans today accept these time-honored philosophies of Government, which were written into our Constitution by the Founding Fathers and implemented by practice over the years.

In searching for a governmental policy to effectively deal with the problems raised by automation, we have certain insights gained by past experience. Automation has sometimes been referred to as the second industrial revolution. What policies were adopted by governments in the past when sudden technological changes appeared?

Most authorities agree that the first industrial revolution took place about 200 years ago, while our country was still divided into colonies of Great Britain. We all remember reading of the violent uprisings in England which accompanied the invention and application of labor-saving machinery in mills and factories. Thousands of workers were thrown out of work in the wave of social and political upheaval. As a result, human suffering under the rule of an absolute monarch caused untold misery and deprivation. Economic justification of the changes, brought about by the first industrial revolution, were expressed by the philosophy that government should not interfere in any way with the right of business and industry to carry out policies, even though they might be detrimental to the public good.

This philosophy dominated the 18th and 19th centuries and extended well into our present century. Certain reactionary elements of our business society even today still cling to this philosophy, which is evident in the lack of social responsibility in the pursuit of their policies.

In America, during the late 1800's, the introduction of mass-production methods brought about a notable acceleration of the first industrial revolution. This period marked the development and growth of giant corporate enterprises of such power as to rival our Government itself. "The public be damned," was the motto of these industrial giants. Their wealth and influence dominated the election of public officials at the State and National governmental levels. Unbridled power and wealth was a corrupting influence on the very foundations of democratic Government.

Resurging public opinion demanded regulation of these monopolistic giants. Antitrust laws, regulatory laws, and court decisions were directed against them, but only a portion of their activities were ever brought under control. Legislation such as the Public Utility Holding Act, and the Securities and Exchange Act, passed during the New Deal years, was a later step to protect the public against further exploitation.

Governmental policy during the period of the growth of monopolistic corporate enterprises was generally one of nonintervention. When the abuses and power of these enterprises grew to such a point as to threaten our form of government, public opinion demanded action. But such action against entrenched economic interests was at best only a checkrein to further abuse.

Some people argue that our material progress during the past 75 years and our present high standard of living could not have taken place otherwise. I am of a different opinion. It was not until corporate excesses began to be curbed that any real advancement of the welfare of the individual citizen took place. Labor was crushed by monopolistic corporate power until the depression and the New Deal afforded working people the legal right to organize and bargain collectively. It has been over the past 20 years that the real advances in our standard of living have taken place, and the role played by organized labor in winning a share of the fruits of corporate wealth is a matter of record.

Here is a lesson which was learned 75 years ago and which is applicable to our present discussion of automation. Government must not surrender its duty of protecting and promoting the welfare of all its citizens, especially in times of economic and technological upheavals. Economic and material progress must never again be permitted to travel a road paved with the bodies of workers, crushed in the mad scramble for wealth and power. Human dignity and the public good must not be subverted to personal greed.

Our Government has a legitimate right to become involved at the very beginning of this "Second Industrial Revolution" so that past abuses will never again be repeated. We, as citizens, should demand such public policies as are necessary to insure that the impact of automation will be intelligently directed toward the realization of benefits which will be enjoyed by all our citizens.

III. THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN MEETING THE CHALLENGE OF AUTOMATION

There can be not doubt that the problem of automation is a national issue. By the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 the Congress of the United States gave legal recognition to the duty of the Federal Government to use its resources to create the conditions making for maximum employment, by fostering and promoting conditions which will afford job opportunities for all people desirous and capable of working.

If the results of automation were to take place suddenly and on a broad scale, millions of workers would be thrown out of work, competing against each other for fewer and fewer jobs at lower and lower pay. Our social and economic system would be in a chaos. Widespread depression and mass unemployment poses a dangerous threat to our democratic way of life. It would be disastrous both in terms of human suffering at home and in terms of the opportunity it would afford to Communist imperialism in its plan for domination of the free world. The stakes in the game are high. Either we adopt public policies to study, anticipate, and channel the course of automation toward human betterment, or like the Frankenstein monster, it may rise up to destroy us.

I am confident that intelligent and informed American citizens will not permit the potential blessings of automation to escape us or be turned against us. We will not permit our Government to stand idly by and await the full impact of automation without preparing ourselves for its effects. We cannot afford the luxury of inaction or failure to face up to the realities of automation. If the administration temporarily in control of the policies of our Government fails to take heed of the impending changes which automation will bring to every phase of our lives, I am sure that a new administration will be elected in its place which will take such action as is deemed necessary.

IV. POSITIVE STEPS NOW

What are some of the ways in which public policy can be effectively directed toward systematic preparation for the social, economic and technological changes brought about by automation?

First, there must be a recognition of automation, what it is, what it means, what

we estimate its effects will be, where its impact will be first felt, and other similar fact-finding questions. Meetings such as this are of tremendous importance because these types of questions are discussed. It is also important that the word "automation" and its meanings be made known to the great numbers of our people who do not have the opportunity of attending such meetings and who may not read or hear about automation. There must be widespread recognition and understanding of the problem, not in technical terms but in the basic understanding of what automation means to individual citizens and how the future of all of us depends on the adoption of sound public policy to deal with the problems which automation creates. Government is motivated into particular courses of action by an awareness of its citizens, and their ability to make their opinions known to their appropriate elected representatives who have a role in the formation of public policy.

One way of making your views known is to call the attention of your public officials to hearings before Joint Committee on the Economic Report. The hearings are entitled "Automation and Technological Change" and contain a wealth of information and statistical data submitted by the expert witnesses who appeared before the committee. A subsequent report on these hearings gives a concise statement of the basic facts of the problem of automation and offers policy recommendations to meet this problem.

Secondly, I feel that sound public policy required that every possible effort be made to strengthen our economy at its foundations so that temporary setbacks resulting from technological change may be compensated for elsewhere in the national economy. By this I mean the enactment of a broad legislative program to place greater purchasing power in the hands of the average citizens. This program would include an increase in personal income tax exemptions; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and an extension of coverage; an increase in social-security benefits, a reduction of the retirement age, and a liberalization of other provisions of the law; liberalization of our unemployment compensation system; assistance to areas of chronic unemployment in the establishment of facilities for vocational rehabilitation, education, and retraining of displaced workers, especially older workers, and the attraction of new industries; an expanded health and medical research program; Federal aid for school and hospital construction; full development of our natural resources, and other similar type programs which will have a long-range beneficial effect on our economy while also meeting the most pressing economic needs of our people.

A dynamic, expanding, full-employment economy is perhaps the best way in which we can prepare ourselves for the impact of automation, and guarantee that hardships to displaced workers and their families will be kept at a minimum. A healthy, expanding economy will be able to absorb displaced workers as well as providing job opportunities for our young people entering the labor market.

Thirdly, it is the responsibility of enlightened management to face up to the broad social aspects of automation and understand and accept their full role in the process of technological change. Industry must be prepared to use part of the wealth and abundance created by more efficient and less costly production in the retraining of displaced workers so that their skills might be utilized in other parts of our economy. Industry has the responsibility of carefully planning and scheduling its production, so that loss of employment and resulting human suffering may be minimized. The institution of new automation machinery must be carefully planned so that due consideration is given to the general state of business so that displaced workers may find new employment more readily.

Fourthly, the impact of automation places on organized labor the responsibility of meeting the challenge of technological advancement. I am proud to pay tribute to the statesmanlike position which the leaders of organized labor have taken in this regard. There will be no machine-smashing riots in the second industrial revolution in America, for the new labor-saving machines offer almost unlimited opportunities for human progress if our technical skill and ability are molded to the needs and betterment of all mankind. This does not mean that labor can afford to sit back and await the fruits of abundance created by more efficient labor-saving machinery. Labor must cooperate with enlightened management in the solution of mutual problems so that the mutual advantages which automation has in store for us may be fully realized. Labor must be prepared to offer constructive recommendations in the application of technological changes to specific situations. Labor must educate its membership to understand automation and mobilize public opinion in the community to a realization of the problems, opportunities and the challenge which we must all meet in this spirit of cooperation.

The horizon is filled with glorious opportunities. A bright new day is dawning, if only we can grasp its significance and adopt policies to meet the challenge of automation.

We look forward to shorter workweeks, more leisure time, greater cultural and recreational opportunities, travel, and an enjoyment of the good things of life with our families.

Men of good will—people in all walks of life, in labor, mangement, and in government—working together in a spirit of cooperation and brotherhood can achieve this goal of freedom, security, and abundance for which civilization has been struggling for thousands of years.

Congratulations, Mr. Kearns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all good Republicans and good Americans rejoice in the victory of our colleague, CARROLL D. KEARNS, in the Pennsylvania primaries yesterday. Pitted against him in the primary was one of the most formidable Republicans of his congressional district. He won, by unofficial reports, by more than 21,000 votes.

While I am not a native of Pennsylvania and know little about the political situation there, it does seem to me that this election's results indicate that our colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, is well on his road to a higher office in the great State of Pennsylvania. I believe that he would make an excellent governor, and an excellent Senator, should my good friend, Senator ED MARTIN, retire.

My wholehearted congratulations and best wishes go to my colleague, CARROLL KEARNS, for his future successes.

Slaughter of Israeli Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1956, a group of Arabs infiltrated into Israel and murdered in cold blood several children and their teachers while they were in the midst of prayer at Habad village. The inhabitants of that village are affiliated with a religious and philanthropic movement whose spiritual head is Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a resident of my district.

I have since received many telegrams of protest from congregations and various religious organizations in my district. Consequently, I have written a letter to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles urging him to take two steps: Condemn those who are responsible for this wanton murder and request indemnification for the families of the victims.

The following is the text of the letter addressed to the Secretary of State:

APRIL 24, 1956.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you in connection with the massacre committed by Arab murderers who infiltrated into Israel on April 11, 1956, and slaughtered in cold blood a group of children and their teachers at prayer in Habad village. This is a most despicable act of atrocity committed against young and innocent children, who weren't even given a chance to defend themselves.

The children of this village in Israel are associated with the religious and philanthropic movement known as Hassidim, which is headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, a citizen of the United States and a resident of my district.

I have received r less than 49 telegrams from congregations and various religious organizations in my district, bearing the signatures of the rabbis and presidents of these groups, in protest against the massacre at Habad village. These religious leaders implore our Government to take the necessary measures to prevent similar outrages in the future and the needless shedding of innocent blood.

Public opinion is still one of the most effective means of stopping such atrocities in a civilized world. I, therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, to take the following two steps:

First, to express in the strongest possible terms our Government's condemnation of those responsible for this act of murder.

Second, to request indemnification for the bereaved families of the victims.

I feel certain that if these two steps are taken it would greatly discourage such inhuman and barbarous acts in the future.

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

The wording of the telegram from the religious organizations and congregations, signed by their respective rabbis or presidents, is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *April 23, 1956.*

Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Washington, D. C.:

The children slain in cold blood while at prayer in Habad Village, Israel, last Wednesday, belong with numerous congregations

and schools in America to the same family of Habad Lubavitch followers of purely religious and philanthropic Hassidic movement headed by Chief Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, American citizen, with headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y. We are our brothers' keeper grieved and heartbroken at cold-blooded murder of young brothers in Holy Land. We demand our Government take energetic effective steps to prevent similar massacre and assure indemnification of bereaved families.

Congregation Bikur Choilim, Rabbi Sholom Hecht; Congregation Tifereth Israel, Meyer Hasper, President; Congregation Kesser Torah, Rabbi Weinberg I. Rosenberg, President; Congregation Beth Aaron Beth Sholom, Rabbi E. Berman; Congregation Chevra Thilim, M. Bernstein, President; Congregation Skwer, Mr. Holtzman, President; Congregation Emunah Sheleimo, Rabbi A. Jacobson; Congregation Chevra Kadishe, Rabbi A. Katzman; Congregation Shaar Hashomayim, Rabbi Rosenbaum; New Hebrew School, Rabbi S. Spiegel, S. Beck, President; Congregation Oilem Sholeim, M. Widovsky, President; Chevra Mishnayos Anshei Wolin, I. Y. Zwieg, President; Congregation B'nei Israel, Rabbi Samuel Baskin, L. Grossman, President; Congregation Beis Aaron Anshei Sfard, D. Weissman, President; Congregation Machzikei Emes, Rabbi Auerbach; Congregation Arugas Haboshem, Grand Rabbi L. Greenwald, Mr. Rosenberg, President; Chevra Liadi, Rabbi Klein; Congregation Pride of Israel, Rabbi Malenick; Congregation Kehal Chareidim, Rabbi Moskowitz, Mr. Friedman, President; Congregation Balchwer, Ch. Meyer, President; Congregation Anshei Ujehle, Rabbi I. Meisels, J. M. Zeidenfeld, President; Chevra Bikur Cholim, Rabbi S. Novick, A. Goodman, President; Agudas Achim, Rabbi B. Z. Peffer, H. Kuznick, President; Congregation Beth Yitzchok, Rabbi Rabinowitz; Congregation B'nai Yissochor, Rabbi L. Spiro; Congregation Adas Yeshurun, Rabbi Teitz; Congregation Beth Jacob, Mr. Pilchick, President; Congregation Shearith Israel, N. Landman, President; Congregation Bnei Issochor, Rabbi E. Shapiro, M. Mermelstein, President; Congregation Knesset Israel, Rabbi E. Cohen, Mr. Finkel, President; Congregation Torah Utefila, Rabbi A. Levine, Mr. Trattner, President; Congregation Dershowitz, Rabbi M. L. Malik, Samuel Dershowitz, President; Congregation Sheveth Achim, Mr. Jagadnik, President; Congregation Kol Israel, Rabbi Shinaller, L. Yandah, President; Boyaner Kloiz, Rabbi I. Stern, M. Weitman, President; Pirchei Agudas Israel, M. Lazar, President; Congregation B'nai Jacob Anshei Sholom, Rabbi Bunim; Congregation Glory Israel, J. Gilberglat, President; Congregation Ahavas Achim Bnai Israel, L. Kott, Secretary; Young Israel of Willoughby, Rabbi Yachnes, Joe King, President; Chasidei Belza, Rabbi M. Feder, M. Weiss, President; Congregation Or Itzchok, Rabbi E. Rosenbaum, J. Kleinbrand, President; Young Israel of Brooklyn, B. Solomon, President; Beth Hamerdrash Chasidei Amshenov, Rabbi I. Kalish; Adas Yereim, H. Lipshitz, President; Congregation Kehilat Jacob, Rabbi J. Grunwald, H. Lipshutz, President; Congregation Divrei Jechezkal, Rabbi Supnick; Congregation Netzach Israel, Rabbi M. Horowitz; National Council of Young Israel, Meyer Wiener, President, Elijah Stein, Chairman of Eretz Israel Committee.

A Well-Deserved Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for his factual, fearless, and exceptionally meritorious work, Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, has been given the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award.

Many of us in Congress have long realized that Mollenhoff's courage, ability, discrimination, and desire to get and report the facts have over the years given the Members of Congress as well as the public the facts not only in connection with the doings of Wolf Ladejinsky, but that he has been true to what I assume to be the reporter's objective—ascertaining and giving to the public an accurate narrative of the incidents he has been called upon to report.

All too often reporters have forgotten what the public has assumed to be their function—a narration of what actually was said or happened in connection with a specific incident. All too frequently, reading carefully a news story, one has found himself compelled to reexamine the article, determine if possible where the factual statement ended, where the expression of an opinion—an editorial or commentator's function—began.

Mollenhoff is not lacking in either the ability or the courage to express an opinion, but his writings make it easy for the reader to separate the two when they are joined in the same story.

Few reporters or writers have done more to clearly, accurately lay the facts on the record, expose the misuse of health and welfare funds, the dues and special assessments paid by union members, the violence and lawlessness in which some—fortunately a few—of their officials have engaged. The stories which he has written about these activities have been a warning to sincere union members and leaders, a notice to legislators of the need for sound, courageous action by them.

From the following press notice comes the notification of the award:

MOLLENHOFF GETS CLAPPER AWARD

The Raymond Clapper Memorial Award, given annually for exceptionally meritorious work by a newspaper correspondent in Washington, was won last night by Clark R. Mollenhoff, of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

Mr. Mollenhoff, 12th winner of the award established in memory of the late Washington correspondent, received a $500 check and scroll in a ceremony at the closing dinner of the American Society of Newspaper Editors at the Hotel Statler.

The judges, five ASNE members, awarded him first prize for his stories concerning Wolf Ladejinsky, former United States agriculture attaché in Tokyo who figured in a controversy over Federal security regulations.

The Time To Help Small Business Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1956, I had the pleasure of addressing the National Association of Tool & Die Manufacturers at its ninth annual dinner held at the Hotel Statler in Washington, D. C. My address follows:

REMARKS OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TOOL AND DIE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is nice to be with you again even though this is the first time you have invited me to sing for my dinner. I probably should have declined on two grounds. First, I have no union card, and, second, your very fine entertainers would no doubt refuse to appear on the same program with me properly urging that my talent fell short of their minimum criteria for entertainment.

Nevertheless, I am prepared to leave with you some of my thoughts. I know that at least some of you may disagree with me but controversy is good for the American soul; that is, the political soul—particularly in an election year.

It has been my happy privilege to serve on the House Small Business Committee for many years. It is one of the few committees of Congress which has been truly nonpartisan. I cannot recall a single recommendation coming from that committee which did not have bipartisan support.

Therefore you should bear in mind that anything I say that is critical is deliberately intended to be critical but is just as deliberately intended not to be political.

The criticisms that have come from my committee were always made constructively, never destructively, and always made without regard to the political affiliations of the appointee against whom directed.

I sincerely believe that my Republican colleagues on our committee will endorse what I say.

I will try to relate my remarks directly to your interests.

You will hear more and more as the year rolls on that small business is the backbone of our free-enterprise economy and that big business aided by big business in Government is more and more throttling small business.

While none of you are small in the colloquial sense, you are small business in accordance with our legal definition. Each of you represents a business which is independently owned and not dominant in your industry. That is the new language of the statute, which defines small business.

The Defense Department had an arbitrary legal definition that any firm with 500 or more employees was big business and any firm with less than 500 employees was small.

The reason for the change of the definition is important. The Congress found that small business must be protected against the depredations of big business and of big government and accordingly, enacted into law many aids, safeguards, and even preferences for small business.

These laws were enacted because the facts as developed in dozens of hearings, sustained by volumes of testimony and documentary evidence demanded them.

Similarly, almost a year ago we enacted a law repealing the Defense Department's arbitrary definition and making it mandatory that the Small Business Act definition, which I enunciated before, be uniformly applied in all Government agencies.

Now, I do not care whether that policy has not been implemented and enforced by the Defense Department because Charlie Wilson is big business or favors big business or because his subordinates unbeknown to him have failed to do so for fear of antagonizing the boss. You and I are not concerned with the motives, good or bad. We are concerned that the congressional committees that urged that policy upon him before enactment of the law, were told that the policy was a good one and should be the rule.

We are more concerned with the simple incontrovertible fact that a concededly good doctrine was not voluntarily effectuated and the Congress was compelled to and did mandate it. The same agency continues to ignore and flout the law.

That is typical of how small business is being mistreated by the executive department of the Government.

We get fine speeches from the top echelon about broadening the base, integrating small business into Government procurement, both military and civilian, and about requiring the big prime contractors to subcontract a fair portion of their contracts to small business. They come into our hearings and document their slogans and shibboleths with directives and regulations.

Then we go out into the field only to learn that the complaints from small business have increased both in number and in bitterness.

What do we find?

Except for isolated instances we find the procurement offices fighting small business and making it impossible for them to get into the program, withholding plans and specifications, imposing impossible conditions, putting obstacles in the way of performance, demanding changes and extras without compensation, and delaying their payments interminably.

Our latest field investigations were made during the Easter vacation only a few weeks ago.

We found that it took 6 to 9 months for directives to reach the personnel in the field and then too frequently they were promptly ignored by the people charged with enforcing them.

Our Defense Department is still spending about $40 billion per year. How much of it are you getting? Not very much. All the small business throughout the whole country is only getting 17.6 percent of the prime contracts.

I am amused and at the same time terrified by Government economists who prate about our prosperity and our stability.

Our national gross income is stable they tell us. Of course, it is when you add big business income to farmers' income to small business income. The total of the gross is about the same for 1955 as for 1954.

What they do not tell you is that the gross income of big business is up over a billion two hundred million dollars and the gross income of the rest of our economy is down by a billion dollars.

They tell you that bankruptcies for the whole country are no more than in the previous years. Of course, they are. Big business failures have practically disappeared and those of the rest of our economy have nearly doubled.

They tell you that the number of business firms has remained stable in the last 3 years, that is, it has not changed. They do not tell you that in the prior 3 years our economy grew to the extent of 50,000 new firms a year. What about the manufacturing firms with less than $250,000 in assets? We are getting closer home to you now. They are the bulk of your customers. Their prosperity or lack of it, is directly tied to yours.

In the first 6 months of 1952 they netted profits after taxes of $175 million. Last year for the same period they netted only $60 million. Did you get the difference of $115 million? I doubt it.

From 1952 to 1955 these same firms had 40 percent less funds available for reinvestment and expansion. That means 40 percent less with which to buy your tools and dies.

But neither you nor they need investment capital. Oh, no. You just call up your banker and tell him what you need—and try to get it.

A recent survey shows that 10,000 manufacturing companies, many of them your customers, will need about $100 million this year to fulfill their contracts.

Big business borrows long-term money at low rates from the insurance companies, sells bonds to the banks and investment houses or sells stock to the underwriters and the public.

What do you and your customers do?

If the bankers have not yet told you they will. They will say:

"The Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are afraid of inflation. They are tightening up on credit. They are raising reserve requirements so we will have less to lend. They are making us buy more Government bonds for the same reason. They are raising the discount rates so we must charge you more interest, so that you cannot afford to borrow."

Congress set up a Small Business Administration which should be able to help you but don't be too optimistic about that. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, both big businessmen control the Loan Policy Board of that Administration. Believe me the Congress wants the Small Business Administration to succeed in serving you.

But the latest figures do not augur too well. They show an average of 11,000 inquiries a month. During the first 2 years of operation only 395 direct loans had been made.

In the insecure world in which we live today, America must always be alert and prepared. It is essential in order to maintain a defense potential that we stockpile the necessary machine tools needed in any war effort. Therefore, let us look at a program in which you, the National Tool & Die Manufacturers, are vitally interested. An industrial mobilization program was developed after the Korean incident. Under this program it was intended that the Government spend up to $800 million a year for the acquisition of machine tools considered essential to maintain our defense potential. If this program had been followed America's bastion of defense now would contain about $2,400,000,000 worth of long-lead-time machine tools; the large and complex machines that require for their own engineering and building a period of many months. The economy aspect of this policy is striking. It was reasoned that instead of actually producing weapons in great volume and taking the chance that these might become obsolete before they were needed, it would be more economical to mobilize capability of production equipment, build and keep up-to-date numerous machines which would be available for defense tasks when the need arose. Although the administration developed such a program, little has happened under it. Congress appropriated $250 million for that specific purpose. Only $29 million has been utilized.

Long delays, continual procrastination, and failure to plan ahead have resulted in the almost complete failure of that part of our industrial mobilization program. Purchasing was cut short by a pretended economy in the Defense Department after only a negligible volume of orders had been placed. This great failure has caused fears that in the event of war there will be a repetition of the same difficulties, the same problems, the same desperate need for complicated weapons, and the same restrictions that hampered output of vital weapons in the last two emergencies.

Is that business that was intended for you, now being channeled into big business?

I do not know.

But my committee intends to find out unless blocked by the favorite but much abused answer to congressional committees—the information is classified.

There is another aspect of our economy which is very bad and needs attention. Small businesses complain of the inability to obtain steel, steel scrap, aluminum, copper, nickel, lead, newsprint, plate glass, and almost every essential material. They point out that the historical allotment pattern used by the suppliers discriminates against the small business firms because they are unable to obtain greater allotments as their orders increase. If they are new users, they are not able to get supplies at all. As prices of basic materials rise the small businessman is squeezed by the inability to raise the price of its products or to pass the increased cost on to its customer. I do not pretend to know the answer. I can only say that I am not satisfied with the administration's answer that in a free economy there is no remedy.

Criticism without suggested remedy may in turn be criticized as ineffective. My suggested remedies are simple:

1. Tax relief to small business that will permit it to retain as much of its earnings as it needs for modernization, expansion, and working capital.

2. Appointments to high Government positions of men who understand that small business is the backbone of our economy and who will devote themselves to executing our laws in the spirit in which they were intended to operate so as to aid, not hinder, small business.

3. Finally, to the big businessmen in Government who give me a big pain, every time they tell you they, too, were small once, you should say, "big boy, move over and give me a chance, too."

Thank you for listening to me.

Address by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, Before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, Norfolk, Va., Thursday, April 19, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 25, 1956

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee addressed the 36th annual banquet of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association at Norfolk. It was my privilege to present Mr. BONNER to this gathering of outstanding business people in my district.

The Hampton Roads Maritime Association represents the shipping and

maritime interests in the entire Hampton Roads area. Although the majority of its members are residents of my district, its membership includes the leaders of this industry in the Newport News community, represented by my colleague, Mr. ROBESON. This association has been a moving force in harbor development and in the stimulation of the movement of overseas commerce through the great world port of Hampton Roads. It has been tremendously effective because of the outstanding leadership provided by its able officials.

Mr. BONNER's address includes much valuable information which I believe would be of interest to the entire membership of the House, and for that reason I have asked permission to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT C. BONNER, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE 36TH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE HAMPTON ROADS MARITIME ASSOCIATION, NORFOLK, VA., APRIL 19, 1956

President Black, members of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, distinguished guests, nothing could please me more than to have the privilege to speak to you here in Hampton Roads today in celebration of the 36th anniversary of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association. My interest in your excellent port is twofold.

As chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in the House of Representatives, I feel deeply concerned about the maritime commerce in and out of all the ports of the United States—and their adequacy to serve the needs of the Nation in times of peace and in times of emergency.

In addition, as a North Carolinian, I view with personal feeling the capacity, the health, and the growth of the great harbor of Hampton Roads which provides a vital link between my home State and the other Southeastern States to the markets of the world. I feel a very close affinity with all you gentlemen and your port when I think of the fact that during 1954, out of more than a quarter of a million net tons of unmanufactured tobacco exported from the combined customs districts of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, shipments from the Virginia ports totaled over 200,000 net tons, reprcsenting better than 60 percent of the total.

I have been thinking back over the years since your association was formed, early in 1920, to organize the efforts of this combined community in the development of the port and the area, in bold effort to hold and develop the overseas commerce which suddenly grew during and immediately following World War I. Our great $3 billion wartime ship-building effort was still not quite completed. Private enterprise was beginning to wake up to the possibilities of American-flag shipping. And, remembering the costly and near tragic consequences of our prewar blindness to the importance of participating with our own ships in the development of foreign commerce—remembering the absolute necessity for maintaining an effective posture of readiness on our sea frontiers—th..t same year saw the enactment of our first legislative program for a merchant fleet in the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. In 1920 Hampton Roads exported nearly 7½ million tons of goods, worth over $226 million, with imports of 331,000 tons worth well over $10 million. Business was good, and the population of about 200,000 was expanding.

The intervening years have seen many ups and downs—years of recessions, depressions, and prosperity—years of hot and cold wars. They have seen the high hopes of the early postwar years fade from the great expansion with the new ships of World War I, when we carried more than 50 percent of our total exports and imports, to 1935, when, despite efforts in Congress and in the industry to carry out our maritime policy, we found our merchant fleet 2d in tonnage, 5th in speed, and 8th in age, among the fleets of the world. In 1939, when war broke out again in Europe, we were only carrying 22 percent of our foreign trade.

By a miracle of coincidence, some of the errors of World War I were avoided as the result of the timely enactment and implementation of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This was followed by the tremendous construction program of modern merchant ships during the war, without which the struggle for democracy would have been lost to the Axis powers. After the war we tried to establish a definite and realistic policy for returning our shipping to privately operated peacetime commerce.

Over the years we have made some progress—but not enough. And the signs, again, point to the old pattern which must be avoided at all costs. During the first 6 months of 1946 the United States merchant fleet carried an average of 67.5 percent of our exports and imports. In 1949, we carried 45 percent, and today we are carrying less than 25 percent of our foreign trade.

The diligent and informed efforts of groups such as yours, which have survived the ups and downs of the dramatic—and sometimes violent—events following the First World War, are perhaps more vital right now than ever before. Today your port ranks third on the Atlantic coast, after New York and Baltimore. Exports from Hampton Roads have more than doubled, both in tonnage and value, since the foundation of your association. More impressively, your imports are 8 times the tonnage of 1920, with a value more than 13 times greater. You are the leading coal port in the United States, and commodities of all kinds move through Hampton Roads to and from all areas of the world. You have modern facilities, excellent shipbuilding and repair yards, good labor relations, and industry of all kinds establishing or expanding plants in the area.

This great development of your port has coincided with the period when we, as a Nation, have adopted a national maritime policy—a policy which, sometimes strongly—sometimes feebly—we have sought to make effective in the interests of our economy and national security.

Yet, with business so good and with the firm bonds of friendship and alliance with the maritime nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is there a national and economic necessity for our Government to support an American merchant marine?

This Nation had so neglected its merchant marine prior to the outbreak of the First World War in Europe that our ships were carrying only nine percent of our export-import trade. In 1914, while we were still a neutral Nation, we found ourselves without ships for even our basic needs. Our foreign trade was paralyzed, and goods and materials were piling up on the docks.

During that period, much of the foreign-flag shipping upon which we had so heavily relied was withdrawn because of the outbreak of war in Europe. Thus, even before the heavy movement of munitions, ocean shipping rates went up 700 percent. By the time this country entered, these rates skyrocketed to 2,000 percent.

Our experience in World War II was a little better. At least the beginning of a modern American-flag merchant marine had been started under the impetus of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Despite the vastly greater demands upon shipping, at no time during that period did American shipping rates rise higher than 70 percent.

Think of where we—and probably the world—would be today if we had not come out of World War II with a strong merchant marine in operating condition, ready to serve in the rehabilitation of the war-torn and weakened countries of Europe and Asia—and thereby provide a bulwark against the insidious advances of communism.

Then we had the years of the Korean conflict, which was supposed to be a United Nations war. At that time, even though the fleets of friendly nations had been extensively restored through purchases of surplus vessels from the United States at bargain-basement prices, it was American ships that supplied better than 80 percent of all ocean transportation to Korea.

I hate to think of what would have happened to ocean shipping rates if there had not been an American fleet to hold the line.

In one sense, it seems incredible that the need for an American-flag merchant marine can still remain a subject for debate. Yet, even today, there are many Americans, including some in high quarters, who fail to realize that a reasonably powerful American merchant marine is more than an arm of our military defense. Of equal if not greater importance, the merchant marine is the protection which provides against a strong enemy on the economic front. It is our guarantee that American exports will reach their markets speedily and in competition with other producing countries of the world. And it is our insurance that we will receive the imports that are so necessary to maintain our economy.

Of 38 critical industrial metals and minerals vital to our industrial society, the United States is self-sufficient in only 9. We import by ship two-fifths of our copper, and nearly one-third of our lead and zinc—all classified as strategic minerals by the Munitions Board. We are almost entirely dependent upon foreign sources for tin, nickel, and platinum. And, of the 20 alloying elements necessary for steel production, the United States is deficient in about a dozen. These facts speak for themselves as to the vital necessity for an American merchant marine.

Less than 2 years ago, the Congress enacted Public Law 664, known as the Cargo Preference Act. I am sure you are all familiar with this legislation. It provides that at least 50 percent of all the United States cargoes given away or sold for foreign currencies must be transported overseas on privately owned United States-flag vessels, if such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. Prior to the enactment of the permanent 50–50 law, beginning with the Marshall plan, there was an annual fight each time a foreign-aid bill came up in Congress over the inclusion of the cargo preference clause. This happened no less than 11 times.

This policy has been the salvation of the American merchant marine during these postwar years. Foreign-aid programs have constituted the bulk of our export foreign commerce. These programs have been conducted on a government-to-government basis, and are totally lacking in the characteristics of ordinary commercial practices. Had it not been for this policy of assurance of 50 percent of these cargoes for United States-flag vessels, I am certain that much, if not all, of the freight would have been directed to the shipping of other maritime nations.

In 1955, when the Cargo Preference Act was less than a year old, charges appeared in the press to the effect that the administration's program for selling farm surpluses

overseas was "running into a bottleneck because of a ship-American provision in the law." It was alleged that the Department of Agriculture was having trouble finding space on American vessels.

We, on the Merchant Marine Committee, were deeply concerned by these allegations and scheduled an immediate investigation.

After full hearings, the committee found no basis in fact for the charges. There was no evidence that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities were being delayed in any way by reason of the Cargo Preference Act. The plain truth is that the act could not have any such effect.

Despite the convincing and objective record of our investigation into the administration and operation of the Cargo Preference Act, an effort was made to nullify its effectiveness by an amendment to a foreign-aid bill reported to the House in May of last year. After spirited debate on the floor of the House, the amendment was defeated by an overwhelming majority, and the 50–50 principle again received a resounding vote of confidence.

But the attacks upon the law did not cease. They shifted to other flanks, but increased in intensity. Allegations were made during the latter part of last year by farm groups and others that the surplus disposal program under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) was suffering by reason of the application to it of the 50–50 cargo preference law. It was said that foreign countries refused to enter into agreements subject to the 50-50 shipping provision; that the operation of the law results in American agriculture providing an indirect subsidy to American shipping, to the detriment of the disposal program; and that the existence of the 50-50 law establishes an undesirable precedent in world trade and offers encouragement to countries which are disposed to adopt similar discriminations in favor of their own national flag.

Again, the House Merchant Marine Committee felt obliged to examine the operation of the law in relation to the farm surplus disposal program.

In hearings held over a period of 3 weeks, during which some 38 witnesses appeared before the committee, we heard expressions of every possible point of view. We spent 2 full days receiving testimony from the administrator of Foreign Agricultural Services and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture, in order that we might overlook no fact bearing upon the opposition which the Department had expressed to the application of cargo preference to the surplus commodity program. The State Department likewise expressed objections to the law. This was, of course, no surprise and nothing new for the State Department. Since I have been in Congress they have opposed almost every bill designed to strengthen the American merchant marine. Opposition was also expressed by the International Cooperation Administration. In addition, we invited the testimony of agricultural groups who were known to have expressed objections to the 50-50 principle. We went still further. We took the unusual step of inviting one of the leading shipping men of Northern Europe. He came all the way from Norway and gave us his views. The American shipping industry was called upon to account for its stewardship in carrying out the 50-50 law and of assuring the success of the agricultural surplus disposal programs.

These two exhaustive and objective studies of the operation of the Cargo Preference Act have proved conclusively that it has not, does not, and cannot work any serious detriment to American agriculture. Now, let me say a few words of what it means to American shipping. The implications of it are devastatingly simple.

The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board brought out some interesting but, in some respects, disturbing figures. During the years 1953–54, American-flag vessels carried only 23 percent of the dry cargo exports from the United States. In other words, this low percentage obtained even with the assistance provided by the 50–50 provision; the loss of those aid cargoes by the removal of 50–50 would reduce our carryings from 23 percent to 19.5 percent.

In the past 2 years the 9½ million tons of aid cargoes produced estimated freight revenues of $142½ million. The Board Chairman concluded that the financial return to the United States from the application of 50–50 far exceeded the small differential of $3 million charged to Department of Agriculture appropriations. Much of this freight revenue was returned to the Government in taxes. Another substantial part was deposited to statutory reserve funds to be used for the construction of new vessels to replace those which are now becoming obsolete. And, of course, bearing in mind the portion of those cargoes carried by American-flag tramps, that segment of our merchant marine was virtually kept in existence by earnings from foreign aid freights. Living in our greatest coal port, you here in Hampden Roads can appreciate the dangerous significance of the loss of those 70-odd Liberty ships that make up our tramp fleet.

I like to think our efforts to bring out the truth about 50–50 have not been in vain. It was reassuring and gratifying when the Senate voted overwhelmingly to strike a provision from the farm bill which would have seriously crippled the 50–50.

I realize I have devoted considerable time to the Cargo Preference Act and its meaning to the American economy and security. I have done so because I believe it is one phase of the problem where we, in the Congress, have been most effective.

If there were such a thing as a free international trade, I, for one, would favor the full, open and fair competition. Unhappily, we do not have today anything approaching free international trade. On the contrary, we have our vast Government-sponsored foreign aid and rehabilitation programs, a program for the disposal of agricultural surpluses, at reduced prices with payment in foreign currency, and programs for the importation of strategic materials—all conducted outside the normal channels of trade. We are confronted with currency exchange problems in many countries. We are confronted with numerous instances of Government monopolies in foreign countries where nationalistic policy directs transportation on vessels of their own flag. In the face of these overwhelming obstacles, the survival of our merchant marine is heavily dependent upon continuing interest and support of our Government.

We, in Congress, are trying to do our share to develop and maintain the merchant marine which we need. But we cannot do it all.

In my many years with the Merchant Marine Committee, I have been concerned with the expense involved in the Government's support of our maritime policy, and yet each year we seem to be falling behind in progress toward the goals set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Today, more people with higher incomes are creating an expanding market for homes, durable goods, and for many items which were once considered luxuries or nonessentials. Along with all this demand for new goods has come new demands for travel, brought on by paid vacations and a reduction in the workweek. At present the population of the United States is increasing at the rate of almost 3 million persons per year. I have heard estimates that by 1965 it will be one-fifth larger than it was in 1953—while production will be one-half again greater—disposable income per person will be one-third larger—and the hours of work one-tenth less.

These trends are not something which developed this year, or this administration, or the previous one—they have been clearly present for years. Yet, today, this Nation, which prides itself on its greatness—its technical and inventive genius—and its productivity, is able to provide only a small fraction of the means for transporting its foreign commerce, upon which it depends more than any other nation in the world.

At present levels, our export foreign trade is almost three times the monthly average of 1.9 million tons exported in 1938. Our 1955 imports are double the 1.7 million tons imported monthly in 1938.

While overseas passenger traffic is expanding at an unprecedented rate, we have much less than one-third the passenger capacity that we had in 1939. In 1954, American-flag steamship lines, operating their passenger vessels at near capacity, carried only 18 percent of the tremendous passenger movement between the east coast of the United States and the tourist mecca of northern Europe. Today the percentage is undoubtedly even less, in view of new foreign ships which have entered the services.

I am keenly aware that nearby we have one of the greatest shipyards in the United States. So it is particularly appropriate that I refer briefly to a hope—yes, an intense desire—that the members of my committee have entertained for some time. You all know that the flagship and pride of the American merchant marine is the great superliner, *United States*. To watch that ship glide majestically up the North River in New York is a wonderful sight. It is as much a part of America as the Star Spangled Banner.

The trouble is we need another, a sistership, in order to provide a well-balanced passenger service to northern Europe under the American flag. With 1 ship it is like walking on 1 leg. So, it is our hope that before many months go by we will hear the familiar and heart-warming sound of those giant cranes and see the hustle and bustle of activity in the building of another great merchant ship—a new steamship *America*—with all the speed, comfort, and safety of the steamship *United States*. At this time I wish to pledge the full and wholehearted support of the Merchant Marine Committee to the fulfillment of that purpose. If legislation is, or becomes, necessary, I am sure I speak for my colleagues on the committee when I give public assurance of speedy, careful consideration to a feasible proposal.

In the extensive inquiries which the Merchant Marine Committee has made into all phases of our merchant marine, I have seen deficiencies which should be corrected. For example, there are problems in the labor-management field. But I do see hope for improvement in those relationships. There are serious problems in other areas too, that we are struggling to remedy.

I do not mean to imply that all is bad or hopeless. Nevertheless, shortcomings stand out like a sore thumb in every phase of our merchant marine. Part of the reason for this lies in the fact that so much Government money is involved. By the same token, we must all be vigilant and strenuous in our efforts to preserve the merchant marine of this country against attack from both within and without. This means, first of all, cleaning out all the dirty corners, and then, keeping the house in good order at all times.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1956

Rev. K. K. Haddaway, D. D., minister, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God eternal, we pray for Thy guiding presence as we lift our hearts unto Thee this day. As Thou hast been in life throughout history, even so come anew into our lives in our generation.

For our Nation, born in the freedom which Thou didst implant in the hearts of our forefathers, we thank Thee. For the steady march of dedicated and resolute souls, who have chartered our course and who have led us, we thank Thee.

We pray for divine leading in the present moment of history. We know that we have reached a high level of discovery concerning the things of this universe, and all at Thy hands. And we pray now that we may discover that we are spirits in Thy love striving to build a better world.

Eliminate, we pray Thee, all prejudice and ugliness in our hearts, and grant that we may see all souls as in Thee, and work through Thy grace to build a safer and better world for the whole of mankind.

May Thy blessing rest upon these, Thy servants, who represent our people. They are responsible unto Thee. Thou art counting upon them, as are we. So may they serve as to bring in Thy kingdom on earth. In Thy spirit and love, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 25, 1956, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services;

The Committee on Armed Services; and

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Floyd Sherman Bryant, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Franklin G. Floete, resigned; and

Lewis E. Berry, Jr., of Michigan, to the Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator, vice Mrs. Katherine G. Howard, resigned.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. George Henry Decker to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of general. General Decker's contemplated assignment is Deputy Commander in Chief, United States European Command. I ask that this nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 4,889 nominations representing appointments, promotions, and transfers in the Regular Army, all in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below. These names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination is passed over, by request.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry routine nominations in the United States Coast Guard, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk without printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that statements made during the morning hour be limited to the usual 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, located, respectively, at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of James Henry from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on January 17, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of Sing Sung Poa, and Sang Cheng Dwu, and Mary Hsiang-Yuin Dwu from reports transmitted to the Senate on June 23, 1955, and January 16, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, with a view to the adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN POSITIONS IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of 35 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended and supplemented (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Connecticut Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, at Cheshire,

Conn., urging a prompt return to the gold standard, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2913. A bill to extend for 2 years the Advisory Committee on Weather Control (Rept. No. 1866);

S. 3164. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating between the United States and Alaska (Rept. No. 1867);

S. 3265. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for filing vessel utilization and performance reports by operators of vessels in foreign commerce of the United States (Rept. No. 1862);

S. 3391. A bill to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers (Rept. No. 1870); and

H. J. Res. 513. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built cargo vessels and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1863).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3113. A bill to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended (Rept. No. 1861); and

S. 3163. A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to authorize permanent certification for certain air carriers operating in Hawaii and Alaska (Rept. No. 1868).

By Mr. PURTELL, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, without amendment:

H. R. 7952. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain mechanically propelled vessels carrying passengers (Rept. No. 1872).

By Mr. PURTELL, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; with amendments:

S. 3072. A bill to require the inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers (Rept. No. 1871).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 483. A bill to amend the Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, so as to provide for appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy (Rept. No. 1869).

PAYMENT TO OWNERS OF NON-FEDERAL WATER-USE FACILITIES FOR HYDROELECTRIC POWER BENEFITS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment the bill (S. 1574) to provide for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to owners of non-Federal water-use facilities for hydroelectric power benefits realized by the United States therefrom, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1865) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the minority views on the bill may be submitted and printed when available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the minority views may be submitted and printed, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

FEDERAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I report favorably an original bill to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1864) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3732. A bill to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3733. A bill for the relief of Aftim Saba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3734. A bill to provide for the procurement by the Government of insurance against risk to civilian personnel of liability for personal injury or death, or for property damage, arising from the operation of motor vehicles in the performance of official Government duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 3735. A bill for the relief of Luciana Papa Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 3736. A bill for the relief of Joan F. Roby; and

S. 3737. A bill for the relief of Lina Gertrude Mattingly and her minor children, Ellen Anna, Vincent, and Deannia Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 3738. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the cost of processing of surplus commodities for distribution; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr YOUNG, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 3739. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to authorize payment of ocean freight on surplus commodities distributed overseas by voluntary agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DANIEL (by request):

S. 3740. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Denny and Dorothy Mae Denny, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 3741. A bill to provide for the inclusion of United States Commissioners within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 3742. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and of forest reserves created from the public domain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG (by request):

S. 3743. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 3744. A bill to establish a United States Court of Appeals for Patents, and for other purposes; and

S. 3745. A bill to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of the application; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'MAHONEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3746. A bill for the relief of Ernest Braun (Mikulas Neufeld) and his wife, Judith Braun (Judith Neufeld); and

S. 3747. A bill for the relief of Harry Siegbert Schmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 3748. A bill to enhance the security, defense and economic potential of the United States by increasing the number of graduate engineers and scientists through a grant of Federal scholarships on a competitive basis to prospective students in those fields; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO COST OF PROCESSING SURPLUS COMMODITIES FOR DISTRIBUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the cost of processing of surplus commodities for distribution. This proposed legislation would grant authority to the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay any necessary processing costs, when surplus foods owned by the Corporation, are made available to the school lunch program and charitable institutions in this country, as well as to needy persons in friendly foreign nations.

The bill which we are introducing today is identical to an amendment to the farm bill, which we sponsored, and which was adopted by both Houses.

I feel that every Member of the Senate who is interested in making the best use of Government-owned surplus foods will support this measure. The cost will be

small but the returns will be very substantial, in terms of increased disposition of wheat and corn under the donation program.

Section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, under which these food donations are made, was modified in 1954, by Public Law 480, to permit the Corporation to pay certain costs in connection with the donation program. This liberalization was a very important factor in achieving a substantial increase in disposals. For example, in fiscal year 1955, over a billion pounds of surplus foods moved into consumption under the donation program, over 79 percent more than in the previous year, and additional gains are being accomplished this year.

Among other things, the liberalized section 416 authority permitted the Corporation to pay necessary reprocessing costs. It did not, however, provide for the repayment of original processing costs by the Corporation. This is proving to be a stumbling block in achieving the increased utilization of wheat and corn, for these foods cannot now be made available by the Corporation as wheat flour and corn meal.

During the last session, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the Department of Agriculture to use section 32 funds to pay the cost of processing wheat and corn into flour and meal for distribution to needy persons and families in this country. However, any State wishing to use surplus wheat and corn in its schools and charitable institutions must accept the raw grain and contract for its milling. Likewise, private welfare agencies distributing foods to the needy overseas must accept the raw grains.

To me, it does not seem reasonable that there should be this distinction, because all of these outlets represent worthy and constructive uses for our surplus foods. There are, in addition, many other sound arguments for this proposed legislation.

Instead of the 48 States and some 40 private agencies all trying to contract for the milling of these grains, the bill would permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase under a series of standard specifications and extend the privilege of participating to all millers on an equal basis. As I understand it, some millers are not effectively eliminated because the lower market value of milling byproducts in their areas places them at a disadvantage in negotiating with the States and with private welfare agencies. Moreover, I also understand that without this proposed legislation very little of the grains made available for overseas relief will be milled in this country. The cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation would not be increased appreciably, because of the value of the milling byproducts. Against this small increase in cost can be balanced the advantages of a much simpler program that would help insure the maximum possible utilization of these surplus grains.

I therefore urge the Senate to go on record as favoring this bill. By so doing, we will be removing an unnecessary barrier to the increased utilization of our record supplies of food surpluses.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3738) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the cost of processing of surplus commodities for distribution, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "In addition, in the case of food commodities disposed of under this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation may pay the cost of processing such commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use, such processing to be accomplished through private trade facilities to the greatest extent possible."

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OCEAN FREIGHT ON CERTAIN SURPLUS COMMODITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from North Dakota Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to authorize payment of ocean freight on surplus commodities distributed overseas by voluntary agencies.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3739) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to authorize payment of ocean freight on surplus commodities distributed overseas by voluntary agencies, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

On behalf of myself, and Senators CLEMENTS, LEHMAN, WILEY, and YOUNG, I have introduced a bill exactly the same as language already approved by this body, by the House, and agreed to by spokesmen for the administration.

This same language was in section 309 of the bill (H. R. 12) to provide an improved farm program, as it passed the Senate, but has gone down the drain along with many other worthwhile improvements.

I hope it can be given speedy approval as a separate piece of legislation to expedite constructive use of our surplus commodities.

The purpose of this measure is to facilitiate the broader utilization of America's farm surpluses in overseas programs and disaster relief efforts of American religious and other voluntary relief agencies.

Under the provisions of Public Law 480, such voluntary agencies have made a substantial contribution to overseas relief and rehabilitation, distributing surplus foods and other commodities to the homeless and destitute in more than 70 countries.

During the fiscal year 1956, 18 agencies will distribute more than 800 million pounds of surpluses to needy people abroad.

The amendment proposes that ocean-freight charges on commodities delivered to voluntary agencies under title III of Public Law 480 may be paid from funds available under title II of Public Law 480 upon a determination by the President that this is in the interest of the United States. It also provides that ocean freight may be similarly paid on commodities donated for disaster or other urgent relief under title II of Public Law 480.

The amendment increases the authority of the President to use surplus commodities for disaster, famine, and other urgent relief, from $300 million to $500 million, for the period ending June 30, 1957.

The amendment increases the effectiveness of the individual financial contributions of American people for foreign relief. It takes advantage of the sincere desire of religiously motivated peoples of all faiths to help feed the needy, wherever they may be, to speed up the disposal of our agricultural surpluses.

Eighteen voluntary agencies participated in freight reimbursement for the distribution of agricultural surpluses abroad during the fiscal year 1955. These organizations were American Friends of Austrian Children; American Friends Service Committee; American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee; American Mission to Greeks; Assemblies of God, Foreign Service Committee; Catholic Relief Services, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Church World Service, National Council of Churches; CARE; Foster Parents' Plan for War Children; International Rescue Committee; Iran Foundation; Lutheran World Relief; Mennonite Central Committee; Rumanian Federation; Save the Children Federation; Tolstoy Foundation; Unitarian Service Committee; United Lithuanian Relief Fund of America.

These agencies are now making their plans for programs in the year ahead, and need to know the basis upon which such planning must be done. They were greatly encouraged by the action of Congress in approving this measure as an amendment to the farm bill. They face less effective operations now, however, unless the authority can be restored.

It is my hope that this once-approved proposal can be reported out of Committee immediately, and approved automatically at our next calendar call. Similar action is being taken in the House, to get this legislation to the President quickly for his signature.

Further information about the bill and about the work of the voluntary agencies in this field is contained on pages 4709–4710 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 14, 1956; in my remarks at the time this same language was approved by the Senate as an amendment to the farm bill.

FOREST AND WOODLANDS USE ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill declaring a national policy on the

development of our public lands for recreation and wildlife use. Somewhat similar bills have been introduced by several Members of the House, including the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Honorable CLAIR ENGLE. I should like to explain in a few words why I am introducing this bill. It is high time that we spelled out a congressional policy for the guidance of the executive branch and its Bureau of the Budget in this vital field. Already—and this is significant—the Senate Appropriations Committee has been taking steps to develop recreational use by making modest increases in funds. However, it is both desirable and necessary that we crystallize our thinking through the legislative procedure available. That is by holding hearings on a bill and hammering out a clear policy and securing its enactment into law. Then, we will get real results.

Now this bill proposes that recreational use—and I stress the word use—and the development of wildlife habitats on Federal lands are just as important as other activities.

Secondly, the bill sets tentative levels of expenditures which are somewhat in excess of the money now being provided. I would like to note here that we are spending virtually nothing on the public domain for recreation and our expenditures on the national forests are only 1 3/10 cents per person which, for all practical purposes, is very close to nothing.

Thirdly, this bill will not affect the amounts available for in-lieu payments to local governments.

Fourthly, the bill is intended to apply to those national forests created from the public domain and to the public-domain lands under Bureau of Land Management jurisdiction. This bill does not include acquired lands or revested lands, such as the O. & C. grant nor does it include the national parks which are under a separate program.

I hope this bill will be carefully studied by conservationists and all other interested groups. The hearings and testimony by interested people will provide an opportunity for complete consideration of our recreational needs and the perfection of a long overdue congressional policy on recreation.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3742) to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and of forest reserves created from the public domain, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Forest and Woodlands Use Act.

SEC. 2. That it is the policy of Congress that all of the resources of the public domain shall be so managed, conserved, utilized, and developed as to assure maximum public multiple use thereof, that public use for purposes of recreation is a beneficial and proper use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and of forest reserves created from the public domain, and that development and maintenance of such areas for maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, and the concurrent maintenance of timber, wood, and forest values, including sources of water, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. Of the moneys received as the share of the United States from public domain forest lands, woodlands, and forest reserves created from the public domain, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and each fiscal year thereafter, there shall be available as of July 1, 1956, an amount equivalent to 10 percent thereof, but not to exced $7,500,000 in any year, which amount is hereby authorized and directed to be set apart in the Treasury of the United States as a special fund to be appropriated and made available to the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture until expended as provided in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in the case of public domain forest lands and woodlands in the several States and Alaska, and the Secretary of Agriculture, in the case of forest reserves created from the public domain in the several States and Alaska shall prescribe such regulations governing the expenditure of funds appropriated and made available by section 2 of this act as will assure:

(1) the developemnt, maintenance, and operation of such areas for recreational use;

(2) improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat thereon; and

(3) provision for adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities,

in accordance with the current and prospective public multiple use thereof: *Provided*, That no part of such moneys shall be used for the acquisition of land: *And provided further*, That whenever the amounts made available hereunder but not appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year aggregate more than $7,500,000, the excess above that amount shall be returned to the general fund of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. Whenever forest lands, woodlands, and forest reserves created from the public domain have been substantially improved for recreational purposes, and whenever by reason of the provision and use of special services and facilities thereon use fees and charges are collected by the administering agency, moneys so collected shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund which shall be available for annual appropriation and made available to the Secretary of the Interior and Agriculture, until expended for the purposes set out in section 3 of this act: *Provided*, That the amount of funds made available under section 2 of this act shall, at the end of each fiscal year, be reduced by the amount of the use fees and charges made available during that fiscal year in the special fund herein established.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PATENTS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to introduce for appropriate reference, two bills relating to patents. The bills are the result of prolonged hearings, through many years. The Patent Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor and pleasure to be chairman, held a round-table discussion last October with respect to means and methods of improving the patent system of the United States.

The first bill, which I now introduce—and I do it in this manner in order to give full public notice to all who may be interested—is a bill to establish a United States Court of Appeals for Patents. Under the present system, in patent cases appeals from decisions of the district court go, first, to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. It is our belief that it will greatly improve the patent system if a single Court of Patent Appeals should be established.

I shall request at the hearings which will be held, and notice of which will be given in due course, that those who come to testify consider the possibility of making this proposed court a court of last resort. This idea may be best explained by the fact that the late Justice Jackson, of the Supreme Court, once remarked, in substance, that the only valid patent in the United States was one which the Supreme Court had not seen, because the record of the Court in overthrowing patents has been rather remarkable.

So, Mr. President, I send forward, first of all, the bill to establish a United States Court of Patent Appeals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3744) to establish a United States Court of Appeals for Patents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that a short release, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

For many years various groups, including the Science Advisory Board, and the United States National Patent Planning Commission, have endorsed the idea of a single court for patent appeals. At the subcommittee hearings held last October strong support was indicated for legislation which would promote the adoption of uniform standards of invention. Judge Learned Hand, one of America's foremost jurists and a man who has had broad experience in the trial of patent suits, expressed the view that a single court of patent appeals would be desirable if such a court were a rotating court with its bench drawn from the judges of the various courts of appeal rather than a court of technical experts.

Following these hearings, the staff and I formulated this bill designed to create a court which would receive and decide appeals from the Patent Office, as well as appeals from all of the district courts in patent cases. Its decisions would be effective throughout the entire United States. I shall request witnesses appearing at hearings on this proposed legislation to express their opinion on the advisability of making this new court of appeals a court of last resort.

There is a real need in the patent system for a more uniform standard of invention and greater consistency in judicial decisions relating to patents. The introduction of this bill is intended to direct attention to this need and to offer a means of solution. By introducing this bill I have not closed my mind to suggestions for improvements in this bill or for a new and different means by which this need can be met.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The second bill is entitled "A bill to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of application."

At present there is a backlog of more than 200,000 patent applications pending in the Patent Office. Under the present law, the life of a patent is 17 years. The Constitution, of course, authorizes the Congress, in order to secure the progress of the useful arts—I am speaking now only of patents, not of copyrights—to grant an exclusive or a monopolistic right for a limited period. The present period is 17 years. It has varied from time to time.

The bill I am now introducing is so drawn that it will probably be called the 20-year bill, because it dates a patent from the filing of the application and seeks to reduce the long delays between the filing and the issuance of a patent, but probably will result in limiting the life of the patent by reducing the period of the patent, which extends for 17 years from its issuance, thereby including the long delay in the Patent Office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3745) to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of the application, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that a release, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

During the subcommittee hearings held in October, last year, and attended by inventors, patent lawyers, and judges, it was almost unanimously agreed that the patent system would be substantially strengthened by finding means to reduce the long delays between the filing of applications and the issuance of patents. These delays were attributable to a combination of circumstances including (a) insufficient personnel in the Patent Office due to inadequate funds, (b) the need for improvement in the Patent Office's classification system to speed up searches and to make prior art readily accessible, and (c) the failure of some applicants to prosecute their applications diligently in order to prolong the patent monopoly beyond the 17-year monopoly provided by the statute.

Some progress has been made toward increasing Patent Office personnel and improving the classification system. Subsequent to preliminary inquiries made by this subcommittee, the Patent Office prepared an 8-year program to reduce the backlog of pending patent applications from a present peak in excess of 220,000 to a manageable total of approximately 100,000. This would enable the Patent Office to act upon applications within 3 to 4 months, in contrast to delays today, in many instances, of over a year. Reflection of this 8-year plan is the budget for fiscal year 1957 which proposes $17 million for the Patent Office. The proposed plan contemplates considerable increase in the size of the Patent Office examining staff, and this entails recruiting engineering, physics, and chemistry graduates, a program which the Patent Office is now vigorously pursuing.

The bill introduced today is designed to speed up the prosecution of applications for patents and limit the period of life of a patent to a maximum term of 20 years from the date the application was filed or 17 years from the date of issuance, whichever is shorter. This bill is directed to eliminating stalling tactics indulged in by some applicants. Upon the passage of this bill, the burden will be upon applicants for a patent to have their patents issued as soon as possible so as not to have the life term of the patent curtailed. At the same time the bill contains safeguards preventing a curtailment of the term of the patent where the delays are not due to the fault of the applicant.

From time to time I will introduce other bills directed to improving the patent system. I solicit the comments of the patent bar and all interested persons upon these bills, and at a proper time there will be an opportunity given for a full hearing on them.

PROGRAM OF FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS TO STUDENTS OF SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide a program of Federal scholarships to students in the fields of science and engineering, designed to not only bridge the shortage of trained personnel in these fields but also to encourage scientific and engineering students to provide the many Federal programs with their services. A shortage of engineers in the service of the State of Kentucky and its highway department prompted me, as Governor of that State, to initiate a program whereby the highway department rendered financial assistance to deserving students in engineering and encouraged their service with the State following procurement of their degrees. This program also made it possible for engineering students to gain practical experience in the course of their studies by working for the highway department during periods when their academic studies did not require their full time.

My bill would make provision for 5,000 Federal scholarships to be awarded annually to deserving high school students who pursued courses of study in science and engineering in college. The bill also contains provision to encourage their entering into Federal service upon completion of their courses of study.

Our dependence upon these highly trained men and women is apparent to all who will look around. A recent report by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy tells of the startlingly small number whose education equips them to guide our technological progress. As of 1954, this country relied upon no more than 700,000 to 740,000 such people with degrees as engineers and scientists. Among them is a small corps whose especially refined training equips them to plan and supervise such programs as that of atomic energy, on which we are now embarked.

The function of these engineers and scientists has been described as "yeasty." They think up and design activities and goals whose accomplishment demands the services of more people with comparable training and ability. And these in turn, engender other tasks and goals similarly demanding. One need look no further than the front page of the daily newspaper for evidence of their influence upon our lives.

Our national defense, our expanding industry, and the normal replacements that occur in any active structure, now require no less than 30,000 new engineers a year. About the same number is needed of those who graduate in science. This latter number is less definite, however, because so many carry on to study for medical and other professions. These demands of our society are well known, yet, during the academic year ending with the graduating class of June 1955, accredited colleges and universities in the United States turned out only 22,589 with a first degree in engineering. That same year 27,237 first degrees were granted to those who had specialized in the sciences. Thus, less than 50,000 engineers and scientists were available to fill some 60,000 places.

To the demand for 30,000 engineers a year must be added a comparable demand for scientists. These figures are dynamic and ever growing. Each year our expanding economy requires an additional 3,000 to 4,000. Thus, by 1960, assuming conditions continue more or less as they are now, and our national defense requires no more than partial mobilization, this country will have an engineer shortage of 60,000 or more. This estimate assumes that engineering graduates in the classes from 1954 through 1960 will have accumulated to the number of 225,000 while the Nation's demands for engineers, alone, will have built up to about 285,000.

According to reports from Soviet Russia, her colleges and universities graduated 53,000 with a first degree in engineering in 1954. That was more than twice the number graduated from comparable institutions in the United States. Allen W. Dulles, Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, has warned that unless we quickly take measures to increase our facilities for scientific education, Soviet scientific manpower in key areas will outnumber ours in the next decade.

We, who depend as never before in history upon those who are disciplined in the fields of science and engineering, may well ask why this has come to pass. The reasons are many. But, without attempting to repeat them, one fact stands out with appalling clarity. I refer to the startling number of bright boys and girls, who, having graduated from high school, never go on to complete their formal education. According to a responsible authority, the colleges claim scarcely more than half of the high school graduates whose mental and scholastic equipment is such as to warrant enrollment. Thereafter, during the years before college graduation, nearly 40 percent drop out. Thus, of every 10 high-school graduates with potential capacities for earning a degree in engi-

neering or science, no more than 2 achieve that goal. In these days when engineers and scientists are already so few as to threaten the very foundations of our economic security, and our physical safety, the loss between high school and college is nothing short of tragic. Eight out of ten promising young people of college age abandon their efforts to secure an education to earn immediate returns in less productive forms of work. Some of these boys and girls would go on with their studies if they had financial encouragement.

It is to save them for the national defense that I have today introduced a bill to provide 5,000 scholarships a year, to continue as far in the future as the need exists. Any of our 1,328 degree-granting, accredited colleges and universities would be open to the holder of one of these scholarships. By the time the program has been underway 4 years, as many as 20,000 students would be enrolled and our country would begin to benefit to the extent of about 5,000 graduates each year.

This sounds big, but in the face of the task before us I fear it is not big enough. We have no time to lose, and a start must be made that we may build as its usefulness is proven. Our task is to defend and protect our national freedoms, and this is part of the price we must pay. It can be a sound investment in the future of our youth and the welfare of our Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3748) to enhance the security, defense, and economic potential of the United States by increasing the number of graduate engineers and scientists through a grant of Federal scholarships on a competitive basis to prospective students in those fields, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL AND RUBBER PLANTS TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE — CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a unanimous-consent request. First, let me say that this matter has been cleared with the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, and the chairmen of both committees involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 3566, to provide for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of certain Government-owned alcohol and rubber plants, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address delivered by him at Goucher College.

Article entitled "All Aboard for the Atomic Age?" written by him, and published in the April 1956 issue of Steelways.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 2435, CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON THE COURT OF CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO THE AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION TO WHICH CERTAIN INDEPENDENT ORE PRODUCERS ARE EQUITABLY ENTITLED FOR URANIUM SUPPLIED BY THEM TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, May 2, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 2435, a bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make certain findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain independent ore producers are equitably entitled for uranium supplied by them to the United States, or its agents, during the period January 1, 1939, to April 10, 1948, and to provide for payment of amounts so determined to such producers. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself, chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 2128, PATENTS EXTENSION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, May 4, 1956, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 2128, to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls.

Prior to the above mentioned date all persons interested in the above bill should file with the committee such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, chairman.

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on last Tuesday, April 24, Adlai E. Stevenson made a magnificent speech at the 7th International Education Conference of the United Auto Workers. It is a worthy speech, and I commend it to each Senator. It points up some of the unfortunate and unfair developments of the past 3 years which, unless corrected, will adversely affect the economy of the Nation and our millions of working people.

According to the reports of the newspapers, Mr. Stevenson was given a standing ovation at the conclusion of his address. After reading it, I can well understand why it was so well received.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text be printed in the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADLAI E. STEVENSON AT UNITED AUTO WORKERS SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 24, 1956

I am honored to be the guest of this convention today.

I am not sure how appropriate my remarks here today will be. I realize that this is an education conference. But I am in the middle of a political campaign, and so full of it that I'm not good these days for much except politics. So if I seem to take advantage of this captive audience, I hope you will realize that it's only because what I'm doing has come to seem very important to me.

And I don't mean just the Democratic primaries or the Democratic nomination. I mean the Democratic winning of the election next fall—and I frankly think each of you has got about as big a stake in that as I have.

You spent yesterday considering the various specific issues in this campaign. I want this morning to talk with you about what I think lies at the root of most of the differences today between the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

Thomas Jefferson marked this difference 132 years ago when he said that "Men by their constitutions are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes, and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them as the most honest and safe * * * depository of the public interests."

It is the Democratic faith—mine, and I know yours—that the government of a democracy must trust all the people it serves, that it must be made up of representatives of all the people, and that its obligation cannot be to any special interest but only to all the people.

It is apparently the Republican proposition, on the other hand—or at least it is the obvious belief of the present Republican administration—that the Government of this Nation can most effectively be vested in the representatives of a single interest, and that the welfare of the society can best be served by promoting that single interest—on the dubious theory that the benefits will then trickle down to people generally.

We have today, if you will, in the executive department in Washington, what amounts for most of us to government without representation.

Does this seem too broad a charge? Then let us look in for a minute at a meeting in the Cabinet room at the White House—

This is the table where decisions are made affecting the needs, the interests, the dreams, the whole future, yes, the survival of 166 million American men and women and children.

Every single one of these 166 million people is a consumer. Who speaks at this Cabinet meeting for these consumers?

Sixty-five million men and women in this country are members of America's work force. For 6 months in 1953 there was a representative of American labor at this table. But when he spoke for American labor, he was silenced. Who from American labor speaks at this Cabinet meeting now? That there have been sitting at this Cabinet table 3 men from 1 corporation—and no one from the 18 million membership of the AFL–CIO.

Thirty-five million Americans—the pride of all the rest of us—are sitting this morning in schoolrooms. Thousands of these rooms are firetraps. The roof of one fell in out in Chicago earlier this month. Everywhere I go, people, particularly women, say to me: "We want to do something about getting better schools and more good teachers for our children." Who represents the 35 million children of America—America's future—at the meeting of this Cabinet?

A gray-haired man came up to me on the street last week and said: "Governor, it is not just social security we want. We want a chance to be somebody." Who at this Cabinet table represents the millions of older men and women in this country who want most of all an opportunity to make the evening of their lives not only secure but worthwhile?

Yes; and who at this table represents the interests of the 22 million Americans who live today on this Nation's farms and whose average per capita income has now dropped to $860 a year? And who represents the men who were farming—doing what they wanted to do—3 years ago, but are now trying to get work in the cities, a thousand of them at a struck plant in Sheboygan, Wis.?

Every man at this cabinet table has boasted of this Nation's prosperity—without ever, so far as I know, suggesting the slightest degree of genuine concern about the fact that 30 million Americans are going to have to make ends meet this year on family incomes of less than $2,000. Who—certainly not the prosperity boasters—represents these 30 million Americans?

This isn't a meeting of a people's cabinet. It is a meeting of a corporate board of directors. What single interest government has come to mean, for most Americans, is simply, I repeat, government without representation.

And the consequences, in terms of the failure of this administration to meet the human problems of America, have become sharp and clear.

We were allowed to suffer through years of the ignominy of McCarthyism—tearing us apart inside, setting neighbors to spying on each other, and blackening the name of America and the image of democracy in the world—and not a word of protest. McCarthyism just wasn't the kind of thing a businessman's government worries about.

Racial tension has been aggravated to a white heat. This could have been prevented, in large part, if the administration had supplied the leadership the Supreme Court decision assumed and required. But this isn't a business matter. So the President turned it over to his lawyer, who after many months recommended to Congress that a study be made of the matter.

There hasn't been time, or energy, for carrying out this administration's promises to labor. And now the Secretary of Welfare in the businessman's cabinet announces that this administration is opposed to the changes in the social-security program which were last year endorsed overwhelmingly by the House of Representatives. This administration went all out to secure tax benefits for corporate stockholders. Now it opposes paying retirement benefits to a man who has worked for his living, paid his social-security taxes, and then, at the age of 50 or more, becomes totally disabled.

And the highway program we need so badly has been held up because the administration tried to make it a bonanza for the bankers who would finance it. And children who needed it didn't get the Salk vaccine fast enough because even where the stakes were life and death it was considered more important to preserve the established commercial channels of supply.

This is what single interest government has come to mean. But it is not a government of or by or for the people.

You know, I remember reading, 8 or 10 years ago, a statement in your UAW magazine "Ammunition." It was about collective bargaining contracts, and I remember especially the last line. "It's time," this statement went, "to write the lawyers out of the contracts and write the people back in." I propose an amendment to that statement. It is time, I suggest, to write the businessman's administration out of this Government and write the people back in.

Let's see what this means.

In a collective bargaining agreement, "writing the people in" means a seniority clause that says plainly that a man's service gives him a right in his job; it means recognition and grievances clauses that bring democracy into the plant; and it means, or is coming to mean, thanks to the insistence of the UAW, clauses that give a man and his family the supplementary unemployment compensation they need and are entitled to.

What does it mean in government?

Well, it means giving first attention to the human problem that is uppermost in people's minds; the establishment of true equality of all opportunity in this country, regardless of race or creed or color.

I know the record of the UAW in this matter. It is a record not just of words, but of deeds—and it is a proud record which places all who believe in democracy in your debt.

I take pride too, I hope fairly, in my own record on this front. Between 1948 and 1952, we were able in Illinois to end all segregation in the schools and to wipe out every trace of racial discrimination in the National Guard and in every employment relationship over which the State had any control whatsoever. And I mean right down to little, but vitally important, things like removing questions about race from the forms used by the Illinois Employment Service. We fought hard for a Fair Employment Practice Act; and lost it only by the narrowest margin in a Republican legislature.

But pride in the past is not enough.

The Supreme Court's decision on segregation in the public schools must be complied with. That decision was morally right; it deserves more than lipservice from both President and presidential candidates.

The Court has provided time to adjust to the new system; but this must be within the good faith limits the Court set when it spoke of all deliberate speed. We must take special care, too, that the strains of this transition period do not result in a denial of any other constitutional rights, particularly the basic and essential right to vote.

Let me only mention, for our time is short, some of the other things "writing the people back into the Government" means today.

It means recognizing that a mathematical or average prosperity in this country isn't enough. If one family's income is $2,000 and another family's income is $50,000, this doesn't put them both in the $26,000 class. Sure America is prosperous; it's prosperous enough that there is no excuse for so many having so little.

We need a depressed-areas program of the kind Senator PAUL DOUGLAS has introduced.

We need an agricultural program that will let America's farm families share the general prosperity the Nation at large enjoys. Here, too, you in this union have expressed yourselves plainly and effectively. And indeed it is the interests of all of us that are at stake. Particularly you who come here from the farm-equipment plants know, in the hard human facts of short workweeks and ever-lengthening layoffs, the broader effects of what is happening on the farms.

The President's veto of the Democratic farm bill has extended by 1 year the most serious threat there is to the whole American economy. The enactment of a new farm program must be placed at the top of the agenda for next year's bargaining session.

"Writing the people in" means, too, a recognition—which this administration has completely denied—of the essential role played in this society and government today by free labor unions and free collective bargaining. The provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which limit union security, permit the so-called State right-to-work laws, make organization difficult, prohibit legitimate, peaceful bargaining pressure—these and other provisions like them must be changed. And the important question is not whether these changes are in the form of repeal and rewriting or in the form of basic amendment; the important thing is that these changes be made.

It is equally important that the NLRB be reestablished as a fairminded, nonpartisan administrative agency, administering the law as it is written and not according to the partisan views of either labor or management.

The Social Security Act must be overhauled. It will not be enough to make adjustments here and there. Nor is security a sufficient purpose. By 1965, 1 of every 10 Americans will be 65 years old or older. Life should be, for all of us when we reach this age not only secure but so arranged for that it means something. Not security but dignity, or meaningfulness, is our purpose here if we are thinking in human terms.

One other point. There is today in this country a growing restlessness and concern about whether these new machines that are coming in are to be men's servants or men's masters and their enemies.

There is a theory that automation is no business of the Government, that the only people who are to have anything to say about fitting automation into our industrial life are the corporations that buy these new machines. And the Secretary of Defense says not to worry about this anyway; that if a machine replaces a man, there will be another job for him making that machine, and that if that new job happens to be a hundred miles away in another city, well, what of it?

The Secretary leaves some things out. What he forgets, of course, are all the human elements here. Does it occur to him that maybe that man, and perhaps even more his family, doesn't want to move, that the community they live in has become part of their lives, that a mother would like, if she could, to spare her children the uprooting that comes from a change in schools in the middle of the year? And it probably never crossed the Secretary's mind that when a man changes jobs he loses his seniority, the biggest capital he has.

It looks now as though within a few years, perhaps 10, possibly 20, the coming of these new machines and the release of atomic energy for industrial use will mean that the Nation's production needs can be met

by three-quarters of the work force, or by all of the work force working 30 hours a week instead of 40; or in the alternative, that we can increase the production of consumer goods so that the standard of living in this country can be raised to the level of people's dreams.

"Writing the people into government" means facing up as a people to the social as well as the economic implications of the second industrial revolution, for this is what is coming. And if anybody says this isn't the business of government then I would recall Woodrow Wilson's reminder that "whenever the United States forgets its ardor for mankind it is necessary that a Democrat should be elected President."

I did not intend to make this a political speech, although I warned you at the start that my mind these days is on a single track. And I'm afraid I've talked too much of what may seem to you politics.

But if there has been politics here it has been only the politics which are born of deepest conviction.

For I believe with all my heart that, under democracy, this country is going forward to such an uplifting of its citizens as mankind has scarcely dreamed of.

I see this uplifting not in terms of technical advances alone, not in terms only of new consumer goods, but even more in terms of a broadening and deepening of the mind and heart of the Nation.

This uplifting will come only as we stop waiting for the good things of life to trickle down to the people from the top of the financial pyramid, and as we work again to insure a fair distribution, not only of the Nation's wealth and production, but of the Nation's opportunities.

It will come as we start measuring prosperity not just in terms of refrigerators and television sets, but even more in terms of the greater goods of education, health, security, and peace of mind.

It will come only as we set our course once again by the stars in the constellation of the general welfare, and by the beacon lights of individual freedom and human dignity.

SUPPORT BY SENATOR CASE, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, OF ADEQUATE POWER FOR NORTH DAKOTA AND SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to rise to speak a word of commendation of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I hold in my hand an article, published in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Daily Journal of March 20, stating that the Senator from South Dakota has said that—

He has no intention of offering legislation to eliminate the preference clause giving priority to public bodies in the allocation of Federal power.

Mr. President, it is typical of the Senator from South Dakota that he has joined some of the rest of us who come from the Northwest in helping to secure adequate power for the States of North Dakota and South Dakota; and it is also typical of the Senator from South Dakota that he is in the very forefront of that fight.

I ask unanimous consent that the article relative to the junior Senator from South Dakota be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE DOES NOT INTEND PREFERENCE CLAUSE BILL

(By Dillon Graham)

WASHINGTON.—Senator CASE, Republican, South Dakota, says he has no intention of offering legislation to eliminate the preference clause giving priority to public bodies in the allocation of Federal power.

He made his position clear the other day in an exchange, at a Senate Public Works Subcommittee hearing, with Clyde Ellis, general manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

"I am of the opinion," CASE told Ellis, "that possibly you have some impression that I had proposed some specific amendment to destroy the preference clause.

"I assure you there has been no such amendment proposed. None is in existence bearing my name, and none will be."

But CASE said he would "try to find some way to make (Federal) power available to the rank and file consumers in South Dakota, so that they can all get the benefits from the Missouri Basin development."

He also said he would seek some power arrangement which would attract industries to his State.

Resolutions passed by several regional rural electric cooperative groups formed the background for CASE's statement.

One of these referred to legislation by CASE which it said would "destroy the preference principle", "establish a precedent that would forever endanger this principle," and "have the net effect of giving commercial power companies all of the major benefits of the power produced by this (Big Bend) dam."

After getting Ellis to say that he did not have a copy of the Case amendment and couldn't remember whether he had ever seen it, CASE informed him there was no such amendment.

Ellis, under questioning, said that REA groups believed plans used in the Southwest Power Administration and the Northwest power pool for the Bonneville Dam had worked out pretty well.

SPA serves private utilities as well as cooperatives. In the Northwest, there is an integration of power produced publicly and privately and an integration of the generating facilities.

Ellis also said his groups favor the Lehman bill for developing Niagara River power. This would give priority to public bodies but would make arrangements for disposition of some power to private utilities in New York, for the benefit of their consumers, and with provision for withdrawal when needed by preference customers.

CASE said that if the REA approved SPA, Northwest pool, and the Lehman bill, he found it difficult to understand why they opposed his position.

The Senator said his idea was for something similar to the Lehman bill to be applied to Missouri River power in South Dakota. He said his idea is also similar to the methods used in the SPA and the Northwest pool. It also, he said, would go further than the Lehman bill by insisting that any benefits, through savings in generating costs, go to customers and not to the private utility companies themselves.

Ellis said his groups approved the Lehman bill only because they regarded it as better than the House-passed bill. And he said he felt that a comparison of the South Dakota problem with the New York situation is not suitable.

Any legislation giving South Dakota people preference over people outside the State, he said, would be very detrimental."

CASE said that if the proposed Big Bend Dam on the Missouri River above Fort Randall were constructed, without some arrangement made to protect South Dakota, it would be built purely for the export of power outside South Dakota.

He said he had stated last year that he would not press for appropriations for building this dam until "we get some plan officially approved or legislation passed that will make Big Bend power available to South Dakota consumers before it is exported outside the State."

The Senator said the Interior Department had informed him that South Dakotans would not be able to get power from Oahe or Big Bend Dams unless they were served by public bodies and that outside claims, including the statewide preference customers in Nebraska, could take all the power if they asked for it.

CASE said some way should be worked out for a pooling of existing generator capacity in South Dakota, and such additional generator capacity as would be necessary to make it possible for the co-ops in South Dakota, as well as other consumers, to get the benefits of Missouri River power, including secondary power. He said he didn't think private utilities in South Dakota would fight such a pool arrangement.

Gov. Joe Foss, of South Dakota, was a brief visitor here last week.

As national chairman of the Easter seal drive, Foss came here for a visit along with other officials and the Easter Seal Girl, with President Eisenhower.

Farm income was down in South Dakota last year but the dollar value of farmland increased 3 percent.

The Agriculture Department reported not long ago that cash receipts from farm marketings in South Dakota were off 11 percent from 1954. Now, in another report, it says farmland dollar values are up.

But the 3 percent rise was less than the national average increase of 5 percent.

Every State except Nevada and Utah showed an increase in farmland values. Nevada's remain level with 1954 figures while Utah's was down 1 percent. The survey covered the period from November 1954, to November 1955. Minnesota showed the biggest increase, 11 percent.

Here's how other Midwestern States compared with South Dakota's 3-percent increase.

North Dakota, up 7 percent; Nebraska, up 4; Kansas, up 9; Missouri, up 2; Iowa, up 5; Wisconsin, up 4; Illinois, up 3; Indiana, up 7; Ohio, up 9; Michigan, up 8; Colorado, up 1; and Wyoming, up 2.

The total value of the Nation's farmland and buildings as of last November 1 was estimated at $101,800,000,000. This would be an average of nearly $88 per acre for the 1,519,000,000 acres of farmland. Such figures were not given by States.

The post-Korean-war rise in values has set new value peaks in all except four States—Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, and Nebraska. The report said that, although values in these four States were above 1952, they were still below 1920. Values in South Dakota were 31 percent below this post-World War I level and in the other 3 States were 5 to 8 percent below that level.

WANT TO BUY A TOWN?

Television viewers may have this question asked them soon.

Senator CASE, Republican, South Dakota, has suggested to one national network that it tell the story of Pickstown in pictures in one of its programs. The idea is under consideration.

Pickstown, as you know, is the town built by the Government to house Army engineers and workers on Fort Randall Dam. The Government soon will have no more use for the houses and other buildings and will consider selling the whole area, except for a few buildings necessary for maintenance crews.

WALTER REUTHER, AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ambassador Extraordinary", which appears in today's Washington Post and Times Herald. It contains a praiseworthy eulogy of Walter Reuther, one of West Virginia's most illustrious sons. He was formerly president of the CIO. He is now president of the United Automobile Workers of America, and one of the outstanding, philosophical labor leaders of the world.

In this article the Post presents a timely and richly deserved appraisal of the great service Mr. Reuther has recently rendered in India by most significantly promoting an increase of understanding and friendship between the millions of that far-off land on the one hand and the people of the United States on the other. The editorial contains, among many other pertinent and important things, the following:

Mr. Reuther recognized that the real competition with the Soviet Union in Asia is not in military prowess, but in the campaign against poverty, hunger, and injustice. He was not merely asserting a truism when he said that the struggle for freedom in Asia would be won on the ricefields, not the battlefield.

Something of the same inspiration and fervor was evident in Mr. Reuther's remarks here Tuesday to the UAW educational conference. Drawing from his experience in India, he observed:

"Every value that you and I cherish as free people, the things for which men have died on the battlefields of the world, all of the things that are woven together in the rich heritage that we call America, all of those values are in jeopardy because they cannot be preserved in a little national vacuum called America. They must be preserved in the world, in which powerful forces are at work threatening these basic values that we believe in. * * * If we had the courage, if we had the good sense, to use the great abundance we have been blessed with, to fight positively in the struggle against poverty and hunger in the world, we could launch a moral force with greater power than all the H-bombs in our stockpile."

Mr. President, let me warmly commend the Post for this, its latest contribution to the general welfare and Mr. Reuther for the priceless service he is rendering all mankind. The editorial is a heartwarming assurance that both Mr. Reuther and the Washington Post are as oil upon the troubled waters of a weary world heartbroken by war and praying as never before for the dawn of universal peace that will never, never end.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY

Walter Reuther, from all accounts, made an enormous hit in India, not by telling the Indians only what they wanted to hear, but by being himself. The dynamic president of the United Auto Workers, thoroughly American in his ideals, was a splendid choice to depict to the Indian National Trade Union Congress the variety of opinions and approaches that exist in America. Mr. Reuther recognized frankly the differences between Indian and American foreign policy, drawing parallels from American history and at the same time expressing his own disagreement with Secretary Dulles on Goa. He talked candidly about America's race problems and about work and productivity as the sources of America's wealth; and in so doing he conveyed his sympathy with and understanding of the problems and democratic ambitions of Indian workers. He recognized that the real competition with the Soviet Union in Asia is not in military prowess, but in the campaign against poverty, hunger, and injustice. He was not merely asserting a truism when he said that the struggle for freedom in Asia would be won on the rice fields, not the battlefield.

Something of the same inspiration and fervor was evident in Mr. Reuther's remarks here Tuesday to the UAW Educational Conference. Drawing from his experience in India, he observed:

"Every value that you and I cherish as free people, the things for which men have died on the battlefields of the world, all of the things that are woven together in the rich heritage that we call America, all of those values are in jeopardy because they cannot be preserved in a little national vacuum called America. They must be preserved in the world, in which powerful forces are at work threatening these basic values that we believe in * * * If we had the courage, if we had the good sense, to use the great abundance we have been blessed with, to fight positively in the struggle against poverty and hunger in the world, we could launch a moral force with greater power than all the H-bombs in our stockpile."

Obviously not all relations with India can be conducted so simply and informally, nor can all problems be resolved by friendly words. But Mr. Reuther performed a real service, particularly in advance of Prime Minister Nehru's visit to Washington, by his extraordinarily successful role as an unofficial ambassador complementing the sensitive work of Ambassador Cooper. The only real way to draw India and America closer together is through such stress on the common chord of mutual aspirations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY LEADERS OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at this time I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to a distinguished delegation in the Senate gallery, who represent the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. They are leaders from across the Nation, and are present in Washington for a brief visit. These young men, active in public affairs on community, State, and national levels, are in Washington on a 3-day tour to observe the operations of the Federal Government. The initiative and enthusiasm of "Jaycees" is well known to all Members of the Senate of the United States.

I should like to commend the representatives of the junior chamber of commerce who are visiting us today, and also the 200,000 members they represent, for their active interest in governmental efficiency and economy. These young leaders were chosen to make the trip by virtue of their outstanding efforts in making known to all citizens the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

I wish them an interesting and an enjoyable stay in Washington, and I sincerely hope that this introduction to the workings of their Federal Government will enable them to return home with a greater understanding of what their representatives in Washington are trying to accomplish.

Mr. President, under our constitutional system of government, the Congress of the United States is a coordinate, not a subordinate branch of the government. Under our constitutional system, the Congress is a part of the great system of checks and balances.

Therefore, we are particularly glad to have these young men, who represent the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce and the various local junior chambers of commerce, make this visit. I should like to ask them to rise, for an acknowledgment.

[The members of the delegation rose in their places in the gallery and were greeted with applause.]

STRENGTH OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1814, House bill 9078.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9078) to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 2,500 officers and members.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 2,500 officers or members.

The current appropriation for the Police Department for the District of Columbia contemplates 2,278 positions. However, the amount appropriated was sufficient to employ only an average of 2,246 persons. To increase the force to a minimum of 2,500 would require additional funds sufficient to pay for 254 additional positions.

At a hearing before the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia on April 11, 1956, among those present who recommended without equivocation that

this legislation be favorably considered were Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department Robert V. Murray; Mr. Ralph D. Pittman, president, Washington Criminal Justice Association; Mr. George L. Hart, chairman, Law Enforcement Council of the District of Columbia; and representatives of numerous citizens' and civic organizations.

I am pleased to inform the Senate that the bill was reported by unanimous vote of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 9078) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1817, Senate bill 3295.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3295) to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3295) to amend the act of April 28, 1953, relating to daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] reported the bill; and I wonder whether he would like to make a statement about it at this time.

Mr. MCNAMARA. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Texas proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have a brief statement which I shall be glad to make, but I thought perhaps the Senator from Michigan would like to explain the bill.

Mr. MCNAMARA. No, Mr. President; I should like to have the Senator from Texas proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the act which permits the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District each year—approved April 28, 1953, District of Columbia Code, section 28–2804. Under existing law the Commissioners may establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia for the period beginning not earlier than the last Sunday in April and ending not later than the last Sunday in September. S. 3295 would permit the Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time to the last Sunday in October.

The committee has been advised that this proposed extension is necessary in order to bring the District of Columbia in line with a number of large cities in the northeastern and midwestern sections of the United States, and to eliminate confusion as to transportation, radio and television schedules and programs.

The bill was unanimously approved by the full committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 3295) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District," approved April 28, 1953 (D. C. Code, sec. 28–2804), is hereby amended by striking out the words "last Sunday of September" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "last Sunday of October."

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT RELATING TO REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 1755, Senate bill 3025, and I call the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to this motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3025) to amend paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "debtor", to strike out "the trustee" and insert "with respect to safety, location of tracks, and terminal facilities, the trustee or trustees"; at the beginning of line 10, to insert "of statewide jurisdiction"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "effective", to strike out "over the objection of the trustee" and insert "(a) unless the trustee or trustees, with the approval of the court, shall consent thereto, or (b)"; in line 10, after the word "trustee", to insert "or trustees"; and in the same line, after the word "his", to insert "or their", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (11 U. S. C. 205 (c) (2)), is amended by inserting in said paragraph, immediately preceding the last sentence thereof, the following: "In operating the business of the debtor with respect to safety, location of tracks, and terminal facilities, the trustee or trustees shall be subject to lawful orders of State regulatory bodies of statewide jurisdiction to the same extent as would the debtor if a petition respecting it had not been filed under subsection (a) of this section except that (A) any such order which would require the expenditure, or the incurring of an obligation for the expenditure, of money from the debtor's estate shall not become effective (a) unless the trustee or trustees, with the approval of the court, shall consent thereto, or (b) unless and until the Commission, upon appropriate application or applications by an interested party or interested parties, shall find that compliance with the order will not impair the ability of the trustee or trustees to perform his or their duties to the public, will not constitute an undue burden upon interstate commerce, will be compatible with the public interest, and will not interfere with the formulation and approval of a satisfactory plan of reorganization for the debtor, and (B) compliance shall be made with any applicable provision of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with all the many vital matters confronting the Congress today, it is indeed unfortunate that consideration of these vital issues must be interrupted to consider the pending legislation which has for its purpose the remedying of a special local situation. But it is comforting to know that when entrenched selfish interests refuse to recognize the public interest in a local situation and when they persistently throttle the progress of a great city, the Congress is not too busy to grant the people the relief they need.

Mr. President, the pending legislation which was unanimously reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, amends paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act in order to allow a trustee of a railroad involved in reorganization proceedings to comply with the lawful orders of a State regulatory body, with respect to such matters as safety, location of tracks and terminal facilities, prior to the final adoption of the plan of reorganization, to the same extent that a railroad not involved in such proceedings is now subject to such orders.

In other words it makes a railroad involved in these proceedings subject to the lawful orders of a State regulatory body with respect to these matters to the same extent that it would be, if it were not involved in such proceedings, by separating from the district court's jurisdiction questions involving the carrying out of certain lawful orders of the State regulatory body relating to safety, location of tracks and terminal facilities, so that the public benefits will not be unduly deferred.

The legislation provides adequate safeguards to protect the parties in interest in that the Interstate Commerce Commission would be required to find that compliance with a lawful order of a State regulatory body will not impair the ability of the trustee to perform his duties to the public, will not constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce, will be compatible with the public interest, and will not interfere with the formulation and approval of a satisfactory plan of reorganization.

The necessity for the legislation is highlighted by a situation which exists in the State of Florida today wherein the Florida East Coast Railway has been unable to complete its reorganization, although it has been in the process of reorganizing since August 31, 1931, a period of almost 25 years. During this period four proposed plans of reorganization have been through the Federal courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The United States Supreme Court has had the matter before it three times. The Interstate Commerce Commission has issued innumerable reports and now has the matter before it once more, and I presume it will approve a fifth plan of reorganization. Under such circumstances, whatever plan is decided upon by the Commission will most likely follow the same tortuous path of the previous plans, that is,

through the district court, the court of appeals, and up to the Supreme Court, and possibly back to the Commission to start all over again.

Meanwhile the Florida East Coast Railway is using facilities in the city of Miami which are outmoded, inadequate, and dangerous to the public safety. Trains block street crossings by the hour in the heart of the city, disrupting midtown traffic and constituting a continuous traffic hazard, which endangers life, limb, and property. As a matter of fact at the 3 downtown railroad crossings from 14 to 19 accidents occur at each 1 of these crossings each year. In addition a little old, rundown, ramshackle station is an eyesore in the heart of the city. This, too, causes serious traffic congestion on the streets in the vicinity of the station and is a barrier to the future growth and development of the business district in Miami. The station was built in 1914 at a time when the population of Miami was about 20,000. Today the normal year-round population of Miami is 850,000, and the wintertime population runs close to 2 million. This same station now exists in Miami as existed in 1914. Efforts to eliminate these conditions in the interest of public convenience, necessity, and safety have been frustrated and ensnarled in what appears to be endless litigation.

The Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission has ordered the Florida East Coast Railway to remove the station and tracks from the heart of the city to a location farther removed from the business district. Under normal conditions this order would have been carried out long ago but for the fact that the trustee of the railway is trying and has been trying for years to reorganize and to date has been unable to get the parties in interest together on a plan which is agreeable to all. Under existing law the needed changes in facilities cannot be made until a final plan of reorganization is adopted. Meanwhile in the situation at hand the public suffers through the inability of the parties involved to reach an agreeable reorganization plan which would allow the changes in improvements to be made. This obviously is not the intent of section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, for, as we all know, the public interest, convenience, and necessity is paramount to that of any private litigant.

Under proper safeguards a State agency should not be frustrated and blocked from doing what it should do to protect the safety of its citizens.

The situation has reached the point where an amendment to the Bankruptcy Act such as that contained in the proposed legislation is vitally needed to protect the public interest. Not only should this particular situation be resolved, but if there are any others like it now or at any time in the future, the adoption of the amendment will safeguard the interest of the public generally. As a matter of fact I am convinced that the adoption of the proposed legislation will inure to the benefit of the bankrupt, the bondholders, and the public at large without having to await the approval and adoption of the final plans of reorganization. I might point out here in the instant case that though the Florida East Coast Railway has been involved in reorganization proceedings for a period of approximately 25 years, it is a solvent railroad, and like any other solvent railroad it should be required to carry out the lawful orders of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission, with respect to matters of safety, location of tracks and terminal facilities, without having to await the final determination and adoption of a reorganization plan.

No railroad which has gone into bankruptcy and seeks reorganization under the bankruptcy law should, by that fact alone, be exempt from the rules and regulations of State regulatory agencies governing operations and safety designed to protect and serve the public interest. I am convinced that the legislation pending before the Senate today, and which has been unanimously reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, is badly needed in order to accomplish the objective sought to be achieved. It is sound legislation, and it is legislation in the public interest. For these reasons I recommend its approval and trust that the Senate will unanimously adopt this bill.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a statement prepared by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3025, AMENDING BANKRUPTCY ACT WITH REFERENCE TO REORGANIZATION OF RAILROADS

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the Bankruptcy Act as it relates to the reorganization of railroads engaged in interstate commerce, to allow the bankrupt estate with respect to safety, location of tracks, and terminal facilities, to comply with the lawful orders of a State regulatory body of statewide jurisdiction, so that improvements in railroad facilities can be made as needed prior to the final adoption of a plan of reorganization. The bill further provides that the trustee or trustees of the estate need not comply with the State regulatory order unless and until the Interstate Commerce Commission shall find that compliance with the order will not impair the ability of the trustee or trustees to perform his or their duties to the public, will not constitute an undue burden upon interstate commerce, will be compatible with the public interest, and will not interfere with the formulation and approval of a satisfactory plan of reorganization for the debtor, and further, that compliance shall be made with any applicable provision of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This legislation was the subject of hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which arose as a result of a situation existing in the city of Miami, Fla. The Florida East Coast Railway went into reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act about August 31, 1931, approximately 25 years ago. During this time proposed plans of reorganization have been through the Federal courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The United States Supreme Court has had the matter presented to it on three occasions. Testimony shows that the Interstate Commerce Commission has issued innumerable reports, and now has the matter before it, so that the situation is static as to the changing of the terminal, the building of a new station, and related matters.

The Miami railroad station was built about 1914. The same station remains today. In 1922, the total population of Miami was about 20,000, and at that time the city of Miami had complained about the inadequacy of the station. Testimony indicates that the normal year-round population of Miami is 850,000 and the wintertime population runs close to 2 million, with the same station.

Due to objections to the various final reorganization plans none of the plans have been completed and adopted, so that nothing may be done about the relocation of tracks and the railroad station or the expenditure of money therefor until the final plans are adopted. The committee, of course, does not desire to interfere with the rights of the bondholders to litigate any matter they desire in the bankruptcy proceeding; but, under the terms of this bill, believes that in the public interest, if the State regulatory body and court, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, find that an order to relocate tracks and build a new station does not impair the ability of the trustee or trustees to perform his or their duties to the public, will not constitute an undue burden upon interstate commerce, will be compatible with the public interest, and will not interfere with the formulation and approval of a satisfactory plan of reorganization for the debtor, then such a move should be allowed without reference to the adoption of a final plan of reorganization.

It is contemplated that parties in interest would have three hearings—one before the State regulatory body, another before the court under whose jurisdiction the reorganization remains, and finally, the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The committee does not know of any other situations of this nature at the present time, but it is believed that there is a likelihood that similar situations will arise in the future, and if such be the case, it is believed that this amendment to the bankruptcy law will be proved beneficial to the interests of the public, to the debtor in reorganization, and others. It is the purpose of the Bankruptcy Reorganization Act, as regards railroads, to try all reasonable and feasible methods, to establish them back in business for their benefit and for the benefit of the public, and it appeared to the committee that the improvements herein allowed are such as to further that theory. The committee, therefore, recommended that this legislation be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1855, Senate Concurrent Resolution 73.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) relative to the fight against mental illness and to observe National Mental Health week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida to make a brief explanation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the pending concurrent resolution calls upon the Congress to request the people of the United States to join and cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and to observe National Mental Health Week beginning April 29 and ending May 5, 1956, with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

This resolution affords the Congress the means of calling to the attention of the American people the importance to the Nation and to each of us as individuals of cooperating in the fight to find effective ways to prevent, to treat, and to cure mental illness.

The excellent work being done in this field by the National Association for Mental Health and by State and local mental health organizations, is of great value and warrants all of our support.

I believe that it is appropriate that we in the Congress urge that this support make itself apparent during National Mental Health Week. It is my sincere hope that such support will be continued until such time as the now awesome incidence and duration of mental illness be reduced to an absolute minimum.

The Congress, as you know, has lent its sanction to this undertaking in the past, and I believe that it will be eager to do so again. I recommend the adoption of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are no committee amendments. The concurrent resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 73) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join and cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness and to observe National Mental Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

ABOLISHMENT OF THE VERENDRYE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1811, House bill 1774.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1774) to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "thereon", to strike out "subject to existing permits" and insert "subject to the reservation to the United States of the right to flood such lands in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before the bill is passed, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after the word "abolished", it is proposed to strike out "and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey the lands contained therein, together with any improvements thereon" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "and the property contained therein is hereby authorized to be disposed of in accordance with the laws relating to the disposition of surplus Federal property", and, on page 1, line 9, after the word "project", to change the comma to a period and strike out "to the State of North Dakota for public recreation use and as a State historic site.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized to execute, on behalf of the United States, the necessary deed or other instrument to effect the purposes of this act. Such deed or instrument shall contain the express provision that the grantee shall use the lands conveyed exclusively for public recreation and State historic site purposes and may contain such other provisions as the Secretary and the grantee shall agree upon.

"SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized herein shall be made upon the further express condition that the title and right to possession to any land so conveyed, together with any improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States upon a finding by the Secretary, after notice to such grantee and after an opportunity for a hearing, that the grantee has not complied with the provisions of the conveyance during a period of more than 3 years, which finding shall be final and conclusive and such lands and improvements, upon reversion to the United States, shall be returned to the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for appropriate administration or disposition as determined by the Secretary: *Provided*, That this condition shall cease to be in effect as to any lands conveyed hereunder 25 years after the conveyance of such lands."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana give a brief explanation of his amendment?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to meet the objections to the bill raised by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Senator from Oregon does not object to this particular piece of property being disposed of under the surplus-property laws. However, he felt that he might be compelled to object to the bill without this amendment. Therefore, the amendment is offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with Calendar No. 1811, H. R. 1774, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in connection with that bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

H. R. 1774, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of North Dakota, without cost, the lands contained in the Verendrye National Monument which would be abolished as a national monument. The conveyance would be subject to the right of United States to flood portions of the land in connection with the operation and maintenance of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project. The bill further provides for the State to use the lands as a State historic site, title to revest in the Federal Government if the lands are not put to that use during a period of more than 3 years.

By agreement with the senior Senator from Oregon, this proposed amendment calls for disposition of the land under the provisions of the laws relating to surplus Federal property. Thus, the land would be disposed of only after a determination had been made whether some other Federal agency might have need for the land and, if not, whether the land should then be disposed of to nongovernmental purchasers with or without compensation to the Government.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1837, Senate Concurrent Resolution 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring appropriate observance of National Hospital Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to make a brief explanation of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this concurrent resolution has not been previously announced as being on the list for consideration, but I think it is clear on both sides of the aisle that, considering the imminence of National Hospital Week, the concurrent resolution must be approved. It was originally submitted by the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and it has been favorably reported by the Judiciary Subcommittee as well as by the full committee. It ought to be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby requests the people of the United States to join in proclaiming the importance of hospitals in the American community and their tradition of devoted service to the American people, and to cooperate in a voluntary effort to observe National Hospital Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The preamble was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF WASHOE RECLAMATION PROJECT, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1853, Senate bill 497.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 497) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] if he will make a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, this is a bill to authorize the Washoe Reclamation project, situated in Nevada and California. The project has been under consideration by the committee for a considerable period of time.

The Washoe project would provide irrigation water to supplement present supplies and to provide a full supply to lands in Carson Valley and the Empire, Dayton, and Fort Churchill areas. In addition during dry cycles it would firm existing supplies of the Truckee River storage and Newlands reclamation projects. Drains would be provided for lands in Carson Valley and under the Truckee River storage project in Truckee Meadows. Hydroelectric energy would be generated to meet urgent local needs and to provide a portion of the repayment revenues. Project reservoirs would provide stream regulation that would materially lessen flood damage.

Nevada, under the leadership of our distinguished predecessor Senator Francis G. Newlands, and President Theodore Roosevelt, cradled reclamation. It was through their efforts that the reclamation law of 1902 was placed on the Federal statutes 54 years ago.

The estimated authorized cost of the project under the bill is $43,700,000, all of which is reimbursable except the flood control and fish and wildlife development measures.

The project will bring only 5,000 acres of new land under irrigation but will provide supplemental water and drainage for 30,000 acres and benefit more than 100,000 additional acres with supplemental water.

The area lies in the Washoe and Truckee Valleys, which will receive flood protection as well as other resource development that will benefit the Pyramid Indians. The flood control features will over the years save many, many millions in property values in the city of Reno, other cities and towns as well as agricultural lands and farm homes.

Powerplants on the project will have 28,000 kilowatts of installed capacity and produce about 95 million kilowatt-hours annually.

The major laws and reservoirs on the project are Watasheama on the East Fork of the Carson River and the Stampede on the Little Truckee.

Representatives of the States of Nevada and California have reached agreements which have been incorporated by amendments to the bill. These protect the interests of both States.

I may say in that connection that in December 1955, flood damage along the Carson and Truckee Rivers was estimated to be somewhat in excess of $3,300,000. Another costly flood swept through the city of Reno in 1950, causing flood damages in excess of $4 million, making a total loss of nearly $8 million. That is the amount the committee feels should approximate the nonreimbursable flood-control allocation for this project.

Benefits to recreation and public health would be created. The project would variously affect fish and wildlife with the net effect to be determined by final structural designs and operating criteria. The preservation and propagation of these resources, one of the purposes of the project, will be assured to the greatest extent possible through the continued cooperation of the Bureau of Reclamation with the fish and game commissions of California and Nevada, and with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which committee considers the project thoroughly planned and well engineered.

The local interests concerned have cooperated fully and have agreed to the financial arrangements, with the exception of the flood-control allocations prepared by the Department, which I have heretofore discussed as not adequate in view of the heavy losses in a single flood that swept the area.

Mr. President, I therefore move the adoption of the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the distinguished Senator has an amendment which the Chair believes he desires to offer to one of the committee amendments.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Chair would suggest that that committee amendment be first considered.

The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 4, after the word "above", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That the Secretary, prior to the delivery of project water supplies, shall have entered into a contract or contracts with an organization or organizations as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which have the capacity to review assessments upon all taxable real property located within their boundaries to assist in making repayments.

(d) Water users in Alpine County, Calif., shall have the opportunity to contract for project water made available by the Watasheamu Reservoir before such project water is offered for the development of any new land in Nevada. Should any such project water be contracted for by Alpine County water users, then in that event, such users shall be permitted to exchange such water for existing rights to natural flow or stored water of the West Carson River.

(e) The use of water of the Little Truckee River solely for the generation of electric power by the Washoe project shall not impair or preclude the appropriation of such waters in the future for beneficial consumptive use within the Little Truckee River watershed in California to the same extent as such waters may be presently available for such appropriation in the State of California: *Provided*, That if and when an interstate compact covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers is approved by the legislatures of the States of California and Nevada and is consented to by Congress, the operation of the Washoe reclamation project shall be in conformance with such compact, and the foregoing restriction shall not apply.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 4, line 9, to strike out the word "review" and insert the word "levy" in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment on page 4, line 9.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I know of no objection to the bill. However, I did have a request that a quorum

call be had before the bill was disposed of so that a certain Senator might be present. If the Senator will yield for that purpose, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BIBLE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I direct attention to my senior colleague [Mr. MALONE], who has just entered the Chamber. I again state that the bill involves a multipurpose project. It involves irrigation, drainage, supplemental water, hydroelectric power, flood control, fish and wildlife development, and recreational facilities. The sponsors of the bill are my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MALONE] and myself.

As I previously stated, the bill was subject to extensive hearings and careful consideration by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It was unanimously reported by the committee to the Senate. I am not clear as to whether all committee amendments have been adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments were about to be considered en bloc when the suggestion of the absence of a quorum was made. They have not been adopted, with the exception of the committee amendment which was amended by the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. That amendment was merely to correct an obvious error of language. At this time I move that the other committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the remaining committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 6, after the word "approximately", to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "thirty-one"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "power", to insert "development of fish and wildlife resources"; in line 8, after the word "lands", to insert "The dam at the Stampede site shall be so constructed as to permit its ultimate enlargement to a height at which the reservoir will have a capacity of approximately 175,000 acre-feet."; on page 3, line 3, after the word "such", to insert "block over a period of not more than 50 years, exclusive of any"; in line 11, after the word "pay", to insert a colon and *"Provided,* That neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649), nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable to lands receiving supplemental water under the Washoe project."

On page 5, line 7, after "SEC. 3", to strike out "Minimum basic facilities may be provided for the accommodation of the visiting public at the major dam structures of the Washoe project and, if responsible local interests agree to assume the operation and maintenance thereof, at Stampede Reservoir. The costs of such facilities shall be nonreimbursable" and insert "The Secretary is authorized to investigate, plan, construct, operate and maintain minimum basic facilities for access to, and for the maintenance of public health and safety and the protection of public property on, lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of the Washoe project, to conserve the scenery and natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by this project by such means as are consistent with its primary purposes. The Secretary is authorized to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public-land laws such public lands as are necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said minimum basic facilities and for the other purposes specified in this section and to dispose of such lands to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. The Secretary is further authorized to investigate the need for acquiring other lands for said purposes and to report thereon to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, but no lands shall be acquired solely for any of these purposes other than access to project lands and the maintenance of public health and safety and the protection of public property thereon without further authorization by the Congress. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

"SEC. 4. Facilities shall be provided for the development of the fish and wildlife resources of the project area including facilities to permit increased minimum water releases from Lake Tahoe and restoration of the Pyramid Lake fishery. The cost of such facilities, including operation and maintenance, shall be nonreimbursable. The cost to the Federal Government of constructing these facilities shall not exceed $2 million. This amount shall not include the cost of measures undertaken pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U. S. C., sec. 661a), to mitigate damages to fish and wildlife resources occasioned by the Washoe project as authorized by section 1 of this act."

On page 7, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; and in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "$41,700,000" and insert "$43,700,000."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, in closing I should like to say that I would be less than fair if I did not commend both the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], for their aid and assistance in working out one of the problems involved in the bill, namely, the interstate relationships between the State of Nevada and the State of California. We jointly worked out language which was incorporated in the amendments, already adopted, and which relates to the recommendations of the compact commissions of both States. I wish to pay special tribute to both Senators from California. Their actions demonstrate beyond any doubt that men of ability can sit around a table and work out problems of water rights insofar as they deal with interstate streams.

My senior colleague is on the floor. I know of his intense interest and his long work in connection with this bill and I am sure he will wish to make some remarks on it.

THE TRUCKEE-CARSON (WASHOE) PROJECT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduced Senate bill 497 on January 18, 1955, for myself and the junior Senator [Mr. BIBLE], authorizing the construction of the Truckee-Carson (Washoe) project—which includes the watersheds of the Truckee and the Carson Rivers.

COST AND REPAYMENT

The project is estimated to cost $43,700,000 which is in addition to the flood-control project for the Truckee River improvement, which includes removal of the reefs below the Truckee Meadows costing $791,000—1956 estimate $960,000—authorized in 1954 subject to the authorization of the Truckee-Carson project.

The proposed legislation conforms to the policies long established by Congress in that that part of the cost allocated to irrigation shall be repaid over a 50-year period without interest—the part allocated to power repaid with interest and the amount allocated to flood control and to fish and game preservation to general benefits.

AREA AFFECTED

The project primarily affects the Washoe County Conservation District, the Newlands Project and the Carson Valley. However the benefits extend to the Lake Tahoe property owners and indirectly to the entire watershed.

BEGINNING OF RECLAMATION

It is interesting to note Mr. President, that Senator Newlands of our State of Nevada introduced the legislation, passed in 1902 that resulted in what is now the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, and that the Newlands project at Fallon, Nev., was the first to be authorized under that great forward-looking work, which has resulted in the reclamation of nearly 20 million acres of public lands in a half century.

TRUCKEE RIVER BASIN

The Truckee River Basin flood-control project was authorized in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, by Public Law 780 providing for flood protection on Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 15, 1954, at an estimated cost of $791,000—1956 estimate $960,000—"provided that the authorization for improvement for flood control on Truckee River, California and Nevada, contained herein shall not become effective unless and until the Washoe Reclamation Project on the Truckee and Carson Rivers, California and Nevada, shall have been authorized pursuant to law."

CORPORATION

I want to join with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] in complimenting the work of the responsible officials of the 2 States of California and Nevada in bringing together the interests of the 2 States and the present and potential water users.

It certainly does show what can be accomplished when friendly but often

adverse interests are involved and the problems are discussed in a spirit of real cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous permission to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a history of the project and of the proposed legislation, together with pertinent communications.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGISLATION

The Washoe reclamation project was introduced as Senate bill 497 by Senator MALONE for himself and Senator BIBLE on January 18, 1955 (the early days of the 1st sess. of the 84th Cong.). As introduced the bill will provide: Irrigation facilities for 50,000 acres in the Carson and Truckee River Basins, drainage facilities for 35,000 acres in the same area, a hydroelectric power source, and basic facilities for accommodating the visiting public at the major dam structures. The project would maintain at a constant yearly flow the existing water supplies under the Truckee River and Newlands storage projects, and provide flood control in the Carson-Truckee River Basin area. Two major construction projects, reservoirs at the Stampede and Watasheamu sites, are also authorized in the bill. The bill authorizes $41,700,000 plus such amounts as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices and plus such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the project.

Hearings were held October 14, 1955, in Reno, headed by Senator MALONE. All evidence introduced at this hearing was favorable to the passage of the bill.

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

MALONE was one of the original proponents of Washoe County Conservation District in 1917 and was one of the principals in the formal organization in 1928, when upstream development of the Truckee River was discussed.

As State engineer, MALONE helped to secure the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation to construct Boco Dam on the Little Truckee River in 1934.

1938: Flood Control Act authorized Corps of Army Engineers to investigate the Truckee River and its tributaries.

1952: August 26 and 27, Reno, hearings, headed by MALONE, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate. The hearings are entitled "Flood Control, River and Water Resource Development, Truckee and Carson Rivers, Nev.

1954: July 22 and 23, Washington, hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. The hearings were of H. R. 9859 of the 2d session of the 83d Congress. This is an omnibus bill entitled "Rivers and Harbors Flood Control." Senator MCCARRAN appeared before the subcommittee asking that his bill S. 3408 be included in H. R. 9859. Senate bill 3408 on the Truckee and Carson Rivers had not been included in the House bill. California opposed McCarran's bill being added to the House bill. Regarding hearings on H. R. 9859, it comes under public law 780 of 2d session of 83d Congress. Also Senate Report No. 2007, Calendar No. 2026, from Mr. MARTIN from the Committee on Public Works. The project for flood protection of Truckee River is authorized at an estimated cost of $791,000, providing the Washoe reclamation project of the Truckee and Carson Rivers shall have been authorized pursuant to law.

1952: Status report, December, United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City. This report is entitled "Washoe Project Nevada-California" and it outlines three plans for developing the water resources of the Truckee and Carson Rivers.

HISTORY OF WORK DONE ON PROJECT BY BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

1903–15: Construction of the Newlands project.

1937–39: Construction of Truckee River storage project, Boca Dam.

1948: Completion of the basin report. This report covers the development of the Lathonton Basin for irrigation, power, and other beneficial purposes.

1949: Initiation of investigations of the present Washoe project to see if project would be as beneficial as the cost of construction and maintenance.

1951: Reconnaissance report was completed. Purpose to see if project would be feasible enough to carry out further investigation. Reconnaissance report was favorable.

1952: Status report, described above.

1954: Feasibility report of regional director. Takes the most feasible plan mentioned in Status report and fully develops it. Plan chosen takes into consideration all aspects of project and also the wishes of the people directly.

1955: Report on Washoe project Nevada and California, completed in June. Not yet printed, but to be printed in the very immediate future by authorization of House Document 193. After it is printed the report is then transmitted to Congress. This report is the status report plus all of the comments that have been attached to it as it has passed through the usual channels of the President's office.

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS' TRUCKEE RIVER PROJECT, NEVADA

June 28, 1938: Flood Control Act of 1938 authorized preliminary examination and survey of Truckee River Basin.

February 28, 1939: Favorable preliminary examination completed by Sacramento district engineer.

March 4, 1939: Favorable recommendation for survey made by South Pacific division engineer.

May 16, 1939: Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommends detailed survey be made by reporting officers.

May 23, 1939: Survey assigned to reporting officers by Chief of Engineers.

January 10, 1953: Favorable interim survey report completed by district engineer. Recommended certain channel improvements which would fit into and become a part of any comprehensive plan that may be selected in the future.

November 20, 1953: Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors concurs in recommendation of reporting officers.

December 22, 1953: Interim report referred to State and Federal agencies for comment and recommendation.

April 26, 1954: Comments of State and Federal agencies received by Chief of Engineers.

April 28, 1954: Interim report referred to Bureau of the Budget for comment.

July 23, 1954: Comments of the Bureau of the Budget received by Chief of Engineers.

July 23, 1954: Truckee River project considered for authorization by Senate Public Works Committee.

August 2, 1954: Report forwarded to Congress by Secretary of the Army. Published as House Document 497, 83d Congress, 2d session.

September 3, 1954: Truckee River project authorized for construction by the Flood Control Act of 1954, Public Law 780, 83d Congress.

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS' ACTION ON THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'S WASHOE PROJECT

October 19, 1954: Proposed report of the Department of the Interior on the Washoe project referred to the Secretary of the Army for comment.

January 13, 1955: Views and comments of the Department of the Army regarding the Washoe project forwarded to the Commissioner of Reclamation by the Chief of Engineers.

January 28, 1955: Receipt of Chief of Engineers' letter of January 13, 1955 acknowledged by the Commissioner of Reclamation.

MAJOR OBJECTIVE—35 YEARS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the passage of this legislation today is very gratifying to me. Only a rancher or owner of property under constant danger from floods can appreciate what it means to see the consummation of a project vital to an important area of our State, and myself, who has been intimately connected with the development of the area over 35 years as an engineer in private practice and as State engineer, and now as the senior Senator.

This has been the major objective over that period of time, though the perfecting of the necessary organizations, the engineering investigations, the agreements between individuals and organizations, often with conflicting interests had to be effected.

I congratulate the people of my State within the area included in this project on their infinite patience and perseverance demonstrated over the years, without which the necessary organization and the passage of this legislation today would not have been possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity of commending the two distinguished Senators from Nevada for their work on this very important piece of legislation. I fully subscribe to what the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] has stated, that the result in this case shows that problems which are of mutual interest to adjoining States can be worked out when men of good will get together, recognize the equities of the situation, and take action which will contribute to the growth and development of the two States. I wish again to commend both Senators from Nevada for their very fine cooperation in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately 50,000 acres of land in the Carson and Truckee River Basins, Nevada and California, providing drainage service to approximately 31,000 acres of land therein, firming the existing water supplies of lands under the Truckee River storage project and the Newlands project, controlling floods, and providing hydroelectric power, development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other beneficial purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project consisting of two principal reservoirs at the Stampede and Watasheamu sites, together with other necessary works for the impounding, diversion, and delivery of water, the generation and transmission of hydroelectric power, and the drainage of lands. The dam at the Stampede site shall

be so constructed as to permit its ultimate enlargement to a height at which the reservoir will have a capacity of approximately 175,000 acre-feet.

SEC. 2. (a) In constructing, operating, and maintaining the works authorized in section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 389, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) except as is otherwise provided in this act.

(b) Any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193; 43 U. S. C., 1952 edition, sec. 485h) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Washoe reclamation project which are properly allocable to irrigation and drainage and which are assigned to be paid by the contracting organization may provide for the repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any project contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into 2 or more irrigation or drainage blocks, to any such block over a period of not more than 50 years, exclusive of any permissible development period, or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within the period stated under normal conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the organization to pay: *Provided,* That neither the provisions of the third sentence of section 46 of the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636, 649), nor any other similar provision of the Federal reclamation laws shall be applicable to lands receiving supplemental water under the Washoe project.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary, all net revenues derived from the sale of commercial power from the Washoe reclamation project shall be applied, first, to the amortization of that portion of the cost of constructing the project which is allocated to commercial power with interest on the unamortized balance thereof at the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this act, and, thereafter, to the amortization of that portion of the cost of constructing the project which is allocated to irrigation and drainage but which is beyond the ability of the contracting irrigation and drainage organizations to repay as provided above: *Provided,* That the Secretary, prior to the delivery of project water supplies, shall have entered into a contract or contracts with an organization or organizations as defined in paragraph 2 (g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) which have the capacity to levy assessments upon all taxable real property located within their boundaries to assist in making repayments.

(d) Water users in Alpine County, Calif., shall have the opportunity to contract for project water made available by the Watasheamu Reservoir before such project water is offered for the development of any new land in Nevada. Should any such project water be contracted for by Alpine County water users, then in that event, such users shall be permitted to exchange such water for existing rights to natural flow or stored water of the West Carson River.

(e) The use of water of the Little Truckee River solely for the generation of electric power by the Washoe project shall not impair or preclude the appropriation of such waters in the future for beneficial consumptive use within the Little Truckee River watershed in California to the same extent as such waters may be presently available for such appropriation in the State of California: *Provided, That if and when an interstate compact covering the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee and Carson Rivers is approved by the Legislatures of the States of California and Nevada and is consented to by Congress, the operation of the Washoe reclamation project shall be in conformance with such compact, and the foregoing restriction shall not apply.*

SEC. 3. The Secretary is authorized to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain minimum basic facilities for access to, and for the maintenance of public health and safety and the protection of public property on, lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of the Washoe project, to conserve the scenery and natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by this project by such means as are consistent with its primary purposes. The Secretary is authorized to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public-land laws such public lands as are necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of said minimum basic facilities and for the other purposes specified in this section and to dispose of such lands to Federal, State, and local governmental agencies by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest. The Secretary is further authorized to investigate the need for acquiring other lands for said purposes and to report thereon to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives, but no lands shall be acquired solely for any of these purposes other than access to project lands and the maintenance of public health and safety and the protection of public property thereon without further authorization by the Congress. All costs incurred pursuant to this section shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 4. Facilities shall be provided for the development of the fish and wildlife resources of the project area including facilities to permit increased minimum water releases from Lake Tahoe and restoration of the Pyramid Lake fishery. The cost of such facilities, including operation and maintenance, shall be nonreimbursable. The cost to the Federal Government of constructing these facilities shall not exceed $2 million. This amount shall not include the cost of measures undertaken, pursuant to section 2 of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080, 16 U. S. C., sec 661a), to mitigate damages to fish and wildlife resources occasioned by the Washoe project as authorized by section 1 of this act.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the Washoe reclamation project the sum of $43,700,000 plus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices appreciable to the types of construction involved therein and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain the project.

PAYMENT OF THE CONSTRUCTION CHARGES ON THE VALLEY DIVISION, YUMA RECLAMATION PROJECT, ARIZONA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1822, Senate bill 2202.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2202) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an additional contract with the Yuma County Water Users Association, with respect to payment of construction charges on the Valley division, Yuma reclamation project, Arizona, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Yuma reclamation project was one of the very early projects. When the contracts were made with the original landowners the obligation under the contracts with the landowners was greater than the total cost of the project to the Federal Government. Therefore this is a readjustment matter which will result in the Government being completely paid all the money involved in the construction of the project, including bridges, and other things.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated, and, without objection, they will be agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, after line 12, to strike out:

"SEC. 2. The general repayment obligation payable under the contract authorized by section 1 hereof shall be ascertained by the Secretary by deducting from the construction cost of $4,274,758.85 identified as 'Construction charge balance, Valley division' in that report designated 'Special Survey Financial Problems, Yuma and Yuma Auxiliary Projects, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1953, Inclusive,' the amounts paid prior to the date of said contract under water-right applications approved by the Secretary on said division or credited thereto prior to said date, the undistributed net profits described in section 3 hereof, and any unapplied credits allocable to said division and by adding to the result thereby obtained the aggregate of any operation and maintenance costs remaining unpaid on the date of said contract and the Valley division's share of the cost of a bridge constructed or to be constructed across the Yuma Main Canal pursuant to contract of April 15, 1912, between the United States and Southern Pacific Co., as amended," and, in lieu thereof, to insert "The general repayment obligation payable under the contract authorized by section 1 of this act shall be ascertained by the Secretary (a) by adding to $165,605.46 any operation and maintenance costs incurred on or after January 1, 1955, which are unpaid on the date of the contract, (b) by subtracting from the sum thereof (i) any payments under water-right applications heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary on the Valley division which have become due and payable and which have been received beginning with January 1, 1955, and prior to the date of the contract, and (ii) net profits earned on or after January 1, 1955, and prior to June 30 preceding the date of the contract which are determined by the Secretary to be properly allocable to the Valley division, all as provided in section 3 of this act, and (c) by adjusting the difference between (a) and (b) to reflect an appropriate share, as determined by the Secretary, of any amount by which the cost to the Government of a certain trestle to be constructed by the Southern Pacific Railway Co. across the Yuma Main Canal pursuant to the contract dated

April 15, 1912, between it and the United States varies from $175,306."

On page 4, line 21, after the word "The", to strike out "undistributed"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "division," to insert "the sale of small tracts within the division pursuant to the act of March 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 39, 43 U. S. C., secs. 375b–375f)"; and on page 6, line 5, after the word "maintenance," to strike out "fund" and insert "appropriation"; so as to make the bill read:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter in this act referred to as the Secretary, is hereby authorized to enter into a contract with the Yuma County Water Users' Association, an Arizona corporation providing for the collection and retention by the association of all construction charge payments made subsequent to the date of such contract under water-right applications on the Valley division of the Yuma reclamation project outstanding on the date of said contract and water-right applications thereafter approved on said division and the release of the association from its guaranty to the United States of all amounts then due or thereafter to become due on said applications in consideration of the assumption by the association of the general repayment obligation defined in section 2 hereof payable to the United States without interest in annual installments not smaller than the aggregate of the payments which, in the opinion of the Secretary, would have become due pursuant to the provisions of said water-right applications.

"SEC. 2. The general repayment obligation payable under the contract authorized by section 1 of this act shall be ascertained by the Secretary (a) by adding to $165,605.46 any operation and maintenance costs incurred on or after January 1, 1955, which are unpaid on the date of the contract, (b) by subtracting from the sum thereof (i) any payments under water-right applications heretofore or hereafter approved by the Secretary on the Valley division which have become due and payable and which have been received beginning with January 1, 1955, and prior to the date of the contract, and (ii) net profits earned on or after January 1, 1955, and prior to June 30 preceding the date of the contract which are determined by the Secretary to be properly allocable to the Valley division, all as provided in section 3 of this act, and (c) by adjusting the difference between (a) and (b) to reflect an appropriate share, as determined by the Secretary, of any amount by which the cost to the Government of a certain trestle to be constructed by the Southern Pacific Railway Co. across the Yuma Main Canal pursuant to the contract dated April 15, 1912, between it and the United States varies from $175,306. The Secretary is hereby authorized to transfer to the association, (a) those structures covered by agreement between the United States and the association dated April 1, 1953, and bearing contract numbered 14–06–303–490, as amended March 29, 1955, and a 24-stall garage in the vicinity of said structures in consideration of the cash payment or addition to the said general repayment obligation of the net book cost of $15,000 less the aggregate of payments made by the association to the United States prior to the date of such transfer under said agreement and under agreement between the United States and the Association dated November 6, 1952, and bearing contract numbered 14–06–303–79; and (b) the buildings located at 105, 115, and 121 North Fifth Avenue, respectively, and at 460 First Street, within the exterior boundaries of the city of Yuma, Ariz., in consideration of the cash payment or addition to said general repayment obligation of the further sum of $3,756.87: *Provided,* That such transfers shall not include title to the lands on which any such structures or buildings are located.

"SEC. 3. The net profits to be deducted pursuant to section 2 hereof shall constitute the portion determined by the Secretary to be allocable to said Valley division of such profits derived to and including the June 30 immediately preceding the date of said contract from the following: leases, permits, and other arrangements for use of project lands and other project property within the division, the sale or use of townsites within the division, the sale of small tracts within the division pursuant to the act of March 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 39, 43 U. S. C., secs. 375b–375f), and the furnishing of water or water service to other than water-right applicants from the irrigation works of the division. The contract authorized by section 1 hereof may also provide that for each subsequent fiscal year that portion of the net profits derived from the above-mentioned sources as well as the net profits from the Siphon Drop Powerplant after reserves for replacements, and/or depreciation and/or other appropriate purposes determined by the Secretary to be allocable to the division shall be credited annually, first on account of general repayment installments under said contract to become payable for the calendar year next following such fiscal year and second on account of operation and maintenance charges to become payable by the association to the United States for such calendar year, including but not limited to advance payments by the association for operation and maintenance of Siphon Drop Powerplant and payments for any rehabilitation work undertaken by the United States on behalf of the division. There is authorized to be transferred and deposited from time to time to the credit of the operation and maintenance appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation from project revenues deposited in the reclamation fund amounts equal to the credits so applied on account of operation and maintenance charges payable by the association to the United States. The amounts thus credited to the operation and maintenance appropriation may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums advanced by the association for the operation and maintenance of works retained by the United States: *Provided,* That if the Secretary determines that the portion of such net profits allocable to the division and available for such credit during any calendar year exceeds the aggregate of the general repayment installment, if any, and the operation and maintenance charge payable by the association to the United States, he may pay the amount of such excess to the association from the reclamation fund."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1846, Senate bill 3498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3498) to extend the authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to expedite the procedure of the Battle Monuments Commission by permitting it to enter cemeteries prior to the time the cemeteries ordinarily would be turned over to the Commission and while still under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Under those circumstances, it is believed that earlier improvement of these cemeteries could take place.

Furthermore, the proposed legislation authorizes promotion of the Secretary of the Commission within the discretion of the President. The bill provides that the officer promoted shall not count against any limitation on the number of officers permitted to be carried on active duty.

It also increases the per diem allowance. This matter has been studied carefully by the committee. It finds the proposed allowances are reasonable and just and will cost the Government very little. The committee feels the allowance should be increased.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his work in connection with this bill. One of the main problems which the Battle Monuments Commission has had—and it is my privilege and honor to be a member of that Commission—has been the fact that the Army had the first jurisdiction in establishing national cemeteries, and the Battle Monuments Commission has not been able to go in until the Army turns the cemetery over to that Commission.

It has been 10 years since the end of World War II, and we are still in the process of developing our national cemeteries. One of the reasons for the delay has been the fact that the Battle Monuments Commission has not been able to work with the Army until the Army was ready to turn the cemeteries over to the Battle Monuments Commission.

This bill will enable them to work together. In case of another war, and the consequent need for cemeteries, we hope that those who lose their lives will have monuments erected to them much more expeditiously than has been the case in the past.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan for the work that he has done in connection with the Battle Monuments Commission and for his aid in connection with this proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first paragraph of the first section of the act entitled "An act for the creation of the American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1509, as amended; 36 U. S. C. 121), is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof, the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President is authorized to appoint to the grade of major general in the Army of the United States the officer

serving as Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission on the date of the enactment of this sentence, who, while so serving, shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances of an officer of such grade, and, upon relief from such services, shall be placed upon the retired list in such grade and receive retired pay computed upon the basis of the basic pay he would receive if serving on active duty in such grade. The person promoted under the provisions of this act shall be in addition to the number of commissioned officers authorized by other provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted for the grade of major general and shall not be counted for the purpose of determining the authorized number of officers of any grade or designation in the Army of the United States.

(b) The second and third paragraphs of such section are amended to read as follows:

"The members of the Commission shall serve as such without compensation, except that (1) their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission, and (2) when in a travel status, a per diem of $20 in lieu of subsistence, may be paid to them from any funds appropriated for the purposes of this act, or acquired by other means hereinafter authorized.

"Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies are authorized to designate such personnel, and to make available to the Commission such facilities, of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act, and may expend for such purposes any funds appropriated to such departments, agencies, and services, with reimbursement from the Commission for the pay and allowances of the personnel so designated. The Commission is authorized to employ such further personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, within the limits of any appropriation or appropriations made for such purposes.

"The provisions of this subsection shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act."

SEC. 2. (a) Sections 5, 8, and 9 of such act are repealed.

(b) Sections 2, 3, and 4 of such act are redesignated as section 3, 4, and 5, respectively, of such act.

(c) Section 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of such act are redesignated as sections 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, respectively, of such act.

(d) Each reference made hereinafter to any section of such act, the numbering of which is redesignated by subsection (b) or (c) of this section, shall be deemed to be made to such section as so redesignated.

SEC. 3. (a) Such act is amended by inserting, immediately after the first section thereof, the following new section:

"SEC. 2. When, as a result of combat operations, the Armed Forces shall establish military cemeteries in zones of operations outside the United States and its Territories and possessions, the Commission and the Secretary of the Army immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, shall determine which of the cemeteries so established, if any, shall become permanent cemeteries or, as they may deem desirable, select new sites at any other location for such cemeteries. The Commission shall be solely responsible for the design and construction of such permanent cemeteries, and of all buildings, plantings, headstones, and other permanent improvements incidental thereto except that (1) the Armed Forces shall be responsible for the maintenance of such permanent cemeteries until such time as the Commission shall express its readiness to assume the functions of administration hereinafter authorized, (2) all construction undertaken by the Armed Forces in establishing and maintaining the cemetery prior to its transfer to the Commission shall be nonpermanent in nature, (3) burials and reburials therein by the Armed Forces shall be carried out in accordance with plans prepared by the Commission, (4) the Armed Forces shall have the right to reenter any cemeteries transferred to the Commission for the purpose of making exhumations or reinterments should they deem any such action to be necessary."

(b) Section 3 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Commission shall prepare plans and estimates for the erection of suitable memorials to commemorate the services of the American Armed Forces, and shall erect and maintain memorials in the United States and at such places outside the United States where the American Armed Forces have served since April 6, 1917, or shall hereafter serve, as the Commission shall determine. The Commission shall also erect and maintain works of architecture and art in such American cemeteries located outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, as have been or may hereafter be declared to be permanent cemeteries. Works of architecture and art erected by the Commission in cemeteries within the United States, its Territories and possessions, shall be maintained by the Department of Defense.

"The Commission shall control as to materials and design and provide regulations for, and supervise the erection of, all memorial monuments and buildings in American cemeteries located outside the United States, its Territories and possessions.

"The Commission shall control as to design and provide regulations for the erection of all memorial monuments and buildings commemorating the services of the American Armed Forces erected in any foreign country or political division thereof which may authorize the Commission to perform such functions."

(c) Section 4 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Before any design for any memorial is accepted by the Commission, it shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 9 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. The records and archives of the Commission shall, when no longer required by the Commission, be deposited with the National Archives in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Records Act of 1950 (44 U. S. C. 397)."

(b) Section 10 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. The President may by Executive order transfer to the Commission, with respect to any permanent military cemeteries located outside of the United States, its Territories and possessions, the same functions of administration which were transferred to the Commission by Executive Order 6614, dated February 26, 1934, and Executive Order 10057, dated May 14, 1949, as amended by Executive Order 10087, dated December 3, 1949, together with any supplies, materials, and equipment located therein or in military depots overseas which are excess to the needs of the Department of Defense and are requested by the Commission for the performance of such functions. Thereafter the Commission shall be responsible for the maintenance of such cemetery and of all improvements therein."

(c) Section 12 of such act is amended by—

(1) striking out the words "such purposes" in the first paragraph thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the purposes of this act";

(2) inserting in the second paragraph thereof, immediately after the word "outside", a comma and the words "or for use outside,"; and,

(3) inserting, immediately after the third paragraph thereof, the following new paragraph:

"Claims of the type described in the first section of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries', approved January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 880, as amended; 31 U. S. C. 224d), on account of damage to or loss or destruction of property both real and personal, or personal injury or death of any person, arising on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph and caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any officer or civilian employee of the Commission while acting within the scope of his office or employment, may be considered, ascertained, adjusted, determined, and paid in the manner provided in such act for the settlement of Army claims, except that in such cases one or more officers or employees of the Commission may be appointed by the Secretary of the Army to a claims commission or commissions or as officers to approve settlements of claims made by such commission or commissions, and all payments in settlement of such claims shall be made out of appropriations made for the purposes of this act."

CONSTRUCTION OF BRANCH TRACK OR SIDING OVER SECOND STREET SE., IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1818, Senate bill 2705.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2705) to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE., in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE., in the District of Columbia. The committee was advised that the Evening Star Newspaper Co. proposes to construct a new building at that point, and a railroad siding will be needed to serve the building. The bill has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and has been favorably reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "operation", to insert "and maintenance", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to construct, maintain, and operate at grade

a single branch track or siding from its present track in square 737 to square 766 over Second Street in the vicinity of Second and I Streets SE., Washington, D. C., with the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to continue the operation and maintenance thereof, anything contained in any prior act or acts of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DUTIES OF JUDGES OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1841, Senate bill 977.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 977) to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Chief Justice to assign temporarily any member of the Court of Claims to serve as circuit or district judge upon presentation of a certificate of necessity from the chief judge or circuit justice of the circuit wherein the need arises. It would also permit judicial service by retired judges of the Court of Claims.

Furthermore, the bill would grant membership in the Judicial Conference to the Court of Claims and require the submission of the budget estimates of the Court of Claims to the Judicial Conference prior to presentation of such budget to the Bureau of the Budget.

All of the foregoing matters are either permitted or required in the case of the circuit and district courts. Since the Court of Claims by Public Law 158 of the 83d Congress achieved the status of a constitutional court, it is appropriate that the court and its members be treated similarly with other constitutional courts. Moreover, these additions to the general law should assist further in the achievement of judicial efficiency.

This measure has the approval of the Court of claims and the Judicial Conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

(e) The second paragraph of section 605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such estimates shall be approved, before presentation to the Bureau of the Budget, by the Judicial Conference of the United States, except that estimates with respect to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Customs Court shall be approved by such courts, respectively."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection 291 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Chief Justice of the United States may designate and assign temporarily any circuit judge to act as circuit judge in another circuit, or any judge of the Court of Claims to serve as a circuit judge in any circuit, upon presentation of a certificate of necessity by the chief judge or circuit justice of the circuit wherein the need arises."

(b) Section 292 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Chief Justice of the United States may designate and assign any judge of the Court of Claims to serve as a judge of any district court, when requested so to do, upon presentation of a certificate of necessity by the chief judge or circuit justice of the circuit wherein the need arises."

(c) Subsection 294 (b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any retired judge of the Court of Claims (1) may be designated and assigned by the Chief Justice of the United States to perform such judicial duties in any circuit as he is willing to undertake, and (2) may be called upon by the chief judge of the Court of Claims to perform such judicial duties in such court as he is willing to undertake."

(d) Section 331 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting, immediately after the second paragraph thereof, the following new paragraph:

"The Chief Justice of the United States shall also summon the chief judge of the Court of Claims, or if he is unable to attend, another judge of such court, to participate in the conference. Any judge summoned shall attend, and, unless excused by the Chief Justice, shall remain throughout the conference and advise as to the needs of such court and as to any matters in respect of which the administration of justice in the courts of the United States may be improved."

(e) The second paragraph of section 605 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Such estimates shall be approved, before presentation to the Bureau of the Budget, by the Judicial Conference of the United States, except that estimates with respect to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Customs Court shall be approved by such courts, respectively."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPORTATION, FREE OF DUTY, OF RACING SHELLS IN PREPARATION FOR 1956 OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1819, House bill 8334.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8334) to permit the importation, free of duty, of racing shells to be used in connection with preparations for the 1956 Olympic games.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to exempt from the duty imposed by paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 racing shells entered or withdrawn from warehouse after December 31, 1955, when such racing shells are to be used in connection with preparation for the 1956 Olympic games. The free entry privilege would be accorded to any athletic team or association in the United States and would include competitions to determine representatives of the United States in such games.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION FREE OF DUTY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES AT INTERNATIONAL THEATER EQUIPMENT TRADE SHOW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1820, H. R. 8942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8942) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without paying of tariff, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the International Theater Equipment Trade Show, to be held in New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION FREE OF DUTY OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES AT THE INTERNATIONAL PHOTOGRAPHIC EXPOSITION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1821, H. R. 8959.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8959) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition, to be held at Washington, D. C., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the bill is similar to H. R. 8942, which was just passed. Its purpose is to permit the entry, free of duty, of articles imported for exhibition at the International Photographic Exposition to be held in Washington, D. C., this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION, FREE OF DUTY, OF ARTICLES IMPORTED FOR EXHIBITION PURPOSES AT THE 11TH ANNUAL INSTRUMENT-AUTOMATION CONFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1854, H. R. 7678.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7678) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation International Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 4, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 7. Any article which is imported from a foreign country for the purpose of exhibition at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition to be held in connection with the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Oklahoma into the Union, at Oklahoma City, Okla., from May 1, 1956, to January 1, 1958, inclusive, by the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, upon which article there is a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff or customs duty or any fees or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. Each provision of sections 1 to 6, inclusive, of this act shall apply with respect to the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition and all rights and privileges extended by such sections and all duties and obligations imposed thereby and each and every requirement thereof shall extend to the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, Incorporated, which shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the authority of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the 11th Annual Instrument-Automation (International) Conference and Exhibit, New York, N. Y., and the Americas' New Frontiers Exposition, to be held at Oklahoma City, Okla., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes."

CONSTRUCTION OF THE AINSWORTH UNIT OF THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1823, S. 2206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2206) to provide for the construction and operation by the Secretary of the Interior of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the report approved by the Secretary of the Interior on November 21, 1955, demonstrating the physical and economic feasibility of the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project, integrated as a part of said project by the act of August 21, 1954 (68 Stat. 757), is hereby approved: *Provided*, That for a period of 10 years from the date of enactment of this act, no water from any participating project authorized by this act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301 (b) (10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when the bill which became Public Law 612 was under consideration, Congress wanted to make certain that the Secretary of the Interior should report on the feasibility of any project. All that is involved in the pending bill is a provision approving the feasibility report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit, Missouri River Basin project.

The bill also amends the title and includes an agricultural amendment of the kind which was involved in the upper Colorado River bill. In that bill an amendment was included which provided that none of the land should be used for the cultivation of a crop which was already in surplus, at least for a period of 10 years. That language has been carried forward into this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project."

RENEWALS OF LEASE OF THE ANNETTE ISLAND AIRPORT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1842, H. R. 6573.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6573) to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to give the approval of Congress to an extension of the existing lease on certain Alaskan Indian lands on which the Annette Island Airport has been built.

Annette, a small island a few miles south of Ketchikan and 600 miles north of Seattle, is the site of an important airport which serves the city of Ketchikan and the Metlakahtla Indian community and is used by Coast Guard airplanes and for emergencies by aircraft bound to or from other sections of Alaska. The airport was constructed by the Federal Government during World War II at a cost in excess of $10 million and for several years served a very useful purpose in the prosecution of the war.

In December 1948, the airport was leased to the United States by the Council of the Annette Island Indian Reserve, the governing body of the Metlakahtla Indian community, for a 1-year term beginning July 1, 1949. This lease contains a clause giving the Government an option to renew the agreement from year to year but with a proviso that no renewal shall extend the period of occupancy of the premises beyond June 30, 1959, unless such extension is approved by Congress, and in no case beyond June 30, 1999. This bill will give Federal authorization for renewing the lease from

year to year for the remainder of the original 50-year term.

The committee unanimously reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE TO VICTOR POWER OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1843, H. R. 6703.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6703) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the sale of approximately 1.14 acres of land in Alaska to an adjoining land owner, Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska.

This tract is in the status of a public-service site. Fronting on Gastineau Channel, it was established to provide public access to and from upland homesites. Since then the main highway has been built and transportation to the homesites is now entirely by automobile.

Consequently, the Department of the Interior is prepared to dispose of this tract, which is irregular in size and which in any case provided a hazardous route of entry to the upland because of the rugged and precipitous nature of the terrain. Mr. Power already owns a homesite of just over 4 acres immediately adjacent to the tract in question and is anxious to round out his holdings by obtaining this additional acreage.

The Delegate from Alaska and a representative of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, testified in favor of the bill. The committee action favoring the bill was unanimous. The bill contains a provision that the purchase price of the land shall be the fair market value thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVIEW AND DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS FOR RETURN OF LANDS TO THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1844, H. R. 7186.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7186) to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 5, after line 12, to insert:

(c) If an eminent domain proceeding for the condemnation of the property, or any part thereof, for public use is brought by the Territory or political subdivision within the time so allowed by the court, in such eminent domain proceeding, the property shall be valued and the proceeding shall be heard and determined in all respects as if filed upon the date of the original conveyance and as if an order had been made letting the Government into possession on said date: *Provided*, That at its option, the Territory or political subdivision may bring eminent domain proceedings for condemnation of the property or part thereof required for public use without invoking the preceding provisions of this sentence: *Provided further*, That in the event the Territory or political subdivision shall have discharged encumbrances upon the property for which it is entitled to reimbursement as provided by subsection (e), the same may be made a setoff in any eminent domain proceeding brought for condemnation of the property or part thereof required for public use.

On page 6, at the beginning of line 7, to change the "(c)" to "(d)"; at the beginning of line 17, to change the "(d)" to "(e)"; at the beginning of line 23, to change the "(e)" to "(f)"; and on page 7, at the beginning of line 7, to change the "(f)" to "(g)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

H. R. 7186 would authorize charitable organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii to file claims in the circuit court of the Territory for return of lands taken from them during World War II. The claims must be filed within a 2-year period.

Thus, the measure in effect constitutes a waiver of any applicable statutes of limitation and confers jurisdiction upon the Territorial courts of Hawaii, established by Federal statute, to review and determine the claims. Spokesmen for the Department of the Interior, which has general administrative responsibility for the Territory, and the elected delegate from Hawaii testified before the committee that there are 3 claims totaling $191,000 of the type that would be authorized by H. R. 7186, pending adjudication.

None of the property is now held by the Federal Government, and the Federal Government would in no way be liable for payment of any claims that might be allowed under the bill. The matter is a local one.

The committee action was unanimously in favor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO APPLY FOR PATENT TO CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1845, House bill 7513.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7513) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blockard, within which to apply for a patent to certain lands in Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, if the Secretary of the Interior finds that the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., pursuant to its certificate of conditional purchase issued on August 20, 1951, for tracts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of block 27 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, and tract 7 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, complied, prior to August 20, 1954, with the provisions of the Alaska Public Sales Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs. 364a–364e), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, except for the requirement pertaining to the application for the issuance of a patent, he shall grant to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., such additional period of time within which to file such application for the aforesaid tracts as he shall deem reasonable.

SEC. 2. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that Joe Blackard and Russell Swank, operating a joint venture as Blackard & Swank, pursuant to their certificate of conditiontal purchase issued on August 20, 1951, for tract 6 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, complied, prior to August 20, 1954, with the provisions of the Alaska Public Sales Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs. 364–364e), and the regulations issued pursuant thereto, except for the requirement pertaining to the application for the issuance of a patent, he shall grant to Joe Blackard and Russell Swank such additional period of time within which to file such application for the aforesaid tract as he shall deem reasonable.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon asks for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, H. R. 7513, as amended, is intended to alleviate what was represented to the committee to be hardship on a small business enterprise in Alaska that would result from strict application of the regulations respecting patenting of lands in Alaska. Not more than 160 acres of public land are involved.

The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to grant the Matanuska Valley bus lines and its proprietors a reasonable period of time in which to file application for a patent to the lands on which they already have made substantial investments, totaling between $65,000 and $70,000. The committee was informed at the hearing that the company and individuals named above purchased the lands in question under the act of August 3, 1949—Sixty-third Statutes, page 679; title 48, United States Code, sections 364a–364e—which authorizes the sale of certain public lands in Anchorage, Alaska. In conformance with this act, the purchasers developed the lands satisfactorily for commercial purposes within the required 3 years after date of purchase. Although payments on the land were completed on July 9, 1951, the purchasers, due to circumstances beyond their control, including a strike, failed to apply for a patent on the land within the required 3-year period, and therefore forfeited their rights to the lands.

The departmental spokesman asserted at the hearing that this proposed legislation is necessary if this Alaska small business enterprise is not to lose its investment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, the question on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LONGER TERMS OF OFFICE FOR JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT AND CIRCUIT COURTS OF HAWAII

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1798, House bill 6162.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6162) to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of House bill 6162 is to provide for longer terms of office for the justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii and the circuit courts of Hawaii.

H. R. 6162 would amend section 80 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended—found in title 48, United States Code, section 633—to provide that the term of office of the chief justice and justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii shall be increased from the present 4 years to 7 years and for the judges of the circuit courts of Hawaii from 4 years to 6 years. H. R. 6162 would become effective at noon on January 20, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any amendments to be offered to the bill? If not, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6162) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION AND CONVERSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1815, House bill 7993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7993) to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, not to exceed 2,800 tons of patrol vessels.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction or for the acquisition and conversion of the foregoing vessels.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, as amended, is to provide authorization for the construction or conversion of 2,800 tons of escort vessels.

The authorization provided is for the construction of two ocean escorts, or escort vessels, which are successors to destroyer escorts.

At the present time the Navy has an unobligated balance of only 314 tons of patrol vessels from Public Law 3, 82d Congress, and Public Law 548, 83d Congress. Accordingly, the 2,800 tons of new authority proposed to be granted by this bill is necessary for the construction of the 2 escort vessels in the 1957 program.

Cost figures for the construction of the vessels authorized by the measure cannot be computed accurately at this time. These figures will be included in the 1957 budgetary estimates. Cost and budget data will, of course, be available when hearings are held on the proposal.

This bill comes from the Committee on Armed Services unanimously. It has been estimated, as nearly as it can be done, that appropriations in the amount of $23,600,000 will be needed for the construction of the 2 vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there further amendments to be proposed? If not, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION OF COOPERATION OF SENATORS IN HANDLING MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and, particularly, the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the minority members of the various committees which have reported the 25 bills the Senate has acted upon today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1824, House bill 8535.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8535) to amend the act of July 4, 1955, relating to the construction of irrigation distribution systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have made this motion in order that we may have some business pending on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand the request of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I made the motion, but I do not intend to take up the bill at this time or have any discussion of it. I wanted it to be the unfinished business, so when the Senate reconvenes on Monday, there will be unfinished business pending before the Senate.

There will be a call of the calendar on Monday, under the unanimous-consent request which was granted yesterday, and the Senate will take up private bills, followed by the bill I have had made the unfinished business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say good naturedly that I can suggest to the majority leader a bill on the calendar which perhaps would elicit a little more discussion on Monday than would the bill he has had made the unfinished business. I refer to the bill which would provide for a settlement of the impending public-transport problem in the District of Columbia. August 14 is not very far away, and there is every indication that, at the rate we are going, the possibility is that thousands of people will be wearing out shoe leather on August 15, unless the bill which was considered by the committee, of which I am a member, is scheduled for early debate in the Senate and we can get the differences with the House into conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When was the bill reported?

Mr. MORSE. It is on the calendar. It was reported some days ago. I am trying to find it on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It certainly must have been very recently, in the past 2 or 3 days, because it is necessary to clear measures with both policy groups.

Mr. MORSE. The bill was reported within the past week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill must have been put on the calendar within the past few days.

Mr. MORSE. I am advised that the bill to which I refer is Calendar No. 1816, Senate bill 3073, relating to a transportation system for the District of Columbia.

If the majority leader will permit me, I should like to take a few minutes to make a statement about the bill, because I interrupted him to call attention to the impending domestic crisis. We may as well face up to the fact that between now and August 14 we shall have to do something about the public transportation system in the District of Columbia. Anybody who has read the newspapers knows there is considerable difference between the House and the Senate proposals, although we hope to iron out the differences. Certainly, we should not wait until just before adjournment to enact legislation which must be enacted if the transportation problem of the District of Columbia is to be solved.

I do not wish to speak at length on the matter at this time, but I hope the majority leader will schedule Calendar No. 1816, Senate bill 3073, for debate at a reasonably early date, so the Senate can take action on the bill and we can proceed to resolve the differences between the two bodies in conference, because I think that is where they will have to be settled. We have had extensive hearings in the Senate committee. We have brought forth a bill which we think proposes a sensible adjustment of this problem. We believe it will be necessary to have a temporary public authority to provide the people of the District with transportation come August 15.

The overwhelming majority of the committee is adamant in the position that it is not going to favor returning the transportation system to the Wolfson outfit, because we recognize that to do so would only be buying further trouble for the transit riders in the District of Columbia.

We believe in home rule; we believe in true home rule; and we believe the District Commissioners ought to have placed in their laps the transit problems and other municipal problems with which the District of Columbia must wrestle as part and parcel of the democratic processes under home rule.

I wish to say most earnestly to the majority leader that therefore I hope that Calendar No. 1816, Senate bill 3073, will be scheduled for debate next week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I do not have the floor; but I ask the majority leader whether he will permit me to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, to whom I am always glad to yield, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to second what the able Senator from Oregon has said. If there is any place in the United States where public transportation partakes of the nature of a public utility and where its continued operation without cessation is a necessity, it is in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senator from South Dakota has clearly implied, the Federal Government has a very great interest in the efficient and satisfactory operation of public transportation in the seat of the Federal Government.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no question about that.

Mr. MORSE. Of course not.

Mr. President, while the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was so able a leader of the Committee on the District of Columbia, as its chairman, he played a most important part in trying to solve some of the traffic bottlenecks which exist in Washington, D. C.

Let me also say that before it adjourns this summer I hope Congress will do something in regard to the bridge problem which faces the District of Columbia. I say in most kindly fashion that, as a Congress, I think we should be ashamed of ourselves; if we are going to retain the powers of municipal aldermen for the District of Columbia, we should be ashamed to permit the present very great and serious congestion of traffic which exists during rush hours in the District of Columbia to continue merely because we do not solve the bridge problem, and merely because every time we try to decide on the location of the needed bridges, we become involved in a hassle. Certainly it is time for Congress to take action which will result in construction of the necessary bridges.

As a result of their construction, not only will there be improved efficiency on the part of the employees of the Federal Government, but those employees will arrive at work in a better frame of mind, as a consequence of no longer having to struggle through the extremely bad traffic bottlenecks which exist at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, apropos of what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, let me state that, as majority leader, I brought to the attention of the policy committee Calendar No. 1816, Senate bill 3073. Some of the Members felt that last year, when they acted on legislation affecting the transportation system in the District of Columbia, there would be persons who would be willing to take over the transportation system and to work out a satisfactory solution. However, since that has not occurred, those Members wish to obtain further information on the proposed legislation, before scheduling it for consideration by the Senate.

The majority leader will bring that matter to the attention of his policy committee at its next meeting, and, after clearing the bill with the minority leader, will schedule it for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Texas for the information.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on Monday we shall have a call of the calendar, in an attempt to act on the private bills on the calendar. I think it is a tribute to the arrangement which has been worked out between the majority and minority, and particularly to the ranking majority and minority members of the various committees, that when they report bills and other measures to the calendar, they are in such shape that they inspire the confidence of the other Members of the Senate, and can be passed without extended discussion. Every measure has been thoroughly explained; and I am glad to report that all measures which have been cleared by the two committees and which were ready for action today, have been brought before the Senate.

I hope all Senators will be on notice that there will be a call of the calendar on Monday; and then we probably shall proceed to consider the Niagara power bill, which is Calendar No. 1428, Senate bill 1823, being a bill to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power, and other purposes. Probably we shall consider that bill following the call of the calendar on Monday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the minority will certainly cooperate in the future, as they have in the past, in attempting to expedite the handling of the legislative business, including action on the measures on the calendar.

In connection with the various measures, the distinguished Senator from Texas has been very generous in meeting the convenience and reasonable requests of the Members of the minority.

I should like to request that the distinguished Senator from Texas main-

tain some flexibility regarding the Senate's consideration of the Niagara River bill to which he has referred. I certainly have no objection to having the bill taken up next week. I think it has been held sufficiently long; and by this time the Members certainly have had an ample opportunity to study it. However, I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Texas to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has been in the hospital. He is recovering, and I am informed that he will return to the Senate next week. I am not in a position to say whether he will return on Monday or on Wednesday.

So I should like, respectfully, to suggest that under these circumstances, if there are some other measures which can be taken up prior to consideration of that bill—and particularly if a delay of only a day is involved—I hope the distinguished Senator from Texas will consider the request of the minority leader in regard to that measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I would not only consider it, but I would agree to it. As the distinguished minority leader knows, I have not previously brought up this bill; I have refrained from doing so, because of the illness of the senior Senator from New York. I understand the situation. I merely wish to announce that if the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] are available, we might work out that situation following the call of the calendar on Monday. If not, we shall schedule other measures. Between now and Monday, I shall discuss the matter with the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement by way of comment on the observations made by the majority leader regarding the position taken, I understand, by some members of the Democratic policy committee in respect to the District of Columbia Transit system. I had heard about that matter, informally and unofficially. Apparently some members of the Democratic policy committee are laboring under the impression that when the District of Columbia transit problem was before the Senate last August, there was some rock-ribbed assurance that the transit company would be taken over by a private company. However, no such assurance was given, as the RECORD will show.

In fact, we very carefully pointed out to the Senate exactly what the District of Columbia Commissioners reported to the Committee on the District of Columbia, namely, that it was their belief, and that they were confident it would so develop, that the offering of the transit system to private investors would result in the coming in of private companies; but the Commissioners very carefully pointed out that that was based upon the inquiries they had received up to that time. They had received a considerable number of inquiries, and the record is perfectly clear that they tried to negotiate with several companies and several groups which were interested at least in considering the possibility of purchasing the transit system in the District of Columbia.

Now it is fairly well known to all that those negotiations did not reach successful fruition.

As one member of the District of Columbia Committee, let me say that we examined the Commissioners at great length on this subject in recent weeks. I am satisfied that the District Commissioners acted in perfect good faith in the recommendations which they made to the District of Columbia Committee last year, which recommendations were submitted to the Senate by the District of Columbia Committee. At that time it was my honest belief that the District Commissioners would have no trouble in getting a private company to take over the transit system. I based my opinion on the fact that the Commissioners had advised the committee that they had received requests from several companies that they be given an opportunity to negotiate for the purchase of the system.

The Commissioners pointed out that one of the difficulties in negotiating a successful transfer of this property into the private ownership of a new company is the present holdings of the Wolfson syndicate, and the difficulties which are involved—legal and otherwise—until the Wolfson syndicate is completely out of the picture. It will be out of the picture, on the basis of the law now on the books, at midnight, August 14. There is reason to believe that under the temporary public authority we propose to establish, for a 3-year period—and we hope early in the 3-year period—the District Commissioners will be able to enter into an arrangement with a private company for the operation of this system by private enterprise.

As the District of Columbia Committee warned last August, and as I warn again today, it has been well known in this country for some years past that municipal transportation systems do not offer a great inducement to investors. It is a declining industry. It is an industry which, across the country, in city after city, is not profitable. It is an industry in which the trend has been toward some kind of public authority or quasi-public authority. In fact, some of the so-called private operations are really quasi-public, if we look at them from a financial standpoint, in that they are really being conducted on the basis of the largess of considerable municipal subsidy.

I have consistently taken the position in the District of Columbia Committee that I prefer, and very much desire, a private enterprise operation of the transit system in the District of Columbia; yet I do not hold out very much optimism about it, because I believe that sooner or later most municipal transportation systems in this country will be publicly operated. That happens to be the trend, because of the fact that they are not good paying investments.

However, they are services which are charged with a public interest. They are services which, in my judgment, must be maintained. If they cannot be maintained on a private basis, by private industry, in my opinion, they must be maintained by municipal governments; and we are confronted with that municipal problem in the District of Columbia.

This problem is a headache to the Congress. It is one of the municipal headaches in connection with which we assure ourselves of frequent returns of suffering because we do not confer upon the District of Columbia the home rule it should have. We take periodic doses of aspirin in the form of debates in the Senate, on municipal problems, and waste tremendous amounts of the taxpayers' money, transacting municipal rather than congressional business.

Let me say, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that I do not favor a proposal to permit the Wolfson syndicate to continue their operations and to mulct the transit riders of the District of Columbia. The record of the Capital Transit Co. is perfectly clear. The chairman of its board, Mr. Wolfson, has said on the witness stand before the Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which conducted an investigation under the direction of the able Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and again last year before the committee presided over by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], that he places the interests of the stockholders first. He has never shown that he had the slightest conception of the primary responsibility of a public utility, that is, to serve the public interest first, and that profit dollars must come second.

If the Congress falls for the lobbying of the Capital Transit Co., even in the interest of campaign contributions, it will do a great disservice to the people of the District of Columbia. This is one Senator who is never going to vote for such a proposal.

We now have the opportunity to provide the people of the District of Columbia with at least a segment of home rule, by putting the responsibility for operating this transit system into the hands of the District Commissioners. That is what is proposed in the bill of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am sure that I can speak for the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, as well as for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this subject, when I say that we would welcome an opportunity to appear before the Policy Committee of the Democratic Party in the Senate, and the Policy Committee of the Republican Party in the Senate, if they would like to hear us, and explain what the record shows in regard to the transit situation.

Let me say, in defense of the committee, that we had the District Commissioners before us in recent weeks. We brought in the transcript of the record of the record of their conferences with us last year, in regard to their representations with respect to their hopes for private ownership of this company. Such hopes were based upon following

the course of action recommended last year.

The Commissioners are men of good faith and men of honesty. They pointed out that it was their honest opinion that if the recommendations made last year had been followed, by this time the system would have been in the hands of a new private owner. They explain that they think the reason why it is not in the hands of a new private owner is the fact that the old owner is not completely out of the picture.

Therefore we are proposing a temporary authority for a 3-year period, giving the Commissioners the opportunity to continue their negotiations for private ownership, and requiring them, at the end of that period, if they have not brought in a private owner, to show cause why their negotiations for the sale of this system to a private owner have failed.

I repeat what I said earlier. If it is conferences with the policy committees of the two parties that we need, let us get on with them. Let us have them very quickly. It will be found that members of the District of Columbia Committee will welcome such conferences. But we had better be thinking in April about what is going to happen to the transit riders in August. Unless we proceed quickly to provide the Commissioners with the authority sought in the bill, the transit riders will be traveling on shoe leather in August.

In my judgment, even now it is too late to assure full transportation on August 15. I think the indications are pretty clear that by August 15, if the Senate committee bill is passed, the transit system in the District of Columbia will become a bus system. It will not be possible to obtain all the new buses which will be needed by August 15. As the transcript will show, one of the Commissioners stated that he thought that while it might not be possible to obtain all the new buses which would be needed, it might be possible to have made available to them some very satisfactory used buses, which could be used to fill in until new buses could come off the assembly line.

This is a municipal problem. It is little from the standpoint of congressionl duties, but pretty big to the transit riders in the District.

Let me make one further point, in conclusion. When we consider the House proposals—and I speak respectfully of the House—if we accept the House proposal, it will be a matter of only a short time before the transit riders will be paying higher fares than they are now paying. In fact, the transit company is well known to be one which, on the basis of its history, believes in charging the last cent the traffic will bear. What we should be thinking about is not increasing the fares, but reducing the fares. I say again that in large degree the operation of a public transportation system is the warp and woof of the economic strength of any municipality. To the businessmen downtown let me say that I think they ought to recognize, before it is too late, the economic stake they have in the matter. It is not in the economic interest of the businessmen of the District of Columbia to let the matter drift.

Therefore, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I urge full speed ahead on the District of Columbia's transit program.

HELPING THE FARMER

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the things which I most regret concerning the President's veto of the farm bill is that this veto carried down into oblivion, at least for the present, the two-price system for wheat. This program, in my opinion, would have done more than any other proposal yet advanced to eliminate crushing wheat surpluses and yet, at the same time, it would have afforded our wheat growers a reasonable return for their product.

One of the periodicals which has at last realized this essential fact is the New Republic. In its issue of April 30, 1956, the New Republic has included a most cogent editorial entitled "Helping the Farmer." I call particular attention to that portion of the editorial which speaks as follows concerning the two-price program for wheat:

> Second, a system for farm price supports must be offered which stops further accumulation of Government-held surpluses, and meets most of the President's objections to rigid 90-percent supports. Such a plan is available. Congress has taken extensive testimony on it. It is called the two-price system, because it offers the farmer a high price for foods consumed by people in the United States, and a lower price for "surpluses" which must move into export or be fed to animals in the United States. The system can be so set up that it involves no Government controls, no Government purchase of supplies, no Government subsidies, no new bureaucracy. Yet it can make full use of our abundant food production and can raise farm income substantially.

Mr. President, I endorse emphatically and wholeheartedly what the New Republic has had to say about the domestic parity, or so-called two-price plan, to eliminate wheat surpluses and yet to assure the wheat rancher his reasonable cost of production and perhaps a little more.

As a Senator from Oregon, I am particularly conscious of the two-price plan because it stems back to the McNary-Haugen bill which was sponsored more than 30 years ago by Oregon's late great United States Senator, Charles L. McNary.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that we still can revise the two-price plan for wheat, either as an independent farm program or as a part of some new overall program.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial from the New Republic entitled "Helping the Farmer," appear at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> While both parties continue to maneuver for a favored position as the farmers' best friend, cynics in Washington maintain that no sensible farm program can be enacted in an election year.
>
> We are less cynical. Though the time is past for perfect programs, it is still possible for Congress to pass legislation which would satisfy three basic requirements. For the farmer, such legislation must raise income this year, and for a period of years ahead. For the Government, it must halt the pileup of Government-owned surpluses and reduce surpluses already in storage. For the consumer and taxpayer, it must hold down the cost of living to the level necessary to give the farmer a fair price for food which is actually consumed.
>
> The Democrats in Congress, now on the spot by the President's request for a pay-in-advance soil bank plan which would tuck Government checks into farmers' pockets approximately 60 days before the fall election, have come up only with piecemeal proposals. They are pushing through the two Appropriations Committees a $1.2 billion fund for the soil bank, minus Eisenhower's request for advance payments. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, is starting hearings on a substantial agricultural-credit plan which would increase loan funds and lower interest rates. Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat of Oklahoma, has tied to the social security bill an amendment authorizing a food stamp plan, under which social-security recipients would receive $10 worth of food stamps a month, redeemable in foods at the grocery store. These steps, it seems to us, are desirable but marginal.
>
> If Congress is to help the farmer, the Government and the consumer in a constructive way, it is probably essential politically to first enact the original Eisenhower soil bank plan with the added protection for the family-sized farm proposed by the Democrats. As presented by the President, this plan would pay the 2,000-acre farmer the same amount as the 200-acre farmer, if they both put the same acreage—say, 40 acres—into the soil bank. But the hardship on the 200-acre farmer is much greater, because he has no agricultural outlet for his labor which the soil bank makes idle. The plan should therefore be amended to provide payment not only for retired acres but for the idled labor those acres take out of employment. The family-sized farm would be the greater benefactor.
>
> Second, a system for farm price supports must be offered which stops further accumulation of Government-held surpluses, and meets most of the President's objections to rigid 90-percent supports. Such a plan is available. Congress has taken extensive testimony on it. It is called the two-price system, because it offers the farmer a high price for foods consumed by people in the United States, and a lower price for surpluses which must move into export or be fed to animals in the United States. The system can be so set up that it involves no Government controls, no Government purchase of surpluses, no Government subsidies, no new bureaucracy. Yet it can make full use of our abundant food production and can raise farm income substantially.
>
> Suppose, for example, the wheat farmer were guaranteed 100 percent of parity on wheat for domestic consumption, and the world price for the balance. That means half a farmer's present wheat crop would bring him $2.50 a bushel, the balance $1.60. American millers who converted wheat into bread and other human food products would, in effect, be taxed $1 a bushel on the wheat they used, and this $1 would go to the farmer. The miller in turn, would pass on the extra cost to the consumer. Since a 1-pound loaf of bread now contains only 3 cents worth of raw wheat, the two-price system would increase the price of a loaf of bread less than 1 cent.
>
> In detailed testimony before the House Committee on Agriculture in April 1954, the economist for the National Grange, Dr. J. T. Sanders, offered figures to show that the American farmer would derive a larger cash

income from this two-price system than from either the rigid 90-percent supports, or from the flexible supports advocated by President Eisenhower.

Third, in order to reduce the $9 billion of farm surpluses already on hand, we need a plan which would use foodstuffs as capital in financing economic development abroad. Mr. Benson has done a good job, much better than his critics give him credit for, in trying to sell surpluses abroad. We have approached the limit. We have tried giving away stocks and that disrupted trade except in actual famine areas. But we have failed to use food as a capital asset in world development.

The President of Bolivia, for example, wishes to settle Inca Indians on the eastern slope of the Andes. Such a project requires the clearing of virgin timber lands for food production, a 3-year task. If the United States would put up a 3-year food supply for the workers from surplus stocks, the Bolivian Government would supply local currency for tools, and the Bolivian Development Corp. would finance the sawmills. No friendly trading nation could contend that this use of American surpluses had displaced any normal sales of food. And the plan has obvious application in such critical areas as India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and the Arabic speaking world where new irrigation projects have been started or are planned.

If congressional farm leaders can come up with a constructive plan of this magnitude, the President's pay-in-advance soil bank will be identified for what it is: an inadequate, campaign-year response to a problem which cannot be solved by politics as usual.

THE PROPOSED ANTISEGREGATION AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York School of Social Work, a very distinguished and outstanding institution attached to Columbia University, recently held its sixth annual alumni conference on April 14.

Among those who addressed the conference was the dean of the New York School of Social Work, the distinguished authority, Dr. Kenneth D. Johnson. He spoke on the subject of school segregation, and the crisis it presents to our entire society. Among other things, Dean Johnson expressed himself in support of an antisegregation amendment to the Federal school construction bill.

The significance of Dr. Johnson's remarks lies not only in the merit of the arguments presented by him, but also in the fact that he is an eminent educator and schoolmaster. As such, he well knows the need for Federal aid to education. He must feel very keenly indeed, as all of us do, the critical urgency of Federal appropriations to help build more public schools. Yet Dr. Johnson understands that the building of schools cannot be separated from the question of the building of a society based on law and order and the building of character in the schools.

We cannot blind ourselves to a moral issue out of sheer expediency.

Dr. Johnson's speech is a powerful and compelling one. Of course, he did not need to persuade me. I have long shared and frequently expressed the views set forth by Dr. Johnson.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful and thought-provoking speech by Dean Johnson be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF DEAN KENNETH D. JOHNSON, GROUP NO. 3, SIXTH ANNUAL ALUMNI CONFERENCE, NEW YORK SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, APRIL 14, 1956

It was just about 100 years ago that a distinguished American stated: "This Nation cannot long survive half free and half slave." It is well for us to be reminded of those words because by the same token we can say with the very same conviction: "This Nation cannot long survive half constitutional and half unconstitutional."

To be sure, the current picture is not as bad as it was in 1861. Today we have a cluster of States where certain vocal leaders, blatantly, brazenly, and boldly proclaim that these States do not propose to live under our Constitution. Bear this in mind, were there but one of our States where such a condition obtained, and even were that State the smallest in population and in area, there would exist an open challenge to the capacity of our Nation to survive.

I need not emphasize the tremendous importance of our constitutional form of government and the many rights, liberties, and freedoms it generously provides for each one of us. Neither do I have to emphasize the responsibilities and obligations we have as individual citizens under this form of government and the countless blessings it affords. Without being an alarmist, however, I say to you that wherever, within the boundaries of our Nation, there is open defiance of our Constitution, such defiance if not resisted, is a threat to the well-being and survival of the entire Nation.

Since we gratefully hailed the unanimity of our Supreme Court in its great and epochal opinion on segregation in May 1954, we have been aware that there has been an increasing tide of expressed opposition to that declared law of the land. More recently we have had evidence of the seriousness of this uprising and are becoming more and more conscious of the impact of that decision with the age-long racial hatreds, rivalries and suppressions that altogether too long have characterized some sections of our country.

I am not one to rush in and advocate the use of force. Such action has the potential of bloody and devastating results. Its employment must be avoided within the extreme limits of maximum human patience, tolerance, and understanding. I do say this, however, that there are times when the application of an economic boycott has the effect of bringing the opposition, no matter how stupid and unreasonable it may be to recognize the folly of its ways. It is for this reason that I cannot get myself to believe that it is a proper use of Federal funds to disburse such funds to any governmental unit of our Nation which insists on open defiance of that Supreme Court decision. I appreciate that this is a subject many people think is too hot to handle but somehow I believe that the hangover of generations of dismal darkness will end and that in order to accelerate that end we must not tolerate such a use of the money that comes from the pockets of all of us. Personally, I would not confine this imposition of what I call an economic boycott to funds appropriated for the construction of new public schools and facilities. I would apply it to every use of such funds be it on the farm, in the home, or on the highways. Somehow I believe—and this I say in a most considered fashion—that were we to take this position and stand our ground, as have done those who preceded us and gave us the glorious institutions we hold so dear, we would do much to reduce the resistance to law and order, particularly in areas where these funds are so critically needed.

I do not consider this to be a radical, unreasoned position. For me it is the only position I can honestly, conscientiously, adopt. To be sure it would be preferred if the power to exercise this control were in the Chief Executive—similar to the power that was held by the war-time President requiring all producers of goods and services for the Federal Government during the war to eliminate from their employment practices any vestige of discrimination by reason of race, creed, or national origin (the FEPC).

Furthermore, I regret that so far the one organization making a Herculean effort to support our Constitution is the NAACP, the leaders of which are almost exclusively Negroes. This should not be. As a citizen I am proud of what they have achieved and am wholly in accord with the goals to which they are directing their efforts. However, they should be joined and supported and augmented by citizens who are not Negroes because what they are fighting to save actually is the United States of America.

Certainly there can be no meeting such as this, on an occasion that places special emphasis on civil liberties and civil rights, without some mention of these ugly facts and the remedies they demand. I call upon each one of you fully, openly, and clearly to assume your responsibilities as a citizen and to join with every honest effort to maintain the integrity and decency of this great country. Where each one of us fails to do this we provide material for those who seek to destroy us. The day for decision is upon us. It can no longer be delayed. This problem and the manner in which we handle it has the potential of both great promise and terrible peril. Neither the role of an ostrich nor of the Roman Governor, Gallio, who "cared for none of these things," can be tolerated at this time. Too often in the treatment of these grave matters which face us, either apathy or lack of sympathy for their importance may cause even more damage than open and inconsidered opposition. To you is given the challenge of determining your course.

CANADIAN PRIME MINISTER SUPPORTS ELEVATION OF COLUMBIA RIVER NEGOTIATIONS TO GOVERNMENT LEVEL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to express my firm and unequivocal support for the proposal just voiced in the Canadian Parliament by the Prime Minister of that nation, Mr. Louis S. St. Laurent, that negotiations between the United States and Canada for joint use of the Columbia River be elevated to consideration between high representatives of the two Governments.

This recommendation by the Prime Minister parallels a proposal of my own, which I made to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. MURRAY] on December 9, 1955, following a survey which I made at Senator MURRAY's request concerning the future of the upper watershed of the Columbia River, in British Columbia.

At that time I suggested to Senator MURRAY:

That responsibility within the United States Government for these important negotiations be raised from the level of a purely advisory committee like the United States section of the International Joint Commission and be explicitly assumed by the policy-making executive departments themselves.

Mr. President, the Columbia River is the greatest stream for hydroelectric

power on the North American continent. A diversion of its water in Canada, now being studied by Canadians, could well strand the economy of our Pacific Northwest. Our relations with the Canadians over this question have deteriorated under the chairmanship of ex-Gov. Len Jordan, of Utah, a long-time foe of Federal power projects on the Columbia River system—projects which might benefit if Canada, rather than diverting the water, cooperates in developing and operating great storage dams near the sources of the Columbia for our mutual benefit.

Mr. President, I digress at this point to say that I realize that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is presiding over the Senate at this time has been a leader in urging that these beneficial storage sites in the Dominion of Canada be developed so as to increase the capacity of our Federal projects downstream in the United States.

In the Parliament at Ottawa, the Prime Minister recently said of his meeting at White Sulphur Springs Hotel, West Virginia, with the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower:

I also suggested to the President that the time seemed to have come when problems regarding the use of water power on rivers crossing the international boundary might well be studied at a conference between representatives of the two Governments. Here I might perhaps extend this a little to answer a question of which notice was telephoned to my office by the honorable member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton). There was no discussion of the problem, but merely the suggestion that it would probably be desirable at this time to have it studied by a joint conference representing the two Governments, to try to get at something which would make for the possibility of expeditious use of these water powers to the best possible advantage of the people who might derive advantage from their use. It was left at that, with the understanding that the subject would be further pursued in discussions between our Department of External Affairs and the Secretary of State of the United States.

Mr. President, this colloquy between the Prime Minister and a member of Parliament, Mr. Fulton, later occurred on the floor of the Canadian House of Commons:

Mr. FULTON. May I ask the Prime Minister whether his statement that it has been suggested that the problems of the control of the Columbia River should now be discussed directly between representatives of the two governments of the two countries means that the Prime Minister or the government feels that the situation has got to the point where it is not likely to be solved under the agency of the International Joint Commission and that it should therefore be discussed at the higher level by direct negotiation between the two governments?

Mr. ST. LAURENT. I would not like to say this was a higher level, but there was a feeling that the chairmen of the two sections had publicly expressed views so diametrically opposite to each other that there was little probability of them being able to make the kind of progress we would hope would be made in arriving at a solution of these problems.

Mr. President, the upstream management of the Columbia River in Canada holds the fate of the vast proposed Libby Dam in Montana, and of the possibility of expanding the capacity of such great existing projects as Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, The Dalles, Bonneville, and McNary Dams on the main stem of the Columbia River—to say nothing of the John Day and Priest Rapids Dams, planned for future construction.

I share the view of the Prime Minister that these crucial and delicate negotiations no longer can be surrendered to the stalemate which has bogged down the International Joint Commission. Furthermore, I personally regret that the American side of the problem apparently has been totally placed in the hands of a man who has so persistently been against the great Bonneville Power Administration program for abundant low-cost public power. Even the Portland Oregonian, a Republican newspaper, has declared editorially that ex-Governor Jordan has "consistently opposed big projects—especially big hydroelectric projects—such as only the Federal Treasury can finance."

Mr. President, I doubt if the fate of so-called big hydroelectric projects should be permanently relinquished to a public official who is opposed to such projects. I back up the recommendations of the Prime Minister of Canada for a high-level conference between the two governments, lest we of the Pacific Northwest suffer a ruinous diversion of Columbia River waters that could wreck our whole basic industrial economy, for generations to come.

I urge that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles look with favor upon this suggestion from the head of the Government of Canada, a nation which shares with us joint ownership of such mighty streams as the Columbia, the Yukon, and the St. Lawrence.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that my basic recommendations to Senator MURRAY, of December 9, 1955, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. That responsibility within the United States Government for these important negotiations be raised from the level of a purely advisory committee like the United States section of the International Joint Commission and be explicitly assumed by the policy-making executive departments themselves.

2. That as long as United States members of the International Joint Commission are to play roles at least comparable to those of senior officers in the Foreign Service, their appointments be made subject to confirmation by the United States Senate.

3. That in its hearings, this committee thoroughly examine the past and recent statements by Governor Jordan on river development, with a view to determining if his profound bias and prejudice on issues of Federal power policy disqualify him from representing us in seeking further capacity for downstream Federal projects in the United States.

4. That this committee recognize as an important objective of negotiations with Canada the urgent need for upstream storage to provide effective flood control for the Columbia River farther downstream, particularly in view of the present administration's irresponsible abandonment of great floodwater storage reservoirs such as Hells Canyon on the Snake River, the main tributary of the Columbia in the United States.

5. That pending the active pursuit of agreement with Canada on the development of the upper Columbia River, the Congress act wisely and promptly to preserve for early Federal development the upstream storage sites in the Columbia River basin within the United States. Especially it would be an unconscionable tragedy to sacrifice forever, in return for the small 1 million acre-feet private project favored by the present administration, the 4 million acre-feet of invaluable storage at Hells Canyon, wholly within the United States, while the storage potential of the upper Columbia is in danger of being forever lost to the United States through diversion into the Fraser River, wholly within Canada.

6. That this committee express its firm intent that, in our negotiations with Canada, no effort be spared to arrive at the best possible program for the development of the upper Columbia River—beginning now with the construction of the Libby and Mica projects—so as to maximize the mutual benefits to both countries which share this unique resource. Such a determined and constructive effort must give frank and open-minded consideration to the fair allocation of upstream costs and downstream benefits attributable to upstream storage—including possible sharing of benefits in generated electric power.

Failure to reach agreement on a mutually beneficial program for developing the Columbia River would threaten the gravest crisis in modern United States-Canadian relations, as well as incalculable economic loss to both countries. Agreement and execution of such a program, on the other hand, can assure economic progress for a generation to come for the Pacific Northwest in both countries, and can make a material contribution to the industrial and defensive strength of the North American continent and the western alliance.

ACCELERATION OF THE ATOMIC-POWER PROGRAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I welcome the announcement by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the committee will shortly begin hearings on proposals to accelerate our atomic-power program. It is my considered opinion that in the absence of action by the Congress we stand to lose the atomic-power race.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has been in effect now for almost 2 years. Under this act we adopted a business-as-usual philosophy in the development of atomically generated electricity in commercial quantities. Under the terms of the act, the Government was restrained from taking action to construct reactors designed to demonstrate the practicality of commercial generation of electricity. By this act the field was abandoned to private enterprise. In effect, private enterprise was given a monopoly on the use of this direct source of power, which had been developed exclusively at the expense of the Government.

Up to now I believe the taxpayers of the United States have expended somewhat more than $14 billion in the development of atomic energy.

Further, the act purported to prohibit the payment of any Government subsidy to anyone desiring to pioneer in this field.

However laudable may have been the motives of the proponents of this act, 2

years of its operation offer conclusive evidence that we are simply not getting ahead with the job with proper efficiency and prompt development of atomic power. Though the law was enacted in August 1954, the Atomic Energy Commission did not get around to asking for proposals under its so-called power reactor demonstration program until January 10, 1955. By that time it was apparent that private companies would show little interest in the construction of power reactors without Government help. Despite the clear prohibition against subsidies, the AEC, under this reactor program proposed to enter into research and development contracts with private companies desiring to build reactors. In effect, the AEC offered to supply funds to partially offset the cost of the reactors in return for an agreement to make available to the AEC such technical information as might be obtained from operation of the reactors. Even with this inducement, the response was limited. The AEC has accepted as the basis for negotiation 5 proposals, 4 submitted by groups of private companies, and the fifth submitted by a public-power district.

To make a long story short, all of these proposals are still in the negotiating stage. No licenses have been issued, no construction has been started, no construction permits have been issued. None is even in early prospect.

Two of these proposals purport to be straight applications for a license. Sponsors of the other three frankly admit that they seek Government subsidy in the construction of their reactors. It is apparent that none of the groups is prepared to go ahead until certain conditions have been met. We hear a lot about the fact that private groups propose to commit upward of a quarter of a billion dollars in this program, but this money has not been spent or even committed yet.

One of the private groups negotiating with the Atomic Energy Commission headed by Detroit Edison whose president is Mr. Walker Cisler. Last week, in testimony before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, presided over by my beloved friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], Mr. Cisler stated very clearly the conditons under which his group would be prepared to go ahead with its proposal, even with the substantial Government subsidy which was requested.

Mr. President, I have here a statement which Mr. Cisler presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I should like to read from page 2 of his statement. The proposal of Mr. Cisler's company, which is a combination of several large companies and is called the Power Reactor Development Co., contains the certain conditions. One of the conditions is that they shall not become subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act by reason of participation in the project.

The second one is more surprising, namely, that the contribution devoted to this project shall be deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

A third condition which Mr. Cisler was seeking in his appearance before the subcommittee was that the Government assume liability as insurer against any damage arising out of the construction or operation of the reactor.

So, Mr. President, to recapitulate, nearly 2 years after the act has gone into effect, not one single license has been granted. Furthermore, there is no immediate prospect that such license will be granted. Indeed, the foremost concern in this field frankly says, in effect, that there will be no private enterprise atomic power until Congress grants these three things:

First. Exemption from the Public Utility Holding Company Act;

Second. Assumption of insurance risks by the Government; and

Third. The granting of special consideration so that all their capital expenditures in this field shall be treated as deductible from their income taxes, just as if they were charitable contributions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. In view of the fact that the corporation tax is 52 percent, the Government would be assuming, under such a proposal 52 percent of the burden. Also, in view of the fact that dividends are taxable to those who receive them, the proposal would mean that the Government would be assuming at least half of the remaining 48 percent.

Mr. GORE. And there is an additional factor of rapid depreciation on the 48 percent remaining which has not been paid for by the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Government normally would get another 24 percent. Add that 24 percent to the 52 percent, and the Government would be directly contributing three-fourths of the cost of the reactor. That, to me, is the most serious part of the testimony. I do not say that all the companies are in that situation. I am sure the Senator will admit that the New York Consolidated did not ask for that treatment, nor did Commonwealth. The Government understands what it has to put up and how much it has to pay.

Mr. GORE. What it would really amount to is a project publicly financed but privately owned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us say a reactor can be built at a cost of from $70 million to $100 million. The Government would contribute 75 or 80 percent. I do not say that is impossible. I merely point out that the facts should be clearly understood in connection with this so-called private enterprise.

Mr. GORE. I should like to bring one additional point to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I should like to read further from Mr. Cisler's statement. He says that his company is a nonprofit enterprise. That can perhaps be understood when I read from the next page of his statement:

> The Detroit Edison Co. (of which I am president) is prepared to build at its expense a turbine generator plant of 150,000 watts capacity, estimated to cost $14 million, to be located on the same site and immediately contiguous to the reactor plant, and to purchase the steam produced by the reactor and utilize it in generating electricity which will be used in the Detroit Edison system.

So it will be seen that the Detroit Edison Co., under this scheme, is to receive all the benefits of the steam generated by the reactor, which would be financed, under the plan, largely by the Government itself.

I now yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me. I wish to applaud and compliment him for at least spotlighting this very important subject.

I shall be frank and honest at the outset by saying that while I do not agree completely with the thesis which the Senator has developed, I think it will serve at least to emphasize the very complex problems which confront us in this particular field.

I am not wholeheartedly in accord with the idea that all the conditions or conditions precedent which have been set forth in the proposal of the Detroit Edison Co. should be granted; but I think we should understand, in the public interest, exactly what kind of involved problem confronts us in the large field of developing reactors for the generation of electric power through the use of nuclear fission.

The Senator knows that I have been presiding over the hearings on S. 2643. While I am prepared to say that the provisions of that bill will have to be greatly refined before I feel it will receive the approbation of the committee or the Members of the Senate, there is one thing we must understand. We are in a contest in the field of production for the peaceful use of the atom. Russia is a regimented nation. We are in competition also with the United Kingdom, and there the electrical industry is completely nationalized.

When Congress passed the 1954 atomic energy law, it said that private industry would be allowed to participate in this field. I am one who from the outset has been quite disappointed with the progress which private industry has made. But we must realize that we are now at the research and development stage. It has been said to us by the experts that it may be 15 or 20 years before electric power generated by the use of nuclear fission will become competitive with power which is generated by the use of conventional fuels, such as coal, oil, gas, or water. That being the case, the fact is that many of the power companies are investing the dollars of their stockholders in something which is not compensatory as of the moment.

Mr. GORE. And, therefore, not profitable.

Mr. PASTORE. And, therefore, not profitable.

So I believe the Senator's remarks will serve the purpose of emphasizing the fact that if we expect the job to be done either it will have to be done by the Government itself or else it will be necessary to make concessions to private industry to enable it to participate in this tremendously speculative area.

The cost of electric current per kilowatt hour, as generated by the use of conventional fuels, is 3.5 mills. The cost

of current per kilowatt-hour generated by the use of nuclear fission today is much more than 9.5 mills. Naturally, before that gap can be closed, a tremendous amount of research will have to be done. The proposition is a losing one at best. There is no hope that tomorrow or the next day power generated by nuclear material will be used or will be capable of use in competition with power which is generated by the use of conventional fuels.

That being the case, I believe sometimes we are too prone to be critical of the part private industry is trying to play in this field. I am one of those who are convinced that as of the moment the Government will have to do a great deal more. Either it will be necessary for the Government to take the money of the taxpayers out of the United States Treasury and hand it to the private companies or else it will be necessary for the Government to make some concessions whereby private industry can meet the competition. I believe the problem is as plain as that.

We must work with the problem and we must watch it very closely. But I am not convinced that private industry is endeavoring to run away with something to which it might not be entitled. We said in 1954 that we wanted private industry to participate in this field. It has already signified its intention to do so. If it is trying to get away with something to which it is not entitled, we ought to halt it.

But at the same time, if we are to be an equal in the contest with Russia and Great Britain, and if the international agency, a reference to which I placed in the RECORD yesterday, is to mean anything to the people of the United States or the free world, we shall have to begin to make reactors.

If private industry cannot build the reactors because they cannot get appropriate relief in order to invest their stockholders' money in this highly speculative field of research and development, then the Federal Government itself will have to do so on its own. It is a case of being "darned if you do and darned if you don't." That is the problem which confronts us today. I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee for bringing it into the open, because we might as well understand it.

I am one who believes we ought to support the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Tennessee, to enable the Government itself to begin to build reactors if private industry is not going to do so. If we do not, the free world will lose the race; and it will be a horribly tragic day for the people of the free world if we ever lose that race.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able and distinguished friend from Rhode Island for his concise discourse. After I have yielded to the distinguished chairman of the committee, I wish to make some observations with respect to his remarks.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also wish to compliment the Senator from Rhode Island on his very good analysis of the present situation. I say to him and to the Senator from Tennessee that at the time industry was saying it would soon be prepared to build reactors, and at the time the Atomic Energy Commission was testifying that $300 million of private money would be going into the construction of reactors in the next few weeks, it seemed almost premature to hold hearings on the bill introduced by the Senator from Tennessee.

But we have waited patiently. It is now more than a year since bids were received, and no final adjustments have been made. Therefore, following the hearing on the insurance item, which is to start on May 14, there will be a hearing to ascertain what other roadblocks are in the way. Following that, there will be a discussion as to whether or not the proposal in the Gore bill is an essential step in the advancement of the atomic energy program. We must get under way with the reactors.

If industry can build the reactors, I shall be very happy to see industry do so. But if there is going to be some delay, then certainly there is no alternative but to turn to the Government construction of reactors. That is the problem which is facing us now.

Therefore, I am glad to have the statement by the able Senator from Rhode Island, who has done outstanding work on our international atomic agreements, and who has been studying what has been taking place in the world, and can speak with authority on what we should do. His attitude concerning the conference in the United Nations has been most helpful. I am glad he and I find ourselves in agreement in saying that this is a good time for the able Senator from Tennessee to bring up this question.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

I should like to revert to the statement of the able junior Senator from Rhode Island, when he pictured the plight of the free world if we should lose in the atomic power race. What would be that plight?

Mr. President, electricity is the lifeblood of modern industry. If the United States is to maintain its position in industrial and economic leadership—yes, and in political leadership—then we must maintain the lead in the development of atomic power. That could be spelled out in great detail. I wish to state in a little different way, perhaps with a shade difference in meaning and emphasis, my belief with respect to the core of the statement of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island. The present challenge is so great that it requires a vigorous partnership of Government and industry in the field of atomic energy. In 1954, I thought we were making a mistake in eliminating the Government itself from direct participation in this challenge. I believe the experiences of the 2 years which have elapsed have demonstrated that.

I agree with the junior Senator from Rhode Island that private enterprise cannot, with prudence, plunge into this field. I do not wish my speech to be interpreted as being critical of private enterprise. I believe in private enterprise. I am a part of it in private life. Private enterprise is actuated by the profit motive. I am not one to condemn the profit motive. As the distinguished Senator has pointed out, the profit motive does not yet operate in this field. Were I a member of a board of directors of a corporation, I think I would be very slow to vote to spend $50 million of the stockholders' funds to build a reactor to produce noncompetitive electricity, at best, under present circumstances, and perhaps, at the worst, to build a reactor which might be outmoded almost before it was completed.

Let me state the role of Government in this field, Mr. President, as I envision it. It is to demonstrate the feasibility of processes, to point the way, to prove the methods.

Would we have had atomic energy at all except for the fact that the Government followed just such a policy? Where is there a private concern that would have built the facilities at Oak Ridge? And at Oak Ridge the gaseous diffusion process, which proved to be the most economical way to separate U–235, was by no means the only method tested. Millions of dollars were expended on an electrical process which proved to be uneconomic and inefficient.

I propose a partnership—a vigorous, effective, efficient partnership—between business and Government in this vital field in which the free world is challenged. It is my firm belief that if the Government would proceed to build reactors, it would facilitate the entrance of private enterprise into this field. Indeed, such action may be the only way, the only avenue, through which we shall bring about vigorous participation in this program by private enterprise. I welcome the sentiments of the junior Senator from Rhode Island. I, too, want to see private enterprise in this field.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If we are to carry out effectively the idea so ably expressed by my colleague from Tennessee, namely that there should be a partnership between Government and private industry, does not that idea necessarily embrace a proposal that the Government shall either have to make a concession or a direct subsidy in the way of payment of money, as it did in the case of the Yankee Atomic Energy Company, where the Government put up $7 million as against the company's putting up $35 million? Unless the subsidy is a direct one, if we do have this plan of partnership, we shall have to make some concessions. By making concessions I do not mean we should do all the things which have been advanced in some of the proposals which have been submitted; but surely we must be practical in realizing that if we are to have a partnership between Government and industry in this very important field, some concessions will have to be made.

Mr. GORE. I agree; and I have watched, with approbation, the conduct of the hearing over which the distinguished Senator presides. I applaud him for the keeness and caution of his examination. I am not prepared to say I would not support a modification of the

bill before the Senator's committee. I sincerely question that there is a need for such widespread exemption from the Utility Holding Company Act as is proposed. I wonder if the Securities and Exchange Commission does not now have sufficient authority and latitude to grant the exemption necessary in this case. However, it is a question on which I shall reserve judgment, and I say, in all frankness, that I shall be prejudiced in favor of the conclusion which the junior Senator from Rhode Island himself will reach, because I respect his opinion, and I know with what care and caution he proceeds.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. On that very point, while I do not want to place myself in the position of prejudging the matter, because the hearings are in progess, I do want to admit that as of this moment the bill goes a bit too far. How far the bill should go is a question which must be decided after all the parties have been heard.

My reason for becoming a cosponsor of the bill, together with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who, I am glad to say, is in the Chamber at this time, is to point up, just as the Senator from Tennessee is trying to do, the problem which confronts us. This is not exactly a case of 6's and 7's. There are many issues involved in the question, and the interested companies are, in large measure, in the business of producing electricity, as supervised companies, for the consuming public.

When it is realized that they are expected to take dollars and invest them in something from which there may not be a return for a long, long time, when it is also considered that the technological advances and developments which will accrue will be for the benefit of the entire industry, and will be owned by the Atomic Energy Commission, I am sure it will be agreed that there will not be any inducement, for them to get into this field unless they have some assurance that they will not be investing their stockholders' money at great jeopardy.

How far we should go in making concessions is a matter that is yet to be determined. But merely because they are asking for concessions before they agree to do what we are asking them to do is no reason why we ought to allege that they are trying to get away with something for nothing. I think that would be an unkind and unwarranted point of view, and that it would retard the whole program.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Rhode Island did not understand the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. PASTORE. I was not referring to something the Senator from Tennessee said; I was speaking in the abstract.

Mr. GORE. I should like to mention the question of insurance, as to which a hearing has been announced by the distinguished chairman of the committee. The limited hearing which the committee has already had has shown rather conclusively, it seems to me, that under present circumstances insurance against the unusual hazards which are involved is simply not available. The junior Senator from Tennessee would be willing to lean over backward, so to speak, in the extension of concessions necessary to bring about effective development of atomic power by private enterprise.

However, the junior Senator from Tennessee believes that the most effective thing Congress can do—and I believe it should be done along with the granting of the concessions referred to—and perhaps the most necessary thing of all, is the actual construction of a few demonstration plants themselves. It is fine for the Government to have little pilot plants; but we did not really learn how to separate U–235 until the Government itself constructed a large plant, financed by the whole people of the United States, in which that work was undertaken.

If the Government should undertake to construct the six reactors in different major regions of the United States, as I have proposed, and if the Government should undertake to utilize, to the extent feasible and practicable, different processes, techniques, and methods of atomically generating electricity, the feasibility of the program might be proven. One company may not have the financial resources with which it would be willing to undertake, or with which it prudently could undertake, the risk of proving the feasibility of different processes; but the whole people can afford it. Indeed, Mr. President, I do not think the whole people can afford not to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield on that very point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree more completely with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Mr. President. Does not he also agree with this point of view: If we are going to use the taxpayers' money to build six different reactors in different parts of the country—which I think we should do——

Mr. GORE. Good.

Mr. PASTORE. Because, after all, we are engaged in a race, and we cannot afford to make a mistake. As I said before, Russia is proceeding with a "crash" program. England is trying to reach out for the markets of the world. President Eisenhower, before the last proposal was made, offered 200 kilograms of U–235 for international cooperation. Shortly after that, we astounded the entire world when we offered 20,000 kilograms of U–235 to be used for international purposes, and 20,000 kilograms to be used for our domestic industry. That is a great deal of refined U–235, and it represents a tremendous amount of power. But what good is all that unless we build a reactor, or reactors, in which to place the fuel?

We are telling the entire world that we shall offer 20,000 kilograms of this fuel; and yet we become niggardly when it comes to investing the dollars in order to build the reactors by means of which we can prove to the world that this fuel can be used for the generation of electric power. I say that if we are to spend as much of the funds of the taxpayers as is required for the building of the six reactors of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee speaks, then why is it so wrong to allow liberal concessions to be made to private industry in this very field, provided we limit such private industry to a nonprofit combination during a period of research and development?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think I would join the Senator from Rhode Island in the inclusion of the two in the same bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to hear the Senator from Tennessee say that, because I think that ultimately that will be the partnership we shall need.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said in different words, the challenge is too great to permit this vital program to be bogged down in a private-power versus public-power fight; and I do not wish to engage in such a struggle in connection with this issue.

Mr. PASTORE. I applaud the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on that statement, because that is precisely the way I feel about this matter.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan. I wish to say that this is the first opportunity I have had to yield to my distinguished colleague, with whom I served so pleasantly in the other body. So I yield to him with great pleasure.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I always enjoyed my association with him when both of us were colleagues in the other House.

Mr. President, I wish to concur in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is serving as chairman of a special subcommittee which is holding hearings on a bill, of which the Senator and I are cosponsors, to allow certain exemptions to be made from the Public Utility Holding Company Act, in the case of companies wishing to participate on a nonprofit basis in the development of reactors—a matter in which at least several companies have shown a great deal of interest, and on which program, as well as on others, they have spent considerable amounts of money. The exemption they have requested in this instance is being considered by the subcommittee, not for the purpose of giving them in any way a special favor, but because the Government has asked them to lend their talents and their resources to the speeding up of this vital program, which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has so eloquently brought to the attention of the Senate today.

I am convinced that there will be many modifications in the bill which is now before our committee. There is no intention on my part—and I know there is none on the part of the Senator from Rhode Island—to liberalize the provisions of the Public Utility Holding Company Act in order to aid in any way

a tendency toward monopoly, which the Public Utility Holding Company Act was enacted in order to restrict.

One question before our committee—and I say frankly it is the question in which I am primarily interested—is that of allowing individual companies, many of them small companies, to pool their efforts in the development of a reactor, so that we can have the benefit of the best brains and can achieve the best possible results, because of the research on and the development of these reactors.

Let me say that I hope that will be done in many other cases; I hope other companies will do the same thing. The progress which is made in this field will, of course, provide the answer as to whether we shall keep pace with the developments made in the Soviet Union and in other countries.

So this is merely one effort to remove a stumbling block, so that we shall be able to speed up the program and arrive at the desired results as quickly as possible.

I should like to state publicly that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has been most conscientious in holding hearings on the bill, and his service as chairman of the subcommittee has been most objective.

I concur in the view of the Senator from Tennessee that this matter is not being considered, and should not be considered, in the light of a public-power versus private-power controversy, but should be considered and handled on the basis of what will bring the results which are needed in the race in which we are engaged for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee for permitting me to make these observations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in turn, I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his very fine and quite frank statement regarding the problem.

Solution of the problem is so vital to the future of our Nation, and is also so vital to the future of the rest of the free world, that it should be lifted above not only the continuing struggle in our country between private power and public power, but also above partisan politics.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I concur in the view of the Senator from Tennessee. The survival of our country may be at stake. This issue is not one between Democrats and Republicans, not one between private power and public power. Instead, it is a national issue; and all the talents and the best brains of our country should be directed toward achieving the results we desire.

Mr. GORE. It is clear that the existing program has not been achieving satisfactory results.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is clear that before even the present program, the exclusively private enterprise method, can be brought to fruition, further legislation will be necessary, and further concessions to private enterprise will be necessary.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Therefore, that being the case, the entire subject, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, needs to be explored. It is the suggestion of the junior Senator from Tennessee that we should mold a partnership between private enterprise and Government itself in this vital field, in order that we may maintain the lead which this country unquestionably had 5 years ago, but which today we are not maintaining.

Mr. POTTER. Irrespective of the arguments the distinguished Senator has put forth as to the degree of Government participation, under existing policy there is a partnership relation. The fuel belongs to the Atomic Energy Commission. Whatever private industry conducts developmental or research programs, there must be close relationship and partnership between the private companies and the Government, through the Atomic Energy Commission. The allocation of the fuel is under the control of the Atomic Energy Commission, so the program is not divorced from the Government, even at the present time.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

I wish to point out to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] that there is one very important difference in the results to be obtained by the use of governmental credit and governmental money for the construction of reactors, on the one hand by private companies themselves, and on the other by the Government. That difference involves the recipients of the benefits. If the benefits come from governmentally constructed reactors, such benefits are then available to all companies, all concerns, all citizens, alike. If, however, the particular concern to which I have made reference, or some other concern, is permitted to develop a reactor at public expense, but privately owned by the private company, the benefits therefrom flow principally to the private concern.

I am willing to take that risk. I am willing to make many concessions in that direction; but I think it is unsound to tie the hands of the Government. I think it would be unwise for the Congress to permit the hands of the Government to remain tied, and for the Government to be prohibited from operating in this field. I see no necessity for giving to private enterprise a monopoly on the use of this natural resource, which belongs to all the people.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. While I am willing to grant concessions, I am not willing to go as far as the Senator from Tennessee has stated he is willing to go. I do not mean that if private industry enters this field, the concessions should be tantamount to or commensurate with the cost to the Government itself if it were to do the entire job. I would expect private industry to risk some of its own money. I would not want whatever concessions private industry obtained to amount to an outright subsidy on the part of the Government. I am not willing to go that far. I am willing to make only those concessions which are necessary in order to get the job underway, in order to provide the impetus or initiative we need to get the job done. I believe we should remove all unreasonable obstacles so that it can be done. I believe the entire venture should be confined to a nonprofit organization in the research and development stage, subject to the provisions of the law. We have already taken care of that in the 1954 law. Whatever patents are developed, the knowledge will have to be shared with all others who are in this activity, subject, of course, to a reasonable charge. That is no more than fair.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has stated a reasonable position. The junior Senator from Tennessee did not mean to convey the impression that he would favor 100 percent Government financing of a project which would be 100 percent privately owned. The junior Senator from Tennessee was using a hypothetical case to show that the benefits from such a program of reactor development might not flow equitably and democratically to all the people.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. One of the problems with which we are confronted is this: The people who wish to engage in this activity are not all utility companies. Some of them make boilers. Others are chemical companies or industrial concerns. Naturally those people are not under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. They urge a rather plausible argument. It is our responsibility to determine whether the motive behind the desire of any of them to enter this field is good or bad. That is our responsibility, representing the people of the country.

The argument which is made is this: "We are willing to enter this field. We desire to engage in this activity; but the minute we do so we automatically become subject to the Public Utility Holding Company Act, under which we do not now operate because we are not a public utility company."

That poses a serious problem. That may tend to discourage many companies from engaging in this program. We all know that there is no profit in this activity, and there will not be any profit for perhaps 15 or 20 years to come.

We are on the horns of a dilemma. Shall we compel these people to subject themselves to the rigorous provisions of a law which does not now apply to them—which was not designed in 1935 to apply to them—because they are not a public utility company? Or shall we say to them, "If you cannot stand that burden, stay out of it"?

That is our dilemma. How are we to reconcile these two positions? That is what the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and I are trying to do in the little hearing room on the third floor of the Capitol. We are trying to reach a reasonable balance, in order to protect the public interest, and at the same time stimulate the initiative and foster the impetus necessary for this program.

Mr. GORE. As I have said, I shall be predisposed in favor of the conclusions which the able Senator's committee will reach on this question.

However, that is but one of the obstacles which must be removed. It is

but one of the obstacles which spokesmen for private enterprise say must be removed before they can or will move forward in this program.

Therefore I revert to my original statement, that under the present program we are simply not getting ahead with this activity.

We are losing the head start that America had in atomic power. Not only have Great Britain and Russia moved ahead, but France has also. Unless we amend our policies, unless we bring into being both policy and program, we will soon, I am sorry to say, not be anywhere.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. On that very point I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and make one further observation. When people pick up their daily newspapers, they read on the front pages about the great achievement on the part of 12 negotiating nations because they have arrived at a draft statute which will be submitted to the members of the United Nations, to be approved by that body before it will come before Congress, either in the form of a treaty or a concurrent resolution.

People believe that a vast achievement has been made because they read in the newspapers that 12 negotiating nations have joined together in order to draw up the framework of an international agency.

The only thing that will make it work—and the only thing that could make it work are the reactors which we are yet to build. Does the Senator know where the people will find the discussion about that? On the back pages of the newspapers.

That international agreement is not worth the paper it is written on unless we build the reactors which will convert special nuclear material into electricity and power. The whole crux of the international agency idea lies in our ability to get on with the job to build these reactors.

Unless we do that, we will not have an international agency to amount to anything. The important thing in this whole dramatic picture is to press on with the task of building these reactors.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, if private industry cannot do it, we ought to find it out quickly. If private industry cannot do it, or will not do it, then the Federal Government should do it. If we do not do it, we will lose the hearts and minds of the people of the free world.

Mr. GORE. But it can be done more quickly and efficiently, I am sure the Senator will agree, by a combination of effort by both the Government and private enterprise.

Mr. PASTORE. I could not agree more completely with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Thus far no one seems able to predict when construction may actually start on any of the projects now under consideration by AEC. In the light of the conditions specified by Mr. Cisler, to which I previously referred, it seems obvious to me that the next 2 years will produce no more reactors than have the past 2 years, unless Congress takes action. We simply cannot afford such delay.

I would like to make it clear that I do not wish my remarks to be construed as being critical of private enterprise. There are many cogent reasons why private companies have not rushed into the field of reactor construction.

Private enterprise is supported by the profit motive. We must recognize that investment in atomic reactors today offers little possibility of immediate profit. The profit incentive will not be very effective until such time as atomic power becomes economically competitive with conventional power.

This was pointed out eloquently by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island.

Electrical energy from atomic reactors thus far demonstrated is high-cost power. There is no longer any doubt—and I hope that on this point I shall likewise have the concurrence of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island, and perhaps also of other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—that existing technological obstacles can be overcome and that a substantial portion of our generating capacity in the future will be atomic. The question is how soon will this come about and, what is even more important, will the United States make this achievement in time to preserve its economic and industrial position in the family of nations?

Private enterprise is inclined to approach the task just as it would approach any other development program. I do not say this critically, either. We must recognize the fact, however, that this means a great deal of research and small prototype reactors, followed in turn by pilot models, all prior to construction of large-scale reactors.

In general, the construction of large-scale reactors would be delayed until the state of technology has advanced to the point of competitive power, with the assurance of a profitable return on the huge investment involved. There is no question but that this approach is prudent from the standpoint of private investment and that it may get the job done eventually. If the economics of the private power industry were the only consideration involved, this might be a proper approach. Then we might be able, as a people, to afford the delay. However, as I have said over and over again in this debate, we need action by the Government to demonstrate costly processes and thus facilitate the effective and early entrance of private enterprise into the field.

The challenge requires concerted effort by both Government and industry.

The debate in the Senate which accompanied the passage of the 1954 act is now history and a matter of record.

It lasted for 13 days and nights. There were those of us who felt the bill failed adequately to protect the public interest and that it would foster patent and technological monopoly by a few large concerns then operating in the field under contract with the Atomic Energy Commission. We felt, too, that the bill would not provide rapid development of economically competitive atomic power, because it effectively tied the hands of the Government in the field of reactor development.

However, whether the proponents of the 1954 act were correct or whether the opponents of the 1954 act were correct is now beside the point. The question is, Where do we go from here, and how quickly? The future is more important than the past. Upon what we do in the future, as the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] has said, may rest the very industrial survival of the United States.

The arguments of the proponents of the bill were characterized by what seemed to be almost a fetish for the infallability of private enterprise.

The time had come, they said, to unfetter the hands of private companies and to remove the Government from the field of generation of atomic power.

As the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said, we were told that hundreds of millions of dollars were waiting to flow quickly into atomic-power reactors, if Congress would but remove the threat of Government competition. We were told that if Congress would but tie the hands of Government and take Government out of the field of atomic power, private enterprise would move quickly and efficiently and certainly into the development of atomic power.

Mr. President, over the protests of several Members of the Senate, that bill did pass. The Government's hands were tied. A monopoly on the use of atomic power was given to private enterprise.

I repeat, Mr. President, that we simply have not received the results which we were promised. Let us not be discouraged by that fact, however. Let us recognize the vital importance of the program and make whatever reasonable concessions may be necessary. But I think the most necessary thing of all is to mold again the partnership between private enterprise and the Government in this field and have the whole people bear the risk of building some reactors, demonstrating the feasibility of processes, with the ultimate result of maintaining America's leadership in this field.

Administration spokesmen take great pride in the fact that we are already selling electricity generated by heat produced in an atomic reactor. It is true that the Atomic Energy Commission has sold $36 worth from a prototype reactor designed for use in submarines, which is located at West Milton, N. Y.

Reporters, photographers, and radio broadcasters have given us the news concerning it, but the amount of atomic power which the Atomic Energy Commission has sold is $36 worth. That does not indicate that we are maintaining American leadership in this field.

These spokesmen often take occasion to refer to the reactor now under construction at Shippingport, Pa. This reactor is expected to produce somewhere between 60,000 to 100,000 kilowatts of power when completed in 1957.

Mr. President, that reactor is being constructed with Government funds, as the distinguished chairman of the joint

committee pointed out, and in accordance with the terms of the provisions of the act of 1946, and its development is not related in any way to the licensing program which apparently today constitutes our national policy.

I repeat, Mr. President, that under the act of 1954 not one license has been granted, not one construction permit has been issued, and none is even in immediate prospect. Such development as we have had in the atomic energy field, so far as the actual construction of reactors is concerned, has come under the 1946 act.

At Geneva last summer, the Russian representatives presented a paper on the design of a 5,000-kilowatt atomic power plant which they said had been in operation since June of 1954. The first power reactor of comparable size on which the United States presented papers at Geneva did not go into operation until a year later, shortly before the conference. The Russians have announced that they will put a 100,000-kilowatt atomic powerplant into operation this year and will have installed generating capacity of 2 million kilowatts by 1960. By contrast, the first large atomic powerplant in this country, the Shippingport reactor, will not go into operation until next year. We have indefinite hopes that by 1960, we will have something over 1 million kilowatts of atomic power capacity in being. But we have no real plan for achieving even this objective.

But if it should be achieved, it is only half that which the Soviet Union has already announced.

In today's issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appears an account of a lecture by a Soviet nuclear expert which, according to the article, "amazed 300 British scientists at Harwell Atomic Energy Station today by indicating that Russia is on the threshold of harnessing the H-bomb."

The article continues:

> In a scheduled lecture, the visiting scientist reportedly spoke so frankly and in such detail that Harwell will now be able to reproduce the Russian experiments and supplement its own progress. Some of the data would be considered top secret by the West, it was noted.

The article strongly suggests that the facts presented in this lecture demonstrate that Russia is ahead of both the British and the United States in the race to control thermonuclear fusion.

Some people assume that the claims of the Russians are exaggerated. The same arguments were advanced about reports of the Soviet progress in aircraft design and production. These arguments became more difficult to support when such planes of advanced design were observed flying over Moscow in significant quantities some months ago. They collapsed entirely when the head of the Soviet Security Forces landed in England recently in a plane which supplied concrete evidence of Russian progress in this field.

Now what about our friends abroad? The British will put their first large atomic powerplant into operation in October of this year. It appears they will be a year ahead of us in this respect. Furthermore, the British announced last year a 10-year program for construction of 22 reactors which will provide approximately two and a half million kilowatts of capacity. The French put their first small reactor into operation this year, and they plan to have a large one in operation about the same time we do.

When questioned about our relative position in the atomic power field, Admiral Strauss continues to say we are "well ahead." It is inferred that projects underway in other countries are of inferior design and will be made obsolete by the improved designs upon which we are working. Possibly, this could be true. I do not possess either the technical knowledge or the technical information with which to pass judgment upon it.

I remember we heard that argument over and over again in the months before World War II. The controversy was between those who believed that our security could best be found in the planes in the air and on the bases, and those who believed we should concentrate on better designs on the drawing board. I say we need to build more reactors now in order to have actual and practical experience.

But the significant thing is that these other countries, both in the free world and of the Communist bloc, started this race at a great disadvantage as compared to the knowledge which we possessed. Unquestionably 10 years or even 5 years ago, we had a commanding lead. The fact that our position of leadership is now even questioned should be a matter of gravest concern. To me, it appears inescapable that others are progressing at a faster pace than we are. I believe the primary reason for this state of affairs is that other countries have established a national policy which recognizes that supremacy in the field of atomic power is a matter of vital national concern. Apparently we have not. Other countries have set up a definite plan and schedule for construction of reactors. We have not. Other countries have set for themselves an objective in the terms of kilowatt capacity. We have no such goals supported by a program of planned action.

In 1953, spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration enunciated a policy on atomic power development which stated in part:

> It would be a major setback to the position of this country in the world to allow its present leadership in nuclear power development to pass out of its hands.

On March 21 of this year, Dr. Willard Libby, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated in an address that the loss to the Soviets of foreign markets for atomic reactors would be a catastrophe to the free world.

More than dollars and cents is involved. Nuclear power, which, in the words of President Eisenhower, will demonstrate that "the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life," is a symbol of the creative genius of man.

The importance of our leadership in this field was underlined again only recently by a Presidential announcement that 40,000 kilograms of fissionable material would be made available for peaceful uses at home and abroad during the next 20 years.

There is no lack of official pronouncements. There is a lack of definite progress. While the administration recognizes the urgency of the matter, it has no program of action to maintain American atomic power supremacy. Responsibility for this situation must be shared by a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration. This situation must be remedied by cooperation between a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress. Remedial legislation must be enacted to bring about the policies and programs which will assure the maintenance of American supremacy of the atomic power field.

We simply are not getting ahead with the construction of reactors. It is well and good to be able to tell the world that we will have nuclear fuel available to supply reactors, but this will not win us many friends or influence many people if Russia is able to supply a better reactor in which to burn the fuel.

I would not want to minimize the importance of our research programs. We must continue them; but we can learn more quickly from the actual construction and operation of reactors themselves.

Of course, this will cost money. Quite possibly, some of the reactors would be obsolete almost as soon as they were completed.

Although private enterprise may not be in a position to undertake this risk, despite the monopoly which the 1954 act gives to private industry, the Government can and should undertake a vigorous atomic power program for the benefit of all the people.

For want of a better term, I suggest that a crash program in the field of atomic power is required. Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, of the Atomic Energy Commission, has advocated that the Government undertake such a program.

A strong proponent of private enterprise—indeed, a man whose family fortunes, as I understand it, came from, and perhaps still remain invested in, the private utility field—Commissioner Murray has recognized the inescapable fact that only the whole people, through their Government, possess the resources necessary to insure that we maintain our lead. Mr. Murray has suggested that a minimum capacity of 2 million kilowatts of atomic power should be constructed by 1960. I think this is a reasonable minimum goal. To do less is to invite defeat. In this regard, I support Commissioner Murray strongly.

I strongly urge that the law be amended so as to untie the Government's hands, and to direct the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with the construction of large scale reactors, using each of the technological approaches which shows promise of success.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from Tennessee really believe that the law must be amended in order to carry

out the idea of having the Government build reactors, or is not the question merely one of appropriations?

Mr. GORE. The 1954 act does not contain an authorization of appropriation.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what I mean. It will be necessary to have an authorization to build the reactors; but fundamentally it would not be necessary to change the concept of the 1954 law.

Mr. GORE. It would take a simple authorization.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is provided in the Senator's own bill, is it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed. The authorization would not be complicated; the legislation would not be complicated. But under the 1954 act a legislative authorization is necessary before Congress can appropriate funds for this purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. The point I wanted to make clear in the RECORD is precisely that Congress did nothing in the 1954 amendment of the Atomic Energy law which would tie the Government's hands and prevent the carrying out of the idea which has just been expressed by the junior Senator from Tennessee. All that is needed, of course, is an authorization in order to secure an appropriation to make possible the construction of reactors.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. It is necessary, first, to establish a policy, next to provide the authorization, and then to provide funds. Then it would be necessary for the Atomic Energy Commission to formulate a program which would bring about the necessary action and result.

Mr. PASTORE. The important point I wish to make is that if that be done—and I subscribe to the view that it should be done—Congress would still be within the concept and spirit of the 1954 amendment of the atomic energy law.

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed; with the exception of the lack of authorization, which was not provided in that act.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. As a matter of fact, I have advocated such a program for a long time. I think it was last July that I introduced a bill to provide for the construction of six such reactors, each to be in a different geographical location in the United States. I believe it is important that reactors be developed in different geographical locations.

I know of no other area in which so large a population lives in a high-cost power area, where atomic power is so direly needed, than the New England section of the United States. The area which I am honored and privileged to represent, in part, has had a supply of economical power. The adequacy of that supply is now seriously questioned, but that is a different question, on which there will be more debate later. But the urgency for atomic power in the Tennessee Valley or in the Great Northwest is not so great as it is in New England, not so great as it is in the Southwest, and not so great as it is in the industrial North or in the Rocky Mountain region.

I believe it is, if not necessary, at least desirable, to have the Government undertake such development in those areas where the power is so direly and vitally needed. Of course, I would not want to discriminate against the area which I, in part, represent. Obviously, a very, very good place to start would be in Tennessee—that is a good place for any good thing to start—particularly so when Oak Ridge needs power, and the Atomic Energy Commission could there utilize the power which would be generated in a reactor.

But, I repeat, the most dire need is not to be found either in the Tennessee Valley or in the Northwest, where the great Columbia River power potential is available.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not also a fact that one of the greatest obstacles which confronts private industry in this particular activity is the question of insurance? The reason why insurance companies have been rather reluctant to underwrite this activity is that they do not have the experience and the background which are necessary in order actuarially to formulate the premium rates which will be necessary.

Therefore, if the Government itself proceeds to build six reactors in different places in the country, not only will the obstacle of insurance be overcome, but also the experience and background which are necessary and helpful will be supplied, and this, in turn, will inspire and induce private industry to enter the field.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator. Will he not go a step further and say, in addition, that the size of the risk is so great and so indefinite that the insurance companies show no readiness to undertake the underwriting of such a liability?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is not the Senator pretty well convinced that the only way we can overcome the insurance obstacle is by Government participation?

Mr. GORE. I reluctantly come to that conclusion.

Mr. PASTORE. No matter how we look at it, there has got to be Government participation. We may as well come to that understanding as quickly as we possibly can, and definitely advance a program which will effectively carry out the spirit and intent of the 1954 law.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I have said, it seems to me we have here a perfect example of the classic role of Government to do for its people that which they as individuals cannot do for themselves, or that which they cannot do as well or as expeditiously for themselves. Here we have a proposal which fortuitously promotes both our aspirations and our responsibilities in the field of international relations and the growth and development of our own economy at home.

This is no time for arguments about the exclusion of either the Government or private enterprise from the field of reactor development. The task ahead presents a challenge which will require the full resources of both.

I wish again to congratulate and thank the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for scheduling the hearings which will soon begin. I express the hope that the examination of this challenge to the industrial supremacy of the United States in the future will be thorough, and that we shall have action by this Congress to formulate a national policy, implemented by a program of action which will maintain American atomic supremacy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire at the outset to congratulate the junior Senator from Tennessee upon his zeal and energy in the matter of attempting to develop atomic power within this country. I am very happy to say that I know the committee will go thoroughly into the merits of the bill he has proposed and many other questions which have arisen in connection with it. The committee will also explore the insurance problem and other roadblocks which seem to be in the way.

Today I should like to say a few words with regard to the possibility of thermonuclear power. Enticing and hopeful as the picture of ordinary atomic power may be, the imagination of the world was pretty largely captured at the Geneva Atoms for Peace Conference by the announcement of the president of that conference, the distinguished physicist from India, Dr. Homi Bhabha, who, in his inaugural address, pointed to the possibility of controlling thermonuclear reaction and what it might do for the well-being of the world.

Those of us who were in the audience that day could not fail to be impressed by the manner in which he presented it—not that his words came as a complete surprise to all of us, but because we were not permitted to discuss that situation and still stay within ordinary security rules of the United States.

There is a special dispatch to the New York Times today telling of the appearance of the leading Russian authority of atomic energy and how he amazed 300 of Britain's top scientists who heard him describe at Harwell, the British atomic energy center, the results of more than 3 years of research toward controlling the energy created by fusion, as in the hydrogen bomb explosion.

It was my pleasure last summer to visit the British atomic energy institute at Harwell and to discuss the progress of that institution with its director and members of his staff, and to hear the things they were willing to discuss with us and to discuss the things we were permitted to discuss with them. There was not a word said by us to them nor by them to us about control of the thermonuclear reaction. I assume the British were under instructions not to talk to us about it, just as we were under a requirement not to talk to them about it. But some very interesting things are now printed, and the New York Times carries a story which, in part, reads:

The method on which the Russians have been working—the passage of extremely large electric currents in short bursts through

tubes containing various gases, especially deuterium, a heavier hydrogen isotope—has been the subject of experiments in various countries, including Britain.

It would be interesting to know if that has been the subject of experiment in the United States. I am sure it is gratifying to industry in the United States to learn what has been done in Russia and in Britain; and I assume industrial leaders of this country, who look upon atomic energy as a potential source of power, would be happy if, in the not too distant future, they might look forward to the day when they could find out what is going on in other countries.

The Russians are behind the Iron Curtain. Yet the Russian scientists were permitted to go to Britain, as Russian scientists were permitted to go to Geneva, and talk about thermonuclear possibilities.

It was my rare and good fortune to be a speaker on April 6 at the sixth annual conference on high energy nuclear physics at Rochester, N. Y. I was barely able to read the subjects of the addresses, since I was the only lay speaker there. The rest of them knew what they were talking about and understood it, but it was a strange and utterly new language to me. But that conference was attended by a Russian physicist, Dr. Vexler, and there was also present Dr. McMillan, of the University of California, who is in charge of a laboratory there. Dr. McMillan thought he was the inventor of the particle accelerator, and the Russian scientist thought he was the inventor of it. Finally the two of them, through interpreters, learned that they had arrived at their conclusions by wholly separate routes. No spying was needed on either side to discover that they had used similar facilities to arrive at the same results.

This very interesting experience at Rochester is not unparalleled in scientific history. One can go back into the development of many things and learn that somebody was working on it in one country while someone else in another country was working on it almost simultaneously. The thing we have learned is that the one way by which these results are most definitely promoted is by cross-fertilization of ideas, which is exchange of information, which is a realization that science is universal, and that scientists in different countries, working in cooperation, can more rapidly develop ideas for the benefit of all the people.

I do not intend to take time this afternoon to discuss construction of certain new types of accelerators in bevatron range. But we found out that certainly some of the things we were doing in this field were being reproduced and paralleled in other countries. Now we find that both can profit by what has gone on elsewhere.

I shall not read into the RECORD the entire New York Times article, but I think it is interesting to note one paragraph:

> Experiments have been carried to a stage at which temperatures of the order of 1,000,000° centigrade have been attained. This is the threshold at which the fusion reaction might be expected to begin.

Again I say I do not believe that news will come as a great shock to the American scientists who have been working in this field, but it is bound to come as a shock to any businessman who has been wondering whether there is a possibility of the development of thermonuclear power, because the one thing on which he could obtain absolutely no information was the field of controlled thermonuclear power and the work in that field.

Mr. President, merely to show how difficult it is to achieve in this country something equivalent to the frankness with which the Russian to whom I referred discussed the matter with the British, I wish to point out that I have been talking about this subject for approximately 1 year. Last July, for a meeting of the National Advertisers' Association at White Sulphur Springs, I prepared an address. In the text I prepared originally I urged that this country devote itself to a "crash" program in the field of controlled thermonuclear power. I went that far before I found out that it was strongly against the policy of the Atomic Energy Commission to make such statements publicly. Therefore, I threw away the text I had prepared and included in my address one short paragraph, in which I alluded to that subject in a fashion which I thought would not be objectionable. I shall read those words:

> Finally, there is the dramatic possibility of controlling thermonuclear energy—or hydrogen energy—to produce power from the light elements. This would be equivalent to using the energy from the sun and stars for constructive purposes here on earth. Our hydrogen bombs prove that uncontrolled thermonuclear energy can be released here on earth. It has long been known, on theoretical grounds, that it might be possible to harness hydrogen energy for constructive uses. In fact, references to this possibility were made in public hearings before the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy 10 years ago. And on the news stands this very moment, there is an article dealing with the subject of the possibility of controlling hydrogen energy for man's benefit. It appears in Foreign Affairs, and it was written by Mr. John S. Walker, a former counsel of the joint committee. Will we be able to tell the world, at Geneva, whether we are trying our hardest to find out whether this technique can be mastered?

That was only several weeks prior to the Geneva Conference; and in that talk I said it would be my good fortune to be present at Geneva, and I hoped that there we might be able to deal with the matter of controlled thermonuclear energy.

It was fairly simple, as we went to Geneva, to stop at London and to visit the British atomic energy center. Some of us did so. A newspaper dispatch from London quoted me as predicting that "the atoms for peace conference in Geneva next week will lead to freer discussion with the Soviets on atomic developments." And that I said:

> It appears that the Soviets intend the conference to be a success.

Dr. Bhabha, as I have said, made his address as president of the conference; and he pointed out that "the historical period we are just entering, in which atomic energy released by the fission process will supply some of the power requirements of the world, may well be regarded one day as the primitive period of the atomic age."

In other words, the extent to which we have progressed in this field up to the present time would so be regarded, he said.

The release of energy, such as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has been discussing today, under the program which he has been trying to get under way, is important, and needs to be gotten under way; and probably will constitute our great source of power within the next 25 or 50 years. But Dr. Bhabha said that some day this period may be regarded as the primitive period of the atomic age.

He also said:

> It is well known that atomic energy can also be obtained by a fusion process, as in the H-bomb, and there is no basic scientific knowledge in our possession today to show that it is impossible for us to obtain this energy from the fusion process in a controlled manner.

That is rather frank talk.

I said at Rochester that Dr. Bhabha opened the thermonuclear pie, regarding the development of power by means of the fusion process, and that thereupon 4 and 20 nations began to sing. Everyone began to talk about it.

The day after his address, I sat next to him at a luncheon. The head of the Russian delegation sat in the next seat on the other side. All about us was talk about the possibility of the development of atomic energy by controlled thermonuclear reaction.

Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy returned to Washington. Many Members of the Senate and many Members of the House of Representatives who were in the group at Geneva were forced to return immediately to their homes, because of previous engagements, and because of the fact that we had remained abroad a long time. But those of us who stayed a day or two in Washington held the customary press conference, at which members of the press sought to learn something about our activities. I have before me a sheet giving a brief press item which went out, as follows:

> Two congressional atomic experts urge a step-up in the Government efforts to harness the energy of the H-bomb—

The reference is to Representative PRICE, of Illinois, and myself. At that time, we hoped there would be some speed-up of this work.

Numerous questions were asked about whether we should have a moderate program. The press dispatch states that—

> The New Mexico Democrat was asked for his opinion of America's "moderate" program of research into the chaining of hydrogen bomb power, as announced by Lewis L. Strauss, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Specifically he was asked if he approved of spending large sums of money on such research.
>
> "Personally, I would," he said. "It is a very promising field."

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that after Dr. Bhabha made his state-

ment, the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission held a press conference the next day, and announced that the United States was at work in this field, and had been at work in it a long time. Prior to that, it had not been regarded as proper to discuss it; but as soon as we learned that India knew about it, that Russia was at work on it, and that various other countries were at work on it it seemed proper that we might mention the fact that we had been at work on it.

At a meeting in Cleveland, on December 15, I discussed the subject of Atoms for Progress. In the course of the discussion at Cleveland, I said:

> It would be criminal if our Joint Committee tried to give advice and guidance on America's military and peacetime atomic policy without knowing all the facts. You, in turn, cannot tell whether we, or your other public servants, are doing a good job on the peaceful uses of atomic energy if you do not have at least all the material facts yourself on the peaceful uses.
>
> Accordingly, we have set machinery in motion to get some of this story out into the open and to organize the facts so that you may see them in proper perspective.

It seemed important for the people of this country who were dealing with the atom and for every industry which was dealing with the atom to know about that study which was attempting to delve into secret areas and evaluate the work.

A little later in my Cleveland address I said:

> Let me cite a second example of security which, in my opinion, is not really security at all. I have in mind our information policy in the field of controlled thermonuclear reactions.

Later in the same speech I said:

> It is my considered opinion that the time has now arrived when we should declassify, and not merely downgrade, all our work in the controlled hydrogen field.

Mr. President, it has been my theory for a long time that the Russians unnecessarily take the play away from this country, which has been very rapid in its development of atomic resources. Here we see the Russians going to Britain, opening Soviet secrets, and talking frankly with the British as to what Russia is trying to do in developing controlled thermonuclear energy. They had full understanding that their information, which we would still classify, could come out from behind the Iron Curtain and be published in all the European press to let the nations of the world know that the Russians, at least, were willing to make abundantly clear what they were doing, or trying to do, to make hydrogen energy the servant of mankind as quickly as possible.

Inasmuch as this country had been long in the thermonuclear field, I thought it was important that we say publicly that we stood ready to try to declassify a great deal of this information and make it available to the people of the earth, who wanted to know how far we could go. It so happened that just after I made the address to which I have referred, the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission went into my home community to deliver an address. The United Press story in that connection reads as follows:

> Chairman Lewis L. Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission rejected demands for full disclosure of fusion-for-power developments. In so doing he placed himself at add with Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON (Democrat, New Mexico), chairman of the congressional Atomic Energy Committee.

The article refers to the fact that I had urged the declassification of this information.

The United Press article reported that Mr. Strauss explained his stand with the statement that thermonuclear things had to remain secret. This is notwithstanding the fact that scientists have contended that there is no military importance whatsoever in the work now going on. However, the statement was made in my home town that anyone who urged that the information be made public was bound to have a limited understanding of what was involved.

I felt that statement raised an important question, so I wrote to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, asking what important information I had failed to get, because under the law the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is to be currently and fully informed. I pointed out that men like Dr. Henry D. Smyth, a Princeton University physicist and a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Brig. Gen. K. D. Nichols, formerly general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, had recommended the relaxation of the security measures surrounding our efforts to use the fusion process for peacetime purposes.

I tried to find out why it could not be known publicly that we were doing this work, and why we were doing it. I hope that the time will shortly come when businessmen in the United States who are eager to learn the implications of this program with respect to their own business will have the same opportunity to find out about it as do businessmen in Britain, France, or some other country.

I am puzzled as to how and why an American newspaper was able to publish this story from London. The subject matter is still pretty much classified in this country.

A few nights ago I had the opportunity to address a meeting of high energy nuclear physicists at Rochester, N. Y., and I outlined some areas in which I thought we could spend a great deal of time in international research.

I said that one such area might be research on the problem of controlling thermonuclear reactions in such a way as to produce useful power.

If I may quote briefly again from the address to which I have referred:

> There seems to be no other field of technology today in which there is a more evident need for pooling all of the imagination and ingenuity which the world's scientists can bring together. The riches for mankind which must flow from the solution of these problems are without parallel. The history of science dramatizes again and again that problems of special difficulty are most usually solved by the cross-fertilization of ideas from diverse sources. The effort of any one country to develop controlled thermonuclear reactors in a unilateral manner under the security required by an attitude of competitive nationalism must certainly have the effect of retarding the progress of such a country in this vital field.

The Russians seemed to feel that there was a better way of doing it. The Russians have frankly discussed the problems with the British, and by this action have made available for all the world what their theories have been, what their progress has been, and how close they are to final solution.

Let me add a few more words from my Rochester address:

> No one can yet say that the immense problems associated with development of controlled thermonuclear power will be capable of solution. What we can say, certainly, is that if their solution is available to man, then it will be most readily available and perhaps only available in an atmosphere of vigorous collaboration built upon the genius of many people from many lands. It would seem that the enlightened self interest of all technologically advanced nations would best be served by their contributing heavily to the creation of a joint world laboratory in which the solution of these problems is sought jointly by scientists from many nations.

It seems that we are always coming along a step behind. The suggestion was made early that we should discuss this thermonuclear subject prior to the Geneva Conference. That suggestion was rejected by the Atomic Energy Commission, but Dr. Bhabha spoke out, and then quickly we confessed that we had been in this field for a long time.

The Swiss have said the United States can control fusion in its laboratories. We do not comment. Khrushchev goes to Britain and says that the Russians have dropped a hydrogen bomb from an airplane. Then we hear from our Atomic Energy Commision that we will do the same next week. The information that this was our intention had been classified up until the time of that statement. But now we confess.

Russian scientists say Russia is near the control of hydrogen power. We are completely silent as to where we are.

Is another step-behind confession due, or are we really behind the Russians on this subject?

I again express the hope I have been expressing steadily for a full year. It is the hope that we may find it possible to declassify our studies in the use of controlled thermonuclear processes. I believe that the scientists of this country are almost unanimously in favor of so doing, and feel that there is no possibility of our losing ground militarily if we do so. Therefore I hope the day is not far off when this country may find it possible to do so.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION: AN ANSWER TO CRITICISMS BY FORMER PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, President Eisenhower and his administration have produced many changes on the American scene since January 20, 1953. However, in my opinion, the most outstanding change has been the establishment of an era of good feeling and the absence of class warfare. President Eisenhower conceives his responsibility to be the President of all the people.

We are happy to be once again united as citizens of the United States, and not pitted as warring groups fighting among ourselves for political advantage.

Because of my deep feelings on this matter, I was shocked that my good friends in Iowa were subjected on Wednesday, April 11, to a political speech by former President Harry S. Truman which was openly designed to inflame every smoldering resentment and to return us to the era of class warfare, when group was pitted against group for partisan political advantage. There is no doubt in my mind that the people of Iowa, in fact of the entire country, have no desire to return to this unfortunate climate which characterized the two decades ending in 1952.

I feel it is my duty to set the record straight. I have prepared a detailed answer to the statement made by former President Truman for my good friends in Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that my complete statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN OF IOWA

President Truman, in his address at Des Moines, said: "In 1948, we had a Republican Congress—remember, it was the notorious do-nothing 80th Congress." You will remember that Hitler and his propaganda chief Goebbels said that people will believe any lie if it is repeated often enough. Former President Truman's statement about the 80th Congress completely fits the Hitler formula for propaganda. It is time for someone to set this record straight.

I was a member of the 80th Congress and I am proud of its accomplishments. It passed bills which were enacted into 906 public laws. This is hardly a "do-nothing" record. The mere number of public laws, however, does not begin to tell the story of the accomplishments of the Republican 80th Congress. Let me review a few of the more important enactments.

Public Law 75 authorized $400 million for aid to Greece and Turkey. It was the "terrible" Republican 80th Congress—the "do-nothing" Congress—which provided the authorization for the Truman program of aid to Greece and Turkey.

Public Law 101, passed over the President's veto, was the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the so-called Taft-Hartley Act. This act is not a perfect solution to all labor-management relations problems, but it is significant that it had remained on the books unchanged through the 81st and 82d Congresses controlled by the Democrats with Harry Truman in the White House. When President Eisenhower requested changes in the act to carry out the promises which he made to labor in the 1952 campaign, the Democrats in the Senate voted to recommit the bill incorporating his proposed revisions. Today we again have a Democrat-controlled Congress and the law remains unchanged. I am sure that with the benefit of 10 years of experience many revisions in this law could be made to advantage. However, any law which remains on the books unchanged for a decade must have some unusually good features.

Public Law 162, enacted by Harry Truman's "do-nothing" Republican 80th Congress, provided for the establishment of a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This was the first Hoover Commission. Former President Truman, under the authority granted under the Reorganization Act, adopted many of the proposals of the Hoover Commission and took credit for the economies they produced.

Public Law 253 was probably one of the most important enactments of any Congress. It created the National Military Establishment and provided for the unification of our Armed Forces.

Public Law 471 provided for individual income-tax reductions. This bill, too, was passed over the veto of former President Harry Truman. It is the bill which increased the personal income-tax exemption from $500 to $600 and provided tax relief in a fair and equitable manner for all of our taxpayers.

Public Law 472 authorized assistance to European countries Greece, Turkey, and China. This was the law that established the Marshall plan—one of the accomplishments of President Truman's administration of which he boasts, but which was enacted by that "terrible" 80th Republican Congress.

Public Law 643 provided for United States membership and participation in the World Health Organization.

Public Law 759, the Selective Service Act of 1948, provided for the first peacetime draft in our history. If the provisions of the law had been carried out by former President Truman, our armed strength would have been far greater and our efforts to maintain world peace would have been far more effective.

Public Law 792 extended the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Public Law 845 provided for the control of stream pollution.

Public Law 897 provided for a coordinated long-range farm program. This law had the support of President Truman's then Secretary of Agriculture, now the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, CLINTON ANDERSON. It provided for flexible price supports. If this law had been allowed to operate by the Democratic 81st and 82d Congresses, the 84th Congress would not now be worried about what to do with burdensome agricultural surpluses.

Another achievement of the "do-nothing" 80th Congress was the unmasking of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Honorable RICHARD NIXON, now the distinguished Vice President and then a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, was responsible for a great deal of the work which led to the conviction of Alger Hiss. This earned him the undying enmity of extreme Democrat partisans, while the rest of us expressed our gratitude to him by elevating him to the high office he now occupies.

On top of all this, the 80th Congress balanced the budget and produced a surplus.

There are some things it did not do. It refused, for example, to institute peacetime price, wage, and salary controls as requested by former President Truman. At the time, we said these controls would not stop inflation. That is why we did not approve them. Inflation could have been stopped by Harry Truman if he had properly administered the monetary and fiscal powers Congress had given him. Our experience since 1953, when inflation was stopped by President Eisenhower without the use of price and wage controls, demonstrates the soundness of the position taken by the 80th Congress.

This is quite a record for a "do-nothing" Congress. I am proud of it, and I make no apologies for my votes as a Member of the House of Representatives during that period.

Harry Truman completely wasted his opportunity to produce peace and prosperity. When he assumed the presidency, we had the greatest Armed Forces in being the world had ever seen. We had exclusive possession of the atom bomb. Our overwhelming military power placed us in a position to have assured peace to all the peoples of the world for generations to come if we had had a foreign policy based on morality and a clear understanding of our own self-interest.

President Truman went to Potsdam with a united Nation behind him. He had military power but lacked the wisdom and judgment to stand for principles. If he had, the Russians would have backed down. There would have been no Berlin corridor. The Korean incident would not have taken place. The opportunity for peace and disarmament was lost because the man who then occupied the White House was too busy advancing the partisan interests of the Democratic Party. While all this was taking place, the Rosenbergs and Fuchs, the atomic spies, were neutralizing our great military advantage over the U. S. S. R.

Harry Truman has the temerity to say of President Eisenhower: "He deserves to be rejected by the people just as the 80th Congress was, because he is a do-nothing President just as that 80th Congress was a do-nothing Congress." While this statement is preposterous, it must be answered.

President Eisenhower has accomplished so much that it is difficult even to begin to enumerate his accomplishments. The most important contribution President Eisenhower has made is, of course, the ending of the Korean war and the reestablishment of peace. American wives, mothers, and sweethearts no longer go to bed at night wondering whether their loved ones will appear on a casualty list tomorrow.

President Eisenhower has reduced Government spending and taxes and balanced the budget. In this fiscal year, President Eisenhower will have reduced Government spending by $10.5 billion from what it was in fiscal 1953, Truman's last year, and by nearly $15 billion from what Truman proposed for 1954. The budget has been balanced in spite of a tax cut of $7.4 billion in 1954, the largest single tax cut ever achieved. This may not be an accomplishment to Harry Truman, but I think it is to most Americans.

President Eisenhower has maintained the purchasing power of the American dollar. The consumer price index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1947–49=100) was 76.9 for the year 1945. The index stood at 113.5 for the year 1952. The cost of living rose 48 percent during Harry Truman's term in office. The consumer price index in February 1956 was 114.6, as contrasted with 113.5 for the year 1952, an increase of less than 1 percent. This is quite an accomplishment for a "do-nothing" President.

In December 1955, 64.2 million people were employed. Unemployment was 2.4 million, or only 3.6 percent of the total civilian labor force. The number gainfully employed was larger than the entire civilian labor force in 1952, employed and unemployed. In 1952 the average gross weekly earnings in all manufacturing was $67.97. In December 1955 the average was $79.90, an increase of more than 17 percent. And let us remember that this increase was in real money, as the cost-of-living index stopped rising under President Eisenhower.

All of the figures under this administration are not pluses. We have a few minuses for which we are equally proud. In 1952, 59,100,000 man-days were lost through idleness from work stoppages and industrial disputes. In 1955 this figure was reduced to only 28 million—less than half of what it was in President Truman's last year in office.

Let me burden you with just a few more statistics. Personal income for the year 1955 totaled $303.1 billion as contrasted with $271.1 billion in 1952 under President Truman—an increase of $32 billion, or 18 percent. Of course, to Harry Truman this is not an accomplishment either.

Let us see how this increase of $32 billion in total personal income was distributed. The figures show that $24.9 billion, or 78 percent of the $32 billion increase in total personal income, was added to labor income—

I mean wage and salary disbursements. Dividends increased from $9 billion in 1952 to $11.1 billion in 1955—an increase of $2.1 billion, or only 6.5 percent of the increase in total personal income.

Let us also examine the national-income figures. In 1952, the last year of the Democrat administration, the national income totaled $289.5 billion. In 1955 it was $322.2 billion—an increase of $32.7 billion, or 11.3 percent, in the short period of 3 years. How was this increase in national income distributed? Of the $32.7 billion, $25.9 billion, or 79 percent, went to increased compensation of employees. Corporate profits before taxes increased $7.3 billion during this period, and remember, more than half of this amount was returned to the Government through taxes.

The statistics show that President Eisenhower's administration is not operating for the exclusive benefit of big business and stock-market gamblers as Harry Truman suggests.

From Harry Truman's speech, you would gather the impression that this administration is only interested in the very rich. He said: "Really, the only people who haven't been messed up are General Motors, big business, and stock-market gamblers." The distribution of the increase in both personal and national income does not support the repeated Democrat claims that this administration is operating solely in the interests of big business. The repeated attacks by Harry Truman, Adlai Stevenson, and Senator KEFAUVER on the businessmen in Government is a terrible disservice to the American people.

Let me remind you that prior to 1939 President Roosevelt used to indulge in attacks on the leading members of the business community. However, when the chips were down and it became necessary to mobilize our resources to fight the Nazis, to whom did President Roosevelt turn? He asked William S. Knudsen, then president of General Motors; Edward R. Stettinius, then chairman of United States Steel; Donald Nelson, the president of Sears Roebuck; Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric; and William H. Harrison, a vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., along with countless others of similar capacities and abilities, to enter the Government service. What happened? A certain Senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, proceeded to impugn the integrity of these people. He questioned the distribution of defense contracts and asserted that undue favoritism had been shown big business. Early in 1941, the Truman committee was established which plummeted Harry Truman into the Vice Presidency, and then the Presidency. A few years later, when confronted with the Korean emergency, what did Harry Truman do? He asked Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric, to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, one of the most important positions in the entire Federal Government.

Do the Democrats imply the people of the United States can only secure the service of competent people in a period of acute emergency—that the rest of the time we must be content with mediocrity, political hacks, and intellectual theorists? As a matter of fact, the Democrats when in power have recruited business leaders for many important posts. Let me remind you that our first Secretary of Defense—an unusually capable man, James Forrestal, was a Wall Street banker. W. Averell Harriman, President Truman's Secretary of Commerce after he kicked Henry Wallace out, was not exactly a barefoot boy. The Biddles and the Morgenthaus would not qualify as little-business men.

It is time that we stopped peddling this kind of nonsense, that we ceased appealing to the basest of human motivations—envy and jealousy of the achievements of others. President Eisenhower is to be commended for having secured the most capable people he could find to operate what is the biggest business in the world, our Federal Government.

Does the presence of former business leaders in the Cabinet mean that President Eisenhower has favored big business—that he has been soft in enforcing the antitrust laws? Let us examine the record. It clearly shows that that has not been the case. I sometimes wonder who speaks for the Democrat Party. They apparently have one story when they are campaigning for the Presidency and another when they are just dealing with the problems of the day in off-years. On the subject of antitrust enforcement, let us see what some Democrats have said concerning the activities of Judge Barnes who has administered the antitrust program of the Eisenhower administration for the past 3 years.

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said: "I have been in Washington many years and have followed the activities of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice most assiduously. I know of no one who has given so much of his effort and so effectively to the work of that Department as Judge Barnes."

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, said: "I have a very real respect for him, and I think he is one of the best officials in the present administration."

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, said: "I think you and your division are doing a very fine job."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, said: "I have been impressed with the type of effort he has put forth * * * and I hope that he is successful in what he is trying to do."

Thurman Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division under President Roosevelt, said: "I have watched some of the cases he has brought, and I have been very much impressed with his integrity and his vigor in antitrust enforcement."

Former President Truman and other Democrat spokesmen have tried to give the impression that the tax reductions voted by the Republican 83d Congress were exclusively for the benefit of big business. Again, let us look at the record. The first tax legislation passed by the 83d Congress was the extension of the excess-profits tax which was due to expire on June 30, 1953, and which President Eisenhower requested be extended for an additional 6 months in order to pay off the I O U's left by Harry Truman. This imposed an additional tax on corporations of $800 million. It helped make possible the reductions in personal income taxes which took place in 1954.

At the request of President Eisenhower, the Congress has extended the Korean corporate income-tax rates which were scheduled to decline in 1953. The most recent extension will produce an additional $2 billion in revenue for the Federal Government. Contrary to the claims of the Democrats, the corporations are the only group still taxed at the full Korean tax rates. This is hardly favoritism to big business.

In his Des Moines speech Harry Truman said:

"In the face of the growing military strength of the Communist nations, the Eisenhower administration has actually been cutting down on the size of our Armed Forces. In the face of growing economic strength of the Communist nations, the Eisenhower administration tells us the Soviet policies have failed."

It is preposterous to think of Harry Truman criticizing the effectiveness of our defense effort under President Eisenhower, one of our greatest military leaders.

Let me recall a little history. Harry Truman was the President who refused to spend the money Congress appropriated to build an adequate Air Force to protect us before Korea. It was Harry Truman who appointed Louis Johnson to be Secretary of Defense. Under Johnson's administration of the Defense Department, our armed strength was reduced to the lowest point since before World War II. It was Harry Truman who failed to provide adequate stockpiles of critical and strategic materials. It was Harry Truman who nominated a political crony, former Senator Mon Wallgren, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. This nomination was finally withdrawn when it became clear that the Senate would never agree to his confirmation. Senator BYRD, a Democrat, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 18, 1949, discussed this nomination. He said:

"As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I participated in the passage of the Security Act of 1947, which created the National Security Resources Board, and was therefore fully informed of the importance of the position as affecting our national defense.

"Confirmation by the Senate of appointments made by the President is one of the checks and balances of our system of representative democracy. It should not be performed as a perfunctory act, but each individual appointment should be scrutinized with the utmost care, and no person should be confirmed for a position for which he is unqualified. This is particularly true in this day when the responsibilities of our Federal Government have assumed such gigantic proportions.

"After the most careful consideration of all the factors involved, I reached the definite conclusion, as did a majority of the committee, that former Governor Wallgren was not competent to perform in a satisfactory manner the duties of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Therefore, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I voted to lay this nomination on the table, and it was tabled by a vote of 7 to 6."

I have taught military science and tactics, and my first service in the House of Representatives was as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I feel I have some qualifications in this area, but I would hesitate to consider myself an expert on the problems of designing and producing intercontinental ballistic missiles. Adlai Stevenson, Senator KEFAUVER, and other Democrats have suddenly become scientific experts. President Eisenhower appointed Donald A. Quarles, a distinguished scientist, as Secretary of the Air Force. I am willing to accept the judgment of Secretary Quarles, a great scientist, Secretary Wilson, an engineer and industrialist, and President Eisenhower, a great military strategist, in preference to the new crop of scientific wonders the Democrats are displaying.

I value the judgment of some Democrats who are willing to let the chips fall where they may. I served for many years in the House of Representatives with CARL VINSON, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who has served in the Congress since November 3, 1914. This is what he said on January 26, 1955, when the Democrats were not trying to elect a President. The Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, had just concluded his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. Chairman VINSON said:

"Mr. Secretary, I want to commend you on an outstanding statement. I have been here a long time and I have heard many résumés on world situations, and defense needs, but I believe your statement is the

most comprehensive and the most forthright one I have ever heard. Your reasoning is sound and your candor is highly commendable. I hope that the American people and the world will take full cognizance of your remarks.

"In other words, Mr. Secretary, the goal of communism is world domination; and knowing what the Communist goal is, this Nation has no choice but to maintain a strong armed force that must be able, as you have so clearly stated, to cope with local aggression and to deter the Communists in their objective of complete world control. We know the Communist objective, and therefore we know what our Armed Forces must be capable of doing.

"So I want to congratulate you most heartily for your comment and position on a matter that has bothered me for many years. I am referring to the stability of our Armed Forces. In your statement you have said: 'The lack of reasonable stability in our military programs is a most wasteful and expensive practice. We cannot afford to revert to the "feast or famine" pattern of our past history, not just because of the effect upon our economy, but primarily because we cannot take the military risks involved in such a policy. Development of a sound, long-term security requires that we design our forces so as to assure a steadily increasing efficiency, in step with scientific advances, but characterized by a stability that is not materially disturbed by every propaganda effort of unfriendly nations, or wishful thinking on the part of ourselves or our allies.'

"Mr. Secretary, there are many other parts of your fine statement which are significant and should be reemphasized. For example, you state that 'the security of the United States and the security of our allies are in reality one and the same.' I find myself in complete accord with that statement. What you have said is that a military aid program for our allies is an aid program for ourselves.

"We cannot look upon a military aid program for our allies as something separate and detached from our own national security.

"I am glad you have discussed our retaliatory capabilities. The world should know, as you have stated:

"'We are prepared to use our total resources in the most effective manner appropriate to the particular situation.'

"I repeat what I said at the beginning, your statement is the most forthright and comprehensive résumé of defense needs that I have been privileged to hear. The Nation is indeed fortunate that the Department of Defense has at its helm a man of your courage and capability."

Let us examine some of the other accomplishments of President Eisenhower, whom Harry Truman called a "do-nothing" President. Let us examine what he has done with the difficult problem of civil rights for our minority groups. Again I shall let a Democrat speak on this point. Representative Powell, a Democrat from New York, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1955, said:

"The executive and the judicial branches of our Government have passed us by so completely and are so far ahead that the peoples of our Nation do not even look to the United States Congress any longer for any dynamic leadership in the field of making democracy real. So many changes, tremendous changes, have taken place under our Supreme Court and under the leadership of President Eisenhower that many of the civil-rights bills which I used to introduce are no longer of any value. This year, for instance, I did not introduce the bill to abolish segregation in the Armed Forces; it was not needed. Nor did I introduce the bill to guarantee civil rights in the District of Columbia; it was not needed."

Let us now turn to another subject. Under the leadership of President Eisenhower, the Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which has made the entire atoms-for-peace program possible. President Eisenhower made a historic address before the United Nations in December of 1953 in which he proposed a program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. As a result of his efforts, the United Nations last August conducted an international scientific conference at Geneva where delegates from the entire world assembled to work together to advance our knowledge of the peaceful uses of the atom. Let us see what some of the leaders of the world thought of President Eisenhower's efforts in this direction. This is what they said of Harry Truman's "do-nothing" President.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his opening address to the conference in Geneva on Monday morning, August 8, 1955, said:

"Let us not fail to recall on this occasion that it is to the initiative taken by the President of the United States in the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1953 that we owe the origins of this Conference. He gave expression to the deepest hope of all humanity when he rejected the prospect that 'atomic colossi are doomed malevolently to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world' and urged the development of effective international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy which would show that 'the great powers of the earth, both of the East and the West, are interested in human aspirations first rather than in building up the armaments of war'."

The permanent president of this conference was a great Indian scientist, Dr. Homi J. Bhabha. He read a message to the conference from the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru, who said:

"I should like to send my greetings to this Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy which has taken shape at the instance of President Eisenhower. Recently, the four-power conference at Geneva gave a ray of hope to a war-weary world which had suddenly come face to face with the terror of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Now this conference will, I hope, turn people's minds still more from the evil aspect of the misuse of this great force which has come into man's hands and show the way to peaceful progress and cooperation."

Perhaps Harry Truman was unaware of these conferences, but the leaders of the world were not. Last fall, the distinguished Democrat Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN PASTORE, was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. On October 27, 1955, he addressed Committee I of the General Assembly on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. This is what he said:

"When President Eisenhower spoke before the United Nations on December 8, 1953, he did not alone speak for himself. He talked from the hearts of 165 million Americans. That is the spirit in which we will proceed on the task that lies ahead. I believe that that is the spirit that prevails here, and with that as our guide and that as our standard I know that we can pass a resolution which will be almost unanimous if not entirely unanimous, and that we can succeed on this very afternoon."

Adlai Stevenson has also joined with Harry Truman in criticizing President Eisenhower's foreign policy. In addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington on Saturday, April 21, 1956, he said our foreign policy was rigid, unimaginative. What could have been more imaginative than President Eisenhower's open-skies proposal which he unveiled at the summit conference in Geneva last summer? Few Americans appreciated the significance of this concept in cementing the solidarity of our free world allies.

When President Eisenhower left Europe in 1952 to campaign for the Presidency, the free people of Europe understood why we were participating in NATO and the reason for the stationing of American military personnel in Europe. After the election, speeches by Adlai Stevenson and countless other Democrats on their visits to Europe cast doubts on our foreign policy and its objectives. The people began to wonder whether perhaps they had not been caught in an impossible situation between two giant powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, who were determined to destroy each other with hydrogen weapons. The spirit of neutralism was rising.

President Eisenhower, with his open-skies proposal, dispelled for all time the fears that the United States would ever start a preventive war and that our Armed Forces had any mission in Europe other than the preservation of the security and integrity of the countries comprising the free world.

When President Eisenhower arose to address the Summit Conference on July 21, 1955, the sun was streaming through the windows. As he spoke the clouds gathered. A terrific thunderstorm arose. The President concluded his proposal and resumed his seat. As he did so, the Palais des Nations, the historic League of Nations building on the shore of Lake Geneva, was struck by lightning and all the lights went out. The press of Europe reported this event and suggested that our great President had received a divine inspiration. The people understood and the spirit of neutralism was dispelled.

Ambassador Lodge discussed the open-skies proposal before the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations on November 25, 1955. He said:

"The President's proposals were made for two reasons of prime importance. One is that it will help protect us all against the horrors of a surprise attack, the dread event which would mark the opening of a major war. The philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson had a phrase in which he spoke about the emphasis of understatement. It is an understatement to say that to protect us against a surprise attack is surely no less important in terms of human life than agreement on a particular program of disarmament, or even than the savings and improvement of living standards that would come from the lifting of the arms burden, important and vital though they are.

"The other cardinal reason which actuated the President is that such inspection and exchange is a practical first step toward disarmament because it would create an atmosphere of confidence in which disarmament can proceed. It should lead promptly and directly to a comprehensive, progressive, enforceable agreement for the reduction of military expenditures, arms, armament, and armed forces under effective inspection and control.

"The United States continues to seek by every means a safe method to insure that nuclear production will be employed for peaceful uses only. We seek an international agreement for the reduction of armaments which would enable the world to enjoy the benefits of the savings which would be realized from lifting the arms burden.

"The United States here renews its pledge never to use any weapons—atomic or otherwise—in any way which is not in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and in defense against aggression."

I ask, is this "rigid unimaginative" foreign policy?

Harry Truman and Adlai Stevenson did not understand its significance. Yet, another Democrat Congressman, Congressman BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas, who was also a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations General Assembly, in an address in Chicago on October 30, 1955, said:

"On this foundation of an informed world opinion we are seeking to build the enduring peace the United Nations Charter

calls for. Just 3 months ago, we witnessed a dramatic example of positive action for peace.

"This conference was a direct outgrowth of President Eisenhower's plan for United Nations cooperation in developing the atom for mankind's betterment rather than his destruction. That plan fired the imagination of all people. It held out hope to mankind that what was desirable—was obtainable * * * peace and a fuller life. The atom conference was of inestimable value. I venture to say that each one of us will benefit personally from that exchange of atomic information in the field of health, agriculture, and industry. It was of value, too, in easing tensions.

"We can be proud as Americans of initiating the idea of a common meeting ground to discuss the atom's future role in the world. We can be proud, too, of the part our scientists, our Government, and our business community played in making the atom conference an outstanding success.

"The peaceful atom is on the agenda of the current General Assembly. Just 3 days ago, Thursday of this past week, in the Political and Security Committee, a resolution for furthering the atoms-for-peace program was passed 53 to 0. This action by the United Nations is another stride forward toward implementing President Eisenhower's proposal of December 8, 1953: that the atom might not be dedicated to man's death but consecrated to his life.

"Also on the agenda for this session is the problem of disarmament. The United States has taken the initiative on this issue, too. I am sure you are all aware that the Disarmament Commission had been bogged down for many months. But now it has before it a realistic plan for lifting the burden of arms from the backs of men: * * * President Eisenhower's proposal for an exchange of military blueprints and aero-photographs between the United States and the Soviet Union. This plan suggests a way to solve what has appeared to be for many years an unsolvable problem.

"It has caused a great stir around the world—this 'open-sky' inspection plan. For over that giant loudspeaker of the United Nations platform what we're calling for, in effect, is this—

"'End the arms race! Do away with the impetus to war! Open up the skies so that no nation need fear surprise attack by another nation. Let's have disarmament—one in which the whole world may rest easily—a disarmament with inspection.'

"Such a plan would be a milestone away from the eternal threat of war."

In spite of all this, Harry Truman had the temerity to say, "the foreign policy is messed up." Let us see what some of our friends abroad think of President Eisenhower's foreign policy. After all, they ought to know something about it.

President Paul E. Magloire, President of the Republic of Haiti, in an address to a joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress on January 27, 1955, said:

"Our visit to the United States, which has afforded us the privilege of being welcomed by one of the most brilliant soldiers of the 20th century and at the same time gives us the honor of being the guest of the Senate and the House of Representatives in joint session, is a new proof of the closeness of the relations between our two nations. The people of Haiti, who follow with interest President Eisenhower's personal efforts to eliminate prejudices of all sorts which constitute handicaps to the mutual understanding which is our common objective in this hemisphere, are very optimistic with respect to the future of these relations. In his merciless fight against the nefarious ideology which the forces of evil try by every means to establish on earth, President Eisenhower has shown that he is of the lineage of those eminent Americans, true citizens of the universe, whose acts throughout the history of this marvelous country aimed less at the greatness of the United States than at the triumph of those fundamental truths without which man cannot attain his goals. His efforts to arrive at international control and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes have already won him the gratitude of all those who are concerned about the future of the human race. The understanding he has found both on the part of Members of Congress and of his fellow citizens and the unreserved approval of his efforts by all free peoples and by all those who aspire to be free, makes him the most authoritative spokesman of a civilization which refuses to fall into the chaos into which a degrading materialism is trying to drag it, which denies to man any rights as an individual.

"His past achievements on the field of battle preserved the independence of the great and small nations of Europe, of Asia, and of the Americas. As Chief of State of a Nation which has from the day of its birth been the most perfect example of the value of a democratic government, he seeks to guarantee the right to life of those states whose every existence is threatened today. In this tribute of gratitude which the Americas owe President Eisenhower for his fruitful efforts, I am happy to join my voice to that of all the countries of this hemisphere, particularly the underdeveloped countries in which poverty constitutes a fertile field for the development of the noxious germs of communism."

President Eisenhower is not only our President, he is also the leader of the free world, and I venture to say even has admirers behind the Iron Curtain. When President Eisenhower was stricken last September the prayers of all of the people of the free world were offered in his behalf. At the Christmas Pageant of Peace here in Washington the Ambassador from Laos, Ambassador Ourot R. Souvannavong, said:

"Let us pray to God to grant a long life to the President, for his life is necessary to the happiness of many of us and to the peace of the world."

His Excellency, Dr. Don Joaquin Jose Vallarino, the Ambassador of Panama, said:

"The President of the United States is today the most outstanding person in his efforts to bring peace and prosperity to the whole world. In that respect he is not only a citizen of the United States but is considered a citizen of the universe, and everyone looks up to him as the person who can accomplish these purposes."

When President Eisenhower announced that he would be willing to serve as President for another term the press of the world were almost unanimous in their jubilation at his decision. The chancelleries of Europe could not refrain from showing their relief.

Crosby S. Noyes, the European correspondent of the Washington Star, reported from Paris as follows:

"At least on this side of the Iron Curtain President Eisenhower's decision to run for a second term has been warmly received in Europe.

"While all official comment is carefully hedged to avoid giving the impression of interfering in the 'internal affairs of the United States', virtually every Western European government has managed to express its satisfaction at the news which broke here late yesterday afternoon.

"The restraint is less than usual in such cases, possibly because most Europeans take it as a foregone conclusion that Mr. Eisenhower will be reelected by a greater majority than the last time whether he campaigns actively or not."

"This prospect is being generally hailed as a contribution to peace, prosperity, and solidarity of the Western World. To a marked degree it takes the form of a personal tribute to Mr. Eisenhower and the moderate line which he is felt to represent. Significantly some of the most enthusiastic comment has come from quarters which have loudly criticized American policy in Europe since the President's illness.

"General reaction contrasts sharply with European sentiment during the last presidential campaign, which more or less openly favored Adlai Stevenson as a candidate for the White House. Even during the congressional elections last year there was considerable rejoicing over the Democratic victory in both Houses of Congress.

"The switch is explained perhaps by the fact that Europeans today look on President Eisenhower as a nonpartisan leader, able to work with both liberals and conservatives. It also reflects anxiety at the prospect of any radical change in United States policy or even a period of turmoil and confusion which a presidential campaign usually entails."

The Times of London said:

"It is impossible not to admire the devotion to duty which has led him, after prolonged private debate, to this decision."

The Morgenbladet of Oslo said:

"The whole free world will greet the President's decision with satisfaction."

The liberal News Chronicle in Great Britain said:

"In a man of his kind, such a decision is a rededication.

"A professional soldier who turned politician is prepared to continue working for a world in which soldiers would become superfluous."

The Nation Belge in Brussels said:

"The decision was happy news for the United States, for Europe, and the free world."

A prominent French politician told Drew Middleton, correspondent for the New York Times that:

"In the circumstances, what the West needs is someone who can talk to the Russians both as the leader of the most powerful nation in the world 'and as a man who has convinced the Russians of his sincerity'."

Drew Middleton also said:

"Moreover, as this source and a number of others noted, the President, in his previous role as Supreme Commander of Allied Powers in Europe, became committed to holding the Western line in Europe. Naturally they expect him to exert himself in this field and they think that because the Soviet leaders respect him, President Eisenhower has a better chance than any other Western leader of maintaining the peace."

Only Harry Truman, Senator Kefauver, Adlai Stevenson, and the other Democrat hopefuls say our foreign policy "is all messed up". I sometimes wonder whether even they really believe it.

The foreigners who deal with us know that they can trust President Eisenhower. If the Democrats would stop attacking him and proceed to enact his legislative program, they would be doing a great deal more for the people of the United States. As I have said before, the 80th Congress performed well. The 84th Congress, under Democrat leadership, has become a "do-nothing" Congress. Here are a few of the President's legislative proposals which are awaiting action by a Democrat Congress: an expanded highway program; a school building program; a health program; the revision of our labor laws; and, a soil bank. There are many others which would benefit all our people.

Former President Truman devoted a major portion of his speech in Des Moines to attacking the agricultural program of the present administration. Most of the decline in farm income and in the parity ratio occurred before the 1955 crop year which was the first under an agricultural program supported by this administration. The surpluses were accumulated under legislation supported by former President Truman and a Democrat Congress.

President Eisenhower sent his farm message to Congress on Monday, January 9, 1956. In view of the hearings that had been held by the Senate Agriculture Committee throughout the summer, it would have been possible to enact workable agricultural legislation and place a bill before the President which he could sign by the middle of February. We still have no legislation because a Democrat Congress has been more interested in November politics than in helping the farmers attain a fair share of the national income.

Our friends in Iowa can see through this obvious plan to discredit the Republican Administration. The performance of the Democrat-controlled Congress on the farm program will make the label "do-nothing" stick to the 84th Congress. No matter what we do now, the farmers will not receive the income that they should during 1956. They will not thank the Democrats for playing politics now when they vote in November.

Let's stop attacking President Eisenhower and get to work. Let's give him the support which the American people have a right to expect of us.

I have said before that I am concerned that we do not destroy our world posture. In a speech I made on the Senate floor on July 6, 1955, just before President Eisenhower left for Geneva to attend the Summit Conference, I said:

"We are living through the most critical period of Western civilization. President Eisenhower carries the most momentous responsibilities of any man alive today. When he meets at Geneva with the leaders of the countries behind the Iron Curtain for negotiations which may have consequences which may last a generation, he should carry with him the assurance that this country is united behind him in defending our basic liberties, our belief in God, and the free-enterprise system, which has been endorsed repeatedly by both major political parties. None of us were elected to this body as Socialists, so let us speak and act like Republicans and Democrats who, regardless of our political differences, are all dedicated to the preservation of a free-enterprise competitive economy.

"Mr. President, we are approaching an election in the United States. Some partisans on both sides of the aisle may make extreme statements which cannot be supported and which can seriously damage our position internationally."

This statement has even greater applicability today as the election campaign is now under way.

I hope that there will be no more ridiculous speeches such as the one made by President Truman in which he makes charges against a great world leader which not only are unfounded but can only give comfort to those abroad who wish to see the United States torn apart by partisan strife.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 10754. An act to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines; and

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 10721) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEVELOPMENT OF POWER FROM ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I turn my attention to the subject matter I have planned to discuss today in the field of foreign policy, I wish to make brief comment on the speeches of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I wish to commend them for forewarning the American people about the posture in which we find ourselves in the worldwide race for the development of atomic energy power and atomic energy uses.

For quite some time now some of us have been warning the American people that we are laggards in this race. I remember it was not so long ago that we had the historic debate in the Senate on the atomic energy bill itself.

Senators will recall that when that bill came before the Senate and an attempt was made on the very afternoon it was taken up for consideration to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill some of us felt the bill was in serious need of revision, and we so suggested. When it became apparent that the leadership wanted to put that bill through with little or no debate, there started what became known as the filibuster on the atomic energy bill. My recollection is that for some 13 days and 6 nights we discussed the bill on the floor of the Senate.

As a result of that discussion, I am satisfied there were added to the bill some amendments, not one of which would have been aded to the bill if the discussion had not been had. Those amendments need some reflection today, because, in my judgment, as the result of that historic debate in the Senate we put the American Government in such a position that it has the legal power and right and, I may say, the duty, to proceed to cooperate with American industry in the development of an atomic energy program which in a very short time will bring us neck and neck with other countries and then speed us on, as should be the case, far down the stretch ahead of Russia. As has been pointed out today by previous speakers, it is generally recognized that we are lagging behind Great Britain. There is reason to believe that we are lagging behind Russia.

No one will fight harder for the protection of the principle of private enterprise and competition in this country than the senior Senator from Oregon. However, I have said before, and I now repeat—and I expect to be criticized for it again, as I have always been in the past—that there are some activities so huge and tremendous that private industry cannot perform them alone, at least in the early stages of the development. I believe the development of power from atomic energy is one of those activities. I said so time and time again during some of the long speeches I made on the atomic energy bill when it was before the Senate.

In the course of that debate I pointed out that we needed to adopt amendments which would protect the people's interests and certain patent rights; that a public preference provision was needed and that, of course, there should be in the bill language which would authorize the Federal Government to proceed to develop, on a Federal basis, an atomic energy program by way of building plants, if events should show that that was desirable in the public interest.

In my judgment, subsequent events have proven not only the desirability of the amendments which were added to the bill after a long fight, but subsequent events have shown that the time has come—in fact, it is long overdue—when the Federal Government should proceed with the building of what may be called pilot plants to hasten the development of an atomic energy power program.

We were confronted with that situation during the war in connection with synthetic rubber. If we look back to the war days, we will see that we were able then to go forward with a program in which private industry was not asked or expected to pay for all the risk involved. We have before us now an economic risk which ought to be subsidized by the Federal Government until such time as the program can be developed on an economic basis and can be turned over to private enterprise.

My record is perfectly clear. I agreed that the rubber plants should be turned over to private enterprise, although I disagreed with some of the conditions upon which they were turned over. However, it is very important that we keep in mind the synthetic rubber parallel or analogy, because it has many things in common with the program under discussion. Private enterprise cooperated with the Federal Government all through the development of the synthetic rubber program. The brains and managerial ability and efficiency of those operating the natural rubber plants were utilized by the Government as a part of a patriotic war service. They served the American people effectively and ably. The result is that we have now developed in this country a synthetic rubber industry second to none in the world. Although we still make important use of natural rubber, in case of a great international emergency we could get along very well without it.

The synthetic rubber program cost a great amount of money. It may have

been a very small sum in comparison with what the atomic energy program will cost, but still it did cost a great many millions of dollars of the American taxpayers to pay the full bill. The bill was not paid by the private rubber companies. The American taxpayers paid the bill. That is as it should be, because, in my judgment, that happened to be one of the costs of the war.

But there are costs of peace, too. There are some fields of endeavor in which we must forge ahead in the interest of peace. I happen to believe that an atomic energy program is such a field.

I believe that has been brought out very clearly by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I am willing to spend the taxpayer's money for peace, because in spending it for peace we make a sound investment in defense dollars.

We cannot wait the long period of time I am satisfied it will take for private enterprise to build up the atomic energy program which our day and age needs. I believe the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico made that point very clear this afternoon.

We cannot permit this Nation to fall behind Great Britain and Russia in the development of an atomic energy program on any assumption that in due course of time private enterprise in America will do the job.

A few days ago I testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with regard to one facet of this program. I stand on that testimony, and on the research which went into it. I am satisfied that it is generally agreed that without Government participation in the program, we will lose the atomic energy race. We dare not allow that to happen from the standpoint of our own security, and we should not from the standpoint of the economic welfare of our people and the spreading of the greatest amount of happiness to the greatest number of people, which could very well flow from a sound atomic energy program.

Therefore, I endorse the recommendation of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], that there be developed in various places in the United States some so-called pilot plant atomic reactors. In fact, there is pending before a committee of the Senate a bill which I introduced some time ago suggesting that an experimental plant be started at Hanford, Wash., because there is already an installation there, as is well known, although the operation at Hanford happens to be still top secret. There is nothing top secret, however, about the fact that there is a great atomic energy installation at Hanford, Wash.

As I have indicated, I suggested many months ago, rather early in this session of the Congress, that further consideration be given to the idea of an atomic energy power pilot plant at Hanford to see whether the heat which is now wasted at that installation might somehow be harnessed and used in connection with a type of atomic reactor. Following an investigation, made at my request by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and a report from the Atomic Energy Commission itself, it would appear that if an atomic energy pilot plant should be developed at Hanford it should not be one which would make use of wasted heat, but one which would make use of other facilities.

But, be that as it may, Mr. President, it is important, in my judgment, that the Government establish—and the law permits it to do so—not only a pilot plant, but across the country at appropriately selected spots to be agreed upon by the experts, a series of atomic reactors, which can develop in an experimental way various phases of an atomic energy power program, to the end—and let the RECORD show that I said so today—that in due course of time, when this great new discovery of man has been harnessed in such a way that it can be operated on an economic basis for the production of power, within our competitive system, it be turned over to private enterprise, on condition that reasonable compensation will be paid.

I think we have got to do that, Mr. President; we have much time in which to do it. Here is another opportunity, Mr. President, for a democratic government, for a government of free people, again to demonstrate that self-government is the best vehicle, after all, for promoting programs which will serve the general welfare of the people.

So, Mr. President, I endorse what has been said by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico today, and I strongly urge that the Congress support a program which will result in the taxpayers of the United States investing some defense dollars and some peace dollars in an atomic energy program based upon the development of some Government reactors across the country.

There was one point I wanted to mention to show some of the obstacles which face private enterprise in this matter. Take the matter of insurance. What is private industry saying to us today in regard to the development of atomic reactors? They cannot afford the insurance risks, because so little is known about the cause-to-effect and the effect-to-cause relationships in this whole question of atomic power. We do not know to what extent risk may be incurred in locating a reactor at point X with reference to the health and the safety of the people living within the environment of that reactor.

I happen to believe that we cannot be justified in expecting private industry in such an instance to assume all the risk. We, the people, ought to assume it; all of us ought to assume it, because it is a program vital to the general welfare, and it may very well be that if we do not proceed with it rapidly our failure to do so will be fatal to the security of our Nation.

Mr. President, that is only one facet of the problem. We are not proposing that private industry be shut out of the program; quite to the contrary.

Again, Mr. President, I recur to my synthetic-rubber analogy. I want private enterprise in the atomic energy power program with the Government, and I am perfectly willing to say that until we get it down to an economic basis, down to the point where private industry can operate it, under our competitive system, which is a sound private enterprise system, I am for the Government paying a subsidy to speed up the program. That means Government participation, too. It may mean the building of a Government plant, development of the facilities, and then saying to General Electric or Westinghouse or Massachusetts Tech, or to any other group, "You come in now. This is your pilot plant laboratory, so to speak; you operate it and develop it to the point where we shall have it as part of our economic system."

Once the American people come to understand the relationship of such a program to their own security, I am not worried about the possibility of being called a creeping Socialist because of my advocacy of this proposal, but, rather, I recognize that under our private-enterprise system there are sometimes things which the Government has to do in order to assure survival.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that yesterday the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary filed a staff report on the study which the committee has conducted of General Motors. Throughout this session of Congress, the subcommittee has been conducting prolonged research and holding extensive hearings upon the various phases of the antitrust laws and the monopoly problem. The subcommittee authorized the publication of a committee print of the staff report on the General Motors hearings. I wish to emphasize that this is not the subcommittee report; it is the recommendations of the very able and well-equipped staff which conducted the research and which planned the hearings, over which I had the honor to preside.

GREAT DEMAND FOR STAFF REPORT

Although the report was printed only this week, it is already in great public demand. The Superintendent of Documents has received so many requests for it that he has asked that a special resolution be agreed to, to authorize the printing of at least 5,000 copies, to be sold by the Superintendent of Documents.

I should like the great public, which throughout the antitrust and monopoly hearings, wrote to me and the other members of the committee, to know that this document, containing about 119 pages, will be, when the resolution shall have been agreed to, as I have no doubt it will be, because of the demand, available for sale at the office of the Superintendent of Documents for only 35 cents a copy. Other copies will be available for the committee and for Senators. I am looking forward to a wide demand for the document.

I hope the general public will examine this summary of the facts which were developed at the hearing. General Motors Corp., I am told, already has ordered 500 copies of the document.

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE

Mr. President, the importance of a public knowledge of the contents of those hearings and the contents of this report cannot be exaggerated. Only last night, by invitation of the Student Bar Association of the George Washington University Law School, I spoke on the subject of the concentration of economic power, with special emphasis upon General Motors. I did not ask for the opportunity; I was invited by the young students. It was they who selected the subject. I was delighted that so many young students of this law school in Washington were interested to receive a discussion of the facts.

Many persons have assumed—and I have noticed the implication in the press—that some members of the committee, and possibly the chairman, are antagonistic to General Motors as a corporate entity per se, and regard it as an evil per se. That is not the fact at all. We undertook the study of General Motors because we knew that it was the largest manufacturing corporation, not only in the United States, but in the whole world. We knew that its operations were efficiently conducted. I have no question at all about the efficiency of the product, for I myself am the proud possessor of a Cadillac car manufactured by General Motors. We were interested in it as a case study of the structure and operation of an economic state of great power and the effect thereof on economic freedom.

I am, nevertheless, not oblivious of the fact that when a corporation grows so great that it has plants in scores of cities and States, and has subsidiary corporations abroad, in Canada, in Britain, and in Germany, it exercises a tremendous effect upon the economic life of the people of the United States.

We think of General Motors Corp. and other corporations as normal entities. But during the hearings, for the first time, I think, small-business corporations throughout the United States, constituting the dealers who sell General Motors cars, Ford cars, and Chrysler cars, realized that they were not at all in the same category as the giant corporations which make the products which the dealers sell to the people. It was made clear, for example, that automobile dealers, who invested their own capital in building their own showrooms, their own repair shops, their own establishments, were not the judges of how to manage those establishments; they were not the judges of what to buy or how much advertising to use; they were not the judges of what the demand in their communities would be. They were under strict control by the central management, who told them what to do. This was made clear by the fact that, although the selling arrangement or the franchise arrangement between General Motors and its dealers—and this was true of the other manufacturers—was only for a year, it could be terminated at the will of the company.

The General Motors management realized that there was so much dissatisfaction among the dealers that, when the hearings began, Mr. Harlow H. Curtice, the president of General Motors, rose in the committee room and announced that hereafter the franchise would be for 5 years, instead of for 1 year. Although the time extension was granted, there was no change whatsoever in the power of the General Motors management to terminate the franchise.

DEALERS ENTITLED TO A DAY IN COURT

For myself, I express the definite opinion that economic freedom, free enterprise for automobile dealers, cannot be established until Congress passes a law allowing a dealer to raise, in court, the question of the validity of the violation of the franchise or the dealer contract, whichever it may be. But that is not the point I wish to emphasize today.

Nobody in the United States, surely, is unaware of the fact that our people today are locked in a great struggle between dictatorship and free government. The Constitution of the United States was written by men who believed in free government, and when they spoke of free government, they were talking not of political freedom alone, but of economic freedom, too, and so they gave to the Congress of the United States, of which this body is one House, the plenary power to regulate commerce, in these words:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

The very first Congress, held under the Presidency of George Washington, enacted a Navigation Act, and that act gave the Federal Government in Washington the power to regulate transportation of passengers across the Hudson River between Manhattan and New Jersey. The owner of the passenger boat immediately raised the cry that we have heard ringing down a century and a half which have passed since the establishment of the Constitution: "What does Washington want to do, interfering with our business? The Government in Washington has no business to interfere."

The issue was raised upon the contention that commerce was only traffic in baggage and freight; that the transportation of passengers was not commerce. Now we know how wrong they were, because we know that the railroads and the airplanes and the vessels and all modes of transportation of persons interstate and with foreign nations, are under the regulation of Federal laws. But this is one thing that we do not know, and it is apparently a thing that Henry Ford II did not know when, last week, he spoke at the Sheraton Park Hotel to Ford dealers, and said in part: "We do not need a law. We can handle this business ourselves. We can carry on this great economic enterprise, national and international in scope, as it is, without Congress interfering." I do not pretend to quote his actual words. I merely want the RECORD to show that what he was saying was that Congress should not interfere in the regulation of this motor business, in the public interest.

WHAT THE CONSTITUTIONAL FATHERS THOUGHT

But the constitutional fathers thought we had the power to regulate, and a great Supreme Court Justice, who was no radical, also thought so. I refer to John Marshall. He was one of the Federalists. He was an opponent of Jefferson, who was the radical of those days. In the case which interpreted the authority of Congress to regulate navigation, the case of Gibbons against Ogden, John Marshall laid down the law, which has never since been changed. He interpreted the law and the Constitution, and he said the right of Congress to regulate commerce is plenary and extends not only to commerce across State lines and across the oceans or across national lines, but extends to the regulation of wholly intrastate commerce which affects the national interest.

I want to show briefly what the concentration of economic power is doing to this country in the deprivation of economic freedom for the people and the businessmen of the States which they have inherited from the framers of the Constitution.

THE AMAZING CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

The United Press has, for a number of years, been publishing annually a list of the billion-dollar corporations in the United States, corporations the assets of which exceed $1 billion. The latest report from the United Press is that in the year 1954 there were 70 such billion-dollar corporations. Some of them had assets as great as $10 billion, but the whole 70 corporations had assets amounting to more than $201 billion.

If every man, woman, and child in America constituting our population of over 160 million each had assets of $1,100, they would not have assets equal to those of the 70 billion-dollar corporations that carry on the interstate and foreign commerce of this country.

I remember that many years ago a very distinguished lawyer, who was a Member of this body, when discussing the failure of prosecutions under the antitrust laws, remarked that it is impossible to convict any person who wears a Hart Schaffner & Marx suit. That was the well-advertised, ready-made suit of fashionable cut in those days. What has been revealed in the hearings is that the wholly owned subsidiary corporation of General Motors, the General Motors Acceptance Corp., with assets in excess of $2 billion, is, in fact, a banking institution, through the power of which it is possible, just because of its great weight and its great wealth, to suppress competition.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL BARNES' VIEWS

Assisant Attorney General Barnes, at this time head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, testified before our committee. He testified regarding mergers; and before the committee he recorded the fact that he had approved the applications of six automobile companies to merge. They were Studebaker and Packard, Nash and Hudson, and Kaiser and Willys. Without any law of Congress, without action by any court, without action by any congressional committee, the Assistant At-

torney General said to these applicants, "If you merge, we shall not bring suit against you for violating the antitrust laws." The declaration that no lawsuit would be filed was based on the sound belief on the part of Mr. Barnes that if no prosecution were undertaken and if the mergers were permitted to be made, the three new companies would be able to deal more competitively with General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler.

Yesterday, the newspaper dispatches from Detroit carried a story—how true it is, I do not know—quoting a Mr. Dann, of that community, who represented the stockholders of the two companies, as saying that there was under consideration a plan by which General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford would loan them $50 million, in order to keep the Studebaker-Packard Corp. from going under. Whether true or not, Mr. President, the story illustrates the fact that in the United States we do like to have competition.

INTRODUCING GRAND CENTRAL IN GENERAL MOTORS

When one considers the fact that 70 United States corporations have assets of over $201 billion, one's attention is drawn to the testimony submitted by General Motors Corp. at our hearing—as that testimony appears at page 3575 of part 7 of those hearings—that the 50 largest stockholders of record as of August 8, 1955, in terms of the common stock, the par value of which is $1⅔ a share, owned 38.94 percent of the total outstanding common stock of General Motors Corp. The great company, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, of Wilmington, Del., owned 63 million shares, which constituted 22.88 percent. The next largest stockholder was GM Shares, Inc., of Wilmington, Del., which owned 2.81 percent. The next largest 48 stockholders—some of them corporations; some of them individuals—did not own as much as 1 percent apiece. But that group regulates this monster industry.

I made an analysis of the holdings of the directors of the corporation; and the following are the amazing statistical figures:

There are 32 directors of General Motors Corp. Sixteen of those directors hold directorships only in General Motors Corp. The other 16 hold outside directorships.

The 16 who held outside directorships, held a total of 81 directorships in banks, insurance companies, railroads, finance companies, industrial companies, and local companies and corporations. Ten of them were directors of banks, as well as directors of General Motors Corp; and those banks had assets of $8,224,000,000.

Three of them were directors of insurance companies, the assets of which amounted to $15,588,000,000.

Six of them were directors of railroads and public utilities, the total assets of which were $8,117,000,000.

Four of them were directors of finance companies, the total assets of which amounted to $572 million.

Twenty-seven of them were directors of other industrial corporations, having total assets of $11,610,000,000.

So, Mr. President, it appears that those 16 directors of General Motors Corp., with their 81 directorships in other companies, were representing—exclusive of General Motors Corp—corporations which had a total asset value of $44,111,000,000. That means concentration of economic power. It means such a concentration that neither the cities nor the States of our country can stand up against it.

THE CHALLENGE WE FACE

Mr. President, if we desire to win the so-called cold war, if we desire to preserve free government in the world, we must preserve economic freedom here in the United States. If we lose it here, it is lost for all mankind. That challenge faces us now.

I would forgive every pending antitrust case in the Department of Justice if, in exchange for that forgiveness, I could bring about the establishment by the Congress of the United States, in harmony with the leading business statesmen of America, of a business code of ethics which would banish forever the practices by which coercion has been exerted by concentrated money upon the livelihood of the American people.

Mr. President, do we wonder that the cold figures show there is a farm problem when farm income is decreasing? Do we wonder that there is a small business problem with small business corporations finding it difficult to exist? Do we wonder why it is that Studebaker and Packard only recently thriving companies, sought to merge, first, to preserve their existence, and that they are now negotiating with various interests, possibly for a loan, and possibly for the sale of their assets? The reason why farm income is going down and small business income is going down is that we in Congress have neglected the problem of the billion-dollar corporation which does business throughout the world.

Think of the problem in the Middle East. Why are we so concerned about the tensions there, and why is it that very little, if anything, is done? It is because great oil companies, some of them American companies, some of them Dutch companies, some of them British companies, are more interested in holding onto the oil which they have secured by their negotiations with the governments of foreign nations than in anything else.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make a comment at that point. I am fearful that the politics of oil has become bigger than American foreign policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall enter into any compact with any other State, or with any foreign nation, without the consent of Congress. Yet these oil companies enter into compacts with the British Government-dominated oil companies and the Dutch-dominated oil companies, and they do what the States, which created them under the Constitution, do not have the power to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, let me say that I think the Senator has placed his finger upon one of the most vital problems facing American foreign policy. I think he illustrates the great need for a complete change of attitude in this country in respect to American foreign economic policy.

What the Senator has described and labeled is dollar diplomacy. We must get away from it. We must get away from the policy of the flag following the dollar, to one in which the dollar follows the flag. That means, of course, that we must exercise Federal jurisdiction over international commerce so far as American corporations are concerned.

I know the criticism to be expected as a result of making this statement. Let me say again that I think the peace and security of the American people are dependent upon our exercising exactly that control.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We read in the newspapers today about the difficulty the defense forces are having in maintaining their strength. We read in the newspapers of the lack of reenlistments, even in the Air Force. Why? Our people do not want to go to war to sustain business enterprises which are operating under European law.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why should General Motors Corp., for example, go over to Britain and take out a charter under the British Government without the consent of Congress? Why should the Ford Co. go abroad to organize under foreign law without a congressional permit? Why should petroleum companies go abroad and enter into the cartel practices of Western Europe, with the result that they learn the practices of monopoly and put them into operation at home, thereby destroying the economic freedom which we received from the founders of the Constitution?

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from Wyoming for emphasizing this point. I happen to be one who believes that trade policies in the field of foreign relations of American corporations are in many instances working to the great detriment of American foreign policy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, Senators who remain to hear me pay me a great compliment. This is the time of day when committees are not in session. We are approaching the end of the week. After exhausting work during the week Senators are seeking a little relaxation.

GENERAL MOTORS AND ITS INTERLOCKING DIRECTORS

Let me read a few names from the list of the directors of General Motors who are also directors in other corporations:

Donaldson Brown, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Lammot du Pont Copeland, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Alfred Pritchard Sloan, Jr., also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Donaldson Brown, also a director in Gulf Oil Corp.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Gulf Oil Corp.

Alfred Pritchard Sloan, Jr., also a director in Kennecott Copper Corp.

George Whitney, also a director in Kennecott Copper Corp.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Newmont Mining Corp., one of the largest mining companies in the world.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Newmont Mining Co.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Homestake Mining Co., the great gold mining company in South Dakota.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in International Nickel Co. of Canada.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in McIntyre Porcupine Mines, Ltd.

Henry Clay Alexander, also a director in Johns-Manville Corp., American Viscose Corp., Standard Brands, Inc.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Continental Can Co., and American Express Co.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in International Nickel Co.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in North American Aviation, Inc.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in Remington Arms Co., Inc.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in American Airlines, Inc., Briggs Manufacturing Co., Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc., American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters, Inc., National Steel Corp., Sheraton-Cadillac Corp.

Edward F. Fisher, also a director in Gar Wood Industries, Inc.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Koppers Co., Inc.

George Whitney, also a director in Continental Oil Co.

Charles F. Kettering, also a director in Mead Corp.

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire list of names. I ask unanimous consent that the entire list may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MOTORS CORP. DIRECTORS

(Directorships held exclusive of General Motors itself (and exclusive of educational and charitable) classified by type of business)

BANKS

Henry Clay Alexander, also a director in J. P. Morgan & Co.

George Whitney, also a director in J. P. Morgan & Co.

Donaldson Brown, also a director in Safe Deposit & Trust Co.

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., also a director in Wilmington Trust Co.

Lammot du Pont Copeland, also a director in Wilmington Trust Co.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in Wilmington Trust Co.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Marine Midland Trust Co.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Marine Midland Corp., Jersey City.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Central Savings Bank of New York City.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Southern Arizona Bank & Trust Co.

Charles T. Fisher, Jr., also a director in National Bank of Detroit.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in Dominion Bank (Canada).

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Mellon National Bank & Trust Co.

INSURANCE

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in General Reinsurance Corp.

RAILROADS AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Pennsylvania Railroad.

Lammot du Pont Copeland, also a director in Pennsylvania Railroad.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in Detroit Edison Co.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in Michigan Bell Telephone Co.

George Whitney, also a director in Consolidated Edison Company of New York.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in Canadian Pacific Railway.

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., also a director in Diamond State Telephone Co.

FINANCE

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., also a director in Christiana Securities Co.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in Christiana Securities Co.

Lammot du Pont Copeland, also a director in Christiana Securities Co.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Lehman Corp.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Pennsylvania Co.

George Whitney, also a director in Discount Corporation of New York.

INDUSTRY

Donaldson Brown, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Walter S. Carpenter, Jr., also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Lammot du Pont Copeland, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Henry B. du Pont, also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Alfred Pritchard Sloan, Jr., also a director in E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Donaldson Brown, also a director in Gulf Oil Corp.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Gulf Oil Corp.

Alfred Pritchard Sloan, Jr., also a director in Kennecott Copper Corp.

George Whitney, also a director in Kennecott Copper Corp.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Newmont Mining Corp.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Newmont Mining Corp.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in Homestake Mining Co.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in International Nickel Company of Canada.

Robert Samuel McLaughlin, also a director in McIntyre-Porcupine Mines, Ltd.

Henry Clay Alexander, also a director in Johns-Manville Corp.

Henry Clay Alexander, also a director in American Viscose Corp.

Henry Clay Alexander, also a director in Standard Brands, Inc.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in Continental Can Co.

Lucius D. Clay, also a director in American Express Co.

Lewis W. Douglas, also a director in International Nickel Co.

Henry B. Du Pont, also a director in North American Aviation, Inc.

Henry B. Du Pont, also a director in Remington Arms Co., Inc.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in American Airlines, Inc.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in Briggs Manufacturing Co.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in American Broadcasting-Paramount Theatres, Inc.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in National Steel Corp.

Charles T. Fisher, also a director in Sheraton-Cadillac Corp.

Edward F. Fisher, also a director in Gar Wood Industries, Inc.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Aluminum Company of America.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Richard King Mellon, also a director in Koppers Co., Inc.

George Whitney, also a director in Continental Oil Co.

Charles F. Kettering, also a director in Mead Corp.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This list shows that in this one corporation, the greatest manufacturing corporation in the world, there are mingled the directorships of more than a score of the great corporations which carry on the trade and business, not only of America, but of the entire world.

We have been drifting. However, the time is coming, and coming rapidly, when we may realize that the loss of American principles will be the result of failure to act.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SPEAKS

Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Stanley N. Barnes, was interviewed by Mr. Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times, last month. In the interview published on March 9 he indicated that there was undue concentration in General Motors. I understand that the Department of Justice, through its Antitrust Division, is presently considering bringing an antitrust suit against General Motors in order to divest it of its bus-manufacturing division. General Motors makes about 80 percent of the motor buses built in the United States, and all competition has been wiped out.

Mr. President, do we want to live in a free economic world, or do we want to live in a controlled economic world?

Judge Barnes, for whom I have great admiration, and who is a man of great integrity and ability, said in the interview that he thought General Motors ought to give up one or more of its divisions. He even went so far as to indicate that it might divest itself of its ownership of Frigidaire and of its financing operations.

My belief is that it ought to give up its financing operations, because GMAC is the money instrument by which competiton is bound and tied and made unable to move.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, the interview given by Assistant Attorney General Judge Barnes to Mr. Anthony Lewis and published in the New York

Times of March 9, 1956, and the interview which I gave to Mr. Lewis a day afterwards, which was published in the New York Times of March 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1956]

UNITED STATES AIDE SUGGESTS GM GIVE UP UNIT—BARNES OFFERS, WITHOUT ANY ADVOCACY, A STEP TO EASE UNDUE CONCENTRATION

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, March 8.— Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General, suggested today that the General Motors Corp. could stop the trend toward economic concentration in the automobile industry by giving up one or more of its divisions.

The Government's antitrust chief said in an interview that General Motors could set Oldsmobile up as an independent company, for example, or divest itself of its Frigidaire, truck, or financing operations.

"I offer these purely as examples, without any advocacy," Mr. Barnes said. But he added pointedly that if concentration continues in the automobile business and General Motors does not take action on its own, "somebody's going to do something."

General Motors produced about 55 percent of the automobiles that have been made in this country since January 1, according to industry figures. During the same period the 2 remaining independent companies—Nash-Hudson and Studebaker-Packard—accounted for 5 percent of production. Ford's share was about 25 percent, and Chrysler's 15 percent.

Last month in a speech Mr. Barnes charged that "an undue concentration" of economic power "is becoming more and more recognizable each day in the automotive industry." He noted especially that the independents had accounted for 15 percent of auto production in 1949 but were now down to a third of that.

Some persons critical of Mr. Barnes' speech said he seemed to be suggesting that the Government could force people to buy automobiles makes they did not want. If the public prefers General Motors cars, these critics said, what could the Government do about it?

Mr. Barnes answered that question today with his suggestion that one or more of the General Motors' five automobile divisions—Chevrolet, Pontiac, Oldsmobile, Buick, Cadillac—be divided off as independently owned companies.

"You could spin off several divisions each one of which would have the ordinary advantages of business concentration," Mr. Barnes said. Establishing one or more of the General Motors lines as independents, he said, would accomplish the aim of increasing competition without in any way using Government pressure on the public's choice of automobiles.

Asked whether he or his staff had conveyed any suggestion to General Motors that it voluntarily divest itself of any division, Mr. Barnes said:

"Well, I can't talk about that."

"NONSENSE," SAYS CURTICE

Harlow H. Curtice, president of General Motors, called the suggestion "nonsense" when questioned about it today. He said General Motors has violated no antitrust laws.

There have been some recent indications of concern on General Motors' part about antitrust matters. The company revised its dealer contracts after public complaints that they gave the corporation too much power over the dealers.

Aside from voluntary action by General Motors, Judge Barnes saw two possibilities for antitrust action—a suit or suits by his Antitrust Division, or new legislation by Congress.

The Antitrust Division has had under active study for months a proposed civil antitrust suit asking that General Motors be divested of its bus-manufacturing division. The suit is now reported ready for filing, but Mr. Barnes said today that no final decision has been reached on the matter.

The broad situation in the automobile industry is getting "serious consideration at the highest levels of the Justice Department," he said. He indicated that any action aside from the bus suit would require rearrangement of the division's limited manpower for a concentrated automobile study—perhaps a "crash program"

No such study has been ordered yet, he said.

Indications are that failure of either of the two remaining auto independents might provide the impulse for drastic antitrust action in the automobile field. Banks and insurance companies that hold the independents' securities would probably join in pressure on the Justice Department and Congress to do something.

Mr. Barnes said today that in such a situation—if concentration continues—there would be possibilities for "extreme action," including the chance of "some rather stringent legislation."

For example, the antitrust statutes now provide that proof of a dominating position in a market is not enough for the Government to win its case. It must also prove that the company has a tendency to use this monopolistic position in a monopolistic way.

Mr. Barnes noted that Congress could amend the law to provide that acquisition of more than a certain share of any market—say 50 percent—would be ground for antitrust action. Or, he said, Congress could pass a law that would force automobile companies to divest themselves of subsidiaries that finance installment purchases. The General Motors Acceptance Corporation has grown to one of the world's largest in the field.

Mr. Barnes has been nominated to the United States Court of Appeals. But he indicated that if he is confirmed, his departure will not change the Justice Department's concern about the automobile situation.

"I don't want to give the impression that I'm sitting around here thinking up ways of slapping a sensational suit on General Motors," he said. "But if concentration continues, somebody's going to do something—maybe not me, but somebody."

[From the New York Times of March 11, 1956]

SENATOR BIDS GENERAL MOTORS REDUCE ITS UNITS—O'MAHONEY URGES DROPPING FINANCING DIVISION AND BUS MANUFACTURING

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, March 10.—Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY called today for separating the installment financing, bus and perhaps other divisions from the General Motors Corp. He excepted from his proposal the company's five automobile lines.

The Wyoming Democrat, who headed a Senate Monopoly Subcommittee investigation of General Motors last fall, said he would favor legislation to make the company give up its financing operations if it did not do so voluntarily. The General Motors Acceptance Corp., which handles financing of General Motors cars, is one of the country's three largest installment borrowing concerns.

"I think it would be a great stimulus to the economy and would counteract a concentration of economic power if General Motors would strip itself, first of all, of its financing company," Senator O'MAHONEY said. "Financing operations have nothing in the world to do with the manufacture of automobiles.

"UNDUE ADVANTAGE" CITED

"The union of financing and an automobile company gives the company an undue advantage over all other competition because it can borrow money at a much cheaper rate than any independent financing concern. The larger a company is, the cheaper it is to borrow money and use it to expand its control."

Senator O'MAHONEY made his statement in commenting on suggestions by Assistant Attorney General Stanley N. Barnes that General Motors could stop a trend toward "undue concentration" in the automobile industry by giving up one or more of its divisions. Mr. Barnes heads the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

Mr. Barnes said that any one of General Motor's automobile divisions, or the Frigidaire or truck or financing operations, could be set up as an independent company. He noted that General Motors now made 55 percent of this country's automobiles, while the so-called "independents" were down to 5 percent. He also said that if the trend to concentration continued and General Motors did nothing on its own, "somebody's going to do something."

"Mr. Barnes has made a distinct contribution to the solution of the problem of the concentration of economic power," Senator O'MAHONEY said today.

"As a matter of fact, he reminds me of the recommendations that were made by the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941," the Senator added. "That report recognized the fact, which Mr. Barnes has now expressed, that there can be too much power in one group.

"General Motors is an excellent example of that fact, and the suggestion of Mr. Barnes that it might be persuaded to spin off some of its operations—like GMAC financing, Frigidaire or the manufacture of trucks—is excellent."

"LIKE O'MAHONEY TALKING"

The Senator added this reference to Mr. Barnes:

"He sounds like O'MAHONEY was talking."

The monopoly subcommittee has not yet turned in a report on its General Motors hearings. The staff has made some suggestions, and they may be acted on by the committee next week.

Senator O'MAHONEY said he personally would favor legislation prohibiting automobile companies from engaging in the financing business. He added that he felt it would be "a benefit to the economy if the manufacture of buses were separated from General Motors, and perhaps the manufacture of diesel engines."

"Whether General Motors should be asked to split up its motor divisions is a question I'd be inclined to answer in the negative," the Senator said, however.

"We have competition within the divisions."

Senator O'MAHONEY himself drives a 1950 Cadillac. A staff assistant said he thought the Senator prefers General Motors cars actually.

RECOMMITTAL OF THE BILL TO COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there was filed this morning from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a report on the bill (S. 1574) to provide for payments by the Secretary of the Interior to owners of non-Federal water-use facilities for hydroelectric power benefits realized by the United

States therefrom, and for other purposes. The bill cannot be taken up today, or, in all probability, on Monday. The committee will meet in regular session on Tuesday.

I was absent from the committee meeting at which the committee voted to report the bill. Because I had notified the chairman of the committee that I could not be present at the meeting, after I had understood that no controversial measure would be acted on, and because I should like to have an agreement reached on this important measure, which deals with waters of the West, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be recommitted with the report for further consideredation by the committee on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what the calendar number of the bill is?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was reported only about an hour ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill was reported today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not on the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming whether the minority members of the committee were advised of this proposed action?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sought all day to get in touch with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], but was unable to do so. I understand he is out of the city. I wish to say that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has done a remarkable job from the standpoint of cooperation on most of the bills it has reported. There has been some disagreement about certain investigations it has carried on, but there has been remarkable unanimity on bills which have been reported by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind waiting until I have had an opportunity to get in touch with minority members of the committee? In the meantime I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would be happy if the Senator would do that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request pending, and the quorum call was for the purpose of bringing to the floor the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

I say to the Senator from Arizona that last week, when the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs met, I called up the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] who wanted some action taken, and told him of the status of the business before the committee. I got the impression that there would be no controversial matter coming up this week. I wrote him a letter stating that I understood no controversial matter was coming up. I hoped the report on Senate bill 1574 would not be filed until I had the opportunity of discussing the bill with the full committee on next Tuesday, which would mean a delay of only 2 or 3 days. Of course, the Senate cannot go behind the records of the committee. The assumption is that a quorum was present, but it may be seriously doubted whether a quorum was present when the bill was ordered reported.

I hope the Senator from Arizona will concede to me an opportunity of discussing the bill with him in the full committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this is the first I have known of the Senator's desire to have the bill discussed further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I tried to reach the Senator today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have been busy in other committee work today.

Hearings were held on the bill on May 27, June 29, and July 13 of last year. Open public hearings were held.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The bill has been before the full committee twice this year. I do not recall that the Senator from Wyoming was present at the first full committee hearing this year, but suggestions were made to change the language of the bill.

The bill came before the committee last week, and suggestions were made to perfect the bill. All who were present agreed to the suggestions, and the bill was reported. On the question of reporting the bill the chairman said "The ayes have it, and the bill will be reported as amended."

I shall be perfectly honest with the Senator from Wyoming. We have always enjoyed mutual kind feelings. The bill has been in the committee for the second year, and I think the place to conduct the argument on it is on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not argue the bill with the Senator now. I have been counting upon the harmonious relationship which has existed between us on all legislation, with this exception.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I hate to find an exception in those cordial relationships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may be able to convince me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am confronted with a long meeting of the lobbying committee. I do not like to see this bill held up any further. I would not want to have it die. I suggest that we allow it to go on the calendar as reported today, and let us argue it on the floor of the Senate. It is a bill which was recommended by the President; it is a part of the administration's program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator will agree with me that if we argue it on the floor it will do more harm to the bill than if we argue it in the committee. Because of the character of the bill there will be only the attendance of the committee members, and we can do a much better job in the committee. Let it go back to the committee, where the work of the Senate is done.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I feel that the work of the committee has been done on this bill. It has been before the committee for over a year. There have been hearings held on it and there have been reports printed. The members of the opposition have expressed themselves very well and thoroughly, as have the proponents.

I cannot honestly imagine what more could be brought out for or against the bill in committee. To be perfectly honest with the Senator, I am most reluctant in taking this stand, because if there is a Senator on the opposite side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle with whom I have enjoyed working, it is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very grateful to the Senator. Let us keep the record going for another week.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am sure we can keep it going, even if the bill is sent back to the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator adamant on that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am most adamant on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are many steps which can be taken in the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I realize that thoroughly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think if the Senator will allow me to analyze the bill paragraph by paragraph in the committee, the result in the end will be better.

I am not going to talk any more about it, Mr. President. I hope my unanimous-consent request will be submitted, and I hope the Senator from Arizona will follow my example and graciously take his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—the Senator from Arizona will graciously take his seat, but before doing so he graciously objects to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today I wish to release certain correspondence which I, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, have received from Mr. James P. Warburg, of New York. Mr. Warburg is a well-known financier, a prominent citizen, and a leader in foreign affairs problems.

The first is a letter addressed originally to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; but it is a mimeographed letter which was sent to each member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and also, I understand, to other persons.

I discussed the matter with Mr. Warburg, and he said he would welcome a public discussion of the point of view expressed in the letter which he sent to the chairman of the committee, to other members of the committee, and to other

persons, for the purpose of eliciting some public interest in his point of view.

I also wish to have printed in the RECORD, together with the letter I have just mentioned, a pamphlet entitled "Turning Point Toward Peace," written by Mr. Warburg, which is on the subject of American foreign policy.

Also, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Mr. Warburg to me, dated April 16, 1956; and also a letter entitled "Our China Policy," written by Mr. Warburg, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of recent date.

I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *April 9, 1956.*

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Attached hereto is a copy of my today's letter to Senator GEORGE, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I should be most grateful for your comment or criticism. In any case I hope that you agree that the situation is now so serious that no time can be lost without great danger.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES WARBURG.

APRIL 9, 1956.

The Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Since our correspondence last autumn concerning my published proposals for a basic revision of United States foreign policy, matters have gone from bad to worse. Not only has the predicted Soviet diplomatic and economic offensive materialized but affairs in the Middle East have taken an even more serious turn than anticipated. This letter is prompted by a deep concern over the fact that the mounting crisis does not as yet seem to have stirred either Congress or the administration to effective action.

It is now perfectly clear that the two immediate aims of Soviet policy are:

1. To win the friendship or at least the benevolent neutrality of the uncommitted peoples of Asia and the Middle East, thereby outflanking the Atlantic community and eventually encircling it.

2. To weaken the Atlantic alliance at its vital center by encouraging neutralism, fostering cleavages among the participants and, if possible, isolating the United States.

In recent months, Soviet leadership has made dangerous progress in both directions.

Is it not apparent that the present bipartisan foreign policy of the United States is inadequate to meet this challenge and that, in fact, some of its aspects play directly into the Kremlin's hands?

In the Far East we are frozen into immobility by our stubborn refusal to recognize the unpalatable but immutable fact that there is no way to settle the questions of Korea, Indochina, and Formosa by peaceful means, except through negotiations with the Chinese People's Republic. You yourself have issued several statesmanlike appeals for such negotiations. Meanwhile, in the absence of direct, highlevel negotiation, we remain poised indefinitely at the brink of war. Not only that, but we increasingly alienate our allies and potential friends by a policy which seems dangerous and unreasonable to all except Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, both of whom openly desire war.

Last July, you wisely warned against our allowing our support of our European allies to place us in a false position with respect to the emerging peoples of Asia, Africa and the Middle East. The disregard of that warning has had disastrous consequences. The subordination of political considerations to the attempt to complete an encircling band of military pacts and alliances has failed to create military strength and has, on the other hand, created precisely that political weakness and dissension which the Communists desired to exploit.

The SEATO alliance has weakened rather than strengthened the anti-Communist front in Asia by antagonizing India and Burma, creating an atmosphere throughout southeast Asia dangerously receptive to Soviet propaganda. Our insistence upon Japanese rearmament, in violation of the constitution which we imposed, is turning Japanese sentiment against us. A recent report to the Japanese Economic Planning Commission expressed the opinion that the West is in the process of losing southeast Asia. As southeast Asia goes, so, inevitably, goes Japan. If southeast Asia goes Communist, Japan will be unable to live except by trade with countries under Sino-Soviet domination.

In the Middle East, the abortive attempt to erect a military barrier against Russia has merely opened the door to Communist political penetration. The Baghdad Pact has split the Arab world, brought Israel and the Arab states to the verge of war and made Egypt into the focal center of an anti-Western revolt which has spread from Asia Minor into north Africa. Our two major allies, France and Britain, now face the loss of possessions which would render the one politically impotent and the other financially bankrupt.

Perhaps most serious of all is the effect of this disaster upon the organization of states which forms the heart and soul of the anti-Communist coalition. The southeastern flank of the NATO alliance has disintegrated. Greece is disaffected because of its quarrel with Britain over Cyprus. Greece and Turkey are no longer on speaking terms. Tito has withdrawn into neutralism.

Worse yet, on the vital central front of NATO, the cream of the French contingents have been withdrawn into north Africa. The 12 West German divisions, for the sake of which we have wrecked our European policy and foreclosed the hope of a German peace settlement, will not exist for 3 years—if, indeed, they ever come into existence as a reliable reinforcement of NATO. German sentiment is rapidly veering away from Chancellor Adenauer's leadership.

The British, the French, the Italians, and the Germans are openly demanding a basic revision of coalition policy. The bankruptcy of that policy is apparent in every part of the world.

What more could the Russians desire? What more is required to make the United States undertake a serious reexamination of the premises upon which it has been operating?

The fact is that Stalin's aggressive tactics originally frightened us into making two assumptions which I ventured to challenge on several occasions in the past when I was invited to testify before your Committee. These assumptions were:

1. That Western Europe constituted the primary target of Soviet expansionism; and

2. That the aggressive designs of international communism would be carried out primarily by military means.

These assumptions led us into twofold error. They led us to adopt a Europe-oriented policy in Asia and the Middle East, instead of a policy based upon the conditions existing in those areas. They led us to attempt the building of a worldwide anti-Communist coalition upon the sole foundation of military defense against physical invasion.

To undermine such a structure, Stalin's heirs needed only to make a convincing show of renouncing warlike intentions and to support Asian and Arab nationalism. The first move was easy because the Russians themselves had never wanted a major war. The second was made possible by our failure to lay the political, economic, and psychological foundations for an effective anti-Communist coalition.

The situation is not yet hopeless, but it is rapidly deteriorating and may well become hopeless unless the United States takes remedial action within the next few months.

Since the administration seems unwilling or unable to undertake the necessary revision and revitalization of American policy, could not such action be initiated by your committee?

With warm personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

JAMES P. WARBURG.

TURNING POINT TOWARD PEACE

(By James P. Warburg)

(Foreword)

The "Summit Meeting" at Geneva, held in the 10th year of the Atomic Age, marked the belated recognition of the outstanding fact of the era which had dawned at Alamagordo—namely, that war had ceased to be even a last resort instrument of national policy and that, in President Eisenhower's phrase, there no longer existed "any alternative to peace."

The meeting resulted in no compromises or agreements, no relinquishments of aims or abandonment of principle by either side. Yet, if more of history remains to be recorded than human history's end, this meeting, presided over by the grim specter of the hydrogen bomb, may well mark the birth of a new age of peace. What happened at Geneva in July 1955 was that the major potential combatants in a final catastrophic conflict recognized that they had no choice but to settle their disputes by peaceful means or, failing that, to find a way of getting along together with their differences unresolved.

The bright hopes raised at Geneva can be fulfilled only if we, the people of the United States, do our part. We alone cannot prevent the holocaust and bring lasting peace to a strife-torn world; but unless we do our full share of the work to be done, the world cannot be safely guided through the present perilous period of transition into what promises to be an age of almost unimaginable progress and prosperity.

Not only our country but the whole world suffered a severe and tragic blow when illness incapacitated a leader who, more than any other single individual, had recently come to personify the new spirit of conciliation and the world's hope for peace. Yet our country can and must rise to the great opportunity which lies before it.

Now more than ever, the extent to which our Nation fiulfills its responsibilities depends upon us as individual citizens. It is true that the future hangs upon the wisdom and skill of the leaders whom we shall elect to office in the coming year; but we, the citizens of the United States, are going to determine the standards by which the fitness of candidates will be measured and to which the candidates will have to conform in order to be elected.

As we approach this test, there are hopeful signs that we are awakening from the long nightmare of irrational fear and self-destructive impulse which has for a time submerged our common sense and paralyzed or perverted our great, creative potential. If this convalescence continues—as the writer firmly believes it will—the anxious months through which we are now living

may well go down in history as the turning point toward peace.

We are privileged to live in a time in which politics as "the art of the possible" has assumed wholly new dimensions, when the impossible is often only that which has not been attempted and when, as Justice Brandies once said, "the irresistible is often only that which is not resisted."

There are already in the Congress of the United States men and women able and eager to face not only the dangers but the vast opportunities for creative work which lie before us. You will meet some of them in this book. They were sent to Congress by constituencies in which the citizens demanded above all else constructive leadership toward peace. These citizens and the representatives whom they have elected set the pattern for all of us to follow. Let them tell their own story.

JAMES P. WARBURG.
GREENWICH, CONN., *October 1955.*

PART I

Chapter 1. Fresh from the people

On March 16, 1955, an unusual event took place on Capitol Hill. Seventeen freshmen Congressmen, recently elected from districts widely scattered across the country, joined together in a 2-hour plea for a "revitalized foreign policy which would put some political, social, economic and spiritual flesh on the bare bones of our present military measures against communism." The group represented not only 30 out of the 35 first-year Democrats in the 84th Congress but a number of first-year Republicans as well.

This violation of the unwritten rule that freshmen are to be seen but not heard was committed with the advice and consent of the House majority leadership and, far from arousing resentment, was enthusiastically applauded by many of the veteran legislators on both sides of the asile. HENRY S. REUS: of Wisconsin, the leader of the freshman group, was afterwards personally congratulated by no less than 50 colleagues. The venerable BARRATT O'HARA of Illinois praised the novice group as having come "fresh from the people" with the courage to defy custom and to speak out at a moment "when the whole world is resting on a concentration of atomic power needing only the winking of an eye to set it ablast." There could be no question that many of the older Members of the House listened sympathetically to Congressman CHARLES VANIK of Ohio when he said:

"I have sat here day after day and patiently listened; I have listened for hour after hour to tedious eulogies of Congressmen who were and no longer are. I spent, I believe, a portion of 1 day listening to a eulogy of the groundhog of Pennsylvania. Entire sessions of this Congress have been consumed in a mutual exchange of birthday greetings. We have spent more time debating the service of food and the quality of the food in the Capitol cafeteria and restaurant than we did in toto on the Formosa resolution."

JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania, told a reporter that "the whole thing wouldn't have occurred if this group had not felt that the people back home wanted something done," that "you can almost reach out and touch their sense of uneasiness." THOMAS ASHLEY, of Toledo, spoke of "the misgivings and confusions with respect to the conduct of our foreign policy, which I often hear in my own district," expressing the view that the uneasiness derived "from an inability to sense a broader purpose in the conduct of our effort to contain communism." EDITH GREEN, recently elected from Portland, Oreg., was sure that her constituents were more concerned over the dangerous drift in diplomacy than over any other issue.

These young legislators were indeed fresh from the people. Arriving in Washington conscious of the anxiety of their constituents and hoping to take part in remedial action, they were shocked to find Congress floundering in trivialities while the Secretary of State piled up air mileage in lieu of diplomatic achievement and foreign policy, to use REUSS' phrase "zigzagged into the wayward paths of agonizing reappraisal, unleashing Chiang, massive retaliation, the New Look, liberation, and other tired slogans" only to return to the Truman policy of containment which at best had been merely an expedient.

Were these novices wrong in their conviction that the folks back home wanted a fresh and more creative approach to foreign policy? Or were they more nearly right than their elders who, if not wholly content with the stagnant and inflexible bipartisan policy, had certainly not seen fit to criticize it?

Within a week of the freshman revolt, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, the powerful and widely respected chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, came out with a statement urging a four-power conference and, by implication, chiding the administration for its reluctance to explore the possibilities of negotiation. On April 11, 1955, Adlai Stevenson, the until then strangely silent titular head of the Democratic Party, raised his voice in protest against risking war over Matsu and Quemoy. Prior to that time, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, one of the handful of Senators who had taken a stand against the Formosa resolution in January, had filled 12 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with short extracts of letters he had received expressing anxiety and discontent with the administration's conduct of foreign affairs.

The freshmen Congressmen were not wrong. Little as their unconventional effort was noted in the press, they correctly sensed the mood of the American people. To say that they touched off a nationwide revolt would be a gross exaggeration, but it is no exaggeration to say that they articulated, sooner than their veteran colleagues, a revolt which was definitely stirring and which, though still largely silent, made it possible for President Eisenhower to break more and more openly with the belligerent rightwing of his own party. It was Congressman UDALL, of Arizona, who said, during the debate of March 16:

"Mr. President, be a little less fainthearted. Perhaps you have more support here than you know of."

Summary of Debate

What did the freshmen Congressmen propose? Let their leader, HENRY S. REUSS summarize the debate in his own words: [1]

"The theme running through the House debate was a simple one. Since nuclear war is capable of destroying civilization, this country can no longer ignore some of the tensions, which quite apart from the centers of Communist power in Moscow and Peking, threaten world peace.

"Military containment is not enough. It must be accompanied by efforts to unite Germany, to permit free governments in Central and Eastern Europe, and to back the fight of underdeveloped peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East for freedom from colonialism and feudalism, their hope for economic aid on an international basis, and their desire for a position of noninvolvement in great-power rivalry.

"What would be the effect on the hearts and minds of Americans everywhere, I asked in the debate, if the President were to come before Congress and offer a constructive program to ease some of the current causes of world tension? If, for example, the President were to speak out before Congress in this vein:

" 'We Americans want peace, and we want to do our part to secure the peace.'

"To the people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East who are about to meet at Bandung, we say this: If you agree, we will ask the United Nations to take over Formosa as a trusteeship, to assume its defense against the aggression that threatens it, and to promote the development of self-government by the Formosan people. If you agree, we will reverse our refusal to join the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and will work with you, both inside and outside the United Nations, for social and economic advancement and against colonialism and feudalism.

"To the people of Europe, we say this: West German rearmament is under way, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany, a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the United Nations.

"To all people of all nations, we say this, We reaffirm our hope to end the destructive phase of nuclear development and to seek man's advancement through science. We rededicate ourselves to work in humble hope with the rest of the world toward the goal of permanent peace, for our own continued survival is hinged to the prospect of permanent peace.

"Such a proposal would recognize the limits of our power to deal with Red China, and would instead concentrate on winning the friendship of the uncommitted peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. The U. N. trusteeship suggested involves no recognition of Red China or admission of Red China to the U. N., no de-recognition of Chiang, and no weakening of our determination to defend Formosa. A trusteeship proposal could well be accommodated to the continued defense of Formosa by Chiang's troops, and the right of Chiang to seek democratic office in Formosa under a U. N. trusteeship. A U. N. trusteeship would enable us to get out from under our current untenable position, whereby we maintain Formosa as a United States province and foist upon it the Government of Chiang without the consent of the 7 million Formosans. A trusteeship would give India and other Asian countries an opportunity through the U. N. to participate not only in the administration of Formosa but in its defense.

"In Europe, the proposal of an unarmed area stretching from the Rhine to Russia's historic boundaries answers whatever is legitimate in Russia's age-old complaint against armed and hostile nations on her borders. By any rational standard, Russia would gain greatly by acquiring such realistic security in exchange for allowing a united Germany and liberation, under some sort of Federal arrangement, for the countries of central and eastern Europe If Russia turned down such a proposal, it would give us the incalculable advantage of making our side the champion of German unification of liberation for the satellites, and of a united Europe. Armed with this moral advantage, the West could then go forward with German rearmament, for which ratification is now almost completed, with a whole heart.

"As tensions disappear, and not until then, will real disarmament be possible."

In the May 1955 issue of the Progressive, Robert Bendiner commented:

"REUSS and his colleagues will probably get nowhere with their particular plan, but, if they have done nothing else, they have served the country well by making it again respectable to talk of genuine negotiation and of large-scale aid to remote nations of the earth. Opponents rose to cry 'appease-

[1] HENRY S. REUSS in the New Leader of April 11, 1955.

ment' and to mutter about 'glo-boloney.' But their views seemed more shriveled and pointless than ever in the glare of a test explosion in Nevada that lit up the sky from Montana to Mexico."

This study proposes to carry forward the initiative of the congressional group. The writer, having advocated similar ideas during the years when it was not yet respectable to do so, does not agree that REUSS and his colleagues will probably get nowhere, provided that they follow up their initial effort.

The American people have been behaving, during the first decade of the atomic age, very much like a group of passengers in an airplane flying blind through a snowstorm and groping for an airport encircled by unseen barren mountains. They have acted like helpless individuals sealed into a metal tube, strapped into their seats, unable to escape and unable to communicate with the pilot. Some have sweated out the landing; some have unconcernedly read westerns or comic books; quite a few have taken sleeping pills hoping not to wake up until the wheels touched ground.

But, unless all the signs fail, this period of passivity is about over. The people are beginning to realize that they are not helpless, that they can communicate with the pilot, and that they know what they want to say to him. The people are going to demand of those who stand for office in 1956 precisely what Congressman REUSS and his colleagues are seeking to develop, namely, a revitalized foreign policy which will put some political, social, economic, and spiritual flesh on the bare bones of our present military measures against communism.

If the chapters which follow serve to throw some light upon how this may be done, this book will have served its purpose. In order to avoid any confusion between what was said in the congressional debate of March 16, 1955, and what the writer has added by way of expansion and elaboration, excerpts from the record of the debate are included in the appendix.

Chapter 2. The fleshless bones of bipartisan policy

Before considering how our foreign policy might be revitalized, let us see why the congressional group felt so strongly that it needed overhauling.

First of all, there was the fact that some $350 billion of cold-war expenditures had neither assured the United States of victory in the event of another world conflict nor provided any guaranty that such a conflict would not take place. On the contrary, it seemed in March 1955, that there was actually a greater danger of a catastrophic war than ever before.

Secondly, because our foreign policy had not brought us peace, it had prevented the resumption of "normal" peaceful progress here at home. The cold war had distorted our economy, creating a dangerous pseudo-prosperity based upon huge Government expenditures for armament.

Peace and peaceful progress are, after all, the basic objectives of national policy. Why had we not attained them?

The Misleading Scapegoat Analysis

Many Americans would be inclined to answer: "Because of the Communists." Unless we realize that this is a very incomplete answer, we shall not get very far with any attempt to revitalize and reorient our foreign policy.

The truth of the matter is that President Roosevelt and President Truman based their wartime policy upon an assumption which turned out to be false. This was the assumption that Soviet Russia, having been a loyal if at times difficult ally during the war, could be counted upon to cooperate with equal loyalty in making and preserving the peace. When it became apparent to Mr. Truman that such was not the case, he did a very natural thing; in his disappointed realization that his hopes for a just peace settlement and a smoothly working peace enforcement machinery had been based upon an over-optimistic appraisal of Soviet intentions, he swung full circle to the conclusion that Soviet intransigence was practically the sole reason why peace had not been achieved. When Soviet refusal to allow free elections in Eastern Europe, Soviet obstructionism in Germany and Communist pressure on Greece and Turkey were capped by Russian rejection of the Marshall plan, and, finally, by the rape of Czechoslovakia, in February 1948, Mr. Truman said to Congress:

"The situation in the world today is not primarily the result of natural difficulties which follow a great war. It is chiefly due to the fact that one nation has not only refused to cooperate in the establishment of a just and honorable peace, but—even worse—has actively sought to prevent it.

"The agreements we did obtain, imperfect though they were, could have furnished the basis for a just peace—if they had been kept.

"But they were not kept. They were consistently ignored and violated by one nation.

"One nation has persistently obstructed the work of the United Nations." (Message to Congress, March 17, 1948.)

This explanation was true insofar as it alleged that a powerful and power-hungry Soviet dictatorship, apparently aiming at the ruthless achievement of world dominations, was challenging the fundamental belief and principles of western civilization. It was not true that only the Soviet Union had violated the wartime agreement[2] and we know now that these agreements—Teheran, Yalta, and especially Potsdam—would not, if kept, have ensured a just peace. Moreover, even had it been true, this explanation would have presented only a small part of the truth; it failed to mention all the other threats to peace which existed at the conclusion of World War II—threats which would have existed even if Russia had been governed by a friendly and cooperative democratic regime, instead of by a hostile, Communist dictatorship. By ignoring all but one of the major factors which combined to create the midcentury world crisis, this oversimple scapegoat explanation of failure led to the logical conclusion that, if only Soviet imperialism could be checked or destroyed, no other serious obstacles would stand in the way of the establishment of enduring peace. Both the analysis and the conclusion were dangerously inconsistent with the facts. Let us recall just a few of them.

Basic Causes of the Postwar Crisis

World War II had accelerated the decline of Western Europe and completed the 50-year process which gradually transferred the center of gravity of the Western World from one side of the Atlantic to the other. This shift left the West European nations with the habit of exercising a world power they no longer possessed, while placing the United States in possession of world power which it was ill-prepared to exercise.

The decline of Western Europe and the total elimination of German and Japanese power by the policy of unconditional surrender had removed or weakened the former barriers to Soviet expansion, leaving vacuums into which Russia proceeded to push but which Russia had not created. Russian pressure, plus the suction of the vucuum itself, had forced the United States to exert counterpressure.

With power concentrated in only two surviving superpowers, the traditional European method of preserving the peace by balance-of-power maneuvering on the part of a number of more or less equal "great powers" had finally become totally obsolete. In the absence of a world organization endowed with the power to enforce universal disarmament, there could now be only peace by agreement between the two superpowers or a race for preponderance of power leading, in all probability, to war.

Finally, the invention of atomic and superatomic weapons had invalidated the traditional concept that "war is the extension of policy by other means." Overnight, instruments of defense had become instruments of self-destruction.

These four facts were at least as important as the existence of an aggressive, expansionist Soviet dictatorship. They called for a realization that the world was confronted with a wholly new set of problems in making and preserving peace. Apart from these changes in the nature and distribution of power, there were two other even more important elements in the world crisis which the simple, scapegoat explanation ignored:

World War II had touched off the long-smoldering revolution against European colonialism. Japanese defeat of European power in Asia and then the destruction of Japanese power by the United States had left the peoples of Asia more on their own than they had been since the first European footholds had been established. The news that the end of the white man's rule in Asia was at hand spread to the Middle East and to Africa. The dawn of freedom on two vast continents produced the inevitable strains and tensions of emerging nationalisms and the inescapable internal conflicts between the old power groups and the new. This in itself would have been enough to create a world crisis.

In addition, however, and quite apart from the revolt against colonialism, two-thirds of the human race was in a rising state of rebellion against conditions of life hitherto patiently accepted as immutable. As the news of scientific and technological progress spread among the world's backward peoples, there spread with it the revolutionary knowledge that hunger, poverty, and pestilence were evils to be conquered rather than burdens to be borne. This, too, sufficed in itself to produce a crisis in world affairs.

Looking back, we can see that the Soviet dictatorship had had very little to do with the decline of Western Europe, with the gradual polarization of power, with the obsolescence of colonialism, or with the technological revolution. The United States, not Soviet Russia, had been the nation to penetrate the secrets of atomic fission and thus to lead the world into a wholly new era for which it was politically, psychologically, and spiritually unprepared. Certainly, it was true that a ruthlessly cynical Soviet regime had exploited every aspect of this many-faceted world crisis and that, in so doing, it had made the establishment of peace infinitely more difficult. To state this fact in the context of other facts would have been to present a true picture. To hold the Soviet Union almost solely responsible for the crisis, for the failure to reach a solution and for the resulting struggle between two hostile power orbits was a perhaps natural but nevertheless dangerous distortion of the truth.

The Bipartisan Containment Policy

Both of our two major political parties shared in adopting the scapegoat explanation of disappointment. The result of this bipartisan loss of perspective was the evolution of a policy which did not aim at the positive achievement of goals consistent with the American character, tradition, and national interest but which aimed almost solely at the frustration of Soviet ambitions. This involved a surrender of initiative unsuited to the American temperament. Moreover, this negative policy orientation was not only

[2] The Potsdam agreement was first obstructed by France and later violated by all the signatories.

unlikely to generate creative enthusiasm at home; it was even more unlikely to attract friends and allies abroad, except among ruling groups primarily interested in preserving the status quo.

When, in addition, this bipartisan policy began to seek the containment of an essentially political threat by military means, it was foredoomed to failure, particularly since it relied upon military power which did not exist and could be created only by a powerful and firmly united coalition.

The containment policy succeeded in Greece and Turkey and, later, in Korea, where actual military threats existed and where the threatened peoples possessed the will to defend themselves. It succeeded magnificently in Western Europe during the years when it was based upon the recognition that the Communist threat was essentially political and when the Marshall plan cut the ground from under Communist penetration by promoting a spectacular economic recovery. It became less successful in Europe from the moment when military rearmament superseded economic recovery and particularly when the proposal to rearm West Germany undermined Europe's solidarity. Elsewhere—notably in Asia—containment failed and was bound to fail because in its preoccupation with military defense, American leadership did not develop the affirmative, creative purposes which alone might have captured and guided the Asian and Middle Eastern revolutions. Emerging nationalism was alienated by support of the remnants of European colonialism. Land reform, next to nationalism the most powerful magnet of political attraction, was left for the Communists to exploit. A futile intervention in the Chinese civil war alined the United States with the past instead of with the Asian future.

Ironical Results of its Failure

Largely as the result of the failure of the containment policy in Asia, there developed, between 1950 and 1952, a curiously ironical situation in our domestic politics. The loss of China made possible the rise of McCarthyism and placed a Democratic administration almost fanatically dedicated to militant anticommunism on the defensive under a charge of being soft toward Communists. The collapse of Chiang Kai-shek followed by the involvement of the United States in a costly, stalemated war in Korea, plus the disclosure of a certain amount of laxity in domestic security, provided the Democratic administration's less scrupulous opponents with material out of which to construct a wholly spurious charge of treason. It is scarcely too much to say that in its last 2 years the Truman administration was almost completely paralyzed by the rantings, investigations, and charges of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

At the end of its incumbency, the Truman administration was bogged down in Asia in a war which it could neither win nor settle by negotiation. It was frustrated in Europe by a revolt against ratification of the treaties which would make the rearmed two-thirds of a permanently partitioned Germany into the keystone in the arch of West European defense. Yet, before it became the prisoner of its own mistakes and of its critics, the Truman administration had saved Greece, Turkey, and Western Europe. It had gallantly stood off the Russians at Berlin, and even more gallantly gone to the defense of the Republic of Korea. Psychologically perhaps most important of all, it had convinced the majority of the American people that their future was inextricably interwoven with the future of the rest of mankind. The Marshall plan and the point-4 program, though the latter was far from living up to its advance billing as a bold new program of aid to the underdeveloped areas, were the outstanding symbols of a new era in American foreign policy. So, in another sense, was the North Atlantic Alliance, before the rearming of West Germany became an end in itself, rather than a means toward reaching a European settlement.

Republican Promises of 1952

In the 1952 campaign, there was no real debate over foreign policy. Republican leadership sought to make capital out of the failure of a containment policy which, on the whole, had enjoyed bipartisan support. However, far from recognizing the basic causes of the failure, the Republicans undertook to outdo the Democrats at their own game. The foreign policy plank in their 1952 platform, drafted chiefly by John Foster Dulles, promised a program that would mark the end of the negative, futile, and immoral policy of containment which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism which in turn enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction.

The meaning of this rather bombastic language was that the Republican leadership would undertake, if elected, not merely to contain but to roll back Communist power; that it would recognize the permanence or legitimacy of the Communist dictatorships, since to do so would be to "abandon countless human beings to * * * despotism and godless terrorism."

The Republican leadership was apparently thinking more of domestic politics than of formulating foreign policy. Its platform promised to repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings, such as those of Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements. In a Pulaski Day statement, issued from Denver, on October 11, 1952, General Eisenhower personally endorsed this promise, declaring presumably for the benefit of Americans of Polish descent, that the Republican Party "pledged repudiation of the Yalta agreement which * * * has resulted in the enslavement of Poland." (It was, of course, not the Yalta agreement but its violation by the Soviet Union which had enslaved Poland. Repudiation of the Yalta agreement, as Mr. Dulles was to discover after he had become Secretary of State, would not liberate any of the Soviet satellites; it would merely expunge Stalin's promise to permit the free election of democratic governments in Eastern Europe.) Otherwise, practically no mention was made of European problems. The one significant foreign policy promise made by General Eisenhower was to end the war in Korea.

The Difficulties of Fulfillment

In attempting to redeem its campaign pledges after winning the election, the Eisenhower administration ran into several kinds of trouble. At home, it ran into difficulties because it attempted to compromise an irreconcilable conflict betwen its own intrinsically moderate, though carelessly formulated, position and the intransigent nationalism of the Republican right wing. The moderate Republican leaders had found it expedient to make extravagant campaign charges and promises; the right-wing Republicans appeared actually to have believed them. In addition, the new administration faced the problem of fulfilling inherently contradictory promises. It had undertaken not merely to contain but to roll back Communist imperialism, while at the same time cutting down military establishments, "detaching" overseas garrisons, balancing the budget and reducing taxes.

Abroad, the Eisenhower administration encountered an open revolt against its so-called "policy of liberation" on the part of the European and Asian nations from which it had expected support. It soon became apparent that the administration would have to choose between "going it alone" in a belligerent policy of "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," threatening "massive retaliation" and waging amateurish but inflammatory "psychological warfare" against the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, or adopting a more moderate policy which the allied nations would support. This choice involved a decision on the part of the administration to break with or be dominated by the ultranationalist Republican right wing.

Faced with this dilemma, the administration backed away from "liberation" in Europe while maintaining a show of belligerence as to Asia. The promise to repudiate the wartime agreements was allowed to fizzle out in a meaningless congressional resolution. More significantly, President Eisenhower decided, against the advice of the embattled psychological warriors, to maintain a hands-off position as to the East German uprisings of June 1953. He did not, however, seize upon the opportunity presented by Stalin's death to hold the "conversations at the summit" proposed by Sir Winston Churchill.

With respect to the central problem in European policy—namely, whether to insist upon rearming West Germany without first making a sincere effort to reach an all-German settlement—Secretary Dulles took over his predecessor's inflexible insistence upon the ratification of the treaties which were to bring a rearmed West Germany into NATO. Where Mr. Acheson had sought without success to obtain ratification by persuasion, Mr. Dulles openly threatened an agonizing reappraisal of American policy, implying that the United States would withdraw from Europe altogether unless the treaties were promptly ratified. Again and again, Secretary Dulles declared that there could be no alternative to the EDC treaty, insisting that it provided the only means of preventing the creation of a national German Army which would be a terrible threat to peace. Within 2 months of the French rejection of the European army, Mr. Dulles agreed to a substitute proposal which involved creating precisely that terrible threat to peace. Upon the Secretary's return to Washington in October 1954, President Eisenhower hailed his action as the greatest diplomatic achievement of our time.

The Unusual Role of a President

The inconsistencies in Far Eastern policy were even more striking, with the President gradually emerging in the unusual role of a Chief Executive determined to save the country from the advice of his own appointees. The fighting was brought to an end in Korea by a compromise truce, which the Republicans would have denounced as appeasement a year earlier and which the Republican Senate majority leader did actually denounce as a peace without honor. The Korean truce was offset, for the benefit of the intransigents, by the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek.

When, as might have been expected, the peace without victory in Korea strengthened the growing French desire to negotiate a settlement in Indochina, Washington declared that all of southeast Asia would be lost if the French failed to hold the Red River delta and Mr. Dulles talked of "massive retaliation." Then, in April 1954, with the cream of its forces trapped in Dienbienphu, Paris sent out a desperate, last-minute cry for help and the majority of the President's advisers favored intervention. At this crucial point, the President overruled his own Chiefs of Staff, Dien Bien Phu fell, and a negotiated settlement became inevitable. But, instead of helping to bring about such a settlement, the United States remained aloof, leaving the work of mediation to Britain and the Soviet Union, so that the Geneva Conference took on the appearance of a defeat for American diplomacy.

Again, when the signing of a mutual defense pact with the Chinese Nationalists led to a crisis over the offshore islands, the President's top advisers favored risking war over Matsu and Quemoy; and, again, the

Chief Executive exercised a restraining influence.

After 2 years in office the Eisenhower administration had, to all intents and purposes, fallen back upon the foreign policy of its predecessor, concerning which John Foster Dulles had said that it "put our Nation in the greatest peril it has ever been in in the entire course of our national history." By this time the President had apparently come to the conclusion that he could not pursue the moderate, patient policy which he now knew the national interest demanded and, at the same time, unite his own party. Not only the brutish behavior of Senator McCarthy but also the wilfull dessidence of Senate Majority Leader Knowland helped to force this long-overdue decision. When, in November 1954, the Democrats captured control of both House and Senate, it became a certainty that, for the remainder of his term, President Eisenhower would have to rely upon bipartisan support.

Uncertain Results of 1954 Elections

It was not at all clear, however, that this situation would result in congressional support for a more moderate policy. There were intransigent fire-eaters among the Democrats in Congress as well as among the Republicans. All of the Democrats, moreover, were still smarting under the charge of "20 years of treason" which had irresponsibly been hurled at them during the election campaign. Many of them were impelled toward belligerence by sincere belief in Mr. Truman's scapegoat analysis of the world crisis and a consequent commitment to militant anticommunism as the major if not the sole dynamic of American foreign policy.

Ironically enough, Mr. Truman himself had long since outgrown his earlier, oversimplified views. This was strikingly evident in his testimony before the Senate subcommittee on revision of the United Nations Charter, given on April 18, 1955. The majority of the Democrats in Congress, however, had not kept pace with the former President's broadening conceptions, nor had they been greatly influenced by the perceptive analysis of the world crisis presented by Adlai Stevenson in his Godkin lectures given at Harvard University in May 1954.[3]

Thus, in the 10th year of the atomic age, as the United States appeared to be drifting into another explosive crisis in the Far East, the predominant bipartisan mood in Congress remained essentially that created by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Truman in 1946–48. United States foreign policy remained based upon promises which had either gone up in smoke over Hiroshima or else had been invalidated by rapidly changing circumstances. If ever there was to be nationwide discussion and debate, the time for it had come when the freshman Congressmen fired off their first broadside.

The congressional group clearly understood that the first imperative must be the prevention of a war which would extinguish civilization, if not all human life upon this planet; but the group was also keenly aware that the mere prevention of a catastrophic conflict would not establish enduring peace nor assure the future welfare of the American people.

In the next six chapters (part 2), we shall examine some of the major questions relating to the development of a more imaginative approach to the patient building of enduring peace. This involves, first, a consideration of what might be accomplished through a revitalized foreign economic policy; and, second, a discussion of the two most pressing political problems of our time—namely, colonialism and disarmament.

In part 3, we shall then explore some of the possible means of reducing existing tensions and thus gaining the time in which to put a more creative long-range policy into effect.

[3] Published in book form under the title Call to Greatness; Harper, 1954.

PART II

Chapter 3. Building toward peace in the atomic age

Not long before he died, Albert Einstein, whose genius had unlocked the door into the atomic age, wrote these two poignant sentences:

"Our world faces a crisis as yet unperceived by those possessing the power to make great decisions for good or evil. The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

To change our modes of thinking is the first and infinitely difficult task.

We are living in a new physical environment in which our existence depends upon rapid adjustment to a host of unfamiliar factors as yet only dimly perceived. We are living in an age in which the nation-state has acquired undreamed of power and yet has become suddenly powerless. The sovereign right of a people to determine its own destiny has become a nostalgic illusion, while at the same time it has suddenly become possible for a single national government to destroy the entire human race. Peace has become indivisible. Prosperity will soon be as indivisible as peace. Yet national sovereignty remains a fetish and the majority of mankind goes on living in the illusions created by past centuries, not realizing that the time is fast approaching when the brotherhood of man must become a reality, or else man must perish.

We are living in a perilous period of transition in which it is apparently too soon for world government and too late for anything less.

On June 26, 1945, the signers of the charter of the United Nations affirmed their determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The only wars they knew were wars waged with what we now call conventional weapons. Less than a month later, their carefully drawn charter had become obsolete. What had been a scourge had become a threat of extinction. The powers given to the new world organization were wholly inadequate to save succeeding generations from suicidal conflict.

We are faced with the fact that the scientific and technological revolution of our time must be matched by a political revolution of equal magnitude and equal imagination. Nothing less will defuse the inhuman weapons which man has invented. Nothing less will save modern superman from destroying himself along with his enemies.

It is easy enough to state the answer in quite precise terms. The two revolutionary changes which must be brought about are the renunciation by all nations of the sovereign right to use force or the threat of force as an instrument of national policy; and the renunciation by all nations and peoples of the sovereign right to seek advantage for themselves at the expense of others. Stated in positive form, the nation-state system must be superseded by supranational universal law enforced by supranational authority.

But to state the answer in this way is like demanding of a 12-year-old boy whose parents have just been killed in an accident that he mature overnight and take charge of his younger brothers and sisters as well as of his father's business. There can be no universal world law until there is a universal concept of justice. There can be no world government until the world's peoples recognize that they are all members of a single world community with common aims and common interests.

The atomic age has come upon us too soon and too swiftly. Yet the fact remains that it has come and that we face its inescapable imperatives.

What Can We Do About It?

Broadly speaking, we can strive to the best of our limited ability in two directions: toward the abolition of national armaments; and toward worldwide cooperation in social and economic development, aimed at giving all the members of the human race a fair share in the benefits of the world's total productive capacity.

These are the two long-range aims toward which the policy of the United States and the policy of all enlightened nations must be directed. So to direct our national policy requires more than lip service; it requires an intense educational effort among ourselves, an effort which openly faces obstacles and opposition and which does not take refuge behind the pretense that only Communist intransigence prevents progress in the direction of ending the present precarious state of international anarchy.

Communist intransigence is a fact. Until it is overcome, there can be no worldwide economic cooperation, no world community and certainly no universal disarmament under world law. But what we must ask ourselves is this: If there were no hostile and uncooperative dictatorships in the world—if every other nation in the world were ready to disarm and to substitute fair rivalry for cutthroat competition, and cooperation for the ruthless exploitation of the weak by the strong, would we, the people of the United States, be ready and willing?

The answer might well be negative, chiefly because, being the wealthiest and most powerful among the nations, we think that we have more to lose by abandoning any part of our sovereign rights than any other nation.

The first step on the road toward enduring peace—a step in which every individual American can participate—is to educate ourselves to the point of recognizing that our own best interest demands that we join the other nations of the world in transferring to a greatly strengthened United Nations those sovereign rights which, when exercised by any one nation, affect the security and welfare of the peoples of other nations. Chief among these sovereign rights are the power to make war and the power to obstruct or interfere with the economic progress of other nations.

Once we have reached this reasoned conclusion, we shall begin to surmount the obstacles that stand in the way. Until we reach it, we shall continue to make only half-hearted and ineffective efforts to achieve the twin goals of disarmament and economic cooperation, using the exising obstacles as a rationalization for our own ambivalence.

Coexistence or No Existence

Looking at the world as it is today, we see roughly one-third of humanity living under regimes which are less concerned with abolishing war than with remaining aloof from a major conflict, if such a conflict should arise. The remainder of the human race is living under national governments which have alined themselves in two camps now locked in an arms race. The leaders on both sides know that there can be no such thing as victory in any future war, yet they seem to know of no better way to prevent that war than to prepare for it. Communists and anti-Communists alike are still dominated by the obsolete Roman precept: "If you want peace, prepare for war."

With the exception of such leaders as Nehru of India and U Nu of Burma, the uncommitted third of the human race is for the most part too weak, too poor, and too preoccupied with the struggle for existence to pay much attention to the danger which threatens it because of the power struggle between the Communist and anti-Communist orbits. Yet these uncommitted peoples

are perhaps doing more toward the preservation of peace than the embattled rival power groups. Merely by remaining uncommitted to either side in the cold war, they are forcing both the Communist and the anti-Communist powers to compete for their allegiance. What little is being done in the world today in the direction of curing and preventing disease, reducing poverty and raising food production to keep pace with population pressures is largely the result of competitive wooing of the uncommitted third of humanity. Yet this constructive by-product of the cold war is wholly inadequate to offset the danger to all of mankind inherent in that struggle.

The two rival power groups are today coexisting in a precarious state of open hostility, with each side viewing the existence of the other as a threat to its survival. Each would like to exterminate the other. Each is restrained from attempting the other's annihilation by fear and a slender margin of reason over irrational impulse.

The immediate problem is how to prevent coexistence from ending in no existence. The first step is to change the nature of the struggle between the two hostile orbits so that coexistence will gradually become safer and more tolerable. The essence of this task lies in mobilizing the vast latent forces for peace which reside in human beings everywhere, including those peoples who now live under tyranny and oppression.

"Free World" Weakness and Its Cure

The present weakness of the so-called free world is that so large a part of it, having as yet no real stake in freedom, seeks change, while the leaders of the active anti-Communist coalition are industrialized nations with relatively high living standards more concerned with the preservation of the existing order than with promoting change and progress.

The greatest strength of the Communists is their identification in the minds of unhappy peoples with change—with any sort of change from an intolerable present. This makes their promises attractive even to those who half suspect them of being false. The Communists are showing people how to break with a hated past. They promise change, while we promise freedom to choose—a freedom which is meaningless to the illiterate and hungry poor. The Communists offer land, while we all too often support feudal rulers. The Communists pretend to support national independence, while we shore up the rickety remnants of the colonial past. Above all, no matter how false the promise, the Communists promise peace, while we urge rearmament and preparedness for defense in war.

The key to the establishment of enduring peace is the creation of conditions in which the majority of mankind will no longer be driven by despair to seek change by violence, in which the majority of mankind will be aware of and satisfied with steady, gradual progress and, hence, will have acquired a stake in preserving peace.

Our first task is to help create those conditions in that part of the world which is not now under Communist distatorships. The strength and solidarity of the anti-Communist coalition depend upon the rapid growth of a sense of cooperative progress toward common aims not only among the present members of the coalition but among the uncommitted peoples whose ultimate moral allegiance will determine the final balance of power. The way to create that sense of progress is through joint efforts in fighting hunger, poverty, disease and ignorance, through self-help and mutual help in developing natural resources, and through cooperation in freeing the exchange of goods and services from artificial restrictions imposed by national governments for reasons of national self-interest.

Our Own Potential Contribution

The United States has a great role to perform in laying this foundation of strength in the non-Communist world. The vast majority of the American people would be eager to follow leadership which recognized both the opportunity and the obligation. Yet, the sad truth is that, while the United States Government is spending billions upon armaments which can at best merely protract a precarious coexistence, it is spending only reluctant millions in laying the foundations of a safer coexistence which might eventually lead to enduring peace. Our Government says—and this has been true under both Democrats and Republicans—that, if the arms race could be halted, the United States would devote the resulting savings to fostering worldwide economic development. This is a noble promise. But starving people cannot eat promises. Nor are the Communists waiting for a disarmament agreement to be signed before they launch their own program of economic development.

Here the freshman group in the House of Representatives displayed a shrewd instinct for the crucial issues. Listen once more to its chief spokesman during the debate of March 16, 1955:

"We forget that the stakes of the game are the hearts and minds of the people in Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and Latin America who as yet remain outside the net of Communist power; who want to live in peace, to be the authors of their own history; who will respond to any leadership which raises the banner of hope that what they want, so desperately, can be theirs to have.

"We are not now raising that banner of hope. We seem bent on vetoing it * * * when we side with the colonial against the anti-colonial countries in the United Nations, we lose the respect of half the world struggling to be free. Our refusal last May to join the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) on the ground that we could not afford the 80 million annual cost until there was disarmament sounds thin to the world."

Supporting Congressman REUSS, EDITH GREEN of Oregon, a former schoolteacher, said:

"If we cannot fight economic injustice and disease because we hate them as we hate communism, then let us fight them because healthy men and secure men make better friends of democracy than do desperate men. If we cannot be generous, then let us be prudent * * * To those who would say that we cannot maintain the level of our foreign aid because it is too expensive, I would suggest that they contemplate for a while the figure of the richest man in the graveyard."

Chapter 4. Food, fuel, and power

Hunger in the Midst of Plenty

One of the basic facts which we in this country tend to overlook is that different parts of the world are living in such different stages of economic development that one might actually say that they live in different centuries. Latin America, largely because of its feudal Iberian background, lags a century behind Canada and the United States. Except for Japan, most of Asia and the Middle East lags at least a century behind Latin America. Yet many of the peoples of these economically retarded countries have a background of culture older than our own.

Food, fuel, and water are the basic minimum essentials of the primitive economies in the backward areas. Even these are often in short supply, causing malnutrition, disease, and a vicious circle of poverty. In order to catch up to the 20th century in economic development, which most of the retarded areas now urgently desire to do, the additional essentials are technical knowledge, capital, access to a variety of raw materials, and the opportunity to exchange any surplus production for the needed products of other lands.

Let us begin with food, the most basic of all necessities, and consider the position of the United States in relation to the rest of the world.

More than half of the world's population is engaged in raising food. In the so-called underdeveloped areas 80 to 90 percent of the population works in the fields. Yet two-thirds of the world's inhabitants are undernourished and millions are constantly threatened by famine, while in a few highly developed nations, where only a small part of the population is engaged in agriculture, great surpluses of food accumulate for which there is no apparent use. Hunger and a sense of injustice arising out of starvation in the midst of plenty are among the major causes of revolutionary discontent.

Food Production Is Not the Main Problem

The problem of adequately feeding the growing population of the earth is not, as is commonly supposed, primarily a problem of production. Nor is hunger, as is commonly supposed, a result of overpopulation. China has a population density of 105 per square mile, India of 261. Both are almost constantly threatened with famine. Yes England and Holland, where food is plentiful, have a population density of 718 and 717, respectively.

The Malthusian specter that population growth would outstrip possible food production has again and again obsessed the minds of men, particularly at times when abnormal conditions have created an actual undersupply of foodstuffs. Great droughts and floods, exceptionally severe climatic changes and, above all, wars have in the course of history from time to time created food scarcities and aroused the fear that ultimately population growth would outrun the earth's capacity to nourish its inhabitants. The devastation and dislocations incident to the last great World War produced one such period.

Farmlands had been laid waste. Manpower had been drawn from the fields and factories into military service or arms production. The manufactuer of farm machinery and other necessities for agricultural production had been curtailed or abandoned. Seed was scarce and had deteriorated. Fertilizer was in short supply. Millions of human beings had been displaced. Ten million Germans alone were expelled from the agricultural East and driven into the rump of industrial West Germany. (These people had formerly produced not only their own food supply but enough of a surplus to feed, in all, about 25 percent of the total German population.) All this meant that, at the end of the war, there was an actual shortage of food, that there were fewer people producing food, and that, in spite of the mass slaughter of human beings, there were more mouths to feed than ever before.

In 1945, when the United Nations and its Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) came into being, the great need was for increased food production. Not only the FAO but most national governments energetically addressed themselves to the problem. The success of these endeavors, viewed from the global point of view, was spectacular. The FAO reported that, in 1954, the world's food production increased by 3 percent, while the world's population grew by only 1½ percent,[4] and that, given peace, the prospects for 1955 and succeeding years were equally encouraging. This prognosis did not even take into account recent developments in atomic science and in chem-

[4] The State of Food and Agriculture, 1954; Review and Outlook, published by FAO, 1954. See also FAO report issued in September 1955.

istry which open up entirely new sources of food supply. Artture Virtanen, the noted Finnish chemist and Nobel prize winner, has expressed the opinion that, if we could fully apply existing knowledge, we could produce enough food for 4 billion as against the present world population of 2,400 million.

The Emergence of Useless Surpluses

But, while it is evident that food supply can keep pace with population growth for the foreseeable future, this encouraging fact does not solve the problem of hunger in the midst of plentiful supply. As early as 1945, the FAO noted the emergence of food surpluses in some parts of the world, while elsewhere millions were still undernourished or dying of starvation. Lord Boyd-Orr, the FAO's first chairman, proposed to attack the problem of food distribution by creating a World Food Board charged with the task of adjusting world food prices to a level at which the law of supply and demand would insure the equitable global distribution of surplus production. More recently his successor, Dr. Josue de Castro, proposed a World Famine Board. Both of these projects, as well as a number of plans to deal with surpluses by a system of international commodity agreements have failed of adoption.

In the winter of 1954–1955, with millions of people suffering from malnutrition in other parts of the world, the United States Government held $7 billion worth of food surpluses in warehouses. It held enough corn to fill a string of boxcars stretching from Miami to Seattle—enough wheat to give every man on earth 15 loaves of bread. By the end of 1955 the surpluses had risen to $8,700,000,000, and the cost of storage amounted to $20,000 an hour.

The reason for the accumulation of useless surpluses is that the majority of national governments have approached the food problem solely from the point of view of the producer, rather than from the point of view of the consumer.

The Forgotten Consumer

Practically all the governments of the major food-exporting countries now take a hand in fixing world food prices. In the interest of their agricultural producers, governments support farm prices by subsidy, by tariffs, by import quotas, by acreage reduction and by withholding surpluses from the market. The law of supply and demand has practically ceased to operate in these commodities. The fact that a huge surplus of wheat or potatoes or butter overhangs the market does not correspondingly reduce the price to the consumer. As a result of national policies which aim almost exclusively at supporting farm prices, more and more consumers are priced out of the market. This is true not only with respect to the overproduction of one part of the world as against the underconsumption of another; it is also true within some of the surplus-producing nations, notably the United States.

A study by the House Committee on Agriculture [5] showed that between 1951 and 1954 American farm prices fell by 20 percent. (They would, of course, have fallen much further but for the Government's farm price support program.) But, in the words of the committee report: "Almost none of the lower prices received by farmers since 1951 has been passed on to consumers in the form of lower retail prices." In June 1954, the dairy farmer was receiving 10 percent less for milk and butterfat than in 1947–1949, but the consumer was paying 3 percent more. From 1948 to 1954, the farm price of wheat dropped 32 percent, but the price of a loaf of bread increased by 23 percent.

The House Committee on Agriculture found that out of every dollar spent for food by the American housewife only 44 cents went to the farmer, while processing, marketing, and transportation accounted for the remainder.

In 1953, 6 percent more milk was sold by American dairy farmers than in the previous year, yet dairy-farm income was $4 billion less. On the other hand, the 1953 profits of two of the largest processors—National Dairy Products Corp. and Borden's—more than doubled over 1952.

Failure of Producer-Oriented Policies

This farmer-consumer dilemma is almost a worldwide phenomenon. National governments, seeking to stimulate agricultural production, adopt various means for guaranteeing the farmers a stable price in order to protect them against the dangers of overproduction. The farmers then produce more than consumers can buy at the existing levels of prices and incomes, surpluses accumulate, governments buy the surpluses and warehouse them, while warehouse facilities suffice. When the surpluses become unmanageable, the governments destroy the food or degrade it so as to make it inedible. Brazil destroyed 75 million bags of coffee—a third of its production—in 11 years. The United States has plowed under potatoes and destroyed pigs.

In spite of all this costly and wasteful manipulation, the existence of the surpluses gradually depresses farm prices. The FAO reports that in recent years world farm prices have steadily declined. On the other hand, a study published by the International Labor Organization in August 1954 showed that in spite of falling farm prices 44 nations reported that food prices remained "remarkably stable."

The present Government policies fail in two directions. Within the surplus-food-producing countries they support overproduction without actually stabilizing farm incomes, since the resulting surpluses do, in time, depress farm prices. At the same time, the consumer pays for the price supports in two ways—through taxation to defray the cost of subsidies and through high prices which are more than doubled in the United States by the high cost of processing and distribution.

Present policies, and especially our own, fail to undertake those moves which alone could assure farmers of stable incomes—namely, those moves which would guide agricultural producers to adjust to changing demand and which would enable consumers who are now priced out of the market to become steady customers.

So far as our own domestic market is concerned, it is apparent that a part of the remedy at least should be sought in a reduction of the 56 cents in every food-buying dollar which now goes to processors and middlemen. A wider development of consumer cooperatives and a serious attack upon the monopolistic practices of the great food processors and manufacturers of farm machinery would go far in this direction. Basically, of course, the maintenance of full employment and social security is the best answer to domestic underconsumption. These questions lie beyond the scope of a reexamination of foreign economic policy, but the problem of dealing with food surpluses in the world market is so intimately related to domestic farm and food policy that some note must be taken here of our present farm price-support program.

Our Policy Unfair as Well as Ineffective

Our present farm policy not only falls far short of stabilizing the agricultural economy because it is producer-oriented; it is also wholly inequitable.

For the past 20 years, there has been an extraordinary growth of big-business agriculture. Since 1935, the number of farms operating 1,000 acres or more has increased by 37 percent, until now such farms comprise 494 million acres, or 42.6 percent of all farmland in the United States.

According to the most recent figures, 9 percent of the Nation's farmers now receive more than 50 percent of the price-support payments made by the American taxpayer. (Less than 2 percent of the Nation's farmers, operating the largest agricultural enterprises, receive over 25 percent of the Government subsidies!) This means that 91 percent of the Nation's agricultural producers—the real farmers—receive in the aggregate less than half of the price-support benefits. The remainder is actually a subsidy of big business in agriculture.

Paradoxically, in some of its more enlightened dealings with the outside world, the United States stands for "land reform"—for the breaking up of great feudal landed estates in countries seeking economic assistance. Yet at home, the American Government is pursuing a policy which promotes the squeezing out of the small farmer and places a premium upon the concentration of agricultural production in the hands of a few gigantic corporate enterprises. This inequitable and ineffective farm policy stimulates the depopulation of rural America and the even greater concentration in our overcrowded cities, each year adding displaced rural workers to the ever-growing number of those who seek industrial employment.

An interesting proposal for a revision of our farm policy has been put forward by Mr. E. G. Shinner, the retired head of a successful chain of meat markets.[6] Mr. Shinner proposes that we replace our present system of Government purchases of agricultural products with a system of direct subsidy payments to individual farmers. Under his plan the farmer would receive from the Government the difference between the free market price he obtains for his production and the parity price, but only on the first $7,000 of gross annual production, with a maximum subsidy of $2,000 per annum. The exact figures suggested are less important than the principle, so long as the change would effectively divert the benefits from big business in agriculture to the 91 percent of small farmers who need them.

The Need for Basic Revision

All this may seem a far cry from foreign economic policy. Actually it is not. Our domestic farm policy constitutes as great an obstacle to the development of an effective program of international cooperation as our outworn protective tariff. We, who preach free trade and free markets, have eliminated the free markets so far as our largest item of production is concerned. Our subsidies promote overproduction. If we give away wheat, we injure the economy of Canada. If we give away dairy products, we hurt the Netherlands and Denmark. While we struggle for export markets to absorb our manufacturers, our agricultural surpluses overhang the economies of our best customers.

Giving away food is, of course, a better way of disposing of surpluses than dumping milk into sewers, burning up coffee, plowing under wheat or blueing potatoes. Gifts or long-term loans of surplus food to countries threatened with famine or to disaster areas furnish helpful temporary relief, but gifts of food to countries in which there is a chronic food shortage serve a useful purpose only if combined with measures which increase employment and consumer purchasing power. One of the most promising possibilities to be explored is the use of surplus food as capital in a program of economic development. This can be more appropriately discussed in a later chapter.

[5] Farm Prices and the Cost of Food; G. P. O., 1954.

[6] See April 11, 1955, special supplement of the New Leader.

An effective farm and food policy must aim not merely at increased production of food but at wider distribution at lower prices. To accomplish this purpose, it must discriminate in stimulating the production of only those foodstuffs for which there is a demand. It must take into consideration that with the more widespread knowledge of what constitutes a healthy diet, people are turning from cereals to animal and dairy products; that, for reasons of economy, consumers are turning from butter to margarine; that fear of lung cancer may reduce the consumption of tobacco—at least in the form of cigarettes; and that synthetic fibers are steadily reducing the demand for cotton.

The basic answer to hunger in the midst of plenty is to raise the purchasing power of the presently undernourished populations and to increase the efficiency of their own agricultural production. Before dealing with this broader subject it may be useful to note three specific actions which might be taken in the narrower field of food production and distribution.

One such action would be to foster international cooperation in working out commodity production agreements designed to increase production of the foodstuffs most needed—such as milk and animal products—and to decrease or limit production of foodstuffs—such as wheat and potatoes—for which there appears to be a declining demand.

A second action would be to increase our support for the excellent work already being done by FAO in stimulating production in the food-scarcity areas.

A third action—and one which we should undertake in any case for domestic reasons—would be the overhauling of our wasteful and inequitable program of farm-price supports. Three facts demonstrate the need for such revision:

1. Losses incurred by the United States Government in price-support operations during 1953, 1954, and 1955 exceeded total losses from such operations in the preceding 20 years.

2. In spite of these great expenditures, farm prices have dropped, during this 3-year period, by about 15 percent.

3. Farm surpluses in the hands of the Government have tripled in size since the end of 1952.

Surely, these questions of farm and food policy should be fully ventilated if we wish to develop a program of action designed to lay the foundations of enduring peace.

Fuel and Power

Fuel comes next after food in the importance of its bearing upon economic development. The three major sources of heat and power are coal, oil, and atomic energy.

Since coal presents no serious problem in foreign policy for the United States—although it does for Europe and other parts of the world—we shall confine ourselves here to a brief discussion of American policy with respect to oil and atomic energy.

The United States and the World's Supply of Oil

Oil is vital for the creation of heat and power for transport and especially for aviation. In wartime it has a strategic significance beyond almost any other single product.

In 1954, North America accounted for 48.6 percent of the world's production, Latin America for 18.5 percent, the Middle East for 19.4 percent, and the Soviet orbit for 10.3 percent with the remainder scattered.

North America consumes about 57 percent of the world's production. Western Europe 11 percent, the Communist orbit 9½ percent.

The chief exports of surplus production are Venezuela (37 percent of total world exports), Kuwait (21 percent), Saudi Arabia (16 percent), and Iraq (14 percent).

In addition to consuming its own tremendous production, the United States imports 16 percent of the total world imports.

The figures show the extent to which the United States dominates the world oil picture, but not nearly as clearly as the following facts:

Eight giant oil companies, five of them American, control the production, refining, and distribution of the non-Communist world's oil supply. These companies are: Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Standard Oil Company of California, the Texas Co., Socony Vacuum Oil Co., and Gulf Oil Co., along with Royal Dutch Shell, Anglo-Iranian (the British Petroleum Co.) and Compagnie Francaise des Petroles.

Each of these giant companies is a vertical combination embodying production, transportation, refining, and distribution. The way the great combines work together was demonstrated by Iran's failure to sell any appreciable amount of oil until its dispute with the Anglo-Iranian Co. was settled.

The world price of oil is to all intents and purposes fixed by the American companies in cooperation with American governmental authorities, notably the government of the State of Texas. Prices set by Government conservation action within the United States to maintain profits on high-cost production within the United States virtually determine world prices and have practically no relation to the much lower cost of production of oil in Venezuela and the Middle East.

Like world food prices, the price of oil bears no relation to demand and supply, but in this case Government intervention does not result in surpluses overhanging and eventually depressing the market. Production is carefully restricted in the interest of maintaining high profits.

American oil policy, like American farm policy, is shaped to serve the interests of the producers. The American consumer pays a large part of the price without being aware of any great hardship, but for the oil-hungry countries of Europe oil is the largest single item of import expense. For the underdeveloped countries which lack domestic sources of supply, the high cost of oil is a serious impediment to economic development.

The cost of exploring for oil and of bringing in production has, in the case of many underdeveloped countries, prevented or delayed the discovery and exploitation of existing oil deposits. Some of these countries have welcomed foreign capital, others—notably Brazil—have been afraid to permit foreign capital to enter. Usually, when the doors have been opened to foreign exploration, the result has been to increase the dominance of the giant companies. This has been the case in Venezuela and the Middle East. The usual arrangement is for a long-term concession to the oil companies and approximately 50 percent of their profits from the sale of crude oil to the country under whose soil the oil is found. This does not affect the companies' additional profits from refining, transportation, and distribution.

Due to the fixing of world prices with high-cost United States production as the basic determinant, the profit of the American companies in their low-cost foreign production has been very large. According to United States Government figures the profits of the American companies in the Persian Gulf area rose from $115 million in 1947 to $300 million in 1951. It has been estimated that the American profits on the sale of crude oil produced in Saudi Arabia alone amounted in 1952 to something like $425 million on a production of about 300 million barrels. This would represent a profit in the neighborhood of $1.40 per barrel or 500 percent.[7]

[7] International Review Service, Rept. No. 19, April 27, 1955.

Protests Against American Policy

While Government influence has been exerted in favor of the oil producers, there has also been no Governmental action to protect the consumer's interests.

One nongovernmental approach to consumer protection, by pricing based on cost, was undertaken by the International Cooperative Movement. In 1947 the International Cooperative Alliance asked the United Nation's Economic and Social Council to consider creating a United Nations Petroleum Commission to "safeguard access to the resources on fair and equal terms to all buyers willing and able to pay the market price, also freedom to transport it on fair and equal terms to port refineries." The ICA said:

"Experience has proved that international rivalry over raw material resources, either on the part of predatory private monopolists or on the part of imperialistic governments, or both, lead to an unbalance in economic affairs, inevitable conflicts and the jeopardizing of peace, such as we have witnessed recently, for example, in the struggle for control of oil resources in the Middle East. Development of such natural resources by consumer-owned cooperatives will operate to checkmate monopolistic concentrations and tend to lead away from rather than toward war, conflicts over oil resources being an ever-present threat to world peace. With a view to implementing the Atlantic Declaration and safeguarding the supply of this vital raw material for all national households, the Sixteenth Congress of the International Cooperative Alliance emphasizes in the strongest terms the immediate need of placing control and administration of the oil resources of the world under an authority of the United Nations, and as a first step in that direction, the oil resources of the Middle East, by and with the consent of the States involved, these resources to be administered in such a way that cooperative organizations can be assured of receiving an equitable share."

The Economic and Social Council took no action other than to note the ICA proposal. The Cooperative Alliance's next move in the United Nations was to ask the ECOSOC to undertake a study of the world oil situation. This request, made in 1949 and repeated in following years, the ECOSOC refused to discuss.

The world cooperative movement is as yet not a large factor in the world's oil business and exerts little influence. The International Petroleum Cooperative Association's effort, in 1950, to come to an agreement with the Mossadegh Government in Iran for the operation of the Abadan refinery collapsed in the face of pressures exerted by the interested governments and oil concerns.

It is obvious that the conservation of oil resources and the widest possible use of oil production consistent with sound conservation are of global interest. It is equally obvious that the widest possible use cannot be made of the world's oil production unless prices are brought into some sort of relation to costs. A search for some effective method of protecting the consumer will inevitably be instituted if not by our Government then by the nations which have no production of their own. The nations of Western Europe, which have taken collective action to assure an equitable allocation of coal through the European Coal and Steel Community, are already restless.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe published a report in 1955, The Price of Oil in Western Europe, which has aroused considerable controversy. The report charged that the oil cartel was unfairly exploiting the European market by selling Near Eastern oil which cost 35 cents a barrel at $1.75, while at the same time using its political influence in the Near East to bar European groups from a share in the devel-

opment of Near Eastern oil resources. The American oil corporations not only attempted to suppress this report but some oil interests have apparently started an anti-United Nations campaign, charging "Communist influence."

The Need for Revision

The conservative Wall Street Journal has warned that the practices of the oil companies are bringing disrepute upon American business, but the American Government has dropped the antitrust proceedings against them which were brought into the courts some years ago.

Oil may be a touchy subject in Washington these days, but the fact remains that our present policy of subservience to the international oil cartel casts doubt upon the sincerity of our professed belief in free competition as well as upon the sincerity of our Atlantic Charter promise of equal access to raw materials for all the world's peoples.

Atomic Energy

All nations capable of mounting the effort are engaged in a race to develop the peaceful uses or nuclear energy. To date, these efforts concern the harnessing of energy derived from atomic fission, but the use of energy derived from the fusion of nuclei—the process used for making the hydrogen bomb—is already under careful study.

The United States Navy's atom-powered submarine *Nautilus*, which made its trial run in January, 1955, was the first example of atomic motive power. The United States is not yet producing electric power from atomic energy on a full-scale commercial basis. The first experimental plant, at Shippingport, Pa., will not be in operation until 1957, but private utility companies have projects for the construction of a number of large powerplants. One of these, with a capacity of 250,000 kilowatts, is to be completed by the Consolidated Edison Company of New York in 1960. The president of the General Dynamics Corp. has predicted that in the next 45 years 50 percent of all electric powerplants in the United States will draw their energy from nuclear reaction. Mr. F. K. McKune of General Electric estimates that atomic power can eventually be produced without Government subsidy at 6.7 mills per kilowatt hour. The average cost of power in the United States today is about 7.5 mills. The former chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Leland Olds, calculates that the Government, paying 2½ percent for its money, could cut the cost of atomic power to 4.2 mills.

The implication of large-scale atomic power production for power-poor countries is obvious.

The English Electric Co. has set the date for the completion of its full-scale Calder Hall plant for the end of 1956. This would put Britain considerably ahead of all the other non-Communist countries in the power-development race.

More than 30 nuclear reactors are now operating in the non-Communist countries and others are planned or being built. Canada and Belgium have projects for large powerplants.

The Soviet Union has had a small atomic powerplant in operation since June 1954, and showed motion pictures of the installation at the U. N. Scientific Conference in August 1955. China is said to be building a reactor with Soviet assistance. Some of the satellite countries are reported to be receiving Russian aid in building reactors.

Development of United States Policy

All the great industrial nations recognize the political importance of supplying atomic powerplants to the underdeveloped areas. Whichever nation is first in this field will greatly strengthen its prestige and influence. Conversely, the industrial nations are aware of the political repercussions of withholding cooperation in atomic development, especially from those countries which supply them with atomic raw material. Secretary Dulles warned in 1954:

"There is a growing tendency among the countries which supply the United States with atomic raw materials to turn to other countries advanced in atomic efforts for nuclear power information because they have been disappointed in our ability to give them significant help."

This statement was made some time after President Eisenhower had given the first great stimulus to international cooperation by his dramatic proposal of December 8, 1953, to the Assembly of the United Nations, asking for the creation of an international pool of fissionable materials to which all the great powers would contribute. The President expressed the hope that nations working together on the peaceful uses of atomic energy would be less inclined to work against each other in preparing for an atomic war.

While this proposal remained under somewhat desultory discussion, the American Government shifted to bilateral action, negotiating a number of agreements for the installation of research reactors with interested nations. However, the much more important matter of supplying power reactors made less headway, chiefly because the United States Atomic Energy Commission refused to declassify essential information. This remained true even after the U. N. Assembly passed a unanimous resolution on December 4, 1954, endorsing the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency and calling for an international scientific conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, especially its use for creating power.

A considerable number of leading atomic scientists in the United States made public statements pointing out the necessity for opening up the whole field of information relating to atomic energy. On June 19, 1955, Gordon Dean, former chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, bluntly condemned the Commission's refusal to depart from its extreme policy of secrecy. Speaking at a dinner commemorating the 90th anniversary of the Nation, at which a number of notable speakers discussed "Atoms for Peace," Mr. Dean said:

"We are simply not implementing the President's 'atoms for peace' proposal. I submit that, if we do not soon change our policy and take the secrecy wraps completely off these power reactors, our pretention that we are spreading blessings will have a very hollow ring."

Mr. Dean attacked secrecy concerning nuclear power reactors as ill advised and unnecessary. He urged the Atomic Energy Commission to "declassify with one bold stroke all power reactor technology, face up to the fact that the Russians long ago perfected the bomb, face up to the fact that without such action we will make enemies out of three-quarters of the Western World whose security systems don't match ours, face up to the fact that what we are talking about here is nothing more than a new source of heat for power and that the world wants what comes from cheap power. Unless this is done," he predicted, "the initiative will be taken by England, France, and possibly Russia."

Progress at the U. N. Conference

The United Nations Conference of atomic scientists, held at Geneva in August 1955, marked a distinct turning point toward a freer exchange of information. The freedom with which the representatives of the three leaders in atomic development, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union, disclosed their past experience and their plans for the future showed that it was now generally recognized that, if each country were to remain walled in by curtains of secrecy, each would have to wend its own tortuous way to success.

The most encouraging revelations at Geneva were those concerning the almost limitless sources of atomic fuel available to the world. It was shown not only that uranium could be extracted from a number of hitherto unsuspected sources, such as granite rock, but that methods had actually been developed by which "breeder reactors" would produce more fissionable material than they consumed. Many of the leading scientists confidently expressed the opinion that mankind had already come within sight of the day when atomic and solar energy would more than supply all needs for power in every part of the world. Some went so far as to predict that the harnessing of energy from fusion as well as fission would be only a matter of time.

The Geneva Conference of scientists served also to highlight the extent to which by-products of atomic fission were already in widespread commercial use. A great number of papers dealt with the practical use of radioactive isotopes in medicine and in agriculture, of atomic tracers in studying the processes of nature and of atomic sources in certain industrial operations. Yet, inevitably, the discussion returned to the use of atomic energy as a source of power, with special emphasis upon its impact upon food production and fuel reserves.

United Nations experts predict a rise in the world's population from 2,400,000,000 to 4 billion by 1984. This increase will not only place a heavy burden on food production but will also create an unparalleled drain on conventional fuels. Even before the disclosure of new sources of fissionable material and the successs of "breeder reactors," it had been estimated that recoverable uranium and thorium reserves were 25 times greater than the known reserves of coal, gas, and oil combined. Moreover, while conventional fuels must be transported over long distances at great cost, the atomic fuel required to start a powerplant capable of supplying the needs of a town of 10,000 inhabitants can in the future probably be carried in a suitcase. Since power and water are the chief basic requirements for extensive agriculture, the probability that atomic energy may bring both to desert areas, opens up an entirely new prospect for many underdeveloped parts of the world.

Will We Hold Our Leadership?

Whether the United States will hold its position of leadership in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, along with the far-reaching political implications of that leadership, will depend partly upon how its policy develops with respect to the exchange of information and perhaps to an even greater extent upon decisions which lie in the field of domestic policy.

Under a Republican administration, strong pressures have developed to "get the Government out of business"—especially out of the business of supplying or regulating the supply of power. The Tennessee Valley Authority has long been under attack by private utility interests and by conservative politicians who have denounced is as "creeping socialism." Plans for similar developments on the Columbia and Missouri Rivers have, for the time being at least, been sidetracked in favor of permitting private utilities to develop the most favorable projects for hydroelectric power expansion. The natural-gas producers have escaped from Government price control. So far, the trend with respect to atomic energy appears likewise to lie in the direction of giving private business interests a free hand, to the extent that this is deemed consistent with military security.

Should this trend develop into a fixed policy, it may seriously affect the position of the United States in the international field. Other countries, such as Great Britain—not to mention the Soviet Union—will be competing with governmental resources

for leadership in supplying the underdeveloped areas with atomic installations. If the United States relies upon profit-seeking American private enterprise to meet this competition in the early stages, it may place itself under a severe handicap.

American leadership will also depend upon another factor; namely, the extent to which the American Government stands ready to supply the very substantial amounts of capital required for atomic energy installations.

Chapter 5. Know-how and capital

The Position of the United States

Next to food, fuel, and power, the most important needs of the economically retarded areas are technical knowledge, the ability to use it and capital. The emerging peoples are impatient to catch up to two industrial revolutions. They will accept help wherever they can obtain it without loss of self-respect.

The United States has been the leader of the 20th century technological revolution. With only 6 percent of the world's population, it produces 40 percent of the world's goods. Because it enjoys the world's greatest surplus of production over consumption, in spite of having the world's highest living standard, the United States has until now been able to accumulate savings (capital) faster than any other nation in the world. These factors should make our country the natural source of assistance for the retarded countries.

In addition, the United States, as the first colonial area to break away from European domination, should be the one Nation in the industrialized West to which the emerging peoples could confidently turn for guidance and help on the road to national independence.

To a very large extent, this natural affinity has been dissipated by three elements in our postwar policy:

Our obsession with the military containment of communism has caused us to be niggardly with economic aid not directly related to the building of an anti-Communist coalition.

The same obsession has caused us to depart from our traditional anticolonialism and to support the remnants of European colonialism in Asia and Africa.

Our arrested development in race relations has given us the appearance of believing more than any other nation except South Africa in white supremacy.

Taken together, these three elements have caused the emerging peoples to be wary of accepting even the limited aid we have offered.

Looking at the matter from the point of view of our own national interest, our hitherto peculiarly fortunate position is now challenged by three relatively new factors:

1. Our own natural resources have been rapidly diminishing in relation to the demands of our economy. Our expanding production is not only depleting the resources we possess, but the increasingly complicated nature of our economy is making us more and more dependent upon raw materials obtainable only from foreign countries.

2. The less privileged peoples of the earth—largely nonwhite—have awakened to the fact that the knowledge and the means exist by which their lives could be lifted out of the intolerable conditions to which they have long been accustomed. They are no longer willing to accept a position of inequality. They are no longer willing to be the suppliers of raw materials—to be the drawers of water and the hewers of wood for the Western World.

3. The Communist dictatorships have emerged as a new imperialist force, seeking to capture the allegiance of that part of humanity which is in open revolt against the past and the present.

The first two of these three factors alone dictate the course which we should follow in our own self-interest, if not for the sake of the moral convictions which are the foundations of our society. Our increasing dependence upon access to raw materials in all parts of the world and our need for expanding markets demand the adoption of a deliberate program of long-term foreign investment in the underdeveloped areas. Our best customers are industrialized nations such as Great Britain and Canada. Apart from these material considerations our professed belief in the equal rights of all men and in the dignity and perfectibility of the human individual should demand that we extend a helping hand to fellow men struggling to emerge from poverty and oppression.

The Communist Challenge

The challenge of the Communist dictators has actually created no new imperatives. It merely reinforces the dictates of American conscience and of intelligent American self-interest. But, beyond pressing us to do what we ought to in any case, the Communist challenge confronts us with a time limit; it faces us with the necessity of acting before continued inaction strips us of our power to act at all.

The Communist challenge is not merely a challenge of promises. If it consisted of nothing more than skillful propaganda, it would constitute no very serious threat to the gradual and relatively orderly solution of the world's problems. Nor does the greatest danger arise from the fact that Communist propaganda is backed by force or the threat of force. The real challenge lies elsewhere and in a field in which we have smugly considered ourselves supreme.

The primary obstacle to lifting the living standards of countries like India, Indonesia, Egypt, or Chile is the absence of capital. No nation can build schools and hospitals, train teachers, doctors and nurses, build roads, railways and canals, or create electric and atomic power developments without capital.

Capital can be derived only from three sources: from the exploitation of natural resources; from savings; and from foreign aid or investment. Since few natural resources can nowadays be exploited without expensive plant, machinery, and transport facilities, the underdeveloped countries can obtain capital only through their own savings or through foreign assistance.

Savings normally grow either out of the voluntary nonexpenditure of earnings by individuals and private enterprises or out of taxes collected by the government. In the past, there has been a third important source of capital formation; namely, the exploitation of colonial resources and the sweating of "native" labor by the colonial powers. This was how Europe drained vast sums of capital out of Asia, Africa, and the Near East, some of which later flowed into the United States and helped to build our own railroads and industries.

The material prosperity of the western world, including that of the United States, has been built up very largely out of developing for western benefit the resources of native peoples who lacked both the knowledge and the capital to develop them for themselves. If now the western peoples find themselves compelled, for the sake of their own continued prosperity, to reverse the flow of capital without seeking immediate direct profits, there is historical justice in their predicament.

Forced Savings

The advent of the modern dictatorships has introduced a new element into what might have been the natural evolution from colonial exploitation to cooperative development of the so-called underdeveloped areas. That new element consists of forced savings—savings that are not accumulated voluntarily by private individuals or business concerns nor voted, in the form of taxes, by the majority of free citizens. In the modern dictatorships the individual has nothing to say about how much of the national income shall be saved privately or through taxation. Capital formation and capital investment are in the hands of a governing clique employing the coercive powers of a police state. In a sense, the modern police state dictatorship exploits its own people much as the European powers and native feudal rulers exploited colonial populations.

As a rule, capital formation by forced savings in a totalitarian state is more rapid than capital formation through voluntary savings and taxation in a democracy.[8] India, for example, though it is trying to develop a system of taxation which will reach the rich and not impose too heavy a burden upon the poor, is able to accumulate only about 6 percent of its gross national income in public and private savings. In Russia, on the other hand, 20 percent of the gross national income is arbitrarily squeezed out of the people in forced savings and invested by the government in industrial or agricultural development and in the maintenance of a huge military establishment.

The Soviet Union has already progressed far enough with its own industrialization to be able to aid China in a similar process. As a result, China's economic development is in some respects progressing faster than that of India.[9] Already the Soviet Union is offering to put up steel plants in India and Indonesia. It is extending aid to Afghanistan. The time may not be far distant when it will actually be easier for the Communist dictatorships than for the Western powers to provide capital for the capital-starved uncommitted peoples who hold the ultimate balance between the Western democracies and the totalitarian regimes.

Our Present Policy Dissipates Our Potential

The United States alone among the Western powers has the ability voluntarily to create an annual surplus of savings sufficient to provide the seed-money needed by the uncommitted peoples. The United States alone could, without depriving its people of consumer goods or imposing too heavy a burden of taxation, meet the threatened competition of the Communist dictatorships. This is not to say that only the United States among the Western powers should contribute to a greatly enlarged program of economic cooperation. Other developed nations can and should in their own self-interest participate. Above all, the underdeveloped areas themselves can provide much of the labor and material required for their own development, but most of them cannot mobilize their own resources without an injection of foreign starting capital; and, unless the United States does its part, the other countries with some surplus of capital cannot provide enough to prime the pumps in the underdeveloped areas. This is why our refusal to cooperate in setting up a special United Nations Development Fund so aroused the freshman insurgents in Congress.

Time is not on our side. The Soviet Union's productive capacity is fast catching up to that of the United States. Our annual growth averages about 4 percent; Russia is increasing its annual production by about twice that figure.[10] Our annual growth consists to a great extent of increased production of consumer goods, which add to the

---

[8] West Germany, from 1948 to 1955, has proved an exception because of exceptional circumstances.

[9] Chinese steel production rose from 200,000 metric tons in 1949 to 2,200,000 tons in 1954. Electric power rose from 4,300,000 kilowatt-hours in 1949 to 10,800,000 kilowatt-hours in 1954.

[10] Soviet statistics are based upon artificial prices and may, therefore, be misleading.

already high American living standard. Russia's forced savings go chiefly into steel plants, heavy industry and producer's goods. Our present advantage in offering aid to the uncommitted peoples will soon vanish, unless we use it.

Pleading poverty and promising increased aid only when we can apply savings from reduced military expenditures not only plays into Soviet hands but actually provides the Soviet Union with the best possible reason for blocking a reduction of armaments. The central theme of long-range Soviet policy is more than likely precisely this:

"Keep the United States sufficiently preoccupied with a possible military threat to prevent it from embarking upon any real program of worldwide economic development."

Our present policy is made to order for the Kremlin.

Technical Aid—Suggestions for Revision

In considering how our policy should be revised, let us discuss first technical assistance and then the provision of capital by public loans or grants and by private investment.

Technical advice and assistance to the retarded areas are currently being supplied in three ways: through the United Nations and its specialized agencies; through regional cooperative organizations, such as the Colombo plan of the British Commonwealth nations; and through bilateral efforts launched by the United States under President Truman's point 4 program.

The United States programs have been shrinking and increasingly submerged in strategic considerations. The United Nations programs have been restricted by the unwillingness of the United States to assume its share of the cost of an expanded effort. The 83d Congress, elected in 1952, refused, in fact, to continue the American participation of $8 million a year and its successor, the 84th Congress, has so far approved only a 6 month's appropriation. This, considering the ridiculously small amount involved, is nothing less than a national disgrace.

There is already ample evidence to demonstrate how much can be accomplished even with limited means, especially in the field of disease control, nutrition, and in the care of mothers and infants. Anyone who doubts this should read the report of the British scientist, Ritchie Calder, on his journey through southeast Asia [11] or the reports issued by the United Nations agencies.

Apart from adopting a less parsimonious attitude, a new approach to technical assistance on the part of the United States might consider these changes in present policy:

(a) The substitution of multilateral cooperation through the United Nations, or through the regional organizations such as the Colombo Plan, for single-handed efforts such as the point 4 program. This is to be considered for a number of reasons.

It would save money. The American Technical Aid Administration duplicates to a certain extent the existing United Nations organizations. In any case, it has become a political stepchild subordinated to strategic considerations.

It would lead to better planning. The United Nations and its specialized agencies, composed as they are of experts from all parts of the world, are better qualified than a group of American experts sitting in Washington to assess the needs and to weigh the priorities in a global undertaking.

It would make for more effective execution. Experience has shown that most Asians would rather take advice and assistance from the United Nations than from the United States. The same thing is true of Africans, Arabs, and even some Latin Americans. This is not merely a matter of prejudice but of better natural understanding.

(b) A reduced reliance upon the use of American experts in the field. The reasons for this recommendation are similar to those cited in support of the preceding suggestions. It costs about $20,000 a year to keep an American point 4 expert in Asia. For this sum 2 or even 3 equally qualified Asians or Latin Americans could often be engaged. The notion that only North American technicians know how to plan and carry out technical programs has been exaggerated. The Indians, for example, are experienced in large-scale malaria control. The Japanese know more about increasing rice production on small farms than American farm experts accustomed to working large farms with machinery. The Indonesians have developed fish culture in flooded rice paddies, thus learning to raise protein food simultaneously with cereal.

(c) The divorce of the whole concept of technical assistance from political and military considerations. If it is deemed essential, for strategic reasons, to accelerate the development of certain areas, such programs—essentially political in nature—should not be permitted to intrude upon the planning or execution of a multilateral program of economic development. This divorce would be achieved automatically, to the extent that economic development efforts were channeled through the United Nations or through regional organizations.

President Eisenhower's recommendation to Congress, conveyed in his messages of January 1955, asked merely for the "carrying forward" of American participation in the existing programs. Even this was cut down by Congress. While requesting an appropriation to support the multilateral United Nations programs substantially at their present inadequate levels, the President declared that "the bilateral programs of the United States should be pressed vigorously," thus reemphasizing the tendency toward single-handed action.

Capital Assistance—Development of United States Policy

A few of the underdeveloped nations are sufficiently endowed with natural resources and with adequate labor to need little more than strictly technical assistance in developing their potential and thus acquiring a higher standard of living. In others, such as the feudal, oil-rich countries of the Middle East, the need is for social reform and technical assistance, rather than for capital. By far the greater number of the underdeveloped countries, however, require not only to be shown how to accomplish what they desire but to be aided with capital in the form of loans, outright grants, and long-term investment of foreign funds. To show them how to proceed and then to leave them without the means of proceeding is worse than ignoring their needs altogether.

The first approach to this problem was made at Bretton Woods in July 1944, when it was decided to create the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This institution, known as the World Bank, was authorized to grant loans to governments, or guaranteed by governments, deemed likely to create sufficient income to provide for repayment. The bank was authorized to obtain its loanable funds by selling its own obligations in the existing capital markets. Most of its outstanding bonds have been sold to American investors. The Import-Export Bank, an arm of the United States Treasury, was organized to make similar loans in the interest of promoting United States foreign trade.

While the work done by these two lending institutions has been useful and important, it has served to meet only a fraction of the need. This has been partly because the banks' available resources were limited, but even more because so few development projects could qualify under their requirements. Malaria control, for example, requires a capital outlay for insecticides, spray-guns and vehicles, but it produces no direct income. The same is true of flood control or the building of roads, harbors, schools, and hospitals. Such projects require outright grants in aid or long-term loans to governments with no positive assurance of repayment.

The United States Government has made a few grants in aid, such as $20 million given to India for DDT. But, so far as providing capital for the underdeveloped areas is concerned, the United States has undertaken no action remotely comparable to the generous assistance extended to the countries of Western Europe through the Marshall plan. It is true that, in 1947, Western Europe had to be saved from economic disaster and probable Communist subversion. It is also true that the West European problem was one of reconstruction rather than development, and that at that time Western Europe was the area through which maximum leverage could be exerted toward world recovery. But, once West European recovery had been almost miraculously achieved, the United States failed to follow up the initial success by undertaking similar efforts in Asia, the Middle East and Latin America.

It must also be noted that Marshall Plan aid Western Europe, while highly effective in stimulating production and employment, did not materially improve the maldistribution of income and purchasing power. The fact that Marshall aid was essentially producer-oriented diminished its impact upon the low-income groups. This is undoubtedly one reason for the continued strength of the Communist parties in France and Italy.

During the last 5 years, the American Government has been so preoccupied with the Communist threat of military aggression that it has diverted its thoughts and its resources from economic aid to military assistance. In so doing it has not only ignored the growing Communist threat of economic penetration but has alienated many of the uncommitted peoples by identifying itself with such symbols of the past as the Nationalist Government of China and French colonial rule in Viet-Nam.

It would not be correct to say that the American Government has given no thought to the capital needs of the underdeveloped areas. President Truman not only launched the point 4 program in 1949 but subsequently appointed 2 commissions to study the problem, the first headed by Gordon Gray and the second by Nelson Rockefeller.

The Rockefeller Commission recommended the establishment of an International Development Authority with an initial capital of $500 million, empowered to make long-term low-interest loans and grants in aid. It further recommended the creation of an International Finance Corporation with a capital of $100 million as an affiliate of the World Bank, empowered to participate in equity financing or in loans to private enterprises without the guarantee of national governments. The purpose of these recommendations was to create both a mechanism by which public funds might be made available to the governments of underdeveloped countries and a channel through which private investment in these countries might be stimulated.

Unfortunately, both of these projects ran into a political dead-end street. Not only the "economizers" in the American Congress but the United States Treasury looked askance at any further "giveaway programs." Having itself evolved the idea of an International Development Fund, the United States refused to subscribe its share when a majority of the members of the United Nations attempted to set up a special U. N. Fund for Economic Development

[11] Men Against the Jungle, Unwin, 1954.

(SUNFED) with an initial capital of $250 million.[12]

Apart from stating that the United States could not presently afford to contribute its share of $80 million, the United States representatives expressed misgivings that the existence of such a fund would subject the United States to continual pressure from other nations. This pressure materialized, especially from Latin America at the Rio Conference of November 1954, even though the fund had not been created. So far, the United States Government has not changed its position with regard to SUNFED but, under Latin American pressure, has taken up once more the proposal for an International Finance Corporation. This institution, with a capital of only $100 million, can scarcely be expected to stimulate the flow of private capital into the underdeveloped areas unless the seed money is furnished through public funds.

Some of the major potential contributors to an International Development Fund—notably the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, Switzerland, Sweden and West Germany—have supported the negative position of the United States. The Soviet Union has also so far opposed the creation of the fund. On the other hand, not only all the underdeveloped countries but an important group of potential contributors, including France, Denmark, Belgium, The Netherlands, Norway, Italy and Japan, has favored the creation of SUNFED with or without prior savings from disarmament. The Belgian Government's official position included this statement:

"The effect of American policy on the world economic and financial situation is, in fact, so great that, at least in the opinion of the Belgian Government, the fund would not be fully effective without American support. That is a question of fact."

There can be little doubt that, if the United States were to reverse its basic position, the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland, and West Germany would follow suit, leaving the Soviet Union and its satellites as the sole objectors.

On July 13, 1955, on the eve of the four-power conference at Geneva, Premier Faure of France, launched a proposal for reducing military budgets and applying the resulting savings to economic development of the underdeveloped areas. The same idea had been proposed in 1950 by the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, and again in 1953, by President Eisenhower.

In his message to Congress of January 10, 1955, however, President Eisenhower ignored the need for the investment of public funds to create the basis for private investment. Declaring that "the whole free world needs capital" and that "America is its largest source," the President stated that "the flow of capital abroad from our country must be stimulated and in such a manner that it results in investment largely by individuals and private enterprise rather than by government."

To stimulate the flow of private capital, the President recommended that Congress reduce taxation on business income from foreign subsidiaries or branches of American concerns to a rate 14 percent lower than the rate applicable to income from domestic sources. (This recommendation, upon which the 1st session of the 84th Congress failed to act, would no doubt be a boon to the oil and copper companies and to large concerns such as General Motors which operate branches in Europe and Canada, but it is hard to see how it would stimulate the industrialization of the underdeveloped areas.) In addition, the President proposed to explore the possibilities of negotiating tax treaties and other means of encouraging "a climate favorable to the private enterprise concept in investment"—a concept not shared by many of the countries seeking economic development. Finally, "as a further step to stimulate investment abroad," the President recommended and Congress approved United States membership in the proposed International Finance Corporation.

The Special U. N. Development Fund (SUNFED) was not mentioned.

Suggestions for Revision

If the United States is to extricate itself from its present negative and politically untenable position, two basic decisions will have to be reached.

1. The notion that the necessary capital can be supplied to the underdeveloped areas by self-liquidating bank loans and private equity investment must be abandoned. There are only a limited number of projects which could qualify for loans from the World Bank or from similarly organized regional lending institutions. As for private investment, the following figures are significant.

Since World War II private investment of capital within the United States has averaged about $46 billion a year. Total private American investment abroad during the entire post-war period has reached only about $10 billion, most of which represents oil expansion in South America and the Middle East or the local re-investment of profits earned in Canada or Western Europe by American corporations. Total private American investment in the underdeveloped areas during the post-war period outside of oil expansion, has been less than $1 billion—an average of about $100 million a year.

The reasons for this merger flow of private capital are abvious. Conditions in most of the underdeveloped areas are not such as to attract profit-seeking venture capital, especially at a time when the domestic market offers a wide choice of opportunities. The economic preconditions for private enterprise have not yet been created. The political conditions are often far from favorable, chiefly because the nations emerging into independence are suspicious of private foreign investment, having learned from past experience that it can lead to foreign political influence and control.

Both obstacles to the flow of private capital can be overcome by long-term, non-profit-seeking loans, or grants of public funds administered through the United Nations or through regional organizations. Such loans or grants will create the economic conditions in which private investment will become attractive; at the same time they will remove suspicion and help to create a more favorable political climate.

2. The notion that the United States cannot afford to contribute substantially to an international fund out of which loans and grants would be made, unless and until savings can be realized from a reduction of armaments, must be recognized as dangerously false. It would be more nearly correct to say that the United States cannot afford not to make such contributions, with or without disarmament.

The highest estimate of the amount needed to raise incomes in the underdeveloped areas by 2 percent each year is about $10 billion per annum, of which the American share would be roughly $3½ billion. In all probability the actual figures would be considerably lower. The amounts involved for the American people during the initial stages would be less than they now spend annually on cosmetics. After the first few years the need for public funds would be reduced, not only by an increased flow of private capital but by the mobilization of the latent potential of the underdeveloped areas themselves.

Failure to reverse the present position of the American Government will not only play into the hands of the Communists but will tend more and more to isolate the United States from its friends.

If these two basic decisions are made, a number of important subsidiary problems remain to be solved.

The Need for a Multilateral Approach

The same reasoning which leads to the recommendation that most technical assistance be channeled through the United Nations applies even more to the provision of capital. Assessing the merits and relative priority of the various requests from national governments for loans and grants in aid requires not only competent practical judgments but political judgments as well. Were the United States, acting through bilateral negotiations, to attempt to make such judgments, it would frequently find itself in an invidious position.

For example, let us suppose that the government of country X applied for a large loan or grant to build harbor facilities and that it were known that the finances of this country were being administered by a corrupt regime. If the United States were to decline assistance, unless the government of country X undertook reforms or until a new government came into power, it would open itself up to severe criticism. The same thing would be true if the United States refused a loan or grant to finance irrigation in country Y, whose arable land was known to be held in large tracts by oppressive feudal landlords, on the ground that land reform would have to be undertaken before such a project could be considered.

If the living standards of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries are to be raised, this purpose can obviously not be accomplished through loans or grants to governments which are feudal, corrupt, inefficient, or unrepresentative of the interests of their people. Were the United States to set itself up as the sole judge of such politically explosive questions, it would justly be accused of interference in the internal affairs of other countries. If, on the other hand, such decisions were made by an international development authority representing the combined judgment of the participating nations, it would be far easier to apply rigorous standards.

The charter of the Development Authority might also provide for the possibility of making certain loans or grants to consumer or producer cooperatives which could qualify under carefully drawn eligibility requirements. The power to make such loans or grants might occasionally enable the Authority to extend aid to people living under a government which could not itself qualify for assistance.

The time factor is another reason for adopting the United Nations multilateral approach to supplying public funds to the underdeveloped areas. Economic development is a slow process at best. A nation cannot be transformed overnight from the colonial raw-material producing status to that of a self-supporting balanced economy. Commitments of capital, if they are to be effective, will have to be made on at least a 5-year basis in order that the beneficiary countries may be able to proceed according to an orderly and carefully planned program. It is far easier for the American Congress to agree to annual contributions to an International Development Fund than to appropriate separate amounts each year for individual countries and projects.

Food as Capital

The idea of using surplus food as capital has already been noted as one which should be thoroughly explored. This might greatly ease the strain upon food surplus producing capital contributors, especially the United States. The execution of the idea requires careful planning so that, concurrently with the sale by the recipient government of, let

[12] See Report on Special U. N. Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) by Raymond Scheyven; U. N. Assembly Official Record, 9th Session, Supplement No. 19.

us say, a grant of surplus wheat, unemployed workers or seasonally unemployed farmers would be put to work on development projects which require little or no capital. The proceeds of the sale of the wheat could then be used to pay the wages of the workers newly employed on dams, roads, or irrigation canals. Thus, development work would be paid for without strain upon the internal economy, purchasing power would be increased through increased employment, and food consumption would be raised.

The limited use of surplus food stocks as capital contributions to an International Development Fund could in this way narrow the existing gap between effective demand and adequate nutritional standards. The end result would be to provide seller countries with wider markets for the future as well as to raise living standards in the underdeveloped areas.

It goes without saying that this device can be used only where local conditions are favorable. If wheat is donated to a country where its consumption will lead to a reduction in the consumption of wheat from other sources or of rice or other foodstuffs, the plan will defeat itself. It can be used only where increased employment will simultaneously bring about increased food consumption.[13]

The Myopia of Business Leadership

Although the Truman administration was slow to recognize the vital importance of technical and capital assistance to the economically retarded areas and failed to match its belated pronouncements with adequate deeds, the Eisenhower administration has actually moved backwards in this area of foreign policy. Some elements within the administration, notably Mr. Harold Stassen, have made an effort to launch an adequate program for Asia. Others, among them President Eisenhower's brother, have tried to bring about more generous aid to Latin America. Secretary of the Treasury, George Humphrey, the "strong man" of the Eisenhower cabinet, seems, however, to have succeeded in blocking all such moves, partly because of his preoccupation with balancing the budget and partly because of his Hooveresque predilection for laissez-faire economics. Secretary of State Dulles, while at times rendering lip service to more liberal policies has, on the whole, evinced little interest in opposing his powerful Treasury colleague.

It is a curious fact that an administration dominated by big business [14] has seemed almost wholly unaware of one of the basic requirements of American prosperity. Our economy is geared not only to continuous expansion but to the annual production of something like 20 percent more goods than the American people can consume. At present, the surplus production necessary to maintain full employment is consumed by military expenditures. We are spending some $50 billion a year on the cold war. If peace were to "break out" tomorrow, the American economy would fall flat on its face, unless the surplus of production over consumption necessary to keep it going were immediately diverted into other channels.

Such rechanneling cannot be done overnight. If the cold war were suddenly to end, we should find ourselves paralyzed by a major depression long before plans could be devised to drain off our surplus production into a program of creative foreign aid and investment. Failure to develop such a program now—at the very least in pilot-plant form—means the creation of a national interest in not making peace.

Defense Secretary Charles Wilson once proclaimed: "What's good for General Motors is good for the United States." Leaving aside the question whether this or the reverse is more nearly correct, would it not be good for General Motors and all the other Government suppliers to be prepared for an instant switchover from war production to the manufacture of those types of motors, pumps, generators, powerplants, tractors, and earthmoving equipment so urgently needed to develop the underdeveloped parts of the world? Would it not be good for General Motors and our great industries to have done the preliminary research and engineering, and to be making some of these goods now, so as to be tooled up and ready to enter upon mass production for peace?

The men of big business have been so busy preparing for a war which they hope to avert that they seem to have neglected almost altogether planning for the peace which they hope to achieve.

Chapter 6. Trade among nations

The economically retarded nations, especially those recently freed from colonial dependency or seeking independence, would far rather pay for their own progress than achieve it through foreign assistance. To undertake their own development, most of the underdeveloped nations must, however, be able to buy abroad a variety of materials and products, from food and DDT to roadbuilding machinery, automobiles and powerplants. This they can do only if they are able to earn a steady income in foreign exchange, particularly in American dollars, since the United States is the chief source of most of the things they need.

The underdeveloped countries can earn a steady flow of foreign exchange only if they can sell their own products—as yet mostly raw materials—at reasonably stable prices to the industrialized countries.

The easier we make it for the underdeveloped countries to sell to us and the less the fluctuations in our demand for what they have to sell, the less will be their need for loans and grants.

Because of our preponderant position in world trade, the recent statement of a foreign diplomat that "when the United States sneezes, the world gets pneumonia" was no great exaggeration. Any recession in the United States which affects its purchases of raw materials depresses the economies of the countries which supply those materials. Conversely, any inflationary boom which raises prices in the United States reduces the ability of other countries to buy American goods. In 1946, for example, the inflationary price rise in the United States reduced by one-third the purchasing power of the dollars we had agreed to loan Britain before the British could even lay their hands on the proceeds of the $3,500,000,000 loan.

Recognition of the tremendous impact of our economy upon the rest of the world presents an added reason for the responsible planning and execution of our domestic economic policies. A discussion of these policies would carry us too far afield from the subject of this study, but there are two aspects of our domestic affairs which require consideration. These are our methods of stockpiling raw materials and the devices we use to protect American producers against foreign competition.

Our Raw Materials Policy

The manner in which we handle our purchase of raw material is particularly important in our relations with Latin America. Five of the twenty Latin American Republics depend for more than 75 percent of their exports upon a single commodity. Six others depend upon a single commodity for over 55 percent. In another six, two commodities account for more than half of the exports. The whole area is at the mercy of price fluctuations in a relatively small number of commodities for which the United States supplies the largest demand.

On the other side of the picture, we are becoming more and more dependent upon Latin American raw materials. Out of 12 raw materials listed as strategic in World War II, 11 are abundantly available in Latin America. Chilean copper, Bolivian tin, Venezuelan oil, Latin American chromium, bauxite, antimony and wood are essential not only to our military security but to our peacetime prosperity; and, of course, without access, to Latin America, we should lack coffee, bananas, and cane sugar.

In the postwar period, Latin America has faced a triple problem of explosively rapid population increase, urbanization, and industrialization. Its growing populations require expanded production, enlarged markets and greater foreign trade. Its growing cities demand housing, transport, and sanitation. Its growing industries require not only capital but adaptation to domestic consumer needs and the procurement or manufacture of machinery. Its predominantly pastoral people need education and training in modern methods of agriculture and production. Much of this development has come suddenly, in part as the result of increased demand for Latin American raw materials generated by World War II. When the demand slackened, the major source of capital dried up. This led in most of the Latin American Republics to resort to the printing press and disastrous inflation.

Chile, for example, fell into a state of economic and political chaos because of the fall in the price of copper after the fighting ended in Korea. Living costs rose by one-third in 1953–54. Similarly, any drop in the price of tin disastrously affects Bolivia while Brazil's economy is at the mercy of coffee prices and Cuba depends upon a demand for sugar.

The United States does not alone control the world price of these commodities, but with respect to many of them, the United States is the largest buyer. When the United States goes on an abnormal buying spree, as it did in 1950 after the outbreak of the Korean war, it raises inflationary havoc in the raw material producing countries. When American purchases drop below normal because of an overaccumulation of stockpiles, sudden and painful deflation is the result.

A new approach to foreign economic policy should, therefore, include a serious effort to develop a more orderly program of raw material purchasing and to establish a system by which stockpiling would be increased in falling markets and decreased when world prices show an inflationary trend.

The Latin Americans must, of course, do their part in curbing inflation and in adopting more orderly plans for growth and development. If they need foreign capital, as most of the republics do, they must create a political climate which will attract investment. But the crying need of the whole area is for a reduction in the fluctuations of raw material prices. The absence of aid from us in that direction, creates continuing resentment and the fallacious assumption that Latin America's plight is all, or nearly all, the fault of the selfish "colossus of the North."

Liberalizing Import Restrictions

The second aspect of our foreign trade policies which demands attention is that of relaxing the restrictions which keep foreign goods out of our domestic market. This is primarily a matter of concern to the other industrialized nations but will, in time, affect our relations with more and more other countries as industrialization progresses. At present, the most acute problems relate to Western Europe and Japan.

---

[13] See Report issued by FAO in May, 1955, on pilot-plant experiments conducted in India.

[14] In the early days of the Eisenhower administration, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay declared: "We are here in the saddle as an administration representing business and industry."

Generous American aid extended under the Marshall plan made it possible for the West European countries to restore their productive capacity and even to increase it over prewar levels, but most of them continue to be plagued by a "dollar shortage" which prevents them from reaching complete independence of continuing American subsidy. The chief reason for this "dollar shortage" (at present concealed by American military assistance grants) is that the West European countries find it difficult to dispose of their production in foreign markets where they can earn dollars. This is due partly to cold-war trade restrictions but even more to the inaccessibility of the American market.

Similarly, American aid has enabled Japan to rebuild its industrial capacity but Japan remains and will remain dependent upon American subsidy in one form or another until it can earn the foreign exchange to pay for its needed imports.

The extent to which military security actually demands restriction of trade with the Sino-Soviet orbit is a political question. From the strictly economic point of view, it is doubtful whether the anti-communist coalition gains more than it loses through the present state of economic warfare.

The United States suffers less directly than its European allies from the ban on trade with the Sino-Soviet orbit, but, in the final analysis, the United States foots a large part of the bill in the form of subsidies to the market-hungry countries of Western Europe. In the case of Germany and Japan—two countries of crucial importance in maintaining a balance of power—it seems very doubtful whether the ban on trade with the Communist orbit can in the long run be maintained. Our present policy urgently requires cool-headed reexamination.

Apart from the needs of other countries, it is a truism that we cannot hope to maintain, much less expand our present level of exports unless we are willing to increase our imports; and that a substantial drop in our exports would bring on a serious recession.

The most recent study of our superannuated protective tariff structure by the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (Randall Commission) appointed by President Eisenhower, while not as far-reaching as earlier studies undertaken by the Truman administration, showed the urgent need for reducing American import restrictions and for simplifying and clarifying customs procedures. The Eisenhower administration, though endorsing most of the findings of the Randall Commission, has not been very successful in inducing Congress to enact the necessary legislation.

The struggle centered about a renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) entered into by the United States and thirty-odd other nations in 1947. President Eisenhower sought and finally obtained a 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, though not without accepting certain protectionist amendments inspired chiefly by the oil industry and the textile interests.

Under the act of 1934, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman entered into a large number of bilateral treaties which, in exchange for reciprocal benefits, gradually reduced the prohibitive rates imposed by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. In 1947, these individual bilateral agreements were replaced by the multilateral General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which provided for further reciprocal tariff reductions.

The multilateral general agreement (GATT) differed from the previous bilateral agreements in that a tariff concession made to any country, and extended to all others under the most favored nation clause, was no longer granted to others for nothing, but only in return for a reciprocal concession. This provision eliminated a feature of the original legislation which had been criticized by the protectionist spokesmen.

President Eisenhower asked for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which would authorize, subject to the present peril and escape clause provision":

1. Reductions, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of tariff rates on selected commodities by not more than 5 per cent per year for 3 years.

2. Reductions, through multilateral and reciprocal negotiations, of any tariff rates in excess of 50 per cent to that level over a 3-year period; and

3. Reduction, by not more than one-half over a 3-year period, of tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945, on articles which are not now being imported or which are being imported only in negligible quantities.

The President's message included no request for authorization to exchange tariff reductions for a reduction of import quotas or other restrictions. It contained no reference to a modification of our own quotas and restrictive devices except a recommendation to simplify further United States Customs procedures and administration.

The President observed that "programs designed to promote the prosperity of agriculture should be consistent with our foreign economic program" and that "we must take due account of the effect of any agricultural program on our foreign economic relations to assure that it contributes to the development of healthy, expanding foreign markets over the years." Beyond this, there was no reference to the growing problem of food surpluses resulting from the existing policies and no recognition that these policies were, in fact, wholly inconsistent with a program of liberalizing world trade and stimulating economic development

The White House ignored a number of excellent suggestions for liberalizing amendments put forward by the Committee for Economic Development, a conservative nonpartisan organization of business and educational leaders. The report of this committee, isued in November 1954, recommended a 5- instead of 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the exchange of tariff reductions for liberalizing concessions of various nature, such as the reduction of import quotas. It recommended that the withholding of tariff-rate reduction under the peril-point provision, or its withdrawal as the result of escape-clause proceedings, should ordinarily be temporary and not permanent, making it clear that the purpose of these provisions is to prevent any reduction of domestic output. All these recommendations were rejected by the President.

On the other hand, the President accepted without much of a fight a number of Senate amendments which opened glaring loopholes in the program. One such amendment allowed an industry to ask for escape-clause relief if any one of its products, rather than its whole business, was being injured by foreign competition. Another permitted any industry which considered itself essential to the national defense to ask for relief. Both clauses are permissive and call for no mandatory action by the President. Whether or not these amendments wreck the program will depend upon how the White House reacts to the flood of appeals which are sure to result.

The indications in this respect are not promising. President Eisenhower sanctioned a 50-percent increase in the tariff on Swiss watches while the debate in Congress over the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act was still in progress. After its passage, in August 1955, the President approved a similar 50-percent rise in the tariff on bicycles. In the same month, the United States Government for the second time rejected the bid of a British concern for the supplying of generators to the Chief Joseph Dam project in favor of the higher bid of American contractors. These actions occasioned strong European protest, especially from Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Great Britain, where it was pointed out that the President's actions seemed to be in sharp contradiction to his professed interest in freeing international trade from artificial restrictions.

The Defense Department's reason for rejecting the British generator bid was that it was necessary to give the work to American contractors who had plants in the Pittsburgh area where there was unemployment. The London Times commented as follows:

It (the decision) is made at a time when the numbers of persons employed in the United States has reached a higher figure than ever. If unemployment, even localized, can be deemed an appropriate argument for special protection now, it is hard to imagine the occasion on which it will be inappropriate.

Conclusion as to Foreign Economic Policy

Summing up the five elements of economic policy discussed (food, fuel, technical aid, capital investment and international trade) it is apparent that our present course of action leaves much to be desired, both from the point of view of national self-interest and building toward a world community and enduring peace. Much of our present policy is based upon obsolete conceptions of the national interest, much of it upon dangerously false notions of economy which lead first to pennypinching and, ultimately, to unnecessary great expenditures. Some of its worst features are not the result of deliberate decisions, but simply the product of pressures exerted upon a complacent government by well-heeled special-interest lobbies.

Taken as a whole, the field of foreign economic policy presents almost limitless opportunities for improvement, if we, the people, are prepared to back representatives in Washington who are neither hopelessly committed to outworn concepts nor subservient to vested-interest pressure groups.

Chapter 7. Colonialism—The challenge of Bandung

We come now to the political aspects of building toward lasting peace.

The Asian-African Conference held at the Indonesian resort town of Bandung in the latter part of April 1955, marked a milestone in the development of the formerly dependent peoples. Here, for the first time, the future of Asia and Africa was discussed without the presence of a single Western Power. Of the 29 nations represented, 2—the People's Republic of China and North Vietnam—belonged to the Communist orbit. Turkey, Iraq, Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippine Republic were allied to the West. The remainder, led by India, Burma, and Indonesia, represented the bloc of uncommitted peoples.

Western diplomats, particularly the American State Department, anticipated that the Bandung Conference would provide a sounding board for Communist and neutralist anti-American propaganda. The fact that Nationalist China was not invited, while Chou En-lai, the Premier of the Chinese People's Republic, was scheduled to be one of the principal figures, caused Washington to view the whole affair with a hostile and distrustful eye. Actually, the result was quite different from what had been expected.

The Conference concerned itself less with the differences which existed between its Communist and anti-Communist participants than with exploring the interests common to the Asian and African peoples as a whole. Colonialism and racial discrimination came in for more bitter attacks than communism or militant anticommunism. Somewhat surprisingly, Sir John Kotelawara, prime minister of neutralist Ceylon, launched an attack upon communism as a new form of colonial imperialism more bitter

than any of the speeches made by the representatives of nations allied to the West. In the face of this and other attacks, Chou En-lai maintained a conciliatory attitude throughout, refraining from throwing into the discussion the explosive question of Formosa and even using the Conference as a sounding-board for an offer to settle outstanding differences with the United States by direct negotiation.

We shall deal presently with the relations between Washington and the Peking government. The basic challenge of Bandung with which we are concerned here was the assertion by the peoples there represented of their determination to be masters of their own destiny. Translated into a message to the United States, this challenge might have read something like this:

"If you want our friendship and respect, respect us and trust us as equals.

"If you believe in your own Declaration of Independence, help those of us who, like you, have achieved freedom from foreign rule to catch up to the industrial revolutions which have passed us by and to free our people from hunger, poverty and pestilence. But, above all, help those of us who are still under colonial rule to win our freedom, instead of supporting the colonial powers in their stubborn effort to hold on to what is left of their empires."

The challenge to take a stand with respect to colonialism is one which we shall ignore at our peril. Already, our intervention in the internal affairs of China and our support of benighted French colonialism in Indo-China have cost us dear. Our wiser policy with respect to Indonesia was adopted when it was already too late to win us the friendship of the Indonesians. We, who led the way in freeing Asians from foreign rule, have in recent years come to be regarded as the chief defenders of the colonial past.

The mistakes of the past cannot be undone, but while we have missed the bus in Asia, there are other areas where we can still redeem ourselves. Africa is approaching the condition in which Asia found itself at the conclusion of World War II. Unlike the situation in Asia, communism plays little if any part in the growing independence movements among the 100 million dependent people of Africa, but the Asian revolution has fired the imagination and the hopes of the inhabitants of the Dark Continent.

The Problem of French Colonialism

Our problem is primarily one of our relations with France. In Anglo-American relations, the colonial question causes no very serious complications since British policy is deliberately oriented toward the gradual conversion of a colonial empire into a commonwealth of independent nations. French colonialism, on the other hand, presents a very real problem, especially in North Africa.

The most serious situation probably exists in Morocco, although plenty of trouble is also brewing in Tunisia and Algeria. Let us consider Morocco as a laboratory case.

The present Sultanate is the remnant of the great Sherifian Moorish empire which at one time included most of North Africa and Spain. Its people have a proud history. One of the earliest commercial treaties which Franklin, Jefferson, and John Adams were able to negotiate for the struggling confederation of the American colonies, before the United States became a Nation, was the treaty signed with the friendly Sultan of Morocco in 1787. One of George Washington's first acts as President was to write a formal letter of grateful acknowledgement, to "The Emperor of Morocco, His Majesty Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdellah," (sic) whom he addressed as "Great and Magnanimous Friend." This was the great-great-great-great grandfather of the Sultan whom the French deposed and exiled to Madagascar in 1953.

The former Empire of Morocco is now divided into three protectorates. The enclave of Tangier is under international protection; a small strip of coast is under Spanish influence; and the remainder is a French protectorate established after the Algeciras Conference of 1911, in which President Theodore Roosevelt acted as mediator.

The population of French Morocco is roughly 9,000,000, of which 350,000 are French and other European settlers. This European minority manages, controls, and ruthlessly exploits the Moorish majority. During their 40 years of occupation, the French have made many physical investments and improvements, but their development schemes have been designed exclusively for their own benefit. They have built an economy based upon discrimination, in which the Europeans own the best land, most of the mines, and practically all the industries. The Moors are the serfs, living in slums, and performing menial labor. Wage scales are, with few exceptions, openly discriminatory. There are only about 2 dozen primary schools for the entire Moorish population. Child labor is viciously exploited. Education, like every other sort of privilege is reserved for the French. In the words of Justice William O. Douglas, written after a visit to North Africa, 'The French have fastened a milking machine on Morocco for their own benefit." [15]

In 1950, Sultan Sidi Mohammed V proposed some mild and long overdue reforms. He did not seek to expel the French; in fact, he proposed to guarantee them against expropriation. He demanded an educational program, a free press, freedom of assembly and freely elected representative government, leading eventually to independence. He asserted the right of Moorish labor to form trade unions.

The French broke with the Sultan over these moderate demands, using force and terror to repress a strike and to maintain their police-state rule. The Istiqlal nationalist party was outlawed and many of its leaders jailed. In 1953, Marshal Juin, appointed as resident-general to suppress the growing revolt, arranged a coup d'etat with the help of Thami El Glaoui, the powerful Berber pasha of Marrakesh. The Sultan was deposed and sent into exile; his unpopular cousin, Moulay Mohammed ben Arafa, was installed in his place. From then on, relations between the Moors and the French went from bad to worse, leading eventually to the bloody disorders of August 1955. The new Sultan agreed to "reforms" which were purely nominal and served merely to increase the spirit of revolt. New "popular assemblies" were, for example, created in which the French minority was given the right to elect half the members. The French continued to control the bureaucracy and the police, backed by ever greater military forces. Probably the only reason why the French colonies refrained from demanding the establishment of complete French sovereignty was that this would have subjected their profits to French taxation.

From Morocco, the spirit of revolt spread to Algeria and Tunisia. Algeria is not a protectorate but a part of metropolitan France. The 8 million Algeria Moslems are theoretically "French citizens," but of the 30 representatives Algeria sends to the National Assembly in Paris, 15 are elected by the French settlers. So also in the logal Algerian assembly, half the delegates are elected by the colons. The law establishes "equality" but one Frenchman's vote is equal to that of eight Moslems. Like the Istiglal in Morocco, the Algerian MTDL [16] and the Tunisian Neo-Destour were outlawed. A French army of some 200,000 soldiers, equipped with tanks and artillery held down the three nationalist movements. French North Africa became another Indochina in the making.

None of the postwar French Governments made any serious effort to deal with this explosive situation until Pierre Mendes-France came into office in May, 1954. Many political leaders publicly condemned the deposition of the Sultan of Morocco. The majority of the French people have been as unsympathetic toward their government's north African policy as they weretoward its policy in Indo-China. Yet, the power of the colons, of the business and financial interests allied to them, and of their political lobby has been such that no French Government could see its way clear to break with the past.

In 1954, with Tunisia momentarily the focus of rebellion, Mendes-France moved to grant the protectorate autonomy within the French Union. Even this moderate proposal infuriated the colons. One of the key figures in the parliamentary intrigue which brought about the fall of Mendes-France was a former premier whose constituency lies in Algeria. Edgar Faure, succeeding Mendes-France, eventually managed to put through Tunisian autonomy, but by this time—April 1955—all of French North Africa was seething with revolt and demanding independence. When, after months of bloody incidents in Morocco, Faure finally moved to depose the unpopular Moulay ben Arafa and to reach a compromise, the colon lobby succeeded in so watering down the proposal as to make it once more an offer of "too little too late."

United States Policy as to North Africa

American policy in North Africa—like American policy in Indochina—has been dominated by strategic considerations arising out of the cold war. El Glaoui is an old favorite in the Pentagon because of his assistance to the invasion of 1942. Five of our most important bases are in Morocco. Hence the view that "this is no time to fool around with any political compromises which might weaken our French ally or endanger the safety of our United States Air Force bases."

The fact is that even on these grounds our policy has made no sense. Had we exercised our influence in the direction of a political settlement in Indochina before it was too late, instead of urging the hard-pressed French to continue their obsolete policy of seeking to suppress revolt by military force, France would not, for 8 long years, have been drained of its best military manpower. The present French policy in North Africa has already necessitated the transfer of several French divisions from NATO to Algeria and Morocco.

If we were to exert only a fraction of the pressure which we have not hesitated to employ in order to prsuade the French to agree to German rearmament, we could still probably help France to prevent north Africa from becoming another Vietnam.

Our bases in Morocco—whatever may be their rapidly diminishing value in this age of guided missiles—are far more seriously threatened by the present trend of events than they would be by Morocco's regaining its right to self-government. The present trend leads only to a vicious circle of more and more determined revolt and more and more uncompromising suppression by force and terror.

This, however, is only one aspect of the question. Even if our present policy made sense from the military point of view, it would still be disastrously wrong from the point of view of meeting the challenge of Bandung. One third of the world's population is asking us:

"Where do you stand on the question of colonialism?"

If we wish to win the moral allegiance of Asia, Africa and the Arab world, we had better ask ourselves that question.

---

[15] Look, October 19, 1954.

[16] Movement for the Triumph of Democratic Liberties.

Other Aspects of Colonialism

The colonial problem is, of course, broader and more complicated than it might appear from this brief consideration of French North Africa. For example:

The discovery of uranium in the Belgian Congo and in Portuguese Africa suddenly gave these colonial possessions a strategic significance which, rightly or wrongly, overshadows all other aspects of colonial policy and tends to work against the realization of native aspirations to self-government and independence.

The case of Cyprus illustrates both the complexities of strategic colonialism and the problem of dual citizenship. The Greek claim to Cyprus does not rest upon past Greek ownership but upon the fact that four-fifths of the island's population is Greek. The British reject self-determination by plebiscite on the grounds that the islanders have no legal right to change overlords. The Turks want the island to remain a British colony because of its large Turkish minority. Back of all this is the fact that Cyprus, Malta, and Gibraltar are the keys to Britain's weakened defense position in the Mediterranean, and beyond strategic considerations, the Cypriotes' claim to self-determination would, if granted, set a dangerous precedent. For, if the Cypriotes are held to be entitled to joint Cyprus to Greece, the Chinese in Malaya might raise a similar demand to join China. Meanwhile, the dispute over Cyprus threatens to disrups the Greco-Turkish alliance which forms the southeastern cornerstone of NATO.

Finally, the fact that some of the colonial peoples are actually far from ready for self-government, let alone independence, stands as a very real obstacle in the way of any sudden and dramatic end to all colonialism. The U. N. Charter clearly looks forward, however, to the abolition of colonialism. The United Nations itself is responsible for the development of 11 trust territories toward self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its people and the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." The nations appointed as administering authorities are asked to report progress each year.

In addition, all United Nations members have pledged themselves to render to the United Nations an annual accounting of their stewardship of their non-self-governing possessions. Since these reports are discussed and voted upon by the General Assembly, they serve the important purpose of focusing world attention upon the problem and upon the amount of progress being made toward its solution. However imperfect the United Nations machinery in this respect, the fact remains that the United Nations was given the task of liquidating the colonial pattern [17] and that world opinion has been mobilized toward its accomplishment.

The Weak Position of the United States

Unfortunately, the voting record of the United States in the United Nations looks more like that of a colonial power than like that of the Nation which has freed the Philippines and given self-government to Puerto Rico.

On July 2, 1955, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, commented upon this problem in a preface to a staff paper on colonialism. Calling for a great and continuous effort on the part of the colonial powers to prepare the dependent territories for self-government, Senator GEORGE declared that independence must be granted as soon as peoples are able to protect their own freedom and to govern themselves. The administering nations must, he said, help them to develop those capacities.

[17] See XI and XII in the charter's declaration of non-self-governing territories.

The Senator conceded that the policies followed by the United States "too often * * * have seemed to put the United States on the side of colonialism" but added: "Despite the fact that throughout many of the dependent areas of the world there is a tendency to associate the United States with the policies of colonial powers, the action of this nation in giving independence to the Republic of the Philippines is good evidence of the sincerity of our desire to advance the cause of human freedom everywhere."

Unhappily, this good evidence applies to our attitude of 1934 but scarcely certifies our present desire to advance the cause of human freedom.

One of the most important realities in the present-day world is that, as Sir John Kotelawara pointed out at Bandung, Sino-Soviet communism is indeed a new form of colonialism. So long as we support an older form of the same evil, we shall not be able to exploit what is perhaps the greatest weakness of our enemies.

Chapter 8. The United States, the United Nations and disarmament

Ambivalence Toward World Organization

The relationship of the United States to supranational world organization and control of armaments reflects a long-standing inner conflict between isolationism and world-mindedness. No nation has done more than the United States to create world organization. No nation has been more reluctant to participate in it.

At the conclusion of World War I, it was an American President who took the initiative in founding the League of Nations only to be repudiated by his own people. Again, toward the conclusion of the second great world conflict, the initiative for the founding of the United Nations emanated from Washington. It was Secretary of State Cordell Hull who, in 1943, flew to Moscow and obtained Marshal Stalin's agreement to participate in a new world organization to preserve peace. The drafting of the United Nations Charter took place at Dumbarton Oaks under American leadership. Yet so strong was President Roosevelt's fear that the American people might once more repudiate a proposal put before the world by their own leadership that the Charter was shaped as much from the point of view of assuming approval by the United States Senate as from the point of view of creating a world organization actually capable of "saving future generations from the scourge of war."

The antithesis between American leadership toward creating a world organization and American reluctance to participate in it reflects an inner contradiction which dates back to the earliest days of the Republic. Thomas Jefferson was the author of a Declaration of Independence which enunciated the principles of a philosophy applicable to "all men everywhere"; yet he asserted no less forcefully than George Washington or John Adams the belief that the United States should avoid foreign entanglements. Since the birth of the Nation, United States foreign policy has reflected the opposite extremes of idealistic universalism and pragmatic self-sufficiency.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was a less idealistic universalist than Woodrow Wilson. His worldmindedness was tempered by cautious appraisal of the limits of the attainable. Where Wilson overestimated, Roosevelt probably underestimated the extent to which the American people might have been induced to abdicate sovereign rights and assume world responsibility. Where Wilson stubbornly refused to consider modifications of his League Covenant in order to make it acceptable to the United States Senate, Roosevelt preferred to weaken the United Nations Charter rather than run the slightest risk of repudiation. The result was the creation of a world organization readily acceptable to the United States Senate and to the American people but not nearly strong enough to be able to enforce peace.

The American people agreed to enter the United Nations in the widespread belief that, if they did so, they would be assured of enduring peace. When peace failed to materialize, they were bitterly disappointed. Those who did not blame Russia blamed the United Nations. And those who saddled the Soviet Union with all the blame were ready to write off the United Nations because Russia "had destroyed its usefulness." Few Americans gave the matter enough serious thought to realize that, in putting their faith in the United Nations as constituted at San Francisco they made the mistake of expecting a toy engine to pull a full-size passenger train. Even when the invention of atomic weapons wholly altered the nature of war and vastly increased the discrepancy between the assignment and the powers given to the United Nations, few Americans attributed its inadequacy to this cause. On the whole, disappointment created an inclination to write off, ignore, or withdraw from the world organization rather than a determination to strengthen it.

This tendency was reflected in the course pursued by the American Government. In the postwar period, a succession of American Secretaries of State issued declarations asserting that support of the United Nations must be the cornerstone of American policy. Yet, with few exceptions, the major actions of the United States in the field of foreign affairs were undertaken unilaterally or at least outside of the United Nations. This was due in part to the fact that the United Nations was not charged with making but only with preserving the peace; and that many of the postwar problems were peace-making problems (e. g. Germany) for which the responsibility rested upon the great-power Council of Foreign Ministers.

This limitation upon the jurisdiction of the United Nations does not, however, account for such unilateral American actions as the intervention in Greece, Turkey and China, nor for the failure to channel economic assistance through the United Nations. These actions can be explained only on the ground of dissatisfaction with or lack of confidence in the United Nations machinery, or else on the ground of impatience with consultative processes and an inclination to "go it alone."

Russian obstructionism and abuse of the Security Council veto have, to be sure, provided a rationalization for taking action outside of the United Nations, especially when time has been of the essence. Russian intransigence might, however, just as readily have stimulated a demand for charter revision. It is significant that, apart from Secretary of State Acheson's initiative in proposing and putting through the "Uniting for Peace Resolution" after the experience gained in the Korean intervention, no such demand for strengthening the United Nations has developed as the result of Communist obstruction. The trend has been in the opposite direction, toward unilateral action or toward regional defense organizations permitted by the United Nations Charter but scarcely expected by its founders to replace the United Nations as the chief instrument of preserving peace. One might sum up the official United States Government attitude toward the United Nations in something like the following paraphrase:

"Soviet obstruction makes it impossible to use the United Nations as more than a forum for discussion. Therefore, other means must be used to prevent aggression. There is no use in discussing a strengthening of the United Nations because the Communists would veto any strengthening Charter amendments that might be put forward."

This somewhat defeatist attitude almost certainly does not derive solely from dis-

couragement; it derives at least as much from a reluctance to subordinate American foreign policy to external influence. The widespread support of the Bricker amendment, the coercive tendencies in legislation such as the Battle Act and the overt attacks upon the United Nations and UNESCO by patrioteering groups provide clear evidence that an important segment of American public opinion resents any outside interference in American pursuit of American objectives. Were this superpatriotism to become dominant in determining United States foreign policy, it would logically result either in a retreat into neo-isolationism (Fortress America) or in a reluctant but nevertheless ruthless American imperialism (The American Century). As it is, the influence of the isolationist imperialists has been sufficiently strong to give American policy overtones of arrogance and a tendency toward coercion rather than cooperation.

Parallel to the trend toward writing off the United Nations, there has developed a contradictory trend toward attempting to convert it into an anti-Communist coalition. The outstanding manifestation of this tendency has been the American attitude toward the admission of Red China and of the European Soviet satellites which, because they had participated in World War II on the side of Germany, did not become original members of the United Nations. This refusal to admit additional Communist nations to membership has been matched by Soviet refusal to admit additional non-Communist members. Both sides have apparently forgotten that the United Nations was created as a universal organization, and that it can fulfill its function only if its membership includes all nations, irrespective of their systems of government.[18]

The Influence of John Foster Dulles

The attitude of Secretary of State Dulles toward the United Nations, which is obviously an important factor in determining the present policy of the United States, can be traced back to the year before the world organization was founded. Mr. Dulles began, in 1944, to represent the Republican Party—more accurately, Governor Thomas E. Dewey—in the inner councils of the Department of State. In that year, he commented as follows upon the draft of the United Nations Charter just formulated at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference:

"The plan to impose peace presupposes a political unity of the great powers which has rarely occurred and which, if it prevails, will itself assure peace. While the Security Council can be useful as a forum where controversial matters are discussed and where public opinion may focus its pressures, the force proposals are little more than scenery."

This was a sharp challenge to President Roosevelt's concept of peace enforcement by the great powers and his declaration that the Security Council "must have the power to act quickly and decisively to keep the peace by force is necessary" and "must be endowed in advance * * * with authority to act.'

Mr. Dulles correctly foresaw that the wartime coalition would not last and that the idea of peace enforcement based upon the assumption of great power cooperation was an illusion. From the conviction that "the teeth" in the proposed charter would not bite, Mr. Dulles did not, however, draw the conclusion that a better way must be devised to give the new world organization the power to enforce peace. He concluded, on the contrary, that the new world organization should be toothless and that peace enforcement should be left to regional military organizations. Thus, in 1947, Mr. Dulles, then a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, recalled his disagreement with President Roosevelt and wrote with smug satisfaction:

"It has not discouraged us to discover that there would not be an indefinitely continuing war alliance to impose peace by force, for we did not believe in that. On the contrary, we redoubled our efforts to make the United Nations a moral mechanism."

In his later book,[19] Mr. Dulles declared that he personally drafted article 51 of the United Nations Charter in 1945 at San Francisco, in consultation with the late Senator Vandenberg and Mr. Nelson Rockefeller. (This is the article which permits regional military alliances and under which the United States has sponsored the Organization of American States, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, etc.) Mr. Dulles relates in his book how he conceived of the United Nations as a "town meeting of the world" while laboring to develop regional military alliances "within the Charter but outside the veto."

As for the Security Council veto, commonly attributed to Soviet insistence, Mr. Dulles makes it clear that he and the Republicans with whom he worked at San Francisco were convinced that the United States must insist upon the right to veto any enforcement action involving the use of American troops.

Mr. Dulles' actions and pronouncements as Secretary of State supply no indication that his attitude toward the United Nations or toward peace enforcement has changed. His negative attitude toward Charter revision in 1956, is wholly consistent with his earlier work as one of the drafters of the Charter. There has been no indication that President Eisenhower differs from his Secretary of State. The present attitude of our Government is to "leave well enough alone" and not "rock the boat." This is all very well except that the United Nations boat is already rocking and will continue to rock dangerously until the basic question as to its reason for existence is decided; namely, whether it is ultimately to be strengthened into an effective organ for the preservation of peace or to remain merely a "town meeting of the world."

At this moment of history, what we do about the future of the United Nations is less important than what we set as our ultimate aim. It is evident that, even if we wished greatly to increase the powers of the world organization, there is not much that we could do about it at the present time. But it makes a vast difference whether we clarify our ultimate aim or continue to wander in the fog of our own ambivalence, rendering lip-service to supranational peace enforcement while playing the old-fashioned game of balance-of-power politics. This is nowhere more painfully apparent than in our present efforts to achieve disarmament.

The Disarmament Delusion

On November 15, 1945, the governments of the United States, Great Britain and Canada proposed the establishment of a United Nations Commission to study methods of controlling the newly invented atomic weapons and to promote the peaceful use of atomic energy. The Soviet Union, France, and China joined in sponsoring the resolution which the General Assembly adopted on January 24, 1946, creating the Atomic Energy Commission.

At the commission's first meeting, in June 1946, the Baruch plan—subsequently adopted by the United Nations and renamed the United Nations plan—was proposed by the United States. This plan, rejected by the Soviet bloc, called for the establishment of an international control authority, within the framework of the United Nations Security Council, which would own, operate, and manage all atomic fuel facilities from mine to finished product. In addition, the authority would conduct continuous inspection of all phases of production of fissionable materials, have the sole and exclusive right to carry on atomic weapons tests and promote the peacetime benefits of atomic energy. National relinquishment of atomic power would proceed in stages, the last of which would be the destruction of all bomb stockpiles.

Five days after the Baruch plan was introduced, the Soviet Union proposed a convention to prohibit the production and use of atomic weapons and to order the prompt destruction of existing bomb stocks. Then and later, the United States ruled out immediate and total prohibition of nuclear weapons on grounds that the West, in the face of Russia's greater strength of land forces, would, without the atom bomb, be left defenseless.

The U. S. S. R. objected to the Baruch plan's provisions for continuous—as opposed to periodic—inspection, as well as to international ownership and management of mines and factories, contending that to vest these powers in the United Nations would violate national sovereignty.

The positions of the East and West remained static through 3 years of Atomic Energy Commission meetings. Meanwhile, Russia succeeded in breaking the American monopoly.

A Commission for Coventional Armaments was set up by the United Nations in February 1947, but accomplished nothing. The present Disarmament Commission emerged in January 1952, when the General Assembly combined the two stalemated commissions into a single body.

When disarmament talks in the Commission remained at a standstill, the General Assembly suggested on November 18, 1953, that the five big atomic powers (U. K., United States, France, U. S. S. R., and Canada) meet as a subcommittee to negotiate a disarmament agreement. The subcommittee met in London in May and June 1954, and produced a compromise, prepared by the United Kingdom and France, declaring that nuclear weapons would not be used except in defense against aggression. What would constitute aggression was left for later definition. This Anglo-French plan projected a 3- (instead of 5-) stage prohibition of bombs (first a ban on use, then on manufacture, then on stockpiles). It proposed to reduce the frequency and freedom of international inspection as envisaged under the Baruch plan and proposed to give the international control organ managerial powers, but not ownership status.

The United States delegate at the London meetings gave his approval to the English-French proposal; the Soviet delegate did not.

When the full Disarmament Commission met in September 1954, it had before it two proposals.

The Anglo-French plan projected a three-stage program:

1. Establishment and effective introduction of a control organ; freezing of troops, conventional weapons and military budgets at December 31, 1953, levels; prohibition of use of weapons of mass destruction except for defense against aggression.

2. Strengthening of control, reduction of troops and conventional weapons by half the difference between the levels previously fixed and future levels mutually agreed upon; prohibition of manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

3. Reduction of the second half of the existing troops and conventional weapons; prohibition of possession of weapons of mass

[18] The Soviet Union has vetoed Austria, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Nepal and Portugal. The Western Powers have excluded Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Mongolian People's Republic, and the Chinese People's Republic.

[19] War or Peace, Macmillan, 1950.

destruction and transformation to peaceful use of accumulated stocks of fissionable materials.

The second proposal before the Commission was a United States project for a United Nations Disarmament and Atomic Development Authority, empowered to organize and conduct field inspections and aerial surveys to verify information, to report installations and to determine whether all installations and facilities had been disclosed, to station personnel permanently in countries to ensure continuous verification and to take emergency action upon discovery of violations or infractions.

"Emergency Action" was stated to mean—in this order—calling upon the offending state to remedy the violation within a reasonable time, suspending the supply of nuclear materials to the offending state, closing down plants using nuclear materials and reporting the violation to the Security Council, General Assembly and all states.

On September 30, 1951, Andrei Vishinsky announced to the General Assembly that his country accepted as a basis for discussion the plan submitted by France and Britain. On October 9, the Soviet delegate introduced a draft resolution proposing that the arms reduction contemplated under the Franco-British plan be undertaken in 2 stages instead of 3. The Soviet resolution provided that the control organ should be given supervisory and inspection powers but that enforcement should be left to the Security Council. The United States objected to this on the grounds that enforcement should not be subject to the veto.

In the course of the debate, from October 11 to 27, positions which had been frozen since 1947 began to thaw. Previously, the Soviet Union had always insisted that a categorical banning of atomic and thermonuclear bombs must be the first step in any disarmament agreement. By 1954, having acquired a considerable stock of such weapons, the Soviet Union was prepared to accept the American demand that conventional and atomic disarmament should proceed simultaneously.

The Anglo-French plan provided a middle ground between the previous extreme United States and U. S. S. R. positions. According to the plan, as accepted by both sides, prohibition of nuclear weapons would come in three stages, each with a simultaneous reduction of conventional arms. The use of atomic and nuclear bombs would be banned first. Bans would then be instituted on the manufacture of bombs, and finally on the possession of nuclear raw material which could be put to destructive purposes.

The Anglo-French plan did not, however, resolve two other major points on which differences remained acute. One of these was over veto power. This major disagreement came to the surface in considering which United Nations organ should control a disarmament convention and what power that organ should have. The other important point of difference lay in the choice of a method for reducing armed forces. The Soviet Union favored percentage cuts, which would mean that its army would remain the largest. The western coalition advocated reduction to numerical ceilings, which would equalize landpower between the two blocs.

The differing points of view on these two questions were not held as rigidly as in previous years. The debate culminated in the first unanimously sponsored resolution since 1946, charging the subcommittee with the task of carrying forward the negotiations.

The new and better climate surrounding the disarmament talks was no doubt influenced by the fact that the United States and Russia had reached a point where each presented a threat of total desruction to the other. The worldwide fear of further experimentation with weapons which might spread fatal radioactivity had, moreover, created pressure for disarmament on the part of the less heavily armed nations. And, finally, the emergence of China, as a great military power allied to Russia put pressure upon the United States, while the threatened rearming of Germany and Japan put pressure upon the Soviet Union.

In a memorandum submitted to Mr. Harold E. Stassen shortly after his appointment—in March 1955—as Secretary of Peace, the writer made the following observations concerning the disarmament negotiations:

"While it is reassuring to note the more constructive turn taken by the United Nations disarmament negotiations in 1954, it is also necessary to emphasize that these negotiations contain a grave element of danger. The current discussions concerning inspection and enforcement machinery have so far avoided rather than faced the real issue. The debate has centered upon three major issues:

"1. The number of stages by which national armaments are to be reduced;

"2. Whether successive reductions are to be made on a percentage basis or to fixed numerical ceilings; and

"3. Whether the United Nations Security Council (where the veto prevails) or some other United Nations organ (where the majority prevails) is to be endowed with the inspection and enforcement powers.

"Assuming that agreement were reached on each of these three points, the basic question would still remain unanswered. That question is: Can there be effective enforcement through 'collective action'?

"Another way of putting this question is:

"Can partial or complete disarmament of the nation-states be enforced by an agency which has no military power of its own and which must rely upon the willingness of national governments to use their military power in a collective effort to restrain or suppress aggression?"

Surely, all past experience, especially that of the League of Nations from 1931 to 1939, suggests that this question must be answered in the negative. The aggressive designs of Japan, Germany, and Italy could have been halted on any number of occasions, beginning with the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, if the majority of peace-loving nations had been willing to act in concert. The Axis aggressions in Asia and in Europe were not halted, because neither the United States nor the majority of the League members were willing to risk war over Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Austria, or Czechoslovakia.

The United Nations intervention in Korea provides no support for the efficacy of collective security, because there could have been no collective action in Korea but for two fortuitous circumstances. The aggression happened to take place in an area where the United States had immediately available air, land, and naval forces, which it was willing to employ, if necessary, alone. The Security Council of the United Nations happened to be able to support American intervention because Russia failed, through its boycott of the Council, to exercise the veto.

It is true that the subsequent enactment of the uniting-for-peace resolution has given the Assembly the power to act, if the Security Council fails to suppress aggression. But even had that power existed in June 1950, it is almost certain that the United Nations would either have failed to act or else would have acted too late, had it not been for American willingness to act with or without United Nations support. Had the Communists accomplished the conquest of South Korea—and their failure to do so was only a matter of days—the United Nations would have been as dead as the League of Nations.

Moreover, the long-run value of the informal charter amendment of 1950 is extremely doubtful. The idea was attractive to the United States at a time when it could count upon the support of a clear majority of the United Nations members. It has become less attractive in a period in which American policy does not always command clear majority support, as, for example, in the dispute over Quemoy and Matsu or even in the matter of defending Formosa. In any case, the device does not go to the root of the problem of enforcement. Neither the Security Council nor the Assembly can enforce peace so long as the United Nations must rely for enforcement power upon the sovereign nation-states.

The evidence strongly suggests that there can be no such thing as "collective security" unless that term is redefined. There can be no such thing as security against aggression through a multilateral treaty obligating all soverign nation-states to come to the aid of a victim of aggression. History clearly shows that such a treaty may be successfully invoked against a relatively weak aggressor but that, if aggression is committed by one or more of the major powers, the majority of national governments will simply fail to carry out their treaty obligations.

The fact is that "collective security" is possible only if all the nations agree to disarm and collectively to pay for an armed policeman to enforce the agreement.

"The danger lurking in the current disarmament discussions is that they do not contemplate an enforcement agency standing above the nation-states and possessing military power of its own. If the Russians (and Chinese) were suddenly to agree to our own proposals, the result would be nothing more than another multilateral treaty between fully sovereign nation-states. For the United States to disarm in reliance upon such a treaty would be foolhardy in the extreme."

On May 10, 1955, after several months of secret negotiations at London, the Russians suddenly announced a new disarmament proposal which actually did go a long way toward meeting the Western position. The outstanding feature of this proposal was that it accepted the Western idea of reducing conventional forces to numerical ceilings. This removed 1 of the 2 major points of disagreement, leaving in dispute only the questions of inspection and enforcement.[20]

The Soviet disarmament proposal agreed that conventional forces should be reduced to 1,000,000–1,500,000 for the United States, the U. S. S. R. and the Chinese People's Republic, 650,000 for Great Britain and France, and 150,000–200,000 for other countries. It was not immediately realized that "other countries" included Germany and Japan. These reductions were to be accomplished within 2 years; when they were 75 percent completed, the use of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, as well as their manufacture was to be prohibited. The proposal provided for somewhat more in the way of inspection than the Russians had previously been willing to permit, agreeing that international officials should have unimpeded access to ports, railway junctions, airports and other "objects of control," so as to facilitate the detection of any breech

[20] The Russian proposal was embodied in a lengthy press release which raised a considerable number of questions not directly related to the previous discussions, such as the withdrawal of forces from bases on foreign soil, cessation of "war propaganda" and withdrawal "except for limited contingents" of occupation troops from Germany. The release was intimately linked to the reversal of Soviet policy as to Yugoslavia and Austria and the pressure thereby exerted toward the neutralization of Germany. The full text of the proposal was published by the New York Times, on May 11, 1955.

of the agreement and thus to make impossible a surprise attack by either side.

The Western Powers countered the Russian move with a release of their side of the supposedly secret negotiations. This revealed that the Western Powers had apparently abandoned their previously held position demanding "foolproof enforcement" of any disarmament agreement, and that they were about to agree to a ban on nuclear weapons without effective enforcement, provided that conventional forces should first have been reduced to the numerical ceilings now accepted by the Russians. Instead of enforceable disarmament they seemed to be contemplating a system of inspection designed merely to give early warning of violation or preparation for attack. The gap had apparently narrowed to a debate over what kind and degree of inspection would assure the working of such a warning system. There was no longer any question of providing effective machinery to deal with violations.

In an article published in a number of leading newspapers across the country in the first week of July, the writer ventured to call public attention to what seemed to him a grave danger overhanging the imminent Big Four meeting at Geneva. The following is a partial quotation:

"As we approach the Geneva meeting of the four chiefs of state, a serious danger looms upon the horizon.

"In recent months, realization of the utter futility of war has grown on both sides of the Iron Curtain, producing a probably sincere desire on both sides to reduce the burden of armaments and the likelihood of conflict. The danger lies in the possibility that we may either fall for a delusive disarmament agreement or be forced into an invidious and ultimately disastrous position. By conceding that 'conventional forces' should be reduced to fixed numerical ceilings as suggested by the West, instead of by percentage cuts, the Russians have removed 1 of the 2 major obseacles to agreement, leaving in debate only the question of enforcement. Were the Russians now to accept our own proposals with regard to inspection and enforcement, we should face the choice of repudiating our own proposal or signing an agreement which might well deliver the whole world to Communist blackmail and eventual domination.

"This danger has arisen because, in reaching for disarmament, we have ignored two vitally important facts: (1) that, as General MacArthur once pointed out, there can be no effective limitation or control of armaments short of their total abolition; and (2) that there can be no reliable enforcement except by a supranational agency possessing adequate power of its own.

"Bluntly stated, there can be no reliable disarmament agreement without the establishment of a world government of defined and limited powers. The fact is that we are living in a time when it is too soon for world government and too late for anything less. It is too soon for world government not only because of Communist intrasigence but because we ourselves are not ready to surrender to a supranational agency the exclusive right to maintain and, if necessary, to use armed force. This being the case, we court disaster when we seek to achieve the blessings of disarmament without paying the price in the necessary sacrifice of national sovereignty." [21]

Retreat From Disarmament

President Eisenhower's remarks on July 18, 1955, the opening day of the summit meeting at Geneva, revealed that the President himself had sanctioned the basic shift in the Western position. This became even more evident through the dramatic offer made by the President to Marshal Bulganin toward the close of the conference. The proposal to exchange "blueprints of military installations" and to extend mutual permission for aerial reconnaissance and photography was manifestly aimed at two objectives: to convince the Soviet leaders and the world at large of American sincerity; and to provide each side with maximum assurance against surprise attack by the other.

As a dramatic demonstration of the peaceful intent of the United States, the President's move scored a spectacular success. From the point of view of making progress toward peace through disarmament, the proposal seemed to foreshadow a retreat rather than an advance since it implied the abandonment of the idea of abolishing armaments in favor of a system of inspection designed merely to prevent the use of armaments for surprise attack. That such was indeed the case became apparent from Mr. Stassen's restatement of the American position before the U. N. subcommittee in September 1955. These discussions showed that, while the Russians wanted disarmament without effective inspection, the United States sought the establishment of a system of inspection without disarmament.

Mr. Walter Lippmann hailed this new American approach as more realistic and more likely to achieve results, declaring that an agreement for mutual inspection would mean the establishment of "a great and new principle," namely, "the right of the nations to be forewarned if any nation is preparing to strike." "It would no longer," said Mr. Lippmann, "be the sovereign right of a nation to arm in secret." [22]

But did this new approach actually mean the establishment of "a great and new principle?" In the League of Nations Covenant, in the Kellogg-Briand Pact and, again, in the United Nations Charter, the nations renounced this sovereign right to strike at all, unless attacked. This verbal renunciation has not prevented unprovoked aggression.

From a practical point of view, former Air Force Secretary Thomas K. Finletter has pointed out [23] that no mere system of inspection can with any certainty give warning of a sneak attack. Such a system might, he said, detect the building of guided missiles and long-range bombers but "it would not warn us of a Russian or Chinese move to use their existing commercial aircraft to carry their concealed A- and H-bombs in a sneak attack," since commercial aircraft "of a short time from now * * * will be capable of mounting a sneak atomic blast at any part of the free world." This led him to the conclusion that "an enforced system will need effective international control, which will probably connote international operation, of all civilian aircraft over a certain size."

Mr. Finletter was speaking here of the kind of system required to enforce disarmament. The warning applies with even greater cogency to a system of inspection designed merely to prevent the use of armaments for surprise attack.

In the same article, Mr. Finletter stated three conclusions almost identical with those contained in the writer's unpublished memorandum to Mr. Stassen:

1. "Collective security cannot enforce a disarmament treaty."

2. "Inspection is not enforcement; it is the fire alarm, not the fire department."

3. "Effective enforcement requires: a U. N. military force strong enough to compel any law-abiding state, including the largest, to stop any violation; and that all countries disarm down to the level needed for domestic policing."

Fish or Cut Bait

Thomas Finletter, almost alone among our political leaders, accepts the two basic facts of the atomic age; namely, that nothing short of enforced universal disarmament will insure lasting peace; and that nothing short of an independently armed U. N. can provide effective enforcement. He does not share the view that any such idea is visionary. He would like, he says, to see the Executive "abandon the idea that it knows for certain that the people of our country would not accept enforced disarmament, including that objectionable U. N. police force and all the other disagreeable elements of such a system." He would like to see the Executive "put forward an enforceable plan in the normal U. N. discussions and at the same time cause to be proposed in Congress a joint resolution * * * calling for a vote by Congress on the policy of enforcement."

"We cannot," says Mr. Finletter, "be sure what the response of the American people would be. It may be that, in this matter of peace, the impossible is only that which we are too timid to try."

The writer has long held the same point of view. Is it too much to hope that at least one aspirant to the Presidency in 1956—be he Republican or Democrat—will have the courage to give the American people an opportunity to understand and say what they think about this basic question?

Danger in New Approach

Meanwhile, there is this to be said for the retreat. Our Government now seems to recognize that unless and until an effective enforcement agency is established any weakening of the military posture of our country will constitute a hazardous gamble on the good faith of the Communist dictators. A system of limited inspection designed to prevent surprise attack, such as our Government is now striving to achieve, may perhaps relax fear on both sides of the Iron Curtain; but there is the danger that it may also relax the vigilance on the part of the democracies which will be required so long as peace rests upon a balance of national armaments rather than upon their abolition. Democracies are notoriously slow to assume a military posture and overready to abandon it at the first sign of diminishing danger. The system now under contemplation may have the virtue of creating the climate in which progress can be made toward enforced universal disarmament. If explicitly undertaken for that reason and recognized to be nothing more than a first step toward enforced disarmament, it may prove useful. If undertaken as a substitute for disarmament, it is likely to comprise more risk than insurance.

Unfortunately, our policymakers seem to think that the development of a plan of foolproof enforcement must wait until a more favorable climate of opinion prevails both at home and abroad. The writer believes that the mere projection of such a plan by the Government of the United States for discussion at home and abroad would materially contribute to the creation of the climate necessary for its adoption. Anyone who doubts that such a plan can be devised should study the testimony submitted to the Senate Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision and especially Mr. Grenville Clark's concrete proposal.[24]

Short of clearly defining its ultimate aim and coming forward with a specific plan for Charter revision, there are many things our Government could do to strengthen the authority and prestige of the United Nations. As already suggested, we could channel

---

[21] This article appeared in the Washington Post, the Minneapolis Star, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Christian Science Monitor, the Denver Post and the San Francisco Chronicle.

[22] New York Herald Tribune, September 1, 1955.

[23] In the New Republic of July 25, 1955.

[24] Grenville Clark, Plan for Peace, Harper, 1950, also C. G. Bolte's forthcoming Plans for Disarmament: Beacon, 1956.

through the United Nations more and more of our foreign economic assistance and investment. We could contribute more generously to the U. N. specialized agencies. We could revise our attitude toward the admission of nonmember nations and endeavor to make the United Nations into a universal organization. Above all, we could make up our minds to refrain from unilateral or group action outside of the United Nations unless compelled to such action by an emergency which brooks no delay.

Finally, there is certainly no reason why limited, enforceable steps in the direction of universal disarmament cannot be taken before the ultimate goal becomes attainable. Prime Minister Eden's suggestion of a demilitarized buffer zone in Central Europe is one which could be adopted and enforced without the existence of a supranational enforcement agency. The same principle might possibly be applied in other parts of the world.

This brings us to a consideration of some of the more immediate questions involved in a policy of relaxing existing tensions, preventing war, and thereby gaining the time to lay the long-range foundations of lasting peace. The chapters which follow comprise a brief review of the background out of which these tensions have arisen, a tentative analysis of the most likely causes of world war III, and an exploration of possible preventive action.

PART III

Chapter 9. Background of today's tensions

There is a long and significant historical background to the tensions which exist between the United States and the Soviet Union. Chinese-American tensions, on the other hand, are of recent origin and may be accounted for primarily by 2 actions—1 by the United States and 1 by China—the wisdom or justification for which we need not discuss here. The first was American intervention on behalf of the Nationalist regime in the postwar, Chinese civil conflict. The second was Chinese intervention in the Korean war. The American intervention incurred the lasting hostility of the Chinese regime which the United States had unsuccessfully attempted to keep from coming to power. Chinese intervention in Korea reinflamed American hostility at the very moment when it seemed likely that the United States would reluctantly accept the finality of Chiang Kai-shek's defeat. Two years of armistice have not yet erased the memory of Chinese soldiers killing Americans and of Americans killing Chinese. Meanwhile, the Communist dictatorship has transformed a weak, disunited China into the strongest military power in Asia. About this new, powerful and hostile China we know very little. The past is but a poor guide to the present.

About Russia, on the other hand, we know considerably more. Soviet diplomacy has deep roots in the past. A large part of what we now call "Soviet imperialism" was a fixed policy of the Tsars, long before the United States became a Nation. Inhabiting a land which possessed few if any natural defenses, the early Russians pursued a consistent policy of pushing forward their frontiers in order to be able to use space in defending their homeland against invasion. To accomplish this expansion, they fought wars with the Swedes, Poles, and Teutons in the west, with the Turks in the south, and with a series of Asiatic invaders from the east. This originally defensive expansionism gradually assumed the aspect of aggressive imperialism as the landlocked Eurasian empire of Tsars sought outlets to the open seas.

At the time when the American colonies revolted against George III, Great Britain had become the chief obstacle to the Russian thrust into the Baltic and into the Mediterranean by way of the Dardanelles. For this reason, Tsar Alexander I looked with favor upon the American revolution and was among the first of the European rulers to recognize the United States. In 1809 he welcomed John Quincy Adams as the first American minister to St. Petersburg.

Early Russo-American relations were friendly but remote. Russian eagerness to sell Alaska to the United States in 1867 derived less from friendship for this country than from a desire to prevent that outpost from falling into the hands of the British Empire. Russia, at the time, was still smarting from her defeat at the hands of Britain in the Crimean War.

Our First Clash With Russia Was Over China

Until the end of the 19th century, the United States remained aloof from European affairs. American diplomacy did not, in fact, first encounter Russia in Europe but in Asia. In view of the present Sino-Soviet alliance it is an interesting fact that the first rift in American-Russian relations was caused by Russian intrusion into Chinese territory and American interest in preserving China's territorial integrity. Briefly, this is how that clash arose.

While we were traditionally inclined to turn our backs upon Europe, our attitude toward the Far East was anything but isolationist. In part, this may have been due to the momentum of the westward drive of "manifest destiny" which carried our ancestors across plains and mountains to the shores of the Pacific. In part, it seems to have been due to a persistent belief that trade with the Orient would some day develop into an American bonanza. Actually, trade across the Pacific has never amounted to more than a small proportion of our foreign commerce.

When John Jacob Astor and others established trading posts in the Vancouver area, commerce with the Orient first became highly profitable. There was little or no demand in China for New England manufactures, but a ready market for some of these products developed among the fur traders of the Northwest; and furs, in turn, could be profitably exchanged in China for tea, silks, and spices. While this triangular trade never assumed great proportions, a single voyage often yielded as much as 200-percent profit.

The New England merchants competing with Britain for this trade became the first China lobby, demanding that the government take measures to assure them of equal access to oriental trade. When Great Britain, after defeating China in the Opium War of 1839–42, obtained important concessions. President Tyler sent Caleb Cushing to negotiate the first Chinese-American treaty. Cushing's Wanghia Treaty of 1844, essentially a "me too" agreement, marked the beginning of the American open door policy.

In 1855, President Pierce sent Commodore Matthew Perry on a mission which resulted in the opening up of Japan to Western trade. In 1880, President Garfield sent Commodore Schufeldt on a similar expedition to open the ancient Hermit Kingdom of Korea. Both of these actions were undertaken without the slightest realization of their political consequences.

Japan quickly developed as an aggressive, expansive power and, in 1895, went to war with China, defeating the Manchu Empire and seizing the island of Taiwan which it renamed Formosa. By this time, Britain, Russia, France, and Germany were all scrambling for concessions from the weak Manchu regime.

The United States, which had carefully avoided entanglement in Europe's quarrels, now suddenly became involved in the Far Eastern backyard of European power politics through two aberrations from its traditional policy.

The first of these was President McKinley's annexation of the Philippines in 1898, an action wholly inconsistent with American anticolonialism and difficult to justify on any grounds of rationally conceived national interest. The extension of the American frontier arcoss the Pacific represented a commitment out of all proportion to the Nation's military and naval power. In acquiring territory on Japan's doorstep which it was unable to defend, the United States unwittingly gave a hostage to the increasingly aggressive Nipponese empire.

The second aberration from a policy of avoiding foreign entanglements was President Theodore Roosevelt's assumption of what amounted to a guaranty of Chinese territorial and administrative integrity. Secretary of State John Hay was drawn into this undertaking by the British, at that time anxious to find an ally in checking Russian designs upon Manchuria. This, too, was a commitment which the nation lacked the power to enforce and which antagonized both Russia and Japan.

Whatever good will might have been created among the Chinese people by American protection of Chinese integrity was largely dissipated when the United States participated with Japan and the European powers in suppressing the Boxer Rebellion of 1900—a patriotic revolt against the Manchu regime because of its concessions to foreign powers.

In spite of Anglo-American efforts, Russian penetration of Manchuria continued. Japan, meanwhile, was establishing a sphere of influence in the independent Kingdom of Korea. Russian advances in Manchuria threatened the Japanese hold on Korea, while Japan's penetration of Korea threatened Russian ambitions in Manchuria. Having previously contracted an alliance with Britain, Japan declared war upon Russia in 1904. British support of Japan was intended to reestablish the balance of power in the Far East, but Japan's unexpectedly rapid and decisive victories resulted in a peace which destroyed the balance and made Japan the dominant power in East Asia. President Roosevelt acted, at Japan's request, as the mediator of the Peace of Portsmouth which deprived Russia of Dairen and Port Arthur and gave to Japan half of the large Russian island of Sakhalin. Thus, the backing of Japan against Russia became the first ransom payment for the safety of the Philippines. But this was not all.

While the Russian and Japanese peace envoys were on their way to the United States, Theodore Roosevelt had sent an emissary to Tokyo to negotiate a secret agreement with the victorious Japanese. The Taft-Katsura Agreement provided that, in exchange for a free hand in Korea, the Japanese would respect the vulnerable American position in the Philippines. And so the betrayal of Korea, which the United States had opened up to foreign trade and influence, became the second ransom payment for the Philippine hostage. In 1910, Japan formally annexed the ancient Hermit Kingdom, converting it into the Japanese province of Chosen.

Thus the United States and Russia, originally friendly because of a common hostility to Britain, came into a conflict of interest in Asia chiefly for two reasons:

1. Because the annexation of the Philippines forced the United States to maintain friendly relations with Japan, whose interests clashed with those of Russia; and

2. because subservience to British diplomacy drew the United States into Far Eastern involvement in a then British policy of "containing" Russian imperialism.

American public opinion, originally sharply divided over the annexation of the Philippines, supported Theodore Roosevelt's pro-Japanese and anti-Russian policy because of a romantic popular concept of Japan as a land of cherry blossoms and a strong antipathy to Tsarist absolutism magnified by Russian persecution of the Jews.

These events of the early 20th century are not without bearing upon our present problems.

Two Forgotten Facts About World War I

It is not necessary to review here either the accidental 6 months' alliance between the United States and Russia in World War I or the period of 16 years following the Bolshevik revolution during which diplomatic relations between the two countries were nonexistent. Two facts should, however, be recalled:

The United States did not become a belligerent in World War I until the overthrow of the Tsarist regime, in March 1917, enabled President Wilson to convince himself and the American people that the conflict had become a struggle between democracy and autocracy.

The second and more important fact—if we wish to understand the deep-rooted Soviet hostility toward the West—is that the abortive Allied military intervention in Russian internal affairs, in which American troops eventually participated both in Europe and in Asia, did not begin after the Bolshevik revolution of October-November 1917 but while the moderate, democratic Russian regime established in March was still loyally fighting with the Allies against the central powers. It is true that the United States did not join in the attempt to overthrow the new Soviet government until after the Bolsheviks had made a separate peace with Germany, but the fact which we tend to forget and which the Russians remember is that Britain and France began the ill-fated intervention as an effort to restore Tsarism.

Prelude to World War II

We come now to the period, beginning with the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, when, time after time, the Western Powers failed to act in concert to halt the unprovoked agression of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Every American schoolchild knows that this period ended with the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, in which Russia threw in its lot with Nazi Germany to join in the conquest and dismemberment of Poland and to annex the three Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Esthonia. The memory of Finland's brave resistance to Soviet demands is still very much alive. But what the Russians remember is that, prior to the outbreak of war, they alone stood up in the League of Nations to demand collective action against Axis aggression, that they alone were willing to fight for Czechoslovakia in 1938 and that their offer of help was ignored. They remember that, even after the "peace at Munich," they again offered to join the West in defense of Poland, provided that Poland would accept their help and Rumania permit the passage of their troops. As for the three Baltic States, the Russians remember, though most of us have forgotten, that in August 1939, Molotov demanded that Britain and France extend their guaranty to Poland to cover these three small states as well and that the Baltic countries refused to accept such a guaranty for fear of offending Hitler.

These are some of the bits of history we must recall, if we seek to understand the sources of Russian hostility to the West which existed before Russia and the United States for the second time became accidental allies in a war against Germany.

Our pre-World War II hostility to the Soviet regime, on the other hand, derived chiefly from the fact that the Bolshevik revolution was not just an internal affair but an explicit challenge to the political and economic system of Western civilization and to the fundamental ethical and religious beliefs upon which that system was founded. The Bolshevik revolution was not, like the American revolution, a challenge by example to an existing order; it was an overt declaration of ideological war against an existing order, carried on by the conspiratorial activity of Moscow-directed fifth columns within the component parts of Western society. The Soviet system was thus not only repugnant to the Western mind but resented because of its avowed expansionist aims which overlapped and reinforced traditional Russian imperialism.

When, after 16 years of nonrecognition, President Roosevelt resumed diplomatic relations upon the explicit Soviet promise to refrain from subversive activity in the United States, that promise was callously disregarded. The opposing policies of Washington and Moscow in the Spanish Civil War, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact and the Soviet attack upon Finland deepened American distrust and dislike of the Soviet regime.

Small wonder, then, that the World War II alliance forged by Hitler and Tojo did not create a bond strong enough to survive the destruction of the common enemy.

The Second Accidental Alliance

When the news of Hitler's attack upon Russia reached the United States, a Senator from Missouri named Harry S. Truman expressed the sentiments of many Americans in the following comment:

"If we see that Germany is winning, we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany and that way let them kill as many as possible, although I don't want to see Hitler victorious under any circumstances. Neither of them think anything of their pledged word."

Between Pearl Harbor and V–J Day, American sentiment veered from hostility to reluctant admiration of Russia and finally to something very like friendly feeling. Soviet resistance bought the time in which American power could be mobilized and brought to bear. American supplies, perilously convoyed to Russia, sustained Soviet resistance. For a short time the American people almost forgot their deep-seated hostility to the Communist regime, or else persuaded themselves that Soviet communism was actually evolving into something like Western democracy. The much-discussed war-time agreements were based upon President Roosevelt's belief that postwar cooperation with the Soviet Union should and could be made the cornerstone of peace.

Sir Winston Churchill, who had been no less eager than Franklin Roosevelt to welcome Russia as an ally, shared no such illusion as to the future. Once the tide of war had turned in 1943, Churchill began to entertain grave misgivings as to Soviet intentions. The British leader's distrust of Stalin doubtless nourished the growth of similar suspicions in the mind of the Soviet dictator. Whether Roosevelt, had he lived and remained in full possession of his powers, might have allayed this mutual distrust and preserved the harmony of the Big Three remains open to argument. The crucial question which will forever remain unanswered is whether Roosevelt would have proceeded, as Truman proceeded, with respect to the disclosure and use of the atomic bomb.

Postwar Disillusionment

Prior to August 6, 1945, when the first atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima, the Soviet leaders had been able to envision a postwar world in which Russia and the United States would be the world's surviving superpowers, widely separated from each other and with few clashing interests. With Germany and Japan eliminated and the United States withdrawing its forces from Europe after 2 years (as indicated by Roosevelt at Yalta) they could imagine Soviet land power dominating the Eurasian land mass, with access to warm water ports on the Baltic, in the Mediterranean through the Turkish Straits and in the Pacific through Dairen and Port Arthur. The ancient Russian dream would be fulfilled.

As of August 7, 1945, all this was changed. Russian help against Japan was not only unnecessary but unwelcome and, in any case, too late. Air power had suddenly been lifted into a wholly new predominance over land power. So long as the United States might hold a monopoly of the new weapons, its power would be vastly greater than that of Russia—greater, in fact, than that of all the other nations of the world combined.

This revolution in the balance of power might have made a weaker man than Joseph Stalin more tractable. In the Soviet dictator it evoked the grim determination to acquire the secrets of atomic fission, to catch up to the United States in atomic power and, meanwhile, to push even further away from the Soviet homeland the frontiers of its expanding empire.

There was another now forgotten factor which no doubt contributed to the hardening of Soviet hostility toward the United States. After President Truman had abruptly terminated lend-lease, Russia, like Great Britain, applied for an American loan to finance reconstruction and reconversion. Britain asked for $7 billion and received roughly half that amount. The Russian application for $6 billion was first "lost" for 6 months in the files of the American Government and ultimately rejected.

On the other side of the picture, Soviet refusal to allow free elections in Poland, the imposition of Communist regimes throughout Eastern Europe, Russian pressure on Turkey and Iran, Communist conspiracy in Greece and Soviet intransigence in Germany disillusioned the Western Powers, causing the United States to promulgate the Truman doctrine and to give military assistance to Greece and Turkey.

When the United States made the conciliatory offer of the Marshall plan, Russia committed the grave error of rejecting it, thereby converting a generous project to promote all-European recovery into a West European anti-Communist alliance.

By the time Soviet spies and scientists had broken the American atomic monopoly, the United States had committed itself to an active policy of global resistance to Communist encroachment. Traditional Russian expansionism, employing the new instrument of Communist conspiracy and accelerated by resentment of the unexpected American supremacy in long-range power, had begun to create the very encirclement which Russia had always feared and sought to prevent.

At this point—September 1949—the American-supported Chinese Nationalist regime was crumbling and the anti-Communist coalition in Europe existed mostly on paper, although its will to resistance had already been tested by the Berlin blockade. This would have been the time for Soviet leadership to realize the wisdom of adopting a more conciliatory policy so as not to provoke the west into serious rearmament. This was the period when Secretary Acheson was "waiting for the dust to settle" after Chiang's collapse, when the "China Lobby" in Washington had reached the lowest ebb of its powers and when it seemed likely that the United States would disentangle itself from its disastrous intervention in the Chinese civil war. Had it not been for the outbreak of the Korean war, the whole course of history might have been changed.

The Korean War a Turning Point

Whatever may have been the American mistakes which "invited" North Korean aggression, it is difficult to see why Soviet leadership committed the grave error of supporting if not actually launching an adventure which led to a crash program of western rearmament, including the decision to rearm West Germany and Japan.

Very likely, the withdrawal of American troops before an adequate South Korean defense force had been created gave the Republic of Korea the appearance of a plum

ripe for the plucking. Possibly, the victory of the Chinese Communists and the emergence of the People's Republic as a powerful military factor in the Far East may have appeared to the Kremlin as a threat to its interests and stimulated the desire to gain Korea as a Soviet satellite. Perhaps also, the Kremlin figured that, if the coup were to succeed, as it very nearly did, the United Nations would be discredited and the United States shown up as a "paper tiger." If such were the Soviet calculations, they went wrong in every respect.

Instead of dealing a mortal blow to the prestige of the United States and the United Nations, the adventure resulted in increasing the prestige of both. Instead of splitting the anti-Communist coalition, it solidified it and stimulated its rearmament. And, in the final outcome, instead of making all of Korea into a Soviet satellite, the adventure ended with China rather than Russia controlling the North Korean Communists.

What saved Communist leadership from a complete fiasco was a development which the Kremlin had certainly not foreseen; namely, the failure of the United Nations forces to halt their advance and offer peace after the great victory at Inchon. MacArthur's advance to the Yalu River not only encouraged Syngman Rhee's ambition to impose his regime upon all of Korea but brought China into the war, alienated most of the uncommitted Asian peoples and split the anti-Communist coalition just when it had been firmly united by the original North Korean aggression.

The Malenkov Period

One might have expected that the election of a President committed to end the Korean war, together with the death of Joseph Stalin on March 3, 1953, would bring about a general reappraisal on both sides and a relaxation of tensions. Unfortunately, however, the Eisenhower administration came into office in no mood to explore the possibilities of conciliation. Its Korean truce was achieved at the cost of unleashing Chiang Kai-shek in order to mollify the Republican right wing, thereby foreclosing for the time being any hope of an all-Korean settlement or of any other kind of accommodation between Washington and Peking. As for tensions in Europe, Sir Winston Churchill's recognition that the cold war had become obsolete and his demand for "conversations at the summit" fell upon deaf ears in Washington.

It was not until the end of the year that Mr. Dulles began seriously to consider even a four-power meeting at the Foreign Ministers' level. By the time the Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers convened, in January 1954, Soviet policy had already swung back to a harder line. The unrest in East Germany and elsewhere in the Soviet orbit following the first relaxation of restrictions on consumer goods was undoubtedly one factor contributing toward this change. The overwhelming victory of Chancellor Adenauer in the West German elections was another. Whatever the Russian motivation, Mr. Molotov's proposals as to the constitution of an all-German government made a mockery of free elections. The West, for its part, was prepared to accept nothing less than unconditional surrender, insisting that a reunited Germany must be free to rearm and join the NATO alliance.

It was clear that neither side was at the moment prepared to negotiate seriously for an all-German settlement.

The Berlin Conference did, however, develop the fact that the new Soviet leaders were worried about the possibility of war in the Far East and anxious to bring about a peace settlement in Indochina. It was chiefly due to Soviet initiative at Berlin that the Geneva conference of 1954 was called.

At this meeting, two badly frightened statesmen, Britain's Eden and Russia's Molotov, worked hard and successfully to help the new French premier, Pierre Mendes-France, reach a settlement with Chou En-lai and the Vietminh representatives. Secretary Dulles sulked in the background, not only avoiding all responsibility for the negotiations but actually priding himself upon his refusal to shake hands with or talk to Chou En-lai. Thus the administration sought to meet the cry of "Far Eastern Munich," which the extremists at home would be sure to launch against the settlement, by disclaiming any major part in making it. Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, however, did not hesitate to state on his return from Geneva that the agreement which ended the war, even though it surrendered half of Vietnam to the Vietminh, was "the best settlement that could possibly have been obtained in the existing circumstances." While this was doubtless true, Geneva nevertheless marked a setback for American leadership and the emergence of Britain as a strong and active moderating influence.

Scarcely had the Indochinese crisis been resolved, when American prestige suffered another and even more serious blow. On August 30, 1954, the French National Assembly rejected the rearmament of West Germany under the European Defense Community Treaty, thereby repudiating the essential core of the Acheson-Dulles-Adenauer policy. Washington's first angry reaction was to proceed with rearming West Germany without French consent. This would have disrupted the whole NATO alliance. Fortunately, wiser counsel prevailed, with President Eisenhower asserting that it was time for the United States to assume the role of partner rather than leader in European affairs. This enabled Foreign Secretary Eden to take the initiative in devising a substitute for the defunct EDC Treaty. At the critical conferences held in London and Paris, in September and October, it was again British diplomacy which saved the day—this time for the NATO alliance.

Secretary Dulles had worked feverishly to organize a counterpart to NATO in Southeast Asia prior to any Indochina settlement. His efforts had been blocked by the insistence of Britain, Australia, and New Zealand that no such move be undertaken without the cooperation of the Colombo powers. When invitations were finally issued for a conference to be held at Manila in the first week of September, India, Burma, and Indonesia declined to send representatives. Of the Colombo powers, only Pakistan agreed to participate. Thus SEATO came into being during the height of the European crisis, with Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines as the only Asian signatories along with the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and France. Clearly, such an organization was too much of a "white man's club" to have any significant influence upon the Asian future. This became all the more evident when India and Indonesia took the lead in calling the Bandung conference of 29 Asian and African nations, including the Chinese People's Republic and excluding all the Western Powers.

On December 2, 1954, the United States signed a mutual defense pact with the Chinese Nationalists, formally committing itself to the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. This treaty, deliberately ambiguous as to the "offshore islands" held by the Nationalists, provoked a renewed far eastern crisis.

Meanwhile, at the autumn session of the United Nations, a somewhat better atmosphere had prevailed between the United States and the Soviet Union, especially, as we have already noted, in the Disarmament Commission. This favorable trend was, however, thrown into reverse by the Formosa crisis and by the final ratification by the German and French parliaments of the treaties providing for the inclusion of West Germany in the NATO alliance.

Early in February 1955, the Malenkov regime came to a sudden end. The indications were that the change of Kremlin leadership betokened a return to a more restrictive internal policy and to a less conciliatory attitude in foreign affairs. The "softer" line of the Malenkov period had certainly brought the Russians no satisfactory results. Soviet diplomacy had helped to bring about a truce in Korea and Indochina, only to see the danger of a general war breaking out in the Far East revived in more acute form over Formosa and the Nationalist-held islands. In Europe, Western policy with regard to the rearming of Germany had remained inflexible, even when Moscow had indicated, as it finally had on January 15, 1955, that it would accept the Eden plan for free all-German elections which it had rejected a year earlier. The failure of Soviet diplomacy to prevent German rearmament may have been one of the factors which contributed to Malenkov's downfall. In any case, the ratifications of the London-Paris agreements ended that chapter in postwar history which had begun with Secretary Acheson's demand for West Germany rearmament in September 1950.

This, in brief, was the background of Sino-Soviet-American relations up to the moment when the freshman group in the House of Representatives made its plea for a reexamination of United States foreign policy.

Chapter 10. Most likely causes of world war III

In the Harvard Alumni Bulletin of June 4, 1955, there appeared an article by Robert Cutler, former special assistant to President Eisenhower in the field of national security. The article dealt primarily with questions affecting the publication of "security information" in a time of cold war, but it contained an appraisal of Sino-Soviet intentions which is interesting because there is probably no one more familiar than Mr. Cutler with the intelligence, the evaluations and the assumptions upon which the Eisenhower administration has based its foreign policy. Here is the view Mr. Cutler expressed:

"The Soviets do not intend to wage a shooting war against the free world so long as the free world remains strong. The subtler ways of subversion, overload, overextension, neutralization, threat, bluster and cunning deception are cheaper for the Communists; and, if their ways take longer, they leave for conquest a far more desirable prize than a land ravaged by shooting war. Europe going full blast industrially is the prime target. Europe destroyed in a nuclear war would be a hollow shell. * * *

"May I interpose to differentiate the Chinese Communists from the Soviet leaders? The sleeping giant of China has awakened into a braggart and a bully. Red China has much to gain and little to lose. In the running sap of her violent spring, she may choose to take incalculable risks. We do not understand the Chinese mind. But we can certainly understand that the same amount of force that could lay waste industrial America would do but little potential hurt to peasant China."

The assumptions underlying the ideas presented in this book are very similar. They be summarized as follows:

Soviet Intentions

1. Soviet leadership does not want a major conflict. Soviet leadership appears to be firmly convinced of the Marxist thesis, reaffirmed by Stalin in his last major public utterance,[25] that "capitalist-imperialism must inevitably destroy itself."

Holding this belief, it seems evident that Soviet leadership has been pursuing a policy

[25] In the October 1952 issue of Bolshevik.

of seeking to divide the anti-Communist coalition and of keeping it off balance by alternating threatening belligerence with "peace offensives." Considering the degree of success which has so far attended these efforts, there would appear to be every reason for Soviet leadership to shrink from the unpredictable hazards of a major conflict.

It is a fact that Soviet leadership worked for a ceasefire in Korea and in Indochina.

2. Soviet leadership realizes that its aggressive expansionism has aroused the West to a point where further overt expansionist moves entail the definite risk of major war. It is, therefore, shifting from overt expansionist tactics to the strategy of wooing the unalined nations, especially India, and of seeking to create neutralized areas open to later seduction or subversion. The latter aim applies particularly to Germany and Japan.

3. In spite of its desire to avoid a major conflict, Soviet leadership had—at least until the "Summit Meeting" at Geneva, in July 1955—become increasingly uncertain whether such a conflict could ultimately be avoided. This hypothesis is supported by the reconcentration of Soviet production upon heavy industry and by the increase in the Soviet military budgets.

4. If uncertainty should ever become conviction that war is inevitable, Soviet leadership will strike first and without warning, wherever and whenever it sees its best chance of delivering an initial knockout blow. This assumption is dictated by ordinary commonsense and by the established fact that moral restraints exercise little or no influence upon the Kremlin's decisions.

5. Soviet anxiety derives primarily from: (a) the unpredictability of Chinese policy, which Moscow does not control but by which Moscow may find itself committed; (b) the threatened resurgence of German and, more remotely, of Japanese military power; and (c) the proximity of American bomber bases and the fear that the United States may use them to deliver a sudden knockout punch.

Chinese Intentions

In guessing at the intentions of the Peking regime we have considerably less evidence at our disposal. We cannot, for example, say with any degree of certainty that Peking wants to avoid a major war, although it seems reasonable to make that assumption. Nor have we any evidence by which to judge whether Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai consider world war III unlikely, probable, or inevitable. What we do know with reasonable certainty is:

1. That the Peking government will not shrink from war if it considers its vital interests threatened. This was clearly demonstrated in Korea.

2. That the Peking government considers the Nationalist possession of the offshore islands a threat to its vital interests which it will not long tolerate.

3. That the Peking government considers itself legally entitled to Formosa and the Pescadores and intends to obtain possession of them.

4. That the Peking government will in no circumstances rest content so long as Formosa is held by a Nationalist regime which does not recognize the finality of its defeat and intends, whenever possible, to reconquer the mainland.

From Chou En-lai's conciliatory behavior at and since the Bandung Conference, we may tentatively deduce two further hypotheses:

(a) That Peking seeks the friendship and respect of the Asian peoples and does not intend, for the time being at least, to attempt the physical conquest or political subversion of any of its neighbors on the mainland; and

(b) That Peking will probably avoid war with the United States in any circumstances which do not clearly place the United States or the American-supported Nationalist regime in the role of aggressor.

The Most Probable Causes of War

What conclusions may be drawn from these hypotheses as to the most likely causes of world war III? Mr. Cutler has given us the following warning:

"I say that the Kremlin leaders do not intend or wish a world war now or in the foreseeable future. But we must never overlook miscalculation. War may come through error. Hitler's gross miscalculation of the 'Bulldog Breed' was a potent factor in bringing World War II. I am as sure that general war will not in the near future spring from Russian intent as I am sure that it might grow out of mistake, or unbridled action and counteraction or loose talk that war is inevitable. There's nothing good or bad, but thinking makes it so. There's nothing makes war so inevitable as often intimating its inevitability."

Drawing our own somewhat more specific conclusions from the hypotheses just stated, we might say:

The point of greatest danger at the present time appears to lie in the possibility that the United States may become involved in war with the Chinese People's Republic over an issue in which Russia will back China's position. This could happen through "unbridled action and counteraction" on the part of either the Communists or the allies of the United States. The danger is magnified by the fact that both Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee openly desire to involve the United States in a major war.

The next most likely cause of world conflagration seems to us (though here Mr. Cutler would doubtless disagree) to derive from that process by which more and more nations are being rearmed and drawn into military alliances. Specifically, the rearming of Germany and Japan as well as the rearming of the Moslem countries could result in the outbreak of "local wars" which would eventually involve the vital interests of the major antagonists and thus trigger the holocaust.

A third danger lurks in the possibility that the Soviet regime may at any time come to the conclusion that war is inevitable and launch a sneak, air-atomic attack upon the bases of American retaliatory power.

In the light of these tentative conclusions, let us now examine the possibilities of preventive action, bearing in mind that the unpredictable developments of the next weeks and months may well alter some of the premises upon which the following chapters have been written.

Chapter 11. Preventive action in Europe

In approaching the problem of reducing tensions in Europe, Congressman REUSS and his colleagues cut straight to the heart of the existing difficulties. Recognizing that the continued partition of Germany and the threatened resurgence of German military power constituted the greatest sources of tension and danger in Europe, the first-year legislators boldly suggested a drastic departure from a bipartisan policy which had for 5 years given the rearmament of West Germany priority over an all-German peace settlement. What they suggested was nothing less than the abandonment of the idea of obtaining a substantial German military contribution to the NATO alliance, proposing instead the creation of an unarmed area stretching from the Rhine to Russia's historic borders, with its security guaranteed by the United Nations.[20]

If Congressman REUSS and his associates had been directing American foreign policy on March 16, 1955, instead of pleading for its revision, the United States might well have seized the initiative and forestalled at least in part the Soviet diplomatic offensive which developed during the next 60 days. In that case, considerably more progress might have been made at the Big Four meeting at Geneva in July.

The Soviet Diplomatic Offensive

As it was, the new Bulganin-Khrushchev regime lost no time in seizing the initiative. Reversing its previous, stubbornly held position, the Kremlin suddenly summoned the Austrian Chancellor to Moscow and offered him the long-delayed Austrian State Treaty and the withdrawal of Russian forces, provided only that Austria would agree to accept a status of guaranteed neutrality. The Western Powers, caught flat-footed by this maneuver, had no choice but to welcome the Austrian Treaty, although they were uncomfortably aware that, by this action, the Russians had made it clear to the German people that they, too, could achieve unification and freedom if they would accept a similar condition.

Next, the Soviet regime came forward with the new disarmament proposal of May 10, which suggested, among other things, the withdrawal of all military forces from bases on foreign soil.

Finally, the Soviet leaders made a pilgrimage to Belgrade, there to confess abjectly that their denunciation of Titoist deviationism in 1948 had been founded on error and to attempt the reestablishment of friendly relations.

These moves, together with Chou En-lai's unexpected declaration at Bandung of Peking's willingness to negotiate outstanding differences with the United States, opened a new chapter in diplomatic history—a chapter in which the next moves in both Europe and Asia were squarely up to the Western Powers.

Upon the urgent demand of its European allies—particularly of Sir Anthony Eden who was then in the midst of an election campaign—the Eisenhower administration agreed with ill-concealed reluctance to join Britain and France in proposing to Moscow the four-power meeting at the summit so long desired by Sir Winston Churchill. Moscow accepted, agreeing to a top-level meeting at Geneva on July 18.

Meanwhile, the Soviet diplomatic offensive continued. Peace talks with Japan were begun at London. Prime Minister Nehru of India paid a lengthy visit to Moscow. Dr. Adenauer, hitherto denounced by the Russians as a militarist and a warmonger, was invited to visit the Soviet capital in order to discuss a "normalization of relations" between the Soviet Union and the Bonn Republic.

The dangerous effect of the Russian initiative upon the German problem was analyzed by the writer in the following letter to the New York Times, dated April 18, 1955:

"The sudden Russian reversal as to the Austrian treaty spotlights for all the world, and especially for the Germans, the dilemma into which a stubbornly inflexible diplomacy has taken the Western Powers. By agreeing to free Austria from occupation, provided that Austria agrees to become a neutralized buffer state, the Russians are saying to the Germans in deeds rather than words that, so far as Russia is concerned, they too can have unification and freedom, provided only that they forgo the right to make military alliances with either East or West. The generous terms offered by Russia, and especially

[20] The author, who has consistently opposed the partition and rearmament of Germany, put forward a very similar proposal at the time when the North Atlantic Treaty was under negotiation. This proposal was published in the Nation of March 19, 1949, and subsequently in the author's Last Call for Common Sense (Harcourt Brace, 1949) pp. 219–225.

the absence of any attempt to plant a Communist Trojan horse within Austria, will have a profound effect upon German opinion.

"Having refused to discuss an all-German settlement until the treaties binding West Germany into the NATO alliance were ratified, the Western Powers now find themselves in this predicament:

"They cannot negotiate without being willing to abandon the very treaties whose ratification they made a condition precedent to negotiation.

"On the other hand, continued refusal to negotiate would constitute an open admission of caring more for rearming West Germany than for making an all-German peace settlement. It would mean assuming the full onus for the continued partition of Germany and of Europe.

"This dilemma has existed for the past 5 years. Western leadership has refused to recognize its existence, insisting that the Russians did not really want an all-German settlement—that their various overtures were mere propaganda. In this belief the Eisenhower administration took the position that it would not discuss an all-German settlement unless and until Russia proved its sincerity by agreeing to internationally supervised, free all-German elections and by ceasing to obstruct an Austrian treaty.

"Both proofs have now been delivered. Last January the Russians declared that they were ready to accept the Eden plan for supervised all-German elections which they had rejected a year earlier at the Berlin conference. The Austrian move completes the picture.

"The western hand has now been called. It is now not Russian but western sincerity in seeking an all-German settlement that is on trial, especially in Germany.

"It goes without saying that Russian sincerity is far from proved by compliance with the criteria set by western leadership. Russian intentions remain very much of a question mark. But by setting these criteria and by their failure to take the initiative in seeking an all-German settlement, the Western Powers have allowed themselves to be put on the defensive. Through their obsession with the need for a German military contribution to their own defense, the Western Powers have permitted the Russians to gain a dangerously advantageous position in the political struggle for the allegiance of the German people.

"This is precisely the eventuality against which the writer has frequently warned in your columns and elsewhere. The answer remains what it has been all along—a specific western proposal for an all-German settlement, designed to immunize a neutralized Germany against Soviet seduction or subversion. Such a proposal, if it skillfully reopens the question of the Oder-Neisse frontier, could even now recapture the initiative from the Russians." [27]

Washington's Reaction

When President Eisenhower was asked at his press conference of May 18, to comment upon the neutralization of Austria and its possible effect on Germany, he said: "There seems to be developing the thought that there might be built up a series of neutralized states from north to south through Europe." The fact that the President neither approved nor rejected this idea was enough to throw Chancellor Konrad Adenauer into a panic. The German Ambassador was instructed to call upon Secretary Dulles to make clear that the Bonn government would have no part of an Austrian solution.

On May 24, Mr. Dulles disclosed that, acting on the President's instructions, he had reassured Chancellor Adenauer and added that the President himself would no doubt make his position clear at his regular press conference. That conference, scheduled for the next day, was, however, called off, and thus the Dulles statement of May 24 was allowed to stand as the definition of United States policy.

What Mr. Dulles said, in essence, was this: "It is the view of the United States that a policy of neutrality has no application to a country of the size and character of Germany, no matter how applicable it is to Austria, a small country with 7 million people. But I do not believe that anybody really believes that the German people, seventy-odd million of them, are designed to play the role of a neutral country."

Noting that the Austrian treaty placed no limit on the size of the Austrian Army, the Secretary added: "I do not think that the German people or the Soviet people or the West European people want to see applied to Germany the concept of its being an independent state with an unlimited army."

Now the fact is that no one, least of all the Russians, had suggested that Germany become an independent state with an unlimited army—no one, that is, except certain Germans, such as the former Chancellors Bruening and Luther, who frankly avowed the desire to see a rearmed, independent Germany pursue a neutral policy as between Russia and the West. The Russians had wanted originally to limit the size of even the Austrian Army; they would certainly insist on restricting German rearmament if Germany, like Austria, were to be neutralized.

Moreover, there was a vastly important difference between "neutrality" and "neutralization." Mr. Dulles rightly rejected the notion that an independent and fully rearmed Germany should be permitted voluntarily to pursue a policy of "neutrality." But, again, that was not the issue. Austria had obtained its freedom by renouncing a part of its "independence"—a very important part, namely, its right to enter into military alliances. The Russian idea as to Germany was apparently that an all-German government should make a similar renunciation, and this was precisely the point to which the Adenauer government objected.

The German Chancellor's objection to neutralization rested upon entirely different grounds than those put forward by Mr. Dulles. Dr. Adenauer rejected neutralization as incompatible with the dignity and full sovereignty of the German people. A more subtle argument advanced by the Chancellor was, however, that "a neutralized Germany will inevitably become a Soviet satellite." Dr. Adenauer produced no evidence or logical support for this contention, any more than he produced supporting arguments for his frequently asserted conviction that the reunification of Germany could be brought about only by the actual rearmament of the Bonn Republic.

It was a curious fact that Mr. Dulles sought to bolster his position by conjuring up American fears of a resurgent, nationalist Germany, while Dr. Adenauer sought to arouse American fears of a bolshevized Germany, and made his appeal to German nationalism.

In his statement to the press of May 24, 1955, Secretary Dulles also expressed a strangely complacent view of the whole Soviet diplomatic offensive, declaring:

"It is clear that we are seeing the results of a policy of building unity and strength within the free world. It is that policy, the failure of the Soviet Union to disrupt it and the strains to which the Soviet Union itself has been subjected, which undoubtedly require a change of tactics."

A month later at San Francisco, after Foreign Minister Molotov had once more outlined the new Soviet proposals before the United Nations delegates, Mr. Dulles repeated his earlier conviction, saying:

"It is not unprecedented to see men make a virtue of necessity. * * * If we want to see that virtue continue, I suggest that it may be prudent to continue what has produced it."

This observer's misgivings concerning the assumption that the dramatic shift in Soviet strategy was to be construed as a retreat forced by wise western diplomacy and concerning the conclusion that more of the same inflexibility would produce further beneficial results were expressed in an article published on July 5, 1955,[28] from which the following is a partial quotation:

"Both sides realize that there can be no peace in Europe so long as Germany remains partitioned. Both sides are convinced that control of a unified Germany means control of Europe. Each side has, therefore, sought reunification on terms which would bring Germany under its control. It has become clear that neither side can succeed.

"In a dramatic reversal of political strategy, the Kremlin has now shifted from overt expansionism to an attempt to create neutral buffer areas in Europe and in Asia which it no doubt hopes will be susceptible to later seduction or subversion. This forces the Western Powers either to reject neutralization altogether or to devise a formula of neutralization which will effectively immunize buffer areas against later Soviet seduction or Communist penetration.

"The danger which looms upon the horizon is that the West will flatly reject neutralization, seeking instead to devise a disarmament agreement between the NATO and anti-NATO blocs which will leave Germany partitioned. Such an arrangement would play directly into Russian hands; first, because it would rest upon little more than good faith; second, because it would freeze the status of the Soviet satellites; and, third, because, by leaving Germany partitioned, it would make almost certain that German reunification will eventually come about as the result of a Russo-German deal in which the West will have little if any voice.

"The alternative is to devise a formula of neutralization acceptable to the Germans and compatible with both Western and Soviet security. The writer has suggested that such a formula might be found in a temporary neutralization which would not affect Germany's right to enter such political and economic affiliations as the Coal and Steel Community, but which would prohibit it from joining any military alliance for a fixed period of 10 to 15 years. Leading Germans who reject permanent neutralization have told the writer that they would find such a formula acceptable. Were the West to make such a proposal and were Russia to reject it, the onus for Germany's continued partition would rest squarely upon the Kremlin.

"Secretary Dulles holds that the shift in Soviet tactics is a victory for Western diplomacy and that more of the same medicine will bear further fruit. It is respectfully suggested that a mere continuation of past policy will not avert the danger of letting the Communists become the champions of disarmament and nonalinement in a world hungering for a surcease from war. Nor will it enable the West to end the partition of Germany and to hold the allegiance of the German people."

In the July 15, 1955, issue of the Foreign Policy Bulletin, published by the Foreign Policy Association, the writer made these further observations:

"It has been clear for a long time that, if the Western Powers continued their refusal

[27] The writer's specific plan for such a proposal, submitted to President Eisenhower at the time of his inauguration, was published in 1953 as a pamphlet (France, Germany, and NATO—Current Affairs Press) and later in the author's Germany—Key to Peace, Harvard University Press, 1953.

[28] In the Washington Post, the Minneapolis Star, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Christian Science Monitor, the Denver Post, and the San Francisco Chronicle.

to negotiate seriously with Russia about Germany, Russia would sooner or later offer to negotiate with Germany, and that not even Dr. Adenauer would be able to decline such an invitation. In view of Dr. Adenauer's stanch loyalty to the West, we may view his impending trip to Moscow with complacency, but the 80-year-old Chancellor cannot hold the fort for us forever. If we do not negotiate German reunification on our terms while we still have the power to do so, the Germans, once they are rearmed, will eventually negotiate it on their terms, which will not necessarily take our interests into consideration.

"It is time to stop congratulating ourselves and to face facts. One of these facts is that an attack on Western Europe would now launch an atomic war in which Europe would be destroyed no matter what the eventual outcome. In these circumstances 12 German divisions will be about as useful as was the Maginot line in 1940."

The Big Four Meeting

At the Geneva meeting of July 18–23, 1955, two important things were accomplished.

Largely because of President Eisenhower's natural tact, his geniality, and his transparently sincere desire for peace, the conference took place in a climate of conciliation and of mutually expressed belief that existing differences should and could be settled by patient effort. The spirit of Geneva was better than that of any postwar conference—better even than that of the wartime meetings of Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, because it was based upon few illusions as to the complexity of the problems to be solved or as to the width of the gaps to be bridged.

Secondly, the Big Four discussions served to clarify the divergent positions to be reconciled by negotiation, as they had not been clarified since the Moscow conference of March-April 1947. If the result of this clarification was discouraging in that it showed how far apart were the demands of West and East, it was a hopeful sign that both sides gave evidence of greater flexibility.

Contrary to the urging of Chancellor Adenauer, President Eisenhower did not make immediate German reunification on western terms a sine qua non of any progress toward a mutual-security agreement. On their part, the Russians retreated from their previous position that the ratification of the Paris-London accords would shut the door upon any discussion of German reunification.

The British and French delegations put forward a number of proposals for a five-power security pact. The essence of these proposals was that Russia should agree to the reunification of Germany within the Potsdam frontiers and to German membership in NATO in exchange for a western guarantee against any German attempt to alter the Oder-Neisse frontier by force. Sir Anthony Eden threw out the suggestion that Russian security might be further safeguarded by the creation of a demilitarized zone between the opposing forces in East Germany and Central Europe. Premier Faure volunteered the additional inducement that a reunified Germany's rearmament might be held down to the same level as that contemplated for West Germany under the London-Paris accords.

Marshal Bulganin rejected any proposal involving German participation in NATO and put forward a general all-European security pact in which both East and West Germany would participate. In a move obviously addressed less to his colleagues at Geneva than to the absent Germans, the Russian Premier demanded the liquidation of NATO as the price for German reunification.

These moves and countermoves indicated precisely those developments which this observer had feared. The three Western Powers, while demanding German reunification, continued to set a condition—all-German participation in NATO—which they knew the Russians could not accept. The Russians, while demanding unification, asked a price—the liquidation of NATO—which they knew the West could not pay. The most likely consequence would be that unification would be postponed and eventually negotiated not by the Western Powers but by the Germans and the Soviet authorities. This was clearly what the Russians wanted.

Oddly enough, the German Chancellor, who had insisted that German reunification be made the No. 1 topic at Geneva, also wished a postponement of the decision. Recognizing that the Russians were not prepared to permit a united Germany to join the NATO alliance, Dr. Adenauer desired to stall until the actual creation of a West German Army should have strengthened both his dominance of western policy and his bargaining position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Thus a curious picture was unfolded, with the Germans and the Russians each assuming time to be on their side and the Western Powers actually less interested in German unification than in obtaining German contingents for the NATO alliance. The Russians were gambling upon Dr. Adenauer's physical or political demise, while the aged German Chancellor was gambling not only upon his own longevity but upon his ability to remain in power without satisfying the German people's growing demand for progress toward unification.

In backing Dr. Adenauer's gamble, the West was taking an extremely dangerous chance. It was staking its hope not only upon the Chancellor's remaining alive and in power but also upon the soundness of his highly dubious assumption that the Russians would agree to unification on western terms, once they were confronted with 12 West German divisions. Yet, if the new spirit of Geneva meant anything at all, it meant the renunciation by both East and West of any hope of changing the status quo by the use or threat of force. This would make nonsense of the assumption that the creation of a West German army would induce the Russians to relinquish their hold on East Germany. If the western statesmen failed to see the fallacy in Dr. Adenauer's policy, a growing number of Germans did.

The Social Democrats, representing about one-third of the West German electorate, declined to have anything to do with the Chancellor's impending visit to Moscow. Doubts concerning the wisdom of the Chancellor's policy were expressed in newspapers which had previously supported him, such as the influential Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung. The almost universally gloomy West German editorial comment could be summed up in a single sentence: "It looks as if peace will be achieved at our expense"—meaning at the cost of the continued partition of Germany.

In a speech to the American Bar Association on August 24, President Eisenhower sought to dispel German pessimism by asserting that "the division of Germany cannot be supported by any argument based upon boundaries, language, or racial origin." Prime Minister Eden reaffirmed Britain's interest in unification. So did French Ambassador Francois-Poncet. There were rumors that the Western Powers were developing "a new plan" for Germany providing for a demilitarization of the Soviet zone.

The Chancellor's discussions at Moscow in the second week of September should have convinced him that he would never obtain unification on any terms permitting a united Germany to enter the NATO alliance, even if the Soviet zone were to be demilitarized. The Russians had invited Dr. Adenauer for one purpose only; namely, to open a channel for eventual direct Russo-German negotiations. The Chancellor went to Moscow declaring that he would agree to the establishment of diplomatic relations only on certain conditions: (1) if his right to speak for all of Germany were conceded; (2) if an exchange of Ambassadors would in no way involve his recognition of the East German government; (3) if it were agreed that the German-Polish frontier remained subject to final settlement in the peace treaty; (4) if a timetable for German unification were agreed upon; and (5) if the Soviet Government would first have released all German war prisoners.

At Moscow, Dr. Adenauer was bluntly told that he could speak only for West Germany; that the East German Government would have to be a party to any discussion of German reunification; that there could be no reunification so long as West Germany remained in the NATO alliance; that the Polish-German frontier had been fixed at Potsdam and that, in any case, it concerned the East German and not the West German Government; and that the release of war prisoners concerned both the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of West Germany.

Having obtained nothing more than an oral promise that both East and West German war prisoners would be released—a concession for which the credit was pointedly given to the East German Government—the Chancellor nevertheless agreed to the establishment of diplomatic relations.

The State Department hailed this meager result as a diplomatic triumph demonstrating "the bankruptcy of Soviet policy with respect to Germany." [29] Dr. Adenauer's own explanation of his surrender was, in effect, that he had been compelled to bow to the superior strength of the Soviet position and that it had seemed the better part of wisdom to establish a channel of direct communication with the powerful Kremlin, instead of depending solely upon negotiations through the Western Powers. If this proved the bankruptcy of any policy, it would seem to have proved the futility of the Acheson-Dulles-Adenauer policy of seeking to negotiate from positions wrongly assumed to be situations of strength.

Upon the unfortunately somewhat improbable assumption that the western foreign ministers will seriously attempt to break the deadlock in the near future, let us now consider what sort of a proposal for reunification they might put forward with a reasonable hope of having it accepted.

Temporary Neutralization as the Solution

It is true that, in the long run, Germany is too important a factor in Europe to be denied any of the attributes of full sovereignty enjoyed by its neighbors. If Europe is to remain a continent divided into the traditional, fully sovereign nation-states, the permanent denial to Germany of the right to rearm and to enter into military alliances is as impossible and as dangerous to attempt as its permanent partition.

Most Europeans, however, recognize that the traditional nation-state system is outworn and that the Continent must unite both politically and economically, if it is to survive and enjoy reasonable prosperity. This realization has already produced the organs of cooperation created by the Marshall Plan, the Coal and Steel Community and the Council of Europe. The trend toward unification, necessarily involving the surrender of certain sovereign rights to supranational authority, was progressing rapidly until it was thrown into reverse by the ill-advised proposal to form a European army before there was a politically united Europe. The French rejection of the European army and the substitution of an old-fashioned military coalition of national armies (Western European Union) set back but by no means killed the European idea. "Europeanism" is still at

[29] See New York Times September 16; also the report of its Bonn correspondent, M. S. Handler, and the comments of its Washington Bureau Chief, James Reston, during the days immediately following.

least as strong a sentiment in many parts of the continent as nationalism, especially among the youth of Germany.

This suggests that, if military neutralization can be made to represent a step toward Europeanization, it can be made not only acceptable to the majority of Germans, but actually desirable. As already indicated, this might be accomplished by a plan of temporary neutralization.

Suppose that the peace treaty to be negotiated with a freely elected all-German Government were to provide that for a period of years, not less than 5 and not over 15, Germany should bind itself not to enter into any military alliances, while the other signatories, including not only the four original occupying powers but all of Germany's neighbors, would undertake to respect and guarantee Germany's military neutrality.

The treaty would explicitly affirm the determination of all the signatories to cooperate in the limitation and eventual abolition of all national armaments other than those required for the maintenance of internal security; it would state explicitly that, in the event that this goal should not have been substantially attained prior to the expiration of the period of Germany's neutralization, then Germany would be automatically released from any restriction upon its sovereignty.

Thus a premium would be placed upon rapid progress toward disarmament; and Germany, far from being treated as a second-class nation would be set up as an example for other nations to follow.

The treaty should provide for the disbanding of the East German Volkspolizei and other military or paramilitary organizations set up by the Communist regime, and for the abandonment of the West German rearmament contemplated under the London-Paris agreements of October 1954. It should prohibit Germany from manufacturing heavy offensive weapons, including nuclear weapons, during the period of its neutralization. It should permit the creation of a limited defense force to stand nominal guard over Germany's frontiers.

The provisions should satisfy the Russians, if they are sincere in wishing to work toward disarmament. They would encounter opposition in Germany on the part of the extreme nationalists but would probably be welcomed by the majority of the German people, especially by the German workers and German youth. Whether or not they would be acceptable to the present West German government depends upon the degree of sincerity with which it actually wants reunification. There are elements within the Adenauer regime whose desire for reunification is, to say the least, doubtful.

German fear of demilitarized neutralization could be considerably reduced if a similar status were agreed upon for those of the Soviet satellites which are Germany's neighbors; namely, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Although it appears doubtful whether Russia would agree to the outright demilitarization of these countries, the Western Powers should certainly try to obtain at least a drastic reduction of their military forces.[30]

The German Peace Treaty should provide that, within 1 year of its going into effect, all foreign troops should be withdrawn from that part of Germany which lies between the Oder-Neisse frontier and the Rhine; and that a United Nations Commission should take over the task of seeing to it that German military forces and the manufacture of arms remained within the treaty limitations. The arms reductions on the part of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary should be supervised by similar United Nations Commissions.

The German-Polish Frontier

We come now to a question which probably presents the greatest obstacle to an all-German settlement; namely, that of immunizing a reunited and temporarily neutralized Germany against Soviet seduction.

There is very little likelihood that the Communist ideology would make any appreciable headway in a free and reunited Germany. Even the most pessimistic observers agree that, if a free, all-German election were held under present circumstances, the Communists would not poll as much as 10 percent of the total vote. For the time being, the danger is not that of ideological subversion. That danger is more likely to arise if Germany remains partitioned than if it is reunited; for, in a partitioned Germany, it is always possible that the West German boom may collapse while East Germany may gradually enjoy a greater degree of prosperity.

If Germany is reunited and neutralized, the greatest danger of Soviet seduction will arise out of Russia's retaining the ability to give back to Germany all or part of the East German lands from which some 10 million Germans were ruthlessly expelled in 1945. In order to deprive the Kremlin of this instrument of seduction—and perhaps even more in the interest of a just settlement—the Western Powers should insist that the peace treaty provide for a reexamination of the Polish-German frontier provisionally fixed at Potsdam.

Various solutions to this problem are possible. An outright revision of the frontier was suggested by the writer some years ago; this would have called for a return to Germany of all the territories annexed by Poland, except East Prussia and Upper Silesia. East Prussia, according to this proposal, would have been permanently amputated from Germany, because the Treaty of Versailles had made it into a strategically provocative German island in the Polish sea.[31] Upper Silesia would have been left to Poland on the theory that a peaceful Germany did not need the so-called "Eastern Ruhr," if it retained its western coal and industry, while Poland did need the industrial complex of Upper Silesia, if it was to have an economy balanced between agriculture and industry. The remaining German lands east of the Oder-Neisse frontier, which used to produce most of Germany's grain crops and which, when this proposal was made, were sparsely settled by Poles and in part uncultivated, would have reverted to Germany.

This formula may now be outdated. Polish resettlement seems to have progressed to a point where there is danger of curing one injustice by creating another, although the Polish and German statistics give conflicting evidence. The best solution would probably be to have the peace treaty provide for a Polish-German renegotiation under impartial arbitrators appointed by the United Nations, to be conducted without interference by either Russia or the Western powers. Such negotiations might develop a formula under which the disputed lands would be open to both Poles and Germans under some form of condominium, with fair and equal treatment guaranteed to local minorities.

Whatever the method adopted, the question of the Oder-Neisse frontier cannot be ignored. No German Government can be expected to accept the Potsdam frontier as a finality. The Western Powers dare not leave Russia in the position of being able to dangle the bait of frontier revision before the German eyes. Whether the Russians, who are well aware of the value of their present position, will be willing to sacrifice it in the interests of a German settlement remains to be seen. This could well be the crucial point in the negotiation.

The Limits of Withdrawal

The Russians have indicated that, in the event of an all-German settlement, they would be willing to withdraw their troops not only from Germany but also from Poland. (The first announcement to this effect was made by the Soviet-controlled Interparliamentary Group on Germany at Warsaw in January 1955.) They have also proposed, in their disarmament plan of May 10, 1955, that Anglo-American forces withdraw from the European continent and that the United States withdraw from its bases on foreign soil.

Congressman REUSS and his colleagues proposed an "unarmed area between the Rhine and Russia's historic frontiers. By this they meant that Russia was to withdraw not only from Germany and the satellites but also from the three Baltic states—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—which have actually been incorporated in the U. S. S. R. Meanwhile, Anglo-American forces would, according to this proposal, presumably remain west of the Rhine.

The Big Four meeting at Geneva made it clear, if it was not apparent before, that the limits of the practically obtainable lie somewhere between these two extremes. The Russians will certainly not evacuate the Baltic States. The Western Powers will not agree to any plan in which withdrawal of the occupation forces means that the Russians withdraw to the Soviet frontier while Anglo-American forces withdraw across the Channel or across the Atlantic Ocean.[32]

The Western Powers would face a serious problem if the American and British troops now stationed in Germany were to be quartered in Holland, Belgium, and France. A possible first step would be to station the Anglo-American forces in that part of Germany which lies west of the Rhine, while an equivalent Russian force would remain in that part of the trans-Oder-Neisse territory which might be returned to Germany or placed under some form of Polish-German condominium. In addition, the treaty might provide that for the period of Germany's neutralization or until a general disarmament agreement were concluded, Russian troops should continue to maintain a garrison at Stettin, while Anglo-American forces would continue to occupy Bremen.

Admittedly, a treaty drawn along the lines of the foregoing tentative suggestions would entail risk and difficulties, but a proposal of this nature might at least serve to break the deadlock and to provide a basis for serious negotiation. It would remain to be seen whether the Russians would agree to neutralization on a basis which would clearly deprive them of any hope of later seducing Germany into an eastern alliance. Were they to refuse, their refusal would, as Congressman REUSS said, "give us the incalculable advantage of making our side the champion of German unification."

One thing seems certain. Unless the Western Powers take the initiative in putting to the Russians some proposal involving the surrender of their demand for German

[30] Minor reductions in the troops strength of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia have already been announced, along with the Soviet announcement of a reduction of its own forces by 640,000, in August 1955.

[31] The Koenigsberg area, comprising almost half of East Prussia, was annexed by Russia without the slightest legal or moral justification. Its possible cession to Poland is a matter between the Russians and the Poles.

[32] Actually, such a withdrawal has been advocated by British Air Marshal Sir John Slessor, but only on condition that a rearmed Germany is included in NATO. See his article in The Reporter of September 8, 1955.

troop contingents, the Russians will sooner or later make a proposal directly to the Germans—a proposal which the Western Powers will be unable to accept without incurring the likelihood of eventual Soviet seduction, but which they will be unable to veto without alienating the majority of the German people.

What Have We To Lose?

What has the West to lose in taking the initiative with a proposal which, at long last, recognizes the futility of demanding over and over again that the Russians surrender East Germany merely in order to let it, too, become a part of the anti-Soviet military coalition?

The only reason for rearming Germany is the belief that Western Europe cannot be defended against Russian invasion without German troops. This is, no doubt, true. But it is also true that Western Europe cannot be defended against a Russian invasion with German troops—least of all if the German contribution to western defense is limited to 12 divisions in order to prevent the German army from outweighing that of France. The fact is that the only way to defend Europe against a Russian invasion is to prevent that invasion from being launched.

The only reasonable case for maintaining that 12 German divisions would make the difference between a defensible and an indefensible Western Europe rested upon an assumption which has been invalidated; namely, that, with both sides in possession of nuclear weapons, neither side would use them, for fear of reprisal. Therefore, it was argued, conventional ground forces would regain their former importance. This never very realistic assumption was knocked into a cocked hat when the NATO Council declared on December 8, 1954, that, in the event of a Russian attack, the NATO forces would at once use tactical atomic weapons to offset superior Russian conventional strength. Field Marshal Montgomery had already made this quite explicit in a lecture delivered on October 12, 1954, in which he had said:

"I want to make it absolutely clear that we at SHAPE are basing all our operational planning on using atomic and thermonuclear weapons in our defense. With us it is no longer: 'They may possibly be used.' It is very definitely: 'They will be used, if we are attacked.'"

It is, therefore, perfectly clear that, if Russia launches an invasion of Western Europe, world war III, fought with atomic and hydrogen bombs, will have begun. Of what use will 12 German ground divisions be in such a war?

Speaking at Bismarck, N. Dak., on February 22, 1955, General Gruenther, the Supreme NATO Commander, stated that the importance of the West German military contribution consisted of making it possible for the West to adopt a forward strategy, instead of a defense based upon holding the line of the Rhine. The addition of the German air and ground forces would, the general said, help to create a sufficiently strong shield to prevent an enemy from advancing in widely dispersed formation, compelling him to concentrate his forces, and thus to make them vulnerable to destruction by atomic weapons.

No doubt this is true; but, in order to force the enemy to concentrate, would not the German forces themselves have to concentrate to some extent and become vulnerable to atomic attack? Moreover, the fact that the frontlines might be 150 miles farther to the east would not materially affect the enemy's ability to lay waste by air not only the Ruhr and the whole of West Germany but also the great cities and vital centers of Western Europe and the British Isles.

One can readily sympathize with the point of view of a military commander who has been assigned the task of defending Western Europe. He will obviously want every battalion and every air unit he can muster. West German contingents—assuming their willingness to fight in the circumstances which would prevail in the event of war—would doubtless enable the NATO commander to put up a stronge initial resistance. The fact remains, however, that, if war comes, Western Europe will be finished, irrespective of whether or not it is overrun by the enemy and irrespective of the war's final outcome.

The point to remember is that we are not discussing how to prepare for a war assumed to be inevitable. We are discussing how best to prevent that war from taking place. German contingents might conceivably be useful to us in the early stages of a fight to the finish with Russia, though it is hard to see how they would serve the interests of Europe or of Germany itself. From the point of view of preventing war, the rearming of a partitioned Germany is more of an irritant than a deterrent. Because all this is quite clear to the majority of Europeans, including the Germans, our present policy has no firm support in popular opinion. Unless and until the people of Europe are convinced, as they are not now convinced, that there is no alternative, the Western European Union structure and NATO itself will remain not "a position of strength" but a position of dangerous weakness.

Chapter 12. Preventive action in Asia

In the debate of March 16, 1955, Congressman REUSS and his colleagues suggested that we "ask the United Nations to take over Formosa as a trusteeship, to assume its defense against the aggression that threatens it and to promote the development of self-government by the Formosan people." Explaining the purpose of this recommendation, Mr. REUSS said:

"The U. N. trusteeship suggested involves no recognition of Red China or admission of Red China to the U. N., no de-recognition of Chiang and no weakening of our determination to defend Formosa. A trusteeship could well be accommodated to the continued defense of Formosa by Chiang's troops and to the right of Chiang to seek democratic office in Formosa under a U. N. trusteeship. A U. N. trusteeship would enable us to get out from under our current untenable position whereby we maintain Formosa as a United States province and foist upon it the government of Chiang without the consent of the 7 million Formosans. A U. N. trusteeship would give India and the other Asian countries an opportunity through the U. N. to participate not only in the administration of Formosa but in its defense."

In one respect this proposal was ambiguous. If it implied that, under U. N. supervision, the people of Formosa were to have the opportunity freely to elect a government of their choice, it necessarily involved the possible "de-recognition of Chiang." In the event that the people of Formosa should freely decide to adhere to the Chinese mainland, the proposal would also involve not a "weakening" but an "abandonment" of our determination to defend Formosa.

It goes without saying that any proposal to "de-recognize Chiang" or to abandon the American defense of Formosa would have aroused a storm of protest. But the fact that these questions were and still are "hot potatoes" in our domestic politics does not mean that we can indefinitely avoid facing them. If we favor a U. N. trusteeship and, ultimately, a free choice by the Formosans as to their own future, we must be prepared to accept that choice, even if it means surrendering the island to the Communists and providing an asylum elsewhere for the Nationalist leaders.

The Reuss proposal, while admirable so far as it went, did not reach the heart of the question which bedevils American policy in the Far East. That question, which sooner or later will have to be faced, is whether the United States accepts the Chinese revolution as a fact and seeks a modus vivendi with the Peking Government, or whether the United States does not accept the revolution as a fact and seeks to overthrow the Peking Government.

This question arises in its most acute form over Formosa and the Nationalist-held islands, but it is also basic to reaching peace settlements in Indochina and Korea.

It seems apparent that we cannot overthrow the Peking Government by any means short of a major war, least of all by attempting to restore Chiang Kai-shek. It seems equally apparent that in any attempt to overthrow Mao Tse-tung by war, the United States would have no allies other than Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee. The American people have already made it clear that they would support no such adventure.

Why, then, continue the pretense? If we seek a modus vivendi with a government which rules 600 million people—one-quarter of the world's population—why continue the stubborn farce of nonrecognition?

Apart from pleasing Senators KNOWLAND, BRIDGES, MCCARTHY, and JENNER and their steadily shrinking group of adherents, our present policy serves only to isolate us from those who might be our friends in Asia and to cement the ties between Moscow and Peking.

As for admitting the Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations, how can we expect it to agree to a U. N. trusteeship for Formosa or to disarmament under U. N. auspices, if it continues to be excluded from that organization? There is no longer any question of "Red China shooting its way into the United Nations." The only shooting going on since 1954 is a purely internal Chinese affair. The Chinese Communists are shooting at Nationalist garrisons on offshore islands which are indisputably Chinese. The Nationalists are shooting at the mainland. Neither the United States nor the United Nations has any right to interfere in the determination of which faction in the Chinese civil war gains control of Matsu and Quemoy.

There is only one legitimate basis for maintaining that the Chinese People's Republic has not purged itself of aggression; namely, its violation of the terms of the Korean armistice. Rectification of such violation should, of course, be made a precondition for Peking's admission to the United Nations.

The United Nations was conceived as a universal organization. Several Communist dictatorships were among its founding members and retain membership today. The United States must dissipate the impression, created by its present attitude, that it desires to make the United Nations into an anti-Communist association, or into a sort of club whose members must conform to Anglo-Saxon standards of behavior or to the idiosyncracies of certain United States Senators and Congressmen. Unless the United States changes its attitude in this respect it is likely not only to destroy the United Nations but to destroy the anti-Communist coalition. In this respect, the following quotation may be of interest:

"I have now come to believe that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts which we like. Therefore, we ought to be willing that all nations should be members without attempting to appraise closely those which are 'good' and those which are 'bad.' Already that distinction is obliterated by the present membership of the United Nations.

"If the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it,

too, should be admitted to the United Nations."

These were the views of Mr. John Foster Dulles before he became Secretary of State, as expressed in his book, War or Peace, published in 1950.

We must conclude, then, that Congressman REUSS and his colleagues, though on the right track, did not grapple with the issues which are fundamental to a relaxation of tensions in the Far East. To eliminate or substantially diminish the likelihood that world war III may be triggered by an American conflict with China in which Moscow will feel bound to support Peking, the following actions seem indicated:

1. Ending the farce of nonrecognition, bearing in mind that recognition does not involve approval and that the United States recognizes and maintains diplomatic relations with a number of governments, including that of the Soviet Union, of whose nature and conduct the American people do not approve.

2. Withdrawing our objections to seating the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations on condition that it shall previously have rectified its violation of the Korean armistice terms and on condition that it shall previously agree to the following procedure as to the islands held by the Nationalist regime:

(a) Evacuation of the off-shore islands by the Nationalists on condition that Peking renounce any intention to seize Formosa and the Pescadores by force.

(b) Turning over to the United Nations as trustee Formosa and the Pescadores, with the understanding that the United Nations will in due course provide the inhabitants with an opportunity to decide in a free election whether they wish to govern themselves as an autonomous state, or to become a state or province of the Chinese People's Republic. In the event that the inhabitants choose an autonomous status, the Nationalist leaders shall be free to seek office by democratic procedure but only on condition that they shall first renounce their Chinese citizenship and become citizens of Formosa.

(c) Assumption by the United Nations of the responsibility for the defense of Formosa and withdrawal of all American military and naval forces except insofar as these may be furnished to the United Nations at its request.

(d) Disbanding of the Nationalist armed forces except insofar as contingents may be requested by the United Nations to serve under its command.

It is by no means certain that Peking would agree to a peaceful settlement on these terms. Whether it would or not is relatively unimportant from the point of view of preventing world war III from arising out of the present Chinese-American tensions. For, if the United States were to make these proposals, it would gain the respect and support of the Asian peoples. Were China to reject these proposals and to threaten a resort to force, it would clearly place itself in the role of the aggressor, in which case it would find itself without friends in Asia and could not count with certainty upon Soviet support.

Apart from having to face a few weeks of right-wing rhetoric, what have we to lose by taking such a course?

We have no legal or moral right whatever to Matsu or Quemoy. We have no right to Formosa, except as one of the 48 nations to whom, under the Peace Treaty of April 28, 1952, Japan surrendered title. This treaty contains two provisions about the islands taken from Japan. One establishes a large area in which the former Japanese possessions are placed under U. N. trusteeship, with the United States as the sole administering authority; this includes Okinawa, where we have a major base. Under a second provision Japan relinquished title to Formosa and the Pescadores, but the treaty does not say to whom. The title, therefore, rests in the 48 nations, who signed the treaty, some of whom, like Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines and Indonesia, have every bit as much interest as we in the future of the islands. In taking the position that Formosa is an essential link in the American defense perimeter, we have all along ignored the fact that we have no legal title to it.

This is what Congressman Reuss undoubtedly had in mind when he said that his proposal of the U. N. trusteeship would get us out from under our current untenable position whereby we maintain Formosa as a United States province and foist upon it the government of Chiang without the consent of 7 million Formosans.

The foregoing proposals, though more far-reaching than those of the Congressional group, do not by any means constitute a program for peace in Asia. They represent merely a course of action designed to reduce tensions, to diminish the likelihood of a major conflict and to make possible the eventual peaceful settlement of the disputes outstanding between the rival power orbits. One such dispute concerns the reunification of Korea. President Syngman Rhee is scarcely less of an obstacle than the communists to a settlement which will give the long-suffering Korean people the independence and freedom of which they have been deprived for the past 50 years by great-power maneuvers. A second issue concerns the drawing of a mutually respected frontier between the rival orbits in Indo-China. The future of Japan is a third major issue requiring settlement. None of these questions can be approached until the pathway to direct negotiations between Washington and Peking has been cleared of obstacles.

What we must recognize is that the existing obstacles have been created not merely by the sins of the new regime in China but also by an historical process in which, as we have seen, our own aberrations, past and present, have played a considerable part.

Certainly no progress toward a relaxation of tensions in the Far East can be made so long as our Government refuses to discuss the outstanding issues with Peking. The State Department's reaction to Chou En-lai's offer of direct negotiations in April 1955 was a flat rejection of any talks in which the Chinese Nationalists would not also participate. The Nationalists promptly declared that they would in no circumstances sit down at the same table with representatives of the Chinese People's Republic. The State Department's declaration thus, for the time being, placed Chiang Kai-shek in a position to block any progress toward peaceful settlement.

Although President Eisenhower subsequently somewhat softened the State Department's hasty declaration of policy, no moves were made by Washington during the ensuing months toward opening up a direct channel of communication. India's efforts to bridge the gap between Peking and Washington received a cool reception. In spite of the waning power of the intransigent right wing, the administration felt itself compelled, for the sake of party harmony to promise Senator KNOWLAND that Far Eastern affairs would not be discussed at the summit meeting to be held at Geneva in July.

No sooner, however, had the Geneva Conference come to its conclusion, than Senator GEORGE once more took the initiative. Just as, in March, he had broken the ground for top-level talks with Russia, so now the outspoken chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee took the lead in demanding that Secretary Dulles meet face to face with Chou En-lai within 6 months, warning that he expected "an acute flare-up in the Formosa Strait" unless the United States should promptly indicate its willingness to discuss outstanding differences with the Peking government.

The favorable reception accorded the Senator's initiative showed the extent to which the popular mood had changed. Among his colleagues, only a dwindling handful expressed misgivings or dissent. Nevertheless, the administration moved with the utmost caution to take up negotiations far below the level of the Foreign Ministers. Announcing that Mr. U. Alexis Johnson, American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia would shortly meet with a representative of the Chinese People's Republic at Geneva to discuss the release of prisoners, the State Department emphasized that these talks would not involve recognition, while Senator KNOWLAND declared that these conversations would signify "no change in American policy."

On August 1, 1955, the day of Mr. Johnson's first scheduled meeting with Ambassador to Poland, Wang Ping-nan, Peking announced the freeing of 11 Americans fliers accused of espionage. A day later, commenting upon a conciliatory speech by Chou En-lai, Mr. Dulles told a news conference that it was possible that the talks might be carried to a higher level, if the Peking regime would renounce the use of force.

Thus it began to appear that, at long last, Mr. Dulles might think it politically safe to shake the hand of Mr. Chou En-lai and engage in direct conversation. A year earlier, he had feared the uproar which would no doubt have taken place in the Congress and in the press at the mere suggestion of any such meeting. When Congress adjourned in early August 1955, there was scarcely a murmur of criticism or dissent. This did not mean that the administration was now prepared to pick up the "hot potatoes" of recognition and ultimate admission to the United Nations, but it certainly indicated that popular support for those moves could now be won by bold leadership.

Whether such leadership would be forthcoming remained to be seen.

Chapter 13. Relaxing tensions in the uncommitted areas

Assuming that the most dangerous tensions in Europe and the Far East can be reduced by give-and-take negotiation, then the most serious remaining risk of world war III probably arises from the likelihood that a little local war may trigger the atomic holocaust. This risk will increase so long as the buildup of opposing conventional forces continues and so long as the expansion of military alliances continues to create new areas of potential conflict.

As matters stand today, it is extremely dangerous to assume that there can be any local brush fires which can be put out with conventional weapons and which will not ultimately involve the vital interests of either or both of the two centers of polarized power. If, for example, war were to break out again between North and South Korea, it is highly improbable that Russia would tolerate a South Korean conquest of the North or that the United States would permit the south to be overrun by the Korean Communists. Only a stalemated, small-scale border conflict could reasonably be expected to remain localized. Nor is it likely, if war were to break out between the Arab States and Israel or between India and Pakistan, that such a conflict would not sooner or later involve the rival power orbits.

These considerations suggest a revision of our present attitude toward neutral nations. Our policy has hitherto been based upon the somewhat primitive thesis that whoever is not with us is against us. Faced with aggressive Communist expansionism, our Government has openly exerted pressure upon India and Pakistan, upon the Arab states, upon Germany and Japan, and even upon traditionally neutral Sweden to line up with the anti-Communist coalition. Its purpose has, of course, not been to build up a satellite empire but merely to prevent additional nations from becoming satellites of

Moscow or Peking. In most of the cases where American pressure has succeeded in drawing previously unarmed or uncommitted nations into military alliance, tensions have been increased. This alone should warrant a reexamination of our Government's policy toward the uncommitted nations.

In addition, however, the recent switch in Soviet tactics urgently demands the formulation of a coalition policy which will not permit the Kremlin to make itself the champion of neutralization of nonalinement in a world whose peoples are increasingly determined to escape from the horrors of atomic war.

One alternative to the expansion of military alliances has already been suggested with respect to Germany; namely, a negotiated neutralization on terms which so far as possible immunize the neutralized area against later Communist seduction or penetration. Where a negotiated agreement between the rival power orbits seems impracticable, another alternative might be found in a unilateral assertion by the leaders of the anti-Communist coalition of a vital interest in the continued freedom and independence of certain nations lying on or near the Sino-Soviet periphery, accompanied by an explicit voluntary renunciation of any intention to draw such nations into military alliance or to establish bases upon their soil. This would be an extension of the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, which would, however, combine a hands off warning with a countervailing self-denial.

Some of the crucially important uncommitted nations, such as India and Burma, resent pressure to rearm and join the anti-Communist alliance, not because they are neutral as between democracy and communism, but because they do not see the primary threat to their newly won independence as being that of military invasion. They reject rearmament and alliance not so much because they are inherently pacifist but because they cannot afford both rearmament and the massive programs of economic development which they consider to be their best defense against Communist penetration. Such countries might well be willing to accept the protection of the unilateral declaration here suggested.

To the extent that a neutralized belt might be created in Europe and Asia, either by agreement or by unilateral action, one might reasonably expect tensions to be relaxed and the danger of armed conflict to be diminished.

It is particularly important to reexamine our Government's policy in the Near and Middle East, where strenuous efforts are being made to create an anti-Communist military front by rearming the Moslem nations. The first thing to recognize here, is that arming an area against a danger which threatens it can be effective only if its inhabitants recognize that the danger exists and wish to defend themselves against it. With the exception of the Turks, who have a long tradition of hostility toward Russia and an active desire to defend themselves against Soviet aggression, most of the peoples of the Moslem crescent are more concerned with shaking off the remnants of European colonialism than with fending off a possible Communist encroachment. They are more resentful of western collusion with their rapacious feudal rulers than alarmed by the machinations of Moscow-directed fifth columns; more aware of their poverty than of their lack of political democracy; more conscious of American bomber bases and British military installations on their soil than of the Red army lurking behind the mountains of the Caucasus.

A second consideration is that arming nations which have outstanding disputes with their neighbors—especially boundary disputes such as exist between India and Pakistan, and, in more explosive form, between Israel and the Arab States—is more likely to lead to war than to peaceful settlements. Secretary Dulles showed his awareness of the danger, when he offered, on August 26, 1955, to help bring about a peace settlement between the Arab States and Israel. He did not, however, recognize that American pressure upon the Arab states to rearm and American aid to Arab rearmament have endangered the peace more than they have strengthened the Near East against Communist invasion.

Finally, there is still another point of view from which our policy toward the uncommitted nations should be reexamined; namely, that its weakness as a deterrent to aggression arises from the fact that it lacks precise definition and that it is, therefore, unconvincing. The threat of massive retaliation must be believed, if it is to deter an aggressor. In Indochina it was shown to have been empty bluff. The Communist dictators are by this time fully aware that the American people are not willing to support "massive retaliation upon the sources of aggression," unless that aggression threatens interests so vital as to make them willing to enter upon world war III. The Communist rulers know also that the United States will not risk engaging itself in a major conflict without strong allies and that its major allies will not expose themselves to atomic retaliation over Matsu or Quemoy, or even over South Vietnam.

The proposal here put forward for discussion might provide middle ground between two undesirable extremes; that is to say, between our present policy, which is dangerous because it lacks precision, and coexistence based upon acceptance of the present status quo as permanent, which would constitute an immoral abandonment of the presently enslaved peoples.

It must be admitted that the policy here suggested will not in itself halt Communist political penetration of the countries to which the hands-off warning would apply. But neither will rearmament halt political penetration. The only insurance against political subversion is that provided by social reform and economic development. These are impeded rather than promoted by rearmament.

Chapter 14. Responsibility of an election year

The anxiety aroused throughout the world by President Eisenhower's sudden, tragic illness and the worldwide solicitude for his speedy recovery show to how great an extent the world's hope of peace depends upon the future course of the United States.

The nature of the American Presidency is unfortunately such that by the time a new incumbent has mastered the job of being President—especially in a time of crisis—his term is often half over and his health likely to be impaired. Even if such is not the case, the 4th year of an American President's term of office tends to be overshadowed by domestic politics.

In the past, our Nation has had a bad habit of almost totally absenting itself from world affairs while it indulged in the domestic Donnybrook of a presidential election. The 1940 campaign between Roosevelt and Willkie was a notable exception in that it did not interrupt the steady development of a policy of aiding the nations resisting Axis aggression. Had this not been the case, the United States might have been compelled ultimately to fight for its own survival without allies and without adequate preparation for its own defense.

At this particular moment of history, uncertainty as to where the United States stands, or even the mere stagnation of American foreign policy, could easily throw into reverse the worldwide trend toward peaceful settlements which has only just set in.

Throughout the first year of the Eisenhower administration, especially while the ineffable Messrs. Cohn and Shine were gallivanting about Europe, many of our friends abroad were asking whether the President or the junior Senator from Wisconsin was actually the determining factor in American foreign policy. Apart from the influence of the Wisconsin demagogue, there were times when it appeared to the world as if some sort of a "war party" existed within the administration's inner councils of whose activities the Chief Executive seemed only dimly aware.

The comparatively rare and sometimes ambiguous utterances of the President during his first years in office were often variously interpreted by his official family, not infrequently in such a way as to give them a more belligerent meaning. The Secretary of State, in particular, seemed given to making such interpretations. At other times, the Secretary of State created ambiguity and confusion by his own pronouncements, as, for example, by his reinterpretations of his original statement of the doctrine of massive retaliation. Vice President NIXON, on one occasion at least (intervention in Indochina), expressed views at variance with those of the President. Senator KNOWLAND, supposedly the administration leader in the Senate, often raised his voice in direct opposition to the views expressed or implied by the Chief Executive.

The result of this early confusion was that official statements intended to deter the Communist dictators from aggression sometimes merely had the effect of frightening our friends and arousing the suspicion among our enemies that important elements in the administration were actually planning a preventive attack. At other times, a deliberate ambiguity—as in the case of defending Matsu and Quemoy—tended to provoke rather than to frighten off aggression. It became all too apparent that what was needed to make a policy of deterrence effective was not cleverness and bluff but clarity and convincing determination.

The tragedy of the President's being stricken with a heart attack was that these earlier defects were rapidly being remedied at the very time when he was incapacitated. During 1955, and especially at and after the July conference at Geneva, President Eisenhower had emerged more and more clearly as the dominant factor in American foreign policy, reacquiring the serene confidence in his own judgment which had distinguished his bearing as wartime military commander. At the same time, it became clearly apparent to the world that this former military leader was a deeply sincere man of peace—that so long as he remained President, the United States would pursue a policy of seeking by every possible means to achieve a just, honorable, and lasting settlement.

The danger that there will be a hiatus in American foreign policy until after the 1956 elections is all too apparent. On the other hand, an election year coming at just this time provides the ideal opportunity for that nationwide ventilation of the great issues without which we can scarcely hope to "put political, social, economic and spiritual flesh on the bare bones of our present military measures against communism."

If we, the people of the United States, want peace for ourselves and for our children and grandchildren, this is our chance—perhaps our last chance—to act effectively toward the realization of our hopes. There can be no doubt whatever that, if a sufficient number of citizens share the desire to revitalize our foreign policy, the job can be done and done within the next critical months. If the voters in some 30 congressional districts scattered across the country were able, in 1954, to elect representatives imbued with the spirit which produced the debate on March 16, 1955, the same thing can be accomplished by voters in other districts in the nationwide elections of 1956.

The question is not necessarily one of partisan politics. While it is true that the Democratic freshmen in the 84th Congress have been the ones to take the lead, there were a considerable number of Republican freshmen who, though silent during the debate, privately expressed an attitude sympathetic to that of the insurgents. If it is possible to have an inflexible and unimaginative bipartisan foreign policy which leans too heavily upon military means, it is also possible to have a well-rounded, flexible and imaginative policy firmly backed by both parties.

Whether or not a bipartisan foreign policy is a thing to be desired is another matter. This depends upon whether "bipartisanship" grows out of a real sense of national unity behind a clearly understood purpose which overrides all other considerations, or whether it is the product of fear, frustration and apathy on the part of the people and timid avoidance of controversial issues on the part of leadership.

The "bipartisanship" of recent years has all too often been the product of cynical expedience on the part of both Democratic and Republican leadership and of frightened conformism on the part of the electorate. As a result, vocal minority groups have exercised an altogether disproportionate influence.

Nothing could, for example, be clearer than that the overwhelming majority of the American people has all along rejected the idea of becoming embroiled in world war III for the sake of restoring Chiang Kai-shek to power over the Chinese people. Yet the handful of fanatical supporters of the Nationalist cause has at various times so intimidated both the Democratic and Republican leadership as to bring the Nation to the brink of war.

At no time, and least of all after General Eisenhower's election to the Presidency, could it be said that Senator McCarthy represented majority opinion. Yet this reckless headline hunter was able to frighten a compliant Secretary of State into hiring his henchmen, firing well-tried veterans of the foreign service and totally demoralizing the "Voice of America." As Wisconsin's freshman Congressman Reuss put it:

"For 3 or 4 wasted years, our foreign policy concerned itself largely with reacting to McCarthyism. Now the junior Senator from Wisconsin is, at least for the moment, sulking in the wings. But the vacuum in our foreign policy, which his commotion has created, remains."

The vacuum can be filled, if we, the American people, make up our minds to fill it. Congressman Reuss and his colleagues have raised the questions which need to be asked. In the opinion of this deeply concerned citizen, they have done more; they have pointed out the direction in which most of the answers are to be sought. If every candidate for office in 1956, from the Presidency down, can be induced to take a clear stand on these issues, we shall have a revitalized foreign policy worthy of our great country and firmly rooted in majority opinion.

Whether the candidates can be induced to define their positions with respect to these basic issues will depend in part upon their political courage. To an even greater extent, it will depend in most cases upon the attitude shown by their constituents; this, in turn, will be largely determined by the extent to which the electorate is informed and interested. To make readily available at least some of the required background material and to stimulate interest in the decisions which lie before us is the purpose of this study.

The question which confronts us in the coming year is not whether these decisions shall or shall not be made. They will be made by conscious choice or by default. If made by procrastination or evasion, the decisions of 1956 are sure to leave us wandering in the fog of uncertainty and anxious apprehension. If made by the conscious choice of the American people, they are almost equally certain to bring us nearer to the distant but attainable goal of an enduring peace.

Appendix

Excerpts From the Remarks in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, March 16, 1955

Mr. Reuss. Mr. Speaker, I speak this afternoon for myself alone. But what I have to say has been discussed with many of my colleagues, and I believe that the general thoughts expressed are theirs as well as mine.

This Congress and this Nation must once again attempt what mankind throughout its history has tried but failed to do. We must move swiftly now to set in motion forces which will insure peace. For we now confront humanity's annihilation by the A bomb, the H bomb, the U bomb, the C bomb, on hand or being perfected.

We had a warning of this several weeks ago in the Atomic Energy Commission's report on the effects of the H bomb. We had a sign of this just a few days ago in the Nevada tests of what the press hinted was a possible trigger mechanism for the H bomb. The explosion shook the earth, and the flash lighted up the sky of 13 Western States. How many more would be shaken and bathed in the deadly light of what the trigger mechanism itself was designed to set off.

Age of Nuclear Weapons

We know, of course, how to wage war. We have the means to wage it. We know, too, that America and the free world have suffered unconscionable abuses from the Communist powers, abuses which in a former day would have justified a stand to arms for redress. Yet we do not live in a former day when the musket over the fireplace was the answer to tyranny, or when the fleet alone seemed sufficient to keep the enemy at bay. We live in the year 1955, in the age of nuclear weapons.

We delude ourselves if we think that a war between America and the centers of Communist power could be limited to the conventional weapons which brought us victory in the past. Our tactics are shifting rapidly to nuclear weapons. We may assume that the same is true of the enemy. Even if leaders of both sides showed a moment of qualm before they used nuclear weapons, they might be compelled by the force of popular passions to use at once what they themselves have proclaimed all along to be the guarantor of a swift, easy, and decisive victory.

There is only one avenue away from the dead-end of worldwide destruction. It does not lie in any agreements to limit the use of atomic weapons if war should come, important as such a limitation may be. It lies in trying to clear up some of the gathering tensions which lead, often by accident, to war.

The tensions of the world today are not of our making. We did not invent colonialism. We came to birth as a Nation because we fought colonialism. We did not invent disease, ignorance, and poverty. We came to greatness as a Nation because we set ourselves the task of fighting all that lays a blight on human existence. And we have every reason to be inflamed when we hear that the best of what we try to do is often portrayed abroad as merely grasping and selfish. But the question for us is not what they ought to do, but what we ought to do; not whether it is just and wise for them to complain when they suffer no wrong from our hands, but whether it is wise in us to invite the distrust of other peoples because of what we, as a great power, have the responsibility and the capacity to do—but have failed to do.

Air Grievances

For example, 30 nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, representing more than one-half of mankind, will confer at Bandung, Indonesia, a month from today—and for what purpose? In part, at least, to air their grievances against the United States because we have failed to take the lead in their common fight for freedom from colonialism and feudalism, in their common hope for economic aid on an international basis, in their common desire for a position of noninvolvement in great power rivalry.

In Europe, Germany is still cut in two. One hundred million people groan under Soviet rule in the enslaved states of central and eastern Europe. The partial rearmament of Western Germany is underway, despite the bitter opposition of half the people of Germany and France.

Short of war—if then—it is not within our power to overturn the present rulers of Moscow and Peiping. Yet the main game is still to be played for around the globe. All too often we forget this to our disadvantage, while Moscow and Peiping keep their thoughts focused all along on what we forget. We forget that the stakes of the game are the hearts and minds of the people of Asia, the Pacific, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and Latin America, who as yet remain outside the net of Communist power; who want to live in peace, to be the authors of their own history; who will respond to any leadership which raises the banner of hope that what they want so desperately can be theirs to have.

Policy Has Zigzagged

We are not now raising that banner of hope. We seem bent on vetoing it, not by design but unwittingly. For our foreign policy in the recent past has zigzagged into the wayward paths of agonizing reappraisal, unleashing Chiang, massive retaliation, the New Look, liberation, and other tired slogans. Now at last we are back to the policy of containment developed by the last administration. To that policy of containment we are adding German rearmament; we have a military agreement with Spain; we have formed the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; and we have exchanged mutual guaranties with Chiang.

These military alliances should not be viewed as ends in themselves. In the nature of the case, the weaker partners in these alliances will always be suspicious of the stronger ones. Unless all are bound together by vital economic, political, or social interests, military alliances tend to come apart at the seams when they are subjected to the acid test of war.

Our view of a policy of containment ought to be that it is merely an expedient. It is to gain through strength a margin of time in which to do the real work before us of removing the causes for worldwide tensions. We have instead viewed that policy as the end itself, while the tensions continue to pile up unattended to, to hammer against and sometimes breach the military retaining wall we have built against them. When we side with the colonial against the anticolonial countries in the U. N. we lose the respect of half the world struggling to be free. Our refusal last May to join the special United Nations Fund for Economic Development on the ground that we could not afford the $80 million annual cost until there was disarmament sounds thin to the free world. In Europe no rhetorical flourishes can disguise that fact that, although we cry "unification" for Germany and "liberation" for Eastern Europe, we have offered no method to achieve either aim.

Beginning Must Be Made

If there is no desire to ease tensions of this sort, then a thousand plausible reasons can be found to explain why this failure of will is really the highest form of statesmanship.

Yet a beginning of some sort must be made; and the time to do it is now. For every day that passes increases the mining of uranium for military use, increases the stockpile of atomic weapons, and brings us 1 day closer to the abyss of nuclear disaster.

Somebody has to make a start. In June 1947 Gen. George Marshall, in his speech at the Harvard commencement, spoke 3 or 4 sentences that inspired the world with their universal promise of a better day. Can anyone doubt today that those 3 or 4 sentences, when translated into concrete yes-and-no decisions, at least temporarily saved Western Europe for the free world?

President Eisenhower can continue this same work. He may not have the power to impose the American national will for peace on Moscow and Peiping. But backed by the national will, he has the power to ease age-old causes for tensions which now keep the world in a constant state of alarm, and which Moscow and Peiping exploit to their own advantage.

SPEAK OUT BOLDLY

The time has come for President Eisenhower to speak out boldly and constructively before the Congress and before the United States in this vein—let him say to the world:

"We Americans want peace, and we want to do our part to secure the peace.

"To the people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East who are about to meet at Bandung, we say this. If you agree, we will ask the U. N. to take over Formosa as a trusteeship, to assume its defense against the aggression that threatens it, and to promote the development of self-government by the Formosan people. If you agree, we will reverse our refusal to join the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, and will work with you, both inside and outside the U. N., for social and economic advancement, and against colonialism and feudalism.

"To the people of Europe, we say this. West German rearmament is under way, because Russia leaves the West no alternative. But if you agree, and if Russia will carry out her part of the bargain by withdrawing to her historic borders, we will welcome a unified and independent Germany; a free Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, Bulgaria, and the Baltic States, each independent but part of a larger central European community based upon a respect for human rights; all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the U. N.

"To the people of all nations, we say this. We reaffirm our hope to end the destructive phase of nuclear development, and seek man's advancement through science. We rededicate ourselves to work in humble hope with the rest of the world toward the goal of permanent peace, for our own continued survival is hinged to the prospect of permanent peace."

Let our President speak in that vein.

OUR HISTORIC MISSION

Perhaps the details are not exactly these. Perhaps more should be said, and perhaps less. But what is said must be in the main current of our historic mission. It must reflect the American genius for ideas and action, the American tradition for independence and justice, the American hatred of war. What is said must ask for action by the Communists, not for paper promises. It must be based on what the Communists themselves could not reject without the risk of being rejected by their own peoples.

Whatever the outcome, this Nation could then face the future secure in conscience that we are striving to do that which is responsible and right.

What the President says will be rendered meaningless unless it is backed in depth, in the halls of Congress, on the streets and farms of this country, in the hearts and minds of every American. I am confident that if he does speak in his way, he will have that backing in depth. The people are hungry for dynamic leadership.

Mr. UDALL (Arizona). I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for this fine, bold presentation. I think he echoes the hopes and beliefs of a great majority of the people of this country. I would like, if I may, to make a few observations and to comment on what seems to me to be one of the large points made by the gentleman. I refer to an issue that is currently in the news, that of the proposal for a foreign-aid program for Asia.

As we all know, a trial balloon was sent up by the State Department people, by Mr. Stassen, 2 or 3 months ago, before Congress convened, and it was indicated that a substantial program of aid for Asia would be proposed. * * *

I do not pretend to know the temper of the Congress here, as a new Member, but I think I do know somewhat the disposition of some of the new Members of Congress on this side of the aisle. It is our belief that we are ready to go ahead with such programs and that the President and the Secretary of State have more support here than they realize if they want to go forward. I think they would have to come up here and fight for such programs, that they might risk defeat; but there is support for substantial programs of this kind if they want to come up here and ask for them. They have been too fainthearted in shaving them down, in emasculating these proposed programs and ideas.

I should like to make one other comment here, as I see some of our veteran Members are with us. Many of you may feel that it is presumptuous on the part of some of us newcomers to discuss a subject of this kind. Certainly, it is presumptuous. We must admit that. But traditionally if freshmen have any assets they can offer a body, whether they are in college or coming into a new body, it is usual that they have a little excess energy and occasionally a fresh point of view. That is what I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to offer us here today and what I would like to offer as a fresh point of view, and to say to the President and the Secretary of State: Be a little bolder, be a little less fainthearted; perhaps you have more support here than you know of.

Mrs. GREEN (Oregon). Mr. Speaker, may I first say that I am in agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin in his statement that in the age of nuclear weapons we have no alternative but to move swiftly to put into effect those activities which will insure peace. * * *

To those who would say that we cannot maintain the level of foreign aid because it is too expensive, I would suggest that they contemplate for awhile the figure of the richest man in the graveyard. * * *

But let's not forget one thing. We are sometimes apt to feel that the money we send abroad for either economic or military aid is going to defend someone else. I don't think we should ever lose sight of the fact that in building the strength of the free world, we are building our own. * * *

Let us strengthen the economic-aid programs and the point 4 program. Let us increase technical assistance; let's show the people of Asia and Africa that we are anxious to see them achieve the status they so badly want. Let us never lose sight of the fact that the biggest single factor in world politics today is the desire—the needs of millions upon millions of human beings who have just emerged from colonial status or who are still in that status. There are several things those people want. They want first—to be treated with common decency—to be treated as equals—if not brothers.

They want economic stability. * * *

If we cannot find it in our hearts to urge independence for an Asiatic group simply because we believe that men have a right to be free, then let us back it because we know that freemen will fight harder than men who have a grievance. If we cannot fight economic injustice and disease because we hate them as we hate communism, then let us fight them because healthy men and secure men make better friends of democracy than do desperate men. If we cannot be generous, then let us be prudent. Whatever our motives, it cannot help but be to our profit.

Mr. LANKFORD (Maryland). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin and I wish to commend him on a most forceful and hopeful statement. With his permission, I would like to associate myself with him in the ideas he has propounded. Particularly, I agree with my distinguished colleague in his statement that the policy of containment, achieved in a large measure by the formation of treaty organizations and military alliances should not be viewed as an end in itself. * * *

Containment, as evidenced by our preparedness to meet the threat of armed aggression with arms, is at best an expedient, a means to an end.

We must never lose sight of the fact merely containing in a given area of the world those ideologies which are inimicable to the free and democratic world is not the end we seek. The end we seek is world peace and security. * * *

Mr. ROOSEVELT (California). Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleague from Wisconsin in urging leadership by the American people and their Government in a positive plan for peace. * * *

Our Government has not been using all of the machinery available to it in its fight for peace. The time has come to recognize that we have bypassed, ignored and in many cases halfheartedly supported the facilities of the United Nations, a body specifically established to promote world peace. On rare occasions such as the address of the President of the United States in 1953 on the sharing, for peaceful use, of atomic energy, our Government has made a great world impact. But we seem to deliver one blow for peace, and then duck back into our shell. Indecision and contradictory statements bring disillusionment in their wake.

The United Nations is the place where we can work for the support—active, vocal, and insistent—of all of the nations who believe in freedom and justice. The United Nations is the place where the machinery exists to attack poverty, disease, the lack of individual opportunity, and the mangling of human rights. These are the root causes of war.

It is in the U. N. that we can meet those who have high hopes for their own economic and spiritual development * * *.

Mr. QUIGLEY (Pennsylvania). May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, apropos of the excellent remarks made here today, particularly those that detail so correctly the manner in which our State Department for the last 2 years has gone all the way round the barn only to come back to the once bitterly denounced policy of containment. I am reminded and would like to point out that the author of that particular policy, the Honorable George F. Kennan, is a distinguished constituent who resides in the 19th District of Pennsylvania * * *.

I believe Mr. Kennan would be the last to contend that in devising the containment policy for Soviet Russia he was thereby suggesting anything that was to be or to become a permanent way of life. The containment policy at its best was a brilliantly conceived but badly misunderstood passing phase of a dynamic foreign policy * * *.

The hope of this Congress, the hope of this Nation, and the hope of freemen everywhere is to look to the future and not to be afraid of a new idea but to earnestly seek

new ways and new means to solve the problems which we face. I believe in this way we can hope to gain the long-sought—the everlastingly sought—goal of peace in this world. Insofar as the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who spoke here today have made a small contribution toward that goal, I firmly believe they deserve the gratitude of the Members of this House and the people of this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH (Michigan). Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin for his thought-provoking and incisive report. There have been many times in our history when the administration and the Congress were not united. I would like to point out that one of the very encouraging things about the situation at present is the fact that the administration can depend upon the wholehearted support of both parties in the House of Representatives, whether of the majority party or the minority. We today, without question, are facing not only as a Nation but as a part of the free world itself, the greatest menace that civilization has ever known. Only by this wholehearted cooperation of both parties and of the administration can we be sure of our life as a Nation * * *.

Mr. SISK (California). Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his very courageous stand. I can appreciate the courage it took to come before this body with some ideas which, to my mind, pose a new and refreshing thought. Whether or not we may all agree entirely with everything the gentleman has said, certainly I commend him on the excellency of his speech and upon the fact that it may cause some soul searching on the part of the American people relative to what our position should be as leaders of the world.

Mr. DAVIDSON (New York). I shall be very brief. I congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who have spoken today for the sober, serious, and conscientious considerations expressed. Implicit in the statement of each is a plea for inherent morality in our foreign policy * * *.

Mr. ASHLEY (Ohio). Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in the remarks of my colleagues because they reflect many of the same hopes and doubts, misgivings and confusions with respect to the conduct of our foreign policy which I often hear in my own district.

With the present tenuous balance between an uneasy peace and a catastrophic war, I believe there is an increasing effort on the part of people everywhere to find, in our foreign policy, positive and constructive goals which offer some hope of a permanent peace * * *

Our foreign policy must have a broader goal than simply drifting from crisis to crisis in our effort to contain communism. If I judge the uneasiness of the men and women in my district with any degree of accuracy, it comes from an inability to sense a broader purpose in the conduct of our foreign affairs * * *

I submit that there has never been a time in our history when it was more essential for us as a Nation to apply our powers of imagination and determination in the establishment of a foreign policy which is truly constructive and positive and which has as its goal, not the prevention of seemingly isolated wars, but the winning of a peace as broad as the world itself.

Mr. MCDOWELL (Delaware). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my remarks to those of my colleagues who have already expressed their views on this most important subject. The need for a positive approach to this complex problem has become more and more obvious with each passing day. However, even though obvious, nevertheless, ignored. Concrete suggestions to bring this ideal about have been very ably presented to this body. I refer specifically to the need for a more efficient use of the United Nations and the wining of the uncommitted people of Asia. In the interest of peace for the world, the threat of complete annihilation must be admitted and not ignored.

No peril has ever before confronted mankind to compare with the fear of atomic war. This fear of war is today universal in the minds of humanity. No amount of bluster on the part of statesmen nor the pratings of dictators can force the peoples of any nation to voluntarily start a war today.

Are all the centuries of civilization to end because man finds himself so fear crazed that he can only find a way out of the cage by fighting, tearing, and rending himself and all others to eternity? The will to overcome such a fatal solution must predominate all other thinking now. It is not safe to wait for time to find the solution. The will to work for peace must be unleashed throughout the world. * * *

Mr. FLYNT (Georgia). Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate my distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin not only for his ability in the presentation of the remarks which he has made but on the courage which he has displayed in bringing to the floor of this House this all-important subject. It is a subject which I feel must be discussed. * * *

For too long, especially during the last 2 years or so, we have been in an abysmal fog as far as our foreign policy is concerned. The people of the United States are entitled to know in which direction we are headed. * * *

Mr. RHODES (Pennsylvania). Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his excellent statement which reflects deep conviction and a thorough understanding of our foreign-policy problems. It offers a positive approach in these crucial days as we hover perilously near the brink of atomic disaster and the horrors of worldwide nuclear war. I wish to associate myself with him in his observations and with the remarks of other colleagues who express similar views on this vital subject.

Mr. Speaker, the people in many areas of the world are looking for a way to free themselves from colonialism and its brood of poverty, misery, and disease. They seek a better life for themselves and their children and the opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom. We all know and understand how the seeds of Communist imperialism have been able to take root and grow in such fertile areas of the world, feeding on the hopelessness and despair of millions and millions of these unfortunate people.

We of the free world should take positive steps to prove our sincerity of purpose and dedication to the principles of decency and human freedom which have made our Nation great.

In the past decade we have taken our first hesitant steps on the road toward international cooperation and understanding relations with other nations. Our participation and support of the United Nations, the genius of the Marshall plan, and the bold new point 4 program are milestones on the road to world peace and justice of which we can be justly proud. But when we view the vast scope of the job which remains to be done, this pride becomes tempered with the realization of the pitiful inadequacy which these approaches have achieved and the opportunities which have been lost to make more significant progress.

Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of our foreign policy cannot be measured in the number of TV speeches by our Secretary of State or the air-mileage records he sets in his trips around the globe. Nor can it be described in slogans or broad policy declarations which seem to change every hour, on the hour. * * *

A broad and vital technical-assistance program has been envisioned in the establishment of the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED. The proposed SUNFED program was to be financed by a $250 million fund. Our share was to have been $80 million, an insignificant amount when we consider that our defense expenditures cost about $1 billion a week.

But the United States delegate to the United Nations refused to participate in SUNFED at the 1953 fall meeting of the U. N. Economic and Financial Committee, citing our heavy burden of defense. This was in line with President Eisenhower's speech of April 16, 1953, in which he outlined our policy with respect to international economic cooperation. He said:

"The Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction."

Thus our participation in SUNFED-type program was put on an either/or basis—we will spend money either for military defense or for increased economic aid, but not for both. Mr. Speaker, this either/or policy is a tragic mistake in judgment. * * *

It is imperative that we reverse our short-sighted opposition to the objectives of SUNFED before next month's meeting in Bandung, Indonesia, of some 30 have-not nations of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. It is not too late for us to supply the necessary positive leadership to demonstrate to the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world that we are sincerely and humanely interested in their welfare. * * *

The stakes are large and the cost of failure fearsome to contemplate. We must not, by default, pass up this opportunity to strike a severe blow at the rulers in the Kremlin and their plans for subversion and conquest of the most populous areas of the world. At the same time, in the same blow, we can prove to the world our determination to wage a continuous war against disease, poverty, suffering and misery among the peoples of these exploited countries. * * *

Mr. THOMPSON (New Jersey). Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin for his able presentation and especially for the effort to which he has gone in the preparation of his remarks. I think that his approach is sound and I find myself in agreement with much that he has said.

We, in the United States, are concerned with the threat of aggression from the Soviet Union, but large areas of the world are concerned with getting enough bread and butter from day to day. Nor are they enthusiastic over the idea of becoming expendables in a power fight between the Soviets and ourselves. From our point of view, defense against Soviet aggression is one barrel of this double-barreled threat. We are keeeping it well oiled and loaded with ammunition. The other barrel is the economic problem. We cannot allow rust to settle here either. SUNFED is a proposal for great and positive help in this area. It is of great importance in the fight against Soviet communism. It would also mean gains for the American economy in a more direct sense. As these primitive economies, based on simple agriculture and mining, change under impact of the technical assistance programs, we may look for ever greater markets for our own products.

Though this fact is not the most important reason for the adoption of this program, it is worth considering in connection with the cost of SUNFED. Our military program is already bold and dynamic. Now is the time to bring our diplomatic and economic leadership up to the same level.

The program I advocate here today is not one which would immediately solve all our problems or those of the world. To think so would be an idle and dangerous hope. But it would be a tremendous step in the right direction, not only in terms of the global struggle in which we are now engaged,

but in terms of the peaceful world we all hope and pray will one day be ours to live in. We still have a choice. Will it be sunfed or unfed, for the underdeveloped nations of the world? The decision is in our hands.

Mr. BOYLE (Illinois). * * * The people all over the United States want peace. They are tired; they are discouraged; they are not interested in anything but the brotherhood of man, and that universal feeling represents the hopes and longings of the whole world. With the ground right under us now trembling from all of those recent atomic assaults and tests in Nevada, it is about time that a new generation with a new look add its little bit to retelling the age-old story that men everywhere believe in fellowship, in brotherhood, in peace under God * * *

In the old days wartime objectives were generally limited and practical ones. It was common to measure the success of our military operations by the extent to which they brought you closer to your military objectives. But when your objectives are moral and ideological ones and run to changing the attitudes and the traditions of an entire people or the personality of a regime, then victory is probably something not to be achieved by military means or, indeed, in any short space of time at all, and perhaps that is a source of our confusion.

In any case I think there is no more dangerous delusion, none that has done us a greater disservice in the past or threatens to do us a greater disservice in the future, than the concept of total victory * * *

Mr. O'HARA (Illinois). Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and to the others who have spoken here today. I have been deeply moved.

The significance of this memorable and historic debate I know will be grasped by the American people. We are living nervously not on a keg of dynamite, as was expressed in earlier times, but upon a vast concentration of the product of atomic energy. For generation after generation the challenge has been to the youth of each succeeding generation to find the way to permanent peace. Each generation, one after the other, has failed to meet the challenge. To this generation again has been given the challenge. If again there is failure to meet the challenge, we have reached the end of our present civilization. Everything man has builded in the long stretch of years that has perfected our present civilization will go down in ruinous debris. Then mankind will have to begin again the long and tortuous climb of the centuries from the caves to a new civilization.

In such a period of crisis, involving the endurance not alone of one nation but of all civilization, there have come to this Congress some new faces * * *

They have come fresh from the people. They know, as do all of us older in service in this Chamber, that what the American people and indeed the peoples of all the world most want is security against war and security against poverty. When you remove from this old world of ours poverty you have brought to all mankind the certainty of continuing peace.

The significance of this memorable and historic debate of today is that the freshman Democratic Members of this body are not contenting themselves by remaining silent and inactive when the whole world is resting on a concentration of atomic energy power needing only the winking of an eye to set it ablast. They may not have the perfect blueprint. I do not think that anyone has a perfect blueprint. But that blueprint will be found in the commonsense of the American people when the thinking of men and women in the homes of the Nation are kindled and inspired by such debates as we have been listening to today * * *

Mr. VANIK (Ohio). I do not concur in all the things that have been said this afternoon by the gentlemen from Wisconsin, and Illinois and New Jersey, and the others who have preceded me. But I do appreciate their enthusiastic and energetic approach to a plan for a peaceful world to which these gentlemen have subscribed. I want to say that there are great areas for agreement available to all Members of the Congress. The debate that has taken place this afternoon has indeed been refreshing. It has been one of the most worthwhile afternoons that I have spent on the floor of this Congress.

As a Member of this Congress I feel that this afternoon's beginning—and I hope it is just a beginning—will afford every Member—every new Member particularly—of this Congress an opportunity to take a more active part in the determination of the foreign policy of this country. This afternoon has been well spent and I hope that it has given every Member of this Congress an opportunity to recheck his own thinking on the foreign policy of our Government.

APRIL 16, 1956.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your friendly and heartening letter. Admittedly, the situation has now become so serious that it is extremely difficult to say just what should and still can be done to prevent further deterioration. Last October, I published and, I believe, sent to you a pamphlet entitled "Turning Point Toward Peace," in which I set forth a rather full proposal for policy revision. Although much has happened since then, the major lines of the argument seem to me still valid. However, since we agree upon the basic premises and since I do not want to bother you to read a pretty long pamphlet, I shall try as best I can to answer your question in a series of brief paragraphs.

It seems to me obvious that the situation cannot be remedied without serious and probably protracted negotiations conducted at the highest level and not in the usual goldfish bowl. Before such negotiations can be undertaken, it would seem to me necessary to take the following preliminary steps here at home.

1. A frank explanation to the American people of the need for a drastic revision of the United States policy, clearly foreshadowing a reversal of present policy with respect to the recognition of the Chinese People's Republic, the rearmament of Germany, Japan, and the Arab States, and a major revision of the relative emphases placed upon military and political-economic action.

2. The careful development of a new approach to world economic development, channeled primarily through the United Nations and divorced from the strategic or military considerations. Such an approach to be based upon the realization that economic development cannot wait upon savings derived from disarmament; and that it is idle to expect private capital to undertake the job until public policy and public funds shall have created the political-economic conditions which may reasonably be expected to attract private investment.

3. The development of an honest approach to disarmament which recognizes that armaments cannot be effectively limited or controlled; that their total abolition is the only alternative to a continuing balance of terror; and that total universal national disarmament can be effectively enforced only by an armed, supranational enforcement agency standing above the disarmed nations.

Assuming that any political leader, Republican or Democrat, would muster the courage to undertake the first step of telling the people the whole truth and the wisdom to initiate the second and third steps of developing a creative policy with respect to world economic development and disarmament, one might then visualize further procedure somewhat along the following lines:

(a) Official recognition of the Chinese People's Republic without prejudice to the future status of Formosa, accompanied by an expressed willingness to negotiate settlements of outstanding disputes.

(b) Quietly conducted diplomatic negotiations with Britain, France and Canada, aimed at reaching a common policy in all parts of the world, especially with respect to winning the friendship of the peoples emerging or seeking to emerge into national independence.

(c) A joint Anglo-American approach to Prime Minister Nehru, asking him to act as host and moderator at a top-level, five-power conference, the conferees being: India, the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic.

The proposed agenda for this conference might be:

I. The admission of the Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations on condition that a peaceful settlement can be reached as to Formosa and the offshore islands, and on the further condition that any violations of the Korean armistice agreement be rectified.

II. The admission to the United Nations of Japan and Outer Mongolia.

III. An all-German peace settlement providing for the unification of Germany under free elections and the establishment of conditions which will ensure that Germany shall not again become a prime mover, partner or pawn in aggression toward either East or West.

IV. An agreement to embargo arms shipments to the Arab States and Israel and to cooperate in safeguarding the peace throughout the area.

V. Consideration of a new approach to total, universal national disarmament, enforced by a supranational enforcement agency endowed with the exclusive right to maintain armed force, the sole exception being lightly armed police forces required by the individual nations for the maintenance of internal order.

VI. An agreement to cooperate through the United Nations rather than to compete as two hostile orbits, in rendering assistance where required to promote world economic development.

VII. The creation of a continuations committee or other suitable machinery to insure uninterrupted progress and to call further high-level conferences as required.

There, my friend, is a rough outline of what I think needs to be done to arrest the disintegration of the so-called free world and the decline of American prestige and leadership.

How it is to be done, especially in an election year, is another matter upon which your judgment is infinitely better than mine. I can only suggest that the first, necessary step is to break through the sound barrier of bipartisan silence. It was to that end that I urged the Foreign Relations Committee to call for a thoroughgoing reexamination of our foreign policy.

If the foregoing is too sketchy, I should be only too glad to try to fill in any gaps either by letter or by coming down to see you at your convenience.

With warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

JAMES WARBURG.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

OUR CHINA POLICY

President Eisenhower is reported to have told the Canadian Foreign Minister at the recent White Sulphur Springs conference that American public opinion would not tolerate the recognition of Communist China, "whose hands were dripping with the blood of Americans killed in Korea."

This appraisal of American sentiment is probably correct so long as the President himself and other leaders continue to speak about this subject in highly emotional terms and so long as no leader of either party undertakes to give the American people the facts upon which to base a cool-headed, rational judgment as to what constitutes their own best interest.

The simple facts are:

1. That the Peking regime is, whether we like it or not, firmly established as the government of a nation containing almost one-quarter of the world's population.

2. That there can be no peace settlements as to Korea, Indochina or Formosa except through war or negotiation with Peking.

3. That we cannot negotiate with a government the existence of which we decline to recognize.

The American people want neither war nor to live forever "at the brink of war." They want peace—real peace, not a precarious balance of terror—if real peace can be achieved with honor. This being the case, the American people would wish their Government to enter upon the only course that can lead to real peace, provided that they were given a chance to understand the facts, instead of being inflamed to intransigence by constant appeals to inevitable postwar emotions.

After all, is not every peace made with an enemy whose hands were recently "dripping with blood?" The President does not speak in these inflammatory terms of the Germans or the Japanese.

Keeping alive the hatred and resentment quite naturally engendered by war confuses the issue and beclouds the true meaning of both "recognition" and "negotiation."

Recognition of Peking would not constitute approval any more than our maintenance of diplomatic relations with Moscow implies that we like or respect the Soviet Government. Nor would recognition of Peking necessarily mean the derecognition of the Nationalist Government of Formosa. Most certainly, it would not mean abandoning Chiang Kai-shek to the tender mercy of the Communists.

Similarly, negotiation with Peking would not imply appeasement, much less surrender. Negotiation would constitute nothing more than an honorable and sensible attempt to settle such questions as Korea, Indochina, and Formosa by peaceful means or, failing that, to find a way of living at peace with some of our differences unresolved.

A continued, ostrich-like refusal to face the unpleasant but immutable facts in the Far East will not only keep the United States indefinitely at the brink of war with China but will very soon lead to the fulfillment of the Kremlin's most cherished hope; namely, the complete isolation of the United States. Our China policy is rapidly alienating both the uncommitted peoples and most of our allies, the exceptions being Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee, both of whom openly hope to involve the United States in war.

President Eisenhower is well aware of these facts. He is, moreover, a deeply sincere man of peace. Has he, then, so little confidence in the commonsense of the American people that he dares not put them to the test? Or is it simply that in an election year, both Republicans and Democrats lack the political courage to open up the question of our China policy to rational discussion?

If the latter is the case, the leadership of both of our major political parties is taking a reckless gamble with the future of our Nation and of the human race. History will not stand still while the United States takes a 6-month leave of absence from world affairs in order to elect a President.

JAMES P. WARBURG.

GREENWICH, CONN.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the leadership which Mr. Warburg is giving on the citizenship level to a thorough appraisal of American foreign policy shows very clearly that irrespective of what the politicians do by way of debating or not debating all phases of American foreign policy, there is rising among our citizenry a tidal wave of discussion and debate on the pros and cons of American foreign policy. One of the outstanding leaders in this public discussion is James Warburg, of New York. He is recognized as a keen scholar of foreign affairs, a highly respected economic conservative, and a very intelligent and patriotic critic of some of the trends in American foreign policy.

Even though one may not agree with all of Mr. Warburg's criticisms and suggestions of American foreign policy, and I certainly do not agree with him in some respects, there is no doubt about the fact that the Congress of the United States and the Republican administration should weigh very carefully the views of that segment of American public opinion for which Mr. Warburg unquestionably speaks and writes.

Although I do not agree with Mr. Warburg's recommendation that the United States should recognize Communist China at this time, I do appreciate the fact that, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, our foreign policy in respect to Communist China cannot continue to drift in a rudderless fashion in Asia and avoid going on the rocks.

I do not agree that recognition of Red China should be considered a condition precedent to negotiating a peace in Asia. It should be recognized by all that the fact that there is no hot war at the present time in Asia does not mean that there is any peace in Asia. Although little attention is being paid to it by the American people at the moment, the fact is that the military buildup in Red China is a growing threat to the security of the United States and her interests in the Pacific. We are in a cold war with Red China as well as with Red Russia and our position in Asia is not improving.

Although I do not agree with Mr. Warburg that we should recognize Red China and consent to her admission into the United Nations at the present time, I recognize that there is great merit in the point of view that the free nations of the world must face up to the reality that Red China exists and must be reckoned with in the contest between freedom and totalitarianism in Asia. I have urged for a long time that as a part of our Asiatic foreign policy we should support the exercise of greater jurisdiction by the United Nations in the settlement of Asiatic issues, which sooner or later will threaten the peace of the world if they are not settled in the meantime through negotiation and juridical determination.

One of the principal reasons for my being unalterably opposed to the recognition of Red China at the present time is that she has conducted herself as an enemy of the United States. In fact, she has waged war against the United States, as is proved by the thousands of American casualties in the Korean war. That war has never been terminated by a satisfactory peace treaty. It has been terminated only by a truce, and the Communist Chinese have violated the terms and conditions of that truce time and time again. It seems to be overlooked by too many persons that the Korean truce is fundamentally a United Nations truce and the carrying out of the truce is a United Nations responsibility.

It seems to me that those who advocate the recognition of Red China at this time do not give sufficient weight to the desirability of requiring an outlaw nation, which Red China has proven herself to be, to become a law-abiding nation before she can expect to be received into the family of peaceful nations. Red China's admission to the United Nations cannot be considered before she demonstrates by actions and proven conduct that she can be counted upon to keep her international commitments within the framework of the United Nations. That is, in my opinion, an essential minimum condition precedent to her being recognized diplomatically by the United States and to her admission to the United Nations.

I appreciate the fact that there are those in our country, such as Mr. Warburg, who do not share my point of view on this particular issue. However, it seems to me that we should attempt through the United Nations to negotiate any desirable settlement of war-threatening issues in Asia by making use of the negotiating procedures of the United Nations.

If we do not do so, then I think we may wake up some day, as Mr. Warburg forewarns, to discover too late that peace in Asia has been lost, and that freedom for millions of people in Asia will be regained only at the ghastly cost of war.

I am glad that we have James Warburgs in America, and I hope their numbers will increase by the thousands, who recognize that the all-important issue that faces the American people in the year 1956 is framed in the question: In what directions is American foreign policy traveling?

I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be authorized to file reports during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS AND TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign bills and resolutions passed

by the two Houses and found to be duly enrolled, and to receive messages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order entered yesterday, April 25, 1956, until Monday, April 30, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 26, 1956:

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard:

The nominations of William L. Maloney and 749 other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard, which were received by the Senate on April 16, 1956, were confirmed today, and full list thereof may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 16, 1956, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William L. Maloney, which is shown on page 6347, and ending with the name of Joseph Henry Wubbold III, which occurs on page 6349.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. J. Sanford Lonsinger, Third Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of our citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government. Dispose us all to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God.

May this Nation be great not only in things material, but in things spiritual. Not flouting her strength as a giant, but bending in helpfulness over a sick and wounded world like a good Samaritan. Not in pride, arrogance, and disdain of other races and peoples, but in sympathy, love, and understanding. Not in treading again the old bloody path of war, but blazing the way to a just and lasting peace.

Bless with wisdom and courage the President and those associated with him in authority. Direct and prosper the consultations of the Congress here assembled, to the advancement of Thy glory and to the safety, honor, and welfare of the people. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10754. An act to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6227. An act to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 31. An act for the relief of Shih Ming Wang;

S. 83. An act for the relief of Ottilie Hitzlberger Lachelt;

S. 1212. An act for the relief of Dr. Lincoln Roy Manson-Hing;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Brigitta Poberetski;

S. 1905. An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co. and the J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; and

S. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3996) entitled "An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. WELKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5862) entitled "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district courts to adjudicate certain claims of Federal employees for the recovery of fees, salaries, or compensation," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NEELY, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SALUTE TO OKLAHOMA JOURNALISM

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a signal honor came to Oklahoma last week with the election of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, as 26th president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

The Tulsa editor succeeds Kenneth MacDonald, editor of the Des Moines Register and Tribune, and thereby becomes the second Oklahoma newspaperman to hold the post of national leadership among America's editors.

Oklahoma's Jenkin Lloyd Jones thus joins a distinguished company of ASNE presidents, among whom the public will readily recognize such journalistic giants as William Allen White, of the Emporia Gazette; Erwin Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor; and James S. Pope, of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

It is a ringing tribute to the quality and the leadership of Oklahoma journalism in general to be added to the small group of five other States which have been awarded the ASNE presidency more than once. Only New York and Ohio have won this distinguished place more than twice. Only Illinois, Missouri, and Kentucky share the double honor with Oklahoma.

As a former newspaperman in Oklahoma, I have long been proud of the initiative, the vigilance, the abiding interest in public matters, and the crusading spirit of many great Oklahoma newspapers. The press services have shared fully in these qualities and have joined our newspapers in sending to Washington and other world capitals some of America's greatest correspondents.

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, of Tulsa, the son of a pioneering newspaper editor who founded the Tulsa Tribune, is a man who exemplifies these refreshing qualities of Oklahoma journalism.

Among the enterprising editors of our State's most vigorous newspapers, he has become widely known for his initiative in editorial policy, his vigilance in news gathering, his continuing interest in public questions, and his courageous leadership of causes in which he becomes concerned.

While I have sometimes disagreed with his position on political questions, I have never doubted his sincerity—nor failed to admire his courage in taking an open and unequivocal stand on controversial questions.

The Tribune editor has also demonstrated on more than one occasion his keen curiosity and determination to get the facts at firsthand when necessary. His recent trip around the world, on which he based his compilation of articles, A Proud Thing, is a fine case in point. This series is worthwhile reading for all Americans who are interested in world problems. It is also a splendid demonstration of Jenkin Jones' writing ability.

Along with other Oklahomans, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the recognition which America's editors have again extended to our State and to our newspaper editors. We appreciated the honor when it was extended to Walter M. Harrison, of the Daily Oklahoman, in 1928. We appreciate it in 1956 as it is conferred on Jenkin Lloyd Jones, of the Tulsa Tribune.

Jenkin Jones will follow in the footsteps of some big men on the Nation's

journalistic scene. We have no doubt he will add distinction to a distinguished position.

MINORITY VIEWS ON THE BILL H. R. 8901

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I received unanimous consent to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 8901, the Capital Transit bill. That time expires tonight. I ask unanimous consent that that time may be extended until tomorrow night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY AND HIGHWAY REVENUE ACTS OF 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 485) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 5 hours, 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to title II of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 10660, the so-called Federal Highway Revenue Act of 1956. The resolution provides for an open rule, with 3 hours of general debate on titles I and III of the bill, to be controlled by the Committee on Public Works, and a closed rule with 2 hours of general debate on title II containing the revenue provisions, to be controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the closed portion of the rule, I merely want to make this observation: I realize that it is the tradition and custom of this House to consider all revenue matters under a closed rule. I have gone along and I am going along with that precedent and that tradition. I am not in love with either. I would much prefer if we could consider this bill in all of its phases under an open rule, where the House would be able to work its will. I know the answer that is made to that position, that it would involve a lot of debate and a lot of amendments, and some even go so far as to say it would bring about chaos. I am just not willing to concede that this House, composed of responsible representatives of the people, cannot consider legislation under an open rule. Over in the other body it is always done. As I say, I am making no point of that; I am merely making the observation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a momentous one; it authorizes the expenditure of gargantuan sums of money. A good feature of this bill is that it provides for a pay-as-you-go program. While there will be additional and substantial taxes, yet in the end if the matter works out as the proponents hope and provide for it to work out we will not add to the already staggering national debt.

I personally would prefer to see these so-called expressways, thruways, on a toll basis. I raised this question last year and I raise it again this year; but again there is overwhelming opposition to such a program. With such a program most of your money is going into these express highways; under my proposal the people who use the highways would pay for them. But again this bill has been brought out here after many months of consideration, and I suspect if we are going to have a highway program we are going to have to go along with it.

There are other features of the bill I might discuss, Mr. Speaker, but they will be considered at the appropriate time.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Under this rule is it possible to pass a highway bill and omit that section that includes the tax feature?

Mr. COLMER. Let me answer my friend this way: I certainly hope that if the rule is broad enough to cover what the gentleman has in mind it will not be done.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is my attitude, and that is the reason I asked the gentleman if it would be possible to do that under this rule.

Mr. COLMER. Let me say to my friend from Tennessee that that question was raised and discussed in the Committee on Rules. There was a division of opinion. I prefer not to give a categorical answer to the gentleman for that reason. But I do not think the rule would permit the section to be stricken.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. But I should certainly hope that no such action would even be attempted, because we cannot afford to burden future generations with these additional billions of dollars. It would add to the national debt and to the inflation and to the eventual collapse of the economy of this country, if that reckless spending and irresponsible financial theory is followed.

Title I of the bill contains the authorization for the Federal-aid highway program for primary, secondary, and urban road systems. In addition to the 700 million authorized in the 1954 act for 1957, $25 million more is authorized, and additional increases of $25 million each year in the total amounts to be authorized for the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 are provided.

Thirty million dollars is authorized for an emergency fund for highway repairs in disaster areas. The authorization for the Interstate System of Highways totals $24,825,000,000 over a 13-year period—1957 through 1969. The matching ratio is 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent State funds.

The bill contains a new provision pertaining to maximum axle weight limitations as an investment against damage caused by heavy loads on the highways.

Another provision of the bill declares that it is the intent of Congress to provide for the reimbursement by the Federal Government to States that have completed sections of the Interstate System and directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the method and amount of such reimbursements.

A further provision provides that the Secretary of Labor shall determine the prevailing wages to be paid on all contracts involving the Interstate System under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Federal Government is also authorized to reimburse the States for the cost of relocation of utility facilities according to the Federal pro rata share applicable to the project.

Title II incorporates the recommendations of the Ways and Means Committee as contained in the Boggs bill, H. R. 9075. It provides for a 1-cent tax increase on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuel, raising the taxes to 3 cents; an increase of 3 cents a pound in the tax on tires, as well as a tax of 3 cents a pound on camelback for retreading tires; a 2 percentage point increase in the 8 percent manufacturers' tax on trucks, buses, trucks and trailers, and so forth, and a new annual tax of $1.50 per 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight for trucks and buses weighing over 26,000 pounds, if registered for use on the highways. A highway trust fund is established and provision made for the appropriation to the trust fund of amounts equal to the collections from certain taxes for a 16-year period from June 30, 1956 to July 1, 1972. The receipts set aside for highway purposes during this period will amount to approximately $38½ billion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am not in agreement with the committee on the utility and labor provisions of the bill. But I understand that committee amendments will be offered to improve these provisions. It is to be hoped that such action will be had.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Mississippi has fully explained the rule. I know of no one who is opposed to the rule but I just want to make an observation and compliment the committee having jurisdiction of this bill on section 113 with

regard to the relocation of utility facilities. It provides that Federal funds may be used to assist the States on such costs at the ratio the Federal funds are expended on existing projects, which is 90 percent. I know of few who oppose that part of the bill. All of us have small telephone lines in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have received considerable mail from the stockholders of those small independent lines. I have also received letters which stated that in the event this section is stricken they will find themselves in a bad financial situation. So I am hoping that the House will retain especially that part which will take care of these independent lines where they have put their poles along single highways which are proposed to be widened and the poles moved. Some of this work has just recently been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, of course I am not opposed to the rule. I am for adoption of the rule and certainly expect to vote for this highway bill.

There is one little matter in the bill, though, that I think should be given very serious consideration by the House and I bring this to your attention because during the past few years I have had considerable experience with the subject matter which I will discuss. I notice on page 24 of the highway bill, section 112 entitled "Prevailing Rate of Wage" is as follows:

> The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the Interstate System authorized under section 108 of this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined—

Here is the part the House should be more than cautious about—

> by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1955, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a).

Mr. Speaker, the first part of the paragraph is perfectly proper and all right. Since the Department of Commerce is the principal Government Department involved in this matter, it should be charged with the responsibility of the payment of prevailing wages in the community where the construction is being done.

There is another partner, however, in this highway work and that is the various States of the Union, the 48 States of the Union. A portion of the money authorized—50 percent of it—is furnished by the States, 50 percent by the Federal Government. The major portion of the money, however, is on a 90 percent United States and 10 percent State matching basis. This further invasion of the control of States should be viewed with caution. When you control the State's money you are coming pretty close to control of the States themselves. In my opinion, it is asking right much of the governor of any State to so abdicate his position and authority that he will say: "Here is the money, I will not have anything to do with its expenditure."

To me the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in here is highly improper and will lead to not only waste but confusion, because I say to you without any reluctance whatever, and the record will disclose this, that the Davis-Bacon Act has probably been the worst administered piece of law on the statute books. There is no reason for the trouble and confusion—for in the first place it is a very simple operation to get an honest prevailing wage figure, and in the second place no one could get labor without paying the prevailing wage of the community.

You are bringing in a third Department, the Labor Department. They will determine what the wages shall be in the expenditure of the funds.

Now, there is no protection for the contractors, and you may rest assured that when they place a bid on a road all of the contractors have learned and learned through bitter experience that they better leave a margin in there, because the Department can change those wages and make orders that will make the project cost millions of dollars more. Now, I would like to suggest to this House, in all seriousness, that an amendment be included so that the Department of Commerce, which is a Federal Department, in conjunction with the State highway department, fix and establish the prevailing wage in a community. The prevailing wage in a community is not difficult to establish. It is about the simplest thing if done properly, but it can be a very difficult thing if it is done improperly.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The crux of this whole prevailing wage thing is this: Some thirty-odd States have prevailing wage laws adopted by their legislatures. They are carrying out those laws. But, if this amendment is not adopted, then the Secretary of Labor, sitting in Washington, will tell each State what the prevailing wage should be in that State, and that, it seems to me, is another violation of States' rights.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman said that the matching is on a 50–50 basis, 50 State and 50 Federal. Where the Davis-Bacon Act applies it is on a 90–10 basis, 90 State and 10 Federal. It does not apply to the other categories.

Mr. BARDEN. I will say to the gentleman that I just read the language, and it was my impression that this section 112 applied to the construction of highways.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Just on the interstate system, which is 90–10.

Mr. BARDEN. Can I reply upon that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. It is only on the interstate system; only on initial construction.

Mr. BARDEN. Then, it is only 10 percent bad. Frankly, I do not think it is a good policy to continue to expand the coverage of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Now, I just want to talk a little practical sense here about your Davis-Bacon situation, If this Congress is going to establish a policy of carrying the fixing of wages by the Secretary of Labor to every single Federal program, whether it it be for housing, veterans housing, farm loans or anything else, then let us enter the field through the front door and let the Davis-Bacon Act be reworked and write the law if the Congress so desires.

Frankly, in my opinion, that is the wrong approach to it. It is definitely wrong. In my opinion, it is not the intent of Congress to carry that provision all the way through. If it is going to apply to matters involving as much as $26 billion and the money from the States, then it should be reworked and some teeth put in it so that somebody will have some kind of control over and protection from the folks who are fixing these wages. I know this from practical experience and from my association with folks. The average laboring man does not want the Government to fix his wages. Government fixing of wages is distasteful to every labor man and labor leader that I know of. I think the only reason they are interested in this particular situation is for the moment. I think they feel that they control the man who fixes the wage. That is very poor policy, in my opinion, and not the type that we want to make a permanent part of this Government. So I should like to see this operated by the Department of Commerce which is the interested Department, in conjunction with and in cooperation with the States.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. I think the gentleman made the statement that those whom he has met and talked to are opposed to Government fixing of wages.

Mr. BARDEN. Surely.

Mr. WIER. That is probably true, but all that is done here under the Bacon-Davis Act is to fix a floor, the same kind of floor that we have under the wage and hour law.

Mr. BARDEN. Let me say to the gentleman that he has never heard of a wage being fixed by the Bacon-Davis Act as was not the ceiling.

Mr. WIER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Then the gentleman has heard something that I have not heard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss for a few moments another controversial section of this bill.

I refer to the section of the measure which deals with the reimbursement of utilities for relocation costs incurred in connection with construction of highways. I know that this section is quite controversial. There are divergent views upon it.

However, I am especially concerned with the fate of some of the smaller utilities and some of the smaller communities under the highway-construction bill if some provision is not contained in the measure to reimburse them for expenses incurred in relocation activities as may be required by the highway-construction authorities, whether they be State or Federal.

I appreciate the fact that in the bill which was before the Congress last year, it was mandatory that the various States compensate or reimburse public utilities for expenditures required in connection with relocation. However, this particular bill has an entirely different provision. It provides that the States may, according to their custom and their past practice, reimburse where, in their own discretion, they believe such reimbursement is fair and necessary.

The argument is made against this section, or was made before the Committee on Rules, that this would be a great benefit to a large utility. Let me answer that simply by saying that I do not believe, whether large or small, we should be unfair to any property owner in the country in connection with highway construction.

However, I want to point out that unless the State legislatures, the governors, the highway directors, or the highway commissions of the various States coming under this provision are corrupt, they will of course provide that compensation will be allotted only on a fair and substantial basis according to actual expenditures required, and will not approve of any kind of reimbursement where it would result in gain for the utility affected, but only for the replacement of the actual cost incurred.

In Ohio for instance we have some 75 percent of our State, geographically speaking, served by small independent telephone companies. There is hardly a one of them but what, if they were compelled to meet the expense of relocating lines because of the widening or construction of a highway, would not be forced into bankruptcy. They are in such financial situations that they simply cannot afford to meet such expenses. They cannot do it. There is no way they can recover the money that they would be called upon to spend.

Then there are all kinds of small communities—and I want you to think about it, for the matter applies not only to Ohio but to your own State as well—where highways go through small communities. They may be interstate highways, connecting one coast with the other. They may be State highways. But those highways and streets will be widened and those local communities, unless we have a section of law like this, something of the type that is included in this bill, would be required to meet the cost of moving their water mains, their sewage systems, their gas mains, and the lighting equipment for their streets, and most of those communities are already bonded to the limit. They have spent their money putting these local utilities into the streets. Now along comes the Federal Government with legislation that says, "We are going to come in and widen your streets and we are going to force you to tear up your utilities and move them without compensation."

I think this Committee on Public Works has been very fair in this matter. They have provided in the bill that where the States find that the local communities or the local telephone companies, whatever you want to call them, a little utility or a big utility, for that matter, is required by the order of the State itself in the construction of a highway to move a utility, it should be compensated for the cost thereof. I think it is just fairness and justice that this provision be included in the bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is a very fair provision in the bill and it should not be stricken. I should like to associate myself with the gentleman on that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much. Unless we have no faith at all in our State and local officials, I feel that this section of the bill should remain about as it is. If there is any amendment needed, I will accept it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the bill require the States to reimburse the local communities?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The bill does not require the States to reimburse anybody. It permits the States to reimburse if that has been the practice within the States in the past and the States so provide. It places the responsibility for saying that the reimbursement is on a fair and equitable basis directly on the State officials who are in charge of the construction of the highways.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the bill as written, who pays the cost of the relocation of municipal lines, light and power?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would depend entirely on whether the State law provides for reimbursement in such construction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Even if they shove an interstate highway through the municipality?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right, because the interstate highway comes under the construction authority of the State itself.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I was interested in what the gentleman said with reference to these small utility companies. It is the truth that they just cannot operate under those circumstances.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would bankrupt half of them.

Mr. JENKINS. If we do not adequately take care of these public utilities at this time, we will work an injustice that will be difficult to remedy. Let us do what is right to all those interested groups.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is fair to say that the bill substantially does what we are doing now throughout the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It continues the practice we have in the various States now, or at least in many of them—I think in 24 States.

Mr. DONDERO. Might I ask the gentleman a further question? Who paid for the construction of these utilities in the first place?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, the local taxpayers or the local investors in these little telephone companies paid for them, if they are private utilities, or the citizens and the taxpayers of the community if they happen to be owned by a village or a city.

Mr. DONDERO. In my State of Michigan as in the State of Ohio, we have many independent telephone companies. I understand there are some 130 of them in my State that could not stand the expense of removing their utilities, if they were required to do so without reimbursement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The same situation by the way applies to the Rural Electrification Administration lines where the bonds have been issued and the lines have been constructed. There are no funds available to meet the cost of relocating these lines and, perhaps, many of these cooperatives will be placed in a very difficult position if we do not keep this particular section in the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. From what the gentleman has just said is there a possibility then of a utility running through two States, where in one State they may be reimbursed and in the other one not be reimbursed?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think that could happen. That happens now under the present law. Of course, it should not happen and I hope every State by some act or proper legislation under the provisions of this bill will see that fair reimbursement is made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I have not had a single communication from the Rural Electrification people in the State of Iowa where they ask for any such treatment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. They are probably in such financial situation that they cannot even afford the postage. I have heard from many and I think most other Members of Congress have heard from them.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is this section in the bill merely writes into law what the existing practices have been between the Bureau of Public Roads and the States for many years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. It leaves the question of reimbursement entirely up to the State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I just wonder what the position of the railroad is under this bill as to reimbursement?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I cannot answer that question for a certainty.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman yield so that I may answer that question?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman who is a member of the Committee on Public Works to answer the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Today, the railroads are reimbursed under the law whenever there is cost arising as a result of grade separation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is under the present law.

Mr. LONG. The point I wanted to make is that if we are going to reimburse the railroads, we ought to reimburse the telephone companies.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe that is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. If this provision remains in the bill, how much less than $51½ billion will remain available for highway construction and improvements?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Based on past experience, the cost would be less than 1 percent, as I understand it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HENDERSON. What would be the effect of this provision upon the municipally owned utilities of the villages such as sewage and water utilities.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under the provisions of this law, if the State law so provides or the State highway regulations so provide, they would be reimbursed for the cost of removing the water mains.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I presume we are going to have the same fight this week on the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act in this bill as we had a year ago when we passed a similar bill in the House. As you remember, a year ago the membership of the committee at that time by a 2 to 1 vote voted to retain in the bill, as we passed it in the House, the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act. I hope when we reach that part of the bill, when the amendment is offered to strike it from the bill, we will have the same record majority as we did a year ago in the retention of this provision providing for the payment of prevailing wages on the work on the interstate highway system. As was stated a while ago, this only applies to that part where the Federal Government is contributing 90 percent of the cost of the highway. If the Federal Government is contributing 90 percent of the cost of the highway in that State, it seems to me we ought to at least guarantee to the workers on that construction job a living wage. That is all it is. The payment of the prevailing wages in local communities is by no means the highest payments made. They are in most areas minimum wages paid for work in that particular area. A minimum wage is just about a livable wage. Contractors who find fault with this provision are contractors who do not want to pay a living wage in this country at the present time. So the contractors who are finding fault with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act are the contractors which history will show have been wanting to pay less than minimum wages in this country. If they did a job for 75 cents an hour they would be trying their best to get as many men as they could to work for 40 cents an hour, or if they could get them to work for 10 cents an hour they would do that. That is the kind of contractors, not only in highway construction but in the construction of Federal buildings and the repair and maintenance of Federal buildings that we have at this time, and that are causing all the trouble in the industry. I have had some experience with painting contractors in my own State. When they come from other States they say they are paying the prevailing wages. It is almost impossible to determine whether they are or not, but after they leave and some painter has a fall from a scaffold and has his back broken, we find after the contract is finished that this contractor had no workmen's compensation and this man is on relief for the rest of his life with a broken back. It is about time, I think, we had more supervision than we have at the present time. One of the faults I find with the law is that it has not been enforced. In my opinion, the Department of Labor ought to have more help, and if this law were enforced, I think everyone who is working for a living would be much better off. At least we would be guaranteeing some of these men a living wage and not a starvation wage.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. I compliment him for the fight he waged in the last session of the Congress in retaining in the bill, then under consideration, the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. I commend him for carrying that effort on the floor today to accomplish what was done in the last session.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works by a majority vote has seen fit to write the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act into the proposal now before us. This decision came after lengthy hearings and much testimony. It appears to me that the committee was on solid ground when it stated that it saw no reason why the act should not apply to the highway construction program when it now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for school, hospital, housing, and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds. The highway program is to be financed by 90 percent Federal funds and I believe that, under this circumstance, the Congress ought to declare that the prevailing rate of wages in the immediate locality ought to be paid those employed under contracts let as a result of the Federal Highway Act.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss briefly the question of the application of the Davis-Bacon Act. The time is very limited. I may get a little more time later. But I want to call one or two things to your attention now, and I will do it as briefly as possible.

In the first place, if you adopt the Davis-Bacon provision, what you are doing is to impose another step on the march to do away with the powers and the sovereignty of the States, because under this bill you not only impose the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act on the Federal money which you are disposing of, but you are requiring the States, out of their 10 percent, to fix the same wage that is required under the Davis-Bacon Act. There is a direct and positive invasion of the sovereignty of the States in telling them how they shall spend their own money and what rate of wage they shall pay.

I shall not go into it further because I do not have the time. But I call attention to the abuse of the application of the Davis-Bacon Act, which is the greatest difficulty in the way of its use in this work.

I have had experience here and many of you have. Let me tell you of one experience with the fraudulent manner in which the Bacon-Davis Act is applied by the Department of Labor throughout the country.

A hospital was built in Winchester, Va. Winchester is some 60 or 75 miles from Washington, and in that instance there was a rate of wage in Winchester, a well-known and settled rate of wage; yet the Department of Labor fixed the wage prevailing in the District of Columbia 75 miles away.

That is not an honest administration of the act.

In my own district, Warrenton, 50 miles from Washington, there was a distinct rate of wage, well established and in operation. They fixed there the rate in the District of Columbia, which increased the cost of that project tremendously.

In the city of Charlottesville, which is 60 or 75 miles from the city of Richmond, Charlottesville being a city of 25,000 or 30,000 people, where they had an actual prevailing rate of wage, well known to everybody there, workers and

contractors alike, agreeable to everybody, satisfactory to everybody, yet the Department of Labor here in Washington undertook to fix the rate of wage there that existed in the city of Richmond.

That is not an honest administration of the act. Everybody knows it is not an honest administration of the act. Many of you have had similar experiences to those I have had.

Now, why impose in this bill where you are supposed to be building roads, why impose on this an added cost, a considerably added cost?

Are we setting out here to build roads? Or are we setting out here to do something for the utilities on the one hand and the labor unions on the other? If we are going to pass a bill let us build roads and let us forget these minority pressure groups that are coming in here trying to make us spend more money and build fewer miles of roads. That is what it comes down to in the last analysis.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If I have any more time, but I have a number of other things I want to say.

Mr. WITHROW. I think this Bacon-Davis provision is different than the other Bacon-Davis provisions; I doubt very much if they could do the things that you are stating here under the provision in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My friend, if they can do what they have been doing, they can do anything. We have been saying all along that the Supreme Court could not do this or that, but it looks to me like they are doing everything.

Now, this same crowd down in the Labor Department will work the same way. I know of one instance involving the Army. I went to the Army and called it an outrage. The Army agreed with me that it was just as much of an outrage as I had said. I asked them why they did not do something about it. He said he had gone to the Secretary of Labor and told him that what he was doing was not related to prevailing wages in the vicinity and the Secretary of Labor said to him: "This is our business assigned to us by the Congress. You people just keep your nose out of it."

Now, how can you ever trust such administrators? Are you going to yield merely to the insistence of these pressure minority groups such as the utilities and the labor unions?

Now, if you expect to build roads with this money do not expect to hand out favors, do not expect to put additional expense on the construction of these roads so that you will get the distribution of more favors and the construction of fewer roads.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] was talking about wage rates in Winchester. Within the last 2 or 3 days a representative of some of the workers who expect to be employed under this bill came to see me at my office. I asked him what the prevailing rate of wage was in his line. He said $3.60 an hour. Assuming that the wage in Winchester was $2 an hour, as I understand the gentleman, the Secretary here can, and probably would, because that Department is created to look after the workers, fix the wage at $3.60.

Now, one more question. Do the taxpayers in the vicinity of Winchester contribute toward the construction of these highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield to answer, of course, that is exactly what is going to happen, just as the gentleman has described it, because that is what has been happening ever since the Davis-Bacon Act was passed. Because of the interruption a while ago, I did not get the opportunity to say that it not only has the effect which I have mentioned but these roads are going to be built in the rural areas. They are a source of work for your country folks. Some of you represent city folks, but a whole lot of you represent country folks, and those country folks expect to get the right to work in that neighborhood. They are not going to get it if you fix the prevailing rates in the metropolitan area and the metropolitan contractor gets the work to the exclusion of the rural contractors and rural labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do those people who live in Winchester help pay for the construction of these highways?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; they pay 10 percent of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. What is their wage, who fixes it, how much is it? Do they get the $3.60 fixed by the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The prevailing wage in California is going to be fixed by somebody sitting down here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point is this: The taxpayers in Winchester contribute toward the construction of the highway and help pay the wage fixed by the Secretary of Labor. Now, do they get the same wage that the fellows from the outside who are working on the highway get?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. They may or may not, I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, they will not, unless they are members of the union. They will be discriminated against because they may not be members of the union, or because their dues or special assessments have not been paid to date. The result is that though they will be taxed to build the highway, they would be denied the right to work on the job, that is, unless the provisions of the Virginia statute, that is, the right-to-work law, are correctly interpreted and adequately enforced.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I did not get the opportunity to complete my question which I was endeavoring to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I would like to call his attention to the fact that this Davis-Bacon Act differs from the other Davis-Bacon Act in that it contains this language: "in the immediate locality." Now by any stretch of the imagination can you presume that the Secretary of Labor will say that the wages in the Washington, D. C., area shall be the prevailing wages in Richmond, Va., or likewise, that he will say the prevailing wage in Washington is the prevailing wage in the immediate locality of Winchester? I think that is bordering on the ridiculous and I am sure it will not happen. I do not think you will have that sort of abuse. It is manifestly unfair to make such a statement or to take that position in this particular case. I do not think those abuses will prevail under the Davis-Bacon Act as it is written into this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is 100 percent right. Another point I had hoped the gentleman would make is that the Secretary of Labor will not arbitrarily state what these prevailing wages are to be. The only way he can do that is on advice from these local communities State by State. He accepts their recommendations. So it is the State recommendation that he is putting into effect. That is the only way he sets these wages.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman and am in complete agreement with him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our committee [Mr. FALLON], the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, and the other members of our committee for the remarkable manner in which hearings on the highway measure have been conducted. Although, I am not entirely in agreement with the bill as recommended by the committee, I am supporting H. R. 10660 and will vote for it.

February 22, 1955, President Eisenhower delivered his message asking for an expanded Federal highway system. In 1944 the Congress recognizing the necessity for an expanded highway system, authorized the selection of a special network not to exceed 40,000 miles in length which would be so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable, the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense, and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico.

The result was the creation of the national system of interstate highways embracing about 1.2 percent of total road mileage, joining 42 State capital cities and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 population. The interstate system carries more than a seventh of all traffic, one-fifth of the rural traffic, serves 65 percent of the urban and 45 percent of the rural population, and is the key network from the standpoint of Federal interest in productivity and national defense. Approximately 37,600 miles have been designated to date, the remaining 2,400 miles are reserved for future additions.

The capacity of the interstate highways to evacuate urban populations in an emergency is of the utmost importance. No urban areas in the country today have highway facilities equal to this task. The rapid completion of this 40,000 mile interstate system, including

the necessary urban connection, is, therefore, vital as a civil-defense measure.

We now have more than 58 million motor vehicles registered, which is one for every 700 feet of every lane in both directions on all streets and highways in the Nation. Vehicle registrations are expected to continue their upward surge, reaching 81 million by 1965, an increase of 40 percent. These estimates, I believe are conservative, and represent the basis upon which the Nation's highway improvement program should be planned. To implement the expanded road program, our committee has recommended the passage of H. R. 10660.

The measure contains two sections. Section 1 has to do with the actual program, while section 2 deals almost entirely with the finances of the program. Section 1 was considered by the Public Works Committee, while section 2 was considered by the Ways and Means Committee. Section 2 containing the tax features is being considered under a closed rule, which will permit only committee amendments. Section 1 is being considered under an open rule, which will permit amendments.

I am including a table—table 1—which outlines (A) the regular Federal aids for the next 13 years, which will be made the same as they are today; namely, the State contribution of 50 percent as matched by the Federal Government's 50 percent. Table (B) has to do with the interstate system, which likewise is a table extending over a period of 13 years. However, the yardstick now used for Federal aid on the interstate system is now 40 percent contribution on the part of the State and 60 percent on the part of the Federal Government. This has been changed in H. R. 10660 so that the contribution is 10 percent on the part of the State and 90 percent on the part of the Federal Government.

TABLE 1.—*H. R. 10660, authorizations and proposed authorizations*

(A) Regular Federal aid (13 years, 1957 to and including 1969):	
1957 (in addition to the $700 million already authorized for 1957 in the 1954 act)	$25,000,000
1958	750,000,000
1959	775,000,000
1960	800,000,000
1961	825,000,000
1962	850,000,000
1963	875,000,000
1964	900,000,000
1965	925,000,000
1966	950,000,000
1967	975,000,000
1968	1,000,000,000
1969	1,025,000,000
Total	10,675,000,000
(B) Interstate system (13 years, 1957 to and including 1969):	
1957 (in addition to the $175 million already authorized for 1957 in the 1954 act)	$1,025,000,000
1958	1,700,000,000
1959	2,000,000,000
1960	2,200,000,000
1961	2,200,000,000
1962	2,200,000,000
1963	2,200,000,000
1964	2,300,000,000
1965	2,300,000,000
1966	2,200,000,000
1967	2,000,000,000
1968	1,500,000,000
1969	1,000,000,000
Total	24,825,000,000
Federal domain roads at $81 million each year (13 years, 1957 to and including 1969): $81,000,000 for 13 years	1,053,000,000
Total	36,553,000,000

H. R. 10660 only authorizes funds for 1957, 1958, and 1959, but expresses an intent of Congress with respect to future authorizations to increase progressively at $25 million per year.

H. R. 10660 only authorizes funds for 1958 and 1959, but expresses an intent of Congress to continue these authorizations for future years at not less than the amounts authorized.

Section 2 of H. R. 10660, which is being considered under the closed rule, has to do with the financing of the expanded highway road program. The following table—table 2—points out the taxes involved and the tax increases. The taxes are collected on a 16-year program. It is truly a pay-as-you-go program.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated tax receipts allocated to highway trust fund, fiscal years 1957–72*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Present law taxes					New or increased taxes								Total receipts	
	Gasoline, 2 cents per gallon	Diesel fuel, 2 cents per gallon	Tires, 5 cents per pound	Inner tubes, 9 cents per pound	Total, present law taxes	Gasoline, 1 cent per gallon	Diesel fuel, 1 cent per gallon	Tires, 3 cents per pound	Tread rubber, 3 cents per pound	Trucks, buses, truck trailers, etc.		Trucks, etc., over 26,000 pounds, $1.50 per thousand pounds annual tax	Total, new or increased taxes	Annual	Cumulative
										3 percent of manufacturers' price (from 5 to 8 percent)	2 percent of manufacturers' price (from 8 to 10 percent)				
1957	846	22	----------	----------	868	407	10	95	8	----------	47	45	612	1,480	1,480
1958	994	27	184	18	1,223	472	13	98	9	75	50	46	763	1,986	3,466
1959	1,031	28	191	18	1,268	489	13	100	11	81	54	47	795	2,063	5,529
1960	1,064	29	197	9	1,299	505	13	103	9	78	52	48	808	2,107	7,636
1961	1,099	30	204	9	1,342	522	14	108	11	84	56	49	844	2,186	9,822
1962	1,133	31	210	9	1,383	538	15	111	8	84	56	50	862	2,245	12,067
1963	1,169	32	217	9	1,427	555	15	111	12	87	58	52	890	2,317	14,384
1964	1,203	33	223	9	1,468	571	15	116	11	90	60	53	916	2,384	16,768
1965	1,237	34	229	9	1,509	589	16	124	14	87	58	55	943	2,452	19,220
1966	1,269	35	235	9	1,548	604	17	127	11	96	64	56	975	2,523	21,743
1967	1,307	36	242	9	1,594	622	17	129	12	96	64	57	997	2,591	24,334
1968	1,341	37	248	9	1,635	638	17	132	14	96	64	59	1,020	2,655	26,989
1969	1,375	37	255	9	1,676	654	18	135	11	99	66	60	1,043	2,719	29,708
1970	1,407	38	261	9	1,715	669	18	135	14	99	66	62	1,063	2,778	32,486
1971	1,436	39	266	9	1,750	683	18	140	11	99	66	63	1,080	2,830	35,316
1972	1,650	47	273	9	1,979	777	22	145	14	105	76	64	1,203	3,182	38,498
Total	19,561	535	3,435	153	23,684	9,295	251	1,909	180	1,356	957	866	14,814	38,498	----------

I would much prefer to finance the program by a bond issue for a portion of the cost for the following reason. Seventy percent of the building of a road is the cost involved in acquiring and constructing the right-of-way. This is permanent—this is lasting. Thirty percent, or the balance, is the cost of surfacing the right-of-way. This is the only portion of road construction that can, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered as temporary. I was very much in agreement with President Eisenhower that a major part of the highway costs should be paid through a bond issue.

I would like to call your attention to table 2. The 2-cent Federal gas tax now raises more than $19 billion over this 16-year period. The additional 1-cent gasoline tax called for in H. R. 10660 would add more than $9 billion more over the 16-year period. Gasoline taxes, namely, the 2-cent present gasoline tax and the additional 1-cent gasoline tax to be imposed, produces more than $28 billion of the $38 billion called for in this measure. Gasoline is a commodity which is already being taxed at a staggeringly high rate when compared with all other automobile products and supplies. Why should the tax on gasoline constantly go up and up—to 40 and 45 percent of the retail price, while all other automotive excises—which are not duplicated at State level—must be held so sacredly to a conservative level of 10 percent or less. Although, I shall vote for this measure, I feel very deeply that by levying this additional 1-cent tax per gallon on gasoline, we are

further invading a field of taxation that rightfully belongs to the several States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act specifying that all contractors on Federal construction must pay their employees the prevailing wage existing in the community in which a Federal project is located is an accepted requirement of all legitimate contractors.

There has been some opposition by those unprincipled contractors who would like to underbid on Government work by paying their employees far below livable wages. Naturally, their bid would be much lower than that of a conscientious contractor who desires to give his employees the high standard of living to which they are entitled in a country of great wealth such as the United States.

In this day of large surpluses on the farm, the purchasing power of the worker plays even a more important part in helping the farmer than the question of parity. If the workers of America receive a sufficient wage they will purchase the products of the farmers in quantities required to feed their families. Much of the surplus of the farmer would then disappear.

Too much stress has been put upon this section of the road bill, implying that labor unions are trying to impose upon the American taxpayers a schedule of wages far beyond the amount that should be paid. This is far from the truth.

In the States where State contracts are denied bidders who do not meet the State-established going wage of the community in which their factory, mill, or project is located, this program has met with great success.

In the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania where I had the honor of being a member of the general assembly for over 21 years, this practice has existed under both Democratic and Republican administrations. It has been warmly received by the general contractor and by the bidders of material used by the Commonwealth.

As an example, in the western part of Pennsylvania, the head of the highway department meets with the American General Contractors Association and representatives of labor—both organized and unorganized. Then agreement is reached on what should be the minimum wage considered for all classes of labor required under the contract. They also meet in the eastern part of Pennsylvania with the American General Contractors Association and labor and follow the same procedure.

In other parts of the State the highway department meets with the Pennsylvania Constructors Association and representatives of labor. Many members of this association have no union contract, but they agree on the standard of wages that should be paid in their community.

In counties not represented by any of the above organizations, the highway department makes a sampling of wages paid by local employers and then establishes the rate to be paid to workers in these communities.

I am surprised that some Members of the House oppose this section of the highway bill. It is not merely a protection for labor but a protection to the respectable contractors against the fly-by-night contractor who has no ethics and merely enters the picture to use an underworld expression "to make a quick buck." This type of individual is not concerned with human welfare. He knows nothing about the economic problems of America. Neither is he concerned with the purchasing power in relation to productivity of the worker.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Members of this House who oppose this section of the bill will be committing a great disservice, not only to the workers but also to the legitimate responsible contractors who take pride in their work and who, over the years, have striven to establish a reputation of the highest workmanship and service.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10660, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-five Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee has approved a bill—H. R. 10660—to authorize a vast highway program which our country needs so urgently.

A separate bill—H. R. 9075—was introduced in the House this year by Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana, and then referred to the Ways and Means Committee which, after extensive public hearings conducted by that Committee in the usual manner, was approved unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee and ordered reported to the House on March 19. That bill—H. R. 9075—as reported to the House has been consolidated, without change, into the Public Works Committee highway authorization bill, and the combined measure—H. R. 10660—is now before us for consideration. Title I of H. R. 10660 provides authorizations for the highway program and will be handled by the Public Works Committee. Title II of H. R. 10660 is the tax revenue section and will be explained and handled here today by the Ways and Means Committee under Chairman COOPER, of Tennessee. The committees will jointly handle this combined bill and divide up the time allotted for debate on the bill. Questions concerning title II of the bill—the revenue section—should be held by the Members for explanation by the gentlemen from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and I will confine myself to the authorization portion of the bill—title I.

Title I provides for authorizations to construct the Interstate System over a 13-year period to bring this 40,000-mile system of controlled-access roads up to a standard of construction which our engineers consider will be adequate to meet the traffic needs of the year 1975. This system, limited to 40,000 miles, was authorized by the Congress in the Federal Aid Act of 1944. It was developed and practically all of the mileage selected by the States, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Department of Defense in 1947. It connects all of our important producing centers, 90 percent of all our cities over 50,000 population, and directly serves more than half our total population. A key feature of the system's concept is that it will be built for complete adequacy over a reasonable future period with provisions whereby these facilities can thereafter be further expanded as growth continues to occur, with a minimum of cost and a maximum of salvage of the facilities already in place.

We must build this system of highways if we are to continue our economic growth and expansion. In recent years, our committee has heard almost continuous testimony from all the responsible groups in our society about the urgent, almost emergency, need for initiation of a program of highway modernization to prevent our highways from becoming jammed and choked with traffic to such an extent that our economy will become stagnated. The growth of highway use has skyrocketed and continues to increase at a much faster rate than our current measures are keeping highway improvements abreast of highway use. Only 10 years ago we had 34 million registered motor vehicles on our highways, but today we have 62 million and can expect to have 85 million in another 10 years—even before this program which we are proposing is finished. This growth in vehicle numbers has been occurring with almost no growth in the miles of highways on which to drive them, and this is the basic reason for the congestion about which you know and hear as much as I. Just to illustrate for you what has happened, it has been calculated by our committee staff that since the end of World War II we have built more automobiles and put them onto our highways than could be parked bumper to bumper on all the new highway miles

which we have added to our systems in the same period of time.

But congestion of itself, while annoying and irritating to all of us, is the least part of the price we are paying for the substandard highway system on which our economic life is so dependent. The tragedy of 38,300 highway deaths last year and 1,350,000 injuries with 100,000 disabled for life cannot truly be measured with a dollar sign, but if we should put a cold, impersonal price tag on last year's highway accident costs we would have to produce $4,700,000,000 to cover it, according to the National Safety Council. But the most alarming thing about this picture is that last year's high toll is still increasing—traffic deaths are running 16 percent ahead of last year and have been increasing for each of the last 12 months. At this rate we shall reach the tragic alltime record of 42,000 highway deaths in 1956. The monetary cost alone is more than two times the annual expenditure which this bill proposes for the purpose of saving many of these lives and reducing the wastage of our resources from this cause. The annual savings from this source alone will more than equal the annual expenditure. Even without capitalizing, this is a 100-percent annual dividend, which is unquestionably a good investment anywhere.

It is estimated by competent authorities that when a vehicle is operated on the type of highway systems proposed in this bill as contrasted to our present inadequate systems, the operator of a passenger car will save a cent a mile and a trucker 4 cents a mile. The expenditures proposed in the bill will cost the average motorist less than the amounts which he will save in reduced operating cost. The program which our committee is recommending to you will give our Nation the highways we need for economic growth, national military defense, and the public safety and welfare.

While I have emphasized this interstate system, because of its closer relationship to the national responsibility as distinguished from the individual State interests, the bill continues authorizations for the long-established regular Federal-aid programs on the primary and secondary Federal-aid systems and their extensions into urban areas, at annual rates which are slightly higher than in the last such bill enacted in 1954. In such a joint Federal-State program the Federal Government will carry the major responsibility for the road system of predominant national concern and the States will continue to carry the major load of responsibility for the road systems which are primarily of local concern. Thus the proven and satisfactory Federal-State partnership in the highway field is continued and no major change is contemplated in this well-established relationship.

I will now go through the bill with a comment on each section to explain its principal features.

This is a clean bill superseding H. R. 8836. Title I of H. R. 10660, as reported favorably by the House Committee on Public Works, contains the authorizations for the Federal-aid highway program. Title II contains the substantive provisions of H. R. 9075 as reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means to provide the tax revenues necessary to finance the highway program. Title III contains separability provisions.

A brief section-by-section summary of title I is as follows:

Section 101, short title for title I: Title I of the bill may be cited as the "Federal Highway Act of 1956."

Section 102, Federal-aid highways: This section authorizes for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and extensions thereof within urban areas, the following: $25 million additional for 1957, $750 million for 1958, $775 million for 1959. These funds would be expended in line with existing procedures. The existing authority to make 10-percent transfers of apportionments is increased to 20 percent. The section expresses the congressional intent to increase the above annual authorizations by at least $25 million annually over a 10-year period ending in 1969.

Sections 103, 104, 105, and 106, Federal domain roads: These sections grant the following authorizations for Federal domain roads for each of the fiscal years 1958 and 1959:

Forest highways from $22.5 million to $25 million.

Forest development roads from $24 million to $27 million.

Park roads from $12.5 million to $16 million.

Parkways from $11 million to $16 million.

Indian roads $10 million.

Public lands highways $1 million.

Contract authority is granted for these authorizations. It is declared to be the intent of Congress to continue these authorizations at not less than the annual rates above indicated.

Section 107, emergency fund: This section increases the present $10 million emergency relief authorization to $30 million. This is standby authority for disasters.

Section 108, National System of Interstate and Defense Highways: This section changes the name of the National System of Interstate Highways to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways referred to in the bill as the Interstate System. It authorizes annual authorizations for the Interstate System totaling $24,825,000,000 for the 13-year period ending June 30, 1969. These funds would be apportioned for the first 2 years on the basis of House Document 120, which is a report of highway needs in the individual States as called for by section 13 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954. Beginning in 1956, the States and the Bureau of Public Roads would commence another study based on standards adopted cooperatively by the States and the Bureau of Public Roads, and this new report when approved by the House and Senate Public Works Committees in the 1958 session would be used as the basis of apportioning the funds authorized for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962. Similarly, another report approved by the Senate and House Public Works Committees would form the basis of apportionments for the fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. Similar reports approved annually in 1967, 1968, and 1969 would govern the apportionment of funds authorized for those years. Thus there would be constant review, approval, and control of the apportionment formula by the Congress, so that each State would receive its proportional share of the total funds in such amounts as to insure the same relative rate of progress in every State to permit completion in all States at the same time by the year 1972. These funds will be expended on a 90–10 Federal-State matching basis. This section prescribes maximum axle weight limitations to protect the Interstate System, but without affecting vehicles that could be lawfully operated on July 1, 1956. It directs the Secretary of Commerce to expedite tests being conducted for the purpose of determining maximum desirable dimensions and weights, and to make a report to Congress by March 1, 1959.

Section 109, declaration of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways: This section declares the intent and policy of Congress to equitably reimburse States for toll or free roads already constructed on the Interstate System to the required standards. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a study and report by January 1958 in order to provide Congress the information it would need in determining the time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement.

Section 110, acquisition of rights-of-way: This section authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, when requested by a State, to acquire rights-of-way for the Interstate System. Such rights-of-way would be later deeded back to the States.

Section 111, availability of funds to acquire rights-of-way: This section makes any of the Federal-aid funds available for advance acquisition of rights-of-way by the States.

Section 112, prevailing rate of wage: This section applies the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires minimum wage-rate determinations by the Secretary of Labor, to projects on the Interstate System.

Section 113, relocation of utility facilities: This section permits Federal funds to pay the regular Federal pro rata share of the cost of utility relocation on any of the Federal-aid systems whenever a State pays for such costs.

Section 114, progress reports on Interstate System: The Secretary of Commerce is directed under this section to make progress reports for each Congress beginning with the calendar year 1958.

Section 115, agreements limiting use of rights-of-way: This section includes safeguarding provisions to insure retention of control of access on the Interstate System and that the users thereof will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services.

Section 116, toll roads, bridges, and tunnels: This section permits toll roads, bridges, and tunnels to be incorporated into the Interstate System for integration purposes, but makes no change in existing law which requires highways constructed with Federal aid to be free from tolls. In doing this, funds are conserved through making the fullest use

of all existing highway facilities on the Interstate System which meet the standards for this system. This avoids the necessity for construction of duplicating roads which would deplete the funds so badly needed for other sections of the system and protects and preserves the large investments which have been made in toll facilities during the past few years.

Section 117, definition of construction: This section broadens the existing definition to include geodetic markers and certain relocation costs incidental to construction or acquisition of rights-of-way.

Section 118, archeological salvage: This section permits Federal-aid funds to participate in archeological salvage.

Section 119, mapping: This section provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall authorize the use of commercial photogrammetric methods to the fullest extent practicable.

Section 120, information from States: This section provides that any State or Federal agency shall furnish information relating to the Interstate System to the Senate and House Public Works Committees at their request, and provides a penalty of withholding Federal-aid funds for noncompliance.

Section 121, relationship of this title to other acts: All provisions of existing Federal-aid road legislation not inconsistent with this title shall remain in full force and effect, and inconsistent provisions are repealed.

There are of course differences of opinion about certain sections of the bill, and many of you have different ideas about how certain sections should be phrased However, the bill is the result of our joint efforts as a committee, and so naturally will reflect in varying degrees the different thinking of 34 different Members. We think it is a good bill because it, in our opinion, will build for our country the system of roads we so urgently need. Significantly, we have had no dissent on the central point of the bill—that is, the authorization of a program to build these highways—and neither have we had any dissent from this point in our committee mail, our individual mail, or in the public press. The authorizations contained in this bill on a self-financing basis, are the really important points upon which we must concentrate. This is a program which will provide substantial savings in human life and property and benefits to the national security and the national welfare. I urge most earnestly the passage of this bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. With respect to the Bacon-Davis Act I am, of course, not opposed to fair conditions, but I am opposed, as the gentleman from Virginia has stated, to going off somewhere and using wage rates that would be disturbed by the wage rates in another locality 60 or 75 miles away. What is the definition of the word "immediate"?

Mr. FALLON. I did not offer that amendment to the bill.

Mr. BONNER. I think it is a fair question to ask.

Mr. FALLON. My definition of "immediate" would be within a reasonable mileage around the area in which the project is being constructed.

Mr. BONNER. But what is a "reasonable" mileage?

Mr. FALLON. My definition of "reasonable" would be not more than 50 miles.

Mr. BONNER. Would be what?

Mr. FALLON. Not more than 50 miles.

Mr. BONNER. For instance, there have been instances where a project in city A was being constructed, between A and C. There was a city B that had a wage rate. They went all the way over from A to set up the wage rate existing in C and bypassed B. It disturbs the local business, local construction, and other things.

Mr. FALLON. I might say to the gentleman that the author of the amendment will speak on the bill and probably emphasize the Bacon-Davis Act.

Mr. BONNER. I would be perfectly in accord with an interpretation which meant within the immediate vicinity, but certainly not a foreign vicinity.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, the acting chairman of our committee, has made a very detailed explanation of this bill and all the sections in it. There is very little I could add to what he has already said by way of information and as to what the bill contains.

I do, however, want to say a few things very briefly in regard to the subject before the House today, namely, the subject of roads. This subject is as old as civilization itself. Not long ago, in fact last October, six members of the Committee on Public Works attended a world conference on roads in the city of Rome, Italy. While there we had the opportunity to ride over a road that has been in use 2,267 years; is still in use; and is still a good road. I refer to the road that was built by the Roman Emperor Claudius Appius, who gave his name to the road. It is known to the world as the "Appian Way." It was built with slave labor. It was built in order to have a highway or an easy passage from what then practically amounted to the capital of the world to other sections of Italy and outlying areas. As I say, it is still a good road.

Centuries later, and long before the day of the automobile even was dreamed about, a philosopher and statesman of another country of Europe believed that good roads occupied a place among the important things essential in keeping a nation alive in this world. I refer to Lord Bacon of England who made a statement that I have quoted from time to time. I think it should be quoted again. He said:

> There be three things that make a nation great and strong, namely, a fertile soil, busy workshops and the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place.

The last one, of course, refers to good roads. If good roads were important more than 200 years ago to the people who then lived in this world, how much more important are they today in this motor age; this automobile age, in which you and I live? So with greater force we apply what Bacon had to say, namely that the easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place is one of the three essentials to make a nation great and strong.

The bill before us today has for its purpose the building of better and safer roads throughout our country in order that we might remain a large, strong, and a greater nation.

As the chairman has already pointed out, with 62 million cars on the roads, and adding about 3 million more every year, we can well understand the congestion that you and I are compelled to encounter when we drive on the highways of the United States. A test was made in a metropolitan area as to how much gasoline is wasted and how much time on the part of our people who must travel from place to place, either to their place of employment or their place of business. It was found that 25 percent of the gas consumed was lost or wasted waiting for traffic lights; waiting at stop signs; and waiting for the traffic to move because of the congestion on the highway. One of the objects of this bill is to try to remedy or relieve that very grave situation so that there may be some saving to the man who drives an automobile no matter where he lives or what business he is engaged in.

As the chairman has already pointed out, the system of highways that we propose to build under this bill, the 40,000 miles in the interstate system, will pay for themselves within a reasonable length of time and give our people safer, more adequate highways.

We are told that about 70 percent of the economy of the United States now moves by motor vehicle. That is a tremendous amount of the business of the country. It can only move on good roads. While there may be some portions of this bill I do not like, nevertheless I am supporting the measure and hope it will be passed and become the law for the benefit of the American people.

I can be a little selfish about this matter also, coming from the automobile capital of the world. The five or six million cars that the industry builds every year must operate on the highways of this country. If we do not have those highways, of course, they cannot be operated. Out of 6 million cars built each year, about 3 million are added to the gross total of the cars upon our roads, while 3 million old or destroyed cars leave the highways each year. A net of 3 million cars added to the total each year means that in 10 years we will have 30 million more cars on the highways than we have today or about 50 percent more. Well, you are as good a judge as I am as to what the conditions will be if the highways of the country are not improved over what they are today. It would be almost impossible to drive.

Now, touching on the human equation involved in this bill, we are killing more than 4 people every hour. Before this debate ends at 5 o'clock this afternoon 20 more of our people will be dead from accidents on the highways of our country. We are now injuring more than 9 million of our people every year. Some

of them will be permanently disabled. Besides the loss of life and those who are injured, consider the cost of the hospital bills and the destruction of property. The amount is almost unbelievable, fantastic, and incredible. We are destroying more property in value than we are spending upon the roads of the United States today. Forty thousand miles is only about 1 or 2 percent of the total highways in the country. We have a little over 700,000 miles, as I am informed, of hard-surface or paved highways. We have 3 million miles of highway in the country, paved and unpaved. This system, as we all know, will connect 42 out of the 48 State capitals and will touch about 90 percent of very city of the United States of 50,000 population or more. This indicates the tremendous network involved in this bill and what it will do to provide safer and better highways for our people throughout the entire country. No State is omitted.

Mr. Chairman, I have said about all I care to say by way of a preliminary statement. We will have some debate upon the Davis-Bacon provision of the bill. I think it is a great mistake to include this section in the bill. There is no intention or even a desire on the part of anybody in this House, certainly not myself, to prevent the laboring people of our country from receiving a fair wage. They are now being paid the prevailing wage as fixed by the States. This amendment, which I will offer at the proper place, proposes to strike out Federal wage fixing and leave the question of the determination of the prevailing wage to the States, where it has been for the last 40 years.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman said that there are a number of provisions in this bill to which he is opposed. Now, the fact is that the main features of the bill are agreed upon by most interests; the features that will actually build the roads. Can we not say that the disagreement extends to what we might call fringe provisions of this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. As I understand, a compromise has been worked out, or will be worked out, so that practically the only section that we are in violent disagreement about is the Davis-Bacon provision.

Mr. SCHERER. In the main provision of this bill there is no objection to, namely, the distribution of funds on the basis of need to build the highways where the traffic exists.

Mr. DONDERO. None whatever, and that is the only reason, may I say, involving the question of national security and safety, why the Federal Government is now providing 90 percent and the States only 10 percent of this 40,000-mile system or the 40,000 miles provided in the bill.

Mr. SCHERER. In other words, the controversy that existed last year on the floor of this House with reference to some of the major provisions of the bill, which provisions actually did prevent us getting a bill, have now been resolved by all interests concerned.

Mr. DONDERO. I believe so. I just want to add one thing before I sit down, and that is this: The Committee on Public Works spent, I think, 5½ months of this year and last year combined in trying to bring to the floor of the House a road bill which would be satisfactory to our people and to every interest represented in our economy. We went over it carefully. There is great need for this legislation and I hope the bill will pass unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

The CHAIRMAN. I think it might be well for the Chair to state at this time that the Chair believes it would be more orderly to dispose of the Public Works interest in this bill before turning to that part of the bill to be handled by the Committee on Ways and Means. If that meets the approval of the committee, we shall recognize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and the the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] until the 3 hours that they control have been consumed.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in taking the floor to discuss the bill now before the committee is in the hope that I may be able to add a few remarks that will be helpful to the Members who have not had the opportunity to know the bill as those of us on the committee have known it through giving consideration to the bill and its various provisions.

To me, after having gone through the lengthy hearings and discussions both in the subcommittee and the full committee it seems that the one important thing to keep in mind is not to lose sight of the over-all scope of this bill and what it proposes to do. The intensity with which some of the side issues or collateral issues have been discussed serves sometimes to take our attention from the main purpose involved; and I hope that the Members as we proceed with consideration of the bill, will keep in mind the major premise involved herein and not permit themselves to be sidetracked by some of these side issues.

I think most of us on the committee found ourselves in the position of having to make concessions on points here and there to the end that we would get a bill of this nature in shape to bring to the House.

I know of no piece of legislation of such magnitude as this since I have been in the House. I know of no piece of legislation that has received the close and careful scrutiny that this bill has received. I think the members of the committee will agree that our chairman was a most patient and considerate chairman and that the members devoted many, many hard and tedious hours in their efforts to bring a bill in here that would do the job that needs to be done and do it with the least amount of harm or friction.

There are some things in the bill that I think are very important and I should like to call attention to them. We know that we have not drafted a perfect bill. We know that we are not wise enough to bring in a pattern, a blueprint, that can do the job of building roads for 13 years, and have in it all the answers. We know that like the highway legislation we enacted in years gone by, amendments have to be made. I believe that since the first Federal highway legislation was enacted by Congress in 1914 up to the present time, Congress has seen fit at one time or another to make some 69 amendments to that original law. I think the House may rest assured that as we go along with this program, some of the fears and some of the problems we are discussing here today and to which we may not have the best answer today will be answered by Congress as the situation will require in the years ahead. We have kept that very much in mind in writing this bill. We have in it provisos to give the Congress the information it will need so that we can take advantage of all the experience that we get as we proceed with the program; and we will have access to all the facts that will reveal how this program works.

There will be no time that I can see when the Congress will not be able to make whatever adjustments experience dictates should be made. We have here, for instance, a proviso that an annual report in detail will be made to the Congress showing what has happened, where the money is going, and how it is being spent. We have reevaluation studies to be made that will be available to the Congress. So we have tried the best we can to set up a system here so that we can have the advantage all the time, every year Congress is in session, of knowing how the program is working and what needs to be done to make it work better.

One other thing I think we ought to reemphasize is this: Since the most glamorous part of this bill is the section which provides for this 40,000-mile system of superhighways, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that the bill does many other things besides providing for the construction of superhighways. Not only are we setting up a superhighway system but at the same time we are going ahead with an increased and enlarged program for all the other roads in this country in which Federal legislation is involved and with which it deals.

For instance, we are providing an increasing amount each year for farm-to-market roads, secondary roads, primary roads, and all other roads. As the program develops and as we come to the end of the time when the superhighway system is completed, we will then have built up the remainder of the road program of this Nation to an all-time high. So I think it is important for you to keep in mind that we are building all roads in this bill and that we are not making secondary or primary roads sacrifice for the sake of building these superhighways.

I find that many people are inclined to believe that we have forgotten all the other roads in the interest of superhighways, but if you will read the bill and study it you will find we are doing more here for all roads than ever was proposed be done before in any legislation that has ever come before the Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment my colleague upon his fine statement and also upon the job he has done during the course of the hearings on this bill. I know personally that he has worked diligently many hours and many days. I think he and his colleagues on the committee are to be commended on the extent to which they have worked out the major difficulties and the manner in which they have brought this piece of legislation before the House.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to join my colleague from Oklahoma in expressing the appreciation which I am sure all the Members have in their hearts to the members of this committee and particularly to my good friend, who represents the Fourth District in Oklahoma, and who I know has put in long hours, many tedious hours of study and of work on this bill. I think you have done an outstanding job of legislating. I certainly want to salute the gentleman, too, for the courageous fight he has conducted in the committee to give credit to Oklahoma for her turnpike program in connection with the Interstate System.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in what has been said with regard to my distinguished colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma. I recognize the fact that he has put in many, many hours on various sections of the bill. Especially he has been most helpful to all of us in our endeavor to arrive at a compromise and an equitable solution relative to the toll road and freeway proposals. We can give a lot of credit to him for getting a compromise on this section relative to reimbursement. We were all in accord that reimbursement possibly should be made, but he joined with us in saying and feeling and recommending that before we made a definite commitment on reimbursement we would cost either in dollars and cents or in mileage.

I join with the gentleman in paying compliment to the distinguished Member from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate these kind words, but I think it is only fair to point out that this bill contains contributions from most of the members of the committee. We have also had the benefit of the advice and help of, as I figured it out one day, about 160 organizations and firms who have shown an interest in this bill in one way or another and made contributions to the committee in bringing it out. Furthermore, there are many important things in this bill which are direct contributions by the members of the committee themselves. I think by-and-large there is one thing that can be said and that is that this is truly a bill which was put together by our chairman and the members of his committee in the finest sense that legislation can be prepared and brought to the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I think we could take all afternoon in eulogizing not only the various members of our particular Committee of Public Works but also that group which possibly might be categorized as "special interests" in submitting to the Committee on Public Works and the subcommittee on roads their position. Some of us felt possibly at times that it was a little hot and probably but if we were in their position, we would be a little hot too—yet, every single one of them that submitted information to us did so in a spirit of helpfulness. I am sure I speak for all the members of the committee when I say we do appreciate it even if at times we were possibly a little aggravated—but to you all many thanks—you helped a lot.

I would like to say a word relative to a chap who had the patience of Job. It was my privilege many times to be sitting next to him, and it was the privilege of another gentleman on the other side to be sitting next to him. That other gentleman and the Member from Ohio differed on many, many occasions and GEORGE FALLON, who was the acting chairman and between us, had a tremendous job on his hands when he was listening to the Member from Ohio, trying to keep his Irish temper down; and the other Member who was sitting on the other side, trying to keep him quiet. So I certainly want to join with the group in eulogizing Chairman FALLON.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read an editorial, if I may, to make certain that it gets in the proper place. This is an editorial appearing on the editorial page of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of Friday, April 20, 1956. It is entitled "Earned Praise."

EARNED PRAISE

Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland, deserves a national round of applause for the Federal highway bill just reported out by the House Committee on Public Works.

FALLON wrote the bill and introduced it in January.

Since then he has guided it patiently through his own Subcommittee on Roads and through the full committee.

We use the word "patiently" in its fullest sense.

A less patient and fair legislator would have thrown up his hands weeks ago.

FALLON'S method was to give everyone concerned a hearing, whether he were in or out of Congress, on or off his committee.

The pace at which the highway bill went through the legislative processes frequently was exasperating to those who regard the reconstruction of the Nation's roads as a national emergency.

Yet it is doubtful if the bill which finally emerged would have been as good a bill as it is if FALLON had tried to gavel it past his colleagues.

Now that it is before the House for a vote, it must be regarded as a bill that has been written and rewritten, studied and restudied, explained and reexplained.

The Hearst newspapers think it's as good a bill as could have been written, and we applaud Representative FALLON for it.

So I join the many applauding our chairman, Hon. GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of our committee.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to join my colleague from Ohio in everything he has said with reference to our acting chairman [Mr. FALLON], and also to our able friend from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], in the part they have played in bringing about this legislation. It has not been an easy matter. It was difficult. Both of them poured oil on the troubled waters during the consideration of the bill, and it is a pleasure for me to add that I confirm every compliment paid to them.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I want to join in paying tribute to our chairman and the members of the subcommittee who did such a fine job on this bill, as well as all members of the committee who took their time to bring out a bill that has great merit. Particularly I want to emphasize the fact that our chairman has shown great patience, as stated earlier by the gentleman, in the handling of this bill and in allowing each member time to fully explore all the possibilities in the legislation.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to pay respect to the senior minority member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] who has shown a great deal of patience. He has been a hard worker for an adequate highway legislation for many years. I am sure that we appreciate his endeavors and we certainly will miss his calming words and guidance.

I see two other Members present who I think are deserving of a great deal of credit. That is the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. Those gentlemen, along with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. These gentlemen, in my opinion, have done a very fine job with a very difficult problem. It is not pleasant to put taxes on anyone, but when they directed this revenue-raising feature of this bill through their committee by unanimous vote, I think the country as a whole will accept it, and I want to publicly thank those gentlemen, as well as the members of their committee—a job well done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about this bill. This is a good bill. There are a

lot of things in it that possibly I do not like in their entirety. If I had my full way and brought out a bill, there are many members of this committee who would disagree with me and what I recommended. But this bill as written is a compromise, as we have suggested in the legislation. Various sections are the result of study and "give and take." The compromises that will be presented to you for your consideration are the privileges of this great Republic that we live in, where those with differences of opinion can get together and agree on something we can present to the people and will be of benefit to all.

We have heard so much about the scraps and differences between the various groups of transportation. I have been contacted at least 20 times since entering this chamber. They say, "Congressman, what is the final result of the weight limits," and so forth, because I am getting so many wires from people back home. I want to refer to a letter from Mr. John V. Lawrence. The gentleman from Louisiana has a statement which is in conformity with this, and I think it will be placed in the RECORD. This letter is signed by the president of the American Trucking Association, and he says:

We want you to know that the trucking industry is perfectly willing to accept and, in fact, supports section 108 (J) of the highway bill reported out by the House Public Works Committee, having to do with truck weights.

We were opposed to this section as originally written because it would have created endless difficulties for truck operators, the States, and the Bureau of Public Roads. Therefore, we had advocated complete elimination of the section, and we were joined in this position by numerous interests, including the Bureau of Public Roads, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Municipal Association, and the American Automobile Association.

However, the revised section as reported by the Public Works Committee accomplishes the objective—protection of the highways—without getting involved in other factors that would have caused the difficulties. The new provision limits the axle weights and, as the Bureau of Public Roads stated, "The axle load of vehicles is the principal determinant of the supporting capacity that must be provided in the surfaces and foundations of roads."

Interests which are unfriendly to the trucking industry and are, in fact, unfriendly to the entire highway program may attempt to have the section amended to affect such factors as dimensions and gross weights which, as any highway engineer will testify, have nothing to do with protecting highway surfaces. Regulation of these other factors should be left in the hands of the States, which know best how to deal with the complications that arise.

Therefore, we urge you to support the section as it was reported by the Public Works Committee and resist changes designed, not to protect the highways, but to create difficulties.

Very truly yours,

JOHN V. LAWRENCE.

I was contacted by some folks who were supposed to have been in opposition to that particular section and I asked: "What is your position?" and I am not carrying the ball for any one group any more than I am carrying the ball for all of you because I hope that we can work out a compromise. That is what we want to do, get a good road bill. I read this statement as given to me:

I have been advised by an authorized representative of the railroad industry that in their opinion the interest of the American taxpayer would have been better served had the original wording of section 7J been retained.

The Public Works Committee, after due consideration, decided to delete from the section those limitations pertaining to total weight and dimensions of vehicles. The single and tandem axle limitation remains the same, statements to the contrary notwithstanding.

The railroad industry has no intention of seeking modification or change in the wording of section 108J as reported by the committee, when the measure comes before the House.

That is the result of the various segments of the transportation world getting together and exchanging views, so a program might be put into effect. That exchange of views you now have in this particular bill—a compromise that as far as they are concerned there will be no attempt to amend or strike from the bill that section, here on the floor of the House today or tomorrow.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I wish to ask my distinguished colleague from Ohio a question relating to lines 19 and 20 on page 29 of the bill, where provision is made for the elimination of the hazards of railroad grade crossings. Does this bill disturb the present law under which railroads are contributing to the cost of the elimination of railroad crossings? Does this provision disturb that section of the law?

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say to the gentleman that the amendment to which he refers on page 29, section 117, contains a new definition of construction that was presented by a Member and it does completely change the term "construction."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. May I say to the gentleman that this does not change the basic act with respect to the allocation of funds with reimbursement of the railroads; it carries the traditional 90–10 formula. I think that is what the gentleman is interested in.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman says it does not change the formula.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, it does not; the section here read does not refer to the apportionment formula whatsoever, so there is no change in respect to that. Under the Ramseyer rule changes must be set out in the report. None is indicated; therefore, there is no change, and I can assure the gentleman from Ohio that he need not be apprehensive over that section.

Mr. McGREGOR. The Ramseyer rule is still in effect. In this particular section we are only amending section 1 of the Highway Act which has to do with the definition of construction. As of now, in my opinion, it in no way interferes with existing law as it affects the allocation of cost formula, but I certainly will be glad to check for sure and advise the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief summary of portions of H. R. 10660.

The highway bill is H. R. 10660. This is a combination of H. R. 8836, the Fallon bill, which is the highway authorization bill reported by the Public Works Committee, and H. R. 9075, the revenue-raising bill, the Boggs bill which was reported by the Ways and Means Committee. The first title of H. R. 10660 relates to the authorization as contained in the Fallon bill as amended.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY, URBAN

Sections 101 through 107 of the bill are approximately the same as the 1954 Highway Act which deals with the primary, secondary, and urban systems of roads as now in effect, with the exception that the funds involved are increased in the new legislation. The amount authorized for the primary, secondary, and urban systems, in addition to the $700 million already authorized for 1957 by the 1954 act is increased by $25 million.

It is established as the intent of Congress that starting in 1957 and continuing through 1969 the total amounts intended for the primary, secondary, and urban systems be progressively increased in the amount of $25 million per year. Thus the total Federal funds involved for these systems during this period is $11,375,000,000.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

It was the opinion of the committee that the Congress should review every 2 years the authorization on the primary, secondary, and urban systems.

Included in the sections up to 107 are increases for forest highway roads, trails, national parks, and so forth, and also some clarifying amendments relative to Indian land and other Federal-domain roads. These sections also include a $30 million authorization for an emergency fund for highway repairs in disaster areas.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Section 108 to section 201 deals with the interstate system as set forth in H. R. 8836, the Fallon measure as amended. The authorizations of this section establishes a Federal expenditure, over the 13-year period 1957 up to and including 1969, for the interstate system of $24,825,000,000. The matching as it deals with the interstate system is 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent State funds. In reality the total expenditure of the two programs as far as Federal funds are concerned is approximately $36,500,000,000.

MAXIMUM AXLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

In the bill will be found new subject matter relating to Federal axle weight limitations on vehicles using the highways. From available information, and taking into consideration the sponsor of the amendment, it would be my opinion that it was submitted upon the recommendation, and with the approval of, the trucking industry. This section

would deny Federal funds to the interstate system in any State which permits single axle loads in excess of 18,000 pounds or tandem axle loads in excess of 32,000 pounds, or which exceeds present State statutory regulations in effect July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. The enactment of this provision will not deprive any vehicle of any legal right it presently enjoys. It is an effort on the part of the Federal Government to insure that the highway facilities to be constructed with this large sum of Federal money shall serve out their economic life and not be prematurely destroyed by excessive loads and the question of safety for the traveling public shall be properly recognized. The bill takes into consideration the research that is now going on, the results of which will be known to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959, and instructs the Secretary of Commerce to make recommendations to the Congress not later than March 1, 1959, with respect to maximum desirable dimensions and weights of vehicles using the public highways.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN HIGHWAYS

The bill contains a section instructing the Secretary of Commerce to do necessary research regarding reimbursement of funds by the Federal Government to those States that have completed sections of the interstate system whether toll or free, subsequent to August 2, 1947, and meeting standards required on the interstate system and to report to the Congress his findings not later than January 2, 1958. It was recognized by the Committee that possibly there was equity in the reimbursement feature but sufficient factual data was not available to permit the establishment of a fair formula either in dollars or miles credited.

PREVAILING RATE OF WAGE

The bill contains a provision for bringing under the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act contract work performed on the interstate system. This provision requires that the Secretary of Labor determine the prevailing wages to be paid on all contract involving interstate sections of the program.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

The bill as written sets forth that whenever a State shall pay for the relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project in the Federal-aid primary or secondary system, or on a national system, Federal funds may be used to reimburse the State for such costs in the same proportion as Federal funds are expended on the project. The term utility includes publicly, privately, cooperatively owned utilities, which, of course, includes sewer systems, water systems, gas, telephone, including REA, light, and power. This leaves the determining power entirely in the hands of the States.

FREE COMPETITION

Other provisions relate to the filing of periodic reports on the progress of the interstate system; the use of right of ways incident to the interstate system and provisions which will insure that the users of the interstate system will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at, or adjacent to, highways in such system.

CHECK BY CONGRESS

The bill provides that departments and agencies of any State and the executive branch of the Government shall furnish to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate or the House, or a subcommittee of each, such information as may be requested relating to the construction of the new interstate system.

TITLE II. REVENUE FEATURES

Incorporates the recommendations of the House Ways and Means Committee as contained in H. R. 9075 by Congressman Boggs. This revenue section, which in all probability will come to the floor of the House under a closed rule, contains provision for a 1-cent gas tax increase; a 1-cent diesel and special fuels increase; a 3-cent increase on all rubber used by highway vehicles; 2-percent ad valorem tax increase on trucks, buses, and trailers, which makes a total of 10 percent as now being paid by automobiles.

The bill places a new tax of 3 cents a pound on camelback or retreading material and a new permit fee of $1.50 per thousand pounds on vehicles in excess of 26,000 pounds.

The total yield anticipated from the revenue measure over a 15-year period is approximately $38 billion. It is to be noted that nonhighway users on all of the above taxes are exempt.

This revenue section recognizes the withdrawal from general revenues after July 1, 1957 of one-half of the total yield of the 10-percent ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and trailers and the total yield of the rubber tax on tires and the assignment of these revenues to the highway program. Prior to July 1, 1957, the revenue measure recognizes the dedication of only the 2-percent increase in ad valorem tax on trucks, buses and trailers and the 3-percent increase in rubber taxes.

This means, in a general statement, that a large amount of money that is now going to the general revenue fund will be designated to the highway trust fund after 1957.

PAY AS YOU GO

After study and attempting to analyze whether or not the revenue-raising feature will meet the authorization, it is the considered judgment that in the overall program we will be short about $3.5 billion. However, it is the belief that possibly this amount can be collected by increased sales and use of the highways so I think, in all fairness, it should be said that the revenue bill as submitted by the Ways and Means Committee and incorporated in title II of this bill will meet the authorization and expenditures as set forth in title I.

In summary, the proposed legislation has the merit of providing for review by the Congress and the correction of any inequities that may develop as the program progresses. The bill is not perfect but I think the general public wants a highway bill and, in my opinion, the controversial features contained in this legislation are the results of various segments of our society compromising to obtain that which the people are asking, namely, better roads.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include a chart showing the approximate apportionment of the Federal highway funds pursuant to the present bill, H. R. 10660, of the Federal Highway Act of 1954. This shows the old allotment of Public Law 350, which it was my privilege to author, and the allotment for 1957, plus the $25 million included in this bill. It also includes, Mr. Chairman, the $175 million for the interstate system in the fiscal year 1957.

Approximate apportionment of Federal highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954

PRELIMINARY—SUBJECT TO SUCH REVISION AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONFORM TO SEC. 108 (F) OF H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1957			Fiscal year 1958			Fiscal year 1959		
	Primary, secondary, and urban ($725.0)	Interstate ($1,200.0)	Total ($1,925.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($750.0)	Interstate ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,450.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($775.0)	Interstate ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,775.0)
Alabama	14.7	19.6	34.3	14.9	26.7	41.6	15.5	31.4	46.9
Arizona	9.0	11.2	20.2	9.2	15.3	24.5	9.6	18.0	27.6
Arkansas	10.9	11.4	22.3	11.1	14.8	25.9	11.5	17.4	28.9
California	38.8	112.1	150.9	40.1	169.7	209.8	41.4	199.6	241.0
Colorado	11.3	9.2	20.5	12.0	11.4	23.4	12.3	13.4	25.7
Connecticut	6.6	26.2	32.8	6.9	40.6	47.5	7.1	47.8	54.9
Delaware	3.0	4.0	7.0	3.1	4.8	7.9	3.3	5.6	8.9
Florida	12.0	24.7	36.7	12.3	36.2	48.5	12.8	42.6	55.4
Georgia	16.9	34.9	51.8	17.2	51.2	68.4	17.7	60.2	77.9
Idaho	7.3	6.4	13.7	7.5	7.8	15.3	7.7	9.2	16.9
Illinois	32.1	55.1	87.2	33.0	77.9	110.9	34.1	91.6	125.7
Indiana	17.4	42.4	59.8	17.7	63.4	81.1	18.3	74.6	92.9
Iowa	15.9	15.7	31.6	16.1	20.2	36.3	16.6	23.8	40.4
Kansas	15.1	12.3	27.4	15.3	15.1	30.4	15.9	17.8	33.7

Approximate apportionment of Federal highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954—Continued

PRELIMINARY—SUBJECT TO SUCH REVISION AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONFORM TO SEC. 108 (F) OF H. R. 10660—continued

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1957			Fiscal year 1958			Fiscal year 1959		
	Primary, secondary, and urban ($725.0)	Interstate ($1,200.0)	Total ($1,925.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($750.0)	Interstate ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,450.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($775.0)	Interstate ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,775.0)
Kentucky	13.0	24.9	37.9	13.3	36.0	49.3	13.8	42.4	56.2
Louisiana	11.5	24.5	36.0	11.9	36.0	47.9	12.2	42.4	54.6
Maine	5.5	7.9	13.4	5.6	10.7	16.3	5.8	12.6	18.4
Maryland	7.8	21.3	29.1	8.0	31.8	39.8	8.3	37.4	45.7
Massachusetts	13.2	40.6	53.8	13.7	61.2	74.9	14.1	72.0	86.1
Michigan	24.9	63.3	88.2	25.5	94.7	120.2	26.3	111.4	137.7
Minnesota	17.6	25.2	42.8	17.8	35.4	53.2	18.4	41.6	60.0
Mississippi	11.7	13.7	25.4	11.9	18.0	29.9	12.3	21.2	33.5
Missouri	20.4	31.1	51.5	20.7	43.7	64.4	21.4	51.4	72.8
Montana	11.5	9.2	20.7	12.2	11.2	23.4	12.6	13.2	25.8
Nebraska	11.9	7.1	19.0	12.5	7.8	20.3	13.0	9.2	22.2
Nevada	7.1	5.1	12.2	7.5	5.4	12.9	7.7	6.4	14.1
New Hampshire	3.2	4.1	7.3	3.3	4.9	8.2	3.4	5.8	9.2
New Jersey	13.5	63.7	77.2	14.0	99.3	113.3	14.4	116.8	131.2
New Mexico	9.5	12.5	22.0	9.9	17.2	27.1	10.3	20.2	30.5
New York	45.6	71.1	116.7	47.1	97.8	144.9	48.7	115.0	163.7
North Carolina	17.5	15.3	32.8	17.9	18.0	35.9	18.5	21.2	39.7
North Dakota	8.6	6.6	15.2	8.6	7.8	16.4	9.0	9.2	18.2
Ohio	28.7	67.3	96.0	29.6	99.5	129.1	30.6	117.0	147.6
Oklahoma	14.1	19.7	33.8	14.3	27.5	41.8	14.8	32.4	47.2
Oregon	11.0	16.3	27.3	11.3	23.3	34.6	11.7	27.4	39.1
Pennsylvania	34.1	42.7	76.8	35.7	55.6	91.3	36.8	65.4	102.2
Rhode Island	3.9	6.5	10.4	4.1	9.0	13.1	4.2	10.6	14.8
South Carolina	9.3	10.4	19.7	9.5	13.4	22.9	9.7	15.8	25.5
South Dakota	9.2	6.3	15.5	9.2	7.0	16.2	9.5	8.2	17.7
Tennessee	15.3	20.4	35.7	15.6	27.7	43.3	16.1	32.6	48.7
Texas	44.2	48.3	92.5	45.4	63.7	109.1	46.9	75.0	121.9
Utah	7.0	12.1	19.1	7.3	17.3	24.6	7.6	20.4	28.0
Vermont	3.0	8.9	11.9	3.0	12.9	15.9	3.2	15.2	18.4
Virginia	13.8	28.6	42.4	14.4	41.7	56.1	14.8	49.0	63.8
Washington	11.7	23.4	35.1	12.2	34.2	46.4	12.6	40.2	52.8
West Virginia	7.9	13.5	21.4	8.1	18.9	27.0	8.4	22.2	30.6
Wisconsin	16.6	18.1	34.7	17.0	23.6	40.6	17.6	27.8	45.4
Wyoming	7.1	14.7	21.8	7.5	21.6	29.1	7.7	25.4	33.1
Hawaii	3.3		3.3	3.4		3.4	3.5		3.5
District of Columbia	4.2	7.8	12.0	4.4	11.1	15.5	4.5	13.0	17.5
Puerto Rico	5.1		5.1	5.2		5.2	5.3		5.3

Mr. Chairman, I know of no concentrated effort to defeat the general principles of this legislation. As stated before, there are many controversial issues, one of them being the matter of reimbursement for existing highways, toll or free. I am including in my remarks a telegram that I have just received from the American Association of State Highway Officials.

This association, I believe, is comprised of every highway department in every State of these United States. They carefully analyze legislation affecting highways and their records show that they give very serious and careful study before any recommendations are made. Our committee carefully analyzed the particular section to which this telegram refers, giving full recognition to the fact that many of our States possibly were entitled to reimbursement, but neither the committee nor the highway departments of the various States, nor the Bureau of Public Roads, had definite information on how to establish a formula of reimbursement. Without such formula, they had no idea what the costs might be in dollars or in mileage. Therefore, your committee in this bill has a section which is a compromise, and which in turn will give us an equitable formula under which we can operate.

I am most happy to include in these remarks the telegram from Mr. Whitton, president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, who, I note, states that his organization considers our proposal in this bill an orderly approach to the problem:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House Office Building:

Regarding the matter of reimbursement for existing highways, toll or free, the proposal in H. R. 10660 offers an orderly approach to the problem, especially in light of the lack of current specific information as how well existing highways will serve as part of the Interstate System and what the impact of financing might be. The highway departments will cooperate and work every way possible to expedite a complete study and analysis of the matter so that the Congress may have complete information upon which to consider reimbursement.

REX M. WHITTON,
President, American Association of State Highway Officials.

I would like to include at this point an editorial entitled "Pass the Highway Bill":

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of April 23, 1956]

PASS THE HIGHWAY BILL

The American people are on the verge of having their highway congestion problems settled.

The House Committee on Public Works has produced an excellent highway bill and the House will soon pass judgment on it.

The Hearst newspapers urgently recommend the passage of this legislation.

Its fundamental provisions—the allotment of Federal aid to the several road systems of the 48 States and the tax schedule which will finance that aid—have been intelligently prepared and are almost unanimously approved by everyone who understands the highway problem and its solution.

Other provisions, the fringe provisions, are more controversial because of the special interests concerned, but in no case do they warrant a vote against the bill.

In the opinion of the Hearst newspapers, which have carefully followed and enthusiastically supported this legislation from its inception, the passage of this bill is in the national interest.

Any reasons that still exist to oppose it are based on such petty, narrow, self-serving reasons that those representatives who vote against it become subject to appraisal as petty, narrow, self-serving individuals.

We believe they will be so appraised by the public they are elected to serve.

Out of our knowledge of this subject may we say this:

A vote against this bill is a vote for chaos in the highway field.

A vote for it is a vote in the national interest of the United States and its people.

Mr. Chairman, I am just in receipt of a letter from one of the large farm organizations, and although this endorsement does not cover anyways near all of the various endorsements that have been given to this bill, yet I do feel it certainly covers a cross-section of our economy and under leave to extend my remarks I am enclosing that list:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1956.

Hon. J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGREGOR: Because adequate highways will mean so much to the people of this Nation, a number of nationally known individuals reflecting the views of many others, have joined in expressing the urgent need for prompt action on pending highway legislation. Grim confirmation of the need is contained in the most recent safety statistics which show an increase of 16 percent in deaths on the roads last month. I have the privilege of transmitting this

message to you and to all other Members of Congress.

Differences of opinion exist among supporters of adequate highway legislation over vital secondary issues, but, nevertheless, as a group we are all ready to submit our cause to the final stages of democratic processes at this time.

Respectfully yours,

HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

AN URGENT HIGHWAY MESSAGE TO MEMBERS OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

Adequate highways are desperately needed in the United States and they are needed now.

They are needed for the defense and the economic development of this Nation.

They are needed to permit the continued advancement of the American way of life in all its cultural, social and spiritual aspects.

They are needed in the interest of the safety of the motor vehicle user and the pedestrian alike.

They are needed for peace or for war.

Good roads, or the lack of them, affect every man, woman and child in this country, directly or indirectly. Your own life, the lives of your children may depend upon safe and adequate roads—in your every day movements or in the event of atomic attack.

The President and congressional leaders on both sides have placed their support solidly behind action for an expanded, balanced Federal highway program.

There is now pending before Congress a proposal to meet these needs.

Under its terms, Federal funds will be authorized for a 13-year building program which will:

Provide the Nation with a modern 40,000 mile interstate system built to meet traffic needs of 20 years ahead.

Reduce congestion in our cities.

Step up the continuing program of improvement of farm-to-market roads.

Accelerate development of the entire Federal aid system, totaling 700,000 miles of roads, of both national and local importance in the United States.

Release State and local funds for the more rapid improvement of roads and streets of lesser traffic use, but still vital to our economy.

Reduce the cost of distribution.

Continue the partnership between Federal and State authorities which has protected States' rights and given us roads rendered obsolescent only by an ever upsurging traffic.

Every day of delay in the passage of this vitally required legislation:

Increases the chances of death, injury and property losses on our highways, figures which today reach the staggering total of 38,300 lives, 1,350,000 injuries, and economic losses of $4.75 billion annually.

Adds to the final cost of rights-of-way which are going up in huge amounts as property valuations rise.

Creates indecision and delay on the part of highway officials everywhere who cannot go ahead with plans for construction until they know what the Congress is going to do.

Adds to the mounting deficiencies in the sheer capacity of our roadways to handle a constantly growing traffic.

Further delay is intolerable.

We urge you to join in carrying forward this all-American program now.

W. E. Adams, master, Idaho, State Grange, Eagle, Idaho.

Harold J. Arthur, master, Vermont State Grange, Burlington, Vt.

Fred W. Asay, president, Capital Stores, Inc., Topeka, Kans.

Murray A. Baldwin, director, Citizens Highway Committee, Fargo, N. Dak.

Thomas A. Ballentine, president, Louisville Taxicab & Transfer Co., Louisville, Ky.

Walter R. Bimson, chairman, Valley National Bank, Phoenix, Ariz.

W. Blackie, executive vice president, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.

Warren B. Bledsoe, president, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Washington, D. C.

C. R. Brock, president, Milk Industry Foundation, Washington, D. C.

Charles H. Brower, executive vice president, Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Leo Burnett, chairman, Leo Burnett Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Charles S. Burr, C. R. Burr Co., Manchester, Conn.

Harry B. Caldwell, master, North Carolina State Grange, Greensboro, N. C.

Dean Chaffin, director, Montana National Automobile Dealers Association, Bozeman, Mont.

Frank L. G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, Nashville, Tenn.

Emil C. Chervenak, Service Fire Insurance Company of New York, New York, N. Y.

Albert E. Cobo, mayor, city of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.

L. L. Colbert, president, Chrysler Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Harry J. Cooper, director, public relations, Lions International, Chicago, Ill.

Walter B. Cooper, president, Colorado Good Roads Association.

Gardner Cowles, president, Cowles Magazines, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Charles T. Cownie, chairman, good roads commission, Greater DesMoines Committee, DesMoines, Iowa.

H. A. Crockard, chairman, Motor Vehicle Advisory Committee to California State Legislature, Berkeley, Calif.

C. H. Diefendorf, chairman, executive commission, Marine Trust Co. of Western New York, Buffalo, N. Y.

Arthur O. Dietz, chairman of the board, Commercial Investment Trust, Inc., New York, N. Y.

John W. Emeigh, secretary, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Roaring Spring, Pa.

Charles C. Freed, president, Freed Motor Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Lawrence FitzLee, president, Occidental Life Insurance Co. & Peninsular Life Insurance Co., Raleigh, N. C.

Roy Fruehauf, president, Fruehauf Trailer Co., Detroit, Mich.

Walter D. Fuller, chairman, Magazine Publishers Association, New York, N. Y.

H. L. Galles, Jr., Galles Motor Co., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Herbert Garrecht, president, Klinke-Reed Dairies, Memphis, Tenn.

A. M. Ghormley, vice president, Carnation Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Abe Goldstein, Georgia State Tire Dealers Association, Atlanta, Ga.

H. E. Hartfelder, president, Oak Farms Dairies, Dallas, Tex.

L. Roy Hawes, commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, Boston, Mass.

W. R. Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, Hearst Publications, New York, N. Y.

Ernest Henderson, president, Sheraton Corporation of America, Boston, Mass.

Christian A. Herter, Governor of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.

Conrad A. Hilton, president, Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of board, Studebaker-Packard Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.

Gilbert H. Hood, Jr., H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mrs. J. Howard Hodge, safety chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Midland, Tex.

William P. Howe, president, Howe Nurseries, Pennington, N. J.

Ray L. Hulick, vice president, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Lewis Webster Jones, president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

William G. Karnes, president, Beatrice Foods Co., Chicago, Ill.

Ridgway Kennedy, Jr., president, Abbotts Dairies, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

R. R. King, president, American Body & Trailer Corp., Oklahoma City, Okla.

Ezra C. Knowlton, Utah Sand & Gravel Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Walter J. Kohler, Governor of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Arthur B. Langlie, Governor of Washington, Olympia, Wash.

Charles R. Lawson, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Bertrand, Nebr.

William G. Laffer, president, Clevite Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

S. F. Laskey, president, Associated Equipment Distributors, Chicago, Ill.

Paul R. Lauritzen, director, Virginia National Automobile Dealers Association, Richmond, Va.

Kenneth Lindsay, president, Construction Industry Manufacturers Association, Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Henry Little, president, Campbell-Ewald Co., Detroit, Mich.

J. Saxton Lloyd, past president, National Automobile Dealers' Association, Daytona Beach, Fla.

E. J. Lucas, vice president, Kingham Trailer Co., Louisville, Ky.

Charles F. McCahill, senior vice president, Forest City Publishing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Samuel J. McCartney, president, Pennsylvania Federation of Womens Clubs, Narberth, Pa.

H. J. McGinn, president, Eaton Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

R. D. McKay, president, R. D. McKay Motors Co., Inc., Wichita, Kans.

Vernon Marshall, president, American Association of Nurserymen, Arlington, Nebr.

J. Paul Mather, president, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.

F. C. Matthaei, chairman of board, American Metal Products Co., Detroit, Mich.

Geo. J. Meuhort, Mid-Continent Distributing Corp., Des Moines, Iowa.

John Moren, National Rural Letter Carriers Association, Howe, Okla.

Paul W. Morton, treasurer, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Freeport, Ohio.

Gilbert C. Morris, Fuller & Smith & Ross, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Robert Moses, head, New York City and State Park Agencies, New York, N. Y.

Timothy J. Murphy, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Kansas City, Mo.

Ross R. Ormsby, president, Rubber Manufacturers Association, New York, N. Y.

Ralph F. Peo, president, Houdaille Industries, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.

Guy S. Peppiatt, president, Federal-Mogul-Bower Bearings, Inc., Detroit, Mich.

Carl A. Peterson, vice president, Country Club Dairy Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Carlton S. Pisch, president, American Institute of Consulting Engineers, New York, N. Y.

Datus E. Proper, vice president and general manager, Pearl Brewing Co., San Antonio, Tex.

Dr. Dorothea F. Radusch, D. D. S., international president, Zonta International, Minneapolis, Minn.

John A. Riggs, Jr., president J. A. Riggs Tractor Co., Little Rock, Ark.

W. F. Rockwell, chairman, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

George Rommey, president, American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Chas. E. Sands, chairman, Wyoming Tire Dealers & Retreaders, Cheyenne, Wyo.

A. Sevaner, director, Milk Industry Foundation, Iowa City, Iowa.

Harold F. Schnurle, vice president, Central Maine Power Co., Augusta, Maine.

George B. Schotte, chairman, Montana Fact Finding Committee for Highways, Streets, and Bridges, Helena, Mont.

Donald J. Simons, National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Green Bay, Wis.

Clyde H. Stocking, vice president, American Association of Nurserymen, San Jose, Calif.

J. Earl Stowe, president, Earl Stowe Tire Co., Phoenix, Ariz.

S. D. DenUyl, president, Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Louis J. Taber, chairman, Farmers and Traders Life Insurance Co., Syracuse, N. Y.

Ralph Veenema, Veenema & Wiegers, Inc., Paterson, N. J.

Joseph P. Tacconelli, owner, Joseph P. Tacconelli Co., Ardmore, Pa.

John J. Verschoor, vice president, South Dakota Retailers, and director of South Dakota National Automobile Dealers Association, Mitchell, S. Dak.

P. M. Talbott, president, National Retail Dry Goods Association, Washington, D. C.

Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York City, and president, American Municipal Association.

Ray Teagarden, master, Kansas State Grange, LaCygne, Kans.

George B. Wallace, director, Oregon National Automobile Dealers Association, Portland, Oreg.

M. B. Terrey, president, American Brakeblok Division, American Brake Shoe Co., Detroit, Mich.

Martin W. Watson, owner, M. Watson General Construction, Topeka, Kans.

C. G. Titus, president, Titus Motor Co., Tacoma, Wash.

R. E. Weaver, president, National Sand & Gravel Association, Washington, D. C.

Ben West, mayor of Nashville, and chairman, committee on highways, American Municipal Association, Nashville, Tenn.

Mrs. Beulah Williams, chairman, midwest conference of women's divisions, chambers of commerce, St. Louis, Mo.

Mrs. Ashmead White, national chairman, Americanization Committee D. A. R., Bangor, Maine.

William L. Wilson, vice present, Universal CIT Credit Corp., New York, N. Y.

John Whickham, president, New York Good Roads Association, Albany, N. Y.

I. W. Wilson, president, Aluminum Company of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Will M. Whittington, former chairman, House Public Works Committee, Greenwood, Miss.

K. B. Woods, chairman, highway research board, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this bill is not perfect but I hope you all will listen attentively to the debate and recognize that we are endeavoring to at least make a start in the direction of an adequate highway bill which will be equitable and fair and certainly will save many fatalities, many accidents, many repair bills and many hours of time. I sincerely hope that this bill will pass this Congress by a large majority vote.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am exceedingly happy today to be on this floor with a highway bill before us. We in the Roads Subcommittee have been working on it for about a year and a half and I think we had about as much trouble as any committee ever had handling such controversial bills as this has been.

Last year we had not only the operational part of the bill but we also had the financial provisions to consider. As I look back I think we discriminated somewhat, although I did not think so at the time, because I voted for the bill. As a matter of fact, I believe we have to vote for almost any bill because the need is so great that we cannot let little squabbles, we cannot let little differences, interfere with the principal objective of getting this bill out.

I agree with what other members of this committee have said about our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. He is a man who does not especially like praise and most certainly does not seek it; he is a very modest person or I would have a lot more to say about his ability. We had our ups and downs in the committee, but I think it was because the members of the committee freely and candidly expressed themselves. That is what we are here for, if we are to properly represent the people of the Nation. I congratulate all members of the committee because I think on both sides they have done a magnificent job. I do not have to tell you that I may and do disagree a great many times, but when the final call comes, in whatever form the bill may be, I am going to vote for it. When there are more than 100 persons a day dying on the highways, some of them through almost criminal negligence, virtually murder, it is about time the Congress of the United States exercises the power it has, and that we as the Representatives in the Congress do something about the cause of this shameful carnage. There are being sent to the hospitals about a million and a half maimed human beings a year due to injuries received in highway accidents. That is something that should not occur. I am advised by the specialists, who are supposed to know and who do know, that a large percentage of these accidents will be eliminated when we get 4-, 6-, or 8-lane roads. Certainly there will be many less accidents when we get rid of these 9-foot lanes and instead install lanes of not less than 12-foot width. When we come to that time we are going to eliminate a great many accidents.

Aside from the cost in human lives there is an enormous money and property loss suffered by the American people every year as a result of our deteriorated highways. A conservative estimate contained in the report by our committee places that annual loss at a figure in excess of $4 billion. I have seen other estimates nearly twice as great as that, but we can be sure that the financial loss over the construction period authorized by this legislation would be more than double the amount we propose to invest in these better and more modern traffic arteries.

There is one highly essential feature in this legislation which I feel has been overlooked in some degree, due to the tendency to consider the legislation purely from the standpoint of dollars and of miles of road to be built. That has to do with the Nation's defense and the protection of the people of the country in event of all-out emergency such as war. I trust the day will never come when we will find it necessary to take the precautionary measures which this program is intended to implement, but I am sure that this Congress is taking a great forward step when it has the foresight to provide better and more adequate means for evacuation of our population from congested centers. In event for need of that evacuation I believe this legislation will be responsible for saving literally millions of lives.

We encountered serious difficulties and bottlenecks in transportation during World War II. Our defense effort and military potential were seriously handicapped. We were forced to resort to many makeshift transport plans because of our highway deficiencies. Failure to pass this legislation would put upon the Congress the responsibility for such widespread disaster as might engulf this Nation in event of another emergency of that kind. I, for one, want no part of such a failure to be ascribed to me. I am sure that every Member of this House feels the same way about it.

I feel that our committee has included in this bill some provisions which can be considered as necessary safeguards. We have provided that additional surveys shall be made at intervals and that the Congress shall be provided with proper information on which to base an intelligent and thorough reappraisal of this highway program. Of course, we do not have the authority that would foreclose to subsequent Congresses the right to make changes in either the construction program or the financing provisions. What we have done in this legislation is to make sure that during its period of authorization the Congress shall be kept informed to the end that proper adjustments or changes can be made. Every effort has been made to avoid what might be construed as any intention on our part to usurp the prerogatives of any future Congress.

We have, however, worked out what I believe will result in completion of the overall road-building program, which will do the necessary job of providing at least the minimum required highway facilities for the entire Nation. If there should be an oversight in any regard it can be corrected.

The groundwork for this modernization of our highway system was laid 40 years ago with the passage of the first Federal-aid highway legislation. Another forward step was taken in 1944 when Congress authorized the interstate system. Again in 1954 we made progress by providing the largest authorization for construction of interstate highways up to that time. This is still another giant stride—the greatest to date—in our Nation's highway progress.

I want to congratulate the Ways and Means Committee for the magnificent job it has done. Last year was the first time when in any committee on which I had ever served I was permitted to say something about taxes. Frankly, I do not want to have any more to say about that matter in committee again. I will leave that to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] who has been handling this so well during all of these years, and also to his associates on the Ways and Means Committee. I would make no suggestion about taxes, because practically everything I said I find was wrong. I think this bill should be passed

unanimously because the entire United States needs the bill. It is not 1 State—it is not 47 States—that needs this legislation, but all 48 States that need it. The quicker we get it passed, the earlier we get it to conference and get the conference report agreed to, the better off the people of this Nation will be.

We have been doing our highway building at such a slow rate that we are now about 20 years behind in the construction of roads when compared to other economic progress in this Nation. We are getting more powerful cars, they make greater speed, but they do not have very much space on the highways in which to perform. When this measure passes we can be very thankful that we have gotten out such a good bill. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] has told you, all the organizations that were in opposition to it last year now say there is no opposition on their part, in fact they favor the bill. That applies not only to the railroads but to the truckers, the American Automobile Association, and the farmers' organizations. I think the committee has done a reasonably good job. As a matter of fact, that is putting it rather mildly.

There are some features of this bill with which I do not agree, and probably I will vote for some amendments that are to be offered, but I am for the main portion of the bill and, whether the amendments are agreed to or lost, I shall vote for the bill. That is what I propose to do. I voted for it last year and I certainly am going to vote for it this year because this is a much better bill. Everyone is satisfied. The people I hear from who will pay the taxes tell me: We do not object to the taxes if you will put the money in roads.

That is where we are going to put all the money this time. So I think they will all be very happy about the whole matter. The thing to do is to get this program started as quickly as possible.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] mentioned an editorial which lauded the able work on this committee of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. That editorial, may I say, appeared not only in the one paper that the gentleman from Ohio mentioned, but was published in all Hearst newspapers from coast to coast, including those in my own State.

Mr. Chairman, the expanded highway bill now under consideration, if it becomes law, will launch on next July 1, only 60 days from now, the most gigantic and colossal public-works program ever undertaken in all the history of mankind. Even the enormous works programs of the Franklin Roosevelt era were pygmies compared to the gargantuan multibillion dollar public works undertakings that will be inaugurated by passage of this bill.

Passage of this bill will result in the entire 40,000 miles of the Nation's interstate highway system being built to perfection standards capable of adequately carrying the traffic of 1980. Most of this interstate highway mileage will be developed into four-lane divided highways. These four-lane divided highways will connect 90 percent of all the Nation's cities that have 50,000 or more inhabitants and will tie together 42 of the Nation's 48 State capitals.

When this interstate highway program is completed 13 years from now, the American motorist can travel from the Canadian border in northern Maine to the Mexican border south of San Diego, Calif., a distance of 4,500 miles, over four-lane divided highways on which traffic will not be interrupted by a single stop light or endangered by a single cross road. Everywhere there will be overpasses and underpasses to handle cross highway traffic and limited access roads to assure safety on the heavily traveled highways near cities. The motorist, when these highways are completed, can travel from the Canadian border in Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin or Michigan south to the Gulf of Mexico or the Mexican border over four-lane divided highways that have no cross roads or traffic lights.

The first benefit to the traveling public of this gigantic roads program will be a reduction of traffic accidents. Last year, 38,300 Americans, many of them children, were killed in traffic accidents and another 1,300,000 Americans were injured, some of them being permanently crippled. By 1965, because we will have 20 million more automobiles on our highways then than now, the experts say that the traffic death toll will increase to 50,000 a year and the injured to 2 million a year unless highways are improved.

Traffic experts told our committee that if the highways proposed in this bill were in use today, that at least 1 out of every 10 highway deaths and injuries would be prevented. If Congress builds the highways this bill proposes, Congress will save by 1965, according to highway safety engineers, not less than 5,000 lives a year and will save 200,000 persons a year from suffering injuries in highway accidents.

Also, the highways proposed in this bill will save motorists millions of dollars of excessive wear and tear on tires and motor equipment, other millions of expenditures for costly automobile repairs necessitated by collisions and also save millions now spent on hospital and medical bills.

Also, as better highways lessen the number of accidents, automobile insurance rates will come down and the motorist will save on his insurance premiums.

These savings will go a long ways to offsetting for motorists any additional taxes that will be imposed on them by this bill.

This bill, however, will provide other benefits than these I already have mentioned. Enactment of this bill will help to insure a long era of high employment for American workers and great prosperity for the Nation's people.

Under this bill, the Federal Government will spend $25 billion more on highway construction during the next 13 years than would be spent at the present rate of Federal highway spending.

Think of the impact on employment and prosperity this additional spending of $2 billion a year is certain to have. For one thing, this spending will provide full-time employment to an additional 200,000 highway workers throughout the next 13-year period. In short, there are 200,000 new jobs in this bill for the construction workers of America. When working people are fully employed at good wages the Nation as a whole is prosperous.

The placing of the $25 billion of increased spending power in this bill in the hands of the President in itself will help create that assurance of full employment and confidence in the future of America that is essential to continue prosperity.

Enactment of this bill will not only provide the Nation with more, wider, better, and safer highways; enactment of this bill, also, will assure continuance of the present high level of employment and general prosperity.

Mark Twain once said, "Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it." That statement, aptly, can be applied to roads. Everybody has talked for years about the need for more, better, and safer highways but nobody until now has done much about it. Our roads, all experts are agreed, have been wearing out faster than they have been rebuilt. They still are.

Until President Eisenhower entered the White House a little over 3 years ago, discussions of road-building programs were largely a procedure employed by politicians to levy more taxes on highway users without providing these highway users much improvement in roads to compensate them for these extra taxes they were compelled to pay.

During the 10 years prior to the Eisenhower administration, our Federal Government collected, on the average, more than two billion dollars a year in taxes from highway users but never spent, in any year, more than $550 million for highway construction.

In short, every time our Federal Government collected $4 from motorists in motor-vehicle taxes levied, and levied on them exclusively, it spent only 1 of those 4 tax dollars on highway construction. Of each $2 billion collected each year in highway-user taxes, about one and one-half billion were spent for other things than building roads, including foreign aid programs.

Now, at long last, President Eisenhower has laid down a new, long overdue highway policy which says motorists will receive more roads for their tax dollars.

The general provisions in this bill, with some minor modifications, are those proposed to Congress 15 months ago by the Clay Commission report and by President Eisenhower in his highway message to the Congress. This is President Eisenhower's program which we are discussing today in debating this bill.

If this bill is passed by the Senate and the House and becomes law, I believe the highway construction program inaugurated will be regarded in future years as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, achievements of Congress in half a century.

Five years from now when the Eisenhower administration has completed its

second term and become past history, historians looking backward to the Eisenhower era will refer to this highway bill, I am sure, as one of the three greatest achievements of the Eisenhower administration. The other two great Eisenhower administration achievements, of course, will be his having kept our Nation out of war and at peace, and his having provided the American people with the greatest era of prosperity in the history of our Nation.

There are provisions in this bill I do not like. On the whole, however, it is a good bill and should, with reasonable amendments, be adopted.

President Eisenhower did not propose the tax provisions which are in this bill. He proposed that the highway construction authorized by this legislation should be completed in 10 years and financed by a bond issue that would be paid off in 30 years, by earmarking all present and future revenues from the present 2-cent-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax for use in bond retirement. Thus, under the Eisenhower bond proposal, the highway program would be carried out without any increase in present Federal highway user taxes.

Cabinet members indicated to our committee that the President would veto any highway bill that did not carry with it a plan for financing the roads program proposed. The financing could be done acceptably, the Cabinet members indicated, either by the President's bond issue plan without additional taxes or if not by a bond issue then by the levying of new and additional taxes.

The President's Cabinet members indicated that the President believed the bond issue to be the better of the two financing ways suggested.

The choice between the bonding plan and the levying of new and additional taxes came to a vote in the House of Representatives last year. The Democrats, by almost unanimous vote of the House Members of their party, rejected the President's bonding plan and insisted that the program be financed by new and additional taxes levied on highway users.

I, personally, believe that the President's bonding plan is the better way to finance this expanded highway program. Most Republicans feel about this as I do. But, we are confronted with a condition not a theory. The Democrats have said, in effect, that the House must vote for new and additional taxes of about $850 million a year on motor users or there will be no highway bill at this session of Congress. They, the Democrats, have the votes to carry out this threat.

If we want this highway program enacted now, and most of us do, we Republicans must vote for these new and additional Democratic taxes even if we do not like them or otherwise there will be no highway bill this year.

I, like many of my Republican friends, do not like to vote for these new and additional taxes. I do not think these additional taxes are necessary. However, if I and others do not vote for these new and additional taxes, there will be no highway bill this year and the 40,000 deaths and about 1,500,000 bodily injury cases which are occurring annually on our highways will continue unreduced.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am very much interested in this tax proposal. The gentleman says that for the past 10 years only $1 in $4 of taxes collected were dedicated to road building; is that correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How does this bill change that situation? How much more money will go into roads, money that is collected in taxes?

Mr. MACK of Washington. There will be approximately $850 million a year derived from the additional taxes in this bill. This all will be spent on this expanded highway program.

I should like to say this. We are up against a condition and not a theory. The members of the Cabinet indicated that the President will veto a highway bill unless it has tax provisions or a bond issue to provide for financing this roads program. Unless Congress passes a bill that has either a bond issue financing plan or a tax financing plan Congress will not get a highway bill that the President will sign. On the other hand, the majority party has indicated it will not approve the bond plan of financing. Therefore we are confronted here today with the question, Shall we vote new and additional taxes or shall we abandon this proposed highway program?

Mr. GROSS. My question is this. How much more than $1 in $4 will go into this program?

Mr. MACK of Washington. All of the gasoline and diesel fuel tax money, as well as the increased taxes to be derived from a 1-cent increase in the taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, will go into a trust fund to pay for the new highways as built.

Also receipts from the proposed 3-cent-a-pound increase in the tax on tires and the 3-cent-a-pound tax on camelback will go into this highway trust fund. Also, into the fund will go the revenues from the weight tax on heavy trucks, above 26,000 pounds, and the additional 2-percent excise tax on the wholesale price of trucks.

All of the money derived from the present 10-percent excise tax on new automobiles, from the present 8-percent excise tax on new trucks, and from the present 5-cent-a-pound tax on rubber will go, as heretofore, into the General Treasury, not into the highway trust fund. The motorists still under this bill will be paying huge sums of tax money that will not go into highway construction.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that this highway bill provides for the greatest public-works program in the history of mankind, and is so vast as to baffle the imagination of man. The interstate highway funds which will be spent in the 11 Western States during the next 12 years under this bill total $4,883,078,000. Here is what each of the 11 States will receive during this 12-year period:

Arizona	$223,435,000
California	2,477,535,000
Colorado	166,327,000
Idaho	114,195,000
Montana	163,845,000
Nevada	79,440,000
New Mexico	250,732,000
Oregon	340,103,000
Utah	253,215,000
Washington	498,983,000
Wyoming	315,278,000

At the present time, Washington State is receiving slightly less than $13 million a year in Federal highway grant money. Under the bill we are now considering, Washington State will be allocated more than $30 million a year during the next 2 years and about $40 million a year by 5 years from now in place of the present $13 million a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] such time as he may require.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I advocated a Federal highway program when I first came to Congress in 1951.

I have been for such a program ever since. It was apparent then as it is now to anyone driving over the highways of the country that there are serious inadequacies and deficiencies.

This has been piling up to such an extent that in 1954 Congress increased Federal aid for highway construction to the largest total in history.

There are several provisions in this bill which will expedite the highway building program to help remove some of the bottlenecks. In the first place the interstate funds authorized for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 are to be given to the State immediately upon enactment of this act. The apportionment of the same funds for fiscal 1959 through 1969 are to be made as far in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year but not more than 18 months prior thereto. This is a far-seeing move which will help a great deal.

In the second place the advance acquisition of rights-of-way is essential and in the public interest. This will also allow the lands to be acquired at the most reasonable cost. Past experience indicates that delay in acquisition always results in much higher acquisition costs. A provision is included in this bill authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to make available any of the Federal aid system funds, including the interstate funds, for the reimbursement of the cost of such acquisitions, providing that actual construction follows within 5 years.

Thirdly, a provision has also been included whereby funds may be advanced to the States to finance the acquisition of rights-of-way as well as the cost of construction as it proceeds.

I could hardly believe the report of the National Safety Council's estimate

that 42,000 people will be killed this year in traffic accidents in the United States. Also there will be approximately 1½ million who will be injured or crippled. The economic costs last year were almost $5 billion which included wage loss, medical expense, property damage, and the cost of insurance.

It is almost an assured fact that a great reduction can be made percentagewise in the number of traffic accidents in a year, once the Federal highway system is fully instituted.

We are rapidly entering a full atomic age. All of us hope there will never be a world war III, but if such an event does occur it would be possible for an enemy to knock out our major railroad centers. Our only possibility of getting troops and materiel from one part of the country to the other would be by fast highway express such as is planned in this bill. The building of this Federal highway program will seriously relieve this one major deficiency in our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, for all of these reasons this bill is not only one which we can all support, but it is definitely in the national interests.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HENDERSON] such time as he may require.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, America is driving modern motor cars on antiquated roads. No matter how safe the manufacturer constructs a vehicle, accidents caused by poor roads and narrow bridges and blind alleys and dangerous intersections will continue to take an appalling toll of lives. People at home have clamored for a better system of roads and the local, State and Federal Governments have been tardy in responding to that clamor. The day of reckoning has come. The point has been reached where the effectiveness of any developments in motor vehicles, their features of comfort, safety, power, and beauty can contribute little to the future of vehicular transportation until an adequate system of roads is built. The responsibility for building roads has been recognized traditionally to assume a local, a State, and a Federal character.

There are some features of the legislation before this Congress today which leave unanswered questions. Representing the southeastern part of Ohio as Congressman for the 15th District, I am most hopeful that this legislation, if enacted, will be beneficial to that district, that it will provide for improved and safer roads in the hilly country of rural Ohio as well as in the flatlands of that great State, that it will connect the hamlets and villages which I represent, as well as the metropolitan areas further to the north and to the west of my district.

It will be the responsibility and the duty of the people of my district to pay a proportionate share for the roads provided by this bill. As they drive their cars, as they purchase gasoline and tires, the additional taxes added to their purchases by the provisions of this legislation will be used for the building of roads in America. I want to see that the people of southeastern Ohio benefit to as great an extent as possible from the expenditure of their tax dollars. The thought has come to my mind many times that a Federal highway program exacts far more from the people of the State of Ohio than does a State highway program. But I recognize also that we are not a single State, that our commerce, which has caused our factories and industries to prosper, is not confined within our borders as a sovereign State, but rather is conducted with the other States of the Union. Ohio, because of its position along the natural traffic routes between the east coast and the west coast, has gained industrywise with the flow of traffic through the State.

I have listened to my colleagues here on the floor point out the areas of agreement and the areas of disagreement in this legislation, and the need which they found for compromise and adjustment. They have brought to the floor after months of study a highway bill which, in their opinion, will best meet the needs of all America. I regret that in this era of high taxes and expensive government, that in order to finance this measure it is necessary to increase the tax on gasoline and other vehicles, as well as upon tires and retread material.

Quite recently I conducted a poll of the people of my 15th District of Ohio. One of the questions was this:

> Do you favor increased Federal aid for new highways financed by increased taxes (on gasoline, tires, etc.) for highway users?

To that question I received 4,229 responses and of those responses, 2,377 voted in the affirmative, which is a percentage of 56.2 percent.

The bill before us is probably the only type of legislation which can be successfully enacted in this Congress. Congress has many diverse points of views. Some are economic while others are political. Both seem to have been at work here.

The financing of this broad program has been the point of controversy which defeated our efforts last year. The committees which considered this bill have now recommended that the burden of cost should be applied in accordance with the extent of the use of our road system. Undeniably, this will result in an increase in taxation on those items which are directly required by highway users.

The plan which had been advanced by the administration had geared highway costs to our national economy rather than to a strict formula of use. The financing would have come from a growing America which it is hoped will continue to receive governmental revenue in excess of its expenditures as we seek to economize in other fields. This would have been accomplished because of increased productivity which will provide for more tax revenue. Thus, the plan envisioned not higher and additional taxes, but simply more tax revenues.

The majority party has seen fit to insist that additional taxes be levied in accordance with the amount of fuel used when the administration's measure would not have disturbed the established tax pattern. If we are to have a highway program this year, it seems, we must abide by the Democrat determination to have a new tax as well.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries forward the traditional and historic authorization for the construction of the so-called ABC roads, or farm-to-market roads, the urban roads and the primary system. In addition, it carries the largest authorization yet made for the Interstate System of roads which were the result of the 1944 Road Act. That Road Act recognized a new principle in road construction and a new philosophy. It recognized that we must have a network of highways that were adequate to be implemented with the continental defense program.

We authorized in a subsequent act a designated network of 40,000 miles of roads which would carry approximately 14 percent of all the traffic. Since that authorization, we have seen the number of vehicles increase by leaps and bounds until at the present time we have 55 million vehicles. We are increasing that number at the rate of 3 million per year. So it has become an acute problem; acute not only for the orderly flow of traffic, but acute also for the defense need. Indeed, it becomes a matter of necessity that the Federal Government devote large sums of money to aid the States in the construction of highways that would conneet the principal large, metropolitan centers of population, one with the other.

Some of you, I am quite sure, are apprehensive in view of the fact that there is an authorization of 40,000 miles of road. Under the act of 1954 we authorized for the first time $175 million to accelerate and to encourage the States to make the matching on a 50–50 basis on their Interstate System. As a result of the construction by the States of the Interstate System either by toll roads or freeways the total mileage has been reduced under this bill to 34,500 miles, but we are hopeful, since the road bill is a biennial matter, that we will take into account the experience of the Bureau of Public Roads with other roads acts, together with what they have done in the preceding 2 years, in trying to rectify any mishaps that may come either with the law or the administration of the law.

I think this bill is a vast improvement over the bill that you had for consideration last year and which you rejected, not only with regard to the highway provisions but also the financing section of the bill. I see no major objections to the bill. We have had our differences in the committee but I think those differences are at the threshold of being resolved.

Let me call your attention to one section of the bill that has been a source of great controversy and misunderstanding. That is section 113, relating to the cost of relocating utilities. A number of Members have talked to me

about the small utilities, about the reimbursement by the Federal Government.

I hope you will keep this in mind. There are some 20 States in the Union that have statutes that provide that if a utility or utilities occupy the public thoroughfare they do so without cost to themselves and, in the event there is need for enlargement of the highway that will require the utilities to remove their poles and other appurtenances remaining on the highway they will do it at their own expense.

There are five additional States that have statutes that are silent as to whether or not the utilities will pay the relocation cost, but in each of those States the State supreme court has held that under the common law the utilities were bound to pay the relocation cost.

The remaining States of the Union up to a total of 42 States provide that the occupancy of the highway by a public utility must be a matter of contract between the State and the utility, and in each instance the burden is on the utility to pay any relocation cost made necessary by enlargement of the highway. The remaining 6 States in the Union have situations either by contract or by agreement. That is the situation we find ourselves in.

Let us not forget that under the existing law and the policy of the administration, both this administration and past administrations, the States may reimburse the utilities for relocation costs, and if that is a proper charge to be participated in by the States, the Federal Government can put up its share of the money. That is existing law and the practice and policy of matching State funds for relocation.

In the fiscal years 1949 through 1953, the Federal Government has expended to reimburse the States the sum total of only $652,000. The problem raised in section 113 we hope will be resolved by an amendment which I expect to offer tomorrow which will leave the question remaining with the State. It will provide that the State statutes will not be violated by the provisions of section 113, nor would that section place in jeopardy the contracts that the States presently have with the utilities. I am quite sure that every member of the committee wants to preserve the integrity and sovereignty of the States and leave it up to them to resolve this question rather than to defer it to us to write in every possible contingency that may be expected from every quarter with reference to the problems that may arise in the relocation of utilities.

That leaves only one outstanding controversial problem, as I understand it, and that is the provision of the Bacon-Davis Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. If the amendment, which you say you are going to introduce, is adopted, then, as I understand it, you will favor the present section as written.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, because I think that will clarify the situation and permit the States to carry out the practices they think are necessary, wise, or prudent rather than defer the problem for us to settle here. Also, let me remind you once again, the Federal Governmnet does not construct any highways. This bill is an assistance or aid program to the States. The States can either elect to build roads under the provisions of this law or they can reject them. I hope we do not do violence to the authority of the State to exercise its own discretion in this matter—which history has proven under existing law is a wise provision of the law. There have been no complaints raised against the administration of the act nor of its application. So I think that the experience of the Bureau of Public Roads is sufficient evidence to demonstrate to us that it is a field which we should not invade.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama, and I wish to make public the statement that he has sincerely endeavored to compromise whatever differences and misunderstandings have arisen relative to this particular section. I am sure he will agree with us that it was certainly never the intent of anyone to take away from the States that which belongs to them. I am certain that the amendment which the gentleman intends to offer will provide for a continuation of the program that is now the practice and certainly will preserve to the States the rights which they now have.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is my objective, and I assure the gentleman the amendment which I am going to offer will further that purpose.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the bill we have before us today is truly a bipartisan approach to the biggest problem that has ever confronted our country. I could well say, as others have, that in this committee which has considered the legislation for the past 2 years we have had many very vexatious situations confront us. But we have a chairman who has a great deal of tolerance. He bided his time until finally we come to you with a bill which I believe can stand the test of time and do the job which has been needed so much in this country for many years.

Our highway construction was practically brought to a standstill during World War II, and has never been able to build up again the proper momentum necessary to keep up with the increased automobile traffic on our highways. It has been said that we are not only building highways but we are protecting the lives of our people. Thousands of people are being killed on our highways every year. Untold billions of dollars of damage are being wrought on property through various types of losses, that run into a figure at least as large as the cost of the projects, over a period of years. I believe that we should look again at our local situations, as it will reflect itself in construction in our various States, because the cost of the interstate highway system as such only amounts to about one-half of the money which will be expended over the next 13 years in highway construction. All of the highways now in the interstate system, being built with State and Federal matching funds, will be shifted to the cost of this interstate program, making available to the States all of their own gas-tax money for highway construction. In my State of California, 40 percent of all the taxes collected from gasoline are now being expended on interstate highways. This money will be released to be expended on primary, secondary, and urban highways.

I believe we have brought to you a bill which you can support. I know there are two controversial subjects in the bill which more than likely will precipitate amendments on the floor. However, I would recommend that we stay with our guns and accept the bill as the committee has recommended.

Mr. Chairman, we are today considering H. R. 10660, which is the result of long study by the Public Works Committee of the House. Last year this committee was given the responsibility of passing an authorization bill and providing for the financing of the program. The bill we have before us today is in two parts. Title 1 adopted by the Public Works Committee, carries the authorizing program and title 2, which was passed unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, provides for the funds to carry out this program.

HIGHWAYS INADEQUATE

There are two basic facts which are recognized and agreed upon by all concerned. First, the whole economy of the United States is directly dependent upon motor-vehicle transportation. Secondly, we are failing to keep our highway systems adequate to meet our needs and the backlog of deficiencies required to be overcome has been and is constantly piling up at an alarming degree. Unless drastic steps are taken immediately, we will fall further and further behind and traffic jams will soon stagnate our growing economy.

Our committee believes that H. R. 10660 represents the best immediate step which can be taken by Congress to solve the highway problem on a pay-as-you-go basis which should not result in increasing the national debt. It is the result of the combined ideas of the members after considering carefully various solutions which were proposed to the committee. It is believed to be a workable program and sound in all respects.

STUDY DIRECTED IN 1954

In 1954 Congress was conscious that the Nation's highway problem was reaching gigantic proportions. As a result the Public Works Committee, on which I am privileged to serve, authorized expenditure of an amount equal to all funds collected from highway users.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 increased Federal aid to the largest sums in history and the Secretary of Commerce was directed, in section 13 of that

act to prepare a study of all highway needs. The President likewise recognized the problem as did the governors of the States at the governors conference at Bolton Landing, N. Y., in July of 1954 when the President directed attention to the problem and, subsequently, took a further step by appointment of an Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. This special committee submitted its report in January 1955, entitled "A Ten-Year National Highway Program," House Document No. 93, 84th Congress.

LOSS TO LIFE AND PROPERTY

Highway construction was greatly curtailed during World War II and subsequently has not progressed in accordance with motor vehicle registration. In 1946 there were 34 million vehicles registered in the United States. Today there are 62 million and it is anticipated within 10 years the registration will reach 85 million. It is imperative that legislation such as we here present be enacted. Highway accidents are claiming 100 lives daily and 3,000 people are being injured every day on our highways.

The National Safety Council reported deaths in February 1956 at 2,630, an increase of 16 percent over the same month a year ago. Deaths continue to increase and from a previous peak of 39,969 fatalities, it is expected that 42,000 people will be killed during the present year. Approximately another 1½ million will be crippled. The economic loss from highway accidents is approaching $5 billion a year and is broken down as follows:

Wage loss	$1,250,000,000
Medical expense	100,000,000
Property damage	1,600,000,000
Overhead cost of insurance (not claims)	1,400,000,000

Good, safe highways will eliminate a great portion of this loss.

INCREASED ALLOCATIONS

The construction of primary, secondary, and urban highways will be greatly accelerated. House bill 10660 provides for an increase of $25 million in present authorizations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957 and additional increases of $25 million for fiscal 1958 and 1959 allocated at the prevailing matching basis ratio of, namely, 45 percent for the primary system, 30 percent for the secondary, and 25 percent for the extensions of these systems within urban areas. For instance, the amount of money that will be allocated to California under this proposal for fiscal 1957 and 1958 will be $41,485,000. Moneys provided for the interstate system will amount to $271,955,000 for the same fiscal years, making a grand total of Federal funds that would go to California for fiscal years 1957 and 1958 of $313,440,000.

The previous law has provided there may be transfers from 1 of the 3 categories, primary, secondary, and urban highways, where such transfer is necessary. The committee has seen fit to increase this to 20 percent, which will give more flexibility to the highway commissions of the various States to more efficiently cope with the highway needs.

FOREST ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

We gave particular attention to the forest highways and roads and trails. Federal highway forest funds are increased from $22½ million to $25 million annually, and the forest-development roads and trails have a corresponding increase from $24 million to $27 million a year. This will encourage development on roads for facilities to further tap our natural resources. Funds have been increased for our parkways and other public highways.

EMERGENCY DISASTER FUNDS

Of great interest to the areas that were stricken by floods throughout the United States, the emergency funds for highway damage resulting from disaster have been increased from $10 million a year to $30 million. The funds will be appropriated annually and allocated to the States on a 50–50 basis for disaster relief.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

This bill authorizes completion of the 40,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The interstate system is the backbone of our Nation's highways. It comprises routes of greatest importance to the economy and welfare of our country in that it connects 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all cities over 50,000 in population. While it only represents 1.2 percent of the total road mileage in the United States, it will carry 20 percent of the Nation's traffic load.

This is a long-range planning program. The construction will extend over a period of 13 years and is expected to cost $24,825,000,000. This is the largest public works program that has ever been developed and more than likely will be the largest program of its type. It will be started immediately upon the passage of the legislation. It is expected that in the fiscal years 1957 and 1958 there will be expended on the interstate system in California $271,955,000. The law also provides that load limits will be restricted so that the highways will be protected from unnecessary overloading.

There is a provision in the bill which provides for the reimbursement to States for highways and toll roads constructed subsequent to August 2, 1947. A 2-year study will be necessary, at which time the recommendations will be made to Congress.

DAVIS-BACON ACT

There are two provisions in the bill that may cause controversy, but I believe that the committee has developed recommendations which should be supported. One of these is section 108, containing the provision of the Davis-Bacon Act that wages shall not be less than the prevailing wage of similar construction in the immediate locality. The provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act now apply to contracts for schools, hospitals, housing and airport projects constructed with Federal aid funds.

UTILITY RELOCATION

The other provision in conflict was the relocation of utilities as the result of highway projects. These utilities, both privately and publicly owned, serve the general public. Under the provisions of this act, the State authorities will be privileged to reimburse, in accordance with their own agreements, a portion of the cost of removing and relocating the utilities such as water, sewer, telephone and power lines.

In the State of California we have for years assisted in the relocation of utilities along our highways.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Last year the highway bill was defeated, largely because of the matter of financing. This year I believe we have developed a bill which is reasonable and well thought out and one which will meet the challenge of our increasing population.

The proposed tax increases on highway users are minor compared to the overall benefits which will be derived.

An important section of title II, the revenue portion, specifies that all moneys collected under this act shall be placed in a highway trust fund and be expended only on highway development.

GREATEST PEACETIME PROGRAM

This bill represents the cross section of thinking of the most interested groups in our country. It is the result of many weeks and months of study and consideration of testimony.

The committee has recognized that there must be honest and efficient administration of the program. I personally feel that with such administration we can go forward with the greatest peacetime highway program ever undertaken.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a consent request.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, while I am committed to support this legislation in almost any form in which it may develop before passage, I am in hearty disagreement with many phases of the bill which is before the House. It seems to me that the bill represents just about all of the interests of the various lobby groups which are affected by this legislation.

MAXIMUM AXLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

Subsection (j) of section 108 in the bill provides that no authorized funds shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the interstate system may lawfully be used by vehicles with weight in excess of 18,000 pounds carried on any one axle, or with a tandem axle weight in excess of 32,000 pounds, or the maximum corresponding axle weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws or regulations established by appropriate State authority in effect on July 1, 1956, whichever is the greater. This section in effect supersedes the authority of any State to provide for a lesser maximum axle weight limitation.

This legislation also fails to place any limitation upon overall width or length of trucking equipment on the interstate

highway system. While it is worded in the nature of a limitation I am seriously afraid that the purpose of this language is to provide an authority. There is nothing in this section which limits the number of axles which may lawfully be used by vehicles, the only requirement being that the weight on one axle must not exceed 18,000 pounds.

I appreciate the plight of the trucking industry and its effort to bring about a standardization of road use laws throughout the Nation. In my judgment, standardization, even if in the form of limitation, would be useful to the entire industry. It seems to me, however, that this subject should be covered by comprehensive legislation on the trucking use of the highways of the interstate system.

DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTION

The definition of the term "construction" in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 by adding after the language "cost of rights-of-way" the following language: "cost of relocation of building tenants, cost of demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites" create new and costly elements of damage heretofore limited in the term "cost of rights-of-way."

At the present time the cost of rights-of-way include most of these elements in accordance with the laws of the several States. The insertion of the language in question gives to persons seeking damages for condemnation elements of damage which go far beyond established concepts on the cost of rights-of-way, providing the owner of such property with the cost of demolition or the cost of moving his building to another location including a new site. This legislation goes so far as to give to the tenant of a room in an appropriated building a cause of action based upon the cost of his finding a room elsewhere. The language in question would impose severe and tremendous added costs to the already high cost of rights-of-way acquisition. It seems to me that while the language may be very useful in several urban communities including my own city, the overall effect would be very harmful in that it would supplement the Eminent Domain law of the several States with new causes for claim and new standards for evaluating damage resulting from rights-of-way acquisition.

LIMITED USE OF RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Section 115 very properly provides that all agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the interstate system shall contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary of Commerce in the plans for such project. This language is properly designed to protect the development of a limited access system.

However, in the second sentence of section 115 this language is almost completely abrogated by the following language:

Such agreements shall also contain provisions to insure that the users of the Interstate System will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways in such system, and such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments for serving motor vehicle users to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System.

The second part of this sentence is very satisfactory, eliminating automotive service stations or other commercial establishments from the rights-of-way. The ostensible purpose of the first part of this sentence is to preclude a State from setting up a monopoly system of service along the Interstate System of Highways. While I have no disagreement with the ostensible purpose of this provision, it seems to me that the insertion of this language providing that the users of the system will receive the benefits of free competition at or adjacent to highways in such system, defeats the purpose of the first sentence of that section which seeks to establish limited access highways.

It would seem to me that it would be in the interest of sound legislation if the Interstate Highway System provided for under this act were planned as a limited access highway in its entirety. With the language of the second sentence of section 115 in the bill, it is entirely possible that fee holders of property adjacent to the highway right-of-way will develop billions of access points to the highway and therefore defeat its purpose as a free-moving artery.

In acquiring highway rights-of-way, it should be provided by law that when a portion of a parcel of property is purchased, the purchase agreement should include the purchase of reservations on the remainder of the property, that portion which will abut or remain adjacent to the highways to restrict its use for agricultural or noncommercial purposes and with the specific reservation that it shall not have access to the new interstate highway. For further protection, the State should be compelled to provide firm zoning authority by local political subdivisions during which interstate highways may pass providing that the area shall be zoned against all forms of business or local enterprise which would acquire access to the highways or derive business therefrom. Otherwise, we will build new interstate highways which will have the ultimate fate of Highway No. 1 from Richmond to Baltimore—a maze of neon and other distracting highway nuisances.

There is a definite relationship between good highway construction and zoning. A beautiful broad new highway built at tremendous expense can end up as a local business street with drive-in markets, supermarkets, drive-in theaters and hot dog stands. It seems ridiculous for the State to buy land for highway improvement at gravel-pit and oil-land prices only to have the abutting owner reap a harvest by selling or renting his land to businesses which desire to locate along the highway. While I do not believe that local zoning authorities should lose control over the zoning of lands adjacent to the roads of the highway system, I feel that it would be a very desirable exercise of legislative power to make the granting of funds contingent upon restrictions being made on the use of land abutting or adjoining the land of the Interstate Highway System which will provide that such land shall not be used in conflict with the purpose of the free-moving highway. This type of legislation would permit State highway departments to bypass urban communities with an assurance that a new community will not grow up along the new highway. It would serve the highway program well to provide for the purchase of covenants by the owners of highway abutting real estate to insure that no business or commercial use will be made of the abutting land as well as any other use which may be adverse or nonconforming to the free and uninterrupted use of the highway.

If local retail business and commercial establishments will find their way into the new and improved Interstate Highway System, traffic lights and access points which will be established will be far more hazardous than intersecting highways. This legislation should strongly state that the purpose of the Interstate Highway System is to principally transport people. Let the highway traveler turn off of the interstate system if he requires food, motor-vehicle service, lodging or Stuckey's pecans. The finest example of a preserved limited-access highway that I know of is the Queen's Highway, which extends from the Buffalo Peace Bridge to the city of Toronto. The only business activity permitted on this highway is the sale of agricultural products at stands established at regular points and several motor-fuel areas.

Another great advantage in limiting the use of land abutting or adjacent to the use and access of the Interstate Highway System is that it will keep the value of such adjacent or abutting land at a low valuation in the event additional lanes of highway must be established and additional rights-of-way land must be acquired. There is a definite connection between the nature of the zoning along the highway right-of-way, the extension of the limited-access principle and the success of this entire program.

In most of the larger urban communities, there are current drives to provide adequate low-cost housing, clear the slums, and provide urban redevelopment as well as off-street parking. Several separate agencies are condemning and acquiring land for their specialized purposes. In the acquisition of the land or right-of-way through cities, it would seem to be in the interest of efficiency that a sense of coordination be developed between the several land acquisitions involved—that there be some linking together of these efforts so that in a single sweep, the land or right-of-way be simultaneously acquired for as many of these purposes as practicable. This will permit a planned redesign of the city with a single relocation of utility facilities and functions which have to be moved. There is a definite relationship between planning for highways and planning for slum clearance, for off-street parking, and urban redevelopment. These relationships must be recognized.

RELOCATION OF UTILITY FACILITIES

Perhaps the most objectionable language in the bill as recommended out of committee is the language which makes Federal funds available for reimbursement for the relocation of utility facilities. This language is in the nature of a gift of Federal funds to the private and a few public utilities in America.

The public utilities generally use the highway right-of-way without cost and therefore receive a considerable subsidy from the public. If it were not for the public-utility use of highway rights-of-way, they would be compelled to buy rights-of-way along their surface transmission lines. In addition, by constructing their facilities along highway rights-of-way, they are provided at public expense with access roads which permit them to service and maintain their utility facilities. The utilities in many instances will receive great benefit in the relocation of their transmission facilities along highway rights-of-way necessitated by highway improvement. Why should the highway user assume the added cost of relocating their facilities?

Most public utilities operate on a cost-plus basis and are permitted to charge utility rates based upon the cost of operation, and in many cases the reproduction new cost of their facilities which may be many times the cost of their original investment. The highway user group is not always the same as the utility user group. The effect of these provisions would be to charge the highway user of 47 other States for the relocation of a utility in one State. Furthermore, there are highway users who may derive no benefit whatsoever from the relocation of public utilities along the public highway system.

There is an even more important objection against this legislation. This language would create pressure for new and unseen obligations on the part of all governments throughout the country to assume all costs of utility relocations, and the burden may ultimately become billions of dollars.

After a diligent search of the testimony before the House committee on this legislation this year, I failed to find any testimony which supports the inclusion of the language to make Federal funds available to the States for the relocation of utility facilities. In a question which I addressed to my distinguished colleague from the State of Ohio, Hon. CLARENCE BROWN, this afternoon on the cost in dollars of relocation of utility facilities, his reply was "not more than 1 percent." It is my judgment that the cost may be closer to 10 percent and that with the inclusion of this language, the highway construction program may result in a $41 billion program instead of a $51½ billion program. It stands to reason that whatever funds are not dissipated for this purpose will be available for more extensive highway construction and reconstruction, and the removal of this language from the bill would provide for more highways by at least 10 percent. The utilities of America have done a pretty good job of looking out for themselves and this legislation is no exception.

I hope that before this committee concludes its work, this bill will be made more palatable.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today is, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, an authorization for contractual obligations that will have to be honored by the Congress for the largest public-works program in the history of the United States, and presumably in the history of the world. It is the largest authorization of expenditure ever approved by the Congress other than military appropriations.

I think there is nothing at all improper in the time that has been devoted by this Congress to the very serious study of this issue, especially in view of the enormous expenditure involved.

The major effort in the 1st session of the 84th Congress was to determine the feasibility of the plan submitted by the President of the United States, the so-called bond plan for highway construction. That plan was rejected. An alternative plan was submitted to the House at that time, but because it was thrust upon us so quickly without sufficient opportunity to consider all of its ramifications is was also rejected by the House last year.

I think the bill we have before us today makes it clear that the House was wise in rejecting the bill last year, because the current bill contains many decided improvements over the 1954 bill that came to a final vote in the House.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

The most important improvement is the greater control of the funds and the allocations under the present bill. We have a better understanding of the control the Congress will be able to exercise.

Our hearings this year made it clear that the allocations as submitted in the so-called Clay plan could not be relied on as accurate; that there were some major errors involved and that if we had passed the plan submitted to us last year we would have been tied down to those errors and would have had a hard job extricating ourselves from the trouble.

The pending bill provides that the allocations to the States of approximately $25 billion for the interstate road program will be restudied and resubmitted to the Congress on or about the first of January 1958. They will not go into effect until they have been submitted and affirmatively approved by the Committee on Public Works.

There is no question in my mind that there will be some major corrections in some of these allocations as a result of this resurvey.

The bill provides also that new estimates must be submitted twice more at 4-year intervals, in 1962 and in 1966.

We will have a continuing check upon the way the program works.

I could elaborate on the necessity for these checks and the greater control that Congress should take over the workings of the program, but I think that what I have already outlined gives a clear picture of the improvement this bill presents in comparison with the previous program.

OTHER IMPROVEMENTS

There are other improvements not quite as important: There is a better allocation, for instance, for forest roads, and trails, and highways that will help the long-range program in that field.

I think we have in this bill resolved the issue with regard to utility reimbursement that has been debated to some extent. We are approaching a solution to this program that I believe will satisfy those who have participated in the discussion of the issue, both for or against reimbursement authorization.

Then, too, in the discussion we have heard reference to the application of the Bacon-Davis law. Certain Members who have spoken on this point seem to be of the opinion that the application of the Davis-Bacon Act as provided in the bill before us is a complete and blanket authority along the lines as that act now applies in connection with other Federal construction today. The debate on that amendment when it is offered will, I believe, clarify the situation. It will make clear the restrictions that have been put in to take care of the various situations. The debate will show that the proposed substitute for the Davis-Bacon Act which it has been indicated will be offered by some of my colleagues involves some very dangerous precedents for our States that are not at present engaged in wage fixing operations and it would, I think, be more violative of the principles of States rights than the present Davis-Bacon Act.

SHORTCOMINGS

This overall road program that we have provided in this bill does have some major defects. For instance, there is too much emphasis on the immediate application of an interstate system with a tendency to hold back the development of primary and secondary roads that should, in my opinion, go hand-in-hand with the interstate system. Unfortunately, my views of that particular point did not prevail. I will continue to try to work for greater emphasis on primary and secondary roads. For the time being we have to make a start under the best agreement that can be worked out.

I hope that we will not accept the idea that the authorization of this program as contained in the bill before us solves all of our highway problems. It is a major step in that direction, but it is by no means a permanent solution. Some three-quarters of the traffic of the country today will be on roads that are not a part of the interstate system. Perhaps the percentage is more than that. Those highway users will get some major benefits from this bill, but I do not think they get the proper attention from the Congress in the way of an accelerated road program that they should. Therefore, 2 years from now when we come to reconsider and renew the Federal aid program for primary, urban, and secondary roads, I hope that we can make some changes in that program which will help accelerate the type of road program that is needed to complement our interstate system. The interstate system will at

that time be just beginning, so far as construction is concerned.

I want to express my appreciation for the good work of all of the members of the committee who have collaborated in bringing in this bill. This bill contains the imprint of the various members of the committee. We had some rather severe and hard fights among ourselves over various issues, but I do believe we have before you the best legislative result that can under the circumstances be achieved at this time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Referring to section 113, being one of the so-called controversial sections, there appears to be the possibility under this section that in one State a utility will have to pay for the removal of its own lines, or whatever property may be involved, and that in other States the same uiltity might not have to pay for such removal or relocation.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is true, but it is a condition that exists today. We leave the decision up to the States. What we are attempting to do under the present language of the bill and under an amendment that I understand will be offered is to confirm that right of the States to make their own decisions. Of course, that means utilities will be treated differently in various States; however, that is something that we decided in the interest of the States the States should decide for themselves.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What would a State gain by reason of the utility taking care of its own expenses?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Some States believe that the utility should pay for it, that it is an obligation on the part of the utility. They believe that large sums of money can be saved which may be used for highway purposes. Other States believe the opposite.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am thinking Federal funds would be used in either situation.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Federal funds are available for that now.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Notwithstanding the fact the State has a State statute that the utilities might relocate their facilities, may still reimburse the utilities for relocation, particularly in those communities or unincorporated communities that do not have a corporate function, therefore they can relieve those hardship or distress cases, so what the gentleman from Kansas has in mind, if he insists on that kind of a proposition, the States will be precluded from doing the things that he wants to be done.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am thinking of, and as I understand, is that a good share of the funds expended are Federal funds in any event. I am wondering if the States would, as such, gain anything if they require the utility to pay its own expenses, since most funds allocated to the States are Federal funds.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It is not assumed that Federal funds would be used to pay the entire cost of relocation, and a good part of this relocation matter concerns problems off the interstate system, too, where it is a 50–50 proposition. It was not the intent of the sponsors of the amendment in the bill to ever provide that the Federal Government would pay the entire cost of the relocation or perhaps even 90 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, at this time in the debate we are wont to become repetitious, but I just want to make this observation. I think the heart of this bill is in the fact that for the first time in the history of this country we are distributing funds on the basis of need; that we are going to build the roads where they are needed and where the traffic is. We are not distributing funds to New York or California or Florida as such, but we are distributing them as I have said on the basis of need.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there should be but a handful of votes, if that many, against this bill, because I want to point out, that the controversies existing over the major provisions of this bill have been fully reconciled. There are only, as I said before, two fringe provisions in this bill that are still in controversy.

Now, let us look at the major provisions that have been reconciled. The method of financing the program has been agreed upon, and that was the reason this bill was defeated the last time, because there was violent disagreement over the method of financing this road program. I know of no persons either in the committee or outside the committee who disagree seriously with the financing provisions in this bill. Secondly, there is no disagreement over the distribution and apportionment of the fnuds among the several States or between the different Federal-aid systems. The proposed method of reimbursing the States which have built toll and freeways has also been reconciled. For a while we thought in committee that that question would prevent a bill from even reaching the floor, but now that highly controversial provision has been resolved. In the last few days the question of maximum weights and size of trucks has also been reconciled. With the statement by the gentleman from Alabama a few minutes ago, who led in the committee, along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY], the opposition to the reimbursement of utilities for relocation costs, it appears as if that controversy has now been resolved. This leaves only one major controversy for this House to decide, and that is the question over the Davis-Bacon amendment.

As I see it, as I said in the beginning, there should be practically no votes against this highway bill. I think we should point out at this time to the rest of the Members of the House the fact that the main controversial provisions of this bill have now been reconciled.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and a member of the Subcommittee on Roads, I am very happy to have before this august body today, H. R. 10660 known as the Federal Highway Act of 1956.

Extensive hearings were held on this important legislation, considered to be the largest road-building program in the history of the world.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the sponsor of H. R. 10660, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, should be congratulated for making it possible to consider this important measure and afford us an opportunity to consider and debate the bill.

The chairman of the subcommittee has been fair at all times with the hearings. He gave everybody an opportunity to be heard who expressed a desire so to do.

It is generally believed that we must build adequate roads. By the word "adequate" is meant a highway system constructed to handle modern traffic safely. It means straight, wide, graded, divided highways, with control of access wherever this is needed.

If highways could be built by direct appropriations that would be favored. If they could be constructed through the issuance of revenue bonds that would be favored. If they could be established by increased taxation that also would be favored.

All of these plans were given consideration and it was the general belief that the only way a bill of this kind can be enacted is through the medium of taxation. This seemed to be the least objectionable of all the plans considered.

The Fallon bill levies tax increases and will pay 90 percent of the cost. Because the House Public Works Committee, despite crushing pressure, has had the courage to report it favorably after many days of intense and sometimes heated private discussions, I am in favor of the enactment of the measure for adequate Federal highways, no matter how it is financed.

When the pressure was at its heaviest, one of the committee members made this remark: "We have heard from everyone except the public." No one can speak adequately for the public except their Representatives in Congress. The public has no organized lobby or pressure groups and I am confident that we will give the public proper representation in the consideration of H. R. 10660 on the floor of the House today and tomorrow.

The public realizes it will have to pay the increased taxes no matter upon what industries or articles they may be levied. The public also knows that you spend the money in building the roads and they will pay for them and nonetheless will bless you for the benefits conferred upon

them in according them safe means of highway transportation.

The American people are on the verge of having their highway problem settled.

Its fundamental provisions—the allotment of Federal aid to the several road systems of the 48 States and the tax schedule which will finance that aid—have been intelligently prepared and are almost unanimously approved by everyone who understands the highway problem and its solution.

The passage of this bill is in the national interest.

The House Committee on Public Works has produced an excellent highway bill and you, the Members of the House, will now pass judgment thereon.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this measure is passed by an overwhelming majority; and stop the slaughter on the highways.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], a member of the committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this is perhaps one of the most important and constructive pieces of legislation to come before this session of Congress. There is no question that this is the greatest public works program in the history of the world; in excess of $51 billion to be spent in the next 13 years; a construction program for the first time in the history of America that will give us a consolidated and well-rounded nationwide highway program; 40,000 miles of interstate highways alone to be constructed, as one of the principal reasons, to give us an adequate national defense highway system.

That is important not only from the standpoint of transporting civilians and their goods and national defense materiel, but also from the standpoint of the evacuation of the cities, if necessary, in time of attack by the enemy. These are matters with which we must be concerned today and vitally concerned. In addition to that, this highway system will connect 90 percent of all the cities in the entire United States with a population in excess of 50,000. It will connect 42 of the 48 State capitals. It will help prevent in the future the killing on our highways which in this particular year will come to some 42,000 people, it is estimated.

These are some reasons why this program is so tremendously important to all of the people of the Nation.

It has been said that this is a measure in which most of the controversial differences have been compromised up to date. I believe that is true. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] has just pointed out, practically every controversial provision has been worked out on a compromise basis. And when I say compromise, we have sat in the Committee on Public Works not for 1 year but for a period of 2 years and discussed and debated this matter. We have tried to work out the differences. And today there seems to be but one issue left on which there is any question of debate, and that is the question of the Davis-Bacon provision.

Mr. Chairman, I say to you in all sincerity that this is a good bill. This is a good bill because it is a bill that is born out of lengthy hearings, fair compromise and out of understanding, understanding of the great purpose that it is intended to serve. It is a good bill, because it has a great many new and beneficial provisions. Today, your State road department is not authorized to do many things that the State road department and the Federal Government can do under this bill, which means better highways. Let me cite just one example of that. Today, for instance, you cannot purchase rights-of-way in advance of construction. Today, when you purchase rights-of-way you must do so only with reference to a given project approved for the present fiscal year.

This bill provides in section 111 which incorporated H. R. 8829, a bill which I introduced, into H. R. 10660 now under consideration that the State road departments may purchase rights-of-way for as much as 5 years in advance of construction. My bill was unanimously approved by the committee when incorporated as section 111 of this bill. What does this mean in such States as Florida, which is growing so rapidly? It means that it is estimated that in this one provision alone there can be saved throughout the country during the 13-year period of construction, as much as $1½ billion it has been estimated, just by giving the States authority to purchase rights-of-way in advance of construction. I am proud to have authored this section and I call it to your attention as one of the many new and beneficial provisions of H. R. 10660.

So we have a good bill and I believe practically all the Members of this House are going to support it.

As a specific example of what this bill will mean to the respective States and to the individual districts, I call to your attention that for fiscal 1957 and 1958 the State of Florida will receive beginning July 1 of this year a total for both years of $70,796,000 in Federal allocation as compared to approximately $28,500,000 in the past 2 years for highway systems within the State with the following allocations as to systems:

Interstate system	$58,420,000
Primary system	5,640,000
Secondary system	3,686,000
Urban system	3,428,000

Further, the bill means in Federal contribution for all roads approximately $50 million a year as an average, over the 13-year period of construction assuming that the $25 million per year increase in other than interstate system road authorizations is carried out.

Over the 13-year period of construction, it means, so far as the interstate system is concerned, the completion of 1,173 miles of four-lane highways in Florida, including the links from Jacksonville to Miami—U. S. 1—a northern entrance to the State southward to Tampa-St. Petersburg—U. S. 301 or U. S. 41—a route from Daytona through Orlando and to Tampa—U. S. 92—and the cross State northern artery from Jacksonville through Lake City, Tallahassee, Pensacola, and on to New Orleans—U. S. 90—and a total expenditure of over the 13-year period on the interstate system alone approximately $528,772,000.

With regard to the improvements of other highways, the present allocation will be increased to $12,334,000 and proportionately thereafter to the extent of some $60 million more during the 13-year period for the construction of other than interstate highway construction than is presently being allocated.

This in effect means a total of approximately $700 million of Federal matching funds for all road systems to be made available to the State of Florida for construction in the next 13 years and an increase of over $500 million in excess of the present Federal program for these 13 years.

This demonstrates the magnitude and importance of this legislation to all the States with Florida as a typical example.

With regard to the first district and the Tampa Bay area, it will mean two 4-lane highways, one approaching from Orlando and one approaching from the north through Ocala. It will further make it possible for a connecting link between Tampa-St. Petersburg and Miami to be planned as a part of the interstate system. It further assures the construction of a third bay bridge across Tampa Bay from Tampa to St. Petersburg.

This highway legislation thus promises not only to open up the State of Florida to many more thousands of tourists per year but also to provide a great impetus for the State's future growth by providing adequate highways for transportation of Florida's products to market and the import of other States' products to Florida. It is certain to add considerable impetus to the already expanding economy of the State and the expansion of industry as well as agriculture in the growth of our great State.

It also means that for the first time under any road legislation, Florida receives in return an amount approximately equal to its contribution to the Federal Government in road-user taxes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, we have spent billions of dollars to defend our Nation against aggression in the fervent prayer that war will thus be avoided and the lives of our citizens spared. Each year we spend millions of dollars and the best specialists in medical science dedicate themselves in an effort to eliminate or diminish the number of deaths caused by cancer, heart conditions, and other diseases which afflict our people. Yet, to a large degree our efforts have been insufficient to preserve the lives of those who ride our highways.

The demands of two wars in the last 15 years prevented the Nation from keeping up with the new and greater demands of our motorists. An expanded bold program must be inaugurated in the interests of our people.

Accidents on the highways in this century have killed more Americans than in all the wars since the Revolution. Since 1900, 1,149,414 deaths have occurred on our highways. Since 1775, 1,130,390 were killed in battle. Last year

alone, over 38,000 died in automobile accidents. This year, it is estimated that 42,000 will so lose their lives. One and one-half million persons were injured last year.

Improvements in some roads have already cut the accident rate 66 percent in those areas. Vigorous action is required to accomplish the tremendous task before us.

While this is an expensive program, even without the consideration of the tragic human losses, present-day accidents cause economic losses which are much greater. Last year alone, those losses in medical expenses, property damage, lost wages, and insurance overhead, exclusive of claims, amounted to $5 billion.

We can no longer afford to ignore this problem. I strongly urge the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take up much time indicating whether I am for or against the many points in this highway legislation. We need highways in America and we need them badly. I had hoped last year we would bring out such a bill as would take care of a great part of the need we know exists.

I shall not belabor you or take your time discussing the points on which I agree and those on which I disagree with some members of the committee. I do feel that it should be made clear that the members of the committee on Public Works have worked long and hard, they and the members of The Committee on Ways and Means have earned the respect of everyone in the work they have done on this bill. The American people want a highway bill. Some think that highway users are now paying enough to build adequate highways.

In trying to ease off the competition of ideas on this bill, as the gentleman from Florida has just said, there are many compromises that have been reached in proper fashion and with propriety by the members of the committee. One such compromise that has helped to make this a better bill is the one having to do with the protection of highways insofar as weights and other dimensions are concerned. This agreement was made as a result of a committee amendment offered by me in Committee. I think each Member of the House of Representatives has received a letter from the American Trucking Association. The one I received reads as follows:

APRIL 19, 1956.

The Honorable T. ASHTON THOMPSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMPSON: We want you to know that the trucking industry is perfectly willing to accept and, in fact, supports section 7 (j) of the highway bill reported out by the House Public Works Committee, having to do with truck weights.

We were opposed to this section as originally written because it would have created endless difficulties for truck operators, the States and the Bureau of Public Roads. Therefore, we had advocated complete elimination of the section, and we were joined in this position by numerous interests, including the Bureau of Public Roads, the American Association of State Highway Officials, the American Municipal Association and the American Automobile Association.

However, the revised section as reported by the Public Works Committee accomplishes the objective—protection of the highways—without getting involved in other factors that would have caused the difficulties. The new provision limits the axle weights and, as the Bureau of Public Roads stated, "The axleload of vehicles is the principal determinant of the supporting capacity that must be provided in the surfaces and foundations of roads."

Interests which are unfriendly to the trucking industry and are, in fact, unfriendly to the entire highway program may attempt to have the section amended to affect such factors as dimensions and gross weights which, as any highway engineer will testify, have nothing to do with protecting highway surfaces. Regulation of these other factors should be left in the hands of the States, which know best how to deal with the complications that arise.

Therefore, we urge you to support the section as it was reported by the Public Works Committee and resist changes designed, not to protect the highways, but to create difficulties.

Very truly yours,

JOHN V. LAWRENCE.

I called on the Bureau of Public Roads to find out what their attitude was as to the measure of protection we would receive by this section as the committee reported it out. I received an answer from Mr. Kaltenbach, the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, which reads as follows:

APRIL 23, 1956.

Hon. J. ASHTON THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: Reference is made to your telephone call requesting information with respect to the limitations of axle weights proposed in section 108 (j) of H. R. 10660.

The axleload of vehicles is the principal determinant of the supporting capacity that must be provided in the surfaces and foundations of roads. All roads, of whatever design, are limited in their axleload supporting capacity. A particular road will support some particular magnitude of axleload in indefinite repetition. Axleloads in excess of this particular magnitude sufficiently repeated cause a fatigue of the road structure and eventually result in failure of the road.

To aid the States in designing highways and developing regulations with respect to sizes and weights of vehicles, the American Association of State Highway Officials, on April 1, 1946, adopted the Policy Concerning Maximum Dimensions, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States, and recommended the policy for uniform incorporation in the laws of all States. The Bureau of Public Roads subscribed to that policy.

The limitations of section 108 (j), namely 18,000 pounds for 1 axle and 32,000 pounds for a tandem axle, are taken from the abovementioned policy. The single axle and tandem axle limitations are the limitations that are significant in the preservation of the highway structure, and consequently of the investment in it.

On the basis of present knowledge, and subject to possible changes upon the completion of the tests referred to in section 108 (k) of H. R. 10660, the Bureau of Public Roads believes that the limitations of single axle and tandem axle weights in section 108 (j) are adequate for the preservation of the Federal investment in the Interstate System.

Very truly yours,

HENRY J. KALTENBACH,
Acting Commissioner of Public Roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege during the past 2 years to serve as a member of the Committee on Public Works on this highway bill which is going down in history as the largest public-works bill ever to have come before this Congress. It has been a privilege to sit in a committee which has been able to compromise so many differences as it has proceeded through this bill.

The bill provides for the inauguration of a new formula for allocation of funds between the States, the needs formula, and that formula recognizes the fact that our major job is to complete this Interstate Highway System, and that the amount of funds allocated to each State should be the funds required to bring the interstate highways in that State up to the standard at which we are aiming, a standard of four-lane, divided highways with controlled access. This means to every section of the country a tremendous opportunity to have improved roads.

In northern California, the section of the country with which I am the most familiar, this will mean that Highway No. 40 as it crosses the Sierra Nevada will be expanded during the period of construction under this bill from a 2-lane road to a 4-lane road. Those who may be familiar with the northern part of the State of California know that this expansion from a 2-lane to a 4-lane highway across the Sierra Nevada will be of untold benefit to that whole area. At the present time, in the middle of the winter, we have at most only two through highways across the Sierra Nevadas. At the time of severe weather conditions sometimes this is reduced to one road, and sometimes neither road is open. This four-lane road across the Sierras will greatly improve winter traffic conditions plus the fact that it will greatly improve our defense standards in that area in case we may ever have to use the road for mass evacuation back into the interior.

There is a section of this bill that has not received much discussion as yet because there are other sections involving much larger monetary expenditures, but I would like to touch briefly on this section of the bill, which provides for funds for the national parks roads and trails and for parkways. This section provides an approximately 33⅓ percent increase for national parks roads and trails and for parkways over the authorization of the bill 2 years ago. It was my privilege on the Roads Subcommittee to submit the amendment providing for this increase and this amendment received practically unanimous support in the subcommittee and then in the full committee. This is going to mean a great deal to those people, and there are millions of them, who go to the national parks each summer for recreation and

enjoyment of the out-of-doors. The pressure on the parks will steadily be greater. We certainly should take the required steps to see that the roads in the parks are adequate to accommodate the needs of our people. I think our expenditures per dollar are better spent on improvements in park facilities, perhaps, than for any other things for which we authorize funds.

One last thing, and that is the Bacon-Davis prevailing-wage provision. We have had numerous tests of support both here in the House and in our committee on the provision. Last year, by a decisive vote the House of Representatives twice voted for the Bacon-Davis provision. It was approved this year first in the roads subcommittee and then in the Committee on Public Works. In the roads committee, as I recall, the vote was about 3 to 1 in favor of the Bacon-Davis provision and in the full committee approximately 2 to 1. It seems to me there has been a clear expression of opinion as to the will of the House. I think this provision should be adopted exactly as it stands in the bill at the present time. Some question has been raised here today as to whether it will require increased costs to complete the roads with this provision in the bill. I can say from the standpoint of the State of California, which has about 2,000 miles of the 40,000 miles in the interstate system, that I checked both with the department of highways and the department of public works in that State and, according to the best estimates, it will make no difference in cost whatsoever in the construction of roads in the State of California. So I hope the House tomorrow, when we reach that section, will sustain the Bacon-Davis provision exactly as it now appears in the bill.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It is the result of many weeks and hours of careful study by our Public Works Committee in both sessions of the present Congress.

I pay tribute to the membership of that committee and to their conscientious staff. All members, the distinguished chairman [Mr. BUCKLEY], and the author of this bill, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], have given the most careful consideration to the whole bill. The members of the committee had many differences of opinion on portions of H. R. 10660. Those differences we resolved in the best traditions of this House. The compromises which are found in the bill are a sincere and intelligent effort to bring onto the floor of the House the very best bill possible.

The bill provides in section 108 (j) for a freeze of weight of vehicles to 18,200 pounds per axle and 32,000 pounds for tandem axles, or such other weight as may be prescribed by the States on July 1, 1956, whichever is greater. I am informed by the trucking industry that this provision is entirely satisfactory to them. At the same time it protects the highways until the completion of a study now being made to determine the effect of heavy truck traffic on road surfaces and the need for a change in present regulatory practices.

In section 112 the bill provides for payment of the prevailing wage in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Commerce. That provision serves a most significant function by giving important protection to the working men and women of this country. It protects them from exploitation by unscrupulous contractors and from low wages in the greatest single public-works program to date.

One vital function of this provision is to guarantee that people in areas which have high standards of living like the people of my own district—in the city of Detroit—will be protected from importation of cheap labor to reduce the living standards and break the wage scale which means so much to the worker and his family.

Now I hope my colleagues will remember that for many years almost every Federal contract has included this provision.

I have heard several of my distinguished colleagues argue that section 112 of the bill, providing for the payment of the prevailing wage, will be so administered by the Secretary of Commerce that wages paid by contractors working on projects under this program will be higher than those rates paid in the area by other contractors governed by State agencies, under similar provisions of State law. I do not agree with this contention, which experience proves is almost universally without merit.

This argument is plainly a charge of wrongdoing on the part of someone. Ordinarily I do not take up the cudgels on behalf of the present administration. But we in Congress must place some degree of reliance in the integrity of administrative and executive officers in our consideration of legislation of this sort.

But if there is such difference in wage scales, and if it favors the workers, I am for it. If true, that argument is the best proof in the world for the prevailing wage or so-called Bacon-Davis provision of this bill as set out in section 112.

To vote against this provision is to vote against creating an adequate wage scale in some of the low-wage areas, or to vote to make it possible to permit low-priced labor to come in to break the wage scale in high-wage areas.

Moreover, this provision as it is now is a guarantee for fair and uniform administration, together with recognition that wage scales vary throughout the country. It is only an effort to adhere to the scale prevailing in individual areas.

I have heard the utility relocation provision characterized as a giveaway to the big utilities. I am no advocate of giveaways to utilities, and I believe I have opposed them on every occasion, but I do recognize simple justice.

If the utilities are compelled to foot this cost of relocating facilities which must be moved under this program, they will merely go to the various State regulatory bodies and obtain a rate raise which will be passed on in turn to their ratepayers.

Section 113 affects not only the large utilities, but also small utilities, municipalities, large and small, and their taxpayers. Farm and REA co-ops, selling both electric power and telephone service, the TVA, and every sewer and water main owned by a municipality are equally affected.

This provision does not affect States rights, nor does it in any way change the organic law of any State. In effect, it recodifies into law the existing Federal practice of reimbursing States for such expenditures as they make in connection with compensating utilities for relocation of facilities on the same ratio as the Federal Government participates in other highway costs.

As we know, this bill is primarily a bill for construction of new highways, and not repair of old roads. For this reason, the utility facilities which are most affected are not those which are presently using highway rights-of-way without cost, but rather facilities now located on other lands which must be relocated for new roads. This is not an expense which can be reasonably anticipated by the utilities.

This is not a burden which ratepayers and municipal taxpayers should bear. I repeat, I do not very often side with the utilities, but the hardship this provision will alleviate is substantial, and it affects not the giants of the industry or their stockholders, but the ratepayers and taxpayers of the utilities and municipalities.

The bill is one which is gravely needed. The cost which an inadequate road program imposes upon us is far in excess of what this bill will cost. The need for highways is so clearly recognized by all of us that no testimony was taken on that subject in the committee during hearings on this bill.

I urge the membership of this House to support and pass H. R. 10660 unchanged for the good of all the people of this country.

Mr. FALLON. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, every place—almost—will benefit by having more and better highways if the bill now being considered is enacted into law.

Every place—almost—will gain as a result of the expanded highway program contemplated by H. R. 10660.

The 48 States will benefit.

Hawaii and Puerto Rico will benefit.

Additional taxes will be assessed against the residents of the States and of Hawaii and Puerto Rico to pay for highway construction.

Alaskans will pay more taxes too.

But their taxes will go to pay for roads elsewhere.

They will not benefit by H. R. 10660. They are not included within its provisions—except as they relate to taxation.

Mr. Chairman, the other day a Federal jury in Alaska acquitted a man who had been charged by the Government with willfully failing to file income tax returns and pay his taxes. His principle plea in defense was that taxation without representation runs counter to the fundamentals of our democracy and too long continued is in direct violation with the basic principles which first caused the organization of the Republic.

Alaskans are becoming restive, Mr. Chairman. They feel themselves to be, and they are, the equals of Americans anywhere. Yet their pleas for more home rule, for statehood if you please, have been ignored, or shoved aside for so long that I detect among them a welling up as it were over the political injustices to which they have been subjected.

This very measure offers further proof, sadly enough, that there is a lamentable lack of concern over a situation which should command the immediate attention of the Nation and of the administration and of the Congress.

I appreciate very deeply indeed the efforts of those who sought to add to H. R. 10660 an amendment which would have given Alaskans roads together with taxes instead of just taxes without roads, as is the case now. I am sensible of the fact that the departments concerned with the administration of this program and of the Territories did not seek inclusion of Alaska, and my efforts and the efforts of those who joined with me were thereby handicapped. The Department of Commerce made no statement whatsoever on this subject. The Department of the Interior asked only for general language which if adopted would merely have been an expression that it was the sense of the Congress that road building in Alaska should be stepped up. This, however, would have been within the framework of the existing organizational pattern and would not have meant that Alaska would be brought within the Federal Aid Highway System. Actually, there is no need for an expression of that sort. All that is needed is submission and approval of larger budgetary requests.

What Alaskans are seeking, Mr. Chairman, is identity with and a partnership in the road program which applies to the States, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and to the Territory of Hawaii. Without it, we can never hope to have a highway system which will open Alaska up for the development to which its resources entitle it.

Let us assume, Mr. Chairman, that when the first Federal aid highway bill became law there had been excluded from its provisions one-fifth of the area of the entire United States. Let us further assume that the road needs of that part of the country had been served only by hit and miss appropriations for a period of 30 years or so, large enough only to build about 250 miles of new roads and to maintain the few existing miles. What would have happened? The answer is obvious. There would have been no development. Not only would people not have been attracted there but the resident population would have moved elsewhere. Transportation is a vital key in the astounding progress America has made. No element of the transportation system, surely, is more important than highways. That is just the way it is in Alaska. It does contain 586,000 square miles or 365 million acres or just about one-fifth the land area of the 48 States combined. We had only about 250 miles of new roads—and these of the pioneer type—built between 1920 and 1940. A few hundred miles of new roads were added in the following decade but now new construction has virtually ceased.

If the Federal Government had deliberately decided to maintain Alaska as a wilderness, it could not have chosen a more effective means than to make sure no roads were built.

What is the situation now? It is that after having been under the American flag for 89 years there are less than 4,000 miles of roads of all sorts and descriptions. I submit that that is shocking proof of the failure of the system we have been using, and is proof likewise of the terrible neglect which Alaska has suffered. It has been treated not as it should have been as an organized, incorporated Territory of the United States and as such a constitutional member of this Union of ours but, if you please, as a distant, unwanted, uncared for colony.

How could it be expected that people would flock to Alaska to settle when after almost a century of United States rule they are substantially without surface transportation? Everywhere else in the United States—in Puerto Rico and in Hawaii—we have recognized and especially in this automobile age that development is so closely geared to adequacy of highway transportation that in many ways the two are synonymous. We have given no such recognition to the Alaska situation.

Mr. Chairman, the highways we do have have been improved, most of them, incredibly since the end of World War II. The Federal Government expended very considerable sums of money to surface the trunk highways. However, this was not done as it would have been elsewhere in the normal course of improving the highway system but only because military authorities insisted upon more adequate appropriations so there would be available for military traffic roads between the principal communities serving as defense centers which were at least black topped.

There are three principal road agencies in Alaska. The most important is the Alaska Road Commission, an operating agency of the Department of the Interior. It constructs and maintains roads on the public domain through direct congressional appropriations made to the Department of the Interior. The Bureau of Public Roads is responsible for forest highways in the two national forests of Alaska, comprising about 5 percent of the total land area. Then there is the Territorial Highway Department. As a matter of operating expediency, the Alaska Road Commission and the Bureau of Public Roads provide construction and maintenance services for the Territorial Highway Department on a reimbursable basis.

Direct congressional appropriations to the Alaska Road Commission totaled in the years from 1913 through 1941 only $18,197,389. In addition, during that period the Alaska Road Commission performed work for the National Park Service in the amount of $1,517,583.07. Additionally, the Alaska Road Commission expended something over $4 million in appropriated funds derived by imposition of license taxes on Alaska businesses collected by United States Clerks of the Court and deposited in the United States Treasury. In the last 10 years we have made one gain at least. Now Alaskans are permitted through their own legislature to collect these taxes locally and to appropriate highway funds more directly.

For many years there was a constitutional limitation on forest highway funds in Alaska. The Territory was denied its rightful share of such appropriations. That prohibition since has been removed.

Highway widening, black-topping and other improvements have naturally been of great assistance to the development of the civilian economy, including tourism, in the regions traversed by the highways. It is important to note, however, that actually even with these improvements there have been few additions to the total road mileage. And only the public domain has benefited. With the exception of one special-purpose appropriation, southeastern Alaska, the geographical boundaries of which are almost synonymous with Tongass National Forest, has continued on a starvation diet in respect to road money.

This random policy has had evil consequences not only for the Territory of Alaska but for the Nation. The valley and peak appropriation history for public domain roads, with the peak being visible for only a few years and then only to satisfy national defense needs, leaves Alaska in 1956 with only 3,700 miles of public domain highway of which 800 are paved. This is an area one-fifth as big as the United States. Alaska's area covers 586,000 square miles. Nevada, 110,540 square miles in extent, has 25,545 miles of rural roads. Delaware's 2,057 square miles have 3,842 miles of rural roads.

Had the Federal aid laws been extended to Alaska at the time of their inception it follows that the Territory now would have a comparable road system, that there would not have been the need for such heavy expenditures in the postwar years, and that the development of Alaska with a functioning highway system would long since have brought about a larger population.

In the national forests, over 35,000 square miles in area, there are only about 300 miles of roads.

Aside from the larger sums which would be available for road building were Alaska under the national system, there would be another great advantage.

Road building could proceed under a planned program. No such planning is possible now because of the ups and downs, chiefly downs, of the annual Interior Department appropriations. For example, the budgetary requests for the 1957 fiscal year calls for only $500,000 for new road construction. This is the second year for which no appropriation request has been made for a highway already started to connect Cordova with the Richardson Highway.

The time has come to place Alaska under the Federal Aid Highway System.

We recognize the fact that despite our just entitlements there may be some concern over admission of Alaska to the system immediately on a basis of full equality because of the very considerable sums which Alaska would receive on account of its public domain area. Likewise, we recognize the fact that because the Federal Government has failed to give Alaska autonomy in ever so many fields, a fiscal problem would confront the territorial legislature if it were required to appropriate the considerably increased funds which would be necessary for carrying on maintenance and providing matching construction funds.

Before the committee I had proposed a formula which would have brought the Territory of Alaska within the scope of the Federal Aid Highway System in recognition of the factors above mentioned.

It is my earnest hope that the other body will consider this proposition and will adopt it. The benefits which will come from planned, accelerated highway construction in Alaska will not be only for the benefit of the Territory. They will flow back to the States. In any case, simple justice demands that Alaska no longer be excluded from laws which apply elsewhere. The era of neglect should be ended. The era of constructive action should begin.

Mr. Chairman, Alaskans are loyal, patriotic Americans. They are also direct descendants of the pioneers of our West who moved against great odds in the march to the Pacific. In the great Northwest Territory they are carving out a new American homeland. In their battle against the obstacles which always confront those in the far places they should not have to contend also against obstacles raised by their fellow citizens. They should be aided, not hindered. They should be treated as equals, not discriminated against. For them, taxation without representation is not just a sentence in the history books. It is very real. It is that which they are obliged to live with daily. Is it any wonder they have become impatient? Is it any wonder a jury listens to a plea based upon taxation without representation?

Mr. Chairman, if Alaskans are given the tools long since handed to their fellow Americans, if they are treated as equals and not as distant outlanders, they will make of this northern rampart, so essential to our defense, a great American community.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, it has been a great pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with the distinguished gentlemen who make up the Public Works Committee who have had under discussion the road bill for the past 2 years. I want to say for the benefit of the membership and as a freshman that it was a matter of great satisfaction for me to have an opportunity to sit with men who were of different political faiths who could discuss openly, reasonably, and honestly the great measures and questions involved in this important legislation.

I want to pay a special tribute to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who always has been very helpful to us, especially to me.

I would like also to pay a special tribute to the chairman of the Roads Committee whose patience at times must have been almost completely exhausted, but who served us very well and gave every member an opportunity to be heard. I think it is because of that, and his patience and demonstration of good will, and his interest in the final objective of the bill that made it possible for us to have such a good bill as we have and made it possible to find an area of compromise.

The subject of my remarks on this occasion is roads. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin in 1808, had this to say of highway construction:

> No other single operation within the power of government can more effectively tend to strengthen and perpetuate that union, which secures external independence, domestic peace, and internal liberty.

Today we can add that adequate highways help insure, yes, they are necessary too, ever-expanding economy. One of the secrets of the great success of our economy is an almost complete freedom from impediments except for inadequacy, to the flow of people and goods. Men and goods move across State lines with the facility of intrastate movements. This freedom, combined with what is probably the most complete and most efficient transportation system in the world, are most important factors in maintaining our great prosperity.

One of the most pressing issues facing the Nation and its government at all levels today is that of a growing inadequacy of our highways. In fact, a recent comprehensive survey of all of the Nation's streets and highways indicates that we have an enormous backlog of needed improvements. Volumes could be said on this.

The inevitable question which follows is, How did we get that way? In the first place we have lagged farther and farther behind in the relative amount of highway work undertaken. During World War II and afterward, shortages of manpower and materials restricted the total street and highway effort. And during the postwar period an important factor has been the impact of inflation on highway construction. The net effect has been that we get less and less construction, relatively, for the actual dollars spent. What we are doing now nationally, is spending 7 mills on highway construction for each mile traveled. This is but half the rate we were spending during the 1920's.

The need for improved highway facilities has increased markedly year after year, particularly during the years following the war. Each year sees a significant advance in the total number of vehicles in use. The Bureau of Public Roads forecast for the end of this year is 61 million vehicles, an increase of nearly 3 million vehicles over 1954, or 4.6 percent. The Bureau estimated that total registrations will reach 81 million 10 years hence. And it follows without question that such increases in the number of vehicles will result in significant surges in the vehicle-mileage totals. Thus, we are literally wearing out many of our roads physically, as well as outgrowing them numerically and from an engineering standpoint.

President Eisenhower recognized the seriousness of the general highway situation. At the 1954 governors' conference held at Lake George, N. Y., the Vice President delivered the President's highway proposal to the governors in attendance. The President requested the governors to study their respective highway needs and to make recommendations concerning those needs.

In September 1954, the President appointed the Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. The Committee was to cooperate with the governors and to propose a plan of action for submission to Congress.

The Advisory Committee's report was made public early in 1955. The report emphasized the urgency of the problem, and admonished that the state of inadequacy will be cumulative until we take major steps to meet it.

Much has been said of the necessity for this bill. I want to point out just two more things that I think are important. Although they probably have been called to your attention I want to mention them. One is this: We are going to pay for this highway system whether we build it or not. We will pay for it in lack of business and the slowing up of the economy of America if we do not build it; and, more important than that, it is not hard to imagine that we could pay for it in the lives and property saved by the increased safety facilities of this highway system.

One other point: Every group that testified before our committee testified to the need, the urgent need of this important system for America. There was no disagreement on that question that I recall. There was some disagreement on how to attain the goal, but on the question of need there was no disagreement.

So I say to you in the interest of the growing, expanding economy of America we should support this bill and see to it that it becomes a part of the law of America at a very early date so we can get started on the program.

A great seer left these words to mankind many years ago, and I want to share them with you:

> No doctrine, faith, or knowledge is of value to man except as it bears fruit in action.

The American people demand action of you on this bill today.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have said in praise of the work of the chairman and other members of the committee and thank them for their patience with me and also express my satisfaction in the 2 years I have spent on this committee. I, too, want a highway bill. Unfortunately I may have to differ with several members of the committee, but I do it only as a matter of principle. The statements and objections I make I will support by reference to the printed hearings which, unfortunately, were only made available to the membership at 9 o'clock this morning, which is unfortunate.

First, I think the Public Works Committee has considered a Labor Committee matter.

Second, there is no precedent for this bill we are considering today, that is, for the Bacon-Davis provision particularly, and I am directing my remarks to section 112. There is no precedent for the Davis-Bacon Act in relation to the building of highways.

Third, I want to tell you without bitterness but with disappointment that misrepresentations were made to our committee by representatives who appeared before it from a labor organization. Possibly they were misinformed.

Next I would like to say to you that none of us disagree about the prevailing wage matter. We all want the workers to have the prevailing wage, myself included. The amendment that will be proposed by the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will include a prevailing wage set at the State level, not by a one-man bureaucracy here in Washington, the Secretary of Labor and the Department of Labor.

I want to mention another thing also. Is there anyone here who seriously believes that our States, which will spend 90 percent of the Federal money, are going to underpay their own people? Beyond that, may I say that I do not fear any labor retaliation. I do not think anyone on the floor of this House needs to be concerned about what labor is going to say when we direct our attention solely to the facts. Surely, no one can take exception to a presentation of the facts.

I shall direct myself specifically to several matters. The hearings have in them the information to which I shall refer. I want to refer if I may, to page 302, and I shall mention various pages, referring to them specifically. Further I will be glad to give you the documentation on anything I say.

At page 302 we are told that there are "inhuman working conditions" existing today similar to the twenties, and so forth, for our construction workers on highways; that there are ten caravans, predatory contractors, and so forth. This is directly contrary to the facts. In our committee we were never given a case that was substantiated.

This absurd statement was only exceeded by one made in reference to my beloved State of Texas, although that is not the reason for my feeling against some of the other things that were said. As I recall the remark made about my State, it was this—the very worst labor laws that exist in this entire country, which would actually drive us back to slavery, exist in Texas today. That situation, it was stated, exists in Texas today. As a matter of fact, we have a marvelous State highway department, and we have no slavery conditions.

As to specific examples, and I shall be brief, one contractor was accused of malpractice in New Hampshire. He was never there. Page 383 of the hearings.

Another incident, a contractor was accused by the workers of a condition in Massachusetts. That was not so and it was so disputed in the hearings.

Thirdly, and the most important example, since it was the witnesses' prime example, was the Aliquippa case in Pennsylvania. I direct my remarks to the court records. You will find this on pages 374 to 380. This was brought up by labor itself to prove what inequities were being worked on construction workers. What were the claims? Workers were being imported from a low-wage area, namely North Carolina. The fact: Five key personnel were brought in.

Secondly, the unions were discriminated against, the contractor would not deal with the unions. The fact: The contractor had a bona fide contract with the United Construction Workers of the United Mine Workers, District 50, which is in the record.

No. 3: Workers were paid less than the prevailing or union wages. The fact is they were paid union wages and prevailing wages or more, and never was the matter of pay brought up during the court dispute, but only when the labor representatives first appeared before our committee.

I can give more illustrations. We found out that this Aliquippa example had no substance at all, that it was a jurisdictional dispute between two unions, the AFL–CIO and the United Mine Workers. This bill should not be used as a vehicle for inter-union warfare. Let the unions work out their own problems in other ways without violence and through collective bargaining.

Next, this is a dangerous precedent since highway construction has never been performed under the Davis-Bacon provision when the 48 States are the contracting party. This State contract work never used or included the Davis-Bacon provisions. There are other Federal contracts that did. There are other Federal contracts entered into by the executive department, by the Government, the Army, the Navy, and post offices. There are others in grants-in-aid, those covering airports, hospitals, defense housing, multifamily rental housing. In none of these are the States contracting parties in highway construction. And highway construction is quite different than the other construction under the Davis-Bacon Act.

The present operation of our existing law, which certainly is true in Texas and I think it is true throughout the Nation, is excellent. The prevailing wages that now pertain in the various States as well as collective-bargaining agreements you will find on page 291. We have not found any legitimate wage complaints, and I want to call your attention to something else that we are overlooking. Highways cover a broad area of our country, not just localities like various building projects concerning which the Davis-Bacon Act has been applied in the past. They cover the entire country as well as the rural areas.

Next, how about the Labor Committee being side-stepped? Last year in our Committee on Public Works we endeavored to write a tax provision that met with disastrous results. This year we have a good tax bill, better than we had last year. The proper committee, Ways and Means, is now responsible. This year in our hearings we rather abruptly cut off the chairman of the Labor Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, by telling him that the Davis-Bacon Act was not before us, and therefore he did not direct additional remarks on the Davis-Bacon Act at that time, but I might say to you that one of the finest statements made is on page 354 of the hearings, if you would like to refer to it.

Now, there is further investigation needed by the Committee on Labor. We found evidence of violence and wanton lawlessness where the State police stood by because they felt they could not interfere, it being a labor matter. This I could not understand. I am not a member of the Labor Committee, but I think they should investigate it. There are other things that ought to be examined by the Committee on Labor as to the violation of constitutional principles. In the interest of time, I will simply say this: Here we are about to put into effect a law which will give great authority to the Secretary of Labor, a law from which our people have no recourse in court. I do not think that is right. Surely it is not our intention to deny our people the right of court protection. There is no appeal from the decision of the Secretary of Labor, and for that reason, if the Dondero amendment fails, keeping wage matters within the States, it seems to me we should amend the Davis-Bacon Act, giving the right of judicial review. Even the Walsh-Healey Act now has been amended by Congress.

What is it that the unions want? I can refer you to pages 370 and 381 of the hearings. The Aliquippa case was purely a jurisdictional dispute. Could it be that the AFL wants to organize the entire country, and it is a fight between the AFL-CIO and United Mine Workers whether or not they can squeeze somebody out. I do not think that in the 48 States we want to put the Davis-Bacon Act into this highway bill. This is not an example of collective bargaining, as the representative of labor said. He said this is to protect the local wages that have been won by collective bargaining. At another place he said that the unions are not needed locally. See pages 340

and 336. Now, I do not believe that any State that is going to spend 90 percent of the Federal money is going to underpay its workers in their respective States. I submit they will not.

Now as to the higher cost. Some higher costs will not go into the pay envelopes, as so many here seem to be concerned about and whose concern I share. It is estimated that there are 20,000 rulings a year right now that the Secretary of Labor is putting out. Further, this bill will require 10,000 more contracts every year. Each contract will have 230 job classifications, more or less, and they will have to have persons to administer, inspect, and enforce it, and with reference to that I would like to call your attention to page 13 of the report. On page 13 of the report the Secretary of Labor is given the authority to enforce the Davis-Bacon Act. Yet this bill itself, section 112, gives this job to the Secretary of Commerce. Here again is a conflict which I do not think was intended.

Economically our localities will be greatly affected by Federal wage fixing. I, in a small way, was in the developing business, and have actually had roads put in. I know a little something about it. It occurs to me that when you have the Interstate System under the provisions of the Bacon-Davis Act, and you have localities under other contracts, you are going to have a man riding a scraper or other equipment going from one job to another under two pay systems. That is the way it is in practice. The answer is that Davis-Bacon is a lever to get the Federal wage rate fixed throughout the entire country, in all of our road programs. You cannot have these two systems existing side by side simultaneously. It seems to me that we need an amendment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will offer an amendment. I think we should get behind it and pass it, and it provides for the prevailing wage.

Let me stress that. There are some who infer we are not interested in the workers. We are interested in the workers. We want them to have the prevailing wage and they will get it. There is no question about workers being underpaid, because these cases that they brought to us in which they said they were underpaid, have been found wanting for lack of evidence.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call your attention to the Davis-Bacon minority views in the report, for your further understanding. If I am given more time later, I should be glad to answer questions, and also to document what I have said.

It seems to me that we are extending this far beyond the Interstate. We are giving the Secretary of Labor far more power than we intended to. I certainly recommend to your earnest consideration that we adopt the Dondero amendment replacing section 112; and failing that, let us revise the Davis-Bacon Act so that we may have judicial review, so that every one of our citizens will have his day in court, something he does not now have under the bureaucratic operation of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I did not register a protest against some of the provisions of this bill. I want to congratulate the committee for the excellent job that they have done, but the bill is not perfect.

First of all, I want to protest the allocation of mileage to the State of West Virginia and to say to you that as is the case in a lot of other matters in legislation approved by Congress, West Virginia is just a mere stepchild. We get a little less than 200 miles out of 40,000 miles. That cannot be justified either on the basis of an equal distribution of mileage, nor can it be justified on a money basis, nor can it be justified on a population basis.

The only answer they can give me is that it costs about twice as much to build a mile of highway across West Virginia as it does to build a mile of highway in some of the other States such as Ohio, Indiana, or some others that have a more favorable topography.

Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to this fact. It provides no north-south highways for the State of West Virginia. It provides not a single mile on Route 50, with over 170 miles across the northern part of the State. It does give 11 miles to a section on Route 11 for the benefit of Pennsylvanians and Virginians who want to get north or south on Route 11, around Winchester, and it approves 12 miles on Route 40, east-west, so that people may cross the northern panhandle of the State from Pennsylvania to Ohio.

There are 178 miles of this route from White Sulphur Springs on the Virginia border over the Midland Trail to Huntington, W. Va., on into Ohio. They propose to relocate 138 miles of that road from White Sulphur Springs to Charleston. The road follows the present right-of-way only approximately 3 miles. In some of the places they are 15 miles off the present right-of-way.

If you figure this on a dollar basis, West Virginia would get $135 million out of the $25 billion of Federal funds that is put in the program. Do you know that by the changing of that route from the present Route 60 you will destroy over $200 million of property that is invested on Route 60 now in gasoline stations, automobile agencies, automobile service stations, motels, and restaurants? They have no recourse at all.

Do not tell me that when a man is coming from the West toward Washington and he crosses the Gauley River down in West Virginia 8 miles above Gauley Bridge he is going to turn off the highway and drive down to Gauley Bridge in order to spend the night there with a man who has a $80,000 tourist installation. Everybody stops there now, almost. But that man will not have any business and his $80,000 investment in it will be just wiped out.

The loss of property values in the State of West Virginia alone will more than offset the benefits that will come to West Virginia through the building of this expressway. It is going to be fenced in with access roads only about every 20 miles. It is not going to mean anything to the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, it is my present intention to vote against the legislation despite the fact that I am an advocate of better roads. I cannot justify my position with the people back in West Virginia under the circumstances.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct some questions to the ranking minority member of the committee in order to clarify section 109 of the bill, the section on the declaration of policy with respect to reimbursement for certain highways. This section is as follows:

> It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse those States for any portion of a highway which is on the interstate system, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the interstate system. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the interstate system measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958. It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

The State of Illinois through legislation has set up the Illinois Toll Road Commission, which is in the process of constructing toll roads in the State of Illinois. One of the toll roads will go through my congressional district, going out on a 25-mile stretch to O'Hare International Airport from the Chicago Loop.

This section very vitally affects my 11th Congressional District on the North West side of Chicago, and the county of Cook, because of the construction of the northwest superhighway under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Toll Road Commission.

One of the outstanding accomplishments under Gov. William S. Stratton's administration was the legislation to set up the Illinois Toll Road Commission as an independent agency to provide Illinois with modern superhighways.

Many years ago the city of Chicago and the county of Cook made plans for a Northwest superhighway which was to serve the residents of the northwest side, and which was at all times contemplated to be a public toll-free highway. When the Illinois Toll Road Commission was set up they agreed with the county of Cook to purchase part of this

original northwest highway to be incorporated into the toll road system. Approximately 14 miles of the northwest highway extends from the Loop to the boundaries of the 41st ward, at Cicero and Lawrence Avenues. In the original agreement with the toll road commission the commission was to take over the building of the road at that point, extending it approximately 7½ miles out to O'Hare Airport and then continuing as a part of the toll road highway system up to the Wisconsin boundary.

The residents of the 41st ward and the residents of the country towns objected to paying a toll as being discriminatory against the residents of the 41st ward and the adjoining suburbs.

Governor Stratton, Austin Wyman, and the other members of the Toll Road Commission, in order to provide the public transportation out to O'Hare Airport and in order to meet the objections of the northwest side residents, effected a compromise plan in which the Toll Road Commission would construct that part of the northwest superhighway from Cicero Avenue out to O'Hare Field and on the day of completion would sell it to the county of Cook and the city of Chicago, so that both of those local governing units could then make it a freeway. There does not seem to be much question in my mind that both of these agencies will cooperate with Governor Stratton and the Toll Road Commission's plans.

To clarify the situation for the people of Illinois, I should like to know if this bill definitely provides for the incorporation of either a part or the whole of this toll road into the Federal Highway System if it meets the requirements.

Mr. DONDERO. It would if the road which is being built now is a part of the designated Interstate Highway System. That system was designated by Congress in 1944. If it is a part of it, it would be considered.

Mr. SHEEHAN. On page 19, in section 109, provision is made as follows:

> It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

Due to the fact that the Illinois Legislature has set up a separate toll road commission which is independent of the State, would the money then be payable to the toll road commission or its bondholders so that the commission would be reimbursed?

Mr. DONDERO. I am quite sure such a report will be made, but I want the gentleman to understand that the provision in the bill on page 19 provides for a study to be made between now and January 2, 1958, with a report made to Congress with a recommendation as to what should be done and how it should be done. I am satisfied that the problem the gentleman presents will be considered favorably.

Mr. SHEEHAN. In other words, if the Secretary of Commerce recommends that this toll road system be taken over, the Congress ordinarily would O. K. it?

Mr. DONDERO. I would say so.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The toll road commission is going to build a toll road from the beginning of the 41st ward out to O'Hare Airport, a distance of about 8 miles. If this connects with other Federal highways under the plan, could the Congress, under this bill, appropriate the money to buy that section connecting with other State and Federal highways?

Mr. DONDERO. Not under this bill, unless that stretch of 8 miles was a part of the Interstate System.

Mr. SHEEHAN. As I recall, it provides for connecting roads to the Interstate System, bridges, and so forth.

Mr. DONDERO. That would come under the interstate highway system.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That would come under the interstate highway system. It looks to me as if in the subject bill there unquestionably is provision for reimbursement to those States that have a toll road system or who have highways already constructed—providing such meet the specifications and also the requirements of the 1944 act—upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce that such roads or portions of them be incorporated into the Federal Highway System.

Mr. DONDERO. The very provision in the bill is to give time to study the situation in the various States including the gentleman's State in order to make a recommendation which would satisfy the situation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make known my support of the bill we are now discussing H. R. 10660, the highway bill of 1956. This legislation, I firmly believe, is as important as any this House will be called upon to consider this session. Our national economy, our national military strength, and the happiness and prosperity of the citizens of this Nation for generations to come depends in large measure, I believe, upon whether this House sees fit to pass the bill now before us. No one, I am sure, will take issue with the proposition that we are totally and completely dependent upon highway transportation today. No one, I am sure, will take issue with the proposition that this dependence will increase with each passing year. Likewise, we are agreed, I believe, that our highway system, by today's standards, is inadequate. It follows then, that in the future, it will prove inadequate in a much larger degree. Failure on our part to act today will not only prove disastrous for this Nation in our time, but the tragedy will be multiplied many times over in the years to come, and should the future thrust this Nation into combat with its enemies, our failure to act on this important measure could prove to be the difference between victory and defeat.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that this problem is one which should be, and could be, properly left to the States. It has been said that roads are local and State problems, in which the Federal Government should take no part.

Mr. Chairman, the presence of the very need which I have just mentioned, disproves that point without the slightest shadow of a doubt. It is proved that good roads and highways are a local problem. They are a problem of the municipalities, and they are the problem of the States. But they are in equal measure a problem of the entire Nation. If we pass the legislation which is before us now, we will, I think, have done our share toward meeting the problem faced by the Nation as a whole. We will not have solved conclusively and for all time the problem of good roads; there will still be a necessity for State action and there will be a need for municipal and local action. We are here dealing with the national highway system, which is interstate in character and upon which our national welfare depends. Let us not then deceive ourselves by avoiding our responsibility in an attempt to thrust it entirely upon the shoulders of those who determine State and local policy.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize the need for this legislation and our responsibility with respect to it for a particular reason. That reason involves the difficulty of drawing up an act of this nature. We all know that this bill was not an easy one to prepare. There are problems of every kind connected with it and at times these problems seemed nearly insurmountable. The bill which the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, has presented to the Congress, is one, which I believe, effectively solves or compromises these various incidental problems. Certainly I do not think that we can reach unanimity with respect to each and every one of them. I am sure that many of us would have preferred a stronger section here, a weaker section there, a little more protection here, a little less there.

But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot let ourselves become so ensnared with these minor, though-important problems, as to overlook the pressing, the urgent, and the undiminishing need for good highways. To the best of my knowledge, the bill which has been reported is largely satisfactory to all the groups and elements who are most concerned and most directly interested.

In the interests of our Nation's welfare, we must therefore each yield in some respect for the common good. It is with this spirit that I hope we can discuss this bill. It is with this spirit that I hope we can pass it. Perhaps there is room for improvement. If so, I shall be happy to see this bill amended, but let us not amend rashly or selfishly.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to mention one other point before I conclude: it is very important, I think, that this bill is on a pay-as-you-go basis. We are recognizing our responsibility in title 1, to build a modern Federal highway system. By the same token, in title 2, we are facing up to our responsibility to finance the construction of this system. We do not, and this legislation does not, increase the national debt beyond its present level. Sufficient revenue is provided by title 2, to enable these roads to be constructed over the period required without incurring additional debt, and without endangering our national solvency. This

revenue is provided in a way which I hope will be regarded as fair by those who will be required to contribute it. Certainly those who travel upon our highways for commercial or private purposes will reap a large harvest from this legislation, should it pass.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the hope and in the belief that this legislation is as fair to all concerned, as liberal as is needed, and as financially prudent as is possible to make, I strongly recommend its passage.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY] does not seem to be on the floor. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult to objectively appraise the relative value and need for legislation to be considered here in the House of Representatives, because our reasons and points of view are frequently influenced by our own knowledge of various needs.

There is scarcely a person in this Nation, however, who is not directly concerned with our highway uses and program. Proper interstate transportation of people and commodities is a matter of deep concern to all our people. The interstate highways of our Nation are of special significance to our program of national defense. The terrible loss of life and injuries to people using our inadequate highways is a cost that cannot be estimated or assessed in dollars and cents. It is, therefore, quite impossible to overemphasize the importance and urgent need for a well-considered program for highway construction.

The legislation we are now considering, Mr. Chairman, is the result of extensive and thorough consideration for a period of months by two great committees of this House. The Committee on Public Works has held extensive hearings over a period of months during which a large number of highly qualified witnesses testified. This testimony properly represents all points of view. The committee then held weeks of executive sessions during which all this testimony was thoroughly studied and reviewed. The resulting construction program and provisions which came into being can, therefore, be viewed with great confidence by all Members of Congress.

Such a construction program, the largest single program ever included in one bill, will cost tremendous sums of money and this money must be provided by the most equitable means possible. The great Committee on Ways and Means considered each and every point of view with great care. The basic philosophy of pay as you ride was adopted as being the most sound method to finance this program. It was also determined, Mr. Chairman, that each of the users of the highways should pay their proportionate and proper share of the cost of this program.

As a Member of this House, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my sincere thanks to all the members of these two great committees all of whom have labored so hard and so long so that we here today may have this legislation before us for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the urgent need for a proper highway program cannot be overemphasized. The tremendous increase in highway traffic of all kinds compels the construction of adequate highways. Many present highways must be widened, straightened, and otherwise improved and made more safe. Many miles of new highways must be built. Thus the establishment of a properly considered, planned, and constructed network of adequate interstate highways is of special concern to everyone in this Nation, so that travel and business can be properly facilitated throughout the Nation.

It is my firm conviction, Mr. Chairman, that we will pay for these highways in many ways whether or not we build these roads. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my sincere hope that this legislation will be approved promptly so that necessary engineering and planning can be started at the earliest possible date.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman to whom I had intended to yield time has left the Chamber. I do not know whether he will be back, but I have no further requests for time at this moment. I would like to use a minute, Mr. Chairman, to express my thanks to the minority side and the majority side of our committee who have worked so diligently and so hard for many, many weeks on this bill. I compliment the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and his committee for bringing such a comprehensive tax bill to us. I also compliment the Bureau of Public Roads who were with us on this legislation from the very beginning. They were helpful and contributed much to this bill. Also, I want to express my thanks to the State highway officials who were in contact with us almost daily not only during the hearings but also in many conferences. My thanks go to the municipal officials and also the American roadbuilders for the information which they furnished us through their task force.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm the statement made by the chairman of the committee in everything that he has said on behalf of all those who took part and furnished information to our committee in preparing this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor President Eisenhower's highway program and hope the highway bill promptly passes. May I congratulate the committee on the good job that they have done in adjusting the various differences of opinion as to method of implementing and financing the program. Particularly to be complimented are the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend, GEORGE DONDERO; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]; and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HARRY MCGREGOR; and others who have gone out to the country and explained the program, that has made this legislation possible.

The Federal highway program is the dawn of a new era for all of America, and we should all be willing to do our share to obtain safe and efficient roads and highways for our good country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE], a member of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, 6 years ago I started service on the Public Works Committee, after completing 12 years of service in the Kansas Highway Department in various executive capacities. Frankly, at the first meeting of the Public Works Committee to consider the highway financing bill of 1950, I was shocked to discover that the Bureau of the Budget was recommending $400 million Federal aid appropriation, when at that time we were collecting $1.2 billion from the automobile users of the United States in gasoline and oil taxes. All of these State highway departments, all of the cities, and all of our governors knew that our highway systems were gradually slipping behind in highway construction. We were not anywhere near keeping up with the automotive expansion, traffic, travel, and speeds, nor were we building adequately to support weights of trucks. One thing that was stymieing the people of the country was not the fact that they were not paying enough taxes for highway construction, but the big end of our trouble was gasoline taxes were being diverted on the national level to pay general operating expenses.

This committee, in the last 6 years, has made rapid strides toward correcting that situation. Our committee increased the appropriation in 1950 $100 million. The next time we considered it we increased it over $800 million. Now today we are considering a bill which will give us a construction program of $27 billion, which will take care of traffic to and through the major industrial centers of the United States. It is true that one-half of this money is going to be spent in the eight larger States of the country, but they also furnish half of the tax money that we are going to provide to build this system. This system is being built where the traffic load is greatest, and where the need on the basis of that load says that the highway system should be.

I am happy to have had an opportunity in helping this committee bring this program to the floor. We have had a tremendous time resolving our differences. I found myself at times in conflict with my experience as an administrative highway official and my duties as a Congressman, because I thought our committee was trying to write some things into this bill which, from an administrative standpoint, would make it tough on our highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads to administer. But we are making rapid strides

toward solving this problem. I think we are on the right road. I hope we can push this bill through to a successful conclusion and build a good adequate highway system for the Nation. At least we are on the road toward such a program at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE] has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of our subcommittee, a man who has been most patient. At times when tempers of people were quite high, he was very, very gracious, and we were able, through his excellent direction, to resolve those differences. It is very nice that the atmosphere of the committee when we passed the bill was in very good accord. I want to thank our chairman for the excellent work he has done on this committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

While we are passing out compliments I think the membership of our committee on both sides of the aisle will agree with me when I pay my respects and thanks to the members of the staff of the Public Works Committee, and our own office staff. They worked long hours. They were very patient with us. I want them to know that we as members of that committee appreciate it. While I am doing that I want to say many thanks to the staff of the Ways and Means Committee for the patience that they have shown, particularly to this Member from Ohio. A number of times I called them at most all hours of the day and night.

Mr. FALLON. I would like to reemphasize everything the gentleman from Ohio has said. I do not know of any group of people on Capitol Hill who have worked harder than the staff of the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Ways and Means, and I want to express on behalf of our subcommittee and the full committee, our deep appreciation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, the overall evaluation of H. R. 10660 must include the following general observations and criticisms, as I see it. We need new and improved highways; of this there is no doubt. Yet the staggering scope of this bill involving huge expenditures means that any defect or poor provision within the bill will be multiplied greatly. It is not enough, therefore, to legislate a highway bill; it must be the right kind of bill. To evaluate this highway bill and its provisions during 2 years of deliberations, I used two yardsticks to determine if the bill should be approved, amended, or rejected. These two yardsticks are:

First. No violation of States rights. Self-explanatory.

Second. Pay-as-you-build financing. Not deficit financing or charge it to the future.

How, therefore, does this bill measure up?

As to the first yardstick:

(a) For the first time in highway building history the right of the State to construct the highways determining wages and working conditions, as necessary, is now transferred to the Secretary of Labor of the Federal Labor Agency. All such jurisdiction now reposing in 48 States, will be centrally lodged in one man—without the right of appeal and court protection which the constitutional separation of powers has always guaranteed our citizens. The provision accomplishing this is know as the Davis-Bacon Act and is included now as part of the highway bill.

(b) The cost of utility relocation, always a State matter, will now be borne by the Federal Government, the effect of which will be to nullify and replace existing State law and contracts with utilities. States necessarily will take the dollars offered by Uncle Sam.

(c) The definition of highway construction has been changed, adding the phrase "cost of relocation of building tenants," which means the Federal Government will now pay the cost, the payment of which will alter and delay present State condemnation procedures and jurisdiction. There is even some doubt as to the meaning of this new language.

(d) Truck weights and sizes are frozen at the present level, preventing State legislatures from doing as they see fit within their respective States.

The second yardstick, the pay-as-you-build principle, has been abandoned in two ways:

(a) The House Ways and Means Committee earmarked $5 billion of Federal highway users' taxes which now pay other Government expenses and did not increase taxes in the new revenue measure so that the final deficit of the entire program, even with increased highway use and revenue, is estimated to be $2 billion.

(b) After the financing features of the bill were completed, the Public Works Committee increased authorizations by adding the above-mentioned new provisions—see first yardstick, a, b, and c—in the bill thereby increasing the cost of the highway program an additional amount, tentatively estimated at $5 billion.

Therefore the total deficit in the program is conservatively estimated at $7 billion even though increasing highway traffic is expected to produce more revenue.

Considering the shortcomings clearly shown by these two yardsticks, there is serious doubt in my mind that this highway bill should be passed in its present form. As I see it, the bill could be changed and made an outstanding piece of legislation through the omission or amendment of the various above-mentioned detrimental provisions. Surely it is not too much to expect that our States' jurisdiction should be maintained and that we pay for what we want. That is the kind of highway bill we should have.

I am opposed to the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in the highway bill. There is no precedent in the 40-year highway construction history of this country for the fixing of wages by the Secretary of Labor in Washington, since never has the Davis-Bacon provision applied to any highway construction of which the individual State was a party. Rather, the wages and working conditions have been prescribed by the fine State highway departments or other appropriate State agencies of these 48 sovereign States in conformance with the local economies, known better by them than by a Federal agency. Such procedure has resulted in the very definition of "prevailing wage."

The proponents of the Davis-Bacon provision claim that all they want is the prevailing wage to be paid to workers on highways throughout the Nation. We submit that prevailing wages are being paid on highway construction today, by economic necessity, by collective-bargaining agreements, or by State prevailing wage laws or regulations. Today in addition to the Fair Labor Standards Act, which certainly applies to interstate construction programs, there are prevailing wage laws or regulations in 30 States. There are collective-bargaining agreements with highway construction unions in 25 States, some of which are also covered by prevailing wage laws. Altogether the States are doing a fine job in protecting the labor standards of our citizens on highway construction work. There is no need for "Federal protection." Members of Congress may well be alarmed at this attempt to put Federal wage fixing on the highway program as a violation of States' rights and the spirit underlying our Constitution.

The bureaucratic determination of wages by the Secretary of Labor is far from the declaration of principle underlying our Government which up to this point has permitted the individual States to construct their own highways. The testimony presented to the committee does not dispute the excellent highway construction by the States, although labor's representatives began their statement with blanket accusations against contractors and existing practice.

Why was this labor legislation not considered by the proper committee, the Committee on Education and Labor? Was it because the proponents of this Davis-Bacon rider lacked confidence in the ability and knowledge of the members of the Labor Committee? Did we permit ourselves to be led into a field in which the Public Works Committee members have no special knowledge? Not a single member of the Labor Committee is a member of our Public Works Committee. Here are the rosters of both committees:

Education and Labor: Graham A. Barden; Augustine B. Kelley; Adam C. Powell, Jr.; Cleveland M. Bailey; Carl D. Perkins; Roy W. Wier; Carl Elliott; Phil M. Landrum; Lee Metcalf; James B.

Bowler; Earl Chudoff; Edith Green; James Roosevelt; Herbert Zelenko; Harris B. McDowell, Jr.; Frank Thompson, Jr.; Stewart L. Udall; Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.; Ralph W. Gwinn; Wint Smith; Carroll D. Kearns; Harold H. Velde; Clare E. Hoffman; Albert H. Bosch; Joe Holt; John J. Rhodes; Stuyvesant Wainwright; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.; Sam Coon; Orvin B. Fjare.

Public Works: Charles A. Buckley; George H. Fallon; Clifford Davis; John A. Blatnik; Robert E. Jones; John J. Dempsey; Frank E. Smith; Thaddeus M. Machrowicz; John C. Kluczynski; Tom Steed; T. Ashton Thompson; Brady Gentry; M. G. Burnside; Iris F. Blitch; James C. Wright, Jr.; W. R. Hull, Jr.; Kenneth J. Gray; Frank M. Clark; Paul G. Rogers; George A. Dondero; J. Harry McGregor; James C. Auchincloss; Russell V. Mack; Hubert B. Scudder; Myron V. George; Frank J. Becker; Gordon H. Scherer; Gardner R. Withrow; William C. Cramer; John F. Baldwin, Jr.; Fred Schwengel; Bruce Alger; Alvin R. Bush; Donald W. Nicholson.

The House Rules and Manual, describing the functions of both committees under subsection 687 on rules, establishes wages and hours and labor standards as within the jurisdiction of the Labor Committee.

Considering labor matters is not the prescribed field for the Public Works Committee, which, of course, only weakens the argument of those who now hold that these hearings should be the basis on which to adopt the Davis-Bacon provision as a part of this highway bill. It would be as appropriate for the Labor Committee to pass public-works legislation as a rider to a labor bill as our action in evaluating labor legislation. This is not the first time, however, that this Public Works Committee has invaded the field of another committee, for as we all know last year the Public Works Committee usurped the functions of the House Ways and Means Committee, with wasteful and unproductive results. Further, meetings of the Public Works Committee on this subject were hurried and brief and by no means exhaustive.

What did come out of these hearings? Was this a question of paying highway construction workers the prevailing wage rate? No. It was simply part of a jurisdictional dispute between the powerful AFL–CIO, on the one hand, and John L. Lewis' United Construction Workers on the other. Further, the AFL–CIO intended to organize the unorganized by means of Federal wage fixing. This would embrace all rural areas not now touched by labor's jurisdiction throughout the 48 States. We challenge and call to the attention of Members of Congress the question now posed—Is the highway bill to be used as a vehicle for promoting union welfare and an AFL–CIO organizational drive on the open shop and unorganized areas of the country, particularly the South and West?

All Members will be interested to know that the hearings actually contain court records and examples cited by the proponents of this Federal wage-fixing rider showing their questionable objectives. This is mentioned because of the shortness of time between the end of the hearings and this debate with the hearings only recently being printed.

Taking the representatives of AFL–CIO at face value, what was our committee told? Stripped to essentials the accusations of the four powerful international unions, which were widely circulated in this Congress and represented before the committee, charged, first, that highway construction contractors exploited their workers by the payment of starvation wages; second, that contractors imported workers from low-wage areas and dislocated the local economy; and third, that they refused to be organized by the unions. Or to quote them:

> With accelerated highway construction, intensified competition and entry of new firms into the field, we have witnessed the revival of the same inhuman conditions of the 1920's, for already these predatory contractors' tent caravans have dotted the landscapes of Federal-aid highway projects in Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Delaware, New Mexico, Arizona, and other States, solely because of their ability to obtain jobs by undercutting prevailing wage rates and importing distant cheap labor. Not only are some localities distressed with serious unemployment problems because of industry emigrating to low-wage areas, but this unemployment has been intensified by these construction crews immigrating from low-wage areas.

Or, as was further testified concerning Texas:

> The very worst labor laws that exist in this entire country, and which would actually drive us back to slavery, exist in Texas now.

The absurdity of such statements must be self-evident to every Member of this Congress who is aware of the relatively high wages and earnings of highway-construction workers today, whether union or nonunion, as compared with workers in other industries. In support of this statement, we call your attention to information in the record of these hearings containing wage studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and information from the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce on wages and earnings in highway construction. The specific examples cited by labor in the testimony completely repudiate the allegations. But, before treating such an example, the Members should also know that in many instances the hearings contain flat contradictions, plain misstatements of fact, evasive answers, and failure to provide additional information as promised. But most serious and disturbing of all, which the Members of Congress should know, was the misrepresentation of information contained in court records, to which the labor witnesses continually referred, knowing all the time these documents contained information to the contrary.

However, it would be that labor's lawyer and spokesman at these hearings was misinformed and did not intend to maliciously misrepresent and distort the facts when testifying before our committee in citing their foremost example of employer exploitation; but the record speaks for itself, and your attention is respectfully called to the printed hearings.

In particular, the foremost example presented was Pennsylvania highway project F–161 (7) at Aliquippa, Beaver County, Pa., whose contractor was the Nello Teer Co. The basic charges made against the contractor were: First, using workers imported into Pennsylvania from low-wage areas; second, discriminating against union labor; and, third, paying wages which were less than local union rates. The court record showed the facts to be just opposite to the representations made by the witness, and are as follows: First, 300 workers were not imported from North Carolina to this job to be paid lower wages, as charged, but rather only 5 persons were brought to this job, and they were key personnel. The rest of the workers were local residents. Second, the record showed no discrimination against union labor, but that the contractor had a contract with the United Construction Workers of District 50, affiliate of United Mine Workers of America, and not the AFL–CIO, which evidently is the cause for the entire grievance of the AFL–CIO. Third, the court record showed wages were not less than the prevailing wage, but equal to union scale or higher, and complied with the laws of the State of Pennsylvania.

The record further showed that the AFL–CIO imported 300 pickets from other areas, mainly Pittsburgh, who picketed the job and who through violence and wanton lawlessness forced the contractor's employees of district 50 to leave their equipment and the job.

The violence and lawlessness arising in this jurisdictional warfare brings to focus again that the consideration of this entire wage-fixing provision should be before the Labor Committee and should be investigated at greater length. The court record also shows that the contractor, Nello Teer, was forced to get an injunction stopping the violence and permitting the resumption of work. When the union refused to abide by the injunction, an NLRB ruling was requested which then forced the AFL–CIO to a consent decree. As another self-contradiction before our committee the AFL–CIO labor lawyer never protested nor charged that any employee received less than the prevailing wage until coming before our committee. It is readily apparent that it is not the prevailing wage they want as they so frequently proclaim, but rather the complete organization of highway construction work by the AFL–CIO, even to the point of throwing out another union.

Based on this example at Aliquippa, which labor selected as exemplary, we on the committee and other Members of Congress may well ask why the Davis-Bacon provision should be included in the highway bill. The Aliquippa case was presented by labor itself as a good example of why Federal wage fixing was needed. The court record proves just the contrary. Further, it leaves unanswered why the AFL–CIO has the temerity to appear before a committee of Congress and mislead the committee. Further, the witness leaves unanswered, but the record does not, why the AFL–

CIO is dissatisfied. The reason, as borne out in the testimony, is simply interunion warfare. The record shows that the AFL–CIO disapproves the contractor's making a contract with the construction workers of the United Mine Workers Union. Could it be that the AFL–CIO further believes that the adoption of the Davis-Bacon provision would permit the AFL–CIO, a nationwide union, to extend union control throughout the rural districts of our several States in competition with the United Mine Workers construction workers? Surely the highway bill now under consideration is not to be the vehicle to provide such competitive union expansion with disregard for what is right and decent and has so successfully operated in the past. Nor should legislative action be taken based on such contradictory evidence. Is, therefore, the Davis-Bacon provision needed in the construction of highways? The answer is obviously "No."

Looking to the details of the Davis-Bacon provision itself, it is obvious that, first, it could well destroy the authority and present excellent operation of the 48 State highway departments. Certainly it would violate a time-honored State right. Further, the multitudinous job classifications, 250 and more, which the AFL–CIO want in order to protect their jurisdictional claims, would require many additional Government administrators, requiring time, and resulting in delay in the construction of highways.

It appears there would be, without question, many jurisdictional disputes over job classifications and work assignments. Thousands of rulings by the Secretary of Labor would result in many protests which could require Labor Department hearings, resulting in further delay. Should a contractor classify a worker contrary to the Labor Department's ruling, the result would be the blacklisting of the contractor and the possible cancellation of contract.

Most dangerous of all, there is no appeal from the ruling of the Secretary of Labor which violates the most basic of American principles, the constitutional separation and balance of powers. This is bureaucracy in its most dangerous form and is antithetical to all that Americans hold dear concerning freedom and the role of Government. Congress saw fit to amend the Walsh-Healey Act—a law similar to the Davis-Bacon Act—providing for judicial review of actions of the Secretary of Labor, but his decisions under the Davis-Bacon Act go unrestrained and unchecked, regardless of how capricious or arbitrary they may be. It cannot be said that the Labor Department hearings are equivalent to judicial review, for the Secretary of Labor in such hearings is at the same time the prosecutor, the judge, and jury. This again proves that the subject matter of Davis-Bacon or Federal wage fixing should be handled by the House Labor Committee which might well investigate the lack of jurisdictional review and the maladministration of this labor law by the Labor Department.

How about the increased cost of highways if the Davis-Bacon were added? It is variously estimated at two or four billion dollars, which means less highway for the money expended. The unfortunate part is that the administrative and bureaucratic red tape, which Federal wage fixing entails, causes waste from which no one benefits and for which the taxpayer must bear the burden. Even as many Members of Congress understand that the Public Works Committee would not increase authorizations, it is equally true that the Public Works Committee does not intend and should not cut the mileage of highway construction, which we feel will result from the increased cost of the Davis-Bacon provision.

Also, the local economies of our Nation would be knocked out of balance with the imposition of incorrect wage rates from Washington. No Federal administrator can be as accurate as the State and local authorities determining the prevailing wages. In this huge highway expenditure of money, 90 percent of which comes from the Federal Government, can anyone seriously and honestly contend that the States would underpay their own people by predetermining less than the prevailing wage?

Finally, as to labor itself, where is collective bargaining at this point? Is wage setting by the Secretary of Labor the good example of collective bargaining which the union witness proclaimed, or is it the reverse and destroys collective bargaining? Do workers want this, really? If wages are set by the Secretary of Labor and not by bargaining—since the wages would be set with or without union activity at the job site—cannot the Secretary also bureaucratically dictate wages to labor not of their liking? Could it be that the proponents of Davis-Bacon rider want to put the power of wage fixing in highway work in the Secretary of Labor and have "this Federal administrator fix their wages because they can control the fixer," as a most prominent Member of Congress and foremost authority speculated in testifying before our committee?

Members of Congress should bear in mind that the proponents of the Davis-Bacon rider have not only the present wording of the Davis-Bacon Act in mind but also some dangerous amendments to this law which are contained in H. R. 4566 now pending before the House Labor Committee. Among other things this bill not only would require the payment of prevailing wage rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor but also all sorts of fringe benefits, welfare payments, pension payments, and working conditions which may be found to be prevailing by the Secretary of Labor. His power would be greatly increased under this bill. Under such amendments to Davis-Bacon a powerful union could have its wage rates and working conditions complied with as a condition of obtaining Federal or Federal-aid contract regardless of whether that union represented the workmen in the area. Further, H. R. 4566 would require the payment of time and one-half after 8 hours a day and would extend the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended, to the entire Federal-State highway system and not just to the interstate system as the union witness assured the committee.

It is not a question alone of misadministration or maladministration by the Labor Department. This is simply a field better left to the States.

If there is any doubt left as to what the real purpose of the proponents of the Davis-Bacon provision is, may I call to your attention a significant development in the Public Works Committee in which the principle of prevailing wages was rejected in a States rights proposal. Specifically, this States rights amendment would have required the payment of prevailing wages on the Interstate System as determined by the appropriate State authority. Because this would protect States rights and the individual worker it was rejected in favor of Federal wage fixing by a Washington official. This States rights amendment reads:

> All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects on the interstate system authorized under section 108 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work in the immediate locality. Such prevailing wages shall be predetermined by the State highway department or other proper State agency, and shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and each bid proposal form, and shall also be made a part of contract covering each project.

DAVIS-BACON NOT NEEDED

The setting of wage rates on State highway contracts is not in the realm of Federal Government and experience shows, documented by the testimony we heard, that the Davis-Bacon provision should not be a part of this highway bill. Therefore, it should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to direct a question to the ranking minority member of the committee. I believe the answer is known to all, but I want to clarify the record as to whether or not a new highway cutting across a right-of-way owned by a utility would not require reimbursement of the utility. As I understand it, whether section 113 is in or out of the bill the utility would be reimbursed just like any other private property owner. Is that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. I think they would be.

Mr. POFF. And in such case would not reimbursement include the cost of acquiring a new right-of-way and the cost of relocating the facilities less salvage, of course?

Mr. DONDERO. It all depends upon the situation. I look upon it this way, that this bill proposes to reimburse costs where costs were incurred by the establishment of the interstate system and no doubt the gentleman's proposal would come under that interpretation.

Mr. POFF. Yes; the utility owning the property right in the right-of-way, would be treated as a private individual owning a house situated on the proposed right-of-way of a new highway.

Mr. DONDERO. Approximately that is correct. We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] for 1 hour to control time allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss and explain the provisions of title II of H. R. 10660. As you know, title II of the bill had its origin in H. R. 9075 which was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, H. R. 9075 was ordered reported unanimously on March 19, 1956—House Report 1899. In rewriting the bill in executive session, the Committee on Ways and Means gave full consideration to the testimony of the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce and of the interested public witnesses who appeared during the course of the five days of public hearings held in connection with the bill.

H. R. 9075 was combined with H. R. 8836, as amended by the Committee on Public Works, in H. R. 10660 which was introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] on April 19, 1956.

Title II is substantively identical to the provisions of H. R. 9075 as it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. On April 20, 1956, I furnished the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works an explanation of title II for inclusion in the report on H. R. 10660. This explanation is the same as the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 9075, except for certain changes to reflect the fact that H. R. 9075 has been included in H. R. 10660, and that two bills affected by title II of H. R. 10660 have become law since the Committee on Ways and Means reported H. R. 9075. These bills are now Public Laws 458 and 466, which relate to the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1956 and the farmers' gasoline tax refund respectively.

Title II of H. R. 10660 is designed to raise sufficient revenue from new and existing highway-user taxes to approximately match estimated Federal highway expenditures under H. R. 8836, the Federal highway bill of 1956, as it was introduced by the Honorable GEORGE FALLON. Therefore, the proposed highway program is self-financing. In this connection it is important to note that the Committee on Public Works has made no change in the provisions of H. R. 8836 as it now appears as title I of H. R. 10660 which requires changes in the revenue estimates contained in the original report of the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 9075 and in the explanation furnished by the Committee on Ways and Means and incorporated in the report accompanying H. R. 10660—House Report No. 2022.

To this end, title II of H. R. 10660 embodies a financing program which utilizes certain existing or basic highway taxes, increases in such taxes, and certain new taxes. As I will shortly explain, provision is made in title II for a highway trust fund into which will be paid amounts equivalent to the designated existing highway-user taxes, the increases in such taxes, and the new taxes.

EXISTING TAXES

The existing or basic highway-user taxes which will be utilized for financing the proposed Federal highway program under the provisions of title II are:

First. Gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels, which are taxed under existing law at 2 cents per gallon;

Second. Tires and inner tubes, which are taxed under existing law at the rate of 5 and 9 cents per pound, respectively.

NEW AND INCREASED TAXES

The new revenue sources are:

First. A 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the gasoline, special motor fuel, and diesel fuel taxes, raising these taxes to 3 cents;

Second. An increase of 3 cents a pound in the tax on tires of the type used on highway vehicles, as well as a new tax of 3 cents a pound on camelback for retreading such tires;

Third. A 2 percentage point increase in the manufacturers' tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers; and

Fourth. A new annual tax of $1.50 per 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight on the use of trucks and buses weighing over 26,000 pounds which are registered—or required to be registered—for use on highways.

The rate changes made by the tax increases detailed above, and the rates applicable to the new taxes as well are effective for the 16-year period July 1, 1956, through June 30, 1972.

The provisions of Public Law 458, H. R. 9166, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1956, which extends the rates on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels of 2 cents per gallon, together with the existing rate of 8 percent on trucks, buses, and truck trailers, to April 1, 1957, are taken into account.

I would like to say just a few words in explanation of each of the increased or new taxes:

1. DIESEL AND SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS

The tax on diesel fuel already applies only in the case of diesel-powered highway vehicles. Title II makes no change in this. The tax on special motor fuels at the present time applies in the case of fuel used for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, and airplanes, however, the bill provides that the new 3-cent tax is to apply only to special motor fuel used in the propulsion of motor vehicles. The tax on special motor fuel used in the propulsion of motorboats or airplanes will remain at 2 cents. The effect of these provisions is to relieve nonhighway type vehicles and other equipment from the additional 1-cent-a-gallon tax in the case of both the diesel fuel and special motor fuel taxes.

Under the bill, the tax rates applicable to diesel and special motor fuels will revert to 1½ cents a gallon on July 1, 1972, the same rate which under Public Law 458 will be effective on April 1, 1957.

2. GASOLINE

Title II increases the tax on gasoline from 2 to 3 cents a gallon. However, this 3-cent-per-gallon rate will apply only in the case of gasoline for use in highway type vehicles. As in the case of diesel and special motor fuels, nonhighway type vehicles and equipment will be relieved from the additional 1-cent-a-gallon tax.

The 3-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline will revert to 1½ cents a gallon on July 1, 1972.

3. TIRES, INNER TUBES, AND TREAD RUBBER

The bill divides tires into two categories:

First. Those of the type used on highway vehicles, which would be taxed at the rate of 8 cents a pound; and

Second. Tires used on nonhighway vehicles, such as tractor tires, which will continue to be taxed at 5 cents a pound.

No change is made in the 9 cents a pound rate on inner tubes.

The new tax on tread rubber is levied at the rate of 3 cents a pound. However, an exemption is provided for tread rubber which is sold for use otherwise than in the retreading of tires of the type used on highway-type vehicles.

In general, a highway vehicle is a vehicle which, if new, would be subject to the manufacturers' excise on trucks, buses, passenger cars, and so forth, or which is a motorcycle. This, of course, means that tires, such as bicycle tires, will not be subject to the increased tax of 3 cents per pound proposed under the bill. This will also be the case with respect to tread rubber since that tax will apply only in the case of tread rubber sold for use in the retreading of tires of the type used on highway vehicles.

On July 1, 1972, the tax on highway vehicle tires will revert to 5 cents a pound, and the new tax on tread rubber will become inapplicable.

4. TRUCKS, BUSES, TRUCK TRAILERS, ETC.

At the present time the ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers is 8 percent of the manufacturers' sales price. The bill raises this rate to 10 percent for the period June 30, 1956, to July 1, 1972, when a 5-percent rate becomes effective.

5. SPECIAL TAX ON HEAVY HIGHWAY VEHICLES

The new tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses will be applicable to vehicles which are registered or required to be registered for use on the public highways and which weigh more than 26,000 pounds. The rate for this tax is $1.50 per year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight, or fraction thereof. Thus, a truck having a taxable gross weight of slightly more than 26,000 pounds would pay the minimum tax of $40.50.

An exemption is provided from this transit buses if the bus in question is of use tax in the case of mass or local the transit type, and at least 60 percent of the passenger fare revenue of the bus system involved is attributable to fares which are exempt from the excise tax on transportation of persons on the grounds that such fares do not exceed 35 cents or are commutation fares.

6. FLOOR-STOCK TAXES

Floor-stock taxes are provided with respect to the additional taxes and the new tax on tread rubber. They apply to inventories of dealers on hand on July 1, 1956, of—first, trucks, truck trailers, buses, and so forth, 2 percent; second, tires of the type used on highway vehicles, 3 cents a pound; third, tread rubber, 3 cents a pound; and fourth, gasoline, 1 cent a gallon but not applicable to retail inventories.

The floor-stock tax imposed on tread rubber will not apply to tread rubber used otherwise than in the retreading of tires of the type used on highway vehicles.

Floor-stock refunds are provided in the bill with respect to inventories, on hand on July 1, 1972, of the same items on which the floor-stock taxes are imposed.

To the extent administratively feasible, the new taxes and the increased taxes are limited to highway users. Generally, this is accomplished in the bill by basing the new and additional taxes upon fuels, tires, and so forth, sold for use in connection with highway-type vehicles. If this were not the case, extremely difficult apportionment problems would result. For example, it would be impossible to determine how much of a tire's life had been used on the public highways until the tire was entirely worn out. Complicating this difficulty is the fact that tires are often retreaded until the carcass is incapable of further use.

REFUNDS OR CREDITS

Special refunds or credits have been provided in the bill to cover cases where gasoline, diesel fuel, or special motor fuel, which is sold at the rate of 3 cents a gallon on the assumption that it would be used in highway vehicles or motor vehicles is used or resold for use for other purposes which, therefore, should be taxed at 2 cents a gallon. Similarly, a refund or credit is provided to cover the case of tread rubber which is taxed at 3 cents a pound, and subsequently used or resold for use otherwise than in retreading tires of the type used on highway vehicles.

The bill also provides a refund or credit for the additional 1-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline, diesel, and special motor fuels used by local transit systems, but only if at least 60 percent of the total passenger fare revenue—excluding tax—of the system is derived from fares which are exempt from the transportation tax under section 4262 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Under section 4262, commutation and season tickets and single fares of 35 cents or less are exempt from tax. The refund or credit thus allowed to local transit systems will be at the same ratio as the passenger fare revenues exempt from tax bears to the total passenger fare revenues of the transit system. As mentioned above, transit buses are also exempt from the tax on heavy trucks and buses.

TRUST FUND

The bill creates a fund to be known as the highway trust fund. In most respects, the highway trust fund thus established is to be handled in a manner similar to that provided for the trust fund for the old-age and survivors insurance program. Generally, the highway trust fund will consist of the receipts of all of the basic, additional, and new taxes imposed by title II of H. R. 10660 for the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1972. These include, first, the 2-cent basic and the 1-cent per gallon increase in the tax on gasoline, diesel, and special motor fuels; second, the 5-cent basic and 3-cent per pound increase in the tax on tires; third, the 2 percentage point increase in the manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers; fourth, the new tax on tread rubber; fifth, the use tax on heavy trucks and buses; and sixth, the floor stock taxes imposed by the bill.

The bill further provides that funds may be appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund, as repayable advances, when required to meet the expenditures incurred under the highway program proposed in title I of H. R. 10660. Provision is also made for the repayment of such advances out of the trust fund to the general fund at such time as the Secretary of the Treasury determines that moneys are available in the trust fund for such purpose. Excess funds in the trust fund are to be invested in Government obligations at interest and advances are to be repaid with interest.

Since the administration has taken the revenues derived from the basic taxes on motor fuels, tires, tubes, and trucks, buses, and truck trailers into account in its budget estimates for the fiscal year 1957, it was necessary to make certain adjustments with respect to these basic taxes to avoid an adverse effect on the budget for that year. To this end title II of H. R. 10660 provides that only those amounts which are received from such taxes after June 30, 1956, and attributable to liabilities incurred after that date are to be paid into the trust fund. In addition, it is provided that the basic tax of 5 cents per pound on tires and the 9 cents per pound basic tax on tubes will not be paid into the trust fund until after June 30, 1957.

Another adjustment is made necessary by the fact that the bill fixes the manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers at 10 percent of the manufacturers' sales price until June 30, 1972. The present rate of this tax is 8 percent and, while it was scheduled to revert to 5 percent on April 1 of this year, Public Law 458, the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1956, extends the 8-percent rate until April 1, 1957. Therefore, for the fiscal year 1958 and subsequent years the trust fund receipts will also include 3 percentage points of the ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers, or a total of 50 percent of the receipts derived from that tax.

Because of the adjustments referred to above, the provisions of title II will have no adverse effect upon the budget for the fiscal year 1957.

Under the bill, amounts in the trust fund are to be available, to the extent provided by appropriation acts, for expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet obligations of the United States incurred under title I to the extent the expenditures are attributable to Federal-aid highways. The total of such expenditures is estimated at $37,308 million. Tax receipts under title II are estimated at $38,498 million for the 16-year period covered by the bill. Thus, tax allocations into the trust fund are expected to exceed highways expenditures by $1,190 million. However, since it is estimated that interest to be paid on repayable advances made from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund will amount to $674 million, a net balance of $591 million will remain for additional highway expenditures in 1970 and subsequent years.

I should point out that revenues have been forecast on a conservative basis, while expenditures have been estimated on a liberal basis so that in all probability an even larger balance may result and be available for additional highway expenditures.

Title II contains a declaration of policy to the effect that it is the intention of Congress to bring about a balance of total receipts and total expenditures of the trust fund for the entire period involved, and states that if it hereafter appears that this balance will not be obtained, then Congress is to enact legislation in order to bring about such balance.

STUDIES

While the Committee on Ways and Means believes that the existing taxes, the new taxes, and the additional taxes reflected in title II of H. R. 10660 is the most equitable distribution of the tax burden among classes of highway users which can be obtained on the basis of present information, and while the bill imposes a special tax on heavy vehicles, the inadequacy of present data makes it difficult to determine with certainty whether or not more of a differential between classes of highway users is desirable. Therefore, the Committee on Ways and Means has called for the preparation of studies which will make such determinations possible in the future. To this end, title II requires the Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, and with the State highway departments to make a study of the effects of highway use by various classes of users; and based on such effects the proportionate share of design, construction, and maintenance costs attributable to each of the various classes of highway users, together with the direct and indirect benefits derived by each class of users.

The Committee on Ways and Means has agreed to establish a subcommittee to receive this study, to examine its conclusions and make such recommendations for the redistribution of the tax burden as appears advisable in the light of this study.

I urge the House to pass H. R. 10660. The roads which will be built by the revenues which will be produced under title II are long overdue. The American people will derive large benefits in personal safety, convenience and an increased flow of goods and commerce under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 72 of the report I find this language:

> Under H. R. 9075 all of the present tire and tube taxes and 37½ percent of the present manufacturers' excise taxes on trucks and buses will be diverted from the general revenue to the highway fund after July 1, 1957.

What becomes of the rest of the tax?

Mr. COOPER. Up until the time that the trust fund comes into operation it continues as at present, but after that date, generally speaking, all of the new increased taxes go into the trust fund. The tire and tube taxes together with half of the tax on trucks, buses, and trailers, will go into the trust fund, effective July 1, 1957.

Mr. GROSS. But only 37½ percent.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The answer, I think, to the gentleman's question is that the remaining 50 percent of the overall excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers, goes into the general fund, as all of it does now.

Mr. COOPER. Just as at present.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I feared. You are continuing the old policy of not earmarking all the funds which come from the various taxes upon the operators of motor vehicles. We are not dedicating all of that to road-building purposes, are we?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Iowa will be interested in knowing that the tax on trucks and heavy vehicles of that sort which is now 8 percent reverts to 5 percent on April 1, 1957, under existing law. We are making that tax 10 percent for a period of 16 years. We are leaving in the general fund that part of the tax that under permanent law goes to the general fund at the present time, but the extra 50 percent we are earmarking and putting in this trust. We are earmarking and putting in the trust the 3 cents on gasoline. We are doing that for motor fuels. We are doing that after July 1, 1957 for the tax on tires and tubes. So that we are earmarking actually more for this fund than the Secretary of the Treasury suggests that we should earmark for it.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman going to speak on this proposal?

Mr. MILLS. I did not intend to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. COOPER] has made a very exhaustive presentation of the technicalities of the bill. At this point I want to say to the House that he deserves great credit for the fine way in which he conducted the hearings on the revenue features of this bill. I also want to commend the members of both the minority and majority for their patience and hard work on this bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I would like the House to know that the able and tireless assistance of the gentleman from New York was most valuable in framing the revenue features of this bill. He offered several amendments in the committee during executive session that helped considerably to improve the revenue features of this program. The House should know that and I want to take this opportunity of so advising the House.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I certainly concur in the remarks that have just been made. I know my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member and former chairman of our committee, joins with me in feeling a great degree of pride in the fact that this bill was reported unanimously by our committee. This was due in no small part to his constructive work.

Mr. REED of New York. I am happy that it was so reported. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support President Eisenhower's recommendations for an interstate highway system. I believe that legislation to give effect to his recommendation has already been too long delayed. For this reason, I support H. R. 10660 because it appears to form the only practical basis for legislation at this time.

The Nation badly needs the bold approach to the highway program which President Eisenhower's recommendations represent. We all know that our highway system is badly out of date. Its present inadequacy is stifling the natural growth of our economy. Our present road system is taking a tragic toll of human lives. It is high time that this Congress take vigorous action to correct this situation.

Those of us from New York State know from personal experience the tremendous advantages of a modern highway system. The New York State Thruway will cover 427 miles when completed. Already, it has been estimated that the throughway has resulted in the construction of more than $150 million worth of new enterprises, with an annual payroll of more than $100 million. These new enterprises have been estimated to employ about 30,000 people, and they range from a $4 million television assembly plant at Batavia, N. Y., to a $30 million shopping center at Yonkers, N. Y. This impetus to the economy of our State is truly extraordinary when it is realized that the throughway has not yet been completed.

Moreover, the thruway has resulted in greater speed and efficiency of transportation, combined with more economical operation. Not only has this been accomplished, but the accident rate has dropped in a truly extraordinary fashion. The accidental death rate on the Thruway for 1955 was 2.8 per 100 million vehicle-miles, compared to a rate of 5.3 for New York State as a whole, and 6.5 for the United States. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this great new road has on the average cut in half the terrible accident toll which is occurring on our Nation's highways. Therefore, in terms of the preservation of human values, the proposed highway program of President Eisenhower deserves the support of all.

As has already been explained to the membership of this House, this bill contains a tax program designed to pay for the proposed highway system. I do not like to impose any new taxes upon the American people who are already overburdened in this regard. However, I support the tax program contained in this bill, although reluctantly, because I have become convinced that it forms the only basis upon which this essential highway program can be enacted. I do find some consolation in the fact that the increased tax costs to the average American will be more than made up by savings derived by him from the increased efficiency and safety of our roads.

The Committee on Ways and Means endeavored to distribute this new tax burden in as fair a manner as possible. When the bill was introduced, the new taxes fell equally on all highway users. The same tax increases applied to small tires and large truck tires equally. The same tax increase applied to gasoline and diesel fuel. In other words, exactly the same tax increase applied to the heavy-truck operator as applied to the average motorist. In my opinion, this was unfair. I do not think there can be any argument over the fact that big trucks wear out the roads faster than does the average passenger car. For this reason, I offered an amendment to require the heavy interstate type of truck to pay a somewhat larger portion of the cost of this program. This amendment which the committee adopted and which is contained in H. R. 10660, simply imposes a tax of $1.50 for each thousand pounds of weight of trucks whose gross weight is 26,000 pounds or more. This new tax will bring in between $800 million and $900 million over the life of the program.

I would like to summarize briefly the other tax provisions in the bill. First, the present 2 cents per gallon tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels, is increased to 3 cents. Secondly, the present 5 cents per pound tax on tires is increased to 8 cents. Third, a new tax of 3 cents per pound is imposed on tread rubber. It will be seen that this new 3 cents tax is equal to the 3 cents increase in tax on new tires. The committee was of the opinion that this action would serve to maintain the present competitive relationship between new tires and retread tires. Fourth, the present 8-percent manufacturer's excise tax on trucks, busses, trailers, and so forth, is increased to 10 percent. Finally, the bill imposes the new use tax on heavy trucks which I have already described.

I believe that it is important to emphasize that the bill provides for the establishment of a highway trust fund. The receipts from the taxes levied to finance this program will be required to

be placed in this trust fund. The existence of this fund will insure that these receipts will not be diverted to other purposes. Moreover, it will make it easier for the Congress as well as the public to know exactly how much the program is costing and to determine to what extent the costs are being met on a pay-as-we-build basis.

One aspect of this bill has given me as well as other members of our committee considerable concern. The majority has described this bill as a pay-as-we-go program. To some extent, it is. However, in certain important respects, it is not. For example, all of the present tire and tube taxes and a substantial portion of the present excise tax on trucks and busses will be diverted from the general revenue to the highway fund after July 1, 1957. These taxes together amount to about $5 billion over the remaining life of the trust fund ending in 1972. The diversion of these taxes, which have always been regarded as ordinary excise taxes available for general purposes, will require new taxes of an equivalent amount to make up the deficiency in the general fund or will prevent general tax relief of this same amount. Therefore, the Congress must recognize that the diversion of these taxes to the highway fund represents a departure from the pay-as-we-build theory of raising new money to pay for the new expenditures required by the highway program.

I am heartily in favor of this bill and I hope it will pass the House by unanimous vote.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I was able to attend most of the meetings held in connection with the tax provisions of this very important piece of legislation. Every moment I was there the distinguished former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, now the ranking minority Member, was present, and he contributed greatly to the proceedings in connection with this vital proposal of national interest. I commend him to the country for the continued sacrifices he is making on behalf of good government for all of the people of our country.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not plan to take all of this 15 minutes, as it is quite obvious that most of the Members of this body understand this legislation and seem to be in favor of it. By way of a review, however, I should like to point out some of the steps which have finally brought us to this happy state.

Last year you will recall the other body passed a bill which did not incorporate any revenue measures. Legislation was then introduced in this body and was referred to the Committee on Public Works. Thereupon the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee appointed a subcommittee which met with the Public Works Committee in an effort to draft the revenue provisions of the then Fallon bill.

Serving as chairman of that subcommittee it soon became rather obvious to me what the main problems were. No. 1 was whether or not we should consider or accept the bond proposal.

No. 2 was: If we accepted a pay-as-you-go proposal, what type of proposal should it be? And that involved a discussion of rate differentials and of other matters. Both in committee and subsequently on the floor of this body the bond proposal was rejected. I think this body was wise in so rejecting that proposal, because had we adopted it we would have spent about $11 billion or $12 billion in interest over a 30-year period and in addition we would not have gotten as many roads as we will get under this proposal. At the same time we also rejected the financing proposals incorporated in the Fallon bill last year.

This year, starting over again, the authorization proposals went to the Public Works Committee and the taxing proposals went to the Ways and Means Committee. We conducted very extensive hearings on the taxing proposals. I have been very pleased to note all of the compliments which have been paid here this afternoon. I think it is in order to compliment the members of the staff of the Treasury Department, of the respective committees, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Roads. Those gentlemen had a very difficult task indeed: The problem of estimating revenues over a 15- or 16-year period to say the least is a unique one. The problem of estimating contractual costs and construction costs over a similar period of time was equally difficult. The problem of estimating cost differentials between different types of users of the highway was another problem that was certainly very difficult. And all of these other items, the exemptions particularly which we have written into this bill were matters that required the most astute technical knowledge, and in that endeavor we also had, as usual, the very able assistance of the Legislative Counsel's office.

So I believe this legislation is in its rather happy state today as compared to last year because: No. 1, there has been a general recognition on the part of Members of this body that one of the things that this Nation needs in its economic development and in its vast expansion is a highway program.

No. 2: The sound way to get that program is to pay for it over the period during which we are building it.

So, having reached that fundamental agreement our problem was not too difficult thereafter. I must say also that generally the industries that are being taxed, as well as the motorists, have come in through their spokesmen and have given their assent and their approval to this legislation. The rubber manufacturers, the automobile manufacturers, the truckers and the others have all recognized the vital importance of this legislation to our country and to our pepole. I repeat, that we find ourselves more or less in agreement this afternoon because there has been general agreement in the country and a general recognition of the necessity for facing this problem.

Just by way of emphasis, I should like to point out several things that we have done in this legislation which I think mark very significant steps in the right direction.

No. 1: The creation of the so-called highway trust fund. For a great many years now highway users have complained, and I think with some justification since the conclusion of World War II and the Korean conflict, that vast revenues were being collected from them but were not being used for purposes of building highways. This bill recognizes that complaint and it establishes the highway trust fund which dedicates most of these funds to highway construction and for that purpose only.

The fund is set up by and large on the same theory and under the same type of basic administration as the social security trust fund. It is fiscally sound and is solvent over the 16-year period.

The other points of great significance have been the fact that we have ordered a fair and comprehensive study of highway costs as compared to use. I would like to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] who suggested that study. In my opinion, it will be invaluable to the Congress in years to come because we provide in the bill before us that succeeding Congresses will take a look at this program from time to time.

I might point out also, that throughout, in the matter of financing we have been highly conservative. It is very difficult, of course, to estimate revenues over a 15- or 16-year period, but throughout those estimates we have used averages which the respective industries tell us are highly conservative. It is not improbable, it is even probable, that our estimates are very low and the yield from these revenues will exceed our expectations. I might remind the Members of this body that we have been off on estimates in many things.

The Treasury Department estimates of revenue receipts this year, for fiscal 1956, prove to be off by $4.5 billion, and it now appears that the estimates for next year will also be off. So, if our economy continues to expand—and I have every reason to believe that it will—financially we will be in very good shape to pay for these roads and we will not be mortgaging our future to pay for them.

In addition to that, we were informed by the Committee on Public Works, by their experts, that their estimates were considered liberal. By that I mean that in projecting the costs over a period of 10 or 12 or 13 years they anticipated certain increases in those costs which in their judgment were liberal. So, we figured the costs high and the revenues low in order to produce a sound piece of legislation.

Now, one final point, and I should like to read these figures to all of you.

The average motorist today is paying only 10 cents out of each dollar spent during the course of the year, because he owns an automobile, for highways. He is paying the other 90 cents for other costs. Yet, the average motorist is today paying for the roads which he ought to have and does not in the form of increased insurance costs which amount to far more to the individual motorist than all of the Federal and State highway users' taxes paid by him combined. I think few people realize that our safety rate on the American highways has dropped so low. I believe there were something like 40,000 Americans killed on the highways last year and billions and billions of dollars of property damage and other casualty losses. But the rates have sunk so low that the average motorist today is paying much more for insurance than he is paying in user taxes for his vehicle. Property damage, loss of life, personal injuries, doctor and hospital bills, loss of wages, increased costs which the creeping pace of commerce imposes, represent a fantastic burden upon the commerce of our country today. Now, it is estimated that these new revenue measures will cost the average motorist $8.83 a year. In exchange therefor he will gain about $20 or a net of about $12 in savings in insurance, maintenance, less damage, less loss of time and wages, and other reduced costs. So, believe it or not, by building this highway system the average motorist can pay for it and save money at the same time by reducing his other costs which have become tremendous because of our present antiquated highway system.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased, indeed, that as the result of the joint effort of these two great committees and the work of the staffs of these committees, and the Treasury Department, and the Commerce Department, and of both parties working jointly we can soon, I hope, present to the American people a highway program which will spell progress for many years to come.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I am grateful to the gentleman for his comment about the self-financing features of this program, and I was particularly glad to hear the observation that the revenue estimates were figured on the conservative side.

I would like to have an explanation of something I do not quite understand in the tabulation on page 53 of the report. Do I understand from the last column that it is anticipated that beginning in the fiscal year 1962 there will be a deficit in the financing of a little over half a billion dollars, which will increase and continue until 1972?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARDY. So that the effect will be to temporarily increase the national debt, in order to finance the highway program?

Mr. BOGGS. That deserves a considerable amount of explanation. Let me put it this way to the gentleman: Using the estimates to which I have just referred as being highly conservative, the program is fiscally sound over the 16-year period. Of course, there will be years in this program, unless it is changed somewhere down the line, when construction is at its peak, when we may have temporary deficits. But under the trust fund, in the surplus years—if the gentleman will refer again to that same chart at page 53, he will note that 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 are all surplus years. In 1 year it amounts to over $1 billion. That money is invested in Government bonds at interest. In the deficit years it is borrowed from the general fund of the Treasury at interest. The net, however, is a surplus over the 16-year period, under our present estimates, of over $½ billion.

Mr. COOPER. There will be an excess of receipts over expenditures of $1.19 billion not taking into account interest.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman for that explanation. But on the assumption that these estimates are conservative and that the revenues will probably be in excess of what has been estimated, it presents a very pretty picture. Suppose, however, we should run the other way. I wonder if there should not be some tie-in betwecn the amounts authorized and the receipts into the trust fund in the event the trust-fund income should fall down.

Mr. BOGGS. I might say to the gentleman that the authorizations are still on an annual basis—the authorizations in title I of the bill. For instance, there would be an intent for an annual increase of $25 million through 1969. But that requires additional implementation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I want the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to call to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] the provision of the bill, which is there for the very purpose of the Congress being abreast of these developments. In the event that we have miscalculated for, say, fiscal year 1965 and thereafter, we shall look at the entire program again. We commit ourselves in this bill by a policy statement to provide such revenues as may be needed, additional revenues in the future, if necessary, to keep the program self-financing.

The gentleman, I think, may be assured that the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is correct, that over the 16-year period these revenues going into the trust fund will at least equal if not exceed the amount of the expenditures. There will be periods, in all probability, certain fiscal years, when expenditures will exceed the receipts in those fiscal years. That is the way the highway program, by its nature, will work. Apparently that is what disturbs the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that these distinguished colleagues of mine are exercising their best judgment in projecting these figures into the future. But that is a rather difficult thing to do. I certainly hope that the projections are on the conservative side. But I am wondering what would happen if they are not.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has answered the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. He has answered the gentleman from Virginia except for this: The policy of taking a look at the situation would require an affirmative action on the part of the Congress to undo the authorizations which this bill provides.

Mr. MILLS. No; not to undo the authorization. It might require affirmative action of Congress to provide some additional revenue in the future if these estimates do not develop to be correct. However, I remind the gentleman that our expenditures estimates include those where there is only an expression of intent and would require implementing legislation.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman is taking the position that the authorization would be inflexible and we would have to find the revenue some other way.

Mr. MILLS. Well, in one way or another, if we go through with the expressed intent and we do not have the money, again I say that there is an expression of intent that the program is to be self-financing. We believe that it is as contained in the bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JERE COOPER, has given an excellent technical discussion of title II of the bill, H. R. 10660. I would like to point out some of the advantages which will accrue to the various classes of highway users under title II of the bill.

As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means designated to attend the sessions of the Committee on Public Works held last summer in connection with the original Fallon bill, for the purpose of offering such advice and cooperation as members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the staff of the committee could supply in connection with the financing plan then under consideration. As a result of my connection with this subcommittee, I became very familiar with the highway needs of the American people and the interests of the various classes of highway users who benefit from our highways. Let me say that I discovered that virtually every highway user group—from the American Automobile Association to the various trucking organizations—has for years recommended that the Federal excise taxes levied upon highway users be dedicated and set aside for the purpose of financing the improvement and extension of the Federal highway system. This recommendation is premised upon the intense feeling of highway groups that it is only fair to utilize the Federal excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, special motor fuel, lubricating oil, passenger automobiles, trucks, buses and trailers, automobile parts and accessories, and tires and tubes, for the purpose of constructing roads.

Section 209 of title II of H. R. 10660, which establishes the highway trust fund, will carry this recommendation into effect. By its terms, the 38 billion, 498 million dollars in highway users' revenues, which will be raised over the 16-year period, from June 30, 1956, to July 1, 1972, will be dedicated to the building of highways. The specific taxes dedicated under the highway trust fund provision include the existing taxes on gasoline, diesel and special motor fuels, and tires and tubes, the increases in such taxes imposed by the bill, and the new taxes on tread rubber and the use of heavy trucks and buses, and the additional taxes on the sale of trucks, buses, and trailers. Thus, for the first time, the American motorist will pay these taxes with the assurance that he will be the direct beneficiary of every penny which he pays and he will pay with the knowledge that every cent derived from these taxes will be devoted exclusively to his personal convenience and safety.

In this connection, I think the Members of the House will find table 4 of the House Report No. 2022 accompanying H. R. 10660 of interest. As shown in this table, the burden of taxation imposed upon the highway users groups from existing Federal highway users taxes will amount to $40,948,000,000 alone over the next 16 years. When the new and increased taxes imposed under the provisions of the bill are added to the existing tax burden, the figure rises to the tremendous sum of $55,756,000,000. The difference betwen this figure and the $38,498,000,000 figure, which will be dedicated to the highway trust fund, results from the fact that the existing highway users taxes on lubricating oil, the sale of passenger automobiles and automobile parts and accessories and the pre-Korean tax on trucks, buses, and trailers are not dedicated to the highway trust fund. The revenue from these taxes will continue to be paid into the general fund of the Treasury for other purposes.

In addition to the dedication of the present 2 cent per gallon tax on gasoline and other motor fuels, which was recommended by the President, the Committee on Ways and Means believes it only proper to use the existing taxes on tires and inner tubes in the financing of the expanded highway program envisioned by the bill. These taxes are just as clearly highway users taxes as the motor fuels which Congress has traditionally recognized as such. The dedication of the existing taxes on tires and inner tubes amounts to no more than a recognition of the fact that substantial benefits from the highway program will accrue to the economy as a whole. In addition, I need not recall to my distinguished colleagues that this highway program has been advocated because it is essential to the country's national defense.

The dedication of the tax on tires and tubes to the highway trust fund is made necessary for another reason. Up to now, the Federal Government has assisted in the financing of the highway program by matching State funds on a 50–50 basis. Since the interstate program will be financed under the bill by matching State funds on a 90–10 basis, the dedication of more of the existing highway users taxes becomes imperative.

Because the revenues raised by this bill are to be dedicated to the highway program, the additional motor fuel taxes; the taxes on tires; tread rubber; the manufacturers tax on the sale of trucks, buses, and trailers; and the tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses have been limited to apply to highway users insofar as it is administratively practical to do so. In addition, special relief is provided in the case of increased motor fuel taxes and the tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses for mass transportation systems. This relief is provided because many such systems are already operating near or below the break-even point, and it was feared that the imposition of additional taxes upon these systems would adversely affect the continued provision of such transportation which is essential to the large urban and suburban population of the country.

Important as the point which I have been discussing is, Mr. Chairman, the most important attribute of the financing plan envisioned in title II of this bill is the fact that the American motorist will purchase exactly $38,498,000,000 worth of roads for the same amount of taxes. This is to be contrasted with the President's bond financing program which would have provided only $31,225,000,000 worth of roads at the cost of $42,773,000,000. The interest charges which would have resulted from the President's proposal alone amounted to $11,548,000,000, and the program proposed by the President would have tied up the revenues derived from the various motor fuel taxes for a 30-year period.

Another feature of the financing program of this bill, of which I am pleased, is that by reason of the self-financing nature of the proposal it pays for today's roads today. This leaves future generations of Americans free to provide for their own road needs unlike the President's proposal which would have saddled the next generation with the roads which the citizens of today will use and perhaps wear out.

I am also happy to be able to point out to the Members of this distinguished body that the financing proposal under discussion here today parallels the recommendation of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission recommended that the expanded highway program be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose. This recommendation was buttressed by the Commission in pointing out that increased taxes are preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting larger highway outlays by the National Government, because deficit financing can only result in high interest charges and operates to shift the burden of existing road needs to future generations who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to worry about.

I believe the distribution of the tax burden which will be established under title II of H. R. 10660 to be the fairest obtainable on the basis of present information. It takes into account the benefits enjoyed by each class of highway user and establishes a differential at an annual ratio of from 25 to 30 to 1 in favor of the motorist as compared to the operators of large trucks. This differential recognizes the fact that the use of our highways by trucks increases the total cost of the program in the form of higher construction and maintenance costs and that the trucker receives substantial commercial benefits from our highways not enjoyed by the average motorist.

Interestingly enough, the average motorist is today paying only 10 cents out of each dollar spent during the course of the year because he owns an automobile for highways. Yet, the average motorist is today paying for the roads which he ought to have and does not in the form of increased insurance costs which average far more to the individual motorist than all of the Federal and State highway users taxes paid by him combined. Property damage, loss of life, personal injuries, and the resulting doctor and hospital bills, loss of wages, and the increased cost which the creeping pace of commerce imposes are also hidden cost items representing motorist payments for the roads which he does not have.

The increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax on gasoline which will be imposed under title II of H. R. 10660 will represent only a 1-percent increase in the cost of owning an automobile for the average motorist who drives 10,000 miles a year. The total cost per year from all of the new increased and existing taxes utilized in the financing program of this bill to the average motorist will amount to only $8.83 per year, 65 to 70 cents per month, or 2 cents a day. On the other hand, the savings which will accrue to the average motorist from the use of the interstate system alone will average $20 per year. These savings come in the form of savings in insurance costs, depreciation, gasoline cost, and does not take into account the shorter time needed nor the real pleasure to be derived from an open, unobstructed, and safe highway on every trip taken.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the financing program envisioned in title II of this bill is not only fair and equitable, but is the best obtainable. I, therefore, urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here all afternoon and heard all the speeches.

It is very evident that this heretofore very complicated legislation is going to pass. It is very evident that those who have been responsible for its preparation believe that it is adequate, at least as near adequate as they can now make it. I am sure they feel in a whole-souled way that we have come now to a solution of this very important matter. I am glad that I had a very active part in its preparation.

We in Ohio probably have felt the necessity for the legislation coming on longer than almost any other State, and I will tell you why. If you have ever noticed the geography of Ohio, located right south of the Great Lakes, you will note that anybody wanting to come by automobile from New York or Pennsylvania or New England going west has to go through our great State of Ohio. Anybody coming back from Milwaukee or Chicago, going east, would come through our State of Ohio.

For many years, 30 years at least, that I can remember, we in Ohio tried to prepare our roads to carry that traffic. We had many miles of brick-paved roads. Along in the spring of the year, after the winter frost would be coming out of the ground, along would come a big truck from the east or west and away to one side our bricks would fly and we would have to fix the roads, with nobody to help pay for it. We had to do that ourselves.

Now we have come to the place where the local governments should have to pay for their road repairs.

This program has ripened into a useful program, a national program. Every State will pay its part and those who use the roads will pay their part. I am not going to go into detail about that, Mr. Chairman.

I should like to stress one thing, however. I do not believe that in the debate today we have clarified absolutely this matter of what we are going to do for these public utilities. The purpose, I am sure, is to take care of them. But their problem is a rather personal and serious one. As we come along with the road program, going east, west, north, and south, we are going to run into them. We are going to run into the telephone poles and electric light poles, and so forth. They do have a just complaint. We ought to listen to them and give them assistance and protection.

I think we can safely say from the debates today that the Congress has a right spirit toward the public utilities. We think the language is proper; at least, I hope so. If it is not, I for one will be ready to come forward with language that will relieve the situation if the need develops.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a few tables that I think are very pertinent to the matter under discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the following tables with regard to the highway-tax program will be of interest to the Members of the House.

Title II of H. R. 10660 provides new or increased taxes from several different revenue sources. These are as follows:

Article	Unit of tax	Rates under—			Increase under H. R. 10660
		Present law		H. R. 10660	
		Before Apr. 1, 1957	On and after Apr. 1, 1957		
Gasoline	Gallon	2 cents	1½ cents	3 cents	1 or 1½ cents.
Diesel fuel	Gallon	2 cents	1½ cents	3 cents	1 or 1½ cents.
Special motor fuel	Gallon	2 cents	1½ cents	3 cents	1 or 1½ cents.
Tires	Pound	5 cents	5 cents	8 cents	3 cents.
Tread rubber (camelback)	Pound	0	0	3 cents	3 cents.
Trucks, buses, truck-trailers, etc	Manufacturers' price.	8 percent	5 percent	10 percent	2 or 5 percent.
Use tax on vehicles and maximum load, where total weight is over 26,000 pounds.	1,000 pounds	0	0	$1.50	$1.50.

Estimated tax receipts allocated to highway trust fund, fiscal years 1957–72 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Present law taxes					New or increased taxes								Total receipts	
	Gasoline, 2 cents per gallon [2]	Diesel fuel, 2 cents per gallon	Tires, 5 cents per pound	Inner tubes, 9 cents per pound	Total, present law taxes	Gasoline, 1 cent per gallon [3]	Diesel fuel, 1 cent per gallon [4]	Tires, 3 cents per pound [5]	Tread rubber, 3 cents per pound [6]	Trucks, buses, truck trailers, etc.		Trucks, etc., over 26,000 pounds, $1.50 per thousand pounds annual tax	Total, new or increased taxes	Annual	Cumulative
										3 percent of manufacturers' price (from 5 to 8 percent) [7]	2 percent of manufacturers' price (from 8 to 10 percent)				
1957	[8] 846	[8] 22			868	407	10	95	8		47	45	612	1,480	1,480
1958	994	27	184	18	1,223	472	13	98	9	75	50	46	763	1,986	3,466
1959	1,031	28	191	18	1,268	489	13	100	11	81	54	47	795	2,063	5,529
1960	1,064	29	197	9	1,299	505	13	103	9	78	52	48	808	2,107	7,636
1961	1,099	30	204	9	1,342	522	14	108	11	84	56	49	844	2,186	9,822
1962	1,133	31	210	9	1,383	538	15	111	8	84	56	50	862	2,245	12,067
1963	1,169	32	217	9	1,427	555	15	111	12	87	58	52	890	2,317	14,384
1964	1,203	33	223	9	1,468	571	15	116	11	90	60	53	916	2,384	16,768
1965	1,237	34	229	9	1,509	589	16	124	14	87	58	55	943	2,452	19,220
1966	1,269	35	235	9	1,548	604	17	127	11	96	64	56	975	2,523	21,743
1967	1,307	36	242	9	1,594	622	17	129	12	96	64	57	997	2,591	24,334
1968	1,341	37	248	9	1,635	638	17	132	14	96	64	59	1,020	2,655	26,989
1969	1,375	37	255	9	1,676	654	18	135	11	99	66	60	1,043	2,719	29,708
1970	1,407	38	261	9	1,715	669	18	135	14	99	66	62	1,063	2,778	32,486
1971	1,436	39	266	9	1,750	683	18	140	11	99	66	63	1,080	2,830	35,316
1972	[9] 1,650	[9] 47	273	9	1,979	[10] 777	[10] 22	[10] 145	[10] 14	105	[10] 76	[10] 64	[10] 1,203	3,182	38,498
Total	19,561	535	3,435	153	23,684	9,295	251	1,909	180	1,356	957	866	14,814	38,498	

[1] Essentially based on an assumed average rate of growth of about 3 percent compounded for the entire period. The rate of growth is not uniform, however, over the period. In the earlier years it is above 3 percent and in the later years below 3 percent.

[2] After deduction of refunds of tax on farm gasoline, estimated at 6 percent.

[3] After deduction of all use in other than highway-type vehicles, estimated at 10 percent, and use by transit systems estimated at $4 million annually.

[4] After deduction for transit use estimated at $1 million annually.

[5] After deduction of tires for non-highway-type vehicles, estimated at 12 percent.

[6] After deduction of rubber for tires for non-highway-type vehicles, estimated at 6 percent.

[7] This is shown as an increased tax because the present rate does not extend beyond Mar. 31, 1957.

[8] Excludes receipts from taxes accrued prior to July 1, 1956.

[9] Including receipts after June 30, 1972, of taxes accrued on or before that date.

[10] Including receipts after June 30, 1972, of taxes accrued on or before that date, less floor stocks refunds paid in 1973.

NOTE.—Derived from data presented to the Committee on Ways and Means by the Treasury Department and Bureau of Public Roads.

Estimated expenditures, receipts, and balances of the highway trust fund for the fiscal years 1957 to 1972, inclusive

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Highway expenditures[1]					Total tax receipts	Excess (+) or deficit (−), tax receipts over highway expenditures	Interest credit (+) or charge (−) to trust fund[3]	Net annual credits (+) or charges (−) to trust fund	Trust fund balance, credit (+) or debit (−) at end of year
	From existing authorizations and those made under H. R. 8836	Anticipated from expression of intent in H. R. 8836	Total expenditures under existing law and H. R. 8836 (including expression of intent)	Funds in excess of requirements, available for additional highway expenditures in 1970–72[2]	Total funds available for highway expenditures					
1957	1,025		1,025		1,025	1,480	+455	+5	+460	+460
1958	1,480		1,480		1,480	1,986	+506	+16	+522	+982
1959	1,993		1,993		1,993	2,063	+70	+23	+93	+1,075
1960	2,190	285	2,475		2,475	2,107	−368	+20	−348	+727
1961	2,175	525	2,700		2,700	2,186	−514	+11	−503	+224
1962	2,360	665	3,025		3,025	2,245	−780	−4	−784	−560
1963	2,260	790	3,050		3,050	2,317	−733	−21	−754	−1,314
1964	2,225	850	3,075		3,075	2,384	−691	−37	−728	−2,042
1965	2,200	900	3,100		3,100	2,452	−648	−53	−701	−2,743
1966	2,200	925	3,125		3,125	2,523	−602	−68	−670	−3,413
1967	2,300	950	3,250		3,250	2,591	−659	−84	−743	−4,156
1968	2,100	975	3,075		3,075	2,655	−420	−98	−518	−4,674
1969	1,700	1,000	2,700		2,700	2,719	+19	−105	−86	−4,760
1970	1,000	600	1,600	425	2,025	2,778	+753	−99	+654	−4,106
1971	800	330	1,130	166	1,296	2,830	+1,534	−75	+1,459	−2,647
1972	325	180	505		505	3,182	+2,677	−30	+2,647	0
Total	28,333	8,975	37,308	591	37,899	38,498	+599	−599	0	0

[1] Including planning and administration expenditures.

[2] By "requirements" it is meant expenditures authorized under existing law, expenditures provided for (including an expression of intent) under H. R. 8836, and estimated interest payments to be made with respect to advances from the general fund.

[3] Computed at 2¼ percent, current applicable interest rate.

NOTE.—Derived from data presented to the Committee on Ways and Means by the Treasury Department and Bureau of Public Roads.

Estimated tax receipts, fiscal years 1957–72

Fiscal year	New or increased taxes under this bill							Total, all taxes
	Gasoline	Diesel fuel	Tires	Tread rubber	Trucks, buses, and trailers	Trucks over 26,000 pounds	Total, new taxes	
	Rates of tax							
	Cents per gallon	*Cents per gallon*	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*	*Manufacturers' price, percent*	*Per thousand pounds*		
1957	1	1	3	3	2	$1.50		
1958–72	1	1	3	3	5	1.50		
	In millions of dollars							
1957	407	10	95	8	47	45	612	2,789
1958	472	13	98	9	125	46	763	2,895
1959	489	13	100	11	135	47	795	3,022
1960	505	13	103	9	130	48	808	3,075
1961	522	14	108	11	140	49	844	3,183
1962	538	15	111	8	140	50	862	3,247
1963	555	15	111	12	145	52	890	3,349
1964	571	15	116	11	150	53	916	3,430
1965	589	16	124	14	145	55	943	3,515
1966	604	17	127	11	160	56	975	3,609
1967	622	17	129	12	160	57	997	3,696
1968	638	17	132	14	160	59	1,020	3,779
1969	654	18	135	11	165	60	1,043	3,856
1970	669	18	135	14	165	62	1,063	3,941
1971	683	18	140	11	165	63	1,080	4,001
1972	777	22	145	14	175	64	1,197	4,369
Total	9,295	251	1,909	180	2,307	866	14,808	55,756

Approximate apportionment of Federal highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954

PRELIMINARY—SUBJECT TO SUCH REVISION AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONFORM TO SEC. 108 (F) OF H. R. 10660

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1957			Fiscal year 1958			Fiscal year 1959		
	Primary, secondary, and urban ($725.0)	Interstate ($1,200.0)	Total ($1,925.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($750.0)	Interstate ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,450.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($775.0)	Interstate ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,775.0)
Alabama	14.7	19.6	34.3	14.9	26.7	41.6	15.5	31.4	46.9
Arizona	9.0	11.2	20.2	9.2	15.3	24.5	9.6	18.0	27.6
Arkansas	10.9	11.4	22.3	11.1	14.8	25.9	11.5	17.4	28.9
California	38.8	112.1	150.9	40.1	169.7	209.8	41.4	199.6	241.0
Colorado	11.3	9.2	20.5	12.0	11.4	23.4	12.3	13.4	25.7
Connecticut	6.6	26.2	32.8	6.9	40.6	47.5	7.1	47.8	54.9
Delaware	3.0	4.0	7.0	3.1	4.8	7.9	3.3	5.6	8.9
Florida	12.0	24.7	36.7	12.3	36.2	48.5	12.8	42.6	55.4
Georgia	16.9	34.9	51.8	17.2	51.2	68.4	17.7	60.2	77.9

Approximate apportionment of Federal highway funds pursuant to H. R. 10660 and Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954—Continued

PRELIMINARY—SUBJECT TO SUCH REVISION AS MAY BE REQUIRED TO CONFORM TO SEC. 108 (F) OF H. R. 10660—CONTINUED

[Millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1957			Fiscal year 1958			Fiscal year 1959		
	Primary, secondary, and urban ($725.0)	Interstate ($1,200.0)	Total ($1,925.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($750.0)	Interstate ($1,700.0)	Total ($2,450.0)	Primary, secondary, and urban ($775.0)	Interstate ($2,000.0)	Total ($2,775.0)
Idaho	7.3	6.4	13.7	7.5	7.8	15.3	7.7	9.2	16.9
Illinois	32.1	55.1	87.2	33.0	77.9	110.9	34.1	91.6	125.7
Indiana	17.4	42.4	59.8	17.7	63.4	81.1	18.3	74.6	92.9
Iowa	15.9	15.7	31.6	16.1	20.2	36.3	16.6	23.8	40.4
Kansas	15.1	12.3	27.4	15.3	15.1	30.4	15.9	17.8	33.7
Kentucky	13.0	24.9	37.9	13.3	36.0	49.3	13.8	42.4	56.2
Louisiana	11.5	24.5	36.0	11.9	36.0	47.9	12.2	42.4	54.6
Maine	5.5	7.9	13.4	5.6	10.7	16.3	5.8	12.6	18.4
Maryland	7.8	21.3	29.1	8.0	31.8	39.8	8.3	37.4	45.7
Massachusetts	13.2	40.6	53.8	13.7	61.2	74.9	14.1	72.0	86.1
Michigan	24.9	63.3	88.2	25.5	94.7	120.2	26.3	111.4	137.7
Minnesota	17.6	25.2	42.8	17.8	35.4	53.2	18.4	41.6	60.0
Mississippi	11.7	13.7	25.4	11.9	18.0	29.9	12.3	21.2	33.5
Missouri	20.4	31.1	51.5	20.7	43.7	64.4	21.4	51.4	72.8
Montana	11.5	9.2	20.7	12.2	11.2	23.4	12.6	13.2	25.8
Nebraska	11.9	7.1	19.0	12.5	7.8	20.3	13.0	9.2	22.2
Nevada	7.1	5.1	12.2	7.5	5.4	12.9	7.7	6.4	14.1
New Hampshire	3.2	4.1	7.3	3.3	4.9	8.2	3.4	5.8	9.2
New Jersey	13.5	63.7	77.2	14.0	99.3	113.3	14.4	116.8	131.2
New Mexico	9.5	12.5	22.0	9.9	17.2	27.1	10.3	20.2	30.5
New York	45.6	71.1	116.7	47.1	97.8	144.9	48.7	115.0	163.7
North Carolina	17.5	15.3	32.8	17.9	18.0	35.9	18.5	21.2	39.7
North Dakota	8.6	6.6	15.2	8.6	7.8	16.4	9.0	9.2	18.2
Ohio	28.7	67.3	96.0	29.6	99.5	129.1	30.6	117.0	147.6
Oklahoma	14.1	19.7	33.8	14.3	27.5	41.8	14.8	32.4	47.2
Oregon	11.0	16.3	27.3	11.3	23.3	34.6	11.7	27.4	39.1
Pennsylvania	34.1	42.7	76.8	35.7	55.6	91.3	36.8	65.4	102.2
Rhode Island	3.9	6.5	10.4	4.1	9.0	13.1	4.2	10.6	14.8
South Carolina	9.3	10.4	19.7	9.5	13.4	22.9	9.7	15.8	25.5
South Dakota	9.2	6.3	15.5	9.2	7.0	16.2	9.5	8.2	17.7
Tennessee	15.3	20.4	35.7	15.6	27.7	43.3	16.1	32.6	48.7
Texas	44.2	48.3	92.5	45.4	63.7	109.1	46.9	75.0	121.9
Utah	7.0	12.1	19.1	7.3	17.3	24.6	7.6	20.4	28.0
Vermont	3.0	8.9	11.9	3.0	12.9	15.9	3.2	15.2	18.4
Virginia	13.8	28.6	42.4	14.4	41.7	56.1	14.8	49.0	63.8
Washington	11.7	23.4	35.1	12.2	34.2	46.4	12.6	40.2	52.8
West Virginia	7.9	13.5	21.4	8.1	18.9	27.0	8.4	22.2	30.6
Wisconsin	16.6	18.1	34.7	17.0	23.6	40.6	17.6	27.8	45.4
Wyoming	7.1	14.7	21.8	7.5	21.6	29.1	7.7	25.4	33.1
Hawaii	3.3	----------	3.3	3.4	----------	3.4	3.5	----------	3.5
District of Columbia	4.2	7.8	12.0	4.4	11.1	15.5	4.5	13.0	17.5
Puerto Rico	5.1	----------	5.1	5.2	----------	5.2	5.3	----------	5.3

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, this is, indeed, a day I have looked forward to with great anticipation. A day when the Congress would finally be able to pass judgment upon the work done by the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Ways and Means and their extensive hearings and deliberations on a much needed Federal highway construction program. I have heard various Members go into detail on this bill here today. In the time allotted to me, of course, I will not have the time to discuss this very important piece of legislation in detail. Instead, I will try to summarize it. I want to use this bouquet here in front of me as an illustration of my thoughts on this important piece of legislation. I first want to give a bouquet to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], to the distinguished minority member of the committee from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] who, incidentally, is leaving the House at the end of this session, and I would like to give a bouquet of roses to him and wish him much success and happiness throughout the rest of his life as he retires from the House. I would also like to give roses to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for his diligent efforts on behalf of this bill, and the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], chairman of the subcommittee handling title II of the bill and to all the members of the House Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Ways and Means. I want to say this very sincerely. I think all of these Members are entitled to a bouquet because for many, many months they have sat intently and have worked hard and listened to testimony and tried to work out a good bill to give the American people better roads.

I want to further use this bouquet here in front of you to illustrate what has transpired concerning a highway bill here in the House of Representatives. Last year our Committee on Public Works worked very hard and reported out a bill we believed acceptable to the people because we knew and the Congress knew that America needed better roads that would cut down highway fatalities, help alleviate crowded conditions, and provide jobs for the people in constructing those roads.

I made numerous speeches back in my congressional district and at each meeting, without exception, interest was expressed in behalf of the proposed highway bill. Everything looked rosy. But what happened? When the bill was referred to the floor of the House for debate we heard from the powerful interests of the trucking lobby and that removed one rose from our bouquet. Then we heard from the utility companies who had a complaint and their pressures removed another rose from our beautiful bouquet. Then, we heard from the people who were opposed to the Davis-Bacon prevailing wage provision who took another rose from our bouquet. Then, we heard from the administration who wanted to pay $11 billion in interest on a bond proposal for financing the highway program and that took another rose from our bouquet. Then, we heard from the airlines who wanted to be exempt from any tax and that took another rose from our beautiful bouquet. Then, we heard from those people who wanted better highways but who were not willing to pay for them with increased gasoline tax and that removed another rose from our bouquet. So, my friends, when we were all finished what did the bouquet look like? Nothing but stems that were completely barren. Now, what has happened to our bouquet since the highway bill was defeated last year?

The high rate of traffic fatalities on the small, crowded highways has continued. Instead of helping prevent the slaughter on the highways, it has increased. I hold here a clipping I received in this morning's mail from the Marion Daily Republican, a newspaper in my congressional district which carries a headline as follows: "Twenty-three killed in automobile crashes over weekend."

My friends, this staggering figure was just for the State of Illinois over one weekend. I dread to think what the total was in the 48 States. At the very

moment I was speaking on the floor of Congress last year urging the passage of the Federal highway construction bill, my aunt and uncle were preparing to go on a church class picnic and as they proceeded down one of our small, crowded two-lane highways, a carload of drunks pulled from behind a truck in the opposite lane and hit the car head on, killing both my aunt and uncle and the third party in the car.

I will not be foolish enough to try to tell you that 40,000 miles of superhighways throughout the United States will stop all fatalities. Of course, it will not, but I want to say without reservation that the building of a four-lane expressway with a divider between the two directions of traffic will definitely cut down on the spilling of human blood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GRAY. Would the gentleman be so kind as to yield me 5 more minutes?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. In addition to helping save lives, these new roads will help relieve some of the congestion.

And last but not least by any means, it will provide jobs for many of our unemployed people in the construction of these highways. We have 51,000 people receiving Government surplus food in 15 southern Illinois counties and these proposed highways will do much in cutting down public assistance and giving good American people an opportunity to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families.

Friends, the American people want and are entitled to good roads and we should give them the bouquet of roses to which they are entitled and need by voting unanimously for the passage of this highway bill and after you do this you can see the bouquet that was once only barren stems will be transformed into a beautiful and growing bouquet of roses.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address myself to certain of the fiscal aspects of this bill. First, I want to commend the previous speakers from the Ways and Means Committee in their explanation of the financing of this bill, and join with them in their statements.

There were supplemental views filed to the Ways and Means Committee's report in which it was stated that as of the date that we passed the revenue features, the Public Works Committee had not yet completed the authorization bill. There were serious doubts in the minds of many of us whether or not the Public Works Committee would keep the bill itself within the revenue that was being raised under the revenue aspects of the bill. At this time I want to say I am very happy to state that the Public Works Committee has done as we really anticipated they would do, kept within the revenue raised in the other feature of the bill.

The reason I wanted to take this time is because there has been talk about two aspects of the authorization bill which might raise the cost of this highway program beyond the thirty-seven plus billions of dollars anticipated revenues. Those two particular provisions are: One, the utility relocation provision, and the Bacon-Davis provision.

I have seen many statements made recently of the cost to be paid out of Federal funds as a result of section 113.

The supplemental views filed to the report of the Committee of Public Works accompanying this bill H. R. 10660 made the statement that it would cost one and one-half billion. Newspaper articles estimated the cost might be from 2 to 4 billion dollars. I think this is a gross exaggeration. Actually we have studies that reveal the limit of these costs as a result of utility relocation, to be at the most one-half billion dollars.

In 1954 a study of utility relocation costs was made by the Secretary of Commerce at the direction of the House. The report of the Secretary—it appears in House Document 127 of the 84th Congress, shows that the total utility relocation cost before any reimbursement was 2.6 percent of the total road construction cost. Two-fifths of this amount or 1 percent of total road construction costs is paid under existing State law or practices, leaving 1.6 percent to be paid by the utilities.

To the extent that the States already pay relocation costs—and there are a few States that do—these costs are a reflection of the estimates of the cost of the roads to be built in the future and therefore were incorporated in the budget figures submitted to the Public Works Committee.

H. R. 10660 authorizes the appropriation of something like $37.6 billion over a period of 13 years, or an average of $2.89 billion annually. 1.6 percent of this amount would be an average of about $46 million annually. You can multiply that out by 13 years. That is why I say the total amount that could possibly be required for utility relocation would be at the very highest $600 million and not $1½ billion.

This estimated cost is the cost of relocating the facilities that utilities are presently required to pay by various State laws and practices. It is the maximum amount that could possibly be expended out of Federal funds. In order for any of this amount to be paid out, of course, the States would have to change their existing laws or practices; and it is obviously impossible for 100 percent of the utility to be paid under State laws and practices in the foreseeable future. So in considering the question of the relocation of the utilities I do not believe the fiscal aspects of it have much bearing, although there are other important policy features that enter into the picture. I am only directing attention to the fiscal aspect of it.

The same argument prevails in regard to the Bacon-Davis provisions as they have been watered down in the present bill to reflect the prevailing local wage. The budgets that have been prepared by the States upon which the Public Works Committee based its figures do take into consideration prevailing local wages, and for that reason, too, I am satisfied that the cost aspects of the Davis-Bacon amendment as amended by the Public Works Committee will not have any great bearing on the revenue features of this bill. I am not attempting to discuss the policy questions involved in Davis-Bacon, only the limited fiscal aspects of it.

So to reiterate, I am satisfied that the qualms of the minority set forth in our supplemental views have no basis. The Public Works Committee has done a good job; they have given us a bill that is well within the revenues provided by the Ways and Means Committee. The bill is well balanced in my judgment, and should be enacted into law.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first highway bill since I have been a Member of Congress that I can support wholeheartedly because it is the first one in which urban States like New Jersey has shared fairly. Usually we in New Jersey pay twice as much in taxes as we ever get back in Federal grants.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word about the trust fund. As you know, all the tax revenues provided by this bill will go into this trust fund which is roughly set up to operate in the same way as does the trust fund under the old-age and survivors insurance act.

There are several advantages in handling the money from the taxes provided for in the bill in this way:

First. It will assure that the new taxes be used for roads alone.

Second. Congress will know whether the taxes levied for this purpose are sufficient. We can in future years increase these taxes if necessary, or reduce them if the revenue is greater than estimated.

Third. All of these taxes are easy ones to collect. Historically we find that easy-to-collect taxes have been left on the books long after the purpose for which they were levied had ended. We want to get rid of these taxes after the roads are built and this trust fund procedure should make it much easier to eliminate them then.

Fourth. If the proceeds of these taxes went into the general revenue fund there would be a false budget picture. We do not want to balance the budget with these taxes. In the early days of the program it is probable that more money will be collected than will be needed, but in the long run every nickel will be necessary. If these taxes went into the general revenue, it would result in a false picture of the budget. These taxes might serve to balance the budget in the next couple of years, and then unbalance it when the money to actually build the roads was called for. We do not want to do this.

In general, putting all of the proceeds of these taxes in such a trust fund to be used for the road program only should make us at all times know exactly where we stand.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions. I want to commend the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] who just preceded me.

I know we need an expanded highway program, but I am interested in what this is going to cost the taxpayers and where the money is going to go that is taken from the taxpayers. I am glad that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Public Works agreed upon a highway trust fund; but I should like to know just how much of the taxes collected from the operators of motor vehicles, all of the use taxes and so forth will actually go into the highway trust fund? I wonder if some one on the Committee on Ways and Means can tell me.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. If my friend from Iowa will turn to page 56 of the committee report he will find table 4 which sets forth the estimated tax receipts from selected excise taxes for the fiscal years from 1957 through 1972. He will see the amount that is estimated to be derived in each of the fiscal years with a total for each of the existing Federal excise taxes imposed on highway users. For example, gasoline would bring in over that period of time $19,561 million.

Mr. GROSS. To what column is the gentleman referring?

Mr. MILLS. That is in the first column of table 4, page 56. Diesel fuel would bring to the fund $535 million, lubricating oil $759 million, the manufacturers' tax on passenger cars would bring in during that period of time to the general fund, not to the highway fund, $11,284 million.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman at this point, Does that include revenues from the old taxes plus the new and additional taxes?

Mr. MILLS. There is no additional tax provided in this bill on passenger automobiles.

Mr. GROSS. No. But on gasoline there is and on lubricating oil there is.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Does that include both?

Mr. MILLS. No, it includes only gasoline.

Mr. GROSS. What I want to get at is this: Do all the taxes presently being levied, all of the revenues derived from the taxes presently being levied under the old and new formulas, go into this trust fund?

Mr. MILLS. Just a moment. Let me set you straight. The first part of table 4, page 56, refers to the amount to be derived from all Federal excise taxes connected with highway use on the basis of existing law for the fiscal years 1957 through 1972. Now, at the bottom of the table, page 57, the amounts that are provided under the new and additional taxes provided in the bill presently before the Committee of the Whole are shown. You will notice that the existing tax of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline brings in $19,561 million. The additional 1 cent brings in $9,295 million, but the trust fund will receive the benefit of both the present 2-cents-per-gallon tax and the additional 1-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline. You can add those together in the case of gasoline, diesel fuel, your truck taxes, and your tire and tube taxes.

Mr. GROSS. And all of those funds are earmarked for the trust fund; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. Lubricating oil is not earmarked for the trust fund. That goes into the general fund.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman why. Why is it not earmarked?

Mr. MILLS. I pointed out to the gentleman that the automobile tax was not, either. It was not thought by the committee that it was necessary to earmark all of the excise taxes that are presently levied on all highway use items for this particular fund. If we did that, we would have had far more money than could possibly have been utilized in the trust fund, and we would have been far short, on the basis of the estimates given us by the Secretary of the Treasury, in the general fund, so that we would have been taking from the general fund that which will be needed in the general fund and putting in the trust fund for highway purposes that which was not needed for highway purposes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. With reference to lubricating oil, the reason we did not put it in the bill for the trust fund was that so much lubricating oil is not used for highway purposes.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. KEAN. It was impossible to allocate the amount used for highway purposes against the amount used for other purposes, and that is the reason why we did not put lubricating oil in the trust fund.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from New Jersey called attention to a very important point. Fifty percent of the lubricating tax is supposed to come from sources other than highway use.

Mr. GROSS. But I seem to get the impression here that somehow or other the Committee on Ways and Means is seeking to protect the Treasury against a deficiency that might accrue if revenues derived from the operators of motor vehicles were used for the building of highways. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that one point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. The committee is, it is true, endeavoring to protect the general fund against the entire road program being charged to existing revenues presently going into the general fund. Now, we were told by those who spoke for the President that if the Congress was not willing to take the bond proposal suggested by the President, the President would go along with us on a pay-as-you-go, but he did not want the cost of this road structure charged to existing revenues. Then the question came up in the committee what new revenues will we raise, depending upon how much of existing revenues the Treasury and others speaking for the administration thought should be transferred from the general fund into the special fund. The Secretary of the Treasury did not want us, for example, to take the tax on trucks in excess of 2 percent. We did more than that. The Secretary did not want us to take the tax on tires and tubes, but we did do that. That is, any part of the old tax. He did not want us to take anything except the tax on gasoline presently levied and on other types of motor fuel such as diesel fuel. He was perfectly willing to give us that in the general fund. So actually this whole thing results more or less in a compromise on what we take from the general fund and put into this special fund.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that it is a little difficult for me to understand why, if as predicted there is to be a $2 billion surplus in the Treasury this year, and no one is talking about paying anything on the public debt with that surplus—why we should continue to load the motorist with taxes to support the general fund of the Treasury. I do not understand it.

Mr. MILLS. The amount that the gentleman is talking about, if it is $200 million or $2 billion——

Mr. GROSS. $2 billion, not $200 million.

Mr. MILLS. It is my sincere hope will be applied to the reduction of the public debt.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so, too. But I hear no talk to that effect.

Mr. MILLS. I am satisfied on the basis of what the Secretary of the Treasury said to our committee both in public session and in executive session that he joins the gentleman and me in that hope. That is his hope; that whatever the surplus for this fiscal year may be it be utilized in reducing the public debt.

Mr. GROSS. I am concerned with the way we are loading down the operators of motor vehicles with taxes. I know that we need roads, but certainly we are loading the motorist down with taxes, and for a long time to come.

Mr. MILLS. There is no doubt but that the motorists of the country will be paying over this period of time more money in dollars than will be going into this trust fund and many more dollars than will be needed to carry out this new program.

But I should like to point out to the gentleman that our committee and Congress never heretofore have connected revenues and expenditures for road purposes as we are doing in this bill. It would be of interest to the gentleman I think to know that the original gasoline excise tax, and the original manufacturer's excise tax, and the original manufacturer's excise tax on automobiles and trucks and on tires and tubes were not levied in a road program initially. They were levied because the general fund of the treasury needed that revenue and it was obtainable from those sources.

Maybe that was wrong, but that is why it was done. Now we are directly relating to road purposes certain of the highway user excise taxes and to the extent that we need those user excise taxes that now exist we are taking them from the general fund of the treasury in the future and putting them into this road fund so that we can say that we are paying this load as we build these roads.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, as one who has spent 10 years on the Committee on Roads, later the Committee on Public Works, I have a little idea how difficult it is to get a road bill that will satisfy everyone. I recall during my service on that committee that oftentimes the very organizations and companies in the United States that could not exist, could not sell their products were it not for the highways, would object to a highway bill. And I am not referring to the trucking industry in that statement, either. I am referring to other segments of our economy.

I know it is practically impossible to bring forth a bill that will satisfy everyone, particularly every organization or group interested in our highways. But at this time I should like to pay tribute to the Committee on Public Works and its members and to the Committee on Ways and Means and its members for bringing out what, in my opinion, is the best, most workable, most satisfactory highway bill that has ever been presented to this Congress in the history of our country. I know that there are provisions in this bill that will not satisfy everyone. In fact, I doubt if anyone would be completely satisfied with all of it and I doubt that any company or any segment of our industry primarily interested in the highway program is wholly satisfied with this bill. But I say this to you, if we start tampering with this bill or changing it in any appreciable or material way, you will find more dissatisfaction with it than there is now. The miracle to me is that these two committees have been able at last to bring forth a bill as workable and as satisfactory as this one is, and at the same time return to the highway user the greatest percentage of the money collected from him that has ever been returned in the history of our country.

As I understand, this bill will return to the benefit of those who use the highway, including the drivers of passenger cars as well as trucks and other vehicles, more for the building and rebuilding of our highways than has ever been returned from the Federal Treasury in the past.

So, in conclusion, I hope that this bill passes substantially in the form in which it was reported to this House. I again commend and thank the members of these two great committees.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in this, and I want to emphasize something that was in my speech this afternoon. Each Member here represents many communities in his congressional district. These highways are going to go through those communities. Almost every one of these communities has a chamber of commerce trying to promote industrial expansion, trying to bring business and industry into their sections.

I just want to repeat an example which has happened on the thruway in the State of New York. I want you to think this over, because the thruway is not completed. It is well on its way but it is not completed. It has brought in construction in the various municipalities of more than $150 million worth of new enterprises, a payroll of $100 million in these towns, and the employment of 30,000 people. When these highways are built, every community is going to have more taxable property. You are going to have more revenue as a result of it. You are going to have an expansion of enterprise that is going to be a credit and a great monument to the work of these two committees here today.

Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD before the vote on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, in addressing this distinguished committee today, I would like, first of all, to pay tribute to the esteemed chairman of the Committees on Ways and Means and on Public Works for the able explanations they have made of the portions of H. R. 10660 for which their respective committees were responsible. The legislation before the committee today is, in my judgment, an outstanding example of two great committees of the House of Representatives working in cooperation toward a common objective, namely, the establishment of a pay-as-you-go Federal highway program.

H. R. 10660 provides a sound, long-range program for the pay-as-you-go development of our Federal highways. It will provide a blueprint for the establishment of a basic highway system that will be adequate for our present needs and will serve as a nucleus for the Nation's future development.

H. R. 10660 will provide a major contribution to our national security, it will enhance the economic well being of all our citizens and will improve the social welfare of our Nation.

In my remarks today, I would like to confine myself to a discussion generally of title II of the bill, relating to the financing features and specifically I would like to disclose why this legislation is not the President's highway program.

Parenthetically, I would like to add that despite the fact that this highway program is not the President's program, it is my prediction that there will be no rash, ill-considered veto of the legislation. At least my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not spoken of any threatened veto if this measure is not amended so as to be in conformity with the President's highway proposal.

H. R. 10660 is Congress' program for providing the American people with an adequate national highway system on a pay-as-you-go basis at a minimum cost to the American taxpayer. It is a program developed by the appropriate committees in the House of Representatives during this 84th Congress to give the people a highway system in keeping with the American standard of living and our Nation's economic needs. This highway program of the 84th Congress is in marked contrast to the highway program suggested by the President. H. R. 10660 will provide greater highway mileage at less expense than would be provided under the administration's proposal.

The Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as provided for in H. R. 10660, over the period from 1957 through 1972, would raise $14.8 billion in new or increased taxes to be dedicated to highway development. In my service in the House of Representatives I have never known a tax-increase measure to receive more general support on the basis of its equity and fairness than has been given to this legislation. For this $14.8 billion in new or increased taxes, plus the dedication to highway purposes of certain existing taxes, the Nation will receive approximately $40 billion in badly needed new highways.

Let us turn now to an examination of the method by which the administration proposed to finance $25 billion in new highways. In the President's message to the Congress of February 22, 1955, calling for legislation to authorize a national highway program it was proposed that motor fuel and lubricating oil taxes levied by the Federal Government be earmarked for the next 30 years in order to finance a 10-year highway development program. The dedication of these tax receipts for 30 years was for a 10-year development program that the President is quoted as having described as only being a "good start" in the development of the Nation's highways. If it is only a good start, we might well ask ourselves from what source we would obtain the necessary revenues to continue our highway program after the 10-year period in view of the fact that our motor fuel taxes would be committed for an additional 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, pay-as-we-go financing, as provided in H. R. 10660, as opposed to the 30-year mortgaging of our tax receipts from motor fuels, is not the only difference between the financing provisions of this bill and the program proposed by the administration. Included in the cost of the administration's program was $11.5 billion in interest charges on the indebtedness that would have been sustained under the proposal. This $11.5 billion was in excess of 50 percent of the principal that would have been used to build highways. These interest charges would not have added 1 mile of road to our highway system. These interest charges would not have

prevented one death or other tragedy on our highways. These interest charges would have contributed little, if anything, to our economic development.

In appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means during the committee's deliberations on the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, the Secretary of the Treasury criticized the legislation then under consideration as being $7.9 billion short of the amount needed to make the highway system self-financing. He made this assertion despite previous testimony before the Public Works Committee and before the Ways and Means Committee that it was impossible to project revenue estimates 15 years in advance. He acknowledged the fact that in less than a 12-month period the Treasury Department had been over $4 billion off in estimating budget figures for the immediately preceeding fiscal year. The effect of the Secretary's charge that the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 provided insufficient revenues to make the highway program self-financing may be analyzed as follows: Under present law, for the 16-year period from 1957 through 1972 revenues from motor-related sources would equal approximately $40 billion. The Secretary proposed raising an additional $19 billion. The Secretary's position was that we should raise $60 billion from motor-related sources in order to finance a highway-construction program of approximately $40 billion.

Because of the urging by the Secretary of the Treasury for higher taxes to finance the highway-development program, inquiry was made of the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce as to the ways in which this additional revenue might be obtained. Neither had any suggestions to offer. Indeed, the Secretary of Commerce informed the committee that he had no data on which to base any recommendations that would apportion the tax burden among highway users in accordance with the cost they impose on our highway system. This statement came from the man who is responsible for the Federal highway program.

It is significant to note that by providing for pay-as-we-go financing it will be possible for Congress to periodically review the adequacy of tax collections to assure that they will be sufficient to defray the cost of the highway system. Under the administration's proposal, we would have been committed to a 30-year dedication of funds with little opportunity to make adjustments required by subsequent developments in the program. This is another aspect of the highway program as developed by the Congress that represents a substantial improvement over the recommendations of the administration.

To make sure that the highway program is soundly financed, H. R. 10660 creates a trust fund in which tax collections will be deposited and from which highway expenditures will be paid so that the Congress and the people may know at all times where we stand. It will be the policy of the Congress to reexamine periodically the adequacy of the highway financing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a great deal of discussion in recent years from Republican sources about the dangers of inflation. Republican spokesmen claim to have stopped inflation but every time anyone suggests tax reduction, the specter of inflation is raised by the administration spokesmen as an argument against reducing the tax burden of our American citizens. These same Republican spokesmen have been strangely silent about the inflationary effects that would have stemmed from the administration's bond-financing proposal for the development of our highway system. The Republican administration was in effect advocating the expenditure of $20 billion in 10 years to be financed by the issuance of bonds to be paid off in 30 years. Mr. Chairman, if that is not deficit financing of the worst sort, then I do not know what deficit financing is.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 10660 will provide our American citizens with the highway system they need. It will do so on the basis of a soundly financed program that will help provide economic prosperity and growth to our Nation without creating inflationary pressures, without resorting to deficit financing, and without dedicating our tax collections for the next 32 years. This important legislation, Congress' highway program, should receive the support of every Member of this distinguished body.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the financing plan incorporated in title II of H. R. 10660 is self-financing over the 16-year period from June 30, 1956, to July 1972. The total revenues which will be paid into the highway trust fund for the 16-year period amount to approximately $38.5 billion, of which about $14.8 billion represents new or increased highway-user taxes. The remaining $23.7 billion is derived from existing highway-user taxes. Expenditures from the fund for the same period are estimated at $37.3 billion, leaving a balance of $1,190,000,000. However, because of interest payments on repayable advances from the general fund of the Treasury, a net balance of $599 million will remain for additional highway expenditures in 1970, and later years. In all probability this balance will be much larger since receipts are estimated on a conservative rate of growth, while highway expenditures are estimated on a liberal basis.

Like all tremendous undertakings, the highway-building program envisioned in title I of H. R. 10660 will not spring into full effect on July 1, 1956. The planning stage which will initially ensue the problem of letting contracts and making land acquisitions will cause expenditures from the highway trust fund to lag behind revenue collections representing the receipts of the trust fund during the first years of the program. During this period, except for the first few months, the trust fund will show a surplus after which, as the program gets underway and construction accelerates, expenditures will exceed receipts. This swing from an excess of receipts over expenditures to an excess of expenditures over receipts will result in the need for temporary advances from the general fund of the Treasury to the trust fund to be repaid in the last stage of the cycle when receipts again exceed expenditures as construction costs begin to fall off and until they ultimately disappear. The trust fund will thus experience three stages: surplus to deficit to surplus. Provision has been made in title II for the Treasury to borrow from the trust fund during the initial surplus stage. It is expected that interest on these loans will produce interest receipts for the fund amounting to $75 million. To provide for the second stage, provision is made for the trust fund to secure repayable advances from the general fund of the Treasury which are expected to result in interest charges against the fund amounting to $674 million, or $599 million in excess of the interest earned on the initial fund surplus. It is the belief of the Committee on Ways and Means that the expenditures and the receipts will balance over the 16-year period covered by title II of the bill and, in addition, a substantial surplus will result. In any event, section 209 of the bill, which establishes the highway trust fund, contains a declaration of policy to the effect that if it appears that the total receipts of the fund will be less than the total expenditures from the fund that Congress shall enact legislation to bring about a balance.

In considering title II of this bill, I would like you to compare the financing plan incorporated herein with the President's proposal for financing the roads program. As you will recall, the President's financing program was premised upon the issuance of $20,235,000,000 in bonds, with maturity dates running over a period of 30 years. To pay off these bonds and provide the additional $11,020,000,000 needed for his construction program, the President's proposal would have tied up the revenues produced by the Federal motor fuel taxes for 30 years and saddled not only this generation but the next one as well with interest charges totaling $11,548,000,000. In other words, the President was asking the American people to pay a total of $42,773,000,000 in taxes for only $31,225,000,000 worth of roads.

In addition to the existing 2 cents per gallon tax on gasoline and other motor fuels which is allocated to the highway trust fund, title II also dedicates the existing tax of 5 cents per pound on tires and the existing tax of 9 cents a pound on inner tubes to the trust fund. As you know, the President recommended that the existing taxes on gasoline and motor fuels be set aside to pay for his roads program.

The fact that the Committee on Ways and Means believes it proper to dedicate existing taxes on tires and tubes to aid in the financing of the roads program envisioned in title I of this bill has been the occasion for some comment. These taxes at existing rates will produce $3,588,000,000 under the 16-year period covered by the financing program, or approximately $223 million per year. The fact that 37½ percent of the existing tax on the sale by manufacturers of trucks, buses, and truck trailers is dedicated to the trust fund has also been the occasion for comment.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to the fact that title II of this bill is so drawn as to have absolutely no effect upon the budget for the fiscal year 1957. This is true because only the new or additional taxes imposed under title II of the bill will be paid into the trust fund beginning July 1, 1956. The additional existing taxes on motor fuels dedicated to the trust fund under the bill will be paid into the trust fund only to the extent that they represent liabilities accruing after July 1, 1956. Only for the fiscal year 1958 and subsequent years will the trust fund receive any revenues derived from the existing tax on tires and tubes. Nor will the trust fund receive any revenues from the ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers which can be denominated as revenue from existing taxes on this source of revenue. The explanation for this lies in the fact that the present ad valorem tax on trucks, buses, and truck trailers at 8 percent expires on April 1, 1957, and reverts to 5 percent. The President has not asked that it be extended beyond that date. Since title II provides a 10-percent tax in the case of such trucks, buses, and truck trailers sold on or after July 1, 1956, it in reality raises the tax 5 percentage points above what it would otherwise be under existing law. Therefore, it can be seen that only $223 million per year of existing taxes are dedicated to the highway trust fund for the 16-year period in question. This dedication is justified because of the expanded nature of the proposed highway program which will involve matching State funds on a 90–10 basis for about two-thirds of the proposed program's entire cost, instead of the traditional matching on a 50–50 basis heretofore followed.

The certainty resulting from the trust fund concept permits the administration to plan future budgets in reliance upon fixed highway expenditures and with the knowledge that revenue will be provided without resort to deficit financing.

Because all the new, increased, and existing taxes involved are dedicated to the financing of the highways proposed in title I of the bill, limitations are provided which, for the most part, have the effect of restricting the application of the new or increased taxes to vehicles used on or suitable for use on highways. In general, a highway vehicle is a vehicle which, if new, would be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on the sale of trucks, buses, passenger cars, and so forth, or which is a motorcycle. Accordingly, much of the heavy equipment used in mining, logging, and other off-highway operations, is not considered to be highway-type vehicles.

Because the base of each of the new or increased taxes imposed under title II of the bill is different, it is necessary to discuss each of them.

1. DIESEL FUEL

The existing 2 cents a gallon tax on diesel fuels already applies only in the case of liquids sold for use or which are used as a fuel in a diesel-powered highway vehicle. Accordingly, the entire 3-cents-a-gallon tax will apply to a liquid sold for use or used in a diesel-powered highway vehicle whether or not such vehicle is in fact used on the highway. Tractors, earth-moving equipment, and bulldozers are not considered diesel-powered highway vehicles, and diesel fuel used in such equipment will not bear the increased tax.

2. SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS

In the case of special motor fuels, such as benzene, benzol, and liquefied petroleum gas the 2 cents a gallon tax under present law is imposed with respect to such fuel sold for use in the propulsion of a motorboat, airplane or motor vehicle. The increased tax of 1 cent a gallon imposed by title II will apply only to such fuels used for the propulsion of a motor vehicle. According to the long-established interpretation of the Internal Revenue Service, a motor vehicle does not include a vehicle ordinarily used to pull or push, but not to carry, a load. Accordingly, vehicles, such as farm tractors, construction equipment, and bulldozers are not motor vehicles for purposes of the special motor fuels tax. However, if a vehicle is designed to carry a load, it is now considered to be a motor vehicle, and fuels used in its propulsion, under this interpretation will be subject to the increased tax on special motor fuels, regardless of the fact that the vehicle is not used on highways.

Both of the foregoing taxes are retailers' taxes imposed at the time of the sale to the user.

3. GASOLINE

The existing tax on gasoline is a manufacturers tax imposed at the time of the sale by the manufacturers at the rate of 2 cents per gallon. A refund is provided under the provisions of Public Law 466, approved April 2, 1956, for gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes. The farm refund is not affected by title II of this bill. The increased tax of 1 cent per gallon imposed under the provisions of title II will apply when such fuel is sold for use in highway-type vehicles. As stated above, generally a highway-type vehicle is a vehicle subject to the manufacturers excise tax on trucks, buses, and automobiles. This means that the increased tax will apply to fuels sold for use in a highway truck, regardless of the fact that the truck is not used on highways. Much of the heavy equipment used in mining, logging, and other nonhighway operations will not bear either the increased manufacturers sales tax or the 1-cent increase in the tax on gasoline. Nor will gasoline used in stationary engines, tractors, bulldozers, or equipment such as road graders, bear the increased tax.

4. TIRES

The increased tax of 3 cents a pound imposed under title II on tires of the type used on highway vehicles applies to tires of that type, even though they are used on nonhighway equipment. Tires other than tires of the type used on highway vehicles, such as bicycle and tractor tires, will not be subject to the increased tax. The foregoing applies to the new tax on tread rubber when such tread rubber is sold for use or used in the recapping or retreading of tires of the highway type.

5. USE OF HEAVY TRUCKS AND BUSES

The tax on the use of heavy trucks and buses will apply only to the use of vehicles which are registered, or required to be registered, for use on highways. For this reason, nonhighway equipment and highway equipment which is not registered, or required to be registered, for use on the highway will not bear this tax.

As I have pointed out, the increased and new taxes imposed by the title have been restricted to the extent administratively feasible to highway vehicles—motor vehicles for the special motor fuels tax—because the revenues under this bill are devoted to the highway program. Some nonhighway use will be subject to the new and increased taxes because of the difficult administrative problems which would result from an attempt to base the taxes on the actual use to which either the vehicles, motor fuels, or tires are put. For example, it would be impossible to finally determine the use to which a tire is put until the tire is actually worn out, since, although initially placed on a nonhighway vehicle, it could be readily transferred to a highway vehicle. Complicating this problem is the fact that modern tires are often recapped until the carcass is unusable and the tire's useful life is thus extended, lasting, perhaps, 3 or 4 years. These, and other administrative difficulties, were considered by the Committee on Ways and Means in reaching its decision to base the new and increased taxes where possible on the type of vehicle, the type of tire, and the type of vehicle in which the motor fuels subject to tax would be used. The testimony of all interested parties, such as representatives of the mining, forestry, gasoline, tire, and automobile industries, were taken into account in reaching the committee's decision.

The manner in which relief provisions for nonhighway users are to be allowed, such as the benefit of the 2 cent rate on motor fuels, as well as the manner in which the exemption for transit systems is to be administered, are left to the regulatory authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service. This is in accordance with the traditional practice followed in revenue statutes. The Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service are in a better position to work out solutions satisfactory to all parties concerned under the latitude afforded by the regulatory power than they would be under a specific legislative proposal which, because of changing circumstances, might prove too restrictive. For example, it is possible, if thought feasible, for the Secretary of the Treasury's regulations to provide for direct purchases of gasoline at the 2 cent rate by nonhighway users.

Mr. Chairman, it is my belief that the taxes reflected in title II of H. R. 10660 represent the most equitable distribution of the tax burden among classes of highway users it is possible to obtain on the basis of presently available data. However, in order to be assured of this for the future there was written into the bill the requirement, now found in section 209 of title II, that the Secretary of Commerce make a study in cooperation with the

Interstate Commerce Commission and the State Highway Departments for the purpose of determining what, if any, changes should be made in the distribution of the tax burden in order to assure as equitable a distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways as possible.

There was also incorporated in the bill a provision calling upon Congress to enact additional legislation if at any time during the course of the 16-year period covered by the bill it appears that the receipts of the trust fund and the expenditures from the fund will not balance.

It is my belief that these and other features of title II make this highway financing proposal the best that can be achieved by Congress at this time. I urge its adoption by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

No amendments to title II are in order except those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956

SEC. 101. Short title for title I.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Highway Act of 1956."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

According the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10660) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide additional revenue from the taxes on motor fuel, tires, and trucks and buses; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION ACT AMENDMENTS TO ASSIST SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, for the purpose of assisting small and independent business. In this action I am joined by my Republican colleagues on the Select Committee on Small Business who are introducing identical bills. These Members, as you know, are the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH], and the gentleman from Illinoios [Mr. SHEEHAN]. The purpose and the effect of the amendments is, first, to encourage subcontracting in Government procurement and to provide incentives for small and independent business, secondly, to encourage prime contractors and subcontractors to subcontract the maximum proportion of their contracts and subcontracts and to provide the proper profit motives for small and independent business concerns, and thirdly, to expand the Government procurement base by providing much needed incentives and encouragement to small and independent business.

When these amendments become law, the Congress will have reaffirmed its long standing policy of assuring to small and independent business concerns a maximum proportion of the contracts for goods and services awarded by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

In the midst of efforts to increase the small business share of military procurement, it has become evident that numerous phases of the Renegotiation Act operate to harm small business.

Since its enactment, the Renegotiation Act of 1951 has created inequities in the small business position and has served to deny to small business a fair opportunity to contribute its well recognized cost-savings skills in subcontracting operations.

It is the purpose of our amendments to reduce these unfair burdens upon small business and to stimulate small business participation in Government contracting, thus helping to reduce the net total cost of military procurement.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SUBCONTRACTING

Many Members of Congress have been disturbed to find that the Renegotiation Act criteria for judging a contractor's performance, specifically, the requirement to consider the "extent of subcontracting," appears to have been interpreted so as to penalize a military contractor who, to any great extent, utilizes the skills of small-business subcontractors in an effort to reduce costs. It is evident that a clear expression of congressional intent to encourage efficient subcontracting would not only operate in the interest of small business, but would serve as incentive to reduce net costs in our national defense program.

The amendment offered to section 103 (e) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, is designed to accomplish the purpose of encouraging subcontracting with small business by providing rewards to contractors in the form of proportionately higher profit allowances where it is evident that their small business subcontracting efforts are aimed at reductions in the net cost of total production.

AWARDS TO LOW BIDDERS

Another serious consideration in the drafting of our proposals was the extent to which certain operating phases of the act tend to penalize the contractor who demonstrates the most efficiency. Thus, in the area of military procurement which is most highly competitive—that is, the type of procurement in which small business participates most actively—the successful low bidder for a contract continues to find himself exposed to the burdens of extra recordkeeping and a Damocles sword of potential renegotiation liability.

We are all aware that active competition in our free-enterprise system is the most certain guaranty for economy in Government procurement operations. Therefore, our proposal is designed to encourage increased competition and bring the benefits of resulting lower prices to the Government by offering protection to the successful low bidder. By an addition to section 106 (a) of the act, we propose to make mandatory the exclusion of any contract or subcontract which has been awarded to the low bidder among three or more responsive bidders.

PRICE REDETERMINATION AND REVISION

As you know, many current contracts contain provisions for price redetermination or revision. Such types of contracts are generally used in the procurement of items for which there is insufficient production experience prior to the purchase of a particular item. Initial pricing in such contracts is based upon best estimates, but the contractor and military procurement agency agree to be guided by actual experience in making one or several subsequent price revisions to establish levels at which no more than reasonable profits shall accrue to the contractor. Obviously, the review and repricing procedure parallels the type of study made by the Renegotiation Board. The purpose of both procedures is identical. The requirement that a contractor who has been subjected to price redetermination repeat the process under renegotiation is to expose him to a form of double jeopardy and to impose upon him a further burden of excessive recordkeeping and financial insecurity.

Without question, this requirement is most burdensome on smaller businesses and discourages such firms from engaging in more active competition for Government contracts which they are well qualified to perform. Therefore, this amendment is designed to relieve such burdens and make mandatory the further exclusion of those contracts or subcontracts which, by their terms, are subject to price redetermination or price revision.

MINIMUM AMOUNTS SUBJECT TO RENEGOTIATION

It has become increasingly apparent that whatever degree of protection the Renegotiation Act currently affords is concentrated in the area of the most highly complex production, for example, the multimillion-dollar procurements of such items as supersonic mis-

siles—the areas of procurement where secrecy and complexity tend to limit direct competition. In spite of this, thousands of smaller firms engaged in the very highly competitive fields of components production, toolmaking, instrument manufacture, and the like, continue to bear the additional administrative costs and uncertainties which renegotiation procedures necessarily impose.

It is our considered opinion that such burdens on these smaller firms are unwise and unwarranted. We propose, therefore, that the minimum dollar value of nonexcluded contracts to which renegotiation is applicable be raised from the current level of $500,000 to a new level of $1 million. We do not believe that the profits of any firm at this level of business would be sufficient to warrant the costs involved in renegotiation from either the Government's viewpoint or from that of the concern which undergoes the renegotiation. Our present tax levels are assurance that no inordinate profits will be retained. In fact, it is very doubtful whether present taxes allow the smaller concerns to retain sufficient funds for growth and expansion.

We sincerely hope in the consideration of an extension of the Renegotiation Act, if it is decided to extend that act, that the Ways and Means Committee will afford small business concerns an opportunity to be heard. We especially request sympathetic consideration on the points which we have raised. In making our proposals we are aware that Public Law 216 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, authorizes and directs the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make a complete study of the Renegotiation Act in order to determine "whether there is any necessity of extending the Renegotiation Act of 1951 beyond December 31, 1956" and also "if any further extension is found necessary, the extent to which renegotiation of Government contracts should apply after such date."

It is because of the alternatives provided in the Renegotiation Act extension, as approved August 3, 1955, that we have offered for consideration proposals which we believe to be both necessary and desirable in any further extension of the Renegotiation Act.

The complete text of the bill follows:

A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress, and the purpose of this act—

(1) to encourage subcontracting in Government procurement to provide incentives for small and independent business concerns,

(2) to encourage prime contractors and subcontractors to subcontract the maximum proportion of their contracts and subcontracts to provide the proper profit motives for small and independent business concerns as the cornerstone of our free enterprise system, and

(3) to expand the Government procurement base by providing incentives and encouragement to small and independent business concerns.

The Congress hereby reaffirms its longstanding policy of assuring to small and independent business concerns a maximum proportion of the contracts for goods and services awarded by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF SUBCONTRACTING

SEC. 2. Section 103 (e) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (setting forth factors to be taken into account in determining whether profits are excessive), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In determining excessive profits, favorable recognition must be given to subcontracting to small and independent business concerns; and a contractor or subcontractor who achieves economies through the program of the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration to increase the share of small and independent business concerns in military procurement shall, subject to other considerations set forth in this subsection, be provided incentive rewards through proportionately higher profit allowances. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'small and independent business concerns' as of any time has the meaning then agreed to by the Department of Defense and the Small Business Administration."

MINIMUM AMOUNTS SUBJECT TO RENEGOTIATION

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 105 (f) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (relating to minimum amounts subject to renegotiation), is amended by striking out "or $500,000 in the case of a fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1953" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000 in the case of a fiscal year ending on or after June 30, 1953, and before July 1, 1956, or $1,000,000 in the case of a fiscal year ending after June 30, 1956."

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (3) of such section 105 (f) is amended by inserting "the $1,000,000 amount," after "the $500,000 amount,".

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTS SUBJECT TO PRICE REDETERMINATION OR AWARDED TO LOW BIDDERS

SEC. 4. Section 106 (a) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (relating to mandatory exemptions from the act), is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) any fixed price or incentive-type contract or subcontract which, by its terms, is subject to price redetermination or price revision; or

"(11) any contract or subcontract which has been the subject of competitive bidding and has been awarded to the low bidder among three or more responsive and competitive bidders."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 5. The amendments made by sections 2 and 4 of this act shall apply only in respect of contracts with the Departments and subcontracts made after June 30, 1956.

BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6227) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this act may be cited as the 'Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2 (a) 'Bank holding company' means any company (1) which directly or indirectly owns, controls, or holds with power to vote, 25 percent or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks or of a company which is or becomes a bank holding company by virtue of this act, or (2) which controls in any manner the election of a majority of the directors of each of two or more banks, or (3) for the benefit of whose shareholders or members 25 percent or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks or a bank holding company is held by trustees; and for the purposes of this act, any successor to any such company shall be deemed to be a bank holding company from the date as of which such predecessor company became a bank holding company. Notwithstanding the foregoing (A) no bank shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its ownership or control of shares in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank, (B) no company shall be a bank holding company which is registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940, and was so registered prior to May 15, 1955 (or which is affiliated with any such company in such manner as to constitute an affiliated company within the meaning of such act), unless such company (or such affiliated company), as the case may be, directly owns 25 percent or more of the voting shares of each of two or more banks, (C) no company shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its ownership or control of shares acquired by it in connection with its underwriting of securities and which are held only for such period of time as will permit the sale thereof upon a reasonable basis, (D) no company formed for the sole purpose of participating in a proxy solicitation shall be a bank holding company by virtue of its control of voting rights of shares acquired in the course of such solicitation, and (E) no company shall be a bank holding company if at least 80 percent of its total assets are composed of holdings in the field of agriculture.

"(b) 'Company' means any corporation, business trust, association, or similar organization, but shall not include (1) any corporation the majority of the shares of which are owned by the United States or by any State, or (2) any corporation or community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private share holders or individuals, and no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, or (3) any partnership.

"(c) 'Bank' means any national banking association or any State bank, savings bank, or trust company, but shall not include any organization operating under section 25 (a) of the Federal Reserve Act, or any organization which does not do business within the United States 'State member bank' means any State bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System. 'District bank' means any State bank organized or operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

"(d) 'Subsidiary', with respect to a specified bank holding company, means (1) any company 25 per centum or more of whose voting shares (excluding shares owned by the United States or by any company wholly owned by the United States) is owned or controlled by such bank holding company;

or (2) any company the election of a majority of whose directors is controlled in any manner by such bank holding company; or (3) any company 25 percent or more of whose voting shares are held by trustees for the benefit of the shareholders or members of such bank holding company.

"(e) The term 'successor' shall include any company which acquires directly or indirectly from a bank holding company shares of any bank, when and if the relationship between such company and the bank holding company is such that the transaction effects no substantial change in the control of the bank or beneficial ownership of such shares of such bank. The Board may, by regulation, further define the term "successor' to the extent necessary to prevent evasion of the purposes of this act.

"(f) 'Board' means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

"(g) 'Agriculture', as used in section 2 (a), includes farming in all its branches including fruitgrowing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, forestry or lumbering operations, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto.

"ACQUISITION OF BANK SHARES OR ASSETS

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful except with the prior approval of the Board (1) for any action to be taken which results in a company becoming a bank holding company under section 2 (a) of this act; (2) for any bank holding company to acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any bank if, after such acquisition, such company will directly or indirectly own or control more than 5 percent of the voting shares of such bank; (3) for any bank holding company or subsidiary thereof, other than a bank, to acquire all or substantially all of the assets of a bank; or (4) for any bank holding company to merge or consolidate with any other bank holding company. Notwithstanding the foregoing this prohibition shall not apply to (A) shares acquired by a bank, (i) in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank; or (ii) in the regular course of securing or collecting a debt previously contracted in good faith, but any shares acquired after the date of enactment of this act in securing or collecting any such previously contracted debt shall be disposed of within a period of 2 years from the date on which they were acquired; or (B) additional shares acquired by a bank holding company in a bank in which such bank holding company owned or controlled a majority of the voting shares prior to such acquisition.

"(b) Upon receiving from a company any application for approval under this section, the Board shall give notice to the Comptroller of the Currency, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired is a national banking association or a District bank, or to the appropriate supervisory authority of the interested State, if the applicant company or any bank the voting shares or assets of which are sought to be acquired in a State bank, and shall allow 30 days within which the views and recommendations of the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority, as the case may be, may be submitted. If the Comptroller of the Currency or the State supervisory authority so notified by the Board disapproves the application in writing within said 30 days, the Board shall forthwith give written notice of that fact to the applicant. Within 3 days after giving such notice to the applicant, the Board shall notify in writing the applicant and the disapproving authority of the date for commencement of a hearing by it on such application. Any such hearing shall be commenced not less than 10 nor more than 30 days after the Board has given written notice to the applicant of the action of the disapproving authority. The length of any such hearing shall be determined by the Board, but it shall afford all interested parties a reasonable opportunity to testify at such hearing. At the conclusion thereof, the Board shall by order grant or deny the application on the basis of the record made at such hearing.

"(c) In determining whether or not to approve any acquisition or merger or consolidation under this section, the Board shall take into consideration the following factors: (1) the financial history and condition of the company or companies and the banks concerned; (2) their prospects; (3) the character of their management; (4) the convenience, needs, and welfare of the communities and the area concerned; and (5) whether or not the effect of such acquisition or merger or consolidation would be to expand the size or extent of the bank holding company system involved beyond limits consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, no application shall be approved under this section which will permit any bank holding company or any subsidiary thereof to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any additional bank located outside of the State in which such bank holding company maintains its principal office and place of business or in which it conducts its principal operations unless the acquisition of such shares or assets of a State bank by an out-of-State bank holding company is specifically authorized by the statute laws of the State in which such bank is located, by language to that effect and not merely by implication.

"INTERESTS IN NONBANKING ORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this act, no bank holding company shall—

"(1) after the date of enactment of this act acquire direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank, or

"(2) after 2 years from the date of enactment of this act or from the date as of which it becomes a bank holding company, whichever is later, retain direct or indirect ownership or control of any voting shares of any company which is not a bank or a bank holding company or engage in any business other than that of banking or of managing or controlling banks or of furnishing services to or performing services for any bank of which it owns or controls 25 percent or more of the voting shares.

The Board is authorized, upon application by a bank holding company, to extend the period referred to in paragraph (2) above from time to time as to such bank holding company for not more than 1 year at a time if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest, but no such extensions shall extend beyond a date 5 years after the date of enactment of this act or 5 years after the date as of which a company becomes a bank holding company, whichever is later.

"(b) After two years from the date of enactment of this act, no certificate evidencing shares of any bank holding company shall bear any statement purporting to represent shares of any other company except a bank or a bank holding company, nor shall the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any bank holding company be conditioned in any manner whatsoever upon the ownership, sale, or transfer of shares of any other company except a bank or a bank holding company.

"(c) The prohibitions in this section shall not apply—

"(1) to shares owned or acquired by a bank holding company in any company engaged solely in holding or operating properties used wholly or substantially by any bank with respect to which it is a bank holding company in its operations or acquired for such future use or engaged solely in conducting a safe deposit business, or solely in the business of furnishing services to or performing services for such holding company and banks with respect to which it is a bank holding company, or in liquidating assets acquired from such bank holding company and such banks;

"(2) to shares acquired by a bank holding company which is a bank, or by any banking subsidiary of a bank holding company, in satisfaction of a debt previously contracted in good faith, but such bank holding company or such subsidiaries shall dispose of such shares within a period of 2 years from the date on which they were acquired or from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later;

"(3) to shares acquired by a bank holding company from any of its subsidiaries which subsidiary has been requested to dispose of such shares by any Federal or State authority having statutory power to examine such subsidiary, but such bank holding company shall dispose of such shares within a period of 2 years from the date on which they were acquired or from the date of enactment of this act, whichever is later;

"(4) to shares which are held or acquired by a bank holding company which is a bank or by any banking subsidiary of a bank holding company, in good faith in a fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of the shareholders of such bank holding company or any of its subsidiaries, or to shares which are of the kinds and amounts eligible for investment by national banking associations under the provisions of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, or to shares lawfully acquired and owned prior to the date of enactment of this act by a bank which is a bank holding company, or by any of its wholly owned subsidiaries;

"(5) to shares of any company which are held or acquired by a bank holding company which do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of such company, and do not have a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company, or to the ownership by a bank holding company of shares, securities, or obligations of an investment company which is not a bank holding company and which is not engaged in any business other than investing in securities, which securities do not include more than 5 percent of the outstanding voting securities of any company and do not include any single asset having a value greater than 5 percent of the value of the total assets of the bank holding company;

"(6) to shares of any company all the activities of which are of a financial, fiduciary, or insurance nature and which the Board after due notice and hearing, and on the basis of the record made at such hearing, by order has determined to be so closely related to the business of banking or of managing or controlling banks as to be a proper incident thereto and as to make it unnecessary for the prohibitions of this section to apply in order to carry out the purposes of this act;

"(7) to any bank holding company which is a labor, agricultural, or horticultural organization and which is exempt from taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; or

"(8) to shares held or acquired by a bank holding company in any company which is organized under the laws of a foreign country and which is engaged principally in the banking business outside the United States.

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 5. (a) Within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act, or within 180 days

after becoming a bank holding company, whichever is later, each bank holding company shall register with the Board on forms prescribed by the Board, which shall include such information with respect to the financial condition and operations, management, and intercompany relationships of the banking holding company and its subsidiaries, and related matters, as the Board may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. The Board may, in its discretion, extend the time within which a bank holding company shall register and file the requisite information.

"(b) The Board is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable it to administer and carry out the purposes of this act and prevent evasions thereof.

"(c) The Board from time to time may require reports under oath to keep it informed as to whether the provisions of this act and such regulations and orders issued thereunder have been complied with; and the Board may make examinations of each bank holding company and each subsidiary thereof, the cost of which shall be assessed against, and paid by, such holding company. The Board shall, as far as possible, use the reports of examinations made by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the appropriate State bank supervisory authority for the purposes of this section.

"(d) Before the expiration of 2 years following the date of enactment of this act, and each year thereafter in the Board's annual report to the Congress, the Board shall report to the Congress the results of the administration of this act, stating what, if any, substantial difficulties have been encountered in carrying out the purposes of this act, and any recommendations as to changes in the law which in the opinion of the Board would be desirable.

"BORROWING BY BANK HOLDING COMPANY OR ITS SUBSIDIARIES

"SEC. 6. (a) From and after the date of enactment of this act, it shall be unlawful for a bank—

"(1) to invest any of its funds in the capital stock, bonds, debentures, or other obligations of a bank holding company of which it is a subsidiary, or of any other subsidiary of such bank holding company;

"(2) to accept the capital stock, bonds, debentures, or other obligations of a bank holding company of which it is a subsidiary or any other subsidiary of such bank holding company, as collateral security for advances made to any person or company: *Provided, however,* That any bank may accept such capital stock, bonds, debentures, or other obligations as security for debts previously contracted, but such collateral shall not be held for a period of over 2 years;

"(3) to purchase securities, other assets or obligations under repurchase agreement from a bank holding company of which it is a subsidiary or any other subsidiary of such bank holding company; and

"(4) to make any loan, discount or extension of credit to a bank holding company of which it is a subsidiary or to any other subsidiary of such bank holding company.

"Non-interest-bearing deposits to the credit of a bank shall not be deemed to be a loan or advance to the bank or deposit, nor shall the giving of immediate credit to a bank upon uncollected items received in the ordinary course of business be deemed to be a loan or advance to the depositing bank.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply (1) to the capital stock, bonds, debentures, or other obligations of any company described in section 4 (c) (1) of this act, or (2) to any company whose subsidiary status has arisen out of a bona fide debt to the bank contracted prior to the date of the creation of such status, or (3) to any company whose subsidiary status exists by reason of the ownership or control or voting shares thereof by the bank as executor, administrator, trustee, receiver, agent, or depositary, or in any other fiduciary capacity, except where such shares are held for the benefit of all or a majority of the stockholders of such bank.

"RESERVATION OF RIGHTS TO STATES

"SEC. 7. The enactment by the Congress of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 shall not be construed as preventing any State from exercising such powers and jurisdiction which it now has or may hereafter have with respect to banks, bank holding companies, and subsidiaries thereof.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 8. Any company which willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued by the Board pursuant thereto, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $1,000 for each day during which the violation continues. Any individual who willfully participates in a violation of any provision of this act shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. Every officer, director, agent, and employee of a bank holding company shall be subject to the same penalties for false entries in any book, report, or statement of such bank holding company as are applicable to officers, directors, agents, and employees of member banks for false entries in any books, reports, or statements of member banks under section 1005 of title 18, United States Code.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 9. Any party aggrieved by an order of the Board under this act may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals within any circuit wherein such party has its principal place of business, or in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, by filing in the court, within 60 days after the entry of the Board's order, a petition praying that the order of the Board be set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Board, and thereupon the Board shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record made before the Board. Upon the filing of the transcript the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify the order of the Board and to require the Board to take such action with regard to the matter under review as the court deems proper. The findings of the Board as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

"AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

"SEC. 10. (a) Subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"'*Part VIII—Distributions pursuant to Bank Holding Company Act of 1956*

"'Sec. 1101. Distributions pursuant to Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.
"'Sec. 1102. Special rules.
"'Sec. 1103. Definitions.

"'Sec. 1101. Distributions pursuant to Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

"'(a) Distributions of certain non-banking property.—

"'(1) Distributions of prohibited property.—If—

"'(A) a qualified bank holding corporation distributes prohibited property (other than stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies)—

"'(i) to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such corporation; or

"'(ii) to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"'(iii) to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"'(B) the Board has, before the distribution, certified that the distribution of such prohibited property is necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956,

then no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such property shall be recognized.

"'(2) Distributions of stock and securities received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies.—If—

"'(A) a qualified bank holding corporation distributes—

"'(i) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such corporation; or

"'(ii) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its common stock; or

"'(iii) preferred stock or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"'(iv) securities or preferred or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (2) applies to a security holder in exchange for its securities; and

"'(B) any preferred stock received has substantially the same terms as the preferred stock exchanged, and any securities received have substantially the same terms as the securities exchanged, then, except as provided in subsection (f), no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such stock or such securities or such stock and securities shall be recognized.

"'(3) Non pro rata distributions: Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to a distribution whether or not the distribution is pro rata with respect to all of the shareholders of the distributing qualified bank holding corporation.

"'(4) Exception: This subsection shall not apply to any distribution by a corporation which has made any distribution pursuant to subsection (b).

"'(5) Distributions involving gift or compensation.—

"'In the case of a distribution to which paragraph (1) or (2) applies, but which—

"'(A) results in a gift, see section 2501, and following, or

"'(B) has the effect of the payment of compensation, see section 61 (a) (1).

"'(b) Corporation ceasing to be a bank holding company.—

"'(1) Distributions of property which cause a corporation to be a bank holding company: If—

"'(A) a qualified bank holding corporation distributes property (other than stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies)—

"'(i) to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such corporation; or

"'(ii) to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"'(iii) to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"'(B) the Board has, before the distribution, certified that—

"'(i) such property is all or part of the property by reason of which such corporation controls (within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) a bank or bank holding company, or such property is part of the property by reason of which such corporation did control a bank or a bank holding company before any property of the same kind was distributed under this subsection or exchanged under subsection (c) (3); and

"'(ii) the distribution is necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policies of such act, then no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such property shall be recognized.

"'(2) Distributions of stock and securities received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies: If—

"'(A) a qualified bank holding corporation distributes—

"'(i) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies to a shareholder (with respect to its stock held by such shareholder), without the surrender by such shareholder of stock in such corporation; or

"'(ii) common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its common stock; or

"'(iii) preferred stock or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies to a shareholder, in exchange for its preferred stock; or

"'(iv) securities or preferred or common stock received in an exchange to which subsection (c) (3) applies to a security holder, in exchange for its securities; and

"'(B) any preferred stock received has substantially the same terms as the preferred stock exchanged, and any securities received have substantially the same terms as the securities exchanged,

then, except as provided in subsection (f), no gain to the shareholder or security holder from the receipt of such stock or such securities or such stock and securities shall be recognized.

"'(3) Non pro rata distributions: Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to a distribution whether or not the distribution is pro rata with respect to all of the shareholders of the distributing qualified bank holding corporation.

"'(4) Exception: This subsection shall not apply to any distribution by a corporation which has made any distribution pursuant to subsection (a).

"'(5) Distributions involving gift or compensation.—

"'In the case of a distribution to which paragraph (1) or (2) applies, but which—

"'(A) results in a gift, see section 2501, and following, or

"'(B) has the effect of the payment of compensation, see section 61 (a) (1).

"'(c) Property acquired after May 15, 1955.—

"'(1) In general: Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), subsection (a) or (b) shall not apply to—

"'(A) any property acquired by the distributing corporation after May 15, 1955, unless (i) gain to such corporation with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b), or (ii) such property was received by it in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies, or (iii) such property was acquired by the distributing corporation in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 305 (a) or section 332, or under section 354 with respect to a reorganization described in section 368 (a) (1) (E) or (F), or

"'(B) any property which was acquired by the distributing corporation in a distribution with respect to stock acquired by such corporation after May 15, 1955, unless such stock was acquired by such corporation (i) in a distribution (with respect to stock held by it on May 15, 1955, or with respect to stock in respect of which all previous applications of this clause are satisfied) with respect to which gain to it was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b), or (ii) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies, or (iii) in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 305 (a) or section 332, or under section 354 with respect to a reorganization described in section 368 (a) (1) (E) or (F), or

"'(C) any property acquired by the distributing corporation in a transaction in which gain was not recognized under section 332, unless such property was acquired from a corporation which, if it had been a qualified bank holding corporation, could have distributed such property under subsection (a) (1) or (b) (1).

"'(2) Exchanges involving prohibited property.—If—

"'(A) any qualified bank holding corporation exchanges (i) property, which, under subsection (a) (1), such corporation could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain to such shareholders or security holders, and other property (except property described in subsection (b) (1) (B) (i)), for (ii) all of the stock of a second corporation created and availed of solely for the purpose of receiving such property;

"'(B) immediately after the exchange, the qualified bank holding corporation distributes all of such stock in a manner prescribed in subsection (a) (2) (A); and

"'(C) before such exchange, the Board has certified (with respect to the property exchanged which consists of property which, under subsection (a) (1), such corporation could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain) that the exchange and distribution are necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956,

then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such distribution.

"'(3) Exchanges involving interests in banks.—If—

"'(A) any qualified bank holding corporation exchanges (i) property which, under subsection (b) (1), such corporation could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain to such shareholders or security holders, and other property (except prohibited property), for (ii) all of the stock of a second corporation created and availed of solely for the purpose of receiving such property;

"'(B) immediately after the exchange, the qualified bank holding corporation distributes all of such stock in a manner prescribed in subsection (b) (2) (A); and

"'(C) before such exchange, the Board has certified (with respect to the property exchanged which consists of property which, under subsection (b) (1), such corporation could distribute directly to its shareholders or security holders without the recognition of gain) that—

"'(i) such property is all or part of the property by reason of which such corporation controls (within the meaning of section 2 (a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956) a bank or bank holding company, or such property is part of the property by reason of which such corporation did control a bank or a bank holding company before any property of the same kind was distributed under subsection (b) (1) or exchanged under this paragraph; and

"'(ii) the exchange and distribution are necessary or appropriate to effectuate the policies of such act,

then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to such distribution.

"'(d) Distributions to avoid Federal income tax—

"'(1) Prohibited property: Subsection (a) shall not apply to a distribution if, in connection with such distribution, the distributing corporation retains, or transfers after May 15, 1955, to any corporation, property (other than prohibited property) as part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is the distribution of the earnings and profits of any corporation.

"'(2) Banking property: Subsection (b) shall not apply to a distribution if, in connection with such distribution, the distributing corporation retains, or transfers after May 15, 1955, to any corporation, property (other than property described in subsection (b) (1) (B) (i)) as part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is the distribution of the earnings and profits of any corporation.

"'(3) Certain contributions to capital: In the case of a distribution a portion of which is attributable to a transfer which is a contribution to the capital of a corporation, made after May 15, 1955, and prior to the date of the enactment of this part, if subsection (a) or (b) would apply to such distribution but for the fact that, under paragraph (1) or (2) (as the case may be) of this subsection, such contribution to capital is part of a plan one of the principal purposes of which is to distribute the earnings and profits of any corporation, then, notwithstanding paragraph (1) or (2), subsection (a) or (b) (as the case may be) shall apply to that portion of such distribution not attributable to such contribution to capital, and shall not apply to that portion of such distribution attributable to such contribution to capital.

"'(e) Final certification.—

"'(1) For subsection (a): Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any distribution by a corporation unless the Board certifies that, before the expiration of the period permitted under section 4 (a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (including any extensions thereof granted to such corporation under such section 4 (a)), the corporation has disposed of all the property the disposition of which is necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 4 of such act (or would have been so necessary or appropriate if the corporation had continued to be a bank holding company).

"'(2) For subsection (b)—

"'(A) Subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to any distribution by any corporation unless the Board certifies that, before the expiration of the period specified in subparagraph (B), the corporation has ceased to be a bank holding company.

"'(B) The period referred to in subparagraph (A) is the period which expires 2 years after the date of the enactment of this part or 2 years after the date on which the corporation becomes a bank holding company, whichever date is later. The Board is authorized, on application by any corporation, to extend such period from time to time with respect to such corporation for not more than 1 year at a time if, in its judgment, such an extension would not be detrimental to the public interest; except that such period may not in any case be extended beyond the date 5 years after the date of the enactment of this part or 5 years after the date on which the corporation becomes a bank holding company, whichever date is later.

"'(f) Certain exchanges of securities: In the case of an exchange described in subsection (a) (2) (A) (iv) or subsection (b) (2) (A) (iv), subsection (a) or subsection (b) (as the case may be) shall apply only to the extent that the principal amount of the securities received does not exceed the principal amount of the securities exchanged.

"'SEC. 1102. Special rules.

"'(a) Basis of property acquired in distributions: If, by reason of section 1101, gain is not recognized with respect to the receipt of any property, then, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate—

"'(1) if the property is received by a shareholder with respect to stock, without the surrender by such shareholder of stock, the basis of the property received and of the stock with respect to which it is distributed shall, in the distributee's hands, be determined by allocating between such property and such stock the adjusted basis of such stock; or

"'(2) if the property is received by a shareholder in exchange for stock or by a security holder in exchange for securities,

the basis of the property received shall, in the distributee's hands, be the same as the adjusted basis of the stock or securities exchanged, increased by—

"'(A) the amount of the property received which was treated as a dividend, and

"'(B) the amount of gain to the taxpayer recognized on the property received (not including any portion of such gain which was treated as a dividend).

"'(b) Periods of limitation: The periods of limitation provided in section 6501 (relating to limitations on assessment and collection) shall not expire, with respect to any deficiency (including interest and additions to the tax) resulting solely from the receipt of property by shareholders in a distribution which is certified by the Board under subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 1101, until 5 years after the distributing corporation notifies the Secretary or his delegate (in such manner and with such accompanying information as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe) that the period (including extensions thereof) prescribed in section 4 (a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, or section 1101 (e) (2) (B), whichever is applicable, has expired; and such assessment may be made notwithstanding any provision of law or rule of law which would otherwise prevent such assessment.

"'(c) Allocation of earnings and profits:

"'(1) Distribution of stock in a controlled corporation: In the case of a distribution by a qualified bank holding corporation under section 1101 (a) (1) or (b) (1) of stock in a controlled corporation, proper allocation with respect to the earnings and profits of the distributing corporation and the controlled corporation shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(2) Exchanges described in section 1101 (c) (2) or (3): In the case of any exchange described in section 1101 (c) (2) or (3) proper allocation with respect to the earnings and profits of the corporation transferring the property and the corporation receiving such property shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"'(3) Definition of controlled corporation: For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "controlled corporation" means a corporation with respect to which at least 80 percent of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote and at least 80 percent of the total number of shares of all other classes of stock is owned by the distributing qualified bank holding corporation.

"'(d) Itemization of property: In any certification under this part, the Board shall make such specification and itemization of property as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"'SEC. 1103. Definitions.

"'(a) Bank holding company: For purposes of this part, the term "bank holding company" has the meaning assigned to such term by section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.

"'(b) Qualified bank holding corporation:

"'(1) In general: Except as provided in paragraph (2), for purposes of this part the term "qualified bank holding corporation" means any corporation (as defined in section 7701 (a) (3)) which is a bank holding company and which holds prohibited property acquired by it—

"'(A) on or before May 15, 1955,

"'(B) in a distribution in which gain to such corporation with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1101, or

"'(C) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1101 (c) (2) or (c) (3).

"'(2) Limitations:

"'(A) A bank holding company shall not be a qualified bank holding corporation, unless it would have been a bank holding company on May 15, 1955, if the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 had been in effect on such date, or unless it is a bank holding company determined solely by reference to—

"'(i) property acquired by it on or before May 15, 1955,

"'(ii) property acquired by it in a distribution in which gain to such corporation with respect to the receipt of such property was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1101, and

"'(iii) property acquired by it in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1101 (c) (2) or (3).

"'(B) A bank holding company shall not be a qualified bank holding corporation by reason of property described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) or clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, unless such property was acquired in a distribution with respect to stock, which stock was acquired by such bank holding company—

"'(i) on or before May 15, 1955,

"'(ii) in a distribution (with respect to stock held by it on May 15, 1955, or with respect to stock in respect of which all previous applications of this clause are satisfied) with respect to which gain to it was not recognized by reason of subsection (a) or (b) of section 1101, or

"'(iii) in exchange for all of its stock in an exchange described in section 1101 (c) (2) or (3).

"'(C) A corporation shall be treated as a qualified bank holding corporation only if the Board certifies that it satisfies the foregoing requirements of this subsection.

"'(c) Prohibited property: For purposes of this part, the term "prohibited property" means, in the case of any bank holding company, property (other than nonexempt property) the disposition of which would be necessary or appropriate to effectuate section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 if such company continued to be a bank holding company beyond the period (including any extensions thereof) specified in subsection (a) of such section or in section 1101 (e) (2) (B) of this part, as the case may be. The term "prohibited property" does not include shares of any company held by a bank holding company to the extent that the prohibitions of section 4 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 do not apply to the ownership by such bank holding company of such property by reason of subsection (c) (5) of such section.

"'(d) Nonexempt property: For purposes of this part, the term "nonexempt property" means—

"'(1) obligations (including notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and bankers' acceptances) having a maturity at the time of issuance of not exceeding 24 months, exclusive of days of grace;

"'(2) securities issued by or guaranteed as to principal or interest by a government or subdivision thereof or by any instrumentality of a government or subdivision; or

"'(3) money, and the right to receive money not evidenced by a security or obligation (other than a security or obligation described in paragraph (1) or (2)).

"'(e) Board: For purposes of this part, the term "Board" means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.'

"(b) The table of parts for subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Part VIII. Distributions pursuant to Bank Holding Company Act of 1956.'

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this act.

"SAVING PROVISION

"SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall be interpreted or construed as approving any act, action, or conduct which is or has been or may be in violation of existing law, nor shall anything herein contained constitute a defense to any action, suit, or proceeding pending or hereafter instituted on account of any prohibited antitrust or monopolistic act, action, or conduct.

"SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require their divestment of their nonbanking interests."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do these Senate amendments make any material changes in the legislation as it was passed by the House?

Mr. SPENCE. I think not. They make some change, but no material change. I can say that the independent bankers are very much interested in the bill and are anxious to have the bill passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] in favor of this?

Mr. SPENCE. I have spoken with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and he was in favor of this procedure.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HYDROGEN BOMB TESTS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, April 21, the titular leader of the Democratic Party, former Governor Adlai E. Stevenson made a rather astounding proposal in a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He severely criticized the foreign policy of the United States as administered by the Eisenhower Republican administration and climaxed his talk with the suggestion that the United States "give prompt and earnest consideration to stopping further tests of the hydrogen bomb."

I do not know how much Governor Stevenson knows about nuclear warfare or the development of nuclear weapons.

I do not know whether he has information on the relative position of the United States and Russia in this respect.

But millions of Americans must have been disturbed and shocked to hear his proposal—made so blithely—and yet possessing such dangerous and far-reaching potentialities.

Now it is interesting to note what kind of reaction Governor Stevenson's speech received in Communist Russia and I have here in my hand a news dispatch from the United Press this morning. It was sent at 10:21 a. m. and it reads as follows:

Moscow.—Today's issue of the Communist organ Pravda contained extensive excerpts from Adlai Stevenson's speech attacking President Eisenhower's foreign policy.

Pravda did not comment on the speech, contenting itself with quotations of Stevenson's demand that the United States halt its hydrogen-bomb tests, his criticisms of the President and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and his description of successful Soviet penetration of underdeveloped nations.

Yesterday's Pravda published a critical report of Mr. Eisenhower's ASNE speech in less than half the space it devoted to Stevenson today.

CERTAIN ACTIVITIES REGARDING POWER, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills designed to carry out the two legislative recommendations made by the Committee on Government Operations on its 13th Intermediate Report to the 84th Congress. This report is titled "Certain Activities Regarding Power, Department of the Interior—Changes in Powerline regulations."

The first bill is one to provide for the publication of advance notice of rules and regulations relating to lands and natural resources owned by the United States.

An investigation of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the Committee on Government Operations, described in the report, disclosed that certain very important changes in the Interior Department's powerline regulations, were obtained from the western power companies for Under Secretary of the Interior Clarence A. Davis, at his request, by a lobbyist of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. These changes were highly detrimental to rural electric cooperatives and to public agencies which have a statutory preference right to federally generated power. They were then quietly engineered through the Department by Mr. Davis so that even the heads of the agencies in the Department which deal with land and power did not know what was going on. Preference customers and their representatives were kept completely in the dark until after the regulations were put into effect.

All this was possible because the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act which provide for notice in the case of rulemaking do not apply to lands and natural resources owned by the Government. These lands and resources, involving mining, oil and gas production, timber, grazing, recreation and hunting and fishing, to name only a few uses, are continually increasing in importance to our citizens and our economy. They must not be administered behind closed doors or through quietly arranged deals.

The first bill I have introduced will help to bring their administration into the open, where it should be, and will provide a definite step forward in the democratic administration of our public domain.

The second bill I have introduced is entitled "To facilitate the transmission of electric power by the United States."

This bill is designed to restore in the form of law a very important regulation which Mr. Davis repealed at the request of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. The bill provides, as did the repealed regulation, that anyone who gets permission to build an electric power line, other than a low-voltage distribution line across lands of the United States must agree to let the Government utilize for the transmission of Government power any excess capacity in the line not needed by its owner so long as the owner does not need the capacity. It also allows the Government to increase the capacity of the lines to carry its power. In each case, of course, the Government must pay its share of the original and maintenance costs of the line. The bill gives reciprocal use of Government lines to the power companies on the same terms. It contains provisions to protect the power companies against pirating of its private customers by the Government.

I am sure that most, if not all, of us are aware of the great difficulties the Government has in securing reasonable wheeling agreements with the power companies who wish to monopolize and control power generated at Federal dams. Time after time Congress has had to appropriate or threaten to appropriate funds for duplicate lines before the companies have agreed to wheel. The repealed regulations provided an effective tool in securing reasonable wheeling arrangements. Under Secretary Davis, at the power companies' request, destroyed the tool. This bill will restore it and protect it from destruction by administrators who are bent on destroying the power policies established by Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania), for balance of week, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR, the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include various charts and extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO, the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include charts and extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include a letter.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. CHUDOFF).

Mr. FJARE.

Mr. PRICE.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 67, favoring the suspension of deportation in the cases of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 10754. An act to authorize the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, to accept and wear the award of the Order of Sikatuna, Lakan Class, tendered by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines; and

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 27, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1786. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize an appropriation to provide for certain costs of United States participation in the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and Sawmill"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1788. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the cases of Sang Cheng Dwu, A-6849387, and Mary Hsiang-Yuin Dwu nee Kwei, A-6620858, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1789. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of James Henry, A-4962265, involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1790. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting additional information relative to the case of Sing Sung Poa, A-9767561, involving the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1791. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report received from the Department of the Air Force covering a violation of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7300.1 entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (i) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1792. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 5, 1953 (ch. 321 (67 Stat. 363)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1793. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the establishment of 35 positions for specially qualified scientific and professional personnel in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation at rates not to exceed the maximum rate payable under Public Law 313, 80th Congress, as amended and supplemented"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1794. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of Foreign-Trade Zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, located, respectively, at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Seattle, pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended by Public Law No. 566, 81st Congress, approved June 17, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 10765. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2067). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 516. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming; with amendment (Rept. No. 2068). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 569. Joint resolution to provide for a joint session of the Congress to honor the surviving veterans of the War Between the States, and to provide for a medal to be struck and presented to such veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 2069). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 9842. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 2073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 609. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2070). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 605. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 2071). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 877. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Amoresano and her children; with amendment (Rept. No. 2072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 10829. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to provide for the designation of a Hawaii defense highway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 10830. A bill to provide for the control of destructive aphids; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 10831. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act with reference to procedure as to making loans by Federal credit unions and to provide authorization for loan officers of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 10832. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act so as specifically to authorize the organization of Federal central credit unions and to authorize Federal credit unions to invest in the shares of, and become members of, central credit unions organized under such act or other laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 10833. A bill to recognize for income-tax purposes prepaid income accounting and reserves for estimated expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 10834. A bill relating to the definition of a personal holding company in the case of corporations filing consolidated income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 10835. A bill to transfer the operation of the Continental Air Command from Mitchell Air Force Base to Sampson Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 10836. A bill to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress (relating to assistance to schools in federally affected areas) to provide an alternative method of computing local contribution rates; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 10837. A bill to provide for the publication of advance notice of rules and regulations relating to lands and natural resources owned by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 10838. A bill to facilitate the transmission of electric power by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 10839. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus property to volunteer fire-fighting organizations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10840. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to rice acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 10841. A bill to amend paragraph 1541 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that the rate of duty in effect with respect to harpsichords and clavichords shall be the same as the rate in effect with respect to pianos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 10842. A bill to provide outpatient treatment for non-service-connected disability for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 10843. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain handmade and moldmade paper on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 10844. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 10845. A bill to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 10846. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 10847. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 10848. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 10849. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 10850. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 10851. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 10852. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 10853. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 10854. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 10855. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 10856. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 10857. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 10858. A bill to establish as a policy of Congress public use of public-domain forest lands and woodlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10859. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 10860. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 10861. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 10862. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEEHAN:

H. R. 10863. A bill to amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 to assist small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 487. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 63 and House Resolution 376; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 10864. A bill for the relief of Jozef Golinowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 10865. A bill for the relief of Antonetta Fede Garretto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 10866. A bill for the relief of White River Distributors, Inc., and certain other creditors of the Westmoreland Manganese Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 10867. A bil for the relief of Ardelia Parsons, Billy Mac Parsons, Danny Leroy Parsons, Charles Ray Parsons, and Marilyn Ann Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 10868. A bill for the relief of Atsuko Suzuki Dickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 10869. A bill for the relief of Tullio Stabilito and Ida Stabilito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 611. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Res. 488. Resolution referring the bill H. R. 10826 to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address Delivered by Hon. John Marshall Butler, of Maryland, at Goucher College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this is the season of mock political conventions in many of our schools, colleges, and universities, and such enthusiasm on the part of our young people is most refreshing, and portends good for the future.

Last Saturday, April 21, 1956, it was my great pleasure to participate in a mock convention at Goucher College, in Towson, Md. Goucher College is one of our State's leading institutions of learning, and we of Maryland are proud of its many graduates who have distinguished themselves in the arts and sciences. The students of Goucher College are indeed alert to the problems of today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which I delivered at this convention.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, members of the convention, ladies and gentlemen, 1956 will be recorded in history as another year of reawakening and resurgence—a year of purpose and action. This climate is not accidental; it is the product of vision, leadership, and determination. It typifies the present strength, unity, and vitality of the American people in support of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration. It offers the opportunity of even greater accomplishments.

Yes, my friends, we can face the future with optimism—with even greater determination—and with even greater dedication to those principles of integrity and of economy and efficiency in government on which our Nation was founded.

The lessons of the past have been fruitful. Unity of purpose and action has developed a cohesive spirit of Republicanism which has been successfully demonstrated in the administration of the Federal, State, and local governments.

I have already stated that this favorable climate did not occur by chance. On the contrary, it has been precisely calculated. It marks a crescendo of energy and wisdom, whose dictating force has been the halting and reversal of dangerous socialistic tendencies at all levels of government. The full volume of this crescendo is unlimited and the promise of the future for our Nation is bright. The national posture of the opposition party has been confounded by a babble of political counsels, resulting in many cleavages. With our critics thus operating in a vacuum of confusion and discord, the solidarity of purpose within the Republican Party assumes greater significance.

You might ask—and the people of America might rightfully demand—"What are the accomplishments of the national administration, under President Eisenhower's leadership, which justify a continuation of Republican management in government?" The record of the past 4 years is truly filled with undeniable successes of lasting impact, and a few of these historic milestones are deserving of special emphasis.

The Eisenhower administration is to be commended for its constructive achievements. It has dispatched the public business with efficiency. It has restored the people's confidence in the integrity of their Government. No longer are we compelled to tolerate the miserable displays of arrogance, scandalous behavior, waste, and inefficiency which characterized 20 years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

The sacrifice of American lives in Korea has been ended. Russian imperialism and Communist aggression have been confronted with our firm determination to safeguard freedom and attain genuine peace. The devious Communist conspiracy, as inspired and carried out by the Kremlin, has been ex-

posed in its true, ugly light. Without any weak-kneed surrender of basic principles, the Eisenhower administration has met this threat to freedom and liberty with a determination of lasting vigor. We shall not, and must not, lose sight of our cherished heritage and our pledge to freedom-loving people everywhere.

Today, able men and women are striving to undo the damage created by the incompetency of the unrealistic foreign policy of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Our national-defense program has been reorganized and strengthened by policies capable of providing long-range security at substantial savings and without disruption of the national economy.

Unification of the armed services has been effectively advanced through efficient management and careful coordination.

We have taken decisive action to safeguard the Nation from enemies within its borders and to remove Communist infiltration and subversion from all phases of our society. This serious threat has been illuminated to the extent that there is now wide public awareness of the potential menace to our traditional American way of life.

The trend toward destructive socialistic tendencies in Government has been arrested by the encouragement of private competitive enterprise, thrift, and the self-reliance of our people. Labor and private enterprise have been urged to solve their own problems without Government interference.

The States have been encouraged to meet their proper responsibilities. Their inherent rights to develop submerged lands and other resources within their boundaries have been restored, and we have rededicated ourselves to the concept of States rights.

The fundamental belief that Government should do only those things which the people cannot best do for themselves has been restored to its rightful ascendency in our way of life.

The difficult transition from war to peace has been successfully bridged without disrupting the Nation's economy. National controls of prices, wages, and rents have been ended, freeing American enterprise from undue Government interference. The nation's economy has been stabilized and the value of the dollar strengthened, ending the cheating of our people by inflation and avoiding the distress of deflation, while employment, production, wages, and earnings have remained high. The solvency of America is one of our greatest weapons in combating those forces which are bent on destroying our free way of life.

Under this prudent administration, taxes have been cut, thereby reducing income-tax payments, excise taxes on goods consumers buy, and providing substantial benefits in other deductions and allowances for individuals and enterprises.

All Americans look to the day when their individual and collective tax burdens will be reduced. For the first time in many years, the Eisenhower administration made possible a tax cut of some seven billion dollars.

For the first time in almost 80 years, our internal-revenue laws have been broadly revised. The continued economic growth of our country has thus been stimulated.

By way of contrast, let us look at the record of the Democratic Party. Since 1913 there have been 15 income-tax increases. All but one of these were voted by a Democratic Congress.

On the budgetary side, in the 1932–52 period, our Government lived within its income on only three occasions. Two of these three times, the budget was balanced only as a result of action by the Republican 80th Congress.

The Republican administration has acted courageously to end the shameful waste of farm surpluses, to reduce the high cost of subsidies, and to provide farmers with a long-range program for an independent, self-reliant agriculture, with Government providing a shield against destructive forces beyond farmer control.

Political courage, the likes of which have seldom been witnessed in our history, best describes President Eisenhower's action of last week in vetoing a hodge-podge, unworkable farm bill.

It has continued and enlarged the program to meet human needs, to strengthen civil rights, to aid our veterans to become established in civilian life and to provide adequate care for the disabled, to expand social security, and to assist the aged, the blind, and dependent widows and children.

In these and all other respects, the Eisenhower administration has fostered the forward progress of a free nation under a government without favoritism, without corruption, without waste or extravagance, but efficient, economical, trustworthy, and fair to all.

The essential task of removing New Dealers, Fair Dealers, and their ilk, from policy-making and confidential governmental positions, has progressed steadily. I prefer to describe this group as "Cryptosocialists."

They seek to subvert the American system of limited government, free enterprise and democracy and to replace it with a system hostile and alien to our traditions as a nation. In striking at this cancer, which is gnawing at the very vitals of our government, we must, and shall, continue to rid the Federal payroll of those "crypto-socialists" and other political hacks. In spite of efforts by the previous administration to preserve these purveyors of destruction and scandal, their replacement by competent men and women has accelerated and continues rapidly.

The evidence of accomplishment by the Eisenhower administration cannot be disputed. The record is clear and positive. Even our severest critics must concede this. The Nation and the world can give grateful thanks to President Eisenhower for his forceful leadership. If the accomplishments of the Republican Party are to continue in the service of the American people, President Eisenhower needs a stronger Congress through the election of Republicans this fall.

Why a Republican Congress?—you might ask. In the political sense, the legislative and executive branches of our Government must respond to the voice of the people. I have already recited some of the main accomplishments of the executive branch under the leadership of President Eisenhower and the stewardship of the Republican Party. But, these attainments have not been realized without a considerable amount of legislative frustration activated by the party in opposition. It has long been true that for effective and continued progress, the legislative and executive branches of our Government must function like two gears in a finely balanced, expensive timepiece. Much can be said on this point.

It has been my very great privilege to represent the people of Maryland in the United States Senate for nearly 6 years. Thus I have been a part of 3 Congresses—the 82d, the 83d, and now the 84th. The 82d Democratic-controlled Congress had such a wretched record that the voters, in their indignation, cast the Democrats out.

Much different indeed were the legislative achievements of the 83d GOP Congress, the record of which will long be regarded as one of the finest in history. Unfortunately, and to our sharp regret, a good job in acquainting the people with those achievements was not done. Candidly, we lost by default.

Strange as it may seem, many of these Democratic Senators and Representatives campaigned for office on a promise to support President Eisenhower. Luminaries in the party of Andrew Jackson mesmerized the people into believing that they would give the President more cooperation than he received from the Republicans.

The results of that duplicity are self-evident in all quarters. The 84th Congress has truly become the Congress of obstruction. The Eisenhower legislative program has been roadblocked. It is a legislative program designed to build upon the successes already forged with vision, leadership, and determination since 1952. Yet, in the United States Senate, at this session, only four major bills have been completed. They are the Upper Colorado River project, the natural gas bill, extension of corporation and excise taxes, and the farm bill. Two have become law. Two were vetoed. The record of the House of Representatives is equally unimpressive. A deliberate political conspiracy seems to exist to deny the American people the benefits of President Eisenhower's great leadership. And quite obviously his farsighted and constructive program for the good of the Nation will not be achieved until the legislative branch is again controlled by the Republicans.

I predict that the American people will remove this roadblock to national progress by overwhelmingly reelecting the President in November, and further by giving him a Republican Senate and House of Representatives. The American people will no longer tolerate a Congress that wastes its time and the taxpayers' money on partisan political speeches. They want deeds not words. They want action not excuses. But above all, they want a Congress whose Members will subordinate personal political ambitions to the common good of all of the people of the United States of America.

Now, I am not going to tell you that we have reached that long-sought utopian state—or that all of the ills of our Nation and the world have been solved. Indeed not. Peace, prosperity, and progress are well on the way. But there is still much to be done. It is going to be a long, difficult, and trying journey. But as an ancient sage once remarked, "The longest journey begins with a single step." It is my firm conviction that we have taken the first step.

With your help, and God's blessing, we can face the future with continued optimism—with even greater determination in providing honest government, better government, and more economical government to the people of our Nation.

Thank you very much.

Freedom for Slovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and at the request of many of my constituents of Slovak descent, I wish to urge the Congress to approve House Concurrent Resolution 231, resolving that it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the Slovak nation, is entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination. I introduced this resolution in the House on April 12, 1956.

The Slovak nation lost all possibility for its freedom and independence when the Soviet troops marched into Slovakia early in 1945 and when the so-called people's democracy was introduced in

that unfortunate country, before the coup of February 1948, totalitarian communism became the ruler.

Since that time Slovakia suffered as much as any other enslaved nation or even more, behind the iron curtain. But there is no country in the Soviet orbit which has a better underground movement than heroic Slovakia, resisting communism through its two underground organizations; the Liberty Legion and the White Legion.

The stirring cry for the freedom of the Slovak nation has the sympathy and friendship of the American people who have always been ready to assist the downtrodden and the oppressed. Since the Slovaks stand on self-determination and since they demand free elections or a plebiscite under United Nations supervision, as clearly stated on many occasions by the leading Slovak exiles and as confirmed by the leading Americans of Slovak derivation, in order to choose their own form of government and to reestablish their own state or its association, if any, with other nations.

We place the Slovak nation in every respect on the same basis of equality enjoyed by any nation of Central or Eastern Europe whether they are Poles, Rumanians, Hungarians, Lithuanians, or Bohemians. Each of them has the basic right for self-determination and the right to set up its own government.

We urge the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to give favorable consideration to this resolution in order to formulate a practical program of assistance to the oppressed Slovak nation, and to direct the United States Representatives at the United Nations to demand that free elections or plebiscite be held in Slovakia under police supervision of the United Nations so that the Slovaks may freely decide their national future without any outside pressure.

We shall not fail the Slovak nation in its struggle for the same freedom and independence we enjoy. From every viewpoint the Slovak nation is entitled to the enjoyment of full freedom and independence. World peace is unattainable without granting the Slovak nation freedom and independence, the basic and elemental right of every nation.

Politics Should Be Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to keep the record straight.

I do not refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but to the record of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable HARLEY STAGGERS, of the Second West Virginia District.

Mr. Speaker, in the heat and stress of interparty political primary battles for party preference, some individuals often distort the facts. Some even resort to half truths and still others are not averse to using untruths in their desire to win political advantage.

I do not subscribe to the old axiom, "Everything is fair in love and politics." It is not a question of whether you win or lose but a question of how you played the game. In this instance, it is a question of keeping the record straight.

Practically every newspaper in my State of West Virginia, both daily and weekly, find their way to my desk. These include the papers from the counties and cities in the Second West Virginia District represented by my colleague, Mr. STAGGERS.

Political news from this area points to systematic and well-planned campaigning by his political opponent to discredit and belittle the record of Mr. STAGGERS on farm and conservation issues. A large part of Mr. STAGGERS' district is the Monongahela National Forest area which is the pride of all West Virginians.

The charge is being made that Mr. STAGGERS has neglected to properly safeguard the interests of this and other forest areas in his district. This I want to disapprove.

I, too, am interested in conservation. Every year since Mr. STAGGERS became a Member of the Congress he has personally accompanied me in appearances before the appropriate House committees interested in conservation and pleaded for increased amounts for improved facilities for both the Monongahela National Forest and the George Washington National Forest within his district.

Some years ago we appeared before the House Appropriations Committee and secured an item of $36,000 for improvements on Camp Horseshoe at Parsons, within the national-forest area. In recent months Mr. STAGGERS accompanied me to a hearing and joined in a plea that the item for replacement of physical facilities and campsites on our national-forest lands be increased by approximately $9 million. This increased amount was approved and is a part of the current budget which will be made available for fiscal 1957.

In 1955 the gentleman from the Second West Virginia District accompanied me before the House committee to secure $1,800,000 increase for fire protection on State and privately owned property surrounding the national forests so as to better remove a hazard in the national-forest holdings.

The charge has been made that the Monongahela National Forest "is being permitted to run to rack and ruin," and that "money for upkeep has been cut drastically and money for improvements has been cut off entirely." Let us look at the official record of the Forest Service. This shows that during Mr. STAGGERS' tenure in Congress—1949 to 1956—the funds appropriated and made available for expenditure on this national forest were increased from $294,000 to $482,000, an increase of from 60 to 70 percent, or an average of almost 10 percent each year.

The charge has been made that "forest roads and tourist facilities are so run down that they are of little, if any, practical use." As a matter of record, the road and trail construction and maintenance funds for the Monongahela National Forest have increased from $110,000 in his first year in Washington to $236,500 during this year, an increase of 114 percent within 8 years.

The charge has been made that the national forests of New England and the Western States have received an unfair share of the national forest recreational funds at the expense of our Monongahela Forest. Forest Service officials in Washington have assured me that the recreational use funds appropriated to the Forest Service are distributed among their national forests based on a careful and impartial analysis of actual use and the number of recreational areas and facilities.

One of the untruths I refer to above is that while the Forest Supervisor at Elkins and his crew on the Monongahela National Forest are doing a good job, one cannot trust the Forest Service officials in Washington in their distribution of funds. All year-long Forest Service officials in Washington—from Chief McArdle on down—are career, technically trained men devoted to their job. I know many of them personally and hope that this will clarify the unfair statements and inferences made which reflect on the fairness and ability of our Forest Service officials whether at Elkins or at Washington.

HARLEY STAGGERS has honestly and efficiently served his district for 8 years. His untiring efforts in behalf of his constituents must not be sacrificed by unfair and unethical political tactics.

Forest and Woodlands Recreation and Wildlife Use Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, along with a number of my colleagues, legislation which has as its broad objective assuring greater public multiple resource use of more than 160 million acres of public domain lands in the United States and Alaska classified as commercial forest areas and woodland areas, and administered by the Department of the Interior.

These vast areas of public domain—whether known or unknown in all respects, and whether developed or undeveloped—contain valuable public resources: land and water resources, mineral and material resources, timber and grazing resources, fish and wildlife resources, recreational, scenic, and wilderness resources.

PRESENT RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The public land laws provide for entry on these areas for resource utilization. The Secretary of the Interior has authority to permit harvesting of timber; the lands embraced within the proposed legislation contain an estimated 411 billion board feet of timber, nearly half of it—199 billion board-feet—located on lands classified as commercial forest land. The bulk of the lands covered in the bill—125 million acres—are located in Alaska, but 22 States contain a total of 4.1 million acres of commercial forest lands and 13 States contain nearly 30 million acres of woodlands.

Grazing is presently permitted on substantial acreages of the lands covered by the bill through operation of the Taylor Grazing Act; water resources development is authorized under the general reclamation law; the Flood Control Acts assure necessary activity in the field of navigation and flood control; and watershed management and development is assured through joint activities of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture. The lands are, in the main, subject to entry under the general mining law, Mineral Leasing Act, and the Materials Disposals Act.

NEED FOR THE BILL

Notwithstanding the foregoing, I feel, as do many of my colleagues, that there is not presently clear-cut and sufficient enough authority in the Secretary of the Interior to assure full utilization of certain other resource values on these lands, nor are sufficient funds made available.

Congress, through enactment of public land laws now on the statute books, has provided for substantial multiple resource use of Interior-managed woodlands and forest lands, but has not to date authorized expenditure of funds for maximum public recreational uses, for improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat values, and for providing adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

The legislation introduced today, would, in my view, remedy the present situation, and at the same time would permit continuation of present multiple resource utilization under the general public land laws. As introduced, the bill would authorize the appropriation of not to exceed $3.5 million annually, from the share of the United States' receipts from these lands, to carry out the program envisaged.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD NOT DO

Before turning to an analysis of what the bill will do, I should like to make some brief observations of what I intend the bill to not do.

It is not intended that the bill operate to disturb or diminish the share of receipts from the lands involved which are presently credited to the States and counties; the basic funds to be expended would come from the share of the United States.

It is not intended that the recreational program or wildlife habitat development program authorized shall interfere in any respect with presently authorized development and utilization of these areas under existing public land laws. In short, the newly authorized programs would have to go forward compatible with presently authorized activities; mining, mineral leasing, and materials development; timber harvesting; grazing; water resource utilization; and related activities.

It is not intended that the legislation interfere with, or modify, operation of present laws providing for the selection of lands by States under the school land selection, lieu selection, and related laws.

It is not intended that the legislation, as proposed, be construed as authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to levy charges and fees not presently authorized by law.

Finally, it is not intended that the legislation proposed be construed as authorizing further land acquisition by the United States; on the contrary, the bill explicitly prohibits land acquisition.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

There follows an analysis of the provisions of the forest and woodlands use legislation introduced today; there is also included information indicating the statistical scope, by States, of the legislation:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS

1. Section 1 constitutes a congressional policy declaration that—

(a) All of the resources of the public domain shall be so managed, conserved, utilized and developed as to assure maximum public use thereof.

(b) Public use for purposes of recreation is a beneficial use of public domain forest lands and woodlands.

(c) Development and maintenance of such areas for maximum safety, sanitation, and wildlife habitat values, and the concurrent maintenance of timber, wood, and forest values, including sources of water, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

2. Section 2 would authorize an annual appropriation of not to exceed $3.5 million in any year, such sum to be made available to the Department of the Interior—which administers the forest lands and woodlands areas covered by the bill—until expended as provided in section 3.

The moneys authorized would be appropriated from the United States share of the receipts from these lands; the intent of the language is to assure that the share of such receipts presently earmarked for States and counties will not be diminished or affected by this legislation.

3. Section 3 directs the Secretary of the Interior to prescribe such regulations governing the expenditure of the funds authorized as will assure—in accordance with current and prospective public mutiple use—

(a) development, maintenance, and operation of public domain forest lands and woodlands for recreational use;

(b) improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat thereon; and

(c) provision for adequate safety, sanitation, and health measures and facilities.

A proviso in this section would prohibit expenditure of funds appropriated by the legislation for land acquisition.

4. Section 4 relates to use fees and charges collected by the United States for improved forest lands or woodlands recreational areas, and provides that amounts so collected shall be set aside as a special fund to carry out the purposes of the legislation, and in turn set off against any amount in excess of the $3.5 million annual appropriation authorized.

ESTIMATED AREA OF PUBLIC DOMAIN FOREST LANDS AND WOODLANDS ADMINISTERED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR [1]

Twenty-two States contain a total of 4,136,190 acres of commercial forest lands administered by Interior, and covered by the proposed legislation; 13 States contain a total of 29,985,000 acres of woodlands, covered by the proposed legislation.

Alaska alone has 40 million acres of commercial forest lands and 85 million acres of woodlands, administered by Interior, and within the scope of the proposed legislation.

Total United States and Alaska, forest lands, 44,136,190.

Total United States and Alaska, woodlands, 114,985,000.

Acreage breakdown, by State, of areas affected by proposed legislation

State	Forest lands	Woodlands
Alabama	23,000	
Arizona	3,000	1,329,000
Arkansas	124,000	
California	275,890	1,500,000
Colorado	605,000	2,709,000
Florida	19,000	
Idaho	381,000	1,070,000
Louisiana	7,000	
Michigan	10,000	
Minnesota	93,000	
Mississippi	15,000	
Missouri	(1)	
Montana	604,000	210,000
Nevada	100,000	10,000,000
New Mexico	91,000	1,974,000
Oklahoma	300	3,000
Oregon	533,000	1,722,000
South Dakota	6,000	10,000
Utah	633,000	8,755,000
Washington	182,000	46,000
Wisconsin	5,000	
Wyoming	426,000	657,000
Alaska	40,000,000	85,000,000

[1] Less than 1,000 acres.

[1] Source: Table 10, p. 14, Report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Statistical Appendix, 1955.

The Coal Industry and H. R. 5550

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE COAL INDUSTRY AND H. R. 5550

H. R. 5550, authorizing United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, has been favorably reported out of the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 17 to 7, and will shortly come before the House of Representatives. This memorandum sets down some facts about the American coal industry and why it has everything to benefit from United States membership in OTC, and nothing to lose from the passage of H. R. 5550.

Although representatives of the coal industry were opposed last year to the enactment of H. R. 1, the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, no spokesmen either from the management or labor side of the coal industry came before the Ways and Means Committee to oppose enactment of this bill. This shows that even though the representatives of the coal industry were opposed to further reduction of tariffs, that they recognize that H. R. 5550

will not lower tariffs by one iota, but would, on the contrary, help to get the greatest benefits for American export trade from foreign countries.

This is so because OTC would be an organization to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. GATT is the multilateral trade agreement negotiated in 1947 by which 33 other free world countries have committed themselves to reciprocal tariff reduction in exchange for the tariff reductions that we have made under the reciprocal trade agreements program. OTC would help get effective reciprocity for us from the GATT trade agreement.

The American coal industry has already experienced great benefits from export trade and will experience even greater benefits if it can have assurance of stability in the treatment that American coal receives in foreign markets. In 1955 we saw a great improvement in coal production in the United States. Bituminous coal production reached a level of about 470 million tons in 1955. This was an increase of 73 million tons above the level of production in 1954. Increased exports accounted for over one-quarter of that increase in production. In 1955 exports of bituminous coal amounted to 51 million tons, an increase of 20 million tons above 1954 exports. In dollar terms, the value of bituminous coal exports in 1955 was $436 million as compared with $253 million in 1954. Thus, the bituminous coal industry depended on exports for the sale of 11 percent of its total production in 1955 as compared with 8 percent in 1954.

GATT has helped achieve this good export record, and OTC, by making GATT more effective, will be even more helpful. For example, in the last 2 years there has been remarkable progress made by Western European countries in eliminating import quotas which discriminated against the sale of American goods in Europe. Whereas in 1953 only 2 of the 13 Western European governments had liberalized their restrictions on imports from the United States to any extent, today 8 of these governments have completely removed quota restrictions on more than 50 percent of their imports of goods from the United States. As a result, American exports to Western Europe in the last couple of years have been booming, and the coal industry has participated in that expansion.

In addition, by using the machinery of GATT, we were successful last year in getting Belgium and Germany to reduce their restrictions against United States coal. In the case of Belgium the situation was that late in 1953 Belgium began to reduce the tonnages of American coal permitted to come into that country. Belgium had been a very important market for United States coal. In 1952, for example, Belgium imported 711,000 tons of American coal, valued at about $7 million. The United States, therefore, tried to get these restrictions that were imposed in 1953 eliminated by Belgium, but Belgium refused. The United States then placed its complaint against Belgium on the agenda of the ninth session of GATT in October 1954. We pointed out that Belgium was not living up to the terms of the GATT trade agreement. By negotiating with Belgium we were able to get her to agree to permit larger imports of American coal. At the present time, American coal is moving into Belgium virtually without any control whatsoever. As a result of that, coal exports to Belgium amounted to over a million tons in 1955 compared to about a quarter of a million tons in 1954.

In the case of Germany, the United States, in the ninth session of GATT, drew attention to certain German regulations which had the effect of reducing imports of coal from the United States. It was the view of the United States that these restrictions were inconsistent with the obligations of West Germany to the United States under the GATT. Consultations between the two governments followed. West Germany began to relax its restrictions and permit the entry of more United States coal. As a result, in 1955, coal imports of the United States into West Germany amounted to 7.7 million tons as compared to 1.4 million tons in 1954.

Thus, taking these two cases of Belgium and Germany together, it can be said that through the GATT the United States succeeded in having these countries remove restrictions on imports of United States coal that resulted in an increase in our coal exports to these countries by over 6 million tons in 1955.

The thing that has troubled the American coal industry so far as its foreign markets are concerned has been the instability that has existed in these markets. There has been a feast or famine situation in exports, but what we can accomplish through GATT, and what can be accomplished even better through OTC is to remove that instability by getting foreign countries to agree to treat American coal fairly and in a stable way. The accomplishments of GATT to date will be multiplied in the future if OTC comes into being.

The coal industry has much to gain from this. For example, the Wall Street Journal for April 19, 1956, carried an article on a statement by George H. Love, president of the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., made at its annual meeting. The Wall Street Journal says, "Mr. Love predicted soft coal production in 1956 will reach or slightly exceed 500 million tons, compared with 470 million tons in 1955. * * * Mr. Love predicted coal's usage in the energy market could well double in the next 10 years."

For the long run, therefore, the coal industry has a great stake in expanding exports. OTC will help to see to it that American coal will have a fair chance to be sold in the markets of the world without discriminatory restrictions being imposed against it.

Since H. R. 5550 would not involve any tariff reductions, would not require any change in United States laws, would not in any way affect the ability of the Congress to legislate on matters of trade and tariffs, would not in any way affect the safeguards of our domestic legislation, such as the escape clause and the peril point, it can be concluded that the coal industry has nothing to lose and everything to gain from its passage.

The Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I wrote to Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, regarding the nickel situation.

Mr. Speaker, a number of reputable businessmen complained to me that they were caught in a squeeze whereby they were forced to pay 300 percent of the market price of nickel—64.5 cents—in the black or gray markets or go out of business.

With the assistance of some of these individuals, I wrote to Dr. Flemming, Director of ODM, on January 11, 1956, and asked him 11 questions—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 15, 1956. It was necessary for him to get information on some of the questions from other agencies, chiefly, I presume, the Departments of Commerce and Defense.

Yesterday, I received a classified document from Dr. Flemming's office which I understand contains the answers to my questions. Since one bit of classified material in a document renders the whole classified, I have returned it, unopened, to Dr. Flemming with the request that it be declassified as much as possible as I want to place it in the RECORD for the benefit of all of those concerned. My letter of April 26, 1956, to Dr. Flemming, follows:

APRIL 26, 1956.

DR. ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,
Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. FLEMMING: On January 11, 1956, I wrote to you concerning the current nickel situation in the United States. The letter propounded 11 questions several of which had been suggested to me by responsible business concerns who are directly affected by the situation which has developed in obtaining nickel for industrial purposes. On March 15, 1956 I placed my letter with the questions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the widespread interest in the subject. Yesterday, April 25, 1956 I received a classified document from you which I understand contained the answers to my questions. I have, however, returned the envelope to you unopened since I consider that this subject generally is a public matter and would be restricted from making available any portion of your answers so long as the material is classified. Furthermore, I much prefer not to have classified material in my office files.

Inasmuch as there are a large number of business concerns and others in the United States who are interested in the answers to the questions I propounded I planned to put your answers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all concerned. Will you be so kind as to send me a letter which is declassified as much as you consider proper in order that I may place it in the RECORD?

I do not wish you to consider my return of the classified material as being critical of your action but I firmly believe that the current nickel situation needs a healthy, effective public scrutiny and comment to the greatest extent possible. I believe that the confusion and suspicion caused by unnecessary classification leads to an unhealthy situation.

United States Jaycees Conduct Nationwide Program To Create Greater Public Interest in Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, through its 3,000 community locals in all 48 States, Hawaii, and Alaska, is now completing a most successful nationwide program to encourage public interest in the efficiency and economy recommendations of the second Hoover Report. I

think that they are to be highly commended for their work in this field.

Tomorrow morning the Honorable Herbert Hoover will address a congressional banquet-breakfast, which will climax a 3-day visit to our Nation's Capital by 56 Jaycee members, selected from the chapter in each State deemed to have conducted the best Hoover Report program. These men have received an opportunity to see the Federal Government in operation and to meet some of the men who make it function. Undoubtedly when they return to their respective States and communities, they will draw upon their Washington experience to increase public interest in governmental affairs.

One of the highlights of their visit in Washington, D. C., is today's opportunity for them to watch the House of Representatives in session. Congressional leaders were honored this morning in a series of presentations made on the Capitol steps on behalf of all Jaycees.

The following is a list of the Jaycee participants who have been honored by their State organizations, and who are participating in the present Meet Your Government program.

George M. Yeager, 113 Ina Street, Fairbanks, Alaska.

Robert Fleming, 3550 Princeton Drive, Montgomery, Ala.

Frank W. Fletcher, 309 Cooper, West Memphis, Ark.

John W. Hamilton, 1638 Walnut Creek Parkway, West Covina, Calif.

Louis P. Martinez, 305 Maplewood Drive, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Gordon C. Smith, 1025 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colo.

Vincent Simko, 57 Dover Street, Bridgeport, Conn.

Lucian H. Vandoren, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Webb H. Vermilya, 1956 Richwood Drive NE., Atlanta, Ga.

Dr. G. W. Atwood, 944 Fair Street, Buhl, Idaho.

Gordon S. Peters, 302 Bigelow, Peoria, Ill.

John B. Hilkin, 9120 Major Avenue, Morton Grove, Ill.

William F. Radcliff, 18 Kimberly Lane, Muncie, Ind.

Gordon J. Forsyth, 1214 North Sixth Street, Estherville, Iowa.

George A. Lowe, 522 East Cedar, Olathe, Kans.

John Coleman Scott, 203 Pinewood Drive, Frankfort, Ky.

F. J. Lungaro, 606 Clarence Street, Lake Charles, La.

Robert Easton, Pleasant Street, Norway, Maine.

Albert D. Darby, Jr., 212 South Allegany Street, Cumberland, Md.

Frank H. Wooton, Holyoke, Mass.

John L. Deal, 1019 Pinehurst Boulevard, Kalamazoo, Mich.

William D. Hurley, 91 Crocus Place, St. Paul, Minn.

Thomas K. (Pete) Griffis, 404 22d Avenue, Meridian, Miss.

Donald C. Woodside, 417 North Washington, Butte, Mont.

Arthur D. Bradley, Jr., 7416 North 28th Avenue, Omaha, Nebr.

David P. Boyer, 1342 Douglas Drive, Las Vegas, Nev.

A. Arthur McKew, Jr., High Street, Troy, N. H.

R. Donald Quackenbush, 372 Owen Avenue, Fair Lawn, N. J.

John A. Voller, 1600 Gonzales Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Walter P. Quinn, Melrose Road, Auburn, N. Y.

Merril Berg, 1526 First Avenue Southeast, Minot, N. Dak.

P. J. Cole, Logan, Ohio.

William G. Boykin, 2624 Southwest 46 Terrace, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Gerald L. Denton, 853 Washington, McMinnville, Oreg.

Don M. McCutcheon, 1301 West Sherman, Hood River, Oreg.

David L. Emrey, 2246 Fairview Avenue, Easton, Pa.

A. Arthur Rosenblum, 83 A Peachtree Street, Charleston, S. C.

Henry G. Harris, 14 South Main Street, Abbeville, S. C.

Paul Hammerquist, 135 Meade Street, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Gordon A. Walhood, 605 Circle Drive, Tullahoma, Tenn.

Don Greaves, 10940 Snow White Drive, Dallas, Tex.

Jack Childress, 755 West 255 North, Orem, Utah.

Walter E. Dunham II, 109 Spring Street, Bennington, Vt.

Samuel Mason Cole, Jr., Conduit Road, Colonial Heights, Va.

Joseph W. Brinkley, Semple Quarters, Williamsburg, Va.

James A. Marks, 1733 Capital Avenue, Madison, Wis.

Robert L. Lawless, 310 East Third Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo.

All Aboard for the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "All Aboard for the Atomic Age," which I wrote for the April 1956 issue of Steelways magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL ABOARD FOR THE ATOMIC AGE?—A PROPOSED ATOMIC LOCOMOTIVE MAY FORESHADOW A NEW ERA IN RAILROADING

(By JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, United States Senator from Maryland, participant in last year's Atoms-for-Peace Conference and sponsor of proposed legislation to build an atomic locomotive. Senator BUTLER is especially qualified to write this article, an exclusive for Steelways)

The age of the atom has only begun and no one knows what exciting developments may yet unfold from the atomic research now in progress or already completed. But from the vantage point of the United States Senate, and as a member of the delegation to last year's Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva, one fundamental hypothesis has been reaffirmed in my mind: that the understanding of the atom brings great promise of good. That, having faith in the future of man and of America, its potential for good far outweighs its potency for destruction

Nuclear reactors are already in operation here and abroad generating electricity for peaceful uses, and the powerplant aboard the submarine *Nautilus*, while placed in a warship, points the way toward the use of atomic power in our national transportation system.

To aid further in speeding the development of "atoms for peace" a bill of my sponsorship has been introduced in the Congress this year calling for immediate construction of an atomic powered locomotive. Of this proposal, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, has said: "A railway locomotive, where weight is not such a problem, seems to offer more and more promise as our reactor technology advances."

Such a locomotive can serve two purposes. First, it could furnish the motive force to pull an "atoms for peace" train to every corner of America. Such a train would carry varied exhibits showing peacetime applications of atomic energy and would vividly emphasize the benefits which atomic energy is bringing, and will continue to bring to all Americans.

Second, there is a coldly practical purpose in building such a locomotive. It would indeed be a pioneering step. The knowledge and experience so gained would spur the economic development of commercial atomic energy by private capital and assure its growth and utilization in keeping with the traditional American free enterprise system.

Since the construction of the atomic locomotive has been proposed, two questions are often asked: Is it possible and practical to build such a locomotive now * * * and can it be designed so it will not expel dangerous radiation or disintegrate like an atomic bomb?

The answer to both is an unqualified "Yes."

The explosion in an atomic bomb is an uncontrolled reaction: the reaction which produces nondestructive atomic energy, as in an atomic locomotive, is a controlled one. More than 50 safety devices can be employed to maintain this control, and special rods activated by the force of gravity would automatically neutralize the locomotive's reactor in event of sudden acceleration or deceleration. Furthermore, it is envisioned that the reactor will be sheathed in a sealed housing of four-foot-thick laminated steel to absorb radioactive rays.

As for its feasibility, engineering studies have already been completed which show us how to go about building an atomic locomotive today. Work is already progressing on the actual manufacture of many of the component parts which would be needed. Engineers and other experts from locomotive manufacturing companies, steel companies and operating railroads are working together on specific design problems. The artist's drawing of an atomic locomotive on these pages is taken directly from practical engineering diagrams: it is not a futuristic dream.

Even now, we know enough about the problem to say that an atomic locomotive would be no heavier or longer than the present-day giant diesels, and therefore suitable for use on any major railroad. And, by its very nature, it would possess certain advantages. Like the highly efficient electric locomotive, the atomic counterpart would be capable of tremendous overloads of energy for short periods. And this means a real economic reward on roads where quick starts and stops with heavy loads spell the difference between profit and loss.

At the same time, an atomic locomotive should prove itself equally efficient operating

at high speed over long distances since refueling will be necessary only every few months. Such refueling would be accomplished by skilled technicians at a central point and thus atomic rail power may ultimately eliminate today's complex of fueling stations, just as the diesel locomotive made obsolete the extensive watering stations required in the days of steam power.

If such a locomotive is practical today, what, then, is the future of atomic power on our Nation's railroads? Certainly none of us expects to see atomic energy revolutionizing rail operations overnight. More accurately it will be the continued evolution of man's ingenuity.

The price of atomic fuel is still high and the cost of the initial unit, not even including developmental costs, will exceed $1 million. Yet experts predict that the railroads can have their first atomic locomotives in operation by 1960, and by 1970 they should be justifying their existence, economically, in long-haul, high-speed service. Not long thereafter they should be able to compete with conventional locomotives under all heavy-duty operating conditions.

The atomic locomotive is only a glimpse into one facet of the future being shaped by the atomic age; one glimmer of the effects it will have on our economy. Certainly the ever-increasing peaceful uses of this energy source will attract tremendous private capital investment, thus expanding the entire economy. In industry, in agriculture, in medicine, in countless ways, the energy of the atom will serve mankind.

The application of atomic energy to rail transportation may, in a sense, be symbolic, for this new age can usher in an era of solidly expanding prosperity which will rival or surpass the great period of expansion which the railroads brought to America in the last century.

Dinosaur National Park Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 26, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, with our growing population and the added freedom of movement of our Nation's people, and with the National Park System finding itself hard pressed to meet these growing demands, I wonder at the position taken by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in creating a stumbling block to a proposal for a new national park. Last week, Congressman WAYNE ASPINALL and myself introduced a bill to make the Dinosaur National Monument a fully accredited national park concluding that this was the natural and honest thing to do for this area that Congress and the President have decided is no longer a part of the upper Colorado River storage project. The many thousands of conservationists who fought the battle to resist invasion of the area are convinced that it is of national park caliber and needs to be given the protection as well as the advantages of national park status.

Senator WATKINS, of Utah, has found it necessary to express himself about the Dinosaur National Park bill, according to the Salt Lake Tribune, of April 19, by making a statement that the conservationists in supporting this bill acted in a "disturbing breech of faith." Senator WATKINS reportedly said that the conservationists had agreed to a review by the Interior Department of possible alternative sites—"yet before this program had a chance to get off the ground the conservationist-sponsored bill was offered to remove the necessity for any review."

The good Senator from Utah went on to say that Echo Park Dam had been shelved for the indefinite future, and he hopes the conservationists would show their good faith and withdraw their support of any such legislation prior to the completion and review of the Secretary's study of alternatives.

There is obviously no basis of truth to this silly accusation and it is perfectly obvious that the conservationists would never have agreed to a temporary withdrawal of Echo Park Dam which is what Senator WATKINS' proposal amounts to. The conservationists emphatically deny that they have ever considered awaiting the study of alternative sites. They are interested only in Dinosaur and only as a site for a national park. Senator WATKINS is apparently determined to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent Dinosaur from getting national park protection because it appears that he is still determined to thwart the will of the people and the express desire of Congress by flooding out the most impressive part of Dinosaur National Monument.

In this connection I would like to present for the RECORD a telegram from David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club, in answer to the article in the Salt Lake Tribune of April 19.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 24, 1956.*

Telegram to Senator WATKINS and the Salt Lake Tribune:

The proposal to establish the Dinosaur National Park is completely consonant with the agreement between conservationists and proponents of the Colorado River storage project. Your comments on the agreement, as reported in the Salt Lake Tribune April 19, are not correct. Here are the facts:

1. Last July the Colorado project bill was doomed, according to whip pools, to inevitable defeat in the House of Representatives because Echo Park Dam was not clearly eliminated. The so-called time-bomb amendment, calling for a study of Echo Park and alternatives, was not acceptable to conservationists and was rejected by the House Interior Committee.

2. In a full page ad in the Denver Post, which appeared the day before you and other project proponents held your Denver strategy meeting, the council of conservationists called for elimination of Echo Park Dam or "any secret hopes" for it.

3. On November 1 the project proponents announced after the Denver conference ended that Echo Park Dam was eliminated. Senator ANDERSON added, "in any form."

4. On November 29 Secretary McKay acquiesced in the Denver action. In answer to my question he said that the project was feasible without Echo Park Dam. In his public statement he added that the Department would "be prepared to recommend alternate action."

5. To underline the sincerity of the action in dropping Echo Park, you and the other proponents in Congress agreed to put in the Colorado Project Act the provision that "it is the intention of Congress that no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of this act shall be within any national park or monument."

6. Thereupon the conservation organizations withdrew their opposition to the Colorado project bill. It passed the House March 1 by a 120-vote margin. You will recall hearing in the final debate on the floor of the House, when you came in to observe, the repeated assurance that Echo Park was really out. This assurance, we feel, brought you victory. The Senate House conferees stood firm, and S. 500, with Echo Park eliminated without qualification, became law.

Considering these facts, I believe you can understand the concern caused by the statement you are reported to have made that you would strongly oppose the creation of the Dinosaur National Park and that you question the good faith of conservationists supporting the proposal. We ask what restriction would be imposed by a Dinosaur Park that you did not accept when you joined your colleagues in agreeing that Echo Park Dam was out, and that neither that dam nor any other Colorado project dam would be in any national park or monument.

Conservationists have held all along that Dinosaur deserves national park status. The Salt Lake Tribune has editorialized that the "time is ripe for developing Dinosaur Park." It can be one of the finest parks in the entire national park system.

At no time did I pledge, as executive director of the Sierra Club or as chairman of the Natural Resources Council of America or in any other capacity that the park status move would await a study of alternatives by the Secretary, as you are reported to have said. To my knowledge, no other conservationists have urged or indicated this. Nor can I understand why you should raise such a question in view of your having joined the agreement to drop Echo Park Dam and to add to the act the conservation proviso mentioned above. We hope you will not jeopardize the appropriations necessary to get your historic project under way by allowing Congress and the Nation's citizens to infer that Echo Park Dam is still so much alive in your mind that you would oppose creation of a great Dinosaur National Park. I hope that you will instead give this park your full support, as a primeval scenic asset to be appropriately developed for Utah and the Nation.

DAVID R. BROWER,
Executive Director, Sierra Club.

I would also like to insert for the RECORD a telegram to the editor of the Salt Lake Tribune signed by the three conservation groups who led the upper Colorado fight to protect Dinosaur:

APRIL 24, 1956.

SALT LAKE TRIBUNE,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Letter to the Editor:

We see by statements attributed to Senator WATKINS in the April 19 edition of the Salt Lake Tribune, that he has attacked the conservation organizations that stopped the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument and accused them of acting in bad faith on their recent support of Congressman ASPINALL'S bill to give Dinosaur national park status. The undersigned groups who represented the united conservationists' effort would like to keep the record straight by outlining three simple facts:

1. The drive to get park status for Dinosaur is the joint effort of all conservation organizations who supported the previous fight. None of the original organizations has any intention of withdrawing from this position.

2. Any statement that the conservationists have agreed to await the study of alternative sites (as Senator WATKINS was reported to have said) is a complete fabrication—throughout this controversy, conserva-

tionists have had no direct concern with any dam or reservoir site which did not involve protected land and have never compromised their determination to remove Echo Park Dam from the project once and for all.

3. Any determined effort on the part of Senator WATKINS to prevent national park status for Dinosaur can have only one motivation—that is to make it easier to restore Echo Park Dam in spite of the public will and the express desire of Congress that no dam or reservoir shall be constructed within any national park or monument in connection with the upper Colorado project. We confidently believe that the Watkins subterfuge will not work now or at any subsequent time and we further believe that it is in the best interest of everyone that this remarkable area be properly developed.

IRA GABRIELSON,
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, D. C.
FRED SMITH,
Council of Conservationists, New York City.
ANSEL ADAMS,
Trustees for Conservation, San Francisco, Calif.

I would also like to include in my remarks the resolution of the Izaak Walton League of America passed during their 34th annual convention in Sioux City, Iowa, April 19 to 21, 1956, just 3 days after the introduction of the Dinosaur National Park bill. I am sure that the members will also be interested in the statement of J. W. Penfold, the league's national conservation director, indicating the unanimous endorsement of this resolution by the delegates to the convention.

ENDORSEMENT OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE 34TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, SIOUX CITY, IOWA, APRIL 19-21, 1956

The Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., in annual convention assembled in Sioux City, Iowa, April 21, 1956, heartily commends the congressional delegations of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming for their successful leadership in securing enactment of an upper Colorado River storage project which excludes Echo Park Dam and firmly protects national parks and monuments from dams and reservoirs constructed under the project authorization.

The Izaak Walton League further heartily commends the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, and the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, for having introduced legislation in the House of Representatives (H. R. 10614 and H. R. 10635) which will create of Dinosaur National Monument a great new national park and thereby assure the permanent protection and preservation of the unique and irreplaceable natural valuse of this magnificent river, canyon, and benchland area and provides for the orderly development of this new national park for the full use and enjoyment of the American people.

The Izaak Walton League of America therefore calls upon all conservationists throughout the land to support this legislation and assure its speedy enactment.

STATEMENT OF J. W. PENFOLD, NATIONAL CONSERVATION DIRECTOR OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

DENVER, COLO.—The Izaak Walton League of America heartily endorses and supports the Aspinall-Saylor bill which would create a great new national park in the Green and Yampa canyon area of Colorado and Utah now included in Dinosaur National Monument. The statement was issued by J. W. Penfold, Denver, the league's national conservation director, upon his return from the league's 34th annual convention held last week in Sioux City, Iowa.

"Over 600 delegates from every State in the Nation, and Alaska voted unanimously for this resolution," Penfold said, "and they are prepared to urge their representatives in Congress to take favorable action on the bill as speedily as possible.

"The Izaak Walton League," Penfold continued, "has urged this action for several years, although we realized that specific bills would be premature until after Congress had disposed of the Echo Park Dam controversy. It is most encouraging, and a source of pride to Pennsylvanians, that Congressman JOHN SAYLOR has taken the lead to secure authorization for Dinosaur National Park. As a national park this magnificent area will be assured of adequate funds for its development for full use and enjoyment by the public.

"Congressman SAYLOR has made an enviable record among conservationists the nation over for his able, effective battling to preserve the national park system and to perpetuate the natural resources upon which healthful outdoor recreation depends. His vigorous defense of Dinosaur National Monument, in which the Bureau of Reclamation sought to construct Echo Park Dam, in no small measure was responsible for deletion of this objectionable feature of the upper Colorado River project. The solid ranks of conservationists in opposition to Echo Park Dam convinced project proponents that a project containing Echo Park Dam could not pass Congress. Echo Park Dam, consequently was deleted.

"The resolution adopted by the nationwide conservation group," Penfold concluded, "commends Mr. SAYLOR and Mr. ASPINALL for their introducing this national park legislation and calls on all conservationists to support it."

The final insertion that I would like to have permission to present for the RECORD is a statement from an advertisement appearing in today's issue of the Washington Post signed by the Council of Conservationists:

NOW IS THE TIME TO MAKE DINOSAUR A NATIONAL PARK

Last week, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, took the floor in the House of Representatives to introduce a bill:

"Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to preserve in a natural condition as a national park for the benefit and inspiration of present and future generations, the nationally important scenic grandeur, geologic phenomena, and scientific features of those portions of the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that are now contained in the Dinosaur National Monument, Colorado and Utah, there is hereby established * * * the Dinosaur National Park."

At the same time an identical bill was introduced by Representative JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania.

Thus was voiced the cherished desire of millions of Americans whose determination made it utterly impossible to bring the mammoth upper Colorado River Basin project into being until it was stripped of Echo Park Dam and Reservoir, which threatened to ruin Dinosaur National Monument—the priceless area which, it is now proposed, should "be preserved, protected, and administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of present and future generations in accordance with the basic policies established by the Congress for the preservation of the national parks."

FURTHER PROTECTION IS ESSENTIAL

Never before has a national park been established by nationwide popular demand; but there is more than popular sentiment behind the determination to secure permanent national park protection for this incomparably beautiful, historically important, area; in Congress itself there is a determination to protect it permanently from invasion by private interests, and from the threat which is hard to kill: the still persisting effort, in some parts of the West, to get Dinosaur dammed and flooded. A local Utah politician is reported to have promised that the bitterly fought Echo Park Dam is "surer now than ever before." Only this week, there is reported the beginning of a drive planned to stop Dinosaur National Park in its tracks. Senator WATKINS, of Utah, arch foe of conservationists and national park friends in the Echo Park battle, is now quoted in Salt Lake City papers as accusing conservationists of bad faith in promoting national park status for Dinosaur. He says that conservationists agreed to do nothing until alternative sites for his dam could be studied. This is a false, trumped-up charge, which has no basis whatever in fact.

With Dinosaur a bona fide national park, all potential invaders would have to face a most powerful weapon: the congressional protection afforded a national park. The battle would finally be won.

THE LEGISLATORS KEPT THEIR WORD

Victory (for the time being) came in the Echo Park struggle because men of stanch integrity in the House and Senate (even though many of them favored Echo Park Dam), listened to the persistent pleas of conservationists, women's club leaders, national park lovers, outdoor club leaders, and thousands upon thousands of independent, unaffiliated people, who begged and pleaded, in letters, in telegrams, on the telephone, and in person, "Don't dam Dinosaur." These legislators, led by New Mexico's Senator ANDERSON, and California's Representative CLAIR ENGLE, and ably assisted by such directly interested western leaders as Montana's Senator MURRAY, Congressmen ASPINALL, of Colorado, DAWSON, of Utah, and METCALF, of Montana, and nonwesterners like JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, agreed that Echo Dam was not essential to the plan, and therefore it was unnecessary to invade Dinosaur Monument. As a result of public reaction these men assured conservationist leaders that Echo Park Dam would be dropped from the project, and it was. The American people owe a debt of gratitude to Senator ANDERSON and his Senate colleagues, and to Representatives ASPINALL and ENGLE and their House colleagues, for carrying out their word in spite of heavy political pressures from several sides. It was not easy to do.

HELP US PRESERVE THIS REMARKABLE AREA

The Nation needs more national parks—more natural areas that provide retreat and escape from the strains and trials of city life. Our national parks are a vital resource—and one we are rapidly outgrowing. There are too few natural recreational areas left—and too many people who need them.

The present Dinosaur National Monument, which under the new bills would become a park, is not only an area of scenic splendor. True, it is one of the world's most wondrous sites—hills, terraces, massive and colorful rock formations that tower high as a skyscraper, raging rivers, and all the rest. But Dinosaur is far more; it is the whole story of millions of years of the earth's life. The story is all there for anyone to see, more complete and more graphic, perhaps, than in any other place on earth.

The remains of long-extinct, 50-ton dinosaurs are the start of the story, the record of what life was like a million centuries ago. The erosions of the wild, foaming river, the mountain that it gnawed in two, the hogback ridges that nature left, the sharp vertical cliffs and the flat mesas—all these are chapters in a long, uninterrupted tale of the earth and its inhabitants adapting to changing conditions. The pictographs of prehistoric Pueblo basket-makers, scratched 3,000

years ago on the sides of canyons, unfold a story of a too-contented life that drifted into nothingness in a dim, distant era—a story that even a school child can read, in a general way, just by walking past a wall. The full record of animal life in Dinosaur's canyons has yet to be established—even by the experts; but when the park is improved, many of the almost-extinct creatures which we know once lived there will be back, protected by the National Park Service. Dinosaur was explored only a few years ago, and perhaps it never was explored completely; but the far reaches of this surprising area already have turned up random chapters of the old West, such as the placard that reads: "To all who this may consarn that I Pat Lynch do lay claim on this botom for my home and support. Wrote the 8th month of 1886 by P. Lynch."

Who can describe even sketchily the incredible world of man and nature that lies within Dinosaur's remarkable acres? What can one really say about it—except that it straddles the Utah-Colorado border, a little south of where that border meets Wyoming, and there it should stay, unharmed, for our children, coming in jet planes and gas-turbined speedsters, to wonder at. Wallace Stegner, in "This Is Dinosaur" (a brilliantly illustrated book well worth enjoying) has this to say:

"To this moment, at least, the Green and Yampa Canyons (in Dinosaur) have been saved intact, a wilderness that is the property of all Americans, a 325-square-mile preserve that is part schoolroom and part playground and part—the best part—sanctuary from a world paved with concrete, jet-propelled, smog-blanketed, sterilized, overinsured, aseptic, a world mass-produced with interchangeable parts, and with every natural beautiful thing endangered by the raw engineering power of the 20th century."

If only because everywhere we turn progress is taking so great a toll, it is essential that we cling desperately to the little natural wilderness beauty we have left. Dinosaur's beauty is unmatched, its charm incredible.

Will you join us in urging Congress to enact the Dinosaur National Park bill in this session—before it is too late? Your Senators and Congressmen will be glad to hear from you about this.

Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N. Y., Executive Committee: Fred Smith, Director, New York, N. Y.; Horace M. Albright, New York, N. Y.; David R. Brower, San Francisco, Calif.; Ira N. Gabrielson, Washington, D. C.; Joseph Penfold, Denver, Colo.; Howard Zahniser, Hyattsville, Md.

These statements prove conclusively that the conservationists will go all out to give Dinosaur park status and assure that a dam will never be built within its boundaries.

An editorial challenge in the Denver Post of April 22 in support of the proposal to make Dinosaur a park states:

Will all the Congressmen who opposed Echo Park Dam line up with alacrity to support the Aspinall-Saylor bill? Will garden clubs and bird clubs and hiking clubs and other groups pass resolutions, write their Congressmen, and testify on behalf of the bill? Will outdoor writers deluge magazines and newspapers with articles about the importance of developing Dinosaur, now that it has been saved?

They will unless most of the opposition to Echo Park Dam was phony. We will just have to wait and see.

I can assure the Denver Post that the same conservationists are committed to finish the job they started.

When Congressman ASPINALL and myself introduced the Dinosaur Park bill we thought, as did conservationists, that it was a natural culmination—but we suddenly found ourselves confronted with Senator WATKINS who, if his statements are correctly reported in the Salt Lake Tribune, has no intention of allowing the area to become a park because he still believes, contrary to the will of the people and the Congress of the United States, that Echo Park Dam will be built. This seems to be a private project of Senator WATKINS and only when viewed in the light of a private project could one realize his intentions. He knows that the bill authorizing the upper Colorado River storage project was passed because conservationists withdrew their opposition when he, along with other upper basin legislators, agreed that Echo Park Dam would not be built. Why then does Senator WATKINS seemingly continue to fabricate opposition for the park bill?